SYMBOLAE PHILOLOGORUM POSNANIENSIUM GRAECAE ET LATINAE XXVII/1 • 2017
pp. 17–40 ISBN ISSN 0302-7384
DOI: 10.14746/sppgl.2017.XXVII.1.2

SILVIO BÄR

Universitetet i Oslo, Institutt for filosofi,
idé- og kunsthistorie og klassiske språk, Georg Morgenstiernes hus,
Blindernveien 31, NO-0313 Oslo

COMPOSITION, VOICES, AND THE POETOLOGICAL PROGRAMME IN THE *CARMINA ANACREONTEA*

ABSTRACT. Bär Silvio, Composition, voices, and the poetological programme in the *Carmina Anacreontea* (Kompozycja, głosy i program poetycki w *Carmina Anacreontea*).

In this article it is argued that various (and partly conflicting) voices of different speakers emerge from the *Carmina Anacreontea* and that they invite the readers to actively engage in a productive dialogue with the collection.

Keywords: Anacreon; *Carmina Anacreontea*; collection; composition; voices; identity; speaker; poetological programme; *Dichterweihe; recusatio* model; coherence; active reader.

The *Carmina Anacreontea* (*CA*) is a collection of sixty ancient Greek poems,[1] written by several anonymous authors from various centuries whose dates range from the late Hellenistic to the early Byzantine periods.[2] The collection was assembled probably in the 6th century, transmitted in a single manuscript from the 10th century (cod. Paris. Suppl. gr. 384 [sigl. P], Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris), and first edited by the French humanist and philologist Henricus Stephanus (Henri Estienne, 1531–1598) in 1554.[3] Fundamentally, all poems from the collection recreate the poetic sphere of their literary model, the archaic Greek poet Anacreon (c. 575–495 BC); however, for the most part the imitation of, and dialogue with, Anacreon is reduced "to the stereotype of the

[1] Textual editions used in this article: BBDSZ for *Carmina Anacreontea*; Gentili 1958 for Anacreon. Other editions of the *CA* include Brioso Sánchez 1981; West 1984a/^{2}1993; Guichard 2012. For Anacreon, cf. also *PMG*; Braghetti 1994; Rozokoki 2006; Leo 2015. Translations from Greek are my own unless otherwise stated.

[2] West (^{2}1993: xvi–xviii) distinguishes between four stages of composition: *CA* 1–20 (without 2, 3, 5); *CA* 21–34 (+ 3?); *CA* 35–53 (+ 2 and 5?); *CA* 54–60 (+ 2 and 5?). This grouping is largely regarded as *communis opinio*; however, there is disagreement about the dating of certain individual poems (cf. especially Brioso Sánchez 1970). Cf. Baumbach and Dümmler (2014b: 4, n. 8) for further references.

[3] The collection's history of transmission is sketched by Weiss (1989: 4–45) and Rosenmeyer (1992: 1–11).

wine-drinking poet who sings about his love affairs with beautiful boys and girls",[4] whereas other typically anacreontic themes are largely neglected.[5]

Our interpretation of the *CA* entails three methodological challenges. One such challenge is the fact that the poetic production of Anacreon himself is available to us only in fragments, and as a result of this it is often difficult (if not virtually impossible) to establish the intertextual relations between individual poems of the *CA* and their literary models (especially so on the level of verbal intertextuality).[6] Another point is the degree of the collection's literariness. In numerous poems, the atmosphere is strongly sympotic, and this may suggest a performative context.[7] However, it is, in my opinion, crucial to acknowledge that the collection first and foremost evokes a sympotic context in the reader's *mind*; the sympotic atmosphere that is created is part of the imagined performative context which results from the stereotypes associated with Anacreon and the archaic drink-song culture. Consequently, the *CA* deliberately oscillates between a performative setting (which may, or may not, have had a *Sitz im Leben*) and its status as a literary product which is the result of a centuries-long tradition of composing and collecting anacreontic poetry.[8] A final aspect to consider is the collection's organisation. Evidently, the individual poems stem from different authors and periods; however, from a receptional point of view, we are faced with a coherent unity all the same. In Rosenmeyer's (1992: 115–116) words, "an editor compiled the present anthology from numerous previous smaller collections, adding his own and other contemporary poets' anacreontic compositions to the pre-existing selections"; hence, we can indeed claim that the "anacreontic collection which has come down to us is clearly a composite work".

Indeed, it may seem a truism to state that we should not read individual poems of a poetic collection in isolation, and that the organisation, structure and composition of a collection feeds back onto the interpretation of the individual poems – and *vice versa*. As Goldberg (2009: 133) aptly phrases it, "what ancient books actually looked like, how they circulated, how they were read, and how they were regarded by ancient readers bore some significant relation to the creation of and response to

[4] Bernsdorff 2014: 11.

[5] An overview of the thematic range of Anacreon's poetry is provided by Bagordo 2011: 214–215. According to Giuseppe Giangrande, Anacreon should also be credited as the inventor of the epigrammatic genre (cf. e.g. Giangrande 2011: 28).

[6] On some recognisable cases of verbal intertextuality between the poems of the *CA* and the existing fragments of Anacreon, cf. Rosenmeyer 1992: 52–62.

[7] For example, West (1990: 273, 275) argues that the "sympotic scenes evoked […] show us something of real-life festivity in the Roman or early Byzantine period" and that they contain "details drawn from real life". Cf. also Danielewicz 1986; Flaschenriem 1992: 53–56; Ladianou 2005; Most 2014: 153–159. For evidence of the performance of archaic Greek lyric at Roman feasts, cf. e.g. Plut. *Mor.* 622c, 711b; Gell. *Noct. Att.* 19.9.1–6, 2.22.1–2.

[8] Cf., along those lines, Rudolph 2014: 139: "the literaricity of the text does not emancipate itself from its contextualisation but rather unfolds itself in it."

what they contained."[9] Nevertheless, in the case of the *CA*, "scholarship has […] mainly focused upon formal aspects of the collection such as questions of dialect, authenticity, dating, and textual criticism", as Baumbach and Dümmler (2014b: 4) recently have stated.[10] Therefore, in this article I will, in essence, argue that the *CA* collection as it stands should be regarded and analysed as a coherent literary corpus, although it is clearly *not* the product of one author and one period, and that various (and partly conflicting) voices of different speakers emerge from these poems. These voices in turn invite the reader of the collection to actively engage in this productive dialogue and to continue the writing process which initially had been passed from Anacreon to his follower. The ideal reader of the *CA* is thus an active reader who engages with his reading to an extent that he is gradually transformed into a poet himself.

DICHTERWEIHE, THE *RECUSATIO* MODEL, AND THE VOICES IN THE OPENING POEMS

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 1 BBDSZ** (= 1 West)

Ἀνακρέων ἰδών με	Anacreon, upon seeing me,	1
ὁ Τήϊος μελῳδός	The singer from Teos,	2
ὄναρ λέγων προσεῖπεν·	Speaking in a dream, he addressed me.	3
κἀγὼ δραμὼν πρὸς αὐτόν	And I, running towards him,	4
περιπλάκην φιλήσας.	Gave him a hug and kissed him.	5
γέρων μὲν ἦν, καλὸς δέ,	He was indeed an old man, but good-looking;	6
καλὸς δὲ καὶ φίλευνος·	Yes, good-looking, and a lover of beds!	7
τὸ χεῖλος ὤζεν οἴνου·	His lips smelled of wine;	8
τρέμοντα δ' αὐτὸν ἤδη	As he was staggering already,	9
Ἔρως ἐχειραγώγει.	Eros led him by the hand.	10
ὁ δ' ἐξελὼν καρήνου	And taking his wreath off his head,	11
ἐμοὶ στέφος δίδωσι·	He gave it to me;	12
τὸ δ' ὤζ' Ἀνακρέοντος.	It smelled of Anacreon.	13
ἐγὼ δ' ὁ μωρὸς ἄρας	And I, foolish me!, took it up	14
ἐδησάμην μετώπῳ·	And bound it round my forehead.	15
καὶ δῆθεν ἄχρι καὶ νῦν	And since then up until now	16
Ἔρωτος οὐ πέπαυμαι.	I don't cease from Eros.	17

[9] The quote is from a review of Hutchinson's (2008) monograph and the collected volume by Johnson and Parker (2009). Another important study in the field of book culture and reading practice is Bing's (2009) collection of essays. Furthermore, cf. the so-called 'New Posidippus', and the volume by Gutzwiller (2005a), which centres on questions about the structure and organisation of Hellenistic poetry books (cf. especially Johnson 2005 and Gutzwiller 2005b in this volume).

[10] One notable exception is the holistic approach to the *CA* taken by Danielewicz (1986: 41), who argues that the "very fact of collecting [the poems] as a separated group resulted from the conviction that they were a separate literary genre", and that consequently, "the question of generic qualification" of the collection was "simply determined by the existing collection". Cf. also Weiss 1989: 46–49.

