The Styles and Voices of Non-dramatic Greek Poetry in the Fourth Century BC

A dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in Classical Languages and Literature

The Styles and Voices of Non-dramatic Greek Poetry in the Fourth Century BC

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Languages and Literature

Seth Phipps, Magdalen College, Oxford University

Trinity Term 2011

Abstract

This thesis is an investigation into the styles and voices of the non-dramatic Greek poetry of the fourth century BC. This has been a neglected area of study in Greek literary history, and the extant poems of the fourth century have either been largely ignored or regarded contemptuously by modern critics. I seek to redress this balance by providing close readings of surviving poems, and aim to show that contrary to widespread opinion, there are signs that this is a period of dynamic creativity. The first section looks more closely at the various factors that have led to a neglect of fourth-century poetry, including issues of periodization, the transmission of texts and the canonisation of poetry, the impact of musical and technological innovations and of social changes. Scholarship on late-classical Greek art is also discussed as a comparison. I then turn to discuss specific texts in depth, focussing on the way poems characterise themselves through speakers and addressees. I begin with inscribed poetry (epigrams and hymns), in which I observe tendencies both to conform to a generic model and occasionally to produce more apparently literary-conscious works. The sometimes intrusive presence of the learned author-narrator is discussed in 'bookish' poems; the final section is devoted to various kinds of sung poetry, including *enkomia*, burlesque and parody. Although the texts I analyse are diverse in genre and character, they are sufficient to point to a wider vitality of literary activity throughout the century.

Preface

This thesis is an investigation into the extant non-dramatic poetry between the end of the Peloponnesian Wars and the emergence of the great Hellenistic poets of the third century BC. It provides a series of close readings of the surviving poems and in doing so seeks to present a counter to the customary narrative of a decline in poetry after the fifth century or indeed of the sudden re-discovery of older poetic forms after the death of Alexander the Great. At issue are questions of periodization and concepts of generic development.

I wish to express my utmost thanks to those who have helped me complete this thesis. In particular, great gratitude is owed to my supervisor, Prof. G.O. Hutchinson, who has guided me and corrected my work with much patience and enthusiasm for the task. I am also grateful for the consultation with other scholars, such as Prof. Irene de Jong of the University of Amsterdam, who helped me shape my ideas on Philoxenos of Kythera, and Dr. D. Obbink (Oxford), whom I consulted on certain papyrological matters and who assisted with my earlier work on Simias of Rhodes out of which this thesis was born. The advice of Dr. A. D'Angour, Dr. J.L. Lightfoot and Dr. S.J. Heyworth (Oxford), who have read early versions of individual chapters, has been invaluable.

I have benefitted from the unpublished work of a number of scholars. I especially thank Prof. A. Ford (Princeton) for sharing with me a manuscript of his book, *Aristotle as a Poet* (Princeton, forthcoming in 2011); Dr. P. LeVen (Yale) who allowed me to see her doctoral thesis, which overlaps in content to an extent with my own, and discussed some of our ideas and disagreements in a most irenic and helpful way; Prof. C. Faraone, who shared with me a fascinating article, now published in *Mnemosyne*, on inscribed Athenian hymns. I have been able to see advance copies of countless other papers subsequently published, too many to list here: I am most appreciative of this assistance.

Finally, I wish to thank those of my friends and family who have supported me patiently over the last four years, above all my dear late mother, to whose memory I dedicate this thesis.

Contents

Introduction 1

Section I. Setting the scene: the background to fourth-century non-dramatic poetry and poetics

Chapter 1: Challenges to poetry in fourth-century culture 12

1.1 The New Music and its legacy *12*

1.2 Poetry, prose, and poetic prose *18*

1.3 Books and readers *21*

1.4 Education, scholarship and the literary canon *25*

Conclusion *30*

Chapter 2: Religious discourse, art, and poetry in the fourth century 31

2.1 Religion *31*

2.2 Art in the fourth century: an instructive comparison *38*

Conclusion *43*

Section II. Voices on stone: inscribed poetry in the fourth century BC

Introduction to Section II 46

Chapter 3: Funerary inscriptions 49

3.1 Fourth-century grave monuments *49*

3.2 Fourth-century funerary epigram: formalisation *53*

3.3 Death as separation *55*

3.4 Mannered pathos and literary affectations *67*

3.5 Epigram-reader interactions *73*

Conclusion *79*

Chapter 4: Inscriptions for votive and honorific monuments 81

4.1 Fourth-century votive monuments and epigram: continuity *81*

4.2 The healing cult *84*

4.3 Inscriptions for honorific portraits *87*

4.4 Inscriptions for athletic victors and politicians *92*

4.5 Narrative voices *96*

Conclusion *102*

Chapter 5: songs on stones: the inscribed hymns 104

5.1 The function of inscribed hymns *104*

5.2 Ritual paradigm *109*

5.3 A literary voice: the paeans of Philodamos and Isyllos *118*

5.4 Other inscribed hymns *127*

Conclusion *133*

Section III Voices on papyrus: book poetry at the start of the Hellenistic period

Introduction to Section III 136

Chapter 6 Literary epigram 137

6.1 Fictional voices, special emphases *137*

6.2 Evoking scenes *142*

6.3 Symposion *and epigram: mutual enrichment (Asklepiades and Philitas)* *149*

Conclusion *157*

Chapter 7 Book lyric at the end of the fourth century 159

7.1 Lyric metres in early-Hellenistic books *159*

7.2 Lyric metres in book epigram *161*

7.3 Longer metrical experiments *165*

7.4 Conclusion *175*

Chapter 8 The voice of the learned narrator: elegiac and hexameter book 176

poetry

8.1 Antimachos: pre-Hellenistic bookishness *177*

8.2 Philitas *188*

8.3 Simias of Rhodes *193*

8.4 Female self-construction in The Distaff *of Erinna* *197*

Conclusion *206*

Section IV Sung voices: performance poetry in the fourth century

Introduction to Section IV 209

Chapter 9 Voices of praise: hymnic, encomiastic and philosophical poems 210

9.1 Ariphron's Hygieia *210*

9.2 Enkomia *in elegiacs* *215*

9.3 The encomiastic voice in Aristotle's Hymn to Areta *218*

9.4 Krates: the philosophical voice *225*

9.5 The songs of early-Hellenistic ruler cult *231*

Conclusion *238*

Chapter 10 Voices of popular entertainment 240

10.1 Narrative as popular entertainment: the example of Timotheos' Persians *240*

10.2 Philoxenos: the dramatic dithyramb *245*

10.3 Bourgeois burlesque: the voice of parody and satire in Philoxenos' Deipnon *249*

10.4 Archestratos of Gela, Hedypatheia *259*

10.5 Matron of Pitane, Attikon Deipnon *269*

Conclusion: enterntainment and poetic τέχνη *276*

Closing Remarks 278

Bibliography 281

Illustrations 321

List of Abbreviations

CA	Powell, J.U., *Collectanea Alexandrina: reliquiae minores poetarum graecorum aetatis ptolemaicae, 323-146 A.C., epicorum, elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum* (Oxford, 1925).
CAT	Clairmont, C., *Classical Attic Tombstones* (Kilchberg, 1993-5).
CEG 1	Hansen, P.A., *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca* (Berlin; New York, 1983-1989).
DNP	*Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike* (Stuttgart, 1996-2003).
FGE	Page, D.L., *Further Greek Epigrams: Epigrams before A.D. 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources, not included in* Hellenistic Epigrams *or* The Garland of Philip. (Cambridge, 1981).
FGrH	Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Leiden, 1923-).
GH	Furley, W.D. and Bremer, J.M., *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period* (Tübingen, 2001).
G-P	Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L., *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1956).
I.Eryth.	Engelmann, H. and Merkelbach, R., *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomen.* (Bonn, 1972-3).
K-A	Kassel, R. and Austin, C., *Poetae Comici Graeci.* (Berlin, 1983).
LSJ^{9}	Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. and Jones, H.S., *A Greek-English Lexicon.* (9th ed: Oxford, 1996).
PMG	Page, D.L., *Poetae Melici Graeci: Alcmanis, Stesichori, Ibyci, Anacreontis, Simonidis, Corinnae, poetarum minorum reliquias, carmina popularia et convivialia quaeque adespota feruntur.* (Oxford, 1962).
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (Amsterdam, 1923-).

List of Illustrations

Fig. 1a. The Dexileos Stele, *c.*394/3 BC. Athens Ker 5976; *CAT* 2.209 (cast of inscription).
Source: Beazely Archive, *Inscription on tomb of Dexileos* (Oxford University Beazley Archive) [image online]. Available at:
<https://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/Sculpture/ashmolean/context/Dexilaos.htm>) [Accessed 7 Jul. 2010].

Fig. 1b. The Dexileos Stele, *c.*394/3 BC. Athens Ker 5976; *CAT* 2.209 (complete monument).
Source: Michael Lahanas, *Dexileos Stele* (Hellenica: 'stele/*stelai*') [image online]. Available at:
<http://www.mlahanas.de/Greeks/LX/DexileosStele.html> [Accessed 9 Jul. 2010].

Fig. 2. Grave stele with family group, *c.*360 BC. New York Met. 11.100.2
Source: Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History, *Grave stele with a family group* (New York Metropolitan Museum of Art 11.100.2) [image online] (published Oct. 2006). Available at:
<http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/11.100.2> [Accessed 7 Jul. 2010].

Fig. 3. Grave *naiskos* depicting three women, *c.*340 BC. J. Paul Getty Museum 73.AA.97.
Source: *Grave naiskos of a seated woman with two standing women* (J. Paul Getty Museum) [image online]. Available at: <http://www.getty.edu/art/gettyguide/artObjectDetails?artobj=8180> [Accessed 7 Jul. 2010].

Fig. 4. Ilissos stele, *c.*340 BC. Athens NM 869.
Source: Michael Lahanas, *Ilissos Stele* (Hellenica: 'stele/*stelai*') [image online]. Available at:
<http://www.mlahanas.de/Greeks/Arts/Stele/IlissosStele.jpg> [Accessed 9 Jul. 2010].

Fig.5. Grave stele of Phylonoe, *c.*380 BC. Athens NM 3790, *CAT* 2.780.
Source: Michael Lahanas, *Another stele: a baby farewells his dead mother* (Hellenica: 'stele/*stelai*') [image online]. Available at: <http://www.mlahanas.de/Greeks/Arts/Stele.html> [Accessed 8 Jul. 2009].

Fig. 6. Grave stele of Bako, Sokrates and Aristonike, *c.*340 BC. Louvre Ma 3113 (MND 909), *CAT* 4.910.
Source: Louvre Museum website, *Attic funerary stele of Baco, Socrates and Aristonike* (Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Antiquities : Classical Greek Art (5th-4th Centuries BC)) [image online]. Available at:
<http://www.louvre.fr/media/repository/ressources/sources/illustration/atlas/x196image_66826_v2_m56577569830706126.jpg> [Accessed 8 Jul. 2010]

Fig. 7. Grave stele of Demetria and Pamphile, *c.*320 BC. Athens Kerameikos.
Source: Private photograph, *Demetria and Pamphile* (blog article) [image online]. Available at:
<http://img232.imageshack.us/i/51demetriaandpamphile1mo.jpg/> [Accessed 8 Jul. 2010].

Fig. 8. White-ground *lekythos* by a member of the Reed-Painter group, *c.*425 BC. Louvre Ca 537. Source: Louvre website, *White-ground lekythos* (Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Antiquities : Classical Greek Art (5th-4th Centuries BC)) [image online] Available at:
<http://www.louvre.fr/llv/oeuvres/detail_notice.jsp?CONTENT%3C%3Ecnt_id=10134198673385027

&CURRENT_LLV_NOTICE%3C%3Ecnt_id=10134198673385027&FOLDER%3C%3Efolder_id=9852723696500785&baseIndex=9&bmLocale=en> [Accessed 11 Jul. 2010]

Fig.9. Grave stele of Pausimache, early-iv BC. *CAT* 1.283, Athens NM 3964.
Source: Syddansk Univeritet wesbite, *Gravstele for Pausimache* (Skulptursamlingen; Hellas) [online image] <http://www.sdu.dk/Forskning/Forskningsformidling/Skulptursamlingen/Hellas/205_Gravstele.aspx> [Accessed: 13 Jul. 2010]

Fig.10. Greek-Phoenician funerary stele, early-iv BC. Athens NM 1488.
Source: Stager (2005), 428, 433.

Fig. 11. Votive relief to Zeus Philios, Piraios, iv BC. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg 234.
Source: Beazley Archive, *Votive relief to Zeus Philio* (Votive reliefs) [image online] from <http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/sculpture/styles/votive3.htm> [Acceessed: 18 Jul. 2010].

Fig.12. Votive relief dedicated by Archinos to Amphiaraos, Oropos, *c.*380 BC. Athens NM 3369.
Source: Outopia, *Relief 1* [image online]. Available at: <http://outopia.gr/ancient/attiki/relief1.jpg> [Accessed: 18 Jul. 2010]

Fig. 13. Dedication to Artemis by Erbinna of Xanthos, early-iv BC. London BM. (*CEG* 2.889 (i)).
Source: Robert (1975), 141.

Fig. 14. Dedication by Erbinna to Apollo at the Letoon of Lykia, early-iv BC. London, BM (*CEG* 2.888 (i)).
Source: Robert (1975), 144.

Fig. 15. Nereid monument, Lykia, early-iv BC. London, BM.
Source: Stephen Vidler, East *Facade of Reconstructed Nereid Monument* (Eurasia Press/Corbis) [image online]. Available at: < http://www.corbisimages.com/Enlargement/42-22879737.html> [Accessed: 23 Mar. 2011].

Introduction

The non-dramatic poetry of the fourth century has been somewhat neglected by modern scholarship.[1] This neglect stems from two factors: firstly, the general absence of a significant corpus of texts from this period to talk about; secondly, a suspicion that even those that do survive are of inferior quality compared to the 'peak' of the classical style in the fifth century. This thesis is not necessarily intended to be revisionist on either count, but does seek to redress the neglect by provide close readings of the extant fragments and by bringing together texts that have not hitherto been discussed in relation to each other so that a more detailed picture of the period may emerge. The particular focus is on the poetic self-presentation (what I shall refer to as the 'poetic voice') and the styles and registers of individual authors and works.

The apparent absence of non-dramatic poetic texts in the fourth century is sometimes attributed to a decline in traditional poetry after the Peloponnesian Wars. It is often thought to reflect in some way the economic conditions, especially at Athens, after the Peloponnesian wars,[2] or socio-cultural changes in the late-fifth century that hastened the decline of poetry.[3] The latter are also used as an explanation for the style of poetry, especially the much-criticised 'New Music' of the late fifth and early fourth centuries, which is regarded as having 'ruined' lyric poetry.[4] Instead, the fourth century is regarded as an 'age of prose' in which oratory, historiography, philosophy and science excel, but contemporary poetry other than drama is largely irrelevant.[5]

---

[1] A classic example is the *Cambridge History of Greek Literature*, which has a chapter devoted to 'Fifth-century choral lyric' (Segal (1985)), but pays brief attention to Timotheos and Philoxenos and does not comment at all on fourth-century musicians. The chapters on other forms of poetry make little or no reference to the fourth century. Cf. a dismissive treatment in Lesky (1966), who calls the verse of this period 'not over-enjoyable' (651); Dihle (1994) spends a few pages to non-dramatic poetry in this period (223-228), as does Webster (1956), 26-33 . For a more positive assessment, see esp. LeVen (2008), who treats lyric in the period *c.*425-323 BC.

[2] Cf. e.g. Henderson (1957), 339 (*multos inter alios*): '... the decisive event was the fall of Athens in 404'. More recent scholarship has tended to downplay the significance: see esp. Wallace (1995). On the socio-economic effects of the war, see e..g Hornblower (2002), 153-180; Strauss (1986), 42-86; Burke (1990); Akrigg (2007).

[3] On such 'revolutions', cf. esp. in Goldhill and Osborne eds. (2006); Osborne ed. (2007).

[4] This draws on the famous image of Pherekrates fr.155 K-A of the dithyrambic poets raping Mousikē. I discuss the impact of the New Music in ch. 1.1.

[5] Cf. e.g. Webster (1956). On prose and its relationship with poetry in the creative sphere, cf. Goldhill (2002), esp. 1-9, and below ch.1.2.

Conversely, the end of the classical period, or the beginning of the Hellenistic period is conventionally placed at the death of Alexander in 323 BC.[6] The start of a new period is attributed variously to the loss of the autonomy of the city-states under Macedonian hegemony,[7] and subsequent turmoil under the Diadochoi,[8] followed by relative calm and the advent of Ptolemaic patronage,[9] together with the cultural significance of the growth of the library at Alexandria, and perhaps a sort of poetical 'regeneration'.[10] The period after the death of Alexander is frequently identified with the emergence of a new aesthetic in literature and art.[11] Sandwiched between the great ages of fifth-century Athens and third-century Alexandria, it is inevitable that the fourth century has largely been disregarded.

However, this is a narrative that needs some modification. It is to some extent a hangover from the treatment of the fourth century among influential nineteenth-century ancient historians as either a mere afterthought to the pinnacle of the fifth century, or as an uninspiring background for the period after Alexander.[12] Yet although the period 404 BC to 323 BC is still generally treated as discrete,[13] it is not immediately obvious why this should guide literary or artistic periodization.[14] Firstly, the notion of a 'crisis' at Athens has tended to be exaggerated, and although there was certainly upheaval it is far from evident that this had an impact on literary

---

6 Alternatively, the watershed moment can be seen to be Philip II of Macedon's victory at Chaironeia (338 BC), or the suppression of Athens in the Lamian war (322 BC). For a summary of the historical background to Hellenistic literature, see e.g. Gutzwiller (2007), 1-25.

7 Cf. e.g. Green (1990), at 53.

8 On the period immediately after Alexander's death, see e.g. Bosworth (2005).

9 On the effect of royal patronage and the political framework of early Hellenistic literature, see e.g. Green (1990), 80-91; Hunter (1996); Selden (1998); Stephens (2002); Strootman (2010).

10 Cf. Bulloch (1985a), who talks of the Hellenistic period emerging from 'a fundamental political restructuring of the Greek world' which 'promoted radical cultural changes which turned intellectual and artistic endeavour irreversibly in new directions' (541); cf. also *id.* (1992). Cf. Gutzwiller (2007), 1: 'The geographic, political, social, and economic changes that took place as a result of these conquests [of Alexander] profoundly affected the intellectual and literary production of the following era'.

11 See e.g. Gutzwiller (2007), 26-49.

12 The idea of decline is prominent in e.g. Grote (1846-56): for a brief summary of attitudes to the historical period, see Tritle (1997), 3-4.

13 Cf. e.g. Dihle (1994), 173: 'In general and literary history alike, the fourth century BC stands out clearly as an era with a character all of its own'. For recent discussion of the boundaries and concept of the classical period, see Walter (2006).

14 The danger of judging literary history according to political context is spelled out by Hutchinson (1988), 9-10, on the background to Hellenistic poetry: 'I should by inclination be pleased to illuminate the poems through their historical setting. But the character of the evidence, and of the literature and of other aspects of the time, seems to discourage attempts to approach the literature by constructing the period.' Cf. generally Perkins (1992).

production.[15] Drama provides a useful comparison in this respect: drama does not, as has often been assumed, enter decline in the fourth century,[16] which is rather a time of expansion in the Greek theatre.[17] The Athenian model is adopted more widely throughout Greece,[18] and new festivals continue to emerge.[19] The acting profession developed considerably over the course of the fourth century, and well beyond Athens;[20] Athens too was seemingly attracting top performers with good pay.[21] Peter Wilson has shown that the *choregia* remained an important institution until the age of Demetrios of Phaleron,[22] and even if public funding was reduced, private sponsorship may have made up the shortfall.[23] It is now no longer believed that the use of the word XOPOY on papyrus manuscripts in place of the text of a choral ode indicates that the dramatic chorus entered decline;[24] in fact the dramatic chorus may have continued much as before.[25] The dithyramb is also well-attested throughout the fourth century (presumably mostly choral, although perhaps there were some solo dithyrambs as well).[26]

These are expensive forms of poetry, so it would be a surprise if the Athenian crisis led to a decline in other, presumably lower-maintenance genres. The shortage of evidence for such poetry does not necessarily indicate that it was not being composed, or even that none of it was memorable. The rise of prose genres and epideictic oratory shows that a creative impulse is still strong, even if in some ways the emphasis is shifting. For example, inscriptions indicate the

---

[15] Cf. esp. Wallace (1995). For a reappraisal on the political 'crisis' at Athens in the fourth century, see esp. Eder (1995) and Davies (1995).
[16] On comedy in particular, cf. e.g. Csapo (2000); Green (1994), 89-104; various articles in Dobrov ed. (1995).
[17] See esp. Csapo (2007) on fourth-century theatre building at Athens; cf. also Wilson (2008).
[18] For the spread of tragedy, see Plato *Leg.*695c, 817b-c; cf. Haigh (1896), 434-443; Taplin (1993, 1999, 2007); Allan (2001); Sourvinou-Inwood (2003), 41-50; Csapo (2004b). On Sicilian drama and choruses, cf. e.g. Dearden (1990); Wilson (2007). It is a process that starts in the fifth century, but certainly extends considerably in the fourth.
[19] See e.g. Pickard-Cambridge (1988), 42-56.
[20] See esp. Csapo (2004b).
[21] So Wilson (2008).
[22] Wilson (2000); cf. also Goette (2007).
[23] Wilson (2000). The latest choregic inscriptions (*IG* II^2 3055, 3056) are dated to around 320/19 BC, at which point the *choregoi* fall under the purview of a single, elected *agonothetes* (first recorded in *IG* II^2 3073, c.307/6). Cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1988), 91-3; Csapo and Slater (1995), 156-7.
[24] Cf.Arist. *Poet.* 1456a27-32 on Euripidean choruses. For the conventional view, see esp. Maidment (1935); Hunter (1979).
[25] Rothwell (1995); cf. the remarks of Wallace (1995), 205: 'by their very nature, dramatic choruses had always been obscure, but Athenian audiences came to realize this only in the later fifth century.'
[26] For the evidence, see Sutton (1989); cf. Wilson (2007), 160-2.

importance of cultic poetry that is not preserved in the literary tradition (see chapters 2-4); sporadic instances of sympotic poetry (see chapter 8) are a testimony to more 'private' contexts for song in the fourth century. But what is preserved is rather random, and often skewed by the tastes of our sources (Athenaeus, for example, seems more concerned with certain themes than the quality of poetry). What does survive includes sufficient amounts of experimentation and innovation to suggest that the poetic scene was rather livelier than is often believed.

It seems better to assume, therefore, that the apparent silence of poetry in the fourth century is likely to be largely an accident of transmission. The Alexandrian canon was very selective,[27] and by no means always a fair representation of existing poetry; the publication of the Milan Poseidippos has shown us how narrow Meleager's criteria were for his epigram collection; the survival of much fourth-century drama and lyric was put in jeopardy by the tastes and decrees of Lykourgos in the late-fourth century;[28] even the more famous dithyrambic poets of the late-fifth century are mostly only known from negative judgements on their style, a negativity that has pervaded into modern consciousness (see ch.1.1). It is worth noting that from the fifth century as well there are actually many poets and genres (e.g. epic) that are distinctly under-represented in our extant texts: there was an overwhelming preference for just a small number of authors who were considered important by a small elite.

Moreover, the prejudices that informed ancient selectivity continue today, with the result that the quality of surviving material is often overlooked. Thus, inscriptions are frequently dismissed as 'sub-literary'; the poems of the New Music or parodists are deemed little more than rabble-rousing; clever poetic games are assumed to belong to a marginal intellectual world. There is a risk that we demand all our Greek poetry should conform to a limited conceptual model, and that we consequently miss what is genuinely exciting. I hope to show in Section II that

---

[27] Cf. Harvey (1955); Davies (1988).

[28] See Seidensticker (2002), 528; Scodel (2007). The mentions of particular tragedies and tragedians Aristotle's *Poetics* illustrate both the classic status of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides and the continuing vitality of fourth-century tragedy. The classic status assigned by Latin poets of the first century AD to those of the first century BC would not now be thought a good reason for dismissing the former.

inscriptions – an area much developed in the fourth century – provide scope for some varied and impressive poetic composition. More generally, performers and writers use new techniques and media to engage and stimulate various sorts of audience.

At the same time, the assumption that the major political factors in the final third of the fourth century cause a rupture in literary history needs qualification. The view that *polis*-hegemony was lost only after Philip's victory at Chaironeia is too Atheno-centric (many other states never had such independence anyway),[29] while the picture at Athens is not an uncomplicated one of decline after the loss of independence.[30] The evidence of inscriptions in particular suggests a continuation of some of the simpler classical styles of epigram, while alongside this many of the literary-cultural features most commonly associated with the post-Alexander years can actually be detected much earlier. A figure such as Menander, for example, occurs late in the fourth century, but may be felt to have more in common with earlier fourth-century comedy than certain third-century poets.[31] It is an obvious point, but one worth stating, that authors of the end of the fourth century would not necessarily have conceived themselves in any significantly different way from those of the first two thirds: 'Hellenistic' or 'Alexandrian' are largely modern constructs.[32] Alexandria models itself on mainland Greek city-states,[33] and although it can hardly be denied that Ptolemaic patronage allows for greater levels of activity, it seems more probable that the *poetae docti* of the early Alexandrian years are simply extending scholarly and literary practices that had emerged over the course of the fourth century (see ch.1.4 below). This awareness can be seen in recent studies of Hellenistic art, for example, which have stressed a sense of continuity with the classical, and earlier strands of 'anti-classicism' rather than rupture in the late-fourth century (see ch.2.2).

---

[29] Cf. esp. Erskine (2010).
[30] Cf. Green (2003).
[31] Cf. e.g. Gutzwiller (2007), 50. Cf. Csapo (2000).
[32] The term 'Hellenistic' was coined in the nineteenth century (Droysen (1836-1843)) to describe what was felt to be a distinctive characteristic of literature between 323 BC and 30 BC. That said, the epigrams on art-realism in the early-third century do indicate a certain self-consciousness about the aesthetic aims of the period: see e.g. Stewart (2005).
[33] See e.g. Scheidel (2004); cf. Erskine (2010).

All this illustrates the problem of writing a literary history, especially when there are relatively few fragments.[34] The temptation must be to create a misleading narrative into which the evidence is forced: either there is a perceived to be a linear development from 'classical' to 'Hellenistic', or a false sense of rupture is imposed that marks the period off too neatly. Neither seems to be an entirely fair view of the fragments, which defy easy classification as either as 'Hellenistic-in-waiting' or 'classical in decline'. How legitimately, for example, can we speak of a move in the direction of Alexandrian poetics among authors who never had any connection with Alexandria? An alternative approach for the literary historian is to eschew any notion of a narrative of the period and treat the extant fragments independently: this is equally problematic, since no literary text exists in a vacuum, and it will not be much use to readers if we cannot locate poems within a broader generic and socio-literary framework.

A closely related problem is the classification of poetic genres.[35] The notion of decline in fourth-century poetry broadly follows a model of genre evolution that derives from a Aristotelian understanding of literary genres as organisms that grow to a high-point and then enter a period of decline. Within a broader context of cultural history, this translates to a cycle of progression and decline. The decline of genres is often associated with a process of 'contamination', such as is implied by Wilhelm Kroll's ubiquitous expression 'crossing of genres' (*Die Kreuzung der Gattungen*):[36] this phrase has gained much currency, especially in the discussion of Hellenistic poetry.[37] This expression has gone somewhat out of fashion in recent critical literature,[38] but the approach prevails, namely of seeing genres as moving from a period of

[34] For the following remarks, see esp. Perkins (1992).
[35] For recent discussion, see e.g. Foley (2008); Carey (2009); Swift (2010), 6-34.
[36] Kroll (1924), 202-3.
[37] Cf. e.g. Selden (1994), 41: 'the hallmark of Hellenistic letters has become the crossing of literary kinds'; Goldhill (1991), e.g. at 285 on Kroll's theory of 'crossing'. Cairns (2010) refined this theory with the notion of 'inclusion'; cf. e.g. Fowler (1982) on 'modes' that signify a 'guest genre'.
[38] Cf. e.g. .Morrison (2007), 19: 'the concept of "crossing of genres"… is too blunt a tool…'; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) generally avoid the term, but cf. Fantuzzi (2000). For a useful discussion of the concept of 'crossing' and its pitfalls, cf. Barchiesi (2001); Harrison (2007), 1-33.

established rules to one in which they can be combined with other generic rules.[39] A famous passage in Plato's *Laws* talks this kind of 'corruption' happening in late-classical poetry,[40] while Aristotle's remarks about Philoxenos' use of musical modes have been taken in a similar way:[41] this sets the scene for understanding the fourth century as a period of decadence and decline.

However, this taxonomy may not always be altogether helpful. The difficulty with the biogenetic model of genre-evolution has been well illustrated by Eric Csapo, whose essay on comedy from Aristophanes to Menander was an early inspiration for this thesis.[42] There, Csapo argues that what is designated 'Old Comedy', 'Middle Comedy' or 'New Comedy' should be understood not as successive stages in the cycle but rather as synchronic styles: a particular age may demonstrate a preference for one particular stylistic feature, but this is not the same as saying that the genre evolves from one form into another. The danger of using the model criticised by Csapo is all too clear in discussions of fourth-century lyric, which have been too influenced by its reception in figures such as Plato, who saw the stylistic innovations as a kind of corruption; there is also a tendency to impose a false narrative onto a period.[43]

The idea of the 'crossing of genres' is also somewhat inadequate, especially when it is used to define the aesthetic of an epoch. We cannot assume that archaic and early-classical poets felt as constrained by generic rules as we (or Plato) might like them to have been (in a culture where so much poetry was connected with ritual, the contexts of performance must always have been the most fundamental generic determiner).[44] Far from being unique to the Hellenistic

---

[39] A pervasive theory of the evolution of Greek genres was expounded by L.E. Rossi (1971), who argued for three progressive stages: firstly, genres had unwritten but observed rules; later they had written and observed rules; finally the written rules were consciously broken. An example of this concept of generic theory can be seen in recent studies of the paean, whereby the inscribed hymns of the fourth century are seen as a stage of formalisation of the generic laws for the paean: see Käppel (1992); *contra* Schröder (1999); Rutherford (2001). Cf. also Ford (2006), and below ch.4.2.

[40] *Leg.* III 700d.

[41] Arist. *Pol.* 8.1342b9-12; cf. Dion. *De Comp. Verb.* 19 on the followers of Timotheos and Philoxenos mixing modes in the same song.

[42] Csapo (2000).

[43] Cf. e.g. Battezzato (2005) on the Aristotelian narrative of the evolution of tragedy: '… the idea of a linear progression is untenable…Aeschylus and Sophocles were not less bold than Euripides in manipulating the conventions they inherited from non-dramatic, choral genres' (161).

[44] Cf. e.g. Cingano (2003); Ford (2002), 8-13; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 22-6; Swift (2010), 7.

period, archaic and classical song seems to have regularly received elements suggestive of other genre-occasions:[45] Plato's account of a stricter taxonomy seems a little like 'creative nostalgia'. Moreover, there is a circularity in assuming that 'crossing' (like apparent scholarliness) is a Hellenistic trait, since it then becomes all too easy to date works purely on this basis.[46] I prefer in this thesis to think of genres as fluid constructs that may at times enrich each other, at other times pull away for sharper self-definition.

Book poetry perhaps creates a special case, since presumably in many instances the reader encounters the text outside the previous contexts of its genre, and so it is necessary to create generic signifiers: to this extent, we can perhaps see the fourth century as a crucial period in constructing attitudes towards genres, since it becomes more essential to think about what constitutes that genre. In Part III of this thesis, I am concerned with how the authors of written texts seek to construct their identity: this is a process that can be identified in the early-fourth century as well as the early-Hellenistic period. However, rather than seeing this as part of generic evolution, it seems preferable to recognise that this is really the formation of a parallel genre or style, in which different contexts and media shape a different voice (which in turn may draw influences from any number of other genres or styles).

This thesis is thus not so much an attempt at literary history as a search for the distinctive styles of fourth-century poetry. The date range covered is roughly 400-300 BC, although I have taken a flexible attitude to these boundaries where there is uncertainty. By including poetry from the very end of the fourth century and even the beginning of the third century, I hope to illustrate its place both within the 'classical' and the 'early-Hellenistic'. My approach is to try and escape the temptations to talk of genre evolution, and instead to

---

[45] So e.g. Morrison (2007).

[46] Cf. e.g. the method for dating epigrams in Page (1981): 'clever' epigrams, that might read as non-inscriptional, are dated to the Hellenistic period, while inscriptions from an earlier period need to be 'authentic'; on an epigram quoted by Aristotle and therefore unambiguously classical, he remarks tellingly:: 'It is well Aristotle is the source; otherwise it would probably have been regarded as a literary exercise from the Hellenistic period' (259).

concentrate on how individual poetic texts construct a distinctive identity and communicate within their relevant contexts.

This distinctive identity can be called the poetic voice(s), by which I mean the features that lend the poems of this period their individual character, their self-definition in the literary sphere. T.S. Eliot wrote that there were three 'voices' in a poem: that of the poet talking to himself, that of the poet talking to an audience, and that of a created character talking.[47] It is an idea that formed the basis of R.O.A.M. Lyne's seminal study of Vergil's *Aeneid*, in which he talks of the text's engagement with contemporary socio-political culture as its 'further voices', and thus frees us from anxiety about identifying any one idea with the author.[48] A little later, Simon Goldhill collected a wide-ranging set of essays on Greek literature that concerned the representation of the figure of the poet:[49] his observations centre on 'the position from which the poet's voice speaks'.[50] In Goldhill's discussions, 'the poet's voice' seems to indicate not so much the poet's talking either directly or through characters, as in Eliot's characterisation, but rather the overall self-representation of that text to its audiences. Various 'speakers', 'addressees' and poetic registers all combine to generate the rhetoric of the text.

This understanding has informed other approaches to classical texts, especially narratology, which has proved a popular way of discussing epic in particular, since it allows for a formal distinction between narrator, speakers, and internal and external addressees.[51] This has the advantage of relating the communication-forms of the poetry to audience-responses. Also of special relevance to this thesis might be the application of speech-act theory to epigram,[52] and a general interest in speakers and addressees in literary epigram.[53]

---

[47] 'The three voices of poetry' (1954).
[48] Lyne (1987).
[49] Goldhill (1991).
[50] Goldhill (1991), ix.
[51] See e.g. De Jong (2001, 2004). De Jong et al. eds. (2004) is a collection of narratological readings of various authors and genres.
[52] Meyer (2005).
[53] Cf. e.g. Bruss (2005); Tueller (2008).

In this thesis, I seek to provide close readings of individual poems, paying attention especially to what it is that audiences hear (or read) in the text, and the devices by which the poem constructs its rhetoric. Section I (chapters 1-2) concerns some of the social, intellectual and cultural background to fourth-century poetry and poetics, and in particular those issues most thought to be associated with poetic decline. The rest of the thesis is a more detailed discussion of the extant fragments, arranged according to the medium of communication: inscriptions on stone (epigrams, chapters 3-4, and inscribed hymns, chapter 5); poems (seemingly) designed to be read on papyrus (book epigram, chapter 6, book lyric, elegiac and hexameter, chapters 7-8), and finally songs that mostly seem intended to be heard in some public context (encomiastic and hymnic song, chapter 9, and songs for public amusement, chapter 10). Sections II and III offer an opportunity to see how the expectation of readers colours the voice of written poetry as against sung media; in the final section, I look at how changing performance scenarios affect the reception of the voice of song.

SECTION I

SETTING THE SCENE

The background to fourth-century non-dramatic poetry and poetics

Chapter 1
Challenges to poetry in fourth-century culture

The first two chapters seek to place the individual texts studied in this thesis within a broader cultural context. I look at some of the factors that may have affected poetic output and style in the fourth century: in the next chapter, I look at religious discourse in the period and briefly discuss art as a comparison to the periodization and classification of poetry. But first I look at some literary contexts that have often been associated with the apparent poetic decline after the fifth century: the New Music and the rise of prose. I also discuss the importance of books, scholarship and the emergence of a literary canon.

1.1 The New Music and its legacy

Our perceptions of poetry at the start of the fourth century is dominated by discourse on the so-called 'New Music', i.e. the various musical innovations, especially in dithyramb, of the second half of the fifth century,[1] which have long been regarded as key to the apparent decline of lyric after the great age of Simonides, Pindar and Bakchylides.[2]

However, this understanding derives from a negative reception of the New Music in antiquity, which is not without its difficulties. The *locus classicus* is from a fragment of the *Cheiron* by Pherekrates, fr. 155 K-A (*ap.* [Plut.] 1141d-1142a): personified *Mousikē* complains of an assault by various dithyrambic poets, starting with Melanippides and culminating in Timotheos of Miletos. Various innovations are ascribed to individual dithyrambists as a manner of sexual attack.[3] The passage corresponds neatly to a claim reported by the scholiast on Aristophanes (Σ

[1] The modern term 'New Music' is used for convenience: it should not be taken to indicate a conscious or organised literary movement.
[2] For a summary of the modern reception, see e.g. Csapo and Wilson (2009), 278-9 (on Timotheos).
[3] On the sexual metaphors, cf. esp. Ar. *Ran.* 1296-1318, where Euripides is accused of treating the Muse as a whore. See esp. Restani (1983). For personified poetry, cf. also Ar. fr.466 K-A (*Poiesis*).

Ar. *Nub.*333d), *οἱ παλαιοὶ διαφθορὰν μουσικῆς ἡγοῦντο εἶναι τοὺς διθυράμβους*. Other comic poets[4] and fourth-century prose writers[5] echo this view.

The cause of the 'ruining' of *Mousikē* seems to be the introduction of such technological innovations as extra strings or tuning devices on the *kithara*,[6] or changes to musical form and style: there are *ἐξαρμόνιαι καμπαί* (possibly melodic ornamentation or modal shifts)[7] and 'ant-runs' (perhaps virtuosic elaborations),[8] while some poets apparently used *anabolai* (probably astrophic preludes in place of responsion).[9] A common theme is that this new style of dithyrambic song is effeminate,[10] while some writers claim words are subordinated to music.[11] In the fourth-century prose writers especially, there is a feeling that the dithyramb, with its long compounds and musical style, has become merely crowd-pleasing: a sign of the new theatocracy.[12] The paucity of extant lyric works from the fourth century is sometimes explained by the belief that music became too complex and the preserve of only a specialised elite.[13]

A shortage of actual fragments of the New Music means the ancient views tend to be accepted uncritically. Our one substantial fragment, the *Persians* of Timotheos (on a mid-fourth-century papyrus found in an Egyptian tomb just over a century ago),[14] appears to be a long and rambling astrophic song with constant metrical shifts, neologisms, long compounds and

---

[4] Cf. e.g. Ar. *Av.* 903-957, 1373-1409; *Pax* 827-831; *Thesm.* 39-69, 95-174; *Ran.* 1296-1318; Strattis fr. 16 K-A (in which Kinesias is a 'chorus-killer'). For discussion, see e.g. Barker (2004).
[5] Cf. e.g. Plat. *Rep.* 3.397a-412b; *Leg.* 3.700a-701b; Arist. *Pol.* 8.7.1339a-1342b; Aristox. fr. 124 Wehrli (*ap.* Ath. 14.632b).
[6] E.g. Melanippides adds 12 strings (Pherek. fr.155.5 K-A), Phrynis adds a tuning device for extra modes on the 7-stringed *kithara* (*l.c.* 16). On the 12-stringed *kithara* cf. Timotheos in the *Persians* (below), perhaps a trope rather than a reality. Cf. esp. Maas (1988); on *kitharoidia* in general, see now Power (2010).
[7] Pherek. fr. 155.9 K-A; cf. Ar. *Nub.*333, *κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἁσματοκάμπτας*. See Restani (1983); Franklin (forthcoming).
[8] Cf. Ar. *Thesm.*100 on Agathon.
[9] Cf.Arist. *Rhet.* 3.9.1409b23-8; [Arist.] *Prob.* 19.918b13-28.
[10] Σ Ar. *Nub.* 969-971; cf. e.g. Ar. fr.178 K-A, and *Thesm.*55, 67-8, 131-3; *TrGF* 39, test. 11, 12. See Csapo (2004a), 230-2, on this trope of musical criticism.
[11] Cf. Plat. *Rep.* 3.399e, 400d; *Leg.* 2.669b-670a. Cf. Pratinas *PMG* 708 (cf. Seaford (1977-8); Zimmermann (1986); D'Angour (1997)).
[12] Plat. *Leg.* 3.701a. Cf. e.g. *Gorg.* 510e (on Kinesias); Arist. *Poet.* 1456a.
[13] Cf. e.g. Wallace (1995).
[14] P.Berol. 9875: Wilamowitz (1903).

suggestions of mimesis. It thus seems to confirm ancient criticisms of decadent musical entertainment.[15]

However, recent scholarship has been kinder.[16] The invaluable studies of Eric Csapo and Peter Wilson especially have focused on the socio-political contexts that generated not only the innovations but also the response to those innovations.[17] It is clear that the New Music needs to be understood in terms of general upheaval in late fifth-century Athens,[18] in which there was considerable emphasis on all things 'new', and in which arose a new class of professionals (e.g. architects, sophists, courtroom orators). The furore that surrounds late fifth-century musical innovations is probably more a reflection on the greater awareness and insecurity about change in contemporary society: the very notion of innovation engenders distrust.[19] Attic comedy mocks other modern trends as much as the dithyrambists: thus we have an over-enthusiastic juror in the *Wasps*, or Socrates and the sophists in the *Clouds*. The debate between Stronger and Weaker Argument in the *Clouds*[20] exemplifies how musical issues are absorbed within wider discourse on social change.

Later writers such as Plato and Aristotle inherit this rhetoric of corruption: for Plato, the good of the *polis* is at stake and musical order and poetic style is an inherent part of that; for Aristotle too, the *ethos* is an important dimension of his response to poetry and social trends (argued against much later by Philodemos).[21] Their nostalgia for a more glorious poetic past is unsurprising, but this past is really just a romantic creation by a particular elite of the late-fifth and early-fourth century. This narrative then becomes a self-repeating theme. But the poetry was

---

[15] Typical is the dismissive attitude of Segal (1985), 242-4.
[16] For a more generous reappraisal of the extant fragments, see esp. LeVen (2008), 43-90 and n.17 below. For discussion of the actual musical changes that took place, cf. esp. D'Angour (1997, 2006); Franklin (forthcoming).
[17] See Csapo (2004a); Wilson (2004); Csapo and Wilson (2009). Cf. also Wallace (1995); Franklin (forthcoming); Power (2009 & forthcoming); LeVen (2008).
[18] See esp. the various articles in Wilson ed. (2007).
[19] So e.g. Wallace (2004).
[20] Ar. *Nub.* 889-1114.
[21] Philodemos *De Mus.* (P.Herc. 1497: Delattre (2007)). For discussion on music and *ethos*, see e.g. Wilkinson (1938); Anderson (1966); Mathiesen (1984); Woerther (2008). On Philodemos' musicology, see esp. various articles in Obbink ed. (1995).

popular among ordinary people in its own day and for some time afterwards: Timotheos very quickly became a 'classic', to the extent that he even became perhaps the most popular poet of antiquity;[22] Alexander the Great is said to have requested texts of Telestes and Timotheos while on expedition;[23] Philoxenos of Kythera, despite drawing the ire of Aristotle,[24] is praised for his style by his contemporary, the comic Antiphanes.[25] Modern readers may be less quick to dismiss the popular.

Rather than dangerous and corrupting, for the poet innovation may have been the essence of his craft: technological and stylistic innovation probably had a long and well-established history in poetry.[26] Is, say, the Pindaric *ποικίλος ὕμνος* (*Ol.*6.87),[27] so different from later dithyrambists?[28] Timotheos of Miletos in one fragment boasts that he is dispensing with the 'old' songs (*PMG* 796, *οὐκ ἀείδω τὰ παλαιά· τὰ γὰρ ἀμὰ κρείσσω*); in the *Persians* (*PMG* 791.202-236 Hordern) he defends this modernism as being part of a long line of innovation. He begins with the *παιάν*-cry (202-205), which associates his work with Apollo, perhaps because the *nomos* genre was connected him,[29] but also because it links his poetry with Apollo's noble *kithara*-tradition.[30] Timotheos opposes himself to the 'aggressive conservatism' of the Spartan oligarchy,[31] which perhaps symbolises an antithesis to Athenian modernism, by citing a long line of innovators from Orpheus, who invented the tortoise-shell lyre and is called *ποικιλόμουσος* (221): Orpheus is thus the first New Musician. The twelve-stringed *kithara* is portrayed as the

---

[22] Cf. e.g. Aristox. fr. 76 Wehrli. See esp. Hordern (2002), 73-79; Csapo and Wilson (2009), 279-280.
[23] Plut. *Vit.Alex.*8.668d (= 'Telestes' test. 3 Campbell).
[24] *Pol.* 1342b.
[25] Antiphanes fr. 207 K-A, *ap.* Ath. 643d. This has sometimes been read as ironic, but cf. e.g. Fongoni (2005). Antiphanes and Philoxenos are both notable exponents of the trope of luxurious eating.
[26] On this point, see esp. Wallace (2003, 2004); D'Angour (2006); Porter (2007); Franklin (forthcoming); Csapo and Wilson (2009), 281-4; Prauscello (forthcoming); Kowalzig (forthcoming).
[27] *ποικιλία* is a buzz-word for the New Music: cf. e.g..Arist. *Pol.* 1142b-c. See esp. Barker (1995).
[28] So e.g. Seaford (1977-8), 92, who remarks that Pindar's dithyrambs are 'not without affinity with the language of later dithyramb'. Cf. e.g. Porter (2007). On the contexts of earlier dithyramb, cf. Kowalzig (forthcoming).
[29] Cf. Rutherford (1995).
[30] Cf. Wilson (2004), 305: 'it annexes the helping and hymnic god of the musical Old Guard – Pythian Apollo the *kitharōidos* (cf. esp. Pi. *Pyth.*1.1; 5.66-7) – as the divine patron of the New Muse.'
[31] Wilson (2004), 306. There is probably an element in which the Spartans could be portrayed as stifled and non-progressive: Wilson *loc. cit.* 300, points us towards a description of Kimon by Stesimbrotos at *FGrH* 107f4 (Plut. *Cim.* 4.4) where a lack of 'Attic cleverness and fluency' is opposed to a Peloponnesian manner in Kimon.

culmination of a gradual escalation of inventions: Terpandros is claimed to 'yoked music to *ten* songs' (225-6); Timotheos 'renews' *kithara* music with '*eleven*-struck rhythms and metres' (229-231); finally, the '*twelve*-walled people' of Miletos is mentioned, to form a politicizing contrast with the Spartan hegemony (235-6).[32] Timotheos is able to claim *eunomia* in his *nomos*[33] (240) in contrast with the strict *nomoi* of the oligarch.[34] It is a passage that neatly illustrates the polarising nature of the debate and the way that political matters cloud that debate.

Nonetheless, we can perceive a theatrical tendency in some of the New Music. The debate as to whether dithyrambs were particularly tied to Dionysiac ritual mirrors the same debate on drama:[35] at any rate, it is evident that large *κύκλιοι χοροί* competed in numerous festivals in a manner analogous to tragedies, comedies and satyr-plays.[36] The competitive element no doubt increased the need to 'entertain', and so whatever the genre's origins, it is unsurprising if the ritual aspects at least sometimes played second-fiddle to exciting mythic narration, music and dance.[37]

In chapter 9, I seek to explain the unusual poetic voice in terms of the impact and popularity of Attic drama, which informs both 'dithyrambic diction'[38] and the use of amusing and virtuosic rare words.[39] It is far from obvious that such poetry should be taken with straightforward seriousness: many of the texts seem ordered towards comic effect, in contrast

---

[32] An allusion to the Ionian league (so Wilamowitz (1903), 63; Ebeling (1925), 18-19; Campbell (1993) *ad loc.*), which perhaps underwent a brief revival at around this time: see Caspari (1915), 182-3. On the performance-context, see esp. Power (2001).

[33] For the pun, cf. Stratonikos *ap.* Ath. 8.352b (='Polyidus' test. 3 Campbell), 'Philotas makes decrees (*ψηφίσματα*), but Timotheos makes *nomoi*'.

[34] Cf. esp. Power (2001); Wilson (2004); Csapo and Wilson (2009). On the politics of appropriating Timotheos, cf. Prauscello (2009).

[35] For a recent discussion, see Swift (2010), 22-26; cf. Rusten (2006).

[36] See e.g. Wilson (2003); Fearn (2007), 65-81. For studies on the dithyramb in general, see esp. Pickard-Cambridge (1962); Zimmermann (1992); various articles in Kowalzig and Wilson eds. (forthcoming). Pindar's dithyrambs may represent a special case: see Hamilton (1990); van der Weiden (1991); Lavecchia (2000).

[37] So Swift (2010), 24. Cf. Plat. *Leg.* 3.700a-701a, which suggests that the removal of Dionysiac myth was part of the corruption of music; perh. cf. also P. Berol. 9571v, an early Hellenistic treatise on dithyramb, which apparently claims there was a bifurcation between a conservative, ritual dithyramb linked to Dionysus, and others that explored other mythological subjects. On this papyrus, see: Schubart (1941), 24-9; Del Corno (1974), 99-110; Longoni (1976); van der Weiden (1991), 4; Porter (2007).

[38] Cf.Arist. *Rhet.*3.3.1406b2; *Poet.*1449a10.

[39] Cf. esp. Willi (2000).

with grander, earlier dithyrambs.[40] Indeed, there are a number of poems in the fourth century with humorous takes on 'higher' genres, especially Homer and tragedy; this probably shows an influence from such genres as comedy and the satyr-play (see chapter 9).[41] Food and luxurious eating is a common theme, which is probably mostly due to the interests of the main source, Athenaeus, but may also indicate the bourgeois concerns of some fourth-century poets. Perhaps indeed it was this connection with drama and 'low' subject matter which invited snobbish criticism from some, perhaps even envy from others.

Dithyrambs are not the only instance of *theatrokratia*: Thucydides' Kleon, for example, claims serious political debate is treated as a spectacle (3.38.2-4). Epideictic oratory emerges as another genre in which the speaker may 'show off'. It can be associated with a general rise in professional performers – who attract audiences precisely because of their virtuosity. Throughout the late-fifth century and the fourth century, there is a growth in professional actors,[42] which is a trend that impacts upon lyric performances too: just as plays are re-performed, so too do professionals re-perform lyric masterpieces.[43] Such specialists probably do allow for greater musical complexity in contrast to the traditional civic chorus.[44]

However, inscriptions and sporadic fragments of lyric hymns and *enkomia* indicate that such forms of poetic entertainment existed alongside, not in place of, more conservative poetic voices. Moreover, we should not forget that many of the dithyrambic poets are known to us only because they were judged to be 'bad' in antiquity; many more dithyrambic poets must have been simply less distinctive.[45] It seems preferable to consider the entertaining, quasi-dramatic dithyramb as just one of a number of poetic voices in the period competing for attention.

---

[40] See Power (forthcoming); below ch. 9.2.
[41] Cf. perh. the connection between the dithyramb and satyr-play at e.g.Arist. *Poet.* 1449a10, 20; *Suda* o 806. On *iamboi* in the theatre, see Bartol (1992).
[42] Cf. Csapo (2004b) & (2010), 83-116.
[43] Cf. e.g. Loukian, *Harmon.* 1, on a fourth-century *aulos*-player called Timotheos of Thebes performing the works of Timotheos of Miletos.
[44] Cf. Csapo (2004a).
[45] On the choregic lists, cf. Wilson (2007), 160-162, 305-7; Sutton (1989); LeVen (2008), 18-19.

1.2 Poetry, prose, and poetic prose

Prose has often been regarded as the hallmark of fourth-century literary output: there is a wide range of prose genres, including those directed at public performance (i.e. epideictic and courtroom oratory), those that are probably more for private reading (scientific treatises or literary commentaries), and some that seem to straddle this divide (such as history or oratory re-worked for publication).[46] This seems to be in contrast with earlier periods, when poetry is the dominant form for authoritative communication.

In the late-fifth century, Herodotus's prose history may set itself up as a rival to poetic authority.[47] It is an 'enquiry' (*ἱστορίη*) and a 'demonstration' (*ἀπόδεξις*), much like scientific or sophistic literature: its authority is much like that of a technical treatise or orator. However, the subject matter is closer to the world of epic poetry: the intention is to record wars and great deeds, in the manner of the Homeric *κλέα ἀνδρῶν*:

> *ὡς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε*
> *ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι*
> *ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλέα γένηται, τά τε ἄλλα καὶ δι' ἣν αἰτίην*
> *ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι* (Hdt. 1.1.1).

Herodotus constructs himself as a more reliable authority than Homer, who he claims suppressed a version of the myth of Helen for poetical reasons (Hdt. 2.116.1).[48] Herodotus is happy to indulge in mythological narrative, but inclusions of alternative versions add a veneer of intellectual credibility. The medium of prose thus becomes part of a strategy of rhetorical authority: persuasion is drawn from being unlike the poets (fifth-century poems and plays on the Persian Wars must have made this contrast a very real matter for audiences).

---

[46] Cf. e.g. C.G. Thomas and Webb (1994); Worthington (1991, 1996); Goldhill (2002); R. Thomas (2003); Yunis (2003b).
[47] See Goldhill (2002), 10-44.
[48] Cf. Allan (2008), 23.

Plato's observations on poetry, which he famously opposes to philosophy,[49] really seem to understand it as a form of rhetoric: the point is that poetic technique is geared towards persuasion (cf. the discussion in *Republic* III).[50] Indeed, fourth-century rhetorical theory seems largely on poetry, which influences stylistic technique in prose, especially in terms of 'emotion arousal'.[51] From this emerges an interesting tension concerning what is proper to prose style, which the role of contemporary poetry is also questioned. Gorgias, for example, assumes an equivalence between epideictic oratory and poetry,[52] which suggests an attempt at a sort of metre-less and music-less poetry. Demosthenes was believed to have used a kind of rhythmic prose that could bear analysis as if poetry.[53] Isokrates, conversely, stresses the independent and equal worth of prose,[54] and seems to envision a non-poetic prose style. Orators seem to use paradigmatic myth in much the same manner that a poet might; this is found also in Platonic philosophy, whereby Plato's myth of Atlantis (for example) seems like an attempt to rival poetic myth-telling in prose. Poetry is rarely quoted by fourth-century orators,[55] nearly always from Homer, Hesiod or occasionally from tragedy, perhaps because these are already deemed 'classics', but such quotations are used primarily as rhetorical devices.[56]

Despite his condemnation of poetry, Plato's prose style seems consciously 'poetic'. On the one hand, the dialogue style plainly owes something to drama: the reader becomes a spectator, who assesses the merits of the arguments like the audience of a tragic *agōn*.[57] Thus the author appears to retreat from the argument ('Socrates' does not necessarily speak for Plato any

---

[49] *Rep.* 607b5-6.
[50] Cf. also the accusation that poets 'play to the gallery', *Rep.* 602b3-4. This same accusation is levelled at orators: cf. e.g. *Gorg.* 453a2-3; 502a6-c12.
[51] Cf. e.g.Arist. *Rhet.* 1.2.1356a, 1.15.1377b.
[52] Gorg. *Hell.* 9.
[53] See e.g. Dion. Halik. on Demosthenes *De Comp. Verb.*. 25.126.13, 16-131.
[54] Isok. 9.11; cf. 15.45.
[55] Cf. Perlman (1964). At times the engagement with poetry is quite detailed or quotation lengthy: cf. esp. Ford (1999).
[56] Cf.Arist. *Metaph.* α 995a7-8 on the value of poetic quotations for persuasion: see esp. Halliwell (2000).
[57] For a selection of recent discussion on this topic, see e.g. Arieti (1991); Ausland (1997); Freyberg (1997); Fendt and Rozema (1998); Gordon (1999); Blondell (2002); Corrigan and Glazov-Corrigan (2004).

more than a Sophoclean character speaks for Sophocles),[58] though he may still shape readers' impressions through what he gives his characters to say (a particular joy in reading Platonic dialogues lies in noticing what is not said).[59] But this suggests a strong dependency on the stage as a vehicle for persuasion: prose philosophy may seem either a 'corrective' for the abuses of dramatic poetry or alternatively a failure to escape such contexts of rhetoric.

On the other hand, Plato's prose style itself seems to be influenced by poetry, in diction, rhythm and aesthetic appeal. The *Phaedrus* illustrates wonderfully Plato's mastery of poetry-in-prose: a succession of speeches culminates in the exquisite palinode evoking that of Stesichoros (244a8-257b6), which engages in the largely poetic tool of mythological allegory and includes a prayer. By setting this alongside the Lysian and Socratic speeches, Plato subordinates poetry to the rhetoric of philosophy.[60]

In Aristotle, poetic and prose registers are assessed more formally. In the *Rhetoric*, the orator is advised to use what Aristotle considers poetic devices, such as unusual words or forms or metaphors. Rhythm is an important in prose, although Aristotle cautions against 'metrical prose', which would be no different from poetry.[61] Aristotle thus retreats from Gorgian audience-manipulation, but the (aural) attractiveness of prose rhetoric is deemed important.[62]

It might be assumed from all this that prose simply 'takes over' from poetry: perhaps it is indeed the case that new prose genres could adopt the roles traditionally filled by poetry (e.g. the treatise in place of didactic etc.). However, this would be too simplistic. Firstly, we must note that even before the fourth century, many poetic genres are distinctly under-represented in extant texts (e.g. didactic and epic); were it not for papyrus discoveries, our knowledge of lyric would be very small. Epideictic oratory and the 'new dithyramb' probably belong to the same

---

[58] On this point, see esp. various essays in Press ed. (2000); Corrigan and Glazov-Corrigan (2004).
[59] Cf. e.g. Ausland (1997), 373: 'Plato's dialogues accordingly need to be appreciated as real works of the literary art, conveying what they do as poetic wholes rather than as vehicles for views attributed to select characters.'
[60] So e.g. Griswold (1988), 74-137.
[61] See e.g. at Arist. *Rhet.*3.7.1408b21-1409a21.
[62] See esp. Dow (2007).

cultural phenomenon of a desire for public entertainment, but there is no evidence that prose performances displace poetic ones (cf. ch.1.1). Although there are prose representations of *symposia*, it seems likely that poetry remained at the heart of the sympotic experience; religious ritual still demanded poetic works; the number of metrical epigrams in the fourth century increases significantly, suggesting that in this genre at least poetic inscriptions were seen as more elevated. Even Aristotle turns to poetry for *enkomia* (cf. ch. 5 and 8 below).

Certainly, a considerable amount of creative energy in the fourth century is directed towards prose genres, but the survival of such texts as opposed to poetic ones is not surprising. Technical treatises or philosophical enquiries were preserved because they could be seen as innovative and useful in a way that large numbers of sympotic poems, for example, probably were not. Many texts were preserved and transmitted through the philosophical schools, so unsurprisingly their interests and preoccupations are reflected in the material. Likewise, Athenaeus is a major source for many literary types, but he only selected what was relevant for his discussions: curiosities or famous names take priority over things that may in fact have been more common in daily Greek life, including presumably no small amount of poetry.

1.3 Books and readers

A phenomenon which seems to define the fourth-century literary culture to a much greater extent is that of increased book circulation and collection, and the closely related growth of education and literary scholarship. The formation of a literary canon in particular seems to have had a major role in shaping reception and perhaps even had some impact on contemporary poetic production.

A book trade seems to have existed in Greece at least by the end of the fifth century,[63] and if the extent of literacy at this stage remains unclear, [64] it is certain that some people were

[63] See esp. Turner (1977); Knox and Easterling (1985).

reading and there is no obvious reason to suppose this did not include literary works. For example, the reference in Aristophanes to audiences reading texts of the plays,[65] even if not serious,[66] suggests that such texts could be purchased and read at the time. Aristophanes also makes a passing mention in the *Birds* to bookstalls (punning on the word for bird-feed),[67] while other fragments of Attic comedy make reference to booksellers and a book trade in the *agora*.[68] Plato apparently requested the purchase of a text of Antimachos of Kolophon,[69] which is fascinating evidence for a trade in relatively recent literary works. Likewise for Plato's Phaidros, who has a scroll of Lysias in his tunic:[70] even if not Lysias' *ipsissima verba*, it suggests that texts could be circulating for private consumption even at an early stage of the author's career.[71] The extant papyrus of Timotheos' *Persians* dates to a mere half-century after first performance.[72]

Writing literary works down on papyrus probably goes back much earlier.[73] It is impossible to know how much texts played a role for the archaic or early-classical poets,[74] but in any case circulation seems unlikely to have extended beyond an immediate and elite circle.[75] If used at all, written texts may have served as performance-prompts, especially for the re-performance of classics (the desire to have a stable version of Homer must have led to the writing down of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*).[76] In the great age of Atttic drama, texts may have helped

---

[64] I do not intend to attempt to resolve this thorny question here. For a selection of the large amount of scholarship on the extent of literacy in ancient Greece, see e.g. Davison (1962); Havelock (1982); Harris (1989); Thomas (1992); Svenbro (1993); Robb (1994); Ford (2002). For the impact of literacy on literature, see various articles in Yunis ed. (2003).

[65] Ar. *Ran.* 1109-14; cf. *ib.* fr. 506 K-A on the 'corrupting' influence of reading.

[66] See esp. Woodbury (1976); Burns (1981).

[67] Ar. *Av.*1286-9 (where it is copies of decrees that are being sold).

[68] Eupolis fr. 397 K-A; Aristomenes fr. 9 K-A. For discussion of these and other relevant passages, cf. esp. Slater (1996, 2002).

[69] Herakl. Pontik., fr. 91 Voss, *ap*. Prokl. *In Plat. Tim*. i 21c (1 90, 20 Diehl); Antim. test. 4 Matthews (= 1 Wyss). Cf. Plat. *Apol.*26d-e on the ready available of books.

[70] Plat. *Phdr* 230e-234c.

[71] Cf. Floristán Imízcoz (2000), 127-131.

[72] Cf. Hordern (2002), 73-4.

[73] Contact with the Egyptians, and so access to papyrus, is first attested clearly in the 6th cent.: but it is certainly not impossible that it existed earlier. See e.g. Knox and Easterling (1985) for a summary of the evidence.

[74] Cf. e.g. Yunis (2003a), 23-4, who challenges the modern assumptions about textual stability for such poets.

[75] See e.g. Ford (2003).

[76] See e.g. the controversial theory of Nagy (1996); but an ongoing performance tradition could easily have existed alongside the circulation of 'editions'. On the motivations for writing, see also Yunis (2003a); Ford (2003).

the instruction of the actors and/or chorus; it is conceivable they were also used to transmit the plays beyond Attica.[77] In the late-fourth century, it seems likely that Menander was indeed writing for an 'export market'.[78]

The epigraphical habit, which is very strong in classical Greece, may have encouraged the notion that poets could 'publish' their creations in writing: an inscribed stone may be read by an indefinitely large number of people in contrast with, say, the small gathering at a *symposion*. Thus a poem can be known across Greece simply through its being read rather than heard (although it is probable that those who have read would then report the text orally to others back home). A written text may also be re-performed in other locations by one who has read it. In this way, the poet's words 'travel':[79] this is echoed self-consciously in the famous Simonidean epigram that commands the reader to report the death of the soldiers in Sparta (*ap.* Hdt. 7.228).

But a 'portable inscription', i.e. writing on papyrus, provides a means to spread an author's work even further. At the beginning of Pindar's *Nemean* 5 (1-5) the poet speaks of his words travelling in a way that a static monument cannot, and although the contrast is between song and artefact,[80] there is a reference to two types of trade ship (ἐπὶ πάσας /ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ, 2-3) which implies a commercial market for his poetry: Xenophon mentions that trading ships routinely carried books in their chests.[81] Writing can perhaps protect a poet's words from corruption or misappropriation: this seems to be the theme of the 'seal' of Theognis (Theogn. 19-26), which was conceivably intended to accompany collections of Theognis's elegiac.[82]

Papyrus rolls are ideal for spreading material that is less likely to be inscribed, such as much longer poems (or indeed several short ones together). Marginal religious texts may have

---

[77] See Knox and Easterling (1985), 8. Perh. cf. Ar. *Ran.* 52-3, where Dionysus claims to have 'read' a play, or references to Kratinos writing in Krat. fr. 208, 209 K-A.
[78] See esp. Slater (1996, 2002).
[79] Cf. Petrovic (2009).
[80] Cf. Currie (2004) and Hubbard (2004) on the re-performance and textual dissemination of Pindaric odes.
[81] Xen. *Ana.*7.5.4.
[82] See e.g. Ford (1985), who argues that the seal 'guarantees not the origin of these *epē* but their homogeneous political character and aristocratic provenance'; cf. Pratt (1995).

been circulated this way[83] – a wonderful fourth-century instance is the Derveni papyrus of an Orphic commentary[84] – and it is also more suitable for technical treatises when these start becoming more common. 'Books' did not always have to be long rolls of papyrus: the idea that a standard roll needed to accommodate a book of epic is surely false. Phaidros was able to carry the Lysias speech in his tunic, suggesting it was not a large roll; Erinna's *Distaff* (c.350 BC?) looks like an example of papyrus text that only contained about three hundred lines: a small piece of papyrus would suffice to circulate this among a small group (see further in chapter 7).[85]

Epigram books are an interesting case. The earliest known instance is a collection of Attic inscriptions by the Atthidographer, Philochoros, in the late-fourth century.[86] But it is a reasonable guess that earlier Atthidographers were also interested in gathering inscriptions.[87] Inscriptions were also collected by a disciple of Aristotle, Krateros (*FGrH* 342),[88] which might suggest a tradition in the philosophical schools. The existence of such collections could explain how fifth- and fourth-century prose writers and orators knew the epigrams they quote,[89] supposing that they had not always seen the monuments themselves or learned of them from local reports. Cultic sites may also have kept inventories of inscribed monuments, while in chapter 3, I suggest that such epigram-collections could have functioned as copy-books for private inscriptions.[90]

An early date for epigram collections could also help explain how Hellenistic editors knew the authorship of classical epigrams, since inscriptions were nearly all anonymous. For

---

[83] Dean-Jones (2003). Cf. Plat. *Rep.* 2.364e; perh. Ar. *Av.* 980-9; see esp. Henrichs (2003a, b). Writing intriguingly becomes identified with quackery: see Dean-Jones (2003).
[84] For the text, see Laks and Most (1997); Janko (2002); Kouremenos, Parássoglou and Tsantsanoglou (2006). The most thorough study of the themes and theology to date is Betegh (2004).
[85] For recent discussion on types of ancient books, see esp. Hutchinson (2008).
[86] Suda s.v. 'Philochoros', φ 441 Adler, Ἐπιγράμματα Ἀττικά.
[87] This was denied by Jacoby (1949), but cf. Harding (1994), 43-44. The first Atthidographer was seemingly Hellanikos of Lesbos (407/6). Fragments are available in *FGrH* 323a-334, and in Harding (1994). Cf. also Rhodes (1990).
[88] Cf. Higbie (1999), 46
[89] On Herodotus and epigrams, see esp. S. West (1985). Cf. Boas (1905), 108-111, on quotations of epigrams by the 4th-cent. historian, Ephoros; see also Higbie (1999).
[90] Cf. Tsagalis (2008).

D.L. Page, this was merely a matter of guesswork,[91] but recently David Sider has proposed that a version of the *sylloge Simonidea* may have existed as early as the late-fifth century.[92] Although this cannot be proved, the theory has met with general acceptance,[93] which raises the intriguing possibility that epigrams were being read away from their objects at an earlier date than often supposed.

At any rate, by the time of the activity of the Alexandrian library in the third century, books had become such a significant part of literary life that works were now being composed directly for a papyrus-readership.[94] It is to be expected that this has an effect on the poetic voice: the act of writing changes the spoken word.[95] In chapters 5-7 I discuss some examples of 'bookish' poetry from the late-fourth century: particularly striking are the *technopaignia* of Simias of Rhodes, in which varying lines lengths created by the metre give the effect of a picture on the page. This is an extreme instance of the way that the written word can be treated as an object in itself, to be seen rather than heard.

1.4 Education, scholarship, and the literary canon

The increased book circulation is likely to be connected with developments in *paideia*,[96] which no doubt facilitated the reading of literary texts. Education through well-known individuals is attested from around the beginning of the fifth century,[97] and was spread mostly through the

---

[91] Page (1981).
[92] Sider (2007).
[93] Cf. e.g. Petrovic (2007a), 90-109.
[94] See e.g. Bing (1988).
[95] See esp. Ong (1982).
[96] *Paideia*, like the English 'education', is of course a notoriously vague word. For the purposes of this section, I limit my discussion to something that we would recognise as a formal education in literacy and numeracy. This is not to say that I do not recognise that this is only a small aspect of what the fifth- and fourth-century Greeks understood by *paideia*: for example, much 'education' took place in the home, and would include matters sexual as well as literary (cf. e.g. a fifth-century Athenian vase depicting a father taking his son to a prostitute, in Neils and Oakley (2003), 99 cat. 62). For discussion on Greek education in general, see esp. Marrou (1956); T. Morgan (1998, 1999); Ostwald and Lynch (1994); Ober (2001); K.A. Morgan (2004).
[97] Havelock (1982) argues against an early literate education, but a school of some sort in the early-fifth century seems to be implied by e.g. Hdt. 6.27.2; Paus. 6.96. Sappho's circle could be seen as a proto-school; other groups of this kind probably also existed: whether written texts had any involvement can hardly be established; poetry certainly did. Cf. e.g. Marrou (1956), esp. 26-35; Burns (1981).

sophists, in the form of instruction via *epideixis*, sort-of public lectures. Something more like a school was founded towards the end of the century by Antisthenes at the Kynosarges;[98] Aristophanes depicts Socrates as head of a school (the 'thinkery') in the *Clouds*, which resembles a sort of research centre as well as a means of educating the paying public (cf. *Nub.* 126-239): this presumably resembled certain sophistic schools at the end of the fifth century. One could learn a variety of subjects including mathematics, astronomy, and music: the emergence of accomplished professionals may be connected with this phenomenon (see 1.1 above).

Socrates seems to have been an important figure in the development of education. The earlier Socratic dialogues of Plato show a very different method from that of the sophists;[99] the representation of Socrates 'teaching' Meno's slave boy (Plat. *Men.* 82a-85b) contrasts with the way Meno had expected to learn (which was rather more like receiving sound-bites from well-known teachers).[100] In the fourth century, instruction seems more formalised, particularly at the 'schools' of Isokrates and Plato.[101] An anecdote about Isokrates' disgruntlement at other teachers' lower charges indicates that the cost of education was coming down in the fourth century.[102] The Aristotelian school is still more systematic and comprehensive, including methods of literary criticism (I shall return to this later).[103] Over the course of the fourth century, the Athenian state played an important role in the education of its citizens.[104] The training of the Athenian *ephēbeia* allowed for more widespread education, especially after the reforms of 335/4 BC; this only declined after 307 when it became no longer compulsory.[105]

Developments in education, like other cultural changes, inevitably produced anxieties: the *agōn* between Stronger and Weaker Argument in Aristophanes' *Clouds* sets up a contrast

---

[98] Diog. Laert. 6.13: see e.g. Ostwald and Lynch (1994), 594.
[99] Cf. Curren (2000), 20-34.
[100] Cf. e.g. Benson (2000); Teloh (1986).
[101] For Plato, cf. also Marrou (1956), 61-78; Curren (2000), 35-62. On Isokrates, see e.g. Marrou (1956), 79-94; T. Poulakos (1997), 93-104; J. Poulakos (2004). On the differences between Plato and Isokrates, cf. also Morgan (2004).
[102] Plut. *Isoc.* 837.
[103] On Aristotle and education, see e.g. Lynch (1972); Lord (1982); Depew (1991); Kraut (1998); Curren (2000).
[104] See esp. Schmitter (1975).
[105] See esp. Marrou (1956), 105-112; Ober (2001); Dillery (2002).

between traditional, aristocratic education (*ἡ ἀρχαία παιδεία*, *Nub.*961), associated with moral and physical training, and the modern, decadent kind, associated with sophistic rhetorical techniques.[106] This is much like the debate over the New Music. Again, the good of the *polis* is at stake: education is felt to affect moral character. Poetry is thus necessarily bound up with educational ideals (so corrupting 'modern' poets are ruled out). These ideas pervade fourth-century theories of education, as a divergence emerges between an education directed towards technical proficiency for its own sake, and education directed towards moral character.[107]

An emphasis on literacy seems to be a distinctive mark of fourth-century *paideia*.[108] Although Plato counsels against the use of written works in teaching (presumably meaning prose treatises),[109] reading and writing seems to have played an increasingly important role: education included 'letters' (*γράμματα*, taught by a *γραμματιστής*)[110] as well as physical training (instructed by a *παιδοτρίβης*) and musical skill (learnt from a *κιθαριστής*).[111] The term *γράμματα* refers primarily to literacy, but there is also a sense that literary texts become an important tool:[112] *mousikē* can be taken to indicate literary education rather than a practical musical one. Poetry retains an important place, despite the prominence of prose genres. From Plato we learn some of the sorts of literary works that could be studied, which interestingly included both whole works and anthologies.[113] The Aristotelian school evidently amassed a wide variety of writings; Herakles in Alexis's *Linos* (late iv BC) has a choice of literary texts from a library that includes Homer and Hesiod, prose histories, philosophy and technical treatises (he chooses the last – a cookbook, which may be a parody on the popularity of such textbooks in the fourth century).[114]

---

[106] Cf. e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 1238.
[107] Cf. e.g. Plat. *Rep.*2.376e on different types of education; cf. *Leg.* 1.643-644a, 718c etc. on virtue as the goal of education. See esp. Ober (2001).
[108] Cf. Morgan (1998), 9-15; *id.* (1999).
[109] Ostwald (1992), 341-51.
[110] It is difficult to be sure precisely what this involved, but it seems to have been more literary, whereas the *kithara* player presumably instructed in performance-technique.
[111] Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 8.6.1337b23. This taxonomy is not exhaustive: other skills and teachers are mentioned in various places.
[112] Cf. Robb (1994); Pownall (2006).
[113] Cf. Plat. *Leg.* 7.810b-811a. Cf. Barns (1950, 1951) on gnomologies.
[114] Alexis fr. 140 K-A.

Such a process of education inevitably raises the profile of certain texts to the status of a classic, and consequently starts (if inadvertently) the process of creating a literary canon.[115] There is a sense of tension in Aristophanes, as I have noted, about the suitability of modern poets, but in Polybios (late-iv BC) we learn that Timotheos is a core ingredient of musical education alongside Pindar.[116] There is some debate over the most suitable texts for study in Plato and Aristotle;[117] this presumably has some impact on the selection of material for Aristotle's library.

There are other signs of an emerging literary canon in the fourth century: from around 386 BC there are re-performances of older tragedies alongside newer ones at the City Dionysia,[118] which no doubt allowed specialists to show-case their acting and musical skill but also implies that the older poets have the status of 'classics'. By extension, such works are deemed particularly suitable for the edification or education of the *polis*.[119] Both politics and literary taste probably informed the Lykourgan decrees that formalised a dramatic canon in the late-fourth century.[120]

Greater text-circulation, the beginnings of a literary canon, and educational developments contribute to the emergence of a sophisticated meta-literary discourse, of which Plato (e.g. in the *Republic* and *Laws*), Isokrates and Aristotle (especially in the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric*) inevitably have a privileged place. In this context, the scholarly work of the Alexandrians does not seem to be quite such a break with the intellectual culture of the fourth century.[121]

Certainly, literary criticism of a kind is not unheard of in the fifth century and earlier: Simonides, for example, criticises the style of an epigram supposedly Midas's tomb,[122] while Old Comedy shows repeated engagement with various forms of poetry, contemporary and older. The

---

115 For a pre-Hellenistic canon, see e.g. Nagy (1989).
116 Polyb. 4.20.8-12.
117 Cf. esp. Plat. *Rep.* 3; Arist. *Pol.* 8.
118 Cf. *TrGF* 1.
119 Cf. e.g. Plat. *Leg.* 3.700a-701c, or *Rep.* passim.
120 For discussion, see Scodel (2007).
121 For discussion on Ancient Greek scholarship, see esp. Pfeiffer (1968); Too (1998); Ford (2002); Halliwell (2003); Dickey (2007).
122 Sim. *PMG* 581: cf. Ford (2002), 105-9.

earliest examples of cross-engagement between poets are not necessarily direct precursors of fourth-century criticism: they are perhaps the inevitable result of a competitive song culture.[123] But from the late-fifth century, the intellectual culture encourages discourse on poetry from a more detached perspective, and within a theoretical framework: Andrew Ford has characterised this as a move from 'song' to 'poetry', from functionalism to formalism.[124] Repeated reading and study of works in books rather than in performance contexts must have facilitated this development.

There is specialism too: Plato depicts the rhapsode Ion as both a specialist in performing Homer and a professional Homeric exegete,[125] indicating a connection between the theoretical and practical.[126] This also shows the importance of Homeric exegesis in the late-classical period. It is in the fourth century that we see the emergence of the *kritikos*, the professional literary critic.[127] Increasingly we can see a tendency to define new poetry in terms of older models: Antimachos of Kolophon defines the voice of his epic, the *Thebaid*, largely in relation to Homer; his narrative elegy, the *Lyde*, can be understood to some extent as a re-working of the elegiac voice found in Mimnermos. It is possible that there are even specific engagements with variant Homeric readings;[128] at any rate, Antimachos goes well beyond superficial imitation or allusion, and has justly been seen as a predecessor of later scholar-poets (in this thesis I discuss Philitas of Kos and Simias of Rhodes from the end of the fourth century).[129] The growth of epic parody also indicates an interest in the texts of Homer and Hesiod:[130] while it is fair to assume only vague familiarity with these poets is needed for most of the jokes, there are occasional hints at

---

123 So Ford (2002).
124 Ford (2002); but cf. Halliwell (2003).
125 *Ion* 531a7.
126 Ion claims competence over other poets: cf. *Ion* 531a3-4, 532b8-c2; 533c4-8.
127 See Ford (2002), 272. Pfeiffer (1968), 3, identifies scholarship as a self-conscious concept beginning in the third century; but as he also notes, this depends of the formation of methodologies and concepts in the preceding period.
128 Matthews (1996). Matthews' methodology, i.e. regarding the choices of rare Homeric words as a preference for certain textual readings, draws on the studies of Giangrande (1970) on Hellenistic poetry: the flaw in this approach is that of course Antimachos etc. could simply be choosing an alternative, perhaps unusual form for the sake of *variatio*. However, even this implies a level of scholarliness and sophisticated interaction with Homer.
129 Philitas: Strabo 14.2.19(cf. e.g. Dettori (2000a, b); Bing (2003)). Simias: Strabo 14.2.13.
130 On the ancient reception of Hesiod, see now König (2010).

something more sophisticated which would appeal to an audience familiar with written texts (see further in chapter 9).

But above all, the impact of the scholarly activity of the philosophical schools shows itself largely in the use of rare words, recondite knowledge and less common versions of myth. Such displays of learning are already evident in the dithyrambic *Deipnon* of Philoxenos (*c.*390-380 BC) and the *Hedypatheia* of Archestratos of Gela (c.350 BC?), which both delight in obscure details about foods and local cuisine. Such scholarliness, combined with serious studies of earlier literature, allows for the emergence of what we can call a 'bookish' poetic voice, which reads quite differently from what we find in other sorts of poetry in the period.

Conclusion

We have seen that the conventional accounts of the ruin of poetry by the new dithyrambists, or the emergence of prose to the exclusion of poetry are too simplistic. However, such cultural phenomena as increased book circulation probably did influence the style of certain kinds of poetry – though certainly not all. The overall picture that emerges is one of a complicated literary scene, with many varying styles and registers, some learned and 'bookish', others applying the techniques of drama, others again adopting a far more conservative and regularised tone (see especially section II below).

This all in fact reflects other elements of contemporary discourse. By way of illustration, in the next chapter I look at the way new cults and religious practices are subsumed within the traditional religious scene. Approaches to fourth-century art are then introduced as a comparison.

Chapter 2
Religious discourse, art, and poetry in the fourth century

2.1 Religion

The conventional narrative of a decline in poetry has often been associated with a shift or even decline in religious beliefs and practices.[1] Both the beginning and the end of the century has been identified as a time of 'crisis' in traditional religion.[2] The first point of crisis is connected with the Peloponnesian Wars. An questioning of the anthropomorphized gods of mythology had already emerged as early as Xenophanes of Kolophon,[3] while there are hints of relativism or agnosticism[4] or even outright denial of the gods' existence[5] among the sophists. Plato represents Socrates as appearing to reject traditional mythology, as for example in the *Euthyphro* , where he ridicules the myths of gods behaving badly; famously, he was tried for impiety,[6] which was probably a reflection of the political and religious insecurity of the post-war Athenian democracy.[7] All this is not so much atheism in the modern sense as a shift in what is believed about the gods.[8]

---

[1] Cf. e.g. Jordan (1979), 15: 'The Peloponnesian War weakened the spiritual, as well as the material foundations of the ancient Greek world, and the ever growing authority of the philosophical schools ensured that this would continue.' A classic discussion of the phenomenon of 'atheism' is Drachman (1922); cf. Fahr (1969). A good example of the organism concept of Greek religion (i.e. having a period of birth, growth, decline and disappearance) is Murray (1955). See e.g. Easterling (1985); Knox (1992), for a discussion of the often-complex relationship between beliefs and poetry.

[2] Cf. Shipley (1999), 155: '... the period after the death of Alexander, perhaps more than any in Greek history, lends itself to (over-)interpretation of religious crisis'.

[3] See e.g. Drozdek (2007), 15-26, on Prodikos's apparent atheism.

[4] Cf. esp. Protagoras, fr. 80b1, 4 D-K. Protagoras may however not have been typical: see e.g. Bett (1989).

[5] Drozdek (2007), 109-120.

[6] For the accusation that Socrates 'failed to worship the gods of the *polis* and introduced other gods', see Diog. Laert. 2.40; Xen. *Mem.* 1.1,1, *Apol.* 10; Plat. *Apol.* 24c; Philodem. *de Piet.* 1696–7 Obbink. On the meaning of *θεοὺς νομίζειν*, see esp. Fahr (1969). On Socrates and religion, cf. Beckman (1979); Burnyeat (1997); McPherran (1999). Some (e.g. Burnyeat (1997)) have seen the accusations of impiety as justified; Parker (1996) 201-10, and *id.* (2000), argues that it is fruitless to separate the political issues from the theological ones, and flatly denies it is a sign of a religious crisis.

[7] See e..g. Colaiaco (2001), 121-126. Cf. Burkert (1992), 247-8, on the reinstitution of religious norms after 411 BC.

[8] So e.g. Drachmann (1922).

The arrival of new ideas is perhaps reflected on stage in the plays of Euripides, of whom Aristophanes famously complains that 'in tragedies, he teaches that the gods do not exist' (*Thesm.*450-1).[9] This seems to be because Euripides' gods are 'bad'; but insecurity about novel religion is also found in the *Bacchae*, while sophistic notions may inform such remarks as found in the *Helen*, θεὸς γὰρ καὶ τὸ γιγνώσκειν φίλους (*Hel.* 560).[10] Aristophanes also has Socrates treating abstract ideas as 'gods' and causing Strespiades to reject the Olympian gods as 'old fashioned'.[11] These seem to be exaggerated and humorous takes on actual theological *nova*.

Perhaps a sign of a sceptical attitude towards traditional religion and mythology in fifth- and fourth-century literature is the emergence of the genre of parody. Burlesques parodied popular mythology, especially the birth-stories of gods.[12] Nothing seems too sacred to be mocked. However, rather than an indication of a lack of belief, such works are probably a testimony to the great cultural importance of these myths: parody provides a safe environment for irreverence. In any case, the point of parody may have been as much to send up higher genres that could be regarded as pompous among ordinary people (contrast Pindar's deliberate exclusion of a version of a myth as inappropriate for the goddess in *Olympian* 1).

War itself is widely believed to have caused a crisis in popular religion at Athens. Thucydides' reports on an Athenian nihilism and despair in response to the plague, while the apparent absence of gods in his history contrasts with Herodotus in such a way that might suggest a shift in thinking.[13] However, it is perhaps dangerous to generalise from Thucydides: the roughly contemporary Xenophon has a much more pious tone,[14] while indeed Thucydides' supposed lack of religiosity has sometimes been doubted.[15] Any crisis at Athens seems to have

---

[9] For discussion, cf. e.g. Sourvinou-Inwood (1986), 294-300.
[10] See e.g. Segal (1982), 335-6; Goldhill (1986), 234; Michelini (1987), 315-20; Lefkowitz (1987, 1989); Mastronarde (2002).
[11] Cf. Ar. *Nub.*245-253, 365-7, 1468-73.
[12] See esp. Nesselrath (1993, 1995).
[13] See e.g. Gomme (1956), 2:380; Lloyd-Jones (1971), 137; Dover (1973), 41; Strauss (1974), Hornblower (1992).
[14] So e.g. Hornblower(1983), 176.
[15] Cf. e.g. Jordan (1986); Marinatos (1981).

been short-lived: war and plague may even have pushed Athenians towards religion.[16] A firmer notion of the dodekatheon seems to have emerged in the fourth century;[17] Plato comes out firmly in support of Olympian religion in *polis*-life.[18] Fourth-century Attic orators frequently utilise traditional religion in their arguments, which at the very least shows the continuing importance of religion in public, civic discourse.[19] Nor is the rationalizing tendency of the sophists necessarily everything: inscriptions such as the hymn to the Idaian Dactyls (late-iv BC: see chapter 5.4 below) are evidence for ongoing popular piety.

New cults are an important aspect of popular religion in the fourth century, but these are worshipped alongside rather than instead of existing ones.[20] Various non-Olympian deities become popular, such as the Phrygian goddess Kybele, or Bendis and Adonis, as do mystery cults, especially the Eleusinian mysteries and Orphism:[21] parodies in comedy suggest they were as important a cultural phenomenon as religious scepticism.[22] Cults to deified abstractions increase (Hygieia, Demokratia etc.):[23] Ariphron's hymn to Hygieia (c.400 BC?) is an example that I discuss in this thesis (and not a kind of philosophical hymn).[24] But other poems addressed to abstractions are not necessarily examples of this trend: I argue (ch.9 below) that Aristotle's song addressed to personified Areta is really a development of the (Pindaric) poetic technique of praising a *laudandus* through his abstract qualities (cf. e.g. Pi. *Ol.* 12, 14); the same device is used in an elegy by Philiskos of Miletos (c.360 BC). Krates of Thebes (late-iv BC) uses the praise of abstractions as means to present his Cynic philosophy: such a device is found in earlier philosophical models, such as the praise of Eros/*eros* in Plato's *Symposium*.

---

[16] So Parker (2000), 20-54; cf. e.g. Furley (1997).
[17] Cf. Rutherford (2010).
[18] On religion in Platonic dialogues, see e.g. Herrmann (2007).
[19] Cf. e.g. King (1955); Dowden (2007).
[20] For a useful overview of the addition of 'new gods' in various different periods, cf. Garland (1992).
[21] See e.g. Bremmer (1987), 85-92; Allan (2004).
[22] Cf. esp. *Frogs* and *Clouds* (Dionysus and Eleusinian mysteries); *Birds* (Orphism), on which see e.g. Csapo (2008).
[23] See esp. Parker (1996), 228-237. On the cult of abstractions in general, cf. Shapiro (1993); Stafford (2001) and (2007), esp. 81-4; various essays in Stafford and Herrin eds. (2005).
[24] As e.g. Furley and Bremer (2001).

Perhaps the most significant new cults are those to do with healing. Asklepios comes to Athens in the late-fifth century;[25] nearly two hundred cults of Asklepios are founded during the fourth century,[26] accompanied by a large body of inscriptions (cf. ch.4 and 5 below). Asklepios is added to existing healing deities at Athens (essentially Apollo and Artemis, but also Athena and Aphrodite): there was already a sanctuary to Apollo Paion, while Athena has the title 'Hygieia': in the late-fifth and early-fourth century, Hygieia and Iaso emerge as distinct divinities in their own right. Hero cults connected with healing (i.e. Heracles Alexikakos or Amphiaraos) also become more popular.[27] These cults sit alongside 'rationalizing' impulses to healing, such as the *Corpus Hippocraticum*.[28]

The healing cults are sometimes identified with a more individualistic approach to religion – many inscriptions testify to personal healing experiences – but it is not evident that this really contrasts with earlier periods. Indeed, the healing cults are also important at a *polis*-level: Apollo and Asklepios are protectors or 'saviours' of the *polis*.[29] In the late-fifth century, we also find the first attestation of a shrine to Zeus *Sōtēr* in Athens:[30] this all suggests an understandable concern for both individual and *polis*-welfare in the wake of war and plague. This extends even to addressing mortal rulers as 'saviours', which is probably a precursor of Hellenistic ruler-cult.

There is a rise in dedications and funerary monuments by private families and individuals as opposed to the state, but this is probably less a reflection of religious change than it is of social developments after the Peloponnesian Wars (and perhaps a relaxing of earlier legislation). New motifs and linguistic styles do emerge in funerary epigrams, some of which reflect beliefs in the afterlife not found in earlier inscriptions: but rather than a change of beliefs, it seems

[25] See esp. Edelstein and Edelstein (1945); Hart (2000); Aleshire (1989).
[26] See Wikkiser (2008), 37-41 (with further bibliography).
[27] Cf. e.g. the relief of Heracles Alexikakos, Boston 96.696 (c. 370 BC); Boardman (1995), pl.144.
[28] Indeed, the Hippocratic corpus defends Olympian religion: cf. e.g. *Morb. Sacr.* 4.
[29] See Mikalson (1998), 42-4.
[30] So Parker (1996), 239.

preferable to note an influence from other genres as part of a process of the 'literarization' of epigram.[31]

Athens in the fourth century emerges as a place buzzing with new ideas but also with many varied religious practices. We do not see a simple linear narrative of decline, but rather the addition of new voices to the religious discourse. Athens is probably a special case within Greece:[32] the picture may be different elsewhere, although we have less complete information.[33] Macedonian hegemony does not seem to have affected the religious sphere in any obvious ways: the desire to prove they were really Greeks may have induced the Macedonians to share in Hellenic religion rather than impose anything of their own on local Greek states.

Nonetheless, towards the end of the century, the Greek states were exposed to other religious cultures: the Hellenistic period has often been painted as an era of considerable religious syncretism.[34] An openness to other religions is evident as early as Herodotus,[35] but in the fourth century we find more widespread appropriation of foreign cults in the Greek mainland.

Egypt in particular is an important point of contact: the worship of Egyptian deities is found especially in the more 'cosmopolitan' Greek states.[36] These again sat alongside rather than displaced local or panhellenic cults: indeed, some Greek and Egyptian cults were seemingly combined (e.g. Zeus Ammon). Sometimes the syncretism is straightforward – Demeter, for examples, is identified with Isis at an early stage[37] – but at other times there are brand new derivative cults, such Serapis, derived from Osiris-Apis under Ptolemy I.[38] Cultural exchange is

---

[31] For a recent study, see Tsagalis (2008). See also below, ch.3.
[32] For studies on Athenian religion (rather than 'panhellenic' religion), see esp. Parker (1996); Mikalson (1987).
[33] See esp. Parker (1996, 2005) on the need to understand religion in terms of the product of local communities: there is no single, overarching orthodoxy.
[34] See e.g. Grant (1953).
[35] Hdt. 3.38.1
[36] See e.g. Brady (1935); Dunand (1973). For individual cult-sites, cf. Roussel (1913); Dow (1937); Pollitt (1965); Smith (1977).
[37] Cf. Hdt. 2.171.2-3. See e.g. Heybob (1975); Pakkannen (1996); Pachis (2004).
[38] See Stiehl (1963); Fraser (1960, 1967); Huss (1994), 58-68; Pfeiffer (2008).

most obvious in third-century Alexandria:[39] Venit has shown there was considerable fluidity between Greek and Egyptian cultures and religious beliefs,[40] while Baines has noted that the social elite happily slid between Greek and Egyptian identities.[41] The new is repeatedly added to and assimilated with the old.

The growth of hero-cult is much the same:[42] it exists alongside traditional religion. Its impact on poetry includes Aristotle's heroizing song and epitaph for Hermias of Atarneus (which may have got him into some trouble); Aristotle may have also constructed an altar for Plato.[43] Ruler-cult is a related phenomenon, which derives not from Pharaonic religion at Alexandria, but rather this heroizing instinct:[44] the apparent deification of figures such as Philip II of Macedon draws on the earlier treatment of civic leaders like Lysandros of Sparta. There is thus considerable continuity between this aspect of Alexandrian religion and earlier practices. Indeed, the Hellenistic ruler-gods tended to assimilate themselves to Greek religion (e.g. Arsinoe-Aphrodite etc.).

Aside from the Egyptian influence, there is some cultural exchange with Judaism.[45] Alexandria is again the melting point for interaction between Greeks and the Jewish diaspora, although contact is certainly earlier:[46] Theophrastos shows an interest in Jewish religion, which he compares and contrasts with Greek religion.[47] There are no signs of any cultural borrowing at this stage, but the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek (early iii BC)[48] probably indicates the increasing enculturation of the Jews in Hellenic society.[49] It would be surprising if

---

[39] See Fraser (1972), 1.24-76.
[40] Venit (2002).
[41] Baines (2004), 55.
[42] See esp. Currie (2005).
[43] So *Olymp. in Plat. Gorg. Comm.* 214.25 Westerlink (cf. fr. 673 Rose). See further ch.9 below.
[44] The classic discussion is Habicht (1970); cf. Fraser (1972), 213-246; Shipley (2000), 156-163; Koenen (1993). On Hellenistic religion in general, see esp. Mikalson (1998); Potter (2003); Chaniotis (2003).
[45] For discussion of the interaction between Jews and Greeks, cf. Gruen (2002, 2003); Bar-Kochva (2009).
[46] See e.g. Jaeger (1938); Bar-Kochva (2009). There is a possible allusion to Jewish circumcision at Hdt. 2.104.3; otherwise, Greek writers generally ignore the Jews.
[47] See esp. Bar-Kochva (2009), 15-39.
[48] The legendary account of the translation commissioned by Ptolemy Philadelphos II is given in the *Letter of Aristeas* 12.20-37; 15.677-687: but this is widely supposed to be a work of Jewish propaganda or apologetics (see e.g. Tcherikover (1958); cf. also Eusebios, *Praep. Evang.* 13.12.1-2).
[49] See e.g. Marcos and Watson (2000), 18-21.

there were no impacts at all on Greek society: in this thesis, I suggest that Hermokles' *Ithyphallos* for Demetrios of Phaleron[50] may show an influence from the Hebrew psalms. The poet contrasts the *laudandus* with other gods, who are mute and deaf: this sounds very much like the condemnation of false idols in e.g. LXX *Ps.* 135.15-17; cf. 113.3-5. A direct connection cannot of course be proved, but the idea of exclusivity is certainly novel in Greek religion. However, it would be rash to generalise from this single poem: the rhetoric is over-the-top, perhaps even humorous, and in no way a serious piece of theology.

Third-century poetry shows clearer signs of an impact from cultural exchange.[51] But book poetry raises other hermeneutical problems. Callimachus's book of hymns is famously irreverent at times, which is sometimes held up as an example of a decline in beliefs.[52] More probably it is to do with the poems' destination, i.e. for reception in books.[53] Rather than evincing a lack of belief, the voice of the hymns is influenced by a desire to entertain the reader in a non-cultic setting.[54] Earlier instances of apparent irreverence might include an epigram by Asklepiades, in which a god is depicted as a frustrated lover (*AP* 5.164 = 14 G-P): this image would amuse more than offend if encountered in a book rather than inscribed in a religious context. The *Hymn to Pan* of Kastorion of Soloi (*SH* 310) delights in its own cleverness, perhaps in contrast with the rustic Pan: but even a believer may use such clever-clever 'joke' poetry as a kind of offering in itself.[55] Orphic themes are appropriated in Simias' pattern poems,[56] but again these are overtly bookish and probably not serious religious texts. In this thesis I discuss some texts that may be narrative hymns (Philitas, *Demeter*, and Simias*, Apollo*), but they are too fragmentary to offer any clues as to religiosity.

---

[50] Ath. 6.253d-f = *FGrH* 76 F13.
[51] See e.g. Susans (2004).
[52] Cf. e.g. McKay (1962); Williams (1978); Bulloch (1984, 1985b); Hopkinson (1984).
[53] On the poetic technique of cult-*mimesis*, see now Bulloch (2010); Depew (1993). On the possibility of performance of these and other 'bookish' poems, see esp. Cameron (1995).
[54] See e.g. Hunter (1992); Stephens (2003), 74-121 (who finds seriousness in the poems).
[55] Cf. Bing (1985). On 'clever' poetry in general, see now Luz (2010).
[56] Cf. esp. Wojaczek (1969); Luz (2008).

I hope to have shown that fourth-century religion is comprised of several mini-trends, in which numerous different religious practices co-exist. There is no simple linear narrative, much less a period of decline. The poetry of the period draws its influences from various trends: but we should always be mindful that belief and poetic taste are different things. It is a period in general in which we find the whole cultural and literary repertoire expanding: hardly the typical context for a poetic decline. In the next section I look at how the art history of the fourth century offers a useful comparison to this observation.

