

Renate Schlesier

KRATĒR. The Mixing-Vessel as Metaphorical Space in Ancient Greek Tradition

Summary

Aristotle conceptualized the noun *metaphora* (literally ‘transfer’) as the result of a linguistic and cognitive process of transfer presupposing a comparison or an analogy between two material or mental elements. However, such a notion of metaphor is unable to convey the impact of semantic mixtures between those elements. This is demonstrated by the term *kratēr* (literally ‘mixing-object’) in ancient Greek poetry, where it is used as an emblem and not necessarily a metaphor for different forms of transfer, spatial and non-spatial ones, but also of mixtures, taking place in the symposion.

Keywords: Transfer; mixture; symposion; comparison; wine; nectar.

Aristoteles konzipierte das Substantiv *metaphora* (wörtlich „Transfer“) als das Ergebnis eines sprachlichen und kognitiven Übertragungsprozesses, der einen Vergleich oder eine Analogie zwischen zwei materiellen oder geistigen Elementen voraussetzt. Dieser Metapherbegriff erlaubt jedoch nicht, die Auswirkung von semantischen Mischungen solcher Elemente zu erfassen. Dies zeigt der Begriff *kratēr* (wörtlich „Misch-Objekt“) in der griechischen Dichtung, wo er als Emblem und nicht notwendigerweise als Metapher für verschiedene Formen räumlicher und nicht-räumlicher Übertragung gebraucht wird, aber auch für Mischungen, die im Symposion stattfinden.

Keywords: Übertragung; Mischung; Symposion; Vergleich; Wein; Nektar.

I On the predicament of metaphor as transfer

The study of any type of metaphor requires an examination of Aristotle's (384–322 BCE) definition of metaphor.¹ The noun *metaphora* (literally 'transfer') which occurs first in the work of the orator Isocrates (436–338 BCE) as a designation of certain poetic techniques² is conceptualized philosophically by Aristotle some decades later and is conceived as the result of a universal – linguistic and cognitive – process of transfer. Thus, the word 'metaphor' itself is from the beginning defined as a metaphor, that is to say a transfer in the figurative sense: the concrete spatial process of 'transporting' is transmuted into a dynamic mental 'transporting'. Aristotle's theory of metaphor is a theory of comparison which is epistemologically substantiated and thus exceeds by far the limits of rhetoric. According to Aristotle, metaphor presupposes that two elements can be thought of as similar (even identical in some respects) as well as different and that in language, for this reason, one can be used instead of the other. This constitutes for him the reflexive, epistemologically relevant value of metaphor, since metaphor stimulates reflection upon possible common characteristics of two material or mental elements despite their differences. This gives rise to the "problem of the relationship between language, thought, reality", which so far has not been solved even by modern metaphor theories such as those of cognitive linguistics.³ Hence the currently popular theory designating metaphor as a relation between a "source domain" and a "target domain" with associated "mappings" (i.e. projections from the first domain onto the second) remains confined to Aristotle's theory of comparison,⁴ in spite of the harsh critique ventured upon it.

As a matter of fact, Aristotle, unlike many of his successors since the Roman theoreticians of rhetoric, does not perceive metaphor as a mere substitution. Furthermore, he does not assume, as is often claimed, that metaphor is a replacement of something basically 'proper' (or 'appropriate') by something basically 'improper' (or 'inappropriate'). In fact, he emphasizes that metaphorical processes of transfer, which he divides into four categories (from genus to species, from species to genus, from species to species, and according to analogy), are not unidirectionally fixed.⁵ Rather, such transfers can run in

1 Arist. *Po.* 21, 1457b; cf. *Rhetoric* 3, 1405a–b, 1406b–1407a.

2 Isoc. 9.9; in plural (μεταφοραί).

3 See Eggs 2001, 1102: "das von der Interaktionstheorie, aber auch der strukturalistischen und kognitivistischen Sprachwissenschaft nicht gelöste Problem des Verhältnisses von Sprache, Denken, Wirklichkeit, d. h. von sprachlicher Bedeutung, begrifflicher Aneignung der Wirklichkeit und Struk-

turen der Wirklichkeit [muss] zu Aporien bei der konkreten Analyse von M[etaphern] führen".

4 Lakoff and Johnson 1980 etc. Cf. the critical assessment of Eggs 2001, 1156.

5 On this matter and on the metaphysical and theological implications of Aristotle's notion of metaphor as well as on the problem of its applicability to ancient Greek lyric poetry see Schlesier 1986/1987. Concerning the fallacies connected with the reading of ancient Greek literature in terms of metaphor see also Stanford 1936.

two opposite directions, and it is only the respective starting point that determines the orientation of the perspective from which the comparison issues.

This excludes an absolute valuation or hierarchization of the elements which are implicitly compared by means of a metaphor. Conversely, Aristotle's theoretical focus on relations of comparability between two terms entails his definition of these terms as expressions of fixed and necessarily different – concrete or abstract – qualities which may connote – concrete or abstract – similarities. Therefore Aristotle does not envisage the possibility of an already established semantic or contextual simultaneity or mixture of qualities.