This poem initiates the poetological programme of the entire collection; it sets the tone and the frame within which the poems and the voices of the collection are going to enter into a dialogue with their 'father' Anacreon.[11] To begin with, it is important to note that the speaker is clearly *not* disguised as Anacreon – we are *not* presented with an anacreontic poem in the sense that it pretends to be written by Anacreon in a pseudepigraphic manner, since the first line unmistakably distinguishes between the 'real' Anacreon, the old poet, and the poem's speaker, that is, Anacreon's imitator and follower, whose identity remains nebulous.[12] The poem's programmatically epigonic character is thus obvious from the very beginning. Anacreon, the model, is described with reference to the most common stereotypes about him and his poetry: he is identified as the historical singer from the Ionian city of Teos, and the main parameters with which his poetry was commonly associated are prominently mentioned, namely: physical beauty, youth vs old age, love and sex, the personified figure of Eros, wine and garlands. As previously mentioned, a sympotic atmosphere is a recurring feature in the majority of the poems in this collection. In this particular poem, one salient feature of such a context is the smell of wine that comes from Anacreon's lips and his wreath (lines 8 and 13). As Bartol (1993: 69) rightly mentions, this almost synaesthetic description is not only an allusion to the stereotype of Anacreon as a drunken old man and an author of sympotic poems, but it is also reminiscent of the topos of a divine scent that heralds a divine epiphany – as can be identified, for example, in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, where the goddess's appearance is accompanied by a sweet fragrance that emanates from her dress (lines 277–278).[13] Furthermore, as several scholars have noted,[14] the oneiric frame of the poetic inspiration ties in with the widespread topos of the *Dichterweihe* in a dream[15] – as we may observe, for example, in Callimachus' prologue to the *Aetia* (Callimachus is said to have been carried to Mount Helicon, the place where, according to *Theogony* 22–28, Hesiod had previously been awarded his position as a poet by the Muses when he was tending sheep),[16] or

[11] Cf. on this poem Brioso Sánchez 1979; Rosenmeyer 1992: 63–70; Bartol 1993; Hopkinson 1994: 72–73; Lambin 2002: 173–175; Müller 2010: 124–131; Rudolph 2014: 139–141; Most 2014: 152–153; Zotou 2014: 23–29; BBDSZ: 154–155.

[12] For a comprehensive discussion of ancient pseudepigrapha, cf. Peirano 2012.

[13] On the passage, cf. the commentary by Richardson (1974: 252) with further references. The passage is quoted by Hopkinson (1994: 72) as a parallel to *CA* 1.

[14] Cf. Brioso 1979: 5–8; Rosenmeyer 1992: 65; Bartol 1993: 65–68; Hopkinson 1994: 72; Zotou 2014: 25.

[15] It is clear that it is the speaker's dream, not Anacreon's; there is no need to change the transmitted text from ὄναρ λέγων to ὄναρ λέγω, as most editors do (cf. my remarks at Bär 2016a: 1083, *pace* West 1984: 206).

[16] Call. *Aet.* 1 fr. 2.1–2 Pf.; cf. *Anth. Pal.* 7.42.1; Prop. 2.34.32; Schol. Flor. ad Call. *Aet.* 1 fr. 2 Pf.; cf. the discussion by Kambylis 1965: 104–109, and the commentary by Harder 2012, vol. 2: 93–102 for discussion and references.

in Ennius' prologue to the *Annales* (Ennius encounters Homer in his dream).[17] Consequently, in this initial poem Anacreon is not only a profane source of poetic inspiration to the speaker, but he is also virtually awarded divine status; his appearance is that of a god with inspirational power similar to that of a Muse.

Another aspect that requires attention is that of the relation between the *persona* Anacreon and the speaker in this poem. On the one hand, the speaker shows great admiration and enthusiasm for his model, as in his dream he runs towards him and hugs and kisses him (lines 3–5); and the speaker's own position as a poet is nobilitated by way of his quasi-divine source of inspiration – he virtually becomes a divinely inspired poet like, for example, Hesiod. On the other hand, the speaker's elevation to the spheres of the poets is not viewed solely in positive terms: the speaker qualifies himself as "foolish" (μωρός, line 14) because he unsolicitously seized and bound Anacreon's wreath around his forehead, as a result of which he is no longer able to "cease from Eros" (Ἔρωτος οὐ πέπαυμαι, line 17). Bartol (1993: 69–70) rightly argues that the act of crowning links back to a common sympotic practice, but is also a stereotype of vocation and honour;[18] and along those same lines, the phrase Ἔρωτος οὐ πέπαυμαι not only refers to the speaker's state as being charmed by Anacreon, even being in love with him (a homoerotic atmosphere is clearly created at the beginning of the poem), but it also highlights the speaker's freshly acquired role as the author of anacreontic poetry: "I don't cease from Eros" also means "I can't stop writing erotic poetry."

At the same time, this 'I can't stop it'-motif invokes yet another topos: the idea that poetic knowledge and abilities come at a high price. This idea is as old as the *Odyssey*, in which it is reported that the bard Demodocus received his poetic inspiration by the Muses in exchange for his eyesight; the Muses granted him the ability to compose poetry and to sing, but instead made him blind (*Od.* 8.63–64).[19] Our poetic speaker here is in a similar situation since he too had to pay a price for his poetic inspiration: to be compelled to continually compose anacreontic poetry, as he had become 'spell-bound' by Anacreon and his poetic influence. The strongly programmatic character of the last line is thus further

[17] Enn. *Ann.* 1, frr. i–xii Skutsch; cf. the commentary by Skutsch (1985: 142–170) for discussion and references. For further passages testifying to the topos of the oneiric inspiration of poets, cf. Brioso Sánchez 1979: 5–8; Rosenmeyer 1992: 65, n. 28; Bartol 1993: 66–67, n. 21; Fountoulakis 2002: 301–302.

[18] Cf. Bartol 1993: 69: "Es ist hervorzuheben, daß der Kranz in der griechischen Tradition nicht nur ein untrennbares Attribut des Gelages war, sondern auch das Zeichen von Würde, Amt und Weihe, auch der Dichterweihe. Die Bekränzung des Dichters wurde allmählich zu einem Topos und symbolisierte, daß eine Gottheit dem Träger des Kranzes (also dem Dichter) beisteht." Cf. further Deubner 1933: 78–88 and Kambylis 1965: 173–176 (quoted by Bartol 1993: 69, nn. 39–42). On the different uses and sociocultural importance of wreaths in ancient Greece, cf. the monograph by Blech 1982.

[19] On the topos of the blind bard/singer and/or poet, cf. Bowra 1952: 420–422; Buxton 1980: 27–30; Strauss Clay 1983: 11–12.

enhanced: we, the readers, can rest assured that we are going to hear more of this type of poetry because our new anacreontic poet will remain spell-bound since he was inspired and nobilitated by his model.

Indeed, we do hear more of this type of poetry in the subsequent poem:

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 2 BBDSZ** (= 2 West)

Δότε μοι λύρην Ὁμήρου	Give me Homer's lyre	1
φονίης ἄνευθε χορδῆς·	Without the murderous chord!	2
φέρε μοι κύπελλα θεσμῶν,	Bring me the cups of the rites,	3
φέρε μοι· νόμους κεράσσω,	Bring them to me! I'm going to add melodies[20]	4
μεθύων ὅπως χορεύσω,	So that I can dance when I'm drunk,	5
ὑπὸ σώφρονος δὲ λύσσης	And that, by moderate frenzy,	6
μετὰ βαρβίτων ἀείδων	Singing with my string instruments,	7
τὸ παροίνιον βοήσω·	I can shout my drinking song.	8
δότε μοι λύρην Ὁμήρου	Give me Homer's lyre	9
φονίης ἄνευθε χορδῆς.	Without the murderous chord!	10

The speaker's wish to compose poetry in the style of Homer, but "without the murderous chord", relates to the typically Hellenistic *recusatio* of grave epic poetry in favour of lighter love poetry, communicated in the form of an incontestable divine order – as it can be found prominently, for example, in Callimachus' prologue to the *Aetia* (Apollo instructs Callimachus to keep his Muse slender and to pursue untrodden paths),[21] or in the opening poem to Ovid's *Amores* (Cupid forces the Ovidian *poeta* to renounce war epic in favour of elegiac poetry by piercing his chest with an arrow).[22] To be precise, the *recusatio* model here is distributed between the two opening poems of our collection, notably, in reverse order: the favouring of love poetry is introduced first (*CA* 1.17) before the actual rejection of war epic follows (*CA* 2.1–2, 9–10).[23] Thus, it can be firmly stated that "these two poems serve as an introduction to the entire corpus", as Zotou (2014: 30) puts it;[24] indeed, the rejection of war epic is a recurrent topic in several poems of the collection (*CA* 6; 13; 23; 26). Simultaneously, this programmatic *recusatio* also establishes an intertextual link to Anacreon's own poetological

[20] On the translation of νόμους (*CA* 2.4) as "melodies", cf. Rosenmeyer 1992: 128; Zotou 2014: 31–32; my remarks at Bär 2016a: 1089, *pace* West 2015.

[21] Call. *Aet.* 1 1.21–28 Pf.; cf. the commentary by Harder 2012, vol. 2: 55–68 for discussion and references.

[22] Ov. *Am.* 1; cf. the commentary by McKeown 1989: 7–30 for discussion and references. Furthermore, cf. Bretzigheimer 2001: 12–18.

[23] On the *recusatio* model, cf. e.g. Cameron 1995: 455–483; Bretzigheimer 2001: 12–13; Harder 2012, vol. 2: 55. Typically, the *recusatio* model does not coalesce with an actual *Dichterweihe* as it does here, but, rather, it insinuates a change or a specific direction which an already established poet is compelled to take in his career (as in the two paradigmatic examples mentioned here: a special style of writing in the case of Callimachus, a specific genre in the case of Ovid).

[24] "Diese beiden Gedichte dienen als Einführung für das gesamte Corpus."

programme (transmitted at Athen. 11.463a): in the form of a personalised rejection, Anacreon here renounces epic poetry as thematically incompatible with the joyful topics of sympotic poetry and festivity.

