

GREEK AND LATIN POETRY OF LATE ANTIQUITY

FORM, TRADITION AND CONTEXT

Edited by Berenice Verhelst and Tine Scheijnen

PART 1
A 'LATE' PERSPECTIVE ON THE
LITERARY TRADITION

Chapter 2. Greek and Roman epigrammatists in the later imperial period: Ausonius and Palladas in dialogue with the classical past¹

Silvio Bär

Heiner Marti zum Gedenken

Drawing on a centuries-old tradition, but at the same time being open for experimentation and new developments, the literary epigram is perhaps the most versatile ancient literary genre of all. It is at home in the Greek and in the Roman world from the earliest days, and remained so uninterruptedly throughout all periods up until the Byzantine era and the European Renaissance, respectively. Within this triangle of tradition, longevity and versatility, epigrammatists have always used their genre as a testing ground for the recollection and construction of their literary past. Indeed, since the Hellenistic period, the epigram was used as a medium for the writing of literary history and canons, as well as for literary polemics.² For example, Hellenistic funerary epigrams on authors of the classical past were employed as a means of constructing identity and bridging the gap between the past and the present.³ Similarly, the Roman epigrammatist Martial devised what has been aptly named his ‘epigrammatic canon’ by establishing his position through references to the main authors of his past such as Cicero, Vergil and Catullus.⁴

This chapter takes a comparative approach towards the corpus of two eminent representatives of the epigrammatic genre from the later imperial period: Decim(i)us Magnus Ausonius on the Roman, and Palladas of Alexandria on the Greek side.⁵ There are several reasons for the choice of these two authors. First, they are (rough) contemporaries, both having lived during the fourth century CE (traditionally, both have been dated to the late fourth century; Palladas has recently been predated to a few decades earlier, but this new dating has not been universally accepted).⁶ Secondly, both share a similar background insofar as both were schoolteachers (*grammatici*).⁷ Thirdly, they are both, inter alia, authors of

¹ I wish to thank the two editors, Berenice Verhelst and Tine Scheijnen, as well as Sophia Papaioannou and Brian Sowers for their perspicacious comments and feedback during various stages of the writing process. Without their help I would not have been able to develop this chapter in the right direction.

² Cf. e.g. Gabathuler (1937) and the chapters in Part IV of the volume by Bing and Bruss (eds. 2007). On literary polemics in Hellenistic epigrams, cf. Cairns (2016: 125–86).

³ Cf. e.g. Bolmarcich (2002) on Hellenistic funerary epigrams on Homer. Cf. also Skiadas (1965) on Homer in the Greek epigrammatic tradition in general.

⁴ Cf. Mindt (2013a, b).

⁵ Textual editions used: Kay (2001) for Ausonius, Beckby (1965²) for Palladas. All translations from Greek and Latin are my own (exception: for Ausonius I use Kay’s translation, with modifications). – There is disagreement as to whether Ausonius’ *praenomen* was Decimus or Decimius (cf. Coşkun 2002: 182–185).

⁶ The traditional dating of Palladas to the later fourth century CE stems from Bowra 1959: 91–5. Kevin Wilkinson, the editor of the latest papyrus findings, the ‘New Palladas’ (= P.CtYBR inv. 4000), predates Palladas to the early fourth century (Wilkinson 2012: 41–57; Wilkinson 2015). However, the established dating has been defended by most scholars since then (cf. especially Benelli 2016 and Cameron 2016b, with further references).