2 The mixing-vessel as emblem of the ancient Greek symposion

The study of the ancient Greek symposion is well-suited to pursuing the problem of such a simultaneity and mixture with regard to the concept of metaphor in general and spatial metaphors in particular. The *symposion* (literally 'drinking together') is an experimental space, an institution, a social rite, and a medium of conviviality whose cultural significance extends well over the archaic and classical periods and at which various modes of space are simultaneously pragmatically linked and operate on a cognitive and metaphorical level as well. This is triggered by the mixture of several qualities⁶ and experiences available in the space of the symposion. It is at once a space of religious rituals (libations for the deities of the symposion, cultic poetry), a space for the use of pottery which often represents the symposion itself and aims at its imaginative construction, a space for aesthetic performances (poetry, music, dance), a space of equally performative and agonistic exchange and interchange involving reciprocity as well as rivalry (poetic, philosophical, erotic, musical), a space of social, sexual, political, and cultural mixture and mobility, a space for the combination of several linguistic forms of communication (discourse, song, mockery, praise, riddle), but also for the overcoming of the constraints of literary and musical genres, a space of ethical education (*paideia*) and playful pleasure (*paidia*), a space in which psycho-physical boundaries can be dissolved (by ecstasy, *enthousiasmos*, inebriation), a space of intertwined sensual perceptions and emotions (shared and potentially conflicting ones), and also a space for the transfer of knowledge and cultural patterns.

6 On these qualities of the symposion cf. Rossi 1983; Vetta 1983; Murray 1983; Lissarrague 1987; Murray 1990; Murray and Tecuşan 1995; Schäfer 1997; Orfanos and Carrière 2003; Lissarrague et al. 2004; Murray 2009; Hobden 2013; Schlesier 2014. On the normative aspects of the symposion see the bal-

anced account of Ford 2002. On the symposion as experimental space, in connection with Dionysos: Fehr 2003. On gender aspects: e.g. Schmitt Pantel 2011. See also earlier scholarship on the symposion, e.g. Von der Mühl 1976; Fehr 1971; Graf 1974.



Fig. 1 Red-figured krater from Southern Italy: Dionysiac procession by night (the satyr on the left carries a black-figured krater). 400–375 BCE.

The question whether the Aristotelian (or a later) notion of metaphor can do justice to the multiple dimensions of the symposion – which are mixed in such a specific manner – shall be demonstrated by the example of the *kratēr* (literally ‘mixing-object’)⁷. Among the many vessels used for the purposes of the ancient Greek drinking-party, the symposion, it is the *kratēr* that is the most particular and emblematic one (see Fig. 1).⁸

It should be emphasized that such a peculiar object was needed since in contrast to the drinking habits of other cultures, as for instance our own, the Greeks typically refrained from drinking pure wine. Therefore, the wine had to be diluted with water, in different proportions, arranged in advance,⁹ and this took place in the space of the *kratēr*. Consequently, numerous visual representations of banquets on ancient Greek symposion pottery include the *kratēr* and give it a conspicuous, and often self-referential, location in the image. As a matter of fact, the mixing-vessel is, in the space of the symposion and for its practices, an indispensable physical object.

Yet in the same way as the mixing-vessel stands for the peculiarity of the ancient symposion of the archaic and classical periods, the symposion stands for mixing in a

7 On the political (aristocratic and democratic) aspects of the *kratēr* see Luke 1994.

8 About this vessel, its different shapes, and its usage see e.g. Boardman 2001, 250–253. Further examples of the visual evidence from the 6th to the 4th cen-

tury BCE are provided in Vierneisel and Kaeser 1990 and in Schlesier and Schwarzmaier 2008. On the lower prominence of the *kratēr* in the archaeological record since the Hellenistic period see Rotroff 1996.

9 Cf. Catoni 2010 *passim*.

more general sense. In the realm of the symposion, mixtures of several kinds take place, not only the mixing of wine with water. On the level of the mixture of the participants, different groups of persons share the space of a symposion: adult men and boys or adolescents, males and females, free citizens and slaves. The activities of these persons can be blended as well: someone who acts as a cup-bearer can also be served a drink, someone who performs music can become a listener, someone who is observed by others is also an observer him- or herself. There is a constant mirroring of the participants mixed together, there is role-playing and even role-exchanging, including gender roles and roles of gods and humans. Moreover, in the space of a symposion, the sensual experience of tasting is not only mixed with hearing and seeing, but with touching and smelling as well. All kinds of physical and emotional states are triggered in the realm of this space, not least erotic ones, and it is also propitious for mental communication through performance of poetry and playful discussion. Against this background, it does not come as a surprise that the mixing-vessel could be understood, by the ancient Greeks, as a metaphor for the symposion itself¹⁰ and for all the mixtures available through its space.

In the following, I shall try to show how some Greek poets coped with the metaphorical potential of the *kratēr* as well as of the sympotic space. In order to doing so, one has to start with the fact that the Greek language had two different terms for ‘mixing’ at its disposal. On one hand, there is the verb *kerannymi* from which the nouns *kratēr*, ‘mixing-vessel’; and *krasis*, ‘mixing procedure’, are derived, and on the other, there is the verb *meignymi* with the noun *m(e)ixis*, ‘mixture’, derived from it, the direct linguistic basis of the English word ‘to mix’.