2.2 Art in the fourth century: an instructive comparison

What follows is not intended as a thorough discussion of artistic trends and styles in the fourth century, but rather a sketch of some of the ways in which scholarship on fourth-century art can suggest approaches to the literary period. This is not to suggest a strict correlation between art and poetry, but rather how some of the concerns overlap for modern scholars.

A particular issue is periodization: when does the classical end, and when does the Hellenistic begin? Among the questions posed by Ridgway in her important survey of the styles of Greek sculpture 400-323 BC is whether the works of this period are more in continuation with fifth-century styles or rather with third-century styles.[57] This is a useful way into examining the validity of talking about a 'late-classical' or 'early-Hellenistic' period and whether our traditional cut-off dates are suitable. Ridgway's supplementary question – whether or not there exists a style peculiar to this time-frame – matches my intentions in this thesis.

For many, what are usually considered distinctive features of the art of the third century are simply derivations of styles from the classical period. This view is expressed, for example, by Martin Robertson: discussing the Mausoleion of Halikarnassos, a fourth-century work that has decidedly oriental features such as might be more expected from the Ptolemaic age, he observes

[57] Ridgway (1997).

that in fact in the 'Hellenistic age proper' there are no works of such a mixed Greek-oriental idiom.[58] There are in fact, oddly few departures after the traditional cut-off date of 323 (or 331, or the various other dates scholars choose for the start of the Hellenistic period). Although Jerome Pollitt, in his study of Hellenistic sculpture,[59] proceeds according to the conventional dating of periods, he acknowledges that the real break occurs at the end of the Peloponnesian War and perceives a continuity in sculpture from the fourth to first century BC; this notion of a greater continuity with later periods than the earlier classical period was also identified by Blanche Brown, who talked of an 'anticlassicism' in classical sculpture.[60] Peter Green, following Brown, identifies a 'trend away from classicism' and suggests the period of 380-370 as the crucial moment.[61] A particular issue concerns archaism, a retrospective style which in its most developed and self-conscious form can be seen as a characteristic of the 'Hellenistic baroque' (that is, of roughly the second to first centuries BC):[62] scholars are divided over whether this is a third-century innovation or earlier.[63] It seems unwise to impose an arbitrary line; we should perhaps be content to note that archaistic features exist in art before the third century.

Discussions of fourth-century art have inevitably focused on the role of high-profile artists, such as Skopas, Praxiteles and Lysippos. These seem to be working in styles that do not seem radically different from those of the third century (and beyond). The features that have most often been noticed are realism and pathos, which is often felt to be a distinctively Hellenistic aesthetic.[64] Third-century epigrams on art or other ekphrastic passages in Hellenistic narrative suggest a certain self-consciousness about this particular stylistic impulse.[65] However, it is wise to sound a note of caution: such literary passages could also imply that realism and emotionalism was as much a rhetorical conceit when talking about art as a reflection of actual

---

[58] Robertson (1993), at 69. See also Pollitt's response to this paper, 90-103.
[59] Pollitt (1986); cf. (1994).
[60] Brown (1973).
[61] Green (1990), 92-118.
[62] For the terminology, cf. Ridgway (1993), 445.
[63] For discussion, see e.g. Pollitt (1986), 164-184.
[64] On realism especially as a Hellenistic characteristic, see e.g. Pollitt (1986), 111-126.
[65] Cf.. Zanker (1987); Williams (2005); Sens (2005); Stewart (2005).

artistic techniques: a distinct lack of originals from the fourth-century masters make it especially difficult to assess how much this rhetoric reflects reality.[66] Moreover, terms such as realism and pathos are often deficient, since they allow the projection of certain modern instincts onto the artworks: realism implies a conscious attempt at likeness, which is difficult to verify (and sculptors had long been accredited with vivid realism: note the stories about the legendary artist Daidalos); pathos is too subjective a notion to be entirely useful. A classic case of such modern projection may be the 'gaze' in funerary sculpture, which has often been regarded as a sign of late-classical pathos, but in fact could well reflect iconographic meaning.[67]

Even so, it is clear at least that the sculpture of this period is characterised by an interest in physical features and expressions: whereas the possibilities of drapery had already started to be explored in fifth century sculpture, in the fourth century, the folds are more intricate and reveal to a greater extent the contours of the body; we also find the emergence of the female nude (most famously the Aphrodite at Knidos by Praxiteles), indicating perhaps a greater interest in the form of the human body.[68] Both realism and pathos has been supposed in such works as the *Dying Iokasta* of Silanion, which apparently used a mixture of bronze and silver to capture the sense of the subject's wasting flesh.[69]

There are a number of works that appear to capture a moment in time, rather than display the subject in a static or 'idealized' pose: this is particularly demonstrated in the works of Lysippos in the later fourth century, but it can be detected in Skopas too – for example, in his statue of a maenad depicted in a moment of excitement, with the neck 'snapping back' in such a way as to suggest the contortions of a dancer (c.340 BC).[70]

---

[66] On this point, see esp. Ridgway (1997).
[67] For discussion, cf. e.g. Bergemann (1997) and Himmelmann (1999), with contrasting points of view.
[68] See esp. Dillon (2006).
[69] Described by Plut. *de aud. poet.* 3.30, *Quaest. Conviv.* 6.1.2. For discussion, see Dörig (1967). On this and other techniques, cf. Boardman (1995), 12.
[70] This is described by Kallistratos *Imag.* 2.1-4, and has been matched with the Dresden statue (cf. Boardman (1995), pl. 33), which may however be a Hellenistic copy. Cf. Ridgway (1997), 253-7.

In portraiture, there is attention to detail, such as motifs that represent age (straggly beards, wrinkled faces etc.).[71] Funerary sculpture soon adopts these techniques.[72] Gods appear more intimate and personal – an effect enhanced by the use of a more relaxed *contrapposto* – which might be thought to anticipate different conceptions of religion in the Hellenistic period but can more probably be put down to an interest in applying sculptural techniques as widely as possible.[73]

Painting too shows real developments during the fourth century that might indicate a greater sense of continuity with the Hellenistic period, especially the *sfumato* and *chiaroscuro* technique;[74] here as in statuary there is an interest in the female nude.[75] The painting of Parrhasios of Ephesos (early iv BC) has been regarded as especially innovative: he was praised in antiquity for his powers of illusion in *trompe l'oeil*.[76] Plato's condemnations of the visual arts may well need to be understood in the context of this sort of method.[77]

Of course, observing that Hellenistic styles have earlier precedents is not to exclude the possibility of significant innovation after the age of Alexander. Andrew Stewart has forcefully argued this point recently:[78] And in this way too, we might observe a connection with literature, since it can hardly be denied that the poetry of Callimachus, Apollonius and Theocritus does appear radically innovative, even if – as I occasionally suggest in this thesis – there do appear to be precedents. In the world of the visual arts, the sheer number of 'celebrity artists' that emerge at the end of the fourth century will surely be connected to the greater possibilities of patronage under Alexander and his successors, and though this need not imply a break as such with the

---

[71] Dillon (2006), 70-3.
[72] So Dillon (2006), 64.
[73] Cf. the 'approachable' Athena, discussed e.g. by Stewart (1990), 179; Robertson (1967), 386. On the difficulties of describing Hellenistic religion in this way, see above §3.
[74] Cf. Lattimore (1997), 254.
[75] See Pollitt (1994), 652.
[76] Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 35.36. Such stories should not, of course, be taken too literally, but they do suggest a great interest in painting techniques in this period.
[77] Keuls (1978).
[78] Stewart (2006).

past, when there were also famous artists plying their trade, it would be strange if more such famous artists did not produce certain new styles.

Indeed, alongside the 'Hellenistic' tendencies in fourth-century art, it is possible also to detect a sense of continuity with the earlier classical period as well. Jerome Pollitt, in his article 'Greek art: from classical to Hellenistic' in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, remarks that there are 'two distinct strands' of Greek art in the fourth century:[79] in addition to those aspects that are said to anticipate the Hellenistic period, there is also 'an external set of stylistic mannerisms derived from the art of the fifth century'.[80] The collapse of the Athenian empire, rather than heralding a great change in Attic art, at first simply seems to mean the export and extension of late fifth-century Attic art across Greece.[81] The funerary and votive sculpture of the first half of the fourth century is to a large extent simply a continuation of the styles of the late-fifth century, although the impact of the techniques in portraiture is certainly noticeable later in the century. Late fifth-century art had already displayed a certain tendency towards what could be called decadent prettiness; this has been associated with 'escapism' from the horrors of the Peloponnesian Wars.[82] It is possible to make a case for saying that many of the developments that have been identified in the fourth century really belong in continuity with this style. Ridgway remarks that if we seek a turning point, it is likelier to be around 350, and denies there is a cut-off point at either the beginning of the fourth century or the beginning of the Hellenistic period.[83]

In addition to this continuity of style, we have to take into account a deliberate classicizing or archaizing, which is not so much in continuity with the late-fifth century as an echo of an earlier, plainer style. As I have mentioned, although this is particular feature of the Hellenistic period, it is something that can be traced earlier; that confuses any neat paradigms we

---

[79] Pollitt (1994).
[80] Pollitt (1994), 647.
[81] Cf. Lattimore (1997), 251; Ridgway (1997), 3-25.
[82] Cf. Pollitt (1972), 115-125.
[83] Ridgway (1997), 364.

wish to create. Pollitt notes for example the contrast between groups on the temple at Epidauros (c.380 BC), which have pedimental sculptures that have a pathos and dissonance that 'looks to the future', but also *akroteria* that seemingly recall High Classicism.[84] Such may be seen in the Eirene group of Kephisodotos, which seemingly harks back to a Pheidian style, perhaps intending to recall the glorious period of the Athenian empire.[85] That 'looking back' is seen again in the works of Praxiteles which, though having their own distinctive style, bear the marks of 'unmistakable flashback' to the fifth century.[86] In painting too, the ancient narratives of a conflict between Parrhasios and Zeuxis probably points towards a tendency towards archaism in the latter that contrasted with the innovations associated with Parrhasios.[87]

Such conscious archaizing was possibly occurring even as early as the late-fifth century,[88] and probably reflects a general conservative tendency that idealizes the past: it could perhaps be considered a reaction against or counterbalance to innovation elsewhere. If anything, this is something that becomes stronger over the duration of the fourth century: it is aided by the conscious imitation of earlier models, within which context newer artistic voices are forged.[89] This makes the dating of works often very difficult, since in the third century an artist may well be working in the style of an artist from the early-fourth century: the tendency to rely on attributions such as 'the Skopas school' indicates this difficulty.[90]

Conclusion

So how does all this affect our investigation into the literature of the fourth and early third centuries? Above all it reveals the inadequacy of linear narratives as a means to describe literary or art history. It is plainly insufficient to compare a few works across the period and deduce

---

[84] Pollitt (1994), 649.
[85] Cf. Walter (2006), 10; Lattimore (1997), 257.
[86] Walter (2006), 10.
[87] See further in e.g. Rumpf (1947, 1951).
[88] Cf. e.g. Palagia (2009).
[89] Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 296 on Lysippos as an imitation of Polykleitos.
[90] Cf. esp. Ridgway (1997), *passim*.

from these a notion of progress from one style to another: we cannot find a clear line of development from high classicism to Hellenistic. Nor is it obvious that there is a stylistic break at either end of the period. Rather, the impression we get of fourth-century art is of one of an additive process, whereby new techniques and styles co-existed with more conservative expressions. What we find is an extension of the great art of Athens in the fifth century, and a multitude of styles; this multitude can be characterised as all of 'continuous', 'retrospective' and 'innovative'. At this point it seems relevant to recall what was said in chapter 1 about the spread of a reading culture, education and *mathesis* in the philosophical schools: the possibilities for innovation are combined with a sense of looking back to earlier models, and the establishment of some sort of canon. It is this double nature of the period that allows both prominent 'celebrities' (i.e. artists, philosophers or orators) and more conservative, 'reduced' styles to coexist.

Likewise, the poetry of the period does not belong to a simplistic narrative but rather a complex milieu in which several trends co-exist. We start to get an impression of a period that is immensely exciting, with all sorts of innovations adding to rather than supplanting the traditional cultural mix: it is a period in which the new and old meet, sometimes uncomfortably so. The remainder of this thesis is devoted to exploring some of the individual trends in more detail.

SECTION II

VOICES ON STONE

Inscribed poetry in the fourth century BC

Introduction to Section II

Inscriptions form the bulk of extant fourth-century poetry: most are short funerary or dedicatory epigrams, but there are also some longer inscribed hymns. Inscriptions form a unique kind of poetry in archaic and classical Greece, since these are texts always intended to be read rather than heard. Perhaps some poems were transcriptions of performed songs, and/or intended to be re-performed from the inscribed text; but the act of inscribing the text fixes the poem to one particular location, where it is to be read from the stone. This makes the reception of the poem different from that of orally performed poetry or of poetry found on papyrus.

There is, as I have said, a tendency to regard inscriptions as somewhat 'sub-literary', and indeed a number of the inscriptions considered in this section may seem rather tame in comparison to more effusive poetry elsewhere. Yet it is clear that inscribing becomes seen as a major means of 'publishing' in the fourth century; the expansion of the repertoire to include hymns indicates that it is a fruitful area for poetry. There is a growing sense that the inscribed stone is a medium useful in many ways, no less in some cases than other erected monuments (such as statues). The brevity of the poems (a necessary reflection of limits on space) actually affords poets an opportunity to display skill in compression, something we see in several powerful inscribed epigrams.

The 'speakers' of inscriptions are an interesting area of investigation.[1] In one sense, the inscribed object itself 'speaks' to the viewer: in numerous epigrams the first-person pronoun refers to the *objet d'art*. Sometimes the *ego* may be that of a person represented in some way by the monument: in such cases the inscribed object appears to speak on behalf of that person. At other times, the text may assume some other voice, such as that of an imagined mourner at a gravesite. But when the text is read, it may be that the reader then appropriates certain characters

[1] For discussion with further bibliography, see esp. Meyer (2005: cf. 2007); cf. Tueller (2008, 2010); Schmitz (2010a); Vestrheim (2010).

of the inscription: if, for example, an inscribed hymns is re-performed, the singer(s) becomes the new 'I' (or 'we') of the text. That the act of reading activates a ritual utterance is a theme common to my interpretations in this section.[2]

Recent years have seen an explosion of interest in epigram:[3] the publication of the Milan Poseidippos has expanded our knowledge about third-century concepts of the genre and about principles of forming epigram anthologies.[4] Consequently the inscribed predecessors of these book collections have also received more attention:[5] there has been much speculation about the shift 'from stone to book'.[6] The inscribed hymn has received far less attention, but by bringing hymns and epigrams together, I hope to show that they can be understood as similar sorts of text. Both forms can seem at times to be 'sub-literary', though both also show signs of 'literarization';[7] dedicatory epigram and inscribed hymn, in so far as they are a written offering to a god, can be seen as belonging to the same basic impulse. In both cases we are bound to wonder how the inscribed poems relate to performed genres: in this thesis I discuss the connection between sympotic lyric or elegiac with the epigram (see chapter 5); inscribed hymns have an unclear relationship to other instances of cult song and the Hellenistic literary hymn (see chapter 8 especially on fourth-century hymns and *enkomia*).

In the next two chapters I examine the distinctive style of inscribed epigrams. I begin with funerary inscriptions, which form the bulk of the surviving texts, before moving on to dedicatory inscriptions in Chapter 4. Although in the earliest inscriptions there is not much

---

[2] See esp. Day (2000); Depew (2000).
[3] By epigram, I mean both funerary/votive/honorific inscriptions and poems of a corresponding type in book form. For a fuller discussion on the meaning and evolution of the word *ἐπίγραμμα* in antiquity, see esp. Puelma (1996). I use the terms 'funerary epigram/inscription' or 'epitaph' interchangeably.
[4] From the large bibliography on Poseidippos, see esp. Acosta-Hughes et al. ed. (2004); Gutzwiller ed. (2005). On anthologies, see esp. Hutchinson (2008).
[5] See most recently Baumbach et al. eds (2010).
[6] So e.g. Baumbach et al eds. (2010), 261, *multos inter alios*. On the relationship between Hellenistic and inscribed epigram, see esp. Reitzenstein (1893); Raubitschek (1968); Giangrande (1968); Hausle (1979); Gutzwiller (1998), esp. 47-114; Bing (1998); Tueller (2008), esp. 57-64 *et passim*; Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), esp. 22-47; Bettenworth (2007); Bruss (2005, 2010b); Rossi (2001); Meyer (2005), esp. 96-106.
[7] On this term and concept, cf. e.g. Petrovic (2007a), esp. 13-19 ('Literarieserung'); Meyer (2005), e.g. at 7 n.259, '[die] Annahme des archaischen Epigramms als Literatur'; Tsagalis (2008).

formal distinction between these sub-genres, in fourth-century Attic monuments in particular funerary artwork and epigrams emerge as a highly distinctive sub-group: this provides the justification for treating them separately here.

Chapter 3
Funerary Inscriptions

3.1 Fourth-century grave monuments

Before 430 there had seemingly been a prohibition against, or at least a general distaste for private grave monuments in Athens:[1] early classical epigrams are mostly for public tombs,[2] while the majority of funeral monuments in this period are clay vases, especially white-ground lekythoi.[3] However, during the Peloponnesian Wars and in the fourth century, there was a surge in monuments for private individuals commissioned by wealthy families: private gravestones now become proportionally higher than public tombs.[4] In 317, the anti-sumptuary law of Demetrios of Phaleron once more curtailed expenditure on lavish tombs and private grave *stelai*.[5] Between about 430 and 317 BC, we find a large concentration of high-quality monuments (around 2,000 in Attica alone),[6] many with poetic inscriptions, forming a discrete group: in this chapter I hope to show that a distinctive epigrammatic language emerges for the inscriptions in this period.[7] The reader's experience of the inscribed text is inevitably linked to that of the

[1] Cf. Cic. *Leg.* 2.26.64; Kurz and Boardman (1971), 121. But cf. *contra* Morris (1992-3); Blok (2006), esp.241-2. Stears (1993), 268-298, dates the earliest Athenian *stelai* to around 450 (cf. *id.* (2000a, b, 2003)). On funerary legislation in general, see e.g. Alexiou (1974), esp. 14-23; Garland (1989); Morris (1987, 1989, 1992-3); Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 440-1; Toher (1991); Holst-Warhaft (1992), 115; Frisone (2000).
[2] See Clairmont (1983); Meyer (1993).
[3] On these, see e.g. Beazley (1938); Kurtz (1985); Oakley (2004).
[4] The reason for the re-emergence of funerary monuments is unclear. For Kurtz and Boardman (1971), 122, such monuments provided work for the Parthenon sculptors, but it is unclear why this would have reversed specific legislation; Stears (2000b), 49, argues for a non-enforcement of legislation. Perhaps Perikleian citizenship legislation had an impact (cf. Walters (1983); Whitley (2001), 370); war and plague is presumably important (cf. e.g. Stupperich (1977)).
[5] See Stichel (1992).
[6] Ridgway (1997), 157.
[7] We should be wary of 'Athenocentrism': cf. esp. Morris (1992-3), who argues for a panhellenic decline in funerary sculpture during the fifth century, due to economic conditions; cf. Toher (1991), 159-175; Garland (1989), 1-15. Nonetheless, there is a high concentration of monuments and epigrams from Attica, and a distinctive style that contrasts with the rest of Greece.

appearance of the monument,[8] so I will start with some brief remarks about what fourth-century gravestones looked like, and suggest how this might suggest readings of the poetic voice.[9]

The best-known monuments are the Attic *peribolos* tombs.[10] Viewers from the roadside would encounter a large wall with the gravestones and inscriptions facing the road.[11] The gravestones could be *stelai* carved in relief or elaborate *naiskoi*, but also possible were marble *lekythoi*[12] or *loutrophoroi*.[13] Images of the deceased tended to be painted or sculpted, with their names and/or an epigram inscribed prominently (usually on a square base or architectural pediment). In the fourth century these were generally clear and often in tight, careful *stoichedon* (cf. e.g. **fig. 1a**). Increasingly, line-breaks occur at metrical divisions, which might suggest a growing awareness of the relationship between the visual and aural aspects of verse.[14] The inscriptions would frequently have been easily legible from the roadside to viewers admiring the whole construction.[15]

The artistic style shows an influence from late fifth-century architectural sculpture, clearly evident in the Dexileos stele (**fig. 1b**): the shallow relief and the strong use of the angle of the rearing horse, or the flowing cloak of the rider,[16] recall the composition of the Parthenon friezes. This style is found on several late fifth-century or early fourth-century tombstones:[17] some have argued on this basis that sculptors hired for public monuments later worked on private grave

---

[8] On this point, see esp. Raubitschek (1968); Stears (2003); Clairmont (1970), *passim*; Newby (2007) 8-9. Clairmont (1970), 114-7 cites a single example of direct correlation (no. 38 = *CAT* 3.410, discussed below). Some points of contact may simply be obscure to us now (cf. Newby (2007), 7-12). On (mostly Hellenistic) art and epigram, cf. Prioux (2007); Männlein-Robert (2007).

[9] For further analysis and discussion of the appearance of grave monuments, see e.g. Johansen (1951); Clairmont (1970) and (1993-5), esp. introductory vol., 19-191; Breuer (1995); Bergemann (1997, 2007); Scholl (1996); Ridgway (1997), 157-170; Himmelmann (1999); Kosmopoulou (2002), 92-110.

[10] See esp. Bergemann (1997), 183-210.

[11] For discussion of the significance of these family plots, see e.g. Closterman (2007).

[12] See Schmaltz (1970).

[13] See Kokula (1984).

[14] Fraser (1956) notes that in *GVI* 886 (iii BC), in-line spaces indicate metrical breaks.

[15] Cf. Closterman (2007), 634 n.4, on an inscription more easily read from the roadside than closer (*IG* II² 7257 = Bergemann (1997), A21). Bing (2002) argues few bothered to read inscriptions in antiquity: this may be a motivation to make the monument and text stand out.

[16] *CAT* 2.209; cf. Boardman (1995), 115; Ridgway (1997), esp. 6-7. On the depiction of the horse, cf. e.g. Markman (1943), 88-9 on this relief and the comparable votive relief of Echelos and Basile.

[17] Cf. e.g. *CAT* 2.48, 130, 131, 209a, 213 (the same motif on three sides).

stelai.[18] In contrast with earlier shallow sculpted reliefs, in the fourth century there seems to be more of a vogue for the *naiskos* monument with figures sculpted in high relief, sometimes even entirely in the round, and with large architectural framing. In the second half of the century, *stelai* sometimes feature a relief on a panel in recess, creating a sense of depth. Grave monuments also become somewhat larger, and reliefs often depict more figures (cf. **fig. 2**); sometimes these are in contrasting depth of reliefs (such as the partial figure in low relief, seen in the background of **fig. 3**). The stele of Demetria and Pamphile, possibly one of the last before the prohibition of Demetrios Phaleron,[19] is a splendid example of the more elaborate late fourth-century style (**fig. 7**).[20] Third-century grave monuments tend to accentuate this highly refined portrait-statue style;[21] they perhaps show an oriental influence too.[22]

The fourth century has often been regarded as a period of more expression in funerary art. Sculpting more in the round allows for a more naturalistic representation of figures. [23] No doubt the techniques of portraiture have some impact on funerary art: [24] there is a greater attention to facial expressions, and folds of clothing are more intricately depicted. In the second half of the century, there is a tendency towards a statuesque style, showing more dimensions of the figures, with greater stylisation:[25] a wider range of features is shown on the figures (e.g. the facial hair or wrinkles on the forehead to indicate age: cf. e.g. the old man on the right-hand side of the Ilissos stele (**fig. 4**)).[26]

---

[18] So e.g. Johansen (1951), 146-7; Clairmont (1970), 43; Kutz and Boardman (1971), 122; Robertson (1981), 131. For criticism of this approach, cf. e.g. Morris (1992), 129.
[19] The chronology of this plot (which contains two *stelai*) is disputed: see esp. Kovacsovics (1990), 73-87.
[20] Ridgway (1997), 176-7, traces an iconographical shift to around 350 BC, perhaps the date of the first stele of Demetria and Pamphile (Kovacsovics (1990)).
[21] See e.g. Smith (1991), 187-190.
[22] Cf. Smith (1991), 190-2.
[23] On the anticipation of 'Hellenistic' realism, see e.g. Dillon (2006), 64-5. On honorific portraits, see ch.4.
[24] So Dillon (2006), 64; cf. esp. Bergemann (2007).
[25] So Dillon (2006), 65.
[26] Athens NM 869, c.340 BC.

Women and children emerge as a dominant artistic theme in Attic funerary art, which probably reflects the impact of the Peloponnesian Wars on Athenian society.[27] Softer poses and detailed facial expressions lend themselves to a sense of pathos[28] and perhaps give a dfferent character to familiar motifs such as the *dexiosis*;[29] modern viewers are also often moved by the apparent 'other worldliness' of the deceased's gaze, although we should be careful not to read modern attitudes into the iconography.[30]

The presence of women and children on the tomb may emphasise the separation of dead from living and the disaster that death brings to a family: as we shall see, the grief left to relatives is a recurring motif of fourth-century Attic epigrams. Some memorable instances of this theme of separation in funerary art are those where a parent tenderly holds a child, as for example the Polyxena monument (Athens NM 723, *CAT* 2.850 = *CEG* 2.859), or **fig. 5**, in which a slave-girl holds out a child to the deceased Phylonoe (Athens NM 3790, *CAT* 2.780 = *CEG* 2.516).[31] The latter suggests the gap between the living and dead by placing a space in the centre between the woman and the child: the infant stretches out a hand forlornly, but the woman does not reciprocate and merely looks down. Such images may be type-scenes,[32] but presumably even ready-sculpted images would have been chosen for their suitability to the situation: it is hard not to find pathos in these monuments. Pathos is sometimes more self-conscious, as for example with the figure who places her face in her hands in **fig. 6.**[33]

---

[27] Oakley (2009) observes around 40% of marble tombstone in the period 430-400 contain depictions of children. Cf. Breuer (1995), 48-9; Tsagalis (2008), 184-5 (on the greater number of epitaphs for women). Cf. also Leader (1997); Burton (2003); Stears (1993, 1995).
[28] Cf. Ridgway (1997), 162, 177.
[29] On the *dexiosis* motif, see also Davies (1985); Pemberton (1989); Breuer (1995), 15-38.
[30] So Bergemann (1997), who argues against reading pathos into images of untimely death etc. in classical funerary monuments: however, see the rebuttal of Himmelmann (1999), who represents the mainstream view (cf. e.g. Pollitt (1972), 143-163). For Todisco (1993), 87, pathos is distinctive of the Skopasian style.
[31] Cf. e.g. *CAT* 1.610 (*CEG* 84, Mnesagora) and 1.660 (*CEG* 89, Ampharete): for discussion of the Mnesagora stele, see e.g. Brown (2005).
[32] Cf. Clairmont (1993-5), 687: 'There is … little correlation between epigram and figured scene but the relief definitely complements… the epigram'. On stock-piled monuments or made-to-order gravestones, cf. Ridgway (1997), 163-6.
[33] *CAT* 4910, c. 340 BC. Cf. Berlin Mus. 499, at Boardman (1995), pl.117.

In the rest of this chapter, I look at how the epigrammatic language of fourth-century epigrams also seeks to arrest the viewer's attention, especially through pathos and a contrast between the worlds of the living and dead.[34] The epitaphs seldom employ innovations as such – nearly every expression found in fourth-century inscriptions has some precedent in earlier inscriptions – but rather they reflect a shift of emphasis that corresponds to what we have seen emerges in the artistic language.[35] Both the art and the inscriptions seem conscious of the reader's participation in the mourning for the deceased: the expression is directed towards generating a response from a viewer. It is probable that the voice of inscriptions is also influenced by other literary genres that talk about death and mourning, such as tragedy[36] or funerary ritual-song and oration.[37]

3.2 Fourth-century funerary epigram: formalisation

Fourth-century inscribed epigrams use a relatively small number of motifs, often repeated verbatim. This probably reflects a formalisation of the genre: the various *topoi* found in earlier grave inscriptions are now considered to be essential markers of the genre, and so appear with more frequency and regularity. Metre and length are also now more standardised:[38] the proportion of epigrams in elegiacs rises to about 70% in the fourth century (including the inversion of pentameters and hexameters, or occasional uses of hexameter with some other metre);[39] the vast majority of fourth-century epigrams are just one or two couplets, in contrast

---

[34] See esp. Breuer (1995); Bruss (2005); Meyer (2005); Tsagalis (2008); Tueller (2008).
[35] This point is neatly illustrated by Tsagalis (2008), 321, Table 1.
[36] On tragedy and fourth-century funerary inscriptions, see esp. Tsagalis (2008), 268-273. Tragedy in itself no doubt draws on an established tradition of lament: see Alexiou (1974), esp. 102-108; Holst-Warhaft (1992), 98-126; Dué (2006); Suter (2008).
[37] On female lament and epigram, cf. Stears (2008) and bibliography in n.foreg. On the classical funeral oration and its relation to contemporary ritual, see e.g. Walters (1980); Ziolkowski (1981); Loraux (1986); Bennett and Tyrell (1990); Hardwick (1993).
[38] Cf. Bowie (2010), 378-384, for a helpful list of the lengths of verse inscriptions c.750-400 BC.
[39] This latter trend is especially notable in the fourth century: I can find only two examples of this before the fourth century, and one instance of a single pentameter. Other metres are very rare in fourth-century Attic epitaphs: cf. e.g. *CEG* 2.622 (=*GVI* 2072), four iambic trimeters. See further at Tsagalis (2008), 285-307; cf. Fantuzzi and Sens (2006) on the metre of Hellenistic inscriptions.

with earlier periods when length seems less homogeneous.[40] This suggests that brevity had started to be seen as an identifying characteristic of the genre.[41]

There is more variation outside Attica in the first half of the century:[42] but the Attic artistic style spreads across Greece[43] and it is reasonable to assume the epigrammatic style did likewise, although the evidence from non-Attic inscriptions is limited. It remains in Attica that we find the largest number and highest quality of grave inscriptions, and so this chapter is largely concerned with these inscriptions.

The repetition of a relatively small number of formulae and motifs could imply the use of epigram copy-books;[44] many grave monuments too are probably from ready-made type-scenes. Copy-books would perhaps allow less-wealthy families to produce decent epigrams without hiring a professional poet.[45] In many late-classical epigrams, the name of the deceased occurs in a separate, non-metrical tag, perhaps because it is added to a pre-composed epigram; at other times there is clumsy metre, which may be due to less capable poets trying to adapt models for their own situation. Perhaps collections of epigrams by famous authors such as Simonides served such a purpose:[46] indeed, the presence of non-Simonidean epigrams within the so-called *sylloge Simonidea* of Meleager's *Anthology* could be the result of new poets adding 'Simonides-style' epigrams to an existing collection.[47] A case of apparent inscriptional imitation of one such poem

---

[40] Fourth-century exceptions: *CEG* 2.591 (late iv BC), actually three separate epigrams for the same deceased, each of two elegiac couplets (see now Fantuzzi (2010a)); *CEG* 2.571 (= *GVI* 747, late iv BC), a run of dactylics.
[41] Cf. Bowie (2007), 105-6, on Meleager's preference for 4-6 line epigrams in his *Anthology*.
[42] For other metres, cf. e.g. *CEG* 668 (= *IG* XII.7.111, *GVI* 1136, Amorgos), 4 chol. trim.; *CEG* 2.707 (= *GVI* 1062) 2 troch. tetr. *CEG* 2.663, 1 ia. trim., is exceptional (= *GVI* 66; cf. *CEG* 147, c. 485-450 BC). For longer inscriptions, cf. *IG* VII 2536 (= GVI 899), 3 el. + 1 hx.; *SEG* 9.362 (Ptolemais, Cyrene), 4 el.
[43] So e.g. Ridgway (1997), 176-7.
[44] See Mariner Bigorra (1959); Clairmont (1970), xviii; cf. Bing and Bruss (2007), 6-7; Tsagalis (2008), 53-5.
[45] A 'bias towards wealth' has commonly been assumed: so Osborne (1985), 130; Meyer (1993), 105 n.9; Morris (1992), 136-155. However, this view has been challenged by Nielsen et al. (1989); Oliver (2000). Presumably commissioning a professional poet would have been costly (this is not directly addressed by Oliver): copy-books may have reduced that cost by enabling lower-quality poets or even the families themselves to draw on a stock of metrical phrases.
[46] On an early date for the *sylloge Simonidea*, see esp. Sider (2007).
[47] For apparent 'internal' imitation within the *sylloge* cf. *AP* 7.512 and 7.442 ('Sim.' 53-4 *FGE*): see Page (1981), 279-80.

is *CEG* 2.595 (ii) (Kerameikos, late-fourth century):[48] the first line, *εἰ τὸ καλῶς ἐστι θανεῖν, κἀμοὶ τοῦτ' ἀπένειμε* Τύχη, is evidently an attempt to imitate the first couplet of an epigram transmitted in the *sylloge Simonidea*:

> *εἰ τὸ καλῶς θνήισκειν ἀρετῆς μέρος ἐστὶ μέγιστον,*
>
> *ἡμῖν ἐκ πάντων τοῦτ' ἀπένειμε* Τύχη ('Sim.' 8 *FGE* = *AP* 7.253, *GVI* 28).

The Kerameikos author has awkwardly compressed this couplet into a single line;[49] several other popular epitaphic motifs are forced into the rest of the epigram (the light of life, 2; death comes to all, 3, earth welcomes the deceased,4) in a somewhat jarring way: it is a reasonable guess that a less competent poet is trying to combine several epigrammatic sources.[50]

I now turn to some of the particular devices that characterise the poetic voice of the funerary epigrams this period. I start with the development of the theme of the separation of the dead from the living; I then move on to the various ways that pathos is evoked and the reader is involved in the 'gravesite drama'.

3.3 Death as a separation

The text of a funerary epigram typically draws attention to the monument itself. Deictic markers indicate the presence of the gravestone: a commonplace such as *τόδ' ἐστὶ μνῆμα* refers to what the reader can actually see, while topographical deixis (*ἐνθάδε* etc.) reinforces the fact that the deceased lies in the place where the reader stands. Both these standard forms of self-reference are frequently expanded or adapted in fourth-century epitaphs: for example, the word *τάφος* is used to refer to the burial site,[51] or *ἐνθάδε* is expanded by references to 'this earth' ([*ἥδε*] *γαῖα/γῆ*,

---

[48] =*IG* II² 7863. Date following Hansen (1989) *ad loc.* (with further bibliography). For discussion, see esp. Tsagalis (2008), 70-4.

[49] Cf. Tsagalis (2008), 299.

[50] For epigrammatic imitation, perh. cf. *SGO* 17/19/03 (Lykia), an inscription with Totenmahl relief for the dynast Apollonios of Olympos which seemingly recalls 'Sim.' 37 *FGE*, although a mutual source is possible. Cf. Ameling (1985).

[51] This appears almost ten times more often in the 4th cent. than in the entire corpus of earlier epitaphs. The meaning always seems to be that of 'grave' (*LSJ*⁹ II), rather than 'funeral rites' (*LSJ*⁹ I).

χθών)[52] or occasionally even the soil (κόνις) that covers the corpse (e.g. *CEG 2*.576, mid-iv BC).[53] The popular motif of the earth covering the body (cf. e.g. *CEG* 2.551.1, σῶμα σὸν ἐν κόλποις, Καλλιστοῖ, γαῖα καλύπτει) [54] emphasises at once that the corpse is nearby yet not visible. [55] There are also far more direct references to the corpse itself (σῶμα) in the fourth century.[56]

The fact that the corpse is hidden from view – of which we are reminded by expressions such as καλύπτει, κεύθει, κατακρύπτει – is in contrast with the visibility of the corpse in the funeral rites: the *prothesis* with mourners is regularly featured on funerary objects from the early geometric period onwards.[57] At the gravesite, the viewer is tantalisingly close to the deceased, but cannot interact with him or her: the stone acts as the sole means of communication between the worlds of the living and the dead. The reader is simultaneously close to and distant from the dead, an idea which may be redolent of the juxtaposition of the living and dead in funerary art: the burial site is the visible link between them. This is borne out by a number of portrayals of grave-visits on fifth-century *lekythoi*, on which the depiction of the gravestone in the centre may act as a symbolic linking device between the deceased and the mourners (cf. e.g. **fig. 8**: the tomb visually divides a grave-visitor on one side from Charon ferrying the deceased on the other).[58]

The simultaneous nearness and non-presence of the deceased is often thematized in the epigrams. For example:

ἐνθάδε τὴν χρηστὴν τ̣ί̣[τθ]ην κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτ|ει

[52] Cf. Tsagalis (2008), 217-9; Bruss (2005), 36-7.
[53] In Hellenistic epigrams, κόνις can indicate the corpse itself: see Bruss (2005), 35, who observes cites Soph. *Ant.* 246-7, 407-10, 429-30 (n.75). Thus the distinction between the body and its covering is collapsed, and the 'otherness' of death more rhetorically suggested.
[54] (= *IG* II² 11812, *GVI* 1782. Pre-iv BC exx: *CEG* 10, 69, 76. Attic, iv BC: *CEG* 2.475, 519, 543.8, 551, 582, 593.6, 601, 620. Non-Attic, iv BC: *CEG* 2.685, 709.2, 716, 737, 739. Cf. also 'anon' 126 *FGE ap.* Dem. *de cor.* 18.289).
[55] See Bruss (2005), esp. 19-37.
[56] The two earlier extant occurrences (*CEG* 2.10.6, 83.3) probably both date to the last third of the fifth century; there are fourteen such references in Attica alone in the 4th century (*CEG* 2.479, 509, 535, 548.2, 549, 551, 570, 572, 585, 593.6, 606.9, 611). Non-Attic examples: *CEG* 2.707,718, 737.
[57] See esp. Ahlberg (1971), esp. 25-219; cf. Vermeule (1979), 12; Shapiro (1991); Oakley (2004), 76-87. On the non-visibility of the corpse, cf. e.g. *CEG* 2.585.4 (= *GVI* 1105), οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἔστιν ἰδεῖν σῶμα γονεῦσιν ἐμόν (for a cenotaph: οὐ γὰρ ἔτι is loaded with pathos).
[58] See e.g. Beazley (1938), 10, on a young woman visiting a soldier's grave; cf. Oakley (2004), pl. IVb. For discussion, cf. Kurtz and Boardman (1971), 104-5; Oakley (2004), 145-214.

Ἱπποστράτης καὶ νῦν π[ο]θεῖ σε (*CEG* 2.571 (iv),1-2 = *IG* II^2 7873, *GVI* 747).

In this epigram, ἐνθάδε and νῦν refer to the world of the mourner, Hippostrate, who has been left behind by her nurse's death. But the 'here and now' contrast sharply with the concealment of the dead woman indicated by the γαῖα καλύπτει trope. In other epigrams, a past-tense verb (e.g. ἥδε χθὼν ἐκάλυψε, *CEG* 2. 599.1) separates the deceased even further from the here and now.

An alternative expression is to say that the earth 'receives' the deceased,[59] as if a guest, or even 'holds' him or her (κατέχει), often in her bosom (ἐν κόλποις). The 'breast of the earth' may have been a conventional literary metaphor,[60] but it suggests a degree of tenderness, like a mourner holding the corpse[61] or a motherly embrace.[62] It is as if after burial the earth takes over this role from the living. A good example is the grave of Kydimachos, for which the epigram claims that the deceased's homeland is now 'covering him in her breast', like a mother embracing an infant:[63]

Κυδίμαχο[ν] χθὼν [ἥδε π]ατρὶς στέρ[νοι]σι καλύπ[τε]ι (*CEG* 2.601.1 = *IG* II^2 6214, *GVI* 546).

Kydimachos's departure from the world of the living is further emphasised by the nautical metaphor in the next line which suggests a movement away: ὄλβιον εὐαίωνα β[ίου] πλεύσαντα πρὸς ὅρμον (2). The deceased's new 'harbour' contrasts with the relatives, who are mentioned in the third line.[64]

A number of epigrams explore the gap between the two worlds by drawing attention to what the deceased has left behind. In *CEG* 2.479, the earth once again 'holds the body', but the

[59] *CEG* 2. 469, 478, 509, 576, 595.5, 607. Non-Attic examples: 633, 661, 713, 737. I can find no examples of this motif before the fourth century.
[60] Cf. e.g. Aes. *Fab.*2.5; Eur. *IT.*1291;
[61] Cf. e.g. *Il.*24.724, the mourning women holding the head of Hector.
[62] Cf. e.g. *h.Hom.Bacch.*4, or perhaps the image of the motherly Gaia holding Erichthonios (e.g. Munich Painter 2413).
[63] So e.g. Bruss (2005), 36.
[64] Such relatives are often featured on the monument as indistinguishable from the deceased, illustrating a state before separation: see e.g. Bergemann (1997), 35-56; Ridgway (1997), 163-4; cf. *contra* Himmelmann (1999), 32-82.

τάφος, rather than act as the thing that hides the deceased, instead fails to conceal her *σωφροσύνη*:

> *σῶμα μὲν ἐντὸς γῆ κατέχει, τὴν σωφ|ροσύνην δέ,*
>
> **Χ***ρυσάνθη, τὴν σὴν ὀ | κατέκρυψε τάφος* (*CEG* 2.479 = *IG* II^2 13071, *GVI* 1778).[65]

This suggests a separation of the deceased from her virtue, which is remembered among the living: if we read this as *litotes*, the tomb in some way becomes a way of communicating this unseen aspect of Chrysanthe to the viewer (I will return to this motif).

Sometimes the separation of dead from living is more vividly expressed by reference to the underworld. The verb of dying can be elaborated as 'going to halls of Hades', which is an expression that had a well-established and formulaic poetic precedence.[66] In the fourth century, Persephone features more frequently in the extant inscriptions:[67] the most common motif, the 'chamber of Persephone',[68] which occurs nearly always in a line-end position, more or less supplants the 'halls of Hades' motif of earlier epitaphs.[69] This shift suggests poetic colouring:[70] it is already to be found in pseudepigrammatic lines in the *Theognidea*:

> *οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων, ὃν πρῶτ' ἐπὶ γαῖα καλύψηι*
>
> *εἴς τ' Ἔρεβος καταβῆι, δώματα Περσεφόνης,*
>
> *τέρπεται οὔτε λύρης οὔτ' αὐλητῆρος ἀκούων*
>
> *οὔτε Διωνύσου δῶρ' ἐσαειράμενος* (Theogn. 972-5 W).

---

[65] <*ὀ*> = *οὐ*: see Hansen (1989) *ad loc.*

[66] Homer regularly has *εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισι* (*Il.*22.52, *Od.*15.350 etc.), *εἰς Ἀΐδαο δόμους* (*Od.*14.208 etc.; cf. *Od.*10.512, *εἰς Ἀΐδεω ἰέναι δόμον*), or *δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω* (*Il.*3.322, *Od.*11.150 etc.). Cf. also Hes.*Th.*455, fr.25.25 West and Merkelbach: *καὶ]θάνε καί ῥ' Ἀΐδ[αο πολύστονον ἵκε]το δῶμα*;Theogn. 1014 W, *εἰς Ἀίδου δῶμα μέλαν κατέβη*; Alc. fr. 45.15 L-P; Sim. *AP*.7.251.4' Eur. *Her.*610, *ἦλθες γὰρ ὄντως δώματ' εἰς Ἅιδου, τέκνον*; *Ion* 1273.

[67] Cf. Tsagalis (2008), 87. The expression may ultimately derive from formulaic combinations of Hades and Persephone, e.g. *Od.*10.564 etc., *εἰς Ἀΐδαο δόμους καὶ ἐπαινῆς Περσεφονείης*.

[68] *CEG* 2. 489, 510, 513, 571, 575, 592, 593.4, 603 (seemingly limited to Attic inscriptions). See Tsagalis (2008), 86-134.

[69] So Tsagalis (2008), 91. But cf. *CEG* 2.661, *σε Ἀίδη[ς ὑπεδέ]ξατο*.

[70] Perh. cf. Aesch. *Pers.*624, *θαλάμους ὑπὸ γῆς*;. Pi.*Ol.*14.20-2; Soph. *Ant.* 893-4; *El.*110; Eur. *Suppl.* 1022, *Περσεφόνης ἥκω θαλάμους*. Cf. 'Sappho' *AP* 7.489, which is however surely Hellenistic.

The importance of Persephone probably owes something to the popularity of the Eleusinian mystery cults and the Thesmophoria in the late classical period,[71] although it is likely that epigram was influenced as much by conventional discourse on death in poetry as actual beliefs in the afterlife and the cult of Persephone.[72] As a literary device, it may have overtones of the grievous search of Demeter and thus serve to reinforce the distance between the living and dead. An early fourth-century Attic example is *CEG* 2.489:[73]

τὸς ἀγαθὸς ἔστερξεν Ἄρης, ἐφίλησε δ' ἔπαινος, |

καὶ γήραι νεότης οὐ παρέδωχ' ὑβρίσαι· |

ὤγ καὶ Γ[λ]αυκιάδης δήιος ἀπὸ πατρίδος ἔργων |

ἦλθ' ἐπ[ὶ] πάνδεκτον Φερσεφόνης θάλ<α>μον (= *IG* II^2 10998, *GVI* 1637).

The past tenses emphasise the remoteness of the dead from the living, but there is a consolatory note: the 'all-welcoming chamber of Persephone' is seen as a fitting destination for the noble youth, who has avoided the insult of old-age (2). The adjective *πάνδεκτος* (line 4) is rare: it may recall the epithet for Hades in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, *πολυδέγμων* (e.g. *h.Hom.Cer.*17), where Gaia is seen Hades' accomplice in Persephone's abduction (cf. *h.Hom.Cer.*7-9).

The inclusion of the (bridal) chamber of Persephone also suggests the marital union between Hades and Pesephone,[74] so the motif of 'going to the chamber of Persephone' might imply that the dead enters into a marriage of his or her own.[75] This is a particularly appropriate motif for girls who die before their wedding day:[76] the maiden obtains a tomb in place of marriage (*τάφον ἀντὶ γάμου*), and in doing so performs their own re-enactment of Persephone. This will often seem an expression loaded with pathos: it is so precisely because it emphasises

---

[71] Cf. Tsagalis (2008), 103, who rather tenuously links the name Melitta in *CEG* 2.571 with bees and the Thesmophoria.

[72] So Mikalson (1983), 74-82, who observes that other traditional characters of the underworld (Kerberos etc.), though sometimes present in archaic funerary sculpture and *lekythoi*, do not appear these epigrams (75). On beliefs in the afterlife, cf. also e.g. Sourvinou-Inwood (1995); Garland (1985).

[73] For further discussion, see Tsagalis (2008), 86-93.

[74] So Tsagalis (2008), 92.

[75] Cf esp. Rehm (1994) on this theme in tragedy.

[76] So Tsagalis (2008), 95. The theme is not of course new: cf. the famous Phrasikleia epitaph, *CEG* 24, were the maiden is 'allotted her name' in place of marriage.

the gap between expectation and actuality. The chamber of Persephone is hidden below the earth, an invisible replacement for the hoped-for visible event.

A poignant and sophisticated example is the set of three epigrams inscribed on a tomb for a twelve-year old girl, Kleoptoleme (c.350-325 BC).[77] The second of the epigrams apostrophizes Hades, who has 'snatched her away' in her youth, like Persephone:[78]

ὦ πολύκλαυθ' Ἄιδη, τ[ί Κλεοπτολ]έμη[ν ἔτι κούρην] |

ἥρπασας ἡλικίας δύσ[μορον; οὐ] σέ[βεαι](*CEG* 2.591.5-6 = *SEG* 25:298).[79]

The third epigram apostrophizes the girl's grieving mother and relatives, who take on the role of Demeter. The theme of non-marriage is introduced at this point:

ὦ μελέα μῆτερ καὶ ὁμαίμονες ὅς τέ σ' ἔφυσεν|

Μειδοτέλης αὐτῶι πῆμα, Κλεοπτολέμη·|

οἳ γόον, οὐ θάλαμον τὸν σὸν προσορῶσι θανούσης, |

θρῆνόν τε ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς καὶ τάφον ἀντὶ γάμου (*CEG* 2.591.9-12).

The reference to the *γόος*, *θρῆνος* and the *τάφος* place the emphasis on the world of the mourners, and the frustration of their hopes: the third line hints pathetically at the bridal chamber the girl never had and which is substituted by lament (4). The hoped-for wedding chamber is replaced by an invisible one (*οὐ θάλαμον τὸν σὸν προσορῶσι*), which is a poignant variation on the theme of the earth hiding the deceased.

In the epitaph for Philostratos, *CEG* 2.564 (=*IG* II^2 12974, Peek *GVI* 1499), the deceased is addressed: references to his nickname and the mention of his parents place attention on the world of the living and generate pathos, but this affectionate family portrait is almost brutally interrupted by the image of a god snatching Philostratos away:

παῖς πατέρος σαυτοῦ πατρὸς ἔχων ὄνομα,

[77] These are inscribed continuously, but are best read as three distinct epigrams. See now Fantuzzi (2010a).
[78] Cf. the depiction of the abduction of Persephone in the wall-painting of the Macedonian tomb at Vergina (mid-iv BC).
[79] For the admittedly speculative supplements, see Peek (1968), 367-370 (*SEG* 25:298).

καὶ παραμύθιον ἦσθα|πατρωνύμιόν τε γονεῦσι,

Νεολλαρίων, δαίμων δέ σ' ἀφείλετο πᾶ<σ>ι πο|θεινόν.

The δαίμων is probably an allusion to Charon or Hermes *Psychopompos*, or perhaps Hypnos and Thanatos.[80] In other inscriptions, the journey to the underworld is lent the more positive notion of reaching the 'boundary of virtue' (e.g. *CEG* 2.510, τὴν πάσης ἀρετῆς ἐπὶ τέρμα μολοῦσαν).[81] Here, however, the adjective ποθεινός suggests a sense of loss, which appears to be a particular characteristic of fourth-century inscribed epigrams.[82]

This word and its cognates have an extensive connection with death in poetry:[83] it suggests an unfulfilled desire, or longing of the living for the deceased,[84] and so powerfully indicates the separation caused by death. A useful comparison is Iokasta's lamentation of separation in Euripides' *Phoenissae* (*Phoen.*317-326), in which she addresses her τέκος as ποθεινὸς φίλοις, ποθεινὸς Θήβαις (320-1). The sense of loss indicated by the adjective is caused by his act of leaving the ancestral house ἔρημον πατρῶιον ἔλιπες δόμον (318), just as in epitaphs the deceased leaves behind the abode of relatives to go to Hades; it is this departure that triggers the πόθος and leads to desolation for the lamenter (cf. *Phoen.* 317, ἔρημον; 23, δακρυόεσσ' ἀνεῖσα πένθει κόμαν).

Fourth-century epitaphs are frequently constructed as miniature versions of this sort of lament. As in the Euripidean passage, the antithesis between living and dead is characterised as leaving something or someone behind, usually with a form of λείπειν.[85] The accusative object can express, as here, the physical place that the deceased has departed from:[86] the abandoned

---

[80] Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 326-7.
[81] = *IG* II² 5450, *GVI* 488. See Tsagalis (2008), 93-4 for a collection of the poetic occurrences of this theme. The sense is ambiguous: it could either mean that the deceased reached the very limits of virtue, or that death ended their virtuous life. Either sense has poignancy.
[82] Earlier examples: *CEG* 10, 104, 128, 175. Fourth-century: *CEG* 2.483, 485.1, 494, 501, 511, 515, 522, 526.8, 527, 530, 543.3, 550, 553.1, 564, 569, 571, 577, 608, 610. Non-Attic examples: 683, 687, 696. Cf. Tsagalis (2008), 271.
[83] Cf. e.g. Achilles mourning for Patroclus, *Il.*24.3.
[84] See esp. Vermeule (1979), 154-5.
[85] Tsaglis (2008), 111-3, provides an extremely helpful list of the various constructions with this verb in 5th- and 4th-cent. inscriptions.
[86] E.g. *CEG* 80, πατρίδα γέν (v BC); cf. *CEG* 2.492 (πατρίδα), 596.6 (Φοινίκην – the sense here is related to the distance between the burial site and the deceased's homeland), 700 (Knidos, γῆν πατρίδα).

δόμος of the living contrasts with the new δόμος of Hades and Persephone. Similarly, the deceased 'leaves the light of life' (e.g. λιποῦσα φάος, *CEG* 2.543.4),[87] which contrasts implicitly with the darkness of the underworld: the dead no longer looks upon the light (e.g. ἡμεῖς δ' ἀελίου... εἴδομεν αὐγήν, *CEG* 2.520.6) much as the living no longer look upon the deceased man or woman. All these themes are brought together in the inscription for Nikoboulos:

> σῆς ἀρετῆς ἕστηκεν ἐν Ἑλλάδι | πλεῖστα τρόπαια
>
> ἔν τε ἀνδρῶν | ψυχαῖς, οἷος ἐὼν ἔλιπες,
>
> Νικόβ|ολε, ἠελίο λαμπρὸμ φῶς, Περσεφ|όνης δὲ
>
> δ[ῶμ]α ποθεινὸς ἐὼν σοῖ|[σι φίλο]ις κατέβας (*CEG* 2.511= *IG* II^2 6004, *GVI* 1492).

The motif of light and dark, which is redolent of Sophoclean tragedy,[88] is an evocative and poetic means of expressing the departure from the world of the living. In this inscription, the contrast is further explored by reference to the souls of men, among whom the monuments of his virtue stand (1-2): ἀνδρῶν ψυχαί is a fairly unusual periphrasis that draws out an opposition to the descent of the soul of the deceased (cf. κατέβας, 4).[89] This theme of the 'light of life' and its significance has recently been discussed extensively by Christos Tsagalis,[90] so I shall not dwell on it further here.

Sometimes it is the relatives themselves who are 'abandoned';[91] at other times, the sense is more metaphorical: the deceased leaves behind πόθος[92] or grief (e.g. *CEG*.2.477.2, πένθος

---

[87] Cf. *CEG* 2.520.6, 590, 543.4, 595.3, 604.
[88] Cf. e.g. Soph. *El.*1244; *O.T.* 375, 419; *Phil.*624-5 (ὧδε κἀξ Ἅιδου θανὼν /πρὸς φῶς ἀνελθεῖν); *OC.* 1549; *Aj.* 394 (σκότος, ἐμὸν φάος, /ἔρεβος ὦ φαεννότατον). Cf. also Theogn.972-3, ὃν πρῶτ' ἐπὶ γαῖα καλύψηι / εἴς τ' Ἔρεβος καταβῆι, δώματα Περσεφόνης.
[89] For the expression, cf. Isok. *Pan.* 12.183.7, ἀλλὰ τῆς τοῖς καλοῖς κἀγαθοῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς μετ' εὐσεβείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἐγγιγνομένης, περὶ ἧς ἅπας ὁ λόγος ἐστίν; Dem. *Epit.*60.23.5, ἡ πάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἄρ' ἐλευθερία ἐν ταῖς τῶνδε τῶν ἀνδρῶν ψυχαῖς διεσῴζετο.
[90] Tsagalis (2008), 63-86.
[91] E.g. *CEG* 2.486, 526.7, 576, 587.
[92] V-BC: *CEG* 104; iv-BC: *CEG* 2.543, 577, 687 (Miletos).

παισὶν ἐμοῖσι λιπών).[93] As I discuss in the next section, a focus on this grief left behind can accentuate a sense of pathos: the reader is invited to empathise with the grieving relatives.

Finally, the deceased may also leave behind a memorial, sometimes meaning the actual funerary monument,[94] sometimes in the more abstract sense of how they are remembered. The standard word for any sort of funerary or dedicatory monument is *μνῆμα*; but in the fourth century we also find *μνημεῖον*,[95] the cognate feminine noun *μνήμη*,[96] and even occasionally *μνημοσύνη*.[97] This might indicate a shift in emphasis: the dead leave behind abstract memory as well as a physical memorial.[98] This connects the funerary monument to *κλέος*:[99] it confers the praise or blame that will remain in the world of the living.

Perhaps the gravestone itself triggers *μνήμη* by recalling aspects of the deceased through sculptural detail. As we saw earlier, Chrysanthe's *σωφροσύνη* cannot be concealed by her tomb (*CEG* 2.479, *τὴν σωφ|ροσύνην / …. τὴν σὴν ὀ| κατέκρυψε τάφος*), while viewers of Pausimache's gravestone can apparently see a memorial of her *ἀρετή* and *σωφροσύνη*, which contrasts with her hidden corpse:

> *σῆς δ' ἀρετῆς μνημεῖον ὁρᾶν τόδε τοῖς παριόσιν*
>
> *σωφροσύνης τε* (*CEG* 2.518.4-5 = *GVI* 1654).[100]

The implication is that the stele somehow projects the woman's virtue: the sculpted relief that accompanies this epigram shows a well-dressed woman holding a mirror, which perhaps

---

[93] Earlier examples: *CEG* 50, 75, 83, 84, 95 (*γόον*), 113; fourth-century: *CEG* 2. 477, 485, 513, 515 (*λύπην*), 518, 529, 543.7, 585 (*λύπας*), 591.7, 593.8, 604, 689 (Rhodes: text restored), 704 (*γόον καὶ κήδεα*).
[94] Cf. *CEG* 2.474 (=*CEG* 99, but probably iv BC), 493, 495, 551, 603; *CEG* 2.627 (Euboia).
[95] There are three earlier instances, of which only one is funerary, *CEG* 92 (c.420-400 BC). Fourth-century Attic examples: *CEG* 2.492, 493, 495, 518, 548.9, 624. Non-Attic: *CEG* 2.638, 647, 674, 681, 734.
[96] There is one earlier attestation: *CEG* 97 (date uncertain, perhaps later). Fourth-century Attic examples: *CEG* 2.509, 551, 577, 591.7, 603, 611. Non-Attic examples: *CEG* 2.627, 728, 738.
[97] *CEG* 2.690, 708.
[98] Cf. *CEG* 2.492 (ii), in which the future tense is used: Καλλίμαχου| *μνημεῖον*| *ἐν ἀνθρώποι|σι τόδ' ἔσται*. Perh. cf. Soph. *El.* 983, 1126, where *μνημεῖον* indicates a jar of ashes, i.e. an object by which someone is remembered..
[99] Meyer (2005), 53-6, convincingly associates *μνήμη* with the *kleos* that Homeric/archaic epigrams seek to record: a hero's reputation exists through people hearing about him in epic or (what is the next best thing) reading his name on a gravestone.
[100] The final line is extra-metrical: it may be an afterthought.

indicates a high social status (**fig. 9**).[101] But Pausimache probably died young (the epitaph mentions both her parents as alive but not a husband, 1-3), so the *μνημεῖον* is not so much a recollection of what was but an idealised portrait of what she should have been.[102]

This theme is an extension of the records of *ἀρετή* (political or military valour) in numerous fifth-century public epitaphs. In the fourth century, *ἀρετή* includes more personal traits and even female concerns: the most common virtue in epitaphs for women is *σωφροσύνη*;[103] for men, it is *δικαιοσύνη*.[104] For Christina Breuer, this shift reflects a change in social consciousness: the individual is no longer seen as submerged in the collective ideology of the *polis*, but comes to have intrinsic value.[105] Christos Tsagalis too has talked of a 'redefining' of social virtues and 'an increasing concern for the individual as a family member'.[106] However, we already see such virtues, and indeed female concerns, played out in fifth-century Attic drama: rather than an ideological change, it is probably rather that a broader social group had access to funerary monuments, in contrast with the limited circumstances of the fifth-century public epitaphs.[107]

There is a contrast between the body, a hidden presence, and the memorial of the virtue left in the world of the living, as is illustrated by the *μέν… δέ* clause of an epitaph for a certain Diphilos:

> *σῶμα μὲν ἐνθάδ' ἔχει σόν, Δίφιλε, γαῖα θανόντο*[*ς*], |
>
> *μνῆμα δὲ σῆς ἔλιπες πᾶσι δικαιοσύνης* (*CEG* 2.549 = *IG* II^2 11200, *GVI* 1779).[108]

---

[101] Cf. Leader (1997), 693.
[102] Cf. Burton (2003), 28.
[103] For thorough discussion and typology, see esp. Tsagalis (2008), 135-160, who notes (at 135; cf. n.1 and 2) that *ἀρετή* and *σωφροσύνη* occurs 6 and 2 times in 5th-cent. inscriptions, 32 and 23 times in 4th-cent. inscriptions (not including those transmitted through literary sources). Note that *ἀρετή* is also common in 5th-cent. prose inscriptions.
[104] Cf. *CEG* 2.472, 484, 549, 554, 559, 586.3, 600. Non-Attic examples: *CEG* 2.639, 662a, 670, 683.
[105] Breuer (1995), esp. 39-62.
[106] Tsagalis (2008), 135. Cf. esp. 183-215.
[107] Cf. e.g. Rademaker (2005) on *σωφροσύνη*.
[108] Cf. e.g. *CEG* 2.551, *σῶμα σὸν ἐν κόλποις*, Καλλιστοῖ, *γαῖα καλύπτει*, / *σῆς δὲ* <*ἀ*>*ρετῆς μνήμην σοῖσι φίλοις ἔλιπες*.

The hiding of the body contrasts with the virtue and memory which cannot be erased:

[σ]ῶμα μὲν ἐν κόλποισι κατὰ χθὼν ἥδε καλ[ύπτει] |
[Τι]μοκλείας, τὴν σὴν δὲ ἀρετὴν οὐθεὶς [φθ]ίσει ἀ[ἰών]· |
[ἀθά]νατος μνήμη σωφρ[ο]σύνης ἕνε[κ]α (*CEG* 2.611 = *GVI* 1781).

In other inscriptions, it is the virtue itself that is the direct object of the verb of leaving, as if it is a thing that can be seen in place of the hidden person.[109] For example, the elderly Chairion leaves behind a 'good reputation':

ἐννέα ἐτῶν ἐβίων δεκάδας, θνείσκω δὲ γεραιός, |
σωφροσύνην δὲ ἤσκησα, ἔλιπον δὲ εὔκλειαν ἀμεμφῆ (*CEG* 2.531 (ii) = *IG* II^2 5452, *GVI* 930).[110]

A different take on the theme is to contrast the mortal body with the immortal soul continuing its journey on to Hades. A lacunose epigram from the mid-fourth century (*CEG* 2.558) apparently hints at a distinction between something 'under the earth' from the 'soul in Olympos', [... ὑπὸ] γ[ῆι κ]εῖται, ψυχὴ δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπ[ωι] (2). The well-known public epitaph for the fallen Athenians at Poteidaia (*CEG* 10, 432 BC) portrays the aether as receiving the soul while the earth receives the body, αἰθὴρ μὲμ φσυχὰς ὑπεδέχσατο, σόμ̣[ατα δὲ χθὸν] / τὸνδε, which probably forms the basis for a fourth-century epigram:

Εὐρυμάχου ψυχὴν |καὶ ὑπερφιάλος διαν|οίας
αἰθὴρ ὑγρὸς ἔχ|ει, σῶμα δὲ τύνβος |ὅδε (*CEG* 2.535 = *IG* II^2 11466, *GVI* 1755).[111]

A set of inscriptions for a Dionysios (mid-fourth century) elaborate the theme slightly differently.[112] The first epigram (inscribed on the architrave of the monument) claims Dionysios

[109] Cf. e.g. *CEG* 2.542, 662.4 (Illyria).
[110] For the expression, cf. *CEG* 2.522, 531, 574, 604, 642 (Thessaly); cf. also 548.6, 708 (Kos).
[111] Cf. Mikalson (1983), 75.
[112] For further discussion, see Tsagalis (2008), 121-130.

is one of the *agathoi* (1-3)[113] who receive unending praise (presumably in *epitaphioi logoi*).[114] Dionysios proceeds to the chambers of Persephone, but his reputation remains in this world:

> ὀθεὶς μόχθος ἔπαινον ἐπ' ἀνδράσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν |
>
> ζητεῖν, ηὕρηται δὲ ἄφθονος εὐλογία· |
>
> ἧς σὺ τυχὼν ἔθανες, Διονύσιε, καὶ τὸν ἀνάνκης |
>
> κοινὸν Φερσεφόνης πᾶσιν ἔχεις θάλαμον. (*CEG* 2.593 (i) = *IG* II^2 11169, *GVI* 1889).

However, the epigram inscribed on the base of the same monument[115] distinguishes between the buried corpse and the soul, both of which are separate from what is left behind for the relatives:

> σῶμα μὲν ἐνθάδε σόν, Διονύσιε, γαῖα καλύπτει, |
>
> ψυχὴν δε ἀθάνατον κοινὸς ἔχει ταμίας·|
>
> σοῖς δὲ φίλοις καὶ μητρὶ κασιγνήταις τε λέλοιπας|
>
> πένθος ἀείμνηστον σῆς φιλίας φθίμενος. |
>
> δισσαὶ δ' αὖ πατρίδες σ' ἣ μὲν φύσει, ἣ δὲ νόμοισιν|
>
> ἔστερξαν πολλῆς εἵνεκα σωφροσύνης (*CEG* 2.593 (iii)).

The μέν...δέ clause contrasts the hidden body with the immortal soul. The κοινὸς… ταμίας seemingly recalls the κοινὸς… θάλαμος of the first epigram, which suggests that it is the soul which has gone to Perephone's chamber, leaving the body behind. However, a different immortal thing, grief, has been left behind for the grieving relatives: πένθος ἀείμνηστον (4) contrasts with Dionysios's perishing (φθίμενος, 4). This is then a very sophisticated development of the basic notion, which incorporates a more elaborate concept of the afterlife than is customary in classical inscriptions.

---

[113] Cf. Tsagalis (2008), 122, 163.
[114] *Eulogia* and *epainos* was an important element of the *epitaphioi logoi*: cf. Tsagalis (2008), esp. 160-170. Perh. cf. *CEG* 2.489 (discussed above).
[115] A third inscription is now lost.

In an epitaph for Demetrios, the soul is even depicted as abandoning the body as it goes off to Erebos,[116] while Demetrios's *σωφροσύνη* 'flourishes agelessly': a second epitaph on this tomb refers to the *ἄφθονον εὐλογίας πηγή* which Demetrios leaves behind (*CEG* 2.548 (iii), 1). A sense of pathos is achieved by depicting the burier, Eryxis, as the one who 'hides' the soul-less body in the tomb,[117] which identifies this man closely with the physical remains: both are abandoned by the soul:

> *ψυχὴ μὲν προλιποῦσα τὸ σόν*, [*Δημήτριε, σῶμα*] |
>
> *οἴχεται εἰς Ἔρεβος, σωφροσύν*[*η δὲ ?καλὴ*] |
>
> *θάλλει ἀγήρατος· τύμβωι δέ σε* [*κρύψε θανόντα*] |
>
> *Ἔρξις, ἴσον στέρξας οἷσι τέκ*[*νοισ(ιν)* [….]. (*CEG* 2.548 (ii) = *IG* II^2 11103, *GVI* 1963).

Such epigrams probably reflect certain popular beliefs about the afterlife or late-classical philosophical discourse on the soul: there may be traces of Orphism,[118] while the use of the phrase *αἰθὴρ ὑγρός* on the Eurymachos stele suggests Empedocles' *ὑγρὸς ἀήρ*.[119] However, it is probably preferable to see them in terms of rhetoric: such themes may add a consolatory tone, or at other times reinforce pathos, but above all they lend sophisticated, poetic register to the report of death. This stylisation particularly characterises the voice of fourth-century epitaphs. I now turn to discuss other examples of stylisation, especially ways of manufacturing pathos.

3.4 Mannered pathos and literary affectations

Emotion derives largely from the context of death, which lends the significance to artistic motifs such as the famous 'gaze' or *dexiosis*; the soft naturalism of fourth-century sculpture can readily

---

[116] Cf. also *CEG* 2.545.1-2, *ὀστέα μὲν καὶ σάρκας εἴχει χθὼν παῖδα τὸν ἡδύν*, / *ψυχὴ δὲ εὐσεβέων οἴχεται εἰς θάλαμον*.
[117] Cf. Hansen (1989) *ad loc.* for a plausible reading of the relationship between Erxis and Demetrios; cf. Tsagalis (2008), 146-7.
[118] So Tsagalis (2008), 128-130.
[119] Cf. also Plat. *Phdr.*69e-70a; perh. Ar.*Pax.*827-841.

suggest tenderness for the deceased or grieving relatives. The majority of inscriptions (of any period) do not express pathos in a literary-conscious way: their role is to provide essential information about the deceased and relatives, and occasionally the circumstances of death. Poignancy is usually something we read into these inscriptions.

However, fourth-century inscriptions sometimes include elements that seem designed to elicit an emotional response. The most obvious method is the use of adjectives that direct the reader towards pity: I have mentioned *ποθεινός* already, and we may add others, such as *δύσμορος*[120] or *οἰκτρός*.[121] In this way the text highlights the death as a sad event, and the reader is invited to identify with the grief of mourners; an emphasis on what the deceased has left behind encourages the reader to see the death as a loss, and so cause him or her to share in the *πόθος* for the deceased.

The references to grief have a performative aspect,[122] in that they instantiate *μνήμη* and *πόθος* when they are read out, much as the speaker of a Simonidean elegy is caused to lament by viewing a monument:

> *σῆμα καταφθιμένοιο* Μ*εγακλέος εὖτ' ἂν ἴδωμαι,*
>
> *οἰκτίρω σε τάλαν* Κ*αλλία, οἷ' ἔπαθες* (Simonides fr. 16 W^2).

There is nothing to suggest that this Simonidean poem was ever an inscribed epigram.[123] But some fourth-century inscriptions do incorporate similar emotional responses to death: the speaker addresses the deceased as a mourner, or empathises with mourning relatives; at other times, the speaker is the deceased himself or herself, and invites pity from the reader. Sometimes this is done by incorporating ejaculations of grief, just as a tragic heroine is wont to call out *οἴμοι*.[124] The reader re-utters these expressions, and so repeats the original mourning.

---

[120] Perh. *CEG* 148 (early v BC: on the reading see Hansen (1989) *ad loc.*); *CEG* 2.492, 591.6, 599.
[121] Cf. *CEG* 2.495, 518, 526.4, 655, 727 (none before iv BC, though cf. *οἰκτείρειν*, *CEG* 27-8, 51, 68, 148; 2.471, 645).
[122] On performative utterances in epigram, cf. Day (2000, 2007) on the *χαῖρε* motif.
[123] For inscriptions, perh. cf. *CEG* 2.470 (c.550-540 BC), *ἀν|ιῶμαι*.
[124] Cf. perh. *CEG* 2.718 (Egypt, 1st half of 4th cent.), *ὤιμοι*, *σὴ(γ) γεφαλ|ήν*.

For example, in *CEG* 2.556, the deceased is represented as crying out in anguish, in a way reminiscent of tragic outbursts;[125] the stone is lacunose, but evidently the speaker is bemoaning his loss of youth. [126] The effect is to generate pity in the reader that he died young:

αἰαῖ, ἐγὼν ἥβης κα[...]

κεῖμαι ἐπ' ἀλλοτρ[ι ...] (*CEG* 2.556 = *IG* II^2 13100/01, *GVI* 332).

A beautiful epigram from Miletos displays an emotional outburst in a highly refined manner.[127] The speaker addresses the deceased, but directs his pity towards the relatives, which emphasises the sense of loss:

αἰαῖ, σεῖο, Κ̣ομαλλίς, ἀποφθιμένης ἀκάχηνται |

μάτηρ θ' ἁ μελέα κουρίδιός τε πόσις, |

πᾶσά τε συγγενέων πληθύς σ' ἀδινὸν στεναχίζει |

δρυπτόμενοι χαίτας τοῦδε πάροιθε τάφου· |

ἦ γὰρ δαίδαλά τε ἔργα χεροῖν καὶ σώφρονα κόσμον |

ἤσκησας, μῶμος δ' οὔτις ἐπῆν ἐπὶ σοί (*CEG* 2.686).

The adjective μελέα lends a distinctly tragic tone, [128] as does the evocation of acts of mourning in the second couplet ('moaning' and 'tearing hair'). The image of the crowd of mourning relatives at the tomb is unusual,[129] and inevitably invites the reader, who is also πάροιθε τάφου, to identify himself with those mourners. The present tenses suggest that this mourning is an ongoing activity, of which the reader is a part.[130]

However, probably the best examples are the set of three epigrams for Kleoptoleme inscribed *en bloc* from the middle of the fourth century (*CEG* 2.591, discussed above).[131] The first

---

[125] I count 155 occurrences in the extant works of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides alone. Perh. cf. Erinna, *Distaff*, αἰαῖ Βαῦκι τάλαιν[…] (col. iii, 48-54).
[126] Cf. Theogn. 526-7, ὦ μοι ἐγὼν ἥβης.
[127] Date uncertain, perh. early iii BC; for a 4th-cent. date, cf. Herrmann (1958), 117.
[128] Cf. e.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 779; Soph. *Trach.*972, *Ant.* 977; Eur. *IT* 868.
[129] Cf. mourners in vase paintings: see e.g. Ahlberg (1971); Vermeule (1979), 12; Havelock (1981).
[130] On this epigram and *CEG* 2.556, perh. cf. 'Sim.' *AP* 7.516 (undatable), which begins αἰαῖ, but addresses the very illness that had deprived the deceased of his youth. The unusually bitter tone may suggest a late composition.
[131] For further discussion, cf. Fantuzzi (2010a); Tsagalis (2008), 240-1.

part of the inscription (1-4) is badly damaged, but there seems to be some sort of emotional outburst which mentions the girl's age (cf. Peek's plausible supplement, *ἡλικίαν δάκ*[*ρυσον*], 1). The sense becomes clearer in the second epigram, in which the speaker addresses Hades as one who has snatched the girl away in her youth:

ὦ πολύκλαυθ' Ἄιδη, τ[*ί* Κλεοπτολ]*έμη*[*ν ……..*]

ἥρπασας ἡλικίας δύσ[*μορον; οὐ*] *σέ*[*βεαι*]*;*

μητρὶ δὲ τεῖ μελέαι πένθ[*ο*]*ς* Μνη[*σοῖ προλέλοι*]*πας*

ἀθάνατον θνητῆς εἵνεκα συν[*τυχία*]*ς* (*CEG* 2.591.5-8)

The juxtaposition, *ἀθάνατον θνητῆς*, is specially striking,[132] all the more so since this immortal grief is connected to an abduction carried out by the immortal Hades: the girl is assimilated to Persephone, the grieving mother takes on the role of Demeter. The third epigram addresses the grieving relatives,[133] and concludes with the *topos* of 'a tomb in place of marriage':

ὦ μελέα μῆτερ καὶ ὁμαίμονες ὅς τέ σ' ἔφυσεν

Μειδοτέλης *αὐτῶι πῆμα*, Κλεοπτολέμη·

οἳ γόον, οὐ θάλαμον τὸν σὸν προσορῶσι θανούσης,

θρῆνόν τε ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς καὶ τάφον ἀντὶ γάμου (*CEG* 2.591.9-12).

The diction points us towards pathos: perhaps in the first inscription, the passer-by is told to weep, *δάκ*[*ρυσον*]; the deceased is 'wretched', *δύσ*[*μορον*]; the immortality of the grief left to the relatives ,*πένθ*[*ο*]*ς…ἀθάνατον*, contrasts sharply with the mortality of the young girl. Hades is addressed as *πολύκλαυτος*, which here has the less common sense of 'causing much grief[134] and which is instantiated in the grieving relatives: twice, the girl's mother is called *μελέα*; the girl is a source of *πῆμα*. The final couplet stresses the mourning for the girl, the *γόος* and *θρῆνος*,

---

132 Perh. cf. Lucr. *DRN* 3.869, *mors… immortalis.*

133 Cf. e.g. *CEG* 2.515, *ὦ μεγάλην λυπήν*.

134 S.v. *LSJ* II. Cf. e.g. *AP* 7.712 (= Erinna 2 G-P, late iv/early iii BC?), *πολυκλαύταν δὲ παρέρπων / στάλαν τῷ κατὰ γᾶς τοῦτο λέγοις Ἀίδᾳ*. There is a sense of bitterness towards Hades in *IG* II/III² 13096, an epigram expressly for a girl who died unwed: [*βάσκα*]*νος ἀνὴ* [*ρώποις Ἀίδ*]*ης*; cf. Leonidas on Erinna, "Βάσκανός *ἐσσ*', Ἄίδα," (*AP* 7.13), perhaps sharing a mutual source with Erinna 2 G-P.

which is said to take the place of her anticipated bridal chamber.[135] As I have already argued, this reference to the *θάλαμος* is likely to be a bitter allusion to the 'chamber of Persephone', a connection that is suggested by the invocation of Hades in the previous epigram on the stone.

The whole inscription is reminiscent of tragic laments, such as the chorus's outburst in Aeschylus' *Persians*:

> *αἰαῖ αἰαῖ·*
>
> *ὦ πολύκλαυτε φίλοισι θανών,*
>
> *τί τάδε, <τί τάδε,> δυνάτα, δυνάτα,*
>
> *†περὶ τᾶι σᾶι δίδυμα διὰ† γοέδν' ἁμάρτια*
>
> *πᾶσαι <γᾶρ> γᾶι τᾶιδ' ἐξέφθινται τρίσκαλμοι*
>
> *νᾶες ἄναες ἄναες*; (Aesch. *Pers.* 673-680 West).

A notable device in both this passage and the second epigram of the inscription is the use of rhetorical questions as an articulation of the grief: these increase the emotional level, and suggest a grief-stricken speaker. The apparent impropriety of accusing a god of a lack of *σέβας* reinforces this sense. A pair of epigrams for Xenokleia (first half of the fourth century) makes similar use of the rhetorical question:[136]

> *ἠϊθέους προλιποῦσα κόρας δισσὰς* **Ξενόκλεια** |
>
> **Νικάρχου** *θυγάτηρ κεῖται ἀποφθιμένη*, |
>
> *οἰκτρὰν* **Φοίνικος** *παιδὸς πενθῶσα τελευτήν*, |
>
> *ὃς θάνεν ὀκταέτης ποντίωι ἐν πελάγει* (*CEG* 2.526.1-4 = *IG* II^2 12335).
>
> *τίς θρήνων ἀδαής, ὃς σὴν μοῖραν,* **Ξενόκλεια**, |
>
> *οὐκ ἐλεεῖ, δισσὰς ἣ προλιποῦσα κόρας*|
>
> *ἠϊθέους παιδὸς θνείσκεις πόθωι, ὃς τὸν ἄνοικτον*|

[135] Cf. *CEG* 2.584; Erinna, *Distaff* (discussed below) and 2 G-P: *καὶ σὺ μέν, ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμων μολπαῖον ἀοιδὰν /ἐς θρήνων γοερὸν φθέγμα μεθαρμόσαο* (=*AP* 7.712).
[136] Cf. Tsagalis (2008), 228-230; Fantuzzi (2010a).

τύμβον ἔχει δνοφέρωι κείμενος ἐμ πελάγει (*CEG* 2.526.5-6).

The epigram lays out the inherently tragic situation: Xenokleia lost her own child during her life before dying herself, leaving behind a husband and two unmarried daughters. The second epigram repeats the information of the first epigram with close verbal echoes ('an exercise in *variatio*'),[137] but ratchets up the pathos by opening with a rhetorical question. This directs an emotional response to the bare facts as already presented; the reader is invited to be one of the supposed many who know about the *threnoi* and feel compassion for Xenokleia's *μοῖρα*. Pathos is also intensified by the emphasis on her son's empty grave in the final line: there is an echo of line 4, but the inclusion of *τὸν ἄνοικτον* / *τύμβον* and *δνοφερός* (which powerfully suggests the darkness of the grave)[138] adds to the emotion. Xenokleia experiences the same loss of her son as mourners feel for her at her tomb (*παιδὸς … πόθωι*, 7), which is exacerbated by the non-presence of her son's body. On the stele, Xenokleia is depicted alone, somewhat unusually in this period, further emphasising her son's absence. The reader too is encouraged to feel this *πόθος*, and so to partake in a double lamentation for both the deceased.

The use of literary devices such as the rhetorical question or ejaculatory apostrophe shifts the voice of the inscriptions more towards that of an expression of mourning in its own right, rather than simply a means of conveying essential information. In the same way, we start finding other poetic devices that suggests a more self-conscious and literary affectation. For example, in the Kleoptoleme inscription discussed earlier (*CEG* 2.591), there is much use of alliteration and assonance:[139]

ἥρπασας ἡλικίας… (6)

μητρὶ δὲ τεῖ μελέαι πένθ[*ο*]*ς* M*νη*[…] (7)

---

[137] Tsagalis (2008), 229.

[138] Cf. e.g. Theogn. 243, *ὅταν δνοφερῆς ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης*; Eur. *IT* 1266; *SGO* 09/14/01.

[139] It might be argued that these are simply common elements of creative expression: see esp. Fehling (1969), who illustrates the great antiquity of such figures. However, it remains a fact that we do not find these with any great frequency in epigrams specifically before the fourth century, so we can confidently claim this to be a late-classical stylistic device.

ἀθάνατον θνητῆς (8)

ὦ μελέα μῆτερ… (9)

οὐ θάλαμον τὸν σὸν προσορῶσι θανούσης

θρῆνόν… (11)

ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς καὶ τάφον ἀντὶ γάμου (11).

As I have suggested, the juxtaposition of *ἀθάνατον θνητῆς* (8) highlights the painful distinction between the immortal grief and the girl's mortality.[140] We find a similar device in a late fifth-century inscription for Ampharete. On the stele, the deceased woman holds her grandchild who has died at the same time;[141] the inscription captures the pathos of this double death through polyptoton:

ἔχον ἐμοῖς γόνασιν καὶ νῦν φθίμενον φθιμένη 'χω.

Such linguistic affectations are also more reminiscent of ritual laments. For example, in the Aeschylus passage I quoted earlier, there is heavy use of â- and âι- assonance that reflects the opening cry, *αἰαῖ αἰαῖ* (*Pers.* 673; cf. 675, *περὶ τâι σâι*; 679, *πâσαι γâι τâιδ'*), while the chorus conclude this epode with repetition, *νâες ἄναες ἄναες* (680). In enunciating the words on the stone, the reader is drawn into a performance of lament.

3.5 Reader-epigram interactions

In this final section, I consider the way in which anticipated readers are included within the language of epitaphs, and how this in turn colours the poetic voice.

Verbally-marked interactions between the epigram and implied reader are not uncommon in archaic epitaphs onwards: it is a standard formula for the first-person speaker of the inscription to address the reader as a passer-by.[142] In its most basic form, the passers-by are

---

[140] Cf. *CEG* 2.780 = *IG* II² 3838, *μνημοσύνην θνητοῦ σώματος ἀθάνατον* (an honorific portrait).
[141] Athens Kerameikos P695, c.430-400.
[142] Cf. e.g. *CEG* 13, 80, 108, 117, 174. On epigram and reader in general, see esp. Svenbro (1988), esp. 24-43 (cf. 44-63); Meyer (2005), *passim*.

addressed simply with *χαῖρε/χαίρετε*,[143] but others invite the reader into more developed interaction with the monument.[144] The voice of the epigram competes for the readership of passers-by,[145] which may be a reflection of the need of graves in large-scale burial plots such as the Kerameikos to demand the attention of visitors.[146]

These inscriptions aim at eliciting complicity with the narratee. The information provided on the stone is seen as being an answer to the reader's investigation, so that the reader is drawn into a sort-of interaction with the stone:[147] the dialogic motif of (mostly) Hellenistic epigrams is a self-conscious representation of this.[148] Peter Bing's seminal study of epigrammatic *Ergänzungsspiel* in Callimachus illustrated that the reader is involved in reconstructing the original context of the inscription:[149] by actually representing a dialogue between stone and reader, the epigram plays on this sort of interaction.

Few inscribed epigrams in the fourth century are as explicitly self-conscious as the Hellenistic dialogue-epigrams. However, one possible hint of that device is *CEG* 2.545:

ὀστέα μὲν καὶ σάρκας εἴχει χθὼν παῖδα τὸν ἡδύν,
ψυχὴ δὲ εὐσεβέων οἴχεται εἰς θάλαμον.
εἰ δὲ ὄνομα ζητεῖς, Θεογείτων Θυμόχου παῖς.
Θηβαῖος γενεάν, κε<ι>μα κλεινα<ι>ς ἐν Ἀθήναις.

We do not get the name of the deceased in the opening couplet, as we might expect: the expression *ὀστέα … καὶ σάρκας* is an unusually vivid extension of the motif of the earth covering the body,[150] but we are not told whose body; the phrase *παῖδα τὸν ἡδύν* implies some familiarity with the subject (note the definite article), but this is belied by the absence of the name. The

---

[143] This is found in six inscriptions pre-iv BC.; for iv BC, cf. *CEG* 2.487, 492, 520.5, 522, 530.1, 4, 655, 677, 719 (cf. e.g. Day (2000, 2007) on this motif). A *ξένος* is addressed directly in *CEG* 120, 131 (cf. also 13, 112 208, 453, 462). It is less common in the 4th cent.: cf. *CEG* 2.597, 648, 713.
[144] Cf. e.g. Simonides 22b *FGE*, in which the dead Spartans ask the stranger (reader) to report their death in Sparta.
[145] Cf. e.g. *CEG* 28 (mid vi-BC), where it is assumed the reader has other things on his mind (*φρασὶν ἄλα μενοινῶν*).
[146] Cf. Bing (2002).
[147] See esp. Bruss (2005), 38-57; Meyer (2005), 83-100; Tueller (2008), esp. 42-4.
[148] See e.g. Meyer (2005), 206-217, 229-235; Tueller (2008), 65-94, and *id.* (2010).
[149] Bing (1995).
[150] Note again the opposition of body and soul; *εἴχει/ οἴχεται*.

speaker belatedly acknowledges in the third line that it is the name that the reader was probably first seeking (*εἰ δὲ ὄνομα ζητεῖς*), and reveals himself as the deceased.

A quite remarkable inscription that was found in the Dipylon cemetery in Athens elicits complicity on a different level (*CEG* 2.596). The monument contains epigrams in both Greek and Phoinikian, no doubt an indication of the cultural exchange happening at Athens in this period.[151] The Greek inscription, which comes first (perhaps because Greeks were the primary audience) commemorates a certain Antipatros, while the Phoinikian text commemorates 'Shem'. The inscriptions accompany a strange relief (Athens NM 1488) that shows the deceased male lying nude on a *klinē* (the *prothesis*); on the left there is a lion, with its feat raised up on the *klinē* and jaws over the dead man; on the other side there is what appears to be another nude male leaning across as if to fight off the lion; the stone is damaged, but there seems to be a prow of a ship in the background (**fig. 10**).[152]

This is a most unusual stele: it follows the Phoinikian custom of depicting the subject as already dead, which had long fallen out of vogue in Greece.[153] The image is without precedent in Attic funerary *stelai*, although it perhaps corresponds loosely to some documentary reliefs of the late classical period. From the Greek inscriptions, we learn that the rest of the image signifies how Antipatros died (killed by a lion; the other man represents a friend coming to the deceased's assistance; the ship's prow could be symbolic).[154] The date of the monument has not been settled, but some point around the end of the fourth century or early-third century seems probable.[155]

---

[151] Stager (2005), 432: 'The epitaph identifies the deceased in perpetuity as a Phoinikian speaker, and more specifically as an Ashkelonite, while emphasizing the degree to which he moved in the Greek-speaking world, adopting a Greek name and, in death, a permanent home in Athens.' Cf. also the Xanthos inscriptions (ch. 4.5 below), in both Lykian and Greek.

[152] See Clairmont (1970), 115, no. 38 (pl. 19); (1993-5), 3.314-5; *CAT* 3.410. Cf. Kurtz and Boardman (1971), 264, (no. 57); Woysch-Méautis (1982), no. 359 (pl. 60); Daux (1972), 544-5; Stager (2005). Some interpret the prow as coming out of the man's body, but cf. esp. Stager (2005), 434, for a rejection of this theory.

[153] Cf. Boardman (1955). On Phoinikian grave *stelai*, see esp. Tore (1995); cf. Baughan (2004); Stager (2005).

[154] So Stager (2005),

[155] Cf. Hansen (1989), *ad loc;* Stager (2005), with further bibliography.

The longer of the two Greek epigrams is the most intriguing. The speaker anticipates that the viewer will be nonplussed by the image:

> *μηθεὶς ἀνθρώπων θαυμαζέτω εἰκόνα τήνδε,*
> *ὡς περὶ μέν με λεών, περὶ δὲγ πρῶιρ' ἰγχτετάνυσται·*
> *ἦλθε γὰρ εἰχθρολέων τἀμὰ θέλων σποράσαι·*
> *ἀλλὰ φίλοι τ' ἤμυναν καί μοι κτέρισαν τάφον οὔτηι,*
> *οὓς ἔθελον φιλέων, ἱερᾶς ἀπὸ νῆος ἰόντες·*
> **Φ***οινίκην* δ' *ἔλιπον, τεῖδε χθονὶ σῶμα κέκρυνμαι* (*CEG* 2.596 = *IG* II^2 8388, *GVI* 1601, *SEG* 33.217).

The opening phrase, 'let no one be amazed at this image', is the only explicit reference to the accompanying relief in surviving classical epigrams.[156] Conventional Attic formulae are eschewed (until the final line) in favour of engaging directly with the reader and thematizing his response to the relief. By acknowledging that the stele will seem out of place in comparison with others that are no doubt near it, the epigrammatist develops the competitive voice of conventional epitaphs. The 'amazement' may of course be rhetorical: the epigrammatist hopes to draw attention to the amazing picture, so that puzzlement yields to admiration. The inscription thus reflects the effort of the monument to 'stand out', and in this way encourages the reader to suppose there is something unique about the individual commemorated.

The following lines then narrate the circumstances of the man's death, and so interpret the image on the relief for the viewer. The opening of line 3, *ἦλθε γάρ*, suggests a narrative structure: it introduces the account of a failed rescue attempt (the second half of line 4, recounting his burial, comes as an abrupt surprise after the arrival of friends, *ἀλλὰ φίλοι τ' ἤμυναν*). The monument emerges as a tribute to those who made the rescue attempt and set up the stele, which provides a neat explanation for the Phoinikian buried in foreign soil.

---

[156] Cf. Simias, *Wings* 1-2, *μηδὲ τρέσῃς* (the speaker is a statue of Eros, who expects a negative reaction to his bearded appearance). On 'ekphrastic' elements in inscribed epigram in general, cf. Bruss (2010a).

However, this kind of overt interaction between monument and reader is unusual. A far more common means of establishing complicity is to use *gnomai* that stress the inevitability of death. *Gnomai* allow the epigram to generalise from the specific situation of this death: the reader is thus invited through the inscription to reflect on his own mortality. The use of such *gnomai*, as Christos Tsagalis has recently illustrated, is an important literarizing device:[157] Tsagalis counts sixteen inscriptions with *gnomai* in *CEG* 2,[158] but a far larger number make passing references to the commonality of death, which has much the same effect.

This is typically signalled through use of a word such as *κοινός* (death as a 'common fate') and/or a form of *πᾶν* ('death comes to everyone').[159] Persephone's chamber is 'common to all' (e.g. *CEG* 2.593, *κοινὸν Φερσεφόνης πᾶσιν ἔχεις θάλαμον*), the underworld has a *κοινὸς …ταμίας* (*CEG* 2.593), or death is a 'common boundary' (e.g.*CEG* 2.586, *Δαιοκράτης κοινὸν τέρμα ἐπέρησε β*[*ίου*]). Other inscriptions refer to the death as a 'common law' (e.g. *CEG* 2.487.1, *πάντων ἀνθρώπων νόμος ἐστὶ κοινὸς τὸ ἀποθανεῖν*).

A splendid instance of this sort of expression is *CEG* 2.518, an epigram and image I discussed earlier in this chapter:

> *πᾶσι θανεῖν <ε>ἵμαρται ὅσοι ζῶσιν, σὺ δὲ πένθος*
> *οἰκτρὸν ἔχειν ἔλιπες Παυσιμάχη προγόνοις*
> *μητρ<ί> τε Φαινίππῃ καὶ πατρὶ Παυσανίᾳ·*
> *σῆς δ' ἀρετῆς μνημεῖον ὁρᾶν τόδε τοῖς παριόσιν*
> *σωφροσύνης τε.*

The move from the generalisation in the first clause ('all must die') to the specificity of the second clause ('you left bitter grief') allows this death to stand out as something more painful than the common fate. The sense is rather more optimistic in *CEG* 2.577:

> [*π*]*άντων ὧν θέμις ἐστὶ τυχεῖν εὐδαίμοσι θνητοῖς* |

---

[157] Tsagalis (2008), 10-62.
[158] Tsagalis (2008), 17-19.
[159] For Kassel (1958), 50-98, that death is common to all is one of the stock expressions of consolation.

ζῶσά τε ἐκοινώνουν καὶ φθιμένη μετέχω (= *IG* II^2 11974)

The phrase [π]άντων …θέμις again directs us to the notion of a common law, but the euphemism, τυχεῖν εὐδαίμοσι θνητοῖς, portrays death as something positive: dying is seen to be an act of sharing in this common fate, suggested by the verbs ἐκοινώνουν and μετέχω in the next line.[160] In this way the experience of all the living is related to death: this is neatly expressed by the balanced pentameter line (ζῶσά… φθιμένη). This encourages the reader to see that he too will share in this necessary end.

A distinctive feature of fourth-century inscriptions is the use of an εἰ-clause (the 'philosophizing conditional'). The force of the εἰ ('suppose that…') is to elicit complicity with the reader by addressing him directly: he is effectively asked to assent to a generalising *gnomē*, and then connect it with the particular circumstances. For example, in *CEG* 2.595 (ii), as we have seen, the epigrammatist adapts a gnomic proposition from a Simonidean epigram, namely that a noble death was the greatest part of virtue, εἰ τὸ καλῶς θνήισκειν ἀρετῆς μέρος ἐστὶ μέγιστον (*AP* 7.253.1):

εἰ τὸ καλῶς ἔστι θανεῖν, κἀμοὶ τοῦτ' ἀπένειμε Τύχη (*CEG* 2.595 (ii), 1).

The implication of the Simonidean epigram is that the speakers had died a noble death: the reader concludes that they are specially virtuous.[161] The Kerameikos epigrammatist adapts this by omitting the element of virtue: the reader assents to the weaker proposition that a καλὸς θάνατος is possible; he cannot draw a further conclusion about the virtue of the deceased, but is apt perhaps to reflect on the hope for a noble death.

In *CEG* 2.571, the speaker praises a deceased nurse: the gnomic proposition here is that worthiness brings with it a reward, which the nurse is deemed to be receiving now in the underworld:

ἐνθάδε τὴν χρηστὴν τ̣ί̣[τθ]ην κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτ|ει

[160] Also common is the motif of 'sharing in virtue': cf. Tsagalis (2008), 137-142.
[161] Cf. *CEG* 2.559: εἴ τι δικαιοσύ[ν]ης ἆθλον τίθεται κατὰ γαίας / Εὔφανες, οὐ χαλεπὸν τοῦδέ σε πρῶτα λαβεῖν.

Ἵππoστράτης, καὶ νῦν π[o]θεῖ σε.
καὶ ζῶσάν σ' ἐφίλ|ουν, τίτθη, καὶ νῦν σ' ἔτι τιμῶ
οὖσαν καὶ κατὰ γῆς, | καὶ τιμήσω σε ἄχρι ἂν ζῶ.
οἶδα δὲ σοὶ ὅτι καὶ κατὰ [γ]|ῆς, εἴπερ χρηστοῖς γέρας ἐστίν,
πρώτει σοι τι[μα]|ί, τίτθη, παρὰ Φερσεφόνει Πλούτωνί τε κεῖνται (*CEG* 2.571 = *IG* II^2 7873).

By delaying the εἰ-clause until the end, the epigrammatist strengthens the association between its proposition and the particular: we have already learnt that the nurse is χρηστή, so that χρηστοῖς in line 5 readily applies to her.[162] The anticipated reward is honour (τι[μα]|ί, 6), which recalls the speaker's own eulogy (lines 3-4, νῦν σ' ἔτι τιμῶ.. τιμήσω σε ἄχρι ἂν ζῶ). The repetition of κατὰ γῆς (4, 5) seems to imply that that the honour given at the gravesite (cf. ἐνθάδε, νῦν) applies even under the earth. The words are performative: as the reader reads them out from the stone, he activates the praise. In this way, he confirms the proposition, εἴπερ χρηστοῖς γέρας ἐστίν (5).

Conclusion

We have seen that the funerary monuments of the fourth century are artistically distinctive; this is matched by the style of the verse epigrams. The epigrammatic voice is coloured by the popularity of a set of motifs, which though clearly related to earlier inscriptional formulae, are especially characteristic of the fourth century. The ones I have focused on in this chapter are linked by a consideration of the relationship between the worlds of the living and the dead, and by what might be called a 'poeticizing', that is, more elaborate ways of communicating the basic information. Another poeticizing feature is the more overt interaction between stone and reader,

[162] Cf. *CEG* 2.600, εἰ τὰ θεὼν τιμ[ὰν χρ]ηστῶν τ' ἔργων ἐπιθυμεῖν… πάντα σὺ ταῦτ' ἔσχες.

in particular through the gnomic motifs that draw the reader into relating the particular death before him with the wider context of the human condition.

The style of funerary epigrams is, perhaps rather surprisingly, somewhat different from that of dedicatory epigrams in the same period. It is to these that I now turn.