Anacreon fr. 56 G. (= *eleg.* 2 IEG)[25]

Οὐ φίλος ὃς κρητῆρι παρὰ πλέῳ οἰνοποτάων	1
νείκεα καὶ πόλεμον δακρυόεντα λέγει,	2
ἀλλ᾽ ὅστις Μουσέων τε καὶ ἁγλαὰ δῶρ᾽ Ἀφροδίτης	3
συμμίσγων ἐρατῆς μνήσκεται εὐφροσύνης.	4
He is not my friend who, drinking wine at the full bowl,	1
Speaks of quarrels and tear-causing war,	2
But the one who mixes the shining gifts of the Muses and those of Aphrodite	3
And thus recalls the lovely merriment.	4

CA 2 creates a clear intertextual link to Anacreon's statement in this poem: the two framing lines and, especially, the phrase φονίης ἄνευθε χορδῆς (lines 2 and 10) take up Anacreon's phrase νείκεα καὶ πόλεμον δακρυόεντα, and the phrase νόμους κεράσσω (line 4) echoes the participle συμμίσγων in the last line of Anacreon's poem.[26] Via this intertextual link, the speaker of *CA* 2 (who otherwise remains silent about his identity) turns out to be a fervent admirer of Anacreon; he is someone who implements Anacreon's call for a combination of "the shining gifts of the Muses and those of Aphrodite", someone who explicitly wishes to achieve the highest level of literary sophistication by calling for "Homer's lyre", but without the element of war and bloodshed. Indeed, the speaker of *CA* 2 seems virtually to be answering Anacreon's call for "the one who mixes" (ὅστις […] / συμμίσγων, lines 3–4) by announcing that he is "going to add melodies" (νόμους κεράσσω, line 4); in other words, he assumes the role of Anacreon's anonymous ὅστις and thus not only enters into a dialogue with his literary 'father', but also fulfils and continues the 'writing assignment'.

In conclusion, we can state that the two opening poems of the *CA* for one thing introduce the topics, the tone and the genre of the collection – primarily by way of the *recusatio* model, which is distributed between the two poems. For another, they are also characterised by a multi-voiced interaction between the poetic *persona* of Anacreon and the speaker. In *CA* 1, Anacreon is portrayed as a quasi-divine figure of poetic inspiration, and the speaker enters into a complex relationship with his literary 'father', whom he views as both a blessing and a curse: first, he embraces Anacreon's appearance with great enthusiasm, but

[25] On this fragment, cf. the commentaries by Braghetti 1994, vol. 2: 175–179 and Rozokoki 2006: 266–268; furthermore, cf. Vox 1990: 40–49.

[26] Zotou (2014: 31), in her commentary on *CA* 2, only cursorily mentions Anacreon fr. 56 G., without considering the verbal intertextuality between the two poems.

subsequently he comes to view the encounter in negative terms when he realises that he is no longer able to cease composing erotic poetry. This ambivalent relationship is crucial for the implementation of the *CA*'s poetological programme: by emphasising his ambivalent attitude towards his 'father', the speaker inaugurates the collection as a polyphonous corpus of poems with different (and potentially conflicting) voices.[27] This complex relationship is further complicated by an implicit ambiguity regarding the (non-)identity of Anacreon and the speaker. As stated above, the non-identity between the two is unequivocally expressed in *CA* 1.1; however, upon further consideration, the strong and insoluble bond between the two figures (including the implied sexual relationship in *CA* 1.3–5), and the successful transfer of poetic knowledge from one to the other (as exemplified by the echo of Anacreon's own poetological programme in *CA* 2), also makes room for the idea that the new anacreontic poet might actually be Anacreon himself.[28] As will be demonstrated and discussed below, some poems of the collection develop this notion further, whereas others adhere to the non-identity as it is initiated in the opening line of the initial poem.

How does the collector of the *CA* relate to all this? To put it simply, he did a good job by choosing these two poems to form the collection's opening because they leave room for virtually all imaginable forms of anacreontic imitations; they permit the incorporation of 'followers' and 'imitators' as well as 'fakers' and 'pseudepigraphists'. Taking this line of thought one step further, I suggest that the voice of the two initial poems could also be read as the collector's voice (who may well have been the author of some of the later poems in the collection), since the collector (like the author) also emerges as a voice even if he is only implicitly present. Seen from this angle, phrases such as Ἔρωτος οὐ πέπαυμαι (*CA* 1.17) and νόμους κεράσσω (*CA* 2.4) could be read not only as statements uttered by a poetic follower or imitator of Anacreon, but also as statements made by the collector, who thus implies that he cannot stop accumulating and arranging anacreontic poems, songs and melodies because he has been infected with an ineffaceable urge to do so.

HIS MASTER'S VOICE

One of the most common (and stereotypical) topoi about Anacreon and his poetry is that of a drunken old man; this is a topos which is often juxtaposed with the

[27] I therefore disagree with Rosenmeyer's (1992: 70) claim that the "newly born 'Anacreon' may mockingly call himself a 'fool' for taking up the wreath, […] but the relationship with his model is one of mutual delight and benefit." – On the relation between the *persona* Anacreon and the speaker in *CA* 1 and 2, cf. also Müller 2010: 124–133.

[28] Cf. Rosenmeyer 1992: 69–70: "The new poet […] actually takes on Anacreon's identity, becomes an Anacreon as a prerequisite to entering the literary circle."

ideal of beauty and young age as well as with the *carpe-diem* motif. This old-age motif pervades the anacreontic collection (cf. *CA* 7; 51; 52A; 53) and is already manifest in several of Anacreon's fragments.[29] *CA* 1 functions as a hinge between Anacreon's poetry and the anacreontic collection since it is explicitly mentioned that the speaker encounters Anacreon as an old man (lines 6, 9–10), a feature the speaker adopts along with his freshly acquired role as a 'new Anacreon'.[30] One poem which deserves attention in this context is *CA* 52A, since it ostensibly exhibits verbal intertextuality with two of Anacreon's fragments:

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 52A BBDSZ** (= 52A West)

Πολιαὶ στέφουσι κάραν·	Grey [hair] garlands my head –	1
δὸς ὕδωρ, βάλ' οἶνον, ὦ παῖ·	Get water, pour wine, boy!	2
τὴν ψυχήν μου κάρωσον.	Stun my soul!	3
βραχὺ μὴ ζῶντα καλύπτεις·	Soon you'll bury me when I'm no longer alive;	4
ὁ θανὼν οὐκ ἐπιθυμεῖ.	Someone who is dead has no desires.	5

Anacreon fr. 36 G. (= 395 *PMG*)[31]

Πολιοὶ μὲν ἡμὶν ἤδη	Grey already are my	1
κρόταφοι κάρη τε λευκὸν,	Temples, and my head is white,	2
χαρίεσσα δ' οὐκετ' ἥβη	And lovely youth exists no more,	3
πάρα, γηράλεοι δ' ὀδόντες·	And old are my teeth.	4
γλυκεροῦ δ' οὐκέτι πολλός	And not much more of sweet	5
βιότου χρόνος λέλειπται.	Lifetime is left.	6
διὰ ταῦτ' ἀνασταλύζω	Because of that I weep	7
θαμὰ Τάρταρον δεδοικώς·	Often, as I fear Tartarus.	8
Ἀίδεω γάρ ἐστι δεινός	The recess of Hades is terrible,	9
μυχός, ἀργαλέη δ' ἐς αὐτόν	And awful is the way down there:	10
κάτοδος· καὶ γὰρ ἑτοῖμον	For it is certain [for the one who]	11
καταβάντι μὴ ἀναβῆναι.	Goes down that he won't come up again.	12

Anacreon fr. 38 G. (= 396 *PMG*)[32]

Φέρ' ὕδωρ, φέρ' οἶνον, ὦ παῖ,	Bring water, bring wine, boy!	1
φέρε <δ'> ἀνθεμεῦντας ἡμίν	And bring us blossoming	2
στεφάνους, ἔνεικον, ὡς δή	Garlands, do bring them, so that	3
πρὸς Ἔρωτα πυκταλίζω.	I can fist fight with Eros.	4

[29] Cf. Anacreon fr. 36 G. (= 395 *PMG*); 71 G. (= 347 *PMG*); 74 G. (= 418 *PMG*); 77 G. (= 420 *PMG*); 84 G. (= 379 *PMG*). Cf. Preisshofen 1977: 71–77 and Tsomis 2001: 256–261.

[30] Bartol (1993: 68) argues that the antithetic qualification of Anacreon as γέρων μὲν ἦν, καλὸς δέ in *CA* 1.6 points to Anacreon's status that meanders between a human and a quasi-divine being.

[31] On this fragment, cf. the commentaries by Braghetti 1994, vol. 1: 118–122 and Rozokoki 2006: 212–215; furthermore, cf. also Preisshofen 1977: 74–77.

[32] On this fragment, cf. the commentaries by Braghetti 1994, vol. 1: 127–130 and Rozokoki 2006: 215–216.

The opening line of *CA* 52A (Πολιαὶ στέφουσι κάραν) is obviously modelled on Anacreon fr. 36.1–2 G. (Πολιοὶ μὲν ἡμὶν ἤδη / κρόταφοι). Furthermore, *CA* 52A.2 (δὸς ὕδωρ, βάλ᾽ οἶνον, ὦ παῖ) is clearly indebted to Anacreon fr. 38.1 G. (Φέρ᾽ ὕδωρ, φέρ᾽ οἶνον, ὦ παῖ), and στέφουσι at *CA* 52A.1 also echoes στεφάνους at Anacreon fr. 38.3 G. However, the intertextual significance does not lie in these verbal echoes alone, but also in the tension that arises between the thematic analogy and contrast from the backdrop of the verbal similarities. Anacreon's *Altersklage* at fr. 36 G. is picked up at the beginning of *CA* 52A, but it is then dismissed for the sake of the *carpe-diem* motif. Similarly, the juxtaposition of the same poem with Anacreon's call for water and wine at fr. 38 G. is characterised by likeness as well as by contrast. As Rosenmeyer (1992: 53–54) convincingly demonstrates:

> behind the formal resemblance lies a substantial difference in attitude towards the role of wine at the symposium. In 396 the tone is fresh, even reckless; the poet calls for wine as a stimulant, to give him the courage to box with Eros. The festive atmosphere brings out this poet's belligerence, and he is eager to take on the world. In contrast, the anacreontic narrator describes himself as a white-haired old man; alcohol has the effect of making him drowsy rather than aggressive. He too believes in the power and charms of Eros, but this awareness takes the form of a comment on the brief time allotted to the pursuit of happiness – death puts an end to all struggles and desires.