Although both Greek terms point to mingling, their field of application is not the same: *kerannymi* means to mix, to blend or to mingle according to a certain proportion, while *meignymi* is applied to procedures of mixing, blending or mingling that are irrespective of proportion. This explains why *kerannymi* and its derivatives *kratēr* and *krasis* are used for the proportioning practice of the mixing of wine and water at the symposion, for which *meignymi* and *mixis* would be less appropriate terms. And this explains as well, why *meignymi* and *mixis* could be applied to a close fight at a military battle, and also to sexual union, that is to kinds of actions and situations where the use of *kerannymi* and *krasis* would be misplaced.

This leads to the following questions: given the specific, but very general significances of these different terms, is it possible to distinguish their literal and their metaphorical usages? How can the usages of terms related to *kerannymi* or *meignymi* generate analytical knowledge and comparative reflection?¹¹ What types of transfer and what types of

10 Expressed in the formula παρὰ κρατήρα (“next to the mixing-vessel”): e.g. Pi. N. 9.49; cf. παρὰ κρητήρι, Thgn. 493, 643, 981. On the emblematic function of the *kratēr* in visual art see Lissarrague 1990.

11 On Plato’s appropriation of the semantic range of *meignymi* and *kerannymi*, sometimes used as synonyms, for philosophical arguments see Pe-

space are at stake in a particular case? Which of them are metaphorizations? Is it impossible, because of the semantic difference mentioned, that the procedure of *krasis* could become a synonym for *mixis*, or is this possible, under certain conditions? These questions will now be pursued with the help of some examples from ancient Greek poetry related to the symposion. The material is organized according to six types of transfer, to be found in texts composed between the 8th century BCE and the Roman imperial period.

3 Some examples

3.1 Homer

Two verses from Homer already illustrate two types of transfer (first and second type of transfer, *Il.* 1.597–598)¹²:

αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοισι θεοῖς ἐνδέξια πᾶσιν
οἰνοχόει γλυκὸν νέκταρ ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσω·

Yet this one, for the other gods, to the right, for all of them
he poured out as wine sweet nectar, drawing it from a mixing-vessel (*kratēr*).

Surprisingly, at this very early occurrence of the term κρητήρ in ancient literature,¹³ it does actually not denote a vessel in which liquids are mixed. In this Homeric passage the god Hephaistos is described as cup-bearer of the other Olympian gods, drawing the communal drink from a *kratēr* and pouring it out from left to right, as in a regular symposion of humans. The first type of transfer therefore consists in transferring practices, and also a typical vessel, from the human symposion to a symposion of the gods. But in contrast to the analogy expressed in such a transfer, this example simultaneously implies a second type of transfer: Hephaistos does not serve a mixture of wine and water, as in the human symposion, but he “pours as wine” (*oinochoei*), or instead of wine, nectar,

poni 2002, 151. On the philosophical context of Plato’s use of *kratēr* as metaphor for his ideal state in the *Laos*, 773d: Schlesier 2006, 60. Cf. *kratēr* as metaphor for a person: *Ar. Ach.* 936, where a sycophant is metaphorically designated as κρητήρ κακῶν (“mixing-vessel of bad things”). See also already *Hom. Il.* 6.528, where Hektor declares that the hoped-for Trojan victory should be celebrated with a “*kratēr* of freedom” (κρητήρα ἐλευθεροῦ) in honor of the gods.

12 Here as elsewhere, the Greek text comes from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* [TLG online source], and the translations are my own.

13 It is not the first, but the second one: the first occurrence of *kratēr* is to be found not much before (*Il.* 1.470), in a formulaic verse several times reused in Homer, and here contextualized by the after-dinner drinking bout following the propitiatory sacrifice to Apollo connected to the restitution of Agamemnon’s slave Chryseis to her father, the god’s priest.

that is the drink of the gods. Yet for this pure drink, the nectar, a mixing-vessel would obviously not be needed. In other words, the function of the *kratēr* does not correspond to its literal meaning, since it is not used as a mixing-vessel, but as a space containing an unmixed drink, nectar. Consequently, the second type of transfer could be described as a transfer from the wine-water-mixture to pure nectar, and, by the same token, a transfer of the *kratēr* from its function as mixing-vessel to the function of a recipient of an unmixed liquid.

