

Alexandros Kampakoglou

Exeter College

Studies in the Reception of Pindar in Hellenistic Poetry

*Dissertation submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Languages and
Literature at Oxford University*

Oxford
Trinity Term 2011

Kampakoglou Alexandros

“Studies in the Reception of Pindar in Hellenistic Poetry”

Exeter College

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Language and Literature at Oxford University in Trinity Term 2011

Abstract

This thesis examines the reception of Pindar in Hellenistic poetry. More specifically it examines texts of three major Hellenistic poets: Theocritus of Syracuse, Callimachus of Cyrene and Posidippus of Pella. The texts discussed have been selected on the basis of two principles: (i) genre and (ii) subject matter. They include texts that inscribe themselves in the tradition of encomiastic, and more specifically, Pindaric poetry either through the generic discourse which they partake in or through the employment of myths that Pindar had used in his own odes. Throughout the thesis it is argued that the connections with Pindaric passages are carried out on the basis of ‘allusions’ which are picked up by the readers. This term is employed to describe one of the ways in which intertextuality functions. Following the model of Conte and Barchiesi, the discussion insists on the distinction between allusions to specific Pindaric passages and allusions to epinician generic motifs that can best be illustrated through Pindaric passages. The aim of the discussion for each case of textual correspondence suggested is to describe the means whereby this connection is suggested to the reader and to propose a ‘meaning’ for it. In this sense, equal emphasis is given to the detailed examination of all texts that partake in the intertextual connection suggested, i.e. to Pindaric and Hellenistic alike.

της μητέρας μου

Παναγιώτας

τί φίλτερον κεδνῶν τοκέων ἀγαθοῖς;

Pind. Isthm. 1.5

Racine, c'est Racine : sécurité admirable du néant

Roland Barthes
Mythologies (1957)

Pindare, c'est Pindare : sécurité admirable du néant

Where to begin? – that was the question; at what point to make the first mark? One line placed on the canvas committed her to innumerable risks, to frequent and irrevocable decisions. All that in idea seemed simple became in practice immediately complex; [...]. *Still the risk must be run; the mark made.*

Virginia Woolf, *To the Lighthouse* (1927)

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page</i>	v
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>		vii
1. Introduction		1
2. The <i>Σωσιβίου Νίκη</i> (fr. 384 Pf.)		19
3. Pindaric elements in the <i>Victoria Berenices</i> (fr. 143 – 156 Massimilla)		51
4. <i>PHorak</i> 4: Callimachus' most recent lost poem		85
5. Pindar's reception in Posidippus' <i>Hippika</i> (AB 71 – 88)		113
6. <i>Theocritus Pindaricus</i> : the reception of Pindar in Theocritus' <i>Idylls</i>		142
7. Intertextual presence vs. textual absence: Pindar and his Hellenistic profile in <i>Idyll</i> 16		167
8. The mytho-poetics of praise: Heracles' strangling the snakes in Pindar and Theocritus		202
9. Pindaric eschatology and inherent excellence in Theocritus' <i>Idyll</i> 17		239
10. Epilogue		267
<i>Bibliography</i>		271

PREFACE

This thesis examines the influence that Pindaric poetry exercised on the work of three Hellenistic poets, Callimachus of Cyrene, Posidippus of Pella and Theocritus of Syracuse. Limits of space and time have made it impossible to take into account Pindar's influence on Apollonius of Rhodes, a project that I hope to deal with in the near future. The idea of treating some of the most fascinating Greek poets occurred to me under the influence of Richard Hunter's ground-breaking and exciting *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge, 1996).

It gives me great pleasure to be able to thank the Board of Graduate Studies of the Faculty of Classics of Oxford University for approving the title of my thesis. To my two Oxford teachers I want to express my sincere gratitude for all the things that they have so generously offered to me. Mr. Adrian S. Hollis, my MSt. Supervisor at Keble, initiated me into the labyrinths of Hellenistic fragments and ignited my passion for Callimachus. Professor Gregory O. Hutchinson kindly agreed to serve as my DPhil. supervisor. I am indebted to him especially for his patience and generosity in sharing his immense knowledge of Greek and Latin literature. His beneficent and graceful influence will be found on almost every page of this thesis. I would also like to thank Professors Tobias Reinhardt, Stephen Harrison and Marc Lauxtermann as well as Mrs. Ghislaine King for their help with technical difficulties that appeared in my way during these last four years. Dr. Bruno Currie offered severe but judicious criticism at an early stage of my research. His remarks helped me considerably in formulating more clearly the theoretical

basis upon which I carried out my research. I would also like to thank Professor Theodore Papanghelis and Associate Professor Evanthia Tsitsibakou-Vassalos for their support and encouragement. Professor Dimitrios Z. Niketas served as my supervisor for the Greek States Scholarship Foundation (I. K. Y.). I thank him for his impeccable collaboration. My research was enabled by the generosity of the Greek State Scholarships Foundation and Mr. John Ratcliffe. I would like to thank my supervisor for suggesting me to the Governing Body of Exeter College for the College's Classics Scholarship. Last but certainly not the least I would like to thank two very special people, Associate Professors Pulheria Kyriakou and Theokritos Kouremenos. Over the years they have enveloped me with their love, trust, friendship and support. I sincerely hope that I have not let them down.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their love and support. The thesis is fittingly dedicated to my mother Panayota. Her self-denying and unstinting encouragement to the devoted study of classical literature for all these years has encouraged me to proceed whenever I lost heart. My only regret is that this thesis is written in a language she cannot read.

A.K.

Exeter College, Oxford

July 2011.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AB Austin, C. and Bastianini, G. (eds.), *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia* (Milan, 2002).
- ABV Beazley, J. D., *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford, 1956).
- ARV² Beazley, J. D., *Attic Red-Figure Vase Painters* (2nd edn., Oxford 1963).
- Bernabé Bernabé, A. (ed.), *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum Testimonia et Fragmenta*, i - iv (Leipzig, 1987 – 2007).
- DK Diels, H. and Kranz W. (eds.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (6th edn., Berlin, 1952).
- Ebert Ebert, Joachim (ed.), *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (Berlin, 1972).
- FGE *Further Greek Epigrams*, ed. D. L. Page (Cambridge, 1981).
- FGrHist *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, i-iii, ed. F. Jacoby (Berlin and Leiden, 1923 – 58).
- FHG *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, i-v, ed. C. and T. Müller (Paris, 1843-70).
- Fontenrose Fontenrose, Joseph Eddy, *The Delphic Oracle: Its responses and operations, with a catalogue of responses* (Berkeley, 1978).
- Fowler Fowler, R. L. (ed.), *Early Greek Mythography*, i- (Oxford, 2000-).
- FJW Friis Johansen, K., and Whittle, E. W., *Aeschylus: The*

- Suppliants, i-iii (Copenhagen, 1980).
- GB Gallazzi, C. and Bastianini G. (eds.) con la collaborazione di C. Austin, *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)* (Milan, 2001).
- HE *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, eds. A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (Cambridge, 1965).
- IC *Inscriptiones Creticae*, i-iv, ed. Margerita Guarducci (Rome, 1935-1950).
- IG *Inscriptiones Graecae*: for details see LSJ xliii, plus *IG I.i-iii* (3rd edn., Berlin and New York, 1981–98).
- IK Knidos I Blümel, Wolfgang (1992), *Die Inschriften von Knidos I* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 41, Bonn, 1992).
- I.Kition Yon, M. et al. (eds.), *Kition dans les textes. Testimonia littéraires et épigraphiques et corpus des inscriptions*, Kition – Bamboula (V. Paris, 2004).
- IvO Dittenberger, Wilhelm and Purgold, Karl (eds.), *Die Inschriften von Olympia* (Berlin, 1896).
- K. – A. Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin, 1983 -).
- Kannicht Kannicht, R. (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta V: Euripides*, i-ii (Göttingen, 1971-2004).
- K. – G. Kühner, R. and Gerth, B., *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, i-ii (Hannover, 1890-1905).
- LGPN *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*: i, eds. P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews (Oxford, 1987); ii, eds. M. J. Osborne and S. G.

- Byrne (Oxford, 1994); iiiia, eds. P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews (Oxford, 1997); iiib, eds. P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews (Oxford, 2000); iv, eds. P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews (Oxford, 2005); va, ed. T. Corsten (Oxford, 2010).
- Liberman Liberman, G. (ed.), *Alcée : Fragments*, i-ii (Paris, 1999).
- LIMC *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, i-viii (Zurich and Munich, 1981-99).
- LSJ⁹ Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S. and Mackenzie, R. (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th edn., Oxford, 1940).
- M. – W. Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L. (eds.), *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford, 1967).
- Maehler *Pindarus*, ii. *Fragmenta, Indices*, ed. H. Maehler (Leipzig, 1989).
- Massimilla Massimilla, G. (ed.), *Callimaco Aetia: libri primo e secondo* (Pisa, 1996); *Callimaco Aetia: libro terzo e quarto* (Pisa, 2010).
- Merkelbach Reinhold and Stauber, Josef (eds.), *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, i-v (Stuttgart, 1998-2004).
- Stauber
- OGIS *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* i-ii, ed. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1903-5).
- Parke- Parke, H. W. and Wormell, D. E. W. (eds.), *The Delphic Oracle: i. The History; ii. The Oracular Responses* (Oxford, 1956).
- Wormell
- Peek Peek, W. (ed.), *Griechische Vers-Inschriften, Band I Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin, 1955 -).
- Pf. Pfeiffer, R. (ed.), *Callimachus*, i-ii (Oxford, 1949-53).
- PMG *Poetae Melici Graeci*, ed. D. L. Page (Oxford, 1962).
- PMGF *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* i-, ed. M. Davies

- (Oxford, 1991-).
- Poltera Poltera, O. (ed.), *Simonides lyricus: Testimonia und Fragmente* (Basel, 2008).
- Powell Powell, J. U. (ed.), *Collectanea Alexandrina: reliquiae minores poetarum Graecorum aetatis Ptolemaicae, 323-146 A.C., epicorum, elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum* (Oxford, 1925).
- Radt Radt, S. L. (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta IV: Sophocles* (Göttingen, 1977).
- Radt, S. L. (ed), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta III: Aeschylus* (Göttingen, 1985).
- RE *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, i-, eds. G. Wissowa et al. (Stuttgart, 1893-1980).
- Schwyzler Schwyzler, E., *Griechische Grammatik*, i-iv (Munich, 1939-53).
- SH *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, eds. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (Berlin and New York, 1983).
- Snell Snell, B. (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I* (Göttingen, 1986).
- Sn. – Mae. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* ed. B. Snell, rev. H. Maehler, pt. I: *Epinicia*⁸ (Leipzig, 1987).
- Bacchylides*¹⁰ post B. Snell edidit H. Maehler (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1992).
- Voigt Voigt, M. E. (ed.), *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta* (Amsterdam, 1971).
- VS *Victoria Sosibii*
- VB *Victoria Berenices*

W² West, M. L. (ed), *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, i-ii (2nd. edn., Oxford, 1989-92).

For journal titles, I have followed the abbreviations of *L'Année philologique*, apart from a few exceptions.

INTRODUCTION

Aim of the thesis and criteria employed for the selection of the texts discussed

This thesis examines the reception¹ of Pindar's poetry in the work of three major Hellenistic poets, all of whom were active in Ptolemaic Alexandria in the first half of the third century BCE: Callimachus of Cyrene, Theocritus of Syracuse and Posidippus of Pella. I use the term "reception" to describe the process whereby these three erudite poets (i) read and understood Pindaric poetry, (ii) imbued their works with allusions to Pindar's *œuvre* and (iii) expected their readers to pick up these allusions in order to appreciate their own poetic work. The criteria used for the selection of the texts discussed were two: (i) genre and (ii) mythological material. On the whole, I have tried to select texts that belong to genres connected with Pindar's poetic activity. I have also included texts that deal with mythological episodes found before in Pindar's poetry, even if Pindar was not the first or the only one to deal with them. These two criteria were used on the basis of evidence, slight though it may be, for the way in which ancient readers read and associated texts with each other: intertextual connections are made more easily when two (or more) texts share the same generic discourse or subject-matter.

As a great deal of Pindar's "non-epinician" poetry has not survived, the discussion necessarily focuses on the reception of his epinician poems. This may lead to false impressions about his reception in Hellenistic times but there is no way to avoid this risk. Still, as we are going to see, we have good reasons to suppose that e.g. Callimachus alluded to Pindar's *Paeon* 4 in the proem of his epinician for

¹ I employ terms such as 'reception', 'influence' and 'intertextual relationship' interchangeably without any implication of variation in the degree of certainty about authorial intention.

Queen Berenice II, while he used imagery from *Paeon* 7b for the articulation of his manifesto in the *Aetia* prologue. A close reading of Theocritus' *Idyll* 24 suggests his acquaintance with the so-called *Paeon* 20, which in all probability represents one of Pindar's *prosodia*. As for the second criterion, I would like to anticipate one of my theoretical points and note that the establishment of an intertextual relationship between a Hellenistic text and an ode of Pindar on the basis of mythological material does not imply that there are (or were) no other possible subtexts. Not only would this contradict the plurality implied by the concept of intertextuality but also the reality of the texts themselves. Intertextuality does not function on a one-to-one, exclusive basis. To foreground the Pindaric associations in our discussion of any given text does not mean that other subtexts are being 'hushed'. On the contrary, from the variety of the available subtexts one focuses on those which are relevant for the purpose of this inquiry. At the same, it is never assumed that when more intertexts than one, Pindaric or not, can be suggested, all of them have the same importance for the discussion. In the following chapters I have tried to stress this whenever I could discern several possible subtexts. To imply that the number of subtexts for a given text is fixed so as to be presentable in the form of a list would go against every tenet of intertextual theory as established by Kristeva (1969: 145-6) and developed by Barthes (1970: 9-20) (*contra* Harder (2002) 189). The loss of possibly relevant texts (e.g. the numerous epics on Heracles for *Idyll* 24) adds further problems to such precarious claims to exhaustiveness in the examination of intertextuality.

The first three chapters examine texts that were represented as epinician poems. These comprise Callimachus' epinician elegies for Sosibius and Queen Berenice II and *P.Horak* 4, a glossary on a lost elegy of probable Callimachean

authorship and epinician content.² These chapters examine the ways in which Callimachus (i) used motifs commonly employed in Pindar's epinician discourse and (ii) alluded to specific passages in Pindar's odes so as to develop his own epinician idiom and represent his *laudandi* and *laudandae* in the light of Pindaric tradition. Crucial to this approach has been the fundamental distinction that Conte and Barchiesi have introduced between *modello esemplare* and *modello genere / codice*: an allusion, that is, can relate to a specific passage so as to add a further layer of meaning or to a generic tradition that can be illustrated through specific passages (Conte and Barchiesi (1989) 94-100).

I have understood genre rather widely so as to include in my discussion (Chapter 4) Posidippus' epigrams on the equestrian victories of the Ptolemies and other notable personages (*Hippika* 71-88 AB). Although some scholars would deny the validity of this classification (e.g. Dickie (2008: 24)), it should be born in mind that agonistic epigrams and epinician odes, albeit parallel praise forms which were created independently of each other, had already come to interact with each other in the lifetime of Pindar and Bacchylides. Furthermore, one may legitimately wonder whether Posidippus' *Hippika* were actually, or should be, regarded from the viewpoint of generic classification just as epigrams or rather as short elegies similar to Callimachus' epinician compositions.

The issue of the existence or not of genres in ancient times is complicated and cannot be treated in detail here. Ideas such as these, if they ever existed, would have changed with the passage of time (cf. Calame (1974) 119-121). Further, the ideas of philosophers (e.g. Plato *Ion* 534C, *Leg.* 700A-B, *Resp.* 394B-C) or grammarians on the topic cannot be assumed to be representative of what poets

² I have not included in my discussion Callimachus' 'epinician' *Iambus* 8, as I believe that Fuhrer's (1992) 205-16 discussion has exhausted the subject.

thought (cf. Calame (1974) 124-5). For poets of Pindar's time the concept of 'genre', as we understand it nowadays, was probably predicated on the context of performance with its cultic content, tradition of previous performances and audience expectations (cf. e.g. Pindar fr. 128c Maehler with Cannatà Fera's (1990) 136-44 discussion). Context of performance went hand-in-hand with subject-matter in the determination of a poem's generic identity (cf. Rossi (1971) 70; Calame (1974) 118; Nagy (1994-5) 11, 13; van Tress (2004) 5-6). The divorce of the text from its performance in Hellenistic times generated the emphasis on content only, as the surrounding context was irrevocably lost (cf. Hunter (1996) 3-4). Hellenistic reader-scholars catalogued texts into genres on the basis of content; furthermore, they seem aware of the importance of motifs, themes and topics for the establishment of a specific generic discourse. The manner in which Callimachus composed his own epinician elegies centuries after the apparent decline of the genre indicates that he comprehended the basics of epinician grammar so as to incorporate its motifs effectively in his poems. Well before Callimachus' times there is evidence to suggest that another avid reader of Pindaric poetry, Plato, was cognizant of the importance of motifs for epinician poetry.³ In a passage from his *Lysis* (205C-D), the importance of which was rightly evaluated by van Groningen (1985: 325 n.1), Plato reproduces the motifs of epinician poetry as he knew them from reading Pindar and other epinician poets and employs them for the creation of a mock prose epinician:

ἃ δὲ ἡ πόλις ὅλη ἄδει περὶ Δημοκράτους καὶ Λύσιδος τοῦ πάππου τοῦ παιδὸς καὶ πάντων πέρι τῶν προγόνων, πλούτους τε καὶ ἵπποτροφίας καὶ νίκας Πυθοῖ καὶ Ἰσθμοῖ καὶ Νεμέα τεθρίπποις τε καὶ κέλῃσι, ταῦτα ποιεῖ τε καὶ λέγει, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἔτι τούτων κρονικώτερα. τὸν γὰρ τοῦ

³ Cf. Irigoin (1952) 16-18, Cole (1992) 15 n. 8. Scholars have detected similarities between epinician motifs and Platonic passages. For instance, Heath (1988) 188 compares Alcibiades' speech of arrival in the *Symposium* with *Nem.* 1.19 (ἔσταν ἐπ' ἀλείαις θύραις); see also Cole (1992) 14-5.

Ἡρακλέους ξενισμὸν πρῶτην ἡμῶν ἐν ποιήματί τινι διήκει, ὡς διὰ τὴν τοῦ Ἡρακλέους συγγένειαν ὁ πρόγονος αὐτῶν ὑποδέξαιτο τὸν Ἡρακλέα, γεγονῶς αὐτὸς ἐκ Διὸς τε καὶ τῆς τοῦ δήμου ἀρχηγέτου θυγατρὸς, ἅπερ αἱ γραῖαι ἄδουσι, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ τοιαῦτα, ὧ Σώκρατες· ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἃ οὗτος λέγων τε καὶ ἄδων ἀναγκάζει καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀκροᾶσθαι.

All these are motifs that one found repeatedly in Pindar's and Bacchylides' odes: praise of the victor's forefathers; *gnomai* on the use of wealth as means of showing one's innate excellence; record of previous victories. The speaker attaches special interest to mythological episodes connected with the ancestral history of the family, like the *theoxenia* offered by the victor's ancestors to Heracles and the mythological connection with Zeus himself. These elements are not to be viewed as generic *per se*, but their employment alludes to the use of family myths in epinician odes; one could compare, for instance, the hospitality offered to the Dioscuri by the *laudandus'* ancestors in *Olympian* 3 and *Nemean* 10.

The second part of the thesis examines Pindaric presence in Theocritus' idylls. The Theocritean *corpus* brings together poems of different character. In this respect, idylls discussed were chosen on different grounds. *Idylls* 16 and 17 inscribe themselves in the tradition of political praise that one finds in Pindar's epinician odes, especially those addressed to powerful political figures of his times, whether tyrants, kings or high-ranking dignitaries. The celebration of their latest athletic victory easily became an occasion for the praise of their political and administrative skills. This was brought about, on the one hand, by the special status of the *laudandi* and, on the other, by the political agenda underlying their participation in the great pan-Hellenic games. Scholars have noted that after the apparent decline of the epinician genre (around the second half of 5th cent.) several of the motifs in Pindar's eulogy of great political personages started appearing in

hexameter encomia.⁴ This would explain to a certain degree the special Pindaric colouring in these two idylls out of the whole Theocritean *corpus*. Furthermore, it is also indicative that Pindaric sentiment in these idylls is centred on the concept of the benefactor and the appropriate use of the *laudandus*' wealth so as to secure for himself a positive, everlasting fame, a characteristically Pindaric concern.

On the other hand, *Idyll* 24 and the majority of the minor cases discussed in Chapter 6 are mythological narratives that deal with episodes from the lives of heroes such as the Dioscuri (*Idyll* 22) and Heracles (*Idylls* 13 and 24). Those were selected because these mythological episodes had been treated before by Pindar. The treatment of the same mythological episode is a strong enough condition on which to base the establishment of an intertextual connection between texts. This seems to have been part of the reading habits of ancient readers as well by early Classical times if one can judge from the following fragment of Simonides (fr. 273 Poltera):

ὄς δουρὶ πάντας
νίκασε νέους, δινάεντα βαλὼν
Ἄναυρον ὑπερ πολυβότρνος ἐξ Ἴωλκοῦ·
οὔτω γὰρ Ὀμηρος ἠδὲ Στασίχορος ἄεισε λαοῖς.

This fragment, probably from an epinician ode of Simonides, is preserved by Athenaeus (4.172 E) to prove that Stesichorus was the author of the poem *Ἄθλα ἐπὶ Πελλίαι*. Homer's name is used here as a generic tag for epic poetry in general and probably alludes to Eumelos' *Corinthiaka* (cf. Poltera (2008) *ad loc.*). Simonides provides his audience with another text against which his version 'ought' to be read.

⁴ A nice example of the community of praise discourse in epinician odes, agonistic epigrams and encomia is the emphasis on the uniqueness of the attainment(s) celebrated: cf. e.g. Pindar (*Ol.* 13. 30-1 ἀντεβόλησεν / τῶν ἀνὴρ θνατὸς οὔπω τις πρότερον) ~ Callimachus (*VS* fr. 384.29-30 Pf. . . . [. . . οὐ] γὰρ πῶ τις ἐπ[ὶ] πτόλιν ἤγαγ' ἄεθλον /], ταφίων τῶνδε πανηγυρίων) ~ Theocritus (17.15 ἀν οὐκ ἀνὴρ οἴός τε νοῆσαι; 38 τῶι οὔπω τινὰ φαντὶ ἀδεῖν τόσον ἀνδρὶ γυναικῶν; 121 μούνος δὲ προτέρων . . .; 129 τᾶς οὔτις ἀρείων; cf. Meincke (1965) 151) ~ *Ep.* 31.2 Ebert (with his note *ad loc.*) etc. See also Dickie (2008) 28 with n. 72.

More interestingly, though, as scholars have pointed out,⁵ this fragment reveals a gradual receding in the importance of the Muses as the providers of factual knowledge and their replacement with previous poetic texts. In this light, the older version can either become the canonical version on which the later poet will rely or from which, for whatever reason, he will depart. With the passage of time this tendency to associate texts dealing with the same material becomes more widespread. Another interesting example from around the same period is provided by Pindar in his *Olympian* 1 (36): *υιὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ' ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι*. The *scholia ad loc.* (58b) unfold the 'polemical' character of the allusion: *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐναντία καὶ ἕτερα οἷς εἶπον οἱ πρότεροι ποιηταὶ δοξάσω σε καὶ ἔρω*. Pindar does not identify the text(s), or generally 'media', in which the 'other' version is to be found; still it is revealing of contemporary 'reading' habits that Pindar expected his audience to make the associations itself and so informs it that he is going against the prevailing opinion (cf. also Nagy (1990) 129 with n. 73, 200-1; Krummen (1991) 168). The argument retains its validity even if the version turned down was not part of another poem but of a different oral, pictorial or sculptural tradition. Similarly Callimachus, who had a greater number of (textual) sources at his disposal than Pindar remarks in his *hymn to Zeus* (60-1):

*θηναιοὶ δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἀληθείες ἦσαν ἀοιδοί·
φάντο πάλλον Κρονίδησιν διάτριχα δώματα νεῖμαι.*

The older singers whose veracity Callimachus doubts are Homer (*Il.* 15.187ff.) and Pindar (*Ol.* 7.54ff.) (cf. McLennan (1971) *ad loc.*). The articulation of the intertextual comparison with the two previous versions is certainly more refined than that of Pindar or Simonides. Callimachus includes linguistic markers that point

⁵ Gianotti (1975) 52 notes that Simonides (cf. e.g. fr. 19 W²) along with Xenophanes was the first poet to introduce citations and references to previous poets.

to both other accounts: *διάτριχα δώματα νεῖμαι* harks back at the Homeric passage (189 *τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται*), while *δηναιοὶ... ἀοιδοί + φάντο* looks quite similar to the Pindaric *φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιὰ ῥήσιες*. Callimachus modifies the function of the Pindaric ‘formula’: in Pindar’s text *φαντί* is supposed to add trustworthiness to his account (cf. e.g. *Pyth.* 1.52; 2.21; 4.88, 287; 6.21; 7.19; *Isthm.* 8.46a; see also Bacchylides 5.155); Callimachus, on the other hand, turns it on its head and attacks the veracity of the older version represented as accurate by Pindar. The finesse of Callimachus’ technique aside, the essence remains the same: ancient authors and their readers tend to associate texts that deal with the same mythological material.⁶

Methodology for the examination of the reception of Pindar in Hellenistic poetry

For a considerable period of time the study of Hellenistic poetry has concentrated on the influence that the Homeric and Hesiodic epics exercised on Hellenistic poets. The reappraisal of archaic lyric poetry for the understanding of erudite Hellenistic poetry poses an important methodological question on the ways in which one could appreciate allusions to lyric poets in Hellenistic poetry. The discussion of the

⁶ Simonides and Callimachus are more specific than Pindar in designating the *medium* of their ‘intertexts’ as textual. Pindar’s employs an expression which is found elsewhere (cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 9.524-5; Mimn. fr. 14.2 W² [*προτέρων πεύθομαι*]; Pind. *Pyth.* 3.80, *Nem.* 3.52-3 [*λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων ἔχω ἔπος*]) and, in my view, should also include artistic representations. For variations cf. Call. *Lav.Pall.* 56 *μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων* where the poet not only indicates his dependence on unnamed sources but also repudiates any responsibility for the version offered; cf. Bulloch (1985) *ad* 55-6 with n.2 on p.161 for a detailed discussion with more examples. On the other hand, the fact that Callimachus talks about poets should not prevent us from taking into account artistic representations for the version repudiated; cf. e.g. Xenokles’ lip-cup from the 6th cent. BCE (London, British Museum B425 = *ABV* 184 = Beazley Archive 302436) which represents the three sons of Cronus as drawing lots for their kingdoms (cf. also Vermeule (1979) 34; *LIMC* IV.1 p. 390). Readers would have probably been aware of, and influenced in their response by, such accounts. Cf. the discussion in Chapter 8. The fifth century had already witnessed an interest in the interaction between poetry and painting. Compare, for instance, Simonides’ definition of poetry as ‘talking painting’ and of painting as ‘silent poetry’ (Plutarch, *de glor. Ath.* 3.346). Cf. also Aesch. *Ag.* 241–2, with Headlam-Thomson (1938) *ad* 233–4, who associate the text with Simonides’ definition. For the same association see also Karouzos (1982) footnote 74.

intertextual relationship with the Homeric or Hesiodic epics in the works of Hellenistic poets has been greatly facilitated by the community or close proximity of the metres and language employed. It is obvious that such an approach cannot be fruitful for examining the reception of other genres. Furthermore, the (re-)use of the plethora of *hapax legomena* in the poetic idiom of Homer and Hesiod has been deemed a safe criterion to guide readers in their search for allusions to archaic epic or elegiac poetry in Hellenistic poetry. For obvious reasons, this methodological tool cannot be effectively utilized in the examination of the reception not only of Pindar but rather of every poet who did not invest his discourse with bizarre and difficult words (cf. van Tress (2004) 2). On the other hand, the discussion on the use of Homeric hapaxes in Hellenistic poetry has gone hand in hand with another dominant trend in secondary literature. It has been assumed, and not always with good reason, that Hellenistic poets employed Homeric hapaxes or even alluded to passages in Homer which presented hermeneutic interest to educated readers in their capacity as scholars so as to demonstrate their stance on a specific scholarly disagreement.⁷ Such approach dangerously limits the plurality and polyvalence of intertextuality, as it assigns a dominant role to what should be viewed as one of its modalities. In this respect, the redefinition of our scholarly methodology for the reception of lyric poetry in Hellenistic times could also have beneficial effects on the reappraisal of Homeric and Hesiodic influence.

The philological framework just delineated was created for, and so focused on, the examination mainly of allusions to epic and elegiac poetry. As such it needed to be drastically revised to meet the needs of my discussion. In what follows I offer a succinct description of the theoretical frame which I have

⁷ Cf. esp. Giangrande (1967) and (1970).

employed. Before I proceed two notes are warranted. Firstly, this framework does not purport to be an original contribution to the domain of literary theory. It makes use of various theoretical approaches filtered through my personal ideas and conceptions about the character of literature and how it needs to be approached. Several of the concepts that I have borrowed from modern theorists have to be revised so as to meet the special needs that arise from the discussion of any ancient work of literature. Secondly, well aware as I am that this theoretical structure will not be to every scholar's satisfaction, I reckon that my arguments in favour of such an eclectic approach will be seen as intrinsically plausible in view of the special nature of the material that I am dealing with. In this light, I argue that *allusions* are the means, or at least one of the means, whereby readers proceed to connect texts.⁸

Allusion and the pleasure of reading

In a short article of 1951 Giorgio Pasquali gave an outline of his theory of the art of allusion, as he named it. Pasquali's allusive art was a reaction to the dominance of romantic criticism, a critical trend which laid the emphasis on the genius of the inspired poet and his originality. Romantic critics tended to disregard the interconnections between works of art. Arguing against such a tradition Pasquali (1951: 11-3) brought out the learned and allusive character not only of literature but of all art forms. Pasquali managed to demonstrate that allusion is inherent in every form of cultural expression and that it is then a necessary condition for the audience to appreciate the beauty of a piece of art.⁹ Still Pasquali understood allusions in terms of *intentional* reference by the author to previous works and not as something *unmotivated* and so *inherent* within artistic expression. On the other hand, in Conte

⁸ Cf. Riffaterre (1980) 4; Genette (1982) 8-9. I would like to note that I use the term 'intertextuality' more broadly to refer to all the *transtextual* phenomena that Genette has described.

⁹ Cf. also Riffaterre (1979) 496; (1980) 4.

and Barchiesi's approach *allusion* does not so much describe the intention of the author but is viewed as an inherent part of poetic language. This is the way the term is used in my discussion as well.

Traditionally critics have thought that it is the author who controls the reception of the allusions, which he has *chosen*, by his audience. This approach leads to serious confusions in the case of ancient literature, where one lacks the important help of all that *paratextual* information that one has in modern literature (cf. Wimsatt and Beardsley (1946) 6-7). Still, even if one were to concede such an opinion as valid in principle, there is no way of ascertaining that even the first audience would have received the *meaning* of the text in exactly the way the author had intended. Such an approach posits the *historicizing fallacy* of a unified horizon of expectations, not to mention our inability to recompose effectively the horizon of the first performance (Iser (1976) 52; Martindale (1993) 15-7; Hinds (1998) 46). So it would seem it is quite hard to determine which allusions the author had intended for the audience and which not. As Martindale (1993: 3-4) argues, "the writer can never control the reception of his or her work, with respect either to the character or to the readership or to any use which is made of that work" (cf. Silk (1974) 74). Said differently, it is not Callimachus who controls the recognition of allusions to Pindar in his own text; rather it is the reader who *constructs* and *negotiates* the relationship between the *images* of the two poets he has also *created* for himself (cf. Martindale (1993) 73). This brings us to our next point concerning the role of the reader in identifying allusions.

Traditional critics demand the designation of parameters, of criteria that is, whereby one could safely define what constitutes an allusion or not, so as to salvage some notion of 'objective' criticism. Still, none of the recent theoretical approaches

to intertextual theory, with the exception of Riffaterre's *non-grammaticalité*, has devised such criteria;¹⁰ this would have been contrary to the *dialogic* character of the term. This said, it would seem that most of the time the devising of such formal criteria is just another expression of 'intentionalism'. Returning, for example, to the works of 'traditional' scholars one can still see that they insist on drawing a firm distinction between significant (*patent*) and insignificant (*latent*) 'choices'. On this basis they would use a battery of terms including *coincidences*, *unconscious reproductions*, *evocations* or *citations*, without ever taking the time to clarify their own criteria.¹¹ Fowler (2000: 122) mentions *markedness* and *sense* as two criteria usually expected in traditional approaches. Nevertheless both terms are far from securing the 'scientific' rigour that a traditional critic would expect.

One could easily object that an allusion is rendered interesting if it is incorporated *effectively* into the universe discourse of the reader-critic. So this would render the second criterion subjective. The same could be argued for the so-called *strikingness* of the allusion. Fowler (2000: 125 n. 15) does not elaborate on this first criterion, whose importance far exceeds that of the second; rather he refers to the criteria set by Silk (1974) for distinguishing between a dead and an interactive metaphor. Silk created an 'autonomous' formalist theory about the appreciation of metaphors in Greek poetry. The fact, however, that he chose not to engage in interaction with other formalist approaches left his model with several drawbacks. If one widens Jakobson's classic definition of poetic language as an 'organised

¹⁰ Riffaterre (1980) 5-6; cf. also van Tress (2004) 10. This *aberration* or *déformation*, as Riffaterre calls it, is the *trace* for his *intertextualité obligatoire* in contrast with Barthes' *intertextualité aléatoire*. This is not the place to get into a detailed critique of Riffaterre's model; suffice it to say that his interpretations indicate that the lines between these modes are, if not non-existent, extremely thin. For a criticism of 'objectivity' in literary interpretation see Barthes (1970) 15-6; cf. also Jauss (1967) 29-30, 43-50; Iser (1976) 21-2; Todorov (1984) 173; Martindale (1993) 5. If subjectivity is inherent in every reading, only arbitrariness, that is, neglect of the context, is unreliable; cf. Derrida (1967) 226-230, Eco (1990) 55 and Culler (2002) 103.

¹¹ See e.g. Kellet (1933) 31-2 quoting Bradley on Tennyson, and Pasquali (1951) 11. Cf. Conte and Barchiesi (1989) 90-3.

violence of poetic form over language'¹² to include, besides rhythm, semantics and rhetoric (both tropes and word position), it would seem that most of Silk's criteria are too vague and should be strictly employed on a contextual basis. They could be considered, that is, as characteristics of the literary *function* of language in general. Further, Silk's metaphors seem to function in a temporal vacuum without taking into account the *normalization* of poetic devices. As Russian Formalists would argue, all 'devices' that cause *defamiliarization* (*ostranenie*) on readers – and which in their ordered form constitute *literariness* (*literaturnost'*) – are prone to *automatization* with the passage of time.¹³ On this view, each generation of poets needs to challenge previous conventions, in order to retain the defamiliarizing effect, which is of crucial importance for every formalist approach. Silk's criteria cannot function effectively on a diachronic level. Even if one were to posit such criteria, again this could not safely reflect the intention of the author. Testimonies of modern authors have actually shown that allusions picked up by empirical readers may have not been there in the author's *consciousness* during the act of writing but were there *subconsciously*.¹⁴ So it could be safely said that the 'picking up' of textual connections relates to each reader's cultural 'cargo'. Another important point is that ancient authors and readers did not seem aware of the importance of such arguments in favour of intertextual connections. This is where Genette's version of intertextuality can become helpful:¹⁵ readers respond to texts

¹² Quoted from the Russian original in Steiner (1995) 24.

¹³ Erlich (1981) 198-200.

¹⁴ Eco (1994) 85-8 offers two illuminating examples from his personal experience. Hinds (1998) 25-6 mentions the criteria Morgan (1977) used in her study of the influence of Propertius on Ovid. With the sole exception of 'similarity in the choice of words' and 'structural development', the rest of Morgan's (1977) 3 'philological criteria' are applicable mainly in the examination of poems that are composed in the same metre. See also Harder (2002) 191 for a descriptive approach.

¹⁵ The basic problem with structuralist varieties of 'intertextuality' (the appropriate term for Genette's theory would be 'transtextuality' [see Genette (1982) 8-9]), represented by Genette and Riffaterre, is the limited and ambiguous role they assign to the reader. Like Saussure before them, Genette and Riffaterre failed to situate their system within a social context, i.e. to take into account

according to their reading habits, which are constructed on the basis of other texts (*transtextualité*) and more importantly of genre expectations (*architextualité*) (cf. Dubrow (1982) 31, 34).

We do not possess enough information about reading practices in Hellenistic times; these could enlighten us on the way in which poets themselves read previous authors and expected their works to be read. Even so, the ancient scholia, I would suggest, could provide us with a vague picture of the way in which educated (Hellenistic) readers read and associated texts with each other in order to understand them. One may point to the extensive corpora of scholia on Theocritus and especially Pindar. In its present state, though, the corpus of Pindaric scholia brings together material of different origin and, more importantly, of different date.¹⁶ With the exception of those few cases in which the scholiast has preserved the name of a great Hellenistic scholar, the authorship of most notes cannot be securely attributed to a certain person. Nonetheless, this does not diminish their inherent value as they reflect the basis on which some educated Hellenistic readers proceeded to associate texts with each other.¹⁷ Their often naïve approaches aside, they are still helpful as they point out models, variations, and correspondences. It is true that not all notes can equally claim our attention in view of their often fanciful interpretations. Nonetheless, they are indicative of the reading practices of scholars, a group of

the social milieu of readers, as Barthes (1970: 9-20) had argued; for a groundbreaking criticism of Saussure's *abstract objectivism* see Vološinov (1986) 65-98. So their approach is *structured* on belief in the meaning of the text as a *transcendental signified*; a signified, that is, that can be received by successive generations of readers in exactly the same way without any alteration (see e.g. Harder (2002) 189, 225-6). Needless to say, such a *unified* perception of the readers' response is misleading and neglects certain important parameters such as gender, age, social class and cultural background, ideological ambience etc.; on this point see also Jauss (1967) 43, Eco (1992) 67 and Martindale (1993) 15-17.

¹⁶ See esp. Deas (1931). In their present form the scholia are based on a 4th cent. CE epitome which, in turn, is based on another epitome (the 'Schulausgabe') of the second half of the 2nd cent. CE. The greater part of the parallels between Pindar and Hellenistic poets is believed to derive from Theon's commentary on Pindar; cf. Deas (1931) 40-2.

¹⁷ Acosta-Hughes' (2010) recent book on the reception of Archaic lyric in Hellenistic poetry has also suggested the importance of ancient scholia for charting out possible textual correspondences which ancient readers could have felt.

readers to which most Hellenistic poets also belonged. Their value for the needs of this discussion is not apodeictic but rather circumstantial. To put it differently, if an (anonymous) scholiast thought that two texts could be associated, for whatever reasons, this could give us a vague idea of the interconnections apparent to ancient reader-scholars' minds vis-à-vis a specific text; against this fragmentary background one could evaluate not the cogency of the allusions suggested by modern reader-scholars but their possible relevance for ancient reading practice or interpretations. An example from Callimachus' epinician elegy for Sosibius (fr. 384 Pf.) could help to illustrate this principle.

In lines 35-6 the speaker, presumably Sosibius himself (note the plural verb *ἔδωκαμεν* (37)) is represented talking about the prizes set in the Panathenian Games: “- καὶ παρ’ Ἀθηναίοις γὰρ ἐπὶ στέγος ἱερὸν ἦνται / κάλπιδες, οὐ κόσμου σύμβολον, ἀλλὰ πάλης [...]” These two lines are not preserved on the papyrus that has restored the elegy to us (*POxy.* 1793) but were quoted by the ancient scholia on Pindar's *Nem.* 10.64a [= 35-6 in Sn.-M.'s text] *γαῖα δὲ καυθείσα πυρὶ καρπὸς ἐλαίας ἔμολε*: *τίθενται γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν ἐπάθλου τάξιν ἐλαίου πλήρεις ὑδρίαι. διὸ καὶ Καλλίμαχος ...* An allusion at this point to Pindar's *Nemean* 10 would not, in my view, add any further layer of meaning. Still, the allusion to the opening lines of *Olympian* 9 in the following lines of Callimachus' poem (38-40) indicates that one is in a 'Pindaric' environment. Apparently, the scholiast quoted Callimachus' lines not as a case of influence, as modern scholars assume (cf. Fuhrer (1992) 184-6), but so as to give another source for the prizes instituted at the Panathenaea. Even so, this could be characteristic of a tendency to associate texts, even if only on account of factual information. *Nemean* 10, it will be argued, is a plausible subtext for Callimachus' epinician elegy for Berenice II. The association

proposed by the Pindaric scholia in the case of *VS* allows us to raise the possibility that certain Hellenistic readers could have similarly made an intertextual association with Pindar's ode themselves when they read the *Victoria Berenices*; this possibility becomes stronger when one remembers that ancient scholars grouped texts into genres on the basis of their content. And if they reacted in this way, this could imply that Callimachus 'intended' this reaction. Another telling case is provided by the ancient scholia on *Nemean* 1.56 [=36 Sn.-M.]. The scholiast notes the discrepancy between the accounts of Pindar and Theocritus in respect of a detail concerning the age difference between Heracles and Iphicles (see Chapter 8). If readers were attentive enough to point out such a minor difference, it would be natural to assume that they would have compared the two versions in other points as well and perhaps even tried to account for them.

The limits of interpretation

Richard Garner (1990: 1), speaking of allusions in Greek poetry, has noted that "poetic allusions [...] cannot be proved or disproved" (cf. also van Tress (2004) 11). The fact that there are no 'safe' criteria to prove an allusion does not mean that 'anything goes in one's reading'; as Silk (1974: 63) reminds us, "to reject intentionalism as a criterion of effective status is not to espouse *arbitrariness*; there is no necessary link. Arbitrary interpretation is *ipso facto* at fault [...]" (cf. also Derrida (1967: 227), Wimsatt (1968: 125), Eco (1990: 54) and Culler (1992:120)). The text is not the playground of the critic-reader: one may sense an allusion but it is one's responsibility to show why this is *probable or plausible*¹⁸ and how this could work. And the safest way to do so is the *context* or what Eco has termed the

¹⁸ For the notion of plausibility in literary criticism see Hirsch (1960) 47 and especially Bénichou *ap.* Todorov (1984) 171-3.

‘intention of the text’; the intention of the text, as a critical tool, coincides with the intention of each reader, who is ‘controlled’ in his reading by the internal coherence of the context.¹⁹ This principle, argues Eco (1990: 41), can help us to distinguish between *legitimate* and *illegitimate* readings. This of course does not mean that every critical reading has – or can have – the same degree of persuasiveness; but this is a matter of the reception of the reading itself (see also Culler (1992) 110-4). In this sense, my effort throughout this thesis has been to establish the way in which I understand each Pindaric and Hellenistic passage on its own and then its interaction with other passages.

Finally, some words on the role of the author in this approach. For Barthes (‘La mort de l’auteur’) the death of the author signalled the birth of the reader (cf. Culler (2002) 78).²⁰ In the field of classics, and from a different theoretical standpoint, Silk’s (1974: 60-2; 233-5) attack on intentionalism has lent further strength to such a critical stance. Still, I have preferred the approach advocated by Hinds (1998: 49). Following Eco, Hinds has argued in favour of the reintroduction of the author into our critical discourse.²¹ For Eco the author is nothing more than a (textual) construction of each reader; a construction, that is, on to which the reader can project the intention of the text as he or she understands it.²²

¹⁹ Eco (1990) 58-60; cf. also Wimsatt and Beardsley (1946) 9-13; Hirsch (1960) 48; Conte and Barchiesi (1989) 91 n. 13. Some scholars view the text as a *process* of producing its Model Reader (Iser (1976) 39; Eco (1990) 58-9); that is, as Iser (1976: 38-9 and esp. 44-50, 60-6) argues, the text offers *objectively definable structures*, which can direct the readers’ responses through time according to their milieu.

²⁰ Barthes (1984) 61-2. Foucault (1979) 143-5 criticises Barthes’ use of notions such as *œuvre* and *écriture*, since they presuppose the unifying presence of the author, vouchsafing the privileges that he attempts to fight. Cf. Bennett (2005) 20-1.

²¹ Eco seems to develop one the *functions* of the concept of author that Foucault (1979: 150) had suggested for further examination ; cf. also Bennett (2005) 22-8.

²² Eco (1992) 63; cf. also Wimsatt (1968) 123; Hirsch (1960) 52-4.

CHAPTER 1

Σωσιβίου Νίκη (fr. 384 Pf.).**Introduction**

The elegy has been restored on the basis of two Oxyrhynchus papyri: *POxy.* 1793 (1st cent. CE) published by Hunt in 1922 and *POxy.* 2258 (6th – 7th cent. CE) published by Lobel in 1952. The first part of the elegy (up to line 30) is provided, one way or the other, by both papyri, while *POxy.* 1793 is our only source for the rest of the elegy. Some lines have been restored to our text by quotations that have come down to us independently (l. 13 = fr. 122 Schneider, ll. 31-2 = fr. 445 Schneider, l. 50 = fr. 217 Schneider and fr. 384a = 192 Schneider).

In *POxy.* 2258 the *Victoria Sosibii* (*VS*) follows directly the *Coma Berenices* (fr. 213 Massimilla), which in this manuscript has two extra lines (94^{a-b}) missing from Catullus' translation.²³ In *POxy.* 1793 the *VS* is the last poem in the papyrus roll (columns vi – x) and follows an elegy in honour of Berenice II (frr. 385 – 391 Pf.), certainly not the *Coma*.²⁴ The *VS*, then, circulated separately, usually with other autonomous elegies, without ever forming part of a wider composition, as was, in all probability, the case with the *Victoria Berenices* (*VB*).²⁵

The identity of the addressee and the exact date of the elegy remain uncertain.²⁶ In view of line 24 (ὄφρα κε Σωσίβιον τις Ἀλεξάνδρου τε πίθηται) and

²³ *POxy.* 2258 preserves fragments from a codex which contained poetical works of Callimachus with commentary; see Lobel (1952) 69-71. Lobel has identified fragments from the *Hymns*, books III-IV of the *Aetia*, the *Hecale*, the *Coma Berenices* and *VS*. In *POxy.* 2258 fr. 2^{v(a)} there is no coronis or gap to separate the *Coma* and the *VS*.

²⁴ Cf. Coppola (1930) 282-3 and Chiesa (2009) 228-231.

²⁵ Cf. Parsons (1977) 50, slightly modifying Pfeiffer (1928) and (1949 ii: xxxvi), and Massimilla (2010) 49-50.

²⁶ For a discussion of this problem see also Barigazzi (1951) 410-3 and Fuhrer (1992) 144-9.

the fragmentary scholion in the lower margin of *POxy.* 2258 fr. 2^{v(a)} (*γέγραπται ἢ ἐλεγεία εἰς ... Σωσίβιον τοῦ Διοσκουρίδου*) it is clear that the *laudandus* was Sosibius, the son of Dioscurides, from Alexandria (cf. also the scholion on line 12 in the left margin of the same papyrus which explains *ᾠτινι* as *Σωσιβίωι*). This agrees with what we know from two other sources. According to Athenaeus (4.144F), Callimachus composed an epinician ode in elegiac couplets in honour of a certain Sosibius: *Θεόφραστος δ' ἐν τῷ πρὸς Κάσσανδρον περὶ βασιλείας (εἰ γνήσιον τὸ σύγγραμμα· πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ φασιν εἶναι Σωσιβίου, εἰς ὃν Καλλίμαχος ὁ ποιητῆς ἐπίνικον ἐλεγειακὸν ἐποίησεν) [...].* The title of the elegy is preserved in the ancient scholia to Lycophron (*Σ Alex. ad 522 p. 188, 28 Scheer*): *ἔστι δὲ καὶ Κορίνθου τόπος ὡς καὶ Καλλίμαχος ἐν Σωσιβίου νίκη τῇ μὲν Κρωμνίτην* (cf. Hunt (1922) 98).

The name of Sosibius' father is provided by fr. 384a Pf. [=Hephaestion *περὶ ἀσυναρτήτων* p. 52, 23 Consbruch] (*ἱερά, νῦν δὲ Διοσκουρίδεω γενεῇ*), which was persuasively connected with our elegy by Herzog.²⁷ The publication of *POxy.* 2258 has proved beyond any doubt that fr. 384a Pf. belongs with the text of our elegy. On these grounds it would be reasonable to identify our Sosibius with Sosibius the *ψευδεπίτροπος* (Polybius 15.25.1; see also Maas (1949)) a personage of great political prominence in Ptolemaic Alexandria (*IG* XI.4 649; *IK Knidos* I.112 [=OGIS 79]; *IG* VII 3166; *IG* VII 507).²⁸ Beside these inscriptions, all of them honorific decrees dating from the second half of the third century BCE, we know

²⁷ Herzog (1924) 424; cf. also Fuhrer (1992) 148-9.

²⁸ Cf. Herzog (1924), Beloch (1927) 589, Coppola (1930) 291, Maas (1949) 448, Holleaux (1942) 51 n. 2, Cahen (1972) 92, D'Alessio (2007) 680-1, Lelli-Parlato (2008) 59; *contra* Wilamowitz (1924) ii. 318. The other candidate, Sosibius the Lacon (*FGrHist* 595), an expert on Spartan lore, could hardly fit the profile of our *laudandus* (cf. Schneider (1873) 220), even if one was willing to identify him with Sosibius the *λυτικὸς* and so place him in Alexandria; *contra* Jacoby (1955) 635-7. His identification with the Sosibius mentioned by Plutarch in the context of the foundation of the cult of Sarapis (*De Is.* 28 p. 361 F) is dubious; cf. Griffith (1970) 397.

from Polybius (5. 35–6; 15. 24a–36) that this Sosibius was politically all-important in the reign of Ptolemy IV (221-203 BCE) (*οὗτος γὰρ μάλιστα τότε προεστάτει τῶν πραγμάτων* 5.35.7-8) and acted along with Agathocles as minister for the young Ptolemy V, but only for a few weeks. Nothing else is known about him and information is lacking concerning the date and manner of his death.²⁹

This identification has been challenged by a series of scholars who have placed the *floruit* of our Sosibius in the reign of Ptolemy I and assumed that he was the namesake grandfather of the Sosibius mentioned by Polybius.³⁰ There are two main reasons for this.

First, the passage from Athenaeus quoted above suggests that the treatise with which Sosibius was credited by some ancient scholars was addressed to Cassander of Macedon. Cassander was crowned king in 305 BCE and died in 297 BCE; these offer the *termini post* and *ante quas* for the composition of the treatise. Holleaux (1942: 50–1) has proved on cogent epigraphical grounds that *IG XI.4 649*, an honorific decree in honour of Sosibius by the people of Delos, ought to be dated around 240 BCE during the reign of Ptolemy III. Even if one supposes that Sosibius was in his thirties or forties at the time (cf. Maas (1949) 443 n. 2 and Beloch (1927) 590), he still would not have been old enough to have composed the treatise “on kingship”.

²⁹ Maas (1949) 446–7 and Wallbank (1967) 483. Sosibius’ daughter served as *canephoros* of Arsinoe II Philadelphus in 215–214 BCE; see Ijsewijn (1961) 33 for *testimonia*, Beloch (1927) 590 and Holleaux (1942) 51 n. 2. For the importance of this priesthood of the dynastic cult in the 3rd century see Fraser (1972) i. 217. Sosibius himself served as priest of Alexander in 235–234 BCE; Ijsewijn (1961) 29. In the light of fr. 384a Pf. it would seem that Dioscurides’ family was at the time in charge of the administration of a certain cult; see already Schneider (1873) *ad fr.* 192 p. 444.

³⁰ Cf. Schneider (1873) 219–20, Pfeiffer (1949) *ad fr.* 384.1 and Wallbank (1957) *ad l.* 35,7; rightly *contra* Wilamowitz (1924) i. 181 n. 1. Accepting this would mean dating Sosibius the minister too late in the 3rd cent., something that does not agree with our inscriptional records, which place his *floruit* around the middle of the century.

Further, the grounds for attributing this treatise to Sosibius instead of Theophrastus are extremely weak. Usener (1912: 63) has shown that the treatise titled in Athenaeus (and in the first part of Diogenes' list [5.47]) *πρὸς Κάσσανδρον περὶ βασιλείας* was actually the first book of the *περὶ βασιλείας* treatise in two books unanimously attributed to Theophrastus in our sources (Diogenes 5.49 p. 223; *POxy.* 1611 fr.1 col. ii 40), the other being *περὶ τυραννίδος α'*. It is, then, quite probable, as Maas suggested (1949: 448), that the treatise which Athenaeus attributed to Sosibius was a *ψευδεπίγραφον* that circulated under Theophrastus' name.

The second reason for denying the identification of our Sosibius with Sosibius the minister concerns the interpretation of 40-1. Several scholars have given a temporal meaning to the prepositional phrase *παρὰ σοί* "in your reign Ptolemy, son of Lagus" (*Λαγείδῃ παρὰ σοὶ πρῶτον ἀεθλοφορεῖν / εἰλάμεθα, Πτολεμ[αῖ]ε*) and so have placed Sosibius' first victory late in the reign of Ptolemy I. More likely, though, the phrase suggests an athletic context, as in 25-6 and 35-6, where it is used for Sosibius' victory at the Nemean and Panathenaean Games respectively.³¹ The designation 'Ptolemy, son of Lagus' sounds more natural for the founder of the dynasty (cf. fr. 734 Pf.; Theoc. 17.14).³² Sosibius addresses, then, Ptolemy I as Callimachus addressed Poseidon, tutelary deity of the Isthmian games, in 9-12.

³¹ One could also compare Pind. *Nem.* 6.61 (*Κρονίου παρ τεμένει*), Posid. AB 79.3 (*Ζεῦ παρὰ σοὶ Νεμεᾶτα*) and the *VB* (fr. 143.7 Massimilla *Εὐφητηϊάδ[αο παρ'] ἡρίων οὐ[νεκ'] Ὀφέλτου*) For the semantic difference between the two constructions see K.-G. i. 509–15. The dative seems to throw into relief the protector of the locality where the games took place, whereas the accusative emphasised proximity. Ptolemy, then, would be the patron hero or god of the games like Zeus or Opheltes; cf. Pfeiffer *ad* 384.40. For heroes as protectors of athletic games cf. also *Nem.* 9.9-10 with Fennell (1899) *ad* 12.

³² Differently in an inscriptional epitaph from Kition (around 3rd / 2nd ce. BCE), (*I.Kition* 2070, 4 *Λαγείδας κοίρανος* [= 1076 Peek]), where the patronymic is used for Ptolemy IV Philometor; see Yon (2004) 275 with bibliography.

The fragmentary scholion in the lower margin in *POxy.* 2258 fr. 2^{v(a)} further adds that [οὗτο]ς ὁ Σωσίβιος λογογράφος³³ ἦν Πτολεμαίο[υ], καὶ διὰ τιμῆς αὐτὸν εἶχεν τούτου ο. [. The designation of Sosibius as λογογράφος, the exact meaning of which is far from certain, is problematic. Barigazzi (1951) 413 was probably right to point out that this does not signify an office but literary activity. Its exact nature however still eludes us. One could associate this, along with Maas (1949) 447, either with the treatise on kingship, falsely attributed with Sosibius, or with his falsification of Ptolemy IV's will (cf. Polyb. 15. 25.5–6).

As for the date of composition, Callimachus' death, sometime in 240 BCE, would offer a reasonably secure *terminus ante quem*.³⁴ If Sosibius was born around 270 BCE, so that he would be at least seventy at the turn of the century, one could place the *VS* and Sosibius' athletic victories in the second half of the 240s during the reign of Ptolemy III.³⁵ This would make the *VS* fairly contemporary with Callimachus' other epinician elegy, the *VB*.

First fragment 1-16:

The first two lines of the *VS* are missing; the traces of the scholium to these lines on the left-side margin of *POxy.* 2258 fr. 2^{v(a)} suggest that the first word in the second line was σπείσωμεν. Pfeiffer compared the similar use of the verb in Pindar's *Isthm.* 6.7-9. The correspondence consists in the employment of the motif of

³³ Cf. also Pfeiffer (1949) *ad* 1 and (1953) xli.

³⁴ Pfeiffer (1932) 220-4 considered the 'artificiality of the style' as an indication of early composition; cf. also Wilamowitz (1924) i. 181. For a judicious criticism of his arguments see Barigazzi (1951) 420-1.

³⁵ The text does not specify any further the time interval between the victories and the composition (and performance?) of the elegy. For the ambiguities in the use of νεῖον see Pfeiffer (1953) 121 *ad* 384, 22 and Fuhrer (1992) 154 with n. 580.

libation at the *incipit* of an epinician ode.³⁶ Although Pfeiffer does not elaborate, it should be remarked that *Isthmian* 6 is the only poem in the extant Pindaric, and epinician, corpus, where the verb is used.³⁷ The linguistic allusion aside, the connection with the Pindaric text can be strengthened by the examination of the analogous contexts.

In well-known fashion Pindar opens his ode with a contextualizing mechanism which reflects or even creates a textual representation of the poem's performative context.³⁸ The setting is a banquet (1-7): symposiasts are feasting and celebrating the victory of young Phylacidas. The cupbearers mix wine and water in the big crater in the centre of the room. Like the cupbearers the poet imagines himself mixing another crater (*κίρναμεν*, cf. also *Isthm.* 5.25; *Nem.* 3.78; fr. 181 Maehler). But instead of water and wine his crater contains a different sort of liquid, the songs of the Muses. Pindar combines the time-honoured convention of the Muses as providers of poetic inspiration with the convivial (textual) reality of his performance and so creates an imposing image of the function of his poetry and his role within the context of celebration.³⁹

The poet informs his audience that this is the second time he is acting as cupbearer and eulogist for the illustrious family of Lampon. Lampon's son had already made his family famous at the Nemean Games (4-5). As the metapoetic image unfolds, it is brought into relation with the performance of the ode, the praise

³⁶ For the memorability and importance of a poem's *incipit* see Angeli Bernardini (1967) 81-2, Conte (1986) 70, Conte and Barchiesi (1989) 85 with n. 6 and Cole (1992) 15.

³⁷ *Isthm.* 6.37-8 is the only occurrence for the cognate *σπονδή* in the whole of the Pindaric corpus. For a discussion of the libation motif which permeates the whole of the ode see Bowra (1964) 23-6, Gianotti (1975) 58-9, Crotty (1982) 83 and especially Carne-Ross (1985) 44-5, 48-50. The epinician ode can also take the form of a funeral libation: see more specifically Kurke (1991) 65-70 on *Ol.* 8.74-84, *Pyth.* 5.9-103, *Pyth.* 9.103-105.

³⁸ On the sympotic context in Pindar's epinicians see Strauss Clay (1999) and Kurke (1991) 137-140 (especially *Ol.* 1.16-19; *Nem.* 9.48-53).

³⁹ The metaphor of the nectar or wine of the Muses is well attested for Pindar and seems to have appealed to Hellenistic poets; cf. Theocritus 7.154-5 (*οἶον δὴ τόκα πῶμα διεκρανάσατε, Νύμφαι, / βωμῶι παρ Δάματρος ἀλωίδος* [...]); cf. Cholmeley (1901) *ad loc.*

of the athlete's family, a short catalogue of his victories and a prayer that Phylacidas may also win at the Olympic Games. This potential Olympic victory of Phylacidas would be another opportunity for Pindar to offer his praise poems as libations to Aegina and her children (7-9).

Callimachus narrates Sosibius' recent and past victories at some length (4-6; 21-2). In his introductory lines he retains the image of the eulogist who offers his poem as libation. While Pindar prays that he may honour Aegina, the island-home of the victor, with further libations (poems), Callimachus seems to connect his poem with a libation to Zeus, as the traces at the end of line 2 could suggest (]. ετελειο]).⁴⁰ Callimachus then would be reusing a technique which one can see fully fledged in the beginning of his *Hymn to Zeus* (1-3). The hymn begins with a rhetorical question; this immediately enables the reader to conjure up a textual world within which he can read the poem: the hymn is being offered as a libation to Zeus in the context of a symposium.⁴¹

On the model of Pindar, Callimachus presents a performative scenario for his own epinician. It is not clear whether this scenario (textual world) actually reflects a real banquet or if the poet creates an ideal and so imaginative performative context within which his readers (or audience?) were invited to read his poem.⁴² The victorious chariot is imagined to have just (?) come to Egypt directly from the Isthmus, where Sosibius' most recent chariot victory was scored, driven by the team of victorious horses. The poet adds a realistic touch about the noise that the axle of the chariot made during the race still echoing in the horses' ears. One could almost speak of a snapshot, giving the audience something of the suspense of the race itself

⁴⁰ D'Alessio (2007) 680 n. 11. Another possibility would be that there was a mention of the τέλειον ἄρμα; cf. Posid. AB 77.1, 78.13, 81.4.

⁴¹ Cf. Hopkinson (1984) 139-40.

⁴² Cf. Nisetich (2001) 290 n. 1 and especially Sevieri (1998) 196.

(cf. e.g. *VB* fr. 143.8-10 Massimilla; Posidippus AB 74.1-3, 76). This poetic miniature contains all the necessary information about Sosibius' victory: the victory was won at the Isthmia in the chariot race and the prize was a celery wreath. The only thing missing is the identity of the victor, which was probably mentioned later on, following a Pindaric mannerism (cf. Pfeiffer *ad loc.*).

If one combines the arrival scene with the libation motif, then the scene becomes clearer: one finds oneself in Sosibius' house (?) or the Ptolemaic court; libations are made as is the practice in banquets; the third libation to Zeus is combined with an expression of thanksgiving for Sosibius' victory (see also n. 87 below). The celebration 'happens' to coincide with the arrival of the victorious chariot.⁴³ The arrival of the victorious chariot reminds the poet of his original reaction to the arrival of the news of Sosibius' victory at the games. In *Ol.* 4.5 – 6 (ξείνων δ' εὖ πρασσόντων / ἔσαναν αὐτίκ' ἀγγελίαν ποτὶ γλυκεῖαν ἔσλοί [...]) Pindar described the reaction of the victor's friends back home to the news of his victory, while in *Pyth.* 7.18 (νέαι δ' εὐπραγίαι χαίρω τι) he presents himself rejoicing at the news of the victory. If Callimachus had such passages in mind, it would seem that he was trying to represent himself as one of Sosibius' friends and suggest to his readers the epinician image of *xenia* between poet and victor as Pindar had done.⁴⁴

⁴³ *καί* has been tentatively restored in l. 1 on the basis of the note in the lower margin (*ποιητικὸν δὲ ἀπὸ συνδέσμου ἄρχεσθαι Ἀλκμάν' 'καὶ δαῦ με'*). It is remarkable, and puzzling, that the poem began with a conjunction. One could assume that the scribe accidentally omitted a line as he did in fr. 384.8 Pf. (= *POxy.* 2258 fr. 2^(a) 15a), which has been restored by *POxy.* 1793 col. vi. 3. For *καὶ δὴ αὖ*, written *δ'αυ* in Homer's manuscripts and in our papyri [cf. West's *apparatus criticus* at *Il.* 2.225, Ameis-Hentze (1877) *ad Il.* 1.340 and Calame (1983) *ad fr.* 178], see Denniston (1954) 250 "καὶ δὴ here signifies, vividly and dramatically, that something is actually taking place at the moment". For *καί* preceding an interrogative (Lobel), usually at the opening of a speech in dialogue, see Denniston (1954) 309; for *καί* with imperatives (Pfeiffer) see K.-G. ii. 248. In all these uses, though, *καί* implies a strong connection with what has gone before. However one construes the use of *καί* here, Callimachus wanted to plunge his readers in the middle of a scene.

⁴⁴ Cf. Kurke (1991) 136 who compares *Ol.* 4.5–6 with Herodotus 7.237.3 (*ξείνος δὲ ξείνωι εὖ πρήσονται ἔστι εὐμενέστατον πάντων*) and Athanassaki (2009) 266.

At the same time, Callimachus alters a traditional motif of the genre. In archaic epinicians it is the poet who sends⁴⁵ the poem (e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 2.67-8; *Nem.* 3.76-8; Bacch. 5.10-4, 195-7) or arrives at the victor's home bringing the ode as a gift (e.g. Pind. *Nem.* 6.57b-59; 4.73-4): in either case the arrival of the poem with or without the poet signals the beginning of the celebrations.⁴⁶ Callimachus goes against epinician tradition in presenting himself receiving and not sending the news of his *laudandus'* victory (cf. also *VB* fr. 143, 4-10 Massimilla).⁴⁷ Be that as it may, Callimachus keeps the function of the arrival motif as signalling the beginning of the celebrations: it is the victorious chariot that arrives at the place of performance and so signals the beginning of the epinician proper. The arrival of the chariot causes the poet to repeat what he 'exclaimed' when he first heard the news of Sosibius' victory (the victory is not specified). Similarly in Pindar's *Nem.* 1.6-7 the victorious chariot of Chromius and the announcement of his victory prompt the poet to start singing: ἄρμα δ' ὀτρύνει Χρομίου Νεμέα / τ' ἔργμασιν νικαφόρους ἐγκώμιον ζευξαι μέλος.⁴⁸ In both cases the chariot of the victor resembles the

⁴⁵ For a detailed discussion see Tedeschi (1985) and Gelzer (1985) 99-101.

⁴⁶ See Bundy (1986) 27-8 with ample documentation, Maehler (1963) 87 with n. 7, Tedeschi (1985) 30-1, especially 50-4, and Schmid (1998) 172. Nünlist (1998) 69-80 gives a detailed survey of the image in archaic poetry.

⁴⁷ Cf. Fuhrer (1992) 177; Nünlist (1998) 76 n. 19. For the difference between sending and receiving the news of the victory see Crotty (1982) 83. In his second epinician Bacchylides asks Fame (Φήμα) to leap to Keos, the home-island of the victor (αἶξον ... ἐς Κέον ἱεράν). Callimachus used the same verb about his 'Hymn to Poseidon' in l. 7 (σημερινὸν δ' ὡσεὶ περ ἑμὸν περὶ χεῖλος αἰτσοῖ), so he may have followed Bacchylides. Similarly, in *Ol.* 14.20-4 Pindar asks Echo to bring the news of Asopichos' victory to his dead father in the Underworld. In a way Callimachus assumes the role attributed to Pheme and Echo respectively.

⁴⁸ In *Nem.* 9.3-5, also for Chromius, the mounting of the victorious chariot is the condition for the poet to command the Muses to begin the song and the celebration; cf. *Ol.* 4.10-1. Simonides' fr. 4.12 Poltera mentions a δῖφρος which probably belongs to the goddess of victory [cf. Poltera (2008) *ad loc.* and §2 p. 277]. This could well be an epinician convention (see Maehler (1963) 92 n. 1). Still it is only in Pindaric poetry that it is found fully fledged; cf. Jebb (1905) *ad* 5.176-8 and Gianotti (1975) 66 with n. 97 ["innovazione pindarica"].

chariot of the Muses, an image of poetic inspiration that both Pindar and Callimachus (esp. *Aetia* I fr. 1. 27-8 Massimilla) used in their poetry.⁴⁹

The arrival of the chariot becomes the occasion for Callimachus to reperform his first epinician poem, which subsequently became part of this elegy. It would appear that the chariot of the victor in Callimachus' case does not provide factual knowledge pertaining to the victory itself but brings memory of the poet's previous composition. Callimachus is an actor in the metanarrative he has fashioned to describe the creation of his elegy for Sosibius. Similarly at l. 48 he (?) is presented as an eye-witness for one of Sosibius' offerings. The technique is well-known from Pindaric passages such as *Ol.* 10.1-8 and *Isthm.* 1.1-10, where the poet constructs a narrative about the prehistory of his ode and its performance.⁵⁰ This dual focalization, as Schmid (1998: 177-9) points out, allows poets to give a picture of epinician poetry from the moment of composition until the homecoming of the athlete.

In an interesting twist of conventional roles the victorious chariot is connected first with poetic inspiration (the composition of the hymn to Poseidon) and secondly with intertextual memory (the embedding or reworking of the hymn in the elegy), replacing in this way the position traditionally held by Mnemosyne and her daughters. Callimachus is very careful to point out that he is repeating what he exclaimed when news first reached him; the hymn to Poseidon was originally an impromptu composition (later incorporated in Callimachus' elegy), or at least this is

⁴⁹ In *Pyth.* 10.63-6 the epinician ode is explicitly called the chariot of the Muses; cf. Simpson (1969) 439-40 and Angeli Bernardini (1995) *ad loc.* In *Isthm.* 8.61 Pindar's poem, called here *Μοισαίων ἄρμα*, sings (and so perpetuates) Nicoles' fame; cf. Simpson (1969) 443-4. The image, Indo-European in its origin (cf. West (2007) 41-5), is found only once in Bacchylides (5.176-8); for its influence in classical comedy see Mastromarco (1987) 85-8. Instead of *ἄρμα* one may also find in similar use *δίφρος* (cf. *Ol.* 9.81; *Isthm.* 2.2) or a circumlocution such as *σθένος ἡμιόνων* (*Ol.* 6.22). Cf. also Bowra (1953) 41-2, Simpson (1969) 439 n. 4 and Loscalzo (2003) 122.

⁵⁰ Schmid (1998) 154 n. 20.

the idea that Callimachus is trying to convey.⁵¹ In a mimetic (epinician) poem such as this, the textual version of the performance of the first epinician is the only thing within the poem along with the *κῶμοι* in 38 and 49 that suggests to the reader the performance of Hellenistic epinicians in the (obsolete) tradition of archaic lyric.⁵²

The form of hymn (to Poseidon) which this impromptu epinician assumes, is modelled on those Pindaric epinicians which begin with a hymnic address to a deity, whether the tutelary god of the games or of the athlete's home, or else assume the form of a hymn, like *Olympian* 14. Pindar also provided cases of embedded songs in his epinicians. Carne-Ross (1985: 113), for instance, has suggested that *Nem.* 4.17-24 is part of the song of the victor's deceased father, while *Nem.* 5.25-39 is the song of the Muses, included in the mythological part of the poem. Still, *Ol.* 9.1-4 places improvised praise poems *in situ* right after the victory (cf. Gelzer (1985) 96-7). In this sense Callimachus' epinician is, in terms of genre tradition, 'misplaced' at the athlete's home instead of the place of the games.

After his address to Poseidon, tutelary deity of the games (9-12), the poet moves on to the games themselves (13-15):

ἔνθα ποδῶν ἵνα χερῶς ἵνα κρίσις δξέο[ς ἵππου
 ἰθυτάτη, χρυσὸν δ' εὐδικίη παραθεῖ,
 χρυσὸν δὲν ἀνθρώποι[σ]ι καλὸν κακὸν ετρα . . [. . .] ξ (15)

The designation of the games as *κρίσις* follows Pindaric language: *Ol.* 3.21 (καὶ μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἀγνὰν κρίσιν / καὶ πενταετηρίδ' ἀμᾶ / θῆκε ζαθέοις ἐπὶ κρημνοῖς Ἀλφειῶ), *Nem.* 10.23 (ἀγών τοι χάλκεος / δᾶμον ὀτρύνει ποτὶ βουθυσίαν Ἥρας ἀέθλων

⁵¹ For "improvisation" in this context see Gelzer (1985) 109.

⁵² Cf. Sevieri's (1998) 196-200 salutary discussion.

τε κρίσιν) and especially *Pyth.* 4.253 (ἔνθα καὶ γυιῶν ἀέθλοις ἐπεδείξαντο κρίσιν ἐσθᾶτος ἀμφίς),⁵³ where the construction is closer to that offered by Callimachus.

The description of the games is not concerned with their myth of origin, as in 25-6 but with the notion of fair judgement (κρίσις ἰθυτάτη ~ εὐδικίη) and with how this manifests the victor's true worth, which has been put to the test and proved. For Pindar the *laudandus'* actions, and especially his victory, are a proof of his character. This is why in *Ol.* 8.1-2 he addresses Olympia as “mistress of truth” (δέσποινα ἀλαθείας): the games test and reveal the true character of the victor.⁵⁴ This is, in all probability, the meaning of these lines as well. Sosibius' victories have been an undisputable proof of his worth, a worth which will be developed more elaborately in 53-60 (or even earlier in 44).

The exact role that gold plays in this context is not clear. In 1.14 Callimachus uses an athletic metaphor to represent gold as a rival of fair judgment in a race.⁵⁵ In *Ode* 11 Bacchylides accused the judges at the Olympic Games of misjudgement and attributed his *laudandus'* failure to win the match to their corruption or partiality (11.26-7 δίκας κέλευθον εἰ μή τις ἀπέτραπεν ὀρθᾶς).⁵⁶ Something similar could be suggested here. The mention of man and the oxymoronic designation of gold as καλὸν κακόν (an “evil blessing” tr. Nisetich)

⁵³ I follow the transmitted text. I am sceptical about the arguments of Braswell (1988) *ad* 235(c), who accepts instead Kayser's conjecture (ἐπεδείξαντ' ἱν; cf. also the editions of Gildersleeve, Bowra and Race). For the resolution of the second *longum* in an e-colon see Farnell (1932) *ad loc.* and now Itsumi (2009) 48-9 and esp. 431. For the correct meaning of κρίσις here see Giannini (1995) *ad loc.* and the translations of Fraccaroli (1894) and Nisetich (1980). The use of the rare epic accusative ἱν in this context would be unparalleled and stylistically ineffective, if no allusion to Homer was intended (only three instances of the acc. sing., *Il.* 5.245; 7.269 = *Od.* 9.538). Still, Pindar follows epic practice in using only the nominative singular in fr. 70 Maehler (ἴς Ἀχελωῖου). He also uses the probably unrelated (see Chantraine and Frisk *s.v.*) nominative plural ἱνες ‘sinews’ as a metaphor for ‘men’ in *Isthm.* 7.53 (cf. Rumpel and Slater *s.v.*). See also D'Alessio (2004) 23 and Kouremenos (2006) on the Derveni Papyrus col. 23.11.

⁵⁴ See Marg (1938) 87-88 and Bowra (1964) 326.

⁵⁵ In Pindar athletic metaphors are usually employed for the poet's self-representation and not for gnomic parts; cf. Lefkowitz (1991) 161-8. If our reading of the poem here is correct, this would suggest a deviation from Pindaric practice.

⁵⁶ Maehler (1982) and Cairn (2010) *ad loc.*

would indicate, in view of the emphasis on fair judgment in the previous line, that its mention was embedded in a gnomological passage (*contra* Barigazzi (1951) 418), which could have possibly led to a mythological part about the origins of gold, as Pfeiffer had supposed:⁵⁷ either the tale of Indian ants, which built their nests from the gold they dug up (cf. Hdt. 3.102),⁵⁸ or the myth of Aeacus, who was also credited with the finding of gold (Pliny *Nat. Hist.* VII 197; Hyginus *Fab.* 274).⁵⁹ Nonetheless, the lacuna of eight lines between lines 15 and 21 suggests that, if this part contained a mythological part, it did not come close to the size of Heracles' myth in the *VB*. The myth of Philoctetes in *Pyth.* 1.50-5 would provide a parallel for a short myth in an epinician ode.

Second fragment 21-34:

The second fragment (16-34) presents the fame bestowed on Alexandria thanks to Sosibius' victories and the joyful reaction of the Nile to the happy news. Sosibius' double victory is presented as something unprecedented: echoing a traditional motif found both in epinician odes and in agonistic epigrams, the Nile proclaims that:

... [... οὐ] γὰρ πώ τις ἐπ[ί] πτόλιν ἤγαγ' ἄεθλον /] ταφίων τῶνδε πανηγυρίων

(cf. Pfeiffer *ad loc.*).⁶⁰ The context does not make clear whether Sosibius is the first

⁵⁷ Pfeiffer (1949) ii. p. 121 *ad* 384.15.

⁵⁸ The mention of ants is inferred by the traces at the end of l. 15, which seems to suggest *μύρμηξ*. The story of the gold-digging ants reappears in Call. *Iambus* 12 fr. 202.58-60 Pf. and Theoc. 17.107. In both cases the *aition* is contextualized within a moralizing discourse about gold and its value in comparison with other commodities or its proper use for the benefit of people; cf. Kerkhecker (1999) 240 and Hunter (2003) *ad* Theoc. 17.106-114. Callimachus' point, then, could have been similar to Pindar's frequent admonitions to his *laudandi* about the proper use of their wealth. (cf. e.g. *Isthm.* 1.42; 4.47). The connection between *Iambus* 12 and *VS* is strengthened by an interesting case of self-quotation: *Iambus* 12 fr. 202.64 Pf., supplemented by Lobel as χρ]υσὸν αἰνήσουσ[ι κάλλιστον κακόν is almost identical to καλὸν κακόν of l. 14. The text is uncertain: *PMich.* inv. 4967 reads τιμι[(probably τίμιον). In the space above a second hand has added the *varia lectio* κάλλιστον also offered by *POxy.* 1110 without, however, excising the first reading; see also Kerkhecker (1999) 242.

⁵⁹ The mention of ants in this case would be explained by the fact that his people were originally ants, which Zeus transformed into humans to keep him company (Hesiod fr. 205 M.-W.).

⁶⁰ Cf. Pind. *Ol.* 13.30-1, Bacch. 8.22-5, Eur. *PMG* 755, Posid. AB 83.3, 84.4, 88. 1. Agonistic epigrams: e.g. 31, 33, 37, 49 Ebert. Cf. also Bettarini (2004) 11 and Angeli Bernardini (2000) 40.

Alexandrian ever to win a single victory chariot race in the Isthmian or Nemean Games separately (i.e. two victories in total) or the first ever to score two chariot victories in both Games (i.e. a total of four victories), as Trypanis' conjecture *διπλόον* in line 30 suggests (cf. Lelli-Parlato (2008) 63). Still the emphasis falls on the fact that he is 'twice wreathed' (*διστεφής*); the uniqueness of his attainment is emphasized through the use of a new word coined by Callimachus. The ensuing *kleos* glorifies both Sosibius and his city, Alexandria.

Callimachus follows Pindaric practice in the presentation of Alexandria. Scholars have shown that Pindar usually avoids any geographical peculiarities in the presentation of the victor's city (Fränkel (1975) 491-5) and instead concentrates on names of places or heroes who have a symbolic value either for the home-city of the victor or for the place of the games: e.g. Olympia (*Ol.* 1.24) is *εὐάνωρ Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικία*, Argos (*Nem.* 10.1) *Δαναοῦ πόλις ἀγλαοθρόνων τε πεντήκοντα κορᾶν*) or *Νίσου εὐαγκῆς λόφος* (*Nem.* 5.46) while Aegina (*Nem.* 7.10) is *πόλις φιλόμολπος δορικτύπων Αἰακιδᾶν*.⁶¹ Similarly Callimachus refers to Alexandria as *Ἀλεξάνδρου ... γῆν*.⁶² As Saïd and Trédé-Boulmer (1984: 166) have pointed out, these circumlocutions attach the city to a mythological founder and evoke its glorious heroic past. In this light the mention of Alexander suggests him to the reader not only as the founder of Alexandria but also as a foil to the *laudandus* in the manner of Pindar's mythological heroes. Carol Dougherty (1993: 95) notes that 'when the victor comes from a colony, colonial legends often replace the ancestral mythology native to the cities in the Greek mainland'. Still, one should add, these

For rivers as witness of heroic exploits see e.g. Catullus 64.357 with Fordyce (1961) *ad loc.* and Tibullus I 7.11 etc. For the connection with Callimachus see Hunter (2006) 51 n.3.

⁶¹ Saïd and Trédé-Boulmer (1984) 163-6.

⁶² *γῆν* is Housman's correction for *τῆν* of *POxy.* 1793 and the scholia on *POxy.* 2258 fr. 2¹; see Lobel (1952) 100. The reading does not affect our argument, since Alexander's role as founder of the city remains unaltered in either case.

colonial legends also integrate the colony with the mainland. Callimachus, however, does not offer a fully blown foundation narrative like Pindar (e.g. *Olympian* 7 (Rhodes); *Pythian* 4, 5 and 9 (Cyrene); cf. Krummen (1990) 149), but only a perfunctory allusion. From a generic point of view Alexander appears in the role traditionally held by Heracles in Pindaric epinicians (e.g. *Nem.* 3.21-6 with Instone's (1996) note *ad loc.*) and this could reflect royal propaganda (cf. Theoc. 17. 17-20).

In the same way, one can approach the role of the Nile from the angle of genre expectations and especially its Pindaric representation. The Nile's importance for the sustenance of life in Egypt and local cult would easily suggest him for an epinician addressed to an Alexandrian potentate (see also Stephens (2002) 256-7). Still, as Péron (1974: 85) has pointed out, in Pindar (and in Bacchylides?)⁶³ rivers such as the *Φᾶσις* and the *Νεῖλος* are used to convey symbolically the concept of a place far distanced and so difficult to reach (cf. *Isthm.* 2.41-2 along with Phasis, *Isthm.* 6.22-3 with the land of the Hyperboreans).⁶⁴

In *Isthm.* 2.41-2 the motif is combined with the praise of Xenocrates' hospitality to suggest that he 'a atteint l'ἔσχατον πλόνον dans le domaine de l'hospitalité'.⁶⁵ On the other hand, *Isthm.* 6.22-4 is the only clear case where the Nile is explicitly mentioned as one of the world's extremes. In this light, it could be claimed that *Isthm.* 6.22-4 preserves in its original form what was probably a

⁶³ For Bacchylides (9.40-1) see Maehler (1982) *ad loc.* and Burnett (1985) 100, *pace* Jebb (1905) and Péron (1974). The phrasing suggests that the Nile is not mentioned here to insinuate the end of the world, as in Pindar, but rather that he forms part of the previously mentioned *π]ᾶσαν χθόνα*, and that he is connected with the Amazons and the Trojan War, (41-6 *καὶ ἐπ' ἔσχατα Νείλου, / ταί τ' ἐπ' ... πόρωι / ... Θερμῶδον[τος] / ... καὶ ... Τροίας ἔδος*). On the analogy with Pindar's *Nem.* 4.45-72 and *Isthm.* 5.33-42, Maehler has convincingly argued that the three places that Bacchylides mentions should be brought into connection with the feats of the Aeacids (46 *ἐγγόνων*) and more specifically of Achilles, Asopos' descendant through his daughter Aegina. Still, we cannot be certain that Hellenistic poets would be perceptive of such differences in context.

⁶⁴ For other appearances of the Nile in Pindar see Bowra (1964) 371-3 and Fränkel (1975) 479.

⁶⁵ Péron (1974) 86; cf. also Fränkel (1975) 493. On Pind. *Isthm.* 6.22-3 see Péron *ibid.* 73.

traditional image put to epinician use by Pindar. We have already established an intertextual connection between the proems of *Isthmian* 6 and *VS* and so we can probably assume that Callimachus meant his readers to compare the role of the Nile in both texts. The emphasis falls on the generic function of the Nile, but it is likely that he borrowed it from this specific Pindaric ode. In this way, *Isthmian* 6 functions at the same time both as Conte's *modello esemplare* and *genere*. The ensuing discussion will show that the singling out of the Nile as *laudator* subverts his traditional role, and thus allows Cyrene to take on a role which suits Callimachus' political and poetic agenda.

Praising Phylacidas' home-island, Pindar emphasizes the spread of the Aeacids' κλέος through far-off (mythical) territories, which include the unknown sources of the Nile (cf. Hdt. 2.27-34) and the mythical and hence unknown land of the Hyperboreans (cf. Privitera (1982) *ad loc.*). Humans may have not discovered the exact location of any of these places, but they were known and so accessible to the gods and their favourites (cf. *Pyth.* 10.27-31 [with Hubbard (1985) 20]; cf. also Lucan 10.286-7). The fact that the fame of the Aeacids transcends the limits of the known world in Pindar's time suggests that they are moving out of the domain of human comparison. In this way Phylacidas' famous countrymen set the limits of heroism and prowess for their young compatriot (cf. Bowra (1964) 253).

In Callimachus now the mention of the Nile takes the place traditionally attributed to the victor's city or friends (e.g. *Pyth.* 9.73-5). Instead of presenting Alexandria rejoicing in Sosibius' victories, Callimachus foregrounds the role of the Nile. So far, nothing of the image that was found in Pindar. However, some lines before, Callimachus claims that 'even a man inhabiting the shores of the river Cinyps in Cyrene will hear of Sosibius' double victory' (24). Sosibius' *kleos* will

reach both Alexandria and Cyrene. The *kleos* of the victor does not journey to the remotest ends of the known world but to his city and to neighbouring Cyrene. Some lines later the Nile will be appropriated in Callimachus' epinician discourse as part of Sosibius' homeland. Callimachus' alterations of epinician tradition could be seen as a balancing act motivated by geopolitical concerns or as a literary statement about his place in epinician tradition.⁶⁶

Within the context of Ptolemaic politics this mention of Cyrene could allude to the reunion of the poet's home with the Ptolemaic kingdom under Ptolemy III.⁶⁷ The transformation of the motif, then, would be predicated on the needs of court propaganda: the journey of Sosibius' *kleos* to a Ptolemaic dominion helps to emphasize the bonds between Alexandria and Cyrene, as parts of the unified Ptolemaic kingdom. At the same time, Callimachus' approach compromises the limits of *kleos* as conjured up by Pindar. In his attempt to achieve a totalizing effect, Pindar picked two far-off places at the ends of the known world (Péron (1974) 67). For most Greeks of Pindar's time the Nile, although well-known, carried with it a sense of the exotic. This was, however, no longer true for Callimachus: the Nile was now part of the expanded Greek world. Callimachus' audience inhabited Egypt and lived on the shores of the great river, so any sense of mystique that the mention of the river may have carried for Pindar's audience was lost for them. They may still not have known the sources of the Nile, but Alexander's campaign opened up the Greek world and led the Greeks to some of these quasi-legendary far-off territories. If Pindar thought that the Nile and the

⁶⁶ The mention of Alexandria and Cyrene in ll. 23-4 is balanced by the mention of Nemea and Isthmia in ll. 25-6. This strengthens the connection between North Africa and mainland Greece; cf. Stephens (2002) 255. Compare also *VB* fr. 143.4-7 Massimilla.

⁶⁷ This then could be an indication of the late date of the elegy; cf. Nisetich (2001) 291 n. 20. For the unification of Cyrenaica with Egypt as a result of Ptolemy Euergetes' marriage to Berenice II see Grainger (2010) 148, and 155 on the uncertainty over the date of this marriage.

Hyperboreans were enough to set up a mythical realm worthy of Peleus' and Telamon's (and subsequently of Phylacidas') fame, this image could not carry the same strength for Callimachus and his *laudandus*. It would appear, then, that Callimachus rearranges epinician discourse in what would seem to be a self-conscious and pointed game with Pindaric and epinician conventions, asserting his role as an *epigonos* in the tradition of epinician praise.

Third fragment 35-41:

The third fragment (35-43) presents a lacunose catalogue of Sosibius' early victories at the Panathenaea and at the Ptolemea. In this catalogue the entry for the Athenian victory presents special interest with regard to Pindaric influence on this poem. This part has been brought into relation with Pindar's *Olympian 9*, and rightly so. There are two features pointing in that direction; firstly the mention of Archilochus' refrain (*ἐφύμνιον*), mentioned in *Ol.* 9.1-2, and secondly the fact that at the games in Athens Sosibius, though an *ἀγένης*, competed and won in wrestling in the class of men, exactly like Epharmostus in *Olympian 9*.⁶⁸

<i>Olympian 9</i>	<i>Sosibius' Victory</i>
<p>Ἄργεϊ τ' ἔσχεθε κῦδος ἀνδρῶν, παῖς δ' ἐν Ἀθάναις, οἶον δ' ἐν Μαραθῶνι συλαθεῖς ἀγενείων (90) μένεν ἀγῶνα πρεσβυτέρων ἀμφ' ἀργυρίδεσσιν</p>	<p>—[καὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις γὰρ ἐπὶ στέγος ἱερὸν ἦνται] (35) κάλπιδες, οὐ κόσμου σύμβολον, ἀλλὰ πάλης— ἄνδρας ὅτ' οὐ δείσαντες ἐδώκαμεν ἠδὲ βοῆσαι</p>
<p>Τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπία, καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλὸς κεχλαδῶς (2) ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἀγεμονεῦσαι κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστῳ σὺν ἐταίροις</p>	<p>ἄνδρας ὅτ' οὐ δείσαντες ἐδώκαμεν ἠδὲ βοῆσαι νηὸν ἐπι Γλαυκῆς κῶμον ἄγοντι χορῶ Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον. (39)</p>

⁶⁸ Cf. Gerber (2002) *ad 2*.