Depending on the point of view, *CA* 52A exhibits a more positive, or a more negative, perception of life and death. As compared to Anacreon fr. 36 G., the speaker is rather optimistic, since he does not wallow in his lament, but rather makes the best of his situation; in relation to fr. 38 G., however, the situation is clearly portrayed in a more pessimistic light, since the reason for celebrating does not lie in the joys of youth, but in anticipation of death. Thus, the voice of the speaker of *CA* 52A navigates between a 'truly' anacreontic and a post-anacreontic voice. On the one hand, the poem is intertextually indebted to (at least) two identifiable models within Anacreon's corpus,[33] and thematically it ties in with a topos that was widespread in Anacreon's poetry.[34] Viewed from this perspective, we are prone to read 'his master's voice' in this poem, too. On the other hand, though, the transition from a juvenile and pugnacious speaker who drinks in order to celebrate his youth to an aged 'I' who, at the prospect of his impending death, desires intoxication for the sake of oblivion feeds back onto the transition from the *persona* Anacreon to his admirer and follower, as implemented in *CA* 1. In conclusion, I therefore argue that the voice of *CA* 52A deliberately meanders between that of a truly pseudepigraphic *Carmen Anacreonteum*

[33] There is further verbal similarity between *CA* 52A.2 and Anacreon fr. 33.1–2 G. (= 356.1–2 *PMG*) Ἄγε δή, φέρ᾽ ἡμίν, ὦ παῖ, / κελέβην and Anacreon fr. 65.7–8 G. (= 346.4.7–8 *PMG*) —⏑] φέροι μὲν οἶνον ἄγγε[ι / —⏑] φέροι δ᾽ ὕδω[ρ] πάφλ[αζον.

[34] Cf. n. 23 above.

and that of a speaker who is not to be considered identical to Anacreon. Both voices are only implicitly present in the poem, and it is up to the reader to decide which of the two dominates.[35]

There is, however, one poem in the *CA* collection in which the speaker is explicitly identified with Anacreon:

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 7 BBDSZ** (= 7 West)

Λέγουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες·	The women say:	1
"Ἀνάκρεον, γέρων εἶ·	"Anacreon, you're an old man!	2
λαβὼν ἔσοπτρον ἄθρει	Take a mirror and have a look:	3
κόμας μὲν οὐκέτ' οὔσας,	There's no more hair,	4
ψιλὸν δέ σευ μέτωπον."	And bald is your forehead."	5
ἐγὼ δὲ τὰς κόμας μέν,	But I, I don't know about the hair,	6
εἴτ' εἰσὶν εἴτ' ἀπῆλθον,	Whether it's there or it's gone –	7
οὐκ οἶδα· τοῦτο δ' οἶδα,	But this I know:	8
ὡς τῷ γέροντι μᾶλλον	That for an old man, it is all the more	9
πρέπει τὸ τερπνὰ παίζειν,	fair to enjoy himself with pleasure,	10
ὅσῳ πέλας τὰ Μοίρης.	The closer death comes.	11

The identification of the speaker with Anacreon is achieved by way of a sophisticated technique of indirect self-identification: that is, by quoting someone else's voice that addresses the speaker by name.[36] The poem begins with an introductory line to a citation of what "the women" (αἱ γυναῖκες, line 1) say to Anacreon (lines 2–5). These women explicitly call their addressee 'Anacreon' (line 2), and the speaker then reacts to the women's accusations with his own comment (lines 6–11). However, even in this seemingly clear case, there are aspects that put the speaker's identification with Anacreon into perspective. First, the verb λέγουσιν in line 1 is ambiguous: it may refer to a single incident ('the women say now'), but it may also be a generalisation ('the women say by default / repeatedly'). In the case of the latter, we might not necessarily have to interpret their allegations as an attack against the speaker, but as a common reaction by women to/against the stereotypes of Anacreon's poetry. Secondly, the speaker's reaction and, especially, the meaning of ἐγὼ δέ (line 6) can be interpreted in two ways, too. It may most naturally be understood as a concrete reaction to the women's accusations, but it could instead be read as an (indirect) reply to Anacreon, who is characterised as being unaware of his bald head (and of his resulting lack of physical attractiveness); this is an accusation to which the speaker reacts by saying that he, for his part, does not know whether the hair – be it his or Anacreon's – is still there or not.

[35] Müller (2010: 190) is too one-sided when he claims that the speaker of *CA* 52A should be directly identified with the *persona* Anacreon.

[36] This technique is reminiscent of, and best known from, Sappho fr. 1 Voigt, where the poetic speaker reports in direct speech what the goddess Aphrodite said to her (lines 18–24) and how she addressed her by name as 'Psappho' (line 20).

Further implications of Anacreon's voice can be found in three poems in which Bathyllus, Anacreon's stereotypical loverboy, is mentioned as the speaker's ἐρώμενος:

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 10 BBDSZ** (= 10 West)

Τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω;	What should I do with you?	1
τί σοι; λάλει χελιδόν.	What, with you? Speak, swallow!	2
τὰ ταρσά σευ τὰ κοῦφα	Your light wings,	3
θέλεις λαβὼν ψαλίξω,	Do you want me to seize them and cut them short?	4
ἢ μᾶλλον ἔνδοθέν σευ	Or, rather, should I cut out	5
τὴν γλῶσσαν, ὡς ὁ Τηρεύς	Your tongue from within, as Tereus	6
ἐκεῖνος, ἐκθερίξω;	Did it, famously?	7
τί μευ καλῶν ὀνείρων	Why from my beautiful dreams	8
ὑπορθρίαισι φωναῖς	With your early morning voice	9
ἀφήρπασας Βάθυλλον;	Did you take away from me Bathyllus?	10

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 17.1–5 BBDSZ** (= 17.1–5 West)

Γράφε μοι Βάθυλλον οὕτω	Paint Bathyllus for me,	1
τὸν ἑταῖρον ὡς διδάσκω·	My companion, like I teach you!	2
λιπαρὰς κόμας ποίησον,	Make his hair bright –	3
τὰ μὲν ἔνδοθεν μελαίνας,	Its hairline dark,	4
τὰ δ' ἐς ἄκρον ἡλιώσας·	But its ends light like the sun!	5

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 18A BBDSZ** (= 18.10–17 West)

Παρὰ τὴν σκιὴν Βαθύλλου	By the shade of Bathyllus	1
κάθισο· καλὸν τὸ δένδρον,	Sit down! Beautiful is the tree,	2
ἁπαλὰς δ' ἔσεισε χαίτας	And he shakes his soft hair	3
μαλακωτάτῳ κλαδίσκῳ·	With his most delicate sprig.	4
παρὰ δ' αὐτὸν ἐρεθίζει	And next to him,	5
πηγὴ ῥέουσα Πειθοῦς.	The gushing source of Peitho is luring.	6
τίς ἂν οὖν ὁρῶν παρέλθοι	So who could pass by upon seeing	7
καταγώγιον τοιοῦτο;	Such a dwelling?	8

There is no room here to discuss these poems, and the way Bathyllus is used and depicted in them, at length.[37] For our purposes, we should simply note that the mention of Bathyllus as the speaker's lover implies the speaker's identity with Anacreon.[38] However, this form of indirect self-identification should also be put into perspective, because Bathyllus' name is unattested in the exi-

[37] On *CA* 10, cf. Rosenmeyer 1992: 104–105; Lambin 2002: 276–278; Müller 2010: 147–148; Zotou 2014: 67–70. On *CA* 17, cf. Lambin 2002: 272–276; Müller 2010: 275–280; Zotou 2014: 115–124; BBDSZ: 121–122; Bär (2016b). On *CA* 18A, cf. Lambin 2002: 220; Rosenmeyer 1992: 199–201; Müller 2010: 149–152; BBDSZ: 122; Zotou 2014: 125–128.

[38] In *CA* 17, Bathyllus is mentioned again in lines 44 and 46 (= the last line); his name thus frames the poem. Moreover, a reference to Samos at *CA* 17.45 further stresses the speaker's iden-

sting fragments of Anacreon, but only appears in later, especially epigrammatic, tradition.[39] Owing to the fragmentary state of Anacreon's corpus, we are, unfortunately, not in a position to definitively decide whether this lack of attestation is a matter of coincidence, or whether Bathyllus was indeed a later invention which came to be connected to the later stereotypes associated with Anacreon.[40] It should be acknowledged, though, that many of Anacreon's fragments do mention erotic attraction to boys (including *nominatim* references to Kleobulos and Smerdies – but *not* to Bathyllus);[41] therefore, it may well be within the range of acceptable speculation to hypothesise that Bathyllus might indeed have been a post-anacreontic invention and that *CA* 10, 17 and 18A thus evoke a speaker who, again, oscillates between being and not being Anacreon, and who thus invites his reader to actively decide about the dominating voice.

THE VOICES OF THE IMITATORS

As noted and discussed in the previous section, in several poems in the *CA* collection it is implied that the 'true' voice of their master Anacreon is their poetic speaker. At the same time, upon further inspection all of these examples leave a way 'out' of their alleged authenticity and thus make room for a more ambiguous perception of their voicing. In this section, I will discuss two poems which head in the opposite direction by recognisably insinuating a *non*-anacreontic voice and thus connecting back to the idea of *non*-identity as it was programmatically announced at *CA* 1.1. In both poems, the speaker's identity remains nebulous, but the way in which Anacreon is introduced clearly suggests that the speaker should not be identified with Anacreon in either case.