Does this make the *kratēr* a metaphor in this context? The Homeric passage highlights that the mixing-vessel which is specific to human banquets has its place at the divine banquet as well. In terms of a modern theory of metaphor, one could perhaps say that a spatial ‘target domain’ (the banquet of the gods) is denoted by means of the term *kratēr* stemming from the spatial ‘source domain’ (the banquet of humans), or else, in Aristotle’s terminology, that this usage constitutes a transfer from the species (mixing-vessel) to the genus (liquid container). But does this entail that the word κρατήρ is a comparison (εἰκῶν)¹⁴, in the sense of Aristotle’s general definition of metaphor? Because of its precise functional determination, it is impossible to equate the *kratēr* with other vessels not designated for the mixing of liquids. Rather, by means of the inclusion of the *kratēr* into this context, divine and human dimensions of experience are specifically mingled: at the divine banquet a particular vessel is used which belongs by definition to the mixture of wine and water at human banquets, but the gods adapt it for their own purposes and alter its function by employing it as container for the pure drink reserved for them, nectar. Thus, a transfer is happening here, however not a metaphorical, but a functional one. What the *kratēr* represents in this context is a mixture different from that of water and wine: it points to the mixture of the human and the divine spheres. It signals that the human dimension is also simultaneously present at the divine banquet and that both kinds of symposion can be compared just like the two kinds of drinks enjoyed at each. Yet the reflective potential of the present semantic context can apparently only be grasped when the framework of the Aristotelian theory of metaphor has been abandoned or at least expanded.

Hence one should ask: could the two types of transfer present in the Homeric passage be conceptualized as metaphorizing processes? I would suggest that this is not directly the case. What we have here is an analogy between a human and a divine symposion, combined with an emphasis on some differences that are, to a certain extent, due to the fundamental contrast between divinities and humans. On one hand, both share their drinking habits, yet on the other, the drink of the immortal gods is not wine, as in the case of the mortals, but nectar, a beverage connected to immortality. Nevertheless, this implies that nectar can be compared with wine, a fact that is alluded to by the use of

14 Arist. *Rh.* 3, 1406b–1407a.

the compound *oinochoein*, ‘to pour out (as) wine.’ Therefore, since here the nectar is said to be poured out as wine (and not just plainly said to be poured out), a metaphorical potential is included in this expression.

Aristotle himself had confronted the problem involved in the use of the verb *oinochoein* for the pouring of nectar. In his *Poetics*,¹⁵ he alludes to its Homeric usage, although pointing to Ganymedes as cup-bearer of Zeus,¹⁶ not to Hephaistos as cup-bearer of the Olympian gods. As for the classification of such a phrasing, however, Aristotle is not quite resolute: on one hand, he seems to suggest that it has to do with “habitual use of diction” (κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς λέξεως), on the other he suggests that “this might also be metaphorical” (εἴη δ’ ἄν τοῦτό γε καὶ κατὰ μεταφωράν). One wonders whether Aristotle thought that this would be a satisfactory solution of the problem,¹⁷ though he took customary speech for granted and evaded the evident complications which are at stake. At any event, it seems as if he was well aware of the fact that nectar – although not explicitly mentioned by him – was set up by Homer as an *analogon* to wine.

However, it requires a further step, which is only taken by later authors, and in later speech habits, to use nectar as a metaphor for wine.¹⁸ In Homer, this is not the case. Yet as a matter of fact, the combination, in the passage quoted from the Homeric *Iliad*, between elements which are analogous to the symposium of humans and those which differ from it¹⁹ prepares such a metaphoric usage.

3.2 Sappho

The next example, three verses from a song of Sappho (composed at least one hundred years after the Homeric epic), include three further types of transfer, and it should be asked whether these verses point to the two types of transfer found in the Homeric lines as well (third, fourth, and fifth type of transfer, Sappho, fr. 2, 14–16)²⁰:

15 Arist. *Po.* 25, 1461a: τὸν κεκραμένον οἶνον φασιν εἶναι, [...] ὅθεν εἴρηται ὁ Γανυμήδης Διὶ οἰνοχοεῦν, οὐ μινόντων οἶνον (“as the mixture is called wine, [...] so Ganymedes is said to pour wine for Zeus, though they [i.e. the gods] do not drink wine”).

16 Hom., *Il.* 20.234.

17 Pace Latacz 2002, 8: according to him, the “Sprachgebrauch [...] (der nämlich ein anderes Verb für ‘als Mundschenk fungieren’ nun einmal nicht zur Verfügung stellt)”, conveys a “Lösung” of the problem.

18 The first testimony is Archilochus, fr. 290 West (Naxian wine compared with nectar). Cf. Pi. *I.* 6.37 (Herakles’ wine libations: *nektareai spondai*); Ar. *Acb.* 196 (libations of wine that smells like ambrosia

and nectar); Aristophanes, fr. 688 Kassel-Austin (wine with a taste of nectar); *Anth. Pal.* [= Marcus Argentarius] 6.248.2. One could argue, however, that Homer’s use of the adjective *nektareos* for a garment’s smell (Helen’s: *Il.* 3.385; Achilles’ *Il.* 18.25), or his designation of the wine Odysseus offers the cyclops as “a drop of ambrosia and nectar” (*Od.* 9.359) come close to those comparisons.

19 On the much debated issue of a possible connection of Homer with the institution of the symposium see Węcowski 2002 and Węcowski 2014. Cf. also Ford 1999.

20 The *TLG* text of the Sappho verses I quote reproduces the edition of Lobel and Page 1955. Note that these verses are cited, in a slightly different version,

χρυσίαισι ἐν κυλίκεσσι ἄβρω
 ὀμ<με>μείχμενον θαλίαισι νέκταρ
 οἶνοχόαισον.

in golden cups, delicately,
 nectar admixed to festive pleasures
 pour out as wine.