Chapter 4
Inscriptions for votive and honorific monuments

4.1 Fourth-century votive monuments and epigrams: continuity

Unlike funerary sculpture, the production of votive artefacts shows no break from the archaic period into the classical period,[1] with the consequence that the style of the fourth century has a much greater sense of continuity with that of earlier periods and areas of Greece. This is reflected by a greater evenness in the number of surviving artefacts and inscriptions from Attica and elsewhere, while there is not the same set of distinctive motifs that characterise funerary epigrams from fourth-century Athens.[2]

Most surviving votive monuments are marble reliefs, which show little variation in form and iconography from the early-fifth century through to the third century; some more elaborate works from the late-fourth century perhaps reveal an influence from Attic funerary steles.[3] Typically they are rectangular in shape, more wide than high, and depict the recipient deity and some worshippers. The god may be set in a *naiskos* shrine or depicted on a *klinē*, receiving worshippers (cf. **fig. 11**);[4] occasionally there are worshippers shown on a separate panel attached to the *naiskos*.[5] Fourth-century reliefs are sometimes set in an architectural frame, as with funerary reliefs:[6] the use of a cave-like structure is apparently an innovation of this period.[7] As with grave monuments, later classical votive reliefs often feature figures carved almost in the round, while free-standing statues were also possible: on the Acropolis in particular a great many

[1] So e.g. Keesling (2003), 41-2.
[2] For a recent discussion of archaic and classical dedicatory epigrams, see Furley (2010).
[3] See Ridgway (1997), 194-204; Boardman (1995), 131-132; Smith (1991), 186-7. Van Straten (1995), 58-63. On late fifth-century Athenian votives, cf. Lawton (2009).
[4] Cf. also the Totenmahl reliefs (e.g. Ridgway (1997), 200-204.
[5] Cf. Athens NM 1377 (c. 350 BC): Boardman (1995), pl. 147.
[6] See e.g. van Straten (1992), 265–266.
[7] Cf. Athens Agora 1.7154. Cf. e.g. Ridgway (1997), 197-8.

votive statues were dedicated throughout the fifth century, a trend that continues into the fourth century.[8]

However, the number of purely votive statues decreases sharply in the fourth century:[9] in their place, especially at Athens, comes the honorific portrait statue,[10] which although nominally votive really serves to commemorate the subject.[11] The erection of a portrait of Konon and Euagoras in 393 BC marks the revival of public honorific monuments, which had been absent since the monument to the tyrannicides.[12] In the first half of the century, such monuments are mainly for military or political figures, but gradually the Athenian Acropolis in becomes dominated by statues commemorating other public figures, such as priestesses.[13] In the second half of the century there also portrait statues of poets, philosophers or orators:[14] Lykourgos apparently encouraged posthumous portraits of the 'golden age' playwrights.[15] There is a similar – if less marked – picture beyond Athens.[16]

Fourth-century sculpture remains largely typological, but it is possible to detect a greater interest in physiognomic realism in contrast with the *kouroi* and *kourai* of earlier periods. Portraits have more emphasis on facial features[17] and a more extravagant *contrapposto* (ie. with one part of the body twisted in the opposite direction from another part); late fourth-century portraits are often described as 'naturalistic' and expressive.[18]

---

[8] Cf. *CEG* 179-298. See esp. Raubitschek (1949); Keesling (2003); Hurwit (1999); Wagner (1997).
[9] See Keesling (2007), 141-2.
[10] Cf. Ridgway (1997), 345-6.
[11] Cf. Keesling (2007), 142: 'occasions that had previously warranted votive dedications of various types had become occasions for setting up portrait statues inscribed with honorific formulas.' On honorific statues in general, see esp. Ma (2007); Petrovic (2010).
[12] See Krumeich (1997), 207-11; Stewart (1979), 122-6. Krumeich (1997) has argued against the received opinion that all honorific statues in the fifth century are posthumous commemorations (as e.g. Boardman (1965), 239).
[13] On the portraits of women in the fourth century, see now Dillon (2010), esp. 9-14 *et passim*; cf. Connolly (2007).
[14] See esp. Zanker (1995).
[15] See e.g. Zanker (1995), 43-89; Schmidt (2007); Stewart (2007). On the Lykourgan reforms, see Parker (1996), 242-253; Faraguna (1992).
[16] So Ridgway (1997), 345-6.
[17] See esp. Dillon (2006), 5-6; on this trend anticipated in funerary sculpture, cf. Bergemann (2007).
[18] For more detailed discussion, see esp. Ajootian (2007); Bergemann (2007); Dillon (2006, 2010); Krumeich (1997), 207-11. On the difficulty of terms such as 'realism' or 'likeness' to describe Classical portraiture, cf. e.g. Schultz and von den Hoff (2007); cf. von den Hoff (2007) on 'naturalism'.

The inscriptions are placed in a variety of positions, with far less uniformity than we find in the funerary monuments: reliefs usually have inscriptions on the architrave or on tall bases.[19] In the second half of the century in particular, dedicatory inscriptions on architectural monuments enjoy striking prominence.[20] Inscriptions for portrait statues are generally on a base, which is often all that now survives. The vast majority of verse epigrams are simple and formulaic in style, extending little beyond a basic statement of who dedicated the object to whom, perhaps with a short prayer of thanksgiving or petition.[21] If we wish to find longer poetic prayers inscribed on stone, we must turn to the hymns discussed in chapter 5 below.

The formal elements of a dedicatory epigram are the mention of who dedicated the object, to whom it is dedicated, and what favour is asked for or is being reciprocated,[22] as we find for example on the well-known Mantiklos statuette:

Μάντικλός μ' ἀνέθεκε ϝεκαβόλοι ἀργυροτόξσοι

τᾶς δεκάτας· τὺ δέ, Φοῖβε, δίδοι χαρίϝετταν ἀμοιβ[αν] (*CEG* 326).[23]

This formula is repeated with very little deviation throughout the classical period. The speakers and addressees do not vary as often as in funerary inscriptions: usually the object itself addresses the deity,[24] although from the end of the fifth century there are occasional inscriptions in which the prayer is in the voice of the dedicator, perhaps by analogy funerary epigrams that address the deceased: this is, however, rare, and mostly limited to honorific inscriptions.[25] In the late-fourth century, some dedicatory epigrams are addressed to passers-by (e.g. *CEG* 2.865),[26] and even more rarely to the object that is dedicated (e.g. *CEG* 2.763). Artists are named *extra metrum*, if at all, although occasionally a metrical 'signature' is included. There are some fourth-century

---

[19] Cf. van Straten (1992), 248–249.
[20] See esp. Umholtz (2002).
[21] See e.g. van Straten (1981), esp. 70-77; cf. Day (1994, 2000, 2007).
[22] Lazzarini (1976), 58-178. Cf. esp. Day (1994, 2000).
[23] For discussion of this inscription and formula, see Day (1994), 39–4, and (2000), 42–54; cf. Powell (1991), 167–9; Henrichs (2003), 48.
[24] Tueller (2008), 27-32.
[25] But perh. *CEG* 459 (early vi BC): see Tueller (2008), 15. The 'dialogue' inscription is unknown in dedications, though perh. cf.*CEG* 286 = *IG* XIII 1204 (early-v BC).
[26] Cf. Tueller (2008), 93-4.

epigrams about the artists rather than the object, which is a type found in the *sylloge Simonidea*,[27] and perhaps related to the practice of naming the maker on smaller objects, such as pottery or coins. Poetic signatures may reflect the growing status of artists in the fourth century.[28]

As with epitaphic inscriptions, there is an overwhelming preference for dactylic metres, especially elegiacs:[29] there are only three extant exceptions,[30] in contrast to a number of iambic inscriptions before the fourth century. There are now very few hexameter-only inscriptions, and the basic single-hexameter epigram common in earlier periods is absent. Most epigrams are one or two couplets or two to four hexameters long, but outside Attica there are some longer exceptions (I discuss some below).

There are two main areas in which the voice of fourth-century inscriptions seems distinctive: inscriptions that reflect religious development (i.e. inscriptions for new cults), and inscriptions for honorific portraits. I begin by looking at an unusual epigram inscribed for the cult of Asklepios at Epidauros, before turning to consider some epigrams for portrait-statues. Finally, I will look at a few instances of some longer epigrams that exhibit 'narrative expansion'.

4.2 The healing cult

As I noted in chapter 2.1, one of the most significant aspects of fourth-century religion is the popularity of the healing cults. The healing deities are worshipped as saviours of both individuals and the *polis*; accordingly we find a large number of private epigrams as well as impressive state monuments. These form an important part of our votive material from the late classical period.

Votive artefacts were often set up in thanksgiving or petition for miraculous cures, but such monuments were no doubt also intended to have an impact on visitors to the cult site, who

---

[27] 'Simonides' 32a & b, 33a & b, 48, 56, 57, 58, 63 *FGE*.
[28] Cf. Osborne (1998), 234-5; Prioux (2007).
[29] In Attica, 2/3 dedicatory epigrams are in elegiacs (although some classed as 2 el. may have been 4 hx.); beyond Attica, just under 78% of votive epigrams are in elegiacs.
[30] Cf. *CEG* 2.861, 893, 900. The date of *CEG* 2.861 (= IK Knidos I 21, *GIBM* IV.1, 796) is disputed: cf. e.g. Bean and Cook (1952), 206-7, 210-12, for a possible late 4th-cent. date.

would be impressed by the images and inscriptions they saw.[31] This could prepare them for their own experience,[32] or perhaps provide instruction about the newish cults.[33] Thus a number of reliefs have a narrative: a beautiful example is a votive relief from the cult of Amphiaraos at Oropos,[34] which seems to narrate the practice of incubation, i.e. sleeping in the sanctuary in anticipation of healing (*enkoimesis*).[35] The dedicator Archinos is depicted showing his wound to Amphiaraos and again sleeping with a snake at his shoulder, while either the god or Archinos again looks on (**fig.12**). Reliefs documenting the experience of a worshipper approaching the god occur frequently.[36] At the same time, there is a fascinating set of prose inscriptions, especially at Epidauros, that provide catalogues of *iamata,*[37] which is presumably the source of the *Iamatika* section in the Milan Poseidippos.[38] These prose texts often with short narratives about the circumstances of the cure and sometimes an assertion of the failure of conventional medicine. There are numerous short verse epigrams, which are mostly expressions of thanksgiving for being 'saved' (in the formula σωθείς with a *verbum dedicandi*).[39] Longer hymns are also inscribed at these sites, as I discuss in the next chapter.

However, there are not verse equivalents of the prose *iamatika*: the votive epigrams are mostly rather bland. One possible exception is *CEG* 2.776, a lacunose inscription preserved on two stones at Epidauros (= *IG* IV 1214/ IV^2 1.255). This epigram was unusual enough to be transmitted into the Hellenistic anthologies, under the name of Aischines Rhetor (*AP* 6.330, Αἰσχίνου Ῥήτορος).[40] Although the authorship may simply be the guesswork of a later period, it

---

[31] Cf. Paus. 2.27.3
[32] So LiDonnici (1992), 27-8.
[33] Cf. Dillon (1994).
[34] Athens NM 3369 (c. 380-70 BC); Boardman (1995), pl. 142.
[35] See e.g. Askitopolou et al. (2002).
[36] Cf. Athens NM 1377 (c. 350 BC); Boardman (1995), pl. 147) which features a slave bringing a sacrificial pig to the god (who is shown with Hygieia and Epione), with a line of worshippers behind him. Cf. Ridgway (1993), 194-7; van Straten (1995), 66-7. See also van Straten (1976, 1992).
[37] *IG* IV^2 1, 121-4. For a recent edition, see LiDonnici (1995). Cf. e.g. Dillon (1994); LiDonnici (1992).
[38] See esp. Bing (2004); Di Nino (2005).
[39] See *CEG* 2.762, 764, 755, 771. Cf. Keesling (2007), 145.
[40] On the identification of this epigram with the inscriptions, see esp. Forbes (1967). There are sometimes slight variations between transmitted and inscribed texts: see Kaczko (2009).

is a strange guess unless the anthologizer knew something: the text reveals the author is Athenian, and after the discovery of the second stone, Peek restored the tag as [Αἰσχίνης Ἀτρομ]ήτου Ἀθηναῖος, i.e. Aischines Rhetor. The epigraphy suggests a fourth-century date,[41] and indeed is not improbable that the Athenian orator would have made such a dedication and composed his own epigram for it.[42] If so, it would be datable to somewhere in the first half of the fourth century. Here is the epigram with the supplements from the *Anthology*:

θνητῶν μὲν τέχναις ἀπορούμενος εἰς δὲ τὸ θεῖον|
ἐλπίδα πᾶσαν ἔχων, προλιπὼν εὔπαιδας Ἀθήνας|
ἰάθην, ἐλθών, Ἀσκληπιέ, πρὸς τὸ σὸν ἄλσος|
ἕλκος ἔχων κεφαλῆς ἐνιαύσιον, ἐν τρισὶ μησίν (*CEG* 2.776 = *AP* 6.330).

We notice firstly that there is no dedicatory formula. The god is addressed directly (cf. Ἀσκληπιέ, σόν, 3), but what follows is really a short narrative about the author's experience at the sanctuary of Epidauros, which is the reason for the dedication.[43] The amount of personal detail is very unusual. Not only do we learn what wound Aischines suffered from (line 4), but also that he had apparently been suffering from it for an entire year, and had tried other remedies (line 1). Asyndeton and repetition lend the poem a more rhetorical style than is customary in fourth-century votive inscriptions.

The contrast drawn between the τέχναι θνητῶν and divine skill in the first line is reminiscent of prose *iamata* that describe the failure of conventional treatments. Scientific (i.e. Hippocratic) theories of medicine may be contrasted with the power of traditional religion: ἀπορούμενος ('left in the lurch') is a striking condemnation of the former, while the author also stresses the relative speed of his cure by juxtaposing ἐνιαύσιον and ἐν τρισὶ μησίν in the last line. On the other hand, ἰάθην comes forcefully at the start of the third line, standing alone; the

[41] So Forbes (1967), 443: 'the letter forms resemble ... those occurring in the Epidaurian inscriptions of the fourth century... The inscription indubitably belongs to the fourth century.'
[42] So Hansen (1989), ad loc. Perh. cf. an epitaph conceivably composed by Aischines, *CEG* 2.519.
[43] Normally described briefly in inscriptions with the formula ἕνεκα + gen. Cf. Pulleyn (1997), 39-55.

slightly awkward double-participle phrase that follows it (ἐλθών ... ἔχων, 3-4) serves to delay the information provided at the end, namely that the cure took place within three months, creating a sense of expectancy that perhaps reflects the speaker's own anxiety in the search for a cure.

Athens is praised as the city 'of noble sons', but there seems to be some play over the idea of leaving the city to find the cure: the participle προλιπών in the second line stands in contrast with the participle in the next line, ἐλθών. The two prepositional phrases, εἰς … τὸ θεῖον, πρὸς τὸ σὸν ἄλσος, reinforce this sense of going towards the divine, towards healing. The τέχναι θνητῶν is to be associated with Athens: this may perhaps allude to the intellectual culture in the city at the time. In this respect, it is notable that the first letters of each line form an acrostic, θεῖε,[44] presumably the vocative of the adjective. This makes the whole epigram an offering not merely to Asklepios but to the divine as against human craft. The acrostic elevates the poem from the level of personal testimony to that of an apologia for the cult of Asklepios against rival healing methods.

This is, however, a far from typical votive inscription in the fourth century. For more elaborate inscriptions, we must look to those that accompany honorific portraits.

4.3 Inscriptions for honorific portraits

The voice of inscriptions for honorific portraits in the fourth century is rather different from that of votive inscriptions: perhaps because the intention is more to commemorate an individual, the language of the inscriptions seems to be influenced by that of epitaphs (which obviously perform a similar function).

One small lexical detail may indicate this shift of emphasis: the word εἰκών ('portrait'), which occurs only once in inscriptions before the fourth century, becomes the preferred word for a statue; the more common word of earlier periods, ἄγαλμα ('offering to the gods', like

[44] Noticed by Irigoin (1976), 121-3.

ἀνάθημα),[45] disappears altogether.[46] This suggests a downplaying of religious significance and instead a focus on an object for others to admire.[47]

The word *εἰκών* also occurs frequently in fourth-century epitaphs: the portrait serves as a memorial of the deceased.[48] The connection between funerary and honorific monuments is especially close in the case of the portraits set up on the Acropolis to honour dead men,[49] which are unsurprisingly 'funerary' in style,[50] such as the very epitaphic *CEG* 2.780 (= *IG* II^2 3838), a commemoration of a deceased man by his brother.[51] Similarly, the inscription for the cenotaph of Nikokreon, the king of Salamis, contains a votive expression, even though it occurs on a funerary monument and is in the voice of the deceased speaking 'from the grave'.

However, the memorializing tendency is also found in more clearly non-funerary inscriptions.[52] Sometimes the word for statue or image is left out altogether, so that the inscription claims it is the subject himself who is 'set up';[53] as with funerary monuments, the monument is often said to preserve the subject's *ἀρετή*. *CEG* 2.859, for example (second half of the fourth century), is an inscription for an *εἰκών* of a 'wise woman to look at' (*ἐσορᾶν*): looking upon the statue memorializes the woman's wisdom.

A number of epigrams develop this idea that an abstract concept is suggested by the visible image. A good example is an inscription for a posthumous statue of the sophist Gorgias of Leontini, set up by his grand-nephew and pupil Eumolpos at Olympia;[54] it seemingly survived

---

[45] Cf. e.g. Hom. *Od.*8.509: it seems to be cognate with *ἀγάλλειν*, 'to give glory'.
[46] On the difference between *εἰκών* and *ἄγαλμα* as a depiction of a human or a god, cf. Isok. *Evag.*57. For *ἄγαλμα* as a statue specifically of a god, cf. Hdt. 1.131, 2.42; Lysias 6.15; but cf. e.g. Eur. *Hel.*262, where Helen wishes that her beauty could be obliterated as if merely an *ἄγαλμα*; perh. cf. Daidalos's lifelike statues, Plato *Men.* 97d.
[47] Cf. Smith (2007), 91: 'The shift from *sēma* to *eikōn*, from 'sign' to 'likeness', captures much of the essence of the revolution in statues in the early-fifth century'.
[48] Cf. e.g. *CEG* 2.505.1, *εἰκὼν μνῆμα χρόνο, τιμὴ δὲ κασιγνήταισιν.*
[49] *CEG* 2.746, 757, 780.
[50] See e.g. Ridgway (1997), 347-8, 'the beginning of a form of private heroization'. But not all statues found on the Acropolis were necessarily first erected there (*id.* n.47).
[51] *εἰκόνα τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε Πολύστρατος αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ | μνημοσύνην θνῆτου σώματος ἀθάνατον.* On use of *μνημοσύνη* for *μνῆμα*, and on *θνῆτου ~ ἀθάνατον*, see ch.3.2 & 3.5 above.
[52] Cf. Keesling (2003), 167; (2007), 144-5; Ajootian (2007), 16.
[53] Cf. e.g. *IG* VII 183 (Thespiai, Boiotia), a statue of Thrasymachos by Praxiteles: discussion at Ajootian (2007), 16-18 (with images). On this phenomenon in Hellenistic honorific inscriptions, cf. Ma (2007), 209-213.
[54] Test. 8 D-K. Early iv BC: so Fränkel (1877), 43, no. 54.

to Pausanias's day.[55] The inscription on the base is in three parts, a simple tag with Gorgias' name, and two verse epigrams. The first epigram has a conventional expression of dedication (*ἀνέθηκεν*, 3), which also explains the family relationship and personal connection that justifies Eumolpos honouring Gorgias, 'for the sake of his education and friendship' (4):[56]

τὴμ μὲν ἀδελφὴν Δηϊκράτης τὴγ Γοργίου ἔσχεν,|
ἐκ ταύτης δ' αὐτῷ γίγνεται Ἱπποκράτης,|
Ἱπποκράτους δ' Εὔμολπος, ὃς εἰκόνα τήνδ' ἀνέθηκεν|
δισσῶν, παιδείας καὶ φιλίας ἕνεκα.

The second epigram serves more to point out particular qualities memorialized by the statue:

Γοργίου ἀσκῆσαι ψυχὴν ἀρετῆς ἐς ἀγῶνας|
οὐδείς πω θνητῶν καλλίον' ηὗρε τέχνην·|
οὗ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος γυάλοις εἰκὼν ἀνάκειται|
οὐ πλούτου παράδειγμ', εὐσεβίας δὲ τρόπων (*CEG* 2.830).

In the first couplet, we are directed to aspects of Gorgias' life: his career as a sophist is suggested by 'displays of *ἀρετή*', while emphasis is placed on his innovation (*ηὗρε τέχνην*, 2). However, the final couplet refers not to *this* statue but to one at Delphi,[57] which is apparently a *paradeigma* of some notable feature about him.[58] The speaker rather defensively denies that the statue is merely a demonstration of the sophist's wealth, before telling us what it does show (*εὐσεβία*). The statue at Delphi, apparently set up by Gorgias himself, was all-golden, and apparently attracted criticism:[59] Pausanias cites it as evidence of the riches that can be earned from teaching oratory.[60]

---

[55] Paus. 6.17-7-8: cf. Tzifopoulos (1991), 211.
[56] Text following Tzifopoulos (1991), 211.
[57] See Paus. 10.18.7; cf. Cic. *de orat.* 3.32.119; Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 33.83.
[58] For the phrase, cf. also *IG* II² 4908, and the Timo epigram (below). There may be an allusion to the *epideixis* of sophists.
[59] Cf. Ath. 11.505d-e. On this anecdote, see esp. Bernardini and Veneri (1981); cf. Morgan (1994). Compare also the golden tripod set up at Delphi by Hieron of Syracuse: an important difference may be that Hieron did not use the pure gold to represent himself, although he certainly set up statues too. For discussion of these erections and the politics behind them, cf. e.g. Scott (2010), 88-90.
[60] On Gorgias' wealth, cf. Isok. *Antid.* 155-6. For golden statues as a sign of wealth, perh. cf. Theoc. 10.31.

If the gold statue had been taken as pure ostentation and self-aggrandisement, it is likely that this portrait and inscription at Olympia is an attempt to defend the sophist's reputation.[61] The speaker thus draws attention to Gorgias' positive attributes: his innovation and *τέχνη* is called *καλλίων*, which contrasts with rather negative assertions about his novelty and aspersions of amoralism in some fourth-century writers.[62] In *ἀσκῆσαι ψυχήν* there may be an allusion to the discourse on whether *ἀρετή* can be taught, with a positive answer on behalf of Gorgias' techniques.[63] We can interpret the statue and inscription as a whole as a visual display (*παράδειγμα*) [64] of Gorgias' *τέχνη*, which allows him to engage in a new *ἀγών*,[65] mirroring the sophist did in life (cf. 5).

The portrait and inscription are thus placed within a wider discourse and act as an *apologia* for Gorgias. Visual elements are clearly important – the luxurious material of the Delphic statue evidently communicated something about Gorgias himself – but we also see that the inscription offered a 'correct interpretation' of the image.

A similar display of qualities is seen in a late fourth-century commemorative epigram on a statue-base for a priestess named Timo or Simo at Erythrai.[66] Statues of priestesses start appearing in numbers in the fourth century:[67] statues in sanctuaries perhaps served the ritual visitations,[68] but moreover invited honour for the priestesses and their family. Praxiteles' portrait of Charippe, for instance, was commissioned by her brothers, probably because her status

---

[61] So Bernardini and Veneri (1981)..
[62] Cf. e.g. Plat. *Gorg.* 453a; Antisthenes at Ath. 220c; Isok. *Hel.* 3.
[63] Cf. Plat. *Apol.*19e: *ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτό γέ μοι δοκεῖ καλὸν εἶναι, εἴ τις οἷός τ' εἴη παιδεύειν ἀνθρώπους ὥσπερ Γοργίας κτλ.* Gorgias disingenuously claimed not to teach *ἀρετή* (cf. Plat. *Men.*96b; *Gorg.*519e), but he did teach the governance of men (cf. Plat. *Gorg.*452d), which is a definition of *ἀρετή* at Plat. *Men.*73d: see e.g. Harrison (1964), 188-190. Morgan (1994), 79-80, notes that Gorgias' statue is placed outside the temple among other mortals, fitting for his role as a trainer; Morgan contrasts the 'Cypselid colossus', located inside along with the gods.
[64] Perh. cf. Plat. *Gorg.*464b.
[65] Cf. e.g. Thuc. 3.67.6: *ποιήσατε δὲ τοῖς Ἕλλησι <u>παράδειγμα</u> οὐ λόγων <u>τοὺς ἀγῶνας</u> προθήσοντες ἀλλ' ἔργων.*
[66] Hansen (1989), *ad loc.* dates to late fourth or early-third century BC; Dillon (2010), 9, identifies it as late-fourth century. The first letter may be a sigma, making the name Simo, but cf. Hdt. 6.134 for Timo, a *hypozakoros* of Demeter at Paros.
[67] See Kron (1996), 140-155; Connelly (2007), 117-164; Dillon (2010), 9.
[68] Connelly (2007), 119.

reflected well on the whole family.[69] Unusually, Timo's portrait was seemingly commissioned by herself, by which act no doubt the priestess confirmed her own piety and high status. It is identified as a dedication to Dionysus, by which act Timo asserts herself as a priestess 'for the *polis*' (2).

[Τ]ιμὼ τήν [δ' ἔστη]σ[ε] γυνὴ Ζωΐλου Διονύσωι|
[ἴ]ρεα πρὸ πόλεως Παγκρατίδεω θυγάτηρ,|
[εἰ]κ[ό]να μὲμ μορφῆς, ἀρετῆς δ' ἐπίδειγμα καὶ ὄλβου,|
[ἀθ]άνατον μνήμην παισί τε καὶ προγόνοις (*CEG* 2.858).

The final two lines especially are reminiscent of the trope of 'leaving behind a memorial' in fourth-century epitaphs: these claim that the memorial offers illustration of Timo's virtue and an everlasting memorial. However, the inscription also invites contemplation of the εἰκών as a likeness of her appearance (μορφή, 3), which implies that the statue memorializes her beauty: this emphasises the statue's visual quality. However, the portrait also indicates non-visual qualities, virtue and wealth. The term ἐπίδειγμα (cf. πλούτου παράδειγμα in the Gorgias inscription) carries the sense of a visual display of these features,[70] as if the viewer were somehow able to *see* Timo's virtue and wealth. To judge from the base, the statue would have been large and rather expensive,[71] which may have illustrated the wealth (by contrast with the Gorgias statue, this is only deemed to be positive), while μορφή perhaps in some way implies ἀρετή. The statue and its inscription 'speak' on Timo's behalf and stress her suitability as an intercessor on behalf of the *polis*.

[69] For this recently discovered inscription, see Ajootian (2007), 25; Connelly (2007), 133.
[70] *LSJ* s.v. ἐπίδειγμα (I, 2); ἐπίδειξις (I).
[71] Dillon (2010), 9, following Gauthier (2000), 48-9, conjectures 3,000 drachmas: cf. Stewart (1979), 109.

4.4 Inscriptions for athletic victors and politicians

Inscriptions for portraits of athletic victors are a category that deserve special consideration. Polykleitan victor statues tended to be nude, and emphasised the athlete's muscular attributes; fourth-century portraits remained generic,[72] but allowed more naturalistic postures and slender, softer attributes.[73] They were erected at the place of victory or in the victor's *polis* as an offering of thanksgiving and to commemorate the victor and the occasion of his victory;[74] they provided a visible reminder of the success, but also allowed for the adulation for the subject.[75] Although most inscriptions simply named the victor and his homeland, some fourth-century epigrams are more extensive.[76]

An interesting instance is an inscription for a statue of a winner in a chariot race, *CEG* 2.778, probably from around the end of the fourth century.[77] The speaker compares the glory received by the athlete with the reflected glory of the citizens who set up his statue:

δόξα μὲν Ἑλλήνων ἱεροῖς ἀναθήμασιν αὔξει |
τόνδε, τέχνης δ' εἰκὼν ἥδε δίδωσ[ι] κρίσιν. |
νικήσας δὲ ἵππων τε δρόμοις ἔργων τε ἐν ἁμιλλα[ις] |
τὴν ἱερὰν στεφανοῖ πατρίδα Κεκροπίαν (*CEG* 2.778 = *IG* II² 3138).

The very act of the citizens making offerings is said to exalt the victor (1-2), presumably because the mere presence of his statue in the sanctuary glorifies him. However, there is a second point (contrasted through μέν and δέ, 1-2), namely that his portrait, εἰκών, passes judgement on his skill in some way: perhaps the statue depicted him in some glorious pose to suggest his prowess at racing.[78] The expression δίδωσι κρίσιν is most unusual in inscriptions and has almost a legal

[72] So Boardman (1995), 106.
[73] Smith (1991), 51-2.
[74] For the Olympian monuments, see esp. Hyde (1921); general discussion in Smith (2007). On archaic victor statues, see e.g. Lattimore (1987); on 5th-cent. styles, cf. esp. Steiner (1998); for 4th-cent./early 3rd-cent. styles, see Smith (1991), 51-5.
[75] Cf. esp. Steiner (1998).
[76] For the epigrams, see Ebert (1972); Köhnken (2007).
[77] Kirchner (*ap. IG* II²) dated to before 306 BC on historical grounds. Cf. Hansen (1989) *ad loc.*
[78] On the iconography of classical victor's statues, see esp. Hyde (1921); Serwint (1987); Smith (2007), 88-9.

tone;[79] it is faintly reminiscent of the *κρίσις* of *τέχνη* in the public *ἀγών* between Aeschylus and Euripides in Aristophanes' *Frogs*.[80] The sense here seems to be that the statue will act as the public validation of the athlete's ability.

However, the final line suggests the statue glorifies something even more importan: now the victor is said to be 'garlanding' his *πατρίς*.[81] We might expect *στέφανος* to refer to the reward received by the victor, but instead it is his homeland that receives it from the victor. The panhellenic glory (*δόξα ... Ἑλλήνων*) that exalts the individual is passed on to his *πατρίς*, which like the victory itself is glorified through the statue and inscription.[82] The repetition of *ἱερός* (*ἱεροῖς ~ ἱεράν*, 1, 4) reinforces this: the offerings to the god (including this statue) are 'holy' but so too is the *πατρίς*, which bathes in the reflected glory of the success commemorated in the offering.

Politics seems to be very much the point in the famous Daochos monument at Delphi, which represents our best original evidence for fourth-century athletic portraits.[83] The dedicator, Daochos II of Pharsala, was a tetrarch of Thessaly and *hieromnemon* of the Amphictyohic league, c.339-334 BC; Demosthenes claimed that he collaborated with the Macedonians, and served in Philip II's panhellenic league.[84] The monument included nine statues on a pedestal, depicting a seated Apollo[85] and six generations of Daochos's family. Each statue had an epigram (collected in *CEG* 795)[86] which recorded the individual's success in the Pythian games. However, the poses

---

[79] It is the expression used for when dikasts judge a case, for example: cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1.15.1377a28.
[80] Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 779-780, *ὁ δῆμος ἀνεβόα κρίσιν ποεῖν / ὁπότερος εἴη τὴν τέχνην σοφώτερος*; 786, *ἀγῶνα ποιεῖν αὐτίκα μάλα καὶ κρίσιν / κἄλεγχον αὐτοῖν τῆς τέχνης*.
[81] For the significance of victory in the panhellenic games for both individuals and *polis*, cf. Thuc. 6.12.2.
[82] Cf. e.g. *CEG* 2.788 (mid-iv BC: Ebert (1972), 135 no. 41), *Γλαυκία [υἱέ, πάτραν] | Θέσπιαν εὐκλέισας*.
[83] The date has been disputed: Daochos II was probably born at around 400 BC, so if he is really the dedicator of the monument it must have been completed either during or very shortly after his office in the Amphictyonic league (see Ridgway (1989), 48). However, Géominy (1998: cf. 2007) disputes this interpretation of the evidence, and proposes redating to c.287-277. On the politics of dedications at Delphi in general in the fourth century, see now Scott (2010), 111-145 (the Daochos monument is discussed at 133-135).
[84] Dem. *de.cor* 18.295-6.
[85] For discussion of a possible fragment of the Apollo statue, see esp. Thémélis (1979).
[86] For the statues, see *FD* IV, pls. 63-8; for the epigrams, see *FD* III.4, 460. For discussion of the monument and statue-fragments, see e.g. Dohrn (1968); Smith (1991), 51-2; Tzirivakos (1972); Ridgway (1989), 46-9; Lattimore (1975) and (1997), 269; Géominy (1998, 2007); Stewart (1990), 187, pl. 551; Jacquemin and Laroche (2001). On the epigrams, cf. esp. Ebert (1972), 137-145, no. 43-45; the same family also at *CEG* 2.794.

are not only those of heroic athletes, but even emphasise the notion of 'good ruler',[87] much like the lavish statues of the Philippeion at Olympia.[88] The purpose is clear: by drawing attention to the dynastic sequence and athletic successes, Daochos is able to make a claim of power at the Delphic sanctuary and legitimacy as a Hellenic ruler through his noble ancestry. [89]

Like the statues, the epigrams are interconnected: for example, the inscription for the statue of Telemachos (*CEG* 2.795.6-9) starts with *κἀγώ*, which refers back to the previous statue and inscription: the relationship between this statue and that of his brother is further cemented through the deictic *τοῦδε*. The inscription for Agelaos, the third brother, refers back to both preceding statues: *ἐγὼ δὲ | σύγγονος ἀμφοτέρων τῶνδε Ἀγέλαος ἔφυν* (11-12). The epigram for Daochos II refers to the entire statue-group, which is said to exalt his ancestors, and provides honour for his lineage and homeland:

αὔξων οἰκείων προγόνων ἀρετᾶς τάδε δῶρα |
στῆσεμ Φοίβωι ἄνακτι, γένος καὶ πατρίδα τιμῶν |
Δάοχος εὐδόξωι χρώμενος εὐλογίαι |
τέτραρχος Θεσσαλῶν, | ἱερομνήμων Ἀμφικτυόνων (*CEG* 2.795.22-25).

Together, the statues and inscriptions create a narrative about Daochos and his family that goes beyond the content of the individual epigrams. This even projects into the future: the family narrative is completed by an epigram for the younger Sisyphos, who does not yet have a glory to commemorate; but by referring to a promise given to him in a dream, the speaker establishes Sisyphos as a divinely-blessed individual, and allows the monument to look ahead to the future of the family:

οὐκ ἔψευσέ σε Παλλὰς ἐν ὕπνωι, Δαόχου υἱὲ |
Σίσυφε, ἃ δ' εἶπε σαφῆ θῆκεν ὑποσχεσίαν· |
ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἔδυς περὶ τεύχεα χρωτί, |

[87] So Fehr (1979), 59-66; Lattimore (1997), 269.
[88] So Ridgway (1989), 49-50; Lattimore (1997), 269. On the Philippeion, see now Schultz (2007).
[89] Cf. Kosmetatou (2002, 2004); Stamatopoulou (2007), 340.

οὔτ' ἔφυγες δήϊους οὔτε τι ταῦμ' ἔλαβες (*CEG* 2.795.18-21).

The political dimensions of these epigrams for victors are reminiscent of the importance of the victor's *polis* in classical *epinikia*: an ode for a ruler of a *polis* might serve on one level as an advertisement for that ruler and his *polis* throughout Greece.[90] The specially-commissioned *epinikion*-poet provides poetic elaboration of the bare information on victor's statue-bases. *Epinikion* as a lyric genre is not attested at all during the fourth century, but perhaps to an extent inscriptions and portrait statues do the same job: an early fourth-century inscription from Keos (*IG* XII 5.608), which lists local victors of the panhellenic games, is a neat example of the way in which inscriptions too could focus attention on the homeland of the victor.[91] We have seen how *CEG* 2.778 develops this concept by referring to the way that the victor confers glory on the *polis*, while the Daochos group at Delphi uses the Pythian victories to assert the importance of the Thessalian aristocracy (Thessaly itself is mentioned six times in the inscriptions).

Another example of epigrams as victory-poems is the set of inscriptions for statues at Delphi, commemorating Lysandros's naval victory at Aigospotamoi (405). These were composed by Ion of Samos, probably in the mid-fourth century,[92] and are mostly conventional; but unusually the poet adds a signature in an extra pentameter line:

ἐ<κ Σ>άμο<υ> ἀμφιρύτ[ου] τεῦ<χ>σε ἐλεγεῖον ⋮ Ἴων (*CEG* 2.819.12 = *FD* 50).

Punctuation marks offset the poet's name at the end of the line and thus draw the eye to it.[93] In the group are statues of the Dioskouroi:[94] in the epigram for Polydeukes, Ion again includes his own name in elegiacs. The text is damaged, but a plausible reconstruction is as follows:

[Παῖ Διός, ὦ] Πολύδευ[κ]ες, Ἴων [καὶ τοῖσ]δ' ἐλεγείοι[ς] |

[λαϊνέαν] κρηπῖδ' ἐστεφάνωσ[ε τεά]ν,|

[90] The bibliography is predictably huge, but cf. e.g. Pfeiffer (2005) on Syracuse in Pi. *Pyth.*1.
[91] For discussion, see esp. Maehler (1982) 2.1-3.
[92] *CEG* 2.819 = *FD* III 1.50; Tod (1946), no. 95; Geffcken 97; Meiggs-Lewis 95c. On Ion of Samos, see Wilamowitz, *RE* s.v. 'Ion'
[93] So Hornblower (2009), 45.
[94] *FD* III 1.51-2.

[ἀρχὸς ἐπ]εὶ πρῶτος, πρότερο[ς δ' ἔ]τι τοῦδε ναυάρ[χου] |

[ἕστας ἀγ]εμόνων Ἑλλάδος εὐρ[υχ]όρου (*CEG* 2.819.5-8 = *FD* 51).

Here the poet depicts himself as conferring glory upon the statue with his epigram (ἐστεφάνωσ[ε]): this elevation of the epigrammatist's role is reminiscent of the distinguished position that the poet occupies in classical *epinikion*. There is no doubt again a political dimension, since by setting up these statues and commissioning a (presumably) well-known poet, the Spartans would have been able to demonstrate wealth and power. We may also get a sense that such victory-epigrams offered a chance for a poet to practise his skill: the inclusion of his name suggests self-advertisement.

The book epigrams of the third century period might lend further support to this idea. In the Milan papyrus of Poseidippos' epigrams, there is a separate section entitled *Hippika* which dealt mainly with equestrian victories (including victories by Ptolemaic royal women):[95] it seems probable that by this date epigrams for victors had replaced lyric performance as the main way of celebrating the victory.[96]

4.5 Narrative voices

A small number of dedicatory epigrams are of greater length and have some narrative content. This is best explained as an extension of the tendency I have been discussing, to view the votive monument as much as a commemoration of a human as an offering to a god; inevitably in such a context, the poet is sometimes desirous to communicate more information about both the dedicator and the circumstances of the dedication.

One such epigram accompanies an image of the 'hunt of Alexander'[97] by Lysippos and Leochares, dedicated at Delphi by Krateros II on behalf of his father, Krateros I, the son of

[95] Poseidippos *Ep.* 71-88 A-B. See Kosmetatou (2004); Fantuzzi (2004, 2005).
[96] On the inscriptional background for the *Hippika*, see esp. Köhnken (2007).
[97] A famous theme: the Alexander Sarcophagus may have served as a prototype. Cf. Palagia (1999).

Alexander of Orestis and a lieutenant of Alexander the Great.[98] The monument is reported by Plutarch (*Vit. Alex.* 40) and Pliny (*HN*. 32.63-4), and probably dates to the last years of the fourth century or beginning of the third century (Krateros I died in 321, the same year that Krateros II was born), although the epigram was perhaps added to the monument some time after its erection.[99] It is the longest surviving elegiac inscription from this period:

υἱὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου Κρατερὸς τάδε τὠπόλλων[ι] |
ἠΰξατο, τιμάεις καὶ πολύδοξος ἀνήρ. |
στᾶσε δ' ὃν ἐμ μεγάροις ἐτεκνώσατο καὶ λίπε παῖδα, |
πᾶσαν ὑποσχεσίαν πατρὶ τελῶν Κρατερός, |
ὄφρα οἱ ἀίδιόν τε καὶ ἀρπαλέον κλέος ἄγρα, |
ὦ ξένε, ταυροφόνου τοῦδε λέοντος ἔχοι· |
ὅμ ποτε, Ἀλ[εξά]νδρωι τότε ὅθ' εἵπετο καὶ συνεπόρθει |
τῶι πολυαιν[ήτωι] τῶιδε Ἀσίας βασιλεῖ, |
ὧδε συνεξαλάπαξε καὶ εἰς χέρας ἀντιάσαντα |
ἔκτανεν οἰονόμων ἐν περάτεσσι Σύρων (*CEG* 2.878).

The epigram opens conventionally enough, identifying the dedicator (cf. στᾶσε, 3) as the younger Krateros. The expression λίπε παῖδα recalls sepulchral motifs of 'abandonment', although there is little pathos: the monument is shown to be a commemoration of the elder Krateros and a particular event. That this event was well in the past is emphasised by the use of πότε... τότε ὅθ' in line 7; but we also learn it occurred in a different place (οἰονόμων ἐν περάτεσσι Σύρων, 10: cf. εἵπετο, 7). This lends a certain exoticism, which is intensified through the use of the epithet for the Syrians in the last line.

---

[98] *FD* III.4, 137; Peek (1958), 55 n.1 and (1961), 298; Hölscher (1973), 181; Bringmann and Steuber (1995), no. 90, 141-3. For discussion, see Perdrizet (1899); Stewart (1993), 270-7, 390-1; Moreno (1987), 104 and (1995), 35; Palagia (1999).

[99] Moreno (1995), 35, dates to 304 (i.e when Krateros II became an ephebe), but Lysippos' last recorded activity was in 316 (*pace* Palagia (1999), 184, who suggests Phila was responsible for the monument). But Perdrizet (1899), 274, believes the lettering is 3rd-cent.

A brief narrative of the incident follows, perhaps to 'interpret' the image for viewers from the perspective of the Krateroi, a technique we have seen before.[100] Deictic pronouns (*τοῦδε λέοντος*, 6; *τῶιδε Ἀσίας βασιλεῖ*, 8) appear to refer to the image itself. In the narrative, Alexander's role is minimised in contrast to Krateros I, whose intervention is crucial in saving the king's life (9-10). Narrating this valiant action ensures his *ἀίδιόν τε καὶ ἁρπαλέον κλέος* (5).

Curiously, the account is narrated through the invocation of a *ξένος*, who presumably represents passers-by. This device, which is familiar in sepulchral epigrams, is rare in dedicatory inscriptions:[101] the nearest example is a florid epigram for an early third-century herm from a gymnasium in Astypalaia in Crete (*CEG* 2.865),[102] which oddly asks a *ξένος* to report information elsewhere in order to invite praise from a different *ξένος* (*τῶι ξένωι εἰπὲ πολῖτα… / ὄφρα καὶ ὁ ξεῖνος Δαμάτριον Ἱππία υἱὸν / αἰνῆι ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπῶν ἄστεα νισόμενος*, 1, 3-4).[103] The invocation of a stranger in the Krateros epigram is perhaps a testimony to the author's desire to spread word of Krateros I's good deed to a wide audience.

An even more unusual inscription comes from Xanthos in Lykia, *CEG* 2.888 (i-iii), from perhaps as early as the very beginning of the fourth century (**fig. 14**).[104] This is a dedication to Leto by the Lykian tyrant, Erbinna son of Kheriga (or 'Arbinas son of Gergis').[105] The statue base (henceforth stone *A*) has Greek inscriptions on the front and right sides, and Lykian inscriptions on the other two sides. A second statue base, *CEG* 2.889 (stone *B*), has a dedication to Artemis, with two Greek epigrams on the front and a Lykian text on the left (**fig. 13**).[106] These

---

[100] Cf. esp. *CEG* 2.686 (ch. 3.4 above).
[101] *CEG* 2.861 (date uncertain) has the word *χαίρετε*, but the sense is unclear.
[102] Date follows Meyer (2005), 102. Ameling (2004), 149 n.124, wrongly calls this epigram a 'Grabinschrift'.
[103] Cf. 'Sim.' *AP* 7.249, Hdt. 7.227-8: *ὦ ξεῖν', ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις, ὅτι τῇδε | κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι.*
[104] So Rhodes and Osborne (2003) no. 13, 58; the rule of Erbinna was c.390-370: cf. Childs (1981), 71.
[105] Perhaps cf. Hdt. 7.82 for an officer of this name in Xerxes' army. The orthography of the names varies: one also finds *xeriga* and *erbbina*.
[106] = *SEG* 28.1245. For text and discussion see Rhodes and Osborne (2003); Bousquet (1975); Robert (1978); Metzger et al. (1992), 149-187, pls. 72-79; Bryce and Zahdle (1986), 94-96 ('Erbinna I & II'); Asheri (1983a) and (1983b), 97-104. For the Lykian text, see Neumann (1979), 28 (#311).

statue bases, which were erected in the *Letoon* just outside the city Xanthos[107] probably belong with Erbinna's magnificent and Hellenizing 'Nereids' monument, which contained his tomb, as a *heroon* (**fig. 15**).[108] All these monuments serve to create a narrative about Erbinna that facilitates his heroization.

The main interest lies in the extended narrative fragments. *A* (i) is a long hexameter poem of some seventeen lines which not only contains the dedicatory formula, but even narrates the circumstances of it in detail; it perhaps continues into the very fragmentary *A* (iii), on the right side of the base. These are the two longest surviving dedicatory inscriptions in verse from the classical period. Here is the first fragment of Greek text:[109]

[. . . Ἀρβ]ί[ν]ας παῖς Γέργ[ιος...|

[. . .] ἀρετῆς ουενι [. . .]|

[. . . εἰκὼν] δὲ ἥδε ἔστη μνῆμα θ̣[εᾶσθαι?]|

[. . . ἄρ]ξας συνέσει δυνάσει τε κ̣[ράτιστος] |

ἀρ[χῆι] ἐφ' ἡλικίας πέρσας ἐμ μηνὶ τρία ἄσ[τη] |

Ξάνθον τε ἠδὲ Πίναρα καὶ εὐλίμενον Τελ[εμεσσὸν] |

πολλοῖσιν Λυκίοισι φόβον παρέχων ἐτυρά[ννει]· |

τῶν μνημεῖα ἀνέθηκε θεοῦ φραδᾶι Ἀπόλλ[ωνος]. |

Πυθῶι ἐρωτήσας Λητῶι με ἀνέθηκεν ἑαυτο̣[ῦ] |

εἰκόνα, τῶν δὲ ἔργων τὸ σχῆμα ἐπιδείκνυ[ται] ἀ[λκήν]. |

κτείνας γὰρ πολλός, πατέρα εὐκλείσας τὸν ἑ[αυ]το[ῦ], |

πολλὰ μὲν ἄστεα ἔπερσε, καλὸν δὲ κλέος κ[ατὰ] πᾶ[σαν] |

γῆν Ἀσίαν Ἀρβίνας ἑαυτῶι προγόνοις τε λέλοιπ[ε], |

---

[107] On the history of the Lykian Letoon, see esp. Bryce (1983). A number of other fascinating inscriptions have turned up here, of which the most important is the so-called 'Letoon Trilingual', a stele (probably mid-iv BC) containing inscriptions in Greek, Lykian and Aramaic that mention the ruler Artaxerxes.

[108] Now in the British Museum (room 17). For discussion, see e.g. Demargne (1990); Robinson (1999); cf. the Mausoleion at Halikarnassos, for which see esp. Hornblower (1982); Boardman (1995), 27-30.

[109] For supplements, cf. Bousquet (1975), 143-8 (cf. Bousquet (1992), 155-8; Bryce and Zahdle (1986), 95-6.

πάντα ἐμ πᾶσι πρέπων ὅσαπερ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες ἴ[σασιν], |

τοξοσύνηι τε ἀρετῆι τε, ἵππων τε διώγματα εἰδ[ώς]. |

εἰς τέλος ἐξ ἀρχῆς, Ἀρβίνα, μεγάλα ἔργα τελ[έσσ]ας |

ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς κεχαριμμένα δῶρα ἀ[νέ]θηκα[ς] (*CEG* 2.888.1-17).

Although the first few lines of the inscription are lacunose, they seemingly contained conventional expressions of dedication: the supplements suggest an inclusion of the 'image to behold' motif of portrait epigrams. From the fourth line, there is praise for Erbinna as a leader, which is developed into a more extensive account of his military success. His prodigious capacity is stressed by the phrase *ἀρ[χῆι] ἐφ' ἡλικίας* (5) and reinforced by the account of sacking three cities in a single month (5-6). Line 7 attests to Erbinna's power over the Lykians (*φόβον παρέχων*, *ἐτυράννει*, 7), of which this monument is a memorial (8).

In what follows, narrative extends the basic epigrammatic voice. The origin of the monument is ascribed to a response to Erbinna from the Pythian oracle: presumably this detail lends legitimacy to the self-aggrandising memorial and inscription, and gives Erbinna 'Greek' status.[110] Interestingly, the speaker directs the reader to the visual image, which is both a portrait of Erbinna (*εἰκόνα*, 10: perhaps also 3, [*εἰκών*]) and a *σχῆμα*: this term, which is unusual in inscriptions, may indicate something about Erbinna's posture in the statue, or perhaps the presence of narrative reliefs depicting his *μεγάλα ἔργα*.[111] Either way, the image illustrates something about Erbinna to the viewer (*ἐπιδείκνυται*, 10): we should probably once more see the inscription as an interpretation or elaboration of this image, as part of the memorialisation of the tyranny.

The narrative voice becomes still more expansive as the epigram celebrates Erbinna's triumphs: distinctly florid language, unfamiliar in verse inscriptions, adds grandeur to the basic

[110] A non-Greek consulting the Pythian oracle is something of a trope in Herodotus: see recently Barker (2006); Kurke (2009).

[111] So Robert (1978), 5 n.1: 'ainsi le pilier, surmonté sur la statue d'Arbinas, comportaité des bas-reliefs figurant les exploits divers du dynaste'. This is, however, speculation.

information. There is insistence on the idea of a dynasty: the tyrant leaves a legacy for his descendants (11) and glorifies his own father (13). Lines 14 to 16 are grandiloquent and rhetorical: the overall tone is one of panegyric; Homerizing language presumably lends Erbinna the character of an Homeric hero.[112]

This language is very similar to that of the Xanthos pillar,[113] which stood on the acropolis of Xanthos, probably to commemorate Erbinna's father, Kheriga,[114] and which also had inscriptions in both Lykian and Greek. The Greek epigram, which is probably around twenty to thirty years older than the Erbinna texts,[115] comprises twelve hexameters narrating the dynast's heroic deeds,[116] and is crammed with Homeric expressions;[117] narrative tenses are used throughout. The Erbinna epigrams are seemingly modelled on this style, and serve to continue the glorification of the dynasty through short heroic narrative on stone.

Although it is very fragmentary, the reverse side (*A* (iii)) seemingly had an even more extensive narrative in elegiacs, perhaps mixed with hexameter passages (*CEG* 2.888.21-53). Leto is invoked directly (26), as is Erbinna (37-8), whose prowesses are further exalted (cf. 38, Ἀρβίνα, *ὑμνήσει σὴν ἀρετὴν* Ἀ[σία]). In 45, Achilles at Troy is mentioned, perhaps killing Hector (the legible text has Πριαμοῖο, 44),[118] which is presumably a comparison to flatter Erbinna.

The elegiac Greek epigram on the dedication to Artemis (*B* (i), *CEG* 2.889) is shorter, but again dwells on Erbinna's achievements: there is another reference to the three cities captured in one month, Xanthos, Telemessos and Pinara. Dynastic continuity is emphasised by calling Erbinna the 'son of Gergis' (1: cf. Ἀρπάγου υἱός on the Xanthos stele).

---

[112] Cf. *Il.* 2.660: *πέρσας ἄστεα πολλὰ*.
[113] Published by Kalinka (1901) [*TL*], no. 44; *CEG* 777; Bousquet (1992). See also *SGO* 17/10/01 (with an illustration of the narrative relief).
[114] This has been the source of much controversy: see esp. the discussion of Gygax and Tietz (2005) with further bibliography.
[115] See esp. Gygax and Tietz (2005).
[116] *TL* 44c, 21-31; Bousquet (1992), 159-60.
[117] Cf. e.g. *ἀριστεύσας* (5); *πτολιπόρθῳ* (7); [*π*]*έρσας* (8); *ἀπεμνήσαντο* (9); *κτεῖνεν... ἄνδρας* (10).
[118] Cf. Bousquet (1975) *ad loc.*, suppl. [Ἕκτορος].

The inscriptions are noteworthy for including verse signatures by the poet, a certain Symmachos of Pellana, who names himself in a single elegiac couplet in A (ii), and probably again in B (ii), although the actual name is missing in the latter. In the first, the poet identifies himself as a seer, who has produced the composition as a gift to Erbinna:

Σύμμαχος Εὐμήδεος Πελλανεὺς μάντις ἀ[μύμων]

δῶρον ἔτευξε ἐλεγῆια Ἀρβίναι εὐσυνέ[τω]ς (*CEG* 2.888 (ii)).

The language is close to that of dedicatory formulae, but the fact that it is Erbinna not a god who receives this δῶρον no doubt plays into the heroizing function of the monument. 'Blameless seer' recalls the Homeric 'true prophet':[119] Symmachos thus characterises himself as one optimally placed to praise Erbinna.[120]

The poet of the Artemis inscription calls himself a παιδοτρίβης, perhaps Erbinna's own educator. Recruiting Greek teachers and epigrammatists was presumably part of the process of Hellenizing the dynasty of Kheriga and Erbinna. The narrative voice of the Greek texts would be an attempt not merely to heroize the dynasts locally, but also among a Greek audience: a Greek identity is constructed for the non-Greek tyrants, with quasi-Homeric narratives, a reference to the Greek dodecatheon on the Xanthos pillar, and the account of Erbinna's consultation.

Conclusion

The dedicatory epigrams discussed in this chapter are the exceptions to the norm, none more so than the Lykian epigrams. These latter in particular should warn us away from making too many generalisations, since the narrative style is not at all reflected elsewhere: political motivations perhaps led the author to seek to be ostentatiously different). On the whole, fourth-century dedicatory inscriptions are notable only for the continuity from the early-classical to Hellenistic types and homogeneity across the Greek mainland, in contrast with the distinctive Attic style of

[119] The end of the line is missing, but can be restored from *Il.*1.92.
[120] Cf. Flower (2009b), 97.

epitaphs. Changes in the religious landscape bring new types of dedication (i.e. to the healing gods or abstract deities), but there is hardly any sign of stylistic shift.

Nonetheless, the rise of the portrait-epigram in the fourth century does add a new dimension, and we have seen how this leads to a shift in focus onto the artwork itself as a representation of a human; in turn, both artefact and inscription act as an *apologia* or glorification of the subject. The voice of such inscriptions is increasingly affected by that of funerary epigrams: both can be said to be directed at a reader, who engages with text and image, quite apart from the supposed religious setting of the artefact. It is not unreasonable to suppose that this interaction between monument and viewer or reader facilitates the emergence of what is really a new type of epigram in the Hellenistic period, that which describes works of art[121] (I will say more on 'literary' epigrams in chapter 6).

Certainly one can perceive a sense in which the inscribed text is seen as a powerful means for communicating an idea, and – as the occasional verse signatures vividly testify – of poetic 'publication'. The praise of an individual in a few lines on stone becomes an occasion for demonstrating the poet's skill in giving such praise. Some of the longer, 'narrative' inscriptions imply a view of the inscribed stone as a place of poetic celebration.

The Lykian inscriptions are exceptional partly because of their remarkable length. The only inscribed texts in verse that rival these are the inscribed hymns of this period, which I consider in the next chapter. It is probable that the inscribed hymns served fairly similar purposes to epigrams on reified prayer-offering, and both draw readers of different times and places into the original act of worship.[122]

---

[121] Cf. Bruss (2010a).
[122] Cf. e.g. Pulleyn (1997); van Straten (1976).

Chapter 5
Songs on stones: the inscribed hymns

5.1 The function of inscribed hymns

In this chapter, I turn to a set of hymns in lyric metres that were inscribed on stones and set up in sanctuaries.[1] This practice is first attested in the fourth century, although most of the extant inscriptions are from the imperial period. Dating the compositions is difficult, since the inscriptions may have been made much later, while some inscriptions may also be later copies or replacements of earlier texts. The main extant hymns are as follows:

- **at Erythrai**, in the Asklepieion, a single marble block with inscriptions on two sides, dating to around 380-360 BC. On one side is a *lex sacra* and the first part of a paean to Apollo,[2] which continues on the other side together with a paean to Asklepios[3] and one to Seleukos that was added later (iii BC).[4] The paean to Asklepios was reinscribed later at Athens (ii AD), Dion in Macedonia (ii AD), and Ptolemais in Egypt (i AD).
- **at Epidauros**, in the Asklepieion, four separate marble blocks with long metrical texts.[5] Three of these were inscribed in iii AD:

  (i) The so-called 'Cassel stone' is a beautiful, tall marble pillar, containing four or five separate paeans.[6] Some compositions may significantly pre-date the inscription: the second paean, Ariphron's *Hygieia,* is probably from the early-fourth century.[7]

---

[1] There has been very little attention to these hymns as literary texts, but cf. esp. Vamvouri Ruffy (2004), esp. 93-106, 167-216; LeVen (2008), 250-294; Fantuzzi (2010b); Kolde (2003) (predominantly on Isyllos of Epidauros). On the inscriptions as musical documents, cf. Pöhlmann and West (2001).
[2] *PMG* 933. For the *lex sacra*, see esp. Sokolowski (1955), no.24.
[3] *CA* 136-140; *PMG* 934; Wilamowitz (1909), 37-48; *I.Eryth* 2.205; Käppel (1992), no. 36-8; Furley and Bremer (2001) [*GH*], no. 6.1.1. Cf. Käppel (1992), 193-4; Rutherford (2001), 39-40.
[4] *CA* 140.
[5] For other fragments, cf. Wagman (1995), esp. 225-255.
[6] *IG* II² 4533. Cf. Maas (1933), 151-4 ('stone C' = Taf. III), who identifies five different hymns.
[7] *PMG* 813; Wagman (1995), 159-178; *GH* 6.3.

(ii) A second stone has two columns of inscription, with another copy of Ariphron's *Hygieia*, a hymn to Athena and what may be a hymn to Asklepios.[8]

(iii) A third stone, again inscribed in two columns, has the texts of a *Hymn to all the gods*, a *Hymn to Pan*, and a *Hymn to the mother of the gods*.[9] The date of the composition of these hymns is very uncertain.[10]

(iv) Finally, there is a very large block of marble with a single long inscription in various metres from the early-third century BC by a certain Isyllos: the text includes a dedication to Apollo Maleatas and Asklepios, a metrical *lex sacra,* a paean to Asklepios and some autobiographical information.[11]

- **at Athens,** two stones found in the Asklepieion.

  (i) The so-called Sarapion monument (ii-iii AD), a triangular block inscribed on all sides, including a paean of Sarapion himself, a version of the Erythraian *Paean to Asklepios*, and a paean ascribed to Sophocles.[12]

  (ii) A block datable to I AD, bears the paean of Makedonikos; the composition perhaps dates to around the first century BC.[13]

- **at Delphi**, several different inscribed blocks.

  (i) + (ii) Two stones found in the Athenian treasury contain hymns (to Hestia and Apollo) by the same author, a certain Aristonoos of Corinth, who is identified by a prose tag which also allows confident dating of the hymns to338/334 BC.[14]

---

[8] *IG* IV² 1.132-4; Cf. Maas (1933), 150-1 ('stone B') & Taf. II; Wagman (1995), 179-224, tav. VII-XI.
[9] *IG* IV² 1.129-131 + *SEG* 40.337; Cf. Maas (1933), 128-147 ('stone A') & Taf. I; Wagman (1995), 109-146, tav. I-VI. Cf. Powell (1933), 204-6. The hymns are respectively: *PMG* 937= *GH* 6.7; *PMG* 936 = *GH* 6.5; *PMG* 935= *GH* 6.2.
[10] The earliest of these could be the *Hymn to the mother of the gods*: cf. Wagman (1995), 107-8; cf. West (1970), 212-215, who dates it to iii BC. The *Hymn to all the gods* is likeliest to be imperial (cf. Wagman (1995), 59-60), and the *Hymn to Pan* from the Hadrianic period (cf. Latte (1913); Wagman (2000, 2002).
[11] *IG* IV ² 1.128; *CA* 132-6; Käppel (1992), no. 40; *GH* 6.4; Kolde (2003), 6-15. For discussion, cf. e.g. Wilamowitz (1886); Käppel (1992), 201-3; Stehle (1997), 132-7; Sineux (1999); Kolde (2002-3, 2003); LeVen (2008), 273-284.
[12] *IG* II² 2481; *SEG* 28.225; *PMG* 737 (b); *GH* 7.3 & 7.7.1-2. Cf. esp. Oliver (1936, 1940); Pritchett (1938); Oliver and Maas (1939). See also Geagan (1991).
[13] *IG* II² 4473, *SEG* 23.126, *CA* 139-140; Käppel (1992), no. 41; *GH* 7.5. Cf. also Faraone (2011); Pordomingo Pardo (1984), 121-3; Rutherford (2001), 41-2.

(iii) Another stone contains a *Paean to Dionysus* composed by Philodamos of Skarpheia (c. 340/339).[15]

(iii) Two more inscribed paeans, ascribed to Athenaios and Limenios (late ii AD).[16]

- **at Palaikastro in Crete**, five fragments of a single stone (inscribed iii AD), containing a *Hymn to Zeus*, which composition is datable to the end of the fourth century or early-third century BC.[17]
- **at Eretria (Euboea)**, an inscribed block found at the sanctuary of Egyptian deities, with a hymn addressed to the Idaian Dactyls.[18] The inscription and composition are perhaps both from the fourth century.

We will inevitably want to ask the purpose of such inscriptions. All apart from those at Crete and Eretria have some connection with the cults of Apollo and Asklepios, which might suggest that the practice is in some way linked to these cults and the genre of the paean. Aristonoos's *Hymn to Hestia* may reflect aspects of the Apolline cult at Delphi, while the hymns to other gods in the sanctuary at Epidauros can easily be explained as a process of adding other gods to the healing group; indeed, the *Hymn to all the gods* mentions Asklepios (*PMG* 937.5). The hymns from Crete and Eretria may either be later imitations of the practice at Delphi and the Asklepieia, or examples of a different, otherwise unknown tradition.

The inscriptions themselves may offer a few clues about their function. On two of the Epidaurian hymns, there seem to be instructions for performance at fixed times: [ὥρᾳ πρώτηι] has been restored on Ariphron's *Hymn to Hygieia*; ὥρᾳ τρίτηι is clearly legible on *IG* IV² 1, 134.

---

[14] *FD* III 2.191-2; *CA* 162-4; Käppel (1992), no. 42; *GH* 2.3-4. Fairbanks (1900), 112-119, prefers a date of c.230 BC, based on identifying the poet with a later *kitharoidos* of the same name, but cf. Crusius (1894); West (1992), 139, n.7; Rutherford (2001), 28-9 & n.22; Vamvouri Ruffy (2004), 211-15. For discussion, see also Audiat (1932); Panagl (1969, 1970); Danielewicz (1978); LeVen (2008), 258-266.

[15] *CA* 165-171; Käppel (1992), no. 39; *GH* 2.5. Cf. also Marcovich (1975); Weil (1895, 1897). For discussion, see esp. Weil (1895, 1897); Fairbanks (1900), 139-153; Rainer (1975); Stewart (1982); Käppel (1992), 207-284; Schröder (1999), 77-96; LeVen (2008), 284-293.

[16] *CA* 141-148, 149-159; *GH* 2.6.1-2.

[17] *ICret.*III 2.2, *SEG* 28.751; *GH* 1.1. Cf. Murray (1910); Powell (1933), 49-53; Guarducci (1983), 38-44; West (1965). See also Perlman (1995); Alonge (2005, 2006).

[18] *IG* XII 9.259; *CA* 171–3.

This suggests that the inscriptions acted as ritual prompt-texts for visitors to the sanctuary, a sort of prayer formulary.[19] Admittedly these inscriptions post-date the fourth century, so this may simply be a later practice, but the Erythraian paeans, which are fourth-century, occur alongside a *lex sacra* that commands the performance of paeans:

> παιωνίζειν πρῶτον περὶ τὸμ βωμὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸνδε τὸμ παιῶνα ἐς τρίς (*I.Eryth.* 2.205.34-5).[20]

Isyllos also included a *lex sacra* with his paean inscribed at Epidauros in the late-fourth century (B, 10-26). Therefore, the inscribed hymns seem closely related to ritual law, which suggests that the stones need to be understood as part of the cultic reception of *theōriai*:[21] the song is to be re-performed by delegate *choroi*, or perhaps admired by individual *hiketai*.[22] At any rate, they envisage re-performance, which I argue here is important for understanding the self-presentation of the songs.

The inscribed hymns may be associated primarily with the healing cults and Delphic Apollo because of the great popularity of these cults in the fourth century. The earliest inscriptions coincide with the establishment of new healing cults (as at Erythrai) or the renovation of old ones (as at Epidauros in the late-fifth century);[23] Sophocles reportedly composed his paean for the reception of Akslepios at Athens.[24] It may not be too fanciful to associate inscribed hymns at Delphi with late fourth-century Amphictyony.[25] Such sites inevitably sought to regulate ritual activity for their constant flow of *choroi*.[26] The *iamata* at Epidauros show

---

[19] So Klinghardt (1999).
[20] See esp. Sokolowski (1955), no. 24; Käppel (1992), 189-193. For a comparison of other such texts, cf. e.g. Kolde (2003), 107-113.
[21] On cultic *theōria*, cf. e.g. Dillon (1997); Rutherford (2000, 2004); Kowalzig (2005). On Epidauros, see esp. Naiden (2005); on Delphi, see e.g. Arnush (2005); Furley and Bremer (2001), 77-8.
[22] On the distinction between *theōroi* and *hiketai*, see esp. Naiden (2005). For choral performances of *theōria*, see e.g. Kowalzig (2005).
[23] On the fourth-century building programme at Epidauros, cf. esp. Melfi (2007), 23-59.
[24] Cf. Connelly (1998) for a useful discussion of this tradition. On the Asklepieion in Athens, see esp. Aleshire (1989); Riethmüller (2005), 241-278.
[25] Cf. Elsner and Rutherford (2005), 15; cf. Kowalzig (2005).
[26] On written regulation, cf. e.g. Gagarin (2008); on its role in cults in the reception of *theōria*, cf. e.g. Dillon (1997), 149-182.

a different possible motivation, namely to form part of the visual narrative that greets a suppliant at the sanctuary.[27]

If these hymns were indeed directed at ritual *theōroi*, the genre of paean especially may have provided an opportunity to invoke the gods for communal well-being (whereas the epigrams tend to focus on individual healing).[28] Nearly all the inscribed hymns feature the *παιάν*-cry (*ἰὴ Παιάν*), which is sometimes visually set apart on the stone.[29] Although the generic development and significance of this cry is disputed,[30] it is a fair guess that longer hymns emerged out of this basic utterance: practically all paeans contain some form of the *παιάν*-cry, or at least the word *παιάν* or its derivatives.[31] Originating probably as an invocation of a god, Paian, it later becomes chiefly associated with Apollo and his entourage (including Asklepios).[32] This utterance seems to be connected with the well-being of the *polis*, either as a battle-cry or with an apotropaic function.[33] Those who shout out *ἰὴ Παιάν* petition or thank the god on behalf of the community; inscriptions allow for delegates to renew this invocation in perpetuity.

Isyllos intriguingly also claims that the Delphic oracle had told him that inscribing the paean would be beneficial for Isyllos, 'both immediately and afterwards', *λώϊόν οἵ κα εἴμεν ἀγγράφοντι καὶ αὐτίκα εἰς τὸν ὕστερον χρόνον* (D, 35-6). This is suggestive of the sort of

---

[27] Cf. e.g. *IG* IV² 1.121.23-5, *θεωρῶν δὲ τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἱαρῷ πίνακας ἀπίστει τοῖς ἰάμασιν καὶ ὑποδιέσυρε τὰ ἐπιγράμματα*. Cf. Dillon (1994); Naiden (2005); above, ch.4.2. For 'seeing' as an important element of pilgrimage, cf. esp. Rutherford (2000), although note the cautionary words of Scullion (2005).

[28] On the genre of the paean, see esp. Fairbanks (1900); Deubner (1919); Käppel (1992); Schröder (1999); Rutherford (2001), 3-136

[29] Cf. Faraone (2011), and below on the Erythraian paeans.

[30] See e.g. Schröder (1999), esp. 10-49, *contra* Käppel (1992), esp. 156-189. Rutherford (2001) provides a useful overview of the scholarship.

[31] Cf. e.g. Bacch. *O.*17.129, where the cry is absent but a verbal form is included. The verbal forms are also found in e.g. Thuc. 4.43.3, 6.32.2; Xen. *Hell.*7.2.15, *An.*4.3.29.

[32] Deubner (1919), whose thesis has recently been revived and modified by Schröder (1999), 10-49, claimed there had been no addressee originally. However, Linear B tablets have revealed a Mycenaean deity called Paiewon (cf. the Cretan *paieones*, *h.Hom.Ap.*517ff: see Huxley (1975)). 'Paieon' seems to be retained as a distinct deity related to healing in Homer and Archaic lyric: cf. e.g. Rutherford (2001), 11-12 & n.6, and 15-17 for a plausible account of the stages of development.

[33] See Rutherford (2001), 36-58, for a list of possible circumstances for paean performances apart from the Apolline cult. These can be reduced, aside from cultic scenarios, broadly to the following: (i) apotropaic prayer (ii) victory celebration (perh. derived from prayer for continued good fortune) (iii) an intermediate scenario, i.e. the *symposion-paian*. Rutherford's connection of Paiewon with battle on the basis of the Linear B tablet *KN* v 52 (*id.* 14-5) is attractive but hardly strong.

transaction and reciprocity that takes place between a dedicator and god, and implies that hymns too can be a type of *dedicandum*:[34] poetic skill corresponds to the artistic merit of votive artefacts,[35] and inscribing the text reifies the poem so that it can be seen as a material offering.[36] A possible example of this idea may be the reported inscription of Pindar's *Olympian* 7 in gold leaf in a temple of Athena at Lindos: the use of precious material implies that the text was an offering to the goddess rather than for mortal readership.[37] Isyllos begins his inscription with a votive formula, Σωκράτευς Ἐπιδαύριος ἀνέθηκε / Ἀπόλλωνι Μαλεάται καὶ Ἀσκλαπιῶι (A, 1-2), which implies that the entire block is to be seen as a dedication. As I have said about epigrams, the subsequent re-reading of inscribed texts allows the original speech-act to be renewed and appropriated, καὶ αὐτίκα εἰς τὸν ὕστερον χρόνον.

The voice of the early inscribed hymns is restrained and largely conditioned by the requirements of presenting a simple prayer that can be repeated by worshippers. In the next section I look at this basic paradigm as represented especially by the Erythraian paeans, before turning to some more complex and self-conscious examples from later in the fourth century.

5.2 Ritual paradigm

The inscriptions at Erythrai are relatively simple in form and dominated by the paeanic refrain. For Käppel, this indicates an 'Automatisierung des Konstruktionsprinzips';[38] Schröder and Rutherford have each preferred to see these hymns as a reflection of a simpler form that may pre-date the great classical works.[39] However, inscriptions are not necessarily good evidence for the performed paean: only the simplest and shortest texts may have been deemed suitable for

---

[34] Cf. esp. Depew (2000), 76-7.
[35] So Depew (2000), 61.
[36] The curse tablets, which date from around the 5th cent., seem to be an example of object-offerings where the written text has more value than the thing it is written on. Cf. Faraone (1991).
[37] *FGrH* 515 F18. I am reminded of the practice in certain Catholic and Orthodox churches of inscribing or painting sacred texts at a height and position impossible for anyone to read: the words are meant for God alone.
[38] Käppel (1992), 189-206.
[39] Schröder (1999), 64-76; Rutherford (2001).

inscription,[40] while choruses could have continued to perform longer and more musically elaborate paeans. If the inscribing of hymns reflects a particular sacral function, then it is fair to consider these songs as belonging to their own sub-genre, and not to a stage of the development of the paean.

The inscriptions, as I have said, provide a paradigm for theoric re-utterance of the *παιάν*-cry. The Erythraian *Paean to Apollo* revolves around the basic form of this cry (*ἰὴ* Παιών, *ὦ ἰὴ* Παιών), which opens the hymn and is repeated three times, followed by a petition to Apollo which indicates the apotropaic function of the cry, [*ὦ*] *ἄναξ Ἄπολλον φείδεο κούρων / φείδ*[*εο*. The rest is highly mutilated, but was evidently brief and repetitive: the *παιάν*-cry occurs at least four more times. Something or someone is called *εὔκαρπος*,[41] which together with references to the Horai and Delphi suggests themes found later in Callimachus's *Hymn to Apollo*:

> *ἰὴ ἰὴ* Καρνεῖε *πολύλλιτε, σεῖο δὲ βωμοί*
> *ἄνθεα μὲν φορέουσιν ἐν εἴαρι τόσσα περ Ὧραι*
> *ποικίλ' ἀγινεῦσι ζεφύρου πνείοντος ἐέρσην,*
> *χείματι δὲ κρόκον ἡδύν* (Callim. *h.*2.80-4).

We may speculate that these themes in the inscription concerned the arrival of the cult in Erythrai from Delphi.

The *Paean to Asklepios* on the same stone is better preserved and more developed. Christopher Faraone has argued that the stonecutter's original layout may be preferable to the lyric colometry imposed by most modern editors:[42] this provides us with three stanzas, each of three dactylic segments,[43] which are rounded off by the *παιάν*-cry; each stanza is completed by a refrain:

> [Παιᾶνα *κλυτό*]*μητιν ἀείσατε* || *κοῦροι*, [Λατοΐδαν Ἔκ]*ατον*,

---

[40] The question of musical notation and performance arises: some later inscriptions have musical notation. Cf. e.g. West (1986).
[41] Perh. cf. Pi. *Pae.* 2 fr. 52b.26 S-M; *Pyth.*1.30.
[42] Faraone (2011), following the drawing at Wilamowitz (1909), 39.
[43] Standard modern colometry is indicated by | |, *pace* Faraone (2011).

ἰὲ Παιάν,

ὃς μέγα χάρ[μα βροτοῖσ]ιν ἐγείνατο ‖ μιχθεὶς ἐμ φι[λότητι Κορ]ωνίδι ‖

ἐν γαῖ τâι Φλεγυείαι, ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἀσκληπιὸν

δαίμονα κλεινό[τατ]ον,

ἰὲ Παιάν,

[το]ῦ δὲ καὶ ἐξεγένοντο Μαχάων ‖καὶ Πο[δα]λείριος ἠδ' Ἰασώ,

ἰὲ Παιάν,

Αἴγλ[α τ'] ἐοῶπις Πανάκειά τε ‖ Ἠπιόνας παῖδες σὺν ἀγακλυτῶι ‖

ἐοαγεῖ Ὑγιείαι, ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἀσκληπιὸν

δαίμονα κλεινότατον, ἰὲ Παιάν,

χαῖρέ μοι, ἵλαος δ' ἐπινίσεο‖τὰν ἐμὰν πόλιν εὐρύχορον,

ἰὲ Παιάν,

δὸς δ' ἡμᾶς χαίροντας ὁρᾶν φάος ‖ ἀελίου δοκίμους σὺν ἀγακλυτῶι ‖

ἐοαγεῖ Ὑγιείαι ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἀσκληπιὸν

δαίμονα κλεινότατον, ἰὲ Παιάν (*GH* 6.1).

The poem is in simple and conventional hymn form: invocation, argument, prayer.[44] The expressions are highly traditional and restrained, and much of the diction is reminiscent of earlier hymns and prayers.[45] It is once again repetitive, with the segment-end *παιάν*-cry and its more extended form at each stanza-end; in stanzas 2 and 3 the repetition extends into the phrase introducing the refrain, ἐοαγεῖ Ὑγιείαι, which is in turn a close-sounding variant on the first

[44] On hymnic structures, cf. Norden (1913); Keyssner (1932); Bremer (1981); Devlin (1994).

[45] There are numerous parallels. E.g. for line 1, cf. *h.Hom.Heph.*1, Ἥφαιστον κλυτόμητιν ἀείδεο; on 2, Soph. fr. 754.3 Radt, (Demeter) βροτοῖσι χάρμα δωρεῖται φίλον, Bacch. *O.*10.13 SM, ἀνθρώποισιν εἴη χάρμα, Xenophanes fr. 2.20 W (a victory that does not benefit the *polis* is a small joy only), Hesiod fr.239.1 West-Merkelbach (Dionysus, as Hom. *Il.*14.239), Hom. *Il.*6.82 etc (and cf. Philoxenos, *PMG* 836e5). On line 4, cf. esp. *h.Hom.Diosc.*5, μιχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότητι κελαινεφέϊ Κρονίωνι, but also *h.Hom.Herc.*3, Hes.*Th.*923, 941, 944 (etc.). Line 8, ὁρᾶν φάος /ἀελίου, recalls epitaphic formulae (see above, ch.3.3).

stanza, *ἐν γâι τâι* **Φλεγυείαι**. Although the relative pronoun (*ὅς*, 2) leads into a brief genealogy,[46] there is no significant narrative.

The mention of Paian Apollo in the first stanza forms a direct link with the preceding hymn. The second stanza situates Asklepios in the context of the healing gods, marking the transition from Apollo to Asklepios, who is finally invoked and petitioned in the final stanza.[47] The speaker here calls Asklepios *ἵλαος*, which is common in prayers for divine favour:[48] this is a prayer on behalf of the speaker's own *polis*, for the *politai* to receive fame and health (personified Hygieia).[49] Both hymns are thus concerned with benefits to the community, represented by the performing *kouroi*, who are to be protected by Apollo and helped by Asklepios.

The speaker, as often in archaic and classical cult songs, can be seen as the chorus leader, who exhorts the *kouroi* to song and dance in the *hic et nunc* of cult ritual:[50] the inscribed text allows this voice to be appropriated by new *choroi* at other times. In the same way that the object 'speaks' in inscribed epigram, here the stone itself seems to be leading the new choric song: in the *Paean to Asklepios*, the imperative *ἀείσατε* (1) reads in continuity with the instructions of the *lex sacra* as a command to the reader, who becomes re-performer. The ritual law is fulfilled by reading out the text. The *polis* is unnamed, allowing identification with the performing *choros* (*ἐμὰν πόλιν εὐρύχορον*, 7).

This basic paradigm is found in a number of other inscriptions: the dactylic paeans of Sophocles and Makedonikos at Athens[51] seem closely related to the Erythraian paeans, which were indeed re-inscribed in other locations with slight variations. Another paeanic inscription with a similarly restrained voice is Aristonoos's *Hymn to Pythian Apollo*.[52] This was found near the

---

[46] On this device, cf. Norden (1913), 166-176. On the myth of Apollo and Koronis, cf. esp. Pi.*Pyth.*3; the extant part of the paean of Sophocles appears to allude to the same myth.
[47] LeVen (2008), 269-271, argues that this signifies the 'legitimization of the use of the paean cry for Asclepius'.
[48] Cf. e.g. Hom.*Il.*1.583; *h.Hom.Vest.* 10; Pi. *Ol.*3.334, *Pyth.*12.4; Soph. *OC* 1480; Theoc. *Id.*15.143.
[49] Cf. e.g Theogn. 780-1 W, *ἀλλὰ σύ*, **Φοῖβε**, / *ἵλαος ἡμετέρην τήνδε φύλασσε πόλιν*.
[50] Cf. e.g. Danielewicz (1990); D'Alessio (2004); Calame and Clay (2004).
[51] See esp. Faraone (2011).
[52] The prose-tag calls this poem a *ὕμνος*, but this term could incorporate 'paean': cf. Didymos at Orion 155-6 Sturz, *ὥς γένος ἀπὸ εἶδος*; cf. Furley (1995), 32; Harvey (1955); Käppel (1992), 62-5 *et passim*. For non-paeanic hymns to Apollo, cf. *h.Hom.Ap.*, Callim. *h.*2, Simias *Apollo* etc.

Athenian treasury, which may indicate that it was composed for an Athenian festival chorus, perhaps at the Delphic Septerion,[53] although stronger evidence is lacking. The text is as follows:

Πυθίαν ἱερόκτιτον
ναίων Δελφίδ' ἀμφὶ πέτραν
ἀεὶ θεσπιόμαντιν ἕ-
δραν, ἰὴ ἰὲ Παιάν,
Ἄπολλον, Κοίου τε κόρας
Λατοῦς σεμνὸν ἄγαλμα καὶ
Ζηνὸς ὑψίστου μακάρων
βουλαῖς, ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν.

Ἔνθ' ἀπὸ τριπόδων θεο-
κτήτων, χλ[ω]ρότομον δάφναν
σείων, μαντοσύναν ἐποι-
χνεῖς, ἰὴ ἰὲ Παιάν,
φρικώεντος ἐξ ἀδύτου
μελλόντων θέμιν εὐσεβῆ
χρησμοῖς εὐφθόγγου τε λύρας
αὐδαῖς, ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν.

Ἁγνισθεὶς ἐνὶ Τέμπεσιν
βουλαῖς Ζηνὸς ὑπειρόχου,
ἐπεὶ Παλλὰς ἔπεμψε Πυ-

[53] Rutherford (2001), 29, following Weil (1893) and Fairbanks (1900), 115. Cf. also Fantuzzi (2010b), 194. Rutherford *loc. cit.* also draws attention to the role of Athena in the poem, suggesting an Athenian connection (so Crusius (1884), 24). However, it is possible that the stone was not found in its original location (cf. Audiat (1932), and the *subscriptio* does not allow us to reconstruct any further information: cf. Furley and Bremer (2001), i 120-1, who suggest a performance at the Theoxenia.

θῶδ', [ἰὴ] ἰὲ Παιάν,
πείσας Γαῖαν ἀνθοτρόφον
Θέμιν τ' εὐπλόκαμον θεὰν
[αἰ]ὲν εὐλιβάνους ἕδρας
ἔχεις, ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν.

Ὅθεν Τριτογενῆ προναί-
αν ἐμ μαντείοις ἁ[γί]οις
σέβων ἀθανάτοις ἀμοι-
[β]αῖς, ἰὴ ἰὲ Παιάν,
χάριν παλαιᾶν χαρίτων
τᾶν τότ' ἀϊδίους ἔχων
μνήμας, ὑψίστα<ι>ς ἐφέπεις
τιμαῖς, ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν.

Δωροῦντ[αι] δέ σ' ἀθάνατοι,
Ποσειδῶν ἁγνοῖς δαπέδοις,
Νύμφαι Κωρυκίοισιν ἄν-
τροις, ἰὴ ἰὲ Παιάν,
τριετέσιν φαναῖς Βρόμιος,
σεμνὰ δ' Ἄρτεμις εὐπόνοις
κυνῶν ἐμ φυλακαῖς ἔχει
τόπους, ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν.

Ἀλλ' ὦ Παρνασσοῦ γυάλων
εὐδρόσοισι Κασταλίας

να[σ]μοῖς σὸν δέμας ἐξαβρύ-
νων, ἰὴ ἰὲ Παιάν,
χαρεὶς ὕμνοις ἡμετέροις,
ὄλβον ἐξ ὁσίων διδοὺς
ἀεὶ καὶ σῴζων ἐφέποις
ἡμᾶς, ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν (*GH* 2.4).

The poem is much longer than the Erythraian paeans, with six stanzas each rounded off with the *παιάν*-cry (ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν); this also occurs as a *meshymnion* (ἰὴ ἰὲ Παιάν). It is metrically straightforward, with a plain run of regularised glyconics and pherecratean period-endings.[54] The basic tripartite structure[55] is elaborated in the development section with a short narrative about Apollo's arrival at Delphi, although the second-person is retained throughout so that we never stray far from the initial invocation: there is no detailed aetiology for example. Innovative diction and artful construction suggests a sophisticated poetic voice;[56] an allusion to the purification after the slaying of Pytho implies authorial selectivity – the more grisly details are avoided[57] – and a preference for a restrained style.

Reciprocity is an important theme.[58] Apollo is helped by fellow gods to obtain the seat at Delphi; in return, Athena is granted a place in the cult: the entire fourth stanza concerns their ongoing *χάρις*-relationship, while the fifth stanza talks about the gifts of other gods to Apollo at Delphi. This mirrors the relationship between worshipper and god: the hymn is offered in exchange for the god's favour:[59] Apollo's anticipated reaction to the hymn (*χαρεὶς ὕμνοις ἡμετέροις*, 45) corresponds to his gratitude to the gifts of the gods; his reciprocal favour is like his return gift to Athena (*ὄλβον ἐξ ὁσίων διδοὺς* , 46: cf. also 47-8, *ἐφέποις* / *ἡμᾶς* with 31-2,

[54] See Crusius (1883); West (1982), 141. Käppel (1992), 76-9, has a useful breakdown of paean metres; cf. also Parker (2001), 32-5.
[55] So Rutherford (2001), 29.
[56] On this point, see esp. LeVen (2008), 262, who notes a number of *hapaces* (sic).
[57] Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) ii 49.
[58] See esp. Vamvouri Ruffy (2004), 94-6.
[59] Cf. Fantuzzi (2010b), 194.

ὑψίστα<ι>ς ἐφέπεις / τιμαῖς).[60] Inscribing the hymn with the author's name allows this text to act as a physical votive gift, and grants Aristonoos a permanent place in the cult, much as Apollo rewards Athena. The *subscriptio* preserves the *memoria* of the original dedication of this song, but subsequent readers renew the gift-exchange with Apollo by re-performing the act of praise: the hymn becomes their own song (cf. 45, χαρεὶς ὕμνοις ἡμετέροις).

Found together with this paean is another composition ascribed to Aristonoos, a short, monostrophic hymn in dactylo-epitrite which is addressed to Hestia:

ἱερὰν ἱερῶν ἄνασσαν
Ἑστίαν ὑμνήσομεν, ἃ καὶ Ὄλυμπον
καὶ μυχὸν γαίας μεσόμφαλον ἀεὶ
Πυθίαν τε δάφναν κατέχουσα,
ναὸν ἀν' ὑψίπυλον Φοίβου χορεύεις
τερπομένα τριπόδων θεσπίσμασι,
καὶ χρυσέαν φόρμιγγ' Ἀπόλλων
ὀπηνίκ' ἂν ἑπτάτονον
κρέκων μετὰ σοῦ θαλιάζον-
τας θεοὺς ὕμνοισιν αὔξῃ.
Χαῖρε Κρόνου θύγατερ
καὶ Ῥέας, μούνα πυρὸς ἀμφιέπουσα
βωμοὺς ἀθανάτων ἐριτίμους,
Ἑστία, δίδου δ' ἀμοιβὰς
ἐξ ὁσίων πολὺν ἡμᾶς
ὄλβον ἔχοντας ἀεὶ λιπαρόθρονον
ἀμφὶ σὰν θυμέλαν χορεύειν (*GH* 2.3).

[60] Perhaps also cf. 42-3, which may be an allusion to the ritual activity of fetching water from the Kastalian Spring: so Furley and Bremer (2001), ii 52.

Although Hestia, the daughter of Kronos and Rhea (cf. 10-11), was already a well-established goddess,[61] and was the object of sacrifices in the *prytaneion*,[62] she seems not to have enjoyed independent cult worship: there are few attestations of a priesthood for Hestia, for example.[63] Rather, she typically took a share in the offerings to other gods, and is often the first invoked in litanies.[64] Thus this inscription probably belongs to the Apolline cult: at Delphi, she was worshipped in common with Apollo and Poseidon.[65] Hestia is the hearth of Apollo's abode, the *omphalos* of the world:[66] in a choral hymn to Athena in Euripides' *Ion*, which shares many linguistic features with the Aristonoos inscription, the *hestia* is the location for Apolline prophecy and worship (Eur. *Ion* 459-464).[67] In Aristonoos' hymn, Hestia is depicted as actively engaging in worship of Apollo (*ναὸν ἀν' ὑψίπυλον Φοίβου χορεύεις*, 5); she joins him to celebrate other gods (*μετὰ σοῦ θαλιάζον-/-τας θεοὺς ὕμνοισιν αὔξῃ*, 9-10). The worshippers dance around her throne, as she in turn dances for and with Apollo (cf. 16, *ἀμφὶ σὰν θυμέλαν χορεύειν*). Such themes make the song suitable as a prelude to worshipping other gods, especially Apollo, perhaps even with Aristonoos's own *Hymn to Apollo*.

The language of the hymn is conventional but sophisticated, with an emphasis on singing and dancing. The future, *ὑμνήσομεν*, is characteristic of Pindaric openings, where it typically refers to the rest of the ode (it creates the fiction that the song has not yet started),[68] although perhaps it is also possible to take it literally as an anticipation of the future re-performance of the inscription: there is in fact a distinct absence of references to the *hic et nunc*.[69] The hymn will be sung and re-sung in reciprocity with Hestia.

---

[61] Cf. Hes.*Th.* 453, etc.; *h.Hom.*24; Apollod. 1.1.5.
[62] Cf. esp. Merkelbach (1996), 52-66.
[63] Cf. Kajava (2004).
[64] Hesych. *s. v. ἀφ' Ἑστίας ἀρχόμενος*. Cf *h.Hom.*32. *5;* Pi. *Nem.*6. 5*;* Plat. *Crat.* 401d*;* Paus.5. 14. 5*;* Schol. in Ar. *Vesp.* 842.
[65] As at Olympia: cf. Paus. 5.26.26; 10.5.3; *h.Hom.* 31. 2. The descriptions of Delphi are almost formulaic: cf. *h.Hom.Ap.*, Pi. *Pyth.*6.
[66] Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001), i 117. For further discussion see e.g. Merkelbach (1996); Kajava (2004).
[67] Cf. also Aesch. *Ag.*1056; Eur. *Andr.*1066. See LeVen (2008), 260, who traces further traditional features in the language.
[68] See esp. Pfeiffer (1999), 33-44. Cf. D'Alessio (2004), 275-6, for criticism of Pfeiffer's analysis.
[69] Cf. LeVen (2008), 260-1.

5.3 A literary voice: the paeans of Philodamos and Isyllos

The basic, almost sub-literary form is expanded in a couple of late fourth-century inscriptions that show a degree of self-referentiality that is familiar from Pindaric lyric, for example.[70] This may be taken as a sign of literary pretensions and an increased authorial presence in the poetic voice.

The first example is the *Paean to Dionysus*, composed by Philodamos of Skarpheia. The stone, now lost, contained two columns of fifty lines each,[71] and a prose *subscriptio* which includes the title and reports rewards for the composition to Philodamos and his family from the Delphians. This *subscriptio* allows us to date the inscription (and presumably the composition) to 340/339 BC.[72] Internal evidence suggests it was composed for the Delphic Theoxenia;[73] it is also seemingly associated with the rebuilding of Apollo's temple in Delphi (c. 370-320).[74] The script was in a loose stoichedon, without colometric division or *paragraphoi*, but each stanza began on a new line.[75] The six aeolo-choriambic stanzas are subdivided further by a paeanic refrain in a different metre: line 5 (etc.) is ionic, or perhaps asclepiadic; an ionic sets apart the end-of-stanza refrain at line 11 (etc.) before two more aeolo-choriambic lines.[76]

The poem's genre has stirred much interest: Dionysus is not customarily addressed with paeans.[77] However, a strict opposition between paeans for Apollo and dithyrambs for Dionysus may be artificial:[78] at Delphi in particular, there may have been much more fluidity.[79] Worship of

---

[70] On this technique in classical choral poetry cf. esp. Henrichs (1994/5); Calame and Clay (2004).
[71] See esp. Weil (1895, 1897); Vollgraff (1924, 1925); Sokolowski (1936). Parts of the text are missing: Vallois (1931) provided some fanciful supplements, but cf. esp. Rainer (1975).
[72] See Furley and Bremer (2001), i 124-6.
[73] Cf. Pi. *Pae.*6 fr.60-61S-M.
[74] Cf. Stewart (1986); Furley and Bremer (2001), i 125-6.
[75] I follow the description of Furley and Bremer (2001), i 123-4.
[76] For discussion of the metre, cf. esp. Parker (2001), 33; Furley and Bremer (2001), ii 57-8.
[77] See esp. Käppel (1992), 207-284; Schröder (1999), 77-96; Rutherford (2001), 134-5.
[78] On this Nietzschean hermeneutic, see e.g. Detienne (2001).
[79] See e.g. Otto (1965), 202-9; Rainer (1975), 149-150; Stewart (1986); Clay (1996).

Dionysus alongside Apollo at Delphi is prophesied by Teiresias in Euripides' *Bacchae*;[80] the rebuilt temple of Apollo seemingly depicted both gods on the pediments, Dionysus even with an Apolline *kithara*.[81] Dionysus was apparently worshipped in the winter months, during Apollo's absence, at which time he no doubt took over the 'paeanic' role of protector of the *polis*.

Even so, this *παιάν*-cry addressed to Dionysus is unique, and indeed the paean seems suited *not* for the winter celebration of Delphic Dionysus but for the spring Theoxenia (cf. lines 110-111, and 3-4, *ἠρινα*[*ῖς ἱκοῦ ταῖσδ'*] *ἱεραῖς ἐν ὥραις*).[82] The festival perhaps offered an opportunity for the gods to share attributes as join protectors of the *polis*: addressing Dionysus as **Παιάν** is not so much a development of the genre[83] as a reinvention of Dionysus, who is 'Apollinized'.[84]

The paean's opening is remarkably dithyramb-like:

> [δεῦρ' ἄνα] **Διθύραμβε**, **Βάκχ'**,
>
> **Ε**[ὔιε, **Τα**ῦρε **κ**]ι̣σ̣σ̣ο̣χαΐ-
>
> *τα*, **Βρόμι'**,… (1-3).

The use of **Διθύραμβος** in particular is striking, as is the presence of the **Εὐοῖ**-cry: both must have sounded odd in a paean, especially when the *παιάν*-cry itself in the *meshymnion* (5) is combined with the 'dithyrambic' **Εὐοῖ**-cry:

> **Εὐοῖ** *ὦ ἰὼ* **Βάκχ'**, *ὦ ἰὲ* **Παιάν**.

A reader encountering this hymn in an inscription[85] would be left with the impression of something half dithyrambic, half paeanic: it must have made an even more stronger impression if read in or near the rebuilt Apolline temple with the gods paired on the pediments. Only the

---

[80] Eur. *Ba.*306-10; cf. *Phoen.*226-38, where Delphi is evoked as the panhellenic cult of Dionysus. Otto (1965), 203, observes that vases are attested from the late-fifth century showing Apollo and Dionysus together: an example is provided by Furley and Bremer (2001), 128, fig. 2.3.
[81] So Stewart (1982).
[82] So Furley and Bremer (2001), i 127, ii 60. All quotations and supplements from Furley and Bremer (2001), no.2.5.
[83] As e.g. Käppel (1992), 207-284.
[84] Cf. LeVen (2008), 284-291: e.g. at 291: 'Philodamus does not apply the "form" that sings Apollo to celebrate Dionysus but constructs a framework to call the god paean by mixing the imagery and narrative used for the two gods.'
[85] As Schröder (1999), 77-96, observers, the genre would be obvious to the audience of a performed song.

stanza-end refrain is more conventionally 'paeanic': here we find the traditional role of Paian as the saviour-god:[86]

> Ἰὲ Παιάν, ἴθι σωτήρ,
> εὔφρων τάνδε πόλιν φύλασσ'
> εὐαίωνι σὺν ὄλβῳ (11-13).

The poem's structure may have reflected the reinvention of Dionysus: the two columns on the stone suggest a division into two halves, which may suggest a progression from the Dionysian (in past-tense, aetiological narrative about his traditional cults: cf. 6, ὃν… ποτ') to the instantiation of the cult under Apollo at Delphi (in the present tense).

The narrative of the god's birth from Thyona (Semele) in Thebes, introduced in the first stanza, and the references to dancing (9-10) are typical material for Dionysus-worship; the god is invoked as [ὦ Β]άκχιε. Perhaps using the less common Thyona in place of Semele and the adjective καλλίπαις (otherwise only for Leto) avoid overloading the dithyrambic associations, [87] if there were any; even so, the second stanza emphasises traditional bacchic activity and geography:

> ἃν τότε βακχίαζε μὲν
> χθὼ[ν….] τε Κάδ-
> μου Μινυᾶν τε κόλπ[ος Εὔ-
> βο]ιά τε καλλίκαρπος (14-17).

But after the *meshymnion* (18), the song looks ahead to Dionysus at Delphi among Delphian dancers. There is now more 'Apolline' diction:

> πᾶσα δ' ὑμνοβρυὴς χόρευ-
> εν [Δελφῶ]ν ἱερὰ μάκαιρα χώρα·
> αὐτὸς δ' ἀστερόεν δέμας
> φαίνων Δελφίσι σὺν κόραι[ς

[86] For εὐαίωνι σὺν ὄλβῳ in paeans cf. e.g. Eur. *Ion* 126-8, 141-3; Timoth. *Pers.* fr.791.238 Hordern.
[87] So Furley and Bremer (2001), ii 61-2.

Παρν]ασσοῦ πτύχας ἔστας (19-23).