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 15.1–10 BBDSZ** (= 15.1–10 West)

"Ερασμίη πέλεια,	My lovely pigeon,	1
πόθεν, πόθεν πέτασαι;	Whence, whence do you come flying?	2

tity with Anacreon in this poem, since Anacreon is reported to have spent time at the court of Polycrates of Samos (cf. e.g. Hdt. 3.121 and Strabo 14.638).

[39] Cf. e.g. *Anth. Pal.* 7.30.3, 7.31.3, 9.542.3; *Anth. Plan.* 16.306.7, 16.307.6; furthermore, cf. Herodianus, *Περὶ παθῶν* p. 205.12–13 vol. 3.2 Lentz ~ *Περὶ παρωνύμων* p. 859.25 Lentz; Maximus Tyrus, *Dialexeis* 18.9 (= 402 *PMG*) and 37.5 (= 471 *PMG*).

[40] Henricus Stephanus, the *CA*'s first editor (1554), considered the collection to be by Anacreon because of the references to Bathyllus (cf. Rosenmeyer 1992: 3–4).

[41] In the existing fragments of Anacreon, the following include erotic references to boys: fr. 3 G. (= 366 *PMG* [Smerdies]); 5 G. (= 359 *PMG* [Kleobulos]); 14 G. (= 357 *PMG* [Kleobulos]); 15 G. (= 360 *PMG* [nameless; possibly with a bi-sexual undertone]); 22–23 G. (= 402 *PMG* [Kleobulos]); 33 G. (= 356 *PMG* [nameless]); 43 G. (= 407 *PMG* [nameless]); 60 G. (= 346 *PMG* [nameless; but it may also be a poem about a girl: cf. Campbell 1988: 41, n. 1]). On the tradition of Anacreon as a lover of boys, cf. e.g. Bowie 2009: 128–129.

πόθεν μύρων τοσούτων	Whence, hurrying	3
ἐπ᾽ ἠέρος θέουσα	In the air do you	4
πνείεις τε καὶ ψεκάζεις;	Smell of so many types of myrrh?	5
τίς ἔστι σοι, μέλει δέ;"	What is it with you, what concerns you?"	6
"Ἀνακρέων μ᾽ ἔπεμψε	"Anacreon sent me	7
πρὸς παῖδα, πρὸς Βάθυλλον	To his boy, to Bathyllus,	8
τὸν ἄρτι τῶν ἁπάντων	Who is, for now, ruling over everything,	9
κρατοῦντα καὶ τύραννον.	And a tyrant.	10
πέπρακέ μ᾽ ἡ Κυθήρη	Cythera has sold me	11
λαβοῦσα μικρὸν ὕμνον,	By taking a small hymn [in exchange].	12
ἐγὼ δ᾽ Ἀνακρέοντι	And I, in Anacreon's attendance	13
διακονῶ τοσαῦτα·	I am in so many things:	14
καὶ νῦν οἵας ἐκείνου	And now, how many of his	15
ἐπιστολὰς κομίζω.	Letters I deliver!	16
καί φησιν εὐθέως με	And he says he's immediately	17
ἐλευθέρην ποιήσειν·	Going to set me free;	18
ἐγὼ δέ, κἢν ἀφῇ με,	But I – even if he lets me go –	19
δούλη μενῶ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ.	Will stay with him as his slave.	20
τί γάρ με δεῖ πέτασθαι	For, what should I fly	21
ὄρη τε καὶ κατ᾽ ἀγρούς	Over mountains and fields,	22
καὶ δένδρεσιν καθίζειν	And sit on trees,	23
φαγοῦσαν ἄγριόν τι;	Eating something wildly grown?	24
τὰ νῦν ἔδω μὲν ἄρτον	Now I eat bread	25
ἀφαρπάσασα χειρῶν	Which I catch from the hands	26
Ἀνακρέοντος αὐτοῦ,	Of Anacreon himself,	27
πιεῖν δέ μοι δίδωσι	And for drink he gives me	28
τὸν οἶνον, ὃν προπίνει,	The wine he serves,	29
πιοῦσα δ᾽ ἂν χορεύσω	And when I'm drunk, I'll dance	30
καὶ δεσπότην †Ἀνακρέοντα†	And I will protect my master Anacreon	31
πτεροῖσι συγκαλύψω·	With my wings.	32
κοιμωμένη δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ	And dozing on his very own	33
τῷ βαρβίτῳ καθεύδω.	Lyre I sleep.	34
ἔχεις ἅπαντ᾽· ἄπελθε·	Now you know it all – go away!	35
λαλιστέραν μ᾽ ἔθηκας,	You made me more garrulous	36
ἄνθρωπε, καὶ κορώνης."	Than a crow, you fellow!"	37

Scholars disagree on the degree of this poem's metapoetic potential. Rosenmeyer (1992: 142–146) strongly argues for a coherent metapoetic interpretation, viewing "the dove as a metaphor for the anacreontic poet who wishes to be the 'slave' or messenger of Anacreon" (146), whereas Müller (2010: 143–145) remains sceptical of this reading because "by far not all elements can conclusively be interpreted poetologically" (144).[42] In my opinion, the equation of each element is no prerequisite for a metapoetic interpretation of the poem as a whole. Rosenmeyer's interpretation of the pigeon as an embodiment of a 'new Anacreon' seems plausible, insofar as the messenger pigeon – with its addiction to, and

[42] "[Problematisch bleibt bei einer poetologischen Interpretation die Identifikation der Taube mit einem anacreontischen Dichter, weil] sich bei weitem nicht alle Elemente wirklich schlüssig poetologisch deuten lassen."

dependence on, Anacreon – is indeed reminiscent of the poetic speaker in *CA* 1. However, this interpretation should, in my view, be modified with regard to the poem's communicative situation. As Rosenmeyer (1992: 146) points out, an important parallel between the two poems is that the speaker of *CA* 15 detects the pigeon because of its odour (lines 3–5), whereas in *CA* 1 Anacreon is noted because he smells of wine (lines 8 and 13); however, her conclusion that "[i]n both cases, the role of Anacreon is to provide the 'new' poet with a voice" is too vague, since the pigeon does not stand for the 'old' Anacreon, and the speaker of *CA* 15 is not the one who is inspired and addicted here. What we are witnessing here, as I understand it, is, rather, a continuation of the communicative situation of *CA* 1, with the addition of an extra level: the poetic speaker – an imitator of Anacreon who is composing an anacreontic poem by quoting his dialogue at the pigeon – witnesses (and reports) the consequences of what it means to be a zealous disciple of Anacreon, as the pigeon is virtually under Anacreon's spell and reports in detail the consequences of her dependence. In other words, the pigeon is what the poem's speaker is going to become; the (relatively) freshly inspired speaker of the *CA* collection (cf. his programmatic exclamation Ἔρωτος οὐ πέπαυμαι at *CA* 1.17) witnesses the ultimate consequences of an 'anacreontic addiction'.[43] Simultaneously, the pigeon not only stands for the paradigmatic follower of Anacreon, but it also fulfils the role of his messenger and his protector.[44] The poetic speaker reports what is happening without further comment; thus, we as the poem's readers are, again, invited to draw our own conclusions. Since the speaker does not comment on the impact which the encounter and the dialogue with the pigeon had on him, the reader is, *nolens volens*, being allotted this task. The reader is therefore confronted with the prospect of ultimately becoming an anacreontic composer (or collector, for that matter) himself – a notion which will become important again at the end of the collection, in *CA* 60A.

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 20 BBDSZ** (= 20 West)

Ἡδυμελὴς Ἀνακρέων,	Sweet-singing is Anacreon,	1
ἡδυμελὴς δὲ Σαπφώ·	And sweet-singing is Sappho.	2
Πινδαρικὸν τόδε μοι μέλος	This Pindaric song here:	3
συγκεράσας τις ἐγχέοι.	Someone shall mix it in for me and pour it.	4
τὰ τρία ταῦτά μοι δοκεῖ	These three [song-types], it seems to me –	5
καὶ Διόνυσος ἐλθών	If Dionysus came	6

[43] The speaker's tone in his question to the pigeon, τίς ἔστι σοι, μέλει δέ; ("What is it with you, what concerns you?", line 6), might be read as an allusion to an ambivalent relationship between Anacreon and the pigeon, in analogy to the ambivalent relation between Anacreon and the poetic speaker in *CA* 1.

[44] Zotou (2014: 92) astutely observes that the pigeon protecting her master with her wings (πτεροῖσι συγκαλύψω, line 32) harks back to the anacreontic admirer hugging and kissing Anacreon at *CA* 1.5 (περιπλάκην φιλήσας).

καὶ Παφίη λιπαρόχροος And the lady from Paphos with her shining skin 7
καὐτὸς Ἔρως ἂν ἐκπιεῖν. And Eros himself: they would drink them up. 8

This is the second poem in the *CA* collection in which Anacreon is mentioned *nominatim* and is not identical to the poem's speaker. The first stanza praises Anacreon, Sappho and Pindar as a triad of outstanding archaic poets; the second stanza then introduces Dionysus, Aphrodite[45] and Eros, that is, the main deities of the collection's sympotic frame and innertextual reality. It appears that the poetic speaker attempts to unite these three eminent figures from archaic Greek lyric under the umbrella of sympotic poetry; this is obvious and logical for Anacreon, but it also works for Sappho, the paradigmatic author of love poetry, and – to a lesser extent – also for Pindar, who as well as composing epinician poetry also composed sympotic poetry.[46] Zotou (2014: 133–134) demonstrates that the adjective ἡδυμελής (lines 1 and 2) can be read as a marker that unites the three poets, since it is a word which is repeatedly attested in their poetry.[47] Furthermore, the notion of 'mixing in and pouring Pindaric song' also evokes the Pindaric metaphor of nectar for poetry, as can be noted at *Ol.* 7.7–10.[48] As a result, Anacreon, Sappho and Pindar are presented on an equal footing, and the combination of the three leads to what the speaker of this poem obviously considers to be the perfect sympotic poem or song. Thus, the speaker opens his frame of reference in order to include another two outstanding archaic poets; the poetological programme as it was implemented in *CA* 1 is thus widened, and the reader is invited to broaden his horizon of subtexts by also incorporating archaic Greek lyric that is not Anacreon's.