The proem of *Olympian 9* is dominated by the presence of Archilochus, something quite uncommon for Pindaric practice: as a rule Pindar does not name other poets in his poetry, unless tradition has assigned them a privileged position (cf. Homer: *Pyth.* 4.277, *Nem.* 7.21, *Isthm.* 3.55, *Pae.* 7b.11; Hesiod: *Isthm.* 6.67).⁶⁹ This case becomes all the more remarkable because the only other mention of Archilochus in *Pyth.* 2.53-56 is far from flattering. Pindar presents us with two different sides of Archilochus' poetry. In *Pythian 2* (475? BCE) Archilochus functions as a foil for Pindar: he is envious (*ψογερός*) and tries to fatten himself with 'heavy words full of animosity' (55). As an iambic poet he is occupied with *ψόγος* and *ἔχθος* the characteristics of human nature that Pindar is usually trying to fight off with his poetry (cf. our 57-8).⁷⁰ In *Olympian 9* (466 BCE) Archilochus has changed camps: no longer is he the embodiment of the iambic idea, of everything alien to the 'virtues' espoused by epinician poets; on the contrary he is considered a fellow praise poet and so an antagonist. In *Pythian 2* Pindar and Archilochus were opposed in genre: Pindar expressed praise, but Archilochus invective. In *Olympian 9* praise is the common denominator for both of them; the difference lies in the level of sophistication in the composition of epinician poetry (cf. Pavlou (2008) 541-5).

Olympian 9 posits two celebrations for Epharmostus' victory in wrestling at the Olympic Games of 466 BCE. The first at Olympia, right after the victory, included the performance of the *μέλος* traditionally attributed to Archilochus. The second was entrusted to Pindar and was celebrated at Epharmostus' house. Pindar's ode is juxtaposed with this traditional and ready-made form of praise. At the same time, Pindar offers a historical sketch of epinician genre and places himself against

⁶⁹ Cf. Schmid (1998) 162-4. Homer can refer generally to epic poetry: cf. Simonides fr. 273 Poltera, where Homer's name stands for epic poetry in general or more specifically for Eumelus' *Corinthiaca*; cf. Nisetich (1989) 1-23 and Kurke (1991) 156-7. For Hesiod's name as signpost for various poems of the Hesiodic corpus see D'Alessio (2005).

⁷⁰ Cf. Miller (1981) 139-141; Nagy (1979) 224-6, 250-2 and Kurke (1991) 100-1.

the older phases in order to point out his own artistic superiority.⁷¹ Similar flashbacks in the history of encomiastic or epinician poetry appear in other epinician odes (*Ol.* 10.76-7; *Nem.* 8.50-51; *Isthm.* 2.1-8) to serve various epinician strategies. The singling out of Archilochus and the omission of contemporaries (say Simonides and Bacchylides) could be predicated upon the special position that Archilochus' poetry held in epinician tradition. Out of the poets who were connected with the sphere of epinician poetry Archilochus was the only one to be explicitly compared or associated with Homer (e.g. Heraclit. 22 B 42 DK), and it may be that Pindar is trying to subvert Archilochus' traditional authority. However this may be, it is obvious that Pindar offers a teleological presentation of the genre and suggests that with himself the genre has reached its artistic peak. In this way he sets the boundaries and defines what is 'archaic' and 'classic' in respect to epinician poetry.

Callimachus borrows Pindar's words to refer to Archilochus' composition. So the reference to Archilochus is really a reference to Pindar in *Olympian* 9. The analogies are close and refer to the form of Archilochus' epinician poem and its performance: (i) **Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος φωνᾶεν ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι, καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλῶος κεχλαδῶς** ~ **Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον**; (ii) **κωμάζοντι φίλοις ... σὺν ἑταίροις** ~ **κῶμον ἄγοντι χορῶι**. Callimachus' language is more specific and technical. His text gives the impression of a scholarly commentary on Pindar's lines. In the first place the generically unclear term *μέλος* used so often by Pindar to refer to his epinician odes (e. g. *Ol.* 10.3; *Pyth.* 2.4, 68; *Nem.* 4.15, 45) is replaced here by the more technical term *ἐφύμνιον*.⁷² This term, believed by modern scholars to be

⁷¹ For the poem's *incipit* as a place for a poet to declare his originality see Conte (1986) 76.

⁷² For Pindar's use of *melos* see Gianotti (1975) 85-7. Bacchylides seems to have used the term only in his *Dithyrambs* (18.3; 19.3).

Callimachus' invention,⁷³ is first attested in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* (98 **ἰὴ ἰὴ παιήον** ἀκούομεν, οὐνεκα τοῦτο / Δελφός τοι πρώτιστον **ἐφύμνιον** εὔρετο λαός) and in Apollonius (2.713 θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσιν, **ἰὴ ἰε** κекληγυῖαι / ἔνθεν δὴ τόδε καλὸν **ἐφύμνιον** ἔπλετο Φοῖβω) in connection with the *ἰή* cry. The context of its other uses suggests choral performance; this may indicate by analogy how Callimachus understood the performance of Archilochus' hymn at the beginning of *Olympian* 9.⁷⁴ *καλλίνικος* modifying *μέλος* (*Pyth.* 5.106),⁷⁵ *ῥυμνος* (*Nem.* 4.16) or on its own (*Nem.* 3.19) is employed by Pindar to describe his own epinician odes. This looks back at the praise of the victorious Heracles in Archilochus' hymn (fr. 324 W² **τήνελλα καλλίνικε** χαῖρε ἄναξ **Ἡράκλεις**; cf. also Eur. *Supp.* 113; *El.* 880).⁷⁶ In *Olympian* 9 the epinician *melos* is 'defined' as the *kallinikos* cry which was uttered three times at Olympia. Even so it is not clear enough whether the original performance included only the hymn's refrain. Callimachus' *νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον*, on the other hand, sounds more like a generic tag: he avoids explicit mention of the poem *per se*, but alludes to it as 'the refrain exclaimed at the occasion of athletic victory', adding the name of the author.

The description of the first celebration for Epharmostus' victory in *Olympian* 9 is completed by the details of the performance, which included Epharmostus' peers (cf. Pind. *Isthm.* 8.1-5). The mention of the *laudandus*' friends

⁷³ Williams (1978) *ad Call. Ap.* 98. Σ *ad Ol.* 9.1i (**ἐφύμνίωι** δὲ κατεχρῶντο τούτωι) and 31 (**βέλτιον δὲ ὅτι τρίς ἐπήιδον λέγειν τὸ ἐφύμνιον οἱ κωμασταί**) use the same term to refer to the refrain of Archilochus' hymn. In view of the connection between Callimachus and Pindar's text it would be tempting to assume that the scholiasts took the word from Callimachus.

⁷⁴ Σ *ad Ol.* 9.1f. revives, although in a far from satisfying manner, a disagreement between Eratosthenes and Aristarchus concerning the genre and the function of Arch. fr. 324 W²; cf. Eratosthenes *FGrHist* 241 F 44. It could be that fr. 384.38-9 Pf. reflects an awareness of this problem and an eagerness to tackle it; cf. also Fuhrer (1992) 186-7.

⁷⁵ Outside Pindaric poetry the collocation is found in military context to refer to the epinician paean (see Rutherford (2001) 45-7); cf. Eur. *Erechth.* fr. 370 Kannicht with Carrara's (1977) notes *ad fr.* 18.

⁷⁶ On *kallinikos* as an adjective of Heracles see Swift (2010) 132-3 and 145-7 on its employment in Euripides *Heracles*.

indicates the informal character of this celebration and contrasts it with the official celebration for which Pindar's poem was commissioned. Callimachus retains the image of the *komos* 'celebration', while he refers to the victor's friends as *χορός*.⁷⁷ In lines 47-9 Callimachus will present himself participating in a *komos*, probably at the consecration of one of Sosibius' offerings.

There remains a discrepancy between the two texts: in *Olympian 9* Archilochus' poem is used in the celebration of a victory at the Olympic Games and not at local games. The erudite Callimachus seems to have made a 'mistake': still this mistake is nothing more than a textual strategy that helps Callimachus to enhance the prestige of Sosibius' early victory and talk about his role. This *komos* at Athens is the second impromptu epinician, after the hymn to Poseidon, to be placed in the past of the present official celebration. Sosibius' recent Nemean and Isthmian victories surpass in glory his past local victories. At the same time, Archilochus' traditional song is used for a local victory, suggesting, perhaps, that Panhellenic victories can be adequately praised only by a poet of Callimachus' calibre. By placing Archilochus' poem in a past celebration Callimachus indicates by means of time the qualitative distance between his epinician poetry and the origins of the epinician genre. In this he agrees with Pindar, who also views Archilochus as the somewhat old-fashioned originator of epinician poetry. Another element that both poets have in common is the antagonistic manner in which they represent their relationship with Archilochus. Like their *laudandi* both Pindar and Callimachus wrestle against previous epinician tradition, so as to prove their

⁷⁷ Hellenistic commentators usually identify the epinician *κῶμος* with the chorus which performed Pindar's odes; see Heath-Lefkowitz (1991) 175 n. 4 for references. Callimachus is careful enough to draw a distinction, but seems to assume that *κῶμος* took the form of a festal procession (*νηδὸν ἔπι Γλαύκης κῶμον ἄγοντι χορῶι*). Still, *κῶμος* as a term described the 'celebration' as a whole, part of which was also the performance of the epinician ode; see Eckerman (2010) *passim* and 309 n. 27 for the *VS*.

superior worth. While Callimachus clearly alludes to Archilochus, he does so through the lens of the Pindaric text.⁷⁸

Fourth Fragment 44-50.

The text breaks up unexpectedly when Sosibius (?) starts talking about his early victories in the Panathenaea and the Ptolemaea.⁷⁹ A lacuna of thirteen lines divides the two fragments. When the text becomes legible again, we find ourselves in the middle of a speech. The identity of the speaker remains unclear. This would have been clarified in the lost lines preceding.

In line 46 the formula *ὡς φημένωι* indicates that a direct speech has come to an end and that another person is speaking (*ἔκλυον, ἴδον*) (cf. Mineur (1984) 28-9). Most likely lines 46-9 were spoken by the poet himself, although the Nile remains an attractive possibility, as the *komos* of l. 49 takes place near his easternmost bank, the *Ostium Pelusiacum* (*πὰρ ποδὶ ... Νείλου / νειατῶι*)⁸⁰ and would have allowed him to ‘witness’ the consecration of Sosibius’ *ex voto*. This could also explain the reason why the Nile was chosen to deliver the praise of Sosibius in the first place. If this is so, the mention of the Nile could prepare the transition to the present time.

The poet juxtaposes his sources of information concerning Sosibius’ offerings. In the case of the Heraeum at Argos the source is not specified: the poet has his information from other men. But he has seen for himself the offering in a temple at Pelusium and may have been present at the consecration. Callimachus like Pindar before him presents himself taking part in the post-victory celebrations

⁷⁸ For Archilochus’ fame in Hellenistic times see also Posidippus’ Seal AB 115 and the Mnesiepes inscription (*IG XII.5 445*[1]); cf. Clay (2004) 10-2.

⁷⁹ The identification of the speaker as Sosibius is based on the use of the first person plural (*ἔδώκαμεν* [37], *εἰλάμεθα* [41]); cf. Pfeiffer (1949) *ad* 37; *contra* Barigazzi (1951) 416, who assigned the lines to the Nile; cf. Fuhrer (1992) 156-7.

⁸⁰ As Pfeiffer notes *ad loc.*, by *Κασίη ἄλς* Callimachus probably meant the lake Sirbonis (Barrington Atlas, map 70 C.3), near the *Κάσιον ὄρος* (see RE (1919) *s.v.* 2. 2264) and east of Pelusium.

for Sosibius. As we have already seen, the celebrations for the *laudandus*' victory can take the form of a banquet where the poet is present (cf. esp. *Nem.* 1.19-24; *Ol.* 1.14-17) or the form of a festive procession, which leads eventually to a banquet (cf. esp. *Nem.* 9.1-3 *κωμάσομεν ... τὰν νεοκτίσταν ἐς Αἴτναν, ἔνθ' ἀναπεπταμένοι ξείνων νενίκηνται θύραι...*).⁸¹ In all these cases the poet celebrates the victor's liberality and hospitality. His presence in the celebrations is the best illustration of these attributes: he is the winner's *ξένος* and his ode is an expression of his gratitude (*χάρις*) for his patron's liberality (cf. Kurke (1991) 135-59).

The context of the celebration in Callimachus' text is indicated obliquely through the adjective *ἐπίκωμος*. Following Kapp's unconvincing suggestion, Pfeiffer understood the adjective as composed from *ἐπί* + *κώμη* with the meaning of *ἐπίδημος*. However this interpretation does not seem to be born out by ancient usage.⁸² Callimachus is saying 'I saw for myself, what he dedicated at the outermost branch of the mouth of the Nile, *participating in a komos* to the Casian Sea'. There is no reason to suppose that Callimachus used the word in a different meaning since the attested denotation gives a meaning similar to that desired by Pfeiffer, and at the same time the adjective alludes to the celebration of the victory.

The first two lines of this fragment remain problematic: we are ignorant of the identity of the speaker and of the exact context. It is widely accepted that *ὁ ξεῖνος* refers to Sosibius.⁸³ The mention of the temple of Hera at Argos (l. 45) is seen by most scholars as an indication that the person *quoted* speaking is from

⁸¹ Pace Eckerman (2010) 305 *κωμάζω* in this context implies movement from Sicyon to Aetna. This would suggest celebration in the form of procession, imaginary though it may be.

⁸² Ancient authors are consistent in their use of the word in a convivial context: e.g. Aristias (fr. 9 Snell), Plutarch (*Conv. sept. sap.* 148B 2; *An seni* 784B 8; *De Is. et Os.* 357F 6; *De tranq. anim.* 472D 5) Triphiodorus *Ἄλωσις Ἰλίου* 561. No lexicon has preserved the meaning Kapp and Pfeiffer posited for Callimachus' text; Hesychius (4916) *ἐπίκωμος ὁ ἐπάιδων τῆι φίλῃι ἢ ἀπὸ οἴνου αἰδων, ὑβριστῆς, συγχαίρων* (cf. also Suidas and Pseudo-Zonaras s.v.: 'συγχαίρων, μέθυσος'). Cf. also Fuhrer (1992) 166 n.639.

⁸³ So both Barigazzi (1951) following note and Fuhrer (1992) 161-2.

Argos and that Sosibius had won a victory in some Argive athletic contest – probably the Heraea or Hecatombea.⁸⁴ The phrase ἀμφοτέρων ὁ ξείνος ἐπήβολος does not necessarily imply athletic victories. ἀμφοτέρων could refer to two athletic victories, probably at Argos,⁸⁵ or to two of Sosibius’ virtues, e.g. his hospitality and munificence (cf. D’Alessio (2007) 688 n. 24). Line 46 complicates matters further: ὡς φάμεναι δώσει τις ἀνὴρ ὁμόφωνον ἀοιδήν. Problems surround the use of ὁμόφωνον, an improvement of the papyrus reading (ὁμόφρονος). Found in poetry before Callimachus only in Aeschylus *Agam.* 158 (“the dirge was exclaimed *in harmony with* his oracle” tr. Fraenkel), it seems to give the following meaning here: “and to him after he has spoken in this manner a man will give a song *in agreement* (with his previous speech)”. What exactly one is to understand by “giving a song” remains unclear.⁸⁶ Perhaps it suggests the composition of a song in accordance with whatever had already been said. Strangely the action of giving a song is placed in the future; but in the following line the poet states that he has heard (past tense) about this offering – the offering suggested in the speech – from other people. The future of the speaker (δώσει) could coincide with Callimachus’ present and, from the point of view of the Argive man, Callimachus could be the poet who ‘will’ (in the future of the Argive speaker) provide the song in accordance with what has been said (cf. also Sevieri (1998) 201). If this is so, line 46 would not belong to the poet but to the person quoted speaking. τοῦτο would refer to everything before. So instead of simply providing the song connected with Argos from his temporal point

⁸⁴ Cf. Barigazzi (1951) 416-7.

⁸⁵ So more recently Lelli-Parlato (2008) 63; see, however Fuhrer (1992) 162-3.

⁸⁶ In Homer it usually describes the gift of poetic talent (ἀοιδήν; cf. e.g. *Il.* 13.730) conferred upon a human by a divine agent like the Muses (e.g. *Od.* 8.63-4 for Demodocus). However, in our text the accusative ἀοιδήν does not signify ‘talent in composing songs’ but ‘song’ and the subject of the verb is not a divine being but a mortal man (τις ἀνὴρ). In Euripides *Tr.* 1244 (μούσαις ἀοιδὰς δόντες ὑστέρων βροτῶν) Hecuba declares that it is the Trojans and their miseries that will provide the Muses of future men with songs and not the other way around (cf. Lee (1976) *ad* 1242-5).

of view, Callimachus presents it as a prediction (prophecy?) embedded in the speech of another person (cf. *VB* fr. 156.1-15 Massimilla).

The speaker suggests (to whom? the Argives?) erecting statues of the Charites, which are not going to be naked any more, but clad. It is, therefore, likely that the speech included an *aetion* concerning the representation of the Charites in Argos. Pausanias informs us that ancient, and probably dressed (cf. Lehnus (2004) 205-6), statues of the Charites adorned the *pronaos* of Hera's temple (2. 17. 3). As far as we can tell, the representation of the Charites as dressed was not canonical. The exact connection between this Argive *aetion* and Sosibius' victory is not clear. The mention of Sosibius' Argive victory (?) and the ensuing celebrations could have suggested such a digression. At the same time the consecration of the statues of the Charites could be a foil to Sosibius' offering at Pelusium. The fact that the city of Argos had been responsible since the end of the fifth century for the administration of the Nemean Games (cf. Miller (1982) 106-7, (1989) 20-3, 57), where Sosibius won one of his two recent victories, could be another reason for the inclusion of such an *aetion* in Callimachus' elegy.

The fragment ends with the quotation of the first line inscribed on Sosibius' votive offering at a temple (of Zeus?) at Pelusium near the Casian Sea.⁸⁷ There is no reason to posit that Sosibius had won victories at games at Cyprus or near Pelusium (cf. Fuhrer (1992) 166-8). In a way reminiscent of first-person expressions in agonistic epigrams the (unspecified) consecrated item is presented speaking and tells its story.⁸⁸ it was carried to Egypt from Cyprus on board a

⁸⁷ If Zeus was indeed mentioned in the proem of the *VS*, it could be that Callimachus began his elegy in the middle of the libation to Zeus supposed to take place at his temple by that place only to return to it at the end of the poem.

⁸⁸ Cf. Ebert (1972) 21. Callimachus' epigram finds no parallel in Ebert's collection. The speaking tomb of Simonides in *Aetia* 3 fr. 163 Massimilla is another case of an inscribed epigram included in a larger text; cf. Acosta-Hughes (2010) 171-3.

Phoenician merchant-boat (‘Κυπρόθε Σιδόνιό[ς μ]ε κατήγαγεν ἐνθάδε γα[ύλ]ος). Trypanis has interestingly suggested that the offering was a chariot. It is possible that the offering was the winning chariot or a monumental representation of it along with Sosibius, as in Posidippus (AB 74.12-13 Θεοῖσι δ’ Ἀδ[ε]λφείοις εἰκὼ ἐναργέα τῶν τότε [ἀγώνω]ν / ἄρ[μα καὶ ἠνίροχον χάλκεον ᾧδ’ ἔθετο).⁸⁹ This would nicely round off the main part of the poem and prepare for the epilogue. An attractive parallel for the first option could be furnished by Pind. *Pyth.* 5.34-42 for the chariot victory of King Arcesilaus in 462 BCE. After the race the winning chariot was dedicated to the temple of Apollo at Delphi. In *Pyth.* 5.35 Arcesilaus’ chariot is called *δαίδαλα*; this suggests the exquisite workmanship of its construction. An *ekphrasis* of the chariot somewhere in the lines lost would not have been out of place. It is worth noting that Callimachus decided to incorporate an agonistic epigram in his epinician, something unprecedented in archaic epinicians. Callimachus, it would seem, interacts with the contemporary blossoming of agonistic epigrams. Unfortunately the rest of inscription is lost.

Nonetheless, the inscription can still give us an idea of Callimachus’ allusive style. It is likely that the agonistic epigram is alluding to Pind. *Pyth.* 2.67-8:⁹⁰ (τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν / μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἀλὸς πέμπεται). The ode, probably, celebrates an unspecified chariot race by Hieron.⁹¹ In the lines quoted above Pindar’s epinician, called some lines before τὸ Καστόρειον (sc. μέλος), is sent overseas to Hieron on board a Phoenician ship. In the same way the offering and

⁸⁹ Trypanis (1958) 240-1 n. a. For epigrams inscribed on equestrian monuments representing the horse-team or the chariot with or without the driver see Ebert (1972) 9-10 and Angeli Bernardini (1992) 972. Alcibiades commissioned a sculptor to create a statue representing him on the chariot (Pliny *N. H.* 34, 8, 80).

⁹⁰ For these lines see Tedeschi (1985) 32-5.

⁹¹ Cf. Bowra (1953) 69, Burton (1962) 111-5, Lloyd-Jones (1990a) 124-5, Lefkowitz (1976) 164-170.

the inscribed epigram have come to Egypt from Cyprus on board a Phoenician ship. The ship is a variant of the arrival motif bringing news of the victory to the *laudandus*' home.⁹² At the same time, in *Pythian* 2 it suggests the maritime supremacy of Syracuse. Hieron's navy can vouchsafe the safety of the poet during his journey, keeping at bay the danger of pirates threatening commercial growth. Similarly in Callimachus' epigram the mention of Cyprus could suggest the power of the Ptolemaic navy and Ptolemaic interest in Cyprus and in the Mediterranean as a whole. Callimachus replaced the word *ἐμπολάν* with the rarer – and perhaps Phoenician – word *γαῦλος*. This erudite note could also indicate Ptolemaic interest in Phoenicia and the contemporary antagonism between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids over Koile Syria.

Fifth Fragment 53-60

When the text becomes legible again after a lacuna of fourteen lines, the poet is occupied with the construction of Sosibius' public image. These lines are heavily indebted to the Pindaric image of the great Sicilian patrons, Hieron, Theron and Chromius.⁹³ Callimachus singles out Sosibius not only for his liberality but also for his concern for people of lower social standing. Pindaric imagery continues in the next lines as the poet expresses his fear that his praise may incur the disbelief and anger of the audience. Pindar usually fears that excess in the praise of the victorious athlete (*κόρος*) will cause the mistrust and envy of the people (*φθόνος*) (cf. e.g. *Pyth.* 1.81-4). Callimachus, on the other hand, postulates, that the 'tongue of the *demos*'

⁹² Cf. Tedeschi (1985) 32-3; Gentili (1995) *ad* 62-3. Compare also Pindar's *Nem.* 5.2-5 (*ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας / ὀλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτω, γλυκεῖ' αἰοιδά, / στειχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ' ὅτι / Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενῆς / νίκη Νεμείους παγκρατίου στέφανον*).

⁹³ Cf. Cahen (1972) *ad loc.* and Fuhrer (1992) 195-7.

will turn against him not only if he praises Sosibius beyond measure but also if he fails to meet their expectations.

The ensuing two lines contain some traces that could give us an idea of what was said. Line 59 begins with a participle in the dative (probably *μεμφομένω* as Pfeiffer suggested). The following letters do not allow a certain understanding of the syntax. Arguably there is someone accusing Callimachus for his praise of Sosibius; his main argument could be given by the second half of line 59 (*οὐδέπ[οτ'] ἐ]σθλὸν ἔρεξεν*): Sosibius never performed anything *esthlon* (?). The text is lacunose and the exact meaning is not certain. Nevertheless, Callimachus seems to demarcate his role as *laudator* and protect his *laudandus* against slanderers and political rivals. Despite its immediate context *ἐ]σθλὸν ἔρεξεν* should not be taken to refer necessarily to Sosibius' athletic victory.⁹⁴ In Theoc. 16.74 (*ῥέξας ἢ Ἀχιλεὺς ὄσσον μέγας ἢ βαρὺς Αἴας*) and 17.6 (*ῥέξαντες καλὰ ἔργα σοφῶν ἐκύρησαν ἀοιδῶν*) Theocritus used *ῥέξω* to talk about the heroic feats of heroes of the past, like Achilles and Ajax; in both cases the heroic feat described is viewed as a condition on the part of the poet for the discovery of a suitable patron and the composition of praise poems in his honour. In *Idyll* 16 the 'itinerant' poet is still searching for such a man while in *Idyll* 17 the poet has found his patron in the person of Ptolemy II. Although Theocritus does not talk about the composition of epinician odes, but of encomia, his discourse seems akin to epinician praise: for instance, both Achilles (e.g. *Nem.* 3.43-52; 6) and Ajax (e.g. *Nem.* 7; 8), mentioned in both poems as suitable role-models for Theocritus' *laudandi*, are used by Pindar as foils for the

⁹⁴ Both words appear in epinician or encomiastic context. Braswell (1998) *ad Nem.* 9.6–7 for *τετελεσμένον ἐσλόν* "a noble accomplishment". Like *καλόν, ἐσλόν* is sometimes used of an athletic victory; cf. also *Pyth.* 8.73, *Nem.* 5.47. Pindar uses *ῥέξω* only three times to signify athletic achievement: *Pyth.* 9.96 (*καλὰ ῥέζοντ'*), *Ol.* 9.94 (*ῥαίως ἔων καὶ καλὸς κάλλιστά τε ῥέξαις*), and *Nem.* 4.32 (*ἐπεὶ ῥέζοντά τι καὶ παθεῖν ἔοικε*). On *Pyth.* 9.96 see Burton's (1962) 55-6 detailed discussion.

victorious athletes.⁹⁵ Callimachus' meaning at this point could be restored to a certain degree by the similar use in *Pyth.* 9.95-6 (κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν / παντὶ θυμῷ σὺν τε δίκῃ καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν): addressing Telesicrates' fellow citizens Pindar admonishes them to grant Telesicrates the honour he is entitled to, even if they are not his friends, since his victories have benefited the whole city. Callimachus could have stressed the social benefit of his *laudandus'* victories and the ties connecting Sosibius with his fellow citizens.

The last line of *POxy.* 1793 col. x preserves traces of the adjective *ψευδής* and a word beginning with the letters *καπ*. Although the text is far from secure, one could argue in favour of *καπνός*; this is found in a similar context in Pindar's *Nemean* 1.24-5, addressed to Chromius Hieron's general (λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἐσλοῦς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν / ἀντίον. τέχνη δ' ἑτέρων ἕτεραι).⁹⁶ Just before this Pindar presents himself as Chromius' *ξείνος* standing at the entrance of Chromius' house and singing. A rich feast has been organized in honour of the important guest who has come to take part in the celebrations. The lines in question come straight after the praise of Chromius' liberality and hospitality. In the same way in Callimachus' elegy the generalization on truth and the role of the epinician poet could have come straight after the praise of Sosibius' liberality.

⁹⁵ For the Pindaric elements in *Idylls* 16 and 17 see Perrotta (1925) 5-29.

⁹⁶ This is not the place for a detailed discussion of these notoriously difficult lines. I believe that Σ *ad Nem.* 1.34e is the only rendition which respects the Greek of the text; cf. especially Privitera (1972) 38-41 and Nisetich (1980): "for those who criticize the noble / are doomed / to carry water against smoke!". Pace Braswell (1992) *ad loc.*, I consider Waring's (1982) analysis of the syntax, with minor modifications, to be the correct one. The accusative *ἐσθλοῦς* should be taken as the object of the participle and not of *λέλογχε*. *μεμφομένοις* is a dative of possessor; see K.-G. i. 416 and Schwyzer ii. 143.

Epilogue

The text breaks off after that, so one lacks any information concerning the ending – and so the overall structure of the poem. Until this point one has no secure evidence whether Callimachus' embedded epinician stopped somewhere in the previous lines or extended to the very end just before the epilogue; there Callimachus would, probably, have returned to the present context of performance that he established at the beginning of the poem. If one may judge from the structure of some of Theocritus' poems (e.g. 11 and 13) one could posit that in Callimachus' elegy for Sosibius there was a frame. As in Theocritus the frame would set the scene (banquet or consecration of *ex voto* at Pelusium (?); arrival of the victorious chariot etc.) and organize the whole poem in a ring composition by occupying the beginning and the end of the poem. The frame in this specific case would embed another epinician poem or better the epinician proper; this embedded epinician would have been placed at the moment in the past when the news of Sosibius' victory had first reached Callimachus in Alexandria. This would enable Callimachus to present himself as one of Sosibius' friends (impulsive joyful reaction to the news of his friend's victory) and so establish a personal bond with the *laudandus*; this would rework the epinician motif of friendship between patron and poet.

In light of our previous discussion the overall structure of Callimachus' epinician could have been be the following:

1. 1-6: Introduction (setting the scene).
2. 7-33: Epinician proper:
 - a. 9-15: Hymn to Poseidon

- b. 16 + lacuna of 5 lines: gnomic digression + myth on origins of gold [?]
- c. 21-28: Sosibius' Isthmian and Nemean victories
- d. 29-33: speech of the Nile
- e. 35-43: speech of Sosibius
- f. 44-46: speech of Argive man
- g. 47-49: the poet's (?) testimony
- h. 50-1: epigram.

3. 53-60: praise of Sosibius' liberality (epilogue?).⁹⁷

It is noteworthy that the poem included so many speeches; and if one believes that the Argive man quotes a speech by another person then the structure becomes even more complicated. It is true that Pindar does not include many direct speeches in his epinicians and, when he does, these usually come at the critical moments of the myth.⁹⁸ On the other hand, in the *VS* the people speaking impart information relevant to the athletic record and the praise of the *laudandus*. In so doing, they appropriate pieces of epinician discourse which traditionally belonged to the poet's *persona* (rejoicing in the news of victory; list of previous victories). In this sense the task of praise does not only fall on the shoulders of the poet but is delegated to his *dramatis personae*, who complement his authoritative voice.

⁹⁷ One usually finds the mention of the *φθόνος* of the winner's fellow-citizens combined with a *gnome* near the end of the poem; the mutilated end of the papyrus does not allow certainty, but it is probable that the mention of unfair envy would lead to the end of the poem. Cf. Gelzer (1985) 106.

⁹⁸ Schmid (1998) 165.

CHAPTER 2

Pindaric Elements in the *Victoria Berenices* (fr. 143-156 Massimilla)**Introduction**

This chapter will focus on the Pindaric allusions in Callimachus' other epinician elegy, which praises the Nemean victory of Queen Berenice II in the chariot race. Several papyrus fragments of various sizes and degrees of preservation provide the text of the elegy. This causes great difficulties in the examination not only of the overall structure of the elegy but of the Pindaric allusions as well. Still the proem (fr. 143 Massimilla) and a recently published fragment, which belongs with it or comes right after it (fr. 144 Massimilla), are preserved in a better condition. As will become clear from the following discussion, the proem was truly endowed with Pindaric, and generally epinician, elements which helped to identify the elegy as an epinician poem and claim something of the prestige of Pindaric odes for the Ptolemaic queen (cf. Massimilla (2010) 225). In view of the state in which our material is preserved, the discussion will focus mainly on the introductory lines, which are preserved best, and less on the other fragments. The discussion will try to describe the way in which Callimachus employed both allusions to general epinician conventions illustrated mainly or solely by Pindar's odes (*modello genere*), as well as allusions to specific Pindaric passages (*modello esemplare*) so as to meet the needs of his patrons by remodelling Pindar's praise discourse.

Epinician Signposts in the Proem of the *Victoria Berenices*

Although independent information certifies (Athen. 4.144E) that Callimachus' elegy for Sosibius was an epinician poem, there is no such ancient information available for the *VB*. Hence our first task is to survey those elements in the proem which suggest that the first elegy of the third book of the *Aetia* had an epinician character.

Before the publication of *PLille* 82, fr. 383 Pf. (*POxy.* 2173) was the only known part of the proem. Although not attributed to the *Aetia*,⁹⁹ it was seen to belong to the epinician genre. Pfeiffer, who could not have seen the association with the *Aetia*, grouped it in his edition with fr. 384 Pf., so indicating the community of genre between the two poems (p. 308 'hoc carmen elegiacum [...] *ἐπινίκιον* esse videtur'). I will return later to the reasons Pfeiffer had to consider fr. 383 Pf. epinician in character. Pfeiffer's claim was substantiated by the publication of the Lille papyrus (*PLille* 82.1a), which complemented fr. 383.3 Pf. as ἡμ[ε]τερο. [.]. *ἔων ἐπινίκιον ἵππων*[ν]. Callimachus himself designated his composition as 'our epinician poem (for?) your horses' or, at least, something similar.¹⁰⁰ Such generic tags are not unprecedented in archaic epinician odes either, where the poets can also talk about their compositions in a self-referential manner.

⁹⁹ The title *Victoria Berenices* was given to the elegy by Peter Parsons (1977), who has offered the most substantial reconstruction of the whole elegy combining the Lille papyrus with fragments already present in Pfeiffer's edition. For the most up-to-date account and discussion of the text of the *VB* see Massimilla's (2010) recent edition.

¹⁰⁰ For the various supplements proposed, see Massimilla (2010) p. 227 *ad* fr. 143.3. For the use of the first-person plural possessive pronoun cf. *Pyth.* 3.65 (μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι ἀμέτεροι). The use of the demonstrative pronoun to refer to his poetry (e.g. τόδε) is much commoner. See, however, *Ol.* 6.105 (ἐμῶν δ' ὕμνων ἄεξ' εὐτερπὲς ἄνθος); *Pyth.* 8. 34 (ἐμᾶι ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾶι); *Pyth.* 3.105 (κατ' ἐμὰν θεραπεύων μαχανὰν); *Nem.* 4. 85 (ἐμὰν γλώσσαν). The role of the genitive (ἵππων) is not clear. It could modify ἐπινίκιον and suggest the event in which the victory was won, even if this was regularly placed in the dative (e.g. the Hellenistic title in Simonides fr. 7a Poltera Κέλητι τοῦς Αἰατίου παισίν). *Ol.* 8.75 (χειρῶν ἄωτον ἐπινίκιον) could provide a parallel: the genitive here modifies ἄωτον, usually rendered as "praise song"; cf. Rumpel (1883) *s.v.* 2, Gildersleeve (1890) *ad loc.* and LSJ⁹ *s.v.* II. The construction could have been similar to this, especially if ἐπινίκιον was adjectival and the lacuna included a word for praise-song, e.g. παιᾶνα, proposed by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983) *ad SH* 254.3, *contra* D'Alessio (2007) 447.

As far as the generic tag *ἐπινίκιον* is concerned, one should note that the word is borrowed from archaic lyric (cf. Lowe (2007) 167-8): cf. *Nem.* 4.78 (*ἐπινικίοισιν ᾠοιδαῖς*) and *Bacch.* 2.13 (*γεραίρουσ' ἐπινικίοις*). Differently from Callimachus, though, neither Pindar nor Bacchylides uses the term to classify his own epinician in a self-referential manner. Instead, they employ it for a genre of utterances or songs which was occasioned by, and contextualized within, the frame of the victory celebration. Still, in *Ol.* 8.75 (*φράσαι /χειρῶν ἄωτον Βλεψιάδαις ἐπίνικον*) the cognate *epinikos* is used in a self-referential manner.¹⁰¹ Outside epinician poetry, Heraclides Ponticus (Aristotle fr. 568 Rose) and Aristotle (fr. 611.55 Rose), who depends on the former, used the same term to classify Simonides' epinician ode for Anaxilas of Rhegion (fr. 2 Poltera *ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ ἐπινίκιον Σιμωνίδης, χαίрет' ἀελλοπόδων θύγατρεις ἵππων*). Callimachus could have also used *epinikion* in order to allude to contemporary scholarly terminology, although this is unclear in view of the much more frequent use of the cognate *epinikos*.¹⁰²

The detailed description of the victorious race in the proem is another indication of the epinician character of the elegy (fr. 143.8–10 Massimilla). This is enough to suggest a wealthy *laudandus*, who has the means to meet the cost involved in maintaining horses and participating in the chariot events (cf. fr. 384.55–6 Pf.; Posidippus AB 73). All this evidence, then, indicated without a doubt that the poet wanted his readers to read this elegy as an epinician poem.

¹⁰¹ This term is not found in Bacchylides. For the terms that Pindar used to describe his poems, see Gianotti (1975) 85-8.

¹⁰² Cf. Färber (1936) 35-6, Harvey (1955) 163-4 and Lowe (2007) 167-8. See also Färber (1936) 44-45 *ἐπίνικός ἐστι ποίημα περιέχον τῶν νενικηκότων ἐγκώμιον, ἐπ' αὐτῇ τῇ νίκῃ καὶ δι' αὐτὴν γεγονός* (Σ Dion. Thrac. 451,10 Hilg.); *Dieg. Call. Iamb.* 8.21-3 (p. 195 Pf., *Ἐπίνικος Πολυκλεῖ Αἰγινήτη νικήσαντι διαύλωι Ἀμφορίτη ἐν τῇ πατρίδι*); and for the *VS*, Athenaeus (4.114E, *εἰς δὲ Καλλίμαχος ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπίνικον ἐλεγειακὸν ἐποίησεν*) and the marginal scholium on *POxy.* 2258 fr. 2ⁱ *ad vv. inter 15 et 23* ([|] *ἀγῶνά φ(ησιν) ἐπηκολουθηκ[ε]ναι τὰ Ν[ε]μεα εἰς ἃ καὶ ὁ [ε]πίνικος γέγραπται*).

Generic Allusions in the Proem of the *Victoria Berenices*

We have now seen the textual signposts which indicated to (ancient) readers that the elegy was to be understood as an epinician poem. Still it ought to be added that the generic character of a poem is not established on the basis of content alone, even if this is usually the case. Both poets and audience were aware that a genre such as epinician poetry was extremely stylized and contained various standard motifs. Motifs of this kind facilitated the communication between poet, *laudandus*, and audience and so formed an indispensable part of the horizon of expectations of the audience.¹⁰³ These generically sanctioned motifs were a guiding line for the composition of the elegy and the efficacious functioning of epinician discourse. Next, I will concentrate on the examination of genre allusions in the proem of the *VB* and see how this could reflect the horizon of expectations which Callimachus was trying to meet with his poem.¹⁰⁴

The elegy begins with a mention of Zeus and the personified Nemea, where notionally Berenice's chariot victory was won.¹⁰⁵ An ancient reader (*Σ ad Ol.* 8.21c) thought that this combination of Zeus and Nemea was modelled on Pindar's *Olympian* 8 (16 **Ζηνὶ γενεθλίωι· ὃς σὲ μὲν Νεμέα πρόφατον**), a fanciful and unconvincing connection, which neglects the context. Out of all the parallels that Pfeiffer (*ad fr.* 383) puts forward only *Nem.* 4.9–11 **τό μοι θέμεν Κρονίδα τε Διὶ καὶ Νεμέα / Τιμασάρχου τε πάλα / ὕμνου προκώμιον εἶη**) seems relevant. D'Alessio (2007: 447 n.2) has also pointed out that *Pyth.* 4.1-3 offers a close *structural* parallel (**ὄφρα ... Μοῖσα, Λατοῖδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυθῶνι τ' αὔξης οὖρον ὕμνων**).

¹⁰³ Cf. e.g. van Groningen (1958) 325, Hamilton (1974) 1 and Segal (1986) 128-130.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. also Corbato (1980) 242-3 and Massimilla (2010) 226 *ad fr.* 143.1.

¹⁰⁵ The *VS* (*fr.* 384 Pf.) also begins with what appears to have been a libation to Zeus. This could hark back to the proem of Pindar *Nemean.* 2 (3 **Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου**); cf. Coppola (1930) 228.

This parallel is of special interest for the proem of the *VB*, an epinician also composed for a Cyrenean victor and by a Cyrenean poet: in *Pyth.* 4.13–16 Medea describes in prophecy the foundation of Cyrene by the descendants of Euphamos. In doing so, she constructs an intercultural bridge which brings together personages of Argive saga (Epaphos and his daughter, Cyrene, l. 14 *Ἐπάφιοι κόραν*) and the Egyptian pantheon (Amun l. 16. *Διὸς ἐν Ἄμμωνος θεμέθλοις*). The association of Argos and Egypt is carried out within the frame provided by the myth of Io’s arrival in Egypt (cf. *Nem.* 10.4-6) and the intercultural identification of mythological figures such as Amun and Zeus (cf. also fr. 36 Maehler *Ἄμμων Ὀλύμπου δέσποτα* [with Paus. 9.16.1]; fr. 57-60 Maehler). The connection of Argos and Egypt within epinician discourse, as we are about to see, is a motif that permeates the colonial discourse of the *VB* and could allude to *Pythian* 4 and *Nemean* 10.

Differently from Pindar, though, Callimachus mentions Io (l. 4 *ἄρμοι γὰρ [Δαναοῦ γ]ῆς ἀπὸ βουγενέος*; cf. *Ep.* 18.1 Gow-Page *Ἰναχίης ἔστηκεν ἐν Ἰσιδος*), though allusively, and even her son, if he is to be identified with the Apis bull mentioned in l. 16 (*εἰδ[υῖ]αι φαλιὸν τ[α]ῦ[ρον] ἠλεμίσαι*).¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, in *Pyth.* 4.3 Pindar entreats his Muse to ‘swell a beneficial wind of songs which is due to the children of Leto and to Pytho’. Similarly, in line 1 of the *VB* Callimachus’ epinician is a wedding-gift due to Zeus and Nemea (*Δατοῖδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυθῶνι τ’ ... οὔρον ὕμνων ~ Ζηνί τε καὶ Νεμέῃ τι χαρίσιον ἔδνον ὀφείλω*). Both

¹⁰⁶ Suidas credited Callimachus with a book on “The Arrival of Io” (*Ἰοῦς ἀφίξις*). Following Bergk, Daub (1880) 465 argued that this was a part of the *Aetia*, which had dropped from the head of the list of Callimachus’ works that Suidas provides; cf. D’Alessio (2007) 30. One may wonder whether this title described an autonomous poem later incorporated in the proem of the *VB*. For instance, most of the fragments that Schneider (1873) 33-5 attributed to this poem have been seen to belong to the *VS* or the *VB*. Io could have played a greater role in the original poem, as she did in [Aeschylus’] *Prometheus* and Bacchylides’ *Dithyramb* of the same name. For the importance of Io’s myth in Ptolemaic discourse see Schneider (1873) 34 and esp. Stephens (2002) 247 and (2003) 25 n. 16.

poets, that is, mention the god(s) presiding over the games in which the victory was won (Apollo and Artemis / Zeus), along with the nymph of the place (Pytho / Nemea); they also present their poems as a debt to these divinities. Finally, the intertextual association of the *VB* with *Pythian* 4 is strengthened by fr. 154 Massimilla, where Callimachus employs an *Abbruchsformel* quite similar to that used by Pindar in *Pyth.* 4.246-8 (on which see below).

Callimachus considers the *VB* as his personal “debt” (*χρέος*) to Zeus and Nemea, who viewed Berenice with a favourable eye and granted her victory in the games. Callimachus is reworking a traditional epinician motif, which Schadewaldt named the *chreos*-motif.¹⁰⁷ The motif can assume several forms, but the closest parallels are furnished by *Pyth.* 4.3, quoted above, and *Ol.* 10.2 (*γλυκὸν γὰρ αὐτῷ μέλος ὀφείλων*). Pindar seems to have developed an elaborate vocabulary to express this motif.¹⁰⁸ Still, Callimachus avoids epinician clichés and employs a new term, which cheats generic expectations: he presents his poem as a *ἔδνον* “a wedding gift” (l.1) due to Zeus and Nemea as a sign of gratitude (*charis*).

Even in this twist of generic expectations, Callimachus remains within the space of Pindaric poetry. The grammatical form of the word (*ἔδνον* in the singular) and the metaphorical meaning (‘praise-song’) with which Callimachus endows it in this context, have a well-documented Pindaric provenance. Pfeiffer states *ad loc.* that the use of *ἔδνον* in the singular is found again in poetry before Callimachus only in Pindar (*Ol.* 9.10 *ἀκρωτήριον Ἄλιδος...τὸ δὴ ποτε Λυδὸς ἥρωος Πέλοψ / ἐξάρατο*

¹⁰⁷ Schadewaldt (1928) 277–9, Gianotti (1975) 19–26, Bundy (1986) 11, 57–8 and Kurke (1991) 98–107; for the connection of *chreos* with *charis* (*χαρίσιον ... ὀφείλω*) see Gundert (1935) 43–4.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Pfeiffer *ad fr.* 383.1 *τίνειν* (e.g. *Ol.* 10.12), *τελεῖν* or *χρέος* (e.g. *Ol.* 9.104–105, *Pyth.* 8.33–4). Bacchylides does not seem to have used any of these words. Still, there is one similar occurrence of *chreos* in the extremely lacunose 8.20 (*σὺν ἀλαθείᾳ δὲ πᾶν λάμπει χρέος*), where the substantive is usually taken to refer to the task of the epinician poet; see Maehler (1982) *ad loc.*

κάλλιστον **ἔδνον** Ἰπποδαμείας); but this is in a rather different context.¹⁰⁹ Here **ἔδνον** refers to Elis and suggests the myth of the chariot competition between Pelops and Oenomaus. Callimachus, however, employed the term self-referentially to refer to his own poem. In this way, he invested it with a different metaphorical meaning ‘praise-song’, which was absent from *Olympian* 9. Scholars have rightly suggested that this was a meaning suggested to Callimachus by Pindar’s *Paeon* 4 (4 γυν]αικῶν **ἔδνώσεται**). The text is extremely lacunose and so difficult to reconstruct. Still, the marginal note on *POxy.* 841 can elucidate the meaning of this line: Σ₄ (Σ^{δ2}) (ἔδνώ)σατο (Σ^{ε1}) ἀντὶ ὑμνήθη [< 10]. The metaphorical equation **ἔδνον** = ὕμνος in Callimachus’ text alluded quite reasonably to Pindar and this allusion was probably perceptible to ancient readers.

Nonetheless, it should be borne in mind that **ἔδνώσεται** in this context retains its marital associations, as the following discussion will make clear – and this should alert the reader to similar association in the use of **νύμφη** in the *VB*. In the proem of *Paeon* 4 the chorus-members offer the paeon as a wedding gift to Delos and its tutelary gods on behalf of Ceos their native island. Artemis, and perhaps Apollo, probably mentioned in the *lacuna* of l.1, presided over the ‘transaction’. The analogy with fr. 143 Massimilla is telling. Callimachus offers his wedding gift (poem) to Zeus and Nemea on behalf of Berenice II, and probably Ptolemy III, who is conspicuously absent from the elegy’s proem. Callimachus qua *laudator* assumes the role of the Cean chorus in Pindar as giver of the gift (the paeon). The nymphs of the place (Delos ~ Nemea) along with its primary gods (Zeus ~ Artemis and Apollo) receive the gift which is offered on behalf of the people of Ceos and Berenice

¹⁰⁹ Pfeiffer is mistaken too. The singular with the meaning of ‘dowry’ is also used in a fragment attributed to Hipponax (fr. 182 W²). Here **ἔδνον** is Haupt’s emendation of the MSS reading **ἔνδον**; cf. Farina (1963) *ad* fr. 74.

respectively. It would seem, then, that Pindar presented the relationship between the islands of Ceos and Delos as a marital one, something that gave the idea to Callimachus for his *ἔδνον*-elegy.¹¹⁰ The metapoetic connotations of *ἔδνον* notwithstanding, the noun retains its marital associations, as is made clear by the ensuing line, where Berenice II is addressed as *νύμφα* “bride” (*pace* Parsons (1977) 8). It is likely that this was meant to bring the poem into connection with the (recent?) marriage of Ptolemy III to Berenice II (cf. Barigazzi (1979) 267 n. 1), without, however, specifying any further the exact time that has elapsed since then. It is likely that Callimachus was trying to recreate on a lesser scale another generic element he found in Pindar’s epinicians, love or marital imagery.¹¹¹

Scholars have suggested that Pindar regularly employs love diction¹¹² or imagery in his epinicians to convey (*a*) the force that drives the athletes to success (*Ol.* 3.33 *γλυκὺς ἕμερος*)¹¹³ as well as (*b*) the role gods can play in securing this victory through their benevolence towards the victor (cf. Crotty (1982) 93-6). It is usual in this regard for mythical foils to be represented as lovers of gods (Pelops in *Olympian* 1; cf. Bowra (1964) 169) or their consorts (Cyrene in *Pythian* 9). By analogy, these myths suggest that the victor enjoys the love of the gods, something that often assumes marital overtones. In this respect, marriage comes to symbolize

¹¹⁰ Cf. Käppel (1992) 97–8, 150-3, Rutherford (2001) 285 and Acosta-Hughes (2010) 178 with n. 27. In *Paeon* 4 marital imagery indicates the close (cultic) connections and relationship which existed between the islands of Ceos and Delos.

¹¹¹ This is absent from Bacchylides and so it remains unclear whether it was a generic convention or a Pindaric innovation; cf. also Lasserre (1974). Ibycus could have been the first to mix epinician and love poetry.

¹¹² Note especially the use of *μείγνυμι*; see Carne-Ross (1985) 26–30 and Gentili (1995) 235-6. Homer had used the same verb, and others like *δάμνημι*, to describe duels at close quarters as love-struggles and to project the dead warrior into the role of the tamed or raped woman; cf. esp. Vermeule (1979) 101. The duality of roles that Homeric heroes demonstrate as warriors and athletes (cf. e.g. *Iliad* 23) could have suggested to Pindar, or some other poet before him, the transferal of the motif from the description of duels to that of athletic victories.

¹¹³ Bowra (1964) 169-70, Hölscher (1975) 96, Carey (1981) *ad Pyth.* 9.87 and Crotty (1982) 29. In *Pyth.* 4.184-5 the *πόθος* that Hera instills in the Argonauts suggests the desire for accomplishment; cf. Norwood (1945) 42, Crotty (1982) 119 and Hubbard (1983) 16–7.

metaphorically the athletic competition, the bride the victory and sexual union the prowess bred into the clan of the *laudandus*.¹¹⁴

So when Pindar represents the personified Cyrene as Apollo's bride in *Pyth.* 9.56 (*δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν δώμασιν ἐν χρυσείοις*) her role in epinician discourse is twofold: as a huntress she is a foil for the athlete, but as Apollo's bride and *athlon*, a foil for Telesicrates' victory. The latter analogy is emphatically suggested in l. 75 (*δόξαν ἱμερτὰν ἄγοντ' ἀπὸ Δελφῶν*), where the glory that Telesicrates brings home to Cyrene is presented as his bride (cf. Köhnken (1985) 96–7; Kurke (1991): 127–8).¹¹⁵ The reception of the victorious Telesicrates in lines 70–4 is described in terms reminiscent of the reception of the divine couple first by Aphrodite (9-13) and then by Libya (55-57) (cf. Crotty (1982) 95; Carne-Ross (1985) 93-4; Kurke (1991) 128-32):

καί νυν ἐν Πυθῶνίνιν ἀγαθὴν Καρνειάδα υἱὸς εὐθαλεῖ συνέμειξε τύχῃ· ἔνθα νικάσαις ἀνέφανε Κυράναν, ἄνιν εὐφρων δέξεται (73) καλλιγύναικι πάτρα δόξαν ἱμερτὰν ἀγαγόντ' ἀπὸ Δελφῶν	ὑπέδεκτο δ' ἀργυρόπεζ' Ἀφροδίτα Δάλιον ξείνον θεοδμάτων (10) ὀχέων ἐφαπτομένα χερὶ κούφῃ· καί σφιν ἐπὶ γλυκεραῖς εὐναῖς ἐρατὰν βάλεν αἰδῶ, ξυνὸν ἀρμόζοισα θεῶ τε γάμον	νῦν δ' εὐρυλείμων πότνια σοι Λιβύα (55) δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν δώμασιν ἐν χρυσείοις πρόφρων· ἵνα οἱ χθονὸς αἴσαν (56a) αὐτίκα συντελέθειν ἔννομον δωρήσεται
--	--	--

Pythian 9 is Pindar's third Cyrenean ode. It contains a great deal of Cyrenean folklore and this renders it an important intertext for the marital imagery in *VB*.

¹¹⁴ For instance, in *Nem.* 4.60-5 Peleus wrestles with a form-shifting Thetis, in order to make her his wife (Carne-Ross (1985) 118), while in *Pyth.* 9.106-18 Antaeus, following Danaus' example, organizes a foot race to marry off his daughter (cf. Oenomaus in *Olympian* 1). In *Nem.* 1.70-5 Heracles' marriage to Hebe becomes a metaphor for the immortality that epinician poetry confers on the victor. In *Ol* 7.14 (τὰν ποντίαν / ὑμένων, παῖδ' Ἀφροδίτας / Ἀελίοιο τε νύμφαν, Ἰόδον) the same motif is used to suggest Helios' benevolence towards Diagora's country and so towards his family and people. On the engagement scene in the beginning of the same ode, see Kurke (1991) 118-25.

¹¹⁵ Cf. also *Pyth.* 5.26–31 (φιλεῖν δὲ Κάρρωτον ἕξοχ' ἐταίρων· / ὅς οὐ τὰν Ἐπιμαθέος ἄγων / ὀψινόου θυγατέρα Πρόφασιν Βαπτιδῶν ἀφίκετο δόμους θεμισκρεόντων) with Kurke's (1991) 125–6 discussion.

Berenice's designation as a *νύμφα* aligns her with the *virago* Cyrene, Apollo's bride. At the same time, it would parallel Telesicrates' description as a much-coveted *πόσις* in ll. 97-100 (*ὡς ἕκασται φίλτατον παρθενικαὶ πόσιν ... εὖχοντ' ... ἔμμεν*). It is hard to tell whether Callimachus went on to present Berenice as Ptolemy's prize as well. Still in l. 2 *ιερόν αἶμα* connects Berenice II with Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II. It also spells out the idea of inherent prowess, which marriage imagery as a rule suggests in Pindar's epinicians.

Callimachus returns to epinician conventions with the use of *χαρίσιον*. Pfeiffer rightly connected this with the notion of *χάρις*, so prominent in Pindaric poetry, and pointed out that Callimachus is the first to use the word in this way (cf. also Corbato (1980) 241 and Massimilla (2010) 226 *ad loc.*).¹¹⁶ With *χαρίσιον* the poet appropriates the notion of *χάρις*, so central in Pindar's economy of *κλέος*, to designate his friendly relationship with the royal pair.¹¹⁷

Mythological Episodes in the Proem

In a fashion familiar to us from fr. 384.4–7 Pf. lines 4–7 describe the journey of the 'golden news of Berenice's victory' (*χρύσειον ... ἔπος*) from Argos to Alexandria:

ἄρμοι γὰρ [Δαναοῦ γ] ἦς ἀπὸ βουγενέος (4)
 εἰς Ἑλένης νησιῶν καὶ εἰς Παλληνέα μάιντιν, (5)
 ποιμένα [φωκάων], χρύσειον ἦλθεν ἔπος

¹¹⁶ Before Callimachus the word appears in poetry only in the fragments of Aristophanes (*Δαιταλῆς* fr. 211.2 K.-A.) and Eubulus (*Ἀγκυλίων* fr. 1.3 K.-A.). However, the word there has a substantival force and denotes a sort of *πλακοῦς* or a kind of bread; see Hunter (1983) *ad* Eubulus fr. 2(b). The exact connection between this use and Callimachus' is not clear; for more details see Chantraine (1999) s.v. p. 1247 and Frisk (1970) s.v. *χαίρω* p. 1063.

¹¹⁷ For *charis* in Pindar's poetry see Gundert (1935) 30-2 and Kurke (1991) 154-5 and *passim*. For the *φιλότης* between the poet and the victor see Gundert (1935) 32-9 and Crotty (1982) 76-9; cf. also e.g. *Pyth.* 1.60 (*ἄγ' ἔπειτ' Αἴτνας βασιλεῖ φίλιον ἐξεύρωμεν ὕμνον*) with Rumpel (1883) s.v. who quotes the rendition of the Scholiast as *προσφιλέστατος* and *Pyth.* 10.65-6 (*τόδ' ἔζηξεν ἄρμα Πιερίδων τετράρορον, / φιλέων φιλέοντ', ἄγων ἄγοντα προφρόνως*) with Kurke (1991) 140-3.

It is remarkable, and indicative of Callimachus' highly wrought style, that mythological personages, like Danaus and Helen, represent the stations involved in the travel of the ἀγγελίη. The aim in this section is to establish how much of this mythological material is indebted to Pindar, not only in terms of subject matter, but also of its function within epinican discourse. This means that the discussion will focus only on Pindar, ignoring other possible subtexts, such as e.g. Herodotus *Book 2*, Aeschylus' *Supplices* and Euripides' *Helen*.

Callimachus connects the locale of the Games with (i) the arrival of Danaus to Argos from Egypt along with his fifty daughters and (ii) the flight of his ancestor, Io, in the form of a cow to Egypt, where she gave birth to Epaphos the Greek progenitor of the royal line of Egypt.¹¹⁸ The designation of Argos as the land of Danaus is modelled on Pind. *Nem.* 10.1 (Δαναοῦ πόλιν ἀγλαοθρόνων τε πεντήκοντα κορᾶν); that ode celebrates an Argive *laudandus* (cf. Pfeiffer *ad fr.* 383.1). This connection is strengthened by the testimony of the Pindaric scholia *ad loc.*, which quote some lines from the *VB* (fr. 146 Massimilla) in order to substantiate the cultic connection of Hera with Argos. The banality of the scholium notwithstanding, this nicely exhibits the way in which an educated reader would create an intertextual network into which he could insert the *VB* to appreciate it. Besides the linguistic similarity, which suggested the intertextual connection in the first place, the proem of *Nemean 10* is interesting for our reading of the *VB*, as it offers an elaborated

¹¹⁸ Note also the mention of the Apis bull later on in fr. 143.15-8 Massimilla. The exact context is ambiguous, but it would seem that a chorus of Egyptian women is mourning for the Apis bull. In the *interpretatio Graeca* of Egyptian religion, the Apis bull was identified with Epaphos; see Stephens (2000) 249. A similar connection between Argos and Egypt appears already in Aeschylus *Supp.* 117 [= 128], where the Danaids address the land of Argos as Ἀπίαν βοῶνιν. As Sommerstein (2008) *ad loc.* remarks, the appellation suggests a double link between Argos and Egypt. First, through the identification of Epaphos with the Apis bull, suggested here by the similarity between Ἀπία and Ἄπις, and second through Io, whose bovine form is insinuated through the substantive βοῦ - νιν; cf. also FJW (1980) *ad loc.*

version of the colonial connection between Argos and Egypt that Callimachus employs.

The proem of *Nemean* 10 assumes the form of a compendium of Argive myths (cf. also *Isthm.* 7.1–15 and *Hymn* 1 for a précis of Theban mythology). The poet begins his narrative with Danaus and the Danaids and moves on to Perseus, Danaus' descendant through Hypermestra (1-4). With a leap several generations backwards, Pindar dedicates the next line (5) to Epaphos and his rule over Egypt before going on to Hypermestra (6) and finishing with Diomedes and Alcmena. Io is conspicuously absent from all this. Instead, the emphasis falls on the personified Argos, which functions as the grammatical subject of *καταόκισεν ἄσπη* (l. 5). Pindar's silence over Io suggests the relatively unimportant role of women in the male-oriented colonial discourse. What matters is the glory of Argos, which has reached Egypt, and not Io's role in the story.

Moving on to Callimachus' text, Io makes a perfunctory and allusive appearance through the adjective *βουγενέος* 'descendant of the cow'.¹¹⁹ The adjective modifies Danaus and so Io is once again relegated to a secondary position, grammatically dependent on a male figure. Still, there is a difference in perspective between Callimachus and Pindar as far as the myth of Danaus is concerned. Pindar approaches the myth from the point of view of the metropolis (Argos) in order to stress its power, suggested through the parade of heroes and heroines (cf. similarly *Nem.* 4.44-72 for Aegina). Callimachus, on the other hand, relates the myth from the point of view of the colony. This difference in point of view is nicely expressed through the analogy existing between the mythological peregrinations of Io and

¹¹⁹ For the correct interpretation of the adjective, see Massimilla (2010) *ad loc.* For Io as Danaus' ancestor, see Aeschylus' *Supplikes* esp. 313-21 and *passim*.

Danaus and the journey of the news of Berenice's victory from Argos to Alexandria.¹²⁰

In mythological times, Io travels from Argos to Egypt (more specifically to the Nile). Some generations later Danaus travels from Egypt back to Argos and so completes the circle. In Hellenistic times, now, the circle moves in the opposite direction: Berenice or her chariot team travel from Egypt to Argos (like Danaus) and then the news of her victory (l. 6 *χρύσειον ἔπος*) return back to Alexandria (like Io) (cf. Stephens (2002) 240).¹²¹ The circumstances in the time of Callimachus re-enact the 'plot' of the mythological archetype; the mythological past is the foil for the present event.

Callimachus suggests links between Egypt and Argos, the hearth of the royal house of the Argeads (cf. Stephens (2002) 247). At the same, by stretching the history of the Ptolemaic dynasty back into the time of Io he adds lustre to the new kingdom and strengthens its rivalry with ancient Greek cities. From a structural point of view, this interest in *origines gentium* connects the elegy with the thematically homologous supra-structure of the *Aetia*, the presentation of *aetiological* myths and origins.

¹²⁰ Stephens (2002) 239 considers such 'transcontinental movements' a characteristic of the *Aetia*'s 'fictive frame' that suggests to the reader the intercultural frame within which he should approach the poem. These comprise the metaphorical transportation of Callimachus to Helicon (fr. 4 Massimilla), Pollis' relocation to Egypt (fr. 89 Massimilla) and the catasterism of Berenice's lock (fr. 213 Massimilla). Note, however, that the mythological interconnection between the place of the games and the athlete's home is also found in *Pythian* 9, although in a much simpler form: Telesicrates' movement from Greece (Pytho) to Cyrene, is couched in marital terms, and so parallels Cyrene's *hierogamia* and movement from Greece (Mount Pelion) to Africa. Similar movements between Greece and the East appear again in Herodotus 1.1-5: the list of women abducted begins with Io and ends with Helen.

¹²¹ The colonial discourse of the *VB* is further strengthened in the following line where Callimachus presents the "non-canonical" version of Helen's myth; cf. Stephens (2002) 242-3 and 246-7. In Egypt Helen stayed under the protection of the local king Proteus, while Menelaus and the Greeks were fighting under the walls of Troy. This, however, concerns the intertextual connection of the *VB* with authors other than Pindar (Stesichorus *PMGF* 193; Herodotus 2.112-20; Euripides *Helen* 1-7 with Allan (2008) *ad loc.*) and so is outside the limits of this discussion. In *Pyth.* 5.83-5 Helen makes a short appearance along with the Antenorids in the foundation history of Cyrene; see Krummen (1990) 127.

Argive mythology appeared later on in the proem, as can be reconstructed on the basis of recently published material (fr. 144 Massimilla with his commentary). In what appears to have been a direct speech (11 ὡς ἔνεπεν; cf. also *Dian.* 158) describing part of the victorious race (cf. 1. 2; 6 δρωμ[ῶ]σιν; 7 ἵππα[στ]ήρ; 12 λαγόνων), there is a mention of the male descendants of the river Inachus (Ἴναχ[ίδα]ις). Inachus was the ancestor of the Argive dynasty through his daughter Io ([Aesch.] *Prom.* 589). So this could refer to the male members of the royal house of Argos or to the Argive people in general (cf. [Simonides] *AP.* 7.431; Nicander *AP.* 7.526 [= fr. 106 Gow and Schofield]), who could have figured as the spectators of the race. The accumulation of mythological names is impressive. It could suggest that Callimachus was trying to recreate a list similar to that offered by Pindar in the proem of *Nemean* 10. This included the Nile, Danaus, his brother Aegyptus, his daughter Amymone (cf. *Aetia* III fr. 165 Massimilla.; *Lav.Pall.* 47-8; Apollod. 2.14–15) and his descendant Proetus, king of Argos. The tracing of the line of the royal house of Argos seems intricate, and close to the proem of *Nemean* 10.

The speech came to an end in line 10 (κεῖνος ὃς ἐν Προΐτου ξ[]). If the prepositional phrase was ‘in Proitus’ house’ or ‘kingdom’, then the reference would have been to Argos and the expression could have been modelled on Pindar *Nem.* 10.41-2 (†ἵπποτρόφον ἄστν τὸ Προΐτοιο θάλησεν†) among other possible sources (cf. also Hesiod fr. 37.10 M.-W. οἱ δὲ καὶ εἰς Ἄργος Προΐτοιο πάριρα δῖον ἔκοντο).¹²² The person to whom the demonstrative pronoun refers is now lost in the lacunae. This could have been either Bellerophon (*Il.* 6.155–80; Eur. *Sthen.* fr. 661–74 Kannicht) or Perseus. In view of the connections with *Nemean* 10, Perseus

¹²² For the text at *Nem.* 10.41-2 see Henry (2005) *ad loc.* Note that in Hesiod fr. 37 Argos can refer broadly to Mycenae and Tiryns; Proitus is represented as king of Tiryns in Hesiod fr. 129.16-7.

would seem a more suitable candidate. He was the forefather of Heracles (and through him of the Ptolemies), the protagonist of the myth of the *VB*. One notes also that the catalogue of Argive heroes in *Nemean* 10 ends with the detailed entry on Heracles after the mention of Proteus (10-18).¹²³

The description of the Race

Fr. 143.7-10 Massimilla constitute the golden report of Berenice's victory. As far as one can tell on the basis of the meagre fragments available, this seems to have been the only substantial (?) description of the victory. One is unable to establish how many details about the race fr. 144 Massimilla originally contained. As a rule, Pindar avoided descriptions of the events *per se*. Instead, he concentrates on the meaning the victory had as a turning point in the life of the *laudandus*, his family and the community.¹²⁴ Callimachus could be following Pindaric practice. On the other hand, thrilling descriptions of chariot races appealed to Greek audiences of all time and so had a venerable tradition in Greek poetry (cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.262-652, Soph. *El.* 680-763).

In the light of this, scholars have looked for models in other poets. West (*ap.* Parsons (1977) 9) has suggested that this part of the *VB* follows Bacchylides' description of Hieron's Olympic victory (476 BCE) in the *κέλης*-race with Phoenicis (5.37-49). Corbato has raised the possibility that 06/02/21 Merkelbach–Stauber ([= 59 Ebert]), an inscriptional epigram (c. 280-272 BCE; Ebert (1972) *ad*

¹²³ In fr. 151 Massimilla Heracles alludes to the myth of Melampus, perhaps in connection with his curing Proetus' daughters (Hesiod fr. 129–33 M.–W.; Bacchylides 11; Pherecydes fr. 114 Fowler; Acusilaus fr. 28 Fowler).

¹²⁴ Cf. e.g. Jebb (1905) 56-7 and Bowra (1964) 165-8. It appears, however, that Simonides indulged himself in descriptions of the circumstances of victories, if one may judge from fr. 5-6 Poltera; cf. also Jebb (1905) 38 and Norwood (1945) 29. In contrast with Pindar the description of races becomes a popular theme in the generically related epinician epigrams and especially Posidippus' *Hippika*; see Bettarini (2004) 14-5 and Angeli Bernardini (2000) 40.

loc.) which celebrated the chariot victory of Attalus, the adoptive son of Philetairos and father of Attalus I, was one of Callimachus' subtexts. Notwithstanding the similarities in treatment, several of which could be considered generic conventions, the spatial use of *πρότερος* that both Hellenistic texts have in common (8 *δίφρος ἀεὶ προτέραν πο[σ]σὶν ἔφαινε κόνιν* ~ fr. 143.8 Massimilla *ἔθρεξαν προ[τέρω]ν οὔτινες ἠνιόχων*) is a clear indication of their dependence on Bacchylides 5.43 (*οὔπω νιν ὑπὸ προτέ[ρω]ν / ἵππων ἐν ἀγῶνι κατέχρανε κόνις / πρὸς τέλος ὀρνύμενον*).

Beside the indisputable linguistic similarities between the *VB* and both Bacchylides 5 and 06/02/21 Merkelbach–Stauber, there is a difference in the way in which Callimachus represented the chariot-race, a difference which, one could argue, brings his description closer to that offered by Pindar in *Pyth.* 5.49-53. Bacchylides' description (37-50) is centred solely on the performance of Pherenicus without any mention of the other contestants, while Callimachus seems to have given a whole scene where all athletes are present, not only Berenice's chariot. The difference is one of technique and the epigram for Attalus seems in this respect closer than Callimachus to Bacchylides.

The juxtaposition of the victorious chariot with the rest of the contestants seems to be modelled on Pindar's representation of Carrhotus' chariot-race in *Pyth.* 5.49-53. The ode, addressed to Arcesilaus, king of Cyrene, imparts a considerable amount of information on the colonial prehistory of Cyrene (55–62, 69–95). This is also one of the very few passages in Pindar where one can find details pertaining to the race. Hence it appears to be a relevant and important intertext for the description of the race of Berenice II, a Cyrenean by descent. The correspondence is stylistic rather than linguistic: the juxtaposition of the victorious chariots with the

other chariots enables the two poets to single out the uniqueness of the performance of the chariot of the *laudandi*.

The Poet's Voice in Pindar and Callimachus (fr. 154 Massimilla)

Despite its fragmentary condition the proem of the *VB* has revealed many of the conventions and techniques that Callimachus employed in his epinician poetry, and so allowed us to expand our knowledge of the reception of Pindaric poetry in Hellenistic times. By contrast, the rest of the elegy is preserved in a hopeless condition with some fragments not connected in an obvious manner with each other. They have been arranged on the basis of Probus' narrative about the encounter of Heracles with Molercus (fr. 145 Massimilla). Even so, some fragments can reveal further important information concerning Callimachus' epinician strategy. In this respect fr. 154 Massimilla is important for the information it imparts on the role of the authorial voice.

The fragment belongs to Molercus' second encounter with Heracles. Heracles has already killed the lion and Molercus has rid himself of the mice that were troubling him. This was described in fr. 149 Massimilla, which also gave the *aition* for the mousetrap (on which see below). The poet does not seem to have given any details concerning Heracles' feat save its outcome. If one may judge from the second line of fr. 154 Massimilla, the poet probably manipulated his narrative in such a way as to give the impression that he would describe the feat at a later point, in the form of a flashback narrative by Heracles. However, Heracles does not deliver this embedded narrative in all its details, but instead focuses on a part of it, Athena's prophecy to him.

Callimachus refers to his readers explicitly, something unprecedented in the rest of his *oeuvre*. The reader is invited (**αὐτὸς ἐπιφράσσαιτο**) to pick up the threads of the narrative and supply all the parts that have been omitted for the sake of brevity (**τάμοι δ' ἄπο μῆκος ἀοιδῆ**). Pindar often expressed his anxiety about the feeling of satiety (**κόρος**) his poetry might cause and the possible influence this could have on the audience's reception of his ode (e.g. *Pyth.* 1.81-4; 9.76-9). He attributes to the audience an active role in the preservation and spreading of his poetic message, and especially of the victor's *kleos*. Still he never speaks so explicitly about it, but rather resorts to *gnomai* and maxims.¹²⁵

In the context of an epinician poem such a statement recalls, and remodels, a traditional motif, a **τεθμός** as Pindar himself calls it (*Nem.* 4.33 **τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός**), of epinician poetry (cf. Hubbard (1983) 28-9 and Loscalzo (2003) 68). One could compare several Pindaric passages: e.g. *Pyth.* 4.246-8 (D'Alessio (2007) *ad loc.*) or *Isthm.* 1.60-2 (Corbato (1980) 241). By Hellenistic times, the episode of Heracles' struggle with the lion had already featured in numerous epic (and lyric) narratives on Heracles' exploits and their artistic representations. Callimachus' *Abbruchsformel* signals that he left out a worn-out subject. The aim is not only to avoid the feeling of excess elaborate narratives could cause (Pindar), but the repetition of trite subject-matter. This agreed not only with his own metapoetic taste (cf. *Aetia* fr. 1.24-6 Massimilla) but also followed Pindar's 'anxiety' to innovate. *Nemean* 8.20-2 (**πολλὰ γὰρ λέλεκται, νεαρὰ δ' ἐξευρόντα δόμεν βασάνω / ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος κτλ.**) attests to the importance that Pindar attributed to varying his traditional discourse in praise of the victor. If that was the meaning of these lines, then one should follow Pfeiffer (*ad fr.*

¹²⁵ For the role of the audience in Pindar see Hubbard (1985) 159 and Loscalzo (2003) 49 n. 84, 66.

57) in associating these lines with the metapoetic *Aetia* prologue, all the more so in view of the prologue's indisputable Pindaric associations:¹²⁶

<p><i>Aetia</i> fr. 1.24-6 Massimilla πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι / τὰ στείβε]ιν, ἐτέρων ἵχνια μὴ καθ' ὀμά / δίφρον ἐλῖαν μῆδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους / ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στε]ι]γοτέρην ἐλάσεις</p>	<p><i>Paeon</i> 7b.9-14 Ὀμήρου [ἐκὰς ἄτρι]πτον κατ' ἄμαξιτόν / ἰόντες, ἀ[εὶ οὐκ ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις / ἐπεὶ αὐ[τοὶ τὸ πο]τανὸν ἄρμα / Μοισα[ῖον ἐλαύνο]μεν.</p>	<p><i>Pythian</i> 4.247-8 μακρὰ μοι νεῖσθαι κατ' ἄμαξιτόν· ὥρα γὰρ συνάπτει καί τινα / οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχύν· πολ- λοῖσι δ' ἄγημαι σοφίας ἐτέροις.</p>	<p><i>Nemean</i> 6.53-4 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαιότεροι / ὁδὸν ἄμαξιτόν εὔρον· ἔπο- / μαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχων μελέταν.</p>
--	---	---	--

The similarity in thought as well as the road imagery that all four passages have in common is close enough to warrant the conclusion that Pindar's texts had influenced the articulation of Callimachus' metapoetic manifesto.¹²⁷

Apart from its metapoetic significance Callimachus' decision to avoid a detailed description of Heracles' fight with the lion allows one to reach an important conclusion about the character of his elegy. Instead of focusing on Heracles' exploit, Callimachus employed it as a narrative background against which he

¹²⁶ Cf. Richardson (1985) 391-2, Hopkinson (1988) 88-9, Braswell (1988) *ad Pyth.* 4.248, Asper (1997) 66-7 and Harder (2002) 206-11. The text of *Paeon* 7b.9-14 is given with D'Alessio's (1995) supplements; see also Rutherford (2001) 247-52. Callimachus probably depended on *Paeon* 7b for the *aition* of Asterie's transformation into Delos in his *Hymn to Delos* 36-8 (~ *Paeon* 7b.43-52); cf. Mineur (1984) *ad* 37, Bona (1988) 157, (1995) 94-5, D'Alessio (2007) 135 n. 12. This confirms that he knew these lines; Bona (1995) 90. Pindar was stressing his originality in the treatment of the myth of Delos and did so by explicitly stating his divergence from previous treatments and especially the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*; see Rutherford (2001) 252 and Loscalzo (2003) 67.

¹²⁷ The association was evident to Eustathius (*Proem. ad Pind.* 23), who paraphrased fr. 1 Massimilla; quoted by Richardson (1985) 392. Pasquali, mentioned by Bonna (1995) associated Callimachus' epigram for Theaetetus (57.1 *HE* Ἥλθε Θεαίτητος καθαρῆν ὁδόν) with *Ol.* 6.23 (ὄφρα κελεύθῳ τ' ἐν καθαρῇ / βάσομεν ὄκχον) and *Isthm.* 5.23 (θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἀν καθαρᾶν); still the meaning of the locution in *HE* 57 is unclear and the connection dubious see Gow-Page (1965) *ad loc.*

presented some minor *aitia* which had attracted his interest: the invention of the mousetrap by Molorcus (fr. 149 Massimilla) and the *aition* for the celery wreath of the Nemean (and Isthmian) games (fr. 156 Massimilla).¹²⁸ This narratorial incongruity or unbalance, so to speak, throws into clear relief the Hellenistic nature of Callimachus' epinician.¹²⁹ Callimachus praised Berenice's victory, but did so with an epinician, which bears characteristic traits of Hellenistic erudite poetry (e.g. marginalization of the main episode, asymmetric emphasis on marginal mythological episodes etc.).

The myth of the *Victoria Berenices*

Fragments 148-153(?) Massimilla seem to have narrated the first meeting of Molorcus with Heracles, their parting and Heracles' struggle against the lion, although this would not have been in detail, at least as far as we know. Fr. 148 Massimilla belongs to their first encounter, when Heracles inquired into the reasons for the devastation of the area. Lines 1–13 contain traces of what appears to have been a description of Heracles' weapons: line 11 mentions 'bows' (τόξα), lines 2–8 (?) a piece of weaponry which Heracles received from his father Amphitryon. The presence of the Taphians in line 5 would suggest that this was probably war booty from Amphitryon's expedition against the Taphians (Hes. *Sc.* 19; Apollod. 2.4.5–7).

¹²⁸ Cf. Livrea (1980) 232 *ad* 1 and Morrison (2007) 7-9 and 190.

¹²⁹ The balance between the heroic and bucolic spheres is disturbed in favour of the latter. This threatens to undercut the epinician character of the whole elegy. Something similar has been observed in Callimachus' *Hecale*: see Corbato (1980) 240 and D'Alessio (2007) 461 n. 28. Apart from the motif of hospitality, which both poems have in common (Hollis (1991) 344-5), they also share similar narratological structures; cf. Corbato (1980) 243-6. Note also *Hecale* fr. 101 Hollis (Κλεωναίοιο χάρωνος). As Hollis has pointed out (*ad loc.* and *ad* fr. 13), Callimachus artfully suggested the analogy between the feats of Theseus and Heracles (cf. also D'Alessio (2007) 284–5 n. 17). The killing of the lion of Nemea was Heracles' first feat (cf. Peisander fr. 1 Bernabé; Panyassis fr. 4–5 Bernabé with Matthews [1974] 22, 44; Eur. *HF* 359-60 a probable allusion to Pindar *Isthm.* 6.48; cf. Bond (1981) *ad* 359-363). Similarly the capture of the Marathonian bull was, if not the first, still an early exploit of the young Theseus (cf. e.g. Bacch. 18.16-30; Plu. *Thes.* 8-14).

So the first part could have also contained a flashback narrative about Amphitryon's expedition, probably motivated by the description of Heracles' weapons (line 1 *ηνικ*[, possibly *ήνίκα*; cf. Theoc. 24.4–5 and [25].62–84). Lines 26–34(?) present the ramifications that the presence of the Nemean Lion has had on the local *bucolic* economy.

The myth of the *Victoria Berenices* and Pindar's *Olympian 3*

The elegy ended with the discussion of Molercus and Heracles after the killing of the beast (fr. 154-158 Massimilla). This discussion would have provided Callimachus with the opportunity to connect the feat with the prize instituted for winners at the Nemean Games (cf. fr. 155-6 Massimilla). Callimachus, we have already seen, did not spend much time on the description of the feat *per se*. Instead, he counted on his readers' familiarity with the myth to fill in the gaps in his account. Callimachus, then, implicitly asserts the intertextual connection of his account with previous texts and so invites his readers to contextualize the *VB* in the group of poems on Heracles.¹³⁰ The following discussion will concentrate primarily on part of this intertextual 'corpus', the Pindaric texts which talked about Heracles' exploit and to which Callimachus alluded in his elegy.

In fr. 154.3-5 and 156 Massimilla Heracles recounts to Molercus the prophecy Athena gave to him after his *athlos*. This harks back to Athena's (?) similar prophecy in Bacchylides *Ode 13*, which also deals with the killing of the Nemean lion as an *aition* for the *pankration* (*ἦ ποτέ φαμι / [τῶδε] περὶ στεφάνοισι /*

¹³⁰ These would include the various epics on Heracles (Huxley (1969) 99–112), and especially those of Panyassis and Peisander (Huxley (1969) 177–88). The epics of Peisander and Panyassis were available in Hellenistic times, since Euphorion could use them. Fr. 84.3 Powell could look back to Peisander's account. Further, if fr. 53 Powell included the stealing of the Delphian tripod by Heracles, as Plutarch *De sera num. vind.* 12 suggests, Euphorion would be alluding to Panyassis fr. 2 Bernabé; see Huxley (1969) 180 and Matthews (1974) *ad* fr. 15.

[παγκ]ρατίου πόνον Ἐλ[λά-] / [νεσσι]ν ιδρώεντ' ἔσεσθαι; cf. Maehler (1982) 251–2; Cairns (2010) 96).¹³¹ Athena's prophecy in fr. 156 Massimilla also ended with the establishment of an *aition* (fr. 156.15 Massimilla σ]ήν κατ' ἔπω[νυμίην), which, however, remains unclear.¹³²

Until recently there has been confusion about the *aition* which the *VB* presented. Already in the *editio princeps* Parsons following the testimony of Probus (fr. 145 Massimilla 'inde Nemea instituta sunt') suggested that in her prophecy Athena connected Heracles' exploit with the foundation of the Nemean Games.¹³³ There is, however, evidence, which suggests that the prophecy was instead concerned primarily with the celery wreath given to the victors (cf. Fuhrer (1992) 112–8). First, fr. 156 Massimilla twice mentions the wreath offered to the victorious athletes (l. 2 . στέφος, 9 ἢ πρὶν ἀγων]ιστὰς ἔστεφε το]ύς Ἐφύρη) as a reminder of their victory (l. 8 ν]ίκης σύ]μβολον).¹³⁴ Second, this can be deduced from the way

¹³¹ Cf. also 13.46–8. The detail on the impenetrability of the lion's skin is found again in Pindar *Isthm.* 6.46–47. Both poems are addressed to the same person, Pytheas son of Lampon, but celebrate different victories; Cole (1992) 64 n. 26 believes that Pindar was following Bacchylides here.

¹³² The adjective *Μολόρ[χειος]* suggests that this involved Molorcus as well, but it would seem that Heracles' speech ended with the prophecy of Athena in line 15. In that case, this line would belong to the external narrator, Callimachus, as is clearly indicated by the third person singular used in lines fr. 156.18–21 Massimilla.

¹³³ The only explicit allusion to the foundation of the Nemean Games in our fragments is provided by fr. 143.7 Massimilla (*Ἐύφηγητιάδ[αο παρ'] ἡρίον οὔ[νεκ'] Ὀφέλτου*); cf. fr. 384.26 Pf. This connects the games with the expedition of the Seven against Thebes and the death of the baby Opheltes; cf. Doffey (1992) 185. This version was narrated in detail by Euripides in his *Hypsipyle* and seems to have been presented in epinician poetry by Simonides (fr. 19 Poltera). Pindar does not provide any allusions to this version, unless one follows Σ *ad Nem.* 8.85 and Doffey (1992) 191, who unpersuasively consider *Nem.* 8.50–2 as such. Pindar refers only perfunctorily to the other version, according to which the Games were founded by Heracles after he had killed the lion of Nemea (*Ol.* 13.44 χόρτοις λέοντος; *Nem.* 6.42 βοτάνα ... ἄ λέοντος; *Isthm.* 3.11–3 κοίλαι λέοντος / ἐν βαθυστέρνου νάπαι); cf. Σ *ad Ol.* 13.62a, Σ *ad Nem.* 6.71a–d and Thummer (1969) *ad Isthm.* 3.11–3. Bacchylides 9.5–14 juxtaposes both versions. In *Ode* 13 he considered the myth of the lion as the *aition* for the *pankration* only, but in *Ode* 9 for the games. For the combination of both versions in Probus and in other sources see Doffey (1992) 187, 192–3 and Cairns (2010) 96–8. It is likely that the *VB* was also meant as a reconciliation of both versions on the model of Bacchylides 9 (note the proximity of fr. 146 Massimilla to Bacch. 9.7–9), but this is not entirely clear from the fragments. For the combination of divergent foundation stories for the Olympic Games cf. also *Olympian* 10 with Barrett (2007) 68–70, and *PHorak* 4 fr. 1 (following chapter). Archaeological evidence supports the connection with the myth of Opheltes; see Miller (1989) 25–30.

¹³⁴ Here belongs also fr. 155 Massimilla concerning the prizes set for the Nemean Games.

in which Euphorion read the *VB*. Fr. 84 Powell gives the *aition* for the pine wreaths that victors received originally in the Isthmian Games (1-2 *ὀκκόθε δὴ στεφάνωμ' ἄθλοις φορέοντο*).¹³⁵ Euphorion adds that, after Heracles killed the lion of Nemea, Isthmian victors were crowned with celery wreaths (ll. 3-5 ... *ἐξότε πυκνὰ σέλινα κατὰ κροτάφων ἐβάλλοντο*). This seems to follow Athena's similar comment in fr. 156.5-9 Massimilla (cf. Meineke (1864) 87). Euphorion, it seems, understood that the *VB* provided the *aition* for the wreath and not for the games in general.¹³⁶

Callimachus' epinician elegy was concerned in the first place with the *aition* of the Nemean wreath rather than with the foundations of the Nemean Games in general. Among the preserved epinician odes of Pindar and Bacchylides, it is only Pindar's *Olympian* 3, composed for the chariot victory of Theron of Acragas, which narrates a similar myth, the *aition* for the winners' wreath at the Olympic Games (*Ol.* 3.13 *γλαυκόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας*). Seen in this light, *Olympian* 3 offers a closer model for Callimachus' choice and could account for the lighter interest he showed in the feat of the Nemean Lion, which is mentioned, so to speak, only as the narrative context for the *aition* (Bornmann (1978) 187–8 and in Lehnus (1980c)

¹³⁵ See Meineke (1864) 81–2 and van Groningen (1977) 156–7. Euphorion wrote a prose treatise on the Isthmian Games (fr. 180–181 van Groningen), which, probably, dealt only with the musical contest, as Athenaeus' testimony would lead one to assume (4.182E-F; 14.635A-B); see also van Groningen (1977) 231. Plutarch *Symp.* 676 F, who preserves, and paraphrases, fr. 84 Powell, does not name the work from which it was extracted. There is no reason, then, to suppose the existence of a poem which was devoted entirely to the foundation of the Isthmian Games. This could have been just a perfunctory mention; cf. van Groningen (1977) 156.

¹³⁶ For Euphorion's dependence on Callimachus in these lines note also the following. Line 4 (*Μήνης παῖδα χάρωνα παρ' Ἀσωποῦ γενετείρη*) could allude to fr. 147 Massimilla, although the phrasing is equivocal (*ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς σελήνης ἀφείθη*); cf. also Epimenides 3 B 2 DK. Note also the use of *χάρων* for the lion. A Macedonian *glotta* (Σ *ad* Lycophron *Alex.* 455 and Eustathius *Od.* vol. 1 p. 441, 10 Stallbaum), it is found again for the lion of Nemea in Lycophron (*Alex.* 455 *χέαντος, ὄν χάρωνος ὠμηστοῦ δορά*) and Callimachus (*Hecale* fr. 101 Hollis *Κλεωναίου χάρωνος*). In contrast with Lycophron, who placed the emphasis on the impenetrability of the lion's skin, Callimachus and Euphorion were more interested in the lion's place of birth. See also Meineke (1864) 85, Hollis (1990) *ad* fr. 101 and Magnelli (2002) 52–3. *Κλεωναῖος* appears only in fr. 101 Hollis. Still fr. 149.37 Massimilla could preserve traces of what could be *Κλεωναί*. Cleonae, Molorcus' home town, controlled the Nemean games until they were taken to Argos around the end of the 5th century BCE; cf. Miller (1982) 106–7, *id.* (1989) 20.

246-7; see also Corbato (1980)). A short analysis of Pindar's *Olympian* 3 will also show that Callimachus modelled his narrative on that of Pindar.

Olympian 3 celebrates Theron's victory in the chariot race (*Ol.* 3.2–4 *Θήρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν / ὕμνον ὀρθώσαις, ἀκαμαντοπόδων / ἵππων ἄωτον*), also praised in *Olympian* 2 (cf. Krummen (1991) 217-8). Pindar's epinician ode appears as a *θεόδματον χρέος* (7) (cf. Call. fr. 143.1 Massimilla), which has been assigned to him by Pisa and the wreaths that adorn the head of the victor (*χαίταισι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἔπι στέφανοι*) (ll. 6-9).¹³⁷ The myth concerns the origins of the sacred grove of Zeus at Olympia, and of the olive wreaths which were given to the victors as a victory prize (*Ol.* 3.17- 8 *Διὸς αἶτει πανδόκω / ἄλσει σκιαρόν τε φύτευμα / ξυνὸν ἀνθρώποις στέφανόν τ' ἀρετᾶν*). Still, Pindar managed to offer his audience a highly polished narrative, which brings together various episodes in the mythology of the games.¹³⁸

The narrative in an intricate way manages to combine the episode of the planting of the olive trees with the foundation of the Games themselves. Pindar has placed perfunctory references to the foundation of the games at nodal points in the beginning (11 *κραίνων ἐφετμὰς Ἡρακλέος προτέρας*), the middle (19–22 *ἤδη γὰρ*

¹³⁷ There is a disagreement in the scholia *ad loc.* as to whether this refers to the mane of the horses or the hair of the chorus-members; Lehnus (1981) 64 refers it to the victory wreath of Theron, Farnell (1932) *ad* 6 to the poet. Hubbard (1985) 149 argues that the wreath in l. 6 belongs to the poet, and the one in l. 13 to the *laudandus*. This would underline the analogy between the wreath of poetry and the wreath of victory; similarly in *Isthm.* 7: l. 39 (poet) ~ l. 50-1 (victor). For the image, cf. *Ol.* 1.100; *Pyth.* 8.57; *Nem.* 7.76-9; Critias 88 B 4 DK; Euripides *HF* 355. *Ol.* 1.8 is not clear, although ancient scholiasts considered it a case of the wreath of poetry metaphor; see Gerber (1982) *ad loc.* For wreaths in Callimachus see fr. 804 Pf. For the metapoetic connotations of *στέφανος* in Hellenistic poetry, see Meleager *Ep.* 1 Gow-Page with their notes *ad loc.*

¹³⁸ Pindar alludes to the part the Aetolians played in the expedition of the Heraclides through Oxylus (*Ol.* 3.12 with *Σ ad Ol.* 3.21b–22d) and to the rival account of the foundation of the Games by Pelops (*Ol.* 3.23 *ἐν βάσσαις Κρονίου Πέλοπος* with Farnell [1932] *ad loc.*). The latter does not assume the size it does in *Olympian* 10 or in Bacchylides 9.6–14. Finally, the poet refers to the role of the Dioscuri as protectors of the Games (36–8), which is not borne out by our evidence; cf. Farnell (1932) *ad* 36. Pindar omits Heracles' battle with Augeas the spoils from which were consecrated at Olympia when Heracles founded the Games (cf. *Ol.* 2.4–5; *Ol.* 10.47–91). Hubbard (1985) 18 has pointed out that Pindar's role as innovator is analogous to that of Heracles: Heracles founded the Olympic Games and Pindar found a new way of celebrating victory in song (4 *Μόσα δ' οὐτω ποι παρέστα μοι νεοσίγαλον εὐρόντι τρόπον ...*).