In this poem of Sappho, it is not the god Hephaistos, but the goddess Aphrodite (considered, in some parts of ancient tradition since the Homeric *Odyssey*, as his wife) who is presented as cup-bearer. She, too, as in the *Iliad* passage, “pours nectar as wine”, although not, as in Homer, drawn from a *kratēr*. In further contrast to Homer, the nectar poured out, in Sappho, is not a pure drink, but something mixed. The third type of transfer, therefore, consists in a transfer from the Homeric pure nectar to something that could be mixed with something else, but has no need, in this regard, of the *kratēr*, an object not mentioned in Sappho’s song.

This type of transfer is connected with a fourth one: while in a human symposion, wine is mixed with water, Sappho transfers this mixture to another one: on the one hand, as in Homer, the nectar in Sappho stands for the wine of the human symposion, but on the other, it is mixed with “festive pleasures” (*thaliai*) which here take the place of the water in the sympotic wine-water-mixture.²¹ Yet these festive pleasures are not just a metaphorical representation of the water. It would not make sense to say, in analogy to the metaphor of nectar as wine of the gods, that festive pleasures (of whoever receives the mixture appearing in Sappho’s poem) are in any way comparable with water. One could only say that in analogy to the sympotic mixing of liquids, a physical substance, water, is replaced by a psycho-physical phenomenon, festive pleasures.

Looking back to the first two types of transfer, one discovers that Aphrodite’s pouring of nectar, in Sappho, is compatible with the second type. This compatibility is stressed by the use of the same verb as in Homer, *oimochoein*, ‘to pour out as wine’. Yet is the scene evoked in Sappho also compatible with the first type detected in Homer, the transfer from the human symposion to a divine one? Or do the third and fourth types of transfer, particular to Sappho’s poem, exclude a compatibility with the first type? Before answering these questions, let us consider a fifth type of transfer to be detected in Sappho’s song: this is a transfer from the action of *kerannymi*, the mixing according to a

by Athenaeus (II, 463e); on this citation, and on Sappho as sympotic poet in the *Deipnosophists* in general, see Schlesier (in press).

21 Cf. Xenoph. fr. B 1.4 Diels-Kranz: κρατήρ μεστός εὐφοροσύνης (“a *kratēr*, filled with well-being”). See also Anacr. fr. eleg. 2 West, with a praise of the exemplary symposiast who “mixes together” (συμμί-σγων) the gifts of the Muses and of Aphrodite.

determined proportion, to the action of *meignymi*, a mixing irrespective of proportion.²² The mingling of nectar and festive pleasures is actually in Sappho not presented as *krasis*, but as *mixis*. And the priority in this mixture is not attributed to the nectar, but to the festive pleasures to which the nectar is just admixed (*anameignymi*), in a procedure in which the proportions of both parts do not count.

As a matter of fact, the mentioning of the festive pleasures does not allow one to attach the sympotic situation at stake in this Sappho poem either to a divine or to a human ambience, since festive pleasures are, for the ancient Greeks, neither reserved to humans nor to gods, but are, on the contrary, something that is common to both kinds of beings. The conditions defining the first type of transfer, that is clear-cut differences between a symposion of humans and a symposion of divinities, are therefore blurred – all the more so since the inclusion of a certain kind of mixture (the third type of transfer, from the pure liquid to something mixed) as well as the nature of the ingredient to which it is admixed (the fourth type of transfer, from water to a psycho-physical phenomenon, festive pleasures) would actually be compatible with both human and divine banquets.

This attracts the attention to the fact that, in further contrast to Homer, little is said, in the context of Sappho's fragment, about the receiver(s) of the mixture. However, Aphrodite's serving of it, in Sappho, does certainly not, like that of nectar by Hephaistos in Homer, imply other gods as receivers of this drink. The only potential receiver available in this poem would be the lyric persona herself who explicitly summons Aphrodite, directly addressed by her, to perform this service. And it should be noted that no other receivers, be they mortals or divinities, are mentioned. In other words: Sappho is neither describing a purely divine symposion nor a purely human symposion, but she is blending both kinds of drinking venues, identifying as exclusive participants a goddess (Aphrodite) and a human (the lyric persona). The sympotic space created in this poem opens up a third dimension, beyond a definite division between the human and the divine sphere, a dimension in which a direct symposiastic meeting of a particular human being and a particular goddess could be possible. The human in this case, however, is provided with a divine privilege: the lyric persona claims to take part of the divine drink, the nectar, as if she were an immortal, and this pure drink is not diluted but rather reinforced by the festive pleasures to which it is admixed.

