

The *Lament for Adonis* or *Epitaphios Adonidos* has since the mid-sixteenth century commonly been known as 'Bion 1'. In editions of Greek Bucolic it comes along with four long and four short poems allegedly by Moschus, a number of short poems or fragments by Bion of Smyrna, and a long fragment (32 lines) also since 1568 often attributed to him. This subcollection is sometimes conveniently called 'Minor Bucolic': 'minor' in relation to the much bulkier surviving work of Theocritus and 'bucolic' apparently only by association with him and through the clear reputation of Moschus and Bion in ancient times as bucolic writers. Editions of Minor Bucolic, i.e. Moschus and Bion published other than as an appendix to Theocritus (though sometimes combined with Callimachus, Musaeus, or 'the Nine Poetesses'), appeared in 1565 (Meetkercke, Bruges), 1568 (Orsini, Rome), 1655 (Whitford, London), 1686 (Longepierre, Paris), and then copiously in the eighteenth century; I count at least eight in the years 1746-1795. Since then, following the example of Ludolf Ahrens and August Meineke in the mid-nineteenth century, it has been the practice to re-attach Moschus and Bion to Theocritus,¹ thus reinforcing the supposedly bucolic character of poems printed under their names. What is 'bucolic' about the *Epitaphios Adonidos*,² or about Bion, will be examined in this paper, as will the correctness of its ascription to Bion of Smyrna, since such ascription has no ancient authority.

The *Epitaphios Adonidos* (hereafter *Ep. Ad.*) is transmitted to us in only two primary manuscripts, namely Vaticanus Graecus 1824 (= V) and Parisinus Graecus 2832 (= Tr). Neither MS is a copy of the other, but as they both display a number of unlikely errors, which can hardly be due to chance, it is probable that they have a common source at the beginning of the fourteenth century.³

¹ The best modern editions of all Greek Bucolic are those by C. Gallavotti, *Theocritus Quique Feruntur Bucolici Graeci* (Rome 1946/1955); A.S.F. Gow, *Bucolici Graeci* (Oxford 1952); H. Beckby, *Die griechischen Bukoliker: Theokrit Moschos Bion* (Meisenheim-am-Glan 1975) with notes in German; P.E. Legrand, *Bucoliques grecs: Théocrite* (1925) and *Pseudo-Théocrite, Moschos, Bion* (1927), both in the Budé collection with commentary in French. The Loeb edition by J.M. Edmonds (1912/1928, numerous reprints) gives Greek and English texts, both often unreliable, of all Greek bucolic. Gow's *Theocritus* (Oxford 1950) does not include Moschus or Bion, but his *The Greek Bucolic Poets* (Oxford 1953) contains English texts only and short exegetical notes in English on all three bucolic poets. A full English-language critical commentary on Minor Bucolic has yet to be written.

² There have hitherto been three book-length monographs on the *Ep. Ad.*, by L. Ahrens (Leipzig 1854), U. Wilamowitz (Berlin 1900) and M. Fantuzzi (Liverpool 1985). The former two, while noteworthy in themselves, have long since been superseded. The last-named, published in Italian by Francis Cairns at the University of Liverpool, was reviewed by the present writer in *CR* 32.3 (1988) 217-9. The poem is also found in N. Hopkinson's *Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge 1988), with critical text, apparatus and commentary.

³ The fullest account hitherto of the manuscript history of the *Ep. Ad.* is to be found in Gallavotti's edition (see n.1). Gallavotti, however, uses R (and not Tr) to designate Cod. Par. Gr. 2832. A Cambridge scholar is currently (1990) researching this field. Wilamowitz' *Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* (Berlin 1906) contains disappointingly little on the *Ep. Ad.*

In V the poem is anonymous; in Tr the poem is entitled⁴ *Θεοκρίτου Ἀδωνίδος ἐπιτάφιος δῶριδι*, but as we know that it was the intention of the collator (Demetrios Triklinios = Tr) to compile a collection of poems he held to be by Theocritus, this fact alone has no weight: by the same token it is clear that Tr also took [Theocr.] 20, 21, 23 and the previously mentioned 32-line fragment (known as [Bion] 2 = *Epithalamios Achilleos kai Deidameias*, hereafter *Epithal. A & D*) to be Theocritean. Conversely, Tr excluded three other poems that in V come in the same cluster as the *Ep. Ad.* (namely Moschus 1, [Theocr.] 19, and *Eis Nekron Adonin*), as he held them to be by other hands: Moschus 1 is amply attested, [Theocr.] 19 being very similar to it was most probably considered Moschean also, while *Eis Nekron Adonin* though in theme related to the *Ep. Ad.* is alien to it in structure, versification, quality and taste. V has since suffered mutilation, but a copy of it (Vat. Gr. 1311) contains all eight poems together.

When first printed in 1495 (Aldus Manutius, Venice) the *Ep. Ad.* appeared under the name of Theocritus; we know the *editio princeps* to have taken its text from V (or possibly from an unidentified descendant of V) and thus the attribution to Theocritus not to have been prompted by the title in Tr. A second⁵ edition, also dated 1495, incorporated a number of changes including some from a copy of Tr (prob. Vat. Gr. 1379) where this MS differs from V; thus Aldus Manutius also had occasion to note the Triklinian title. Yet it seems that in the first edition the poem was attributed to Theocritus for no better reason than the blanket ascription that was applied to all poems in the 'bucolic' tradition that were not specifically ascribed in ancient sources to Moschus or Bion. Thus the poem was published under the name of Theocritus in the Juntine and Calliorgan editions of 1515-16, and subsequently for the next half-century. First to query this was Joachim Camerarius (=Kammermeister), though his own edition (Hagenau 1530) and those of Peter Brubach (Frankfurt 1545, 1553, 1558) continued to print the poem under the name of Theocritus. Camerarius mentioned in a note how he considered the usual practice of ascription of anonymous poems to Theocritus to be unwise, and the *Ep. Ad.* was among the samples he gave. His remark however was tentative, being intended not so much as a critical observation on the *Ep. Ad.* in particular as simply an instance of what he considered to be over-hasty ascription of anonymous poems to Theocritus in general. The relevant text of the remark, which Camerarius wrote in a somewhat latinised Greek, is as follows:

Ἰστέον ὅτι τῶν βουκολικῶν ποιητῶν γεγόνασι τρεῖς, Θεόκριτος, καὶ Μόσχος, καὶ Βίων, καὶ τούτων ποιημάτων τὸ πρὶν σποράδην

⁴ Most editors who mention the title, including Gow, Gallavotti and Beckby, get it wrong, not only by claiming it is unattributed but also by inverting MS *Ἀδωνίδος ἐπιτάφιος*. In fact Tr's title, scarcely legible but unmistakable, gives the poem to Theocritus and identifies its dialect as Doric. Beckby informs us that both author and dialect were added in a copy of Tr. Legrand says the same regarding dialect; he acknowledges its MS attribution and says 'De titulo non ambigitur'. Fantuzzi puts the record straight on all counts.

⁵ There may have been a further edition of Manutius, intervening between the 'first' and 'second' editions of 1495. Evidence for this comes from a scrutiny of early editions in the Laurentian Library, Florence, and concerns the text of three poems in particular: [Theocr.] 19, [Theocr.] 23 and the *Ep. Ad.*, all from the same 'cluster' in V (information by courtesy of Mr Peter Hicks).

περιφερόμενα συνήκται, οὐκ εὖ οἶδ' ὑπὸ τίνος, διό που καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπομένοις εἰδυλλίοις εἶναι δοκοῦσι τινὰ οὐ πεποιημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοκρίτου ὡς τὸ ἐπικτήδειον εἰς Ἄδωνιν, ὅπερ τις εἶναι τοῦ Βίονος φάμενος, οὐκ ἂν ὡς οἶμαι ἀμάρτοι μακρόν τοῦ ἀληθοῦς· καὶ εἰς Βίωνα, τῷ ὄντι γ' οὐ συντεθὲν ὑπὸ Θεοκρίτου, εἰς τὸν Μόσχον ὀρθῶς ἂν ἀναφέροιο.

Brubach's various editions repeated the remark in its entirety, thus extending it to a wider public, but it was not until 1565 that the poem was actually published under the name of Bion, by Adolf Meeterkercke in Bruges. Subsequent editions by Henricus Stephanus (= Étienne) in 1566 in Paris and Fulvius Ursinus (= Orsini) in 1568 in Rome, which had a much wider dissemination than that of Meeterkercke, established the practice, which has now long since been undisputed.

Later in his commentary, in a note on the *Ep. Ad.* in particular, Camerarius has this to say:

οὐδὲ τοῦτο δοκεῖ εἶναι Θεοκρίτου ἀλλὰ Βίονος. μνήμη γὰρ ποιεῖται τοῦ Ἀδωνιδος φιλήματος ἐν τούτῳ ἐπιταφίῳ [sic], τοῦ καὶ πρότερον ἐν τῷ εἰς Βίωνα.