⁷ Cf. Kaster (1988: 100–6, 247–9, 327–9).

scoptic epigrams and thus share common ground within the broad spectrum of the epigrammatic genre.⁸ Furthermore, their epigrammatic corpus is comparable in quantity, too: the number of Palladas' existing epigrams amounts to a total of ca. 160 poems in the *Greek Anthology*,⁹ whereas Ausonius' œuvre comprises 121 epigrams. Finally, it has even been suggested that Ausonius may be intertextually indebted to Palladas in some of his epigrams (this point, however, is only tangentially relevant for the argument of my chapter, given its comparative, rather than intertextual, approach).¹⁰ In sum, this common ground provides a basis for comparison and, potentially, allows for some generalisations. To this end, several epigrams by Ausonius and Palladas are analysed and discussed. Concerning Ausonius, the selection is limited to five epigrams which contain *nominatim* references to one or more classical authorities from the literary past (henceforth I call this type of epigram a '*nominatim* reference epigram'). In essence, I argue that Ausonius' dialogue with the literary past is characterized by a discourse about the value, validity and reliability of classical authors and authorities from the Greek and the Roman world. For this purpose, Ausonius uses various techniques, amongst which the tension between acknowledged and anonymous sources, the inclusion of potentially invented 'fake sources', and a recurring discussion of Greek versus Roman authorities prevail. In contrast, Palladas constructs a *persona* of himself which resorts to Greek authorities only and, especially, to Homer. Therefore, for Palladas a slightly different approach is taken here: I restrict myself to a selection of Homeric epigrams, some of which mention Homer by name, whereas others refer to him by other means. As is demonstrated, Homer and the Homeric epics were to a large extent appropriated in order to construct Palladas' personal voice, whereas the actual discourse about classical authors and authorities remains comparatively flat and limited as compared to Ausonius.

2.1. AUSONIUS: FROM QUESTIONING AUTHORITIES TO FAKING SOURCES

In the epigrammatic corpus of Ausonius, we find six *nominatim* reference epigrams: *Epigr.* 12 (Cicero), 35 (Sappho), 72 (Ovid, Pliny), 73 (Lucilius, Pythagoras), 75 (Afranius) and 103 (Sappho). In what follows, five of these epigrams are discussed in order of their appearance in Ausonius' collection (*Epigr.* 35 is omitted because of its brevity).

*O*takes the form of an interrogative dialogue between the spectator of two statues and the two statues which the speaker contemplates:

‘Cuius opus?’ ‘Phidiae, qui signum Pallados, eius,
 quique Iovem fecit, tertia palma ego sum.
 sum dea.’ ‘quae?’ ‘rara et paucis Occasio nota.’
 ‘quid rotulae insistis?’ ‘stare loco nequeo.’
 ‘quid talaria habes?’ ‘volucris sum; Mercurius quae 5
 fortunare solet, trado ego, cum volui.’
 ‘crine tegis faciem.’ ‘cognosci nolo.’ ‘sed heus tu,
 occipiti calvo es.’ ‘ne tenear fugiens.’

⁸ Cf. Zerwes (1956: 292–320) for Palladas and Szelest (1976) for Ausonius.

⁹ Cf. Zerwes (1956: 4–7, 414–21). This corpus is now supplemented by the ‘New Palladas’ (cf. n. 6 above).

¹⁰ Kay (2018: 18) mentions four cases where ‘Ausonian epigrams may be derived from, may be the model for, or may share the same source as pieces by Palladas’. Those who accept the earlier dating of Palladas (on which cf. n. 6 above) may be inclined to accept a direct ‘dependence’ of Ausonius on Palladas (but the risk of circular argumentation is high in this case). On other Greek models of Ausonius, cf. e.g. Munari (1956), Benedetti (1980: 9–14), Cameron (1993: 80–84) and Kay (2001: 13–19).

‘quae tibi iuncta comes?’ ‘dicat tibi.’ ‘dic, rogo, quae sis.’
 ‘sum dea cui nomen nec Cicero ipse dedit; 10
 sum dea quae facti non factique exigo poenas,
 nempe ut paeniteat: sic Metanoea vocor.’
 ‘tu modo dic, quid agat tecum.’ ‘quandoque volavi
 haec manet; hanc retinent quos ego praeterii.
 tu quoque dum rogitas, dum percontando moraris, 15
 elapsam disces me tibi de manibus.’

‘Whose work [are you]?’ ‘That of Pheidias, he who made the statue of Pallas, I’m his!

And he made the Jupiter; I’m his third-best piece.
 I’m a goddess!’ ‘Which one?’ ‘Opportunity, infrequent, and known to few.’

