Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary

BASSINO, PAOLA

Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi:

Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary

Paola Bassino

Ustinov College

This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics and Ancient History

University of Durham

2013

Abstract

Paola Bassino

***Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary.**

This dissertation provides an up-to-date introduction to the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, a critical edition of the text, and the first commentary in English on it. The *Certamen* is an anonymous work composed around the second century AD. It gives an account of the lives of Homer and Hesiod and of their poetic contest by re-elaborating biographical anecdotes attested from the sixth century BC onwards. As a biographical work that draws on older texts and oral traditions which developed over hundreds of years, it yields unique insights into the reception of early Greek Epic in the course of classical antiquity.

This thesis begins with an introduction to the tradition of the contest between Homer and Hesiod that collects and discusses the extant ancient accounts of that story. It argues that all versions are equally authoritative in principle, for they testify to different acts of reception of the poets in different contexts. The thesis then offers an up-to-date analysis of the manuscript witnesses of the *Certamen* and of their contribution to our understanding of the textual tradition of this text, and shows that the ancient biographies of the poets form a corpus that is naturally open to variation. The Edition provides a text that accounts for such an open tradition. The line-by-line Commentary offers a systematic analysis of both general and specific issues related to the text: this is a necessary and urgent task, not least because the *Certamen* is a stratified text, bringing together traditions of very different provenance, which can only be assessed and interpreted through a process of close reading.

The ultimate aim of the thesis is to show how the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod provides crucial insights into the processes of reception and canonisation of early hexameter epic from the archaic period to late antiquity.

Table of contents

Statement of Copyright

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the people and the institutions that supported me during these years at Durham. This experience would not have been possible without the financial support provided by the Department of Classics and Ancient History, the Faculty of Arts and Humanities and Ustinov College at Durham University.

My supervisor, Prof. Barbara Graziosi, has always been a fundamental point of reference for me. I applied for a PhD under her supervision because of her expertise on my field of research, but her understanding, patience, encouragement and trust in me, especially during hard times, have given me more than I could have ever expected from a supervisor. My second supervisor, Prof. Johannes Haubold, gave me precious comments on my work and saved me from many mistakes. Prof. Paola Ceccarelli too provided much good advice and support. It is a pleasure to acknowledge them here as two of the most influential academic figures during my postgraduate experience at Durham.

I have benefitted greatly from discussing my work with Giovanna Menci, who also shared with me the drafts of her *editio princeps* of P.Duk. inv. 665 while her work was in progress, and with the scholars who took part in the *Kyklos* teleconference (Harvard 2012) and the conference *Conflict and Consensus in Early Hexameter Poetry* (Durham 2012).

I have shared ideas and good times with many fellow graduate students and post-doctoral researchers of my Department. All of them have contributed to my work, either by discussing ancient epic with me, proofreading parts of this thesis, or just patiently lending their ears to me when I needed someone to talk to: Chiara Blanco, Lilah Grace Canevaro, Mirko Canevaro, Luke Evans, George Gazis, Nora Goldschmidt, Leonardo Gregoratti, Chiara Grigolin, Louise Hodgson, Nikoletta Manioti, Aglae Pizzone, Daniele Sberna, Erika Taretto, Talisa Tavella.

In Ustinov College many friends made me feel at home from the very first days: Zahra Afshar, Lara Bezzina, Sakib Bin Amin, Michele Fontefrancesco, Matteo Fossati, Alan May, Pauline Moret, Claudia Morgavi, Alice Panepinto, Rushil Ranchod, Azizullah Safi, Jay Wisayjorn, Nooshin Zolfaghari.

Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to all the people who supported me from Italy: my friends, especially Valentina Rizzo, for being always present although from a distance, and my family for their unconditional love. My nephews Riccardo and Alberto are the most important people in my life, and this thesis is dedicated to them.

Abbreviations of editions and works of reference

Classical authors are abbreviated as in LSJ, journals as in the *Année Philologique*. For the Lives of Homer I have used West's edition. All websites were last accessed on 13 June 2013.

BNJ = *Brill's New Jacoby.* Editor-in-chief I. Worthington. Leiden, 2007 –

BNP = *Brill's New Pauly: encyclopaedia of the ancient world. Classical tradition.* Eds. M. Landfester et al. Leiden, 2006-10.

CGFP = *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris reperta*. Ed. C. Austin. Berlin, 1973.

D.-K. = *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker.* Eds. H. Diels and W. Kranz. Berlin, 1961 (10th ed.).

F (FGrHist) = *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker.* Ed. F. Jacoby. Berlin, 1923 –

GDI = *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften.* Ed. H. Collitz et al. Göttingen, 1884-1915.

ID = *Inscriptiones Deli.* Ed. F. Dürrbach. Berlin, 1929.

IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Berlin, 1873 –

LDAB = *Leuven Database of Ancient Books.* Online resource: http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/

LfgrE = *Lexicon des frühgriechischen Epos.* Eds. B. Snell and H. Erbse. Göttingen, 1955-2010.

LIMC = *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. Eds. L. Kahil et al. Zurich, 1981-97.

LSJ = *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Eds. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Jones et al. Oxford, 1996 (9th ed.).

M.-W. = *Fragmenta Hesiodea*. Eds. R. Merkelbach and M. L. West. Oxford, 1967.

MP^3 = *Mertens-Pack 3 online Database*, online resource: http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/indexanglais.htm

PCG = *Poetae Comici Graeci*. Eds. R. Kassel and C. Austin. Berlin, 1983 –

S.-M. = *Pindari Carmina Cum Fragmentis.* Eds. B. Snell and H. Maehler. Leipzig, 1987.

SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Eds. J. C. Gieben et al. Amsterdam, 1923 –

Suppl. Hell. = *Supplementum Hellenisticum: Supplement.* Ed. P. H. Lloyd-Jones. Berlin, 1983.

TGrF = *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Eds. R. Kannicht, S. Radt and B. Snell. Göttingen, 1971-2004.

Bernabé = Bernabé, A., ed. (1987). *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Leipzig.

Boissonade = Boissonade, J. F. ed. (1851). *Tzetzae Allegoriae Iliadis*. Paris.

Colonna = Colonna, A., ed. (1953). "I Prolegomeni ad Esiodo e la Vita Esiodea di G. Tzetzes." *BPEC* 2: 27-39.

Couvreur = Couvreur, P., ed. (1901). *Hermeias von Alexandrien. In Platonis Phaedrum scholia*. Paris.

Cribiore = Cribiore, R. (1996). *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta.

Davies = Davies, M., ed. (1988). *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Göttingen.

De Lannoy = De Lannoy, L., ed. (1977). *Flavii Philostrati Heroicus*. Berlin.

Downey = Downey, G., et al., eds. (1971). *Themistii Orationes quae supersunt*, vol. 2. Leipzig.

Drachmann = Drachmann, A. B., ed. (1903). *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina recensuit A. B. Drachmann*. Leipzig.

Foerster = Foerster, R., ed. (1903-27). *Libanii Opera*. Leipzig.

Fowler = Fowler, R. L., ed. (2000). *Early Greek Mythography*. Oxford.

Gostoli = Gostoli, A., ed. (2007). *Margite*. Pisa-Rome.

Keaney = Keaney, J. J., ed. (1991). *Harpocration: Lexeis of the Ten Orators*. Amsterdam.

Kindstrand = Kindstrand, J. F., ed. (1979). *Isaac Porphyrogenitus. Praefatio in Homerum*. Uppsala.

Macleod = Macleod, M. D., ed. (1972). *Luciani Opera. Tomus I.* Oxford.

Matthews = Matthews, V. J., ed. (1996). *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary*. Leiden.

Most = Most, G., ed. (2006). *Hesiod. Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia*. Cambridge (MA).

Paton = Paton, W. R., et al., eds. (1974). *Plutarchi Moralia*. Leipzig.

Rose = Rose, V., ed. (1886). *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*. Leipzig.

Sandbach = Sandbach, F. H., ed. (1969). *Plutarch's Moralia XV. Fragments*. Cambridge (MA).

Schneider = Schneider, O. and H. Keil, eds. (1856). *Nicandrea: Theriaca et Alexipharmaca*. Leipzig.

Wehrli = Wehrli, F., ed. (1967 (2nd ed.)). *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Basel.

West = West, M. L., ed. (1978). *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford.

Wyss = Wyss, B., ed. (1936). *Antimachi Colofonii Reliquiae*. Berlin.

Van Der Valk = Van Der Valk, M., ed. (1971). *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes. Volumen primum*. Leiden.

Voigt = Voigt, E. M., ed. (1963). *Sappho Et Alcaeus. Fragmenta. Edidit Eva-Maria Voigt*. Amsterdam.

Preface

> *Discipuli in fabulis de morte Hesiodi traditis discere possunt variis de eadem re traditis memoriis recte uti, quod philologi officium est non minus grave quam variis uti lectionibus.*
> Wilamowitz 1916: 2

The *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* is a text that has often attracted the interest of modern scholars. It deals with a biographical episode that was very famous in antiquity, the story of the contest of Homer and Hesiod, and it is the only extant work created precisely in order to tell this story. Furthermore it is the longest extant account of that story, and the most detailed witness of the verses that the poets allegedly exchanged on that occasion. However, it is also a problematic text. The *Certamen* has been transmitted anonymously, and the only clue in the text that can help us determine its chronology, a mention of the emperor Hadrian, is difficult to interpret and place in relation to the overall history of the text. Clearly, the text collects materials from different periods, and it is not always possible to identify its sources. Some of its contents, such as the story of Homer's death following his failure to solve a riddle, were already circulating in the sixth and fifth centuries BC. The story of the contest, and more specifically some of the verses that the two poets exchanged, were known to Alcidamas, a sophist of the fourth century BC, but the precise extent to which he influenced our extant text of the *Certamen* has been the object of much debate. Moreover, the *Certamen* is transmitted in its entirety in only one medieval manuscript, and some papyrus fragments transmit portions of a similar, but not identical, text.

In this dissertation I clarify the problems related to this text, through a systematic study that includes an introduction to the tradition of the story of the contest, an analysis of the manuscript witnesses, a critical edition of the text, and the first commentary in English on it. In doing so I take into account the

peculiar nature and status of the biographical material in antiquity: I aim to show that biographical traditions form a corpus that is open to variations, both in terms of the contents of the biographical episodes and of the textual traditions of the individual texts.

My treatment of the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod is informed by recent studies on the value of biographical material as evidence for the early reception of a poet's work. It has long been acknowledged that the ancient biographical accounts on the poets should not be considered as reliable historical sources to reconstruct their real lives. An approach such as that of Wilamowitz, who famously tried to produce a consistent and plausible biography of Homer out of conflicting claims transmitted in the ancient sources, was already criticized by Jacoby a few years later.[1] More recently, in the first edition of her book *The Lives of Greek Poets* in 1981, Lefkowitz argues that most of the biographical material is derived from statements included in the poets' own verses and that it can be therefore disregarded as popular fiction.[2] In an equally skeptical approach, Latacz titles the chapter of his 1991 book *Homer: His Art and His Work* on the figure of Homer 'The source situation: nothing authentic'.[3] More recently however, scholars have proposed other ways to approach these fictional texts. In the introduction of *Inventing Homer*, Graziosi suggests that early speculations about the author of the Homeric poems must ultimately derive from an encounter between the poems and the ancient

[1] Wilamowitz 1916b: 397 suggested that the claims by Smyrna, Chios and Colphon could be put together to fashion a plausible biography for Homer. He could have been born in Smyrna, been active as a teacher in Colophon and then settled in Chios. Jacoby 1933 on the other hand suggested that those are local and independent claims. More generally, nineteenth – early twentieth century scholars who doubted the historical value of the ancient biographical material are Lehrs 1875 and Leo 1901.

[2] Lefkowitz 1981: vii-xi.

[3] Latacz 1996: 23-30.

audiences.[4] This material, therefore, becomes important not as a source for reconstructing a poet's real life, but as evidence for the reception of his works. Along similar lines, Hanink proposes to read Euripides' biographies by considering the cultural and political forces within which the active imagination of biographers operated.[5] Beecroft likewise claims that biographical anecdotes offer 'implied poetics'.[6] In the second edition of her book, Lefkowitz acknowledges and, to an extent, adopts these new perspectives on biographical material.[7] The Introduction of this thesis argues that the ancient accounts of the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod testify to different acts of reception of the poets in different contexts and were re-shaped, indeed re-created, accordingly.

Biographical texts were subjected to variations and modification in terms of their textual transmission too. Biographies, as West notes, are one of the categories of texts for which it is impossible to draw standard stemmata and which were subject to embellishments, alterations and revisions, so that the high number of respectable-looking variants does not allow us to construct an archetype.[8] It seems that we rather need a looser model, a net of criss-crossing influences among these texts. Reconstructing the *Ur*-text of a Life is often impossible because of the very high number of variant readings, corruptions and interpolations which affect both single words and entire sections of the

[4] Graziosi 2002: 2-3.

[5] Hanink 2008. See esp. p. 132.

[6] Beecroft 2010. See esp. pp. 2 and 19.

[7] See e.g. Lefkowitz 2012: 2: 'biographers could not tell their readers who Homer really was, but they could offer a portrait of the kind of person who might have written the *Odyssey*', and therefore biographies 'can provide clues to what ancient writers and audiences supposed the creative process to be, and can give us an impression of the kinds of poetry and subject matter that ancient people admired at different times and places'.

[8] West 1973: 16-17.

text.[9] The number of variants which we find in the manuscripts of the Lives is arguably due to the fact that these stories were considered essentially fictional and therefore fluid from the beginning. There was no strong need, in antiquity, to preserve the original because there never was an original Life of Homer, or an original Life of Hesiod, but just a series of different, interconnected versions. Those who wrote, excerpted and transmitted these early versions did not feel bound to transmit them faithfully: they rather selected material that could then be further mixed and modified, in order to recreate the figure of the author. This explains why it is often impossible to find the correct or original version of a story about Homer or Hesiod; or even the correct or original reading of a version of such a story. Our aim should rather be to understand the value of such variants as evidence for the innate flexibility of literary reception. Through my analysis of the text, I ultimately aim to show that the *Certamen* is the product of a conscious and purposeful adaptation of its sources, and deals with material that is itself fluid and suitable for alterations.

[9] It follows that a model such as that proposed by Allen 1924: 31-3 for the Lives of Homer, still considered valid by Esposito Vulgo Gigante 1996: 63, is in fact unacceptable. Allen suggested that all the extant Lives derive from a lost common source, of which the Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1 preserves the fullest memory; the other texts are divided in two branches deriving from the Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1. The situation seems to be similar for other *corpora* of ancient biographies, such as the *Vidas* of the Provençal troubadours: Boutière and Schutz in their edition of the *Vidas* (1950 and 1964) acknowledge that many of those texts are transmitted in different versions and claim that it is not possible to draw a stemma for them. Avalle 1960 in his edition of the *Vida* of Peire Vidal recognizes the existence of different branches of manuscripts but, again, does not create a stemma.

1. *Introduction: the tradition of the contest between Homer and Hesiod.*

This section analyses the extant versions of the story of the poetic contest of Homer and Hesiod other than the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*. It treats them in chronological order and investigates their relationship to the *Certamen*. The tradition originated from the passage from *Works and Days* (650-9, quoted below) in which Hesiod proclaims his victory in a poetic contest. This chapter shows that later authors never contradicted the features of the episode as told by Hesiod, but created and adapted all other details to their own needs. As well as the inherent flexibility of the contest tradition – which is reflected in the textual fluidity and (at times) textual uncertainty of the sources discussed – this chapter highlights the contexts in which the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod appeared. Broadly speaking, it appears in exegetical and biographical texts – commentaries on the *Works and Days*, Lives of Homer and Hesiod – but also, and importantly, in rhetorical works. Clearly, the competition between Homer and Hesiod was treated as a useful *exemplum*, which could be used in support of several different points and positions, and was therefore adapted to fit the particular purpose to which it was put. The popularity of the contest story in rhetorical works helps to explain the transmission of the *Certamen*, which survives for us in a manuscript that contains mainly rhetorical material.

Hesiod.

The story of the poetic contest between Homer and Hesiod originated from the passage from *Works and Days* (650-9) in which Hesiod proclaims his victory in a poetic contest:

650 οὐ γάρ πώ ποτε νηὶ γ' ἐπέπλων εὐρέα πόντον,
εἰ μὴ ἐς Εὔβοιαν ἐξ Αὐλίδος, ἦ ποτ' Ἀχαιοὶ
μείναντες χειμῶνα πολὺν σὺν λαὸν ἄγειραν
Ἑλλάδος ἐξ ἱερῆς Τροίην ἐς καλλιγύναικα.
ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼν ἐπ' ἄεθλα δαΐφρονος Ἀμφιδάμαντος

655 Χαλκίδα τ' εἰς ἐπέρησα· τὰ δὲ προπεφραδμένα πολλά
ἆθλ' ἔθεσαν παῖδες μεγαλήτορος· ἔνθά μέ φημι
ὕμνῳ νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' ὠτώεντα.
τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ Μούσῃς Ἑλικωνιάδεσσ' ἀνέθηκα
ἔνθά με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς. (Ed. West)

As has often been pointed out, this is a programmatic passage: Hesiod does not (only) aim at giving instructions on sailing, of which, as he admits, he does not have much experience. He is establishing his credentials as a didactic poet against heroic epic.[10] For this reason, although Hesiod does not explicitly mention his rival in the contest, Homer's name was readily supplied. Indeed, it even penetrated the textual tradition of *Works and Days*: a scholium to line 657 gives as a variant a line that was also part of the epigram allegedly inscribed on the tripod Hesiod won:

ὕμνῳ νικήσαντ' ἐν Χαλκίδι θεῖον Ὅμηρον.[11]

We do not know how widely attested this variant was but, as Nagy claims, there is no proof for the conventional explanation that this variant verse is a mere interpolation from the epigram: as a reported variant it may have reflected a genuine traditional alternative that has been gradually ousted in the course of a poem's crystallization into a fixed text.[12] This shows that the interaction and the relationship between the Hesiodic passage and the contest story are very strong: if the verses from *Works and Days* gave the input for the creation of the contest story, in turn the contest story influenced and penetrated the textual

[10] Nagy 1982: 66, Rosen 1990 and 1997: 478-9, Graziosi 2002: 170. These studies point out that, by showing his awareness of the right time for sailing, Hesiod differentiates himself from the Homeric heroes, who had to wait before sailing from Aulis to Troy; furthermore, the formulae with the epic epithets καλλιγύναιξ and ἱερή are reversed compared to the Homeric poems.

[11] The epigram is transmitted by *Cert*. 213-4, *AP* 7.53, Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 6, D. Chr. *Or*. 2.11, P.Freib. 1.1b.

[12] Nagy 1990: 78. A supporter of the 'interpolation' theory is West 1978: 321. Cf. for discussion also Skiadas 1965: 10-13 and Debiasi 2001: 19-20.

tradition of *Works and Days*. This interaction is also shown by the fact that the authors who wanted to deny that the contest happened also denied the Hesiodic authorship of *Op*. 650-9 and proposed to athetise that passage.[13]

Hesiod's victory, therefore, is proclaimed by the poet himself in his work, and for this reason is a non-negotiable aspect of the story. But a fundamental role in sealing the verdict was played also by the *material* reception of the Hesiodic passage. A tripod bearing the epigram of Hesiod's victory was displayed in antiquity in the place where Hesiod himself (*Op*. 657-8) claims to have dedicated it, on Mt Helicon. It was visible in Pausanias' times (Paus. 9.31.3):

ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἑλικῶνι καὶ ἄλλοι τρίποδες κεῖνται καὶ ἀρχαιότατος, ὃν ἐν Χαλκίδι λαβεῖν τῇ ἐπ' Εὐρίπῳ λέγουσιν Ἡσίοδον νικήσαντα ᾠδῇ. περιοικοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἄνδρες τὸ ἄλσος, καὶ ἑορτήν τε ἐνταῦθα οἱ Θεσπιεῖς καὶ ἀγῶνα ἄγουσι Μουσεῖα.

The tripod of Hesiod's victory against Homer was the material evidence of Hesiod's greatness, and 'guarantees the immortal presence of Hesiod in the Valley of the Muses'. [14] Its presence played an important role in the celebration of Hesiod's poetry on Helicon – a celebration that was mainly made in relation to Homer, as is confirmed by the absence of the statue of Homer from the statuary in the sanctuary of the Muses on Helicon.[15] Because of its importance, most writers were aware that the treatment of the story involved almost by necessity a discussion of the tripod.

According to Varro, for example, the tripod proves that the two poets

---

[13] See sections on Plutarch, Proclus and Tzetzes in this chapter (pp. 18-28 and 44-51).

[14] Manieri 2009: 316. The presence of Hesiod on the Mt Helicon is connected to the festival of the *Mouseia*, and arguably to their very institution: see Vox 1980: 321, Lamberton 1988, Calame 1996, Manieri 2009: 315-18 and 353.

[15] Hunter 2006: 19 notes that thanks to the tripod and to the absence of a statue of Homer the grove on Helicon is 'not just explicitly Hesiod's mountain, but also, importantly, not Homer's'.

were contemporaries and competed against each other.[16] Dio Chrysostom (*Or*. 2.11, see pp. 28-31) makes a similar use of the tripod and the epigram. Plutarch, on the other hand, in the scholium to *Op*. 650-9 (see p. 26) proposes the athetesis of the Hesiodic passage on the contest on the ground that the story is 'silly stuff', and probably believed that the passage was inserted at a later time precisely in order to justify the presence of the tripod on Mt Helicon – in turn a forgery created to give ancient roots to the *Mouseia*.[17]

Another fixed feature of the tradition that is inspired by the Hesiodic passage is the location of the contest: Chalcis. This leads to the discussion of another passage traditionally attributed to Hesiod, [Hes.] fr. 357 M.-W., where Homer and Hesiod are depicted together in the act of singing a hymn to Apollo at Delos.[18]

> ἐν Δήλῳ τότε πρῶτον ἐγὼ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἀοιδοί
> μέλπομεν, ἐν νεαροῖς ὕμνοις ῥάψαντες ἀοιδήν,
> Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορον ὃν τέκε Λητώ.

Some modern scholars have seen the meeting of the two poets on Delos as connected to that at Chalcis. West suggests that this fragment comes from a poem that told the story of the first (πρῶτον) meeting between the two poets in which Homer won, followed by the Chalcidean episode which would be Hesiod's revenge. According to West, such a work could not have existed before

---

[16] Gell. *Noctes Atticae* 3.11: *M. Autem Varro in primo de Imaginibus .. dicit… non esse dubium quin aliquo tempore eodem vixerint, idque ex epigrammate ostendi, quod in tripode scriptum est, qui in monte Helicone ab Hesiodo positur traditur*.

[17] Lamberton 1988: 503.

[18] This pseudo-Hesiodic fragment derives from a scholium to Pindar's *Nemean* 2.1 (3.31.7 Drachmann). The scholiast reports Philochorus' opinion on the etymology of the word rhapsode, which he connects to ῥάπτειν τὴν ὠιδήν: 'to stitch the song' (cf. 328 F 212). The fragment is quoted in support of it. This scholium contains information that is vital to our knowledge of ancient performative practices, and touches on matters that are relevant to the *Certamen* too (e.g. the Homeridae, Kynaithos and the *Hymn to Apollo*). It therefore features at several points of my commentary: see *Cert*. 13-15n., 56n. and 317n.

Alcidamas, or he would have set his story on Delos rather than at Chalcis because, at *Works and Days* 650-9, Homer is not mentioned, whereas in this fragment he is.[19] This argument seems to me unconvincing because the mere existence of this fragment does not prove its ability to become more influential than the *Works and Days* in determining the location of the contest between Homer and Hesiod for Alcidamas. Kivilo (who unlike West situates the origins of the Delian fragment before Alcidamas) and Nagy believe Delos to be an alternative location for the episode of the contest between Homer and Hesiod that took place at Chalcis.[20] However, the *Works and Days* is the canonical source of the story and locating the contest on the island of Delos would contradict two of the details given by Hesiod: that the contest took place at Chalcis (*Op*. 655) and that the poet never sailed the sea except from Aulis to Chalcis (*Op*. 650-1). The tone of Hesiod's words in the fragment, the apparent collaboration between the two bards in order to create one new song, the mention of Apollo – aspects which are completely absent from the verses about Chalcis – are further reasons to look for the origins and the meaning of fr. 357 M.-W. in other circumstances, independent from the Chalcidean episode.

A plausible and now widely accepted hypothesis was proposed by Burkert in 1979, and at the same time developed independently by Janko, who published it three years later.[21] These scholars connect our fragment to a festival organised by Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, in 523-2 BC: this festival was held on Delos and was a joint celebration of Apollo of Delos and Apollo of Delphi. The occasion may also have seen the first joint performance of the two parts of the

[19] West 1967: 440.

[20] Kivilo 2000: 3 and 2010: 21, Nagy 2010: 70. Based on a doubtful passage of the *Certamen* (55n.), they also propose Aulis as a third possible location – although Kivilo 2010: 19 seems to be open to the possibility, accepted in this commentary, that Aulis is mentioned as the place from which the two poets sailed to Chalcis.

[21] Burkert 1979: 59-60, Janko 1982: 113.

Hymn to Apollo, the Delian and the Pythian. Fr. 357 M.-W. worked therefore as an attempt to give ancient and authoritative roots to this festival, by attributing the proto-performance of the joint parts of the *Hymn* to Homer and Hesiod respectively.[22] If this suggestion is correct, it also accounts for the emphasis on the cooperation between the two bards that seems to emerge from the verses, and that makes the episode look quite different from the story told in the *Certamen*.[23]

Because one of the versions of the proto-performance of the *Hymn to Apollo* is told in the *Certamen*, it is interesting to proceed with a comparison between the witness given by our fragment and the others that have reached us. Another famous story about Homer (this time Homer alone) performing this *Hymn* is told by Thucydides. At 3.104, the historian gives an account of the purification of Delos carried out by the Athenians in 426 BC, the first purification of the island after Pisistratus' times. He remarks that the action taken by his fellow citizens in 426 BC also included the revival of the festival of the *Delia*, which, he recalls, in ancient times saw Homer himself reciting the *Hymn to Apollo*.

It seems that we have here two different versions of the story, each of which emphasises different issues. These can be explained, at least in part, as

[22] For the Delian part as 'Homeric' and the Pythian as 'Hesiodic' see e.g. Janko 1982: 113.

[23] This has long been noted too: Graziosi 2002: 182 notes that in the fragment the two poets sing a hymn to a god, and that when they are presented together as religious experts the emphasis is on their cooperation rather then on their rivalry; Collins 2004: 181 stresses that the two are said to produce *one* song (ἀοιδήν). However, as noted by Koning 2010: 246 n. 27 who criticises Heldmann 1982: 16-17, the emphasis on their cooperation does not exclude that the context in which the performance was set was a competitive one. The verses pronounced by each poet in the *Certamen*, which are poetic entities of their own, assume additional nuances and new meanings when seen in response to one another (see most remarkably the exchanges at 107-37 and the relations between the two 'finest passages' at 180-204n.), thus creating in turn new poetic unities.

responses to the different political contexts in which the anecdotes were told. Moreover, some elements of the Thucydidean version seem to suggest that the two traditions were engaging and competing with each other. Because the story told in [Hes.] fr. 357 M.-W. probably has its origins in a festival in honour of Apollo of both Delos and Delphi, which hosted the joint performance of the Delian and Pythian parts of the *Hymn*, the presence of Hesiod in the anecdote seems to have been determined by the Delphic element. The Thucydidean version, by contrast, focuses only on the Delian elements: the Athenians revived the festival called *Delia*; only Homer is mentioned; verses from the Delian part and strictly connected to the figure of Homer are quoted (esp. 165-72). All this underlines the Athenian connection with Delos, with all the political and symbolic meaning that it had for the Athenian empire.[24] The relationship between Athens and Delphi were difficult at the time of the Peloponnesian War because of the pro-Spartan sympathies of the oracle.[25] It is perhaps not too surprising that Thucydides fails to refer to the Delphic/Hesiodic part of the *Hymn*.[26] The version given by the *Certamen* at 315-21 is similar to that given by Thucydides, although not all details are the same. In both accounts, however,

[24] Hornblower 1991: 142 and 520-1 remarks that Delos was the birthplace of Apollo, the father of Ion, which makes the island a particularly interesting site for Athens that proposed herself as the mother-state for the Ionian cities. Delos was also chosen as site of the League treasury before it was moved to Athens.

[25] Hornblower 1991: 521-2.

[26] Interestingly, then, an element in the Thucydidean account seems to show that there was also a certain degree of awareness of and engagement among these different traditions: on the occasion of the festival to which fr. 357 M.-W. is connected, Polycrates spectacularly dedicated the island of Rheneia to Apollo by bounding it with a chain to Delos. Thucydides, before mentioning the Athenians' own revival of the Delian festival in 426 BC, relates that the Athenians during the purification of Delos brought the corpses to Rheneia, and then remarks that the two islands are so close to each other that Polycrates could bind Rheneia to Delos with a chain. This minimizes the role of an event that was surely important to the Polycratean propaganda.

Homer emerges as a Panionian poet. The *Certamen* seems to take inspiration from the tradition testified by Thucydides, according to which the process of Panhellenisation of Homer is connected to the image of the blind bard from Chios presented in the *Hymn to Apollo*: this was the image of the poet accepted and promoted by the Athenians, and thus became predominant.[27]

In conclusion, fr. 357 M.-W. has no relation with the Chalcidean contest: the mention of Homer and Hesiod performing together on a different occasion may have been inspired, or supported, by the Chalcidean tradition, but it does not represent an alternative version of it.

Plutarch.

Plutarch (first-second century AD) refers to the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod in three passages: *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 153f-154a; *Table Talk* 674f–675a; *Commentary on Hesiod's Works and Days* fr. 84 Sandbach.

The story as told in the *Dinner*, with which this discussion starts, contains many features that make it unique. The one that has attracted the greatest scholarly attention is the textually disputed mention of Lesches. The following analysis justifies the presence of Lesches as a competitor, rather than – as often suggested– the narrator or creator of the story. In the *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 153f-154a, Plutarch tells the story of a dinner hosted by Periander and attended by the Sages and others. At the point of the text where mention of the contest occurs, the king of the Egyptians, Amasis, enlists the help of Bias, one of the Sages, to solve a riddle proposed by the king of the Ethiopians: how to drink up the ocean. Bias offers a suitable solution for the challenge (blocking the rivers flowing into the ocean), and Chilon suggests that Amasis should learn from Bias how to improve his government instead of how to play these silly games. After the Sages have engaged in political discussions and exchanged some riddles in turn, Cleodorus announces that this game, too, is a waste of time. At

[27] See also *Cert*. 315-21n.

this point, Periander refers to the story of the famous poetic contest in which Hesiod gained victory and a tripod.

Below is the text in the Teubner edition:[28]

Ἀκούομεν γὰρ ὅτι καὶ πρὸς τὰς Ἀμφιδάμαντος ταφὰς εἰς Χαλκίδα τῶν τότε σοφῶν οἱ δοκιμώτατοι [ποιηταὶ] συνῆλθον· ἦν δ' ὁ Ἀμφιδάμας ἀνὴρ πολεμικός, καὶ πολλὰ πράγματα παρασχὼν Ἐρετριεῦσιν ἐν ταῖς περὶ Ληλάντου μάχαις ἔπεσεν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ παρεσκευασμένα τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἔπη χαλεπὴν καὶ δύσκολον ἐποίει τὴν κρίσιν διὰ τὸ ἐφάμιλλον, ἥ τε δόξα τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν [Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου] πολλὴν ἀπορίαν μετ' αἰδοῦς τοῖς κρίνουσι παρεῖχεν, ἐτράποντο πρὸς τοιαύτας ἐρωτήσεις, καὶ προύβαλε μέν, ὥς φασι, Λέσχης,

Μοῦσά μοι ἔννεπε κεῖνα, τὰ μήτ' ἐγένοντο πάροιθε
μήτ' ἔσται μετόπισθεν,

ἀπεκρίνατο δ' Ἡσίοδος ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος

ἀλλ' ὅταν ἀμφὶ Διὸς τύμβῳ καναχήποδες ἵπποι
ἅρματα συντρίψωσιν ἐπειγόμενοι περὶ νίκης.

καὶ διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται μάλιστα θαυμασθεὶς τοῦ τρίποδος τυχεῖν.

Here Lesches is presented as one of the contestants: he proposes a riddle that Hesiod solves, thus winning the contest. But the presence of Lesches, indeed that of any other poet than Homer and Hesiod, is not attested elsewhere in the tradition of the contest, and scholars have therefore proceeded to expel Lesches from it. Following one of the variants attested in the manuscript tradition, Allen published a text in which Lesches is not a competitor, but the narrator of the story. [29] According to Allen, Lesches might have written about

[28] Paton, Wegehaupt and Pohlenz 1974. This text is essentially the same as that in Wilamowitz 1916, in the Belles Lettres edition of Plutarch by Defradas, Hani and Klaerr 1985 and in Most 2006. All the quotations from Plutarch are from the Teubner edition.

[29] Allen 1912: 136, 218 and 1924: 25. The text is accepted in the Loeb edition of Plutarch by Babbitt 1928. I copy here for the sake of clarity the apparatus as it appears in the Teubner edition:

15 secl. Larsen **19** secl. Wil. **21** προύβαλε (–βαλλε **P**) **PQB** προυβάλομεν v προυβάλλομεν **O** φασι **QhJ nwB** φησί **O.**

Some of the scholars who have dealt with the manuscript tradition of this passage have misunderstood it because of the presence of an ambiguous *siglum* in the apparatus. Kirk 1950: 150 n. 1 claims that **O** is alone in transmitting the reading φησί, and he is followed by West

the contest story either in the *Little Iliad*, or in a poem that Lesches wrote about Homer's life. Allen's text, recently defended by O' Sullivan, Kivilo and Koning, runs: καὶ προέβαλ' ὁ μέν, ὥς φησι Λέσχης ('and he (*scil*. Homer), as Lesches asserts, proposed the following'). [30] This reading does not seem plausible to me. To begin with, it is improbable that a poet closely associated with Homer, such as Lesches, would have told a story in which Hesiod defeated Homer. The poems attributed to Lesches, such as the *Little Iliad*, are set in the heroic age, in which the story of the contest does not belong.[31] More fundamentally, the very attempt to discover the original author of such a story seems misguided, since most of the biographical episodes related to the lives of the archaic poets circulated anonymously at an early stage.

It has been argued in defence of Allen's reading that we have no evidence for a contest of singers with three or more contestants competing at the same time.[32] But the last part of Periander's introductory sentence does, indeed, seem

---

1967: 439 and Kivilo 2000: 4 and 2010: 23. In fact, the *siglum* present in this section of the apparatus, **O** (Greek letter omicron), stands for *codices omnes praeter citatos*, while it is O (Latin alphabet) that represents a manuscript, the Ambr. 528 s. (cf. *conspectus siglorum* at p. XLVI in the Teubner edition), which is not mentioned here. It follows that the manuscripts **QhJ nwB** give the reading φασι; all the others (except for those mentioned and including O) give φησί.

[30] O' Sullivan 1992: 80-1, Kivilo 2000 and 2010:23-4 (cf. also Kivilo 2010b: 90) and Koning 2010: 260 n. 83.

[31] In this respect it is useful to remark, with West 1967: 439, that 'we know of a considerable number of early hexameter poems that were current in antiquity, and not one of them was about post–Dark Age personalities. 'Biographical' poetry did not exist, to the best of our knowledge'. Kivilo's attempts to 'trace an archaic biographical poem here' (2010: 24 n. 72) do not seem convincing. To argue for an early date for the origins of the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod, we do not necessarily need a connection with Lesches or any other specific name. Another, more convincing attempt to trace the earliest developments of the legend in archaic times is in Debiasi 2012, according to whom the story originated in connection to the Lelantine war.

[32] Kivilo 2010: 23.

to imply a contest among more than two participants. Furthermore, other witnesses of the story such as the *Certamen* and even Hesiod's *Works and Days* (650–9) seem to set no limit on the number of competitors who took part in the event as a whole. Even if such a version of the contest did not exist before Plutarch, he may, in any case, have invented further competitors to suit his own rhetorical purposes. The mention of the competition between the poets occurs in the context of advice given to kings. In the *Dinner*, Plutarch suggests a connection between riddle solving and the ability to rule well, two talents which have σοφία in common. The Sages, who can solve riddles, are also engaged in enlightened political discussions, and a female character in the work, Cleobulina, who improved the government of her father, is also famous for her riddles. Amasis, by contrast, does not excel in either ability. It stands to reason that, when telling of one of the most famous competitions in riddle solving, Plutarch wants to draw as close a parallel as possible between the σοφοί who took part in that competition and the σοφοί at his banquet, and that may well be why he suggests, by mentioning Lesches, that more than two wise poets competed in the contest. Lesches fits well as an extra competitor for several reasons: he was an epic poet and even shared with Homer the attribution of the *Little Iliad*.[33] But that work could not compete with the real *Iliad* in terms of perceived poetic quality; and Lesches was nowhere near as famous as Homer.[34] Unlike the *Certamen*, where Hesiod defeats Homer solely

[33] Collection of *testimonia* in Davies 1988: 49-52.

[34] As Graziosi 2002: 172 suggests, he is 'the perfect substitute in that he is traditionally very close to Homer, but less authoritative'. That does not necessarily contradict the claim that at the contest τῶν τότε σοφῶν οἱ δοκιμώτατοι ποιηταὶ συνῆλθον (*pace* Koning 2010: 260 n. 85). Important, here, is the fact that the *Dinner of the Seven Sages* mentions several obscure names of sages and other guests: clearly Plutarch is displaying his erudition by revealing surprising and generally unknown elements both of the Seven Sages traditions and of the poetic contest tradition. Comparing his version with other accounts of the Seven Sages (Pl. *Prt.* 343a; D.L. 1.40; Stob. 3.1.172) we find, then, differences in the names of the Sages and in the place of their

on the basis of Panedes' verdict, here the poetic skills of Hesiod do not leave room for disagreement over his victory: Plutarch can thus safely use this episode to make his point about the importance of riddle solving. Lesches was also known to have participated in another poetic contest, against Arctinus, and that may have been at the back of Plutarch's mind when he included him in this story.[35]

A related textual problem in this passage is posed by the words τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου. These have almost unanimously been considered to contradict the presence of Lesches at the contest: some scholars use them as evidence for the fact that Plutarch refers to a contest between Homer and Hesiod *only*.[36] Others solve this apparent problem by athetizing Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου, and suggesting that it was a marginal gloss that made it into the text at an early stage of transmission.[37] This latter suggestion seems

meeting. As in the account of the poetic contest between Homer and Hesiod, the variations often have a clear rationale.

[35] Phaenias fr. 33 Wehrli: ναὶ μὴν καὶ Τέρπανδρον ἀρχαίζουσί τινες· Ἑλλάνικος γοῦν (4 F 85b) τοῦτον ἱστορεῖ κατὰ Μίδαν γεγονέναι, Φανίας δὲ πρὸ Τερπάνδρου τιθεὶς Λέσχην τὸν Λέσβιον Ἀρχιλόχου νεώτερον φέρει τὸν Τέρπανδρον, διημιλλῆσθαι δὲ τὸν Λέσχην Ἀρκτίνῳ καὶ νενικηκέναι. Other tentative explanations have been offered: Milne 1924: 57 suggests that Lesches' name was substitute for Homer's in the Hellenistic period or later because of the chronological problem of making Homer and Hesiod contemporaries; Richardson 1981: 2 argues that Plutarch's account may reflect an earlier version of the story; Erbse 1996: 313-14 suggests emending the name of Lesches to Panedes. Among the attempts to account for the role of Lesches as the narrator of the story in the Plutarchean passage, Fowler's remarks (*apud* Kivilo 2010: 23 n. 71) seem the most reasonable: he claims that 'Plutarch may not necessarily have quoted first hand and there could be false inference behind his reference'. That is, even if Plutarch was indeed presenting Lesches as a narrator, he could have been wrong and this passage alone cannot prove Allen's and Kivilo's theory of Lesches as the creator of the contest story.

[36] Koning 2010: 260 n. 84 and Kivilo 2000: 4 and 2010: 23.

[37] The athetesis was first proposed by Wilamowitz 1879: 161. See also Wilamowitz 1916: 55 and 1916b: 405. It was later accepted in the Teubner and Belles Lettres editions and by West 1967:

plausible, but the alleged gloss is attested in all our manuscripts, so we should be careful about suggesting an athetesis.[38] In fact, it is possible to make sense of the text as it stands: it says that the quality of Homer's and Hesiod's performance made it difficult for the judges to issue a verdict; hence they asked for the competition to go on and Hesiod, able to solve Lesches' riddle, was eventually awarded the victory. The fact that Hesiod replies ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος may also mean that Hesiod was the first to reply to a riddle proposed to all the contestants. Lesches poses a riddle, and Hesiod solves it first – thus winning the competition.

Another explanation for the presence of Lesches that has gathered some consensus among modern scholars, and deserves attention here, is West's. He argues that the name Λέσχης replaced Ὅμηρος in the text: Homer would be the contestant who actually proposes the challenge, but a reader may have been reminded of Lesches by the verses of the question, and his name written in the margin of a copy of Plutarch's text would then have penetrated the text.[39] If the presupposition of West's statement is right, i.e. that these verses were in antiquity (sometimes) attributed to Lesches, Plutarch, too, must have been aware of this connection: there is no need to postulate that he gave Homer verses traditionally attributed to another poet, when we consider that the tradition offered an alternative version for the question, which Plutarch may well have known.[40] It seems to me more probable that Lesches was present in

---

439.

[38] However, from my remark it does not follow that the presence of these words in all the manuscript guarantees their genuineness. The fact that the readings φασι and φησί, that allow Lesches two completely different roles in the passage, are both well represented in the manuscript tradition shows that this passage was not perceived as easy by those who copied it, and it would not be surprising that an attempt made by someone to specify the names of the most canonical contestants successfully entered the text and was then transmitted unanimously.

[39] West 1967: 439-40.

[40] On a general level, it should be noted that Plutarch in general was certainly well aware of the

Plutarch's account from the very beginning, or that a marginal 'Lesches' was inserted simply in order to spare Homer the indignity of being beaten by Hesiod. In any case, there is no definitive proof that the lines were ever associated with poems attributed to Lesches, and this makes it particularly unfortunate that they are often included in collections of fragments from the lost works of Lesches.[41] This is not to argue that the verses pronounced by Lesches in this passage are a creation of Plutarch: it is rather to suggest that they could well derive from another source, for example a now lost *corpus* of hexameters used in poetic contests similar to the collection of verses in the *Certamen* or indeed fluid oral epic performances and stock phrases used in a witty and provocative way. The fact that the Muses are asked *not* to sing a particular topic reverses the traditional epic invocation to the Muses, and in

---

tradition of the contest, as he mentions it in three passages. He also commented on the relevant passage from *Works and Days*, which surely implied some research on the topic. Moreover, he mentions details that are not found anywhere else, e.g. the fact that Amphidamas died in a naval battle during the Lelantine war. More specifically on this exchange of question and answer: in the relevant section of the manuscript of the *Certamen* (f. 16v), the words καναχήποδες ἵπποι are missing. Plutarch's text was used to complete the hexameter by the earliest editors of the *Certamen* (e.g. Nietzsche 1871) and P.Petr. I 25, published in 1891 (Mahaffy 1891) confirmed that Plutarch's reading was current already in the third century BC (cf. ll. 45-7). In both the *Certamen* (97-8) and the papyrus (P.Petr. I 25 ll. 38-41) the question is different from the one in Plutarch, and as he was well informed about the tradition of the answer, he might also have been aware of the alternative question with which it circulated.

[41] Because of the mention of Lesches these verses have sometimes been connected with the *Little Iliad* and interpreted as its *incipit* (fr. 1 Bernabé: see Bernabé 1984 and 1987: 76). But the poem is more likely to have started with another couplet, transmitted in Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 16 and explicitly glossed as the beginning of it (fr. 1 Davies: see Davies 1989: 60, id. 1989b: 6 and Burgess 2001: 24). Fr. 1 Davies is also more ancient than the Plutarchean couplet can be proved to be, as it is found in an inscription from the fifth century BC (Vinogradov 1969: 142-3; Vinogradov and Zolotarev 1990: 109 and 119 fig. C = SEG 1990: 612). For other hypotheses see also Scafoglio 2006. I discuss this matter at length in a forthcoming article.

itself suggests a riddling or agonistic context for their creation, which is precisely the kind of context in which Plutarch mentions them.

There is one further peculiarity to this exchange of verses: the second verse in the question is left incomplete. Lesches is asking his opponent to talk about something that never was in the past and never shall be in the future; the second verse is then abruptly interrupted. Anyone familiar with the formulae of epic poetry will notice that the present is not mentioned: the couplet recalls the famous epic formula τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα, which is also used in the corresponding question in the *Certamen* and in P.Petr. I 25.[42] Most remarkably, because of the absence of the present, the question in Plutarch does not contain an obvious difficulty: if asked not to sing of the past or the future, Hesiod could refer, in his answer, to anything happening in the present.[43] Again it is instructive to see how this fits the context in which the verses appear, in particular by looking at the treatment of time as a philosophical issue in the *Dinner*. In the passage described at the beginning, Bias solves the riddle posed to Amasis by referring to the present time: Amasis should ask the king of the Ethiopians 'to stop the rivers which are now emptying into the ocean depths, while he is engaged in drinking up the ocean that now is; for this is the ocean with which the demand is concerned, and not the one which is to be'.[44] In another passage (153b), time is defined as partaking of past, present and future; in another work (*On Common Conception against the Stoics* 1081c-1082d), Plutarch criticizes the Stoic doctrine according to which time partakes only of past and

[42] The formula is found at: *Il.* 1.71; Hes. *Th.* 38; *Th.* 32 in the shortened form τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα (again leaving out the present).

[43] The reference to the tomb of Zeus, something that can never exist because of the immortality of the god, well responds to the question formulated in the *Certamen* (see 97-8n. and 100-1n.). Strictly speaking, it is not appropriate in this context.

[44] 151d: Φραζέτω τοίνυν,' ἔφη, 'τῷ Αἰθίοπι τοὺς ἐμβάλλοντας εἰς τὰ πελάγη ποταμοὺς ἐπισχεῖν, ἕως αὐτὸς ἐκπίνει τὴν νῦν οὖσαν θάλατταν· περὶ ταύτης γὰρ τὸ ἐπίταγμα γέγονεν, οὐ τῆς ὕστερον ἐσομένης.' The above translation is by Babbitt 1928.

future. In Lesches' question the importance of the present is demonstrated by its very absence: a verse is left incomplete and thus the couplet contains no difficulty to solve. The curtailed couplet suits Plutarch's philosophical discourse on time better than any corresponding verse transmitted in the rest of the tradition; and this in turn suggests that, whatever Plutarch's source, he felt quite free to adapt it for his own purposes.

The other two passages by Plutarch confirm that he allowed himself to deal with the story of the contest freely and creatively. In *Table Talk* (674f-675a) Plutarch says that poetry competitions are ancient, but although many expect him to give as an example the contest between Homer and Hesiod, he 'scorns this hackneyed lore of the schoolroom':

ἐνίοις μὲν οὖν ἐπίδοξος ἦμην ἕωλα παραθήσειν πράγματα, τὰς Οἰολύκου τοῦ Θετταλοῦ ταφὰς καὶ τὰς Ἀμφιδάμαντος τοῦ Χαλκιδέως ἐν αἷς Ὅμηρον καὶ Ἡσίοδον ἱστοροῦσιν ἔπεσι διαγωνίσασθαι. καταβαλὼν δὲ ταῦτα τῷ διατεθρυλῆσθαι πάνθ' ὑπὸ τῶν γραμματικῶν[…]

In a scholium to Hesiod's *Works and Days* (fr. 84 Sandbach = sch. *Op.* 650-62), Plutarch is said to have athetized the passage in which Hesiod proclaims his victory as a later interpolation, because it contains nothing of value:

ταῦτα πάντα περὶ τῆς Χαλκίδος <καὶ> τοῦ Ἀμφιδάμαντος καὶ τοῦ ἄθλου καὶ τοῦ τρίποδος ἐμβεβλῆσθαί φησιν ὁ Πλούταρχος οὐδὲν ἔχοντα χρηστόν. τὸν μὲν οὖν Ἀμφιδάμαντα ναυμαχοῦντα πρὸς Ἐρετριέας ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ληλάντου ἀποθανεῖν· ἆθλα δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγῶνας θεῖναι τελευτήσαντι τοὺς παῖδας· νικῆσαι δ' ἀγωνιζόμενον τὸν Ἡσίοδον καὶ ἆθλον μουσικὸν τρίποδα λαβεῖν καὶ ἀναθεῖναι τοῦτον ἐν τῷ Ἑλικῶνι, ὅπου καὶ κάτοχος ἐγεγόνει ταῖς Μούσαις, καὶ ἐπίγραμμα ἐπὶ τούτῳ θρυλοῦσι. πάντα οὖν ταῦτα ληρώδη λέγων ἐκεῖνος, ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἄρχεται τῶν εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ πλοῦ συντεινόντων, 'ἤματα πεντήκοντα'.

The explanations proposed for Plutarch's athetesis agree on one fundamental point: in Plutarch's opinion the contest between Homer and Hesiod does not have a historical basis.[45] Plutarch, the scrupulous critic of literature, rejects the authenticity of the contest story; and, precisely because he

[45] See e.g. Lamberton 1988.

regards it as essentially fictional, he feels free to adapt it to his own creative purposes, in suitable contexts such as his *Dinner of the Seven Sages*.[46]

Indeed, it is quite possible that in Plutarch's version of the contest Homer did not feature at all. If Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου in the *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 153f-154a can be dismissed as a gloss, then it is possible that Plutarch's version of the contest did not actually include Homer, but had Lesches as a minor, and chronologically viable, replacement.

What can, in my view, be concluded without controversy is this. First of all, Plutarch differs considerably from the version of the contest we know from the *Certamen*, however we read and edit his text. Secondly, it is clear that his version of the story was variously discussed and altered, so that external glosses may have entered the text early on in the history of its transmission, and so that part of the manuscripts have Lesches as narrator of, rather than participant in, the contest. The role of Lesches as narrator aligns Plutarch's version more closely with the *Certamen*, and may be the result of ancient or medieval attempts at harmonising the story. But it must be said that Lesches' role as narrator, and Homer's role as participant, do not accord with Plutarch's own take on the story of the contest in other works: his *Table Talk* 674f–675a and his *Commentary on Hesiod's Works and Days* fr. 84 Sandbach count against it. Finally, the manuscript reading which makes Lesches into a narrator of the contest has the knock-on effect of creating one more Lesches fragment, which is then sometimes included in collections of his work. On that basis, some scholars argue for a very early origin of the story of the contest, ascribing its creation to a sixth- or seventh-century Lesches. That seems to me a conclusion of very dubious standing. Beyond the uncertainties, my discussion of Plutarch shows

[46] Cf. also Kirk 1950: 150 n. 1: 'Plutarch had in any case doubted the authenticity of the Amphidamas-passage at *Erga* 654 ff., and would not be particularly concerned over the accuracy of Periander's story'.

how flexible the story of the contest was, and how often it was manipulated, in antiquity and in modern times, through the work of editors.

Dio Chrysostom, *Oration on Kingship* 2.7-12.

Dio Chrysostom (first-second century AD) mentions the contest between Homer and Hesiod in his second oration *On Kingship*. In this work, Alexander the Great and his father Philip on their way home from Chaeronea engage in a conversation about Homer which is in fact, as is stated at the very beginning of the work, a discussion about kingship as well.[47] In the first few paragraphs Alexander puts forward the idea that lies at the heart of the oration: kings should read Homer, because his poetry alone is 'truly noble, lofty and suited to a king'[48]. His father then asks him about his opinion of other poets, including Hesiod, and this gives the opportunity for a reflection on the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod that also resembles a 're-enactment' of it, with Philip and Alexander performing Hesiodic and Homeric verses respectively.[49]

(7) […] πάνυ οὖν ὁ Φίλιππος αὐτὸν ἠγάσθη τῆς μεγαλοφροσύνης, ὅτι δῆλος ἦν οὐδὲν φαῦλον οὐδὲ ταπεινὸν ἐπινοῶν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τε ἥρωσι καὶ τοῖς ἡμιθέοις παραβαλλόμενος. (8) ὅμως δὲ κινεῖν αὐτὸν βουλόμενος, Τὸν δὲ Ἡσίοδον, ὦ Ἀλέξανδρε, ὀλίγου ἄξιον κρίνεις, ἔφη, ποιητήν; Οὐκ ἔγωγε, εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ παντός, οὐ μέντοι βασιλεῦσιν οὐδὲ στρατηγοῖς ἴσως. Ἀλλὰ τίσι μήν; καὶ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος γελάσας, Τοῖς ποιμέσιν, ἔφη, καὶ τοῖς τέκτοσι καὶ τοῖς γεωργοῖς. τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ποιμένας φησὶ φιλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν Μουσῶν, τοῖς δὲ τέκτοσι μάλα ἐμπείρως παραινεῖ πηλίκον χρὴ τὸν ἄξονα τεμεῖν, καὶ τοῖς γεωργοῖς, ὁπηνίκα ἄρξασθαι πίθου. (9) Τί οὖν; οὐχὶ ταῦτα χρήσιμα, ἔφη, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὁ Φίλιππος; Οὐχ ἡμῖν γε, εἶπεν, ὦ πάτερ, οὐδὲ Μακεδόσι τοῖς νῦν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πρότερον, ἡνίκα νέμοντες καὶ γεωργοῦντες Ἰλλυριοῖς ἐδούλευον καὶ Τριβαλλοῖς. Οὐδὲ τὰ περὶ τὸν σπόρον, ἔφη, καὶ τὸν ἀμητόν, ὁ Φίλιππος, ἀρέσκει σοι τοῦ Ἡσιόδου μεγαλοπρεπῶς οὕτως εἰρημένα;

Πληιάδων Ἀτλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομενάων
ἄρχεσθ΄ ἀμητοῦ, ἀρότοιο δὲ δυσομενάων.

[47] Par. 1: οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ λόγοι οὗτοι σχεδόν τι καὶ περὶ βασιλείας ἦσαν.

[48] Par. 6: τὴν δέ γε Ὁμήρου ποίησιν μόνην ὁρῶ τῷ ὄντι γενναίαν καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆ καὶ βασιλικήν. The above translation is by Cohoon 1932.

[49] Koning 2010: 263.

(10) Πολύ γε μᾶλλον, εἶπεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος, τὰ παρ΄ Ὁμήρῳ γεωργικά. Καὶ ποῦ περὶ γεωργίας εἴρηκεν Ὅμηρος; ἤρετο ὁ Φίλιππος, ἢ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀσπίδι μιμήματα λέγεις τῶν ἀρούντων καὶ θεριζόντων καὶ τρυγώντων; Ἥκιστά γε, εἶπεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος, ἀλλὰ ἐκεῖνα πολὺ μᾶλλον·

οἱ δ΄ ὥστ΄ ἀμητῆρες ἐναντίοι ἀλλήλοισιν
ὄγμον ἐλαύνωσιν ἀνδρὸς μάκαρος κατ΄ ἄρουραν
πυρῶν ἢ κριθῶν· τὰ δὲ δράγματα ταρφέα πίπτει·
ὣς Τρῶες καὶ Ἀχαιοὶ ἐπ΄ ἀλλήλοισι θορόντες
δῄουν, οὐδ΄ ἔτεροι μνώοντ΄ ὀλοοῖο φόβοιο.

(11) Ταῦτα μέντοι ποιῶν Ὅμηρος ἡττᾶτο ὑπὸ Ἡσιόδου, ὁ Φίλιππος εἶπεν· ἢ οὐκ ἀκήκοας τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τὸ ἐν Ἑλικῶνι ἐπὶ τοῦ τρίποδος·

Ἡσίοδος Μούσαις Ἑλικωνίσι τόνδ΄ ἀνέθηκεν
ὕμνῳ νικήσας ἐν Χαλκίδι θεῖον Ὅμηρον;

(12) Καὶ μάλα δικαίως, εἶπεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος, ἡττᾶτο· οὐ γὰρ ἐν βασιλεῦσιν ἠγωνίζετο, ἀλλ΄ ἐν γεωργοῖς καὶ ἰδιώταις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν ἀνθρώποις φιληδόνοις καὶ μαλακοῖς. τοιγαροῦν ἠμύνατο τοὺς Εὐβοέας διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως Ὅμηρος. Πῶς; ἤρετο θαυμάσας ὁ Φίλιππος. Ὅτι μόνους αὐτοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων περιέκειρεν αἴσχιστα, κομᾶν ὄπισθεν ἀφεὶς ὥσπερ οἱ νῦν τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἀπαλούς. […] (ed. Cohoon)

In this oration the story of the contest *between* Homer and Hesiod is presented within another quasi-competitive context, a contest *over* Homer and Hesiod acted by Philip and Alexander. Through the way he develops the narrative of both competitions, Dio shows a good awareness of some of the most common features of the tradition of the contest between Homer and Hesiod (e.g. the finest passages, the outcome, the tripod and the epigram celebrating Hesiod's victory). At the same time he stages the final judgment in the way that best suits his work.

Alexander insists that Homer's is the only poetry suitable for kings, while the rest is for 'shepherds, carpenters, and farmers' (par. 8): Hesiod does give useful advice to such people, but not to a ruler such as he is. To this Philip replies by asking his son what he thinks about some magnificent (cf. μεγαλοπρεπῶς, par. 9) lines by Hesiod about seed-time and harvest: a performance of *Works and Days* 383-4 follows. These verses, famously, are the beginning of the passage that Hesiod chooses as his finest in the contest. Here too Philip seems to select these verses because they stand out in the Hesiodic

production.

To this challenge Alexander replies that he prefers what Homer says about agriculture, and performs a passage from the *Iliad*, as in the rest of the tradition of the contest. In this case, however, the selected verses are *Il*. 11.67-71, a simile in which warriors of the Trojan and Achaean side are said to leap on one another like reapers who 'start from opposite ends of the field of a powerful man, and drive their path through wheat or barley, and the handfuls fall thick and fast'. This simile is chosen because it uses an impressive agricultural simile to represent a battle, thereby revealing the kind of agricultural work Alexander favours.[50]

At this point, the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod makes its way into the narrative. Philip remarks that 'despite such beautiful lines' (par. 11) Homer was defeated by Hesiod, and offers as evidence for this the epigram of the victory and the tripod on which it was inscribed. The tripod and its epigram are valuable pieces of evidence and are difficult to overlook: indeed these details come from Hesiod himself (*Op*. 657-8).[51] Alexander therefore, to defend his thesis of Homer's superiority over Hesiod, uses another detail of the story, which is omitted by Hesiod: the final verdict. In Alexander's version the people who judged the performance were not 'kings, but farmers and plain folk, or, rather, men who were lovers of pleasure and effeminate', and these are the people, as Alexander pointed out earlier, who can find useful advice in Hesiod's poetry and prefer it to Homer's. A king, Alexander seems to claim implicitly, could not have issued such a verdict.[52] Consequently, the existence of a character such as Panedes is completely omitted here. Dio may well have

[50] See also Koning 2010: 264 and n. 95.

[51] See Introduction on Hesiod, esp. pp. 13-14.

[52] The opposition between Homer and Hesiod on which the judgement is grounded, made on the basis of the different subject matters of the poems and the people they appeal to, is well rooted in ancient literature. See esp. and most recently Koning 2010: 269-95.

known it, because the name of that king was already circulating by the third century BC;[53] but a king who prefers Hesiod over Homer would be a threat for the main argument of the oration: kings should like Homer.[54]

Another interesting detail that may show that Dio was very well conversant with the biographical and exegetical tradition is that Alexander claims that Homer was 'rightly' (par. 12: μάλα δικαίως) defeated: this accords with traditions such as that of the *Certamen*, where it was 'right' for Hesiod to win because of his subject matter.[55]

Philostratus, *Heroikos* 43.7-10.

Philostratus' *Heroikos* (second-third century AD)[56] stages a dialogue that takes place in the Thracian Chersonesus between a local vinedresser and a Phoenician merchant who had to interrupt his navigation because of unfavorable winds. The vinedresser turns out to be a friend of Protesilaos, the first Greek hero to die at Troy.[57] Together they cultivate the vines and discuss the Homeric poems.

---

[53] P.Petr. I 25, l. 4. Incidentally, as it has been noted (Richardson 1984 and Koning 2010: 264 n. 97), this confutes Heldmann's theory that the scene of Panedes is a late addition to the contest story made precisely in response to Dio's account (see Heldmann 1982: 45-53).

[54] Dio could also have attributed the verdict to the king and blame him for an unwise decision; but as the character who is making this comment, Alexander, is himself a king, avoiding mention of another king and blaming the verdict on common people probably allows Dio to keep his arguments on a safer level.

[55] See *Cert*. 208.

[56] The attribution and dating of the *Heroikos* is debated. The Suda (φ 421-3) mentions three people with the name Philostratus and attributes the *Heroikos* to Philostratus II, son of Philostratus I the son of Vero, whose death is placed in 244-9 AD. Although inconsistencies between some of the information given in the Suda entries and internal evidence from the works of the Philostrati have raised doubts about the reliability of the Suda entries themselves, the majority of modern scholars seems to accept the attribution of the *Heroikos* to Philostratus II: for the debate see esp. Solmsen 1940, Anderson 1986: 294-5, de Lannoy 1997: 2391, Berenson Maclean and Bradshaw Aitken 2001: xlii-xlv.

[57] See *Il.* 2.695-710.

At 43.5 the Phoenician claims that knowledge of the Trojan deeds shown in the Homeric epics is 'more fitting for a god than for a mortal'.[58] To prove that Homer was in fact a man, although a divinely inspired one, the vinedresser offers a brief survey of biographical information about Homer, which includes the episode of his contest with Hesiod:

γέγονε γάρ, ξένε, γέγονε ποιητὴς Ὅμηρος καὶ ἦδεν, ὡς μέν φασιν ἕτεροι μετὰ τέτταρα καὶ εἴκοσιν ἔτη τῶν Τρωικῶν, οἱ δὲ μετὰ ἑπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσι πρὸς ταῖς ἑκατόν, ὅτε τὴν ἀποικίαν ἐς Ἰωνίαν ἔστειλαν, οἱ δὲ ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἔτη γεγονέναι μετὰ τὴν Τροίαν ἐπὶ Ὅμηρόν τέ φασι καὶ Ἡσίοδον, ὅτε δὴ ᾄσαι ἄμφω ἐν Χαλκίδι, τὸν μὲν τὰ ἑπτὰ ἔπη τὰ περὶ τοῖν Αἰάντοιν καὶ ὡς αἱ φάλαγγες αὐτοῖς ἀραρυῖαί τε ἦσαν καὶ καρτεραί, τὸν δὲ τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Πέρσην, ἐν οἷς αὐτὸν ἔργων τε ἐκέλευσεν ἅπτεσθαι καὶ γεωργίᾳ προσκεῖσθαι, ὡς μὴ δέοιτο ἑτέρων μηδὲ πεινῴη. καὶ ἀληθέστερα, ξένε, περὶ τῶν Ὁμήρου χρόνων ταῦτα· ξυντίθεται γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὁ Πρωτεσίλεως. δύο γοῦν ποιητῶν ὕμνον ποτὲ εἰπόντων ἐς αὐτὸν ἐνταυθοῖ καὶ ἀπελθόντων, ἤρετό με ὁ ἥρως ἀφικόμενος ὅτῳ αὐτῶν ψηφιζοίμην· ἐμοῦ δὲ τὸν φαυλότερον ἐπαινέσαντος (καὶ γὰρ μᾶλλον ἔτυχέ με ἡρηκώς) γελάσας ὁ Πρωτεσίλεως „καὶ Πανίδης' εἶπεν, „ἀμπελουργέ, ταὐτόν σοι πέπονθεν· Χαλκίδος γὰρ τῆς ἐπ' Εὐρίπῳ βασιλεὺς ὢν ἐκεῖνος Ἡσιόδῳ κατὰ Ὁμήρου ἐψηφίσατο, καὶ ταῦτα τὸ γένειον μεῖζον ἔχων ἢ σύ. (Ed. de Lannoy)

The way Philostratus discusses the life of Homer shows that he was familiar with the Homeric biographical tradition, and it seems that he may have had access to material that was similar to the extant Lives of the poet.[59] As it is typical of the Lives, several possible solutions for the date of the poet are listed and attributed generically to 'some people'; Homer's date is measured in relation to his chronological proximity to events such as the Trojan war and the Ionian migration, or to poets such as Hesiod.[60] In the passage that follows the

[58] ὅθεν τὸ ὑπὸ ἐνίων λεγόμενον, ὡς Ἀπόλλων αὐτὰ ποιήσας τὸν Ὅμηρον ἐπέγραψε τῇ ποιήσει σφόδρα μοι δοκεῖ ἐρρῶσθαι· τὸ γὰρ γιγνώσκειν ταῦτα θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώπῳ ἔοικεν. All the translations of passages from the *Heroikos* are by Berenson Maclean and Bradshaw Aitken 2001.

[59] Kim 2010: 207 n. 86 too cursorily remarks the similarity between this biographical interlude and some of the extant Lives of Homer.