The phrase Πινδαρικὸν τόδε […] μέλος ("this Pindaric song here", line 3) deserves particular attention. By using the deictic pronoun τόδε, the speaker of the poem is referring to his own song with this phrase. Why should a pseudo-anacreontic poet refer to his own poem as a Pindaric poem? This seemingly self-contradictory statement has puzzled modern editors so much that

[45] Aphrodite is called "the lady from Paphos" (Παφίη, line 7; cf. also *CA* 17.37 and 57.29) because of her sanctuary in the town of Paphos on Cyprus (on which cf. Maier 1995).

[46] Cf. van Groningen 1960; Stehle 1997: 213–261; Strauss Clay 1999.

[47] Anacreon fr. 112 G. (= 394a *PMG*) Ἡδυμελὲς χαρίεσσα χελιδοῖ (probably the beginning of a poem, too); Sappho fr. 44.24 Voigt αὖλος δ' ἀδυ[μ]έλης; Pind. *Ol.* 7.11, 11.14, *Pyth.* 8.70, *Nem.* 2.25, *Isthm.* 7.20 (passages taken from Zotou 2014: 133–134).

[48] Pind. *Ol.* 7.7–10 (translation: Race 1997): καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοισᾶν δόσιν, ἀεθλοφόροις / ἀνδράσιν πέμπων, γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός, / ἱλάσκομαι, / Οὐλυμπίᾳ Πυθοῖ τε νικώντεσσιν. ("So I too, by sending the poured nectar, gift of the Muses / and sweet fruit of the mind, to men who win prizes, / gain the favour / of victors at Olympia and Pytho.") – The metaphor of Pindar's song as a drink is also reminiscent of *CA* 6, the swallowing of Eros by the speaker, who subsequently is being tickled by Eros in his limbs/songs (*CA* 6.6–7: καὶ νῦν ἔσω μελῶν μου / πτεροῖσι γαργαλίζει, "and now, in my limbs/songs, / he tickles me with my wings" [on the ambiguity of μελῶν in line 6, cf. Zotou 2014: 52–53]). The drinking metaphor is prominently used again in the subsequent poem (*CA* 21).

numerous suggestions have been made as to how the text should be emended; West (1984/²1993) suggested Πινδαρικὸν δ' ἔτι μοι μέλος ("in addition to this, [someone shall also mix in] a Pindaric song for me [and pour it]"). However, the text as it is transmitted is correct Greek, and it is metrically sound. Therefore, altering it is unjustified, in my opinion. When we consider how the *CA* collection is concerned with discussing and negotiating questions about voices and identities, it does not seem too far-fetched that there should also be room for a poem with a Pindaric voice, and that a collector, whose goal is evidently to assemble poems with a multitude of voices, would be inclined to include such a poem as well. As was demonstrated above, in several poems in the *CA* collection the speaker's voice oscillates between being and not being Anacreon; viewed from this perspective, *CA* 20 is, in fact, just another example of a non-anacreontic voice – a voice which, for once, does not remain undefined.

CONCLUSION: READ, COLLECT – AND "IMITATE ANACREON!"

***Carmen Anacreonteum* 60A BBDSZ** (= 60.24–36 West)

Ἄγε, θυμέ, πῇ μέμηνας	Ahead, my heart! What do you rage,	1
μανίην μανεὶς ἀρίστην;	Furious in your best fury?	2
τὸ βέλος φέρε κρατύνων,	Come on! Shoot your missile,	3
σκοπὸν ὡς βαλὼν ἀπέλθῃς,	So that, when shooting, you hit your target;	4
τὸ δὲ τόξον Ἀφροδίτης	But leave Aphrodite's bow,	5
ἄφες, ὡς θεοὺς ἐνίκα.	For she defeated gods.	6
τὸν Ἀνακρέοντα μιμοῦ,	Imitate Anacreon,	7
τὸν ἀοίδιμον μελιστήν.	The singer famous in song.	8
φιάλην πρόπινε παισίν,	Drink your cup to the boys,	9
φιάλην λόγων ἐραννήν·	Your lovely cup full of words;	10
ἀπὸ νέκταρος ποτοῖο	From the potion of nectar	11
παραμύθιον λαβόντες	Getting relief	12
φλογερὸν φυγόντες ἄστρον.	And fleeing the blazing star.	13

This poem terminates the *CA* collection and its poetological programme.[49] Along with the preceding poem, *CA* 60, it is full of thorny philological problems. Many of these problems concern textual criticism and the understanding of grammar and syntax;[50] furthermore, scholars disagree as to whether *CA* 60 and 60A are one or two poems;[51] finally, it has even been conjectured that the

[49] Cf. on this poem Rosenmeyer 1992: 129–137, 193–194; Lambin 2002: 175–177; Müller 2010: 135–140; Most 2014: 145–151; BBDSZ: 133.

[50] Cf. West 1984b: 219–221.

[51] The manuscript transmits one poem; as such, it is presented by Brioso Sánchez 1981, West 1984a/²1993 and Guichard 2012, whereas Campbell 1988 and BBDSZ print two (cf. Most 2014: 146, n. 4, and BBDSZ: 133 for arguments in favour of two separate poems).

last line may not have been the ending of *CA* 60A and that the poem(s) could, in fact, be fragmentary.[52] I will not deal with these questions here; suffice it to state that I take *CA* 60A to be one complete poem, which I will, in consequence, analyse as a unity. To begin with, as other scholars have noted before, this poem subtly evokes several topoi that can be traced to numerous literary subtexts.[53] Two metaphors can be identified as Pindaric in origin: the notion of (the shooting of) a missile as a metaphor for (the composition of) poetry (lines 3–4) can be found at *Ol.* 1.111–112, 2.83–86, and 13.93–97,[54] and nectar as a metaphor for poetry (lines 11–12) at *Ol.* 7.7–10.[55] Furthermore, Rosenmeyer (1992: 136, n. 56) also identifies verbal intertextuality between *CA* 60A.1 Ἄγε, θυμέ and Pind. *Ol.* 2.89 ἔπεχε νῦν σκόπῳ τόξον, ἄγε θυμέ ("now aim the bow at the mark, come, my heart!") and concludingly states that this poem's "language, style, and tone are aggressively Pindaric" (136). In addition to the Pindaric references, scholars have also identified various other parallels, such as Alcaeus fr. 347a and 352 Voigt (the Dog Star [Sirius] as a trigger of sexual desire, linked to a sympotic context [cf. *CA* 60A.13]);[56] Plat. *Phaedr.* 265b (erotic madness as the best kind of madness [cf. *CA* 60A.2]);[57] and Theocr. *Id.* 11.1–4 (poetry as a remedy against lovesickness).[58] Finally, line 9 of our poem (φιάλην πρόπινε παισίν) possibly also harks back to two fragments of Anacreon:

---

[52] Cf. Rosenmeyer 1992: 131–132.

[53] Cf. Danielewicz 1986: 46, 51, n. 22; Campbell 1988: 245, nn. 1–3; Rosenmeyer 1992: 57, 136–137, with n. 58; BBDSZ: 133; Most 2014: 147–148.

[54] Pind. *Ol.* 1.111–112: ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦν / Μοῖσα καρτερώτατον βέλος ἀλκᾷ τρέφει. ("And now for me / the Muse tends the strongest weapon in defence.") – Pind. *Ol.* 2.83–86: πολλά μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη / ἔνδον ἐντι φαρέτρας / φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν· ἐς δὲ τὸ πὰν ἑρμηνέων / χατίζει. ("I have many swift arrows under my arm / in their quiver / that speak to those who understand, but for the whole subject, they need / interpreters.") – Pind. *Ol.* 13.93–97: ἐμὲ δ' εὐθὺν ἀκόντων / ἰέντα ῥόμβον παρὰ σκοπὸν οὐ χρὴ / τὰ πολλὰ βέλεα καρτύνειν χεροῖν. / Μοίσαις γὰρ ἀγλαοθρόνοις ἑκὼν / Ὀλιγαιθίδαισίν τ' ἔβαν ἐπίκουρος. ("But I, in casting whirling javelins / on their straight path, must not hurl / those many shafts from my hands beside the mark. / For I have come as a willing helper for the Muses / on their splendid thrones, and for the Oligaithidai.") – Translations: Race 1997.

[55] Cf. n. 47 above.

[56] Alc. fr. 347 Voigt: Τέγγε πλεύμονας οἴνῳ, τὸ γὰρ ἄστρον περιτέλλεται, / ἀ δ' ὥρα χαλέπα, πάντα δὲ δίψαισ' ὑπὰ καύματος, / ἄχει δ' ἐκ πετάλων ἄδεα τέττιξ … / ἄνθει δὲ σκόλυμος· νῦν δὲ γύναικες μιαρώτατοι, / λέπτοι δ' ἄνδρες, ἐπεὶ <δὴ> κεφάλαν καὶ γόνα Σείριος / ἄσδει. ("Wet your lungs with wine: the star is coming round, / the season is harsh, everything is thirsty under the heat, / the cicada sings sweetly from the leaves … / the artichoke is in flower; now are women most pestilential, / but men are feeble, since Sirius parches their heads and knees…") – Alc. fr. 352 Voigt: Πώνωμεν, τὸ γὰρ ἄστρον περιτέλλεται. (Let us drink: the star is coming round.") – Translations: Campbell 1982.