The reason for Camerarius' hunch regarding the *Ep. Ad.* is thus the apparent echo of it, and reference to its author, at lines 68-69 of the *Epitaphios Bionos* (= [Moschus] 3, hereafter *Ep. Bi.*). The relevant lines are as follows:

χὰ Κύπρις φιλεῖ σε πολὺ πλεον ἢ τὸ φίλημα
τὸ πρῶαν τὸν Ἀδωνιν ἀποθνήσκοντα φίλησεν.

These lines seem to be a clear echo of lines 13-14 of the *Ep. Ad.*, namely:

Κύπριδι μὲν τὸ φίλημα καὶ οὐ ζώντος ἀρέσκει
ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδεν Ἀδωνις ὃ νιν θνήσκοντα φίλησεν.

Camerarius' reasoning here is almost syllogistic:

- The *Ep. Bi.* in its adulation of Bion claims that Aphrodite (here called Cypris) reserves for Bion kisses (φιλήματα) that are even more passionate (πολὺ πλεον) than those she bestowed on the dying Adonis.
- The *Ep. Bi.* clearly imitates the *Ep. Ad.* in a number of places, both poems being ultimately modelled on the Thyrsis-song in Theocr. *Id.* 1.64-145. In particular, lines 68-69 of the *Ep. Bi.* recall lines 13-14 of the *Ep. Ad.*
- Therefore the dead hero of the *Ep. Bi.* must be the author of the *Ep. Ad.*

Now while this is perfectly possible, there are several considerations that should intervene before we allow a probable hypothesis to transform itself imperceptibly into an established fact:

1. Camerarius' remark in the extract quoted above also attributed the *Ep. Bi.* to Moschus, and a later part of the remark also cast doubt on the authenticity of Theocr. *Id.* 22, whereas modern scholarship refutes the former and confirms the latter. Thus the attribution of the *Ep. Ad.* to Bion, plausible as it may be, finds itself bedfellow of certain other hypotheses now held to be disproven. While this does not weaken the intrinsic force of Camerarius' argument for Bionean authorship of the *Ep. Ad.*, it does suggest that a certain caution should be exercised with Camerarius' hypotheses.

2. Bion comes across in the *Ep. Bi.* as the bucolic poet *par excellence*, where he is portrayed as *βουκόλος* and *βούτας*. His place in the canon of the 'Bucolic triad' goes back at least to the Suda on Theocritus, closely echoed by Camerarius in the passage quoted above: *Ἰστέον δὲ δι τρεῖς γεγόνασι βουκολικῶν ἔπων ποιηταί, Θεόκριτος οὔτοσί, Μόσχος Σικελιώτης καὶ Βίων ὁ Σμυρναῖος*. Most of the fragments preserved by Stobaeus are quoted *ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Βίωνος βουκολικῶν*. Yet very little of the *Ep. Ad.* can be called 'bucolic' in even the most generous interpretation of the term (at most lines 32-36 and 64-66; the authenticity of the latter passage, which seems structurally to have little to do with the rest of the poem, has been doubted). It is true that many of the fragments are not obviously bucolic either, but those 'fragments' that are genuinely fragmentary may conceal bucolic content now lost to us. If we did not possess lines 68-69 of the *Ep. Bi.* we would have no compelling reason to associate the *Ep. Ad.* with the author of the fragments or with the hero of the *Ep. Bi.* For a programmatic interpretation of *fr.* 10 touching on bucolicity, see below.
3. Neither the *Ep. Ad.* nor the fragments are extensive enough for arguments drawn from internal evidence alone to be conclusive, and differences of *genre* may also be at work in a period characterised by 'contamination' or mixture of *genres* ('Kreuzung der Gattungen'), but it must be said that an analysis of the language of the *Ep. Ad.* on the one hand and the fragments on the other does little to suggest that both blocks of writing are by the same author. The results of such an analysis are given below.
4. Of the several writers of late antiquity who seem to have been acquainted with the work of Bion as commonly understood, the most copious borrowers were Stobaeus (*Florilegium*, whence we have all but one of the fragments), Nonnus (*Dionysiaca*, most noticeably in the lament at the end of book 15), and the unknown authors of [Theocr.] 23 and the *Ep. Bi.* It is odd that of these, Stobaeus quotes sixteen 'fragments' (some of which are most probably complete short poems) but makes no quotations at all from the *Ep. Ad.* Conversely, Nonnus and Pseudo-Theocritus show a close knowledge of the *Ep. Ad.* but none at all of the fragments. It is true that echoes of 'Bion' (though much less clamorous ones) from both sources can be detected in both Vergil and Ovid, but this need mean no more than that those Roman poets knew both their Bion and their Pseudo-Bion, and in the case of Ovid at any rate, whose love-related poetry is so vast, it is hardly surprising that he overlaps with *topoi* of love-poetry written only a century or so before him. The *Ep. Bi.* is clearly written, albeit superficially, in imitation of the *Ep. Ad.*, and has certain features in common with some of Bion's fragments, but none that cannot be explained by overall similarity of theme. Thus no single ancient source gives the impression of regarding the *Ep. Ad.* and Bion's fragments as being by the same author.
5. The obvious allusion in *Ep. Bi.* 68-69 to *Ep. Ad.* 13-14 does not itself *prove* that the latter poem was written by the hero of the former, even though it points to this conclusion as likely. At least three other explanations are within the bounds of possibility:
 - i) that the author of the *Ep. Bi.* wished, in good faith or otherwise, to pass off the *Ep. Ad.* as the work of Bion when in fact it was not.
 - ii) that the *Ep. Ad.* was written by a pupil of Bion or a member of his

'school' to whom another pupil and/or adulator of Bion, namely the author of the *Ep. Bi.*, wished to pay an indirect compliment. The existence of such a 'school' is however itself unsupported.

iii) that both poems echo a third and earlier one unknown to us, other than the model of both in the *Thyrsis*-song⁶ in Theocr. *Id.* 1.64-145.

However it must be said that hypotheses (ii) and (iii) are on balance less likely, since the link between *Ep. Ad.* 13-14 and *Ep. Bi.* 68-69 is surely unique and direct. An amalgam of hypotheses (i) and (ii) might result in the theory that the *Ep. Ad.* was composed by a follower of Bion but was alluded to by the author of the *Ep. Bi.* in terms suggesting that the former poem, though not actually written by Bion, was put together under his guidance, much as the so-called Socratic Dialogues, though actually committed to writing by Plato, represent the work of Socrates. On such an hypothesis Bion would be the 'author' of the *Ep. Ad.* in a broad sense. There is no shred of evidence that any of these theories is true, but they remain theoretically possible and cannot be discarded *a priori*.

6. Echoes are in any case an unreliable guide to identity of author. It is certainly possible for a poet to re-use a given phrase, and the practice was standard in epic, but in the late Hellenistic period reputable poets came to consider *variatio* (whether of Homer,⁷ each other⁸ or themselves⁹) more of a virtue than *repetitio*. Within the bucolic *corpus* whole lines are seldom repeated, and even then with minor elements of variation. For instance Theocritus re-uses in *Id.* 5.46 a line he had already used in *Id.* 1.107, but the phraseology is slightly altered, while the recurrence in [Theocr.] *Id.* 27.4 of Theocr. *Id.* 3.20, which must be meant to be an allusion to Theocritus by his imitator (if not by a scholiast), contains a variation of dialect. The somewhat slavish re-use in [Theocr.] 23 of phrases taken from the *Ep. Ad.* is more an argument *against* common authorship than for it: no reputable poet repeats

⁶ Both the *Ep. Ad.* and the *Ep. Bi.* look to *Id.* 1 but resemblances are counterbalanced by significant differences: in the *Thyrsis* there are no kisses of a dying hero, and the portrayal of both Daphnis and the goddess is not such as to promote them. Further, the lamented hero of Theocritus' poem dies only near the end (Theocr. *Id.* 1.140), whereas in the *Ep. Bi.* he is dead from the start and in the *Ep. Ad.* he dies at an undisclosed point towards the middle.

⁷ See, inter alia, Sonya Lida Tarán, *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden 1979); G. Giangrande, "'Arte Allusiva" and Alexandrian Epic Poetry' *CQ* n.s. 17 (1967) 85-97, and 'Hellenistic Poetry and Homer' *Antiquité Classique* 39 (1970) 46-77.