‘Why are you standing on a wheel?’ ‘I can’t stand still.’
 ‘Why have you got winged sandals?’ ‘I am very swift. Whenever I want,
 I hand over the good fortune which Mercury customarily creates.’
 ‘You cover your face with your hair.’ ‘I don’t want to be recognized.’ ‘But,
 good heavens,

 the back of your head is bald!’ ‘So I can’t be caught as I make off.’
 ‘Who is the companion with you?’ ‘Let her tell you.’ ‘Please tell me who
 you are.’

 ‘I am a goddess to whom even Cicero himself did not give a name:
 I am the goddess who exacts punishment for what has and has not been
 done,

 so that one truly regrets it. Hence I am called Metanoea.’
 ‘Now you again please, tell me what she is doing with you.’ ‘Whenever I’ve
 flown away,

 she stays behind. Those whom I’ve passed by hold on to her.
 You too, while you’re asking all these questions and procrastinating with
 your interrogation,

 will discover that I have slipped through your hands.’

This epigram is closely related to a Greek epigram by Posidippus (*Anth. Plan.* 16.275) which consists of a similar dialogue between a statue of Καίρως, crafted by Lysippus, and an anonymous speaker who questions the statue as to its provenance and appearance. As Kay (2001: 98–99) puts it, ‘[t]he similarities between Ausonius and Posidippus are so close that coincidence is not credible’. In essence, Ausonius introduces three significant changes as compared to the Greek original:¹¹ first, a change of sculptor (Pheidias instead of Lysippus); secondly, a gender shift from a male (Καίρως) to a female (*Occasio*) statue; and, thirdly, the addition of a second statue (*Metanoea*). Whereas Cicero is prominently mentioned as the ‘non-translator’ of the Greek personification of Μετάνοια, Ausonius does not acknowledge the fact that the translation of Καίρως as Latin *Occasio* does in fact date back to Cicero (*Off.* 1.142). Therein we can see an implicit comment on the speaker’s attitude towards Cicero: for one, Cicero is clearly attributed the role of the principal classical authority when it comes to the translation of Greek terms and concepts into Latin. For another, though, he is silenced in the one case he ought to be credited, and mentioned when he cannot be given credit as a translator. This may be read as a smug comment *ex silentio* by Ausonius on Cicero’s reputed

¹¹ For a detailed comparison, cf. Benedetti (1980: 109–25) and Kay (2001: 97–103).

quod Canace Phyllisque et fastidita Phaoni.’

‘hoc das consilium?’ ‘tale datur miseris.’

‘Look, Venus, you’ve persuaded me, unlucky in love as I am, to love two girls.

They both hate me. Now give me different advice.’

‘Win them both over with gifts.’ ‘I’d like to, but I’ve straitened circumstances at home.’

‘Ensnare them with promises.’ ‘There’s no trust in the poor.’

‘Testify before the gods.’ ‘It is not right for me to deceive the gods.’

‘Mount watch outside their doors.’ ‘I’m afraid of getting arrested at night.’

‘Write elegies.’ ‘I can’t, I’m inexperienced with the Muses and Apollo.’

‘Break down their doors.’ ‘I fear the punishment of the law.’

‘You fool, you’re prepared to die of love, but not for love?’

‘I’d rather be called unhappy than unhappy and charged with a crime.’

‘I’ve given you what advice I can. You should ask others for advice now.’

‘Tell me who.’

‘Phaedra and Elissa will give you the counsel they gave themselves,

as will Canace and Phyllis and the one who was scorned by Phaon.’

‘So that’s your advice?’ ‘Such [advice] is given to wretches!’