This anticipates the paeanic worship of Dionysus at Delphi thematized in the second half; in the rest of the (much mutilated) first half, there seems to be a narrative of the arrival of the Dionysus cult at various locations: the god is invoked as Iakchos at Eleusis (27-36), with seemingly ecstatic worship; the fourth stanza, which is largely lost, presumably described worship somewhere else (the first line has reads […]δὲ καὶ χοροῖς, implying more song and dance), before an arrival in Thessaly in the fifth stanza. This has the effect of building up Dionysus's arrival at Delphi, which is eagerly anticipated by the worshippers there: the next three stanzas are mostly lost, but it is a fair guess that these described the god coming to Delphi. [88]

In the third and fifth stanzas there are hints of Dionysus's role at Delphi: he is established as a god that relieves mortal suffering, [89] βροτοῖς πόνων / ὦι̑ξ[ας ὄρ]μον [ἄμοχθον] (35-6), which corresponds to the more Apolline healing cult. In Thessaly, which had contemporary political associations with Delphi through the Amphictyonic league,[90] Dionysus is celebrated by 'the Muses crowned with ivy', who call on him as Paian:

Μοῦσαι δ' αὐτίκα παρθένοι

κ[ισσῶι] στεψάμεναι κύκλωι σε πᾶσαι

μ[έλψαν] ἀθάνα[το]ν ἐς ἀεὶ

Παιᾶν εὐκλέα τ' ὀ[πὶ κλέο]υ-

σαι, [κα]τᾶρξε δ' Ἀπόλλων (58-62).

The allusion to the circular chorus in 59 retains a bacchic element (cf. 133-4), but in line 62, it is made clear that this is Apollo's dance: Dionysus is now being treated as a fellow 'saviour of the *polis*', and is thus gradually brought into Apollo's sphere, which reaches its fulfilment at Delphi.

Stanzas IX-XII are characterised by present tenses (e.g. κελεύ/ει, 106-7). In the ninth stanza, as in the fifth, the god instructs paeanic ritual for Dionysus, but the present tense lends it

---

[88] Cf. Käppel (1992), 249-252.
[89] Cf. also Käppel (1992), 237-243: 'Dionysus-Iakchos als Soter'.
[90] Cf. the Daochos monument, a symbol of Thessalian power at Delphi (ch.4 above).

a sense of cultic immediacy: the stanza reads as a sort of poetic *lex sacra* for ritual in the *hic et nunc*. Now Dionysus is afforded distinctively Apolline attributes. There is a direct reference to the building of Apollo's temple, which makes the present generation 'blessed':

ὦ μάκαρ ὀλβία τε κεί-
νων γεν̣[εὰ] βροτῶν, ἀγή-
ρων ἀμίαντον ἃ κτίσῃ
ναὸ̣[ν ἅ]γ̣ακ̣[τι] Φοίβῳ (118-121).

This recalls the prayer in the paeanic refrain (τάνδε πόλιν φύλασσ'/εὐαίωνι σὺν ὄλβῳ): Dionysus fulfils that prayer by blessing the *polis* in the construction of the temple. Stanza XI entirely concerns Apollo's instructions for the new Dionysus-worship; in the final stanza, the speaker exhorts a ritual performance much like the Muses in stanza V. Dionysus is to be 'received' in a traditional role, as god of the bacchantes (144-5: cf. the reference to dithyrambic competition in 133-4), but he is finally invoked as an Apollo-like healing god, ἄναξ ὑγιείας.[91]

A statue of Dionysus is mentioned, in which he is depicted in typical pose, in a lion-drawn chariot (137): if such a statue were visible to readers of this inscription, the hymn would unfold as an *aition* for this statue in Apollo's temple. The hymn and the temple's visual imagery form a combined rhetoric for visitors to the sanctuary,[92]illustrating and explaining the worship of Dionysus in Apollo's realm.

At the heart of the song are Apollo's ritual instructions, which then, in the inscription, serve as instructions for future choral re-performance by which Apollo continues to renew this form of Dionysus-worship in his sanctuary. The choral self-referentiality perhaps does point to a real performance for which Philodamos was honoured; but it also serves for subsequent re-appropriation: 'Apollo orders us' becomes an instruction for future choruses.

---

[91] On Dionysus as 'doctor', see e.g. Detienne (2001), 155-8. Cf. LeVen (2008), 291: 'We now realize that initially calling Dionysus "Dithyrambe" and having him associated with all his dithyrambic paraphernalia was a sign of the power and authority of Apollo'.
[92] Cf. Vamvouri Ruffy (2008), 196-206.

This hymn shows literary conceits that move far beyond the basic models at Erythrai; but a still more remarkable inscription is on the stele of Isyllos at Epidauros (c.300 BC).[93] The unusually long inscription (seventy-nine lines) has six sections of various metres (one in prose),[94] including a paean in ionics *a minore*.[95] Inconsistent lettering size (not *stoichedon*) means that certain sections appear more prominent to the eye; *paragraphoi* and blank lines are used to mark the different sections of the inscription,[96] which also begin with a new metre: a single elegiac couplet marks off to adjacent hexameter sections (sections B and C). Clearly some thought has gone into the visual impression of the whole monument.

The poetic voice is notable for the overbearing authorial presence. Isyllos, whose name stands boldly at the top of the inscription, refers to himself four times in the inscription, as the text's author, the monument's dedicator, the inventor of a certain *gnōmē* and the proposer of a *lex sacra*. Isyllos claims he inscribed the text after an oracular response from Apollo, while in the stone's final section he provides autobiographical information about his relationship with Asklepios and the historical and political circumstances of the inscription. The opening elegiac couplet, which stands out in larger text, announces the inscription as Isyllos's dedication to Apollo Maleatas and Asklepios (A, 1-2); a dedicatory formula in the last two lines of the inscription creates a sort-of *Ringkomposition*:[97]

> ταῦτα τοί, ὦ μέγ' ἄριστε θεῶν, ἀνέθηκεν Ἴσυλλος
>
> τι[μ]ῶν σὴν ἀρετήν, ὦναξ, ὥσπερ τὸ δίκαιον (F, 83-4).

We are left with the impression that the whole text serves as a monument to Isyllos rather than merely a record of a communal act of worship.[98]

After the initial dedicatory formula, there is a clumsy trochaic *gnōmē* extolling aristocracy:

---

[93] This dating follows the reasonable assumption that the 'Philip' of the inscription is Philip II of Macedon: for further discussion, see Kolde (2003), 257-301. On Isyllos and the Epidauros site, see esp. Wilamowitz (1886); Tomlinson (1983).
[94] On the metres, see esp. Kolde (2003), 18-40.
[95] Metrical analysis and colometry suggested at Kolde (2003), 36-7.
[96] For a comprehensive description of the stone, see esp. Kolde (2003),
[97] So Kolde (2003), 42.
[98] So also LeVen (2008), 280.

δᾶμος εἰς ἀριστοκρατίαν ἄνδρας αἰ προάγοι καλῶς,

αὐτὸς ἰσχυρότερος· ὀρθοῦται γὰρ ἐξ ἀνδραγαθίας.

αἰ δέ τις καλῶς προαχθεὶς θιγγάνοι πονηρίας

πάλιν ἐπαγκρούων, κολάζων δᾶμος ἀσφαλέστερος (A, 3-6).[99]

This seems intended to show Isyllos as a sage, much in the manner of the wisdom inscribed on the Hipparchan herms.[100] Isyllos is at pains to stress the maxim is his own (τάνδε τὰν γνώμαν τόκ' ἦχον καὶ ἔλεγον καὶ νῦν λέγω, 7), and that it is approved by both demos and gods. Isyllos again stresses his own involvement in the *lex sacra* that follows (in plodding hexameters), which establishes a procession for Apollo and Asklepios:

τόνδ' ἰαρὸν θεῖαι μοίραι νόμον ηὗρεν Ἴσυλλος (B, 10)

The prayer-instructions that follow reveal the sense of the *gnōmē* in section A:

καὶ ἐπεύχεσθαι πολιάταις

πᾶσιν ἀεὶ διδόμεν τέκνοις τ' ἐρατὰν ὑγίειαν,

εὐνομίαν τε καὶ εἰράναν καὶ πλοῦτον ἀμεμφῆ,

τὰν καλοκαγαθίαν τ' Ἐπιδαυροῖ ἀεὶ ῥέπεν ἀνδρῶν (C, 21-4).

This indicates the ritual is directed at communal well-being, which as we have seen is probably a major function of inscribed paeans. But here it concerns not only the health of the citizens but also the entire civic order (εὐνομία and εἰράνα); the inclusion of the Epidaurian nobility (καλοκἀγαθία) reminds us that the for Isyllos, the strength of the *polis* lies in her ἀριστοκρατία.[101]

The final hexameter section (F, 62-84) identifies this generalisation with a particular scenario. There is an account of Asklepios answering the prayers of Isyllos's sick son,[102] which is

---

[99] I follow the text printed in Furley and Bremer (2001), *GH* 6.4.

[100] [Plat.] *Hipp.* 228d. LeVen (2008), 281-2, suggests Isyllos is depicting himself as a new Solon (cf. Solon fr. 6 W).

[101] As Furley and Bremer point out (ii 187, *ad* 25), this strongly political dimension to the language of the inscription puts Isyllos into the role of a sort-of Epidaurian Lykourgos: indeed, the phraseology of B, 25, ὥραις ἐξ ὡρᾶν νόμον ἀεὶ τόνδε σέβοντας, recalls a Lykourgan expression; the prose section (D) in which Isyllos consults the Delphic oracle may also be intended to ape Lykourgos (cf. F, 76). Cf. also Kolde (2003), 62-3, 97-102 (on Spartan *eunomia* and Lykourgos).

[102] I take the παῖς of F, 69, as Isyllos' son rather than Isyllos as a young man: the latter interpretation sits very awkwardly with the first-person construction of this passage. Isyllos re-enters in the third-person only at 81-2, which can be regarded as a stand-alone *sphragis*.

redolent of the *iamata* inscriptions;[103] however, rather than narrating the boy's cure, the focus shifts to Asklepios protecting Sparta, which is portrayed as a defence of local aristocracy against Philip of Macedon's incursions.[104] Isyllos depicts himself as spreading the word to Sparta about Asklepios's 'salvation':

οἳ δ' αὐδήσαντος ἄκουσαν

σώτειραν φήμαν, Ἀσκλαπιέ, καί σφε σάωσας.

οἳ δὴ ἐκάρυξαν πάντας ξενίαις σε δέκεσθαι

σωτῆρα εὐρυχόρου Λακεδαίμονος ἀγκαλέοντες (F, 79-82).

This political discourse frames the actual paean, which is relatively short (twenty-four lines) in the middle of the long inscription. Thus the paean is presumably intended as part of a whole, the purpose of which is to proclaim a particular vision of Epidaurian and Spartan society. The poem differs from the other inscribed paeans we have seen, since the παιάν-cry is not marked off as a separate invocation, but is always incorporated within the metre and sense of the hymn. It may be that this did not emerge out of 'real' ritual but was Isyllos's own creation for the sake of his public monument.

The account of Isyllos consulting the Delphic oracle, which is the justification for the song and its inscription, serves as an introduction. There is also a short aetiology for the cult of Apollo Maleatas at Epidauros (C, 27-31), which even takes precedence over the ancient shrine in Trikka (cf. 29-30). This aetiology is then developed somewhat in the paean itself (cf. E, 41-4); the worshippers are depicted as recipients of this tradition:[105]

ὧδε γὰρ φάτις ἐνέπουσ' ἦλυθ' ἐς ἀκοὰς

προγόνων ἀμετέρων (E, 39-40).

The paean's narrative is this φάτις, the geneaology of Asklepios, which serves to legitimize the Epidaurian cult. There is much emphasis on Epidauros, which is a πατρίς for Phlegyas, the

[103] On comparisons with the *iamata*, cf. esp. Kolde (2003), 265-6, 287-91.
[104] For discussion, cf. esp. Sineux (1999); cf. Kolde (2003), 97-102, 265-271.
[105] Cf. Sineux (1999), 166; Furley and Bremer (2001), ii 188-9.

father of Aigla (also called Koronis), but also a *ματρόπολις* for Asklepios (E, 59-60).[106] This selection of myth seems designed to emphasise the local authority for Asklepios:[107] via Koronis and Phlegyas, Asklepios can claim this as his 'homeland', but there is also a sense of reciprocity: the *polis* is the nourishing parent for Asklepios, who in turn fosters the *polis* (E, 59-61).

The speaker exhorts the Epidaurian people to praise Asklepios:

> Ἰὲ Παιᾶνα θεὸν ἀείσατε λαοί,
>
> ζαθέας ἐνναέτα[ι] τᾶσδ' Ἐπιδαύρου (E, 1-2).

This has far more specificity than the use of *ἀείσατε* that we noted in the Erythraian inscriptions: this time the *kouroi* are of a particular *polis*. In the light of the other parts of the inscription, these *λαοί* are connected with the aristocratic system that Isyllos praises and which is the *ὑγίεια* given to the *polis* by Asklepios (A, 3-4: cf. B, 24); the community sings to the *polis*-protector as part of the resistance against Macedonia. Elsewhere in the inscription, Isyllos' preferred word for citizens is δᾶμος, so perhaps *λαοί* here carries the implication of a Homeric (i.e. aristocratic) army. Asklepios appears in section F as a warrior (*σὺν ὅπλοισιν / λαμπόμενος χρυσέοις*, F,68-9), setting out from Epidauros to save Sparta (F, 65). He is the embodiment of Isyllos's ideal ruler , who brings *εὐνομία*, *εἰράνα* and *πλοῦτος* to the *polis*, and displays *ἀρετή* (cf. F, 62: *καὶ τόδε σῆς ἀρετῆς Ἀσκληπιέ, [τ]οὔργον ἔδειξας*). The final section, which as I have noted corresponds loosely to the *iamata* inscriptions, presents Asklepios's activity as the military defence of Spartan royalty.[108] At the end of the inscription, Asklepios is addressed as *ὦ μέγ' ἄριστε θεῶν*, while the poet claims to be 'honouring his *ἀρετή*' (F, 83-4). His role is that of a saviour-hero, not very different from the 'divine' rulers at Athens in the early Hellenistic period.[109]

---

[106] On the various different traditional genealogies for Asklepios, cf. e.g. Furley and Bremer (2001), ii 189. For a thorough discussion of the myths of Asklepios, cf. esp. Riethmüller (2005), i 33-54; on the origins of the cults, *id.* i 91-228.

[107] Isyllos disregards alternative versions of the myths. Cf. e.g. Stehle (1997), 132-138; Kolde (2003), 160-163; Vamvouri Ruffy (2004), 168-171; LeVen (2008), 279-280.

[108] Cf. Kolde (2003), 182-3, 228-9.

[109] So Kolde (2003), 364-398.

The putative performers of the paean (the λαοί) are exclusively Epidaurians, which disavows ritual appropriation by visiting *choroi*: the non-Epidaurian reader is left as an observer rather than a participant: he receives the text as information (propaganda) about Asklepios, in the same way he might read the didactic elements of the *iamata*.[110] The genealogical narrative suggests a certain amount of local cult propaganda.

A few elements of the inscription might even encourage us to see the paean as a *mimesis* of cult song, rather than record of or prompt text for actual performance.[111] The metre of the paean, lively ionics *a minore*, differentiates this part of the inscription from the other sections (it is also marked off visually by use of a blank line): but the metre is not a common one for the inscribed paeans,[112] and may perhaps indicate a desire to represent energetic cult performance in stronger contrast with the other poetic parts of the stone, which are to be read not sung. Although a choral plural is used in the first four lines of the paean, and again in the last line, in the middle of the song occurs a singular form, σέβομαί σε. This interrupts the narrative flow, and has the feeling almost of being added as an afterthought: it reads as Isyllos himself once again breaking into his own poem to express his individual devotion to the god.

5.4 Other inscribed hymns

There are a few inscribed hymns that are not addressed to Apollo or the healing gods. Some of these still seem to be loosely associated with the healing cult: the stones containing hymns to various other gods at the Asklepieion at Epidauros imply that at some stage the worship there was extended.[113] I omit further discussion of these here since a fourth-century date is difficult to

---

[110] Cf. Dillon (1994).
[111] On the comparison (and contrast) of this inscription with the cult *mimesis* of Hellenistic literary hymns, cf. esp. Kolde (2002-3); cf. Kolde (2003), 237-253.
[112] Wilamowitz (1886), 133, who suggests the metre is more appropriate for a dithyramb (which he regards as a sign of Isyllos' poetic inability): however, I am unconvinced genres ever had quite such a level of metrical specificity (surviving paeans and dithyrambs are both in a range of metres).
[113] Cf. Melfi (2007), 156-159, for a helpful compilation of dedications to gods other than Apollo or Asklepios in the Asklepieion at Epidauros.

sustain. However, both the *Hymn to the Idaian Dactyls* from Eretria and the *Hymn to Zeus* from Palaikastro in Crete seem likelier to be within my date-range. Each inscription is very different from the others discussed so far.

Sadly, the entire right-hand part of the stone containing the *Hymn to the Dactyls* is missing. Nonetheless, forty-eight lines of inscription can be detected; the letter-shapes are consistent with the late-fourth century BC. The actual composition cannot be dated with much confidence: the assumption that the cult of the Idaian Dactyls must be primitive (and thus the hymn from a long tradition) has no real evidence, so a fourth-century composition is certainly possible. There are few signs that at this date orally-transmitted hymns tended to be inscribed (which was, however, the practice in the Roman period).

As Powell has pointed out, the existence of a cult of Idaian Dactyls in Eretria, near the copper- and iron-rich Lelantine plain, is unsurprising: the Dactyls were associated with metallurgy.[114] Otherwise, nothing is known of this cult.[115] The barely-legible top section of the stone seems to contain various male names, probably benefactors of the cult or this monument; the word *ὕμνος* (line 12) is centralised and is probably a title (Powell's edition begins at this point).

Despite the hymn's fragmentary nature, it is evident that it contained more narrative than most fourth-century inscribed hymns. This narrative seemingly concerned the geneaology of the Dactyls: a certain Eurytheos is mentioned[116] and described as an innovator in medicine ([E]*ὐρύθεος ὃς πρῶτος ϵ*[…] / [*ϕ*]*ἀρμακα ἀλεξητ*[*ήρια* […]/ [*π*]*ρῶτος δὲ ἰάτ*[*ρ*]*ϵυσϵ*, 5-7) and tree-planting ([*πρ*]*ῶτος δένδ*[*ρα*] *ϕ*[*ύτϵυσϵ*], 9). The last part of the inscription seems to narrate the transference of the cult to Phrygia ([*ϵἰ*]*ς Φρυγίας κώμαν* [*ἰ*]*ϵρ*[…], 25). Other gods are mentioned (Zeus, Apollo, Hephaistos, Ares, Pan and 'all the gods'), perhaps in order to connect

[114] Powell (1921).
[115] The stone was actually found in the Iseion, which however dates from the first-second centuries AD.
[116] Lines 5, 11 (Powell's numbering). Eurytheos is not elsewhere known in connection with the Dactyls (cf. Powell (1921)).

these minor demons to the pantheon; two of the Dactyls are named (Damnameneus and Kelmis) as is a certain 'mother', probably the Magna Mater, perhaps Adrasteia.[117] A fragment of the epic poet Phoronis (viii-vii BC) may reveal the context, namely that the Dactyls are Adrasteia's servants:

ἔνθα γόητες

Ἰδαῖοι Φρύγες ἄνδρες ὀρέστεροι οἰκί' ἔναιον,

Κέλμις Δαμναμενεύς τε μέγας καὶ ὑπέρβιος Ἄκμων,

εὐπάλαμοι θεράποντες ὀρείης Ἀδρηστείης,

οἳ πρῶτοι τέχνης πολυμήτιος Ἡφαίστοιο

εὗρον ἐν οὐρείησι νάπαις ἰόεντα σίδηρον

ἐς πῦρ τ' ἤνεγκαν καὶ ἀριπρεπὲς ἔργον ἔτευξαν (Phoronis fr. 2 Bernabé).

The Eretrian hymn shares some of the diction of the Phoronis fragment, which suggests that traditional material was used to formulate the poetic voice: two of the lines in which the *Mater* is mentioned include the adjective ὀρεία in the genitive (8 = 23), just as Phoronis uses it of Adrasteia; Phoronis's εὐπάλαμοι may be echoed by the use in the hymn of ἐκ παλαμάω[ν] (4). The emphasis on Eurytheos' innovations may correspond to Phoronis's οἳ πρῶτοι. There may be a reference to the musical innovations of the Dactyls ([ὄρ]γανα χειροτέχνη[ς], 35),[118] and there is also a tantalising reference to mixing the blood of wolves, an otherwise unknown image for the Dactyls: we should like to know more about this.

The *Hymn to Zeus*, found in a *temenos* of Zeus Diktaios in Palaikastro, Crete, is very different in style again. The stone dates to the second or third century AD, but linguistic evidence suggests the composition was around the end of the fourth century or first part of the third century BC.[119] The hymn is inscribed twice on the stone: it seems that the second

[117] Cf. also Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.*1.1125-9.
[118] Cf. Strabo 10.3.14-15; [Plut.] *De Mus.* 1132f.
[119] An earlier date is suggested by Wilamowitz (1921) and Bowra (1970), but cf. esp. West (1965), 151, who argues for a late fourth-century or early third-century date on the basis of the orthography; see also Furley and Bremer (2001), ii 4; Alonge (2006), 217.

inscription was intended to supplant the first, which was riddled with errors; these errors imply that the first inscription was itself a poorly-made copy from an earlier stone.[120] We obviously cannot know if the hymn was inscribed at the time of its composition, but it is perhaps telling that dialectal features have not been 'ironed out' in the later copies.

A three-line refrain occurs seven times in the hymn,[121] and is written out on the stone each time: this implies that – like the *παιάν*-cry – this refrain was an old and basic unit elaborated by new parts.[122] It is thus a reasonable assumption that the hymn draws on a long-established ritual invocation: the inscribing of this hymn would probably fulfil a similar role to writing up the paradigmatic *παιάν*-cry at Erythrai. In this case, it is a cletic invocation, so re-performing the inscribed text is to repeat the demands for the god's presence in the community:

> Ἰώ, *μέγιστε* Κο*ῦρε*, *χαῖρέ μοι*, Κ*ρόνειε*,
>
> *πανκρατὲς γάνους*, *βέβακες δαιμόνων ἀγώμενος·*
>
> *Δίκταν εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ἔρπε καὶ γέγαθι μολπᾷ.*

The stanzas, each only two lines, are in lively ionics *a maiore* (with the final stanza in ionics *a minore*); the refrain seems to be basically trochaic.[123] Stanza I concerns present-day cult performances of the song (present tense); stanzas II-IV form the mythological argument for the petition (narrative tenses).[124] Zeus's previous presence on Dikte brought about fertility, justice, peace and prosperity (stanza IV), which serves as the basis for a petition for similar fertility (stanza V) and wellbeing for the *polis* (stanza VI).

The common assumption is that the hymn is addressed to the young Zeus, associated with a pre-historic Minoan cult.[125] There is an allusion to the Kouretes raising the infant Zeus

---

[120] For a thorough discussion, see Alonge (2006), 218-222.
[121] I follow the text and line-divisions adopted by Alonge (2006), 212, who imitates that of the inscription on 'side A'. 'Side B' is written continuously. For a transcription and edition of the whole stone, see Alonge (2006), 200-213 (drawings 214-216). Furley and Bremer (*GH* 1.1) print the refrain as six lines and the stanzas as four lines.
[122] So Bowra (1970); cf. Alonge (2006), 223-225.
[123] See Alonge (2006), 222-3, with further bibliography. Trochees sometimes replace ionics in the stanzas, suggesting metrical conformity (*id.* 223).
[124] The text of the third stanza is largely missing.
[125] See e.g. Furley and Bremer (2001), i 70-75 with further bibliography.

(stanza II) on Mt Dikte (cf. ἔνθα, line 9, which links this myth to Dikte in the refrain): the hymn thus celebrates a local alternative to the more popular account that Zeus was raised on Mt Ida.

However, this view has recently been challenged in a doctoral thesis by Mark Alonge, which argues that the myth of Zeus's Diktaian infancy is invoked merely to support the petition for the god's adult epiphany among the community at Palaikastro.[126] Alonge's interpretation of the opening line, Ἰώ, μέγιστε κοῦρε, χαῖρέ μοι, Κρόνειε, as 'O greatest [of the gods], son (*kouros*) of Kronos, salutations',[127] is doubtful: as he concedes, κοῦρος Κρόνειος in the sense of 'son of Kronos', would be unique, and rhythmically μέγιστε κοῦρε seems to form a discrete unit.[128] Nonetheless, Alonge is convincing on the poem's rhetorical strategy: Zeus is perhaps invoked as the greatest (i.e. most prodigious) *kouros* because Dikte is the scene of that prodigy; his epiphany among the ritual community is a re-working of the birth of the *Kouros* among the *Kouretes* (indeed, the request for Zeus to 'leap up' in the last two stanzas may be a re-presentation of that birth, narrated in stanza II).[129]

According to this reading, the hymn sets up a mythological paradigm – i.e. the reception of the infant Zeus by the *Kouretes* – for renewal among future generations. The act of reading (performing) the inscribed text assimilates the worshippers to the original *Kouretes*. The second stanza develops the mention of μολπά in the refrain to draw attention to the speakers' own ritual actions and the place of the rite:

> τάν τοι κρέκομεν πακτίσι μείξαντες ἅμ' αὐλοῖσιν
>
> καὶ στάντες ἀείδομεν τεὸν ἀμφὶ βῶμον εὐερκῆ (4-5 = *GH* 1.1.7-10).

Murray has provided a reasonable restoration of the much-damaged stanza III:[130]

> ἔνθα γὰρ σέ παῖδ' ἅμ<β>ρ<ο>τον ἀσπιδ̣[ηφόροι] τροφῆες

---

[126] Alonge (2006); cf. Alonge (2005).
[127] Alonge (2006), 83-99.
[128] Alonge is correct to state that we would expect a dependent genitive if the sense if 'greatest of the *kouroi*', but if we take the line as 'o greatest, o Kouros, o son of Kronos', then it is easier to see that Zeus is not being contrasted with other *kouroi* but rather singled out as both very great and a *kouros*.
[129] So Alonge (2006), 99-101.
[130] Bosanquet and Murray (1908-9); so also Alonge (2006), 76.

πὰρ Ῥέας λαβόντες πό<δ>α κ[ρούοντες ἀπέκρυψαν] (9-10 = *GH* 1.1.12-15).

An allusion in Callimachus's *Hymn to Zeus* (*h.*1.52-4) tells us that these shields belong to the *Kouretes*: it is easy to see how the noise of the present worshippers is a re-enactment of the clamour of the shields at the infant's reception from Rhea.[131]

'Ritual clamour' may also be suggested by the lively rhythm and heavy use of repetition and alliteration, which intensifies through the hymn: the anaphor in stanza V (θόρ' ἐς…θόρ' εὔποκ' ἐς, κὲς…θόρε κὲς, 20-1) occurs in relatively 'weak' positions in the line, but in the final stanza – marked (climactically?) by a metrical change – it occurs at the start of each colon; an urgent and ecstatic feel is created:

θόρε κὲς] πόληας ἁμῶν, θόρε κὲς ποντοπόρος νᾶας,

θόρε κὲς ν[έος πο]λείτας, θόρε κὲς θέμιν κλ[ηνάν] (26-7 = *GH* 1.1.32-5).

The breathless excitement in these lines is highly suggestive of energetic ritual performance. The image is one of a chorus of worshippers in a state of excitement as they anticipate the theophany.

The refrain provides a specific occasion for the song (ἐνιαυτόν, 3 = *GH* 5). This may be not dissimilar to the ritual instructions we find accompanying other inscribed hymns. By way of a closing comment, we can perhaps speculate that the inscription was again not so much a transcript of existing cultic tradition, but rather sought to establish norms for worship of the *Kouros*. The atmosphere of excitement in the song, which is not unlike the method of Callimachus in his mimetic hymns,[132] is perhaps intended to represent and generate ritual emotions rather than reflect them.

---

[131] Cf. also Strabo 10.3.9-11 for a description of the orgiastic rites of the *Kouretes*.

[132] Cf. e.g. Harder (1992), with some helpful bibliography in n.2; Depew (1993). For a criticism of the assumption that Callimachus' poetry was not intended for performance, see esp. Cameron (1995), *passim.*

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have sought to describe the voice of the inscribed hymns in terms of their impact as inscriptions: this approach sees the hymns in much the same way as inscribed epigrams. As with dedicatory epigrams, the poem 'speaks' to two implied audiences: the god, who is the primary addressee of the song, and the reader, who appropriates the text to address the god himself. The point of writing up the songs, I have argued, is connected with a desire to provide ritual instruction and paradigm, so that ideal worship is renewed in future ages. It is no surprise that the paean is the most common inscribed text, since the genre seems connected with community-protection and well-being, suitable categories for constant renewal among any community. The Palaikastro *Hymn to Diktaian Zeus*, although rather different in style, can be understood as a logical extension of this idea to the cletic invocation of a god on behalf of the community.

For the most part, then, the voice of the hymns is characterised by simplicity: it is entirely dependent on its primary ritual purpose, so that there is little development beyond the invocatory refrains. We have seen a couple of hymns move beyond this paradigm: for literary style, none can match the Philodamos inscription at Delphi; the Isyllos inscription at Epidauros, though short on literary merit, is fascinating for the overbearing authorial presence. The *Hymn to the Idaian Dactyls* appears to have had a more developed narrative section. We can see, perhaps, hints of a more self-conscious literary voice emerging; but this never reaches the heights of contemporary epigram, still less the more elaborate oral hymns of the archaic and classical periods. There is one further hymn that could have been included in this discussion, the *Hymn to Hygieia* of Ariphron, which is indeed inscribed at Epidauros. However, there are grounds for supposing this work enjoyed oral transmission and was only later inscribed: I discuss it instead in chapter 8 with other performed hymns and *enkomia*.

This concludes our study of inscribed poetry in the fourth century. It is certainly to be admitted that on the whole, inscriptions in this period are marked by conformity and a non-expansive style; the conformity shows the solidification of generic convention. Yet there appears to be a growing sense that inscriptions are a potent means to display poetic skill, and occasional more exuberant pieces indicate the possibilities afforded by the medium. We have seen a few poets impose their personality on the texts (Ion, Symmachos, Isyllos); exceptional as this is, it seems to indicate that the stone was worthy place for poets to ply their trade. It is possible that the appeal lay in expressing sentiments within very narrow confines; from time to time we see this done with no little expertise by authors of inscribed epigrams and such composers as Philodamos. At any rate, the popularity of inscriptions seems such that the forms were adopted self-consciously in other generic contexts, most notably book epigram. It is the more obviously self-conscious 'literary' style of poetry on papyrus that I discuss in the next section.

SECTION III

VOICES ON PAPYRUS

Book poetry at the start of the Hellenistic period

Introduction to Section III

The three chapters in this section concern what I am loosely calling 'book poetry', by which I mean poetry that we can fairly suppose was circulated on papyrus. In at least some cases, it is reasonable to believe that poetry was actually composed for this medium; but no clear method exists for identifying which poems were intended to be read on papyrus and which were not. My concern in this thesis is not so much to reconstruct original performance contexts but rather to analyse the way the poetic voice is shaped. A poem read on papyrus rather than heard within customary generic frameworks inevitably needs to forge its identity in a different way: the methods used lend the works a distinctive character.

I begin by looking at 'literary epigram',[1] and consider how the epigram voice is constructed not only in reference to inscribed epigram but also other literary genres, especially elegy and lyric. I aim to show how the very stylised epigrams of the end of the fourth century relate to various models. This sets the scene for a discussion of non-epigrammatic lyric in chapter 7 and longer elegiac works in chapter 8. At issue in each of these chapters is the so-called 'bookishness' of the poetic voice. I explore how this voice emerges not simply through generic development from earlier models but as its own distinctive form: it is constructed in self-conscious reference to various other genres.

However, I conclude the section with a discussion of a rather different instance of book poetry, the *Distaff* of Erinna. This I argue is best understood as a skilfully-constructed, personal poem which may have been circulated initially among a small, intimate circle: the act of publishing the poem on papyrus is seemingly linked to the feminine poetic identity.

[1] I adopt this term with some reluctance as a means to distinguish these poems from inscribed epigram. It should not be taken to imply that inscribed epigrams are not also in their own way 'literary'.

Chapter 6
Literary Epigram

The development of so-called 'book epigram' in the late-fourth and early-third century BC has been the subject of considerable scholarship, especially since the publication of the Milan papyrus of the epigrams of Poseidippos (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309),[1] from which we have learnt much about the third-century approach to epigram books, and glimpsed kinds of epigram barely attested in the Meleagrean anthologies.[2] My main aim here is to draw attention to a few devices that allow the formation of a distinctive epigram voice among the generation of poets before Poseidippos, in the last decades of the fourth century or in the early-third century. This is when we first start seeing epigrams with a highly-stylised poetic voice that cannot be seen simply as developments out of inscribed epigram.[3] A number of the poets I discuss (Anyte, Asklepiades, Philitas) were certainly working well into the third century, but the story of book epigram begins in the late-fourth century, so I include them here as illustrative of the new style.

6.1 Fictional voices, special emphases

Not everything actually inscribed on objects was necessarily an authentic dedication or commemoration. By at least the fourth century, monuments in honour of mythological figures are known; there are also various dedicated objects given fictional histories in the inscription. For example, the historian Phainias (c. 375-300 BC) quotes an epigram for the dedication at Delphi

---

[1] Austin and Bastianini (2002). The recent bibliography on Poseidippos is enormous: see esp. the articles in Acosta-Hughes *et al.* eds. (2004); Gutzwiller ed. (2005). Martin Cuypers has provided a valuable and regularly updated bibliographic resource: <http://sites.google.com/site/hellenisticbibliography/epigram/posidippus>. For a sceptical view on the artfulness of the collection, see Schröder (2004).

[2] Cf. also P.Petrie II 49a (early-iii BC), which may be a compilation of epigrams by different poets, one of which is Poseidippos, though cf. Gutzwiller (1998), 18, who takes it as a miscellany by one poet. Various principles of epigram-collection are discussed e.g. by Krevans (2005, 2007); Argentieri (2007); Hutchinson (2008), 1-41.

[3] On 'literariness' in inscriptions, see above ch.3-4, and esp. Tsagalis (2008). Cf. e.g. Bruss (2005); Meyer (2005, 2007); Tueller (2008). Schmitz (2010b), 372-6, gives a useful summary of the aspects of the voice of inscriptional epigram that appealed to the Hellenistic poets.

of a dagger supposedly carried by Heliakon at the siege of Troy (fr. 11 Wehrli). Such an epigram may have lent some glamour to an otherwise mundane object, perhaps one whose real background had become obscured:

θάησαί μ'· ἐτεὸν γὰρ ἐν Ἰλίου εὐρέι πύργωι
ἦν, ὅτε καλλικόμωι μαρνάμεθ' ἀμφ' Ἐλένηι·
καί μ' Ἀντηνορίδης ἐφόρει κρείων Ἑλικάων·
νῦν δέ με Λητοίδου θεῖον ἔχει δάπεδον ('anon.' 118 *FGE*).

There is no dedication formula in the poem, which instead addresses the viewer, and commands him to look at the object: this is at odds with other early dedicatory epigrams, suggesting a late composition. The speaker interprets the object for the viewer, so that a glorious history unfolds from looking at the object in the present (*θάησαί μ'*, 1; *νῦν*, 4).

There was also a vogue for composing epitaphs for mythological heroes: Kathryn Gutzwiller has suggested plausibly that epitaphs for heroes in the Trojan War, found in the Aristotelian *Peplos*, are not solely the work of Hellenistic imagination but actually reflect real inscriptions: an epitaph for Oedipus on a fourth-century vase may be one such case.[4] An epitaph for Orpheus is quoted by Alkidamas or Ps-Alkidamas (perhaps fourth-century) in a speech called *Odysseus* ('anon.' 132 *FGE*).[5] Diogenes Laertius, who quotes the first couplet, claims it was inscribed at Dion in Macedonia, and ascribes it to Lobon (perhaps fourth century);[6] the second couplet also turns up in the *Peplos*. One possibility is that a real inscription was creatively re-used by later authors (Lobon, for example, is not known to have composed poetry: Diogenes may simply mean that Lobon is his source for the poem). Otherwise unknown details about Orpheus[7]

[4] Cf. Gutzwiller (2010). Another 'literary' instance of this phenomenon is the *Axe* of Simias of Rhodes, on which see further below.
[5] For the fragments of Alkidamas, see Muir (2001), who goes against common opinion in believing Akidamas is the author of the *Odysseus* fragments (67-85). If the fragments are not genuine, the date of this speech is uncertain.
[6] Cf. *AP* 7.617; Diog. Laert. *prooem.* 1.5 = Lobon fr. 7 Crönert. On Lobon and his date, see esp. e.g. Garulli (2004), who suspends judgment on the Orpheus epigram, since it escapes 'ad ogni ragionevole tentativo di classificazione' (126).
[7] So Page (1981), 441.

may indicate such inscription was an attempt to give legitimacy to an alternative mythological tradition.[8]

There is also an instance of inscriptional epigram being used for polemics. Aristotle composed an epigram for the cenotaph of his friend Hermeias, whom he also honoured with an encomiastic song (*PMG* 842).[9] There is not any obvious reason to think the epigram was not inscribed on a monument, but the tone is hostile, with more emphasis on political matters than commemoration of the dead.[10] Hermeias's murderer (Ataxerxes II) is openly accused of acting impiously (*οὐχ ὁσίως παραβὰς μακάρων θέμιν ἁγνήν*, 1) and using trickery (*ἀλλ' ἀνδρὸς πίστει χρησάμενος δολίου*, 4). Even more surprising is an epigrammatic response to this inscription by a certain Theokritos of Chios, which directs its polemics at Aristotle himself:[11]

> Ἑρμίου εὐνούχου τε καὶ Εὐβούλου τόδε δούλου
> σῆμα κενὸν κενόφρων τεῦξεν Ἀριστοτέλης,
> ὃς γαστρὸς τιμῶν ἄνομον φύσιν εἵλετο ναίειν
> ἀντ' Ἀκαδημείας βορβόρου ἐν προχοαῖς (Theocritus Chius 1 *FGE*).

It is uncertain if this epigram was ever inscribed:[12] we cannot rule out the possibility that Theokritos erected a rival monument near the original one, or even wrote it on the same stone. The direct reference to another epigram is most unusual, as are the *ad hominem* insults.

Real inscriptions may also display humour and cleverness. A possible instance is the anonymous epitaph for the sophist Thrasymachos, which is quoted by Neoptolemos of Parion (iii BC, *ap.* Ath.10.454f),[13] from among inscriptions in Chalkedon. It is thus probable that the

---

[8] For Linforth (1931), 11, 'the epigram was composed as a bit of propaganda, about the year 431, in Athens, or possibly in Abdera'. Cf. Anagnostou-Laoutides (2005), 376 n.263, who points out that the epigram reflects well-known beliefs about Orpheus in the later 5th century.
[9] See esp. Düring (1957), 277; Ford (forthcoming) and below.
[10] So Ford (forthcoming), 37: 'more indignant than grieving'.
[11] See Runia (1986); Clayman (2007), 500-1; Ford (forthcoming).
[12] For example, Ford (forthcoming), 41-2, is convinced it is a 'fictional' epitaph, never inscribed, and draws attention to apparent oral performances of it.
[13] On Neoptolemos see Mette (1935) & (1981); Asmis (1982).

epigram was really inscribed, but it has a playful character, which Page felt was inappropriate for a real epitaph:[14]

τοὔνομα θῆτα ῥῶ ἄλφα σὰν ὖ μῦ ἄλφα χεῖ οὖ σάν·

πατρὶς Χαλκηδών· ἡ δὲ τέχνη σοφίη ('anon.' 124 *FGE*).

There is self-conscious play on the dialogic trope: the reader is imageined to be looking for the name on the stone. The first line spells out the name letter by letter; the second tells us his craft was 'cleverness', which is fittingly matched by the cleverness of the epigram. [15]

We have seen, therefore, that fictionality, humour and rhetoric may be a part of actual inscriptional epigrams, albeit perhaps not to the extent that they are found in some Hellenistic epigrams. The use of clever poetic devices in epigrams, both real and in book publications, was probably a means of showing off the poet's skill to potential clients: book collections may even have been a way to advertise that skill. It must have been an attractive challenge to poets to display the maximum ability in just a few lines (we have encountered a few instances of such skill in inscriptions: cf. especially chapter 3). Interestingly, idiomatic styles can be detected in different authors, which is perhaps in modern parlance their 'selling point'.

Nonetheless, the publication of epigrams in books must have made a difference. The early history of epigram books is uncertain,[16] but one can conjecture three broad stages of development:[17] first, the copying and collecting of real inscriptions; second, the adoption of some principle of arrangement (alphabetic order, thematically etc.); third, the composition of new epigrams just for the book collections. I have already given some reasons for thinking that this process may have started earlier than is commonly believed (ch.1.3 above). Perhaps some real inscriptions were even reworked for book publication. Often the only notable difference is the quality of composition: inscriptions were presumably included in books because they were

[14] Page (1981), 430.
[15] So e.g. Sider (2007). Cf. e.g. Antagoras *ep.* 1 G-P (= *AP* 7.103), an epitaph for Polemon and Crates that pays tribute to their philosophical contributions
[16] Cf. esp. ch.1.3 above.
[17] *Pace* e.g. Argentieri (1998).

the high-quality work of a professional poet; many inscriptions known to us are seemingly by less skilled amateurs.[18]

But something that stands out in early-Hellenistic epigrams is the accentuation of particular features found in inscribed epigrams for one effect or another: for example, the accentuation of pathos in funerary epigrams, or exploitation of the dialogic motif. In the new Poseidippos, such emphases have even become principles of arrangement: the *epitymbia* are specifically for deceased women; men lost at sea have their own section (*nauagika*);[19] *tropoi* are exclusively those funerary epigrams addressed to passers-by.[20] There are sections for epigrams on statues of men (*andriantopoiika*),[21] precious stones (*lithika*)[22] or poems on the subject of miraculous cures (*iamatika*).[23] Some of these epigrams seem to break completely free from the constraints of the inscriptional genres. Poseidippos's *hippika* poems, for example, evidently derive from the honorific type (cf. ch.4 above), but really function as short elegiac *epinikia*;[24] the *oionoskopia*, poems on bird-divinations, are highly unusual poems that have at best a marginal background in inscriptions.[25] Some Poseidippan epigrams are also quite long, breaking away from the typical constraints of inscriptional material: although, as we saw in chapter 4, there are occasional instances of longer dedicatory inscriptions, Poseidippos shows us that book epigrams too can be expanded. For example, *SH* 978 is fifteen lines (missing an initial hexameter);[26] AB 116 and 117 are lengthy also, while the twenty-line AB 118 may have acted as a *sphragis* poem for a collection.[27]

---

[18] The notion of professional composers of inscriptions is supported by a 3rd-cent. decree mentioning Poseidippos as an *epigrammatopoios*: see Bing and Bruss (2007), 14-15.
[19] See e.g. Thomas (2004).
[20] Cf. esp. Obbink (2004).
[21] See e.g. Kosmetatou (2004a); Stewart (2005); Sens (2005).
[22] See e.g. Hunter (2004); Schur (2004); Smith (2004); Bing (2005); Kuttner (2005).
[23] See e.g. Bing (2002b, 2004), and cf. above ch.4 on the votive epigrams of the Asklepieia.
[24] See e.g. Kosmetatou (2004b); Fantuzzi (2005).
[25] On the *oionoskopia*, see esp. Sider (2005); Baumbach & Trampedach (2004).
[26] The ascription to Poseidippos is uncertain: see the editors' note at AB 113.
[27] See Reitzenstein (1893), 89-102; Lloyd-Jones (1963); Fraser (1972), i 560; Gutzwiller (1998), 18. Compare the elegiac 'seal of Theognis', on which see esp. Pratt (1995).

In the next section I look at a few earlier instances in which epigrammatists exploit aspects of traditional epigram in such a way as to create virtually a new, distinctive epigram voice.

6.2 Evoking scenes

In this section, I look at two devices by which epigrammatists display their poetic skill: firstly, using various 'tricks' by which to excite emotion over a gravesite scene; second, describing luscious scenes of the countryside.

As we have already seen, the conventions of inscribed funerary epigram offer much opportunity for poetic exploration: pathos, especially in the theme of the absent corpse, is a favourite device of Hellenistic epigrammatists;[28] the different characters can also be developed more extensively.[29] I have observed that the accentuation of such specific features eventually even forms the basis for arrangements in anthologies such as the new Poseidippos.

One particularly appealing feature was the 'gravesite drama', that is to say, the thematization of a mourner at the tomb: in chapter 3, we saw a few signs of inscribed epigrams developing this idea to pathetic effect. Literary epigrams often accentuate the first-person mourning speech – a lament *in breve* – or alternatively narrate or comment on the grieving from the perspective of a detached observer. It is the representation of grief that holds the interest: the speaker invites the reader to imagine the gravesite scene; the poetic skill lies in creating powerful pathos in just a few lines.

An epigram by one of the earliest literary epigrammatists, Perses,[30] illustrates this craft (*ep.* 4 G-P):[31]

Εὖρου χειμέριαί σε καταιγίδες ἐξεκύλισαν,

Φίλλι, πολυκλαύτῳ γυμνὸν ἐπ' ἠιόνι,

[28] Bruss (2005).
[29] Tueller (2008). Cf. esp. Meyer (2005, 2007).
[30] For Perses, see e.g. Wilamowitz (1924), i 137-8; Gow and Page (1965), ii 446-7; Meusel (1995), 41-2.
[31] See also Bruss (2005), 118-120.

οἰνηρῆς Λέσβοιο παρὰ σφυρόν· αἰγίλιπος δέ

πέτρου ἁλιβρέκτῳ κεῖσαι ὑπὸ πρόποδι (Perses 4 G-P = *AP* 7.501).

The speaker addresses the deceased, Phillis, directly, but the reader is struck by the apparent absence of a tombstone. Instead, Phillis lies under a sea-beaten promontory. Although we may guess that this epigram could be found on a cenotaph, it is notable that the speaker seeks to reinvent the promontory as Phillis's tomb; the beech is called πολύκλαυτος, a transferred epithet which seems very apt when the whole area has been turned into the grave.[32] The deceased is minimised: he is naked (2), without a proper burial, and subordinated to the sea that his belched him onto the shore (1-2). The place in fact has the dignity of a descriptive phrase, which he lacks (οἰνηρῆς Λέσβοιο παρὰ σφυρόν, 3). Thus the poem cleverly creates pathos by emphasizing the undignified nature of Phillis' death.[33] The identity of the speaker is mysterious: this is not so much a conventional act of mourning at the gravesite, but rather a commentary on Phillis's sad end. The reader is perhaps invited to imagine passing by the unburied corpse.

In an epigram by the innovative poet Phalaikos (late-iv BC),[34] we have an example of a more elaborate treatment of the gravesite drama (*ep.* 4 G-P = *AP* 13.27). This is an epigram for a sailor, Phokos, who has died at sea, leaving behind a cenotaph 'on foreign shore'. Phalaikos here explores the potential of the genre by focusing on the lamentation of the man's mother:

Φῶκος ἐπὶ ξείνῃ μὲν ἀπέφθιτο, κῦμα γὰρ μέλαινα

νεῦς οὐχ †ὑπεξήνεκειν οὐδ' ἐδέξατο†·

ἀλλὰ κατ' Αἰγαίοιο πολὺν βυθὸν ᾤχετο πόντου

βίῃ Νότου πρήσαντος ἐσχάτην ἄλα·

τύμβου δ' ἐν πατέρων κενεοῦ λάχεν, ὃν πέρι Προμηθίς

---

[32] Cf. Erinna 2.1-2 G-P (= *AP* 7.712), Νύμφας Βαυκίδος εἰμί· <u>πολυκλαύταν</u> δὲ παρέρπων / <u>στάλαν</u> τῷ κατὰ γᾶς τοῦτο λέγοις Ἀίδᾳ·

[33] Cf. Bruss (2005), 120: 'Phillis thus occupies the liminal world between the living and the dead. Never proclaimed dead, he enjoys a sort of half-funeral: the beach is lamented…. he is laid out….and he is "under" something.'

[34] On Phalaikos, cf. e.g. Wilamowitz (1924), 134-5; Gow and Page (1965), ii 458-9. A late-iv BC date can be deduced from a poem in praise of the comic poet Lykos (*fl.* 320s). I discuss the metrical innovations later.

μήτηρ λυγρῇ ὄρνιθι πότμον εἰκέλη

αἰὶ αἰὶ κωκύει τὸν ἐὸν γόνον ἤματα πάντα,

λέγουσα τὸν πρόωρον ὡς ἀπέφθιτο (*AP* 13.27 = Phalaecus 4 G-P).

The amount of circumstantial detail in the first couplet is unusual,[35] and together with the poignant expressions in the next couplet (*πολὺν βυθὸν ᾤχετο* 3; *βίῃ* Νότου,4), seems calculated to lend emotional impact. This anticipates the information in line 5 that the tomb is empty: the speaker contrasts the place of the tomb (*ἐν πατέρων*) and the location of the body (*κατ' Αἰγαίοιο πολὺν βυθὸν … πόντου*). But it is the representation of the grieving mother, Promethis that catches the eye (5-8). With the sort of poetic flourish we do not tend to find in inscriptions, she is afforded a simile: this serves to add intensity to the description of her grief. The ejaculation in line 5, *αἰὶ αἰ*, may be an utterance of Promethis herself, or the speaker of the poem expressing solidarity with her (as a tragic chorus might groan at the grief felt by a hero or heroine).[36]

At this point we are detached from the conventional temporal perspective of epitaphs. Firstly, Promethis is said to perform this act of grief 'every day' (7), which belies the normal static time-orientation of the grave-inscription; in the final line, this detachment is confirmed by the device of reported speech (*λέγουσα… ὡς*): the original speaker has told us in the first line that Phokos has died on foreign shore; now Promethis echoes this statement, but now adds that he has died 'before his time' (*πρόωρον*, 8). At this point, the epigram has moved away from the fiction of a speaking stone that reports the death, and instead appears to be a narration of the gravesite lament by a neutral observer. The absence of any deictic pronouns mark this shift in perspective: the interest is not so much commemoration of the deceased as a description of the grief of the mother.

---

[35] The textual difficulties make precise interpretation of the second line difficult: I am inclined to side with Hutton (1967), 177, who translates as 'When a violent storm had arisen, the black ship neither eluded nor yet stood up to the seas, but went to the bottom'.

[36] The chorus imagine a scene such as this in Soph. *Aj.*628-34.

Another poet that employs highly stylised representations of the act of mourning is Anyte, who was seemingly working at the start of the third century,[37] but who neatly illustrates the potential for creating a unique poetic voice in a series of epigrams.[38] Anyte frequently develops the theme of girls who died before their wedding day that we saw was an occasion for pathos in some fourth-century inscriptions: the recurrence of this theme in her corpus has been identified as a feminine concern.[39] Many take the form of laments by graveside mourners, as for example, e*p.* 6 G-P (= *AP* 7.490). In *ep.* 8 G-P (= *AP* 7.649), the speaker addresses the girl via her tomb, which she has obtained in place of marriage. The statue of the latter somehow captures the girl's maiden state (*παρθενικὰν μέτρον τε τεὸν καὶ κάλλος ἔχοισαν*, 3), which is thus preserved forever: by addressing this statue, the speaker encapsulates the main source of grief, the perpetual virginity of the deceased.

Others, like the Phalaikos epigram, narrate the act of mourning from a distance. *Ep.* 5 G-P (= *AP* 7.486) describes the anguish of the deceased's mother, Kleina (*μάτηρ ὠκύμορον παῖδ' ἐβόασε φίλαν*, 2), poignantly depicted as 'repeatedly… over the corpse' (*πολλάκι τῷδ' … ἐπὶ σάματι*, 1). The mother calls upon her daughter's soul (*ψυχὰν ἀγκαλέουσα*, 3), which is of course no longer present: it has crossed the Acheron. It is a powerful, pathetic image, designed to excite the reader's emotions. Conversely, in 7 G-P (= *AP* 7.646), the speaker imagines the final words of the dead girl to her father: thus the epigram breaks out of the conventional mode of the tomb speaking on the girl's behalf and instead recreates a moment in the past, again for pathetic effect.

Anyte also cleverly explores the speech of mourners in an epigram for a dead war-hero, *ep.* 4 G-P (= *AP* 7.724). The speaker opens with conventional enough expressions of mourning,[40] but then the monument is described as 'singing', *ἀλλὰ καλόν τοι ὕπερθεν ἔπος τόδε*

---

[37] On Anyte and her date, see e.g. Reitzenstein (1907), col. 84-5; Wilamowitz (1924), 136-7; Gow and Page (1965), ii 89-91; Geoghegan (1978).
[38] Cf. Gutzwiller (1998), 55: 'Anyte may have been the first epigrammatist to project a distinct literary persona', namely an 'orientation towards female concerns' (58).
[39] See esp. Barnard (1978, 1991); Snyder (1989), 69-77; Skinner (1991); Greene (2000); Gutzwiller (1998), 54-74; Murray and Rowland (2007).
[40] The text is corrupt: see esp. Ypsilanti (2003), 505-7.

πέτρος ἀείδει (3).[41] It seems that the stone has a different lament to perform, claiming an heroic death for his country. Thus the epigram presents the speaker and the stone in opposition, each with their own distinct words about the deceased.

However, where Anyte really shows her originality as an epitaph-poet is in her epigrams for animals: conventional mourning expressions are now applied to novel contexts. Sometimes the language is very close to that of 'real' inscriptions (perhaps there were sometimes inscriptions for pets); however, others are for more bizarre animals and have a humorous undertone. One epigram represents a young girl crying over insects:

> ἀκρίδι, τᾶι κατ' ἄρουραν ἀηδόνι, καὶ δρυοκοίται
>
> τέττιγι ξυνὸν τύμβον ἔτευξε Μυρώ,
>
> παρθένιον στάξασα κόρα δάκρυ· δισσὰ γὰρ αὐτᾶς
>
> παίγνι' ὁ δυσπειθὴς ὤιχετ' ἔχων Ἀίδας (*AP* 7.190 = Anyte 20 G-P).

Gutzwiller suspects a metapoetic meaning behind the grasshoppers and cicadas, and suggests that Myro could represent Anyte herself, mourning for the loss of a fellow poetess.[42] Indeed, the word used for the insects, παίγνια (4), could refer to poetry,[43] suggesting Hades has taken away poets with their works.

However, the literal sense is no less interesting. The mourner is described hyperbolically, with 'dripping tears', an image that suggests the girl weeping uncontrollably at the tomb. The adjective παρθένιον, and the identity, κόρα, imply childish behaviour. In this context, the use of epithets for both animals take on a sense of false grandeur, as if the girl is trying to elevate their dignity to that of 'adult' mourning (the epithets also have the effect of emphasising the strangeness of this tomb). The god's involvement in the last line seems incongruously over-the-

---

[41] Grandiose, Homeric language may make be suitable for the sung ἔπος: see Geoghegan (1979), 57-60.
[42] Gutzwiller (1998), 65-7. Cf. *id.* (2007), 110: 'Since grasshoppers and cicadas were symbols of tuneful poetry, this epigram may have been intended as a tribute to another woman poet or a projection of Anyte's own earlier self, a girl entranced by a childish vision of a mellifluous sound.'
[43] Perhaps cf. Simias *ep.* 1 G-P (= *AP* 7.203), an epitaph for a dead partridge: references to the partridge singing a 'woodland song' suggest a rustic poet-figure.

top, but it reminds us that in other Anyte epigrams, it is the young girl herself who is mourned. Here the maiden breaks out of that stereotype and develops her own voice of mourning, albeit one greatly removed from the conventional world of epitaphs. The poem thus emerges as a fascinating representation of female speech-acts and grief.

Another great contribution of Anyte is to the descriptive epigram. The voice of the detached narrator which we have seen in some funerary epigrams is used in dedicatory epigrams to describe an object or even a place. Descriptions of places, especially rustic scenes, are a speciality of Anyte, which mark her voice out as different from typical epigrams.[44] They are a good example of the way that the epigrammatists play with the reader's imagination.

For example, in an epigram for a sanctuary of Aphrodite,[45] the poet evokes the surrounding area. The reader is invited to 'see' not the statue or sanctuary itself but rather the vista:

> Κύπριδος οὗτος ὁ χῶρος, ἐπεὶ φίλον ἔπλετο τήνᾳ
> αἰὲν ἠπείρου λαμπρὸν ὁρῆν πέλαγος,
> ὄφρα φίλον ναύτῃσι τελῇ πλόον, ἀμφὶ δὲ πόντος
> δειμαίνῃ λιπαρὸν δερκόμενος ξόανον (Anyte 15 G-P = *AP* 9.144).

The epigram thematizes harmony and reciprocity between goddess and place: Aphrodite enjoys looking out at the scene, the sea returns the gaze (2, ὁρῆν; 4, δερκόμενος); both the ocean and statue of the goddess gleam (λαμπρόν ~ λιπαρόν). Aphrodite's pleasure in her sanctuary is matched by the benefits sailors receive from her (1, φίλον ἔπλετο τήνᾳ; 3, φίλον ναύτῃσι τελῇ πλόον).

---

[44] Reitzenstein (1893), esp.25-26, called the epigrams of Anyte, Simias *et al.* 'rein bukolisch', but most modern scholars are reluctant to commit to the existence of a bucolic genre, as such, before Theocritus. See Whitmore (1918); Bernsdorff (2001), 91-180; Rossi (2001); Sens (2006); Stanzel (2007).It is possible that there was a tradition now lost to us of country-based inscriptions, e.g. dedications to Pan etc. (cf. e.g. *IG* II² 4545 (=*IG* I³ 955, c.410 BC) , 4646 (iv BC)): cf. Geoghegan (1979), 42-55.

[45] Perhaps cf. e.g. *IG* II² 10108 (mid-iv BC), πατρίδα μὲν Πόντον Κυπρὶς κατέχει.

Another descriptive epigram is Anyte 17 G-P (= *AP* 9.314), in which this time the god himself provides a luscious evocation of the area which provides respite for passers-by: the reader is enticed to imagine this refreshment through colourful descriptive language. In the poem immediately before this one in the *Anthology*, the addressee is commanded to sit under a laurel tree,[46] placing her in the scene, which unfolds as a *locus amoenus*:

ἵζε᾽ ἅπας ὑπὸ καλὰ δάφνας εὐθαλέα φύλλα
ὡραίου τ᾽ ἄρυσαι νάματος ἁδὺ πόμα,
ὄφρα τοι ἀσθμαίνοντα πόνοις θέρεος φίλα γυῖα
ἀμπαύσῃς πνοιᾷ τυπτόμενα Ζεφύρου (*AP* 9.313 = Anyte 16 G-P).

There is no artefact for the passer-by to admire: it is the place itself which 'speaks'. We note that the addressee is female (unknown in inscribed epigram), and described as 'breathless from the heat' (3). Thus the reader is invited to imagine an internal addressee: so we are detached from the scene, left to admire an unknown woman taking refreshment in this idyllic setting. Perhaps on one level the addressee is to be taken as Anyte herself, withdrawing into her separated, personal poetic world.

Perhaps most curious of all are the pair of epigrams describing rustic scenes involving goats (*ep.* 13, 14 G-P = *AP* 6.312, 9.745): the first addresses a goat with whom children are playing; in the second, the reader is invited to look at and admire the goat. Geoghegan takes these as epigrams for paintings[47] (the θάεο…. ὡς of *ep.* 14.1 G-P is reminiscent of Hellenistic ekphrastic literature),[48] but we should not rule out the possibility that the epigrams simply stimulate readers' imaginations of idealised rustic scenes. The second goat perhaps evokes

[46] Cf. Theoc. *Id.*1.12, 11.45.
[47] Geoghegan (1979). As Gutzwiller (1998), 67, observes, the lemmatist on *AP* 9.745 thought the epigram was for a bronze statue.
[48] For the scene, perhaps. cf. Philostratos *Imag.*1.22, a description of a painting of Midas and Seilenos. On the sub-genre of 'ekphrastic epigram', see esp. now Bruss (2010b) on inscriptions; cf. Goldhill (1994); Gutzwiller (2002); Zanker (2003); Rossi (2001), 17-21, esp. on Theocritus; Stewart (2005) and Sens (2005) (both on Poseidippos); Männlein-Robert (2007a, b).

notions of shaggy-haired Seilenos,[49] the foster-father of Dionysus (cf. 1, *τὸν* Β*ρομίου κεραὸν τράγον*);[50] the association is triggered by Seilenos's wife, Nais, taking a lock of hair from the goat. These images of the satyr and nymph removes us to a world quite detached from the customary *locus* of epigram, and grants Anyte's poetic voice a curious and distinctive character.

Such epigrams that appeal to readers' imaginations become more frequent over the third century; epigrams describing supposedly dedicated objects also start to emerge. But for now let us observe that the literary epigram has presented an opportunity for poets to display considerable poetic skill by evoking complex mental images within just a few lines. The exploration of funerary scenes or evocation of rustic images are both illustrations of this idea of a powerful, emotional poem in miniature.

6.3 *Symposion* and epigram: mutual enrichment (Asklepiades and Philitas)

Such epigrams as those we have looked at so far cannot be seen simply as an evolution out of the inscribed forms. Other generic influences are important in shaping the epigrammatic voice. Sympotic poetry seems to have had a particularly strong influence,[51] although just as Hellenistic epigram does not simply evolve out of inscriptions, neither does it evolve directly out of earlier elegy or lyric,[52] although it is plausible that some epigrams were performed at *symposia*.[53] Other generic influences are important too (especially tragedy and epic), as Hellenistic epigram authors accentuate various aspects of the genre for poetic ends.

However, it seems helpful to speak of an earlier 'mutual enrichment'[54] between sympotic poetry and inscriptions which leads to the creation of a new concept of epigram as a sort of

---

[49] On Seilenos and the satyr-play, cf. e.g. Sutton (1974). It is tempting to draw a generic connection with Theocritean bucolic (cf. also Vergil *Ecl.* 6), but it is hard to suppose there was a strong sense of a bucolic genre in Anyte's time.
[50] Cf. e.g. Paus. 3.25.2; *h.Orph.* 54; Diod. Sic. 4.3.3.
[51] The *locus classicus* is Reitzenstein (1893); cf. *id.* (1907). The issue was revived by e.g. Gentili (1968); Giangrande (1968); West (1974); Bowie (2007); Aloni and Ianucci (2007).
[52] See esp. Bowie (2007) on this point.
[53] See, most recently, Cameron (1995), 70-103.
[54] This term seems preferable to Kroll's 'crossing of genres'; cf. Harrison (2007), esp. 1-33, and above, 'Introduction'.

entertainment piece analogous to sympotic song. In the age before Poseidippos and Callimachus, this is most reflected in the sympotic-erotic epigrams of Asklepiades and Philitas (the erotic epigrams ascribed to Plato are most probably later).[55] An earlier important figure seems to be Simonides, who wrote both elegy and epigram, not least because he evidently had a reputation for wit: amusing epigrams in the *sylloge Simonidea* may have been included because they were known to be a Simonidean trademark; subsequently this became a feature of the Hellenistic epigrammatic voice. We also find epitaphic themes in his lyric poem for the dead of Thermopylai (*PMG* 531); this indicates a certain degree of mutual enrichment at an early stage.

Several elements of sympotic song, especially elegy, lend themselves to comparison with inscribed epigram. The most important is brevity: short elegiac poems for the *symposion* and inscribed epigrams may both have been regarded as exercises in pithiness. Moreover, perhaps the speakers and addressees of epigram could be felt to be analogous to those of the *symposion*: the deceased (for example) addresses the community of the living just as the singer addresses the gathering. The use of gnomic expressions in fourth-century Attic epitaphs is probably an indication of the sense that epigrams are poems in a broader context.

When poems are read on papyrus, the context of the speech-act is of course lost, and two short poems of originally quite different designations may look even more like each other.[56] There is a fiction: the speaking page invites the reader to imagine a context, such as a sympotic gathering or an inscribed monument;[57] it becomes even harder to differentiate the speakers and addressees, who all now need to be recreated by the reader. Thus the voice of sympotic elegy, iambic or lyric may have started to 'rub off' on that of epigram when papyrus collections of both came into wider circulation.

---

[55] See esp. Ludwig (1963); West (1982), 158, on the metre (ii/i BC). However, the 'Dion' elegy looks older. On Plato's *Symposium* and Hellenistic erotic epigram, see e.g. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 338-349.
[56] So Gutzwiller (1998), 177. Cf. Sens (2011), xliv.
[57] Cf. Bing (1995).

One effect seems to have been the emergence of amusing or sententious epigrams, sometimes with little or no connection to inscriptional contexts; topics such as drinking and sex may have found their way into epigrams. Many surviving elegiac texts are *paroimiai*, possibly often quotations from longer works extracted as pithy observations on something or other;[58] these were sometimes included alongside melic *skolia*, which could also be seen as short, witty poems that made a clever point briefly.[59] An extant example is *P. Berol.* 13270 (iii BC: composition perhaps iv BC), which has three melic *skolia* (*PMG* 917) followed by an elegiac poem after a *paragraphos* (*adesp. eleg.* fr. 27 W^2).[60] 'Aristotle' too quotes *adesp. eleg.* fr. 6 W^2 from ἐν τοῖς σκολίοις (*Ath.Pol.*20.5).[61] Such collections may have provided models for new short compositions, thus influencing the style and perhaps even sometimes the metre of literary epigram (I discuss lyric metres in ch.7). Collections of elegiac and/or melic poems and epigrams side by side would particularly aid mutual enrichment: perhaps the *Theognidea* was an example.[62]

The sense that an epigram was simply another kind of amusement piece may have been helped by the quoting of epigrams at *symposia*:[63] for example, Chamaileon (late-iv BC) apparently quoted an elegiac couplet which he ascribes to Simonides, but also notes that it was inscribed on an object in Chalkis (Chamaileon fr. 34 Wehrli). He calls the poem a riddle (γριφώδη); there are no obviously inscriptional features: perhaps only part of the original inscription was reused in a sympotic context. Chamaileon also provides us with evidence for improvisatory pieces that he calls ἐπιγράμματα (fr. 33 Wehrli, *ap.* Ath. 656d = Simonides fr. 26 W^2).[64]

---

[58] Cf. e.g. *adesp. eleg.* fr. 4 and 5 W^2 (proverbs on 'the good man'); *adesp. eleg.* fr. 7 W^2 (a proverb about the winds quoted by Theophrastos).
[59] See Robbins, *DNP* s.v. 'Skolion'. Cf. Reitzenstein (1893); Gerber (1994), 180-4; Cingano (2003).
[60] See Ferrari (1988); Perignotti and Maltomini (2002), esp. 67-75.
[61] See more at Fabbro (1995), 182-5. At *Ath.Pol.* 19.3, 'Aristotle' had also cited an iambic poem ἐν τοῖς σκολίοις.
[62] On an early date for the *Theognidea* see e.g. Bowie (1997).
[63] Elegiacs are easily memorized for re-performance: see e.g. Ford (forthcoming), 41-44.
[64] Cf. Ath. 3.125c, where another seemingly improvisatory elegy attributed to Simonides is referred to by Kallistratos (ii BC) as an ἐπίγραμμα. On the meaning of the word ἐπίγραμμα, see esp. Puelma (1996).

However, a much more direct sign of this overlap comes in the epigrams of Asklepiades of Samos,[65] who was – like Anyte – probably composing around the end of the fourth century or beginning of the third century.[66] Of Asklepiades' epigrams, even those closest to epitaphic or dedicatory contexts are highly stylised and humorous, and show a willingness to play with conventions. For example, in *ep.* 30 G-P (*AP* 7.284),[67] the speaker (the grave of Eumares) addresses the sea and waves: the command for them to stay away inverts the trope of appealing to passers-by; they are amusingly assumed to be grave-diggers, who will find only bones and dust. That teases out the trope of the separation of body and soul that we have seen (ch. 3). The grave's fear for its own safety rather than keenness to praise the dead man lends it humorous characterisation.

However, it is the sympotic-erotic epigrams that are the most innovative. These show various generic influences, sympotic elegy being the most obvious but also comedy;[68] elements of inscribed epigram are incorporated for a very distinctive poetic voice.[69] Asklepiades really treats the epigram simply as a short elegiac genre in which one character addresses another, sometimes in the manner of an inscription, often not. There are a wide variety of addressees and implied speakers, including gods, *hetairai*, lovers, and even lamps (9 G-P = *AP* 5.162; cf. 10 G-P = *AP* 5.150) or the night (13 G-P = *AP* 5.164). Sometimes the speaker is male, other times female. Speaking graves, or dedicators addressing gods, are treated much like symposiasts addressing fellow drinkers (as e.g. 16 G-P). Part of the delight in reading the corpus of epigrams must have been wondering which *persona* would be adopted next, and reconstructing a scenario for the utterances.

---

[65] The epigrams and fragments have recently been edited with translation and commentary by Sens (2011); on the erotic epigrams, see also Bettenworth (2002); Ihm (2004); Tueller (2008), 117-131.
[66] Cf. Gutzwiller (1998), 122 and n.20 with further bibliography; Sens (2011), xxxvi, 'Asclepiades' likely dates place him among the oldest known authors of literary epigram'.
[67] Cf. Sistakou (2007), 396; Sens (2011), 201-206.
[68] See e.g. Giangrande (1968); Bowie (2007); Gutzwiller (1998), 122-150 & (2007), 315; Handley (1996).
[69] Cf. e.g. Gutzwiller (2007), 315, 'he gives this material from other genres a new shape and feel that can only be called epigrammatic'.

For example, a blend of epitaphic and erotic imagery is found in *ep.* 2 G-P (= *AP* 5.85):[70] the theme of death lends urgency to an appeal for a *parthenos* to renounce her virginity:[71]

φείδῃ παρθενίης· καὶ τί πλέον; οὐ γὰρ ἐς Ἅιδην
ἐλθοῦσ' εὑρήσεις τὸν φιλέοντα, κόρη.
ἐν ζωοῖσι τὰ τερπνὰ τὰ Κύπριδος· ἐν δ' Ἀχέροντι
ὀστέα καὶ σποδιή, παρθένε, κεισόμεθα (*AP* 5.85 = Asclep. 2 G-P).

The girl is addressed as if dead, but future tenses undercut the epitaphic sense; the use of the plural in the last line (*κεισόμεθα*) asserts that speaker and addressee are in the same situation: the 'epitaph' is for both of them! This future death is contrasted with a present life; bones and dust in Acheron contrast with *τὰ τερπνὰ τὰ* Κύπριδος.[72] The epigram may draw on the regret for non-marriage in epitaphs for numerous *parthenoi*: here Hades is held up as a threat (1-2). The claim that there will be no lover in Hades cleverly inverts the common theme that death is a kind of marriage (cf. ch.3 above).

Dedicatory motifs are equally sexualised. A famous case is the epigram ostensibly for a dedication by a certain Lysidike to Aphrodite, where the ostensible occasion of dedication becomes a means for some amusing innuendo:

Λυσιδίκη *σοί*, Κύπρι, *τὸν ἱππαστῆρα μύωπα,*
χρύσεον εὐκνήμου κέντρον ἔθηκε ποδός,
ᾧ πολὺν ὕπτιον ἵππον ἐγύμνασεν· οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτῆς
μηρὸς ἐφοινίχθη κοῦφα τινασσομένης·
ἦν γὰρ ἀκέντητος τελεοδρόμος· οὕνεκεν ὅπλον
σοὶ κατὰ μεσσοπύλης χρύσεον ἐκρέμασεν (*AP* 5.203= 6 G-P).[73]

---

[70] See e.g. Ihm (2004), 39-40; Gutzwiller (1998), 124-5; Meyer (2005), 125-6; Cairns (1993, 1996); Di Marco (2002).
[71] Cf. e.g. Theogn.1298-1301; *PMG* 913.
[72] Perh. cf. e.g. Eur. fr.533 Kannicht, *τερπνὸν τὸ φῶς τόδ'· ὁ δ' ὑπὸ γῆς Ἅιδου σκότος | οὐδ' εἰς ὄνειρον ἡδὺς ἀνθρώποις μολεῖν.*
[73] Cf. Sens (2011), 36-42.

The opening couplet looks like the conventional language of dedication, although inscriptions would tend only to identify the object briefly (if at all). By associating the spur with Lysidike's 'pretty ankle and foot', we are already thinking about Lysidike's attractiveness; the girl's nakedness (3) strongly suggests an erotic sense (she adopts the role of a male athlete 'training in the nude'). Calling the horse 'supine' – hardly the expected adjective – opens the way for interpreting the horse as a male lover receiving a sex-act from Lysidike.[74] In the most overtly sexual part of the epigram, it is said that 'her thigh does not run red': the implication seems to be that thanks to her light movements she avoids being penetrated.

In this context, one cannot avoid suspecting that the *dedicandum,* a κέντρον, refers to the *membrum virile*;[75] but why does Lysidike own this instrument, and why is she dedicating it? In fact, in the final part of the poem we learn of her finishing the race without the need for a spur (ἀκέντητος, 5).[76] What emerges is a subtle suggestion about gender-role: normally the rider should be spurring the horse, yet the experienced Lysidike evidently takes the dominant role. Such dominance perhaps renders the κέντρον redundant: the meaning of ἀκέντητος turns out to be that she has not been 'goaded' (a meaning which complements the reference to unbloodied thighs).[77] The dedication of the κέντρον to Aphrodite[78] is probably an indicator of the *hetaira*'s skill, perhaps a tribute by a rueful client.

The use of the *persona* of the lovesick patient may perhaps owe something to the speaking corpse or grieving relative – the epigram provides a model for a concise expression of such grief (cf. e.g. *ep.* 33 G-P) – but seems more closely derived from lyric and tragic models. For example, in *ep.* 8 G-P (= *AP* 5.162) the speaker complains of his treatment from a lover, Philainon, who

---

[74] For the image, cf. Theogn. 1249-52, 1267-70; Anakreon *PMG* 417, on which cf. Hutchinson (2001), 282: '[there is] a connection between sexual climax and winning a race'. Cf. also Pretagostini (1993).
[75] Cf. *LSJ*[9] 5d.
[76] Cf. Gutzwiller (1998), 126-7, who suggests that this is a prop she no longer needs due to her skill. Maxwell-Stuart (1981), 43-4, is a trifle forced with 'it is *she* [*sic*] who is doing the deflowering'. I certainly see no indications of Asklepiades' state of mind, as she claims here.
[77] The same adjective in Pindar (*Ol.*1.21) is applied directly to the horse Pherenikos, who is so compliant or speedy as to complete the race without being spurred.
[78] Cf. *ep.* 7 G-P, in which the speaker prays to Aphrodite to reprimand two women involved in the wrong sort of sexual activity.

has 'wounded' him, *μ' ἔτρωσε* (1).[79] An epitaphic tone occurs in the final line, *ἠδ' ἔθιγόν γ' Ἀίδα*,[80] but the voice is more that of the lyric lover or tragic heroine:[81] there is neurotic hyperbole in the second line, *ὁ πόνος δύεται εἰς ὄνυχα*, before the tragic utterances, *οἴχομ', Ἔρωτες, ὄλωλα, διοίχομαι*.[82] The representation of gravesite lament is thus lent an erotic context. This voice is also adopted in *ep.*14 G-P (= *AP* 5.167), in which the speaker compares his tears to rainfall: an irreverent invocation of Zeus to fall silent adds a comic touch.[83]

The roughly contemporary Philitas of Kos also composed innovative short, elegiac poems with influences from inscriptional genres.[84] Only a few survive, but these are enough to indicate a 'bookish' voice. Stobaeus (*Flor.*2.4.5) cites one fragment from a work he calls *Paignia* (fr. 11 Powell = 22 Spanoudakis), a name which suggests they were read as amusement pieces. An elegiac poem quoted from *Epigrammata* by Stobaeus (*Flor.*4.15.5; fr.10 Powell = 21 Span.) is in fact not at all like inscribed epigrams; a third Stobaean quotation is lemmatised both as from *Epigrammata* and *Paignia*, which suggests these names had become interchangeable.

This last poem is in fact the most 'epigraphic' of Philitas poems, but illustrates neatly the delight Hellenistic authors take in representing different characters within the genre. The deceased speaks to the passer-by, telling him to grieve 'within reason'; the passer-by picks up on the very words used by the original speaker, saying that he does not mourn at all:

ἐκ θυμοῦ κλαῦσαί με τὰ μέτρια, καί τι προσηνὲς
εἰπεῖν, μεμνῆσθαί τ' οὐκέτ' ἐόντος ὁμῶς.
- οὐ κλαίω ξείνων σε φιλαίτατε· πολλὰ γὰρ ἔγνως
καλά, κακῶν δ' αὖ σοι μοῖραν ἔνειμε θεός (fr. 24 Span.).

---

[79] On this epigram, see also Gutzwiller (1998), 134-5; Ihm (2004), 61-3; Defreyne (1993), 200-201; Rosenmeyer (1992), 186.
[80] Cf. e.g. Rosenmeyer (1992), 186: '... a nod in the direction of Eurydice's mythical death... and the metaphorical sense of 'dying' at the point of falling in love.'
[81] Rosenmeyer (1992), 186, observes the closeness to e.g. *Anacreontea* 35.10.
[82] Cf. also 15.2-3 G-P, *Ὤρωτες, τί κακὸν τοῦτο; τί με φλέγετε; / ἦν γὰρ ἐγώ τι πάθω, τί ποιήσετε;*
[83] See Gutzwiller (1998), 140-1; Ihm (2004), 115-25. Cf. also Giangrande (1968), 171-2; Tarán (1979), 56-62; De Stefani (1996); Mastromarco (1997).
[84] For editions, see Sbardella (2000a); Spanoudakis (2002); Lightfoot (2009).

The second speaker responds to the request for a kind word (1-2) by addressing the deceased with an intimacy that belies the fact he is supposedly a stranger (*φιλαίτατε*). The brief explanation for the passer-by's lack of grief fulfils the request to 'remember' (2), but only raises more questions than it answers: we should like to know what the *καλά* are that cause the speaker to rate the deceased so highly, and again what the *κακά* imposed by the god might be. It seems strange to mention these *κακά* when he has just said that he will not mourn him. Although the poem seems straightforward on first reading, the enjoyment no doubt comes from the puzzle that arises from further inquiry.

There is another elegiac couplet which is not ascribed to the *Paignia*, but which probably best belongs there, despite Spanoudakis' attempts to ascribe it to the *Demeter*. It seems to be a kind of *griphos*:[85]

γηρύσαιτο δὲ νεβρὸς ἀπὸ ψυχὴν ὀλέσασα,

ὀξείης κάκτου τύμμα φυλαξαμένη.

A singing deer is already surprising, but the references to 'losing its life' and 'avoiding the prick of a sharp cactus') adds to the oddity. *τύμμα* is a fairly rare word (only once in verse before Philitas, at Aesch. *Ag.*1430), one which probably has medical or scientific overtones.[86] Its conjunction with *κάκτος* will add to this impression, yet this is rather at odds with the 'singing deer'. Fortunately, our source, the late third century paradoxist Antigonos of Karystos, also provides the answer, telling us that the deer-bone can only be used for a musical instrument if it has not been damaged, i.e. by the prick of a cactus.

Equally baffling at first sight is another pseudo-epigrammatic poem, fr. 25 Span. (= 10 Powell):

---

[85] This riddling pseudo-epigrammatic style is the main reason for ascribing an anonymous elegiac poem entitled the 'oyster', and about Memnon, to Philitas (*SH* 983-4), found on a second-century papyrus (PLouvre 7734). It goes without saying that this is speculative in the extreme, but it is at least possible to identify the early-third century as a time when this riddling-style came into vogue (cf. also on Simias). On the poem, see Lasserre (1975); Parsons (1977); D'Alessio (1990); Sbardella (2000a), 182-4.

[86] Cf. in the *Corpus Hippocraticum*, *De Morb. Pop.* 7.1.37; Arist. *Hist.An.*.5.21.624a16.

οὔ μέ τις ἐξ ὀρέων ἀποφώλιος ἀγροιώτης
αἰρήσει κλήθρην, αἰρόμενος μακέλην·
ἀλλ' ἐπέων εἰδὼς κόσμον καὶ πολλὰ μογήσας
μύθων παντοίων οἶμον ἐπιστάμενος.

Although this is apparently in the voice of an object in fact it turns out not to be a dedicatory or even ekphrastic epigram, but another poem which invites the reader to participate in a guessing game. Given its distinctly self-referential character, with references to the poetic expert rather than the untrained rustic, and pointing out the *ἐπέων … κόσμον*, we might legitimately wonder if the *μέ* is not in fact a musical instrument, as might be supposed,[87] but the text of Philitas' poetry.[88] Since the adjective confirms that the speaker is feminine,[89] it is highly tempting to conjecture that this speaker is the 'tall lady/long elegy' mentioned by Callimachus. This is of course entirely conjecture: but we might note that such a poem would be ideal to open or close an edition of the *Paignia* and *Epigrammata*, and as such would also be an appropriate point of reference for Callimachus.

Conclusion

It would, of course, have been possible to choose other authors and other poems; and there is far more to say about the poems than I have space for in this thesis. But it has been my purpose to illustrate how prominent epigrammatists in the late fourth and early-third century fashioned a stylised form of the genre, which drew not only on the generic conventions of inscribed epigram but also adopted the self-representation and characters of sympotic and erotic elegy. The result

[87] The sense of *κλήθρη* ('alder-wood') has puzzled all readers: see esp. Bing (1986); Dettori (1999). Spanoudakis (2002), 318-22, summaries the discussion so far.
[88] Cf. Bing (1986), 223, 'We can interpret this poem as a 'talking tablet"; Spanoudakis (2002), 321, 'This is a talking book'. On this poem as an example of Philitan erudition, cf. Bing (2003).
[89] See Bing (1986).

was a new kind of genre that was not derived linearly either from elegy (or other sympotic genres) or epigram, but rather formed a distinctive and innovative poetic voice.

This is one instance of book poetry as it is found in the earliest stages of the Hellenistic period. But other sorts of poetry seem to have been composed for books. Some of these are more or less directly related to epigram: the use of various unusual and innovative metres for epigram spreads into longer forms of poem, in what is sometimes referred to as book lyric. These literary experiments are the focus of the next chapter, before I turn to non-epigrammatic elegy

Chapter 7
'Book lyric' at the end of the fourth century

7.1 Lyric metres in early-Hellenistic books

In the previous chapter, I mostly considered the case of elegiac literary epigram; but I noted that if the melic *skolia* provided a model for the new style of composition,[1] then this may have led to epigrams or other short poems in other metres. Although Meleager by and large excluded non-elegiac epigrams from his anthology – as we saw in ch.3-4, elegiacs had become the metre predominantly associated with epigram – *AP* 13 and 15 show epigrams could be composed in other metres; most are of a later date, but some are ascribed to Callimachus and various other early-Hellenistic poets.[2] In this chapter I consider some of these and other bookish poems that seem to show experimentation with metres, such as Kastorion's *Hymn to Pan*. It is to be doubted whether ancient authors and readers always saw a strong demarcation between epigrams and short poems in lyric metres more influenced by other genres: they all belong to the same spectrum of poetic fiction.

An interesting case of lyric metres occurring in a collection of non-epigrammatic poems is an early third-century BC papyrus found in a Greek garrison in Elephantine, Egypt, *P. Berol.*inv. 13270,[3] which contains what looks like three distinct poems in lyric metres (*PMG* 917 a-c) [4] followed by a short elegiac poem (*adesp. eleg.* fr. 27 W^2). The poems themselves cannot be dated with certainty, but late-fourth century seems probable.[5] The poems are obviously sympotic in nature: the opening of the elegiac poem, χαίρετε, συμπόται ἄνδρες (1), suggests the voice of

[1] See esp. Reitzenstein (1893).
[2] For a helpful discussion of lyric epigrams in the *Anthology*, see now Dale (2010). Throughout this chapter, I will use 'lyric' in a very loose way, as meaning nothing more than non-stichic verse. For a thorough discussion of the metres themselves, see esp. West (1982).
[3] *BKT* 5.2 no. 15, 53-64; *Pack* 1924; *LDAB* 6927.
[4] Cavallo and Maehler eds. (2008), 27, have a photograph of the manuscript; for text and discussion, Pellizer and Tedeschi eds. (1983); Ferrari (1988); Bravo (1997), 43-99 (with detailed bibliography and criticism of approaches); Perignotti and Maltomini (2002); Kwapisz (2008).
[5] So Page (1962) *ad loc.*

the master of ceremonies (cf. e.g. Xenophanes el. fr. 1 W^2). The first lyric poem is too fragmentary to be useful, but in the second there is an instruction for symposiasts to mix a 'bowl of the Graces'; the third is again short enough to be identified with the *skolia*.[6] Bravo's idea that the lyric part of the papyrus was part of a dithyramb or *pannychis*-song involves some overly-inventive reading of the *lacunae*.[7]

The papyrus has marginal notes beside the third lyric poem, μοῦσαι, εὐφώρατ[ος], and **Μ**νημοσύνη. These are seemingly tags for each of the *skolia*: in the lacunose first poem, there is a reference to a daughter or daughters, which Pellizer and Tedeschi reasonably restored as σεμν]αὶ θυγάτρ̣[ες],[8] indicating that this could indeed be a poem about the Muses. The tag 'easy to detect' perhaps alludes to the last line of the second poem, which refers to a spy 'captured by the ships at Troy';[9] the opening invocation of the last poem, **ὦ Μ**οῦσα, would be suitable for addressing Mnemosyne. The poems are not particularly riddle-like in style, so rather than see the marginalia as solutions to riddles, it is preferable to understand them as editorial glosses.[10]

This may suggest a deliberate selection or arrangement of material. Each poem is linked by connection to the Muses, who are invoked together in the first *skolion*, Mnemosyne on her own in the last. The middle *skolion* refers to a libation to the Graces and promises tales in 'countless hymns', which it follows with a sort of précis of various epic themes. The final song too promises song:

ἄρτι βρύουσαν ἀοιδὰν

πρωτοπαγεῖ σοφίαι διαποικίλον ἐκφέρομεν (c, 3-4).

This is followed by a set of imperatives that seem to belong to a narrative situation, but seem to place the symposiast in the midst of the action. This device lends dramatic urgency: line 5 sets the scene briefly and vividly; then the series of imperatives in short, breathless phrases imagine a

---

[6] So Ferrari (1988); cf. Cameron (1995), 74-5.
[7] Bravo (1997), 43-99.
[8] Pellizer and Tedeschi eds. (1983).
[9] Cf. Dolon at *Il.* 10.299-30 (see Campbell (1993), *n. ad loc*).
[10] So Bravo (1997), esp. 58-63.

situation in which a sailor struggles to cope with a storm. The diction of the poem is characterised by the use of compounds and a syntax that seems designed to convey a sense of drama and immediacy. It acts, as it were, as a snapshot of a moment.

It is tempting, then, to see each poem as an exercise in pithy redaction of narrative themes. The elegiac poem that comes after the *skolia* (the change of metre indicated by a *paragraphos*) discusses appropriate behaviour at the *symposion*, but makes a reference to the beginning and end of 'speech' (ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ γὰρ / ἀρξάμενος τελέω τὸν λόγον [ϵ]ἰς ἀγαθόν, 1-2): a possible interpretation is that this acted as a 'seal' on the mini-series of lyric poems.

Whether such poems were composed for performance or the book – or indeed, both – is hardly possible to resolve. They are however a fascinating glimpse of the composition of non-elegiac, short entertainment pieces for the *symposion* from a time when very few such works are attested. It is not unreasonable to connect these sorts of poem with the literary epigram collections of around the same period: the elegiac poem would certainly help a reader to imagine a sympotic setting for the little songs.

7.2 Lyric metres in book epigram

Mutual enrichment between non-elegiac sympotic poetry and epigram is evident in the poetry of Aischrion (of Samos or Mytilene) in the late-fourth century,[11] who even seems to have lent his name to a version of the iambic metre, the 'aischrionion' (a catalectic iambic dimeter). Little is extant: Athenaeus quotes just a few fragments, an *On Glaukos* (*SH* 5), which apparently talks about the food that made Glaukos immortal, and another fragment that alluringly invokes the moon as 'heaven's pretty new sigma' (μήνη τὸ καλὸν οὐρανοῦ νέον σίγμα, *SH* 6).[12] Other

[11] Although Athenaeus names 'Aischrion of Samos' as an author (Ath. 8.335c), in the *Suda* he is called 'Aischrion of Mytilene': it is probable that he should be identified with the 'Aischrion of Mytilene' referred to by Tzetzes (*ad Lycophron* 638; cf. *Chil* 8.406), an epic poet who also wrote in iambics, and who was apparently a companion of Alexander the Great and a pupil of Aristotle. The epithet 'Samian' may derive from his epigram on Philainis of Samos – but Samos had a reputation for moral degeneracy which may be the point of this poem about a prostitute. Cf. Tsantsanoglou (1973); Gow and Page (1965), ii 3; Plant (2004), 45.
[12] Ath. 7.296f; 8.335c-d.

fragments, *SH* 7-10, perhaps belong to a single, longer iambic poem. Sadly we have no other clues about the contexts of these fragments.

However, a complete epitaphic poem is ascribed to Aischrion, *AP* 7.345 (cf. Ath. 8.335c).This is in choliambics, and is purportedly an epitaph for a prostitute called Philainis, who was believed to be the author of a fourth-century pornographic manual:[13] Aischrion seeks to clear her name and ascribe the authorship to the sophist Polykrates:

ἐγὼ Φιλαινὶς ἡ 'πίβωτος ἀνθρώποις
ἐνταῦθα γήρᾳ τῷ μακρῷ κεκοίμημαι.
μή μ', ὦ μάταιε ναῦτα, τὴν ἄκρην κάμπτων
χλεύην τε ποιεῦ καὶ γέλωτα καὶ λάσθην.
οὐ γὰρ μὰ τὸν Ζῆν', οὐ μὰ τοὺς κάτω κούρους,
οὐκ ἦν ἐς ἄνδρας μάχλος οὐδὲ δημώδης.
Πολυκράτης δὲ τὴν γενὴν Ἀθηναῖος,
λόγων τι παιπάλημα καὶ κακὴ γλῶσσα,
ἔγραψεν οἶ' ἔγραψ'· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐκ οἶδα (*AP* 7.345 = Aeschrion 1 G-P, *SH* 4).

The genre of epigram is assumed as a rhetorical device by which the deceased Philainis can defend herself against accusations. Another poet, Dioskorides (probably second half of the third century), composed a similar epitaph in elegiacs in imitation of this (*AP* 7.450 = Dioskorides 26 G-P),[14] which is even more overtly epitaphic in style: it identifies Philainis' country of origin, and speaks as the woman's μνῆμα, referring to her στήλη, τάφον, and ὀστέα. The voice is very much that of an *apologia* from beyond the grave against the impugning of her character: the monument acts as a memorial so that readers can detect her true nature.[15]

[13] See P. Oxy. 2891 (early ii AD), a περὶ ἀφορδισίων, which opens with: 'Philainis of Samos daughter of Okymenes wrote these things for those wanting... life'.
[14] On the arrangement in *AP*, see esp. Dale (2010). Tsantsanoglou (1973) posits that Aischrion is the imitator, but the argument does not seem conclusive. For the epigrams of Dioskorides, see Clack (2001).
[15] Bruss (2010a), 131, suggests plausibly that the epigram could have introduced an edition of the treatise.

Aischrion's poem, however, is rather different. Its declarative tone, and the metre, may have more of a resonance of Hipponactean iambics.[16] The direct command (3) and oath (5) add a forceful rhetorical element to the poem, a rhetoric that is supported by alliteration (e.g. 3, *μή μ', ὦ μάταιε*) and repetitions (*οὐ γὰρ μά ~ οὐ μά*, 5; *ἔγραψεν οἷ' ἔγραψ'*, 9). The oath in 5 lends an almost improvisatory character. These features may all give the impression of a performance in a 'live' setting, Philainis defending herself before a gathering. It seems likely that Dioskorides 'conventionalised' these features into epitaphic formulae.

The final words in Aischrion's version, in which Philainis assumes naïveté, present an attempted rhetorical climax to her defence. However, this may betray the poem's humorous voice: the lady doth protest too much, and the apparent non-knowledge of the contents of the scandalous book might be a disclaimer too far. As Jon Bruss has recently elaborated, it becomes possible to find *double entendre* throughout the poem: for example, the 'here I lie' trope (2) perhaps has the sense of the 'I've been laid'; the addressee, a 'flippant sailor', can be understood as one of Philainis' clients; *τὴν ἄκρην κάμπτων* (3) may have sexual overtones.[17] The epigram seems to wink at a knowing audience, who chuckle at the idea of this famous prostitute claiming she is innocent.

Although a performance-scenario for this poem is not impossible, it seems more probable that Hipponactean and epigrammatic notions were blended to create a fun text for reading on papyrus. This new form of epigram forms a useful pretext for recovering a metre that may well have fallen into a certain amount of disuse. Other epigram writers also seemingly used lyric metres: the fact that an archaic metre is called 'asklepiadic' (cf. Hephaistion 33.6 Consbruch) suggests Asklepiades used this metre too (though no such poems are extant); similarly, the phalaecean metre takes its name from Phalaikos (Heph. 33.1-2 Consbruch).[18] Both these poets

[16] On the Hellenistic revival of interest in Hipponax, see esp. Kerkhecker (1999), 6-8.
[17] See Bruss (2010), 130-1.
[18] Sadly Hephaistion, who quotes poems by Kratinos and Alkaios, does not give us any further detail about how the Hellenistic poets used the metre.

are best known as epigrammatists, so it is a fair guess that the metrical experiments took place in 'epigram'. They did not invent the metres, but probably did cause them to become more familiar through their epigrams: Hephaistion's study of unusual metres is seemingly mediated through these Hellenistic revivals.

A remarkable instance is the Phalaikos' hendecasyllabic *ep.* 2 G-P (= *AP* 13.5), which takes the form of a dialogue between honorific statues of athletic victors:

α— νικῶ δίαυλον. β — ἀλλ' ἐγὼ παλαίων.

γ — ἐγὼ δὲ πεντάεθλον. δ — ἀλλ' ἐγὼ πύξ.

ε — καὶ τίς τύ; α —Τιμόδημος. β — ἀλλ' ἐγὼ Κρής.

γ — ἐγὼ δὲ Κρηθεύς. δ — ἀλλ' ἐγὼ Διοκλῆς.

ε — καὶ τίς πατήρ τοι; α —Κλεῖνος. βγδ —ὥσπερ ἄμμιν.

ε — ἔμπη δὲ νικῇς; α —Ἰσθμοῖ. ἦ τὺ δ' ἔμπη;

β? — Νέμειον ἂν λειμῶνα καὶ παρ' Ἥρᾳ.

The point seems to be to recreate for the reader the sense of visiting a family plot of victors' statues: in line 5, we learn that the speakers share a father. The questions are precisely what such a visitor would wish to know the answers to, but putting them in the mouth of the statues themselves brings amusement. Making the statues inquisitive undercuts the expectation that the inscriptions for the statues will provide relevant information. The unison response of the statues ('us too', 5) in response to the question, 'who is your father?' is humorous – one would expect the brothers to know each other! This perhaps plays on the gap between representations of people in statues and the actual people commemorated: the whole text reads as a parody of the genre. The layout above follows Gow and Page's identification of speakers: but guessing who was supposed to be speaking must have been part of the enjoyment for the papyrus-reader. The poetic voice is one of entertainment through mimicking and inverting traditional aspects of the genre; the reader is involved in this process.

7.3 Longer metrical experiments

A non-epigrammatic poem with an overtly bookish nature is an unusual *Hymn to Pan* by Kastorion of Soloi (late-iv BC),[19] which uses the form of a hymn but also explores metrical possibilities.[20] The first five lines only are preserved by Klearchos (*ap.* Ath. 10.454f-455b):

> *σὲ τὸν βολαῖς νιφοκτύποις δυσχείμερον*
> *ναίονθ' ἕδραν, θηρονόμε Πάν, χθόν' Ἀρκάδων,*
> *κλήσω γραφῇ τῇδ' ἐν σοφῇ πάγκλειτ' ἔπη*
> *συνθείς, ἄναξ, δύσγνωστα μὴ σοφῷ κλύειν,*
> *μωσοπόλε θήρ, κηρόχυτον ὃς μείλιγμ' ἰεῖς…* (*SH* 310).