⁸ Thus Callimachus berates his literary opponents for writing at length (*Hymn* 2.106-112 and μέγα βιβλίων μέγα κακόν; cf. Theocr. *Id.* 7.45-48) but can himself be unbearably long-winded and abstruse. The legends of Tiresias in *Hymn* 5 and (probably) Erysichthon in *Hymn* 6 comprise innovations by Callimachus in respect of existing myth; his Hecale in the fragmentary poem of that name is a recreated character (see G. Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry* [London 1987] 209-214). Moschus' *Europa* also represents 'variation' in that what begins as an aetiological myth (model: Callimachus) and then proceeds by way of ecphrasis towards classic pastoral (model: Theocritus) turns out to be neither.

⁹ The best known example is Theocritus, who wrote in (at least) four poetic modes (bucolic/mimetic/hymnic/miniature epic), four metres (epic hexameter/14-syllable Sapphic/16-syllable Sapphic/elegiac couplets), three dialects (Doric/Ionic/Aeolic), and three identifiable styles (high: *Id.* 13, 16-18, 22; middle: *Id.* 1-7, 10-12; low: *Id.* 14, 15). In the Greek Anthology two poets of considerable versatility are Philodemus and Crinagoras. Variation both of self and others is common in the Anthology, with endless and tiresome replays of common themes: dedications of spoils, love-become-hate, weddings closely followed by funerals, Myron's cow, statues that breathe, and the like.

himself quite so often or quite so baldly. Similar remarks are relevant to parts of [Theocr.] 9 and its claims to Theocritean authorship: the very features whereby its author wished to copy Theocritus betray it as not really being by him at all. *Ars est celare artem*.

There are however certain counter-arguments to some of the above points:

7. It has been argued¹⁰ that Bion fr. 10 (*ἃ μεγάλα μοι Κύπρις...*) comprises a major programmatic statement, whereby Bion announces his intention to turn away from *δοσα βουκολιασδον*, i.e. from bucolic poetry, in favour of love poetry (*ἐρωτύλα*) learned at the hands of Eros, whom it had been Bion's mission to instruct in various 'bucolic' musical instruments. This theory begs certain questions, notably the appropriateness of the *πλαγίανλος* and the *χέλυσ* to bucolic poetry; at the same time there is a certain thematic attractiveness about the thought of a revulsion against Bion's reputation as *βούτας* (fr. 10.4) in favour of *ματέρος* (= Aphrodite's) *ἔργα* (fr. 10.11); the same *iter* was trodden (if for different reasons) by Meleager in AP 7.535 and 12.128, arguably also by Callimachus in AP 7.518, and would be trodden — if only Eunika would agree — by the author of [Theocr.] *Id.* 20. Arguably a similar transformation takes place in the *Ep. Ad.* in lines 68–69, where after a 'bucolic frame' (32–39, 64–66) to the centre of the poem (Aphrodite's Lament, 42–61), there is the injunction *μηκέτ' ἐνὶ δρυμοῖσι τὸν ἀνέρα μύρεο Κύπρι* (68), since *οὐκ ἀγαθὰ στιβάς ἐστιν Ἀδώνιδι φυλλὰς ἐρήμα* whereupon the remaining thirty lines of the poem, which hitherto has been set in the 'bucolic outdoors', are played out indoors in the *quondam* marital chamber that has become a morgue.
8. The same fr. 10 and the preceding fr. 9 offer a possible internal cross-reference to the theme of the *Ep. Ad.* Fr. 10.11 portrays Eros as teaching Bion *θνατῶν ἀθανάτων τε πόθως καὶ ματέρος ἔργα* without an obvious reason for the mortal/immortal divide, and the same is more explicit (because singular) in fr. 9.8: *ἦν μὲν γὰρ βροτὸν ἄλλον ἢ ἀθανάτων τινα μέλπω*. Now it is one of the themes of the *Ep. Ad.* that Adonis is mortal but Aphrodite, to her own disadvantage, immortal (51–53); it is thus helpful to understand fr. 9 and 10 as referring to Adonis and Aphrodite, and fr. 9 in particular as contrasting Bion's poetry on this topic with his less inhibited verse on other topics in bucolic-erotic vein (*ἦν δ' αὖτ' ἐς τὸν Ἔρωτα καὶ ἐς Λυκίδα νι μελίσδω/καὶ τόκα μοι χαίροισα διὰ στόματος ῥέει αὐδά*). The outcome is a *different kind* of poetry (*ὥς πάρος οὐκέτ' αἰεῖται*), which we should today identify as a *different genre*: though both indeed treat of love, the *Ep. Ad.* is altogether different from the love-ditties exemplified in several of the fragments, including most of those that seem to be complete short poems, and explicitly named as such (*ἐρωτύλα*) in fr. 10.10, 13.

These counter-arguments are intuitions rather than provable truths regarding Bion and do not eliminate all the objections that can be raised against Bionean authorship of the *Ep. Ad.*, but they would, if accepted, go a long way towards solving some of the puzzles explicit or implicit in points 2, 4 and 6 above.

So much for what might be called the conscious signals within a poem (or group of poems) that are relevant to its authorship. More significant in the long

¹⁰ By W. Arland, *Die nachtheokritische Bukolik* (Diss. Leipzig 1937) 40–52, and esp. 40–43.

term are the subconscious signals, which can, as in the case of [Theocr.] 9 or 23, on occasion contradict the conscious ones. They comprise linguistic signals and (for poetry) prosodic ones, and these will now be examined. One limitation must be kept in mind throughout, namely the paucity of material: the *Ep. Ad.* contains 98 or 99 lines while the fragments total 116; thus both items together make up the bulk of only about one half of a short book of Homer.

LINGUISTIC SIGNALS

A linguistic analysis of the *Ep. Ad.*, which the present writer has undertaken in another connection,¹¹ shows up the following distinctive features:

1. high frequency of *καί* and *δέ*, with little use of other copulas
2. high incidence of parataxis and low frequency of hypotaxis
3. relatively little use of the definite article
4. a detectable pattern in the use of contracted or uncontracted forms
5. a complex pattern in the use or non-use of verbal augment.

In the first three of these areas there are found to be substantial differences in Bion's fragments, while the fourth and fifth exhibit minor rather than major points of divergence. The findings may briefly be summarised as follows:

1. The standard *μέν/δέ* binary contrast occurs five times in the fragments (8.4; 8.6; 9.8; 10.5; 10.12), whereas no standard use of *μέν* occurs at all in the *Ep. Ad.* *μέν* either is not followed by *δέ* at all (13, 18, 30), or if so it is not in binary contrast (81, 83). *ἀλλά* occurs three times in the fragments (5.2; 10.10; 11.8) but only once in the *Ep. Ad.*, and that untypically (14), where *ἀλλά* replaces *δέ* as a reply to *μέν*.¹² Negative copulas (*οὐδέ/μηδέ/οὔτε/μήτε*) are quite common in the fragments (2.16 bis; 5.2; 6.1; 7.1; 11.7; 13.2) but do not occur in the *Ep. Ad.* at all; instead we have *καί οὐ* (13, 53), *ἀλλ' οὐ* (14) or combinations of *οὐ* and *δέ* (88/89, 95, 96) separately. *τε* occurs three times in the fragments (2.6; 10.11; 16.2) but in the *Ep. Ad.* not at all. To some extent differing copulatory usage can be explained by different semantic content: thus fragments 8, 9, 10 are argumentative-contrastive in content, which calls for contrastive particles, while the use of the priamel in some fragments lends itself to the accumulation of compound negatives; at the same time it must surely be significant that the *Ep. Ad.* has such a narrow range of affirmative copulas and resorts to various devious means to avoid negative ones.
2. Parataxis is frequent, and hypotaxis correspondingly infrequent, in the *Ep. Ad.*¹³ The ratio of subordinate clauses (totalling 20) to main clauses (totalling 102) is approximately 1:5 — a broadly similar proportion obtains also in other bucolic lament, i.e. in the *Ep. Bi.* and in the Thyrsis song in Theocr. *Id.* 1. In Bion's fragments however the figures are 36 subordinate clauses to 80 main clauses, or 9:20, which is more than double the ratio

¹¹ Namely, in a doctoral dissertation at Berne University, Switzerland.

¹² *ἀλλ' ἐλεγ'* is often conjectured at *Ep. Ad.* 89, but *ᾄδεται* is at least as likely a conjecture for MSS *ἄλλεται*, and one with a long pedigree (16th century).

¹³ High incidence of parataxis naturally collates with copula use, thus linking this point with the last, and with enjambment. See M. Parry, 'The Distinctive Character of Enjambment in Homeric Verse', *TAPA* 60 (1929) 200 f.

exhibited by the *Ep. Ad.* This is all the more surprising in that in a short poem, such as some of the fragments at least fully comprise, one expects a rather higher degree of simple clause conjunction; a clear case is [Theocr.] 19 (which some following Valckenaer in 1779 have attributed to Bion) with ten main clauses in eight lines; even the four subordinate clauses carry the narrative along in a factual way as 'disguised main clauses'. Again the semantic element is a mitigating factor (hypotaxis in the fragments is most frequent in 'argumentative' *frr.* 8-10) but again one is led to wonder whether it can be the sole explanation of a rather puzzling feature.