This epigram is a direct response to the preceding *Epigr.* 102, in which Venus promises the speaker (who, as in *Epigr.* 73, bears the run-of-the-mill *praenomen* Marcus) that she is going to resolve his problem of loving and hating the wrong two girls by making him fall in love with both. According to *Epigr.* 103, Venus has fulfilled Marcus’ wish, but only partially – now he loves both girls, but they both reject him. Therefore, in the rest of the epigram Venus gives Marcus various pieces of advice about how he should win both, but Marcus rejects every single piece until Venus loses her patience and directs him to other authorities. Both epigrams recognisably play with topoi from Roman, and especially Ovidian, love elegy.¹⁸ On a metapoetic level, the dialogue between Venus and Marcus, and the latter’s repudiation of the former’s advice, can be read as a dialogue between Ovid and Ausonius in which the latter refutes the former as his model. This metapoetic quality becomes particularly obvious at two points: first, in line 7, Marcus rejects Venus’s advice that he should write elegies by self-ironically replying: ‘I can’t, I’m inexperienced with the Muses and Apollo’ (*nequeo, Musarum et Apollinis expers*). Secondly, when Venus finally loses her temper, she sneeringly recommends that Marcus seek advice elsewhere: namely, from women who all committed suicide because of unfulfilled love. Whereas the first four (Phaedra, Elissa, Canace and Phyllis) are mythical figures, the last one is Sappho who, according to an ancient myth, threw herself off a rock because her love for a man called Phaon was unrequited.¹⁹ This orientation towards figures from the Greek world may, at first sight, be read as a metapoetic statement in favour of Greek over Roman models. However, upon closer consideration, the line of thought is more complex, and more witty: as Kay (2001: 271) points out in his commentary, ‘all the

¹⁸ Cf. Kay (2001: 267–8).

¹⁹ On the various sources of these stories, cf. Kay (2001: 271–2).

viewed as unnatural within the Roman classification system of sexual behaviour because they were non-penetrating and non-vaginal.²² Both traditions ‘may go back to Greek comedy’, as Green (1991: 408) notes. However, it is also possible that Ausonius deliberately toys with Martial, his major model, by virtually inventing a different sexual deviation for Philoctetes and thus feeding back into the idea of the ‘fake source’.²³

The second example is a reference to the Roman comic author Lucius Afranius (second century BCE), and it is the only *nominatim* reference in this epigram. Afranius is a representative of the native Roman comedy, the *fabula togata*.²⁴ According to Quintilian, he was notorious for the depiction of pederasty on stage (*Inst.* 10.1.100), and it is possible that Quintilian’s authority cemented this judgement and that Ausonius here reads Afranius through the lenses of Quintilian.²⁵ Finally, the source of the third example is again unacknowledged, as was the first example. However, again in Quintilian we can find a potential allusion to Nola as a place where *fellatio* was notoriously practised: at *Inst.* 8.6.53, the orator Marcus Caelius Rufus is quoted as having said that Clytemnestra was ‘a Coan at the dining-coach, a Nolan in the bedroom’ (*in triclinio coam, in cubiculo nolam*). According to Kay (2001: 221), a pun may be at work here ‘where “nolam” stands for “Nolanam”’. In sum, we can state that besides Afranius who is acknowledged by name, Ausonius relates two further literary models that remain hidden between the lines. In the case of Martial, a deliberate deviation from the model’s authority may be at work. Quintilian, in turn, may actually serve as the principle model on the two other occasions.

2.2. PALLADAS: CONSTRUCTING ONE’S *PERSONA* WITH, THROUGH, AND AGAINST HOMER

In contrast to Ausonius, Palladas refers to authors from the classical past considerably more often, and his references are solely restricted to Greek figures. His *nominatim* reference epigrams include figures such as Homer (*Anth. Pal.* 6.61; 9.165; 9.166; 10.47; 10.50), Callimachus (*Anth. Pal.* 9.175), Pindar (*Anth. Pal.* 9.175; 10.51), Plato (*Anth. Pal.* 10.45; 11.305), Pythagoras (*Anth. Pal.* 10.46), Isocrates (*Anth. Pal.* 10.48), and Menander (*Anth. Pal.* 10.52; 11.263). As far as Homer is concerned, further epigrams can be found where the dialogue with Homer is not established via a reference to the author by name, but, rather, through other means such as the mention of Homeric characters, settings, or the citation of Homeric phrases.²⁶

In what follows, I discuss a selection of the Homeric epigrams that can be regarded as representative of Palladas’ use of Homer. As is going to be demonstrated in the course of the subsequent analysis, these epigrams exhibit a number of characteristics and techniques which are typical of the construction of Palladas’ *persona* in dialogue with the classical past and which can invite a comparison with Ausonius’ methods and techniques. Thematically, they centre around three different areas. One recurring topic is Palladas’ role as a schoolteacher

²² On the Roman ‘classification system’ of sexual behaviour, cf. e.g. Parker (1997) and Williams (2010²).