[60] In particular, that Homer was born twenty-four or one hundred and twenty-seven years after

mention of the contest, then, Homer is said to travel to several places, including Ithaca.[61] Finally, Homer emerges from the discussion of his birthplace as being ἄπολις, a person claimed by all cities because he belongs to none.[62] In the same or similar sources Philostratus must have also found information about the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod, about which he seems to be well informed. As in the *Certamen* (44-55) the episode of the contest is introduced in connection with the discussion of Homer's chronology, with explicit reference to the issue of his contemporaneity with Hesiod. The passages the poets recite (although no verse is quoted) are clearly taken from the same sections of the *Works and Days* and the *Iliad* as in most versions of the contest story, but the specific selection is peculiar to this account: the description of Hesiod's performance suggests that the poet is reciting *Op*. 384-404;[63] Homer recites the 'seven epics' on the two Ajaxes and their ranks of battle.[64]

---

the Trojan war is known from no other source; his contemporaneity to the Ionian migration is mentioned in Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.3 (= Arist. fr. 76 Rose), Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 2.3 and Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 7, but in the last two sources (where the information is said to go back to the school of Aristarchus) the Ionian migration is dated one hundred and forty years after the Trojan war, rather than one hundred and twenty-seven as in the *Heroikos*; that Homer was born one hundred and sixty years after the Trojan war is known also from Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 4. For more discussion on Homer's dating in antiquity see also commentary on *Cert*. 44-55 and cross-references therein, with bibliography.

[61] For biographical traditions on Homer and Ithaca, including also attempts to establish genealogical connections between the poet and some Odyssean characters, see commentary on *Cert*. 23-4n. and 25-6n.

[62] For the diffusion of this idea in antiquity see commentary on *Cert*. 7-8.

[63] The expression ὡς μὴ δέοιτο ἑτέρων, μηδὲ πεινῴη sums up the content of *Op*. 395-404, where Hesiod explains that agriculture makes a man self-sufficient. This lead West 1967: 442 n. 3 to suggest that in the *Certamen* too 'originally the extract may have gone on to v. 404'. But it seems safer to conclude that the length of the selected passages was one of the semi-fixed features of the story that could be purposefully modified, rather than postulating the existence of an 'original' extract – impossible to verify – and several 'variations' from it.

[64] It is not clear what τὰ ἑπτὰ ἔπη precisely refers to. Some manuscripts omit ἑπτά (see de

Philostratus also knew the outcome of the contest, one of the few non-modifiable elements of the tradition. But Protesilaos, the character to whom Philostratus entrusts the report of the competition, has too high an opinion of Homer to accept the verdict without protest. According to the hero, Homer 'surpassed all the poets he encountered, each in the area of their expertise', and more pertinently is explicitly said to 'include all matters pertaining to peace' and 'touch on agricultural tasks and the appropriate seasons for performing them'.[65] These are famously and typically Hesiodic areas of expertise, which granted him victory in some versions of the contest story. Philostratus therefore expresses disagreement with the verdict by accusing the judge Panedes of having chosen the simpler of the two poets, a strategy that has often been used to justify Homer's defeat. Philostratus' account has many points in common with Dio's: for instance, both insert the contest between Homer and Hesiod within another contest (a dispute between Alexander and Philip in Dio, one between two poets singing hymns to Protesilaus in Philostratus)[66] and both disagree with the final verdict. But the two different narrative contexts require framing the story differently, and offering different details. Hence, according to Dio Hesiod is awarded the victory by the common people because of the connection between Homer's poetry and kingship established in that work. That connection is not present in Philostratus, who can thus make use of the figure of the incompetent king Panedes.

Lannoy's apparatus *ad loc*.) perhaps because this number creates difficulty: such selection must include at least eight verses to reach a syntactical stop (*Il*. 13.126-33) as in *Cert.* 191-8, rather than seven.

[65] *Her*. 25.3: καὶ ὁπόσα κατ' εἰρήνην εἰσὶ καὶ χοροὺς καὶ ᾠδὰς καὶ ἔρωτας καὶ δαῖτας ἔργα τε, ὧν γεωργία ἅπτεται, καὶ ὥρας, αἳ σημαίνουσιν, ὁπόσα ἐς τὴν γῆν δεῖ πράττειν.

[66] Plutarch too inserts the story of the contest within a different story about a different contest in wisdom (*Dinner of the Seven Sages* 153f-154a).

Lucian, *True Story* 2.20-22.

Lucian (second century AD) briefly alludes to the story of the contest in his *True Story*. At 2.22 the two poets are said to compete on the occasion of the Θανατούσια, the Games of the Dead on the Island of the Blessed, and Hesiod wins 'although actually Homer was far the best'. This playful comment is concise, but clearly alludes to a well known story: Lucian shows the most common reaction of readers to the outcome of the competition, a fixed feature of the contest tradition which was rarely accepted without surprise. The allusion to the contest follows one of the most famous and entertaining episodes of the whole *True Story*, the interview with Homer. This passage shows that Lucian knew ancient Homeric scholarship and biography well:

(20) Οὔπω δὲ δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἡμέραι διεληλύθεσαν, καὶ προσελθὼν ἐγὼ Ὁμήρῳ τῷ ποιητῇ, σχολῆς οὔσης ἀμφοῖν, τά τε ἄλλα ἐπυνθανόμην καὶ ὅθεν εἴη, λέγων τοῦτο μάλιστα παρ' ἡμῖν εἰσέτι νῦν ζητεῖσθαι. ὁ δὲ οὐδ' αὐτὸς μὲν ἀγνοεῖν ἔφασκεν ὡς οἱ μὲν Χῖον, οἱ δὲ Σμυρναῖον, πολλοὶ δὲ Κολοφώνιον αὐτὸν νομίζουσιν· εἶναι μέντοι γε ἔλεγεν Βαβυλώνιος, καὶ παρά γε τοῖς πολίταις οὐχ Ὅμηρος, ἀλλὰ Τιγράνης καλεῖσθαι· ὕστερον δὲ ὁμηρεύσας παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀλλάξαι τὴν προσηγορίαν. ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀθετουμένων στίχων ἐπηρώτων, εἰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰσὶ γεγραμμένοι. καὶ ὃς ἔφασκε πάντας αὑτοῦ εἶναι. κατεγίνωσκον οὖν τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Ζηνόδοτον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον γραμματικῶν πολλὴν τὴν ψυχρολογίαν. ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῦτα ἱκανῶς ἀπεκέκριτο, πάλιν αὐτὸν ἠρώτων τί δή ποτε ἀπὸ τῆς μήνιδος τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο· καὶ ὃς εἶπεν οὕτως ἐπελθεῖν αὑτῷ μηδὲν ἐπιτηδεύσαντι. καὶ μὴν κἀκεῖνο ἐπεθύμουν εἰδέναι, εἰ προτέραν ἔγραψεν τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν τῆς Ἰλιάδος, ὡς οἱ πολλοί φασιν· ὁ δὲ ἠρνεῖτο. ὅτι μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ τυφλὸς ἦν, ὃ καὶ αὐτὸ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν, αὐτίκα ἠπιστάμην· ἑώρα γάρ, ὥστε οὐδὲ πυνθάνεσθαι ἐδεόμην […] (22) Προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ χρόνου ἐνέστη ὁ ἀγὼν ὁ παρ' αὐτοῖς, τὰ Θανατούσια. ἠγωνοθέτει δὲ Ἀχιλλεὺς τὸ πέμπτον καὶ Θησεὺς τὸ ἕβδομον. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα μακρὸν ἂν εἴη λέγειν· τὰ δὲ κεφάλαια τῶν πραχθέντων διηγήσομαι […] ποιητῶν δὲ τῇ μὲν ἀληθείᾳ παρὰ πολὺ ἐκράτει Ὅμηρος, ἐνίκησεν δὲ ὅμως Ἡσίοδος. τὰ δὲ ἆθλα ἦν ἅπασι στέφανος πλακεὶς ἐκ πτερῶν ταωνείων. (Ed. Macleod)

The *True Story*, as Lucian himself points out in the prologue, invites readers to take part in a game of allusion. In order for this game to work, Lucian must refer to works or passages that are famous enough to be recognised by his

audience.[67] The fact that he mentions Homer's superiority over Hesiod and his unexpected defeat means that these features were common enough in the contest tradition to be recognised by Lucian's audience. By choosing this as the object of one of his parodic allusions, Lucian is making fun of all the scholarly efforts that had been made to cope with it, just as in ch. 20 he ridicules the debates over other famous controversies of Homeric scholarship.[68]

Before referring to the contest, Lucian fills the episode of the interview with Homer with learned allusions to many other details of the ancient Homeric biographical tradition.[69] First, Lucian refers to the dispute about Homer's birthplace by mentioning the three contenders generally recognised in antiquity as having the strongest and most ancient claims on Homer's origins: Smyrne, Chios and Colophon.[70] Homer's own surprising assertion of his Babylonian origins, then, works well as a parody of the many outlandish solutions that had been proposed in antiquity to the famous question concerning his birthplace.[71] But Lucian, as well as making a preposterous

---

[67] See e.g. *VH* 1.2: […] καὶ τῶν ἱστορουμένων ἕκαστον οὐκ ἀκωμῳδήτως ἤνικται πρός τινας τῶν παλαιῶν ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ φιλοσόφων πολλὰ τεράστια καὶ μυθώδη συγγεγραφότων οὓς καὶ ὀνομαστὶ ἂν ἔγραφον, εἰ μὴ καὶ αὐτῷ σοι ἐκ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως φανεῖσθαι ἔμελλον. Studies on this allusive method and the proem of *True Story* are Hall 1981: 339-54, Georgiadou and Larmour 1998: 22-4 and 51-9, Moellendorff 2000.

[68] Georgiadou and Larmour 1998: 205 suggest that Homer in *VH* does not win the contest because this would not be consistent with all the criticism and parodies Lucian has made of him. But this seems secondary: first and most importantly, Lucian is making a playful allusion to a well known tradition.

[69] Full studies of this episode are Jones 1986: 54-5, Georgiadou and Larmour 1998: 200-3, Moellendorff 2000: 367-73, Nesselrath 2002, Ni Mheallaigh 2009, Kim 2010: 162-8. Together with the allusions to Homeric biographical traditions that will be discussed below, Lucian in this passage refers also to ancient textual exegesis: chronological priority of the *Iliad* over the *Odyssey*, the athetised verses, the first word of the *Iliad*. On these, see quoted bibliography.

[70] See *Cert*. 8-17n.

[71] See for example Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 2 for a list of no fewer than twenty cities that had claims on

suggestion, is also alluding to the doctrines of a specific Homeric school: we know from some ancient scholia on *Il*. 23.79 that scholars of the school of Pergamum such as Crates and Zenodotus of Mallos argued that Homer was a Chaldaean.[72] Homer's claim also allows for a series of interrelated allusions to other biographical anecdotes. Lucian says that the Babylonian Homer was originally called Tigranes, a name that evokes the river Tigris in Babylonia: according to many biographical accounts Homer was originally called Melesigenes, a name associated with the river Meles which runs through one of the alleged Homeric hometowns, Smyrne.[73] Homer is then said to have changed his name after being taken hostage, and this too echoes a well attested biographical anecdote.[74] Tigranes, moreover, is the name of a number of historical kings who were likewise taken hostage, and this creates the possibility for further levels of allusion.[75] Finally, the feature of Homer's *persona*

---

the poet, many of which were outside the Greek world. See also Heath 1998.

[72] See e.g. Bompaire 1998: 110 n. 76, Georgiadou and Larmour 1998: 201, Broggiato 2001: 181 n. 161. The parody of the school of Pergamum is balanced later on by the mention of the other main centre of Homeric studies, the Alexandrian school, of which 'the grammarians Zenodotus and Aristarchus' were the most famous exponents. For further discussion of Homer's Babylonian origins see also Matteuzzi 2000-2002 who suggests that Lucian, Syrian by origins, by making Homer a Babylonian wanted to make him his 'fellow-citizen' and his *alter ego* as an Eastern Greek; see also Zeitlin 2001: 246 and n. 76, Nesselrath 2002: 155, Kim 2010: 165-6.

[73] For the Smyrnean tradition and its features see *Cert*. 8-12n. and cross-references therein. That the name Tigranes is a parody of Melesigenes has been suggested only by Moellendorf 2000: 368-9. But it is only to be expected that Lucian, when making up an alleged original name for Homer, plays with the existing traditions on the topic. That Lucian was aware of such traditions, and more specifically of the name Melesigenes, is proved by another passage coming from his *Dem. Enc.* (par. 9): …πατέρα δὲ Μαίονα τὸν Λυδὸν ἢ ποταμόν, ὅπου γε καὶ τοὔνομα πρὸ τοῦ γνωρίμου τὸ Μελησιγενῆ προκρίνουσιν…

[74] See commentary on *Cert*. 29-32.

[75] As Allen 2006: 151-4 points out, the name Tigranes, combined with hostageship, became an opportunity for sarcasm for Lucian, who is probably casting doubt on the validity of the Roman custom to influence the attitude of foreigner adolescents towards Rome by taking them as

that is perhaps best known is his blindness: Lucian reverses this too by claiming that it was absolutely clear that Homer could see very well.[76]

The question here – with both the allusions to the names and places of origins of Homer, and the brief reference to his defeat in a competition against Hesiod – is whether Lucian is alluding to specific texts or to well known stories. This is, given the level of our own knowledge, a difficult question to answer, but there seems to be discernable evidence to suggest specific textual allusions, as opposed to more general references to well known debates and anecdotes.

Themistius, *Oration* 30.348c-349a.

Themistius (fourth century AD) refers to the story of the poetic contest between Homer and Hesiod at the beginning of his *Oration* 30, known by the title θέσις εἰ γεωργητέον (*Should one engage in farming*?). This work belongs to the group of Themistius' so-called private orations, a miscellaneous group of rhetorical pieces. [77] It is a brief but enthusiastic piece in praise of agriculture as the fundamental activity for human beings, from which all good things come.[78]

Because of the topic and rhetorical aim of this *Oration*, Themistius can

---

hostages. Tigranes II, moreover, is actually mentioned in a work of the Lucianic corpus, which is however unanimously considered spurious (*Macr.* 15). Some ancient sources on Tigranes and hostageship are: Str. 11.15 for Tigranes II taken hostage among the Parthians; Tacitus *Ann*ales 2.3.14.26. and 15.1 for Tigranes III and Tigranes V taken hostages among the Romans.

[76] On Homer's blindness see *Cert*. 11-12n.

[77] The modern numbering of Themistius' orations and the division of the corpus in two parts (private and public speeches) have no manuscript support. They were first proposed in Harduinus' edition of Themistius in 1684. See Penella 2000: 6-9 for detailed history and discussion of the modern classification of the speeches in the different editions.

[78] Many reasons have been proposed for Themistius' passionate encomium of the agricultural activities: it may have autobiographical significance; it may have sociopolitical purposes such as encouraging agricultural productivity; or may be related to a specific historical event such as Theodosius' Visigothic treaty of 382 that secured peace for the farmers of the Balkans. Discussion in Maisano 1995: 935 and Penella 2000: 33-4.

conveniently include the story of the triumph of Hesiod, the poet of agriculture, over Homer. Hesiod's victory is here a matter of celebration rather than controversy or disappointment. That such an episode was considered very useful in narrative terms by Themistius is indicated by the fact that he puts it right at the beginning of the work, after a few introductory words that underline how for Hesiod, just as much as for Themistius himself, agriculture and virtue are 'one and the same thing'.[79]

δεῖ δὲ ἤδη καὶ ἡμᾶς Ἡσιόδῳ καὶ Μούσαις ἀκολουθοῦντας ἐπιδεῖξαι διὰ πλειόνων ὡς ἄρα οὐ μάτην Ἡσίοδος σοφὸς ἐνομίσθη, ἀλλ' εἰς τοσοῦτον εὐκλείας διὰ (d.) τοὺς εἰς γεωργίαν λόγους προῆλθεν, ὥστε καὶ Ὁμήρῳ περὶ σοφίας καὶ μουσικῆς ἐν ταφαῖς Ἀμφιδάμαντος εἰς ἀγῶνα ἐλθὼν παρὰ τῶν κριτῶν τὸν στέφανον καὶ τὴν νίκην ἔχειν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ πολέμους καὶ μάχας καὶ τὸν συνασπισμὸν τοῖν Αἰάντοιν καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα προσῇδεν, ὁ δὲ γῆς τε ὕμνησεν ἔργα καὶ ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς τὰ ἔργα βελτίω γίνεται· 349. (a.) καὶ διὰ ταῦτα πᾶσι τοῖς κριταῖς κρατεῖ. (Ed. Downey – Norman – Schenkl)

Themistius underlines the ethical value of agriculture from the very first sentences of the work: agriculture is virtue, and one should learn one from the other. The setting of the victory of the wise Hesiod is presented accordingly as a contest 'in wisdom and song' (περὶ σοφίας καὶ μουσικῆς). Of all the several types of challenges that Homer and Hesiod are traditionally said to engage in, then, Themistius chooses the one that best emphasises the traditional image of Hesiod as the poet of agriculture as opposed to that of Homer as the poet of war: the recitation of the two selected passages from the poets' works. As in most versions of the contest that include this scene, Homer performs the scene of 'the two Ajaxes fighting each other'.[80] Hesiod is said to sing, more generically, of 'the earth's works and days' (ὁ δὲ γῆς τε ὕμνησεν ἔργα καὶ ἡμέρας), apparently without referring to any specific passage of the *Works and Days* but

[79] 348c: καὶ τοὺς περὶ γεωργίας λόγους τοῖς περὶ ἀρετῆς καταμίξας, ὡς ταὐτὸν ὄν, γεωργίαν καὶ ἀρετὴν δι' ἀλλήλων καὶ ἅμα μαθόντας εἰδέναι.

[80] *Il*. 13.126 ff. Whether or not Themistius knew anything about the length of the passage recited is not clear from what he says here.

to the work as a whole. The following words, 'the days in the course of which earth's works are augmented' (ἐν αἷς τὰ ἔργα βελτίω γίνεται), underline the positive and constructive effects of Hesiod's poetry on human life (a view that is echoed in the *Oration* as a whole),[81] as opposed to the destructive ones of 'war and battles' (πολέμους καὶ μάχας), the topic of Homer's song.

Because of the importance that is given in this work to agriculture and to Hesiod as its poet *par excellence*, Themistius cannot but express agreement with the outcome of the competition that favoured Hesiod. To stress the success of Hesiod's performance as much as possible, Themistius claims that the poet 'won the support of all the judges' (πᾶσι τοῖς κριταῖς κρατεῖ): unlike other versions of the story in which Hesiod's victory was not viewed in a positive light, there is no need of singling out the figure of a single judge on whom to blame a questionable verdict, or of a group of people who do not have the necessary expertise to judge such competition. On the contrary, because of the impact of his songs on human life, Hesiod wins unanimously and deservedly.

There is another passage from Themistius' works that describes the same sharp opposition between Homer and Hesiod on the basis of the subject matter of their poems: *Or*. 15.184c-d. Interestingly, although in that passage that opposition is not dramatised in biographical terms (that is, there is no explicit reference to the poetic contest between Homer and Hesiod), Themistius seems to be using the same elements as the contest story. Specifically, the description of the poets' works echoes the two passages which they traditionally perform when competing against each other:

Ἡσιόδῳ δὲ τῷ Ἀσκραίῳ δόρατα μὲν φρίττοντα καὶ ἀσπίδας συνερειδούσας καὶ ὀλλύντας τε καὶ ὀλλυμένους καὶ αἵματι ῥεομένην τὴν (d.) γῆν οὐκ

[81] See e.g. the idea that thanks to agriculture men 'have been relieved of preoccupation with their need for food' and 'look up to heaven and honor the gods and live by a system of justice and law' (350a: τῆς περὶ τροφὴν ἀνάγκης ἀπαλλαγέντες πρὸς οὐρανόν τε ἀνέβλεψαν θεούς τε ἐτίμησαν καὶ δίκη καὶ νόμοις ἐχρήσαντο).

ἐδόκει εἰσενεγκεῖν εἰς τὴν ποίησιν, τὰ δὲ χαμαίζηλα ταῦτα καὶ εἰρηνικὰ καὶ ἀσπαστότερα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὁπηνίκα μὲν χρὴ ἀροῦν, ὁπηνίκα δὲ σπείρειν, ὁπηνίκα δὲ κλᾶν τὰς ἀμπέλους καὶ ἡλίκον τὸν ἄξονα τέμνειν καὶ ἡλίκην σφῦραν. καὶ ταῦτα ᾄδοντι αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ Ἑλικῶνος τὰ ὦτα ὑπεῖχον οἱ Ἕλληνες καὶ ἐκηλοῦντο καὶ ᾠοντο ὠφελίμους οὐχ ἧττον εἶναι τὰς Ἡσιόδου νουθεσίας ἢ τὰς Ὁμήρου ἀνδροκτασίας.

What Hesiod is said *not* to sing (and which is rather attributed to Homer, mentioned in the previous lines) paraphrases *Il*. 13.130-1 (*Cert*. 195-6):

> φράξαντες δόρυ δουρί, σάκος σάκεϊ προθελύμνῳ·
> ἀσπὶς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ.

The expression δόρατα μὲν φρίττοντα used by Themistius recalls the Homeric φράξαντες δόρυ δουρί. ἀσπίδας συνερειδούσας reads as a prose version of ἀσπὶς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, and ὀλλύντας τε καὶ ὀλλυμένους has the same meaning as ἔρειδε … ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ. Here, then, we certainly have a specific verbal correspondence between the story of the contest, and the Homeric passage quoted in it, and its rhetorical reworking in Themistius. When Themistius then lists the topics that interested Hesiod, the references to his finest passage (*Op*. 383-92) seem less pointed but two main features of his poetry are emphasised in both texts: Hesiod teaches all the main agricultural activities and the right moment for each of them. This passage does not mention the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod explicitly, but the fact that the author does use features of it when drawing an opposition between Homer and Hesiod testifies to the great resonance that this story had in antiquity.

Libanius, *Defence of Socrates* 65-66.

One of Libanius' works (fourth century AD), the *Defence of Socrates*, contains a reference to the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod. This *Defence* is the longest and most elaborate of the two extant Socratic pieces by Libanius: in this work, an anonymous advocate defends Socrates from the two traditional charges brought against him, corruption of the young and impiety.[82] Part of the

[82] The second Socratic work is a shorter declamation in which Socrates' accusers propose that,

accusation is based on the fact that Socrates criticised poets such as Hesiod, Theognis, Homer and Pindar, who have always 'enjoyed honour and glory everywhere and especially in Athens'. In order to show that 'we are perfectly free' to do so, Libanius introduces the poetic competition of Homer and Hesiod as an example. [83]

(65) ἠγωνίσατό ποτε Ὁμήρῳ Ἡσίοδος καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸς Ἡσίοδος ἐν ἐπιγράμματι διδάσκει φιλοτιμούμενος καὶ λέγων νενικηκέναι τὸν Ὅμηρον. οὐκοῦν εἰ μὲν ἁπάσαις Ἡσίοδος ἐνίκα, πάντες δήπου ληρεῖν ἡγοῦντο τὸν Ὅμηρον· εἰ δ' οἱ μὲν τοῦτον ἡγοῦντο βελτίω, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς πλείοσιν εὐδοκίμει τὰ τοῦ Ἡσιόδου, τῶν οὐκ ἐπαινούντων ἑκάτερος ἐτετυχήκει καὶ δῆλον ὡς τοῦ συλλόγου διαλυθέντος οἱ μὲν τούτῳ θέμενοι τὸν Ἡσίοδον ἐκάκιζον, οἱ δὲ ἐκείνῳ τοῦτον. αὐτοῖς γὰρ οὕτω γε ἐβοήθουν οἱ δὲ ἐκείνῳ τοῦτον. αὐτοῖς γὰρ οὕτω γε ἐβοήθουν ἄν. (66) εἶπεν οὖν τις τῶν τὰς ἱστορίας συντεθεικότων, ὅτι δίκην τις ἔδωκεν ἐν Χαλκίδι διὰ τὸν Ἡσιόδου ψόγον ἢ τὸν Ὁμήρου; οὐδείς. πῶς οὖν οὐ δεινὸν τοῖς μὲν πάλαι τῶν ποιητῶν αὐτῶν λεγόντων ἀκηκοόσιν ἐξεῖναί τι καὶ ἐπιτιμῆσαι, τῶν δ' ὕστερον τοὺς οὐ χρηστόν <τι> παρ' ἐκείνοις ὁρῶντας ἢ σιγᾶν ἢ ἀπολωλέναι; (Ed. Foerster)

This *exemplum* contributes to the development of Libanius' argument that criticising poets is not, and never has been, against the law: indeed no historian has ever written of any punishments inflicted on those members of the audience who, during the competition in Chalcis, found fault with either poet's performance.

In this account, an epigram in which Hesiod proclaims his victory against Homer is mentioned as the source for the story of the contest: this is obviously (although the text is not quoted) the epigram allegedly inscribed on the tripod that Hesiod won at the contest and dedicated to the Muses.[84] The epigram gives only very basic information about the contest: the name of the two participants, the location and the winner. Accordingly, Libanius' account does not add any further details to the narrative, and different reactions of the

---

whilst in prison, he should be forbidden to speak as an additional punishment. Translation in Russel 1996: 58-66.

[83] Cf. parr. 62-3. Translations are from Russell 1996.

[84] On the tripod and the epigram see Introduction on Hesiod esp. pp. 12-14.

public to the performances and to the outcome are only listed as possibilities.

It could be argued that this was because Libanius knew the story exclusively from the epigram, and was unaware of the tradition that developed around it. For we know that the epigram also had independent circulation, and was transmitted in school books.[85] It may be in a similar context that Libanius learned of the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod. However, Libanius' decision to mention the epigram as a source for the story may also reflect the fact that he found in this text and in its scarcity of detail a particularly suitable rhetorical ally: it helps him to build up his argument in the way that best suits him.

At the beginning of the passage he presents the different ways in which Hesiod could have been proclaimed the winner. Hesiod was supported either by everyone, or by the majority of the people. The first option, however, implies that everyone thought that Homer talked nonsense. Therefore, some must have favoured Hesiod and some Homer, and conversely 'both poets found some who did not praise them'. Consequently, criticising the poets must be an ancient habit and must have happened on that occasion already. Since there is no evidence that this was considered a crime at that time, there is no reason why it should be so for Socrates. As the example goes, this is the only acceptable conclusion, and it is reached through a purposeful selection of the material circulating about the story of the contest of Homer and Hesiod.

Proclus, *Life of Homer* 6.

The story of the contest also features in some biographical sources, including a *Life of Homer* by Proclus (fifth century AD), which was part of the first book of his *Chrestomathy*.[86] Proclus' version of the life of Homer, based on 'extensive

[85] See *AP* 7.53 and P.Freib. 1.1b (on which see pp. 83-6).

[86] The *Chrestomathy* is now lost, but its contents can be in part reconstructed thanks to Photius' summary (*Bibliotheca* cod. 239) and to a few manuscripts transmitting the *Life of Homer* and a summary of the Epic Cycle. Photius informs us that the *Chrestomathy* also included a *Life* of

research' that he carried out for his pupils,[87] is particularly encomiastic and often refutes some of the most well known features of the Homeric biographical tradition. The poet, for example, was not blind, nor poor, nor did he write anything that could be considered inferior to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[88] Similarly, Proclus maintains that Homer was never defeated by Hesiod in a poetic contest:

εἰσὶ δὲ οἵτινες ἀνεψιὸν αὐτὸν Ἡσιόδου παρέδοσαν ἀτριβεῖς ὄντες ποιήσεως· τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἀπέχουσι τοῦ γένει προσήκειν ὅσον ἡ ποίησις διέστηκεν αὐτῶν. ἄλλως δὲ οὐδὲ τοῖς χρόνοις συνεπέβαλον ἀλλήλοις. ἄθλιοι δὲ οἱ τὸ αἴνιγμα πλάσαντες τοῦτο·

Ἡσίοδος Μούσαις Ἑλικωνίσι τόνδ' ἀνέθηκεν,
ὕμνῳ νικήσας ἐν Χαλκίδι δῖον Ὅμηρον.

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐπλανήθησαν ἐκ τῶν Ἡσιοδείων Ἡμερῶν· ἕτερον γάρ τι σημαίνει. (Ed. West)

Homer's defeat does not fit the image of the great poet that Proclus is offering in his biography and, consequently, he needs to find a way to deny it. To do so, he discards the very possibility that the two poets met each other, on the grounds that they were not contemporaries. This is an interesting detail, because it helps us to set out the controversy concerning the authorship and date of the *Chrestomathy*.

The ancient sources unanimously attribute this work to Proclus Diadochus, the Neoplatonic philosopher who lived in the fifth century AD.[89]

Hesiod. For the manuscript tradition of Photius and the other fragments of the *Chrestomathy* see Severyns 1938-1963 and Ferrante 1957. For the discussion of its authorship see below.

[87] Par. 5: ἀλλὰ δὴ ταῦτα μὲν πολλῆς ἔχεται ζητήσεως, ἵνα δὲ μηδὲ τούτων ἄπειρος ὑπάρχῃς, διὰ τοῦτο εἰς ταῦτα κεχώρηκα.

[88] For Proclus on Homer's blindness see par. 6: τυφλὸν δὲ ὅσοι τοῦτον ἀπεφήναντο αὐτοί μοι δοκοῦσι τὴν διάνοιαν πεπηρῶσθαι· τοσαῦτα γὰρ κατεῖδεν ἄνθρωπος ὅσα οὐδεὶς πώποτε. On his poverty, par. 8: τούτωι δὲ προσυπονοητέον καὶ πλούτου πολλὴν περιουσίαν γενέσθαι· αἱ γὰρ μακραὶ ἀποδημίαι πολλῶν δέονται ἀναλωμάτων. On the attribution of works, par. 9: γέγραφε δὲ ποιήσεις δύο, Ἰλιάδα καὶ Ὀδύσσειαν.

[89] Suda *s.v.* Πρόκλος ὁ Λύκιος attributes to him the *Chrestomathy* and commentaries on Hesiod's

But some modern scholars have attributed it to Eutychius Proclus, a grammarian of the second century AD.[90] Scholars who study the attribution of the *Chrestomathy* often overlook the *Life of Homer*, but its treatment of the contest story is virtually identical to that found in another work which is certainly by Proclus Diadochus: his *Commentary on Works and Days*.[91] The passage at issue is the scholium on *Op*. 650-62, in which Proclus reports Plutarch's denial of the story and his athetesis of the Hesiodic passage (quoted in the section on Plutarch's passages on the contest). In the scholium the discussion of the contest is linked to the analysis of the related Hesiodic passage; in the *Chrestomathy* too Proclus is aware that the contest tradition arouse from that passage – and more specifically, so he claims, from a misinterpretation of it (ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐπλανήθησαν ἐκ τῶν Ἡσιοδείων Ἡμερῶν· ἕτερον γάρ τι σημαίνει). The contest between Homer and Hesiod, then, is denied in both texts. It seems therefore that Proclus, while writing his commentary on *Works and Days*, made extensive use of the commentary by his predecessor, Plutarch; from Plutarch's

---

Works and Days; the manuscript *Ottobonianus gr.* 58 (fifteenth c. AD) introduces Proclus' *Life of Homer* with the words Πρόκλου Πλατωνικοῦ διαδόχου περὶ Ὁμήρου; a scholium to Gregorius Nazianzenus' *Or.* 43 attributes a treatise on the Epic Cycle to Proclus Πλατωνικός.

[90] On Eutychius Proclus see *Historia Augusta*, Iul. Capit. *Vit. Ant*. 2 and Pollio *Aemil. Tyr*. 22, 13 (he was a Latin grammarian; he was advanced to a proconsulship; he was the most learned man of his time; and the author of a work about foreign countries). Welcker 1835: 3-7 was one of the first scholars to question the traditional attribution. Hillgruber 1990 proposed that the Pseudo-Plutarchean treatise *De Homero* derives from the *Chrestomathy* and dated both works to the second century AD. Kuisma 1996: 57 then denied the presence of explicit Neoplatonic features in the *Chrestomathy*. In defence of the traditional attribution, Ferrante 1957: 10-13 underlined that the wide range of Proclus Diadochus' cultural interests included also the study of literature. Ferrante also rightly pointed out that, according to the *Historia Augusta*, Eutychius Proclus was not a Greek but a Latin grammarian. More recently, Longo 1995 convincingly questioned Hillgruber's theory about the derivation of the Ps.-Plu. *De Homero* from the *Chrestomathy*.

[91] For the attribution of the *Commentary* to Proclus Diadochus see Salemi 1951, Ferrante 1957: 11, Pertusi 1955, Marzillo 2010.

work he learned that the contest never happened, and exported this idea to another work, his *Chrestomathy*.[92] There is, however, a difference between Plutarch and Proclus: Plutarch athetises the Hesiodic passage; Proclus, as the *Life* shows, suggests that it needs to be reinterpreted. Unfortunately, the scholium breaks off before giving Proclus' interpretation as opposed to Plutarch's. Lamberton identifies another point of strong agreement between this *Life* and Proclus Diadochus' *Commentary on Plato's Republic*.[93] In his commentary (1.174.4-5), Proclus claims that the blindness of Homer was a metaphor for his inner vision. In the *Life* (par. 6 quoted above), Proclus says that Homer was not blind, but able to see more clearly than any man ever could: those who invented this story were in fact mentally blind. In both passages, the ability to see to which Proclus refers is not simply physical one. Furthemore, Homer in the *Life* is said to be κοσμοπολίτης, a citizen of the world. This word is remarkably rare in extant Greek texts, but belongs to philosophical discourse.[94] This again supports the attribution of the *Chrestomathy* to Proclus Diadochus.

John Tzetzes.

John Tzetzes (twelfth century AD) makes extensive use of the story of the poetic competition between Homer and Hesiod in his works. He mentions it several times in his *Commentary* on Hesiod's *Works and Days* (268ter, 274bis, 280bis, 652); in his *Life of Hesiod*, *prolegomenon* to his *Commentary* (123-42 Colonna); and in the *Allegories of the Iliad* (89-92 Boissonade). Tzetzes denies that the contest ever took place, on the grounds that the two poets were not contemporaries. As a commentator on Hesiod's *Works and Days*, when developing his approach to

[92] The 'extensive research' that Proclus claims to have made may have also included a study of Plutarchean commentary. A later commentator on *Works and Days*, John Tztetzes, will in turn take this idea from the exegetic tradition built up by Plutarch and Proclus and support it in his own commentary and in other works. See the section on Tzetzes below.

[93] Lamberton 1986: 177-8.

[94] e.g. D. L. 6.63.3.

this episode, he was certainly influenced by, and building on, the earlier exegetic tradition, that is Plutarch's and Proclus' commentaries, where the contest tradition was already denied. Tzetzes' comment on *Op*. 652 is particularly informative in this respect:

(652.) ΑΜΦΙΔΑΜΑΝΤΟΣ. Οὗτος ὁ Ἀμφιδάμας Εὐβοίας ὢν βασιλεὺς πρὸς Ἐρετριέας ναυμαχῶν ἀνῃρέθη· καὶ οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῷ προεκήρυξαν ἀγῶνας παντοίους, καὶ ἆθλα, ὅπερ τὸ ΠΡΟΠΕΦΡΑΔΜΕΝΑ δηλοῖ, ἤγουν προκεκηρυγμένα. Οὗ νικήσας Ἡσίοδος, ὡς ληροῦσι, τὸν ἡμίθεον Ὅμηρον, τρίποδα ἔλαβε, καὶ ταῖς Ἑλικωνίτισι Μούσαις ἀνέθετο, ὅπου πρῶτος ἐπαιδεύετο· ἢ καὶ κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ ἀνυπερβλήτῳ χρησάμενος ἐμεμαθήκει, ἅπερ μεμάθηκεν. Ὅτι δὲ ὕστερος ἦν Ἡσίοδος τοῦ παλαιοῦ Ὁμήρου, καὶ πρότερον εἰρήκειν, κἂν καὶ ὁ Ἡρόδοτος, ὁ ἐν πολλοῖς ἐμοὶ ἐλεγχθεὶς ὡς ψευδηγορῶν, ὁμοχρόνους τούτους φησί. Καὶ εἰ ὁμόχρονος ἦν Ἡσίοδος, ὁ θεῖος ἐκεῖνος ἀνὴρ ἡττήθη ἂν εὖ οἶδα, καὶ οὐκ ἐνδοιάζων φημί. Αἰεὶ γὰρ κατὰ τοῦτον

τὰ χερείονα νικᾷ. (Ed. Gaisford)

Tzetzes' text explicitly draws from Plutarch's/Proclus' scholium on *Op*. 650-62. Besides the already mentioned agreement on the denial of the story, both passages give the same biographical information on Amphidamas, king of Euboea, who died in a naval battle against the Eretrians, and explain that his sons organized funeral games for him. Moreover, Hesiod's victory is mentioned and denied in the two scholia with the very same words: Plutarch, according to Proclus, says that all this information about the contest is λῃρώδη, 'silly stuff'; Tzetzes claims that those who created this story ληροῦσι, 'talked nonsense'.

That Tzetzes used the earlier exegetical material is also confirmed by a comparison with other extant scholia.[95] A scholium to *Op.* 653 runs: ΤΑ ΔΕ ΠΡΟΠΕΦΡΑΔΜΕΝΑ. Τὰ ἆθλα, τῶν ἀγωνιζομένων δηλονότι, προκεκηρυγμένα ἦσαν. Tzetzes seems to insert this comment into his own

[95] The *scholia* mentioned here are fragments from ancient commentaries transmitted by the manuscripts together with fragments from Plutarch and Proclus in the *scholia vetera*: see Pertusi 1951 and 1955 and Marzillo 2010. It means that probably Tzetzes read Proclus' commentary in a form similar to that we know: marginal comments transmitted with the text of Hesiod drawn from different commentaries.

work by saying: ὅπερ τὸ ΠΡΟΠΕΦΡΑΔΜΕΝΑ δηλοῖ, ἤγουν προκεκηρυγμένα. In addition, on vv. 656 and 657 we read: (656.) ΤΟΝ Τριπόδα ἐγὼ φησὶν ἀνέθηκα εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὅπου ἐποίησάν με ἐκ ποιμένος ἀοιδὸν αἱ Μοῦσαι. (657.) ΕΝΘΑ ΜΕ ΤΟ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ. Ἢ ἐν Χαλκίδι, ἢ ἐν ἄλλῳ τόπῳ, ὅπου πρῶτον ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ αἱ Μοῦσαι. In claiming ἀνέθετο, ὅπου πρῶτος … ἐπαιδεύετο, Tzetzes seems to have borrowed from these *scholia* the notion that the tripod was dedicated in the place where Hesiod was first educated as a poet by the Muses.

Tzetzes' original contribution, then, enables us to understand the reasons of his agreement with the previous commentators on the denial of the story: Homer's poetry is better than Hesiod's. He adds a witty reflection based on *Il*. 1.576: he claims that, had the contest ever taken place, Hesiod would have certainly defeated Homer, since Homer himself claimed that 'the worst wins'.

Other mentions of the contest in Tzetzes' commentary are always linked to his criticism of Hesiod's poetry, which often related, in turn, to Proclus' criticism.[96] The instance that deserves a closer look is found in the so-called *Vita Hesiodi*, included in the *Prolegomena* to this work. There are several problems related to the history of the transmission of this text, and there is a serious lack of scholarly attention to this work. All we can understand from the existing studies is that it was transmitted in forms with differing length and that the attribution is disputed, in the manuscripts, between Proclus and Tzetzes.[97]

[96] The most passionate comment on Homer's defeat by Tzetzes is on *Op*. 280bis: Ὢ τῆς ἀβελτερίας! ὢ τῆς ἀνοίας! ὢ τῆς ἀπαιδευσίας! ὦ λόγου ἀρετὴ καὶ παιδεία, οὐχὶ δακρύετε; καὶ σὺ δὲ ἥλιε στύγνασον τοῖς τούτων ληρήμασι, καὶ τῇ ἀβλεψίᾳ τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν.

[97] Gaisford 1823 included the same *Vita Hesiodi* in both Proclus' and Tzetzes' *Prolegomena*, without giving details on the manuscript situation. Wilamowitz 1916: 47 on this matter claims that the manuscripts provide two recensions of the text ('*duas codices praebent recensiones*'); Pertusi 1951 considered the attribution to Proclus in some manuscripts as arbitrary and reached the conclusion that Tzetzes was the original author of this text, which was later shortened, inserted in the manuscripts of the *scholia* and wrongly attributed to Proclus. Following Pertusi's

However, some considerations on this text and its relationships to other accounts of the episode (esp. Proclus and *Certamen*) can be made. This is the section of the text concerning the contest (123-42 Colonna):

οἱ δὲ συγχρόνους αὐτοὺς εἶναι λέγοντες ἐπὶ τῇ τελευτῇ Ἀμφιδάμαντος τοῦ βασιλέως Εὐβοίας φασὶν αὐτοὺς ἀγωνίσασθαι, καὶ νενικηκέναι Ἡσίοδον, ἀγωνοθετοῦντος καὶ κρίνοντος τὰ μέτρα Πανείδου τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ἀμφιδάμαντος, καὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμφιδάμαντος Γανύκτορός τε καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν. ἐξηρωτηκέναι γὰρ αὐτοὺς πολλὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους φασὶ δι' ἐπῶν αὐτοσχεδίων καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι, καὶ πᾶσι τὸν Ὅμηρον τὰ πρωτεῖα λαμβάνειν· τέλος τοῦ βασιλέως Πανείδου εἰπόντος αὐτοῖς τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἐπῶν ἀναλεξαμένους εἰπεῖν, Ὅμηρος μὲν ἄρχεται λέγειν τουτὶ τὸ χωρίον ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐπῶν ἀρξάμενος ὄπισθεν·

ἀσπὶς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ,
ψαῦον δ' ἱππόκομοι κόρυθες λαμπροῖσι φάλοισι
νευόντων· ὡς πυκνοὶ ἐφέστασαν ἀλλήλοισι,

καὶ περαιτέρω τούτων. Ἡσίοδος δὲ τοῦ·

Πληιάδων Ἀτλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομενάων

ἀπάρχεται καὶ ὁμοίως Ὁμήρῳ προβαίνει μέχρι πολλοῦ τῶν ἐπῶν. καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τούτοις οἱ παρεστῶτες πάντες τῶν ἐλλογίμων καὶ στρατιωτῶν τὸν Ὅμηρον ἐστεφάνουν, ὁ δὲ Πανείδης ἔκρινε νικᾶν τὸν Ἡσίοδον, ὡς εἰρήνην καὶ γεωργίαν διδάσκοντα, καὶ οὐ καθάπερ ὁ Ὅμηρος πολέμους καὶ σφάγια. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ληρήματα τῶν νεωτέρων εἰσὶ καὶ πλάσεις τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐρωτημάτων καὶ τῶν ἐξ Ὁμήρου παρεκβεβλημένων ἐπῶν καὶ ὑπ' ἐκείνου δῆθεν ῥηθέντων. Ὅμηρος γὰρ ὁ χρυσοῦς, ὡς ἐγῷμαι, μᾶλλον δ'ἀκριβεστάτως ἐπίσταμαι, πολύ τε παλαιότερος Ἡσιόδου ὑπῆρχε.

To start with, the version of the episode presented here is virtually identical to that in the *Certamen*. The story is introduced during the discussion of the chronology of the two poets; both King Panedes and the sons of Amphidamas are mentioned as the organisers of the contest; the contest itself is developed through an exchange of improvised challenges leading up to the performance of each poet's finest passages; Homer is ahead of the game but Panedes crowns Hesiod. Furthermore, there are similarities between Proclus,

studies, Colonna 1953 attempted to establish the original text of Tzetzes' *Vita Hesiodi.* The results of these studies are are also reflected in Marzillo's recent edition of Proclus' *Commentary* (Marzillo 2010), which does not include the *Vita Hesiodi*.

Tzetzes and the *Certamen* in the account of other biographical episodes too: Homer's meeting with Creophylus[98] and Homer's death after slipping on some mud and falling on a stone.[99]

As for the issue of the attribution of the *Life of Hesiod*, given the many points in common between Proclus' and Tzetzes' biographical narratives, and Tzetzes' extensive use of Proclus' exegetical work, it seems plausible that the confusion in the manuscripts may have arisen from the fact that two similar *Lives of Hesiod* existed, one by Proclus contained in the *Chrestomathy* (as testified by Photius) and one – which comprehensively draws on the Proclean one – by Tzetzes. The lost *Life of Hesiod* written by Proclus, therefore, must have been similar in contents to the extant one circulating under Tzetzes' name. Another consideration that can be made is that the *Certamen* appears to have many points of contact with the ancient and late antique exegetical material, and may have circulated in the same environments.

Like Proclus and Plutarch, Tzetzes uses the work he has done for the *Commentary* in other contexts too. In his *Allegories of the Iliad* (89-92 Boissonade) he claims:

Οἱ μάτην γράφειν θέλοντες ἱστορικὰ βιβλία
ὁμόχρονον τὸν Ὅμηρον λέγουσιν Ἡσιόδου,
ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀμφιδάμαντος τάφῳ δοκιμασθέντας.
Ἀλλ'οὗτοι μὲν ἠγνόησαν εἶναι πολλοὺς Ὁμήρους.

Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer's Iliad* I 6.4-7.1 Van der Valk (*passim*).

The last witness I consider for the story of the contest of Homer and Hesiod is Eustathius' commentary on the *Iliad* (twelfth century AD). Eustathius inserts a mention of the contest between Homer and Hesiod in an account of the life of Homer that is part of the introduction to his *Commentary*. In this section, he presents Homer's poetry as a source of wisdom and knowledge, and claims that

[98] *Cert.* 321-323; Procl. *Vit. Hom.* 5; Tz. *Alleg.* 119 ff.; Tz. *H.* 13. 658.

[99] *Cert.* 323-38; Procl. *Vit. Hom.* 5; Tz. *Alleg.* 129 ff.; Tz. *H.* 13.665-6. This account is present also in P.Mich. 2754 – for its relationship to the *Certamen* see pp. 70-80.

all writers receive inspiration from Homer just as all rivers receive their water from the Ocean.[100]

The discussion of the life of Homer is included in Eustathius's work only as a brief introduction to Homer's poetry rather than as the focus of his attention in its own right. When approaching the topic, Eustathius does not suggest that he is developing new research on it; he rather collects the results of the research which had been carried out by his predecessors and which had crystallized into traditional forms by his time. Eustathius starts with the standard remark that, despite the fundamental importance of Homer's poetry, nothing is known with certainty about his life because there is no biographical information in Homer's own works; he then says that for this reason the poet is claimed as a fellow citizen by every city:[101]

Ὁμήρου δὲ γένος οὐδ' αὐτὸ περιεργασόμεθα. εἴρηται γὰρ πολλοῖς ἑτέροις, ὡς οὐκ ἂν ἡμεῖς κρειττόνως εἴπωμεν· εἰ μὴ ἄρα τοῦτο καὶ μόνον ῥητέον κατὰ τὸ ἐπιτρέχον, ὅτι ἐπικρύψας ἑαυτὸν ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ σιγήσας, ὅστις ποτὲ καὶ ὅθεν ἦν, περιμάχητος ἄλλον ἐγένετο καὶ πολύπατρις.

As in many other biographies, a list of the contender cities follows, with a few comments. After mentioning the names of poets allegedly older than Homer, the poet's blindness, change of name, and works, Eustathius comments on the tradition of the poetic competition between Homer and Hesiod:

εἰ δὲ καὶ ἤρισεν Ὅμηρος Ἡσιόδῳ τῷ Ἀσκραίῳ καὶ ἡττήθη, ὅπερ ὄκνος τοῖς Ὁμηρίδαις καὶ λέγειν, ζητητέον ἐν τοῖς εἰς τοῦτο γράψασιν, ἐν οἷς ἔκκεινται καὶ τὰ ῥητὰ τῆς ἔριδος.

As in the case of the other biographical anecdotes, Eustathius offers but a scarce amount of detail on the story of the contest, and invites the reader to search for more information on it in other works. Similarly, he does not offer his own opinion on the episode, although his overall positive attitude towards Homer would probably suggest that, like the Homeridae, he must have hesitated to tell

[100] On this metaphor see Cesaretti 1991: 135-6; 180-1; 213-15.

[101] Cf. *Cert*. 2-4n. and 7-8n.

it. The mention of the Homeridae is interesting: it may suggest that they had an active role in the transmission, and perhaps selection, of the Homeric biographical material, or may be used by Eustathius as a general name to describe Homer's admirers, descendants, and keepers of his reputation.[102]

Perhaps the most interesting detail in this passage is the fact that the author encourages his readers to find information on the contest ἐν τοῖς εἰς τοῦτο γράψασιν: Eustathius elsewhere uses εἰς with the title of a work in the accusative to refer to line by line commentaries.[103] Here, therefore, he seems to be pointing to the existence of works on the story of the contest of Homer and Hesiod accompanied by detailed exegetical notes, arguably for use in school environments, rather than generically referring to works about that story. ἐν οἷς ἔκκεινται καὶ τὰ ῥητὰ τῆς ἔριδος, then, suggests that, although we only have one manuscript transmitting the *Certamen* and some reference to the so called finest passages in a few literary works, the verses that the two poets exchanged circulated more widely up to the Middle Ages.

[102] On the Homeridae see *Cert*. 13-15n.

[103] *In Il*. I 3, 34; I 46, 26; I 55, 1; I 80, 14; I 94, 22.

2. Textual tradition.

Vielleicht bringt ein neuer Papyrusfund einmal weitere Aufklärung.
Vogt 1959: 219

This chapter offers the first systematic and up-to-date analysis of all the extant manuscript witnesses for the *Certamen*.[104] The text in its entirety is transmitted only by one manuscript, *Laur. Plut*. 56, 1 (**L**). Five papyrus fragments preserve sections of texts that can be variously related to the *Certamen*: three of them testify to works that can be seen as the literary sources of it and are attributed to Alcidamas (P.Petr. I 25 (1), P.Mich. inv. 2754, P.Ath.Soc.Pap. inv. M2); the other two transmit some of the epigrammatic material used in the *Certamen* (P.Freib. 1.1 b and P.Duk. inv. 665). By analysing each witness individually, the present study aims to identify the main features of the textual tradition through which the *Certamen* was transmitted.

From the context of transmission of the *Certamen* in manuscript **L** and some features of the papyri, it will emerge that the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod was likely taught in schools. It was also probably used for rhetorical exercises, and thereby made its way into several literary works. The fact itself that it was considered as material of such sort indicates a somewhat innate susceptibility to adaptation, and the versions of the story which are presented in rhetorical works, analysed in the previous chapter, confirm this. By comparing the texts of the papyri with the corresponding passages of the *Certamen*, moreover, we can see a tendency to compress and alterate which emerges as a characteristic feature of the textual transmission of this material.

This invites reflection on the practice of textual criticism on this material. Undoubtedly the contribution of the papyri is often useful to our understanding of the text transmitted in manuscript **L** and *vice versa*; but

[104] Some preliminary remarks in Bassino 2012.

ultimately the *Certamen* is the product of conscious and purposeful acts of adaptation, and contains material that is itself fluid and suitable for alterations. Each case of divergence between the textual witnesses should therefore be considered individually.

Note on the papyrus fragments.

After introducing the manuscript **L**, I introduce each papyrus fragment individually, providing general information on the fragment, a description of its contents and an outline of its contribution to the textual tradition. I then present a text of the papyrus itself. In the case of P.Petr. I 25 (1) and P.Mich. inv. 2754, I propose new editions of the text on the basis of high resolution images. In the other three cases, making a new edition was not possible or not necessary: there is no workable image of P.Ath.Soc.Pap. inv. M2 available in the public domain or for purchase; only two lines of the text of P.Freib. 1.1 b are relevant here, and they do not contain any textual problems; P.Duk. inv. 665, finally, was published in a reliable edition while this study was in progress.

The format of a line by line commentary is adopted for the first three papyri because it allows for close comparison of their texts with that of **L,** and detailed discussion of textual problems. The other two papyri are each given a consecutive commentary that analyses their general contribution to our knowledge of the textual transmission of the *Certamen*.

Manuscript

The text of the *Certamen* as a whole survives in a single manuscript, *Laur. Plut*. 56, 1 (**L**).[105] This manuscript was bought and brought from Crete to Florence in 1492 by Janus Lascaris on behalf of Lorenzo de' Medici, and then became part of the Medicean Library. Among the documents that attest the purchase of

[105] URL: http://opac.bml.firenze.sbn.it/Manuscript.htm?Segnatura=Plut.56.1. Fryde 1996 is a recent and exhaustive summary of the known information about the manuscript; see esp. p. 784, with further literature. See also Daneloni and Martinelli 1994: 311-12. Images are available at the URL above.

manuscripts by Lascaris one mentions a manuscript containing *Polienus de stratagematibus et Polux in uno volumine*: this volume is to be identified with **L**.[106] One of its readers seems to have been Angelo Poliziano.[107] It was also used by Giovanni Pico della Mirandola.[108] It was copied by Henricus Stephanus in the first half of the sixteenth century (*Leid. Voss. Gr. qu*. 18 = **S**) and in 1573 he published much material from **L** in a miscellaneous book (**E**). This was also the *editio princeps* of the *Certamen*. [109]

L is a paper codex made up of 292 pages, written by several hands and dated to the twelfth to fourteenth century AD.[110] The codex contains mainly

---

[106] Piccolomini 1874 publishes the documents which attest Lascaris' trips to Greece. See also Desmed 1974: 316 n. 20, Fryde 1983: 223 n. 11 and 1996: 127, Rubinstein 1990: 20 n. 38, Gentile 1997: 490 and n. 85, Cameron 2004: 336, Daneloni 2005: 185.

[107] The manuscript even seems to have been found in Poliziano's *scriptorium* after his death (Daneloni-Martinelli 1994: 312). Poliziano also mentions the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod in his *Silvae* (*Nutricia*, 388-90) published in 1486, but he cannot have been influenced by the *Certamen* which reached Florence only in 1492. According to Daneloni and Martinelli (*ibid*.) and Fryde 1996: 573 and 729-30, Poliziano was interested in the manuscript mainly because of the *Paradoxographus Florentinus*. For Poliziano and the manuscript's text of Pollux see Daneloni 2005: 185-9. For Poliziano and this manuscript more generally, see also Desmed 1974: 316 n. 20, Bausi 1996: 203, Harsting 2001: 16 n. 17.

[108] Gentile 1994: 490 and n. 85.

[109] The full title of the publication is *Homeri et Hesiodi Certamen. Matronis et aliorum parodiae. Homericorum heroum epitaphia.* Digital images of the book are available at: http://www.e-rara.ch/gep_g/content/pageview/1777967.

[110] The different parts seem to belong to different periods: Canart 2002: 41, Cameron 2004: 336. The website of the Biblioteca Laurenziana dates the whole manuscript to 1301-1400 AD: see http://teca.bmlonline.it/TecaRicerca/showMag.jsp?RisIdr=TECA0000647661. Russell and Wilson 1981: xli have dated the hand that copied Menander's works to the second half of the 12th century. The same period has been proposed by Rubinstein 1990: 20 n. 38, Fryde 1996: 127, 382, 409 n. 384. 13th-14th c.: Giannini 1965: 315, Desmed 1974: 316 n. 20, Daneloni and Martinelli 1994: 311-12. 14th c.: Allen 1912: 188, Rzach 1913: 234, Colonna 1959: 74.

rhetorical works and seems to have been used as a school book.[111] It has lost its opening pages and the title of the first work is missing. The *Certamen* is copied at 15v-19r, by the first identifiable hand of the book. It belongs to a group of pages running from 1-83v. These pages constitute the first of four codicological units which make up the book.[112] This is a detailed list of the contents of the first section of the manuscript:

1r: excerpts from the works of Menander Rhetor.

11r: a series of anonymous works among which the *Certamen*:

11r: Κρῆναι καὶ λίμναι καὶ πηγαὶ καὶ ποταμοὶ ὅσοι θαυμάσιά τινα ἔχουσι. This is a catalogue of springs, lakes and rivers which are said to be marvellous by ancient authors. Sources are often quoted. It ends with a treatise about the flooding of the Nile. The work is also known as the *Paradoxographus Florentinus*.

13r: Γυναῖκες ἐν πολεμικοῖς συνεταὶ καὶ ἀνδρεῖαι. This text, also known under the title *De Mulieribus*, contains short *exempla* of women who distinguished themselves for courage and ability in war. Here too, sources are often quoted.

14v: Τίνες οἶκοι ἀνάστατοι διὰ γυναῖκας ἐγένοντο. List of families ruined by a woman; the name of the family is usually accompanied by the name of the woman who destroyed it. This and the remaining texts listed below contained in 14v-15v are also known as *Anonymus Florentinus*.

14v: Φιλάδελφοι. List of brothers who loved each other.

14v: Φιλέταιροι. List of friends who loved each other.

15r: short notice on Kleobis and Biton, with no title. The pair seems to be cited as an example of people who loved their mother, which would not be out of place after examples of brothers and friends who loved each other. For this

[111] Cavallo 2000: 231.

[112] Daneloni and Martinelli 1994: 311.

reason Westermann supplied the title Φιλομήτορες.[113]

15r: a text telling the story of the Phrygian Lityerses. Without title in the manuscript, Westermann proposed Ἀσεβεῖς, as Lityerses seems to be an *exemplum* of impiety.[114] The passage includes a quotation from *Daphnis*, a lost drama by Sositheus.[115]

15r: a list of people struck by thunderbolts. Included under the heading Ἀσεβεῖς in early editions, it was first distinguished from the previous list of 'impious people' by Wilamowitz, who suggested the title Κεραυνωθέντες. [116]

15r: a collection of mythical *exempla* of metamorphoses brought about by the will of some gods or goddesses. Again there is no title in the manuscript; Westermann proposed Μεταμορφωθέντες.[117]

15v: the stories of Leucone, wife of Cyanippus, and Polyhymnus of Argos. **L** gives no title. [118]

15v: Περὶ Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου καὶ τοῦ γένους καὶ ἀγῶνος αὐτῶν: this is our *Certamen*.

19v: Ποῦ ἕκαστος τῶν Ἑλλήνων τέθαπται καὶ τί ἐπιγέγραπται ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ. A collection of epigrams inscribed on the tombstones of some Greek heroes.

---

[113] Westermann 1843: 346. The suggestion is accepted by Cameron 2004: 338.

[114] *Ibid*. (see note above).

[115] *TrGF* 99 F 2-3.

[116] Wilamowitz 1875: 181 n. 4. This suggestion too is accepted by Cameron 2004: 338.

[117] Westermann 1843: 346. See also Cameron 2004: 338.

[118] Early editions of the texts that preceed the *Certamen* in **L** (except for Menander) are Heeren 1789, Westermann 1839: 213-23 and 1843: 345-8. Landi 1895 provided a new transcription of these texts on the basis of **L**. For more recent work on the *Paradoxographus Florentinus* see Öhler 1913 and esp. Giannini 1965: 315-29; on the *De Mulieribus* see Gera 1997 and also Brodersen 2010; on the *Anonymus Florentinus* see Cameron 2004: 240-2, 245, 286-303; with new edition of the text at 335-9. **L** was the antigraph for the other three main manuscripts transmitting these texts, two of which were copied by Michael Apostoles in Crete: Öhler 1913: 28-33, Dain 1950: 425-39, Gera 1997: 5-6, Cameron 2004: 335-6.

20v: four orations by Theophylact of Bulgaria.

43r: Polemo's epitaph for Callimachus and Cynaegeirus.

52r: extracts from a commentary on Hermogenes' rhetorical writings by Gregory of Corinth.

82r: *Hypotheseis* to seven of Demosthenes' orations.

The rest of the manuscript is written by other hands. It contains:

83v: a list of Demosthenes' orations.

84r: books 5-10 of Pollux's *Onomasticon*.

163r: an anonymous fragment on geometry.

165v: Polyaenus's *Stratagems.*

284r: another anonymous fragment, on the origin of dreams, capped by an investigation of the winds. [119]

As we have seen, **L** was a school book which in its first section contains, after excerpts from Menander's rhetorical works, a series of anonymous texts including the *Certamen*. These texts are mainly lists with little or no narrative content: they give several examples of marvellous springs, lakes and rivers; courageous women; families ruined by women; and so on. I now offer an analysis of the context of transmission of the *Certamen*: by taking into account the peculiarities of the texts transmitted alongside the *Certamen*, it is possible to shed light on the nature and use of our text too. What will emerge from this analysis is that the very context of transmission suggests that the *Certamen* was, like the other texts that accompany it, unlikely to be protected by a desire to preserve one authentic version; the scribes and readers of **L** clearly envisaged adaptation to specific rhetorical aims and different narrative contexts. This may be due ultimately to the fact that our text originated, and was used, in a school environment, as a didactic piece or a rhetorical exercise. Moreover, we may speculate that the very nature of the biographical material made the text

[119] The content of the manuscript is also listed in Bandini 1768 II: 289-94, Daneloni-Martinelli 1994: 311-12, Cameron 2004: 335-6.

inherently adaptable to new contexts and purposes. The contribution of the papyrus witnesses will confirm these hypotheses.

The nature and purpose of *De Mulieribus* and the *Anonymus Florentinus* have recently received close attention.[120] It is therefore useful to start from these works to understand the editorial plan behind the section of the manuscript that contains the *Certamen*. Both are sub-literary works: they were not meant to have a literary integrity of their own, but rather draw on existing literary texts. Their lack of literary ambition can be seen in a tendency to employ simple sentences and a very plain style. More specifically, Gera points out with reference to *De Mulieribus* that in this text the sentences are usually short, with few subordinate clauses or participles.[121] The *exempla* given in this work are all basically summaries, or brief encyclopaedic notices, whose contents turn out to be less picturesque than their literary sources were, or were supposed to be. Similar points apply to the *Anonymus Florentinus*: Cameron remarks that the list of metamorphoses goes back to an earlier and fuller text, either a dictionary or a series of narratives.[122] We are therefore presented with texts that are collected from fuller sources, selected and then elaborated. These texts may have been used for rhetorical exercises, and may be defined as collections of 'memorable precedents to be quoted or copied when occasion arises':[123] i.e., they provide the reader with the necessary material to construct his arguments when he needs *exempla* of fraternal love, courageous women etc.[124]

---

[120] Gera 1997, Cameron 2004.

[121] Gera 1997: 26-8.

[122] Cameron 2004: 287.

[123] This expression is borrowed from Momigliano 1993: 72.

[124] Practical examples of how this might have worked are provided by Cameron 2004: 245, who compares the list of examples of families ruined by women to a similar list found in a novel, and argues that the source for that literary work must have been somewhat similar to what we find in the *Anonymus Florentinus.* Later (pp. 286-303) he suggests that the collection of metamorphoses goes back to the same source as Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

The *Certamen* shares some of the characteristics of these other texts. Already at a first glance, the dry style of its prose signals the same pronounced tendency toward concision. This is particularly evident in the agonistic section, where there is little or no description of how the competition unfolds, besides the mere exchange of verses. The verses themselves are only rarely attributed to either interlocutor. At the beginning of the section we learn that Hesiod asks the questions and Homer replies to each of them (72-4). After that, only a few words indicate changes of speaker (77, 80, 83). A similar introduction is given to another section of the contest, that containing the 'ambivalent proposition' (102-37), and the verses that follow are not attributed explicitly to either poet.[125] The same concise approach is also evident in the second last section of the contest (esp. 161-75). Some of the papyri studied in the next pages show a more complex and ornate text,[126] suggesting that the author of the *Certamen* adopted a similar attitude towards his sources to that of the *De Mulieribus*, the *Anonymus Florentinus* and the other texts in this part of **L**: they all involve simplication, abridgment, and adaptation. The *Certamen* was copied among texts that were not 'sacrosanct literary entities' [127] and appears not to have been one itself.

---

[125] *Cert*. 103-6: καὶ πλείονας στίχους λέγων ἠξίου καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστον συμφώνως ἀποκρίνασθαι τὸν Ὅμηρον. ἔστιν οὖν ὁ μὲν πρῶτος Ἡσιόδου, ὁ δὲ ἑξῆς Ὁμήρου, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ διὰ δύο στίχων τὴν ἐπερώτησιν ποιουμένου τοῦ Ἡσιόδου. This comment is not only short but also very vague; in fact it *creates* problems of attribution rather than solving them. See for example *Cert*. 133-7n.

[126] Examples of this practise occur in several of the papyri and will be described each time *ad loc*. As a general guideline, here it suffices to say that P.Petr. I 25 gives the longer descriptions of the change of interlocutors during the very first exchanges of challenge and response; P.Mich. inv. 2754 gives a text on the death of Homer of which the corresponding lines on the manuscript appear as a summary.

[127] Cf. West 1973: 16.

Papyri

P.Petr. I 25 (1) (= P.Lond.Lit. 191)

Catalogues = Brit. Lib. 500; MP³ 0077; LDAB 178.

Editions and critical studies mentioned in the apparatus = Mahaffy 1891, Allen 1912, Rzach 1913, Wilamowitz 1916, Milne 1927, Colonna 1959, Avezzù 1982, Cavallo-Maehler 2008.

P.Petr. I 25 (1) contains, after a few introductory words, an account of the first stages of the poetic competition between Homer and Hesiod: it transmits a text that closely resembles *Cert*. 69-102.[128] This papyrus was discovered in Gurob (Fayyum, Egypt) and comes from the cartonnage of a mummy. It was first published by Mahaffy in 1891 and acquired by the British Library, where it is now, in 1895. It was originally part of a papyrus roll and transmits on the *recto* forty-eight lines of text on two columns. It is unanimously dated on palaeographic grounds to the second half of the third century BC.[129]

This papyrus shows that a text similar to the *Certamen* was circulating at least as early as in the third century BC. It also confirms that Panedes was included in the narrative among the judges already in very early stages of the tradition,[130] and features the same exchange of verses that we find also in the *Certamen*. Furthermore, it includes the couplet quoted by Stobaeus as coming

[128] The two texts do not correspond precisely: the papyrus text begins with the phrase τὸ]ν̣ τ̣ρ̣όπ̣[ον τοῦτον and then mentions the judges and king Panedes; in the *Certamen*, the order is reversed: first the judges and the king are introduced (68-70) and then the contest starts (72).