In this way, Sappho's poem could be said to be metaphorically functioning as a *kratēr* – a metaphorical mixing-vessel, in which the sympotic mixture of Aphrodite and the lyric persona spatially replaces, by implicit comparison, the mixture of wine and water in a *kratēr*. But this *krasis* is compatible with a *mixis* – since the mixture of nectar and

22 Note, however, that Homer sometimes uses *meignymi* for the mixing of wine in the *kratēr*: *Il.* 3.270; *Od.* 1.110 (here explicitly of wine and water), although he mostly uses *kerannymi* in this respect. Generally, when mixing in a *kratēr* occurs in Homer, only the wine is mentioned, not the water.

festive pleasures, which in this song is shared by the goddess and the human persona, does not take care of proportion and unites both under the auspices of immortality. When Pindar one century later speaks of the “sweet *kratēr*” of his “loudly ringing songs” (γλυκὺς κρατῆρ ἀγαφθέγκτων ἀοιδᾶν),²³ he apparently does not suggest such sweeping implications as evoked in Sappho’s sympotic poem.²⁴ By metaphorically conferring the quality of a drink mixed from wine and water to his poetry, he implies that his songs, too, could be distributed in equal shares to a community. And insinuatingly, he attributes to them the sympotic effect of drunkenness. But for the ancient Greeks, this is a state of divine obsession, especially by Dionysos the wine-god, and by the divinities who rule over love.²⁵

3.3 An Anacreontic poem

Much later, sometime between the 1st and the 4th century CE, an anonymous poet composed a sympotic poem in which the metaphor of a “*kratēr* of songs” is further elaborated. This represents a sixth type of transfer (*Anacreontea*, no. 20):

Ἡδυμελῆς Ἀνακρέων,
 ἡδυμελῆς δὲ Σαπφώ·
 Πινδαρικὸν δ’ ἔτι μοι μέλος
 συγκεράσας τις ἐγγέοι.
 τὰ τρία ταῦτά μοι δοκεῖ
 καὶ Διόνυσος ἐλθῶν
 καὶ Παφίη λιπαρόχροος
 καὶ τὸς Ἔρωσ ἄν ἐκπιεῖν.²⁶

Sweet-singing is Anacreon,
 and sweet-singing is Sappho;
 and of Pindar, in addition, a song
 after having them mixed together should someone pour out to me.

23 Pi. O. 6.91; cf. *Isthm.* 6.1–9. On Pindar’s “sympotic *epiticia*” see Clay 1999.

24 But see also O. 7.7, where Pindar boldly designates his song, in explicit association with the drink poured at the symposium, as “poured nectar, gift of the Muses, [...] sweet fruit of the mind” (νέκταρ χυτὸν, Μοισᾶν δόσιον, [...] γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός), i.e. something that is much more valuable than the wine-water-mixture.

25 On Dionysos and drunkenness see Schlesier and Schwarzmaier 2008 *passim* (esp. with regard to visual art); Dionysos as god of ecstasy (also connected with erotics): Schlesier 2011. On the gods of the symposium: Nilsson 1951.

26 This ‘drinking out’ of poetry can be compared with another Anacreontic poem (*Anacreont.* no. 60b, 9–10), which invites to drain in honor of boys (πρόμυε πασῶν) the “lovely cup (*phiale*) of words” (φιᾶλην λόγων ἐραυνήν), following the example of Anacreon himself.

The three of them seem to me such that
 Dionysos as well in his coming
 as well as she from Paphos with gleaming skin
 as well as Eros himself would drink them out.

The ingredients of the mixture to be drunk are here identified, first of all, with two of the traditionally most important sympotic poets, Anacreon and Sappho who, in the verses of this poem, metonymically represent their own poetry, and then with a Pindaric song as well. The songs of these three poets are mixed as if they enter the space of a *kratēr*, from which, like the sympotic wine-water-mixture, this mixture of poetry should be drawn and poured out to the human lyric persona. The use of the verb (*syn-*)*kerannymi*, ‘mixing (together)’, makes clear that this mixture is meant to correspond to a certain proportion. And since just one song of Pindar shall be part of the mixture, this should clearly be the smallest part of the proportion, in which the songs of the two other poets unmistakably form the main part. But who metaphorically represents here the wine and the water?²⁷ According to the typical drinking habits of ancient Greek symposia, the precise proportion depends on the regulations fixed at the beginning of a party: more water is needed, if sobriety should be kept as long as possible, more wine, if the state of drunkenness should not much be delayed. The elusiveness of this poem does not allow us to decide what regulations are presupposed. If a quicker inebriation would be desired, then water should be represented by the Pindaric song, and wine by Anacreon’s and Sappho’s songs together.²⁸ If a longer sobriety is aspired to, the Pindaric song would stand for the wine and Anacreon’s and Sappho’s poetry for the water.

But it is perhaps not an exact physical condition that this mixture suggests. The point seems to be rather the pleasure that is conferred. And this does not appear to be metaphorical. At any event, the metaphorical drink mixed from Anacreon, Sappho and Pindar would not only please the lyric persona, but also the three most important divine sympotic companions, Dionysos, Aphrodite and Eros.²⁹ And since these gods

27 For the use of wine (or of the mixture of wine and water) as metaphor or as implicit analogon, see e.g. Anacr. fr. 376 and 450 PMG (love: to be drunken, in analogy to wine); Cratinus, fr. 195 Kassel-Austin (wine analogous to a beloved boy). On Οἶνος (= Wine) as name of satyrs see Heinemann 2000, 339.