αὐτῷ, πατρὶ μὲν βωμῶν ἀγισθέντων [...] καὶ μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἀγνὰν κρίσιν / καὶ πενταετηρίδ' ἀμᾶ / θῆκε ζαθέοις ἐπὶ κρημνοῖς Ἄλφειοῦ) and the end of the narrative proper (33–4 τῶν νιν γλυκὺς ἕμερος ἔσχεν / δωδεκάγναμpton περὶ τέρμα δρόμου / ἵππων φυτεῦσαι), before the narrator returns to the *hic et nunc* of the performance (*Ol.* 3.34ff.). In this way, the myth of Heracles' capture of the hind with the golden antlers functions as the narrative backbone, which supports, or contextualizes, the minor episode of the *aition* of the κότινος. In the same way, the feat of the Nemean Lion forms the background against which Callimachus presents the *aition* of the Nemean celery wreath in the *VB*.

The uniqueness of the mythological part of *Olympian* 3 seems unparalleled before Callimachus' elegy for Berenice, which seems to have been styled after it. The connection of the origins of the prize wreath with a feat of Heracles, even in the convoluted form that Pindar gives in *Olympian* 3, is a basic structural element that both poems have in common. Further, in *Ol.* 3.15 Heracles is said to have fetched the olive trees to be μνάμα τῶν Οὐλυμπία κάλλιστον <ἀέ>θλων. In a somewhat similar way, Athena will designate the Isthmian wreath in her prophecy ν|ίκης σύ|μβολον Ἴσθμιάδος (fr. 156.7 Massimilla). Furthermore, both *aitia* are represented in the form of a flashback narrative, delivered in *Olympian* 3 by the authorial voice and in the *VB* by Heracles. Callimachus' technique is the more complicated: he presents the *aition* for the celery wreath as a prophecy spoken by Athena and embedded in Heracles' flashback narrative to Molorcus. Callimachus then gives out to Heracles part of the narrative role that 'Pindar' had in *Olympian* 3.

Both Pindar and Callimachus attribute to Heracles the 'invention' of the Olympic and Nemean wreaths respectively. The structure of the episode in

Olympian 3 makes evident the role that Heracles was summoned to play within the epinician discourse of the poem as paragon for Theron (Lehnus 1981 *ad* 13-34). The correspondence between the two poems would make it probable that Callimachus followed Pindar partially (?) in this respect as well. The creation of the Olympic wreath is an *athlos*, similar in toil to that of the main Heracleian feats. After all, in the narrative of *Olympian* 3 the episode of the wreath assumes prominence over the mainstream labour of the hind with the golden horns. In that respect, this feat of Heracles is a point of comparison for the victory of Theron (cf. Krummen (1990) 256). In this feat Heracles shows features not found in other episodes, features appropriate to a ruler: he employs reason instead of violence (15 δᾶμον Ὑπερβορέων πείσαις Ἀπόλλωνος θεράποντα λόγῳ)¹³⁹ and shows piety towards his father in establishing the sacred grove of *Altis* (16 πιστὰ φρονέων). The end of the poem seems to imply that after his death Theron will be honoured as a hero following in the steps of Heracles, even if Pindar is unwilling to spell this out explicitly (cf. Currie (2005) 192). These elements are also present to a certain degree in Callimachus' elegy. Heracles causes the wreath to be created by his actions, although as in the case of *Olympian* 3 this is more of a *parergon*. The toil of his feat, killing the lion, is matched by that of Berenice's victory – and of course by that of Molorcus (on which see below). More importantly, though, Heracles was important in Ptolemaic propaganda as setting a precedent for the deification of a mortal (cf. *Ol.* 2.1–5 imitated by Theoc. 17.1–12) thanks to his deeds and benefactions (culture hero).¹⁴⁰ By analogy, Callimachus could insinuate that Berenice was a benefactor of her people and so worthy of deification. The analogy

¹³⁹ Cf. Jason's conciliatory speech to Pelias in *Pyth.* 4.155 with Segal (1986) 33.

¹⁴⁰ In Lysias *Olympiacus* 1 the foundation of the Olympic Games is considered an act of benefaction (Ἄλλων τε πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν ἔργων ἕνεκα, ὧ ἄνδρες, ἄξιον Ἡρακλέους μεμνήσθαι, καὶ ὅτι τόνδε τὸν ἀγῶνα πρῶτος συνήγειρε δι' εὐνοίαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος). Pindar presents Theron as *εὐεργέτης* in *Ol.* 2.94; cf. Currie (2005) 170.

with *Olympian* 3 which is overtly concerned with such issues, as well as the role that Heracles played in other court poems makes this an attractive, but necessarily speculative suggestion.

Comic Elements in the *Victoria Berenices*

Fr. 149 Massimilla describes Molorcus' attempts to get rid of the mice that have infested his house. The scene focuses on the havoc that the mice have wrought in Molorcus' humble abode. The juxtaposition of this episode with Heracles' feat would lead one to compare the destruction caused by the mice with the destruction caused by the lion, described in fr. 148.20-35 Massimilla. The size of the destruction is disproportionate to the size of the mice and this in turn affects the presentation of the lion itself, the more so since the mice appear to be equally destructive. The fragment ends with the *aition* for the mousetrap, which Callimachus attributed to Molorcus, a mythological detail not known from any other source. This does not imply that Callimachus came up with this episode, although that would not be foreign to his art: a marginal event is treated in an elevated, and unsuitable, way, almost as if a mock-heroic. The humble Molorcus, whom later scholars remembered only for giving his name to a city at Nemea (cf. e.g. Stephanus Byzantius s.v. *Μολορχία* p. 455 Meineke), is here elevated to the realm of important mythological personages for a rather insignificant event, insignificant at least in comparison with other *aetia* known to us from Callimachus' fragments. Nevertheless, the attribution of an *aition* to Molorcus could strengthen the comparison with Heracles, who is credited with the invention of the Nemean wreath.

The fragment is placed in the time between the two encounters of Heracles with Molorcus and so occupies the time Heracles needed to find and kill the Lion. Embedded as it would have been between the two encounters, the episode assumed the role of the main mythological episode, a function one would have expected Heracles' deed to play. This narrative manoeuvre would motivate the flashback narrative about the deed, which, however, is never given to us, another sign of the prominence of this episode over Heracles' deed. The juxtaposition between rustic and heroic / epinician is articulated in the form of two *aitia* (mousetrap vs. Nemean wreath), two micro-elegies, with the one embedded in the other, and both forming the myth for this highly unusual epinician poem. The juxtaposition has a comic effect, which puts pressure on the traditional form of epinician poetry.

The poet sets up a series of analogies between the 'feat' framed and the frame (cf. Livrea (1979)): (a) Molorcus sets out to kill the mice, which he designates as *σκούμνος*, a word regularly employed for lion cubs. We learn from fr. 160 Massimilla that Callimachus used it also for the Nemean lion. (b) The analogy between mice and lion is further developed by the use of *ἀλκαία* for the mice's tails (fr. 149.24 Massimilla), a noun literally used for a lion's tail. This in turn helps to sustain the analogy not only between Molorcus and Heracles, but also between their respective 'feats' and the *aetia* they establish. The episode reaches its conclusion with the invention of the mousetrap (fr. 149.32–3). It is noteworthy that even at this point Callimachus makes use of a word (*ἴππος*) that has Pindaric resonances (*Ol.* 4.8). Next, I would like to raise the possibility that Callimachus alludes here to the representation of Typhos in *Olympian* 4, showing the specific way in which he understood not so much the meaning of the word, but rather the spirit of the context.

This, in turn, will lead a discussion of comic elements in archaic epinician odes and its ramifications for Callimachus' elegy.

Mousetraps in Pindar and Callimachus

In the following discussion, I will examine the possibility that Callimachus, by using the rare word *ἵπος* 'mousetrap' in fr. 149.33 Massimilla, was trying to evoke the use of the same word in Pindar *Ol.* 4.8 (ἀλλὰ Κρόνου παῖ, ὃς Αἴτναν ἔχεις / ἵπον ἀνεμόεσσαν ἑκατογκεφάλα / Τυφῶνος ὀβρίμου ...) ¹⁴¹ to describe the capture of Typhon by Zeus under Etna. The incongruity between the size and danger of Molocrus' mice and their intertextual counterpart, Typhos, would add a further layer of humorous allusion to the narration of the whole episode. Although one cannot be certain, it is a possibility that deserves to be raised, if only as a suggestion.

LSJ⁹ distinguish between two meanings: in a mousetrap *ἵπος* is used 'for the piece of wood that falls and catches the mouse' (Callimachus), while more generally it can also mean 'the fuller's press' or just 'weight'. There is no way of telling if Pindar *meant* his audience to picture Typhos under a fuller's press, in a mousetrap, both arresting images, or just under the mountain's weight.¹⁴² All that can be said for certain is that in *Ol.* 4.8 the mountain Aitna is presented as an *ἵπος* and this would certainly cause lexicological recollections in the audience. All

¹⁴¹ Callimachus alludes to *Ol.* 4.1 (Ἐλατῆρ ὑπέρτατε βροντᾶς ἀκαμαντόποδος / Ζεῦ) in *Jov.* 3 (Ζηνός ... Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικασπόλον οὐρανίδησιον); cf. Ziegler (1913) 353, who notes, that Pindar was the first to use *ἐλατῆρ* figuratively, and Smiley (1919) 48-50. The meaning in Callimachus is contested: 'driver away of the Giants' [cf. e.g. McLennan (1977) *ad loc.*] and 'driver / leader of clayborn men' [Köhnken (1984)] have been suggested. Köhnken's (1984) interpretation, which I find more cogent, would be closer to *Ol.* 4.1, since the noun would have the same meaning in Callimachus too.

¹⁴² This figure is repeated in [Aesch.] *Prom.* 365 (ἰπούμενος ῥίζαισιν Αἰτναίαις ὕπο), which clearly depends on Pindar; cf. Rose (1957) and Griffith (1983) *ad loc.* With the exception of Mader (1990) 32 ("wo der Ätna ebenfalls als Mausfalle gezeichnet ist") most commentators are not conclusive about the meaning of the image in this line.

modern dictionaries consider its use in *Ol.* 4.8 metaphorical: LSJ⁹ *s.v.* ‘of Aitna as the weight which holds Typhoeus down’ (cf. also Rumpel and Slater *s.v.*).¹⁴³ However, the ancient scholia would seem to leave all possibilities open: (a) Σ *ad* 1f ἀλλ’ ὦ Ζεῦ, ὅστις τὴν Αἴτναν κατέχεις τὴν οὔσαν ἵπον καὶ πίεσμα καὶ βάρος τοῦ Τυφῶνος; (b) Σ *ad* 11a ἀλλ’ ὦ Ζεῦ ὅς τὴν Αἴτναν ἔχεις τὴν παγίδα τὴν ἀνεμόεσσαν.¹⁴⁴ If the meaning ‘trap’ or ‘dead-fall’ was indeed current in Pindar’s times, the line would suggest that Zeus threw the mountain on his foe and captured him like a mouse (cf. Bowra (1964) 241 with n. 2 and Mader (1990) 32). If such connotations are indeed inherent in the image, Pindar could ironically convey the futility of Typhos’ attempt on Zeus, since in the long run he is nothing but a ‘mouse’ in comparison with Zeus. This possibility has already been raised by Bowra (1964: 257), who perceptively notes, ‘By such single words, which embody an unusually powerful image, Pindar keeps his language fresh with surprises and rich in far-reaching associations.’ Callimachus’ use is explicit from the context; it can only mean ‘mousetrap’. If there is any pointed allusion to the Pindaric use (after all, we are in an epinician poem) the poet shows himself consistent in his parodic technique. The duel between Zeus and Typhos had far-reaching consequences and could overturn the universal order of things. To present a domestic inconvenience in such terms would

¹⁴³ Pollux (*Onom.* 7.41 Bethe) καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος δ’ ἔφη **κέαται δ’ ἐν ἵπῳ**. ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἵπος καὶ ἡ μνάγρα, ἀλλ’ ἔοικεν μᾶλλον τῷ τῶν κναφῆων ἐργαλείῳ προσήκειν (cf. *ibid.* 10.135 Bethe καὶ ἵπος τὸ πιέζον τὰς ἐσθῆτας ἐν τῷ κναφείῳ, ὡς Ἀρχίλοχος “κέαται δ’ ἐν ἵπῳ”) reflects the uncertainty that readers felt about the proper interpretation of the word in Archilochus’ poem. Whatever significance this may carry, Pollux, who opts for the meanings ‘fuller’s weight’ in Archilochus (fr. 235 W²), did not quote Pindar’s text as an argument in favour of his reading, as he did in his discussion of the verb where he quotes both Aristophanes (*Eg.* 923) and Cratinus (fr. 98 K.-A.). The word appears now in the meaning ‘fuller’s weight’ in Philodemus’ third book *περὶ ποιημάτων*; see Janko (2010) 52 n.4 and on fr.16 pp. 80-1.

¹⁴⁴ Σ *ad Ol.* 4.11c quote *Aetia* I fr. 1.35-6 Massimilla (τριγλώχιν δλοῶ νῆσος ἐπ’ Ἐγκελάδῳ). This, however, would suggest that Callimachus agreed with Pindar as to the location of Typhon’s burial. Nonetheless, it is indicative of the intertextual connections scholiast made in their readings of Callimachus’ poetry.

add bathos to Molorcus' attempts to safeguard his own domestic order.¹⁴⁵ This would render Callimachus' epinician elegy decisively un-Pindaric.¹⁴⁶

Nevertheless, there is some exiguous evidence that could indicate that comic elements were commoner in Simonides' epinicians.¹⁴⁷ In such a case, Callimachus could be following Simonides' tradition in *VB* as well. In fr. 16 Poltera for the victory of Krios in boxing the humorous effect is brought about by the pun with the victor's name.¹⁴⁸ Still, Σ *ad Ar. Nu.* 1355b which preserves the text does not make this explicit (τῇ πρὸς τὸ ζῶον κοινωνία τῆς λέξεως συνέπλεξε τὰς ἴκοινωνίας ὁ ποιητῆς λέγων), as is the case with fr. 2 Poltera (see, however, Poltera (2008) *ad loc.*). Heraclides Ponticus, our source for this fragment, explicitly indicates the playfulness of the composition, which would have been duly appreciated in the merry atmosphere of the banquet (ἐπέσκωψεν εἰπών). Here the humorous effect is caused by the representation of mules as daughters of horses.¹⁴⁹ To a certain degree the technique is analogous to that of Callimachus: Simonides comically exaggerates the epinician credentials of mules, while Callimachus exaggerates the heroic, almost 'monstrous', elements of the mice. Both poets, that is, compare mice and mules with animals, such as horses and lions, which were 'dignified' in heroic and epinician discourse.

¹⁴⁵ One of course may doubt whether ancient readers would have felt the incongruity between Molorcus' episode and epinician context in the same way as we do. Still, it may be suggestive that the poet of the *Batrachomyomachia* used fr. 149 Massimilla in his parody of the Homeric epics. Several lines bespeak allusions to Callimachus' *oeuvre*: (*Batr.* 3 ~ *Aet.* I fr. 1.21 Mass.; 12 ~ *Dian.* 265; 48-9 ~ *Aet.* III fr. 149.21; 116-7 ~ *Aet.* III fr. 149.16-9; 179-192 ~ *Aet.* III fr. 149.23-33). It is intriguing that a Hellenistic poet was sensible enough as a reader to sense the comic elements in fr. 149 Massimilla and use them in his own parody.

¹⁴⁶ For humour in Pindar see Kurz (1974) 5. See especially *Isthm.* 4.67-73 with his analysis p.7-8.

¹⁴⁷ On the issue, see Bagordo (1999) 118-120, who sees this as an element of the first stage of epinician poetry, which was subsequently lost in the odes of Pindar and Bacchylides.

¹⁴⁸ Bagordo (1992) points out instances of the same device in the poetry of Bacchylides (puns with the name of the *laudandus*): *Ode* 6 (Λάχων Διὸς / μεγίστου λάχε φέρτατον πόδεσσι / κῦδος ἐπ' Ἀλφειοῦ προχοαῖσ[ι]). It is unlikely, though, that Bacchylides meant, or his audience understood, this in a comic way.

¹⁴⁹ One need only compare the praise of victories in the mule race in Pind. *Ol.* 4.1 and [*Ol.*] 5.3 to understand the difference in tone. [*Olympian*] 5 calls the mule-cart ἀκαμαντόπους, an adjective Pindar used in *Ol.* 3.3 for Theron's race horses.

It would be also interesting if we could know more about the representation of Heracles in the elegy. The encounter between Heracles and Molorcus, it would seem, was motivated in the first place by Heracles' hunger (cf. especially fr. 148. 14–17 Massimilla). Heracles' hunger is a well established trait of the hero's comic representation, since the Hesiodic *Κήρυκος γάμος* (fr. 263–9 M.–W.), which enjoyed considerable fame in fifth-century Athens and especially comedy.¹⁵⁰ The image proved to be a success (cf. e.g. Euripides *Alcestis*); it was a favourite with the tradition of the Sicilian comedy of Epicharmus (cf. also Theocritus' *Ep.* 24 for Epicharmus with Rossi's (2001) discussion). In the field of Hellenistic poetry similarly parodic elements are also found in Theocritus' *Idyll* 24 (especially lines 136–40) and even in 17.27–31. Heracles' hunger is a recurrent motif, especially in the stories which Callimachus included in the first book of his *Aetia*, the 'Sacrificium Lindium' (fr. 24–5 Massimila]) and more importantly 'Thiodamas Dryops' (fr. 26–7 Massimila])¹⁵¹, and in his *Hymn to Artemis* (145-61).¹⁵² It would not, then, be unexpected for Callimachus to present such an image of Heracles, the more so since the closely structured *Hecale* also thematicized Theseus' hunger. In that case, Heracles' figure could add further comic elements.

Lehnus ((1975) 294-5 and with revisions (1981)) has suggested that Callimachus' Heracles could have been conceived on the basis of a Pindaric poem

¹⁵⁰ See Schwartz (1960) 205–8 and D'Alessio (2007) 400 n. 75.

¹⁵¹ For the analogy between these two stories and the structure of the first book of the *Aetia* at this point see especially D'Alessio (2007) 400 n.75 and 404 n.83. *σκῶλος* in fr. 149.13 Massimilla could allude to fr. 26.1 Massimilla (*σκῶλος ἐπεὶ μιν ἔτυψε ποδὸς θέναρ*); cf. Lloyd-Jones–Parsons *ad SH* 259.13.

¹⁵² *Dian.* 159-161 (*παύσατ' ἀδηφαγίης· ἔτι οἱ πάρα νηδὺς ἐκείνη, / τῆι ποτ' ἄροτριῶντι συνήντεο Θειοδάμαντι*) is an eloquent proof that Callimachus himself made such connections between his texts; cf. Bornmann (1968) *ad* 161. The reaction of the assembled gods to Heracles' greed (148-9 *θεοὶ δ' ἐπὶ πάντες ἐκείνῳ / ἄλληκτον γελώσῃ*), although Homeric in its provenance (*Il.* 1.599-600), could be viewed as a textual indication of the comic effect Callimachus intended: cf. Bornmann (1968) *ad* 149. The representation of Hera as Heracles' malignant mother-in-law could also suggest links with the popular genre of mime; cf. Sophron's *Πενθερά* (fr. 13 Hordern) with Hordern's (2004) note *ad loc.* Fowler (1982) 47 considers *Il.* 147-51 a parody of Pind. *Nem.* 3.43-9; see also Smiley (1919) 60-4.

which exists today only in fragments (fr. 168b Maehler). More specifically he has proposed a correspondence between the two texts on the basis of the corrupt line fr. 148.23 Massimilla (ὄφρα κεπιω.[] [ω σε πάλιν πυρὶ δεῖπνον), which could recall, he argues, fr. 168b.2 Maehler (δοιὰ βοῶν / θερμὰ πρὸς ἀνθρακιὰν / στέψαν, πυρὶ δεῖπνον¹⁵³ / σώματα). However, both lines are problematic and cannot be restored to everyone's satisfaction. As we have already seen, fr. 148 Massimilla deals with the first encounter between Heracles and Molorcus. Although the fragment is in a poor condition, its content seems generally certain. In l. 23 Molorcus probably says to Heracles: 'I do not have wood (=πυρὶ δεῖπνον) to cook you dinner'. Fr. 168b Maehler, on the other hand, is preserved in the tenth book of Athenaeus (10.411C). The book's topic is ἀδηφαγία (cf. Call. *Dian.* 160)¹⁵⁴ and the first five paragraphs comprise a list of people, mythical (Heracles, Odysseus) and semi-mythical (Theagenes, Milon), who were notorious for their insatiable hunger. Heracles figures at the top of this list. Athenaeus provides several literary examples that attest to the image of the hungry Heracles. These include Astydamas' satyr-drama *Heracles*, Epicharmus' *Bousiris*, Ion's *Omphale* and Pindar's fragment, without any explicit indication of genre or subject-matter. Athenaeus' text gives the impression that it belonged to the episode of Heracles and Lepreus: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ Λεπρεὺς Ἡρακλεῖ ἐρίξει δίσκῳ καὶ ὕδατος ἀντλήσει καὶ ὅστις ἀναλώσει θᾶπτον ταῦρον, καὶ λείπεται πάντα. εἶτα θωρηχθεὶς προκαλεῖται Ἡρακλέα καὶ θνήσκει ἐν τῇ μάχῃ (Athen. 10.411C–412B). Fr. 168 (b), then, could

¹⁵³ This is Lehnus' emendation for the nonsensical reading (ὕπνῳων τε) of Athenaeus' manuscripts. Snell's reading (πυρὶ δ' ὤπτων) disturbs the syntax by introducing abruptly a second verb. In Lehnus' (1981: 251-2) text *πυρὶ δεῖπνον* is in apposition to *δοιὰ βοῶν*. For a revised text with full apparatus, see Lehnus' (1973) 11–12 and *id.* (1975) and (1981) with updates. Lehnus' correction has been accepted by D'Alessio (2007) 452 n. 10 and Massimilla (2010) *ad loc.*

¹⁵⁴ In the *Hymn to Artemis ἀδηφαγία* seems a key word that indicates to the erudite reader the comic tradition of Heracles' insatiable hunger; cf. Bornmann (1968) *ad* 160.

belong to the description of the third contest, although the fragment does not mention one bull but two oxen. If Lehnus' suggestion is right, the analogy of situation between the two texts is characteristic. Still, it would seem that Callimachus would once more have twisted the expectations of his readers, as Molorcus was unable to offer to his guest a feast similar to that of Lepreus in Pindar's fragment. Molorcus would seem to be aware of Heracles' previous gastronomic feats, as the use of the Pindaric expression would lead the reader to surmise, and would disappoint both his guest and the readers by not living up to the expectations excited by the use of the Pindaric expression.

Conclusion

It would be interesting to consider these playful tones as an element that came about through the context of performance of the elegy, especially if the elegy was recited at a royal feast. Callimachus' *jeu d'esprit* would have been appreciated in such a context. Be that as it may, this performance would not need to be the banquet for the victory of Berenice, but could be some other banquet in which the court poet read the most recent parts (or books?) of his *Aetia*, parts which were dedicated to the royal pair. This could mean that the epinician elegy originally circulated on its own as an autonomous elegy and was associated with this mythological episode only after its 'inclusion' in the *Aetia*.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁵ For the inclusion of the *VB* in the *Aetia* see Carlini (1980) 237, D'Alessio (2007) 446 n.1 and Hutchinson (2008) 65 n.2. On the other hand, it is also possible that the praise of Berenice's chariot victory was never an independent elegy, but was composed as a proem before the first *aetion* of the third book just before the presentation at court of Callimachus' second part, or second edition, of the *Aetia*. This choice may have been suggested to Callimachus by the queen's recent (?) victory.

CHAPTER 3

PHorak 4: Callimachus' most recent lost poem

This chapter deals with *PHorak 4*. The glossary preserved on this papyrus could contribute to our knowledge of Callimachus' epinician poetry and of Pindaric influence on it. In the following discussion it will be shown that the glossary explicated a lost elegy which probably celebrated a Ptolemaic victory at the Olympic Games. The aim is to adumbrate the content of the lost elegy, suggest points of similarity and divergence from Callimachus' other epinician poems and point to traces that could indicate Pindaric influence.

Part 1: The Text**Glossarium ad Callimachi elegiam perditam****fr. 1**

].[
]ενωι
]....[.....υ]
]
5	π]ερὶ τήν
]δ' αὐτὸν
]ε[.....]
	<i>Με]ρσηνίας</i>
	ἐτε]θήπεα διὰ του[
10]
	<i>Πελο]ποννήσῳ</i>

] . . ς Ἡρακλείδαις[
 Πέλο]πος νήσον [
] χρησάμενοις
 15] . γωῖ ἔτυχε
] . αἰρους ἐπι
 ἵπ]που ὀχοῦμενος
] πεντάθλων
 π]ένταθλοι
 20] ἀγωνίας
] υἱ Ταραξίππο]υ

1-21 = PSI inv. 3191 verso (= *PHorak* 4) col. I fr. A || 3 in ras. fort. τοῖούτου Menci, sscr. ταῦτόν || 7 in ras. sscr. . . . δὲ τοῦ : fort. . οἱ δὲ τοῦ Menci || 8 suppl. Menci || 9 suppl. Menci διὰ τοῦ || [το potius quam δι' αὐτοῦ Menci || 11 suppl. Menci || 13 Πέλοπ]ον ante corr., suppl. Menci || 14]ορρησάμενοις post corr. Π || 16 κατὰ] καιρούς conii. Menci || 17 suppl. Menci || 19 suppl. Menci || 21 τοῦ] suppl. D'Alessio

fr. 2

] . ον[
]
] . ἰλη
] . [] . ων . . . ς
 5] . . . Πτολεμα[ί]ω<ι> παρ[
] παλαιέ
] . . ἥμις υδ' Ἀσσύρι
] ον παρο ητρ[
 δεεν[
 10] . νκι[] .
] αςτρ[] . [] .

1-11 = PSI inv. 3191 v. (*PHorak* 4) col. I fr. B fragmentum utrum ante an post fr. A sit collocandum incertum est || 3 κ]οῖλη Menci || 4 Ἀντιδ]χω<ι> dubitanter Menci || 5 vel παφ[|| 6 ἐ]πάλαιε vix

probabile || 7 Πέρσ]ην ἡμῖσιν δ' Ἀσσύριον Menci; hunc enim versum eundem esse atque fr. 506 Pf. ἡμῖσιν μὲν Πέρσαι, ἡμῖσιν δ' Ἀσσύριοι. ubi potius de accusativo singulari Πέρσην scribendo quam nominativo plurali Πέρσαι cogitat; vide nunc *Et. Gen.* A 1304 ed. Lasserre et Livadaras || 8 πάροχον vel παρ' ὄχον μητρ[ὸς vel μητρ[ῶιον Menci || 10 ἀγκί[στροι]ς = ἀγκί[στροι]ς Menci || 11 de ἄστρ[ον] cogitavit Menci

fr. 3

[]είτ[]ς αλ[±7
 []λυβδαινα []
 [τὸ] μέλαν δρυὸς . []
 [Ἰά]ων ποταμὸς . [±4
 5 [Π]ῖσα χωρίον τῆ[ς Ἡλιδος ἀπὸ
 Πί-]]
 ρον βασιλέως ὅστις[]
 [ἀ]μφιμ[ά]ς]αθε περι . []
 [ὀ]πασσ[ά]μενος περι . []
 [χ]λωρό[ν] νέον []
 10 ἔπις]α ἔκγονο[ς]
 λαγόνι ἐκ μεταφορ[ᾶς]
 ἄζωστος ἀνασευρμ[ένος / η]
 ὀχήνη ἱερὸν ὀστοῦ[ν]
 ἀνακλῶν ποταμὸς []
 15 κόσμος διάκτωρ . []
 ἀσύφηλον ἀπαίδευτον
 προχάνη πρόφασις
 Ἐγνα πόλις []

1–18 = PSI inv. 3191 v. (*PHorak* 4) col. II fr. A atramento nigriore scripta lemmata || 1 [ἀ]λείτ[η]ς ἀλ[ιτρὸν vel ἀλ[οίτην Menci || 2 [κο]λύβδαινα vel [μο]λύβδαινα Menci || 5–6 Ἡλιδος ἀπὸ Menci Ἀττά-]λοῦ conī. Lehnus ap. Bastianini p. 275 || 7 περιμ[ά]σσετε vel. sim. Menci || 8 περιπ[οιή]σας Menci || 10 ἔγγονος Π || 11 μεραφορ[Π: correxit Menci || 15 ἡ[γεμῶν] dubitanter Menci || 18 τ[ῆ]ς Menci: ἐν [D'Alessio

fr. 4

5
] .ικε .[
] []
]σενε .[
] .καλε .[
] .νησ .[
]ταμο[
]λαισ λ[
] .οσε[

1–8 = PSI inv. 3191 v. (*PHorak* 4) col. II primum versum suppletum]Cικελ[ίαισ iungi posse cum versu ultimo fragmenti antecedentis ut legeretur *Ἔγνα πόλις τῆς Cικελ[ίαισ* putavit Menci; lacinae tamen fragmentorum recte non iungi posse videntur || 1]Cικελ[ίαισ Menci:]Cικελ[ίαι D’Alessio || 4]καλεῖ[ται dubitanter Menci || 6 πο]ταμό[ς dubitanter Menci

fr. 5

5
 ..[].. []
 ἀρετᾶ<ι> [] .[]
 Ἡλείων cu .. [. . . .] .[]
 Πτέριο[ν] χωρίον τῆς Μ[ηδίας]
 κ[α]ῖ Περσίδος [.]ηλεος
 κρότ[ημα]]τὸ ἔλασμα τοῦ . [. . . .
 τ[. . .]ης τοιαύτης ὑλη[ς]
 κροτεῖτ[ω] {ι} ἐλα[ν]νέτω . []
 [θ]αμβαλέης πλ[η]κτικῆ<σ> . []
 10 χιραλέοι τρα[. . .] καὶ ἀπο[]
 καὶ δι’ ἀσφ[α]λείας εχο . []
 †[κ]ατακορρησ† συ[νε]χῶς ὀχλ[ῶν]
 κά]ρφο[ς] χόρ[το]ς ἄχυρο[ν]

1–13 = PSI inv. 3191 v. (*PHorak* 4) col. II fr. D+E+F+G || 2 Menci et D’Alessio || 3 *κυγγ[ενεί]αι* Menci: *εὐίπ[π-* dubitanter Lehnus ap. Bastianini p. 275 || 5 *θ]ήλεος* Menci || 6 vel *κρότ[αλον χ[αλκοῦ ῆ]* Menci || 7 *τ]ῆς τοιαύτης ὕλη[ε* Montanari ap. Bastianini p. 275: *τ[αύτ]ης τοιαύτης ὕλη[ε* Menci, quod vix intellegitur || 8 del. Menci || 9 corr. D’Alessio: *πλ[η]κτικῆ* Π: *πλ[ηθον]τικῆς* dubitanter Lehnus ap. Bastianini p. 275 || 10 *τρα[χεῖς]* vel *τρα[ύμα(τα)]* Hunter ap. Bastianini p. 275: *τρά[γοι]* vel *τρά[γον]* Menci || 11 *ἔχον[τες]* Menci || 12 *[κ]ατακορης* Π ante corr.: *[κ]ατὰ κόρης* D’Alessio; vix tamen interpretamento congruit *ὀχλ[ῶν]* vel *ὀχλ[ηρός]* Menci

fr. 6 *incertae sedis*

]occ[

fr. 6 = PSI inv. 3191 v. (= *PHorak* 4) fr. H; ad utram columnam hoc frustrum pertineat incertum.

Part 2: Interpretation

The papyrus:

The latest accretion to our knowledge of Callimachus’ literary output comes from PSI inv. 3191 *verso* (= *PHorak* 4).¹⁵⁶ The *recto* of the papyrus contains a list of people, which has been dated on palaeographical grounds to the second half of the first or the beginning of the second century CE. The *verso* preserves fragments of a glossary, from the same period, on a Hellenistic text.¹⁵⁷ There are seven major fragments, which are labelled with letters of the alphabet (A to G), and an unplaced *frustulum* (fr. H).¹⁵⁸ All the fragments belong to the same *kollema*. The lemmata

¹⁵⁶ The *editio princeps* was by Giovanna Menci in 2004. An interim text was presented by the same scholar in 1995 at the international papyrological conference in Berlin. This was the basis for Bastianini’s (2002) discussion. An updated text with notes can be found in D’Alessio (2007) 793–800.

¹⁵⁷ See also Bastianini (2002) 271 and D’Alessio (2007) 793.

¹⁵⁸ Fragments D,E,F and G belong together [=fr. 5 in our text]. The exact place of C [=fr. 4] remains unclear. Fr. A [= fr. 1 and 3] is the largest fragment, preserves two columns and so is the most helpful in the reconstruction of this part of the papyrus. The glossary was in two columns and the

are not ordered alphabetically, so it is probable that the glossary follows the order in which the words appeared in the text now lost (cf. Bastianini (2002) 272). The mention of the Peloponnese in fr. 1.11-13, of Pisa in fr. 3.5-6 and of Elis in fr. 5.3 would suggest, as we are going to see, that both columns preserve notes on the same text (cf. D'Alessio (2007) 798-9 n. 18).

The authorship of the lost text:

In its present condition the papyrus cannot furnish us with strong evidence about the authorship of the lost text. However, there are some indications which suggest that the original text could have been an elegy of Callimachus.

Menci (2004: 19 and *ad* fr. B. 7) has suggested the most important argument in favour of Callimachean authorship of the lost text. She has argued that fr. 2.7 (]. ἤμισυ δ' Ἀσσύρ[ι) preserves part of the second half of fr. 506 Pf. (ἤμισυ μὲν Πέρσαι, ἤμισυ δ' Ἀσσύριοι). This line is transmitted along with fr. 505 Pf. (cf. Pfeiffer's note *ad loc.*) under the name of Callimachus *s.v.* Ἀσσύριοι in the *Et. gen.* AB and a series of other etymological lexica (Sym. 1479, *EM* 1962, *Et. Gud.* (c) α 1856). Still, Pfeiffer challenged its authenticity because of the 'un-Callimachean' hiatus at the *diaeresis* of the pentameter.¹⁵⁹ However, in their 1992 edition of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* Lasserre and Livadaras report that the manuscripts read ἤμισυ μὲν Πέρσην, ἤμισυ δ' Ἀσσύριοι. The hiatus disappears, so there is no reason to deny the Callimachean origins of fr. 506 Pf. any more. Fr. 506 Pf. comes from an elegy of Callimachus. If this were a lemma taken from the lost text, as most

intercolumnial space ranged from 2 to 3 cm. Each column had two sub-columns: the first contained the lemmata and the second the glosses after a blank space of c. 1 cm. The glosses appear to have been quite short, containing two to three words and expanding to no more than two lines (fr. 1.9-10; fr. 2.7; fr. 3.5-6; fr. 5.4-5, 6-7).

¹⁵⁹ The only other known case is fr. 668 Pf., also considered corrupt by Pfeiffer.

scholars seem to assume, then the original text would have been an elegy composed by Callimachus.

Another element which scholars consider indicative of possible Callimachean authorship is the high number of rare words, some of which are found again only in Callimachus.¹⁶⁰ The most remarkable case is *προχάνη*, rendered as *πρόφασ[ις]* in fr. 3.17: as far as one can tell, it appears only twice in Greek poetry, in Callimachus (*Cer.* 73 *αἰδόμενοι γονέες, προχάνα δ' εὕρισκετο πᾶσα*, and *Aetia* III fr. 171 *Μασιμίλλα ἄγραδε τῶι πάσησιν ἐπὶ προχάνησιν ἐφοίτα*).¹⁶¹

The genre of the lost text:

The lost text, it would seem, was a poem composed by Callimachus in elegiac couplets.¹⁶² The lemmata of fr. 3 and 5, which are better preserved suggest poetic

¹⁶⁰ *Hapax* Homeric forms: (i) fr. 1.9 *ἐτε]θήπεια* (*Od.* 6.162), (ii) fr. 3.7 *ἀ]μφιμ[άσ]ασθε* (*Od.* 20.151), (iii) fr. 3.8 *[δ]πασσ[ά]μενος* (*Od.* 10.59). Rare or dialectal words: (i) fr. 3.10 *ἔπισσα* (Hecataeus *FGrHist* 1 F 363; cf. Call. fr. 735 Pf.), (ii) fr. 3.16 *ἀσύφηλον* (*Il.* 9.647; 24.767). Words used in a rare meaning: (i) fr. 3.12 *ἄζωστος* (cf. fr. 620a Pf.), (ii) fr. 3.11 *λαγών* (cf. fr. 552 Pf.), (iii) fr. 3.15 *κόσμος*. *Hapax legomena*: fr. 3.13 *ὀχῆνη*.

¹⁶¹ Callimachus' name appears whenever this word is discussed, although it is clear that our sources depend on each other for their information. The most elaborate discussion is provided by Eustathius, who offers two different etymologies:

(a) In *Il.* vol. 2 p. 617, 13ff. van der Valk and *Od.* vol. 2 p. 95, 43ff. Stallbaum he connects it with the verb *χαίνω*, quoting as his source some unnamed scholiasts on Soph. *Aj.* 1227. The same etymology is offered in *Σ Il.* 9.29a, which is usually taken to refer to Call. *Cer.* 73 (see Erbse *ad loc.*).

(b) In *Il.* vol. 4 p. 63, 6ff. he connects it with *προὔχομαι* quoting Soph. *Ant.* 80; *Σ ad loc.*, which quotes fr. 72 Pf., could preserve something of Eustathius' original source.

Eustathius based his discussion on a commentary on Sophocles [cf. van der Valk *ad Il.* vol. 2 p. 617, 13ff]: the word does not appear in Sophocles' surviving works, but is employed by the scholiast to clarify the Sophoclean uses of *χαίνω* and *προὔχομαι*; cf. Ellendt (1872) *s. vv.* Although *Σ Soph. Ant.* 80 quotes Callimachus, it does not do so at *Aj.* 1227. Nevertheless, the Homeric scholium, which gives an etymology similar to *Σ Aj.* 1227, seems to refer to Callim. *Cer.* 73. In this sense, the connection of the word with Callimachus seems secure in both discussions. The use of Callimachean material in the explanation of Sophocles suggests that Eustathius used Sallustius', or less likely Didymus', commentary on Sophocles; for Sallustius' Callimachean studies see Pfeiffer (1949) xxviii-ix.

¹⁶² Menci (2004) 20 notes that most of the lemmata are compatible with the dactylic metre, the only exception being fr 5.12: the papyrus reads [], *?τακο, ?ης συ[νε]χως οχ. ?* which was tentatively restored by Menci as *[κ]ατακορής συ[νε]χῶς οχ. [*. The adjective is not compatible with the dactylic metre. It would appear, however, that this was perceived by the scribe, who added a second *rho* above the line, so as to read *[κ]ατὰ κόρρης*, which, however, does not agree with the gloss (cf.

rather than prose idiom. It is extremely difficult to distinguish between the lemmata and the glosses in the rest of the fragments. As for the content, fr. 1 seems (a) to deal with some part the foundation tale of the Olympic Games and (b) to imply a chariot race at Olympia. This could be strengthened by fr. 5. On the other hand, the first editor has tentatively associated fr. 3 with the stories of Alpheius and Arethusa, and Persephone's abduction (Menci (2004) 21 and 29). The allusions to Elis in different parts of the glossary (fr. 3.5-6 (Pisa); fr. 5.3 (Elean) suggest that Olympia and Elis figured extensively in the lost poem (cf. D'Alessio (2007) 798-9 n. 18). This could imply that the poem celebrated some athletic victory at Olympia, perhaps a chariot race (cf. the mention of *Ταράξιππος* in fr. 1.21).

The addressee and the date of the lost poem:

The fragments are meagre and not very helpful in establishing either the identity of the addressee or the date of composition of the lost poem. That means that any indications are necessarily provisional and rest primarily on the interpretation of the extremely lacunose fr. 2.¹⁶³

The first four lines are too damaged to allow any idea about the content of the poem in this part. But line 5 preserves the name of a Ptolemy in the dative case (] . . . *Πτολεμα[ι]ω παρ*]).¹⁶⁴ There could have been a mention of the games which

D'Alessio (2007) 800 n.23). It is possible that a mistake had already infiltrated the scribe's copy of Callimachus' text.

¹⁶³ Fr. 2 derives from the same column as fr. 1, but one cannot be certain if it came before or after it; cf. Menci (2004) 19-20 n 4.

¹⁶⁴ There is no sign of an *iota* adscript or subscript on the papyrus. It is possible, although not very likely, that this was a Doric genitive (cf. Theoc. 15.22 *βᾶμες τῷ βασιλῆος ἐς ἀφνειῷ Πτολεμαίῳ* spoken by a Corinthian woman). *Πτολεμαίῳ* as a genitive singular appears also in two Hellenistic inscriptions from Crete: *IC* III iv 4.10 and *IC* IV 181.10. Although genitive singulars in *-ω* were a characteristic of Laconian, Heracleean and Cretan dialects only, they were adopted in Hellenistic times as a characteristic of literary Doric (Hopkinson (1984b) 45). Callimachus employed Doricisms mainly in the *Ectheosis Arsinoes* (fr. 228 Pf.), in his *Hymn to Demeter*, and the *Hymn to Athena*. According to Bulloch (1985) 26-7, this could be related with the performative context or the form that these poems assumed: Doric dialectical colouring is a sign of Callimachus' continuation or

Philadelphus inaugurated in honour of his deified father: *Πτολεμαίω<ι> πάρις* (?) (cf. *VS* fr. 384.41-3 Pf., which could also refer to the Ptolemeia). However, the evidence is not enough and the similarity with the *VS* may be misleading.¹⁶⁵ Still, fr. 1 deals with the foundation of the Olympic Games and this would suggest that the victor had won an Olympic victory, unless this came from a catalogue of previous victories or the poet drew an analogy between the Ptolemeia and the Olympic games.

As far as the date of the poem is concerned, two elements could help:

(a) Fr. 2.7, we have already seen, appears to preserve the second half of fr. 506 Pf.

The most recent edition of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* has shown that the line as printed by Pfeiffer was corrupt and that one should read *Πέρσην* instead of *Πέρσαι* (*ἡμῖσιν μὲν † Πέρσην, ἡμῖσιν δ' Ἀσσύριοι*).¹⁶⁶ Nonetheless, it is not clear whether this was a name¹⁶⁷ ‘Perses’ or a national adjective ‘Persian’, and if so, what relevance Persians may have had in the lost poem. Menci (2004: *ad* fr. B 3) has raised the possibility that fr. 2.3 (. . . ιλη) mentioned *Κοίλη Συρία* in the context of the Syrian Wars, either the second or, more probably, the third.¹⁶⁸

revival of choral lyric. If the lost text was an epinician elegy, Callimachus could have included Doricisms as an allusion to Pindar’s epinician poems and so stress the continuity of the genre. Be that as it may, the rest of the glossary does not preserve any examples of Doric dialect.

¹⁶⁵ Fr 2.6 reads *παλαιε*. If this is a vocative, a person (either the poet or someone else) addressed the deified monarch (cf. fr. 384.41 Pf. *εἰλάμεθα, Πτολεμαῖε, τεῆμι*...). One can also interpret the traces as an (un-)augmented imperfect of *παλαίω* ‘to wrestle’; cf. Menci (2004) *ad loc.* Still, wrestling would not qualify as an event appropriate for a royal personage. It could be, of course, that the context had nothing to do with the event in which the victor has scored his or her victory. Menci and D’Alessio *ad loc.* consider the figurative meaning ‘combat’ (cf. e.g. Eur. *IA*. 1013; Plat. *Rep.* 362d8) as another possibility.

¹⁶⁶ The connection of an accusative singular with a nominative plural is intolerable and suggests further corruption in the transmission of the text. If one reads *Ἀσσύριον* along with Bastianini (2002) 272 and Menci *ad loc.*, the singular could modify a noun like *στρατόν* (cf. [Eur]. *Rhes.* 429, 662 *Θρήικα ... στρατόν*).

¹⁶⁷ The name occurs four times in Thessaly (*LGPN* iii(B) *s.v.*) and Macedonia (*LGPN* iv *s.v.*), twice in Boeotia (*LGPN* iii(B) *s.v.*) and Athens (*LGPN* ii *s.v.*) and once in Andros (*LGPN* i *s.v.*) and Smyrna (*LGPN* v *s.v.*).

¹⁶⁸ For the history of this war, see Menci (2004) *ad* fr. B. 7 and Grainger (2010) 150–70.

This line, then, could refer to Seleucus II's army.¹⁶⁹ On the other hand, one cannot exclude some kind of mythological reference.

- (b) The only other possible indication of the date of the lost poem rests on Menci's conjectural reading]ἄστρ[ον at fr. 2.11. She has tentatively interpreted this as a reference to the catasterism of Berenice's lock (cf. fr. 213 Massimilla). D'Alessio (2007), on the other hand, has associated it with fr. 388 Pf., from an elegy addressed to Magas and Berenice II. Following Coppola's (1935: 188-90) reconstruction, based on Hyginus (*Astr.* II 24), he takes fr. 388 Pf. (= *POxy.* 1793 col. I-V) to be from an elegy celebrating an Olympic victory of Berenice II. The most recent collation of the fragments from the first five columns of *POxy.* 1793 by Chiesa (2009) has shown that all fr. 385-391 Pf., including fr. 388 Pf., derive from the same elegy, which would not have exceeded one hundred lines (Chiesa 2009: 228).¹⁷⁰ According to Chiesa (2009: 230-1), there is no evidence in the fragments to support Coppola's reconstruction. Instead she considers this elegy as an epithalamium. But if one compares the fragments of the *VB*, it would seem that with the exception of the proem (fr. 143 Massimilla), there are not many epinician elements in the rest of the fragments either. Further, the mention of Berenice's marriage (fr. 388.2 and 10 Pf.) would not be out of place in an epinician elegy (cf. fr. 143.2 Massimilla *νύμφα*). Finally, fr.

¹⁶⁹ In the *Et. gen* AB s.v. Ἀσσύριος fr. 506 is quoted along with fr. 505 Pf. (ἡ μὲν ἀπ' Ἀσσυρίων ἡμεδαπὴ στρατίη), but one cannot tell whether both lines derive from the same poem. Both lines are quoted in the discussion of the etymology of Ἀσσύριος. The gloss offers two different etymologies. The first, attributed to Epaphroditus (second part of the 1st cent. CE; cf. Pfeiffer *ad Aet.* fr. 52-3 and (1949) ii. p. xxviii), derived Ἀσσύριος from the proper name Assaracus. The second suggests a-privative plus Σύρος and explains 'that the inhabitants of Pontos are so called, because they are no longer Syrians'. Σ Aesch. *Pers.* 84 reports οἱ γὰρ Πέρσαι τὸ πρότερον Ἀσσύριοι ἐκαλοῦντο. If the reference is to the Third Syrian War, perhaps it is relevant that the new king Seleucus II waged the war against Ptolemy III from neighbouring Cilicia, where his mother, Queen Laodice, was living with her two sons. If so line 7 would indicate that Seleucus' army was made up of loyal subjects inhabiting Cappadocia and Persia, which is historically accurate.

¹⁷⁰ According to Chiesa (2009) 227, fr. 387 Pf. [= *POxy.* 1794 col. III 1-4] belongs in the lacuna between columns II and III on *POxy.* 1793 (see Hunt 1922: 99), so that all fragments would derive from the same manuscript; cf. also Hollis (1992) and Bing (1997) 90-1.

387.2 Pf. (πρὶν ἀστῆ[ρι τ]ῶι Βερενίκης), which Chiesa has shown to belong with fr. 388 Pf. (and the smaller fr. 385-6, 389-391Pf.), places this elegy after Ptolemy's III accession to the throne (246 BCE) and renders D'Alessio's suggestion an attractive hypothesis.

So the lost elegy explicated by the glossary on *PHorak* 4 could be dated at some point in the second half of the 240's after the marriage of Ptolemy III to Berenice II, the exact date of which is not known (Grainger 2010: 155) and before Callimachus' death (240 BCE). If the poem celebrated an Olympic victory of Berenice's there are only two possible dates for her victory after Ptolemy's accession to the throne in 246 BCE, 244 or 240 BCE. This elegy, then, one of Callimachus' latest works, dates approximately from the same years as the *VS* and *VB* and attests to his ever increasing engagement with epinician poetry in the last years of his life.¹⁷¹

The fragments

Fr. 1

The first fragment of the glossary seems to have dealt with a part of the poem that told of some episodes in the myth of the Heraclids. It is hard to establish exactly how much space Callimachus devoted to the story or even to a passing allusion to specific mythological incidents. The Peloponnese figures twice: first in the dative case in line 11 (*Πελο]ποννήσῳι*) and then in line 13 as *Πέλο]πος νῆσον*. The latter could derive directly from Callimachus' text (cf. e.g. *Cypria* fr. 15.4 Bernabé; Tyrtaeus 2.15 W²; Alcaeus fr. 34a.1 Liberman; Ion fr. 24.3 Snell), or could be the scholiast's etymology of *Πελοπόννησος*, perhaps so as to account for the mention of Pelops in the lost text. Such a mention would tally nicely with the *μετονομασία* of

¹⁷¹ For the possibility that the lost text was part of the *Aetia* see D'Alessio (2007) 799 n. 18.

the land from *Ἀπία* to *Πελοπόννησος* occasioned by the arrival of Pelops and his rivalry with Oenomaus, the king of Elis (cf. Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. *Πελοπόννησος* [pp. 515-6 Meineke] ἐπὶ δὲ Πέλοπος [τοῦ τὸν Οἰνόμαον νικήσαντος] *Πελοπόννησος* [ἔσχε τοῦτο τὸ κύριον ὄνομα]).¹⁷² The lost poem could have included a description of the famous chariot race between the two men, which enabled Pelops to marry Hippodameia and so become king of the land (cf. Pind. *Ol.* 9.7-10). The story provided the *aition* for the most illustrious event in the Olympic Games, the chariot-race, and in some accounts for the foundation of the Games as a whole (cf. *Ol.* 3.23; 10.24 with Nagy (1990) 127-9). If Callimachus talked about Pelops in the context of the foundation of the Olympic Games, it is reasonable to expect him to have alluded to the most famous version of the myth, Pind. *Ol.* 1.75-90.

Finally, some details of the ‘narrative’ could be gleaned from line 21 (Ἰν *Ταραξίππο*[ν]). This refers to a certain spot in the race-course at Olympia, where the horses became agitated and frightened. Such places were found also at the Isthmus (Paus. 6.20.19) and Nemea (Paus. *ibid.*; Statius *Thebaid* 6.491-512). In Olympia this was connected with the tomb of Myrtilus, Oenomaus’ charioteer, or with Oenomaus himself (Pausanias 6.20.15-9 who gives other versions as well).¹⁷³

Line 12 mentions the descendants of Heracles, the Heraclids (*Ἡρακλείδαις*). This has rightly been connected with line 9 which mentions Messene (*Με]σσηνίας*). According to the myth (Euripides’ *Τημενίδαι* or *Τήμενος* fr. 727e-741 Kannicht; Apollod. 2.171-80; Paus. 2.18.6-8, 4.3.3-5), three generations after the death of Hyllus, Heracles’ son, his descendants decided to invade the Peloponnese so as to

¹⁷² Suidas (κ 221.20-1 Adler) attributes to Callimachus a treatise on *Κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων καὶ μετονομασίαι*. One could get an idea of how this could have worked in the lost poem from *Aet.* III fr. 174.62 Massimilla with his notes *ad loc.* or *Cer.* 42-3.

¹⁷³ D’Alessio (2007) 795 n. 2 suggests a possible connection with Lyc. *Alex.* 42-3, where the altar (tomb in Lycophron’s text) is associated with the Cronian hill at Olympia.

claim their rightful inheritance. The contingent was led by Temenus, Cresphontes and the two sons of their deceased brother Aristodemus. After their victory the conquered lands were divided among the three families; Cresphontes took Messene. The mention of Messene along with the Heraclids is an indication that at least the division of the lands between the Heraclids was probably mentioned. Fr. 1.14 ([*χρησαμένοις*]) and 17 (*[ἴπ]που δούμενος*) seem to allude to the role the Aetolian Oxylus played in the Heraclid conquest of the Peloponnese. According to an oracle from Delphi that the Heraclids received on the eve of their campaign, they needed a three-eyed man to guide them into the Peloponnese. This was Oxylus, whom they met riding a one-eyed horse. In return for his services they gave him Pisatis. This episode explained the foundation of Elis by Oxylus (Ephoros *FGrHist* 70 F 18), and how the Aetolians came to be in charge of, or (re-)found, the Olympic Games.¹⁷⁴ One cannot be certain about the exact way in which Callimachus combined these two or possible three versions of the foundation of the Olympic Games (Pelops, Heracles (?) / Heraclids, Oxylus). Already at *Ol.* 10.24-5 Pindar had combined the two foundation stories of the Olympic Games current in his time, and it is possible that Callimachus had such texts in mind.¹⁷⁵ There Heracles is explicitly said to be the first to set the games near the pre-existing tomb of Pelops (24-5: ἀγῶνα δ' ἐξαίρετον αἰεῖσαι θέμιτες ὤρσαν / Διός, ὃν ἀρχαίῳ σάματι παρ Πέλοπος / ἔβωμῶ

¹⁷⁴ According to Eleian propaganda it was the Aetolian king Iphitus who reorganized or refounded the Games in 776 BCE, after a period of 28 Olympiads (cf. Phlegon *FGrHist* 257 F 1) in which the games had stopped (Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 115 [= Strab. 8.3.33]; Paus. 5.4.6; Phlegon *FGrHist* 257 F 1).

¹⁷⁵ Pausanias (5.8.4) and Phlegon (*FGrHist* 257 F 1) report that Heracles presided over the first Olympic Games, which he instituted in honour of Pelops. Phlegon quotes a fourteen-line oracle from Delphi (487 Parke-Wormell; p. 269 Q3 Fontenrose) which brings together three legendary founders (Peisos, Pelops, and Heracles) in what seems to be a 'reconciliation of traditions', as Fontenrose (1978) notes *ad loc.* The list could represent an official compromise; for more extensive forms of this list see Jacoby's commentary *ad* Phlegon *FGrHist* 257 F 1.

ἐξάριθμον ἐκτίσασατο).¹⁷⁶ At any rate, it is safe to argue that in Callimachus' poem the juxtaposition of the two myths, if there was any, probably had nothing to do with local antagonisms. More likely it should be attributed to Callimachus' taste for conflicting mythological variants (cf. e.g. Zeus' birth place *Jov.* 6-7).¹⁷⁷

The rest of this fragment is occupied with some sort of athletic contest: (i) ll. 18-9 mention the pentathlon or pentathletes (πεντάθλων; (π]ένταθλοι),¹⁷⁸ (ii) l. 20 a race (ἀγωνίας),¹⁷⁹ and (iii) l. 21 Taraxippus (Ταραξίππο[υ]). It is unclear why Callimachus would have mentioned either a pentathlon contest or pentathletes in an epinician elegy addressed to a royal personage. The mention of Taraxippus, the demon who frightened the horses in races, would suggest an Olympic chariot race, a sport more appropriate for a Ptolemy. One could argue that both the pentathlon and Taraxippos had nothing to do with the real circumstances of the victory, but belonged to the description of some mythological games, which functioned as the foil for the games in which the *laudandus* or *laudanda* had won his or her victory.¹⁸⁰ One could compare, for instance, the description, and function, of the first Olympic Games in Pind. *Ol.* 10.55-75 or the funerary games for Pelias in Ibyc. *PMGF* 176 (cf. Page (1971) 89-93 and Jenner (1986) 61-3).

¹⁷⁶ Barrett (2007) 69-70 has argued that this juxtaposition represents the conflict of interest between the Eleians and the Pisatans about the control of the sanctuary of Olympia. Pindar's 'combination' could reflect the official version which was propagated at Olympia and combined elements of both myths. See also Bowra (1964) 164-5.

¹⁷⁷ One should not forget that Temenos connected the royal house of Macedonia with Heracles (cf. also Harder (1985) 127-39). In the light of this, the myth of the Heraclids could also acquire importance for the Ptolemies, who also claimed descent from Heracles.

¹⁷⁸ Callimachus would have used the uncontracted form πεντάεθλον (cf. Pind. *Ol.* 13.30; *Nem.* 7. 8; Bacch. 9.26) or, less likely, the rare Pindaric form πενταέθλιον (*Pyth.* 8.66; *Isthm.* 1.26 is Boeckh's emendation for the unmetrical πένταθλον of the Vat. gr. 1312 and Laur. 32,52). The only case of the form πένταθλον used in poetry is the spurious Soph. *El.* 691, probably a late interpolation; see Finglass (2007) and Jebb (1894) *ad loc.*

¹⁷⁹ ἀγωνία could also describe the anxiety that Taraxippus caused to the horses during the race; cf. Menci (2004) *ad fr.* A 20. This would make sense only in the context of a race.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. *Iambus* 8 (fr. 198 Pf.): Callimachus narrated how the Argonauts competed on Aegina. In this way, he provided the origin of the event (δίαυλος ἀμφορίτης), in which Polycles, the addressee, had scored his victory.

The available information concerning mythological pentathlon contests is scarce. As far as one can tell, there are three (marginal) stories enveloping the origins of this sport (cf. Jacoby *ad* Pherecydes of Athens *FGrHist* 3 F 12): the Argonauts, the Funeral Games for Pelias, and Perseus. It is noteworthy that all three of them are connected in some way with Pindar and so it is likely that Callimachus drew from his work. Callimachus, author of a prose treatise *περὶ ἀγώνων* (fr. 403 Pf.), could have known and used any one of them in his lost poem.¹⁸¹

(a) The Argonauts: Philostratus (*Gymn.* 3) recounts that the first pentathlon was organised by the Argonauts on the island of Lemnos and that Peleus was the first champion (cf. Σ Pind. *Ol.* 4.32a-c).¹⁸² Pindar states that the prize awarded was a piece of clothing (*Pyth.* 4.251-4), a detail found also in Simonides fr. 267 Poltera. In *Ol.* 4.19-26 Pindar described how the Argonaut Erginus won the *δπλίτης δρόμος* in the same games. The scholia *ad Ol.* 4.32a quote a line from an unnamed poem of Callimachus (fr. 668 Pf. *Ἐργίνος †Κλυμένου† ἔξοχος ἐν σταδίῳ*), a sign that Callimachus knew the myth and could have reworked Pindaric material in one of his poems.¹⁸³ The genre of this poem is not specified, but in view of the mythological association of Erginus with the Argonauts' expedition one could suggest some possible places in Callimachus' *oeuvre*, e.g. in the first book of the *Aetia* (frr. 919-23 Massimila): the sacrificial rites at Anaphe occasioned a detailed

¹⁸¹ Menci (2004) *ad* 14 mentions the story which Herodotus (9.33) recounted about the oracle which Teisamenus received at Delphi: Pythia told him that he would win five great contests which he understood as a reference to the pentathlon. I cannot see how this story could have been developed in Callimachus' elegy.

¹⁸² The ancient *scholia* considered these as funerary games either in honour of Hypsipyle's deceased father, Thoas (Σ *ad Ol.* 4.32a-c and Braswell (1988) *ad* 253(b)), or the Lemnian men who had perished at the hands of their wives (cf. Σ *ad Pyth.* 4.450a-b – 451).

¹⁸³ Wilamowitz (1922: 420) argued that this episode was not Pindar's invention, but rather part of some version of the Argonautic expedition. Still, it is conspicuously absent from all other versions of the myth.

digression on the return of the Argonauts to Greece. Another possibility is that the line came from an autonomous elegy (cf. D'Alessio (2007) 769 n. 139).

(b) Funeral Games for Pelias: A different scenario about the origins of pentathlon could be suggested by Pind. *Isthm.* 1.21-7. In lines 22-25 Pindar credits Iolaos and Castor, who function as models for the *laudandus*, with victories in the stadium run, the armed run, javelin and discus throwing. The poet finishes off with an 'antiquarian' remark: οὐ γὰρ ἦν πενταέθλιον, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ / ἔργματι κείτο τέλος. For a moment the comparison between the *laudandus* and the two heroes gets out of focus as Castor and Iolaos are not praised as skilled charioteers only. Pindar seems to claim that they would have been victorious in the pentathlon if it had existed in their own time. This suggests the idea that both heroes were champions of some archaic proto-form of the pentathlon (cf. Privitera (1982) *ad* 26). Σ *Isthm.* 1.30b suggests that Pindar was 'revising' the myth about the Ἀθλα ἐπὶ Πελῖαι.

(c) Perseus: The story, preserved in Σ A.R. 4.1091, is considered by Jacoby (1957: 391) to be an excerpt from the prose work of Pherecydes of Athens (*FGrHist* 3 F 12 [= fr. 12 Fowler]). Perseus was Heracles' ancestor on the side of his mother and this could have suggested the connection in Callimachus' poem; on the other hand, it is interesting, as Wilamowitz (1922: 333 n.1) pointed out, that Pherecydes, a contemporary of Pindar, used an expression quite similar to the 'antiquarische Notiz' in Pind. *Isthm.* 1.26: τό<τε> δὲ πένταθλον οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλὰ ἕνα ἑκαστον τῶν ἄθλων ἦθλον. It is unclear whether Pherecydes was alluding to Pindar or vice versa and how this would have been received by Callimachus. It is possible that Callimachus gave a similar note about the date of the pentathlon. On the other hand, the mention

of Taraxippus could allude to the chariot-race at the first Olympic Games¹⁸⁴ or to the victory celebrated by Callimachus and so signal the rounding-off of the digression.

Finally, some comments on some possible traces of the poet's technique which fr. 1.9 ([] *ηπεα δια του* []) could impart. Menci has suggested that *ηπεα* in line 9 could be the ending of the Homeric pluperfect *ε̅τεθη̅πεα* (found only in *Od.* 6.166 *ὡς δ' αὐτῶς καὶ κεῖνο ἰδὼν ε̅τεθη̅πεα θυμῶ*; cf. Hesychius *s.v.* (ε 6522) *ε̅τεθη̅πεα · ἐξεπλάγην, ἐθαύμασα*, and Eustathius *Od.* vol. 2 p. 313 Stallbaum). It is more likely to assume that this rare form derives from the poem and not from the scholiast, even if it is found in the sub-column of the scholia (cf. Menci (2004) *ad* fr. A. 9). The first person would suggest that there was a person speaking who expressed his / her amazement at something (*ε̅τεθη̅πεα δια̅* [?]). This could have been the poet himself or a personage who was presented speaking. Embedded speeches are a feature we have already found in Callimachus other epinician elegies (e.g. *VS*: the speeches of the Nile and the Argive man; *VB*: the speeches of Molercus and Heracles).

Fr. 3

As far as one can tell from this part of the glossary, the lost elegy seems to have included mythological episodes not strictly related with the foundation of the Olympic Games. Menci has suggested that this part of the poem focused on the story of Alpheus and Arethusa. A perfunctory account of this local myth can be

¹⁸⁴ Reported victors: Iolaos driving Heracles' chariot (Pausanias 5.8.4) or Samos the son Halirrothius from Mantinea (*Ol.* 10.69-70). Iolaos is also presented as the victor in the chariot race at the funeral games for Pelias (Ibycus *PMGF* 176; Pausanias 5.17.11; Hyginus 273; *contra* Σ Pind. *Isthm.* 1. 30b: victor in the *hoplites dromos*). Still, this version is unlikely here, since there is no connection between Taraxippos and these games. In *Isthmian* 1 Pindar, it would appear, combined versions of the first Olympic Games and the funeral games for Pelias.

found in Pind. *Nem.* 1.1-8. This could again suggest a possible intertextual connection with Pindar's odes. The following discussion will focus primarily on elements which suggest connections with the Olympic Games and Pindaric poetry.

Lines 4-6 could help one to adumbrate the scene:

[Ἰά]ων ποταμός

[Π]ῖσα χωρίον τῆ[ς Ἡλιδος ἀπὸ Πι]

-]σου βασιλέως[

It is not clear whether Callimachus mentioned or alluded to the mythological king Pisu. In the oracle, which Pythia gave to Iphitus and Lycurgus (*apud* Phlegon *FGrHist* 257 F 1) Pisu was considered the first founder of the Olympic Games and Callimachus may have dealt with this version too.¹⁸⁵ The mention of Iacon and Pisa seems to suggest that at this point the narrative was situated at the Peloponnese, a point of connection with fr. 1. Even so, line 18 seems to mention the city of Enna in Sicily (*Ἐννα πόλις*).

Lines 4¹⁸⁶ and 14 (*ἀνακλῶν ποταμός*) clearly indicate that a river was mentioned and Menci has argued that the connection of Olympia and Sicily was provided by Alpheus. In an epinician poem, the mention of Alpheus would have been occasioned in the first place by the Olympic victory of the *laudandus* (cf. e.g. Pind. *Ol.* 7.15; *Bacch.* 8.26, 13.156; *Posid.* AB 83.3-4, 84.1-2; *Ep.* 55.1 Ebert, c.

¹⁸⁵ See also Hansen (1996) 193. Ovid's *Met.* 5.493-4 ([...] *huc hospita ueni. / Pisa mihi patria est et ab Elide ducimus ortus*) could suggest a context for the mention of Pisa in Callimachus' poem: Pisa as home of Alpheus.

¹⁸⁶ Menci (2004 *ad fr.* A col. II 4) identifies Iacon with Alpheus. However, this is problematic, since for Callimachus (*Jov.* 22) and Dionysius Periegetes (409-12), who depended on him (cf. McLennan (1977) *ad* 22), Iacon is a distinct Arcadian river. The identification of the two rivers goes back to an unconvincing suggestion of Müller (1855) *ad* Dionys. *Perieg.* 416 (cf. D'Alessio (2007) 796 n.7), who supposed that Dionysius failed to understand Callimachus. He, further, surmised that Callimachus used *Iacon* instead of the commoner appellation *Alpheios*, because he wanted to allude to the derivation of the river's name from the flower *ion*. But Nicander (fr. 74 Gow and Scholfield) does not support this: instead, he associates *Ἰων* with the *Ἰωνιάδες* Nymphs, who, in turn, are connected with *Ἰων* and Ionia. The shrine these Nymphs had near river Cytherius in Elis (cf. Strabo 8.3.32.) cannot establish the proposed identification of Alpheus with Iacon.

300 BCE; 76.6 B Ebert, 49 CE). Menci has raised the possibility that Callimachus included some version of the story of Alpheius' love for Arethusa: enamoured of the nymph Arethusa, or, according to an older version (Telesilla *PMG* 717; Σ *ad* Pind. *Nem.* 1.3), of Artemis herself, Alpheius chased her from Elis to Ortygia (Pausanias 5.7.2; Σ *ad* Pind. *Nem.* 1.1a) where she was transformed into a spring in order to escape the embraces of the river-god.¹⁸⁷

Pindar alludes to the myth of Alpheius' passage to Sicily in the opening lines of his first *Nemean*. However, it is unclear if he, or any other poet before him, knew the story of Alpheius' love for Artemis or Arethusa.¹⁸⁸ As far as we can tell, Moschus (fr. 3 Gow) is the first who deals with the myth in an unequivocally erotic way. Still, the scholia *ad loc.* suggest that this was the version of the story known to Pindar and his audience(s) (cf. Σ *Pyth.* 2.12a-b and *Nem.* 1.2b).¹⁸⁹ The narrative provided by the scholia is meant to account for the cultic connection of Artemis with Alpheius in Olympia (διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν Ἀλφειῶαν προσαγορεύεσθαι· καὶ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ δὲ ὁ Ἀλφειὸς τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι συναφίδρυται). Apart from this, this could be a case of the 'erotic imagery' in epinician discourse about which we talked in the previous chapter: Alpheius serves to highlight the *eros* as 'devotion' of the victor to the idea of victory.

¹⁸⁷ Callimachus' acquaintance with *Nemean* 1 is further confirmed by Antigonus' epitome (fr. 407 (XII) 140 Pf.) of Callimachus' prose treatise *θανμάτων τῶν εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν γῆν κατὰ τόπους ὄντων συναγωγή* (fr. 407-11 Pf.). Antigonus explicitly mentions Pindar as one of the sources for this tale (*Ἀρέθουσαν δὲ τὴν ἐν Συρακούσαις, ὥσπερ οἱ λοιποὶ φασιν καὶ Πίνδαρος, τὴν πηγὴν ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἡλείαν Ἀλφειοῦ*), it is probable, then, that Callimachus himself mentioned Pindar's *Nemean* 1 as his source.

¹⁸⁸ Antigonus (see previous n.) notes that Callimachus in his treatise "on wondrous things" mentioned two stories that proved the subterranean connection of Alpheius with Arethusa: the *Ὀλυμπιακὴ φιάλη* and the blood of the sacrificial victims travelling from Elis to Ortygia through the stream of Alpheus. Σ Theocr. 1.117 attributes the former to Ibycus (*PMGF* 323), who dealt with it perfunctorily (*παριστορῶν*) in one of his poems. Even so, Barron (1984) 22 has suggested that both stories were mentioned in a praise poem for a Syracusan victor in the Olympic Games.

¹⁸⁹ *Contra* Braswell (1992) 33 *ad* 1, who considers the erotic motif a Hellenistic innovation.

However, the glossary does not mention Ortygia, which lies at the south-eastern side of Sicily but Enna in the centre of Sicily. In Greek myth Enna was mostly known as one of the sites where the abduction of Persephone took place.¹⁹⁰ It is possible then that Callimachus narrated the abduction of Kore. If that is the case, one should not be surprised to find Arethusa (or Artemis) mentioned in such a context: in Eur. *Helen* 1310-16 Artemis, along with Athena, is Persephone's companion and an eyewitness to her abduction.¹⁹¹ Callimachus, then, could have combined both myths. In this way, he could have juxtaposed the successful rape of Persephone with the unsuccessful rape of Artemis / Arethusa by Alpheus and have included an allusion to Artemis' cult in Elis (cf. Pausanias 6. 22. 9; Σ *ad Nem.* 1.2b) – especially if the poem celebrated an Olympic victory in Olympia.¹⁹²

Diodorus Siculus (5.3.2–6), our most detailed authority for the Sicilian version of the myth of the rape of Persephone, could preserve traces of Callimachus' narrative. It is interesting to see how he brings Athena and Artemis into the main narrative frame of Persephone's abduction; his treatment suggests the possibility for the inclusion of *aetia*. What is more, this version also includes an elaborate presentation of the spring of Arethusa, which is explicitly said to have many fishes. This could square nicely with the mention of a hook in fr. 2.10 (], νκι[

¹⁹⁰ For the 'Sicilian version' of the rape of Persephone see Richardson (1974) 76-7. Basic sources include: Carcinus (fr. 5 Snell), Diodorus Siculus (5.2-5), Cicero (*Verr.* 4.106) and Ovid (*Fast.* 4.394-621 and *Met.* 5.330-660). Jacoby argued that Diodorus' account derived from Timaeus (*FGrHist.* 566 F 164). *Nem.* 1.13 and perhaps *Ol.* 6.95-6 seem also to allude to this version; for the importance of the cult of Demeter and Kore in Hieron's propaganda see Privitera (1982b). Paus. 9.23.2 (Pind. fr. 37 Maehler) could suggest that Pindar had composed a hymn to Persephone that may have told of the rape; see also Bowra (1964) 51.

¹⁹¹ The connection appears already in the *h.Cer.* 424 (*Παλλάς τ' ἔγρεμάχη καὶ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα*); see Richardson's (1974) *ad loc.* 'it is possible that the presence of Athena and Artemis was already a traditional feature before the *Homeric hymn*'. In Ovid's *Met.* 5.375-7 Venus mentions Proserpina along with Minerva and Diana because of their virginity; this too suggests a sort of companionship; cf. Bömer (1976) *ad* 375.

¹⁹² For Artemis' role in epinician context compare Pind. *Pyth.* 2.1-8: Hieron could not have won without her help. Artemis could have been mentioned, because Arethusa was a member of her retinue. Artemis took pity on Arethusa and transformed her into a spring.

] supplemented as ἄγκιστρον by Menci; see, however, D'Alessio (2007) 796 n. 5 for a different interpretation) and of the fish or oyster in the first two lines of fr. 3.¹⁹³

Nevertheless, it is not clear why Callimachus chose Sicily to figure so extensively in a Ptolemaic epinician. Diodorus (4.23.4-5) could again suggest a solution to this problem: when Heracles visited Syracuse, he learnt the local traditions about the rape of *Kore*, and instituted sacrifices in honour of Persephone and the local nymph Cyane, who plays an important role in Ovid's version of the rape in *Metamorphoses* 5.¹⁹⁴ Callimachus then could have associated the foundation of the Olympic Games by Heracles or his descendants in fr. 1 with Heracles' peregrinations in Sicily and the rape of Persephone in fr. 3.¹⁹⁵

It is not clear whether in the ensuing lines the story remains the same. One could get some snapshots from the following lines:

(a) Line 7 ([] . φ ι . [] α σ θ ε π ε ρ ι . []), restored by Menci as the plural imperative ἀμφιμ[άσ]ασθε,¹⁹⁶ suggests that a person is addressing a group of people ordering them to purify or bathe themselves.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹³ [] λ υ β δ α ι ν α in l. 2 has been supplemented as [κ ο] λ ύ β δ α ι ν α 'a kind of oyster' (Ath. 3.105e) or [μ ο] λ ύ β δ α ι ν α 'τὸ ἄγκιστρον παρ' Ὀμήρω. καὶ μολυβδίνη' (Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, μ 1369.18-9). [τὸ] μ έ λ α ν δ ρ υ ό ς in l. 3 could refer (i) to a kind of tuna fish (Montanari *ap.* Bastianini (2002) 275), (ii) to several different parts of (oak) trees (cf. *Od.* 14.12 with the ancient scholia *ad loc.* and Eustathius *Od.* vol. 2 p. 58; Aesch. *Philoctetes* (fr. 251 Radt); Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 1. 6. 2; Hesych. τ 1107; Photius μ 244) or (iii) to a type of black oak tree (Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 1. 6. 2; Eustathius *De emendanda vita monachica* 101).

¹⁹⁴ In *Metamorphoses* 5 Arethusa makes an extensive appearance, first as an informant of Ceres (487-508) and then to narrate her own story to her (572-642). How much of Ovid's version could have been found in Hellenistic poems is a difficult question to answer. Cf. Hind's judicious discussion (1987) 52-7. At any rate on the basis of Diodorus (and Timaeus?) it could be that Arethusa 'belonged' to the Sicilian version of the myth; *contra* Bömer (1976) 351, who considers Arethusa an Ovidian feature.

¹⁹⁵ The following elements would suggest Ptolemaic interest in Demeter and her cult: (i) Philicus' hymn to Demeter (676-680 *SH*); (ii) Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter*; (iii) in Callimachus' *Ἐκθέωσις Ἀρσινόης* (fr. 228.43-5 Pf) the deified Philotera, sister of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, figures as a member of Demeter's entourage at Enna. Cf. also Fraser (1972) i. 198-201, Richardson (1974) 68-73 and Hopkinson (1984b) 32-43. For the identification of Ptolemaic queens with Demeter one could consult Tondriau's (1948) list.

¹⁹⁶ In theory it could also be an unaugmented aorist indicative.

(b) The abundance of anatomical information in lines 11-13 could indicate that a person (probably a woman or women as suggested by line 10 ἔπισσα: ἔγγονο[ς]) raised her dress above her knees (ll. 11-2 λαγόνι: ἐκ μεταφορᾶς / ἄζωστος: ἀνασεσυρμ[ένος /η) and entered the water of the river up to her waist (l. 13 ὀχρήνη ἱερὸν ὄστοῦ[ν]). Line 10 implies that the poet elaborated upon the genealogy of a feminine personage.

(c) On the other hand, lines 8 ([ὄ]πασσ[ά]μενος περιπ[οιήσας), 15 (κόσμος διάκτωρ), and 16 (ἀσύφηλον ἀπαίδευτον) imply that one should also reckon with at least one male presence. This could be the river-god himself, although it is difficult to associate all the words with the river-god, especially l. 15 (above), which would be more suitable for Hermes: the river could be trying to abduct or carry away the nymph who is standing halfway in (or near) his waters. The scenario would easily fit Alpheus and Arethusa (or Artemis), who wanted to bathe after hunting. If line 15 refers to Hermes, the scene could have described the rape of Persephone, and Hermes could be accompanying or even leading the chariot of Hades; compare e.g. the depiction of this episode on the north wall of the famous Tomb of Persephone in Vergina (Aigae) [cf. Andronikos (1994)]. Perhaps [χ]λωρό[ν] in line 8 was modifying a flower like the one which captured the attention of Persephone in the *Homeric hymn to Demeter* (8-11).

Fr. 5

¹⁹⁷ They could have gone into the water to clean themselves; at this point, several possibilities appear before us: they could have been members of the hunting party of a goddess (for lassitude as an erotic motif cf. Callim. *Lav.Pall.* 70-9 and 105-119 with Bulloch's (1985) notes *ad* 107-18 and Ovid *Met.* 5.585-6 with Bömer *ad loc.*) or maidens participating in some rite or athletic contest. Σ Ψ Call. *Dian.* 14 explains ἄζώστους as μὴ διαπαρθενευμένας. So the women mentioned in the text would be maidens.

The bottom part of the second column is not well preserved and there is not enough information that could help one to reconstruct the content of the poem. The last fragments preserve traces of words which could suggest an athletic context (horse race) and so could be brought into connection with what has already been discussed.¹⁹⁸ The mention of Pterion, a town in Media (l. 4 Πτερίο[ν] χωρίον τῆς Μ[ηδίας]), could indicate a military context (Syrian War?), but this would be difficult to reconcile with the previous mythological narrative, unless the poet returned to the issue of Ptolemy's victories (fr. 2).

The lemmata of lines 6 (κρό[τημα]) and 8 (κροτείτω{ι}) are ambiguous. The imperative in line 8 could describe the noise produced by a religious band using κρόταλα 'rattles'.¹⁹⁹ On the other hand, lines 6-13 could describe a scene from the chariot race in which the *laudandus* won his victory. Similar scenes, as we have already seen, were included in both the *VS* and the *VB*. This could square well with line 3 which reads 'Eleian' neuter (ἡλείων) and could suggest a return to the praise of the Olympic victor or even belong to the description of the race contest between Pelops and Oenomaus. In such a case, the emphasis would have fallen on the noise produced by the running chariots (cf. *VS* fr. 384.5-6 Pf.).²⁰⁰ Nevertheless, the imperative would cause awkwardness, unless the poet or someone else admonished the spectators to applaud the (returning) victorious chariot (cf. Hesych. κ 4210-12;

¹⁹⁸ ἀρετά in l. 2, although suitable for an athletic or military context, would hardly agree with the Ionic dialect that we observe in other cases (cf. δχῆνη fr. 3.13). One should, therefore, opt for the verbal form ἀρεταῖ found before in Hom. *Od.* 8.329 (οὐκ ἀρετᾶ κακὰ ἔργα); cf. D'Alessio (2004) 799 n. 19.

¹⁹⁹ Another imperative is found in fr. 3.7 ([ἀ]μφιμ[άσ]ασθε), where one may see the activities of a group of maidens (see also n. 196 above). The mention of Pteria in ll. 5-6, however, discourages one from connecting the two scenes. κροτέω is regularly used to describe the noise produced during cult ceremonies, Pind. *Pae.* 6.18 [= D6 Rutherford] (μελπ[ό]μεναι / ποδὶ κροτέο[ντι γᾶν θο]ῶι); Eur. *Bacch.* 188 (θύρωσι κροτῶν γῆν).

²⁰⁰ Homeric poetry offers the only example of this use; *Il.* 15.453 (ὑπερώησαν δέ οἱ ἵπποι / κείν' ὄχεα κροτέοντες) and *h.Ap.* 234. Cf. Ebeling s.v. 'magno cum crepitu trahunt.'

LSJ⁹ s.v. II. 2).²⁰¹ *κρότημα* is found before Callimachus only in a figurative meaning: twice in tragedy for Odysseus (Soph. fr. 913 Radt *πάνσοφον κρότημα, Λαέρτου γόνος*; [Eur.] *Rhes.* 499 *ἔστι δ' αἰμυλώτατον / κρότημ' Ὀδυσσεύς*).²⁰² The context does not seem to allow for this meaning. The gloss (*τὸ ἔλασμα τοῦ* .[]) suggests 'an item wrought with the hammer' (LSJ⁹ s.v.); this could refer to a *κρόταλον* used in some rite (cf. Hesych. κ 4205 *κρόταλον· περίτριμμα. κρότημα*) or even to some part of the victorious chariot (cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 5.34-44).

Some final points:

- (a) The lemma in l. 9 ([*θ*]αμβαλέης) was rendered in the gloss in the feminine gender as *πλ[η]κτικῆ<c>*: one could suppose that the victor was a woman (Berenice II ?), unless this refers still to the mythological part (Arethusa, Persephone ?).
- (b) *χιραλέοι* 'with chapped feet' (cf. also Hesych. s.v. χ 485 *τοὺς πόδας κατειργασμένους*) in l. 10 could refer to the horses that drove the chariots in the race (cf. Hunter *ap.* Bastianini (2002)). *κάρφος* in l. 13 this context may suggest the grazing of the running horses. One should keep in mind that the praise of the winning horse or even mules (Simonides fr. 2 Poltera for Anaxilas of Rhegium) was a standard part of epinician ode and can be paralleled in both Pindar and Bacchylides, both of whom extolled the speed of Hieron's steed Pherenicus (*Ol.* 1.18; *Pyth.* 3.74; 8.37, 184; Bacch. *Encomia* fr. 20c.9). In

²⁰¹ Both uses of the imperative are found in Pindar's epinicians; see Hummel (1993) 259 'l'ordre peut être adressé [...] au chœur (*Isthm.* 8.1-4), à l'auditoire (*Pyth.* 6.1)'. *Isthm.* 8.1-4 (*ἰῶν ἀνεγειρέτω κῶμον*) is closer to our grammatical form (3rd person middle-passive): Pindar addresses the members of the chorus; one does not have to assume a choral performance for Callimachus' epinician. If Callimachus is addressing the audience here, it is more likely a contextualizing device.

²⁰² Σ Theoc. 15.48-50c-d: *ἡ δὲ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ κεκροτημένου χαλκοῦ*. Cf. Hesych. (κ 4209); Long (1968) 115-6; Σ [Eur.] *Rhes.* 499 and Paley's (1872-80) note *ad loc.*

Hellenistic times Posidippus' epigram for Callicrates' Pythian victory (AB 74) devotes eleven lines to his fillies (cf. also AB 75).

Conclusion

What can this new glossary tell us about Callimachus' epinician poetry and the way in which he used Pindar's *œuvre* to revive an archaic lyric genre?

First, fr. 1 and 5 indicate that the lost elegy was concerned with the Peloponnese and possibly with a chariot race at the Olympic Games. Fr. 2 suggests that the poem was probably addressed to a member of the royal house. In the light of this, *PHorak* 4 should be read along with the rest of Callimachus' epinician output: *Sosibii Victoria*, *Victoria Berenices* and *Iambus* 8. Second, it strengthens the impression that in the last decade of his life Callimachus was seriously engaged in the composition of several epinician poems, probably to meet the rising interest that the Ptolemies and their courtiers (e.g. Sosibius) showed for propagandistic exploitation of athletic games. In his effort to revive epinician discourse Callimachus turned back to the master of the genre Pindar. The examination of the glossary on *PHorak* 4 has shown how Pindaric influence could be detected in the selection of mythological subject matter (foundation of Olympic Games, pentathlon events etc.) and in the combination and presentation of different *aetia* (the divergent *aetia* for the Olympic Games). Still, as in Callimachus' other elegies, and despite the Pindaric provenance of certain myths and motifs, the overall structure remains ultimately un-Pindaric. In this respect, the present reconstruction of the lost elegy, if correct, would lend strength to our previous conclusions concerning Callimachus' other epinician elegies.

Like the *VS* and the *VB*, the lost elegy also contained direct speeches (fr. 1, 9; 3, 7; 5, 8). Unfortunately, one is unable to distinguish the levels and establish if the person talking each time is the narrator or a mythological figure. *ἔτε]*θήπεια in fr. 1.9, if Menci's supplement is sound, is a remarkable case: although the form is un-Pindaric, if it belonged to the *laudator*, it would recall the admiration which heroes (Jason Pind. *Pyth.* 4.79 ἀνήρ ἔκπαγλος; 80 θαητοῖσι γυίοις; 95 τάφε ... παπταίνων; Achilles *Nem.* 3.50 (τὸν ἐθάμβεον)), or the victor (e.g. *Ol.* 9.94; *Pyth.* 9.97-100) can cause to onlookers, the audience or even to the poet himself (*Ol.* 10.100-105). Fr. 3, the most difficult for the reconstruction of the lost elegy, could suggest that the myth of the poem dealt with the abduction of Persephone. If this is so, the myth would not, strictly speaking, have been connected with the actual circumstances of the victory.²⁰³ This is a structural element that we came across in Callimachus' *VB* and could possibly reflect the opinion Hellenistic scholars had of the myths in Pindar's epinician odes as digressions.²⁰⁴ Nonetheless, one can detect a clear encomiastic or religious bent in the selection of the myth of Kore, something which Callimachus had in common with Pindar. One could compare, for instance, the reference to Kore in *Nemean* 1.14, addressed to Chromius and alluding to the importance of Demeter and Kore's cult for Hieron (see Privitera (1982b)).

Like Pindar, Callimachus composed epinician poetry for *laudandi* living outside the limits of mainland Greece. This is the reason he shows such an interest in constructing bridges that connect Alexandria with other parts of the Hellenic world and especially mainland Greece: Corinth (fr. 384.10-14 Pf.), Athens (fr. 384.35-6 Pf.) and Cyprus (fr. 384.50 Pf.) in the *Victoria Sosibii*; Argos in the

²⁰³ The wealth of mythological details that *PHorak* 4 demonstrates is comparable to the *VB* (esp. fr. 143 Massimilla) – the *VS* stands out in its dearth of mythological material.

²⁰⁴ Cf. e.g. *Σ Nem.* 1.49c (ὑπερ αἰτιώτατον τῆς παρεκβάσεως), *Nem.* 7.76 (βούλεται ἤδη λῆξαι τῆς περὶ Νεοπτόλεμον παρεκβάσεως). Similarly also for Ibycus (*Σ Theoc.* 1.117a παριστορῶν) and Simonides (*Σ ad Nem.* 4.60b καὶ κείνος παρεκβάσει χρῆσθαι εἴωθε).

Victoria Berenices (esp. fr. 143 Massimilla and *passim*). Similarly, in *PHorak* 4, Callimachus tries, by using the figure of Heracles and his descendants, to connect the Ptolemies with the Peloponnese and Sicily. Pind. *Pyth.* 1.61-5 (θέλοντι ... καὶ μὰν Ἡρακλειδᾶν ἔκγονοι ... αἰεὶ μένειν τεθμοῖσιν ἐν Αἰγιμιοῦ / Δωριεῖς) could be relevant in this context: Heracles and his descendants connect the population of newly-founded Aetna with the homeland of the Dorians. Callimachus' choice to retain Heracles and the Heraclids has similar propagandistic undertones: it suggests the connection of the Ptolemaic ruling house with the Argeads and hence with Alexander the Great, so as to boost Ptolemaic credentials in their antagonism against other Hellenistic kingdoms. The prominence of Heracles is another nice example of the way in which Callimachus re-employed a Pindaric figure: in Pindar Heracles was the personification of the limit between the mortal and immortal worlds; by his deification Heracles becomes the paragon for all victorious athletes. In Hellenistic literature, as Theocritus' *Idylls* 17 and 24 also suggest, Heracles becomes the example *par excellence* for the deification of Kings and their consorts. The origins of this could be traced again in Pindar (*Olympian* 3; *Nemean* 1).