3. The *Ep. Ad.* is characterised by high frequency of article omission, broadly defined as omission of the article in contexts where its insertion would be normal in prose. This feature is held by G. Zanker¹⁴ to belong to the 'high' style in Alexandrian poetry, and applies in the *Ep. Ad.* to most of the easily classifiable categories of nouns: parts of the body, clothing or other objects accompanying the body, aspects of the natural world. With a total of two exceptions, all forty or so instances of these categories of noun are without article in the *Ep. Ad.* However, one noun area where article insertion is frequent is in words referring to the sentiment, expression or act of love: in this area, which is central to the theme of the *Ep. Ad.*, there are ten instances of insertion and only two of omission. Turning to the fragments we find a somewhat mixed bag for the first three categories, with only a slight edge for omission over insertion, but in the area of love-making (again a theme central to many of the fragments, some of which are self-proclaimed *έρωτύλα* as in *fr.* 10.10, 13) we note that the few nouns used for this purpose are all without article. A subdivision of this point is use or non-use of articles with proper names: the *Ep. Ad.* consistently gives *Ἀδωνις* (without) but *τὸν Ἀδωνιν* (with), while Aphrodite is mostly called *Κύπρις* (without) or *ἡ Κυθέρεια* (with); where she is called *Ἀφροδίτα* it is also with the article. Bion's fragments are noticeably inconsistent, with *Μοῖσας/Μοῖσαι/ται Μοῖσαι* in consecutive lines in 3.1-2, *τὸν Ἐρωτα* but *Ἐρωτα* in 9.1 and 9.5, *τὸν Ἐρωτα* but *Ἐρωτα* in 13.6 and 13.2, 10, *ὁ Πάν* but *Ἀθάνη/Ἐρμάων/Ἀπόλλων* all without article in 10.7-8; similar internal inconsistency not involving proper names comes at 2.18 (*χὰ νῆξ...δῶς*) and 13.7, 11 (*χὼ παῖς...παῖδα*). The one instance of *Κύπρις* (10.1) is with the article, while *Ἀφρογενείας* (11.1) is without it (*Κυπρογένεια* at 14.1 is vocative). Thus in the matter of article use or non-use the *Ep. Ad.* shows itself to be at odds with Bion's fragments. As well as metrical-segmental considerations, to the forefront with initial-vowel names such as Adonis, Aphrodite, Athena, Apollo or Eros, the 'high style' factor alluded to may play a role here, as may questions of *genre*, but it is hard to measure, the more so when another candidate for Bionean authorship, namely the *Epithal.* A & D — also as far as we can judge belonging to the 'high' style — does not on these criteria show itself obviously to be by Bion either.
4. The *Ep. Ad.* is in literary Doric; thus it is not surprising that the many contractions of Attic (and of *koiné*) are there left uncontracted. However it is noticeable that finite verbs are nearly always contracted, with the

¹⁴ Zanker, *op.cit.* 167, 219 n.54; and see references given there.

exception of imperatives in -εο. In Bion's fragments, likewise in Doric, non-contraction is again general but for finite verbs both contraction and non-contraction occur, the latter somewhat more frequently. Occurrences in the fragments which by this criterion run counter to the practice of the *Ep. Ad.* are numerous: λαλέειν (2.8), ἐξερῶ (2.11), καλέοι (3.1), ποθέοντι (3.2), πονέεσθαι (7.1), φοβέονται (9.1), ὑπνῶντι (10.1), ὁδοιπορέοντας ἐνοχλέω (11.7), ἐρῶ (11.8), φιλέοντες... ἀντεράωνται (12.1), παρέοντος (12.2), ἀσχαλῶν (13.7), μειδιάων (13.11). This list does not take into account monosyllabic stems in -ε which would remain uncontracted anyway (9.6, 11), nor two instance of ἐπέοικε (2.9; 7.1) where *digamma* plays a role. One imperative in -εο occurs in contracted form, namely ἔρχευ in 13.12. However, the occurrence of uncontracted φειδεο in the same line opens the way to a possible metrical rather than a syntactical criterion: as a rule, contraction occurs when the word in question is at verse-end. The exceptions to this, which are quite numerous, are at least distributed evenly between the *Ep. Ad.* and the fragments. One other related phenomenon in the fragments, also motivated by metrical needs, is the 'unravelling' of diphthongs at 13.1 (δλσεῖ) and 16.2 (δίονα), and the insertion of an extra short vowel at 2.18 (ὁμοίολος); nothing like this occurs in the *Ep. Ad.*

5. Use or non-use of the augment in the *Ep. Ad.* is complex:

i) Syllabic augment occurs nine times, and fails to occur five times, in normal circumstances, by which is meant where the syllable that comprises the augment is indeed an extra syllable. In this matter Bion's fragments present a striking contrast, with five instances of insertion and sixteen of omission. But if the syllable that comprises the augment is such as simply to elide the preceding vowel, then in both the *Ep. Ad.* and Bion's fragments we observe the following pattern:

a) Within one word, i.e. in cases of a compound verb whose prefix ends in a vowel, that vowel always cedes to the augment.

b) Across a word break, i.e. in all other cases than the preceding, there is a strong tendency for the augment not to occur.

Of these two points, (a) is valid without exception, while (b) is general in the *Ep. Ad.* and predominant also in Bion's fragments. One caveat, however, concerns the factor of alteration in transmission: because augment plus elision is metrically equivalent to no augment and no elision, the possibility of scribal interference (whether deliberate or accidental) cannot be ruled out. A clear example of this is *Ep. Ad.* 14, where both MSS have θνάσκοντ' ἐφίλασεν, whereas collation both with other comparable places in the *Ep. Ad.* (30, 42, 60) and with line 69 in the *Ep. Bi.* strongly indicates θνάσκοντα φίλησεν as what the poet actually wrote. A less clear-cut case is line 76, where the MSS πάντ' ἐμαράνθη gains support from exactly the same words at *Ep. Bi.* 32, making Wilamowitz' alteration to πάντα μαράνθη more dubious.

ii) Non-syllabic augment occurs in both the *Ep. Ad.* and Bion's fragments in broadly comparable proportions if one remembers that one is dealing with low figures anyway; thus the ratio of use to non-use is 4:4 in the former and 6:8 in the latter. Interestingly the position of the *Epithal. A & D* in the matter of augment is such as to bring it into closer proximity to the *Ep. Ad.* (syllabic — 9:5; non-syllabic — 6:4) than to the fragments,

suggesting that on the criterion of augment alone one might posit one poet (Bion) for the fragments, and one other (unknown) for both the *Ep. Ad.* and the *Epithal. A & D.*

These are the principal areas of divergence regarding use of language. There are however a few other isolated points worthy of mention: though alone not carrying much weight, collectively they add a little to observable differences between the lament and the fragments:

1. The Doric preposition *πρὶ* is such a favourite with Theocritus as almost to be a genre-marker, occurring in 32 distinct uses (not counting repeats) in Theocritean bucolic, 14 uses in non-bucolic Theocritus, and 9 uses in Pseudo-Theocritus (of which 3 in the clearly bucolic and possibly genuine *Idyll* 8).¹⁵ The *koiné* form *πρός* on the other hand occurs only six times in genuine Theocritus, and only once in a bucolic poem by him (*Id.* 5.93); it also occurs twice in [Theocr.] 9. Doric *πρὶ* occurs seven times in Bion's fragments (5.1; 8.11 *bis*; 11.4; 13.3; 13.8; 16.2), always with the accusative. In the *Ep. Ad.* it occurs only once (line 65), and that in the dative (*πρὶ χθοῖ*) and in a use that is Homeric (*Il.* 21.426 *varia lectio*, *Od.* 8.378, *Hom. Hym. Ap.* 459) rather than bucolic; that part of the poem (*viz.* 64-66) is in any case suspect on other grounds. The compound adjective *ποτικάρδιον* occurs at line 17. On the other hand, as well as *βέλη ποτικάρδια*, *ποτί* occurs four times in [Theocr.] 23, a poem which clearly imitates the *Ep. Ad.* in a number of places. It must be said that *πρός* does not occur in the *Ep. Ad.* either: where it might have been expected we have other prepositions: *ὥς* (50), *παρά* (52), *ἐν* (81-82). At line 74 *πόθες* (= *ποτι ἐς*) was conjectured by Platt and subsequently taken up by Gow (1952) and Hopkinson (1988) for *ποθεῖ*, of uncertain accent and meaning.
2. For the second person singular pronoun, forms of both *τύ* and *σύ* are found in the fragments, though neither is frequent. The *Ep. Ad.* shows a clear preference for forms of *σύ*, though *τύ* occurs in the MSS at line 93 (where it is often edited out) and the hiatus provided by MSS *σεῦ* at line 73 is avoided by editing in the *tau*-form *τεῦς*, following Wilamowitz. The only undisputed *tau*-form is that of the possessive adjective *τεόν*, which occurs at line 48. Against this, *sigma*-forms occur a total of ten or eleven times in the *Ep. Ad.* (the *Epithal. A & D* also has only *sigma*-forms).
3. Crasis occurs considerably more frequently in the fragments (9 times) than in the *Ep. Ad.* (3 times in the MSS; a fourth instance, conjectured at line 94, is commonly accepted). Further, two of the instances in the *Ep. Ad.* are really the same one *bis* (81, 83).
4. Elision occurs in both bodies of verse in roughly equivalent proportion (*Ep. Ad.*: 27; fragments: 22) but nearly all the instances in the former poem concern prepositions, particles or functional adverbs, i.e. 'light' elision. Cases of 'heavy' elision, or elision of lexis-bearing words, are very few, there being only one completely undisputed instance in the MSS (78: *ἄλετ'*

¹⁵ The figures are based on an entry-count in J. Rumpel's *Lexicon Theocriteum* (Teubner 1879), reprinted by Georg Olms, Hildesheim 1961.