Klearchos claims that the positions of each of the *metra* are interchangeable. Peter Bing has shown that this is only theoretically possible rather than functionally so, since other orders work far less well.[21] However, it still looks like a deliberate ploy (the implication is that this continued for the rest of the poem), and since each *metron* also contained the same number of written letters, we must suspect that Kastorion aimed for a visual effect rather than aural.[22]

Indeed, the poem appears to revel in its own cleverness (*γραφὴ σοφή*, 3); the speaker asserts that the uninitiated would find it hard to understand (4). This is reminiscent of the exclusion of the uninitiated from mysteries, but seems to point more to the artistry of the poem than the religious content. The expression, *δύσγνωστα μὴ σοφῷ*, can be taken as 'hard to understand' either for 'for one who is not wise' or even 'for the non-poet'. It is tempting to speculate that *γραφῇ τῇδ' ἐν σοφῇ* is also a reference to the technology of writing, which would be particularly relevant if the poem is encountered either as an inscription or on papyrus: the *σοφός* is one capable of reading the letters and perhaps noticing details such as the number of

---

[19] The date of Kastorion is reliably judged by the poem that he apparently composed for Demetrios of Phaleron (*PMG* 845, *SH* 312, *ap.* Ath. 12.542e).
[20] Perhaps cf. also Boiskos of Kyzikos, *SH* 233, which is undatable unless this is the same Boiskos as the author of New Comedy from the end of the second century BC. Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 38.
[21] Bing (1985).
[22] For this and other such games, see now Luz (2010).

letters in each *metron*. The prefix in δύσγνωστα recalls the description of Pan's Arcadian territory, δυσχείμερον (1): Kastorion's style of poetry is perhaps as 'uninhabitable' to the uneducated reader as the land of the Arkadians is to outsiders. The hymn revels in verbal humour: it seems to make a theme out of Pan's visual form, adapting the idea of the 'beast-ruler' (2) so that he becomes himself a beast (5); πάγκλειτ' ἔπη may be a pun on the god's name. Perhaps indeed the very cleverness of the poem is a sort of antidote to the god's rustic image. Even if such cleverness could be conceived as an act of religious devotion, it is difficult to take this poem too seriously as a cult-hymn.

The sort of cleverness displayed by Kastorion is surpassed only by a contemporary set of three poems in unusual metres by Simias of Rhodes, commonly called the *technopaignia* (although this title is a modern invention).[23] These poems form part of a series of similar poems in *AP* 15, all of which contrive to create a pattern on the page by means of altering the metre to vary the length of lines.[24] The Simias poems appear to the oldest: one is ascribed to Theocritus, but is believed to be of a later date;[25] the others are seemingly from the imperial period.[26] Simias can, however, be dated fairly confidently to around the turn of the century, on the basis of evidence from Hephaistion, who informs us that Simias' use of the choriambic pentameter pre-empted that of Philikos of Korkyra (Heph. 31.1-2 Consbruch), a poet of the tragic pleiad in the early-third century.[27]

---

[23] *AP* 15.22 (*Axe*); 15.24 (*Wings*, written twice). 27 (*Egg*). For the texts of *AP* 15, see esp. Beckby (1968, 1975). For texts and commentary on the Simias poems, see esp.: Häberlin (1887), 69-79; Fränkel (1915); Wojaczek (1969) *CA* 117-9; Gow (1958); Gallavotti (1993); Strodel (2002) (text and commentary). For general discussion and a full bibliography, see also Ernst (1991); Guichard (2006); Bruss (2010), 123; Luz (2010).
[24] On the interesting history of *AP* 15, see esp. Cameron (1993), 298-328; Strodel (2002), 10-11, 15-41, offers unparalleled discussion of the bucolic MSS as well as *AP*.. For a facsimile, see Preisendanz (1911).
[25] *AP* 15.21 (*Syrinx*).
[26] *AP* 15.25 (*Altar*, in Doric, by Dosiadas); 15.26 (*Altar* in Ionic, perh. by Besantinos). On pattern poetry in general, cf. Ernst (1991).
[27] Cf. Fraser (1972), ii 619.

Written out on the page, the first two of Simias' poems form the shape of an axe and a pair of wings;[28] the third poem has been given the title 'Egg', and is laid out in *AP* so as to form a triangular shape that could be interpreted as a rough egg-shape. The effect is achieved by subtracting or adding one *metron* to each line of verse to make it longer and shorter. This implies a strong awareness of the appearance of words on the page and the correspondence between metre and what is seen. Indeed, if the layout in *AP* 15 is to be trusted, then the lines are not even written out in the *ordo legendi*: this is apparently how Hephaistion read them since he remarks that the *kola* of the 'Egg' are not 'in their own order' (61.19-62.6 Consbruch).[29] Even if, as Cameron rather implausibly claims, this layout was a retrospective decision of the imperial period,[30] and the varying line-lengths were chosen to suit inscription on a real object, this would still be unique among inscriptions.[31] In any case, although 'Axe' and 'Wings' can both be read as inscriptions on objects, 'Egg' assumes an altogether different voice: as we shall see, it is really a metapoetic exercise in which the unusual metre is part of the poem's topic. It nowhere claims to have been written on an egg, but rather uses the shape of an egg as a lens for its complicated set of metaphors.

'Axe' follows the vogue of epigrams for mythological characters (see ch.6.1). It purports to be a dedication of an axe used by Epeios in the Trojan War to Athena, who helped him to build the wooden horse.[32] Epeios is a minor character in the epic tradition, although the *Ilias*

---

[28] *AP* 15 has the shape of a double-headed axe, which involves changing the order of the lines so that the two shortest lines occur in the centre of the poem: this is an almost identical appearance to 'Wings', which thus forms the shape of two spread wings, but is written in its correct order.

[29] The layout in *AP* 15 has the two shortest lines at the top and bottom, with each line increasing in length towards the longest pair of lines in the centre. Other (less likely) possibilities include writing the poem out in a series of concentric circles. The pairing of metrical lengths to me suggests the first possibility more strongly.

[30] Cameron (1995), 37. There remains the problem as to why any later editor would project this onto a poem that had not come to him in this form: it seems a degree of imagination too far. Cameron's argument that the early Ptolemaic papyri do not exhibit colometry is a rather weak *argumentum ab silentio*: it is known from c.275 BC (the 'Lille' Stesikhoros, Turner *GMAW* 2 pl.12). There are insufficient numbers of earlier papyri for certainty about the practice, while we have seen that fourth-century inscriptions on stone are often aware of the visual impact of the layout.

[31] For a useful survey of the discussions, see Strodel (2002), 265-78; Guichard (2006). Cameron (1995), 32-7, resuscitated the debate popular in the historicists of the early twentieth century: see e.g. Reitzenstein, (1907), col. 83-4; Wilamowitz (1899), esp. 58-9; Fränkel (1915), 58-62.

[32] Cf. *Od.* 8.493, 11.523.

Parva apparently contained a narrative of Athena inspiring him to build the horse.[33] The reader thus inevitably expects the dedicated axe to be that used to make the horse. However, Simias' interest is in more obscure elements of his story, and claims that this axe was rather used to rout the Trojans:[34]

Ἀνδροθέᾳ δῶρον ὁ Φωκεὺς κρατερᾶς μηδοσύνας ἥρα τίνων Ἀθάνᾳ (1)

τᾶμος ἐπεὶ τὰν ἱερὰν κηρὶ πυρίπνῳ πόλιν ᾐθάλωσεν (3)

οὐκ ἐνάριθμος γεγαὼς ἐν προμάχοις Ἀχαιῶν (5)

νῦν δ' ἐς Ὁμήρειον ἔβα κέλευθον (7)

τρὶς μάκαρ, ὃν σὺ θυμῷ (9)

ὅδ' ὄλβος (11)

ἀεὶ πνεῖ (12).

ἴλαος ἀμφιδερχθῇς (10)

σὰν χάριν, ἁγνὰ πολύβουλε Παλλάς (8)

ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κρανᾶν ἰθαρᾶν νᾶμα κόμιζε δυσκλής· (6)

Δαρδανιδᾶν χρυσοβαφεῖς τ' ἐστυφέλιξ' ἐκ θεμέθλων ἄνακτας (4)

ὤπασ' Ἐπειὸς πέλεκυν, τῷ ποκα πύργων θεοτεύκτων κατέρειψεν αἶπος (2) (*AP* 15.22).[35]

Lines 5-7 suggest a transition from Epeios as a minor figure who carried water for the main heroes[36] into a major Homeric figure (*νῦν δ' ἐς Ὁμήρειον ἔβα κέλευθον*, 7).[37] Highly epicizing

[33] Procl.*Chrest.*222.
[34] For this in later versions, cf. Verg.*Aen.*2.264; Quint.Smyrn.12.329. In both accounts he is the last to enter, suggesting the probability of a mutual source (but exaggerating a minor hero's role is typical of the second sophistic). *Cf.* also Luc. *Hippias* 2.19-21. The scene may be reminiscent of Stesich. *Iliou Persis* (cf. fr. 199): a painting of Polygnotos at Delphi apparently depicted Epeios in the act of throwing down the walls of Troy (Paus. 10.26.2), which may be based on Stesichoros (but cf. Robertson (1967); Horsfall (1979)).
[35] This is the layout given in *AP* 15.
[36] Cf. Stesich. fr. 200b.
[37] Perh. cf. Callim fr. 127 Pf.

language reinforces a link with Homer:[38] Simias' epigram allows Epeios to take centre stage in the way Homer did not.[39] The axe emerges on the page as a symbol of this reinvention.

If the line-order given in the *Anthology* is correct, the reader must have had fun working out the correct *ordo legendi*. Hutchinson observed a correspondence between the appearance on the page and the poem's meaning: the gradual shortening of the lines towards the centre forms a crescendo, while at the same time emphasising Epeios's littleness, so that 'the form sometimes enhances, sometimes pulls against, the rhetoric'.[40] The force of the climactic central four lines is perhaps reinforced by setting them apart in the visual middle: these lines are gnomic in style, recalling Pindaric *gnomai* or the *Homeric Hymn to Gaia*:[41] The verb used of Athena, ἀμφιδερχθῇς, a *hapax legomenon*, suggests looking on 'from around', which perhaps alludes to the reader's visual progress to the gnomic centrepiece; θυμῷ / ἴλαος could then extend to the reader's favourable reception of the text-image.

'Wings' too is concerned with appearance: the voice is that of the god Eros, so the shape of wings probably alludes to the usual depiction of him with golden wings:

> λεῦσσέ με τὸν Γᾶς τε βαθυστέρνου ἄνακτ' Ἀκμονίδαν τ' ἄλλυδις ἐδράσαντα·
>
> μηδὲ τρέσῃς, εἰ τόσος ὢν δάσκια βέβριθα λάχνᾳ γένεια.
>
> τᾶμος ἐγὼ γὰρ γενόμαν, ἀνίκ' ἔκραιν' Ἀνάγκα,
>
> πάντα δὲ Γᾶς εἶκε φραδαῖσι λυγραῖς
>
> ἑρπετά, πάνθ', ὅσ' ἕρπει
>
> δι' αἴθρας.
>
> Χάους δέ,

[38] Cf. esp. 2, πύργων θεοτεύκτων ... αἶπος (a conflation of Homer's αἰπύ ... τεῖχος, *Il.*6.327, and θεοδμήτων ... πύργων, *Il.*8.519); 3, τὰν ἱερὰν ... πόλιν (cf. e.g. *Il.*7.20, Ἴλιον ... ἱερήν); 4, ἐστυφέλιξ' ἐκ θεμέθλων (cf. *Il.*1.581, ἐξ ἑδέων στυφελίξαι, a verb rare outside Homer).

[39] In the *Iliad* he is only shown as a failed discus-thrower, but a successful boxer (*cf.* also Apollod. 4.8.6); he is considered poor in battle (23.664-99). Lyk. *Alex.*930-50, claims he was born a coward due to his father's perjury. For a Hellenistic interest in Epeios, *cf.* Callim, *Iamb.* fr. 197.3 Pf., which relates a minor statue made by the maker of the wooden horse, πάρεργον ἱπποτέκτον[ος].

[40] Hutchinson (1988), 18.

[41] *h.Hom.*30.7-8; Pi. *Ol.*1.56, 5.23, *Pyth.*12.28.

οὔτι γε Κύπριδος παῖς

ὠκυπέτας οὐδ' Ἄρεος καλεῦμαι·

οὔτι γὰρ ἔκρανα βίᾳ, πραϋνόῳ δὲ πειθοῖ·

εἶκε δέ μοι Γαῖα Θαλάσσας τε μυχοὶ χάλκεος Οὐρανός τε·

τῶν δ' ἐγὼ ἐκνοσφισάμαν ὠγύγιον σκᾶπτρον, ἔκρινον δὲ θεοῖς θέμιστας (*AP* 15.24).

The god is not the infant of the most popular literary tradition, however, but rather one which seems more closely related to the Orphic tradition: the speaker expresses his expectation that viewers will be surprised to look at him and see his beard. This may be a joke on the fact that the reader in fact does not see this bearded image on papyrus. 'Looking at' the god (cf. λεῦσσέ με, 1) is possible because the reader can see his wings on the page, but this visual experience does not prepare us for his size and features (τόσος ὢν δάσκια βέβριθα λάχνᾳ γένεια).

The rest of the poem serves to frustrate any initial expectation from the image of wings that this is the 'usual' Eros. The first half connects him with a version of the Orphic creation myth, emphasising his great age;[42] the second half, the 'other wing', contrasts his Hesiodic or Orphic theogony with more popular later accounts of his birth.[43] The eye is drawn naturally to the centre, lending emphasis to the claim in 7-8 that he is born from Chaos not Aphrodite and Ares.[44] Eros's rule with 'gentle-willed persuasion' (10) perhaps suggests Aphrodite's characteristics, though here it is given a distinctively Orphic context.[45]

---

[42] On Eros as a *protogonos*, cf. Plato, *Symp.*178c2, (quoting Parmenides, fr.13 Hölscher), πρεσβύτατος, of which the meaning is presumably more 'earliest' than 'oldest'; cf. *id.* 195a8 and 1956a1, νεώτατος.

[43] On Orphic theogonies, see esp. West (1983). The basic source is Hes. *Th.*116ff; cf. also Ar. *Av.* 685ff.; Plat.*Symp.*195cff. The Orphic hymns mostly date to a later period, but *P. Derveni* indicates an earlier tradition. There was no fixed tradition: it is difficult to identify what elements are Simias' own inventions.

[44] The text of 5-9 is highly corrupt: *AP* has πάνθ' ὅσ' ἔρπει / δι' αἴθρας / Χάους τε… (accepted by Powell (1925), Strodel (2002), Wojaczek (1969)); ὠκυπέτας δ'ἄερις καλεῦμαι. I opt for Bergk's conjecture of Χάους δέ as the easiest resolution of 7, and Beckby's reading of 9. The scholiast glossed as οὐκ εἰμὶ δὲ ὁ Ἀφροδίτης υἱός, καλοῦμαι δὲ Ἔρως, but this need not imply Eros's name was in the original. For fuller discussion on the readings of both cruces, see esp. Strodel (2002), 199-200, 219-22.

[45] Cf. e.g. *P.Derveni* col.A.5; Aesch. *Supp.* 1034-42; Paus. 5.11.8.8.

This poem could be taken as a sort of Oprhic mystery-text,[46] but it seems preferable to see it as a literary game in which Simias uses different conceptions of Eros as a means of generating surprise: the visual image of wings on the page again works with and against the poem's rhetoric. One is reminded of the hesitation of the hymnist in Antagoras's *Hymn to Eros* (*CA* 120, roughly contemporary), in which the speaker is 'in two minds' (*ἐν δοιῇ μοι θυμός*, 1) as to which version of Eros to praise (*ὅ τοι γένος ἀμφίσβητον*);[47] he concludes aporetically by claiming the god even has more than one physical characteristic, *τὸ καὶ σέο σῶμα δίφυιον*.

For Simias, the pair of wings also present a 'double form'. As with the 'Axe', the image is carefully and symmetrically arranged. The first and last lines, each pentameters, correspond to each other to create a sort of *Ringkomposition*: Eros is the overturner of the Akmonidai (1) and has taken over the sceptre of the gods (12). The first trimeter (3) refers to Ananke's rule, *ἀνίκ' ἔκραιν' Ἀνάγκα*, which corresponds to his own rule in the equivalent trimeter, *οὔτι γὰρ ἔκρανα βίᾳ*, the symmetry reinforcing the difference. All creatures yield to Ananke on the first wing (cf. 4); on the second wing this is reversed, so that all yield to Eros (cf. esp. *εἶκε*, 4 ~ *εἶκε*, 11).[48]

The poetic voice of each of these epigrams is plainly derived from inscriptional epigram, although evidently there are bookish elements. However, the 'Egg' is a different sort of poem, which departs from this epigrammatic fiction. At twenty lines, it is also among the longest lyric poems that I consider in this thesis. I reprint it here in what seems to me the most probable papyrus-layout of the text, to create a (very) rough 'egg-shape' on the page:[49]

Κωτίλας (1)

τῆ τόδ' ἄτριον νέον (3)

πρόφρων δὲ θυμῷ δέξο· δὴ γὰρ ἁγνᾶς (5)

[46] See esp. Wojaczek (1969) for this suggestion.
[47] Cf. Callim. *h.*1.4-5.
[48] Cf. Ernst (1991), 62-3, sees a correspondence between 11 and 2, the trembling of the viewer with the yielding of the gods.
[49] Cf. in addition to the doubts of Cameron (1995), 35, Legrand (1927), 223, 'une sorte de losange qui ne ressemble à rien'. Further discussion also in Männlein-Robert (2007b), 142-150.

τὸ μὲν θεῶν ἐριβόας Ἑρμᾶς ἔκειξε κᾶρυξ (7)

ἄνωγε δ' ἐκ μέτρου μονοβάμονος μέγαν πάροιθ' ἀέξειν (9)

θοῶς δ' ὕπερθεν ὠκυλέχριον φέρων νεῦμα ποδῶν < σποράδων > πίφαυσκεν (11)

θοαῖς ἴσ' αἰόλαις νεβροῖς κῶλ' ἀλλάσσων, ὀρσιπόδων ἐλάφων τέκεσσι· (13)

πᾶσαι κραιπνοῖς ὑπὲρ ἄκρων ἰέμεναι ποσὶ λόφων κατ' ἀρθμίας ἴχνος τιθήνας· (15)

καί τις ὠμόθυμος ἀμφίπαλτον αἶψ' αὐδὰν θὴρ ἐν κόλπῳ δεξάμενος θαλαμᾶν μυχοιτάτῳ (17)

κᾆτ' ὦκα βοᾶς ἀκοὰν μεθέπων ὅ γ' ἄφαρ λάσιον νιφοβόλων ἀν' ὀρέων ἔσσυται ἄγκος· (19)

ταῖς δὴ δαίμων κλυτὸς ἶσα θοοῖσι ποσὶν δονέων ἅμα πολύπλοκα μεθίει μέτρα μολπᾶς (20)

ῥίμφα πετρόκοιτον ἐκλιπὼν ὄρουσ' εὐνὰν ματρὸς πλαγκτὸν μαιόμενος βαλιᾶς ἐλεῖν τέκος· (18)

βλαχαὶ δ' οἰῶν πολυβότων ἀν' ὀρέων νομὸν ἔβαν τανυσφύρων τ' ἐς ἄντρα Νυμφᾶν· (16)

ταὶ δ' ἀμβρότῳ πόθῳ φίλας ματρὸς ῥώοντ' αἶψα μεθ' ἱμερόεντα μαζόν, (14)

ἴχνει θενὼν <τὰν> παναίολον Πιερίδων μονόδουπον αὐδάν, (12)

ἀριθμὸν εἰς ἄκραν δεκάδ' ἰχνίων, κόσμον νέμοντα ῥυθμῶν, (10)

φῦλ' ἐς βροτῶν ὑπὸ φίλας ἑλὼν πτεροῖσι ματρός, (8)

λίγειά μιν κάμ' ἶφι ματρὸς ὠδίς· (6)

Δωρίας ἀηδόνος· (4)

ματέρος (2) (*AP* 15.27).

Perhaps the unusual layout on the page turns this poem into a sort of object that can be dedicated (cf. 1-5). The words πρόφρων δὲ θυμῷ δέξο (5) are more closely related to hymnic expressions,[50] but it seems likely that this is addressed not to a god but to a reader, who is to 'receive' the text favourably.

There is a riddle-like character to the poem:[51] the large amount of metaphorical and metonymic language is redolent, say, of Lykophron's *Alexandra*. But 'egg' is not simply a solution to the poem's word-games: rather, the idea of the egg is seemingly an essential metaphor for the

[50] Cf. e.g. *Il.*8.39-40; 24.139-40.
[51] So e.g. Luz (2008); cf. now Luz (2010).

poem itself. We can summarise the narrative as follows: a nightingale (who presumably represents the poet) gives birth to (i.e. composes) an egg (representing the poem); which (s)he hopes will be received gladly (1-5), which might indicate 'read favourably'. Hermes however snatches the egg/poem away from its mother/composer and puts it among humans (7-8), whereupon he gives orders for it to grow from a size of a single unit to ten (9-10): these dimensions correspond to the poem's metrical progression from a pair of single catelectic trochees to a pair of lines with ten feet of mixed *metra*. Hermes himself starts to lead a rapid dance movement (11-12), the increasing speed of which is compared, in an elaborate simile which develops a life all of its own, to running fawns chasing their mother (12-16);[52] these are pursued by a wild beast (17-19); in the final line the god 'releases' the song (20).[53]

The poem is, then, about the development of the poem from its inception to its final version: the egg stands for the poem's origin, but it appears to 'grow' beyond that into a fully-fledged creature. The god Hermes, who is responsible for its growth and final release, seemingly provides divine inspiration, but the god shapes the poet's idea rather than giving that idea in the first place.[54]

But the dominant image in the poem is one of weaving, which is an established metaphor for poetic composition.[55] The object is not called an egg but an ἄτριον (3),[56] the lengthwise threads in a woven cloth (warp).[57] It seems that Hermes helps to make the 'egg' grow by completing the woven material: the warp needs also the weft (κρόκη): this may be the sense of the 'crosswise command' that Hermes brings to it (λέχριον φέρων νεῦμα, 11), by which Hermes 'makes manifest' the poem (πίφαυσκεν). In the last line, it has become 'the much-interwoven

---

[52] On this simile and the 'new Sappho', see now Méndez Dosuna (2008).
[53] Cf. also Prier (1994) for the metapoetic reading.
[54] Prier (1994), 87, calls this a 'double-birth'.
[55] See e.g. Rosati (1999); Scheid and Svenbro (1996), esp. 111-30.
[56] Some MSS do have ᾠόν, but this is probably a gloss of the unusual and unexpected ἄτριον.
[57] *LSJ*[9] s.v. ἤτριον: in the plural it may refer to the individual threads. The sense of Leon. Alex. in *AP* 9.350.1-2 ('book leaves') is appealing for the Simias poem, but lacks early support; though Strodel (2002), 249, finds both senses probable.

measures of the song', *πολύπλοκα ... μέτρα μολπᾶς* (20), which confirms a metapoetic sense. This idea of the woven material neatly suggests the intricate arrangement of this poem.

If the layout given above is correct, the reader needs to 'decode' the complex arrangement. Order needs to be assigned to the disarray of its rhythms, *κόσμον νέμοντα ῥυθμῶν* (10),[58] which is precisely what a reader must do to the reordered *kola* of the egg-shape. Line 13 talks about 'exchanging limbs', *κῶλ' ἀλλάσσων*, presumably on one level describing Hermes' Pierian dance, but since *κῶλα* was already a technical term of metre,[59] it is reasonable also to read into this the act of shifting around ('exchanging') the lines of poetry in creating the egg shape.

This is, then, a poem that explores to a unique extent the text-reader interaction. The bucolic imagery in the second half of the poem can even be read as encapsulating this process. Hermes puts the poem among mortals, as a sort of act of publication; at this stage the 'egg' has evidently hatched into a creature. Weaving images now give way to suggestions of song-performance, as if the poem now comes 'off the page'. The running fawns form an extra layer of imagery for the poem itself: they represent the ever increasing speed of the dancing, the god beating his feet (12). The noise of the foot-beats (a motif: *ἴχνος* and *ἴχνια*, 10, 12, 15; *πούς* and its compounds, 11, 13, 15) coupled together with vocal sounds (*βλαχαί*, 16; *βοᾶς*, 19), can easily be taking for the sound and rhythms of poetry,[60] while at the same time as the lines get longer, the tempo also increases: there is a highly innovative mix of choriambic, trochaic and anapaestic *metra* providing a large number of short syllables.[61]

The inclusion of the wild beast in the second part of this simile appears at first to be a fanciful and redundant detail, yet since it is described as *receiving* the *song* of the fawns in its den, *ἀμφίπαλτον ... αὐδὰν ... δεξάμενος* (17),[62] we can take the beast a sort of audience, listening to the

---

[58] The late supplement, *σποράδων* (11), would reinforce this reading.
[59] Cf. e.g. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1409b13.
[60] So Prier (1994), 88.
[61] For a complete metrical analysis, see Strodel (2002), 54-5; Prier (1994), 84. This emphasis on the increasing speed of footsteps would be still more interesting if the hypothesis of 'one syllable one step' for choral lyric (assessed recently by David (2006), 228-36) could be proven.
[62] For *αὐδάν*, cf. 12.

poem. It is no kind critic, intent on a kill (18) and described as ὠμόθυμος (17). We recall the apostrophe in line 5, πρόφρων δὲ θυμῷ δέξο: there may be an anticipation of a hostile response to the poem, which the speaker implores will not happen.

It is worth pondering why a poet should produce a poem entirely about itself. It may simply be revelling in cleverness for its own sake, the epitome of a new Hellenistic aesthetic of *l'art pour l'art.*[63] Rather more sympathetically, we could observe that the 'Egg' would make a suitable *sphragis* poem for an entire collection of pattern poems (and perhaps other fictional epigrams, many of which have an Anyte-like rustic theme). Moreover, the pattern poems point to an awareness of a text as a kind of object: the 'Egg' thematizes this new dynamic and reflects on the possibilities of this extraordinary poetic voice.

Conclusion

All the texts I have discussed indicate an interest in poetry in different metres, in all probability metres that had fallen out of general use: the book becomes an ideal way to 'rediscover' these metres. The Simias poems, and the Kastorion *Hymn to Pan,* apparently represent a different sense of what the book is for from the collection of *skolia* that we considered earlier, although there too there were some indications of principles of arrangement rather than a mere 'record' of actual lyric performance. Such emphases on artistic presentation of the text and consciousness of readership are the characteristics of a new poetic voice, one that is designed like inscriptions to be seen and read rather than heard, but also one that appears to demand more careful reading and even re-reading.

The personality of the scholar-poet is far more evident in this sort of verse. I now turn to discuss some other instances of the presence of the scholar-poet in elegiac and hexameter works, and the voice of the solitary maiden in Erinna's *Distaff.*

[63] So e.g. esp. Guichard (2006); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 37-41.

Chapter 8
The voice of the learned narrator: elegiac and hexameter book poetry

In this chapter I investigate the poetic persona created in longer, scholarly poems in elegiacs and hexameter. While scholar-poets may be felt to be a phenomenon of the Hellenistic period – in this chapter I discuss some works by Philitas of Kos and Simias of Rhodes – many of the trends seem to be anticipated by the fragments of Antimachos of Kolophon, who composed an epic (*Thebaid*) and narrative elegy (*Lyde*) at the end of the fifth or start of the fourth century.[1] There is a 'bookish' quality about these poems, exhibited in an interest in a learned use of alternative myths, unusual words and expressions, an interest in aetiology.[2] The poetic voice is considered here in relation to earlier models, especially Mimnermos and Homer; this sets the tone for our discussion of the early-Hellenistic poets (indeed, the *Lyde* in particular seems to have exerted great influence). Sadly all of these texts are highly fragmentary, and so observations are necessarily limited in scope; one cannot also entirely avoid speculation.

Finally, I provide a reading of a text that defies easy categorisation (or indeed dating), the hexameter poem of Erinna, the *Distaff*. Much of the interest in Erinna has been because she is a female poet: recent scholarship has been especially alert to the possibilities of gendered voices in ancient literature. Whereas these poets are present in their text through their erudition, Erinna's self-presentation is one of an active participant in an act of mourning and love. But although she is less overtly bookish than Antimachos or Philitas, I argue that the act of writing is connected with the construction of her non-male poetic identity.

---

[1] On the date of Antimachos, see esp. Matthews (1996), 15-18.
[2] So e.g. Pfeiffer (1968), 94; Del Corno (1962), 58, 94; Serrao (1979); Krevans (1993).

8.1 Antimachos: pre-Hellenistic bookishness

The epic *Thebaid*[3] was written at a similar time to an epic on the Persian wars[4] by Antimachos's slightly older contemporary, Choirilos of Samos (died no later than 399 BC).[5] The *Lyde* seems to have been an elegy with mythic-narrative content. Both were in the Alexandrian canon,[6] while the *Lyde* seems to have been particularly famous. Of other works by Antimachos, an *Artemis* and a *Deltoi*, next to nothing is known beyond the titles and sporadic words ascribed to them.

A number of short fragments survive of the *Thebaid* (frs. 1-68 Matthews), bolstered by several lacunose papyri.[7] Unfortunately, these fragments are insufficient to give a strong impression of the poetic style. Remarks in antiquity that the epic ran to twenty-four books may simply derive from the fashion of talking about all epic in the manner of Homer;[8] only five books are known for sure (Matthews' guess at ten books lacks evidence). The *Thebaid* may have gained a reputation for being long-winded: Catullus describes Antimachos as *tumidus*, which contrasts him with the neoteric Cinna, who wrote refined *epyllia*.[9] However, it is not certain that Catullus was thinking of the *Thebaid*, so this is not enough reason to call the *Thebaid*, as one scholar has, 'stuffy, long-winded, turgid poetry'.[10] This negative judgment may be unfairly imputed from Callimachus's assessment of the *Lyde* (not *Thebaid*).

The narrative concerned the Seven against Thebes; it is uncertain if it also included the Epigonoi.[11] This mythological saga is in contrast with Choirilos, whose epic concerned recent history.[12] Choirilos's choice may have been seen as innovative for epicists: the poet opens with a

---

[3] See Matthews (1996), 20-6; Lombardi (1993).
[4] See Lombardi (1997). The fragments of Choirilos are available in Bernabé (1987), *PEG* 1.191-208. To these it may be possible to add P.Oxy. 2524 (*SH* 928-935), which is a fascinating account of the Neleids and Arismaspoi (who could indicate the Athenians and Persians); however, the ascription is highly speculative, and a Hellenistic date seems more likely.
[5] See e.g. Huxley (1969); cf. MacFarlane (2009).
[6] Cf. e.g. test. 28, 29 Matthews.
[7] P.Oxy 2518, frs.1-14 (*SH* 52-61, 41-49 Matthews); P.Oxy. 2516 (*SH* 65, 112 Matthews).
[8] So Matthews (1996), 21.
[9] Cat. *carm.* 95.9-10. On Antimachos' *Thebaid* as 'sterile', cf. e.g. Hainsworth (1991), 60-1.
[10] Vessey (1971), 4.
[11] Cf. Σ [Acro] Hor. *Ars Poet.* 146 (2.333 Keller), *Schol. recent.* B φ Hor. *Ars Poet.* 136 (2.600 Hauthal) = test. 26a, c Matthews.
[12] So Hainsworth (1991), 60; Cf. e.g. Briggs (1981), 950-3.

lament about the current state of poetry, and suggests that his choice is something new (*SH* 317).[13] In *SH* 318-320 Choirilos seemingly included a catalogue of Xerxes' army, which may be similar to the accounts of Herodotus (7.61-99).[14] Antimachos could then be seen as 'going back' to traditional epic subject matter (the *Thebaid* was treated in the cyclic epics). However, we lack much evidence about the themes of fifth-century epic; and it is worth noting that Aeschylus composed both a *Seven Against Thebes* and a *Persians*.

Even so, it is a fair guess that the style aped Homer and the cyclic epics. Clearly the diction was chiefly Homeric, with a particular interest in unusual words and Homeric *hapax legomena*.[15] The narrator clearly recalls Homer in an invocation which may have opened the work or an individual book (ἐννέπετε, Κρονίδαο Διὸς μεγάλοιο θύγατρες), although we also see there a taste for rarities: for example, the plural of the invocatory verb, ἐννέπετε, is only previously attested in the opening of Hesiod's *Work and Days* (line 2), while the genitive form, Κρονίδαο is only found twice (and never in an invocation). There is some interest in marginal aspects of the Homeric text. For example, Matthews has argued that fr. 27 M could be an attempt to vindicate an awkward reading of *Od.* 15.295, (absent from the MSS), which would have placed the town Dyme in the wrong area, by inventing a place called 'Kaukonian Dyme' (cf. *Od.* 3.366) that contrasts with the more familiar 'Achaean Dyme'.[16] This does not necessarily indicate that Antimachos was expressing a view about the correct reading so much as delighting in Homeric curiosities: the poetic voice is largely constructed in terms of his illustrious predecessor. At times the style may have even tended towards Homeric pastiche.[17] We cannot tell if, like Apollonius of Rhodes, he studiously avoided using Homeric formulae.

---

[13] *Ap. Arist. Rhet.*3.1415a4, 16; cf. *Poet.* 1451b2 on history vs. epic, and see esp. MacFarlane (2009). For Choirilos' reputation, see esp. Hollis (2000).
[14] So Hollis (2000).
[15] Cf. Giangrande (1970), 46. For Hainsworth (1991), 60, 'Antimachus was a conscious user of the Homeric idiom'.
[16] See Matthews (1996), 131-3.
[17] Cf. Matthews (1996), 72-4.

There is little continuity between the extant fragments of the *Thebaid* except those from 'book five', which seem to belong to a narrative of a banquet of Adrastos. Seemingly at this banquet, different characters gave alternative accounts of the same battle (cf. frs. 27-8 Matthews): this suggests digression, perhaps slowing the pace in anticipation of something more momentous. Other fragments give little clue about the overall style. However, a fascinating passage is fr. 41a Matthews (= *SH* 52).[18] A reference to Polyneikes and Eteokles (19-23) probably indicates this comes from a narrative connected to the combat between these two; however, this is preceded by a strange account of a scene in Tartaros:

] *νι τόθ*[*ι* Κ*ρον*]*ίδης* Ἀϊ̈δωνεὺς

]*υει λεύσ*[……Τ]*άρταρα γαίης*

γηγενέας τε θεοὺς προτερογηγενέας Τι*τῆνας*

] *ν περι τ*[….. *ἀ*]*μφί τ' ἐραννήν*

] [ ]*αντες* Ὀλύ*μπου*

] *νο*[…]*ς τέκετο* Ῥέ*α υἷας*

]*ν πεφοβημέναι ἔνθα καὶ ἔν*[*θα*

] *καταφθιμένων ἀν*[*θρ*]*ώπω*[*ν*

]*σως ὀξέα τ*[*ρ*]*ιγυ*[*ι*] (fr.41a.6-13 M).

The connection with Polyneikes and Eteokles is uncertain: the focus is on Aidoneus and the Titans. However, the 'sons of Rhea' could perhaps serve as a mythological *comparandum* for the fraternal strife of Polyneikes and Eteokles. The image of shades (?) flitting about (11) seems especially vivid. The passage can perhaps be taken together with another memorable fragment (*incertae sedis*) that describes Erinys and Hades, fr. 112 Matthews (*SH* 65); this seems to be connected with Oedipus in the underworld.[19]

---

[18] P. Oxy. 2518 fr.1, for which cf. fr. 45 Wyss for the ascription to the *Thebaid*.

[19] P.Oxy. 2516 fr.4 + P.Mil. Vogl. I 17, ii 47-9 (the latter papyrus seemingly contains a commentary on this and other passages of Antimachos). The connection with Oedipus is not explicit however, and Matthews ascribes the fragment to the *Artemis*: however, at least part of P.Mil. Vogl. I 17 dealt with the *Thebaid*, and the description would certainly suit Oedipus.

Most passages from the *Thebaid* are cited by the sources because of their use of rare words or collocations. A good example is fr. 36 M (= 39 Wyss, *ap.* Herod. 2.909.4 Lentz), *τὼ δ' αὖτ' ἀμφὶ κονισάλεον πεπονήατο δίφρον*.[20] The adjective, *κονισάλεος*, is a new coinage, derived from a rare Homeric word, *κονίσαλος*, 'dust', which is found in connection with horses (cf. *Il.* 5.503; 22.401). The perfect, *πεπονήατο*, seems to recall *Il.* 15.447, where the sense is 'struggled with horses': thus the unusual adjective reminds the reader of the Homeric idea of horses and dust even though it is only a chariot that is mentioned.[21] Likewise, the abode of Hades is unexpectedly called *θοὸν δόμον* (fr. 112.2 M), which is a collocation attested on a papyrus fragment of an Homeric glossary.[22] There appears to be a faint allusion to the unusual sense at *Il.* 10.394, *θοὴν διὰ νύκτα*.[23] The poem is thus constructed as a clever re-use of Homeric language and themes.

There are some hints of the treatment of less common myths, and aetiological and topographical excursus. For example, fr. 2 Matthews (*ap.* Arist. *Rhet.*. 3.6.1408a2),[24] is seemingly a topographical ekphrasis of Teumessos, which probably led into a narration of the myth of Zeus and Europa (fr. 3 M). Antimachos seems to have depended on a local Boiotian version of the myth, which may have acted as a *comparandum* for the main narrative. Likewise, the myth of the horse, Arion (fr. 31.3-5 M), perhaps derived from an Arkadian account.[25] This gives the impression of using less familiar material to lend colour to mythological narrative (not unlike Herodotean methodology). This is more evidently the style of Apollonius of Rhodes: in fact, the scholia on Apollonius are our source for the majority of Antimachos's fragments. Although it cannot be proved, it is a fair assumption that Antimachos was an essential intermediary between

[20] Cf. Apoll. Rhod. 1.752.
[21] So Matthews (1996), 154.
[22] P.Oxy. 2517.
[23] See esp. Carrara (1983), 29-35; Matthews (1996), 290-1.
[24] Cf. e.g. Matthews (1996), 89-90 (on fr. 3 M);
[25] So e.g. Lombardi (1997), 91.

archaic epic and Apollonius in the third century, and suggested the scholarly approach hinted at here.

Even fewer fragments remain of the *Lyde*: our knowledge of it almost entirely depends on its Hellenistic reception. It was evidently popular in the third century: Asklepiades, Poseidippos, Callimachus and Hermesianax all mention it. Clearly it was a narrative elegy in two books. Its contents are described by Ps-Plutarch, who informs us that Antimachos composed the work in order to comfort himself over the death of his wife, Lyde (elsewhere called a *hetaira*),[26] and that it was a catalogue of disasters that befell heroes.[27] According to Klearchos, there was a melic poem of the same title and with the same aim composed by Lamynthios (*PMG* 839);[28] Philoxenos of Kythera (roughly contemporary with Antimachos) was also said to have composed his *Cyclops, or Galateia* as a *consolatio*. The stories about Lyde may be romantic fictions, but there is no reason to reject the idea that the topic was reversals of fortune. This is certainly tenable from the myths we know were narrated: Jason and Medea, Bellerophon (fr. 80-1 M = 68-9 Wyss), and Oedipus (fr. 84 M = 70 Wyss).

Whether it took the form of a catalogue cannot be said with any certainty: Ps-Plutarch could conceivably have been extrapolating from the *Leontion* of Hermesianax, which is an elegiac catalogue poem and uses the theme of Antimachos burying his lover Lyde.[29] The generic model for Hermesianax is the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*,[30] while fourth-century poets such as Philoxenos of Kythera and the parodists also use a cataloguing style. It would not be surprising to learn that this was something of a fourth-century vogue: it offers the poet an opportunity to narrate diverse myths with little internal connection, and thus to display a wide range of mythological knowledge and poetic skill. The method need not have been identical with

---

[26] Klearchos fr. 34 Wehrli, *ap.* Ath.596f = test. 10 Matthews.
[27] [Plut.] *cons. ad Apoll.* 9.160b = test. 7 Matthews.
[28] Test. 10 Matthews (=8 Wyss).
[29] Cf. Matthews (1996), 35, on this point. The nature of the Argonaut fragments, especially the implication of the inclusion of a catalogue, implies longer narratives than afforded in what survives of Hermesianax.
[30] So Serrao (1979), 92-4. On Hesiodic catalogue poetry and its reception, cf. West (1985); Hirschberger (2004); Asquith (2005). Cf. also below, sect. IV on parody.

Hermesianax's, who probably refined the genre for his own ends, but an elegiac catalogue by Antimachos offers a useful intermediary between this and the Hesiod catalogue.

The comparison with Hermesianax should also cause us to doubt whether Lyde was a real woman, or even a woman's name: his standard method is to turn some element of the poem into erotic lovers (e.g. Ehoia as Hesiod's lover, from the refrain ἦ οἵα). We would expect the same method for Antimachos's Lyde or Philitas's Bittis, and not suppose any erotic content.

However, an epigram by Asklepiades (*AP* 9.63), which possibly introduced an edition of Antimachos, does suggest there was a woman called Lyde, whom everyone will know about through Antimachos's work (τίς γὰρ ἔμ' οὐκ ἤεισε; τίς οὐκ ἀνελέξατο Λύδην, 3). If this is not obscurely ironic, it must imply that Lyde herself featured prominently in the poem. An allusion in Ovid's *Tristia* (1.6.1-3), a work which fits Ps-Plutarch's description of the *Lyde*,[31] also suggests Lyde was a lover, though this may only be a later tradition, perhaps again derived from Hermesianax and Asklepiades rather than the original (Ovid also mentions Philitas' supposed love for Bittis). We must plead ignorance.[32]

None of the fragments that can be confidently ascribed to the *Lyde* mention her. One exception could be an anonymous papyrus, *P.Berol.* 21340 (ii BC).[33] A conceivable restoration gives Lyde as the opening word; she is called 'well-hymned'.[34] This and the ascription to Antimachos are speculative, but it would make a suitable opening to the *Lyde*:

Λ]ῠ̣δην εὐύμνον ἀείσας

ἀθ]ανάταισιν ἴσην

] ἐθέσπισε παιδί τε Μουσέων

[31] On the sources for Roman elegy, see e.g. Cairns (1979), 214-230; but cf. Cameron (1995), 315, for a contrary view.
[32] Matthews (1996), 64, points out that 'Ovid knows that Lyde was Antimachus' beloved, but that fact need not mean that he had actually read the poem', a view supported by Del Corno (1962), 76, and Henrichs (1972), 77. However, it is unlikely that the reputation of the poem would have deviated too far from the reality, and I see no reason why a poem so popular in iii BC would not still be available in Roman times.
[33] See Brashear (1994).
[34] Brashear (1994), 286 ,transcribes the first trace as ῥ̣, but comments that only a sub-linear vertical trace can be seen: this leaves ῠ̣ as quite possible, and indeed it would be hard to get as much sense out of a sequence -]ῥ̣δην.

] χερσὶν ἔθηκε φίλην

]υτ' ἐυώδεος ὄζης

] πολὺς ἐκκέχυσαι

πί]ναξ πῇ πρῶτον ἐπέλθω

] γὰρ ἡμέτερα…

The mention of the Muses reminds us of the Asklepiades epigram, τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου; (*AP* 9.63.4). If indeed it is Lyde who is 'child of the Muses' (3), then she can be taken as the inspiration for the ensuing narrative; the prophecy mentioned here remains obscure.[35]

The absence of Lyde in other fragments may simply reflect the nature of the sources, which tend to be Homeric, mythological, or linguistic commentaries, which are unlikely to dwell on elements of the poem that do not support their particular interests. Nonetheless, Martin West has ingeniously proposed that one otherwise unascribed fragment[36] may have come from a narration of Antimachos and Lyde making love by the river Paktolos in Lydia:

Πακτωλοῦ χρυσέοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδήροισι θάασσον (fr. 191 W^2).[37]

Hermesianax may allude to this:

Λυδῆς δ' Ἀντίμαχος Λυδηίδος ἐκ μὲν ἔρωτος

πληγεὶς Πακτωλοῦ ῥεῦμ' ἐπέβη ποταμοῦ (Hermes. fr. 7.40-1 Powell).

If there was a personal or even erotic element, this may allow us to see a connection with Mimnermos, to whom was ascribed a work called the *Nanno*, apparently named after a flute-girl (cf. Ath. 13.597a): Hermesianax again suggests a romantic connection (fr. 7.37 Powell). He also composed a narrative elegy, such as the *Lyde* is supposed to be, on the battle of the Smyrnaeans

[35] On account of the mention of a writing-tablet ([πί]ναξ), Parsons attributed the fragment to the otherwise little-known *Deltoi* of Antimachos: this seems rather tenuous. Cf. Matthews (1996), 45-6, on the *Deltoi*.
[36] The source (Σ Lyk. 1352) does note name the author: Pfeiffer (on Callim. fr. 814 Pf.) supplemented 'Antimachos' here.
[37] See West (1974), 170.

against Gyges.[38] It is not certain if the *Nanno* was a single poem or a collection of shorter ones: no fragments can be confidently ascribed to it. It is possible that an elegy addressed to Nanno simply headed up a collection of Mimnermos's poems. However, the unusual fact of using a woman's name for the title implies a connection between the *Nanno* and *Lyde*.[39] A fair hypothesis is that Antimachos sought to imitate or refine something of the Mimnerman style; West even argues that Antimachos actually edited Mimnermos's elegies and construed the *Lyde* to correspond to it.[40]

The pairing of the two works is already implied by Aristotle (test. 7 M). An epigram by Poseidippos also apparently contrasts the two poets:

Ναννοῦς καὶ Λύδης ἐπίχει δύο καὶ φιλεράστου[41]

Μιμνέρμου καὶ τοῦ σώφρονος Ἀντιμάχου· (Pos. 9.1-2 G-P = *AP* 12.168).

Hermesianax also interrupts the logical chronological sequence of his catalogue of poets to place Antimachos and Mimnermos next to each other (elevating Antimachos above Alkaios). This again suggests that the two were read together: the love affairs with Lyde and Nanno are equated.[42] Mimnermos invents elegiac poetry after much suffering (*τὸν ἡδὺν ὃς εὕρετο πολλὸν ἀνατλὰς / ἦχον καὶ μαλακοῦ πνεῦμα τὸ πενταμέτρου*, fr.7.35-6 Powell); Antimachos finds respite from his weariness (*ἐκ παντὸς παυσάμενος καμάτου*, 46).

If Mimnermos's suffering came from Nanno in some way, we can see how Hermesianax would have identified this with Antimachos and Lyde. In the extant fragments of Mimnermos, we have a number where the poet grumbles in his bitter old age (cf. esp. Mimn. fr.5 W^2 and probably frs. 1-3, 6 W^2); the Tithonos myth in fr. 4 W^2 could easily have been a *comparandum* for

---

[38] Mimn. fr. 13 W (*ap.* Paus. 9.29.4).
[39] Theognis' Kyrnos poems, for example, never seem to have been named after Kyrnos. Both Nanno and Lyde were fairly common names in antiquity (Nanno is found four times in *LGPN*, Lyde nineteen times; there is a *parthenos* called Nanno in Alkaios, fr. 1).
[40] See West (1974), 76. There is not enough evidence for West's suggestion that it was Antimachos who actually named the *Nanno* on the model of his own *Lyde*, but it is an attractive suggestion: see Allen (1993), 22. Cf. also Spanoudakis (2001).
[41] The text of *AP* is corrupt: this seems the most likely solution. Another possibility is *καὶ φέρ' ἑκάστου*, yet an adjective for Mimnermos seems desirable to create the balance.
[42] Cf. Caspers (2006) for discussion of the correspondence between the passages on each poet.

the old, suffering poet. Nor is it impossible that this was linked to some narrative material: Mimn. fr. 9 W^2 includes a narrative about Smyrna, which was the poet's own town and so could have personal elements; a narrative of the battle of the Smyrnaeans against Gyges and Lydia is also found in Mimnermos frs. 13 and 13a W^2, the latter a papyrus commentary on Antimachus which is our only source for a poem of Mimnermos entitled *Smyrneis*. While this remains speculation, it is possible that narrative emerged from a personal frame. This could have provided Antimachos with a model for mythological or historical narrative elegy developed out of the pretext of the poet's relationship with Lyde.[43] The voice of sympotic elegist is brought together with that of the narrative elegist (such as that of Simonides' Plataean elegy).

There also appears to be some thematic overlap between the *Lyde* and *Nanno*. Both evidently treated the myth of the Argonauts. Jason and Medea occur in Mimnermos frs. 11 and 11a W^2, while Antimachos has the Argo in fr. 68-9 M (= 57-8 Wyss), and catalogues the Argonauts (cf. fr. 67 M);[44] Kolchis is mentioned in fr. 75 M (= 64 Wyss), while fr. 73 & 5 M (= 63-4 Wyss) are cited by the scholiast on Apollonius's account of Jason and Medea. Antimachos apparently placed the lovemaking of Jason and Medea by a river instead of in a cave, as in Apollonius. Fr. 86 M (= 66 Wyss) describes Erytheia escorting the Sun in a golden cup:

τότε δὴ χρυσέῳ ἐν δέπαϊ

Ἠέλιον πόμπευεν ἀγακλυμένη Ἐρύθεια.

This seems to echo lines from the *Nanno* (Mimn. fr. 12 W^2), quoted by Athenaeus in close proximity to the Antimachean passage,[45] which narrates the Sun settling in a golden bed, in which he is transported (apparently Mimnermos was hinting at the shape of a cup in the description of the hollowed-out bed). Since the personified sun features as the father of Aietes in

[43] Benecke (1970), 2, however, goes too far in proposing that 'the real originator of that new feeling which we encounter in Alexandrian literature – in other words, the first man who had the courage to say that a woman is worth loving – was Antimachus of Colophon' .
[44] Σ Apoll. Rhod. 1.211-5c.
[45] Antim. fr 86 M *ap.* Ath. 11.469e; Mimn. fr. 12 W^2 *ap.* Ath. 11.470a.

the Jason myth, it is a fair guess that this passage was connected to the Argonaut-narrative, perhaps in both poems.

As with the *Thebaid*, the voice of the learned scholar-poet stands out. That either work was a 'book poem' can hardly be asserted with any certainty, but it may be revealing that a number of sources refer to Antimachos' poems as 'writing'. Plato, it is reported, sent Herakleides of Pontos to gather the poems of Antimachos, presumably on papyrus rolls,[46] which at least implies an early book-publication for Antimachos.[47] Hermesianax says that 'Antimachos filled his books with tears' (fr. 7.45 Powell); Asklepiades refers to Lyde as the *ξυνὸν* **Μ***ουσῶν γράμμα καὶ* **Ἀ***ντιμάχου*; Callimachus famously dismissed the *Lyde* as a *παχὺ γράμμα* (fr.398 Pf.).[48] Though these may only indicate how Hellenistic readers received the poem, it is attractive to speculate that the *πίναξ* in *P.Berol.* 21340, if this is from the *Lyde*, could refer to the poet writing in response to the inspiration of the Muses (a reflection of the famous scene of Hesiod, also imitated by Callimachus in *Aet.* fr. 1).

The fact that most fragments are from quotations that illustrate recondite facts suggests that the *Lyde* was full of obscure and learned details. A wide geographical spread indicated by the fragments suggests the possibility of topographical or mythological digression (like Apollonius). Philodemos quotes a Stoic philosopher who observes that Antimachos provides his own explanations for myths (test. 32a Matthews), which suggests that aetiology was important. Porphyrios mentions that Antimachos included an aetiology of Bellerophon being hated by the

---

[46] Herakl. Pontik., fr. 91 Voss, *ap*. Procl. *in Plat. Tim.* i 21c (1 90, 20 Diehl); test. 1 Wyss.

[47] Plato may have 'heard' the work performed: but this could easily have been a reading from the scroll as opposed to the conventional settings of oral epic.

[48] There appears to be some connection between this criticism of the *Lyde* and Callimachus' disparaging remarks about a certain poem in *Aet.* fr. 1.11-12 Massimilla, **Μ***ίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς α* [*ι…*] / [*….*] *ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή*. There is no agreement over what poem is meant, but one possibility is that the 'big lady' is the *Nanno*, in which case we have another glimpse of the paired reception of the *Nanno* and *Lyde*. This would make sense if Antimachos or another editor had presented the *Nanno* as a single, long book of elegiac poetry, like the *Lyde*. It is noteworthy that Callimachus uses the theme of old age and the Tithonos myth that is found in Mimnermos' *Nanno*, but instead presents himself as youthful ('sweet' unlike Mimnermos?), perhaps in an effort to distance his own poetry from the *consolatio*-style of both Antimachos and Mimnermos. Cf. esp. Crane (1986); King (1986); Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2001 & 2002); Geißler (2005). On Antimachos in the *Aetia*, cf. also Serrao (1979); Giangrande (1974); Krevans (1993); Spanoudakis (2001). Cameron (1995) has some useful criticism of conventional approaches.

gods, fr. 80 M (= 68 Wyss); he also explained the origin of the name of the Solymians according to a genealogy of Solymos (fr. 81 M = 69 Wyss, Σ Hom. *Od.* 5.283). Similarly, according to Σ Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 1.1289-91a, Antimachos provides a different explanation from Hesiod or Apollonius for Herakles' non-arrival with the Argonauts at Kolchis (fr. 69 M = 58 Wyss). Jason and Medea's lovemaking at Kolchis is another variation.

As with the *Thebaid*, most sources quote Antimachos for his use of unexpected expressions, or unusual words or word-forms. For example, the reference in fr. 77 M (= 106 Wyss) to a 'woody voyage' is quoted in two places as an example of a peculiar correlation: *πλόον* has the unusual metaphorical sense of a journey across land rather than sea (probably the Argo, hence 'woody': cf. fr. 76 M). The most substantial fragment of the *Lyde* is from an *ostrakon* of the third century BC (fr. 68 M = 57 Wyss), and is cited for the use of the form *σοῦσα*: the source believes this be equivalent to *σχοινία* (this comes seemingly from a narrative of the equipping of the Argo). The passage echoes Homer *Od.* 21.390: the use of the rarer word is either intentional variation from or perhaps even (*pace* Matthews) an expression of opinion about the correct reading in the Homeric text.[49] A similar point may be made about the choice of *ἤδυμος* rather than *νήδυμος* (cf. Hom. *Il.* 14.253) in fr. 74 M (= 94 Wyss). At the very least this shows an interest in word forms.

There is often Homeric *imitatio*, as in the passage quoted on the *ostrakon*, which Cameron claims reads'like a typical scene from the *Odyssey* written in elegiacs instead of hexameters':[50]

> *ἐν δ' ἱστὸν θῆκεν, λαίφεσι δὲ λινέοις*
> *σοῦσ' ἐτίθει παντοῖα θεά, πόδας ἠδὲ κάλωας,*
> *ἐν δ' ὑπέρας στρεπτάς, ὅπλά τε πάντα νεώς.*

For Cameron, it was an Homeric and formulaic style that Callimachus so famously objected to: certainly, if this passage is representative, it easy to see how the work could seem ponderous.

---

[49] Matthews (1996), 211: cf. also *Od.*14.346
[50] Cameron (1995), 350.

Porphyrios, who contemptuously remarks that Antimachos even used the Homeric formula *τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος*, considers that Antimachos borrows from Homer without improvement (fr. 88 and 90 M = 77 and 79 Wyss).

It is hard to see from the extant fragments whether Porphyrios was entirely fair. The use of Homeric formulae alone could just as easily have been a point of departure,[51] and there are certainly signs of innovation elsewhere. All this provides us with the sense that Antimachos was doing at the start of the fourth century the sort of things Hellenistic poets are famed for. This learned philological and Homerizing seems to have been the style that made Philitas of Kos famous; it is evident also in the fragments of Simias of Rhodes. It is to these figures that I now turn.

8.2 Philitas

The most significant elegiac poets to be preserved from the late-fourth century or early-third century are Philitas and Simias. I have discussed some of their epigrammatic and short lyric works already (ch.7).

Philitas (sometimes spelt 'Philetas'),[52] who was composing in the late-fourth century,[53] was included alongside Kallinos, Mimnermos and Callimachus in the Hellenistic elegiac canon,[54] and like Callimachus slightly later, seems to have been important for Roman elegy: both Ovid and Propertius acknowledge a debt to him.[55] He was known for using rare words and Homeric *hapax legomena*, suggesting a style not unlike that of Antimachos; he was a *grammatikos*, and wrote

---

[51] For *τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος*, cf. also [Theoc.] 25.42.

[52] A case can be made for both **Φιλίτας** and **Φιλήτας**, but the oldest papyri all have **Φιλίτας**. It is possible that the *η* spelling emerged due to a false construction from *φιλεῖν* once the pronunciation shift of [ē] > [i] had taken place. See Spanoudakis (2002), 19-23; Sbardella (2000a), 1-7. I shall opt throughout for the spelling 'Philitas'.

[53] An early date for Philitas is implied by the *Suda* (φ 332), who places him in the lifetime of Philip and Alexander of Macedon; he was the tutor of the young Ptolemy II Philadelphos (who was born on Philitas' native island of Kos c. 309/8), probably around the turn of the century or shortly after, by which time he must have been well-established.

[54] See test. 19a+b Lightfoot.

[55] Cf. Prop. 2.1.4-6; 2.34.39-32; 3.1.1-2; 3.3.11-12, 51-2; ; 3.9.43-6; 4.5.57-8; 4.6.3-4. Ov. *Am.*3.229-30; 759-60; *Trist.* 1.6.1-3; *Pont.* 3.1.57-8.

philological as well as poetic works.[56] His importance as a scholar-poet is indicated by the story that the Koans set up a statue of him under a plane tree.[57] He would be in the first generation of Hellenistic scholar-poets, and thus a crucial figure in the emergence of bookish poetry in the period.

Callimachus, in the *Aetia* prologue, appears to have praised one of his works, and criticised another, although the identity of each work is in doubt. One was the *Demeter*, alluded to as ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρος (fr.1.10 Pf.), but the fragmentary text of the *Aetia* does not allow us to know whether Callimachus approved of this poem.[58]

Sadly, no fragment longer than four lines is extant; it is also difficult to know what belonged to the *Demeter* or to other works. Sbardella was only prepared to include seven fragments in the *Demeter;*[59] Spanoudakis increased this to fourteen by including far more *fragmenta dubia.*[60] Caution seems advisable: many of Spanoudakis's ascriptions are on the basis of tenuous associations with the *Demeter* myth and reconstructions from the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, the hymns of Callimachus and Philikos,[61] and the allusion to Philitas in Theocritus' *Id.* 7.[62]

It is fair to assume it was a narrative hymn. The hymns to Demeter by Philikos and Callimachus – which indicate this was a popular topic in the third century – are both experimental: Philikos uses the unusual choliambic pentameter (earlier used by Simias in his pattern poems: see ch.7), multiple allusions and innovative lexical choices; Callimachus's poem is in hexameters but is one of his 'mimetic' hymns. No doubt the Demeter myth was poetically

---

[56] See Dettori (2000a; cf. 2000b); Spanoudakis (2002), 347-404; Bing (2003). Hermesianax appears to allude to a story that Philitas made himself very thin through worrying over linguistic details (cf. the *Suda* entry; Plutarch in test. 20 Span.): but for discussion of the device of comic *leptotes* in the *bios* of Philitas, see Cameron (1991); Spanoudakis (2002), 54-5. This may have little to do with his actual poetry, but Hermesianax's connection with dialects is suggestive of a scholarliness that probably does invade his poetic style.

[57] Hermesianax fr. 7.76-7 Powell; Poseid. AB 63. Neither mention is unproblematic: see esp. Hollis (1996); Hardie (1997, 2003); Angiò (2002); Sbardella (2000a), 38; Spanoudakis (2002), 34-7; Stewart (2005).

[58] Callim. *Aet.* fr. 1.9-10 Massimilla. Of the other work, only the tantalising adjective μακρή remains. Hermesianax (fr. 7.75-7 Powell) depicts Philitas as in love with Bittis, but this could simply be allegory. Cf. Knox (1993); Caspers (2005, 2006); Sbardella (1996, 2000b).

[59] Sbardella (2000a), frs. 5-11: commentary at 112-127.

[60] Spanoudakis (2002), frs. 5a-21: commentary at 142-222; reconstruction, 223-243.

[61] Callimachus *Hymn* 6; Philikos *SH* 677-80 (c. 270 BC?).

[62] Spanoudakis (2002), 223-273.

attractive: it offered the opportunity to portray the goddess in anguish as she searched for Persephone; the wide geographical spread of her search, and the numerous peoples she encounters, could also allow for various digressions and aetiologies of local cults. For Philitas, this would have been an opportunity to aetiologize the Thesmophoria on his native Kos.

Indeed, a reference to the Koan spring, Bourina (*νάσσατο δ' ἐν προχοῇσι μελαμπέτροιο βυρίνης*, fr. 6 Span.= 11 Sb.), associates the poem with the appearance of Philitas himself and Bourina in Theocritus *Id.*7.4-7.[63] The word *νάσσατο* could imply setting up a cult:[64] this would be an aetiology of Koan Demeter. The use of the adjective *μελάμπετρος*, a *hapax legomenon*, could be a very subtle allusion to the myth that Chalkon miraculously created the spring by striking the rock with his knee.[65]

In fr. 8 Span., a reference to a plane tree invites comparisons with the plane tree under which Philitas' statue allegedly stood (Hermesianax fr. 7.76 Powell).[66] However, here it is presumably Demeter who is mourning for Persephone under the tree:[67]

θρήσασθαι πλατάνῳ γραίῃ ὕπο (Philitas, fr. 8 Span.= 14 Powell, 17 Sb.).[68]

Plane-trees are suitable for shrines,[69] so it would be possible that the narrative of Demeter mourning her loss under a plane-tree is to be closely associated with her establishing the cult at the Bourina spring.[70] As for the mourning itself, frs. 9 and 10 Span. are both first-person speeches by someone nursing a grievance, and so it is logical to assume this is in the voice of Demeter:

---

[63] On Theoc. *Id.* 7 and the associated appearance of Philitas in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, see esp. Bowie (1985); Hunter (1983)*;* Whitmarsh (2005).
[64] So Spanoudakis (2002), 149-50: he notes the verb is 'appropriate for wandering figures'.
[65] Σ Theocr. *Id.* 7.5-90 = 81.7 Wendel.
[66] Cf. Bing (1986). The link is denied by Spanoudakis (2002), 157.
[67] The fragment is quoted by Athanasius to explain that *θρήσασθαι* (a *hapax*) means 'sit down'*:* for Demeter sitting and mourning, cf. *h.Hom.Cer.* 98-101, and Spanoudakis (2002), ad loc.
[68] Sbardella (2000a) does not include this fragment in the *Demeter*; Stewart (2005) suggests that it may be from a *sphragis* poem, but this suggestion seems to me to arise from working backwards from knowing that there was a statue of Philitas under a plane tree: there is no obvious reason to think that a reference to a plane tree would have functioned as a *sphragis* to Philitas himself.
[69] Cf. Spanoudakis (2002), 156: 'Plane-trees were the common constituents of sanctuaries… because they grew quickly, were lofty, beautiful, long-living and provided ample shade.' He cites such a sanctuary, mentioned by Paus. 2.36.8-37.1.
[70] See also Hardie (1997), 32-3, for discussion of this fragment, esp. the linguistic issues.

νῦν δ' αἰεὶ πέσσω· τὸ δ' ἀέξεται ἄλλο νεώρες

πῆμα· κακοῦ δ' οὔπω γίγνεται ἡσυχίη (fr. 9 Span. = 5 Sb., 1 Lightfoot).[71]

τῷ οἴμοι πολέω γαίης ὕπερ ἠδὲ θαλάσσης

ἐκ Διὸς ὡραίων ἐρχομένων ἐτέων.

οὐδ' ἀπὸ μοῖρα κακῶν μελέῳ φέρει, ἀλλὰ μένουσιν

ἔμπεδ' ἀεί, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλα προσαυξάνεται (fr. 10 Span = 6 Sb., 3 Lightfoot).[72]

The language of seasons in the second of these fragments is perhaps picked up in what may be a reply (from Chalkon to Demeter?), which consoles her with a generalising truism:

ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἐπὶ χρόνος ἔλθῃ, ὃς ἐκ Διὸς ἄλγεα πέσσειν

ἔλλαχε, καὶ πενθέων φάρμακα μοῦνος ἔχει (fr. 13 Span. = 7 Sb).

The closeness of the language between these three fragments (*πέσσω ~ πέσσειν*; *πῆμα ~ ἄλγεα*; *ἀέξεται ~ προσαυξάνεται*; *ἐπὶ χρόνος ἔλθῃ, ὃς ἐκ Διὸς ~ ἐκ Διὸς ὡραίων ἐρχομένων ἐτέων*) is strongly suggestive: not only does this add to the suspicion that all are from the *Demeter*, it furthermore forces firmer links between the goddess in her cultic role in the Thesmophoria and her narrative persona in the search for Persephone.[73] It would not be hard to see how these fragments might fit in with a general account of the cult on Kos.

The final line of fr. 13 Span. seems to draw on *adesp. eleg.* fr. 21 W^2 (*ap.*Stob. 1.1.6), **Ζεὺς** *πάντων αὐτὸς φάρμακα μοῦνος ἔχει* (*adesp. eleg.* fr. 21 W^2).[74] This maybe an ironic echo, since Zeus has just been deemed the cause of pain; there may be an allusion to his role in Persephone's abduction.[75] The expression *πενθέων φάρμακα* is unusual and illustrates a penchant for surprising turns of phrase.

---

[71] Lightfoot (2009), 37 n.1. suggests that the sense of fr. 9 Span. (= fr. 1 Lightfoot) is 'Had I been mortal, there would have been a limit to my sufferings, but as it is…'.
[72] Text following Lightfoot (2009), fr. 3.
[73] The echoes continue in fr. 12 Span. (8 Sb.) which (as in Powell and Sbardella's editions) probably follows fr. 13 Span.: cf. fr.10.3, *μελέῳ* ~ fr. 12.1 *μελέοιο*.
[74] Cf. also Solon fr. 16 W^2.
[75] So Spanoudakis (2002), 178.

There are even stranger collocations exhibited in fr. 12 Span.:

καὶ γάρ τις μελέοιο κορεσσάμενος κλαυθμοῖο

κήδεα δειλαίων εἶλεν ἀπὸ πραπίδων ...(fr. 12 Span. = 8 Sb., 2.3-4 Powell)

The first line is modelled on Homer's κλαίουσα κορέσσατο, *Od.* 20.59, while κλαυθμός is also Homeric diction (e.g. *Od.* 4.801, παύσειε κλαυθμοῖο γόοιό τε δακρυόεντος).[76] Yet the construction of κορεσσάμενος κλαυθμοῖο, with the objective genitive, goes against the Homeric practice with the participle, so marking *variatio.* The transfer of δείλαιος onto the organ of emotion, πραπίδες, is also unusual: the whole couplet reads somewhat strangely.

Elsewhere we can perceive a predilection for Homerisms and *hapax legomena*. The aforementioned coinage, μελάμπετρος (fr. 6 Span.), is closely modelled on other similar adjectives in μελα-. Fr. 7 Span. (= 21 Powell, assigned to the Bourina part of the *Demeter*), creates another new adjective, νήχυτος, which adopts the νή- prefix but with an intensive rather than the usual Homeric negative force:[77] the water is abundant like Demeter herself. It is a fair guess that this is representative of the overall style of the *Demeter*: we also find circumlocutions, highly stylised repetitions and internal rhymes and other playful mannerisms.

Philitas also composed another narrative poem in hexameters called *Hermes,* which seemingly included a narrative of Odysseus and the daughter of Aiolos.[78] Barely anything of this remains, but a summary given by Parthenios suggests another close engagement with Homeric geography and language.[79] This, and the readings proposed for the *Demeter*, tie in neatly with Philitas' reputation for glossography: it is easy to see why he has gained a reputation as the Hellenistic poet *par excellence*, before Callimachus; the treatment of elegy is seemingly in continuity with that of Antimachos.

[76] Further references at Spanoudakis (2002), ad loc.
[77] So Spanoudakis (2002), 154-5.
[78] Cf. Sbardella (2000), 16-28.
[79] Cf. Lightfoot (2009), 3.

8.3 Simias of Rhodes

Simias of Rhodes, like Philitas, is described as a *grammatikos*. I have already illustrated the clever bookishness of his *technopaignia* (ch.7): it would be a surprise if his other poetry was not of a similar style. Simias' elegiac and hexameter poems, which have sadly been largely ignored,[80] do not seem as radically innovative as the *technopaignia*, but still reveal a sense of the scholarly poetic persona.

The two best preserved poems are hexameter works, the *Apollo* and the *Gorgo*. The first is perhaps part of a *Hymn to Apollo*, but we lack any context for the fragments. The most substantial fragment is a first-person narrative, presumably Apollo, since it describes an arrival at Hyperborea.[81] This is probably part of an aetiological narrative for Apollo wintering among the Hyperboreans, and perhaps an explanation for the story that the Hyperboreans sent tributes to Delos:[82]

τηλυγέτων δ' ἀφνειὸν Ὑπερβορέων ἀνὰ δῆμον
τοῖς δὴ καί ποτ' ἄναξ ἥρως παρεδαίσατο Περσεύς,
ἔνθα δὲ Μασσαγέται τε θοῶν ἐπιβήτορες ἵππων
ναίουσιν τόξοισι πεποιθότες ὠκυβόλοισιν,
θεσπέσιόν τε παρὰ ῥόον ἦλυθον ἀενάοιο
Κασπάσου, εἰς ἅλα δῖαν ὃς ἀθάνατον φέρει ὕδωρ.
ἐκ δ' ἰκόμην ἐλάταισι περὶ χλωρῇσιν ἐρεμνὰς
νήσους ὑψικόμοισιν ἐπηρεφέας δονάκεσσιν.
Ἡμικύνων τ' ἐνόησα γένος περιώσιον ἀνδρῶν,
τοῖς ὤμων καθύπερθεν ἐϋστρεφέων κύνεος κρὰς
τέτροφε γαμφηλῇσι περικρατέεσιν ἐρυμνός.

[80] See now Di Gregorio (2008); Perale (2010 & forthcoming). The texts are also available in Fränkel (1915); *CA* 109-114.
[81] On the Hyperboreans, see esp. Bridgman (2004), who discusses Simias' version at 77.
[82] Cf. Hdt. 4.32-36.

τῶν μέν θ' ὥστε κυνῶν ὑλακὴ πέλει, οὐδέ τι τοίγε

ἄλλων ἀγνώσσουσι βροτῶν ὀνομάκλυτον αὐδήν (fr. 1 Powell = fr. 1 Fränkel)

Although the mythical Hyperboreans and their magical region was evidently a popular topic,[83] the mention of Perseus feasting with them is reminiscent of Pindar, *Pythian* 10:

ναυσὶ δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰών <κεν> εὕροις

ἐς Ὑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν.

παρ' οἷς ποτε Περσεὺς ἐδαίσατο λαγέτας,

δώματ' ἐσελθών,

κλειτὰς ὄνων ἑκατόμβας ἐπιτόσσαις θεῷ

ῥέζοντας (Pi. *Pyth.* 10.29-34).

Pindar's account of Perseus slaying the Gorgon is not included here, but the attribution of another hexameter fragment of Simias to a *Gorgo* could indicate a fuller treatment of this myth elsewhere (perhaps indeed this was part of the *Apollo*). But perhaps the allusion to the Pindaric version is sufficient to trigger associations for the reader. The epicism in the opening line, τηλυγέτων … Ὑπερβορέων,[84] no doubt alludes to the inaccessibility of the Hyperboreans, which may have been a commonplace although it is unknown before Pindar. Placing the Massagetai in the Hyperborean territory is perhaps Simias' own innovation (in Aristeas and Herodotus they are seemingly not that far out).[85] This passage is also the only recorded instance of the river Kaspasos.

It is possible that Apollo delivers this narrative as part of an instruction to establish a cult elsewhere (the god makes his epiphany by coming from abroad): we do not know whom he is addressing. The passage reads more like a geographical excursus, as it is almost entirely descriptive: lines 2-4 provide an initial digression through the allusion to the Perseus myth and

[83] Cf. e.g. Aristeas, *EpGrF* 81-88 (Hdt. 4.13; cf. Bolton (1962)); Hes. *Cat.* fr. 150.21 M-W; Hdt. 4.32-36.
[84] Cf. *Il.* 3.175; 5.153; 9.143, 482; 13.470; *Od.* 16.19; *h.Hom.Cer.* 164. Perh. also Hes. *Cat.* fr. 243.4 M-W; Eur. *IT* 829. It is also used three times by Apoll., *Arg.* 1.99, 149, 719.
[85] Cf. Hdt. 4.11; 1.201-216.

elaborate description of the Massagetai; even once we get our main verb (5) we are quickly back into descriptive language: firstly, the place is described (as in Pindar) as a sort of *locus amoenus* (7-8); then, in lines 9-12, the speaker describes at some length the peoples encountered there, the strange race of half-men, half-dogs, who bark like dogs but understand human language.

The diction is epicizing, with a particular fondness for rarer Homeric words or phrases (e.g. *θοῶν ἐπιβήτορες ἵππων*, 4; *γένος περιώσιον*, 9; *ἐϋστρεφέων*, 11; *γαμφηλῇσιν*, 11), with a few coinages (e.g. *κράς*, 10, the only attestation of the nominative); there is a heavy use of epithets, especially compounds.[86] The description of the dog-men has an alluring, exotic flavour, especially the circumlocution of line 11: the canine head hangs off the creatures like an item of clothing.

Little can be deduced from other fragments ascribed to the *Apollo*. One is a description of some sort of creature:

χρυσῷ δ' αἰγλήεντι προσήρμοσεν ἀμφιδασείας

κόρσας καὶ στόμα λάβρον ὀπισθοδέτοισιν ἱμᾶσιν (fr. 3 Powell = fr. 5 Fränkel)

Could this be one of the dog-men of fr. 1? Again, the passage is notable for its Homerizing (*αἰγλήεντι* is Homeric diction, while *ἀμφιδάσεια* is an Homeric *hapax*, *Il.* 15.309) blended with neologisms (e.g. *ὀπισθοδέτοισιν*). The final fragment looks like a passage of the same narrative: there is another reference to gold and a similar structure to that of fr. 3 Powell:

χρυσῷ τοι φαέθοντι πολύλλιστος φλέγεται κράς (fr. 4 Powell = fr. 7 Fränkel).

This line would suit a description of Apollo himself, who is 'well-hymned' and with a radiant forehead. Simias again uses the nominative *κράς* (cf. fr.1.10 Powell): the suggestion may be one of a parallel between two opposing forces. We might also compare Apollonius's description of a golden, shining epiphany among the Hyperboreans:

τοῖσι δὲ Λητοῦς υἱός, ἀνερχόμενος Λυκίηθεν

τῆλ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα δῆμον Ὑπερβορέων ἀνθρώπων,

[86] Discussed fully by Di Gregorio (2008), 54-9.

ἐξεφάνη· χρύσεοι δὲ παρειάων ἑκάτερθεν

πλοχμοὶ βοτρυόεντες ἐπερρώοντο κιόντι· (Ap. Rhod. 2.674-7).

Another fragment could belong to this poem, an anonymous papyrus (ii BC) containing eighteen hexameters, *P. Mich.* III 159 (*SH* 906).[87] Admittedly, there are no conclusive reasons for connecting this fragment with Simias' *Apollo*. The diction is certainly similar, and there is a reference to a '[temple?] of far-shooting Apollo' (line 4); it is also clearly a descriptive passage similar to that of fr.1, and suggests another sort of geographical excursus. Reference to the north and south winds could be a reference to a far-flung land; the lacunose text does not allow us to say much about apparent allusions to the myths of Hippothoe and Amphitrite. However, the rather cursory mention of Apollo's temple would seem to suggest that Apollo is not the narrative's main focus, which would perhaps be strange if the poem was a hymn or epic-style narrative about the god.

Two fragments remain of the *Gorgo*, which give little sense of the overall style. The most substantial (fr.6 Powell) narrates Neoptolemos taking Andromache as a prize from the Trojan War; Aeneas is also mentioned.[88] As with the *Apollo*, there is Homerizing tone and diction. Rather than a hymn the title implies this was a narrative of a particular mythological episode, perhaps like a bookish version of the 'new dithyramb' (see ch.10 below): it is at least a fair guess that this is an early version of what modern scholars have dubbed 'epyllion', since there is no indication that this was full-scale epic.

Remaining fragments of poetry ascribed to Simias include a number in elegiacs, evidently including hymns (e.g. fr. 9 Powell, the opening of a hymn to Hestia; fr. 13, addressed to Doris 'mother of the nymphs';[89] fr. 15, perhaps from a hymn to Dionysus;[90] fr. 17, χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἑκατε,

[87] Ed. princ. Winter (1922). On the ascription to Simias, cf. esp. Merkelbach (1951); Di Gregorio (2008), 88-95. But cf. *SH* ad loc.
[88] Cf. esp. Lyk. *Alex.*1268; *Il. Parv.* (for which, see Bravo (2001); Perale (2010)); Σ *Eur. Andr.* 14).
[89] Cf. White (2003), 307.
[90] So White (2003), 306.

ζαθέας μάκαρ ἤβας[91]). One elegiac fragment is intriguingly given the title 'Months' by the source; the fragment itself refers to Amyklas, so it is hard to guess at the nature of this poem, but one is tempted to speculate that it would be aetiological.

While these fragments give us little to work with, it seems as though they belong to the same sort of scholarly poetic milieu as Philitas; both, I have suggested, can probably be regarded as a development of the epic and elegiac style of Antimachos. I now turn to a very different sort of 'book poetry': the hexameter *Distaff* of the female poet, Erinna.

8.4 Female self-construction in *The Distaff* of Erinna

The date and identity of Erinna are shrouded in uncertainty.[92] Her name was probably actually Herinna: the psilosis is due to a false association with Lesbos and Sappho.[93] The *Suda* offers several possibilities for her provenance, of which Telos and Tenos look the most likely: there is too little to settle the debate.[94] The guess at her date (contemporary with Sappho) appears to be a misinterpretation of *AP* 9.190, in which the styles of the two poetesses are compared.

The *Chronikon* of Eusebios, best preserved in St Jerome's Latin adaptation,[95] indicates that a poetess called Erinna was 'well-known' in 353/2 BC;[96] Tatian mentions a statue of Erinna by the artist Naukydes,[97] who flourished at the end of the fifth century.[98] Neri has ingeniously shown that these disparate dates can be reconciled by supposing a simple error of transcription from Eusebios' Greek: the date could have been intended to read as 392 BC.[99] Without knowing

---

[91] Text following White (2003), 305, who rejects Powell's reading: (Χαῖρε ἄναξ ἑτάρε ζαθέας μάκαρ ἤβας). This is, according to White, a hymn to Heracles. Cf. Di Gregorio (2008), 111.
[92] For general discussion, see Cameron and Cameron (1969); West (1977); Scholz (1973); Neri (2003), 47-53.
[93] So Neri (2003), 35-7, who points out that the first hand of *AP* 7.11 ('Asklepiades') wrote ὁ γλυκὺς Ἠρίννας, which was changed in the margin to the psilotic form; *AP* 9.190 has Λέσβιον Ἠρίννης, indicating the link between this psilotic spelling and Lesbos. We might also note that St. Jerome's translation of Eusebios (see below) has *Herinna* in the MS. I retain the spelling 'Erinna' throughout for the sake of familiarity.
[94] Neri (2003), 38-42.
[95] Merton College MS 315 (ix AD). There is also an Armenian version: see Neri (2003), 43-6.
[96] Eus. Caes. *Chron.* 14g (dating acc. to Ol. 106.4 or 107.1).
[97] Tatian, *adv. Graec.* 51, 113 Worth.
[98] Pliny, *HN* 34.8.19, acc. to Ol. 90 (420 BC).
[99] Neri (2003), 46.

Eusebios' source, however, it is difficult to know why he should be considered a trustworthy testimony. Most critics opt for a later fourth-century date,[100] because they suspected a 'crossing of genres',[101] although it is hard to find considerable innovation in Erinna.[102] Martin West's claim our papyrus was a forgery by a male Hellenistic poet has not received general acceptance, but it cannot be excluded.[103] At any rate, the Hellenistic epigrams on Erinna indicate that she was active no later that the late-fourth century or early-third century: Asklepiades *AP* 7.11 may have introduced an edition of Erinna, providing a useful *terminus ad quem*.

According to the *Suda* (H 521), the *Distaff* was a poem of three-hundred lines in a mixture of Doric and Aeolic; it has been identified with a single papyrus, *PSI* 1090,[104] which contains fifty-four partials lines of a hexameter poem, in a mostly Doric dialect with occasional Aeolicisms.[105] Various obscure references to the distaff on the papyrus suggest this is the poem related by the *Suda*; the main theme of the text is the death of a young bride Baukis. The *Suda* claims that the author died as a nineteen year-old virgin, which seems to derive from a number of epigrams concerning and ascribed to Erinna.[106] The language of the *Suda* entry is especially close to the anonymous *AP* 9.190,[107] which simply says that it is the poem 'of a nineteen year-old girl' (line 4),[108] which could very easily have meant a poem *about* a nineteen year-old girl: this would fit the descriptions of Baukis on the papyrus. However, other epigrams mention that

---

[100] Neri's analysis of the style, language and metre (2003: 521-569) suggest a fourth-century date (perh. late iv BC), but I am unconvinced that there is sufficient material to be decisive.
[101] E.g. Parsons (1993), 154: 'we see the crossing of genres in… Erinna, whose poem transfuses Sapphic material into epic metre and Doric dialect'.
[102] Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 28-9.
[103] West (1977). For the rejection of West's controversial thesis, see esp. Pomeroy (1978), 19-20; Arthur (1980), 55-8. Snyder (1989), 96, seems to go too far in claiming it is 'a genuine record of female experience'.
[104] For a study of the papyrus, see esp. West (1977), 112-3; Neri (2003), 154 (transcription), 229-430 (commentary), 501-520 (papyrological commentary).
[105] On the dialect, which West (1977) regarded as experimental, see the helpful analysis of Levaniouk (2008), 220-5. Levaniouk prefers to ascribe the dialect mixture to matters of genre (see more below).
[106] For a complete review of the *testimonia* and fragments, see Neri (2003), 130-155.
[107] The points of contact are: *AP* 9.190.3, *οἱ δὲ τριηκόσιοι ταύτης στίχοι ἶσοι Ὁμήρῳ* ~ *Suda*, *οἱ δὲ στίχοι αὐτῆς ἐκρίθησαν ἶσοι Ὁμήρῳ*; *AP* 9.190.4, *τῆς καὶ παρθενικῆς ἐννεακαιδεκέτευς* ~ *Suda*, *τελευτᾷ παρθένος ἐννεακαιδεκέτις*; the final two lines of *AP* 9.190 seem to have been taken too literally by the *Suda*: *AP* 9.190.5-6, **Σ***απφὼ δ'* **Ἠ***ρίννης ὅσσον μελέεσσιν ἀμείνων*, / **Ἤ***ριννα* **Σ***απφοῦς τόσσον ἐν ἑξαμέτροις* ~ *Suda*, *ἦν δὲ ἑταίρα* **Σ***απφοῦς καὶ ὁμόχρονος*.
[108] Cf. Asklep. *AP* 7.11.2, a probable source for *AP* 9.190.

Erinna died young too, and it is plausible that both this epigram and the *Suda* take their information from this tradition.

One of the epigrams ascribed to Erinna in the *Anthology* offers what looks like a synospsis of the *Distaff*, or at least the part of it that survives. It is an epitaph for Baukis:

> Νύμφας Βαυκίδος εἰμί· πολυκλαύταν δὲ παρέρπων
> στάλαν τῷ κατὰ γᾶς τοῦτο λέγοις Ἀίδᾳ·
> "Βάσκανός ἐσσ', Ἀίδα." τὰ δέ τοι καλὰ σάμαθ' ὁρῶντι
> ὠμοτάταν Βαυκοῦς ἀγγελέοντι τύχαν,
> ὡς τὰν παῖδ', ὑμέναιος ἐφ' αἷς ἀείδετο πεύκαις,
> ταῖσδ' ἐπὶ καδεστὰς ἔφλεγε πυρκαϊᾷ·
> καὶ σὺ μέν, ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμων μολπαῖον ἀοιδὰν
> ἐς θρήνων γοερὸν φθέγμα μεθαρμόσαο (*AP* 7.712 = Erinna 2 G-P).

The epigram is not necessarily by Erinna herself, but it would be no surprise if it were a sort of epigrammatic redaction of the *Distaff*'s themes: the direct speech in line 3 reads like a quotation; the final two lines in particular closely parallel the last part of our papyrus fragment, which is (as West and Neri confirm with their papyrological studies)[109] very likely to have been the completion of the poem:

> Βαῦκι κατακλα[ίουσα
> ἄν φλόγα μὲν τ̣[
> ὠρυγᾶς ἀΐ̈οις̣[
> ὦ πολλὰν Ὑμέν̣[αιε
> π]ο̣λλὰ δ' ἐπιψαύ[ην
> π]ά̣νθ' ἑνός· ὦ Ὑμ[έναιε
> αἰαῖ Βαῦκι τάλαιν[α (*PSI* 1090, col. iii, 48-54).[110]

[109] West (1977), 112.
[110] All quotations follow Neri (2003), with supplements from Levaniouk (2008).

Line 48 of the papyrus, Βαῦκι κατακλα[ίουσα], may well also be imitated by the epigrammatist's πολυκλαύταν; an apparent invocation of Hymenaios (51) is also found in the epigram (7). The reference to fire (49) could easily be an allusion to a funeral pyre (cf. *AP* 7.712.6). There is no certain means of knowing the date of the epigram, but it is notable that an epigram ascribed hesitantly to Leonidas in the *Anthology* (*AP* 7.13) appears to allude to either this epigram or a mutual source; however, in this epigram, the speaker is made Erinna herself, rather than Baukis, which seems to illustrate the way in which the contents of the *Distaff* are transferred onto the poetess. This may well be an early instance of that transference which so informs the biographical tradition.

The *Distaff* appears, then, to be in the form of a lament for the dead Baukis, who is addressed directly by the speaker consistently throughout the papyrus fragment. While the use of hexameters may recall Homeric female laments (e.g. Briseis at Hom. *Il.*19.287-300),[111] the Aeolo-Doric dialect suggests a departure from narrative (i.e. epic) hexameter; the highly personal nature of the poem is perhaps more redolent of lyric genres. Some have argued that it depends on a now largely lost tradition of non-Ionic hexameter poetry: there is perhaps a connection with Sappho's epithalamic poems in 'Aiolian epos' (frs. 105a+b, 106 Voigt).[112] We cannot be sure if it was her own innovation or an inherited form, but there is perhaps a case for saying that Erinna has blended elements of the Sapphic epithalamium with heroic female laments: Sapphic themes of separation may have suggested this connection (cf. esp. frs. 94, 96 Voigt),[113] although we should note that the interpretation of the Sappho poems is also conjectural.[114] One thing we can say is that the poem uses this full range of epic and lyric sources for both lamentation and wedding diction, to produce a most remarkable expression of mourning.[115]

---

111 See esp. Skinner (1982), 265; Rayor (2005), 59.
112 So Levaniouk (2008).
113 So Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 29. Cf. Bowra (1953), 167-8; Rauk (1989).
114 So Rayor (2005), 59.
115 Rayor (2005), 66, calls the *Distaff* an 'epyllion', and claims that the poem 'reads as a heroic treatment of women's concerns'.

The invocation of Hymenaios suggests a marriage theme, and so it is possible that the poem blended elements of marriage-song with lament: Olga Levaniouk, in her marvellous reading of this poem,[116] has shown the dependence of the poem's imagery on wedding-song.[117] The epigram, *AP* 7.712, draws on the *topos* of death as a sort of marriage with Hades.[118] Rauk and Levaniouk incorporate another fragment which Athenaeus (7.283d) hesitantly ascribes to Erinna ('or the male poet who composed it').[119] This is addressed to Pompilos, the fish who traditionally escorts sailors in love: it is plausible that the previous part of the poem had established Baukis' 'journey into marriage' as the scene of her death, although this must remain speculation.[120]

The reason for the title, *Distaff*, remains unclear. One tantalising clue comes in *AP* 9.190, which alone of the Erinna epigrams claims that Erinna's mother frightened her into working at the distaff:

> ἢ καὶ ἐπ' ἠλακάτῃ μητρὸς φόβῳ, ἢ καὶ ἐφ' ἱστῷ
> ἑστήκει Μουσέων λάτρις ἐφαπτομένη (*AP* 9.190.5-6).

A few words on the papyrus may suggest this theme:

> Ἡριννᾳι [.]ϵ φίλαι παᾳ[ρὰ
> ἀλακάταν ἐσόρει[σα (col. iii, 38-9).

In col. ii, there is also a reference to a mother with wool-workers, and using Mormo to cause fear (line 25). While the precise reconstruction of these passages will remain in doubt, we start to get the sense of a poem in the voice of a young girl who is commanded by her mother to do her wool-work, but mourns the loss of her friend Baukis. As I argue below, the role of mother-figures may be an important element of the self-characterisation in this poem.

---

[116] Levaniouk (2008).
[117] Cf. e.g. Levaniouk (2008), 201: 'the *Distaff* is not just a lament but a lament that is so distinctively full of wedding diction as to constitute a wedding song for the dead Baukis'.
[118] So Gutzwiller (1997), 208 n.9. Danforth (1982), 75-7, traces some Modern Greek parallels for this notion in lament.
[119] Rauk (1989); Levaniouk (2008).
[120] Neri (2003), 91-4, charts a possible structure of the whole text: but the information we have is too scanty.

Col. i is so badly mutilated that barely anything is legible: nonetheless, Bowra was able to observe that, together with the first three lines of col. ii, we almost certainly have a reference a game called *χελιχελώνη* (often translated as 'torty-tortoise').[121] Pollux describes this game as follows:

> *ἡ δὲ χελιχελώνη, παρθένων ἐστὶν ἡ παιδιά, παρόμοιόν τι ἔχουσα*
> *τῇ χύτρᾳ· ἡ μὲν γὰρ κάθηται, καὶ καλεῖται χελώνη, αἱ δὲ*
> *περιτρέχουσιν ἀνερωτῶσαι*
> *χελιχελώνη, τί ποιεῖς ἐν τῷ μέσῳ;*
> *ἡ δὲ ἀποκρίνεται*
> *ἔρια μαρύομαι καὶ κρόκην Μιλησίαν.*
> *εἶτ' ἐκεῖναι πάλιν ἐκβοῶσιν*
> *ὁ δ' ἔκγονός σου τί ποιῶν ἀπώλετο;*
> *ἡ δέ φησι*
> *λευκᾶν ἀφ' ἵππων εἰς θάλασσαν ἅλατο* (Pollux 9.125).

Here we learn that it is a game played by *parthenoi*, which would suit Baukis and Erinna: most have taken this to imply a childhood game, drawing on the sense of contrast between Erinna's memories of these *παίχνια* (described as 'already ashes', col. ii, 19-20) and the present (when Baukis has died). [122] Levaniouk has meticulously argued that it would be most consistent with the poem's wedding-imagery to suppose that they played this game at the marrying age.[123] However, one of the most interesting aspects of the game as described by Pollux is the roles of 'mother' and 'daughter' within the game: the girl in the centre of the circle, the torty-tortoise, represents a mother-figure, who by weaving becomes a symbol of domesticity. The outer group refer directly

[121] Bowra (1953), 154. The only serious voice of dissent has been from Michelazzo Magrini (1975), who preferred to see a reference to the tortoise-shell lyre: but the verbal similarities of col. ii, 15 are too striking, and the appropriateness of the game to the context too enticing.
[122] Cf. e.g. Rayor (2005) for the function of memory in this poem, which she compares with Sappho's devices of memory.
[123] Levaniouk (2008), 209.

to the death of that mother's son, which is described by the torty-tortoise as 'leaping off white horses', before the character performs a ceremonial leap of her own into the group, tagging a new torty-tortoise.[124]

It is not hard to see how these themes could have been used in the *Distaff*. There is clear allusion to the son's leap to death: in line 15 (top of second column), there is a mention of movement (with feet?) away from mad white horses (following West's resolution, which has been generally accepted, this line now reads as [λε]υκᾶν μαινομέν[οισιν ἐσάλαο π]οσσὶν ἀφ' ἵ[π]πω[ν]). The following line refers to a yard in a great court, which might be the sort of place where such a game took place (the first word of the line looks like a participle, perhaps 'going into the yard'). Line 14 mentions a wave (κῦμα), which has been taken as a metaphorical sea, a symbol of death into which the character leaps like the son of the torty-tortoise. The most widely accepted supplement is [ἐς βαθ]ὺ κυμα[...], but we may glean something from the description of Erinna's death in *AP* 7.12:

> ἤλασεν εἰς Ἀχέροντα διὰ πλατὺ κῦμα καμόντων
>
> Μοῖρα (*AP* 7.12.3).

Given the way that the epigrammatic tradition seems to ascribe to Erinna what has presumably happened to Baukis in the poem, there is a good chance that Baukis (actual?) death is somehow foreshadowed by the symbolic leap of the game. The speaker, it seems, becomes the torty-tortoise, and expresses this with first person verbs, and a cry of anguish in line 16; this easily slides into an apostrophe to Baukis. By following the analogy of the game, Erinna here speaks in the role of the mother lamenting her dead son. This is striking, since their mutual play implies that they were both *parthenoi*; this contrasts with a 'present' in which Erinna assumes a role of domesticity, the wool-working mother who mourns a loss.

---

[124] The ritual meaning of this game and its appropriateness to the *Distaff* has been the subject of considerable discussion: see esp. Arthur (1980); Skinner (1982); Rauk (1989); Stehle (2001); Rayor (2005); Levaniouk (2008).

The probable sense is that Baukis' death means she never achieves this role of domesticity herself. In line 28, there is a reference to Baukis going into a man's bed, and in 29 an intriguing mention of 'listening to [her] mother', *ματρὸς ἄκουσας*. A likely interpretation is that Baukis failed to listen to her mother's advice; a connection with Aphrodite and forgetfulness (*λάθας . . ϵ.[ ] . Ἀφροδίτα*, 30) may suggest romantic passion causing her to forget her mother's words. The mother is associated with wool-work, and as we have seen, may impose this upon Erinna (cf. Erinna as *λινοκλώστου δεσπότις ἠλακάτης, AP* 7.12.4): the contrast between Erinna and Baukis, then, may be one of obedience to this role. Baukis, perhaps, has transgressed social norms, such as through an illicit affair. [125]

This may go some way to explaining a mysterious passage, in which the speaker claims she cannot attend Baukis' funeral:

]τῶ του κατακλα[ί]ουσα τὰ [ ]λλᾳ δὲ λείπω[·]
]οὐ [γ]άρ μοι πόδες [.] φ[υγῆν] ἀπὸ δῶμα βέβαλοι
]οὐδέ ἐσιδῆν φαέ[σσιν ἔχω νέ]κυν οὐδὲ γοᾶσαι
γυμναῖσιν χαίταισιν [. . . φ]οινίκεος αἴδως
δρύπτε[ι] μ' ἀμφὶ πα[ρηΐδας . . .] (31-35).

There has been much discussion about why the speaker is prohibited from leaving the house.[126] Perhaps *parthenoi* were not expected to participate in the public act of mourning; but a prohibition is all the likelier if Baukis' death had in some way been disgraceful.[127] At any rate, it intensifies the contrast between Baukis, who has left home, and Erinna, who is confined within

[125] For the imagery contrasting Baukis and Erinna, cf. esp. Stehle (2001), 185, who draws attention to Baukis' movement, contrasted with Erinna's stationery role.
[126] See e.g. Bowra (1953), 151-168; West (1977), 108-9; Barnard (1978); Arthur (1980), 62-4; Manwell (2005), 81; Gutzwiller (1997), 209.
[127] So West (1977), 108-9; Arthur (1980), 62; Gutzwiller (1997), 209, who hyperbolically remarks: 'For Erinna… *aidōs* is the internalization of restraints imposed upon her by society, restraints that control her ability to express her grief for the person she loved most in the world.' For Manwell (2005), 81, 'the inability of Erinna to attend Baukis' funeral further illustrates the extent to which she is separated not only from her former companion, but even from those activities most associated with Greek women'.

the home. At home, Erinna expresses her grief in an unbridled manner: [128] in this private sphere, she is able to take on the public role of the mother. If we accept the supplement proposed for line 46, we may even have a reference to an old-aged spinster, perhaps a vivid self-characterisation of the *parthenos* in this *persona* of a grieving mother. This allows us to perceive in the memories expressed in the poem a sense of loss not just of Baukis herself, but also of a time when Erinna could have followed Baukis' route. Further tantalising ideas suggest themselves: is Baukis a real girl or a fiction, an image of what Erinna might have been?

While this reading is admittedly speculative – the *lacunae* in the papyrus and the dubiousness of the 'biographical' epigrams do not allow us any confidence – what does emerge is a poem quite remarkable for its tone and self-presentation. There is a touching intimacy to the expressions and personal quality that has struck almost every reader. Erinna, we assume is the speaker, although the appearance of her name in line 38 would seem to suggest a reference to her either in the third person or possibly direct speech in which she is being addressed (by Baukis, perhaps?).

We are not, of course, in a position to know the context of the performance and first reception of this poem. The speaker's absence from the funeral rites should probably be enough for us to exclude the possibility that this was an actual, performed funeral lament. The self-presentation of the speaker as one confined to a private sphere suggests that we should look to a more private context. I would suggest that it is probably a representation of an act of mourning in book form rather than that act itself, a *mimesis* of what is impossible for the Erinna of the poem.

Although we tend to think of poetry books as long papyrus rolls, there is no reason why a small piece of papyrus could not have been used to circulate a poem of modest length such as

[128] Levaniouk (2008), 215-6, argues that the 'crimson shame' and 'naked hair' are sexual images, turning the language of sexual union into expressions of grief: 'her unusual way of describing uncovered hair as naked… may be an example of wedding imagery acquiring a different meaning in the context of lament'. She compares Soph. *Ant.* 1237-41 and Eur. *Phoen.* 1485-7 for the blushing cheek of a modest bride.

this – especially among a fairly small private circle. The poetic language is sophisticated: the allegorical use of the game, the wedding imagery, and perhaps the motif of the wool-working mother, and the device of memory (i.e. recalling a past with Baukis), all imply an high level of poetic technique – and some innovation. Martin West famously found this level of sophistication too implausible for a nineteen year-old poetess;[129] but there is no certainty that the poem was actually composed when Erinna was that age. At any rate, the adoption of the female voice is remarkably convincing.