[57] Plat. *Phaedr.* 265b: τετάρτην δὲ Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Ἔρωτος ἐρωτικὴν μανίαν ἐφήσαμέν τε ἀρίστην εἶναι. ("And we said that the fourth type of madness was the best – the one by Aphrodite and Eros, the madness of love.")

[58] Theocr. *Id.* 11.1–4 (translation: Gow 1950): Οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο, / Νικία, οὔτ' ἔγχριστον, ἐμὶν δοκεῖ, οὔτ' ἐπίπαστον, / ἢ ταὶ Πιερίδες· κοῦφον δέ τι τοῦτο καὶ ἀδύ

Anacreon fr. 33.1–6 G. (= 356.1–6 *PMG*)[59]

Ἄγε δή, φέρ᾽ ἡμίν, ὦ παῖ,	Come on, bring us, my boy,	1
κελέβην, ὅκως ἄμυστιν	A cup, so that I can toast and drink	2
προπίω, τὰ μὲν δέκ᾽ ἐγχέας	In one long draught, and first you shall pour ten	3
ὕδατος, τὰ πέντε δ᾽ οἴνου	Ladles of water, then five of wine,	4
κυάθους, ὡς ἀνυβρίστως	So that I can, with decency,	5
ἀνὰ δηῦτε βασσαρήσω.	Break again into dance and frenzy.	6

Anacreon fr. 43 G. (= 407 *PMG*)[60]

ἀλλὰ πρόπινε	Come on, offer	1
ῥαδινούς, ὦ φίλε, μηρούς	Your tender thighs, my friend!	2

Anacreon fr. 43 G. is too fragmentary to permit us to do more than note the identical form used (πρόπινε at fr. 43.1 G. and *CA* 60A.9); Anacreon fr. 33.1–6 G., in turn, shares the use of the *terminus technicus* προπίνειν (προπίω at fr. 33.3 G.) as well as the general idea of dampening sympotic frenzy.[61] In Anacreon's poem, this is achieved by way of mixing wine and water, whereas in *CA* 60A the topic is elevated onto a meta-level by the speaker's call for a continuation of anacreontic production, but without the element of love (τὸ δὲ τόξον Ἀφροδίτης / ἄφες, lines 5–6), which is subsequently expected to have a soothing effect on the lovesick (παραμύθιον λαβόντες, line 12).

In sum, *CA* 60A thus proves to be a multilayered poem which is exceptionally rich in literary subtexts that originate from various sources from archaic to Hellenistic poetry. These subtexts include references to Anacreon's own poetry, which, once more, provide a clue that we should think of this last post-anacreontic poem as an imitation, and continuation, of its 'original' predecessor. Simultaneously, the various allusions to Pindar do not only establish a link to Pindar's poetry, but they also refer back to *CA* 20, in which poem the triad Anacreon – Sappho – Pindar was explicitly mentioned as a frame of reference

/ γίνετ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀνθρώποις, εὑρεῖν δ᾽ οὐ ῥᾴδιόν ἐστι. ("No other remedy is there for love, / Nicias, neither unguent, methinks, nor salve, / save only the Muses; and this remedy is painless / for mortals and pleasant, but hard to find.")

[59] On this fragment, cf. the commentaries by Braghetti 1994, vol. 2: 106–112 and Rozokoki 2006: 172–176.

[60] On this fragment, cf. the commentaries by Braghetti 1994, vol. 2: 140–142; Rozokoki 2006: 222; Leo 2015: 145–148.

[61] In sympotic poetry, προπίνειν denotes the act of drinking, serving and toasting; cf. Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 7.5a Drachmann (which is where Anacreon fr. 43 G. is transmitted): προπίνειν ἐστὶ κυρίως τὸ ἅμα τῷ κράματι τὸ ἀγγεῖον χαρίζεσθαι ("προπίνειν really means: to offer the drinking vessel together with the mixed wine"); Athen. 11.498c: κυρίως γάρ ἐστι τοῦτο προπίνειν, τὸ ἑτέρῳ πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ δοῦναι πιεῖν ("for this is what προπίνειν really means: to give the other person something to drink in front [or: before] oneself"); cf. also LSJ s.v.; Steph., *Thes.* s.v.; Rozokoki 2006: 174–175; Leo 2015: 146–147. At Anacreon fr. 43.1 G., the verb clearly has a sexual connotation.

for the composition of new anacreontic/sympotic poetry, and in which a Pindaric (instead of anacreontic) voice was implied (lines 3–4; cf. the discussion above). Thus, *CA* 60A as a whole points both 'out' of the collection (by relating to its literary predecessors) and back 'within' its own frame (by harking back to the widened poetological programme at *CA* 20). This cluster of references and associations constitutes the backdrop against which the poem's central statement should be understood: the speaker's call to "imitate Anacreon" (τὸν Ἀνακρέοντα μιμοῦ, line 7). In plain terms, someone who has read, and 'digested', the entire *CA* collection up to this point should have learnt how to compose anacreontic poetry and should thus also assume this role by writing and/or editing and collecting anacreontic poetry himself.[62] Thematically, this last poem also offers an option for a new, modified poetological programme: the continuation of anacreontic/sympotic poetry, but without the element of love, in combination with the notion of poetry as a remedy for lovesickness. The collection's openness regarding the polyphony of its voices thus finally appears purposeful: it is not just a literary game for the readers' intellectual pleasure, but it fulfils the function of virtually educating them in order to turn them first into active, then into productive, readers (and, thus, into editors, collectors, and poets) themselves.

An objection to this conclusion may be that it is merely an intellectual game, taking a reader-response approach as a pretext for an aloof interpretation of a poetic collection – whose multitude of voices could, after all, simply be viewed as the result of the collection's origins and the editor's careful arrangement. However, in one case, a concrete result of the collection's reader involvement and its general openness to new voices, new producers and new editors has survived: *CA* 4 exists in three different versions which vary considerably in length and detail, but are recognisably the 'same' poem. The version in cod. Paris. Suppl. gr. 384 (= *CA* 4.iii West) consists of 21 lines; two shorter versions can be found at *Anth. Pal.* 11.48 (= *CA* 4.ii West; 11 lines) and at Gell. *Noct. Att.* 19.9.6 (= *CA* 4.i West; 15 lines).[63] The latter is indeed a perfect example of the concrete implementation of the exhortative τὸν Ἀνακρέοντα μιμοῦ at *CA* 60A.7: the anacreontic poem is reported as being performed on the occasion of a dinner party where "boys and girls […] sang in a most charming way several odes of Anacreon and Sappho, as well as some erotic elegies of more recent poets that

[62] Cf. Baumbach and Dümmler 2014b: 4: "This programmatic request to compose and perform Anacreontic poetry can be taken poetologically as an invitation to the recipient of the collection to become a new Anacreontic poet and to continue the tradition of Anacreontic song." The role of the collector/editor is briefly considered an option by Rosenmeyer (1992: 132) and Most (2014: 146). In addition to this, we might also consider the option of a self-address by the poetic speaker to himself, who, in the first line, addresses his own heart and subsequently motivates himself to continue writing and/or collecting this type of poetry.

[63] Cf. Weiss 1989: 88–95; West [2]1993: ix, xviii, n. 1; Campbell 1988: 167, n. 5; Müller 2010: 269–270; BBDSZ: 115; Zotou 2014: 37–43.

were sweet and graceful".[64] The song is not only performed and, thus, 'imitated' and 'interpreted' in exactly the type of context for which the *CA* collection sets the general frame (that is, the symposium) – it also changes shape and length in accordance with the claim to the active reader involvement which *CA* 60A proclaims. In short, the performance and interpretation of this song on this occasion is 'mimetic' in all possible senses of the word. It appears that the *Carmina Anacreontea* had imitators and followers long ago.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bagordo 2011: A. Bagordo, "Anakreon," in: B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike. Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit*, Munich 2011, 213–217.

Bär 2016a: S. Bär, Review of Zotou 2014, *GFA* 19 (2016), 1067–1095, <https://gfa.gbv.de/dr,gfa-,019,2016,r,10.pdf> (last accessed 03.02.2017).

Bär 2016b: S. Bär, "'Come, Second Best of Painters!' Irony, Ambiguity and Voices in Carmina Anacreontea 16 and 17," *Phoenix* 70 (2016), 23–39.

Bartol 1993: K. Bartol, "TON ANAKPEONTA MIMOY. Einige Bemerkungen zum *Carmen Anacreonteum* 1 W.," *A&A* 39 (1993), 64–72.

Baumbach and Dümmler 2014a: M. Baumbach and N. Dümmler (eds.), *Imitate Anacreon! Mimesis, Poiesis and the Poetic Inspiration in the* Carmina Anacreontea, Berlin and Boston 2014.

Baumbach and Dümmler 2014b: M. Baumbach and N. Dümmler, "Introduction," in: Baumbach and Dümmler (2014a), 1–7.

BBDSZ: S. Bär, M. Baumbach, N. Dümmler, H. Sitta and F. Zogg (eds., tr., comm.), *Carmina Anacreontea. Griechisch/Deutsch*, Stuttgart 2014.

Bernsdorff 2014: H. Bernsdorff, "Anacreon's Palinode," in: Baumbach and Dümmler (2014a), 11–24.

Bing 2009: P. Bing, *The Scroll and the Marble. Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*, Ann Arbor 2009.

Blech 1982: M. Blech, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin and New York 1982.

Bowie 2009: E. Bowie, "Wandering poets, archaic style," in: R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture. Travel, Locality and Panhellenism*, Cambridge 2009, 105–136.