'Αδωνις').¹⁶ One other (59: ἀνὰ δάματ' Ἐρωτες) is now universally accepted for unmetrical MSS ἀνὰ δάμα Ἐρωτες; Valckenaer in 1779 had suggested ἀνὰ δάμα γ' Ἐρωτες, with 'light' elision. Two further instances depend on maintaining a MS reading (76: πάντ' ἐμαράνθη, see above) or altering it (89: ἀλλ' ἔλεγ' αἰαί, from MS ἄλλεται αἰαί); the very rarity of 'heavy' elision can itself be a factor encouraging resort to other conjectures (resp. πάντα μαράνθη and ῥιζεται αἰαί). The case of line 14, where θηύσκοιτ' ἐφίλασεν is commonly altered for other reasons as well, has been mentioned already. In the fragments on the other hand there are six clear instances of 'heavy' elision (μ' ἄλιος 2.12; πάντ' εἰαρος 2.16; πάντ' ἄλλω 5.2; μ' ἀγέραςτον 6.1; οἶδ' οὐδέ 7.1; λαθόμεθ' ἤ 8.13; and four further ones in the MSS that can however be solved by eliminating the augment, three of them in the same poem: με δίδασκε...με δίδαξεν...πάντα διδάχθην (with Wilamowitz) at 10.10-13, and δδε πλέτο (though all editors, including Wilamowitz, retain δδ' ἐπλετο here) at 9.7.

5. One matter which touches also on metre but is basically a linguistic feature is the non-occurrence in the *Ep. Ad.* of 'Sperrung'. As there is no agreed English term for this phenomenon, for whose discovery and description we are indebted mainly to German scholarship, I use the German word here, which we might loosely render 'interlocking device' in this context.¹⁷ It is referred to by Fantuzzi¹⁸ as a 'vezzo stilistico' or 'stylistic trick'. 'Sperrung' comprises the separation of noun and attributive adjective by placing the one before the main caesura, the other at the end of the line. This metrical and rhetorical artifice, which can quickly come to tire the modern reader, is characteristic of late Hellenistic *poetae docti* such as Hermesianax and Euphorion, and there is some reason to think that ancient readers too were irritated by it.¹⁹ It is avoided by the author of the *Ep. Ad.* in the interests of fidelity to a canon of purity that Fantuzzi²⁰ regards as quasi-Callimachean.²¹ Fantuzzi acknowledges a single instance in the poem (at line 65) though

¹⁶ Precisely, V has ἀλεθ' Ἀδωνις (sic, with *theta* but smooth breathing), and *tau* written in over the *theta*. Vat. Gr. 1311 (=copy of V) has the reverse, i.e. *tau* in the text and *theta* above it. Ahrens, who must have inspected V, took this as evidence that our poem named its hero Ἀδωνις ('Hadonis') throughout, and printed it in 1855 accordingly, including ἐφ' Ἀδωνι at line 81 without any support from V, a choice that has inevitably earned him comparison (e.g. by August Meineke, 1856) with Catullus' Arrius or 'Harry' in *Carm.* 84.

¹⁷ On 'Sperrung' see H. Patzer, 'Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters', *MH* 12 (1955) 86 f., and C. Conrad, 'Traditional Patterns of Word Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil', *HSCP* 69 (1965) 195 f.

¹⁸ Op.cit. 148.

¹⁹ For an ancient criticism of Euphorion, see *AP* 11.218, which combines accusations of literary peccadilloes with sexual ones. For Hermesianax, E.A. Barber's judgement in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* follows a brief description of fondness for 'glosses' and characterisation of 'Sperrung' as 'monotonous' with the punch-line 'a very mediocre brain'. See also N.B. Crowther, 'ΟΙ ΝΕΩΤΕΡΟΙ, poetae novi, and cantores Euphorionis', *CQ* 20 (1970) 322-7, and footnote 21 below.

²⁰ Op.cit. 148: 'Tale artificio metrico ... estraneo a Callimaco non trova seguito nell' [*Ep. Ad.*]. It is true that Callimachus uses 'Sperrung' sparingly but he does not totally abstain: examples in the first two *Hymns* are: H. 1.23, 58; H. 2.22, 24, 38, 66. Fantuzzi rather lionises Bion's devotion to Callimachus: 'Bione rifacendosi al poeta di Cirene con la rigidità di un epigono'.

²¹ See preceding note; yet Propertius, who portrayed himself as 'the Roman Callimachus' (*Carm.* 3.1.1; 4.1.64) uses 'Sperrung' copiously: 20 times in the 38 lines of *Carm.* 1.1.1, of which the first 12 instances come in as many lines.

even this is not strictly an infringement as *ἀνθή* there is clearly predicative. In Bion's fragments on the other hand this 'rule' (if that it may be called) is broken six times (all of them in *frr.* 11 and 12); thus *ἐρατᾶς... Ἀφρογενείας/ἱερὸν ...ἀγαλμα/μοι...ἀγοντι* from *fr.* 11, and *ἀμειλίκτηιο ...Ἀΐδαο/δλβιος...Ὁρέστας ξυνᾶς...κελεύθως* from *fr.* 12. Of these, only the penultimate instance may be argued not strictly to infringe the rule as *δλβιος* does not immediately precede the main caesura, but this is in turn explained by the fact that that caesura is 'bridged' (H. Fränkel's 'Überbrückung');²² in any case a predicative expression is again involved. In all, the language of the *Ep. Ad.* displays considerably more conservative, purist features than does that of Bion in his fragments and short poems. It would be unwise to jump to quick conclusions here since quality, register, tone and 'pitch' of language can all be varied by a skilled word manipulator, and many of the Hellenistic poets were past masters at that, notably Theocritus and Callimachus but also others who took *ποικιλία/variatio* seriously to heart.²³ And not only they: a challenge is hereby issued to the reader to identify the author of the gushy, tasteless, semi-sadistic piece of soft porn that follows:

He wrings her nose, he strikes her on the cheeks,
He bends her fingers, holds her pulses hard;
He chafes her lips, a thousand ways he seeks
To mend the hurt that his unkindness marr'd;

rising to its supreme banality in:

He kisses her; and she, by her good will,
Will never rise so he will kiss her still.

The answer²⁴ may surprise but should not; the passage has a certain relevance also because of its subject matter (see Appendix). Regarding however the Greek texts we are confronted with, all that can be said at this point is that the hypothesis that Bion of Smyrna wrote the *Ep. Ad.* is not supported (but nor is it disproved) by linguistic evidence alone.

PROSODIC SIGNALS

Not only the language but also the prosody of the *Ep. Ad.* is characterised by a quasi-Callimachean purity involving a number of restrictions and limitations on the poet's choices in composition. These are as follows:

1. a limited number of verse-designs
2. infrequent and limited use of spondees
3. infrequent use of enjambment
4. infrequent use of the B1 caesura and restrictions on how it is used.

In addition to this, there are a few non-Callimachean features which also characterise the *Ep. Ad.*:

5. predominance of bucolic diaeresis (= C2)
6. use of the word division (- ~ | ~ - ~) preceding the B2 caesura

²² Herman Fränkel, 'Der kallimachische und der homerische Hexameter' in *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (Munich 1968) 100-156 (=reprint from 1926).

²³ Cf. Cicero on this topic: *Pro Archia Poeta* 8.18.

²⁴ It is, of course, William Shakespeare, *Venus and Adonis*, lines 475-480.