²³ I owe this point to Sophia Papaioannou.

²⁴ Cf. Manuwald (2011: 263–6).

²⁵ Cf. Welsh (2010: 121): ‘Ausonius certainly did not know the works of Afranius at first hand, but instead derived his quotations and references to the playwright from intermediate sources.’ Ausonius refers to Afranius again in the prefatory letter to the *Cento nuptialis*, where he juxtaposes him with Plautus.

²⁶ On Homer in Palladas, cf. Zerwes (1956: 385), Skiadas (1965: 153–7) and Guichard (2017).

Zeus to Prometheus in response to the latter having stolen the fire from the gods; the gift which the humans are going to receive in exchange for the fire is Pandora, the prototypical evil woman. Eur. fr. 429 *TrGF* stems from a choral passage from the lost *Hippolytos Kalypptomenos* in which the women call themselves a greater fire that was created in place of ‘ordinary’ fire. This passage, in turn, suggests an allusion to *Op.* 57–58. In sum, Palladas here again employs a technique similar to that of Ausonius, namely, the juxtaposition of acknowledged/open (< Homer) and unacknowledged/ hidden (< Hesiod, Euripides) source.

The explicit reference to Homer and a Homeric *hapax legomenon* provides the backdrop of an ironic role transferal and a metapoetic statement in *Anth. Pal.* 6.61:³⁵

ἽΩ ξυρὸν οὐράνιον, ξυρὸν ὄλβιον, ᾧ πλοκαμίδας
 κειραμένη πλεκτὰς ἄνθετο Παμφίλιον,
 οὐ σέ τις ἀνθρώπων χαλκεύσατο, πὰρ δὲ καμίνῳ
 Ἥφαιστου χρυσέην σφῦραν ἀειραμένη
 ἢ λιπαροκρήδεμνος, ἴν’ εἶπωμεν καθ’ Ὀμηρον, 5
 χερσί σε ταῖς ἰδίαις ἐξεπόνησε Χάρις.

Heavenly razor, happy razor, with which Pamphilion
 clipped her plaited locks and dedicated them!
 Not one of the humans forged you, but at the side of the furnace
 of Hephaestus, lifting her golden hammer,
 Charis with the bright headband – to say it according to Homer –
 wrought you with her very own hands.

This epigram harks back to a characteristic type of Hellenistic votive epigram that evokes the dedication of small, but precious, objects along with the metapoetic association of equally small, but artistically refined, poetry in favour of pompous and orotund epic.³⁶ The preciousness of the object described is emphasized by its provenance in Hephaestus’ smithy, as well as by its creator Charis, Hephaestus’ wife. It is, however, only via the Homeric quote in line 5 that the epigram’s full potential becomes apparent: *λιπαροκρήδεμνος* is a Homeric *hapax legomenon* which is used at *Il.* 18.382, in a context that is both similar and dissimilar to that of our epigram. In *Iliad* Book 18, the creation of Achilles’ shield by Hephaestus is narrated; thus, a context is evoked which deals with a much larger object and, accordingly, a considerably longer text. In other words, the grandiosity of one object (Achilles’ shield) and its genre (epic) is contrasted with the tininess of the other object (Pamphilion’s razor) and its corresponding genre (epigram). Moreover, *Il.* 18.382 refers to a scene where Charis appears in order to tend to Thetis who is visiting. Thus, a further point of irony lies in the conversion of Charis’ role: in *Iliad* 18, she is Hephaestus’ wife and acts as a servant for Thetis; contrastingly, in Palladas’ epigram she assumes the role of Hephaestus by creating the object of art herself, as is explicitly emphasized in the last line.