If indeed the character of Baukis is a device by which Erinna fantasises about her own condition, then we start to see publication of this lament as an expression of her femininity: the papyrus text then can be seen as an expression of what Erinna is denied publicly, and allows the 'private' voice of the confined maiden to emerge beyond the confines of her imposed domesticity.

Conclusion

I have proposed a reading of Antimachos' *Lyde*, which sees it as a construction of the personal voice of elegy with extended narrative sections, perhaps as a bookish version of the archaic poetry of Mimnermos; it is probable though less certain that his epic, the *Thebaid*, was a like treatment of the oral epic style inherited from Homer and the cyclic epics. Philitas, despite the fragmentary state of his poetry, reveal a similar approach towards elegy and narrative, which tends towards the learned use of rare words and alternative myth; the hexameter fragments of Simias likewise show erudition. I have also suggested that we should probably regard these poets as engaging in episodic narrative: their works could be seen as narrative hymns, but the narrative focus perhaps suggests a forerunner of the 'epyllion' style (although this term is of course

[129] West (1977).

anachronistic). In all these narrative texts, the voice is distinguished by the presence of the scholar-poet, who offers learned commentary on myth and language.

Erinna's *Distaff* does not look at first sight as though it was composed within the same milieu as these other works; and we might not expect a young girl (if that is the identity of the poet) to be such a scholar-poet. Even so, I have proposed grounds for regarding this poem as another sort of book poem, albeit one in which a very different voice emerges. The poetic voice here is not of detached erudition, but rather a very personal, intimate expression of mourning. The genius of the poem is, perhaps, the able way in which it recreates the situation of the young girl kept at home and stimulated by grief into various memories. And yet it is worth noting that if we were to encounter such a device as Erinna's use of the game in a poet such as Callimachus, we would not hesitate to label this as erudition: it is artfully woven into the poem's rhetoric.

I have now completed my survey of 'book poetry' in the fourth and early-third century. In the final part of this thesis, I turn to song: firstly, I look at shorter songs of praise and worship (hymns and encomia); the final chapters are devoted to some of the longer poems from this period, which I consider are best characterised as 'parodic'.

SECTION IV

SUNG VOICES

Performance-poetry in the fourth century BC

Introduction to Section IV

The poetry discussed so far in this thesis has been almost entirely written, whether on stone or papyrus. Granted, at least some, perhaps many, of these works had some sort of oral performance context as well: presumably, for example, the inscribed hymns were at some point performed by somebody; the short, epigram-like poems may have had performances at *symposia*. But in the main I have tried to show that their poetic voice can be understood in terms of the written word.

But public events – festivals, competitions, *symposia* – continued to be an important part of civic life, and poetry continued to be composed for them. Not much survives: in the introduction and chapter 1, I put forward some possible reasons for this. Nonetheless, the controversy over the New Music shows that at least at the beginning of the fourth century, there were significant poems for public festivals: I discuss some examples in chapter 10, along with works of parody, all of which I argue are best appreciated as theatrical entertainment songs. In chapter 9, I focus on the other main type of poetry to survive, encomiastic and religious song. Because these pieces rather stand alone in the literary history of the period, it is difficult to talk of genre development: indeed, the specific genre is in many cases disputed. I prefer to concentrate on the self-characterisation of these works, how they 'speak' to an assumed audience, and how the figure of the poet emerges from the text.

Chapter 9
Voices of praise: hymnic, encomiastic and philosophical poems

The main element that connects the poems considered in this chapter is the use of abstractions in praise: Ariphron of Sikyon composed a song in praise of deified health; Aristotle praises a friend, by extolling personified *ἀρετή*, and in an elegiac poem praising Plato mentions a dedication to Philia. Philiskos of Miletos praises Lysias by addressing Phrontis. The chapter concludes with a look at the poems of the Cynic Krates of Thebes, who uses abstractions to recommend his philosophical world view.

9.1 Ariphron's *Hygieia*

Ariphron's *Hygieia* (*PMG* 813) could easily have been discussed in ch.5 among inscribed hymns: it was twice inscribed alongside paeans at Epidauros and Athens.[1] Perhaps it is the same type of poem: there is no refrain, but in length and style it is comparable to the *Hymn to Hestia* at Delphi. But the inscriptions are late, and our sources tell us it was 'on everyone's lips' (*τὸ γνωριμώτατον ἐκεῖνο καὶ πᾶσι διὰ στόματος λέγω*).[2] It would be unsurprising if a much-enjoyed song were later 'written up' on stone. In any case its style and themes offer a suitable point of departure for this chapter.

Athenaeus quotes the hymn as a paean at the conclusion of the *Deipnosophistae* (15.701f-702b): this context suggests a paean for post-prandial libations,[3] although formally there seems little paeanic about it except the association of Hygieia with the healing cults. Rutherford

[1] *IG* IV[1] 132; II[2] 4533 (the 'Cassel stone', fr.b. Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001), i 224-230 (translation and discussion) and ii 175-180 (text and commentary). For discussion and bibliography on the inscriptions, see above ch.5.
[2] Loukian, *pro lapsu* 6. Cf. Max. Tyr. 7.1a; Stob. 4.27.9; Sex. Emp. *adv. math.*11.49.
[3] Traditionally to Olympian Zeus, chthonic heroes and Zeus Soter, although we know of variations (see Rutherford (2001), 50-2). The apotropaic paean to Poseidon sung at a symposium (Xen. *Hell.*4.7.4) is of a different type, evidently influenced by the situation. A broad sense of 'paean' is implied at Plut. *Quaest. Conviv.* 615b-c ('the song of the gods', differentiated at *symposia* only from the *aisakos* and the *skolion*).

plausibly suggests a *παιάν*-cry could have been added to refrainless song;[4] obviously we cannot know if this happened here. Elements of popular wisdom in the song are reminiscent of *skolia*.[5]

The author may be the dithyrambic poet known from an inscription of c.400 BC,[6] although the name is common enough.[7] Wagman argues for a fourth-century date on the grounds of metre and language helps.[8] Furley and Bremer think it is Hellenistic, and deny any link with Aristotle's song for *Hermias*;[9] however, in ch.9.3 I argue that Aristotle's song does consciously re-use Ariphron's ideas and form.[10] An early fourth-century date therefore seems likely.

Here is the text of the poem in full:

> Ὑγίεια βροτοῖσι πρεσβίστα μακάρων, μετὰ σεῦ
> ναίοιμι τὸ λειπόμενον βιοτᾶς, σὺ δέ μοι πρόφρων ξυνείης·
> εἰ γάρ τις ἢ πλούτου χάρις ἢ τεκέων
> ἢ τᾶς ἰσοδαίμονος ἀνθρώποις βασιληΐδος ἀρχᾶς ἢ πόθων
> οὓς κρυφίοις Ἀφροδίτας ἔρκεσιν θηρεύομεν,
> ἢ εἴ τις ἄλλα θεόθεν ἀνθρώποισι τέρψις ἢ πόνων
> ἀμπνοὰ πέφανται,
> μετὰ σεῖο, μάκαιρ' Ὑγίεια,
> τέθαλε καὶ λάμπει Χαρίτων ὀάροις·
> σέθεν δὲ χωρὶς οὔτις εὐδαίμων ἔφυ (*PMG* 813).

---

[4] Rutherford (2001), 21. This attractive idea is, of course, rather difficult to prove.
[5] Indeed, Max. Tyr. 7.1a, calls it merely an ᾄσμα ἐν εὐχῆς μέρει. Cf. Schröder (1999), 51-3, who also denies that it was a paean (*contra* Käppel (1992)). Cf. LeVen (2008), 231-2; Ford (forthcoming), 87-8. For hymnic or prayerful *skolia*, cf. e.g. *PMG* 884, addressed to Pallas; *PMG* 885, addressed to Demeter, 'mother of wealth'; *PMG* 887, addressed to Pan.
[6] *IG* II^3 1280.
[7] So e.g. Maas (1933).
[8] Wagman (1995), 169-171.
[9] Furley and Bremer (2001), i 226.
[10] Ford (forthcoming) states that it is unclear which poet is the imitator: but there can be little doubt that whereas Aristotle's song is the more unusual, and deviations from Ariphron's language seem to reflect deliberate poetic choices.

The hymn is short, monostrophic, and largely conventional in form; the metre is dactyl-epitrite. Hymns addressed solely to Hygieia are uncommon: [11] her cult is part of the late-classical vogue for healing deities and deified abstractions,[12] but it need not indicate a move away from traditional Olympian religion[13] as much as a growing tendency towards specialization (i.e. the healing cults help address specific issues).[14] She is found with Apollo and Asklepios in the Erythraian paeans:[15] Likymnios (v BC) makes the same connection, apparently in a lyric *prooimion* that opened with an invocation of Hygieia, 'queen of Apollo's reverent throne' (*PMG* 769). Ariphron's song is a 'cletic' hymn, in that the first lines appeal for an epiphany, but the main objective seems to be praise: Hygieia's qualities are extolled through a priamel.

In the absence of a significant petition or mythological narrative section, ὑγιείᾳ may be taken as a human good rather than a goddess:[16] thus it is less a cletic invocation than a desire to have health. The use of ξυνεῖναι, rather than say the cletic ἔλθε, expresses this ambiguity: humans need to live with health (μετὰ σεῦ / ναίοιμι, 1-2), but Hygieia is also conceived as a distnict person (σὺ δέ μοι πρόφρων ξυνείης, 2).[17] She is at once a goddess whose help is desired and an *end* that is desired. Generalising scenarios (εἰ γάρ τις…, 4) illustrate the importance of Hygieia/ὑγίεια, but not her divine power. There follows a list of benefits for which Hygieia/ ὑγίεια is needed: the inclusion of children in the list reminds us that the childless often turned to

[11] Cf. Paus. 5.26.2 on Hygieia depicted with Asklepios at Olympia (early v BC); images are more widespread in the fourth century (see *LIMC* v, 554-572). For further discussion of the cult, see Sobel (1990); Shapiro (1993), 125-131. Stafford (2001), 147-171, identifies Hygieia as an autonomous deity from c. 420 BC, but observes earlier attestations of Athena Hygieia, and a Peloponnesian Hygieia closely connected with Asklepios.
[12] On which, see e.g. Hamdorf (1964); Parker (1996), 227-237; Stafford (2001).
[13] So e.g. Furley and Bremer (2001), i 47.
[14] So Stafford (2001), 231. Cf. also Ford (forthcoming), 84.
[15] Cf. e.g. *PMG* 934.15.
[16] For the sake of clarity, I use the capitalised, transliterated form for the goddess, the Greek without a capital for the good.
[17] There may be a sexual element to this phrase: cf. e.g. Ar.*Eccl.*619, ἢν ταῖς αἰσχραῖσι συνῶμεν. Cf. also Likymnios, *PMG* 769.2, Hygieia as ποθεινά; Kritias, Hygieia among the ἔργ' Ἀφροδίτης, as τερπνοτάτη... θεῶν θνητοῖς (fr.6.18-20 W²).

the healing gods for assistance.[18] Sexual pleasures (4-5) and the final good ('the conversations of the Graces', 9) may reflect on a putative sympotic context.[19]

The opening invocation of Hygieia as the *πρεσβίστα μακάρων* may indicate either 'oldest of gods' or 'most revered'.[20] This links the poem with traditional hymnic song,[21] but there may be irony since Hygieia as an independent goddess seems to have been quite recent. But of course, as a human good *ὑγίεια* can legitimately be called 'very old': notably, Plato uses the same adjective in praise of Eros/*ἔρως* at *Symp.* 178c2 with again both a literal and non-literal sense.[22]

Ariphron's song also draws on popular discourse on the human goods (such as health), in a way that makes it comparable with classical *skolia*. In particular, Ariphron's poem draws on a common 'ordering of goods',[23] which ranked health as the primary good, as in the famous proverbial expression, *ἀνδρὶ δ' ὑγιαίνειν ἄριστόν ἐστιν*.[24] Plato too quotes a *skolion* in which health heads a list followed by beauty then wealth;[25] Isokrates lists health of body and soul, comfortable circumstances and finally honour as the 'greatest goods'.[26]

Varying such lists was probably a means of generating rhetorical effect. A seemingly new aspect in Ariphron is including pleasure among the subordinate goods,[27] especially identified with sex (5). Indeed, *all* the subordinate goods are linked by pleasure, as we see in the all-encompassing phrase, *εἴ τις ἄλλα θεόθεν ἀνθρώποισι τέρψις ἢ πόνων | ἀμπνοὰ πέφανται* (8-9): each item in the list can be seen as god-sent pleasures or absence of suffering. The sense is that pleasure and freedom from suffering cannot be attained without the presence of health. This

---

[18] Cf. e.g. *IG* IV 2.-2. Dinarchos 1.71 claims offspring are essential for orators or generals (iv BC).
[19] Cf. Ford (forthcoming), 87: 'The implication is performing the song itself is an expression of the kind of happiness health makes possible'.
[20] On the form of the superlative, cf. Ford (forthcoming), 85.
[21] Cf. e.g. *h.Hom.Ga.* 1-2.
[22] So Ford (forthcoming), 86-7.
[23] Listing 'the goods' is relatively old: cf. e.g. Hdt.1.32.
[24] [Epicharmus] fr. 19 DK, *ap.* Arist. *Rhet.* 2.1394b13; cf. Theogn.1.254.
[25] = *PMG* 890 *ap.* Plato *Gorg.*451e3: cf. also at *Leg.*631 c and 661a6 (where it the truism is denied), *Euth.*279a; *Phil.*48b. Σ Plat. *Gorg.* also adds spending one's youth with friends.
[26] Isok.*Panath.*1.7.6-8.4. Cf. LeVen (2008), 233-5, with further examples and discussion.
[27] Perh. cf. Philemon (mid-iv BC), fr.150 K-A, *αἰτῶ δ' ὑγίειαν πρῶτον, εἶτ' εὐπραξίαν, τρίτον δὲ χαίρειν, εἶτ' ὀφείλειν μηδενί*.

suggests that Ariphron is not simply regurgitating a well-worn cliché about health but even adding his own poetic voice to the discourse, by attempting to draw a connection between health and pleasure: he claims not simply that health is superior to other goods, but actually a necessary condition of all other goods, and thus of *eudaimonia*: σέθεν δὲ χωρὶς οὔτις εὐδαίμων ἔφυ (10). Again, the idea can be linked with popular thought, as for example, Simonides (*PMG* 604):[28]

οὐδὲ καλᾶς σοφίας ἐστὶν χάρις

εἰ μή τις ἔχει σεμνὰν ὑγίειαν.

We may also mention Plato's insistence that although pleasure is a necessary condition for *eudaimonia*, the latter cannot be understood purely as an accumulation of pleasures.[29] Ariphron elaborates on this theme by listing traditional human pleasures that 'flourish and shine' in Hygieia's presence: this also implies that health is not a sufficient condition of *eudaimonia*, but that health and the pleasures complement each other.[30]

In this way, elements of philosophical discourse colour the poetic voice of what is, otherwise, a fairly straightforward song of praise. One can imagine this being popular both in a cultic context as genuine worship of Hygieia and in a scenario more like that of the *skolia*. Ariphron adopts the hymnic form as a means to hold forth on mortal happiness. In a later section (10.3) I discuss the appropriation of this poem's form and style for the praise of a mortal, also addressed to an abstraction. The same technique is also found in the two poems I consider next, elegiac *enkomia*.

---

[28] Cf. Pi.*P.*3.73; Eur. *Tel.* fr. 714 Nauck. On these references, and medical definitions of ὑγιεία, cf. Stafford (2001), 148-9.

[29] Cf. *Philebus* 65b-f (pleasure ranked 5th). On pleasure as a good in Plato, see e.g. Russell (2005).

[30] Perh. cf. Plat. *Crit.* 47e-48a: life is not worth living if the body is destroyed; but the soul is needed for the body's wellbeing.

9.2 *Enkomia* in elegiacs

The longest fourth-century elegiac fragment is ascribed to Philiskos of Miletos, a student of Isokrates and friend of Lysias.[31] Plutarch cites it as an epigram for Lysias: the *laudandus* is seemingly dead (cf. 8, *τοῦ φθιμένου*, and perhaps line 6, *καταφθιμένων*),[32] but the poem does not seem epitaphic.[33] The poem is not of the highest quality, but it is a fascinating glimpse into fourth-century encomiastic poetry. Here is the full extant part of the poem:

<νῦν> ὦ **Καλλιόπης** *θύγατερ*, *πολυήγορε* **Φροντί**,
δείξεις, *εἴ τι φρονεῖς καί τι περισσὸν ἔχεις·*
τὸν γὰρ ἐς ἄλλο σχῆμα μεθαρμοσθέντα καὶ ἄλλοις
ἐν κόσμοισι βίου σῶμα λαβόνθ' ἕτερον
δεῖ σ' ἀρετῆς κήρυκα τεκεῖν τινα **Λυσίαι** *ὕμνον*
†δόντα καταφθιμένων καὶ σοφῷ ἀθάνατον†,
ὅς τό τ' ἐμῆς ψυχῆς δείξει φιλέταιρον ἅπασιν
καὶ τὴν τοῦ φθιμένου πᾶσι βροτοῖς ἀρετήν (Philiscus fr. 1 W^2).

This may not be the whole poem,[34] but the content would – like Ariphron's *Hygieia* – suit a short, improvisatory piece at the *symposion*.[35] It is constructed as a prayer to Phrontis, but since this stands for wit and eloquence, qualities no doubt to be associated with Lysias himself,[36] it becomes clear the addressee is part of the praise for Lysias. The text is difficult and the metaphor obscure, but apparently the speaker is asking Phrontis to create an appropriately witty and eloquent song in order that Lysias should be well-known after his death. Phrontis, by displaying her qualities (*δείξεις εἰ*, 2), will communicate Lysias' *ἀρετή*, which in turn will be a testimony to his friendship with Philiskos (cf. *ὅς … δείξει*, 7). The phrasing of lines 3-4 is somewhat obscure,

---

[31] So Plut. *Oratorum decem vitae* 836c. Cf. Engels (1998).
[32] The date of Lysias' death is unknown, but his latest works are datable to the 380s.
[33] Cf. West (1974), 20.
[34] Bergk *PLG* ii 160 asserts that this is only part of a longer poem; yet what we have *could* be self-contained.
[35] Cf. Bowie (1993), 361.
[36] Cf. perh. Theogn. 729-30, *Φροντίδες ἀνθρώπων ἔλαχον πτερὰ ποικίλ' ἔχουσαι, / μυρόμεναι ψυχῆς εἵνεκα καὶ βιότου*.

but it has the whiff of a technical expression: the speaker could well be trying to characterise himself as 'Lysian'. The tone is one of an intimate tribute to friendship. The final lines echo the formulae of fourth-century epitaphs, and like inscriptions attempts to reveals the deceased's ἀρετή (ὃς … δείξει …/ τὴν τοῦ φθιμένου πᾶσι βροτοῖς ἀρετήν, 7-8). Philiskos assumes the right to eulogise Lysias as a friend, just as epitaphs can often be read as the voice of grieving relatives.

Aristotle appears to have composed a similar sort of poem. Diogenes Laertios,[37] in a list of Aristotle's works, informs us that he composed a hexameter poem that invoked Apollo, and cites an elegiac couplet invoking the 'daughter of the mother of fair children', καλλιτέκνου μητρὸς θύγατερ (fr. 672 Rose). Presumably these were both hymns: the phrasing of the latter would perhaps suit Artemis; the expression is so redundant as perhaps to imply humour.[38]

A better preserved elegiac poem is Aristotle fr. 673 W^2, which Olympiodoros quotes in his commentary on Plato's *Gorgias*,[39] after mentioning Aristotle had composed an *enkomion* for Plato:

ἐλθὼν δ' ἐς κλεινὸν Κεκροπίης δάπεδον
εὐσεβέως σεμνῆς φιλίης ἱδρύσατο βωμὸν
ἀνδρὸς ὃν οὐδ' αἰνεῖν τοῖσι κακοῖσι θέμις,
ὃς μόνος ἢ πρῶτος θνητῶν κατέδειξεν ἐναργῶς
οἰκείοι τε βίοι καὶ μεθόδοισι λόγων
ὡς ἀγαθός τε καὶ εὐδαίμων ἅμα γίνεται ἀνήρ·
οὐ νῦν δ' ἔστι λαβεῖν οὐδενὶ ταῦτά ποτε (Aristotle, fr. 673 Rose).

The poem occurs, Olympiodoros says, ἐν τοῖς ἐλεγείοις τοῖς πρὸς Εὔδημον. Was there then a book of elegiac poetry by Aristotle addressed to Eudemos? The force of πρός here, if part of the actual title and not a mistake by a later editor, is uncertain: though it implies that Eudemos is the addressee, it conceivably means 'concerning' Eudemos, perhaps elegies composed in his honour.

[37] Diog. Laert. 5.27.
[38] The epithet καλλιτέκνος is not attested before Aristotle.
[39] Olymp. *in Plat. Gorg. comm*. 214.25 Westerlink.

We also do not know if this is Eudemos of Rhodes, Aristotle's pupil (in which case the poem is late),[40] or Eudemos of Cyprus (d. 352 BC),[41] in whose honour a dialogue discussing Platonic matters was composed ('Eudemos or On the Soul').[42] The Platonic connection may argue in favour of the latter, in which case it is even possible that this poem was included as part of that philosophical text.[43] But Plato is seemingly already dead (cf. the past tense in 4),[44] which would put it at post-347 BC: if Jaeger was correct to assume that *πρὸς Εὔδημον* implies that Eudemos is still alive,[45] or if Eudemos is the subject of the verb in 2, it can hardly be Eudemos of Cyprus who died five years before Plato. However, the verb may have a different subject,[46] and it is not certain that the *πρὸς* requires Eudemos to have been alive at the time of composition. Another Eudemos altogether cannot be ruled out either.

Since we have only these few lines, we can get little sense of the overall poetic style. The description of Plato (4-6) is the most notable aspect. The voice is that of a narrator: we should like to know the identity of the subject of *ἱδρύσατο* (2); one wonders if it is Aristotle himself. Just as the invocation of Phrontis served as a means for Philiskos to praise the wit and eloquence of Lysias, here the dedication of an altar to Philia acts as a tribute to the intimacy between Aristotle and Plato. There is a solemn tone to the mention of *σεμνὴ φιλίη*, which encourages us to see Philia as a divinised abstraction;[47] this religious language continues in the next line, *ἀνδρὸς ὃν οὐδ' αἰνεῖν τοῖσι κακοῖσι θέμις* (3), which elevates Plato (as the unnamed *laudandus*) almost to the

[40] For a discussion of the scholarship on this question, see esp. Renehan (1991).
[41] So Gaiser (1966), 93-4.
[42] See Bos (2003), 238-257.
[43] So Bos (2003), 349.
[44] So Jaeger (1927), 16.
[45] Jaeger (1927), 14. Cf. also Renehan (1991).
[46] Jaeger (1923), 108, assigns it to an unknown follower of Plato; for Düring (1966), 15, it is Aristotle himself, following the interpretations of the *Lives of Aristotle* (this seems less likely: the *Lives* have probably adapted what little information they could gather from this poem); Gaiser (1966), 100-3, suggests Dion the tyrant may have been responsible at Aristotle's wish. Theiler (1966), 192-3, modifies to a second-person verb, in defence of the theory that Eudemos is the subject.
[47] Empedokles famously set up Philia and Neikos as a complementary pair of cosmic forces: in fr. 17.24, Philia is identified with Aphrodite; Philia or Philotes is recorded as a deity in Hes. *Theog.* 223.

divine.[48] It also suggests that Aristotle is one of the 'initiated' able to perform this praise poem.[49] It is doubtless related to the *εὐσέβεια* mentioned in the second line.

The next three lines are devoted to Plato's particular contribution, which is said to be unique or at least seminal (*μόνος ἢ πρῶτος*, 4): we may wonder if the inclusion of the second possibility is a subtle suggestion that Aristotle may see himself as doing the same thing.[50] Plato's life and philosophy are not deemed to be separate things but rather jointly illustrate that very philosophy (6), through the achievement of goodness and happiness (7). The final line is of course directed at extending the praise for Plato (as one who had achieved this blessed state), but the exclusiveness of this attainment suggested in this line presumably also says something about the speaker: we recall that this speaker is not among the *κακοί* (3) and that Plato may not have been the last to teach in his way (4). Aristotle's praise for his master's philosophy becomes self-praise. If this was directed at Eudemos of Rhodes, it is possible that the teacher sought to illustrate to his pupil his own credentials as a successor to Plato.

9.3 The encomiastic voice in Aristotle's *Hymn to Areta*

Aristotle's use of the abstract concept, Philia, is matched by a *Hymn to Areta*, in which the ostensible praise of the deified abstraction again serves as a foil to praise a human, this time his deceased friend and benefactor, the tyrant Hermias.[51] I discussed his polemical epitaph for the same person in ch.6. This work looks like a 'performance' eulogy.

---

[48] Cf. Renehan (1991), 263.
[49] Cf. Renehan (1991), 264-5: there is not an implication that anyone had already 'blasphemed' Plato by praising him.
[50] For this as a technical expression, cf. Arist.. *Rhet.* 1.9.1368al, 1.14.1375a2, 2.6.1385a21.
[51] The orthography is variously Hermeias or Hermias. Both forms of the name are well attested in antiquity: very little seems to suggest one form over the other.

Much of the ancient and modern interest in this poem has concerned its genre, and particularly its relationship with a charge of impiety that was brought against Aristotle.[52] The problem apparently centred on whether it was legitimate to compose a paean for a mortal: the source in Athenaeus, Hermippos, responds that it is not a paean, as it lacks the formal elements (i.e. the *παιάν*-cry); he adds that Hermias was already dead so it could not be a paean.[53] This is a fascinating glimpse into Hellenistic eidographical classification, but it is uncertain how seriously we should take the arguments. Hermippos finally concludes that the poem was really a kind of *skolion*:[54] this is particularly interesting in view of my remarks on Ariphron's *Hygieia*, which I have suggested was probably a sympotic song of some sort. Aristotle's song has long been considered in relation to that of Ariphron.[55] It is longer than typical *skolia*; the repeated performances suggest perhaps a type of *threnos*,[56] although there is no obviously threnodic content. At any rate, a sympotic context is probable: we are told in Athenaeus that it was sung daily *ἐν τοῖς συσσιτίοις*, presumably in the Lykeion. Perhaps the unusual circumstances allowed for a unique type of song;[57] and of course all such songs could be re-performed in other settings.[58]

There are several points of contact with the Ariphron *Hymn to Hygieia*, but the most important is the use of an abstraction treated as a deity. As with Ariphron, this occasions an elaboration on that abstract quality in life; Aristotle develops it further as a means to extol

---

[52] Ath. 15.696a-697b (the source is apparently the third-century BC historian and biographer, Hermippos); the story is also told in Diog. Laert., and mentioned in the papyrus of Didymos, *Comm. in Dem. Phil.* col. vi. For modern discussion, see Wormell (1935); Düring (1957), 280-2. See also Ford (forthcoming), for more extensive treatment of the story and this poem in its literary and historic context. On Aristotle's epitaph for Hermias, and the unsympathetic response, see above ch.5.

[53] But paeans were sometimes performed for living men: cf. Rutherford (2001), 95-6.

[54] For *skolia* commemorating the dead, cf. e.g. *PMG* 894 (for the deceased Harmodios: parodied in Ar. *Ach.*); *PMG* 898 (associated with hero-worship).

[55] Wilamowitz (1893), ii 403-412; Bowra (1938); Renehan (1982); Ford (forthcoming). Furley and Bremer (2001) however consider the similarities to be superficial.

[56] So e.g. Bowra (1936): 'but it differed in being sung not yearly but daily' (186).

[57] Cf. e.g. Renehan (1982), 256: 'as far as *style* is concerned, the composition approximates neither to hymn nor to paean, neither to skolion nor to threnos, but to a distinct and different genre'.

[58] See esp. Ford (forthcoming) on this point. Wilamowitz (1893), 406-8, thought it was intended for a one-off performance; cf. Wormell (1935), 76, who thought it likely to have been performed along with the encomium of Kallisthenes (*FGrH* 124). See however Rutherford (2001), 95.

Hermias as one who embodies this quality. To this extent, the approach is much like that of Pindaric *epinikion*. Here is the complete poem:[59]

Ἀρετὰ πολύμοχθε γένει βροτείῳ,
θήραμα κάλλιστον βίῳ,
σᾶς πέρι, παρθένε, μορφᾶς
καὶ θανεῖν ζηλωτὸς ἐν Ἑλλάδι πότμος
καὶ πόνους τλῆναι μαλεροὺς ἀκάμαντας·
τοῖον ἐπὶ φρένα βάλλεις
καρπὸν ἰσαθάνατον χρυσοῦ τε κρείσσω
καὶ γονέων μαλακαυγήτοιό θ' ὕπνου.
σεῦ δ' ἕνεκεν <καὶ> ὁ δῖος
Ἡρακλῆς Λήδας τε κοῦροι
πόλλ' ἀνέτλασαν ἐν ἔργοις
σὰν †[...]έποντες δύναμιν†·
σοῖς τε πόθοις Ἀχιλεὺς Αἴ-
ας τ' Ἀίδαο δόμους ἦλθον·
σᾶς δ' ἕνεκεν φιλίου μορφᾶς Ἀταρνέος
ἔντροφος ἀελίου χήρωσεν αὐγάς.
τοιγὰρ ἀοίδιμος ἔργοις,
ἀθάνατόν τέ μιν αὐξήσουσι Μοῦσαι,
Μναμοσύνας θύγατρες, Δι-
ὸς ξενίου σέβας αὔξου-
σαι φιλίας τε γέρας βεβαίου.

[59] Text following Renehan (1982), 252-3. Renehan deals with the contentious lines in his discussion: see also the text with critical apparatus and commentary in Furley and Bremer (2001), ii 221-8 (translation and discussion at i 262-8)

Much of the poem's language is ambiguous.[60] Areta is addressed as *παρθένε*, as if in a nod to hymnic convention, but invoking Areta *qua* deity is unusual:[61] the earliest attestations of her cult are from ii BC.[62] As with Ariphron's *Hygieia*, hymnic 'Du-Stil' is preserved throughout. However, it once again becomes evident that the subject is *areta* as a goal: Hermias is presented as one who has achieved this goal. There is no petition at all, but the 'argument section' is given greater prominence than in Ariphron: the emphasis of the lengths mortals go to in pursuit of *areta*, serves to stress Hermias's achievements.

The sense of Areta/*ἀρετά* slides repeatedly between the god and the good. In calling Areta *πολύμοχθε* (1), the speaker asserts that 'she' is a thing reached through human effort: the passive sense of the adjective is hardly applicable to a person, but does suit an objective or idea. The phrase *γένει βροτείῳ* (1) could be expected in a hymn to refer to the community of worshippers, but here it seems to emphasise that *ἀρετά* is a mortal achievement. The hunting metaphor of the next line seems to recall Ariphron's 'nets of Aphrodite' (i.e. sexual pleasure), but Areta is the hunted one, *θήραμα* (2):[63] this image, along with the vocative, *παρθένε*, confirms the personification, but *κάλλιστον βίωι* (2) also suggests a philosophical dimension, *ἀρετά* as a life-goal. Whereas Ariphron depicted Hygieia as a competitive good, whose presence was necessary alongside others (*μετὰ σεῦ / μετὰ σεῖο*), Aristotle presents Areta as an end pursued in itself (*σᾶς πέρι... μορφᾶς*, 3; *σᾶς δ' ἕνεκεν ... μορφᾶς*, 15). But the repeated word *μορφή* also suggests physical beauty, recalling Areta as a *παρθένος* (it is tempting to spot an allusion to Platonic forms, but it is difficult to hold up a technical sense in this poem).[64]

---

[60] Renehan (1982) has referred to what he calls a *lexis dithyrambikē*. Certainly, disagreement over the precise text testifies to the strangeness of many expressions, but I see no good reason to associate this particularly with dithyrambs (which he takes from Wilamowitz (1900), 408, 'das *dithyrambodes* des stiles').

[61] Furley and Bremer (2001), i 266, compare Eur. *Andr.* 768-801, but this is hardly an 'ode to Areta' (*sic*).

[62] Wagman (1995), 207. Bowra (1938) helpfully lists previous attestations of personified *ἀρετά*, of which the most interesting is at Xen. *Mem.*2.1.22-34, which 'Aristotle used the story for his conception of Areta' (*id.* 187). Cf. also Ἀρετή in *GVI* 1564.

[63] There is a rather nice symmetry with the first line: *ἀρετά* is a thing toiled after by the mortal race; Areta is a girl hunted throughout life.

[64] Cf. esp. Renehan (1982) on this point.

Areta is also a *καρπὸν ἰσαθάνατον* (7): the fruit metaphor associates her with something firmly in the human domain, an object; *ἰσαθάνατος* (if this reading is correct)[65] carries the implication of 'as good as, but not actually, a deity'. Significantly, Ariphron's adjective on which this is presumably modelled, *ἰσοδαίμων* (4), had been used of something self-evidently mortal (the rule of kings). Aristotle's form perhaps reminds us of Plato's conception of virtue as one of the 'divine' goods,[66] but particularly seems to go with the later assertion that Hermias has obtained immortality through his pursuit of *ἀρετά* (17-18).[67] The sense seems to be that Hermias has grasped the 'immortal-like fruit'.

Like Ariphron, Aristotle uses a priamel, although he varies the details. There is a structured 'order of goods' that Areta surpasses, *χρυσοῦ τε κρείσσω / καὶ γονέων μαλακαυγήτοιό θ' ὕπνου* (7-8). It was evidently a commonplace to say that a good rates higher than gold,[68] but 'parents' (cf. Ariphron's 'blessings of children') and 'sleep' (presumably an echo of Ariphron's reference to sex) are such unexpected continuations that the text has often been doubted.[69] We are certainly in quite abstract territory. 'Gold' may indicate a special kind of prosperity, one that perhaps particularly suggests Hermias's power as a tyrant; it has been suggested that it also indicates moral sincerity.[70] 'Parents' is a less obvious choice than Ariphron's 'children'[71] and so we are justified in reading here a sense of Aristotle's conviction that parents and upbringing are an essential means for forming the *ethos* of one who attains *ἀρετά*. Aristotle is not concerned

---

[65] So Wilamowitz (1893), confirmed by the Didymos papyrus: the text given in Athenaeus has *τ'ἀθάνατον*, Diogenes has *εἰς ἀθάνατον*.
[66] *Leg.* 631b-c.
[67] Cf. Soph. *Phil.* 1420 (so Ford (forthcoming), 112-114.
[68] Fruit is ranked better than gold in Bacch.1.159-161 (Furley and Bremer (2001), ii 226); Renehan (1982), 259, rightly compares Ananios fr.3 W², *τὰ σῦκα τοῦ χρυσοῦ κρέσσω*, which also justifies the reading of *καρπός* as a metaphorical expression for *ἀρετά*; cf. also Pindar's famous priamel in *O.*1.1-2, where water comes before gold (*Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ / ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἐξοχα πλούτου*); Aesch. *Choe.*372; perh. Eur. fr.1046 Kannicht, *πολλοῦ γὰρ χρυσοῦ καὶ πλούτου |κρείσσων πάτρα σώφρονι ναίειν*.
[69] Renehan (1982), 260-2, has defended the reading of *γονέων* (cf. Ariphron's *τεκέων*, 3) commenting that 'parents are a source for life for their offspring', and citing *inter alia* Aristotle's own philosophical writings that regard parents as *aitioi*. On 'parents' in such a *topos*, cf. Hom. *Od.*9.34-5, *ὡς οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἢ̃ς πατρίδος οὐδὲ τοκήων / γίνεται*, although as Renehan points out (260, n.21), the expression is more particular in Homer.
[70] Renehan (1982), 263, citing West (1978), 178.
[71] Cf. Aristotle on children and happiness at *EN* 1100a18-21 (on which, see Pritzl (1983)).

with happiness in this poem, but with gaining *ἀρετά*. The final good, 'soft-eyed sleep', seems to disavow Ariphron's sexual pleasures: the sense may be that of respite from toil or freedom from pain (*ἀλυπία*),[72] which again in Aristotle's ethical writings is an important ingredient of the virtuous life.[73]

The poem is not a philosophical treatise, and it is unwise to push parallels with Aristotle's philosophical writings too far.[74] Hermias's achievement of *ἀρετά* is illustrated primarily through heroic examples (he is compared to Herakles and Achilles), which perhaps suggests an old-fashioned notion of *ἀρετά*. Much of the language of the poem is associated with that of classical epigram, especially for fallen war-heroes. The virtuous death is said to be enviable:

> *σᾶς πέρι, παρθένε, μορφᾶς*
>
> *καὶ θανεῖν ζηλωτὸς ἐν Ἑλλάδι πότμος*
>
> *καὶ πόνους τλῆναι μαλεροὺς ἀκάμαντας* (3-5).

This recalls the gnomic expressions of classical threnodic lyric and epigram (see chapter 1). For example, Simonides praises the war-dead of Thermopylai:

> *τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων*
>
> *εὐκλεὴς μὲν ἁ τύχα, καλὸς δ' ὁ πότμος* (Simonides, *PMG* 531).

This notion of the 'glorious chance' and 'fine fate' is echoed in one of the Simonidean epigrams:

> *εἰ τὸ καλῶς θνήσκειν ἀρετῆς μέρος ἐστὶ μέγιστον,*
>
> *ἡμῖν ἐκ πάντων τοῦτ' ἀπένειμε τύχη·*
>
> *Ἑλλάδι γὰρ σπεύδοντες ἐλευθερίην περιθεῖναι*
>
> *κείμεθ' ἀγηράτῳ χρώμενοι εὐλογίῃ* ('Sim.' 8 *FGE* = *AP* 7.253).

---

[72] Cf. e.g. the invocation of Hypnos at Soph. *Phil* 827, *Ὕπν' ὀδύνας ἀδαής, Ὕπνε δ' ἀλγέων* (etc.). Bowra (1938), 183, observes sexual overtones in Aristotle's line, but these do not seem prominent.
[73] Cf. 1105a17-28.
[74] So Bowra (1938), 189: 'it is unwise to look for philosophical ideas in this poem'. Renehan (1982), 269, and Furley and Bremer (2001), *ad loc.*, are probably right to observe that the *dynamis* cannot easily be identified with the *dynamis* of the *Ethics*, although such a connection is tempting.

This epigram asserts the glory of the deceased through the generalising ϵἰ-clause: their death is a sharing in ἀρετά. The kind of ἀρετά that the epigrammatist has in mind here is plainly militaristic: their death occurs in a defence of the freedom of Hellas. Aristotle's reference to a death ἐν Ἑλλάδι suggests a wider political context, perhaps implying that Hermias's killer was a threat to panhellenic Greek well-being. Aristotle's elegiac epigram for Hermias draws attention to Hermias's killer as the 'king of the Persians' (*τόνδε ποτ' οὐχ ὁσίως παραβὰς μακάρων θέμιν ἁγνὴν / ἔκτεινεν Περσῶν τοξοφόρων βασιλεύς*, 1-2), which hints that Hermias was involved in the sort of fight for Greek freedom equivalent to that of the Persian wars celebrated by Simonides and the fifth-century epigrammatists.

Other aspects of the poem imitate the language of inscriptions (cf. chapter 3 above). Achilles and Ajax achieve ἀρετά, 'going to the halls of Hades' (Ἀίδαο δόμους ἦλθον), which sounds like an epitaphic *topos*. Achilles and Ajax act as a precursor to Hermias, whose own death obtains for him the same ἀρετά. Another epitaphic *topos* is used for Hermias, that of 'departing from the light':

> σᾶς δ' ἕνεκεν φιλίου μορφᾶς Ἀταρνέος
>
> ἔντροφος ἀελίου χήρωσεν αὐγάς (15-16).

Hermias is said to achieve immortality, elevated by the Muses (17-18): this suggests that the immortality is one obtained through poetry, which presumably means Aristotle's song. This reminds us of the final line of the Simonidean epigram quoted above: the dead achieve 'unending eulogy', of which the epigram and songs such as that of Simonides on the dead of Thermopylai are the major part.

Thus we can see a powerful rhetorical message emerging in the song: the invocation of Areta, and the priamel that asserts the importance of excellence, serves to place Hermias in heroic company, and to associate his death with that of the panhellenic struggle for freedom. The poetic voice is constructed in terms of religious praise, but that praise is directed more at

Hermias; and despite appearances, a polemical undercurrent can be detected. I now turn to a somewhat different use of pseudo-religious praise for abstractions.

9.4 Krates: the philosophical voice

Philosophy is a major genre in the fourth century, but it is nearly all in prose: there is little sign of poetic philosophy before the third century, when the Stoic Kleanthes composes a hexameter *Hymn to Zeus* which incorporates Stoic ideas;[75] in roughly the same period, there are also philosophical poems by Timon of Phleios.[76]

Nonetheless, there are verse fragments ascribed to Krates of Thebes, the Cynic, in the second half of the fourth century, which like those of Timon, need to be understood within their philosophical traditions. Krates, a disciple of Diogenes of Sinope, seems to have adopted similarly extreme responses to the Antisthenian ideas by giving up considerable personal wealth and living a life of voluntary poverty:[77] the epistles (admittedly falsely) ascribed to him make much of the value of mendicity, *askesis*, and *parrhesia*.[78] If these claims are an authentic impression of the historical Krates, it is unlikely that any poetry Krates composed would have been performed at *symposia*, at least according to the conventional picture of equal, wealthy diners in a luxurious setting. Even so, it is not impossible that he would have performed for rich patrons, perhaps even sending up that world. One fragment, of which we have only a few words, 'eaters by mutual consent' (*SH* 360), may fit such a context. Other fragments appear to recommend and provide advice for living in penury: it is interesting to speculate that these may have been addressed to a wealthier audience (the *Lives* inform us, for example, that he won over the noble woman, Hipparcheia, who became his wife and joined his manner of life in Athens);[79] a reading

[75] See esp. Thom (2005).
[76] On Timon, see esp. Clayman (2010); Bett (2000).
[77] On Antisthenes, see e.g. Rankin, (1986); Navia (2001). For Krates and the early Cynic tradition, see e.g. Long (1996). The fragments of the Cynic philosophers are now helpfully collected in Giannantoni (1990); for Krates, Noussia has a forthcoming edition of the fragments (*non vidi*); cf. Noussia (2006).
[78] For the epistles, see Müseler (1994).
[79] Diog. Laert. 6.96.

of social satire, though far from necessary, is certainly possible of the surviving fragments, and a humorous voice is certainly detectable.

At any rate, an elegiac hymn addressed to Euteleia ('Thrift', *SH* 361), would suit the sort of circumstances I have speculated for the elegiac poems addressed to abstractions and Aristotle's song to Areta:

> Χαῖρε, θεὰ δέσποινα, σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀγάπημα,
> Εὐτελίη, κλεινῆς ἔγγονε Σωφροσύνης·
> σὴν ἀρετὴν τιμῶσιν, ὅσοι τὰ δίκαι' ἀσκοῦσιν (*SH* 361).

The deity is less an object of worship than a symbol of the lifestyle Krates espouses. Euteleia is called the 'offspring of famous Sophrosyne', which encourages us to see *εὐτέλεια* as a virtue closely connected with that of *σωφροσύνη*. By imitating the hymnic practice of invoking the god's relatives, or the theogony, Krates is thus able to illustrate something about his theological *novum*. In the first line, *εὐτέλεια* is placed among the virtues, where perhaps it is not always thought to belong, as well as to insist that this is a practical virtue: the adoption of *εὐτέλεια* is to be identified with living a life of justice. The verb *ἀσκεῖν* evokes the Cynic's emphasis on *askesis*, but the phrasing of the clause also recalls Sophocles' Oedipus (*OC* 913-4, *ὅστις δίκαι' ἀσκοῦσαν εἰσελθὼν πόλιν /κἄνευ νόμου κραίνουσαν οὐδέν*).[80] There, it is the city that 'practises justice', according to Theseus, but here the point is probably to allude to Oedipus's state of exile: in this exile, he can be seen to be practising mendicity and freedom from subservience, and in this way on an individual level exercises the justice of a *polis*. The Cynic's life is a rejection of being subject to human laws (cf. Theseus's *ἄνευ νόμου*), and adoption instead of the laws of nature.[81]

Krates' poetic method is illustrated in another elegiac hymnic poem, *SH* 359.[82] This is addressed to the Muses, but seems to have the purpose of recommending the life of penury. The

[80] Cf. also Xen. *Mem.*6.20.5, *Sym.* 8.27.3, *Cyr.*1.5.9.2 etc; Eur. fr. 853 N.
[81] Cf. perhaps Diog. Sin. *ap.* Diog. Laert. 6.63, on the virtue of being a 'citizen of the world' rather than a *polis*. See e.g. Moles (1996) for discussion.
[82] = Giannantoni (1990), ii VH 84.

point seems to be to emphasise that virtue is more important than material prosperity. The speaker prays to be given food, confesses that he does not seek riches and asks for virtue; this virtue will then redound to the god as his thanksgiving:

Μνημοσύνης καὶ Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἀγλαὰ τέκνα,
Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες, κλῦτέ μοι εὐχομένωι·
χόρτον ἐμῆι συνεχῶς δότε γαστέρι, ἥτε μοι αἰεί
χωρὶς δουλοσύνης λιτὸν ἔθηκε βίον.
<. . . . . >
ὠφέλιμον δὲ φίλοις, μὴ γλυκερὸν τίθετε.
χρήματα δ' οὐκ ἐθέλω συνάγειν κλυτά, κανθάρου ὄλβον
μύρμηκός τ' ἄφενος χρήματα μαιόμενος,
ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνης μετέχειν καὶ πλοῦτον ἀγινεῖν
εὔφορον, εὔκτητον, τίμιον εἰς ἀρετήν.
τῶν δὲ τυχὼν Ἑρμῆν καὶ Μούσας ἱλάσομ' ἁγνάς
οὐ δαπάναις τρυφεραῖς, ἀλλ' ἀρεταῖς ὁσίαις.

The tripartite structure is conventional, with an invocation, petition, and closing promise of future dedication if the petition is granted. It is plainly intended to recall Solon's hymn to the Muses (fr. 13 W^2), of which the first two lines are a direct quotation and the rest a close imitation with variation. Krates' hymn seems to be self-contained and may easily have stopped where our text runs out, but it is also possible that it was of a similar length to Solon's hymn, with further correspondences to the 'original'. The variations are significant and suggest a direct rejection of Solonian ethics: Solon's petition for prosperity and a good reputation (ὄλβον μοι πρὸς θεῶν μακάρων δότε, καὶ πρὸς ἁπάντων / ἀνθρώπων αἰεὶ δόξαν ἔχειν ἀγαθήν, fr. 13.3-4 W^2) is subverted for simple food for the speaker's belly (3-4). The expression recalls comic *topoi* of food:[83] but just as we might be expecting this to be the prayer of a greedy man, desiring to be well fed, the fourth

[83] On comic food *topoi* and parody, see ch.10 below.

line pulls this back and asserts that this prayer is really an act of virtue (the absence of servitude is another evocation of the Cynic ideal of freedom). The sixth line adopts the well-known proverbial expression used by Solon, *εἶναι δὲ γλυκὺν ὧδε φίλοις, ἐχθροῖσι δὲ πικρόν* (fr.13.5 W^2): but the desire not to be 'sweet' is an inversion that again reminds the listener that the Cynic places himself on the edge of society in search of virtue. It is an explicit rejection of the search for a good reputation.

The phrase 'wealth of a beetle or possessions of an ant' (7-8) is a dismissive contrast that perhaps ironically indicates the Cynic's external appearance (which may seem small like the animals mentioned). It is a vivid image of the accumulation of material goods, which then seem to be no more use than the acts of an insect (cf. Solon fr. 13.7 W^2, *χρήματα δ' ἱμείρω μὲν ἔχειν*). The speaker's 'possessions', by contrast, are deemed to be interior, i.e. the virtuous life: the adjectives *εὔφορον*, *εὔκτητον* (10) evoke a contrast with the vain efforts of the working insects. The Cynic seeks only a metaphorical wealth, one that is applicable for virtue (*τίμιον εἰς ἀρετήν*, 10). Finally, the speaker asserts his difference from other hymnists, and the interiority of the Cynic life by promising 'not feasts but pious virtues'. Read against Solon's hymn, this is an amusing, parodic piece, but one in which a significant philosophical meaning also emerges. Invoking the Muses is a literary pretext for Krates' self-distancing from the traditional forms of Greek piety.

This use of the device of parody may again reflect the self-imposed marginalisation of the Cynic's life: the parodic speaker acts as a commenter from the margins, who uses the poetic language of the mainstream but subverts it for comic effect in order to make some sort of point. Another instance of this is a fragment of narrative hexameters that describe a utopian *polis* (*SH* 351-2).[84] The opening two lines are based on Odysseus's description of Crete in Homer:[85]

---

[84] = Giannantoni (1990), ii VH 70.

[85] For direct Homeric parody, cf. also *SH* 357, *ἕλκε ποδὸς τεταγὼν διὰ πηλοῦ θεσπεσίοιο*, a parody of Hom. *Il.*1.591; *SH* 347, a parody of *Odyssey* 11, perhaps to suggest philosophical wandering like the physical wandering of Odysseus. It is possible that this wandering is what brings Krates' speaker to Pera, as a philosophical arrival.

Κρήτη τις γαῖ' ἔστι μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ,

καλὴ καὶ πίειρα, περίρρυτος (Hom. *Od.* 19.172-3).

Krates, however, replaces Crete with Pera ('Knapsack'), and defines it through a negation of the Homeric adjective:

Πήρη τις πόλις ἐστὶ μέσωι ἐνὶ οἴνοπι τύφωι

καλὴ καὶ πίειρα, περίρρυτον οὐδὲν ἔχουσα (*SH* 351.1-2).

The name Pera obviously suggests the Cynic's voluntary poverty, although it is perhaps also a pun on πέρα (= περαία: the point being that Krates' *polis* is very different from conventional society).[86] The insertion of the word τύφως for Homer's πόντος ('in the midst of wine-dark nonesense'). may be a humorous suggestion of the place's non-existence, but probably also serves to contrast the Cynic view of reality with the conventional image: everything around the ideal *polis*, i.e. society's conventional values, is mere vanity.[87] Elsewhere (conceivably the same poem), Krates uses this word to refer to the prosperity that he has rejected:

ταῦτ' ἔχω ὅσσ' ἔμαθον καὶ ἐφρόντισα καὶ μετὰ Μουσῶν

σέμν' ἐδάην· τὰ δὲ πολλὰ καὶ ὄλβια τῦφος ἔμαρψεν (*SH* 355.1-2).

What follows in the passage on Pera is an assertion of the ideal city in the mode of Plato's *Republic*: the qualities are mostly again defined through the absence of undesirable characteristics (and persons), although the speaker grants the presence of certain herbs and loaves, which presumably indicate the simple existence that Krates rates (they are not deemed to be a cause of wars or a search for glory):

εἰς ἣν οὔτε τις εἰσπλεῖ ἀνὴρ μωρὸς παράσιτος

οὔτε λίχνος πόρνης ἐπαγαλλόμενος πυγῆισιν,

ἀλλὰ θύμον καὶ σκόρδα φέρει καὶ σῦκα καὶ ἄρτους.

ἐξ ὧν οὐ πολεμοῦσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τούτων,

---

[86] Cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 262, *Ag.* 190.
[87] Cf. e.g. Jul. *Or.* 6.202c; Cic. *Att.* 13.39.2.

οὐχ ὅπλα κέκτηνται περὶ κέρματος, οὐ περὶ δόξης (*SH* 351.3-7).

SH 352, which is quoted by Clement of Alexandria (with a spurious initial pentameter), is probably a continuation of this passage. It continues to define Cynicism by the absence of commonly sought-after commodities:

οὔθ' ὑπὸ χρυσείων δουλουμένη οὔθ' ὑπ' Ἐρώτων
τηξιπόθων οὐδ' εἴ τι συνέμπορόν ἐστι φίλυβρι.
ἡδονῆι ἀνδραποδώδει ἀδούλωτοι καὶ ἄκναπτοι
ἀθάνατον βασίλειαν, ἐλευθερίαν, {τ'} ἀγαπῶσιν (*SH* 352.2-5).

The 'immortal queen' is presumably by the poem's internal logic Pera's ruler, but she is seemingly identified with ἐλευθερία, indicating that the hierarchy for Krates is only in the abstract: Pera acts as a symbol of freedom, an absence of servitude (2), of *autarkeia*. The freedom is defined not only as freedom from temporal rulers but also from passions and pleasures.[88]

Two further hexameter fragments, *SH* 353 and 354, use the theme of food: the point seems to be an emphasis on non-luxury:

μὴ πρὸ φακῆς λοπάδ' αὔξων
εἰς στάσιν ἄμμε βάλῃς (*SH* 353)

This appears to be a rather obscure pun that serves to advise against extravagance; *SH* 354 is evidently a recommendation for 'overcoming penury':

†κόγχον καὶ κύαμον συνάγαγε κἂν τάδε δράσῃς
ῥηϊδίως στήσεις τρόπαιον κατὰ πενίας† (*SH* 354).

This theme was also used in a number of iambic fragments ascribed to Krates, that may have belonged to a drama (*SH* 362-8): they are assigned by the editors of *SH* to a tragedy, but would perhaps suit a comedy better, since food and overeating had become a comic trope; given

[88] Cf. Giannantoni (1990), ii VH 44.

Krates' fondness for parody and satire, this seems a more likely context (I discuss this theme further in the next chapter).[89]

We have seen, then, how Krates adapts conventional poetic forms, often parodically, in order to express his philosophical ideology. This innovation is best understood alongside the trends of popular entertainment in the period, which I discuss in ch.10. I conclude this chapter by a look at a different innovation in the voice of early-Hellenistic religious poetry: songs of praise for human rulers.

9.5 The songs of early-Hellenistic ruler cult

One of the most interesting developments in Greek religion to take place in the early Hellenistic period is the emergence of a so-called 'ruler-cult'. This seems to originate with the payment of honours to benefactors (including but not limited to rulers), which were then inflated to the point of treating such figures as divine:[90] individuals are sometimes associated with specific gods.[91] The beginnings of this process of deifying rulers are generally traced to Philip II of Macedon,[92] while the deification of Alexander the Great is perceived as a critical point of departure.[93] Through the time of wars of the *Diadochoi* and into the Ptolemies it is a well-attested practice. But we can detect earlier instances of religious praise-songs addressed to humans. The Samians honoured Lysander with a paeanic composition and renamed their religious festival the 'Lysandreia': Douris (iv BC) tells us that Lysander was the first mortal to be addressed in paeans.[94] A few lines are quoted:

τὸν Ἑλλάδος ἀγαθέας

[89] See esp. Noussia (2006).
[90] Habicht (1970); Fraser (1972), I 213-46; Chaniotis (2003).
[91] I.e. Seleukos I with Zeus, Antiochos I with Apollo, Arsinoe II with Isis, Demeter and Aphrodite. Shrines for these are well attested: see e.g. Pollitt (1986), 274-5.
[92] See Fredericksmeyer (1979a, 1981).
[93] Sources in Worthington (2003), 236-272. The modern literature is considerable, but see e.g. Balsdon, (1950); Habicht (1970), 3-16; Fredericksmeyer (1979b); Badian (1981).
[94] Douris fr. 65 Muller *ap.* Plut. *Lys.* 18.3-4.

στραταγὸν ἀπ' εὐρυχόρου

Σπάρτας ὑμνήσομεν, ὦ,

ἰὴ Παιάν.

In fact, the paean is an obvious choice of genre for this usage, since (as we have seen) one of its functions is to celebrate or pray for communal well-being. A leader of the state could easily be seen as the 'saviour of the city' (a title sometimes used for more traditional paean gods, i.e. Apollo or Asklepios). More unusual is Douris' account of altars and sacrifices: it is unclear if these belonged to Lysander's lifetime.[95]

Plutarch reports similar honours for Dion of Syracuse: as he led his troops, 'shouts of joy and loud battle-cries mingled with prayers and supplications were raised by the Syracusans, who called Dion their saviour and god';[96] Diodoros's account mentions that they 'accorded him honours suited to a Hero', and that they honoured Dion as the 'saviour of their native land'.[97] The stress on Dion as a saviour of the *polis* strongly links the sentiment of the paean with the leader, while the reference to battle cries with prayers makes this connection closer still: this is the typical situation of the battle *paian*-cry, and it is unsurprising if its focus is turned to the individual.

It is not clear to what extent the pre-Hellenistic characters were regarded as really divine, or whether the honours occurred during their lifetimes (the story about Dion implies that at least some were); but there is an increase in the number of paeans addressed to humans in the Hellenistic period.[98] The inscriptions at Erythrai include a fragmentary paean in dactylo-epitrite (*CA* 140, early-iii BC),[99] of which the three remaining lines indicate the ruler Seleukos I was hymned directly; it seemingly also included propaganda about Seleukos's birth that made him

[95] However, cf. Flower (1988), which traces the process back still further in the fifth century.
[96] Plut. *Vit. Dion* 45.3 - 46.2.
[97] Diod. Sic. 12.60.5-6.
[98] Helpfully listed by Habicht (1970), 148; Rutherford (2001), 57-8 esp. n.80.
[99] See Grainger (1990), 185. Text at Käppel (1992), 374, no.38.

'son of Apollo'.[100] Its addition to the other Erythraian paeans may be an attempt to formalise this new devotion and insert Seleukos into the cult.

A little earlier, Antigonos I and Demetrios Poliorketes had, according to Diodoros, a joint altar for them as *Sōtēres*.[101] This is a situation analogous to that of Lysander: the honours paid to the rulers is a testimony to their role in liberating Athens from Demetrios of Phaleron (306 BC).[102] The inscription for this is apparently preserved as *CEG* 2.777 (= *IG* II^2 3424.12-19), which records the names of eleven donors, who have set up the altar at their own cost and whose benefaction of the monument is seemingly regarded as exemplary (*[ὧν ὁ λίθος δείκνυσι σοφοῖ]σι χαράγμασι Μουσῶν / [τοὐνόματ', ὄφρα εἰδῆτε πατρὸς] δήμου τε ἕκαστον*, *CEG* 2.777.3-4).[103] The very existence of such an altar is interesting since it presumes sacrifices and thus the treatment of these living rulers as divinities.[104]

The inscription appears to stop short of actually calling them gods,[105]but hymns composed for the occasion may have gone further.[106] Douris ((*ap.* Ath. 15.697a) tells us that Hermokles won a competition to compose paeans for Antigonos and Demetrios (cf. *SH* 492);[107] according to Demochares (*ap.* Ath. 6.253b-c), there were also processional songs by *phallophoroi*.[108] Our only extant example is a quite extraordinary *ithyphallos* for Demetrios:[109]

> [...]
>
> *ὡς οἱ μέγιστοι τῶν θεῶν καὶ φίλτατοι*

---

[100] Cf. Just.15.4.3-6 for the account of Apollo's liaison with Seleukos' mother.
[101] Diod.20.46.2; cf. Plut. *Dem.*12.3. For the political background, see esp. Billows (1990).
[102] Diod. Sic. 20.46.1–4. Cf. Plut. *Dem.* 8.4–9.1, describing Demetrios' reception at Athens; in Alexis fr. 116 K-A, Demetrios receives toasts parallel to those offered to Aphrodite and Eros. The importance of the *sōtēr* in a paean is also attested much later, in the *Paean for Titus*, our fragment of which concludes, *ἰὴ ἰὲ Παιάν· ὦ Τίτε σῶτερ* (*CA* 173 = Käppel (1992), 386 no. 43,).
[103] The text is very fragmentary: see Hansen (1989) *ad loc.*
[104] Mikalson (1998), 82-3.
[105] The final line is reconstructed by Hansen (1989) as *[τῶι δοίητ' ἀγαθὰ πλεῖστ]α, θεοὶ δὲ χάριν*, which might even seem to disavow that Antigonos and Demetrios are to be regarded as gods.
[106] Ath. 15.697a (some texts give the name as Hermippos, but the geographical epithet, Kyzikos, makes it likely to be the same Hermokles).
[107] Käppel (1992), 348 test. 7.
[108] See Stehle (1997), 45-6, on the *phallos* in communal song (here and more generally).
[109] Ath. 6.253d-f = *FGrH* 76 F13. The text with *apparatus criticus*, *testimonia* and a brief commentary is also in Marcovich (1988), 8-19; Stehle (1997), 42-6, with some useful sources. See also Henrichs (1999), at 243-247, for a brief discussion.

τῇ πόλει πάρεισιν·

ἐνταῦθα γὰρ Δήμητρα καὶ Δημήτριον

ἅμα παρῆχ' ὁ καιρός.

χὴ μὲν τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Κόρης μυστήρια

ἔρχεθ' ἵνα ποιήσῃ,

ὁ δ' ἱλαρός, ὥσπερ τὸν θεὸν δεῖ, καὶ καλὸς

καὶ γελῶν πάρεστι.

σεμνόν τι φαίνεθ', οἱ φίλοι πάντες κύκλῳ,

ἐν μέσοισι δ' αὐτός,

ὅμοιον ὥσπερ οἱ φίλοι μὲν ἀστέρες,

ἥλιος δ' ἐκεῖνος.

ὦ τοῦ κρατίστου παῖ Ποσειδῶνος θεοῦ,

χαῖρε, κἀφροδίτης.

ἄλλοι μὲν ἢ μακρὰν γὰρ ἀπέχουσιν θεοί,

ἢ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὦτα,

ἢ οὐκ εἰσίν, ἢ οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ἕν,

σὲ δὲ παρόνθ' ὁρῶμεν,

οὐ ξύλινον οὐδὲ λίθινον, ἀλλ' ἀληθινόν.

εὐχόμεσθα δή σοι·

πρῶτον μὲν εἰρήνην ποίησον, φίλτατε,

κύριος γὰρ εἶ σύ,

τὴν δ' οὐχὶ Θηβῶν, ἀλλ' ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος

Σφίγγα περικρατοῦσαν,

Αἰτωλὸς ὅστις ἐπὶ πέτρας καθήμενος,

ὥσπερ ἡ παλαιά,

τὰ σώματ' ἡμῶν πάντ' ἀναρπάσας φέρει,

κοὐκ ἔχω μάχεσθαι·
Αἰτωλικὸν γὰρ ἁρπάσαι τὰ τῶν πέλας,
νῦν δὲ καὶ τὰ πόρρω·
μάλιστα μὲν δὴ κόλασον αὐτός· εἰ δὲ μή,
Οἰδίπουν τιν' εὑρέ,
τὴν Σφίγγα ταύτην ὅστις ἢ κατακρημνιεῖ
ἢ σπίνον ποιήσει (*CA* 173-4).

As in the inscription and the paeans, Demetrios is here addressed as a saviour of the *polis*; the final section of the song (23ff.) is apotropaic, appealing for Demetrios to ward off the threat of the Aitolians. Something of the manner of the performance may be suggested by the phrase, φίλοι πάντες κύκλῳ, which evokes a chorus awaiting a divine epiphany in its midst. [110]

Demetrios is addressed not alone, but as in the company of Demeter (Δήμητρα καὶ Δημήτριον), who is in Athens apparently for the mysteries of Persephone (5-6). The pairing of these two may be a pun on Demetrios' name, perhaps as an attempt to force a divine connection. However, it also suggests that the procession honours Demetrios as if he were the god making an epiphany at the mysteries: the expected pairing with Demeter would be Dionysus, so Demetrios is evidently being set up as a Dionysus-type figure.[111] Plutarch makes reference to just such a welcome for Demetrios and Demeter.[112] As Henrichs has pointed out, the description of Demetrios then echoes the attributes associated with Dionysus (for example, in Euripides' *Bacchae*): he is ἱλαρός, καλός and γελῶν (7-10), [113] while the speaker acknowledges that these attributes are expected by adding that they 'befit the god', ὥσπερ τὸν θεὸν δεῖ (7). The definite article can be taken to apply to Demetrios, of course, but it also suggests that these are the traits

[110] The opening of the song is lost: Stehle (1997), 44, observes that the ὡς of line 1 implies that the chorus is addressing the crowd. In the final part, this turns into an address of Demetrios himself.
[111] The pairing has been explained as a reference to Demetrios' wife, Lanassa: see e.g. Scott (1928). Marcovich (1988), 10-11, has some apt arguments against this conjecture.
[112] Plut. *Dem.*12.1.
[113] Henrichs (1999), 224. Cf. Eur. *Ba.*47ff, 380, 434ff, 453ff, 622, 636, 1021.

of another, more famous, god. Like Dionysus, he is also made 'similar to the sun', while his dancing friends are 'stars' (11-12).[114]

The hymn's greatest novelty is to address Demetrios along with Demeter as the *μέγιστοι τῶν θεῶν* (1): it would perhaps not be surprising for Dionysus and Demeter to be regarded as *φίλτατοι τῇ πόλει* (1-2), but it is a remarkably hyperbolic promotion for Demetrios as a new deity. Later it speaks only to him (Demeter has now been altogether abandoned), given divine parentage, *ὦ τοῦ κρατίστου παῖ Ποσειδῶνος θεοῦ, / χαῖρε, καὶφροδίτης* (13-4).[115] Here the *θεοῦ* is redundant, and so serves (rather gratuitously) to reinforce the divinity of the addressee.

Still more remarkable is the chorus's assertion that Demetrios *alone* is a true god, or is the only one who is present in mortals' lives or pays attention to their concerns:

> *ἄλλοι μὲν ἢ μακρὰν γὰρ ἀπέχουσιν θεοί,*
> *ἢ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὦτα,*
> *ἢ οὐκ εἰσιν, ἢ οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ἕν,*
> *σὲ δὲ παρόνθ' ὁρῶμεν,*
> *οὐ ξύλινον οὐδὲ λίθινον, ἀλλ' ἀληθινόν.*
> *εὐχόμεσθα δή σοι·* (15-20).

As a religious expression, this is exceptional.[116] Rather than imply a wholesale rejection of traditional religion, it is probably a hyperbolic contrast of Demetrios with other gods as a means to assert his power, to establish Demetrios as a *parvenu* god. Demetrios, a new addition to the pantheon, is now made not only the greatest but even the only one of note. The language used is reminiscent of some of the Hebrew Psalms that contrast the one true God with false idols, and which similarly play on the inability of statues to hear and see.[117] However, this image may owe

---

[114] The comparison to the sun may have been a trope for Demetrios: cf. Kastorion, *PMG* 845 (*SH* 312), which addresses Demetrios as 'sun-like'.
[115] Marcovich (1988), 12-13, draws attention to numismatic evidence for Poseidon as Demetrios' *Schulzgott*, while 'son of Aphrodite' he takes to be a reference to his five marriages, or perhaps his outstanding beauty (cf. Plut. *Dem.*2.2).
[116] On its relationship to Hellenistic theology, see e.g. Marcovich (1988), 13-15.
[117] E.g. Ps. 113(114).12-14; 134(135).15.

something to the very fact that Demetrios is a living human, which set him apart from traditional gods. The implication is that other gods do not involve themselves in human affairs, whereas Demetrios' presence is obvious: the crowds will actually see him. Indeed, since Demetrios is here addressed in the singular, we may even wonder if Demeter's epiphany is a subject of doubt, an admission that she will remain unseen.

There is a humorous tone to the description of other gods: the gods are not merely unable to hear, but even do not have any ears at all (16), a line which strikes an absurd note.[118] The phrasing, *οὐ ξύλινον, οὐδὲ λίθινον, ἀλλ' ἀληθινόν*, with its internal rhymes (*-ινον…-ινον…-ινόν*; *ἀλλ' ἀλ-*) may reflect the processional characteristic, but it comes across as over-the-top and playful, somewhat undercutting the poem's religiosity.[119]

That playful voice is found throughout the poem: in the final lines, the Sphinx is introduced as a mythological comparison for the threat facing Athens at that moment, the Aitolians. No doubt this refers to real historical circumstances, namely the attempt of the Aitolian league to assert control over its environs in the ongoing struggle for control of post-Macedonian Greece; Demetrios was engaged in the fight-back.[120] In this context, Demetrios's divine epiphany is one of a state leader. However, the image of some unnamed Aitolian sitting on a rock like the Sphinx is bizarre, if vivid: the personification of the Aitolian League is a pleasingly humorous touch. But this strange image is compounded further by the expression that follows:

> *Αἰτωλικὸν γὰρ ἁρπάσαι τὰ τῶν πέλας,*
> *νῦν δὲ καὶ τὰ πόρρω* (28-9).

[118] Marcovich (1988), 15, interprets this as 'the gods lend no ear', denying an anthropomorphic element: but I feel that the oddity of the phrase speaks in favour of my reading, in the context of such a humorous poem.
[119] See e.g. Kerkhecker (1999), 147-8, who believes that 'the composition is shoddy', and cites this pun as an example; but cf. Marcovich (1988), 17, who regards it as 'eloquent enough and serves as a slogan in his *programmatic* [sic] poem'.
[120] The most comprehensive discussion is Grainger (1990), esp. 87-104. On the Aitolian league generally, see e.g. Scholten (2000).

The construction Αἰτωλικὸν γὰρ ἁρπάσαι, is an amusing characterisation; the neuter plurals *τὰ τῶν πέλας*, *τὰ πόρρω*, reduces states to almost the level of possessions. This passage – perhaps the entire poem – appears to be a *reductio ad absurdum*, an aspect only further highlighted by the closing lines, where the chorus impetuously demands that if Demetrios is not capable of solving Athens' problems after all, he should 'find an Oedipus' to remove the threat instead.[121] This adds an uncomfortable bathos, which could be taken as a humorous twist on the genre: there is perhaps a hint of doubt in these lines, as if Demetrios might not be the 'greatest of the gods' as first proclaimed.

We need not assume too much from this humorous tone about the author's religiosity; but we do see signs of finding fun in the poetic form that had been appropriated. Perhaps this simply suited the celebratory occasion. But it is a nice instance of traditional religious forms being re-used for new contexts, something we have seen in several ways over the course of this chapter.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed a number of ways in which the poetic voice of praise poetry is represented. All of them in some way use traditional religious modes, though Ariphron's *Hygieia* may be the only instance of conventional religious song. We have seen that the use of deified abstracts is a popular method for establishing the praise of individuals. In the case of Ariphron, we could see how this introduced a quasi-philosophical idea; for Krates of Thebes, the point is plainly philosophical. Krates' poetic voice is also imbued with parody, which puts it in the same category as some of the works I look at in the next chapter. At the end of the chapter we saw a poetic voice that is self-conscious about the novelty of the situation: the singer addresses

[121] The second option, 'overthrow or turn into stone' adds another ridiculous element, and undercuts the Oedipus comparison. Perhaps the reference to a stone Sphinx also picks up the doubt about images of deities expressed in 19.

Demetrios as a god, but expressly contrasts him with traditional deities and adds a humorous touch.

I now turn to look at poetry that was probably composed for other sorts of public performance, what I am calling 'popular entertainment': voices of burlesque and parody.

Chapter 10
Voices of Popular Entertainment

10.1 Narrative as popular entertainment: the example of Timotheos' *Persians*

I have discussed already (ch.1.1 above) the controversy of the 'New Music', and the emergence of a form of the dithyramb geared towards popular entertainment. The dithyramb of the late-fifth and early-fourth century should be regarded, I have argued, as a mythological narrative poem that often drew on techniques of other forms of theatrical entertainment, especially comedy and the satyr-play, to produce a crowd-pleasing set-piece.

The focus on narrating mythological excerpts seems to have been sometimes regarded as a defining characteristic of the dithyramb;[1] it is also possible that dithyrambists even before the New Music experimented with form (an example may be Bakch. 18 SM).[2] Even so, the professional dithyrambists of the late-fifth and early-fourth century evidently took this experimentation further: in this chapter I discuss the innovative dithyrambic poetry of Philoxenos of Kythera.

It seems possible to make similar observations about *nomos*, although we know even less about this genre.[3] Ancient discussions frequently associate the *nomos* and dithyramb together: some claim that the two styles became 'mixed' in the time of the New Music.[4] This seems to imply a corruption of the genre analogous to that believed about the dithyramb: a comparison may be drawn between the dithyramb's supposed loss of Dionysiac associations and the *nomos*'s

---

[1] Cf. e.g. P.Oxy. 2368, a commentary on poems of Bakchylides, which cites Aristarchos as claiming the presence of a narrative about Kassandra makes one poem (Bakch. 23 SM) a dithyramb. See esp. Rutherford (1991); Ucciardello (1996-7); Schröder (1999), 110-119; Fearn (2007), 209-210.
[2] E.g. Robbins (1997), 286: 'Dithyramb 18 is vividly dramatic'. But cf. Wind (1972), 33: 'to speak of the poem as dramatic... is misleading'. The genre is far from certain: e.g. D'Angour (1997) suggests a processional song.
[3] For discussion and evidence about the *nomos*, see: Crusius (1888); Wilamowitz (1903), 83-105; del Grande (1923); Grieser (1937); Fleming (1977); Barker (1984), i 249-255; Nagy (1990); Rutherford (1995); Hordern (2002), 15-32.
[4] E.g. [Plut.] *de mus.*1132e, (Timotheos) διαμιγνύων διθυραμβικὴν λέξιν; cf. Plato *Leg.*700a-c on contemporary poets mixing *nomoi* and dithyrambs. See e.g. Fleming (1977), 'Timotheos ...was proverbial for confusing the *nomos* with the dithyramb' (224); Ellingham (1921), 61. On the 'mixing of the genres', cf. Zimmermann (1992), 133-6.

loss of Apolline associations.[5] It is claimed that the genre started off as stately and restrained, with strict rules;[6] later composers (after Phrynis, mid-v BC) started to break these rules, so that it became much like the dithyramb.[7] However, in all probability, the term *nomos* had always encompassed a wide range of types of performance. The generic names given to *nomoi* (e.g. *Pythikos nomos*, *Boethios nomos*, *orthios nomos*, or *trimeles nomos*) seem to imply that the word meant little more than 'tune'; the epithet apparently indicates subject matter, local style, register or structural or melodic principle.[8] Timotheos' *Persians*, our only substantial extant fragment of a *nomos*, shows considerable metrical fluidity; but metrical variations may already have been used in earlier *nomoi*: Strabo tells us that the *Pythikos nomos* had five sections, including ἴαμβοι καὶ δάκτυλοι.[9]

Certainly narrative and musical *mimesis* seems to have been a characteristic of fifth-century *nomoi*. In the *Pythikos nomos*, the *aulos* soloist represented Apollo's fight against the Pythian serpent:[10] Pindar's κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμον (*Pyth.* 12.23) may allude not only to the many-headed serpent but also to melodic turns, the αὐλῶν ...πάμφωνον μέλος (*Pyth.*12.19).[11] The scholiast on this ode tells us that the *laudandus* Midas won an auletic contest in 490 BC by imitating a snake's hissing (cf. *Pyth.* 12.20-1, ὄφρα… σὺν ἔντεσι μιμήσαιτ').[12] This suggests dramatic mimesis was already a feature of *nomoi* before the New Music. Probably this meant that

---

[5] See Hillgruber (1990); Rutherford (1995).
[6] The early *nomos* was believed to have a stately style: cf. [Plut.] *De mus.* 1134c; Proklos *ap. Phot.* 320b12-18. Cf. the (probably) false etymology of [Plut.], *de mus.* 1133b11-c1, that the genre of the *nomos* followed strict rules (*nomoi*), calling it a νενομισμένον εἶδος.
[7] [Plut] *de mus.* 1133b, who claims that Phrynis shifted between *harmoniai* within the same *nomos*; Aristophanes (*Nub.*969-972) mentions the same Phrynis as breaking the rules of *harmonia*.
[8] Cf. perhaps Pindar's παντοίων νόμων (*Nem.* 5.25).
[9] Strabo 9.13.10; Pollux 4.84. Cf. Pollux 4.66 for the seven sections of the Terpandrean *nomos*. See Crusius (1887), 261; cf. Fleming (1977), 223.
[10] See Pollux 4.84; Strabo 9.3.10.
[11] See e.g. Clay (1992); Martin (2003), 162–3.
[12] See also West (1993), 214.

by the fourth century both dithyramb and *nomos* could be seen as little more than narrative entertainment pieces.[13]

Timotheos of Miletos composed both dithyrambs and *nomoi*. His works probably fall a little outside my date range, but a short discussion of his *Persians* will be suitable background for our examination of fourth-century demotic entertainment.[14] The fragments and testimonies[15] suggest a certain theatricalism. A work called *The Madness of Ajax* (*PMG* 777) was probably a vignette on a small part of the Ajax myth, which would no doubt have afforded much opportunity for vivid depiction (perhaps like the mad-scene in in Donizetti's *Lucia di Lammermoor*). Dorion apparently mocked the representation of a storm in Timotheos' *Nauplios*;[16] Stratonikos was offended by an extravagant *Birth-pangs of Semele* (*PMG* 792 *ap.* Ath. 8.352a).[17] His kitharoidic *nomos*, the *Persians*, was a narrative of the Greek naval victory at Salamis.[18] There were probably around six hundred lines in total: the extant passage is entirely astrophic,[19] with an unparalleled mixture of metrical forms;[20] it is a fair guess that there were also modal shifts. Numerous neologisms and circumlocutions, a narrative full of surprising details and vivid descriptions, and elements of caricature, all suggests crowd-pleasing through verbal and musical skill and graphic depiction of battle.

---

[13] Perh. cf. [Arist.] *Prob.* 19.15, in which it is claimed that *nomoi* were long and multiform, astrophic songs, and that the dithyramb abandoned responsion to become more like these. This passage also connects the mimetic style with the use of 'actors' (i.e. solo performers) rather than choruses.

[14] See Hordern (2002), 3-5; on the date of the *Persians*, cf. also Bassett (1931); Hansen (1984); Hordern (2002), 15-16.

[15] For which, see esp. Hordern (2002).

[16] Hegesander, *FGrH* 4.416, *ap.* Ath. 8.338a.

[17] Cf. also Aristotle on *aulos*-led mimesis, *Poet.* 1454a, 1461b.

[18] P.Berol. 9875, ed. Wilamowitz (1903). The text has been re-edited and collected with other fragments by Page, *PMG* 788-791; Campbell (1993), 82-121; Hordern (2002), 84-95.

[19] Korzeniewski (1974) argues for a form of internal responsion, rightly rejected by Hordern (2002), 56. For an attempt to explain the dance movements, cf. Herington (1985), 158.

[20] The form is basically iambo-trochaic, but with various aeolic and dactylic *kola* brought in juxtaposition (I prefer Page's reading of iambics and choriambics in 66-9 and 76, rather than the dochmiacs described by Wilamowitz (1903), 29, for which cf. West (1982), 138). The iambics largely correspond to Aeschylean usage (so Hordern (2002), 56); aeolics are generally unresolved, except in a few places that accord with Euripidean practice (so West (1982), 139; Hordern (2002), 56).

The obvious source is the messenger speech describing this battle in Aeschylus's *Persians* (Aesch. *Pers.* 353-432, 448-471 & 480-514).[21] Timotheos adopts the bare elements in this speech, but imaginatively adapts them: rich details provide a graphic vision of the battle. For example, Aeschylus's messenger reports that the sea had become hidden from sight due to the mass of wrecks and dead bodies (Aesch. *Pers.* 419-20). Timotheos adapts this grisly detail in macabre fashion:[22]

σμαραγδοχαίτας δὲ πόν-
τος ἄλοκα ναΐοις ἐφοι-
νίσσετο σταλά[γμασι (Timoth. *Pers.* fr.791.31-3 Hordern).[23]

Similarly, a matter-of-fact report of the Greeks pressing home their advantage (Aesch. *Pers.* 424-8) becomes a lavish narrative of the complete destruction of the Persians (Timoth. *Pers.* fr.791.15-20 Hordern). There is a particularly gruesome description of the Persian men being impaled on fire-darts, like sacrificial meat on a spit:

ἴσος δὲ πυρὶ δαμ[.....
...] ἀγκυλένδετ[ο]ς μεθίετο
χερσίν, ἐν δ' ἔπιπτε γυίοις
αἰθε[.....]ῶμα διακρα[[ι]][δ]αίνων·
στερεοπαγῆ δ' ἐφέρετο φόνι-
α [.....] α[..]τά τε περίβο-
λα πυρὶ φλεγόμεν' ἐν ἀποτομάσι
βουδο[.....] βίοτος
ἐθύετ'.... (Timoth.*Pers.* fr.791.21-9 Hordern).[24]

[21] The parallels have been well illustrated by Ebeling (1925), who regrettably did not follow through his observations to find further conclusions. See also Hordern (2002), 122 *et passim* on the influence of Aeschylus on the language.
[22] Cf. also Aesch. *Pers.* 597 (the land stained by blood).
[23] Perhaps the choice of ἐφοι|νίσσετο is intended to suggest 'Phoinikian': cf. e.g. Aesch.*Pers.* 410, **Φοινίσσης** νεὼς. For discussion of this scene, cf. Hall (1994).
[24] There may here be a faint echo of Aesch. *Pers.* 424, a simile in which men are compared to fish.

Aeschylus' messenger retreats from describing everything (429-430); Timotheos seems determined to narrate them in more and bloodier detail. Imperfect tenses and participles are used through (contrast the aorists in Aeschylus: imperfects are restricted to 'scene-setting'). This creates narrative excitement and vividity; it is almost a 'snapshot' of the battle, with descriptive phrases are piled up on top of each other without any sense of completion. Gratuitous details and multiple adjectives compound to create a sense of a chaotic scene in the confusion of battle.

There are also elements of humour, such as the ridiculing description of an islander floundering in the water (44-5), gnashing his teeth and calling upon Poseidon in deranged ramblings. He involuntarily drinks seawater: the phrase 'Bakchos-less rain' (*ἀβακχίωτος ὄμ|βρος*, 63)[25] at first seems like a pointless circumlocution, but there is comic disparity between his situation and drinking wine. He amusingly finishes his mad speech by belching up seawater (83-5). The Kelaineian captive is presented in a similarly mocking way: his mix of Greek and Asian language (146-9), and barely comprehensible speech (*ἔπω μοί σοι κῶς καὶ τί πρᾶγμα*, 150), with repetitions (151, 155, 157) and bad grammar (cf. esp. 161) all create humour. Bungled foreigner speech is probably a device taken from Attic comedy:[26] it all adds to the sense that the poem is a source of 'dramatic' amusement for the audience.[27]

While this work may not be at all typical of contemporary lyric, elements of these entertainment techniques can be found in fourth-century dithyrambic poems. Here I focus on the *Cyclops or Galateia* of Philoxenos of Kythera, which seems to use various aspects borrowed from the stage, and the voice of which may be slightly satirical or parodic.

10.2 Philoxenos: the dramatic dithyramb

[25] Cf. Timoth. *PMG* 780, where wine is called the blood of Bacchus, mixed with tear-drops.
[26] Cf. e.g. Ar. *Thesm.*1001-1225; *Ach.* 91-122. See esp. Colvin (1999), 287-94; Long (1986); Hordern (2002), 205. Mockery of speech also occurs in the mimes of Herodas.
[27] The influence of comic forms may also be suggested by the inclusion of a *parabasis* at the end (on comic *parabases*, cf. e.g. Hubbard (1991)).

Philoxenos of Kythera, who was composing in the early-fourth century, is like Timotheos mentioned in Pherekrates' account of the degradation of music (fr. 155 K-A); other portrayals show he was a musical innovator.[28] Philodemos of Gadara claims that stylistically the dithyrambs of Philoxenos and Pindar were similar, and only in the representation of characters did they vary, *μεγάλην εὑρήσεσθαι τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν ἐπιφαινομένων ἠθῶν, τὸν αὐτὸν δ' εἶναι τρόπον* (Book 1, fr. 23 = Philox. test. 7 Campbell).[29] This presumably draws on the account of *mimesis* and *ethos* in Aristotle,[30] who seemingly claims that Philoxenos and Timotheos, like comic poets, portrayed men as 'worse than they are,' *ἡ μὲν* [*s.c. κωμῳδία*] *γὰρ χείρους ἡ δὲ* [*s.c. τραγῳδία*] *βελτίους μιμεῖσθαι βούλεται τῶν νῦν* (*Poetics* 1448a17-8).[31]

Aristophanes reportedly claimed Philoxenos made formal innovations, by introducing *μέλη* into his dithyrambic choruses.[32] The sense is difficult here: various supplements have been suggested, of which the best seem to be *<μονῳδικὰ>* or *<προβατίων αἰγῶν τε> μέλη*. The dithyramb is already a melic genre, so the inserted *μέλη* must be a different sort of song, such as solo ode contrasting with the song and dance of the dithyrambic chorus. Aristophanes refers to *προβατίων /αἰγῶν τε κιναβρώντων μέλη* (*Plut.* 292-3), which might be an allusion to one of Philoxenos' dithyrambs: if so, these would be songs sung by very unheroic characters (it is easy to imagine goatherds being given appropriately rustic language analogous to Timotheos' foreigner).

The most famous dithyramb, the *Cyclops, or Galateia*, which is known primarily through snippets of parody in Aristophanes' *Plutus* (*PMG* 819-820) and tiny fragments quoted by later

---

[28] Cf. e.g.Arist. *Pol.*8.7.1342b9-12, which claims Philoxenos attempted an innovation by composing his *Mysians* in the Dorian mode but slipped back into Phrygian. However, for v-BC dithyrambs in Dorian, see West (1993), 181.
[29] Rispoli (1969).
[30] The first book seems to have largely comprised an account of earlier musical theory from the Academy and peripatetics, and this most probably fits into that schema, although we lack more detail here. Book 1 fr. 1 had seemingly summarised and presumably crticised Plato's theory of *mimesis*. An important aspect of Philodemos's (chiefly epicurean) programme here is to argue against the view that music effects *ethos*: see Wilkinson (1938); Anderson (1966), at 153–76, 189–91. Cf. also esp. Book 4, col. ii on *mimesis* and *ethos* (for which book, see now Neubecker (1986) and Delattre (1989)).
[31] On the corrupt text, cf. Hordern (1999), 450. Perh. cf. Aristox. (*ap.* [Plut.] 1142b-c): Telesias – who had been trained in Pindar and Philoxenos – failed at Philoxenian songs because of his good upbringing.
[32] [Plut.] 1142a = Philox. test.5 Campbell.

authors (*PMG* 821-824, three entire lines and two partial lines). The Cyclops myth was also treated in a satyr-play by Euripides and frequently in Middle Comedy;[33] we also find it in the lyric of Stesichoros II of Himera, and probably in mime. These works suggest a humorous treatment in Philoxenos too.

The scholiast on Aristophanes' *Plutus* confusedly refers to the work as a δρᾶμα, and calls Philoxenos a tragic poet. The mistake is understandable if the dithyramb had solo songs and perhaps even on-stage props:[34] indeed, the scholiast claims Polyphemos was shown carrying a *kithara* and a leather wallet.[35] Aristophanes seemingly mocked the sound of the *kithara* with his use of the word θρεττανελό (*Plutus* 296): the use of such a prop in a drama would hardly invite comment, but it might in a dithyramb. Similarly, according to the *Suda*, a piper wore Milesian shoes and a yellow cloak to perform Philoxenos' *Komastes* (*PMG* 825), an anecdote that adds to the impression method-acting was needed for Philoxenian dithyrambs. Our sources imply there was at least some dialogue: *PMG* 823 is apparently the Cyclops speaking to Odysseus; Zenobios (*Paroem.*5.45) claims *PMG* 824 is a speech by Odysseus in the Cyclops' cave. In *PMG* 822, the Cyclops seemingly sings (συμβαλοῦμαί τι μέλος ὑμῖν εἰς ἔρωτα), which would be the perfect scenario for a solo *melos*.

There is a little evidence for the content of the *Cyclops*: a summary of the plot for a Cyclops and Galateia tale in a letter by Synesios may have little relation to Philoxenos' song.[36] An allusion in Hermesianax (fr.7.68-74 Powell),[37] Βάκχου καὶ λωτοῦ πιστότατον ταμίην, could imply

[33] Cf. e.g. Nikochares fr. 3-6 K-A; Antiphanes frs. 129-31 K-A; Alexis fr. 37-40 K-A.
[34] Sutton (1983), who calls the work a 'lyrico-mimetic experiment'.
[35] One cannot help but think that the leather wallet (πήρα) is a pun in some way on the blinding of the Cyclops (cf. πηρός, a pun made in Theoc. *Syrinx*, *AP* 15.21).
[36] On the connection, see e.g. LeVen (2008), 191-2. Hordern (2004), 287 esp. nn.11-12, argues that since the role of Odysseus disappears in the Hellenistic versions of the myth, Synesios' source must be at least iv BC, but cf. Hutchinson (2007), who observes that there is nothing in the letter to indicate Synesios is referring to a specific text. There is no reason why Odysseus's connection with Polyphemos would be altogether forgotten (they are found together in Roman paintings and in Ovid). The *argumentum ab silentio* is not convincing; in any case, the lovesick goatherd is a theme of Theocritus' *Idylls*.
[37] = *PMG* 815.

rustic themes within a dithyramb. Characteristically, he also mentions a love-story with the socially low Galateia:

> ἀΐουσα μέγαν πόθον ὃν Γαλατείη
>
> αὐτοῖς μηλείοις θήκαθ' ὑπὸ προγόνοις (7.73-4).

Although attributing the love to Philoxenos could be Hermesianax's usual allegorical method, the mention of low rank is reminiscent of Aristotle's criticism of Philoxenos' unheroic characters.

It is probable that the emphasis was on Polyphemos himself, and in particular his hopeless love for Galateia (cf. Σ Ar. *Plut.*290, εἰσήνεγκε τὸν Κύκλωπα ἐρῶντα τῆν Γαλάτειαν). Two fourth-century authors, Phainias and Douris, both give somewhat implausible explanations for the origin of this tale.[38] For Phainias, it was a satire aimed at the tyrant Dionysios I of Syracuse, with whose mistress, Galateia, Philoxenos had an affair;[39] Douris less romantically claims that Philoxenos invented the story to explain why Polyphemos made a dedication to Galateia, not knowing it was due to receiving an abundance of milk (*gala*). Importantly, neither writer seems aware of a previous tradition of a Polyphemos-Galateia romance, which lends credence to the view that this really was an innovation of Philoxenos.[40] Lykophronides did depict a love-sick goatherd dedicating a rose to his beloved (*PMG* 844, τὸν ἐρῶντα ἐκεῖνον αἰπόλον),[41] but it is not clear which poet comes first.[42] How prominent the romantic theme was in Philoxenos cannot be known.[43]

At any rate, the image of a love-sick, ugly Polyphemos trying to woo Galateia, with Odysseus caught up in the middle, is essentially comic. In Synesios' version of the story, there is

---

[38] *PMG* 816 = Phainias fr.13 Wehrli (*ap.* Ath.1. 6e-7a); *PMG* 817 = Douris *FGrH* 76 F58, *ap.* schol. in Theoc. 6.
[39] Phainias (*ap.* Ath. 1.6e) and Σ Arist. *Plut.* 290 each claim Philoxenos was banished for this affair; the *Suda* (φ 397) and Diod. Sic. (15.6) each relate that it was because he had refused to praise Dionysios' own poetry (cf. Paus. 1.2.3; Cic. *Att.*4.6.2).
[40] So LeVen (2008), 193.
[41] = Ath. 15.670d-f (seemingly from Klearchos' *Erotika*).
[42] On the close connection with Philoxenos, cf. esp. the phrase Χάρισι φίλαν παῖδα καὶ καλάν, with Philoxenos *PMG* 821, χαριτόφωνε, θάλος Ἐρώτων.
[43] Cf. Hordern (1999).

comic incongruity: Galateia is a posh girl who washes three times a day, in contrast to the stinking goatherd; the wily Odysseus advises on romantic matters (*PMG* 818). There may be similar incongruity in Philoxenos as Polyphemos attempts to seduce Galateia by praising her noble appearance:

> ὦ καλλιπρόσωπε, χρυσεοβόστρυχε [Γαλάτεια],
>
> χαριτόφωνε, θάλος Ἐρώτων (*PMG* 821).

This looks like an attempt to be a sophisticated lover, using three hyperbolic expressions. It apes at earlier lyric love poetry and songs of praise;[44] for Athenaeus (13.564e-f), it contrasts unfavourably with Ibykos's wooing of Euryalos *PMG* 288: Philoxenos perhaps adopted Ibykos's phraseology (*χαρίτων θάλος*, *καλλικόμων*), which would be incongruous in Polyphemos's voice.[45] He attempts to cure his love-sickness through singing (*PMG* 822 *ap.* Plut. *Quaest.* 1.5 = *Mor.* 622c), which may have provided a moment of either pathos or humour.[46] If, as in Synesios, Odysseus was caught up in this story, then it is easy to see how Philoxenos could be accused of treating Homeric myth with less dignity, and putting priority on unheroic characters.

As we have seen, Philoxenos probably used comic devices to represent the story: other titles by Philoxenos, *Komastes* (mentioned earlier), *Mysoi*, *Syros*, all might strengthen the association and give credence to Aristotle's notion that Philoxenos portrayed 'low characters' perhaps in comic situations. The myth-telling perhaps owes something to Homeric parody as well, though too little remains to be sure.[47] However, parodic elements are more clearly evident in the remarkable *Deipnon*, which I consider next.

---

[44] Cf. Anakreon *PMG* 346 fr.1.15, ὦ καλλιπρό[σ]ωπε παίδ[ων]; Eur. *Phoen.* 191, *μήποτε μήποτε τάνδ', ὦ πότνια, / χρυσεοβόστρυχον ὦ Διὸς ἔρνος / Ἄρτεμι, δουλοσύναν τλαίην.*

[45] For love-songs in dithyramb, cf. Likymnios, *PMG* 771, which looks like a 'higher' treatment of a love-story involving Nanis, daughter of Croesus. Cf. e.g. Hordern (2003), 286 and n.3. However, cf. LeVen (2008), 195, who feels that Athenaeus does not do Polyphemos justice.

[46] Cf. Σ Theoc. 11.1-3b (241 Wendel) for a description of this scene: the quotation of the passage by scholiast here suggests it was not far away from the self-consolation of goatherds found in Theocritus' *Idylls*.

[47] So LeVen (2008), 198-200. Cf. perh. *PMG* 823, where the *Suda* claims a misinterpretation of *Od.*9.231. But the fragments are too exiguous for LeVen's claim that 'Philoxenus engages with the Homeric text to rewrite the Cyclops story and the Cyclopic character… Polyphemus is presented as a witty reading of Homer' (198).

10.3 Bourgeois burlesque: the voice of parody and satire in Philoxenos' *Deipnon*

The *Deipnon* (*PMG* 836a-e), which is one of our longest pieces of extant fourth-century lyric, is preserved by Athenaeus in five fragments across Books 4, 9, 14 and 15 of the *Deipnosophistae*.[48] It is a narrative of a luxurious feast, with sumptuous descriptions of an endless supply of magnificent and exotic dishes. Like the *Cyclops*, it was connected unsympathetically by Aristotle with empty showmanship, crowd-pleasing entertainment;[49] modern scholarship, which has tended to focus exclusively on the text's socio-historic information,[50] has hardly been more sympathetic. However, it offers a fascinating glimpse into the innovations of early fourth-century lyric entertainment poetry: in what follows I try to show that the poetic voice is again humorous, parodic, and perhaps even satirical.

Although authorship, date and genre are all disputed, there are good reasons for thinking the poet is the same as that of the *Cyclops*,[51] i.e. Philoxenos of Kythera, and not Philoxenos of Leukas.[52] The ascription to the latter derives seemingly from the epitomator of Athenaeus, who refers to an apparent quotation from the work by Platon Komikos in his *Phaon* (**Φιλοξένου καινή τις ὀψαρτυσία**, fr. 189 K-A). In fact, Platon gives the author no epithet: when Athenaeus himself refers to the same passage (4.146f-147e), he ascribes it first to Philoxenos of Kythera, and suggests Philoxenos of Leukas as an afterthought (*εἴπερ τούτου καὶ ὁ κωμῳδιοποιὸς* **Πλάτων** *ἐν τῷ* **Φάωνι** *ἐμνήσθη καὶ μὴ τοῦ* **Λευκαδίου Φιλοξένου**). Elsewhere he calls the author of the *Deipnon* **Φιλόξενος... ὁ Κυθήριος** (twice), or 'Philoxenos the dithyrambist' (twice). After quoting *PMG* 836e, Athenaeus that the fourth-century comic poet Antiphanes praised 'Philoxenos

---

[48] The quotations in Book 4 and 9 largely overlap, and form together our 836b *PMG*.

[49] Ath. *Epit.* 1.6d: *Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ φιλόδειπνον ἁπλῶς, ὃς καὶ γράφει που ταῦτα· 'δημηγοροῦντες ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις κατατρίβουσιν ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν τοῖς θαύμασι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ* **Φάσιδος** *ἢ* **Βορυσθένους** *καταπλέοντας, ἀνεγνωκότες οὐδὲν πλὴν εἰ τὸ* **Φιλοξένου** *Δεῖπνον οὐχ ὅλον* (fr. 793 Gigon = fr. 63 Rose).