28 This seems more probable, since the largest quantity is obviously represented by Anacreon and Sappho, the smallest by Pindar (just one song). Arguably, this *Anacreonteion* alludes to Pindar’s famous praise of water (O. 1.1: ἀριστον ὕδωρ, “the best is water”). Moreover, it seems to point to Pindar’s frequent use

of metaphors taken from the symposion in order to highlight his own poetry (see above).

29 The three deities and their sequence, in the arrangement of this poem, clearly enough correspond to the three poets: Dionysos to Anacreon, Aphrodite to Sappho, and Eros to Pindar (perhaps rather surprisingly, but Pindar’s erotic poetry survives only in some scattered fragments). Furthermore, this Anacreontic poem itself could be taken as a *kratēr* of songs; in which the deities themselves are, implicitly, no less mixed than, explicitly, the three poets. In other words: those who ‘drink’ this poem by the same token ‘drain’ a mixture of the emblematic divinities of the symposion.

as well as the human would not hesitate to drink this mixture, a potential blurring of the difference between a divine and a human symposion is emphasized. This links up with the poetical and analytical reflections expressed already, as we saw, in the poetry of Homer and Sappho. The Anacreontic poem, the example for a sixth type of transfer, thus also alludes to the other five types considered in my paper. This sixth type of transfer consists in the transfer from drinking a mixture of wine and water to the metaphorical 'drinking' of a mixture of poetry – an experience no less central to the symposion than the factual drinking. But only 'drinking' functions here as a metaphor, not mixing. This further underlines that not all types of transfer are metaphors, and that the symposion is a space in which several transfers and mixtures, not necessarily metaphorical ones, are available, including even those of divine and human spheres. And this explains why the *kratēr* could serve as an appropriate metaphor for many other specificities of the symposion, and even for this venue itself that is most favourable for all these mixtures and transfers.

Bibliography

Boardman 2001

John Boardman. *The History of Greek Vases. Potters, Painters and Pictures*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2001.

Catoni 2010

Maria Luisa Catoni. *Bere vino puro. Immagini del simposio*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 2010.

Clay 1999

Jenny Strauss Clay. "Pindar's Sympotic 'Epinicia'." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 62 (1999), 25–34.

Eggs 2001

Ekkehard Eggs. "Metapher." In *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Ed. by G. Ueding. Vol. 5. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2001, 1099–1183.

Fehr 1971

Burkhard Fehr. *Orientalische und griechische Gelage*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1971.

Fehr 2003

Burkhard Fehr. "What Has Dionysos to Do With the Symposion?" In *SYMPOSIUM. Banquet et représentations en Grèce et à Rome*. Ed. by C. Orfanos and J.-C. Carrière. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2003, 23–37.

Ford 1999

Andrew Ford. "Odysseus after Dinner. Od.9.2–11 and the Traditions of Sympotic Song." In *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*. Ed. by J. N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999, 109–123.

Ford 2002

Andrew Ford. "Table Talk and Symposium." In A. Ford, *The Origins of Criticism. Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002, 25–45.

Graf 1974

Fritz Graf. "Das Symposium." In F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1974, 98–103.

Heinemann 2000

Alexander A.J. Heinemann. "Bilderspiele beim Gelage. Symposiast und Satyr im Athen des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr." In *Gegenwelten zu den Kulturen Griechenlands und Roms in der Antike*. Ed. by T. Hölscher. München and Leipzig: Saur, 2000, 321–349.

Hobden 2013

Fiona Hobden. *The Symposion in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Lakoff and Johnson 1980

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Latacz 2002

Joachim Latacz. "Einleitung: Zur Homer-Kommentierung. Von den Anfängen bis zu diesem Kommentar." In *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*, 2. Auflage. Ed. by J. Latacz. München and Leipzig: Saur, 2002, 1–26.

Lissarrague 1987

François Lissarrague. *Un flot dimages. Une esthétique du banquet grec*. Paris: Biro, 1987.

Lissarrague 1990

François Lissarrague. "Around the 'Krater'. An Aspect of Banquet Imagery." In *SYMPOTIKA. A Symposium on the 'Symposion'*. Ed. by O. Murray. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, 196–209.

Lissarrague et al. 2004

François Lissarrague, Pauline Schmitt Pantel, Louise Bruit, and Athanassia Zografou. "Le banquet en Grèce." In *Thesaurus cultus et rituum antiquorum*. Ed. by J. Paul Getty Museum, L.A., Calif. Vol. 2. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2004, 218–250.

Lobel and Page 1955

Edgar Lobel and Denys Page, eds. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Luke 1994

Joanna Luke. "The Krater, 'Kratos' and the Polis". *Greece & Rome* 41 (1994), 23–32.

Murray 1983

Oswyn Murray. "The Symposium as Social Organisation". In *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation*. Ed. by R. Hägg. Stockholm: Åström, 1983, 195–199.

Murray 1990

Oswyn Murray, ed. *SYMPOTIKA. A Symposium on the 'Symposion'*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Murray 2009

Oswyn Murray. "The Culture of the 'Symposion'". In *A Companion to Archaic Greece*. Ed. by K. A. Raafaub and H. van Wees. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, 508–523.