The last epigram to be considered provides an example of the *iam Homerus*-motif in combination with two quotes from the *Iliad* (*Anth. Pal.* 10.47):

Ἔσθιε, πῖνε, μύσας ἐπὶ πένθεσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἔοικεν

³⁵ On this epigram, cf. also Guichard (2017: 164).

³⁶ On Hellenistic votive epigrams, cf. e.g. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 291–338). *Anth. Pal.* 6.61 constitutes a direct continuation of *Anth. Pal.* 6.60, where Pamphilion’s dedication of her hair to Isis is reported.

γαστέρι πενθῆσαι νεκρόν, Ὅμηρος ἔφη·
καὶ γὰρ ὁμοῦ θάψασαν ὀλωλότα δώδεκα τέκνα
σίτου μνησαμένην τὴν Νιόβην παράγει.

Eat and drink with closed lips in your sorrow, for it isn't appropriate
to mourn for a dead with your stomach, [as already] Homer said:
For he puts forward one who buried her twelve children, deceased at the
same time,
and who remembered her food: Niobe!

The quote in line 2 is an almost literal citation of *Il.* 19.225: γαστέρι δ' οὐ πως ἔστι νέκυν πενθῆσαι Ἀχαιοῦς ('but it is by no means possible for the Achaeans to mourn for a dead with their stomach').³⁷ There, Odysseus reacts to Achilles' call for a return to battle without having eaten by appealing to his sense of responsibility, arguing that there is no point in the warriors fighting unfed even if Achilles himself wishes to do so. Through this quote, the epigrammatic speaker assumes the role of Odysseus. The epigram may thus be understood as relating back to *Anth. Pal.* 9.168.3, where Palladas stages himself as an anti-Odysseus through the adjective πολύμηνης. The second distichon of the epigram, then, is an allusion to (and partial quote from) *Il.* 24.602–603: καὶ γὰρ τ ἠΰκομος Νιόβη ἐμνήσατο σίτου, | τῆ περ δώδεκα παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ὄλοντο ('for, even the fair-haired Niobe remembered her food, | although all of her twelve children had died in her halls'). These words are spoken by Achilles, who reminds Priam of the necessity to eat and drink by reference to a mythical example. Intratextually, the passage relates back to *Il.* 19.225: Achilles – who has finally found peace and put his anger aside – has internalized Odysseus' admonition and now passes it on. Palladas, in turn, refers to both passages and combines them into one epigram; the two separate character speeches are merged into a single voice – that of the author Homer: Ὅμηρος ἔφη ('Homer said').

2.3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Ausonius' dialogue with the classical past can, in essence, be divided into two areas. The first main aspect is the way he initiates a discourse about the authority and the value of the classical past and its representatives. Classical authors and their authority are implicitly questioned on several occasions; this concerns Cicero and his role as a translator of Greek terms into Latin (*Epigr.* 12), Ovid and Pliny who turn out to be almost useless (*Epigr.* 72 and 103), and Pythagoras who is ironically employed as an authority in a highly obscene context (*Epigr.* 73). In addition (and in close connection) to this, Ausonius also discusses the relation of Greek versus Roman authors and sources: *Epigr.* 12 is a free translation of an epigram by Posidippus; in *Epigr.* 103, the shift from Roman to Greek models is only superficial, whereas Ovid remains the principal classical authority beyond the surface. In sum, we can conclude that Ausonius' discourse about the classical past and the authority of its representatives is surprisingly complex and differentiated; he does not suggest a straightforward answer, and most notably, he prioritizes Roman over Greek authorities but at the same time also questions the former.