The insistence on the detailed description of the race suggested by the traces in fr. 5, which is found again in the *VB* (fr. 143.8-10 Massimilla) and in Posidippus' epigrams, is another indication of the various differences in treatment between Pindar and Callimachus. All in all, in Callimachus one misses the religious aura that surrounds the representation of the victor and his attainments; this could account for the obvious absence of gnomological material in Callimachus' epinician elegies. In Pindar victory is viewed with awe and respect as the unique moment in the victor's life when he surpassed the limitation of his mortal status, and raised claims for the poetic immortality conferred by the praise of his victory.

Callimachus seems indifferent to this aristocratic code of values. Instead he is preoccupied with the details of the victory and the display of mythological lore. In conclusion, then, *PHorak* 4, the most recent addition to Callimachus' epinician corpus, is a welcome testimony to the unique physiognomy of Callimachus' archaizing epinician 'experiments'.

CHAPTER 4

Pindar's Reception in Posidippus' *Hippika* (AB 71 – 88)²⁰⁵**Introduction**

Among the nine categories in which the poet or the ancient editor grouped the 112 epigrams of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, there are eighteen epigrams (AB 71–88) which celebrate victories scored in horse-events in some of the major pan-Hellenic games. The epigrams are inscribed as *Hippika* and praise victories of various *laudandi*. Among them one comes across an epigram dedicated to the Pythian victory in the chariot-race of Callicrates of Samos (AB 74), the notable politician who served under Ptolemy II (cf. Bingen 2002), as well as epigrams celebrating members, predominantly female, of the royal family, such as Queen Berenice I (AB 87–8) and the royal princess Berenice the Syrian (AB 78–82) or Queen Berenice II, depending on how one identifies her (see below n. 236). The rest of the group celebrates victories won by various persons either unknown or known to some degree from elsewhere.²⁰⁶ The geographical dispersion of the *laudandi* is limited, in comparison, for example, with other parts of the anthology like the *Lithika*, with four of them coming from Thessaly (AB 71, 83–5) and one from Sparta (AB 75). The rest of the epigrams are either too lacunose to reveal the city of origin of the victor (AB 73, 77) or do not dwell on this detail at all (AB 72, 76, 86 [perhaps Messenian like his horse?]).

²⁰⁵ I use the text and the numbering of the edition by Austin and Bastianini (AB).

²⁰⁶ AB 72 praises the Nemean victory of Molyucus. GB *ad loc.* have raised the possibility that this is Cassander's general (Diodorus Siculus XIX.54). The time gap, however, is quite large and the identification dubious. On the other hand, Etearchus, the *laudandus* of AB 76, has been tentatively identified by Thompson (cited in *apparatu critico ad loc.* by AB) with one nomarch mentioned in the Zenon archives. On the whole, one ought to bear in mind that the fact that we lack information about Posidippus' victors does not mean that they were not well known.

Scholars have shown beyond a doubt that Posidippus was well-acquainted with previous literature: didactic poetry, scientific prose, archaic lyric and contemporary Hellenistic poetry are only some of his subtexts.²⁰⁷ But this is only one side of the coin. Posidippus established himself in a genre with a great inscriptional tradition behind it.²⁰⁸ When Posidippus came to composing epigrams, he found a rich epigraphical tradition and practice, which contained various standard *topoi* and motifs. Posidippus made use of them, endowing them with the heritage of lyric poetry.

In the case of the *Hippika*, as we are going to see, Posidippus was the recipient of two branches of poetic tradition, one personal including the great lyric odes of Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides and the other anonymous and inscriptional. This duality influenced the way in which Posidippus came to reflect on his archaic predecessors, if not actually view them through the lens of epinician inscriptions. The ensuing discussion proceeds from the assumption that for all his idiosyncrasy as an epigrammatist Posidippus was a poet typical of the cultural ambience in which he composed his poetry and that as a *doctus poeta* he would hardly have neglected Pindar's poetic patrimony in composing his own epinician poetry. In this respect, it is natural to assume that his readers would associate his epinician epigrams²⁰⁹ with the odes that archaic epinician poets composed to celebrate the victories of their patrons in various horse-events. The discussion will take into account only passages that seem close to or modelled on Pindar.

²⁰⁷ See e.g. Smith (2004) 106 on the *Lithika*, Kosmetatou (2004) 210-1 on the *Andriantopoiika* and Sider (2004) on the *Oionoskopika*.

²⁰⁸ Cf. Lelli (2004) 89 for the *usus* and *tradizione epigrafica* in Posidippus' epigrams.

²⁰⁹ Throughout this chapter I follow Köhnken (2007) in using the terms 'agonistic' or 'epinician' epigrams interchangeably. In both cases I refer to epigrams inscribed, or represented as if they were inscribed, on monuments to praise athletic victories.

Bacchylides and Simonides will be brought into the discussion only to strengthen a general point about the reception of archaic epinician poetry in the *Hippika*.

A double tradition: agonistic epigrams and epinician odes

The first agonistic epigrams date from the 6th century BCE, almost a century before the development of epinician lyric. Although epinician epigrams were from the beginning a parallel praise form (cf. Angeli Bernardini 2000: 29-30; Dickie 2008: 14), they could not claim for themselves the refined and exalted character of the kindred epinician odes. The apparent decline of epinician poetry in the period following the death of Pindar and Bacchylides left the field open to epinician epigrams, which now witnessed an unprecedented growth. Joachim Ebert (1972: 18-9) has emphasized that after the second half of the fifth century agonistic epigrams become more elaborate, using motifs that until then were found predominantly or exclusively in epinician odes. To be more specific, what marks the second half of the fifth century as a turning point in the history of agonistic epigrams is the preponderance from that time on of what Angeli Bernardini (2000: 32) has termed *dati accessorii*,²¹⁰ elements, that is, that appertain to the praise of other family victories, the victor's city, the exceptional quality of the victor, the description of the defeat of his opponents, the record of his victories and hymn elements (address to a divinity, prayer for further victories etc.).²¹¹ All these were

²¹⁰ Angeli Bernardini (2000: 32) has divided the information conveyed by epinician epigrams (and odes) in *dati indispensabili* and *dati accessorii*. The former includes documentary or factual information, e.g. name of the athlete, name of his father, city of origin, sport and games in which the victory was won.

²¹¹ Ebert (1972) 19 and Angeli Bernardini (1992) 968, *ead.* (2000) 34, with several examples from both epinician odes and agonistic epigrams. *FGE* 43 (= 26 Ebert) constitutes a unique specimen of this tendency. Nine out of the twelve lines of this fifth-century inscription, falsely attributed to Simonides in the *Anthologia Palatina*, are taken up with a detailed record of Nicolaidas' athletic victories, probably fashioned on the model of Pindaric passages such as *Ol.* 7.81-7 and others (cf. also Ebert 1972: 93 and Page 1981: 262).

generic motifs that were found consistently in the epinician poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides, so that their appearance in agonistic epigrams is a case of borrowing from the more cultivated but declining genre of epinician odes.

(a) *δαπάνη* in Pindar and Posidippus

This tendency is more evident in the case of a *doctus* Hellenistic poet as Posidippus, who not only followed the evolution of the genre in the composition of his epigrams but also endowed them with a deep knowledge of previous poetry. AB 77 constitutes an interesting example. The epigram, which celebrates an Olympic victory in the chariot race, the most illustrious of events at the games, is preserved in an extremely lacunose state. Although we cannot tell who is speaking, or what the name of the *laudandus* is, we learn about his three previous Olympic victories, scored probably in the same event. Interestingly, though, this is the first, and only, time in the collection we hear of the expenses which are involved for those participating in the chariot race:

ἄρμ[ατι ±11] . τελέωι τρις Ὀ[λύμ]πια νικῶ
 Εὐ . [±13 ο]ὕκ ὀλίγαι δαπ[άνα]ι
 α . [±15] κομιδᾶς . [. . . .] . [. . . .]
 εἴ γ' ἀ[ρ]κεῖ δόξαι, λείπεται οὐ[δ]ὲν ἐμοί

Posidippus is reworking a traditional or generic motif of lyric epinicians. The same term (*δαπάνη*) appears already in Pindar (*Isthm.* 4.47) in conjunction with horse racing:

οὐδὲ παναγυρίων ξυνᾶν ἀπείχον
 καμπύλον δίφρον, Πανελλά-
 νεσσι δ' ἐριζόμενοι δαπάνη χαῖρον ἵππων.

The Cleonymids, the *laudandus*' ancestors, participated in the chariot race at pan-Hellenic games without minding the expense. The emphasis on *δαπάνη* in AB 77

seems *qualitatively* different from Pindar's outlook. *Isthm.* 6.10, a most characteristic specimen of Pindaric ideology on victory, is enough to throw into relief the fundamental difference in the ways that both poets handled this generic motif:

εἰ γάρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάνῃ τε χαρεῖς (10)
καὶ πόνῳ πράσσει θεοδμάτων ἀρετάς
σύν τέ οἱ δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν ἐπήρατον, ἐ-
σχατιαῖς ἤδη πρὸς ὄλβου (12)
βάλλετ' ἄγκυραν θεότιμος ἑών

In only five lines Pindar has given a *précis*, as it were, of his viewpoint (cf. Willcock (1995) 15). The effective combination of money spent with athletic toil and inborn excellence, along with divine support, forms the foundation upon which any potentially successful athletic endeavour ought to base itself. Divine support at the right moment leads to victory and places the victor in a state of 'bliss' (*olbos*). This is the furthest he may go in the honours he receives from the gods. This piece of Pindaric *sophia* is repeated throughout his odes, and indicates the socio-religious connotations that *δαπάνη* acquires in his epinician discourse.²¹² So, whereas Pindar goes to lengths to invest such a mundane piece of business with the grandeur of his sublime style and almost religious ideology, Posidippus retains, it would seem, a more down-to-earth approach. The last line of the epigram, and especially the conditional clause (εἰ γ' ἄ[ρ]κεῖ δόξαι), seems to equate the victor's expenses with the *kleos* he has won (λείπεται οὐ[δ]ὲν ἑμοί).²¹³ actually the fame that the *laudandus* has won compensates for his expenses. From a means, in Pindar, through which one can prove his inherent potential for excellence, in Posidippus

²¹² Cf. also *Ol.* 5.15, *Isthm.* 1.42, 5.5. On *δαπάνη* in Pindar see Hubbard (1985) 14-5 with n. 12 and more extensively 108 and especially Campagner (1988) 82-4 and Kurke (1991) 98-9.

²¹³ I find Nisetich's (2005) 33 rendition ('if it's enough for glory, *I miss nothing*') intrinsically more plausible than that of Austin ('though this suffices for fame, *I have nothing left at all*') or Bastianini ('anche se questo basta per la gloria, *nulla mi resta*') [My emphasis].

wealth is promoted and represented as equal to the fame that the victor has won and almost as an independent reason for praise.

(b) Pindaric myths and Posidippus' figures of the past

Be that as it may, in epinician epigrams one still misses the wealth of *gnomai* found in the elaborate odes of Pindar and Bacchylides and the extensive use of myth. In fact allusions to myths in agonistic epigrams, be they inscriptional or literary (e.g. Posidippus'), remain an exception to the rule (cf. Köhnken 2007: 298). Nonetheless, in the case of Posidippus' *Hippika* we can see that a change has taken place. In epinician odes myths allowed the poet to transport his *laudandus* and audience from the here and now of the performance to the mythological world of unaging gods and heroes (cf. Hölscher 1975: 100–1). Myths would often serve propagandistic purposes, but on the whole they offered foils for the *laudandus*, paradigms of prowess, that is, which helped to render the athlete's victory more prestigious. Indubitably, Posidippus has nothing similar to the elaborate Pindaric myths to offer his readers. Nevertheless, he differentiates himself considerably from most epinician epigrammatists in his attempt to recreate the effect of Pindaric epinician myths in the humble space of a single epigram.

In some cases the poet alludes to important athletic figures of the past, especially personages whose victories were praised by Pindar and Bacchylides. The great tyrants of Sicily, especially Hieron, present in the first part of the *Hippika* (AB 71–3) through the allusion to his victorious horse Pherenicus, or the Thessalian aristocrats (e.g. Scopads AB 83), have taken the place of Pindar's heroes as mythological foils, or, to be more precise, as historical figures more suitable for the praise of a newly founded royal dynasty. AB 87, for instance, which praises the

Olympic victory of Queen Berenice I evokes the Spartan princess Cynisca explicitly as an example of a female victor but implicitly as a precedent for the deification of a royal lady.²¹⁴ At the same time, the mention of venerable dynastic families (Scopads, Iamids, royal house of Sparta) permits Posidippus to connect the Ptolemies with the history of the great pan-Hellenic Games and so with mainland Greece, and hence to further their political agenda.²¹⁵

The collection opens with an epigram (AB 71) that celebrates the victory of a Thessalian *laudandus*:

οἶτος ὁ μουννοκέλης Αἰθῶν ἐμὸς ἵππος ἐνίκα]
 κάγω τὴν αὐτὴν Πυθιάδα στ[άδιον·]
 δις δ' ἀνεκηρύχθην Ἴππόστρ[ατος] ἀθλοφ[όρος τ'] ἦν
 ἵππος ὁμοῦ καγώ, πότνια Θεσσαλία.

The placement of an epigram for a Thessalian victor at the beginning of the section has been seen as an indication of the importance of Simonides' epinicians for Thessalian victors. All three great epinician poets were associated at some point in their careers with Thessalian aristocratic clans (Aleuads, Scopads, Echekratids).²¹⁶ However, Hellenistic poetry repeatedly associates Simonides alone with Thessaly (Theoc. 16.44-45 and Call. *Aetia* III fr. 163.13–14 Massimilla).

The initial demonstrative pronoun suggests that the speaking persona, the owner of the horse, is describing a sculpture depicting his horse. The horse is

²¹⁴ See the in-depth analysis of Fantuzzi (2005) 256–64.

²¹⁵ For the political significance of athletic victories in archaic and classical times see Angeli Bernardini (1992) 969 and 971–2.

²¹⁶ Molyneux (1992) 117–132 surveys the fragmentary evidence concerning Simonides' connection with Thessaly. With the exception of fr. 7 Poltera, an epinician for Aetius, probably of Thessalian origin [Molyneux *ibid.* 129 – 132], we do not possess any fragments from Simonides' epinicians for the Aleuads or the Scopads. His connection with the latter family is established by way of fragments only by a dirge (fr. 244 Poltera) and the poem on *arete* (fr. 260 Poltera). Pindar's *Pythian* 10, which celebrates the Pythian victory of Hippocles in the *dioulos*-race, was commissioned by the Aleuad Thorax. Thessalian overlords appear again in Pindar's fragments: *Thren.* 5 fr. 128e(a). 9 Maehler mentions a descendent of Aleuas, while Lobel thought he could discern the name of Skopas in the extremely lacunose fr. 60 (b) col. II, 13 Maehler (see *ap. cr. ad loc.*). For fr. 255 Maehler see below n. 222. Bacchylides' *Ode* 13 celebrates the victory of the Thessalian Cleoptolemus at the Thessalian games of Petraia, 14 the victory of Aristoteles of Larissa.

designated as *μουνοκέλης* (cf. AB 83). The same adjective had been used before only once for Hieron's victorious horse, Pherenicus, in an epigram (Paus. 8.42. 9 [= 17 Ebert]) inscribed on the base of a sculpture dedicated by Deinomenes on behalf of his deceased father and crafted by Onatas (first half of the 5th cent. BCE)²¹⁷

σόν ποτε νικήσας, Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε, σεμνὸν ἀγῶνα
 τεθρίππῳ μὲν ἄπαξ, μουνοκέλητι δὲ δίς, (5)
 δῶρ' Ἰέρων τάδε σοι ἐχαρίσσατο· παῖς δ' ἀνέθηκε
 Δεινομένης πατρὸς μνήμα Συρακοσίου.

The emphasis is given to the victorious horse. Posidippus names the horse too, something done in extant epinician odes only for Hieron's Pherenicus. He also designates the event, using an adjective employed by the above epigram commemorating the victories of Hieron with Pherenicus. If there is a connection, this would suggest the importance of Pherenicus and his 'image' in archaic epinician poetry for epigrams AB 71-7. At the same time, this first epigram in the *Hippika* signals the change in priorities that has come about since Pindar. Posidippus calls the horse *ἀθλοφόρος*, a common designation for horses in agonistic epigrams and poetry (e.g. *Il.* 9.124; Alcman *PMGF* 1.48; Ibycus *PMGF* 6.6; Callimachus *Lav.Pall.* 109). Still Pindar never used it for horses but only for the victors (cf. *Nem.* 3.83; 6.23; *Ol.* 7.7).²¹⁸ The horse receives precedence of place over its owner who is placed second; this would agree, after all, with the sculpture, which depicted only the horse.

In AB 73 it is the victorious horse which is presented talking in the first person about the race.

εὐθὺς ἀπὸ γραμμῆς ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι ἔτρεχον οὕτω
 κέντρα καὶ ἐξώ[σεις οὐδ' ἐπιδεξά]μενος,
 ἀδὺ βάρος ταχυ[τᾶτι ἐστ]εφάνωσαν

²¹⁷ Cf. Ebert (1972) 71–73 and Moggi and Osanna (2003) *ad loc.*

²¹⁸ Outside Pindaric poetry whenever it is used for people, *ἀθλοφόρος* usually refers to Polydeuces (cf. Hesiod fr. 23a. 39; 198.8; 199.1 M.–W.;; *Cypria* fr. 15.6 Bernabé).

θαλλῶι Τρυγαῖ[ον] . . [.] . [ο]υ.

In its self-representation the horse puts the emphasis on the way in which it competed (2 κέντρα καὶ ἐξῶ[σεις οὐδ' ἐπιδεξά]μενος): the horse prides itself on not having to wait for his jockey to whip it to get started like most horses. The phrasing and the general context recalls Pindar's representation of Hieron's victory with Pherenicus in the κέλῃς race at the Olympic Games of 476 BCE (*Ol.* 1.17–23):

ἀλλὰ Δω-
ρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου (17)
λάβαν', εἴ τί τοι Πίσας τε καὶ Φερενίκου χάρις
νόον ὑπὸ γλυκυτάταις ἔθηκε φροντίσιν,
ὄτε παρ' Ἀλφεῶ σῦτο δέμας (20)
ἀκέντητον ἐν δρόμοισι παρέχων,
κράτει δὲ προσέμειξε δεσπότην,
Συρακόσιον ἵπποχάρ-
μαν βασιλῆα.

Pindar's description of the victorious race focuses on the adjective ἀκέντητον. This implies the horse's determination to win the victory for his master. Posidippus' κέντρα καὶ ἐξῶ[σεις harks back to Pindar's description.²¹⁹ Bacchylides (5.36-49) lacks this small detail in his account of Pherenicus' swiftness in the same race. Nonetheless, by laying the emphasis on this detail, Pindar's more economical description manages to throw into relief the special bond between the horse and its owner, a central motif throughout Posidippus' *Hippika*. In this way, Pindar underlines their common determination to excel and provides an early example of the prominence of the victorious horse.²²⁰ So there appears an overt intertextual

²¹⁹ For the contrary idea see 'Parmenon' *AP* 13.18.2 [= *FGE* 1] κεντροραγῆς with Page (1981) *ad loc.*

²²⁰ Pindar's account of Pherenicus' race seems to have captured the imagination of one of Posidippus' poet-friends, Asclepiades of Samos. *AP* 5.203.5 (= *Ascl. HE* 6), attributed to Asclepiades, uses Pindar's expression in a totally different context to describe the amorous encounters of a hetaera named Lycidice with her lovers; cf. Gow and Page (1965) *ad loc.* and Sens (2011) *ad loc.* and p.37. The epigram is thematically connected with *AP* 5.202 (= *Ascl. HE* 35), attributed to Asclepiades or Posidippus, and seems to imitate it; cf. Sens (2011) 235-6. An interesting network of allusions is thus connected with both poets, who use equine metaphors to describe the sexual activities of prostitutes; for the possible influence of the *Hippika* on these

dimension to Posidippus' epigram for Trygaeus. The representation of the way in which his horse won the victory finds a close parallel in Pindar's account of Hieron's victory in the same event and games two centuries ago. Hieron is brought to mind by means of intertextual allusion as a model of Olympic horsemanship for Posidippus' *laudandus* and Pherenicus for Trygaeus' horse. In a way Hieron and Pherenicus have taken the role of ancient heroes as foils to the victor. It is significant that they have entered the realm of athletic 'myth' and so constitute material suitable for the 'mythological' allusions of the Hellenistic epinician poet.²²¹ Further it is not the poet or Trygaeus but the victorious horse itself which talks and compliments itself on its running skills. In this respect, it is comic to find a race-horse able to evoke details from the race that Pherenicus ran in 476 BCE, details the horse could have known only if it had read *Olympian* 1. There could be a kind of humorous side in the epigram that one does not regularly find in Pindar's epinician odes.

Another interesting case of Posidippus' mythological 'innovation' is provided in AB 83 for a Theban *laudandus*.

Θεσσαλὸς ὀξ[ύταθ'] ἵππος Ὀλύμπια μουνοκέλης τρὶς
 νικῶν ἄγ[κειτ]αι μνήμ' ἱερὸν Σκοπάδαις
 πρῶτος κ[αὶ μ]όνος οὗτος· ἐλέγχετε, τρὶς γὰρ ἐνίκων
 [. ἐπ' Ἀλ]φειῶι, μάρτυρες Ἰαμίδαι.

In the fourth line Posidippus addresses the Iamids as witnesses to the three victories won by the victorious horse. The number of victories in the Olympic Games would

epigrams see Sens (2011) 37 and 235-6. One would love to know what Pindar would have thought about this (mis)use of his epinician poetry, but it could be that compositions like his *Encomium* for Xenophon of Corinth (fr. 122 Maehler) had given Asclepiades and Posidippus an insight into his less 'serious' side.

²²¹ νεμεοδρομέων in AB 72. 3 seems to have been modelled on Bacchylides' θοάς τ' Ὀ[λυμ]πιοδρόμους Ἰέρωνος ἵππ[ο]υς (3.4), possibly his coinage. This would reinforce the impression that the representation of the victorious horses in the *Hippika* tries to capture something of the imposing picture of Hieron's Pherenicus, which one can find in Bacchylides (3.3-8) and to a lesser degree in Pindar (*Ol.* 1.18-23).

cover a time-span of twelve years and may have been seen with mistrust by some people (see, however, Jebb (1905) 198-9 n.2 for similar cases of exceptional horses). So the horse challenges those who show mistrust to compete against it and evokes the testimony of the Iamids. The mention of them is related to their official function in Olympia. It is reasonable to assume that the mention of the Iamids in an epinician context would evoke in the mind of most educated readers the myth of their origins in Pindar's *Olympian* 6. In *Olympian* 6 Pindar gives the myth of Iamos the clan's forefather (24-5 *ἴκωμαί τε πρὸς ἀνδρῶν / καὶ γένος*), because Hagesias, the *laudandus*, is his descendant (5 *βωμῶι τε μαντείωι ταμίας Διὸς ἐν Πίσαι;* cf. Hutchinson (2001) 371-4 and esp. *ad* 25). The Iamids were connected with the Olympic Games and the shrine there from time immemorial. Pindar quotes Apollo's prophecy to his child (60-73). According to his story, Apollo granted Iamus an oracle on the Cronian hill where he would divine hearing a voice 'that knows of no lies' (64-6 *ἴκοντο δ' ὑψηλοῖο πέτρην ἀλίβατον Κρονίου / ἔνθα οἱ ᾤπασε θησαυρὸν δίδυμον / μαντοσύνας, τόκα μὲν φωνὰν ἀκούειν ψευδέων ἄγνωτον;* cf. Hutchinson (2001) *ad* 64-70). In this sense one can get a clearer picture of what Posidippus is trying to say here by turning to Pindar's account of the clan in *Olympian* 6: the Iamids are brought to bear on the horses' claim, not only as eyewitnesses but also as soothsayers who do not tell lies.

The mention of the Skopads in line 2 suggests the time of the great epinician poets.²²² The mention of them here could suggest the tradition of agonistic epigrams that Simonides was considered to have established, an area totally alien to

²²² Σ *ad Nem.* 7.103 notes that *Σκοπάδας καὶ Ἀλευάδας εἴωθε Πίνδαρος καλεῖν τοὺς Θεσσαλοὺς*, so Posidippus could have followed Pindaric practice here and used it with the special meaning 'Thessalians'.

both Pindar and Bacchylides.²²³ The names of both ancient clans, the Iamids and Skopads, are placed at parallel positions at the end of the pentameters: the poet is trying to throw into relief the ancient grandeur that both names suggest and so to situate his own epigram in the venerable tradition which their names suggest. In this way the two clans by means of their epinician credentials are employed as foils and supply a quasi-mythological part for the epigram.

What in AB 83 was alluded to with the mention of the famous clan is explicitly spelled out by the Thessalian *laudandus* himself in AB 85 with the mention of the old glory of Thessaly (3-4 *καὶ οὐ κατέλυσα παλαιᾶς / δόξας [εἰν] ἵπποις πατρίδα Θεσσαλίαν*). The locution *παλαιᾶς δόξας* suggests a tone of proud self-proclamation similar to that of Berenice in AB 78.2 (*δόξα παλαιόγονος*), a possible sign of the rivalry between Thessalian victors and the Ptolemies. AB 78 was the first epigram in the Berenice subgroup and the echo could prepare for the transition to epigrams AB 87-88, which are concerned with royal *laudandi*. With the exception of epigrams AB 72, 73, 76, 77 in which the origin of the *laudandus* is unknown, we know that AB 74 was for Callicrates of Samos, AB 75 for a Spartan and AB 86 perhaps for a Messenian. There is a tendency in the *Hippika* to praise royal (Ptolemaic) and immediately after that Thessalian victories. The anthologist or the poet could have been trying to suggest to his readers some sort of antagonism, be it political or athletic, between Alexandria and Thessaly. On the other hand, Posidippus could have evoked Thessaly's tradition in race-events as part of his encomiastic strategy to celebrate the recently founded Ptolemaic dynasty by associating it with an aristocratic family of the past.

²²³ Still *AP* 13.28 is ascribed to Bacchylides or Simonides.

New ground is broken with AB 87, which celebrates the victory of a woman victor, Queen Berenice I (something we find again only in Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices*), but more importantly evokes the figure of the Spartan princess Cynisca as a foil for the *laudanda*.²²⁴ Cynisca is the first *laudanda* in the chronicles of epinician poetry and so is a suitable parallel for the first royal *laudanda* of the Ptolemaic dynasty. The fact that Cynisca received a hero-cult in her own country adds a further edge to the epigram, as it suggests a historical analogy for the deification of Berenice I (cf. Fantuzzi (2005) 262).²²⁵ Differently, though, from epinician conventions the *laudanda* is said to surpass the statue of the mythical example (3-4 *ὦι τὸ Κυνίσκας / ἐν Σπά[ρ]ται χρόνιον κῦδος ἀφειλόμεθα*): in Pindar heroes, standing on the line that separates divinity from mortality, constitute the matchless measure of success and *olbos*. In AB 87 Berenice is explicitly said to steal Cynisca's place of prominence among women athletes.

The closest one comes to the representation of female athletes in the Pindaric corpus is Cyrene in *Pythian* 9. Cyrene, a marginal figure, a man-like maiden (*Pyth.* 9.6 *παρθένον ἀγροτέραν*; cf. *Ἄρτεμις ἀγροτέρη* in *Il.* 21.471), exists between the boundaries of the two sexes and functions as a foil to the male victorious athlete. Her virginity and quasi-masculinity allow her to retain her 'athletic' dimension and lead to her final deification.²²⁶ After her rape by Apollo

²²⁴ Cf. Gutzwiller (2005b) 290; see also the general discussion of the character of feminine sport events in Angeli Bernardini (1995b) 193–7.

²²⁵ One aspect that should be stressed further is the importance of Cynisca for the *laus* of Hellenistic royal women; cf. Ebert (1972) 112: 'Wie Nachahmung sieht aus das Epigram auf die Königin Olympias, Plutarch., *quaest. conv.* 748 A.' If the epigram which Plutarch quotes was pre-Hellenistic, then the choice of Berenice to allude to Cynisca would also suggest an analogy between Berenice I and Olympias and the latter's importance for the public image of Ptolemaic queens. However, there is no indication as to the exact date of the epigram; cf. Teodorsson (1996) *ad* 747F.

²²⁶ Cf. Fränkel (1975) 445–6. See also Ahlert (1942) 6–9 and especially 8 n. 1 who reminds us that *εὐώλενος*, which Pindar used for Cyrene (*Pyth.* 9.17) is a 'männliches Epitheton', used by Euripides for Hippolytus (*Hipp.* 605). The similarity is striking and could suggest an analogy between two personages who vehemently rejected the joys of Aphrodite. For the use of *εὐώλενος* see also Köhnken (1985) 99.

she never returns to her pre-marital wild existence.²²⁷ This is not a claim that one can make for our Hellenistic *laudandae*. Cynisca does not dwell on her marital status, but Berenice I and Arsinoe II were married women whose maturity came to symbolize the prosperity of the kingdom. Berenice II is also praised as a married woman in the *VB* (fr. 143.1–2 Massimilla Ζηνί τε καὶ Νεμέηι τι χαρίσιον ἔδνον ὀφείλω,) / νύμφα, κα[σιγνή]των ἱερὸν αἶμα θεῶν). On the other hand, the only kind of feminine ‘athlete’ that Pindar, and arguably archaic epinician poets in general, would allow in their myths suggests Artemis-like women such as Cyrene and Atalante, both of whom are mentioned as members of Artemis’ entourage (cf. Call. *Dian.* 189–224).²²⁸ In this respect, one could suggest, Posidippus’ insistence on Berenice’s virginity (AB 79.1; 80.4 (?)) tries to capture something of an Artemis-like figure. Artemis’ connection with chariot racing (*Pyth.* 2.9 ἰοχέαιρα παρθένος), her virginity and her masculine characteristics are the credentials for her introduction to the male-dominated epinician world²²⁹ and could suggest her as a foil for Berenice here. On the other hand, Berenice’s maidenhood could also suggest her desirability as a royal bride (cf. *Pyth.* 9. 98–9, which shows affinities with *h. Ven.* [6] 15–8).²³⁰

²²⁷ Cf. Kyriakou (1994) 43–4.

²²⁸ The evidence on the role which Artemis played in Ptolemaic propaganda is scanty; see Fraser (1972) i. 195–6. Tondriau (1948) lists three queens (Arsinoe II, Arsinoe III, and Cleopatra I) who were identified with Artemis. To this evidence one should add a ring with intaglio gemstone depicting Artemis now at the Getty Museum in Los Angeles (92. AM.8.8). Pfrommer (2001) 39–40 identified the Artemis depicted on the ring with Arsinoe II on the basis of some standard motifs in her representation on coins (protruding eyes, pointed nose etc.). However, this identification is dubious; cf. Rotroff (2002). Callimachus’ *Hymn to Artemis* could be situated in a Ptolemaic context, but there is no internal or external evidence to support such a claim.

²²⁹ See Ahlert (1942) 20–2.

²³⁰ Eroticism is inherent in the representation of the victors (e.g. Pindar *Ol.* 10.103, 9.94, *Nem.* 3.19), and at times is brought into connection with the marriage prospects of the young *laudandus* (see also *Pyth.* 10.58–9). For love imagery in Pindar’s poetry see Bowra (1964) 169–170, Gundert (1935) 40 and Hubbard (1985) 22–3. A suggestion such as this is not influenced by the much debated issue of Berenice’s identity. In Callimachus’ fr. 388 Pf., Berenice II is compared to the virgin goddesses, Athena and Artemis (fr. 388.10–11 Pf.), but the exact context of the comparison is now lost (perhaps

(c) Race descriptions

A number of epigrams are distinguished by their insistence on the realistic description of the race (e.g. AB 72, 73, 74 etc.). This thirst for sensational details of horse races (AB 73 and especially 74, 59 Ebert; cf. Callimachus *VB* fr. 143.7–9 Massimilla) is peculiarly un-Pindaric (see, however, *Pyth.* 5.49-53 and Bacchylides 5.37-49).²³¹ Instead Pindar places the emphasis on the ‘eternal’ message that can be conveyed by the particular victory and its impact on the life of the victor and his family. AB 72, which celebrates Molycus’ Nemean victory in the *κέλης*-race, is a characteristic example of description:

τοῦ πώλου θηεῖσθε τὸ λιπαρές, ὡς πνόον ἔλκει
παντὶ τύπῳ καὶ πᾶς ἐκ λαγόνων τέταται
ὡς νεμεοδρομέων· Μολύκῳ δ’ ἤνεγκε σέλινα
νικήσας ἄκρω νεύματι καὶ κεφαλῇ.

The *persona loquens* is identified with the poet. The poet addresses the onlookers, inviting them to admire the skill of the artist who fashioned the horse.²³² Pindar often gives instances where the spectators at the games admired the victorious athlete, suggesting at the same time his desirability and attractiveness (cf. *Ol.* 9.93–4 *διήρχετο κύκλον ὄσσα βοᾶ, / ὠραῖος ἐὼν καὶ καλὸς κάλλιστά τε ῥέξαις, Pyth.* 9.96–100 *πλεῖστα νικάσαντά σε καὶ τελεταῖς / ὠραῖαις ἐν Παλλάδος εἶδον ἄφωνοί θ’ ὡς ἕκασται φίλτατον / παρθενικαὶ πόσιν ἤ / υἱὸν εὐχοντ’, ὦ Τελεσίκρατες, ἔμμεν).*²³³ AB

an account of her military exploits; cf. Hyg., *Astr.* II 24). Virginité could have been a piece of poetic imagery that should not be taken literally, at least not any more than the presentation of Arsinoe II as the virgin goddess Athena in the *Oionoskopika* (AB 36).

²³¹ Norwood (1945) 29–30 gives a list of passages that describe the circumstances of the victory in Pindar. See also Jebb (1905) 56 and Hornblower (2004) 342 n. 43 with older bibliography. Add *Isthm.* 4.49–52, which the scholiast believed to describe the way Melissus competed in the pancration (cf. Σ Pind. *Isthm.* 4.77b-c).

²³² Posidippus foregrounds the action of ‘gazing’ at the statue of the victorious horse. On the whole, compare Pollitt’s (1974) 63–4 and 189–191 discussion *s.v.* *θαυμαστός, θαῦμα*. Posidippus uses *θηεῖσθε*, which recalls the frequent Pindaric use of *θαητός* (cf. Slater (1969) *s.v.*). See also Porter (2011) 283 on *μέγα θαῦμα* in AB 15.

²³³ Cf. also Carne-Ross (1985) 28–30 on *Olympian* 9 and 99–100 on *Pythian* 9 respectively. In *Pythian* 9 the gaze of the female spectators is anticipated by the admiration of Apollo (26–28) as he watches Cyrene wrestle with a lion; cf. Crotty (1982) 95. For gods admiring mortal heroes in Pindar

72 functions on a radically different principle. In an artful way Posidippus recreates a part of the race by describing the monument which is supposed to commemorate the race. Gazing at the statue of the victorious horse would have permitted the beholder a temporal and spatial dislocation to the last moment of the race at Nemea. The sculpture, whose existence was probably only textual, captures the final efforts of the victorious horse. The poet commenting on this piece of art ‘liberates’ it from its supposed base and so allows the readers (who in this textual scenario function also as viewers) to travel to the last moment of the race. In this manner the poet balances his poem between an *ekphrasis* of the monument and a narrative of the race, skillfully embedding the latter in the former.²³⁴ As a result the reader of the epigram becomes the admirer of the ‘textual’ sculpture and subsequently a spectator of the race praised. Posidippus posits the existence of a sculpture which depicts the victorious horse in realistic terms only to contextualize it within his poem (this includes the photo finish of the race and the glorious return home; cf. Call. fr. 384.4 - 6 Pf.).²³⁵

(d) Inherent excellence (φύά) in Pindar and Posidippus

In certain other epigrams the central part is taken up completely by a chronicle of family victories (e.g. AB 78 or 88). This happens only in the epigrams for royal *laudandi*. Catalogues were common in epinician odes and subsequently in epinician

see also *Nem.* 3.50 (τὸν ἐθάμβεον Ἄρτεμις τε καὶ θρασεῖ Ἀθάνα) with Ahlert’s (1942) 21–2 discussion. Add also *Pyth.* 10.58–60 with van Groningen (1958) 347. A different kind of audience is suggested in *Pythian* 4, which seems closer to *Nemean* 3. *Pyth.* 4.237–241 describes the reaction of Aetes to Jason’s victorious completion of his *athlos* (ἐξεπόνησ’ 236; πόνος 243). The reaction of Jason’s friends (who form a sort of chorus; cf. e.g. *Ol.* 9.4) is reminiscent of similar scenes like, *Pyth.* 9.123–4 and *Ol.* 10.93–6 or even Call. *Hecale* fr. 69 Hollis (the reception of Theseus by the locals); in general see Braswell (1988) *ad* 240(b). The reaction of Aetes is juxtaposed with that of Pelias when he first set eyes on the stranger with the one sandal (95); see Segal (1986) 40 and Hubbard (1985) 96.

²³⁴ This structure has been aptly described by Del Corno (2002) 64. Cf. also Bingen (2002) 185 on AB 74.

²³⁵ Cf. Papalexandrou (2004) 251.

epigrams, but in these cases the epigrams come close to the spirit of Pindaric passages such as *Ol.* 2.7–47 and narrate the travels of the Ptolemaic family through the major pan-Hellenic Games from their ancestral home in Macedon to Alexandria.

AB 78 is the first epigram in the collection to deal with a royal personage. The epigram is taken up in its entirety by information of a documentary type: the victor's family, her pedigree and country of origin. Nonetheless, one cannot help but admire the sophisticated, and at the same time simple, way in which Posidippus fashioned this remarkable epigram. Staying close to Pindar's admonition to improvise new ways (e.g. *Nem.* 8.19-21), Posidippus offered traditional genre motifs filtered through his talent.

The epigram is placed in the mouth of the *laudanda*, Berenice, herself (cf. Call. *VS* fr. 384.35-43 Pf.). The queen or princess (*βασιλίσ*)²³⁶ addresses the *ἄοιδοί* asking them to recount her *kleos*. However, the princess does not rely on their services to have her *kleos* disseminated. It seems that her *kleos* is already well-known, since her fame is as old as her family. This goes against Pindar, who in *Pyth.* 1.94, addressing Hieron, talks about the role that the *ἄοιδοί* play in perpetuating the fame of men that have died:

ὀπιθόμβροτον αὔχημα δόξας (92)
οἶον ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει
καὶ λογίους καὶ ἄοιδοῖς.

Pindar advises his patron to govern his city in a fair manner, so as to provide future poets and prose authors with a favourable subject-matter. In this respect it is the

²³⁶ Berenice is called *βασιλίσ* again in AB 82.6. The term may designate either a queen or a princess (Eur. *Hec.* 552 for Polyxene; *Med.* 1003 for Creon's daughter). LSJ⁹ s.v. Αβ are certainly wrong to understand it as 'princess' in Eur. *Hipp.* 778, since here it refers to Phaedra, who as consort to Theseus is the queen. For the corrupt Soph. *Ant.* 941 see Jebb (1900) *ad loc.* Ptolemaic royal titelature is not clear enough to assist in the debate about Berenice's identity. Similarly in AB 116.5 Queen Arsinoe II is called *βασιλισσα*, a title used in inscriptions for her sister Philotera; see the detailed discussion of Pfeiffer (1922) 17–8. The title was also used for Berenice, the daughter of Euergetes; see Pfeiffer *ibid.* 18 n. 2. See also Dickie (2008) 38, who confuses Ptolemy Philopator with Ptolemy Euergetes.

ἄοιδοί who will determine Hieron's fame and deliver it to future generations. Adhering to a well-established epinician motif Posidippus does not differentiate Berenice's *kleos* from that of her family but rather employs it to reinforce the prestige of the Ptolemaic dynasty. This is why she declares her *kleos* to be already 'known' to the singers. The ἄοιδοί are asked to tell of Berenice's fame only if they take pleasure in talking about things which are well-known (1-2 εἴπατε, πάντες ἄοιδοί, ἐμὸν [κ]λέος, εἶ[ί] π[οτ] ἄρέσκει / γνωστὰ λέγειν, ὅτι μοι δόξ[α παλαιόγονος]). Berenice's self-proclamation comes very close to rendering almost useless the role that poets, Posidippus included, can play in the dissemination of her *kleos*. Berenice could only imply that in view of her family's athletic excellence it should not come as surprise to anyone that she, a *female* member of the royal family, could also win a victory. In this sense, her praise encapsulates the praise of her family's inherent potential for excellence, which had already been rendered well-known through their previous victories and their celebration by other poets. It would appear, then, that Posidippus has remoulded the traditional aristocratic notion of *φύα* in a highly provocative way, which comes close to challenging the Hellenistic taste for novelty in subject-matter, so as to throw into relief the sex of the victor.

Such an approach would be in accordance ironically with the Hellenistic tendency for innovation, both stylistic and thematic, but it would also accord with Pindaric tradition (cf. Angeli Bernardini (1967) 82, 87). Pindar 'complained' about the difficulty of devising new ways to praise the athletic feats of his patrons. *Nemean* 6, a possible model for Callimachus' programmatic road-motif in Call. *Aetia* I fr. 1.25–8 Massimilla, is characteristic of Pindar's *feigned* distress (cf. Gerber (1999) *ad* 53-4): καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαιότεροι / ὄδῳ ἀμαξιτὸν εὗρον· ἔπομαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχων μελέταν (54). Similarly, in *Nemean* 8.19–21 Pindar uses a metaphor

from the long jump so as to describe the danger of coming up with new things to say, and to highlight the individuality and freshness of his odes in contrast with those of his rivals:

ἴσταμαι δὴ ποσσὶ κούφοις, ἀμπνέων τε πρὶν τι φάμεν.
πολλὰ γὰρ πολλᾶ λέλεκται, ν<εα>ρὰ δ' ἔξευ- (20)
ρόντα δόμεν βασάνω (20)
ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος.

The poet brings the Lydian stone into the picture as a criterion whereby his poetic endeavours are to be judged. The picture of the *basanos* which judges poetry is used again in *Pyth.* 10.67 and especially in fr. 122.16 Maehler (*διδάξαμεν χρυσὸν καθαρᾷ βασάνω*), where the poet talks about his own role.²³⁷ In most cases, it would be the audience (the friends and family of the victor) and its reactions which would show whether Pindar's choice was successful or not.

As we have already noted, it is customary in lyrical epinicians to associate the *laudandus'* athletic prowess with his family's inherent potential for excellence. As a rule this leads into a short digression on the family's record of victories (e.g. *Ol.* 2.49-51; 13.30-46; *Nem.* 4.73-90; 6.11-24). The same generic device is found at work in this epigram: Berenice's claim that her glory is *παλαιόγονος*²³⁸ is substantiated with a catalogue of Ptolemaic victories, which forms the backbone of the whole composition.

This epigram possesses interest also for its address to the Macedonians in the last two lines (13-4 *τεθρίππου δὲ τελείου αἰείδετε τὸν Βερ[ε]νίκη[ς] / τῆς βασιλευούσης, ᾧ Μακέτα[ι], στέφανον*). There is no reason why one should identify them with poets, so as to mean 'poets from Macedon', an indirect reference to Posidippus. This would be anticlimactic after *πάντες* in line 1. Rather it would

²³⁷ See van Groningen(1960) *ad loc.*

²³⁸ For the temporal implications in the choice of the adjective cf. Pind. *Ol.* 13.50 and 14.4, both of which give the feeling of moving far back into the past.

seem that the Macedonians form the internal (or fictional) audience of the epigram.²³⁹ In Pindar's times the performance of the epinician ode coincided with or was contextualized within a celebration organized by the city or by the victor's family, with the participation of the citizens. For instance, *Isthmian* 8 begins with Pindar's address to the young friends of the *laudandus* who, in all probability, also form the chorus for the performance of the ode.²⁴⁰ I would suggest that the address to the Macedonians in the last line of the epigram serves a similar textual function and reflects the manner in which Hellenistic readers construed the performative context of Pindar's odes. The princess asks her compatriots to join in the celebration of her athletic victory.²⁴¹ The Macedonians mentioned adopt the role of the indigenous chorus participating in the performance of the poem. In this manner the poet offers a version, real or textual it is not clear,²⁴² which envelops the epigram by providing it with a performative context. The emphasis on the nationality of the chorus-members should be viewed in connection with the political agenda of the dynasty (cf. Dickie 2008: 34). In the multiethnic environment of Hellenistic Alexandria Posidippus was trying to recreate the archaic structures of the city state. Berenice situates the celebration of her victory in the frame of her ancestral home or amidst her kinsmen in her family's new home, as she would have

²³⁹ For such internal (or textual) audiences in Posidippus see also AB 63 and 64 with Gutzwiller's notes (2002: 45–6 and 50–1 respectively).

²⁴⁰ On performers of epinician odes see Carey (2007) 206–8.

²⁴¹ Pace van Bremen (2007) 372, who follows a 'suspicion' of Thomson (2005) 279, there is no way to decide on the gender of the chorus-members. *Μακέται* can be the plural of *Μακέτης* or *Μακέτη* (cf. e.g. Adaeus *AP* 7.51; Callixeinus *FHG* 2.148). We never hear of women choruses in epinician celebrations, but this should not carry much weight with fictional Hellenistic performances. In the *VB* (fr. 143.14 Massimilla) Callimachus mentions some 'women from Colchis' whom scholars have associated with a ritual offering to Apis, forming part, in all probability, of the celebrations for Berenice's victory; see Parsons (1977) 11 *ad* 31 and D'Alessio (2007) 450 n. 5. A queen could have her victory celebrated by her male subjects. Still, if the Berenice mentioned here is the royal princess, it may have been more appropriate to have her victory celebrated by maidens.

²⁴² On the thorny issue of the performance of Hellenistic epigrams see Bing's (2000) 146–8 salutary remarks. Cf. also van Bremen (2007) 350–2.

done in archaic or classical times. In this way, at the end of the epigram the *laudanda* establishes her ties with the native land of Macedon.

Textuality vs. monumentality in Pindar and Posidippus

AB 83 introduces a different style to the collection: up to this point most epigrams have been placed either in the mouth of the victorious horse or, in AB 78, in the mouth of Berenice herself. Only the epigram for Callicrates (AB 74) explicitly suggests in the final two lines that it was inscribed on the basis of a monument (13-14 *Θεοῖσι δ' Ἀδ[ε]λφείοις εἰκὼ ἐναργέα τῶν τότε' [ἀγώνω]ν / ἄρ[μα καὶ ἡνί]οχον χάλκεον ᾧδ' ἔθετο*). No other epigram in the *Hippika* gives any explicit indication of being inscribed on the base of sculptures. AB 83 is an exception, since it makes an unmistakable reference to its monumental character (2 *νικῶν ἄγ[κειτ]αί μνημ' ἱερὸν Σκοπάδαις*). *ἄγκειμαι* appears again in the first epigram of the *Anathematika* (AB 36.2) and in the epigram for the statue of Philitas (AB 63.10). Further *μνημα*, the substantive Posidippus used for the monument, appears repeatedly in agonistic inscriptions for epinician monuments (see Ebert's index *s.v.*). Nonetheless, both terms were used by Pindar in his epinician odes (see below). This does not mean that Posidippus took these motifs from Pindar. On the contrary, it is more likely that Posidippus used epigraphic formulae independently of Pindar. Be that as it may, these similarities in the employment of traditional inscriptional motifs in both poets clearly demonstrate that the interaction between epinician lyric and epinician (inscriptional) epigrams, which we have noted in Posidippus' *Hippika*, can be found already in Pindar's odes.²⁴³ At the same time, this point of contact permits us to

²⁴³ None of the terms I use in my discussion (*ἀνάγκειμαι, ἀνατίθεμαι, μνημα*) appear in Bacchylides' epinicians. This would suggest that the use of sculptural motifs in epinician odes was peculiar to Pindar.

throw into relief in an explicit way the differences between the epinician discourses of Pindar and Posidippus. In what follows I argue that Pindar employs metaphors from agonistic epigrams and monuments to talk about his own role in the dissemination of the *kleos* of the victor and his family. On the other hand, Posidippus describes in his epigrams agonistic monuments on which his *Hippika* were supposed to be inscribed. Still, these ‘monuments’ were nothing more than fictional or textual creations that contextualized his work in the tradition of agonistic epigrams. It would seem, then, that in principle both Pindar and Posidippus construct textual monuments on which they ‘inscribe’ their poetry or part of it. Yet they did so for different purposes. Pindar wants to underline the superiority of his art in comparison with other forms of praise, while Posidippus wishes to suggest a context for the reading of his epigrams. The ensuing discussion will provide examples of the way in which this principle functions in the epinician poetry of Pindar and Posidippus.

(a) μνήμα

In *Olympian* 3 the wreath from the leaves of the wild olive-tree that Heracles brought to Olympia is called ‘the fairest reminder of the Olympic Games’ (13-5 *τάν ποτε / Ἰστρου ἀπὸ σκιαρᾶν / παγᾶν ἔνεικεν Ἀμφιτροωνιάδας, / μνᾶμα τῶν Οὐλυμπίαι κάλλιστον ἀέθλων*). In *Isthmian* 8 (63 *ἔσσυται τε Μοισαῖον ἄρμα Νικοκλέος / μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆσαι*) the same term is applied to the ‘chariot of the Muses’, here a symbol for the epinician ode, which will sing the *kleos* of the deceased boxer Nicocles (cf. Loscalzo (2003) 137). In both cases, the olive-wreath and the epinician ode will constitute *μνήματα* which will tell of the athletic prowess of the victor in times to come. In AB 83 the textual statue and the epigram on it

constitute the literal and figurative *monumentum* for the whole clan of the Scopads: literal in the sense of a material object like a wreath and a copy of an ode and figurative in the sense of the *kleos* offered by poetry. However a closer examination indicates that the monument in AB 83 is nothing more than a textual construction: in this sense the supposed literal monumentality of the statue is translated into the actual monumentality of the papyrus carrying the epigram.

(b) ἄγκειμαι ~ ἀναθέμεν

Another characteristic case of contact between the two poets is the use of ἀνάκειμαι. Pindar uses ἀνάκειμαι in relation to his epinician poetry or his *laudandus*' victory three times. This Pindaric use is based on an epigraphic formula found in agonistic inscriptions. The formula comprises the verb ἀνάκειμαι and the substantive μνήμα as its grammatical subject.²⁴⁴ Pindar, however, varied the junctura: in *Ol.* 11.8 (ἀφθόνητος δ' αἶνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαις / οὗτος ἄγκειται)²⁴⁵ the epinician praise (i. e. the epinician ode) is seen as a verbal dedication, a poetic offering erected by the poet on behalf of the victor. In its other attestations it is the victory of the athlete itself which functions as the subject of the verb: ἀρετὰ παγκρατίου in *Isthm.* 5.18²⁴⁶ and αἴγλα ποδῶν in *Ol.* 13.36 (cf. 6 Ebert).²⁴⁷ In both cases, the excellence of the

²⁴⁴ Cf. 6.2 Ebert (ἄγκειται Κρονίδαι μνήμα ποδῶν ἀρετᾶς), 24 Ebert (Βαλείου πύκτα τόδε Χαρμ[ίδα ἐσσομέ]οισ[ιν] [ἀ]γκ[ε]ι[τα]ί νίκας μνάματ' Ὀλ[υμπ]ιάδος.) with Ebert (1972) *ad loc.* See also n. 247 below.

²⁴⁵ The reading here is vouchsafed by the scholia *ad loc.* against the manuscripts, which read ἔγκειται; cf. Gildersleeve (1890) and Farnell (1932) *ad loc.*

²⁴⁶ ἄγκειται here is an improvement by Maas on the basis of the scholia; cf. Privitera's (1982) detailed comment *ad loc.* The MSS reading κείται (tr. "abides" Nisetich) has been accepted by some modern editors (e.g. Bowra) but explained in various ways. For instance, Farnell (1932) connects it with the record of victories kept in the Isthmus, while Thummer (1969), following Mezger's analysis (see *ap.* Bury [1892] *ad loc.*), notes that the victory remains in the place where it was won, awaiting the poet to disperse it into the world. Finally, Bury (1892), though quoting Mezger with approval, rightly sees this as a figurative use and asserts that 'the expression suggests the dedication of a statue of the victor'.

²⁴⁷ One should also compare *AP* 6.135 [= 6 Ebert = *FGE* 'Anacreon' vi, second half of 6th ce.] attributed to Anacreon. The phrasing of the second line (ἄγκειται Κρονίδα μνήμα ποδῶν ἀρετᾶς)

victorious athlete in wrestling or in running has been fixed in time, as if it were a votive offering, an inscription or possibly a statue, thanks to the *kleos* and memory imparted by the epinician ode.²⁴⁸

The same or similar associations are evoked by the use of ἀνατίθημι in *Pyth.* 8.29–32 (εἰμὶ δ' ἄσυχολος ἀναθέμεν / πᾶσαν μακραγορίαν / λύρα τε καὶ φθέγματι μαλθακῶ, / μὴ κόρος ἐλθὼν κνίσῃ). The poet wishes to avoid the enumeration of all the glorious deeds of the Aeginitans, since these may cause *koros*, harm the balance of his poem (*μακραγορία*) and so test the reaction of his audience (cf. *Pyth.* 1.81–4; *Nem.* 10.19–20). As Pfeijffer notes, such an account would have given the impression of a tiresome and rather tedious inscription, a comparison suggested by the use of ἀναθέμεν.²⁴⁹ Still, the poet insinuates that only a large inscription or perhaps a prestigious *ex-voto* with an inscription²⁵⁰ could do justice to their heroic past, but he cannot set up such a ἀνάθημα with only his lyre and the soft voices of the chorus members. In *Nem.* 4.80–1 (εἰ δέ τοι / μάτρω μ' ἔτι Καλλικλεῖ κελεύεις / στάλαν θέμεν Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν) the praise of the *laudandus*' deceased maternal uncle, a standard motif of epinician strategy (praise of the family's athletic prowess), is incorporated into the ode through the image of the funerary *stèle* (cf. *Σ ad Nem.* 4.129b). The poet granted Callicles poetic immortality by 'erecting' a poetic funerary *stèle* in his memory (cf. *Σ ad 129c ἀλληγορικῶς τὸ ποίημα στήλην*

looks close to *Olympian* 13: Pindar seems to have replaced the epigrammatic 'formula' *mnama* with a more favourite word of his, *aigla*. It also seems to have been the model for Posidippus' epigram; see, however, Dickie (2008) 20–1 who expresses doubts about this connection.

²⁴⁸ Cf. Lehnus (1981) *ad Ol.* 13.16 and Privitera (1982) *ad Isthm.* 5.18, who leaves open both possibilities, 'dedicato come un ex-voto in un tempio' and 'si erge come una statua'.

²⁴⁹ Pfeijffer (1999) *ad Pyth.* 8.29; cf. also Gildersleeve (1890) who compares *Ol.* [5].7 (τὴν δὲ κῦδος ἀβρόν / νικάσας ἀνέθηκε) with Lehnus (1981) *ad loc.* (il verbo fa anche sospettare l'effettiva dedica di un'epigrafe commemorativa in Camarina).

²⁵⁰ Gildersleeve (1890) *ad loc.* 'The poet is thinking of the inscription of the votive offerings (*Ol.* 3.30).'

λέγει), which surpasses the fragility of marble.²⁵¹ Similarly, in *Nem.* 8.46–8 Pindar declares his inability to restore to life the dead father of the victor (cf. *Σ ad 79b τὸ μὲν ἀναστῆσαι τὸν τεθνεῶτα, φησὶν, ἀδύνατόν μοί ἐστι*). Still, he tries to make up for this (cf. *Pyth.* 3.63–67). He will set up a poetical funerary *stèle* which will praise the *laudandus*' family and city. Once again the *stèle* refers to a part of the ode which is being performed (cf. *Σ ad Nem.* 8.79b *ὑπερεῖσαι λίθον Μουσαῖον; τουτέστι στήλην ἀπὸ Μουσῶν, ἤγουν τὸν ὕμνον, δυνατός εἰμι, ἐφ' οὗ ἡδρασμένοι ἔσσονται ἔνδοξοι*).²⁵² The immortality conferred on Megas by Pindar's musical (funerary) *stèle* is superior to the transient immortality that a fragile *stèle* could provide (cf. Loscalzo (2003) 136–7).²⁵³

The ambiguity in the character of the offering notwithstanding,²⁵⁴ Pindar's use is analogous to that of Posidippus who sees both monument and epigrams as a *μνημα*. This is the point where the similarities between the two poets end. Pindar creates a fictional monument within his poem on which some parts of the ode are thought to be inscribed, but he never says that his ode *was* a material offering; rather he presents it in such a way. The reason is simple. Material offerings stay at the

²⁵¹ My analysis disagrees with the reading of Pfeijffer (1999) 62 who argues that 'while Pindar emphasizes the permanence of his odes elsewhere by comparing them to monuments (*Nem.* 4.81, *Nem.* 8.46–8), the opening lines of this ode [sc. *Nemean* 5] emphasize the advantages of song over actual monuments.' I can find no suggestion of permanence of the material object in any of the above passages. The fragility of monuments is rightly pointed out by Péron (1974) 153 'et à la fragilité de la pierre s'oppose l'éternité du verbe'; see also Jebb (1882) 177 'The marble has too often perished; the song [...] attests for us the truth of Pindar's claim, *ῥῆμα ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει*.' Cf. also Steiner (1986) 132.

²⁵² For the meaning of *λίθος* in this context see Mezger (1880) 333 *ad Nem.* 8. 47 and *Σ Nem.* 8.79a and 79b. *Contra* Bury (1890) who associates it with the secret pebbles in line 26 and Henry (2005) *ad loc.* who explains it as the setting up of a statue. Neither suggestion seems to square well with the context, which clearly has funerary connotations. See rightly Steiner (1986) 64.

²⁵³ This is not the sentiment that one comes across in funerary columns of the archaic era; see, for instance, *IG* XII.9 285 from Eretria (6th cent.) lines 10–15 ... *τύμδι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ στέλεν ἀκάματον. / ἥτις ἐρεῖ παριῶσι διάμερες ἄματα πάντα: / 'Τιμαρέτῃ μ' ἔσσεσε φίλδι ἐπὶ παιδί θανόντι'* with the discussion of Karouzos (1982) 51–4, who traces the motif back to Homer *Il.* 17.432–7.

²⁵⁴ See especially Schroeder (1922) *ad Pyth.* 8.29, who lists several possibilities. There are, however, cases in which the votive to which Pindar compares or juxtaposes his ode is explicit (see also the discussion below): i) *στήλη Nem.* 4.80–1 and 8.46–8; ii) *ἀνδριάς Nem.* 5.1–3 and *Isthm.* 2.45. On *Nem.* 3.10–4 and 8.13–6 (*ἄγαλμα*), which have been erroneously identified as statues (see e.g. Bury (1890) *ad loc.*, Steiner (1993) 161–7 and Hubbard (2004) 75–6) see n. 256 below.

place of the dedication. Pindar's odes are poetic offerings and as such they can travel thanks to their reperformance through time and space, carrying with them the fame of the victor (cf. Athanassaki 2009: 154-6 on *Nem.* 5.1-3). Pindar used writing for the composition of his odes, but he followed archaic tradition in downplaying its importance as means of conservation for his poetry. Instead he placed the emphasis on its mobility through time and space (cf. Segal (1986) 9-12, 156-9, 191-3).²⁵⁵ *Nemean* 5 is illustrative in this respect. The ode opens with an elaborate comparison between composing epinician poetry and erecting statues in honour of the victorious athlete:

Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργά-
 ζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς βαθμίδος (1)
 ἔσταότ'· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας
 ὀλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτω, γλυκεῖ' αἰοιδά, (2)
 στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλουσ' ...

Both Pindar and sculptors are τέκτονες (cf. *Pyth.* 3.113, *Nem.* 3.4) who compose ἀγάλματα, a generic term which can describe a statue, a monument or even a victory ode as 'any concrete representation of glory or honour.'²⁵⁶ As Pfeijffer

²⁵⁵ Pindar points out persistently the divine origins of his poetry, which defies human conditions and can travel through time and space even to the realm of the dead (cf. *Ol.* 14.20–24). In *Pyth.* 3.114–15 he asserts that *arete* can last only thanks to 'songs of *kleos*' (ἀ δ' ἀρετὰ κλειναῖς αἰοιδαῖς / χρονία τελέθει) not writing; cf. also *Nem.* 4.6–7 and *Ol.* 4.8–10 with Farnell (1932) *ad loc.* *Ol.* 10.1–3 is a metaphor from book-keeping (Norwood (1945) 111–4, (1956) 110–2; Kromer (1976) 412–3), and does not allude to the ode's textuality, as Hubbard (2004) 91 suggests (cf. *id.* 1985: 66–70 and Segal (1986) 159 n. 13); cf. rightly Verdenius (1988) *ad Ol.* 10.3. Metaphors from the world of trade (*Pyth.* 2.58–68; *Nem.* 5.1–5; 6.30–4) do not indicate that Pindar saw his odes as commodities in circulation (so Hubbard 2004: 89). Pindar associates the image of ship or boat (cf. Cingano (1995) *ad Pyth.* 2.67–8, Nünlist (1998) 265–76), with the nautical and commercial prosperity of the *laudandus*' country, whether Hieron's Syracuse or Aegina, and the worth of his own poetry; cf. Péron (1974) 153–6, esp. Kurke (1991) 232–235 and Pfeijffer (1999) 62–3 on *Nem.* 5.1–5. There is nothing in these passages to suggest that Pindar placed the emphasis on written circulation or that he believed this to allow poetic immortality, as Hubbard (2004) 89–91 believes. *Ol.* 6.87–91 could reflect the real circumstances for the performance of some odes: the poet sends the chorus along with the chorus master, to whom the poet entrusted a copy of the ode. This, of course, does not mean that Pindar saw this as the way to preserve his poetry and so the *kleos* of his *laudandi* and of his poetry nor that he says anything explicit about it. It is not important whether Pindar used writing but rather how he presented himself, and he presented himself as an oral poet.

²⁵⁶ See the detailed note of Wilamowitz (1909) *ad Eur. HF* 49, Kurke (1991) 104–5, 190–1 and especially Pfeijffer (1999) *ad Nem.* 5.1–2 with the discussion of *Nem.* 3.12–13 on pages 617–18. Unfortunately this polyvalence has led to the misinterpretation of several Pindaric passages.

notes *ad loc.*, '[t]he noun is susceptible to both the rejected and the preferred type of immortalization of the victor, the focus is on the qualifications.' These similarities notwithstanding, Pindar places the emphasis on the differences that characterize the product of his art and of a sculptor: statues are motionless, and so prevent the effective dissemination of the athletes' *kleos*, and are also quiet, resting (cf. Athanassaki (2009) 320-7). Pindar repeats the same idea almost a decade later at *Isthm.* 2.45,²⁵⁷ the only other passage in his epinicians where epinician odes and statues are explicitly juxtaposed (**ἐπεὶ τοι / οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς** [sc. **τούσδ' ὕμνους**] **ἐργασάμαν**).²⁵⁸

Differently from Pindar, and the rest of the archaic epinician poets, Posidippus does not voice similar aspirations. His epinician poetry lacks the mobility which we witnessed in Pindar's odes and is always presented tied, as it were, to the sculptures which he conjures up as a background for his epigrams. In this respect, one cannot find in his epigrams the archaic, and especially Pindaric, idea of the immortality of the victor's *kleos* (cf. Dickie (2008) 24). Whatever the real circumstances of their composition may have been, the *Hippika*, or at least a

Following Bury (1890) *ad Nem.* 3.10–14 and *Nem.* 8.13–16, Steiner (1993) 164–7 and more recently Hubbard (2004) 75–6 have erroneously identified ἄγαλμα with 'statue'. In both cases, however, the term refers to the epinician ode that is being performed, as Pfeijffer (1999) *ad Nem.* 3.12–13 has shown; cf. also Rumpel (1883) *s.v.* 'ornamentum, decus' and not 'statua', which includes only *Nem.* 5.1; similarly also Slater (1969) *s.v.* a 'glory, delight'. The use of ἄγαλμα for the epinician ode finds several parallels in Bacchylides (cf. Harriott 1969: 55): 1.184; 5.4; 10.11; fr. 20.5 B Maehler; see also Jebb (1905) *ad* 1.184. This should not mean, as Harriott *ibid.* claims, that both meanings are always present at the same time (for a similar approach see Carne-Ross (1985) 70-1); the decision should be made strictly on a contextual basis.

²⁵⁷ Noted already by Σ *ad Isthm.* 2.66. Cf. also Thummer (1969), Privitera (1981) and Verdenius (1988) *ad loc.*, Kurke (1991) 250-1, Cole (1992) 61 and Athanassaki (2009) 153–4.

²⁵⁸ Pace Steiner (1993) 166-7, *Nem.* 2.3–5 and *Pyth.* 7.1–3 do not describe the laying of the foundation for a statue, but rather the beginning of the construction of a building, as in *Nem.* 1.8, *Ol.* 6.1–3 and *Pyth.* 6.5–18; on the image see Hutchinson (2001) *ad Ol.* 6.1 and Giannini (1995) *ad Pyth.* 6.7–8. For the architectural image in *Pyth.* 7.3–7 see Gildersleeve (1890), Schroeder (1922), Farnell (1932) *ad loc.*, van Groningen (1958) 328, Angeli Bernardini (1995) *ad loc.*, and Athanassaki (2009) 277 and 322. Cf. also for the use of κρηπίς in *Pyth.* 4.138 (with Braswell (1988) *ad loc.*, who adds fr. 77.1–2 and 194.1 Maehler). For *Nem.* 2.3–5 see Bury's (1890) note *ad Nem.* 1.8. Callimachus seems to have had this text in mind in his elegy for Arsinoe's marriage fr. 392 Pf. (**Ἀρσινόης ὦ ξέινε γάμον καταβάλλομ' αἰεῖδεν**); cf. D'Alessio (2007) 695 n. 36 and Lelli (2004) 118.

number of them, suggest themselves to the reader as inscriptions on agonistic sculptures. And this is the scenario we need to follow in their interpretation. In the case of epigrams inscribed on stone it is the transition from stone to papyrus-collections which enables not only the preservation but also the wider circulation of their text. History, and Hellenistic scholars of the early third century BCE knew this, had shown that this was also true for the text of most lyric poets. Whatever Simonides (fr. 262 Poltera)²⁵⁹ and Pindar may have thought about their own compositions, it was their collection in editions that guaranteed their existence for a longer time.²⁶⁰ For inscribed epigrams this transition opened new paths in their dissemination and preservation, because written circulation had the advantage of liberating the poetic message from its monumental basis, preserving it along with other epigrams in collections and allowing it to reach greater audiences (cf. the *Sylloge Simonidea*).

Epilogue

It is important to note that Posidippus' agonistic epigrams are more concerned with the description of the monuments on which the *Hippika* are supposed to be inscribed than most epigrams inscribed on agonistic monuments. If these epigrams were indeed inscribed on monuments, Posidippus would not need to have spent so much effort on their detailed description, as if the reader could not see the statue on which the epigrams were inscribed. This is a possible indication of their fictional character. At the same time, the textual indices (demonstrative pronouns,

²⁵⁹ See Karouzos (1982) 54-6 and Poltera (2008) *ad* fr. 262; both assume that Simonides, like Pindar, wanted to stress the duration of *kleos* provided by poetry as opposed to the praise conferred by monuments. For the association of *Nemean 5* with Simonides see Loscalzo (2003) 150-1.

²⁶⁰ 'Simonides' Tomb' in Call. *Aetia* III fr. 163 Massimilla remains a characteristic case: the epigram on Simonides' *stèle* is preserved, even after the destruction of his tomb, thanks to its 'inclusion' in Callimachus' work, which is preserved on another material, papyrus; see Acosta-Hughes (2010) 177-8.

descriptions of monuments etc.) that these epigrams contain enable the reader to recreate mentally the ‘lost’ textual monument on the basis of the ‘detached’ epigram (cf. Porter (2011) 273). So, differently from most anonymous epigrammatists, Posidippus shows himself aware of the transition from stone to papyrus (cf. especially AB 122.5–6 *Σαπφῶναι δὲ μένουσι φίλης ἔτι καὶ μενέουσιν / ὠιδῆς αἱ λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες*). The *Hippika* like most epigrams in the Milan collection (with the possible exception of the *Οἰωνοσκοπικά*) operate on the fiction of their monumentality (cf. Porter (2011) 272). They take advantage of their textuality in a way that archaic epigrams could not, because the archaic poets meant their epigrams to be inscribed and not collected in collections. They believed that the monument could stand the passage of time (see n. 253 above). Posidippus does not have to adhere to this, because he is composing his epigrams for written circulation from the beginning. In this sense, the employment of inscriptional motifs, as in Pindar’s case, is fictional. Differently from Pindar, though, he employs inscriptional motifs to place his composition in the frame of a certain poetic tradition. This is one of the many reasons why Posidippus comes so close to the epinician poetry of Pindar, though formally belonging to the tradition of agonistic epigrams, and yet remains so unique.

CHAPTER 5

Theocritus Pindaricus: the reception of Pindaric poetry in Theocritus'***Idylls***

The four previous chapters discussed texts that either belong to the genre of epinician poetry (*Sosibii Victoria*, *Victoria Berenices*, *PHorak* 4[?]), or partake of what one could term epinician discourse or language of praise (Posidippus' *Hippika*). The generic frame of epinician praise rendered Callimachus' elegies and Posidippus' epigrams on equestrian victories the most suitable place to look for Pindaric influence and allusions, all the more so as Pindar was especially famous for his epinician odes.²⁶¹ Things are not so straightforward in the case of Theocritus. Theocritus' *corpus* comprises poems that cover a great variety of 'genres': (i) bucolic idylls (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7), (ii) mimes (2, 10, 14, 15) (iii) mythological poems or 'epyllia' (11, 13, 18, 22, 24 [= hymn?], 26), (iv) pederastic poems (12, 29, 30, 31), (v) dedicatory poems (28), (vi) encomia (16, 17, *Berenice*?) and (vii) epigrams. Classifications such as these overemphasize the fine lines that distinguish idylls in different categories and obscure the common themes and motifs that run through the whole of the collection (cf. especially Hutchinson (1988) 142-5), not to mention the combination of different discourses or generic traditions. An interesting case is *Idyll* 4, the only one of Theocritus' idylls to deal with the world of athletes and epinician poetry. The following discussion will examine the way in which

²⁶¹ If we can put any trust in so late a testimony as that of Eustathius of Thessalonica (*Proem. ad Pind.* 34 ποιήματα δὲ πολλὰ γράψαι Πίνδαρος λέγεται, ὧν καὶ φέρονται οὐκ ὀλίγα, οὐ μὴν τὰ πάντα ὑπερμνηματισμένα [...] οἱ (sc. ἐπίνικοι) καὶ περιάγονται μάλιστα διὰ τὸ ἀνθρωπικώτεροι εἶναι καὶ ὀλιγόμυθοι καὶ μηδὲ πάνυ ἔχειν ἀσαφῶς κατὰ γε τὰ ἄλλα [...]). For an exhaustive discussion of Eustathius' testimony see Negri (1997). Negri (105-8) points out that Eustathius was probably following some older source from the Late Antiquity.

Theocritus received and remodelled in a truly bucolic fashion the erotic imagery that Pindar employed in his odes to express his praise of the victorious athlete. Furthermore, it will appear that in alluding to one of Simonides' epinicians Theocritus not only was cognizant of the use and function of genre motifs in epinician discourse but also did not hesitate to inflate them comically, so as to express his criticism of epinician poets' exaggerations.

Idyll 4: Theocritus and the Olympic games

Idyll 4 is a dialogue between Corydon and Battus. Their discussion focuses on Aegon's decision to drop his job as cowherd and compete in boxing at the Olympic Games. What makes this idyll stand out is the fact that it is the only idyll explicitly concerned with athletics (cf. Barigazzi (1974) 304). The two men ponder on the impact that Aegon's departure is having on his flock, while Battus jocularly deplores the silencing of Aegon's pipe. At this point, Corydon interferes so as to present himself as a worthy heir to the talent of his vanished master. To prove his claim, Corydon delivers an impromptu 'praise' poem in honour of Aegon.²⁶² This celebrates some past feats that Aegon performed in his attempt to win the heart of Amaryllis, who deceased.

In many respects Aegon resembles Daphnis in the first *Idyll*. Like Daphnis, Aegon stands high in the hierarchy of the bucolic world as the *βουκόλος*;²⁶³ both poems are concerned with the absence of the *βουκόλος* and the impact his absence has on the bucolic order. In a sense Daphnis' death is analogous to Aegon's change

²⁶² The suggestion was made for the first time by Reitzenstein (1893) 229 n.2. *Contra* Gow (1952) *ad* 32ff., who does not consider lines 32-7 as an embedded song by Corydon, due to the 'harshness' of the beginning.

²⁶³ Theoc. 1.80 (*ἦνθον τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες, αἰπόλοι ἦνθον*) led to the creation of the theory of a "bucolic hierarchy" cf. Hunter (1999) *ad. loc.* Each of these "classes" was expected to behave in a specific way in reference to love; so in lines 86-7 Pan criticises Daphnis for behaviour unbefitting a cowherd: *βούτας μὲν ἐλέγην, νῦν δ' αἰπόλωι ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας*. See also Wendel (1914) *prolegomena* C.

of career. This change signals Aegon's 'death' for the bucolic world and his entry in the world of athletics. Further, both poems are concerned with the way in which animate life responds to the absence of the *βουκόλος*. In the first *Idyll* animals which are usually seen as enemies of the shepherds (jackals, wolves, lions) and Daphnis' flock weep for the dead cowherd. Just before he passes away Daphnis bids farewell to them (115-21). Similarly in the fourth *Idyll* Aegon's departure causes sadness and loss of appetite to his cattle; the animals mentioned are the same as those mentioned in the first *Idyll* (74-5, 120-1: heifers, calves, bulls, oxen). It is noteworthy that in Aegon's case the relationship between cowherd and cattle is articulated in quasi-erotic terms (cf. Lawall (1967) 43-5): heifers are said to "long for their master" (12 *ποθεῖντι*); both heifers and bulls have lost their appetite (14 *οὐκέτι λῶντι νέμεσθαι*), while the calves are all bones (15-6). Withering and loss of appetite are characteristic symptoms of love.²⁶⁴ The animals' love for their master is unrequited, since Aegon has a new love, sport (27 *ὄκα καὶ τὸ κακῶς ἡράσσοο νίκας*).²⁶⁵ Aegon is striving for athletic victories and fame. Following a set of images which occurs quite often in Pindar, as we have already seen (pp. 56-60 above),²⁶⁶ Theocritus articulates Aegon's desire for athletic attainments in erotic terms. In this way, his desire for victory and fame is juxtaposed with the animals' desire for their master; it leads him to neglect his duties as herdsman. The dire effects that Aegon's decision has on his animals suggest the incompatibility of bucolic and epinician activity and depict the tension which the inclusion of

²⁶⁴ For withering as a symptom of love compare Daphnis (1.82) and Polyphemus (11.14). For line 15 compare 2.88-90 (*δοτὶ ἔτ' ἦς καὶ δέρμα*), 11.69, 14.4-5 (*ταῦτ' ἄρα λεπτός, / χῶ μύσταξ πολλὸς οὔτος, ἀυσταλέοι δὲ κίκινοι*), and Callimachus' 12.3 *HE* (*δοτέα σοι καὶ μοῦνον ἔτι τρίχες*). On the motif see McKeown (1989) on Ovid *Am.* 1.6.5-6.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Lawall (1967) 45.

²⁶⁶ Cf. e.g. Bowra (1964) 169-170; Crotty (1982) 29, 93-6, 119; Carne-Ross (1985) 26-29, 93-100, 118; Hubbard (1985) 16; Lasserre (1974). For (homo-)erotic myths in Ibycus' epinicians see Cavallini (1997) 20-3.

epinician elements in the bucolic world can cause. But this is only one part of the story. Corydon's song (32-7) makes abundantly clear that Aegon's desire for victory is juxtaposed with and supplants his past desire for Amaryllis:

αἰνέω τάν τε Κρότωνα- 'Καλὰ πόλις ἄ τε Ζάκυνθος ...'-
καὶ τὸ ποταῶιον τὸ Λακίνιον, ἄπερ ὁ πύκτας
Αἴγων ὀγδώκοντα μόνος κατεδαίσατο μάξας.
τηνεὶ καὶ τὸν ταῦρον ἀπ' ὄρεος ἄγε πιάξας
τᾶς ὄπλᾶς κῆδωκ' Ἀμαρυλλίδι, ταὶ δὲ γυναιῖκες
μακρὸν ἀνάσαν, χῶ βουκόλος ἐξεγέλασεν.

In these lines Corydon appropriates the discourse of an epinician or praise song first to prove to Battus his poetic talent as a successor of Aegon and second to praise his master's prospects in his new career as a professional boxer. First of all, αἰνέω in line 33 is a generic tag that indicates the connection with the tradition of praise poetry. The importance of this verb in epinician poetry can best be illustrated by Pindaric passages such as *Pyth.* 9.95-6 (κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν / παντὶ θυμῶι σύν τε δίκαι καλὰ ρέζοντα ἔννεπεν), *Nem.* 3.29 (ἔπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος, 'ἔσλὸν αἰνεῖν').²⁶⁷ In both cases, the need to praise the winner is represented as a maxim attributed either to the Old Man of the Sea or to common opinion, while in *Nem.* 8.39 it appears as the personal creed of the poet (ἐγὼ δ' [sc. εὔχομαι] ... χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι / αἰνέων αἰνητά ...).²⁶⁸ Further, the first person singular is reminiscent of similar Pindaric uses: *Ol.* 4.15 (ἐπεὶ νιν αἰνέω), *Isthm.* 5.59 (αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν), *Ol.* 7.15-6 (ἄνδρα παρ' Ἀλφειῶι στεφανωσάμενον / αἰνέσω πυγμαῖς ἄποινα), *Nem.* 7.63

²⁶⁷ Cf. also Herodotus (5.102.13): καὶ πολλοὺς αὐτῶν οἱ Πέρσαι φονεύουσι, ἄλλους τε ὀνομαστούς, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ Εὐαλκίδην στρατηγέοντα Ἐρετριέων, στεφανηφόρους τε ἀγῶνας ἀναραιοῦσθαι καὶ ὑπὸ Σιμωνίδῳ τοῦ Κηίου πολλὰ αἰνεθέντα.

²⁶⁸ *Pyth.* 9.95-6: Christ (1896); Schroeder (1922); Carey (1981); Giannini (1995) *ad loc.* Instone (1996) *ad loc.* points that *Nem.* 3.29 and 9.6-7 (no use of αἰνεῖν) refer to the same proverb, which probably derived from a Hesiodic poem; see already Duchemin (1967) *ad loc.*, quoting Puech. *Nem.* 3.29: Instone (1996); Pfeijffer (1999) *ad loc.* On the Old Man of the Sea (ἄλιος γέρον) see Lesky (1947) 107-9, 112-13.

(κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω), *Ol.* 10.99-100 (παῖδ' ἐρατὸν <δ'> Ἀρχεστράτου / αἶνησα).²⁶⁹

The epinician character of the composition is also suggested by a probable allusion to a lost epinician of Simonides (fr. 302 Poltera *ἵπποτροφία γὰρ οὐ Ζακύνθῳ / ἀλλ' ἀρούραισι πυροφόροις ὀπαδεῖ*).²⁷⁰

However, the structure of line 39 is problematic and its exact meaning far from certain. As the line stands in most modern editions (cf. Hunter (1999), Beckby (1975), Gow (1952), Legrand (1946), Gallavotti (1946), Wilamowitz (1912)), the second half of the hexameter appears as a parenthesis, the relationship of which to what comes before and after remains unclear. It is usually assumed that 'καλὰ πόλις ἄ τε Ζάκυνθος ...' is the beginning of a song which praised Croton.²⁷¹ Corydon says: 'I praise the city of Croton – "Beautiful is the city of Zacynthus..."'. However, it does not make sense for Corydon to begin a new poem half way into the line, only to drop it after the first three words. With some minor alterations in punctuation the text could read: *αἰνέω τάν τε Κρότωνα – καλὰ πόλις ἄ τε Ζάκυνθος – / καὶ τὸ ποταῶιον τὸ Λακίνιον ...* 'I praise Croton – the city is as beautiful as Zacynthus – / and

²⁶⁹ Bacchylides, as far as can be seen, does not use the first person singular in this way. For its use in his epinicians see 5.16,188; 13.50, 164.

²⁷⁰ The text of Simonides has been tentatively restored by Schneidewin (1835) 23-4. He assigned these lines to an epinician celebrating a chariot-race victory, a suggestion accepted by all subsequent editors; cf. Poltera (2008) 545. According to Plutarch (*quomodo adul. ab amico* 49c), Zacynthus was mentioned as a place inappropriate for horse-breeding. If Zacynthus was the *laudandus'* home, his victory becomes more illustrious since Zacynthus is unsuitable for horse-breeding. If, however, it is not, Zacynthus was mentioned as a foil to the *laudandus'* home: 'Horse breeding does not consort with Zacynthus, but ...'; for this version see Rawles (2008) 12-19. Poltera (2008) 545 argues persuasively that Zacynthus was originally juxtaposed with Thrace, famous for horse-breeding (cf. Hes. *Op.* 507 *Θρήκης ἵπποτρόφου*). Bowra (1936) 327-8 discussed the fragment only in the first edition of his book; he considered the mention of Zacynthus a proverbial saying meaning that 'there is a right place and a wrong place for everything.'

²⁷¹ This has been assumed by most scholars: cf. Paley (1869) 'cantare possum nota illa locorum encomia qualia sunt'; Fritzsche (1869); Snow (1873); Cholmeley (1901); Legrand (1946); Gow (1952); Dover (1971); Hunter (1999) *ad loc.* Gow (1952) *ad loc.*, following Fritzsche (1896), points to Vergil *Ecl.* 5.86-7 as a parallel (haec nos 'formosum Corydon ardebat Alexin' / haec eadem docuit 'cuium pecus? an Meliboei?'), but the comparison is hardly convincing. It is obvious from the text that the mention of Croton and Zacynthus prepares for the mention of Lacinium which was the setting for Aegon's exploits (cf. Dover (1971)). Otherwise, Corydon would hardly make sense because he would quote unconnected *incipits* of songs and then mention what occurred in one of the places mentioned in the line from the third song; cf. Reitzenstein (1893) 229 n.2.

Lacinium, to the East, where...'²⁷² In this way, Croton would be compared to Zacynthus in the second half of l. 32 and, further, both towns, Croton and Lacinium (connected through $\tau\epsilon - \kappa\alpha\iota$), would have a modifier: fair ~ to the East. However one chooses to construe this problematic line, the mention of Zacynthus in this context is puzzling. Scholars have suggested that it is mentioned as a foil for Croton, Aegon's hometown (cf. Gow (1952) *ad* 32; Rawles (2008) 22), but one cannot go any further than this.²⁷³

Zacynthus and Croton are parts of a catalogue (priamel) which leads to Lacinium the setting for Aegon's bucolic *athlon*. Croton, Aegon's home-town, was famous for its athletic tradition, while Lacinium's claim to fame was connected with the local shrine of Hera. Still, Lacinium was also famous as an excellent pasture for flocks (Livy 24.3.3). In this sense, the choice of Lacinium as the scenery for Aegon's feat artfully connects Cordyon's praise with the bucolic sphere.²⁷⁴ At any rate, the praise of Croton satisfies the $\chi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\varsigma$ of the praise poet towards the city of the *laudandus* and adds to his praise.²⁷⁵ The movement from the praise of the locale (Croton, Lacinium) to the praise of Aegon follows a similar opening technique common in Pindar's epinicians (cf. Dornseiff (1921) 100-1; Bundy (1986) 6 and especially 36-44; Race (1982) 22-4): e.g. *Pyth.* 10.1-5 $\delta\lambda\beta\acute{\iota}\alpha \text{ Λακεδαίμων, / μάκαιρα}$

²⁷² Proposed already by Edmonds (1928) 54 n.2; *contra* Gow (1952) *ad* 32. For $\delta\tau\epsilon$ Laconian form of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ see LSJ⁹ s.v.

²⁷³ Σ *ad* 33 understand the juxtaposition of Croton with Zacynthus in the light of a proverb: $\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota\alpha \tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha \text{ παρὰ Κρότωνα τᾶστέα}$ probably in reference to athletic successes; cf. Barigazzi (1974) 307. Moretti's index lists 13 Olympic victors from Croton – three in boxing – and only one from Zacynthus. Zacynthus did not produce many athletes: there is only one dedicatory inscription (IvO 224) from the base of the statue of Polyxenus, son of Apollophanes, the first Zacynthian Olympic victor (nr. 737 Moretti; boy's wrestling in 4 CE); cf. Moretti (1957) 153. More recently, Rawles (2008) 23 has suggested a combination of the proverbs pointed out by Bowra (n. 270 above) and of the scholia.

²⁷⁴ Hunter (1999) *ad* 34 believes that the celebrated athletic festivals at Croton form the context for the exploits narrated. But there is nothing in the text to imply this. On the contrary, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\pi\epsilon\rho$ modifies only Lacinium. Aegon's exploits took place in the countryside, far away from the official context of athletic contests. This way the transition from the time before Amaryllis' death would be sharper.

²⁷⁵ Barigazzi (1974) 306-7 believes that the ode is intended for 'l'esaltazione di Crotona'. As Pindar's odes show, however, the athlete's city partakes in the *laudandus*' praise; for the civic dimension of praise poetry see Bundy (1986) 20-2, 82-3; Carey (2007) 202-4.

Θεσσαλία. πατὸς δ' ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλέος βασιλεύει. /τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν; ἀλλά με Πυθῶ τε καὶ Πελοποννησίον ἀπύει [...]).

It appears, then, that Corydon composes a sort of a 'bucolic epinician' in praise of Aegon. The embedded ode comprises an introductory priamel, including the praise of the place of origin of the athlete, and, as will be seen shortly, mythological foils. The main part of the eulogy is taken up by a description of Aegon's hunger and strength. The emphasis on the amount of food that Aegon consumed one specific time (and certainly now that he is turned to professional boxing) gives a comical tincture to Corydon's praise, since it appears as the first of Aegon's achievements. Boxers and wrestlers, like Milon, were notorious for their hunger (Theodorus of Hierapolis *FHG* IV 513 [=Athen. 10.412E]; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1106b 2-3; fr. 520 Rose). Alexander Aetolus, is said by Athenaeus (10.412F), to have described a contest between Titormus and Milon in which the first to eat a whole ox for breakfast would be the winner (fr. 14 Magnelli [= 11 Powell]); *Τίτορμος τε ὁ Αἰτωλὸς διηριστήσατο αὐτῶι βοῦν, ὡς ἱστορεῖ ὁ Αἰτωλὸς Ἀλέξανδρος*).²⁷⁶ The same theme is found again in some myths about Heracles who is mentioned below in l. 8 as Aegon's foil. Heracles is usually invited to an eating contest which ends with his victory and the death of his rival: (i) Heracles vs. Coron (Apollod. 2.7.7; Diod. Sic. 4.37; Philostratus *Imag.* 2.24); (ii) Heracles vs. Lepreus (Paus. 5.5.4). As we have already seen in the discussion of the *VB*, Pindar seems to have dealt with one of these myths in some poem (fr. 168b Maehler). It is unclear whether Theocritus alludes to either Alexander or Pindar. Still, it is probable that

²⁷⁶ Aelian *VH* 12. 22 calls Titormus a *βουκόλος* like Aegon. He met with the arrogant Milon and surpassed him in two feats of strength; for the game of throwing rocks cf. Moretti (1953) 4-6. The episode ends with Milon declaring in amazement: "ὦ Ζεῦ, μὴ τοῦτον Ἡρακλῆ ἡμῶν ἕτερον ἔσπειρας;" ἐντεῦθεν ῥηθῆναι λέγουσι τὴν παροιμίαν. "ἄλλος οὗτος Ἡρακλῆς." For Milon's representation as Heracles see Diod. 2.9.5. See also Reitzenstein (1893) 230-1 and Magnelli (1999) *ad loc.*

Aegon's gluttony is 'modelled' on the gluttony of a great athlete (Milon) and the greatest of heroes who had traditional epinician associations (Heracles). The second part of Corydon's eulogy concerns a feat performed by Aegon probably in imitation of Milon: Aegon dragged a bull from the mountain by its leg and gave it to Amaryllis (35-6); Milo was said to have gone round the stadium at Olympia carrying an ox on his shoulders (Phylarchus *FGrHist* 81 F 3; cf. also Paus. 6.14.6 and Quint. *Inst.* 1.9.5).²⁷⁷ However, as depicted in lines 43-4 the scene bears similarities to Call. *Hecale* fr. 69 Hollis (cf. Hunter (1999) *ad* 35-7): Theseus has captured the bull alive and brings it to Marathon. The crowd, scared at first, then makes a circle around him, and showers him with leaves. In a similar way, Theocritus describes the frightened reaction of the women (36-7) when they saw Aegon. In Callimachus the scene is modelled on the *περιαγωγή* of the victorious athlete (cf. Hollis (1991) *ad loc.*) and casts Theseus in the role of the victorious athlete or of a surrogate figure for 'epinician' Heracles.²⁷⁸ If this is the case, Corydon would be suggesting Theseus too as a foil for his master. Corydon's epinician, then, includes foils for Aegon which are brought to mind by means of intertextual allusions to Pindar, Alexander and Callimachus.

