Durham E-Theses

The Bookish Turn: Assessing the Impact of the Book-Roll on Authorial Self- Representation in Early Hellenistic Poetry

CHESTERTON, BARNABY

The Bookish Turn:

Assessing the Impact of the Book-Roll on Authorial Self-Representation in Early Hellenistic Poetry

Barnaby Chesterton

Thesis submitted to the Department of Classics and Ancient History, Durham University, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
19th August, 2016

Table of Contents

Abstract

My thesis takes its start from the oft-used description of Hellenistic poetry as 'bookish', but looks beyond the connotations of this label as denoting a milieu which was self-consciously intellectual, and instead considers the more fundamental ramifications of the designation: that Hellenistic poetry was bookish in its form, as much as in outlook. To consider the implications of this, I focus upon a period, and a significant poetic *topos*, wherein the effects of the book-roll can be most keenly discerned, assessing the impact of the medium upon authorial self-representations - particularly in the construction of authorial personae - undertaken in early Hellenistic poetry (c.323-246 BC).

In Part I of the thesis, I assess the evolution of authorial self-representation in epigram, charting developments from the inscribed form of the genre through to the book-epigram collections of the Hellenistic period: I argue that the author acquired a newfound prominence in this medial transition, asserting their presence as a voice within the text as opposed to a figure situated strictly in antecedence to it. I demonstrate this through analyses of Posidippus, Callimachus, Nossis, Asclepiades, and the epigrams ascribed to Erinna, and suggest that we repeatedly observe authors undertaking composite processes of self-representation, as a direct result of the composite context of the book-roll.

In Part II of the thesis, I examine the *Mimiambs* of Herodas. Through the analysis of *Mimiamb* 8 (in which Herodas constructs an authorial persona, and defines his poetic programme) in conjunction with an appraisal of the metapoetic dimension of the other *Mimiambs*, I assess the manner in which Herodas undertakes a complex, intertextual process of self-representation. Arguing that the author reflects upon the generic and medial innovations of his poetic practice across his corpus, I demonstrate that this process of reflection complements Herodas' overt authorial self-representation in *Mimiamb* 8.

In summary, I argue that the impact of the book-roll on authorial self-representation was wide-ranging, but that the most significant consequence of the medium was the evolution of authorial self-representation as a composite, roll-spanning activity.

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of the names of ancient works and authors follow those of the Liddell Scott Jones and Oxford Latin Dictionaries; abbreviations of journals in the bibliography follow those used by *L'Année Philologique*. All dates referring to the ancient world are BC, unless otherwise noted.

AB	Austin, C. and Bastianini, G., (eds.) 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae Supersunt Omnia* (Milan)
AP	*Palatine Anthology*
APl	*Planudean Anthology*
Bergk	Bergk, T., (ed.) 1853. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (Leipzig)
BMC	Gardner, P., Head, B.V. and Poole, R.S., et al., (eds.) 1873-. *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum* (London)
CEG	Hansen, P.A., (ed.) 1983, 1989. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca,* 2 vols. (Berlin)
Degani	Degani, E., (ed.) 1991. *Hipponactis Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Leipzig)
Domingo-Forastè	Domingo-Forastè, D., (ed.) 1994. *Claudii Aeliani Epistulae et Fragmenta* (Leipzig)
FD III (Paris)	Bourguet, É., et al., (eds.)1929-. *Fouilles de Delphes, III. Épigraphie*
FGE	Page, D.L., (ed.) 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams*, rev. R.D. Dawe and J. Diggle (Cambridge)
FPhGr	Mullach, F.G.A., (ed.) 1881. *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum* (Paris)
FrGHist	Jacoby, F., et al., (eds.) 1923-. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Berlin)
Gow	Gow, A.S.F., (ed.) 1950. *Theocritus*, 2 vols. (Cambridge)
GP	Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L., (eds.) 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge)
GPh	Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L., (eds.) 1968. *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip*, 2 vols. (Cambridge)
Gramm.Lat.	Keil, H., (ed.) 1855-80. *Grammatici Latini*, 7 vols. (Leipzig)
GVI	Peek, W., (ed.) 1955. *Griechische Vers-Inschriften I, Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin)
IDorIns	Peek, W., (ed.) 1969. *Inschriften von den Dorischen Inseln (AbhLeipzigAk 62 (I)* (Berlin)

IG	1893-. *Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin)
Keil	Keil, B., (ed.) 1898. *Aelius Aristidis Smyrnaei quae Supersunt Omnia*, 2 vols. (Berlin)
La Penna	La Penna, A., (ed.) 1957. *Publi Ovidi Nasonis Ibis* (Florence)
LGPN	Fraser, P.M. and Matthews, E., (eds.) 1987-2010. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, 6 vols. (Oxford)
LSJ	Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R., et al. (eds.) 1843-. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. and augmented by H.S. Jones (Oxford)
Matthews	Matthews, V.J., (ed.) 1996. *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary* (Leiden)
Pf.	Pfeiffer, R., (ed.) 1949, 1953. *Callimachus*, 2 vols. (Oxford)
PH	Patton, W.R. and Hicks, E.L., (eds.) 1891. *The Inscriptions of Cos* (Oxford)
PCG	Austin, C. and Kassel, R., (eds.) 1983-. *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin)
PMG	Page, D.L., (ed.) 1962. *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford)
Powell	Powell, J.U., (ed.) 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina: Reliquiae Minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae 323-146 A.C.: Epicorum, Elegiacorum, Lyricorum, Ethicorum. Cum Epimetris et Indice Nominum* (Oxford)
Rose	Rose, V., (ed.). 1863. *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* (Leipzig)
Sandbach	Sandbach, F.H., (ed.) 1969. *Plutarch, Moralia; Volume XV, fragments* (Cambridge, Mass.)
SEG	Hondius, J.J.E., et al., (eds.) 1923-. *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (Leiden)
SH	Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P., (eds.) 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin)
Snell-Maehler	Maehler, H. and Snell, B., (eds.) 1980-1984. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis,* 2 vols. (Leipzig)
Tcal	Segre, M., 1952. 'Tituli Calymnii', in *Annuario della (Reg.) Scuola Archaeologica di Atene*, 22-23, pp.1-248
Thilo	Hagen, H. and Thilo, G. (ed.), 1878-1902. *Servii Grammatici qui Feruntur in Vergili Carmina Commentarii,* 3 vols. (Leipzig)
Wendel	Wendel, C., (ed.) 1914. *Scholia in Theocritum Vetera* (Stuttgart)
West	West, M.L., (ed.) 1989. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, 2 vols. (Oxford)

Introduction

> "We have reached the age which we called - hesitatingly - a 'bookish' one; the book is one of the characteristic signs of the new, the Hellenistic, world."[1]

Despite his hesitation, Rudolph Pfeiffer's description of the Hellenistic milieu as bookish has proven to be a defining judgement of the age - so much so that to reference it now may be thought to make a somewhat unnecessary point. The fact remains, however, that it is a remarkably apt qualifier for a period in which the poetic zeitgeist was defined by aesthetics and by critical approaches which developed because of the book-roll medium, in which many poets now worked.[2] An overt example of this bookishness can be seen in the burgeoning field of poetic scholarship which flourished at Alexandria. Moreover, the fluidity of the distinction between 'scholar' and 'poet' can be observed in a number of the great works of the period - nowhere more so than in Callimachus' *Aetia*, a work that proudly displays its learned quality, and which has, for many, come to encapsulate the bookish Hellenistic aesthetic *tout court*.[3] However, in discussing Hellenistic bookishness, it is important to avoid treating 'bookish' as synonymous with 'recherché' in any absolute sense: as Nita Krevans and Alexander Sens note, "the label 'bookish' so often applied to Hellenistic poetry is not simply a description of the scholarly interests of the Hellenistic authors but also a description of the new importance of the written form of literature."[4] This is a fundamental observation, and it is this observation which informs my approach. While commentary upon the scholarly innovations of Callimachus and his colleagues in the Library will feature in this thesis, the 'bookish turn' of my title does not principally refer to this activity: rather, it refers to the revolutionary impact of the book-roll becoming the prime medium through which poetry was disseminated and, moreover, to the changing habits of authorial self-representation within this newly bookish context.

---

[1] Pfeiffer (1968), 102.
[2] See particularly Pfeiffer (1968), 102-103, though cf. Cameron (1995) on assessments of the prominence of the book-roll in the Hellenistic period, and further Bing (2001) for a response to Cameron.
[3] See the assessment of Hunter in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 43; Hunter notes particularly the value of the *Aetia* as a reference source for other, lost works, a testament to its breadth of intertexts. The scholarship on Callimachus as *poeta doctus* is vast, and catalogued by Martine Cuypers on the invaluable Hellenistic Bibliography website, which is available online at https://sites.google.com/site/hellenisticbibliography/: an interesting recent contribution to the topic is Harder (2013), which considers the influence of the library as a reference source on the work of Callimachus and Apollonius.
[4] Krevans and Sens (2006), 194.

The importance of the written medium as a facet of self-representative acts in Hellenistic poetry has been acknowledged in recent years, particularly following the publication of Peter Bing's *The Well-Read Muse*.[5] Building particularly upon the work of Pfeiffer's *A History of Classical Scholarship,* Bing demonstrated the extent to which the written mode affected the Hellenistic poets' perception of themselves. His conclusion that, on the one hand, "the written word creates the possibility of transforming the traditions of the literary past", while equally "the very freedom that writing provides has … another function, namely to affirm the continued validity of the tradition",[6] has prompted much further investigation into the interaction of tradition and innovation in Hellenistic poetry - particularly the frequent juxtaposition of notionally traditional and innovative elements.[7] However, despite the wealth of scholarship generated in the wake of *The Well-Read Muse*, another significant conclusion offered therein, that "the poet's self-image is now also geared to the reader", continues to demand attention.[8] How this image was formed in a medium which, by its nature, offered multiple encounters with the author, over the course of a corpus or a collection in which many poems were brought together (within the physical context of the roll), remains a compelling question.[9]

I take this question as a starting point, assessing the bookish turn of self-representation, and considering how the form and context of the book-roll influenced the process in early Hellenistic poetry (a period which I define as that between the deaths of Alexander and Ptolemy II Philadelphus, 323-246). This span of years sees the invention or reformation of numerous genres, and the reapplication of existing forms and contexts in innovative fashion, but it is furthermore the first instance in which authors begin explicitly presenting themselves as creators of book-poetry, and it is for this reason why I have chosen to focus my investigation on this period. However, it must be stated at the outset that I do not propose to offer a definitive answer to the 'how' of this topic for every author active at this time: rather, by focusing on

---

[5] Bing (1988b).
[6] Bing (1988b), 26.
[7] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) is the landmark study of tradition and innovation in Hellenistic poetry. See further Klooster (2011), a thoughtful recent evaluation of these elements.
[8] Bing (1988b), 15.
[9] A number of recent works have tackled aspects of this question, with epigram proving an area of recurrent interest: on epigram see, e.g., Meyer (2005), (2007), Höschele (2007), (2010), Campbell (2013). Krevans (1984) provides a sound introduction to the role of the book-roll in Hellenistic and Latin poetry, and considers the editorial function of the author in a bookish context. Acosta-Hughes' (2002) analysis of Callimachus' *Iambs* is an excellent demonstration of the fundamentally intertextual process of authorial representation at work in the corpus, which can be linked to its bookish form. Morrison (2007) considers the development of narrative voice from the archaic to the Hellenistic periods, touching upon issues of authorial self-representation. Hutchinson (2009) collects a number of investigations into Hellenistic and Latin books and their authors. Fantuzzi (2011) offers an insightful analysis of authorial presentation across the corpus of Callimachus' *Hymns*. Klooster (2011), 175-208 considers the question tangentially, focusing principally on *sphragis*-poetry, on which further below.

specific and - I would suggest - paradigmatic examples, I illuminate a number of key trends which attend the process of self-representation within the book-roll context, which I thus argue are the hallmarks of the bookish turn.

I focus my analysis of authorial self-representation upon the construction of authorial personae, and I propose that, for numerous authors, the employment of the book-roll medium evinces a significant evolution of this programmatic device *par excellence* within overarching strategies of self-representation. The authorial persona, the supposed manifestation of the author as a character within their work,[10] occupied a prominent role in programmatic delineations of Greek poetry, from the works of Homer and Hesiod onwards. However, the device undergoes a radical transformation within the bookish context, as a direct result of the implicit invitation for intertextual analysis which the book-roll medium invites. Recurrently, we observe authorial personae presented as the embodied distillation of a poetic programme: this trend is not unique to Hellenistic poetry, but what is quintessentially Hellenistic is the manner in which authorial personae now respond to programmatic motifs which permeate corpora as a whole. The personae of Nossis and Asclepiades, which form the case studies treated in Chapter 3, emerge as a result of the intertextual reception of their epigrams as unified collections; that of Herodas - discussed principally in Chapter 4 - embodies the programmatic motifs which run throughout the author's poems, similarly inviting analysis of the author's self-representation within the context of the collection as a whole. This form of persona, representing a collective body of work, is a device that is fundamentally bookish in character.

In the remainder of this introduction, I provide an outline of the two parts of this thesis, and of the three chapters contained within each part. Following this outline, I discuss two issues which underpin my investigation: firstly, I consider the bookish background of the early Hellenistic milieu, and provide a number of archetypal examples which demonstrate the extent to which the authors of the day engaged in sustained reflection upon the medial form of their poetry. Secondly, I consider the authorial persona as an element of literary-critical theory, offer an overview of my conceptualisation of this device, and present my rationale for its application to the study of self-representation in early Hellenistic poetry.

---

[10] I consider the features which demarcate an authorial persona in greater depth in the final section of this introduction.

Outline of chapters

I begin my assessment, in Part I of this thesis, by tracing the evolution of authorial representation in a genre which has the most well-established textual dimension prior to the Hellenistic period: epigram, the genre that best typifies the Hellenistic fascination with the aesthetics of the bookish form.[11] What makes epigram a particularly suitable starting point for this investigation is that we possess excellent evidence for the habits of authorial self-representation in the book-roll format - the archetypally Hellenistic form of the genre - and its inscribed antecedent. We are thus able to track the development of authorial personae within a genre which presupposes reception as reading from its outset: as a result, epigram offers a unique opportunity to analyse broader change in written self-representation prior to and within the Hellenistic period.

Transposed from the lithic context of inscription to the papyrus leaves of the book-roll, epigram becomes an inherently reflective genre. With the lack of the particular contextual and communicative frame provided by the material situation of inscription, a reader of book-epigram is prompted to consider the artificiality which the genre engages in, precisely as a result of its persistent appeal to a now-elusive physical context. As a consequence of the delapidarisation of epigram,[12] the genre loses the particular social, political and religious role inscribed poems possess: the functional dimension of inscribed epigram is inherently tied to its physical materiality, and thus book-epigrams are a departure from the conventions of that form from their inception.[13] What is noteworthy, however, is that Hellenistic epigrammatists continued to allude to an inscriptional context despite the reconfiguration of epigram as a genre, creating the illusion of materiality - and the suggestion of a context beyond the book-roll -

---

[11] Much recent scholarship has considered the contrasting (and sometimes complementary) roles of 'literacy' and 'orality' in Ancient Greece - I do not address this topic directly here, though reference will be made to it, particularly in Chapter 1.1. General surveys can be found in Harris (1989), Thomas (1989), (1992), and there are many useful discussions in the volumes of (the formerly titled) Orality and Literacy in the Ancient Greek and Roman Worlds - now Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World - published by Brill: Worthington (1996), Mackay (2002), Watson (2001), Worthington and Foley (2002), Mackie (2004), Cooper (2007), Mackay (2008), Lardinois, Blok and van der Poel (2011), Minchin (2012), Scodel (2014). The papers collected in Johnson and Parker (2009) are also of interest, particularly the epilogue provided by Olson (2009), which astutely assesses the theoretical applications of the term 'literacy', both in the field of Classics, and more widely.

[12] On the process of delapidarisation, see Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (2010), 17-19, and further Baumbach (2000), 8-9 who coins the term *Entlapidarisierung*.

[13] On the rise of the book and the practice of anthologising see e.g. Krevans (1984), 22-94 and (2007), Bing (1988b), 10-48, Meyer (2007), Hutchinson (2008), 1-41, particularly 1-20, Gutzwiller (1998), 1-53, and see 2.n.5 for bibliography on the transition from oral to literate culture with regards to the development of epigram. On the changing social role of epigram, see among others Meyer (2005), particularly 25-52, Day (2007), Bettenworth (2007), A. Petrovic (2009) and more generally the essays collected in Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (2010).

regardless of its literal absence.[14] The evocation of an absent physical dimension is perhaps the most overt change between stone and book-roll, but this is hardly the extent of the transformation wrought upon the genre in that transition. A quintessential aspect of Hellenistic book-epigram is its ability to evoke complex narratives in a microcosm - not despite, but as a result of, its characteristic brevity and intangibility: book-epigram is a genre of allusion and encapsulation,[15] but equally a form defined by the tensions caused by disjunction between the internally envisaged mimetic reception-situation, and the situation experienced by the reader.

The title for Part I of the thesis is taken from Kathryn Gutzwiller's assessment that epigram held particular attraction for those attuned to the aesthetic preference for "the miniature, the intricate, and the fragmented":[16] the fragmentation and intricacy that Gutzwiller highlights as characteristic aspects of Hellenistic book-epigram can be seen to include this disjunctive reception situation, but equally encompass a range of other issues, the most significant of which is the identity of the speaking voice which emerges from an epigram. The precise nature of the speaking voice in book-epigram - and the means by which a reader is prompted to ascribe identity to it - becomes a recurrent facet of the games of supplementation and interpretation which authors devise within their poetry. The investigation undertaken by a reader to identify the speaker of a book-epigram is a mirror-image of the endeavour to detect and define an author's persona within poetry, rather appropriately encapsulating the process *en miniature*. The inevitable act of material contextualisation which occurs in a reader's reception of an inscribed epigram is replaced by a more open-ended, and not strictly enforced process of bookish contextualisation: the reception of an epigram occurs within the broader setting of an author's oeuvre and the narrower surroundings of the collection within which a poem stands. In this more ephemeral context, the strictures which delimit the participants of epigrammatic communication - those being, the reader and the text - weaken and dissolve, allowing the author to engage the reader from within the text, as an authorial persona. However, though the enforced absence of the author in text is abolished with the contextual shift, book-epigrammatists nevertheless evoke inscriptional *topoi* in order to undertake complex and

---

[14] See Tueller (2008), 58-61 on Perses 5 *GP* = *AP* 7.445 as a particularly explicit attempt to re-create an absent material context and an example of 'false verisimilitude'. See further Köhnken (1993), Bettenworth (2007), 73ff., Männlein-Robert (2007a), particularly 255ff.

[15] See also Sens (2007) on the role of literary allusion in the conceptual formation of an epigrammatic tradition within the Hellenistic period. Recent assessments of what has been termed 'flash fiction' - perhaps the best known example of which is the six-word story sometimes attributed to Hemingway, "for sale, baby shoes, never worn" - have noted the roots of this form of ultra-brief yet highly evocative literature in ancient poetry, including epigram: see further Rourke (2011), Lucht (2014).

[16] Gutzwiller (1998), 4.

innovative manifestations within their work. With the rise of book-epigram, we observe new applications of epigrammatic conventions and, moreover, wholesale reapplications of the context of inscribed epigram within the new bookish setting. The upshot of this is a radical change in the relationship between author, text and reader within the genre, most overtly apparent in the widespread emergence of authorial personae within the work of numerous epigrammatists.

Part I is comprised of three chapters. In Chapter 1, I assess the developing presence of the author within Hellenistic book-epigram. I start by considering the growth of authorial representation from inscribed epigram - in which the author is wholly absent within the text - to book-epigram, which evinces a complex manifestation of authorial presence in response to the implied material context the genre presupposes. I argue that this development occurs as a result of the medial shift from stone to book-roll. To analyse this, in the second part of this chapter, I consider the sepulchral epigrams ascribed to Erinna: I argue that, in these poems, the material context of inscribed epigram is superseded - as a frame of reference - by the intertextual nexus of book-poetry, in which other poems serve to provide the contextual information once supplied by the physical memorial. I propose that these epigrams display a complex engagement with Erinna's poetry, in a process that re-envisages Erinna as an epigrammatic author (through the representation of her epigrammatic authorial persona), and which testifies to the new possibilities for authorial self-representation in epigram, in its bookish form.

In Chapter 2, I consider the role played by poetic predecessors in the process of authorial self-representation, examining two cases in which authors utilise the memorialisation of predecessors as opportunities for self-representation, and concurrently as a chance to encapsulate the nature of their bookish poetic activity. I posit that the authors in question - Posidippus and Callimachus - engage with their predecessors through conspicuously epigrammatic means, despite the works in question - the *Seal*, and the *Tomb of Simonides*, respectively - being at most para-epigrammatic in form. In utilising the conventional mechanisms of remembrance associated with epigram to engage with their predecessors, I suggest that Posidippus and Callimachus acknowledge the memorialising potential of the genre, and capitalise upon it, within the new context of the book-roll. In so doing, they demonstrate the complex entanglement of past and present - and, of memorialisation and self-aggrandisement - which suffuses the process of authorial self-representation.

Chapter 3 draws together the themes explored in Chapters 1 and 2: in it, I consider how the composition of epigrammatic poetry books - particularly, collections of a single author's work - gave rise to new forms of authorial self-representation. I demonstrate - through two case studies, focusing on Nossis and Asclepiades, respectively - that the nature of the book-roll, as a space within which authors presented numerous individual epigrams that could both be read alone and in conjunction, engendered a remarkable development of the authorial persona as an expression of an author's work. I assess how, as a result of the composite nature of the epigrammatic poetry book, we observe the reconfiguration of the authorial persona, as a figure who emerges through the reception of a number of works received in conjunction. I furthermore suggest that this form of cumulative self-representation is itself characteristic of the self-representative trends of early Hellenistic poetry overall.

With Part II of the thesis, I shift my focus from epigram, and consider the process of self-representation as undertaken in Herodas' *Mimiambs*. In Herodas' collection, I propose that we observe an equally complex engagement with the book-roll format as that undertaken by the epigrammatists considered in Part I. Indeed, while epigram and mimiamb are two distinctly different genres - the one well-established and inherently textual, the other a Hellenistic invention, and evincing a subtle combination of textual and performative aspects - Herodas undertakes a self-representative process which occurs over the course of his collection and which, like those of the epigrammatists, is crowned by the construction of an authorial persona, a figure that unifies the programmatic aspects of the collection as a whole.

In Chapter 4, I assess the complex programmatic activity undertaken in *Mimiamb* 8: I demonstrate that this work is key to understanding Herodas' poetic activity, and suggest that the poem ultimately functions as the culmination of programmatic motifs which run throughout the *Mimiambs*. I first consider the manner in which Herodas presents his authorial persona, arguing that the author displays a novel approach in constructing his self-representation as an amalgam of attributes adopted from his poetic predecessor and divine guarantor, thereby implying the transference of their authority and poetic legitimacy to the persona (thus also authorising the programmatic statement which the persona issues). Second, I consider how the narrative context of *Mimiamb* 8 further supports these claims to fame and authority, and analyse the manner in which Herodas draws upon the familiar *topoi* of heaven-sent dreams and poetic initiations to situate his self-representation within an implicitly significant narrative frame. I demonstrate that *Mimiamb* 8 evinces Herodas' programmatic interests in the leitmotif of hybridity, as pertaining to media, tone and genre: these are integral facets of Herodas' self-

representation, as seen in the characterisation of the persona, and I further suggest that the same leitmotif runs throughout the *Mimiambs* as a whole.

In Chapter 5, I consider the role of performance in the activity of Herodas' self-representation, and the interplay between the book-roll format of the *Mimiambs* and their persistent evocation of the performative mode. I begin by proposing that the *Mimiambs* should be interpreted as a collection which enjoyed reception in text form, but one which also possesses a prominent performative dimension informing that reception, thus creating a tension between the internal presumption of a performance reception-situation and the reception mode which the reader experiences (similar to many book-epigrams). In light of this hypothesis, I assess - in the first section - the manner that performance is utilised as an aspect of Herodas' programmatic self-representation within *Mimiamb* 8, and posit that performance has a multivalent role within the poem: first, Herodas' persona exhibits his abilities in a setting redolent of both dramatic and ritual performance, thereby bolstering his assertions by situating his programmatically self-authorising narrative within a doubly significant context; second, the performative aspects of both the opening of the mimiamb and its overarching narrative recall an important poetic model, and the intertextual reminiscence of this work serves to embed Herodas within the greater tradition of Greek dramatic poetry. In the second section, I consider the role of embedded audiences within *Mimiambs* 4 and 8, and suggest that Herodas envisages said audiences - and more specifically, their acts of reception - as precursors to the reception-act which the external, reading audience of the *Mimiambs* undertakes, in effect providing models of good and bad mimiambic reception for his readership to follow and eschew.

In Chapter 6, I consider the extent to which Herodas' poetic programme, and the programmatic themes of *Mimiamb* 8, are taken up in the other *Mimiambs*. Focusing on the leitmotif of hybridity which underpins Herodas' self-representation, I first consider *Mimiambs* 6 and 7: I argue that, in these works, the hybridity of Herodas' poetry is explored through the juxtaposition and combination of elements which have a masculine or feminine character, a process which reimagines the mono-gendered poems of an important generic antecedent to Herodas' work, the mimographer Sophron. Much as Herodas' mimiambic poetry is symbolically unified in the character of his authorial persona, I suggest that, in the diptych, masculine and feminine poetics are united in the βαυβών, an object which symbolises Herodas' reworking of Sophron's practice. Second, I assess *Mimiamb* 1, and propose that this work complements *Mimiamb* 8 in its treatment of programmatic themes. While *Mimiamb* 8 displays a successful unification of genre through character, *Mimiamb* 1 presents a failure of generic

hybridisation at the same level. However, I argue that, when considered as a facet of Herodas' collection-spanning programmatic reflection, this failure paradoxically testifies to Herodas' successful unification of genres within his *Mimiambs*, affirming the combination of mimic and choliambic elements within Herodas' poetry and demonstrating the aesthetic potential inherent in their intermingling, in a manner which directly parallels *Mimiamb* 8.

The bookish age and the bookish author

The book-roll was not the invention of the Hellenistic age, nor was the quality of bookishness.[17] The growth of a recognisable book-culture already in the late 5th and 4th Centuries is well-substantiated, particularly in Athens:[18] representations of reading appear on vases from the 5th Century,[19] and depictions of book makers, collectors and collections also appear in oratorical, philosophical and dramatic works, attesting to widespread familiarity with such concepts (at the very least, in populous urban centres).[20] The Hellenistic period, therefore, should not be presumed as the first flourishing of bookishness, despite being so characterised by that quality. Rather, as Nita Krevans puts it, the distinction between the Greek world before and after the

---

[17] Identifications (and accusations) of authorial bookishness predate the Hellenistic period proper: e.g., Aristophanes repeatedly presents Euripides as a bookish author, e.g., at *Ra.*943, 1409, *Ach.*393-489. On Aristophanes' own bookishness, see below, n.20.

[18] Evidence for the 6th Century is more tenuous. Athenaeus provides a list of famous book-collectors who possessed libraries, including among their number Polycrates of Samos, and Peisistratus, tyrant of Athens (Ath. 1.4): Pfeiffer (1968), 7, followed by Krevans (1984), 36, concludes that this is a retrospective reimagining the earlier period skewed by Hellenistic influence. See further on this passage Jacob (2013), 78-81.

[19] See Turner (1952), 13-15, and particularly Immerwahr (1964), (1973).

[20] I give here a representative sample of examples: Alcidamas rails against those who utilise the written works (σύγγραμμα) of previous thinkers to compose their own speeches (*Soph.*4); compare Isocr. *Ad Nic.*41, 44, Arist. *Top.*105b. Xenophon depicts Socrates and a group of students pouring over book-rolls and excerpting interesting snippets (*Mem.*1.6.14), and further records Socrates' dialogue with the book-loving Euthydemus (*Mem.*4.2), and their discussions on the use of books in learning. Plato records how Euclides apparently composed a book that contained the transcriptions of various Socratic conversations, from which he has a slave read Socrates' dialogue with Theodorus and Theaetetus (*Tht.*142d-143c): Plato himself purportedly facilitated the collection and/or transcription of the works of Antimachus and Sophron, on which see further Chapters 3.2 and 6.1 respectively. A fragment of Eupolis mentions οὗ τὰ βιβλί᾽ ὤνια, "where the books are for sale" (fr.327 *PCG*), which finds a parallel in Aristophanes' *Birds*, where we are presented with an image of men swooping down upon bookstalls to browse through legal decrees (*Av.*1286-1289): compare also Plat. *Ap.*26d-e. Alexis' *Linus* records the eponymous teacher of Heracles asking his charge to choose a book from a collection - from which Heracles chooses a cookbook (fr.140 *PCG*). Famously, the chorus of Aristophanes' *Frogs* remarks to the quarrelling Aeschylus and Euripides that βιβλίον τ᾽ ἔχων ἕκαστος, "each one (of the audience) has a book" (*Ra.*1114) - the audience imagined by the play might thus be envisaged unfurling their book-roll copies of the script to compare and contrast the arguments made by each playwright while taking place on stage. On Aristophanic presentations of books and literacy, see further Slater (1996). On the circulation of book-rolls and their functions, Harris (1989), 84-88; on the development of the book-roll from purely functional, to aesthetic object, Thomas (1989), 45-94, Gutzwiller (1998), 2-6, 47-48, Murray (2010), 109. See generally, on representations of 5th and 4th Century book-culture, Thomas (1992), Pinto (2013), and further Turner (1952), Krevans (1984), 34-66, particularly on the development of βίβλος as "book-roll", rather than "document" in the more general sense.

advent of the Ptolemies - as pertaining to book-culture - is one of quantity: "the developments in the 4th Century continue, but at an accelerated pace and on a massive scale, exemplified by… the Alexandrian Library".[21] Discussions of the Hellenistic poetic milieu can hardly fail to mention this institution: though, as noted by Annette Harder, there are seemingly no direct references to the Library in the poetry of the period (as opposed to the Mouseion more broadly),[22] an awareness of the Library's existence necessarily shapes our appreciation of all poetic activity undertaken by the authors of the day, despite the scarcity of actual information we possess regarding its precise form, or mode of operation.[23] Though the dearth of specifics is frustrating, the persistence of the Library of Alexandria as a concept inherently connected to Ptolemaic rule is telling in itself: as Dorothy Thompson remarks, "it is hard to imagine a more striking symbol of Ptolemaic power and of the dominance of Greek culture than the new Library of Alexandria",[24] and its prominence within the cultural imagination - even up to the modern day - attests to the corresponding pre-eminence of the book-roll as a signifier of cultural power within the Hellenistic zeitgeist.

This prominence is exemplified further by the numerous reflections upon the medial form of poetry found in the works of the early Hellenistic period: while writing and reading had been mentioned in the context of poetry prior to the 4th Century,[25] it is in the final years of the 4th Century, and on into the 3rd, that we see authors begin recurrently acknowledging the book-roll format of their work, and indeed referencing the format for poetic effect. A notable example of this comes from Theocritus' *Idyll* 16 (5-12):

> 5   τίς γὰρ τῶν ὁπόσοι γλαυκὰν ναίουσιν ὑπ' ἠῶ
>   ἡμετέρας Χάριτας πετάσας ὑποδέξεται οἴκῳ
>   ἀσπασίως, οὐδ' αὖθις ἀδωρήτους ἀποπέμψει;

---

[21] Krevans (1984), 67. On the possible Egyptian models for the Library, see Rhyholt (2013). On the broader influences of Egyptian culture on the Ptolemaic realm, see particularly Fraser (1972), Thompson (1994) and Stephens (2002). Cf. Strabo, who seemingly suggests a decidedly more Greek origin for the Library, noting that Aristotle διδάξας τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ βασιλέας βιβλιοθήκης σύνταξιν, "taught the kings in Egypt how to arrange a library" (*Geog.*13.1.54).

[22] Harder (2013), 96. Reference is made to the Mouseion, e.g., at Herod. 1.31 and perhaps 7.72, though see further Chapter 5.2 on this second instance. Allusive reference may be made either to the Library or Mouseion by Timon of Philus in an epigram, wherein he scorns the scribblers Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ, "in the birdcage of the Muses" (*SH* 786). On the distinction between the Library and the Mouseion - or lack thereof - see Krevans (1984), 69-70.

[23] As noted particularly by Bagnall (2002), specific details about the Library are sparse, in contrast to the mythology to which it gave rise. The *Suda* entry on Callimachus (*Sud.*s.v. Καλλίμαχος, K 227 Adler) records that his *Pinakes* preserved details of authors and works, in 120 book-rolls, and this may give some idea as to the scale of the collection - though, as noted by Jacob (2013), 76-77, the *Suda* entry does not suggest the *Pinakes* were a catalogue of the Library's holdings. On the Library, see further Fraser (1972), I.320-335, El-Abbadi (1990), Blum (1991), Yatsuhashi (2010), Harder (2013). On the ancient library more generally, see Casson (2001), Too (2010), and further the essays collected in König, Oikonomopoulou and Woolf (2013).

[24] Thompson (1994), 67.

[25] See the discussion in Krevans (1984), 39-66.

αἳ δὲ σκυζόμεναι γυμνοῖς ποσὶν οἴκαδ᾽ ἴασι,
πολλά με τωθάζοισαι, ὅτ᾽ ἀλιθίην ὁδὸν ἦλθον,
10   ὀκνηραὶ δὲ πάλιν κενεᾶς ἐν πυθμένι χηλοῦ
ψυχροῖς ἐν γονάτεσσι κάρη μίμνοντι βαλοῖσαι,
ἔνθ᾽ αἰεί σφισιν ἕδρη, ἐπὴν ἄπρακτοι ἵκωνται.

5   Now, who of all who live under the gleam of day
will give a glad welcome and receive at home
my Graces, and will not send them away unrewarded?
They come home, grumpy and barefoot,
with much scorning that they went out on the road in vain,
10   and shrinking back into the bottom of the empty box,
they remain, heads laid onto their cold knees,
the resting-place they always come to when unsuccessful.

Theocritus here undertakes a remarkable juxtaposition of the content and physical form of his poetry. Imagined as the *Charites* - the Graces - his poems are personified but, in a swift reversal of expectations, it is revealed that the Graces are not women, but have maintained their bookish materiality: in depicting them at the bottom of the box, 'heads' resting on 'knees', Theocritus evokes the physical appearance of the rolled-up book-roll, in which the outer leaves (the beginning of the roll) enclose the inner.[26] This overtly bookish representation of poetry (and thus, implicitly, of the poet) finds numerous parallels in other Hellenistic works: Meleager, in the preface to his *Garland*, concludes his list of the poetic flowers from which he has woven his collection with the mention of ἄλλων τ᾽ ἔρνεα πολλὰ νεόγραφα, "many newly-written shoots of others" (1 *GP = AP* 4.1.55);[27] Callimachus imagines Apollo appearing to him when he first placed the δέλτον, "tablet" upon his knees (*Aet.*fr.1.20 Pf.); Posidippus makes his Muses writers when he exhorts them to γραψάμεναι, "inscribe" their song of hateful old age in the δέλτων… χρυσέαις σελίσιν, "golden columns of your tablets" (705 *SH = AB* 118.6).[28] We can also compare the opening of the *Batrachomyomachia*, which neatly encapsulates the situation of Hellenistic poetry *en miniature* (though it must be noted that the date of the poem is uncertain) with a medial transformation from song to text, and from draft tablet to the *selides* of the book-roll (1-3):[29]

---

[26] On the form and construction of book-rolls, see Turner (1968), (1987), Johnson (2004).
[27] Compare Phil. *AP* 4.2.3.
[28] See also *AB* 118.16-17, wherein the author imagines himself reading: this text is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.1.
[29] The dating of the *Batrachomyomachia* is much-contested, but a Hellenistic origin has been suggested, e.g., by Bing (1988b), 19.n.19 with earlier references, and Sens (2006); cf. West (2003), 229-230 who supposes a later origin. For further discussion of the transformation of media within text, See the analysis of Callimachus' engagement with predecessors in Chapter 2.2.

ἀρχόμενος πρώτης σελίδος χορὸν ἐξ Ἑλικῶνος
ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐμὸν ἦτορ ἐπεύχομαι εἴνεκ' ἀοιδῆς,
ἣν νέον ἐν δέλτοισιν ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκα

Beginning the first column, I pray for the chorus of Helicon
to come into my heart on account of the song,
which I have just set down in the tablets on my knees

Such examples attest not only to the acknowledgement that the written medium was the principal means by which these authors' poetry was produced and received, but equally demonstrates the lengths to which authors explicitly emphasised the format of their work, ensuring their readers were aware of the bookish act they were engaging in. It is this bookish awareness which so colours the self-representations undertaken in the period, and a further aspect of the same phenomenon can be seen in the embedded presumption of intertextuality which many works evince: in their *Garlands*, the poet-anthologists Meleager and Philip acknowledge their intertextual activity of binding together the poems of many others; indeed, that they characterise their practice as 'weaving' is a testament to this awareness.[30] However, the awareness of intertextuality is not the preserve of later anthologists and editors alone, and this is illustrated in a pair of epigrams by Callimachus, one for the grave of his father (29 *GP* = *AP* 7.525), another for his own tomb (30 *GP* = *AP* 7.415). These two poems typify the nuanced play with authorial presence which characterises Hellenistic book-epigram, but equally highlight how the context of the book-roll allowed for innovative, composite forms of self-representation which demanded a reader consider the overarching relationship between each text. *AP* 7.525 begins ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα, Καλλιμάχου με / ἴσθι Κυρηναίου παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην, "You who walk past my tomb, know that I am the son and father of Callimachus of Cyrene", while *AP* 7.415 runs:

Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας, εὖ μὲν ἀοιδήν
εἰδότος, εὖ δ' οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι.

You are walking past the tomb of Battiades, well versed in song,
and in knowing the time to laugh with the wine.

It has long been noted that these epigrams form a complementary pair, and suggested that they cleverly play off of one another, with the deceased in each case only being directly identified

---

[30] E.g., Mel. 1 *GP* = *AP* 4.1.5-6, πολλὰ μὲν ἐμπλέξας Ἀνύτης κρίνα, πολλὰ δὲ Μοιροῦς / λείρια, καὶ Σαπφοῦς βαιὰ μέν, ἀλλὰ ῥόδα; Phil. *AP* 4.2.3-4, ἀντανέπλεξα / τοῖς Μελεαγρείοις ὡς ἴκελον στεφάνοις. See further Argentieri (1998), Gutzwiller (1998), Höschele (2010).

in the other poem,[31] if we read Battiades as a patronymic and not solely as a reference to Cyrene's legendary founder.[32] The purposeful ambiguity of Callimachus' presence within these epigrams exemplifies the self-awareness which authors displayed in the early Hellenistic period, with regards to the contextual expectations their work engendered. In *AP* 7.525, Callimachus is seemingly embedded within the poem, identified by name, but this apparently sphragistic self-identification - unlike that found in the *Seal* of Theognis, discussed below - counterintuitively problematises the notion of authorial presence. The reader is faced, not with one Callimachus, but two, and neither of these is the speaking voice of the epigram. This Callimachean multiplicity is reversed in *AP* 7.415: here, the use of another name requires a reader to engage, as Peter Bing notes, in a process of supplementation, reading the epigram in conjunction with its companion - and mentally situating the graves in spatial collocation - in order to perceive that it is Callimachus (the author) whom this second epigram memorialises.[33] We can also note that, while in *AP* 7.525, a reader can easily appreciate that the voice of the epigram is the deceased (particularly with the reference to ἐμὸν σῆμα, in conjunction with the use of the first person), *AP* 7.415 obscures the speaker and the epigram's setting: whether it is the envisaged tomb or the deceased who speaks the words of the epigram remains unclear, and thus the nature and extent of Callimachus' presence within the poem is equally elusive.[34]

---

[31] See, e.g., Walsh (1991), Livrea (1992), Bing (1995), 126-128, Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 298. See particularly Kirstein (2002) on complementary epigrams, and 117-121 on these epigrams specifically.

[32] As by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1924), I.175.n.2, Pfeiffer (1949), *ad loc.*, Walsh (1991), Livrea (1992), Bing (1995), Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004). In support of the reading which favours an identification of the founder, Cameron (1995), 8, 78-79, White (1999). White (1999), 170-171 notes that later poets who refer to Callimachus using Battiades as a signifier do not necessarily imply a patronym, e.g., Cat. 5.16, 116.2 (see also Cat. 7.6), adesp. *AP* 7.42, Ov. *Am.*1.15.13, *Tr.*2.367, Stat. *Silv.*5.3.157. Strabo (*Geog.*17.21) relates that Callimachus calls Battus his ancestor, but this refers to the founder of Cyrene. Cf. Call. *Ap.*65ff. on the legendary Battus' receipt of aid from Apollo in founding Cyrene, and *Ap.*95-96, which declares Apollo most honoured by the sons of Battus; οὐδὲ μὲν αὐτοὶ / Βαττιάδαι Φοίβοιο πλέον θεὸν ἄλλον ἔτεισαν. The only explicit identification of Battus as Callimachus' father comes from the *Suda* entry on the poet, which begins Καλλίμαχος, υἱὸς Βάττου: *Sud.*s.v. Καλλίμαχος (K 221 Adler). Despite this tenuous evidence, that these epigrams encourage complementary reception (thus, that Battiades is intended as a patronymic) is eminently plausible. We can note, particularly, the repetition of παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα/πόδας in both epigrams: Bing (1995), 128 notes that the expression πόδας φέρειν is not attested before Callimachus, and he suggests this phrase strengthens the association between the two poems as belonging to the same imagined Callimachean family plot - a conceit which acquires added resonance within the spatio-material context of the book-roll. See further Walsh (1991), 94.

[33] Bing (1995), 127; see Bing (1995) on the concept which he labels *Ergänzungsspiel* in Hellenistic poetry more generally. On the conjuration of a mental funerary landscape in these epigrams, see further Meyer (2005), 170, 176-177. Cf. other self-naming epitaphs, e.g., Leon.Tarent. 93 *GP* = *AP* 7.715, Noss. 11 *GP* = *AP* 7.718, Mel. 2 *GP* = *AP* 7.417, 3 *GP* = *AP* 7.418, 4 *GP* = *AP* 7.419.

[34] Furthermore, the sympotic setting evoked by l.2 creates further tension between the generically expected context of reception (before a tomb), the context evoked by the text (both sepulchral and symposiastic) and the reader's literary reception. See Reitzenstein (1893), 87-88, Gow and Page (1965), II.188, Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 39 on the interpretation of the sentiment expressed here.

The contribution of both epigrams to a greater self-representative endeavour only becomes clear when they are perceived within the wider context of the book-roll: whether intended as opening and closing programmatic pieces of a collection - or perhaps whether one followed the other in sequence - when reading these epigrams in conjunction, we can detect their author as a presence, not wholly perceptible within either epigram, but who rather emerges as a product of the greater whole to which their intertextual relationship gives rise.[35] This example is characteristic of a trend we will observe repeatedly across the range of early Hellenistic poetry: while epigram lends itself naturally to such intertextual readings, it is equally a facet of Callimachus' *Aetia* and *Iambs,* and of Herodas' *Mimiambs*, which will be discussed in greater detail in Chapters 2 and 6 respectively.