[50] E.g. Henderson (2000), 7: 'of more antiquarian than literary worth'.

[51] The most thorough analysis of the question has been by Degani (1998). See also Wilkins (2000), 345-350; Dalby (1996), 114-6.

[52] As per Page (1962), following Diehl[3] (1954); subsequently too Campbell (1993), 181: 'the *Banquet*... is best attributed to Phil. of Leucas'.

Kytherios' (fr. 207 K-A, *ap.* Ath. 9.643d; Antiphanes' *Parasitos* may be closely related to the *Deipnon*: cf. fr. 180 K-A).[53] It seems probable therefore that he considers the Kytherian to be the author, and only once briefly entertains a different possibility.

Philoxenos of Leukas was apparently known as a glutton and parasite,[54] so the ascription to him of a poem about a dinner party is hardly surprising, but he is not known as a poet unless he is the author of *PMG* 828 (performed at a wedding feast: the context is unclear which of a number of possible Philoxenoi is meant).[55] Some of the same stories about gluttony were also told of other Philoxenoi, including Philoxenos of Kythera;[56] since the latter worked at the court of Dionysios I of Syracuse, it is easy to see how he could have gained a reputation as a 'hanger-on'. The luxurious dining described in the *Deipnon* may be especially redolent of such a location:[57] *PMG* 828 seems to imply the activity of one who is both dithyrambist and parasite.

The genre of the *Deipnon* is unclear. Contemporary cookery books may have been an influence (this seems to have been especially linked with Sicily; Philoxenos of Kythera worked at the Syracusan court),[58] but the *Deipnon* is a narrative of the actual eating, not a pseudo-didactic

---

[53] So Dalby (1996), 114 & 246 n.7, who compares Philoxenos fr. 836b 7: cf. Wilkins (2000), 353-4.

[54] See *Suda* φ 395*:* on the stories in Athenaeus from Klearchos, see Bartol (2004), and further Roskam (2006). For gluttony in the ancient world, see esp. Davidson (1995), and the response by Romeri (2000), 266 and 566, n. 24. A parasite was originally in fact an individual designated to perform a ritual function at public *thoinai*, according to Zaidman (1995) part of an institutionalized commensality. Only later did it become a comic *topos*, identified with flatterers (*kolakes*), perhaps a literary persona intended 'to denounce a relationship to eating that expresses a form of social organization' (Zaidman (1995), 202); Nesselrath (1985) maintains that the distinction between *parasitos* and *kolax* was retained and even sharpened in New Comedy. On the representation of parasites in Athenaeus, see also Whitmarsh (2000); Romeri (2002).

[55] See esp. Storey (1995), 184, on the possibility of at least four Philoxenoi: Kytherios, Leukadios, the son of Eryxis, and the son of Pternokopis. The ascription of *PMG* 828 by the *Suda* (φ395) to 'P. son of Leukadios' is an obvious misconception; the Kytherian is said to be son of Eulytidas (φ393). On the son of Eryxis, cf. Plut. *de latenter vivendo* 1128b, *Suda* σ1192 (see Storey (1995), 183-4).

[56] Cf. Ath. 1.6e, Phil. of Kyth. as *περιπαθὴς ὢν τοῖς ὄψοις*; cf. Ath. 341a for the same accusations by Machon and Sopater, while the same anecdotes were evidently variously told of different individuals. Cf. Ath.1.5f: *τὰ δ' αὐτὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ* Κυθηρίου Φιλοξένου *ἱστοροῦσι καὶ Ἀρχύτου καὶ ἄλλων πλειόνων*.

[57] Dalby (1996), 115-6, compares *Deipnon* fr. 836b.1-2, which describes the huge size of the dinner, with the comment by Satyros the Peripatetic on the lavishness of Dionysios I's feasts (*ap.* Ath. 541c). As Wilkins (2000), 348 n.127, counters, the precise connection is a little tenuous, but the feast is certainly out of the usual.

[58] Wilkins (2000), 312-368. Herakleides and Mithaikos, who composed prose treaties on cooking, came from Syracuse; the Sicilian *mageiros* becomes a *topos* of Attic comedy (see e.g. Dohm (1964). Cf. also Ar. fr. 216.2 K-A, Συρακοσία *τράπεζα*; Olson and Sens (2000), esp. xvi-xliii.

work about sourcing or preparing food.[59] The **Φιλοξένου καινή τις ὀψαρτυσία** quoted by Platon Komikos and mentioned above (189.4 K-A) is plainly not the *Deipnon* either, as this is in hexameters whereas our poem is in dactylo-epitrite,[60] and the alphabetical list of ingredients there is at odds with the narrative style of the *Deipnon*. Platon's text is probably simply a parody of the culinary literature in vogue at the time;[61] it need not imply a real Philoxenos actually composed such a text.[62]

Nor is there any strong reason to call the work a dithyramb, even though Athenaeus twice calls its author **διθυραμβοποιός**.[63] A Dionysiac connection may be made in fr. 836c, which is a toast **ἐν βακχίᾳ**:

πραΰ τί τοι Βρόμιος γάνος τόδε δοὺς ἐπὶ τέρψιν πάντας ἄγει (fr. 836c.3).

But it is hard to see how this could be programmatic. It seems to belong to the internal narrative, probably coming after the washing of hands (cf. fr. 836b); a mention of the **μεταν**ι**πτρίς**, a drinking cup that comes after hand-washing, implies that the guests were simply drinking at the time, which explains the 'Bacchic' connection. The fragment is presumably addressed to a fellow diner, not Dionysus.

The showy language certainly associates the text with the popular-entertainment songs discussed so far in this chapter.[64] However, the form and poetic voice is novel: the narrator is a

---

[59] In this way it also differs from the hexameter epic parodies by Archestratos and Matron that come after Philoxenos: its lyric metre specifically seems to disavow formal parody as its genre.

[60] We should note that these hexameters are an artificial insertion into the iambic metre of the play, and so presumably a reflection of an 'original' metre of the work or genre. For the use of hexameters in comedy to reflect a different genre, cf. e.g. oracular utterances in Aristophanes (e.g. *Lys.*770-7, *Eq.*1015-95, *Av.* 951-99, on which see now Platter (2007), 108-142), or the hexameter fragments of Euripides *Oedipus* (fr. 540-557 Kannicht).

[61] So Dalby (1996), 115; Degani (1998). The adjective **καινή** implies something novel: perhaps putting a cook-book in mock-Hesiodic hexameters was such a novelty (no instance is known). Cf. e.g. Olson and Sens (2000), xlii-xliii, who compare with Archestratos of Gela (see below). Hegemon's description of a feast (Ath. *Epit.*1.5a-b) was probably an earlier humorous poem on a similar theme.

[62] The name ('lover of *xenoi*') is not beyond suspicion (cf. LeVen (2008), 103-115. Similar remarks may perhaps be made for the ascription of a fourth-century AD recipe book to Apicius (a popular cognomen) or the cognomen Arbiter (*sc.* Elegantiae) for Petronius. We might also compare the treatment of famous people elsewhere in comedy: e.g. 'Socrates' in the *Clouds*, which may only partly be based on the historical Socrates (so e.g. Dover (1971): cf. also Bowie (1998); Brown (2004)).

[63] It is normal to refer to a poet by his best-known output, even when the work in question does not belong to that genre. Nonetheless, it seems a reasonable place to begin the investigation.

[64] So LeVen (2008), 213-230.

participant in the feast, who addresses an individual friend evidently not present.[65] This personal addressee is very different from what we are used to in the public, cultic dithyramb. [66] Perhaps Hesiodic didactic is an influence,[67] but this intimate tone is closest to sympotic poetry.

The lengthy descriptions of the preparations for the feast draws on the sort of meta-sympotic compositions known in the earlier iambo-elegiac tradition. In particular we might note Solon frr. 38-40 & 41 W^2, in which we find a similar sort of 'listing' of foods and sympotic preparation.[68] There are even closer verbal echoes of Xenophanes' prescriptions for the ideal banquet (fr. 1 W^2).[69] Philox. fr. 836a, which must have come near the beginning,[70] is highly reminiscent of the first lines of the Xenophanes fragment,[71] which first describes the washing of hands (cf. Philox. fr. 836a.1-2, *κατὰ χειρὸς δ' /ἤλυθ' ὕδωρ*), followed by a slave placing a garland on the guests (cf. Philox., fr. 836a.3-5, *εἶτ' ἔφερε στέφανον... δισύναπτον*); Philoxenos' slave, *ἁπαλὸς παιδίσκος* (836a.2), carries associations of erotic sympotic poetry.[72] Several elements of Xenophanes' arrangements for the feast are echoed by Philoxenos, e.g. bread (Xen. fr.1.9 W^2; Philox. 836b.6-7), the table (Xen. fr.1.9-10 W^2, called *γεραρή*; Philox. 836b.1-2, called *λιπαρῶπα*).

Philoxenos probably uses these elements to construct a fictional feast.[73] But whereas Xenophanes' arrangements are present tense and carry a prescriptive element, for the *hic et nunc* of the *symposion*, Philoxenos uses past-tense narrative without any sense of prescription. One can perhaps imagine such a narrative occurring at the *symposion* (i.e. describing a previous feast): a later comparison might be Horace *Satires* 2.8, in which the narrator describes Maecenas' dinner party to Horace. Interjections addressed to an individual in the *Deipnon* allow a connection (and perhaps also contrast) to be made between the present of performance and the past of the feast.

---

[65] Direct mention is made of the interlocutor at 836b.7, 16, 19, 23, 35; perhaps 836c.1-3. No addressee features in frs. 836a or d-e. *ὦ φιλότας* seems to be used simply as a synonym for *ὦ φίλε*: cf. Plato *Phdr.* 228d6.
[66] So e.g. Campbell (1993), 181; Wilkins (2000), 350; Sutton (1989), 70-3.
[67] Cf. e.g. Perses in Hes. *Op.*
[68] Discussed by Noussia (2001). Cf. also Alcman 19 *PMGF*.
[69] So Wilkins (2000), 350, who observes the comparisons made here.
[70] See Ath. 15.685d on P. placing the garlanding at the beginning.
[71] Not quite the beginning, as implied by the *γάρ* (Xen. fr.1.1 W^2; nor do we have the very start of the *Deipnon*.
[72] Theogn.2.1341; Sappho fr.82a L-P; cf. perh. Asklep. *AP* 12.161= 20 G-P.
[73] Xenophon and Plato each show that fictional *symposia* were a useful literary conceit in the fourth century.

Although we can hardly assume this work was a dithyramb, there is perhaps a case for saying that the (new) dithyrambic style could be appropriated for sympotic entertainment. The re-performance of non-sympotic songs or excerpts at *symposia* is certain;[74] dithyrambs too could presumably be treated this way. Perhaps just as *ἐπίγραμμα* came to mean a style of short poem rather than an inscription,[75] so too the word dithyramb started to indicate merely popular entertainment-poetry, in which case sympotic dithyrambs do not seem so unlikely. Indeed, when a poet called Philoxenos was praised for his performance of a *Hymenaios* (i.e. wedding-song: it opened with an invocation of *γάμος*), *PMG* 828, it is said he beguiled his audience because he was a dithyrambist (*πάντας ἐψυχαγώγησεν· ἦν δὲ διθυραμβοποιός*).[76] Presumably this means he used the attractive dithyrambic style in a non-dithyrambic context.

There is a lightly mocking tone throughout: perhaps excessive eating is here paraded as a negative role-model, like passages of iambic invective directed at gluttons.[77] But the excessive abundance (cf. fr. 836e.22, *ἄλλα θ' ὅσσα πρέπει παρὰ θοίναν ὀλβιόπλουτον*), the long *kola* and continuous flow of dishes, in almost a listing style, probably also suggest an influence from comedy. Excessive eating is already found in Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*, including a nonsensical food-list (1168-75), while food is also prominent in *Peace*.[78] As John Wilkins has elaborated,[79] luxurious dining or over-eating becomes a significant *topos* in fourth-century comedy.[80] It can

---

[74] See e.g. Reitzenstein (1893). Cf. e.g. the performance of Aeschylean choruses in Ar. *Nub.*1365. Cf. Bartol (1992) on iambics both in theatres and at *symposia*.

[75] Cf. Puelma (1996) and above, ch.6.

[76] Cf. Telestes, *PMG* 808 *ap.* Ath.14.637a: Athenaeus expressly names Telestes' *Hymenaeus* a dithyramb.

[77] For the socio-political portrayal of excessive eating, cf. the aforementioned food-lists of Solon, which are unfortunately without context, although we may imagine invective played a part. Cf. e.g, the glutton in Hipponax fr. 126: on the relationship between Old Comedy and iambic invective, see e.g. Degani (1988), Rosen (1988), esp. 19-35. Later, Pindar shows gluttonous eating leading to divine retribution in *Olympian* 1 (see Steiner (2002)), and represents Archilochus metaphorically as a glutton (*Pyth.*2.52-6), probably as a device that opposes him to Pindar's patron, Hieron (so Brown (2006)). On food and society, see e.g. Dalby (1994); Wilkins (2000), 257-311 *et passim*; Davidson (1995, 1997). Little has been done, however, to examine the sociological implications of food beyond Athens.

[78] See e.g. Compton-Eagle (1999).

[79] Wilkins (2000), 360-8. On the *topos* in Attic comedy, see also Olivieri (1939); Nesselrath (1990), esp. 297-317; Arnott (1996), esp. 21-2

[80] Cf. e.g. Antiphanes, *Parasitos* frs. 180-4 K-A (post-385 BC); Euboulos fr. 63 K-A. Antiphanes praises Philoxenos in his *Tritagonistes*, fr. 207 K-A.

probably be traced (*pace* Wilkins) to the Sicilian burlesques of Epicharmos and others.[81] This implies that as with the *Cyclops*, humour is an important part of the poetic voice of the *Deipnon*.

The listing style of the narrative also suggests catalogue poetry.[82] Catalogues had been used in archaic lyric, as for example in Ibykos S151, which 'is no anomaly',[83] but probably primarily suggests epic or didactic. Philoxenos represents himself much like the narrator of the Homeric catalogue of ships (*Il.* 2.488-492), who invokes the Muse, claiming he is incapable of recalling and naming the entire crowd. Philoxenos omits the invocation, but professes a similar inability to list all the foods:

> κοὔ κε λέγοι τις πάνθ' ἃ παρῆν ἐτύμως
>
> ἄμμιν, παρέπεισε δὲ θερμὸν σπλάγχνον (836b.26-7).

Philoxenos' catalogue is a parade of meats, cheeses and cakes rather than great heroes or mythological figures. Like Homeric heroes, they can be of greater size than usual, or like nothing the audience will usually have seen: a bream, for instance, is ἰσοτράπεζος (836b.14),[84] while there is every kind of adornment:

> ... σύν τε χλιδῶσαι
>
> παντοδαποῖσι τέχνας εὑρήμασι πρὸς βιοτάν,
>
> ψυχᾶς δελεασματίοισι (836b.4-6).

The repeated assertions that the gods would eat such foods (836b.9, θεοτερπές, 34, ἂν δὴ φιλέοντι θεοί,) elevates the procession of foods to an incongruously 'heroic' level of dignity; the gods approve of this feast just as they have their special interests in the characters of epic lists.[85] Descriptions of the food with almost human characteristics – e.g. white-skinned bread (836b.6),

---

[81] Wilkins (2000), esp. at 69-71 on gluttony.
[82] Cf. my remarks on Antimachos, ch.8.
[83] Hutchinson (2001), 235-256.
[84] The same expression at Antiphanes, *Parasitos* fr. 180.2 K-A; cf. also fr. 172 K-A (the 'second tables'), which may even mimic the dactylo-epitrite of Philoxenos.
[85] This also breaks down the traditional distinction between the gods and mortals (cf. e.g. Hes. *Th.*535-616; *Op.* 42-105), who must eat: we are certainly talking about *opsa*, the more luxurious additions to staple foods.

youthful chickpeas (836e.20) and cuttlefish with 'delicate locks' (836b.13)[86] – serve to strengthen the link with the Homeric catalogue of heroes.

This all suggests we are approaching epic parody,[87] which was a genre seemingly in vogue at this time and which often featured food (cf. below on fourth-century pseudo-Hesiodic hexameter poems on food and eating). The parodist Hegemon possibly wrote a treatise on *deipna;*[88] a comedy which mentioned eating an octopus may also be relevant. Hermippos lists imported goods (including food and drink) with a direct quotation from the Homeric catalogue of the ships, ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι (fr. 63.1 K-A),[89] which is precisely how Matron of Pitane begins his *Attikon Deipnon* (*SH* 534, late-iv BC).

Philoxenos does not systematically imitate Homer and Hesiod, but apart from the catalogue, there may be recollections of Homer's heroic feasts. For example, the Homeric formula that closes a feast, οἳ δ' ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο... (*Il.*9.221-2, 24.627, *Od.*1.149, 4.218, 5.200 etc.), may find a counterpart with such expressions in Philoxenos as at 836e.10, χερσὶν δ' ἐπέθεντο <τότ' οὐκέτι > στόμιον μαλεραῖς, or 836b.39, ὅτε δ' ἤδη βρωτύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος ἐς κόρον ἦμεν ἑταῖροι. But such Homeric feasts only involve meat, rather than the fishes, cheeses and cakes on offer here:[90] Philoxenos' *Deipnon*, as a θοίνα ὀλβιόπλουτος, subverts the heroic ideal.[91]

The poetic voice is, then, humorous and parodic; we may also wonder if there is also a satirical note.[92] If the excessive eating is mocked, then perhaps the poet is not entirely complicit in the luxurious scenes. Various traditions depicted a quarrel between Philoxenos of Kythera and

---

[86] Cf. LeVen (2008), 224-5.
[87] Cf. e.g. Braund (1994), 44: 'such lists were the stuff of utopias, and utopias were the stuff of comedy'.
[88] See Ath.1.5a-b.
[89] See Gilula (2000), who suggests that the fragment, which is in hexameters, may not be from his play, the *Phormophoroi* as is usually thought (thanks to a quotation of l.20 by Hesychius), but from an epic parody. The evidence is, of course, rather lacking.
[90] Cf. e.g. Euboulos fr. 118 K-A (= 120 Hunter); Davidson (1996); Rundin (1996); Wilkins (2000), 264-5; Berdowski (2008). Cf. Ath. 1.8f on Homeric moderation, εὐτελῆ κατεσκεύασε πᾶσι τὸν βίον καὶ αὐτάρκη.
[91] Cf. also Philox. 836b.4-6.
[92] Perh. cf. satirical feasts in Horace or Juvenal, or Petronius, *Cena Trimalchionis*. For a recent discussion and further bibliography, see Hooley (2007).

his patron Dionysios I, who is meant to have banished him; as we have seen, his *Cyclops* was believed by some (however unreliably) to be a satire against the tyrant. While it would be rash to attach to much credibility to such stories, the same tyrant was seemingly treated satirically elsewhere.[93]

The personal interlocutor may play a role in this. The friend is made an envious absentee from the feast, compelled to hear about it second hand.[94] The speaker draws attention to this fact, with remote optatives (e.g. 836b.35, ἔσθοις κε), and expectations of the friend's surprise at the size or manner of the dishes (e.g. 836b.7-8, <τοῖς> δ' ἐπὶ πρῶτα παρῆλθ' | οὐ κάκκαβος, ὦ φιλότας, ἀλλ' †ἀλλοπλατεῖς τὸ† μέγιστον;[95] 836b.20, an exclamation of surprise, ναὶ μὰ θεούς). In this way the addressee becomes a foil for the unusual nature of the meal, but also in a way a focalizer for each of us as the text's subsequent recipients. Through the elaborate details, the absent reader gorges on the feast and becomes immersed in its exoticism.

The strangeness of the food, and emphasis on the enormous size of the dishes, are recurrent themes. The narrator casts himself at times as the expert, able to explain the unusual foods for us: at 836b.18-19, for instance, he mentions the colloquial name for a food, such as he and his interlocutor would use:

ὀμφαλὸς θοίνας καλεῖται | παρά γ' ἐμὶν καὶ τίν, σάφ' οἶδα.[96]

Such an expression serves to dislocate the feast from our 'normal' experience: at the same time, more common dishes are given rarer names.[97] This distance is stressed further by such bizarre

---

[93] See further in Sanders (1987), 1-25, esp. 15-23, who believes that the *Cyclops* of Philoxenos influenced other attacks on the tyrant, e.g. in Aristophanes' *Plutus*. Sanders, *l.c.*, suggests a contrast in Euripides *Cyclops* between the *physis* of the brutish Cyclops and more cultured *nomos*: perhaps the *opsophagia* of the *Deipnon* also contrasts with refined norms.

[94] Again, cf. Horace, *Satires* 2.8.

[95] The text is corrupt, but the implication seems to be: 'not the *kakkabos* you were expecting, but a much larger dish'.

[96] For the expression, cf. Theoc. 6.37, ὡς παρ' ἐμὶν κέκριται (where it seems to have a concessive sense, i.e. 'at least in my judgement').

[97] We might compare the way that Horace presents a list of foods at *Sat.*2.4 as a sort of 'mock wisdom'. Cf. also the *faux-naiveté* of the speaker who claims at b, 37 that he and the other guests supposed the curded milk was actually cheese.

passages as the simile comparing custard to a spider's web, which emphasizes how unusual it looks:

> *ταῖς δ' ἐν μέσαισιν*
>
> *ἐγκαθιδρύθη μέγα χάρμα βροτοῖς, λευκὸς μυελὸς γλαγερός*
>
> *λεπτᾶς ἀράχνας ἐναλιγκίοισι πέπλοις*
>
> *συγκαλύπτων ὄψιν αἰσχύνας ὕπο, μὴ κατίδηις*
>
> *πῶυ τὸ μαλογενὲς ἀνάγκᾳ*
>
> *ξηρὸν ἐν ξηραῖς Ἀρισταίου μελιρρύτοισι παγαῖς* (836e.4-10).[98]

We note again that the custard is afforded personal characteristics, with the sort of unusual application of imagery that Hellenistic poets often delight in: it is depicted as even displaying shame at leaving behind its flock, playing humorously on the idea that the *μυελός* is too rich to be used to feed the young; the texture is evoked by comparison to different sorts of objects, the *πέπλος* or a spider's web. This has the effect of drawing attention to the unexpected characteristic of the food at this feast; but the elaborate detail of the description, which resembles the technique often found in artistic *ekphrasis* (focusing both on physical and emotional characteristics), gives vivid visualisation to the custard for the unseeing audience.

The multiple florid adjectives, neologisms and circumlocutions further emphasise the rich blend of foods on the table. We enjoy the entertainment and marvel at such a feast: but crucially, unlike the narrator, we are apart from it, able to watch the feast but not participate in it. We are saved from the accusations of gluttony that must come with such a dinner. For example, as the speaker describes the arrival of an oversized tunny, he stops to mention that he and his addressee would have liked to help carving it into portions, stressing quantity ('the whole length'):

---

[98] The text here is highly corrupt. I have opted to follow Campbell's text (1993: 193), although preserving Page's *μελιρρύτοισι* over Campbell's *παλι-*, since I assume that the reference to Aristaios's fountains indicates the milk produced from the sheep, which are left 'dry' when the milk is taken away from them. However, it may be possible to read an echo of Sophocles' 'rivers of retribution' (*El.*1420), in which case the phrase would indicate anger at the custard, which might prompt *συγκαλύπτων ὄψιν αἰσχύνας ὕπο*.

<αἷς> διανεκέως ἐπαμύνειν

εἴπερ ἐμίν τε μέλοι καὶ τίν, μάλα κεν κεχαροίμεθ'.

(836b.22-3).[99]

Again, the remote optative ('we would have greatly enjoyed it') reinforces the distance of such excess from the addressee, and thus the reader, who of course *cannot* enjoy this tunny. Expressions such as *ἐμίν τε.... καὶ τίν* seem to link the narrator more closely to the narratee, perhaps suggesting that he too remains aloof from the extravagant feasting: he contrasts himself with the other guests, who are described in the third person (thus excluding the narrator), and who apply themselves to the meal with excessive vigour. In fr. 836d, the guests' drinking is narrated in the passive voice:

πίνετο νεκτάρεον πῶμ' ἐν χρυσέαις προτομαῖς

τελέων κεράτων, ἐβρέχοντο δὲ κατὰ μικρόν.[100]

Again, in 836e.10, *χερσὶν δ' ἐπέθεντο <τότ' οὐκέτι > στόμιον μαλεραῖς* (probably a pun on *στόμα*); at the end of our last fragment, the narrator does not join in praising a joke:

ἔνθα τι καινὸν ἐλέχθη

κομψὸν ἀθυρμάτιον, καὶ θαύμασαν αὖτ' ἐπί τ' ἤινη-

σαν < >.

The past tenses remind us that the feast is something 'other' from the audiences experience, at the time of performance, demonstrably in the *illic et tunc*. As a result, the text *is* our experience of the feast: almost every metrical colon ushers in the latest dish described with equally opulent language, each 'course' of the dinner lends the poem its natural structure.[101] From our safe

---

[99] For a similar image, cf. the Sicilian tunny-fish vendor depicted on the Cefalù vase (iv BC).

[100] I take this phrase as 'got drunk very quickly': cf. e.g. Men. *Dysc.* 231.

[101] Cf. e.g. references to the bringing out of tables in 836a.1-3 and again in 836e (the 'second tables'). There may be a hint of ring-composition at the end of 836b (washing the hands and garlands: cf. 836a.1-2, *κατὰ χειρὸς δ' ... ὕδωρ*, ~ 836b.40-1, *κατὰ χειρῶν ... ὕδωρ*; 836a.3, *στέφανον λεπτᾶς ἀπὸ μυρτίδος εὐγνήτων κλαδέων δισύναπτον*, ~ 836b.43, *στεφάνους ἰοθαλέας*). Ath.'s quotation ends here, so the recapitulation may signal the close of a section. The 'drinking fragments', 836c-d, cannot be placed with confidence, although Ath. says 836c follows the washing of the hands; 836d could follow easily from this. The end of 836e seems to mark a transition of some sort, perhaps to a closural section.

distance, perhaps at a *symposion* following a more humble *deipnon*, the listener is able to envy yet ultimately even laugh at this strange and excessive procession.

Philoxenos, then, at once causes his audience to salivate and to laugh: a splendid blend for an entertaining evening. I now turn to two other examples of food being used humorously in fourth-century poetry.

10.4 Archestratos of Gela, *Hedypatheia*

This anti-heroic use of food poetry is even more strongly evident in hexameter parody, where the whole point is that the poetic voice is defined in comparison and contrast with 'serious' poetry (i.e. epic and didactic).[102] The use of food as a comic *topos* coincides with the emergence of literary and mythological parody, both as an independent genre and comic device.[103] Parody had been a formal genre[104] at least since Hegemon in the fifth century,[105] but it seemingly reaches its zenith of popularity in the fourth century.[106] I discuss a clear instance of such parody from the end of the century, the mock-Homeric *Attikon Deipnon* by Matron of Pitane (late iv/early iii BC),[107] later in this chapter.

First, however, I look at an earlier hexameter food poem, the *Hedypatheia*[108] of Archestratos of Gela[109](mid-iv BC).[110] Athenaeus quotes over three hundred hexameters of

---

[102] See Lelièvre (1954).
[103] See esp. Rau (1967); Nesselrath (1993, 1995).
[104] I.e. a feature of festival competitions.
[105] So Arist.*Poet.* 1448a12-13.
[106] Our earliest inscriptional record of a parody competition comes from Eretria, mid-iv BC.
[107] On the date, cf. Wilamowitz (1923), 75; Olson and Sens (1999), 3-4. The mention of various historical figures helps date the work: Euboios of Paros, fr. 7.1-3 OS; Xenokles son of Xeinis, a contemporary of Lykourgos, frs. 1, 2, 7 OS; Stratokles, fr. 1.30, 122; Chairophon the parasite, fr. 1.9, 98; the pankratiasts Astyanax and Antenor of Miletos, fr. 1.42.
[108] This is the title most favoured by modern critics, but there were a number of variations in antiquity: see esp. Olson and Sens (2000), xxiii-iv; Dalby (1995), 402
[109] See esp. the recent edition of Olson and Sens (2000), whose numbering I adopt here for convenience. For criticisms of their readings, however, see Giangrande (2002), who calls it 'a disaster... often they are unable to understand what Archestratus' words mean' (32: cf. Giangrande (1989)). For other editions, see Brandt (1888); *SH* 132-92; Montanari (1983). Athenaeus also tells us that Archestratos comes from Syracuse, not Gela, but this can be explained as a straightforward confusion.

Archestratos, most if not all from the same work: it appears to be a sort-of cookery tour of the Greek world, wherein the speaker recommends to his addressee the best ingredients from each place, and ideal methods of preparation. Although nearly all moderns scholars treat this poem as didactic parody,[111] it is less clearly parodic than the Matron poem. Archestratos does not seem to have been regarded in antiquity as a parodist: his admittedly bad reputation was not linked that of the parodists.[112] Nor is it certain that Ennius's Latin adaptation of the *Hedypatheia* was epic-didactic parody.[113]

Part of the difficulty is our lack of knowledge about the genre of parody: it is possible that the genre allowed for quite a wide range of applications,[114] while poems of other genres can obviously be 'parodic'.[115] Nor did all parodists necessarily use the same technique: more than a century divides Hegemon and Matron. There may be relatively little interaction with epic in 'parodies' such as the *Margites*, which instead employs mock-heroic figures;[116] comedy also uses such figures, but evokes literary models more closely, especially tragedy. Even some Attic tragedy contains 'paratragic' elements.[117] The link between these texts is the notion of an amusing deviation from a serious model, be it a literary archetype, character or plot-motif.

---

[110] The date cannot be stated more precisely than after the founding of Tyndaris (396 BC), which is mentioned in fr.35.7 OS (*SH* 165) and before the *floruit* of Klearchos. Diodoros of Sinope cites the work, but little is known of his date other than that he won the Lenaia in 340 BC: see Olson and Sens (2000), xxi-ii. Dalby (1995) tries to draw further inferences from the places mentioned in the text, although as Olson and Sens point out, in most cases there is still too little to go on. However, if we accept Dalby's argument that Archestratos actually did visit the places he refers to, then it is more probable than not that these places would have been sufficiently thriving not only to receive visitors but even allow them to experiment with local cuisine: all the places 'were of a certain size and prosperity at that precise time' (Dalby (1995), 407). There are references to Archestratos in fourth-century comedy, but the name may have been fairly common and in any case, the dates of these comedies themselves is not certain enough.

[111] As suggested, e.g. by Brandt's edition (1888), which places Archestratos alongside epic parodies: cf. also Giangrande (1989, 2002); Wilkins (2000), 354: 'Archestratus wrote in the genre of 'parody"; Gutzwiller (2007), 132-3..

[112] On the reception of Archestratos, see esp. Olson and Sens (2000), xliv-xlv.

[113] On the Ennius poem, see esp. Fucarino (1991-93); Schade (1998).

[114] On the meaning of the word *parodia* in Greek and modern usage, see esp. Rose (1993), 5-53. For further discussion on Greek parody, cf. Lelièvre (1954); Degani (1975, 1982); Rau (1967); Nesselrath (1995).

[115] On forms closely related to parody, such as burlesque, see e.g. Rose (1993), 53-102.

[116] See Bossi (1986), who suggests that Xenophanes is a possible author and that the work was a burlesque of Homer; but this is another poem which was never referred to as parody in antiquity.

[117] See Rau (1967).

Undoubtedly, however, Archestratos does draw on Hesiodic motifs, to create a sort-of sub-heroic didactic form. Giangrande, who follows Brandt's list of epic rarities in the *Hedypatheia*,[118] assumes that 'Archestratus, like all *poetae parodici*, reproduced Homeric and Hesiodic *Wortgut*, including *unica* and rarities, in order to obtain allusive parodies from it, by switching such *Wortgut* from the elevated epic world down to the banal level of cookery.'[119] However, it is hard to see a detailed engagement with Homer or Hesiod: with a few exceptions that we shall note below, there seems to be little sense of deliberate variation or context-switching (unlike Matron, for whom it is the chief source of humour). [120] Archestratos seems more concerned to portray himself as a technical expert on all matters food-related and so casts himself as having Hesiodic authority. Humour, with Homeric and Hesiodic touches, is only occasionally deployed with faintly ridiculous and exaggerated descriptions of the foods or the lengths one has to go to in order to obtain them.

The various names given to the work in antiquity (*gastrologia*, *opsopoiia* etc.) seem to be generic rather than actual titles;[121] this suggests a book of opinions on cooking or even an actual cookbook. As we have seen, Platon Komikos apparently quotes a hexameter cookbook (fr.189 K-A), which is more comparable to Archestratos than Philoxenos' *Deipnon*. There are several points of contact, which perhaps implies a common source or at least some conventionalised food expressions.[122] Platon's 'quotation' is probably a parody of serious cookbooks (sexual

---

[118] Brandt (1888).
[119] Giangrande (2002), 37-8 n.5. For Giangrande's original discussion of the text in the light of Hellenistic scholarly practice, see Giangrande (1989).
[120] So Olson and Sens (2000), lviii. Cf. also Wilkins (2000), 357-8: 'Archestratus... adapts Homer to a much more limited extent than does Matron'.
[121] Cf. Ath 7.278e, *Hypothekai*; 7.286c, *Gnomai*. Ath. also mentions that some call it *Opsopoiia*; Lykophron (*ap.* Ath. 7.278a) and Chrysippos (*ap.* Ath. *Epit.* 1.4e) both cite the work as *Gastrologia, Gastronomia* respectively, seemingly with a pun on *Astrologia*, suggesting the Hesiodic sense of the poem (so too the *Deipnologia* given by Klearchos, *ap.* Ath. 1.4e). Callimachus and Lynkeios both support the title *Hedypatheia* (*ap.* Ath. 1.4e). *Hedypatheia* is a less choice obvious in this sense (so Olson and Sens (2000), xxiv), but since already in Xenophon the word is found with a pejorative implication, it is not impossible that when later authors (Lykophron and Callimachus) cited this work, they simply chose a title with suitably negative overtones
[122] So Brandt (1888), 125-7; cf. Wilkins (2000), 349.

innuendo is derived from the ingredients).[123] The name Archestratos appears in various comedies, which would make sense if he were thought to be a serious food-writer.[124]

Archestratos apparently even identifies himself as an academic researcher on the topic of food in an Herodotean opening, ἱστορίης ἐπίδειγμα ποιούμενος Ἑλλάδι πάσῃ (fr. 1.1 OS = SH 132: cf. Hdt. 1 *proem.* ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις). There is an obvious link with the Herodotus's geographical interests: Archestratos demonstrates precise knowledge of the best foods in numerous different locations,[125] although it is the dishes themselves rather than the places that provide the main organisational feature.[126] Unlike Herodotus, Archestratos shows no interest in political issues or local mythologies. There may be a closer link with technical treatises, especially in the detailed descriptions of how to prepare each food. The speaker is able to show considerable technical expertise.[127]

On the other hand, Athenaeus compares Archestratos to Hesiod or Theognis (Ath. 7.310a). Not only are the hexameters 'Hesiodic', but the inclusion of an internal narratee (Moschos)[128] recalls the Perses of *Works and Days*.[129] As in Philoxenos, the endless procession of foods is reminiscent of epic catalogues: on more than one occasion, this genre is hinted at through the use of the 'denial' motif (fr. 36.2 OS = *SH* 166; fr. 47.2 OS = *SH* 177).

The Theognis link is more surprising: it seems to cast the narratee, Moschos, more like a fellow symposiast (cf. on Philoxenos' *Deipnon*, above); a reference to other individuals in one

---

[123] On Greek recipe books, see esp. Wilkins and Hill (1996); Wilkins (2000), *passim.*
[124] Cf. e.g. Dionysios *Thesm.*, fr.2.24 K-A; Wilkins (2000), 364, comments: 'Archestratus has arrived in comedy very quickly, both directly in what he has written and more broadly in the notice people have taken'.
[125] Brandt (1888) associated the style with the *periegeseis* or *periploi* of prose authors.
[126] Olson and Sens (2000), xxx.
[127] Certainly later authors call the treatises by e.g. Thales or Hippokrates *historiai* (e.g. ἡ Γεομετρικὴ ἱστορία), even if Herodotus appears to be alone in identifying his own work as such. For ἱστορία to indicate research in general, cf. e.g. Isok. *Pan.*246.6, Plato *Phaed.* 96a8 etc.
[128] Addressed directly at fr. 5.2 OS =*SH* 135), fr. 28.1 OS = *SH* 158, fr. 36.4 OS = *SH* 166; this is presumably also the implied identity of the second-person verbs or imperatives throughout the poem. An unnamed *hetairos* and a certain Kleandros are addressed in fr. 18 OS = *SH* 148.
[129] See e.g. Schmidt (1986); Clay (2003). The Hesiodic link may be reinforced by e.g. the suggestion that Archestratos' words are a *muthos*: τί σοι τάδε μυθολογεύω, fr. 36.2, evidently aimed at ὦ φίλε Μόσχε (v.4), for which cf. Hes. *Op.* 10, ἐγὼ δέ κε Πέρσῃ ἐτήτυμα μυθησαίμην.

fragment may suggest an intimate gathering.[130] Olson and Sens argue for a small elite and erudite circle:[131] it could be the same sort of dinner-party entertainment that I have hypothesized for Philoxenos' poem (and both cases may also be fictionalised settings). Much as Philoxenos narrates the meal-preparations, Archestratos has a passage concerning the proper number of guests at a dinner party (fr. 4 OS = *SH* 191); a fragment dealing with garlands and aromas could belong to a prescription for the ideal *deipnon* (fr. 60 OS = *SH* 192, not certainly the same poem). Narrative in Philoxenos becomes *didaxis* in Archestratos, who may also follow the dinner-party arrangement, proceeding dish by dish.[132] The idea may be something like: 'the first course should be various types of fish; the best fish is...'

The fragment on breads (fr. 5 OS =*SH* 135) allows us to reconstruct something of the poetic method. The speaker begins grandly, first announcing his subject in a manner reminiscent of religious poetry (*πρῶτα μὲν οὖν δώρων μεμνήσομαι ἠυκόμοιο / Δήμητρος*, 1-2). After a summary of the best options, he declares he will praise ash-cake, a product from wheat-flour, *τὸν ἐν Τεγέαις σεμιδάλεος υἱὸν ἐπαινῶ /ἐγκρυφίην* (14-15), which has the tone of encomiastic poetry; each successive wheat-product is introduced in turn (cf. *εἶτα*, 14), much like the argument section of a praise-poem. Food is not actually present in the *hic et nunc* of the narrator, who adapts a Hesiodic line in such a way as to mean that the addressee must imagine the food:

> *πρῶτα μὲν οὖν δώρων μεμνήσομαι ἠυκόμοιο*
>
> *Δήμητρος, φίλε Μόσχε· σὺ δ' ἐν φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῇσιν* (fr. 5.1-2 OS = *SH* 135, cf. Hes. *Op.*274).

Although the work does not engage systematically with Homer or Hesiod, Homeric allusions do occasionally add humorous incongruity. For example, like Philoxenos (and Matron

---

[130] Fr. 18 OS (*SH* 148).
[131] Olson and Sens (2000), xliii-xlv.
[132] Proem, frs.1-3 OS =*SH* 132-4, perh. fr. 4 OS = *SH* 191; breads, frs. 5-6 OS = *SH* 135-6; seafood, frs. 7, 10-56 OS = *SH* 139-188; meats, frs. 57-8 =*SH* 188-9; wines, fr. 59 OS = *SH* 190. The text is of course too fragmentary for confident reconstruction.

too), he adapts the Homeric formula, *οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον*.[133] Archestratos echoes this line in a prescription for *avoiding* food:

ἐν δὲ Θάσῳ τὸν σκορπίον ὠνοῦ, ἐὰν ᾖ

μὴ μείζων πυγόνος· μεγάλου δ' ἀπὸ χεῖρας ἴαλλε (fr. 30 OS =*SH* 160).

Another instance where Homeric language is adapted is this hyperbolic comparison of the appearance of a fish to a god:

καὶ ξήρ' ἂν ἐθέλῃς ἔσθειν, γενναῖα πέλονται,

ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι φυὴν καὶ εἶδος ὅμοια (fr. 38.6-7 OS = *SH* 168).

This conjures up an amusing image of someone who loves fish so much that the dish even takes on for him the appearance of a beautiful, godlike woman, just as Odysseus first perceives Nausikaa (Hom. *Od.* 6.16). The Homeric allusion is incongruous, and so serves to mock such an attitude.

Hyperbole runs throughout the poem. A fish in fr. 13 OS = *SH* 143 is an improbably large size; other fishes are praised excessively for their quality, as for example in fr. 22 OS =*SH* 152, where the *ἀλώπηξ γαλεός* ('thresher shark') [134] is said to be so good that Moschos should even risk death attempting to steal it![135] White bread from Eresos is the sort gods would purchase:

θεοὶ εἴπερ ἔδουσιν

ἄλφιτ', ἐκεῖθεν ἰὼν Ἑρμῆς αὐτοῖς ἀγοράζει (fr. 5. 6-7 OS = *SH* 135).

Of course, in Homer, the gods do not eat food such as barley;[136] the comic potential is also heightened by the faintly ridiculous image of Hermes going shopping at the market-place. Likewise, the boar-fish from Ambrakia, called *τὸ γάρ ἐστιν νέκταρος ἄνθος* (fr.16.4 OS = *SH*

---

[133] Cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.91, *Od.* 9.288.

[134] I follow Olson and Sens' identification of the fish-names: cf. e.g. Thompson (1947); Montanari (1999), and the translations in Wilkins and Hill (1994).

[135] Wilkins (2000), 358, plausibly suggests a connection with the ridicule (e.g. in comedy) of gluttons who pursue fish to an excess.

[136] *Il.*5.341, *οὐ γὰρ σῖτον ἔδουσ', οὐ πίνουσ' αἴθοπα οἶνον*.

146), is so good that it must be purchased even if it is very expensive, *ἰσόχρυσος* (v.3, 'costs its weight in gold'):[137] there is even a dire warning of what could happen if this fish is *not* obtained: *μή σοι νέμεσις καταπνεύσῃ / δεινὴ ἀπ' ἀθανάτων* (cf. Hom. *Il.*13.121-2 etc.) The Homeric allusion reinforces the humorous inversion of the idea that *nemesis* comes to those who eat nectar. The subsequent lines are obscure, but evidently continue the idea of 'forbidden food' to stress the exclusivity of this fish:

τούτου δ' <οὐ> θέμις ἐστὶ φαγεῖν θνητοῖσιν ἅπασιν
οὐδ' ἐσιδεῖν ὅσσοισιν, ὅσοι μὴ πλεκτὸν ὕφασμα
σχοίνου ἑλ<ε>ιοτρόφου κοῖλον χείρεσσιν ἔχοντες
εἰώθασι δονεῖν ψήφους †αἴθωνι λογισμῷ
ἄρθρων μηλείων ἐπὶ γῆν δωρήματα βάλλειν (fr. 16.5-9 OS).

There seem to be references to certain fishing customs, perhaps local ones: one suspects there were many 'in-jokes' that we simply no longer 'get' today. Presumably the sense is that only a few specialised fishermen get the opportunity to taste such a fish, which explains its high price.

There is presumably amusement in the use of rhetorical exaggerations, such as the speaker's claim that he would rather eat 'an oven-roasted crocodile' than talk about certain dishes:

ἀλλὰ τί χρὴ ῥίνης λόγον ἢ πλατυνώτου
λειοβάτου ποιεῖσθαι; ὁμῶς κροκόδειλον ἂν ὀπτὸν
δαισαίμην ἀπ' ἰπνοῦ τερπνὸν παίδεσσιν Ἰώνων (fr. 47. 2-3 OS = *SH* 177).

Personifying food also adds humour: for example, a fish is called 'greedy', and said to 'like' adornment with cheese and olive-oil, which turns the fish into a figure like a chef or one of the diners:[138]

---

[137] So Olson and Sens (2000) *ad loc.*

[138] Cf. Wilkins (2000), 359, who observes, 'The fragment well illustrates the comic potential of Archestratus. The apparently didactic tone of the hexameters is undercut by the concluding remarks, which may sound a sarcastic note – the *kitharos* was not greatly favoured by nutritionists, and Archestratus elsewhere does not favour a dish which need cheese sauce'.

καὶ πολλῷ τυρῷ καὶ ἐλαίῳ τοῦτον ἄλειφε·

χαίρει γὰρ δαπανῶντας ὁρῶν, ἔστιν δ' ἀκόλαστος (fr. 32.6-7 OS = *SH* 162).

There may be a nod towards the negative reputation of the Sicilian *mageiros* when the speaker criticises his local cooks for ruining simple dishes by overdoing them with spices and sauces:

μηδὲ προσέλθῃ σοί ποτε τοὖψον τοῦτο ποιοῦντι

μήτε Συρακόσιος μηθεὶς μήτ' Ἰταλιώτης·

οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστανται χρηστοὺς σκευαζέμεν ἰχθῦς,

ἀλλὰ διαφθείρουσι κακῶς τυροῦντες ἅπαντα

ὄξει τε ῥαίνοντες ὑγρῷ καὶ σιλφίου ἅλμῃ (fr. 46.10-14 OS = *SH* 47).

We do not know whether this is a realistic portrayal of Sicilian culinary tastes or simply a humorous stereotype; it seems to hint at a rather pretentious kind of chef.[139] At any rate it helps characterise the speaker as an expert, one superior to Syracusan and Italian chefs: the cooking skill is a matter of ἐπιστήμη (cf. v. 12, 16). In fr. 39 OS, the judgment of others is again criticised, implicitly promoting the speaker's own expertise:

σαπέρδῃ δ' ἐνέπω κλαίειν μακρά, Ποντικῷ ὄψῳ,

καὶ τοῖς κεῖνον ἐπαινοῦσιν· παῦροι γὰρ ἴσασιν

ἀνθρώπων, ὅ τι φαῦλον ἔφυ καὶ κεδνὸν ἔδεσμα (fr. 39.4-5 OS = *SH* 169).

This passage is notable for its use of colloquialism (κλαίειν μακρά).[140] Likewise, on the subject of wines, the speaker uses a comic coinage to express his ire towards those who adopt a particular strand of conventional wisdom:

εἰ δέ τινες σκώπτουσιν ἀλαζονοχαυνοφλύαροι,

ὡς ἥδιστος ἔφυ πάντων Φοινίκιος οἶνος,

οὐ προσέχω τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῖς [. . .] (fr. 59.12-14 OS = *SH* 190).

---

[139] Cf. Dobrov (2002) on the *alazoneia* of the *mageiros* in comedy: the over-saucing of food could be the culinary equivalent of the verbal pretention comic chefs display in Middle Comedy.

[140] So Olson and Sens (2000), lix, who suggest a comic influence on such expressions.

Such abuse contrasts sharply with his own profession of knowledge, stated with an emphatic first-person verb at the start of the line:

οἶδα δὲ κἀξ ἄλλων πόλεων βοτρυοσταγῆ ἔρνη

εἰπεῖν αἰνῆσαί τε καὶ οὔ με λέληθ' ὀνομῆναι (fr. 59.17-18 OS).

However, this claim is rather undercut by the fact that the speaker then says nothing further about it, other than a sweeping closing statement:

ἀλλ' οὐθὲν τἆλλ' ἐστὶν ἁπλῶς πρὸς Λέσβιον οἶνον.

ἀλλά τινες χαίρουσιν ἐπαινοῦντες τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς (fr.59. 19-20 OS).

The comic effect of the coinages (ἀλαζονοχαυνοφλύαροι, βοτρυοσταγῆ) is perhaps all the greater because Archestratos' text is not so liberally sprinkled with such forms as, say, Philoxenos' *Deipnon*.[141] They occur with more frequency whenever the speaker is mocking someone or something: the effect is much like that of comedy. They perhaps hint at the sort of language used in comedy by chefs, who often combine culinary skills with literary and social pretensions: [142] for example, in Antiphanes fr. 55 K-A,[143] a cook uses a series of riddling circumlocutions, and at fr. 192 K-A breaks into hexameters;[144] in Straton fr. 1 K-A the chef is fond of using epic diction (cf. fr.1.29 K-A, Ὁμηρικῶς γὰρ διανοεῖ μ' ἀπολλύναι) and is called a 'sphinx' because of his confusing riddles.[145]

In fr. 60 OS, which perhaps comes at or near the end of the poem,[146] the speaker begins discussing matters of etiquette (wearing a garland, taking food with drink). The concluding gnomic lines are out of character with the tone of the rest of the poem:

οὕτω τοι δεῖ ζῆν τὸν ἐλεύθερον ἢ κατὰ τῆς γῆς

---

141 For other examples of this sort of construction (*pace* Olson and Sens (2000), lviii-lix), cf. ἴσοχρυσος (fr. 16.3 OS), ἐλειότρυφος (16.7), στρογγυλοδίνητος (5.11), στενοκύμων (17.1), ὁρπαξίβος , βοτρυοσταγής (58.17), κουφαττελεβώδης (24.14), ἡδυσματύληρος (43.18), κατάτυρα (57.8), κατέλαια (57.9).

142 On the development of the chef in comedy, see esp. Dohm (1964); Wilkins (2000), 369-414; Nesselrath (1993), 297-309; Dobrov (2002).

143 Nesselrath (1993), 257-8; Dobrov (2002), 172-3.

144 See Dobrov (2002), 180-2.

145 For riddling chefs, see esp. Dobrov (2002), 174-5.

146 It would form a neat frame with the section on ideal numbers for a *deipnon* at the start.

καὶ κατὰ τοῦ βαράθρου καὶ Ταρτάρου ἐς τὸν ὄλεθρον

ἥκειν καὶ κατορωρύχθαι σταδίους ἀναρίθμους (fr. 60.19-21).

Since this follows directly from a contrast between eating fine cakes and a more modest living (the πτωχείης παράδειγμα κακῆς), the phrase οὕτω τοι δεῖ ζῆν seems to be a conclusion about the relative values of each way of life. However, it could also encapsulate the whole poem, which overall describes how the *eleutheros* ought to live (i.e. *hedypatheia*). Athenaeus (3.101f) identified this passage as a precursor of Epicureanism, a form of the *carpe diem* sentiment.[147] But the sense does not seem to be 'eat well because one day you will die', but instead the starker 'eat well *or* die'. For the speaker, the good life is the only life. Moschos is not merely being taught how to cook and have a dinner party: he is being trained for a way of life.

However the humorous touches elsewhere open up the possibility of a non-serious interpretation of this fragment. The Syracusans are called an example of meagre living: they 'live like frogs'(fr.60.10-12 OS), a hyperbolic and perhaps therefore comic expression. Moschos's radical choice – 'eat well or die' – is perhaps deliberately over-the-top, in such a way as to send-up gluttonous people. While the speaker's self-characterisation as an expert no doubt does depend on intimate knowledge of the subject, it may also serve to poke fun at this level of obsession with food.[148]

10.5 Matron of Pitane, *Attikon Deipnon*

Far less of Matron's *Attikon Deipnon* is preserved,[149] but Athenaeus's quotation of one hundred and twenty-two lines *en bloc* (fr. 1 OS = SH 534) allows us to get a sense of the poem's overall style. Although Athenaeus's speaker claims to quote the poem in full, the ending feels too

[147] See e.g. Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) *n. ad* Hor. *Carm.* 1.11.8; Olson and Sens (2000) *ad loc.*
[148] Cf. e.g. Davidson (1997), 11-2: 'Archestratus… was sending himself up'. Cf. Wilkins and Hill (1994), 11-15.
[149] Editions: Brandt (1888); Olson and Sens (1999); Condello (2005a). On the readings of individual lines, see esp. Condello (2001, 2003, 2005b); DiMarco (2004); Giangrande (2004); Montanari (1980-2).

abrupt; there may be other gaps within the fragment:[150] either the text of Athenaeus is corrupt, or the work had already come down to Athenaeus in fragmented form (his source says that it had already become rare in his day). Of six further fragments quoted in the *Deipnosophistae* (fr. 3-8 OS = *SH* 535-540), one is cited as *ἐν τῷ* Δείπνῳ (fr. 2 OS = *SH* 535), the rest as *ἐν παρῳδίαις* (or at Ath. 183a, *ὡς ὁ παρῳδός φησι* Μάτρων *ἐν τούτοις*). Since fr. 1 OS is named as *Ἀττικὸν ... δεῖπνον* (Ath. 4.134d), the other *Deipnon*-fragment probably belongs in this work, perhaps following more or less directly after fr. 1 OS. The *παρῳδίαι* are also gastronomic, so these could also be the same work, although direct continuity cannot be established: Matron may of course have composed more than one food poem.[151]

Of Matron himself, virtually nothing is known. Historical figures in frs.1 and 7 OS help date the work to the late-fourth century; his place of origin is deduced from a reference to a parodist called 'Matreas of Pitane' (Ath. 1.5a-b), whose name was probably confused with another parodist, Matreas of Alexandria (Ath. 1.19d). Intriguingly, the dinner is seemingly situated at Athens (hence, *Ἀττικὸν δεῖπνον*): whether this reflects real autobiographical detail or literary convention (cf. e.g. food in Attic comedy) is of course impossible to know. .

A fragment concerning earlier parodists seems to locate the poet within this tradition:

> *οἱ μὲν γὰρ δὴ πάντες, ὅσοι πάρος ἦσαν ἄριστοι,*
> Εὔβοιός *τε καὶ* Ἑρμογένης *δῖοί τε* Φίλιπποι,
> *οἱ μὲν δὴ τεθνᾶσι καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισιν·*
> *ἔστι δέ τις,* Κλεόνικος, *ὃς ἀθάνατον λάχε γῆρυν,*
> *οὔτε ποιητάων ἀδαήμων οὔτε θεάτρων,*
> *ᾧ καὶ τεθνειῶτι λαλεῖν πόρε* Φερσεφόνεια (fr. 6 OS = *SH* 540).

---

[150]However, Degani (1995), 413, supposes that little has been lost from the *Attikon Deipnon*.

[151] For fuller discussion, cf. Olson and Sens (1999), 4: Meineke accepted frs. 1 and 3-5 OS as part of the same poem, while acknowledging that a case could be made for fr. 6 OS; Brandt (1888), 54-6, regarded them as belonging to a separate work or works. Olson and Sens comment that fr. 7 OS is a different sort of work, while Shero (1929) connects fr. 3 OS with a putative *cena rustica* of Lucillus. The evidence either way is scanty, and we are hampered by a lack of detailed knowledge of what to expect in a text such as this.

Line 2 presumably refers to the parodist Euboios of Paros (cf. Ath.15.699c), whose surviving fragments (*SH* 410-12) indicate some close imitation of Homer:

> *βάλλον δ' ἀλλήλους χαλκήρεσιν ἐγχείῃσιν* (*SH* 411)[152]

> *μήτε σὺ τόνδ' ἀγαθός περ ἐὼν ἀποαίρεο, κουρεῦ,*
> *μήτε σύ,* **Πηλεΐδη** (*SH* 412).[153]

Unlike Archestratos, Matron does not seem to have been known as a *gourmand*: his use of food seems solely as a parodic *topos*. The parodic programme is announced from the opening line, which apes the opening of the *Odyssey*:

> *δεῖπνά μοι ἔννεπε,* **Μοῦσα**, *πολύτροφα καὶ μάλα πολλά* (fr. 1.1 OS).

These words indicate Matron's *modus operandi*: this is less a poem about food than systematic re-use of Homeric lines. Although, like Philoxenos' *Deipnon*, it is presented as a narrative of a dinner,[154] there seems little organisational cohesion to the narrative, or little effort to describe a realistic dinner. We once again have hints of a catalogue style (Shero called it the 'Catalogue of Fish'):[155] fr. 1 OS contains a series of seafood dishes. However, there is no sign of a clear division of courses or foods such as we find in Philoxenos or Archestratos.

Matron's humour chiefly derives the closeness of expression to Homeric verses, often verbatim quotation with the occasional word wittily switched.[156] In the first line, replacing *ἄνδρα* with *δεῖπνα* announces the topic and serves to characterise the poem as mock epic; but there is also humour from substituting *πολύτροφα* for Homeric *πολύτροπον*. The Odyssean *ὃς μαλὰ*

---

[152] Cf. *Il.* 18.534 = *Od.* 9.55 (verbatim).
[153] Cf. *Il.*1.275, *μήτε σὺ τόνδ' ἀγαθός περ ἐὼν ἀποαίρεο κούρην*.
[154] The plural *δεῖπνα* (fr.1.1 OS) is strange: there seems to be only one *deipnon* in our fragments. It is probably intended to form a closer aural parallel with Homer's *ἄνδρα* (and evade a metrical difficulty).
[155] Shero (1929). The effect is reinforced by authorial presences, e.g. 30, *ἴδον*; 36, *εἶδον*, and the application of Homeric names (of gods or heroes) to the dishes.
[156] *Parodia* is often translated as 'counter-song', but necessarily involves what Bakhtin called a 'coessentiality' with an original form. The model need not be belittled: the pleasure comes 'from the degree of engagement of the reader in the intertextual "bouncing"... between complicity and distance' (Hutcheon (2000), 32). On how Greek parody 'works', cf. Degani (1975); on gastronomic poetry and parody, see also *id.* (1982, 1991); Matron alone, *id.* (1995), D'Andria (2002),: Salvioni (1979/80).

πολλά (i.e. about the endurance of Odysseus) is subtly adapted to καὶ μάλα πολλά, which becomes instead a description of the δεῖπνα; in line 3, hunger, λιμός rather than an army, λάος (*Od.* 6.164), follows the speaker 'to that place': this single switch in the line causes a complete change of sense. Chairephon the parasite is made 'an expert on other people's dinners', a minor deviation from *Od.* 5.250: εὖ εἰδὼς τεκτοσυνάων becomes εὖ εἰδὼς δειπνοσυνάων (a new coinage).[157] The idea of a 'professional eater' is no doubt also intended to raise some laughs (and draws on comic *topoi* of parasites).

Wilamowitz (and many others) found this method rather vulgar,[158] but sometimes the parody is rather subtle.[159] For example, in line 4, Homer's simile for Rhesos's mares (*Il.* 10.436-7, θείειν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοῖοι) becomes a comparison of some bread loaves to other, better loaves, ἔσθειν δ' ἀμύλοισιν ὁμοίους. Part of the joke seems to be the aural similarities of θείειν ~ ἔσθειν, ἀνέμοισιν ~ ἀμύλοισιν. Homer's genuine simile is turned into a rather pointless comparison: a perfect encapsulation of the parodic method. An even more subtle aural joke is made by playing on the word division in fr. 1.60 OS, where Homer's οὐκ οἷος, ἅμα τῷ γε δύω κύνες ἀργοὶ ἔποντο (*Od.* 2.11 = 17.62, 20.145) is converted to οὐκ οἷος, ἅμα τῷ γε δυώδεκα σαργοὶ ἔποντο.[160]

Degani illustrates that the comparison between a squid and Iris is not entirely superfluous, since the squid was regarded in antiquity as being 'winged';[161] an eel (fr. 1.59-62 OS) is said to have mated with Zeus, partly because it is introduced as having the 'white arms of Hera', but perhaps also because an anatomical tradition held that this fish lacked genitals and so was incapable of reproducing through 'normal' intercourse.[162] Most ingeniously of all, Degani[163]

---

[157] Degani (1995), 415, suggests translating this word as 'lunchitecture'.
[158] Wilamowitz (1923), at 73.
[159] See esp. Degani (1995), 423-6.
[160] See Olson and Sens (1999), 21. What I call aural cognition here could perhaps just as well be achieved through the visual appearance of the text on the page, especially given the lack of word-division and probably accents too for a scribe at this date.
[161] Epicharmus fr. 61 K; Degani (1995), 423.
[162] Arist. *Hist.An.* 5. 576a6-24; Degani (1995), 424.
[163] Degani (1995), 425-6.

draws our attention to the appropriateness of the comparison between the cuttlefish and Thetis by pointing out that the Tzetzian commentary on Lyk. *Alex.* 175[164] mentions Thetis and Peleios had intercourse in 'the place of the cuttlefish', *Sepias*,[165] while the cuttlefish was regarded as being highly cunning – like Thetis herself.[166]

Sometimes the parody may depend on context-recognition. When Matron refers to oysters, ὄστρεα μυελόεντα (fr. 1.16 OS), in place of 'bones' in a Homeric line (*Od.* 9.293, ὀστέα μυελόεντα) – the effect deriving from the closeness of the two words, ὀστέα ~ ὄστρεα – part of the point must be that the 'original' was already referring to a meal, the Cyclops eating humans (*Od.* 9.291-3). The oysters take the place of *human* remains, making this exorbitant feast sound like the sacrilegious eating of the Cyclops. In the unfortunately corrupt fr.1.24 OS, it seems that the Cyclops is said to like small-fry, which is presumably ironic: it reinforces the contrast between bones and seafood that has already been made.

A similar device is used again when the parasite Chairephon is introduced with a simile that replicates that of Hermes passing over the sea 'like a cormorant', λάρῳ ὄρνιθι ἐοικώς (fr. 1.10 OS = *Od.* 5.51): the point may be that the cormorant is a vivacious bird; there may also be a pun on the Homeric adjective, λαρός ('pleasant to the taste', applied to a feast at *Il.*19.316). But unquoted lines are also significant:

> ὅς τε κατὰ δεινοὺς κόλπους ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο
>
> ἰχθῦς ἀγρώσσων πυκινὰ πτερὰ δεύεται ἅλμῃ (*Od.* 5.52-3).

The allusion thus provides a splendid image of Chairophon 'sweeping' upon the meal, seeking fish to eat, perhaps even plunging his hands into the food like the Homeric bird getting its wings wet. Olson and Sens find this technique again at fr. 5.3-4 OS, which closely recalls *Il.*2.765, where the horses of Pheres, driven by Eumelos, are said to be ὄτριχας οἰέτεας σταφύλῃ ἐπὶ νῶτον ἐΐσας. As usual, Matron uses close-sounding words that pervert the meaning:

---

[164] Scheer (1881-1908), 85, 2-6.
[165] Cf. Eur. *Andr.*1265-72.
[166]Ar. *Hist. An.* 5.621b28-35; Plut. *De Sollert. An.* 978a-b.

σιτευτὰς ὄρνιθας ἐπ' ἀργυρέοισι πίναξιν,

ἄτριχας, οἰέτεας, λαγάνοις κατὰ νῶτον ἐΐσας (fr. 5.3-4 OS).

Here, as Olson and Sens observe, the first word of the list is almost opposite to the Homeric sense ('one-colour hair' becomes 'hairless'); the third, λάγανον (a kind of cake) is completely removed from the militaristic arena: Homer's σταφύλη is a 'leveller', but Matron may have taken it as σταφυλή, 'a bunch of grapes'. But the unquoted previous line in the *Iliad* had compared the horses to birds, ὄρνιθες, which lends appropriateness to Matron's description of ὄρνιθες here.[167]

The speaker reverses the sentiment of Odysseus longing for his homeland (*Od.*9.27-8) in order to express disdain for monkfish (which is loved by the other guests, here called τέκτονες, 56):

τρηχεῖ', ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος· οὔ τι ἐγώγε

ἧς γαίης δύναμαι γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ἰδέσθαι (*Od.*9.27-8).

τρηχεῖ', ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος· ἦ γὰρ ἔγωγε

ἧς σαρκὸς δύναμαι γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ἰδέσθαι (Matron, fr. 1.57-8 OS).

The appropriation is subtle: τρηχεῖα, used of a rugged island in Homer, is now used for the texture of food; γλυκερώτερον is now taken literally to refer to taste. But we also note that Odysseus speaks his words at a *deipnon* (cf. *Od.* 9.5-18); and whereas Ithaka is far from him, the monkfish is supposedly in front of Matron's narrator.

Specific Homeric lines and scenes are thus parodied;[168] but the whole dinner is also cast as a sort of Homeric episode, with the foods as protagonists. The cook introduces each dish like a character in heroic catalogues,[169] each with Homeric epithets (often using painful puns). The swordfish is a swordsman, κρείων δουρικλυτός and a leader, ἡγεμόνευεν (fr. 1.69 OS); the

[167] So Olson and Sens (1999), 21.
[168] Cf. also the observation of Olson and Sens (1999), 21 & 36, that lines or hemistichs from different contexts but that have a slight connection are frequently joined (e.g. Ajax from *Il.* 2.557-8 and 16.102-3 at Matron fr. 1. 93-4, 95, 97).
[169] Cf. Olson and Sens (1999), 22, for a list of parallels with the catalogue of ships.

'thirteen ducks from Salamis' recalls Ajax with thirteen ships from Salamis (*Il.* 2.557-8);[170] a lobster is eager to 'put on its armour', θωρήσσεσθαι (fr. 1.66 OS), which not only puns on its appearance but also implies enters the feast like a battle (cf. e.g. *Il.* 2.72; 19.352 etc.). The same verb can have the sense of 'to become intoxicated',[171] so perhaps even the dish is made into a participant at the feast.[172] The food, like Homeric heroes, is always the biggest or the best; guests compete 'heroically' for glory.[173] For example, Stratokles holds a fish's head like Andromache holding Hector (*Il.*24.724); the fish is nonsensically given Hector's stock epithet, ἱπποδάμοιο. The narrator plays Achilles by attacking Stratokles (1.32 OS), seizing the fish as if it were a trophy; there is the same 'eagerness for battle' (χάρμη) as an Homeric hero (e.g. *Il.*7.285, 13.82 etc.). At fr. 1.85-6 OS, a casserole appears untouched, as if in respite from battle, ἐν καθαρῷ, ὅθι περ λοπάδων διεφαίνετο χῶρος (cf. e..g *Il.*8.491, 10.199); guests mimic the way Homeric heroes eat at fr. 1.14 OS, ἔνθ' ἄλλοι πάντες λαχάνοις ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἴαλλον (cf. *Il.* 9.91 etc.) – and note that vegetables (λάχανα) add a very unheroic twist.[174]

Some of the puns also hint at a contemporary vogue for riddles or obscure word-games (cf. Simias, *Technopaignia*, Lykophron, *Alexandra*). For example, at fr. 1.76 OS,[175] the cook brings in σάνδαλα ... ἀειγενῆ ἀθανατάων: this first suggests Hermes' sandals (cf. *h.Hom.Merc.* 79, 83, 139), but the feminine plural, ἀθανατάων, points to a different meaning. In the context of seafood, we naturally think of sea-goddesses, i.e. the Nereids: thus σάνδαλα emerges as a reference to a kind of fish. This was probably not its formal name, but from Hesychios' gloss on ψῆττα,[176] we learn that both the diminutive σανδάλιον and the word βούγλωσσον (cf. Matron fr. 1.77 OS, lit. 'ox-tongue') were alternative names for the fish, no doubt deriving from the shape.

---

[170] Cf. also Hes. Fr.204.44 (*pace* Olson and Sens *ad loc.*).
[171] Cf. Pi. fr. 72; Theogn. 470, 482.
[172] So Degani (1995), 418; Condello (2005) (n. *ad* v.96 of the Italian translation).
[173] Degani (1995), 416.
[174] Cf. Degani (1995), 415.
[175] So Condello (2005) (n. *ad* vv. 111-2 of the Italian translation). Olson and Sens note the pun in their translation but do not comment on it.
[176] Cf. Hesych. ψ 156.1; Alkiphr. *Epist.* 1.7.1.2.

Thus the reader's initial expectations are confounded. The application of this kind of technique has led Heather White to posit an ingenious solution to an apparent textual crux at fr. 1.25 OS, *πίν<ν>ας ἦλθε φέρων †καὶ ἄμυλα† ἠχήεντα*: it is unexpected for mussels to appear alongside ἄμυλα (which replace δώματα, 'booming caves', from *Od.* 1.72). By White's reading, ἄμυλα are not 'wheat-cakes' (cf. fr. 1.5 OS) but rather a rare synonym for *μῆτραι*, 'wombs', which was sometimes used as a metaphor for the mussel-shells;[177] hence with the otherwise-odd *ἠχήεντα* it refers to the hollow shells of the molluscs.

Matron, then, defines his poetic voice by a close relationship with the Homeric poems, and seemingly demands a relatively high level of competence from his audience to get the jokes (especially very slight lexical shifts).[178] Part of the fun of hearing or reading a poem such as this must have been noticing the author's cleverness. Written texts of Homer were likely to have been in circulation at the time, which would aid the reception of this style; indeed, it is not impossible that Matron's poem itself was really a 'book poem', although evidence is lacking.

Conclusion: entertainment and poetic *τέχνη*

In this chapter I have surveyed a range of different texts under the broad umbrella of 'voices of popular entertainment'. By gathering these texts together I have tried to show how they all construct themselves in respect of amusing audiences in various ways; all to one extent or another draw on some of the techniques pioneered in Attic drama. In some cases this dependence is quite obvious – Philoxenos' use of stage-props for example – but we also find in the use of absurd compounds and neologisms, which are a feature of Aristotelian comedy. In a few instances there are elements of satire: politics plays an obvious role in Timotheos' *Persians* (cf. ch.1.1), and I have suggested there may be a satirical note in the Philoxenos poems. But as

[177] White (1996), at 31; cf. Giangrande (2004), 1. Giangrande is as disdainful of Olson and Sens' edition of Matron as he was of their edition of Archestratos.
[178] Cf. e.g. Revermann (2006), who argues that among classical theatre audiences such a sophistication could be expected from an elite few.

seems to be the case in fourth-century comedy, this does not come across as quite as pointed as in Old Attic Comedy. The point seems to be one of pleasing theatre-goers (and perhaps symposiasts: I have argued that Philoxenos' *Deipnon* may be aimed at such a 'market'). Even Archestratos's *Hedypatheia*, which in many ways is the odd one out since it may have a genuinely didactic element, cannot avoid being regarded as humorous and perhaps even parodic.

Even if for the likes of Plato and Aristotle these pieces were aimed at 'ordinary' people (which may in any case be a misleading characterisation), they are poems by professionals. Both composition and performance no doubt required a high level of technical accomplishment, and there are significant advances in poetic stylisation. The graphic narrative passages of Timotheos seem to mark a new stage in poetic story-telling, for example. Moreover, a number of the texts show sophisticated interaction with the text of Homer, which suggests they are composed within a similar milieu to the works of Antimachos of Kolophon (ch.8). The parodic poems, despite the apparently boorish humour, seem at times to exhibit a rather sophisticated turn. This may be part of what I referred to in chs.1-2 as a growing tendency to 'look backwards', that is define oneself against earlier models. But it should also help shatter the illusion that 'cleverness', or *τέχνη*,[179] is a purely Hellenistic phenomenon.

[179] For which, cf. esp. Callim. *Aet.* fr.1.17 Massimilla.

Closing Remarks

At this point, it is desirable to draw some conclusions about the fourth century as a whole. In what follows I sketch out a few generalisations based on the readings of individual texts given in this thesis.

A number of connections are now apparent. One is an interest in the media of poetry. A large part of this thesis has been given over to inscriptions, which have a real importance in the literary sphere: the inscriptions include not only include epigrams, as in earlier periods, but also hymns, which implies an expansion of this writing habit. There is a self-confidence about epigram-composition that most clearly reflects itself in funerary inscriptions of the fourth century (ch.3), but can be seen generally in more stylised epigrams of all types (cf. ch. 4): writing on stone is seen as a worthwhile poetic enterprise and a means for a poet to publish his work.

But inscriptions have interesting links with what we might more readily associate with 'literature'. Inscribing cult hymns is one example, while in the emergence of a non-inscriptional form of epigram we see a conscious aping of the stone forms. Simias' pattern poems are an extreme instance of papyrus being regarded as analogous to the stone. But increasingly we find other sorts of poetry that are seemingly intended for papyrus circulation. Poetry more associated with performance scenarios is also adapted for the book, sometimes extravagantly so: The trends to adapt inscribed and performed poetry seem to meet in the emergence of the sympotic-erotic book epigram at the end of the century. Contexts of performance itself are explored too, as for example in the emergence of the solo singer analogous to the actor in drama.

We can also speak of a certain experimentalism in the fourth century. A number of poems defy easy categorisation. For Krates to use parody to express philosophical opinions seems genuinely radical; no less daring in its own way is Aristotle's song for Hermias, while Erinna's *Distaff* too stands alone; the *Technopaignia* of Simias are an extreme instance of such experimenting. But we see this trend also in the entertainment poets of the New Music: the use

of innovations in performance, such as soloists or props, is one form of experimentation; but audiences are also entertained and stimulated by exuberant language.

Indeed, although we may reconstruct very different contexts of reception, there is a clear connection between the 'demotic' elements of the New Music and the learned self-consciousness of the book poets. Timotheos' *Persians* may, as I have described, seek to entertain crowds through its mimesis and musical extravagances, but the language and poetic devices are challenging; it concludes with a forceful defence of his poetic art which would be imitated by Callimachus in book poetry more than a century later. Similarly, I have tried to show how Philoxenos' songs demand at times sophisticated engagement from the audience, with subtle meanings emerging. The parodists and book poets both evince re-working of Homeric lines and contexts, perhaps to different ends but with distinct similarities of method (and we see the same technique adopted again in the philosophical poems of Krates).

There are perhaps also grounds for saying that the figure of the poet can take on a more central role in spheres where this would not previously have been expected. There can be a movement from the text's self-characterisation as 'this is a poem' to 'I am a poet'. In a few inscribed epigrams we see a relatively elaborate voice 'break out'.[1] Isyllos of Epidauros makes his presence felt decisively in an inscription which otherwise characterises itself as a conservative religious text; this presence is even found in a couple of inscribed dedicatory epigrams. The presence of the poet-narrator is felt still more keenly in the bookish poetry discussed in Section III. It often emerges implicitly, through a sense of the poet's activity. So there is a notably self-conscious use of generic models (especially Homer and Hesiod) in Antimachos and Philitas, who seem concerned to portray themselves as scholarly; book epigram does not merely adopt the form of inscribed and sung poetry but does so with artful variation. Such authorial intrusion can be taken so far as to destroy the fiction (as in Simias for example). This is not a matter of naïve

[1] Not that personality is altogether absent in the norms: the very process of formalization and conformity implies a self-conscious desire to compose poetry of a certain style and register.

self-revelation.There are signs everywhere of self-conscious stylisation, even in a text as seemingly personal and intimate as Erinna's *Distaff* : the device of the child's game seems to be every bit as artful and sophisticated as we find in more obviously bookish poetry.

The humorous tone in a number of the poems discussed may cause some readers to consider that they should not be regarded as serious poetry (as compared to say Sappho or Pindar – neither of whom is without humour). But this dismissal implies a confusion over the word 'serious' ('grave' or 'significant'). Once again it tries to force ancient poetry into an overly narrow bracket. When the actual texts are read attentively, it becomes apparent that many of these works display considerable craft and ingenuity.

Despite what is commonly thought, then, the fourth century emerges as a period of great poetic interest. Certainly the surviving texts are few in number and somewhat disparate, but they are sufficient to point to a lively literary culture. The fourth century is not a third century waiting to happen, nor a fifth century in decline. Rather, much is happening and there are new voices clamouring for attention. By looking closely at the construction of different sorts of poem, I hope to have shown that we can discern a dynamically creative stage of Greek literary history.

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S. (2001), '*Aetia* fr. 1.5: I told my story like a child', *ZPE* 136, 214-16.

— (2002), 'Rereading Callimachus' *Aetia* fragment' *CP* 97, 238-255.

Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E. and Baumbach, M. eds. (2004), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves. Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309).* Cambridge, MA.

Ahlberg, G. (1971), *Prothesis and Ekphora in Greek Geometric Art*. Göteborg.

Ajootian (2007), 'Praxiteles and fourth-century Athenian portraiture', in Shultz and von den Hoffeds. (2007), 13-33.

Akrigg, B. (2007), 'The nature and implications of Athens' changed social structure and economy', in Osborne ed. (2007), 27-43.

Aleshire, S. B. (1989), *The Athenian Asklepieion: the People, their Dedications, and the Inventories*. Amsterdam.

Alexiou, M. (1974), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Cambridge.

Allan, W. (2001), 'Euripides in Megale Hellas: some aspects of the early reception of tragedy', *G&R* 48, 67-86.

— (2004), 'Religious syncretism: the new gods of Greek tragedy', *HSCP* 102, 113-155.

— (2008), *Euripides:* Helen. Cambridge; New York.

Alonge, M.C. (2005), 'The Palaikastro hymn and the modern myth of the Cretan Zeus', *Princeton and Stanford Working Papers in the Classics vers. 1* [article online] Available at: <http://www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/pdfs/alonge/120512.pdf> [retrieved 1 Jun. 2008].

— (2006), *The Hymn to Zeus from Palaikastro. Religion and tradition in post-Minoan Crete.* Diss., Stanford University.

Aloni, A. and Iannucci, A. (2007), *L'elegia greca e l'epigramma dalle origini al V secolo. Con un'appendice sulla 'nuova' elegia di Archiloco.* Florence.

Ameling, W. (1985), '**Φάγωμεν και πίωμεν**. Griechische Parallelen zu zwei Stellen aus dem Neuen Testament', *ZPE* 60, 35-44.

— (2004), 'Wohltäter im hellenistischen Gymnasionin' in Kah, D. and Scholz, P. eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasion* (Berlin, 2004), 129-161.

Anagnostou-Laoutides, E. (2005), *Eros and Ritual in Ancient Literature. Singing of Atalanta, Daphnis and Orpheus*. Piscataway.

Anderson, W.A. (1966), *Ethos and Education in Greek Music: the Evidence of Poetry and Philosophy*. Cambridge, MA.

Anderson, W.D. (1966), *Ethos and Education in Greek Music*. Cambridge, MA.

Angiò, F. (2002), 'Filita di Cos in bronzo (Ermesianatte, fr. 7, 75-78 Powell-P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, col. X, ll. 16-25)', *APF* 48, 17-24.

Argentieri, L. (1998), 'Epigramma e libro. Morfologia delle raccolte epigrammatiche premeleagree', *ZPE* 121, 1-20.

— (2007), 'Meleager and Philip as epigram collectors', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 147-64.

Arieti, J.A. (1991), *Interpreting Plato: The Dialogues as Drama.* Savage, Maryland.

Arnott, W.G. (1996), *Alexis: the Fragments. A Commentary.* Cambridge.

Arnush, M. (2005), 'Pilgrimage to the oracle of Apollo at Delphi: patterns of public and private consultation', in Elsner and Rutherford eds. (2005), 97-110.

Arthur, M.B. (1980), 'The tortoise and the mirror. Erinna *PSI* 1090', *CW* 74, 53-66.

Asheri, D. (1983a), 'Fra ellenismo e iranismo. Il caso di Xanthos fra il V e IV sec. a. C', in *Modes de contacts et processus de transformation dans les sociétés antiques. Actes du colloque de Cortone* [24-30 mai 1981] (Pisa/Rome, 1983), 485-500.

— (1983b), *Fra Ellenismo e Iranismo. Studi sulla società e cultura di Xanthos nella età achemenide*. Bologna.

Askitoplou, H., Konsolaki, E., Ramoutsaki, I.A. and Anastassaki, M. (2002), 'Surgical cures under sleep induction in the Asclepieion of Epidauros', *International Congress Series* 1242, 11– 17.

Asmis, E. (1992), 'Neoptolemus and the classification of poetry', *CP* 87.3, 206-231.

Asquith, H. (2005), 'From genealogy to catalogue: the Hellenistic adaptation of the Hesiodic catalogue form', in Hunter ed. (2005), 266-286.

Audiat, J. (1932), 'L'hymne d'Aristonoos à Hestia', *BCH* 56, 299-312.

Ausland, H.W. (1997), 'On reading Plato mimetically', *AJP* 118, 371-416.

Austin, C. and Bastianini, G. (2002), *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia.* Milan.

Badian, E. (1981) 'The deification of Alexander the Great', in Dell, H. J. and Borza, E. N. eds. *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (Thessaloniki, 1981)*,* 27–71.

Baines, J. (2004), 'Egyptian elite self-presentation in the context of Ptolemaic rule', in Harris, W.V. and Ruffini, G. eds., *Alexandria between Egypt and Greece* (Leiden, 2004), 33–61, 269–89.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. (1950), 'The "divinity" of Alexander', *Historia* 1, 363–88.

Barker, A. (1984), *Greek Musical Writings*. I: *The Musician and his Art*. Cambridge.

— (1995), '*Heterophonia* and *poikilia*: accompaniments to Greek melody' in Gentili, B. and F. Perusino eds., *Mousike: Metrica ritmica e musica greca in memoria di Giovanni Comotti* (Pisa, 1995), 41-60.

— (2004), 'Transforming the nightingale: aspects of Athenian musical discourse in the late fifth century,' in Murray and Wilson eds. (2004), 185-204.

Barker, E. T. E. (2006), 'Paging the oracle: interpretation, identity and performance in Herodotus' History', *G&R*, 53, 1-28.

Bar-Kochva, B. (2009), *The Image of the Jews in Greek Literature: the Hellenistic Period. Hellenistic Culture and Society 51.* Berkeley; London.

Barnard, S. (1978), 'Hellenistic Women Poets', *CJ* 73: 204-213

— (1991), 'Anyte: Poet of Children and Animals', in de Martino, F. ed., *Rose di Pieria* (Bari, 1991), 165-76.

Barns, J. (1950), 'A new gnomologium: with some remarks on gnomic anthologies (I)', *CQ* 44, 126-137.

— (1951), 'A new gnomologium: with some remarks on gnomic anthologies (II)', *CQ* n.s. 1, 1-19.

Bartol, K. (1992), 'Where was iambic performed? Some evidence from the fourth century BC', *CQ* n.s. 42 (1992), 65-71.

— (2004) 'What did he do? Clearchus on Philoxenus of Leucas', *CQ* n.s. 54, 292–6.

Bassett, S. (1931), 'The place and date of the first performance of the *Persians* of Timotheus', *CP* 26, 153-65.

Battezzato, L. (2005), 'Lyric', in Gregory, J. ed., *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 2005), 149-166.

Baughan, E. P. (2004), *Anatolian funerary klinai: tradition and identity*. Diss., Univ. of California.

Baumbach, M. and Trampedach, K. (2004), '"Winged words". Poetry and divination in Posidippus' *Oiônoskopika'*, in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 123-60.

Baumbach, M., Petrovic, I. and Petrovic, A. eds. (2010), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram. Papers from a Conference on the Epigram Held in April 2005 in Giessen.* Cambridge.

Bean, G.E. and. Cook, J.M (1952), 'The Cnidia', *BSA* 47 (1952) 171-212.

Beazley, J.D. (1938), *Attic White Lekythoi*. London.

Beckby, H. (1968), *Anthologia Graeca* (2nd ed.). München.

— (1975), *Die griechischen Bukoliker*. Meisenheim.

Beckman, J. (1979), *The Religious Dimension of Socrates' Thought*. Toronto.

Benecke, E.F.M. (1970), *Antimachus of Colophon and the Position of Women in Greek Poetry* [orig. published 1896]. Groningen.

Bennett, L. J. and W. B. Tyrrell (1990), 'Sophocles' *Antigone* and funeral oratory,' *AJP* 111. 4, 441-456.

Benson, H. (2000), *Socratic Wisdom. The Model of Knowledge in Plato's Early Dialogues*. Oxford.

Berdowski, P. (2008), 'Heroes and fish in Homer', *Palamedes* 3, 75-91.

Bergemann, J. (1997), *Demos und Thanatos: Untersuchungen zum Wertsystem der Polis im Spiegel der attischen Grabreliefs des 4.Jahrhunderts v. Chr.und zur Funktion der gleichzeitigen Grabbauten*. Munich.

— (2007), 'Attic grave reliefs and portrait sculpture in fourth-century Athens', in Shultz and von den Hoff eds. (2007), 34-46.

Bergk, W.Th. (1878) *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (3 vols.). Leipzig.

Bernabé, A. (1987), *Poetae Epici Graeci* [*PEG*]. Stuttgart.

Bernardini, P.A. and Veneri, A. (1981), 'Il Gorgia di Platone nel giudizio di Gorgia e l' 'aureo' Gorgia nel giudizio di Platone (Athen. 11,505d-e)', *QUCC* 7, 149-160.

Bernsdorff, H. (2001), *Hirten in der nicht-bukolischen Dichtung des Hellenismus*. Palingenesia 72. Stuttgart.

Betegh, G. (2004), *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation*. Cambridge.

Bett, R.A. (1989), 'The sophists and relativism'*, Phronesis* 34, 139-169.

— (2000), *Pyrrho, his Antecedents and his Legacy*, Oxford.

Bettenworth, A. (2002), 'Asclepiades XXV GP (*AP* 5.181). Ein Beitrag zum sympotisch-erotischen Epigramm', in Harder et al. eds. (2002), 27-38.

Bettenworth, A. (2007), 'Inscribed and literary epigram', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 69-93.

Billows, R. A. 1990. *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State.* Berkeley.

Bing, P. (1985), 'Kastorion of Soloi's Hymn to Pan', *AJP* 106, 502-509.

— (1988), *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets.* Hypomnemata 90. Göttingen.

— (1995), 'Ergänzungsspiel in the epigrams of Callimachus', *A & A* 41, 115-131.

— (1998), 'Between literature and the monuments', in M. A. Harder, R. F. Retguit, and G. C. Wakker eds. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry. Hellenistica Groningana III* (Groningen, 1998), 21-43.

— (2002a), 'The un-read Muse? Inscribed epigram and its readers in antiquity', in Harder et al. eds. (2002), 39-66.

— (2002b), 'Medeios of Olynthos, son of Lampon, and the *Iamatika* of Posidippus', *ZPE* 140, 297-300.

— (2003), 'The unruly tongue: Philitas of Cos as scholar and poet', *CP* 98, 330-348.

— (2004), 'Posidippus' *Iamatika*', in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 276-291.

— (2005), 'The politics and poetics of geography in the Milan Posidippus, Section One: On Stones', in Gutzwiller ed. (2005), 119-140.

Bing, P. and Bruss, J.S eds. (2007), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden; Boston.

Bing, P. and Bruss, J.S. (2007), 'Introduction', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 1-26.

Blok, J. (2006) 'Solon's funerary laws: questions of authenticity and function,' in Blok, J. and Lardinois, A. eds., *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philosophical Approaches* (Leiden, 2006), 197-247.

Blondell, R. (2002), *The Play of Character in Plato's Dialogues*. Cambridge

Boardman, J. (1955), Painted funerary plaques and some remarks on prothesis', *BSA* 50*,* 51–66.

— (1995), *Greek Sculpture. The Late Classical Period*. London.

Boardman, J. and Kurtz, D.C. (1971) *Greek Burial Customs*. London.

Boas, M. (1905), *De epigrammatis Simonideis. Pars prior. Commentatio critica de epigrammatum traditione*. Diss., Groningen.

Bolton, J.D.P. (1962), *Aristeas of Proconnesus.* Oxford.

Bommelaer, J.-F. (2005), 'Un peu d'air des îles à Delphes ?' *Ktêma* 25, 65-74.

Bos, A.P. (2003), *The Soul and its Instrumental Body: a Reinterpretation of Aristotle's Philosophy of Living Nature*. Leiden.

Bosanquet, R.C. and Murray, G. (1908-9), 'The Palaikastro hymn of the Kouretes', *BSA* 15, 339-365.

Bossi, F. (1986), *Studi sul Margite*. Ferrara

Bosworth, A.B. (2005), *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, Warfare and Propaganda under the Successors.* Oxford; New York.

Bousquet J. (1992), 'Les inscriptions du Létôon en l'honneur d'Arbinas et l'épigramme grecque de la stéle de Xanthos' in Metzger et al. eds. (1992), 147-200.

— (1975), 'Arbinas, fils de Gergis, dynaste de Xanthos' *CRAI* 119, 138-150 [with response by P. Demargne, 148-150].

Bowie, E. (1985), 'Theocritus' seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus', *CQ* n.s. 35, 67-91.

— (1986), 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106, 13-35.

— (1993), 'Greek table-talk before Plato', *Rhetorica* 11, 355-371.

— (1997), 'The Theognidea: a step towards a collection of fragments?' in Most, G.W ed. *Collecting Fragments / Fragmente Sammeln.* Aporemata 1 (Göttingen, 1997), 53-66.

— (1998), 'Le portrait de Socrate dans les *Nuées* d'Aristophane', in Trédé, M. and Hoffmann, P. eds. *Le Rire des anciens* (Paris, 1998), 53–66.

— (2007), 'From archaic elegy to sympotic epigram', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 95-112.

— (2010), 'Epigram as narration', in Baumbach et al. eds. (2010), 313-284.

Bowra, C.M. (1938) 'Aristotle's hymn to Virtue', *CQ* 32, 182-189.

— (1953), *Problems in Greek Poetry.* Oxford.

— (1970), 'A Cretan hymn', in *On Greek Margins* (Oxford, 1970), 182-198.

Brady, T.A. (1935), *The Reception of the Egyptian Cults by the Greeks, 330-30 BC*. Missouri.

Brandt, P. (1888), *Corpusculum poesis epicae Graecae ludibundae. Vol. I.* Leipzig.

Branham, R.B. and Goulet-Cazé, M-O. (1996), *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy.* Berkeley.

Brashear, W. (1994), 'Literary and sub-literary papyri from Berlin', in Bülow-Jacobs, A. ed., *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists* (Copenhagen, 1994), 286-8.

Braund, D. (1994), 'The luxuries of Athenian democracy', *G&R* n.s. 41, 41-48.

Braund, D. and Wilkins, J. eds. (2000), *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire.* Exeter.

Bravi, L. (2006), Gli epigrammi di Simonide e le vie della tradizione. Filologia e critica 94. Roma.

Bravo, B. (1997), *Pannychis e simposio. Feste private notturne di donne e uomini nei testi letterari e nel culto.* Pisa; Roma.

— (2001), 'Un frammento della "Piccola Iliade" (P. Oxy. 2510), lo stile narrativo tardo-arcaico, i racconti su Achille immortale', *QUCC* 67, 49-114.

Bremer, J.M. (1981), 'Greek hymns', in Versnel, H.S. ed. *Faith, Hope and Worship* (Leiden, 1981), 193–215.

— (1987), *Greek Religion.* Oxford; New York; Toronto.

Breuer, C. (1995), *Reliefs und Epigramme griechischer Privatgrabmäler*. Cologne.

Bridgman, T.P. (2004), *Hyperboreans. Myth and History in Celtic-Hellenic Contacts*. New York.

Briggs, W.W. Jr. (1981), 'Virgil and the Hellenistic epic,' *ANRW* 31.2, 948-984.

Bringmann, K. and von Steuben, H. (1995), *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*. Vol. 1.

Brown, B. (1973), *Anticlassicism in Greek Sculpture of the Fourth Century BC*. New York.

Brown, C.G. (2005), 'The stele of Mnesagora and Nikochares ("CEG" 84)', *ZPE* 152, 1-5.

— (2006), 'Pindar on Archilochus and the gluttony of blame (*Pyth.*2.52-6)', *JHS* 126, 36-46.

Brown, P. (2004), 'Socrates in comedy', in Karasmanis, V. ed., *Socrates: 2400 Years since his Death* (Delphi, 2004), 526–30.

Bruss, J. (2005), *Hidden Presences: Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram*. Hellenistica Groningana 10. Leiden.

— (2010a), 'Epigram' in Clauss and Cuypers eds. (2010), 117-135.

— (2010b), 'Ecphrasis in fits and starts? Down to 300 BC', in Baumbach et al. eds. (2010), 385-403.

Bryce, T. R. and Zahdle, J. (1986), *The Lycians. A Study of Lycian History and Civilisation to the Conquest of Alexander the Great*. I: *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*. Copenhagen.

Bryce, T.R. (1983), 'The arrival of the goddess Leto in Lycia', *Historia* 32, 1-13.

Budelmann, F. ed. (2009), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge.

Bulloch, A. W. (1984), 'The future of a Hellenistic illusion. Some observations on Callimachus and religion', *MH* 41, 209-230.

— (1985a), 'Hellenistic poetry', in Knox and Easterling eds. (1985), 541–621.

— (1985b) *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge.

— (1992), 'Difference and dissonance in Hellenistic poetry', *TAPA* 122, 331-334.

— (2010), 'Hymns and encomia', in Clauss and Cuypers eds. (2010), 166-180.

Burke, E.M. (1990), 'Athens after the Peloponnesian War: restoration efforts and the role of Maritime commerce', *CA* 9, 1-13.

Burkert, W. (1992), 'Athenian cults and festivals', in Lewis et al. eds. (1992), 245-267.

Burns, A. (1981), 'Athenian literacy in the fifth century B.C.', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 42, 371-387.

Burnyeat, M.F. (1997), 'The impiety of Socrates', *Ancient Philosophy* 17, 1-12.

Burton, D. (2003), 'Public memorials, private virtues: women on classical Athenian grave monuments', *Mortality* 8, 20-35.

Cairns, F. (1979), *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge.

— (1993), 'Asclepiades AP 5.85 = Gow-Page 2', *Grazer Beiträge* 19, 35-8.

— (1996), 'Asclepiades AP 5.85 = Gow-Page 2 again', in Cairns, F. and Heath, M. eds., *Roman Poetry and Prose, Greek Poetry, Etymology, Historiography* (Leeds, 1996), 323-6.

— (2010), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Ann Arbor (rev. ed.).

Calame, C. and Clay, J. S. (2004), 'Deictic ambiguity and auto-referentiality: some examples from Greek poetics', *Arethusa* 37, 415-443.

Cameron, A. (1991), 'How Thin Was Philitas?', *CQ* n.s. 41, 534-8.

— (1995), *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.

Cameron, A. and Cameron, A. (1969), 'Erinna's distaff', *CQ* n.s. 19, 285-8

Campbell, D.A. (1993), *Greek Lyric.* V: *The New School of Poetry and Anonymous Songs and Hymns.* Cambridge, MA; London.

Carey, C. (2009), 'Genre, occasion and performance', in Budelmann ed. (2009), 21-38.

Caspari, C. (1915), 'The Ionian confederacy', *JHS* 35, 173-188.

Caspers, C.L. (2005), 'Hermesianax fr. 7.75-8 Powell. Philitas, Bittis … and a parrot?' *Mnemosyne* 58, 575-81.

— (2006), 'The loves of the poets. Allusions in Hermesianax fr. 7 Powell', in Harder et al. eds. (2006), 21-42.

Cavallo, E. and Maehler, H. eds. (2008*) Hellenistic Book Hands*. Berlin, New York.

Chaniotis, A. (2003), 'The divinity of Hellenistic rulers', in Erskine ed. (2003), 431-446.

Childs, W.A.P. (1981), 'Lycian relations with Persians and Greeks in the fifth and fourth centuries re-examined,' *AS* 31 (1981), 55-80.

Cingano, E. (2003), 'Entre skolion et enkomion: réflexion sur le "genre" et la performance de la lyrique chorale grecque,' in Jouanna, J. and Leclant, J. eds. *Colloque: la poésie grecque antique. Actes* (Paris, 2003), 17-45.

Clack, J.P. (2001), *Dioscorides and Antipater of Sidon. The Poems.* Wauconda, Il.

Clairmont, C. (1970), *Gravestone and Epigram. Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Period*. Mainz am Rhein.

— (1983), *Patrios Nomos: Public Burial in Athens during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC: the Archaeological, Epigraphic-literary, and Historical Evidence*. Oxford.

— (1993-5) *Classical Attic Tombstones* (vol. I-VI). Kichelberg.

Clauss, J.J. and Cuypers, M. eds. (2010), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature.* Oxford.

Clay, J.S. (1992), 'Pindar's twelfth Pythian: reed and bronze', *AJP* 113, 519-525.

— (1996), 'Fusing the boundaries: Apollo and Dionysos at Delphi', *Métis* 11, 83-100.

— (2003), *Hesiod and Cosmos*. Cambridge.

Clayman, D.L. (2007), 'Philosophy and philosophers in Greek epigram," in P. Bing and J. Bruss eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden, 2007), 497-517.

— (2010), *Timon of Phlius: Pyrrhonism into Poetry.* Berlin; New York.

Closterman, W.E. (2007), 'Family ideology and family history: the function of funerary markers in classical Attic *peribolos* tombs', *AJA* 111, 633–52.

Colaiaco, J.A. (2001), *Socrates Against Athens: Philosophy on Trial.* New York.

Colvin, S. (1999), *Dialect in Aristophanes: and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature.* Oxford.

Compton-Eagle G. (1999), 'Aristophanes' *Peace* 1265-1304: food, poetry and the comic genre', *CP* 94, 324-9.

Condello, F. (2001), 'Matro fr. 1.87 O.-S. (SH 534)', *Eikasmos* 12, 129-32.

— (2003), 'Una crux in Matrone (fr. 1,89 O.-S. = SH 534)', *Eikasmos* 14, 105-107.

— (2005a), 'Matrone di Pitane. Il banchetto attico', *Testo a Fronte* 17, 49-67

— (2005b), 'Matro fr. 1,34 O.-S. (= SH 534): la seppia parlante', *ARF* 7, 39-42.

Connelly, A. (1998), 'Was Sophocles heroised as Dexion?' *JHS* 118, 1-21.

Connelly, J.B. (2007), *Portrait of a Priestess. Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece.* Princeton, London.

Connors, R. J. (1986), 'Greek rhetoric and the transition from orality', *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 19, 38-65.

Cooper, C. ed. (2007), *Politics of Orality: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 6*. Mnemosyne Supplement 280. Leiden; Boston.

Corrigan, K. and Glazov-Corrigan, E. (2004), *Plato's Dialectic at Play*. University Park, PA.