However, epinician motifs are not restricted to Corydon's composition but can be found in the preceding dialogue between Corydon and Battus (8-9):

*ΚΟ. φαντί νιν Ἡρακλῆι βίην καὶ κάρτος ἐρίσδειν.
ΒΑ. κῆμ' ἔφαθ' ἀμάτηρ Πολυδεύκεος ἦμεν ἀμείνω.*

²⁷⁷ Cf. Dorieus *SH* 396; for similar stories see Hunter (1999) *ad* 35-7. Knaack (1880) 84-5 on the basis of *Σ ad* 34-6a (about Astyanax of Miletus as a model for Aegon's representation) sees an allusion to the work of Pyrrhus mentioned in l. 31; cf. Reitzenstein (1893) 230.

²⁷⁸ This can be detected already in the way in which Athenian tragedy represented Theseus as an Athenian version of Heracles. For instance, in Eur. *Suppl.* 113 (ὦ καλλίνικε γῆς Ἀθηναίων ἄναξ) and 1059 (ἐνταῦθα γὰρ δὴ καλλίνικος ἔρχομαι) the use of καλλίνικος for Theseus brings to mind Heracles (cf. also Eur. *El.* 34 ὦ καλλίνικε πατρός ἐκ νικηφόρου [for Orestes] < Archilochus fr. 324 W² τήνελλα καλλίνικε χαίρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεις) and 'reflects his projection as the Athenian Heracles' (Collard (1975) *ad* 113). For the analogy between Theseus and Heracles see esp. Plu. *Thes.* 6.8 – 8.2, 29.3-5.

Corydon, always supportive of his master's aspirations, reports that people say that Aegon is Heracles' match in strength, only to receive Battus' derisive response 'well, now, my mother claimed that I was a match for Polydeuces'. Battus is obviously joking and comically exaggerates the conventions of epinician praise that have induced Corydon to compare his master with Heracles in the first place.²⁷⁹ The ultimate source for the comparison of Aegon with Heracles and of Battus with Polydeuces is an epinician of Simonides for Philon of Corcyra²⁸⁰ (fr. 18 Poltera οὐδὲ Πολυδεύκεος βία / †ἀνατείνασθαι ἄν αὐτῶι ἐναντίας τὰς χεῖρας †/ οὐδὲ σιδάρεον Ἀλκμάνας τέκος). In Simonides' poem both Heracles and Polydeuces were employed as foils for his *laudandus*. Already in antiquity the combination of the two heroes for the same athlete was deemed excessive and hence inappropriate (Lucian *Pro imag.* 19.4-18). It is interesting, therefore, to find that in Theocritus' text the originally encomiastic example is scrutinized and deconstructed through Battus' satire. The mention of Battus' mother as the source of the comparison with Polydeuces suggests the puerility of Battus' ineffective comparison and the exaggerations of the unnamed people that Corydon reports (cf. Theoc. 10.57-8). It is possible that Theocritus was trying to expose the absurdities to which epinician odes often lent themselves. Further, I would suggest that Battus interrupts Corydon just before he completes his praise of Aegon. Aegon, that is, is about to mention Polydeuces as a second foil for Aegon on the model of Simonides, but he gets interrupted.²⁸¹ In this way, Battus twists the intertextual expectations Corydon's

²⁷⁹ Heracles, founder of the Olympic games (Pind. *Ol.* 10.43-76), was deemed the athlete *par excellence*; cf. Barrett (2007) 68-9. Each Olympian victor was hailed with an archaic hymn to Heracles, supposedly composed by Archilochus (fr. 324 W²); cf. Pind. *Ol.* 9.1-4. For Polydeuces see also Pind. *Nemean* 10 *passim*, *Isthm.* 5.33.

²⁸⁰ Cf. Poltera (2008) 318.

²⁸¹ Pace Rawles (2008) 29 there is nothing in the text to suggest that Battus and Corydon enter into a formal contest of amoeban exchange of verses at any point. If this was so, one would expect Battus

line gave rise to and opens Corydon's epincian discourse to ridicule. Battus keeps an obviously skeptical attitude towards the world of athletes and in doing so follows similar criticism by Xenophanes (fr. 2W²) and Euripides (fr. 282 Kannicht). His criticism of athletes, though, seems to concern the possibility of successfully combining the bucolic environment with epincian elements and the tensions caused by this. Aegon's 'feats' belong to the past, presented as a happy and carefree time: the *βουκόλοι* grazed their flocks and played with the girls. This happy era came to an end with the mysterious death of Amaryllis. Aegon tries to replace his *ἔρως* for Amaryllis with his *ἔρως* for athletic victory; the *κακὴ νίκη* that Battus mentions might indicate that Aegon's attempt to forget Amaryllis through athletics is doomed to fail (cf. also *ὦ τάλα Αἴγων* in l.26). Aegon's status as the champion of the bucolic world is challenged as soon as he leaves his flock to become a professional athlete; as soon, that is, as he leaves one literary genre to enter another. Aegon is an athlete suitable only for the bucolic world, distanced from the formalities of professional athletics, something pointed out by the light sense of irony in Battus' words.

In *Idyll* 4 Theocritus attempts to "bucolicize" the epincian genre and lower it from the level of sublime poetry to that of folkloristic naïveté.²⁸² Aegon's past achievements pertain to his desire to 'win' the heart of Amaryllis. In the bucolic world athletic achievements, if one can call them so, express the desire of the

to offer an answer to Corydon's praise song. The amoebean form relates to the form of bucolic mime that Theocritus chose for his poem.

²⁸² There is no reason to view *Idyll* 4 within the 'tradition' of a popular form of jocular praise which preceded or ran parallel to formal epincian odes and survived *in nuce* in Simonides' fragments, as Rawles (2008) 27-9 argues. The jocular tone of *Idyll* 4 should be attributed first of all to its genre 'bucolic mime' and then to the *possible* influence of some tradition *hardly perceptible* to us nowadays. Interestingly, no examples of this subliterate epincian form have been detected in the existing epincians of Pindar, Bacchylides or epincian epigrams, and it is hard to reach valid conclusions about Simonides' epincians on the basis of small fragments. Any conclusions about Simonides' original poem extracted from *Idyll* 4 should be put in perspective by the difference in genre between the two poems.

‘*laudandus*’ (Aegon) to win the heart of his beloved. They are a suitable topic for a bucolic poem but wholly inappropriate for the praise of a serious athlete. Corydon’s epinician bears the hallmark of Theocritus’ bucolic poetry: rustic love. As before (l.12, 15, 20), Theocritus twists the erotic imagery which Pindar employed in his epinician odes to express the victor’s determination to win, and gives it a decisively bucolic bent; in this way he manages to incorporate motifs of Pindaric epinician discourse into his love poetry and to suggest the meeting point of these two completely unrelated genres, the idea of *eros*. Seen in this light, *Idyll* 4 proposes to its readers and juxtaposes with each other two different aspects of *eros*, the bucolic and the epinician.

Pindarica minuta: some minor cases

A considerable number of idylls are imbued with ‘circumstantial’ allusions to Pindar’s poetry. Although their number is enough to indicate Theocritus’ close acquaintance with Pindar’s *œuvre*, their use as a rule is not such as to influence the overall argument of the poem, as is the case in *Idylls* 16, 17 and 24. In the second part of this chapter I will discuss some minor cases of allusion to Pindar’s poetry.

In some cases Theocritus employs a Pindaric phrase or image but in a totally different context. The ensuing discrepancy can convey a variety of meanings which results from the immediate context. For instance, in *Nemean* 4 Pindar represents the praise of the victor’s deceased uncle, which he includes in the same ode, as a *stèle* whiter than Parian marble (79-81):

εἰδέτοι
 μάτρῳ μ’ ἔτι Καλλικλεῖ κελεύεις
 στάλαν θέμεν Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν...

The same phrase appears in the grotesque, and obviously comic, self-description of Polyphemus in *Idyll* 6 (38 τῶν δέ τ' ὀδόντων / λευκοτέραν ἀγὰν Παρίας ὑπέφαινε λίθῳ) (cf. Cholmeley (1901) *ad loc.*; Gow (1952) *ad loc.*). Both texts employ the whiteness of the Parian marble, renowned in antiquity for its exquisite quality, to opposite ends: in Pindar it relates to the quality of his praise of Callicles and the deceased man's prowess; in Theocritus, however, it concerns the beauty of Polyphemus' teeth. Horace (*C.* 1.19.5-6 *urit me Glyceræ nitor / splendentis Pario marmore purius*) which imitates Pindar (cf. Christ (1896) *ad Nem.* 4.80) helps to throw into relief the comicality, if not morbidity, of this image when applied to Polyphemus' teeth as opposed to Glyceræ's sensuous body (cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad loc.*). The educated reader who knows the *Odyssey* cannot forget that these same teeth on which the misguided Polyphemus prides himself will be later stained with the innocent blood of Odysseus' comrades. At the same time, the discrepancy between the two uses causes the association of Polyphemus' teeth with the Pindaric image of the *stèle*, an altogether telling comparison in view of his gigantic size.

Another interesting case is provided in *Idyll* 12. Lines 32-4 describe the return of the boy who won the kissing contest at Megara (ὄς δέ κε προσμάξει γλυκερώτερα χεῖλεσι χεῖλη / βριθόμενος στεφάνοισιν ἐὰν ἐς μητέρ' ἀπῆνθεν). This is not the place to enter into the discussion of the historicity of these games (on which see Gow (1952) *ad loc.*). The return of the victorious athlete to his home and the reception by his family and co-citizens is a standard epinician motif (cf. Crotty (1982) 118-19). However, the reception of the young returning athlete specifically by his mother is found again only in *Pythian* 8 (83-6):

τοῖς οὔτε νόστος ὁμῶς
ἔπαλπνος ἐν Πυθιάδι κρήθη,

οὐδὲ μολόντων παρ' ματέρ' ἀμφὶ γέλωσ γλυκὺς
ὤρσεν χάριν.

Once again the context is different. These lines depict the return home of the athletes whom Aristomenes, the *laudandus*, beat at the Pythian Games. The reaction of their mothers suggests *e contrario* the ways in which mothers receive the victorious boys: a sweet smile gives rise to *charis*, a notion central in Pindar's epinician discourse. Theocritus, on the other hand, does not describe an athletic but a homoerotic contest. The age-group of the contestants in both texts is similar and one could make the claim that the *makarismos* in 12.34 recalls similar passages in Pindar (cf. e.g. *Pyth.* 9.4 ὄλβιον ἄνδρα; 7.10). Here the adjective describes the judge who receives the youthful kisses rather than the *arete* of the victorious athlete.²⁸³ There is a distinctly Pindaric colouring in some other places of the poem as well, although one cannot point out specific Pindaric subtexts. For instance, in lines 15-19 the *persona loquens* promises to his *eromenos* that future generations will remember their love, thanks to the immortalizing powers of song. The pederastic context suggests as a closer parallel Theognis' similar promise to the youth Cyrnus (236-52). Still, the ability of song to travel to the realm of Hades in order to announce *klea* to the dead men is characteristically Pindaric (19): (i) *Ol.* 8.77-84; (ii) *Ol.* 14.20-4; (iii) *Pyth.* 5.98-103; (iv) *Nem.* 4.85-8; (v) *Isthm.* 6.62-6 (see Segal (1985)).

More widely, the allusion to Pindar in a pederastic poem could suggest a tradition which emphasized the homoerotic element in Pindar's poetry. A tradition, one may add, that led to the creation of the anecdote in the *Suda* (π 1617 Adler)

²⁸³ A similar discrepancy can be noted in the use of the image of the Lydian stone. The image is not peculiarly Pindaric (see e.g. *Bacch.* fr. 14 Sn.-M.) but it is common in Pindar's epinicians. Pindar employs it for the worth of the victorious athlete (*Pyth.* 10.67-8) or self-referentially about his poetry (*Nem.* 8.20; *Encom.* fr. 122.16 Maehler). Nonetheless, Theocritus employs it for the mouth of the judge assessing on the sweetness of the kisses offered by the competitors.

about the way Pindar ended his life: αὐτὸν ἀποθανεῖν ἐν θεάτρῳ, ἀνακεκλιμένον εἰς τὰ τοῦ ἐρωμένου Θεοξένου αὐτοῦ γόνατα. The mention of Theoxenos points to fr. 123 Maehler, a *skolion* that Pindar composed in honour of the youth. The anecdote probably arose from the tendency towards a biographical reading of Pindar's poems and suggests as originator a Peripatetic source, probably Chamaeleon. However this may be, the *skolion* is important as it appears again in another idyll which also deals with pederastic love (*Idyll* 13).

Idyll 13 is concerned with an episode of the Argonauts' expedition: Hylas' disappearance and Heracles' search for him (cf. A. R. 1.1208-326). Along with *Idyll* 22 this is the only other idyll to deal with episodes from the Argonautic saga. Pindar dealt with the myth in his grand *Pythian* 4. Along with *Idyll* 24 which follows *Nemean* 1 and 'Paeon' 20 (fr. 52u Maehler) and part of *Idyll* 22 this is the only other case in which one can compare the use of the same mythological material in both poets.

There are some minor similarities in the diction and the outline of the story which do not affect the whole idyll (cf. Hunter (1999) *ad loc.*): (i) the Clashing Rocks (22 ἄτις κυανεᾶν οὐχ ἄφατο συνδρομάδων ναῦς ~ *Pyth.* 4.208-9 συνδρόμων κινήθμων ἀμαιμάκετον / ἐκφυγεῖν πετρᾶν); (ii) the South wind assists Argos in reaching the Black Sea (29 Ἑλλάσποντον ἴκοντο νότῳ τρίτῳ ἄμαρ ἀέντι ~ *Pyth.* 4.203 σὺν Νότου δ' αὔραις ἐπ' Ἀξεινοῦ στόμα πεμπόμενοι / ἤλυθον: note also ἐπ' Ἀξεινοῦ στόμα ~ 1.75 ἄξενον ἴκετο Φᾶσιν). More interesting is the description of Heracles that *Idyll* 13 offers. To begin with, lines 21 (σὺν δ' αὐτῷ κατέβαινε Ἵλας εὐεδρον ἐς Ἄργος) and 27-8 ([...] τᾶμος ναυτιλίας μιμνάσκετο θεῖος ἄωτος / ἠρώων) look quite close to *Pyth.* 4.188 (ἐς δ' Ἰαλκὸν ἐπεὶ κατέβα ναυτᾶν ἄωτος). Theocritus alters the circumlocution ναυτᾶν ἄωτος which Pindar uses for Jason and, probably,

combines it with another one, traditionally Herculean, *ἥρως θεός* (*Nem.* 3.21). The latter derives from a passage (*Nem.* 3.20-2) where Pindar represents Heracles as setting the limits of human excellence and prowess (cf. Pfeijffer (1999) *ad loc.*):

οὐκέτι πρόσω
ἀβάταν ἄλα κίωνων ὑπερ' Ἡρακλέος περᾶν εὐμαρές,
ἥρως θεὸς ἃς ἔθηκε ναυτιλίας ἐσχάτας
μάρτυρας κλυτάς.

Heracles as the deified son of Zeus was allowed to move from the status of hero to that of god (cf. *Ol.* 2.2, *τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;*, where he is a hero). As an example of a deified human and an ancestor to the Ptolemaic family Heracles becomes a popular figure in court poetry. The issue of ontological categories (mortals vs. gods) appears again in the frame of *Idyll* 13 (1-4). The dramatic setting is an ongoing dialogue between Theocritus and his poet-friend Nicias (cf. *Idyll* 11 and 28). The example of Heracles is employed by Theocritus to prove that, despite their differences, both gods and humans are united in their utter resourcelessness when faced with the power of *eros*. The myth of Heracles' infatuation with the boy Hylas is employed to prove the claim about *eros*' omnipotence. In this context, it is interesting to note the way in which Theocritus chooses to present the hero (5-6):

ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀμφιτρύωνος ὁ χαλκεοκάρδιος υἱός,
ὃς τὸν λῖν ὑπέμεινε τὸν ἄγριον, ἦρατο παιδός.

Our business is with *χαλκεοκάρδιος*, a *hapax legomenon* that has puzzled scholars (Kirstein (1997) 380-1; Hunter (1999) *ad loc.*). Apparently it denotes the heroic courage and endurance that Heracles showed throughout his life (cf. e.g. *Nem.* 1.70-1).²⁸⁴ In an attempt to account for its meaning, Kirstein has persuasively, in

²⁸⁴ Hildebrandt (1911) 57. In Theoc. 17.20-1 Heracles sits on a throne made of steel, when Ptolemy I has a throne of gold (17). Meincke (1965) 99 has suggested that this minor detail reflected features of Heracles' character such as his strength and determination.

my view, suggested Pindar's encomium for Theoxenos of Tenedos (fr. 123 Maehler) as a possible subtext (Kirstein (1997) 381-2). The connection between the two texts goes beyond the choice of the adjective and concerns Theocritus' representation of Heracles as an infatuated man.

In the *skolion* for Theoxenos Pindar presented himself as a candle melting away consumed by the ardent passion that the sight of the handsome youth inspired in him (fr. 123.10-12 Maehler). His reaction was contrasted with the person in the previous lines who remains oblivious to Theoxenus' beauty. Pindar gives three possible reasons for this: venality, interest in feminine audacity²⁸⁵ or a black heart made of steel and worked in cold fire.²⁸⁶

Τὰς δὲ Θεοξένου ἀκτῖνας πρὸς ὄσων
μαρμαρυζοίσας δρακεῖς
ὄς μὴ πόθῳ κυμαίνεται, ἐξ ἀδάμαντος
ἢ σιδάρου κεχάλκευται μέλαιναν καρδίαν
ψυχρῶι φλογί[...].

By representing Heracles as having a brazen heart Theocritus emphasizes Heracles' virility and heroic status. Yet, his brazen heart was not enough to protect him from the charms of Hylas. When love gets hold of Heracles, he does not react as a man of brazen heart ought to, and was expected to, in view of Pindar's poem. Instead he deserts his post and leaves in search of his *eromenos*. Seen in this light, the application of 'brazen-hearted' to Heracles in *Idyll* 13 becomes oxymoronic, as it does not render him impervious to boyish charms but rather more susceptible to them. The ensuing tension between *eros* and the demands of heroic status is articulated through the etymological pun ἥρωες ~ ἠρώησε (73-4):²⁸⁷ on the one

²⁸⁵ For the several ways in which scholars have understood this line see van Groningen (1960) *ad* 8-9; I follow his analysis. Heterosexual love is presented not only as a foil to pederastic love, but as a love of lower status, alien to the refined ideological purity that pederastic love assumed in the context of the aristocratic symposium.

²⁸⁶ Cf. Hildebrandt (1911) 59 and van Groningen (1960) *ad* 4-5.

²⁸⁷ Cholmeley (1901), Hunter (1999) *ad loc.*

hand, this represents Heracles' helplessness, mightiest of heroes (26-7 ἄωτος ἡρώων) and son to a heroine (20 Ἀλκμήνης υἱὸς Μιδεάτιδος ἡρωῖνης), in the hands of Love; on the other hand, it indicates the scorn of his comrades, emphatically called here ἥρωες.

Idyll 22, as the frame makes clear, assumes the form of a hymn to the Dioscuri.²⁸⁸ It includes two episodes: the first (27-134), drawn from the myth of the Argonautic expedition (cf. 27-33), represents Polydeuces' encounter with Amycus and their ensuing fight; the second episode is comparatively shorter and narrates the fight of Lynceus with Castor (137-213). A version of the latter occupies the last two triads in Pindar's *Nemean 10* (55-90). In this case the appreciation of the intertextual relationship between Pindar's and Theocritus' texts is beset with problems stemming from our difficulty in tracing the historical evolution of the myth and in reconstructing its original form. Scholars, that is, have often maintained that in Theocritus' version Castor, and consequently both brothers, despite Polydeuces' glaring absence from the stage, appear at a moral disadvantage as their actions are ethically reprehensible (cf. Hutchinson (1988) 164; 166). On the other hand, Pindar is supposed to have given a 'cleansed' version which omitted those parts of the story which could offend his or his audience's religious sentiments.²⁸⁹ However, one cannot fully appreciate the tone of both narratives and

²⁸⁸ Cf. l.1 (ὑμνέομεν Λήδας τε καὶ αἰγιοχου Διὸς υἱῶ) ~ 4. (ὑμνομεν καὶ δις καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἄρσενα τέκνα) ~ 26 (ἀμφοτέρους ὑμνέων Πολυδεύκεα πρῶτον ἀείσω) ~ 135 (καὶ σὺ μὲν ὕμνησά μοι ἄναξ· σὲ δὲ Κάστορ ἀείσω); 25 (Κάστορος ἢ πρῶτου Πολυδεύκεος ἄρξομ' ἀείδειν); < e.g. *h.Cer.* 1 (Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον σεμνήν θεὰν ἄρξομ' ἀείδειν) *et passim*; 214 (χαίρετε Λήδας τέκνα, καὶ ἡμετέροις κλέος ὕμνοις) < e.g. *Hom. hym. Diosc.* 5 [= 18] (χαίρετε Τυνδαρίδαι, ταχέων ἐπιβήτορες ἵππων), *h.Dian.* 21 (χαίρετε τέκνα Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς ἠυκόμοιο). The closest parallel is provided by *Hom. hym. Mus. et Apol.* 6 (χαίρετε τέκνα Διὸς καὶ ἐμὴν τιμήσατ' αἰοιδήν).

²⁸⁹ Theory of 'Umgestaltung' see Staehlin (1903) 182-3 and 188; cf. Nisetich (1980) 281. This was already suggested by the ancient scholiast *ad* 112a; cf. Christ (1896) *ad* 60. For a judicious criticism of similar approaches with older bibliography see Stern (1969) 128 n.12.

their relationship without first examining the ways each poet chose to contextualize the episode within their poems.

In Theocritus' poem just before the fight with his cousin, Castor, Lynceus delivers a long monologue in an attempt to avert the fight. His talk offers *his* narrative context for this episode. The reason for the confrontation appears to have been the 'abduction' of the daughters of Leucippus by the Dioscuri. Lynceus claims that the Leucippides were promised to his brother (Idas) and him by their father (147-8 *ἔας ἔδνωσε θυγάτρως [...] ἡμῖν γάμος οὗτος ἐν ὄρκῳ*). Castor and Polydeuces bribed Leucippus with oxen and mules (151 *ἄνδρα παρετρέψασθε, γάμον δ' ἐκλέψατε δώροις*) and so got the girls for themselves (145-151).²⁹⁰ *πολλάκις* in 152 (*ἦ μὴν πολλάκις ὕμῖν ἐνώπιον ἀμφοτέροισι ...*) and lines 154-66 clearly suggest that prior to this confrontation there had been an ongoing antagonism and disagreement between the Dioscuri and the Apharetiadai over the daughters of Leucippus. Judging from *τοῦτον μὲν ἔασατε πρὸς τέλος ἐλθεῖν / ἄμμι γάμον* (165-5) the women were abducted before their marriage to Idas and Lynceus.²⁹¹ Pindar's version is much shorter and completely different (60-1): 'Idas, enraged in a quarrel over cattle, wounded him (sc. Castor) with the point of his brazen spear' (tr. Nisetich). Theocritus, it would appear, combined two mythological episodes, which until Hellenistic times appeared independently from each other: (i) the fight of the Dioscuri with their cousins the Apharetiadai and (ii) the abduction of the daughters of Leucippus by the Dioscuri (cf. Wide (1893) 327-8; Calame (1977) i. 327-8; Hermary (1986) *LIMC* III.1 592; Henry (2005) *ad Nem.* 10.60).

²⁹⁰ It is interesting that in one version, considered to be the original, the Dioscuri stole the cattle of the Apharetiadai because they made fun of the Dioscuri for not giving gifts to Leucippus for his daughters; cf. Σ *ad Lyc. Alex.* 547; for a different version including the cattle again see *ibid. ad* 511 which agrees with the version given by Apollod. 3.135-7.

²⁹¹ The demonstrative pronoun (148 *τάσδε*) indicates that the two women are present without having an active role. This would imply that this episode takes place right after the abduction and the chase (138-43); cf. Sens (1997) *ad* 137-140.

The first episode appeared for the first time in the *Cypria* (cf. Proclus' summary pp. 39-40 Bernabé):²⁹² Castor stole the cattle of the Apharetiadae, but Lynceus saw him. In the ensuing combat Idas killed Castor, and Polydeuces killed both Idas and Lynceus. The summary ends with the peculiar after-life that Zeus assigned to the two brothers (cf. *Cypria* fr. 8 Bernabé). This is also the version followed by Pindar (*Nem.* 10.60-2; cf. *Cypria* fr. 15 Bernabé):

τὸν (sc. Κάστορα) γὰρ Ἴδας ἀμφὶ βουσίν πωσ χολω-
θεὶς ἔτρωσεν χαλκείας λόγχας ἀκμῶ.
ἀπὸ Ταυγέτου πεδαυγά-
ζων ἴδεν Λυγκεὺς δρυὸς ἐν στελέχει
ἡμένους.

The oxen and mules that Lynceus mentions (Theoc. 22.150) are probably the same ones that the Dioscuri stole from the Apharetiadae, although Lynceus says nothing explicit about it. The two daughters of Leucippus are not connected with this episode before Hellenistic times. A papyrus commentary on Alcman from the second half of the first century CE (*POxy.* 2389 fr. 4 col. ii) mentions the names of the two sisters (*PMGF* 8.2 Φοίβη καὶ Ἰλάειρα).²⁹³ According to Lobel (1957: 28), Alcman seems to have dealt with their myth in a poem from the first book of the Alexandrian edition.²⁹⁴ The myth was probably relevant for the Spartan cult of the Leucippids (Paus. 3.16.1; Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 48) and perhaps due to this did not possess interest for authors outside Sparta.²⁹⁵ However, it is better represented in pottery and sculpture (cf. *LIMC* III.1: 189-211). Theocritus and the Pindaric

²⁹² Homer (*Od.* 11.300-4) knows the special after-life arrangement for the Dioscuri but does not connect it with this episode; cf. also Pind. *Pyth.* 11.61-4.

²⁹³ See also Calame (1983) *ad fr.* 20. The names given by the Meidias hydria (450-400 BCE; *ARV*² 1313, 5 [= 220497 Beazley Archive]; *LIMC* III.1 p.584 nr. 201) are Eriphyle and Elera; the latter is usually explained as the Attic equivalent of Hilaeira; cf. Farnell (1921) 232.

²⁹⁴ *PMGF* 5 and 7 from the same commentary mention the Dioscuri. *PMGF* 7.11 could mention the Apharetiadae but the reading is far from certain. On the whole, see Calame (1977) i. 332-3; (1983) *ad fr.* 19-21. For the problematic Leucippids fragments that Snell attributed to Bacchylides (fr. 60-1 Sn.-M.) see Maehler (1997) 359.

²⁹⁵ On Paus. 3.16.1 see Musti and Torelli (1991) *ad loc.* For the Laconian cult of the Leucippids see Wide (1893) 326-32, Farnell (1921) 229-33 and esp. Calame (1977) i. 323-3.

Scholia (*ad Nem.* 10.112(a)) are the first to associate the two episodes. Whether they depended for this on some archaic text, for instance the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, as Staehlin (1903: 187 n.23) supposed, is not clear.²⁹⁶ In view of our ignorance of the version(s) current in Pindar's times it would be misleading to claim that Pindar omits elements so as to 'bowdlerize' the myth. Pindar was concerned primarily with the love and devotion of the two brothers (cf. *Nem.* 10.54 *μάλα μὲν ἀνδρῶν δικαίων περικαδόμενοι. καὶ μὰν θεῶν πιστὸν γένος*).²⁹⁷ The myth interested him in as much as it provided the immediate context for the death of Castor and the subsequent sacrifice of Polydeuces. In this respect, the origins of the dispute between the Dioscuri and the sons of Aphareus are of secondary importance and accordingly receive only one (60) out of the forty lines of the myth. On the other hand, the importance which Theocritus accorded to the claiming in the dispute is obvious from Lynceus' speech.

Theocritus diverged in the representation of the fight: in his version it is only Castor who fights.²⁹⁸ Polydeuces, though present like Idas, who watches the fight reclining (199-200),²⁹⁹ does not participate in the fighting. This, in turn, influences the character of Zeus's intervention. In *Nem.* 10.67-8 Zeus interferes to protect Polydeuces, the immortal brother and his son (80-2), from the *stele* that Idas hurled at him, although Polydeuces was in no mortal danger. No explicit reason is given

²⁹⁶ The same story is given by Ovid *Fast.* 5.699-720 and [Hyginus] *Fab.* 80. Propertius i.2.15-6 and Ovid *Her.* 16.330 just mention the abduction with no more details. A red-figure lekythos (ca. 400-350 BCE; Virginia Museum 80.162; *LIMC* III.1. p. 585 nr. 217) could be the earliest representation of Theocritus' combined version; see Hermary (1986) *LIMC* III.1 591 and Sens (1997) 168-9.

²⁹⁷ This gnome is applied not to the Dioscuri only but to their relationship with the victor's family as well (37-8). The Dioscuri lent their support to Theaeus' family in their athletic endeavours because Pamphaes, his ancestor, had offered hospitality to them (49-51); cf. Fraccaroli (1894) 626-9; Christ (1896) 308.

²⁹⁸ On the other hand, several of the similarities that scholars have pointed out were indispensable elements of the traditional story: (i) Aphareus' tomb seems to belong to the tradition as the setting of the fight; (ii) Lynceus flees there to escape Castor (141 *ἀλλ' ὅτε τύμβον ἴκανον ἀποφθιμένον Ἀφάρηος* ~ *Nem.* 10.66 *ἦλθε Λήδας παῖς διώκων. τοὶ δ' ἔναντα στάθεν τύμβωι σχεδὸν πατρώωι*).

²⁹⁹ Note the use of dual (137-40) and plural (141-3; 145 etc.) forms throughout this scene.

for Zeus's action. The subsequent lines indicate that Zeus's involvement is predicated on 'moral' grounds.³⁰⁰ Idas, a mortal, is fighting against an immortal hero, a descendant of Zeus himself:

*Ζεὺς δ' ἐπ' Ἴδαι πυρφόρον πλάξε ψολόεντα κεραυόν
ἄμα δ' ἐκαίοντ' ἐρήμοι. Χαλεπὰ δ' ἔρις ἀνθρώ-
ποις ὀμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων.*

The concluding remark 'How harsh it is for men to clash in strife against their betters' (tr. Nisetich) reveals the impiety and foolishness of the sons of Aphareus in turning against the Dioscuri. Not only are they close to Zeus, but also they are excellent fighters. Interestingly, Pindar notes the isolation of the Apharatiadae: in fighting against the Dioscuri the two brothers distance themselves from the rest of the community and expose themselves to the dangers that the encounter with the divine world entails (cf. Stern (1969) 126; 130). However, Theocritus' story is different at this point. After the death of his brother, Idas attempts to hurl the *stèle* at Castor. If Zeus had not intervened, Castor would have found certain death. Zeus protects the human brother who is not his child but Tyndareus' (cf. Sens (1997) 213-4).³⁰¹ Interestingly, the narrator does not seem concerned with the difficulties of his version: by keeping Castor alive after the fight Theocritus cannot account for the privileged lot accorded to them in the myth. It is unclear why Theocritus did this and how he would account for their peculiar after-life status. Nevertheless, in doing so he altered the physiognomy of the myth: the episode is not employed as an instance of brotherly affection (Christ (1896) 309 on *Nemean* 10: 'suavissima species amoris fraterni') but becomes an 'epic(-izing)' demonstration of heroic

³⁰⁰ Pace Stern (1969) 127 I do not believe that Zeus's intervention is caused by the defilement of Aphareus' tomb. On the contrary, Zeus seems to be motivated by the importance of family connections and personal favour in both narratives. Further, in Theocritus Idas does not honour the arrangements of the dual but interferes, causing his punishment by Zeus; cf. Sens (1997) 213-4.

³⁰¹ There is no indication in the poem about Zeus's paternity of either Polydeuces or both Dioscuri; in line 137 they are both 'sons of Zeus' (*Διὸς υἱώ*); in 202 Castor and in 212 both brothers are 'son(s) of Tyndareus'.

proWess, closer to the spirit of a hymn. This difference in perspective is more clearly expressed by the different ways that both poets contextualized the same maxim in their narratives: ‘one should not fight with one’s betters’ (212 οὕτω *Τυνδαρίδαις πολεμιζόμεν οὐκ ἐν ἐλαφρῶι* ~ *Nem.* 10.72 χαλεπὰ δ’ ἔρις ἀνθρώποις ὀμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων). While Pindar’s use has a broader ethic-religious application (‘one should not fight against stronger (divine) powers or opponents’), Theocritus’ use is not only narrower but more specifically applicable to the needs of his hymnic discourse.

Idyll 22 presents itself as a hymn. Hymns emphasize the gap that separates humans from gods (Hunter (1996: 47). The duality of Theocritus’ hymn depicts the two different faces of the Dioscuri.³⁰² Neither Pindar nor Theocritus had any moral inhibitions about the proper representation of divinities or heroes. Even if they had, altering a well-known myth is the least effective way not to evoke it in the minds of the audience or the reader. On the contrary, several passages demonstrate that Pindar, like Greek poets in general (cf. e.g. Stesich. *Geryoneis PMGF* S 11), was at ease talking about mythological episodes (*Ol.* 9.29-35; fr.169a Maehler) that were difficult to explain within the human conceptual frame of what is right and wrong. As for Theocritus, Lynceus’ pathetic speech and death may win the sympathy of modern readers, but this does not validate his behaviour. Lines 145-170 give Lynceus’ interpretation of the events that the narrator perfunctorily presents before his speech (137-140). As such Lynceus’ interpretation is not necessarily the ‘correct’ one (cf. Hunter (1996: 67); it is obvious that for Castor it is the Apharetiadai who seek to shed kindred blood not the Dioscuri (171 εἰ δ’ ὕμῶν κραδίην πόλεμον ποθεῖ...)). Lynceus’ account sounds incomprehensibly confused. If

³⁰² On the various interpretations of the dual nature of the idyll see Cameron (1995) 431-3.

Leucippus had sworn (146-8) to give his daughters to the Apharetiadai and was subsequently bribed³⁰³ by the Dioscuri (149-151), as Lynceus claims, then Leucippus only was responsible for the breach of any previous arrangement. For instance, when the poet Archilochus found himself in a position similar to that of the Apharetiadai, he turned his iambs against Lycambes (fr. 172 W²) and Neoboule (fr. 196a W²), not the new groom (cf. also fr. 173 W² for Lycambes' oath). Further, if that was the case, there was no need for the Dioscuri to abduct his daughters just before the wedding as lines 137-40 suggest (cf. Sens (1997) 176). The pre-history of the controversy and the antagonism between the cousins as well as what actually took place are issues not adequately clarified in Lynceus' speech.³⁰⁴ The narrator seems to consider the Dioscuri's act as a "rape" (137 ἀναρπάξαντε), but the verb does not imply violence; on the contrary it describes the usual way for gods and goddesses to select their mortal lovers – with a possible allusion to Laconian marriage customs (cf. Plut. *Lyc.* 15.4).³⁰⁵ From this point of view, the Dioscuri, related to Zeus as they are, have the right to choose their brides first. For all his keen-sightedness³⁰⁶ Lynceus is unable to distinguish the divine nature of his adversaries. He approaches their behaviour on the basis of mortal human compass

³⁰³ Lynceus is using forensic vocabulary here. For the meaning δῶρα "bride" see LSJ⁹ s.v. 2.

³⁰⁴ The Dioscuri were not always considered to claim the Leucippids as their wives by force: the peacefulness on the Lisbon calyx-crater (c. 475-425 BCE; *ARV²* 1042 [= 213535 Beazley Archive]) attributed either to the Polygnotus Group or the Peleus painter; *LIMC* III.1 p.583 nr. 197) suggests another version; cf. Calame (1977) i. 329-30 and esp. Hermary (1986) *LIMC* III.1 590.

³⁰⁵ Pace Sens (1997: ad 137) who seems to miss the point, Theocritus' use follows a well-established pattern: see Calame (1977) i. 328; Hermary (1986) *LIMC* III.1 590. Poets are consistent in the use of ἀρπάζω and its cognates to describe the abduction of consorts by gods (see Sowa (1984) 122-6): e.g. Hades (*h.Cer.* 19 ἀρπάξας δ' ἀέκουσαν ἐπὶ χρυσόοισιν ὄχοισιν); Zeus (*h.Ven.* 202-3 with Faulkner (2008: 263); ἤρπασεν δὲν διὰ κάλλος ἴν' ἀθανάτοισι μετείη); Eos (*ibid.* 218 ὡς δ' αὖ Τιθωνὸν χρυσόθρονος ἤρπασεν Ἥως; cf. also *Od.* 15.250-1 ἀλλ' ἦτοι Κλειῖτον χρυσόθρονος ἤρπασεν Ἥως); Apollo (*Pyth.* 9.5-6 with Köhnken (1983) 82-3; ἄρπασ'); Boreas (Plato, *Phaedrus* 229B-D). See also *Paeon* 6.134-7 ἰδάτ<εσσ>ι δ' ἐπ' Ἀσ[ωποῦ π[οτ' ἀ]πὸ προθύρων βαθύκολπον ἀνερέψατο παρθένον Αἴγιναν with Radt (1958) and Kirkwood (1982) *ad loc.* For the use of this form in abduction scenes cf. *Il.* 22.234; Hes. *Theog.* 990; A. R. 1.211-15. See also Ibycus *PMGF* 289(a) [=Σ A. R. 3.114-7 (p. 220 Wendel)].

³⁰⁶ Theoc. 22.194 ἀκριβῆς ὄμμασι Λυγκεύς ~ *Nem.* 10.62 κείνου γὰρ ἐπιχθονίων πάντων γένετ' δξύτατον ὄμμα; cf. A. R. 1.153-4; 4.1466-7, 1478.

and attempts to check their prerogatives by suggesting eligible wives (154-63). In this regard, it is not a matter of right or wrong but of gods vs. men. Following hymnic tradition, Theocritus has refashioned the myth so as to suggest the unpredictability and cruelty divinities often demonstrate in their behaviour (cf. Morrison (2007) 238-9).

I will conclude this chapter with the discussion of a minor, yet interesting, case of Pindaric allusion. In its first part (1-62) *Idyll* 2 stages the magical ritual that Simaetha performs in order to bring back Delphis, the lover who has spurned her. The ancient scholia (*Hypothesis* b, p. 270 Wendel) point out that Theocritus was following one of Sophron's female mimes (fr. 6 Hordern). Theocritus' poem owes a great deal to subliterate magical texts which gave instructions for similar rituals. In her refrain Simaetha addresses one of these implements, a magical instrument employed in love-magic (*ἱυγξ*), and asks it to bring her man back to her (*ἱυγξ, ἔλκε τὸ τῆνον ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα*). The origins of the *ἱυγξ* were connected with the love episode of Jason and Medea. The myth of its origins and first use is given by Pindar in *Pythian* 4 in the context of the Argonautic expedition:

πότνια δ' ὄξυτάτων βελέων (213)
 ποικίλαν ἱυγγα τετράκναμον Οὐλυμπόθεν
 ἐν ἀλύτῳ ζεύξαισα κύκλῳ (215)
 μαινάδ' ὄρνιν Κυπρογένεια φέρειν
 πρῶτον ἀνθρώποισι λιτάς τ' ἐπαιδᾶς
 ἐκδιδάσκησεν σοφὸν Αἰσονίδα

In an uncommon case of textual awareness of a character Simaetha points the readers to her intertextual foils (15-16):

φάρμακα ταῦτ' ἔρδοισα χερείονα μῆτε τι Κίρκας
 μῆτε τι Μήδειας μῆτε ξανθᾶς Περιμήδας.

Simaetha is a spurned woman in love; she turns to magic because she wants to take her revenge. In this respect she is cast as a textual variant of Medea. Of course,

Theocritus had several Medeas from which to draw elements (e.g. Eumelus, Pindar, Euripides, Carcinus, Apollonius etc.). Nonetheless, the association with the origins of the *ἰυγξ* lends the Pindaric subtext a certain degree of prominence. Still, in Pindar's text one watches exactly the opposite situation. The *ἰυγξ* is here employed by a man in order to make Medea get over her *αἰδώς*. So, although Simaetha shares in Medea's myth as a witch and a scorned woman, her situation is different. Simaetha does not need to be allured through the use of the *ἰυγξ*. Further, her use of it is inconsistent with its first use ever and this could suggest the ineffectiveness of its use in the present circumstances.

CHAPTER 6

**Intertextual presence vs. textual absence: Pindar and his Hellenistic
profile in *Idyll 16***

Introduction

Idyll 16 poses an interesting question on the reception of Pindar in Theocritus' poetry. Although Theocritus names Simonides (44), poets of the epic cycle (50) and Homer (57), he does not mention Pindar at all.³⁰⁷ Be that as it may, scholars have always recognized a special quality in this poem that makes them think of Pindar, a Pindaric patina so to speak (cf. Kuiper (1889) 384; Clapp (1913) 310; Meincke (1965) 79-84). This chapter will examine the character and the use of Pindaric elements in this poem. The idyll negates easy attempts at generic classification. Its protean nature has given rise to several contradictory approaches (cf. esp. Griffiths (1979) 10-11; Kyriakou (2004) 221; González (2010) 65-6). In the following discussion, it will be argued that Theocritus appropriated the profile of Pindar which Hellenistic readers had constructed, in order to unfold the encomiastic mood of his poem and represent himself as a praise poet in the light of the archaic poetry of *kleos* and its conventions (cf. Hunter (1996) 83, 97; Kyriakou (2004) 222).³⁰⁸ Further, it will be suggested that several of the peculiarities that scholars have noted like (i) the delay in the naming of Hieron (see n. 315 below), (ii) the digressive character of the first part (see n. 316 below), (iii) the 'venality' the

³⁰⁷ Griffiths (1979) 32 gives an overview of proposed explanations.

³⁰⁸ The poem is supposed to have been composed at some point in the decade 275-265 BCE with the pendulum turning towards the earlier date; cf. Kuiper (1889) 383. For the orthodox view see Gow (1952) 305-7; *contra* Hutchinson (1988) 191-2, who dates the poem around 265-264 BCE. The poem does not impart any information concerning any previous acquaintance of Theocritus with Hieron, which should remain open as a possibility.

of poet (pp. 175-6) and (iv) his sending the poems without previous invitation (pp. 192-3) could accord with the opinion that Hellenistic scholars had of Pindar and his role as a praise-poet. In this regard, *Idyll* 16 should be treated in a manner similar to Horace's *Ode* 4.2 as a poetic testimony to Pindar's Hellenistic image.

The story

The poem opens with the Hesiodic image of the Muses as praise-singers to the gods. The analogy between the two existential categories, gods and mortals is an opening device that Theocritus also employs in *Idyll* 17 in regard to the status of his patron and in *Idyll* 13 as the frame within which he contextualizes the topic on which Nicias and he are discoursing. In this case the comparison with the Muses seems to add points to Theocritus' honourable activity as a poet, while it explains the total absence of any divine presence in the poem beyond the Charites and the Muses.³⁰⁹ More importantly, though, the opening lines also suggest the comparison between mortal men and gods.³¹⁰ To be more precise, Theocritus' encomiastic activity is analogous to that of the Muses, who act as his role-models and as such suggest the

³⁰⁹ There is no reason to assume a break with Hesiodic tradition on the part of Theocritus, as Gutzwiller (1983) 219-20 and González (2010) 75 have argued; cf. also Willi (2004) 35. On the contrary, Theocritus adheres to poetic tradition: he is the interpreter of the Muses' messages (29), while they are his trusted companions in his poetic peregrinations (69, 107). Theocritus follows Pindar's metapoetic 'theology' according to which the Charites are associated with poetic style, while the Muses are responsible for factual knowledge (cf. *Pae.* 6.54-8). In this sense their roles are complementary (cf. Carey (1981) *ad Pyth.* 9.2). In *Nem.* 9.54-5 the Muses direct Pindar towards the target that he must hit with his spear (*ἀκοντίζων σκοποῦ ἄγχιστα Μοισᾶν*), if he wants to represent reality accurately, while the Charites are related with the choice of appropriate style (*ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδῆσαι / σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν*). For a variation of the same concept see Bacchylides 19.1-8: the Muses offer the *δῶρα* (content) of poetry, while the Charites *τιμῆ*, the recognition, so to speak, of the poet's artistry; see Scott (1984) 4. In this idyll the Muses are underrepresented probably because Theocritus does not sing in praise of something that has happened but rather of what he hopes will happen. In this sense, it is more important to show his artistry, which is traditionally related with the Charites.

³¹⁰ I take the *βροτοί* who form the subject of Theocritus' songs as identical with the *ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες* mentioned in line 2; *contra* Gutzwiller (1983) 230 who associates them with the people of humble birth mentioned at various points in the poem (55, 87-97). In this regard, I find rather unconvincing González's (2010) 70 attempt to represent this idyll as a *παράνευσις* on the model of Theognis to the nobles of Syracuse, the *ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες* of line 2, who found themselves in discord (p. 75).

only way for mortal men to approach the eternal world of the gods, being praised in poetry.

Lines 5-21 depict the Charites as they return to the poet, crying and complaining that they have not received any gifts. The indifference of the potential clients gives the poet the opportunity to assume a primarily didactic role and so to appropriate the wealthy treasure-house of Pindaric *gnomai* concerning the correct way to lead one's life and spend one's riches: money is not to be hoarded and kept hidden in chests but generously spent on benefactions and on poets (22-33).³¹¹ In order to illustrate the commemorative power of poets, Theocritus employs the paradigm of Simonides, epic poets of the cycle and Homer (34-57). Hieron is a god-sent answer to Theocritus' prayers for a generous patron. In a way explicitly reminiscent not only of Achilles and Ajax, but also of Hieron I, Hieron is represented while putting on his armour, before his *aristeia*. This is all that we are going to hear about Hieron's military prowess and (wished-for) achievements. Theocritus would rather dwell more excessively on the outcome of Hieron's campaign. In a bucolic scene, the only one in the poem, he describes the future peaceful reign of his *laudandus* (58-103).³¹² The poem ends with Theocritus' address to the Charites, who now appear as venerable and ancient goddesses with their remit far surpassing the field of poetic composition, so as to include military

³¹¹ *παρελθεῖν* (63) has been seen by several scholars, esp. Gutzwiller (1983) 229, to cast doubts on the sincerity of Theocritus' didactic stance. Σ *ad* 63 renders it as ἀπατήσαι καὶ ἀφέλειν τι, while Gow (1952) and Dover (1971) *ad loc.* have tried to downplay the negative connotations inherent in the verb by postulating a neutral meaning 'persuade', which, however, is not attested (cf. LSJ⁹ s.v.). For the most up-to-date discussion see Hunter (1996) 104 n. 86. I understand the text differently. In view of the reactions described previously (16-21), Theocritus implies that the only way to take money from these men *would be* to cheat them out of it; but this too, is presented as an *adynaton*. So what hope can a poet have with them, even if he tries not to cheat people but convince them with arguments (22-57)? Convinced that he cannot bring around his potential patrons, Theocritus momentarily evokes the image of the 'trickster' so as to play his opponents in their own game, profit-mongering. But this is just a rhetorical pose to emphasize the recalcitrance of his contemporaries and does not express the poet's 'intentions'.

³¹² For the bucolic elements in the poem see Vahlen (1884) 214, Meincke (1965) 67-9, Fantuzzi (2000) 144-5 and Kyriakou (2004) 240. Griffiths (1979) 40 calls this idyll the 'inauguration of the pastoral encomium'.

action (104-109; note esp. 105 ἀπεχθόμενον ποτε Θήβαις).³¹³ Throughout the poem the image of the *charites* fluctuates constantly, articulated through the various meanings the term can acquire in Pindaric idiom (see Perrotta (1925) 13-4): (i) poem of praise, (ii) Charites, (iii) special bond that exists between the poet and his *laudandus* (reciprocal gratitude), (iv) poetic artistry.³¹⁴

Idyll 16 as a political encomium

The last 20 lines, almost one fifth of the whole poem, are occupied with the explicit ‘praise’ of Hieron II of Syracuse.³¹⁵ The first eighty lines appear as a castigation of the venality that contemporary aristocrats display and a catechism on what is the right, and noble, way to spend one’s wealth. Only in hindsight does one comprehend that the two parts, unequal though they may be in the number of their lines, are juxtaposed and so meant, from a rhetorical point of view, to add to Hieron’s praise (cf. Perrotta (1925) 10-2, Meincke (1965) 35, 62-3; *contra* Fantuzzi (2000) 142, González (2010) 67-8).³¹⁶ The heightened sense of gloom and despair that one senses in the depiction of contemporary morality throws into relief

³¹³ The interest that the poet asks the Charites to show for Hieron and his people (102-3) reworks the interest Charis shows for the victor in Pindar’s epinicians; cf. *Ol.* 7.11 ἄλλοτε δ’ ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζωθάλμιος [...]. Charis lies in the very nature of, and so enables, athletic victory. In the military, and quasi-Homeric, world of *Idyll 16* Charis looks with a favourable eye on Hieron and his people in his war against the Carthaginians.

³¹⁴ For the different meanings that *charis* can acquire in Pindar’s poetry see esp. Gianotti (1975) 7-6; cf. also Gerber (1982) *ad Ol.* 1.18; Privitera (1982) *ad Isthm.* 5.21-2; Verdenius (1987) 104-6.

³¹⁵ Delaying the naming of the *laudandus* is considered a Pindaric mannerism; cf. Pfeiffer (1949) *ad fr.* 384.4. For instance: in *Nemean 10* the *laudandus* is named after 23 lines, almost one fourth of the poem; in *Olympian 14* after 16 lines, more than half the poem. Quite often the delay is rhetorically motivated by the inclusion of an introductory priamel suggesting the poet’s *aporia* (*Nem.* 10.1-18; *Isthm.* 7.1-15); cf. Austin (1967) 3. Theocritus does not propose other suitable objects of praise, perhaps to emphasize Hieron’s uniqueness; that is also suggested through his juxtaposition with the stingy men depicted in lines 16-21.

³¹⁶ The ‘digressive’ character of this part of the idyll could reflect the similar trait that Hellenistic readers attributed to Pindar, especially about his myths; cf. e.g. *Σ Ol.* 13.133b (πλείονι τῆι παρεκβάσει κέχρηται), *Σ Pyth.* 10.46b (ἀκαίρῳ παρεκβάσει χρησάμενος) ~ 79b (ὡς πολλῆι χρησαμένῳ τῆι παρεκβάσει). *Pace* Austin (1967) 17 the ancient scholiasts do not seem alert to the fact that ‘personal notes’ or such digressions were ‘subordinate to the praise of the victor’. This is part of modern reading perception. The same characteristic was also attributed to Simonides (*Σ Nem.* 4.60b).

Hieron's image as an ideal ruler and promising patron. The future tense in line 73 (*ἔσσεται οὗτος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐμοῦ κεχρήσεται ἀοιδοῦ*), in combination with the almost oracular tone in the preceding couplet (cf. Dover (1971) *ad loc.*), adds an air of pointed solemnity to Hieron's praise.³¹⁷ Hieron is temporally 'displaced' into the future with regard to the tightfisted contemporaries deprecated by Theocritus. This temporal manoeuvre widens the gap separating Hieron from the rich men of Theocritus' times and helps to underline his uniqueness.³¹⁸ Hieron is a future hope for something better, something closer to the honourable past represented by Greek tradition and especially Homer's epics (cf. Griffiths (1979) 31; 45-6).

The stage is now occupied by two opposing armies; the Phoenicians and the Syracusans, who are defending their country. In their midst appears their general Hieron preparing for the battle as a Homeric hero would do (80 *ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς Ἰέρων προτέρους ἴσος ἠρώεσσι / ζώννυται*). Some lines before, Theocritus had already compared him with Achilles and Ajax, the mightiest of the Greek heroes who fought at Troy (74 *ῥέξας ἢ Ἀχιλεὺς ὅσον μέγας ἢ βαρὺς Αἴας*).³¹⁹ The poem's discourse is imbued with Homeric language which eloquently indicates the poetic affiliation of its discourse. On the other hand, the employment of the (un-Homeric) Doric dialect situates the poem in a different branch of poetic tradition, one connected with lyric encomia and predominantly Pindar. This duality of poetic character applies also to the examples that Theocritus used in order to bring home to

³¹⁷ One should also note the confidence with which this line is pronounced; from a Homeric point of view it recalls the certainty with which Homeric heroes talk about the eventual fall of Troy in the *Iliad* (4.164 = 6.448 *ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ' ἄν ποτ' ὀλώλη Ἴλιος ἱρή*).

³¹⁸ This, however, could have been due to Hieron's lack of achievements to praise; cf. Vahlen's designation of the poem an 'Encomium der Zukunft' [historical framework given on pages 218-222] – this approach is also adopted by Griffiths (1979) 13-6; 45-6 who employs the term 'future retrospect' [...] to describe 'the increased reliance on future tense narrative'; cf. also Gutzwiller (1983) 231.

³¹⁹ The presence of the Homeric world is felt already from the proem (1-4); the task of the Muses is to compose hymns for the immortal gods, while mortal bards sing *κλέα ἀνδρῶν* (2 ~ 14 *ἔργμασιν ... ἐσθλοῖς*). Homer's *Il.* 22.304-5 seems to prefigure Theocritus' use (*μη μὲν ἀσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην, / ἀλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι*).

his readers the point about the powers of poetry to convey immortality (cf. Kyriakou (2004) 222).

Hellenistic perspectives on poetic tradition³²⁰

In lines 34 to 57 Theocritus gives three sets of examples of the unique ability that poets have to bestow poetic immortality on their patrons. The first set concerns Simonides' praise of Thessalian aristocratic clans (Aleuadai, Skopadai). Tradition has preserved the strong connection between Simonides and Thessalian patrons (see p. 119 n. 216 above). Already in ancient times readers had detected the presence of Simonides in the first part of the poem (cf. argument to Theoc. 16 pp. 325-6 Wendel): the chest in which Theocritus keeps his poems is generally supposed to hark back at a certain anecdote concerning Simonides' venality.³²¹ Theocritus' insistence on the remuneration of poets for their services has been seen in modern times as coming dangerously close to the image that Hellenistic, and modern, readers have of Simonides as a profit-seeking poet who put money above all (cf. Griffiths (1979) 18).³²² However, *pace* Austin (1967) 10, there is some slight evidence to suggest that Pindar was also the victim of such distorting interpretations, although it was not the dominant trend in his case (cf. *Σ Isthm.*

5.2a): ἴσμεν φιλόχρυσον ὄντα πανταχοῦ τὸν Πίνδαρον. κἀνταῦθα οὖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φιλάργυρον προαίρεσιν τεκμηριοῖ τὸν πλοῦτον ἐγκωμιάζων καὶ ὑπαινιττόμενος, ὡς

³²⁰ Cf. Sbardella (2004) 75 n.32 'una sorta di storia a ritorsio del potere celebrativo della poesia' and Willi (2004) 42 'une histoire de la littérature encomiastique à l'envers.'

³²¹ Vahlen (1884) 205, Kuiper (1889) 385 and Perrotta (1925) 12-3 have doubted the meaningfulness of such a connection. For Simonides' presence in the poem see Meincke (1965) 39-42, Austin (1967) 11, Hunter (1996) 99-109, esp. Vox (2002) 194-201, Kyriakou (2004) *passim* and González (2010) 98-107.

³²² Cf. e.g. Call. fr. 222 Pf. and *Σ Isthm.* 2.9. Both poets and scholiasts seem to have been influenced in their evaluation of Simonides as the avaricious poet *par excellence* by Aristophanic comedy (e.g. *Av.* 919; *Pax* 698 -9); cf. Austin (1967) 9-10, Lefkowitz (1986) 279. Callimachus' depiction of Simonides in *Aetia* III fr. 163 Massimilla seems dependent on Theocritus: (9) *Κῆριον ἄνδρα τὸν ἱερόν* ~ (44) *θεῖος ἀοιδὸς ὁ Κῆριος*; (13-14) *Κραννώνιος ... οἶκος ... ἰC, κιο, πάδι, α, ιC* ~ (36-8) *Σκοπάδαισιν ... ἄμ πεδίον Κραννώνιον*.

προσῆκει τοὺς ἐγκωμιαζομένους χρυσῶ ἀμείβεσθαι τὸν Πίνδαρον. There is, then, no reason to understand Theocritus' insistence on monetary rewards as an allusion to Simonides only (cf. e.g. Griffiths (1979) 26), as it could (also / only) refer to Pindar. In the light of this, one could turn one's attention to the Hellenistic interpretation of the proem of *Isthmian 2* and its possible significance for the financial aspect of Theocritus' 'Pindaric' *persona* in *Idyll 16* (cf. Austin (1967) 6 and Sbardella (2004) 68 who suggest a different interpretation).

Pindar the φιλάργυρος

The ancient *scholia* preserve two independent hermeneutic trends in respect to the opening of *Isthmian 2* (cf. Pavese (1966) 104-5). One group of scholars, which included Callimachus (cf. fr. 222 Pf. and n. 322 above), understood Pindar's words as an oblique attack on his favourite target Simonides (cf. Σ 9a (λέγοι δ' ἂν πρὸς Σιμωνίδην ταῦτα, ὡς φιλάργυρον διασύρων τὸν ἄνδρα), 15a). On the other hand, the *scholia* give testimony also to the diametrically opposite interpretation (Σ *inscr.* a): φανερόν γὰρ ὡς μισθὸν αἰτῶν τὸν Θρασύβουλον τό τε ἀπόφθεγμα προσήνεγκε τὸ περὶ τῶν χρημάτων [...]. The dispute in the reading of this poem should alert one to the possibility that some, certainly not the majority of, Hellenistic readers, including perhaps Theocritus, understood Pindar in the same way as Simonides. The relevance of *Isthmian 2* for our *idyll* could be suggested from the following considerations.

The opening of *Isthmian 2* does not operate solely on the opposition between past and contemporary poets (Σ 1b). Whatever Pindar may have intended, it seems that some scholiasts believed Pindar to include himself in the category of poets financially remunerated for their services (Σ *Isthm.* 2.1b). So they understood the

incipit on the basis of a different antithesis between Thrasyboulos and the rest of his contemporary patrons. In this reading special emphasis is given to Thrasyboulos' knowledge of the financial side of the patron-poet relationship and the immortalizing power of poetry (12 ἔσοι γὰρ σοφός). In this respect, the juxtaposition that one finds in *Idyll* 16 between Hieron II and other rich men could have been modelled on a specific reading of the opening of *Isthmian* 2. Still this could reflect a wider tendency in the Hellenistic interpretation of Pindar. Σ *Pyth.* 2.125a in its explanation of κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν has no misgivings about attributing 'profit-seeking' to Pindar the very same thing that Pindar had castigated in his odes (οἶον ἐπὶ κέρδει καὶ πράσει). Another note on the same passage (Σ *Pyth.* 2.127), explains that Pindar composed the ode for a fee (ἐπὶ μισθῶι) but also sent a *hyporchema* (fr. 105 Maehler) *gratis* (Σ *Pyth.* 2.126c χάριν καὶ προῖκα), one may assume as a sign of friendship and respect. At any rate, it appears that some Hellenistic scholars did not believe in an idealist Pindar any more than we should necessarily think Theocritus to have done. There is no reason to confuse our modern perspective of an idealist Pindar (cf. e.g. Austin (1967) 7, 10-1; Gutzwiller (1983) 229) with that of Hellenistic readers, mistaken though the latter may be, if it is relevant for an understanding of Theocritus' work.

Simonides, the Thessalians and Homer

The detailed description of the earthly goods (34-9) that Simonides' Thessalians left behind them emphasizes their uselessness in the face of inevitable death: (40) ἀλλ' οὐ σφιν τῶν ἡδῶς, ἐπεὶ γλυκὺν ἐξεκένωσαν / θυμὸν ἐς εὐρείαν σχεδίαν στυγνοῦ Ἀχέροντος ~ (23) οὐχ ἄδε πλούτου ὄνασις). Only poetry can open an escape route for human fate: poetic immortality, which can be easily acquired by giving

patronage to poets (43-5). It is this ability that the poets have to rescue men from oblivion with the help of Muses (source of their inspiration) that accounts for their designation as sacred or divine (44 *θειὸς ἀοιδὸς ὁ Κήϊος*;³²³ cf. 29 *Μοισάων ... ἱεροῦς ὑποφήτας*) (cf. Hunter (1996) 107 with n. 90).³²⁴ It took a poet of Simonides' calibre to transform their image thanks to their athletic victories (45-6 *τιμᾶς δὲ καὶ ὠκέες ἔλλαχον ἵπποι / οἷ σφισιν ἐξ ἱερῶν στεφανηφόροι ἦλθον ἀγώνων*). In antithesis to their worldly goods, all long lost, their fame survives on to Theocritus' times thanks to Simonides who has rendered them with his guitar *ὄνομαστοὺς ὄπλοτέρους* (45-6).

Thanks to a recent papyrus discovery we know that this phrase was a direct loan from the elegy that Simonides composed for those fallen at the battle of Plataea (fr. 11.17-18 W²):³²⁵

... καὶ ἐπώνυμον ὄπ[λοτέροι]οισιν
ποίησ' ἡμ]ιθέων ὠκύμορον γενεήν.

³²³ For the text in this line (*θειὸς* or *δεινός* instead of the transmitted *κεῖνος*) see Gow (1951) *ad loc.*

³²⁴ For the appellation 'interpreters of the Muses' compare also 17.115 (*Μοισάων δ' ὑποφήται*) and 22.115 (*εἰπέ θεά, σὺ γὰρ οἶσθα· ἐγὼ δ' ἑτέρων ὑποφήτης*); cf. Meincke (1965) 60 n.1. The self-representation of the poet as the 'interpreter of the (oracular) messages of the (possessed) Muse' looks back at the analogy between poetry and divination which one finds fully developed in Pindar's poetry (cf. Kuiper (1889) 384; Perrotta (1925) 21-2; Dover (1971) *ad* 29): cf. e.g. *Pae.* 6.5-6 (... *με ... δέξαι ... ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν*) with Radt (1958) *ad loc.* and esp. (fr. 150 Maehler *μαντεύεο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγὼ*) with Dodds (1951) 82. The image is of course traditional (cf. Bacchylides 9.3 *Μουσᾶν γε ἰοβλεφάρων θεῖος προφά[α]τας*). Despite the different prefixes (*ὑπό-* ~ *πρό-*), there is no perceptible difference in the meaning or image evoked (*pace* Kuiper (1889) 384; cf. Eur. *Or.* 364 *Νηρέως προφήτης Γλαύκος* ~ A.R. 1.1311 *Νηρήος θείου πολυφράδμων ὑποφήτης*). *ὑπό-* suggests that the poet talks under the influence of the Muses [cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. *ὑπό* F.3], *πρό-* that the poet talks on behalf of the Muses [see Braswell (1989) *ad Nem.* 9.49]. In *Nem.* 9.49 the wine being mixed is called *γλυκὺς κώμου προφάτας* 'sweet harbinger of the revel' (tr. Braswell (1998) *ad loc.*). In addition to explicitly designating himself as prophet of the Muses Pindar often suggests an analogy between his role as a *laudator* and famous oracles mentioned in the myth of the ode (cf. *Nem.* 1. 60 *Διὸς ὑψίστου προφάταν ἔξοχον / ὀρθόμαντιν Τειρεσίαν* [see also p. 209 with n. 378 and 215-16 with n. 393]). Note also the analogy in the phrasing: *Pae.* 6.6 (*ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν*) ~ *Nem.* 1. 60 (*Διὸς ... προφάταν ἔξοχον*) [~ *Pae.* 9.42 (*θεμίτ[ων] ~ / ἐξάιτερον προφάταν ...*)]. Theocritus appears to interpret the stories with which the Muse inspires him. Interestingly, the combination of lyric and Homeric material that one can detect in *Idyll* 16 appear also in regard to this image in 22.115, which looks back to *Il.* 2.484-6.

³²⁵ *ὄπ[λοτέροι]οισιν* had been proposed by Hutchinson before the discovery of *οισιν* [on *POxy.* 2327 fr. 27.5 and its combination with *POxy.* 3965 fr.1.9 (*οπ[]*) by Parsons confirmed it; cf. Parsons (1992) 31.

The context refers to the heroes (here called demigods) that participated in the Trojan War. Homer's poetry rendered them famous to future generations. Within Simonides' poem the reference to Homer suggests an analogy between his role as an immortalizing poet and the status of the dead, who are put on an equal footing with the demi-gods (cf. Kyriakou (2004) 226).³²⁶ Provided we accept the allusion to Simonides' elegy, Theocritus' combination would seem quite daring if not startling, the more so since the Thessalian lords of Simonides could claim nothing in common with these heroes; on the contrary, they seem to have taken the part of the Persians in the same war (cf. Austin (1967) 7-8; Kyriakou (2004) 239). Even so, the point that emerges is that of Simonides as a praise poet who is able, like Homer, to convey immortality, and can transmit a positive image of his patrons to future generations (*pace* Austin (1967) 9; Willi (2004) 42 n.36). This allusion casts a shadow of doubt on the allegedly negative image of Simonides that Theocritus is supposed to project in this poem.

The analogy that Simonides had suggested between the dead of Plataea and the Trojan heroes reappears in Theocritus' praise of Hieron: as we saw above, Hieron is equal to Achilles and Ajax (74-5). Subsequently, this comparison would also suggest an analogy between the roles of Theocritus and Homer as immortalizing poets (cf. Vox (2002) 195; Kyriakou (2004) 237). This interpretation is further supported by the two other examples that Theocritus mentions in his attempt to convince potential patrons (48-57).

The other examples that Theocritus brings up derive from epic poetry which, as already indicated, is seen as a branch of praise discourse: (i) epic cycle (50 *προτέρων ὕμνησαν ἀοιδοί*) and (ii) *Odyssey* which is here attributed to Homer (57

³²⁶ Kyriakou (2004) 225 points out that it was epinician poets who first implied 'that posterity would not know of the heroes of the past without epic poetry'.

Ἰάονος ἀνδρὸς ἀοιδαί). Apart from Simonides Pindar too had used Homeric examples to demonstrate the power of poetry to convey everlasting fame; there are several elements that suggest Theocritus' dependence on Pindar's *œuvre* in these lines (see below). For the general idea expressed in these lines one could compare *Pyth.* 3.112-5:³²⁷ Νέστορα καὶ Λύκιον Σαρπηδόν', ἀνθρώπων φάτις, / ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν, τέκτονες οἶα σοφοί / ἄρμοσαν, γιγνώσκομεν. ἅ δ' ἀρετὰ κλειναῖς ἀοιδαῖς / χρονία τελέθει. The prowess or excellence (ἀρετή), which Pindar considers Nestor and Sarpedon to have exhibited at Troy, was saved from oblivion thanks to Homer (cf. Gentili (1995) 80). Pindar draws an analogy between heroic epic narrating the glorious acts of valiant heroes and the epinician odes he composed to praise the athletic victories of the aristocrats of his times (cf. Nagy (1990) 199-214). Consequently, the analogy places Homeric heroes and the potentates of Pindar's time on the same level (see also *Nemean* 7 below). Interestingly, in the lines just before this Pindar had emphasized the importance of wealth as means to secure good fame (110 εἰ δέ μοι πλοῦτον θεὸς ἄβρον ὀρέξαι, / ἐλπίδ' ἔχω κλέος εὐρέσθαι κεν ὑψηλὸν πρόσω; cf. Crotty (1982) 121–2 and Hubbard (1985) 76–7). Pindar implied

³²⁷ Cf. Holzinger (1892) 195; Kuiper (1889) 386; Gutzwiller (1983) 227. The intertextual connection with *Pythian* 3 is further strengthened by l. 98 (ὑψηλὸν δ' Ἰέρωνι κλέος φορέοιεν ἀοιδοί) which is assumed to be a borrowing from *Pyth.* 3.111 (ἐλπίδ' ἔχω κλέος εὐρέσθαι κεν ὑψηλὸν πρόσω); cf. Vox (2002) 195 and Kyriakou (2004) 244. This not only reinforces the idea about the analogy, intertextually suggested, between Hieron I and II, but more importantly demonstrates the same condition upon the realization of which the two poets counted for the composition of their praise poems: the acquisition of wealth. Theocritus will add the performance of military deeds at the end of his poem (cf. Willi (2004) 43-4); Pindar did not have to, as Hieron had already proved himself in the wars against the barbarians (*Pyth.* 1.71-80). Note also the analogy with the Trojan War that both poets draw in their praise of Hieron I or II: *Pyth.* 1.50-7 ~ Theoc. 16.74-5. Kuiper (1889) 386, Perrotta (1925) 19 and Dover (1971) *ad* 34-57 suggest as another possible subtext *Isthm.* 8.49-55. This passage lacks the programmatic character of *Pyth.* 3.122; still, it is relevant in view of the latent juxtaposition it suggests between the victor and Achilles (cf. Theoc. 16.74): Achilles is also a young man (47-8 *νεαράν* ... ἀρετὰν Ἀχιλλέος 'young valor of Achilles' tr. Nisetich; [cf. Bury (1892) *ad* 52; Carey (1981) *ad* 47; Privitera (1982) *ad* 47-8; differently Christ (1896) 48 and Thummer (1969) *ad loc.*]) and can be connected with Aegina, Kleandros' home-island (cf. Carey (1981) *ad* 47-60, p.207; Privitera (1982) 121; Burnett (2005) 117-8). The adverb of quantity in Theocritus' text (ἄσσον) looks like a summary of the various catalogues of Achilles' exploits at Troy that Pindar gives in his odes; see Thummer (1968) 153-4. The comparison of Hieron with Achilles and Ajax that Theocritus suggests later in l.74 follows the employment of these heroes in epinician discourse. On Ajax in Pindar's epinicians see below n. 354.

that wealth was a prerequisite for participation in the costly athletic contests in which the *laudandus* can prove his god-given prowess (cf. e.g. *Isthm.* 6.10-3). This does not appear explicitly in Theocritus' representation of the *kleos* of the Thessalian families but could be understood in the mention of the chariot victories celebrated by Simonides (46-7) and more generally in the *ἔργμασι ... ἐσλοῖς* of line 14 (see also below).³²⁸

Theocritus does not mention any Iliadic heroes in this section of his poem; but he does later in connection with the praise of Hieron II. This part (48-57) focuses on figures which played a less important role in the Iliadic and Odyssean narratives, if they played one at all (cf. Kyriakou (2004) 240-1).³²⁹ In the first part the emphasis falls on the Lycians and probably their leader Sarpedon, Priam's sons and Cycnus. Pindar regularly mentions Cycnus along with Hector and Memnon in the list of Achilles' victims (*Ol.* 2.82 ὃς σφᾶλε, *Τροίας* / ἄμαχον ἀστραβῆ κίονα, *Κύκνον τε θανάτῳ πόρεν* / Ἄοῦς τε παῖδ' Αἰθίοπα; *Isthm.* 5.39-41 λέγε, τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἔκτορα πέφνον, / καὶ στρατάρχον Αἰθίοπων ἄφοβον / Μέμνονα χαλκοάραν;). An examination of the way in which Pindar dealt with Cycnus would certainly modify Theocritus' assertion: Cycnus is mentioned only as a victim of Achilles but never for his own sake. In this sense, like Hector and Memnon, he is a traditional part in Achilles' praise-catalogues. This would suggest that his *kleos*, if he is assumed to have any, is part of the *kleos* of Achilles. Within the laudatory discourse of *Idyll* 16 this would confirm that Theocritus implies an ascending scale of poetic objects (Thessalian lords → epic heroes of the cycle and *Odyssey* → epic

³²⁸ Callimachus has ἐ]σθλὸν ἔρεξεν in his epinician elegy for Sosibius (fr. 384.59 Pf.) in a context which includes also, but not exclusively, benefaction. In an epinician context ἐσθλός is used both for the winner (*Isthm.* 3.7) and for the victory itself (*Pyth.* 8.73; *Nem.* 5. 45; 9.6; 10.20); cf. Rumpel (1883) and Slater (1969) s.v.

³²⁹ Cycnus belongs to the 'ante-Iliadic' events narrated in the *Cypria*; see Adler (1922) s.v. 'Kyknos' [3] *RE* 11: 2438-41 and the *Cypria* hypothesis *ap.* Bernabé p. 42, 55; cf. Vahlen (1884) 209.

heroes of the *Iliad* (Achilles, Ajax) and subjects (Simonides → Epic poets → Homer). Both Hieron II and Theocritus constitute analogues for the best examples of heroes and poets respectively.

The third set of examples deals with episodes from the *Odyssey*: Odysseus' wandering at sea, his descent to Hades, and his visit to the cave of Polyphemus (51-4); this part is completed with an allusion to the incidents that took place after Odysseus' arrival in Ithaca and the role played in them by minor figures such as Eumaeus, Philoetius and Laertes. Homer's narrative about Odysseus' adventures gave Odysseus a 'long-lived *kleos*' (54 *δηναιὸν κλέος*). The emphasis on the imperishable fame that Homer has conferred on his protagonist has been rightly seen to allude to a difficult passage in Pindar's *Nemean* 7 (cf. Kuiper (1889) 386; Sbardella (2004) 75-6):

ἀφνεὸς πεν<ιχ>ρός τε θανάτου παρά
 σᾶμα ν<έο>νται. ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι (20)
 λόγον Ὀδυσσεὸς ἢ πάθαν
 διὰ τὸν ἄδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὀμηρον· (21)
 ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσὶ οἱ ποτανᾶ <τε> μαχανᾶ
 σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι σοφία
 δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις.

Theocritus' dependence on these lines is manifold: (i) lines 51-7 elaborate on the Pindaric *πάθα*; (ii) *ὑπὸ κέρδει βλάβειν* (Pind. *Nem.* 7.18) is cast in Homeric idiom as *φιλοκερδείη βεβλαμμένον* (Theoc. 16.63); the inevitability of death for poor and rich is refashioned in the pathetic image of the dead rich man who lacks fame and so weeps like an impoverished farmer (Theoc. 16.31-3). As in Pindar, all these elements point to the importance of praise-poetry as dispenser of poetic immortality.

Yet contrary to what is usually assumed (cf. e.g. Most (1985) 148-56; Sbardella (2004) 80-1), Pindar, and Theocritus after him, do not attack Homer's representation of Odysseus. The fact that this part is flanked by *gnomai* (in chiasmic

placement [ABBA]) around the inevitability of death for poor and rich alike and poets' power to confer everlasting fame (17-20 ~ 30-32) suggests that Homer is marshalled as a positive example:

(A) σοφοὶ δὲ μέλλοντα τριταῖον ἄνεμον
ἔμαθον, οὐδ' ὑπὸ κέρδει βλάβεν·
(B) ἀφνέος πενιχρὸς τε θανάτου παρά
σᾶμα νέονται.

(B) ἀλλὰ κοινὸν γὰρ ἔρχεται
κῦμ' Αἴδα, πέσε δ' ἀδόκητον ἐν καὶ
δοκέοντα· (A) τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται
ᾧν θεὸς ἄβρον αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων.

Homer conferred everlasting fame on Odysseus; but he did more than that: he offered future generations an 'enhanced' or 'exaggerated' version of his sufferings (cf. Most (1985) 149; Sbardella (2004) 73). This ability lies, as Pindar explains, in the nature of Homer's art (23 σοφία): his lines are sweet (21 ἄδυεπη), his high-flown discourse (22 ποτανῶι μαχανῶι) successfully combines lies (22 ψεύδεσι) with solemnity (23 σεμνόν). In this way, his artistry succeeds in presenting tales (24 μύθοις) that can mislead people (24 κλέπτει παράγοισα). The inclusion of lies in poetry is a meta-literary commonplace from Hesiod on (*Op.* 26-8). Still, the mirror image that Pindar employed previously (14) and the insistence on the mob's inability to discern truth (24-5) juxtapose not Homer and Pindar but rather the genres that they served: epic and epinician poetry. Both have the same effect but display different techniques. Epic poets can use 'myths' to embellish their narratives, while epinician poets report only the truth: Pindar does not need to resort to Homeric technique to praise his victor, since the victor is truly excellent in the manner of Ajax, his countryman.³³⁰

³³⁰ The importance of Truth for Pindar is demonstrated by the fact that *Alatheia* is the daughter of Zeus (*Ol.* 10.3); cf. Komornicka (1972) 236, Verdenius (1983) 29. In fr. 205 Maehler Pindar prays to *Alatheia* to deliver his *synthesis* from the danger of stumbling over the sharp rocks of lies (cf. Gentili (1981): Ἀρχὰ μεγάλας ἀρετᾶς, / ὄνασσο' Ἀλάθεια, μὴ πταίσης ἐμάν / σύνθεσιν τραχεῖ ποτὶ ψεύδει. At the beginning of *Olympian* 8 Olympia is addressed as 'mistress of truthfulness' (2); this suggests that the true value of athletes is proved in the games (cf. *Ol.* 4.18); see Komornicka (1972) 238. Thus 'truth' can be (i) truthfulness in the praise of noble acts by the poet, but also (ii) the true nature of the athlete, which comes to light only through his act of valour. Pindar's adherence to this

The mythological episode that Pindar turns to next involves Odysseus and Ajax. The ὄπλων κρίσις is unrelated to Odysseus' sufferings mentioned above (21): it was narrated in a different epic and had a different nature altogether; it involved Odysseus not as sufferer but as exponent of prowess. People did not see the truth about Ajax' prowess and so gave Achilles' weapons to Odysseus. The people (ἀνδρῶν ὄμιλος) form a kind of audience that is placed in between the two episodes. So one gets the impression that they are left hanging in a temporal vacuum: they are Homer's readers who cannot discern his beautification of Odysseus' image, but they seem to be Ajax' contemporaries as well (cf. Loscalzo (2000) *ad* 20-30). What is the connection? One could venture the following interpretation. People are unable to recognize true prowess, be it athletic (the victor) or heroic (Ajax). One needs a poet to render one's prowess manifest to the people and protect one from their φθόνος.³³¹ Furthermore, it is only poets who have the ability to render one's fame immortal by means of their poetry and to 'mesmerize' the audience with their art. Viewed in this way, the passage could operate on the so-called χρέος motif.

In a similar vein, Theocritus suggests that Simonides and epic poets have represented an enhanced image of their *laudandi*, be they powerful patrons and heroes or swine-herds. This is what he does in the case of his own *laudandus*: the image of Hieron II is enhanced more than he deserved in the same manner as Pindar had suggested for Odysseus' Homeric image. It is of no interest whether Hieron II is actually equivalent to Achilles; it is enough for his people to believe he is or, in

principle (most emphatically expressed in *Ol.* 4.17 οὐ ψεύδει τέγξω / λόγον), especially in the communication of the *laudandus*' virtuous character, is manifest in passages such as *Ol.* 2.91–5 and *Ol.* 6.19–20, where the poet's testimony is supported by a pledge (ἔρκος) (cf. Crotty (1982) 60). In *Ol.* 13.98–100 the same combination comes to lend strength to the poet's testimony concerning the superb record of athletic victories of Xenophon of Corinth. It would appear then that for Pindar (and certainly for other epinician poets), the propagandistic needs of the *laudandus* and his family notwithstanding, the task of the *laudator* was to remain as close as possible to truth.

³³¹ For Ajax as the archetypal victim of the people's envy see below n. 354.

our case, could be. This side of encomiastic activity, sycophantic though it may look to us nowadays, is a result of the benevolent influence of the Charites, who beautify everything they look upon.

κέρδος and κλέος

A close reading of the rhetoric of these lines reveals a bipolar articulation that functions on several levels. In their senselessness Theocritus' contemporaries consider the accumulation of wealth as 'advantage' (23 ὄνασις) and 'delight' (40 ἡδος). This, says Theocritus following a well-established epinician tradition (cf. e.g. Bacch. fr.1 Maehler), is a sign of the perversion that profit mongering has led them to (63 φιλοκερδείη βεβλαμμένον).³³² Otherwise, they would have comprehended the basic truth that Theocritus sings of: only poetry can truly benefit mortals (58 εἰ μὴ σφέας ὤνασαν Ἰάονος ἀνδρὸς ἀοιδαί). Using an athletic (or military) metaphor, Theocritus represents them as athletes who have been beaten by profits (νενίκηνται δ' ὑπὸ κερδέων) and who disregard the noble activities that befit them (14-5). Their desire (65 ἕμερος) is not for everlasting fame but for more

³³² The depiction of 'profit(-seeking)' (κέρδος) as 'harm' or 'damage' (βλάβη) to one's perception of the rules of human existence is Pindaric (*Nem.* 7.17): σοφοὶ δὲ μέλλοντα τριταῖον ἀνεμον / ἔμαθον, οὐδ' ὑπὸ κέρδει βλάβειν; cf. Gow (1952), Dover (1971) *ad* 63, Loscalzo (2000) *ad Nem.* 7.17, Sbardella (2004) 66-8. According to Carey (1981) 142, the gnome, which includes all people in general, functions through the antithesis between the short-sighted or avaricious and the prudent mariner. The latter does not put his life at risk for an ephemeral *kerdos*, like the former, but seeks secure profit that will last him to the future as well (cf. also Σ *Nem.* 7.25a). For a survey of all suggested interpretations see Loscalzo (2000) *ad* 17-8. On the opposition κέρδος ~ κλέος see also Pavese (1966) 108-10 and Campagner (1988) 89-91 ['reciprocità negativa']. This opposition is a specialization of, and functions within, a wider ethical framework, which is not represented in its complete form in Pindar and includes the traditional sequence κέρδος – ἄτη – τίσις (cf. Solon fr. 13.70-6 W² ≈ Theognis 227-32); cf. Campagner 89 n. 85. In turn, this sequence elaborates upon the Hesiodic pair of δίκη - ἄβρις; more specifically, in the Theognidean *corpus* Solon's lines are prefaced in the previous lines (225-6) with the concepts of κακοκερδείη 'base love of gain' and δολοπλοκία ἀπιστοι; for the differences between the two texts and their significance for human culpability [esp. Solon (74) κέρδεά τοι θνητοῖς ὥπασαν ἀθάνατοι ~ Theognis (230) χρήματά τοι θνητοῖς γίνεταί ἀφροσύνη see Defradas (1962) 46, van Groningen (1966) 90-3 and Carrière (1975) 149-50. Theocritus, following Pindar (see, however, Asclepius in *Pyth.* 3.54), does not insinuate any breach of δίκη on the part of the profit-monger, as is the case with Solon (cf. Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010) 197-8) and Theognis, but just foolish shortsightedness.

possessions (65 *πλεόνων*).³³³ The pointed juxtaposition of the participles *ζώντες* and *θανόντων* in line 59 throws into relief the futility of such a life-style: the living squander (*ἀμαλδύνουσι*) the riches that those now deceased had gathered; this proves that the advantage and sweetness caused by such transitory goods is evanescent. Dead men leave behind them earthly goods (42 *πολλὰ καὶ ὄλβια τῆνα λιπόντες*); interestingly, this goes hand in hand with the loss of something more important, posthumous memory, as they remain forgotten (42 *ἄμναστοι*). On the other hand, ‘noble fame’ derives from the Muses themselves (58 *ἐκ Μοισῶν ἀγαθὸν κλέος ἔρχεται ἀνθρώποισι*) and as such transcends the limits of human existence (30 *ὄφρα καὶ εἰν Αἴδαο κεκρυμμένος ἐσθλὸς ἀκούσης*).

The situation adumbrated for those who do not heed Theocritus’ words is described in dark colours: like the Charites of Theocritus that they had scorned (5-12) in life, they will weep bitterly without fame (31 *ἀκλεῆς μύρηαι* ~ 33 *κλαίων*); they are lowered to the level of men that they could have employed to work on their fields, men who weep for their poverty. Even Odysseus’ swineherds and cowherds are in a more privileged position as their fame is long-lasting and not kept silent (54 *ἔσιγάθη*). The pretensions of the latter social group to fame are hindered by their penury (33 *ἐκ πατέρων πενίην ἀκτῆμονα*) (cf. Perrotta (1925) 19). Still the results of poetic intervention appear miraculous: (i) it restores dead people to poetic immortality enabling a crossing of the lines dividing mortal men and gods; (ii) as the examples from the *Odyssey* indicate, it can do away with social stratifications, despite the aristocratic spirit of the ideology exhibited in these lines.

³³³ From a Pindaric point of view, their desire for profit contrasts with the desire for athletic attainments and fame that Pindar’s heroes and victors demonstrate (cf. *Ol.* 3.33 *γλυκὺς ἕμερος*). For erotic imagery in the praise poetry of Pindar see pp. 58-60 above.

Theocritus' discourse in these lines looks like a hexametric rendition of Pindaric discourse, a pastiche of Pindaric material (cf. Kuiper (1889) 385; Holzinger (1892) 195; Clapp (1913) 312; Perrotta (1925) 16; Gutzwiller (1983) 226 n. 56). The emphatic juxtaposition of human mortality and poetic immortality articulated in the power of praise poetry to traverse the limits between the world of the living and Hades is characteristically Pindaric (cf. Segal (1986); Kurke (1991) 66-70). '[T]he dust of the grave doth not darken the goodly glory won by kinsmen' (tr. Farnell) declares Pindar in *Olympian* 8 (79-80 *κατακρύπτει δ' οὐ κόνις / συγγόνων κεδνὰν χάριν*). In a way which is peculiar to Pindar, the deceased relatives of the victor remain sentient even after death and so can receive, and rejoice in, the news and fame of the victory (cf. Farnell (1930) 46). Divine powers such as Echo (*Ol.* 14.20-1) or Announcement (*Ol.* 8.81-2 *Ἄγγελία*) are employed to convey the message to Hades. In *Pythian* 5 Arcesilaus' praise, poured as a funeral libation for them (cf. *Ol.* 8.77-8 [cf. Ferrari (1998) n.29]), reaches the ears of the dead kings buried in Cyrene's agora (98-103).

The inevitability of death for all men is a basic feature of Pindaric ideology (cf. *Nem.* 7.19-20 *ἀφνεὸς πενιχρός τε θανάτου παρά / σᾶμα νέονται*). The man with hands blistered from toiling on the earth (*Theoc.* 16.32-3) cannot aspire, resourceless as he is, to any kind of immortality; his juxtaposition with the well-off and their potential for fame recalls a similar juxtaposition in *Ol.* 2.61-6: the *ἔσλοί*, the group which comprises Pindar's clientèle, lead a more comfortable existence (*ἀπονέστερον ... βιοτόν*) as they do not need to toil on earth or at sea, like the men of

no means (οὐ χθόνα ταρασσοντες ἐν χερὸς ἀκμᾶι / οὐδὲ πόντιον ὕδωρ / κεινὰν παρὰ δίαιταν).³³⁴

For Pindar the darkness of the human condition is dispelled by the bright light, the αἴγλα, of achievement (*Pyth.* 8.95-7); the misers of Theocritus weep in the dark, cold recesses of Hades (30-1), similarly to the man of no achievement and so of no fame. In his address to Poseidon in *Olympian* 1 Pelops emphatically associates lack of fame with darkness and old age, a condition he designates as futile in view of the necessity of death (82-4): θανεῖν δ' οἷσιν ἀνάγκα, τά κέ τις ἀνώνυμον / γῆρας ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος ἔψοι μάταν, / ἀπάντων καλῶν ἄμμορος; Instead Pelops rushes to the risk of contest which will grant him immortal fame (85 ἄεθλος ~ opposite Theoc. 16.14) (cf. Crotty (1982) 56). In *Nemean* 7 acts of prowess are thrown into the 'darkness' when they lack praise (ταῖ μεγάλοι ἀλκαί / σκότον πολὺν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι) (cf. Loscalzo (2000) *ad* 13). The importance of this admonition is revealed by the fact that it can be also represented as a piece of traditional wisdom (*Nem.* 9.6): ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, τετελεσμένον ἐσλόν / μὴ χαμαὶ σιγᾷ καλύψαι. Silence, the opposite of praise, is like a cloak that covers praiseworthy attainments.³³⁵ Hence it is the χρέος of the poet to praise what he deems to be praiseworthy. In a way, spending one's gold (which means taking it out of the darkness of the chest) equals the escape from the darkness of lack of

³³⁴ I follow Jacob's (2005) 14-7 attractive suggestion that ἴσσις δὲ νύκτεσσιν αἰεὶ / ἴσσις δ' ἀμέραις ἄλιον ἔχοντες does not refer to the spring equinox in the place of rest intended for the virtuous, as has been traditionally accepted, but is a poetic way of perceiving mortal existence on earth. The participial phrase ἄλιον ἔχοντες means 'living' (*Phoe.* 541-6; with Mastronarde (1994) *ad loc.*). To get this meaning, Jacob alters the punctuation, printing a full stop or a semi-colon before ἀλλά in line 65. The ἐσλοί of l. 63 are the aristocrats; their condition would then be described as ἀπονέστερον in comparison with people of humbler social strata (Jacob (2005) 15-6). For the people of the same category as Theron and his family 'wealth and divine favour' are a god-sent addition to their inborn virtues (10-1 αἰὼν δ' ἔφεπε μόρσιμος, / πλοῦτόν τε καὶ χάριν ἄγων / ἐπὶ γνησίαις ἀρεταῖς); so they have the luxury of not having to secure an everyday living for themselves.