The authorial persona: between fiction, reality and the reader

An attempt to offer a straightforward definition of the term 'authorial persona' encounters immediate difficulties: while there is general consensus about what the term designates - the manifestation of the author in the text, as noted above - the troubles start with the movement from generalities to specifics. As a term employed in contemporary literary criticism, we can observe a variety of applications which distinguish, for example, between first and third person authorial manifestations and, beyond these variant applications, numerous scholars also employ other terms which evoke a similar purview, but are not wholly analogous.[36] Despite this protean aspect (though indeed to some extent, as a result of it), discussing authorial manifestations in poetry with reference to the construction of authorial personae remains a

---

[35] See further Bing (1995).

[36] E.g., 'implied author', Booth (1961) *passim*, and particularly 73, 138, 535; 'second-self', discussed by Booth (1961), 83; 'reader's author', Small (1984); 'speaker of the text', Gibson (1980); 'author's *ethos*', on which see Cherry (1988); 'literary persona' utilised by Clay (1998). Much has been written on the origins and meaning of the Latin word *persona*: for possible Etruscan connections, see Skutch (1908), Vetter (1938), Hanfmann (1973), Szemerényi (1975), Elliott (1982). Aulus Gellius reports Gavius Bassus' explanation that the word is formed from *personare*, "to sound through" as the theatrical mask - *persona* - of the actor concentrates the voice, resulting in a clear, resonant sound (*N.A.*5.7.2): this explanation is not without controversy, on which see Müller (1888), 34-35, Rheinfelder (1928), Allport (1937) 26, Elliott (1982), 19-20, Small (1984), 93-94, Pickard-Cambridge (1988), 195-196. Müller (1888) remains a good general introduction to its origins and usage through to the 19th Century, while McCann (1971), Elliott (1982) and Small (1964) provide further contemporary analysis. Burke (1992), (1995), Savu (2009) and Gallop (2011) discuss the persona in the context of the issue of authorship: the foundational Derrida (1967), Barthes (1968) and Foucault (1977) underpin much of these discussions. See further the essays collected in Hill and Marmodoro (2013) on ideas of author and authorship in the ancient Greek and Roman contexts, and Clay (1998) and Mayer (2003) on the existence of ancient theories of the persona.

useful hermeneutic framework - particularly for an assessment of early Hellenistic poetry - as I will outline here.

The perception of authorial manifestations in poetry as personae - with stress upon the notion that these manifestations are characters - is frequently exhibited across a range of ancient sources: we observe pleas from authors for their character not to be judged on the basis of what they write,[37] comic presentations of authors' characters in harmony with the character of their verse,[38] and discussions of authors' work based upon readings of them speaking either *in propria persona*, or that of another character.[39] However, this body of evidence raises a number of questions - particularly, to what extent should we understand an ancient distinction between the concept of the 'author' and of the 'narrator' (denoting a detachment of the author from the speaking 'I')? In an insightful discussion of what he terms 'fictional autobiography', reacting against narratological compartmentalisations of author and narrator, Tim Whitmarsh has recently suggested that problems with this issue stem from a contemporary inability to elide these two figures on a conceptual level.[40] Whitmarsh returns to Ewen Bowie's assessment of

---

[37] This is common in Latin poetry, e.g., Cat. 16.1-6 (particularly 16.5-6, *nam castum esse decet pium poetam / ipsum versiculos nihil necessest,* "for the pious poet ought to be chaste himself - his poems need not be so"), Mart. 1.4 (particularly 1.4.8, *lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba,* "my page is wanton, my life's virtuous"), Ov. *Trist.*2.353-360 (particularly 2.353-354, *crede mihi, distant mores a carmine nostro / vita verecunda est, Musa iocosa mea,* "believe me, my character's other than my verse - my life is modest, my Muse is playful"). See also Hor. *Sat.*2.1.30-34.

[38] E.g., Euripides as presented in *Acharnians*, perched atop the *eccyclema* and dressed in tragic rags (410-417), or the presentation of Agathon in the *Thesmophoriazusae* (135-175), in which, explaining his costume and accoutrements, the poet remarks that Φρύνιχος, τοῦτον γὰρ οὖν ἀκήκοας, / αὐτός τε καλὸς ἦν καὶ καλῶς ἠμπέσχετο· / διὰ τοῦτ' ἄρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ κάλ' ἦν τὰ δράματα / ὅμοια γὰρ ποιεῖν ἀνάγκη τῇ φύσει, "Phrynicus - have you not heard - was both beautiful and beautifully dressed: because of this his plays were also beautiful. For it is necessary to compose poetry akin to one's nature" (Ar. *Thesm.*164-167). See further, particularly on the presentation of Agathon and the elision of costume and character, Stehle (2002), Duncan (2005), Given (2007).

[39] E.g., Plat. *Rep.*3.393a-b, on Homer, wherein Socrates distinguishes between moments in which λέγει τε αὐτὸς ὁ ποιητής, "the poet speaks himself", and times where, for example, ὥσπερ αὐτὸς ὢν ὁ Χρύσης λέγει, "he speaks as though he were Chryses himself". Aristotle praises Homer because ὁ δὲ ὀλίγα φροιμιασάμενος εὐθὺς εἰσάγει ἄνδρα ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἄλλο τι ἦθος, καὶ οὐδέν' ἀήθη ἀλλ' ἔχοντα ἦθος, "after a brief preamble, he at once brings on a man or women or other figure, and they are not indistinguishable, but full of character" (*Poet.*1460a9-11). See further on interpretations of Homer's character particularly Dachs (1913), Graziosi (2013). Much later - from the 4th Century AD - we observe theoretical analyses of authorial character utilising the term *persona*/πρόσωπον in a manner directly comparable to modern criticism, e.g., Diomedes on Vergil (*Gramm.Lat.*I.482), *poeta ipse loquitur sine ullius personae interlocutione, ut se habent tres Georgici et prima pars quarti, item Lucreti carmina et cetera his similia*, "the poet speaks himself without another persona, as is the case of the first three books of the *Georgics* and the beginning of the fourth, and the poem of Lucretius, and other works that are similar"; Servius, also on the Georgics (*pro. ad Georg.,* Thilo III.129), *hi libri didascalici sunt unde necesse est ut ad aliquem scribantur; nam praeceptum et doctoris et discipuli personam requirit*, "these books are didactic and for this reason they must be written to someone: for teaching requires both the persona of a teacher and a pupil". Compare also the comment of the scholiast on Theocritus (Wendel, *proleg.* D, 6.16-18), ἔστι δὲ δραματικὸν μὲν τὸ μηδαμῇ γε ἐμφαῖνον τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ ποιητοῦ, διηγηματικὸν δὲ τὸ διόλου ἐμφαῖνον / μικτὸν δὲ τὸ πῇ μὲν ἐμφαῖνον, πῇ δὲ οὔ, "the dramatic genre never exhibits the persona of the poet, the narrative genre reveals it throughout, and the mixed genre reveals it at some times, and not others". See Clay (1998), Mayer (2003). On distinctions between persona and *ethos*, see further Cherry (1988).

[40] Whitmarsh (2013).

Theocritus' *Idyll* 7, in which Bowie notes that an initial assessment that the "I" who was walking into the countryside is Theocritus is problematised by Lycidas' identification of the speaker as Simichidas (7.21), and thus "Simichidas both is and is not Theocritus… his name Simichidas has been deliberately held back to allow the presumption to develop that the narrator is Theocritus himself".[41] Whitmarsh suggests that such instances reflect a dynamic and ongoing interplay between the concepts of the 'real' author and the 'fictional' narrator within the poem, exemplifying ancient habits more broadly:[42] the lack of a strong sense of the narrator results in a corresponding ambiguity of the author in text, as a figure which stands astride the boundary between fact and fiction.[43]

That ancient authors were often perceived by their readers through the medium of their personae, and that it was believed that something substantial could be deduced about the real author on the basis of their characters' words, is frequently attested. Furthermore, this practice has often been held as a testament to the so-called 'biographical fallacy' in action, wherein a reader conflates the position of a character within a work - often one speaking in the first person - with that of the author.[44] However, the (modern) belief in the ancient prevalence of the subconscious operation of the fallacy discounts the fact that numerous authors capitalise upon an awareness of the fallacy in their work: while Latin examples are numerous,[45] we can equally observe it in the Greek milieu: for example, in Aristophanes' send-up of Euripides' purported reputation for hating women in the *Thesmophoriazusae,* or in Theocritus' epigram on a statue of Anacreon (15 *GP = AP* 9.599).[46] Such examples play upon the inextricable entanglement of reality and fiction which attend depictions of the author in their own text, and it is on the basis of the neither wholly factual, nor wholly fictional nature of so many self-representations in poetry that I have chosen to utilise the term authorial persona - as opposed, for example, to authorial voice - as a designation which maintains an ambiguity as to the extent of any authorial manifestation's historical basis. As I will demonstrate, numerous Hellenistic authors play with the malleable reality (and, occasionally, accountability) of expressions made via authorial personae: Asclepiades constructs two complementary personae which encapsulate both the objective and subjective perspectives of the author, Callimachus unearths 'Simonides' and has the poet speak, as a means of celebrating his own memorialising authorial practice, and

---

[41] Bowie (1985), 68.
[42] Whitmarsh (2013), 240-242.
[43] See further Lefkowitz (1983), and Hodkinson (2010) on 'deliberate' fictionality in ancient biography.
[44] See Beecroft (2010), 2ff. and Graziosi (2013).
[45] See, e.g., the examples in n.37 above.
[46] On which see further the introduction to Chapter 2, below.

Herodas dreams-up an alter-*ego* through which to decisively conquer his critics - though his authorial persona provides an insulating buffer of detachment, should those critics take umbrage with the author behind the poem at such a depiction.[47]

With this evidence, and the variety of factors which attend to our perception of the author in text in mind, it is now possible to offer a basic yet functional definition, from which we can delineate what constitutes an authorial persona: I propose that this figure should be designated as any character within poetry that a reader is encouraged to perceive as an intra-poetic manifestation of the external, purportedly real author of the same poem, and who contributes in some fashion to reflection upon the nature of that author's poetry. The methods by which this encouragement occurs are various: we can note more overt instances in which it is given, such as with the employment of the first person,[48] or through the use of the author's name,[49] and less obvious cases, such as metaliterary recognition of the work as a poetic product, or of its genre, or form.[50] There is, however, no single unifying hallmark of each and every authorial persona - beyond that which I have proposed as a starting point - and no one element guarantees that a character is or is not an authorial persona, in a definitive sense. Furthermore, attempts to delimit what constitutes an authorial persona any further risk stifling comparative analysis. As an example, we can note that the 'Posidippus' of his *Seal* poem and the 'Simichidas' of Theocritus' *Idyll* 7 present very different types of authorial personae, which differ significantly in terms of their explicit/implicit claim to be reflective of the real author; however, categorising one as an authorial persona, while excluding the other, obscures the fact that both occupy an analogous role within their respective authors' strategies of self-representation. In both cases, the authorial persona serves as a focal point around which the process of programmatic authorisation and legitimation of poetry coalesces: they present to the reader a character which emblematises the author's poetry, and a figurehead for the broader process of authorial self-representation.

---

[47] We might perhaps imagine a modern-day Herodas prefacing *Mimiamb* 8 with a tongue-in-cheek disclaimer imitating those which adorn many creative works, asserting "any resemblance to actual persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental…" Compare, e.g., the nebulous 'Telchines' of Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue, and see further the discussion of this strategy as used by Herodas in Chapter 5.2.

[48] See particularly the discussions of Lefkowitz (1991) and Whitmarsh (2013) on the use of the first person in constructions and perceptions of authorship.

[49] E.g., Thgn. 19ff. West, Hes. *Theog.*22-24, Noss. 1 *GP* = *AP* 5.170, 11 *GP* = *AP* 7.718, Posidip. 705 *SH* = *AB* 118, Nic. *Ther.*957. However, there are equally instances in while the appearance of an author's name problematises assumptions of direct connection to the author, as in Call. 29 *GP* = *AP* 7.525 discussed above.

[50] See particularly the discussions of Asclepiades' personae in Chapter 3.2, Herodas' persona in Chapter 4.1, or Cerdon - who possesses elements which suggest he is a further persona of Herodas - in Chapter 6.1.

As an example of this process, whereby the persona comes to embody the programmatic process *tout court*, we can consider one of the earliest cases in which the figure of the author is utilised as an explicit figure of authority. The *Seal* of Theognis is perhaps the most well-known example of *sphragis*-poetry, in which the author embeds, within the work, an apparent testament to their authorship (Thgn. 19-23 West):[51]

<div style="margin-left: 4em;">

Κύρνε, σοφιζομένῳ μὲν ἐμοὶ σφρηγὶς ἐπικείσθω
20   τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν - λήσει δ' οὔποτε κλεπτόμενα,
οὐδέ τις ἀλλάξει κάκιον τοὐσθλοῦ παρεόντος,
    ὧδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ· "Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη
τοῦ Μεγαρέως"· πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός.

Cyrnus, let a seal be set by me, as I practice my art,
20   on these utterances - thus they will never be stolen unobserved,
nor will anyone exchange something inferior for the present good,
    and all will say, "the utterances are Theognis
of Megara's"; his name is known among all men.[52]

</div>

Putting aside the complex issue of the historical 'Theognis' behind this work,[53] and precisely what form the σφρηγίς is envisaged to take,[54] what is noteworthy about these verses is the imposition of the notion of an author onto poetry, a demarcation of the person who authorises the work.[55] Regardless of the historicity of such a person, the Theognis who speaks and is present within this passage leads one to perceive an author whose existence informs the reception of the work, a Theognis who must have existed prior to the work's creation, to give it form. This character's fact of being underpins the poem, and their existence as 'the author' situates the interpretation of the work within the broader perception of 'Theognis'. The act of identifying the presence which we interact with as readers through our engagement with the poem (but more broadly as perceivers of any creative medium in which the creator of the work is physically absent from the act of reception) plays upon an inherent desire to give form, however scant, to a creator-figure identified within the work: the implicit author becomes explicit, re-emerging from the background to influence the process of reception - but this figure is not the author, but rather an authorial persona.

---

[51] See further, on *sphragides*, Kranz (1961), Lloyd-Jones (1963), Peirano (2013), (2014).
[52] Trans. Nagy (1985), 29 adapted.
[53] See e.g., Nagy (1985), 46-51, Bowie (1996), Edmunds (1997), Hubbard (2006), Gärtner (2007b).
[54] Explored by Ford (1985), Nagy (1985), 29-31, Pratt (1995), Gerber (1997), 117-128, particularly 125-127.
[55] See Ford (1985), 89, "the assertion that the seal has preserved a work intact is an assurance that this body of precepts constitutes a comprehensive, reciprocally explanatory education for an aristocratic youth".

The *Seal* of Theognis demonstrates a further significant aspect of the authorial persona, as a device: it is a feature of poetry which explicitly presupposes reception, and which overtly presumes an audience. Diskin Clay notes the significance of this in the context of writing:

> "literacy and the ancient book opened a gap between a poet and his audience, and the absence of the performing poet is filled by the mask or persona of the writer. Contemplating this mask is the unfamiliar mask of the reader. Both are the creations and necessities of wide-spread literacy."[56]

In text, the creation of an authorial persona is joined by the persona of the reader: it is critical to recognise that, for the authors considered in this thesis, the persona of the reader was an equally important, though often far more enigmatic facet of their processes of self-representation. We observe a variety of techniques by which this readerly persona might be constructed: in book-epigram, a number of authors return to inscriptional convention and employ the *topos* of reader-as-passerby, as Nossis does in one self-representative epigram (11 *GP* = *AP* 7.718), but equally, said *topos* is also subverted in the process of self-representation; this is particularly visible in the epigrams ascribed to Erinna. Some authors establish the reader as an eavesdropper (for example, Asclepiades), others leave the precise reader's role open to interpretation (Posidippus, Callimachus), though this does not detract from their importance as recipient of the narrative. In *Mimiamb* 8, Herodas places the reader into the role of the slave Annas, the addressee of his persona's account, employing a character within his poetry to embed the reader within the narrative he constructs. As we will observe, the role of the reader presupposed by the text is an integral facet of authorial self-representation across the spectrum of genres.

I close this introduction with an excerpt from a text that was formative in my own interest in the question of authorial self-representation and which, though modern (in the temporal sense), is typically, bookishly Hellenistic in its sensibility. The following passage of Italo Calvino's *If on a Winter's Night a Traveller* provides a masterful encapsulation of the issues I have set out here:

> So here you are now, ready to attack the first lines of the first page. You prepare to recognise the unmistakable tone of the author. No. You don't recognise it at all. But now that you think about it, who ever said this author had an unmistakable tone? On the contrary, he is known as an author who changes greatly from one book to the next. And in these very changes you recognise him as himself. Here, however, he seems to have absolutely no connection with all the rest he has written, at least as far as you can recall. Are you disappointed? Let's see. Perhaps at first you feel a bit lost, as when a person

---

[56] Clay (1998), 30.

who, from the name, you identified with a certain face, and you try to make the features you are seeing tally with those you had in mind, and it won't work. But then you go on and you realise that the book is readable nevertheless, independently of what you expected of the author, it's the book itself that arouses your curiosity; in fact, on sober reflection, you prefer it this way, confronting something and not quite knowing yet what it is.[57]

This passage gives a reader pause, as the subconscious processes enacted by reading are brought to the fore, and they are called upon - in fact, made - to confront the underpinning questions which attend any engagement with a text: who's voice does the text speak with, how can I identify them, and why should I believe they are who they say they are?[58] Here, these questions are problematised, as the text denies that it might reveal its author internally - though of course, in paradoxical fashion, such a denial and the consequent destabilisation of readerly certainty is itself an authorial characteristic, as the text notes (then immediately disavows). Indeed, the figure who emerges from the text is not the author, but the reader, or rather, a persona of the reader, adopted by the persona of the author. One is left in no doubt that the problems of attribution and authenticity which this passage raises are a result of the bookish form of the reception act, given the readerly persona's purported attempts to engage in an intertextual process, and to weigh the author as they are here against their manifestations in other works: ultimately, the speaker of the text advises a separation of author and book, and a dismissal of expectations regarding the author in text.

The particular artistry of this passage lies in the concurrent establishment and disestablishment of an authorial persona, a figure whom the text evokes and yet abolishes in the same moment, who frames the reception of the text, while the same text steadfastly prefigures the reader's response as though the author exerted no influence upon it. When it comes to self-representation, the writers of the early Hellenistic period are as subtle in their engagement with the reader - and the textual format of their poetry - as Calvino: indeed, as this thesis demonstrates, the authors of the turn of the 4th Century stand at the head of a tradition of bookish self-representation which continues to flourish to this day.

---

[57] Calvino (1981), 9.

[58] The existence of such questions in the Greek context is exemplified by, e.g., the prevalence of the verb εἰμί in archaic inscribed epigrams, as a means of rapidly demarcating the identity of the speaking voice of the text, on which see further Chapter 1.1.

Part I
The Miniature, the Intricate and the Fragmented: Epigrammatic Authorial Personae in Early Hellenistic Poetry

Chapter 1
Developments in Authorial Self-Representation from Inscribed to Book-Epigram

Introduction

In his assessment of Callimachus' epigrams, Peter Parsons warns against any absolute conceptual delineation between Hellenistic book-epigram and its inscribed predecessor:

> "There is a temptation to make a simple division between stone-epigrams and book-epigrams, the former old, functional and anonymous, the latter new, ornamental and authored, and to link this with a chronological scheme, under which the epigram expands from stone to book only in the Hellenistic age and in so doing moves to new functions or non-functions … but of course things are not so simple."[59]

The view that epigrams, when inscribed, stand as a genre of lesser 'literary' quality in contrast to the book form has been soundly challenged by recent scholarship on the topic,[60] but it is equally reductive to assert that epigram as a genre *tout court* undergoes a linear development in the shift from an inscriptional context to that of the book-roll.[61] Taking Parsons' point into account, it is nevertheless the case that the contexts for the two forms of epigram engendered a markedly different relationship between the author, the text and the reader in both, the upshot being a significant disparity in the role the author occupies as they relate to the text, particularly in its reception. While book-epigram evinces numerous authorial personae, none can be detected in its inscribed antecedent. It follows to ask two questions: why are authorial personae absent from inscribed epigram, and what occurs in the shift from stone to book-roll which allows authorial personae to be present? These overarching questions contain a host of related issues, such as the role and nature of 'voice' in epigram more generally, the role and effect of the physical context of inscribed epigram (and the lack thereof for book-epigram) and the use of inscribed epigrammatic conventions by Hellenistic authors. Before turning to these authors, then, it is vital to consider the background for Hellenistic acts of epigrammatic self-representation, by assessing the situation of the author in the inscribed form of the genre in

---

[59] Parsons (2002), 111.

[60] See e.g., the collected essays in Bing and Bruss (2007), Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (2010) and Liddel and Low (2013).

[61] On the inverse influence of book-epigram on its inscriptional counterpart, see particularly Bettenworth (2007) and Garulli (2014), with further bibliography.

comparison with the endeavours of the Hellenistic poets: this assessment forms the basis of this chapter.

I thus begin here by assessing the occurrence - or rather, the absence - of authorial personae in the inscribed poems that precede the book-epigrams of the Hellenistic period. I argue that the overt focus on the experience of the reader in inscribed epigram predetermines the absence of the author in the moment of reception, a situation which only changes with the rupturing of the material context in the transition to book-epigram. I then explore the resulting potential of this rupture for a new form of authorial representation, taking as a case study the sepulchral epigrams ascribed to Erinna (1 *GP* = *AP* 7.710 and 2 *GP* = *AP* 7.712). I propose that, in these epigrams, we observe a nuanced engagement with the issue of authorial presence and absence. However, I further argue that the purported presence of the authorial persona of Erinna in these epigrams is itself an intertextual reinterpretation of Erinna's self-representation in her famous lament for Baucis, the poem called the *Distaff*. The persona of Erinna constructed in the epigrams is, I posit, a reconfiguration of the authorial persona of the *Distaff* through an epigrammatic lens, an act which manipulates the medial and material conventions of the genre to remarkable effect, and one which testifies to the complex appreciation the authors of the Hellenistic period had for epigram as a mode of authorial representation.

1.1 *Speaking objects, silent authors: assessing the absence of authorial personae in pre-Hellenistic inscribed epigram*

Epigram is marked, from the earliest instance, by the demand for its readers to engage in an imaginary act of performance, in which their voice suffuses the text and vocalises the utterance therein.[62] In dedicatory inscriptions, we observe cases in which the voice of the epigram is presented as that of the object's dedicator,[63] as well as epigrams that present multiple speakers in conversation, in which the reader's response is prefigured by the text. Readers of inscribed dedicatory epigrams may, therefore, have approached a text with an immediate query regarding the identity of the speaker,[64] but in cases in which it was not explicitly the dedicator speaking, or when the reader was assumed to be uttering the epigram *in propria persona* - in short, cases in which no person was perceived behind the text - the plausible fiction of communication was grounded in the physical situation of the epigram, and the dedicated object itself was assumed to fill the speaking role.[65] The "I" of an inscribed dedicatory epigram seems to have been, in a majority of cases, the dedicated object located before the reader: the proximity of the dedication to the inscription informed the reception of the text, prompting a reader to ascribe the voice of the epigram to the object they beheld.[66] Cases in which the object is explicitly not a speaking voice within the text only begin to occur in the 4th Century as, for example, in the following epigram (*CEG* 763):[67]

> [Τηλέμαχ]ός σε ἱέρωσε Ἀσσκληπιῶι ἠδὲ ὁμοβώμοις |
> πρῶτος ἱδρυσάμενος θυσίαις θείαις ὑποθήκαις.
>
> [Telemach]us dedicated you to Asclepius and those of the same altar,
> setting you up first as counselled by divine sacrifices.

---

[62] The interaction between reader's voice and voice of the text in inscription has been considered particularly by Jesper Svenbro; see, e.g., Svenbro, (1988), (1993), (1999).

[63] For a tabulated summary of the speakers of epigrams in the archaic and classical periods, see Tueller (2008), 17-22, and further Tsagalis (2008), 321. Cases in which dedicatory epigrams speak as if in the voice of their dedicator are scarce, but do occur after the archaic period: e.g., the late 5th Century *CEG* 833, on which see below. Cf. the 6th Century *CEG* 459 which is not definitively classifiable as either sepulchral or dedicatory, in which the voice of the epigram is akin to that of the dedicator/erector. Several epigrams, such as those which employ the third person or deictic markers in formulations such as τόδ᾽ ἄγαλμα ἀνέθηκε(ν)... (e.g., *CEG* 202 below), might be interpreted as speaking in the voice of the dedicator, though Svenbro argues that deictic demonstratives do not rule out, and in fact imply, that the object speaks: Svenbro (1993), 31-34, and cf. Tueller (2008), 16-27.

[64] Some inscriptions pre-empt questions of who speaks by explicitly identifying the source of the voice with a verb of speaking, as can be observed for the dedicated objects identified in *CEG* 286 and 429.

[65] Burzachechi (1962) coins the term *oggetti parlanti* - for a recent overview of scholarship on the phenomenon of the speaking object, see Wachter (2010).

[66] See e.g. Day (2010), 30ff. on the Manticlus epigram (*CEG* 326) as a poem whose interpretation is significantly informed by the arrangement of the text upon the dedicated object. See further Lorenz (2010), 141ff.

[67] Tueller (2008), 13 notes that the first voice of the early 5th Century dialogue epigram *CEG* 429 addresses the object, which then responds. See also *CEG* 844.

Here, the object is addressed by the text, and the reader is deprived of the natural assumption that it is the object which speaks. Lacking the assertion of a specific alter-*ego*, the voice that the reader encounters within the text would seem to be that of the reader themselves, prefigured and explicitly guiding the reader in their response. Indeed, what emerges from an assessment of dedicatory epigram is that the core narrative of the genre - that being, the information regarding the dedication, dedicator and the recipient divinity - is always presented from the reader's perspective. Deictic references to the dedicated object serve to express the reader's viewpoint within the text itself, thereby eliding the narrative constructed within the text with the reader's present experience of viewing the object and attendant epigram. This is even the case in epigrams wherein the reader is not the explicit addressee of the text, such as in the following (*CEG* 190):

> σοί μ[ε], θεά, τόδ’ ἄγα[λμα ἀνέθ]εκε Μελάνθυρο[ς ἔργον] |
> εὐχσάμενος δε[κάτ]εν παιδὶ Διὸς μηεγάλο.

> For you, goddess, Melanthyrus dedicated me, this *agalma*,
> having vowed a tithe of his works to the child of great Zeus.

Joseph Day has advocated that dedicatory epigrams prompt, on the part of the reader, a re-performance of the original act of dedication:[68] here, the reader lends their voice to the object in the moment of utterance, and their ego is briefly subsumed into that of the *agalma*.[69] In so doing, the reader aggrandises the dedicator and Athena in a contemporary *mimesis* of dedication, recreating the original dedication in the present moment of reading. It is this overt 'presentness' of dedicatory inscriptions that is significant for our inability to detect traces of authorial presence within inscribed epigram. The explicitly here-and-now character of such texts disallows the possibility of detecting the presence of an authorial figure as encountered in book-epigram, despite the shared medium and conventional similarity of both forms of the genre. Inscribed epigram's emphatic focus on the moment of the reader's reception - within the text itself - obscures the text's genesis as the product of an author, because the author exists outside of, and in antecedence to, that moment.[70] The absence of the author from the moment of reader-reception is as true for Hellenistic book-epigram as for its inscribed antecedent, but the differing contexts in which the two forms were received results in a sharp disparity in the

---

[68] Day (2010). See further Raubitschek (1969), van Straten (1981), Day (1989), (1994), (2000), Furley (2010).
[69] Day (2000), 44, 53. On the nature of the *agalma* in dedicatory inscriptions, see Day (2010), 89-129.
[70] See further Svenbro (1993), 42-43 who suggests the act of writing engenders a distance between author and speaker-in-text, and further Svenbro (1999), Schmitz (2010a), 373-375, Schmitz (2010b), 27.

author's role in the process of reception.[71] The material situation of an inscribed epigram informs a reading of the text at a fundamental level, by enforcing a reception-context with a specific, present source to which the voice that speaks from the text can be ascribed.[72] By delimiting potential speaking voices to those represented within the immediate context of the act of reading,[73] inscribed dedicatory epigram prescribes a closed circuit of communication, isolating the interaction of reader, text and object, and precluding the influence of voices from outside the direct spatio-temporal moment of reception.

Despite the difference in subject matter, I posit that the reception situation constructed within sepulchral epigram is demonstrably similar to that of its dedicatory counterpart. In sepulchral epigram, we observe cases in which an epigram speaks with the voice of the monument, or in the voice of the deceased, bestowing on the dead a fleeting moment of life once more.[74] Much like the dedicatory epigrams, sepulchral epigrams express themselves in terms of the reader's experience of encountering the inscription (and monument), with elements such as deictic pronouns, greetings to the passerby and the use of imperatives to instruct behaviour while reading serving to place the reader squarely at the centre of the narrative constructed by the poem.[75] Christos Tsagalis suggests that, in instances where the speaker is the monument, first

---

[71] See Schmitz (2010a), 372ff. who suggests that the established distance between author and reader is what attracted Hellenistic poets to the epigrammatic form.

[72] The phenomenon of the speaking object is perhaps easiest to conceptualise when the object in question was anthropomorphic, after a fashion - see particularly Lorenz (2010), 132-138, and Wachter (2010), 259 who suggests anthropomorphic dedications may well have been the first such instances of speaking objects - but this does not preclude non-anthropomorphic objects from occupying the role: see further Burzachechi (1962), Raubitschek (1968), Svenbro (1993), 29ff., Wachter (2010). See further Webster (1954) on personification more generally.

[73] This therefore includes the dedicator of the object, who is made present in the moment the reader engages with the text, thereby re-performing the dedicator's action.

[74] A notable example of vocal ambiguity is given in *CEG* 108.1, in which the speaker of the epigram is seemingly the deceased from the introductory remark that ἐγὸ δὲ θανὸν | κατάκειμαι, "I lie below, dead" - yet this speaker notes that his mother erected a στέλεν ἀκάματον, "untiring pillar" above him hάτις ἐρεῖ παριõσι δια|μερὲς ἄματα πάντα· Τ|ιμαρέτε μ᾽ ἔσστεσε φίλ|οι ἐπὶ παιδὶ θανόντι, "which will say to passers-by in perpetuity: "Timarete set me upon her beloved dead child"" (108.5-7): the epigram seemingly acknowledges the act of 'speaking' undertaken by the inscription, implied by the invitation to the passerby to approach and ἀνάνεμαι, "read"(108.2). However, the ambiguity is not open-ended: the potential speakers are already identified as present within the text. Compare also *CEG* 119, which seems to display a similar self-awareness. See further Casey (2004), 64-69, Tueller (2010), 55, Vestrheim (2010), 67-75.

[75] Deictic pronouns are recurrent aspect of both dedicatory and sepulchral epigrams: see above n.63. Imperatives commanding certain acts during or after reading are a particularly common feature of sepulchral epigram, e.g., imperatives commanding grieving such as at *CEG* 27.1 (στῆθι : καὶ οἴκτιρον) - see also *CEG* 13, 28, and further Day (1989), 20, Walsh (1991), 78; imperatives demanding the passerby read the text as at *CEG* 108.2, above (ἀνάνεμαι) - see also *CEG* 49, 556, 686; imperatives demanding action following reading, as in *CEG* 13.4 which instructs the reader to go and to perform a good deed (ταῦτ᾽ ἀποδυράμενοι νεσθε ἐπ|ὶ πρᾶγμ᾽ ἀγαθόν). Greetings to the passerby are prevalent in sepulchral epigram, e.g., *CEG* 487.4 (χαίρε|τε οἱ παρι‹ό›ντες). On the presentness of inscribed epigram, see e.g. Tueller (2008), 36-42, (2010), particularly 46 n.8 on the first cases (mid-4th Century) which allow for dis-temporality between the reader and the narrative of the epigram. See, on an epigram's purpose in commanding cessation of movement, Höschele (2007), 343-349, (2010),111-121.

person deixis automatically triggers the expression of a second person deictic response on the part of the reader, arguing:

> "If every 'I' implies a 'You', then the function of the speaking 'I' either in the persona of the deceased or in the monument's propria persona aims at making the reader become the 'You' who would receive the epitaph's message. Thus, when the passer-by read the personified monument's speaking 'I', he would have recognized himself as the other end of the communicative spectrum, i.e. as a reader."[76]

This is broadly a reversal of the situation observed in *CEG* 763 above (in which the text establishes a 'you' but neglects to acknowledge the 'I', thus allowing the reader to fill that role) but the results are comparable: in both cases, the reader's role within the narrative constructed by the epigram is controlled through the application - and withholding - of identifying markers. The text establishes who it is that takes part in the communication, and what roles they play, by demarcating the participants, and disallowing the possibility that anyone outside the closed circuit of reader-monument-deceased might intrude upon the communicative act.

There is, however, one possible exception to this hermetically sealed conception of the moment of reception, that being the seemingly external voice that issues forth in a number of funerary epigrams, such as the following (*CEG* 51):

> οἰκτίρο προσορο[ν] | παιδὸς τόδε σῆμα | θανόντος ⁝
> Σιμικύθ[ο] | hός τε φίλον ὄλεσε|ν ἔλπ᾽ ἀγαθέν.

> I feel pity as I look upon this marker of the dead child
>   of Simicythus, who destroyed the good hope of his friends.[77]

The identity of the speaker in this epigram - and others that express an emotive response as if engaged in the act of viewing the monument - has been a point of contention in discussions of voice in inscribed epigram of the archaic period.[78] Some have termed the speaker here the 'anonymous first person mourner', and suggested the voice is comparable to one detected often in Hellenistic book-epigram,[79] such as can be observed in the following epigram of Callimachus (45 *GP* = *AP* 7.271):

---

[76] Tsagalis (2008), 255; see further 256-257.
[77] See Lewis (1987) and Tueller (2008), 40-41 on the rejection of Hansen's printing of οἴκτιρο‹ν›, and Hansen in his note to *CEG* 470: though Hansen accepts the rejection, this is not noted in the *addenda et corrigenda* to *CEG* 51 in vol.2 of *CEG*, as noted by Tueller.
[78] E.g. *CEG* 43, 470, as well as *CEG* 4, *AP* 7.511 and *AP* 13.26 ascribed to Simonides, on which see Sider (2007), 120. See also *SEG* 41.540.
[79] E.g., Gutzwiller (1998), 59-60. See also Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 294-296. Cf. Meyer (2005), 78-79, Tueller (2008), 52 n.67, 79.

ὤφελε μηδ’ ἐγένοντο θοαὶ νέες, οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἡμεῖς
    παῖδα Διοκλείδεω Σώπολιν ἐστένομεν·
νῦν δ’ ὁ μὲν εἰν ἁλί που φέρεται νέκυς, ἀντὶ δ’ ἐκείνου
    οὔνομα καὶ κενεὸν σᾶμα παρερχόμεθα.

If only there were no swift ships, we would not
    be lamenting Sopolis, child of Dioclides.
But now, his corpse is carried on the sea, and instead of that man
    we pass a name and an empty tomb.

In both works, the voice that speaks within the poem seems to imply it possesses an existence external to the process of reading - that is, that it belongs to someone who can perceive the monument (and therefore the inscription) other than the reader, and thus outside the closed circuit as conceptualised above. In opposition to those who assert the persistent occurrence of a defined character, an 'external I' or 'anonymous first person mourner' in both inscribed and book-epigram, a number of scholars have argued persuasively that - as the voice which speaks in the first person must, in the case of inscribed epigram, always be attributed to the passerby - it must be a manifestation of the reader's voice which is heard here.[80] The argument runs that, in the case of epigrams such as *CEG* 51, the reader becomes the first person mourner constructed within the text,[81] and, at the moment when the text utters "I feel pity", "I am distressed" (*CEG* 470) or "I lament" (*CEG* 43) the reader necessarily adopts the act as their own, thereby performing the role of the voice presented within the text. As a result, instead of imagining this voice as an 'external I' we might identify the phenomenon rather as an 'internalising I' - a voice which draws the reader into the narrative by prefabricating their response within the text.[82] Perceiving such voices in this manner, we can detect similarity with Day's notion of a dedicatory inscription as an instigator of re-performance: funerary epigrams that speak with an internalising I occasion the reader to re-perform the mourning act of those for whom the grave-monument possesses inherent and instinctual emotional resonance due to what it signifies - such as the φίλον noted in *CEG* 51.[83] The thread of continuity between the

---

[80] See Day (1989), 26-27, Meyer (2005), 71-72, 78-79, Tsagalis (2008), 254-256, Tueller (2008), 40-42, 78-80, (2010), 44-46. See further Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 175, 282-283, Schmitz (2010b), 33-35. See also Svenbro (1993), 44-63, 187-216.

[81] See, e.g., Day (1989), 26, Meyer (2005), 79, Tsagalis (2008), 256.

[82] This activity is already evident in dialogue epigrams, in which one voice speaks words expected by the reader: see e.g. *CEG* 429 (a dedicatory epigram) or *CEG* 512, 530 and 545 (sepulchral). See further Meyer (2005), 83-88 and Tsagalis (2008), 257-261.

[83] Compare the mention of the deceased's mother in the fragmentary *CEG* 470 as a similar means of introducing a personage emotionally or genealogically close to the deceased as a model for the reader's response as prefigured by the text. See Chapter 3.2 on *CEG* 512 below.

inscribed tradition and poems such as the epitaph by Callimachus thus becomes clearer: in both forms, the employment of an internalising I results in the reader becoming embedded within the dramatisation of the narrative, assuming a persona to suit the dramatic situation of the text. Callimachus' epigram, however, displays a level of inclusivity which surpasses the inscribed examples, by not only internalising the reader but - through the use of the first person plurals ἐστένομεν and παρερχόμεθα - also implying the author's presence before the stele and alongside the reader in the moment of reading.

Unsurprisingly, the first instance in which a poet can be detected as the author of an epigram occurs as a result of their explicit identification by the text, not due to a manifestation of their authorial presence as a voice speaking *in propria persona*.[84] The earliest definitive examples of author-attributed inscribed poems are two mid-4th Century epigrams which form part of a triptych for a group of statues dedicated at the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi: the epigrams (*CEG* 819.ii and *CEG* 819.iii), both contain references to their author, Ion of Samos:

(*CEG* 819.ii.1-2)

> [παῖ Διός, ὦ] Πολύδευ[κ]ες, Ἴων [?καὶ τοῖσ]δ᾽ἐλεγείοι[ς] |
>   [?λαϊνέαν] κρηπῖδ᾽ ἐστεφάνωσ[ε ?τεὰ]ν

> [Child of Zeus], Polyduces, [with these] elegiacs Ion
>   crowned [your stone] base[85]

(*CEG* 819.iii.5)

> ἐξάμο ἀμφιρύτ[ας] τεῦξε ἐλεγεῖον ː Ἴων

> Ion of sea-girt Samos composed this epigram[86]

Though Ion is named as the composer of these verses, the acknowledgment of his authorship does not definitively equate to his presence within the epigrams as a speaking voice: Marco Fantuzzi has suggested that "the text is not presented as the voice of the dedicator or of the statues (as is usual in dedicatory inscriptions), but rather as the voice of the poet who 'comments on' the statues, in a manner familiar from Hellenistic deictic epigram",[87] but Michael Tueller notes that Ion is referred to only in the third person,[88] which is equally true for

---

[84] The earliest attribution of an epigram to a particular author seems to occur at Hdt. 7.288, where Herodotus notes that Simonides had the epigram for the seer Megistias inscribed: see further A. Petrovic (2007a), (2007b).
[85] Trans. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 290.
[86] Trans. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 290, adapted. See West (1974), 3, Bowie (1986), 22-27, Pulema (1997), 190 on the noun ἐλεγεῖον in the singular to mean elegiac couplet, and further epigram. See also Bruss (2004), 2-10 on the usage of the term ἐπίγραμμα.
[87] Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 290.
[88] Tueller (2008), 53 n.69.

the other pre-Hellenistic examples we possess.[89] The author is thus located in a liminal position, exerting influence upon the text without manifesting fully as a voice within it. Indeed, the attribution of authorship in these epigrams is akin to the almost paratextual references exhibited in book-epigrams, such as in one sepulchral example ascribed to Erinna (1 *GP* = *AP* 7.710) which contains a comparatively removed acknowledgement of authorship, considered further below. The suggestion that authorial signatures such as those of Ion are comparable to poems such as Nossis' dedicatory epigrams, or Posidippus' *Andriantopoiika,* in which the poet's persona manifests as a voice that guides reader-reception and comments upon the statues the epigrams adorn, is therefore untenable.[90]

From this analysis, we can conclude the following: in pre-Hellenistic inscribed epigram, the situation of the reader's reception of the text, their physical collocation with the unified group of object/monument and text, and the communicative role-defining markers within the text establish a closed context which define the parameters and participants of that communication. The highly circumscribed, occasional nature of this communication, located within a defined spatio-temporal moment (the moment of reading; the here-and-now) precludes the possibility of the author being present within the text: the text is constructed with an emphasis on the reader's own presence in front of the inscription, and, as the author's role in the production of the text stands absolutely in antecedence to the reading act, they are excluded from being present at the moment of reception. The first instances of definitively authorised epigrams maintain the dislocation of the author from the communication between reader and text, with the author only acknowledged through the third person, therefore forcibly excised from the communicative act.

---

[89] *CEG* 888.18-19 from Lycia, late 5ᵗʰ/early 4ᵗʰ Century, notes Symmachus as its composer: Σύμμαχος Εὐμήδεος Πελλανεὺς μάντις ἀ[μύμων] | δῶρον ἔτευξε ἐλεγῆια Ἀρβίναι εὐσυνε[τω]ς, "Symmachus of Pellana, son Eumedes, [blameless] seer fashioned with easy understanding elegiac verses as a gift for Arbinas," (trans. A. Petrovic (2009), 197). *CEG* 889.7-8, also from Lycia and also in praise of Arbinas, is fragmentary and does not retain the name of the composer, but does seem to indicate him in the final couplet of the epigram: παιδοτρίβας Ἐπ[| δῶρ᾽ ἐποίησε ἐλ[εγῆια (or ἐλ[εγῆιον), "*paidotribas…* composed as a gift el[egiacs." *CEG* 700.3 from Cnidus, 4ᵗʰ Century, may also contain a reference to its composer with the mention of ταῦτα ἐλεγε[ῑ]ον, but the text is too badly preserved to determine further. See also Hansen (1989), 283, Gutzwiller (1998), 48, Parsons (2002), 112, Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 290-291, A. Petrovic (2009). On later inscriptions that preserve authorial signature, see Santin (2009) and Santin and Tziafalias (2013).

[90] Fantuzzi (2009) posits that use of the third person in such authorial signatures might be analogous to usage in archaic *sphragides*, (e.g., Alc. *PMG* 39, *h.Ap.*172-173, the *Seal* of Theognis) in which the third person is seemingly preferred for self-expression, but his assessment that this usage "in place of a self-statement, authoritatively acknowledges the operation of the poet from the outside world" highlights the distinction between the *sphragides* and the occasional and contextual hyper-specificity of the inscribed epigrams, in which that outside world is strictly prevented from intruding on the moment of reception. Cf. Beecroft (2010), 61ff. on the comparable indirect authorial references at Hom. *Il.*2.484 and *Od.*1.1.