Crane, G. (1986), 'Tithonus and the Prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*', *ZPE* 66, 269-78.

Crossett, J. (1967), 'Aristotle as a poet. The Hymn to Hermeias', *Philological Quarterly* 46, 145-55.

Crusius, O. (1888), 'Über die Nomosfrage', in *Verhandlungen der 39. Versammlung der deutschen Philologen und Schulmänner in Zürich vom 28. September bis 1. Oktober 1887* (Leipzig, 1888), 258-75.

— (1894), 'Die delphischen Hymnen', *Philologus* 53 [suppl. 24], 3-28.

Csapo, E. (2000), 'From Aristophanes to Menander: genre transformation in Greek comedy', in Depew and Obbink eds. (2000), 115-133.

— (2004a), 'The politics of the New Music', in Murray and Wilson eds. (2004), 207-248.

— (2004b), 'Some social and economic conditions behind the rise of the acting profession in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.', in Hugoniot, C., Hurlet, F. and Milanezi, S. eds., *Le Statut de l'acteur dans l'antiquité grecque et romaine* (Tours, 2004), 53-76.

— (2007), 'The men who built the theatres: *theatropolitai, theatronai and arkhitektones*', in Wilson ed. (2007), 87-115.

— (2008), 'Star Choruses: Eleusis, orphism and new musical imagery and dance', in Revermann and Wilson eds. (2008), 262-290.

— (2010), *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theatre*. Oxford.

Csapo, E. and Slater, W.J. (1995), *The Contexts of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor.

Csapo, E. and Wilson, P.J. (2009), 'Timotheus and the New Music', in Budelmann, ed. (2009), 277-293.

Curren, R.C. (2000), *Aristotle on the Necessity of Public Education*. New York.

Currie, B. (2004), 'Reperformance scenarios for Pindar's odes', in Mackie ed. (2004), 49-70.

D'Alessio, G.-B. (2004), 'Past future and present past: temporal deixis in Greek archaic lyric', *Arethusa* 37, 267-294.

D'Andria, A. (2002), 'Matrone di Pitane tra Omero e Aristofane. Modelli cultural della parodia gastronomica di Orazio', *Bollettino storico della Basilicata* 18, 99-120.

D'Angour, A. (1997), 'How the dithyramb got its shape', *CQ* n.s. 47, 331-51.

— (2006), 'The New Music – so what's new?' in Goldhill and Osborne eds. (2006), 264-283.

Dalby, A. (1994), *Unequal Feasts: Food and its Social Context in Early Greece*. Diss., Birbeck College, London.

— (1996), *Siren Feasts: a History of Food and Gastronomy in Greece*. New York.

Dale, A. (2010), 'Lyric epigrams in Meleager's Garland, the *Anthologia Palatina*, and the *Anthologia Planudea*', *GRBS* 50, 193-213.

Danforth, L.M. (1982), *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece*. Princeton.

Danielewicz, G. (1978), 'De Aristonoi hymno in Vestam', *Eos* 66, 55-60.

— (1990), 'Deixis in Greek choral lyric', *QUCC* 34, 7-17.

Daux, G. (1972), 'Stèles funéraires et épigrammes (à propos d'un livre récent)', *BCH* 96, 503-566.

David, A.P. (2006), *The Dance of the Muses: Choral Theory and Ancient Greek Poetics* Oxford.

Davidson, J. (1995), '*Opsophagia*. Revolutionary eating in Athens', in Wilkins et al. eds. (1995), 204–13.

— (1996), 'On the fish missing from Homer', in Wilkins, J. ed. *Food in European Literature* (Exeter, 1996), 57-64.

— (1997), *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. New York.

Davies, G. (1985), 'The significance of the handshake motif in classical funerary art', *AJA* 89, 627-640.

Davies, J. (1995). 'The fourth-century crisis: what crisis?' in Eder ed. (1995), 29-36.

Davies, M. (1988) 'Monody, choral lyric, and the tyranny of the hand-book.', *CQ* n.s.38, pp 52-64

Davison, J.A. (1962), 'Literature and literacy in Ancient Greece II: caging the Muses', *Phoenix* 16, 219-233.

Day, J. W. (1989), 'Rituals in stone: early Greek grave epigrams and monuments,' *JHS* 109, 16-28

— (1994), 'Interactive offerings: early Greek dedicatory epigrams and ritual,' *HSCP* 96, 37-74

— (2000), 'Epigram and reader: generic force as (re-)activation of ritual,' in Depew and Obbink eds. (2000), 37-55.

— (2007), 'Poems on stone: the inscribed antecedents of Hellenistic epigram', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 29–47.

De Jong, I.J.F, Nünlist, R. and Bowie, A. eds. (2004), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* I. Mnemosyne Supplement 257. Leiden.

De Jong, I.J.F. (2001), *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.

— (2004), *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. London (2nd ed.).

De Stefani, C. (1996), 'Asclepiadea (*AP* 5.210.1; 167.1)', *Sileno* 22, 339-45.

Dean-Jones, L. (2003), 'Literacy and the charlatan in Ancient Greek medicine', in Yunis ed. (2003), 97-121.

Dearden, C.W. (1990), 'Fourth-century drama in Sicily: Athenian or Sicilian?', in Descoeudres, J.P. ed., *Greek Colonists and Native Populations* (Oxford, 1990), 231-242.

Defreyne, L. (1993), 'Erotes and Eros in the epigrams of Asclepiades', *Aevum* 6, 199-236.

Degani, E. (1975), 'Note ai parodi greci', *Sileno I*, 157-74

— (1995), 'Problems in Greek gastronomic poetry. On Matro's Attikon deipnon', in Wilkins et al. eds. (1995), 413-28.

— (1998), `Filosseno di Leucade e Platone Comico (fr. 189 K-A.)', *Eikasmos*, 9, 81-100.

Del Corno, D. (1962), 'Ricerche intorno alla *Lyde* di Antimaco', *Acme* 15, 57-95

Del Grande, C. (1923), 'Nomos citarodico', *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica* 7, 1-17.

Delattre, D. (1989), 'Philodème, *De la musique:* livre IV, colonnes 40 à 109', *Cronache ercolanesi* 19, 49–143.

— (2007), *Philodème de Gadara. Sur la musique, Livre IV* (2 vols.). Paris.

Demargne, P. (1979), 'Athéna, les dynastes lyciens et les héros grecs', in *Florilegium Anatolicum*, *Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche* (Paris, 1979), 97-101.

— (1990), 'Das Nereiden-Monument von Xanthos', in Borchhardt, J., Dinstl, A. and Jacobek, R. eds., *Götter, Heroen, Herrscher in Lykien* (Vienna, 1990), 65-9.

Depew, D. J. (1991), 'Politics, music, and contemplation in Aristotle's ideal state', in Keyt, D. and Miller, F.D. Jr. eds., *A Companion to Aristotle's Politics* (Oxford, 1991), 346-80.

Depew, M. (2000), 'Enacted and performed dedications: the genre of Greek hymn', in Depew and Obbink eds. (2000), 59-80.

— (1997), 'Reading Greek prayers', *CA* 16, 229-58.

— (1993), 'Mimesis and aetiology in Callimachus' hymns' in Harder et al. eds. (1993), 57-71.

Depew, M. and Obbink, D. eds. (2000), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge, MA; London.

Detienne, M. (2001), 'Forgetting Delphi between Apollo and Dionysus', *CP* 96, 147-158.

Dettori (2000a), *Filita grammatico. Testimonianze e frammenti. Introduzione, edizione e commento*. Rome.

— (2000b), 'La "filologia" di Filita di Cos (con qualche osservazione sulla filologia del III sec. a.C.)', in Pretagonisti ed. (2000), 183-98.

— (1999), 'Filita, frg.10 Kuch. e la "poesia di corteggiamento"', *Scholia* 2:6–12.

Deubner, L. (1919), 'Paian', *NJKA* 22, 385-406.

Devlin, N. G. (1994), *The Hymn in Greek Lterature: Studies in Form and Content.* Diss., Oxford.

Di Marco, M. (2002), 'Asclepiade, 1 e 2 G.-P. (= *AP* 5, 169; 5, 85)', in Torraca, L. ed. *Scritti in onore di Italo Gallo* (Naples, 2002), 255-64.

Dickey, E. (2007), *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period.* London; New York.

Diehl, E. (1954) *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* (3 vols.). Leipzig [3rd edn.]

Di Gregorio, L. (2008), 'Sui frammenti di Simia di Rodi, poeta alessandrino', *Aevum* 82, 51-117.

Dihle, A. (1994). *A History of Greek Literature from Homer to the Hellenistic Period.* London.

Dihle, A. et al. eds. (1968), *L'Épigramme grecque*. Genève; Vandoeuvres.

Dillery, J. (2002), 'Ephebes in the stadium (not the theatre): *Ath. Pol.* 42.4 and *IG* II^2 351', *CQ* n.s. 52, 462-470.

Dillon, M.P.J. (1997), *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*. London.

— (1994), 'The didactic function of the Epidaurian *iamata*', *ZPE* 101, 239–260.

Dillon, S. (2006), *Ancient Greek Portrait Sculpture: Contexts, Subjects and Styles*. New York.

— (2010), *The Female Portrait Statue in the Greek World*. Cambridge.

DiMarco, M. (2004), 'Le pinne e il *leukon udor* (Matro 1, 26 O.-S. = SH 534)', *Paideia* 59, 141-6.

DiNino, M.M. (2005), *'Posidippo e la letteratura* incubatoria', in Di Marco, M., Palumbo, B.M. and Lelli, E. eds. *Posidippo e gli altri. Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14-15 maggio 2004* (Pisa; Rome, 2005), 47-76.

Dobrov, G.W. (2002), '**Μάγειρος ποιητής**: language and character in Antiphanes', in Willi, A. ed., *The Language of Greek Comedy* (Oxford, 2002), 169-190.

Dobrov, G.W. ed. (1995), *Beyond Aristophanes: Tradition and Diversity in Greek Comedy,* Atlanta.

Dohm, J. (1964). *Mageiros: Die Rolle des Kochs in der griechisch-römischen Komödie*. Zetemata 32. Munich.

Dohrn, T. (1968), 'Die Marmor-Standbilder des Daochos-Weihgeschenks in Delphi,' *Antike Plastik* 8, 33-51.

Dörig, J. (1967), 'The early classical period', 'high classicism' and 'the late classical period', in Boardman, J., Dörig, J., Fuchs, W. and Hirmer, M. eds., *Art and Architecture of Ancient Greece* (London 1967), 263-498.

Dover, K.J. (1971), 'Socrates in the Clouds,' in Vlastos, G. ed., *The Philosophy of Socrates* (Garden City, N.Y., 1971), 50-78.

— (1973), *Thucydides*. Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics 7. Oxford.

Dow, J. (2007), 'A supposed contradiction about emotion-arousal in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*', *Phronesis* 52, 382-402.

Dow, S. (1937), 'The Egyptian cults at Athens', *HThR* 30, 183-232.

Dowden, K. (2007) 'Rhetoric and Religion', in Worthington, I. ed., *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford, 2007), 320-335.

Drachmann, A.B. (1922), *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity*. London.

Droysen, J.G. (1836-1843), *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (3 vols.). Hamburg.

Drozdek, A. (2007), *Greek Philosophers as Theologians: The Divine* Arche. Aldershot.

Dué, C. (2006), *The Captive Woman's Lament in Greek Tragedy*. Austin.

Dunand, F. (1973), *Le Culte d' Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée* (3 vols.). Leiden.

Düring, I. (1957), *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition.* Göteborg

Easterling, P.E. (1985), 'Greek poetry and Greek religion', in Easterling, P.E. and Muir, J. eds. *Greek Religion and Society* (Cambridge, 1985), 34-49.

Ebeling, H.L. (1925), 'The *Persians* of Timotheus', *AJP* 46, 317-331.

Ebert, J. (1972), *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*. Berlin.

Edelstein, E.J. and Edelstein, L. (1945), *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*. Baltimore [repr. 1975].

Eder, W. (1995), 'Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Krise oder Vollendung?' in Eder ed. (1995), 11-28.

Eder, W. ed. (1995), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?: Akten Eines Symposiums 3.-7. August 1992*. Bellagio.

Ellingham, C.J. (1921), 'Timotheus' *Persae*', in Powell, J.U. and Barber, E.A. eds. *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Recent Discoveries in Greek Poetry and Prose of the Fourth and Following Centuries B.C.* (London, 1921), 59-65.

Elsner, J. and Rutherford, I. (2005), 'Introduction', in Elsner and Rutherford eds. (2005), 1-40.

Elsner, J. and Rutherford, I. eds. (2005), *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity*. 2005.

Engelmann, H. and Merkelbach, R. (1972-3), *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomen* (2 vols.). Bonn.

Engels, J. (1998), 'Philiskos of Miletos', in Schepens, G. ed., *Felix Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker Continued.* IV: *Biography and Antiquarian Literature* (Leiden; Boston; Köln, 1998), 356-375.

Ernst, U. (1991), *Carmen figuratum: Geschichte des Figurengedichts von den antiken Ursprungen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters.* Pictura ut Poesis 1. Köln.

Erskine, A. (2010), 'From Alexander to Augustus', in Clauss and Cuypers eds. (2010), 17-29.

Erskine, A. ed. (2003), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford.

Fabbro, E. (1995), *Carmina convivialia Attica.* Rome.

Fahr, W. (1969), *ΘΕΟΥΣ NOMIZEIN. Zum Problem der Anfänge des Atheismos bei den Greichen.* Hildesheim; New York.

Fairbanks, A. (1900), *A Study of the Greek Paean.* Cornell.

Fantuzzi, M. (2000), 'Theocritus and the 'demythologizing' of poetry', in Depew and Obbink eds. (2000), 135-152.

— (2004), 'The Structure of the *Hippika* in *P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309*', in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 212-224.

— (2005), 'Posidippus at court: the contribution of the *Hippika* of P.Mil. Vol. VIII 309 to the ideology of Ptolemaic kingship', in Gutzwiller ed. (2005), 249-268.

— (2010a), 'Typologies of variation on a theme in Archaic and Classical metrical inscriptions', in Baumbach et al. eds. (2010), 289-310.

— (2010b), 'Sung poetry', in Clauss and Cuypers eds. (2010), 181-196.

Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R.L. (2004), *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry.* Cambridge.

Fantuzzi, M. and Sens, A. (2006), 'The hexameter of inscribed Hellenistic epigram', in Harder et al. eds. (2006), 105-122.

Faraguna, M. (1992), *Atene nell'età di Alessandro. Problemi politici, economici, finanziari.* Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei 9.2. Rome.

Faraone, C. (1991), 'The agonistic context of early Greek binding spells', in Faraone, C. and Obbink, D. eds. *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion* (Oxford, 1991), 3–32.

— (2011), 'An Athenian tradition of dactylic paeans to Apollo and Asclepius: choral degeneration or a flexible system of non-strophic dactyls?' *Mnemosyne Ser. 4* 64, 206-231.

Fearn, D. (2007), *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*. Oxford.

Fehling, D. (1969), *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*. Berlin.

Fehr, B. (1979), *Bewegungsweisen und Verhaltensideale. Physiognomische Deutungsmöglichkeiten der Bewegungsdarstellung an griechischen Statuen des 5. u. 4. Jh. v. Chr.* Bad Bramstedt.

Fendt, G. and Rozema, D. (1998), *Platonic Errors*: *Plato, a Kind of Poet*. Westport.

Ferrari, F. (1988), 'P. Berol. inv. 13270: i canti di Elefantina', *SCO* 38, 181-228.

Fleming, T.J. (1977), 'The musical *nomos* in Aeschylus's *Oresteia*', *CJ* 72, 222-233.

Floristán Imízcoz, J. M. (2000), *Lisias. Discursos*. III: *Discursos XXVI-XXXV. Fragmentos.* Madrid.

Flower, M.A. (2009a), 'Athenian religion and the Peloponnesian War', in Palagia ed. (2009), 1-23.

— (2009b), *The Seer in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.

— (1988), 'Agesilaus of Sparta and the origins of ruler cult', *CQ* n.s. 38, 123-34.

Foley, H. (2008), 'Generic boundaries in late fifth-century Athens', in Revermann and Wilson eds. (2008), 15-36.

Fongoni, A. (2005), 'Antifane e Filosseno', *QUCC* 81, 91-98.

Fontenrose, J.E. (1959), *Python. A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins*. Berkeley [repr. New York, 1974].

Forbes, C.A. (1967), 'An episode in the life of Aeschines', *AJP* 88, 443-448

Ford, A. (1985), 'The seal of Theognis: the politics of authorship in archaic Greece', in Figueira, T.J. and Nagy, G. eds. *Theognis of Megara* (Baltimore, 1985), 82-95.

— (1999), 'Reading Homer from the rostrum: poetry and law in Aeschines, *In Timarchum*', in Goldhill and Osborne eds. (1999), 281-313.

— (2002), *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton.

— (2003), 'From letters to literature: reading the "song culture" of Classical Greece', in Yunis ed. (2003), 15-37.

— (2006) 'The genre of genres. Paeans and *Paian* in early Greek poetry', *Poetica* 38.3-4, 277-295.

— (2010), 'Aristotle on Σωκρατικοὶ λόγοι and fourth-century theories of genre', *CP* 105, 221-3.

— (forthcoming), *Aristotle as a Poet*. Princeton.

Fowler, A. (1982), *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Cambridge, MA.

Fränkel, H. (1915), *De Simia Rhodio*. Diss., Göttingen.

Fränkel, M. (1877), 'Inschriften aus Olympia No. 54-56', *Archäologische Zeitung* 35, 43-6.

Franklin, J. (forthcoming), '"Song-benders of circular choruses": dithyramb and the "demise of Music"', in Kowalzig and Wilson eds. (forthcoming).

Fraser, P. M. (1956), 'Bibliography: Graeco-Roman Egypt: Greek inscriptions (1955)', *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 42, 105-115.

— (1960). 'Two studies on the cult of Sarapis in the Hellenistic world', *Opuscula Atheniensia*, 1-54.

— (1967). 'Current problems concerning the early history of the cult of Sarapis', *Opuscula Atheniensia*, 23-45.

— (1972), *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (2 vols.). Oxford.

Fredericksmeyer, E.A. (1979a), 'Divine honors for Philip II, *TAPA* 109, 39-61.

— (1979b), 'Three notes on Alexander's deification', *American Journal of Ancient History*. 4, 1-9.

— (1981), 'On the background of the ruler cult', in Dell, H.J. ed. *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson.* (Thessaloniki, 1981), 145-156.

Freyberg, B. (1997), *The Play of the Platonic Dialogues.* New York.

Friis Johansen, K. (1951), *The Attic Grave-Reliefs of the Classical Period.* Copenhagen.

Frisone, F. (2000), *Leggi e regolamenti funerari nel mondo greco.* I: *Le fonti epigraphiche*. Lecce.

Fucarino, C. (1991-93), 'Ennio buongustaio. L'arte culinaria come metafora del mutamento civile', *Annali del liceo classico G. Garibaldi di Palermo* 28-30, 189-203.

Furley, W.D and Bremer, J. M. (2001), *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs From the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period.* (2 vols). Tübingen.

Furley, W.D. (1995), 'Praise and persuasion in Greek hymns', *JHS* 115, 29-46.

— (1997), *Andocides and the Herms: a Study of Crisis in Fifth-Century Athenian Religion*. London.

— (2010), 'Life in a line: a reading of dedicatory epigrams from the archaic and classical period', in Baumbach et al. eds. (2010), 151-166.

Gagarin, M, (2003), 'Letters of the law: written texts in Archaic Greek law', in Yunis ed. (2003), 59-77.

— (2008), *Writing Greek Law*. Cambridge.

Gaiser, K. (1966), 'Die Elegie des Aristoteles an Eudemos', *MH* 23, 84-106.

Gallavotti, C. (1993), *Theocritus quique feruntur Bucolici Graeci.* Rome.

Garland, R. (1985), *The Greek Way of Death*. Ithaca.

— (1989), 'The well-ordered corpse: an investigation into the motives behind Greek funerary legislation', *BICS* 36 (1989), 1-15.

— (1992), *Introducing New Gods: The Politics ofAthenian Religion*. London.

Garulli, V. (2004), *Il Peri poiêtôn di Lobone di Argo. Eikasmos. Studi* 10. Bologna.

Gauthier, P. (2000), Le décret thessalonique pour Parnassos. L'évergète et la dépense pour sa statue à la basse époque hellénistique', *Tekmeria* 5, 39-62.

Geagan, D.J. (1991), 'The Sarapion monument and the quest for status in Roman Athens', *ZPE* 85, 145–165.

Geißler, C. (2005), 'Der Tithonosmythos bei Sappho und Kallimachos. Zu Sappho fr. 58 V., 11-22 und Kallimachos, *Aitia* fr. 1', *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 8, 105-14.

Gentili, B. (1968), 'Epigramma ed elegia', in Dihle et al. eds. *L'Épigramme grecque* (Genève/Vandoeuvres, 1968), 39-81.

Geoghegan, D. (1979): *Anyte: The Epigrams*. Rome.

Geominy, W. (1998), 'Zum Daochos Weihgeschenk', *Klio* 80, 369-402.

— (2007), 'The Daochos monument at Delphi: the style and setting of a family portrait in historic dress', in Shultz and von den Hoff eds (2007), 84-98.

Gerber, D. E. (1994), 'Greek lyric poetry since 1920. Part II: from Alcman to *fragmenta adespota*', *Lustrum* 36: 7-188 and 285-97.

Giangrande, G. (1968), 'Sympotic literature and epigram', in Dihle et al. eds. (1968), 93-172.

— (1970) 'Hellenistic Poetry and Homer', *AC* 39, 46-77.

— (1974) 'Kallimachos und Antimachos.' Hermes 102, 117-9.

— (1989), 'Interpretazione di testi poetici ellenistici', *Sicul. Gymn.* 42, 3-39.

— (2002) 'On the language and text of Archestratus' *Orpheus* 23, 32-40.

— (2004), 'On the text of Matro', *Orpheus* 25, 1-2.

Giannantoni, G. (1990), *Socraticorum reliquiae* (4 vols.). Naples.

Gilula, D. (2000), 'Hermippus and his catalogue of goods (fr. 63)', in Harvey, D. & Wilkins, J. eds., *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London, 2000), 75-90.

Goette, H. (2007), 'Choregic monuments and the Athenian democracy', in Wilson ed. (2007), 122-149.

Goldhill, S. (1986), *Reading Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.

— (1991). *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge.

— (1994), 'The naïve and knowing eye: ecphrasis and the culture of viewing in the Hellenistic world', in Osborne, R. and Goldhill, S. eds. *Art and. Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge, 1994), 197-223.

— (2002), *The Invention of Prose*. Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics 32. Oxford.

Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. eds. (1999), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.

— (2006), *Rethinking Revolutions Through Ancient Greece*. Cambridge; New York.

Gomme, A.W. (1956), *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides Books II-III* (vol. 2). Oxford.

Gordon, J. (1999), *Turning Toward Philosophy: Literary Device and Dramatic Structure in Plato's Dialogues*. University Park, PA.

Gow, A.S.F. (1958), *Bucolici Graeci*. Oxford.

Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L ed. (1956). *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (2 vols.). Cambridge.

Grainger, J.D. (1990), *The Cities of Seleukid Syria*. Oxford.

Grant, F.C. (1953). *Hellenistic Religions: The Age of Syncretism*. New York.

Green, P. (1990), *Alexander to Actium: the Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*. Berkeley; Los Angeles.

— (2003), 'Occupation and coexistence: the impact of Macedon on Athens, 323-307', in Palagia, O. and S. V. Tracy eds. *The Macedonians in Athens, 339-329 BC* (Oxford, 2003), 1-6.

Greene, E. (2000), 'Playing with tradition: gender and innovation in the epigrams of Anyte', *Helios* 27, 15-32.

Greene, E. ed. (2005), *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Norman.

Grieser, H. (1937), *Nomos. Ein Beitrag zur griechischen Musikgeschichte*. Heidelberg.

Grote, G. (1846-56), *A History of Greece from the Earliest Period to the Close of the Generation Contemporary with Alexander the Great* (8 vols.). London.

Gruen, E. (2002), *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans.* Cambridge, MA.

— (2003), 'Jews and Greeks', in Erskine ed. (2003), 246-279.

Guarducci, M. (1983), *Scritti scelti sulla religione greca e romana e sul cristianesimo.* Leiden

Guichard, L.A. (2006), 'Simias' pattern poems. The margins of the canon', in Harder et al. eds. (2006), 83-104.

Gutzwiller, K. (1997), 'Genre development and gendered voices in Erinna and Nossis', in Prins, Y. and Shreiber, M. eds. *Dwelling in Possibility. Women Poets and Critics on Poetry* (Ithaca; London, 1997), 202-22.

— (1998), *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigrams in Context.* Berkeley; Los Angeles; London.

— (2002), 'Art's echo: the tradition of Hellenistic ecphrastic epigram', in Harder et al. eds. (2002), 85-112

— (2007), *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature.* Oxford.

— (2010), 'Heroic epitaphs of the classical age: the Aristotelian *Peplos* and beyond,' in Baumbach et al. eds. (2010), 219-249.

Gutzwiller, K. ed. (2005), *The New Posidipppus. A Hellenistic Poetry Book.* Oxford.

Gygax, M. D. and Tietz, W. (2005), '"He who of all mankind set up the most numerous trophies to Zeus": the inscribed pillar of Xanthos reconsidered', *Anatolian Studies* 55, 89-98.

Häberlin, C. (1887), *Carmina figurata Graeca.* Hannover.

Habicht, C. (1970) *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*. Munich (2nd ed.).

Haigh, A.E. (1896), *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks.* Oxford.

Hainsworth, J.B. (1991), *The Idea of Epic.* Berkeley.

Hall, E. (1994), 'Drowning by nomes: the Greeks, swimming and Timotheus' *Persians*', in Kahn, H.A. ed., *The Birth of European Identity: The Europe-Asia contrast in Greek Thought, 490-322 BC* (Nottingham, 1994), 81-89.

Halliwell, S. (2000), 'The subjection of muthos to logos: Plato's citations of the poets', *CQ* n.s. 50, 94-112.

— (2003), 'From functionalism to formalism: or did the Greeks invent literary criticism? [reveiew of Ford (2002)]', *Arion* 10, 171-185.

Hamdorf, G. (1964), *Griechische Kultpersonifikationen.* Mainz am Rhein.

Handley, E.W. (1996), 'Two epigrams by Asclepiades (XXV, XVI G.-P.),' *MH* 53, 140-7.

Hansen, O. (1984), 'On the date and place of the first performance of Timotheus' *Persae*', *Philologus* 128, 135-8.

Hansen, P.A. (1989) *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca: saeculi IV a Chr. n.*. Berlin; New York.

— (1983), *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca: saeculorum VIII-V a.Chr.n.*. Berlin; New York

Harder, M.A. (1992), 'Insubstantial voices: some observations on the hymns of Callimachus', *CQ* n.s. 42, 384-394.

Harder, M.A., Retguit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. eds. (1993), *Callimachus*. Hellenistica Groningana 1. Groningen.

— (2002), *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Hellenistica Groningana 5. Leuven.

— (2006), *Beyond the Canon*. Hellenistica Groningana 11. Leuven.

Hardie, A. (1997), 'Philitas and the Plane Tree.' ZPE 119, 1997, 21-36.

— (2003), 'The statue(s) of Philitas (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 Col. X 16-25 and Hermesianax fr. 7.75-78 P.)', *ZPE* 143, 27-36.

Harding, P. (1994), *Androtion and the Atthis: the Fragments Translated with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.

Hardwick, L. (1993), 'Philomel and Pericles: silence in the funeral speech', *G&R* 40, 147-162

Harris, W.V. (1989), *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, MA; London.

Harris, W.V. and Ruffini, G. eds. (2004), *Ancient Alexandria between Egypt and Greece*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 26. Leiden.

Harrison, E.L. (1964), 'Was Gorgias a sophist?', *Phoenix* 18, 183-192.

Harrison, S.J. (2007), *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford.

Hart, G.D. (2000), *Asclepius: the God of Medicine*. London.

Harvey, A.E. (1955), 'The classification of Greek lyric poetry', *CQ* n.s. 5, 157-178.

Häusle, H. (1979), *Einfache und frühe Formen des griechischen Epigramms*. Innsbruck.

Havelock, C.M. (1982). *The Literate Revolution in Ancient Greece and its Cultural Consequences*. Princeton.

— (1981), 'Mourners on Greek vases: remarks on the social history of women,' in Hyatt, S.L. ed., *The Greek Vase* (Latham, N.Y., 1981), 103-18.

Hazzard, R.A. (1992), 'Did *Ptolemy* I get his Surname from the Rhodians in 304?', *ZPE* 93, 52-6.

Henderson W.J. (2000), 'Aspects of the Greek symposium', *Aktorion* 45, 6-26.

Henderson, I. (1957), 'Ancient Greek music' in Wellesz, E. ed. *The New Oxford History of Music* I*: Oriental and Ancient Music* (Oxford, 1957), 336-403.

Henrichs, A. (1972), 'Toward a new edition of Philodemus' treatise on piety', *GRBS* 13, 67-98.

— (1994/5), 'Why should I dance? Choral self-referentiality in Greek tragedy', *Arion* 3, 56-111.

— (1999), 'Demythologising the past' in Buxton, R. ed., *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (Oxford, 1999), 223-250.

— (2003a), 'Hieroi Logoi and Hierai Bibloi: the (un)written margins of the sacred in Ancient Greece', *HSCP* 101, 207-266.

— (2003b), 'Writing religion: inscribed texts, ritual authority, and the religious discourse of the *polis*', in Yunis ed. (2003), 38-58.

Herington, C.J. (1985), *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. California.

Herrmann P. (1986), 'Grabepigramme von der milesischen Halbinsel', *Hermes* 86, 117-121.

Herrmann, F.G. (2007) 'Greek religion and philosophy: the god of the philosopher', in Ogden ed. (2007), 385-397.

Heybob, S.K. (1975), *The Cult of Isis among Women in the Graeco-Roman World*. Leiden.

Higbie, C. (1999), 'Craterus and the use of inscriptions in ancient scholarship', *TAPA* 129, 43-83.

Hillgruber, M. (1990), 'Zur Zeitbestimmung der Chrestomathie des Proklos', *RhM* 133, 397-404.

Himmelmann, N. (1999), *Attische Grabreliefs*. Opladen

Hirschberger, M. (2004), Gynaikôn Katalogos und Megalai Ehoiai. *Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 198. München; Leipzig.

Hollis, A.S. (1996), 'Heroic honours for Philetas?' *ZPE* 110, 56-62.

— (2000), 'The reputation and influence of Choerilus of Samos', *ZPE* 130, 13-15.

Hölscher T. (1973), *Griechische Historienbilder des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr*. Würzburg.

Holst-Warhaft, G. (1992), *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature*. London; New York.

Hooley, D.M. (2007), *Roman Satire*. Oxford.

Hopkinson, N. (1984), 'Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*', *CQ* n.s. 34, 139-48.

Hordern, J.H. (1999a), 'The *Cyclops* of Philoxenus', *CQ* n.s. 49, 445-455.

— (1999b), 'Some observations on the *Persae* of Timotheus (791 *PMG*)', *CQ* n.s.49, 433-438.

— (2002), *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford.

— (2004a), 'Cyclopea. Philoxenus, Theocritus, Callimachus, Bion', *CQ* n.s. 54, 285-92

— (2004b), *Sophron's Mimes: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.

Hornblower, S. (1982), *Mausolus*. Oxford.

— (1992), 'The religious dimension to the Peloponnesian War, or, What Thucydides does not tell us', *HSCP* 94, 169-197.

— (2002), *The Greek World 479-323 BC*. London (3rd ed.).

Hornblower, S. and Morgan, C. eds. (2007), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals*. Oxford.

Horsfall, N. (1979), 'Stesichorus at Bovillae?' *JHS* 99, 26-48.

Hubbard, T. (2004), 'The dissemination of epinician lyric: pan-Hellenism, reperformance, written texts', in Mackie ed. (2004), 71-94.

Hunter, R. (1979), 'The comic chorus', *ZPE* 36, 23-38.

— (1983), *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe*. Cambridge.

— (1992), 'Writing the God: Form and Meaning in Callimachus'Hymn to Athena', *MD* 29, 9-34.

— (1996), *Theocritus and the archaeology of Greek poetry*. Cambridge.

— (2003), 'Reflecting on writing and culture: Theocritus and the style of cultural change', in Yunis ed. (2003), 213-234.

— (2004), 'Notes on the *lithika* of Posidippus', in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 94-104.

Hunter, R.L. and Rutherford, I. eds. (2009), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism.* Cambridge; New York.

Hunter, R.L. ed. (2005), *The Hesiodic* Catalogue of Women*: Constructions and Reconstructions*. Cambridge.

Hurwit, J.M. (1999), *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*. Cambridge.

Huss, W. (1994), *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester. Studien zur Geschichte des ptolemaiischen Ägypten.* Stuttgart.

Hutcheon, L. (2000), *A Theory of Parody: the Teachings of Twentieth-century Art Forms*. Urbana, IL.

Hutchinson, G.O. (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry.* Oxford.

— (2001), *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Commentary on Selected Longer Fragments.* Oxford.

— (2007), 'The monster and the monologue: Polyphemus from Homer to Ovid', in Finglass, P.J., Collard, C., Richardson, N. J. eds., *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford, 2007), 22-39.

— (2008), *Talking Books. Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry.* Oxford.

Hutton, J. (1967), [Review of Gow and Page (1965)], *CJ* 62, 172-5.

Huxley, G. (1975), 'Cretan Paiawones,' *GRBS* 16, 119-24.

— (1969), 'Choirilos of Samos', *GRBS* 10, 12-29.

Hyde, W.W. (1921), *The Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art*. Washington, DC.

Ihm, S. (2004), *Eros und Distanz. Untersuchungen zu Asklepiades in seinem Kreis.* München/Leipzig.

Irigoin, J. (1976), 'Le plus ancien acrostiche grec? (Anth. Pal. VI, 330 et *IG* IV^2 255)' in *Recueil Plassart. Etudes sur l'antiquité grecque offertes à André Plassart par ses collègues de la Sorbonne* (Paris, 1976), 119-123.

Jacoby, F. (1949), *Atthis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford.

Jacquemin, A. and Laroche, D. (2001), 'Le monument de Daochos ou le trésor des Thessaliens', *BCH* 125, 305-332.

Jaeger, W. (1938), 'Greeks and Jews: the first Greek records of Jewish religion and civilization', *Journal of Religion* 18, 127-143.

— (1927), 'Aristotle's verses in praise of Plato', *CQ* 21, 13-17 [= *Scripta Minora* 1 (1960), 339-345].

Janko, R. (2002), 'The Derveni Papyrus: an interim text', *ZPE* 141, 1–62.

Jordan, B. (1986), 'Religion in Thucydides', *TAPA* 116, 119-147.

— (1979), *Servants of Gods. A Study in the History, Religion and Literature of Fifth-Century Athens*. Göttingen.

Kaczko, S. (2009), 'From *stone to parchment*: epigraphic and literary transmission of some Greek epigrams', *Trends in Classics 1, 90-117*

Kajava, M. (2004), 'Hestia: hearth, goddess, and cult', *HSCP* 102, 1-20.

Kalinka, E. (1901), *Tituli Asiae Minoris: Tituli Lyciae Lingua Lycia Conscripti*. Vienna.

Kallet, L. (2009), 'War, plague, and politics in Athens in 420s BC', in Palagia ed. (2009), 94-127.

Käppel, L. (1992), *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 37. Berlin.

Keesling, C.M. (2007), 'Early Hellenistic portrait statues on the Athenian acropolis: survival, reuse, transformation', in Schultz and. von den Hoff eds (2007), 141-160.

— (2005), 'Patrons of Athenian votive monuments of the archaic and classical periods: three studies,' *Hesperia* 74.3, 395-426.

— (2003), *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge.

Kerkhecker, A. (1999), *Callimachus' Book of* Iambi. Oxford.

Keuls, E.C. (1978), *Plato and Greek Painting*. London; New York.

Keyssner, K. (1932), *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im Griechischen Hymnus*. Stuttgart.

King, D.B. (1955), 'The appeal to religion in Greek rhetoric', *CJ* 50, 363-371, 376.

King, H. (1986), 'Tithonus and the Tettix', *Arethusa* 19, 15-35.

Klinghardt, M. (1999), 'Prayer formularies for public recitation. Their use and function in ancient religion', *Numen* 46, 1-52.

Knox, B.M.W. (1992), 'Athenian religion and literature', in Lewis et al. eds (1992), 268-286.

Knox, B.M.W. and Easterling, P.E. eds. (1985), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* I*: Greek Literature*. Cambridge.

Knox, B.M.W. and P.E. Easterling (1985), 'Books and readers', in Knox and Easterling eds. (1985), 1-16.

Koenen, L. (1993), 'The Ptolemaic king as a religious figure', in Bulloch, A.W., Long, A. A. and Stewart, A. eds. *Images and Ideologies in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1993), 25-115.

Köhnken, A. (2007), 'Epinician epigram' in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 295–312.

Kokula, G. (1984), *Marmorlutrophoren*. Berlin.

Kolde, A. (2003), *Politique et religion chez Isyllos d'Epidaure*. Basel.

— (2002-3), 'Is Isyllus of Epidaurus' poetry typically Hellenistic?' *Hermathena* 173-4, 155-164.

König, H.H. (2010), *Hesiod: the Other Poet. The Ancient Reception of a Cultural Icon*. Mnemosyne Supplement 325. Leiden.

Kornarou, E. (2008), 'The display of the dead on the Greek tragic stage: the case of Euripides' *Supplices*', *BICS* 51, 29-38.

Korzeniewski, D. (1974), 'Die Binnenresponsion in den Persen des Timotheos', *Philologus* 118, 22-39.

Kosak, J.C. (2004), '*Polis nosousa:* Greek ideas about the city and disease in the fifth century BC', in Hope, V.M. and Marshall, E. eds. *Death and Disease in the Ancient City* (London; New York, 2004), 35-54.

Kosmetatou E. (2002), 'Remarks on a Delphic Ptolemaic dynastic group monument', *Tyche* 17, 103-111.

— (2004a), Vision and visibility: art historical theory paints a portrait of new leadership in Posidippus' *andriantopoiika*', in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 187-211.

— (2004b), 'Constructing legitimacy: the Ptolemaic *Familiengruppe* as a means for self-definition in Posidippus' *hippika*', in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 225-246.

Kosmopoulou, A. (2002), *The Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Madison, Wis.

Kouremenos, T., Parássoglou, G.M.and Tsantsanoglou, K. (2006), *The Derveni Papyrus. Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Studi e testi per il "Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini", vol. 13*. Florence.

Kovacsovics, W.K. (1990), *Die Eckterrasse an der Gräberstrasse des Kerameikos. Kerameikos 14*. Berlin.

Kowalzig, B. (2005), 'Mapping out *communitas*: performances of *theoria* in their sacred and political context', in Elsner and Rutherford eds. (2005), 41-72.

— (2007), *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford.

— (2008), 'Nothing to do with Demeter? Something to do with Sicily! Theatre and society in the early fifth-century West', in Revermann and Wilson eds. (2008), 128-159.

— (forthcoming), 'Dancing dolphins: dithyramb and social change in archaic Greece' in Kowalzig and Wilson eds. (forthcoming).

Kowalzig, B. and P.J. Wilson eds. (forthcoming), *Song-Culture and Social Change: the Contexts of Dithyramb*. Oxford.

Kraut, R. (1998), 'Aristotle on method and moral education', in Gentzler, J. ed., *Method in Ancient Philosophy* (Oxford, 1998), 171-90.

Krevans, N. (1993), 'Fighting against Antimachus. The *Lyde* and the *Aetia* reconsidered', in Harder et al. eds. (1993), 149-60.

— (2005), 'The editor's toolbox: strategies for selection and presentation in the Milan epigram papyrus', in Gutzwiller ed. (2005), 81-96.

— (2007), 'The arrangement of epigrams in collections', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 131 – 146.

Kroll, W. (1924), *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart.

Kron, U. (1996), 'Priesthoods, dedications and Euergetism: what part did religion play in the political and social status of Greek women', in Hellström, P. and Alroth, B. eds. *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World* (Stockholm, 1996), 139-82.

Krumeich, R. (1997), *Bildnisse griechischer Herrscher und Staatsmänner im 5. Jahrhunder v. Chr.* Munich.

Kurke, L. (2009), "'Counterfeit oracles" and "legal tender": the politics of oracular consultation in Herodotus', *Classical World* 102, 417-438.

Kurtz, D.C. (1985), *Athenian White-Ground Lekythoi*. Oxford.

Kuttner, A. (2005), 'Cabinet fit for a queen: the *lithika* as Posidippus' gem museum', in Gutzwiller ed. (2005), 141-163.

Kwapisz, J. (2008) 'Muse vs. muses in the *P. Berol.* inv. 13270', *ZPE* 164 (2008), 45-46.

Laks, A. and G.W. Most (1997), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*. Oxford.

Latte, K. (1913) *De saltationibus Graecorum capita quinque*. Gießen.

Lattimore, S. (1987), 'The nature of early Greek victor statues,' in Bandy, S. J. ed. *Coroebus Triumphs: The Alliance of Sports and the Arts* (San Diego, 1987), 245-56.

— (1997), 'Art and architecture', in Tritle, ed. (1997), 249-282.

Lawton, C.L. (2009), 'Attic votive reliefs and the Peloponnesian War' in Palagia ed. (2009), 66-93.

Lazzarini, M. (1976), 'Le formule delle dediche votive nella Graecia arcaica', *MAL* ser. 8 vol. 19.2, 47-354.

Leader, R.E. (1997), 'In death not divided: gender, family, and state on classical Athenian grave stelae', *AJA* 101, 683-699.

Lefkowitz, B. (1987), 'Was Euripides an atheist', *SIFC* (ser. 3) 5, 149-66.

— (1989), '"Atheism" and "impiety" in Euripides' dramas', *CQ* n.s. 39, 70-82

Legrand, P.E. (1927), *Bucoliques grecs (II): Pseudo-Théocrite, Moschos, Bion, Divers*. Paris.

Lelièvre, F. J. (1954), 'The basis of ancient parody', *G&R* n.s. 1, 66-81.

Lesky, A. (1966). *A History of Greek Literature* [trans. J. Willis and C. de Heer]. New York.

Levaniouk, O. (2008), 'Lament and Hymenaios in Erinna's *Distaff*', in Suter ed. (2008), 200-32.

LeVen, P. (2008), *The Many-Headed Muse. Tradition and Innovation in Fourth-Century Lyric*. Diss., Princeton/Sorbonne.

Lewis, D. M. Boardman, J., Hornblower, S. and Ostwald, M. eds. (1994), *The Cambridge Ancient History*. VI: *The Fourth Century BC*. Cambridge.

Lewis, D.M., Boardman, J., Davies, K. and Ostwald, M. eds. (1992), *The Cambridge Ancient History* V: *The Fifth Century BC*. Cambridge.

LiDonnici, L.R. (1992), 'The compositional background of the Epidaurian *Iamata*', *AJP* 113.1, 25-41.

— (1995), *The Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Atlanta.

Lightfoot, J.L. (2009), *Hellenistic Collection: Philitas, Alexander of Aetolia, Hermesianax, Euphorion, Parthenius*. Cambridge, MA; London.

Linforth, I. M. (1931), 'Two notes on the legend of Orpheus', *TAPA* 62 (1931), 5-17.

Livingstone, N. and Nisbet, G. (2010), *Epigram. Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics 38*. Cambridge.

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1963) 'Seal of Posidippus', *JHS* 83, 75-99.

— (1971), *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley.

Lombardi, M. (1993), *Antimaco di Colofone. La poesia epica*. Roma

— (1997), 'Tradizione e innovazione nell'epica prealessandrina. Antimaco di Colofone e Cherilo di Samo', *QUCC* 56, 89-104

Long, A.A. (1996), 'The Socratic tradition: Diogenes, Crates, and Hellenistic ethics', in Branham, and Goulet-Cazé eds. (1996), 28-46.

Long, T. (1986), *Barbarians in Greek Comedy*. Carbondale.

Loraux, N. (1986), *The Invention of Athens*: *The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Cambridge, MA [tr. A. Sheridan; French orig. 1981].

Lord, C. (1982), *Education and Culture in the Political Thought of Aristotle*. Ithaca.

Ludwig, W. (1963), 'Plato's love epigrams', *GRBS* 4, 59-82.

Luz, C. (2008) 'Das Rätsel der griechischen Figurengedichte', *MH* 65, 2008, 22-33.

— (2010), *Technopaignia. Formspiele in der griechischen Dichtung.* Mnemosyne Supplement 324. Leiden.

Lynch J.P. (1972), *Aristotle's School.* Berkeley.

Ma, J. (2007), 'Hellenistic honorific statues and their inscriptions', in Newby and Newby-Leader eds. (2007), 203-20

Maas, P. (1933), *Epidaurische Hymnen*. Halle.

Mackie, C.J. ed. (2004), *Oral Performance and Its Context.* Mnemosyne Supplement 248. Leiden.

Maehler, H. (1982), *Die Lieder des Bakchylides. I: Die Siegeslieder.* Mnemosyne Supplement 62. Leiden.

Maidment, W.J. (1935), 'The later comic chorus', *CQ* 29, 1-24.

Männlein-Robert, I. (2007a), Epigrams on art: voice and voicelessness in Hellenistic epigram', Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 251-271.

— (2007b), *Stimme, Schrift und Bild: Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtung.* Heidelberg.

Manwell, E. (2005), '*Dico ergo sum*. Erinna's voice and poetic reality', in Greene ed. (2005), 72-90.

Marcos, N.F. and Watson, W.G.E. (2000), *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible.* Leiden.

Marcovich, M. (1975), 'Philodamus' Delphic Hymn to Dionysus', *ZPE* 18, 167-68.

Marcovich, M. (1988), *Studies in Graeco-Roman Religion and Gnosticism.* Leiden.

Marinatos, N. (1981). *Thucydides and Religion. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 129*. Königstein.

Mariner Bigorra, S. (1959), 'Il problema degli epitaffi ripetuti e le sue derivazioni', *Atti del Terzo Congresso internazionale di Epigrafia greca e latina Roma 4-8 settembre 1957)* (Rome, 1959), 207-211.

Markman, D.S. (1943), *The Horse in Greek Art.* Baltimore.

Marrou, H.J. (1956), *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Madison [trans. G. Lamb: French original 1948].

Martin, R. (2003), 'The pipes are brawling: conceptualizing musical performance in Athens', in Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. eds., *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration* (Cambridge, 2003), 153–80.

Mastromarco, G. (1997), 'Vino triste e notte tempestosa in Asclepiade (*Anth. Pal.* 5.167)', in Degani, E., Gnoli, G., Mariotti, S. and Munzi, L. eds, *Mousa: scritti in onore di G. Morelli* (Bologna, 1997), 135-8.

Mastronarde, D.J. (2002), 'Euripidean tragedy and theology', *Seminari Romani di Cultura Classica* 5, 17-49.

Mathiesen, T.J. (1984), 'Harmonia and ethos in Greek music', *Journal of Musicology* 3, 264-279.

Matthews, V.J. (1996), *Antimachus of Colophon. Text and commentary.* Mnemosyne Supplement 155. Leiden.

Maxwell-Stuart, P.G. (1981), *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology*. Mnemosyne Supplement 65. Leiden.

McKay, K.J. (1962), *The Poet at Play: Kallimachus, The Bath of Pallas*. Mnemosyne Supplement 6. Leiden.

McMullin, R.M. (2001), 'Aspects of medizing: Themistocles, Simonides, and Timocreon of Rhodes', *CJ* 97, 55-67.

McPherran, M.L. (1999), *The Religion of Socrates*. University Park, PA.

Melfi, M.(2007*), I santuari di Asclepio in Grecia,* I. Rome.

Méndez Dosuna, Julián. 'The literary progeny of Sappho's fawns: Simias' Egg (AP 15.27.13-20) and Theocritus 30.18', *Mnemosyne* 61, 2008, 192-206.

Merkelbach, R. (1996), *Hestia und Erigone. Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Stuttgart; Leipzig.

Mette, H.J. (1935), 'Neoptolemus' *R.E*. 16, cols. 2465-70.

— (1981), 'Neoptolemus von Parion,' *RhM* 123 (1980), 1-24.

Metzger, H., Bougarel, A. and Bousquet, J. eds. (1992), *Fouilles de Xanthos*. IX: *La région nord du sanctuaire et les inscriptions gréco-lyciennes*. Paris.

Meusel, H. (1995), 'Dichterinnen der griechischen Anthologie – Grabepigramme der Erinna und Anyte', *AU* 38, 27-44.

Meyer, D. (2005), *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen. Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos*. Hermes Einzelschriften 93. Stuttgart.

Meyer, E.A. (1993), 'Epitaphs and Citizenship in Classical Athens,' *JHS* 113, 99-121.

Michelazzo Magrini, M. (1975), 'Una nuova linea interpretativa della *Conocchia* di Erinna', *Prometheus* 1, 225-36.

Michelini, A.N. (1987), *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition*. Madison.

Mikalson, J.D. (1983), *Athenian Popular Religion*. Chapel Hill; London.

— (1998), *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. London.

— (2010), *Ancient Greek Religion*. Oxford.

Millett, P. (1989), 'Patronage and its avoidance in classical Athens', in Wallace-Hadrill, A. ed. *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London; New York, 1989)*,* 15-62.

Moles, J.L. (1996), 'Cynic cosmopolitanism', in Branham and Goulet-Cazé eds. (1996), 105-120.

Molyneux, J.H. (1992), *Simonides: a Historical Study*. Wauconda, Il.

Montanari , O. (1983) *Archestrato di Gela*. I: *Testimonianze e frammenti*. Bologna.

— (1999), 'I pesci di pregio nella *Vita di delizie* di Archestrato di Gela', *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome, Antiquité* 11, 67-77.

Moreno P. (1964-1965), 'Il realismo nella pittura greca del iv secolo a.C.', *Rivista dell' Istituto d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte* 13-14, 27-98.

— (1987), *Vita e arte di Lisippo*. Milan.

— (1995), *Lisippo: L'arte e la fortuna*. Rome.

Morgan, K.A. (1994), 'Socrates and Gorgias at Delphi and Olympia: *Phaedrus* 235d6-236b4', *CQ* n.s. 44.2, 375-386.

— (2003), 'The tyranny of the audience in Plato and Isocrates', in Morgan, K.A. ed., *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece* (Austin, 2003), 181-213.

— (2004), 'The education of Athens: politics and rhetoric in Isocrates and Plato', in Poulakos and Depew eds. (2004), 125-154.

Morgan, T.J. (1998), *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds.* Cambridge.

— (1999), 'Literate education in classical Athens', *CQ* n.s. 49, 46-61.

Morris, I. (1987), *Burial and Ancient Society*. Cambridge.

— (1989), 'Attitudes toward death in archaic Greece', *CA* 8 (1989), 296-320.

— (1992), *Death, Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge.

— (1992-3), 'Law, culture and funerary art in Athens, 600-300 B.C.', *Hephaistos* 11/12 (1992-3), 35-50.

Morrison, A.D. (2007), *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry.* Cambridge.

Morrison, J.V. (2004), 'Memory, time, and writing: oral and literary aspects of Thucydides' history', in Mackie ed. (2004), 95-116.

Muir J.V. (2001), *Alcidamas: The Works and Fragments.* Bristol.

Murray, G. (1910), 'The Hymn of the Kouretes', *BSA* 15, 357–365.

— (1955), *The Five Stages of Greek Religion.* Garden City, NY (3rd ed.).

Murray, J. and Rowland, J.M. (2007), 'Gendered voices in Hellenistic epigram', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 211-32.

Murray, P. and Wilson, P.J. eds. (2004), *Music and the Muses: The Culture of 'Mousike' in the Classical Athenian City*. Oxford.

Müseler, E. (1994), *Die Kynikerbriefe* (2 vols). Reihe.

Nagy, G. (1989), 'Early Greek views of poets and poetry', in G. Kennedy ed. *Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* I (Cambridge, 1989), 1-77.

— (1990), *Pindar's Homer: the Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.

— (1996), *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond.* Cambridge.

Naiden, F. (2005), '*Hiketai* and *theōroi* at Epidauros', in Elsner and Rutherford eds. (2005), 73-96.

Navia, L.E. (2001), *Antisthenes of Athens: Setting the World Aright.*

Neils, J. and Oakley, J.H. (2003), *Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images of Childhood from the Classical Past.* New Haven.

Neri, C. (2003), *Erinna. Testimonianze e Frammenti.* Bologna.

Nesselrath, H.G.(1985), *Lukians Parasitendialog.* Berlin; New York.

— (1990), *Die attische mittlere Komödie: Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte.* Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte vol. 36. Berlin

— (1993), 'Parody and later Greek comedy', *HSCP* 95, 181-195.

— (1995), 'Myth, parody, and comic plots: the birth of gods and Middle Comedy," in Dobrov ed. (1995), 1-27.

Neubecker, A.J. (1986), *Philodemus: Über die Musik IV. Buch*. Naples.

Neumann, G. (1979), *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*. Vienna.

Neumann-Hartmann, A. (2004), 'Der Paian des Philodamos an Dionysos und der Ausbruch des 4. Heiligen Krieges', *MH* 61, 9-31.

Newby, Z. (2007), 'Introduction', in Newby and Leader-Newby eds. (2007), 1-18.

Newby, Z. and Leader-Newby, R.E. eds. (2007), *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World.* Cambridge.

Nielsen, T. H., Bjertrup, L., Hansen, M. H., Rubenstein, L. and Vestergaard, T. (1989), 'Athenian grave monuments and social class,' *GRBS* 30, 411-20.

Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. (1978), *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes *Book II.* Oxford

Norden, E. (1913), *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religioser Rede*. Leipzig.

Noussia, M. (2001), 'Solon's symposium (frs. 32-4 and 36 Gentili-Prato^2 = 38-40 and 41 West^2', *CQ* n.s. 51, 353-359.

— (2006), 'The fragments of Cynic tragedy', in Harder et al. eds. (2006), 229-248.

Oakley, J.H. (2004), *Picturing Death in Classical Athens: the Evidence of the White Lekythoi*. Cambridge.

— (2009), 'Children in Athenian funerary art during the Peloponnesian War', in Palagia ed. (2009), 207-235.

Obbink, D. (2004), '*Tropoi* (Posidippus AB 102-103)', in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 292-301.

Obbink, D. ed. (1995), *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace.* Oxford.

Ober, J. (2001), 'The debate over civic education in classical Athens' in Too ed. (2001), 273-305.

Ogden, D. ed. (2007), *The Blackwell Companion to Greek Religion.* Oxford.

Oliver, G. (2000), 'Athenian funerary monuments: style, grandeur and cost,' in Oliver, G. ed. *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome* (Liverpool, 2000), 59-78.

Oliver, J.H. (1940), 'Paeanistae', *TAPA* 71, 302-314.

— (1936), 'The Sarapion Monument and the Paean of Sophocles', *Hesperia* 5, 91-122.

Oliver, J.H. and Maas, P. (1939), 'An ancient poem on the duties of a physician', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 7, 315-323.

Olivieri, A. (1939), 'Il comico Alessi di Thurii'. *Dioniso*, 7: 279–95

Olson, D. and Sens, A. (1999), *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE. Text, Translation, and Commentary.* New York; Atlanta.

— (2000), *Archestratus of Gela. Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE. Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford.

Ong, W. (1982), *Orality and Literacy. The Technologizing of the Word.* New York.

Osborne, R. (1985), *Demos: the Discovery of Classical Attika*. Cambridge.

— (1998), *Archaic and Classical Greek Art*. Oxford.

Osborne, R. ed. (2007), *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy, and Politics 430-380 BC.* Oxford.

Ostwald, M. and Lynch, J.P. (1994), 'The growth of schools and the advance of knowledge', in Lewis et al. eds. (1994), 592-633.

Pachis, P. (2003), 'Manufacturing religion in the Hellenistic age: the case of the Isis-Demeter cult', in Martin, L. and Pachis, P. eds. *Hellenisation, Empire and Globalisation: Lessons from Antiquity* (Bergen, 2003), 163-207.

Page, D.L. (1962), *Poetae Melici Graeci: Alcmanis, Stesichori, Ibyci, Anacreontis, Simonidis, Corinnae, poetarum minorum reliquias, carmina popularia et convivialia quaeque adespota feruntur*. Oxford.

— (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams: Epigrams before A.D. 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources, not included in Hellenistic Epigrams or The Garland of Philip*. Cambridge.

Pakkanen, P. (1996), *Interpreting Early Hellenistic Religion. A Study Based on the Mystery Cult of Demeter and the Cult of Isis*. Helsinki.

Palagia, O. (1999), 'Hephaistion's pyre and the royal hunt of Alexander', in Bosworth, A.B. and Baynham, E. eds., *Alexander the Great: Fact and Fiction* (Oxford, 1999), 167-206.

— (2009), 'Archaism and the quest for immortality in Attic sculpture during the Peloponnesian War', in Palagia ed. (2009), 24-51.

Palagia, O. ed. (2009), *Art in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*. Cambridge.

Panagl, O. (1969), 'Stationen hellenischer Religiosität am Beispiel des delphischen Sukzessionsmythos', *Kairos* 11, 161-171.

— (1970), 'Apollons Pythonkampf und die delphische Orakelgründung im Spiegel antiker Mythenkritik', *Kairos* 12, 31-41.

Parker, L.P.E. (2001), '*Consilium et ratio*: papyrus A of Bacchylides and Alexandrian metrical scholarship' *CQ* n.s. 51, 23-52.

Parker, R. (1996), *Athenian Religion: a History*. Oxford.

— (2000), 'The trial of Socrates: and a religious crisis?', in Smith, N.D. and Woodruff, P.B. eds. *Reason and Religion in Socratic Philosophy* (Oxford, 2000), 40-54.

— (2005), *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford.

Parsons, P.J. (1993), 'Identities in diversity', in Bulloch, A. W., Gruen, E.S., Long, A.A. and Stewart, A. eds. *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley, 1993), 152-171.

Peek, W. (1958), 'Ein delphisches Weihgedicht', *Philologus* 102, 43-59.

— (1961), 'Zur Löwenjagd des Krateros', *Philologus* 105, 297-298.

— (1968), 'Grabgedichte aus Myrrhinus', *Maia* 20, 366-372.

Pellizer, E. and Tedeschi, G. eds. (1983), 'Poesia conviviale in un papiro di Elefantina. Edizione critica e commento', *QFC* 4, 5-23.

Pemberton, E.G. (1989), 'The Dexiosis on Attic Gravestones', *Medit. Arch.* 2, 45-50.

Perale, M. (2010), '*Il. Parv.* fr. 21 Bernabé e la *Gorgo* di Simia di Rodi', in Cingano, E. ed., *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia in Grecia*. *Edizioni dell'Orso* (Alessandria, 2010), 497-518.

— (forthcoming), 'Simia e la testa del Sole: fr. 4 Powell', *Eikasmos* 22.

Perdrizet, P. (1899), 'Venatio Alexandri', *JHS* 19, 273-279.

Perkins, I. (1992), *Is Literary History Possible?* Baltimore; London.

Perlman, P. (1995), '*Invocatio* and *Imprecatio*: the hymn of the Greatest Kouros from Palaikastro and the oath in ancient Crete', *JHS* 115, 161–167.

Perlman, S. (1964), 'Quotations from poetry in Attic orators of the fourth century BC', *AJP* 85, 155-72.

Pernigotti, C. and Maltomini, F. (2002), 'Morfologie ed impieghi delle raccolte simposiali: lineamenti di storia di una tipologia libraria antica', *MD* 49, 53-84.

Petrovic, A. (2007a) *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften.* Leiden and Boston.

— (2007b) 'Inscribed epigram in pre-Hellenistic literary sources', in P. Bing and J. Bruss eds. *Brill Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden, 2007), 49-68.

— (2009), 'Epigrammatic contests, poeti vaganti and local history', in Hunter and Rutherford eds. (2009), 195-218.

— (2010), 'True lies of Athenian public epigrams', in Baumbach et al. eds. (2010), 202-216.

Pfeiffer, I.L. (1999), *First Person Futures in Pindar.* Hermes Einzelschriften 81. Stuttgart.

— (2005), 'Propaganda in Pindar's first Pythian ode' in Enenkel, K..A.E. and Pfeijffer, I.L. eds., *The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity: A Collection of Case Studies.* Mnemosyne Supplement 261 (Leiden, 2005), 13-42.

Pfeiffer, R. (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.

Pfeiffer, S. (2008), The god Serapis, his cult and the beginnings of the ruler cult in Ptolemaic Egypt', in McKechnie, P. and Guillaume, P. eds. *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World.* Mnemosyne Supplement 300 (Leiden, 2008), 387-408.

Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. (1988), *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (2nd ed. rev. by J. Gould and D.M. Lewis). Oxford.

Pöhlmann, E. and M.L. West (2001), *Documents of Ancient Greek Music: The Extant Melodies and Fragments*. Oxford.

Pollitt, J.J. (1965), 'The Egyptian gods in Attica', *Hesperia* 34, 125-130.

— (1972), *Art and Experience in Classical Greece*. Cambridge.

— (1974), *The Ancient View of Greek Art: Criticism, History and Terminology*. New Haven.

— (1986), *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge.

— (1994), 'Greek art: classical to Hellenistic', in Lewis et al. eds. (1994), 647-660.

Pomeroy, S.B. (1978), 'Supplementary notes on Erinna', *ZPE* 32, 17-22.

Pordomingo Pardo, F. (1984), 'El peán de Macedónico a Apolo y a Asclepio, un nuevo hallazgo epigráfico', *Corolla Londiniensis* 4, 101-129.

Porter, J.I. (2007), 'Lasus of Hermione, Pindar and the riddle of *S*', *CQ* n.s.57, 1-21.

Potter, D. (2003), 'Hellenistic religion', in Erskine ed. (2003), 408-430.

Poulakos, J. (2004), 'Rhetoric and civic education: from the sophists to Isocrates', in Poulakos and Depew eds. (2004), 69-83.

Poulakos, T. (1997), *Speaking for the Polis: Isocrates' Rhetorical Education*. Columbia, SC.

Poulakos, T. and Depew, D. eds. (2004), *Isocrates and Civic Education*. Austin, Texas.

Powell, B.P. (1991), *Homer and the origin of the Greek alphabet*. Cambridge.

Powell, J.U. (1921), 'Hymn to the Idaean Dactyls', in Powell, J.U. and Barber, E.A. eds., *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature* (Oxford, 1921: repr. 1974), 49-51.

— (1933), *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Third Series. Some Recent Discoveries in Greek Poetry and Prose of the Classical and Later Periods.* Oxford.

Power, T. (2001), *Legitimating the* Nomos*: Timotheus' Persae in Athens.* Diss., Harvard.

— (2010), *The Culture of Kitharoidia*. Cambridge, MA.

— (forthcoming), "*Kyklôps kitharôidos*: dithyramb and *kitharôidia* in play', in Kowalzig and Wilson eds. (forthcoming).

Pownall, F. (2006), *Lessons from the Past. The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose*. Ann Arbor.

Pratt, L. (1995), 'The seal of Theognis, writing, and oral poetry', *AJP* 116, 171-184.

Prauscello, L. (2009), 'Wandering musicians, "travelling" music. Timotheus' muse and some case-studies of shifting cultural identities', in Hunter and Rutherford eds. (2009), 168-194.

— (forthcoming), '"Epinician sounds" and their reception: Pindar and musical innovation', in Agocs, P., Carey, C. and Rawles, R. eds. *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge).

Preisendanz, C. (1911). *Anthologia Palatina. Codex Palatinus et Codex Parisinus phototypice editi*. Leyden.

Press, G.A. ed. (2000), *Who Speaks for Plato? Studies in Platonic Anonymity*. Lanham.

Pretagostini, R. (1993), 'Vicende di una allegoria equestre: da Anacreonte (e Teognide) ad Asclepiade', in Pretagostini, R. ed. *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all' età ellenistica* (Rome, 1993), 959-69.

Pretagostini, R. ed. (2000), *La letteratura ellenistica. Problemi e prospettive di ricerca. Atti del colloquio internazionale, Università di Roma "Tor Vergata", 29-30 aprile 1997*. Rome.

Prier, R.A. (1994), 'And who is the woof? Response, ecphrasis and the "Egg" of Simmias', *QUCC* 46, 79-92.

Prioux, É. (2007), *Regards alexandrins: histoire et théorie des arts dans l'épigramme hellénistique*. Leuven.

Pritchett, W.K. (1938), 'A new fragment of the Sarapion monument', *AJP* 59, 343-5.

Pritzl, K. (1983), 'Aristotle and happiness after death: Nicomachean Ethics 1.10-11', *CP* 78, 101-111.

Puelma, M. (1996), 'Epigramma: osservazioni sulla storia di. un termine greco-latino', *Maia* 49, 189–213

Pulleyn, S. (1997), *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford.

Race, W.H. (1987), 'Pindaric encomium and Isokrates' *Evagoras*' *TAPA* 117, 131-155.

Rademaker, A. (2005), *Sophrosyne and the Rhetoric of Self-Restraint: Polysemy and Persuasive Use of an Ancient Greek Value Term.* Mnemosyne Supplement 259. Leiden.

Rainer, B. L. (1975). 'Philodamus' *Paean to Dionysus*: a literary expression of Delphic propaganda,' Diss. University of Illinois.

Rankin, H.D. (1986), *Anthisthenes Sokratikos*. Amsterdam.

Rau, P. (1967), *Paratragodia. Untersuchungen einer komischen Form des Aristphanes*. München.

Raubitschek, A.E. (1949), *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*; *A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.* Cambridge, MA.

— (1968), 'Das Denkmal-Epigramm', in Dihle et al. eds. (1968), 1-26.

Rauk, J. (1989), 'Erinna's Distaff and Sappho fr. 94', *GRBS* 30, 101-16.

Rayor, D.J. (2005), 'The power of memory in Erinna and Sappho', in Greene ed. (2005), 59-71.

Rehm, R. (1994), *Marriage to Death. The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton.

Reitzenstein, R. (1893), *Epigramm und Skolion*. Giessen.

— (1907), 'Epigramm', *RE* 6, cols. 71-111.

Renehan, R. 1982), 'Aristotle as lyric poet. The Hermias poem', *GRBS* 23, 251-274.

— (1991), 'Aristotle's elegiacs to Eudemus', *ICS* 16, 255-67

Restani, D. (1983) 'Il Chirone di Ferecrate e la "nuova" musica greca', *Rivista Ital. di Musicologia* 18, 139–92,

Revermann, M. (2006), 'The competence of theatre audiences in fifth- and fourth-century Athens', *JHS* 126, 99-124.

Revermann, M. and Wilson, P.J. eds. (2008), *Performance, Iconography, and Reception. Essays in Honour of Oliver Taplin*. Oxford.

Rhodes, P.J. (1990) 'The Atthidographers', in Verdin, H., Schepens, G., de Keyer, E. eds. *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.* Studia Hellenistica 30 (Leuven, 1990), 73-81, 111-23.

Rhodes, P.J. and Osborne, R. (2003), *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC*. Oxford.

Ridgway, B.S. (1990), *Hellenistic Sculpture: The Styles ca. 331-200 BC*. Madison, Wi.

— (1993a), 'Painterly and pictorial art in Greek relief sculpture' in W.G. Moon ed. *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (Madison, Wi, 1993), 193-208.

— (1993b), *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*. Chicago (2d ed.).

— (1997), *Fourth-Century Styles in Greek Sculpture*. Madison, Wi.

Riethmüller, J.W. (2005), *Asklepios: Heiligtümer und Kulte. Studien zu antiken Heiligtümern* (2 vols). Heidelberg.

Rispoli, G.M. (1969), *Il primo libro del* Peri mousikēs *di Filodemo*. Naples.

Robb, K. (1994), *Literacy and* Paideia *in Ancient Greece*. New York.

Robbins, E. (1997), 'Public poetry', in Gerber, D.E. ed. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Mnemosyne Supplement 173 (Leiden, 1997), 221-288.

Robert, L. (1978), 'Les conquêtes du dynaste lycien Arbinas', *Journal des Savants* 197, 3-48.

Robertson, M. (1967), 'Conjectures in Polygnotus' Troy', *BSA* 62, 6-10.

— (1975) *A History of Greek Art* (2 vols.). Cambridge.

— (1981), *A Shorter History of Greek Art*. Cambridge

— (1993), 'What is Hellenistic about Hellenistic art?', in Green, P. ed. (1993), *Hellenistic Culture and Heritage* (Berkeley/London, 1993), 2-90.

Robinson, T. (1999), 'Erbinna, the 'Nereids' monument, and Xanthus', in Tsetskhladze, G.R. ed., *Ancient Greeks West and East* (Leiden; Boston; Köln, 1999), 361-378.

Romeri (2002), 'Platon e la tradition conviviale', *REA* 104, 51–9.

— (2000), 'The *Logodeipnon*. Athenaeus between banquet and anti-banquet', in Braund and Wilkins eds. (2000), 256-271

Rosati, G. (1999), 'Form in motion: weaving the text in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', in Hardie, P. Barchiesi, A. and Hinds, S. eds. *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the* Metamorphoses *and its Reception.* PCPS Supplement 23 (Cambridge, 1999), 241-53.

Rose, M.A. (1993), *Parody, Ancient, Modern and Post-Modern*. Cambridge; New York.

Rosen, R.M. (1988), *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition.* Atalanta.

Rosenmeyer, P. (1992), *The Poetics of Imitation. Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*. Cambridge.

Roskam, G. (2006), 'Philoxenus of Leucas again', *CQ* n.s. 56, 652-656.

Rossi, L. (2001) *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach.* Leiden.

Rossi, L.E. (1971), 'I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte nelle letterature classiche', *BICS* 18, 69-94.

Rothwell, K.S., Jr. (1995), 'The continuity of the chorus in fourth-century Attic comedy', in Dobrov ed. (1995), 98-118.

Roussel, P. (1913) *Les Cultes égyptiens à Delos du iiiau i siècle av. J.-C.* Nancy.

Rumpf, A. (1951), 'Parrhasios', *AJA* 55, 1-12.

— (1947), 'Classical and post-classical Greek painting', *JHS* 67, 10-21.

Rundin, J. (1996), 'The politics of eating: feasts in early Greek society', *AJP* 117.2, 179-215.

Runia D. T. (1986), 'Theocritus of Chios' epigram against Aristotle', *CQ* n.s. 36., 531-534.

Russell, D. (2005), *Plato on Pleasure and the Good Life*. Oxford.

Rutherford, I. (1990), 'Paeans by Simonides', *HSCP* 93, 169-209.

— (1991), 'Pindar *Paean* VIIIA, The "Cassandra" of Bacchylides and the Anonymous "Cassandra" in P.Oxy.2368: An Exploration in Lyric Structure', *Eos* 79, 5-12

— (1993), 'Paeanic Ambiguity. A Study of the Representation of the Paean in Greek Literature', *QUCC* 44, 77-92.

— (1994-5), 'Apollo in Ivy: Paeans in Tragedy', *Arion* 3, 112-35.

— (1995a), 'Apollo's other genre. Proclus on *nomos* and his source', *CP* 90, 354-61.

— (1995b), '*Et hominum et deorum . . . laudes* (?). A hypothesis about the organisation of Pindar's paean-book', *ZPE* 107, 44-52.

— (2000), '*Theōria* and *darsán*: pilgrimage and vision in Greece and India', *CQ* n.s. 50, 133-146.

— (2001), *Pindar's* Paeans. *A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.

— (2002), 'Theoria', *Der Neue Pauly*, 12/1 (Stuttgart, 2002), 398–400.

— (2004), '*χορὸς εἷς ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως* (Xen. Mem. 3.3.12): song-dance and state-pilgrimage at Athens', in P. Murray and P. Wilson eds. *Music and the Muses - The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford, 2004), 67-90.

— (2010), 'Canonizing the pantheon: the Dodekatheon in Greek religion and its origins', in Bremer, J.M. and Erskine, A. eds. *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations* (Edinburgh, 2010), 43-54.

Salvioni, L. (1979/80), 'Qualche definizione di procedimenti parodici desunta dal Banchetto attico di Matrone', *Bollettino dell' Istituto di Filologia greca dell' Università di Padova* 5, 21-9.

Sanders, L.J. (1987), *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny*. London.

Sbardella, L. (2000a), "'Bittida … thoên." Il problema dell'elegia erotica in Filita', in Pretagonisti ed. (2000), 79-89.

—(2000b), *Filita. Testimonianze e frammenti poetici. Introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commento.* Roma

Schade, G. (1998), 'Ennius und Archestratus', *Philologus* 142, 275-8.

Scheer, E. (1881-95), *Lycophronis Alexandra.* Berlin.

Scheid, J. and Svenbro, J. (1996), *The Craft of Zeus: Myths of Weaving and Fabric.* Cambridge, MA; London.

Scheidel, W. (2004), 'Creating a metropolis: a comparative demographic perspective', in Harris and Ruffini eds. (2004), 1-31.

Schmaltz, B. (1970), *Untersuchungen zu den attischen Marmorlekythen.* Berlin.

Schmidt, J-U. (1986), *Adressat und Prainesiform. Zur Intention von Hesiods "Werken und. Tagen" Hypomnemata 86*. Gottingen.

Schmidt, S. (2007), 'Fashion and meaning: beardless portraits of artists and literati in the early Hellenistic period' in Schultz and von den Hoff eds. (2007), 99–112.

Schmitter, P. (1975), 'Compulsory schooling at Athens and Rome? A contribution to the history of Hellenistic education', *AJP* 96, 276-289.

Schmitz, T. (2010a), 'Speaker and addressee in early Greek epigram', in Baumbach et al. eds. (2010), 25–41.

— (2010b), 'Epigrammatic communication in Callimachus' epigrams', *GRBS* 50, 370-390.

Scholl, A. (1996), *Die attischen Bildfeldstelen des 4. Jhs. v. Chr. Untersuchungen zu den kleinformatigen Grabreliefs im spätklassischen Athen.* Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung. Beiheft 17. Berlin

Scholten, J.B. (2000), *The Politics of Plunder: Aitolians and their Koinon in the Early Hellenistic Era*. Berkeley; London.

Scholz, U.W. (1973), 'Erinna', *A&A* 18, 15-40.

Schröder, S. (1999), *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian*. Stuttgart, Leipzig.

— (2004), 'Skeptische Überlegungen zum Mailänder Epigrammpapyrus,' *ZPE* 148, 29-73.

Schultz, P. (2007), 'Leochares' Argead portraits in the Philippeion,' in Schultz and von den Hoff eds. (2007), 205-233.

Schultz, P. and von den Hoff, R. (2007), 'Early Hellenistic portraiture: an introduction', in Schultz and von den Hoff eds. (2007), 1-9.

Schultz, P. and von den Hoff, R. eds. (2007), *Early Hellenistic Praiture: Image, Style, Context*. Cambridge.

Schur, D. (2004), "A garland of stones: Hellenistic *lithika* as reflections on poetic transformations', in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 118-122.

Scodel, R. (2007), 'Lycurgus and the tragic canon', in Cooper ed. (2007), 129-154.

Scott, K. (1928), 'The deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes', *AJP* 49, 228-239.

Scott, M. (2010), *Delphi and Olympia: The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Cambridge.

Scullion, J.S. (2005), '"Pilgrimage" and Greek religion: sacred and secular in the pagan *polis*', in Elsner and Rutherford eds. (2005), 111-130.

Seaford, R. (1977-8), 'The "hyporchema" of Pratinas', *Maia* 29-30, 84-94.

Segal, C. (1982), *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides'* Bacchae. Princeton.

— (1985), 'Choral lyric in the fifth century', in Knox and Easterling eds. (1985), 181-203.

Seidensticker, B. (2002), 'Wie die Tragiker zu Klassikern wurden', in *Die griechische Klassik. Idee oder Wirklichkeit: eine Ausstellung im Martin-Gropius-Bau.* (Berlin, 2002), 526-9.

Selden, D. (1994), 'Genre of genre', in Tatum, J. ed. *The search for the ancient novel* (Baltimore, 1994), 39-64.

— (1998), 'Alibis', *CA* 17, 289-412.

Sens, A. (2005), 'The art of poetry and the poetry of art: the unity and poetics of Posidippus' statue-poems', in Gutzwiller ed. (2005), 206-228.

— (2006), 'Epigram at the Margins of Pastoral,' in Fantuzzi, M. and Papanghelis, T. eds. *A Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral* (Leiden, 2006), 147-166.

— (2011), *Asclepiades of Samos. Epigrams and Fragments*. Oxford.

Serrao, G. (1979), 'La struttura della *Lide* di Antimaco e la critica callimachea', *QUCC* 32, 91-8.

Serwint, N.J. (1987), *Greek Athletic Sculpture from the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC.* Diss., Princeton.

Shapiro, H.A. (1993), *Personifications in Greek Art: the Representation of Abstract Concepts 600-400 BC.* Zurich.

— (1991), 'The iconography of mourning in Athenian art', *AJA* 95.4, 629-656.

Shero, L.R. (1929), 'Lucilius' *cena rustica*', *AJP* 50, 64-71.

Shipley, G. (1999), *The Greek World after Alexander, 323-30 BC.* London; New York.

Sider, D. (2005), 'Posidippus on weather signs and the tradition of didactic poetry', in Gutzwiller ed. (2005), 164-82.

— (2007), 'Sylloge Simonidea', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 113-28.

Sifakis, G.M. (1971), 'The comic chorus in the fourth century', *AJP* 92, 410-32.

— (1963), 'High stage and chorus in Hellenistic theatre', *BICS* 10, 31-45.

Sineux, P. (1999), 'Le *Péan* d'Isyllos: form et finalitées d'un chant religieux dans le culte d'Asklepios à Epidaure', *Kernos* 12, 153–166.

Sistakou, E. (2007), 'Glossing Homer: Homeric exegesis in early third-century epigram', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 391-408.

Skinner, M.B. (1982), 'Briseis, the Trojan women, and Erinna', *CW* 75, 273-99.

— (1991), 'Nossis Thēlyglōssos: the private text and the public book', in Pomeroy, S. B. ed. *Women's History and Ancient History* (Chapel Hill), 20-47.

Slater, W.J. (1996), 'Literacy and Old Comedy', in Worthington ed. (1996), 99-114.

— (2002), 'Dancing the alphabet: performative literacy on the Attic stage', in Worthington and Foley eds. (2002), 117-129.

Smith, D.E. (1977) 'The Egyptian cults at Corinth', *HThR* 70, 201-231

Smith, M.(2004), 'Elusive stones: reading Posidippus *lithika* through technical writing on stones', in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 105-117.

Smith, R.R.R. (1991), *Hellenistic Sculpture. A Handbook*. London.

— (2007), *'Pindar,* athletes, and the early Greek *statue* habit', in Hornblower and Morgan eds. (2007), 83–139.

Snyder, J.M. (1989), *The Woman and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome*. Carbondale.

Sobel, H. (1990), *Hygieia: Die Göttin der Gesundheit*. Darmstadt.

Sokolowski, F. (1955), *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*. Paris.

— (1936), 'Sur le péan de Philodamos', *BCH* 60, 135-143.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1995), *Reading Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford.

— (2003), *Tragedy and Athenian Religion*. Lanham, MD.

Spanoudakis, K. (2002), *Philitas of Cos*. Leiden.

—(2001), 'Poets and Telchines in Callimachus' Aitia-Prologue', *Mnemosyne* 54, 425-41.

Stafford, E. (2001) *Worshipping Virtues. Personification and the Divine in Ancient Greece*. London.

— (2007), 'Personification in Greek religious thought and practice', in Ogden ed. (2007), 71-85.

Stafford, E. and Herrin, J. eds. (2005), *Personification in the Greek World: from Antiquity to Byzantium*. Aldershot.

Stager, J.M.S. (2005), 'Let no one wonder at this image: a Phoenician funerary stele in Athens', *Hesperia* 74, 427-449'.

Stamotopoulou, M. (2007), 'Thessalian aristocracy and society in the age of epinikian', in Hornblower and Morgan eds. (2007), 309-342.

Stanzel, K-H. (2007), 'Bucolic epigram', in Bing and Bruss eds. (2007), 333-351.

Stears, K. (1993), *Women and the family in the funerary ritual and art of classical Athens*. Diss,. King's College, London.

— (1995), 'Dead women's society: constructing female gender in Classical Athenian funerary sculpture', in Spencer, N. ed., *Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology. Bridging the "Great Divide"* (New York, 1995), 109-131.

— (2000a), 'Losing the picture: change and continuity in Athenian grave monuments of the fourth and third centuries BC', in Rutter, N.K. and Sparkes, B.A. eds., *Word and Image in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh, 2000), 206-227.

— (2000b) 'The times they are a'changin': developments in fifth-century funerary sculpture' in Oliver, G.J. ed. *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome* (Liverpool), 25-58.

— (2008), 'Death becomes her: gender and Athenian death ritual', in Suter ed. (2008), 181-199.

Stehle, E. (1997), *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece. Non-Dramatic Poetry and its Setting.* Princeton.

— (2001), The good daughter: mothers' tutelage in Erinna's *Distaff* and fourth-century epitaphs', in Lardinois, A. and McClure, L. eds., *Making Silence Speak. Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (Princeton, 2001), 179-200.

Steiner, D.T. (1998), 'Moving images: fifth-century victory monuments and the athlete's allure' *CA* 17, 123-150.

— (1999), 'To praise, not to bury: Simonides fr. 531P', *CQ* 49, 383-395.

— (2002), 'Indecorous dining, indecorous speech: Pindar's first *Olympian* and the poetics of consumption', *Arethusa* 35 (2002), 297-314.

Stephens, S.A. (2003), *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria.* Berkeley.

— (2004), 'Posidippus's poetry book: where Macedon meets Egypt', in Harris and Ruffini eds. (2004), 63-86.

Stewart, A.F. (1979), *Attika: Studies in Athenian Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*. London.

— (1982), 'Dionysus at Delphi: the pediments of the sixth temple of Apollo and religious reform in the age of Alexander", in Barr-Sharrar, B. and Borza, E. N. eds. *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times. Studies in the History of Art 10* (Washington, 1982), 205-227.

— (1990), *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration*. New Haven, London.

— (1993), *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*. Berkeley, London.

— (2005), 'Poseidippos and the Truth in Sculpture', in Gutzwiller ed. (2005), 183-205.

— (2006), 'Hellenistic art: two dozen innovations', in Bugh, G.R. ed. (2006), *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge, 2006), 158-185.

— (2007), 'Alexander, Philitas, and the Skeletos: Poseidippos and truth in early Hellenistic portraiture', in Schultz and von den Hoff eds. (2007), 123-138.

Stichel, R.H.W. (1992), '*Columella-Mensa-Labellum:* zur Form der attischen Grabmäler im Luxusgesetz des Demetrios von Phaleron', *AA*, 433-440.

Stiehl, R. (1963), 'The origin of the cult of Sarapis', *History of Religions* 3, 21-33.

Storey, I.C. (1995), 'Philoxenus... of doubtful gender', *JHS* 115, 182-4.

Strauss, B.S. (1986), *Athens after the Peloponnesian War.* Ithaca.

Strauss, L. (1974), 'Preliminary observations on the gods in Thucydides work', *Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy* 4, 1-16.

Strodel, S. (2002), *Zur Überlieferung und zum Verständnis der hellenistischen Technopaignien.* Studien zur klassischen Philologie 132. Bern; Frankfurt.

Strootman, R. (2010), 'Literature and the kings', in Clauss and Cuypers eds. (2010), 30-45.

Stupperich, R. (1994), 'The Iconography of Athenian state burials in the classical period', in Coulson, W.D.E., Palagia, O., Shear Jr., T.L., Shapiro, H.A. and Frost, F.J. eds. *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica Under the Democracy* (Oxford, 1994), 93 – 103.

Suter, A. (2008), 'Male lament in Greek tragedy', in Suter ed. (2008), 156-180.

Suter, A. ed. (2008), *Lament: Studies in the Mediterranean and Beyond*. Oxford.

Sutton, D. E (1983), 'Dithyramb as δρᾶμα: Philoxenos of Cythera's *Cyclops* or *Galateia*', *QUCC* 13, 37-43.

— (1989), *Dithyrambographi Graeci.* Hildesheim.

Sutton, D.F. (1974), 'Father Silenus: actor or coryphaeus?' *CQ* n.s. 24, 19-23.

Svenbro, J. (1988), *Phrasikleia. Anthropologie de la lecture en Grèce ancienne*. Paris.

Swift, L. (2010), *Hidden Choruses. Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric.* Oxford.

Taplin, O. (1993), C*omic Angels – and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase-Painting.* Oxford.

— (1999), 'Spreading the word through performance', in Goldhill and Osborne eds. (1999), 33-57.

— (2007), *Pots and Plays. Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century B.C.* Oxford.

Tarán, S.L. (1979), *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Tcherikover, V. (1958), 'The ideology of the *Letter of Aristeas*', *HTh*R 51, 59-85

Teloh, H. (1986), *Socratic Education in Plato's Early Dialogues*. Notre Dame, IN.

Theiler, W. (1966), 'Plato und Eudem', *MH* 23, 192-193.

Thémélis, P. (1979) 'Contribution à l'étude de l'ex-voto delphique de Daochos', *BCH* 103, 507-520.

Thom, J.C. (2005) *Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Tübingen.

Thomas, C.G. and Webb, E.K. (1994), 'From orality to rhetoric: an intellectual transformation', in Worthington, I. ed (1994), *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (London, 1994), 3-25.

Thomas, R. (1992), *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.

— (2003), 'Prose performance texts: *epideixis* and written publication in the late fifth and fourth centuries', in Yunis ed. (2003), 162-188.

— (2004), 'Drowned in the tide: the *nauagika* and some problems in Augustan poetry', in Acosta-Hughes et al. eds. (2004), 259-275.

Thompson, D. (1947), *A Glossary of Greek Fishes*. London.

Tod, M. N. (1946), *Historical Greek Inscriptions.* Oxford.

Todisco, L. (1993), *Scultura greca del IV secolo: maestri e scuole di statuaria tra classicità ed ellenismo.* Milan.

Toher, M. (1991), 'Greek funeral legislation and the two Spartan funerals', in Flower, M.A. and Toher, M. eds., *Georgica* (London, 1991), 159-175.

Tomlinson, R. A. (1983) *Epidauros.* London, New York.

Too, Y.L. (1998), *The Idea of Ancient Literary Criticism*. Oxford.

Too, Y.L. ed. (2001), *Brill's Companion to Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Leiden.

Tore, G. (1995), 'L'art: Sarcophages, relief, stèles', in Krings, V. ed. *La Civilisation phenicienne et punique: Manuel de recherche* (New York, 1995), 473–492.

Tritle, L.A. (1997), 'Introduction', in Tritle ed. (1997), 1-7.

Tritle, L.A. ed. (1997), *The Greek World in the Fourth Century: from the Fall of the Athenian Empire to the Successors of Alexander*. London; New York.

Tsagalis, C. (2008), *Inscribing Sorrow. Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams*. Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes 1. Berlin; New York.

Tsantsanoglou, K. (1973) 'The memoirs of a lady from Samos', *ZPE* 12,183-195.

Tsirivakos, E. (1972), 'Παρατηρήσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ μνημείου τοῦ Δαόχου', *Arch. Eph.*, 70-85.

Tueller, M.A. (2008), *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram*. Hellenistica Groningana 13. Leuven.

Turner, E.G. (1977) *Athenian Boks in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* London.

Tzifopoulos, I.Z. (1991), *Pausanias as a στηλοκοποίος. An epigraphical commentary of Pausanias' Ἠλιακῶν ᾱ and β̄*. Diss, Ohio State University.

Ucciardello, G. (1996-7), 'Riesame di P.Oxy. 2368: alcuni problemi di lettura e di interpretazione', *Analecta Papyrologica* 8-9, 61-88.

Umholtz, G. (2002), 'Architraval arrogance? Dedicatory inscriptions in Greek architecture of the classical period', *Hesperia* 71, 261–293.

Vallois, R. (1931), 'Les strophes mutilées du péan de Philodamos', *BCH* 55, 241-364.

Vamvouri Ruffy, M. (2004), *La Fabrique du divin: les hymnes de Callimaque à la Lumière des Hymnes Homériques et des Hymnes épigraphiques*. Liège.

Van Straten, F.T. (1976), 'Daikrates' *dream*: a votive relief from Kos, and some other *kat'onar* dedications', *BABesch* 51, 1-38.

— (1981), 'Gifts for the gods', in Versnel, H.S. ed., *Faith, Hope, and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*. Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 2 (Leiden, 1981), 65–151.

— (1992), 'Votives and votaries in Greek Sanctuaries,' in A. Schachter ed. *Le sanctuaire grec*. Entretiens Hardt 37 (Geneva, 1992), 247–289.

— (1995), *Hiera kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Leiden, New York, Köln.

Venit, M.S. (2002), *The Monumental Tombs of Ancient Alexandria: The Theater of the Dead*. New York.

Vestrheim, G. (2010), 'Voice in sepulchral epigrams: some remarks on the use of first and second person in sepulchral epigrams and a comparison with lyric poetry', in Baumbach et al. eds. (2010), 61-78.

Vermeule, E. (1979), *Aspects of Greek Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*. Berkeley.

Vollgraff, W. (1924), 'Le péan delphique à Dionysos', *BCH* 48, 97-208.

— (1925), 'Le péan delphique à Dionysos', *BCH* 49, 104-142.

von den Hoff, R. (2007), 'Naturalism and classicism: style and perception of early Hellenistic portraits', in Schultz and von den Hoff eds. (2007), 49-62.

Wagman, R.S. (1995), *Inni di Epidauro*. Pisa.

— (2000), *L'Inno epidaurico a Pan. Il culto di Pan a Epidauro*. Pisa.

— (2002), 'Pan diletto delle Naiadi ("IG" IV² 1, 130, 1-2)', *QUCC* 75, 145-150.

Wagner, C. (1997), *Dedication practices on the Athenian Acropolis : 8th to 4th centuries B.C.* Diss, Oxford.

Wallace, R.W. (1995), 'Speech, song and text, public and private. Evolutions in communications media and fora in fourth-century Athens', in Eder ed. (1995), 199-226.

— (2003), 'An early fifth-century Athenian revolution in aulos music', in *HSCP* 101, 73-92.

— (2004), 'Damon of Oa – a music theorist ostracized?' in Murray and Wilson eds. (2004), 249-268.

Walter, U. (2006), 'The classical age as a historical epoch', in Kinzl, K.H. ed., *A Companion to the Classical Greek World* (Oxford, 2006), 1-25.

Walters, K.R. (1983) 'Perikles' citizenship law,' *CA* 2, 614-336.

— (1980) 'Rhetoric as ritual: the semiotics of the Attic funeral oration,' *Florilegium* 2, 1-27.

Webster, T. B. L. (1956). *Art and Literature in Fourth Century Athens*. London.

Weil, H. (1895), 'Un péan delphique à Dionysos', *BCH* 19, 393-418.

— (1897), 'Un péan delphique à Dionysos', *BCH Suppl.* 21, 510-13.

West, M. L. (1965), 'The Dictaean Hymn to the Kouros', *JHS* 85, 149-159.

— (1970), 'Melica', *CQ* 20, 205-215.

— (1974), *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Oxford

— (1977), 'Erinna', *ZPE* 25, 95-119.

— (1982), *Greek Metre*. Oxford.

— (1983), *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford.

— (1985), *The Hesiodic* Catalogue of Women. Oxford.

— (1986), 'The singing of hexameters: the evidence from Epidaurus', *ZPE* 63, 39-46.

— (1993), *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford.

White, H. (2003), 'Six philological notes', *Myrtia* 18, 305-9.

Whitley, J. (2001) *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.

Whitmarsh, T. (2000), 'The politics and poetics of parasitism. Athenaeus on parasites and flatterers', in Braund and Wilkins eds. (2000), 304–15.

— (2005), 'The lexicon of love: Longus and Philetas grammatikos', *JHS* 125, 145-8.

Whitmore, C.E. (1918), 'Pastoral elements in Greek epigram', *CJ* 13.8, 616-620.

Wikkiser, B.L. (2008), *Asklepios, Medicine, and the Politics of Healing in Fifth-Century Greece: Between Craft and Cult*. Baltimore.

Wilamowitz, U. v. (1886), *Isyllos von Epidauros*. Berlin.

— (1899), 'Die griechischen Technopaegnia', *JDAI*, 51-9

— (1900), *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker*. Berlin.

— (1903), *Timotheos. Die Perser*. Leipzig.

— (1909), *Nordionische Steine*. Berlin.

— (1921), *Griechische Verskunst*. Berlin.

— (1923), 'Leserfrüchte', *Hermes* 58, 57-86

— (1924), *Hellenistische Dichtung* (2 vols.). Berlin.

Wilkins, J. (2000), *The Boastful Chef: the Discourse of Food in Ancient Greece*. Oxford.

Wilkins, J. and Hill, S. (1996), 'Mithaikos and other Greek cooks', in Walker, H. ed. *Cooks and other People: Proceedings of the Oxford Symposium on Food and Cookery 1995* (Totnes, 1996), 144-8.

— (1994), *Archestratus: the Life of Luxury: Europe's Oldest Cookery Book. Translated, with Introduction and Commentary*. Devon.

Wilkins, J., Harvey, D., and Dobson, M. eds (1995), *Food in Antiquity*. Exeter.

Wilkinson, L.P. (1938), 'Philodemus on ethos in music', *CQ* n.s. 32, 174–81.

Willi, A. (2000), *The Language of Aristophanes. Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*. Oxford.

Williams, F.J. (1978), *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo, a Commentary*. Oxford; New York.

Williams, M.F. (2005), 'The New Posidippus: realism in Hellenistic sculpture, Lysippus, and Aristotle's aesthetic theory (P. Mil.Vogl. VIII.309, Pos. X.7-XI.19 Bastianini = 62-70 AB)', *Leeds International Classical Studies* 4, 1-29.

Wilson, P.J. (2000), *The Athenian Institution of the 'Khoregia': the Chorus, the City and the Stage*. Cambridge.

— (2003), 'The politics of dance: dithyrambic contest and social order in ancient Greece', in Phillips, D. J. and Pritchard, D. eds. *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea,2003), 163–96.

— (2004) 'Athenian Strings', in Murray and Wilson eds. (2004), 269-306.

— (2007), 'Sicilian choruses', in Wilson ed. (2007), 351-377.

— (2008), 'Costing the Dionysia', in Revermann and Wilson eds. (2008), 88-127.

Wilson, P.J. ed., (2007), *The Greek Theatre and Festivals. Documentary Studies*. Oxford.

Wind, R. (1972), 'Myth and History in Bacchylides' Ode 18', *Hermes* 100, 511-523.

Winter, J.G. (1922), 'Some literary papyri in the University of Michigan collection', *TAPA* 53, 128-141.

Woerther, F. (2008), 'Music and the education of the soul in Plato and Aristotle: homoeopathy and the formation of character', *CQ* n.s. 58, 89-103.

Wojaczek, G. (1969), *Daphnis. Untersuchungen zur griechischen Bukolik*. Musenheim am Glan.

Woodbury, L. (1976), 'Aristophanes' *Frogs* and Athenian literacy: *Ran.* 52-53, 1114'. *TAPA* 106, 349-57.

Wormell, D.E.W. (1935), 'The Literary. Tradition concerning Hermias of Atarneus', *YCS* 5, 57-92.

Worthington, I. (1991), 'Greek oratory, revision of speeches, and the problem of historical reliability', *Class. et. Med.* 42, 55-74.

— (1996), 'Greek oratory and the oral/literate division', in Worthington ed. (1996), 165-178.

— (2003) *Alexander the Great. A Reader*. London; New York.

Worthington, I. and Foley, J.M. eds. (2002), 'Epea *and* Grammata*: Oral and Written Communication in Ancient Greece. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* IV. Mnemosyne Supplement 230. Leiden.

Worthington, I. ed. (1996), *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece.* Mnemosyne Supplement 157. Leiden.

Woysch-Méautis, D. (1982), *La Représentation des animaux et des êtres fabuleux sur les monuments funéraires grecs: de l'époque archaïque à la fin du IV^e s. avant J.C.* Lausanne.

Ypsilanti, M. (2003), 'Notes on Anyte', *Hermes* 131, 502-7.

Yunis, H. (2003a), 'Why written texts?', in Yunis ed. (2003), 1-14.

— (2003b), 'Writing for reading: Thucydides, Plato, and the emergence of the critical reader', in Yunis ed. (2003), 189-212.

Yunis, H. ed. (2003), *Written Texts and the Rise of the Literate Culture in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge.

Zaidman, L.B. (1995), 'Ritual eating in ancient Greece. Parasites and paredroi', in Wilkins, J. Harvey, D. and Dobson, M. eds., *Food in Antiquity* (Exeter, 1995), 196-203.

Zanker, G. (2004) *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art.* Madison.

— (1987), *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: a Literature and its Audience.* London.

Zanker, P. (1995), *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity.* Berkeley.

Zimmermann, B. (1992), *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung*. Gottingen.

— (1986) 'Überlegungen zum sogenannten Pratinas fragment', *MH* 43, 145-54.

Ziolkowski, J.E. (1981), *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens*. Salem, NH.