[129] Information on the papyrus is available on the online catalogues MP³ (0077) and LDAB (178); first published in Mahaffy 1891: 70-3; see also Milne 1927: 157, Cavallo and Maehler 2008: 59, 62 (nr 30); for a palaeographical analysis see also Cavallo and Maehler 2008: 1-26, esp. 9, 14, 19. Image of the papyrus in Mahaffy 1891 and Cavallo and Maehler 2008: 59.

[130] Heldmann 1982: 45-53 suggests that the presence of king Panedes in the *Certamen* is an addition from the second century AD (see also p. 31) but the presence of the king's name at l. 4 in the papyrus, underestimated by Heldmann because the text does not read exactly as in **L**, clearly proves this suggestion wrong.

from Alcidamas' *Musaion* on the basis of which Nietzsche had proposed Alcidamas as one of the sources for the *Certamen*.[131] Accordingly, the papyrus has been attributed to Alcidamas, thus becoming the earliest extant piece of evidence for the literary sources used by the author of the *Certamen*.

The papyrus confirms what I have argued above about the nature of the text as preserved in **L**: it shows that the short and cursory sentences of the manuscript version are indeed the product of a process of abbreviation and re-elaboration of a fuller and more sophisticated text found in a literary source. The passages indicating changes of speaker show that the papyrus text pays more attention to literary form than the *Certamen*, where we are often left with the sole name of the new speaker or little more than that. The papyrus also shows that the source was treated quite freely and was subjected to a process of adaptation: for example, we find changes to the word order and different syntactical structures. There are variations in the hexameters too: evidently, this hexametric material was also malleable. Some of the verses are reported in, or quoted from, other literary works: in these cases, too, comparison with **L** reveals a tendency toward textual variation.

TEXT[132]

Col. I

1 τὸ]ν̣ τ̣ρ̣όπ[ον τοῦτον·
τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνο]ς̣ ἁπάντων

[131] See *Cert*. 78-9n.

[132] This edition is based on a digital image of the papyrus provided by the British Library. Hexameter lines have been supplemented on the basis of **L**: this aims at giving a readable text (Allen's and others' choice to leave most lines unsupplemented ultimately limits the utility of the text) but the possibility that the papyrus contained different readings needs to be borne in mind. The apparatus is divided into two registers: the first collects sources that transmit some of the verses included in the *Certamen* and notes variants between them, the papyrus (**Π**) and the manuscript (**L**); the second collects modern editorial interventions (relevant differences in reading, supplements) and registers peculiarities of the papyrus text (e.g. omissions, script above the line).

]των κριτῶν
Π]ανήδου προε-
εἰς τὸ μέσον] παρελθόν-
τα φασὶν μὲν τὸν] Ἡσίοδον ἐρω-
τῆσαι τούσδε τοὺς στίχου]ς· υἱὲ
Μέλητος Ὅμηρε θεῶν ἀ]πὸ μήδεα
εἰδὼς, εἶπ' ἄγε μοι πάμπρω]τα, τί
φέρτατόν ἐστι βροτοῖσι]ν; τὸν
δ' Ὅμηρον ἀ]ποκρί-
νασθαι τάδε τὰ ἔ]πη· ἀρ-
χὴν μὲν μὴ φῦναι ἐ]πιχθονίοισι-
ν ἄριστον, φύντα δ']ὅπως ὤκισ-
τα πύλας Ἀίδαο περῆσ]αι. ἐπιβα-
λόμενος δ' ὁ Ἡσίοδ]ος ἐρωτᾶι τὸ
δεύτερον· εἶπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ το]ῦτο θε-
οῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ὅμηρε, τί θν]ητοῖς κάλ-
λιστον ὀίεαι ἐν φρεσὶν ε]ἶναι; ὁ δ' Ὅμη-
ρος ἀποκρίνεται τοὺς] στίχους
[τούσδε· ὁππότ' ἂν εὐφροσύνη μὲν]
[ἔχηι κατὰ δῆμον ἅπαντα, δα]ιτυ-
μόνες δ'ἀνὰ δώματ' ἀκουάζ]ων[τ]αι
[ἀοιδοῦ ἥμενοι ἑξείης, παρὰ δὲ πλή-]

12-15 Thgn. 425 + 427, Stob. 4.52.22 **21-8** *Od*. 6-11
4 π]ανηδου **Π** Πανοίδης **L** **14** ὅπως **Π** Thgn. Stob. ὅμως **L** **18-19** κάλ- / [λιστον] **Π** ἄριστον **L**

1-7 τὸν] τρό[πον / τοῦτον φασὶν] ἁπάντων / κρατῆσαι] τῶν κριτῶν / ἐν ἀγῶνι, τοῦ Π]ανήδου προε- / στηκότος·] παρελθόν- / τα γὰρ τὸν] Ἡσίοδον ἐρω- / τῆσαι τὸν Ὅμηρον οὕτ]ως· υἱὲ Colonna τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνος ἁπάντων τῶν ἐπισήμων ὄντων κριτῶν τῶν Χαλκιδέων μετὰ Π]ανήδου, πρὸς τοὺς κριτὰς πρότερον παρελθόντα φασὶν τὸν Ἡσίοδον ἐρωτῆσαι τοὺς στίχους τούσδε Avezzù **4-5** π]ανηδου προε / [… Milne Allen Rzach προε / [στηκοτος Mahaffy προς / [… Wilamowitz **6-7** ἐρω- / [τῆσαι Wilamowitz ερω- / [ταιν κατα τοιαδε Mahaffy Rzach Allen **8** απο] Mahaffy Allen Rzach ἀπ]ὸ Wilamowitz **11** δ' Ὅμηρον Mahaffy δὲ Ὅμηρον Wilamowitz δὲ Ὅμηρον καλῶς Colonna **11-12** ?σοιπ / …] η αρ Mahaffy σοιπ / …επ]η αρ[χην Allen σοιπ / …επ]η αρ[Rzach ἀποκρί- / νασθαι τοῦτον τὸν τρό]πον Milne Colonna **14** ἄριστον: φέριστον Wilamowitz Avezzù **15-16** επιβα- / λομενος δ ο ησιοδ]ος Allen Rzach ἐπιβα- / λῶν δὲ Ἡσίοδ]ος Wilamowitz Colonna (δ' ὁ Colonna) Avezzù **17** δεύτερον Wilamowitz Colonna Avezzù δε Rzach; το]υτο θε[οις Allen **19-21** ὁ δ' Ὅμη- / ρος ἀποκρίνεται τοὺς] στίχους / [τούσδε Wilamowitz Colonna Avezzù **22** υ̣ Mahaffy δαιτ]υ[μονες δ Allen Rzach δαιτ]ύ- Wilamowitz Colonna **23b** om. **Π**

Col. II

θ[ωσι τράπεζαι σίτου καὶ κρειῶν, μέ-
θυ δ’ἐ[κ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων] οἰν[οχό-
ος φορέηι[σι κ]αὶ ἐγχε[ίηι δεπάεσσιν
τοῦτο <τί> μοι κάλλιστ[ον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φαί-
νεται εἶναι. ῥηθέν[των δὲ καὶ τού-
των τῶν ἐπῶν [οὕτω σφοδρῶς
φασὶν θαυμασθῆν[αι τοὺς στί-
χου῾ς‘ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήν[ων ὥστε χρυ-
σοῦς αὐτοὺς προσα[γορεύσαντες
πρὸ τῶν δείπνων καὶ [τῶν σπον-
δῶν προκατεύχονται[πάντες.
ἀχθεσθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἡσίοδος ε[ἐ-
πὶ τὴν ἀπορίαν τῆς ἀ[ποκρίσεως
ὥρμησεν καὶ λέγει τ[οὺς στίχους
τούσδε· Μοῦσ’ ἄγε μοι τ[ὰ τ’ἐόντα
τά τ’ἐσσόμενα πρό τ’ἐ[όντα
τῶν μὲν μηθὲν ἄειδ[ε, σὺ δ’ἄλλης
μνῆσαι ἀοιδῆς. ὁ δ’ Ὅμ[ηρος βουλό-
μενος λῦσαι τὴν ἀπο[ρίαν τῆς ἐ-
ρωτήσεως ἀποφ̣θ̣[έγγεται τοὺς
στίχους τούσδε· [οὐδέποτ’ἀμφὶ
Διὸς τύμβον κἀν[αχήποδες ἵπ-
ποι ἅρμα[τα συντρίψουσιν ἐρί-
ζοντες [περὶ νίχης. καλῶς δὲ τοῦ
Ὁμήρου[

44-7 Plu. *Conv. Sept. Sap.* 154a
27-8 φαί-] / νεται **Π** εἴδεται **L** *Od.* **30-1** [τοὺς στί- /]χου῾ς‘ **Π** τὰ ἔπη **L** **40** μηθὲν **Π** μηδὲν **L** **45** τύμβον **Π** τύμβωι **L** Plu. **46-7** ἐρίζοντες **Π L** ἐπειγόμενοι Plu.

25 δ’ἐ[κ κρ]ητῆρ[ος Colonna **27** <τί> om. Π **27-8** φαί-] / νεται Wilamowitz Colonna εἴδ-] / εται Allen Rzach φαιν-] / εται Mahaffy **28** δὲ καὶ Wilamowitz **32** προσα[γορεύσαντες Rzach προσα[γορευουσι και ετι Mahaffy προσα[γορευθηναι Allen προσα[γορεύοντες Wilamowitz Colonna Avezzù **35-6** ε[? / πι την απορiαν της [ερωτησεως Mahaffy Allen Rzach ἐ[πὶ τούτοις ἐ- / πὶ … ἀ[ποκρίσεως Wilamowitz ἐ- / πὶ ἀ[ποκρίσεως Colonna ἐπὶ τῇ Ὁμήρου εὐημερίᾳ Avezzù **38** Μοῦσ’ ἄγε Wilamowitz Avezzù μουσα γε Mahaffy Allen Rzach Colonna Cavallo-Maehler **43** ἀποφ̣θ̣[έγγεται Wilamowitz Colonna Avezzù αποφε[υγειν προφερει Mahaffy αποφε[τους] Allen Rzach αποφε Cavallo-Maehler **45** δυος **Π** **46** ποι αρμα[τα ερι] Allen **47-8** Καλῶς δὲ τοῦ] /

Ὁμήρου Wilamowitz Colonna καλως δε] / ομηρου Mahaffy] / ομηρου Allen Rzach Wilamowitz Colonna **48** [καὶ ἐν τούτοις Colonna [καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀπαντήσαντος Avezzù.

COMMENTARY

1-6. These lines are in a very poor state of preservation but even from the few visible words the papyrus text appears quite different from that in **L**. The first line might be the end of an introductory statement to the effect that Hesiod won, or that the contest went, 'in the following manner'. In the *Certamen* there is a parallel phrase (71-2: νικῆσαί φασι τὸν Ἡσίοδον τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον), but it comes after the presentation of Panoides (as his name is spelled in **L**) and the other judges (68-70). The order in the papyrus seems to be reversed, as Panedes and the other judges make their appearance only at 3-4. The syntax seems different too, as the three words in the genitive απαντων, κριτων and Π]ανηδου suggest the presence of a genitive absolute (as opposed to *Cert*. 68-70: τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνος ἄλλοι τέ τινες τῶν ἐπισήμων Χαλκιδέων ἐκαθέζοντο κριταὶ καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν Πανοίδης, ἀδελφὸς ὢν τοῦ τετελευτηκότος). Colonna suggested to read τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον φασὶν ἁπάντων κρατῆσαι τῶν κριτῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι ('it is said that he won the support of all the judges in the contest in the following way') τοῦ Πανήδου προεστηκότος ('Panedes being at their head'). But he based the supplement ἁπάντων κρατῆσαι τῶν κριτῶν on the passage about the contest from Themistius' *Oration* 30, where Hesiod πᾶσι τοῖς κριταῖς κρατεῖ ('won the support of all the judges'), and that is a different version of the story that fits specific purposes (see Introduction, pp. 38-41).

2-4. In the papyrus the contest seems to be judged by all the Chalcideans ('all…judges'), while in the *Certamen* we have only 'some' of them (68-9: ἄλλοι τέ τινες τῶν ἐπισήμων Χαλκιδέων).

2. **τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνο]ς:** a fairly clear trace of ς can be read and this gives some support to Avezzù's τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνος.

4. Π]ανήδου: the papyrus transmits the name of the king in the form Πανήδης. Editors of the *Certamen* have emended **L**'s form Πανοίδης on the basis of the papyrus text, but this is questionable: see *Cert*. 69n.

5. [εἰς τὸ μέσον]: cf. *Cert.* 72, προελθόντα γὰρ εἰς τὸ μέσον: the phrase εἰς τὸ μέσον may well have been present in Alcidamas' version of the story, see *Cert.* 72-4n.

5-6. παρελθόν- / [τα: more representative of Classical Athenian idiom than the *Certamen*'s προελθόντα, see Biles 2011: 48.

6-7. φασὶν … στίχου]ς̣: before introducing Hesiod's question, the *Certamen* (72-4) adds a sentence that finds no correspondence in the papyrus. It explains how the contest will develop: πυνθάνεσθαι τοῦ Ὁμήρου καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον, τὸν δὲ Ὅμηρον ἀποκρίνασθαι. The expansion is merely apparent: by giving this information at the beginning of the contest, **L** can be much more concise in its handling of individual speech introductions. A first example of this occurs in *Cert.* 74, where **L** has φησὶν οὖν Ἡσίοδος as against the papyrus' more expansive φασὶν μὲν τὸν] Ἡσίοδον ἐρω[τῆσαι τούσδε τοὺς στίχου]ς̣.

7-10. υἱὲ … βροτοῖσι]ν: the first question seems to be the same as in the *Certamen* (75-6), but it is not possible to verify whether the papyrus transmitted exactly the same text as in **L** or a slightly different one, as in some of the subsequent lines.

10-12. τὸν … ἔ]π̣η: the introduction to Homer's answer is again more elaborate than in the *Certamen* (77: Ὅμηρος). At the end of the line, there are traces which seem to be compatible with the letters ΠΟΚΡΙ, and could be part of the verb ἀποκρίνασθαι sometimes used in the *Certamen* too to introduce Homer's answers (*Cert*. 104, 142). The tentative identification of the traces at l. 11 with ΣΟΙΠ, proposed by Mahaffy and accepted by some early editors, was doubted already by Wilamowitz (see his apparatus). Only Colonna, on the basis of Milne's reading, proposes the supplement ἀποκρίνασθαι, but his reading of the

rest of the line as τοῦτον τὸν τρό]πον cannot be correct: the letters AP indicating the beginning of the second question are at the end of l. 12 rather than at the beginning of l. 13, as he suggests; before them, H is visible, possibly following Π, which may lead us to supplement ἔ]πη, and hence the phrase ἀποκρίνασθαι [...] τάδε τὰ ἔπη.

12-15. ἀρ / [χὴν] … περῆσ]αι: this is the first case in the hexameter verses where the *Certamen* diverges from the text of the papyrus. At l. 14, where the papyrus and all the other witnesses transmit ὅπως, **L** reads ὅμως; both variants are acceptable.

15-17. ἐπιβα / [λόμενος] … [δεύτερον]: Hesiod asks the second question; the corresponding passage is *Cert.* 80: Ἡσίοδος τὸ δεύτερον. As previous editors suggest, τὸ δεύτερον seems an adequate supplement to fill the lacuna at the beginning of l. 17. If the reconstruction of ἐπιβαλόμενος δ' ὁ Ἡσίοδος ἐρωτᾶι τὸ δεύτερον is correct, the *Certamen*'s τὸ δεύτερον appears as a shortened version of the papyrus text.

17-19. [εἶπ' ἄγε] … ε]ἶναι: a difference between the papyrus and the manuscript is clearly visible: at the end of l. 18 the letters ΚΑΛ lead us to supplement κάλλιστον, whereas *Cert.* 82 reads ἄριστον**.** In this case the papyrus helps understand what seems to be a problematic passage of the manuscript text: in the papyrus text the second exchange of verses presents a question and an answer which are both about the κάλλιστον for men (ll. 18-9 and 27); in the corresponding sequence in the *Certamen* Hesiod asks what is the ἄριστον (82), which however Homer has already defined in his previous answer (78), and Homer replies by defining the κάλλιστον (89). An emendation of the manuscript on the basis of the papyrus text allows to have in the *Certamen* too an exchange on the 'best' and one on the 'finest' thing. In the *Certamen*, the reading ἄριστον may be due to the influence of the same word at l. 78 (in Homer's first answer). See also *Cert*. 82n.

19-21. ὁ δ' … [τούσδε]: these lines introducing Homer's answer are absent from

the *Certamen* where we only read ὁ δέ (83). The supplements proposed by Wilamowitz and Colonna, although tentative, seem compatible with the lacuna and may give a sense of what was written on the papyrus.

21-8. [ὁππότ'] … εἶναι: the verses of Homer's response are a passage from the *Odyssey* (9.6-11). The few visible traces on the papyrus in these lines between the end of the first column and the beginning of the second confirm that Homer is performing the same passage as in the *Certamen* (84-9). The papyrus lines can be therefore tentatively reconstructed on the basis of the text of the *Odyssey* and that of the *Certamen* too, bearing in mind the possibility of textual variations. At least one instance of variation is in fact visible: at ll. 27-8 the papyrus gives the reading φαίνεται, while the Homeric manuscripts and the *Certamen* read εἴδεται. Some of the editors of the papyrus print εἴδεται, but NETAI at the beginning of l. 28 makes the reading φαίνεται inevitable.

23b. This line is missing in the papyrus.

28-34. ῥηθέν[των … [πάντες]: the audience's reaction to Homer's verses is very similar in the papyrus and in the manuscript, but each text has its own peculiarities. Cf. *Cert*. 90-4: ῥηθέντων δὲ τῶν ἐπῶν, οὕτω σφοδρῶς φασι θαυμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς στίχους ὥστε χρυσοῦς αὐτοὺς προσαγορευθῆναι, καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν ταῖς κοιναῖς θυσίαις πρὸ τῶν δείπνων καὶ σπονδῶν προκατεύχεσθαι πάντας. The syntax is different: while the *Certamen* has two coordinated infinitives (προσαγορευθῆναι … καὶ … προκατεύχεσθαι), in the papyrus the second verb ΠΡΟΚΑΤΕΥΟΝ[seems compatible with an indicative present; reasonable supplements for the first verb, of which fewer traces are left on the papyrus, are Rzach's προσαγορεύσαντες ('after calling them golden verses … they all invoke them'), or Wilamowitz's προσα[γορεύοντες. Allen's προσαγορευθηναι seems incompatible with the indicative form of the other verb in the sentence. There are further differences between the two texts: at ll. 30-1 the papyrus gives τοὺς στίχους, which may be used to emend **L**'s τὰ ἔπη (after ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων). **L**'s

reading does not agree with the following words χρυσοῦς αὐτούς and may well owe its existence to τῶν ἐπῶν earlier in the sentence. Other attempts to emend **L** are less legitimate. For example, there is no need to insert τούτων at *Cert*. 90 on the basis of ll. 28-9 of the papyrus (see e.g. Allen). Changing the word order at *Cert*. 91 on the basis of lines 30-1 of the papyrus is not necessary either; e.g. Allen: θαυμασθῆναι τοὺς στίχους ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, instead of θαυμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς στίχους (**L**: τὰ ἔπη). See apparatus and commentary on *Cert*. 90-4 for more details. *Cert*. 92 adds that these verses are performed 'even today': καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν. This may be an attempt by the author of the *Certamen* to make his sources seem relevant to his own time.

35-8. ἀχθεσθεὶς … τούσδε: Hesiod is vexed at Homer's success and decides to ask a new type of question. The same episode is told in the *Certamen* (94-6): ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος ἀχθεσθεὶς ἐπὶ τῇ Ὁμήρου εὐημερίᾳ ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ἀπόρων ὥρμησεν ἐπερώτησιν καί φησι τούσδε τοὺς στίχους. The end of l. 35 is difficult**.** Wilamowitz proposed the supplement ἐπὶ τούτοις] ἐ[/πὶ τὴν ἀπορίαν ('vexed at these [verses, he turned] to [asking perplexing questions]'). Colonna connected ε as the last letter of the line with the following line, but there is actually room after it for some more letters.

36. τῆς ἀ[ποκρίσεως: the supplement τῆς ἐρωτήσεως proposed by some of the earliest editors allows to get a correspondence with ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ἀπόρων ὥρμησεν ἐπερώτησιν (*Cert*. 95), but the last visible letter of the line almost certainly is A rather than E. Wilamowitz's τῆς ἀποκρίσεως should therefore be accepted.

38-41. The verses are also preserved in *Cert*. 97-8. **Μοῦσ' ἄγε:** this reading of the text (Wilamowitz, Avezzù; cf. **L**) is preferable to Μοῦσά γε (Mahaffy Allen Rzach Colonna Cavallo-Maehler): the form ἄγε plus imperative (Μοῦσ' ἄγε μοι … ἄειδε) finds parallels in εἶπ' ἄγε, as found in the same section, *Cert*. 76 and 81.

41-4. ὁ δ' Ὅμ[ηρος … τούσδε: the text of the *Certamen* (99) runs differently: ὁ

δὲ Ὅμηρος βουλόμενος ἀκολούθως τὸ ἄπορον λῦσαι φησίν. The *Certamen* resorts to more common words and simpler syntax (τὸ ἄπορον λῦσαι instead of τὴν ἀπορίαν τῆς ἐρωτήσεως λῦσαι, and φησίν for ἀποφθ̣έγγεται τοὺς στίχους τούσδε. ἀκολούθως has no correspondence in the papyrus).

43. ἀποφ̣θ̣[έγγεται: the last letter before the lacuna can be identified with a good degree of confidence as a θ. The only Greek verb which fits the context is the one proposed by Wilamowitz, ἀποφθέγγομαι.

44-7. [οὐδέποτ'ἀμφὶ … [περὶ νίχης: these verses are mentioned also in Plu. *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 154a, in connection with the same contest story (see Introduction, pp. 18-28). Plutarch's text, however, reads ἐπειγόμενοι where the manuscript of the *Certamen* and the papyrus transmit ἐρίζοντες. The words κἀναχήποδες ἵπποι are missing in **L** and in Stephanus' copy, and they have been integrated by Barnes on the basis of Plutarch's text. The traces of the letters present in the papyrus fit these words, and confirm the soundness of Barnes' supplement.

47-8. καλῶς δὲ τοῦ Ὁμήρου[: It is difficult to suggest safe supplements for these lines, since only the name of Homer can be read, and it is not present in the corresponding passage of the *Certamen* (102-3): καλῶς δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀπαντήσαντος ἐπὶ τὰς ἀμφιβόλους γνώμας ὥρμησεν ὁ Ἡσίοδος. The end of l. 47 may be tentatively supplemented with καλῶς δὲ τοῦ, but any further attempt at supplementing these lines seems unsafe.

P.Mich. inv. 2754

Catalogues = MP^3 0076; LDAB 177.

Editions and critical studies mentioned in the apparatus = Winter 1925, Hunt (in Winter 1925), Körte 1927, Solmsen 1932, Page 1935 (appendix to revised edition of Evelyn-White 1914), Kirk 1950, Dodds 1952, West 1967, Koniaris 1971, Renehan 1971 and 1976, Richardson 1981, Avezzù 1982.

P.Mich. inv. 2754 transmits, in ll. 1-14, an account of the death of Homer in a

version which is similar to *Cert.* 327-38; ll. 15-23 contain a section in praise of the poet that is not found in the *Certamen* or indeed in any other source; a *subscriptio* giving the name of Alcidamas closes the text. This papyrus was discovered in 1924 during an excavation conducted by the University of Michigan at the Egyptian site of Karanis (Arsinoite nome). It is the final column of a papyrus roll, written both on the *recto* and on the *verso*. While the *recto* is covered by accounts, the *verso* contains twenty-three lines of text and ends with a *subscriptio*. Its 'small well-formed book-hand' has been dated to the second-third century AD.[133]

P.Mich. inv. 2754 offers important insights into our understanding of the textual tradition of the *Certamen*, and sheds light on the more general issue of the relationship between Alcidamas and the *Certamen*. As in the case of the text transmitted by P.Petr. I 25 (1), a comparison between papyrus (esp. ll. 1-14) and manuscript shows that they give virtually the same account of the story.[134] However, the papyrus text is more elaborately phrased, and differs from the manuscript text on some details. The *subscriptio* allows us to identify Alcidamas as the source for the *Certamen*'s section on the death of Homer.[135]

TEXT[136]

1 οἱ δὲ ὁ̣ρ̣ῶ̣ν̣τ̣ε̣[ς αὐ]τὸν ἐσχεδίασαν τόνδε [τὸ]ν
στίχον· ὅσσ' ἕλομεν λ[ι]πόμεσθ' ὅσσ'οὐκ ἕλομεν
φερόμε[σ]θα. ὁ δὲ οὐ δυ̣ν̣ά̣μενος εὑρεῖν τὸ λε-

---

[133] URL: http://wwwapp.cc.columbia.edu/ldpd/apis/item?mode=item&key=michigan.apis.1622. Information on the papyrus is available in the online catalogues MP^3 (0076) and LDAB (177); first published by Winter 1925. An image is available at the URL above. The quotation is from Winter 1925: 120.

[134] In particular, P.Mich. inv. 2754 offers details of the story that are otherwise found only in the *Certamen*. These will be discussed in the commentary.

[135] Some scholars argue that Alcidamas was the author of the text in ll. 15-23, but not of ll. 1-14. This idea will be challenged in the course of the next pages.

[136] This edition is based on an inspection of the digital image of the papyrus available online at the URL: http://wwwapp.cc.columbia.edu/ldpd/apis/item?mode=item&key=michigan.apis.1622.

χθὲν ἤρετο αὐτοὺς [ὅτι] λέγοιεν. οἱ δὲ ἔφασαν ἐ-
φ’ἁλιείαν οἰχόμ̣ενο[ι ἀγρ]εῦσαι μὲν οὐδέν, καθή-
μενο᾽ι΄ [δ]ὲ φθειρ[ί]ζ̣εσ[θ]α̣ι· τῶν δὲ φθειρῶν οὓς ἔλα-
βον αὐτοῦ κατα[λ]ιπεῖν, οὓς δ’οὐκ ἔλαβον ἐν
τοῖς τρίβωσιν ἐ[.]ν̣αποφέρειν. ἀναμνησθεὶς δὲ
τοῦ μαντε[ίο]υ [ὅτι] ἡ καταστροφὴ αὐτῶι̣ το[ῦ]
βίου ἥκεν, π[οι]εῖ εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐπίγραμ[μ]α τό[δ]ε·
ἐνθάδ[ε] τὴν ἱε[ρὴ]ν κεφαλὴν κατὰ γαῖα κάλυ-
ψε, ἀνδρῶν ἡρώω̣ν̣ κοσμήτορα θεῖον Ὅμηρ[ο]ν.
καὶ ἀν[α]χωρῶ᾽ν΄ πηλοῦ ὄντος ὀλισθάνει καὶ πε-
σὼν ἐπὶ πλευρὰν οὕτως, φασίν, ἐτελεύτησεν.
περὶ τούτου μὲν οὖν †ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἀρετὴν ποι-
ήσομεν†, μάλιστα δ’ὁρῶν τοὺς ἱστορικοὺς θαυ-
μαζομένους. Ὅμηρος γοῦν διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ζῶν
καὶ ἀποθανὼν τετίμηται παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώ-
ποις. ταύτη[.] οὖν αὐτῷ τῆς παιδιᾶς χάριν ἀ-
ποδίδω̣[μι, τό τε γ]έ̣νος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἄλλη[ν] ποί-
ησιν δι’ἀκ̣[ριβ]είας μνήμης τοῖς βουλομέ-
νοις φι̣[λοκαλ]εῖν τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰς τὸ κοινὸν
παραδο]ύς.

[Ἀλκι]δάμαντος
Περὶ Ὁμήρου

2 ἕλομεν … ἕλομεν: ελ[αβ]ον et ελαβον **Π** corr. Winter **5** οἰχόμ̣ενο[ι Hunt **6** μενο⟦υ⟧᾽ι΄ **Π** **7** κατα[.]ιποιεν **Π** corr. Winter **8** ε[ν]θ̣ αποφερειν Winter ἐ̣ναποφέρειν Körte Page Kirk Koniaris Renehan **12** ανθ᾽δ΄ρων **Π** **13** παληου **Π** corr. Winter **15** ποιεῖσθαι: πονεῖσθαι Dodds secl. Körte lac. post ποιεῖσθαι stat. West **15-16** ποιεῖσθαι … ποιήσομεν inter cruces Renehan ποιήσομεν: πειρασόμεθα Page πειράσομεν Solmsen fort. ποιήσομαι Dodds πειράσομαι Avezzù **16** ορων‹τες› Winter ὁρῶ Dodds **19** ταύτη[ν] Winter Kirk Dodds West ταύτη[ς] Körte Koniaris; παιδείας Körte Dodds Renehan **19-20** ἀποδίδω̣[μι, τό τε γ]έ̣νος Avezzù αποδιδω̣[μεν αγ]ω̣νος Winter ἀποδιδό̣[ντες, τὸ γ]έ̣νος Page Koniaris ἀποδιδό̣[ντες].νος Kirk ἀποδιδο[ύς τὸ γ]έ̣νος Dodds ἀποδιδο[ύς, ἀφέμ]ενος West ἀποδιδό̣[ ]νος Renehan ἀποδιδο[.....]ε̣νος Richardson **21** δι’ἀκ̣[ριβ]είας Körte Kirk Dodds Avezzù δι αγ̣[χιστ]ειας Winter διὰ β̣[ραχ]είας West Koniaris αγ.[ ]ειας Renehan **22** φι̣[λοκαλ]εῖν suppl. Hunt **23** παραδο]ύς Avezzù παραδώ̣[σω West, παραδῶ̣[μεν Winter Kirk Koniaris Renehan, παραδῶ Dodds **25** [Ἀλκι]δάμαντος suppl. Winter.

COMMENTARY

Since its first publication this papyrus has been the object of a lively debate over the authorship of the text transmitted in it and its relationships with the

Certamen. It has been suggested on various grounds that the *subscriptio* refers only to the text in ll. 15-23, while ll. 1-14 are not by Alcidamas; as a consequence, Alcidamas should not be seen as the source for the *Certamen*'s section on the death of Homer. However, no indisputable argument has been offered yet as to why we should dissociate Alcidamas from ll. 1-14.

The first editor, Winter, had no doubts that the whole text on the papyrus was to be attributed to Alcidamas and that the sophist was one of the sources for the *Certamen*.[137] Soon after that, however, Körte claimed that ll. 1-14 were not by Alcidamas because they contain seven instances of hiatus, which Alcidamas avoided in his *On Sophists*: according to Körte, the lines may have been quoted by Alcidamas in his work, but were not written by him.[138] Kirk later built on these considerations. He argued that the lines in question are an interpolation from an anonymous Life of Homer into two consecutive sentences of Alcidamas' Περὶ Ὁμήρου. He based his argument on a perceived lack of continuity between ll. 1-14 and ll. 15-23; traces of Koiné Greek in ll. 1-14 (ἐσχεδίασαν, ἁλιείαν, φθειρίζεσθαι and the parenthetic use of φασίν); the fact that the *Certamen* does not mention Alcidamas as the source for that specific section, while on other occasions it does; the fact that a 'circumstantial prose biography of Homer' is not likely to have existed 'as early as in the fifth century'.[139] Dodds accepted Kirk's objections to the unity of the papyrus text, but proposed yet another scenario for its transmission: according to him, the roll contained a number of *excerpta* περὶ Ὁμήρου, and after a quotation on the death of Homer from an anonymous work the compiler quoted an extract from the preface of Alcidamas' *Musaion* to close his collection in a suitably grand

[137] Winter 1925: 124-5 claims that 'the new fragment proves conclusively the validity of the Alcidamas tradition' because the text at ll. 1-14 'agrees so closely with the *Certamen* ... that the relationship is apparent', and the *subscriptio* proves it 'as conclusively as anything can'.

[138] Körte 1927.

[139] Kirk 1950: 149-57.

manner.[140] By contrast, Koniaris suggested that the papyrus fragment was part of a roll which contained the *Certamen* approximately as we have it, followed by a series of quotations about Homer; in his view, a quotation from Alcidamas started the series.[141]

The attempts to deny Alcidamas' authorship of ll. 1-14 were not, however, completely successful. Renehan, building on West's studies, has shown that the forms considered by earlier scholars to contain traces of Koiné Greek are not exclusively postclassical. As for hiatus, Renehan suggests that the avoidance of it in the only treatise by Alcidamas that has reached us in its entirety may be coincidence rather than conscious practice. In fact, he argues on the basis of another fragment, Alcidamas did not always avoid hiatus.[142]

Other arguments can be added. First, the restoration [Ἀλκι]δάμαντος, on the basis of which ll. 15-23 are unanimously attributed to Alcidamas, is ultimately due precisely to the contents of ll. 1-14. In these lines the account of the death of Homer is very similar to that in the *Certamen*, whose connection with Alcidamas is proved by other independent pieces of evidence.[143] Turning to the alleged break between the two sections, the fact that l. 15 seems to be corrupt suggests that we are not in a strong position to make a judgment.[144] In any case, the two passages still seem to be linked at least at a thematic level. The papyrus does not directly connect Homer's death to his inability to solve a riddle, and therefore does not call his wisdom into question. In this version, the riddle seems to work as no more than a *terminus post quem* for Homer's death.

---

[140] Dodds 1952.

[141] Koniaris 1971.

[142] West 1967: 434-8, Renehan 1971 and 1976: 144-59.

[143] Renehan 1971: 104 concludes that 'if only lines 15-25 of the papyrus had survived no one would be calling it, as it is commonly called, the Alcidamas papyrus'.

[144] West 1967: 437-8, Renehan 1971: 104 n. 22. Renehan suggests that τούτου in l. 15 may be masculine and refer to Homer. If he is right, that would give us a connection between the two halves of the papyrus on the level of language. See commentary.

This seems to be in line with the content of ll. 15-23, in which Homer is praised: separating Homer's death from an event that could cast doubt on his wisdom is a good way of reinforcing his educative value.[145] Furthermore, the text is copied continuously, with no sign of separation or space between lines 14 and 15, which suggests that the scribe perceived the text that he was copying as a unity, rather than as two separate sections. The *subscriptio*, then, because of its size and its position at the bottom margin of the papyrus, seems to refer to the whole text rather than only to its final section.

In conclusion, there seem to be good reasons for thinking that Alcidamas is the author of the whole text on the papyrus, and that both it and the *Certamen* go back to Alcidamas as their ultimate source.

1-2. οἱ δὲ … στίχον: the *Certamen* (327) gives εἰπόντων δὲ ἐκείνων. This phrase introduces the text of the riddle with fewer words than the corresponding one in the papyrus. It is not possible to know whether the papyrus text contained the scene of Homer asking the boys if they had caught anything (*Cert*. 325-6).

2. ἕλομεν … ἕλομεν: the papyrus text reads ΕΛΑΒΟΝ in both cases. The fishermen are here clearly addressing Homer in direct speech, and the first plural person is in fact what they are expected to use (cf. also λ[ι]πόμεσθ' and φερόμε[σ]θα). Since Winter 1925: 128, the papyrus reading ΕΛΑΒΟΝ has been considered a diplography arising from the use of the same word in ll. 6-7 (indirect speech).

3-4. **ὁ δὲ … λέγοιεν:** the papyrus and the *Certamen* use the same words to inform us that Homer asked about the meaning of the riddle (*Cert*. 329: ἤρετο αὐτοὺς ὅ τι λέγοιεν); but the *Certamen*'s οὐ νοήσας τὸ λεχθέν seems a concise form of the papyrus' ὁ δὲ οὐ δυνάμενος εὑρεῖν τὸ λεχθέν. The story is told with the same details (Homer asks the fisher boys for the meaning of the riddle and they explain it to him) also in the *Certamen*.

4-6. οἱ δὲ … φθειρ[ί]ζεσ[θ]αι: cf. *Cert*. 329-30: οἱ δέ φασιν ἐν ἁλείᾳ μὲν

[145] See also *Cert*. 323-38n.

ἀγρεῦσαι μηδέν, ἐφθειρίσθαι δέ. In both texts the explanation of the riddle is based on the contrast, indicated by μέν and δέ, between the two actions of fishing and killing the lice (with minimal lexical variations). The participles that in the papyrus further characterise these actions, οἰχό̣μ̣ε̣ν̣ο[ι and καθήμενοι, are dropped in the *Certamen*.

5. οἰχό̣μ̣ε̣ν̣ο[ι: this form, supplemented by Hunt, is not attested in other accounts of the story but has been unanimously accepted by all editors because, as Winter points out, it accords with the traces and gives the necessary contrast with καθήμενοι.

6-8. τῶν δὲ … ἐ[.]ν̣αποφέρειν: cf. *Cert*. 330-2: καὶ τῶν φθειρῶν οὓς ἔλαβον καταλιπεῖν, οὓς δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβον ἐν τοῖς ἱματίοις φέρειν. The *Certamen* simplifies the papyrus text: it eliminates αὐτοῦ and gives φέρειν instead of a compound of φέρω (though it is difficult to identify the verb: ἐ[.]ν̣αποφέρειν). The *Certamen* also offers a variation: ἐν τοῖς ἱματίοις for the papyrus' ἐν τοῖς τρίβωσιν. It may be relevant that this is a context where variations were indeed common: ἐν τῇ ἐσθῆτι Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4, Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 3.5; εἰς οἴκους Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 35.

7. κατα[λ]ιπεῖν: Winter's emendation κατα[λ]ιπεῖν for the papyrus' reading ΚΑΤΑ[.]ΙΠΟΙΕΝ is here accepted, since it provides a syntactical parallel to the infinitive ἐ[.]ν̣αποφέρειν. The papyrus' spelling may be partially explained through iotacism.

8-12: ἀναμνησθεὶς … Ὅμηρ[ο]ν: cf. *Cert*. 332-3**:** ἀναμνησθεὶς δὲ τοῦ μαντείου ὅτι τὸ τέλος αὐτοῦ ἥκοι τοῦ βίου, ποιεῖ τὸ τοῦ τάφου αὑτοῦ ἐπίγραμμα. The story develops in the same way in the *Certamen* and in the papyrus: Homer remembers the oracle, its content is briefly summarised, and he then writes his tomb epigram. The oracle is however summarised differently in the two texts: ἡ καταστροφή becomes τὸ τέλος in the *Certamen*; different verbal forms are used (ἥκοι, ἦκεν); the personal pronoun is used in different cases (dative and genitive); τοῦ βίου is in different positions. Compare also τὸ

τοῦ τάφου αὐτοῦ ἐπίγραμμα and εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐπίγραμ[μ]α τό[δ]ε. τόδε in the papyrus introduces the epigram which is reported straightaway; whereas the author of the *Certamen* puts it at the very end of his work, after saying that Homer slipped on mud and died. For the position of the epigram in the *Certamen* see *Cert*. 336-8n.

12 κάλυψε: the *Certamen* and most other sources of the epigram have the form καλύπτει, and both forms are equally possible.

13-14. Cf. *Cert*. 334-5: ἀναχωρῶν δὲ ἐκεῖθεν, ὄντος πηλοῦ ὀλισθὼν καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν πλευράν, τριταῖος ὥς φασι τελευτᾷ. The *Certamen* short-circuits the balanced syntax of the papyrus texts (ἀν[α]χωρῶ᾽ν᾽ … ὀλισθάνει καὶ πεσὼν … ἐτελεύτησεν) by assimilating ὀλισθάνει to πεσών. It also introduces some new ideas: ἐκεῖθεν, τριταῖος and καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν Ἰῳ.

15-16. **περὶ τούτου ... ποιήσομεν†:** this sentence, well preserved and clearly readable in the papyrus, is quite obscure in meaning and convoluted in style; the text transmitted seems faulty (hence the *cruces*, in the absence of fully convincing emendations). This obscure text has also given to several scholars the impression of an abrupt transition between the two sentences, and has been used as evidence for the fact that the papyrus contains two separate texts. However, τούτου in this context can be seen as a masculine pronoun (instead of neuter, as it has so far been interpreted): in this case it would be referring to Homer, resulting in a clearer meaning to the sentence and a better link to the previous one; second, as already mentioned, the version of the death told in the previous lines seems to be in line with the encomiastic tone of this section. Some interpretations (and translations) proposed: Page emended ποιήσομεν to πειρασόμεθα and translated: 'on this subject, then, we shall endeavor to make our reputation'. Solmsen emended to πειράσομεν, while Körte proposed to expunge ποιεῖσθαι, and interpreted the passage as 'on this subject, then, we shall make our reputation for excellence'.

16-17. μάλιστα … θαυ- / μαζομένους: the general meaning seems to be that

the author wants to enhance Homer's reputation, in competition with that of the historians.

ὁρῶν: there is no reason to propose either ὁρῶν<τες> (Winter) or ὁρῶ (Dodds). The first person singular does not seem to be problematic (and is used later in the text too, if the supplements ἀποδίδω[μι and παραδο[ύς are correct); the participle may function as a reason clause.

τοὺς ἱστορικούς: it has been suggested that Alcidamas either sees Homer as a historian (Kirk 1950: 154, who however finds this 'quite untypical of the Greek assessment of Homer') or that he sees himself as one, and Homer as a good subject on which to build his own reputation for excellence (Koniaris 1971: 122). But it seems that Alcidamas rather sets himself and Homer against the historians: the particles μέν and δέ and the gist of the passage, as far as it can be reconstructed, seem to suggest this contrast. It is impossible to know more precisely what Alcidamas means by 'historians' and how he views them, because this is the only occurrence of the word in his extant works.

17-19. Ὅμηρος … ἀνθρώ- / ποις: the idea of Homer being honoured by all men is repeatedly emphasized in the *Certamen* (see also Richardson 1981: 4-5).

19-23. **ταύτη[.] … παραδο]ύς:** these last few lines are fundamental to our understanding of the papyrus text. In the first part of the sentence Alcidamas thanks Homer (χάριν ἀποδίδ.[ ) while the second part refers to his account of Homer's life and poetry (γ]ένος ...καὶ τὴν ... ποίησιν …παραδ.] – on the supplement γ]ένος see below). In the papyrus the ending of both verbs is unreadable, and there is no agreement among previous editors on the identification of the last letter (ο or ω) before both lacunae. Scholars have suggested a range of verbal forms, and as a consequence the syntax of the whole passage has been variously interpreted. Some question the very unity of ll. 1-14 and 15-23. The most plausible supplements for the two verbs are those by Avezzù: ἀποδίδω[μι and παραδο[ύς. He seems right in identifying the traces of the last visible letter of each verb respectively with Ω and O, which makes

some of the the other supplements that have been proposed altogether impossible (see below). Avezzù's reading also gives a plausible general meaning to the whole fragment: Alcidamas is giving thanks to Homer (now, in the last few lines), after having written (in the previous section of the text, i.e. ll. 1-14) about his life and his poetry. That Alcidamas gives thanks to Homer *after* discussing the poet's life and poetry sits well with the text of the papyrus, for ll. 1-14 look like the end of a biographical account. The alternatives proposed are less convincing. Page read the lines as meaning 'Let us then thank (χάριν ἀποδιδό[ντες) him thus … and as for his origins and the rest of his poetry, let us hand them down (τὸ γ]ένος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἄλλη[ν] ποίησιν … παραδῶ[μεν) ...'. Page's supplements were accepted by Kirk and Koniaris (who however did not propose a translation). Dodds' text and translation are similar: 'offering (ταύτη[ν] … χάριν ἀποδιδο[ύς) him this tribute, let me publish … an accurate account of where he came from and what else he wrote (τὸ γ]ένος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἄλλη[ν] ποίησιν … παραδῶ)'. None of these texts is paleographically likely (see above, on omega and omicron before the two lacunas) or results in a plausible overall interpretation, for they suggest that Alcidamas' account of Homer's life and poetry is yet to come. Other interpretations seem even less likely: Winter proposes 'let us then give him these thanks for the amusement of the contest itself (ταυτη[ν] αυτω της παιδιας χαριν αποδιδω[μεν αγ]ωνος αυτου) … and the rest of his poetry let us hand down (την αλλη[ν] ποιησιν παραδω[μεν)...' but this rests on an incorrect reading (αγ]ωνος in l. 20 cannot be right); while West's 'offering him this return (ταύτη[ν] … χάριν ἀποδιδο[ύς) … I will leave him (ἀφέμ]ενος αὐτοῦ) and go on to make other poets available too (τὴν ἄλλη[ν] ποίησιν … παραδώ[σω).' makes the passage overly convoluted (see also Koniaris 1971: 123).

19. **ταύτη[.]:** both ταύτη[ν] and ταύτη[ς] seem possible.

τῆς παιδιᾶς: the papyrus reading has sometimes been emended in παιδείας, which results in Alcidamas thanking Homer for his 'educational value' rather

than for the 'entertainment' he provides. But other sources show that Homer could be associated with παιδιά too: in Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.5, the manuscripts attest both the reading παιδείας and παιδιᾶς.

20. **γ]ένος**: the letter after the lacuna is with a good degree of certainty E: Winter's αγ]ω̣νος is therefore to be rejected. γένος and ποίησις are the subject of many ancient treatises on the poets, including the extant Lives of Homer.

21. **δι'ἀκ[ριβ]είας:** this supplement seems to be the most plausible in the context: Alcidamas claims that his account of Homer's life and poetry is *precise*, rather than *short* (διὰ β[ραχ]είας: West Koniaris).

P.Ath.Soc.Pap. inv. M2

Catalogues = MP³ 0077.01; LDAB 6838.

Editions = Mandilaras 1990, reprinted in Mandilaras 1992.

This papyrus fragment transmits a text that has been identified, on the basis of a few visible words in the first lines, as an account of the death of Hesiod similar to that attributed to Alcidamas in the *Certamen*; cf. *Cert*. 226-35. The fragment was found in the cartonnage of a mummy, probably in the Fayyum and it belonged to a roll. It is not very well preserved, but thirteen lines of text are visible on the *verso*. On palaeographical grounds it has been dated to the second century BC.[146]

Although this papyrus has received only little attention compared to the previous two fragments, it does contain some interesting information.[147] The text does not correspond completely to that transmitted in the manuscript, and reveals once again that the literary sources used by the author of the *Certamen* were subjected to a process of compression and adaptation. Mandilaras shows

[146] Information on the papyrus is available in the online catalogues MP³ (0077.01) and LDAB (6838); it has been published by Mandilaras 1990, reprinted in Mandilaras 1992, which includes an image of the papyrus.

[147] Some scholars ignore it altogether (e.g. Koning 2010). It has been published only once, and has never been the object of further study.

that in at least two cases (ll. 1-2 and 7) the text of the manuscript is too short to fit the lacunae in the papyrus. Moreover, the presence in l. 8 of ΑΥΤΟΝ, absent from the corresponding passage in the *Certamen*, shows that the papyrus transmits a somewhat more elaborate text.

Below is Mandilaras' edition of the text. Although he recognises that the papyrus differs from the manuscript text on several points, he extensively supplemented the former on the basis of the latter. However, we should allow for the possibility that the original text of the papyrus was more different from the *Certamen* than these supplements suggest.

TEXT

εἰς δὲ] Ο[ἰνόην] τῆς Λοκρίδος[ἔρχεται καὶ κατα-
λύει παρ'] Ἀμφιφάνει καὶ Γανύ[κτορι] τοῖς [Φηγέως
παισὶν ἀ]γνοήσας τὸ μαντεῖον. Ὁ γὰρ [τόπος οὗτος
ἅπας ἐκαλε]ῖ[το] Διὸς Νεμείου ἱερόν. [Δι]α[τριβῆς]
δ'αὐτῷ πλείονος γε]νομένης ἐν τοῖς Ο[ἰνοεῦ]σιν
ὑπονοήσαντες] οἱ νεανίσκοι τὴν ἀδελ[φὴν αὐτῶ]ν
παρθένον οὖσαν αἰσχῦναι τὸν Ἡσίο]δον[
[ἀποκτείναντε]ς αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ [τῆς ἀκτῆ]ς
[τῆς Λοκρίδος καὶ] τῆς Εὐβοίας [πέλαγος κατεπόν-
τισαν. Ὕστερον δὲ] τοῦ νεκροῦ τρ[ι]τα[ίου πρὸς τὴν
γῆν ὑπὸ δελφίνων] προσενεχθέντ[ο]ς [ἑ]ορτῆς [τινος]
ἐπιχωρίου παρ' αὐτοῖς οὔ]σ[ης Ἀριαδνείας πάντες
ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν ἔδραμον καὶ τὸ] σ[ῶμα γνωρίσαν-
[τες κτλ]

COMMENTARY

1-3. εἰς δὲ … μαντεῖον: cf. *Cert*. 226-8: εἰς δὲ Οἰνόην τῆς Λοκρίδος ἐλθὼν καταλύει παρ' Ἀμφιφάνει καὶ Γανύκτορι, τοῖς Φηγέως παισίν, ἀγνοήσας τὸ μαντεῖον. The first lines of the papyrus are fundamental for identifying the text on the papyrus, as they contain some key elements of the episode: the names Locris (l. 1), Amphiphanes and (partially) Ganyctor (l. 2), and a reference to the misunderstood oracle (l. 3). The supplements Οἰνόην (l. 1) and Φηγέως (l. 2) seem fairly secure, as these same details are found in other versions of the story, including the *Certamen* (226-7). The *Certamen*'s ἐλθὼν καταλύει is too short to

fit the lacuna between lines 1 and 2. Mandilaras proposes ἔρχεται καὶ καταλύει. The suggestion is certainly attractive: we have seen that **L** makes a more extensive use of subordination than earlier texts, especially through participles (see e.g. P.Mich. inv. 2754 ll. 13-14).

3-4. Ὁ γὰρ … ἱερόν: cf. *Cert*. 228-9: ὁ γὰρ τόπος οὗτος ἅπας ἐκαλεῖτο Διὸς Νεμείου ἱερόν. Line 4 gives another key phrase, Διὸς Νεμείου. The rest of the text can only be tentatively supplemented on the basis of the manuscript.

4-5. [Δι]α[τριβῆς] … Ο[ἰνοεῦ]σιν: cf. *Cert*. 229-30: διατριβῆς δὲ αὐτῷ πλείονος γενομένης ἐν τοῖς †Οἰνῶσιν†. That the papyrus reads γε]νομένης in l. 5 is taken for granted by Mandilaras on the basis of the manuscript text. The end of l. 5 would be of great interest if it was better preserved, as it overlaps with a difficult word in the manuscript: Οἰνῶσιν. See commentary on *Cert***.** 230.

6-7. Cf. *Cert*. 230-1: ὑπονοήσαντες οἱ νεανίσκοι τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν μοιχεύειν τὸν Ἡσίοδον. From the position of the words νεανίσκοι (which seems to be the only entirely visible word on l. 6) and Ἡσίοδον (reasonable supplement for the only visible letters in l. 7: ΔΟΝ), and the space available for additional letters around these, Mandilaras deduces that once again the text of the *Certamen* does not fit the papyrus. His supplement παρθένον οὖσαν αἰσχῦναι gives an idea of how much is missing.

8-10. [ἀποκτείναντε]ς … κατεπόντισαν: cf. *Cert*. 231-2: ἀποκτείναντες εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ τῆς Εὐβοίας καὶ τῆς Λοκρίδος πέλαγος κατεπόντισαν. The corresponding sentence on the papyrus must have been more elaborate. It contained a personal pronoun that is not attested in the manuscript (l. 8: ΑΥΤΟΝ); the space between εἰς τὸ μεταξύ and τῆς Εὐβοίας shows that, unlike in the manuscript, something is missing between these words: it is possible that some of the space was occupied by τῆς Λοκρίδος, as Mandilaras suggests, so that we would have the two geographical names in reverse order. Εὐβοίας in l. 9 is a very significant reading: it confirms, against all attempts to emend the corresponding passage in the *Certamen*, that according to Alcidamas the place of

Hesiod's death was Eastern Locris. See *Cert*. 231-2n.

10-14. Ὕστερον δὲ] … γνωρίσαν- / [τες: cf. *Cert***.** 232-4: τοῦ δὲ νεκροῦ τριταίου πρὸς τὴν γῆν ὑπὸ δελφίνων προσενεχθέντος ἑορτῆς τινος ἐπιχωρίου παρ' αὐτοῖς οὔσης Ἀριαδνείας πάντες ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν ἔδραμον καὶ τὸ σῶμα γνωρίσαντες […]. The only relevant words that seem to be visible in the papyrus are τοῦ νεκροῦ and προσενεχθέντ[ο]ς in l. 10 and 11 respectively. Everything else is supplemented to give a readable text.

P.Freib. 1.1 b (inv. 12)

Catalogues = MP³ 1577; LDAB 2729; Cribiore 248.

Edition = Aly 1914.

P.Freib. 1.1 b transmits the epigram of Hesiod's victory (*Cert.* 213-4) as the third in a group of four texts written on the *recto* of the papyrus. The others are eight comic verses, four epic hexameters and a passage from the *Iliad*.[148] The papyrus belonged to a roll that was used as a school book; on the *recto* there are traces of mathematical exercises that were washed out to copy the anthology of verses, and the *verso* contains a lexicon of Homeric words.[149] It is dated to the second or first century BC.[150]

The text of the epigram as transmitted on the papyrus is identical to that in the manuscript of the *Certamen* and in most of the other sources. The context in which the epigram is cited, however, makes the contribution of this papyrus very interesting as it proves that the contest story was used in schools; the analysis of the texts with which the epigram is copied in this papyrus, then,

[148] See commentary for details.

[149] P.Freib. 1.1 a Ro: MP³ 2658 ('Exercices de fractions') = LDAB 6902 ('exercise in fractions'); P.Freib. 1 c: MP³ 1219 ('Homerica, Lexique alphabétique de mots homériques en ou-') = LDAB 5266 ('Lexicon Homericum, alphabetic').

[150] Information on the papyrus is available in the online catalogues MP3 (1577) and LDAB (2729); first published by Aly 1914. See also Cribiore 1996: 232. An image is available at the URL: http://www.ub.uni-freiburg.de/index.php?id=882.

may give some suggestions as to how the story could have been used.

Below is Aly's edition of the text.

TEXT

Α. - - - - σαυτῷ λα/λεῖς;
δοκεῖς τι παρέχειν/ἔμφασιν λυπουμένῳ;
Β. ἐ/μοὶ προσανάθου· λαβέ με//σύμβουλον. [τί δ'οὐ;]
μὴ καταφρο/νήσῃς οἰκέτου συμβουλί/αν.
πολλάκις ὁ δοῦλος τοὺς/τρόπους χρηστοὺς ἔχων/
τῶν δεσποτῶν ἐγένετο//σωφρονέστερος.
εἰ δ'ἡ τύ/χη τὸ σῶμα κατεδου/λώσατο,
ὅ γε νοῦς ὑπάρχει/τοῖς τρόποις ἐλεύθερος./

ὡς δ'ἁλιεὺς ἀκτῇ ἐν//άλιρράντῳ ἐπὶ πέτρῃ/
ἀγ(κ)ίστρου δ' ἕλικος τε/λιουχίδα μάστακ' ἀεί/ρας,
ὦδ'- - - - - - - - - - -
οὔραχος (?) ἐγ λο/[φιῆς ἁ]παλὴν τρίχα // — ˘˘ πῶυ/.

Ἡσίοδος Μούσαις Ἑλικωνίσι/τόνδ' ἀνέθηχεν
ὕμνῳ/ν(ι)κήσας ἐν Χαλκίδι θεῖον/Ὅμηρον. //

χαλκέῳ δ' ἐν κεράμῳ δέ/δετο τρεισκαίδεκα μῆν(α)ς/
καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης/ἄατος πολέμοιο,/
εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς //Ἠερίβοια/
Ἑρμείᾳ 'ξήγγειλεν· ὁ δ' ἐξέκλε/ψεν Ἄρηα/
ἤδη τειρόμενον, χαλεπὸς/δέ ἑ δεσμὸς ἐδάμνα.

COMMENTARY

On this papyrus the epigram of the *Certamen* is the third in a series of four texts. The verses that open the sequence are from a lost drama from New Comedy in which a slave encourages his master to accept his counsel.[151] The second text (four epic hexameters) is a simile in Homeric style.[152] The contents of the verses, although the second part of the simile is badly preserved, are described by

[151] *PCG* VIII 1027 = *CGFP* 297. See also Arnott 1999: 78-9 and 2000: 486-9; attributed to Philemon or Menander.

[152] Bernabé 1987: 203 (nr 21). See also Powell 1925: 251, Huxley 1969: 25-6; attributed to Antimachus of Theos or Choirilus.

Huxley with these words: 'they compare, somewhat uneasily, a fisherman's rod, baited hook and line with the notch of a spear or arrow dragging out the thin thread from a helmet's plume through which it has passed'.[153] The epigram of the *Certamen* is then followed by *Iliad* 5.387-91, where Dione tells the story of Ares bound by Otus and Ephialtes and helped by Eëriboia. In the *Iliad* this story occurs in a list of gods wounded by mortals that Dione gives to her daughter Aphrodite, who has just been wounded by Diomedes.

The relationship between these four texts and the presence of such a sequence of material in a schoolbook are not clear, but a recent study argues that three of the passages (i.e. except for the simile) describe people of inferior status who advise or overcome a person of superior status: in these texts there would be a slave who offers advice to his master, a mortal who hurts a god and an inferior poet who wins against a superior one. This suggests that the papyrus contains a list of *exempla*, which was possibly to be used for rhetorical exercises in schools.[154] If this suggestion is right, the presence of the epigram of Hesiod's victory against Homer in this context becomes significant of the way Hesiod's victory was commonly perceived. On a general level, it shows how the story of this poetic contest could enter the repertoires of rhetoricians such as Dio Chrysostomus, Themistius and Libanius. More specifically, the fact that the story is placed among examples of inferior people who overcome their superiors shows that Hesiod's victory was seen as a crucial, if problematic, feature of the episode. It was the final verdict more perhaps than anything else that encouraged and challenged rhetoricians and other authors to take up the story and shape it to their own purposes.

P.Duk. inv. 665 (*olim* P.Duk. inv. MF75 6)

Catalogues = MP^3 0077.02 (*antea* 2860.01); LDAB 5947.

Edition = Menci 2012.

---

[153] Huxley 1969: 25.

[154] Pordomingo 2010: 52.

A new papyrus has recently been added to the group of known fragments of the *Certamen*. In 2012, Giovanna Menci of the Istituto Papirologico 'G. Vitelli' at Florence pointed out that P.Duk. inv. 665 contains part of an epigram transmitted in the *Certamen*: the lines in question are *Certamen* 309–12, that is, the first four lines of the epigram inscribed on the statue of Homer dedicated by the Argives.[155] The fragment, of unknown origin, transmits the text in five lines of script, the first of which is occupied by a short title (Ο]μ̣ῃ̣ρου εν Αργει). The text is on the *recto*. Menci has dated it to the sixth-seventh century AD.[156]

This papyrus is particularly interesting and its contribution especially welcome because it is the only witness of the Argive epigram other than the *Certamen.* The fact that we can now compare two versions of the epigram helps us draw some conclusions on the selection, use and transmission of the epigrams present in the *Certamen*, and indeed of the *Certamen* itself: adaptability to new contexts and use in schools will appear once again as two of the main characteristics of this material.

Below is Menci's edition of the text. The supplements she proposes are based on Allen's text of the *Certamen*.

TEXT

1 Ο]μ̣ῃ̣ρου εν Αργει
Vacuum
θειος Ομηρος οδ εστιν ος Ε]λ̣λαδα την [μεγα
λαυχον πασαν εκοσμησ]εν καλλιεπι̣ [σοφιηι
] _____
] δ̣ .ῳ̣ριαυχεα Τ̣ροιην̣ [η
5 ρειψαν ποινην ηυ]κομου Ελενης̣ > > –[

[155] The text of the papyrus had previously been catalogued as marginal scholia: 'Papyrus marginal scholia from Egypt. Mentions Argos, Troy and Helen.' LDAB and MP[3] have now been updated; cf. Menci 2012: 43 n. 3.

[156] URL: http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/records/665.html. Information about the papyrus is available in the online catalogues MP[3] (0077.02) and LDAB (5947); first published by Menci 2012. An image (72 and 150 dpi) is available at the URL above; reproduction in Menci 2012.

For the sake of clarity and following Menci's example, I reproduce here the corresponding text in the *Certamen*:

θεῖος Ὅμηρος ὅδ' ἐστὶν ὃς Ἑλλάδα τὴν μεγάλαυχον
πᾶσαν ἐκόσμησεν καλλιεπεῖ σοφίῃ,
ἔξοχα δ' Ἀργείους, οἳ τὴν θεοτειχέα Τροίην
ἤρειψαν ποινὴν ἠϋκόμου Ἑλένης.

COMMENTARY

The first relevant peculiarity of the papyrus text is that at l. 4 it transmits a variant reading: while the *Certamen* reads θεοτειχέα ('built by a god'), the papyrus gives the reading .ριαυχεα that has been supplemented by the editor as ἐριαυχέα ('greatly glorious'). This case of variation is especially interesting because both words seem to be attested nowhere else.[157] The two variants also show how the epigram could be adapted to different contexts and respond to different traditions. The papyrus reading ἐριαυχέα seems to be suitable for a school context. It creates a balance between the two sides of the Trojan war, each qualified with a compound of αὔχη, 'pride': Ἑλλάδα τὴν μεγάλαυχον and τὴν ἐριαυχέα Τροίην. This correspondence between ἐριαυχέα, a *hapax*, and μεγάλαυχον, an attested adjective, can also aim at explaining the meaning of the former on the basis of the latter. Moreover, ἐριαυχέα is very similar in sound with a Homeric word, ἐριαύχην (an epithet for horses, 'with large neck'): this similarity may have had a role in the creation of the *hapax* and we may see this as a didactic game on Homeric vocabulary. On the other hand, it may also

[157] Menci 2012: 46: 'L'alternativa al tràdito θεοτειχέα («con le mura costruite da un dio»), che è *hapax legomenon*, sembra proprio un altro *hapax*, ἐριαυχέα («grandemente gloriosa»)'. Menci 2012: 45: 'in un papiro che conserva soltanto sei parole pressoché intere, di cui tre nomi propri, è presente sicuramente una variante di un *hapax* (θεοτειχέα), che è a sua volta *hapax* (r. 4, ἐριαυχέα); ciò potrebbe dunque accordarsi con l'impressione che si ha da almeno tre degli altri quattro papiri testimoni del *Certamen*, e cioè la libertà di trattamento che caratterizza testi di questo genere, appartenenti alla letteratura di consumo o scolastica.'

be noted that θεοτειχέα puts the maximum emphasis on the achievement of the Argives by saying that the walls they destroyed were a creation of the gods, and this makes it fit the encomiastic context of the corresponding passage in the *Certamen*.[158] However, some readers may have objected that what is built by the gods cannot be destroyed by men: ἐριαυχέα may therefore have worked as a corrective reading. The presence of ἐριαυχέα in place of θεοτειχέα may also correspond to a tradition about the Trojan walls according to which they were not built entirely by the gods. In *Il*. 6.433-4 Andromache mentions a point on the wall that is particularly vulnerable and open to assault; Pindar (*Ol*. 8.31-46), referring perhaps to this very passage, says that a portion of the wall was built by a mortal rather than by Apollo and Poseidon.[159]

The papyrus also shows that the epigram could circulate in longer or shorter versions. The editor suggests that the quotation of the epigram on the papyrus may be limited to the first four lines.[160] The longer version of the *Certamen* may be an innovation designed to emphasise the quasi-divine status that Homer has achieved at this point in the narrative.

The fragment may have been part of a roll that contained a collection of epigrams.[161] Although it is later than the assumed time of the composition of the *Certamen*, it suggests how biographical compilations such as the *Certamen* may have come into being: authors used material that was available in collections, on which they could draw to enrich and shape the text. The fact that P.Duk. inv.

---

[158] In the *Certamen* the Argives feel honoured by a passage which Homer performs at Argos and pay him back with signs of divine respect. See esp. *Cert*. 302-8.

[159] See further Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 33 and 202.

[160] Menci 2012: 43: '…il r. 5 termina con due *diplai* e un tratto orizzontale la cui funzione potrebbe essere, oltre che riempitiva, indicativa della fine del testo.'

[161] Menci (2012: 45) 'Le peculiarità paleografiche di P.Duk. inv. 665 suggeriscono una copia ad uso privato; la particolare mise en page indirizza verso l'ipotesi di un frammento di rotolo contenente una raccolta di passi, in particolare di epigrammi, destinata alla scuola; tuttavia non si può escludere la possibilità di un foglio isolato.'

665 was probably meant for school use suggests that much of this process took place in school environments.

3. *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*: *Edition.*

Note

This edition is based on an inspection of the digital images of the manuscript available online on the website of the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana: http://opac.bml.firenze.sbn.it/Manuscript.htm?Segnatura=Plut.56.1

The line numbers are Allen's.

Sigla

L = *Laur. Plut*. 56, 1

S = *Leid. Voss. Gr. qu*. 18 (apograph of **L** copied by Henri Estienne).

E = *Homeri et Hesiodi Certamen. Matronis et aliorum parodiae. Homericorum heroum epitaphia. Excudebat Henr. Stephanus.* Geneva 1573 (*editio princeps*).

Editions

Nietzsche = Nietzsche, F., ed. (1871). "Certamen quod dicitur Homeri et Hesiodi. E codice florentino post Henricum Stephanum denuo edidit Fridericus Nietzsche Numburgensis." *Acta societatis philologae Lipsiensis* 1: 1-23.