7. adherence to 'Tiedke's Rule' regarding accentuation before caesura. An examination of these features as they apply to Bion's fragments is less striking than the language comparison in the first part of this paper, and produces few surprises for those who simply assume the *Ep. Ad.* is by Bion, but nonetheless shows up just a few points of divergence:

1. *Verse-designs.* A comparison of the fragments with the *Ep. Ad.* (and the *Epithal. A & D*) gives the following result (d= dactyl, s= spondee in the first five feet; the sixth is irrelevant):

<i>Verse-design</i>	<i>Ep. Ad.</i>	<i>fragments</i> [§]	<i>Epithal. A & D</i> [#]
d d d d d	27	24 (30)	10
s d d d d	20	21 (23)	6
d s d d d	18	20 (25)	5
d d s d d	2	6	1
d d d s d	6* (12)	6	1
d d d d s	3	-	-
s s d d d	2	5	1
s d s d d	1	1	-
s d d s d	8	4	1
s d d d s	1	1	-
d s s d d	3	4 (5)	3
d s d s d	1	5	-
s s s d d	-	-	1
s s d s d	-	1	1

* 12 absolutely, but 6 of these come in refrains containing *ἐπαίδουσαν ἑρωτες*, which disorients the statistics for a relatively infrequent verse-pattern.

§ For convenience of comparison, the figures for the fragments are based on the first 98 full and textually unproblematic lines. Where different, figures for all 112 such lines are given in brackets. Four lines remain unaccounted for, two because incomplete (4.2; 8.14) and two because corrupt (6.1-2).

Figures for the 30 reliable lines of the *Epithal. A & D* are given to broaden the comparison, since this poem too has sometimes been attributed to Bion.

From the table above it is immediately clear that the pattern of verse-designs is strikingly similar, not only between the *Ep. Ad.* and the fragments, but between these and the *Epithal. A & D*, keeping in mind the shortness and the incompleteness of the last-named poem. More important however is the limited variety of verse-designs, being 12 in both the *Ep. Ad.* and the fragments, though not entirely the same 12. By way of comparison Callimachus uses 20 different verse-designs and Theocritus 28 out of a theoretically possible 32; their surviving work is much more extensive, but length is not a major consideration: Theocritus uses 15 verse-designs in 66 different lines in the *Thyrsis* (= *Id.* 1.64-145) while Moschus uses 21 verse-designs in 166 lines in the *Europa*. The author of the *Ep. Bi.* uses 11 verse-designs in 114 different lines (the refrain, occurring 14 times, is invariable), his list being largely coincident with those of the author of the *Ep. Ad.* and the author of the fragments.

2. *Spondees*. The table of verse-designs illustrates immediately the overall frequency of spondaic lines. A tabulation of these for the *Ep. Ad.* together with other real (the fragments) or possible (*Epithal. A & D*) *bionea* follows: to widen the comparison, figures are given also for other bucolic lament (*Thyrsis/Ep. Bi.*) and for 100-line samples of other Theocritus (the first idylls not involving refrains or stichomythia are *Idd.* 3 and 6 which total exactly 100 lines) and Moschus (*Europa* 1-100). Calculations are based on the number of effective lines, thus counting identical refrain lines once only (but see below), and discounting lines that are incomplete or irremediably corrupt. (s = spondee)

<i>poem</i>	<i>no s</i>	<i>one s in 1st or 2nd</i>	<i>one s late in verse</i>	<i>more than one s</i>
<i>Ep. Ad.</i> *	29	38	18 (12)*	15(6)*
fragments	27	43	11	19
<i>Epithal. A & D</i>	33	37	7	23
<i>Ep. Bi.</i>	27	39	10	24
<i>Thyrsis</i>	17	30	8	45
<i>Theocr.</i> 3 and 6	23	32	9	36
<i>Europa</i>	23	24	19	34

* As the refrain in the *Ep. Ad.* varies continuously, line computation is complex. The figures here consider each distinct full refrain line as a different line. There are 5 of these, giving a total of 94 effective lines (out of 98/99). Refrain half-lines alone, or refrain-echoes, are not taken into account.

The raw score is misleading, owing to the recurrence of part-refrain lines. The bracketed figures, though not totalling 100, are more realistic.

From these figures it transpires for both the *Ep. Ad.* and the fragments (and, indeed, the *Epithal. A & D*) that the proportion of lines with no spondees at all is slightly higher than for the other poems considered, and of lines with more than one spondee noticeably lower. The figures for the *Epithal. A & D* are less significant since the surviving portion of that poem is so short, but the close approximation of scores for the *Ep. Ad.* and the fragments is striking. Thus here there is clear similarity between the two sets of writing. Fantuzzi is however not entirely right in claiming that Bion never uses three spondees in one line (he refers expressly to 'l'intero *corpus* bioneo', op. cit. 149), since this happens at *fr.* 8.9 and but for the artificial device to avoid it (namely -εῖ for -εῖ) would also happen at *fr.* 13.1. It also happens twice in 30 lines in the *Epithal. A & D*, thrice in 114 effective lines in the *Ep. Bi.*, six times in *Europa* 1-100 and no fewer than 14 times in the 166 lines of Theocritus here considered. Four-spondee lines occur once each in the Theocritean and Moschean samples also.

3. *Enjambment*. While the distinction between 'strong' and 'weak' varieties of enjambment is sometimes slippery, it is useful and is adopted here, though a more rigid view is here taken of what comprises enjambment than

will be found in Fantuzzi's brief analysis. Discounting final lines of each fragment or lines preceding a change of speaker or a refrain (but see below), we arrive at the following position: (NFL = non-final lines; ENJ = enjambment)

<i>poem</i>	<i>NFL</i>	<i>no ENJ</i>	<i>weak ENJ</i>	<i>strong ENJ</i>	<i>all ENJ as % of NFL</i>
<i>Ep. Ad.</i> [*]	88	65	12	11	26
fragments [*]	94	53	27	14	44
<i>Epithal. A & D</i>	28	18	6	4	36
<i>Ep. Bi.</i>	100	64	19	17	36
<i>Thyrsis</i> [#]	30	21	4	5	30
Theocr. 3 and 6	95	70	14	11	26
<i>Europa</i>	100	44	22	24	46

* The number of non-final lines in the fragments is identical with the total non-repetitive lines in the *Ep. Ad.*, thereby facilitating a closer comparison.

Again the statistic for poems with refrains is misleading. The *Thyrsis* (lines 83-85) and the *Ep. Bi.* (lines 44-46) both provide a precedent for refrains not necessarily concluding syntactic or semantic units. If that does not happen in the *Ep. Ad.*, this is therefore a contingent fact about it, not one to be taken for granted. Thus the effective percentage in the *Ep. Ad.* is somewhat higher.

Noticeable here is the gap between the *Ep. Ad.* and the fragments, but this may be due to the method of computation and/or the allowance for refrain lines; Fantuzzi's figures (p. 148) for the *Ep. Ad.* come out at 54:30:14, which is very close to the above figure for the fragments. The last 10 lines or so of the *Ep. Ad.*, being of heightened emotional tension are difficult to classify: if these are to be counted as cases of enjambment the figures may be closely compatible. The same observation applies to parts of the *Epithal. A & D* (lines 16-26).

4. *Masculine caesura.* The incidence of masculine caesura is noticeably low in both the *Ep. Ad.* (19%) and the fragments (13%). Poles of comparison are the *Epithal. A & D* with 43%, the *Ep. Bi.* with 30%, the *Thyrsis* with 58%, Theocr. 3 and 6 with 53%, the *Europa* with 41%. Fantuzzi observes (p. 147) that it is a self-imposed rule in the *Ep. Ad.* that a long vowel or other heavy syllable can follow masculine caesura (= B1) only if bucolic diaeresis occurs in the same line. This is in fact true in that poem, though there are only seven examples (11, 26, 36, 44, 64, 82, 96) and when one considers that 77% of the poem contains bucolic diaeresis anyway, it follows that even a purely chance distribution would be likely to produce only two infringements. It is however not altogether true of the fragments, where out of 15 instances there are two clear infringements (3.1; 12.2); again, since 70% of the fragments contain bucolic diaeresis in any case, a

chance distribution might be expected to produce at most only four to five infringements. Thus to enunciate the 'rule' as Fantuzzi does is not in fact to say very much; at the same time there is here a modest area of divergence between the *Ep. Ad.* and the fragments.