³³⁵ In other places, Pindar associates the celebration of an athletic victory with prominence of place, whereas the envy of the *laudandus*' enemies is close to the ground in darkness, where no one can see it (*Nem.* 4.39-41 φθονερά δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων / γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότῳ κυλίνδει / χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν).

fame. This important tenet of Pindaric discourse is reapplied by Theocritus in addressing his contemporaries.

Against this background, Theocritus provides a description of the right way in which his potential patrons ought to behave in order to secure positive fame. Lines 24-9 present the portrait of the ideal patron as a benefactor (note especially 25 εὖ ἔρξαι). Most of the themes in it will also be detected in the discussion of *Idyll* 17. Theocritus admonishes wealthy men to support their family and friends (25); to show piety toward the gods (26); to be hospitable towards strangers (27-8); and to reward poets who can provide them with undying fame (24 ~ 29). The inclusion of the support for poets, emphasized through the use of μάλιστα (29),³³⁶ indicates that acts of benefaction are not enough by themselves to secure everlasting fame, if not sung by a poet. Again Theocritus follows Pindaric ideas. Only the poet can give access to the immortalizing powers of the Muses' song that can allow one's *kleos* to spread (*Ol.* 10.95-6 τρέφοντι δ' εὐρὸν κλέος / κόραι Πιερίδες Διός). The point is made explicitly by Pindar in *Olympian* 10: (even) acts of prowess (91 καλὰ {μὲν} ἔρξαις) when not celebrated in song (ἀοιδᾶς ἄτερ) are a mistaken reason for pride (93 κενεὰ πνεύσαις), which returns a short-living joy to one's toils (ἔπορε μόχθῳ βραχὺ τι τερπνόν).³³⁷ The epinician celebration (93-4) is a prerequisite for the realization of the victory. In the same fashion, celebration of one's benefactions is a necessary condition for their actualization (cf. Cholmeley (1901) and Dover (1971) *ad* 42-3, Gow (1952) *ad* 30; Kuiper (1889) 386, Perrotta (1925) 19). A danger that lurks for men who have committed worthwhile acts, be they athletic victories or, in the case of Theocritus' addressees, benefactions, is to forget their mortality and suppose that

³³⁶ The construction of line 29 makes more natural the association of the adverb with the rewards offered to the poets; cf. Meincke (1969) 49 n. 1; Gow (1951) *ad loc.*; Gutzwiller (1983) 224 n. 47.

³³⁷ For the interpretation of this line see Lehnus (1981), Verdenius (1988) and Ferrari (1998) *ad loc.*

their present bliss is everlasting without the succour of poets (*Ol.* 8.72-3 *Αἶδα τοι λάθεται / ἄρμενα πράξαις ἀνήρ;*; cf. *Σ ad 95a ἀθάνατα φρονεῖ διὰ τὴν παρεστῶσαν εὐφροσύνην*).

Guest-friendship and the poetics of *charis*

In this portrait special attention is paid to the image of the host's 'table' (27), which is developed in detail, as it includes not only strangers but the poet and his poems. Theocritus encourages his addressees to be good hosts, to treat their guests with kindness and not turn them out before they express a wish to depart. The same image is often employed in Pindar's epinicians³³⁸ in the context of the praise of the *laudandus*' hospitality (cf. Gerber (1982) *ad Ol.* 1.30).³³⁹ Pindar associates the image of the victor's dining table with the celebration for the victory and the performance of the epinician ode (*Ol.* 1.16-7 *οἶα παίζομεν φίλαν*³⁴⁰ / *ἄνδρες ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν*). At the same time, it conceptualizes the *laudandus*' hospitality towards everyone (*Ol.* 3.40 *ὄτι πλείστασι βροτῶν / ξεινίαις αὐτοὺς ἐποίχονται τράπεζαις*) and suggests, in this regard, an analogy with Zeus as the protector of guests (*Nem.* 11.8 *καὶ ξείλου Διὸς ἀσκείται Θέμις ἀεναίος / ἐν τραπεζαίῃς*). In one instance, Pindar goes so far as to suggest that the dining table of the victor resembles a sailing boat: the warm reception that his guests and the poet found at

³³⁸ Cf. also fr. 187 Maehler (*ἥρωες αἰδοίαν ἐμείγνυντ' ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν θαμά*) which presents linguistic similarities with *Ol.* 1.17 (*ἄνδρες ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν*). One could suggest that celebratory praxis in Pindar's times imitates heroic celebrations (note the juxtaposition *ἥρωες* ~ *ἄνδρες*). For the parallelism of *laudandi* and Homeric heroes see *Pyth.* 3.113-15 (above). The comparison with Homeric heroes that Theocritus develops in *Idyll* 16, it would seem, follows similar comparisons that run through the whole of Pindar's laudatory discourse.

³³⁹ For the connection with Pindar see esp. Gow (1952) *ad 27*.

³⁴⁰ Calling Hieron's table 'friendly' suggests the friendly ties that connected the poet with his patron; cf. Verdenius (1988) *ad loc.* with further examples and bibliography.

his table will carry his fame like a boat, to the furthest reaches of the world (*Isthm.*

2.39 οὐδέ ποτε **ξενίαν** / οὐρος ἐμπνεύσαις ὑπέστειλ' ἰστίον ἀμφὶ **τράπεζαν**).³⁴¹

Theocritus has fashioned the ideal relationship between the praise poet and his patron after the Pindaric model: it is centred on the idea of mutual ‘affection’ *φιλότης* (13 *τίς εὖ εἰπόντα φιλήσει*; ~ 66 *φιλότητα*) and ‘reciprocity’ *χάρις* (68 *δίζημαι δ' ὅτινι θνατῶν κεχαρισμένος ἔλθω*).³⁴² In lines 68-70 the poet, like his personified poems in the opening lines, represents himself as wandering in search of a suitable patron; in line 4 Theocritus wondered who was liberal enough to receive the poet’s Charites in his house (6) and send them back home with a gift of hospitality (7 *οὐδ' ἀθίς ἀδωρήτους ἀποπέμψει*). Apart from the epinician image of hospitality with which these lines are invested,³⁴³ Theocritus’ conception of the Charites seems like a development of Pindaric usage (cf. Kuiper (1889) 385; Meincke (1965) 38).

Pindar accepts the Hesiodic tradition of a triad of Charites but occasionally employs the singular *Χάρις* in order to denote the personified power that the goddesses convey to their protégés. Since every poem is, or could be thought of as a manifestation of the splendid power of the Charites, each poem is a ‘charis’ itself: *εἶξον, ᾧ Ἀπολλωνιάς· ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος* (*Isthm.* 1.6). In this way, the poet claims to arrive at the place of the performance in the company of the Charites; this could indicate either that the poet travels under the protection of his inspiring goddesses or that he travels with the poems that contain the power of the goddesses (*Pyth.* 9.1-4: *ἐθέλω χαλκάσπιδα Πυθιονίκαν / σὺν βαθυζώνοισιν*

³⁴¹ The idea that guests are instrumental in spreading their host’s fame can be found already in Homer (*Od.* 19.333-4 *τοῦ μὲν τε κλέος ἐνρὺ διὰ ξείνοι φορέουσι / πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, πολλοὶ τέ μιν ἐσθλὸν ἔειπον*); cf. Kyriakou (2004) 223-4 n.6.

³⁴² Cf. Hunter (1996) 97; Kyriakou (2004) 221 n.2.

³⁴³ The image of hospitality is also present in the representation of the relationship between Simonides and his Thessalian patrons; Vahlen (1884) 209 points our attention to the modification *φιλοξείνοισι* for Kreondai in line 39.

ἀγγέλλων / Τελεσικράτη Χαρίτεσσι γεγωνεῖν; *Isthm.* 5.21-2 σὺν Χάρισιν δ' ἔμολον
 Λάμπωνος υἱοῦς / τάνδ' ἐς εὖνομον πόλιν).³⁴⁴ At the same time, the designation of the
 poem as *χάρις* suggests the guest-friendship imagery of epincian poetry: the poem is
 a 'favour' or 'gift' presented to the *laudandus* and his family in return for the feast,
 the reception, and of course, the reward to the poet. Pindar cloaks the financial
 aspect of his relationship with his client in the aristocratic imagery of reciprocity, of
 guest-friendship, of *φιλότης* (cf. Campagner (1988) 80-9: 'reciprocità bilanciata').

The image of Theocritus sending out his personified poems to the houses of
 wealthy men in search of patronage could follow on the image of Pindar sending out
 his poems to his patrons. Hellenistic scholars came up with the concept of the
ἀποστολικὸς ἐπίνικος (*Σ Pyth.* 2.6b) or *ἀποστολικὴ ᾠδή* (*Σ Isthm.* 2 *inscr.* a) to
 describe one scenario for the performance of Pindar's odes: whenever the poet was
 not supposed to be present for the performance of his odes, scholiasts assume that
 he sent the ode along with a chorus (*Σ Pyth.* 2.6b *διὰ γὰρ χοροῦ ἔπεμπε τοὺς*
ἐπινίκους). In some cases, this was supposed to happen without the previous
 invitation or commission of a patron (cf. *Σ Pyth.* 2.127 for fr. 105 Maehler) and this
 could suggest a possible explanation for the scenario that Theocritus has unfolded in
 this idyll. Seen in this light, Theocritus' Charites could be said to resemble the
 choruses that Pindar sent to his patrons to perform his odes. However, Theocritus'
 Charites, at least in the first part of the poem, do not remind one of the glory of their
 Pindaric counterparts. On the contrary, they are mendicant and vagabonds, barefoot
 and miserable: something that has reminded modern scholars of the so-called
Bettelgedichte.³⁴⁵ In view, though, of Theocritus' attitude towards his

³⁴⁴ On the ambiguous meaning of *σὺν* in this use see Kirkwood (1982) and Verdenius (1987) *ad Ol.* 14.5, Giannini (1995) *ad Pyth.* 9.2.

³⁴⁵ See Holzinger (1892) 195, esp. Merkelbach (1952), Austin (1967) 12-3 and Griffiths (1979) 23.

contemporaries after line 60 this depiction could rhetorically emphasize Hieron's welcoming of Theocritus' poems. On the other hand, it could also relate with the (Hellenistic) image of the poor poet who repudiates wealth in favour of poetry.³⁴⁶

The picture of the ideal reception of Theocritus' Charites resembles scenes from Pindar's odes for Chromius, Hieron's general (cf. Kuiper (1889) 385; Perrotta (1925) 21; Gow (1952) *ad* 6; Gutzwiller (1983) 223): in *Nemean* 9 the gates of Chromius' house are wide open 'conquered' by his guest (2-3 *ἐνθ' ἀναπεπταμέναι ξείνων νενίκανται θύραι* ~ Theoc. 16.6 *ἡμετέρας Χάριτας πετάσας ὑποδέξεται οἴκω*). In *Nemean* 1 Pindar represents himself standing at the threshold of Chromius' dining hall, where a glorious dinner has been prepared for him (19-23). In Pindar's eulogistic discourse the banquet which functions as the context for the performance of the epinician ode offers the opportunity to the poet to praise his patron on his liberality towards himself (i.e. Pindar) and his guests. This is, as Pindar explicitly says, a sure means to affect the way in which people talk about one even after one is dead (*Pyth.* 1.90ff.). It is in the same ode³⁴⁷ that Pindar juxtaposes the uselessness of wealth hoarded and kept hidden in the recesses of the house and its effectiveness in benefiting one's people and so securing a good fame (31-2):

*οὐκ ἔραμαι πολὺν ἐν
μεγάρῳ πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις ἔχειν, (31)
ἀλλ' ἐόντων εὖ τε παθεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦ-
σαι φίλοις ἐξαρκέων.*

Pindar suggests that wealth should be used as means of benefit so as to bring joy to the victor's *φίλοι*, a category which typically includes the poet too (cf. e.g. *Pyth.*

³⁴⁶ See esp. Tarditi (1978) and Gutzwiller (1983) 215. Callimachus' *Iambus* 3 (*Dieg.* VI.34-5) *καταμέμφεται τὸν καιρὸν ὡς πλοῦτου / μᾶλλον ἢ ἀρετῆς ὄντα* [...]; *Iambus* 12.67-8 deals with the superiority of song over gold [see also Pfeiffer's *addenda* in vol. ii. pp.118-9]. In fr. 222 Pf., probably also from the *Iambi*, Callimachus rejects avarice suggested by Simonides' poetry. Cf. Tarditi (1978) and Gutzwiller (1983) 215.

³⁴⁷ Theocritus obviously depended on *Nemean* 1 for *Idyll* 24.

10.65-6 τόδ' ἔζευξεν ἄρμα Πιερίδων τετράορον / φιλέων φιλέοντ', ἄγων ἄγοντα
 προφρόνως).³⁴⁸ The underlying concept of *φιλότης* implies a kind of friendship that is binding, involves reciprocal pledges and is sealed with sacrifices. The term is usually coupled with *ξένος* and suggests 'the behaviour incumbent on a member of the community towards a 'guest-stranger' (Benveniste (1973) 278). In light of this, Pindar's suggestion to Chromius means that wealth is to be spent in honour of the *laudandus*' guest as a form of munificence; this would in return bring him good fame. Any defiance of this precept can have grave effects on the patron's 'fame': in *Pythian* 1 Pindar employs the image of cruel Phalaris to bring this home to Hieron. Hostile is the reputation (96 ἐχθρὰ φάτις) that holds fast (κατέχει) Phalaris (as Aetna previously in the same poem kept Typhos captured); the sound of the lyres in the banquet do not 'welcome him to the soft embrace of boy's voices' (tr. Nisetich).

Following *Nemean* 1, Theocritus wonders about the advantage of keeping one's gold inside the house (22 δαιμόνιοι, τί δὲ κέρδος ὁ μύριος ἔνδοθι χρυσός / κείμενος;).³⁴⁹ In a related passage (*Isthm.* 1.67-8) that Theocritus could have had in mind,³⁵⁰ Pindar bewails the short-sightedness of the miser who keeps his wealth hidden at home (εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κορυφαῖον) without investing it in honourable activities (ἄλλοισι δ' ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ);³⁵¹ little does he realize that he too will give his soul as payment to Hades (Farnell (1932) *ad* 68) but without the glory he could have acquired (ψυχὰν Ἄϊδαι τελέων οὐ φράζεται δόξας ἀνευθεν).

³⁴⁸ For *φιλότης* in Pindar and its connection with *ξενία* see e.g. Bowra (1964) 387-8. Cf. also p. 60 n. 117 above.

³⁴⁹ Cf. Kuiper (1889) 386, Cholmeley (1901) *ad loc.*, Perrotta (1925) 17, Dover (1971) *ad loc.* Vahlen (1884) 206 rightly stressed that, from a contextual point of view, ἔνδοθι here answers ἐξ ἐμεῦ οἴσεται οὐδέν (21) 'from inside my house'.

³⁵⁰ Cf. Kuiper (1889) 385, Cholmeley (1901) *ad* 31, Perrotta (1925) 18, Gow (1951) and Dover (1971) *ad* 22, Gutzwiller (1983) 225, Sbardella (2004) 72.

³⁵¹ The meaning of this phrase is debated; see Thummer (1969) and Privitera (1982) *ad loc.*

Interestingly, in this context *κέρδος* does not retain its negative connotations as an impediment to securing an everlasting fame (63 *φιλοκερδείη*). Used in the right way, gold can indeed become an advantage to the wealthy man, a benefit to his soul (24) and posthumous fame. This, however, entails not hoarding wealth but spending it in benefactions, in *ἔργα ἐσθλά* to use Theocritus' words (14).

So far one does not get any instance of athletic achievements or of heroic prowess like the ones celebrated by Simonides and Homer respectively. On the contrary, the fame that Theocritus promises to his contemporary is predicated entirely on financial means and its employment, unless one is to believe that they will be praised for acts of benefaction that Theocritus suggests to them in lines 24-9. On the other hand, in the praise of Hieron Theocritus focuses only on his (future) military exploits in the fight against the Carthaginians and the ensuing peace and stability for Sicily and keeps silent on his liberality and benefactions.

The poet's creed

Just before turning to the explicit praise of Hieron, which presumably forms the climax of the whole poem, Theocritus will turn to Pindaric 'rhetoric' once more in an attempt to strengthen his basic point about the appropriate use of one's wealth. Having established the privileged position of bards thanks to their divinely given power to confer immortality with their work, Theocritus employs his own personal stance as the most important example, after the series examples (34-57), to convey his message (cf Meincke (1965) 56-8). He employs a priamel to project his complete disagreement with the short-sighted venality exhibited by his contemporaries (63-7):

*χαιρέτω ὅστις τοῖος, ἀνήριθμος δέ οἱ εἴη
ἄργυρος, αἰεὶ δὲ πλεόνων ἔχοι ἕμερος αὐτόν·* (65)

*αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τιμὴν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων φιλότητα
πολλῶν ἡμιόνων τε καὶ ἵππων πρόσθεν ἐλοίμαν.*

The efficacy of this as a means to bring around men ‘hurt’ by profit-mongering is limited, as is indicated by the *adynata* in lines 61-2, but it suggests the ‘sincerity’ of a poet who employs what he ‘preaches’ as a guide in his life.³⁵² The technique had been used in a laudatory context by Pindar and allows the poet to assume the point of view of his audience, to become one of them (cf. Griffiths (1979) 33).³⁵³ Scholars have picked up an allusion to *Nemean* 8 (cf. Cholmeley (1901), Gow (1952), Dover (1971) *ad* 66; Clapp (1913) 312-3, Perrotta (1925) 17, Meincke (1965) 58 n.3):

*εἴη μή ποτέ μοι τοιοῦτον ἦθος, (35)
Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους (35)
ἀπλόαις ζωᾶς ἐφαπτοίμαν, θανῶν ὡς παισὶ κλέος
μὴ τὸ δύσφραμον προσάψω. χρυσὸν εὔχον-
ται, πεδίον δ' ἕτεροι (37)
ἀπέραντον, ἐγὼ δ' ἀστοῖς ἀδῶν καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι,
αἰνέων αἰνήτά, μομφὰν δ' ἐπισπείρων ἀλιτροῖς.*

The implications of the priamel are of crucial importance for establishing the profile of the poet in both poems. The attitude of the poet is juxtaposed with that of unnamed other (*Nem.* 8: ἕτεροι ~ ἐγὼ διέ) or with a stereotypical figure (*Theoc.* 16 ὅστις τοῖος ~ αὐτὰρ ἐγώ). The poet of praise rejects earthly riches, be they gold, silver (*Nem.* 8. 37 ~ *Theoc.* 16.65) or cattle (the reference probably to the cattle of Simonides’ Thessalian patrons); the rejection is either stated by the meaning of the verb employed (*Nem.* 8.37 εὔχονται) or by the mood selected (*Theoc.* 16.67 ἐλοίμαν ~ *Nem.* 8.36 ἐφαπτοίμαν). Instead the poet prefers to spend his life in the enjoyment of the honour (*Theoc.* 16.66 τιμὴν ~ 29 τίειν ἱεροῦς ὑποφήτας) and friendship (*Nem.*

³⁵² For the twisting of the encomiastic use of *adynata* in Pindar’s poetry (*Ol.* 2.98; 13.45-6) see Gutzwiller (1983) 229.

³⁵³ For Pindar’s use of the first person in admonitions see esp. Bundy (1986) 85 (“persuasive hortatory soliloquy”) and Young (1968) 58, (1971) 10-2 (“first- person indefinite”); cf. also Hubbard (1985) 145-8 with more details and Schmid (1998) 170-1.

8.38 ἀστοῖς ἀδῶν ~ Theoc. 16.66 φιλότητα) accorded him by the community. In this way, he himself guarantees a good fame not only for himself but for his descendants as well (*Nem.* 8.36-7). *Nem.* 8.38 projects an image of Pindar as the generic praise poet embedded in the bipolar antithesis of praise (αἶνος) and criticism (ψόγος). The poet needs to resort to either of these two extremes in the right measure and according to the situation at hand; being fair in this respect wins him the respect of his community. Even if Theocritus did not say this in such explicit terms, his whole idyll is articulated on this antithetical pair: he castigates the majority of the contemporary élite for their venality but praises Hieron for his valour. Pindar prays to Zeus to sustain him in the continuous selection of the path of simplicity, the path of truthfulness, and so deliver him from the shame that slanderous words can cause (cf. the story of Ajax' suicide in the previous lines 25-35 see n. 354 below). Theocritus, on the other hand, caps his priamel with a prayer that the Muses may protect him in all his wanderings in search for a right patron. This again juxtaposes his attitude with that of his mean contemporaries, who shun the Charites and their gifts (cf. Kyriakou (2004) 237). The technique of prayers is thus utilized by Theocritus to emphasize his despair and obliquely his praise of Hieron.

The praise of Hieron

Hieron's praise comprises three scenes. First, comes the description of Hieron as he puts on his armour to face his enemies. The scene is modelled on Homeric scenes of heroes preparing to go out on the battlefield and prefigures Hieron's ἀριστεία (cf. Meincke (1965) 65 with n. 3). The association with the Homeric world is suggested

with the explicit comparison of Hieron with Achilles and Ajax (see above).³⁵⁴ Theocritus does not dwell on the battle *per se* but instead introduces a prayer to Zeus for the victory of Hieron. Within the prayer Theocritus depicts the serenity that Sicily will experience thanks to Hieron's protection of it. Hieron, it seems, introduces a new golden age where peace dominates and weapons stay unused.³⁵⁵

Furthermore, the scene recalls images and themes introduced previously in the poem. The image of the 'countless thousands of sheep that graze and bleat on the fields' looks back to 'the countless silver' that the poet had previously wished for the profit-monger: (90-1) *αἰ δ' ἀνάριθμοι / μῆλων χιλιάδες βοτάναι διαπιανθεῖσαι / ἄμ πεδίον βληχῶντο* ~ (64-5) *ἀνήριθμος δέ οἱ εἶη / ἄργυρος*. Similarly, the image of

³⁵⁴ Pindar mentions Ajax mainly in his Aeginetan odes as a member of the illustrious clan of the Aeacids in order to stress their hereditary prowess (*Nem.* 4.48; *Isthmian* 6 [cf. *Bacch.* 13.104]). On the whole, Pindar follows Homer (e.g. *Il.* 2.768-9; 17.279-80) in his representation of Ajax as a valiant warrior, the best after Achilles (*Nem.* 7.26 *κράτιστον Ἀχιλῆος ἄτερ μάχαι* [...]; *Nem.* 2.14 *ἐν Τροίῃ Ἐκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν*; *Isthm.* 6.53 *λαῶν / ἐν πόνοισ ἐκπαγλον Ἐνναλίου*; fr. 184 Maehler *ὑπερμενῆς ἀκαμαντοχάρμαν Αἴαν*). In most odes (*Nem.* 7.26; 8.27; *Isthm.* 3.53) Ajax is associated with the *ὄπλων κρίσις*, a post-Iliadic episode treated either in the *Aethiopsis* or in the *Little Iliad*. Pindar's utilization of material stemming from the epic cycle gives a precedent for Theocritus' employment of similar material in lines 47-50. In addition, these three last cases are of interest for this idyll, as the narration of the episode is embedded in the 'discussion' of the power of poetry to enhance or damage the fame of a worthy hero (cf. Thummer (1968) 131), one of Theocritus' main arguments in *Idyll* 16. Ajax is the victim of *φθόνος par excellence* (*Nem.* 8.22-3; cf. *Ol.* 1.46-51 but *Pyth.* 1.85 *κρέσσον γὰρ οἰκτιρμοῦ φθόνος*) who suffers under the malicious lies of his opponents (*ibid.* 25-6, 32-4). The wrong that Ajax' comrades committed against him (*Nem.* 7.25-30) has been put right by Homer, who has praised him throughout all men (*Isthm.* 4.55 *τετίμακεν διὰ ἀνθρώπων*) and so rendered all his deeds immortal for future generations (*ibid.* 56-8), an 'inextinguishable ray of fair exploits' (59-60). As has already been seen above, Homer is marshalled as the model of immortalizing praise poet (*ibid.* 40-1 *τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἔρπει, / εἴ τις εἶπῃ τι*) who can even enhance the 'ambiguous' status of a great hero like Ajax (cf. Bury (1892) 51-2; Thummer (1969) *ad* 55; Privitera (1982) 51). At the same time, it is suggested, it is the responsibility of the poet to protect his *laudandus* against such lies by following the path of truthfulness (*ibid.* 35-9). Theocritus' mention of Ajax focuses on this last part only. At any rate, one could argue that Theocritus' vision of Ajax in epic discourse is filtered through a Pindaric lens esp. in *Isthmian* 4 (cf. also Perrotta (1925) 19-20; Dover (1971) *ad* 34-57; Sbardella (2004) 76).

³⁵⁵ Vahlen (1884) noted the allusion in 94-5 to Alcaeus fr. 347.3 Liberman (*ἄχει δ' ἐκ πετάλων ἄδεια τέτιξ*) which reworks Hesiod's *Op.* 582-96 (see Liberman (1999) ii. 150). Hieron's rule is represented as the carefree rustic world of Hesiod and Alcaeus where simple men combine hard work with the enjoyment of wine. The graphic detail about spiders making their webs on the weapons is borrowed from Bacchylides' *Paeon* for Apollo Pythiaeus (fr. 4.69-70 Sn. -M.). It is also found in Sophocles *Inachus* fr. 286 Radt (*πάντα δ' ἐρίθων ἀραχνᾶν βρίθει*) and Euripides *Erechtheus* fr. 369 Kannicht (*κείσθω δόρυ μοι μίτον ἀμφιπλέκειν ἀράχνας / μετὰ δ' ἠσυχίας πολιοῦ γῆρας συνοικῶν*) [cf. Treu (1963) 288], but the context is contested in both cases: see Radt *ad* fr. 286 and Pearson (1917) i *ad loc.* 'sign of decay'. For the same image see also Tibullus 1.10.50 and Nonnus 38.13.

men toiling in the abundant fields (89-90) presents a positive version of the image of the field-worker in lines 32-3. On the whole, this part insists on the reversal of the negativity of previous lines, something which also includes the representation of the poet and his Charites (cf. Griffiths (1979) 34). Wealth is not counted in silver or gold but shown by the abundance of the fields (90 ἀγροὺς τεθαλότας), the countless flocks that graze on the fields (91) and the herds of oxen (92 βόες δ' ἀγεληδόν). The praise of Hieron is articulated on the basis of two antithetical images, waging war and peaceful living as a consequence of his victories on the battlefield (cf. Griffiths (1979) 16). In this respect, the praise songs offered by poets to Hieron are qualitatively different: Hieron is praised as a soldier (αἰχμητής), not as a wealthy man. He is the opposite of the men who are only interested in amassing gold; he rushes to noble deeds as Theocritus says in lines 14-15, deeds which, as the comparison with Achilles and Ajax makes evident, fall in the category of the Homeric κλέα ἀνδρῶν (2). In a way, this is an effective answer to the ludicrous responses of Theocritus' miserly contemporaries who retorted to Theocritus' 'pleas' that 'Homer is enough for all';³⁵⁶ the example, and more importantly the quality, of Hieron's praise puts to the test the validity of such an arrogant claim. Homeric discourse can be successfully employed in the praise of soldiers like Hieron. Theocritus, then, employs Pindaric *gnomai* to bring home to his readers the preposterousness of their aspiration to Homeric praise. Two traditions and two poetic images, those of Homer and Pindar juxtaposed to form the profile of the Hellenistic poet of praise.

³⁵⁶ For a different interpretation see Sbardella (2004) 80-1. Theocritus' style is not even close enough to the convoluted Pindaric idiom to claim any distance from Homer's poetry, as Sbardella claims. Though Theocritus' encomiastic poetry may be finer than most Hellenistic encomiastic poems – even this is a precarious claim in view of the limited number of texts – he does not accuse his contemporaries of lack of taste or refinement but rather of meanness.

The same combination of Homeric and epinician laudatory discourse is found in this part of the poem. Indubitably the representation of Hieron brings to mind the great Iliadic heroes. Nonetheless, Theocritus' prayer to Zeus looks like an imitation of Pind. *Pyth.* 1.67-80.³⁵⁷ The connection of the two poems seems to have occurred to ancient readers as well (cf. *Σ ad 76a*):

ἤδη νῦν Φοίνικες ὑπ' ἡελίῳ δύνοντι: τοὺς
 Καρχηδονίαν οἰκοῦντάς φησι Φοίνικας. οὔτοι γὰρ
 συνεχῶς ἐπεστράτευσαν Συρακουσίοις, ὡς λέγεται καὶ
 παρὰ Πινδάρῳ (*Pyth.* I 73—75).

Pindar addresses only Zeus, who functions as foil to Hieron in his capacity as a ruler (see also pp. 240-3 below). Theocritus also includes Athena, Demeter and Persephone. Pindar's prayer concerns the future of the newly founded city. He prays for harmony in public life and mutual respect between citizens and their ruler. Zeus is asked to keep the new city safe from the danger posed by the Phoenicians and the Etruscans. Their defeat at the sea-battle of Cumae is represented in moral terms as a hubris that caused the loss of their fleet and more importantly of their young men. The punishment that Zeus inflicted on them should restrict their incomprehensible battle cries at home; this resembles Aetna holding Typhon down (*Pyth.* 19-20 ... κίων δ' οὐρανία συνέχει, / νιφόεσσ' Αἴτνα ... ~ 72 ὄφρα κατ' οἶκον ὁ Φοίνιξ ὁ Τυρσανῶν τ' ἀλαλατὸς ἔχηι ...).

In Theocritus' text Hieron's enemies will keep away from Sicily because anguish (85 *κακαὶ ἀνάγκαι*) will preserve some of his enemies as messengers; they will bring back to the women in their country the news of sons' and husbands' death. One misses the solemn religious tone of Pindar's image. The role to be accorded to the surviving Phoenicians by cruel fate is parallel to that of the praise

³⁵⁷ Cf. Cholmeley (1901), Gow (1952), Dover (1971) *ad* 82-103; Perrotta (1925) 23-4, Griffiths (1979) 38, Hunter (1996) 84-7.

poet and the table of hospitality. Phoenicians will tell stories of what a formidable opponent Hieron was. Their testimony serves the praise of the *laudandus* and reifies Theocritus' poetic claim about Hieron's fame travelling to far off places.³⁵⁸ In both poems the activity of the *laudandus*, it is hoped, will keep the (inarticulate) sound of war away from the harmonious life led under his rule.³⁵⁹

The poem ends with Theocritus' address to the Charites, who are now seen in all their Pindaric splendour. The last lines offer a succinct version of the Pindaric ideology of *charis* and the role Theocritus hopes to play in the praise of Hieron's future successes. Theocritus declares that he enjoys the love of the Charites (101) and wishes that they will interest themselves from now on in the praise of Hieron and his people (102-3). The context suggests the Pindaric idea of Charis as a divine power which grants longevity to great feats celebrated through the medium of poetry (cf. Hunter (1996) 90): *ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει, / ὄ τι κεν σὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι / γλῶσσα φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας* (*Nem.* 4.7-8).³⁶⁰ This is one part of the picture: the benevolent power of Charis will be channelled through Theocritus' poetry. The poem ends with a question which has an ambiguous rhetorical function (108-9). *τί γὰρ Χαρίτων ἀγαπατόν / ἀνθρώποις ἀπάνευθεν*; asks Theocritus. His answer assumes the form of a wish: *ἀεὶ Χαρίτεσσιν ἄμ' εἶην* "may I always be in the

³⁵⁸ This recalls a well-known epinician motif describing the spread of the victor's fame (cf. Perrotta (1925), Gow (1952), Dover (1971) *ad* 99-100). Already in the *Odyssey* Odysseus arrogantly claims that his *kleos* reaches the sky above (9. 20 *καὶ μὲν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει*); epinician poets transformed the motif in such a way that the victor's fame is represented travelling to two geographically opposite places: in *Isthmian* 6 Peleus's *kleos* travels to legendary places, the Nile's sources to the east and to the Hyperborean's to the north-west (22-5; see Thummer (1969) *ad loc.*). The motif is found again in Callimachus' epinician for Sosibius (see pp. 33-5 above).

³⁵⁹ It could well be that Theocritus took advantage of Hieron's name to imply a comparison with Hieron I, whose fame was rendered immortal by Pindar (cf. Holzinger (1892) 194-5; Clapp (1913) 311; Perrotta (1925) 22-3; Meincke (1965) 80; Hunter (1996) 83; Sbardella (2004) 69; Willi (2004) 32).

³⁶⁰ See Carne-Ross (1985) 111-112 and Kurke (1991) 143-5. For the motif of the poet as purveyor of poetic immortality see e.g. *Isthm.* 4. 55-60 with Nisetich (1989) 13-14. The mention of the coming generations in *Isthm.* 4.57 (*θεσπεσιῶν ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν*) is akin to that expressed in *Pyth.* 1.92-3 (*ὀπιθόμβροτον αὔχημα δόξας*). See also Gundert (1935) 22 and 28.

company of the Charites”. From a contextual point of view, the Charites prove themselves more hospitable than the poet’s contemporaries in offering him a shelter. Still, the first-person wish could be perceived as an indirect admonition to Hieron II following well-known Pindaric practice (see n. 353 above). In this way, Theocritus would urge Hieron obliquely to realize the benefits of his poetic talent. Benefits which recapitulate the essence of Pindar’s *Charis* as the source of everything sweet and joyful in the lives of humans (cf. *Ol.* 14.5-6 κλῆτ’, ἐπεὶ εὐχομαι· σὺν γὰρ ὑμῶν τά <τε> τερπνὰ καί/ τὰ γλύκε’ ἄνεται πάντα βροτοῖς).

Epilogue

Idyll 16 is not an ordinary praise poem; a comparison with *Idyll* 17 shows that such a generic tag might prevent us from grasping the polyvalence of the poem’s imagery.³⁶¹ The idyll is constructed in such a way as to allude to a variety of generic modes (hymn, iambus, epinician ode, epic, bucolic, and encomium). *Idyll* 16 has affinities with all these genres, but at the same time is none of them. In a poem of a protean nature, which constantly transforms itself, the invocation of the Graces, the inspirers of suitable poetic style and imagery, emphasizes the poet’s attempt to define his poetic identity (cf. Vox (2002) 193-4). The poem purports to be just a eulogy of Hieron; instead of that the poet give us a taste of what his talent is capable of (cf. Griffiths (1979) 9, 12, 46-7).

Emblematic of the transformations that the poet’s discourse undergoes during this poem is the transformation of the Charites themselves: from the pauper Charites, personifications of Theocritus’ idylls, at the beginning of the poem they reveal themselves at the last lines in all their ancient splendour as the primordial and

³⁶¹ See, however, Perrotta (1925) 5-8 on the similarities between the two poems.

powerful deities of Orchomenus (cf. Perrotta (1925) 12). The mention of Orchomenus, cultic seat of the Charites from time immemorial, is generally agreed to allude to Pindar's *Olympian* 14, a short epinician ode which adopts the form of a hymn to the tutelary deities of the victor's home (*Ol.* 14.3-4 ᾠ λιπαρᾶς ἀοίδιμοι βασιλειαί / Χάριτες Ὀρχομενοῦ, παλαιογόνων Μινυᾶν ἐπίσκοποι ... ~ 105-6 ᾠ Ἐτεόκλειοι Χάριτες θεαί, Μινύειον / Ὀρχομενὸν φιλέοισαι ...).³⁶² The mendicant, barefoot Charites at the beginning of *Idyll* 16 bear little resemblance to Pindar's goddesses (cf. Clapp (1913) 311). On the other hand, their appearance in all their majesty in the final lines of the poem is close to their Pindaric representation in *Olympian* 14. There the Charites are depicted as omnipotent goddesses; their sphere of influence embraces Olympus, earth and Hades. On Olympus they entertain the gods at their feasts and so hold a position analogous to that of the mortal poet (9-12): ἀλλὰ πάντων ταμίαι / ἔργων ἐν οὐρανῶι, χρυσότοξον θέμεναι πάρα / Πύθιον Ἀπόλλωνα θρόνους, / αἰέναον σέβοντι πατρὸς Ὀλυμπίου τιμάν. Interestingly, the feast of the gods and the role of the Charites within it assume universal importance as part of Zeus's rule. The Charites' 'performances' on Olympus are meant as praise of the universal order that Zeus has established as king of the gods.³⁶³ In their capacity as eulogists, so to speak, they offer a prototype for the mortal poet who similarly transforms the occasion of the athletic victory into a praise of the divine order. The allusion to this Pindaric poem at the very end of this remarkable idyll serves to evoke the image of Pindar, present throughout the poem,

³⁶² Cf. Holzinger (1892) 194-6, Cholmeley (1901) *ad* 104-8; Perrotta (1925) 15; Meincke (1965) 71 with n.2; Hunter (1996) 83-4.

³⁶³ For the Charites' role in divine performances see Verdenius (1987) 104-6. In *h.Ap.* 189-207 it is the Muses that sing the immortal gifts of gods and the sufferings of men (190-1 ὑμνεῦσιν ῥα θεῶν δῶρ' ἄμβροτα ἢ δ' ἀνθρώπων / τλημοσύνας [...]), while the Charites and the Horae dance with the rest of the gods (203-5). On the ambiguous θεῶν δῶρ' ἄμβροτα which form part of the Muses' song see Richardson (2010) *ad* 189-193. On the other hand, Theognis (15-17) represents both Muses and Charites as singing at the wedding of Cadmus and Harmonia.

as the praise poet *par excellence*. At the same time it sets this image in perspective as it represents it in comparison with the activity of the Charites on Olympus. Theocritus offers Hieron an intertextual glimpse of the festal atmosphere his poetry can create, an image that complements and completes the bucolic depiction of peace in lines 87–100.

CHAPTER 7

**The mytho-poetics of praise: Heracles' strangling the snakes in Pindar
and Theocritus**

Introduction: the myth in pre-Hellenistic poetry

Theocritus' *Idyll* 24, entitled the *Heraclicus* in our manuscripts,³⁶⁴ narrates a scene from Heracles' life: his killing of the two snakes sent by Hera to devour the new-born baby. Heracles is a popular figure in Hellenistic poetry (cf. e.g. Theoc. 13, [25], Call. *Aetia* I fr. 26-7 Massimilla, and *VB*). His popularity could be attributed to the hero's importance as an ancestor of the royal house of Macedon for Ptolemaic propaganda.³⁶⁵ As far as we can tell nowadays, this mythological episode had been treated in poetry before Theocritus only by Pindar who, along with some contemporary depictions on Attic red-figure vases and Pherecydes,³⁶⁶ is also our earliest source.³⁶⁷ Pindar recounted this miraculous exploit twice: in *Nemean* 1 (476

³⁶⁴ In the Antinoë Papyrus the poem bears the inscription *Ἡρακλίσκος Δωρίδι*. On the titles of Theocritus' idylls see Gow (1952) i. lxxix–lxxx.

³⁶⁵ See also the so-called Adulis Inscription of Ptolemy III (*OGIS* 54.4-5 [= Kosmas Ind., *Topogr. Chr.* 2.58-9]) *ἀπόγονος, τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ πατρὸς Ἡρακλῆος τοῦ Διός, τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ μητρὸς Διονύσου τοῦ Διός* [...]. Cf. Tondriau (1950) 397-8. One should also take into account the artistic representations of reigning Ptolemies as Heracles, especially on coins; cf. Tondriau (1950) 404-5 and Palagia (1986) 142-4. On the bronze statuettes representing Ptolemy II Philadelphus as Herakliskos killing the snakes see Laubscher (1997) and below.

³⁶⁶ The story is treated around the same time by Pherecydes of Athens (fr. 13b-c + 69a-b Fowler). Pherecydes did not follow Pindar's versions: fr. 69 a-b Fowler suggest that in his account it was Amphitryon, not Hera, who sent the snakes so as to check whether Heracles was really his son or Zeus'. We do not know what the basis for Amphitryon's suspicions was. Still, it appears that the aim of the test was to reveal Heracles' divine parentage. There is no agreement in our sources about the time when this event took place in Pherecydes' narrative (nine months after Zeus visited Alcmene (fr.13c.25 Fowler); when the babies were eight months or one year old (fr.69a and 69b Fowler respectively), although I find the version of fr. 13c the more likely, as it agrees with our other testimonies for the myth, I cannot explain the origin of the other two. See also n. 373 below.

³⁶⁷ The earliest representations come from Athens and generally date from the early fifth century; on the whole see Woodford *LIMG* iv.1: 831. These comprise (i) a *stamnos* in the Louvre (Louvre G 192 = *ARV*² 208.160 = 201979 Beazley Archive) by the Berlin Painter (c. 480 BCE), (ii) a crater in Perugia (Mus. Naz. 73 = *ARV*² 516 = 205787 Beazley Archive) probably by the Mykonos Painter (c. 475 BCE), (iii) a fragment from a cup in Leipzig (T 3365 = *ARV*² 559.151 = 206397 Beazley Archive) by the Pan Painter (c. 470 BCE), and (iv) a hydria in New York (MMA 25. 28 = *ARV*² 1110.41 = 214681

BCE?), addressed to Hieron's general, Chromius, and in a fragment (fr. 52u Maehler [= *POxy.* 2442 fr. 32 col. i]) which probably derives from a *prosodion*.³⁶⁸ Still, one lacks more information concerning its wider presence, if there was any, in classical literature.³⁶⁹ Despite our fragmented perception of the literary (and cultural) history of the myth, it is to be expected that any educated reader, let alone an erudite Hellenistic poet, would connect Theocritus' idyll with Pindar's versions.³⁷⁰ Furthermore, if Pindar was the first poet ever to deal with this episode, as some scholars have assumed (e.g. Farnell (1930) 161), Hellenistic poets would have assigned to Pindar's versions a canonical status and could have hardly ignored them in their reworking of the same myth (cf. Effe (1980) 162). Yet we have only slight evidence that would suggest that Pindar was the first to treat this episode: (i) the short-lived interest that Athenian vase painters showed for this episode in the first half of the 5th century roughly at the same time as Pindar's versions were written and (ii) Pindar's (not very helpful) testimony. All that Pindar says is that the myth was an 'old story' (35 ἀρχαῖος λόγος). *λόγος*, a common enough word in Pindar, is usually understood here to mean a 'fabula mythologica et poetica' which has been preserved in the collective memory of the community (cf. Rumpel (1883) s.v. 3).³⁷¹ On the

Beazley Archive) by the Nausicaa Painter (c. 460-450 BCE). For the possibility that these representations reflect the popularity of Pindar's first *Nemean* ode see Moret (1998) 90 and below. This episode was also the theme of a lost painting by Zeuxis (Pliny, *Nat.* 35. 63).

³⁶⁸ In the most recent editions of Snell-Maehler and Race the fragment is placed without any plausible reason among the *Paeans*. This classification has been lately brought into question by D'Alessio (1997) 37 and Rutherford (2001) 401, who have proposed instead that the fragment derived from a *prosodion* (Rutherford 2001: 406). For *prosodion* see Färber (1936) 30-1 and Fowler (1987) 93.

³⁶⁹ Farnell's (1932) 247 *ad* 33-59 assertion that 'as in the earlier epic poem of Peisandros of Rhodes the slaying of the Nemean Lion was made his first exploit, there was probably no mention of the infantine feat' is unwarranted. We lack information about the structure of this epic, which could have presented this episode in the form of a flashback narrative.

³⁷⁰ However, and this needs to be stressed, this connection reflects only a part of the possible intertextual associations that ancient readers would make while reading Theocritus' poem.

³⁷¹ In other passages Pindar employs this term to distinguish between poetic and prose discourses: in *Nemean* 6 (30 ἀοιδαὶ καὶ λόγοι τὰ καλὰ σφιν ἔργ' ἐκόμισαν [ἀοιδοὶ καὶ λόγοι codd. and *PBerol.* 16367]) Pindar draws a distinction between poems and *logoi* which here seem to refer to tales or stories found in prose chronicles (cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. *λόγιος* A. I.; Rumpel (1883) and Slater (1969) s.v. and *Σ ad Ol.* 7. 100a-101 and *ad Nem.* 6. 50) and possibly not dealt with in poetry before – although this is never

other hand, ἀρχαῖος emphasizes the antiquity of the story. One could read this as attempt on Pindar's part to envelop his myth, not represented in lyric poetry before, with the authority that only tradition can confer.³⁷²

Establishing the intertextual relationship

As we have already seen in the case of other poems, the ancient scholia are a source likely to furnish modern readers with bits and pieces of the intertextual connections that the text suggested to (Hellenistic) educated readers. Unfortunately, in the case of fr. 52u Maehler and *Idyll* 24 we lack such evidence altogether, because they survive without scholia. On the other hand, *Nemean* 1 has come down to us with a full apparatus of scholia. It is worth mentioning that the association between *Idyll* 24 and *Nemean* 1 from which our discussion proceeds was perceived already in the Pindaric scholia: Σ *ad* Pind. *Nem.* 1.56 is a clear indication that (some) ancient readers brought the two texts into connection so as to compare the mythological information provided by them:

διδύμω σὺν κασιγνήτῳ: τῷ Ἴφικλεῖ. ἐναντίως τῷ Θεοκρίτῳ.
ἐκεῖνος γὰρ φησι (24, 2)· καὶ νυκτὶ νεώτερον Ἴφικλῆα.

explicitly spelled out in our sources. The same distinction appears again in *Pythian* 1 (92-94 *ὀπιθόμβροτον αὔχημα δόξας / οἶον ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει / καὶ λογιόις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς*). Σ *ad* *Pyth.* 1.181b again renders this as ἀοιδοῖς μὲν τοῖς ποιηταῖς, λογιόις δὲ τοῖς πεζογράφοις. Cf. von Fritz (1967) ii. 343 and Loscalzo (2003) 78 with n. 167.

³⁷² In *Ol.* 7.55 Pindar refers to the myth of the creation of Rhodos as *παλαιαὶ ῥήσιες ἀνθρώπων*. Σ *ad* *Ol.* 7. 101 notes that the story is not found before Pindar. Verdenius (1987) *ad loc.* argues that this was an attempt on Pindar's part to disguise his invention of the story (cf. Lehnus (1981) *ad loc.*); differently Farnell (1932) *ad loc.* On the other hand, Telepolemus' colonization of the island is narrated in Hom. *Il.* 2.657-70. It is unclear if this could suggest by analogy that Pindar came up with the myth of *Nemean* 1 as well. In the *Iliad* Heracles is the son of Zeus (14.323; 19.95-133), although he is once called *κρατερὸς πάϊς Ἀμφιτρύωνος* (5.392; cf. *Od.* 11.270). *Il.* 19.95-133 tells of his birth but does not include the story of the two snakes. Generally, most of Pindar's myths about Heracles can also be found in the *Iliad*: e.g. attack on Pylos (*Ol.* 9.30-5? ~ *Il.* 5.395-7; 11.683-93); sack of Laomedon's Troy (*Isthm.* 1.25-30; fr. 140a Maehler ~ *Il.* 5.638-51; 20. 145-8); arrival on Cos (fr. 33a ~ *Il.* 14.250-61; 15.18-30). We cannot tell if this tale was unknown to Homer. Still, this would not be the first myth about Heracles not found in Homer: foundation of Olympic Games (*Ol.* 10.44-85) or the story of the olive tree in Olympia and the deer with the golden antlers (*Olympian* 3). For Heracles in the *Iliad* see West (2011) 30-2.

The interest in this note falls on the mythological material and not on the appreciation of the literary affinities between the two texts: the scholiast indicates the discrepancy between the two accounts in respect of a rather petty detail: in *Nem.* 1.36 Pindar presented Heracles and Iphicles as twins, while Theocritus (24.2) presented Iphicles as younger by one night.³⁷³ Still, the comparison is suggestive of a literary track that, in all probability, Theocritus would have followed as a reader before he composed his own version and would have expected his readers to follow in reading or hearing his text.³⁷⁴

The following discussion will offer a close comparison of the structure of the three poems in an attempt to highlight the differences that Theocritus brought about vis-à-vis his Pindaric model. I will then try to account for these differences by embedding them within the literary and cultural ambience of Hellenistic Alexandria.

³⁷³ It is usually assumed that Theocritus diverged from Pindar in placing the event ten months after Heracles' birth. Dover (1971) 252 understood this as a realistic touch under the influence of Pherecydes' version (fr. 69a-b Fowler; see, however, n. 366 above); cf. also Horstmann (1976) 58 n. 186, Otto (2009) 150. However, this assumption is open to doubts. Theoc. 24.1 (*Ἡρακλέα δεκάμηνον ἔοντα*) seems to recall Pherecydes' fr. 13c.25 Fowler (*ἤδη δὲ ἐκείνης δεκαμηνιαῖον χρόνον τῆς μίξεως ἐχούσης γεννᾶται Ἡρακλῆς*). *δεκαμηνιαῖος* / *δεκάμηνος* is to be reckoned inclusively, i.e. 'in the ninth month of the pregnancy' counting from Zeus' visit; for inclusive reckoning see Richardson (2004: 11). In my opinion, Theocritus' version agrees with Pindar's (and especially with fr. 13 Fowler of Pherecydes) in placing the event, if not on the day of Heracles' birth, still soon after his birth. So, *δεκάμηνος* should be rendered as follows: "Heracles when he was born in the ninth month" ≈ "newly born"). This reading is supported by Moschus *Megara* 84-5 (*ἐπεὶ δέκα μῆνας ἔκαμνον / πρὶν καὶ πέρ τ' ἰδεῖν μιν ἐμῶι ὑπὸ ἧπατ' ἔχουσα*) and Ovid *Met.* 9.285-9 (*namque laboriferi cum iam natalis adesset / Herculis et decimum premeretur sidere signum* [...]) with Hill's (1999) note *ad loc.* Furthermore, in Greek and Latin normal pregnancies are said to last ten months: cf. *h.Mer.* 10 (*τῆ δ' ἤδη δέκατος μείς οὐρανῶ ἐστήρικτο*); Hdt. VI.63.1 (*ἐν δὲ οἱ χρόνῳ ἐλάσσοι καὶ οὐ πληρώσασα τοὺς δέκα μῆνας ἡ γυνὴ αὐτῆ τίκτει τοῦτον δὴ τὸν Δημάρητον*); VI.69.5 (*τίκτουσι γὰρ γυναῖκες καὶ ἐννεάμηνα καὶ ἐπτάμηνα, καὶ οὐ πᾶσαι δέκα μῆνας ἐκτελέσασαι*); Alexander Aphr. *Probl.* 1.40. *ἐν μήτρῃ δεκαμηνιαῖον βρέφος* (i.e. in the ninth month of pregnancy); Verg. *Ecl.* 4.61 (*matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses*). The tale seems to follow a pattern popular in hymnic poetry (noted already by Dover (1971) 252-3), the 'birth-narrative' or 'Succession Myth' followed by the god's first exploits (*h.Mer.* 17-23); cf. Sowa (1984) 23-4; Richardson (2010) 4-5. It would be more impressive to have the mighty son of Zeus perform his first feat on the day of his birth, like his divine brothers and sisters (cf. *h.Ap.* 127-130, *h.Mer.* 17-18), rather than wait for ten months to pass.

³⁷⁴ One is unable to follow exactly the history of the reception of the so-called *Paeon* 20. In spite of the lack of scholia, however, it seems that *Idyll* 24 is generally closer to this version and agrees with it in several minor details that contribute to the creation of a more 'homely' background against which the heroic event is represented; cf. also Zanker (1987) 176.

The two Pindaric versions:

Pindar dealt with Heracles' first miraculous exploit in at least two poems: *Nemean* 1 and fr. 52u Maehler. The examination of the exact relationship between the two poems is beset with numerous problems which to a certain degree arise from the fragmentary status of the latter. Although textual correspondences indicate that there is a connection between the two versions (on which see below), one is unable to ascertain the priority of one poem over the other and so establish the 'direction' of the allusions. Further, our ignorance of the genre (and consequently of the intended audience) of fr. 52u Maehler deprives us of crucial points for the appreciation of the form that the myth assumed in this literary version (cf. D'Alessio (1997) 36; for an attempt see n. 376 below). Nevertheless, enough of the text has survived to allow some comparison between the two Pindaric versions and Theocritus' *idyll*.

As fr. 52u Maehler stands now, the narrative sets in quite quickly.³⁷⁵ Of course one cannot determine the number of lines from the beginning of the poem that have been lost. Line 4 (*Ἀλκαῖδα*) refers to Heracles (cf. *Ol.* 6.68 *Ἡρακλέης, σεμνὸν θάλας Ἀλκαῖδᾶν* with *Σ ad Ol.* 6.115).³⁷⁶ Line 6 (*μορ]μορῦξίας*) introduces us

³⁷⁵ Some scholars have maintained that fr. 52s Maehler (*Pae.* 18) was the beginning of our poem (cf. Rutherford 2001: 402). This has been rejected by D'Alessio (1997) 41–3 on paleographical grounds.

³⁷⁶ Fr. 291 Maehler [= Probus *ad Verg. Ecl.* 7.61] could also belong here: *Pindarus initio Alcidem nominatum postea Herculem dicit ab Hera ..., quod eius imperii opinionem famamque virtutis sit consecutus*. Fr. 52u Maehler is the only case where Pindar uses this patronymic for Heracles in the context of a myth dealing exclusively with him. If this version included Heracles' ascension to Olympus Probus' note would fit the context nicely. For the mention of Hera at this point, cf. *Nem.* 1.69–75, *Isthm.* 4. 73–8 and *Theoc.* 24.169 (*βοώπιδα*), on which see below. The (etymological) association of Heracles' name with Hera is usually situated in a different time in the narrative, after the killing of his children; cf. *Apollod.* 2.73.3; *Et. Gud. s.v. Ἡρακλῆς*. Diodorus Siculus (4.10.1) discusses the change of Heracles' name in the context of the myth of the two snakes but stresses the Argive origin of this appellation (*διόπερ Ἀργεῖοι πυθόμενοι τὸ γεγονός Ἡρακλέα προσηγόρευσαν, ὅτι δ' Ἡραν ἔσχε κλέος [...]*). It could be that Pindar's poem reflected the same version and served as one of Diodorus' sources. If so, the poem could have been performed at Argos at the festival in honour of Hera (for a similar suggestion cf. also D'Alessio (2004b) 114–5); for the cult of Hera at Argos see Farnell (1896–1909) ii. 186–8: (i) Dionysus of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* I. 21) talks about choruses of young girls praising the goddess with hymns in her honour (*χοροὶ τε παρθένων ὑμνουσῶν τὴν θεὸν ὠιδαῖς πατρίοις*) and (ii) there is a similar reference in Eur. *Electra* (171–80); cf. Denniston (1939) and Cropp (1988) *ad loc.* Fr. 52u Maehler could have been performed by a chorus of maidens. Although both of Heracles' parents were of Argive descent (cf. *Pind. Pyth.* 9.81–3), he was inserted in Argive

directly to the ‘nursery room’ and helps to set up a homely atmosphere for the description of the heroic feat. In this respect, this version seems to have diverged from that offered in *Nemean* 1 and to come closer to that of Theocritus, which is richer in realistic details, such as the bathing of the babies, Alcmena’s lullaby, and the rocking of the shield. On the whole, it would seem that the poet did not devote much space to the killing *per se* (cf. also *Nem.* 1.43-47), which in this version must have taken up no more than three lines (10–13). Still, it is impossible to know whether this scene led to the succinct description of Heracles’ future career and deification as in the other two poems (cf. Bona (1988) 285).

Moving to *Nemean* 1, one notices that Pindar again avoids a detailed depiction of the actual fight and presents the whole affair in four rapidly changing pictures:³⁷⁷

- i) ὁ δ’ ὀρθὸν μὲν ἄντεινεν κάρα (43)
- ii) πειρᾶτο δὲ πρῶτον μάχας (43)
- iii) δισσαῖσι δοιοῦς αὐχένων / μάρψαις ἀφύκτοις χερσὶν ἑαῖς ὄφιας (43-44)
- iv) ἀγχομένοις δὲ χρόνος / ψυχὰς ἀπέπνευσεν μελέων ἀφάτων (46-47)

The narration of the central scene extends into just five lines (41–45). The rapidity of the two narratives apart, the two Pindaric versions seem to have some linguistic

mythology at a later date. He is more at home at Tiryns and this has led Kowalzig (2007) 172-3 to suggest a connection of this poem with the Tirynthian cult of Heracles. On the other hand, Schachter (1986) *s.v.* HERAKLES (Thebes) connects the episode as depicted in *Nemean* 1 with Thebes and the Herakleia. In Thebes Heracles took the place of a young champion at the head of a group of warriors. This explains the emphasis on his representation as an infant or an adolescent on Theban coins (cf. Woodford (1983) 123-5) and the presence of Theban chieftains in *Nem.* 1.51 and 63 (see below). It is interesting that fr. 52v Maehler deals with Hera, as the order of the poems on the papyrus could indicate that the two poems were ordered alphabetically after their titles: an ode for Heracles followed by an ode for Hera, or two odes for Hera (cf. D’Alessio (2004b) 114). Her title in this poem’s refrain (*βασιλεια*) reflects one of her cult epithets in Argos, Lebadea and Pisidia (*IG* 7.3097; 9.1; cf. Farnell (1896-1909) ii. 188 with n. a and Schachter *s.v.* HERA (Lebadeia); see, however, *Phoronis* fr. 4 Bernabé; *Nem.* 1.39; and the *h.Jun.* (12).2 ἀθανάτη βασιλεια ὑπείροχον εἶδος ἔχουσαν [cf. Allen-Halliday-Sikes (1936) and Càssola (1975) *ad loc*] and could suggest Argos as the place of performance (see the discussion of D’Alessio (2004b) 115-121); Kowalzig (2007) 173-7 argues in favour of Tiryns.

³⁷⁷ On the rapidity of Pindar’s narrative see Cusset (1999) 358 and Otto (2009) 138-9. Rapidity (*γοργότης*; cf. Eust. *Proem. ad Pind.* 8) or brevity (*συντομία*; cf. *Σ ad Pyth.* 4.400, 442) was considered a hallmark of Pindar’s (narrative) style by ancient scholars; see esp. Negri (1997) 99-100.

details in common (cf. Bona (1988) 285). For example, *ὁ δ' ἀντίον ἀνὰ κάρᾳ τ' ἄειρ[ε]* in fr. 52u.10 Maehler looks quite close to *Nem.* 1.44 (*ὁ δ' ὀρθὸν μὲν ἄντεινεν κάρᾳ*). The rest of the similarities are more general. Fr. 25u.11-2 Maehler (+5] *χειρὶ μελέων ἄπο ποικίλον / σπά]ργανον ἔρριψεν ἔάν τ' ἔφανεν φυάν*) provides the description of the battle and so would correspond to *Nem.* 1.43-4, while fr. 25u.13 Maehler (+4] *ὀμμ]άτων ἄπο σέλας ἐδίνασεν*) gives the reason for Alcmene's awakening and intervention, an element missing from *Nemean* 1 but present in *Id.* 24.18-19 (see also p. 211 n. 387 below). It is interesting that in fr. 52u Maehler Pindar avoids a detailed description of the killing altogether and instead alludes to it with the phrase *ἔάν τ' ἔφανεν φυάν* (12), as if this was enough to alert the audience to the outcome of the confrontation. The phrase is analogous to *Nem.* 1.43, but there is a difference in its function within the overall structure of the poem. In fr. 52u Maehler this could indicate that the mythological narrative served to reveal Heracles' true parentage. The mythological pattern underlying this narrative structure is well-known and quite popular with Greek heroic myths (cf. for example, Theseus' exploit in Bacch. 17.57–63, which serves to prove his claim that he is the son of Poseidon). On the other hand, in *Nemean* 1 the narrator does not reveal the *telos* of his myth but lets the audience come to it through the structure of his ode.

To be more specific, in *Nemean* 1 lines 33–4 enable the transition between the first part of the ode, which deals with Hieron's policy in Sicily (1–18) and with the eulogy of the victor Chromius (19–32), to the second part, which deals with Heracles' heroic exploit(s). At the same time, the narrator specifies the ideological goal that he hopes to achieve with his story: “But when I move among the heights of triumph, Heracles comes to mind” (tr. Nisetich). Heracles is the pinnacle of excellence and as such functions as an ‘appropriate’ foil to the *laudandus*. There is no need for us to

get into the vexed question of the reasons that may have led Pindar to choose this specific exploit and not some other, a problem which, after all, does not affect the intertextual connection with *Idyll* 24. None the less, the numeral in l. 43 *πειρᾶτο δὲ πρῶτον μάχας* prefigures³⁷⁸ for baby Heracles a series of other battles³⁷⁹ (61–69) in which Heracles will have the opportunity to demonstrate his *arete* until he finally reaches Olympus (70–73). In other words, the episode with the snakes, although it assumes prominence of place as the ode’s central myth, is nonetheless embedded in a summary of Heracles’ heroic career which serves to depict a heroic life permeated by the aristocratic idea of virtue (cf. Galinsky (1972) 35-6; Effe (1980) 149; Carey (1981) 129). In this respect, the aim of the narrative section in fr.52u Maehler seems to have been similar to that of *Nemean* 1: to illustrate Heracles’ divine parentage and through that the aristocratic notion of hereditary excellence and *arete*.³⁸⁰ In *Nemean* 1, and presumably also in fr. 52u Maehler, this is made clear by the ‘frame’ of the myth (Privitera (1972) 43). It must remain unclear, however, within what (cultic or performative) context this was attempted in the case of fr. 52u Maehler. Still, this seems to be a structural motif absent from Theocritus’ poem, where the myth seems to be told ‘for its own sake’, without any explicitly stated goal that could have been indicated, for example, in a frame, as happens in *Idylls* 11 and 13 (cf. Cusset (1999) 376). As a matter of fact, the possible connection of the myth with Ptolemaic propaganda that I suggest³⁸¹ later in this chapter could only be inferred on the basis of

³⁷⁸ At this point the narrator’s voice assumes a prophetic tone, which connects it with the explicitly prophetic voice of Teiresias and so reinforces the parallelism between the role of the poet and the seer (on which see below).

³⁷⁹ Note especially lines 67–8 *καὶ γὰρ ὅταν θεοὶ ἐν / πεδίῳ Φλέγγρας Γιγάντεσσιν μάχων / ἀντιάζωιν*.

³⁸⁰ Cf. Privitera (1972) 43-8, Rose (1974) 175 and Nieta Hernández (1993) 90. For the idea of Heracles’ ‘career’ in *Nemean* 1 and its applicability to Chromius see Farnell (1932) 160 and esp. Rose (1974) 155-6.

³⁸¹ See already Hunter (1996) 12.

allusions provided by other poems in the corpus concerning the role of Heracles in Ptolemaic discourse as for instance in Theoc. 17.26–27:

ἄμφω γὰρ πρόγονός σφιν ὁ καρτερὸς Ἡρακλείδας,
ἀμφότεροι δ' ἀριθμεῦνται ἐς ἔσχατον Ἡρακλῆα.

To this ‘evidence’ one should also add two bronze statuettes from Hellenistic times representing Ptolemy II as the infant Heracles straggling the snakes (cf. Laubscher (1997) 155-8).³⁸² According to Laubscher (1997: 158), who was the first to point out the similarity, these miniatures were probably modelled after monumental statues which supported Philadelphus’ claims as the rightful successor of Ptolemy Soter against his half-brother Ptolemy Keraunos. We will return later to the relationship between *Idyll* 17 and *Idyll* 24. However, if one is allowed to use this piece of Ptolemaic propaganda to elucidate some aspects of the mythological imagery in *Idyll* 24, it seems that the Pindaric notion of *phya* could be helpful for the support of Ptolemaic propaganda. This could suggest in the first place a reason for a connection between Theocritus’ version with both Pindaric accounts, where this idea figures predominantly (cf. Hunter (1996) 26-7).³⁸³ Nevertheless, it is unclear whether the choice of this myth was made by Theocritus independently or was part and parcel of court propaganda. Scholars interested in the Egyptian background of Theocritus’ poem interpret the choice of this myth as a reflection of Pharaonic ideology. On this reading the poem is supposed to have been performed on the occasion of Ptolemy II’s proclamation as coregent (285/4 BCE) or generally quite early in his reign. For Ludwig Koenen (1977: 82), the myth alludes to a piece of Pharaonic tradition: the new king is considered the reincarnation of the previous king and the true son of the

³⁸² One of these is now in Brooklyn Musuem (nr. 63. 185) [cf. also *LIMC* IV (1988) 830 nr. 1643]; the other is part of a private collection. Laubscher (1997) provides photos of both. Both statuettes are dated approximately to the third or second centuries BCE, although their original supposedly dated from the period of Philadelphus’ coregency (285-283 BCE); see Laubscher (1997) 155-7.

³⁸³ For *φύα* in Pindar’s epinician odes, see Marg (1938) 87-99.

highest god (Zeus). In addition to this, Susan Stephens (2003: 132-42) argues that the episode of Heracles' throttling Hera's snakes suggests the incessant battle between the forces of light and order against darkness and chaos, exemplified in the mythological combat of Horus and Seth; the enthronement of the new king is a crucial moment for the safety and stability of the realm.³⁸⁴ The myth, then, suggests the new king's victory over the powers of anarchy and chaos (snakes of Seth).

As we have already seen, in *Nemean* 1 the idea underlined is that of virtuous endurance and heroic consistency throughout Heracles' life, the role-model for any decent aristocrat with political aspirations, like Chromius (von Leutsch (1859) 55; Privitera (1972) 32; Carey (1981) 129; Braswell (1998) 30-1).³⁸⁵ On the other hand, fr. 52u Maehler focuses directly on the idea of Heracles' divine origin, something further highlighted by the prominent absence of his mortal father, Amphitryon. Line 9 describes the ominous movement of the two snakes towards Heracles, who is explicitly said to be 'the child of Zeus the king of Heaven' (*ἐπὶ βρέφος οὐρανόυ Διός*). The unequivocal declaration of the hero's parentage in this context is at odds with what one gets at the same point in the narrative in the other two versions. In *Nem.* 1. 42 Pindar speaks generally of both infants without specifying their parentage (*τέκνοισιν ὠκείας γνάθους / ἀμφελίξασθαι μεμαῶτες*). Of course, l. 35 (*ἐπεὶ σπλάγγων ὑπο ματέρος αὐτίκα θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν παῖς Διός ... μόλεν*) had already specified Heracles' (only) parentage so that there was no need for Pindar to repeat it.³⁸⁶ On the other hand, although he uses the same word as fr. 52u.9 Maehler

³⁸⁴ Cf. Sowa (1984) 24 on the importance of the 'Succession Myth' (*ibid* 23; and n. 373 above). For the important role that such myths play in Ptolemaic propaganda see also Barbantani (2010) 244-5.

³⁸⁵ According to the ancient scholia (*ad* 49c), Aristarchus believed that the primary function of the myth was to stress the idea of inborn excellence as opposed to learning by teaching (*ἀεὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος ἐπαινεῖ τοὺς φύσει μᾶλλον τῶν ἐκ διδαχῆς περιγυνομένων*).

³⁸⁶ As far as Heracles' paternity is concerned, Pindar employs two circumlocutions which are equally represented in his poetry: (i) *Διός παῖς* (*Ol.* 10.44-5 *Διός ἄλκιμος / υἱός ... πατρὶ μεγίστωι*; *Nem.* 1.35) and (ii) *Ἀμφιτρωνιάδας* (*Ol.* 3.14; *Isthm.* 6.38; fr. 346b.10 Maehler [cf. also *Il.* 5.392; *Od.* 11.270]).

(βρέφος), Theocritus avoids naming Zeus (24.16 ἀπειλήσασα φαγεῖν βρέφος Ἡρακλήα). Still, he alludes to Zeus' fatherhood in line 21 through his interest in the well-being of the two babies (Διὸς νοέοντος ἅπαντα) (cf. Horstmann (1976) 62).³⁸⁷ It is also remarkable that fr. 52u Maehler and Theocritus agree in presenting Heracles alone as the target of the two snakes, while *Nemean* 1 brings Iphicles into the picture as well by the use of the plural τέκνοισιν. In fr. 52u Maehler the genitive Διός in line 9 seems to be 'balanced' by the genitive Ἀμφιτρύωνος in line 16 (οἶκον Ἀμφιτρύωνος).³⁸⁸ In a sense, although the fragmentariness of the poem may be misleading, Amphitryon seems to be absent from the scene altogether, and to appear obliquely only as the *kyrios* of the house which shelters the child of Zeus – as we are going to see shortly this was an element that Theocritus chose to preserve in his version too.

Another indirect reference to Amphitryon is to be found in the presentation of the 'chorus' of the ἀμφίπολοι in fr. 52u.19 Maehler. Pindar specifies that the women

Both forms are attested in Bacchylides although the latter is commoner: Ἀμφιτρωνιάδας (5.85; 16.15; 25.25); Διὸς υἱός (5.79; cf. also 5.58 but the exact form of the circumlocution is not certain: παῖδ' ἀνίκ]ατον ... / Διός] Jebb; ἄνδρ' ἀνίκ]ατον ... / ἔρνος Διός] Snell-Maehler; 16.28). One notes that 'child of Zeus' emphasizes Heracles' connection with Zeus (cf. *Ol.* 10.44-5) or the proximity to the divine world which enables him to carry out superhuman feats (5. 58, 79). In Bacch. 17.20 and 86 the same expression is used to emphasize Zeus' fatherhood of Minos. Interestingly, both expressions can be found in the same poem, as if the poets wanted to represent in this way Heracles' dual paternity: Pind. fr. 52u.9 ~ 16 Maehler; Bacch. 16.15~28, see also n. 25. Cf. also Catullus 68B.112 (*falsiparens Amphitryoniades*).

³⁸⁷ The divine light that appears suddenly in the nursery in Theoc. 24.22 (φάος δ' ἀνὰ οἶκον ἐτύχθη) is not sent by Zeus nor is it a sign of divinity, as has been falsely assumed (e.g. Gutzwiller (1981) 15; Stephens (2003) 136; Otto (2009) 154) but emanates from the eyes of the two snakes as stated previously in *Il.* 18-19 (ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν δὲ κακὸν πῦρ / ἔρχομένοις λάμπεισκε [...]); see correctly Stern (1974) 356-7. Differently Cusset (1999) 361, who suggests that the bright light comes from Heracles' eyes as a sign of his divine strength. As Stern notes, Theocritus refashions and uses for a different purpose an element he found in one of his Pindaric subtexts: fr.52u.13 Maehler (... ὀμμ]άτων ἄπο σέλας ἐδίναεν). Pindar is considered to employ a similar expression found in the *h.Mer.* 45 (ἧ ὅτε δινηθῶσιν ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἀμαρνηαί); cf. Bona (1988) *ad loc.* This would suggest a connection with the theme of the precocious infant in the Homeric hymns, texts that Theocritus also followed in his version (see below). *θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν* in *Nem.* 1.35 has nothing to do with these passages, as Stern erroneously proposes. For its proper meaning and connection with the *Homeric hymn to Apollo* see below at n. 409.

³⁸⁸ For similar structural games cf. *Isthm.* 6.30 (Ἀλκμήνας τέκος) ~ 35 (Ἡρακλέης) ~ 38 (Ἀμφιτρωνιάδαν) with Bury (1892) *ad Isthm.* 5.38: 'observe that names of Heracles are placed three times in emphatic position at the end of the clauses'. Hubbard (1983) 56 offers an interesting discussion of Amphitryon's role seen from the angle of the *oikeion* / *allogrion* juxtaposition.

came from Cephallene (19 *Κεφ[αλ]λαν[ι]*) probably as part of the war booty from Amphitryon's expedition against Pterelaos, a detail altogether absent from *Nemean 1* (48-9 *ἐκ δ' ἄρ' ἄτλατον δέος / πλᾶξε γυναῖκας, ὅσαι τύχον Ἀλκμήνας ἀρήγοισαι λέχει*) but present in *Idyll 24* (5 *ἀπεσκύλευσε*).³⁸⁹ Theocritus does not offer anything of this sort, but he still alludes to this expedition in the first line of his poem through the mention of the shield in which Alcmena put her babies to sleep (Theoc. 24.4-5). In comparison with *Nem.* 1.51-4, then, where Amphitryon retains something of his heroic grandeur, these are the only indications of heroism that fr. 52u Maehler and *Idyll 24* allow their Amphitryon, who is relegated to a secondary position, if he is not absent altogether from the scene. Be that as it may, it is this element of heroism which adds another dimension to the scene: Amphitryon's absence during this expedition gave Zeus the opportunity to visit Alcmena in his guise (cf. Apollod. 2.61). In this regard, the allusion to the expedition against the Taphians in fr. 52u Maehler squares nicely with the overall idea of Zeus' parentage of the precocious child. In *Idyll 24*, however, it contributes to the comic character of the introductory scene: together with l. 21 it suggests to the alert reader the version avoided (cf. Griffiths (1979) 96; Stephens (2003) 128).³⁹⁰ It is only at the end of the poem with Heracles' ascension to Olympus that his divine descent is revealed (cf. Griffiths (1979) 54).³⁹¹

³⁸⁹ Cf. also the fragmentary scholium in the intercolumnial space between frs. 52u-v Maehler on *POxy.* 2442 (*ἡ Κεφαλλήνη*) *πρότερ[ον τοῦ Ἀμφιτρυῶνος] Δουλίχιο(ν) ἐκαλεῖτο· ἦν δ' ὑπὸ τὸν Πτερέλαον ἀπὸ δ(ὲ) Κεφάλ(ου) τὴν προσηγορίαν ἔσχ[εν]*: text according to Rutherford's (2001) edition). For Amphitryon's expedition against the Taphians see Strabo 10.2.14; Apollod. 2.54-60; Plaut. *Amph.* 251. The Taphians appear in a fragment from Euripides' *Alcmena* (fr. 87b Kannicht). It seems that the myth was quite popular in tragedy (see Kannicht *TrGF* 5 p. 220). In Call. *VB* fr. 148 Massimilla the mention of the same expedition probably refers to the origin of Heracles' arrows.

³⁹⁰ Gutzwiller (1981) 14 points out that by leaving out the information about Zeus' parentage of Heracles Theocritus undercut the glory of the hero, a standard motif in Greek hymns. For the poem as a hymn (see below).

³⁹¹ On the whole, all three literary versions agree with the pictorial representation on most Attic vases (see n. 367 above). With the notable exception of the hydria in the Metropolitan Museum in New York (*ARV*² 1110.41), on which Amphitryon is depicted approaching with drawn sword the *kline*

In fr. 52u Maehler the absence of Amphitryon, although not at all certain, could have something to do with the ‘internal’ audience that Pindar chose for his mythological feat. In both Pindaric versions, that is, the narrative seems to be occupied more with the aftermath of the exploit than with the exploit itself. Pindar is more interested in the description of the way in which an ‘interior’ audience reacts to the miraculous event. As a rule, this audience consists of three parties: Heracles’ immediate family (Alcmene and Amphitryon), the maids of Alcmene (absent in Theocritus’ version), and a third party, which may assume different forms. In *Nemean* 1 this is ‘the leaders of the Thebans’ (51 *Καδμείων ἀγούι*), while in *Idyll* 24 generally it is the household servants (53 *δμῶες· ἐνεπλήσθη δὲ δόμος σπεύδοντος ἐκάστου*). Fr. 52u Maehler, at least as far as we can tell on our present evidence, omits this third group altogether. Attic vases adhere in principle to this schema. With the exception of Athena, who may be an addition of the painters,³⁹² on the Louvre *stamnos* (*ARV*² 208.160) and the Leipzig cup (*ARV*² 559.151) the scene includes a female figure at the farthest left edge of the scene, so as to balance Amphitryon who stands at the opposite side. If the painters had Pindar’s versions in mind, this woman could represent Alcmene’s maids. *Nem.* 1.46–54 offers the clearest example of the way in which Pindar handled the emotional reaction of all these groups. The reaction of both parents stands out against, and at least in the case of Alcmene contrasts with, the background provided by the reaction of their respective ‘supporting’ choruses, the maids (48-9 *ἐκ δ’ ἄρ’ ἄτλατον δέος / πλᾶξε*

where the babies lie, in all other cases Amphitryon is placed at the farthest right or left edge of the scene as a witness behind Athena. Neither Pindar nor Theocritus mentions that Athena was present at the scene. Her presence is usually understood as a homage of Attic painters to the patron goddess of their city; cf. More (1998) 89. Woodford *LIMG* iv.1 p. 831, on the other hand, suggests that this indicates the close connection between the goddess and the hero, as this is demonstrated in his other exploits.

³⁹² For Athena as an internal spectator see e.g. Pindar *Nem.* 3.50 and the beginning of Bacchylides 13, although the identity of the female personage here is contested.

γυναῖκας) and soldiers. At the same time, the reaction or even the self-sacrifice of Alcmena (50 ἄμυνεν ὕβριν κνωδάλων) is juxtaposed with the awe of Amphitryon, who remains passive and does not get involved in the action (55-6 ἔστα δὲ θάμβει δυσφύρωι / τερπνῶι τε μιχθείς). Pindar's insistence on the aftermath of Heracles' exploit parallels, I would suggest, his interest in the significance that the victory has for the athlete's life and his community rather than in the description of the victory itself. In this respect, Pindar avoids dwelling on the details of the killing of the dragons in the same way he avoids details of the *laudandus'* victory. Instead he offers a complicated emotional portrait of the reaction of the audience, which, to a certain degree, parallels the way in which Chromius' co-citizens would have accepted his victory. At the same time, the diversity of feelings about the incident suggests that the event is complicated and eludes the clear understanding of the bystanders. As lines 58–9 indicate, it is only through Teiresias' prophecy, addressed to all the male citizens of Thebes (61 ὁ δὲ οἱ φράζει καὶ παντὶ στρατῶι), that people become able to comprehend the true nature of the miraculous event. The fact that men assume narrative primacy over women as the audience of Teiresias may reflect genre demands and the sympotic context of performance of the ode (cf. 19–21). In a certain way, that is, Pindar's position *qua* epinician poet is analogous or homologous to that of Teiresias: Teiresias reveals the true nature of Heracles' first exploit by 'contextualizing' it in a description of his heroic career (lines 61–75) (cf. Hubbard (1983) 51, 56; Otto (2009) 144-5). Similarly Pindar reveals and interprets the importance of Chromius' victory by placing it within the context of Hieron's colonial propaganda (l. 6-18) and the epinician discourse of the comparison with the paradigm of human *arete*, Heracles.³⁹³ Both Pindar and Teiresias function within a sex-

³⁹³ The idea of an analogy between Teiresias and Pindar can be found already in Bury (1890) 6; cf. also

segregated and predominantly male context of performance. In this way, Pindar manages to endow his epinician discourse with a unique semantic depth, which seems to be absent from fr. 52u Maehler and *Idyll* 24 – although one should mention again that in the case of fr. 52u Maehler this is due to our ignorance of the respective generic context.

As we have already seen, fr. 52u Maehler in its present condition does not specify whether Amphitryon or any other men were mentioned. The only people whose presence we can make out from the fragmentary lines are Alcmene and her maids. On the whole, the emotional reaction of the women is similar to that in *Nemean* 1:³⁹⁴ Alcmene is said to leap from her bed in fear (15 []οθ[.]νόρουσε περὶ φόβῳ) to rescue her son while the maids flee in terror (17 **δέι|ματι** σχόμεναι φύγον). The representation of Alcmene's reaction on red-figure Attic vases differs from both Pindaric versions. On the Perugia crater (*ARV*² 516), the Leipzig cup (*ARV*² 559.151) and the New York hydria (*ARV*² 1110. 41) Alcmene is usually identified with a frightened woman who tries to flee. She assumes the role that Pindar assigns to her maids. This discrepancy in the depiction of Alcmene could speak against the hypothesis of Pindaric influence. Still, Amphitryon's reaction on the New York hydria is probably modelled on *Nemean* 1 (52-3 ἐν χερὶ δ' Ἀμφιτρύων κολεοῦ γυμνὸν τινάσσων <φάσγανον> / ἴκετο). On the other hand, the Louvre stamnos (*ARV*² 208.160) represents her taking frightened Iphicles in her arms. This detail

Fracaroli (1894) 527-8, Privitera (1972) 50 and Petrucione (1986) 43-4. The analogy between prophetic and epinician discourse is found again in the roughly contemporary *Isthmian* 6 (480 BCE). Heracles' prophecy (51-4; note ἄτε μάντις ἀνήρ in l. 51) stands for Pindar and his song; cf. Slater (1984) 255 and Nieto Hernández (1993) 93-4. Hubbard (1985) 56 locates a similar analogy in *Nem.* 1.72 (αἰνήσειν νόμον): just as Pindar praised his host, Chromius, Heracles praises his father / host, Zeus. For the possibility of a similar mention in fr.52u Maehler, see n. 408 below.

³⁹⁴ The only lexical correspondence between the two scenes is found in the description of Alcmene's attire: fr. 52u.14 Maehler (ἄπεπλος ἐκ λεχέων νεοτόκων) ~ *Nem.* 1.50 (καὶ γὰρ αὐτὰ ποσσὶν ἄπεπλος ὀρούσαισ' ἀπὸ στρωμνῆς). It is unlikely that this was a coincidence. The echo was probably meant to evoke the other poem, but one is unable to determine the direction of the allusion.

appears again in *Idyll* 24 (60-1 Ἀλκμήνα μὲν ἔπειτα ποτὶ σφέτερον βάλε κόλπον / ξηρὸν ὑπαὶ δείους ἀκράχολον Ἰφικλῆα) and it is likely that Theocritus knew similar representations. After all, his representation of Amphitryon charging into the nursery with his sword drawn picks up a detail found both on the New York hydria and in *Nem.* 1.52-3 and so could strengthen the impression of his acquaintance with similar artistic representations.

Unfortunately, one is unable to ascertain the way in which this scene was contextualized within the structure of fr. 52u Maehler. Still, it is significant that although the place remains the same in both Pindaric poems (i.e. the interior of Amphitryon's *oikos*), Pindar oscillates between the two poles represented by male and female interior audiences. If that should be the case, the narrative prominence or exclusivity of women in fr. 52u Maehler could be related with the cultic context of performance of the original poem, especially if the poem was performed by a chorus of maidens at the Argive Heraia (see n. 376 above). The same holds true for Theocritus' version, which, on the whole, could be said to stay clear of Pindar's heroic elements and give the emphasis instead to his mother Alcmene (see below), but for different reasons.

The Theocritean version

Theocritus' version, as is to be expected, bears the hallmarks of the Hellenistic penchant for realism in depictions. This is a tendency one finds fully developed in some other idylls of Theocritus (e.g. 2, 14, 15) which come closer to the tradition of the mime, a genre popular with Hellenistic audiences. In this regard, two characteristic alterations that Theocritus brought about were firstly the introductory scene, in which Alcmene puts her babies to bed singing a lullaby, and secondly the

scene of the couple jumping from bed half-asleep. Both scenes, and especially the second, come closer in tone to comedy than archaic lyric (cf. Effe (1980) 162; Gutzwiller (1981) 16-8). Theocritus appears to elaborate *more Alexandrino* on those spots in the mythological narrative which Pindar left blank or blurred in one or both of his versions (see Otto (2009) 157, 170). So, in view of the details one can make out in fr. 52u Maehler, Theocritus constructed his version mainly from the homely details he found in that poem. Seen from this angle, the embedding of a lullaby, a sub-literary genre not well-represented in Greek ‘high’ literature,³⁹⁵ tallies with the general interest which Theocritus, and Hellenistic poets in general, showed for the ‘resurrection’ of marginal lyric genres (cf. e.g. the magical incantation of Simaitha in *Idyll* 2, the reaper’s song in *Idyll* 10, the hymn to Adonis in *Idyll* 15 and the *epithalamion* in *Idyll* 18).³⁹⁶ In *Idyll* 24 the commotion caused in the household by the miraculous event has been brought down to the level of popular mime: all participants and especially Amphitryon are deprived of their heroic credentials (cf. Galinsky (1972) 116-7; Horstmann (1976) 70-1; Bona (1988) 287). In both versions Pindar avoids dialogues and banal details about household proceedings, elements, on the whole, foreign to his poetic vocation and genre. It was at this point that Theocritus saw the potential to develop a genuinely Hellenistic scene (cf. Gutzwiller (1981) 10). But even in the case of scenes which appeared in Pindar’s poems, like the strangling of the snakes and Teiresias’ prophecy, Theocritus’ version bespeaks the Hellenistic interest in marginal details, realism and thoroughness. Theocritus, that is,

³⁹⁵ On Greek lullabies see Wærn (1960) and Lambin (1992) 16-17. The only known specimens of this sub-literary genre are inscribed in other genres (cf. Wærn 1960: 2). In Simonides’ *Danae* (fr. 271 Poltera) the lullaby is inscribed in a lyric poem of unknown genre (cf. Hutchinson (2001) 306-7 and Poltera (2008) 498). Another example is Euripides *Hypisipyle* fr. 752f.11-3 Kannicht (ὄτι δ’ εἰς ὕπνον / ἢ χάριν ἢ θεραπείματα πρόσφορα / παιδὶ πρέπει νεαρῶν / τάδε μελωιδὸς αὐδῶ); cf. also Aristophanes *Frogs* 1305–07 with Stanford (1958) *ad loc.* For some other examples see Wærn (1960) 4-5. If fr. 271.21 Poltera is modelled on Alcman *PMGF* 89 perhaps this too came from a lullaby; see, however, Calame (1983) *ad fr.* 159.

³⁹⁶ For the inscription of subliterate genres in Theocritus’ idylls see esp. Dover (1971) lxii and Rossi (1971) 85.

seems indifferent to the symbolic (and quasi-religious) meaning that these scenes acquire within the ideological world represented by Pindaric odes. He is not interested in the way in which Heracles' *athlos* reveals his true pedigree or foretells a glorious and heroic future, nor in the way in which these can work within the context of, or furnish support for, aristocratic ideology. Theocritus gives us an unpretentious mythological narrative, which acquires an extra layer of meaning only if we read it in the context of Ptolemaic propaganda. Where Pindar saw higher powers at work, Theocritus saw a first-class opportunity for a realistic scene of combat: Theocritus focuses on the description of the combat, while Pindar had focused on its interpretation. In this respect, even the prophecy of Teiresias, a motif that Theocritus chose to retain in his poem, loses much of the symbolic meaning it acquired in Pindar's ode (cf. Horstmann (1976) 68). Theocritus' Teiresias, especially in the second half of his speech (88- 100), does not resemble the authoritative figure that Pindar created, but rather a Hellenistic magician, similar to Simaetha and the Assyrian wizard in Theoc. 2.162 (cf. also Horstmann (1976) 59 n.187).³⁹⁷ This difference in ideological purport is also suggested in the most characteristic way by the catalogue of Heracles' educators that Theocritus gives in his version. Next I am going to concentrate on the function that this element serves within the idyll and try to establish whether it has any connection with Pindar's poetry.

The catalogue of Heracles' educators

The catalogue of Heracles' educators seems to be Theocritus' innovation. It emphasizes the differences in the cultural and political ambiances which fostered the creation of the two versions: catalogues become extremely popular with Hellenistic

³⁹⁷ Koenen (1977) 85 exaggerates the importance of lines 99-100 when he argues that the poem served as an *aition* for the swine sacrifice probably offered to Zeus at the Basileia of 285/4 BCE.

authors, if one may judge from their frequent appearance in their poems (cf. e.g. Hermesianax fr. 7 Powell, Phanocles fr. 1 Powell, Euphorion *SH* 413–5, *SH* 970, *The Fame of Halicarnassus* (01/12/02 Merkelbach-Stauber), etc.). The catalogue assumes the form of a *recherché résumé* of material culled from mythological or epic sources and represents Heracles as the ideal hero competent both in letters and in physical exercise. In my view, the inclusion of the catalogue of Heracles' trainers should be associated first with the hymnic form that *Idyll* 24 explicitly assumes at the end as the eulogy (*aretologia*) of the god praised (Heracles) and second with the Pindaric juxtaposition of inherent prowess with learning through teaching.

A marginal scholion on the Antinoe papyrus seems to suggest that *Idyll* 24 was meant for performance or perhaps recitation in some contest, quite likely under the Ptolemaic *aegis*:³⁹⁸

ἐγὼ ὁ φθαρτὸς ποιητ(ῆς)
κελεύω τῶ(ι) Ἡρακλεῖ . .
θεῶι ἐναλλασσόμενος
καὶ ἐκ διαδοχ(ῆς) νικήσας
5 δικαίως ποιησ() καὶ τὸν ποιητ(ῆν)
πάντ(ας) νικῆσ(αι).