The second area is the way Ausonius negotiates the value and validity of literary sources and models as such. We noted several instances where a tension is created by

³⁷ Cf. also Guichard (2017: 165).

explicitly acknowledged sources versus implied, anonymous, hidden ones. In *Epigr.* 72, an unacknowledged source is juxtaposed with Ovid and Pliny; in *Epigr.* 73, Ovid is alluded to by way of an intertextual reference, whereas Pythagoras and Lucilius are mentioned by name; in *Epigr.* 75, Afranius is acknowledged, but Martial and Quintilian are made at least equally important (if not more) by way of intertextual hints. Furthermore, this aspect is reinforced by what I chose to call ‘fake sources’: textual allusions which raise suspicions about the credibility and authenticity of a model, such as the place name of Vallebona in *Epigr.* 72, a dodgy reference to Lucilius in *Epigr.* 73, and an unclear relation to Martial in *Epigr.* 75. Thus, Ausonius feeds back into the question about the relation between the classical past and the present; to how far an extent literary models and sources are valuable and reliable for an epigrammatic author of his period; and to what extent the classical past and its recollection is a mere construct, an invention, a fantasy.

Palladas, then, is conspicuously different from Ausonius in both content and tone. For reasons of scope and focus, this analysis had to be selective and was therefore restricted to Homeric epigrams. Content-wise, Palladas often focuses on his role as a schoolteacher as well as his excessive misogyny. Thus, in contrast to Ausonius, Palladas constructs a considerably more tangible *persona* of himself in his epigrams. Viewed from this ‘personal’ angle, his relation to Homer is twofold: as a *grammaticus*, he clearly has an ambivalent attitude towards Homer, whose works constitute the source of his living although Homer himself is the cause of Palladas’ dissatisfaction. In his role as a misogynist, however, Palladas displays a less ambivalent attitude towards Homer – in these epigrams, he resorts to the *iam Homerus*-motif by (ab-)using Homer as a paradigm and justification for his misogyny. On one occasion, Palladas even goes so far as to stylize himself as a counterpart to a Homeric character: as an anti-Odysseus who does not wish to return to – but, rather, wants to be released from – his wife (*Anth. Pal.* 9.168).

From a more technical perspective, it can be noted that Palladas creates Homericity both through *nominatim* references as well as via verbal and structural intertextuality. One specific technique is that of the scholastic practice of teaching inflection on the basis of the first lines of the *Iliad* – in these cases, we are faced with a triangle of a personal voice, a concrete *Sitz im Leben*, and an idiosyncratic literary technique. Another literary technique – often used by Ausonius, too, as discussed above – is that of the juxtaposition of acknowledged and unacknowledged sources or *topoi*. This technique is clearly more at home in the work of Ausonius, but it can be found in Palladas on two occasions as well: namely, in *Anth. Pal.* 9.166 (the stereotype of the destructive Helen paired with an analogous *ad hoc* penalisation of Penelope) and in *Anth. Pal.* 9.165 (Homer as an acknowledged *nominatim* model versus Hesiod and Euripides as hidden sources).

It goes without saying that any generalisation which is deduced from this comparison between Ausonius and Palladas can only be tentative and provisional. Further studies will have to take into consideration more authors and larger corpora. It could, for example, be rewarding to expand the analysis to Ausonius’ *Epitaphia heroum qui bello Troiano interfuerunt* (‘Epitaphs on the heroes who participated in the Trojan War’), a collection of epigrams many of which engage with the Homeric tradition and its reception in Roman epic (Vergil), or to the *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, a collection of Latin epigrams attributed to various (partly unidentified) authors, the latest of which are dated to the age of Ausonius, and

some of which have been identified as imitations of epigrams by Palladas. Another epigrammatist appropriate for this type of study could be Christodorus of Coptus, author of the 'Description of the statues in the public bath-gymnasium of the so-called Zeuxippus' in Constantinople (late fifth century CE); this epigrammatic catalogue of museal statues features numerous characters from the classical past of both Greece and Rome. As the analysis in this chapter has shown, there are considerable differences in the approaches to the literary past between Ausonius and Palladas. Further research, going beyond individual authorial differences, will have to contemplate the question as to whether there is a typically Roman versus Greek way of dealing with the classical past in later imperial epigrammatic poetry.