Allen = Allen, T. W., ed. (1912). *Homeri Opera Tomus V: Hymnos Cyclum Fragmenta Margiten Batrachomyomachian Vitas Continens*. Oxford.

Rzach = Rzach, A., ed. (1913). *Hesiodi Carmina recensuit Aloisius Rzach. Editio Tertia. Accedit Certamen Quod Dicitur Homeri Et Hesiodi.* Leipzig.

Evelyn-White = Evelyn White, H. G., ed. (1914). *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns, and Homerica.* Cambridge (MA).

Wilamowitz = Wilamowitz, U. v., ed. (1916). *Vitae Homeri et Hesiodi in usum scholarum.* Bonn.

Colonna = Colonna, A., ed. (1959). *Opera et dies / Hesiodi; recensuit Aristides Colonna*. Milan.

Avezzù = Avezzù, G., ed. (1982). *Alcidamante. Orazioni e frammenti*. Rome.

West = West, M. L., ed. (2003). *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of*

Homer. Cambridge (MA).

Earlier editions consulted:

Barnes = Barnes, J., ed. (1711). *Ilias et Odyssea. Accedunt Opera Minora*. Cambridge.

Boissonade = Boissonade, F., ed. (1824). *Hesiodus*. Paris.

Goettling = Goettling, C. W., ed. (1843). *Hesiodi Carmina*. Gotha.

Westermann = Westermann, A., ed. (1845). *Biographoi: Vitarum Scriptores Graeci Minores*. Braunschweig.

Other critical studies mentioned in the apparatus are cross-referenced to the Bibliography.

Text

Περὶ Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου καὶ τοῦ γένους καὶ ἀγῶνος αὐτῶν

Ὅμηρον καὶ Ἡσίοδον τοὺς θειοτάτους ποιητὰς πάντες ἄνθρωποι πολίτας ἰδίους εὔχονται λέγεσθαι. ἀλλ' Ἡσίοδος μὲν τὴν ἰδίαν ὀνομάσας πατρίδα πάντας τῆς φιλονεικίας ἀπήλλαξεν εἰπὼν ὡς ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ·

εἵσατο δ' ἄγχ' Ἑλικῶνος ὀιζυρῇ ἐνὶ κώμῃ
Ἄσκρῃ, χεῖμα κακῇ, θέρει ἀργαλέῃ, οὐδέ ποτ' ἐσθλῇ.

Ὅμηρον δὲ πᾶσαι ὡς εἰπεῖν αἱ πόλεις καὶ οἱ ἔποικοι αὐτῶν παρ' ἑαυτοῖς γεγενῆσθαι λέγουσιν. καὶ πρῶτοί γε Σμυρναῖοι Μέλητος ὄντα τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς ποταμοῦ καὶ Κρηϊθίδος νύμφης κεκλῆσθαί φασι πρότερον Μελησιγενῆ, ὕστερον μέντοι τυφλωθέντα Ὅμηρον μετονομασθῆναι διὰ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων συνήθη προσηγορίαν. Χῖοι δὲ πάλιν τεκμήρια φέρουσιν ἴδιον εἶναι πολίτην λέγοντες καὶ περισῴζεσθαί τινας ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς Ὁμηρίδας καλουμένους. Κολοφώνιοι δὲ καὶ τόπον δεικνύουσιν, ἐν ᾧ φασιν αὐτὸν γράμματα διδάσκοντα τῆς ποιήσεως ἄρξασθαι καὶ ποιῆσαι πρῶτον τὸν Μαργίτην.

5-6 Hes. *Op*. 639-40 **5** νάσσατο Hes.

2 λεγέσθαι **L** corr. **S** : γενέσθαι Barnes Nietzsche Rzach Evelyn-White **5** εἴσατο **L** corr. **S** **7** ἄποικοι Hermann (1835: 282) Nietzsche Evelyn-White **8** γεγεννῆσθαι **…** τε **L** corr. **S** **10** Κρηθηίδος edd. Κριθηίδος Barnes; Μελησιγένη edd.

περὶ δὲ τῶν γονέων αὐτοῦ πάλιν πολλὴ διαφωνία παρὰ
πᾶσίν ἐστιν. Ἑλλάνικος <4 F 5c = fr. 5 Fowler> μὲν γὰρ καὶ Κλεάνθης
<fr. 592 Arnim; cf. et 84 F 40> Μαίονα λέγουσιν, Εὐγαίων <535 F 2 = 2 Fowler>
δὲ Μέλητα, Καλλικλῆς <758 F 13c> δὲ †Μασαγόραν, Δημόκριτος δὲ <ὁ>
Τροιζήνιος <*Suppl. Hell*. 378> Δαήμονα ἔμπορον, ἔνιοι δὲ Θαμύραν, Αἰγύπτιοι
δὲ Μενέμαχον ἱερογραμματέα, εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ Τηλέμαχον τὸν
Ὀδυσσέως· μητέρα δὲ οἱ μὲν Μῆτιν, οἱ δὲ Κρηθηίδα,
οἱ δὲ Θεμίτην, οἱ δὲ Εὐγνηθώ, ἔνιοι δὲ Ἰθακησίαν τινὰ
ὑπὸ Φοινίκων ἀπεμπολη θεῖσαν, οἱ δὲ Καλλιόπην τὴν Μοῦ-
σαν, τινὲς δὲ Πολυκάστην τὴν Νέστορος. ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ
Μέλης, ὡς δέ τινές φασι Μελησιγενής, ὡς <δ'> ἔνιοι
Αὐλητής. ὀνομασθῆναι <δ'> αὐτόν φασί τινες Ὅμηρον διὰ τὸ
τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ὅμηρον δοθῆναι ὑπὸ Κυπρίων Πέρσαις, οἱ

19 Νεάνθης von Arnim (1905: 133) Colonna **20** Μαίονα: μ in ras. **L** rest. Sturz (1787: fr. 171) : βίωνα **E**; Εὐγαίων: γ in ras. **L** rest. Meineke (1843: 61) : Εὐμαίων **S E** **21** †Μασαγόραν Wilamowitz : Δμασαγόραν Barnes Westermann Allen Colonna West (coll. Eust. *Od*. 1713.17) Μνασαγόραν Rzach Evelyn-White Μαιαγόραν Nietzsche; Δημοκρίνης in app. Allen (coll. Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.3) **23** ἱερογραμματέα: ιε in ras. **L** rest. Nauck (coll. Tz. *Alleg*. 60) : προγραμματέα **S** in marg. Nietzsche **25** Θεμίστην **S** edd. Θεμιστώ Barnes (coll. Paus. 10.24); Εὐγνηθώ: Ὑρνηθώ Westermann edd. (coll. Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.1) praeter Nietzsche Evelyn-White; Ἰδακησίαν Rzach **28** Μελησιγένης edd. **29** αὐλητήν **L** : Ἄλτης Welcker (1835 I: 149) edd. (coll. Schol. T *Il*. 22.51) **29-30** post φασί et αὐτοῦ dist. **L**

δὲ διὰ τὴν πήρωσιν τῶν ὀμμάτων· παρὰ γὰρ τοῖς Αἰολεῦσιν οὕτως οἱ πηροὶ καλοῦνται. ὅπερ δὲ ἀκηκόαμεν ἐπὶ τοῦ θειοτάτου αὐτοκράτορος Ἀδριανοῦ εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τῆς Πυθίας περὶ Ὁμήρου, ἐκθησόμεθα. τοῦ γὰρ βασιλέως πυθομένου πόθεν Ὅμηρος καὶ τίνος, ἀπεφοίβασε δι' ἑξαμέτρου τόνδε τὸν τρόπον·

ἄγνωστόν μ' ἔρεαι γενεὴν καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν
ἀμβροσίου σειρῆνος. ἕδος δ' Ἰθακήσιός ἐστιν,
Τηλέμαχος δὲ πατὴρ καὶ Νεστορέη Ἐπικάστη
μήτηρ, ἥ μιν ἔτικτε βροτῶν πολὺ πάνσοφον ἄνδρα.

οἷς μάλιστα δεῖ πιστεύειν διά τε τὸν πυθόμενον καὶ τὸν ἀποκρινάμενον, ἄλλως τε οὕτως τοῦ ποιητοῦ μεγαλοφυῶς τὸν προπάτορα διὰ τῶν ἐπῶν δεδοξακότος.

37-40 *AP* 14.102 **37** ἐρέεις γενεῆς καὶ πατρίδος αἴης *AP* **38** Ἰθάκη τις Ὁμήρου *AP* **39** Πολυκάστη *AP* **40** πολυπάνσοφον ἄλλων *AP*

33 ἀδιανοῦ **L** corr. **S** in marg. **39** Πολυκάστη Nietzsche in app. West (coll. *Od*. 3.464 et *Cert*. 27) **40** πέρι πάνσοφον West

ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν προγενέστερον Ἡσιόδου φασὶν
εἶναι, τινὲς δὲ νεώτερον καὶ συγγενῆ. γενεαλογοῦσι δὲ
οὕτως· Ἀπόλλωνός φασι καὶ Θοώσης τῆς Ποσειδῶνος
γενέσθαι Λίνον, Λίνου δὲ Πίερον, Πιέρου δὲ καὶ νύμφης
Μεθώνης Οἴαγρον, Οἰάγρου δὲ καὶ Καλλιόπης Ὀρφέα,
Ὀρφέως δὲ Ὄρτην, τοῦ δὲ Ἁρμονίδην, τοῦ δὲ Φιλοτέρπην,
τοῦ δὲ Εὔφημον, τοῦ δὲ Ἐπιφράδην, τοῦ δὲ Μελάνωπον,
τούτου δὲ Δῖον καὶ Ἀπέλλαιον, Δίου δὲ καὶ Πυκιμήδης τῆς
Ἀπόλλωνος θυγατρὸς Ἡσίοδον καὶ Πέρσην· Πέρσου δὲ Μαίο-
να, Μαίονος δὲ θυγατρὸς καὶ Μέλητος τοῦ ποταμοῦ Ὅμηρον.

46-53: cf. Charax (103 F 62) apud Suda Ὅμηρος 1 **49-53** cf. Hellanicus (4 F 5b = fr. 5 Fowler), Damastes (5 F 11b = fr. 11 Fowler), Pherecydes (3 F 167 = fr. 167 Fowler) apud Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 4

46 Αἰθούσης Nietzsche Rzach Evelyn-White (coll. 103 F 62) **49** Ὄρτην: Δρῆν Goettling Nietzsche Rzach Evelyn-White (coll. 103 F 62) Ὄθρυν Barnes Ὄτρυν Welcker (1835, I: 149); τοῦ δὲ Εὐκλέα post Ὄρτην add. Goettling Nietzsche Rzach Evelyn-White West (coll. 103 F 62); Ἁρμονίδην: Ἰαδμονίδην Nietzsche Rzach (coll. Hdt. 2.134, Plu. *De Sera Numinis Vindicta* 557) id est Ἰδμονίδην (cf. 103 F 62, Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 4) **52** Πέρσου: Ἀπέλλου Nietzsche Ἀπελλοῦ Rzach Wilamowitz Evelyn-White Ἀπελλαίου West **53** θυγατρὸς καὶ: καὶ θυγατρός Nietzsche Rzach Evelyn-White

τινὲς δὲ συνακμάσαι φασὶν αὐτοὺς ὥστε καὶ ἀγωνίσασθαι
ὁμόσε <γενομένους> ἐν Αὐλίδι τῆς Βοιωτίας. ποιήσαντα γὰρ τὸν Μαργίτην
Ὅμηρον περιέρχεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν ῥαψῳδοῦντα, ἐλθόντα δὲ
καὶ εἰς Δελφοὺς περὶ τῆς πατρίδος αὑτοῦ πυνθάνεσθαι τίς
εἴη, τὴν δὲ Πυθίαν εἰπεῖν·
ἔστιν Ἴος νῆσος μητρὸς πατρίς, ἥ σε θανόντα
δέξεται· ἀλλὰ νέων παίδων αἴνιγμα φύλαξαι.
τὸν δὲ ἀκούσαντα περιίστασθαι μὲν τὴν εἰς Ἴον ἄφιξιν,
διατρίβειν δὲ περὶ τὴν ἐκεῖ χώραν. κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν

59-60 *AP* 14.65; Paus. 10.24; Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 5; St. Byz. s.v. Ἴος; Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4 **60** παίδων: ἀνδρῶν Ps.-Plu. Procl.

55 <γενομένους> Busse (1909: 112-3) Wilamowitz West : ἐν Χαλκίδι τῆς Εὐβοίας Nietzsche Evelyn-White ἐξ Αὐλίδος τῆς Βοιωτίας Gallavotti (1929: 40 n. 2) Avezzù (coll. Hes. *Op*. 651)

χρόνον Γανύκτωρ ἐπιτάφιον τοῦ πατρὸς Ἀμφιδάμαντος βασιλέως Εὐβοίας ἐπιτελῶν πάντας τοὺς ἐπισήμους ἄνδρας οὐ μόνον ῥώμῃ καὶ τάχει, ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα μεγάλαις δωρεαῖς τιμῶν συνεκάλεσεν. καὶ οὗτοι οὖν ἐκ τύχης, ὥς φασι, συμβαλόντες ἀλλήλοις ἦλθον εἰς τὴν Χαλκίδα. τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνος ἄλλοι τέ τινες τῶν ἐπισήμων Χαλκιδέων ἐκαθέζοντο κριταὶ καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν Πανοίδης, ἀδελφὸς ὢν τοῦ τετελευτηκότος. ἀμφοτέρων δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν θαυμαστῶς ἀγωνισαμένων νικῆσαί φασι τὸν Ἡσίοδον τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον· προελθόντα γὰρ εἰς τὸ μέσον πυνθάνεσθαι τοῦ Ὁμήρου καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον, τὸν δὲ Ὅμηρον ἀποκρίνασθαι. φησὶν οὖν Ἡσίοδος·

69-102 cf. P.Petr. I 25 (1) **69** Πανήδης P.Petr. I 25 (1) l. 4

63 Γαννύκτωρ **L** **69** Πανείδης Hermann (1835: 151) Nietzsche Evelyn-White Πανήδης Rzach Allen Wilamowitz Colonna Avezzù West (coll. P.Petr. I 25)

υἱὲ Μέλητος Ὅμηρε θεῶν ἄπο μήδεα εἰδὼς
εἶπ' ἄγε μοι πάμπρωτα τί φέρτατόν ἐστι βροτοῖσιν;

Ὅμηρος·

ἀρχὴν μὲν μὴ φῦναι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον,
φύντα δ' ὅμως ὤκιστα πύλας Ἀίδαο περῆσαι.

Ἡσίοδος τὸ δεύτερον·

εἶπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τοῦτο θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ὅμηρε,
τί θνητοῖς κάλλιστον ὀίεαι ἐν φρεσὶν εἶναι;

ὁ δέ·

ὁππότ' ἂν εὐφροσύνη μὲν ἔχῃ κατὰ δῆμον ἅπαντα,
δαιτυμόνες δ' ἀνὰ δώματ' ἀκουάζωνται ἀοιδοῦ
ἥμενοι ἑξείης, παρὰ δὲ πλήθωσι τράπεζαι
σίτου καὶ κρειῶν, μέθυ δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων
οἰνοχόος φορέῃσι καὶ ἐγχείῃ δεπάεσσιν.
τοῦτό τί μοι κάλλιστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶν εἴδεται εἶναι.

78-9 Thgn. 425 + 427; Stob. 4.52.22; P.Petr. I 25 (ll. 12-5) **78** ἀρχήν: πάντων Thgn. **79** ὅπως Thgn. Stob. P.Petr. I 25 **84-89** *Od*. 9.6-11 **84** ὁππότ' ἂν εὐφροσύνη: ἢ ὅτ' ἐϋφροσύνη *Od*. 9.6 **89** εἴδεται: φαίνεται P.Petr. I 25 (ll. 27-8).

79 ὅπως Nietzsche Rzach Wilamowitz Evelyn-White (coll. Thgn. 425) **82** θνητοῖσιν ἄριστον **L** corr. Rzach Evelyn-White Allen West (coll. P.Petr. I 25 l. 18)

ῥηθέντων δὲ τῶν ἐπῶν, οὕτω σφοδρῶς φασι θαυμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς στίχους ὥστε χρυσοῦς αὐτοὺς προσαγορευθῆναι, καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν ταῖς κοιναῖς θυσίαις πρὸ τῶν δείπνων καὶ σπονδῶν προκατεύχεσθαι πάντας. ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος ἀχθεσθεὶς ἐπὶ τῇ Ὁμήρου εὐημερίᾳ ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ἀπόρων ὥρμησεν ἐπερώτησιν καί φησι τούσδε τοὺς στίχους·

Μοῦσ' ἄγε μοι τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα
τῶν μὲν μηδὲν ἄειδε, σὺ δ' ἄλλης μνῆσαι ἀοιδῆς.

ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος βουλόμενος ἀκολούθως τὸ ἄπορον λῦσαι φησίν·

οὐδέ ποτ' ἀμφὶ Διὸς τύμβῳ καναχήποδες ἵπποι
ἅρματα συντρίψουσιν ἐρίζοντες περὶ νίκης.

100-1 Plu. *Sept. Sap. Conv.* 154a **101** ἐρίζοντες: ἐπειγόμενοι Plu.

90 τούτων τῶν ἐπῶν Rzach Allen Evelyn-White Wilamowitz West (coll. P.Petr. I 25 ll. 28-9) **91** τοὺς στίχους: τὰ ἔπη **L** corr. Rzach Allen Evelyn-White Wilamowitz West (coll. P.Petr. I 25 l. 31); τοὺς στίχους ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων Allen **92** αὐτοὺς <στίχους> Nietzsche (στίχους in marg. **S**) **97** Μοῦσά γέ Rzach **100** καναχήποδες ἵπποι om. **L S** rest. Barnes (coll. Plu.; cf. et P.Petr. I 25 l. 45-6)

καλῶς δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀπαντήσαντος ἐπὶ τὰς ἀμφιβόλους
γνώμας ὥρμησεν ὁ Ἡσίοδος, καὶ πλείονας στίχους λέγων
ἠξίου καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστον συμφώνως ἀποκρίνασθαι τὸν Ὅμηρον.
ἔστιν οὖν ὁ μὲν πρῶτος Ἡσιόδου, ὁ δὲ ἕξῆς Ὁμήρου, ἐνίοτε δὲ
καὶ διὰ δύο στίχων τὴν ἐπερώτησιν ποιουμένου τοῦ Ἡσιόδου·
Hes. δεῖπνον ἔπειθ' εἵλοντο βοῶν κρέα καὐχένας ἵππων
Hom. ἔκλυον ἱδρώοντας, ἐπεὶ πολέμοιο κορέσθην.
Hes. καὶ Φρύγες, οἳ πάντων ἀνδρῶν ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἄριστοι
Hom. ἀνδράσι λιστῆρσιν ἐπ' ἀκτῆς δόρπον ἑλέσθαι.
Hes. χερσὶ βαλὼν ἰοῖσιν ὅλων κατὰ φῦλα γιγάντων
Hom. Ἡρακλῆς ἀπέλυσεν ἀπ' ὤμων καμπύλα τόξα.

107-8 Ar. *Pax* 1282-3 **107** δεῖπνον ἔπειθ' εἵλοντο: ὡς οἱ μὲν δαίνυντο Ar. **108** ἐπεὶ πολέμου ἐκόρεσθεν Ar.

108 πτολέμου **L S** corr. **E**; πολέμου ἐκόρεσθεν Wilamowitz (coll. Ar. *Pax* 1283) **110** δόρπα πένεσθαι Wilamowitz West δοῦλοι ἔπεσθαι in app. Nietzsche **111-112** hoc ordine Nietzsche pler. edd. 112-111 **L** Allen Colonna **111** ἰοῖσιν: ἰούς Nietzsche in app.; ὄλλων **L**; ἰοὺς οὖλον Rzach Evelyn-White ἰοὺς ἀνόμων Wilamowitz West **112** Ἡρακλέης edd. praeter Wilamowitz

Hes. οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἀνδρός τ' ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἀνάλκιδός ἐστι

Hom. μητρός, ἐπεὶ πόλεμος χαλεπὸς πάσῃσι γυναιξίν.

Hes. οὔτ' ἄρ σοί γε πατὴρ ἐμίγη καὶ πότνια μήτηρ

Hom. †σῶμα τό γ' ἐσπείραντο† διὰ χρυσῆν Ἀφροδίτην.

Hes. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δμήθη γάμῳ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα

Hom. Καλλιστὼ κατέπεφνεν ἀπ' ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖ<ο>.

Hes. ὣς οἳ μὲν δαίνυντο πανήμεροι, οὐδὲν ἔχοντες

Hom. οἴκοθεν, ἀλλὰ παρεῖχεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων.

Hes. δεῖπνον δειπνήσαντες ἐνὶ σποδῷ αἰθαλοέσσῃ

Hes. σύλλεγον ὀστέα λευκὰ Διὸς κατατεθνειῶτος

Hom. παιδὸς ὑπερθύμου Σαρπηδόνος ἀντιθέοιο.

Hes. ἡμεῖς δ' ἂμ πεδίον Σιμοέντιον ἥμενοι οὕτως

Hes. ἴομεν ἐκ νηῶν ὁδὸν ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἔχοντες

Hom. φάσγανα κωπήεντα καὶ αἰγανέας δολιχαύλους.

115 οὐ γάρ Westermann ἦ τ'ἄρα Hermann (1835: 284) Nietzsche αὐτάρ Rzach Evelyn-White οὔ τ'ἄρ Wilamowitz; ἐμίγην Wilamowitz **116** cruces West **:** τότε σπείραντε Hermann Nietzsche Wilamowitz τό γε σπείραντε Rzach Evelyn-White **122** κατατεθνηῶτος Goettling Allen Rzach Evelyn-White Colonna **124** σιμοούντιον **L** corr. Barnes; οὕτως **L** Wilamowitz : αὔτως Barnes edd. cet.; ἥμενοι οὕτως inter cruces West; post 124 lacunam stat. Barnes Goettling Westermann

Hes. δὴ τότ’ ἀριστῆες κοῦροι χείρεσσι θαλάσσης

Hom. ἄσμενοι ἐσσυμένως τε ἀπείρυσαν ὠκύαλον ναῦν.

Hes. κολχίδ’ ἔπειτ’ ἤγοντο καὶ Αἰήτην βασιλῆα

Hom. φεῦγον, ἐπεὶ γίγνωσκον ἀνέστιον ἠδ’ ἀθέμιστον.

Hes. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τε καὶ ἔκπιον οἶδμα θαλάσσης

Hom. ποντοπορεῖν ἤμελλον ἐυσέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν.

Hes. τοῖσιν δ’ Ἀτρείδης μεγάλ’ εὔχετο πᾶσιν ὀλέσθαι

Hom. μηδέ ποτ’ ἐν πόντῳ, καὶ φωνήσας ἔπος ηὔδα·

Hes. ἐσθίετ’ ὦ ξεῖνοι, καὶ πίνετε· μηδέ τις ὑμῶν

Hes. οἴκαδε νοστήσειε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν

Hom. πημανθείς, ἀλλ’ αὖτις ἀπήμονες οἴκαδ’ ἵκοισθε.

127 ἀριστή **L** corr. **S** **129** ἔπειθ’ ἵκοντο **L** corr. Wilamowitz Rzach Evelyn-White West; βασιλεῖα **L** **132** ἐυσσέλμων edd. **133-7** sic Goettling Evelyn-White Di Benedetto (1969: 163) Avezzù West : 133-134 Hesiodo 135-137 Homero tribuit Hermann, 133-136 Hesiodo 137 Homero Nietzsche, 134 καὶ φωνήσας ἔπος ηὔδα Hesiodo Busse Rzach Wilamowitz

πρὸς πάντα δὲ τοῦ Ὁμήρου καλῶς ἀπαντήσαντος πάλιν φησὶν ὁ Ἡσίοδος·

τοῦτό τι δή μοι μοῦνον ἐειρομένῳ κατάλεξον,
πόσσοι ἅμ' Ἀτρείδῃσιν ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον Ἀχαιοί;

ὁ δὲ διὰ λογιστικοῦ προβλήματος ἀποκρίνεται οὕτως·

πεντήκοντ' ἦσαν πυρὸς ἐσχάραι, ἐν δὲ ἑκάστῃ
πεντήκοντ' ὀβελοί, περὶ δὲ κρέα πεντήκοντα·
τρὶς δὲ τριηκόσιοι περὶ ἓν κρέας ἦσαν Ἀχαιοί.

τοῦτο δὲ εὑρίσκεται πλῆθος ἄπιστον· τῶν γὰρ ἐσχαρῶν οὐσῶν πεντήκοντα ὀβελίσκοι γίνονται πεντακόσιοι καὶ
χιλιάδες β′, κρεῶν δὲ δεκαδύο μυριάδες ,ε †ϋν̃† . . . κατὰ

142 ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος Barnes Goettling **146-8** interpolationem stat. West **148** ,ε*** Westermann Nietzsche Rzach Allen Colonna <χιλιάδες> ,ε Boissonade Wilamowitz <καὶ χιλιάδες> ε′ †ϋν̃† West

πάντα δὴ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ὑπερτεροῦντος φθονῶν ὁ Ἡσίοδος
ἄρχεται πάλιν·

υἱὲ Μέλητος Ὅμηρ’ εἴ περ τιμῶσί σε Μοῦσαι,
ὡς λόγος, ὑψίστοιο Διὸς μεγάλοιο θύγατρες,
λέξον μέτρῳ ἐναρμόζων ὅ τι δὴ θνητοῖσι
κάλλιστόν <τε> καὶ ἔχθιστον· <πο>θέω γὰρ ἀκοῦσαι.

ὁ δέ φησι·

Ἡσίοδ’ ἔκγονε Δίου ἑκόντα με ταῦτα κελεύεις
εἰπεῖν· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μάλα τοι πρόφρων ἀγορεύσω.
κάλλιστον μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔσται μέτρον εἶναι
αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ, τῶν δὲ κακῶν ἔχθιστον ἁπάντων.
ἄλλο δὲ πᾶν ὅ τι σῷ θυμῷ φίλον ἐστὶν ἐρώτα.

Hes. πῶς ἂν ἄριστ’ οἰκοῖντο πόλεις καὶ ἐν ἤθεσι ποίοις;

Hom. εἰ μὴ κερδαίνειν ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσχρῶν ἐθέλοιεν,
οἱ δ’ ἀγαθοὶ τιμῷντο, δίκη δ’ ἀδίκοισιν ἐπείη.

152 ὑψίστοι **L** corr. **S** in marg. **153** μέτρον **L** corr. Barnes Wilamowitz West; ἐναρμόζον **L** corr. Boissonade edd. **154** <τε> **S** <πο>θέω: θεω **L** ἴσως ποθέω **S** in marg. post **159** versum 165 pos. **SE** lacunam stat. Nietzsche Rzach **163** τιμοῖντο **LSE** post 163 lacunam stat. Hermann

Hes. εὔχεσθαι δὲ θεοῖς ὅ τι πάντων ἐστὶν ἄμεινον;

Hom. εὔνουν εἶναι ἑαυτῷ <ἀεὶ> χρόνον ἐς τὸν ἅπαντα.

Hes. ἐν δ' ἐλαχίστῳ ἄριστον ἔχεις ὅ τι φύεται εἰπεῖν;

Hom. ὡς μὲν ἐμῇ γνώμη φρένες ἐσθλαὶ σώμασιν ἀνδρῶν.

Hes. ἡ δὲ δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἀνδρείη δύναται τί;

Hom. κοινὰς ὠφελίας ἰδίοις μόχθοισι πορίζειν.

Hes. τῆς σοφίης δὲ τί τέκμαρ ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι πέφυκεν;

Hom. γιγνώσκειν τὰ παρόντ' ὀρθῶς, καιρῷ δ' ἅμ' ἕπεσθαι.

Hes. πιστεῦσαι δὲ βροτοῖς ποῖον χρέος ἄξιόν ἐστιν;

Hom. οἷς αὐτὸς κίνδυνος ἐπὶ πραχθεῖσιν ἕπηται.

Hes. ἡ δ' εὐδαιμονίη τί ποτ' ἀνθρώποισι καλεῖται;

Hom. λυπηθέντ' ἐλάχιστα θανεῖν ἡσθέντα <τε> πλεῖστα.

164 θεοῖσι τί Nietzsche Rzach Wilamowitz West **165** <ἀεὶ> **S** Nietzsche Allen Evelyn-White Colonna : εὔνομον εἶναι ἑῷ θυμῷ Rzach εὔνουν εἶναι ἑοῖ αὐτῷ Wilamowitz †εἶναι ἑαυτῷ† West **166** ἔχειν σ' **L** corr. edd. **167** ἐμῇ γνώμῃ Nietzsche Rzach Allen Evelyn-White Colonna West **168** ἀνδρία **L**; δύναταί τι **L** **169** ὠφελείας **L** corr. **S** **171** γινώσκειν **LSE** **172** βροτοῖσι **LSE** corr. Barnes **173** οἷς αὐτοῖς Wilamowitz; ἔτι **L** corr. **S** in marg. **175** <τε> **S**

ῥηθέντων δὲ καὶ τούτων, οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες πάντες τὸν Ὅμηρον ἐκέλευον στεφανοῦν, ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Πανοίδης ἐκέλευσεν ἕκαστον τὸ κάλλιστον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ποιημάτων εἰπεῖν. Ἡσίοδος οὖν ἔφη πρῶτος·

Πληιάδων Ἀτλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομενάων
ἄρχεσθ' ἀμήτου, ἀρότοιό τε δυσομενάων·
αἳ δή τοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἤματα τεσσαράκοντα
κεκρύφαται, αὖθις δὲ περιπλομένου ἐνιαυτοῦ
φαίνονται, τὰ πρῶτα χαρασσομένοιο σιδήρου.
οὗτός τοι πεδίων πέλεται νόμος, οἵ τε θαλάσσης
ἐγγύθι ναιετάουσ', οἵ τ' ἄγκεα βησσήεντα
πόντου κυμαίνοντος ἀπόπροθι πίονα χῶρον
ναίουσιν· γυμνὸν σπείρειν, γυμνὸν δὲ βοωτεῖν,
γυμνόν τ' ἀμάειν, ὅτ' ἂν ὥρια πάντα πέλωνται.

180-9 = Hes. *Op*. 383-92 **181** ἀρότοιο δὲ Hes. *Op*. 384 **183** αὖτις Hes. *Op*. 386 **189** εἴ χ' ὥρια πάντ' ἐθέλησθα Hes. *Op*. 392

177 Πανοίδης cf. 69 **181** ἀμητοῖο **L** corr. edd. (coll. *Op.* 384) **183** αὖτις Nietzsche Allen Rzach Evelyn-White Colonna Avezzù coll. *Op*. 386 **186** ἄγγεα **L** corr. edd. **189** γυμνούς θ' **L** corr. edd. (coll. *Op*. 392)

μεθ' ὃν Ὅμηρος·

ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' Αἴαντας δοιοὺς ἵσταντο φάλαγγες
καρτεραί, ἂς οὔτ' ἄν κεν Ἄρης ὀνόσαιτο μετελθών
οὔτε κ' Ἀθηναίη λαοσσόος. οἱ γὰρ ἄριστοι
κρινθέντες Τρῶάς τε καὶ Ἕκτορα δῖον ἔμιμνον
φράξαντες δόρυ δουρί, σάκος σάκεϊ προθελύμνῳ·
ἀσπὶς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ,
ψαῦον δ' ἱππόκομοι κόρυθες λαμπροῖσι φάλοισι
νευόντων· ὡς πυκνοὶ ἐφέστασαν ἀλλήλοισιν
ἔφριξεν δὲ μάχη φθισίμβροτος ἐγχείῃσι
μακραῖς, ἂς εἶχον ταμεσίχροας. ὄσσε δ' ἄμερδεν
αὐγὴ χαλκείη κορύθων ἄπο λαμπομενάων
θωρήκων τε νεοσμήκτων σακέων τε φαεινῶν
ἐρχομένων ἄμυδις. μάλα κεν θρασυκάρδιος εἴη
ὃς τότε γηθήσειεν ἰδὼν πόνον οὐδ' ἀκάχοιτο.

191-204 = Hom. *Il*. 13.126-33 et 13.339-44 **200** μακρῇς Hom. *Il*. 13.340

196 ἀσπὶς δ' ἄρ' **L** corr. edd. (coll. *Il*. 13.131) : ἀσπὶς δ' Allen **199** φθεισίμβροτος Rzach Colonna Avezzù

θαυμάσαντες δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸν Ὅμηρον οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐπῄνουν, ὡς παρὰ τὸ προσῆκον γεγονότων τῶν ἐπῶν, καὶ ἐκέλευον διδόναι τὴν νίκην. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τὸν Ἡσίοδον ἐστεφάνωσεν εἰπὼν δίκαιον εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ γεωργίαν καὶ εἰρήνην προκαλούμενον νικᾶν, οὐ τὸν πολέμους καὶ σφαγὰς διεξιόντα. τῆς μὲν οὖν νίκης οὕτω φασὶ τυχεῖν τὸν Ἡσίοδον καὶ λαβόντα τρίποδα χαλκοῦν ἀναθεῖναι ταῖς Μούσαις ἐπιγράψαντα·

Ἡσίοδος Μούσαις Ἑλικωνίσι τόνδ' ἀνέθηκεν
ὕμνῳ νικήσας ἐν Χαλκίδι θεῖον Ὅμηρον

τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνος διαλυθέντος διέπλευσεν ὁ Ἡσίοδος εἰς Δελφοὺς χρησόμενος καὶ τῆς νίκης ἀπαρχὰς τῷ θεῷ ἀναθήσων. προσερχομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ τῷ ναῷ ἔνθεον γενομένην τὴν προφῆτίν φασιν εἰπεῖν·

ὄλβιος οὗτος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐμὸν δόμον ἀμφιπολεύει,
Ἡσίοδος Μούσῃσι τετιμένος ἀθανάτῃσιν ·
τοῦ δ' ἤτοι κλέος ἔσται ὅσην τ' ἐπικίδναται ἠώς.
ἀλλὰ Διὸς πεφύλαξο Νεμείου κάλλιμον ἄλσος·
κεῖθι δέ τοι θανάτοιο τέλος πεπρωμένον ἐστίν.

213-14 *AP* 7.53, Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 6, D. Chr. *Or*. 2.11, P.Freib. 1.1b **213** ἀνέθηκα AP

219-23 Tz. *Vita Hesiodi* 166-70 Colonna

210 οὕτως West **221** τοῦ δή τοι **L** corr. Nietzsche West : τοῦ δ' ἦ τοι Allen Rzach Wilamowitz Colonna; ὅσον **S** Nietzsche Rzach Wilamowitz

ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος ἀκούσας τοῦ χρησμοῦ, τῆς Πελοποννήσου
μὲν ἀνεχώρει νομίσας τὴν ἐκεῖ Νεμέαν τὸν θεὸν λέγειν,
εἰς δὲ Οἰνόην τῆς Λοκρίδος ἐλθὼν καταλύει παρ' Ἀμφι-
φάνει καὶ Γανύκτορι, τοῖς Φηγέως παισίν, ἀγνοήσας τὸ
μαντεῖον. ὁ γὰρ τόπος οὗτος ἅπας ἐκαλεῖτο Διὸς Νεμείου
ἱερόν. διατριβῆς δὲ αὐτῷ πλείονος γενομένης ἐν τοῖς
†Οἰνῶσιν† ὑπονοήσαντες οἱ νεανίσκοι τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν
μοιχεύειν τὸν Ἡσίοδον, ἀποκτείναντες εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ τῆς
Εὐβοίας καὶ τῆς Λοκρίδος πέλαγος κατεπόντισαν. τοῦ δὲ
νεκροῦ τριταίου πρὸς τὴν γῆν ὑπὸ δελφίνων προσενεχ-
θέντος ἑορτῆς τινος ἐπιχωρίου παρ' αὐτοῖς οὔσης Ἀριαδνείας
πάντες ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν ἔδραμον καὶ τὸ σῶμα γνωρίσαντες
ἐκεῖνο μὲν πενθήσαντες ἔθαψαν, τοὺς δὲ φονεῖς ἀνεζήτουν.

226-35 cf. P.Ath.Soc.Pap. inv. M2

226 Οἰνεῶνα Westermann Avezzù **230** Οἰνοεῦσιν Friedel (1878-9: 236) Allen Rzach Colonna West Οἰνεωνεῖσιν Sauppe (1850: 155) Nietzsche Avezzù Οἰνεῶσιν Goettling ἐν τῷ Οἰνεῶνι in app. Westermann **231-2** τῆς Βολίνας (vel τῆς Εὐπαλίας) καὶ τῆς Μολυκρίας in app. Nietzsche τῆς Μολυκρίας καὶ τῆς Λοκρίδος Goettling τῆς Ἀχαίας καὶ τῆς Λοκρίδος Westermann Evelyn-White **234** Ῥίου ἁγνείας Nietzsche West (coll. Plu. *Sept. Sap. Conv.* 162e)

οἱ δὲ φοβηθέντες τὴν τῶν πολιτῶν ὀργὴν κατασπάσαντες
ἁλιευτικὸν σκάφος διέπλευσαν εἰς Κρήτην. οὓς κατὰ
μέσον τὸν πλοῦν ὁ Ζεὺς κεραυνώσας κατεπόντωσεν, ὥς
φησιν Ἀλκιδάμας ἐν Μουσείῳ. Ἐρατοσθένης δέ φησιν
ἐν †ἐνηπόδω† Κτίμενον καὶ Ἄντιφον τοὺς Γανύκτορος ἐπὶ τῇ
προειρημένῃ αἰτίᾳ ἀνελόντας σφαγιασθῆναι θεοῖς <τοῖς>
ξενίοις ὑπ' Εὐρυκλέους τοῦ μάντεως. τὴν μέντοι παρθένον
τὴν ἀδελφὴν τῶν προειρημένων μετὰ τὴν φθορὰν ἑαυτὴν
ἀναρτῆσαι, φθαρῆναι δὲ ὑπό τινος ξένου συνόδου τοῦ
Ἡσιόδου Δημώδους ὄνομα· ὃν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναιρεθῆναι ὑπὸ
τῶν αὐτῶν φησιν. ὕστερον δὲ Ὀρχομένιοι κατὰ χρησμὸν
μετενέγκαντες αὐτὸν παρ' αὑτοῖς ἔθαψαν καὶ ἐπέγραψαν
ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ·

Ἄσκρη μὲν πατρὶς πολυλήιος, ἀλλὰ θανόντος
ὀστέα πληξίππων γῆ Μινυῶν κατέχει
Ἡσιόδου, τοῦ πλεῖστον ἐν ἀνθρώποις κλέος ἐστὶν
ἀνδρῶν κρινομένων ἐν βασάνῳ σοφίης.

250-3 *AP* 7.54, Paus. 9.38.4, Tz. *Vita Hesiodi* 179-82 Colonna **251** πληξίππου γῆ Μινύης Tz. πληξίππων γῆ Μινυῶν *AP* Paus. **252** ἀνθρώποις κλέος ἐστὶν: Ἑλλάδι κῦδος ὀρεῖται Paus. **253** βασάνοις Tz.; σοφίας Paus.

241 ἐν †ἐνηπόδω† Allen Colonna : ἐν Ἡσιόδῳ Goettling Nietzsche Rzach Wilamowitz Evelyn-White West ἐν Ἀνδραπόδῳ Barnes ἐν ἑνάτῃ Ὀλυμπιάδι Bernhardy (1822: 241); Γαννύκτορος **L** **242** <τοῖς> Bernhardy (1822: 241) **246** δημώδους **L** <Τρωίλου> Nietzsche Rzach **251** πληξίππων γῆ Μινυὰς **L** corr. Barnes Nietzsche Wilamowitz West (coll. *AP* Paus.) : πληξίππος γῆ Μινυὰς Rzach Evelyn-White

καὶ περὶ μὲν Ἡσιόδου τοσαῦτα· ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος ἀποτυχὼν
τῆς νίκης περιερχόμενος ἔλεγε τὰ ποιήματα, πρῶτον μὲν
τὴν Θηβαίδα ἔπη ,ζ ἧς ἡ ἀρχή·

Ἄργος ἄειδε θεὰ πολυδίψιον ἔνθεν ἄνακτες·

εἶτα Ἐπιγόνους ἔπη ,ζ ὧν ἡ ἀρχή·

νῦν αὖθ' ὁπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα Μοῦσαι.

φασὶ γάρ τινες καὶ ταῦτα Ὁμήρου εἶναι. ἀκούσαντες
δὲ τῶν ἐπῶν οἱ Μίδου τοῦ βασιλέως παῖδες Ξάνθος καὶ
Γόργος παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἐπίγραμμα ποιῆσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ
τάφου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν, ἐφ' οὗ ἦν παρθένος χαλκῆ τὸν
Μίδου θάνατον οἰκτιζομένη. καὶ ποιεῖ οὕτως·

256 ,ξ **L** corr. Hermann **258** ἐπειγομένου **L** corr. Barnes; ξ **L** corr. Hermann

χαλκῆ παρθένος εἰμί, Μίδου δ' ἐπὶ σήματος ἧμαι.
ἔστ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε νάῃ καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλῃ
καὶ ποταμοὶ πλήθωσι, περικλύζῃ δὲ θάλασσα,
ἠέλιος δ' ἀνιὼν φαίνῃ λαμπρά τε σελήνη,
αὐτοῦ τῇδε μένουσα πολυκλαύτῳ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
σημανέω παριοῦσι Μίδης ὅτι τῇδε τέθαπται.
λαβὼν δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν φιάλην ἀργυρᾶν ἀνατίθησιν ἐν
Δελφοῖς τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, ἐπιγράψας·
Φοῖβε ἄναξ δῶρόν τοι Ὅμηρος καλὸν ἔδωκα
σῇσιν ἐπιφροσύναις· σὺ δέ μοι κλέος αἰὲν ὀπάζοις.

265-70 cf. Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 11, Pl. *Phdr*. 264d, Favorin. *Or. Cor*. 38, D. Chr. 37.38, D. L. 1.89, Phlp. *In Apo*. 156, *AP* 7.153, *APl*. 3b.6.1 **265** Μίδα *Pl. AP* Dio; ἐπὶ σήματος ἧμαι: ἐπὶ σήματι κεῖμαι test. cet. **266** cf. et Ps.-Longin. 36.2, S.E. *M*. 1.28 et 8.184, id. *P*. 2.37, Lib. 17.34. εὖτ' *APl* ὄφρ' Pl. Lib.; ῥέῃ Ps.-Hdt., Ps.-Longin., S.E. *M*., D. L., D. Chr. **267** om. Pl., Favorin., D. Chr., Phlp., *AP*, *APl*; post 268 Ps.-Hdt., D. L.; γε ῥέωσιν Ps.-Hdt., D. L.; ἀνακλύζῃ Ps.-Hdt., D. L. **268** om. Pl., Favorin., D. Chr., *AP*, post 266 Ps.-Hdt.; φαίνῃ: λάμπῃ test. cet. **269** cf. et Suda s.v. αὐτοῦ. πολυκλαύτου ἐπὶ τύμβου Ps.-Hdt., Pl. **270** cf. et Suda s.v. αὐτοῦ. σημανέω: ἀγγελέω test. cet.; Μίδας Pl,. Favorin., D. L., AP, Suda
273-4 cf. et Tz. ad Lyc. 21-23 **273** ἑλὼν ὁ Ὅμηρος ἔδωκα Tz. **274** ἦσιν ἐπ' εὐφροσύναις Tzetzes

265 χαλκέη Rzach; Μιδέω Rzach

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ποιεῖ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν ἔπη μ,β′, πεποιηκὼς ἤδη τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἐπῶν μ,εφ′. παραγενόμενον δὲ ἐκεῖθεν εἰς Ἀθήνας αὐτὸν ξενισθῆναί φασι παρὰ Μέδοντι τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ἀθηναίων. ἐν δὲ τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ ψύχους ὄντος καὶ πυρὸς καιομένου σχεδιάσαι λέγεται τούσδε τοὺς στίχους·

ἀνδρὸς μὲν στέφανοι παῖδες, πύργοι δὲ πόληος,
ἵπποι δ′ αὖ πεδίου κόσμος, νῆες δὲ θαλάσσης,
λαὸς δ′ εἰν ἀγορῇσι καθήμενος εἰσοράασθαι.
αἰθομένου δὲ πυρὸς γεραρώτερος οἶκος ἰδέσθαι
ἤματι χειμερίῳ ὁπότ′ ἂν νείφῃσι Κρονίων.

281-5 cf. Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 31, Suda *s.v*. Ὅμηρος 88-92 Adler **281** στέφανος Ps.-Hdt. Suda **282** ἐν πεδίῳ Ps.-Hdt. Suda; ἐν θαλάσσαις Suda; χρήματα δ′ (δ′ om. Suda) αὔξει οἶκον· ἀτὰρ γεραροὶ βασιλῆες / ἥμενοι εἰν ἀγορῇ κόσμος τ′ ἄλλοισιν ὁρᾶσθαι post 282 add. Ps.-Hdt. Suda **283** om. Ps.-Hdt. Suda **285** om. Ps.-Hdt. Suda

275 μβφ **L** corr. Nietzsche **276** με **L** corr. Nietzsche**;** παραγενόμενος **LSE** corr. Westermann **281** στέφανος Wilamowitz West (coll. Ps.-Hdt. Suda); lacunam post **282** stat. Nietzsche Rzach: χρήματα δ′ οἶκον ἀέξει, ἀτὰρ κοσμὸς βασιλῆες in app. Nietzsche χρήματα δ′ οἶκον ἀέξει, ἀτὰρ γεραροὶ βασιλῆες suppl. Rzach **283** λαοῖς εἰν ἀγορῇσι καθήμενοι Nietzsche Rzach

ἐκεῖθεν δὲ παραγενόμενος εἰς Κόρινθον ἐρραψῴδει τὰ
ποιήματα. τιμηθεὶς δὲ μεγάλως παραγίνεται εἰς Ἄργος
καὶ λέγει ἐκ τῆς Ἰλιάδος τὰ ἔπη τάδε·

οἳ δ' Ἄργος τ' εἶχον Τίρυνθά τε τειχιόεσσαν
Ἑρμιόνην τ' Ἀσίνην τε, βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἐχούσας,
Τροιζῆν' Ἠιόνας τε καὶ ἀμπελόεντ' Ἐπίδαυρον
νῆσόν τ' Αἴγιναν Μάσητά τε κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν,
τῶν αὖθ' ἡγεμόνευε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης
Τυδεΐδης οὗ πατρὸς ἔχων μένος Οἰνεΐδαο,
καὶ Σθένελος, Καπανῆος ἀγακλειτοῦ φίλος υἱός·
τοῖσι δ' ἅμ' Εὐρύπυλος τρίτατος κίεν ἰσόθεος φώς,
Μηκιστέως υἱὸς Ταλαϊονίδαο ἄνακτος.
ἐκ πάντων δ' ἡγεῖτο βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης.
τοῖσι δ' ἅμ' ὀγδώκοντα μέλαιναι νῆες ἕποντο·
ἐν δ' ἄνδρες πολέμοιο δαήμονες ἐστιχόωντο
Ἀργεῖοι λινοθώρηκες, κέντρα πτολέμοιο.

289-93 + 295-9 cf. Hom. Il. 2.559-68 **292** οἵ τ' ἔχον Αἴγιναν *Il*. 2.562 (cf. et Hes fr. 204.47) **294** om. Hom. **296** Εὐρύαλος *Il*. 2.565 **298** συμπάντων *Il*. 2.567 **300-1** om. Hom. **301** cf. *AP* 14.73.6

292 οἵ τ' ἔχον Αἴγιναν **S** in marg. (coll. *Il*. 2.562); Αἴγιναν τε Μάσητά **L** **296** Εὐρύαλος Wilamowitz (coll. *Il*. 2.565) **297** Μηκιστέος Rzach

τῶν δὲ Ἀργείων οἱ προεστηκότες ὑπερβολῇ χαρέντες
ἐπὶ τῷ ἐγκωμιάζεσθαι τὸ γένος αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνδο-
ξοτάτου τῶν ποιητῶν, αὐτὸν μὲν πολυτελέσι δωρεαῖς
ἐτίμησαν, εἰκόνα δὲ χαλκῆν ἀναστήσαντες ἐψηφίσαντο
θυσίαν ἐπιτελεῖν Ὁμήρῳ καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ κατὰ μῆνα καὶ
κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν <καὶ> ἄλλην θυσίαν πενταετηρίδα εἰς Χίον
ἀποστέλλειν. ἐπιγράφουσι δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ·

θεῖος Ὅμηρος ὅδ' ἐστὶν ὃς Ἑλλάδα τὴν μεγάλαυχον
πᾶσαν ἐκόσμησεν καλλιεπεῖ σοφίῃ,
ἔξοχα δ' Ἀργείους, οἳ τὴν θεοτειχέα Τροίην
ἤρειψαν ποινὴν ἠϋκόμου Ἑλένης.
οὗ χάριν ἔστησεν δῆμος μεγαλόπτολις αὐτὸν
ἐνθάδε καὶ τιμαῖς ἀμφέπει ἀθανάτων.

309-12 cf. P.Duk. inv. 665 **311** θεοτειχέα: .ριαυχεα P.Duk. inv. 665 (ἐριαυχέα Menci)

307 <καὶ> Westermann : ἄλλην δὲ θυσίαν Hermann Boissonade, ἀλλὰ καὶ θυσίαν Wilamowitz **309** μεγαλαύχην **L** corr. Barnes **310** καλλιεπίηι σοφίῃ τε **L** corr. **S** in marg. **312** ποινῆς **L** corr. Barnes **313** ἔστησε … μεγαλόπολις **L** corr. **S** supra lineam

ἐνδιατρίψας δὲ τῇ πόλει χρόνον τινὰ διέπλευσεν εἰς Δῆλον εἰς τὴν πανήγυριν. καὶ σταθεὶς ἐπὶ τὸν κεράτινον βωμὸν λέγει ὕμνον εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα οὗ ἡ ἀρχή·

μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἑκάτοιο.

ῥηθέντος δὲ τοῦ ὕμνου οἱ μὲν Ἴωνες πολίτην αὐτὸν κοινὸν ἐποιήσαντο, Δήλιοι δὲ γράψαντες τὰ ἔπη εἰς λεύκωμα ἀνέθηκαν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῷ. τῆς δὲ πανηγύρεως λυθείσης ὁ ποιητὴς εἰς Ἴον ἔπλευσε πρὸς Κρεόφυλον κἀκεῖ χρόνον διέτριβε πρεσβύτης ὢν ἤδη. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης καθήμενος παίδων τινῶν ἀφ' ἁλείας ἐρχομένων ὥς φασι πυθόμενος·

ἄνδρες ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης θηρήτορες ἦ ῥ' ἔχομέν τι;

318 *h.Ap*. 1 **326** cf. Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 5, Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.3, Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.5, Tz. *Exeg. in Il*. 37. ἁλιήτορες Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.3, Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.5, Tz.; ἆρ' Procl.

322 Κρεόφυλον **L** Wilamowitz : Κρεώφυλον edd. cet. **326** ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης: ἄγρης ἁλίης Koechly (1857: 222) Evelyn-White

εἰπόντων δὲ ἐκείνων·

ὅσσ' ἕλομεν λιπόμεσθα, ὅσ' οὐχ ἕλομεν φερόμεσθα,

οὐ νοήσας τὸ λεχθὲν ἤρετο αὐτοὺς ὅ τι λέγοιεν. οἱ δέ φασιν

330 ἐν ἁλείᾳ μὲν ἀγρεῦσαι μηδέν, ἐφθειρίσθαι δέ, καὶ τῶν

φθειρῶν οὓς ἔλαβον καταλιπεῖν, οὓς δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβον ἐν τοῖς

ἱματίοις φέρειν. ἀναμνησθεὶς δὲ τοῦ μαντείου ὅτι τὸ τέλος

αὐτοῦ ἥκοι τοῦ βίου, ποιεῖ τὸ τοῦ τάφου αὑτοῦ ἐπίγραμμα.

ἀναχωρῶν δὲ ἐκεῖθεν, ὄντος πηλοῦ ὀλισθὼν καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ

335 τὴν πλευράν, τριταῖος ὥς φασι τελευτᾷ· καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν Ἰῳ.

ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τόδε·

ἐνθάδε τὴν ἱερὴν κεφαλὴν κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτει,

ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων κοσμήτορα θεῖον Ὅμηρον.

327-38 cf. P.Mich. inv. 2754 ll. 1-14

328 cf. P.Mich. inv. 2754 ll. 2-3, Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 35, Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 5, Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.6, Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.3, Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.5, Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4, Suda s.v. Ὅμηρος 206 Adler. ἅσσ' ἕλομεν … ἃ δ' οὐχ ἕλομεν Ps.-Hdt. Suda, οὓς ἕλομεν … οὓς δ' οὐχ ἕλομεν Procl., ὅσσ' ἕλομεν … ὅσσ' οὐχ ἕλομεν Ps.-Plu., ἅσσ' ἕλομεν … ἅσσ' οὐχ ἕλομεν Anon. *Vit*. *Hom*. 1., ὅσσ' ἕλομεν … ὅσα δ' οὐχ ἕλομεν Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2 Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.

337-8. P.Mich. inv. 2754 ll. 11-12, *AP* 7.3, Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 36, Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4, Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.6, Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.3, Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.5, Suda s.v. Ὅμηρος 54-5 et 220-221 Adler, Tz. *Exeg. in Il.* 37 **338** καλύψεν Ps.-Hdt., κάλυψε P.Mich. inv. 2754.

4. *Commentary*

The text of the *Certamen* has been transmitted with no author name and no date of composition. The only element that can be used to date the text is a mention of the emperor Hadrian, who is said to interrogate the Pythia about Homer's origins. The episode may have been inserted in the narrative when the memory of Hadrian's actual visit to Delphi, in 125 AD, was still fresh (32-43n.), and in any case provides a *terminus post quem*.

Although the text as we have it was composed during the imperial times, or later still, the core of the narrative goes back to the fourth-century sophist Alcidamas. Two verses uttered by Homer in the *Certamen* are attributed by Stobaeus to Alcidamas, and P.Petr. I 25 proves that these verses were connected to the story of the contest of Homer and Hesiod by the third century BC (78-9n.). Furthermore, Alcidamas is mentioned as one of the sources for the death of Hesiod at 240, and P.Mich. inv. 2754 (see pp. 70-80) shows that Alcidamas told the story of Homer's death in a version similar to that in the *Certamen*. At the heart of the *Certamen* there is an elaborate narrative structure that presents the two poets according to parallel patterns and depicts a nexus (oracle-contest-death) that may well have already been present in one of the *Certamen*'s literary sources, quite possibly Alcidamas (56-62n.).

However, Alcidamas probably did not invent the story of the contest between the two poets, and was certainly not the the first author of some of the verses in the *Certamen*. Two lines mentioned in the *Certamen* are also found in Aristophanes' *Peace* vv. 1282-3; the appearance of these verses in this play, performed for the first time in 421 BC, shows that at least some of the hexameter material included in our text predates Alcidamas and was perhaps already connected to the story of the contest of Homer and Hesiod in Aristophanes' times (107-8n.). The author of the *Certamen* also knows traditions that were widely circulating in the sixth-fifth century BC. For example, Heraclitus referred to the episode of Homer's death (323-38n.) and Thucydides

is the earliest witness of the legend surrounding Hesiod's (215-23n.).

Some of the verses at 107-37, the 'ambivalent propositions', seem to represent fifth-century BC concerns about Homeric language and can be associated with sophistic circles, as does the syntax of this section (102-37n.). The verses at 148-75 also deal with topics that stem from fifth- and fourth-century philosophical and political discourse. The narrative framework surrounding the contest seems to foster the image of Homer as a democratic poet, which again would fit a fifth- or fourth-century BC context (276-85n.).

The work opens by mentioning Homer and Hesiod as (apparently) equal, but the two poets are quickly set in contrast to each other. The first difference the text underlines involves their place of origin: while Hesiod mentioned his own birthplace, Homer's silence on the matter inspired a big debate and a wide range of local claims (1-8). Similarly, there is no certainty in respect to his parents. The text thus gives a list of seven alleged fathers and mothers (18-27n.). This sets the scene for claiming Homer as a Panhellenic poet, a claim that becomes explicit later in the text, where Homer's poetry is said to appeal to all the Greeks (90-1n.).

Once the contest begins, Homer appears as the champion of Greek traditional values, and thereby gains general approval from the public. Homer is able to define what the best and the finest thing are for mortals in terms conformed to dominant Greek views (75-89), and to solve a theological impropriety put in the form of an *aporia* (96-101), while Hesiod's reaction to his success worsens as the contest proceeds (94n.). Perhaps the most impressive poetic enterprise Homer embarks on during the contest is in reply to Hesiod's 'ambivalent propositions', a series of verses that propose unacceptable views on issues such as the life and behavior of heroes and gods, and which Homer turns into expressions of standard Greek morality. When, in another stage of the competition, Homer demonstrates his expertise on topics that were traditionally considered Hesiodic, he appears to be the inevitable winner of the competition

(151-75). However, King Panoides makes a surprising appearance in the text and asks both poets to perform what they consider the finest passage from their poetry (176-9).

Homer's performance makes him appear to be a truly divinely inspired poet, as he enables humans to share, through poetry, the gaze of the gods, while viewing something that they could not bear in reality: war and death. Hesiod, with his description of the cycle of nature and agriculture, does not offer anything that a man cannot experience in his everyday life (180-204n.). Nonetheless Panoides decides that Hesiod should win on the basis that he celebrates peace. As happens in other versions of the story, however, Hesiod's victory is not at all strongly endorsed in the text (205-10n.). Furthermore, Homer seems to be presented as younger than Hesiod and therefore arguably less expert: during the discussion of the relative chronology of the two poets there seems to be an implicit preference for the version according to which Homer was born a long time after Hesiod, making it perhaps even impossible for them to meet and compete (44-55n.); and in any case Homer is said to have composed only the *Margites* before competing against Hesiod (55n.).

After the contest, Hesiod is never said to compose new poetry or to travel Greece to perform his works; he only visits Delphi to dedicate the tripod, and to Locris, after misunderstanding an oracle, in an attempt to escape his fate (224-53n.).

By contrast, Homer's artistic production starts, in fact, after the contest. After the comic *Margites*, he composes two cyclic poems (255-60n.), then the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (275-6n.) and finally the *Hymn to Apollo* (315-21n.). This list does not include all the titles attributed to Homer in antiquity, but selects significant examples for each kind of poem linked to him and builds to a climax: the works that were considered of lower status in antiquity are located in the initial phases of his career, and through the *Hymn to Apollo* the poet is finally consecrated as a Panhellenic poet whose fame will last for evermore. Homer also composes the

funeral epigram for the Phrygian king Midas, a dedication to Apollo engraved on a silver cup (260-74), and the verses recited at Athens before king Medon (276-85). The composition of each of these works is not always connected to a specific city, and Homer is consistently depicted as a travelling poet (56n.). As he goes round Greece performing his poems, the honours he receives increase. At Argos, for example, he is made the object of a cult, and sacrifices are established in his honour (302-8n.). At Delos for the first time, Homer performs in a Panionian context and his success on this occasion results in the attribution to him of the title of 'common citizen' of all the Ionians (315-21n.).

Homer's success brings about a complete reversal of the verdict of the competition, and compensates Homer for it: the Midas episode (260-74), for example, involves an invitation by the sons of another king, a silver cup, and a dedication to Apollo, in a mirror image of the honours Hesiod secured through winning the contest. Later on, Homer also receives 'costly gifts', which parallel the gifts offered by the organisers of the poetic contest that Homer lost (304-5n.).

The prophecy concerning Homer's death, like Hesiod's, is finally fulfilled while the poet is in Ios. But unlike Hesiod, Homer is never said to misunderstand the oracle, and even his inability to solve a riddle proposed by some boys, which was the basis for some early criticism of Homer's alleged wisdom, is not emphasised as a outright failing (323-38n.). The work closes with a funerary epigram for the divine Homer, composed by the poet himself.

Title: the title of the work in the manuscript gives an exhaustive description of the contents of the work. The title *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, with which the work is commonly known, comes from a Latin translation of the shortened form of the title (Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου ἀγών) and goes back to the *editio princeps*.

1-2. Ὅμηρον … λέγεσθαι: the opening sentence elevates Homer and Hesiod

above all other poets (for the possibility that other versions of the story of the contest may have given more prominence to other participants, see Introduction on Plutarch, *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 153f-154a, pp. 18-28). But although Homer and Hesiod are formally presented as equal poets, the description offered fits Homer and subsumes Hesiod as his companion: θειότατος and in fact θεῖος are standard epithets of Homer but not of Hesiod; similarly, there is discussion and controversy only about Homer's birthplace because – as the text admits at 2-6 – Hesiod names his own place of origin. The overall effect of the opening sentence is to present Homer as the privileged poet in the pair, and that is indeed how he will be described at many points in the narrative: the *Certamen* draws on and endorses the traditional image of Homer as the divine poet *par excellence* in Greek literature (see esp. 180-204n.); Homer is explicitly called θεῖος at 214, 309 and 338. The opening is geared towards Homer to such an extent that West 1967: 444 suggests that the author might have taken an opening of a lost Life of Homer and simply adapted it to his own work. West tentatively reconstructs the sentence as follows: Ὅμηρον τὸν θειότατον ποιητὴν πάντες ἄνθρωποι πολίτην ἴδιον εὔχονται λέγεσθαι. But the author of the *Certamen* may, just as easily, have thought of Homer as generally depicted in many ancient Lives, and adapted the description to include Hesiod. The superlative θειότατοι is used of Homer and Hesiod together only here in extant Greek literature. The epithet θειότατος is rarely given to Homer (only a few occurrences: e.g. Pl. *Ion* 530 b) but never to Hesiod alone. Θεῖος is a standard epithet of Homer, and θεῖος Ὅμηρος a hexametric formula (Skiadas 1965: 63-75, Burkert 1987: 44, Graziosi 2002: 67), but is applied to Hesiod only once (Plut. *The Obsolescence of Oracles* 431e). The claim that all men wish that both poets were said to be their fellow citizens suits, once again, only Homer (see e.g. Eust. *Il.* 4.17; Isaac Porphyrogenitus *Praefatio in Homerum* 4 Kindstrand).

2. λέγεσθαι: the popular emendation γενέσθαι does not account for the fact that the biographical material was perceived as fictional already in antiquity. In

order for a city to make its local tradition successful, the poet should persuasively 'be said' to be – not necessarily 'be born' – a fellow citizen.

2-4. ἀλλ' Ἡσίοδος … ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ: the contrast between Homer and Hesiod is now explicitly put in biographical terms: the statement that Hesiod precluded any rivalry by mentioning his birthplace in his work clearly engages with the standard claim in Homeric biographies that Homer's silence about himself occasioned a big debate about his life (see e.g. Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.1; Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 2; Eust. *Il.* 4.17). For the contrast established here between Homer and Hesiod, cf. also Vell. Pat. 1.7.1: *Hesiodus … qui uitauit ne in id quod Homerus incideret, patriamque et parentes testatus est*. West 1967: 444 posits a common source, but both the *Certamen* and Velleius may be responding to a wide-spread trope or idea.

5-6. εἴσατο … ἐσθλῆ: = *Op.* 639-40. The *Certamen* exploits the practice, common in the ancient Lives, to draw information about the life of a poet from his/her own work. For other biographical anecdotes on Hesiod derived from the *Theogony* or *Works and Days* see most recently Kivilo 2010: 7-61, Koning 2010: 31-2, 38-9 and Lefkowitz 2012: 6-13. Although these lines are not quoted in other Hesiodic biographies, they had undisputed influence on the matter of Hesiod's birthplace. They are echoed in Tz. *Life of Hesiod* 80-1 Colonna (οἱ (*scil*. Hesiod's parents) ... τὴν ἑαυτῶν πατρίδα Κύμην ἀφέντες μεταναστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἄσκρην, χωρίον τῶν Βοιωτῶν δυσχείμερον καὶ κακοθέρειον, περὶ τοὺς πόδας κειμένην τοῦ Ἑλικῶνος). They feature in many other works (see West 1978: 126. apparatus on *Op*. 639-40) and are in fact memorable – partly because it is an unusual rhetorical move to disparage one's own place of origin.

5. εἴσατο: the Hesiodic manuscripts and the other *testimonia* read νάσσατο. Despite a minor slip in the manuscript (**L** reads εἴσατο, from εἶμι, emended by **S** in εἴσατο, from ἵζω – a near synonym of the Hesiodic reading) the *Certamen* clearly preserves an otherwise unattested variant reading of *Op.* 639.

7-8. Ὅμηρον δὲ … λέγουσιν: this claim makes Homer a Panhellenic poet, a

view that is endorsed also, and more explicitly, later in the text. It is in fact one of the most salient features of Homer as portrayed in the *Certamen*: see esp. 91n., 176 and 205, where Homer is said to appeal to 'the Greeks' or indeed 'all the Greeks'; and the episodes told at 286-338. This claim is based on the view, common at least from the imperial era, that the endless debate on Homer's origins makes him the possession of every city. See e.g. Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 2 and Heraclit. *All*. 76.8-9.