1.2   *Personae of author and reader in the sepulchral epigrams ascribed to Erinna*

Erinna is known primarily as the author of the *Distaff*, (the principal fragment of which is preserved as *SH* 401),[91] a poem lamenting the early death of her companion Baucis, written in a mixture of Doric and Aeolic.[92] Her historical situation is uncertain: the *Suda* places her as a companion and contemporary of Sappho, a native of Teos, Telos or Lesbos;[93] Eustathius follows the *Suda* closely, concurring on the friendship with Sappho, but also suggesting Rhodes as a possible point of origin;[94] Eusebius places her *floruit* later, in either the 106th or 107th Olympiad, mid-4th Century, and this date has been generally accepted as at least a plausible reflection of Erinna's period of operation:[95] her *terminus ante quem* can be securely dated to the late 4th or early 3rd Century, when Asclepiades composed the first of many epigrams about the poet, celebrating the short span of her life.[96] Indeed, Erinna is particularly noteworthy for the strength of the biographical tradition which develops about her and her poetry: she is, alongside Homer and Anacreon, one of the most oft-occurring subjects of the epigrams written about poets in the Hellenistic period. Apart from the texts which treat Erinna as a subject, we also possess three epigrams which are attributed to the poet's own hand: one (3 *GP = AP* 6.352) celebrates a portrait of the maiden Agatharchis, which I will not consider here;[97] the other two (1 *GP = AP* 7.710, 2 *GP = AP* 7.712) both purport to be inscriptions upon the tomb of Baucis, whose passing is the subject of Erinna's lamentation. I argue that both are epigrammatic variations on the leitmotif of the *Distaff*: much as Nossis adapts Sapphic poetics to the epigrammatic form (as I discuss in Chapter 3), so the epigrams on the grave of Baucis engage in a transformative process, whereby the lament of Erinna's poem is reconceptualised in a new generic mode as, at the same time, is Erinna herself.[98]

---

[91] On the name of Erinna's poem, see Bowra (1936), 339-340, Cameron and Cameron (1969), West (1977), 96, Neri (2003), 94-98. On the fragments that comprise the *Distaff*, see particularly Neri (2003), 153-161, 223-430.

[92] On Erinna's language, see particularly Scholz (1973), 33, West (1977), 114, Neri (2003), Hunter (2006), 15-17.

[93] *Sud.*s.v. Ἤριννα (H 521 Adler), cf. Step.Byz. s.v. Τῆνος, see further Neri (2003), 140-145

[94] Eustath. *ad Il.*β p.327.

[95] Euseb.Chron. *Ol.*106.3/107.4. See further Levin (1962), 193-194, Neri (2003), 35-53, particularly 42-47, 211, Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 28.n.104.

[96] Asclep. 28 *GP = AP* 7.11, discussed in Chapter 3.2 below.

[97] This epigram is comparable in subject matter to Nossis' dedicatory epigrams, a similarity which leads West (1977), 115-116 (who argues all three epigrams attributed to Erinna are spurious) to consider it more likely the work of that author, though cf. a rebuttal of this ascription by Pomeroy (1978) and Cavallini (1991). See further Gutzwiller (1998), 77-78, Neri (2003), 438-440, Rayor (2005), 69-70, Tueller (2008), 143.

[98] See Bowra (1936), 337-338 on Erinna's generic variation on the form of earlier choral *threnoi*, and further, Manwell (2005), 76, Gutzwiller (1997), 206-207, Levaniouk (2008).

It is necessary to note that the attribution of these epigrams to Erinna is strongly contested: Camillo Neri, who offers a detailed consideration of the arguments for and against the possibility that the epigrams are genuinely Erinnean, concludes that the two sepulchral epigrams together constitute a *sphragis* of the poet's oeuvre but concludes, with some trepidation, that the epigrams should be considered *dubia*.[99] However, the attribution of the epigrams to the historical Erinna is of secondary importance when considering them as evidence for the creation of an authorial persona. In these epigrams, we observe the intertextual construction of an author's persona (between the epigrams themselves, and between the epigrams and the *Distaff*): this project does not depend upon the definitive attribution of the texts to the historical Erinna to be of interest from a critical perspective - rather, of primary significance is that the epigrams are presented as the products of Erinna's authorship, not only through the paratextual apparatus of the anthology, but internally, within the epigrams themselves.

Considerations of the two epigrams have noted the overt recollection of the *Distaff* in thematic terms,[100] but that these poems go beyond a mere thematic reiteration, and actually recapitulate the complex, liminal context of lamentation which the *Distaff* establishes, has gone unnoticed. The voice which sounds out from the *Distaff* is unmistakable - the reader is invited to identify Erinna's authorial persona as Baucis' mourner (rather than a generic voice of lamentation) and she makes repeated direct address to the deceased.[101] Owing to its highly personal character, the *Distaff* has therefore been interpreted in light of the personalised songs of mourning found in the *Iliad*, such as those uttered by Andromache for Hector, or Briseis for Patroclus,[102] and likened to a *goos* - a "quasi-spontaneous outburst of sorrow"- rather than a *threnos*, the composed, professional song of lament (though notably Erinna subverts the practice of the Homeric *gooi* by making a female companion, rather than a male relative, the subject of mourning).[103] The lament is, in part, a nostalgic reminiscence of times past, when Erinna and Baucis played together as children,[104] which serves to imply a longstanding closeness between

---

[99] Neri (2003), 85-88, 431-434. Cf. the arguments of Pomeroy (1978) and Cavallini (1991) who take the epigrams as the genuine works of Erinna.

[100] See e.g., Scholz (1973), West (1977), Gutzwiller (1997), Levaniouk (2008).

[101] E.g., 18: τυ Βαυκὶ τάλαι[να; 30: Βαυκὶ φίλα; 47-48: τυ φίλα… / Βαυκὶ; 54: αἰαῖ Βαυκὶ τάλαιν[α.

[102] Hom. *Il.*22.477-514, 19.287-300.

[103] Skinner (1982), 266: Bowra (1936), 337 provides the earliest assessment of the *Distaff*'s departure from the expected conventions of *threnoi*. See further Fantuzzi (1993), 31-36, Manwell (2005), 76. On generic distinctions between individual and public lamentation as categorised into *gooi* and *threnoi*, see Alexiou (2002), 11-14, 102-103, Tsagalis (2004), *passim* and especially 15-17, Nagy (2010), 30-35.

[104] The fragmentary opening lines of *SH* 401 have been interpreted as reference to a game of tag: see Bowra (1936), 327-328, Arthur (1980), 58-62, Levaniouk (2008), 207-210. References to δαγύ[δ]ων, "dolls" (21), and

the two women. But, over the course of the lament, the closeness of this relationship is shown to have faltered, until Erinna is decisively separated from Baucis twice over - first by Baucis' impending marriage, and then by her death.[105] The finality of this separation is emphasised in the persona's lament that she cannot attend Baucis' funeral proceedings in person (32-35):

>]οὐ γ[ά]ρ μοι πόδες ....[.].[   ]ἄπο δῶμα βεβάλοι·
>]οὐδ᾿ ἐσιδῆν φαέ .[..].[   ]κυν οὐδὲ γοάσαι
>]γυμναῖσιν χαίταισιν[φ]οινίκιος αἰδώς
> 35   δρύπτε[ι] μ᾿ ἀμφὶ πα[ρῆιδας[106]

> For my feet … are not allowed [to leave] the house,
> nor gaze upon [?your body] … nor to lament
> with hair unbound … crimson restraint
> 35   tears about my [cheeks]

The question of why Erinna's persona presents herself as unable to attend Baucis' funeral proceedings is unclear from the text alone: those who interpret the *Distaff* as a biographically accurate record have sought to deduce a cause based on Erinna's life experiences. It has thus been posited that Erinna occupied a priestly or cultic position;[107] that she was for some reason forbidden to leave by her mother;[108] that the simple fact of geographical distance prevented her attendance;[109] or that her status as a *parthenos* barred her from attending the funeral of anyone outside her immediate family.[110] Whatever the precise cause, as Kathryn Gutzwiller notes, the restriction forms the basis for an inability to perform the *goos* within the public sphere (emphasised in 33-34), and as a consequence of this, Erinna instead produced the *Distaff*, a literary memorial in place of an oral lament.[111] Consequently, Erinna's persona, her lament and (by extension) the reader of the *Distaff* exist at a distance from the public, performative occasion of lamentation which Baucis' death engenders, instead occupying an ambiguous, liminal space.[112] Though Baucis is perceived as the primary recipient of the persona's words, the reader's act of reception - their inevitable presence as a covert addressee, engaging with the

---

the φόβον ἄγαγε Μορμώ, "fear Mormo brought" (25) seem further to evoke childish pursuits and games - see further Bowra (1936), 332-333.
[105] See Rauk (1989), 106, Manwell (2005), 76-78.
[106] The text of the *Distaff* is that printed by Neri (2003).
[107] Bowra (1936), 333-335, Gow and Page (1965), II.282.
[108] For which the anonymous 38 *FGE = AP* 9.190 is adduced as evidence.
[109] Rauk (1989), 115.
[110] West (1977), 108-109, though he notes that this explanation "does not do full justice to the τῶ in 31 which implies that Erinna's absence has something to do with her friend's having married." See further Arthur (1980), 62, Gutzwiller (1997), 209.
[111] Gutzwiller (1997), 209-210. See further below on the internal allusions to oral performance in the *Distaff*.
[112] A suggestion which parallels that of Arthur (1980), 62 who considers the *Distaff* as an expression of Erinna's "narcissistic retreat into the inner recesses of her own being" following Baucis' death. See also Manwell (2005), 74.

Distaff as a text - throws the artificiality of this intimate communion between Erinna's persona and Baucis into sharp relief: the former frames her mourning as a spoken, private utterance intended for the latter, occurring within the confines of her home, but the *Distaff*'s existence as a publically disseminated work subverts the avowed privacy of the lament.[113] The *Distaff* is thus a transgressive work on multiple levels, one which is neither definitely spoken or written, public or private.

I suggest that a recognition of the thematic centrality of this transgression to the *Distaff* is crucial for the interpretation of *AP* 7.710 and *AP* 7.712: it is an evocation of this liminality and the transgression of contextual and medial boundaries which both epigrams seek to recapitulate. Crucially, this repurposes the functional and performative dimension of inscribed epigram: while inscribed sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams prompt a contemporary *mimesis* of the act of memorialisation which attends a burial or dedication, these epigrams evince (and encourage) a *mimesis* of a different memorial - the *Distaff*. Furthermore, in re-contextualising the *Distaff* within an epigrammatic frame, *AP* 7.710 and *AP* 7.712 reimagine the authorial persona of the *Distaff*: I propose that, as her lament is inscribed in the book-roll, Erinna, the authorial persona of the *Distaff*, is correspondingly transformed into an epigrammatist.

Considering *AP* 7.710, we can detect a clear engagement with - and development of - the epigrammatic tropes familiar from inscribed texts:

> στάλα καὶ Σειρῆνες ἐμαὶ καὶ πένθιμε κρωσσέ,
>   ὅστις ἔχεις Ἀίδα τὰν ὀλίγαν σποδιάν,
> τοῖς ἐμὸν ἐρχομένοισι παρ᾽ ἠρίον εἴπατε χαίρειν,
>   αἴτ᾽ ἀστοὶ τελέθωντ᾽ αἴθ᾽ ἑτεροπτόλιες·
> 5 χὤτι με νύμφαν εὖσαν ἔχει τάφος· εἴπατε καὶ τό,
>   χὤτι πατήρ μ᾽ ἐκάλει Βαυκίδα, χὤτι γένος
> Τηνία, ὡς εἰδῶντι, καὶ ὅττι μοι ἁ συνεταιρίς
>   Ἤρινν᾽ ἐν τύμβῳ γράμμ᾽ ἐχάραξε τόδε.

> Stele and my Sirens and sorrowful urn,
>   who holds the little ash of Hades,
> speak greeting to those passing my tomb,
>   whether they be citizens or those from another city:
> 5 the grave holds me, though I am a bride: say this,
>   and that my father called me Baucis, that my people were
> of Tenos, so they may know, and that my companion
>   Erinna carved this inscription upon the tomb.

---

[113] That the *Distaff* was intended for public dissemination as a text seems reasonable: see, e.g., West (1977), 117. That the text was in circulation in a written form by the close of the 4th Century is supported by Asclep. 28 *GP* = *AP* 7.11, which begins by asserting ὁ γλυκὺς Ἠρίννας οὗτος πόνος, implying, at the very least, that it was not unusual for *Distaff* to be considered as book-poetry. See further, on Asclepiades' epigram, below, Chapter 3.2.

Within the epigram, the revelation of Erinna's authorial role partially follows the pattern established in the epigrams of Ion and the other inscribed examples considered in the previous section. Erinna does not speak herself, but is identified as the author in the third person, in this case by the deceased - Baucis - who occupies the epigram's speaking role. However, Erinna's identification as the author is revealed through a recollection of the act of engraving a tombstone: rather than a generic term such as τεύχειν (*CEG* 819 iii.5, *CEG* 888.19),[114] or ποεῖν (*CEG* 889.8),[115] or even a more metaphorical description, such as Ion's use of στεφανοῦν (*CEG* 819 ii.2), Erinna's activity is characterised as overtly inscriptional with the verb χαράσσειν, which evokes the physical act of carving.[116] In so doing, the epigram highlights the disjunction between the material context implied by the text and the reader's own perception of the text as a literary creation, and this disjunction recalls the medial duality of the *Distaff*. In that poem, the mode of lamentation is presented as explicitly oral,[117] but is received as text by the reader, emphasising the persona's dislocation from the funeral proceedings - and her inability to offer lamentation in the proper context - in the reader's disjunctive mode of reception. In *AP* 7.710, the explicitly inscriptional character of Erinna's activity, juxtaposed with the reader's awareness of the book-form of the epigram,[118] emphasises the dislocation of reader from the

---

[114] See further Parsons (2002), 115 and Meyer (2005), 98 n.265 who note the use of τεύχειν in, e.g., *CEG* 548 to describe the activity of the builders of the tomb.

[115] See in general, on the 'making' of poetry, Ford (2002), 130ff.

[116] Compare Theoc. *Id*.23.46, Alph. 6 *GP* = *AP* 7.237, Leon.Alexandr. 9 *FGE* = *AP* 7.547, D.S. 12.26.1. Tueller (2008), 55 notes Erinna's identification as the carver of the epigram, but does not consider how this evokes or eschews earlier self-representative habits.

[117] E.g., through repeated usage of αἰαῖ (16, 54), vocative address to Baucis (18, 30, 47-48, 54), vocative address to Hymenaeus (51, 53) and numerous verbs denoting oral expression - ἄϋσα (16), γόημ[ι] (18), κατακλα[ί]οισα (31), γοάσαι (33), κατακλα[ίοισα] (48).

[118] That these epigrams were composed as book-epigrams - rather than inscribed epigrams copied and collected during the process of anthologising - is not definite, but seems the most probable circumstance: on the transcription of inscribed epigram to the book-roll in general, see Bing (2002). The evidence for the plausibility that one (or both) of these epigrams was inscribed is circumstantial: Pomeroy (1978), 21 argues against West (1977), 115, who suggests the lack of identification by name of Baucis' father-in-law (whom he presumes would be the party responsible for the erection of the tomb) in *AP* 7.712 confirms its literary status, by noting the examples of paratextual identifications in other inscribed epigrams (e.g., the 4th Century *GVI* 1912): see further Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 296-297. Gutzwiller (1998), 77.n.81 and Stehle (2001), 182 note that the 5th Century *CEG* 97 provides a parallel to the implied situation of *AP* 7.710, in which one Euthylla sets up a stele for her ἑταίρα Biote, suggesting that memorials erected by non-kin women for companions, while rare, were not entirely unheard of; compare Posidip. *AB*.49, 51, 53 in which women are presented in mourning for other women, though only in *AB* 49 does a woman appear to have performed the act of memorialisation. In favour of reading the texts as book-epigrams, we can note the density of intertextual engagement with the *Distaff* (particularly the apparent quotation of the *Distaff* at *AP* 7.712.3, βάσκανος ἔσσ', Ἀίδα, on which see West (1977), 115 and Neri (2003), 86, 435) which would place the epigrams' production after the composition of Erinna's lament (thus, after Baucis' burial rites) in terms of narrative chronology. We can also note the overt reference to the act of inscription through the use of χαράσσειν, which is unparalleled in definitely inscribed epigrams of the archaic and classical periods but occurs elsewhere in the seventh book of the *Palatine Anthology*, such as Antip.Sid. 29 *GP* = *AP* 7.424 and Leon.Alexandr. 9 *FGE* = *AP* 7.547, in the second case used exactly as in *AP* 7.710 to describe the act of the burier/memorialiser: moreover, its usage in *AP* 7.710 evokes the reflexive focus upon the purported act of inscription recurrent in Hellenistic book-epigram; compare, e.g., Asclep. 25 *GP* = *AP* 5.181, Theoc. 23 *GP* = *AP*

text/monument dyad, reminding the reader that they now access the material situation of the epigram indirectly, via the medium of the text.

The sense of disconnection between the epigram and the reader is intensified by the former's lack of direct address to the latter. The imperatives and greetings to the passerby, a staple element of inscribed sepulchral epigram, are here absent - Baucis does not entreat the reader to recount and remember her name, family, or who it was that carved the words, but rather speaks inwards, exhorting the tomb and its ornamentation to perform the memorialising act, and providing them with the requisite biographical details regarding the deceased.[119] In pre-Hellenistic epigrams in which the reader is not directly addressed, it can be assumed that the direct addressee functions as a cipher for the reader: in the sepulchral *CEG* 467, for example, Time is addressed with the vocative - ὦ Χρόνε - at the opening of the poem, and exhorted to ἄγγελος ἡμετέρων πᾶσι γενοῦ παθέων, "become a messenger of our sufferings to all men," (467.2) and the inscription proceeds to give the expected information regarding the circumstances of the deceased's fate.[120] In this epigram, a reader can readily elide himself with 'Time' and perceive himself as the text's addressee, thus becoming the agent by which the memory of the deceased is disseminated. In the case of *AP* 7.710, this process is not so straightforward: the multiplicity of addressees - στάλα καὶ Σειρῆνες ἐμαὶ καὶ πένθιμε κρωσσέ (7.710.1), all addressed in the vocative - fractures the notion of direct communication between reader and the text/monument by already establishing an identified body of addressees.

Compounding the reader's sense of disconnection, the poem seems to purposefully situate the reader at a remove from the temporal moment in which the epigram's narrative occurs. By encouraging the tomb and its attendants to speak to those passing by, and outlining what to say

---

7.262, Arat. 1 *GP* = *AP* 12.129. See also particularly Mel. 2 *GP* = *AP* 7.417, a self-epitaph in which the author remarks that πουλυετὴς δ᾽ ἐχάραξα τάδ᾽ ἐν δέλτοισι πρὸ τύμβου, "I inscribed these verses in my tablets before the tomb (i.e, before interment)" (7.417.7). We can also note the strangeness of multiple epigrams for one deceased: this suggests that at least one of the two was a later (book-epigram) imitation of the former, whatever medium the first epigram originated in, but is equally reminiscent of the Hellenistic penchant for variation on a theme, on which see Tarán (1979). See further Scholz (1973), 25-28, West (1977), 115-119, Rauk (1989), 103-104, Wöhrle (2002), 46-48, Neri (2003), 85-88.

[119] Tueller (2008), 32 notes that pre-Hellenistic epigrams which do identify an addressee ascribe that role to the passerby. It can be presumed that in cases in which the passerby is not directly addressed using a term such as ξένος *vel sim.*, they remain the addressee. See further Tsagalis (2008), 219-224. In the rare cases in which another is named as the addressee, they function as a persona of the passerby: see e.g. *CEG* 467 discussed below, or *CEG* 512, a dialogue epigram in which the poem is paratextually framed by the name of the deceased and his mother (which appear above and below the epigram on the monument), with the voice of the mother uttering the words expected by the passerby: see on this epigram further, Chapter 3.2. See also *CEG* 545.

[120] See further Tsagalis (2008), 223-224. Cf. Manwell (2005), 84 who states "in (*AP* 7.710), the poem itself is schooled by the poet in what to say, though only in the final line do we learn that Erinna has provided the tutelage", a position which I consider below.

(thus, what the passerby will hear), Baucis foresees a reader's encounter with her tomb, but, in that encounter, she is not the speaking voice, as she is in the reader's reception of the present epigram. The reception of the epigram that Baucis envisages is not, therefore, analogous to that which the reader actually experiences, and thus the reader's precise engagement with the epigram is rendered ambiguous: they are not the direct addressee of the present speaker, nor the passerby imagined hearing the epigrammatic voice of stele, Sirens and urn. In order to highlight the innovative re-application of convention that this epigram displays, we might consider the following inscribed epitaph (*CEG* 590):

> Φίλαγρος Ἀγγελῆθεν. Ἥγιλλα Φιλάγρο.
>
> ἡλικίαν μὲν ἐμὴν ταύτην δεῖ πάντας ἀκοῦσαι·
> εἰκοστῶι καὶ πέμπτωι ἔτει λίπον ἡλίου αὐγάς. |
> τοὺς δὲ τρόπους καὶ σωφροσύνην ἣν εἴχομεν ἡμεῖς
> ἡμέτερος πόσις οἶδεν ἄριστ᾿ εἰπεῖν περὶ τούτων.

> Philagros, of the deme Aggelai. Hegilla, wife of Philagros.
>
> Everybody must hear about my exact age:
> I left the light of the sun at my twenty fifth year.
> With respect to my habits and the prudence I had,
> my own husband knows how to speak best about them.

This 4th Century example displays a number of points of similarity with *AP* 7.710: the readership of the epigram is also explicitly extended beyond the reader engaged in the act of reception, by the assertion that δεῖ πάντας ἀκοῦσαι, "everybody must hear" (590.2) the details of the deceased's age at the time of her death.[121] However, the situation differs - while the reader of *CEG* 590 might conceptualise themselves as included within the greater whole of πάντας, the reader of *AP* 7.710 is implicitly excluded, owing both to the multiple specific addressees the epigram refers to, and the envisagement of an act of reception which differs from their own. Interestingly, this second facet also seems to occur in *CEG* 590, though with differing results: Christos Tsagalis has suggested that, in the closing lines, Hegilla - the deceased, and speaker of the epigram - obliquely refers to another epigram that divulges her good character, spoken in the voice of her husband.[122] The actuality of that inscription is unverifiable, and unimportant - Tsagalis stresses that its implied existence in what he terms the 'extra-carminal present' results in the actualisation of the memorialising effect that epigram

---

[121] Meyer (2005), 94-95, Tsagalis (2008), 221.
[122] Tsagalis (2008), 222.

would have engendered through the reception of the present epigram.[123] Similarly, I posit that the reader's encounter with *AP* 7.710 actually alludes to a second epigram.[124] Baucis' entreaty that stele, Sirens and urn say that Erinna ἐν τύμβῳ γράμμ᾽ ἐχάραξε τόδε, "carved this inscription upon the tomb" (7.710.8) demonstrates a remarkable subversion of the practice of epigrammatic self-reference, whereby the deictic τόδε does not refer directly to the epigram the reader encounters, but rather to the inscription that will be spoken in the voices of Baucis' tomb-attendants, upon the intended reader's encounter with the tomb. As a result, the actual reader is left decidedly unsure of their place in the relation to the epigram's narrative.[125]

Though the inscription which Baucis envisages her tomb's attendants speaking in *AP* 7.710 need not exist for the epigram's disjunctive point to hit home, the other sepulchral epigram ascribed to Erinna (2 *GP* = *AP* 7.712) would seem to preserve precisely such an inscription, now uttered, not by the deceased, but the tomb:

> νύμφας Βαυκίδος εἰμί· πολυκλαύταν δὲ παρέρπων
> στάλαν τῷ κατὰ γᾶς τοῦτο λέγοις Ἀίδα·
> "βάσκανος ἔσσ᾽, Ἀίδα." τὰ δέ τοι καλὰ σάμαθ᾽ ὁρῶντι
> ὠμοτάταν Βαυκοῦς ἀγγελέοντι τύχαν,
> 5 ὡς τὰν παῖδ᾽, Ὑμέναιος ἐφ᾽ αἷς ἀείδετο πεύκαις,
> τᾶσδ᾽ ἐπὶ καδεστὰς ἔφλεγε πυρκαῖᾶς·
> καὶ σὺ μέν, ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμων μολπαῖον ἀοιδὰν
> ἐς θρήνων γοερὸν φθέγμα μεθηρμόσαο.

> I am the tomb of the bride Baucis: passing the much mourned
> stele, say this to Hades below the earth:
> "You are envious, Hades." To you looking upon them, the fair symbols
> will announce Baucis' most cruel fate,
> 5 how, with the same torches with which Hymenaeus was hymned,
> her father-in-law kindled the girl on this conflagration:
> and you, Hymenaeus, transformed the harmonious song of weddings
> into the wailing cry of the *threnos*.

---

[123] Tsagalis (2008), 222.n.16: "In the case of epitaphs extra-carminal presents are unverifiable because of the lack of another epigram, where the 'promised' speech-act would be realised. This unverifiability is compensated for by the use of the present tense, which 'eternalises' past events by turning their potential commemoration in the future into a speech-act effectuated in the present."

[124] See Call. 40 *GP* = *AP* 7.522 which seems to evince a similar form of displacement: the epigram records the response of a reader upon an encounter with the stele of one Timonoë, but the actual inscription is supplanted by the reader's reaction to it - compare Call. 61 *GP* = *AP* 7.725. See further Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 318-320, Tueller (2008), 80.

[125] See Höschele (2007), 343-349 and (2010), 111-121 on a near-reverse of the unintended reader, the 'accidental reader', a figure whom the text addresses as if they had no intention of reading, and whose continued reading presence is ensured with direct commands to stop and read.

Indeed, here the tomb speaks directly to the passerby, as Baucis entreated it to in *AP* 7.710. Overall, this epigram appears, at first glance, more conventional in its usage of epigrammatic mechanics: the direct address to the passerby is accompanied by a command regarding how to act, in the moment the reader stands before the inscription.[126] However, the ambiguity of the precise nature of communication undertaken between reader and epigram is once more in evidence. *AP* 7.710 begins by speaking inwards - Baucis addresses her grave marker and tomb-ornaments, and envisages as their addressees a broad readership of local citizens and foreigners (*AP* 7.710.4-5), but she is seemingly unconcerned with the current reader's presence. In the final line she looks backwards in time, to the fiction of the tomb's creation, its moment of inception and inscription by Erinna. By comparison, in *AP* 7.712, the tomb begins by situating the reader physically in relation to itself - a recollection of the closed form of communication found in inscribed epigram - but this is disrupted by the epigram's second half, in which Hymenaeus is transformed from an actor in the narrative (*AP* 7.712.5) to the direct addressee of the epigram's voice, made overt by the vocative address ὦ Ὑμέναιε (7.712.7), the case always otherwise reserved for the passerby or their analogue.[127] Here, however, there can be no possibility that the address to Hymenaeus is, as in *CEG* 467, a covert address to the reader, as the reader has already been established by reference to their metaphorical activity of παρέρπων, "passing by" the epigram. There is thus a notable shift in the epigram's focus of attention with regards to the act of the reader: we can compare *AP* 7.712 with inscribed epigrams such as *CEG* 13, which concludes by informing the reader that ταῦτ᾽ ἀποδυράμενοι νεῖσθε ἐπ|ὶ πρᾶγμ᾽ ἀγαθόν, "after having uttered these bitter laments, go and do a good deed" (*CEG*.13.4), or even Nossis' sepulchral epigram which concludes with the stern ἴθι, "go" (11 *GP* = *AP* 7.718.4). These epigrams make overt a common expectation - that a reader will read the epigram in its entirety, and then go on their way, having (by their reading) fulfilled the memorialising function of the epigram - but no such expectation is present in *AP* 7.712.[128] Having commanded the reader to speak and say βάσκανος ἔσσ᾽, Ἀίδα (7.712.3), the epigram's voice shifts its focus, until the reader is emphatically removed from centre of attention with the address to Hymenaeus. In so doing, *AP* 7.712, much like *AP* 7.710, looks beyond the immediate

---

[126] Cf. the examples in n.75 above.

[127] The vocative address to Hymenaeus recalls the highly fragmentary 51-54 of the *Distaff*, in which the god is likewise addressed: Hymenaeus plays a similar role - mourning instead of offering expected benediction on the occasion of marriage (though not addressed directly) - in a number of sepulchral epigrams, both inscribed - such as the 4th Century *CEG* 587 - and book-forms; Posidip. *AB*.50, Leon.Alexandr. 9 *FGE* = *AP* 7.547. See also Diosc. 18 *GP* = *AP* 7.407, Antip.Sid. 56 *GP* = *AP* 7.711 and Mel. 123 *GP* = *AP* 7.182, and further de Stefani and Magnelli (2011), 540-541.

[128] See further Svenbro (1993), 48-63, Meyer (2007), Schmitz (2010b), Tueller (2010).

moment of reader-reception, eschewing the persistent focus upon the reader that we expect in inscribed sepulchral epigrams.

These two epigrams seem to form a complementary duo, not only in their treatment of the same theme, but furthermore as multiple moments in the perception of a single tomb and inscription pair. As Jackie Murray and Jonathan Rowland note, the first words of *AP* 7.712 respond to *AP* 7.710.5-6, Baucis' requests for the identification of her name and marital status (χὤτι με νύμφαν εὖσαν ἔχει τάφος· εἴπατε καὶ τό, / χὤτι πατήρ μ᾽ ἐκάλει Βαυκίδα) being substantiated in the utterance νύμφας Βαυκίδος εἰμί.[129] On account of this, we might well interpret the καλὰ σάματα of 7.712.3 as a multivalent reference to both the letters of the inscription - the current epigram, spoken in the voice of the tomb - and the ornaments addressed by Baucis in *AP* 7.710. Thus, as *AP* 7.710 looks forward to *AP* 7.712, so the reverse is true also: *AP* 7.712 recalls the content of the previous epigram, while at the same time enacting the reception situation that epigram perceived.[130]

The epigrams, therefore, engage with one another, and with the *Distaff*, in order to present a revised instance of the form of closed communication observed in inscribed epigram. In a departure from that tradition, the reader is ousted from their conventional central role, forced to become a passive attendant as the narrative of the epigrams occurs without regard for their continued engagement. The dislocation of the reader engendered by these epigrams thus stands as a notable revision of expected epigrammatic practice, but it equally serves to evoke the context established within the *Distaff*, thereby more closely linking all three poems.

In the *Distaff*, Erinna constructs an eternal context of lamentation (the *Distaff* itself) which exists beyond the spatio-temporally delimited occurrence of memorialisation enacted through Baucis' funeral, yet in constant contact with that fixed occasion: her persona expresses this duality by despairing over her inability to offer public lament at the graveside, while simultaneously engaged in the act of lamentation that, by the fact of its reception, supersedes the limited public context of the funeral rites. The lament thus occupies a liminal space both between and beyond public and private spheres: Erinna's persona despairs at the enforced privacy of her mourning but, in the process of the poem's dissemination, that mourning is transformed into a public utterance. On one level, the epigrams preserve this liminal aspect through the dislocation of the reader, but the texts equally recapitulate the dimorphous

---

[129] Murray and Rowland (2007), 222.
[130] On καλὰ σάματα, see particularly Scholz (1973), 26.n.45.

contextual character of the *Distaff*, through the manner in which they allude to their purported author.

Erinna's authorial presence, though never overt, permeates both texts: in *AP* 7.710, the closing identification of Erinna as the epigram's carver not only serves to allude to her authorship of the text, but equally stands as the culmination of elements directing a reader to interpret the poem in the context of the *Distaff*. Elizabeth Manwell posits that the stele, Sirens and urn are metonyms for Erinna's own words, and further suggests, ultimately, that the epigram presents a merger of Baucis and Erinna into one "narrating "I".[131] I suggest that Manwell's conflation of author-figure and narrator into a unified voice diminishes the interpretive nuance of her prior point: Erinna is not the direct narrating voice of the epigram, but rather exerts authorial influence in the process of its creation. That she is not the speaking voice, but rather the cause of that voice, renders her position in the process of reception ambiguous, involved in - yet aloof from - the mourning of Baucis, as in the *Distaff*.

In *AP* 7.712, Erinna is never mentioned by name, but is rather made manifest in a subtler manner than the previous epigram. Firstly, the command to the reader to speak to Hades, saying βάσκανος ἔσσ᾽, Ἀίδα, "you are envious, Hades" (7.712.3) is notable - this expression is attributed to Erinna herself in a sepulchral epigram ascribed to either Leonidas of Tarentum, or Meleager (98 *GP* = *AP* 7.13):[132]

> παρθενικὴν νεάοιδον ἐν ὑμνοπόλοισι μέλισσαν
>   Ἤρινναν Μουσῶν ἄνθεα δρεπτομένην,
> Ἄιδας εἰς ὑμέναιον ἀνάρπασεν· ἦ ῥα τόδ᾽ ἔμφρων
>   εἶπ᾽ ἐτύμως ἀ παῖς, "βάσκανος ἔσσ᾽, Ἀίδα."

> As Erinna, the maiden honeybee, the new singer in the poets' choir
>   was gathering the flowers of the Muses,
> Hades carried her off to wed her: that was a true word, indeed,
>   the girl spoke when she lived, "you are envious, Hades."

Neri, following Martin West, has argued convincingly that βάσκανος ἔσσ᾽, Ἀίδα is itself likely a quotation of the *Distaff*, rather than an original product of this epigram.[133] The voice of Erinna's authorial persona as established in the *Distaff* thus seemingly sounds out from *AP* 7.712 but, more than that, the reader is enlisted as the medium for her utterance. By asking the reader to repeat Erinna's words - to assume her voice - the epigram enacts a reversal of the

---

[131] Manwell (2005), 86.
[132] Gow and Page give it as Leon.Tarent. 98 *GP* = *AP* 7.13: see further Gow and Page (1965), II.394.
[133] Neri (2003), 86, West (1977), 115. See also Rauk (1989), 104.

Distaff: Erinna becomes an addressee of the narrative, rather than the addresser, through the cipher of the reader. I suggest that the epigram's covert address to Erinna continues, despite the previously discussed shift in focus from the reader, and this can be detected if we consider the address to - and depiction of - the god Hymenaeus (7.712.7-8):

> καὶ σὺ μέν, ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμων μολπαῖον ἀοιδὰν
> ἐς θρήνων γοερὸν φθέγμα μεθηρμόσαο.

> and you, Hymenaeus, transformed the harmonious song of weddings
> into the wailing cry of the *threnos*.

The transformation of Hymenaeus from the subject of song (at 7.712.5) into the singer is significant, in part because it deviates from the more standard descriptions of the god's role within the marriage ceremony, a deviation which mirrors the change in theme of the song itself. Recurrently, the god is described as presiding over the wedding festivities,[134] or is hymned as the wedding song personified,[135] but is rarely depicted as the singer and - in other Hellenistic examples we possess - occasions on which his singing is invoked are subversions of expected practice: in Bion's *Lament for Adonis*, Hymenaeus is described as ceasing his own song (ἑὸν μέλος, *Epitaph.Adon*.89) and offering spoken laments (ἔλεγ', "αἰαῖ αἰαῖ", *Epitaph.Adon*.89-90) for Adonis while, in an erotic epigram of Dioscorides (6 *GP = AP* 5.52.5-6), the epigram's voice proclaims:

> θρήνους, ὦ Ὑμέναιε, παρὰ κληῖσιν ἀκούσαις
> Ἀρσινόης, παστῷ μελψόμενος προδότῃ.

> Hymenaeus, when you come to sing at the traitorous marriage bed,
> may you hear laments for Arsinoe at the latch.[136]

In *AP* 7.712, as in these other examples, Hymenaeus' song is a subversion of expectation (as a result of the change in tone from nuptial into mournful): his transgression of the narrative frame - his shift from subject to addressee, from song to a singer - reiterates this subversive aspect of his presentation.[137]

In light of this, it follows to consider what role Hymenaeus plays within the epigram beyond that of flavour, or ornamentation: the god's connection not only with marriage, but also with

---

[134] E.g., *CEG* 587.
[135] E.g., Sapp. fr.111, Ar. *Av*.1720, *Pax*.1316ff., E. *Troad*.308ff., *Phaëth*.229, A.R. 1158ff.
[136] See Gärtner (2007a) on the reading of μελψόμενος in l.6 as opposed to μεμψαμένους by Gow and Page (1965).
[137] The presentation of Hymenaeus as the (successful) singer of the wedding song becomes more common over time, e.g., Cat. 61.1-15, Stat. *Silv*.1.2.238, *Theb*.5.65-70.

death intermingled with marriage,[138] makes him a particularly suitable figure to preside over Baucis' epitaph, much as he is an apt presence in other such epigrams for the virginal dead,[139] but this thematic suitability should not obscure a more covert metapoetic role. I posit that Hymenaeus also functions as a cipher, but not for the reader as we would expect, but for Erinna, making the epigram's concluding address to the god the continuation of an ongoing, covert address to the poet. Three particular aspects in Hymenaeus' depiction liken the god to Erinna: firstly, we can note that Hymenaeus' dual role within the epigram as both the subject of song and its singer recapitulates the transgression of the narrative frame of the *Distaff* which Erinna's persona undertakes (occupying both the role of a character within the lament and that of its performer).[140] Secondly, if we consider the narrative development of both epigrams, we can observe that Hymenaeus' presentation within *AP* 7.712 is a parallel to that of Erinna in *AP* 7.710: both are the last figures to be named within the respective epigrams, and both are described as engaged in an act of poetic production and memorialisation - Erinna 'carving' the γράμμα, Hymenaeus transforming the harmonious song of weddings into the wailing cry of the *threnos*, both preserving the memory of Baucis in an act of medial metamorphosis.[141] Considering the nature of Hymenaeus' compositional act in greater detail, we can finally perceive a clear comparability in the depiction of the god's action with Erinna's own act of composing the *Distaff*: Olga Levaniouk, in her analysis of the *Distaff*, persuasively argues that the poem is "not just a lament but a lament that is so distinctly full of wedding diction as to constitute a wedding song for the dead Baukis", and further suggests that Baucis, and the persona of Erinna to an extent, come to embody the hybrid form of wedding song mixed with lament.[142] Taking this assessment into account, we can observe that, in *AP* 7.712, Hymenaeus' act of singing, and particularly the transformative aspect of his song, echoes Erinna's own composition of the *Distaff*.

AP 7.712 thus undertakes a startling reconfiguration of the standard dynamics of epigrammatic communication: the reader, once the sole focus of an epigram's attention, becomes a liminal figure, displaced to the edges of the narrative, addressed only temporarily, and as the cipher for another. That this other is Erinna, the purported author of the text, is a subversion of expected

---

[138] A fragment of a *threnos* by Pindar laments Hymenaeus, and notes that the god died ἐν γάμοισι χροϊζόμενον; Pind.fr.128c7-8 Snell-Maehler. On the ritual similarities of mourning and marriage, see Alexiou (2002), 118-130, and further Levaniouk (2008), with bibliography at 205.n.15.
[139] See above, n.127.
[140] See West (1977), 109-110 on the self-referentiality of Erinna's naming within the *Distaff*.
[141] Compare the depiction of Erinna as eternally remembered in Antip.Sid. 58 *GP* = *AP* 7.713.
[142] Levaniouk (2008), 201. Cf. Rauk (1989) on the separation of lament and wedding-song within the poem.

epigrammatic practice, particularly with regards to the conventions of the sepulchral sub-genre: though book-epigrams which take poets as their subject are numerous, and there are a number of examples of self-epitaphs, epigrams which manifest their author in the role of addressee are extremely rare, and those examples we do possess are obvious departures from the standard epigrammatic forms.[143] *AP* 7.712 retains the formal conventions of sepulchral epigram, utilising familiar elements such as the address to the passerby, and the recurrent conceit of the tomb occupying the speaking role, but drastically revises the role the author adopts within the narrative development and reception of the epigram. In so doing, the text displays a wholly original construction of authorial persona in epigram. The Erinna created by *AP* 7.712 occupies the same conceptual space as the anonymous authors of inscribed epigram, as a figure whom the text's reception presupposes the existence of, but who occupies no immediate role within the process of reception. However, by covertly occupying the role of the epigram's addressee, Erinna transcends the enforced anonymity of the majority of inscriptional epigrammatists and becomes an integral facet of the act of reading. The Erinna of the epigrams possesses an authorial persona which exists in antecedence to the reader's engagement with the text, and, simultaneously, contemporaneous with the moment of reception. The dual liminal/central character of Erinna's role within the epigram recalls the *Distaff* on a thematic level, but also evokes the role Erinna's persona adopts within that work. *AP* 7.712 thus serves as a multivalent recapitulation of the *Distaff*, utilising and subverting the conventions of epigrammatic communication in order to re-present Erinna's lament on numerous levels.

The epigrams ascribed to Erinna therefore evince a deft reconfiguration of the relationship between author, reader and text. The strict delineation of the roles each agent involved in the production and reception of the epigram must adopt is, in these poems, fractured: *AP* 7.710 demonstrates an epigram's ability to displace a reader from the envisaged moment of epigrammatic reception, while *AP* 7.712 demonstrates the possibility for an author to enter the process of reception through wholly unexpected and unconventional means. These subversions of expected practice occur in conjunction with - and in service of - the thematic re-presentation of the *Distaff,* in order to recreate the distinctive context that poem evokes: the distancing,

---

[143] E.g., Asclep. 16 *GP = AP* 12.50, an epigram which mixes sympotic and erotic elements with conventional sepulchral aspects, and in which the precise identity of the speaking voice is purposefully ambiguous: see further the discussion of this epigram in Chapter 3.2. Hedyl. 5 *GP =* Ath.11.473a, a similarly sympotic work, plays with the notion of address to the author, with the speaking voice of the epigram exhorting the reader to say παῖζε Ἡδύλε, "play, Hedylus": see further Gutzwiller (1998), 179-180, Sens (2015).

displacing mode which characterises Erinna's persona in the *Distaff* - reflecting her dual separations from Baucis - is evoked through the manipulation of expectations engendered by the material and medial contexts of epigram, in order to capture the essence of her lament in epigrammatic microcosm. The poems further manage to encapsulate the authorial persona established by Erinna in the *Distaff*, despite her absence in either epigram as a direct speaking voice: indeed, these epigrams ingeniously demonstrate that an author need not speak in order that they might be palpably detected as an authorial presence in text.

*   *   *

Assessing both Hellenistic book-epigram, and its inscribed antecedents, I have proposed that the critical change between the two forms of the genre is the rupturing of the emphatic presentness of the moment of reception. This can be attributed in large part to the differing material situations within which the two forms function. The symbiosis of text and object that defines inscribed epigrammatic reception is fractured with the advent of the book-roll as a medium:[144] the notion of communication between text and reader, grounded in the fiction of the speaking object or the still-vocal corpse which epigram engages in, is problematised when all material trappings that encourage a subscription to said fiction are lacking.[145] With the absence of physical materiality, the spatio-temporal demarcation of the moment of reception dissolves, leaving authors free to choose whether to adhere to the contextual strictures established by the inscriptional tradition or abandon them: the results of this new, ambiguous context can be clearly observed in the flourishing of book-epigrams which capitalise on the subversion of readerly expectation with regards to the material (un)reality of book-epigram. The ambiguity which attended epigram in its medial transition resulted, most significantly, in the possibility for the author to figure within in the text: in contrast to Ion and his contemporaries - identified as the author by the text, but placed in strict actecedence to the reception and resolution of the same - later authors began to emphasise their authorial role through their occurrence within the text as an internal presence, thus remaining a part of the reader's receptive act. In articulating this presence, Hellenistic epigrammatists utilised the very elements which had absented their inscribed counterparts as a means of revealing and defining themselves.