Bowra 1952: C. M. Bowra, *Heroic Poetry*, London 1952.

Braghetti 1994: G. A. Braghetti (ed., comm.), *Anakreon. Edition und Kommentar*, 2 vols., Diss. Freiburg i.Br. 1994.

Bretzigheimer 2001: G. Bretzigheimer, *Ovids* Amores. *Poetik in der Erotik*, Tübingen 2001.

Brioso Sánchez 1970: M. Brioso Sánchez, *Anacreontea. Un ensayo para su datación*, Salamanca 1970.

Brioso Sánchez 1979: M. Brioso Sánchez, "¿Otra consagración poética? Anacreóntica primera," *Emerita* 47 (1979), 1–9.

Brioso Sánchez 1981: M. Brioso Sánchez (ed., tr., comm.), *Anacreónticas*, Madrid 1981.

Buxton 1980: R. G. A. Buxton, "Blindness and Limits: Sophokles and the Logic of Myth," *JHS* 100 (1980), 22–37.

Cameron 1995: A. Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics*, Princeton 1995.

[64] Gell. *Noct. Att.* 19.9.4 (translation: Rolfe ²1952): *pueri puellaeque […] iucundum in modum Ἀνακρεόντεια pleraque et Sapphica et poetarum quoque recentium ἐλεγεῖα quaedam erotica dulcia et venusta cecinerunt.*

Campbell 1982: D. A. Campbell (ed., tr., comm.), *Greek Lyric*, vol. 1: *Sappho, Alcaeus*, Cambridge MA and London 1982.
Campbell 1988: D. A. Campbell (ed., tr., comm.), *Greek Lyric*, vol. 2: *Anacreon, Anacreontea, Choral Lyric from Olympus to Alcman*, Cambridge MA and London 1988.
Danielewicz 1986: J. Danielewicz, "Anacreontics as a Literary Genre," *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 22 (1986), 41–51.
Deubner 1933: L. Deubner, "Die Bedeutung des Kranzes im klassischen Altertum," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 30 (1933), 70–104.
Flaschenriem 1992: B. L. Flaschenriem, *Seeing Double. Amatory Rhetoric and Gender in Sappho, the* Anacreontea*, and Propertius*, Diss. Univ. of California at Berkeley 1992.
Fountoulakis 2002: A. Fountoulakis, "Herondas 8.66–79: Generic Self-Consciousness and Artistic Claims in Herondas' Mimiambs," *Mnemosyne* 55 (2002), 301–319.
Gentili 1958: B. Gentili (ed., tr., comm.), *Anacreonte. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione, studio sui frammenti papiracei*, Rome 1958.
Giangrande 1975: G. Giangrande, "On the Text of the Anacreontea," *QUCC* 19 (1975), 177–210.
Giangrande 2011: G. Giangrande, "Anacreon's Sense of Humour and the Greek Language," *Habis* 42 (2011), 27–33.
Goldberg 2009: S. M. Goldberg, Review of Hutchinson 2008 and Johnson and Parker 2009,*Hermathena* 187 (2009), 133–139.
Gow 1950: A. S. F. Gow (ed., tr., comm.), *Theocritus. Edited with a Translation and Commentary*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1950.
Guichard 2012: L. A. Guichard (ed., tr., comm.), *Anacreónticas. Introducción, traducción, notas y comentario*, Madrid 2012.
Gutzwiller 2005a: K. Gutzwiller (ed.), *The New Posidippus. A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford 2005.
Gutzwiller 2005b: K. Gutzwiller, "The Literariness of the Milan Papyrus, or 'What Difference a Book?'", in: Gutzwiller (2005a), 287–319.
Harder 2012: A. Harder (ed., tr., comm.), *Callimachus* Aetia. *Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, 2 vols., Oxford 2012.
Hopkinson 1994: N. Hopkinson (ed., comm.), *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period. An Anthology*, Cambridge 1994.
Hutchinson 2008: G. O. Hutchinson, *Talking Books. Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry*, Oxford 2008.
IEG: M. L. West (ed.), *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, 2 vols., 2nd rev. ed., Oxford 1989 and 1992.
Johnson 2005: W. A. Johnson, *The Posidippus Papyrus: Bookroll and Reader*, in: Gutzwiller (2005a), 70–80.
Johnson and Parker 2009: W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies. The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford 2009.
Kambylis 1965: A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik. Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius*, Heidelberg 1965.
Ladianou 2005: K. Ladianou, "The Poetics of Choreia: Imitation and Dance in the Anacreontea," *QUCC* 80 (2005), 47–58.
Lambin 2002: G. Lambin, *Anacréon. Fragments et imitations*, Rennes 2002.
Leo 2015: G. M. Leo (ed., tr., comm.), *Anacreonte: I frammenti erotici. Testo, commento e traduzione*, Rome 2015.
LSJ: H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., with a revised supplement, Oxford 1996.
Maier 1995: F. G. Maier, "Le sanctuaire d'Aphrodite à Paphos, Chypre," *Dossiers d'Archéologie* 205 (1995), 84–87.

McKeown 1989: J. C. McKeown (ed., comm.), *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary*, vol. 2: *A Commentary on Book One*, Leeds 1989.
Most 2014: G. W. Most, "Τὸν Ἀνακρέοντα μιμοῦ. Imitation and Enactment in the Anacreontics," in: Baumbach and Dümmler (2014a), 145–159.
Müller 2010: A. Müller, *Die Carmina Anacreontea und Anakreon. Ein literarisches Generationenverhältnis*, Tübingen 2010.
Peirano 2012: I. Peirano, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake. Latin* Pseudepigrapha *in Context*, Cambridge 2012.
PMG: D. L. Page (ed.), *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962.
Preisshofen 1977: F. Preisshofen, *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung des Greisenalters in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Wiesbaden 1977.
Race 1997: W. H. Race (ed., tr., comm.), *Pindar*, vol. 2: *Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*, Cambridge MA and London 1997.
Richardson 1974: N. J. Richardson (ed., comm.), *The Homeric Hymns to Demeter*, Oxford 1974.
Rolfe 1952: J. C. Rolfe (ed., tr., comm.), *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*, vol. 3, 2nd rev. ed., London and Cambridge MA 1952.
Rosenmeyer 1992: P. A. Rosenmeyer, *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*, Cambridge 1992.
Rozokoki 2006: A. Rozokoki, *Ἀνακρέων. Εἰσαγωγή, κείμενο, μετάφραση, σχόλια*, Athens 2006.
Rudolph 2014: A. Rudolph, "The Problem of Self-Thematisation in the *Carmina Anacreontea* 1, 6 und 32," in: Baumbach and Dümmler (2014a), 131–144.
Skutsch 1985: O. Skutsch (ed., comm.), *The* Annals *of Q. Ennius. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1985.
Stehle 1997: E. Stehle, *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece. Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting*, Princeton 1997.
Stephanus 1554: H. Stephanus (ed., tr.), *Anacreontis Teii odae ab Henrico Stephano luce et Latinitate nunc primum donatae*, Paris 1554.
Steph., *Thes.*: H. Stephanus et al. (eds.), *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, ab Henrico Stephano constructus. Post editionem anglicam novis additamentis auctum…*, 9 vols., Paris 1572; 1829.
Strauss Clay 1983: J. Strauss Clay, *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the* Odyssey, Princeton 1983.
Strauss Clay 1999: J. Strauss Clay, "Pindar's Sympotic Epinicia," *QUCC* 62 (1999), 25–34.
Tsomis 2001: G. Tsomis, *Zusammenschau der frühgriechischen monodischen Melik (Alkaios, Sappho, Anakreon)*, Stuttgart 2001.
van Groningen 1960: B. A. van Groningen (ed., comm.), *Pindare au banquet. Les fragments des scolies édités avec un commentaire critique et explicatif*, Leiden 1960.
Vox 1990: O. Vox, *Studi Anacreontei*, Bari 1990.
Weiss 1989: I. M. Weiss, *Un nuovo approccio alle Anacreontiche*, Diss. Urbino 1989.
West 1984a: M. L. West (ed.), *Carmina Anacreontea*, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1984.
West 1984b: M. L. West, "Problems in the Anacreontea," *CQ* 34 (1984), 206–221.
West 1990: M. L. West, "The Anacreontea," in: O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica. A Symposium on the* Symposion, Oxford 1990, 272–276.
West 1993: M. L. West (ed.), *Carmina Anacreontea*, 2nd rev. ed., Stuttgart and Leipzig 1993.
West 2015: M. L. West, Review of Zotou 2014, *BMCR* 2015.01.12, <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2015/2015–01–12.html> (last accessed 03.02.2017).
Zotou 2014: A. Zotou, *Carmina Anacreontea 1–34. Ein Kommentar*, Berlin and Boston 2014.

COMPOSITION, VOICES, AND THE POETOLOGICAL PROGRAMME IN THE *CARMINA ANACREONTEA*

Summary

The *Carmina Anacreontea* (*CA*) is a collection of ancient Greek poems which recreate the literary inheritance of their model, the archaic Greek poet Anacreon. The poems were written by several anonymous authors from various centuries and were later arranged by an anonymous collector/editor. Although the collection is clearly not the product of one author and one period, it should be regarded and analysed as a coherent literary corpus. In this article it is argued that various (and partly conflicting) voices of different speakers emerge from these poems; that some of them suggest identity between the poetic speaker and Anacreon, whereas others do not; and that, in certain cases, a deliberate ambiguity between identity and non-identity is implied. These voices invite the readers of the collection to actively engage in a productive dialogue and to subsequently continue the writing process which initially had been passed from Anacreon to his follower. The ideal reader of the *CA* is thus an active reader who engages with his reading to the extent that he is gradually transformed into a poet and/or collector himself.