8-17. καὶ πρῶτοί … τὸν Μαργίτην: the text claims that all cities wanted to be considered Homer's hometown, but then mentions only three. The number is small but the list includes the cities that were generally recognised as having the strongest and most ancient claims about Homer's origins: Smyrna, Chios and Colophon. These are mentioned at the beginning of the list of Homer's alleged birthplaces in most of the ancient biographies and in other literary works (Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4 (= *AP* 16.296) and 2.2; Procl. *Vit. Hom.* 2; Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 2; Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.2; Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.1; Lucianus *VH* 2.20; *AP* 16.298). Because of the wide circulation of this triad the author of the *Certamen* may have made his selection without the help of any specific source (*contra* West 1967: 445 who suggests a fourth-century source because other birthplaces, which are attested later, are missing in this list). Connections between Homer and these three cities are very old and in fact go back to three passages in the Homeric *corpus* itself (analysed in Graziosi 2002: 62-79): the *Hymn to Apollo* (172-3) introduces the figure of the Chian blind man, whom already Thucidides (3.104) identified with Homer; in the *Margites* (fr. 1 West) the old divine singer who came to Colophon is characterised in a way that fits the traditional descriptions of Homer; finally, in the *Hymn to Artemis* 9 there is a possible reference to the legend of Homer's birth by the river Meles near Smyrna. Nagy 2004 suggests that Athens, as the Ionian metropolis, had an interest in stressing the importance of Chios, Smyrna and Colophon. These and other local traditions also appear elsewhere in the text: Ithaca at 23-27 and 37-40 (some of

the alleged parents and the Pythia's response to Hadrian); Ios at 59-60 (the Pythia to Homer); Smyrna at 75 and 151 (Homer is called 'son of Meles'); Chios again at 307-8 (the Argives send periodical sacrifices to Chios in Homer's honour).

8-12. καὶ πρῶτοί … προσηγορίαν: the Smyrnean tradition about Homer was very well known in the classical period (Stesimbr. 107 F 22; Pi. fr. 264 S.-M.; Eugaion 535 F 2 = 2 Fowler; Critias fr. 50 D.-K.), and it seems likely that legends about Homer circulated in Smyrna before Alyattes' destruction of that city in 600 BC (Jakoby 1933: 31, Graziosi 2002: 75). The *Hymn to Artemis* 9, which seems to connect Homer with Smyrna via the river Meles, may also be dated to the same period (West 2003: 17). Beecroft 2010: 75 argues attractively that between its destruction in 600 BC and its rebuilding in the Hellenistic era Smyrna was the ideal place for Homer's birth in that everyone could accept it because it belonged to no-one. It is certainly true that the Smyrnean tradition contained some of the most common features of Homer's persona, accepted also in other local claims: Homer's original name Melesigenes; the epithet υἱὲ Μέλητος, interestingly used for Homer also in an epigram aiming to prove that Homer was a Colophonian (Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4 = *AP* 16.292); the very birth of Homer in Smyrna, accepted in the traditions of Ios and Cyme (Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom.* 1.2 and 3). Smyrna's special place in the tradition also explains why in the *Certamen* it is mentioned first (note also πρῶτοι, l. 8).

9-10. Μέλητος ὄντα … Κρηϊθίδος νύμφης: the parental couple Cretheis-Meles is among the most widely attested for Homer. In the ancient sources Meles is paired only with Cretheis, but Cretheis could also be paired with Maion (Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 2.2 and Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.3). The presence in the *Odyssey* of a similar story (Poseidon rapes Tyro disguised as the river Enipeus, *Od*. 11.235-52) may have a bearing on the success of this anecdote; it seems also relevant that Tyro is said to marry Cretheus, a son of Aeolus, whose name is very similar to Cretheis'. The similarity between the two stories was certainly

seen by Philostratus (*Im*. 2.8). The River Meles is the father of Homer also in Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 2.2; Castricius of Nicaea in Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 1; Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.3; Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 2.1; Anon. *Vit. Hom* 3.1; in other sources it is the place where Cretheis gave birth to the poet (Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 2-3; Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 3). Both versions are attested already in the fifth century BC (Meles as Homer's father: Critias fr. 50 D.-K., Eugaion 535 F 2 = *Cert*. 20-21; Homer born by the River Meles: Stesimbr. 107 F 22). The author of the *Certamen* perhaps uses the former version of the legend because it was the one that best illustrated the Smyrneans' claim about Homer: the mere fact that Homer was born in Smyrna is not sufficient to prove his Smyrnean origins: Ephorus and Aristotle (Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.2 and 3) claim that Homer was born by the River Meles in Smyrna, but only because Cretheis, who was from either Cyme or Ios, had to leave her city after becoming pregnant. According to them, the poet is therefore a native of Cyme or Ios (as also Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom* 2.2; Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1.2 and 3; Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 3.1). By accepting this version of the story the *Certamen* can later report a genealogy of Homer according to which he is the son of Meles (53) and have Hesiod address Homer as υἱὲ Μέλητος Ὅμηρε during the contest section (75 and 151): all these details strengthen the image of Homer as a divine poet. Both Meles and Cretheis are mentioned later in the text in the list of Homer's alleged fathers and mothers respectively (21 and 24) and although they are mentioned separately, there too we are probably meant to see them as a couple (see 18-27n.). Meles is also given as one of Homer's alleged original names at ll. 27-28.

10. Κρηϊθίδος: the manuscript form Κρηϊθίδος has been unanimously emended on the basis of Κρηθηίδος at l. 24. The form in l. 24 is one of the best attested in the manuscripts of other biographies, as **S** indicates ('confirmatur ab aliis'). However, other different spellings of the name are transmitted elsewhere too: emendations force a unified tradition that never existed, especially in the case of proper names (see also on Melesigenes, below).

κεκλῆσθαί φασι πρότερον Μελησιγενῆ: as in the case of the name of

Cretheis (above), the two different manuscript forms for Melesigenes are kept (here and at 28). That the original name of Homer was Melesigenes, explained as 'Born by the River Meles' or 'Born of the River Meles', is a common feature of all Homeric biographies. The etymology has no linguistic basis (see e.g. Wilamowitz 1916b: 370, Marx 1925: 406-8). Maass 1911 suggests that the name Melesigenes means that the poet was born during the Melesia, a festival in honour of Meles (which however is not attested); more convincingly, Marx suggests that the real meaning of Melesigenes is 'he who takes care of his people' ('born of/by the Meles' being actually Μελητογένη), and this suited the rhapsodes who sometimes claimed to be Homer's descendants (Graziosi 2002: 75 n. 72). The connection with the river Meles must have been created in order to support the Smyrneans' claim and the popular etymology will have spread together with the Smyrnean traditions about Homer. However, the manuscripts of other Homeric biographies also testify to forms of the name that show its versatility, and this may have played a role in its wide diffusion: the variants Μελισσογενής or Μελισσογενῆ and Μελιτογενής (cf. e.g. Allen's apparatus of Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* on ll. 54 and 64, and more significantly that of Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 2 on l. 4) seem to connect this name with the words μέλι or μέλισσα ('honey' and 'bee', common symbols for poetry and poets; cf. also Eust. *Od*. 1713.17, where honey is said to flow from Homer's mouth), rather than to a specific place. Fluctuation between -ησ- and -ισσ- is also attested for two other 'original' names of Homer, Μελησιάναξ (Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 2.1) and Μελησαγόρας (Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.5). Of these, only Melesigenes features in the list of alleged original names at 28.

11-12. Melesigenes changes his name into Homer after becoming blind, because ὅμηρος is a common term for blind people in the Aeolian dialect: this is another very well known and widely spread piece of information on the poet (see also Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 13; Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1.5; Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 2.1). It is again based on folk etymology (cf. 10n.): the word ὅμηρος is not in fact attested with the

meaning 'blind' in extant Greek literature. The etymologizing explanation connects the poet with a quintessential feature of his work: on Homer's blindness as a sign of his closeness to the gods see esp. Graziosi 2002: 138-63. Other ancient sources dismiss the link between the name Homer and blindness (perhaps because they did not accept that ὅμηρος meant blind, or because they denied the very fact that Homer was blind) and on the basis of an independently attested meaning of the word ὅμηρος claim that Melesigenes was called Homer because he was taken hostage (Procl. *Vit. Hom.* 3; Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 3; Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1.5). The *Certamen* knows and mentions this alternative view (see 29-32n.) but without expressing any preference. However, Beecroft 2011: 9 notes that Homer in the *Certamen* is never said to write, which may suggest that according to this text he was indeed blind.

13-15. Χῖοι δὲ … Ὁμηρίδας καλουμένους: Chian traditions about Homer are well attested in Greek literature and from ancient times (Simon. fr. 19 West, Anaximen. 72 F 30, Damastes fr. 11 Fowler, Pi. fr. 264 S.-M., Theoc. *Id*. 7.47 and 22.218). This passage of the *Certamen* mentions its most common features: the Homeridae as Homer's descendants, and their connection with Chios. The link between the Homeridae and Chios is attested already in the classical period: Acusilaos and Hellanicus in Harp. O 19 Keaney: Ὁμηρίδαι· Ἰσοκράτης Ἑλένῃ (10.65). Ὁμηρίδαι γένος ἐν Χίῳ, ὅπερ Ἀκουσίλαος ἐν γ′ (2 F 2). Ἑλλάνικος ἐν τῇ Ἀτλαντιάδι (4 F 20) ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ φησιν ὠνομάσθαι. *Pace* Fehling 1979: 198, who claims that there was no connection between Chios and the Homeridae, this and the following passage clearly link the two. A scholion to Pindar draws a connection between the Homeridae and Chios and also refers to their kinship with Homer: Schol. Pi. *Nem*. 2.1 Drachmann: Ὁμηρίδας ἔλεγον τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὁμήρου γένους οἳ καὶ τὴν ποίησιν αὐτοῦ ἐκ διαδοχῆς ᾖδον· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ οἱ ῥαψῳδοὶ οὐκέτι τὸ γένος εἰς Ὅμηρον ἀνάγοντες. The expression ἐκ διαδοχῆς, intended as 'by right of succession' (Burkert 1979: 54; Graziosi 2002: 214), refers to a genealogical connection with

Homer, though, as pointed out most recently by Collins 2004: 183, it can also be interpreted as 'by relay', with reference to a continuous performance of the Homeric verses. The words οἱ ῥαψῳδοὶ οὐκέτι τὸ γένος εἰς Ὅμηρον ἀνάγοντες seem to imply that in later times a rhapsode who was not a descendant of Homer's could also be called a Homerid. Some ancient scholars questioned the Homeridae's descent from Homer (Harp. *ibid.*: Σέλευκος δὲ ἐν β′ περὶ βίων ἁμαρτάνειν φησὶ Κράτητα νομίζοντα ἐν ταῖς Ἱεροποιίαις Ὁμηρίδας ἀπογόνους εἶναι τοῦ ποιητοῦ· ὠνομάσθησαν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν ὁμήρων…). Nevertheless, it is clear that our text drew on a very well attested tradition, which is also found in one of the ancient Homeric biographies: in Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 25 Homer married a woman in Chios and had two daughters, one of which died unmarried while the other married a Chian man. It must have been easy for ancient readers acquainted with this material to see in these lines a reference to the Homeridae (*contra* West 1999: 372; for the use of the Homeridae as evidence for Homer's Chian origins see Str. 14.1.35.21: ἀμφισβητοῦσι δὲ καὶ Ὁμήρου Χῖοι, μαρτύριον μέγα τοὺς Ὁμηρίδας καλουμένους ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκείνου γένους προχειριζόμενοι; Eust. *Il.* 4.17: ἀμφισβητοῦσι δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ Χῖοι μαρτύριον προχειριζόμενοι τοὺς καλουμένους Ὁμηρίδας ὧν καὶ Πίνδαρος μέμνηται). The Homeridae seem to have been personally involved in the making of Homer's biographical legends: Isoc. *Hel*. 65 testifies to their activity in this respect; Eustathius says that the Homeridae hesitated to mention that Homer was defeated by Hesiod in a poetic contest (see Introduction on Eustathius, pp. 51-2). The idea that Homer was from Chios probably became predominant in fifth- and fourth-century Athens precisely thanks to the Homeridae and their connection with the Peisistratids.

15-17. Κολοφώνιοι δὲ ... Μαργίτην: Homer's Colophonian origins are attested also by Nicander (fr. 14 Schneider) and Antimachus (fr. 130 Wyss = 166 Matthews). Colophon has ancient claims to Homer, and they are probably connected with *Margites* fr. 1 West (for a good survey of the problems related to

this fragment and a discussion of its role in the *Margites* see Gostoli 2007: 20-3 and 71-4). That the *Margites* played a key role in the Colophonian tradition is evident also in this section of the *Certamen*; though our text chooses to present it as the first work of a young Homer (thus dissociating him from the old singer of *Margites* fr. 1 West). This way of dating the *Margites* in relation to Homer's other works is common in the imperial period, when its authenticity was often questioned and at times strongly denied. Moreover, it fits the way Homer features in the rest of the *Certamen* and seems to have an apologetic function. The attribution of the *Margites* to Homer seems to have been accepted from the time of Archilochus (Archil. fr. 303 West *apud* Eustr. *in EN* 6.7 = *Margites* T1 Gostoli; see Gostoli 2007: 11-13 on this difficult testimony) to at least the fourth century BC (Arist. *Po.* 1448b24-1449a1 = *Margites* T3 Gostoli). In later times, when Homer was strictly and solely associated with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the *Margites* was considered the work of a young and immature Homer (D. Chr. 53.4 = T6 Gostoli: δοκεῖ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο (*scil.* τὸν Μαργίτην) τὸ ποίημα ὑπὸ Ὁμήρου γεγονέναι νεωτέρου καὶ ἀποπειρωμένου τῆς αὑτοῦ φύσεως πρὸς ποίησιν) and was gradually excluded from the Homeric corpus, together with other works (Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom.* 1.5: ἔγραψε δὲ ποιήματα δύο, Ἰλιάδα καὶ Ὀδύσσειαν· ὡς δέ τινες, οὐκ ἀληθῶς λέγοντες, γυμνασίας καὶ παιδιᾶς ἕνεκα καὶ Βατραχομυομαχίαν προσθεὶς καὶ Μαργίτην; Procl. *Vit. Hom.* 9: γέγραφε δὲ ποιήσεις δύο, Ἰλιάδα καὶ Ὀδύσσειαν ... προστιθέασι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ παίγνιά τινα· Μαργίτην, Βατραχομαχίαν…; Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 3.3: οὐδὲν δ' αὐτοῦ θετέον ἔξω τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ὕμνους καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένων ποιημάτων ἡγητέον ἀλλότρια καὶ τῆς φύσεως καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ἕνεκα. τινὲς δ' αὐτοῦ φασιν εἶναι καὶ ... τήν τε Βατραχομυομαχίαν καὶ τὸν Μαργίτην). In the *Certamen*, the position of the *Margites* in Homer's career helps to mitigate his defeat, for there seems to be a suggestion that he composed only that work before competing against Hesiod (55n.): Homer composed the *Margites* as his first work (ποιῆσαι πρῶτον τὸν

Μαργίτην); after that, he went round from town to town reciting poetry (ποιήσαντα γὰρ τὸν Μαργίτην Ὅμηρον περιέρχεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν ῥαψῳδοῦντα); *around the same time* (κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον) Ganyctor organizes the contest.

18-27. περὶ δὲ … τὴν Νέστορος: the text lists seven alleged fathers and seven mothers for Homer, many of which are otherwise unknown. The number seven is also used to control the sprawling tradition about Homer's birthplaces (e.g. *AP* 16.297-8). Sources for the names are indicated only in a few cases, and only in relation to the fathers. Some mothers quite clearly seem to match the fathers in the same order so as to form couples attested by external evidence (Maion-Metis; Meles-Cretheis; Masagoras-Themite; Telemachus-Polycaste): that may help to explain the lack of authorities for the mothers. Some of these characters are explicitly paired up in Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 1, that reports a similar list. But it is not possible to prove that the two separate lists derive in fact from one list in which the names were paired (as suggested by West 1967: 445): we do not know enough about the remaining characters to speculate about the legends circulating about them. As far as we can tell, the lists offer a fairly comprehensive overview of the tradition by alluding to several of its main branches (Smyrnean, Cypriot, Egyptian and Ithacan claims are all recognizable). The lists seem to be carefully structured: they start off by referring to the best-known traditions and their characters (Smyrna: Maion, Meles, Metis, Cretheis; Cyprus: Masagoras, Themite) and conclude with less common and at the same time more striking names (Telemachus, Calliope, Polycaste). It is not possible to identify the source for these lists but Tzetzes (*Alleg*. 59-66 Boissonade) and Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 1 transmit similar ones: either the *Certamen* was the source for these later texts or a list was circulating in antiquity that was used as a common source for all. Tzetzes reports the same list of fathers as in the *Certamen*, sometimes with different spellings and sporadically incorporating additional information (see Introduction on Tzetzes,

pp. 47-51, for other similarities between the *Certamen* and Tzetzes' works). The Suda, after reporting a shorter but very similar list, goes on to give the same genealogy as is found at 45-53.

19-20. Ἑλλάνικος … Μαίονα: 4 F 5c = fr. 5c Fowler. Hellanicus (mythographer and ethnographer, fifth-fourth century BC) is mentioned to confirm the Smyrnean tradition, which heads the list as in the case of Homer's birthplaces (8-12). Maion is indeed often connected to Smyrna (e.g. Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 3; on Maion see also 20n.). We know that Hellanicus took an interest in Homer's and Hesiod's genealogy from 4 F 20, on the Homeridae, and 4 F 5a-b-c, according to which Maion was Homer's father, and Homer and Hesiod were both descended from Orpheus. The *Certamen* too reports this genealogy (45-53) but with the important difference that Homer is here the son of Meles. From Charax (103 F 62), we can infer that according to Hellanicus Maion was paired with Metis (West 1967: 445, Fowler *ad loc*.).

19. Κλεάνθης: fr. 592 von Arnim; see also 84 F 40. This claim may come from Cleanthes' Περὶ τοῦ ποιητοῦ (so Wachsmuth *apud* Pearson 1891: 51; Pearson 1891 fr. 67; the title is known from D. L. 7.174-5), to which most of Cleanthes' fragments on Homer are attributed (frr. 55, 65, 66, 67 Wachsmuth *apud* Pearson 1891; 54, 55, 63, 65, 66, 67 Pearson; fr. 526, 535, 549, 592 von Armin). Von Arnim 1905: 133 (on fr. 592) suggested that Κλεάνθης in **L** is a misspelling for Νεάνθης, with whom he was sometimes confused (see e.g. fr. 593 von Arnim). The suggestion is attractive, for Cleanthes' fragments on Homer mainly deal with allegoric interpretation of the Homeric poems. By contrast, Neanthes certainly had biographical interests: he wrote a work titled Περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν (84 F 13) and dealt with lives of philosophers and poets (84 F 18 on Sophocles' death; 84 F 20 on Plato's death; 84 F 25 on Epicurus' death; 84 F 27 the young Empedocles' poetic activity). However, the emendation here seems unsafe because we cannot be certain that Cleanthes did not also include some biographical information about the poet in his work.

20. Μαίονα: Maion is the most prominent figure as Homer's father in the poet's biographies together with Meles, which explains the fact that these two names start off the list. Maion is also mentioned in the genealogy at 52-53, but as Homer's grandfather (her daughter generated Homer with the river Meles). See also 19-20n. Maion's presence as Homer's father may be connected to the Homeric works, where Maion is the name of a minor character from Thebes (*Il*. 4.391-400) who led an attack on Tydeus. Furthermore, in some biographical texts Maion is connected with Lydia (Aristoteles in Ps.-Plu. *Vit*. *Hom*. 1.3; Lucianus *Dem*. *Enc*. 9), and we know that Μαίονες was an alternative name for the Lydians, which allegedly derived from the name of the eponymous hero or that of a local river (Ael. Her. *De Pros. Cath.* 3.1.296). Homer himself used the ethnic Μήονες, whence the later form Μαίονες (see Eust. 1575.26). In the Lives Maion is paired with Metis, Cretheis and Hyrnetho (Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom.* 2.2; Anon. *Vita Hom.* 2.1; Stesimbr. in Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1.3).

20-1. Εὐγαίων δὲ Μέλητα: 535 F 2 = 2 Fowler. The source is a historian from Samos who lived in the fifth century BC. His name is spelled differently in the sources (see Bertelli BNJ *s.v.* Euagon of Samos on 535 T1 and T2): **L** gives the form Εὐγαίων, but an inscription from Priene (535 F 3), the oldest attestation of Euagon's name (180 BC), suggests that he was in fact called Εὐάγων. He may have been singled out here because he seems to be one of the most ancient sources for Meles as the father of Homer. The scarcity of fragments from his work (only four, and two *testimonia*) leaves us without a context for this biographical claim. However, we know that Euagon had a strong interest in biographies: in 535 F 4 he deals with the life of Aesop and claims that he was a Thracian slave. Euagon's choice of Meles as the father of Homer may reflect his interest in *mirabilia*; cf. 535 F 1 (on the Neia, mythological wild beasts living in Samos; see also Bertelli on 535 T 1). Like later sources, Euagon may already have paired the river Meles with Cretheis (thus Fowler).

21. Καλλικλῆς δὲ †Μασαγόραν: 758 F 13c. Callicles is a historian or

grammarian from the Hellenistic era. Here he is most likely mentioned to introduce a Cypriot tradition about Homer: we know from Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1.2 that Callicles thought that Homer was from Salamis in Cyprus (758 F 13a: κατὰ Καλλικλέα δὲ τῆς ἐν Κύπρωι Σαλαμῖνος). At 29-30 (= 758 F 13c) the *Certamen* claims that Homer's father was offered as a hostage by the Cypriots to the Persians: Callicles may be the source for that claim too. As we learn from Paus. 10.24.3 (= 758 F 13d) the Cypriots reckoned Themisto to be Homer's mother. The name Θεμίτη at 25 may refer to the same character, so that we would have another parental couple implicitly paired up in the text. In the Homeric biographies, a Cypriot origin for Homer is referred to also at Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 2.1; Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 2; Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. B 2. Connections between Homer and Cyprus were also established by interpreting the Homeric poems: for the *Iliad* see *Schol*. T *Il*. 21.12 = 758 F 13b: ὡς δ᾽ ὅθ᾽ ὑπὸ ῥιπῆς πυρὸς ἀκρίδες ἠερέθονται / φευγέμεναι ποταμόνδε· ἐντεῦθέν τινες Κύπριόν φασι τὸν ποιητήν· κατά τινας γὰρ χρόνους ὀχλεῖται ἡ Κύπρος ὑπὸ ἀκρίδων, ὡς ἡ Κυρήνη καὶ ἡ Βάρκη; for the *Cypria* see Pi. fr. 265 S.-M. in Ael. *VH* 9.15; Tz. *H*. 13.637 (the poem was given by Homer to Stasinus of Cyprus as the dowry of his daughter) and esp. Proclus in Phot. *Bibl*. 319a 24 (Proclus reports that according to some people the poem was named *Cypria* after Homer's birthplace).

†**Μασαγόραν:** the name is not clearly readable in **L**. Μασαγόραν has been suggested on the basis of traces in the manuscript and on the form Μασσαγόραν transmitted by Tzetzes (*Alleg*. 62), who is the only other source for this name. Tzetzes also informs us that Mas(s)agoras was a merchant, either because he confused him with the next name in the list (Daemon, a merchant: see 22) or because he had access to now lost information. The form Δμασαγόραν, restored by Barnes on the basis of the name of Homer's father as transmitted by Eustathius (*Od.* 1713.22) and accepted by most editors, goes back to a tradition that Homer was from Egypt, rather than Cyprus, and therefore does not seem to have any connection with the source and the story given here.

21-2. Δημόκριτος δὲ <ὁ> Τροιζήνιος Δαήμονα ἔμπορον: *Suppl. Hell.* 378. Democritus of Troezen is a writer who lived in the first century AD (Lloyd-Jones and Powell 1983: 175). His extant fragments deal with poets (e.g. Aristophanes: *Suppl. Hell.* 377) and philosophers (e.g. Empedocles: *Suppl. Hell.* 375). It is difficult to contextualize the claim attributed to him in the present passage of the *Certamen*: the view that Homer's father was a merchant is unique (except for Tzetzes' claim about Massagoras, on which see 21n.), though travel is widely attributed to Homer and his lineage. The name Daemon is attested only here and in Tzetzes. It may be seen as a speaking name designed to explain Homer's special talents; cf. his father Thamyras and his mothers Metis and Calliope, discussed below. Democritus is not mentioned anywhere else in relation to Homer's biography. The spelling of his name varies in the manuscript tradition: while Athenaeus gives Δημήτριος (*Suppl. Hell.* 376-7), the form Δημόκριτος in **L** is transmitted also by the manuscripts of Diogenes Laertius (*Suppl. Hell.* 374). Allen's suggestion to reduce this claim of the *Certamen* and that in Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1.3 (which runs: κατὰ δὲ Δημοκρίνην Ἀλήμονος) to the same tradition is interesting but would need more evidence. First, it would presuppose yet another different form of the name of Democritus of Toezen. Secondly, it would involve identifying two characters, Alemonos and Daemon, which may in fact represent two different traditions about Homer's origins. Even if it is possible that these two names were confused in the manuscript tradition of Democritus' work, or of the two Lives, Democritus may be presenting Homer's father as a 'skilled, experienced' (δαήμων) merchant, while Democrines suggests a poor beggar (ἀλήμων is the Homeric word for beggars: cf. *Od*. 17.376 and 19.74). Finally, a person called Democrines is mentioned in Schol. A *Il*. 2.744 in relation to a textual problem (Αἰθίκεσσι: Δημοκρίνης ἀγνοήσας 'Αἰθιόπεσσιν' ἔγραφεν, κακῶς), but we do not have evidence for the philological activity of Democritus: Democritus and Democrines may in fact be two different people.

22. ἔνιοι δὲ Θαμύραν: this character must be identified with Thamyris (see also Tz. *Alleg*. 64, who writes Θαμύριν), the bard who is said at *Il.* 2.591-600 to challenge the Muses in song and to be punished by them. Thamyris is nowhere else attested as the father of Homer and the source of the *Certamen* is not indicated. However, it is a common habit in the ancient biographies to manufacture genealogical links between poets and the character Thamyris in particular seems to present some features that make him suitable for such a role. First, he is a Homeric character. Secondly, some sources say that Thamyris was punished by the Muses by becoming blind (e.g. Hes. fr. 65 M.-W.). On Thamyris see the recent study by Wilson 2009. Nothing else is known about the biographical legend linking Thamyris and Homer. The corresponding character in the list of mothers is another unknown character, an Ithacesian girl sold by the Phoenicians. West 1967: 445 pairs Thamyris with the Muse Calliope (26-7), but he is not on safe ground: according to tradition, Thamyris asked to marry one of the Muses if he won the contest against them (Schol. b *Il.* 2.595), but he was defeated and punished (see also Paus. 4.33.7; D. Chr. 13.21) and there is no trace of an actual union of Thamyris with any of the Muses.

22-3. Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ Μενέμαχον ἱερογραμματέα: there is no other known source for Menemachus besides Tzetzes (*Alleg*. 60) who, as usual in this passage, does not mention his own source. The reading ἱερογραμματέα is not completely clear in **L** but Tzetzes may give some authority to it. In his list of Homer's seven birthplaces Tzetzes lists Egyptian Thebes, which is the only Egyptian city that seems to have had claims on Homer (perhaps because of its mention in *Il*. 9.381-4; see also Anon. *Vit*. *Hom*. 3.1: ἄλλοι δ' Αἰγύπτιον ἀπὸ Θηβῶν), but in the *Certamen* there is no explicit mention of Menemachus' home town. The *Certamen* connects Homer's Egyptian origins with an Egyptian source, uniquely so. Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 2 does not give any source (οἱ δ' Αἰγύπτιον); Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1.2 (ἄλλοι δ' Αἰγύπτιον αὐτὸν εἶπον διὰ τὸ {ἢ} παράγειν τοὺς ἥρωας ἐκ στόματος ἀλλήλους φιλοῦντας, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἔθος

τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ποιεῖν) may point to the ancient habit of inferring Homer's birthplace from his poetry, not always with a view to making him a fellow citizen (Zenodotus of Mallos made him a Chaldaean: see Schol. AT *Il.* 23.79b; Aristarchus an Athenian: Schol. A *Il.* 13.197). Homer was considered an Egyptian by a Cypriot, Alexander of Paphos (in Eust. *Od.* 1713.17). There is no evidence of a connection between Menemachus and any of the women in the list of mothers, so that pairing him with Calliope (the corresponding name in the list of mothers) or the woman from Ithaca (West 1967: 445) is mere speculation.

23-4. εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ Τηλέμαχον τὸν Ὀδυσσέως: another case of a genealogical connection between the poet and his characters: on Thamyris see 22n. The reference to Telemachus is evidently designed to connect the poet with Odysseus; this is clear also from ll. 37-43. In Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 1 Telemachus and Polycaste are mentioned as parents of Homer, and in the *Certamen* too Polycaste is mentioned in the list of mothers (27): this is another couple that seems to be implicitly matched up in our text. The legend derives from the meeting between Polycaste and Telemachus described in *Od*. 3.464, where Polycaste bathed Telemachus upon his arrival at Pylos. Despite the concerns of the ancient scholiasts (Schol. *Od*. 3.464: τόφρα δὲ Τηλέμαχον λοῦσεν καλὴ Πολυκάστη· λουθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν· οὐ γὰρ αὐτὴ ἔλουσεν. ἢ ὅτι ὑπὸ παρθένων ἔθος ἦν τοὺς ἥρωας λούεσθαι), legends about the offspring of the couple were current already in archaic times (cf. Hes. fr. 221 M.-W., where they have a child called Persepolis). In the oracle uttered by the Pythia to Hadrian, however, Telemachus is matched with Epicaste: see 32-43n.

24. οἱ μὲν Μῆτιν: this character is mentioned as the mother of Homer only here; *Suda* Ὅμηρος 1 gives the name in the form Εὔμητις. Her name, 'Cleverness', is appropriate for the mother of Homer; see above for connections with Odysseus. The Suda confirms that Maion is connected to Metis in one strand of the tradition (on Maion see 20n.): the *Certamen* too seems to pair them

up as both names are in the first position in their respective lists. The Suda also adds that Eumetis was the daughter of Euepes son of Mnesigenes and married Maion who went to Smyrna at the same time as the Amazons (Μαίων, ὃς ἦλθεν ἅμα ταῖς Ἀμαζόσιν ἐν Σμύρνῃ καὶ γήμας Εὔμητιν τὴν Εὐέπους τοῦ Μνησιγένους ἐποίησεν Ὅμηρον). The names Euepes and Mnesigenes are otherwise unknown but are both speaking names (built on the words ἔπος and μνήμη). The fact that Maion went to Smyrna 'together with the Amazons', who are connected to foundation myths of Smyrna (see e.g. Str. 12.3.21; Schol. bT *Il*. 6.186), may also connect Homer with these myths, and certainly makes him one of the first citizens of Smyrna.

οἱ δὲ Κρηθηίδα: on Cretheis, and the couple Cretheis-Meles, see 9-10n.

25. οἱ δὲ Θεμίτην: she is probably to be identified with Themisto, Homer's mother in the Cypriot tradition according to Pausanias (10.24.3): see 21n.

οἱ δὲ Εὐγνηθώ: this name is not otherwise attested. The merchant Daemon is the man in the corresponding position in the list of fathers, but there is no evidence to connect them. However, there is no need to emend Εὐγνηθώ to Ὑρνηθώ (see apparatus), as the *Certamen* suggests no connection with Maion, Hyrnetho's partner in the Homeric Lives (Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1.3; Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.1). The appearance of Eugnetho here may perhaps have been inspired by Hyrnetho, but it is no mere slip: somebody created an obviously speaking name, and it should stand.

25-6. ἔνιοι δὲ Ἰθακησίαν τινὰ ὑπὸ Φοινίκων ἀπεμποληθεῖσαν**:** this character is nowhere attested in the Homeric biographies but it displays some features that are common in this type of literature: the fact that she is said to be from Ithaca is clearly an attempt to connect Homer with the *Odyssey* (see also the case of Telemachus, 23-4n.); stories about forced movements of the mother of Homer, and more generally the modest origins of the poet, were common: see e.g. Cretheis who had to escape from her home town after becoming pregnant (Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.2-3). The role of the Phoenicians as traders and

their connection with abduction stories in the *Odyssey* (esp. *Od*. 15.415-84) seem also relevant here. It is unclear why Rzach proposed the emendation Ἰδακησίαν.

26-7. οἱ δὲ Καλλιόπην τὴν Μοῦσαν: a transparent attempt to make Homer the inspired poet *par excellence*. Ancient readers were attuned to the symbolic force of this claim: compare an epigram by Antipater (*AP* 16.296: εἰ δέ με Φοίβου/ χρὴ λέξαι πινυτὰν ἀμφαδὰ μαντοσύναν,/ πάτρα τοι τελέθει μέγας οὐρανός, ἐκ δὲ γυναικὸς/ οὐ θνατᾶς ματρὸς δ' ἔπλεο Καλλιόπας; see also *AP* 16.295) and the way this same epigram is introduced in Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom.* 1.4 (ἄξιον δὲ μηδὲ τὸ ὑπὸ Ἀντιπάτρου τοῦ ἐπιγραμματοποιοῦ γραφὲν ἐπίγραμμα παραλιπεῖν, ἔχον οὐκ ἀσέμνως); see also Isaac Porphyrogenitus *Praefatio in Homerum* 8 Kindstrand (οἱ δὲ τὴν Καλλιόπην φασὶ γεννῆσαι τοῦτον, εἰκότως διὰ τὴν τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ καλλιέπειαν). Calliope is Homer's mother also in Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 2.1. In the Suda (Ὅμηρος 1) her partner is Apollo, who does not appear in the *Certamen*'s list of fathers. Apollo and Calliope are mentioned in the genealogy at 46 and 48 respectively, but with different roles.)

27. τινὲς δὲ Πολυκάστην τὴν Νέστορος: see 23-4n.

27-32. ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ … πηροὶ καλοῦνται: the issue of the poet's original name, already mentioned earlier in the text (see 10-12n. for a discussion on the connection between Smyrne and the name Melesigenes), now becomes the focus of attention. The *Certamen* offers three alleged original names (thus echoing the list of birthplaces at 8-17) and suggests two explanations as to why they were dropped. As in other lists, the text combines well known traditions with less widely attested ones: Meles and Auletes are otherwise unknown while Melesigenes is very common. The change of name is motivated with reference to the most widely circulating etymologies for the name Homer ('blind' and 'hostage') but unlike what we are told in all the extant Lives, here it is Homer's father, rather than Homer himself, who has been taken hostage. Conversely

Meles, elsewhere the name of Homer's father, is here attributed to the poet himself.

27-8. **ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Μέλης:** otherwise the name of Homer's father, in the context of the Smyrnean tradition (9-10n.). The absence of punctuation in this part of the manuscript seems to show that Melesigenes was perceived, at the very least by the scribe of **L**, as another form of the name Meles, rather than a different one (the manuscript text runs: ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Μέλης ὡς δέ τινές φασι Μελησιγενής· ὡς δὲ ἔνιοι αὐλητήν). As a proper name, Meles is attested for a singer mentioned by Plato (*Grg*. 502a4).

28. ὡς δέ τινές φασι Μελησιγενής: see 10n.

28-9. ὡς <δ'> ἔνιοι Αὐλητής: an otherwise unknown name for Homer, clearly referring to Homer's poetic activity; for other speaking names in Homer's family see the genealogy at 45-53. Welcker 1835: 149 proposed the emendation Ἄλτης, unanimously accepted by later editors, on the basis of Schol. T *Il*. 22.51: ὀνομάκλυτος Ἄλτης· Ἀθηνοκλῆς φησι τὸν Ὅμηρον πρώην Ἄλτην καλεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ ἐπαινεῖν αὐτὸν ὀνομάκλυτος. Altes is a minor Homeric character, the father of Priamus' first wife Laotoe, and is mentioned in the *Iliad* only twice (*Il*. 21.85-6 and *Il*. 22.51). The fact that Homer called him ὀνομάκλυτος (despite his minor role) led Athenocles to think that Altes was Homer's original name. But although Αὐλητής may result from a corruption of Ἄλτης, it also testifies to the continued creative energy of the biographical tradition and may respond to a shift in paedagogical emphasis: Ἄλτης responds to the habit of drawing biographical information on Homer from his works; Αὐλητής would be a speaking name, like many others transmitted in the poets' genealogies and in the *Certamen* too. There is no need therefore to emend the name given by the manuscript, except for its ending: the accusative in the manuscript (see apparatus) is due to a misunderstanding of the copyist, who probably thought that this name was connected to the following infinitive ὀνομασθῆναι (as the absence of the necessary punctuation seems to point out), which is instead to be

taken with the accusative Ὅμηρον.

29-32. ὀνομασθῆναι … καλοῦνται: the text lists the two most common etymologies for the name Homer, 'blind' and 'hostage': for discussion of this alternative etymology see 11-12n. The *Certamen* does not express a preference for either of the etymologies listed. About the possibility that Homer's Cypriot father Masagoras was given hostage to the Persians, and more generally for the Cypriot tradition on Homer, see 21n. That it is Homer's father who was given hostage and that he was given to the Persians are details unique to the *Certamen*: in the rest of the biographical tradition Homer himself is said to be given hostage by the Smyrneans either to the Chians (Procl. *Vit. Hom.* 3) or the Colophonians (Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 3). For modern discussion of Homer's name see Bonfante 1968, Deroy 1972, Durante 1957, West 1999, Nagy 1979: 296-300 and 2006, Debiasi 2001 and 2012: 463-70.

32-43. ὅπερ δὲ ἀκηκόαμεν … δεδοξακότος: the mention of the emperor Hadrian (117-38 AD) is our only clue for dating the *Certamen*, but it is not easy to interpret. The Greek may mean that Hadrian was still alive (e.g. Nietzsche 1870: 536 and most recently Uden 2010), but does not exclude that the compilation was made a little after the emperor's death: see Wilamowitz 1916: 397 ('der Verfasser wird nicht viele Dezennien nach Hadrian gelebt haben'), Vogt 1959: 196 n. 6 ('Freilich darf man nicht an eine Entstehung noch in hadrianischer Zeit denken, sondern lediglich an die Regierungszeit Hadrians als *terminus post quem*'), West 1967: 433 ('Hadrian is dead but of fresh memory'). Furthermore, the epithet θειότατος was used of Hadrian both during his life and after his death (cf. Mason: 1974: 53 and 125). However, the claim that we must trust the oracle 'given the identity of the enquirer and the responder' (41-2) and the very presence of the episode in this work seem to indicate that it was inserted in the narrative while the emperor was still alive, perhaps not much after his visit to Delphi (125 AD). In a recent study Uden 2010 (esp. 123-9) convincingly argues that this claim

is to be seen in the context of Hadrian's role in contemporary debates about Greek literature and culture, which did not always meet with approval. The presence of a different response by the Pythia to the same question (56-60) suggests that who authored the *Certamen* did not really believe that the answer given to Hadrian was the most trustworthy, and probably inserted that claim only as a formal sign of respect for the emperor. But the content of Pythia's response does not need to be read as ironic: Uden 2010: 127 claims that the notion of an Ithacan Homer would have appeared absurd to anyone in antiquity, but there is nothing to prove this claim. Certainly, within the *Certamen* that tradition is presented as equal to any other (see 23-4.: Telemachus; 25-6: the Ithacan girl).

37-40. ἄγνωστόν … ἄνδρα: this epigram is found only here and in *AP* 14.102, with some textual variants, among which the name Epicaste, instead of Polycaste (see also *Od*. 3.464 et *Cert*. 27). In *AP* 14 it is transmitted among riddles, mathematical problems and other oracular texts (book 14 is titled Ἀριθμητικὰ καὶ γρῖφοι). For other stories of people interrogating the oracle on Homer, and other oracular responses, see *AP* 16.292-299, and Lucian *Alex*. 53.

44-55. ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν προγενέστερον … ἐν Αὐλίδι τῆς Βοιωτίας: the *Certamen* now discusses another much debated issue of Homer's biography, his date. The discussion is based on a comparison between Homer and Hesiod, which was one of the most common ways of approaching the matter in antiquity. Graziosi 2002: 90-124 identifies three distinct ways of dating Homer by connecting him to a particular place or event, to a specific individual (usually another poet), and to his subject matter, the Trojan War. Focussing on Homer's connection with Hesiod is a meaningful choice in the present context, in that it allows the text to introduce their contest, and hints at its outcome. In antiquity, moreover, such discussion of Homer's and Hesiod's relative chronology was also seen as a means to assess the relationship between heroic

and didactic poetry; see most recently Beecroft 2010: 79: genealogical claims function as claims about genre theory, therefore the variations in the relationships between two poets are a means of assigning priorities to the different genres and configuring their relationships in different ways. The *Certamen* introduces three options, apparently without taking sides (ἔνιοι μέν ... τινὲς δέ … τινὲς δέ). But only the second option, which portrays Homer as a younger contemporary of Hesiod, is supported by a genealogy. The first one (Homer is older than Hesiod), as also the third (Homer and Hesiod are exact contemporaries and competed with one another) are presented without any further support. This confirms the impression, given early on in the text, that at the time of the contest Homer was only at the beginning of his artistic career (see 15-17n.), perhaps as a way of mitigating Homer's defeat against an older and more expert Hesiod. In fact, a close reading of the genealogy and a comparison with other sources, may even suggest that the *Certamen* presents the contest as potentially implausible: according to the final part of the genealogy as found in **L** (and quite differently from other sources of the genealogy, see esp. 51-3n.) the two poets' lifetime would hardly have overlapped.

44-5. ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν προγενέστερον Ἡσιόδου φασὶν εἶναι: the text does not offer any support to the view that Homer is older than Hesiod. Homer's chronological priority was often used to assert his greater authority (T5-T9 Most, esp. T7 = Vell. Pat. 1.7.1: *ut tempore tanto viro* (scil. *Homero*), *ita operis auctoritate proximus*; T8 = Plut. *Letter of Condolence to Apollonius* 105d: ὁ δὲ (Ἡσίοδος) μετὰ τοῦτον καὶ τῇ δόξῃ καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ), a view which is clearly incompatible with Homer's defeat in the contest.

45-53. τινὲς δὲ νεώτερον … Ὅμηρον: the presence of an extended genealogy makes this option look like the most trustworthy among the three proposed. The genealogy must have been circulating as early as in the fifth century BC: see Proclus (*Vit. Hom*. 4), who quotes the historians Hellanicus (4 F 5b = fr. 5

Fowler), Damastes (5 F 11b = fr. 11 Fowler) and Pherecydes (3 F 167 = fr. 167 Fowler); another version is transmitted in Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 1, with reference to the historian Charax (103 F 62). For an overview see Kivilo 2010: 12-17. This traditional material, however, is consciously adapted in the *Certamen* to suit its view of Homer and Hesiod. Thus, the *Certamen* provides the two poets with divine origins, in accordance with the opening claim that Homer and Hesiod are the most divine poets (see 1-2.). Examples include Apollo, Poseidon, Methone, Calliope, Meles and the nymph Thoosa, whose counterpart in Charax was a Thracian woman, Aithousa. For the same purpose the genealogy includes some divine mothers: we find them together with those male figures who are neither gods nor poets, thus ensuring that each level of the genealogy features either a divinely inspired figure, or a deity (Methone is mentioned with Pierus, Calliope with Oeagrus). Divine mothers are also mentioned at the beginning and end of the genealogy: Thoosa, daughter of Poseidon, appears at the beginning, Hesiod's mother Pycimede, daughter of Apollo, at the end. (Homer's own mother does not need to be a goddess as his divine origins are secured by his father, the river god Meles.) As well as several poets (Linus, Orpheus and Melanopus) the genealogy also features names that would suit poets (Harmonides, Philoterpes, Euphemus, Epiphrades). Other names are attested elsewhere, but with different roles (Melanopus, Dius, Apelles, Maion) and the precise relations among some of the characters also vary; for example, while Homer and Hesiod are first cousins in Proclus and the Suda, the genealogy in the *Certamen* supports the claim that Homer was younger than Hesiod. Accordingly, the positions of some characters are changed and additional characters inserted (Perses, Maion's daughter and Meles) in order to increase the chronological gap between the two poets.

46. Ἀπόλλωνός φασι καὶ Θοώσης τῆς Ποσειδῶνος: Thoosa is a character known also from other sources, but with different roles than the one attributed to her in this context: she is Poseidon's wife rather than his daughter and is

never said to be Apollo's partner (*Od.* 1.71-3: she is a nymph, daughter of Phorcys, mother of Polyphemus by Poseidon; Schol. *Il*. 1.71; Schol. Theoc. 11.67-68; Apollod. 7.4.6; Eust. *Od.* 1.22.3; Emp. fr. 122.9; Nonn. *D*. 39.293). In Charax' version Aithousa, described as a woman from Thrace, takes Thoosa's place: unlike the *Certamen*, Charax does not emphasise the divine origins of the poets. In other sources, Aithousa is the name of a nymph, who is also said to be Poseidon's daughter and to have had a son by Apollo (Apollod. 3.100; Paus. 9, 20, 1; Schol. Hes. *Th*. 54b1; Ael. Herod. *De Pros. Cath*. 296, 7; the son is named Eleutheros, not Linus). Some early editors followed Charax and emended Θοώσης to Αἰθούσης, but there is no reason to believe that that was the name used in a hypothetical original version of this genealogy.

47. Λίνον: on this character see West 1983: 56-67 and Ford 2002: 151. Linus and the Linus song, funeral dirge to which he is connected, are known to both Homer and Hesiod (*Il*. 18.569-70; Hes. fr. 305-306 M.-W.); his presence is thus suitable for the genealogy of these two poets. Several myths circulated about Linus in antiquity; cf. Paus. 9.29.9, who reports the view that at least two poets of this name existed. The genealogy of the *Certamen* is unique: most commonly, Linus is said to be the son of Apollo and Calliope (Apollod. 1.3.2; Paus. 1.43.7 and 2.19.7), though D. L. 1.4.1 claims that his parents are Hermes and the Muse Ourania (for Ourania only cf. also Hes. fr. 305 M.-W.), and sometimes he is said to be the son of Oeagrus and Calliope (also mentioned in the *Certamen*, but as parents of Orpheus two generations later). Linus is said to have competed with the god Apollo, and after losing the contest was killed by the god (Paus. 9.29.6).

Λίνου δὲ Πίερον: Pierus is known as the father of nine maidens called Pierides. As was the case with Linus (see above), his family too is connected to a contest story: the Pierides are said to have challenged the Muses in a poetic contest and, after their defeat, to have been turned into birds (Paus. 9.29.3-4; Ant. Lib. 9). In the *Certamen* he is the son of Linus and father of Oeagrus. In the genealogy of Charax he occupies the same position. Other sources suggest a

different lineage: according to Melisseus (402 F 1) Pierus is Linus' father and Methone his sister.

47-8. Πιέρου δὲ καὶ νύμφης Μεθώνης Οἴαγρον: among the extant versions of this genealogy Methone is mentioned only here: Proclus starts with the following generation (Orpheus) and Charax gives only the names of the male characters. She is a nymph, one of the Alkyonids, who threw themselves into the sea after Herakles killed their father, and subsequently turned into halcyons: see Suda *s.v.* Ἀλκυονίδες ἡμέραι.

48. Οἴαγρον: it seems that there is no other trace of Oeagrus' being the son of Pierus and Methone. In D. S. 3.65.6 he is the son of the Thracian king Charops and king of Thrace himself. The claim that he fathered Orpheus is found in all versions of this genealogy and seems to be the only fixed feature of this character. See below.

Οἰάγρου δὲ καὶ Καλλιόπης Ὀρφέα: several witnesses agree that Orpheus' parents were Calliope and Oeagros (A. R. 1.23; Tz. *Ad Lyc*. 831); though others give no name for the mother (Pl. *Smp*. 179d, D. S. 4.25.2 and Clem. Al. *Protr*. 7.63). Oeagros has a different son in Proclus (Dorion) and in Charax (Dres). According to Apollod. 1.14.1, Calliope and Oeagrus also had Linus, who in this genealogy is in another position. On Calliope see 26-7., where she is mentioned in the list of Homer's mothers. Here she guarantees the presence of a divinity in earlier levels of Homer's genealogy.

Ὀρφέα: the *Certamen* is the only extant text in which Homer and Hesiod are descendants of Orpheus. Orpheus is arguably the most important poet in this genealogy, and indeed Proclus reports the genealogy only from Orpheus onwards, claiming that 'Hellanicus, Damastes, and Pherekydes trace his lineage back to Orpheus'. According to Kivilo 2010: 16-17 and 54-6 his presence in the genealogy may point to a role of the Orphic poets in creating it, and more generally in shaping biographical traditions (see esp. pp. 54-6, where she also spots Orphic influences in the traditions about Hesiod). The connection

between Homer, Hesiod and Orpheus was not only genealogical: frequent references to Orpheus, Musaeus, Hesiod and Homer (usually in this order, cf. Hes. T17, T18, T116a, T119bi, bii Most) suggest that together they were seen as the most ancient and authoritative poets. For the possibility that this series of names is to be interpreted chronologically, see Graziosi 2002: 107 n. 51, Ford 2002: 45, Koning 2010: 52-5.

49. Ὀρφέως δὲ Ὄρτην: this seems to be the only attestation of a character named Ortes. His counterpart in the genealogy of Charax is called Δρῆς: Goettling, Nietzsche and Rzach emend the text of **L** on that basis, but Dres too is otherwise unknown. Proclus gives yet another name, Dorion. Both Proclus and Charax add Eukles, a name that is integrated into this genealogy by many editors (see apparatus) but on no safe ground.

Ἁρμονίδην: the name is suitable for a poet, but as many others in this context it is nowhere else attested in relation to the genealogy of Homer and Hesiod. In *Il*. 5.60 Harmonides is the father of Phereclus, and, like his son, is described as a Trojan ship-builder. The scholium to the passage makes it clear that the name Harmonides was connected with the verb ἁρμόζειν and that it was felt to be significant in this context (Ἁρμονίδεω: ὅτι ὀνοματοθετικὸς ὁ ποιητής, καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ παραπλησίως ποιεῖ· οἰκεῖον γὰρ τέκτονος τὸ ἁρμόζειν, κἀκεῖ (sc. Χ 330)· ‘Τερπιάδης δέ τ’ ἀοιδός’). It would seem that Lucian aimed for a similar effect when introducing Harmonides the flute-player as the protagonist in his homonymous dialogue. Tzetzes (*H*. 168), commenting on the Iliadic passage, exemplifies the many uses of the verb ἁρμόζειν by comparing ship-builders and rhetoricians on the ground that they both ‘ἁρμόττουσι’ (πλοῖα, ships, or λόγους, words). Proclus and Charax transmit the name Ἰδμονίδην, another unknown character. The emendation Ἰαδμονίδην, proposed by Nietzsche and Rzach, is unconvincing: this name is not attested, and it has been created on the basis of Aesop’s kinsman Ἰάδμων, or Ἴδμων (see Hdt. 2.134; Suda *s.v.* Αἴσωπος; Plu. *The Delays of Divine Vengeance* 557a) that seems to be irrelevant in this

context and it misses the importance of speaking names in the text. See also, on Auletes, 28-9n.

Φιλοτέρπην: this name is attested only in this genealogy, in all of its versions. It is clearly another speaking name ('fond of pleasure') which may suit a poet. The compound is also attested as an adjective (e.g. Nonn. *D*. 40.366).

50. Εὔφημον: another speaking name suitable for a poet, or for a poet's ancestor. It is frequently found as the name of Stesichorus' father (Pl. *Phdr.* 244A; St. Byz. *s.v.* Μάταυρος; *Vita Pindari, De Novem Lyricis* 11 Drachmann; Suda *s.v.* Στησίχορος) and also appears in Musaios' genealogy (Suda *s.v.* Μουσαῖος). As an ancestor of Homer and Hesiod, Euphemus is attested only here and in the genealogy of Charax. Proclus gives the form Chariphemus. For Chariphemus as the founder of Cyme see Ephorus 70 F 99 = Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.2. For Euphemus as a Homeric character see *Il*. 2.846 (he is the son of Troezenus and the captain of the Ciconian spearmen).

Ἐπιφράδην: another little-known character with a name that may suit a poet; cf. ἐπιφραδέως (from ἐπιφράζομαι), 'wisely', 'circumspectly'. The name is not attested outside this genealogy.

Μελάνωπον: a mythical poet from Cyme who features also in other biographies of Homer and Hesiod, though in different roles: Pausanias (5.7.8) claims that he lived after Olen; he composed a hymn to Opis and Hecaerge, two daughters of Boreas who introduced the worship of Artemis to Delos (as testified also by Call. *Del.* 292). Melanopus apparently claimed that these two maidens came to Delos before Achaeia, who according to Olen was the first to arrive on the island. In the *Certamen* Melanopus is the father of Apellaios and Dios; in Proclus he is the father of Apelles and grandfather of Dios and Maion; cf. Suda *s.v.* Ἡσίοδος (father of Apelles, grandfather of Dios). The name of Melanopus is also attested elsewhere in connection with Homer: in Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 1 a character with the same name, although not safely identifiable with the poet mentioned by Pausanias, is a man of modest means who went from

Magnesia to Aeolian Cyme when this city was founded and there fathered Homer's mother Cretheis; in Lucian *Enc. Dem*. 9.16 he is again said to be the father of Homer's mother (καὶ μητέρα <τὴν> Μελανώπου).

51-3. τούτου δὲ ... Ὅμηρον: as this genealogy is used here as evidence for Homer's being younger than Hesiod and related to him, the final part differs substantially from Proclus' version, where the poets are said to be contemporaries: Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 4: Μαίονα γάρ φασι τὸν Ὁμήρου πατέρα καὶ Δῖον τὸν Ἡσιόδου γενέσθαι Ἀπέλλιδος τοῦ Μελανώπου. (Charax reports only Homer's parentage and neglects to insert Dius and Hesiod.) This is achieved mainly by giving different roles to Apelles, Maion and Dius and other subtle variations. In the *Certamen* Maion is presented as two generations younger than Dius, Hesiod's father, and Homer is not his son but his grandson by his daughter. The ultimate result is to present Homer as three generations younger than Hesiod. The reading Πέρσου makes Maion the son of Hesiod's brother, and the kinship between the two poets is reinforced. There is no need to emend it to Ἀπέλλου or a different form of this same name (see apparatus). This emendation would balance the genealogy, otherwise brutally interrupted by Apelles' side, and would make it more similar to its counterparts in other sources; but complete consistency between the various versions cannot be achieved. Inserting another female character, the daughter of Maion, allows the text to introduce the river god Meles and give Homer a divine parent (thus balancing the fact that Hesiod's mother Pycimede is the daughter of Apollo). Nietzsche's emendation (καὶ θυγατρός instead of θυγατρὸς καί) is not necessary.

51-2. Δίου δὲ καὶ Πυκιμήδης τῆς Ἀπόλλωνος θυγατρὸς Ἡσίοδον καὶ Πέρσην: while the name of Hesiod's brother comes from *Works and Days*, and perhaps that of his father too (cf. *Op*. 299: Πέρση, δῖον γένος), Hesiod makes no mention of his mother in his work. The tradition, however, unanimously transmits the name Pycimede since at least the fourth century BC (Ephorus 70 F

1= Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. A 2). Nothing is known about the origins of her name, which is appropriate for the mother of a didactic poet: it means 'cautious minded', 'wise' (see also Kivilo 2010: 9). Ephorus (*loc. cit*.) claims that Dius married Pycimede in Ascra, after leaving Cyme because of debts. In Tz. *Life of Hesiod* 1 Colonna Dius and Pycimede leave Cyme together; in this context she is also explicitly said to be the mother of Perses. In P.Oxy. 3537 r. she is mentioned as ὀλβίστη μήτειρα; cf. also Suda *s.v.* Ἡσίοδος. The fact that Pycimede is said to be Apollo's daughter (a suggestion not found anywhere else) reinforces the claim of kinship between the god of poetry, mentioned at the very beginning of the genealogy, and the two poets who at the beginning of the work were introduced as θειότατοι (1).

54-5. τινὲς δὲ συνακμάσαι ... ἐν Αὐλίδι τῆς Βοιωτίας: in a work that devotes much space to the contest of Homer and Hesiod, this episode is introduced in a surprising way. The phrasing implies that Homer and Hesiod had to be contemporaries in order to be able to compete, but this option is introduced in the same way as the others (τινὲς δὲ ... φασίν) and is supported by no evidence. Some authors in antiquity refused to believe that the contest happened on the basis that the two poets did not live at the same time (Proclus and Tzetzes, see Introduction, pp. 44-51). The connection between the story of the contest and the view that the two poets lived at the same time is found elsewhere too (cf. Philostratus in Introduction, pp. 31-5; Aul. Gell. *NA* 3.11.3) and the two traditions may well have developed to support each other (see also Kivilo 2010: 22; but note Hdt. 2.53.2; Clem. Al. *Strom*. 1.21.117.4; Sync. *Chron*. 202.21-2 and 206.9 (T 10, 12, 14 Most), where no such connection seems to be implied.

55. ὁμόσε <γενομένους> ἐν Αὐλίδι τῆς Βοιωτίας: by saying that Homer and Hesiod met up in Aulis before the contest, the compiler draws a further detail of the story from Hesiod's *Works and Days* 650-9: the two poets are said to make the same trip from Aulis to Chalcis that Hesiod mentions in that passage, and by which he sets his poetry against that of Homer – see Introduction on Hesiod,

esp. p. 12. It is unlikely that Aulis is mentioned here as the location of the contest, *pace* Nagy 2010: 43 among others. First, there is a linguistic problem in the transmitted text of the manuscript: the expression ἀγωνίσασθαι ὁμόσε ('compete with each other'?) is never attested in Greek literature, and it is unlikely that ὁμόσε should be taken together with ἀγωνίσασθαι. Moreover, at 67-8 the contest is said to have taken place at Chalcis. Because the location of the contest was fixed at Chalcis by Hesiod himself, and was accepted unanimously in all other versions of the story, Chalcis must be the correct location of the contest in the *Certamen* too. Nietzsche's emendation ἐν Χαλκίδι τῆς Εὐβοίας may thus seem tempting (see Nietzsche's apparatus *ad loc.*: 'Εὔβοια et Βοιωτία nomina saepius confunduntur, veluti in schol. ad Hesiod. Theog. v. 54'), but it too founders on the difficulty of construing ἀγωνίσασθαι with ὁμόσε. Busse's supplement <γενομένους> elegantly restores the gist of the text before corruption occurred: the two poets met at Aulis before the contest, and together sailed to Chalcis to compete. Importantly, this sequence of events is also implied in the following lines: 66-8: καὶ οὗτοι οὖν ἐκ τύχης, ὥς φασι, συμβαλόντες ἀλλήλοις ἦλθον εἰς τὴν Χαλκίδα. The particles γάρ at 55 (ποιήσαντα γὰρ τὸν Μαργίτην) and οὖν at 66 (καὶ οὗτοι οὖν), that brings the narrative back to the contest, indicate the presence of a digression that explains how the poets ended up competing in Chalcis after their initial meeting in Aulis.

ποιήσαντα γὰρ τὸν Μαργίτην: the *Margites* is the only work that Homer is said to have composed before the contest; all other works are attributed to the period after it (*Thebaid* and *Epigoni* at 256 and 258, *Iliad* and *Odyssey* at 275-6, *Hymn to Apollo* at 317; some epigrams). Moreover, Homer is explicitly said to be getting on in years only after the composition of the *Hymn to Apollo*, his last work to be mentioned before his fatal sojourn on Ios (323). The *Certamen* thus seems to suggest that the contest happened while Homer was still young, perhaps to play down the significance of his defeat. The idea, current in

Imperial times, that the *Margites* is a juvenile work, and more specifically that it was Homer's first, was already introduced in par. 2 (see 15-17n.).

56. περιέρχεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν ῥαψῳδοῦντα: from the beginning of his artistic career Homer is presented as a travelling poet and performer. The verb ῥαψῳδέω appears twice in the *Certamen.* In both instances it refers to Homer, and means 'to perform'. By contrast, compounds of ποιέω are used in the text to indicate acts of poetic creation: 55-6: ποιήσαντα γὰρ τὸν Μαργίτην περιέρχεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν ῥαψῳδοῦντα; 286-7: ἐκεῖθεν δὲ παραγενόμενος εἰς Κόρινθον ἐρραψῴδει τὰ ποιήματα. Homer is thus depicted here both as a poet and as a proto-rhapsode, that is, the first performer of his own poetry. The latter idea may have been promoted by Homeric rhapsodes keen to give their profession a respectable ancestry. Indeed, the very fact that composition and performance are separated so clearly in the text may point to rhapsodic practice, as reflected also in the famous story of Cynaethus stealing from Homer told in Schol. Pi. *N*. 2.1. On the rhapsodes see Graziosi 2002: 21-40; on 'wandering poets' more generally see Hunter-Rutherford 2009. Some Greek texts present Hesiod too as a rhapsode, and indeed as a proto-rhapsode, sometimes along with Homer: [Hes.] fr. 357 M.-W. (on which see the Introduction, pp. 14-18) and 4 F 464 (ῥαψωιδῆσαι δέ φησι πρῶτον τὸν Ἡσίοδον Νικοκλῆς), both transmitted in Schol. Pi. *N*. 2.1; Pl. *R*. 10.600d: Ὅμηρον δ' ἄρα οἱ ἐπ' ἐκείνου, εἴπερ οἷός τ' ἦν πρὸς ἀρετὴν ὀνῆσαι ἀνθρώπους, ἢ Ἡσίοδον ῥαψωιδεῖν ἂν περιιόντας εἴων. Rhapsodes must have performed Hesiod's works too: cf. Pl. *Lg*. 2.658d: ῥαψωιδὸν δὲ καλῶς Ἰλιάδα καὶ Ὀδύσσειαν ἤ τι τῶν Ἡσιοδείων διατιθέντα τάχ' ἂν ἡμεῖς οἱ γέροντες ἥδιστα ἀκούσαντες νικᾶν ἂν φαῖμεν πάμπολυ. For the hypothesis that Hesiod depicts himself as a rhapsode in *Th*. 30, see Patzer 1993. In the *Certamen*, however, the verb ῥαψῳδέω is only used of Homer, one of several points of contrast between the two poets. While Homer travels a lot and his travels are always connected to his poetic performances, Hesiod travels far less: he goes to

Chalcis to participate in the contest; after that, he goes to Delphi to dedicate his victory and consult the oracle, and then to Oinoe in an unsuccessful attempt to escape his fate. The text thus reinforces the image of Hesiod as a poet who was always, and from the beginning, connected to a particular place. Homer, by contrast, emerges as a poet who travelled around the cities of Greece during his lifetime and could therefore be claimed by every Greek city after his death.

56-62. ἐλθόντα δὲ καὶ εἰς Δελφοὺς … περὶ τὴν ἐκεῖ χώραν: Homer himself goes to interrogate the Pythia about his own birthplace: this fits well in a text that opens by emphasising the debate existing over the poet's origins. The Pythia establishes a genealogical connection between Homer and Ios: an apparent contradiction with 37-40, according to which the Pythia told Hadrian that Homer was from Ithaca. This may agree with the impression that the author of the *Certamen* does not share his own claim on the truthfulness of this utterance (41-3). On the Pythia's response to Homer see 59-60n. The oracle also contains a prophecy on Homer's death: this allows a parallel with the oracle consulted by Hesiod, later in the text (215-23). The fact that Homer's oracle is mentioned so early in the narration, while Hesiod visits Delphi only after the contest, is meaningful in narrative terms. The oracles (and therefore the fate of the two poets) and the contest seem to have strong causal relations with each other. The meeting between Homer and Hesiod, hence their contest, takes place ultimately because of the oracle Homer received (the poet ended up in Aulis in an attempt to stay away from the established place of his death as revealed by the Pythia); Hesiod in turn consults the oracle precisely because of the contest (he goes to Delphi to dedicate the victory). As Vogt 1959 and West 1967 argue, it is possible that the episode of Homer's oracle was present already in Alcidamas' account. Alcidamas was the source for the the episode of Hesiod's oracle and death (240), and the source for Homer's death too (P.Mich. inv. 2754): the episode of Homer's oracle would complete an elaborate narrative structure and

depict a clear nexus oracle-contest-death, which may well have been present already in one of the *Certamen*'s literary source.

59-60. ἔστιν Ἴος νῆσος ... αἴνιγμα φύλαξαι: (*AP* 14.65) the epigram is transmitted with several variations in other sources, some of which mix it with verses from another oracle given by the Pythia to Homer: (*AP* 14.66) Ὄλβιε καὶ δύσδαιμον—ἔφυς γὰρ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις / πατρίδα δίζηαι· μητρὸς δέ τοι, οὐ πατρός ἐστι / μητρόπολις ἐν νήσῳ ἀπὸ Κρήτης εὐρείης, / Μίνωος γαίης, οὔτε σχεδὸν οὔτ' ἀποτηλοῦ· / ἐν τῇ μοῖρ' ἐστίν σε τελευτῆσαι βιότοιο, / εὖτ' ἂν ἀπὸ γλώσσης παίδων μὴ γνῷς ἐσακούσας / δυσξύνετον σκολιοῖσι λόγοις εἰρημένον ὕμνον· / δοιὰς γὰρ ζωῆς μοίρας λάχες· ἣν μὲν ἀμαυρὰν / ἠελίων δισσῶν, τὴν δ' ἀθανάτοις ἰσόμοιρον, / ζῶντί τε καὶ φθιμένῳ· φθίμενος δ' ἔτι πολλὸν ἀγήρως. On this epigram see Skiadas 1965: 49-52. Pausanias (10.24.9) and Stephanus of Byzantium (*s.v.* Ἴος) report a version of the oracle that starts with the first two verses of *AP* 14.66 and then continues with our *AP* 14.65. Pseudo-Plutarch reports both the epigrams in succession, as they are in the *Greek Anthology*.

62-8. κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον … ἦλθον εἰς τὴν Χαλκίδα: these lines are part of the short digression which started at 55n. and explains how the two poets ended up competing in Chalcis. Many of the details concerning the setting of the poetic contest are taken from *Op*. 650-9 (Hesiod's sea trip from Aulis; the contest is held on the occasion of Amphidamas' funeral games; these games were organized by Amphidamas' sons; and remarkable prizes are announced).