Reflection upon the medium and materiality of epigram pervades the process of authorial representation, and I have demonstrated their centrality in the epigrams ascribed to Erinna, which can be taken as exemplary or the artful nuance at play in the genre at large. Particularly, I have emphasised the co-mingling of authorial representation, generic reflection, conventional manipulation and intertextual reproduction within these exegetically dense texts: the epigrams ascribed to Erinna are masterful examples of the evocative potential of the genre, but also highlight how epigram had itself become an apparatus for critical engagement with ideas of authorship and poetic appreciation. Whether we accept the epigrams as genuinely the work of Erinna, or that of one or more other authors using her name as their persona, I have argued that

---

[144] See among others Rossi (2001), 17-21 and A. Petrovic (2005) on the unity of monument and inscription, and further Zanker (2004), Männlein-Robert (2007a), (2007b) on the unity of image and text in Hellenistic poetry.
[145] See further Bing (1998), 29, Männlein-Robert (2007a), 252-253, Höschele (2010), 93-99, Wachter (2010). On the appropriation of the reader's voice by text, see particularly Svenbro (1993), 44-63, 187-216.

the interrelation between the epigrams and the *Distaff*, and the reimagining of Erinna's poetry as both a template for epigrammatic expression, and a model for authorial (re-)presentation, testifies to the nuanced appreciation Hellenistic authors held for epigram as a medium for literary criticism. This appreciation was further reflected in the complex role occupied by poetic predecessors in relation to the genre, and moreover within the process of authorial self-representation. It is to this phenomenon that I turn in the following chapter.

Chapter 2
The Roles of Predecessors in Acts of Self-Representation

Introduction

By the first decades of the 3rd Century, epigram had been established as the medium *par excellence* through which contemporary authors engaged with poets of the past, imagining dedications accompanying their statues, envisaging the epitaphs inscribed upon their tombs, or - particularly representative of the tastes of the age - writing labels to accompany collections of their poetry. Peter Bing has labelled this habit, as it pertains to Hellenistic poetry more generally, the 'memorialising impulse', whereby the authors of the day sought not only to honour and praise their predecessors, but also to exert control over the tradition which those predecessors embodied.[146] The inextricable interconnection of these two aims - memorialisation and control of the poetic past - typifies the fundamentally cross-spatiotemporal nature of the Hellenistic poetic milieu: while the grandees of the archaic and classical periods might strictly precede their Hellenistic counterparts, their ubiquity within contemporary poetry meant that the geographical and temporal specificity of their historical situation was, effectively, circumvented. This is not to say that poets (Hellenistic or earlier) existed in an acontextual limbo; indeed, as I touch on in this chapter, geographical associations played a part in the representation of many poets. It is equally the case that biographical traditions about pre-Hellenistic poets flourished post-mortem, and in this flourishing we must recognise that, though the poets themselves were dead, their lives continued on, shaped by the contemporary context of their reception. As a result of this, poetic predecessors did not stand in static antecedence to the authors of the Hellenistic period, but were rather an active element in the processes of self-definition and reflection upon tradition which contemporary authors engaged in.

We can observe one of the most significant consequences of the continued liveliness of poetic predecessors in the impact biographical perceptions of poets had upon the construction of

---

[146] Bing (1993), 620. The literature on this topic is vast, and I give here a select number of items: on the memorialising impulse expressed as biographical narrative more generally see Momigliano (1971), Lefkowitz (1978), (1981), (1983), (1991), Bing (1993), Clay (1998), Hodkinson (2010), Peirano (2013), Whitmarsh (2013), and more generally the items collected in Hill and Marmodoro (2013); Bing (1988a), Gutzwiller (1998), Rossi (2001), 81-106 and Klooster (2011), 15-42 consider the impulse in epigram; Clay (2004) and Kimmel-Clauzet (2013) treat the manifestation of the trend as embodied in the cults of poets; Hannink (2008), Knöbl (2010) and Hägg (2012) have examined Satyrus' *Life of Euripides* as an example of the memorialising impulse directly joined with literary criticism.

corpora ascribed to them. The recurring presence of poets as personae overtly shaped the development of their biographical traditions: this is in part due to fluidity between the concepts of 'author' and 'narrator' in the process of reception (as discussed in the Introduction), but equally, the occurrence of the persona of the poet outside their own work - that is, their representation by another, which implicitly (though occasionally also explicitly) claimed to be a faithful depiction of the poet in question - contributed to the formation of the poet's biography. The effect of the notion of the poet *qua* persona, with a defined personality which emerges from their poetry (and which is further epitomised in their later representations), is apparent in the processes of collation and anthologising, activities which utilised the character of the poet as a tool by which to determine the authorial identity behind works transmitted without a record of authorship. This can be observed particularly well in epigram: Hellenistic readers encountered, in the inscribed poems which predated the texts of their own day, a wealth of epigrams that for the most part lacked authorial attribution, regardless of their socio-political significance or aesthetic merit.[147] This trove of poems with absentee authors was set upon by a Hellenistic readership intent on discovering authorship, and determined to substantiate the tradition which predated the poetry of their own day, in an expression of the memorialising impulse which demonstrates the biographical underpinnings of the phenomenon. We can schematise readers' biographically-minded responses to the issue of epigrammatic attribution in the following manner:

1) Readers sought to ascribe poems based on personal, thematic or contextual markers which aligned a poem with what was known of the poet (viz., their biographical tradition).

2) Readers conceptualised the poet as a persona born of those same markers, which could then be used to identify further works seemingly generated by that constructed persona.[148]

Through this recursive process, the persona of the poet and the character of the poems ascribed to them became entangled, giving rise to a representation of the poet that stereotypically emblematized their work. Poets who possessed even a hint of pre-existing epigrammatic

---

[147] On the Hellenistic poets as readers, see particularly Bing (1988b) and, as readers of inscriptions, Bing (2002). On the sources through which inscribed epigrams were transmitted, see particularly A. Petrovic (2007a), (2013).
[148] Gutzwiller (1998), 52-53, specifically sees the collecting habit as the basis of these responses in the case of epigram: "eventually, the epigrams ascribed to Simonides and Anacreon were gathered into editions, where the individualising traits of the authors, those that were often the basis for ascription, could be constructed by the reader as a poetic persona". See further Turner (1968), 103-104, Krevans (1984), (2007), Argentieri (1998), Hutchinson (2008), 1-41, Höschele (2010), 89-93.

association, such as Simonides, rapidly acquired epigrammatic corpora,[149] sometimes based on ascriptions by earlier writers such as Herodotus and Thucydides,[150] but also due to the literary biographies of authors such as Chamaeleon,[151] which testified to their character as deduced from anecdotal evidence about their lives.[152] This process of ascription and retroactive 'en-corporation' was not conducted in a vacuum: rather, as collections of epigrams were compiled and edited over scores of years, earlier authors attracted works of later Hellenistic origin penned by imitators, in what Kathryn Gutzwiller terms a "creative interaction between scholarly practice and poetic originality."[153] The ubiquity of this tendency is particularly evident in the extension of the process beyond authors with established epigrammatic associations to include poets already famed for non-epigrammatic and non-inscribed compositions, such as Plato, Sappho, Pindar, and Erinna, as observed in the previous chapter.[154]

Considering epigram as a genre, the memorialising impulse can be seen to take two forms. The biographical traditions of earlier poets' personae influenced the reception of existing works, contributing to the construction of epigrammatic corpora for those poets as a result of their perceived characters. Simultaneously, predecessors' personae were constructed by contemporary authors within their own works, in order to situate themselves within the poetic milieu, through close association with their forebears. Recognising these processes at work leads to a question: how far were contemporary authors aware of the pitfalls of an uncritical reconstruction of the poet from their poetry, and of falling foul of the biographical fallacy? The answer, I suggest, is more than has perhaps been granted by many modern scholars. Bing stresses that perceiving all of those engaged in the memorialising impulse as naïve, with regards to the veracity of their construction of a biographical representation of an author, is a folly,[155] and this is borne out by the analysis of said representations. We can consider, as an example, Theocritus' complex reflection on the process of biographical inference in his epigram on a statue of Anacreon (15 *GP* = *AP* 9.599):

---

[149] See in general Gutzwiller (1998), 47-53; on Simonides' collection, see, e.g., Reitzenstein (1893), A. Petrovic (2007a), (2007b), Sider (2007).

[150] On the quotation of epigrams in historiographical sources, See Volkman (1975), West (1985), Higbie (1999), (2010), A. Petrovic (2007a), (2007b).

[151] E.g., of Simonides: Ath. 10.456c, 14.656c-d.

[152] See generally Kivilo (2010), Lefkowitz (2012).

[153] Gutzwiller (1998), 53. On the Hellenistic poets' scholarly practices, see particularly Pfeiffer (1968) and Blum (1991).

[154] See, e.g., Barbantani (1993) on lyric poets represented in Hellenistic epigram, and, e.g., Acosta-Hughes (2010), 82-104 on the changes wrought upon the authorial persona of Sappho as a result of the epigrams which circulated under her name. See further Rossi (2001), 81-106, Klooster (2011), 15-42, de Vos (2014).

[155] Bing (1993), 627-631.

θᾶσαι τὸν ἀνδριάντα τοῦτον, ὦ ξένε,
　σπουδᾷ, καὶ λέγ᾽ ἐπὴν ἐς οἶκον ἔνθῃς·
"Ἀνακρέοντος εἰκόν᾽ εἶδον ἐν Τέῳ
　τῶν πρόσθ᾽ εἴ τι περισσὸν ᾠδοποιῶν".
5　προσθεὶς δὲ χὤτι τοῖς νέοισιν ἅδετο,
　ἐρεῖς ἀτρεκέως ὅλον τὸν ἄνδρα.

Look at this statue attentively, stranger,
　and when you return home, say
"I saw an image of Anacreon in Teos
　the best of the singers of old, if there was one."
5　If you add that he found delight in the young,
　you will accurately describe the whole man.

It has been suggested that the poem - instructing the reader that a viewing of the statue, coupled with a touch of supplementary information regarding the old poet's pederasty, will ἀτρεκέως ὅλον τὸν ἄνδρα, "accurately describe the whole man" (9.599.6) - is itself a damning response to biographical depictions of Anacreon.[156] While such interpretations metamorphose the themes of his poetry into characteristics of the man himself, Theocritus' epigram highlights one's inability to get the measure of the man through such reductive and stereotypical characterisation. Here, much as in the epigrams ascribed to Erinna, the tension between the internal presumption of the text's material/physical context and the reader's divergent perception of the text as a literary artefact reiterates the critical point of the poem: the reader's inability to 'see' the statue means that any viewing, whether attentive or not, is ultimately impossible.[157] The reader will be forever unable to provide a full encapsulation of Anacreon on the basis of this epigram alone, divorced as it is from the necessary supplementary information required for true accuracy.

Anacreon makes for a particularly apt figure through which to raise the question of biographical misrepresentation - as Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Silvia Barbantani remark, "the

---

[156] Bing (1988a), 117-121. See also Rossi (2001), 283-285. Cf. Klooster (2011), 40-41 who suggests the poem is, instead, an introduction to Anacreon for a schoolboy, not yet mature enough to learn the salacious details of the poet's oeuvre, and Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007), 443, who read the poem as analogous to the stereotypical epigrams offered by the other Hellenistic epigrammatists. Cf. other epigrams on statues of the poet, such as Leon.Tarent. 31 *GP* = *APl* 306, 90 *GP* = *APl* 307; or epitaphs, e.g., 'Simon.' 3 *GP* = *AP* 7.24, 4 *GP* = 7.25, Diosc. 19 *GP* = *AP* 7.31, all of which dwell on Anacreon's poetically appropriate fondness for wine. Compare also later examples, Antip.Sid. 13 *GP* = *AP* 7.23, *AP* 7.23B, 14 *GP* = *AP* 7.26, 15 *GP* = *AP* 7.27, 16 *GP* = *AP* 7.29, 17 *GP* = *AP* 7.30, Jul.Aegypt. *AP* 7.32, *AP* 7.33. See further Barbantani (1993), 47-66, Rossi (2001), 280-283, Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007), 442-445, Campbell (2013), 142-143, Gutzwiller (2014), 48-56.
[157] Rossi (2001), 279 notes that the epigram fails to provide information about the material from which the statue is made, a feature she identifies as characteristic of such epigrams; its absence in this epigram seems to further emphasises the reader's failure to perceive the statue's physical form. See further Rossi (2001), 17-21, particularly 17.n.14.

epigrammatic tradition views Anacreon as a character rather than an author",[158] and this character - the received and revised persona of the poet - was almost wholly reduced to the traits of drunkenness and infatuation by epigrammatists such as Leonidas, who begins an epigram on the poet (31 *GP* = *APl* 306) πρέσβυν Ἀνακρείοντα χύδαν σεσαλαγμένον οἴνῳ / θάεο, "gaze upon old Anacreon, befuddled and stumbling from wine".[159] In isolation, Theocritus' epigram seems to address the particular problem of Anacreon's biographical tradition but, considering the author's other epigrams which take poets as their subject, we can observe a more sustained rejection of an uncritical reading of poets' lives through their poetry, as well as a rebuttal to the reductionist depictions of poets in epigram. Theocritus' poems on statues of Pisander (16 *GP* = *AP* 9.598) and Epicharmus (17 *GP* = *AP* 9.600) laud the poets' works, but make no attempt to suggest that either man takes after the character of his poetry. The epigrams on Hipponax (13 *GP* = *AP* 13.3) and Archilochus (14 *GP* = *AP* 7.664) - both poets who acquire clearly defined personae, within the biographical tradition - eschew a purely stereotypical biographical representation: the sepulchral poem for Hipponax dwells on the poet's oft-recalled anger, but that anger is redirected and refined, aimed now only at the morally wicked, rather than humanity *tout court*;[160] the epigram on a statue of Archilochus focuses solely on the extent of his fame, and does not touch on the venomous character of his verse (or, supposedly, of the man himself) which forms the crux of other epigrams which take the poet as their subject.[161]

Theocritus' rejection of the stereotypical biographical representations of poets offers a counterpoint to the notion that all ancient readers were acting on the biographical fallacy.[162] However, we should not extrapolate Theocritus' approach to the Hellenistic milieu *in toto*. Indeed, many authors did adhere to stereotypical depictions of their predecessors - but the supposition that this, in turn, is evidence of the fallacy in action does not necessarily follow. To utilise Jacqueline Klooster's terminology, predecessors functioned as window and mirror

---

[158] Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007), 442.

[159] On the selective development of Anacreon's persona by the later tradition, see particularly Rosenmayer (1992). On the development of the Anacreontic corpus, see Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007), 442-445, 455-457. Gabathuler (1937), 71 suggests that the epigrammatic conception of Anacreon may depend on a lost work by Chamaeleon. Pfeiffer (1968), 118 suggests Zenodotus may have made the first critical edition of Anacreon's poetry in the early part of the 3rd Century, which would doubtless also have provided material for those constructing a biographical portrait of the author. See further Dell'Oro (2014), Gutzwiller (2014).

[160] Cf. the more stereotypical epigrammatic depictions of the poet; Leon.Tarent. 53 *GP* = *AP* 7.408, Alc.Mess. 13 *GP* = *AP* 7.536, Phil. 34 *GP* = *AP* 7.405: Rossi (2001), 298 suggests Theocritus' epigram is intended as a "correction" to the negative representation of Hipponax as seen in Leonidas' epigram. See further Rosen (2007), 470-471.

[161] See below, n.185.

[162] See Beecroft (2010), 2 on the modern tendency to assume the biographical fallacy in ancient readers.

for their Hellenistic descendants:[163] in representing their forebears, authors simultaneously represented something of themselves, creating their predecessors in accordance with their own perceptions, predilections, or an underpinning programmatic agenda.

I focus on two works which contain just such a programmatic aspect in this chapter: the so-called *Seal* of Posidippus and Callimachus' *Tomb of Simonides*. Both authors demonstrate a complex engagement with notions of media, materiality and of the poetic predecessor as a model, with neither straightforwardly adducing their forebears as a template, either for their poetry, their authority or their reception.[164] Rather, within these poems, Posidippus and Callimachus draw upon the biographical traditions which surround particular predecessors - Archilochus and Philitas for the former, Simonides for the latter - and reinterpret them as characters, whose very representations serve to aggrandise their authors: concurrently, both authors establish authorial personae (Posidippus overtly, Callimachus covertly) which are themselves memorialised in the the recollection of their predecessors.

Both Posidippus and Callimachus utilise the traditional physical memorials which accompanied epigrams (the statue and the tomb, respectively) as a means of engaging with their predecessors. However, the works themselves are not epigrams *per se*, but rather evoke the conventions and context of the genre, resulting in poems which we might term para-epigrammatic, texts which utilise the genre as a conceptual framework, but do not adhere to its formal structure. This act of recontextualisation is, I suggest, a particular innovation of the book-roll format both authors employ, and it is this aspect that makes the *Seal* and the *Tomb of Simonides* eminently suitable as case studies for issues of bookish self-representation.

---

[163] See, e.g., Klooster (2011), 9.
[164] See particularly the discussion of poetic predecessors as models by Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 1-42 and Klooster (2011), 43-73.

2.1   *The intertextual representation of predecessors in the Seal of Posidippus*

In this section, I consider one of the more fascinating - and, in parts, frustratingly unclear - poems in which authorial self-representation occupies a central role: the *Seal* of Posidippus (*P.Berol.* inv.14283 = *SH* 705 = *AB* 118).[165] Containing reflections on poetic immortality, intermingled with hints of a more substantive eschatological desire for continued life after death, the work simultaneously evinces a complex intertextual engagement with poetic predecessors, in which two poets - Archilochus and Philitas - are seemingly adduced (overtly and covertly) as models for Posidippus' own self-representation, and the honours he desires. However, the author does not recapitulate the honours received by his predecessors for himself, *tout court*: rather, he iterates on the traditions surrounding his predecessors in a manner which, I suggest, reflects Posidippus' own perception of his bookish poetic practice.

Prior to the turn of the 21st Century, the scholarly assessment of Posidippus was that, while an epigrammatist of some import in his day, his output was not of the quality or significance of Callimachus, Asclepiades or his other early 3rd Century contemporaries.[166] This lukewarm reception underwent a dramatic reassessment following the publication, in 2001, of the *editio princeps* of *P.Mil.Vogl.* VIII 309 - now more commonly referred to as the Milan Papyrus - by Guido Bastianini and Claudio Gallazzi:[167] the papyrus, used as cartonnage and dating to the

---

[165] See Barigazzi (1968), 194 for earlier scholarship on the *Seal*; see also recent useful discussions of text, or aspects of it, in Fernández-Galiano (1987), 36-39, Bing (1988b), 15, 37-38, Rossi (1996), Angiò (1997), (2011), Gutzwiller (1998), 153-154, Clay (2004), 30-32, 84-86, Hunter in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 74-75, Gärtner (2006), Kwapisz (2010), Klooster (2011), 177-183, Tsantsanoglou (2013).

[166] The judgment of Hollis (1996), 59-60 that Posidippus was a poet of "better than average" epigrams, though not comparable to Asclepiades, typifies scholarly assessment of the author, prior to the discovery of the Milan Papyrus. Posidippus can be dated securely to the 3rd Century: he is named in degrees of proxeny from Delphi (*FD* III.3 no.192), dating to either 276/5 or 273/2, and Thermon (*IG* IX 1^{2}.17.24), dating to 263/2; in the latter he is referred to as Πο[σ]ειδίππῳ τῷ ἐπιγραμματοποιῷ Πελλαίῳ (we compare his description as ἐπιγραμματογράφος at schol. ad A.R. I.1289), which concurs with the author's own testament to his Pellaean origins in the *Seal* (118 *AB* = *SH* 705). The chronological span of the epigrams in the Milan Papyrus extend from the mid-280s to the late 240s; see further Gow and Page (1965), II.481-484, Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001), 17, 208, 215, Gutzwiller (2005a), 4-7. The placement of Posidippus and Asclepiades amongst Callimachus' Telchines in the *scholia Florentina* (schol. Flor. ad Call. *Aet.*fr.1 Pf.), and the occurrence of the name Asclepiades in the Delian proxeny decree, in the line following that of Posidippus, supports the notion of a general association between the two poets; the suggestion by Reitzenstein (1893), 100-102 that Posidippus belonged to an epigrammatic clique along with Asclepiades and Hedylus - based on the supposition that the three published a joint collection called the Σωρός (see schol. A ad Hom. *Il.*11.101 = 114 *AB* = *SH* 701) - has been much debated: see Lloyd-Jones (1963), 96-97, Gow and Page (1965), II.116, Gutzwiller (1998), 18-19, 152-157, Ferrari (2004), Höschele (2010), 82, 309-311, Sens (2011), xciv-xcv on the collection as solely that of Posidippus; see Bergk (1853), 507-508, Merkelbach (1956), 123-124, Cameron (1993), 369-376, Lloyd-Jones (2003a), (2003b) in support of the multi-author hypothesis. I am grateful to Peter Bing for allowing me to see his forthcoming article on the *Soros*, in which he convincingly argues for its sole authorship by Posidippus, and that it principally contained sepulchral epigrams for epic heroes, on which see further Nagy (2004).

[167] Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001).

late 3nd Century, contained approximately 112 epigrams in a rare example of a Hellenistic epigram book, complete with subheadings, though seemingly lacking the original opening or close of the roll, or a colophon.[168] It has now been generally accepted that the papyrus is a single-author collection and, based on the previous ascription of two of the epigrams to Posidippus in other sources (*GP* 18 = *AB* 65, *GP* 20 = *AB* 15, the only epigrams within the roll recorded elsewhere), the book-roll has been labelled as Posidippean in its entirety.[169] A number of scholars have noted the thematic overlap between the so-called 'New' and 'Old' Posidippus: Nita Krevans has particularly highlighted the characteristic sympotic/erotic motifs of wine, women and song that colours the first section of the Milan Papyrus on stones (with the restored heading [λιθι]κά), which harken back to the previously known Posidippean epigrams, the majority of which are found in books 5 and 12 of the *Palatine Anthology*.[170] Equally, the themes of Ptolemaic aggrandisement and aesthetic reflection which are prominent in the Milan Papyrus - particularly in the *Lithika* and the ἀνδριαντοποιικά, on statues - find parallels in the other poems, notably in the most commented-upon text of 'Old' Posidippus:[171] the *Seal* poem.

An elegy of c.25 damaged lines, preserved only on wax tablets,[172] and seemingly the product of a 1st Century AD school exercise, the *Seal* (as named by Hugh Lloyd-Jones)[173] is a variation on a common programmatic leitmotif, wherein the author appeals to the Muses to aid him against oncoming old age.[174] That this poem either opened or concluded a book of Posidippus'

---

[168] See Johnson (2005) who argues, *contra* Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001), that at least a column is missing from the beginning of the roll; cf. Bing (2005) who suggests that the *Lithika* constitutes a programmatically appropriate opening to the collection, and I. Petrovic (2014), who demonstrates how the *Lithika* synthesises Greek, Achaemenid and Near-Eastern motifs in a programmatically potent evocation of Ptolemaic royal propaganda.

[169] For assessment of the view that the papyrus is wholly Posidippus' work, see Parsons (2002), 117-118. More strident opposition to the single-author position is offered by Lloyd-Jones (2003a), Ferrari (2004), Schröder (2004); cf. Fantuzzi (2002), Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou and Baumbach (2004), 4-5, Sider (2004), Gutzwiller (2005a), 2.n.3. The question of whether Posidippus edited the collection is more vexed; Krevans (2005), 88 suggests the headings "indicate the reference librarian", though much scholarship has demonstrated the internal aesthetic coherence of the sections, suggesting a less utilitarian organising purpose - for a general overview, see Gutzwiller (2004), (2005b) - though this of course does not rule-out the possibility of an aesthetically astute editor.

[170] Krevans (2005), 84-86. See further on the interrelation between 'Old' and 'New 'Posidippus particularly Obbink (2004), Sider (2004), Nisetich (2005).

[171] On Ptolemaic themes in Posidippus, see particularly Kosmetatou (2004a), (2004b), Stephens (2004), (2005), Bing (2005), Fantuzzi (2005), Thompson (2005), Belloni (2008), I. Petrovic (2014). On Ptolemaic motifs in the *Seal*, see particularly Gauly (2005).

[172] See P.14283 A, B, http://smb.museum/berlpap/index.php/04036/ (last accessed June 2016), which offers high-quality photographs of the tablets, though one can note the serious deterioration of the wax compared to the photographs of the tablets found in Lloyd-Jones (1963).

[173] See Lloyd-Jones (1963), 96 for the identification of particularly sphragistic features; compare Thgn. 19ff., discussed in the Introduction. See Dickie (1995), 67 on the alternate appellation of the poem as the 'testament' of Posidippus.

[174] Compare Call. *Aet.*fr.1.36-40 Pf. See further Barigazzi (1968), 201, Cameron (1995), 183-184, Hunter in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 72-76.

poems has long been assumed,[175] though which book this was remains unclear.[176] The work constitutes a dense programmatic statement in which the author proclaims the legitimacy of the poetry he composes (and that his poetry is authored in conjunction with the Muses), foreseeing the spread of his fame, and the forms of honour he will receive as a result:

εἴ τι καλόν, Μοῦσαι πολιήτιδες, ἢ παρὰ Φοίβου
  χρυσολύρεω καθαροῖς οὔασιν ἐκλ[ύ]ετε
Παρνησοῦ νιφόεντος ἀνὰ πτύχ[α]ς ἢ παρ᾿ Ὀλύμπου
  Βάκχῳ τὰς τριετ‹ε›ῖς ἀρχόμεναι θυμέλα[ς,
5 νῦν δὲ Ποσε[ι]δίππῳ στυγερὸν συναείσατε γῆρας
  γραψάμεναι δέλτων ἐν χρυσέαις σελίσιν.
λιμπάνετε σκοπιάς, Ἑλικωνίδες, εἰς δὲ τὰ Θήβης
  τείχεα Πιπ[ ]. . .ς βαίνετε †. . . αλαδες†
κεἰ σὺ Ποσ‹ε›ίδιππόν ποτ᾿ ἐφίλα‹ο›, Κύνθιε, Λητοῦς
10   υ. . . . .
10A [. .] . [. . . . . .] . . ραγ[.]νω . . . .
  †φήμη‹ν› τὴν (ἀφ)ίεις, τὴν κατὰ† τοῦ Παρίου,
  τοίην ἐκχρήσ‹α›ις τε καὶ ἐξ ἀδύτων καναχήσαι[ς
  φωνὴν ἀθα‹νά›την, ὦ [ἄν]α, καὶ κατ᾿ ἐμοῦ,
  ὄφρα με τιμήσω[σι] Μακηδόνες, οἵ τ᾿ ἐπὶ Νείλ[ῳ
15   οἵ τ᾿ Ἀσίης πάσης γ‹ε›ίτονες ἠϊόνος.
Πελλαῖον γένος ἀμόν· ἔοιμι δὲ βίβλον ἑλίσσων
  †ἄμφω† λαοφόρῳ κείμενος εἰν ἀγορ[ῇ.
ἀλλ᾿ ἐπὶ μὲν Παρ‹ί›η δὸς ἀηδόνι λυγρὸν ἐφ. . . .
  νᾶμα κατὰ γληνέων δάκρυα κεινὰ χέω[ν
20 καὶ στενάχων, δι᾿ ἐμὸν δὲ φίλον στόμα. . . . . [
20A   . . . [. . .] . . . .[
20B [. .] . . . .[
  μηδέ τις οὖν χεύαι δάκρυον. αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ
  γήραϊ μυστικὸν οἶμον ἐπὶ Ῥαδάμανθυν ἱκοίμην
  δήμῳ καὶ λαῷ παντὶ ποθεινὸς ἐών,
  ἀσκίπων ἐν ποσσὶ καὶ ὀρθοεπὴς ἀν᾿ ὅμιλον
25   καὶ λείπων τέκνοις δῶμα καὶ ὄλβον ἐμόν.[177]

---

[175] See Lloyd-Jones (1963), 96 on the *Seal* as an opening poem, Barigazzi (1968), 202 on it as a concluding piece.
[176] Schol. A ad Hom. *Il*.11.101 seemingly testifies to two books, with a comparison being made between information found in τοῖς Ποσειδίππου ἐπιγράμμασι and in the Σωρῷ: see on the *Soros*, Bing (forthcoming). Gutzwiller (1998), 154-157 suggests the heading σύμμεικτα ἐπιγράμματα at *SH* 961 testifies to a further book, and believes at least five different books circulated under Posidippus' name (*Soros*, *Epigrammata*, *Miscellaneous Epigrams*, the collection contained within the Milan Papyrus, and a collection of a principally amatory character), with the *Epigrammata* being a final, authorised collection, capped by the *Seal*. Lloyd-Jones (1963), 84, 96 posits that the *Seal* may have headed a collection entitled Γῆρας, based on the call to the Muses to νῦν δὲ Ποσε[ι]δίππῳ στυγερὸν συναείσατε γῆρας, "sing now with Posidippus of hateful old age" (118.5). On Posidippus' non-epigrammatic works, see Gow and Page (1965), II.483-484.
[177] I give the text printed by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983), with the following alterations: in l.3, I follow Lloyd-Jones (1963) who gives Ὀλύμπου as opposed to Ὀλύμπῳ; In l.12, I accept the suggestion of Tsansanoglou (2013), who builds upon the reading of the line by Clay (2004), and proposes φήμη‹ν› τὴν (ἀφ)ίεις, τὴν κατὰ τοῦ Παρίου, as opposed to †φημητινιφιεντοικεια† τοῦ Παρίου; in l.14, I follow Kwapisz (2010) in supplementing the end of the line as Μακηδόνες, οἵ τ᾿ ἐπὶ Νείλ[ῳ as opposed to Μακηδόνες οἵ τ᾿ ἐπὶ ν[ήσων.

If Muses of my city, you have heard something fair with pure ears,
    from Phoebus of the golden lyre
in the glens of snow-clad Parnassus or from Olympus,
    as you initiate the triennial rituals of Bacchus,
5   sing now with Posidippus of hateful old age,
    inscribe it in the golden columns of your tablets.
Leave the peaks, Heliconians, and come to the walls
    of Pip[lean] Thebes, [   ]
And you, Cynthus, if you ever loved Posidippus, Leto's
10   [son]………………
10A   ………………………
    (?as you proclaim the renown) of the Parian -
such you prophesied and thus was the immortal voice
    you made echo from your inner chamber - give for me the same also, o lord,
so that the people of Macedon, those on the Nile
15   and the neighbours of all the Asian shore might honour me.
Pellean is my descent: might I, unrolling a book-roll
    (?with both hands), rest in the thronged agora.
But give now a mournful stream for the Parian nightingale,
    empty tears pouring down from the eyes,
20   and groaning, while through my own dear mouth . . . . .
20A   . . . [. . .] . . . .[
20B   [. .] . . . .[
    let no one shed a tear. For nevertheless I,
in my old age, might come to the mystic path of Rhadamanthus,
    missed by my fellow citizens and all the people,
on my feet without a staff and speaking rightly amidst the crowd,
25   and leaving to my children my home and wealth.

The damaged state of the tablets means that a degree of caution must be exercised in reconstructing the text: that being said, we can readily appreciate that the *Seal* contains a multifaceted construction of Posidippus as an authorial persona. Throughout the work, we observe divergent forms and ideas being brought together to contribute to Posidippus' self-representation and aggrandisement. This is apparent in the juxtaposition of the desire for poetic immortality - unending recognition for the excellence of one's work - with spiritual immortality, gained through initiation into mystery cult.[178] These two types of immortality, for the poetry and the man, are intertwined, and this is noticeable from the outset of the work: the invocation to the Muses in the opening lines recalls the oft-utilised motif of a poet requesting aid in composing from those figures, but, as Matthew Dickie has noted, it equally evokes motifs

---

[178] See particularly Dickie (1995), (1998), Rossi (1996); see also Dignas (2004) on the sepulchral epigrams of the Milan Papyrus as reflective of Posidippus' association with Dionysiac mystery cult. See further Bernabé and Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008), 51, 164-165.

closely connected the mysteries,[179] a duality which the reader is primed to recognise with the depiction of the Muses beginning the Βακχῳ τὰς τριετ‹ε›ῖς θυμέλα[ς (118.4).[180] The overlapping concerns of poetic immortality and immortality beyond that which poetry can provide sets the *Seal* apart from other statements which attest to the notional everlasting memorial which poetry establishes: we can compare the *Seal* with Callimachus' epigram on the death of the poet Heraclitus (34 *GP* = *AP* 7.80) as a paradigmatic example:

> εἶπέ τις, Ἡράκλειτε, τεὸν μόρον, ἐς δέ με δάκρυ
>   ἤγαγεν, ἐμνήσθην δ' ὁσσάκις ἀμφότεροι
> ἠέλιον [ἐν] λέσχῃ κατεδύσαμεν. ἀλλὰ σὺ μέν που,
>   ξεῖν' Ἁλικαρνησεῦ, τετράπαλαι σποδίη,
> 5   αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, ᾗσιν ὁ πάντων
>   ἁρπακτὴς Ἀΐδης οὐκ ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ.

> Someone, Heraclitus, told me of your fate, and brought me to tears,
>   when I remembered how often the two of us
> had sunk the sun in conversation. Though you,
>   Halicarnassian guest-friend, are, I suppose, dust ages past,
> 5   your nightingales live:
>   Hades, who grasps all, will not lay a hand on them.

In Callimachus' epigram, a distinction is made between Heraclitus' mortal existence, punctuated by his death, and the immortal memorial of his poetry.[181] In the *Seal*, by contrast, there is no such differentiation: that Posidippus' persona envisages coming to the path of Rhadamanthus when he is γήραϊ (118.22) immediately recalls the appeal made to the Muses to sing with him of στυγερὸν γῆρας (118.5), raising the question of whether the mystic path will arise solely as a result of lived practice, or whether Posidippus' poetry will contribute to this end.

The juxtaposition of multiple forms of immortality is characteristic of Posidippus' programmatic endeavours within the *Seal*, and the author's engagement with his poetic predecessors is likewise multifaceted, drawing together disparate elements and unifying them

---

[179] Dickie (1998), 67-68: Dickie notes particularly the potential ritual connotations of καθαροῖς οὔασιν (118.1) and the recollection of the Orphic gold *lamellae* in the δέλτων χρυσέαις σελίσιν (118.6) used by the Muses to record their joint singing with Posidippus.

[180] See, on the Orphic connection of the Dionysian triennial rites, *Orph.H.*30.5, 43, 44.7, 51, 53.4-5, 54.3; see further *h.Bacch.*fr.D.1-3, West (2003), Hdt. 4.108, Virg. *Aen.*4.300-303 Stat. *Achil.*594-597, *Theb.*2.662, Plut. *Qaest.Conv.*671c-672c, *SEG* 35.1327. See also Graf (2009), Athanassakis and Wolkow (2013), particularly 161-162. On the Muses' relationship to the mysteries more generally, see Hardie (2004) and (2016).

[181] It has been plausibly suggested that Heraclitus' ἀηδόνες are, at least, a metaphor for his poetry, if not actually a reference to a collection entitled *Nightingales*: see further MacQueen (1982), Walsh (1990), 1-4, Hunter (1992), Gutzwiller (1998), 206-207, 250-251.

through the presentation of his authorial persona. Posidippus' process of self-memorialisation is particularly notable for its programmatic employment of differing mediums, and forms of media, in conjunction with the representation of his predecessors. Within the *Seal*, instances of writing, reading or speaking (all activities which, when occurring in a poem of programmatic importance, have an inherently self-referential aspect) signpost Posidippus' engagement with other poets, recalling traditions associated with his predecessors and incorporating those traditions into his own act of self-representation.

The presence of Archilochus within the *Seal* has been well established, with Lloyd-Jones recognising the allusion to the oracular responses on Archilochus preserved in the inscriptions of Mnesiepes and Sosthenes.[182] That Posidippus' desire for a statue equally recalls the honours purportedly bestowed upon Philitas of Cos has also been recognised; however, I suggest that Posidippus does not simply evoke general details about the Coan poet. Rather, the author brings to mind his own representation of Philitas, in an epigram found in the Milan Papyrus, and tellingly also on a statue of the poet (*AB* 63): I suggest that this is a comparably programmatic work, which also contributes to the process of authorial self-representation as undertaken in the *Seal*. The representation of Archilochus, and the recollection of that of Philitas elsewhere in Posidippus' poetry, serve partially as models for Posidippus' own desired honour and memorialisation, but equally act as foils for Posidippus' authorial persona. The traditions surrounding each predecessor are reflected in Posidippus' self-representation, a process which suggests both continuity with the great poets of the recent and more distant past, but equally implies - through the combination of these various traditions as aspects of Posidippus' own honours - the author's surpassing of his predecessors.

That Posidippus desires for himself honours comparable to those received by Archilochus is clear: despite the difficulties in reading *AB* 118.11, the concluding τοῦ Παρίου, the letters φημη which open the line and the subsequent description of an Apolline oracular response prompt the recollection of the most famous Parian who received such tributes. Active in the 7th Century, and long famed for his iambic invective, Archilochus was in receipt of a cult on Paros by at least the 4th Century. Numerous later sources attest its existence: Aristotle reports that Πάροι γοῦν Ἀρχίλοχον καίπερ βλάσφημον ὄντα τετιμήκασι, "the Parians honour Archilochus, despite his abuse of them" (*Rhet.*2.23.1398b 11-12), alluding to the vituperative genre in which he

---

[182] Lloyd-Jones (1963), 87-89. The Mnesiepes Inscription is *SEG* 15.517, the Sosthenes Inscription is *IG* XII 5, 455.

composed, while Plutarch recounts that both Archilochus and Hesiod received fame in death, διὰ τὰς Μούσας (*Numa*.4.6).[183] Happily, inscriptional evidence supports the literary record for Archilochus' cult. Dating to the mid-3rd Century,[184] the Mnesiepes inscription preserves the oracle purportedly received by Archilochus' father Telesicles, which guaranteed Archilochus' heroisation (*SEG* 15.517.col.II.50-52):

> 50   [ἀ]θάνατός σοι παῖς καὶ ἀοίδιμος, ὦ Τελεσίκλεις,
>   ἔσται ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ὃς ἄμ πρῶτός σε προσείπει
>   νηὸς ἀποθρῴσκοντα φίλην εἰς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

> 50   That son of yours will be immortal, Telesicles,
>   and a theme of song among men, he who is the first to greet you
>   as you have leapt from your ship onto your beloved native land.

The inscription recounts, furthermore, how Mnesiepes - on account of a proclamation from Apollo - was undertaking construction of a precinct wherein he had established an altar, on which he was sacrificing to the Muses, Apollo, Mnemosyne and other Olympian deities (1-13). The god, in response to an offering made by Mnesiepes at Delphi, declared that is was best to honour Archilochus (14-15), and henceforth the Parians had called the precinct the Archilocheion (15-20). Furthermore, the inscription describes how Archilochus, as a boy, had made fun of a group of women he thought were travelling to the city, who laughed with him and asked to buy the cow Archilochus was bringing back from the fields for his father. When he agreed, both cow and women vanished, and lying at the boy's feet was a lyre. Archilochus realised that then that the women were the Muses, and that the lyre was their gift to him (20-40). Telesicles, travelling to Delphi to decipher the events, received the oracular response above, and Archilochus was the first of his sons to greet him as he disembarked upon his return (50-55).

Recollections of the narrative of Archilochus' heroisation can be found throughout the *Seal*: the description of Apollo's φωνὴν ἀθα⟨νά⟩την which bestowed upon the Parian an oracular response (118.13) evokes the Delphic reply recorded in the Mnesiepes inscription, with its pronouncement that Archilochus will be ἀθάνατος, a condition which will come about in part as a result of the oracle itself. There is not, however, a direct parallel between what Posidippus' persona desires and what Archilochus experienced. The differences between the two may

---

[183] See also Oenom. *FPhGr* II 374 Mullach, D.Chr. *Orr*.(A)33.11
[184] See, on the date of the inscription, Bing (1993), 619, Clay (2004), 10-11.

perhaps have been precisely delineated in the fragmentary *AB* 118.20 and following: we can glean, despite the damage, that while the nightingale of Paros should be given a λυγρὸν νᾶμα δάκρυα (118.18-19), for Posidippus himself, μηδέ τις οὖν χεύαι δάκρυον (118.21). A contrast may further have been drawn between Posidippus' φίλον στόμα (118.20) and the famously bitter tongue of Archilochus:[185] Lloyd-Jones suggests that Posidippus here suggested a suitable offering for himself to contrast with the tears Archilochus was due, perhaps wine.[186] There is equally a difference in the two poets' relationships with the Muses. Seemingly, Archilochus' encounter with the Muses, and his receipt of the lyre which symbolises his poetic ability (*SEG* 15.517.col.II.36-38),[187] is inverted in the *Seal*, as rather than a young man meeting unknown strangers in the wilds and receiving (unbidden) a symbolic gift, Posidippus' elderly persona knowingly summons the Muses to him, in the city,[188] and requests they bring the emblem of his poetry - the δέλτος - so that they might record their joint composition, transforming song into text (118.5-6). Therefore, while Posidippus' persona desires comparable recognition from Apollo, he does not simply wish to be a second Archilochus: as Peter Bing has noted, Posidippus' Muses are metamorphosed from singers to writers,[189] evincing a bookishness in keeping with the vogue of early Hellenistic poetry. At the same time, Posidippus takes care to depict himself as a correspondingly bookish figure (118.16-17):[190]

> Πελλαῖον γένος ἀμόν· ἔριμι δὲ βίβλον ἑλίσσων
> †ἄμφω† λαοφόρῳ κείμενος εἰν ἀγορ[ῆ.

> Pellaean is my descent: might I, unfurling a book-roll
>   (?with both hands), rest in the thronged agora.

Particularly noteworthy in this passage is the convergence of the two signature means by which poets were depicted in epigrams: opening with an attestation of descent, these lines immediately recall an epitaph, and this notion is reinforced by the usage of κεῖμαι to describe Posidippus' activity, given the verb's frequent usage of the deceased in sepulchral epigrams.[191]

---

[185] Compare Diosc. 17 *GP = AP* 7.351, adesp./Mel. 132 *GP = AP* 7.352, adesp. 32 *FGE = AP* 9.185, Gaet. 4 *FGE = AP* 7.71, Jul. Aegypt. *AP* 7.69, 7.70: notably, Julian of Egypt, writing in the 5th Century AD, refers to Archilochus' πικροχόλου στόματος (*AP* 7.69.4), and we could readily imagine such a description contrasting with Posidippus' 'friendly' mouth here.

[186] Lloyd-Jones (1963), 91. See also Clay (2004), 75.

[187] On the receipt of symbolic items by poets during moments of initiation, see further Chapter 4.2.

[188] Also notable is that, in their description as πολιήτιδες (118.1), the Muses are characterised as overtly urban. See further Bing (1988b), 37-38.

[189] Bing (1988b), 15.

[190] We can note such bookish self-representation by Posidippus elsewhere, in the description of himself (as the "Muses' cicada") as ἐν βίβλοις πεπονημένη, in *AB* 137 = 6 *GP = AP* 12.98.

[191] See, e.g., *CEG* 52, 95, 500, 720, and further Tueller (2008), 46-48. Compare also the usage of τίθημι in a similarly multivalent passage in Call. *Aet*.fr.64.11-13 Pf., discussed below, Chapter 2.2.

However, the expectation of an epitaph is undercut, firstly by the absence of Posidippus' name (or that of his father), and secondly by the fact that he does not rest (dead),[192] but rests while βίβλον ἑλίσσων. The readers must, therefore, reconfigure their expectations: Posidippus' persona does not envisage his tomb, but rather desires a statue memorial depicting himself to be placed in Pella's busy agora (given the declaration of Pellaean origins which precedes the wish, we can assume that town as the statue's location),[193] perusing the symbol of his poetry (with a textual form akin to that of the Muses' δέλτοι), and the means by which his renown will be disseminated. Thus, Posidippus here conjoins the two principal modes of memorialising poets in epigram, reapplying the language of the epitaphs which adorn their tombs to a different kind of memorial - a statue. His statue's activity of unfurling the book-roll reflects the re-contextualisation of epigrammatic remembrance in which Posidippus engages, along with his peers: it is through the book-roll that one now encounters poetic predecessors and memorialises them, but, correspondingly, it is equally the vehicle through which authors memorialise themselves. The statue which Posidippus' persona desires is itself, therefore, a wholesale encapsulation of the author's poetry, emphasising its memorialising ability.