Murray and Tecuşan 1995

Oswyn Murray and Manuela Tecuşan, eds. *IN VINO VERITAS*. Oxford: Alden Press, 1995.

Nilsson 1951

Martin P. Nilsson. "Die Götter des Symposions". In M. P. Nilsson, *Opuscula Selecta*. Vol. 1. Lund: Gleerup, 1951, 428–442.

Orfanos and Carrière 2003

Charalampos Orfanos and Jean-Claude Carrière, eds. *SYMPOSIUM. Banquet et représentations en Grèce et à Rome*. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2003.

Peponi 2002

Anastasia-Erasmia Peponi. "Mixed Pleasures, Blended Discourses. Poetry, Medicine, and the Body in Plato's 'Philebus' 46–47c". *Classical Antiquity* 21 (2002), 135–160.

Rossi 1983

Luigi Enrico Rossi. "Il simposio greco arcaico e classico come spettacolo a se stesso". In *Spettacoli conviviali dall'antichità classica alle corti italiane del '400: Atti del VII convegno di studio*. Ed. by Centro di Studi sul Teatro Medioevale e Rinascimentale. Viterbo: Agnesotti, 1983, 41–50.

Rotroff 1996

Susan Rotroff. *The Missing Krater and the Hellenistic Symposium. Drinking in the Age of Alexander the Great*. Christchurch: University of Canterbury, 1996.

Schäfer 1997

Alfred Schäfer. *Unterhaltung beim griechischen Symposion*. Mainz: Von Zabern, 1997.

Schlesier 1986/1987

Renate Schlesier. "Der bittersüße Eros. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Kritik des Metapherbegriffs". *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 30 (1986/1987), 70–83.

Schlesier 2006

Renate Schlesier. "Platons Erfindung des wahn-sinigen Dichters. Ekstasis und Enthusiasmus als poetisch-religiöse Erfahrung". *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 51 (2006), 45–60.

Schlesier 2011

Renate Schlesier. "Der bakchische Gott". In *A Different God? Dionysos and Ancient Polytheism*. Ed. by R. Schlesier. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2011, 173–202.

Schlesier 2014

Renate Schlesier. "Symposion, Kult und früh-griechische Dichtung. Sappho im Kontext". In *Medien der Geschichte. Antikes Griechenland und Rom*. Ed. by O. Dally, T. Hölscher, S. Muth, and R. Schneider. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014, 74–106.

Schlesier (in press)

Renate Schlesier. "A Sophisticated 'hetaira' at Table. Athenaeus' Sappho". In *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry 600 BC–400 AD*. Ed. by B. Currie and I. Rutherford. Leiden: Brill, in press.

Schlesier and Schwarzmaier 2008

Renate Schlesier and Agnes Schwarzmaier, eds. *Dionysos. Verwandlung und Ekstase [Essays and Catalogue, Pergamon-Museum Berlin]*. Regensburg: Schnell + Steiner, 2008.

Schmitt Pantel 2011

Pauline Schmitt Pantel. "Dionysos, the Banquet and Gender". In *A Different God? Dionysos and Ancient Polytheism*. Ed. by R. Schlesier. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2011, 119–136.

Stanford 1936

William Bedell Stanford. *Greek Metaphor. Studies in Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936.

Vetta 1983

Massimo Vetta. *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica. Guida storica e critica*. Rom and Paris: Laterza, 1983.

Vierneisel and Kaeser 1990

Klaus Vierneisel and Bert Kaeser, eds. *Kunst der Schale, Kultur des Trinkens [Essays and Catalogue]*. München: Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, 1990.

Von der Mühlh 1976

Peter Von der Mühlh. "Das griechische Symposion". Originally 1957. In P. Von der Mühlh, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Ed. by B. Wyss. Basel: Reinhardt, 1976, 483–505.

Węcowski 2002

Marek Węcowski. "Homer and the Origins of the Symposion". In *Omero tremila anni dopo*. Ed. by F. Montanari. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2002, 625–637.

Węcowski 2014

Marek Węcowski. *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Illustration credits

1 Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Antikensammlung, F 3186, photo: Johannes Laurentius.

RENATE SCHLESIER

Renate Schlesier, Dr. phil. (Berlin 1980), Habilitation (Berlin 1988), was a Professor of the Study of Culture and Anthropology at the University of Paderborn from 1993 to 2002 and is a Professor of the Study of Religion at the Free University of Berlin since 2002. She has been a visiting professor in France, the U.K., Israel, Italy, Japan, Canada, Switzerland and the USA. Her main field of research is ancient Greek religion in the context of cultural and intellectual history, including the history of transformation and interpretation of ancient concepts and figures down to the present. This focus of her interest is documented in numerous articles and books as well in her involvement in several collaborative research groups.

Prof. Dr. Renate Schlesier
Freie Universität Berlin
Fachbereich Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften
Institut für Religionswissenschaft
Fabeckstr. 23–25, Raum 0.2004
14195 Berlin, Germany
E-Mail: Renate.Schlesier@fu-berlin.de