63. Γανύκτωρ: this name occurs in two circumstances in the account of the life of Hesiod. He is the son of Amphidamas, organiser and judge of his father's funeral games, here and in Tz. *Life of Hesiod* 126 Colonna. But according to other traditions, of which the *Certamen* too, among others, is aware, Ganyctor is a son of Phegeus, from Locris, one of Hesiod's murderers with his brother

Amphiphanes (226-7n.) or a man from Naupactus father of Hesiod's murderers (241n.).

63-4. Ἀμφιδάμαντος βασιλέως Εὐβοίας: this character is mentioned only by Hesiod (*Op.* 654) and in passages related to the story of the contest. Plutarch (fr. 84 Sandbach, p. 26) says that Amphidamas died in a sea battle during the Lelantine war. This war was fought between Chalcis and Eretria and it is approximately dated between the end of the eighth and the beginning of the seventh century BC. See Breilich 1961: 47-64 and Parker 1997: 59-93. Hesiod's mention of Amphidamas and Plutarch's claim have also been taken as a chronological clue for Hesiod. However, given the scarcity of precise information on Amphidamas and the Lelantine war, some scholars have doubted the credibility of Plutarch's claim (for discussion see Evelyn-White 1914: XVI, Sinclair 1932: 68, West 1966: 43-4 and 1978: 321, Edwards 1971: 203-4, Fehling 1979, Janko 1982: 94-8, Kivilo 2010: 46, Ercolani 2010: 16, Kõiv 2011). Thucydides shows that this war was perceived as a big event that took place in an undefined past and in which for the first time the rest of the Greek world was divided in alliance with one side or the other (Th. 1.15.3: μάλιστα δὲ ἐς τὸν πάλαι ποτὲ γενόμενον πόλεμον Χαλκιδέων καὶ Ἐρετριῶν καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἑκατέρων διέστη). In this respect, regardless of the historical reliability of Plutarch's claim, the Lelantine war may have been perceived in antiquity as an appropriate historical background for the story of the contest of the two greatest poets.

64-6. πάντας τοὺς ἐπισήμους ἄνδρας ... συνεκάλεσεν: this claim highlights the importance of the event. The fact that other competitions besides the poetic one were included in Amphidamas' funeral games is not explicitly claimed in Hesiod's *Works and Days* but could easily have been inferred from the fact that the poet specifies that he won 'ὕμνῳ' (657), in song, thus not ruling out the possibility of other kind of games. The idea of an opposition between wisdom and physical strength (ῥώμῃ καὶ τάχει and σοφίᾳ, l. 65) appears already in

Xenophanes (fr. 2 West) and was a common contrast for Alcidamas: Richardson 1981: 5, and O' Sullivan 1992: 80.

68-70. τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνος ... τοῦ τετελευτηκότος: the way the judges are introduced creates (unfulfilled) expectations about how the competition will be judged. No one would expect that Panoides, who appears here at the same level as the other notable Chalcideans sitting as judges (μετ' αὐτῶν) and is apparently singled out only as brother of the deceased, will in fact have total decisional power (205-10n.).

69. Πανοίδης: a character who is attested only in texts related to the contest of Homer and Hesiod. In the form given by **L** (here and in l. 177) it is a speaking name meaning 'All-knowing'. However it is probably used ironically here, as the *Certamen* does not seem to agree with the final verdict and other texts too show that he became famous precisely because he turned out to be wrong in his judgement (205-10n.). P.Petr. I 25 l. 4 gives Πανήδης and this form has been unanimously used to emend **L.** But the two forms represent two different attempts at etymologising the name and should both be kept in the text of their respective witnesses. Πανήδης has been interpreted as 'he who enjoys everything' (πᾶν + ἡδύς: see Kirchhoff 1892: 887) and again indicates the king's ineptitude as a judge. Another attested form is Πανίδης (Philostratus, Tzetzes and Michael Apostoles *Collectio Paroemiarum*). Iotacism alone does not explain the existence of the different forms of the name.

70-2. ἀμφοτέρων δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν … τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον: the outcome of the contest is well known, and not modifiable. Thus the text reveals it already at the beginning of the account of the competition, focussing thereafter on the way (τρόπον) Hesiod came to win.

72-4. προελθόντα … Ὅμηρον ἀποκρίνασθαι: the words that describe Hesiod taking centre stage, εἰς τὸ μέσον, are common in the description of perfomative contexts in antiquity: see Detienne 1990: 83-98 and Ford 2002: 32 (esp. n. 25 for references)**.** The text then briefly explains that, throughout the

competition, Hesiod will ask questions and Homer will reply to each of them. This general summary substitutes for more precise indications given in earlier versions before each exchange of verses: cf. P.Petr. I 25. The roles of Homer and Hesiod were different in other accounts of the contest: see Plu. *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 153a-154f, where Hesiod answers a riddle, and Tzetzes (*Life of Hesiod* 127 Colonna) who claims that the two poets exchanged improvised verses πρὸς ἀλλήλους, 'to each other'.

74-89. The first two exchanges of verses are aimed at defining the 'best' and the 'finest' thing for mortals. These themes are very common in lyric and symposiastic poetry and inform early philosophical enquiry too (Ford 1997: 92-3. See e.g. Sappho fr. 16 Voigt on the κάλλιστον; Plu. *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 153a for Thales replying to similar questions). Taken together the first two challenges and responses are expressions of common Greek thoughts: Homer claims that the best thing for mortals is not to be born, or to die as soon as possible; the 'finest' thing for men, the activity that gives most pleasure to mortals once they are born, is the symposium. From the first few verses, it becomes clear that the hexameters of the *Certamen* fully draw on the epic tradition. They are created by using a high number of epic formulae and metrical patterns (e.g. the caesura κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον, on which see e.g. West 1982: 35-6 and Kirk 1985: 18-24). Sometimes traditional or very popular verses are quoted too. The passage can also be taken as evidence for the quotation of Homeric verses in symposiastic contexts.

75. υἱὲ Μέλητος … εἰδώς: the expression υἱὲ Μέλητος Ὅμηρε is created on the model of similar invocations of epic heroes: Ἀτρέος υἱέ (Agamemnon: e.g. *Il*. 2.23); Τυδέος υἱέ (Diomedes: e.g. *Il*. 4.370); υἱὲ Πριάμοιο (Hector: e.g. *Il.* 7.47); Μενοιτίου υἱέ (Patroclus: e.g. *Il*. 9.202); Πηλῆος υἱέ (Achilles: e.g. *Il*. 16.21). υἱὲ Μέλητος is also at 151 and parallels ἔκγονε Δίου (i.e. son of Dius) used by Homer for Hesiod at 156. For Homer as the son of the river Meles see 9-10n.; θεῶν ἄπο μήδεα εἰδώς in the second half of the hexameter is formulaic too (*Od.*

6.12, Hes. fr. 136.12 M.-W.). Both parts of the verse highlight Homer's divine nature.

76. εἴπ' ἄγε μοι … βροτοῖσιν: the actual question is contained in the last part of the couplet while the first part of this hexameter is again created by using formulaic expressions: εἴπ' ἄγε μοι is used at the beginning of the hexameter in e.g. *Il*. 3.192. Πάμπρωτα is in connection with καὶ τοῦτο (81) that follows the second instance of εἴπ' ἄγε μοι ('come, tell me first of all' ... 'come, tell me this too'). The expression φέρτατόν βροτοῖσιν provides a metrically suitable substitute for the corresponding words in the verses that Homer uses to answer, ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον.

78-9. ἀρχὴν μὲν μὴ φῦναι ... Ἀίδαο περῆσαι: Homer replies with traditional verses. They are first attested in Theognis (425-8, with added pentameters) but Campbell 1983: 23 suggests that Theognis might have taken the hexameter lines from an earlier source. They are widely attested in several sources: for a list see West 1971, apparatus *ad* Thgn. 425 ff. More generally, the concept they express was very common (see e.g. S. *OC* 1225-7, B. 5.160-2). The wide circulation of these verses and ideas certainly explains Homer's success in this stage of the competiton (ll. 90-94), and the very fact that Homer pronounces them makes him a repository for wisdom in the *Certamen*. The presence of this couplet in P.Petr. I 25 (ll. 12-15) proves that it was connected to the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod at least by the third century BC, but the connection may well be even older: the couplet is quoted by Stobaeus (4.52.22) under the lemma ἔπαινος θανάτου as coming ἐκ Ἀλκιδάμαντος Μουσείου and on the basis of this quotation Nietzsche (1870 and 1873) found in Alcidamas' *Musaion* the source for the agonistic section of the *Certamen* (for a more sceptical view see Muir 2001: xix). Theognis' version has πάντων at the beginning of the couplet, while all the passages that connect these verses to the contest story (implicitly, i.e. Stobaeus, or explicitly, i.e. *Certamen* and P.Petr. I 25) transmit the reading ἀρχήν. For detailed discussion see Nietzsche 1870: 536, Busse 1909: 113

n. 1, Wilamowitz 1916b: 401, Vogt 1959: 196 and 202. ὅμως is only in the *Certamen*, but the emendation in ὅπως (see apparatus) is unnecessary. For πύλας Ἀίδαο περῆσαι cf. *Il.* 5.646: πύλας Ἀίδαο περήσειν; *Il.* 23.71: πύλας Ἀίδαο περήσω.

81. εἶπ' ἄγε μοι … Ὅμηρε: for the first half of the hexameter see 76n. The second part is used to address Homer with another formulaic epithet, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελος. This epithet, found always in the same position in the hexameter, is used in Homeric poetry for Achilles (θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ: e.g. *Il*. 9.485) and in Hesiod is found in the forms θεοῖς ἐπιείκελα τέκνα and θεοῖς ἐπιείκελον ἄνδρα (*Th*. 963, 987 and 1020). Homer's divine nature is again emphasised (see also 75n.).

82. τί θνητοῖς … εἶναι;: Hesiod's new question centers on the theme of the 'finest thing' for men. The emendation θνητοῖς κάλλιστον (first proposed by Rzach on the basis of the corresponding papyrus reading), in place of θνητοῖσιν ἄριστον of the manuscript, is here accepted. Homer has already defined the 'best thing' (ἄριστον) for men in the first session: it would make no sense for Hesiod to ask again the same question and for Homer to give a different answer. ἄριστον may be due to the influence of the same word at 78. See also commentary on P.Petr. I 25, 17-19.

84-9. ὁππότ' ἂν εὐφροσύνη … εἴδεται εἶναι: the verses used for Homer's response to Hesiod's challenge are a description of feasting taken from *Odyssey* 9.6-11, although this work has not been composed yet at this point in the narrative: see 275-6n. These verses in their original context start off Odysseus' speech, when Alcinous invites him to reveal his identity and tell his story. In the *Certamen* Homer's choice of performing these verses is a guarantee of success for him (see 90-4 for the audience's reaction), for they express another common Greek view (cf. Heldmann 1982: 77: 'typisch griechische Lebensfreude und Diesseitigkeit'). In antiquity these Homeric lines were often seen as problematic and criticised (e.g. Plato, *R.* 390a-b) and were very famous and widely quoted

and discussed (see Hillgruber 1999: 335-6, Pontani 2005: 236 n. 232). Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989: 12 also remark that the scene depicted by Odysseus, 'the joyful, lavish banquet is an outward and visible sign of a stable and peacefully ordered community as exemplified by the Phaeacian utopia': Homer, by choosing to perform these verses in reply to Hesiod's question, appears as a supporter of the social order that they signify. This image of Homer will be central in the exchanges at 151-75. Like the verses of the previous answer, these verses too were certainly connected to the contest story by the third century BC (P.Petr. I 25), and also in this case the connection may go as far as back as Alcidamas' *Museion.* The beginning of this passage has been adapted in the *Certamen* to the new context: while in the *Odyssey* the first verse starts with ἢ ὅτ' ἐϋφροσύνη (connected to the comparative in the previous verse: οὐ γὰρ ἐγώ γέ τί φημι τέλος χαριέστερον εἶναι) the quotation here begins with ὁππότ' ἂν εὐφροσύνη. In the last verse, the papyrus reads φαίνεται while both the *Certamen* and the vulgata of the *Odyssey* read εἴδεται.

90-4. ῥηθέντων δὲ … προκατεύχεσθαι πάντας: the position of prominence that Homer will hold throughout the competition is asserted already after the first round. The reaction of the public highlights some of the most important features of Homer as depicted in the *Certamen*: the ability to provoke wonder and amazement in the public, the obvious appeal to a Panhellenic audience, and the fact that his performance is used as aetiology for future festivals and performances in antiquity.

90-1. ῥηθέντων δὲ τῶν ἐπῶν: most editors added τούτων after δέ on the basis of the papyrus reading, but this seems unnecessary.

οὕτω σφοδρῶς φασι θαυμασθῆναι: θαῦμα appears from the beginning as a prominent feature of Homeric poetry: it is a reaction that Homer will inspire throughout the contest and will lead the public to ask for him to be awarded the victory (205-6: θαυμάσαντες δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸν Ὅμηρον οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐπήνουν). Reactions to poetic performances are described in similar terms

already in the *Odyssey* (see e.g. *Od*. 1.325-6 and 1.339-40; more references and discussion in Lanata 1963: 8-9 and Ford 1992: 51-2) and in other Homeric biographies (Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 5 12, 22, 36). θαῦμα is an important idea in Alcidamas' stylistic theory too (O' Sullivan 1992: 74) and he attributes it explicitly to Homer: P.Mich. inv. 2754, ll. 15-18: Ὅμηρος γοῦν διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ζῶν καὶ ἀποθανὼν τετίμηται παρὰ πάσιν ἀνθρώποις.

τοὺς στίχους: the manuscript reading τὰ ἔπη causes a grammatical problem with the following χρυσοῦς αὐτούς (91-2). Rzach's emendation τοὺς στίχους (on the basis of the papyrus) is the most convincing solution proposed (better than Nietzsche's αὐτοὺς <στίχους>). The manuscript reading may be simply due to the influence of the previous τῶν ἐπῶν.

ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων: by calling the public that is attending the contest 'the Greeks' (cf. also l. 176 'οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες πάντες' and l. 205) the *Certamen* parallels the claims of Homer's Panhellenism made at the opening of the text on biographical grounds (dispute over his birthplace: see 7-8n.). P.Mich. inv. 2754 offers a similar assessment (17-19: Ὅμηρος γοῦν διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ζῶν καὶ ἀποθανὼν τετίμηται παρὰ πάσιν ἀνθρώποις. Cf. also τῶν Ἑλλήνων at l. 22 of the same papyrus) thus showing that this idea was supported by Alcidamas too.

91-2. ὥστε χρυσοῦς αὐτοὺς προσαγορευθῆναι: the definition of *Od*. 9.5-11 as 'golden verses' is attested only here and in P.Petr. I 25, 31-2, and it is not possible to know whether it goes back to Alcidamas, or to an earlier source (see Kaiser 1964: 213-14, with references at p. 214 n. 3). It is nevertheless clear in meaning and based on traditional elements. It recalls the definition of χρυσέα ἔπη for Pythagoras' words, for example. The metaphorical use of the adjective χρύσεος is already attested in epic poetry (e.g. referred to Aphrodite: *Il*. 3.64; *Od*. 8.337) and, perhaps more pertinently, Homer himself is called 'golden' (Tz. *Life of Hesiod* 141 Colonna: Ὅμηρος γὰρ ὁ χρυσοῦς; Anon. *Vit. Hom* 2.2 and

Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.4 (= *AP* 11.442): ἡμέτερος γὰρ κεῖνος ὁ χρύσεος ἦν πολιήτης).

92-4. καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ... προκατεύχεσθαι πάντας: Homeric poetry was recited on public sacrifices and banquets (see e.g. Pl. *Ion* 535d) but there is no evidence for such performances of this specific passage. It is therefore impossible to know whether this claim was inspired by actual performative experiences or not, but it surely fits the habit of the *Certamen* to use (or perhaps create) myths on performances by Homer as aetiology for other (actual?) festivals and sacrifices: cf. Homer at Argos, at 302-8. Such claims emphasise the persistence of Homer's legacy. There is no space in the papyrus for καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν and it may be an attempt by the author of the *Certamen* to make his sources seem relevant to his own time (discussion in Wilamowitz 1916b: 401 n. 1 and Vogt 1959: 216 n. 65).

94. ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος ἀχθεσθεὶς ἐπὶ τῇ Ὁμήρου εὐημερίᾳ: this description of Hesiod's reaction to Homer's success starts depicting a great contrast between the two poets. From here onwards Hesiod will appear keener than Homer on quarrels and competition (see also 148-50n.), and this will be in striking contrast to the grounds on which Panoides will issue his judgement (205-10n.).

95. ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπόρων ὥρμησεν ἐπερώτησιν: the contest moves on to a more difficult challenge: a question to which there seems to be no possible answer. Such challenges are found in a variety of contexts in ancient Greece (e.g. Heracl. fr. 18 D.-K., Plu. *Alex*. 64). In Alcidamas' *On Sophists* the word *ἀπορία* is used to describe the condition in which those who are used to written speeches find themselves when it comes to speak on the spot (*Soph.* 8, 15, 16, 21; in contrast with *εὐπορία*, see *Soph.* 3, 6, 13, 19, 24, 34): for him, therefore, the fact that Homer does not find himself in an aporetic situation, but is able to solve challenges immediately, may be a relevant illustration of good rhetorical performance.

97-101. Μοῦσ' ἄγε μοι ... περὶ νίκης: Homer is asked not to talk about anything that is, was or shall be and replies by giving a negative prophecy: there will never be funeral games for Zeus, as he is an immortal god. Plutarch mentions this part of the contest as the decisive one in his account of the story; the question is set forth by Lesches, while Hesiod has to reply and is consequently awarded the victory; Plutarch's version of the question contains no 'difficulty' (*Dinner of the Seven Sages* 153f-154a, see Introduction).

97-8. Μοῦσ' ἄγε μοι ... σὺ δ' ἄλλης μνῆσαι ἀοιδῆς: the ability to know present, past and future is usually connected to the Muses and their ability to sing everything: for the formula τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα see e.g. Hes. *Th*. 38; cf. also [Hes.] fr. 204.113 M.-W. (see West 1966: 166). The same ability is attributed with the same words to the seer Chalcas as well (*Il*. 1.70) and the scholium to *Th*. 32 (where the formula appears in a shortened version) makes it clear that poets and prophets are similar in that both categories are divinely inspired. Therefore the presence of this formula (although reversed, as Homer is asked to sing nothing that is, shall be, or was, but rather 'another song') together with Homer's ability to answer such question, outlines once again Homer's divine inspiration. For Alcidamas, this section of the contest may have been particularly significant as an expression of another key point of his literary theory: the freedom to choose any subject for a declamation (in response e.g. to the attack put forth by Isocrates (*Hel.* 11; see O'Sullivan 1992: 83). Μοῦσ' ἄγε μοι is not formulaic but it may have been constructed on the model of εἶπ' ἄγε μοι (76) with the addition of an invocation to the Muses since the formula that follows, as mentioned above, is often connected to them. The second verse too is reminiscent of the epic formulaic vocabulary. Collins 2004: 104 sees in μηδὲν ἄειδε a parodic reference to the Homeric μῆνιν ἄειδε (*Il.* 1.1); σὺ δ' ἄλλης μνῆσαι ἀοιδῆς is an adaptation of the verse that closes many Homeric *Hymns* (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς. See e.g. *h.Hom.* 2.495, 3.546.

100-1. οὐδέ ποτ' ἀμφὶ Διὸς … ἐρίζοντες περὶ νίκης: the funeral games for an immortal god are something that cannot exist at any present, past or future times. Homer here supports the traditional image of the gods presented in his work, against a long tradition of attacks, and alternative versions. There was a well-developed debate about the existence of a tomb of Zeus in Crete and this debate can be traced back to the fourth century BC (Kokolakis 1995: 125; complete list of references in Cook 1914: 157-63 and 1925: 940-3) – although the debate flares up in the Hellenistic period: Callimachus (*Jov.* 4-7) and Euhemerus (T 69 A in Winiarczyk 1991). Homer in the *Certamen* goes back to the topic of Zeus' immortality at 122-3 (where Hesiod provokingly mentions the 'white bones of dead Zeus') and defends another orthodox view on the gods when he denies the possibility of Artemis' marriage at 117-18. The tomb of Zeus seems to have been a topic for declamations, even if there is only one late witness for this: Philostr. *VS* 2.4.569-570. O' Sullivan's suggestion about the significance of this exchange of verses for Alcidamas (see 97-8) finds perhaps some confirmation in Philostratus.

102-37. Because of Homer's success in solving the ἄπορον question, Hesiod turns to a more difficult challenge, the 'ambiguous proposition'. Hesiod's challenges are ambiguous in that they present, more or less explicitly, improper views on issues that mattered to the Greeks: the life and behaviour of heroes (e.g. 107), the enemies of the Greeks (e.g. 109), the nature and behaviour of the gods (e.g. 117). Sometimes the exchanges of verses also reflect points of disagreement between Homeric and Hesiodic poetry (e.g. 113-14). Thematic connections marking the transition between groups of exchanges (a series of verses is on banquets, another on men and women, another on water and navigation) may have helped in memorizing the sequence. Homer turns Hesiod's claims into the expression of a common Greek thought by adding a new line that enjambs an element of Hesiod's and changes its meaning. Some of the hexameter material was circulating by Alcidamas' time and may have been

known to him: ll. 107-8 are transmitted in Aristophanes' *Peace*, performed in 421 BC; furthermore, as has been noted, in terms of content the challenges in this section are often sophistic in flavour and may represent fifth century BC concerns about Homeric language (see e.g. 113-14n). For Sophistic approaches to archaic epic see: Richardson 1975, Ford 2002: 80, Morgan: 2000 esp. 89-132, Koning 2010: 111-15 and 217-23, Boys-Stones 2010: 40-8. Sophistic influences are apparent in terms of syntax too: Homer is forced to introduce into hexameter poetry complicated syntactical structures reminiscent of sophistic prose, in order to present a complete 'proper' thought. Most epic hexameters stand on their own in terms of both syntax and meaning; similarly, Hesiod's verses in the *Certamen* stand on their own grammatically (most of them are main clauses, and have all the elements necessary to work syntactically) and express ideas that can be conceived in principle (for example, a tradition on Zeus' mortality: see 100-1 n.). While in the Homeric poems enjambment in most cases is used to expand or elaborate the thought expressed in the previous line ('progressive' enjambment), sometimes a Homeric runover line has a stronger connection with the previous one, and in extreme cases it may contain an element that is necessary for the first line to make sense, or even to correct a statement which may be problematic at the level of content (e.g. *Il*. 5.339-40: …ῥέε δ' ἄμβροτον αἷμα θεοῖο / ἰχώρ, οἷός πέρ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν). Similarly, Hesiod's lines too are problematic at the level of content and correction is provided by an enjambment. Yet, unlike in the Iliadic lines, the impropriety is resolved at the level of syntax: in other words, Homer gives Hesiod's line a new syntactical structure by reinterpreting it as requiring 'necessary enjambment'. The final result is that each 'proper' unit of thought is now contained in two lines, rather than in one, as is generally the case in the Homeric poems. Possibilities inherent in the Homeric tradition (the practice of the 'necessary' enjambment and the possibility of using enjambment correctively) are in these lines set in dialogue with new intellectual developments. For studies on the Homeric enjambments

see e.g. Parry 1971, Kirk 1966, Higbie 1990, Bakker 1990, Clark 1997. For an analysis of the practice of capping verses in performance and in different literary genres see Collins 2004.

105-6. ἔστιν οὖν … Ἡσιόδου: in the manuscript the verses are reported in succession, two per line, with no indication of the speaker and no separation between the different exchanges. This is the only guideline for the attribution of verses to each speaker and will turn out to be not detailed enough (see esp. 133-7n). It is a sign of the text's tendency towards conciseness (contrast P.Petr. I 25).

107-8. δεῖπνον … κορέσθην: in Hesiod's verse the heroes are said to be eating beef and necks of horses. Homer corrects Hesiod's improper suggestion about eating necks of horses, which is reminiscent of barbarian, rather than Greek, food habits (Collins 2004: 187), by enjambing καὐχένας ἵππων with another verb, ἔκλυον, the heroes turn out to dine on beef, and cleanse the horses' necks of sweat, as they were sated with war. The couplet is transmitted, with variants, in Aristophanes' *Peace* 1282-3. There, it is not used as an example of ἀμφίβολος γνώμη (the two verses are recited by the same character and the first verse is not seen as problematic), but offers the opportunity for a comic response by another character (Son of Lamachus: ὣς οἱ μὲν δαίνυντο βοῶν κρέα, καὐχένας ἵππων / ἔκλυον ἱδρώοντας, ἐπεὶ πολέμου ἐκόρεσθεν. Trygaeus: εἶεν; ἐκόρεσθεν τοῦ πολέμου κᾆτ᾽ ἤσθιον / ταῦτ᾽ ἄδε, ταῦθ᾽, ὡς ἤσθιον κεκορημένοι), on which see Sommerstein 1985: 194 and Olson 1998: 308. The mention of these verses in *Peace*, performed for the first time in 421 BC, shows that at least some of the hexameters contained in the *Certamen* pre-date Alcidamas. It is also possible that Aristophanes was aware that the couplet was connected to the story of the contest of Homer and Hesiod. On a general level, both Aristophanes and the *Certamen* present the couplet in contexts where the opposition between poetry of war and poetry of peace is a core issue; many of the verses mentioned in the passage from *Peace* come from Homeric poetry (cf. also Richardson 1981: 2); the *incipit* of Aristophanes' quotation, ὣς οἱ μὲν

δαίνυντο, is also transmitted in the *Certamen* in another passage connected to a feasting scene (119); hence Aristophanes may have been aware of a collection of verses similar to that in the *Certamen*. The whole scene in *Peace*, then, starts by quoting at l. 1270 another verse transmitted in the *Certamen* as well, the *incipit* of the *Epigoni* (259; the scholium to Aristophanes attributes the *Epigoni* to Antimachus, while the *Certamen* attributes it to Homer; cf. Di Benedetto 1969: 161 and 259n.). Even more interestingly, Aristophanes seems to echo, in his re-enactment of a contest between a poet of peace and a poet of war, the same poetic strategies Homer and Hesiod use in this section of the *Certamen*. At *Peace* 1270 the boy begins the verse, which is completed by Trygaeus, who adds a new one, so that the previous' speaker's words are reversed: Π. Α': νῦν αὖθ' ὁπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα- ΤΡ. Παῦσαι, / ὁπλοτέρους ᾄδον, καὶ ταῦτ', ὦ τρισκακόδαιμον,/ εἰρήνης οὔσης (the *Certamen* transmits Μοῦσα instead of the Aristophanic παῦσαι; for a similar poetic game see also *Peace* 1286-1287). The description of a cruel battle at vv. 1273-8, 'a slight misquotation from *Il.* 4.446-9' (Sommerstein 1985: 194), echoes Homer's finest passage in the *Certamen* (176-204). For discussion see also Meyer 1892: 377, Busse 1909: 108-19, Kirk 1950: 150, Compton Engle 1999: 327-8. Alcidamas therefore can have been responsible neither for the insertion of these hexameters within the contest story, nor the invention of the story itself. The hexameter at 108 as it stands in the manuscript does not scan. Emending πτολέμου in πολέμοιο seems the most convenient solution: while πολέμοιο is a very common epic form, πτολέμου is rarer and never found in this metrical position. Aristophanes' πολέμου ἐκόρεσθεν is fifth-century language and may be Aristophanes' own adaptation of the epic forms πολέμοιο and κορέσθην (e.g. *Od*. 4.541); it should not be used to emend the manuscript (against Wilamowitz). βοῶν κρέα in this metrical position and καὐχένας ἵππων are not Homeric.

109-10. καὶ Φρύγες … δόρπον ἑλέσθαι: Hesiod's verse claims that the Phrygians are the best people at navigation. Homer's answer is difficult and

different interpretations have been proposed, where the dative ἀνδράσι λιστῆρσιν is given different meaning and function: Evelyn-White translates 'to filch their dinner from pirates on the beach' and Collins 'among thieves to take their dinner on the shore'. Wilamowitz suggests the emendation δόρπα πένεσθαι (based on *Il*. 24.444) and he is followed by West who translates 'at preparing supper on shore for a pirate crew'. In any case, by giving this answer Homer achieves two goals. First, he denies the Phrygians' maritime supremacy: in the *Iliad* (e.g. 2.862-3) they were not a maritime force, so ἐπ' ἀκτῆς is a more appropriate location for them than ἐπὶ νηυσίν. Second, by associating them with pirates and possibly making them stealing food, he presents them in an overall negative light. In this respect Homer expresses a typically Greek attitude toward these people and consequently is able to gather approval among his Greek audience. The Phrygians were allies of the Trojans, and in the Athens of the fifth century BC these two names were interchangeable. The Phrygians were also associated with cruelty, luxury and cowardice (see Hall 1988 and 1989: 38-9, Erskine 2001: 73-4, West 2003: 329, Collins 2004: 187, Bryce 2006: 140-2). καὶ Φρύγες at the beginning of verse is also at *Il*. 10.431; λιστῆρσιν is in the same position at *Od*. 16.424; δόρπον ἑλέσθαι recalls δόρπον ἕλοντο at *Od*. 14.347.

111-12. χερσὶ … τόξα: in Hesiod's verse someone (as yet unspecified) is said to shoot arrows at the Giants with his hands, χερσί. Homer solves the problem by linking χερσί to ἀπέλυσεν (ἀπ' ὤμων καμπύλα τόξα): with his hands Heracles undoes the bow from his shoulders, and then uses it to shoot arrows. The Giants are described as δολίχ' ἔγχεα χερσὶν ἔχοντας by Hesiod (*Th.* 186) and this may explain why the difficulty of Hesiod's verse is based precisely on the word χερσί. This exchange seems to refer to the Gigantomachy, the battle between gods and Giants in which Heracles helped the gods; in epic, the episode is mentioned, or alluded to, at *Th.* 954 and Hes. fr. 43a.65 M.-W. (see West 1966: 419 and Clay 2003: 113-15). In the manuscript the verses are presented in the opposite sequence to this edition: it seems necessary to reverse

the order, as proposed first by Nietzsche, because at 112 there is no apparent difficulty that could be solved by any element in the previous line. Line 111 as it is transmitted in **L** does not scan, but it seems sufficient to emend ὄλλων in ὅλων. The dative ἰοῖσιν does not necessarily need to be emended to its accusative form (see apparatus) because this would require, for metrical reasons, a further emendation (οὖλον and ἀνόμων). καμπύλα τόξα is formulaic and often occurs in the same metrical position as at 112 (e.g. *Il.* 3.17).

113-14. οὗτος … γυναιξίν: this couplet starts off a series of verses about the theme of the union between man and woman. Hesiod is applying two opposite adjectives to the same person: a man is said to be the son of a 'good and cowardly' man. Homer enjambs the second adjective, ἀνάλκιδος, with a new, feminine name, μητρός, so that the man is now said to be the son of a good man and a cowardly mother: war, as Homer explains, is hard for all women. The play on the double value of the adjective ἄναλκις may reflect early fifth-century concerns about Homeric language. Protagoras (A 28 D.-K.) remarked that the word μῆνιν because of its meaning should be masculine, but Homer uses it as feminine (Graziosi 2001: 67). In this exchange Homer is using language properly, because ἄναλκις is an adjective for women, not for the Homeric ἀγαθὸς ἀνήρ. For such man, ἀλκή is an important martial quality (Kirk 1990: 97), while ἄναλκις is strongly connected to inability in war (together with ἀπτόλεμος: *Il*. 2.201; 9.35; 9.41), and it is usually applied to warriors as a rebuke (e.g. the formulaic κακὸν καὶ ἀνάλκιδα, on which see below); or indeed to women, as in the present couplet after Homer's contribution: ἄναλκις is used in connection with Aphrodite when Diomedes recognizes her in *Il.* 5.330-2 and is used of women more generally at *Il*. 5.349. The verse as proposed by Hesiod and the way Homer corrects it also seem to reflect two different views, one more Hesiodic and the other more Homeric, on what an ἀγαθὸς ἀνήρ is, for, unlike the Homeric poetry, Hesiod does not emphasise ability in war as a necessary requirement for good men. For his verse Hesiod reverses a Homeric

formula, found always in the same metrical position: ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἀνάλκιδος instead of the Homeric κακὸν καὶ ἀνάλκιδα (*Il.* 8.153; 14.126) and κακὸν καὶ ἄναλκιν (*Od.* 3.375).

115-16. οὔτ' ἄρ ... Ἀφροδίτην: according to Hesiod's verse, in order to conceive a child (σοί, 'for you', 'to have you') a father and a mother did not have a physical union (οὔτ' ἄρ ... ἐμίγη). It is not precisely clear how the syntactic connection between this and the following verse works and the text of Homer's answer seems corrupt. It seems though that the key element for Homer's solution is διὰ χρυσῆν Ἀφροδίτην: i.e. the body was sowed 'by the action of golden Aphrodite', presented as a substitute for physical union. The couplet may be centered on a parodic use of the formulaic διὰ χρυσῆν Ἀφροδίτην (cf. also *LfgrE*) and may point to ancient and now lost discussions about this formula. That phrase is generally used in epic in the opposite sense to Homer's answer, that is as a metaphor for sexual union. The fact that the formula occurs only in Hesiod (*Th.* 822; 962; 1005; 1014; fr. 23a.35 M.-W.; fr. 221.3 M.-W.; for discussion see West 1966: 78 and 398) and is here pronounced by Homer may also suggest that it is the point of the discussion in this exchange. Πατὴρ ἐμίγη καὶ πότνια μήτηρ is built on the Homeric πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ which occurs both in the *Iliad* (e.g. *Il*. 9.561) and in the *Odyssey* (e.g. *Od*. 6.30). The emendation αὐτάρ (Rzach, Evelyn-White), which eliminates the negation οὔτε at the beginning of the verse, does not clarify the meaning of the couplet, nor does the translation proposed by Evelyn-White (who accepts it): 'But for you, your father and lady mother lay in love – / when they begot you by the aid of golden Aphrodite'. West gives yet a different meaning to the first verse, but by putting σῶμα τό γ' ἐσπείραντο between *cruces* does not offer a definitive solution: 'Nor with you your father and lady mother make love – / †the body which† they sowed through golden Aphrodite'. Both the manuscript reading ἐσπείραντο and the emendation proposed σπείραντε are unattested forms.

117-18. αὐτὰρ ... βιοῖ<ο>: this couplet closes the series of verses about men and

women. δμήθη γάμῳ, cannot be allowed to refer to the virgin goddess Artemis, as Hesiod's verse implies. Homer's contribution clarifies that it was Callisto who got married, and for this reason Artemis shot her with an arrow. Homer is referring here to the story of Callisto, friend and hunting companion of Artemis, told in different versions (listed in *LFGrE s.v.* Καλλιστώ). She had sworn to preserve her virginity in honour of Artemis but was seduced by Zeus, and as a punishment she was either transformed into a bear or, as in this couplet, killed by Artemis. This exchange too may be seen as reflecting fifth-century Sophistic concerns about Homeric language (Graziosi 2001: 66-7). Homer's answer suggests solving the impropriety by means of a different distribution of words among the sentences in the couplet – that is, moving an imaginary comma from the end of the verse to after γάμῳ; in a similar vein, a fragment from Democritus (fr. 22 D.-K.) deals with the possibility of alternative word division in the Homeric poems. Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα (or its accusative form) is formulaic (e.g. *Il.* 5.53, Hes. *Th.* 14) and generally occurs at the end of the hexameter. ἀπ' ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖο occurs only once in epic, at *Il.* 24.605 (but cf. *Il.* 1.49: ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖο) and refers to Apollo rather than Artemis. Nevertheless, in *Il.* 24.605 too it is closely connected to the formula Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα (found in the next verse) and introduced by the same verb (πέφνεν) as in this couplet: *Il.* 24.605-6: τοὺς μὲν Ἀπόλλων πέφνεν ἀπ' ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖο / χωόμενος Νιόβῃ, τὰς δ' Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα.

119-20. ὣς οἳ μὲν ... Ἀγαμέμνων: the poets deal again with the topic of feasting. Homer corrects the absurd suggestion that the heroes 'feasted throughout the day with no food' by saying that they had no food 'of their own' (οἴκοθεν), but it was provided by Agamemnon. Through this exchange of verses Homer and Hesiod are presenting and defending their different conceptions of feasting, food, and society. Hesiod's verse may be an exaggeration of the frugality advocated in the *Works and Days* (see e.g. vv. 40-1: νήπιοι, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν ὅσῳ πλέον ἥμισυ παντὸς / οὐδ' ὅσον ἐν μαλάχῃ τε καὶ

ἀσφοδέλῳ μέγ' ὄνειαρ), while Homer transforms this couplet into a typically Homeric scene of feasting. The visible difference is Agamemnon's generous behaviour: the only banquet offered by Agamemnon in the Homeric poems is in *Il.* 9.89-91, where he is said to invite the Achean leaders (for feasting in Homer see Foley 1999: 169-200; list of Homeric feasting episodes in Foley 1999: 272-3). Perhaps not surprisingly, the *Certamen* uses here the highly formulaic epithet ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν for Agamemnon, which is also found later in that Iliadic passage (at *Il.* 9.96). The exchange also looks like a comment on the question of how the heroes support themselves, as they are never seen to work, while according to the Hesiodic ideal of self-sufficiency, one cannot eat without working and it is a bad idea to rely on gift-eating kings, or even on neighbours. Homer transforms this couplet into a typically Homeric scene of royal patronage, as the food was provided by Agamemnon.

121-3. δεῖπνον … ἀντιθέοιο: in Hesiod's verses it is said that after feasting the heroes looked for the bones of the dead Zeus among the sooty ashes. But Homer, who cannot accept the idea of Zeus' mortality (see also 115-16n. on another theological impropriety, and 100-1n. on the tomb of Zeus), connects the genitive Διός with παιδός and thereby specifies that the bones are those of Sarpedon, the mortal son of Zeus, and not those of the god himself. Sarpedon's death causes much grief to Zeus in the *Iliad* (16.419-683), and the episode was also popular on vases (*LIMC s.v.* Sarpedon). On Sarpedon see Clay 2008-2009; more specifically on Sarpedon's death see Nagy 1983. For the first time Hesiod's question takes up two lines (cf. 105-6). Hesiod's first verse (121) also contains a difficulty, which is solved by Hesiod's own second verse (122). According to 121 the heroes are actually said to be feasting among the sooty ashes: the second verse connects more suitably the sooty ashes with another action, the search of bones. The fact that the bones are said to be those of Zeus brings about a second difficulty, which the next verse solves as explained above. In this context, according to the statement of the text at 105-6, we have to see in 121-2 Hesiod's

question, and in 123 Homer's answer (and in this case Evelyn-White's translation of 101-2, which leaves out the difficulty and solution contained in these two verses and focuses on 122-3, seems very appropriate: 'When they had feasted, they gathered among the glowing ashes the bones of the dead Zeus – / born Sarpedon, that bold and godlike man'). In other contexts, though, we may imagine that the verses were distributed in a different way, as a back and forth, or even between a number of speakers, as follows: Speaker A: l. 121; Speaker B: l.122; Speaker A or C: l. 123 (see also West 1967: 441). The phrase ἐνὶ σποδῷ αἰθαλοέσσῃ is not epic (but cf. *Il*. 18.23; *Od*. 24.316: αἰθαλόεσσαν at the end of the verse). ὀστέα λευκά is in the same metrical position in Hes. *Th*. 540, 555 and 557 (cf. also *Il.* 16.347, 23.252, and Emp. fr. 96.19 at the end of the verse; *Il*. 24.793 at the beginning of the verse). ἀντίθεος is a common epithet for Sarpedon (e.g. *Il*. 5.629) although never used in the same case and metrical position, while ὑπέρθυμος is never connected to him. κατατεθνειῶτος is not attested in epic, where there is the form κατατεθνηῶτος (e.g. *Il*. 7.89, also in the same metrical position); but this is not a sufficient ground for an emendation (see apparatus).

124-6. ἡμεῖς … δολιχαύλους: a new theme links, from now onwards, the last group of verses: water and navigation. As in the previous exchange (121-3), Hesiod asks his question in two verses and Homer replies with one. This too may be a double riddle (that is, the first verse presents a difficulty that the second verse of the question itself seems to solve) but the text is quite unclear. At 124, ἂμ πεδίον ('over the plain') is improperly accompanied by ἥμενοι ('sitting') instead of a verb of motion as would be required (cf. the instances of ἂμ πεδίον in the *Iliad*: 5.87, 5.96, 23.464). This is provided at 125 (ἴομεν), but in this new line there is nothing that attaches to ἥμενοι (cf. also West 1967: 441 n. 1). For this reason, it has been proposed that after 124 a line attributed to Homer has fallen out. In any case, Homer's skills are put to test on the basis of the difficulty at 125. The paradox contained in the new line is that ὁδόν seems to be the object of ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἔχοντες (carrying the road on their shoulders?).

Hence Homer in his line gives a new object to the verb ἔχοντες, and leaves ὁδόν in connection with ἴομεν ('we walk our way'; cf. also Hdt. 6.34: ἰόντες τὴν ἱρὴν ὁδόν). 'Hilted swords and long-socketed javelins' seems an obvious continuation for Homer, as in Homeric poetry ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν is often connected to weapons (cf. *Il.* 2.45, 3.328, 11.527). φάσγανα occurs only three times in Homer (*Il.* 15.713, *Od*. 16.295, *Od*. 22.74) and only once with κωπήεντα (this adjective is more often connected to ξίφος). αἰγανέας δολιχαύλους is Homeric and occurs in the same metrical position at *Od*. 9.156.

127-8. δὴ τότ' ἀριστῆες ... ὠκύαλον ναῦν: the problem proposed by Hesiod's verse lies in the expression χείρεσσι θαλάσσης ('with hands of/from the sea'). Homer enjambs it with elements that change its function within the sentence: with their hands the boys tear off (ἀπείρυσαν) from the sea a speedy ship (ὠκύαλον ναῦν). In this exchange of verses there may be a reference to the problem of personification of rivers, such as the Scamander in *Il.* 21.136-60. In this passage the river Scamander is angry at Achilles because the hero has thrown many bodies of Trojan warriors into his water. The river is repeatedly said to talk to Achilles, and to chase him with its water, but in one particular verse its human appearance is explicitly mentioned: v. 213, ἀνέρι εἰσάμενος, βαθέης δ' ἐκ φθέγξατο δίνης. Interestingly, this verse is omitted in some of the manuscripts of the *Iliad*, which may point to the fact that an anthropomorphic appearance of the river god may have been seen as problematic. This verse, certainly known to Aristarchus (cf. scholia *ad loc*.), was either included in later times because 'it was thought that the river god could not address Akhilleus unless he took human form', as Richardson 1993: 71 observes, or omitted precisely because the river god was thought not to be human in form. The expression ἀριστῆες κοῦροι is not attested in Homeric or Hesiodic poetry (but cf. Hes. fr. 1.2-3 M.-W.: Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδε[ς, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο / αἳ τότ' ἄρισται ἔσαν), while ἄσμενοι is found at the beginning of verse, in the formulaic ἄσμενοι ἐκ θανάτοιο, at *Od*. 9.63, 9.566, 10.134; ἐσσυμένως is

suitable in most metrical positions: it is found in the same position as in this couplet at *Od*. 9.73 and 16.51; ὠκύαλον ναῦν at the end of verse is found, in the metrically equivalent nominative form, at *Od*. 12.182 and 15.473.

129-30. κολχίδ' … ἀθέμιστον: Medea, the Colchian maid, was taken away from King Aietes, but there is no mention of King Aietes himself being borne away, as Hesiod's verse suggests. Through Homer's reply Αἰήτην βασιλῆα becomes the object of φεῦγον: they bore away the Colchian maid, and fled King Aietes. The episode of Medea being carried away by Jason is told by Hesiod (*Th.* 992-5) but does not feature in Homer. See also *Th*. 956-62 for another mention of both Aietes and Medea in Hesiod. This exchange between Homer and Hesiod also reflects the different attributes of King Aietes in their respective poetry: against the Hesiodic διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος (*Th*. 992) Homer uses ὀλοόφρονος Αἰήταο (*Od*. 10.137), in line with the negative epithets used in the answer: ἀνέστιον ἠδ' ἀθέμιστον. **L** reads Κολχίδ' ἔπειθ' ἵκοντο ('when they reached Colchis'), a reading that does not allow the verse to be an ἀμφίβολος γνώμη as there is no apparent difficulty. Wilamowitz interpreted Κολχίδα as the Colchian maid, rather than as Colchis, and then emended the following text in ἔπειτ' ἤγοντο, inspired by the Hesiodic κούρην δ' Αἰήταο… ἦγε παρ' Αἰήτεω (*Th*. 992-5). The manuscript reading can easily be explained in terms of the double meaning of the form κολχίδα and the similar sound of ἵκοντο and ἤγοντο, each of which suits one of the meanings of κολχίδα. Also Αἰήτην βασιλῆα in the same metrical position is found in the Hesiodic passage (*Th*. 957). For ἀνέστιον ἠδ' ἀθέμιστον cf. *Il.* 9.63-4: ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιός ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος / ὃς πολέμου ἔραται ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυόεντος, a single but very famous instance, as the many quotations of it show (e.g. Ar. *Pax* 1097).

131-2. αὐτὰρ … ἐπὶ νηῶν: the salty water of the sea, οἶδμα θαλάσσης, cannot be the object of ἔκπιον. Homer connects it to another verb: they prepared to sail (ποντοπορεῖν ἤμελλον) the water of the sea. Drinking the sea is used in the context of an ἀπορία in another relevant passage, Plu. *Dinner of the Seven Sages*

153f (see introduction on Plutarch, pp. 18-28). There the Egyptian king Amasis, during an exchange of riddles in a competition in wisdom with the king of the Ethiopians, was asked to drink up the ocean. The first part of the first verse is clearly and extensively based on a Homeric formulaic verse: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τε πίον θ' ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός (e.g. *Il*. 9.177; *Od*. 3.342; cf. also *Od*. 21.273), conveniently modified on the basis of the new context (inclusion of the difficulty at the end and slight variations in the central feet of the hexameter). οἶδμα θαλάσσης is in the *Hymn to Demeter* 14 in the same metrical position; ἐυσέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν too is based on Homeric verse-making practice: ἐύσσελμος (the normal epic form) is common epithet for ships and ἐυσσέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν is found in *Od*. 8.500 and 24.117. Similar forms (in different cases or with different prepositions, but always in the same metrical position) are also common: cf. e.g. *Il*. 7.419; *Od*. 12.358.

133-7. τοῖσιν … ἵκοισθε: these verses contain two separate but connected sequences of challenges and responses. At 133 Hesiod claims that Agamemnon prayed that the heroes might die. Homer corrects this statement in his line (134) by making Agamemnon pray that the heroes might never die at sea (μηδέ ποτ' ἐν πόντῳ); and with the second part of his verse seems to invite Hesiod to go on with another challenge on the same topic, more specifically he invites him to create an utterance by Agamemnon (καὶ φωνήσας ἔπος ηὔδα). Hesiod then creates the new challenge in two verses (this time only the second one seems to contain a difficulty): Agamemnon is again said to pray that the Achaeans might never go back to their homeland. In the last verse, thanks to Homer's intervention Agamemnon is said to pray that that Achaeans might never go back harmed, but rather in safety. The text here reflects Agamemnon's problematic standing as a leader in the *Iliad*. The issue of returning home is dramatised with particular force at the beginning of the poem, through Agamemnon's false dream, and its demoralising consequences; on Agamemnon's leadership see Haubold 2000: 52-68. The suggested division of

the verses among the speakers seems to be the one that best suits the structure of the competition as described in this section of the *Certamen*: both verses which contain difficulties (133 and 136) are attributed to Hesiod, while the solutions belong to Homer (134 and 137). Moreover the number of verses attributed to both speakers is in agreement with the general guidelines given at the beginning of the section: Homer always replies with one verse, while Hesiod sometimes asks the question in two verses. Other solutions have been proposed. Nietzsche suggests attributing to Homer only the last verse. Hermann's proposal (133-4 to Hesiod, 135-7 to Homer) would not involve any solution of difficulty by Homer. Busse's suggestion of dividing line 134 between the two speakers would again go against the set rules. The expression καὶ φωνήσας ἔπος ηὔδα is inspired by the Homeric formulaic verse καί μιν (or σφεας) φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (e.g. *Il*. 1.201; *Od*. 1.122; *Hymn to Apollo* 451). Line 136 is inspired by *Od*. 19.258: οἴκαδε νοστήσαντα φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν (but see also οἴκαδε νοστήσειε at *Od*. 2.343 and οἴκαδε νοστήσας e.g. *Od*. 4.103).

138-9. πρὸς πάντα … Ἡσίοδος: Homer's success continues, and seems to be increasing after each stage of the competition (cf. also the previous descriptions at 90-4 and 102) until he finally receives praise from 'all the Greeks' (176: οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες πάντες). All this leads the reader to believe that Hesiod is left with no chance of winning.

140-1. τοῦτό … Ἀχαιοί: Hesiod asks how many Achaeans went to Troy together with the Atreides. Arithmetical riddles in hexameter were common in antiquity: see e.g. the contest between Chalcas and Mopsus (esp. [Hes.] 278 M.-W. and Pherecydes 3 F 142) and the collection of arithmetical riddles in *AP* 14. The topic of this riddle is touched on by Homer in the *Iliad*: during the invocation to the Muses that opens the Catalogue of Ships (*Il*. 2.484-93) he claims that it would not be possible for him to describe or name the whole crowd of the soldiers who went to Troy unless the Muses themselves were to

recount all those who went to besiege Troy. Such a task, therefore, would require the assistance of the Muses, and by giving an answer Homer proves that he has the Muses on his side. On the value of this invocation to the Muses for Homeric poetics see most recently Ford 1992: 57-90, Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 1-8, Clay 2011 (esp. ch. 1). Whether or not Homer knew the actual number of Achaeans who participated in the war was also object of debate, and was naturally related to the interpretation of the poet's claim at *Il*. 2.488-93 (see Schol. bT on *Il*. 2.488: […] χρὴ οὖν νομίζειν ὅτι οὐ χαλεπὸν τὸ εἰπεῖν τὸν ἀριθμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ περὶ ἑκάστου διελθεῖν οὕτως ἀκριβῶς ὡς περὶ τῶν ἡγεμόνων, τίς καὶ πόθεν καὶ τίνων πατέρων καὶ προγόνων, καὶ τὰς πράξεις καὶ τὰ πάθη, ἃ καὶ ὑπὲρ διήγησιν). Such exchange may have been of interest to a fifth-century audience: the size of the Achaean expedition was calculated and discussed by Thucydides, according to whom the Trojan war was not as big as those fought in his own time (Th. 1.10.5: πρὸς τὰς μεγίστας δ' οὖν καὶ ἐλαχίστας ναῦς τὸ μέσον σκοποῦντι οὐ πολλοὶ φαίνονται ἐλθόντες, ὡς ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος κοινῇ πεμπόμενοι). See also Graziosi 2001: 68. The first verse contains a request to speak which draws on the formulaic vocabulary of epic poetry. ἐειρομένῳ is found in the expression εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένῳ (but in the first colon of the hexameter) at *Od.* 15.263 and *Od*. 24.114. The imperative κατάλεξον is in the same metrical position in a highly formulaic verse with the same introductory function as this (ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον, e.g. *Il*. 10.384). It also occurs in *Od.* 16.235-6, in a similar context: Odysseus is asking Telemachus to count the number of the suitors (ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι μνηστῆρας ἀριθμήσας κατάλεξον / ὄφρ' εἰδέω, ὅσσοι τε καὶ οἵ τινες ἀνέρες εἰσί). ἅμ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν occurs only three times in epic poetry and always in relation to the Achaean expedition: at *Il.* 2.761-2 the poet asks the Muses to tell him who were the best among the Acheans who followed the Atreides at Troy (v. 762: οἳ ἅμ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἕποντο); at *Od*. 17.103-4 Penelope says that her bed is always wet with her tears since Odysseus went to Troy with the Atreides

(…ἐξ οὗ Ὀδυσσεὺς / ᾤχεθ’ ἅμ’ Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἐς Ἴλιον); at *Od*. 19.182-3 Idomeneus is said to have gone to Troy with the Atreides (ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν ἐν νήεσσι κορωνίσιν Ἴλιον εἴσω / ᾤχεθ’ ἅμ’ Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν…). In the two occurrences from the *Odyssey* the expression ἅμ’ Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν is in the same metrical position as in our verse.

142. ὁ δὲ … οὕτως: the expression ἀποκρίνομαι διὰ λογιστικοῦ προβλήματος does not have parallels in extant Greek literature. Nevertheless its meaning is clear: ‘to reply by means of an arithmetical problem’ (West).

143-5. πεντήκοντ’ … Ἀχαιοί: Homer calculates in 112,500,000 the number of the Achaeans who took part in the expedition to Troy (50 fire-hearths x 50 spits x 50 pieces of meat x 900 Achaeans; on the recurrence of number fifty in Homer’s reply see Unanua Garmendia 2003). The number Homer proposes is striking and 146-8 present an interesting comment in this respect. But the fact itself that Homer gives an answer to this question is sufficient to prove that he is a divinely inspired poet (see 140-1n.). Moreover, the high number Homer proposes seems (playfully) to reassert the greatness of the Achaean expedition in reply to attacks such as that of Thucydides (above) (Graziosi 2001: 68). That this is an important point is also suggested by a comparison with another Iliadic passage, *Il*. 8.562-3: there the Trojans are counted in a way that is closely similar to Homer’s answer (they are gathered in groups of fifty people around a thousand fire-hearths: χίλι’ ἄρ’ ἐν πεδίῳ πυρὰ καίετο, πὰρ δὲ ἑκάστῳ / εἵατο πεντήκοντα σέλᾳ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο), and turn out to be considerably fewer than the Achaeans. The practice of counting people by dividing them in groups is common in epic poetry: see e.g. *Il*. 2.123-8 (another passage about the numerical superiority of the Achaean over the Trojans), as well as the contingents of the Boeotians (*Il*. 2.509-510) and of Philoctetes *(Il*. 2.719-720) in the Catalogue of Ships.

146-8. τοῦτο δὲ εὑρίσκεται … μυριάδες ,ε †ϋνῆ†: this claim seems incompatible with 149, where it is said that Homer has replied successfully to

all the challenges (κατὰ πάντα δὴ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ὑπερτεροῦντος). Hence West 1967: 442 n. 2 (see also West 2003: 335 n. 13) suggests that it is a marginal gloss that has been interpolated in the text in later times. It is an interesting claim nonetheless, because it shows that the topic of the exchange, the number of Achaeans who went to Troy, generated debate and comments throughout antiquity. The manuscript text is incomplete and unclear towards the end. Either the sentence was already incomplete in the source, perhaps because of physical damage (West 1967: 442 n. 2), or the copyist stopped copying the sentence after the letters ,ε ϋ ν͂ because of the difficulty of interpreting them. ,ε may well be the symbol for 5,000 (which with δεκαδύο μυριάδες would make 125,000, the expected quantity of pieces of meat) but ϋ and ν͂ are more problematic: if they too are numerals (400 and 50 respectively) they give a wrong result. Nietzsche proposes that the symbols ,ε and ϋ should be read together as εὐ and connected to the next sentence (εὐ κατὰ πάντα δὴ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ὑπερτεροῦντος).

148-75. κατὰ πάντα ... πλεῖστα: Hesiod now moves to asking a series of philosophical questions about morality, religion, government and good citizenship. In some cases the questions touch on topics already presented in previous sections (Wilamowitz 1916b: 403 defines this section as a 'Dublette') but there are differences. As West 1967: 442 notes, the verses 'reek of the late fifth or early fourth century'. In terms of language, the epic formulaic vocabulary is less frequently exploited, and some words are rarely or never used in early epic (see e.g. δικαιοσύνη at 168 and καιρός at 171). The topics discussed in this section informed widely fifth- and fourth-century philosophical and political discourse. Sophistic influences are identifiable throughout the section. More specifically, there are also many connections with Alcidamas' *On Sophists*, which explain why these verses might have been relevant to him, or why he might have created them. Furthermore, more explicitly than in the previous sections, Homer masterfully discusses and covers

topics that were traditionally considered Hesiod's fields of expertise and sometimes recall specific passages from *Works and Days* (e.g. justice and the city at 161-3; warning against corruption at 162; wisdom at 170-1; interactions between men at 172-3; see Koning 2010: 161-86). Homer's wisdom seems all-encompassing.

148-50. κατὰ … πάλιν: once again Homer is said to be able to reply well to every question and Hesiod's disappointment continues. Hesiod this time reacts with φθόνος. The presence of this word recalls *Works and Days* 24-6 (and may indeed be a pointed reference to that passage), where Hesiod says that the 'good' ἔρις regulates, among other things, the competition between bards: φθόνος is an important component of it (Hes. *Op*. 25: καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῷ φθονέει καὶ ἀοιδὸς ἀοιδῷ). (On this passage see West 1978: 147 and Verdenius 1985: 27). Hesiod therefore seems to be acting in accordance with his own teaching, and is stimulated by the success of his opponent to do better in the competition (Koning 2010: 257-8). However, this mention of φθόνος occurs in a context where the Hesiodic idea of it can easily be misinterpreted: the contrast with Homer's peaceful and nevertheless successful attitude is very clear and can put the Hesiodic φθόνος in a negative light (see also Clay 2003: 179 on Hesiod being a 'bad sport' here). The *Certamen* seems to be putting in action a perceptive reading of a Hesiodic passage and inviting readers to do the same.

151-4. υἱὲ Μέλητος ... ἀκοῦσαι: Hesiod asks Homer what is at the same time the best and the worst thing for mortals. The way Hesiod addresses Homer seems to respond to the previous exchange: Homer answered to Hesiod's question about the number of the Achaeans who went to Troy and thereby showed that the Muses are on his side (see 143-5n.). It may therefore be for this reason that Hesiod uses the epithet υἱὲ Μέλητος, that refers to Homer's divine origins (for the river god Meles as Homer's father see 8-9n.) and asks for yet another piece of evidence for the fact that Homer is honoured by the Muses (εἴ περ τιμῶσί σε Μοῦσαι). Hesiod's insistence on this matter may also be due to

the fact that he had famously claimed in his works a connection with the Muses for himself, and indeed this was a constant feature in the reception of his *persona* (Heldmann 1982: 83): this is the first example in this section of Homer taking upon himself some Hesiodic features. The epithet ὑψίστοιο Διὸς μεγάλοιο θύγατρες is never attested for the Muses in this form; Διὸς μεγάλοιο θύγατρες is also, in the same metrical position, in Antimachus fr. 1 Wyss; Διὸς μεγάλοιο is in the same metrical position at *Od*. 11.268 (Διὸς μεγάλοιο μιγεῖσα). Zeus in early hexameter poetry is never called ὕψιστος, but he is in later sources: Pind. *Nem*. 1.60; Aesch. *Eum*. 28. The core of Hesiod's question is contained in the last two verses of his utterance. This recalls the first two exchanges, about the best and finest things for men (75-9 and 81-9), but with a Sophistic twist: the practice of making opposite speeches on the same topic is Sophistic, and the contents of both answer and question seem to refer to specific philosophical doctrines (see below).

μέτρῳ: the interpretation of this question depends on the solution of a textual problem concerning this word. The manuscript reads μέτρον but the emendation μέτρῳ, first proposed by Barnes and followed by Wilamowitz and West, seems necessary. Editors and translators have given two different meanings to the word μέτρον depending on whether they accepted the transmitted accusative or the emendation in dative: 'standard' for those who have kept the accusative, (Evelyn-White translates 'tell me a standard that is both best and worst'; Avezzù: 'dimmi una misura che sia la migliore e la peggiore insieme'); 'meter' (hexameter) for those who have emended in dative (West: 'say – fitting into meter – what is for mortal the finest and the worst'; De Martino 1984: 'dimmi, nel metro adatto, qual è per i mortali la cosa più bella e più odiosa'). The form μέτρῳ solves grammatical inconsistencies in the text and gives the most appropriate meaning for the word μέτρον in this context. The accusative of the manuscript reading does not suit the verb ἐναρμόζων (which is itself a necessary and unanimously accepted emendation of the transmitted

ἐναρμόζον): 'to adapt a standard', or even 'to adapt a meter', would not make sense in this context. Those who keep the accusative and give to μέτρον the meaning of 'standard' in fact do not translate ἐναρμόζων. With the emendation in dative and the meaning 'meter' the sentence would mean 'fitting into meter': ἐναρμόζων is given a role in the sentence and the question assumes an additional nuance: this request to fit the contents of the answer into meter may be seen as an allusion to the fact that the issues touched on in it are typical also of some Sophistic literary production in prose (cf. also Gorgias, *Hel*. 9: τὴν ποίησιν ἅπασαν καὶ νομίζω καὶ ὀνομάζω λόγον ἔχοντα μέτρον). Homer in his answer uses μέτρον as 'standard' but this does not mean that the word must have the same meaning in the question as well: there may be an intentional play on these several meanings of the word of the same type as in Critias 4 *IEG* (ll. 3-4): οὐ γάρ πως ἦν τοὔνομ' ἐφαρμόζειν ἐλεγείωι, / νῦν δ' ἐν ἰαμβείωι κείσεται οὐκ ἀμέτρως. Note the presence of ἐφαρμόζειν, which parallels the *Certamen*'s ἐναρμόζων. On the use of μέτρον in this passage by Critias see Ford 2002: 43.

156-60: Ἡσίοδ' ἔκγονε Δίου … ἐρώτα: the expression Ἡσίοδ' ἔκγονε Δίου parallels and at the same time contrasts the epithet used for Homer in the question (υἱὲ Μέλητος at 151): while Homer's father is a river god, Hesiod's father Dius is never said to be more than a common mortal in the extant sources (Koning 2010: 133, Kivilo 2010: 8). The next words of Homer's answer make the contrast between the two poets even sharper: to Hesiod's φθόνος (148-50), Homer responds by replying willingly (ἑκόντα) and gladly (πρόφρων). For πρόφρων in epic cf. e.g. *Hymn. Merc.* 561: προφρονέως ἐθέλουσιν ἀληθείην ἀγορεύειν. The core of Homer's answer is that the best and at the same time the worst thing for mortals is to be a measure for oneself: to be so of good is the best thing, to be so of evil is the worst. See also West's translation: 'the finest thing is to be a measure of good for oneself, and the worst of all, to be so of evil'. The word μέτρον may be a reference to the Protagorean doctrine of the ἄνθρωπος μέτρον (fr. 1 D.-K.: πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, τῶν μὲν

ὄντων ὡς ἔστιν, τῶν δὲ οὐκ ὄντων ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν), to which sometimes Homer was connected in antiquity: Pl. *Tht*. 160d. But Homer claims that being a standard for oneself is also the worst of things for mortals, thus firmly taking distance from such Sophistic doctrines. For another possible reaction by Homer to Protagorean attacks see 113-14n.

ἄλλο δὲ πᾶν ὅ τι σῷ θυμῷ φίλον ἐστὶν ἐρώτα: Homer is inviting here Hesiod to ask another question in the same way in which rhetoricians and Sophists like Alcidamas and Gorgias invited the public to put forth a topic on which they would test their improvisation skills (Vogt 1959: 198 for references). ὅ τι σῷ θυμῷ φίλον ἐστὶν: cf. the formulaic φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ (e.g. *Il*. 7.31).

161-3. πῶς ἂν … ἐπείη: Hesiod asks now what the best way to run a πόλις is. This is another central issue in Hesiodic poetry, and a topic of great interest to the Sophists too. Homer manages to reply in a very Hesiodic fashion. The warning to avoid immoral and illegal profit is typical of Hesiod and informs Hesiod's addresses to Perses and the kings: e.g. *Op*. 352: μὴ κακὰ κερδαίνειν: κακὰ κέρδεα ἶσ᾽ ἀάτῃσιν. For the necessity of punishment of unjust behaviour see Hes. fr. 286: Justice is done (δίκη κ᾽ ἰθεῖα γένοιτο) if a wrongdoer suffers the same injustice he brought about. Also in this case we can see a contrast to certain Sophistic doctrines according to which 'justice is nothing other than the advantage of the stronger' (Thrasymachus fr. 56 D.-K.).

164-5. εὔχεσθαι … ἅπαντα: Hesiod asks what the best thing to pray the gods for is. Although the text of the answer is metrically incomplete and it has been suggested that it is corrupt, it seems to mean that the best thing men should pray the gods for is that they allow humans to be always well-disposed toward themselves. Cf. Evelyn-White's translation: 'that he (a man) always be at peace with himself'); according to another interpretation, that the gods themselves be well-disposed toward men (West: 'that they (the gods) be well-disposed to the city evermore'). Homer therefore agrees with the traditional Greek views on religion, according to which gods should be objects of prayers and honours, and

in saying so he appears to be taking distance from Sophistic opinions on the divine intervention on human affairs. According to Protagoras, humans cannot know anything about the gods and therefore interaction is impossible (fr. 4 D.-K.: 'περὶ μὲν θεῶν οὐκ ἔχω εἰδέναι'). Thrasymachus claims that gods do not care about human affairs, which makes prayers ineffective (fr. 8 D.-K. 'οἱ θεοὶ οὐχ ὁρῶσι τὰ ἀνθρώπινα').

<ἀεὶ>: the addition by Stephanus allows the hexameter to scan correctly and does not involve substantial modifications of the manuscript text.