At the mid-point of the *Seal,* the wish for a statue marks a transition, from the persona's cletic appeal to the Muses and Apollo for divine recognition and aid (118.1-10), and the description of how the propagation of his fame might occur (118.11-15), to an imagining of the results of the spread of his fame (118.18-25). The statue, while playing with the tropes of poetic representation which operate within epigram, is simultaneously a materialised substantiation of the desired honour done to Posidippus by the people of the Ptolemaic realm.[194] As noted, the wish for a statue in a location of long-standing importance for the poet finds a parallel in the honours reportedly bestowed upon (and perhaps also sought by) Philitas.[195] A fragment of

---

[192] Cf., e.g., *CEG* 720, κεῖμαι τε[ῖδ]ε θανοῦ|σα (πατρὶ[ς] δέ μοί ἐστ|ι Κόρινθος).

[193] See Lloyd-Jones (1963), 89-90, Dickie (1994), 377.

[194] The possibility that Posidippus' desires were acted upon is not wholly implausible: a statue in the Vatican Museum (inv. no.735), bearing the label ΠΟΣΕΙΔΙΠΠΟΣ on its base (and holding a book-roll) has been identified either as Posidippus the epigrammatist or Posidippus of Cassandreia, a 3rd Century comic playwright. On this statue, see particularly Dickie (1994), Clay (2004), 30-32, 84-86, Stewart (2005), 202-203: on the typically Roman appearance of the statue, see Fittschen (1992).

[195] See particularly Dickie (1994), Hollis (1996), Hardie (1997), (2003), Sens (2002), Spanoudakis (2002), 34-40. It appears Archilochus was also represented in sculpture, seated holding a lyre: a 1st Century copy of a late 3rd Century original survives today, now in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (inv. no.1563). Clay (2004), 58-60 highlights that depictions of a sitting Archilochus were not rare, but notes the usage of a throne rather than a stool was a Hellenistic embellishment on the previous traditions of representation: compare Theoc. 14 *GP = AP* 7.664. See further Clearchus fr.92 Wehrli which describes Simonides of Zakynthos performing Archilochus' poems while seated, and further a 1st Century silver tetradrachm from Paros, bearing an image of a seated figure, holding a lyre and perhaps a book-roll (see Clay (2004), pl.31). See also, on the evidence of revisionist depictions of poets, Pausanias 9.30.3 on the seated statue of Hesiod with a *kithara* in the Heliconian sanctuary of the Muses; the author

Philitas' poetry, preserved in Athenaeus, which reads θρήσασθαι πλατάνῳ γραίῃ ὕπο, "to sit under an old plane tree" (fr.14 Powell) has often been read in conjunction with a passage from Hermesianax' *Leontion,* as evidence both of Philitas' desires for cultic honours, and their subsequent fulfilment (fr.7.75-78 Powell):[196]

> 75   οἶσθα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃν Εὐρυπύλου πολιῆται
>   Κῷοι χάλκειον θῆκαν ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ
> Βιττίδα μολπάζοντα θοήν, περὶ πάντα Φιλίταν
>   ῥήματα καὶ πᾶσαν ‹τ›ρυόμενον λαλίην.

> 75   You know the singer, whom the citizens of Eurypylus,
>   the Coans, set up in bronze under a plane tree
> singing of nimble Bittis - Philtas,
>   worn out by all the words and sayings.[197]

This, along with later references to the poet's honours,[198] have been taken as possible evidence for a cultic site established for Philitas on Cos.[199] If Hermesianax' passage reflects an actual dedication, the statue celebrating Philitas would have been in place towards the beginning of Posidippus' *floruit*, and thus his own persona's wish for a statue would find precedent - and a near-contemporary model - in the honours done to the Coan.[200] This notion is given further credence by an epigram from the Milan Papyrus: it has been suggested that the statue of Philitas which stood under the plane tree in Cos is the same as that depicted in the following Posidippean epigram, on a bronze of Philitas sculpted by Hecataeus (*AB* 63):[201]

> .τόνδε Φιλίται χ[αλ]κὸν [ἴ]σον κατὰ πάν‹θ›{α} Ἑκ[α]ταῖος
>   ἀ]κ[ρ]ιβὴς ἄκρους [ἔπλ]ασεν εἰς ὄνυχας,
> καὶ με]γέθει κα[ὶ σα]ρκὶ τὸν ἀνθρωπιστὶ διώξας

---

comments that this depiction is inappropriate, as Hesiod's own poetry makes clear he should be holding a staff of laurel (compare Hes. *Theog.*30-31). See further Corso (2007), Rotstein (2010), 232-234.

[196] Hollis (1996) considers whether fr.14 Powell may have itself been a sphragistic work, though cf. Spanoudakis (2002), 156-157 for reservations regarding this reading.

[197] Cf. Caspers (2005), 575, who proposes ρυόμενον at l.78 and translates "rescuing all difficult words and glosses". See further discussion below on the trope of Philitas as worn out by his research.

[198] E.g., Prop. 3.1., *Callimachi manes et Coi sacra Philitae*; Prop. 3.9.43-46, *Inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos / et cecinisse modis, Coe poeta, tuis. / Haec urant pueros, haec urant scripta puellas, / meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant*; see also Prop. 4.6.1-4; Stat. *Silv*.1.2.252-255, *hunc ipse Coo plaudente Philetas Callimachusque senex Umbroque Propertius antro / ambissent laudare diem, nec tristis in ipsis / Naso Tomis divesque foco lucente Tibullus*. See, on these cases, particularly Hollis (1996), 56-59, Spanoudakis (2002), 37-40, 59-63.

[199] See particularly Hardie (1997).

[200] On the comparable dating of Hermesianax and Posidippus, see Hardie (2003), 36. To this day, the plane tree called the 'Tree of Hippocrates' stands in Cos on the square named the *Platía Platanou*: if this was (or was envisaged as) the site of Philitas' statue, the public setting would align with that desired by Posidippus. See further Sherwin-White (1978), 283.n.78; on the possible location of the statue(s) of Philitas (those recorded by Hermesianax and Posidippus) see particularly Hardie (2003).

[201] Stewart (2007), 131 argues that the statue referred to by Posidippus is the same as that depicted in Hermesianax; Hardie (2003) is more cautious, suggesting it might either be the same statue, or a Ptolemaic dedication in Alexandria.

<div align="center">

5   γνώμο]ν', ἀφ' ἡρώων δ' οὐδὲν ἔμειξ{ε} ἰδέης,

ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀκρομέριμνον ὅλ[ῃ κ]ατεμάξατο τέχνῃ

πρ]έσβυν, ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν [ἔχων] κανόνα·

αὐδήσ]οντι δ' ἔοικεν, ὅσῳ ποικίλλεται ἤθει,

ἔμψυχ]ος, καίπερ χάλκεος ἐὼν ὁ γέρων·

.. Πτολε]μαίου δ' ὧδε θεοῦ θ' ἅμα καὶ βασιλῆ⟨ο⟩ς

10   ἄγκειτ]αι Μουσέ{ι}ων εἵνεκα Κῷος ἀνήρ.[202]

</div>

Hecataeus formed this bronze equal in every way to Philitas,
    accurate to the extremity - down to the nails.
Pursuing a human measure in size and body,
    he mixed in nothing from the form of heroes,
5   but modelled the deep-thinking old man with all his skill,
    [holding] to the straight canon of truth:
he seems [about to speak], so greatly embellished with character -
    [living], though an old man of bronze.
Thus by Ptolemy, god as well as king,
10   the Coan man [is dedicated], on account of the Muses.

This epigram stands out amongst Posidippus' collection for a number of reasons: as Alex Hardie notes, it is the only epigram of the *Andriantopoiika* to describe a contemporary sculpture.[203] Furthermore, it is also the only poem in the Milan Papyrus to take a named poet as its subject, and - amongst Posidippus' extant corpus - it is one of only two epigrams to make reference to named poets or their works (and the only one which dwells on one poet exclusively).[204] The shared nexus of ideas which occur in *AB* 63 and the *Seal* invites a closer comparison of the two poems, as comparable works with a programmatic aspect. However, what emerges from such a comparison is the realisation that there is not a straightforward correspondence between the depiction of the two poets. Points of similarity do exist: we can observe that the statue of Philitas is explicitly that of an old man (63.6, 8), which recalls Posidippus' persona's allusion to his own (perhaps incipient) aged status (118.5, 22). Furthermore, the initial evocation of the Μοῦσαι πολιήτιδες (118.1) might imply an imagined performance-context for the *Seal* within a civic Museion, as suggested by Hardie,[205] and a similar setting may well be perceived for *AB* 63, implied by the final comment that Ptolemy

---

[202] I print the text given by Austin and Bastianini (2002). See further Sens (2005), 209, Seidensticker (2015), 256-261, and also Acosta-Hughes, Angiò, Cuypers and Kosmetatou (2016), 32.

[203] Hardie (2003), 34, 36: *AB* 63 must have originated after 272/271, when Ptolemy II Philadelphus was deified. The Colossus of Rhodes, described in *AB* 68, is the next most recent sculpture of the *Andriandtopoiika*, completed in 294.

[204] The other being 9 *GP* = *AP* 12.168, on which see Gutzwiller (1998), 162-163. *AB* 9, on a stone set upon Polycrates' signet ring, describes the inscribed depiction of a man singing with a lyre before the tyrant: the choice of this image as Polycrates' σφρηγ[ῖδα] (9.1) could well reflect Posidippus' own perceived relationship between himself and the premier literary patrons of the day, the Ptolemies.

[205] Hardie (2016), 127.n.332.

dedicated the statue Μουσέ{ι}ων εἵνεκα, "on account of the Muses" (63.8).[206] However, as with Archilochus, Posidippus eschews the presentation of his predecessor as a model *tout court*. Instead, he employs the tradition surrounding his predecessor's memorialisation - and utilises his own representation of the poet - as a point of comparison for his own self-representation.

The representation of Philitas' statue draws upon a recurrent motif of descriptions of statuary: we are told that the figure is so lifelike that, though bronze, it seems about to speak: αὐδήσ]οντι ἔοικεν (63.7). This expression of wonder at the remarkably lifelike quality of the statue - so vividly realised that it might even begin talking - finds multiple parallels in other works,[207] with one particularly notable example in an epigram ascribed to Asclepiades, which seemingly provides model for Posidippus' epigram (43 *GP* = *APl* 120):[208]

> τόλμαν Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ ὅλαν ἀπεμάξατο μορφὰν
>   Λύσιππος - τίν' ὁδὶ χαλκὸς ἔχει δύναμιν -
> αὐδασοῦντι δ' ἔοικεν ὁ χάλκεος ἐς Δία λεύσσων·
>   "γᾶν ὑπ' ἐμοὶ τίθεμαι, Ζεῦ, σὺ δ' Ὄλυμπον ἔχε".

> The courage of Alexander and his whole form were modelled
>   by Lysippus - what power this bronze possesses -
> he seems about to speak, the bronze man gazing at Zeus:
>   "I set Earth beneath me, Zeus, you hold Olympus!"

We can here observe a situation akin to that found in *AB* 63, though with one critical difference: Alexander seems about to speak… and then does so! In contrast, Philitas remains silent. The supposition that Philitas does not speak is based on a restoration of ἄγκειτ]αι in *AB* 63.10, as opposed to ἄγκειμ]αι, proposed by Ruth Scodel and followed by Andrew Stewart, which would have the statue utter the final lines *in propria persona*.[209] Scodel suggests that the preceding remark on the lifelike quality of the statue "is very weak if the statue does not say anything".[210] This, however, does not take into account that the deviation from model of *APl* 120 contributes to Posidippus' overarching process of aesthetic reflection within the *Andriantopoiika*, nor does it recognise the complex programmatic role the recollection of *APl* 120 plays in *AB* 63.

---

[206] See particularly Hardie (2003) for a discussion of the evidence to support this assumption, and further Hardie (1997), Angiò (2002), 23.
[207] See, e.g., Erinn. 3 *GP* = *AP* 6.352, Herod. 4.32-34, and further below.
[208] The epigram is also ascribed to one Archelaus, but the ascription to Asclepiades is more secure; see Gow and Page (1965), II.146-147. On the relationship between this epigram and *AB* 63, see Sens (2005), 213-215, (2011), 291-294.
[209] Scodel (2003), Stewart (2005), (2007).
[210] Scodel (2003), cf. Sens (2005), 215.n.31.

To fully grasp the import of *APl* 120 as partial model in *AB* 63, we must turn to the previous poem in the sequence of the *Andriantopoiika*, which is the first of the section. In the opening words of *AB* 62, μιμ[ή]σασθε τάδ᾽ ἔργα, "imitate these works", Posidippus establishes the programmatic tone of the *Andriantopoiika* (or, at the very least, of the few poems which follow *AB* 62 directly):[211] the author undertakes a microcosmic analysis of the state of Hellenistic portraiture and its forerunners, considering issues of representative accuracy, aesthetic ability, grandeur, size and heroism. Within *AB* 62, Posidippus presents a catalogue of sculptors, before ultimately judging Lysippus a master of the medium - but the author's judgement is not solely confined to sculpture: as Alexander Sens has suggested, the initial reference to τάδ᾽ ἔργα might well be taken as a reference to Posidippus' epigrams, as well as the statues they present, thus expanding Posidippus' aesthetic critique from statuary alone, to statuary and poetry simultaneously.[212] In so doing, Posidippus implies that his criteria for judging sculpture might equally be applied to poetry, particularly his own.[213] Posidippus' presentation of Lysippus as the pinnacle of sculptural achievement in *AB* 62 must therefore be kept in mind when considering the role of *APl* 120 - a similar celebration of Lysippan excellence - as an intertext for *AB* 63. The oblique recollection of Lysippus' magnificent representation of Alexander (in *APl* 120), through the comparable reflection on the Philitas-statue's lifelike quality (in *AB* 63), alludes to Lysippus' crowning as sculptor *par excellence* in *AB* 62, and thus connects *AB* 63 to the critical commentary of the *Andriantopoiika* as a whole, through the intermediary of the non-Posidippean epigram. The use of *APl* 120 as a programmatic intertext for select epigrams of the *Andriantopoiika* can equally be detected in the next poem in the sequence (*AB* 64):[214]

αἴ]νεέ γ{ε} Ἰδομεν‹ῆ›α θέλων χάλκειον ἐκεῖν[ον
    Κρησίλ‹α›· ὡς ἄκρως ἠργάσατ᾽ εἴδομεν εὖ.
γ]αρύ[ει] Ἰδομενεύς· ἀλ[λ᾽] ὦ ᾽γαθὲ Μηριόνα, θεῖ,
    ....]πλασται δὰν [ἀδό]νητος ἐών.

Praise, if you please, that bronze Idomeneus
    of Cresilas: we observe well how accurately he made it.
Idomeneus speaks: "good Meriones, run,
    ….. having been long immobile."

---

[211] The damaged state of *AB* 66, 68, 69 and 70 make a full assessment of the overarching themes of the *Andriantopoiika* more difficult; see further Sens (2005), 224-225.

[212] Sens (2005), 209; Gutzwiller (2002), 45 had previously proposed that we might read these first words as an expression of Posidippus' authorial position.

[213] See further Gutzwiller (2002), Stewart (2005).

[214] Sens (2005), 225 proposes that the thematic consistency of the first epigrams of the *Andriantopoiika* may reflect authorial - as opposed to just editorial - arrangement.

Reinforcing the notion that this epigram engages with the overarching motifs of the section, and that it invites comparison with *AB* 63, the sculptor Cresilas is, like Hecataeus, commended for his accuracy in sculpting, ἄκρως ἠργάσατ᾽ (64.2) recalling ἀ]κ[ρ]ιβὴς ἄκρους [ἔπλ]ασεν (63.2). Then, like Lysippus' Alexander, Idomeneus takes voice, exhorting Meriones to run, in a recollection of the meeting of Idomeneus and Agamemnon in the *Iliad* (*Il*.4.250-274).[215] The proximity of the epigrams on Philitas and Idomeneus, as well as the shared expression of wonder over their paradoxically brazen life-like quality, invite a comparison between the poet and the hero. Philitas' decidedly un-heroic depiction - posessing, as it does, ἡρώων δ᾽ οὐδὲν ἰδέης (63.4) - contrasts with Idomeneus, whose very form seems to bring to mind the heroic text *par excellence*. Furthermore, as Sens notes, there is a more explicit presentation of a figure of heroic stature within *AB* 63:[216] while Philitas has nothing from the form of heroes, Ptolemy, his dedicator, is described as both θεός and βασιλεύς (63.9). Though Sens has since rejected his supposition that this creates a contrast between Posidippus (who does make Ptolemy more than human) and Hecataeus (who emphasises Philitas' ordinary mortality),[217] instead positing that "the poem's implicit admiration of Hecataeus' truthful realism suggests that the poet is himself telling the truth about what may have seemed to some readers a controversial claim about Ptolemy's divine status",[218] these two positions are not dichotomous. Indeed, both Posidippus and Hecataeus adhere to the principles of accurate representation as lauded within the epigram: for Hecataeus to represent Philitas as more than mortal would go against the ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν κανόνα, and for Posidippus to represent Ptolemy as less than both god and king would do likewise.

The juxtaposition of Ptolemy and Philitas within *AB* 63 reveals that the unheroic quality of the latter's statue is more than incidental. Indeed, reading *AB* 63 alongside *AB* 64, it becomes apparent that both poems form part of a sustained analysis of what it means to be accurate in representing a subject. Equally, these epigrams invite reflection upon how the nature of said subject - whether heroic or not - is expressed through a creative medium. For Idomeneus and Philitas, the distinction between their relative heroic and unheroic quality is expressed in contrasting capacity to 'speak' as statues. Despite statuesque form, the vitality of Idomeneus (and Lysippus' Alexander in *APl* 120) suffuses his representation, giving it voice. However,

---

[215] See particularly Hom. *Il*.4.251-254, οἳ δ᾽ ἀμφ᾽ Ἰδομενῆα δαΐφρονα θωρήσσοντο: / Ἰδομενεὺς μὲν ἐνὶ προμάχοις συῒ εἴκελος ἀλκήν, / Μηριόνης δ᾽ ἄρα οἱ πυμάτας ὄτρυνε φάλαγγας; - see further Angiò (2002), Sens (2004), 75-76, (2005), 217-220.
[216] Sens (2005), 215.
[217] Sens (2002), 5-7
[218] Sens (2005), 215.

Philitas' mortality, captured so well by Hecataeus, means the old man, though lifelike, will remain ultimately silent.

Within the context of the *Andriantopoiika*, Philitas' silence can be interpreted as part of Posidippus' ongoing commentary on representative accuracy, but reading this commentary alongside the *Seal*, a different agenda emerges. As discussed, the statue which the author's persona desires is reminiscent of the heroic honours done to Philitas by the Coans, recorded by Hermesianax: however, we are confronted, in *AB* 63, with a Philitas whose fundamental mortality, and whose lack of heroism - in the sense with which it can be applied to the iliadic Idomeneus, and to Alexander - renders his statue mute, alongside his talkative companions. I propose that the silence of Philitas in *AB* 63 further emphasises Posidippus' divergence from a purely linear uptake of the honours done to his predecessor, by depicting, within the *Seal*, another heroised poet, whose heroism is repeatedly qualified in vocal terms.

The recollection of the oracular response given to Telesicles for Archilochus is characterised as a φωνὴν ἀθα‹νά›την (118.13), and Archilochus himself is described as the Parian nightingale (118.18): while the description of this particular poet as a sweet-singing bird is perhaps incongruous, given the famed venom of Archilochus' songs, it nevertheless reiterates that song is the cause of his heroic honour. Indeed, this description comes precisely at the moment when the reader is told to give offerings for Archilochus, as expected for a hero - singing and heroism are, therefore, juxtaposed. Archilochus' heroism is characterised by precisely that which Philitas lacks, and thus the iambicist is presented as a counterpoint to the Coan scholar-poet. Posidippus then takes this juxtaposition a step further, and presents himself as the heroised poet who receives all that which his predecessors did, unifying within his own persona the traditions surrounding Archilochus' and Philitas' honours.[219] To fully grasp this, we first need to turn back to *AB* 63. In the careful description of Philitas' statue, Posidippus creates a parallel between the sculpted subject and the activity of his creator: while Hecataeus sculpts Philitas ἀ]κ[ρ]ιβὴς ἄκρους (63.2), Philitas himself is the ἀκρομέριμνον πρ]έσβυν (63.5-6), the hapax evoking Philitas' reputation for serious scholarly pursuits, echoing the description offered by Hermesianax (fr.7.77-78 Powell).[220] As Sens has noted, Posidippus expands upon the trope of

---

[219] We might also note, in the persona's assertion that he stands ἀσκίπων (118.24), a further suggestion that he has eschewed directly taking a predecessor as a direct model, given the significance of staves - particularly, their transference between predecessors or guarators and poets - in scenes of poetic initiation and legitimation, on which see further Chapter 4.2.

[220] On the description of Philitas as ἀκρομέριμνος, see particularly Bing (2003), 332. See also adesp. *FGE* 134, Ael. *VH*.9.14. See further Bing (2003), (2009), 15, Sens (2005), 210-212, Stewart (2005), 202.

Philitas' activity being reflected in the character of the man himself - a trope found in other statue epigrams, as discussed in the introduction to this chapter - by that same activity of hyper-carefulness being transferred to Hecataeus, evident in his act of crafting.[221] The ability to be ἀκριβής in action thus connects Philitas and Hecataeus, establishing a link between the activity of the two professions.[222] This interrelation between the acts of poets and craftsmen is particularly significant for our consideration of the *Seal* and *AB* 63 as intertexts. Both poets and craftsmen are conceptually linked by their comparable engagement in the creative process, but equally, both professions share a purpose: the *raison d'être* of their work is, fundamentally, that of memorialisation, and it is for their success in this task for which both Hecataeus and Philitas are praised. Within *AB* 63, Posidippus establishes that Hecataeus is a master of representative accuracy, a capacity which mirrors the abilities demonstrated by Philitas, and Hecataeus' memorialisation of Philitas is, therefore, quintessentially faithful to his subject. However, the holistic depiction of craftsman and craft extends further, beyond Hecataeus, to the other creative force at work in this epigram: Posidippus himself. I propose that Posidippus implicitly suggests that he, like Hecataeus, holds to the straight canon of truth. As noted, we can read this in the representation of Ptolemy as god and king, but we also obliquely detect it in Posidippus' own presentation of Hecataeus' sculpture, perfectly capturing its detail in the epigram - even εἰς ὄνυχας (63.2) - and thus he is equally in possession of the accuracy shared by Philitas and Hecataeus.[223] Such an assertion on Posidippus' part would complement the author's overarching program with the Milan Papyrus as a whole: as we have observed, within the *Andriantopoiika,* the author displays a persistent focus on precision and exactness as a reflection of excellence, in both poetry and material craftsmanship (this focus is found also in the *Lithika*). I suggest, however, that we also observe the programmatic import of accuracy, and the notion that a craftsman's ability is reflected in (and reflective of) the represented object, in the *Seal*. In the closing lines, Posidippus' authorial persona envisages himself speaking rightly, ὀρθοεπής, amongst the crowd (118.24). This celebration of straightness, accuracy and truth broadly reiterates the leitmotif of *AB* 63, but the performance of an ὀρθός act must also explicitly recall Hecataeus' lauded ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν κανόνα (63.6). The ability to be ὀρθός thus connects Hecataeus with Posidippus' persona, much as to be ἀκριβής linked Philitas and Hecataeus: as a result, the implicit parallel between the activity of Posidippus-as-poet and

---

[221] Sens (2002), 3-4.
[222] Sens (2005) further traces the development of this relationship through the first four epigrams of the *Andriantopoiika.*
[223] Stewart, (2005), 205; see further Stewart (2007) 135-136.

Hecataeus-as-craftsman made in *AB* 63 is both reiterated and further substantiated in the *Seal*. We can further posit that Posidippus desires his readers to detect a similarly complementary relationship between the poet and his craft, here represented by the statue in the Pellaean agora: much as the man is straight and truthful, so is the statue, and thus so is that which the statue symbolises - Posidippus' poetry *in toto*. The description of Posidippus' persona as ὀρθοεπής thus recursively authorises the message of the *Seal*: if Posidippus is straight-talking, then that which he creates must be equally ὀρθός. Furthermore, the ability to speak is itself significant, as we have seen: Posidippus thus surpasses Philitas, in that he is both represented as a statue and manages to speak, reaching the heroic heights of Idomeneus, and Alexander.

To conclude, I have demonstrated that Posidippus' act of self-representation within the *Seal* is an intertextual process, which draws upon the traditions which surround his poetic predecessors, and utilises the author's other poems as a frame of reference. The narrative of Archilochus' heroisation serves as a partial model from which Posidippus takes his start: familiar elements (the oracular response, and the role of the Muses in guaranteeing the poet immortal fame) are reconstituted in the *Seal*, though Posidippus makes his persona an active proponent of his fame, as opposed to Archilochus' more passive role as recipient of both the Muses' gift and Apollo's oracle. Simultaneously, Posidippus looks to Philitas as a near-contemporary poet who likewise enjoyed honour and status as a result of his work. Once again, however, Posidippus does not take up Philitas' honours for himself without emendation. Indeed, Posidippus engages with the tradition of Philitan honours via the intermediary of his own representation of the poet, utilising the aesthetic discourse of *AB* 63, and the wider critical context of the *Andriantopoiika*, as a framework for his self-representation in the *Seal*. Read alone, *AB* 63 celebrates the triumph of Hecataeus, and his production of a representation which captures, to the greatest of accuracy, the mortality of Philitas. However, reading the epigram in conjunction with the epigram on Idomeneus, with their shared model *APl* 120, and further with the *Seal*, it becomes apparent that, without something from the form of heroes, a statue remains silent, and that without a voice, those most celebrated by its accuracy are its maker(s) and its dedicator. By contrast, Posidippus ensures that his statue will not remain voiceless. Within the *Seal*, the statue serves as only one facet of Posidippus' immortal fame: borrowing from Archilochus' tradition, and having received an oracular pronouncement from Apollo's own φωνὴν ἀθα‹να›την (118.13), Posidippus will ultimately stand in the crowd ὀρθοεπὴς (*AB* 118.24), attesting to the author's heroic quality and speaking with a voice which Hecataeus' ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν κανόνα denied his sculpted subject.

2.2   *Materiality, memory and predecessor in Callimachus' Tomb of Simonides*

In *Aet.*fr.64 Pf., usually called the *Tomb of Simonides*,[224] Callimachus presents a fascinating exploration of the poetics of memorialisation and the epigrammatic tradition, and equally offers a reflection upon the nebulous concept of authorial presence within poetry. These themes are closely interconnected: the absence of Simonides' tomb stands in opposition to the memorialising act that the dead poet undertakes, as this act reveals that Simonides retains the ability to speak - to be present within the narrative - despite the tomb's removal. In commemorating the loss of his tomb, Simonides recalls its inscription, further blurring the boundaries between the text (the *Tomb of Simonides* itself) and the absent verses inscribed on the tomb. I argue that Callimachus chooses Simonides as the paradoxical speaker of an absent epitaph precisely because of that poet's engagement with the theme of commemoration - particularly in the context of inscription - within his poetry. Furthermore, Callimachus draws on the tradition that held that Simonides was famed for his prodigious memory*,* and equally upon his perceived status as one of the founding fathers of the epigrammatic genre. In the presentation of Simonides and the lamentation of his situation, Callimachus encapsulates the ambiguity of the issues of voice and presence that underpin sepulchral epigram in both inscribed and book form.

More than just a consideration of the tropes of epigrammatic genre, however, I suggest that the *Tomb of Simonides* presents a complex instance of a poet employing the persona of a poetic predecessor in order to reflect upon his own poetic activity. I argue that Callimachus establishes Simonides as a persona, drawing on the voice of that poet gleaned from a biographical interpretation of a number of his poems, emphasising Simonides' divinely sanctioned commemorative abilities before then implying, through his own act of preserving the poet's memory within the *Aetia*, that he himself possesses similar powers of memorialisation. In so doing, Callimachus effectively presents himself as a second Simonides, but one refashioned for the Hellenistic milieu: Callimachus' poem reveals, subtly, that the book-roll, rather than stone or song, has become the memorialising medium *par excellence*. I further demonstrate that the presentation of Simonides bears a marked similarity to that of Hipponax in the *Iambs*, and suggest that both occupy a similar encapsulatory position, within the context of Callimachus' poetry: both personae embody the genres they were famous for composing in,

---

[224] Pfeiffer (1949).

but also reflect the generic innovations that Callimachus had wrought upon said genres. I ultimately suggest that Callimachus' memorialisation - and concurrent materialisation - of his poetic predecessors typifies the complex relationship Hellenistic poets held with their antecedents, reflecting their desire both the continue the traditions of the past, but equally, emphasising their innovations.

The text of the *Tomb of Simonides* is curtailed due to damage, but the preserved lines of the text present an intriguing narrative:

> Οὐδ᾽ ἄ]ν τοι Καμάρινα τόσον κακὸν ὁκκόσον ἀ[ν]δρός
>   κινη]θεὶς ὁσίου τύμβος ἐπικρεμάσαι·
> καὶ γ]ὰρ ἐμόν κοτε σῆμα, τό μοι πρὸ πόληος ἔχ[ευ]αν
>   Ζῆν᾽] Ἀκραγαντῖνοι Ξείνι[ο]ν ἀζόμενοι,
> 5 … κ]ατ᾽ οὖν ἤρειψεν ἀνὴρ κακός, εἴ τιν᾽ ἀκούει[ς
>   Φοίνικ]α πτόλιος σχέτλιον ἡγεμόνα·
> [   ] δ᾽ ἐγκατέλεξεν ἐμὴν λίθον οὐδὲ τὸ γράμμα
>   ᾐδέσθη τὸ λέγον τόν [μ]ε Λεωπρέπεος
> κεῖσθαι Κήϊον ἄνδρα τὸν ἱερόν, ὃς τὰ περισσὰ
> 10 ..καὶ] μνήμην πρῶτος ὃς ἐφρασάμην,
> οὐδ᾽ ὑμέας, Πολύδευκες, ὑπέτρεσεν, οἵ με μελάθρου
>   μέλλοντος πίπτειν ἐκτὸς ἔθεσθέ κοτε
> δαιτυμόνων ἄπο μοῦνον, ὅτε Κραννώνιος αἰαῖ
>   ὤλισθεν μεγάλους οἶκος ἐπὶ Σκοπάδας.
> 15 ὦνακες, ἀλ..[ϊ..]. γὰρ ἔτ᾽ ἦν[
>   ]...φοῦμεδ[   ].βο̣σ̣ι̣ν[
> ....λμοὺσ[   ].ϊ̣ο̣υνδο.[
>   .....ησ̣τ.[   ]εν ἀνῆγεν[
> ....[   ].[.].ετ᾽ κ ..[²²⁵

Not even Camarina would threaten as great an evil
    as the tomb of a holy man if it was moved from its place.
Once, you see, my grave, which the Acragantines
    built up in front of the city in reverence for [Zeus] Xenios,
5   an evil man tore down: you may have heard of him,
    [the Phoenician,] the merciless general of the city.
He built my stone into a [   ] and did not respect the inscription
    which says I lay there, the son of Leoprepes,
    the sacred man of Ceos, who additional…
10   [and] I who first perceived the art of memory.

---

²²⁵ The supplement for the opening of l.7 commonly suggested is πύργῳ, but this depends upon *Sud.*s.v. Σιμωνίδης (Σ 441 Adler): as Morrison (2013), 291.n.9 and Dyer (Suda Online http://www.stoa.org/sol-bin/search.pl last accessed March 2015) note, the version of events therein is improbable: cf. D.S. 13.85-88. Bruss (2004) and Livrea (2006) suggest Φοίνικ]α at 64.6 which may refer to "the Phoenician": see also Pind.*Pyth*1.72, Thuc. 1.116, D.S. 13.80ff. Diodorus Siculus reports that the Carthaginian Hannibal destroyed Acragas in 406 by means of a causeway constructed from destroyed tombs: D.S. 13.86.1, and see further on interpreting this Hannibal as "the Phoenician" below. Dyer suggests πορθμῷ, "causeway", or πορμῷ, "carrying sack" as possible alternative supplementations, while Livrea (2006), 53n.2 posits χώματι, "mound". For criticism of the reading of φοῖνιξ as an ethnonym, see Massimilla (2006), 41-42.

> Nor, Polydeuces, did he fear you two,
> > who once placed me alone of the guests
> outside the hall at the moment of collapse, when - alas! -
> > the house at Crannon fell on the great Scopadae.
> 15 O lords…

That absence and presence is a core theme of the *Tomb of Simonides* is overtly apparent within the narrative: the speaker of the poem - one immediately assumes Simonides, though I will return to this identification momentarily - bemoans his sorry lot, his tombstone having been ripped from its proper place and pressed into service as masonry. Despite the absence of the tomb, however, the incumbent still speaks. The deceased-as-speaker is a staple feature of sepulchral epigram,[226] but in the *Tomb of Simonides*, Callimachus subverts this trope: the fiction of the deceased being able to speak out from the tomb is, as discussed in Chapter 1, sustained by the co-located presence of the deceased, the tomb and, most importantly, the inscription, but these core elements have been separated in this instance. The situation is more closely paralleled in examples drawn from sepulchral book-epigram, in which the reception of the text is predicated upon the absence of the tomb, but a notable difference is that, in the case of such book-epigrams, the absence of the tomb at the point of reception is a result of the reconfiguration of the epigram from inscriptional to book form: the tomb is not absent *in toto*, as a reader is able (and, often, encouraged) to construct a facsimile of the physical situation through the recapitulation of stylistic and formal aspects of inscribed epigram.[227] A particular sub-type of sepulchral epigrams - epigrams for those that died at sea - does evince the situation we encounter here, a particularly fine example being the epigram for Timolytus by Leonidas (16 *GP = AP* 7.654) which concludes with the startling revelation that τύμβῳ δ' οὐχ ὕπο Τιμόλυτος, "Timolytus is under no tomb", prompting a reader to question the very notion that this is an evocation of an inscribed text.[228] In a similar fashion, the reader of the *Tomb of Simonides* is encouraged to question how it is that Simonides imparts his message at all, given that the text emphasises that the tomb and inscription - the means through which the deceased might speak post-mortem - no longer remain. The act of memorialisation that Simonides undertakes within the poem mirrors his erstwhile tomb's memorialising function, but is equally paralleled in Callimachus' act of composing the text: as Peter Bing notes, the poem itself is a

---

[226] Bruss (2005) provides a fulsome consideration of this feature throughout his analysis of absence and presence in sepulchral epigrams. Further valuable recent studies: Tsagalis (2008), Tueller (2008), Vestrheim (2010).

[227] The Hellenistic epigrammatists were, of course, liable to play with the expected presence of the inscribed object in epigram, much as they did with the ambiguity of the speaking voice.

[228] See in general on this sub-type Bruss (2005), particularly 117-139.

"commemoration of a commemoration of a commemoration".[229] These nested acts of remembrance encompass the Acragantines who erected Simonides' tomb, Simonides as the speaker of the poem and the tomb's incumbent, Callimachus and, in the act of reception, the reader. The centrality of memorialisation as a theme, however, stands in opposition to the seemingly impossible nature of the communication which Simonides engages in: much as the epigram for Timolytus reveals its own artificiality, so Simonides, in commemorating the destruction of his tomb, reveals the subversion of standard epigrammatic practice. The ability of the tomb and its inscription to enact memorialisation is disrupted, yet the act of memorialisation still takes place. The deceased ironically commemorates the 'death' of his tomb, thus flaunting the seemingly paradoxical nature of his speech.

Those expecting a funerary epigram are, as Annette Harder has noted, destined to be frustrated, with the content of the epigram - the γράμμα - appearing only through an indirect report (64.8-9) embedded within the poem.[230] At the same moment, however, the deceased honoured by the inscription (reckoned to be Simonides, particularly with his identification as son of Leoprepes) is, it seems, also the voice behind the present elegy, a notion encouraged by the references made to ἐμόν σῆμα (64.3), ἐμὴν λίθον (64.7) and the report that the inscription λέγον [μ]ε κεῖσθαι (64.8-9).[231] As numerous scholars have highlighted, the situation of the speaker casts a reader into doubt: how should we envisage Simonides' locative situation, particularly the point of origin from which his speech issues?[232] Furthermore, is it even certain that we should perceive Simonides behind these words, despite the biographical data prompting us to make just such an identification? I posit that our response as readers of the *Tomb of Simonides* - to question the nature of who speaks and how they endeavour to do so - is actively encouraged, particularly when we consider the nexus of allusions that Callimachus evokes through the figure of Simonides.

Callimachus' presentation of Simonides and his situation finds notable parallels in Simonides' own works. In particular, scholars have detected echoes of the principal themes of the *Tomb of*

<hr/>

[229] Bing (1988b), 69.
[230] Harder (1996), 97. See also Meyer (2005), 227.
[231] The facts regarding the identity of the deceased coincide with the information regarding Simonides given elsewhere, e.g., Simon. fr.89 West (=146 Bergk = Arist. *Or*.28.59-60, II. 160.20 Keil), Hdt. 7.228, *Mar.Par.*54: see *Sud*.s.v. Σιμωνίδης (Σ 439, 440, 441 Adler) for a collection of biographical evidence regarding his life - 441 explicitly uses fr.64 Pf. and the anecdotes therein, though as noted, this source is less than reliable. Männlein-Robert (2009), 49 notes that Chamaeleon's Περὶ Σιμωνίδου was most probably a source for Callimachus - the work is only fragmentarily preserved in Athenaeus: Ath. 14.656c-e, 10.456c-457a, 13.611a. See further Kegel (1961), Podlecki (1979), (1984) 178-202, Lefkowitz (1981), 49-56.
[232] See e.g., Bing (1988b), 67-70, Harder (1996), Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 48-49, Morrison (2013).

Simonides - memorialisation, remembrance and the role of the written word - in a number of Simonidean poems. This is certainly the case in *PMG* 581 (= D.L. 1.89-90):

<div style="text-align:center">

τίς κεν αἰνήσειε νόῳ πίσυνος Λίνδου ναέταν Κλεόβουλον,
ἀενάοις ποταμοῖσ᾽ ἄνθεσι τ᾽ εἰαρινοῖς
ἀελίου τε φλογὶ χρυσέας τε σελάνας
καὶ θαλασσαίαισι δίναισ᾽ ἀντιθέντα μένος στάλας;
5   ἅπαντα γάρ ἐστι θεῶν ἥσσω· λίθον δὲ
καὶ βρότεοι παλάμαι θραύοντι· μωροῦ φωτὸς ἅδε βουλά.

</div>

Who if he trusts his wits would praise Cleobulus who dwells in Lindus
for setting beside ever-flowing rivers and the flowers of spring
and the flame of the sun and the golden moon
and the eddies of the sea, the force of a stele?
5   For all things are weaker than the gods; and stone
even mortal hands can shatter; this is the devising of a fool.

PMG 581 is a direct response to Cleobulus' epigram on the tomb of Midas:[233]

<div style="text-align:center">

χαλκῆ παρθένος εἰμί, Μίδα δ᾽ ἐπὶ σήματι κεῖμαι.
ἔστ᾽ ἂν ὕδωρ τε νάῃ καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλῃ,
ἠέλιός τ᾽ ἀνιὼν λάμπῃ, λαμπρά τε σελήνη,
καὶ ποταμοὶ γε ῥέωσιν, πλήθωσι, ανακλύζῃ δὲ θάλασσα,
5   αὐτοῦ τῇδε μένουσα πολυκλαύτῳ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ,
ἀγγελέω παριοῦσι Μίδας ὅτι τῇδε τέθαπται.

</div>

I am a maiden of bronze, and I rest upon Midas' grave.
So long as water flows and tall trees flower,
and the rising sun shines, and the radiant moon,
and rivers swell, and sea laps shore,
5   remaining here, over the much-lamented tomb,
I will tell passers-by that Midas is buried here.

In these two poems we can observe an exploration of one of the primary motifs of the *Tomb of Simonides*: the permanency and efficacy of the tomb as a site - and propagator - of memory. As Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Harder note, the closing lines of Simonides' poem, λίθον δὲ / καὶ βρότεοι παλάμαι θραύοντι (581.5-6) are an obvious precursor to the narrative of Callimachus' elegy:[234] Simonides, so forthright in his dismissal of the stele as an immortal memorial of fame is, ironically, proved wholly correct in his assessment by the destruction of his own tomb.[235] Hermann Fränkel suggests that Simonides' anger in *PMG* 581 occurs because

---

[233] The epigram is preserved variously: I give here the text found in D.L. 1.89-90. The version quoted at Plat. *Phaed.*264d (to which the version at *AP* 7.153 is identical) omits vv.3-4. See also *Cert.Hom. et Hes.*15
[234] Acosta-Hughes (2010), 177-178, Harder (2012), II.515.
[235] Bruss (2004), 63 highlights the ironic incongruity of a poet so famed for his sepulchral epigrams lamenting the destruction of his own inscribed monument.

of "the presumptuous claim made by an inscription ascribing immortality to the grave-monument of which it formed a part",[236] a point which Andrew Ford develops by stressing that Simonides rails against the stele precisely because it is inscribed, because it claims the ability to tell the passers-by of Midas (and thus propagate his fame) forever.[237] By Callimachus' period of writing, the possibility for inscriptions to express themselves with an artful, poetic nuance was recognised, but this should not be heralded as a Hellenistic phenomenon, as it can already be observed during Simonides' *floruit*: one 5th Century epigram (*CEG* 429), for example, opens with a reflexive exhortation; αὐδὴ τεχνήεσσα λίθο, λέγε τίς τοδ' ἄ[γαλμα] | στῆσεν, "skilful voice of stone, tell who dedicated this statue".[238] The identification of the stone as a possessor of *techne* elevates it above the status of a passive medium for poetry, an instead makes it akin to an active performer. I posit that Simonides has the concept of the poetically skilful stone in mind in *PMG* 581: it is λίθος - rather than χαλκός, for example - which is the target of Simonides' approbation, because it is inscribed stone and the worrying claim (for Simonides, at least) that it might usurp the role of the singer in the dissemination of fame which concerns him, first and foremost.[239] Simonides does not oppose stelae *tout court*, merely the interconnected claims that they might possess an intrinsic poetic skill of their own, and that they themselves might function as eternal monuments to fame.