5. *Bucolic diaeresis*. If this prosodic feature is correctly held to be an indication that poems making extensive use of it are considered to comprise a given *genre* distinct from those whose use of it is only sporadic, then the *Ep. Ad.* very properly belongs to this *genre*, since it shows an even higher incidence of bucolic diaeresis (77%) than the fragments (70%), which are cited by Stobaeus as ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Βίωνος βουκολικῶν, and from the *Ep. Bi.* we know Bion to have been considered βουκόλος (11) and βούτας (65) *par excellence*. It is clear that 'bucolic' had long since ceased to mean what it meant for Theocritus; the name of the *genre* is in any case unimportant. Figures for the other poems here being compared with the *Ep. Ad.* are as follows (in %): *Epithal. A & D* 87%; *Ep. Bi.* 82%; Theocr. *Id.* 1 (whole poem) 81%; *Europa* (whole poem) 69%. Theocritus is known to have varied the incidence of bucolic diaeresis considerably between different parts of his work: *Id.* 1, 3-7 give 83% (top scorer is *Id.* 5 at 89%), while the average for all his genuinely bucolic idylls (1, 3-7, 10-11) is 79%. Considerably lower scores are reported²⁵ for his urban mimes (*Id.* 2, 14, 15) and epyllia (*Id.* 13, 22, 24, 26) at 59% and 49.5% respectively. This leaves *Id.* 12, 16-18 unaccounted for, while the authors of non-Theocritean but clearly bucolic *Id.* 8 and 9 score 65% (hexameter parts) and 53% respectively. Other poets' ratings are given as Homer 62% (*Iliad*) and 59% (*Odyssey*), Callimachus 67% and Apollonius Rhodius 62%; surprisingly, Vergil's *Eclogues* scores only 62.5%
6. *Feminine caesura*. One licence that the author of the *Ep. Ad.* permits himself is the word-division - ~ ~ ~ in the second and third feet, which Fantuzzi maintains occurs in only 30 out of 600 (where he must mean 900) hexameters of Callimachus and only five times in nearly 200 lines of known Moschus, yet ten times in the *Ep. Ad.* He adds, rightly, that it is the pattern of καλὸς Ἄδωνις which we might call the theme-song of the poem occurring (with variations) a number of times. The ten occurrences in the *Ep. Ad.* come at lines 2, 14, 32, 43, 45, 51, 60, 79, 89, 93; of these, six (2, 14, 43, 45, 51, 79) contain Ἄδωνις, Ἄδωνι or Ἄδωνιν in the third foot. There are thus four instances not involving the name Adonis. In the fragments the same word division also occurs four times in the same *sedes metrica*, namely at 2.5 (χεῖμα δύσεργον), 10.10 (αὐτὸς δειδεν), 13.10 (δεῖξεν Ἑρωτα) and 14.7 (πικρὸν ἐόντα). However, a subdivision of this word division occurs three times (9.10 εἰς τὸν Ἑρωτα; 10.5 χά μὲν ἀπῆλθεν, 13.6 τῇ τὸν Ἑρωτα) and there are two instances of single long words whose component parts break down in this way: 14.1 Κυπρογενεῖα and 15.1 θηλυτέραισι. The same analysis applied to the *Epithal. A & D* shows a similar

²⁵ Figures for bucolic Theocritus, Moschus and Bion or Pseudo-Bion are my own; other figures are from D. Halperin, *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*, (Yale 1983) 209-11, 259-66. Halperin in turn has taken some of his statistics from other scholars' computations. Where they overlap, my figures are mostly 3-4% more generous than Halperin's.

proportion: two straight cases (12 *λαὸν ἀγείρειν*, 24 *καλὸν δειρε*) and one each of subdivision (26 *κοινὸν ἐς ὕπνιον*) and a single long word (6 *Πηλεΐδαο*). This feature is thus common in broadly similar proportions in all three claimants to Bionean authorship.

7. *Tiedke's Rule*. As enunciated by Fantuzzi, this rule states that masculine caesura can be immediately preceded by a final-syllable accented word²⁶ only if bucolic diaeresis follows. As with masculine caesura above, in a poem (*viz.* the *Ep. Ad.*) that contains only 19% masculine caesura and yet 77% bucolic diaeresis, to say this is to say rather little, the more so since accentuation on the final syllable in Greek is on the whole less common than the converse. A rider to the rule, which Fantuzzi (p. 151 n. 31) traces to W. Meyer in 1884, further states that in the case of feminine caesura, an immediately preceding bisyllabic word cannot have final-syllable accent. Turning to Bion's fragments we detect five occasions where Tiedke's rule is observed (3.3; 8.10; 11.1; 13.4; 14.6) but also two where it is broken (12.2; 12.5), while Meyer's rider to it is infringed once (11.7). Thus here too there is broad but not total convergence between the *Ep. Ad.* and the fragments. It is noteworthy that the infringements all occur within the same two fragments (11 and 12) that provide all the several infractions of a previously mentioned 'rule' in the *Ep. Ad.*, namely avoidance of 'Sperrung'. Yet there is little to suggest that these two fragments (the former probably, the latter possibly, a complete short poem) have anything in common which would explain, or be explained by, their aberrant behaviour in the two respects mentioned. As for the *Epithal. A & D*, Tiedke's rule applies (and is respected) once at line 29, while there is one infringement of Meyer's rider at line 9, if a visibly corrupt line can be amended to involve *κατὰ παστὸν* at this point.

What then can be made of language and prosody as criteria whereby to judge the authorship of the *Ep. Ad.*? Briefly the results here delineated suggest that as far as language is concerned there are a number of distinctive features that do not particularly promote Bionean authorship, whereas in the matter of prosody points of divergence without being entirely absent are far fewer. Thus the two factors of language and prosody in a mechanical sense cancel each other out, but it is central to the comparative contrast exercise that prosodic features of the kind discussed here are less susceptible to conscious or subconscious alteration than points of language use, since considerations of *genre*, type of discourse (narrative-expository/argumentative-persuasive) and overall poetic purpose more naturally impinge upon choice of word, or phrase, or lexis, than upon the metrical 'fit' of the words so chosen, above all in the case of *Leseapoësie* destined for perusal in the study.²⁷ In dearth of any decisive proof that the *Ep. Ad.* cannot be by Bion (disproving authorship is always easier than proving it) we may conclude by acknowledging areas of linguistic divergence but attributing them to the *genre*- and subject-related

²⁶ What Fantuzzi actually writes is 'ossitonia' but it is clear from the context that he uses the term to cover all words accented on the final syllable, thus both 'oxytone' and 'perispomenon' as commonly understood.

²⁷ The *Aufführungstheorie*, or theory of stage production in the style of Theocr. *Id.* 15. 100-144, is now discounted, though it was defended by Wilamowitz.

considerations previously mentioned, while giving more weight to the less easily alterable prosodic side, from which it emerges that the ascription of the *Ep. Ad.* to the author of the fragments, i.e. to Bion of Smyrna, can be maintained; indeed, seems likely. Camerarius' original hypothesis of 1530 is thereby upheld. This is hardly a striking conclusion, as in fact it reiterates what has long been an unchallenged position, but ample supportive evidence (together with some counter-evidence) has been found for what began as a frankly casual remark by a German humanist unprepared to accept uncritically that all anonymous components of the bucolic *corpus* must be by Theocritus. A fuller study of the issue would involve linguistic and prosodic analysis not only of the poems by Bion and Pseudo-Bion hitherto examined but also of all those that have at times been ascribed to him ([Theocr.] 19, 20, 27; Pap. Vindob. 29801)²⁸ or are otherwise associated with him (*Ep. Bi.*, [Theocr.] 23, *Eis Nekron Adonin*), and with a more extensive body of verse of undisputed authorship as a clinical model.

A broader canvas of this kind throws up a curious speculation. Early in this paper the transmission history of the *Ep. Ad.* was briefly outlined, and it was seen that the compilers of V and Tr had before them a cluster of poems, eight in number, that (allowing for MS mutilation in V and editorial excisions in Tr) occur in a fixed order, and (with one exception) are not found anywhere but in these two MSS and their descendants.

These poems are, in order: (1) [Theocr.] 20, (2) [Theocr.] 21, (3) Mosch. 1, (4) [Theocr.] 19, (5) *Ep. Ad.*, (6) *Eis Nekron Adonin*, (7) [Theocr.] 23, (8) *Epithal. A & D*. There is no obvious link between them, and no ready explanation why they should occur together as a group. Yet one common feature that does not visibly reside in the poems themselves but seems to have arisen in the course of post-Renaissance scholarship is a connection of some kind — whether of theme, authorship or literary association — with Bion of Smyrna. Thus items 5, 8, 4 and 1 have at times (in decreasing order of likelihood) been attributed to Bion, 7 shows evidence of borrowing, 6 shares a theme with 5, 3 is attested elsewhere but is akin to 4. The only one of the eight poems not to have any plausible link with Bion is 2. This is not to say, or even to imply, that Bion wrote them all (he did not write 3 and by all common criteria cannot have written 6 or 7), but it may not be too fanciful to suppose that the poems comprise, if not a 'Bion group', at least a 'Bion-related group' which reflects in part the poetic output of Bion, in part the literary fantasy and armchair speculations of an unknown Byzantine anthologist determined to collate him.