166-7. ἐν δ' ἐλαχίστῳ … ἀνδρῶν: the contents of both question and answer are very similar to a *dictum* attributed to Periander by Stobaeus (3.3.45): Περίανδρος ἐρωτηθείς, τί μέγιστον ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ, εἶπε 'φρένες ἀγαθαὶ ἐν σώματι ἀνθρώπου'. Again Homer is connected to traditional Greek morality. The awareness that the bodies of men are 'the smallest thing' evokes the brevity of human life and the suffering it involves, topics that Homer mentions at several points, with the consequent exhortation to enjoy life (cf. above, 75-9 and 81-9, and below, 174-5). By contrast to the human body, φρένες ἐσθλαί are presented as the typically and exclusively human compensation for the unpleasant mortal condition. In fact all the advice Homer gives in this section aims ultimately at allowing humans the best possible time on earth. As O' Sullivan 1992: 87 notes, ἐν δ' ἐλαχίστῳ may also refer directly to εἰπεῖν, rather than to φύεται: the question would thus mean 'what is the best thing you can say *in the shortest time*?'. This interpretation discloses a reference to the issue of the length of speeches, relevant to Gorgias and to his pupil Alcidamas: already Nietzsche 1873: 540 related this verse to Pl. *Grg.* 449 as evidence for Alcidamas' influence on the *Certamen*; O' Sullivan goes as far as to see in these verses a hint at the polemic between Alcidamas and Isocrates on this point, which they both inherit from Gorgias as a concern. Alcidamas proclaimed the importance of regulating the length of a speech depending on the audience's needs and level of attention, and claimed that this could be achieved only by those who perform

improvised – rather than written – speeches: *On Sophists* 22-3.

168-9. ἡ δὲ δικαιοσύνη ... πορίζειν: according to Homer righteousness and manliness are to be used to serve the common good. Even though the two virtues mentioned in the questions are relevant to both Homer's and Hesiod's works, the answer seems to fit Hesiod better. The role of justice in the government of a city is prominent in *Works and Days*: in the Iron Age, the fact that men are χειροδίκαι (*Op*. 189), that is, 'justice is decided by main force' (West 1978: 202*)* results in a lack of mutual help and assistance and to the ruin of cities; conversely, the just cities and their people will blossom (*Op*. 225-7). The word δικαιοσύνη is never used by Homer and Hesiod: it is first attested in Theognis 1. 147 (144-8: Βούλεο δ' εὐσεβέων ὀλίγοις σὺν χρήμασιν οἰκεῖν / ἢ πλουτεῖν ἀδίκως χρήματα πασάμενος. ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνηι συλλήβδην πᾶσ' ἀρετή 'στι, / πᾶς δέ τ' ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, Κύρνε, δίκαιος ἐών); but it seems, from its first appearance, to be strongly linked with a very Hesiodic concept (expressed e.g. in *Op.* 40-1; on this parallel see also Jellamo 2005: 79).

170-1. τῆς σοφίης ... ἔπεσθαι: the next question is about wisdom, which Homer defines as 'judging situations correctly and seizing the moment'. In this answer Homer deals with two other very Hesiodic topics: both concepts of σοφία and καιρός are in antiquity closely associated with Hesiod. For Hesiod as the wise poet see Koning 2010: 161-5: σοφός seems to be Hesiod's *epithetus ornans* as much as θεῖος is Homer's, and even though Homer is often said to be wise, this epithet seems to be more closely connected to Hesiod; his σοφία is for example mentioned in both his funeral epigrams (*AP* 7.54; *EG* 428), one of which is also transmitted in the *Certamen* (250-3). As for the καιρός, O'Sullivan 1992: 92 notes that Homer does not use this word in his poems (although he uses the adjective καίριος). Hesiod, by contrast, uses it in an often quoted passage from *Works and Days*: μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι· καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος (*Op*. 694: quoted e.g. by Thgn. 401). It is noteworthy that in this section of the contest Homer becomes the poet of σοφία and καιρός. The notion of

καιρός is also important to Alcidamas, and these verses have often been taken as evidence for his influence on the *Certamen* (Vogt 1959: 215, O' Sullivan *loc. cit*.). In Alcidamas' *On Sophists* καιρός is connected to the ability of improvising speeches; importantly, the occurrences of this word in that work show that the concept as expressed by Alcidamas fits the image of Homer built throughout the contest, as well as in this specific section: seizing the right moment is not for everyone but only for gifted people, who are therefore admired as if they were divine (e.g. *Soph*. 3 and 9). On the contrary, according to Alcidamas, performers of written speeches are not able to seize the moment (e.g. *Soph*. 10 and 28).

172-3. πιστεῦσαι … ἔπηται: Hesiod's question deals with trust: when do men deserve to be trusted? Homer replies that it is worth trusting men only when they run the same risks as you. The concept of πίστις does not seem to be Homeric and it is indeed first attested in Hesiod (*Op*. 372, see below). Moreover, Hesiod's advice on interactions between people was seen as authoritative in antiquity (Koning 2010: 177-83). The way in which Homer formulates his answer here suggests that he is championing another Hesiodic idea, cf. *Op*. 370-2: μισθὸς δ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ εἰρημένος ἄρκιος ἔστω· /καί τε κασιγνήτῳ γελάσας ἐπὶ μάρτυρα θέσθαι· / πίστεις δ' ἄρ' ὁμῶς καὶ ἀπιστίαι ὤλεσαν ἄνδρας. Koning 2010: 148 also points out that the Hesiodic passage is one of those that 'seem to invite treatment by successors' (e.g. Thgn. 1.831-2) because of what he calls the catch-word factor: it is therefore plausible that the *Certamen*, in its attempt to show how 'Hesiodic' Homer could be, refers to this passage from *Works and Days*.

174-5. ἡ δ' εὐδαιμονίη … πλεῖστα: Homer is now asked to define happiness for men, and this is another concept that is dealt with in Hesiodic, rather than Homeric, poetry. While in Homeric poetry the word εὐδαιμονίη is attested only once in the Homeric *Hymn to Athena* (v. 5: Χαῖρε θεά, δὸς δ' ἄμμι τύχην εὐδαιμονίην τε) and never in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, the definition of the εὐδαίμων man closes Hesiod's *Works and Days* and sums up Hesiod's teaching:

the εὐδαίμων man is the one who works without offending the gods, understands the omens of birds and avoids transgression. *Op*. 826-8: τάων εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὄλβιος ὃς τάδε πάντα / εἰδὼς ἐργάζηται ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, / ὄρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων. The definition that Homer gives is in line with what Homer had said in the first two exchanges of verses: in spite of the unavoidability of pain and death, inherent in their condition as mortal, men are encouraged to enjoy life as they can. The reaction of the public is, in both cases, positive.

176-9. ῥηθέντων δὲ καὶ τούτων ... εἰπεῖν: king Panoides has been mentioned so far only once at the beginning of the contest (cf. 69), but now makes a new and unexpected appearance in the text. Although the public confirm their preference for Homer, he imposes a new test on the two poets: a performance of what they consider the finest passage from their own poems. It is only now that the competition appears explicitly to assess Homer's and Hesiod's poetry. For Panoides' verdict see 205-10n.

180-204. Hesiod's finest piece is *Works and Days* 383-92, the opening of the farmer's calendar; Homer describes a battle scene by stitching together two passages from *Iliad* 13 (vv. 126-33 and 339-44). The ultimate effect of this selection is to show that Homer's poetry allows humans to share the gaze of the gods on the world, thus allowing them to go beyond their mortal nature, while Hesiod's poetry, with the description of the cycle of nature and agriculture activities, does not offer anything that a man cannot experience in his everyday life. This is achieved by setting up and developing contrasts between the poetry of peace and that of war, of which *Works and Days* and *Iliad* were traditionally taken as representative already by the time of Aristophanes (*R*. 1033-6). On this traditional opposition see Graziosi 2002: 168-84 and Koning 2010: 269-84. The two selected passages describe well the contrast as they respond to each other in a number of details, presented in one context as symbols of peace, and of war in the other (see also Hunter 2009: 264 and Koning 2010: 253). Both passages

start by presenting an image of non-human entities and then zoom in to focus on men: Hesiod mentions the constellation of the Pleaides that regulates the productive cycle of agriculture (180), while Homer mentions the gods Ares and Athena rejoicing in the spectacle of the battle (191-3); the Hesiodic man works in order to ensure a means of life for himself, while the Homeric fighters strive in the 'battle that destroys the mortals' (199: μάχη φθισίμβροτος). Iron is sharpened in the Hesiodic passage to reap (184), and interestingly a scholium to this line of *Works and Days* feels the needs to specify that the iron in question is indeed that used for reaping, almost in an attempt to avoid any possible disturbance to the peacefulness of this description. Indeed, metal is also an instrument of death, as the Homeric ταμεσίχροας at 200 shows. The Hesiodic man is emphatically and repeatedly said to be naked, while the Homeric heroes are covered by their armour. Then, the metaphor in the Homeric passage, 'the fight bristled' (like a corn field) at 199, responds to the literal reaping in Hesiod. The choice of a passage from *Works and Days* for Hesiod is an obvious one, because of the mention of his programmatic trip to Chalcis and victory at 650-9. (For the suggestion that Hesiod at Chalcis may have performed the *Theognony* see West 1966: 44). More specifically, *Works and Days* 383-92 'underlines like no other Hesiod's image of the peace-loving farmer poet' (Koning 2010: 252), thus proving an appropriate selection to represent poetry of peace. This may also explain why Hesiod's performance in the *Certamen* stops right before the reference to the poet's quarrel with his 'foolish' brother Perses, that follows these peaceful lines in their original context in *Works and Days*: for the suggestion, made on the basis of Philostratus' passage (see Introduction, pp. 31-5), that those lines may have been included in an 'original' version of the contest see West 1967: 442 n. 3.The Pleiades in *Works and Days* are also said to regulate the right time of seafaring, as well as agricultural activities (see *Op*. 615 and 619): the choice of a passage mentioning the Pleiades may work as a cross reference to the *Nautilia* section, where Hesiod's programmatic mention of the

contest belongs. Ancient sources underlined the ethical value of these verses, which makes them compatible with Panoides' verdict: according to him it was just (208: δίκαιον) for Hesiod to win as he sang peace and agriculture; according to the scholium to *Works and Days* 381-2, these verses encourage agricultural work and the just (δίκαιον) income that comes from it. Homer stitches together two sequences of verses from book 13 of the *Iliad*, where they are separated by some 200 lines. This particular scene of war, may suit a fifth-century Athenian audience interested in seeing in Homer the poet of communal fighting (Graziosi 2002: 180); the selection as it stands also seems to have been purposefully made to provide the reader with a means of exploring the relationship between the Muses, the poet and audience: Homer turns out to be an inspired intermediary between the Muses and the audience, and therefore shares and allows the audience to share his divine gaze on something that their human nature would not choose to bear in reality, the sight of war and death. Homer's passage presents a close comparison between divine and human perspectives on war: the gods enjoy the sight of that battle (192-3), but a human internal spectator cannot do so (203-4), because for him war means death. Homer's poetry however allows mortals to face the spectacle of war in safety (Hunter 2009: 265) – that is, from a divine perspective. The claim that the audience in the *Certamen*, as external spectators, define these verses as 'transcending the merely fitting' (206) may be read in this sense. By putting at the centre of Homeric poetry its ability to allow humans to share a divine perspective on the world, the *Certamen* gives a perceptive reading of the Homeric epics. The same reaction to the sight of war by gods is found also, for example, at *Il*. 17.398, and, at *Iliad* 4.539-44, an internal spectator is said to enjoy the sight of war, but only because Athena takes him by the hand and protects him. Eustathius (506.6-8), commenting on this passage, interestingly remarks that this man watching safely the battle scene can be identified with the public who listens to the poet's performance. Another detail in this passage hints at the

possibility of seeing beyond what human nature allows seeing: at 200-3 it is said that eyes were dazzled with the glint of bronze from the shining helmets, and the bright shields: a human being, therefore, cannot see the spectacle. The sight of it for a man means becoming blind, and the same goes for Homer too: one of his biographies (Anon. *Vit*. *Hom*. 1.5) claims that Homer was blinded by the dazzle of the armour after praying that he might behold the hero as he was when he went out to join the battle arrayed in his replacement, but Thetis and the Muses took pity of him and honoured with the gift of poetry. And this is how we have the description of Achilles' armour in book 19, that allows us too to see it without getting blinded, and this is also how we are allowed to see the battle in book 13. The parallel with the story of Demodocus' blindness in *Od*. 8.63-4 is obvious: it seems therefore, that the *Certamen* offers a perceptive reading of the epics which is tune with biographical representations of Homer.

181. ἀμήτου is the necessary emendation for the unmetrical form transmitted by **L** ἀμητοῖο. The form ἀμητοῖο is also present in some Hesiodic manuscripts.

183. αὖθις is the reading of **L**, emended on the basis of the passage in Hesiod. But the manuscript reading seems unproblematic and is transmitted by part of the Hesiodic manuscripts too.

189. ὅτ' ἂν ὥρια πάντα πέλωνται: these words (the second part of 189) differ substantially from the corresponding section of the verse as we find it in Hesiod's work (*Op*. 392): εἴ χ' ὥρια πάντ' ἐθέλησθα ('if in good season you want all –'). The Hesiodic text continues for a few more lines before it reaches the first possible syntactical stop at the end of verse: εἴ χ' ὥρια πάντ' ἐθέλῃσθα / ἔργα κομίζεσθαι Δημήτερος, ὥς τοι ἕκαστα / ὥρι' ἀέξηται, μή πως τὰ μέταζε χατίζων / πτώσσῃς ἀλλοτρίους οἴκους καὶ μηδὲν ἀνύσσεις. The variant in the *Certamen* is attested nowhere else. It may be an *ad hoc* re-elaboration of this Hesiodic verse in order to make the passage shorter and therefore suitable for the *Certamen*. Be it as it may, the verse as it is in the *Certamen* sums up the contents of a part of the following lines (εἴ χ' ὥρια ...

ἀέξηται) while leaving out the mention of the beggar.

196. The reading of **L** ἀσπὶς δ' ἄρ', which does not work metrically, can be emended to ἀσπὶς ἄρ' on the basis of the reading of the Homeric manuscripts.

205-10. θαυμάσαντες … διεξιόντα: the public reacts with θαῦμα at Homer's performance (see also 90-1n.), because the verses 'transcend the merely fitting'. As suggested above (180-204n.) this is because Homer, unlike Hesiod, appears as an inspired poet who allows men to share the gaze of the gods on the world. Panoides, however, prefers Hesiod's performance on the basis of its greater ethical value. The *Certamen* does not express any explicit opinion on this verdict, but many clues suggest a disagreement with it. First of all, the whole episode is 'constructed in terms that are carefully taken over from the *Iliad*'s portrayal of consensus and its discontents': it recalls the opening assembly of the *Iliad*, an 'example of unjustice but also as violation of social norms' where the king, Agamemnon, 'defies collective will in favour of his own inclination' (Elmer 2013: 220). Furthermore, Panoides' judgement seems partial: it takes into account only the last test, and is issued by one single person, even though other judges were said to be present and the public constantly expressed their opinion. Moreover, Panoides judges the poets only on the basis of the contents of their works and not for their poetic skills. The very introduction of the figure of Panoides contributes to cast doubts on the verdict. When an ancient author wants to show agreement with Hesiod's victory he does not introduce Panoides in his narrative, but rather attributes the verdict to the whole public: see Introduction on Themistius, pp. 38-41. On the other hand, when mentioned, Panoides is never presented as a competent judge. Furthermore, as portrayed in the *Certamen*, the victory of Hesiod is not the central point of the story. Indeed it is anticipated already in the introduction to the competition, where the focus is rather on the fact that both poets competed admirably and on the way the competition developed until Hesiod eventually won (70-1). Likewise, the final verdict and the celebration of Hesiod's victory occupy relatively little space, and

φασί at 210 seems to indicate some distance on the part of the author of our text. Consequently, the arguments of those scholars who see Panoides' judgement as fair seem problematic. Koning 2010: 255 claims that 'there is no explicit indication that Panedes' judgement is a bad one: neither the author, nor Homer or the public comments on it. *Sophia* is in the end defined as knowing what is beneficial to the *polis*, a type of wisdom with which Hesiod was traditionally associated, and his victory thus remain unchallenged'. This interpretation does not account for Homer's ability to show what is beneficial to the *polis*, masterfully expressed by the poet in the exchanges at 149-75. Koning also adds that it is not surprising that the king, whose brother has just been killed in war, should make such a decision; or perhaps the newly appointed king uses the contest to announce a change of politics. The second option seems reasonable, though again it would imply that his judgement is concerned not with poetics, but merely with the contents of poetry: it still appears as partial. As for the first hypothesis, it should not be forgotten that only Plutarch mentions that Amphidamas died in a battle, while the *Certamen* does not: it seems unwise to integrate so straightforwardly one text with the other, especially as they differ in the presentation of so many aspects of the story. West 1967: 443 claims that 'there is not a word to suggest that the decision was unjust', and that 'the story belongs to a type much favoured by the Greeks, in which a man does the opposite of what is expected, and justifies himself with an original and by no means contemptible analysis of the situation'. West adds that Alcidamas, who according to him was the inventor of the contest story, agreed with the fact that Hesiod, as the poet of peace, deserved to win. But every attempt to interpret the final verdict in the *Certamen* on the basis of its alleged presentation in Alcidamas is speculation, as it is impossible to know how faithful the author of the *Certamen* was to his source, and how and to what extent he modified his source's words. Moreover, some scholars who have attempted to interpret the verdict on the basis of what it may have meant in

Alcidamas reached quite opposite conclusions: Vogt 1959, for example, sees Homer in the *Certamen* as the champion of the improvised speeches, who certainly deserved the victory in the contest. He claims that Alcidamas could not, therefore, agree with Panoides and that the king's judgement in the *Certamen* is presented as biased. O' Sullivan 1992: 98, in turn, concludes that Alcidamas did not attach any importance to the mere fact of Hesiod's victory, but rather to the manner of it.

210-12. τῆς μὲν οὖν νίκης ... ἐπιγράψαντα: the prize for the competition is a tripod, which Hesiod dedicates to the Muses: these details of the story are inspired by *Op*. 657-8. The tripod and the epigram inscribed on it (see 213-14n.) feature in many literary accounts of the contest, but the story also had a material reception: a tripod bearing the epigram of Hesiod's victory was displayed in antiquity in the place where Hesiod himself (*Op*. 657-8) claimed to have dedicated it, on Mt Helicon, and it was visible in Pausanias' times (Paus. 9.31.3); see Introduction on Hesiod, esp. pp. 12-14. A tripod was the usual prize at games in Homeric poetry (e.g. *Il*. 11.700, 22.164, 23.259) and in historical times. A famous extant tripod, a prize at a musical contest, is *GDI* 5786 (fifth c. BC, from Dodona).

213-14. Ἡσίοδος ... Ὅμηρον: the epigram is transmitted in several accounts of the contest, but it also had independent circulation in anthologies of epigrams and school books (see apparatus; see also pp. 83-6 on P.Freib. 1.1b). The second verse of this epigram is attested in the scholia to *Works and Days* 657 as a variant for the Hesiodic verse. This may be a genuine variant, rather than a simple interpolation from the text of the epigram, and shows that the interaction and the relationship between the Hesiodic passage on the tradition of the contest are very strong (see Introduction on Hesiod, esp. pp. 12-14).

215-23. τοῦ δὲ … ἐστίν: after winning the contest Hesiod consults the Delphic oracle, which predicts to him the place of his death. Homer too consulted the oracle and was warned against going to Ios; thus the text is building an

elaborate narrative which connects oracles, contest and deaths of the poets: see 56-62n. The legend of the death of Hesiod following the misinterpretation of an oracle was circulating already in the fifth century BC. The oldest attested witness of it is Thucydides, who however does not report the verses given by the oracle (Th. 3.96.1: αὐλισάμενος δὲ τῷ στρατῷ ἐν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Νεμείου τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐν ᾧ Ἡσίοδος ὁ ποιητὴς λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν ταύτῃ ἀποθανεῖν, χρησθὲν αὐτῷ ἐν Νεμέᾳ τοῦτο παθεῖν). The misunderstanding of an oracle predicting the place of one's death is a common pattern of many ancient biographies: for a list see Fontenrose 1978: 59-60.

219-23. ὄλβιος … ἐστίν: the text of this oracle is transmitted only by the *Certamen* and Tzetzes (*Life of Hesiod* 166-70 Colonna). Although the story of this oracle was known already in the fifth century BC (Th. 3.96.1, quoted above at 215-23n.), it is not possible to know whether the lines were in circulation in this form already by that time. According to Fontenrose 1978: 371 these verses are a fifth-century production manufactured *ad hoc* for the legend. The greeting by which the oracle starts is common in oracular epigrams, see e.g. *AP* 14.77: Ὄλβιος οὗτος ἀνήρ, ὃς νῦν κατὰ λάινον οὐδὸν etc. (Fontenrose 1978: 171-2); and the oracle received by Kypselos: Ὄλβιος οὗτος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐμὸν δόμον ἐσκαταβαίνει etc. (Hdt. 5.92 = Q61 Fontenrose, with commentary); D. Chr. 37.5.5: Ὄλβιος οὗτος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐμὸν δόμον εἰσαφικάνει. The second verse of the oracle is Homeric: it is transmitted in the very same form at *Il*. 7.451 (τοῦ δ' ἤτοι κλέος ἔσται ὅσον τ' ἐπικίδναται ἠώς) and a few verses later (*Il*. 7.458) with a slight variation at the beginning (σὸν δ' ἤτοι κλέος etc.).

221. ὅσην: this is the reading of the manuscript **L**, emended in ὅσον on the basis of the Iliadic verse. But the emendation is unnecessary, as the Iliadic manuscripts give support to both readings. The scholia also show that ὅσην was the reading preferred by one of the major ancient editors of Homer, Aristarchus.

224-53. ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος ... ἐν βασάνῳ σοφίης: the text devotes relatively little

space to the events of Hesiod's life after the contest and, unlike Homer's case, there is no mention of the poet's artistic production or his travels. The text thus gives the impression that Hesiod's 'dreary end is vengeance for his unfair victory, as Hesiod's death occurs after, and as a consequence of, his sensational success' (Debiasi 2012: 482). The text offers two different accounts of the story of Hesiod's death, one by Alcidamas and one by Eratosthenes. In both cases the title of the work used as sources is cited with the name of the author, but in the case of Eratosthenes the manuscript gives a problematic reading (see 241n.). The main differences between the two versions of the story concern the location of the murder (Eastern Locris in Alcidamas, 226n.; not specified in Eratosthenes), the identity of Hesiod's murderers and their destiny (see 226-7n. and 241n.), and whether or not Hesiod was actually guilty of the crime of which he was charged (230-2n.). In general, Eratosthenes' version appears more positive in its depiction of Hesiod, as the poet is clearly said to be innocent (245-7n.), and more rationalising, because of the exclusion of Zeus' intervention and of the miraculous rescue of Hesiod's body by dolphins. Hesiod's death was told in many other sources and always with different details. This diversity was acknowledged already in antiquity (Paus. 9.31.6). Collection of testimonia: T30-T34 Most 2006; discussions: Friedel 1878-1879, Kivilo 2010: 25-36, Koning 2010: 134-8.

226. εἰς δὲ Οἰνόην τῆς Λοκρίδος: Oinoe is the name of various places (LSJ *s.v.* Οἰνόη). The form Οἰνόη seems to be a later form for Οἰνεών testified at Th. 3.95.3. (Cf. also St. Byz. *s.v.* Οἰνεών). The city where the death of Hesiod was located by most of the ancient sources was in Olozean (Western) Locris and close to Naupactus, although the precise site of it is not identifiable with certainty (Lefkowitz 1981: 3 n. 4; Kivilo 2010: 26 n. 81). The earliest witness of the episode of Hesiod's death, Thucydides, locates the episode in the Ozolean Locris too: cf. Th. 3.95.3, the passage immediately before the mention of Hesiod's death: ὡρμᾶτο δὲ ἐξ Οἰνεῶνος τῆς Λοκρίδος. οἱ δὲ Ὀζόλαι οὗτοι

Λοκροὶ ξύμμαχοι ἦσαν. Pausanias (9.31.6) connects it to Ozolean Locris as well: he says that the murderers fled from Naupactus (in the Ozolean Locris), to Molycria, in the opposite coast, and also claims that this is one of the few details of the episode on which everybody agrees. Plutarch mentions that Hesiod's corpse was brought to Rhium in Molycreia (*Dinner of the Seven Sages* 162d and *The Cleverness of Animals* 984d) and that the murderers were the sons of Ganyctor of Naupactus (*The Cleverness of Animals* 969d-e). However, the mention of 'the sea between Euboea and Locris' shows that Alcidamas locates the episode of Hesiod's death in the Opuntian (Eastern) Locris rather than in the Ozolean (Western) Locris. Against West 2003: 343 n. 15, who thinks of a mistake by Alcidamas, Nagy 2009: 306 suggests that different locations may respond two different claims about the poet. This detail in particular may originate from the version of the myth promoted by the people of Orchomenos. Moreover, to solve this inconsistency it is necessary to emend two readings of the manuscript that however are not problematic: τῆς Εὐβοίας καὶ τῆς Λοκρίδος (231-2) and Ἀριαδνείας (234).

226-7. παρ' Ἀμφιφάνει καὶ Γανύκτορι, τοῖς Φηγέως παισίν: according to Alcidamas, Hesiod's murderers are Amphiphanes and Ganyctor the sons of Phegeus. This is only one of the couples to whom the tradition attributes the crime, and it is found also in Aristotle (fr. 565 Rose) and Tzetzes (*Life of Hesiod* 171-2 Colonna); for the other couple see 241n. It is difficult to see the reasons of these differences in the names of the killers, but it is certainly striking that Alcidamas chooses the option according to which one of the murderers has the same name as the son of Amphidamas who organised the funeral games where the contest took place (63). In fact, Alcidamas is the oldest testimony to this identity of the murders and he may have even created this particular detail as a sort of reversal of Hesiod's undeserved victory at the contest. Debiasi 2012: 476 notes that the onomastics of the killers point to Euboea, the site of the controversial contest: this confirms, first of all, that the location of the episode

for Alcidamas was Eastern Locris, and secondly suggests again a connection of the poet's death with the contest episode. Phegeus, as the father of Amphiphanes and Ganyctor, is mentioned only in the context of Hesiod's death.

230. †Οἰνῶσιν†: the reading of the manuscript is not attested anywhere else. Stephanus of Byzantium (*s.v.* Οἰνεών) gives for Oinoe the ethnic adjective Οἰνεωνεύς, which however looks incompatible with the manuscript reading. Other attested forms are Οἰνοαῖος (St. Byz.) and Οἰναῖος (*IG* 22.99, 1623.5, 1926.130), but it is uncertain whether they refer to our city or not. A locative Οἰνόησι is attested (*IG* 12.845.5) and the reading of the manuscript looks like a contracted form of it. But there seems to be no definitive solution to this textual problem. P.Ath.Soc.Pap. inv. M2 (l. 5) cannot help here because of its poor condition.

230-2. ὑπονοήσαντες … κατεπόντισαν: the episode of Hesiod's death seems 'sordid' to many readers (Scodel 1980: 304, O' Sullivan 1992: 98, Rosen 2004: 303). Koning instead finds in this episode one of the signs of Hesiod's heroic status, as heroes 'often suffer from an abnormally great sexual appetite' (Koning 2010: 135), but the image of the poet that emerges from this account is far from positive, especially when compared to Eratosthenes' version in which Hesiod's innocence is pointedly asserted. More details on the identity of the girl seduced by Hesiod and her offspring are given by Tzetzes (*Life of Hesiod* 154-5 Colonna), who informs us that the son of Hesiod and the girl he raped, called Ctimene, was Stesichorus. Other sources give different details about the girl and the child, but do not connect them explicitly to the episode of the rape (sources listed in Kivilo 2010: 10-11). There is also mention of a son in Hesiod's own *Works and Days*, and this may have been connected to this story in antiquity and fostered its development: *Op.* 270-1: νῦν δὴ ἐγὼ μήτ' αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δίκαιος / εἴην μήτ' ἐμὸς υἱός...

231-2. τῆς Εὐβοίας καὶ τῆς Λοκρίδος: this reading locates the story in Eastern Locris. See also 226n. The emendations proposed for these lines are all meant to

relocate the episode in Western Locris, by substituting the name of Euboea with places in the coast opposite Western Locris, namely Molycria and Achaia (Goettling and Westermann), or substituting both names altogether (Nietzsche). P.Ath.Soc.Pap. inv. M2 offers an indisputable solution to this problem: the word Εὐβοίας visible at l. 9 proves that the story could be located in Eastern Locris and that there is no need for an emendation (Mandilaras 1990: 61).

232-4. τοῦ δὲ νεκροῦ … ὑπὸ δελφίνων προσενεχθέντος: the rescue of Hesiod's corpse by dolphins closely parallels an episode told in myths about the lives of other cult heroes (Nagy 2009: 306) and in fact it is the 'most strongly heroic trait of Hesiod's vita' (Koning 2010: 135). Similar episodes are present in the biographies of many characters who enjoyed heroic status in antiquity: among the singers, Coeranus from Miletus (Ath. 13.606e) and most famously Arion (first attested in Hdt. 1.23). The choice of the dolphins for this role must be due to the particular consideration they enjoyed in antiquity (partly no doubt as a response to the fact that these animals do sometimes rescue other mammals from drowning) and to wide-spread beliefs concerning their pleasure in music. Furthermore, these animals were sacred to different gods: Poseidon, Aphrodite, Apollo and Dionysus (Apollo and Dionysos being especially relevant in the case of singers and poets). See for references BNP *s.v.* Dolphin. The intervention of the dolphins may be seen therefore as a sign of divine support: after they miraculously rescue Hesiod's body, Zeus punishes the murders and throws them into the sea. This episode may also be related to the legend of the second birth and youth of Hesiod (see 247-53n.). It may be a 'mythical expression of the poet's death and rebirth' (Koning 2010: 136; see also Scodel 1980: 317; the most recent and detailed discussion of the legend of the second youth is Kivilo 2010: 28-35, who however does not connect it with the episode of the dolphins). This episode is also told by Plutarch (*Dinner of the Seven Sages* 162c-f = T32 Most and *The Cleverness of Animals* 9840d = T33b Most) and Tzetzes (*Life of Hesiod* 174-5 Colonna). Other animal helpers are involved in

the legend of Hesiod's death: a crow sent by the Pythia guides the Orchomenians to the poet's grave (Paus. 9.38.3-4); and Hesiod's dog helps find the murderers by barking (Plu. *The Cleverness of Animals* 984d, 969e = T33ab Most, Poll. 5.42 = T34 Most).

234. Ἀριαδνείας: Ῥίου ἀγνείας instead of Ἀριαδνείας, proposed by Nietzsche on the basis of the account of Hesiod's death by Plutarch (*Dinner of the Seven Sages* 162e), connects again the episode to Western Locris, where Rhion is located. A cult of Ariadne in Locris is testified only in this passage of the *Certamen*, and also for this reason the manuscript reading has been emended so as to get more consistency with other sources of the same episode. But the fact that the murderers try to escape to Crete (238) and are punished during this trip, is no reason to exclude a connection between this story and Ariadne. It has also been suggested that the story of Hesiod's death is an aetiological myth for this festival, which may have been performed similarly to that in Crete (Nilsson 1906: 383-4, Lefkowitz 1981: 4 n. 10). Colbeau 2005: 243-4 notes that Ariadne is often connected with Dionysus and wine, which evokes the stem of the name Oinoe.

235-40. πάντες ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν … Ἀλκιδάμας ἐν Μουσείῳ: Lefkowitz 1981: 4 sees a connection between this punishment of Hesiod's murderers by Zeus and a Hesiodic passage: *Op*. 270-3: νῦν δὴ ἐγὼ μήτ' αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δίκαιος / εἴην μήτ' ἐμὸς υἱός, ἐπεὶ κακὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον / ἔμμεναι, εἰ μείζω γε δίκην ἀδικώτερος ἕξει / ἀλλὰ τά γ' οὔπω ἔολπα τελεῖν Δία μητιόεντα. As anticipated by Hesiod, Zeus' justice prevailed over the murderers. Koning 2010: 135 n. 34 finds this a tenuous interpretation, but it is not possible to exclude that this connection may have actually been made in antiquity, and may have contributed to the diffusion of this anecdote. The divine intervention by Zeus, as well as the episode of the dolphins, is omitted in the more rationalising version by Eratosthenes.

238. εἰς Κρήτην: see 234n.

240. Ἀλκιδάμας ἐν Μουσείῳ: the mention of Alcidamas was one of the reasons why Nietzsche first postulated that Alcidamas' work was used as a source by the author of the *Certamen*. The way he is mentioned also suggests that he was the main source: it seems that he is named only because an alternative version, that by Eratosthenes, was about to be quoted.

241. ἐν †ἐνηπόδω†: this is a particularly difficult reading. It has been variously emended (see apparatus and below) because it does not make sense, and there is no attested work by Eratosthenes with a title similar to the manuscript reading. One of the earliest and most widely accepted emendations is Goettling's ἐν Ἠσιόδῳ, based on Hiller's suggestion that Ἠσίοδος could be a second title of Eratosthenes' poem Ἀντερινύς. That poem might have contained the story of Hesiod's death and his murderers' punishment. See Erat. fr. 17 Powell. However, there is no evidence that the Ἀντερινύς had such a second title and, as pointed out by Fraser 1972: 902 n. 200, the title Ἀντερινύς is hardly sufficient to justify the assumption that that poem dealt with the legend of Hesiod. Another fragment by Eratosthenes (fr. 21 Powell = Choerob. *In Theod*. Gaisf. i, p. 81) mentions Ganyctor, a character who is always linked to this legend and therefore confirms Eratosthenes' interest in it, but again this fragment does not offer a solution for this textual problem. Erat. fr. 19 Powell (= schol. Nic. *Ther*. 400) gives another interesting but doubtful clue: in this fragment Eratosthenes mentions Erigone's dog which, like Hesiod's, played an important role after its owner's death. This fragment is attributed by the ancient source to the Ἀντερινύς, but as far as we know that story is told in Eratosthenes' *Erigone.* From Eratosthenes' poetic fragments, therefore, an interest in the legend of Hesiod's death emerges quite clearly, but they do not reveal the title of the work in which he discussed it. On the other hand, there is no trace of an account of the episode of the poetic contest of Homer and Hesiod in Eratosthenes and therefore we cannot know whether or not his account of Hesiod's death was attached to the contest, as in the *Certamen*. A passage in

Strabo (7.3.6) seems to suggest that, according to Eratosthenes, Hesiod was younger than Homer, and if it is the case then he could hardly have spoken of their contest, which presupposes the two poets being contemporaries: see Pfeiffer 1968: 164, who however does not mention Strabo's passage, and Koning 2010: 123 n. 67 and 124 n. 71. Eratosthenes' broad interests in the biographies of the poets is testified by two other fragments that attribute to him two (discordant) claims concerning Homer's chronology: see 241 F 9a (= Tat. *Ad Graec*. 31) and 241 F 9b (= Anon. *Vit. Hom.* 1.4).

Κτίμενον καὶ Ἄντιφον τοὺς Γανύκτορος: other attestations of these names for Hesiod's murderers are Plutarch (*The Cleverness of Animals* 969e), Pausanias (9.31.4) and Suda *s.v.* Ἡσίοδος. For the other couple see 226-7n. Antiphus is the name of Homeric heroes on both the Trojan (*Il*. 2.864, 12.191) and the Greek sides (*Il.* 2.678, 17.68). The name Ctimenus is not attested in archaic literature, while Ctimene (who is also the sister of Amphiphanes and Ganyctor according to Tzetzes, *Life of Hesiod* 155 Colonna) is Odysseus' sister (*Od*. 15.363). These Homeric names again suggest that the *Certamen* stems from intimate knowledge of the poems.

243-5. τὴν μέντοι παρθένον ... ἑαυτὴν ἀναρτῆσαι: this detail about the destiny of the girl contributes to increase the pathos that surrounds the episode of Hesiod's unjust death in this version. On the girl see also 230-2n.

245-7. φθαρῆναι δὲ … αὐτῶν φησιν: unlike Alcidamas, Eratosthenes is very clear about Hesiod's innocence. Protestations of the poet's innocence are found in most of the sources on the poet's death. Paus. 9.31.6 (T31 Most): τὴν δὲ ἀδελφὴν τῶν νεανίσκων οἱ μὲν ἄλλου τού φασιν αἰσχύναντος Ἡσίοδον λαβεῖν οὐκ ἀληθῆ τὴν τοῦ ἀδικήματος δόξαν, οἱ δὲ ἐκείνου γενέσθαι τὸ ἔργον. Particularly apologetic seems the version by Plutarch in *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 162d, which confirms the positive image of Hesiod emerging from the account of the contest in the same work by Plutarch (see Introduction, pp. 18-28). According to Plutarch's account Hesiod was not even suspected to have

committed the crime against his hosts' sister but only to have helped Troilus, his friend and actual perpetrator of the crime, to conceal it: ὑποψίαν ἔσχεν ὡς γνοὺς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ συνεπικρύψας τὸ ἀδίκημα, μηδενὸς ὢν αἴτιος. The same version features in the Suda, *s.v.* Ἡσίοδος: ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ἐπιξενωθεὶς παρ' Ἀντίφῳ καὶ Κτιμένῳ, οἳ νύκτωρ δόξαντες ἀναιρεῖν φθορέα ἀδελφῆς αὐτῶν, ἀνεῖλον τὸν Ἡσίοδον ἄκοντε.

246. Δημώδους ὄνομα: the only other name given to Hesiod's friend in the tradition is Troilus (Plu. *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 162c). The name Demodes given by Eratosthenes does not seem to be attested anywhere else as a personal name. It is found as an adjective and means 'of the people, popular' (LSJ). It was used by Nietzsche and Rzach who proposed to add the name Troilus in the text (Τρωίλου, see apparatus): this character would therefore be 'a certain man of the people, a foreigner travelling with Hesiod, called Troilus'.

247-53. ὕστερον δὲ Ὀρχομένιοι … ἐν βασάνῳ σοφίης: the story of Hesiod's second burial follows in the text the account by Eratosthenes, but it is not impossible that it was told by Alcidamas as well. The compiler may have given two different accounts on Hesiod's murder and of the destinity of Hesiod's killers, and included at the end an anecdote told in a similar way by both sources. The story is mentioned in several other sources (Plu. fr. 82 Sandbach and Arist. fr. 524 Rose = Schol. *Op*. 631, Plu. *Dinner of the Seven Sages* 162, Paus. 9.38.3-4, Tz. *Life of Hesiod* 177-85 Colonna). After the Thespians destroyed Ascra, the Ascreans who survived went to Orchomenos. A plague broke out in the city and the Pythia (in Aristoteles', Pausanias' and Eratosthenes' versions) suggested taking Hesiod's bones to Orchomenus. According to Pausanias, a crow helped the Orchomenians to find Hesiod's first grave. The story of the transportation of Hesiod's bones and second burial in Orchomenos has been taken as evidence for a cult of Hesiod in that city (in particular, the beneficial power that the poet's bones were thought to have, and the fact that according to Pausanias a crow guided the Orchomenians to Hesiod's first grave). On the cult of Hesiod see

Breilich 1958: 321-2, Nagy 1979: 296 and 2009: 306, Lefkowitz 1981: 10, Calame 1996, Beaulieu 2004, Clay 2004: 74-6, and Koning 2010: 134-8.

248-9. ἐπέγραψαν … ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ: unlike Homer (see 333), Hesiod did not compose his own tomb inscription.

250-3. Ἄσκρη μὲν πατρὶς ... ἐν βασάνῳ σοφίης: the whole text of the epigram is transmitted also in *AP* 7.54, Paus. 9.38.4 and Tz. *Life of Hesiod* 179-82 Colonna. The *Greek Anthology* attributes it to Mnasalces, Pausanias to Chersias. For detailed discussion of attribution and chronology of this epigram see Debiasi 2010. Like the other epigrams in the *Certamen*, this too presents many variant readings compared to other attestations of it. The most remarkable is Ἑλλάδι κῦδος ὀρεῖται by Pausanias at 252 (see discussion in Debiasi 2010: 263). Another tomb epigram that presupposes the story of Hesiod's second burial in Orchomenus is transmitted by Arist. fr. 565 Rose, Suda *s.v.* τὸ Ἡσιόδειον γῆρας, Tz. *Life of Hesiod* 184-5 Colonna, and is attributed to Pindar: χαῖρε δὶς ἡβήσας καὶ δὶς τάφου ἀντιβολήσας / Ἡσίοδ', ἀνθρώποις μέτρον ἔχων σοφίης. See Scodel 1980.

254-5. ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος … περιερχόμενος ἔλεγε τὰ ποιήματα: the text now starts to describe Homer's artistic production and travels after the contest. For Homer's activity as a travelling poet, as opposed to Hesiod's stationary stance, see 56n.

255-60. πρῶτον μὲν … Ὁμήρου εἶναι: the text attributes to Homer the *Thebaid* and, with some caution, the *Epigoni.* Their position in the sequence of the works produced by Homer, after the *Margites* and before his two major poetic works *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, reflects the status of the cyclic epics in antiquity: see e.g. Aristotle's view that *Iliad* and *Odyssey* 'surpass all other poems in diction and thought' (*Po*. 1459b 16: λέξει καὶ διανοίᾳ πάντα ὑπερβέβληκεν). Although they were considered minor works, the insertion of *Thebaid* and *Epigoni* here serves to highlight the extent of Homer's knowledge of the epic past and the range of his artistic production. Both poems belong to the Theban saga, and the

choice of these two works among all those belonging to the Epic Cycle allows the text to present Homer as an expert of the Theban expedition as well as the Trojan one, dealt with in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (275-6). It also shows how consistent Homer's knowledge was because, as the ancient public may have known, acquaintance with some of the events of the Theban saga is presupposed in the *Iliad* (see Davies 1989b: 22-3). The *Thebaid*, in comparison with other poems of the Cycle, enjoyed a good reputation and this too may have encouraged its inclusion in this selective list of poems by Homer. Pausanias claims that it was his favourite Homeric poem after the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (Paus. 9.9.5: ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν ποίησιν ταύτην μετά γε Ἰλιάδα καὶ τὰ ἔπη τὰ ἐς Ὀδυσσέα ἐπαινῶ μάλιστα.). The attribution of the *Thebaid* to Homer may be very ancient: according to Pausanias it goes back to Callinus, in the seventh century BC, and seems to have been usually accepted in antiquity (Paus. 9.9.5: τὰ δὲ ἔπη ταῦτα Καλλῖνος ἀφικόμενος αὐτῶν ἐς μνήμην ἔφησεν Ὅμηρον τὸν ποιήσαντα εἶναι, Καλλίνῳ δὲ πολλοί τε καὶ ἄξιοι λόγου κατὰ ταὐτὰ ἔγνωσαν. On this testimony see, however, Bowie 2010: 152). Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 9 too depicts Homer as the author of a poem concerning the Theban cycle, although the work that in the *Life* is called *Amphiaraus' expedition to Thebes* may be indicating 'not the whole *Thebais* but a partial narrative covering perhaps Eriphyle's machinations and the seer's instruction of his son' (West 2003b: 9). It is uncertain whether Herodotus was referring to the *Thebaid* in 5.67 when he mentions the 'Homeric poems in which it is the Argives and Argos which are primarily the theme of the songs' (τῶν Ὁμηρείων ἐπέων εἵνεκα, ὅτι Ἀργεῖοί τε καὶ Ἄργος τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ὑμνέαται): see Cingano 1985 and West 2003b: 8. If he does, this confirms that Herodotus too accepts the attribution of that poem to Homer, although at 4.32 Herodotus denies the attribution to Homer of the other Theban poem mentioned here, the *Epigoni* (see below). In other passages the authorship of the *Thebaid* is dealt with more vaguely (e.g. Ath. 465e: ὁ τὴν κυκλικὴν Θηβαίδα πεποιηκώς; Schol. S. *O.C*. 1375: ὁ τὴν κυκλικὴν Θηβαίδα ποιήσας;

Apollod. 1.8.4: ὁ γράψας τὴν Θηβαίδα), but its attribution to Homer is never challenged explicitly, and – importantly – no other author's name is associated with the *Thebaid* in extant testimonia. By contrast, the *Epigoni* was less widely accepted as Homeric: Herodotus, for example, expresses his doubts at 4.32: ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ὁμήρῳ ἐν Ἐπιγόνοισι, εἰ δὴ τῷ ἐόντι γε Ὅμηρος ταῦτα τὰ ἔπεα ἐποίησε, and our text seems to share them: see 260n. The scarcity of fragments and testimonia makes it difficult to understand why Homeric authorship was doubted or denied. Aristophanes in his *Peace* quotes the verse transmitted here as the incipit of this poem (see 87-8n.) and the scholium to that Aristophanic verse attributes the poem to Antimachos of Teos.

256. ἔπη ,ζ: in the case of the two Cyclic poems and of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the text gives the number of lines for each work – a detail that would suit a school environment. The manuscript reads ἔπη ,ξ (60,000 verses) for the *Thebaid* and ἔπη ξ (60 verses) for the *Epigoni.* Both numbers are implausible and the emendation ,ζ (7,000) proposed by Hermann is unanimously accepted in both cases. Welcker 1835, I: 204 suggests that the number may indicate the quantity of the books of the poems, rather than that of their lines, but considering that the length of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is expressed in lines (275 and 276), it stands to reason that the text is giving the number of lines in this case too (see also West 1967: 447 who argues that the indication of the number of books would be 'inappropriate in the context'). The only other known source that might have contained information about the length of the two poems is the Borgian table, a marble fragment that preserves a list of title of epic poems, their authors and lengths, but the length of the *Thebaid* is not visible and the presence of the *Epigoni* is only reconstructed. See McLeod 1985.

257: the *Certamen* is an important source for the first verses of the *Thebaid*, and of the *Epigoni (*259). The incipit of the *Thebaid* is attested nowhere else; for the Aristophanic passage that transmits the same verse that is said here to be the incipit of the *Epigoni*, see 107-8n. The fact that also another source, the scholium

to that Aristophanic passage, claims that the verse is the incipit of the *Epigoni* (although attributing it to another poet), suggests that the information given here is reliable. Another Homeric biography transmitting an incipit of a poem of the Epic Cycle, the *Little Iliad*, is Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 16 and also in this case there is no reason to doubt the reliability of this piece of information (see Introduction on Plutarch, pp. 18-28).

258. Ἐπιγόνους: the manuscript reading ἐπειγομένου does not make sense here, and the emendation proposed by Barnes is necessarily to be accepted both because the *Epigoni* is the sequel of the previously mentioned *Thebaid*, and because the verse that follows is attributed to the same work (although the work itself is attributed to a different author) in Sch. Arist. *Pac*. 1270.

259. See 257n.

260. φασὶ γάρ τινες καὶ ταῦτα Ὁμήρου εἶναι: this claim may be interpreted as referring only to the *Epigoni*, rather than to both epics, and tallies with wide-spread doubts about Homer's authorship of the *Epigoni* (see 255-60n.). This may be a way for the text to defend its own scholarly authority, after reporting more imaginative biographical stories about Hesiod and Homer. If this is right, then there is no need to think that these words are 'evidently interpolated' and that 'they cannot have been written by a man who has just stated as a fact that Homer did recite these among his poems' (West 1967: 447 n. 1).

260-4. ἀκούσαντες … οὕτως: Homer is now asked to compose the funeral epigram to be engraved on the tomb of Midas, and after that he receives a silver cup and dedicates it to Apollo. Midas is a king of Phrygia who ruled, according to Eusebius, between 738 and 696 BC. For discussion on his funeral monument see Raubitscheck 1969: 13-15, Munn 2006: 70-3. Although this episode, which involves Homer's synchronisation with a historical figure, could have allowed reflection on Homer's chronology, there seems to be none in extantsources. The only time Homer and Midas are mentioned together in a discussion concerning chronology, the source (Diogenes Laertius 1.89) strongly denies the possibility

that they could be contemporary, and on this ground also rejects the Homeric authorship of the Midas' epigram. Synchronisation with Midas was instead proposed for Terpander (by Hellanicus, 4 F 85b; discussion in Kivilo 2010: 159-60). The insertion of this episode here is functional to the development of the narrative. As West 1967: 447-8 remarks, this story parallels the episode of Hesiod's victory of the tripod at the contest (both include invitation by sons of a dead king, prize, dedication, and inscription). Although Avezzù 1982: XXX, 48 and 87 finds this a weak parallel, all these similarities between the two episodes seem to be more than coincidental. The episode indeed seems to be meant to re-establish Homer's credentials as a poet after the contest and is used as a means of securing future fame for him: see below 271-4n. West also suggests that the inclusion of this episode into the contest narrative may stem from Alcidamas, as he tended to fit Homer and Hesiod into a similar story-pattern (oracle, death, epitaph). It is impossible to establish with certainty whether Alcidamas included this episode in his narrative or not (cf. Avezzù 1982: 87: 'se la coppa è un parallelo, seppur inadeguato, del tripode, non per questo si dimostra che l'esigenza di contrappesare la sconfitta col dono sia alcidamantea'), but West's suggestion seems attractive.

265-70. χαλκῆ … τέθαπται: the epigram for Midas' tomb is one of the two so-called Homeric epigrams reported in *Certamen* (the other one is at 281-5). These are short poems that Homer is said to have composed for specific occasions, usually on the spot. Many of them are transmitted in the Ps.-Herodotean *Life of Homer*. Markwald 1986 remains the most thorough study of these texts. This epigram is transmitted by several other sources (see apparatus), including the *Vita Herodotea*, which offers the only other biographical framework for the quotation. As usual in the tradition of the epigrams reported in the *Certamen*, each of its extant sources presents the text with variant readings, but the case of this epigram is particularly interesting: some of the sources present it in a shorter form and some invert the order of the verses. Variants probably reflect

oral circulation of the epigram (Gutzwiller 2010: 243). Some of these variations are significant: Livingstone and Nisbet 2010: 43 argue that the reason why Plato omits two lines (267-8) is that this is necessary for Socrates to make his point about the structure of this text (see below); similarly, it can be argued that a fuller version of the text, that includes those two lines that strongly emphasise the concept expressed in the line that precedes them, contributes to making the point of the *Certamen*: the epigram will perpetuate Midas' fame, but at the same time is a means by which Homer's fame too becomes everlasting (see 271-4n.). Variants attested only in the *Certamen* are: ἐπὶ σήματος ἦμαι at 265; πλήθωσι and περικλύζῃ at 267; φαίνῃ at 268; σημανέω at 270. Omissions and reversal of the order of the verses concern mainly lines 267 and 268: Plato, Favorinus, Dio Chrysostomus and the *Anthologia Palatina* transmit only four verses and omit both lines; Philoponus and the *Anthologia Planudea* omit only 267. The *Vita Herodotea* and Diogenes Laertius invert the order of the two verses. Indeed the possibility of reversing the order of the verses was considered in antiquity as a peculiar characteristic of this epigram and Plato mentions it precisely because of its structure. In *Phdr*. 264b he criticises this epigram on the ground that 'it makes no difference whether any line of it is put first or last' (οὐδὲν διαφέρει αὐτοῦ πρῶτον ἢ ὕστατόν τι λέγεσθαι), because the speech lacks organisation and a fixed structure. The Neoplatonist Hermias, commenting on this Platonic passage, claims that these epigrams are called 'triangular, because it is possible to start from whatever verse one wishes' (*In Phdr*. 231 Couvreur: τινὲς τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπιγράμματα τρίγωνα καλοῦσιν, ἐπειδὴ ὅθεν ἂν ἐθέλῃς δύνασαι ἄρξασθαι). Philoponus (*In APo*. 156) calls this structure τὸ σχῆμα κύκλος. Ancient readers therefore were aware of the fact that fluidity was the main peculiarity of this epigram, which makes it futile to try and identify a possible original version of the text (contra e.g. Weber 1917, who suggests that lines 267 and 268 are a later addition to the original text that included only the first and the last three verses; Raubitschek 1968: 14 tried to determine the original order

of the verses by reconstructing their position on the monument). The attribution of the Midas' epigram to Homer was not unanimously accepted in antiquity. Only Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* and the *Anthologia Planudea* attribute it to him. Plato is not explicit: he either does not know or rejects Homeric attribution (Beecroft 2010: 71 n. 18). The poet who shared the attribution of this epigram with Homer was Cleobulus of Lindos, one of the Seven Sages. The *Anthologia Palatina* testifies to this double attribution with the lemma ΟΜΗΡΟΥ οἱ δὲ ΚΛΕΟΒΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΛ ΛΙΝΔΙΟΥ. Diogenes Laertius attributes it to Cleobulus on the basis of a passage from Simonides, where the poet criticises a passage by Cleobulus that compares some natural elements to a stone, and because of the difficulties of making Homer and Midas contemporaries. For modern discussion on the relationship between the quotation from Simonides and the Midas' epigram see Kegel 1962: 60, De Vries 1969: 212, Ford 2002: 105-9.

271-4. λαβὼν δὲ … ὀπάζοις: after composing this epigram Homer is awarded a silver cup, which he dedicates to Apollo at Delphi in the hope that the god may grant him fame. Homer's request seems to be fulfilled when, at the end of his career (see 315-21), he composes the *Hymn to Apollo*, which guarantees eternal fame to the 'blind bard from Chios'. This episode has thus been inserted in the narrative as part of the overall reversal of the final verdict of the contest in favour of Homer and to reinforce his relationship with Apollo. This particular episode follows naturally after the epigram for Midas, since both episodes are concerned with fame and Midas too is connected to Apollo and Delphi (Hdt. 1.14).

275-6. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα … ἐπῶν μ,εφ: Homer composes his major works, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, at a late stage in his career. The text specifies that Homer composes the *Odyssey* when he has already composed the *Iliad* (πεποιηκὼς ἤδη τὴν Ἰλιάδα), and thus takes part in the lively ancient debate concerning which of the two poems was composed first (see e.g. Lucian *VH* 2.20 – discussed in the Introduction, pp. 35-8 – and Seneca, *De Brevitate Vitae* 13.2, *On Sublime* 9.12-13).

The claim of the priority of the *Iliad* allows for a correspondence between the order of the composition of the poems and that of the events they narrate: Homer first sings the Theban saga (255-9), then the Trojan war and finishes with Odysseus' return home. Colbeau 2005: 260 suggests that Homer is said to have composed the *Iliad* before the *Odyssey* because it was considered the most important of the two poems. But the *Certamen* seems to present the two works as equally important and rather sets up a contrast between these two works and the other Homeric epics. The composition of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is not linked to any specific place, but is rather mentioned in between Homer's visits to Delphi and Athens: the text may be remaining purposefully vague on the matter, or making the poems gravitate towards Athens where Homer is directed. In the agonistic section, Homer already recited verses from the *Odyssey* (9.6-11 at 84-9) and the *Iliad* (13.126-33 + 13.339-44 at ll. 191-204), but their provenance was not stated. This seeming inconsistency suits narrative needs: each sequence of Homeric verses was an appropriate response to a specific challenge, while the composition of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* fits this particular point of the narrative. West 1967: 447 notes that the mention of the composition of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is odd and if Alcidamas had included it in his narrative 'he would surely have done it less awkwardly'. He concludes that this section of our text cannot derive from Alcidamas' narrative. It is hard to believe that Alcidamas did not mention the composition of Homer's two major poems in the *Mouseion*, but admittedly it is not possible to know whether he did so in the same point of the narrative as in our *Certamen*, and how much he was concerned with the internal consistency of the narrative framework. The problem, in any case, hardly seems pronounced: Homer may have composed some extemporaneous verses which he then included in his major poems. The text gives the length of the two poems in line numbers, as it did for the *Thebaid* and the *Epigoni* (256, 258). In this case too the manuscript readings seem problematic, as is often the case with the transmission of numbers. According to **L** the *Odyssey* would be 12,500 lines long

(μβφ) and the *Iliad* 15,000 (με). Nietzsche emended the readings on the basis of the number of lines in the current versions of the two poems: 12,109 for the *Odyssey* and 15,693 for the *Iliad.* The copyist (or his source) may have easily written the symbol for 500 (φ) in the wrong place, attaching it to the *Odyssey* rather than to the *Iliad*.

276-85. παραγενόμενον … Κρονίων: Homer goes from Delphi to Athens. There he is hosted by king Medon and performs an epigram in the council chamber. For the choice of performing an epigram see 277n. The fact that Homer is hosted and honoured by a king works as a reversal of and a compensation for the unfavourable judgement on Homer's poetry by another king, Panoides. Although Athens is here said to be ruled by a monarch, there are also hints in the text that prefigure the democratic constitution of the city: king Medon (who was himself seen in some of the sources as a figure of transition between monarchy and another form of government, the perpetual archonship – see 277-8n.) is in the βουλευτήριον, a building that in Athens was built at the end of the sixth c. BC to host the meetings of the βουλή (see 278n.); the epigram praises the people sitting in an assembly as a beautiful sight and, especially when compared to other versions, the text appears democratically oriented (see 281-5n.). The epigram seems to foster the image of Homer as a democratic poet, which would fit a fifth- or fourth-century BC source.

277. εἰς Ἀθήνας: the scarce presence of verses in praise of Athens in the Homeric poems may explain why Homer performs an epigram there – and a piece from the *Iliad* at Argos (288-301). That Homer in his works praised those two cities to different degrees was acknowledged already in antiquity: at Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 27, Homer composes verses for Athens and adds them to the *Iliad* 'κατανοήσας δὲ ὅτι ἐς μὲν Ἄργος πολλαὶ καὶ μεγάλαι εἶεν εὐλογίαι πεποιημέναι, ἐς δὲ τὰς Ἀθήνας οὔ'. Late sources testify that Homer was sometimes thought to be Athenian by birth (cf. e.g. Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Hom*. 2.2; Suda *s.v.* Ὅμηρος 2; Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.2; Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.2), the most important

supporters of this view being Aristarchus and Dionysius Thrax. For Aristarchus, who seems to have based his claim on Homer's use of the dual, see Sch. *ad Il*. 13.197 (on which Janko 1992: 71). For studies on the successful Athenian strategy for the appropriation of the Homeric texts, that may have involved a connection between the Peisistratids and the Homeridae to different degrees, see West 1999, Graziosi 2002: 220-7 and Nagy 2010.

277-8. παρὰ Μέδοντι τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ἀθηναίων: ancient sources disagree as to whether Medon was a king or rather the first of the archons elected for life. Aristotle in his *Constitution of the Athenians* expresses the existing uncertainties about this issue (Arist. *Ath*. 3, on which see Von Fritz and Kapp 1950: 150-2 and Rhodes 1981: 66 and 100). Hellanicus (4 F 125) does not specify whether the young Medon would become king or archon. According to Pausanias, with Medon's dynasty the political role of the members of the royal family changed (Paus. 4.5.10). By presenting him as a king, the *Certamen* reverses the outcome of the contest due to another king's verdict (see also the episode of the silver cup dedicated by Homer to the Muses, which responds to Hesiod's victory and dedication of the tripod after the contest: 260-4n.).

278. ἐν δὲ τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ: buildings known as βουλευτήρια are testified to in Greece from the late sixth century BC onwards, and the old βουλευτήριον in Athens dates back to the same period (Rhodes 1972: 18 and 30).

281-5. ἀνδρὸς … Κρονίων: for Homer reciting an epigram rather than a piece from the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* see 277n. This epigram is transmitted by two other sources, the *Vita Herodotea* and the Suda. As the Suda transmits it in the section derived from the *Vita Herodotea*, it gives the text in almost the same form (for the few minor differences see apparatus). The differences from the version of the *Certamen* are much greater: the epigram is recited in different contexts, and there are substantial differences in the form of the epigram itself. In the *Certamen* Homer recites it at Athens before king Medon, in order to praise the fire burning in the council chamber. In the *Vita Herodotea* Homer recites it at

Samos on his way to Athens. In the Ps.-Herodotean version of the episode the verses are said to be pronounced either because a fire was burning in the room, as in the *Certamen*, or in order to encourage the clansmen to light one. The version of the epigram performed here has been seen as fitting the Athenian democratic regime. The version transmitted in the *Vita Herodotea* and in Suda has the verses χρήματα δ' αὔξει οἶκον· ἀτὰρ γεραροὶ βασιλῆες / ἥμενοι εἰν ἀγορῇ κόσμος τ' ἄλλοισιν ὁρᾶσθαι ('property enhances the house, and proud kings / as they sit in the gathering are a fine sight for the others' Transl. West adapted: he emends ἄλλοισιν in λαοῖσιν and translates 'for the people'). For a study of these verses see Markwald 1986: 210-13 and Colbeau 2005: 261-2. The *Certamen* reads λαὸς δ' εἰν ἀγορῇσι καθήμενος εἰσοράασθαι (283). West 2003: 347 n. 16 notes that the line in the *Certamen* is a democratic adaptation of the two lines in the version of the Ps.-Herodotus. See more recently Beecroft 2010: 70 n. 16 and 88, who rightly notes that the two versions suited the two different political regimes of the cities where the epigram was recited, the Samian oligarchy and the Athenian democracy. See also Markwald 1986: 214, who suggests that the Athenian version is more recent.

285. ἤματι … Κρονίων: this is the only occurrence of this verse; it is not included in the *Vita Herodotea*. This verse suits the context in the *Certamen*, where the epigram is explicitly said to be recited when the weather is cold (278-9: ψύχους ὄντος). The *Vita Herodotea* does not emphasise this point.

286-7: ἐκεῖθεν δὲ παραγενόμενος εἰς Κόρινθον ἐρραψῴδει τὰ ποιήματα. τιμηθεὶς δὲ μεγάλως: Homer's visit to Corinth is 'uneventful' (West: 447 n. 3). There is no mention of the piece of poetry Homer recites or of the people he meets, but we are told that he is greatly honoured after his performance (287). Thus, despite the lack of details, this visit contributes further to the construction of a Panhellenic Homer, who travels extensively and is honoured across different cities. Nagy 2010: 53 suggests, based on the use of the verb τιμάω here (287), that this anecdote shows that Homer was honoured as a local cult hero in

Corinth and that anecdotes such as these were an aetiology that explained the reality of seasonally recurring Homeric performances at a given festival. There is no corroborating evidence for a cult of Homer or for such festivals in Corinth, but the presence of Corinth among the cities Homer visits indicates that it too may have claimed some connection with the poet. Corinth features in some passages of the *Iliad*, and this may have facilitated or inspired its mention here: the first mention of Corinth is in the Catalogue of Ships (2.570) where it is favourably defined as prosperous (ἀφνειόν τε Κόρινθον). These verses may be suitable for a performance by Homer in Corinth: the verses he performs in Argos are from the Catalogue of Ships too, and in general that section of the *Iliad* offers suitable material for local performances: see further 289-301n. The second mention of Corinth in the *Iliad* is at 13.664, where the poet tells the story of the Corinthian Euchenor (defined, like the city itself, as ἀφνειός). West 1967: 447 n. 3 connects Homer's visit to Corinth to the mention of Ἐφύρη in *Il*. 6.152 and 6.210 (Glaucus' speech): on the basis of a claim by Aristarchus, according to whom Homer refers to Corinth by the name Ἐφύρη in the carachter speeches, but by the more recent name Κόρινθος when he speaks in his own voice (Sch. *ad Il*. 6.152), West concludes that Homer 'is made to visit Corinth, in this account, simply to make sure that he is acquainted with the place'. But the actual identification of Ephyre with Corynth in this Iliadic passage is still debated: see for discussion Kirk 1990: 177 and Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 119.

286. ἐρραψῴδει: for the use of this verb in the *Certamen* see 56n.

287-8. παραγίνεται εἰς Ἄργος καὶ λέγει ἐκ τῆς Ἰλιάδος τὰ ἔπη τάδε: unlike Athens (277n.), Argos plays a major role in the *Iliad*, which may have inspired Homer's visit to this city and his choice to perform a passage from the *Iliad*. Argos' predominance in Homeric epics was acknowledged already in antiquity. Herodotus (5.67.1) informs that Clisthenes, the tyrant of Sicyon, banned the performance of Homeric epics from his city because of their excessive praise of Argos, against which Sicyon had just engaged in a war. Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 27

compares the attention devoted in the Homeric poems to Athens and to Argos.

289-301. οἳ δ' Ἄργος … πτολέμοιο: this is the passage on Argos from the Catalogue of Ships (*Il*. 2.559-68), an appropriate choice for Homer to perform in the different places he travels, because each community is represented in the Catalogue and will cherish 'its' lines. The efficacy of the verses from the Catalogue is shown in the *Vita Herodotea* too (27-8), where Homer inserts in the Catalogue verses for Athens before going there. Moreover, sections from the Catalogue may be easily detached from their original context and be recited on their own; they also lend themselves to the omission or insertion of verses. For the suggestion that Homer may have recited a passage from this Catalogue at Corinth too, see 286-7n. As usual, the quotation in the *Certamen* presents some variant readings compared to the text as we have it in the *Iliad* (see below for discussion). The *Certamen* also transmits three verses that are not present in the Iliadic manuscripts (lines 294, 300, 301). Even though we do not know their provenance, they are recognisably constructed by using elements well attested in the hexameter tradition. One of them (301) is also known from another source (*AP* 14.73.6).

292. νῆσόν τ' Αἴγιναν Μάσητά τε κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν: the Homeric text (*Il*. 2.562) reads οἵ τ' ἔχον Αἴγιναν and **S** records this reading in the margin of the line. The verse as transmitted in the *Certamen* is also in Hes. fr. 204.47 M.-W. Strabo (8.6.10) informs us that the two readings coexisted and were used to distinguish between two different places with the same name:: Αἴγινα δ᾽ ἔστι μὲν καὶ τόπος τις τῆς Ἐπιδαυρίας, ἔστι δὲ καὶ νῆσος πρὸ τῆς ἠπείρου ταύτης, ἣν ἐν τοῖς ἀρτίως παρατεθεῖσιν ἔπεσι βούλεται φράζειν ὁ ποιητής: διὸ καὶ γράφουσί τινες 'νῆσόν τ᾽ Αἴγιναν' ἀντὶ τοῦ 'οἵ τ᾽ ἔχον Αἴγιναν,' διαστελλόμενοι τὴν ὁμωνυμίαν. Aegina mentioned here is the island; hence the variant is not out of place. The manuscript reading Αἴγιναν τε Μάσητά needs to be emended by deleting τε, for metrical reasons.