A further epigram by Simonides seems to respond, implicitly, to the issues raised by the Midas epigram (*PMG* 531 = D.S. 11.11.6):[240]

<div style="text-align:center">

τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων
εὐκλεὴς μὲν ἀ τύχα, καλὸς δ' ὁ πότμος,
βωμὸς δ' ὁ τάφος, πρὸ γόων δὲ μνᾶστις, ὁ δ' οἶ[κ]τος ἔπαινος·
ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον οὔτ' εὐρὼς
5   οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος.
ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅδε σηκὸς οἰκέταν εὐδοξίαν
Ἑλλάδος εἵλετο· μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ Λεωνίδας,

</div>

---

[236] Fränkel (1975), 430.
[237] Ford (2002), 107.
[238] On inscribed epigrams adduced in discussion of literary *techne*, see A. Petrovic (2007a), 59-64.
[239] Fearn (2013) argues for a very different interpretation of *PMG* 581, suggesting that Simonides' target is not epigraphy, but Cleobulus' literary endeavours: see particularly Fearn (2013), 234-235. However, I am not convinced by the argument that Simonides' attack on the μένος στάλας is targeted with specificity at the author of the Midas epigram; it is, rather, inscribed stelae which are depicted as the hubristic claimants of impermeable fame, and Cleobulus' poem exemplifies this. Klooster (2011), 33 makes an attractive point regarding *PMG* 581, suggesting that Simonides may be ironically highlighting the contemporary predominance of oral dissemination, if we assume that the poet probably never actually saw the tomb of Midas, and only received a report of its inscription.
[240] The connection has been well noted: see, e.g., Steiner (1999), Ford (2002), 110-112, Fearn (2013). Particularly noteworthy is the recurrence of variations of ἀέναος, "ever-flowing" in all three poems: ἀενάοις ποταμοῖσ' in *PMG* 581.2, which alludes to the bronze maiden of Cleobulus' epigram reporting that she will proclaim Midas' fame as long ἔστ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε νάῃ, and the description of a fame that is ἀέναον in *PMG* 531.9.

Σπάρτας βασιλεύς, ἀρετᾶς μέγαν λελοιπὼς
κόσμον ἀέναόν τε κλέος.

Of those who died at Thermopylae,
well-famed is their fate, and fine is their destiny.
The tomb is an altar; instead of lamentations they have remembrance,
groaning for them is praise;
they are wrapped in such a shroud as neither stain
5   nor all-subduing time will darken.
This shrine for worthy men has as its attendant the esteem
of Greece. Leonidas, the Spartan king,
bears witness also, he who has left behind a great ornament of his excellence
and an ever-flowing fame.[241]

The tomb for the Spartans is markedly different to Midas' tomb as presented in Cleobulus'
epigram. Whereas in that epigram, the maiden - and the inscription - became the means through
which the fame of the deceased would be propagated,[242] there is, in Simonides' poem, no
mention of its inscribed nature. Simonides instead presents the tomb propagating the fame of
the Spartans without any acknowledgement of an inscription. Indeed, the tomb is not a τάφος,
but rather a βωμός (531.3), and thus, as our expectations of lamentation at the graveside are
replaced with visions of praise at an altar, so our general assumptions regarding the expected
form of commemoration through tomb and inscription are subverted.[243] Deborah Steiner has
argued persuasively that Simonides gradually dematerialises the deceased, the tomb, their
memory and the incipient fame, constructing a verbal monument in place of the physical, and
imbuing the resulting memorial with an impermeable quality, precisely as a result of its
erstwhile materiality.[244] This process of de-location renders the memory of the Spartans
unassailable, because their fame lives, recurrently, through the performance and dissemination
of Simonides' encomiastic poem: bearing witness to this process is - not an 'eternal' bronze
maiden - but rather Leonidas, whose own fame, rather than materiality, will ensure immortal
memory.

---

[241] Trans. Ford (2002), adapted.

[242] Notably, by emphasising its materiality at the outset with the assertion that χαλκῆ παρθένος εἰμί, combined
with an outlook which surpasses the moment of reading, the Cleobulus epigram does not allow readers to easily
envisage themselves as the "I" of the text: see Svenbro (1993), 26-43 on the conception of the speaking object as
an autonomous entity. See further Stehle (1997), 311-318, Meyer (2005), 70-74, Day (2010), 44-46.

[243] Compare *PMG* 594: Plutarch, speaking about the fame which a man accrues during life, which is bestowed to
him as a 'gift' upon his death by the community, says that Simonides said that this gift ἔσχατον δύεται κατὰ γᾶς,
"is the last to sink beneath the earth", Plut. *Mor.*783E. See further Burzacchini (1977) for this fragment's
correspondence to *PMG* 531.

[244] Compare 'Simon.' *FGE* 8 = *AP* 7.253. See further Steiner (1999), 386-387. See also Svenbro (1993), 51-52,
Sourvinou-Inwood (1996), 147-151, Cf. Fearn (2013), 237-239.

By contrast, inscriptions after the form of the Midas epigram represent a fixation of memory which is counter-intuitive to Simonides' dematerialised poetics, as conceptualised in the two poems above. Indeed, the unwillingness to imbue an inscribed monument with the ability to spread fame in and of itself (as the bronze maiden claims to) seems even to extend to cases in which we possess an inscription seemingly composed by Simonides himself, such as the epitaph for the deceased Spartans - a poem which has been recurrently adduced in discussions of the poet's views on fame and memorialisation (*FGE* 22b = *AP* 7.249 = Hdt. 7.228):

> ὦ ξεῖν', ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίος ὅτι τῇδε
> κείμεθα, τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι.

> Stranger, tell the Lacedaemonians that here
> we lie, obedient to their orders.[245]

Here, the stele is conceived of primarily as an instigator, or a conduit, through which the deceased may receive commemoration, while it is the reader who is explicitly tasked with propagating the message (and thus the fame) of the dead.[246] The voice which resounds is that of the deceased Spartans: the inscribed stele remains a silent participant, and its role remains strictly mediatory.[247] Thus, it can be argued that the epigram reflects the approach to inscribed monuments advocated in *PMG* 581 and implied in *PMG* 531: however, using the epigrams ascribed to Simonides as a source from which to construct a poetic approach advocated by the author must be hedged with caveats, not least of which is that his authorship of the poems is, in almost every case, debated, leading scholars such as Denys Page to group prospective epigrams under the tenuous heading 'Simonides'.[248] What can be gleaned from a general survey of the sepulchral epigrams ascribed to the author is the relative dearth of instances in which the speaker is the tomb or the inscribed monument, as is the case in Cleobulus' epigram. Of the epigrams purportedly written by Simonides, only three employ language which designates tomb or stele as the speaker:[249] in the fifty or so other sepulchral epigrams, the

---

[245] See Petrovic (2007b), 245-249 on the variants of this text.

[246] See further Sider (2007), 122-123, A. Petrovic (2007b), 246-248.

[247] See further Baumbach, Petrovic and Petrovic (2010), 16-19 on the delapidarisation of this epigram.

[248] Page (1981). See further on the issue of authorship, e.g., Erbse (1998), Bravi (2006), Sider (2007), A. Petrovic (2007b), particularly 25-51, Schmitz (2010b).

[249] *FGE* 82 = *AP* 7.509, *FGE* 83a = *AP* 7.344a, *FGE* 83b = *AP* 7.344b. The final two of these epigrams, however, present their own puzzle, particularly with regards to their relationship to one another: in the *Palatine Anthology*, the epigrams are separated, and the second is attributed to Callimachus (both speakers being lions placed upon tombs). In the Planudean Anthology, the two are juxtaposed, with 'b' bearing the heading 'by the same author': see further Page (1981), 298-299.

identity of the speaker is either the deceased, or unclear.[250] If we are willing to accept that the epigrams ascribed to Simonides give, at the very least, a not wholly inaccurate reflection of his actual output, then it seems reasonable to conclude that Simonides rarely placed the tomb into a speaking role, and that, if he did in fact occasionally do so, it did not advertise its ability to memorialise, or its role in the dissemination of the fame of the deceased.[251] I thus posit that Simonides demonstrates a marked tendency to efface the inscribed monument in the process of an epigram's reception. If we take as a subset the sepulchral epigrams which Andrej Petrovic identifies as most plausibly Simonidean in origin,[252] it is notable that the speaker is never the tomb, it is either the deceased (*FGE* 11, *FGE* 16, *FGE* 22b = *AP* 7.249) or unclear (*FGE* 1, *FGE* 6 = *AP* 7.677, *FGE* 22a, *FGE* 26a). Furthermore, in the instances in which the deceased does occupy the role, it is notable that it is a group rather than an individual who speaks.[253] In these sepulchral epigrams then, the voice of the epigram is either ambiguous, or de-specified to the extent that a host of persons can be detected behind the words of the text: crucially, it is never implied that the inscribed stele, or the tomb more generally, speaks *in propria persona*.[254] The stone upon which the epigram is written is thus figuratively displaced in the reader's engagement with the text: the materiality of the epigram is de-emphasised within the text itself, and the act of communicative performance which the poem engenders takes centre stage (as is overtly the case in the epigram on the Spartan dead). In so doing, the inscription transgresses its material limits, encouraging the perception of oral communication at the point of reception,

---

[250] The only notably different speaking voice of these epigrams is that of *FGE* 75 = *AP* 7.511, in which the epigram employs the 'internalising I', as discussed in Chapter 1.1. The case of the speaking voice in the dedicatory epigrams is similar to that of the sepulchral poems - in only one of the epigrams is the voice distinct (*FGE* 17a = *AP* 6.197), and in that case the voice is seemingly that of the dedicator.

[251] No parallel to the bronze maiden's role as explicit disseminator of memory can be detected: in the case of *FGE* 82 = *AP* 7.509, the monument announces simply σῆμα Θεόγνιδος εἰμὶ Σινωπέος, ᾧ μ᾽ ἐπέθηκεν / Γλαῦκος ἑταιρείης ἀντὶ πολυχρονίου, "I am the marker of Theognis of Sinope, Glaucus placed me over him on account of their long companionship." In the case of *AP* 7.344a and b, the epigrams are more decorative, and the speaker more artful: *FGE* 83a = *AP* 7.344a, θηρῶν μὲν κάρτιστος ἐγώ, θνατῶν δ᾽ ὃν ἐγὼ νῦν / φρουρῶ, τῷδε τάφῳ λάινος ἐμβεβαώς, "I am the most valiant of beasts, and most valiant of men is he whom I guard standing on this stone tomb"; *FGE* 83b = *AP* 7.344b, ἀλλ᾽ εἰ μὴ θυμόν γε Λέων ἐμὸν οὔνομά τ᾽ εἶχεν, / οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ τύμβῳ τῷδ᾽ ἐπέθηκα πόδας, "Never, unless Leo had had my courage and strength would I have set foot on this tomb." However, we can note that the speakers' self-presentation is ultimately subsumed into the process of honouring the deceased, in marked opposition to the bronze maiden, whose existence is ultimately separate from that which she honours. See further Tueller (2008), 19-20: Tueller's survey of *CEG* evinces a far higher proportion of cases in which the tomb or monument is the speaker in epigrams of Simonides' *floruit* as opposed to the epigrams ascribed to the author.

[252] A. Petrovic (2007b), 280.

[253] E.g., *FGE* 11.1; ὦ ξεῖν᾽ εὔυδρον ποκ᾽ ἐναίομες ἄστυ Κορίνθου, "Stranger, once we lived in the water-rich city of Corinth"; *FGE* 16.1-2; Ἑλλάδι καὶ Μεγαρεῦσιν ἐλεύθερον ἆμαρ ἀέξειν / ἱέμενοι θανάτου μοῖραν ἐδεξάμεθα, "For Greece and the Megarians, to glorify the day of freedom we hasten to receive the fate of death"; see also *FGE* 22b = *AP* 7.249 = Hdt. 7.228 above.

[254] See Svenbro (1993), 39-42 on the assessment of ὅδε or τόδε as potential markers for egocentrism: see further Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 281-283, Day (2000), 44, Meyer (2005), 17-19.

rather than inscribed. Thus, I suggest that when Simonides avows that he does not trust the propagation of fame to the μένος στάλας (*PMG* 581.4) he specifically means the physical object. Instead, he entrusts the commemorative act to the de-materialised voice which issues from the inscription, which resounds through the reader's reception, and in the subsequent dissemination of the memorial it creates.

Reading the *Tomb of Simonides* in light of this proposed Simonidean approach to inscription and epigram, it becomes clear that Callimachus undertakes a nuanced engagement with Simonides' dematerialised poetics: the author presents his poem as a development of Simonides' critique of stelae with regards to their role as both physical monument and vocal propitiator of fame, by framing said critique in the context of the biographical narrative regarding the poet's remarkable mnemotechnical skill. The thematic centrality of memory within the poem is, as Bing notes, in ironic opposition to its narrative: the destroyer of Simonides' tomb showed neither respect for the physical site of memory which it represented, nor for the memorialising powers of its incumbent.[255] Simonides' argument regarding the impermanence of inscribed stone (in and of itself) as a guarantor of memory is therefore demonstrated to be unfortunately astute: the tomb as presented by Simonides is literally a stone which has the ability to speak (64.7-8), but this speech is ultimately impermanent, and the intended act of memorialisation fails upon the dematerialisation of this speaking object. It is, however, worth considering the role of memory beyond its potential value as a source of irony within the poem. Callimachus is the first extant source to connect two anecdotes regarding Simonides: that he was the first to devise a system of mnemotechnics,[256] and that he was saved from a house-collapse by the Dioscuri, an anecdote which goes on to recount that he was able to identify every person who had been banqueting in the house for burial from where they had been sitting, made possible only through his prodigious powers of recollection.[257] The

---

[255] Bing (1988b), 68-69. Bruss (2004), 64 further notes the possibility that φοῖνιξ recalls the ascription of the invention of writing to the Phoenicians - and the irony that "the *ethnos* that gave the Greeks writing cannot understand it", leading to an absolute failure of memory.

[256] Numerous later sources reiterate this: particularly interesting is *P.Oxy.*1800 fr.1.col.2.36, a biography on Simonides which, at l.40, reports τινες δ' αὐτῷ τὴν τῶν μνημονικῶν εὕρεσιν προστιθέασιν, καὶ αὐτὸς δέ που τοῦτο φαίνει διὰ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων, "some ascribe to him the invention of mnemonics, and he demonstrates this somewhere through his epigrams". See also Plin. *N.H.*7. 24.89, Longin. *Rhet.*718. See further Slater (1972), 235-236, Lefkowitz (1981), 54-55.

[257] Callimachus is one of our earliest sources for the anecdote on the house at Crannon, on which see Massimilla (2006), 46-48. Callimachus' connection of the two anecdotes is explored further by Männlein-Robert (2007b) and (2009). The episode is also referenced in Theoc. *Id.*16.34-39, 40-46, and later versions appear in, e.g., Cic. *de Orat.*2.86.351-353, Quint. *Inst.*11.2.11-16 (= *PMG* 510). See further Molyneux (1971), 197-198, Carson (1999), 38-44.

revelation of Simonides' mnemotechnical abilities (64.10) stands between the report of the poet's epitaph (64.8-9) and his concluding, prayer-like address to the Dioscuri, which further exemplifies Simonides' memorialising powers (64.11ff.).[258] The reader is thus guided through an evolution of the Simonidean conception of oral-memorial primacy, moving from the now defunct tomb - a physical site of inscriptional memory which fails in its purpose - through to Simonides' development of mnemotechnics, and finally on to the deployment of the same memory-system, an act which is conducted under the auspices of the divine, and which still resonates as an act of memory via Callimachus' poem.[259] In doing so, Callimachus recalls Simonides' dismissal of the inscribed stele as an impermeable record of fame: the speaking object fails its task, to ensure the memorialisation of the deceased, when confronted with a passerby who fails to honour the implicit contract between reader and object, disrespecting the monument and proving that, as Simonides warned, λίθον… βρότεοι παλάμαι θραύοντι (*PMG* 581.5-6). Indeed, the only way to ensure lasting fame is to propagate the memory of the deceased amongst the living, superseding the stone's memorialising function through oral re-performance and recollection of the inscribed commemoration. Simonides himself demonstrates this, within Callimachus' poem: he once again preserves the memory of the Scopadae by recalling them in his prayer to the Dioscuri, obliquely evincing the superiority of oral recollection.

The motif of memorialisation thus connects the biographical persona 'Simonides' with the persona of the poet who emerges from a reading of *PMG* 581 and *PMG* 531: Callimachus contextualises Simonides' rejection of inscribed stelae as permanent sites of memory within the anecdotes regarding the poet's memorialising abilities, anecdotes which highlight the communal and oral nature of said abilities. Indeed, I would suggest that Callimachus elides Simonides' memorialising abilities with the poet's anti-inscriptional position, by presenting the poet's memorialisation of the Scopadae - as it occurs in the *Tomb of Simonides* - with a twist

---

[258] Compare Simon. fr.89 West (=146 Bergk = Arist. *Or.*28.59-60, II. 160.20 Keil).

[259] Acosta-Hughes (2010), 177 suggests along similar lines that "the reader of Simonides, as configured here, moves backward, in sequence of narrated events: the present tomb, its destruction, its inscribing, the living Simonides, and backward through memory. Simonides' renowned mnemonic, celebrated in the tomb's inscription, is itself explained through narrated memory and, hence, remembered": he reiterates the point, and contrasts with the reader's narrative forward progression, in Acosta-Hughes (2011), 599-600. I would suggest that it is more constructive to conceive of both the act of reading and the creation of Simonidean memory, though temporally regressive, as thematically progressive: the systematic laying-out of the facets of memorialisation emphasise the ultimately imperishable nature of memory when divorced from physicality.

on the act of establishing an inscribed memorial.[260] Prior to the recollection of the Scopadae, the language of inscribed epigram has already been employed within the poem, in the usage of κεῖσθαι within the report of the inscription on Simonides' tomb. However, Callimachus includes a further more metaphorical application of conventional epigrammatic language: in recalling the Dioscuri's timely intervention at Crannon, Simonides notes that the gods placed him - ἔθεσθε (64.12) - outside of the house. The use of τίθημι here is significant, as, similarly to κεῖμαι (which, as we observed, was used to epigrammatically evocative effect in the *Seal* of Posidippus), it is a stock feature of inscribed epigram. Τίθημι and related forms, such as ἀνατίθημι and ἐπιτίθημι, are the most prevalent verbs used in dedicatory and sepulchral epigrams, utilised to describe the act of dedicator, or the burier in erecting a monument upon a grave.[261] In describing the action of the Dioscuri using the verb τίθημι, and re-emphasising - on several levels - Simonides' ability to memorialise (and to commemorate the Scopadae in particular), Callimachus presents Simonides as an eternal testament, much as Simonides presented Leonidas in *PMG* 531. However, Callimachus does not reduplicate Simonides' efforts directly: the form in which Leonidas bears witness is unclear: do we imagine a statue of the king, or should we rather perceive his presence in more ephemeral terms? By contrast, Simonides is given memorialising substance: though the use of τίθημι, the poet is presented as an 'inscription' that commemorates those 'entombed' within the house-collapse at Crannon - an act of pseudo-material commemoration undertaken by the gods themselves. Callimachus thus depicts Simonides as a delapidarised epigram, a speaking record which, freed from the detrimental constraints of materiality, functions in perpetuity. By thus blurring the medial distinctions of commemoration, Callimachus presents a re-envisaged form of sepulchral epigram, in which the act of memorialisation which stands at the heart of the genre transcends material restriction, to occupy the same conceptual space as performed song.[262]

---

[260] To what extent this figurative inscriptional act has a parallel in actual practice is unclear. Stobaeus provides, under the heading Σιμωνίδου Θρήνων, a quotation from the poet on the brevity of mortal life (Stob. *Ecl*.4.41.9 = *PMG* 521), accompanied by a note by Favorinus which runs Φαβωρίνου· ἄνθρωπος - ἔσσεται. ἀλλὰ μηδὲ οἶκον. ὥσπερ ἀμέλει ὁ ποιητὴς διεξέρχεται τὴν τῶν Σκοπαδῶν ἀθρόαν ἀπώλειαν; "Favorinus: you are a man - prosper. Don't say it of a household, either. Look at how the poet described the utter destruction of the Scopadae" (Fav. *AP* Stob. *Ecl*.4.41.62). Whether Favorinus refers to the quoted poem as the same in which Simonides treated the destruction of the Scopadae is uncertain; see further Bowra (1961), 325, Kegel (1962), 47-48, Molyneux (1971), 201n.12, (1992), 121-129. However, this suggests Simonides composed actual dirges in commemoration of the Scopadae following the house collapse, at which he may have been in attendance, and Callimachus' presentation of Simonides' pseudo-inscriptional commemoration may therefore adapt and reprise an actual instance of sung memorialisation, thereby reformatting the historical reality to suit Callimachus' re-envisaged inscriptional Simonides. Compare Theoc. *Id*.16.34-37, schol. ad *Id*.16.44. See further Page (1962), 243-244, Molyneux (1971), 203.

[261] As, e.g., in *FGE* 73 = *AP* 7.300, ascribed to Simonides. See further Tueller (2008), 23-27, 36, 50-52.

[262] See particularly Day (2000) on the reading of an epigram as a performance-act.

At every level of the *Tomb of Simonides*, the process of memorialisation evokes the nature of epigrammatic commemoration, in that said commemoration is brought to completion primarily through the communication between the voice of the text and the reader.[263] The reader is, therefore, a central figure in our interpretation of the poem but, similarly to the speaking voice, who it is that is envisaged as the addressee of the poem is purposefully ambiguous. The Dioscuri are addressed in the closing third of the poem,[264] but it is equally possible to perceive a more generic 'reader' - that is, the figure outside the poem, at this moment engaged in the process of reading the *Aetia* - as an unacknowledged addressee of the text.[265] Enrico Livrea, however, raises the possibility that the addressee, rather than being a non-specific or 'everyman' figure, might be Callimachus himself:[266] such a notion becomes particularly attractive if we consider the programmatic potential of Simonides, his poetry and the art of mnemotechnics for Callimachus,[267] and further perceive that the relationship between Simonides and the addressee as not dissimilar to that between Apollo and Callimachus in the *Aetia* Prologue.[268] In composing the poem, we might imagine Callimachus recording the inscription on Simonides' tomb in order to preserve it for posterity in the *Aetia,* particularly if the 'inscription' was not transmitted as a materialised text, but rather as an oral report, similar to Simonides' memorialisation of the dead Scopadae.[269] This activity of preserving the inscription contrasts Callimachus favourably with the general who reused Simonides' tomb as *spolia*: while the general seemingly built the gravestone into a military structure,[270] with the consequent loss of Simonides' memorial, Callimachus' activity of embedding the inscription

---

[263] On this trend in Callimachean epigrams, see particularly Meyer (1993).

[264] Beginning at 64.11 with the address to ὑμέας, Πολύδευκες, and reiterated with the vocative ὦνακες at 64.15: see further Meyer (2005), 227, Harder (2012), II.526, 528-529.

[265] E.g., Bing (1988b), 68, Harder (1996), 97, Morrison (2013), 292. The impression that a generic reader is envisaged as recipient of the text is equally encouraged by the overt allusions to sepulchral epigraphy the poem evinces, particularly the report of the inscription at 64.7-9.

[266] Livrea (2006), 53.

[267] A point raised by Männlein-Robert (2007b), 174. Meyer (2005), 228 suggests (with a comparison to Simon. fr.89 West (=146 Bergk = Arist. *Or.*28.59-60, II. 160.20 Keil) that the presentation of Simonides in fr.64 Pf. evokes the bookish type of scholar-poet, particularly with regards to his prodigious memory: it is certainly not impossible to perceive that Callimachus is here re-imagining Simonides with an updated, Alexandrian character. Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), 138-139 posit further that Callimachus may have approached Simonides' elegy on the battle of Plataea as a partial model for his production of the *Aetia*, given that poem's interweaving of myth in historical narrative.

[268] See further Hunter (2001) who explores the comparative usage of old age as a programmatic theme in Callimachus and Simonides.

[269] For such a notion in action, we can adduce Callimachus' epigram on Heraclitus (34 *GP = AP* 7.80) - with the initial note that εἶπέ τις, Ἡράκλειτε, τεὸν μόρον - as a comparable case of oral report transmitted into material memorial.

[270] See above, n.225, on the supplementations for the opening of l.7.

within a greater literary edifice inverts this earlier impious action, with the result that Callimachus can be said to treat the grave and its occupant with the appropriate piety.

The motifs of pious and impious action play a critical role in the programmatic agenda which Callimachus undertakes within the *Tomb of Simonides*: this is particularly apparent if we consider the historical events to which the poem alludes. The first line, with its reference to Camarina, recalls a famous anecdote which relates that the citizens of that town, beset by plague and illness, went to an oracle enquiring whether they might drain the lake which surrounded the settlement:[271] the marshy body of water, which had the same name as the town,[272] was presumed as the cause of the disease. The oracle's response, which is latterly preserved as μὴ κίνει Καμάριναν, ἀκίνητος γὰρ ἀμείνων, "Don't move Camarina, it is better unmoved",[273] was seemingly ignored, and the citizens soon learned the folly of their ways, as it transpired the lake had served as a protective barrier from attack which, now gone, left the town open to assault. Camarina was subsequently destroyed by aggressors, and the oracular response became proverbial.[274] The authenticity of the tale is debatable; nevertheless, Camarina became synonymous with rash action, ignoring sound advice, and 'solving' a lesser problem only to give rise to a greater disaster, as can be seen in the following anonymous epigram (*AP* 9.685), preserved with the heading εἰς Καμάριναν τὴν ἐν Σικελίᾳ λίμνην, "on Camarina, the lake in Sicily":

> μὴ κίνει Καμάριναν, ἀκίνητος γὰρ ἀμείνων,
> μή ποτε κινήσας τὴν μείονα μείζονα θείῃς.

> Don't move Camarina, it is better unmoved,
> unless, by moving it, you make the lesser greater.

The allusive reference to Camarina in the *Tomb of Simonides* is significant for our identification of the man who desecrated Simonides' burial-site: in moving the tomb, which stood πρὸ πόληος (64.3), the Phoenician general unwittingly repeats the impious mistake of the Camarinan citizens. Morrison, following Livrea, suggests that the missing word at the beginning of line 64.6 is Φοίνικ]α, and should indeed be read as an ethnic - thus as "the

---

[271] Serv. *ad.Aen.* 3.701 reports that the oracle was Apolline: other sources omit its origin.
[272] See also Pind. *O*.5.11-12, Verg. *Aen*.3.701. Pindar relates the existence of a nymph of the same name.
[273] See Fontenrose (1978), 85, 328, on the transmission of the oracular response.
[274] See also Serv. *ad.Aen.* 3.701, Ov. *Fast*.4.447, Sil. 14.198, *Sud*.s.v. Μὴ κίνει Καμάριναν (M 904 Adler); the *Suda* entry reports ὅθεν ἡ παροιμία εἴρηται ἐπὶ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτῶν βλαβερῶς τι ποιεῖν μελλόντων, "this (the failure to heed the oracle) gave rise to the proverb, referring to those about to do some harm to themselves." On Callimachus' use of this proverb, and proverbs more generally, see Lelli (2011), particularly 390.

Phoenician" rather than the name "Phoenix".[275] If this is the case - and I suggest it is - then the most likely 'Phoenician' brought to mind by this poem is the Carthaginian general Hannibal, who sacked Acragas in 406:[276] Diodorus Siculus' account of Hannibal's siege of the city notably recalls the *Tomb of Simonides* (13.86.1-3):

> οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀννίβαν σπεύδοντες κατὰ πλείονα μέρη τὰς προσβολὰς ποιεῖσθαι, παρήγγειλαν τοῖς στρατιώταις καθαιρεῖν τὰ μνήματα καὶ χώματα κατασκευάζειν μέχρι τῶν τειχῶν. ταχὺ δὲ τῶν ἔργων διὰ τὴν πολυχειρίαν συντελουμένων ἐνέπεσεν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον πολλὴ δεισιδαιμονία. τὸν γὰρ τοῦ Θήρωνος τάφον ὄντα καθ᾽ ὑπερβολὴν μέγαν συνέβαινεν ὑπὸ κεραυνοῦ διασεῖσθαι· διόπερ αὐτοῦ καθαιρουμένου τῶν τε μάντεων τινες προνοήσαντες διεκώλυσαν, εὐθὺ δὲ καὶ λοιμὸς ἐνέπεσεν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον, καὶ πολλοὶ μὲν ἐτελεύτων, οὐκ ὀλίγοι δὲ στρέβλαις καὶ δειναῖς ταλαιπωρίαις περιέπιπτον. ἀπέθανε δὲ καὶ Ἀννίβας ὁ στρατηγός, καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὰς φυλακὰς προπεμπομένων ἤγγελλόν τινες διὰ νυκτὸς εἴδωλα φαίνεσθαι τῶν τετελευτηκότων.

> Hannibal, being eager to make attacks in an increasing number of places, ordered the soldiers to tear down the *mnemata* and to build mounds up to the walls. But when these works had been quickly completed, because of the joint labour of many hands, a great superstitious fear fell upon the army. For it happened that the tomb of Theron, which was exceedingly large, was shaken by a stroke of lightning; consequently, when it was being torn down, certain soothsayers, foretelling what might happen, forbade it, and at once a plague broke out in the army, and many died of it while not a few suffered agonies and terrible distress. Among the dead was also Hannibal the general, and among the watch-guards who were sent out there were some who reported that in the night spirits of the dead were to be seen.[277]

The destruction of the μνήματα, and their reuse as χώματα with which to scale the walls, is directly comparable to 64.3-7. Furthermore, the fate of the impious Hannibal, perishing as a result of a heaven-sent plague after hastily desecrating the tomb of Theron (despite clear divine warnings to avoid such action), is an echo of the destruction of the short-sighted Camarinians, evoked at 64.1.[278] The parallels between the two accounts take on even greater significance when we note that Camarina was one of the Sicilian cities sacked in 405 by Himilco, who had

---

[275] Morrison (2013), 291.n.11, Livrea (2006).

[276] This reading runs counter to *Sud*.s.v. Σιμωνίδης (Σ 441 Adler), which makes 'Phoenix' an Acragantine general who destroyed Simonides' tomb in an ultimately failed defence of the city against a Syracusan assault but, as Dyer notes in his commentary to the entry, (Suda Online, http://www.stoa.org/sol-bin/search.pl last accessed June 2016), there is no record of this account in any other source: its absence (particularly from Diodorus' history) leads to the supposition that the *Suda* entry is likely a confused interpretation of *Aet*.64 Pf.

[277] Trans. Oldfather (1950), adapted.

[278] The purported connection between Simonides and Theron (see, e.g., schol. Pind. *O*.2.29, which relates that Simonides settled a quarrel between Theron and Hieron, and schol. Pind *I*.2 which reports that Simonides composed an ode for the Isthmian and Pythian victories of Theron's brother Xenocrates), could lend further credence to the notion that Callimachus utilised the account of the desecration of Theron's tomb as a particularly relevant model for the *Tomb of Simonides*; see further Molyneux (1992), 233ff., but cf. Podelecki (1979), 15-16 on the relative paucity of direct evidence regarding Simonides' presence on Sicily in the years leading up to his death (c.468).

succeeded Hannibal as leader of the Carthaginian offensive upon his death,[279] further situating the actions of Hannibal and the Camarinians within the same narrative sphere. Precisely when the Camarinians are purported to have drained their lake is unclear,[280] but despite this uncertainty, that Camarina had a proverbial reputation by Callimachus' time of writing, and that the city had, like Acragas, been a victim of Carthaginian aggression at the close of the 5th Century, readily allows for an intertextual reading of these twin Sicilian-based narratives of impiety. When taken together, the actions of the Camarinians and Hannibal thus serve as an impious counterpoint to the actions of Simonides - who celebrated the Dioscuri, and commemorated the Scopadae - and to Callimachus, who rescues the memory of Simonides from forgotten oblivion. Callimachus reinforces his own piety (and indeed, emphasises that he shares this trait with his predecessor) through the recollection of negative *exempla*, which he - the diligent scholar-poet - notes well, and knows to avoid.

Indeed, Callimachus' knowledge of Camarina and all that it symbolises is made clear much earlier in the *Aetia*. In *Aet.*fr.43 Pf., Callimachus, speaking *in propria persona* to the Muses, demonstrates his abundant knowledge by giving a list of Sicilian cities which invoke the name of their founders at sacrifices, seemingly questioning why the people of Zancle do not follow suit.[281] Amongst these, the poet asserts that φήσω καὶ Καμάριναν ἵν' Ἵππαρις ἀγκύλος ἕρπει "I will speak also about Camarina, where winding Hipparis streams" (43.42). The mention of Camarina recalls (or, more correctly, presages, given their relative positions within the *Aetia*) the *Tomb of Simonides*,[282] but there is furthermore a distinction made between Camarina and the other Sicilian cities which Callimachus identifies: I posit that this distinction may enhance our perception of Callimachus' presence within the *Tomb of Simonides*. In a manner which recalls the catalogues of epic poetry,[283] Callimachus reels off the cities of Sicily: after remarking that he will speak (φήσω, 43.42) of Camarina - and following three lacunose lines - he reveals that he knows (οἶδα, 43.46) of the city at the mouth of the river Gela and Cretan Minoa, that he knows (οἶδα, 43.50) of Leontini and of the Megarians, and that he can tell (ἔχω

---

[279] D.S. 13.86.3. On the relationship between Acragas and Camarina, D.S. 13.87; on the siege and sack of Camarina in 405, D.S. 13.91-96, 111-114.

[280] Pind. *O*.5, written in celebration of Psaumis of Camarina and dated to c.448, mentions the rivers Oanus and Hipparis, and also the ἐγχωρίαν λίμναν (10-12) which may support the ascription of the proverb to the assault and destruction of Camarina by the Carthaginians in the late 5th Century, rather than the city's sacking by the Syracusans in 552, or the attacks by Hippocrates in 492 or Gelo in 484 (both from Gela), with the assumption that the lake was still prominent prior to 448.

[281] 43.54-55. See further Harder (2012) *ad loc.,* and II.299-303.

[282] Notably, these are the only instances in which the town is mentioned in the *Aetia,* as far as can be determined from the fragments we possess.

[283] See Krevans (1984), 234-235, Harder (2012), II.302.

ἐνισπε[ῖν, 43.52) about Euboea and Eryx. [284] Camarina is the only city for which Callimachus places his action in the future, and indeed it is Camarina alone of these cities that reoccurs in the *Aetia*, in the *Tomb of Simonides*. While it seems plausible that Callimachus looks forward to when Camarina will again be spoken about in the *Aetia*, thereby subtly acknowledging his own speaking role in that poem, it is necessary to treat this notion with a degree of trepidation, given the incomplete status of the catalogue. We are particularly badly served by the omission of any definitive mention of Acragas or the Acragantines - Adelmo Barigazzi and Giambattista D'Alessio posit that]γύλονη[(43.44) may be a form of γογγύλος, "round", and refer to Acragas, a city situated on a hill which may have been described as rounded.[285] Knowing whether a mention Acragas (if it did appear amongst the exemplar cities Callimachus lists)[286] similarly foreshadowed the city's appearance in the *Tomb of Simonides* would lend greater certainty to the intertextual reading of these poems I propose here. In any case it is, I suggest, quintessentially Callimachean to provide evidence well before the fact that he, unlike Hannibal, knows the lesson exemplified by Camarina,[287] and that though he too appropriates Simonides' tomb within his own construction, he does so piously, in the furtherance of its original, memorialising purpose.

Within the *Tomb of Simonides*, Callimachus performs an act of memorialisation akin to Simonides' commemoration of the Scopadae, in effect reprising his predecessor's role, in order to memorialise him: as author and as a reader, he assumes both creative and receptive roles within the imagined epigrammatic discourse, recursively aggrandising Simonides through the reiteration of his memory. As the author of the text, Callimachus stands in antecedence to it, grounding it within the context of his oeuvre: the occurrence of the *Tomb of Simonides* within the *Aetia* - as a part of the corpus - inherently affects the reception of the poem, as a facet of the greater whole. However, Callimachus subtly occupies a receptive role simultaneously, through the preservation and presentation of the inscription on Simonides' tomb:[288] in the metafictional narrative of the composition of the *Aetia*, the author Callimachus must notionally

---

[284] See Harder (2013), 102 who suggests that these attestations of knowledge are tacit references to Callimachus' engagement with earlier authors.

[285] Barigazzi (1975), 6-7, D'Alessio (1996), II.424.n.15. See also D.S. 13.85.4-5.

[286] A possibility which seems plausible, given that the town was founded by citizens from Gela and had known founders, Aristonous and Pystilus, (see, e.g., Thuc. 6.4).

[287] Notably, the marshy land which the Camarinans drained bordered the river Hipparis: the river's mention in conjunction with the city in 43.42 may foreshadow the proverbial nature of Camarina's marsh in the *Tomb of Simonides*.

[288] Cf. Call. 40 *GP* = *AP* 7.522, in which the passerby reads the name on an inscription, and the expresses his grief - the act of reading occurs at both intra- and extra-textual levels, and the original object of reading is explicitly absent. See further Morrison (2013), 292, Walsh (1991), 95-97.

have borne witness to, or received some report (whether oral or written), of the content of Simonides' epitaph. The author therefore occupies a role analogous to the reader of the *Aetia* at the same moment in which he stands in antecedence to the poem, a seemingly dichotomous state of affairs mirrored by the incongruity of the deceased narrating his own absent commemoration.[289] With these two interconnected roles in mind, it benefits us to return to a question posed at the outset of this section: namely, by what means are we encouraged to hear Simonides as the speaker of this poem? Andrew Morrison distils the possible interpretive options readers face when engaging with the problem of identifying the speaker into two likely scenarios: a reader might assume that Simonides has risen from the dead, or might believe that the voice issues, as in many sepulchral epigrams, from the tomb itself.[290] However, Bing, who discounts the previous possibilities, raises a third: that Callimachus here impersonates Simonides, "allowing (Simonides) to borrow his voice in order to speak not from, but about his tombstone".[291] As Silvia Barbantani notes, the duality of voices engendered in the poem was noted in antiquity. Aelian (whose quotation of and commentary on an excerpt of fr.64 Pf. is *Suda* Σ 441 Adler) hears the voice of Simonides, but acknowledges that this voice is only allowed to sound-out thanks to Callimachus - the Hellenistic poet, Barbantani summarises, is perceived of as speaking *"in persona Simonidis"*:[292] οἰκτίζεται γοῦν τὸ ἄθεσμον ἔργον, καὶ λέγοντά γε αὐτὸν ὁ Κυρηναῖος πεποίηκε τὸν γλυκὺν ποιητήν..., "The Cyrenean (Callimachus) laments the unlawful deed, and makes the sweet poet (Simonides) speak".[293] The fragmentary status of the poem makes an absolute resolution as to the source of the speaker impossible - we cannot know from where the voice ultimately issues, whether the tomb, or Simonides revived - but Morrison argues, plausibly, that Callimachus need not have ever made the 'location' of the speaker explicit:[294] indeed, an ambiguous speaking voice would serve as yet another recapitulation of Simonidean epigrammatic style. I suggest, following Bing's proposal regarding the possibility that Callimachus impersonates rather than revives his predecessor, that the ambiguous locative origin of the voice of the poem allows Callimachus, blurring the delineation between the character of Simonides realised in the text and his own authorial

---

[289] Acosta-Hughes (2011), 598.
[290] Morrison (2013), 290-291. Morrison notes Callimachus' use of both techniques in his epigrams, e.g., 43 *GP* = *AP* 7.521, 48 *GP* = *AP* 7.728. See further Bruss (2005), Tueller (2008), 112-116, 185-193.
[291] Bing (1988b), 68.
[292] Barbantani (2010), 46.
[293] *Sud*.s.v. Σιμωνίδης (Σ 441 Adler) = Ael. fr.66 p.56.12 Domingo-Forasté.
[294] Morrison (2013), 292-293.

persona, to permeate every level of the poem, becoming author, narrator and reader of the text simultaneously.

As noted, Callimachus responds to Simonides' critique of lithic permanence by purposefully dematerialising the poet from the physical site at which he would be memorialised: Callimachus, however, preserves the memorialising function one would expect of the tomb-and-inscription composite by returning the words of the inscription to the voice of the tomb's incumbent, transfiguring the third person grave-report (this is the tomb in which Simonides lies) into first person utterance ("this is my tomb: it said I lay there"). Callimachus reconfigures the text of the inscription into speech - evoking an oral performance of the epigram - by strongly asserting the lack of material context. In doing so, Callimachus metaphorically gives voice to Simonides: the book of the *Aetia* becomes the space from which the poet can speak, a simultaneously material and ephemeral space of reading and performance.

The relationship between Callimachus and Simonides is, therefore, a complex engagement between Callimachus and his poetic predecessor, but also between the author and the encapsulated representation of the epigrammatic genre. Callimachus inhabits the role of the reader of an epigram, but this role of commemoration equally elides him with the memorialiser *par excellence*, thereby presenting himself as a Simonides for the Alexandrian milieu. This process - the representation of a poetic forebear undertaken in conjunction with an adoption of that forebear's status (achieved through the author's re-imagining of said forebear) - is, as already observed in the *Seal* of Posidippus, a recurrent technique of authorial self-representation in the Hellenistic period. Perhaps the most famous example of the process is Callimachean: in *Iambs* 1 and 13, the author revives the poet Hipponax, and then assumes a Hipponactean character to reinforce his own programmatic assertions. Much scholarship has been written considering Callimachus' engagement with Hipponax: Acosta-Hughes' analyses of the two *Iambs* are particularly incisive.[295] I will not here reiterate the wealth of discussion over the intertextuality of the two poems, but rather focus particularly on the manner in which Callimachus establishes Hipponax as both an autonomous character within the *Iambs*, and also as a figure through whom he channels his own authorial presence. I suggest that, in Callimachus' multi-layered engagement with Hipponax, we observe a situation with definite thematic and metapoetic parallels to the relationship between the author and his predecessor in

---

[295] Acosta-Hughes (1996), (2002), 21-103. Other important studies: Degani (1977), 106ff., Clayman (1980), Hunter (1997), Kerkhecker (1999).

the *Tomb of Simonides*. In light of these similarities, I argue that we should consider the *Tomb of Simonides* in similar terms; that is, as a programmatically significant work in which the poet reflects upon his own practice, through the means of representing, reconfiguring and adopting the character of a poetic antecedent.

At the opening of *Iamb* 1, Hipponax makes a dramatic entrance (191.1-4):

> Ἀκούσαθ' Ἱππώνακτος· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω
> ἐκ τῶν ὅκου βοῦν κολλύβου πιπρήσκουσιν,
> φέρων ἴαμβον οὐ μάχην ἀείδοντα
> τὴν βουπάλειον

> Listen to Hipponax, for indeed I have come
> from the place where they sell an ox for a penny,
> bearing an iamb which does not sing
> of the Bupalean battle[296]

As Acosta-Hughes notes, "almost every syllable in the first two lines serves to deceive the audience":[297] the command to Ἀκούσαθ' Ἱππώνακτος does not immediately reveal the speaker's identity, which is only resolved with ἥκω.[298] This, however, raises further problems: Hipponax, it seems, has risen from the Underworld to scold the *philologoi* of Alexandria (as the *Diegesis* relates),[299] untroubled by the transgression of the boundary between life and death.[300] However, in returning Hipponax to the world of the living, Callimachus makes it clear that the poet will remain but briefly to give the scholars a chance to learn his lesson, as observable in the following passage (191.31-35):

> σωπὴ γενέσθω καὶ γράφεσθε τὴν ῥῆσιν.
> ἀνὴρ Βαθυκλῆς Ἀρκάς - οὐ μακρὴν ἄξω,
> ὦ λῷστε μὴ σίμαινε, καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' αὐτός
> μέγα σκολάζ[ω·] δ[ε]ῖ με γὰρ μέσον δινεῖν
> 35 φεῦ φ]εῦ Ἀχέρο[ντ]ος

> Let there be silence, and write down what I say.
> Bathycles, a man of Arcadia - I'll not draw on at length,
> good man, don't turn up your nose, for I don't have
> much time: alas alas, for I must whirl

---

[296] Trans. Acosta-Huges (2002).
[297] Acosta-Hughes (2002), 37.
[298] Although the first line may be a Hipponactean borrowing: see Acosta-Hughes, (1996), 207, (2002), 37 n.15, Kerkhecker (1999), 19.n.52.
[299] *Dieg*.6.3-4.
[300] The poet's legendary ability to harangue perceived opponents is well observed in the funerary epigrams which purport to be on his tomb, as noted above. See also, on the comparable characterisation of Hipponax in Herodas *Mimiamb* 8, on which see Chapter 4.1.