3 θεῶι Henry ap. Bernsdorff: θ̣ι ω̣ι Π: θ̣ι ω̣ι editores
principes || 5 ποίησ(ον) Bernsdorff vel ποιῆσ(αι)
Henry sug. ap. Bernsdorff

If the scholiast has not misunderstood the missing lines, it would seem that the poet drew a comparison between the victorious outcome of Heracles' battle and his longed-for victory in the contest in which the poem was (supposedly) performed or

³⁹⁸ I am grateful to Professor Hans Bernsdorff for his permission to use material from his forthcoming article (Bernsdorff (2011)) on the fragmentary end of *Idyll* 24.

recited.³⁹⁹ The note is too lapidary to allow any insight into the original context of performance. Further, it is possible that this was nothing more than a contextualizing device similar to those employed in the beginning of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* and *Hymn to Athena*: Theocritus wanted his readers to imagine that this poem was recited at a court competition. However this may be, in the final lines of *Idyll 24* Theocritus imitated the formulaic and generic closure of Homeric hymns which were meant for performance at competitions (cf. Pohlenz (1931) 373-4; Gutzwiller (1981) 12; Bernsdorff (2011)). Next I print the two last lines following the most up-to-date discussion by Bernsdorff (2011):

χαῖρε, δυωδε|κᾶμοχθε· θε|.....|θηητός
.....|!| ἀοιδὸν ἀμ|.....|τυ †νικῶς†.

171 χαῖρε Pohlenz *GGA* 93 (1931) 374 | δυωδε|κᾶμοχθε Fränkel ap. Pohlenz | θε[ὸν δ' ὡς ἦνεκα] Pohlenz : θε[ὸν δ' αἵτημί τυ] Hutchinson e.g. ap. Bernsdorff || 172 δὸς χαίρειν τ]ὸ[ν] Pohlenz : νικάσας, τ]ὸ[ν] Hutchinson e.g. ap. Bernsdorff | ἀμ coniecerit Hutchinson, confirmavit Henry ap. Bernsdorff : ἀγο Hunt et Johnson || ἀμ[οιβᾶι δὸς με] τὸ Hutchinson e.g. ap. Bernsdorff : ἀν' ο[ὐρανὸν ὥστε] τὴ, Pohlenz | νικῶς Π : accentu scripto; νεικῶς ante corr.: νίκαϊς Pohlenz : νικῆν (inf.) Hutchinson e.g. ap. Bernsdorff

These lines come quite close to the ending of the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (VI) which seems to have been performed in some sort of competitive context (19-20):

χαῖρ' ἔλικοβλέφαρε γλυκυμείλιχε, δὸς δ' ἐν ἀγῶνι

³⁹⁹ For a detailed commentary and tentative restoration of this scholion see Bernsdorff (2011). As the marginal note makes clear, *θηητός* in l. 171 refers to the poet not to Heracles as Griffiths (1979) 95 assumed. Theoc. 17.112-6 suggests the recital or performance of poems at *agones* held in honour of the Ptolemies. Some scholars connect these two passages in order to prove that *Idyll 24* was performed; cf. Griffiths (1979) 92. Although there is nothing inherently impossible about this, there is nothing in the text to suggest it either; cf. Stephens (2003) 124-5.

νίκην τῶιδε φέρεσθαι, ἐμὴν δ' ἔντυνον ἀοιδήν.

Theocritus was apparently trying to recreate in his text the performative context of his subtexts and at the same time place his poem in the generic tradition of Homeric hymns. This association is also suggested by the topic of his poem. We know that Hellenistic culture showed a remarkable interest in the realistic representation of children, a tendency well documented both in sculpture and literature (cf. Hughes Fowler's (1989) index *s.v.* "children" and Ambühl (2005)). The moderate amount of Hellenistic poetry that has survived preserves a considerable number of divine *pueri* and *puellae*: Zeus, Apollo and Artemis in Callimachus' *Hymns*, Ptolemy in Theocritus 17, Hermes in Eratosthenes' poem of the same name (fr. 1-16 Powell) etc. For several of the above poems a court interpretation has been tentatively put forward: young Zeus or Apollo have often been seen as representation of Ptolemy II, while the scene of his birth, as described in *Idyll* 17, has rightly been brought into connection on the Greek side of royal propaganda with the birth of Apollo in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (Perrotta (1925) 41-8).⁴⁰⁰ These myths appear in texts that assume the form of a hymn, as is the case with Callimachus' poems, or of an encomium, as in Theocritus' *Idyll* 17 (cf. Griffiths (1979) 53).⁴⁰¹ The analogy could strengthen the view of *Idyll* 24 as a hexameter hymn. Despite its popularity the theme of divine or precocious babies is not an invention of Hellenistic hymnology. Rather it has a long-standing tradition going as back to the Homeric hymns (Apollo, Hermes) and Pindar (Iamos, Aristaeus, Achilles, Jason), who was also following them (see Newman (1985) 184-5 and below). Seen from this point of view, the catalogue of Heracles' instructors could be taken as part of the aretology of the god or, as

⁴⁰⁰ For possible association of these poems with Pharaonic ideology, see Stephens (2003).

⁴⁰¹ Ancient Grammarians considered both genres praise forms: hymns were addressed only to gods and encomia only to humans (cf. Hermogenes Aphth. progym. 8 ed. Rabe 21,5: διενήνοχε δὲ ὕμνον [...] τῶι τὸν μὲν ὕμνον εἶναι θεῶν, τὸ δὲ ἐγκώμιον θνητῶν [...]); see Färber (1936) 56-7 and 42-4.

Pohlenz (1931: 373) suggested, the *τροφή* of the *laudandus*, parts traditional in the genres of hymn and encomium respectively.⁴⁰²

On the other hand, I would also argue that Theocritus chose to dwell on Heracles in view of his important role in Pindar's epinician discourse as the personification of mortal excellence and its limits (cf. e.g. *Ol.* 3.40-5 and *Nem.* 3.22-5; see also the helpful overview of Pike (1984)). Heracles, that is, both as the son of Zeus and the warrior or athlete *par excellence* allowed Theocritus to raise issues of inherent excellence and training, both of which recur repeatedly in Pindar's odes (cf. Stern (1974) 359-60). Further, if this idyll was performed at the Basileia or Genethlia of 285/4 BCE for Philadelphus' enthronement, the catalogue could allude to the various events held at those games (cf. Koenen (1977) 85). Theocritus, then, would present Heracles as the exemplary athlete who is able to win in most events thanks to his rigorous training. Be that as it may, Heracles remains the role-model that the athletes can imitate but not surpass. That would require the divine strength of the hero, although this is never explicitly mentioned.⁴⁰³ Also, in the context of Ptolemaic propaganda in which Heracles was the forefather of the dynasty, the harmonious combination of *phya* and *didache* which Theocritus suggested for Heracles would put up the image of an ideal monarch to which Ptolemy II Philadelphus supposedly

⁴⁰² For *τροφή* as *topos* of rhetorical eulogies see Pernot (1993) i. 161-3.

⁴⁰³ However, it is illustrated through his privileged ascension to the sky (Theoc. 24.79 *τοῖος ἀνὴρ ὄδε μέλλει ἐς οὐρανὸν ἄστρο φέροντα / ἀμβαίνειν τεὸς υἱός*). This is a prerogative guaranteed to a chosen few and helps to distinguish Heracles, in all his Theocritean humanity, from the ordinary athletes; cf. Vermeule (1979) 126-7. Interestingly, the verb that Theocritus uses is associated in archaic poetry with unsuccessful, if not hubristic, attempts to ascend Olympus without the consent of the gods: (i) *Od.* 11.316-17 *Ἵοσαν ἐπ' Οὐλύμπωι μέμασαν θέμεν* (sc. Otos and Ephialtes), *ἀτὰρ ἐπ' Ἵοσσηι / Πήλιον εἰνοσίφυλλον, ἕν' οὐρανὸς ἀμβατός εἶη*; (ii) Pind. *Pyth.* 10.26 *ὁ χαλκῆος οὐρανὸς οὐ ποτε ἀμβατὸς αὐτῶι*; cf. Rumpel's (1883) *s.v.* interpretation. Pindar's and Theocritus' passages convey the idea of mortal limitations and by contrast of human potential for achievement (cf. Angeli Bernardini (1995) *ad Pyth.* 10.26). However, to travel across the great divide separating gods and humans, one needs divine assistance and this is given only to Heracles and, it is implied, to Ptolemy. Within *Pythian* 10 Bellerophon's unsuccessful (vertical) translation to heaven (cf. *Isthm.* 7.44-7), implicitly suggested, is juxtaposed with the successful translation of Perseus (Heracles' ancestor) to the land of the Hyperboreans (see also Heracles in *Olympian* 3), another paradisiacal land, out of common reach; cf. Hubbard (1985) 20.

conformed or was expected to in the future.⁴⁰⁴ There is, however, a difference in the respective handling of the image of Heracles by Pindar and by Theocritus: for Pindar Heracles is the product solely of inherent divine excellence whereas for Theocritus he is a product of the combination of divine origins and training, if not of training alone in view of the suppression of Zeus' fatherhood at the beginning of the poem. Pindar never gives any information about Heracles' trainers as he does for other heroes e.g. Jason in *Pythian* 4 and Achilles in *Nemean* 3. Before I turn to the representation of heroes' training in Pindar's epinician odes I will shortly examine the function of *διδασχῆ* in the catalogue of Heracles' educators and the prominence accorded to Alcmena throughout this section of Theocritus' poem.

The catalogue extends to thirty lines (103–33) and provides entries with the names of Heracles' teachers and trainers in several disciplines: Heracles mastered reading and writing, the use of bows and arrows, the playing of the lyre, boxing and wrestling, chariot-racing, hoplite fighting and horse-riding. Theocritus' Heracles appears to be the model of a young prince skilled in the arts of both war and music. Still, as is to be expected in view of his mythological profile, the greater part of the catalogue is taken up by Heracles' military training. So Heracles emerges as the ideal warrior and as such a possible point of comparison for the king (cf. Hunter (1996) 17 n. 67).

In *Nemean* 1 Pindar called Heracles the pinnacle of prowess (34 *ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετᾶν μεγάλας*) and substantiated this by the myth he narrated: Heracles' unparalleled excellence is proved first by the description of his infantile feat and then

⁴⁰⁴ One is in the dark about the exact dates of Theocritus' sojourn in Alexandria and the date of *Idyll* 24. The explicitly Ptolemaic idylls (14, 15 and 17) can be approximately dated in the second half of 270s BCE; cf. Gow (1952) xxv-vi, Dover (1971) xxi-ii. Cholmeley (1901) 29-30, 36 dates the poem to this period; *contra* Gow (1952) xxix. A high date would agree with the hypothesis in Koenen (1977) 80 that *Idyll* 24 was meant for performance at the Basileia of 284 BCE at Ptolemy's enthronement as coregent. Cf. also Stephens (2003) 125-6 in favour of an early date.

by the list of battles that Teiresias provided in his prophecy (61-9). In a way, both parts complement each other, suggesting respectively the beginning and end of Heracles' marvellous career. Theocritus' representation of Heracles, it would appear, follows Pindar closely in this respect but lacks the subtlety of his art. Theocritus' depiction of Heracles as the most valorous of heroes is carried out more on the basis of the catalogue than on that of the myth and the prophecy. The catalogue demonstrates that Heracles received the best of education in all disciplines from the best trainers, most of whom were famous heroes in their own right.⁴⁰⁵ Further, in view of his superhuman strength and demanding heroic training, the part on his insatiable hunger (37-40), its comic associations aside, would not seem out of place (cf. also Milon in *Idyll* 4). His excellence, however, is predicated more on training than on pedigree, by contrast with both Pindaric versions.

The emphasis on Heracles' *διδασχῆ* is certainly alien to Pindar's Heracles. Theocritus does not name Heracles as the son of Zeus or comment on the importance of the episode for establishing the identity of his real father. Instead he emphasizes the relationship between mother and son (cf. Griffiths (1979) 54). Twice, at the beginning and end of the catalogue, Theocritus stresses Alcmene's part in the upbringing of Heracles (103-4 ~ 134-6):

<p><i>Ἡρακλῆς δ' ὑπὸ ματρὶ νέον φυτὸν ὡς ἐν ἄλωῃ</i> <i>ἔτρέφετ', Ἀργείου κεκλημένος Ἀμφιτρώων</i> <i>ος.</i></p>	<p><i>Ἵδεν μὲν Ἡρακλῆα φίλα παιδεύσατο μάτηρ.</i> <i>εὐνὰ δ' ἧς τῷ παιδί τετυγμένα ἀγρόθι πατρός</i> <i>δέρμα λεόντειον μάλα οἱ κεχαρισμένον αὐτῷ.</i></p>
---	--

Alcmene's primacy is emphasized through her role as the protector (103 *ὑπὸ ματρὶ*) or the subject of the verb (134). Amphitryon, on the other hand, is conspicuously absent. In the first passage, he just gives his name to the illegitimate child of his

⁴⁰⁵ It is only here in the poem that Amphitryon appears in all his heroic grandeur.

wife, while in the second he appears indirectly in proximity to the baby's cradle. But again it would seem that it is the lion's hide which is more important for the young baby than his father is. Still, Alcmena's importance is most emphatically spelled out in Teiresias' prophecy.

Teiresias addresses his prophecy solely to the queen. The king and the male Thebans citizens of Pindar's *Nemean* 1 are absent. Further, in an obvious deviation from Pindar's model, it is the queen who summons the seer and not her consort (Theoc. 24.65-7 ~ *Nem.* 1.60-1), whose indifference is thrown into relief at every stage of the narrative, with the possible exception of lines 62-3 when Amphitryon puts Heracles back to sleep. Most details in Teiresias' prophecy can be found in the relevant passage in *Nemean* 1. Differently from Pindar Theocritus gives twelve as the number for Heracles' exploits (l. 82; cf. l. 171? *δυωδεκάμοχθε*), canonical by his time, and mentions Heracles' end at Trachis, elements absent from Pindar's version. Furthermore, Theocritus' Teiresias reveals to Alcmena that the snakes were sent by the gods to devour the baby (84-5). Interesting is also the divergence from Pindar in lines 76-8:

πολλὰ Ἀχαιάδων μαλακὸν περὶ γούνατι νῆμα
χειρὶ κατατρίψουσιν ἀκρέσπερον αἰδοῖσθαι
Ἀλκμήναν ὀνομασί, σέβας δ' ἔση Ἀργεΐαισι

Heracles' heroic feats and deification will reflect on his mother who will become a suitable subject-matter for the songs of Greek women. Heracles' career serves also to praise and glorify his mother. Quite likely the emphasis accorded to Alcmena was an act of deference towards Queen Berenice I, especially if one accepts the supposition that Heracles' figure alludes to Ptolemy II (cf. Griffiths (1979) 94; Stephens (2003)

137).⁴⁰⁶ Theocritus composed a poem for this queen entitled *Berenice* (Athen. 7.284A). The prominent position that Ptolemaic queens enjoyed in the court of Alexandria is evident from other court poems (e.g. *Idyll* 15), especially *Idyll* 17, where Berenice I is explicitly compared to mothers of other famous Greek heroes such as Diomedea and Thetis (53–56).

However, the most important difference from Pindar concerns Theocritus' focus on Heracles' training. In *Nemean* 1 there is no concession on the poet's part to the importance of training for boosting Heracles' inherent potential for excellence. This is a possibility, however, raised more explicitly in *Nemean* 3, which is addressed to Aristocleides of Aegina. The ode's myth deals with the exploits of six-year-old Achilles during his tutelage under Chiron. It combines the motif of the precocious child and of training a hero that we find fully developed in *Idyll* 24. This could suggest it as a possible subtext for Theocritus' innovation in his poem. In the following part, I will argue in favour of an intertextual connection between *Idyll* 24 and *Nemean* 3.

Achilles' training in *Nemean* 3: innate excellence vs. *techne*

The ode's mythological part assumes the form of a catalogue enumerating the exploits of famous Aeginetan heroes, such as Peleus, Telamon and Achilles (33-63).

The catalogue is constructed around the idea of excellence inherent in the *genos* of

⁴⁰⁶ Alcmena's role is also thrown into relief by her reaction in *Nemean* 1 in contrast with the rest of the women and Amphitryon; cf. also Bona (1988) 286. There are some passages in which Pindar designates Heracles as the 'child of Alcmena' (*υἱὸς Ἀλκμήνης* *Isthm.* 3.73, fr. 172 Maehler, Bacch. fr. 4. 41; *Ἀλκμήνας τέκος* *Isthm.* 6.30); Heracles appears as 'Alcmena's child' also in Simonides fr. 18 Poltera from an epinician for Philon of Coreyra; cf. Poltera (2008) *ad* 18.2. Note also Bacch. 5. 71 (*Ἀλκμή<ν>ιος θαυμαστός ἥρωος*) and Simonides fr.17 W² (*υἱὸν Ἀλκμήνης ... καλλισφύρου* [*<* Hes. *Theog.* 526 = 950 *Ἀλκμήνης καλλισφύρου ἄλκιμος υἱός*]). Cf. also Theoc. 13.20 (*Ἀλκμήνας υἱὸς Μιδεάτιδος ἥρωῖνας*). These offer the maternal counterpart of the expressions examined in n. 386 above. Still, Pindar never assigns to Alcmena the prominent position she holds in *Idyll* 24.

the Aeakids, as can be also seen by the gnomic digression emphatically placed at the core of the myth (40–3) (cf. Pfeijffer (1999) 207-10):

συγγενεῖ δέ τις εὐδοξία μέγα βρίθει. (40)
ὅς δὲ διδάκτ' ἔχει, ψεφεννὸς ἀνήρ
ἄλλοτ' ἄλλα πνέων οὐ ποτ' ἀτρεκεῖ (41)
κατέβα ποδί, μυριᾶν δ' ἀρετᾶν ἀτελεῖ νόω γέυεται

The man of mere learning is obscure, his gait unsteady, and his taste of *arete* incomplete. The gnome strengthens *e contrario* the family bond connecting the Aeacids, but it is remarkable that Pindar later on in the same catalogue chose to emphasize the role of Chiron as educator of heroes and of Achilles specifically (cf. also *Pyth.* 4.102-3,115-16 (Jason); *Nem.* 4.60-1; *Isthm.* 8.41-4 (Pelesus)). Achilles' part is the most extensive and complicated in terms of narrative technique. It begins with a catalogue of Achilles' exploits as a young boy under the guardianship of Chiron (43–52), goes on with a list of other heroes or divine children who were trained by Chiron (53–58) and concludes in the pattern of ring-composition with Achilles' exploits as an adult man under the walls of Troy (59–63). The structure of this part shows several affinities with the general way in which both Pindar and Theocritus depict Heracles' upbringing in their poems.

Like Heracles, Achilles is also a prodigious child: at the age of six he kills lions and boars and carries their dead bodies by himself to his master's cave. Interestingly, Heracles is mentioned in *Nem.* 3.19–21 as a foil for the entire clan of the Aeacids and the *laudandus*.⁴⁰⁷ Achilles' exploits, like those of infant Heracles, are also admired by an interior audience, which is made up by Athena and Artemis (50). Finally, in both cases Pindar refers his audience to his sources about the myths of these miraculous children. We have already seen that in *Nemean* 1 the myth of

⁴⁰⁷ This is not the place to get into the much-debated problem of the relevance of Heracles' myth in *Nemean* 3. On the whole, see Pfeijffer (1999) 224-8 and Burnett (2005) 142-3.

Heracles is called an ἀρχαῖος λόγος (34), although Pindar is the first to deal with it. In *Nemean* 3 with regard to the story of Achilles' attainments in hunting Pindar declares: λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων / ἔπος ἔχω (52-3), although again this story is not found before and is probably his own invention (cf. Pfeijffer (1999) 212; see, however, Instone (1996) *ad loc.*). Pindar seems to have felt the need to envelop his stories of incredible infantine or adolescent exploits with the authority of tradition.

The most interesting part, however, concerns the representation of Achilles' heroic career in relation to the description of Heracles' career in *Nemean* 1 and *Idyll* 24. The mini-narrative of lines 60–3 concentrates on the apogee of his career, the killing of Memnon, the son of a goddess like himself. From this point of view, the first part of the catalogue (43–52) not only prefigures but also functions as the necessary condition for the fulfillment of Achilles' heroic mission in the third part (cf. Pfeijffer (1999) 211-3). Similarly, in *Nemean* 1 the episode with the snakes is the first revelation of Heracles' heroic nature, which will lead to the events prefigured in the prophecy; these culminate in his assistance to the gods in their war against the giants. Finally, both heroes are descendants of Zeus (*Nem.* 1.35 παῖς Διός ~ fr. 52u.9 Maehler βρέφος οὐρανόου Διός ~ *Nem.* 3.65 Ζεῦ, τεὸν γὰρ αἶμα), and as such their brilliant career is contextualized within the broader frame of the praise of Zeus' rule (*Nem.* 1.75 σεμνὸν αἰνήσειν νόμον ~ *Nem.* 3.65-6 Ζεῦ, τεὸν γὰρ αἶμα, σέο δ' ἀγών, τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν / ὅπῃ νέων ἐπιχώριον χάρμα κελαδέων).⁴⁰⁸ Similarly in *Idyll* 24 the prophecy complements the main episode of the poem leading the reader to Heracles' completion of the twelve exploits according to his destiny (80–3). This will enable

⁴⁰⁸ It seems that this was included in fr. 52u Maehler as well. A fragmentary margine on *POxy.* 2442 gives ἀν(τὶ τοῦ) ὕμνη[...]. Some form of ὕμνέω is to be supplied. Pindar probably used a poetic synonym which the scholiast explained. It could refer to the deified Heracles' praising the rule of Zeus, as in *Nemean* 1. In *Nem.* 1.75 the manuscripts give two variants δόμον and γάμον. νόμον has been restored on the basis of Σ *Nem.* 1.112a, b; cf. Carey (1981) *ad loc.* '[...] looking back, [Heracles] sees the essential connection between the labour and the glory, and can praise the νόμος which ordains it.'

him to become immortal and spend his days in the midst of the other gods on Olympus.

There is no independent evidence that suggests the connection of *Idyll* 24 with *Nemean* 3 but the theme of the self-sufficient prodigious child and Chiron's training of Achilles are quite relevant in themselves. Theocritus followed on the whole the Pindaric image of Heracles but twisted it in such a way as to make room for his training; here *Nemean* 3 could have been one of his models. Pindar does not provide many examples of heroic children, and those he gives (*Iamus Olympian* 6, *Asclepius Pythian* 3, *Aristaeus Pythian* 9) lack the similarities with Heracles just pointed out in Achilles' case.⁴⁰⁹ Apart from this, however, it is interesting to see the way in which the theme of training is developed in both *Nemean* 3 and *Idyll* 24 in relation to the idea of inherent excellence. In *Nemean* 3 Chiron is brought forward as a trainer in order to emphasise the way in which training can enhance the inborn virtue of Achilles (cf. Instone (1996) *ad* 43-63; Pfeijffer (1999) 228-9; and especially Burnett (2005) 147-9). This is a piece of epinician discourse which regularly appears in Pindar's odes. Pindar does not stress the benefits of innate excellence on its own, but combines them with training, effort and toil (cf. Marrou (1965) 79; Hubbard (1985) 107-16). This is suggested in the representation of heroes such as Jason in *Pythian* 4 or Achilles in *Nemean* 3, but there is no instance in the Pindaric corpus of Heracles ever being represented as undergoing training. This is a Theocritean innovation. For Pindar he is the embodiment of the concept of inborn prowess. Theocritus, I would

⁴⁰⁹ This is not entirely true. *Ol.* 6.43-4 (*ἦλθεν δ' ὑπὸ σπλάγχνων ἵπ' ὠδίνεσσ' ἑραταῖς Ἴαμος / ἐς φάος αὐτίκα*) is nearly identical with *Nem.* 1.35-6 (*ἐπεὶ σπλάγχνων ὕπο μητέρος αὐτίκα θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν παῖς Διός / ὠδῖνα φεύγων ...*); cf. Mezger (1880), Christ (1896) and Bury (1890) *ad* 35. Both myths describe the birth of divine and precocious babies. It is probable, therefore, that the description of the birth of Iamus in *Olympian* 6 was meant to recall that of Heracles in *Nemean* 1 composed almost a decade before it. After all, both *laudandi* were connected in some way with Hieron. Both these scenes, of course, go back to the description of Apollo's birth in the *h.Apol.* (119 *ἐκ δ' ἔθορε πρὸ φάωσ δέ, θεαὶ δ' ὀλόλυξαν ἄπασαι*), which is Pindar's subtext.

suggest, combined two distinct Pindaric images, those of baby Heracles and child Achilles. The *Homeric Hymns* do not provide anything similar and so Pindar's Achilles remains an attractive candidate. Still, Theocritus is silent on the notion of inborn qualities in his poem. In view of the Ptolemaic context suggested above and the 'identification' between Ptolemy II and Heracles, it could be that Theocritus' silence on Heracles' divine father is not due to avoid exaggeration or explicit flattery but is rather a part of his encomiastic technique. Heracles' and Ptolemy's divine ancestry is alluded to but never explicitly spelled out. As Griffiths (1979: 56) has pointed out, Theocritus is interested in creating elaborate scenes which are full of implications but never explicit in their encomiastic agenda (cf. also Stephens (2003) 128).

The end of *Idyll* 24

The publication of the Antinoë Papyrus has shown that the poem went on after line 140, as scholars had already suspected (see Bernsdorff (2011)). The catalogue is followed by a description of Heracles' everyday portions of food. The poet exaggerates the amount of food consumed by the young boy, adding a characteristically comic colouring to his version; this element is absent from Pindar's serious account. As we saw in the discussion of the *Victoria Berenices*, Heracles' voracity was a standard topic in Sicilian and Middle comedy, mythological burlesque and mime; it is probable that Theocritus was alluding to that literary tradition at this point. The tone in these lines is not incongruous with the rest of the poem. Theocritus has been consistent in his effort to lower the myth from the solemn heights of Pindaric lyric to the everyday routine of Hellenistic realism. One should not forget that a similar comic element in the representation of Heracles appears in the explicitly

political *Idyll* 17. In lines 27-33 Heracles takes part in a banquet alongside his descendants, Alexander and Ptolemy I. By the end of the scene Heracles is so drunk that his descendants need to help him to his bed-chamber (cf. Hamm (2009) 97-9). This scene too alludes to two *topoi* well-represented in comedy: Heracles' insatiable thirst for wine and for sex, although the poet is very careful in the way he incorporates these traditional elements in his court poem.⁴¹⁰

The end of the idyll is preserved on the papyrus but in too a fragmentary condition to allow a deep understanding of the structure of the poem from this point onwards. Still, it suggests that Teiresias' prophecy took up the central part of the idyll. Lines 141–55 are extremely lacunose and they are followed by a lacuna of approximately twelve lines. However, the last five lines of the poem seem to be more accessible, partly because of their better preservation and the marginal scholium that we have already talked about. Line 168 seems to preserve the ending of the name of mountain Olympus. It is, then, likely that the last part of the poem described Heracles' apotheosis as a verification of Teiresias' prophecy (79–83). Further, the traces in lines 168 –70 imply that the poet talked about an incestuous marriage: either that of Heracles to his half-sister Hebe or that of Zeus to his full-sister Hera (cf. also Bernsdorff (2011)):

.....| α . . . ων μ | Ὀλυμπον
| δε βρώπιδα ||c
 . . . κασιγνήταν ὁμοπάτριον| λᾶι.

168 Hunt et Johnson || **169** βρώπιδα Henry ap. Bernsdorff: ἐρρώπιδα
 Hunt et Johnson || **170** Pohlenz; de αὐτοκασιγνήταν cogites si ante
 κασιγνη] non tres sed quattuor litterae deesse scias

⁴¹⁰ For irony and its limits in Hellenistic court poetry see Hamm (2009).

Henry (*ap.* Bernsdorff (2011)) reports that the traces in line 169 suggest *βοώπιδα* rather than *ἐριώπιδα*, as Hunt and Johnson (1930) had deciphered them.⁴¹¹ So at this point in the narrative there was a mention of Hera, whose typical adjective this is (e.g. *Il.* 1.551 *βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη*).⁴¹² There seems to be a further argument in favour of Hera's not Hebe's presence in the end of the idyll. In line 170 one could supplement *αὐτοκασιγνήταν* and so get the *iunctura* *αὐτοκασιγνήταν ὁμοπάτριον*, even though in the missing part of the line there is supposed to be room for ten not eleven letters.⁴¹³ However this may be, the underlying concept is clear: this collocation is found again in an epic fragment which has been tentatively assigned either to a Hesiodic *Πειρίθου Κατάβασις* (fr. 280.18 M.–W.) or, with more probability (cf. Schwartz (1960: 27-8), to the *Minyas* (fr.7.18 Bernabé). The line derives from a passage in which Theseus explains to Meleager why Peirithous and he have descended to Hades. Theseus informs his interlocutor that intermarriage is the custom between the gods (14-6 [ἀθανά]των τε νόμοις ἵνα ἐδνώσειεν ἄκ[ο]ιτιν / [καὶ γὰρ] ἐκείνους φασὶ κασιγνήτας μεγ[ακ]υδέϊς / [μνησ]τεύειν, γαμέειν τε φίλων ἀπάγ[ευθε τοκῆων]). Peirithous' claim to the hand of Persephone is supported by the fact that as her half-brother (*Il.* 2.741; 14.317) he stands closer to her than her uncle Hades (18 [αὐτοκ]ασιγνήτην

⁴¹¹ In their edition of the papyrus Hunt and Johnson (1930: 80 *ad* 169) erroneously posited the presence of Hebe in these lines. This hypothesis rests entirely on their tentative reading *ἐριώπιδα* which they considered an epithet of Hebe. However, *ἐριώπις* is attested as an adjective only in Hesychius (*s.v.*) but never in poetry (except for Maximus *περὶ καταρχῶν* 11.545 in late antiquity). In Homer it is the name of Oileus' mother (*Il.* 13.697=15.336). Apart from this, Hebe is usually praised for her limbs and not her eyes: she is either *καλλίσφυρος* (*Od.* 11.603; *Hes. Cat.* fr. 25.28 M.–W.) or *ἀγλαόγυις* (*Pind. Nem.* 7.4). Although Hebe usually appears whenever there is mention of Heracles' deification (*Od.* 11.603; *Hes. Theog.* 950; *Pind. Nem.* 1.71; *Eur. Heracl.* 91; *Theoc.* 17.33-4), there is no reason, at least on the basis of the information provided by the papyrus, to suppose her presence in these lines too.

⁴¹² It can be used for lesser female deities (*Hom. Il.* 3.144; 7.10; 18.40; *Theog.* 335; *Pind. Pyth.* 3.91; *Bacch.* 11.99) or mortal women (*Clytemnestra* fr. 23a.9 M.–W.). However, the mention of Olympus renders it more likely that it referred to Hera here. The form is a hapax. The only form for the accusative singular attested in poetry and prose, but never in Homer, is *βοῶπι* (*Hes. Cat.* fr. 23a.9 M.–W.; *Pi. Pyth.* 3.91; *Bacch.* 11.99, 16.110; *Lyc.* 1292).

⁴¹³ For similar expressions see Bernabé's apparatus *ad Minyas* fr. 7.18 and Richradson (1974) *ad h.Cer.* 85: (e.g. *Il.* 12.371 *κασίγνητος καὶ ὄπατρος*); (*Il.* 24.47 *κασίγνητον ὁμογάστριον*); (*h.Cer.* 85 *αὐτοκασίγνητος καὶ ὁμόσπορος*); cf. also [Aesch.] *PV* 559; *Eur. Phoen.* 136-7.

δροπάτριον ~ 21 **κασίγνητος καὶ ὄπατρος**). In this way, he will be following the divine custom according to which gods marry their sisters without the consent of their parents.⁴¹⁴ If then **βοῶπις** in line 169 refers to Hera and not to Hebe, the collocation (**αὐτό-**) **κασίγνητα δροπάτριος** would allude to the incestuous marriage of Zeus to Hera. In *Idyll* 17 the marriage of Zeus to Hera is explicitly used as a role-model for the marriage of Ptolemy II to Arsinoe II (128-34).

It would seem quite possible, then, that the same theme was selected again in *Idyll* 24 in accordance with its court significance to allude to the marital union of the two royal siblings (cf. also Theoc. 15.64; Posid. AB 114; Call. *Aetia* III fr. 171 Massimilla).⁴¹⁵ This would square nicely with the possible context of performance of *Idyll* 24, the more so if the poem was intended for a Ptolemaic audience. It is unclear whether Theocritus also mentioned the incestuous marriage of Heracles to his half-sister Hebe (cf. Theoc. 17.33-4), as Pindar did in *Nemean* 1. In Theocritus' version Teiresias does not elaborate on the identity of Heracles' bride but vaguely predicts that he is going to be called groom to the gods (84 **γαμβρός δ' ἀθανάτων κεκλήσεται**).⁴¹⁶ The name of the bride is not revealed, but it could have been at the end of the poem. Be that as it may, it seems that Theocritus replaces the description of Heracles' marriage to Hebe in *Nemean* 1 with the marriage of Zeus to Hera. This, of course, brought about a change in the way in which the theme of marriage is employed in the discourse of both poems.

⁴¹⁴ I have not been able to find any other mention of this 'divine custom' in Greek literature. The use of **νόμος** is certainly post-Homeric (cf. LJS⁹ s.v. I). Lines 15-6 seem, however, to depend on the description of the first erotic encounter between Zeus and Hera in *Il.* 14.295-6 (**οἶον ὅτε πρῶτόν περ ἐμοισγέσθην φιλότῃ / εἰς εὐνήν φοιτῶντε φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας**); cf. also the Homeric scholiast at *Il.* 14.296, Pfeiffer *ad* fr. 48 and Massimilla *ad* fr. 56.

⁴¹⁵ Cf. also Otto (2009) 162 with n. 552. To the texts mentioned above one should add also Sotades fr. 16 Powell (**Ἥρην ποτέ φασιν Δία τὸν τερπικέραυνον**), especially if one is to follow Pretagostini's attractive hypothesis that it came from the same poem as fr. 1 Powell; see Hamm (2009) 78-81.

⁴¹⁶ Cf. Eur. *Phaethon* fr. 781.240-4 Kannicht (**ὦ μάκαρ, ὦ βασιλεὺς μείζων ἔτ' ἄλβον, / ὅς θεῶν κηδεύσεις / καὶ μόνος ἀθανάτων / γαμβρός δι' ἀπέριονα γαῖαν / θνατὸς ὑμνήσει**) with Diggle's (1970) comments *ad loc.*

In the context of *Nemean 1* the final scene of Heracles' marital bliss harks back to the idea of rest suggested in the beginning of the ode by the scene of Alpheus lying in the arms of the nymph Arethusa (cf. Bury (1890) 7; Carey (1981) *ad 1*).⁴¹⁷ As we have seen in a previous chapter (pp. 58-60 above), in Pindar's epinicians love imagery indicates the victor's determination to win *kleos*, while his representation as a (young) groom enhances his praise by stressing his desirability. In the case of *Nemean 1*, however, there seems to be more to the use of this imagery. Heracles' marriage to Hebe grants him eternal youth and immortality, a sort of immortality analogous to that offered by Pindar to his *laudandus*. Pindar's ode will render Chromius immortal and represent him to generations to come at his athletic peak as a winner at the Nemean Games.⁴¹⁸ Chromius' position is analogous both to that of Alpheus reaching the *δέμνιον* of his lover and to that of Heracles arriving in the chamber of Hebe (Mezger (1880) 110-2, although he goes too far in his biographical reading; Fraccaroli (1894) 519; Christ (1896) 236).⁴¹⁹ This analogy, along with other echoes pointed out by scholars make possible the parallelism between Chromius and Heracles, between the frame and the myth (cf. Carey (1981) 129).⁴²⁰ In Theocritus' poem, Heracles' marriage alludes to the royal marriage and his deification in the final part prefigures Ptolemy's immortality in the frame of dynastic cult. However, the divine marriage is no longer a metaphor for eternal youth (*Nemean 1*) but rather

⁴¹⁷ For the interpretation of these lines see pp. 102-3 above.

⁴¹⁸ Cf. Σ *ad Pi. Nem.* 1.49b *ἐπαπορήσειεν ἂν τις, διατί τοῦ Ἡρακλέους μνημονεύει· οὐ γὰρ εὐκαιρος δοκεῖ ἡ μνήμη νῦν Ἡρακλέους. καὶ φαμεν, ὅτι βουλόμενος δεῖξαι ὡς οἱ διαφανεῖς ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ τοῖς λόγοις ἀθάνατοι γίνονται τῇ μνήμῃ, διὰ τοῦτο μέμνηται Ἡρακλέους ἀρετῆς, ἐπιφέρων τοῖς τοῦ Χρομίου θαύμασιν [...].*

⁴¹⁹ Slater (1984) 250-9 makes the interesting suggestion that the reception of Heracles in the symposium of the gods on Olympus reflects the reception of the chorus in Chromius' palace for the celebration of his victory (19-24); cf. Athanassaki (2009) 186. One should also take into account *Nem.* 9.44-5 (*ἐκ πόνων δ', οἱ σὺν νεότατι γένωνται / σὺν τε δίκαι, τελέθει πρὸς γῆρας αἰὼν ἡμέρα. / ἴστω λαχὼν πρὸς δαιμόνων θαυμαστὸν ὄλβον*), also composed for Chromius some years after *Nemean 1*, which reflects the sentiment of *Nem.* 1.69-72 (*αὐτὸν μὰν ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον <ἐν> σχερῶι / ἡσυχίαν καμάτων μεγάλων / ποινὰν λαχόντ' ἐξαιρετον / ὀλβίοις ἐν δώμασι [...]*).

⁴²⁰ Cf. especially Mezger (1880) *passim*, Bury (1890) 4-7 (and esp. his notes on lines 51, 58 and 59) and Fraccaroli (1894) 527-8.

offers a paradigm that sanctions the incestuous marriage of Ptolemy II to Arsinoe II. The representation of Heracles' marriage in *Idyll* 24 tallies with similar mythological marriages employed by Theocritus for the representation of the marriage of the royal couple. It is interesting that in all these cases the wedding of a mortal man (Adonis, Menelaus) to a divine consort (Aphrodite, Helen) functions as the means whereby he can achieve immortality. In the final part of this chapter I will argue that this piece of Ptolemaic imagery was based on the similar representation of the marriages of Cadmus and Peleus in Pindar's epinician odes. Pindar provided Theocritus with examples of heroic weddings which in the context of his epinician discourse functioned as a metaphor for the transition from mortality to divinity and at the same time demarcated the dividing lines between the two categories.

Divine marriages in Pindar and Theocritus

In *Idyll* 18, a poem with possible Ptolemaic associations, Menelaus, like Heracles in Theoc. 24.84, is described as groom to the gods (*μῶνος ἐν ἡμιθέοις Κρονίδαν Δία πενθερόν ἐξεῖς*. / *χαίροις, ὦ νύμφα· χαίροις, εὐπένθερε γαμβρέ*). In both cases, marriage is employed as a metaphor to suggest that the 'groom' has moved to a higher existential category: as groom to the gods Heracles becomes immortal and Menelaus a 'demigod'. In this sense, both Heracles and Menelaus exemplify through their weddings the highest honours a mortal man can reach. This pattern of images, I would argue, bears similarities to the way in which Pindar represented the marriages of Cadmus to Harmonia and of Peleus to Thetis in his epinician odes. Pindar was Theocritus' model for the development of marriage imagery as a metaphor for the deification of Ptolemaic kings. Like Heracles (cf. *Isthm.* 4.78 *χρυσέων οἴκων ἀναξ καὶ γαμβρὸς Ἥρας*), Peleus is 'son-in-law to the gods': *ἄτις οὐ Πηλέος ἀίει κλέος ἥρωος*,

εὐδαίμονος γαμβροῦ θεῶν (*Isthm.* 6.25); he is also **εὐδαίμων** because his marriage to Thetis opened up the way to the world of gods for him. Both Peleus and Cadmus are repeatedly employed in Pindaric poetry along with Heracles as personifications of the highest level of **εὐδαιμονία** that any mortal can attain (cf. Currie (2005) 398). The description of the divine banquet in Theoc. 17.16-32, where all members of the Macedonian and Ptolemaic royal houses are represented as feasting along with their progenitor, Heracles, and the rest of the Olympians shows similarities with the Pindaric passages that represent the two heroes feasting in the company of the gods on the occasion of their wedding (*Pyth.* 3.92-5; *Nem.* 4.66-8; *Isthm.* 4.73-8).⁴²¹

Apart from this, what unites all these men (Menelaus, Heracles, Peleus, Cadmus) is the privileged after-life that they gain as consorts to divine women or goddesses (Helen, Hebe, Thetis, Harmonia). Heracles joins the rest of the gods on Olympus and acquires everlasting youth (Hebe); Cadmus and Peleus are accepted on the Island of the Blessed (*Ol.* 2.75-87). Similarly, according to an old tradition, found in the *Odyssey* but not in Pindar,⁴²² Menelaus was not meant to die but go on living in the Elysian Fields, some sort of paradise meant for the special few. In most, if not in all, of these cases the consorts were instrumental to the ‘deification’ of their husbands. This would explain their relevance as models for Theocritus in the light of the importance of female royal figures in Ptolemaic public discourse. For instance,

⁴²¹ *Od.* 11.602–3 would be another subtext: (Heracles), *αὐτὸς δὲ μετ’ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι / τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃς καὶ ἔχει καλλίσφυρον Ἥβην*; Cf. Hunter (2003) *ad* Theoc. 17.22. One could also compare Glaucus’ prophecy in A.R. 1.1318-19 (*ἐκπλήσσει μογέοντα δώδεκα πάντας ἀέθλους, / ναίειν δ’ ἀθανάτοισι συνέστιον [...]*). The phrasing is close to Teiresias’ prophecy in Theoc. 24.82-3 (*δώδεκά οἱ τελέσαντι πεπρωμένον ἐν Διὸς οἰκεῖν / μόχθους ...*). Theocritus’ version is closer to Pindar (note also the similarity *ἐν Διὸς οἰκεῖν* ~ *Nem.* 1.74 *δαίσαντα παρ Διὶ Κρονίδαι* ~ *Isthm.* 4.75-6 *νῦν δὲ παρ’ Αἰγιόχῳ {Διῖ} ... /...ναίει*).

⁴²² Pindar probably followed the mention of Menelaus’ privileged after-death fate as a groom to Zeus in the fourth book of the *Odyssey* (4.560-9 [569 *οὔνεκ’ ἔχεις Ἑλένην καὶ σφιν γαμβρὸς Διὸς ἔσσει*]) for the representation of Cadmus and Peleus; cf. Nisetich (1989) 59–61 and 64–5 with note 20). *Σ ad Od.* 4.569 informs us that this line was not found in all ancient editions; *ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ οὐ φέρεται ὁ στίχος διὰ τὸ ἀκύρωσ ἔχειν τὴν ἀνωθυμῖαν. οὐ γὰρ Διὸς γαμβρὸς ὁ Μενέλαος*. Cf. West (1988) *ad loc.* Compare also Euripides *Helen* 1676-8.

Arsinoe II was considered and represented publicly not only as a benefactor to her subjects but also as a benefactor and protector of her husband's sovereignty (Koenen (1983) 159-60 with n. 51): in the so-called Mendes *stèle* Arsinoe is called 'sweet in love', a title which, Koenen believes, is rendered in Greek by *φιλάδελφος*. Ludwig Koenen (1983: 161-3) has further demonstrated that in Ptolemaic public discourse (incestuous)⁴²³ *eros* between the royal couple, their ancestors and descendants symbolized the existence and prosperity of the kingdom. Thus, the emphasis on the representation of divine and royal marriages and their frequent appearance in Ptolemaic poetry⁴²⁴ suggests that 'marriage' and *eros* were a standard topic in Ptolemaic propaganda and Pindar was the source Ptolemaic that poets employed to handle it.

⁴²³ Cf. the case of Ptolemy III and Berenice II, who were represented as full siblings (cf. Call. *VB* fr. 143.2 Massimilla) although they were foster cousins and not blood-related; Koenen (1983) 160 and 164-5; *id.* (1993) 62-3.

⁴²⁴ Call. fr. 392 Pf. (*Ἀρσινόης ὦ ξείνε γάμον καταβάλλομ' αἰδεῖν*) is believed to derive from an epithalamium in elegiacs that Callimachus composed to celebrate Arsinoe's marriage. There is also a lacunose elegiac fragment (*SH* 961) preserving the name of an Arsinoe and which could be describing the same marriage.

CHAPTER 8

Pindaric eschatology and inherent excellence in Theocritus *Idyll* 17**Introduction**

This chapter deals with *Idyll* 17, the most explicitly Ptolemaic poem in the whole of Theocritus' corpus, and its connection with Pindaric poetry. In the following discussion it will be argued that *Idyll* 17 is imbued with the propagandistic discourse⁴²⁵ of the royal house and attempts to project an ideal image of the reigning monarch (*optimus rex*) (105 οἱ ἀγαθῶι βασιλεῖ [...]). It will further be suggested that Theocritus created his image of Ptolemy II as the ideal king on the basis of a long established tradition, a tradition which included not only philosophical and historical treatises but also the previous poetic tradition, in which Pindar's Sicilian odes and especially *Olympian* 2 played an important role.

Patronage is a social phenomenon not peculiar to Hellenistic times; well before Hellenistic kings, tyrants and monarchs employed literature and arts to enhance their public image.⁴²⁶ To give one famous example, Hieron, the powerful tyrant of Syracuse, invited several great poets, among them Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides, in order to support his public profile as a righteous and fair ruler. The odes Pindar addressed to him (*Olympian* 1; *Pythians* 1-3) or to his dignitaries like Chromius (*Nemean* 1 and 9) agree in their projection of the picture of a thriving Syracuse under his protection and government. The praise of Hieron's athletic victories is combined with the praise of his rule and the furthering of his political

⁴²⁵ For the concept see Barbantani (2010) 227-8. Differently Meincke (1965) 149-50, 155, 163, who sees the poem more as a sincere outpouring of Theocritus' admiration of and gratitude to Ptolemy II for his benefactions towards him.

⁴²⁶ For patronage in Archaic and Classical times see Podlecki (1980), Bremmer (1991) and Mann (2000). Cf. also Meincke (1965) 147-8 for Ptolemy as patron of the arts.

agenda. The several similarities in the handling of Hieron's public profile in the odes of Pindar and Bacchylides show that their contribution to the construction of Hieron's public profile was permeated by some basic motifs (righteousness, courage, piety towards the gods and tradition) which were dictated by the propagandistic needs of the tyrant. *Mutatis mutandis* Pindar's and Bacchylides' cases are similar to those of Hellenistic court poets. There remain, however, considerable differences: Hieron's court did not exhibit the same degree of organization and system in the propagation of his public image as Ptolemaic monarchy (cf. Meincke (1965) 147). Further, Pindar unlike Ptolemaic poets, never sought to become a court poet in the sense that he never intended to become the resident eulogist in Hieron's court. Be that as it may, the similarities in the eulogistic discourse employed by Archaic and Hellenistic poets can hardly be denied. It would, then, be worthwhile to examine how closely *Idyll 17*, a typical specimen of Ptolemaic poetry, agrees with the imagery that Pindar employed for the great rulers of the West. In the following discussion I will turn to the examination of the intertextual relationship between *Idyll 17* and *Olympian 2* composed for Theron the tyrant of Acragas.

On gods, heroes and ... men

ἀρχομένου δ' ἔργου πρόσωπον / χρῆ θέμεν τηλαυγές, advised Pindar (*Ol.* 6.3-4) some two hundred years before Theocritus composed his idyll in honour of king Ptolemy II. Due to its propagandistic character this poem has not found sympathy with most modern readers of Theocritus (cf. e.g. Meincke (1965) 144 n.3; notable exception Hunter (2003)). Nevertheless, the opening of this idyll, for all its rhetorical formalism, is one the most impressive and effective parts of the poem. The proem (1-12) is divided into three quatrains: (i) 1-4: Zeus vs. Ptolemy; (ii) 5-8: heroes of old vs.

Ptolemy; (iii) 9-12: woodcutter vs. Poet. Each quatrain is further divided into two couplets. In the first two quatrains the first couplet refers to the divine and heroic world (Zeus, heroes), while the second is concerned with the world of humans. The third quatrain concerns the poet himself and his self-representation. The structural motif that helps to articulate the first four lines is the analogy between Zeus and Ptolemy (cf. Hunter (2003) 95; Heerink (2010) 394), an analogy emphatically underlined by the chiasmic juxtaposition of their attributes (2: ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον, ἐπήν † ἀείδωμεν αἰοδαῖς ~ 12: οἷσι θεοὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐτίμησαν βασιλῆων). The meeting-point between the two of them is their respective excellence (Zeus, ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον ~ Ptolemy, ὁ γὰρ προφερέστατος ἄλλων). Still, Theocritus is careful to retain the boundaries of the two statuses; the repetition of the genitive ἀνδρῶν at the beginning and the end of Ptolemy's couplet (ἀνδρῶν δ' αὖ Πτολεμαῖος ἐνὶ πρώτοισι λεγέσθω / καὶ πύματος καὶ μέσσοις· ὁ γὰρ προφερέστατος ἀνδρῶν) makes certain that whatever the similarities with Zeus, Ptolemy still belongs to the realm of mortal men.⁴²⁷

In the roughly contemporary *Hymn to Zeus*, Callimachus suggests a similar analogy between the rule of Zeus and Ptolemy Philadelphus (cf. Perrotta (1925) 37-41).⁴²⁸ However, in Callimachus' poem the analogy is never spelled out in such explicit terms as in *Idyll* 17. It is rather insinuated by the selected account of Zeus'

⁴²⁷ Theocritus juxtaposed gods or heroes with men again in the opening lines (1-4) of *Idyll* 13. In a passage that owes a lot to the proem of Pindar's *Nemean* 6 (cf. Cholmeley (1901) *ad loc.*), Theocritus reminds his friend Nicias of the inability of humans to know the future as opposed to gods' omniscience (4 οἱ θνατοὶ πελόμεσθα, τὸ δ' αὔριον οὐκ ἔσορῶμες); in *Nemean* 6 this is the *κεκριμένα δύναμις* that separates gods from men (6-7) with Gerber (1999) *ad loc.*; cf. also Pind. *Ol.* 12.7-9, [Aesch.] *Pr.* 250-3. More importantly, though, Theocritus employs the Pindaric motif of the community between the two existential categories (*Nem.* 6.1-2) giving it a different application: the common ancestral bond between gods and humans is not detected in the prowess of athletes and heroes as in Pindar (cf. Jaeger (1946) i. 205; Bowra (1964) 97; Fränkel (1975) 472-4) but rather in the similarly helpless way in which both gods and humans react to the power of *eros* (Theoc. 13.1-2); cf. Hunter (1999) 265-6.

⁴²⁸ I cannot discuss here the question of which poem comes first. It is enough for the aims of this discussion that both reflect motifs and themes that derived from the needs of Ptolemaic propaganda.

ascent to the throne of the gods (60-7), which is understood to allude to the conflict between Philadelphus and his half-brothers, Ptolemy Keraunos and Magas,⁴²⁹ and the special interest that Zeus shows towards Ptolemy and his realm (85-90). The intertextual relationship of these two poems aside, their similarities in this central motif would imply that the analogy between Zeus and Ptolemy was suggested by court circles (cf. Barbantani (2010) 240-2).⁴³⁰ At any rate, Pindar's *Pythian* 1 provides an interesting precedent for this analogy. In *Pythian* 1 Pindar drew an elaborate comparison between the calmness of Zeus' and of Hieron's rules,⁴³¹ a calmness which is expressed in musical terms (38 *καὶ σὺν εὐφώνοις θαλίαις ὄνυμαστάν* and 70 *τράποι σύμφωνον ἐς ἡσυχίαν*; cf. Lefkowitz (1976) 105, 109, 114; Segal (1985) 187-8; Cingano (1995) *ad* 70);⁴³² on the other hand, the noises produced by the Etruscans, Hieron's enemies (72 [...] *κατ' οἶκον ... ὁ Τυρσανῶν τ' ἀλαλατὸς ἔχρη*), resemble those that Typhos makes as he lies under Aetna, whenever he hears the sound of Apollo's lyre (cf. Schroeder (1922) *ad* 70ff; Lefkowitz (1976) 119; Segal (1985) 189; Cingano (1995) 355). Aetna, the mountain in whose vicinity Hieron's (supposedly) newly founded city was situated and which functioned in the ode's myth as the eternal prison of Zeus' arch-enemy, enables the transition from the divine sphere of Zeus' rule to that of the mortal Hieron: in fact, Aetna is represented as a sky-high column (19 *κίων δ' οὐρανία συνέχει*) which in suppressing Typhos metaphorically connects the two kingdoms and symbolizes the order of Zeus's rule

⁴²⁹ Cf. Perrotta (1925) 50-2, Barbantani (2010) 238-9; for the problems of this interpretation see McLennan (1977) *ad* 61. This is more or less Hesiod's version (*Theog.* 881-5), where Zeus is the youngest of the three brothers. The old poets whom Callimachus accuses of lying were Homer (*Il.* 15.187-9) and Pindar (*Ol.* 7. 54-5), who presented the three brothers dividing the world among themselves by drawing lots; cf. D'Alessio (2007) 72 n. 18.

⁴³⁰ For the cults of Zeus in Ptolemaic Alexandria see Fraser (1972) i. 193-5.

⁴³¹ For the parallelism between Zeus and Hieron see Gundert (1935) 71-4 Norwood (1945) 102-5, Carne-Ross (1985) 107-11 and Hubbard (1985) 92.

⁴³² For the concept of musical order and its significance for the ode cf. e.g. Burton (1962) 91-3 and Cingano (1995) 20.

(cf. Segal (1985) 188). This image along with the celebrations taking place, as it were, simultaneously on Olympus and at Hieron's court, along with the power of music and dance strengthens the analogy between the two universes.

The second quatrain of Theocritus 17 concerns an in-between ontological category, that of heroes born of demigods (5-6). So the proem presents a descending scale which comprises gods, heroes and a lower type of existence mortal men. The tripartite division of existential categories which articulates this proem comes quite close to the opening of Pindar's *Olympian* 2 and suggests this ode as one of Theocritus' major subtexts for the unfolding of his eulogistic discourse (cf. Hunter (2003) 95-6; Currie (2005) 83-4).⁴³³

Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι,
τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;

Scholars have rightly suggested that in his effort to encompass all existential categories (gods, heroes, men) Pindar followed a rhetorical *topos*, the preamble-question, usually found in the proems of epic poems and hymns (cf. *h.Ap.* 19-24 with Richardson's (2010) note *ad loc.*). This would be another, indirect way to praise Theron: although Pindar has at his disposal a variety of topics concerning gods, heroes and men to sing about, he still chose Theron.⁴³⁴ This is certainly true but one cannot disregard the function this *incipit* serves within this ode. The rhetorical

⁴³³ Manetho (*FGrHist* 609 F 3a) divided his history in three parts comprising *θεοί*, *νέκυες* or *ἡμίθεοι*, and *ἄνδρες*. Murray (1970) 168 considers the proem of *Idyll* 17 a possible reminiscence of Hecataeus' threefold division; cf. Hunter (2003) 96. Still, the attraction of Pindar's poem for Theocritus, and court circles, would be even greater in view of its agreement with independent Egyptian tradition. The *incipit* of *Olympian* 2 was frequently imitated in antiquity; apart from the well-known Horatian rendition (*C.* I.12.1-3) *quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri / tibia sumis celebrare, Clio? / quem deum?*), the same tripartite division appears in Antiph. 27 and Isocr. *Euag.* 39; see Christ (1896) *ad loc.* For the memorability of a poem's opening see Conte (1986) 70.

⁴³⁴ See Lehnus (1981) and especially Ferrari (1998) *ad loc.* In a similar way, Theocritus compares himself with a woodcutter who climbs mountain Ida and does not know where to begin from (9-12); the imagery operates on the analogy between woods (*ἄλγη*) and the *μύριαι τιμαί* of Ptolemy. The poet's inability to find a suitable point from which to begin his poem serves the same encomiastic strategy. It is possible that the image was borrowed from Simonides (11.2-3 W² *ἢ πῖτυν ἐν βήσ[σαις] / ἔλοτόμοι τὰ[μνωσι]*). The context, though, is too lacunose to allow any certainty.

exaggeration of the opening question aside, the eschatological character of the myth and the subtle promises for a privileged afterlife it suggests for Theron would have alerted the audience of the first performance to specific implications suggested to the poet by Theron himself or his supporters. According to Diodorus Siculus (11.53.2 *καὶ τελευτήσας ἥρωικῶν ἔτυχε τιμῶν*), Theron received heroic honours after his death. It is likely that this was not a decision taken suddenly but rather prepared by the tyrant himself during his lifetime (cf. Currie (2005) 192). Pindar, then, following Theron's wishes, insinuated his approaching 'heroization'. As we are going to see next, the elements Pindar used for Theron's 'portrait' were employed by Theocritus in his representation of Ptolemy II.

In *Olympian 2*, then, Pindar touches on the sensitive topic of the boundaries separating mortality and divinity (cf. lines 22-30). Gildersleeve (1908: 142) nicely summarized the poem's dominant issue: 'This is a poem for one who stands on the solemn verge beyond which lies immortal, heroic life.' The tone is struck from the very beginning of the ode when the narrator asks 'songs that dominate *phorminges*' for a proper topic to sing. Similarly at the end of his poem the poet will ask his *thymos* this time for a target proper for his poetic shafts (89-90 *τίνα βάλλομεν / ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὔτε φρενὸς εὐκλέας δῖστοῦς ἰέντες*;). Theron is the answer to all these questions. Throughout the ode Pindar suggests a comparison or even an analogy between the three ontological categories enumerated in the first line: god (Zeus), hero (Heracles), and man (Theron). In his capacity as king of the gods Zeus functions as a foil to Theron the tyrant of Acragas in the way he will do six years later in *Pythian 1* for Hieron (see above). On the other hand, Heracles was the founder of the Olympic Games (cf. *Ol.* 10.55-77) but more importantly he was the hero to whom immortality

was granted thanks to his benefactions to human kind (cf. *Nem.* 3.23-6). In his capacity, then, as a deified hero Heracles paves the way for Theron.⁴³⁵

In general, one point that one can make about the intertextual relationship between *Olympian 2* and *Idyll 17* is that the structure of Theocritus' poem renders Pindar's subtle associations more easily perceptible. To a certain degree this difference in perceptibility reflects the changes in religious consciousness that have come about since Pindar's times. Nevertheless, Callimachus, writing at the same time as Theocritus, is, as a rule, more elusive in suggesting similar analogies between gods or heroes and members of the reigning house in his hymns (cf. Barbantani (2010) 228).⁴³⁶ As we saw, instead of the Pindaric descending order god-hero-man Theocritus places Ptolemy, a man, between Zeus and the 'heroes born from demigods' (5).⁴³⁷ This enables Ptolemy to be juxtaposed with both categories explicitly: with Zeus in his status as a king⁴³⁸ and with heroes as a descendant of

⁴³⁵ In *Olympian 3* the Land of the Hyperboreans symbolizes the boundaries between mortality and divinity. Heracles' access to their land signifies his potential for deification as a reward for his deeds. The latent comparison between Heracles and Theron becomes apparent only towards the end of *Olympian 3* with possible suggestions of a similar fate (43-5; cf. also Lehms (1981) *ad* 13-34; Robbins (1984) 224-8).

⁴³⁶ θεὸς ἄλλος / [...] Σωτηράων ὑπατον γένος (*Del.* 165-6) is a notable exception.

⁴³⁷ Theocritus innovates in distinguishing between heroes and demigods, thought in archaic times to be the same (cf. e.g. Hes. *Op.* 159-60; Alc. fr. 42.13 Liberman [Achilles]; Simon. fr. 245 Poltera); see also Rossi (1989) 22 and Hunter (2003) 101-2. Theocritus uses the term ἥρωες for the Argonauts (13.28; 22.78), the Dioscuri (24.163), and Menelaus (18.18). Even so, he is not consistent in this distinction between heroes and demigods: e.g. 13.169 ἰστία δ' ἡμίθεοι μεσονύκτιον αὐτε καθαίρουσι; 18.18 μῶνος ἐν ἡμιθέοις Κρονίδαν Δία πενθερὸν ἔξεις; 24.132 Κάστορι δ' οὐτις ὁμοῖος ἐν ἡμιθέοις πολεμιστῆς. The use of ἡμίθεος for the Argonauts follows Pindaric precedent: *Pyth.* 4.12, 184, 211. Pindar uses it only for the Argonauts. In Bacchylides the term is used of the Argives who attacked Thebes (9.10) and the heroes who fought under Proetus against Acrisius (11.62).

⁴³⁸ Note also the following analogies: (i) ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα καὶ ἐς Δία λήγετε ~ ἐνὶ πρώτοισι λεγέσθω ... καὶ πύματος καὶ μέσσοις; (ii) justification of (i): ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον ~ ὁ γὰρ προφερέστατος ἀνδρῶν. The way in which Theocritus speaks of Ptolemy, recalls the Stoic description of Zeus. The scholia 1-4a indicate the allusion to the first line of Aratus' *Phaenomena*; it would be tempting to see in these lines an allusion to the *Phaenomena* which could have given rise to a Stoic reading of our poem, an attempt on Theocritus' part to represent Ptolemy as the ideal Stoic σοφός – king; see Privitera (1925) 29-36; Meincke (1965) 90; Hamm (2009) 94 n.56. Apart from that the explanation offered by the scholiast 1-4c is the most reasonable. Apparently Theocritus is echoing current court practice; in the Greek version of the synodical decree of Memphis (Rosetta Inscription) in 196 BCE Ptolemy V is called εἰκόνας ζώσης τοῦ Διός, the Greek phrase translating the Egyptian title njšwt-bjt 'living image of Amun'; see Koenen (1993) 48-50 and especially 59: "he [sc. Ptolemy V] is on earth what Zeus or, to

deified heroes himself (Ptolemy I (13-5); Alexander (18-9); Heracles (20-7)): (i) the prepositional phrase ἐκ πατέρων ('from the forefathers'; cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. VII.1) includes all the personages mentioned in lines 13-33 (cf. Meincke (1965) 95 n.2); (ii) Theocritus explicitly designates the Ptolemies as descendants of Heracles and as such connects them with Alexander (cf. Tarn (1933) 57-61) and more importantly with Zeus himself (cf. Meincke (1965) 152). Heracles is said to take pleasure in the immortality and everlasting youth that Zeus granted to his descendants (23 *υἰωνῶν ... υἰωνοῖσιν*), Ptolemy I and Alexander (23-7).⁴³⁹ As a descendant of men who are now worshipped as *ἀθάνατοι* (25)⁴⁴⁰ and feast along with the rest of the immortals like Heracles (22) Ptolemy is assumed to follow suit; further, as we will shortly see, lines 71-8 make it abundantly clear that Ptolemy II enjoys Zeus' benevolence. Consequently, it seems to be implied, the son of Cronus will remove old age from Ptolemy's limbs too (74), and allow him to take his rightful place at the banquet of the gods.

In addition, certain points throughout the idyll suggest the ambiguous or marginal status that Ptolemy holds. To begin with, Ptolemy will receive a hymn (8 *ὑμνήσαιμι*), explicitly said to be *ἀθανάτων γέρας αὐτῶν* (8), when the heroes of old, a category higher than mortal Ptolemy, received only *αἰδαί* (6) as a reward for their military prowess (5-6) (cf. Meincke (1956) 93-4; 152). The undying *κλέος* that poets have purveyed to the 'descendants of Atreus' (*Ἀτρεΐδαισι* 118) in lines 118-20 is an example of the songs that Theocritus has in mind here (cf. Meincke (1965) 135).

use the Egyptian name of the god, what Amun-Re is in heaven"; cf. Hunter (2003) 95, Heerink (2010) 395.

⁴³⁹ *σφέων ... μελέων ἐξείλετο γήρας* (24) indicates that Zeus granted Heracles' descendants everlasting youth in addition to immortality; cf. Cholmeley (1901) and Hunter (2003) *ad loc.*, Meincke (1965) 99. *Contra* Gow (1952) *ad loc.*, who thinks that the phrase indicates immortality only. Heracles wedded Hebe, the personification of youth; the same fortune was bestowed upon his descendants.

⁴⁴⁰ Berenice, Ptolemy's mother, is also deified. She receives her honours alongside Aphrodite as her *σύμμαχος* (46-50).

Lines 135-6 (χαῖρε, ἄναξ Πτολεμαῖε· σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ ἴσα καὶ ἄλλων / μνάσομαι ἡμιθέων [...]) are modelled on the ending of Homeric hymns (cf. Meincke (1965) 140, 158; Heerink (2010) 385, 393-4); the poet appropriates the χαῖρε formula and considers Ptolemy equal to other demigods, a designation employed elsewhere in Theocritus for Castor, Menelaus and Adonis (see n. 437 above).⁴⁴¹ By the time the poem ends Ptolemy has made the transition from being a man (3 ἀνδρῶν) to being a demigod (136 ἡμιθέων)⁴⁴² – a case of poetic and textual heroization.⁴⁴³ Furthermore, Ptolemy is addressed as ἄναξ (135); the hymnic undertones of the imperative χαῖρε aside, this is used in the same poem for Apollo (70 ἴσον καὶ Ῥήναιαν ἄναξ ἐφίλησεν Ἀπόλλων) in a scene which obviously imitates the *Homeric hymn to Apollo* (60-70).⁴⁴⁴ The parallelism (or perhaps identification) with Apollo is suggested with more details through the scene of Ptolemy's birth on Cos (see below); lines 3-4 are modelled on Theognis' address to Apollo in the proem of the earliest collection (3-4) (cf. also Young's apparatus criticus *ad loc.* and Heerink (2010) 395 n.56):

<p>ἀνδρῶν δ' αὖ Πτολεμαῖος ἐνὶ πρώτοισι λεγέσθω / καὶ πύματος καὶ μέσσοσ· [...].</p>	<p>ἀλλ' αἰεὶ πρῶτον σὲ καὶ ὕστατον ἔν τε μέσοισιν ἀείσω· [...].</p>
--	---

⁴⁴¹ In the Homeric hymns χαῖρε ἄναξ is used for Apollo only once in 21.5; it is frequent for lesser deities: 15. 9 to Heracles (χαῖρε ἄναξ Διὸς υἱέ· δίδου δ' ἄρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον; cf. Call. *Jov.* 94-6), 16. 5 to Asclepius, 19.47 to Pan, 31.17 to Helios, 32.17 to Selene. Cf. also Fantuzzi (2001) 232 n. 1.

⁴⁴² Pace Gow *ad loc.* 'possibly we need not infer that Ptolemy is thought of here', although before he had correctly noted that 'he seems to be promoted to the rank of demigod'; cf. Fantuzzi (2001) 233 n. 2 and 237. Fantuzzi believes that Theocritus' challenge of Hesiodic existential taxonomy is role-modelled on Simonides elegy for the battle of Plataea (11 W²) and reaches some interesting conclusions concerning the choice of this specific text by Theocritus.

⁴⁴³ The phenomenon is aptly described by Mann (2000) 35 in his discussion of the myth of Croesus in Bacchylides *Ode* 3: "Hieron überwindet die Grenzen zwischen der menschlichen und der heroischen Sphäre, es handelt sich beim Text des Bakchylides um eine literarische Heroisierung".

⁴⁴⁴ The scene of Ptolemy's birth on Cos is modelled on the birth of Apollo in the Homeric hymn (19-132); the analogies are numerous: Delos and Cos are personified, Eleithuia is present in both cases, the divine retinue gives a ceremonial cry to hail the new-born god, the personified islands demand honours from the young god. It is Cos herself who reveals that the scene in which she 'stars' is an imitation of the Homeric hymn, in lines 66-7; cf. Meincke (1965) 111-8. Beyond this, Heracles' joy for his descendants (22-5) reminds one of Leto's joy on seeing Apollo (12-3). The catalogue of Ptolemy's dominions (86-94) holds a position analogous to the catalogue of Apollo's shrines (21-50).

As Young notes in his edition of Theognis' poems, similar expressions reappear in hymns for gods: e.g. Hesiod (*Theog.* 34) for the Muses, *Hymn. Hom.* 21 for Apollo (cf. Meincke (1965) 92 n.2). In the light of this, although Theocritus praises Ptolemy as the most suitable *laudandus* over all mortal men, he does so using a formula employed in hymns for gods. In addition, Ptolemy's marriage to his sister and the comparison with the 'sacred marriage' of Zeus and Hera that Theocritus draws (130-4) is a final indication of Ptolemy's proximity to the world of the gods (cf. Meincke (1965) 149). The image that Theocritus fashioned for Philadelphus oscillates between the analogy with Zeus and his identification with Apollo (cf. Hunter (2003) 94). It would appear, then, that Theocritus did not hesitate to present a divine 'promotion', so to speak, of Ptolemy, something that Pindar avoided mentioning explicitly, although he alluded to it as something imminent. In the following part I offer a brief description of the argument of *Olympian 2*. This will allow us to appreciate the role of the eschatological myth within Pindar's eulogistic discourse and examine its importance for the image of the *optimus rex* in *Olympian 2* and so for Theocritus' encomium of Philadelphus in *Idyll 17*.

In the company of heroes: Theron's prospects in the afterlife

Pindar insinuates Theron's final reception of heroic honours through the extensive eschatological part he includes in his ode (56-84). This part of the ode raises several difficult questions, a convincing answer to some of which is still wanted. This is not the place to enter into a detailed discussion of the vexed problem of the doctrine exposed in lines 55-70, as this does not influence our discussion directly. I will discuss only those parts that could have a bearing on our appreciation of Theron's portrait as a benefactor in *Olympian 2*.

Pindar makes it abundantly clear that Theron's final after-life destination is, or more correctly, could be, the Isle of the Blessed (70-1 *μακάρων νᾶσον*) where Cronus and Rhea rule. Lines 70-83 give a detailed representation of the paradisiacal existence that some chosen few lead there in the company of renowned heroes such as Achilles (79-83), Peleus and more importantly Cadmus (86), Theron's ancestor. The first part of the ode gives an elaborate exposition of the ancestral line of Theron's family, from Cadmus and his offspring (Semele and Ino) to Thersander the son of Polynices (23-47). Local propaganda, it would appear, maintained that Theron's family drew its descent from Cadmus through Thersander (cf. 46-7 *ἔθεν σπέρματος ἔχοντα ῥίζαν πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου / ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε τυγχανέμεν*) (cf. *Σ ad Ol.* 2.70b, 82d; Lehnus (1981) 38-40). As a matter of fact, *Σ ad Ol.* 2.39a and 70f bring these lines into relation with an encomium that Pindar composed for Theron (fr. 118-9 Maehler) and which also traced Theron's descent back to Cadmus and Adrastus (45 *Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἄρωγόν δόμοις* with *Σ ad* 81a, 81f). This would seem to be an important part of Theron's public image. In *Idyll* 17 Heracles was joined on Olympus by his descendants who participated in the feasts of the gods (16-27); this scene could have been developed from the idea provided by an analogous scene in *Olympian* 2: like Heracles, Cadmus begins a line that includes gods (Ino, Semele and through her Dionysus) and rulers; further, he will eventually be joined by one of them, Theron, on the Island of the Blessed (cf. Hunter (2003) 96). It is worthwhile, in this respect, to compare and contrast the introduction of the *laudandus'* forefathers in the praise discourse of both poems: Theoc. 17.13. (*ἐκ πατέρων οἶος μὲν ἔην τελέσαι μέγα ἔργον*) ~ *Ol.* 2.7 (*εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν*; cf. *Σ ad Ol.* 2.13b-c). In *Idyll* 17 line 13 stands at the beginning of a section dealing with Ptolemy's deified male ancestors (13-33) (see above). On the other hand, in *Olympian* 2 line 7 is used

more generally to praise Theron against the background formed by all his forefathers. The most ancient and noble part of them will be introduced in more detail later in the poem after the *gnome* about the power of Chronos (15-22). This, in turn, leads us to a fundamental difference in the way in which the two poets deal with the family history of their *laudandi*.

Differently from *Idyll* 17, that is, in *Olympian* 2 Theron's admission to the company of his forefather on the Isle of the Blessed is not unconditional. Theocritus does not include any 'warnings' for his patron; on the contrary, he represents his path to Olympus as open and uneventful, not only because Ptolemy already enjoys the love of Zeus (71-84) but also because he is a benefactor to his people (85-122) and shows piety towards the gods (123-7) (cf. Meincke (1965) 132). Theron does so too and, as we will see next, Ptolemy's profile closely follows that of Theron in *Olympian* 2. However, Pindar adds a proviso which is explained through the ancestral myth of Theron's clan, a proviso that Theron needs to heed.

Contrary to what one would expect in an encomiastic poem, Pindar is not silent about the dark pages in the chronicles of Theron's family. He refers to the worries that befell Cadmus and his daughters (23-37), he alludes in passing to Laius' hybris (38-40; cf. Σ ad 72a) and mentions the internecine feud between Eteocles and Polynices and the second expedition against Thebes (40-45). Against this sombre family background Theron stands out as a potential inhabitant of the Isle of the Blessed thanks to the wise use of his wealth and his inborn virtues (51-5; 91-100; cf. Σ ad 96e). However, he ought to be careful not to stray from this path, because, as Pindar himself notes, mortal fate is uneven and leads from happiness to sadness and *vice versa* (19-21): the daughters of Cadmus suffered in their lives, but were admitted to the company of the gods (cf. also *Pyth.* 3.80-4; 104-9). Theron has every prospect

of being admitted to the Isles of the Blessed, but he needs to adhere until the very end to the ideal of the benefactor that Pindar describes in his eschatology (cf. Bollack (1963) 244-6).

εὐεργεσία as prerequisite for deification.

Ol. 2.53-6 suggests that the right use of wealth during one's lifetime in combination with other inborn ἀρεταί can influence one's lot after-death: to quote the most plausible rendition of this passage offered by the ancient scholia (Σ ad 102d), the person who is invested by nature with wealth and virtue puts them to good use because he knows that punishment awaits the wicked and the crooked (Cf. Nisetich (1988) 6-8; Koniaris (1988) 240-4; (1997a) 12-4.):

ὁ μὰν πλοῦτος ἀρεταῖς δεδαιδαλμένος
 φέρει τῶν τε καὶ τῶν (53)
 καιρὸν βαθεῖαν ὑπέχων μέριμναν ἤ ἀγροτέραν,
 ἀστὴρ ἀρίζηλος, ἐτυμώτατον (55)
 ἀνδρὶ φέγγος.

The full purport and implications of these lines can be grasped only if contextualized within the image of εὐεργέτης which Pindar created for his patron. Pindar was the first to exploit the image of εὐεργέτης in his poetry.⁴⁴⁵ In Pindar the term has not yet acquired the fixed political meaning that one finds in decrees and political texts but still bears the original meaning “benefactor” (cf. Skard (1931) 12-13; Hampe (1952) 47-50; Currie (2005) 286-7). It can relate to athletic activity and so designate the god by whose good favour an athlete scored a victory (e.g. Poseidon in *Isthm.* 1.53:

⁴⁴⁵ The term is attested for the first time in two inscriptions dated in the decade 480-470 BCE honouring Alexander I of Macedon and Themistocles; Skard (1931) 6-7. As a political term it is associated with the institution of προξενία; it confers protection upon the one honoured, while the title can be passed on to the following generations. Even so, it lacks the explicit and palpable political nature of προξενία and is delegated to a lesser position. Schubart (1937) 14-5 provides a useful overview of documentary papyri and inscriptions while Bringmann (1993a-b) explores the significance of the idea of εὐεργέτης for ‘international’ politics in Hellenistic times.

εὐεργέτας) or a mortal, like Carrhotus (*Pyth.* 5.44) who drove Arcesilaus' chariot and won on his behalf in the Pythian Games of 462 BCE. In other passages (*Pyth.* 2.24, 4.30, and *Isthm.* 6.70) εὐεργεσία is brought into relation with ξενία (“hospitality”) with the emphasis falling on the χάρις that one owes to one's benefactor (cf. the negative example of Ixion in *Pythian* 2).

Against this background *Olympian* 2 invites our attention for its connection of themes and motifs which acquired significance in Hellenistic political theory as depicted in court poems. For instance, the end of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* (94-6) seems to recall the Pindaric combination of ἀρετή and wealth expressed in the passage from *Olympian* 2 above (cf. Smiley (1919) 53; Duchemin (1967) *ad Pyth.* 5.1):⁴⁴⁶

χαῖρε, πάτερ, χαῖρ' αὖθι· δίδου δ' ἀρετὴν τ' ἄφενός τε.
οὔτ' ἀρετῆς ἄτερ ὄλβος ἐπίσταται ἄνδρας ἀέξειν
οὔτ' ἀρετὴ ἀφένιοι· δίδου δ' ἀρετὴν τε καὶ ὄλβον.

Callimachus prays to Zeus to give ἀρετή and wealth to himself and presumably also to Ptolemy II. The effective combination of both will enable Ptolemy to use his wealth to strengthen his public image as benefactor: his ‘virtuous’ nature will drive him to put his wealth to good use. As we will see shortly, similar concerns are observable in *Idyll* 17. Pindar explicitly calls Theron a ‘benefactor’, a characterization that gains in importance in the light of Theron's posthumous heroization:

ἐπί τοι
Ἀκράγαντι τανύσαις
αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόωι,
τεκεῖν μή τιν' ἑκατόν γε ἐτέων πόλιν
φίλοις ἄνδρα μᾶλλον (93)
εὐεργέταν πρᾶπίσιν ἀφθονέστερόν τε χέρα
Θήρωνος.

⁴⁴⁶ Compare also *Pyth.* 5.1-4 (ὁ πλοῦτος εὐρύσθενής, / ὅταν τις ἀρετᾶι κεκραμένον καθαρᾶι / βροτήσιος ἀνήρ πότμου παραδόντος αὐτὸν ἀνάγη / πολύφιλον ἐπέταν) with Giannini (1995) *ad loc.* The Pindaric scholia mention that the combination was also found in a poem of Sappho (fr. 148 Voigt). Appreciation of the Sapphic lines is difficult due to the loss of the original context. For other possible subtexts see McLennan (1971) *ad loc.*

There is no need for us to enter here into the controversial issue of Pindar's or Theron's beliefs or alleged affiliations with Orphic-Pythagorean sects, which after all are the results of the notorious biographical approach to Pindaric poetry.⁴⁴⁷ Hampe has demonstrated that the passages usually purported to have a specifically Orphic importance were, in fact, standard encomiastic *topoi* employed in other odes as well;⁴⁴⁸ odes about which there can be no claim for connection with Orphic-Pythagorean beliefs.⁴⁴⁹ The importance of the fair and right use of the *laudandus'* wealth (53) is repeatedly stressed in odes addressed to tyrants (cf. e.g. *Pyth.* 1.89-90; *Bacch.* 3.64-6).

An interesting parallel, with possible relevance for the use of wealth in our discussion but with no obvious mystical connotations, is provided by Bacchylides' ode for Hieron's Olympic victory with the chariot (468 BCE). The ode's myth deals with how Apollo miraculously rescued Croesus and transported him to the land of the Hyperboreans. The land of the Hyperboreans constitutes a quasi-paradisiacal land similar to the Isle of the Blessed to which only the gods' favourites are admitted (cf. Lefkowitz (1976) 133; Vermeule (1979) 126-7, 134-6): e.g. Heracles in *Olympian* 3; Perseus in *Pyth.* 10.30-6 and Simias *Apollo* fr. 1 Powell (cf. Gentili (1958) 94).

⁴⁴⁷ Scholars have been using labels such as 'Orphic' or 'Pythagorean' freely to describe a whole array of various marginal cults: 'local mystery cult of Demeter' [Del Grande (1956) 76-9] or 'of Zeus of Cretan-Rhodian origin' [Demand (1979)]. For the influence of Pythagorean doctrines see Solmsen (1968) 503-6 and Lloyd-Jones (1990b) 101-3. It should be stressed, though, that the idea of Pythagorean or Orphic influence on *Olympian* 2 is nothing more than a speculative conjecture of Hellenistic scholiasts manifesting their difficulty with the poem (cf. Σ ad 104c, 106a, 123d). Modern scholars have elaborated a pseudo-historicizing scenario to accommodate the presence of Theron's belief in marginal cults in this ode: Theron is old and overcome with worries; in his time of anxiety Pindar comes bearing this 'epistola poetica consolatoria' or 'parole di conforto e di consolazione' to ease Theron's anxiety before death [Bonconi (1941) 26-9]. On the antiquated and false idea of 'poetic epistle' see Kurke (1991) 3 n.7, Gibson and Morrison (2007) 4-9. To make matters worse Impellizzeri (1939) 109-110 considered the ode a contamination of epinician and *θρηνηος*. On the whole see the sober approach of Bollack (1963) and esp. 246-254.

⁴⁴⁸ Hampe (1952) 46-52 on *εὐεργέτης*, 53 on *πλοῦτος* and 53-4 on *Lichtvergleiche*.

⁴⁴⁹ Even so, Hampe (1952) 59-65 allowed for the possibility that lines 75-7 allude to the Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration. The exact way in which 'Pindaric' transmigration operates still eludes scholars; see, however, Bollack (1963), esp. 246-7 who rejects Pythagorean or Orphic influence. Both von Fritz (1957) and McGibbon (1964) follow suit the ancient scholiasts in their precarious interpretations; for Hellenistic scholiasts' interpretation of *Olympian* 2 see Gianotti (1971) 26-30.

Apollo's intervention in favour of the Lydian king is predicated on Croesus' piety manifested through his wise use of his wealth (58–62): *τότε Δαλογενή[ς Ἀπό]λλων / φέρων ἐς Ὑπερβορέο[υς γ]έροντα [...] / δι' εὐσέβειαν, ὅτι μέγιστα θνατῶν / ἐς ἀγαθέαν <ἀν>έπεμψε* [: <ἀπ> Hutchinson 2010] Π[υθ]ῶ. The lines immediately following suggest Hieron (63-5) as the most liberal in donations, and so pious, towards the temple of Delphi. Whether this suggests a privileged after-life lot for Hieron too remains unclear (cf. Hutchinson (2001) *ad* 61-6).⁴⁵⁰ Unlike Pindar and Theocritus, Bacchylides focused only Hieron's wealth rather than incorporating it into a complete profile of him as a ruler.

In other odes (cf. e.g. *Pyth.* 1.90-94), the right use of wealth includes spending it on appropriate (prestigious) activities and on lavishly rewarding the poets who confer upon them everlasting fame (*Ol.* 2.94 *ἀφθονέστερόν τε χέρα*). The same array of meanings is conveyed by Theocritus but in his typically more elaborate manner. Ptolemy does not hoard his wealth (106-7): he spends it on dedications to gods (108; 124-7), he benefits his friends and allied cities with it (110-1) and more importantly he uses it to reward the poets who praise him (see also below). Interestingly, Theocritus calls Ptolemy a benefactor of the poets:

*Μουσάων δ' ὑποφῆται αἰείδοντι Πτολεμαῖον
ἀντ' εὐεργεσίας.*

The social network implied in these two lines resembles that of Pindar (cf. Meincke (1965) 133): the poet praises his patron for his (financial) benefactions towards him and so ensures that his *laudandus'* fame (117 *ὄλβιον κλέος*) will remain alive when his earthly possessions will have perished (118-20) (see also pp. 190-2 above).

⁴⁵⁰ For the comparison of Hieron with Croesus see Lefkowitz (1976) 128, 134. Heracles' journey to the Land of the Hyperboreans is employed in Pindar's *Olympian* 3 for Theron. It is assumed that there it could refer to Theron's future reception of heroic honours. Even so, lines 85-92 would suggest that Bacchylides was interested not so much in this, but rather in the immortal *kleos* that he can bestow on his *laudandus* with his poetry; cf. Gentili (1958) 94. Cf. also Pindar *Pyth.* 3.59-62, 110-5.

Olympian 2 is construed in the form of a ring-composition: the final eulogy of Theron (89-100) recalls the encomiastic remarks about him in the first strophe (5-11) (cf. Hampe (1952: 47)). As we saw, both parts are introduced by questions about the appropriate subject of praise: (1) *τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;* ~ (89-90) *τίνα βάλλομεν ... εὐκλέας ὀϊστοὺς ἰέντες;* The “proclamation” of the victor (5-6) is followed by a short encomium of Theron (6-7), typical of epinician: Theron is praised on account of his hospitality, his wise administration of Acragas and his illustrious pedigree (6-7, *ὅπι δίκαιον ξένων, ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος, / εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν*). Similarly, in the end of the ode Theron is singled out among all men of the past century for being (94) “more liberal in thought [and] lavish in hand” (tr. Nisetich). The proximity of *ἀφθονέστερον* to *μᾶλλον εὐεργέταν* (94) suggests that Theron’s benefactions were mainly of a financial nature. Hence the depiction of Theron’s rule agrees with the proviso emphatically placed before the eschatological part of the ode (53-6; see above).⁴⁵¹

Theron’s life, as represented in *Olympian 2*, suggests that he experiences the most divine favour: he is the wealthy tyrant of a prosperous and thriving city (5-11)); he makes a fair and wise use of the gifts of fate (21-2); he descends from an illustrious family (21-47) and he has been victorious in the most prestigious of events at the Olympic Games (48-9). Divine benevolence and support will help Theron, like Heracles before him, to cross the boundary separating common men from god and heroes. In an unusual case of eulogistic exaggeration Pindar gives a hyperbolic picture of Theron’s benefactions to his people: *ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν, / καὶ κείνος ὅσα χάρματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν, / τις ἂν φράσαι δύναιτο;* *Olympian 2* implies that

⁴⁵¹ It would be consistent with Pindar’s encomiastic strategy to take *εὐεργέταν* in line 94 in connection with *ὅπι δίκαιον ξένων* and Theron’s other traits mentioned in line 6, a connection that reflects similar eulogistic associations in other odes of his. *ὅπι* in this context is problematic; for a detailed discussion see Del Grande (1956) 81-5.

in the case of Theron his benefactions will guarantee him a privileged afterlife on the Island of the Blessed (78-80); at the same time, his people will perpetuate his memory with the foundation of a heroic cult in his honour.⁴⁵² On the Island of the blessed Theron will be in the company of the respected heroes and demigods (70-80). Although Pindar is careful not to state explicitly that this is the fate that awaits Theron, the image of grandeur that he has cleverly composed would have lulled Theron into believing that in the other world he would be feasting alongside Achilles, Peleus and Cadmus (cf. Race (1979) 257-8).

Ptolemaic Kings as benefactors

Ideas such as the ones expressed in *Olympian* 2 would have attracted the interest of the Ptolemies in their efforts to further the dynastic cult and solidify the king's public image as the fair and righteous ruler, the founder of cities, the beloved of gods, in a word, as a *εὐεργέτης*. In the present part I will examine the reception of this image in Ptolemaic propaganda, as represented by *Idyll* 17, and evaluate the importance of Pindaric poetry for its articulation.

Scholars such as Hecataeus of Abdera and perhaps Euhemerus had prepared the ground for a positive reception of such beliefs.⁴⁵³ Hecataeus of Abdera had presented the ancient kings of Egypt as humans who were subsequently deified due to their benefactions (Skard (1931) 40; Murray (1970) 159-61). With the establishment of the Ptolemaic dynasty the belief was easily applied to Greek heroes who had special Ptolemaic connections and who, according to well-established Greek tradition, were themselves deified because of their benefactions (e.g. Heracles, Dionysus; see

⁴⁵² Note also the importance of 'witnesses' (*μάρτυρες*) for the creation and preservation of good fame for Hieron in *Pyth.* 1.88 (*πολλοὶ μάρτυρες ἀμφοτέροις πιστοί*); cf. also Hubbard (1985) 159.