Bigoria, Switzerland

R.J.H. MATTHEWS

²⁸ Proponents of firm or tentative Bionean authorship for these poems include the following:

[Theocr.] 19: Valckenaer, Hermann, Meineke

[Theocr.] 20: Meineke; school of Bion: Wilamowitz, Legrand

[Theocr.] 27: Hermann, Gallavotti; influence of Bion: Wilamowitz

Papyrus Vindobonensis 29801 (= 'Rainer Papyrus'): Gallavotti (who calls it *Panis Epyllium*) and Beckby (who calls it 'Bion IV' or *Πάν και Ἡρώ*). Gow prints it in his *Bucolici Graeci* (O.C.T.) without comment on authorship.

Appendix

The solution contained in footnote 24 to the problem-solving exercise set in this paper raises the question of what debt, if any, Shakespeare had to Bion. Briefly, not much: Shakespeare was like most poets, mythistorians, painters and sculptors, who took their knowledge of 'Venus and Adonis' primarily from Ovid (*Metam.* 10. 298-739). In all 1194 lines of *Venus and Adonis* (if I have counted right) Shakespeare only once seems directly to quote a line from the *Ep. Ad.*, namely at lines 1019-20: 'For he being dead, with him is beauty slain/And beauty dead, black chaos comes again'; cf. *Ep. Ad.* 29 and 31. Other passages echo the ideas without the words, e.g. the contrast of black (death), red (blood) and white (flesh), or Aphrodite getting worsted by the undergrowth, but these are commonplace, and besides the details are different: Bion uses 'black' also of blood (*Ep. Ad.* 9, 25) and his thorns lacerate only Aphrodite's feet (*Ep. Ad.* 21-22), not her entire body. The poem is a mine for the curious: those not fully convinced that 'melting buttock' is either poetic or Shakespearean should consult line 298; for 'churlish swine' see line 616, for 'sweating lust' see line 794, for 'sluttish ground' see line 983.

The search for other traces of the *Ep. Ad.* in English literature makes one think of Milton's *Lycidas*, whose debt to Theocritus' *Thyrsis* and the anonymous *Ep. Bi.* is evident. Nothing of the *Ep. Ad.* is to be identified there, however, unless one counts 165f., 'Weep no more ... weep no more', as an allusion to *ἄλγε γόων ... ἰσχεο κομμῶν* at *Ep. Ad.* 97, yet the 'woeful shepherds' have no more place in the Greek poem than has Venus in the English one. Other Miltonian references to Adonis make no allusions to the *Ep. Ad.* or to Bion, save *Comus* 1002, where Venus is 'the Assyrian Queen'; cf. *Ep. Ad.* 24, where the punctuation suggested by J.A.K. Thomson in 1946, *Ἀσσύριον βοόωσα, πόσιν καὶ παῖδα καλεῦσα* (and not, as usually printed, *Ἀσσύριον βοόωσα πόσιν, καὶ παῖδα καλεῦσα*), makes it clear that Venus is the one whose Assyrian connections are being alluded to. The 'beds of hyacinth and roses' of *Comus* 998 recall, however, *Ep. Bi.* 5-6 more readily than *Ep. Ad.* 65-66. The 'Bion' of Matthew Arnold's *Thyrsis* line 84 ('Piping a ditty sad for Bion's fate') is the hero of the *Ep. Bi.* rather than the poet of the *Ep. Ad.*; Tennyson's *In Memoriam* also recalls Bion the hero rather than Bion the poet.

But the saving grace of Greek Pastoral Lament in English is Shelley's dirge for John Keats, known as the *Adonais*, written in 1821. At 495 lines it is five times the length of the *Ep. Ad.*, four times that of the *Ep. Bi.*; it contains ample echoes of, allusions to, and borrowings from both. These are briefly as follows:

Stanza	line	word(s)	<i>Ep. Ad./ Ep. Bi.</i>
1	1	I weep for Adonais	<i>Ep. Ad. 1: αἰδάω τὸν</i>
(also 3.1, 9.1)		He is dead!	<i>Ἄδωνιν</i> <i>ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις</i>
	6-7	With me/Died Adonais	<i>Ep. Ad. 29: ὤλεσε ...</i> <i>συνώλεσεν</i>
3	2	Wake ... wake and weep	<i>Ep. Bi. 65: συγκάθθανε</i>
		melancholy	<i>Ep. Ad. 3: ἔγρεο...</i> <i>καὶ πλατάγησον</i> <i>Ep. Ad. 3: δειλαία</i>

4	9	The third among the sons	<i>Ep. Bi. 74-5 νῦν πάλιν ἄλλον υἷα</i>
6	2	thy widowhood	<i>Ep. Ad. 59: χήρα δ' ἁ Κυθήρεια</i>
8 (whole stanza)			<i>Ep. Bi. 99-104, and esp. 103-104</i>
9	3-4	flocks...near living streams	<i>Ep. Bi. 23-24: αἱ βόες...νέμεσθαι</i>
11 (whole stanza)			<i>Ep. Ad. 79-85: the Erotes</i>
12	6	icy lips	<i>Ep. Ad. 11: ῥόδον φεύγει τῷ χεῖλεος</i>
14	4	and her hair unbound	<i>Ep. Ad. 20: λυσαμένα πλοκαμίδας</i>
	5	tears...ground	<i>Ep. Ad. 64-65: δάκρυον... ποτὶ χθονί</i>
15	1	Lost Echo ...mountains	<i>Ep. Ad. 38: Ἀχῶ δ' ἀντεβόασεν</i>
ἐστὶν		voiceless mountains	<i>Ep. Bi. 23: ὦρεα δ' ἄφωνα</i>
	4	amorous birds...green spray	<i>Ep. Bi. 46-9: ἀδονίδες...ἐπὶ πρέμνοισ</i>
	6-7	more dear...pined away	<i>Ep. Bi. 68: φιλέει σε πολὺ πλέον Ep. Bi. 75: καὶ νῶ δ' ἐπὶ πένθει τάκη</i>
16	3	dead leaves	<i>Ep. Ad. 69: φυλλὰς ἐρήμα</i>
	9	dew all turned to tears	<i>Ep. Bi. 29: καὶ ὕδατα δάκρυα γέντο</i>
17	1-6	nightingale...eagle	<i>Ep. Bi. 38-9: Ἀηδών... Χελιδών</i>
18	2	grief ...revolving year	<i>Ep. Ad. 98: πάλιν εἰς ἔτος ἄλλο δακρῶσαι</i>
24	4-5	wounded the...feet	<i>Ep. Ad. 21-2: αἱ δὲ βάτοι...κεῖροντι</i>
	8	sacred blood	<i>Ep. Ad. 22: ἱερὸν αἷμα</i>
25	6	wild/drear/comfortless	<i>Ep. Ad. 56: ἐμμὶ δ' ἐγὼ πανάποτμος</i>
26 (whole stanza)			<i>Ep. Ad. 42-53: Venus/kiss/ can't die</i>
27 (whole stanza)			<i>Ep. Ad. 60-61: English much expanded</i>
	1	O gentle child (cf. 2.1, 3.2: mighty/ melancholy Mother; 6.1: thy youngest, dearest one)	<i>Ep. Ad. 18: περὶ παῖδα Ep. Ad. 24: καὶ παῖδα i.e. Ad. is Aphrodite's/ Urania's son</i>

30	6-7	veiling...in sorrow	<i>Ep. Ad.</i> 88-9: οὐκέτι δ' ὑμῖν...αἰαῖ
36	1-3	poison...viperous murderer	<i>Ep. Bi.</i> 109-12: φάρμακον ...φύγεν ὥδάν
41	2	Mourn not for Adonais <i>ἀνέρα μύρεο</i>	<i>Ep. Ad.</i> 69: μηκέτι...τὸν
45	3-8	Chatterton/Sidney/Lucan	<i>Ep. Bi.</i> 87-93: Hesiod to Theocritus

Keats is in several ways a fitting 'Adonis': he is young (cf. Theocr. *Id.* 15. 129), pale of complexion (cf. *Ep. Ad.* 8, 11, 79, 85) and worthy of embrace even in death (cf. *Ep. Ad.* 13-14; Theocr. *Id.* 3.47-48). His *Ode to Melancholy* shows traces of the language of bucolic lament: Proserpine (*Ep. Ad.* 54-55; *Ep. Bi.* 119 f.), droop-headed flowers (*Ep. Ad.* 76; *Ep. Bi.* 32), glut thy sorrow (*Ep. Ad.* 21, 33; *Ep. Bi.* 75, 114 and refrain line *passim*), Beauty that must die (*Ep. Ad.* 31), Poison (*Ep. Bi.* 109-112). But Pastoral for Keats is 'Cold' (*Ode on a Grecian Urn* 45); Keats is no Shelley.