35   in the midst of Acheron[301]

Notably, Hipponax encourages in his listeners the characteristically Hellenistic act of medial transformation, in a similar manner to Posidippus' Muses, who are requested to turn song into text (*AB* 118.5-6). However, the immediate interruption of his tale of Bathycles with the seemingly placatory address to one of the scholars surrounding him underscores that Hipponax is only on day release from Hades: Callimachus' composition has resurrected him but, at the close of the narrative of *Iamb* 1, the poet will cease to speak, and will thus return to the silence of the grave (it is not difficult to conceive of the dead poet hoping that, by writing his words, the *philologoi* will ensure his continued revival).[302] This promise of coming absence is, however, juxtaposed with a recapitulation of Hipponactean presence in *Iamb* 13: the speaker of that poem repeatedly uses the language employed by Hipponax in *Iamb* 1,[303] and the resumption of Hipponactean voice seems to signal a return of the poet himself. However, the speaker, in answer to a critic who castigates him for having not gone to Ephesus and been there inspired (203.12-14),[304] revels in the fact (203.64-66), and in doing so, disallows the notion that the speaker might be Hipponax. Instead, a reader is encouraged to hear Callimachus' voice modulated with Hipponactean overtones: it is particularly telling that the first lines of Callimachus' response (203.24-25) are redolent of Hipponax' words in *Iamb* 1, establishing from the outset the polyphonic character of Callimachus' utterance.

If we consider the manner in which Callimachus engages with the figure of Hipponax over the course of *Iambs* 1 and 13, we can observe a number of techniques by which the author recalls his predecessor in the words spoken by his own persona. It becomes apparent that Callimachus infuses his authorial persona with the essence of his forebear through their comparable utterances but, critically, the 'Hipponax' which Callimachus' persona evokes is equally a Callimachean construct. Indeed, Callimachus creates Hipponax as a persona, whose depiction is informed by the perceived authorial persona of the poet encountered in the reading of Hipponax' own poetry, as the Hipponax of *Iamb* 1 maintains the characteristically aggressive mode familiar from those Hipponactean verses seemingly spoken *in propria persona*. However, this figure is not transposed to the Callimachean setting unchanged: instead,

---

[301] Trans. Acosta-Hughes (2002), adapted.
[302] Bing (1988b), 66 suggests that the *philologoi* might remain fundamentally uninformed if Hipponax' message was transmitted in any other media than text.
[303] E.g., we can read 203.24-25, ὦ λῷστ᾽, ερῆμος[   ]. ρ ἡ ῥῆσις / ἀκου...., with 191.33, ὦ λῷστε, 191.31, τὴν ῥῆσιν, 191.1, Ἀκούσαθ᾽. Compare also 191.11 with 203.17; 191.89 with 203.27; 191.91-92 with 203.25-26. See further Pfeiffer (1949), *ad loc.*, Clayman (1980), 46, Acosta-Hughes (2002), 96.
[304] See Bing (1988b), 38.n.60.

Callimachus reinterprets his predecessor, updating him for the Hellenistic era. This alter-Hipponax then serves as a model for Callimachus' authorial persona in *Iamb* 13, and the composition of the Callimachean Hipponax in turn forms the basis for the Hipponactean Callimachus. Central to Callimachus' effort is the establishment of a poetic predecessor to legitimise his act of composing poetry: Hipponax comes to encapsulate Hipponactean poetics, but through his presentation, Callimachus emphasises that he is not beholden to his forebear as an inspirational figure. Rather, Callimachus' Hipponactean aspect attests to his own facility with iambic verse.

Callimachus' depiction of and engagement with Hipponax is, I suggest, a critical parallel for an understanding of the relationship between Simonides and Callimachus in the *Tomb of Simonides*. In both cases, the situation of Simonides and Hipponax - that is, where they are, how they speak, in what form they return to speak - is a reflection of their role as encapsulations of poetic genres, and those genres' own treatment by Callimachus. Hipponax' generally antagonistic aspect towards the *philologoi* is tempered by his moralising tale, but he emphatically asserts his iambic character in the first lines of the poem. Though the song he brings is not that of Bupalus, it is, resolutely, still an ἴαμβος (191.3).[305] Similarly, Simonides is depicted after the epigrammatic genre for which he is renowned: he is identified by - and then characterised as - a dematerialised inscribed poem. There is, however, one significant difference in the establishment of the two poets within Callimachus' work. The query over the identity of the speaker in *Iamb* 1 is swiftly resolved, and there is no question as to where Hipponax' voice issues from, as he himself attests to his return from Hades and his presence in contemporary Alexandria.[306] As opposed to the disinterred, disenfranchised Simonides, Hipponax is rendered tangible, located with topographical certainty in the temple of Sarapis (191.9; *Dieg.*6.3-4). Where Simonides is liminal - a disembodied voice speaking in explicitly decontextualized circumstances - Hipponax is central, surrounded by the throng of Alexandrian scholar-poets, a centrality which mirrors his programmatic role within the *Iambs* as a whole.[307] Despite these differences, however, there is a notable parallel: the material state of both poets encapsulates the innovations Callimachus has wrought upon their respective genres. Hipponax,

---

[305] Acosta-Hughes (2002), 46 notes the manner in which both Hipponax and Euhemerus' poetic outputs are treated as equivalent for their authors - it is the *iambus* which does not sing of the battle with Bupalus (ἴαμβον οὐ μάχην ἀείδοντα / τὴν Βουπάλειον, 191.3-4), while it is the books which are castigated as unrighteous (ἄδικα βιβλία, 191.11): poetry and poet are elided, in a process which mirrors that of Callimachus' adoption of Hipponactean characteristics.
[306] Morrison (2007), 202 notes the frequency of self-naming in Hipponax' own poetry. Cf. Clayman (1980), 56-57 who proposes a reading of Hipponax *qua* Callimachus in this instance due to the spatial and temporal setting.
[307] See Harder (2007), 90-91 on the temporal ambiguity of Simonides in fr.64 Pf.

made manifest, commands his audience to transform his utterance (ῥῆσιν, 191.31) into material form through writing (γράφεσθε at 191.31 recalling Ἀκούσαθ' at 191.1, and reinforcing the conceptual evolution of Hipponax' medium).[308] This evokes Callimachus' own materialisation of the iambic genre - his activity of writing iambic poetry in book-form.[309] Likewise, Simonides' dematerialised state corresponds to Callimachus' dematerialisation of epigram, his transposition of the genre from the lithic context of the inscribed stele to the book-roll.

Callimachus' generic developments are therefore encapsulated in the representation of Hipponax and Simonides. Abandoning his traditional themes, "the new Hipponax - keenly alive and meddlesome, yet mellowed and humane - is all (Callimachus') own", as Arnd Kerkhecker puts it.[310] Much as Hipponax returns from Hades a changed man, the Simonides who emerges from the *Tomb of Simonides* is not a straight analogue of the historical figure: as I have demonstrated, Callimachus artfully depicts the poet through the lens of literary reception, utilising Simonides' poetry as a basis for the character, and then reworking that character within his own Alexandrian context. Simonidean views on inscription and memorialisation - along with the anecdotes regarding the poet's famous memory - are layered and recomposed, and the resulting palimpsest is re-inscribed in a Callimachean style, to create a figure who is at once reminiscent of the Simonides of old, and yet a thoroughly novel character. In Callimachus' presentation of Simonides, the poet creates a multifaceted evocation of the epigrammatic genre, his predecessor's critique of stone's claim to speak of fame eternally and, finally, an encapsulation of his own memorialising powers. In composing the *Tomb of Simonides*, Callimachus revives Simonides' concerns regarding the memorialising ability of stone, but also presents an alternative vehicle for commemoration, that being his own bookish poetry. Callimachus, through the deft employment of the language and tropes of inscribed epigram, demonstrates that his poetry can function as a pseudo-epigrammatic memorial, without the necessary material context of the stone. Callimachus emphasises his own centrality to the act of commemoration, as the author demonstrates the ability to embody the memorialising role which Simonides' plays in relation to the Scopadae: by recalling Simonides and saving his memory from going unremembered, Callimachus takes on a role akin to that of the Dioscuri. His relocation of Simonides from the defunct tomb to his own book-roll preserves

---

[308] Again, it is noteworthy that Hipponax insults Euhemerus through his composition of ἄδικα βιβλία (191.11), reinforcing the literary dimension of his revived iambic mode. See further Edmunds (2001), 77-79, Acosta-Hughes (2002), 46, 51-52.

[309] See 203.24-25, ῥῆσις / ἀκου.... with *Dieg.*9.33-36, which characterises the criticism levelled at Callimachus as criticism of what he writes, γράφει (*Dieg.*9.35).

[310] Kerkhecker (1999), 17.

the poet in the literary edifice of the *Aetia* but - as might be expected - the effort serves to celebrate Callimachus as much as it memorialises Simonides.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

In Posidippus' *Seal*, and Callimachus' *Tomb of Simonides*, I have assessed how authors engaged with their predecessors as a facet of the broader activity of self-representation, and as part of a reflection upon the nature of their poetry. In the *Seal*, Posidippus draws upon the aesthetic commentary he undertakes in the Milan Papyrus, particularly in his engagement with Philitas, as an intertextual frame of reference: in simultaneously utilising the narrative which surrounded the heroisation of Archilochus, the author creates a new, composite tradition which borrows aspects from those of both predecessors, unified within his own self-representation. At the same time, the author embeds his engagement with predecessors within a sustained reflection on the nature of his epigrammatic poetics. Indeed, we find Posidippus eliding these two strands, as the representation of Philitas, and the characteristically epigrammatic manner in which Posidippus alludes to his tradition through his own reading statue, merges reflections upon genre and predecessor in a manner that surpasses the basic presumption of the predecessor as a static model. It is striking that Callimachus undertakes an eminently similar a process in the *Tomb of Simonides*: Callimachus' Simonides is both Simonides (the poet) and Simonides (the embodiment of epigram) and the author's engagement with this composite figure further reflects the complex perception of predecessors as something more than fixed figures, who existed solely in antecedence to the authors of the day.

In their representations of predecessors, Posidippus and Callimachus further evince a conception of epigram as a context of memorialisation which builds upon the established, inscribed tradition. For both authors - and for others, as I shall demonstrate subsequently - epigram became a means of critically appraising poetic tradition at both the level of content and form, ultimately applicable as an apparatus even beyond works of formally epigrammatic character. Particularly in the case of Callimachus, the book-roll frames this re-appraisal: the physical site of memory brought into existence through the collocation of text and inscribed object is transformed, with the book-roll offering a new form of material memorialisation, without the hyper-occasional aspect of the text-object memorial. I pick up this thread in the following chapter, assessing how the book-roll functioned as a fundamentally new context for composite acts of self-representation.

Chapter 3
Composite Self-Representation in Epigrammatic Collections

Introduction

In Chapter 1, considering how the transition from the stone to the book-roll effected authorial self-representation, I posited that it was the rupturing of the strictly delimited communication context of inscribed epigram that allowed authors to manifest as a presence within the genre. The impact of this contextual shift is observable on an epigram-by-epigram basis, but this, of course, is far from a complete picture: indeed, while the possibility for authors to make themselves present within individual epigrams is significant in itself, what is equally notable is how the context of the collection as a format allowed authors to undertake the process of self-representation over the course of multiple poems. We have already seen this phenomenon occurring, to an extent, in Posidippus' *Andriantopoiika*, wherein each successive poem responds and contributes to an overarching process of aesthetic reflection, only fully perceptible when appreciating the sequence as both a collection of individual epigrams, and as a unified body. This interplay between individual and whole, requiring a reader to appreciate both the micro and macrocosmic context of each poem, became a staple facet of authorial self-representation across the spectrum of poetry. However, the early epigrammatists, and their composition of poetic collections, are the forerunners of this habit. It is two leading lights of early Hellenistic epigram whom I focus upon in this chapter, precisely on account of their construction of composite authorial personae.

I begin by considering the epigrams of Nossis: assessing her corpus as a unified whole, I demonstrate that we observe the author creating a persona cumulatively, over the course of the collection. I argue that Nossis encapsulates the process of her development as an independent poetic voice through the interrelation of her epigrams, moving out of the shadow of her predecessors, and becoming a figure of poetic authority within her own right. Turning to the poems of Asclepiades, I argue that the author engages with the self-representative potential of the book-roll twice over. Firstly, I examine how the author uses the roll as a means for self-reflection; as a medium through which to recursively respond to the poems of the collection from within the collection itself. In so doing, Asclepiades effectively creates a bifurcated authorial persona, divided between two guises, that of the 'poet-lover', and that of the editorial persona: an authoritative, pseudo-omniscient figure with knowledge of Asclepiades' poems

qua poems, and of the collection as their contextual frame. Secondly, I suggest that Asclepiades uses the book-roll as a device through which to conceptualise his predecessors' poetry: in his 'book-label' epigrams for the poetry of Erinna and Antimachus, Asclepiades enmeshes the character of the poets with their work, creating a composite of poetry and predecessor that reflects the Alexandrian bookish aesthetic, but which also exhibits a knowing extrapolation of the habits of biographical interpretation, as applied to earlier poets.

3.1 *Silencing the echoes of Sappho: Nossis' assertion of poetic individuality*

Nossis has been heralded as one of the first authors to offer a collection of her own poetry: her epigrams, which date from the early 3rd Century,[311] are seemingly bookended by two poems in which the author names herself, and which seem to establish Nossis' poetic programme.[312] It has been persuasively argued that these epigrams are the culmination of a broader activity of authorial self-representation within Nossis' collection:[313]

(1 *GP* = *AP* 5.170)

> ἅδιον οὐδὲν ἔρωτος, ἃ δ᾽ ὄλβια, δεύτερα πάντα
> ἐστίν· ἀπὸ στόματος δ᾽ ἔπτυσα καὶ τὸ μέλι.
> τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς· τίνα δ᾽ ἁ Κύπρις οὐκ ἐφίλασεν
> οὐκ οἶδεν τήνας τἄνθεα ποῖα ῥόδα.

> Nothing is sweeter than desire, all that is blest is second
> to it: I spit even honey from my mouth.
> Nossis says this: the one who has never been loved by Cypris
> does not know what kind of flowers roses are.

(11 *GP* = *AP* 7.718)

> ὦ ξεῖν᾽, εἰ τύ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μυτιλάναν
> τᾶν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐναυσομένος,
> εἰπεῖν ὡς Μούσαισι φίλαν τήνᾳ τε Λόκρισσα
> τίκτεν· ἴσαις δ᾽ ὅτι μοι τοὔνομα Νοσσίς, ἴθι.[314]

> Stranger, if you are sailing to Mytilene of fair dances,
> to be inspired by the flower of Sappho's graces,
> say that a Locrian woman bore me, one dear to the Muses and to her.
> Knowing that my name is Nossis, go.

In the first epigram, Nossis seems to situate her authorial persona amongst and against a gaggle of poetic antecedents, while also taking the first steps to establish the female-orientated and highly personal world that emerges over the course of her epigrams.[315] Here, the debt which Nossis' authorial persona owes to Sappho is easily felt: particularly notable is the echo of Sappho fr.16.3-4 - in which the speaker announces that ἐγὼ δὲ κῆν᾽ ὅτ/τω τις ἔραται, "I hold

---

[311] On Nossis' *flourit,* see Gutzwiller (1998), 74-75.
[312] As noted by Reitzenstein (1893), 139, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1913), 298-299, (1924), I.135. See further Luck (1954), 183, Gigante (1974), (1981).
[313] Gutzwiller (1997), 211-222, (1998), 74-88, 113-114.
[314] Lines 3-4 follow Gow and Page (1965), Gallavotti (1971) and Gutzwiller (1998) in printing Λόκρισσα rather than Λοκρὶς γᾶ. See Gallavotti (1971), 243, 245-246 for a defence of this reading.
[315] See particularly Luck (1954), Skinner (1989), (2002), (2005) Gutzwiller (1997), (1998), 74-88, Bowman (1998), Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007), 445-446.

(the most beautiful thing) is whatever one loves" - in the epigram's opening assertion of the primacy of desire above all other things. Through Sappho, Nossis connects herself also to the poetic/erotic power of Aphrodite, engendering a distinctly female quality to her self-representation and the programmatic delineation of her poetry.[316] Nossis' recollection of Sapphic eroticism is wedded to a remembrance (and revision) of Hesiod's presentation of the poet's relationship to the Muses, in a similar fashion to that undertaken by Sappho: ὁ δ᾽ ὄλβιος, ὄντινα Μοῦσαι / φίλωνται· γλυκερή οἱ ἀπο στόματος ῥέει αὐδή, "blest is the one whom the Muses love: sweet song pours from his mouth" (*Th.*96-97).[317] Marilyn Skinner, furthermore, sees here a recollection and rejection of Pindaric epinician.[318] By emphasising the primacy of Aphrodite and the rose (which itself alludes to Sappho's βρόδων τὼν ἐκ Πιερίας, "roses from Pieria", fr.55.2-3),[319] Nossis rejects Pindar's assertion that κόρον δ᾽ ἔχει / καὶ μέλι καὶ τὰ τέρπν᾽ ἄνθε᾽ Ἀφροδίσια, "even honey and Aphrodite's delightful flowers can be cloying" (*N.*7.52-53).[320] Skinner suggests that we observe "a pivotal opposition between Pindar and Sappho - that is, between two antithetical modes of lyric composition", in which Sappho emblematises Nossis' own female-orientated poetic mode.[321]

To what extent Nossis engages with her contemporaries - or near-predecessors - is less certain: Kathryn Gutzwiller's suggestion that Nossis here rejects the non-erotic poetry of Erinna is attractive, though relies on the notion that Erinna connected her work to the bee within her own poetry, which cannot be substantiated from the extant fragments of the *Distaff*.[322] In *AP* 5.170, Nossis might connect herself to the developing traditions of epigram by recalling Asclepiades' programmatic assertion of the primacy of eroticism (1 *GP* = *AP* 5.169).[323] Benjamin Acosta-

---

[316] See particularly Skinner (2002) on the distinction between male and female patterns of poetic inspiration with regards to Nossis' connection to Sappho, and Aphrodite through that poet.

[317] See Martino (1987). See further Waszink (1974), 6-9, Bowman (1998), 49-50, Gutzwiller (1998), 76-77, Skinner (2002), 70-71.

[318] Skinner (1989), 10-11.

[319] On Sapphic influences see Gigante (1974), 25, Bowman (1998), Gutzwiller (1998), 76-79, Skinner (2002), (2005). See further Pind. *O.*6.105. Compare also Mel. 1 *GP* = *AP* 4.1.6 who describes Sappho's poems within his anthology as βαιὰ μέν, ἀλλὰ ῥόδα: see further Degani (1981), 52 and Skinner (1989), 8-11, (2002), 70 on the interpretation of Nossis' flowers as her poems. Both note the poetological significance of the Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος in *AP* 7.718.2. See further Gutzwiller (1998), 79.

[320] Notably, Pindar emphasises the honey-like quality of his verse on multiple occasions, e.g., μελίγαρυες ὕμνοι (*O.*11.4) - compare ἀδυμελῆ κελαδήσω (*O.*11.4); see further Waszink (1974), 8-11.

[321] Skinner (1989), 10.

[322] Gutzwiller (1997), 219-221, (1998), 77-79. That Erinna was likened to a bee is readily apparent, but all examples are seemingly later than Nossis' *floruit*, barring perhaps *AP* 7.13, which is ascribed either to Leonidas or Meleager. See, on *AP* 7.13, Neri (2003), 192. The fact that Herodas refers to one Nossis as daughter of Erinna (6.21-22) does not necessarily imply Nossis herself established - or eschewed - such a connection, given the broader purpose behind Herodas' incorporation of female poets in *Mimiamb* 6 and 7, on which see Chapter 6.1.

[323] Gutzwiller (1997), 215, (1998), 86 argues for Nossis' use of Asclep. 1 *GP* = *AP* 5.169 as a model, the text of which is given below, Chapter 3.2. Asclepiades' poem is itself seemingly engaged in the act of looking back to

Hughes has suggested that Asclepiades' epigram is itself a "perception of Asclepiades as a reader of Sappho",[324] but there is no clear means by which to determine whether Asclepiades influenced Nossis or vice versa.[325] Despite disagreement over the extent to which Nossis acknowledges her immediate poetic zeitgeist in this epigram, her engagement with the established tradition of poetic predecessors is unequivocal. Nossis presents her authorial persona as an adherent of Sappho's poetics and, through this predecessor, of Aphrodite, demonstrating the strength of her attachment through the rejection of Pindaric and Hesiodic poetics. Sappho thus underpins Nossis' poetic activity, but the assumption that the poet's adherence to her model remains static, and is in fact recapitulated *tout court* in *AP* 7.718, misses the artful renegotiation of tradition and the concept of poetic inspiration that Nossis undertakes in that epigram. In order to fully appreciate Nossis' engagement with Sappho, and her own process of authorial self-representation, it is first necessary to re-address the nature of the relationship between the two poets in *AP* 5.170.

The act of self-identifying by name within poetry is the most overt form by which an author could make their presence felt in relation to their work (with the proviso being, of course, that a reader would have to possess some awareness that said person was, in fact, the author of the piece beforehand).[326] However, as observed in Chapter 1, explicit authorial identification in inscribed epigram still separated the author from the narrative action - and reception - of the epigram itself. In *AP* 5.170, Nossis is made present not simply as the author behind the text, but as an authorial persona identified by the text: the sphragistic declaration of whose voice issues forth from the epigram that occurs at *AP* 5.170.3, τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς, "Nossis says this",[327] is recapitulated in *AP* 7.718 with the assertion that the reader stands in full knowledge that μοι τοὔνομα Νοσσίς, "my name is Nossis", and, possessing that knowledge, is able to go on their way. However, the interpretation of τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς as a defiant statement of

---

epigrammatic antecedents: Gutzwiller (1998), 73-74, 76-77 suggests Asclepiades presents a revision of the pastoral subject matter of Anyte in his programmatic self-definition. See further Sens (2011), 1-3.

[324] Acosta-Hughes (2010), 90.

[325] Asclep. 31 *GP* = *AP* 7.500 has been suggested as the direct inspiration for *AP* 7.718, but similar elements in both hearken back to pre-existing models, as discussed below. Perhaps surprisingly, there seems to be little - if any - recollection of Anyte's work in Nossis' epigrams, beyond a general reconfiguration of that poet's practice in Nossis' employment of a semi-external authorial presence as a unifying device. See further Gutzwiller (1998), 87, Acosta-Hughes (2010), 89-90.

[326] Equally, there is the possibility that self-naming may not be wholly obvious, as in cases where a poet gives their name through an acrostic. See Courtney (1990), Klooster (2011), 177.n.8. See further the discussion of naming and *sphragides* in the Introduction.

[327] Bowman (1998), 50 notes the comparison with the *Seal* of Theognis l.22, Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη τοῦ Μεγαρέως, "this is the utterance of Theognis of Megara", combined with the assertion that he will be famous - ὀνομαστός, "named" - among all men.

personal poetics misses the inherent irony of such a statement within a work rendered cacophonous by the intrusion of so many other poetic voices. While Nossis stridently rejects the masculine poetics of Hesiod and Pindar in favour of Sappho's voice, there is little sense of Nossis' own authorial persona here, so entangled with - and indebted to - extant tradition is her programmatic stance in this poem. It is further significant that, while Nossis speaks in the first person in *AP* 7.718, her utterance in *AP* 5.170 is made more remote through the use of the third person.[328] I posit that the declaration that "Nossis says this", when taken in concert with the profusion of external poetic influences exhibited in the epigram, is not an assertion of personal poetic creed, but rather a subtle demonstration that the Nossis presented in *AP* 5.170 is, at best, a recapitulation of a Sapphic persona: the echo of Sappho's "I hold (the most beautiful thing) is whatever one loves" (fr.16.3-4) demonstrates that, in reality, here Nossis says nothing new, but simply repeats the assertions of her predecessor.

Nossis' authorial position becomes more distinct and personal throughout her dedicatory epigrams: though 2 *GP* = *AP* 6.132 and 3 *GP* = *AP* 6.265 contain nothing in the way of authorial interjection, and resemble rather the depersonalised dedicatory epigrams familiar to us from the inscribed sources (though the latter is addressed to Hera, and seems to commemorate a dedication made by Nossis and her mother),[329] 4 *GP* = *AP* 9.332 represents a distinct emergence of a personalised voice. In it, the voice of the epigram accompanies the (female) reader, with the poem opening by suggesting ἐλθοῖσαι ποτὶ ναὸν ἰδώμεθα τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας / τὸ βρέτας, "let's go to the temple and see the statue of Aphrodite". Similar to Callimachus' epigram on Sopolis' cenotaph discussed in Chapter 1 (45 *GP* = *AP* 7.271), Nossis here utilises the 'internalising I' of inscribed epigram to internalise not only the reader, but the author simultaneously, allowing her voice to sound out from within the text. This more direct engagement between the voice in the epigram and the reader - which, with every recurrence, suggests a consistent and constant companion accompanying the reader throughout the collection - continues in 5 *GP* = *AP* 6.275, 6 *GP* = *AP* 9.605, 7 *GP* = *AP* 9.604 and 8 *GP* = *AP* 6.353, all of which contain reflections by the voice of the epigram on the subject of the dedication, the quality of the craftsmanship and the excellence of the dedicators. 9 *GP* = *AP* 6.354 represents a further manifestation of 'Nossis', as the voice of the epigram commands the reader to θάεο, "observe", and, noting the lifelike quality of the dedicated image, remarks τὰν πινυτὰν τό τε μείλιχον αὐτόθι τήνας /

---

[328] See Skinner (2005), 125-126. See also the consideration of Fantuzzi (2009) on the use of the third person in *sphragides*, outlined at n.90.
[329] On this poem see Skinner (1989), 1-3.

ἔλπομ᾽ ὁρῆν, "I hope from here to see her wisdom and tenderness" (6.354.3-4). As Gutzwiller notes, "the 'Nossis' who narrates assumes a double role, an internal dramatic narrator speaking to her Locrian friends at the site of the dedications and, at the same time, as author and compiler speaking to us, her readers, from some uncertain literary or imaginative time and place".[330] The dedicatory epigrams attest to the growing substance of Nossis' own voice, emerging through the aesthetic appreciation of women's dedications: Nossis draws the reader into her constructed world, a world that coheres because of the underlying presence of her authorial persona throughout. This self-expression culminates in the decisive speech of Nossis' authorial persona in *AP* 7.718.

It has been noted that *AP* 7.718 recalls an epigram of one of the author's contemporaries, that being Asclepiades' epigram written as an accompaniment to a cenotaph for one Euippus, lost at sea (31 *GP* = *AP* 7.500).[331] Both epigrams open with an address to the reader using conventional terms, requesting that the reader pass on a message of sorts should he then reach a certain destination, before concluding with an assertion of the deceased's name.[332] Sonya Tarán, following Richard Reitzenstein, raises the possibility that both epigrams take Simonides' epigram on the Spartan dead as a model.[333] However, she concludes that we should avoid viewing Nossis' epigram as simply sepulchral, making a comparison between *AP* 7.718 and the self-epitaphs produced by Callimachus, Leonidas and Meleager, and further suggesting that in the former, "the general tone and intention are different".[334] The notion that this epigram should be treated as pseudo-sepulchral underpins the responses of Gutzwiller, Acosta-Hughes and Silvia Barbantani, who posit that Nossis reforms the funereal context into a celebratory, and reflexively laudatory, appreciation of Sapphic (and Nossis' own) poetics.[335] While I am persuaded by the suggestion that Nossis in part breaks with strict conventionality, I suggest that this reading discounts Nossis' engagement with traditional elements of sepulchral epigram,

---

[330] Gutzwiller (1998), 83-84.
[331] See Tarán (1979), 132-149. Asclep. 31 *GP* = *AP* 7.500: ὦ παρ᾽ ἐμὸν στείχων κενὸν ἠρίον, εἶπον, ὁδῖτα, / εἰς Χίον εὖτ᾽ ἂν ἴκῃ, πατρὶ Μελησαγόρῃ / ὡς ἐμὲ μὲν καὶ νῆα καὶ ἐμπορίην κακὸς Εὖρος / ὤλεσεν, Εὐίππου δ᾽ αὐτὸ λέλειπτ᾽ ὄνομα. See also Acosta-Hughes (2010), 85.
[332] Though note Tueller (2008), 64.n.19 for reservations on reading either poem as an influence upon the other.
[333] *FGE* 22b = *AP* 7.249 = Hdt. 7.228. Tarán (1979), 132.n.2, 146, after Reitzenstein (1893), 137.n.2. Reitzenstein notes particularly the corresponding use of infinitive in place of imperative in both poems.
[334] Tarán (1979), 148. See further Reitzenstein (1893), 139, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1913), 299. Cf. Gallavotti (1971), Bowman (1998), 42. Compare the epitaphs of Callimachus (29 *GP* = *AP* 7.525, 30 *GP* = *AP* 7.415 discussed in the Introduction); Leonidas (93 *GP* = *AP* 7.715); and Meleager (2 *GP* = *AP* 7.417, 3 *GP* = *AP* 7.418, 4 *GP* = *AP* 7.419). What Tarán does not note, however, is that each of these epigrams evinces a play with epitaphic convention: consider Callimachus' engagement with notions of absence and presence as discussed, or Leonidas' epitaph, which sees the author removed from his desired geographical funerary context (his Tarentine homeland).
[335] Gutzwiller (1998), 86, Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007), 446.

and her poetic purpose in doing so. Rather than just reconfiguring sepulchral epigram, I argue that Nossis utilises characteristically epigrammatic elements to underpin the construction and legitimation of her authorial persona. The form of her poems *qua* epigrams thus becomes a means for Nossis to define herself as an author, but moreover, the author utilises the collocation of the epigrams within the collection to undertake a gradual, composite revelation of her authorial persona.

AP 7.718 makes its epigrammatic nature clear from the outset: as noted, the address to the reader as ὦ ξεῖν᾽ recalls Simonides᾽ epitaph for the Spartan dead and, as Michael Tueller has emphasised, this had become a conventional means of addressing the reader in the inscribed epigrams of the Hellenistic period.[336] However, the epigrammatically conventional nature of such an opening does more than simply affirm the author᾽s choice of genre. Nossis᾽ address to her reader as ὦ ξεῖν᾽ acquires an additional resonance if we accept the final word of *AP* 7.718.2 as ἐναυσομένος, as has been by the majority of scholars: this would thus represent the only extant epigram by Nossis in which the addressee of the epigram is decisively masculine. In Nossis᾽ dedicatory epigrams, the sex of the addressees is, for the most part, linguistically unclear, but the context (dedications made by women, in a temple dedicated to a goddess)[337] envisages an implied female addressee, and this notion is made explicit in *AP* 9.332, opening with the declaration ἐλθοῖσαι ποτὶ ναὸν ἰδώμεθα τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας / τὸ βρέτας, "let's go to the temple and see the statue of Aphrodite" (9.332.1-2). If we accept that, in the case of *AP* 7.718, Nossis follows convention in making the addressee of her sepulchral epigram masculine, as posited by Acosta-Hughes,[338] I suggest that the convention is not employed solely for its own sake: rather, Nossis here calls attention to the disjunction between the fictive audience of her collection as envisaged in the dedicatory epigrams, and the reality of their likely reception. Laurel Bowman has argued persuasively against the notion that Nossis᾽ texts were intended primarily for an intimate circle of female friends, instead asserting their widespread publication and reception amongst a male audience,[339] but this does not diminish the sense that Nossis᾽ epigrams imagine a female readership: in addressing a male reader in *AP* 7.718, Nossis deconstructs the established fiction of a close-knit group of Locrian women as her intended

---

[336] Tueller (2008), 44-46, (2010) 51-54; see, e.g., *CEG* 131, 597, 648, 713, 878.

[337] Hera is the recipient divinity of 3 *GP* = *AP* 6.265, Aphrodite of 4 *GP* = *AP* 9.332, 5 *GP* = *AP* 6.275, 6 *GP* = *AP* 9.605. One possible exception to the female-orientated perspective is 2 *GP* = *AP* 6.132, which records the dedication of weapons taken from the defeated Bruttians in the θεῶν... ἀνάκτορα, "temple of the gods": on the interpretation of this epigram, see Gutzwiller (1998), 79-80.

[338] Acosta-Hughes (2010), 86.n.85.

[339] Bowman (1998), 46-51. For considerations of primarily female reception see e.g. Luck (1954), 187, Snyder (1989), 155, Skinner (1989), 14, (2005), 127-130, Rayor (2005), 66-67.

audience and, in so doing, speaks directly to what we might term the inevitable reader of her epigrams, whose masculinity forces him to intrude (as a stranger) into the world the collection envisages. This reconfiguration of the public, implicitly masculine context of inscribed epigrammatic reception into a more private, female-orientated space is mirrored in the play with gendered self-representation which we observe in Nossis' only other preserved sepulchral epigram, 10 *GP* = *AP* 7.414. The poem purports to be an epitaph for the poet Rhinthon and, in contrast to the other poems of Nossis' corpus, seems to be uttered in his own masculine voice:

> καὶ καπυρὸν γελάσας παραμείβεο καὶ φίλον εἰπών
>   ῥῆμ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἐμοί. Ῥίνθων εἰμ᾽ ὁ Συρακόσιος,
> Μουσάων ὀλίγα τις ἀηδονίς, ἀλλὰ φλυάκων
>   ἐκ τραγικῶν ἴδιον κισσὸν ἐδρεψάμεθα.

> Laughing loud, pass by, and speak a kind word
>   over me. I am Rhinthon the Syracusan,
> a little nightingale of the Muses, but from
>   phlyax tragedies I plucked my own ivy.

Gutzwiller suggests that this epigram serves to contextualise and support Nossis' own poetic endeavours:[340] firstly, the epigram alludes, through the person of Rhinthon, to the literary milieu of Magna Graecia, a poetic context in which Nossis herself might have operated. Secondly, the epigram may invite a comparison between Rhinthon, who combined comedy and tragedy as the progenitor of phlyax-plays, and Nossis, whose revision of dedicatory epigram inverted the genre's public, masculine focus to nuanced poetic effect. Beyond this, however, I suggest we can detect here a subtle play with conventions of self-identification, which inform our reading of Nossis' practice over the course of her collection. That we are encouraged to compare the representation of Rhinthon with that of Nossis seems assured, due to a number of features which recur across the epigrams, such as the connection between each poet and the Muses, and the prominence of generically appropriate floral elements as symbolic depictions of poetry.[341] However, these similar aspects belie a sharp contrast in the manner each poet reveals their identity. Rhinthon is assertive in his self-naming and in the delineation of the poetic mode in which he composed, speaking in the first person. By comparison, Nossis' initial authorial self-representation in *AP* 5.170 is oblique, utilising the third person, with no clear statement of her relative presence within the poem itself. However, the obliquity of this self-

---

[340] Gutzwiller (1998), 85.
[341] See. *AP* 7.414.4, κισσὸν; *AP* 5.170.4, ῥόδα; *AP* 7.718.2, τᾶν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος, though we can note that the flowers in this last case are explicitly not those of Nossis, but rather Sappho - the lack of floral imagery applied to Nossis' own poems in *AP* 7.718 perhaps further symbolises the divergence from the practice of her forebear.

representation is revealed over the course of the dedicatory epigrams to be part of a broader strategy, in which her authorial persona - 'Nossis' - emerges through engagement with the addressees of her epigrams, and through her comments upon the dedications which stand as their subjects. As opposed to the direct and overt self-representative strategy of Rhinthon, Nossis' self-representation is altogether subtler, enacted in the process of the reader's recognition of the authorial persona's constant presence amidst the female community created within her collection. It is only once this process of gradual composition is complete that Nossis asserts herself in the first person, in the final line of *AP* 7.718.[342]

In *AP* 7.718, Nossis, having individuated her authorial persona over the course of her dedicatory epigrams, emphatically distinguishes her voice from that of Sappho, for whom she relied so heavily upon as a conduit of inspiration and poetic validation in her introductory work. We can once again see the employment of epigrammatic conventions at the heart of this process: whether we read Λόκρισσα or Λοκρὶς γᾶ,[343] it is apparent that Nossis' Locrian origins were attested in some form, and this is further characteristic of sepulchral epigram, constituting one of the core informative elements a grave inscription would be expected to provide. However, the identification of Nossis' homeland plays a significant role in the distinction of her voice from that of Sappho, through the physical dislocation of the two poets - the former in Locri, the latter far over the waves in Mytilene. Indeed, it is not simply that Sappho resides in Mytilene: rather, it is the seat of her poetic power, and thus a place of inspirational significance for her followers.[344] In portraying Mytilene in such a fashion, Nossis draws upon a common association between a poet's homeland and their posthumous ability to enthuse others with poetic ability, most notably explored - and rejected - in the case of Hipponax at

---

[342] Nossis seems subtly to undermine the veracity of Rhinthon's self-assertion, perhaps in support of her own more gradual, long-form method of self-representation: Skinner (2005), 124 highlights the feminine form of ἀηδονίς, suggesting that, though we seem to encounter a masculine poet speaking here, it is in truth merely a mask through which the voice of the female author issues. See further Gow and Page (1965), II.441, Klooster (2011), 150.

[343] On which see above, n.314.

[344] It is tempting to subscribe to the notion that Nossis here engages with an actual tradition of Sappho receiving heroic honours on Lesbos, as Archilochus received at Paros, but the evidence for a site of cultic significance in honour of Sappho at Mytilene is sparse: Pollux (*On.*9.84) notes Mytilenean coins which honour Sappho, and we possess a number which date from the 2nd and 3rd Century AD: one (*BMC* Troas 169) depicts a bust with the label ΨΑΠΦΩ on the obverse, while the reverse depicts a lyre with the label ΜΥΤΙΛΗΝΑΙΩΝ, while a further example (*BMC* Troas 170) depicts a seated female figure within a temple-like structure on the obverse, with a lyre and the label ΜΥΤΙΛΗΝΑΙΩΝ on the reverse: see further Richter (1965), I.70. Many earlier Mytilenean coins bear images of a female figure, often on the reverse of coins bearing an image of a bust of Apollo on the obverse, while the lyre is also a frequent motif: see further Clay (2004), 83. The use of the word καλλίχορον has been suggested to reference the performance of Sappho's verses (e.g., Bowman (1998), see also Ar. *Ra.*440-459), but may equally be taken as indicative of a site of religious significance: the word appears recurrently in descriptions of Eleusis and the springs connected to the performance of the Eleusinian mysteries, e.g., *h.Cer.*272, in which Demeter orders an altar built above καλλίχορον; compare E. *Supp.*392, 619, E. *Ion.*1075, Paus. 38.6, Apollod. I.V.

Ephesus in Callimachus' *Iamb* 13. A direct comparison between *AP* 7.718 and Callimachus' work can be made on the basis of the usage of ἐναύειν in each poem: the verb occurs twice in *Iamb* 13, in the question as to whether Callimachus' persona has been to Ephesus, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες / τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύονται, "which inspires those who will compose scazons skilfully" (203.13-14), and the closing lines in which it is emphasised that, indeed no, he has not been to Ephesus to receive inspiration (203.65-66).[345] As discussed in Chapter 2, this is a significant programmatic point for Callimachus' poetic activity and, beyond the usage of similar language, we can see in *AP* 7.718 a comparable reflection on the complex relationship between poets and their predecessors to that expressed by Callimachus in *Iamb* 13. Marco Fantuzzi, following the notion that Nossis here describes the process of seeking inspiration at sites linked to poetic grandees (specifically their homeland), argues that she herself eschews this activity, remaining in Locri and pointedly free of inspiration.[346] I concur, but posit that we can further extend this argument in light of the overt 'Sapphocentricity' of *AP* 5.170, and read *AP* 7.718 as a statement of Nossis' newfound independence from Sappho's inspiration, in direct contrast to her opening poem, and in light of the gradual revelation of Nossis' poetic individuality over the course of the collection.

I have suggested that *AP* 5.170 is a recapitulation of Sapphic poetics in which Nossis' individual voice is drowned-out by that of her predecessor. Equally notable, however, is the paucity of elements that can be considered archetypal of the inscribed form of the genre in this poem. Whereas conventional motifs occur throughout Nossis' dedicatory epigrams, *AP* 5.170 is wholly bereft of them, displaying neither the elements of dedicatory or sepulchral epigram.[347] By contrast, as I have demonstrated, *AP* 7.718 is laden with such elements, differentiating the opening and closing poems of Nossis' collection: the former is acontextual, lacking either spatial or material definition, while the latter is situated through the implied physical presence of the addressee before the stele (thus through the redeployment of the conventions of inscribed epigram). Nossis constructs a fictitious monument and, by emphasising the importance of her Locrian heritage, implies that said monument stands in her homeland. In so doing, and in simultaneously situating Sappho in Mytilene, Nossis physically distances herself from her poetic model. This spatial distance mirrors the generic distance between the two poets: in *AP*

---

[345] On the interpretation of these lines see Russo (2001), 109-112, Acosta-Hughes (1996), (2002).

[346] Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 16, particularly n.61.

[347] The opening poems of epigrammatic collections do not necessarily reflect the inscribed conventions of the genre - see, e.g., Mel. 1 *GP* = *AP* 4.1 - but I suggest that the contrast between their lack in Nossis' opening poem and their presence in the closing poem justifies special attention.

7.718, Nossis undertakes her self-representation with epigrammatic apparatus, renegotiating her relationship with Sappho as established in *AP* 5.170 by revealing her authorial persona using the conventions of her own non-lyric genre, thereby displaying her own poetic individuality. Where once she was inspired and enthused by Sappho, now she stands apart, dear to Sappho as she is to the Muses, but not enthralled by her. The final line of the epigram displays Nossis' individuality fully: her authorial persona now speaks forth decisively, and, moreover, commands the reader to speak her message, much as she once spoke the words of Sappho.

Utilising (and failing to utilise) epigrammatic conventions in her programmatic epigrams, Nossis offers a nuanced picture of the development of her authorial persona: at first defined by the assumption or rejection of the voices of poetic predecessors, she ultimately delineates her own voice through the genre in which she composes, re-envisaging Sapphic poetics through her own epigrammatic mode. *AP* 7.718 stands as a complement to *AP* 5.170, but equally serves as a culmination of Nossis' process of self-representation, undertaken in the female-orientated world the author constructs within her epigrammatic collection. The book-roll, and particularly the format of the collection, thus becomes a critical element in the construction of Nossis' authorial persona. It is only within this context - a context which encourages a comparative reading of Nossis' poems in light of one another, but which simultaneously maintains their individuality - that Nossis is fully able to demonstrate the progression of her authorial development, from Sapphic adherent to an authoritative poet in her own right.