⁴⁵³ Euhemerus' dates are too uncertain to allow any certainty. Further, his presence in Egypt is inferred on the basis of scholarly assumptions about his influence on Hellenistic poets rather than on historical evidence; see Winiarczyk (2002) 1-10.

also above).⁴⁵⁴ Ptolemaic ‘propaganda’ insisted on the representation of the king and queen as benefactors; this explains why the term is found mainly applied to heroes who, according to philosophical speculation about the beginnings of social life, were the founders of all social institutions.⁴⁵⁵ *εὐεργέται* are often said to show *εὐνοια*, which implies active interest in the well-being of people. In this light, it is hardly surprising to find Berenice, a new goddess (Theoc. 17.50-2) and member of Aphrodite’s entourage, taking interest in human affairs, and benignly intervening to soothe the distress that love can cause (cf. Hunter (2003) *ad loc.*); her *εὐνοια* assumes the form of being *ἡπιος* and sending *μαλακοὺς ἔρωτας* and *κούφας μερίμνας*.⁴⁵⁶ Among other things, *εὐεργέται* were believed to have engaged in the foundation of new cities, being the first to find something or teaching people the cultivation of the earth, the building of houses etc. (cf. Skard (1931) 37-9). In Hecataeus’ description of ancient Egypt Osiris and Isis were represented as mortal sovereigns who were raised to divinity by means of their benefactions.⁴⁵⁷ On this point Egyptian ideology met with Greek philosophical and political theory; a fruitful combination ensued.⁴⁵⁸ The benefactions of royal personages were considered the reason for their deification and

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. Diodorus Siculus I.2.4 *Ἡρακλῆς μὲν γὰρ ὁμολογεῖται πάντα τὸν γενόμενον αὐτῷ κατ’ ἀνθρώπου χρόνον ὑπομῆναι μεγάλους καὶ συνεχεῖς πόνους καὶ κινδύνους ἐκουσίως, ἵνα τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργετήσας τύχη τῆς ἀθανασίας*. On Heracles as a model for Philip II of Macedon and Hellenistic rulers see Kötting (1966) 850. See also Diodorus Siculus I.20.3 on Osiris. For Diodorus’ dependence on Hecataeus’ work see n. 456 below.

⁴⁵⁵ Kötting (1966) 851-2. Aristotle’s argument (*Pol.* 1286b 10-12) about the priority of monarchy is characteristic *καὶ διὰ τοῦτ’ ἴσως ἐβασιλεύοντο πρότερον, ὅτι σπάνιον ἦν εὐρεῖν ἄνδρας πολλὰ διαφέροντας κατ’ ἀρετὴν, ἄλλως τε καὶ τότε μικρὰς οἰκοῦντας πόλεις. ἔτι δ’ ἀπ’ εὐεργεσίας καθίστασαν τοὺς βασιλεῖς, ὅπερ ἔστιν ἔργον τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν.*

⁴⁵⁶ Skard (1931) 31 “Überhaupt ist wohl die *εὐνοια* der Götter, wovon öfter gesprochen wird, nur ein Ausdruck dafür, dass sie *εὐεργέται* sind.” This is explicitly stated by Theocritus in 17.123-5 (*ματρὶ φίλαι καὶ πατρὶ θυώδεας εἶσατο ναοῦς· / ἐν δ’ αὐτοὺς χρυσῶι περικαλλέας ἠδ’ ἐλεφάντι / ἰδρῦται πάντεσσιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀρωγούς*) with Gow’s notes *ad loc.* For a temple to Berenice mentioned by Callixenus see Fraser (1972) i. 228.

⁴⁵⁷ Diod. Sic. I.13.1 *ἄλλους δ’ ἐκ τούτων ἐπιγείους γενέσθαι φασίν, ὑπάρξαντας μὲν θνητοῦς, διὰ δὲ σύνεσιν καὶ κοινὴν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν τετευχότας τῆς ἀθανασίας, ὧν ἐνίοις καὶ βασιλεῖς γεγονέναι κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον*. On Osiris and Isis’ benefactions to mankind *ibid.* 14-21. Diodorus’ account is generally believed to be based on Hecataeus’ lost treatise on Egypt; for the vexed issue of authentic Hecataean material and interpolations by Diodorus see Murray (1970) 144-50.

⁴⁵⁸ Murray (1970) 161-2; for the problems of the source of the Hellenistic ideal of *εὐεργέτης* see Kötting (1966) 851-3 who is also in favour of syncreticism.

privileged fate in the afterlife.⁴⁵⁹ As we will see next, *Idyll* 17 agrees to a great degree with this conceptual framework.

Ptolemy II as benefactor in *Idyll* 17

Idyll 17 could be divided into four thematic units: (i) the proem (1-12), (ii) the praise of Ptolemy's ancestors (13-70), (iii) the praise of Ptolemy's rule (71-134), and (iv) the poet's farewell to Ptolemy (135-7). The second section comprises the praise of Ptolemy's father and male ancestors (13-33), of his mother Queen Berenice I (34-57), and the scene of Ptolemy's birth on Cos (58-70).

The praise of Ptolemy's rule opens with the idealistic representation of the country of the *laudandus*. *Olympian* 2 also opened with an idealized representation of Acragas. Similarly, *Idyll* 17 gives a 'paradisiacal' version of the Ptolemaic realm under Philadelphus' rule. Theocritus' description of Egypt owes a lot to the work of Hecataeus of Abdera. True to the image that Hecataeus propagated, Theocritus places the emphasis on the prosperity of the land which is expressed on the one hand by the calmness and tranquillity (77-8 ἔθνεα μυρία φωτῶν / λήιον ἀλδήσκουσιν [...]; 97 λαοὶ δ' ἔργα περιστέλλουσιν ἔκηλοι) that people experience in their everyday lives, and on the other hand by the plethora of words denoting abundance (75-6 πολὺς ... πολλᾶς ... πολλᾶς; 77 μυρίαί ... μυρία; 79 τόσα ... ὄσα ~ 81 τόσσα; 82 τρεῖς ... ἑκατοντάδες ~ 82 τρεῖς δ' ἄρα χιλιάδες τρισσαῖς ἐπὶ μυριάδεσσι ~ 83 δοιαὶ δὲ τριάδες ... ἐννεάδες τρεῖς). Following Egyptian traditions, the Nile is given a prominent position as the source of life and economic growth (79-80) (cf. Meincke (1965) 125; Barbantani (2010) 231). At the same time two further reasons are added for Egypt's prosperity: Zeus' favor

⁴⁵⁹ Winiarczyk (2002) 43-50; as he puts it (136), 'εὐεργασία führe zur Deifikation, [...] dies ist das allgemeine Verständnis des Euhemerismus.'

(73-5; 78 *ὀφελλόμεναι Διὸς ὄμβρωι*) and Ptolemy's vigilance and unique administrative abilities.⁴⁶⁰

In both respects Ptolemy's image resembles that of Theron in *Olympian 2*. As we have already seen, Theron is praised as 'Acragas' bulwark, exalter of his city' (tr. Nisetich) (7-8 *ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος, [...] ὀρθόπολιν*). There divine favour is manifested through the good luck that ensued on the foundation of the new city (lines 11-13, *αἰὼν δ' ἔφεπε μόρσιμος, / πλοῦτόν τε καὶ χάριν ἄγων / γνησίαις ἐπ' ἀρεταῖς*). The importance of Zeus' benevolence is further underlined by Pindar's prayer that Zeus may keep Acragas safe for future generations (12-5). Theocritus' eulogy of Ptolemy's administrative skills is indeed impressive: Ptolemy protects his people from hostile neighbours and, one might add, from internal dangers (15.46-50) thanks not only to the organization of a reliable army and fleet, but also to his military prowess⁴⁶¹ (90-4; 98-104; cf. 14.37-64).

A considerable part of the praise of Ptolemy as king is concerned with his liberality and benevolence towards his people and allies. This part of the eulogy is imbued with Pindaric reminiscences (cf. Meincke (1965) 130-1; Hunter (2003) *ad* 118-20). Ptolemy is praised as a generous king who does not hoard his riches so that they give no benefit (*ἀχρεῖος*) but shares them with his vassals (110) (cf. Gow (1952) *ad loc*; Meincke (1965) 181 n.4), allied cities⁴⁶² and comrades (111):

⁴⁶⁰ For Egypt's self-sufficiency (*αὐτάρκεια*) in Hecataeus' work see Murray (1970) 147-8, where he also discusses the possible place that the description of the Nile might have had in the original work. On the possible sources of financial and political *αὐτάρκεια* in Hecataeus *ibid.* 165-6.

⁴⁶¹ The idyll presents a consistent nexus of subtle allusions to Ptolemy's prowess; apart from line 103 (*ξανθοκόμας Πτολεμαῖος, ἐπιστάμενος δόρυ πάλλειν*) ἐνὶ πρώτοισι in line 3 is used in Homer to describe courage at war; cf. Meincke (1965) 129, Rossi (1989) *ad loc.* and Hamm (2009) 95 n. 58. In lines 53-7 Ptolemy is put in the company of great heroes such as Diomedes and Achilles while the appearance of Zeus' eagle at the moment of his birth recalls a similar incident in Ajax's life at Pind. *Isthm.* 6.51-5 (see below). In Theoc. 16.74 Hieron is also compared to Achilles and Ajax – the mention of Achilles may also allude to his presence on the Island of the Blessed in *Ol.* 2.88-91. For the king's prowess, and especially his lance, as a standard motif of Ptolemaic propaganda see Barbantani (2010) 235-6.

⁴⁶² Elaborating upon the way in which *εὐεργεσία* worked in Hellenistic politics, Bringmann [(1993a) 16-7; (1993b) 87-8] pointed out that *φιλοδοξία* became the word describing Hellenistic monarchs'

οὐ μὰν ἀχρεῖός γε δόμῳ ἐνὶ πτόνι χρυσὸς
 μυρμάκων ἄτε πλοῦτος ἀεὶ κέχεται μογεόντων

In a similar passage Pindar advised Chromius against keeping wealth hidden inside the house, but recommended instead its use for securing good fame through benefactions (*Nem.* 1.31-2):

οὐκ ἔραμαι πολὺν ἐν μεγάρῳ πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις ἔχειν,
 ἀλλ' ἐόντων εὖ τε παθεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φίλοις ἐξαρκέων.

Some lines before Pindar praises Chromius' liberality in arranging a dinner for himself and his hospitality towards strangers (19-24).⁴⁶³ Keeping one's wealth hidden is considered a sign of *φιλοκέρδεια* 'love of gain', one of the dangers against the detrimental effects of which Pindar constantly warns his powerful patrons. In *Pythian* 1 Pindar cautions Hieron not to be 'deceived by cunning thrift' (tr. Nisetich):

μὴ δολωθῆς,
 ὦ φίλε, κέρδεσιν ἐντραπέ- (92)
 λοις· ὀπιθόμβροτον αὔχημα δόξας (92)
 οἶον ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει
 καὶ λόγιοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς.

The rhetorical articulation of the passage throws into relief the polarity between *κέρδος* and fame. *φιλοκέρδεια* can only have negative effects on the posthumous fame of Hieron; the implication is that Hieron ought to spend his wealth on benefiting his people and 'sponsoring' poets (cf. Hubbard (1985) 159). Hieron is urged to spend his money on benefactions which will secure him a positive fame (90 *εἴπερ τι φιλεῖς*

incentive in wanting to excel: benefaction brought fame which in turn brought heroic or divine honours from states outside of Egypt. The same principle is attributed to Osiris by Diodorus (I.17.1-2) with regard to his mission to teach agriculture; ὥσπερ εὐεργετικὸν ὄντα καὶ φιλόδοξον [...] ὑπολαμβάνειν γὰρ αὐτὸν ὅτι παῖσας τῆς ἀγριότητος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διαίτης ἡμέρου μεταλαβεῖν ποιήσας **τιμῶν ἀθανάτων** τεύξεται διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς **εὐεργεσίας**. The benefited city or community saw itself as bound by moral obligation to its benefactor; Bringmann (1993a) 21-4, (1993b) 93-5 offers an illuminating discussion of the impact this moral principle had on decision-making.

⁴⁶³ The image of hoarding one's riches appears also in Bacchylides 3.13-4 (*οἶδε πυργωθέντα πλοῦτον μὴ μελαμ- / φάρει κρύπειν σκότῳ*). Bacchylides, however, turns this generic image in the original image of hoarded wealth as a fortress which as such is analogous to Croesus' kingdom under siege (26-7); cf. Lefkowitz (1976) 127-9 and Hutchinson (2001) *ad* 13-14 with further bibliography.

ἀκοὰν ἀδείαν αἰεὶ κλύειν, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις).⁴⁶⁴ In a passage similarly occupied with the transitory condition of all mortals Bacchylides represents Apollo pointing out to Admetus that the highest profit derives from the joy of doing what is right (3.83-4 ὅσια δρῶν εὐφραίνει θυμόν· τοῦτο γὰρ / κερδέων ὑπέρτατον).

The emphasis on liberality seems to reflect an important part of the public image of the ruler as well as of dignitaries standing high in the hierarchy of Ptolemaic court. One could compare the emphasis on Sosibius' benefactions to the people of Alexandria in Callimachus' epinician for him (fr. 384.52-6 Pf.).⁴⁶⁵ It would seem then that the dignitaries of the court were expected, so to speak, to demonstrate qualities similar to those of the king. In the short praise that he puts in Thyonichus' mouth in *Idyll* 14 (61-8) Ptolemy never refuses petitions for help but spends his wealth lavishly as befits a true king (63-4):

πολλοῖς πολλὰ διδούς, αἰτεῦμενος οὐκ ἀνανεύων,
οἷα χρῆ βασιλῆ·

The note on royal propriety regarding the king's munificence recalls similar admonitions in Pindar's odes (cf. *Pyth.* 1.90; 3.70-1). As we saw above, wealth like prowess is god-sent. It is man's duty to make good use of it to secure the benevolence of the gods and good fame for generations to come. On the basis of these and similar passages, it would appear that this happens in two ways: (i) the good report of common people that rulers can secure through benefactions; and (ii) the fame which poets can confer upon their patrons. The poetic immortality which Pindar can bestow on his patrons with his poetry is meant as a solace for the inevitable reality of death that awaits all mortal beings. In *Olympian* 2 this general tenet of Pindar's ethical framework was connected with the specific demands of Theron's propaganda.

⁴⁶⁴ On the negative connotations of κέρδος see Hubbard (1985) 93 and Kurke's (1991) index s.v.

⁴⁶⁵ Note especially ἄρθμα δήμωι / εἰδότα καὶ μικρῶν οὐκ ἐπιληθόμενον (53-4).

Similarly to Pindar Theocritus gives an account of Ptolemy's benefactions, praising with more details Ptolemy's liberality towards poets who praise the monarch (111-6). As we saw, he views this also as a kind of benefaction (116). The following comment (116-120) about the transient character of all worldly possessions in contrast with everlasting *kleos* comes quite close to Pindaric passages such as *Isthm.* 1.67-9 (see also pp. 191-2 above). Ptolemy's portrait is completed with a note on his piety towards gods and his commitment in supporting various cults, among them the cult of his parents (108; 120-7).⁴⁶⁶

It would appear, then, that Theocritus was trying to create for Ptolemy the image of the *optimus rex*. In this he had rich Greek and Egyptian traditions on which he could rely. It has been argued above that one of his sources was the representation of Theron in *Olympian* 2. The connection between the two poems is suggested first by the similarity in the articulation of the opening parts of both poems and second by the similarity in the development of motifs about the liberality of the king and his fate after death.

Ptolemaic politics and Pindaric *phya*

Ll. 58-74 represent the birth of Ptolemy on Cos. The model for these lines, as Cos herself makes clear (66-7), is the birth of Apollo in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (cf. Meincke (1965) 111-6). Cos hopes that Philadelphus will honour her in the same way in which Apollo honoured his own birthplace. Differently, though, from the hymn, the scene ends with the appearance of an eagle which screams three times (71 ὁ δ' ὑψόθεν ἔκλαγε φωνᾷ / ἐς τρίς ἀπὸ νεφέων μέγας αἰετός, αἰσιος ὄρνις). The eagle is Zeus' bird and as such its appearance constitutes a sign of divine favour and signifies

⁴⁶⁶ On the other hand, his bestowal of riches on the shrines of gods reminds one of Bacchylides' representation of Hieron's liberality towards the oracle of Delphi (3.10-21).

that Ptolemy will repay Cos by granting her wish. Scholars have suggested that the scene could also allude to an anecdote circulating in Ptolemaic circles concerning the origins of the dynasty: Ptolemy I, said in this story to be an illegitimate son of Phillip I by his mistress Eurydice,⁴⁶⁷ was exposed and miraculously saved by an eagle; the eagle symbolises Zeus's interest in the infant and Ptolemy I's real origin as the son of Philip and brother of Alexander. From this point view in *Idyll 17* the eagle could similarly represent Ptolemy as the true son and heir of his father. At the same time, Zeus's love for him renders Philadelphus *ἔξοχον* amongst his peers, which translates as the possession of *ἄλβος* and of many dominions both on land and at sea. Furthermore, the scene of Ptolemy's birth reinforces the claim about the reciprocity of Soter and Berenice's love (63-4 *ὃ δὲ πατρὶ ἐοικώς / παῖς ἀγαπητὸς ἔγεντο*) and his rights as heir to the throne of Egypt.⁴⁶⁸

Although the scene of Ptolemy's birth of Cos is cast in the likeness of the parallel scene in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the appearance of Zeus's eagle as an indication of heroic or divine identity is probably taken from Pindar's *Isthmian 6*. This part of the chapter will focus on the intertextual connection between *Idyll 17* and *Isthmian 6*. It will be suggested that Theocritus included this element in his birth-scene because it tallies with the overarching theme of origin and birthright that permeates the whole idyll. In this context, special attention is given to the role of the queen and the representation of the royal marriage.

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. Koenen (1993) 44-6. The court's approval of this political myth is shown by the coins that Ptolemy I minted depicting on the obverse Ptolemy I and on the reverse Zeus's eagle. For the eagle as the emblem of the founder of the Ptolemaic dynasty on Ptolemaic coins, see Svoronos (1904-08) i. νδ' and iv. p. 555 s.v. *ἀετός*.

⁴⁶⁸ For Ptolemy's II dispute with Soter's children from his marriage with Eurydice see Koenen (1983) 164. One should also note the use of *παῖς ἀγαπητός* for Ptolemy II. For the meaning "only child" see *Il.* 6.401 (Astyanax); *Od.* 2.365, 4.727, 817; 5.18 (Telemachus); Hesiod fr. 326 M.-W.; and Sappho fr. 132 Voigt with Hallett's [*QUCC* 39 (1982) 21-21] notes on it.

The appearance of Zeus' eagle in the scene of Philadelphus' birth recalls the appearance of the eagle in a similar passage in Pindar's *Isthmian* 6 (51-5):⁴⁶⁹

ταῦτ' ἄρα
οἱ φαμένω πέμψεν θεός (49)
ἀρχὸν οἰωνῶν μέγαν αἰετόν· ἄ- (50)
δεῖα δ' ἔνδον νιν ἔκνιξεν χάρις, (50)
εἶπέν τε φωνήσας ἄτε μάντις ἀνὴρ
“Ἔσσεταί τοι παῖς ὄν αἰτεῖς, ὦ Τελαμών.

Isthmian 6 celebrates the victory of Phylacidas, son of Lampon, at the boys' pancratium in 480 BCE. Phylacidas came from a family whose members exhibited a remarkable athletic record: Phylacidas' older brother, Pytheus, had already won a Nemean victory in the same event (4-5), probably in 483 BCE, which was also celebrated by Pindar (*Nemean* 5); the boys' maternal uncle, Euthymenes, is also named as a great athlete in pancration (58). In this sense, it is expected that the stress falls specifically on the family's inherent prowess (*φύα*). Pindar treats the relationship between the athlete – and his family – with Aegina, his city, in reciprocal terms; the athlete's victory adds to the city's record of victories and honours and in return the city shares some of her glory with the athlete and his family. Grounding the present circumstances against the background of mythical precedent, the poet construes an analogy between the Psalychiadae, the victor's clan, and the local heroic family of Aegina, the Aeacidae.⁴⁷⁰

In Privitera's (1982: *ad* 47-9) words, in the scene of Heracles' prayer (47-9) “il paragone è tra *φύα* e *δέρμα*, ambedue infrangibili.” In a certain way the Pindaric relationship of fathers to sons (Telamon – Ajax; Lampon – Phylacidas / Pytheus)

⁴⁶⁹ The connection has also been noted by Schneider (2004) 353-4. Against this intertextual background he has proposed to read *ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον ἐπὴν ῥαίνωμεν αἰοδαῖς* in line 2 instead of the problematic *†ἀ(ε)ἰδωμεν† αἰοδαῖς* on the model of *Isthm.* 6.19-21 (*τάνδ' ἐπιστείχοντα νᾶσον ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαις*). Although Theocritus never used *ῥαίνω* in this way, certain lines in *Idyll* 7 suggest that he was acquainted with this image, which is found quite often in Pindar's poetry: 7.82 (with Dover's (1971) note *ad loc.*) ~ *Ol.* 7.7; 7.154 (with Cholmeley's note *ad loc.*) ~ *Isthm.* 6.1

⁴⁷⁰ Privitera (1982b) *ad* 19-21: “il vincitore infatti è un emulo, un continuatore degli eroi della patria.”

foreshadows that of Soter to Philadelphus in *Idyll* 17. The praise of the son adds to that of the father: Heracles' prayer is in fact an oblique praise of his comrade's and future son's prowess. Through Heracles' 'prophetic' activity (*εἶπέν τε φωνήσας ἄτε μάντις ἀνήρ*)⁴⁷¹, so to speak, Pindar brings the issue of inherent excellence into relation not only with Telamon and his (unborn) son Ajax, but also with Heracles. The appearance of Zeus' eagle is not only an indication that Heracles' prayer will come true, but a revelation of his divine origin as son of Zeus. It is because Heracles is the true son of Zeus that his prayer will be fulfilled. From this perspective in *Isthmian* 6 the *διοσημία* suggests both Ajax and Heracles as genuine sons of their fathers, while, on the other hand, it indicates Zeus's love for his son.

The allusion to Pindar carries with it the aristocratic notion of *phya* but also refers to the turbulent circumstances surrounding the succession of Philadelphus to the throne of his father. The representation of Ptolemy II as the rightful and legitimate son of Ptolemy I and Zeus's approval of his birthright to the throne of Egypt stood high in the agenda of Ptolemaic propaganda because of Philadelphus' conflict with his half-brother Ptolemy Keraunos over the throne of their father (cf. Heerink (2010) 392). It is in this light that one should view the special position accorded within the poem to Berenice I and her marriage to Soter. Berenice bears all those traits usually attributed to a conscientious wife: she is pre-eminent among wise women, beautiful, amicable and a boon to her parents. All these features make her a highly suitable consort and queen mother. Berenice's representation comes very close to the representation of women in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*:⁴⁷² women are

⁴⁷¹ In this scene Heracles functions as the textual persona of Pindar himself. Heracles' visit to Telamon in the midst of the celebrations there parallels Pindar's arrival in Aegina for the celebration of Lampon's son's victory (21 *τάνδ' ἐπιστείχοντα νᾶσον ραινέμεν εὐλογίαις*; 57 *Φυλακίδαι γὰρ ἦλθον, ὦ Μοῦσαι, ταμίαις ... κώμων ...*); cf. also Thummer (1969) *ad* 1.

⁴⁷² Cf. also *οἶα* in line 34: it corresponds to *οἶος* in line 13 for Ptolemy I and, as in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, signals the beginning of Berenice's section.

praised as matriarchs, mothers or wives to great male heroes. Similarly, Berenice's praise is contextualized within what appears to be a catalogue of mythic women, mothers of some of the greatest heroes (54-9):

<i>Ἄργεῖα κύνοφρυ</i>	<i>λαοφόνον Διομήδεα</i>	<i>Τυδῆι Καλυδωνίωι</i>
<i>Θέτις βαθύκολπος</i>	<i>ἄκοντιστὰν Ἀχιλῆα</i>	<i>Αἰακίδαι Πηλῆι</i>
<i>ἄρῖζηλος Βερενίκα</i>	<i>αἰχμητὰ Πτολεμαίε</i>	<i>αἰχμητᾶι Πτολεμαίωι</i>

All three entries are governed by *μισγομένα ... τέκες* (54), which suggests that Berenice is praised as part of the dynastic chain that by means of its procreative potential makes possible the continuation of the royal line.⁴⁷³

⁴⁷³ Scholars have pointed out that throughout the poem Theocritus uses the Phaeacians to portray the relationship between Ptolemy I and Berenice; see Gow (1952) *ad* 38f.; Hunter (2003) 128–30.

EPILOGUE

We have now explored extensively interactions with Pindar in three Hellenistic poets. The focus has been rather different from common approaches to this poetry, which privilege Homer and Hesiod and find connections mostly between Pindar and Callimachus' manner and aesthetics. These connections are not to be denied;⁴⁷⁴ but a complementary picture has emerged from this study.

Firstly, metamorphosed epinician appears as a major and significant part of Hellenistic poetry; it holds particular interest through its rendition of polarized images in forms evolved from classical lyric. This perspective has partly been made possible by discoveries recent (*Victoria Berenices*) or very recent (Posidippus' *Hippika*;

⁴⁷⁴ This topic has been briefly touched on above (pp. 46-8). Notwithstanding the apparent similarities, it should be noted that in general Callimachus liberates Pindar's metapoetic utterances from their original rhetorical function, which was connected with the performance of the ode; so Callimachus employs them freely in the structuring of his narrative to support his aesthetic ideals (cf. Richardson (1985) 384). More specifically, in his insistence on using such rhetorical motifs, Callimachus is trying to recreate on a textual level the relationship between the poet and his audience in the original performative context. Pindar's feigned fear of the audience's *koros* and dissatisfaction with eulogistic excess similarly becomes for Callimachus the textual excuse for omitting, or fragmentarily inserting, narrative sections and so constructing an allusive narrative style which demands the participation of the reader. In other cases the omission is supposedly predicated on the religious sensitivities of the audience. For example, in the Acontius *aetion* in the third book of the *Aetia* (fr. 174 Massimilla) one comes across a descendant of Pindar's so-called hush passages (on which see Norwood (1945) 80-1; Hubbard (1985) 103, 119-20). When our fragment begins, the narrator has already started to describe the preparations for Cydippe's wedding. On the eve of the wedding Cydippe is to lie on a bed with a young boy who has both his parents alive (1-3). This custom reflects an episode from the love-life of Zeus and Hera. But the narrator reproaches himself for having the impudence to narrate a secret (?) story (4-9). In this way the poet stops his digression and at the same time exhibits half-jokingly his vast erudition (*πολυιδρεΐη*), which could have got him into serious trouble. The narrative would verge on impiety and this seems to be verified by a closely related passage in Theocritus (15.64 *πάντα γυναικες ἴσαντι, καὶ ὡς Ζεὺς ἀγάγεθ' Ἥραν*, with Gow (1952) *ad loc.*). Still, it would seem that in both cases the need to restrain themselves occurs to the poets (ostensibly) too late, as they have already alluded to the material they are determined to omit. The device has been compared to Pindaric passages like *Ol.* 9.35-9 (cf. Fuhrer (1988) 62-5; Morrison (2008) 192). Pindar has just narrated (29-35) Heracles' fight against three major Olympian Gods, Hades, Poseidon and Apollo. Pindar refuses to offer a complete account of the myth(s). His decision is (supposedly) predicated on moral grounds (speaking ill of the gods). At the same time, the moment gives the feigned impression of *ex impromptu* composition (cf. Pavlou (2008) 549). Even so, the myth that is 'hushed' is related, on the one hand, on most interpretations to the *gnome* in the preceding lines (28-9) about the divine provenance of prowess and skills and, on the other, to the praise of the victor (cf. esp. Molyneux (1972); Gerber (2002) *ad* 29-35 and 35-41). Callimachus, on the other hand, tries to give the impression that the episode hushed, whatever its cultic relevance, is unrelated to the major myth and so introduced for the sake of display.

PHorak 4). Whether epinician is turned into relatively extended elegiacs, a very popular form for Hellenistic poetry, or into the microscopic genre of epigrams, inscribed or textually represented as inscribed, this type of poetry shows an unprecedented blossoming after its apparent decline in classical times. The rediscovery mirrors the interest which the new ruling class shows in athletic contests and their importance for the construction of its members' public image. Epinician genre, especially in its Pindaric version, gained 'popularity' in Hellenistic times thanks to newly shaped social realities. The dynastic cult and the marginal status that Hellenistic kings enjoyed suggested Pindaric eulogistic discourse as a source rich in strategies for the effective praise of the monarch and his entourage (cf. Hunter (1996) 47).

Second, praise poetry more widely picks up from Pindar's perceived role as prime exemplar of praise poetry, and from his intense and wide-ranging depiction of rulers in a self-reflective poetic context. Neither early hexameter nor Athenian poetry offered anything comparable. Alluding to Pindar becomes a heavily charged textual strategy that should be viewed in connection with Hellenistic poet's status in a society of fluid and emerging cultural identities. By associating themselves with Pindaric praise discourse, Hellenistic writers appropriate thematic and stylistic patterns and shapes; these help them to define their poetic role in connection not only with their literary past but also with their social environment and especially the expectations of their Ptolemaic audience. Again, interaction with Pindar links to interaction with the political environment.

Third, we have seen extended reworking of Pindaric versions of myth. Pindar puts myths to use, explicitly and visibly: he provides a notable point of comparison for poets who want to relate their poetic heritage and their new contexts, especially

their political contexts; he does so even when the later poets themselves proceed more implicitly in their uses of myth. Colonialism, imperialism, and monarchy inform Hellenistic treatment of myth, to a greater degree than is superficially evident. Ptolemaic rulers direct the focus of their poets towards mythological figures which can sustain their dual status as Greek monarchs in an African kingdom and can solidify their claims on a foreign land. The employment of myths like that of Io in Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices* functions on two levels, one spatial and one temporal: the Ptolemaic dynasty is connected both with mainland Greece and with the mythological past which accounts for Hellenic presence in Africa. Seen from this angle, the circularity in temporal progress which this imperialist mythology presupposes indicates the representation of Ptolemaic rule as a return to the golden era of Greek myth. At the same time, re-enacting the narrative sequences of archaic myths allows the creation of a Ptolemaic mythology; here the monarch and his family can move from one level of existence to the other and so accommodate themselves to the indigenous Pharaonic tradition about the deification of the monarch. The reasons for the association with the world of Pindar's myths are apparent. Pindaric myth is a world inhabited by divine and mortal beings — a world in which the frontiers separating the two realms are still open and gods permit their protégés to escape death by moving from one existential status to the other. Further, Pindar excelled in his ability to employ mythological traditions in such a way as to intimate to his audiences the quasi-divine element in the human potential for excellence as exemplified by the victory praised.

Fourthly, we see that Posidippus and Theocritus are no less engaged with Pindar than Callimachus. Posidippus makes an especially striking case: the small and

the sublime are self-consciously conjoined.⁴⁷⁵ Theocritus is a striking case too: his preoccupations with hexameters (and Lesbian monody) does not present a rich engagement with a poet of spectacular moments and phrases.⁴⁷⁶

Consideration of this intertextuality is not simply a matter of tracing resemblance. The cohesive poetic and religious world of Pindar is drastically transformed as Hellenistic poets rebuild his constructions. The Ptolemaic wish for a past and for the poetic enrichment of the ruler's glory does not prevent a quite different sort of voice and manner from emerging; it emerges all the more palpably through sustained interplay with these works of classical choral lyric.

So a new look at Pindar in Hellenistic poetry may help to alter our sense of the literary world which that poetry creates and lives in, and may avert the risk of ossified conceptions.

⁴⁷⁵ AB 14 constitutes a unique case. It is the only epigram by Posidippus to deal with a Pindaric myth, the myth of Bellerophon. Posidippus manages to give the basic outline of Pegasus' myth in only 4 lines, and all this while he is describing a work of art. Potter (2011) has recently challenged the one-sided focus on the so-called *λεπτότης* of Posidippus' epigrams and has redirected our attention to 'the impression of magnitude' that the stone objects 'for all [their] smallness of scale' cause (283). This contrast between detail and large magnitudes of perception (*ibid.* 295), he argues, is a necessary condition for a fuller appreciation of Posidippus' epigrams and is characteristic of Hellenistic poetics in general. In the case of AB 14 the absence of Bellerophon from the gem occasions the allusion to his omitted act of *hybris*. The myth appears in *Olympian* 13. Pindar gives a short outline of Bellerophon's exploits on his winged horse (86–90): the war against the Amazons, the killing of Chimaera and of the Solymoi. Still, he avoids mentioning Bellerophon's attempt to reach Olympus without the permission of the gods (91-2 *διασωπάσομαι οἱ μόρον ἐγὼ / τὸν δ' ἐν Οὐλύμπω φάτναι Ζηνὸς ἀρχαῖαι δέκονται*); differently in *Isthm.* 7.44-7 where the emphasis is on human limitations as opposed to divine omnipotence (cf. Thummer (1969) *ad* 44-7). The emphatic use of *ἐγὼ* in l. 91 suggests that the audience can complete the omitted part on its own (cf. Fuhrer (1988) 65). It is interesting that in both cases the poet offers a final image, Pegasus flying alone or received at Zeus's stables, and this motivates an allusion back to the event omitted, Bellerophon's *hybris*. The fragmentariness of the narrative in *Olympian* 13 is a rhetorical device to throw Bellerophon's act into relief and so cast him as a negative foil to the *laudandus*. In the case of Posidippus it is occasioned by the *ekphrasis* of the jewel and comes to imply the poetic potential of such a minor genre as the epigram. The refined style of the epigrams stands for the craftsmanship of the jewel, strengthening in this way the metapoetic correspondence between the precious stone and Posidippus' epigram (cf. Fantuzzi – Hunter (2002) 454; Gutzwiller (2005b) 314 n.75; Hutchinson (2008) 93). There is, then, difference in the perspective, but affinity in the device.

⁴⁷⁶ The episodic character of Callimachus' poetry allows a closer approach to the Pindaric manner (cf. Newman (1985) 181; Fuhrer (1988) 58-9) than Theocritus' epicizing style: Theocritus is epicizing in the exhaustive handling of his material rather than manipulatively selective like Pindar (cf. e.g. *Idyll* 24).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin (2002), *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* (Berkeley).
- , Kosmetatou Elizabeth and Baumbach Manuel, (eds.) (2004), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)* (Hellenic Studies 2, Washington D. C.).
- (2010), *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry* (Princeton).
- Ahlert, Paulheinz (1942), *Mädchen und Frauen in Pindars Dichtung* (Leipzig).
- Allan, William (2008), *Euripides: Helen* (Cambridge).
- Allen, T. W. – Halliday, W. R. – Sikes, E. E. (1936), *The Homeric Hymns*² (Oxford).
- Ambühl, Annemarie (2005), *Kinder und junge Helden: Innovative Aspekte des Umgangs mit der literarischen Tradition bei Kallimachos* (Hellenistica Groningana 9, Leuven).
- Ameis, K. F. – Hentze, C. (1875-91), *Homer Ilias*, 2 vols. in 8 parts with Anhang (Leipzig).
- Andronikos, Manoles (2004), *Vergina II: The Tomb of Persephone* (Athens).
- Angeli Bernardini, Paola (1967), 'Linguaggio e programma poetico in Pindaro', *QUCC* 4: 80 – 97.
- (1992), 'La storia dell'epinicio: aspetti socio-economici', *SIFC* 10: 965 – 78.
- (1995), [Introduction to and Commentary on *Pythians* 7, 10, 11, 12] in Gentili et al. (1995).
- (1995b), 'Donna e spettacolo nel mondo ellenistico' in R. Raffaelli (ed.),

- Vicende e figure femminili in Grecia e a Roma* (Ancona) 185 – 97.
- (2000), ‘Epinici e iscrizioni agonistiche: un percorso da ricostruire’ in Maria Cannatà Fera and Simonetta Grandolini (eds.), *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera* (Naples) 29 – 41.
- (2004), ed., *La città di Argo: mito, storia, tradizioni poetiche*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale Urbino, 13-15 giugno 2002 (Rome).
- Asper, Markus (1997), *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos* (Hermes Einzelschriften 75, Stuttgart).
- Athanassaki, Lukia (2009), *Ἀεῖδετο πᾶν τέμενος: Οι χορικές παραστάσεις και το κοινό τους στην αρχαϊκή και πρώιμη κλασική περίοδο* (Herakleion).
- Austin, C. - Bastianini, G. (2002), *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia* (Milan).
- Austin, Norman (1967), ‘*Idyll 16: Theocritus and Simonides*’, *TAPhA* 98: 1-21.
- Bagordo, Andrea (1999), ‘Eine Bemerkung zum Epinikion’, *Hermes* 127: 118 – 20.
- Barbantani, Silvia (2010), ‘*Idéologie royale et littérature de cour dans l’Égypte lagide*’ in Ivana Savalli-Lestrade and Isabelle Cogitore, (eds), *Des rois au prince : pratiques du pouvoir monarchique dans l’Orient hellénistique et Romain* (Grenoble) 227 – 51.
- Barigazzi, Adelmo (1951), ‘L’epinico per Sosibio di Callimaco’, *PP* 21: 410-26.
- (1974), ‘Per l’interpretazione e la datazione del carme IV di Teocrito’, *RFIC* 102: 301-11.
- (1979), ‘Callimaco e i cavalli di Berenice (Pap. Lille 82)’, *Prometheus* 5: 267 – 71.
- (1980), ‘Per la ricostruzione del Callimaco di Lilla’, *Prometheus* 6: 1 – 20.

- Barrett, W. S. (2007), *Greek Lyric, Tragedy and Textual Criticism: Collected Papers edited by M. L. West* (Oxford).
- Barthes, Roland (1970), *S/Z* (Paris).
- (1984), ‘La mort de l’auteur’ in *Le Bruissement de la langue : essais critiques* IV (Paris) 61-7 (originally published in 1968).
- Bastianini, Guido, Gallazzi, Claudio, Austin, Colin (2001), *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)* (Papiri dell’Università degli Studi di Milano VIII, Milan).
- Bastianini, Guido (2002), ‘Frammento inedito di glossario’ in Montanari and Lehnus (2002) 271 – 6.
- Beckby, Hermann (1975), *Die griechischen Bukoliker* (Meisenheim am Glan).
- Beloch, Karl Julius (1912 – 27), *Griechische Geschichte*², 4 vols. (Berlin – Leipzig).
- Bennett, Andrew (2005), *The Author* (London).
- Benveniste, Emile (1973), *Indo-European Language and Society* (tr. Elizabeth Palmer, London).
- Bernsdorff, Hans (2011), ‘Der Schluss von Theokrits ‚Herakliskos‘ und Vergils vierte Ekloge’, *AfP* 57 (forthcoming).
- Bettarini, Luca (2004), ‘Posidippo e l’epigrama epinicio: aspetti linguistici’ in di Marco et al. (2004) 9 – 22.
- Bing, Peter (1997), ‘Reconstructing *Berenike’s Lock*’ in G. W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments* (Göttingen) 78 – 94.
- (2000), ‘Text or Performance / Text and Performance. Alan Cameron’s *Callimachus and His Critics*’ in Roberto Pretagostini (ed.), *La letteratura ellenistica: Problemi e prospettive di ricerca* (Rome) 139 – 48.

- and Bruss, Jon Steffen, (eds.) (2007), *The Brill Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden).
- Bingen, Jean (2002), ‘La victoire pythique de Callicratès de Samos (Posidippe, *P. Mil. Vogl. VIII* 308, XI. 33 – XII.7’, *CE* 77: 185 – 90.
- Bollack, Jean (1963), ‘L’or des rois: le mythe de la deuxième *Olympique*’, *RPh* 37: 234 – 54.
- Bona, Giacomo (1988), *I peani di Pindaro. Testo, traduzione, scoli e commento* (Cuneo).
- (1995), ‘Pindaro tra poeti e filologi alessandrini’, *Aevum(Ant)* 8: 87 – 103.
- Bonconi, Alessandro (1941), ‘La seconda *ode olimpica* di Pindaro’, *SIFC* 18: 25-53.
- Bond, Godfrey (1981), *Euripides: Heracles* (Oxford).
- Bornmann, Fritz (1968), *Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam: introduzione, testo critico e commento* (Florence).
- (1978), ‘Il nuovo Callimaco del papiro di Lille’, *A&R* 23: 187-8.
- Bowra, C. M. (1936), *Greek Lyric Poetry: From Alcman to Simonides*¹ (Oxford).
- (1953), *Problems in Greek Poetry* (Oxford).
- (1964), *Pindar* (Oxford).
- Braswell, Karl Bruce (1988), *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin).
- (1992), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One* (Fribourg).
- (1998), *A commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Berlin).
- Bremen, Riet van (2007), ‘The entire house is full of crowns: Hellenistic *agones* and the commemoration of victory’ in Hornblower and Morgan (2007) 345 – 75.

- Bremmer, Jan (1991), "Poets and their Patrons" in Annette Harder and Heinz Hofmann, (eds.), *Fragmenta Dramatica: Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte* (Göttingen) 39-60.
- Bringmann, Klaus (1993a), 'The king as benefactor: some remarks on ideal kingship in the age of Hellenism' in Bulloch et al. (1993) 7-24.
- (1993b), 'Der König als Wohltäter: Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zur hellenistischen Monarchie' in Jochen Bleicken (ed.), *Colloquium aus Anlass des 80. Geburtstages von Alfred Heuss* (Frankfurt) 83-95.
- Bulloch, Anthony (1985), *Callimachus, The Fifth Hymn: Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge).
- Bulloch, Anthony et al. (eds.), (1993). *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley).
- Bundy, Elroy (1962), *Studia Pindarica*, i-ii (Berkeley) (reprinted 1986).
- Burnett, Anne Pippin (1985), *The Art of Bacchylides* (Harvard).
- (2005), *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aegina* (Oxford).
- Burton, R. W. B. (1962), *Pindar's Pythian Odes: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford).
- Bury, J. B. (1890), *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London).
- (1892), *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar* (London).
- Cahen, Émile (1972), *Callimaque* (Paris).
- Cairn, Douglas (2010), *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes (3, 5, 9, 11 and 13)* (Cambridge).
- Calame, Claude (1974), 'Réflexions sur les genres littéraires en Grèce archaïque', *QUCC* 17: 113-28.

- (1977), *Les Chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*, 2 vols.
(Rome).
- (1983), *Alcman : Introduction, texte critique, témoignages, traduction et commentaire* (Rome).
- Cameron, Alan (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton).
- Campagner, Roberto (1988), 'Reciprocità economica in Pindaro', *QUCC* 58:
77 – 93.
- Cannatà Fera, Maria (1990), *Pindarus: Threnorum Fragmenta* (Rome).
- Carey, Christopher (1981), *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (Pythian 2,
Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8) (Salem).
- (2007), 'Pindar, Place and Performance' in Hornblower and Morgan (2007)
199 – 210.
- Carlini, A. (1980), [Discussion] in Livrea (1980) 234 – 37.
- Carne-Ross, D. S. (1985), *Pindar* (New Haven and London).
- Carrara, Paolo (1977), *Euripide Eretteo: introduzione, testo e commento*
(Florence).
- Carrière, Jacques (1975), *Théognis : Poèmes élégiaques* (Paris).
- Càssola, Filippo (1975), *Inni omerici* (Milan).
- Cavallini, Eleonora (1997), *Ibico: nel giardino delle vergini* (Lecce).
- Chantraine, Pierre (1999), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque :
histoire de mots avec un supplément sous la direction de Alain Blanc,
Charles de Lamberterie, Jean-Louis Perpillou* (Paris).
- Chiesa, Isabella (2009), 'L'elegia «In Magam et Berenicen» di Callimaco : «In
Berenices nuptias»?', *Acme* 62: 227 – 34.
- Cholmeley, R. J. (1901), *Theocritus: The Idylls* (London).

- Christ, Wilhelm von (1896), *Pindari Carmina, prolegomenis et commentariis instructa* (Leipzig).
- Cingano, Ettore (1995), [Introduction to and Commentary on *Pythians* 1, 2] in Gentili (1995) et al.
- Clapp, Edward B. (1913), 'Two Pindaric poems of Theocritus', *CPh* 8: 310-16.
- Clay, Diskin (2004), *Archilochus Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis* (Washington, D. C.) .
- Cole, Thomas (1992). *Pindar's Feasts or The Music of Power* (Rome).
- Collard, Christopher (1975), *Euripides, Supplices: Introduction and Commentary*, 2 vols. (Groningen).
- Conte, Gian Biagio (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (tr. Charles Segal, Cornell).
- Conte, Gian Baigio and Barchiesi, Alessandro (1989), 'Imitazione e arte allusiva, modi e funzioni dell'intertestualità' in G. Cavallo, P. Fedeli, A. Giardina (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica I* (Rome) 81 – 114.
- Coppola, Goffredo (1930), 'Callimachus senex', *RIFC* 1930: 273 – 91.
- (1935), *Cirene e il nuovo Callimaco* (Bologna).
- Corbato, C. (1980), [Discussion] in Livrea (1980c) 238 – 45.
- Cropp, M. J. (1988), *Euripides Electra: Translation and Commentary* (Warminster).
- Crotty, Kevin (1982), *Song and Action, Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore and London)
- Culler, Jonathan (1992), 'In defence of overinterpretation' in Eco (1992) 109-23.
- (2002), *Barthes: A Very Short Introduction²* (Oxford).
- Currie, Bruno (2005), *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).

- Cusset, Christophe (1999), *La Muse dans la bibliothèque : réécriture et intertextualité dans la poésie alexandrine* (Paris).
- D'Alessio, Giovan Battista (1995), 'Una via lontana dal cammino degli uomini (Parm. 28 B 1+ 6; Pind. *Ol.* VI. 22-27; *Pae.* VIIb 10-20)', *SIFC* 88: 143-81.
- (1997), 'Pindar's *prosodia* and the classification of Pindaric papyrus fragments,' *ZPE* 118: 23 – 60.
- (2004), 'Textual fluctuations and cosmic Streams: ocean and Acheloiios', *JHS* 124: 16 – 37.
- (2004b), 'Argo e Argolide nei canti cultuali di Pindaro' in Angeli Bernardini (2004) 107 – 26.
- (2005), 'Ordered from the catalogue: Pindar, Bacchylides and Hesiodic genealogical poetry' in Hunter (2005) 217 – 38.
- (2007), *Callimaco*⁴, 2 vols. (Milan).
- Daub, A. (1880), 'De Suidae biographicorum origine et fide', *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, Suppl.* XI: 401-90.
- Deas, Henry Thomson (1931), 'The Scholia Vetera to Pindar', *HSCP* 42: 1-78.
- Defradas, Jean (1967), *Les Élégiques grecs* (Paris).
- Del Corno, Dario (2002), 'Posidippo e il mestiere di poeta' in *Un poeta ritrovato* (Milan) 61 – 6.
- Del Grande, C. (1956), 'Lettura della seconda *olimpica*' in *Filologia minore* (Milano – Napoli) 77-112.
- Demand, Nancy (1975), 'Pindar's *Olympian* 2, Theron's faith, and Empedocles' *Katharmoi*', *GRBS* 16: 347-57.
- Denniston, J. D. (1939), *Euripides Electra: Introduction and Commentary*

- (Oxford).
- (1954), *The Greek Particles*², revised by K. J. Dover (London)
- Derrida, Jacques (1967), *De la grammatologie* (Paris).
- Dickie, M. W. (2008), ‘The *ἰππικὰ* of Posidippus’, *Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar* 13: 13 – 54.
- Diggle, James (1970). *Euripides: Phaethon* (Cambridge).
- Di Marco, Massimo, Palumbo Stracca, Bruna M., and Lelli, Emanuele (2004), (eds.), *Posidippo e gli altri: il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario* (Appunti Romani di Filologia 6, Pisa).
- Dodds, E. R. (1951), *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley).
- Doffey, Marie-Christine (1992), ‘Les mythes de fondation des concours néméens’ in Marcel Piérart (ed.), *Polydipson Argos : Argos de la fin des palais mycéniens à la constitution de l'état classique* (BCH. Suppl. 22, Paris) 185 – 93.
- Dornseiff, Franz (1921), *Pindars Stil* (Berlin).
- Dougherty, Carol (1993), *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Ancient Greece* (New York and Oxford).
- Dover, Kenneth (1971), *Theocritus: Select Poems* (London).
- Dubrow, Heather (1982), *Genre* (London).
- Duchemin, Jacqueline (1967), *Pindare. Pythiques (III, IX, IV, V)* (Paris).
- Ebeling, Heinrich (1880 – 1885), *Lexicon Homericum* (Leipzig).
- Ebert, Joachim, (1972), *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger am gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (Berlin).
- Eckerman, C. (2010), ‘The *κῶμος* of Pindar and Bacchylides and the semantics of of celebration’, *CQ* n.s. 60: 302-12.

- Eco, Umberto (1990), *The Limits of Interpretation* (Bloomington and Indianapolis).
- (1994), *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, edited by Stefan Collini (Cambridge).
- Edmonds, J. M. (1928), *The Greek Bucolic Poets* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Effe, Bernd (1980), ‘Held und Literatur: Der Funktionswandel des Herakles-Mythos in der griechischen Literatur’, *Poetica* 12: 145 – 66.
- Ehrlich, Victor (1981), *Russian Formalism: History – Doctrine*³ (New Haven and London).
- Ellendt, Friedrich (1872), *Lexicon Sophocleum* (Berlin).
- Erbse, Hartmut (1969-1988), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, 7 vols. (Berlin).
- Fantuzzi, Marco. (2000), ‘Theocritus and the “Demythologizing” of poetry’ in Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink, (eds.), *Matrices of Genres. Authors, Canons, and Society* (Harvard) 135-51.
- (2001), ‘Heroes, descendants of *Hemitheoi*: the proemium of Theocritus 17 and Simonides 11 W²’ in Deborah Boedeker and David Sider, (eds.), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (Oxford) 232-41.
- and Hunter, Richard L. (2002), *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).
- (2005), ‘Posidippus at court: The contribution of the *ἱππικὰ* of *P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309* to the ideology of Ptolemaic kingship’ in Gutzwiller (2005) 249 – 68.
- Farina, Antonio (1963), *Ipponatte: introduzione, testo critico, testimonianze, traduzione, commento, con appendice e lessico* (Naples).
- Farnell, Lewis Richard (1921), *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford).

- (1930 – 1932), *The Works of Pindar: Translation, Literary and Critical Commentaries*, 3 vols. (London).
- Färber, Hans (1936), *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* (Munich).
- Faulkner, Andrew (2008), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Fennell, C. A. M. (1899), *Pindar: the Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge).
- Ferrari, Franco (1998), *Pindaro: Olimpiche* (Milan).
- Finglass, Patrick (2007), *Sophocles Electra: Edited with Introduction and a Commentary* (Cambridge).
- Fontenrose, Joseph E. (1978), *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations with a Catalogue of Responses* (Berkeley).
- Fordyce, Christian James (1961), *Catullus: A Commentary* (Oxford).
- Foucault, Michel (1979), ‘What is an author?’ in Josué V. Harari (ed.), *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (Ithaca) 141-60.
- Fowler, Barbara Hughes (1989), *The Hellenistic Aesthetic* (Bristol).
- Fowler, Don (2000), ‘On the shoulders of giants: intertextuality and classical studies’ in *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford) 115-37.
- Fowler, Robert Louis (1987), *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (Phoenix Suppl. 21, Toronto).
- Fraccaroli, Giuseppe (1894), *Le Odi di Pindaro* (Verona).
- Fraser, P. M. (1972), *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
- Fränkel, Hermann (1975), *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy: A History of Greek Epic, Lyric, and Prose to the Middle of the Fifth Century* (tr. Moses Hadas

and James Willis, Oxford).

Friis Johansen, Holger – Whittle, Edward W. (1980), *Aeschylus: The Suppliants*,
3 vols. (Copenhagen).

Frisk, Hjalmar (1970), *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols.
(Heidelberg).

Fritz, Kurt von (1957), ‘*Ἐστρὶς ἐκατέρωθι* in Pindar’s second *Olympian* and
Pythagoras’ theory of metempsychosis’, *Phronesis* 2: 85-89.

— (1967), *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung: Von den Anfängen bis
Thukydides*, 2 vols. (Berlin).

Fritzsche, Hermann (1896), *Theokrits Idyllien* (Leipzig).

Fuhrer, Therese (1988), ‘A Pindaric feature in the poems of Callimachus’,
AJPh 109: 54 – 68.

— (1992), *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des
Kallimachos* (Basel and Kassel).

Galinsky, Gotthard Karl (1972), *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero
in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century* (Totowa, NJ).

Gallavotti, Carlo (1946), *Theocritus quique ferunter bucolici graeci* (Rome).

Garner, Richard (1990), *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek
Poetry* (London and New York).

Gelzer, Thomas (1985), ‘*Μοῦσα ἀθλιγενής*: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ
pindarischer und bacchylideischer Epinikien’, *MH* 42: 95-120.

Genette, Gérard (1982), *Palimpsestes : la Littérature au second degré* (Paris).

Gentili, Bruno (1958), *Bacchilide: Studi* (Urbino).

— (1981), ‘Verità e accordo contrattuale (*σύνθεσις*) in Pindaro, fr. 205 Sn. –
Maehl.’, *ICS* 6: 215 – 20.

- et al. (1995), *Pindaro: le Pitiche* (Milan).
- (1995), [Introduction to and Commentary on *Pythian* 3, Introductions to *Pythians* 4, 5, 6, 8, 9] in Gentili et al. (1995).
- Gerber, Douglas E. (1982), *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary* (Phoenix Suppl. 1, Toronto).
- (1984), (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in honour of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico, California).
- (1999), 'Pindar, *Nemean* 6: A Commentary', *HSCP* 99: 33 – 91.
- (2002), *A commentary on Pindar Olympian 9* (Hermes Einzelschriften 87, Stuttgart).
- Giangrande, Giuseppe (1967), 'Arte allusiva and Alexandrian epic poetry', *CQ* n.s. 17: 85 – 97.
- (1970), 'Hellenistic Poetry and Homer', *AC* 39: 46 – 77.
- Giannini, Pietro (1995), [Commentaries on *Pythians* 4, 5, 6, 8, 9] in Gentili et al. (1995).
- Gianotti, Gian Franco (1971), 'Sull'*olimpica* seconda di Pindaro', *RFIC* 99: 26-52.
- (1975), *Per una poetica pindarica* (Torino).
- Gibson, Roy K. - Morrison A. D. (2007), 'Introduction: what is a letter?' in Ruth Morello and A. D. Morrison, (eds.), *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography* (Oxford) 1 – 16.
- Gildersleeve, Basil (1890), *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (London).
- González, José M. (2010), 'Theokritos' *Idyll* 16: The *Kharites* and Civic Poetry', *HSP* 105: 65 – 116.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1952), *Theocritus: Translation and Commentary*², 2 vols.

(Cambridge).

Gow, A. S. F. – Page D. L. (1965), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*,

2 vols. (Oxford).

Grainger, John D. (2010), *The Syrian Wars* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 320, Leiden and

Boston).

Griffith, Mark (1983), *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge).

Griffiths, Frederick T. (1979), *Theocritus at Court* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 55,

Leiden).

Griffiths, J. Gwyn (1970), *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride* (Cardiff).

Groningen, Bernhard van (1958), *La Composition littéraire archaïque grecque*

(Amsterdam).

— (1960), *Pindare au banquet : les Fragments des scolies* (Leiden).

— (1966), *Théognis : le premier livre* (Amsterdam).

— (1977), *Euphorion* (Amsterdam).

Gundert, Hermann (1935), *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Frankfurt am Main).

Gutzwiller, Kathryn (1981), *Studies in the Hellenistic Epyllion* (Meisenheim/Glan).

— (1983), ‘Charites or Hiero: Theocritus’ *Idyll 16*’, *RhM* 126: 212-38.

— (2002), ‘Posidippus on Statuary’ in Guido Bastianini and Angelo Casanova

(eds.), *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo* (Florence) 41 – 60.

— (2005), (ed.) *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book* (Oxford.)

— (2005b), ‘The literariness of the Milan Papyrus, or ‘What difference a book?’

in Gutzwiller (2005) 287 – 319.

Hamilton, Richard (1974), *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar*

(Hague).

Hamm, Ulrich (2009), ‘Zum Phänomen der Ironie in höfischer Dichtung oder:

- Ironie ist, wenn der Herrscher trotzdem lacht' in Reinhold F. Gleis (ed.), *Ironie: griechische und lateinische Fallstudien* (Trier) 77 – 105.
- Hampe, Roland (1952), 'Zur Eschatologie in Pindars zweiter *olympischer Ode*' in *EPMHNEIA: Festschrift Otto Regenbogen* (Heidelberg) 46-65.
- Hansen, William (1996), *Phlegon of Tralles' Book of Marvels* (Exeter).
- Harder, Annette (1985), *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 87, Leiden).
- (2002), 'Intertextuality in Callimachus' *Aetia*' in Montanari and Lehnus (2002) 189-233.
- Harriott, Rosemary (1969), *Poetry and Criticism before Plato* (London).
- Harvey, A. E. (1955), 'The classification of Greek lyric poetry', *CQ* n.s. 5: 157-75.
- Headlam, Walter G. and Thomson, George (1938), *The Oresteia of Aeschylus*, 2 vols. (Cambridge).
- Heath, Malcolm (1988), 'Receiving the *κῶμος*. The context and performance of epinician', *AJPh* 109: 180 – 95.
- Heath, Malcolm and Lefkowitz, Mary R. (1991), 'Epinician performance', *CPh* 86: 173-91.
- Heerink, Mark (2010), 'Merging paradigms: translating Pharaonic ideology in Theocritus' *Idyll 17*' in Rober Rollinger *et al.* (eds.), *Interkulturalität in der alten Welt: Vorderasien, Hellas, Ägypten und die vielfältigen Ebenen des Kontakts* (Wiesbaden) 383-403.
- Henry, W. B. (2005), *Pindar's Nemeans: A Selection* (Munich).
- Herzog, R and Crusius, O. (1924), 'Der Traum des Herondas', *Philologus* 79: 370-434.
- Heubeck, Alfred, West, Stephanie, Hainsworth, J. B. (1988), *A Commentary on*

- Homer's Odyssey*, Volume I (Oxford).
- Hilderbrandt, R. (1911), 'Zu bekannten Stellen', *Philologus* 70: 52 – 78.
- Hill, D. E. (1999), *Ovid: Metamorphoses IX – XII* (Warminster).
- Hinds, Stephen (1987), *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge).
- (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Hirsch, E. D. (1960), 'Objective interpretation' in Newton – De Molina (1976) 26 – 54.
- Hölscher, Uvo (1975), 'Pindar und die Wahrheit' in *Wandlungen: Studien zur antiken und neueren Kunst Ernst Homann–Wedeking gewidmet* (Waldsassen – Bayern) 90 – 102.
- Holleaux, Maurice (1942), 'Décret du peuple de Délos en l'honneur de Sosibios d'Alexandrie' in *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques III : Lagides et Séleucides* (Paris) 47 – 54.
- Hollis, Adrian S. (1990), *Callimachus: Hecale* (Oxford).
- (1992), 'The nuptial rite in Catullus 66 and Callimachus' poetry for Berenice', *ZPE* 91: 21 – 8.
- Holzinger, C. von (1892), 'Theokrit in Orchomenos', *Philologus* 51: 193-7.
- Hopkinson, Neil (1984), 'Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*', *CQ* 34 n.s.: 139 – 48.
- (1984b), *Callimachus, Hymn to Demeter: Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge).
- (1988), *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge).
- Hordern, J. H. (2004), *Sophron's Mimes: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford).

- Hornblower, Simon (2004), *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, Simon and Morgan, Catherine (2007), (eds.) *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford).
- Hortsmann, Axel E. – A. (1976), *Ironie und Humor bei Theokrit* (Meisenheim am Glan).
- Hubbard, Thomas K. (1985), *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 85, Leiden).
- (2004), 'The dissemination of epinician lyric: Pan-Hellenism, performance, written texts' in C. J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 248) 71 – 93.
- Hummel, Pascale (1993), *La Syntaxe du Pindare* (Paris).
- Hunt, Arthur S. (1922), 'POxy. 1793: Callimachus' *Sosibii Victoria*' in B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XV* (London).
- Hunter, Richard L. (1983), *Eubulus: The Fragments* (Cambridge).
- (1996), *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).
- (1999), *Theocritus. A Selection: Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13* (Cambridge).
- (2003), *Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Berkeley).
- (2005) (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge).
- (2006), *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry in Rome* (Cambridge).
- Hutchinson, Gregory O. (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford).
- (2001), *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford).
- (2008) *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry*

- (Oxford).
- Huxley, G. L. (1969), *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London).
- Ijsewijn, Jozef (1961), *De sacerdotibus et sacerdotiisque Alexandri Magni et Lagidarum eponymis* (Brussels).
- Impellizzeri, Salvatore (1939), 'La II Olimpica e i frammenti di ΘΡΗΝΟΙ di Pindaro', *SIFC* 16: 105-10.
- Instone, Stephen (1996), *Pindar: Selected Odes* (Warminster).
- Irigoin, Jean (1952), *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris).
- Iser, Wolfgang (1976), *Der Akt des Lesens: Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung* (Munich).
- Itsumi, Kiichiro (2009), *Pindaric Metre: The 'Other Half'* (Oxford).
- Jaeger, Werner. (1947), *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*², 3 vols. (tr. Gilbert Highet, Oxford).
- Jakob, Daniel (1997), 'Pindar's *Pythian* 9 and Callimachean Poetics' in J.-Th. A. Papademetriou (ed.), *Acta of the First Panhellenic and International Conference on Ancient Greek Literature* (Athens) 187 – 95.
- (2005). 'Ο Πίνδαρος και η μεταθανάτια ζωή', *Hellenica* 55: 7-18.
- Jakoby (1957) see abbreviations under *FGrHist*.
- Janko, Richard (2010), *Philodemus On Poems III-IV with the Fragments of Aristotle On Poets: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Jauss, Hans Robert, (1967), *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft* (Konstanz).
- Jebb, Richard C. (1882), 'Pindar', *JHS* 3: 144 – 83.
- (1894), *Sophocles Electra: Critical Notes, Commentary and Translation* (Cambridge).

- (1900), *Sophocles Antigone: Critical Notes, Commentary and Translation* (Cambridge).
- (1905), *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments* (Cambridge).
- Jenner, E. A. B. (1986), 'Further speculations on Ibycus and the epinician ode. S220, S176, and the Bellerophon ode', *BICS* 33: 59 – 66.
- Käppel, Lutz (1992), *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung* (Berlin).
- Karouzos, Christos (1982), *Περικαλλῆς ἄγαλμα ἐξέποιήσ' οὐκ ἄδαῆς: Αἰσθήματα και ιδέες των αρχαϊκῶν Ελλήνων για την τέχνη* (Athens).
- Kellet, Ernest E. (1933), *Literary Quotation and Allusion* (Cambridge).
- Kerkhecker, Arnd (1999), *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford).
- Kirkwood, Gordon M. (1982), *Selections from Pindar* (Chico).
- Kirstein, Robert (1997), 'Zu Theokrit, *Idyll* 13, 5 χαλκεοκάρδιος', *Hermes* 125: 380-2.
- Knaack, Friedrich Wilhelm (1880), *Analecta alexandrino-romana* (Greifswald).
- Koenen, Ludwig (1977), *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemäische Königsfeste* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 56, Meisenheim am Glan).
- (1983), 'Die Adaption Ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof' in E. van 't Dack et al. (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven – 22-26 May 1982* (Leuven) 143-90.
- (1993), 'The Ptolemaic king as a religious figure' in Bulloch et al. (1993) 25-115.
- Köhnken, Adolf (1984), 'Πηλογόνων ἐλατήρ Kallimachos, *Zeushymnos* v. 3', *Hermes* 112: 438-45.
- (1985), 'Meilichos Orga: Liebesthematik und aktueller Sieg in der neunten

- pythischen Ode* Pindars in A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare : huit exposés suivis de discussions* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XXXI, Vandœuvres-Genève: Fondation Hardt) 71 – 116.
- (2007), 'Epinićian epigram' in Bing (2007) 295 – 312.
- Kötting, B. (1966), 'Euergetes', *RLAC* 6: 848-59.
- Komornicka, Anna A. (1972), 'Quelques remarques sur la notion d' Ἀλάθεια et de Ψεῦδος chez Pindare', *Eos* 60 : 235 –53.
- Koniaris, George L. (1997), 'More on Pindar's *O.* 2: I. Major points of interpretation', *Hellenica* 47.1: 7-34.
- Kosmetatou, Elizabeth (2004), 'Constructing legitimacy : The Ptolemaic Familiengruppe as a means for self-Definition in Posidippus' *hippika*' in Acosta-Hughes et al. (2004) 225 – 46.
- Kouremenos, Theokritos, Tsantsanoglou, Kyriakos, Parassoglou, George (2006), *The Derveni Papyrus Edited with an Introduction and a Commentary* (Florence).
- Kowalzig, Barbara (2007), *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Oxford).
- Kristeva, Julia (1969), *Σημειωτική: Recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris).
- Kromer, Gretchen (1976), 'The value of time in Pindar's *Olympian* 10', *Hermes* 104: 420 – 36.
- Krummen, Eveline (1990), *Pyrros Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythische-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation* (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3) (Berlin).
- Kuiper, K. (1889), 'De Theocriti *Carmine XVI*', *Mnemosyne* 17: 378-87.
- Kurke, Leslie (1991), *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social*

Economy (Ithaca and London).

- Kurz, Gebhard (1974), 'Humor bei Pindar?' in U. Reinhardt and K. Sallmann (eds.), *Musa iocosa: Arbeiten über Humor und Witz, Komik und Komödie der Antike: Andreas Thierfelder z. 70. Geburtstag am 15. Juni 1973* (New York) 3 – 25.
- Kyriakou, Poulheria (1994), 'Images of women in Pindar', *MD* 32: 31 – 54.
- (2004), 'ΚΛΕΟΣ and poetry in Simonides fr. 11 W² and Theocritus, *Idyll* 16', *RhM* 147: 221-46.
- Lambin, Gérard (1992), *La Chanson grecque dans l'antiquité* (Paris).
- Lasserre, François (1974), 'Ornements érotiques dans la poésie lyrique archaïque' in J. L. Heller (ed.), *Serta Turyniana: Studies in Greek Literature and Palaeography in Honour of Alexander Turyn* (Urbana, Illinois) 5-33.
- Laubscher, Hans Peter (1997) 'Der Schlangewürgende Herakles. Seine Bedeutung in der Herrscherikonologie', *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 112: 141 – 66.
- Lawall, Gilbert (1967), *Theocritus' Coan Pastoral: a Poetry Book* (Washington, D. C.).
- Lee, K. H. (1976), *Euripides: Troades* (New York).
- Lefkowitz, Mary R. (1976), *The Victory Ode* (New Jersey).
- Legrand, Philippe – Ernest (1946), *Bucoliques grecs*³, 2 vols. (Paris).
- Lehnus, Luigi (1973), 'Contributo a due frammenti pindarici', *SCO* 22: 5 – 18.
- (1975), 'Spigolature callimachee e neoteriche', *PP* 30: 291 – 300.
- (1980), 'Pindaro fr. 168(b).3 Snell – Maehler e Callimaco *Victoria Berenices* fr. B II 24 Livrea', *Anagennesis* 1: 249 – 53.
- (1981), *Pindaro: Olimpiche* (Milan).

- (2004), ‘Argo, Argolide e storiografia locale in Callimaco’ in Angeli Benardini (2004) 141-209.
- Lelli, Emanuele – Parlato Giorgia (2008), ‘Le vittorie di Sosibio’, *ZPE* 166: 59 – 65.
- Lesky, Albin (1947), *THALATTA: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer* (Wien).
- Leutsch, Ernst von (1859), ‘Pindarische Studien II’, *Philologus* 14: 45 – 68.
- Liberman, Gauthier (1999), *Alcée*, 2 vols. (Paris).
- Livrea, Enrico (1979), ‘Der Liller Kallimachos und die Mausefalle’, *ZPE* 34: 37 – 42.
- (1980), ‘Il nuovo Callimaco di Lille’ *Maia* 32: 225 – 53.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh and Parsons, Peter (1983), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin and New York).
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh (1990a), ‘Modern interpretations of Pindar: The second *Pythian* and seventh *Nemean* Odes’ in Lloyd-Jones (1990c) 110-153 [= *JHS* 93 (1978): 109 – 37].
- (1990b), ‘Pindar and the Afterlife’ in Lloyd-Jones (1990c) 80-109 [= in A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare : huit exposés suivis de discussions* (Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique XXXI, Vandœuvres- Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1985) 245 – 83].
- (1990c), *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- Lobel, Edgar (1952), ‘*POxy.* 2258: Callimachus’ in E. Lobel, E. P. Wegener, C. H. Roberts, (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XX* (London): 69 – 107.
- (1957) (ed.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXIV* (London).
- Long, A. A. (1968), *Language and Thought in Sophocles: A Study of Abstract Nouns and Poetic Technique* (London).

- Loscalzo, Donato (2003), *La parola inestinguibile. Studi sull' epinicio pindarico* (Rome).
- Lowe, Nick. J. (2007), 'Epinician eidography' in Hornblower and Morgan (2007) 167 – 76.
- Maas, Paul (1949), 'Sosibios als *ψευδεπίτροπος* des Ptolemaios Epiphanes', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 9 : 443 – 8.
- Mader, Walter (1990), *Die Psaumis-Oden Pindars (O. 4 und O. 5): Ein Kommentar* (Innsbruck).
- Maehler, Herwig (1963), *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit des Pindars* (Hypomnemata 3, Göttingen).
- (1982-1997), *Die Lieder des Bakchylides: Teil 1, Die Siegeslieder: Edition des Textes mit Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar, 2 vols; Teil 2, Die Dithyramben und Fragmente* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 62, 167, Leiden).
- Magnelli, Enrico (1999), *Alexandri Aetoli Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Florence).
- (2002), *Studi su Euforione* (Roma).
- Mann, Christian (2000), 'Der Dichter und sein Auftraggeber. Die Epinikien Bakchylides und Pindars als Träger von Ideologien' in Andreas Bagordo and Bernhard Zimmermann, (eds.), *Bakchylides: Hundert Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung* (Zetemeta 106, Munich) 29-46.
- Marg, Walter (1938), *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Würzburg).
- Marrou, Henri Irénée (1965), *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*⁶, 2 vols. (Paris).
- Martindale, Charles (1993), *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the*

Hermeneutics of Reception (Cambridge).

Massimila, Giulio (2010), *Callimaco Aitia: libro terzo e quarto* (Pisa).

Mastromarco, Giuseppe (1987), 'La parabasi aristofanea tra realtà e poesia',

Dioniso 58: 75-93.

Mastronarde, Donald (1994), *Euripides, Phoenissae: Introduction, Commentary*
(Cambridge).

Matthews, Victor. J. (1974), *Panyassis of Halikarnassos: Text and Commentary*
(Mnemosyne Suppl. 33, Leiden).

McGibbon, Donald (1964), 'Metempsychosis in Pindar', *Phronesis* 9: 5-11.

McKeown, J. C. (1987 -), *Ovid Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary*
i-iv (Liverpool).

McLennan, G. R. (1977), *Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus: Introduction and*
Commentary (Rome).

Meincke, Werner (1965), *Untersuchungen zu den enkomiastischen Gedichten*
Theokrits (Kiel).

Meineke, Augustus (1843), *Analecta Alexandrina* (Berlin).

Menci, Giovanna (2004), 'Glossario a Callimaco?' in H. Herrauer and R. Pintaudi
(eds.), *Gedenkschrift Ulrike Horak (PHorak)*, 2 vols. (Florence) 19 – 31.

Merkelbach, Reinhold (1952), 'Bettelgedichte (Theokrit, Simonides und Walther
von der Vogelweide)', *RhM* 95: 312-27.

Mezger, Friedrich (1880), *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig).

Miller, Andrew M. (1981), 'Pindar, Archilochus and Hieron', *TAPhA* 111: 135-43.

Miller, Stephen G. (1982), 'Kleonai, the Nemean Games and the Lamian War' in
Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography Presented to
Homer A. Thompson (Hesperia Suppl. 20, Athens) 100 – 8.

- (1989), *Nemea: A Guide to the Site and Museum* (Berkeley).
- Mineur, W. H. (1984), *Callimachus, Hymn to Delos: Introduction and Commentary* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 83, Leiden).
- Moggi, Mauro and Osanna, Massimo (2003), *Pausania, Guida della Grecia. Libro VIII. L'Arcadia: Tradizione e commento* (Milan).
- Molyneux, John H. (1972), 'Two problems concerning Heracles in Pindar *Olympian* 9.28-41', *TAPhA* 103: 301-27.
- (1992), *Simonides: A Historical Study* (Wauconda, IL).
- Montanari, F. and Lehnus L. (2002) (eds), *Callimaque: sept exposés suivis de discussions* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité Classique XLVIII, Vandoeuvres-Genève).
- Moret, Jean Marc (1998), 'Iconographical appendix: the earliest representations of the infant Herakles and the snakes' in Braswell (1998) 83 – 90.'
- Moretti, Luigi (1953), *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* (Rome).
- (1957), *Olimpionikai. I vincitori negli agoni antichi olimpichi* (Bardi).
- Morgan, Kathleen (1977), *Ovid's Art of Imitation: Propertius in the Amores* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 47, Leiden).
- Morrison, A. D. (2007), *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Most, Glenn (1985), *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes* (Hypomnemata 83, Göttingen).
- Müller, Karl (1855), *Geographi Graeci Minores*, 2 vols. (Paris).
- Murray, Oswyn (1970), 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship', *JEA* 56: 141-71.
- Musti, Domenico and Torelli, Mario (1991), *Pausania, Guida della Grecia: Libro*

III. *La Laconia: Traduzione e Commento* (Milan).

Nagy, Gregory (1979), *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek poetry* (Baltimore and London).

— (1990), *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore and London).

— (1994-5), 'Genre and Occasion', *Métis* 9-10: 11-25.

Negri, Monica (1997), 'La sopravvivenza degli *Epinici* di Pindaro: le ragioni della scelta antica' in *Discentibus obuius: omaggio degli allievi a Domenico Magnino* (Como) 87 – 108.

Newman, J. K. (1985), 'Pindar and Callimachus', *ICS* 10: 169 – 89.

Newton–De Molina, David (1976) (ed), *On Literary Intention: Critical Essays* (Edinburgh).

Nieto Hernández, Maria P. (1993), 'Heracles and Pindar,' *Métis* 8: 75 – 102.

Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, Margaret (1970), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I* (Oxford).

Nisetich, Frank (1980), *Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore and London).

— (1988), 'Immortality in Acragas: poetry and religion in Pindar's second *Olympian Ode*', *CPh* 83. 1: 1-19.

— (1989), *Pindar and Homer* (Baltimore and London).

— (2001), *The Poems of Callimachus* (Oxford).

— (2005), 'The Poems of Posidippus' in Gutzwiller (2005) 17–64.

Norwood, Gilbert (1945), *Pindar* (Berkeley).

Noussia – Fantuzzi, Maria (2010), *Solon the Athenian: The Poetic Fragments* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 326, Leiden).

Nünlist, René (1998), *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen*

Dichtung (Stuttgart - Leipzig).

Otto, Nina (2009), *Enargeia: Untersuchung zur Charakteristik alexandrinischer*

Dichtung (Hermes Einzelschriften 102, Stuttgart).

Palagia, Olga (1986), 'Imitation of Herakles in ruler portraiture: a survey, from

Alexander to Maximinus Daza', *Boreas* 9: 137 – 51.

Page, Denys L. (1971), 'Ibycus, Stesichorus, Alcman. *POxy.* 2735, 2618, 2737',

PCPhS 17: 89 – 98.

— (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge).

Paley, Frederick A. (1869), *Theocritus* (Cambridge).

— (1872 – 1880), *Euripides with an English Commentary*, 3 vols. (London).

Papalexandrou, Nassos (2004), 'Reading as seeing: *P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309* and

Greek art' in Acosta-Hughes et al. (2004) 247 – 58.

Parsons, Peter J. (1977), 'Callimachus: *Victoria Berenices*', *ZPE* 25: 1-51.

— (1992) et al. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LIX* (London).

Pasquali, Giorgio (1951), 'Arte allusiva' in *Stravaganze quarte e supreme*

(Venice) 11-20.

Pavese, Carlo (1966) 'XPHMATA, XPHMAT' ANHP ed il motivo della liberalità

nella seconda *Istmica* di Pindaro', *QUCC* 1:103-12.

Pavlou, Maria (2008), 'Metapoetics, poetic tradition, and praise in Pindar

Olympian 9', *Mnemosyne* 61: 533-67.

Pearson, A. C. (1917), *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 3 vols. (Cambridge).

Pernot, Laurent (1993), *La Rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*,

2 vols. (Paris).

Péron, Jacques (1974), *Les Images maritimes de Pindare* (Paris).

Perrotta, G. (1925), 'Studi di poesia ellenistica', *SIFC* 4: 5 – 68.

- Petrucione, John (1986), 'The role of the poet and his song in *Nemean 1*',
AJPh 107. 1: 34 – 45.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf (1922), *Kallimachosstudien: Untersuchungen zur Arsinoe und zu den Aetia des Kallimachos* (Munich).
- (1928), 'Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos', *Hermes* 63: 302 – 42.
- (1932), 'Βερενίκης Πλόκαμος', *Philologus* 87: 179 – 228.
- (1949-53), *Callimachus*, 2 vols. (Oxford).
- Pfeijffer, Ilja Leonard (1999), *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III & Pythian VIII* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 197, Leiden).
- Pfrommer, Michael (2001), *Greek Gold from Hellenistic Egypt* (Los Angeles).
- Pike, D. L. (1984), 'Pindar's treatment of the Heracles myths', *AClass* 27: 15-22.
- Podlecki, Anthony, J. (1980), 'Festivals and flattery: the early Greek tyrants as patrons of poetry', *Athenaeum* 58: 371-95.
- Pollitt, J. J. (1974), *The Ancient View of Greek Art: Criticism, History, and Terminology* (New Haven).
- Poltera, Orlando (2008), *Simonides lyricus: Testimonia und Fragmente* (Basel).
- Porter, James I. (2011), 'Against λεπτότης: rethinking Hellenistic aesthetics' in Andrew Erskine and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones (eds.), *Creating a Hellenistic World* (Swansea) 271 – 312.
- Privitera, Aurelio G. (1972), 'Eracle nella prima *Nemea*,' *GIF* 24: 28–51.
- (1982), *Pindaro: le Istmiche* (Milan).
- (1982b), 'Politica religiosa dei Dinomenidi e idologia dell' *optimus rex*' in *Perennitas: studi in honore di Angelo Brelich* (Rome) 393 – 411.
- Race, William H. (1979), 'The end of *Olympia 2*: Pindar and the *vulgus*',
California Studies in Classical Antiquity 12: 251 – 67.

- (1982), *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes* (Atlanta).
- Radt, Stefan L. (1958), *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian: Text, Scholien und Kommentar* (Amsterdam).
- Rawles, Richard (2008), 'Simonides and Theocritus 4: Intertextual Readings', *MD* 59: 9 – 34.
- Reitzenstein, Richard (1893). *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte alexandrinischer Dichtung* (Gießen).
- Richardson, Nicholas (1974), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford).
- (1985), 'Pindar and Later Literary Criticism in Antiquity', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5: 383 – 401.
- (2010), *Three Homeric Hymns: to Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite* (Cambridge).
- Richardson, William F. (2004), *Numbering and Measuring in the Classical World²* (Exeter).
- Riffaterre, Michael (1979), 'La syllepse intertextuelle', *Poétique* 40: 496-501.
- (1980), 'La Trace de l'intertexte', *la pensée* 215: 4-18.
- Robbins, E. (1984), 'Intimations of immortality. Pindar, *Ol.* 3.34-5' in Gerber (1984) 219-28.
- Rose, Herbert J. (1958), *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam).
- Rose, Peter W. (1974), 'The Myth of Pindar's first *Nemean*: sportsmen, poetry, and paideia' *CPh.* 78: 145 – 175.
- Rossi, L. E. (1971), 'I generi letterari e loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche,' *BICS* 18: 69 – 94.
- Rossi, Laura (2001), *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach* (Leuven).

- Rossi, Mary Ann (1989), *Theocritus' Idyll XVII : A Stylistic Commentary* (Amsterdam).
- Rotroff, Susan I. (2002), Review of Michael Pfrommer, *Greek Gold from Hellenistic Egypt* (Los Angeles, 2001), *BMCR* 2002.05.14.
- Rumpel, Ioannes (1883), *Lexicon Pindaricum* (Leipzig).
- Rutherford, Ian (2001), *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford).
- Saïd, Suzanne and Trédé-Boulmer, Monique (1984), 'L'éloge de la cité du vainqueur dans le épinicies de Pindare', *Ktema* 9 : 161-170
- Sbardella, Livio (2004), 'Teocrito pindarico', *SemRom* 7: 65-83.
- Schachter, Albert (1981-94), *Cults of Boiotia*, 4 vols. (BICS Suppl. 38, London).
- Schadewaldt, Wolfgang (1928), *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion* (Halle).
- Schmid, Michael J. (1998), 'Speaking personae in Pindar's epinikia', *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* 8: 147-81.
- Schneider, Otto (1873), *Callimachea II* (Leipzig).
- Schneidewin, Friedrich Wilhelm (1835), *Simonidis Cei carminum reliquiae* (Braunschweig).
- Schroeder, Otto (1922), *Pindars Pythien* (Leipzig).
- Schubart, W. (1937), 'Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri', *AFP* 12: 1-26.
- Schwartz, Jacques (1960), *Pseudo-Hesioda: recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d'œuvres attribuées à Hésiode* (Leiden).
- Scott, Mary (1984), 'Charis from Hesiod to Pindar', *AClass* 27: 1 – 13.
- Segal, Charles (1985), 'Messages to the underworld: an aspect of poetic

- immortalization in Pindar', *AJPh* 106: 199-212.
- (1986), *Pindar's Mythmaking: The fourth Pythian Ode* (Princeton).
- (1985), 'Pindar' in Easterling, P.E. and Knox B. M. W. (eds), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I, Greek Literature* (Cambridge) 185 – 94.
- Sens, Alexander (1997), *Theocritus: Dioscuri* (Idyll 22) (Hypomnemata Heft 114, Göttingen).
- (2005), 'The art of poetry and the poetry of art: the unity and poetics of Posidippus' statue-poems in Gutzwiller (2005) 206 – 25.
- (2011), *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments edited with Translation and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Sevieri, Roberta (1998), 'Le molte voce dell'io: polifonia narrativa in Callimaco', *Acme* 51: 191 – 204.
- Sider, David (2004), 'Posidippus old and new' in Acosta-Hughes et al. (2004) 29 – 41.
- Silk, Michael (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery: With Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Simpson, Michael (1969), 'The chariot and the bow as metaphors for poetry in Pindar's odes', *TAPhA* 100: 437-73.
- Skard, Eiliv (1931), *Zwei religiös-politische Begrieffe: Euergetes-Concordia* (Oslo).
- Slater, William J. (1969), *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin).
- (1984), 'Nemean One: the victor's return in poetry and politics' in Gerber (1984) 241 – 64.
- Smiley, M. T. (1919), 'Callimachus' debt to Pindar and Others', *Hermathena* 18: 46 – 72.

- Smith, Martyn (2004), 'Elusive stones: reading Posidippus' *lithika* through technical writing on stones in Acosta-Hughes et al. (2004) 105 – 17.
- Smith, R. R. R. (2007), 'Pindar, athletes, and the early Greek statue habit' in Hornblower and Morgan (2007) 83 – 139.
- Snow, Herbert (1873), *Theocritus: Idylls and Epigrams* (Oxford).
- Solmsen, Friedrich (1968), 'Two Pindaric passages on the hereafter', *Hermes* 96: 503-06.
- Sommerstein, Alan. H. (2008), *Aeschylus*, 3 vols. (Cambridge Mass.).
- Sowa, Cora A. (1984), *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* (Michigan).
- Stahlin, Friedrich (1903), 'Der Dioskurenmythus in Pindars 10. nemeischer Ode', *Philologus* 62: 182 – 95.
- Stanford, W. B. (1958), *Aristophanes, The Frogs: Introduction and Commentary* (London).
- Steiner, Deborah (1986), *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar* (London).
- (1993), 'Pindar's 'oggetti parlanti'', *HSCPh* 95: 159 – 80.
- Steiner, Peter (1995), 'Russian Formalism' in Selden, Raman (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism VIII: From Formalism to Poststructuralism* (Cambridge) 11-29.
- Stephens, Susan (2002), 'Egyptian Callimachus', in Montanari and Lehnus (2002) 235 – 70.
- (2003), *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Berkeley).
- Stern, Jakob (1969), 'The Myths of *Nemean 10*', *GRBS* 10: 125 – 32.
- (1974), 'Theocritus' *Idyll 24*', *AJPh* 95: 348 – 61.
- Strauss Clay, Jenny (1999), 'Pindar's sympotic epinicia', *QUCC* 62: 25-34.

- Svoronos, Ioannes (1904-08), *Τὰ νομίματα τοῦ κράτους τῶν Πτολεμαίων*, 4 vols. (Athens).
- Swift, Laura (2010), *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric* (Oxford).
- Tarditi, Giovanni (1978), 'Le Muse povere (Call. *Ia.* 1 fr. 191, 92-93 Pf.)' in Enrico Livrea (ed.), *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni*, 2 vols. (Rome) 1115-21.
- Tarn, W. W. (1933), 'Two notes on Ptolemaic history', *JHS* 53: 57-68.
- Tedeschi, Alberto (1985), 'L'invio del carme nella poesia lirica arcaica: Pindaro e Bacchilide', *SIFC* 78: 29-54.
- Teodorsson, Sven-Tage (1989 – 1996), *A Commentary on Plutarch's Table-Talks*, 3 vols. (Göteborg).
- Thomson, Dorothy J. (2005), 'Posidippus, poet of the Ptolemies' in Gutzwiller (2005) 269 – 83.
- Thummer, Erich (1968 - 1969), *Pindar: Die isthmischen Gedichte*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg).
- Todorov, Tzvetan (1984), 'La littérature comme fait et valeur (Entretien avec Paul Bénichou)' in *Critique de la critique: un roman d'apprentissage* (Paris) 143 – 77.
- Tondriau, J. L. (1948), 'Princesses ptolémaïques comparées ou identifiées à des déesses (IIIème – Ier siècles av. J. C.)', *BSAA* 37: 12 – 33.
- (1950), 'Héraklès, Héraklides et autres émules du héros', *RIL* 83: 396 – 406.
- Tress, Heather van (2004), *Poetic Memory: Allusion in the Poetry of Callimachus and the Metamorphoses of Ovid* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 258, Leiden).
- Treu, Max (1963), 'Selbstzeugnisse alexandrinischer Dichter (Kallimachos, 13.

- Iambus; Theokrit XVI*)' in *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni* (Torino) 273-90.
- Trypanis, Constantine A. (1958), *Callimachus* (London and Cambridge, Mass).
- Usener, Hermann (1912) 'Analecta Theophrastea' in *Kleine Schriften I* (Berlin), 50 – 87.
- Vahlen, Johannes (1884), 'Über Theokrits *Hiero*', *SB Berlin* : 823-842 [= *Gesammelte philologische Schriften*, ii (1923, Leipzig-Berlin) 202 – 25].
- Valk, Marchinus van der (1971-1987), *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes ad fidem Codicis Laurentiani* (Leiden).
- Verdenius, W. J. (1983), 'The Principles of Greek Literary Criticism', *Mnemosyne* 36: 14 – 59.
- (1987-8), *Commentaries on Pindar*, 2 vols. (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 97, 101, Leiden).
- Vermeule, Emily (1979), *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Vološinov, V. N. (1986), *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (tr. L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik, Cambridge, Mass.).
- Vox, Onofrio (2002), 'Agathon kleos: poeta e committente nelle Cariti (Theocr. 16)', *Kleos* 7: 193-209.
- Wærn, Ingrid (1960), 'Greek lullabies', *Eranos* 53 :1 – 8.
- Walbank, F. W. (1957-1979), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
- Wendel, Karl (1914), *Scholia in Theocritum vetera* (Leipzig).
- West, Martin L. (2007), *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).

- (2011), *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* (Oxford).
- West, Stephanie (1988) in Heubeck et al. (1988), ‘Commentary on Books I-IV’.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von (1909), *Euripides: Herakles*² (Berlin).
- (1912), *Bucolici Graeci* (Oxford).
- (1922), *Pindaros* (Berlin).
- (1924), *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, 2 vols. (Berlin).
- Willcock, M. M. (1995), *Pindar Victory Odes: Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7* (Cambridge).
- Willi, Andreas (2004), ‘Poétique au seuil de l’alexandrinisme : l’idylle 16 de Théocrite’, *AC* 73: 31 – 46.
- Williams, Frederick (1978), *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo* (Oxford).
- Wimsatt, W. K. and Beardsley, Monroe C. (1946), ‘The intentional fallacy’ in Newton – De Molina (1976) 1 – 13.
- Wimsatt, W. K. (1968), ‘Genesis: a fallacy revisited’ in Newton – De Molina (1976) 116 – 38.
- Woodford, Susan (1983), ‘The iconography of the infant Herakles strangling snakes’ in F. Lissarrague and F. Thelamon (eds.), *Image et céramique grecque* (Rouen) 121 – 33.
- Winiarczyk, Marek (2002), *Euhemeros von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 157, Leipzig)
- Yon, Marguerite (2004), *Kition dans les textes. Testimonia littéraires et épigraphiques et corpus des inscriptions* (Paris).
- Young, David G. (1968), *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3 and Olympian 7* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 9, Leiden).

Zanker, Graham (1987), *Realism in Hellenistic Poetry: a literature and its Audience* (London).

Ziegler, Konrat (1913), 'Zum Zeushymnus des Kallimachos', *RhM* 68: 336-54.