294. Τυδεΐδης οὗ πατρὸς ἔχων μένος Οἰνεΐδαο: this verse is not transmitted

in the Homeric manuscripts but draws fully on Homeric hexameters. Τυδεΐδης appears at the beginning of the line at e.g. *Il*. 5.18; οὖ πατρός in the same metrical position at *Od*. 7.3 and ἔχων μένος at *Il*. 12.96; Οἰνεΐδαο closes the verse at *Il*. 5.813. As already suggested (Colbeau 2005: 265), this hexameter may have been inserted here to give a piece of information about Diomedes (the fact that he is the son of Tydeus) which is very common in the *Iliad*, but not present in this specific passage. More generally, the fact that this verse did not make it into the vulgata of the *Iliad* may be due to the difficult position of Tydeus as a role model for his son Diomedes in the *Iliad* (on which see Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 38 and 140).

296. Εὐρύπυλος: in the *Iliad* the character mentioned in this passage (2.565) is Εὐρύαλος, an Argive hero mentioned in two other episodes: his *aristeia* at 6.20-8, and his competition on the occasion of the funerary games for Patroclus at 23.677-99. Eurypylus is an Iliadic character too (e.g. 2.734-7: he was the leader of forty ships), but his presence here is slightly problematic. Kirk 1985: 234-5 discusses the realm of Eurypylus as presented in the Catalogue of Ships and remarks that its borders are quite vague. He is not explicitly said to be Argive, and another source (Apollod. 3.131) claims he was Thessalian. Moreover, it is in fact Euryalus who is the son of Mecisteus (see 297), while Eurypylus is the son of Euemon (*Il*. 11.575-6). Furthermore, as Kirk notes, Eurypylus appears at several points in the poem and seems to be a well-known figure in the epic tradition: this would justify the confusion between these two names. Wilamowitz consequently emends the name given in the *Certamen* with that transmitted in the Iliadic manuscripts, but he is alone in doing so.

297. Μηκιστέως: in the Iliadic manuscripts many variant readings are attested for the genitive form of this name, and Μηκιστέως, which is what **L** transmits, is one of those. It does not seem problematic and it is also the reading that Van Thiel accepts in his edition of the *Iliad* in this verse. There is no reason to emend it in Μηκιστέος (Rzach, see apparatus). West publishes Μηκιστῆος in the text

of the *Iliad* and keeps Μηκιστέως in the text of the *Certamen*. For discussion of the genitive forms listed above, see Kirk 1985: 211 and Janko 1992: 264.

298. ἐκ πάντων: this verse, as transmitted in at *Iliad* 2.567, begins with the word συμπάντων. This word is found in the same metrical position also at *Il*. 1.90. But ἐκ πάντων too is used at the beginning of Homeric hexameters: cf. *Il*. 4.96 and *Od*. 2.433.

300-1. Like 294, these two verses are not present in our version of the *Iliad*. But whatever their origins are, they fit well this encomiastic context for Argos. While 300 is attested nowhere else, 301 is transmitted also in *AP* 14.73.6. In this epigram the Pythia, responding to a Megarian enquiry, claims that the Argives are the best warriors and uses this very same verse to characterise them (vv. 4-6: ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ τῶν εἰσιν ἀμείνονες, οἳ τὸ μεσηγὺ / Τίρυνθος ναίουσι καὶ Ἀρκαδίης πολυμήλου, / Ἀργεῖοι λινοθώρηκες, κέντρα πτολέμοιο). ἐν δ' ἄνδρες is at the beginning of the hexameter in the verse ἐν δ' ἄνδρες ναίουσι πολύρρηνες πολυβοῦται which occurs at *Il*. 9.153 and 9.295; ἄνδρες is in the same metrical position at *Il*. 10.525 (ὅσσ' ἄνδρες), 21.405 (τόν ῥ' ἄνδρες), *Od*. 9.126 (οὐδ' ἄνδρες). πολέμοιο is in the same metrical position at e.g. *Il*. 3.150: γήραϊ δὴ πολέμοιο; δαήμονες at *Od*. 8.263. ἐστιχόωντο occurs nine times in the *Iliad*, eight of which at verse end, as here (e.g. *Il*. 2.92). λινοθώρηκες: only the singular form λινοθώρηξ occurs in Homer, at *Il*. 2.529 (Aias the lesser) and 2.830 (Araphius), both times at verse end. At least in the case of Aias, the linen corslet is not characterised positively (see Kirk 1985: 202). κέντρα πτολέμοιο is found only in the occurrences of this verse (*Certamen*, *AP* and quotations from *AP*).

302-8. τῶν δὲ Ἀργείων … εἰς Χίον ἀποστέλλειν: these are the highest honours Homer has been awarded so far: an actual cult, while the poet himself is still alive. This happens after a performance of a passage from the *Iliad*, as it is the highest achievement of Homer's poetic production at this point in the narrative. The honours he receives on this occasion are presented in climactic

order too, and with an effect of accumulation (gifts, statue, and daily, monthly, yearly and quadrennial sacrifices). This episode seems to mark a turning point for Homer, for some elements in the text point to his achievement of lasting fame, granted by the statue and the epigram inscribed on it (compare this to Homer's epigram for Midas' funeral monument and its emphasis on the perpetuation of fame: 271-4n.) and to his divine nature (he is offered periodic sacrifices thereafter, and is called θεῖος in the epigram). Another interesting mention of a cult of Homer at Argos is a passage from Aelian that seems to confirm that the honours the Argives paid to Homer were in fact divine, as the poet is invoked together with Apollo (Ael. *VH* 9.15). Archaeological and literary evidence shows that Homer was an object of cult, which may have included the offer of sacrifices too, in several other cities: for surveys of available tesimonia see Pinkwart 1965: 169-73, Brink 1972, and Clay 2004: 74-6 and 136-43.

304-5. αὐτὸν μὲν πολυτελέσι δωρεαῖς ἐτίμησαν: Homer has received and dedicated a silver cup (271-4) and has been honoured by a king (276); by making him receive 'costly gifts', which parallel the gifts offered by the organisers of the poetic contest that Homer lost (66-7), the compensation for the outcome of the competition seems complete.

305. εἰκόνα δὲ χαλκῆν ἀναστήσαντες: with this statue, Homer's fame is given material and lasting support. For another mention of a statue of the poet in his biographies see Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Hom.* 1.4: that statue is in Colophon and an epigram was inscribed on it too. See West 2003: 411 n. 34 for discussion of that monument. For dedication of statues of poets, and especially those of Homer, see Clay 2004: 89-92. For surveys and discussion of ancient portrayals of Homer see Boehringer 1939, Mansuelli 1963, Richter 1965, and Schefold 1997.

305-8: ἐψηφίσαντο θυσίαν … ἀποστέλλειν: the number of sacrifices offered to Homer (every day, month, year and four years) seems hyperbolic, but this surely mirrors the fact that the Argives were ὑπερβολῇ χαρέντες (302).

307-8. θυσίαν πενταετηρίδα εἰς Χίον ἀποστέλλειν: it is not possible to know

whether Argos (or indeed any other city) ever sent such sacrifices to Chios to honour Homer; Nagy 2010: 81 assumes on the basis of Pl. *Ti*. 26e that θυσία means not only 'sacrifice' but also, metonymically, 'festival', and more specifically a Panhellenic festival; he therefore suggests that this passage hints to a quadrennial festival in Chios during which Homeric poetry was performed, and sees it as a prototype of the Great Panathenaia in Athens – but it is also possible, of course, that this passage is itself modelled on the Great Panathenaea. The fact that the Argives send sacrifices to Chios seems to suggest that they saw Chios as the poet's birthplace: in fact this connection seems to have been made already in the sixth-fifth c. BC by another Argive, Acusilaus, who reports that the descendants of Homer, the Homeridae, are from Chios (2 F 2). Nevertheless, there was also a tradition according to which Homer was born in Argos (Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Hom*. 2.2; Anon. *Vit*. *Hom*. 3.1; Anon. *Vit*. *Hom* 1.1, which mentions Philocorus as a source, see 328 F 209), but the *Certamen* does not acknowledge it.

307. <καὶ> ἄλλην θυσίαν: the syntax of this sentence does not flow smoothly in the manuscript text, and the insertion of καί (Westermann) is the easiest way to solve this problem; καί may well have been in **L**'s antigraph and fallen because of an haplography (note the repetition of καί throughout the sentence).

309-14. θεῖος Ὅμηρος ... ἀμφέπει ἀθανάτων: the epigram confirms the image of Homer that is emerging from the rest of the text. The formula θεῖος Ὅμηρος, emphatically placed at the beginning of the epigram, underlines the poet's divine nature, which is also stressed at the very end of the epigram by τιμαῖς ἀμφέπει ἀθανάτων; Ἑλλάδα [...] πᾶσαν ἐκόσμησεν and ἔξοχα δ' Ἀργείους underline Homer's ability to appeal to a Panhellenic poet, that emerged ever since the contest, and at the same time to each community he visited thereafter. Some features of this epigram are found in other epigrams on Homer too. For θεῖος Ὅμηρος see 1-2n.; ἐκόσμησεν recalls the epithet κοσμήτωρ given to him in his funerary epigram at 348; for Ἑλλάδα [...] πᾶσαν

cf. *AP* 7.7.1 (Ἐνθάδε θεῖος Ὅμηρος, ὃς Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν ἄεισε) and Ps.-Plu. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4 (... σὺ γὰρ κλέος Ἑλλάδι πάσῃ ... θῆκας ἐς ἀίδιον).

309-12: these lines are preserved in P.Duk. inv. 665, seventh century AD. See pp. 86-9. Note especially the variants θεοτειχέα in the manuscript and ἐριαυχέα in the papyrus, line 4.

310. καλλιεπεῖ σοφίῃ: despite losing the contest on the ground that his verses did not have ethical value, Homer confirms here his reputation for wisdom, as well as for verbal art. The manuscript reading καλλιεπίηι σοφίῃ τε ('with beautiful language and wisdom', where καλλιεπίηι is a form for καλλιεπείᾳ) does not allow the pentameter to scan. The correction καλλιεπεῖ σοφίῃ ('with wisdom elegant in diction') was proposed by **S** in the margin and has been unanimously accepted. P.Duk. inv. 665 l. 2 reads καλλιεπι[and Lapini (*apud* Menci 2012: 46) suggests that this confirms the circulation of the manuscript's mistaken reading; Menci thinks it more likely to be a iotacism.

313. μεγαλόπτολις: the reading of **L** μεγαλόπολις needs a correction for metrical reasons and μεγαλόπτολις (**S** above the line) is a satisfying emendation. But, interestingly, this form is attested nowhere else; furthermore, μεγαλόπολις is never attested for Argos: it is attested for Athens (Pind. *Pyht*. 7.1) and Troy (Eur. *Tr*. 1291): see Colbeau 2005: 268.

315-21. ἐνδιατρίψας δὲ τῇ πόλει ... ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῷ: Homer's last poetic performance, the *Hymn to Apollo* in Delos, is the peak of his career. Through this episode Homer achieves what he has been seeking throughout his lifetime: a privileged relationship with the gods, lasting fame, and universal acknowledgement of his poetic skills. The episode is best read together with Homer's visit to Delphi to dedicate a silver cup to Apollo and subsequent request for future fame (271-4n.), and represents the fulfilment of the poet's wish. The durability of his fame is also guaranteed by the inscription of the *Hymn* on a tablet (see 320n.). This episode celebrates Homer as the Panhellenic poet: in the other episodes Homer was always praised and celebrated by each

community he visited, but the celebration remained mostly on a local level. Here, for the first time, Homer performs in a Panionian context (316n.), and his success on this occasion results in the attribution to him of the title of 'common citizen' of all the Ionians (κοινὸς πολίτης, 319-20n.). The process of Panhellenisation of Homer is historically connected to the image of the blind bard from Chios presented in the *Hymn to Apollo*, as it is the one accepted and promoted by the Athenians and thus became predominant. The *Certamen* makes this connection too and therefore shows to be influenced by this tradition and to engage with it. Although an explicit claim of Homer's Chian origin is always avoided in the *Certamen*, as it would contradict the very opening of the work (esp. 7-8), the text seems to gravitate towards the Chian tradition as Homer assumes the role of the Panhellenic poet: see also 302-8, where the Argives are said to send sacrifices to Chios to honour the poet.

315. διέπλευσεν εἰς Δῆλον: this is the only account of Homer's visit to Delos in his biographies. The tradition of Homer reciting the *Hymn to Apollo* in Delos is nevertheless old: (Thuc. 3.104.3, and see Introduction on Hesiod, esp. pp. 14-18). This tradition has certainly influenced the shaping of this episode of the *Certamen*. On the relationships between the composition of the *Hymn to Apollo* and the Delian festival, see Förstel 1979: 71-84, Miller 1985: 145 and Clay 1989: 47. An inscription testifies to the existence of a *Homereion* in Delos (*ID* 443, Bb 147) but the function and shape of this building are not clear. In his commentary on the mentioned inscription Durrbach 1929: 190 points out that the building may have been devoted to a cult of Homer. See also Bruneau 1970: 455 and Farnoux 2002: 101 for discussion.

316. πανήγυριν: the occasion of the performance is a πανήγυρις, a general meeting, of the Ionians. This word never appears to be used to describe a general meeting in archaic and classical times; it was instead used from the Hellenistic age onwards for other festivals (Bruneau 1970: 532). This word, together with the expression κοινὸς πολίτης (see 319n.) may be therefore a

trace of the times of composition of our text. Although the word used to designate the meeting may be late, the setting of Homer's proto-performance of the *Hymn to Apollo* in a Panionian festival in Delos is traditional and goes back to the fifth century BC (see 315-21n.).

τὸν κεράτινον βωμόν: this is the altar of horns, one of the major cult objects in Delos. For archaeological studies and collection of literary and epigraphic evidence, see Bruneau 1970 and Bruneau and Fraisse 2002. This altar was the setting of sacrifices to Apollo and it was said to have been built by the god himself by fastening together several horns of goats (Call. *Ap.* 60-4; the Delian altar mentioned in Call. *Del*. 312 too is to be identified with the altar of horns: see Mineur 1984: 242). Plutarch informs us that the altar was reckoned to be one of the seven wonders of the ancient world (*The Cleverness of Animals* 983e) and that Theseus performed a dance called Crane around it (*Thes*. 21). No other source claims that the altar of horns was the setting of a performance of the *Hymn to Apollo*, but there is no reason to exclude that the text or its sources knew that the *Hymn* was actually performed there. In any case, because of its function, this monument works well as the site of the performance through which Homer seals his relationship with Apollo: the poet offers his hymn on the altar as if it was a sacrifice to the god, and Apollo will grant fame in exchange.

317. λέγει ὕμνον εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα: the *Hymn to Apollo* was attributed to Homer as early as Thucydides (3.104), and perhaps by Aristophanes too (see Richardson 2010: 98 for discussion of the reference to the *Hymn* as a Homeric work in Aristophanes' *Birds* 575). For a list of later authors who attributed the *Hymn* to Homer see Allen 1936: lxvii-lxxviii). But a scholium to Pindar's *Nemean* 2 attributes it to Cynaethus, who probably performed the *Hymn* during the festival organised by Polycrates in Delos in 524-3 BC: on Cynaethus see Förstel 1979: 92-101, Burkert 1979, Janko 1982: 112-15, 200, 228-31, West 1975 and 2003: 11, Aloni 1989. The Homeric authorship of this text was mostly accepted and the *Certamen* does not need to mitigate this claim (contrast the case of the

Epigoni, at 260) or to support it with evidence (cf. the case of the *Margites*, at 15-17).

318. μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἑκάτοιο: as in the case of *Thebais* and *Epigoni* (255-8), the *Certamen* quotes the first verse of the work. The quotation is in this case especially appropriate to the context for its emphasis on the theme of memory.

319-20. οἱ μὲν Ἴωνες πολίτην αὐτὸν κοινὸν ... ἐποιήσαντο: Homer is made 'common citizen of the Ionians': the text had anticipated this outcome already during the contest, when Homer repeatedly got the approval of 'all the Greeks'. The title of 'common citizen' is not attested in confederations in the archaic, classical and Hellenistic ages; it may derive from Roman imperial institutions (Farnoux 2002: 102, with n. 30 for further bibliography). The author of the *Certamen* has either inserted this anecdote in a narrative that originally did not contain it, or updated its language.

320. Δήλιοι δὲ γράψαντες τὰ ἔπη εἰς λεύκωμα: writing is used in the text for the inscriptions on funeral monuments, statues, tripods and cups (213-14, 250-3, 265-70, 273-4, 309-14, 337-8) but the *Hymn to Apollo* is the only literary work to be transcribed in the narrative of the *Certamen*. This use of writing emphasises its importance as a means to perpetuate fame. While in other biographical narratives the act of transcription is not depicted positively, in the *Certamen* it legitimates the text and the Homeric authorship of it: see Beecroft 2010: 94. It is remarkable that the only literary work said to be inscribed is by Homer; transcription of Hesiod's *Works and Days,* which other sources do mention (Paus. 9.31.4), here does not feature. It is unclear whether this transcription (but also the performance) involved only the so called Delian part of the *Hymn* or the whole of it (cf. West 2003: 9) and there is no evidence that such transcription and dedication in Delos ever took place. However, as remarked already by Allen 1936: lxxv there is no reason to doubt that the story may have some historical basis. It is relevant that the text uses the word λεύκωμα (a wooden

table covered with gypsum), which was indeed used in the island to release information to the public and to make offerings (Farnoux 2002: 102). Richardson 2010: 13 also suggests that the inscription of the *Hymn* might date from a relatively early period, as the sources used by the *Certamen* may date as far back as the sixth century (as he himself suggested in Richardson 1981). See also Clay 1989: 87-9 and 1997: 501, Förstel 1979: 92-101, Graziosi 2002: 120-1.

320-1. ἀνέθηκαν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῷ: Artemis' temple was older than Apollo's and this may explain the claim that the λεύκωμα was dedicated to her temple, rather than to Apollo's; see Janko 1982: 257. Farnoux 2002 remarks that the exchanges of offerings between divinities were frequent at Delos: what is described here may also be one of such cases.

321-3. τῆς δὲ πανηγύρεως λυθείσης … πρεσβύτης ὢν ἤδη: Homer goes to Ios and is hosted by Creophylus. Other sources too mention Creophylus as Homer's host, and claim that Homer gave him the poem *Oechaliae Halosis* in exchange (e.g. Strab. 14.1.18). In the *Certamen* no detail is given about Homer's visit to Creophylus, and Creophylus himself remains rather faceless. But the fact that he is the last person Homer meets, and especially that the poet dies while being his guest (cf. also Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 5, Tz. *H*. 13.652-9), leaves open the possibility that the *Certamen* draws on a source where Creophylus was not depicted positively. This source may be Alcidamas: he is the source for the very next lines (Homer's death, see 323-8n.) and moreover it seems that a meeting between Homer and Creophylus right before Homer's death would suit Alcidamas' time: in fifth-century Athens, Creophylus was known as someone who did not take good care of Homer in his lifetime (Pl. *R*. 600b6-c: οὐδ᾽ αὖ, ἔφη, τοιοῦτον οὐδὲν λέγεται. ὁ γὰρ Κρεώφυλος, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἴσως, ὁ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ἑταῖρος, τοῦ ὀνόματος ἂν γελοιότερος ἔτι πρὸς παιδείαν φανείη, εἰ τὰ λεγόμενα περὶ Ὁμήρου ἀληθῆ. λέγεται γὰρ ὡς πολλή τις ἀμέλεια περὶ αὐτὸν ἦν ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου, ὅτε ἔζη). This may also explain why here, unlike in other sources, Creophylus is said to be from Ios, the predestined place of

Homer's death (in Schol. Pl. *R*. 600b: Creophylus is from Chios; according to Call. *Epigr*. 6 from Samos; according to Tz. *H*. 13.652 from Arcadia). Claims such as Plato's and Alcidamas' may be seen as an Athenian response to the tradition according to which Sparta was the first Greek city to receive the Homeric poems precisely through Creophylus or his descendants, the Creophylei (on which see Burkert 1972), which was in conflict with the Pisistratides' claims (on Creophylus and the Spartan tradition, and its relationship with the Athenian one, see Graziosi 2002: 189-93 and 217-22). Athough many sources give the name in the form Κρεώφυλος, the reading of **L** Κρεόφυλον does not need emendation (see apparatus). The form Κρεόφυλος too is testified in ancient sources (see e.g. Plu. *Lyc*. 4.4); it is transmitted also in some of the manuscript of Proclus, and this gives some authority to the reading of **L**.

323. πρεσβύτης ὢν ἤδη: claiming that Homer has become old by this time serves as a justification for his failure to solve the riddle proposed by the fisher boys and confirms that a long time has passed since he lost the contest to Hesiod.

323-38. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης … θεῖον Ὅμηρον: according to the biographical tradition, Homer dies after failing to solve the riddle of the fisher boys (see 327-8). The peculiarity of the *Certamen*'s account is that the inability to solve the riddle is not the cause of the poet's death, but only seems to work as a *terminus post quem* for the realisation of the oracle. Indeed Homer dies accidentally after realising that the meeting meant that his death was approaching. The death of Homer is presented quite differently from Hesiod's. Hesiod dies a violent death as a punishment for an alleged crime, while Homer dies accidentally. Unlike Hesiod, Homer is never said to misunderstand the oracle, he only seems to forget it. Homer accepts his destiny and even composes his own epitaph. The source for this part of the text must be Alcidamas. The most compelling evidence is P.Mich. inv. 2754 (see pp. 70-80), in which an account of the death of Homer almost identical to this is followed by Alcidamas' name. Alcidamas in

turn uses material that predates him. The episode of the riddle of the lice was known already to Heraclitus who seems to refer to it as to a traditional anecdote (fr. 56 D.-K.: ἐξηπάτηνται, φησίν, οἱ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς τὴν γνῶσιν τῶν φανερῶν παραπλησίως Ὁμήρωι, ὃς ἐγένετο τῶν Ἑλλήνων σοφώτερος πάντων. ἐκεῖνόν τε γὰρ παῖδες φθεῖρας κατακτείνοντες ἐξηπάτησαν εἰπόντες· ὅσα εἴδομεν καὶ ἐλάβομεν, ταῦτα ἀπολείπομεν, ὅσα δὲ οὔτε εἴδομεν οὔτ' ἐλάβομεν, ταῦτα φέρομεν). Although Heraclitus does not make an explicit connection between this episode and the poet's death, it is likely that such a connection was established early. See also Kirk 1950: 160 n. 1, Janko 2011: 529.

323-6. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης … ἦ ῥ' ἔχομέν τι; Homer approaches the fisher boys and asks if they have caught anything. This episode is also told in other sources: Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 5; Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4; Anon. *Vita Hom*. 2.3; Anon. *Vita Hom*. 3.5; Tz. *H*. 13.660; id. *Exeg. in Il.* 37.22. In Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 36 it is the boys who approach Homer and challenge him. The fact that Homer's opponents are παῖδες has been seen as a response to the assumed mental inferiority of the young men to their elders in the Homeric poems (Levine 2002: 147-50) and, more generally, the 'learned man surpassed by the ignorant' is a traditional feature of several folk-stories (Thompson 1957, 5: 13-14, Levine 2002: 144 n.12). The verse uttered by Homer is transmitted in several sources: see apparatus. Ps.-Plu. reports the question in prose and Tzetzes in *H*. 13.660 in a different metre. The reason why Homer addresses the boys as 'men from Arcadia' seems to remain obscure (see also Kivilo 2010b: 93 n. 65), as it is the presence of the variant ἁλιήτορες for θηρήτορες in some versions of the verse (see apparatus). Generally, it must be relevant that Arcadia is land-locked, and people from there cannot be fishers, but hunters. This was surely felt as problematic already in late antiquity, as Tzetzes in both of his accounts of the episode seems to try and harmonise the tradition by making Ios a place in Arcadia.

327-8. εἰπόντων δὲ ἐκείνων … φερόμεσθα: the text of the riddle is

transmitted in all the Homeric biographies, with some minor variations (see apparatus). The text of the riddle is also partly visible on the wall of the so called *Casa degli Epigrammi* in Pompei, as a caption for a fresco that represents two boys proposing the riddle to Homer: see Gigante 1979: 50-3 and most recently Bergmann 2007: 71-6. As Hess 1960: 34 points out, a death following a riddle is a traditional motif: the most famous example are the stories of Chalcas and Mopsus (in Strab. 14.1.27) and of Oedipus and the Sphinx. The riddle itself is shaped according to a model (contradiction) found in other cultures too: De Vries 1928: 132, Thompson 1957: 427. Scholars have tried to unfold possible hidden meanings of the riddle. A key word is ἕλομεν, which can be translated as 'grasped', 'understood': Bergmann 2007: 75-6 suggests that the real solution of the riddle is the riddle itself, which brings about the fulfilment of the oracle: what the boys could not grasp is the riddle, which they are carrying with themselves and taking to Homer, whose destiny is thereby accomplished; Kahane 2005: 20-2 suggests that what has not been grasped, the unknown, is death, which is also signified by the very solution of the riddle, the lice ('*phtheires* bring about the disintegration of the flesh') – but for Homer death represents the start of the tradition, his 'immortality'.

329-32. οὐ νοήσας τὸ λεχθὲν … ἐν τοῖς ἱματίοις φέρειν: without hesitation Homer asks for the solution of the riddle: he does not feel his reputation for wisdom to be in danger, and in fact here Homer seems to be more unconcerned with solving the riddle than in any other version of the episode. The solution is given by the fisher boys also in Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 37; in other cases the solution is given by the text (Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4; Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 5; Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.5) or is not given at all, which probably means that it was very widely known (Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.6; Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.3).

332-3. ἀναμνησθεὶς δὲ τοῦ μαντείου … αὐτοῦ ἐπίγραμμα: unlike Hesiod, Homer never misunderstood the oracle predicting his death. When he received it, at a young age before the contest, he carefully avoided Ios (61-2); when, as an

old man, Homer eventually goes there and realises that the prophecy has been fulfilled, he accepts his destiny and writes his funeral epigram – which is, as Kahane 2005: 5 puts it, 'a symbolic form of suicide'. The view that the epigram was composed by Homer himself is shared also by Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.5. Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 37 seems to respond to this tradition when the text specifies that the epigram was composed by the Ietans, and not, as some say, by Homer (καὶ τὸ ἐλεγεῖον τόδε ἐπέγραψαν Ἰῆται ὕστερον χρόνῳ πολλῷ … οὐδὲ Ὁμήρου ἐστίν). Other sources too attribute it to the Ietans (Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4), others report it anonymously (Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.6; Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.3). Hesiod's epitaph, though uttered in the first person (250-3), was never attributed to the poet himself.

334-5. ἀναχωρῶν δὲ ἐκεῖθεν … ὥς φασι τελευτᾷ: unlike other texts, the *Certamen* seems to enact strategies to avoid a direct connection between Homer's inability to solve the riddle and his death, so as not to call into question Homer's wisdom. According to Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Hom*. 1.4 Homer dies because, 'unable to work this out, he became distraught and died' (ὅπερ οὐ δυνηθεὶς συμβαλεῖν Ὅμηρος διὰ τὴν ἀθυμίαν ἐτελεύτησε); in Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 1.6 he 'found himself helpless' because he was unable to solve the riddle (ἀμηχανίᾳ περιπεσόντα, ἐπειδήπερ τῶν παίδων τῶν ἁλιέων οὐχ οἷός τε ἐγένετο αἴνιγμα λῦσαι); in Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 2.3 he 'starved himself to death in chagrin at not solving the problem' (διὰ λύπην ἀποκαρτερήσαντα τελευτῆσαι διὰ τὸ μὴ λῦσαι τὸ ζήτημα); in Anon. *Vit. Hom*. 3.5 'not understanding the utterance, he died from depression' (οὐ νοήσας δὲ τὸ λεγόμενον ἀπὸ θλίψεως ἐτελεύτησεν). That detaching Homer's failure in solving the riddle from his death is a way to save Homer's reputation is also confirmed by Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 36: after claiming that Homer died of illness, this text adds 'not from his failure to interpret the boys' saying, as some suppose, but from his indisposition' (ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἀσθενείας ταύτης συνέβη τὸν Ὅμηρον τελευτῆσαι ἐν Ἴῳ, οὐ παρὰ τὸ μὴ γνῶναι τὸ παρὰ τῶν παίδων ῥηθέν, ὡς οἴονταί τινες,

ἀλλὰ τῇ μαλακίῃ). An account similar to that of the *Certamen* is told by Procl. *Vit. Hom*. 5 and Tz. *H*. 13.664-5; but both Proclus and Tzetzes mix it with the more widespread tradition according to which the poet dies because he cannot solve the riddle (Proclus: οὕτω δ' ἐκεῖνον ἀθυμήσαντα σύννουν ἀπιέναι, τοῦ χρησμοῦ ἔννοιαν λαμβάνοντα, καὶ οὕτως ὀλισθόντα περιπταῖσαι λίθῳ, καὶ τριταῖον τελευτῆσαι. Tzetzes: ὑπέστρεφε λυπούμενος ὡς μὴ νοήσας τοῦτο. / πηλοῦ δ' ὄντος ὠλίσθησε καὶ κεκρουκὼς εἰς πέτραν / κλᾶται πλευρὰν τὴν δεξιὰν καὶ τελευτᾷ τριταῖος).

335. καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν Ἴῳ: while Homer's birthplace was a disputed matter, the place of his death and burial is universally identified in Ios. Along with Homer's biographies, the tradition of Homer's tomb on Ios is testified also by Pausanias (10.24.2) and Strabo (10.5.1). The alleged site of Homer's tomb is a tourist attraction even today.

336-8. ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τόδε … θεῖον Ὅμηρον: the text of Homer's funeral epigram is transmitted by virtually all the biographies of Homer and also in anthologies of epigrams with minimal textual variations (see apparatus). Two gravestones with Homer's epitaph have been found in Ios: *IG* 12.5.1.1[1] and 1[4]; they may have been displayed in front of Homer's tomb. A similar text has also been found in funeral inscriptions for other people: *IG* 12.5.1.678 and *IG* 14.763 l. 2. There were other funeral epigrams for Homer: see *AP* 7.1-7. In the *Certamen* the fact that it is situated at the end of the narration of Homer's death creates a structural parallel with the episode of Hesiod's death, closed by the epitaph of the poet (250-3). The overall effect is a final emphasis on Homer's divinity.

Bibliography

Allen, J. (2006). *Hostages and Hostage-Taking in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.

Allen, T. W., ed. (1912). *Homeri Opera Tomus V: Hymnos Cyclum Fragmenta Margiten Batrachomyomachian Vitas Continens*. Oxford.

Allen, T. W. (1924). *Homer. The Origins and the Transmission.* Oxford.

Allen, T. W., et al., eds. (1936 (2 ed)). *The Homeric Hymns*. Oxford.

Aloni, A. (1989). *L'aedo e i Tiranni: Ricerche sull'Inno Omerico a Apollo*. Rome.

Aly, W. (1914). "1. Inv. N. 12. Aus einem Schulbuche". *Mitteilungen aus der Freiburger Papyrussammlung, I. Literarische Stücke.* Heidelberg 7-22.

Anderson, G. (1986). *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.* London.

Arnim, v., I. (1905). *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta. Collegit Ioannes ab Arnim. Volumen I. Zeno et Zenoni Discipuli*. Stuttgart.

Arnott, W. G. (1999). "Notes on some comic papyri." *ZPE* 126: 77-80.

Arnott, W. G., ed. (2000). *Menander. Volume IIII, Samia, Sikyonioi, Synaristosai, Phasma, Unidentified and excluded papyri.* Cambridge (MA).

Avalle, S., ed. (1960). *Peire Vidal, Poesie*. Milan.

Avezzù, G., ed. (1982). *Alcidamante. Orazioni e frammenti*. Rome.

Babbit, F. C., ed. (1928). *Plutarch's Moralia II*. Cambridge (MA).

Bakker, E. J. (1990). "Homeric Discourse and Enjambement: A Cognitive Approach." *TAPA* 120: 1-21.

Bandini, A. M. (1768). *Catalogus codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Laurentianae varia continens Opera Graecorum Patrum*. Florence.

Barnes, J., Ed. (1711). *Ilias et Odyssea. Accedunt Opera Minora.* Cambridge.

Bassino, P. (2012). "*Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*: nuovi spunti per una riconsiderazione delle testimonianze papiracee." *ZPE* 180: 38-42.

Bausi, F. (1996). *Silvae. Angelo Poliziano; a cura di Francesco Bausi*. Firenze.

Beaulieu, M. (2004). "L'héroïsation du poète Hésiode en Grèce ancienne." *Kernos* 17: 103-17.

Beecroft, A. (2010). *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China: Patterns of Literary Circulation*. Cambridge.

Beecroft, A. (2011). "Blindness and literacy in the Lives of Homer." *CQ* 61: 1-18.

Berenson Maclean, J. K. and E. Bradshaw Aitken (2001). *Flavius Philostratus: Heroikos*. Atlanta.

Bergmann, B. (2007). "A painted garland: weaving words and images in the House of the Epigrams in Pompeii". *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World* Z. Newby and R. E. Leader-Newby, eds. Cambridge: 60-101.

Bernabé, A. (1984). "¿Mas de una Ilias Parva?" *Estudios clásicos* 26(1): 141-50.

Bernabé, A., Ed. (1987). *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Leipzig.

Bernhardy, G. (1822). *Eratosthenica*. Berlin.

Bertelli, L., ed. "Euagon of Samos (535)". Brill's New Jacoby, Brill Online.

Biles, Z. P. (2011). *Aristophanes and the Poetics of Competition*. Cambridge.

Boehringer, R. and E. Boehringer (1939). *Homer: Bildnisse und Nachweise*. Breslau.

Boissonade, J. F., ed. (1824). *Hesiodus*. Paris.

Bompaire, J., ed. (1998). *Lucien. Oeuvres: Opuscules 11-20* Paris.

Bonfante, G. (1968). "Il nome di Omero." *PP* 23: 360-1.

Boutière, J. and A.-H. Schutz, eds. (1950 (2nd ed. 1964)). *Biographies des Troubadours*. Paris.

Bowie, E. L. (2010). "Historical narrative in archaic and classical Greek elegy. *Epic and History*". D. Konstan and K. A. Raaflaub, eds. Oxford: 145-64.

Boys-Stones, G. (2010). "Hesiod and Plato's history of philosophy". *Plato and*

Hesiod. J. H. Haubold and G. Boys-Stones, eds. Oxford: 31-51.

Breilich, A. (1958). *Gli Eroi Greci*. Rome.

Breilich, A. (1961). *Guerre, Agoni e Culti nella Grecia Arcaica*. Bonn.

Brink, C. O. (1972). "Ennius and the Hellenistic worship of Homer". *AJPh* 93: 547-67.

Brodersen, K. (2010). "Mannhafte Frauen bei Polyainos und beim Anonymus *de mulieribus*". *Polyainos. Neue Studien. Polyaenus. New Studies.* Berlin: 149-59.

Broggiato, M., ed. (2001). *Cratete di Mallo: I frammenti. Edizione, introduzione e note.* La Spezia.

Bruneau, P. (1970). *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*. Paris.

Bruneau, P. and P. Fraisse (2002). *Le Monument à abside et la question de l'autel de cornes*. Athens.

Bryce, T. R. (2006). *The Trojans and their Neighbours.* London.

Burgess, J. (2001). *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore.

Burkert, W. (1972). "Die Leistung eines Kreophylos. Kreophyler, Homeriden und die archaische Heraklesepik." *MH* 29(2): 74-85.

Burkert, W. (1979). "Kynaithos, Polycrates, and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo". *Arktouros: Hellenic studies presented to B. M. W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday*. G. W. Bowersock, W. Burkert and M. C. J. Putnam, eds. Berlin.

Burkert, W. (1987). "The making of Homer in the sixth century BC: rhapsodes versus Stesichorus". *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World*. D. v. Bothmer, ed. Malibu: 43-62.

Busse, A. (1909). "Der Agon zwischen Homer und Hesiod." *RhM* 64: 108-19.

Calame, C. (1996). "Montagne des Muses et Mouseia: la consecration des Travaux et l'héroisation d'Hésiode". *La Montagne des Muses*. A. Hurst and A. Schachter, eds. Genève: 43-56.

Cameron, A. (2004). *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*. Oxford.

Campbell, D. A. (1983). *The golden lyre: the themes of the Greek lyric poets*. London.

Canart, P. (2002). "Il Bandini e la catalogazione dei manoscritti greci. Osservazioni di un catalogatore". *Un erudito del Settecento: Angelo Maria Bandini*. R. Pintaudi, ed. Messina: 37-42.

Cavallo, G. (2000). "Scritture informali, cambio grafico e pratiche librarie a Bisanzio tra i secoli XI e XII". *I Manoscritti Greci tra Riflessione e Dibattito, Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia Greca (Cremona, 4-10 ottobre 1998)*. G. Prato, ed. Florence: 219-38.

Cavallo, G. and H. Maehler (2008). *Hellenistic Bookhands*. Berlin.

Cesaretti, P. (1991). *Allegoristi Di Omero a Bisanzio: Ricerche Ermeneutiche (XI-XII Secolo)*. Milan.

Cingano, E. (1985). "Clistene di Sicione, Erodoto e i poemi del ciclo tebano." *QUCC* 49: 31-40.

Clark, M. (1997). *Out of Line. Homeric Composition Beyond the Hexameter*. Lanham.

Clay, D. (2004). *Archilochos Heros. The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*. Cambridge (MA).

Clay, J. S. (2003). *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge.

Clay, J. S. (2008-2009). "Sarpédon: «Aristos Heroon»." *Gaia* 12: 15-27.

Clay, J. S. (2011). *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad*. Cambridge.

Cohoon, J. W., ed. (1932). *Dio Chrysostom. Translated by J.W. Cohoon*. Cambridge (MA).

Colbeau, M.-A. (2005). *Raconter la vie d'Homère dans l'Antiquité*. Thèse soutenue à l'Université de Lille 3, le 1er décembre 2005.

Collins, D. (2004). *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry*. Harvard.

Colonna, A. (1953). "I Prolegomeni ad Esiodo e la Vita Esiodea di G. Tzetzes."

BPEC 2: 27-39.

Colonna, A., ed. (1959). *Opera et dies / Hesiodi; recensuit Aristides Colonna*. Milan.

Compton-Engle, G. L. (1999). "Aristophanes *Peace* 1265-1304: food, poetry, and the comic genre." *CPh* 94(3): 324-9.

Cook, A. B. (1914). *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion, vol. 1*. Cambridge.

Cook, A. B. (1925). *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion, vol. 2.2*. Cambridge.

Dain, A. (1950). "Un manuscrit de Polyen, le Scorialensis T.i.12 " *Emerita* 18: 425-39.

Daneloni, A. (2005). "Due libri postillati dal giovane Poliziano." *Studi medievali e umanistici* 3: 165-212.

Daneloni, A. and L. Martinelli (1994). "Angelus Politianus: manoscritti e edizioni". *Pico, Poliziano e l'Umanesimo di fine Quattrocento: Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana 4 novembre - 31 dicembre 1994.* P. Viti, ed. Florence: 305-43.

Davies, M., ed. (1988). *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Göttingen.

Davies, M. (1989). *The Greek Epic Cycle*. Bristol.

Davies, M. (1989b). "Kinkel redivivus (review of Bernabé 1987)." *CR* 103: 4-9.

de Lannoy, L. (1997). "Le problème des Philostrate (État de la question)" *ANRW* 34(3): 2362-449.

De Martino, F. (1982). *Omero Quotidiano. Vite di Omero*. Venosa.

De Vries, J. (1928). *Die Märchen von klugen Rätsellösern* Helsinki.

De Vries, G. J. (1969). *A Commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato*. Amsterdam.

Debiasi, A. (2001). "Variazioni sul nome di Omero." *Hespería. Studi sulla grecità di occidente.* 14: 10-35.

Debiasi, A. (2010). "Orcomeno, Ascra e l'epopea regionale minore". *Tra Panellenismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia*. E. Cingano. Alessandria: 255-98.

Debiasi, A. (2012). "Homer agonistes in Chalcis". *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis And The Interpretation Of Oral Poetry* F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis. Berlin: 471-500.

Defradas, J., et al., Eds. (1985). *Plutarque. Oeuvres Morales II*. Paris.

Deroy, L. (1972). "Le nom d'Homère." *AC* 41: 427-39.

Desmed, R. (1974). "La découverte et la première édition de la seconde centurie des "Miscellanea" de Politien." *Scriptorium* 28: 314-19.

Detienne, M. (1990). *Les Maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque*. Paris.

Di Benedetto, V. (1969). "Aristophanes, *Pax* 1282-1283 e il certamen tra Omero e Esiodo." *RAL* 24: 161-5.

Dodds, E. R. (1952). "The Alcidamas-Papyrus Again." *CQ* 2: 187-8.

Durante, M. (1957). "Il nome di Omero." *Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 12: 94-111.

Edwards, G. (1971). *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context.* Oxford.

Elmer, D. (2013). *The Poetics of Consent: Collective Decision Making and the Iliad*. Baltimore.

Erbse, H. (1996). "Homer und Hesiod in Chalkis." *RhM* 139: 308-15.

Ercolani, A., Ed. (2010). *Esiodo, Opere e Giorni*. Rome.

Erskine, A. (2001). *Troy Between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford.

Esposito Vulgo Gigante, G. (1996). *Vite di Omero*. Naples.

Evelyn White, H. G., ed. (1914). *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns, and Homerica.* Cambridge (MA).

Farnoux, A. (2002). "Homère à Délos." *Ktema* 27: 97-104.

Fehling, D. (1979). "Zwei Lehrstucke über Pseudo-Nachrichten (Homeriden, Lelantischer Krieg)." *RhM* 122: 193-210.

Ferrante, D., Ed. (1957). *Proclo, Crestomazia: introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento degli estratti relativi ai generi letterari, luoghi paralleli: testo e traduzione, ciclo e vita di Omero: testo e traduzione*. Naples.

Foley, J. M. (1999). *Homer's Traditional Art*. University Park: Pennsylvania State.

Fontenrose, J. E. (1978). *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalog of Responses*. Berkeley.

Ford, A. (1992). *Homer: the Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca.

Ford, A. (1997). "The Inland Ship: Problems in the Performance and Reception of Early Greek Epic". *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*. E. Bakker and A. Kahane, eds. Cambridge (MA).

Ford, A. (2002). *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton.

Förstel, K. (1979). *Untersuchungen zum homerischen Apollonhymnos*. Bochum.

Fowler, R. L. (2000). *Early Greek Mythography: Volume 1: Text and Introduction*. Oxford.

Fraser, P. M. (1972). *Ptolemaic Alexandria. Vol. 2*. Oxford.

Friedel, O. (1878-9). "Die Sage vom Tode Hesiods." *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* suppl. 10: 235-78.

Fritz, v., K. and E. Kapp (1950). *Constitution of Athens and related texts / Translated with an introd. and notes by Kurt von Fritz and Ernst Kapp.* New York.

Fryde, E. B. (1983). *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography*. London.

Fryde, E. B. (1996). *Greek manuscripts in the private library of the Medici: 1469-1510. 2*. Aberystwyth.

Gaisford, T., Ed. (1823). *Poetae minores Graeci: Scholia ad Hesiodum*. Oxford.

Gallavotti, C. (1929). "Genesi e tradizione letteraria dell'Agone tra Omero ed Esiodo." *RFIC* 7: 31-59.

Gentile, S. (1997). "Pico filologo." *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: convegno internazionale di studi nel cinquecentesimo anniversario della morte (1494-1994):*

Mirandola, 4-8 ottobre 1994. G. C. Garfagnini. Florence: 465-90.

Georgiadou, A. and D. H. J. Larmour (1998). *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories.* Leiden.

Gera, D. L. (1997). *Warrior Women: The Anonymous Tractatus De Mulieribus*. Leiden.

Giannini, A., Ed. (1965). *Paradoxographicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Milan.

Gigante, M. (1979). *Civiltà delle Forme Letterarie nella Antica Pompei*. Pompei.

Goettling, K., Ed. (1843). *Hesiodi Carmina*. Gotha.

Gostoli, A., Ed. (2007). *Margite*. Pisa-Rome.

Graziosi, B. (2001). "Competition in Wisdom. *Homer, Tragedy and Beyond. Essays in Honour of P.E. Easterling*". F. Budelmann and P. Michelakis. London: 57-74.

Graziosi, B. (2002). *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*. Cambridge.

Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold, eds. (2010). *Homer: Iliad Book VI*. Cambridge.

Gutzwiller, K. (2010). "Heroic epitaphs of the classical age: the Aristotelian Peplos and beyond." *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*. M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic, eds. Cambridge: 219-49.

Hall, E. (1988). "When did the Trojans turn into Phrygians? Alcaeus 42.15." *ZPE* 73: 15-18.

Hall, E. (1989). *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy*. Oxford.

Hanink, J. (2008). "Literary Politics and the Euripidean Vita." *CCJ* 54: 115–35.

Harsting, P. (2001). "More Evidence of Menander Rhetor on the Wedding Speech: Angelo Poliziano's Transcription." *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Age grec et latin* 72: 11-34.

Haubold, J. H. (2000). *Homer's people. Epic Poetry and Social Formation*. Cambridge.

Heath, M. (1998). "Was Homer a Roman?" *Papers of the Leeds International Latin*

Seminar 10: 23-56.

Heeren, A. H. L. (1789). "Tractatus anonymi de mulieribus quae bello claruerunt." *Bibliothek der Alten Literatur und Kunst* 6: 3-24.

Heldmann, K. (1982). *Die Niederlage Homers im Dichterwettstreit mit Hesiod*. Göttingen.

Hermann, G.. Ed. (1835). *Opuscula. Vol. 6*. Leipzig.

Hess, K. (1960). *Der Agon zwischen Homer und Hesiod, seine Entstehung und kulturgeschichtliche Stellung*. Winterthur.

Heubeck, A. H. and A. Hoekstra (1989). *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume II: Books IX-XVI*. Oxford.

Higbie, C. (1990). *Measure and Music: Enjambment and Sentence Structure in the Iliad*. Oxford.

Hiller, E. (1872). *Eratosthenis Carminum Reliquiae*. Leipzig.

Hillgruber, M. (1990). "Zur Zeitbestimmung der Chrestomathie des Proklos." *RhM* 133: 397-404.

Hillgruber, M. (1994). *Die pseudoplutarchische Schrift De Homero Teil 1: Einleitung und Kommentar zu den Kapiteln 1-73*. Stuttgart - Leipzig.

Hillgruber, M. (1999). *Die pseudoplutarchische Schrift De Homero. Teil 2. Kommentar zu den Kapiteln 74–218*. Stuttgart - Leipzig.

Hornblower, S. (1991). *A Commentary on Thucydides, vol. 1: books 1-3*. Oxford.

Hunter, R. (2006). *The Shadow of Callimachus. Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome.* Cambridge.

Hunter, R. (2009). Hesiod's Style: Towards an Ancient Analysis. Montanari et al. (2009). Leiden: 253-69.

Hunter, R. and I. Rutherford, eds. (2009). *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*. Cambridge.

Huxley, G. (1969). "Choirilos of Samos." *GRBS* 10: 12-29.

Jakoby, F. (1933). "Homerisches I: Der Bios und die Person." *Hermes* 68: 1-50.

Janko, R. (1982). *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction.* Cambridge.

Janko, R. (1992). *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume 4 books 13-16*. Cambridge.

Janko, R., Ed. (2011). *Philodemus On Poems Book 3-4 with the Fragments of Aristotle On Poets.* Oxford.

Jellamo, A. (2005). *Il cammino di Dike. L'idea di giustizia da Omero a Eschilo*. Rome.

Jones, C. P. (1986). *Culture and Society in Lucian*. Cambridge (MA).

Kahane, A. (2005). *Diachronic Dialogues. Authority and Continuity in Homer and Homeric Tradition.* Lanham.

Kaiser, E. (1964). "Odyssee-Szenen als Topoi." *MH* 21(4): 197-224.

Kegel, W. (1962). *Simonides.* Groningen.

Kim, L. (2010). *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. Cambridge.

Kindstrand, J. F., ed. (1990). *De Homero*. Leipzig, B.G. Teubner.

Kirchhoff, A. (1892). *Der Roman eines Sophisten*. Berlin.

Kirk, G. S. (1950). "The Michigan Alcidamas-Papyrus; Heraclitus fr. 56D; the riddle of the lice." *CQ* 44: 149-67.

Kirk, G. S. (1966). "Studies in some technical aspects of Homeric style." *YCS* 20: 75-152.

Kirk, G. S. (1985). *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume 1 books 1-4*. Cambridge.

Kirk, G. S. (1990). *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume 2 books 5-8*. Cambridge.

Kivilo, M. (2000). "Certamen." *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 1: 1-5.

Kivilo, M. (2010). *Early Greek Poets' Lives: The Shaping of the Tradition*. Leiden.

Kivilo, M. (2010b). "The early biographical tradition on Homer." *Identities and*

Societies in the Ancient East-Mediterranean Regions: Comparative Approaches T. Kämmerer, P. Funke, M. Kõiv and A. Lill. Münster, eds.: 85-104.

Koechly, H. (1857). *Opuscola Academica I*. Leipzig.

Kõiv, M. (2011). "A note on the dating of Hesiod." *CQ* 61(2): 355-77.

Kokolakis, M. (1995). "Zeus' tomb: an object of pride and reproach." *Kernos* 8: 123-38.

Koniaris, G. L. (1971). "Michigan Papyrus 2754 and the Certamen." *HSPh* 75: 107-29.

Koning, H. H. (2010). *Hesiod, the Other Poet: Ancient Reception of a Cultural Icon*. Leiden.

Körte, A. (1927). "Alkidamas Περὶ Ὁμήρου." *APF* 8: 261-5.

Kuisma, O. (1996). *Proclus' Defence of Homer.* Helsinki.

Lamberton, R. (1986). *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. Berkeley.

Lamberton, R. (1988). "Plutarch, Hesiod, and the Mouseia of Thespiai." *ICS* 13(2): 491-504.

Lanata, G. (1963). *Poetica preplatonica*. Florence.

Landi, C. (1895). "Opuscula de fontibus mirabilibus, de Nilo etc. ex cod. Laur. 56,1 descripta." *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 3: 531-48.

Latacz, J. (1996). *Homer, His Art and His World*. Ann Arbor.

Lefkowitz, M. (1981 (2nd ed. 2012)). *The Lives of the Greek Poets.* London.

Lehrs, K. (1875). *Über Wahrheit und Dichtung in der griechischen Literaturgeschichte. Populäre Aufsätze aus dem Alterthum.* Leipzig.

Leo, F. (1901). *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form.* Leipzig.

Levine, D. (2002). "Poetic Justice: Homer's Death in the Ancient Biographical Tradition." *CJ* 98(2): 141-160.

Livingstone, N. and G. Nisbet (2010). *Epigram*. Cambridge.

Lloyd-Jones, P. H., et al. (1983). *Supplementum Hellenisticum: Supplement*, De Gruyter.

Longo, A. (1995). "Sull'attribuzione della Crestomazia a Proclo neoplatonico " *SIFC* 13: 109-24.

Maass, E. (1911). "Die Person Homers." *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 27: 539-50.

Mahaffy, J. P. (1891). *The Flinders Petrie Papyri with Transcriptions, Commentaries and Index*. Dublin.

Maisano, R. (1995). *Discorsi di Temistio*. Turin.

Mandilaras, B. (1990). "A New Papyrus Fragment of the Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi." *Platon* 42: 45-51.

Mandilaras, B. (1992). A New Papyrus Fragment of the Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi (reprinted). *Papiri letterari greci e latini (Papyrologica Lupiensia 1)*. M. Capasso. Lecce 54-62.

Manieri, A. (2009). *Agoni poetico-musicali nella Grecia antica vol. 1 (Beozia)*. Pisa-Roma.

Mansuelli, G. A. (1963). "Omero." *Enciclopedia dell'arte antica, classica e orientale, vol. 5*. Rome.

Markwald, G. (1986). *Die homerische Epigramme: sprachliche und inhaltliche Untersuchungen*. Meisenheim.

Martino, F. de (1984). *Omero Quotidiano: Vite di Omero*. Venosa.

Marx, F. (1925). "Die Überlieferung über die Persönlichkeit Homers." *RhM* 74: 395-431.

Marzillo, P., ed. (2010). *Der Kommentar des Proklos zu Hesiods „Werken und Tagen"*. Tübingen.

Mason, H. (1974). *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*. Toronto.

Matteuzzi, M. (2000-2002). "A proposito di Omero "babilonese" (Lucian. V.H. II 20)." *Sandalion* 23-25: 49-51.

McLeod, W. (1985). "The 'Epic Canon' of the Borgia Table: Hellenistic Lore or Roman Fraud?" *TAPhA* 115: 153-65.

Meineke, A. (1843). *Analecta Alexandrina*. Berlin.

Menci, G. (2012). "Un epigramma del *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* (309-312 Allen) in P.Duk. inv. 665." *ZPE* 180: 43-7.

Merkelbach, R. and L. West, eds. (1967). *Fragmenta Hesiodea*. Oxford.

Meyer, E. (1892). "Homerische Parerga: der Wettkampf Homers und Hesiods." *Hermes* 27: 377-80.

Miller, A. M. (1985). *From Delos to Delphi: A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Leiden.

Milne, H. J. M. (1927). *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum*. London.

Milne, M. J. (1924). *A Study in Alcidamas and his Relation to Contemporary Sophists*. Bryn Mawr.

Mineur, W. H., ed. (1984). *Callimachus. Hymn to Delos.* Leiden.

Möllendorff, P. v. (2000). *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit. Lukians Wahre Geschichten.* Tübingen.

Momigliano, A. D. (1993). *Development of Greek Biography, Expanded Edition*. Harvard.

Montanari, F., et al., eds. (2009). *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*. Leiden.

Morgan, K. A. (2000). *Myth and Philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato*. Cambridge.

Muir, J. V., ed. (2001). *Alcidamas. The works and fragments*. Bristol.

Munn, M. H. (2006). *The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the tyranny of Asia: a study of sovereignty in ancient religion*. Berkeley.

Nagy, G. (1979). *The best of the Achaeans: concepts of the hero in Archaic Greek poetry*. Baltimore.

Nagy, G. (1982). Hesiod. *Ancient Greek Authors*. T. J. Luce. New York.

Nagy, G. (1983). On the death of Sarpedon. *Approaches to Homer* C. A. Rubino and C. W. Shelmerdine. Austin: 189-217.

Nagy, G. (2004). "L'aède épique en auteur: la tradition des Vies d'Homère." *Identités d'auteur dans l'Antiquité et la tradition européenne*. C. Calame and R. Chartier, eds. Grenoble: 41-67.

Nagy, G. (2006). "Homer's Name Revisited." *La langue poétique indo-européenne; Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes. Paris, 22-24 octobre 2003*. G.-J. Pinault and D. Petit, eds. Leuven – Paris : 317-30.

Nagy, G. (2009). "Hesiod and the Ancient Biographical Traditions." Montanari et al. (2009): 271-311.

Nagy, G. (2010). *Homer the Preclassic*. Berkeley.

Nesselrath, H.-G. (2002). "Homerphilologie auf der Insel der Seligen: Lukian VH II 20." *Epea Pteroenta* 75: 151-162.

Nietzsche, F. (1870). "Der Florentinische Tractat über Homer und Hesiod, ihr Geschlecht und ihren Wettkampf, 1-2." *RM* 25: 528-40.

Nietzsche, F. (1871). "Certamen quod dicitur Homeri et Hesiodi. E codice florentino post Henricum Stephanum denuo edidit Fridericus Nietzsche Numburgensis." *Acta societatis philologae Lipsiensis* 1: 1-23.

Nietzsche, F. (1873). "Der Florentinische Tractat über Homer und Hesiod, ihr Geschlecht und ihren Wettkampf, 3-5 " *RM* 28: 211-49.

Nilsson, M. P. (1906). *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung.* Leipzig.

Ni-Mheallaigh, K. (2009). "Monumental fallacy: the teleology of origins in Lucian's Verae Historiae." *A Lucian for our Times*. A. Bartley, ed. Newcastle upon Tyne: 11–28.

Öhler, H. (1913). *Paradoxographi Florentini anonymi opusculum de aquis mirabilibus: ad fidem codicum manu scriptorum ed. commentario instructum*. Tübingen.

Olson, S. D. (1998). *Aristophanes: Peace*. Oxford.

O'Sullivan, N. (1992). *Alcidamas, Aristophanes, and the Beginnings of Greek Stylistic Theory*. Stuttgart.

Parker, V. (1997). *Untersuchungen Zum Lelantischen Krieg und Verwandten Problemen der Frühgriechischen Geschichte*. Stuttgart.

Parry, M. (1971). *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry, ed. A Parry*. Oxford.

Patzer, A. (1993). "Hesiod als Rhapsode." *Ut Poiesis Pictura: Antike Texte in Bildern*. N. Holzberg and F. Maier, eds. Bamberg: 83-96.

Pearson, A. C., Ed. (1891). *The Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes, with Introduction and Explanatory Notes.* London.

Penella, R. J. (2000). *The Private Orations of Themistius*. Berkeley.

Pertusi, A. (1951). "Intorno alla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii di Proclo ad Esiodo IV: Proclo e non Proclo." *Aevum* 25(2): 147-59.

Pertusi, A., ed. (1955). *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*. Milan.

Pfeiffer, R. (1968). *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.

Piccolomini, E. (1874). "Due documenti relativi ad acquisti di codici greci, fatti da Giovanni Lascaris per contro di Lorenzo de' Medici ". *RFIC* 2: 401-23.

Pinkwart, D. (1965). *Das Relief des Archelaos von Priene und die "Musen des Philiskos"*. Kallmünz.

Pontani, F. (2005). *Eraclito, Questioni Omeriche sulle allegorie di Omero in Merito agli Dèi.* Pisa.

Pordomingo, F. (2010). "Antologías escolares de época helenística." *Libri di scuola e pratiche didattiche. Dall'Antichità al Rinascimento. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Cassino, 7-10 maggio 2008*. L. D. Corso and O. Pecere, eds. Cassino: 37-69.

Powell, J. U. (1925). *Collectanea Alexandrina: reliquiae minores poetarum Graecorum aetatis Ptolemaic, 323-146 A. C.: epicorum, elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum*.

Oxford.

Raubitschek, A. E. (1968). "Denkmal und Epigram." *L'épigramme grecque, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 14*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva: 1-37.

Renehan, R. (1971). "The Michigan Alcidamas-Papyrus: A problem in methodology." *HSPh* 75: 85-105.

Renehan, R. (1976). *Studies in Greek texts: critical observations to Homer, Plato, Euripides, Aristophanes and other authors*. Göttingen.

Rhodes, P. J. (1972). *The Athenian Boule*. Oxford.

Rhodes, P. J. (1981). *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.

Richardson, N. (1975). "Homeric professors in the age of the Sophists." *PCPS* 21: 65-81.

Richardson, N. (1981). "The contest of Homer and Hesiod and Alcidamas' *Mouseion*." *CQ* 31: 1-10.

Richardson, N. (1984). Review of Heldmann 1982. *CR* 34(2): 308-9.

Richardson, N. (1993). *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume 6 books 21-24*. Cambridge.

Richardson, N., ed. (2010). *Three Homeric Hymns. To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite.* Cambridge.

Richter, G. (1965). *The Portraits of the Greeks*, vol. 1. London.

Rosen, R. M. (1990). "Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's 'Works and Days.'." *Cl Ant* 9(1): 99-113.

Rosen, R. M. (1997). "Homer and Hesiod." *A New Companion to Homer*. I. Morris and B. Powell. Leiden: 463-88.

Rosen, R. M. (2004). "Aristophanes' Frogs and the Contest of Homer and Hesiod." *TAPhA* 134: 295-322.

Rubinstein, N. (1990). "Il Bruni a Firenze: retorica e politica." *Leonardo Bruni cancelliere della Repubblica di Firenze: Convegno di Studi (Firenze, 27-29 ottobre 1987*. P. Viti. Florence: 20-8.

Russell, D. A. (1996). *Libanius: Imaginary Speeches: a Selection of Declamations Translated with Notes.* London.

Russell, D. A. and N. G. Wilson, eds. (1981). *Menander Rhetor edited with translation and commentary by D.A. Russell and N. G. Wilson*. Oxford.

Rzach, A., ed. (1913). *Hesiodi Carmina recensuit Aloisius Rzach. Editio Tertia. Accedit Certamen Quod Dicitur Homeri Et Hesiodi.* Leipzig.

Salemi, V. (1951). "Spunti neoplatonici nel commento di Proclo agli *Erga kai Hemerai*" *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere dell'Università di Napoli* 1: 75-83.

Sauppe, H. (1850). *Oratores Attici: Scholia, Fragmenta, Indices. Vol. 2*. Zurich.

Scafoglio, M. (2006). "Two Fragments of the Epic Cycle." *GRBS* 46: 5-11.

Schefold, K. (1997). *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker, 2nd edition.* Basel.

Scodel, R. (1980). "Hesiod Redivivus." *GRBS* 21: 301-20.

Severyns, A., ed. (1938-1963). *Recherches sur la Chrestomatie de Proclos*. Paris.

Sinclair, T. J. (1932). *Hesiod: Works and Days.* London.

Skiadas, A. D. (1965). *Homer Im Griechischen Epigramm*. Athens.

Solmsen, F. (1932). "Drei Rekonstruktionen zur antiken Rhetorik und Poetik. I: Alkidamas." *Hermes* 67: 133-44.

Solmsen, F. (1940). "Some works of Philostratus the Elder." *TAPA* 71: 556-72.

Sommerstein, A. H. (1985). *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Peace*. Warminster.

Sturz, F. G., ed. (1787). *Hellanici Lesbii Fragmenta e variis scriptoribus collegit emendavit illustravit et praemissa Commentatione de Hellanici aetate vita et scriptis in universum edidit Fridericus Guilielmus Sturz.* Leipzig.

Thompson, S. (1957). *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature.* Bloomington.

Uden, J. (2010). "The Contest of Homer and Hesiod and the ambitions of Hadrian." *JHS* 130: 121-35.

Unanua Garmendia, M. Á. (2003). "El catálogo de las naves de la « Ilíada » : un problema de cálculo." *Helmantica* 54: 219-46.

Verdenius, W. J. (1985). *A Commentary on Hesiod Works and Days vv. 1-382*. Leiden.

Verity, A. (2011). *Homer. The Iliad. A New Translation by Anthony Verity*. Oxford.

Vinogradov, J. G. (1969). "Cyclic Poetry in Olbia." *VDI* 3(109): 142-8.

Vinogradov, J. G. and M. Zolotarev (1990). La Chersonèse de la fin de l'archaïsme. *Le Pont-Euxin vu par les Grecs*. T. Khartchilava and E. Geny. Paris: 85-120.

Vogt, E. (1959). "Die Schrift vom Wettkampf Homers und Hesiods." *RhM* 102: 193-221.

Vox, O. (1980). "Esiodo fra Beozia e Pieria." *Belfagor* 35: 321–5.

Weber, L. (1917). "Steinepigramm und Buchepigramm." *Hermes* 52(4): 536-57.

Welcker, F. G. (1835). *Der Epische Cyclus, Oder Die Homerischen Dichter. Vol. 1*. Bonn.

West, M. L. (1966). *Theogony: edited with prolegomena and commentary by M.L. West*. Oxford.

West, M. L. (1967). "The Contest of Homer and Hesiod." *CQ* 17(2): 433-50.

West, M. L. (1973). *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique: Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart.

West, M. L. (1975). "Cynaethus' Hymn to Apollo." *CQ* 25(2): 161-70.

West, M. L. (1978). *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford.

West, M. L. (1982). *Greek Metre*. Oxford.

West, M. L. (1983). *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford.

West, M. L. (1999). "The Invention of Homer." *CQ* 49(2): 364-82.

West, M. L., ed. (2003). *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer*.

Cambridge (MA).

West, M. L., ed. (2003b). *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge (MA).

Westermann, A. (1839). *Paradoxographoi: Scriptores rerum mirabilium graeci.* Braunschweig.

Westermann, A. (1843). *Mythographoi Scriptores Poeticae Historiae Graeci*. Braunschweig.

Westermann, A. (1845). *Biographoi: Vitarum Scriptores Graeci Minores*. Braunschweig.

Wilamowitz, U. v. (1875). *Analecta Euripidea*. Berlin.

Wilamowitz, U. v. (1879). "Parerga." *Hermes* 14: 161-86.

Wilamowitz, U. v., ed. (1916). *Vitae Homeri et Hesiodi in usum scholarum.* Bonn.

Wilamowitz, U. v. (1916b). *Die Ilias und Homer*. Berlin.

Wilson, P. (2009). "Thamyris the Tracian: the archetypal wandering poet?" R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (2009). Cambridge: 46-79.

Winiarczyk, M., ed. (1991). *Euhemeri Messenii Reliquiae*. Stuttgart-Leipzig.

Winter, J. G. (1925). "A New Fragment on the Life of Homer." *TAPhA* 56: 120-9.

Zeitlin, F. (2001). "Visions and Revisions of Homer in the Second Sophistic." *Greek Identity in the Second Sophistic*. S. Goldhill. Cambridge: 195-266.