Asclepiades is one of the most significant figures of the early days of Hellenistic poetry, not solely for epigram, but for the development of a recognisably Hellenistic aesthetic approach to poetic conventions of the past: active at the close of the 4th and the first decades of the 3rd Century,[348] Asclepiades' poetry typifies the changes wrought on existing generic forms by the authors of the period, and it is unsurprising that his efforts serve as a source of imitation and emulation for both his contemporaries and later authors.[349]

Much as with Nossis' poems, Asclepiades' epigrams evince a complex intermingling of epigrammatic convention with extra-generic innovation, most notably in the introduction of erotic and sympotic elements alongside the inscriptional form of epigram.[350] Asclepiades' erotic poems display a remarkable juxtaposition of the functionality, concision and public aspect of inscribed epigram with the private, ongoing and transitory emotive experiences which the author recurrently chooses as his subject-matter.[351] Recursively, Asclepiades encapsulates an extended narrative, evoking the mutability and pain of erotic yearning in a single scene from a larger, unseen saga, utilising the characteristic succinctness of epigram as a means of distilling emotional expression into a dense portrait sketch. This technique has been recognised througout the erotic epigrams and, partially on account of this, attempts to identify a programmatic position within Asclepiades' corpus have focused principally on that type, while largely disregarding those epigrams with non-erotic subject matter.[352] While this might follow on account of the makeup of Asclepiades' surviving corpus, given that the majority of his poetry is erotic in character,[353] a failure to consider the non-erotic epigrams as potentially reflective of a programmatic stance has, I suggest, obscured a broader stylistic position which

---

[348] It is now generally held that the poet was born at some point in the third quarter of the 4th Century, likely 340-330: see further Hutchinson (1988), 264-266, Gutzwiller (1998), 122-123, Sens (2011), xxv-xxxii, though cf. Gow and Page (1965), II.115, who propose c.320, and Argentieri (2003), 196-199 who proposes c.310. On these suggestions, see Sens (2011), xxvi-xxvii.

[349] On Asclepiades' influence, see Sens (2011), li-lxii.

[350] Noted by Reitzenstein (1893); see particularly Tueller (2008), 117-131 and Sens (2011), xlii-l on the generic and inscriptional backgrounds of Asclepiades' erotic epigrams.

[351] See Gutzwiller (2007b), particularly 318-321; see further Leader (1997), 694, Tsagalis (2008), 191, Campbell (2013), 25-28.

[352] Cf. Sens (2003), who hints at a programmatic dimension to 28 *GP = AP* 7.11 on Erinna, but does not develop this idea with reference to the broader context of Asclepiades' collection. Tueller (2008), 116-117 notes the innovative application of sepulchral convention in 32 *GP = AP* 9.63 on Antimachus, but explicitly separates this from a programmatic consideration of Asclepiades' erotic epigrams.

[353] Of the epigrams securely ascribed to Asclepiades, 26 are erotic, two present miniature mimes (25 *GP = AP* 5.181, 26 *GP = AP* 5.185), four are sepulchral (29 *GP = AP* 7.145, 30 *GP = AP* 7.284, 31 *GP = AP* 7.500, 33 *GP = AP* 13.23) and two, which form the basis of my investigation, present themselves as book labels in pseudo-sepulchral fashion (28 *GP = AP* 7.11 on Erinna, 32 *GP = AP* 9.63 on Antimachus).

underpins Asclepiades' output. The habit of narrative encapsulation - offering a vivid glimpse into one of an ongoing sequence of events, or alluding to a grander narrative through the presentation of a single instance within it - is not solely a trend of Asclepiades' erotic epigrams: surveying his sepulchral epigrams, we can note as parallels the statue of Arete's reflection on the contest of Ajax and Odysseus over Achilles' armour as a means to consider the moral values of epic heroes (29 *GP* = *AP* 7.145); the cenotaph of Euippus, which imagines a future encounter between the reader and the deceased's father, while equally highlighting the ambiguities of the presence of the speaking voice of epigram (31 *GP* = *AP* 7.500); or the poignant reversal of expected practice in an epigram which, though appearing at first to be straightforwardly sepulchral, focuses on the grief experienced by Botrys, rather than upon his deceased son, who goes unnamed (33 *GP* = *AP* 13.23). This technique can be traced back to inscribed sepulchral epigram, which must necessarily evoke a broader narrative in brief (i.e., the deceased's life and death), but Asclepiades does not reduplicate it as-is, but rather adapts it to encapsulate narratives of greater complexity. Simultaneously, as is evident in the case of the sepulchral epigrams, Asclepiades' style of encapsulation becomes a tool through which the author reflects upon the character of his own work, emphasising his play with epigrammatic convention and his generic innovations, but equally reflecting his own bookish practice. This style is a consequence of Asclepiades' production of book-epigram, and this is encapsulated in his own self-representation as an editorial presence.

I begin with the erotic epigrams, and consider Asclepiades' authorial self-representation, which I suggest is redolent of Nossis' practice within her collection. The revelation of Asclepiades as an authorial persona within his work is a composite process, occurring over the course of multiple epigrams, developing as a result of the intertextual reference of these poems to one another, before ultimately being crowned by a work of sphragistic character (16 *GP* = *AP* 12.50), in which the author seemingly occupies the role of the text's addressee. However, I suggest that there is a greater complexity to this instance of self-representation. Rather than simply appearing as an addressee, I argue that Asclepiades constructs his persona doubly, both as a personal, subjective voice, and as a second figure who reflects upon and responds to that first speaker. In so doing, Asclepiades demonstrates a quintessentially epigrammatic prowess at encapsulating, *en miniature*, that which has already been miniaturised once (viz., the narrative snapshots which constitute the other epigrams in which we can detect 'Asclepiades' as the speaker of the poem) but also a complex self-awareness of the bookish form of his poetry. Advocating that Asclepiades emphasises his prowess as a narrative miniaturist, alongside his

mastery of the book-roll in his own act of self-representation, I then assess the two securely Asclepiadean epigrams which take poetic predecessors and their work as subjects, the one on the poetry of Erinna (28 *GP* = *AP* 7.11) and the other on that of Antimachus (32 *GP* = *AP* 9.63).[354] Both poets have clear thematic significance for Asclepiades, their poetry foreshadowing his own intermingling of love, longing and death, but neither is adduced as a direct model for his own practice. Instead, the representation of his predecessors serves as a means for Asclepiades to reflect upon the form of his own poetry, rather than providing models for him to follow. The epigrams themselves are formally interesting, purporting as they do to be labels for book-rolls of the work of these poets: though epigrammatic book-labels are recurrent in the Hellenistic period and beyond, Asclepiades' poems are among the first of the type.[355] I suggest that within these poems Asclepiades applies his style of narrative encapsulation as a critical method of representing and engaging with his predecessors, and the tradition they emblematise. This engagement occurs in a conspicuously textual setting, through the conceit of the epigrams *qua* book-labels. Their epitomising form mirrors the encapsulating essence of Asclepiades' poetry more broadly, but equally reflects the author's idealised self-representation, as an editorial, unifying presence which pervades his collection.

Asclepiades' authorial persona has been interpreted principally as the 'poet-lover', whose yearning is expressed, across multiple epigrams, in the first person: this persona is most obviously detected in the following two epigrams, in which the lack of a dramatic setting allows - as Gutzwiller suggests - the reader to seemingly eavesdrop on the thoughts of 'Asclepiades':[356]

(15 *GP* = *AP* 12.46)

> οὐκ εἴμ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἐτέων δύο κεἴκοσι καὶ κοπιῶ ζῶν.
>   Ὥρωτες, τί κακὸν τοῦτο; τί με φλέγετε;
> ἢν γὰρ ἐγώ τι πάθω, τί ποιήσετε; δῆλον, Ἔρωτες,
>   ὡς τὸ πάρος παίξεσθ᾽ ἄφρονες ἀστραγάλοις.

> I'm not yet twenty-two and already I'm sick of living.

---

[354] I do not here consider 45 *GP* = *AP* 9.64 on Hesiod, more likely the work of Archias, or 47 *GP* = *AP* 13.29, on Cratinus, of disputed authorship; see on both Sens (2011).

[355] See the comparable label-epigrams of Antipater of Sidon for the two poets (58 *GP* = *AP* 7.713 on Erinna's poetry, 66 *GP* = *AP* 7.409 on that of Antimachus). Compare other examples: Leon.Tarent. 101 *GP* = *AP* 9.25 and Call. 56 *GP* = *AP* 9.507 for Aratus' *Phaenomena*, adesp. *FGE* 32 = *AP* 9.185 for verses of Archilochus, Crin. 11 *GP* = *AP* 9.545 for Callimachus' *Hecale*. Theoc. 27 Gow = *AP* 9.434 is seemingly a label for Theocritus' own poetry, though the ascription has been contested; see Gow (1950), 549, Gutzwiller (1996), 138, Rossi (2001), 343-347. Adesp. 38 *FGE* = *AP* 9.190 also purports to be a book label for Erinna's poetry: on Erinna's appearances in this epigrammatic sub-type, see Neri (2003), 55-57.

[356] Gutzwiller (1998), 143, 149.

Erotes, why this evil? Why do you burn me?
For if I die, what'll you do? Clearly, Erotes,
   you'll go on without care, playing knucklebones as before.

(17 *GP* = *AP* 12.166)

τοῦθ᾿ ὅτι μοι λοιπὸν ψυχῆς, ὅτι δήποτ᾿, Ἔρωτες,
   τοῦτό γ᾿ ἔχειν πρὸς θεῶν ἡσυχίην ἄφετε.
ἢ μὴ δὴ τόξοις ἔτι βάλλετέ μ᾿ ἀλλὰ κεραυνοῖς,
   καὶ πάντως τέφρην θέσθε με κἀνθρακιήν.
5 ναί ναί βάλλετ᾿, Ἔρωτες, ἐνεσκληκὼς γὰρ ἀνίαις
   †ἐξ ὑμέων τούτων, εἴτ᾿ ἔτι† βούλομ᾿ ἔχειν.[357]

Whatever that is left of my soul, whatever it is, Erotes,
   permit that to have rest, in the name of the gods.
Or at least don't still strike with bows, but thunderbolts,
   and make me utterly ash and cinder.
5 Yes, yes, strike, Erotes, for, parched with sorrow
   I wish to have… (?from you…)

The speaking persona of these epigrams might be described - without fear of hyperbole - as overwrought, particularly when reading the poems in conjunction: the fatalism observed in *AP* 12.46 develops into an all-out death wish in *AP* 12.166, and a degree of humour is generated in the incongruity of the speaker's troubles when weighed against the divine destruction at the point of a thunderbolt which he requests as a 'cure'.[358] The over-emotional speaker of these epigrams, whom a reader might identify with the author himself, is offered counsel in a further poem (16 *GP* = *AP* 12.50), in which the lovelorn youth is directly identified, with the poet's own name:

πῖν᾿, Ἀσκληπιάδη· τί τὰ δάκρυα ταῦτα; τί πάσχεις;
   οὐ σὲ μόνον χαλεπὴ Κύπρις ἐληίσατο,
οὐδ᾿ ἐπὶ σοὶ μούνῳ κατεθήκατο τόξα καὶ ἰούς
   πικρὸς Ἔρως. τί ζῶν ἐν σποδιῇ τίθεσαι;
5 πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα· δάκτυλος ἀώς.
   ἦ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἰδεῖν μένομεν;
†πίνωμεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔρως·† μετά τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πουλύν,
   σχέτλιε, τὴν μακρὰν νύκτ᾿ ἀναπαυσόμεθα.

Drink, Asclepiades: Why these tears? What's the matter with you?
   Not you alone has cruel Cypris despoiled,
nor against you alone has bitter Eros raised his bow and arrow.
   Why are you placed in ashes while living?
5 Let's drink an unmixed draught of Bacchus. Dawn's a finger's-breadth.

---

[357] On the difficulties of interpreting the final line of *AP* 12.166, see Gutzwiller (1998), 146, Sens (2011), 111.
[358] See further Handley (1996), Sens (2011), 112; see Campbell (2013), 23-31 on the influence of new comedy on Asclepiades' depiction of his besotted epigrammatic speakers.

> Or are we waiting once more to see the light that puts us to bed?
> (?Let us drink, …) after not much longer,
>   miserable one, we shall rest for the long night.

The identity of the speaker of this epigram has proven elusive: most scholars have suggested the speaker is a generic symposiast,[359] while Gutzwiller, seeing the epigram as a concluding piece, suggests that an "unnamed symposiast may present… the internal auditor's response to the content of the collection".[360] The occlusion of the precise speaker, combined with the apparent address to the author of the epigram, results in a work in which vocal ambiguity is central: however, the questionable identity of the speaking voice should not here be taken as a failing of the epigram, but rather one of the central features of its programmatic point.[361]

The proposition that Asclepiades here addresses himself has been largely rejected in favour of identifying the speaker as a companion of the author within a symposiastic setting,[362] but a number of aspects make a reappraisal (and refinement) of this position attractive. Rather than arguing that Asclepiades can here be observed consoling himself (that is, evincing the form of reflexive communication described as 'audible thought' by George Walsh),[363] I propose that we can modify Gutzwiller's reading, and interpret Asclepiades - a figure who possesses a degree of detachment from the collection itself, whom I will call the 'editorial persona' - consoling 'Asclepiades' - the embedded persona of the anguished, occasionally parodic poet-lover, generated through the first person speech of the erotic epigrams.[364] We can note, particularly, the precise knowledge of the poet-lover's plight which the editorial persona displays, which, instead of a generalised response, takes the form of specific recollections of the other Asclepiadean epigrams, through the reuse of imagery and the recapitulation and reversal of the poet-lover's words: τί τὰ δάκρυα ταῦτα; τί πάσχεις (12.50.1) recalls τί κακὸν τοῦτο; τί με φλέγετε (12.46.2); οὐδ᾽ ἐπὶ σοὶ μούνῳ κατεθήκατο τόξα καὶ ἰοὺς / πικρὸς Ἔρως (12.50.3-4) responds to μὴ δὴ τόξοις ἔτι βάλλετέ μ᾽ (12.166.3); τί ζῶν ἐν σποδιῇ τίθεσαι (12.50.4) evokes the imagery of the speaker burned by love in *AP* 12.46.2 (τί με φλέγετε) and *AP* 12.166.4 (πάντως τέφρην θέσθε με κἀνθρακιήν), and further recalls another epigram (2 *GP*

---

[359] E.g., Wiliamowitz-Moellendorff (1924), II.113, Gow and Page (1965), II.127 (who also note that the speaking voice might belong to Asclepiades himself), Garrison (1978), 23, Hutchinson (1988), 275, Sens (2011), 103.
[360] Gutzwiller (1998), 149.
[361] See Sens (2011), 103, Hunter (2010), 286.
[362] E.g., raised by Handley (1996), though cf. Gutzwiller (1998), 148.n.64 and Sens (2011), 109 on the issues with his position.
[363] Walsh (1990).
[364] Gutzwiller (1998), 139-140 suggests we detect precisely this duality (between 'poet-lover' and 'poet-editor') in the context of Asclepiades' collection as a whole, but not in *AP* 12.50.

= *AP* 5.85) in which the speaker seemingly attempts to impel a young women to sleep with him through the assertion that ἐν δ᾽ Ἀχέροντι / ὀστέα καὶ σποδιή, παρθένε, κεισόμεθα, "in Acheron, maiden, we'll lie, bones and ash" (5.85.3-4). In so doing, the speaker of *AP* 12.50 does more than just present an internal auditor's response to the collection: rather, he excerpts and inverts the poet-lover's words in such a manner as to establish a clear relationship between the two, but one marked not only by similarities, but by diverging patterns of thought and response to the hazards of love.

In *AP* 12.50, the editorial persona's repeated encouragements to the poet-lover to drink can be seen as a very literal solution to the metaphorical plight of being ἐνεσκληκὼς ἀνίαις experienced by the latter in *AP* 12.166.5, but equally presents a veiled response to 1 *GP* = *AP* 5.169, a poem of programmatic aspect, that perhaps stood as the opening poem of Asclepiades' collection,[365] in which the speaker extols the virtues of love:

> ἡδὺ θέρους διψῶντι χιὼν ποτόν, ἡδὺ δὲ ναύταις
> ἐκ χειμῶνος ἰδεῖν εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον·
> ἥδιον δ᾽ ὁπόταν κρύψῃ μία τοὺς φιλέοντας
> χλαῖνα, καὶ αἰνῆται Κύπρις ὑπ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων.

> Sweet in summer is snow to drink, and it is sweet for sailors
> to see the spring Garland after winter:
> but sweeter whenever a cloak hides the lovers,
> and Cypris is praised by both.

However, this epigram is incongruous as an encapsulation of Asclepiadean poetry *in toto*: while many epigrams do offer a glimpse of the sweetness of love, in keeping with the sentiment offered here, many depict the bitterness of unrequited longing, and Cypris - along with Eros - is not always a subject of praise, but is often beseeched by those unsuccessful in love,[366] and sometimes held to account for their part in erotic misfortune.[367] This epigram, then, is a fitting programmatic statement for the poet-lover as he is at the start of the collection, before the narrative of his unrequited love has been rolled-out. Following that narrative, the presentation of a Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα (12.50.5), to assuage the pains inflicted by χαλεπὴ Κύπρις (12.50.2), can readily be interpreted as the editorial persona responding to the naïve pronouncements of the poet-lover in *AP* 5.169: he offers his besotted counterpart a more potent drink than snow in

---

[365] Gutzwiller (1998), 128-129.
[366] See 7 *GP* = *AP* 5.207 in which Cypris is requested to hate those who spurn what the speaker considers proper worship of the goddess (i.e., heterosexual intercourse); see further Sens (2011), 44-45. Compare 8 *GP* = *AP* 5.162.
[367] See 19 *GP* = *AP* 12.153 in which Eros' dual distribution of sweetness and pain through longing is emphasised, and compare *AP* 12.46 and *AP* 12.166 above.

summer, a new god to banish the ravishes of Cypris and the thirst-making bitterness of Eros, and simultaneously presents a counterpoint to the programmatic sentiment expressed in *AP* 5.169. Read together, the two epigrams present a complete depiction of the joys - and sorrows - of the affairs of the heart. Just such an intertextual reading of these epigrams is seemingly supported by their joint recollection of one of the most famous depictions of the two sides of Eros: love's transformation from ἡδὺ in *AP* 5.169, to πικρὸς in *AP* 12.50, breaks the identification of Eros by Sappho as γλυκύπικρον - "sweet-bitter" (fr.130) - back into its constituent parts: to perceive the unified whole, one must perceive the poems together.

The editorial persona's encouragement to drink is notably phrased by the recollection of poetry of symposiastic tone: in this we can most clearly observe Asclepiades employing predecessors as 'models' in a more straightforward fashion, as the repeated commands to drink recalls Theognidean verse.[368] Furthermore, *AP* 12.50.5-6 clearly reiterates Alcaeus (fr.346.1); πώνωμεν· τί τα λυχν᾽ ὀμμένομεν; δάκτυλος ἀμέρα, "let us drink; why do we await the lamp? Day's but a finger's-breadth".[369] In so doing, Asclepiades adapts the voices of other poets to delineate his own position, situating the expression of the editorial persona within the tradition of symposiastic poetry, thereby framing his own authorial efforts and the voice of his poems within that milieu.[370]

AP 12.50 is thus a nuanced distillation of Asclepiades' poetry, and his authorial persona, on multiple levels. Reiterating the thematic juxtaposition of love and longing with drinking and death observed throughout his corpus, the epigram is framed within the tradition of symposiastic poetry, while simultaneously acknowledging the author's play with epigrammatic conventions. We can note the epigrammatic overtones of 'Asclepiades' being placed (τίθεσαι) in ashes (12.50.4), much as Posidippus (in the *Seal*) and Callimachus (in the *Tomb of Simonides*) utilised paradigmatically epigrammatic language to comparably allusive effect.[371] Drawing together these disparate aspects is the bifurcated persona of Asclepiades: the voice of the poet-lover encapsulates the subjective, personal character of Asclepiades' erotic poems, mixing together love and death in his utterances. Complementing this personal figure is the more detached editorial persona, whose quick-fire summary of the poet-lover's woes situates

---

[368] See Thgn. 763-764, 879-874, 973-976, 1041-1042, 1047-1048.

[369] Compare Alc. fr.38a.1-4, 347.1, 401a, 401b; on Asclepiadean allusions to Alcaeus, see particularly Hunter (2010), 284-288.

[370] Sens (2011), 106-107 notes that the speaker, through the quotation of poetry in 'performance', may be recapitulating the practice expected at actual symposia.

[371] See further Tueller (2008), 50-52; compare further the example of *CEG* 11.2, in which the deceased is described as being 'placed' by those who buried him: ἐνθάδ᾽ Ἀθηναῖοι Πυθαγόρην ἔθεσαν.

that subjective viewpoint in the wider tradition of symposiastic poetry, establishing Asclepiades' work within the broader poetic milieu which precedes it. These two Asclepiades mirror the micro and macrocosmic situations of the author in relation to his work: the poet-lover is the internal voice of Asclepiades' poetry, embedded within the narrative of multiple epigrams and expressing a subjectivity in keeping with their genre. The editorial persona is quintessentially a result of the book-form of Asclepiades' poetry. He exists within the work, yet surpasses the limits of any single epigram. He is thus able to reflect upon the collection's status as a poetic product, allowing him to transcend the self-indulgent woe of 'Asclepiades', and reassure him that he is not alone in feeling the pain of love (having access, as he does, to multiple other examples of such heart-ache within the collection). By emphasising the sympotic scene, the editorial persona acknowledges the overarching fictional setting of the erotic epigrams, reflecting Asclepiades' presentation of multiple tales of love:[372] in the 'symposium' which is Asclepiades' collection of epigrams, the poet-lover's narrative is simply one of many, but unifying all of those accounts is Asclepiades *qua* author, a role expressed through the presentation of the editorial persona.

Asclepiades' self-representation thus plays with an awareness of the medium of his poetry, while simultaneously evincing a reflexive appraisal of the question of the 'personal' voice of the author within poetry. Strikingly, these issues are likewise central to the epigrams on the work of Erinna and Antimachus, and it is to the former which I turn now (28 *GP* = *AP* 7.11):

> ὁ γλυκὺς Ἠρίννας οὗτος πόνος, οὐχὶ πολὺς μέν,
> ὡς ἂν παρθενικᾶς ἐννεακαιδεκέτευς,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἑτέρων πολλῶν δυνατώτερος· εἰ δ᾽ Ἀίδας μοι
> μὴ ταχὺς ἦλθε, τίς ἂν ταλίκον ἔσχ᾽ ὄνομα;

> This is the sweet labour of Erinna, not great in volume,
> as she was a maiden of nineteen,
> but with greater power than that of many others: if Hades
> had not come early to me, who would have had so great a name?

A key aspect of this epigram is its engagement with the biographical tradition surrounding Erinna: while providing the details expected of a typical sepulchral epigram, Asclepiades' poem transcends simple conventionality in their usage, which can be appreciated if we consider the tradition surrounding the life of Erinna, and its development. The relative stability of Erinna's biography - codified in the epigrams of the late 4th or early 3rd Century, and remaining

---

[372] Gutzwiller (1998), 149-150.

mostly unaltered through to the *Suda* and the work of Eustathius - is notable in comparison to the poet against whom she is measured by one anonymous epigram, which asserts that οἱ δὲ τριηκόσιοι ταύτης στίχοι ἴσοι Ὁμήρῳ, "her three hundred lines are equal to Homer" (38 *FGE* = *AP* 9.190.3):[373] in contrast to the multiple warring traditions surrounding that poet's life and work, Erinna's biographical afterlife - while not without ambiguity, particularly with regards to her homeland - is remarkably coherent.[374] In part, this relative coherency can be attributed to the differing circumstances in which Homer and Erinna produced their work, particularly to the likelihood that there was not a substantial gap between the composition of the *Distaff* and its circulation as text.[375] Equally, if we accept the mid-4th Century as a likely date of composition for the *Distaff*, Erinna was contemporary with, or slightly predated, the first flourishing of biographical and para-biographical writing about poets, such as that by authors such as Chamaeleon and Hermesianax, and latterly the epigrams written purportedly accompanying poets' statues, graves or poetry. This situation may have immunised her tradition against the possibility of wildly variant readings, to an extent. However, the notion that context alone preserved Erinna is unsatisfying, and does not explain the popularity of her biographical tradition, particularly compared to other authors of the late classical period.[376] Rather, it seems that later authors found, in her poetry and authorial persona, a particular quality which lent itself readily to biographical representation.

In an article innocuously entitled 'Erinna', Martin West offered an extreme interpretation of the reality of Erinna's identity and origins: namely, that 'Erinna' (the perceived author of the *Distaff*) was wholly a fabrication, and that the author of the poem was not a precocious ingénue from the back-of-beyond, but rather a (male) poet of the 4th Century active in Cos, Rhodes or another of the centres of Hellenistic poetic activity, who assumed 'Erinna' as a persona.[377] Immediate responses to West focused upon the possibility that the Erinna depicted in the

---

[373] On this comparison, see Klooster (2011), 68-69.
[374] On Homer's biographical tradition, see particularly Lefkowitz (1981), 14-29, Graziosi (2002), Beecroft (2010), 61-105.
[375] See West (1977), Neri (2003), 55-60.
[376] On which see now particularly LeVen (2014).
[377] West (1977), 117-119. Snyder (1989), 65 notes the contrasting situation of male and female poets in the early Hellenistic period, highlighting that, while the former tend to become associated with literary centres such as Cos or Alexandria, the later seem to flourish only on the periphery (e.g., Erinna, Tenos/Telos; Nossis, Locri; Anyte, Tegea; Moero, Byzantium), which she suggests occurs due to the lack of participation by women in the major literary institutions of the day. Given, however, that this information is at least in part drawn from these poets' own works, it might be tempting to speculate on the existence of a purposefully defined counter-culture, whereby female poets eschewed direct association with major centres: as their works were definitely received at Alexandria, Pergamum et al., life on the periphery does not seem to have overly hampered their fame. See further Bowman (1998), 48-49, (2004), Gutzwiller (1998), Skinner (2002), 73-74, de Vos (2014), 417-432.

epigrams and later sources (i.e., an un-married woman who died young, born somewhere on one of the Aegean islands between the 6th and 4th/3th Centuries) might plausibly have composed the *Distaff*.[378] More significantly, however, West's assessment re-energised investigations into the voice of the *Distaff* as an explicitly female utterance, one which built upon the extant female tradition as embodied in Sappho's poetry, but which equally stripped away the "ventriloquizing male voice of the epic narrator" of the Homeric *goos* in order to present an authentic female voice of lamentation.[379] Indeed, Gutzwiller suggests that Erinna's popularity among the Hellenistic poets was precisely because of the emotional authenticity of her lament in which, as opposed to the laments of Briseis, Andromache and Homer's characters, "the voice of the character… became identical with the voice of the narrator".[380] That the *Distaff* was taken as an authentic record of personal grief - and further, of biographical accuracy - is thus reflected in the coherence of Erinna's biographical tradition, which rapidly coalesces around several core features and maintains stability over time,[381] precisely because 'Erinna' was seen to possess a definitive authorial character.

It seems likely that Asclepiades' epigram on Erinna was the first of such bio-bibliographical representations of the poet, and in it we can see many aspects which the later epigrams reiterate, particularly her early death and the significance of her nineteenth year. Indeed, a consistent thread which runs throughout the sources on Erinna's life is her youth,[382] but what is noteworthy is the recurrence of nineteen as an age of significance,[383] a detail which appears to have been drawn from her own work. The word ἐννεα[και]δέκατος has been widely accepted as the restoration of l.37 of the *Distaff*, and the occurrence of Erinna's name in the following line (the only extant occurrence in what remains of the poem) has led some to suspect that this may be a reference to Erinna's own age.[384] Regardless of whether ἐννεα[και]δέκατος was, in fact, intended to refer to Baucis in the *Distaff*, Erinna's ancient readers seem happily to have

---

[378] See particularly Pomeroy (1978) and Arthur (1980).

[379] Rowlands and Murray (2007), 213. See further Arthur (1980), Skinner (1982), Rauk (1989), Snyder (1989), 86-97, Gutzwiller (1997), (1998) 86-88, Stehle (2001), Wöhrle (2002), Manwell (2005), Levaniouk (2008). On the form and context of the *goos* see Alexiou (2002), 102-103. On Sapphic recollections in Erinna's poetry, see particularly Rauk (1989), Cavallini (1991), 129-130.

[380] Gutzwiller (1997), 210-211.

[381] See particularly the discussion of the epigrams ascribed to Erinna in Chapter 1.2.

[382] Compare Asclep. 28 *GP* = *AP* 7.11.2, Leon.Tarent./Mel. *AP* 7.13.1, adesp. 39 *FGE* = *AP* 7.12.1, Christod. *AP* 2.108-110. See also Mel. 1 *GP* = *AP* 4.1.12, in which Erinna is likened to a crocus, a symbol both of her virginity and of death: see further Neri (2003), 201.

[383] See adesp. 38 *FGE* = *AP* 9.190.4, *Sud*.s.v. Ἤριννα (H 521 Adler).

[384] Scholz (1973), 19, West (1977), 110, Rauk (1989), 115, Gutzwiller (1998), 77n.80, Stehle (2001), 197. However, others have approached the conclusion that this is Erinna's age (rather than that of Baucis) with greater trepidation, e.g. Levin (1962), 197-198, Gow and Page (1965) II.282.n.4, Neri (2003), 392-393.

accepted the detail as autobiographical, and ascribed it to the author. However, in Asclepiades'
epigram, this detail becomes more than just biographical colour: Alexander Sens suggests that
Asclepiades compresses Erinna's biography, and elides the age at which Erinna composed the
Distaff and the age at which she died.[385] Interpreted thusly, nineteen is the age at which Erinna's
poetic life supersedes her flesh-and-blood existence, a period of transition, from mortality to
immortal memory, which Asclepiades' epigram effectively encapsulates.[386] Compression and
elision colour this epigram in more ways than one: beyond the juxtaposition of real life with
living memory through poetry, Asclepiades' epigram exhibits the entanglement of Erinna the
author with her creation that is characteristic of many of the epigrams on poets. Richard Hunter
notes the equivocatory applicability of πόνος as a term to describe Erinna's poetry, one which
could encapsulate both literary labour and the labour of weaving:[387] Sens expands on this point
by suggesting that γλυκὺς πόνος may have been Erinna's description for Baucis' act of wool-
working within the *Distaff*, and thus its use as a reflexive description of Erinna's poetry
conceptually juxtaposes the work of Baucis with that of Erinna.[388] This process of
juxtaposition, and the elision of the poet with her character, is mirrored in the following
anonymous sepulchral epigram addressed to Erinna (39 *FGE = AP* 7.12):[389]

> ἄρτι λοχευομένην σε μελισσοτόκων ἔαρ ὕμνων,
>   ἄρτι δὲ κυκνείῳ φθεγγομένην στόματι,
> ἤλασεν εἰς Ἀχέροντα διὰ πλατὺ κῦμα καμόντων
>   Μοῖρα, λινοκλώστου δεσπότις ἠλακάτης.
> 5 σὸς δ᾽ ἐπέων, Ἤριννα, καλὸς πόνος οὔ σε γεγωνεῖ
>   φθίσθαι, ἔχειν δὲ χοροὺς ἄμμιγα Πιερίσιν.

> Just as you were bringing forth the spring of your honeyed hymns,
>   and beginning to sing with your swan-like voice,
> Fate, mistress of the distaff that spins the thread,
>   bore you over the wide water of the dead to Acheron.

---

[385] Sens (2003), 80 who further highlights that the funereal overtones of this epigram would make the inference
that nineteen was the age of Erinna's death natural. Cf. Levin (1962), 197, who argues against this reading, and
Gow and Page (1965), II.136 who suggest that the epigram is "not sepulchral, but might be carelessly read as
such".

[386] Leon. Tarent./Mel. *AP* 7.13.1-3 suggests a similar conjunction of Erinna's composition of the *Distaff* and her
death.

[387] Hunter (1996b), 15. On weaving as a metaphor for poetic production, see particularly Snyder (1981), Scheid
and Svenbro (1996), Bassi (1998), 70-74, Kruger (2001).

[388] Sens (2003), 84-85; see further Neri (1996), 198-200. De Vos (2014), 426-428 suggests that the image of
Erinna sitting at a spindle may have provided the model for statues depicting the poet, adducing Tat. *Ad Gr.*33.8-
16, 21-23 and Christod. *AP* 2.108-11 (cf. Christod. *AP* 2.69-71 on a statue of Sappho, described almost
identically). Though these sources are late, Tatian claims the statue of Erinna was made by Naucydes (c.400): this
does not align with the supposed *floruit* of Erinna in the mid-4th Century (on which see Neri (2003), 210), but may
testify to a long-held, traditional mode of representing the poet. The motif of Erinna engaged in weaving is notable
in adesp. 38 *FGE = AP* 9.190.

[389] Confidently assigned by Page (1981), 346 to the period 250-150.

> 5   Erinna, the beautiful labour of your verse proclaims you not to
>   have perished, but to have joined in the chorus of the Pierides.

That this epigram responds not only to Erinna's biographical tradition generally, but to Asclepiades' epigram more specifically is clear, given the echoes of Asclepiades' γλυκὺς πόνος (7.11.1) in the description of Erinna's poetry as καλὸς πόνος (7.12.5).   The poem blurs the distinction between Erinna the author and her subject, the character Baucis, as the latter's tragically early demise is re-ascribed to the former. However, the entanglement of author and character is not passed over without reflection, but rather seems to be highlighted through the use of a particularly symbolic motif: within the epigram, the central role of the emblem of Erinna's poem - the distaff itself - highlights the transposition of biographical detail from Baucis to Erinna via the medium of her work. Numerous scholars have noted the appropriateness of the distaff as the thematic crux of Erinna's lament, given the dual symbolism of both domesticity and the metaphorical weaving of the thread of fate associated with the item:[390] in *AP* 7.12, the distaff serves to weave together Baucis and Erinna, intertwining the fate of the character with the biographical narrative of the author's life, as the *Distaff* had woven author and character together in the minds of Erinna's readers. The final address to the poet further emphasises the conceptual merging of Erinna with her poetry: Erinna's καλὸς πόνος is a means for the poet to escape the cruellest ravages of fate - that is, being forgotten - that the distaff must ultimately symbolise for mortals.[391]

I propose that Asclepiades' epigram is a forerunner of *AP* 7.12, in that it displays a comparably nuanced entanglement of Erinna, Baucis and the *Distaff*. Similarly, the manner of the entanglement emphasises that it is not simply a by-product of a biographically fallacious reading, but an integral feature of Asclepiades' representation of Erinna, and his broader aims in undertaking that representation. Following the assertion of the identity of the speaking voice at the outset (ὁ γλυκὺς Ἠρίννας οὗτος πόνος, 7.11.1), we can readily perceive that Erinna's poetry is itself the speaker. However, the closing lines of the epigram problematise this assertion - whose voice are we to interpret uttering εἰ δ᾽ Ἀίδας μοι / μὴ ταχὺς ἦλθε, τίς ἂν ταλίκον ἔσχ᾽ ὄνομα (7.11.3-4)? The implication must surely be that Erinna herself takes over the speaking role. Sens - as a rejoinder to those who seek to emend μοι to maintain the seeming consistency of the speaking voice - suggests that, in fact, Asclepiades here draws on inscribed

---

[390] See e.g., Levin (1962), 200, Cameron and Cameron (1969), 287, West (1977) 96.
[391] See above, Chapter 2.1 on Callimachus' epigram for Heraclitus, 34 *GP* = *AP* 7.80. See also Antipater of Sidon's epigram on Erinna, 58 *GP* = *AP* 7.713, which further explores the motif of Erinna's perpetual remembrance.

tradition, wherein it is "not unusual for the (ostensible) voice of the monument to give way to the first-person voice of the deceased".[392] While I agree that Asclepiades is here engaging with inscribed convention, I do not wholly conclude with Sens' position: inscribed epigrams in which the tomb speaks as if it were the deceased - rather than the deceased speaking without intermediary - are exceptional,[393] and epigrams which evince a change of speaker make use of signposting techniques to highlight this. Rather than transposing inscribed conventions into a new context, I suggest that, instead, Asclepiades is here fracturing those conventions to reflect the entanglement of Erinna and her work through their vocal comingling, a phenomenon which can only occur because of the book-epigram form with which he composes.[394] We can observe the differences between Asclepiades' epigram and its multi-vocal inscribed forebears clearly, if we consider the representation of different speakers in the following epigram (*CEG* 512):

> Τηλέμαχος | Σπουδοκράτος | Φλυεύς.
>
> "ὦ τὸν ἀειμνήστου σ᾽ ἀρετᾶς παρὰ πᾶσι πολίταις |
>   κλεινὸν ἔπαινον ἔχοντ᾽ ἄνδρα ποθεινότατον |
> παισὶ φίλει τε γυναικί." - "τάφο δ᾽ ἐπὶ δεξιά, μῆτερ, |
>   κεῖμαι σῆς φιλίας οὐκ ἀπολειπόμενος."
>
> Ἱερόκλεια | Ὀψιάδου | ἐξ Οἴου.

> Telemachus, son of Spoudocrates, from Phlya.
>
> "O man, possessing among all citizens a famous praise
>   for your always remembered excellence, and being greatly missed
> by your children and wife." "On the right of your grave, mother,
>   I lie, not leaving off my love for you."
>
> Hierocleia, daughter of Opsiades, from Oion.

In this epigram, the presence of two speakers is revealed both paratextually (through the inscription of the names of the deceased above and below the epigram) and internally. Hierocleia speaks first of her son, before Telemachus himself takes over: in doing so, he situates himself in relation to the previous speaker in spatial and genealogical terms, highlighting the change of speaker by responding to the text which precedes his own utterance

---

[392] Sens (2003), 80, reiterated at (2011), 186, 192. See further Gow and Page (1965), II.136.
[393] Sens' example - the Phrasiclea epigram (*CEG* 24) - is much debated, precisely on account of the uncertainty of the source of its initial utterance, σέμα Φρασικλείας, and its implications for interpreting the voice of the epigram more broadly. See further Svenbro (1993), 8-25, Tueller (2004), 305-307.
[394] See Campbell (2013), 24 on the comparable rupturing of sepulchral convention in Asclep. 15 *GP* = *AP* 12.46, and further on this epigram below.

- and thus also revealing the identity of the first speaker.[395] The closest inscribed parallel to Asclepiades' epigram is *CEG* 119:

νεπία ἐσσ᾽ ἔθανον καὶ οὐ λάβον ἄνθος ἔτ᾽ ἔβας, |
ἀλλ᾽ ἱκόμαν πρόστεν πολυδάκρυον εἰς Ἀχέροντα. |
μνᾶμα δὲ τεῖδε πατὲρ Ὑπεράνορος παῖς Κλεόδαμος |
στᾶσέ με Θεσαλίαι καὶ μάτερ θυγατρὶ Κορόνα.

I died an infant, and had not yet plucked the flower of youth,
but I arrived early and much-wept to Acheron.
The father Cleodamus, son of Hyperanor - and the mother Corona -
set me up here as a memorial to his daughter Thessalia.

Here, the epigram undertakes a change in voice more subtly, but a reader cannot fail to recognise the change by the epigram's conclusion. Particularly upon encountering the expression στᾶσέ με (119.4), that it is the μνᾶμα (119.3) which speaks the epigram's second couplet is decisively revealed.[396] By contrast, Asclepiades' epigram displays no signposting of a change in speaker: while the recognition of a change in the identity of the speaking voice is contextually encouraged, it is left wholly to the reader to deduce that Erinna becomes the epigram's voice, with no orientating reference back to the previous speaker to demarcate such a shift.

I suggest that the ambiguity of the precise identity of the speaker in this epigram serves a specific literary-critical purpose, contributing to a notion which Asclepiades has already presented at the level of content: namely, that the character of Erinna's work can be read as analogous with the author's own character (with the ambiguity of what 'character' might imply here overt). Within the epigram, the voice of Erinna's poetry is not replaced or superseded by the voice of Erinna. Rather, they intermingle, and become indistinguishable from one another. In so doing, Asclepiades appears to adhere to a biographically fallacious interpretation of his predecessor, but I would propose instead that Asclepiades finds in Erinna an eminently suitable figure through which to explore the inability to easily disentangle the voice of the author from

---

[395] See Tsagalis (2008), 259. This form of delineation is apparent in other dialogue-type epigrams we possess, e.g., *CEG* 429, αὐδὴ τεχνήεσσα λίθο, λέγε τίς τόδ᾽ ἄ[γαλμα] | στῆσεν... | Παναμύνης υἱὸς Κασβώλλιος, εἴ μ᾽ ἐπ[οτρύνεις?] | ἐξειπεῖν…; *CEG* 530, χαῖρε τάφος Μελίτης· χρηστὴ γυνὴ ἐνθάδε κεῖται· *v* φιλοῦντα | ἀντιφλοῦσα τὸν ἄνδρα Ὀνήσιμ|ον ἦσθα κρατίστη· *v* τοιγαροῦν ποθεῖ | θανοῦσαν σε, ἦσθα γὰρ χρηστὴ γυνή. *v* - | καὶ σὺ χαῖρε φίλτατ᾽ ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ | τοὺς ἐμοὺς φίλει; *CEG* 545, ὀστέα μὲν καὶ σάρκας | ἔ{ι}χει χθὼν παῖδα τὸν ἡ|δύν, ψυχὴ δὲ εὐσεβέων | οἴχεται εἰς θάλαμον. | εἰ δὲ ὄνομα ζητεῖς, Θεογείτ|ων Θυμόχου παῖς Θηβα|ῖος γενεὰν κεμα‹υ› κλειν|αῖς ἐν Ἀθήνα|ις. See also *CEG* 120, 'Simon.' 31 *FGE* = *API* 23, 50 *FGE* = *AP* 13.11. See further Meyer (2005), 83-88, Tsagalis (2008), 253-255, 257-260, Tueller (2008), 42-43, Schmitz (2010a), 377-379, Vestrheim (2010), 71-73.
[396] See further Casey (2004), 65-67, Tueller (2004), 305.

the voice of their poetry, on account of the highly personal nature of the *Distaff*. In failing to demarcate the precise identity of the speaker within the epigram, Asclepiades reflects a process which might readily take place within the narrative conjured by the epigram, upon the reader's subsequent encounter with the personal voice of Erinna's poetry (which this epigram necessarily purports to precede). Thus, in prefiguring a reader's conceptual entanglement of Erinna with her poetry, through their vocal collocation and combination within the epigram, Asclepiades subscribes to the notion that the narrative voice within the *Distaff* was taken as an authentic reflection of the author's own perspective, as expressed by Gutzwiller.[397] However, rather than doing so uncritically, Asclepiades incorporates this seemingly biographically fallacious representation of Erinna into a more ambitious project, whereby the author 'becomes' their poetry, not simply as a subconscious facet of the reader's process of reception, but within the text itself.

Asclepiades' epigram on Antimachus' *Lyde* (32 *GP* = *AP* 9.63) continues the trend of blurring the distinction between authors, poetry and the characters therein. Though it does not directly parallel the entanglement of author with their poetry observed in the epigram on Erinna, the underlying motif of poetic elision is recurrent:

> Λυδὴ καὶ γένος εἰμὶ καὶ οὔνομα· τῶν δ᾿ ἀπὸ Κόδρου
>   σεμνοτέρη πασῶν εἰμὶ δι᾿ Ἀντίμαχον.
> τίς γὰρ ἔμ᾿ οὐκ ἤεισε; τίς οὐκ ἀνελέξατο Λυδήν,
>   τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου;

> I am Lyde, in race and name: because of Antimachus
>   I am nobler than all the daughters of Codrus.
> For who has not sung me? Who has not read *Lyde*,
>   the joint writing of the Muses and Antimachus?

The epigram appears, at first glance, to be praise of the *Lyde*, a work purportedly composed by Antimachus to honour the passing of the eponymous woman, reckoned to be the author's wife or mistress.[398] Little is known about the *Lyde*, Lyde, or their author/lover, Antimachus: the poet's biographical record is less narratively rich than that of Erinna,[399] and sources reflect,

---

[397] Gutzwiller (1997), 210-211.

[398] On the subject of the *Lyde*, see further Del Corno (1962), 76ff., Vessey (1971), 2, West (1974), 18, Krevans (1993), 149-151, 154, Matthews (1996), 27-28, 32-36.

[399] Two key elements are recurrent, that being the admiration Plato had for the poet, and that the Antimachus edited an edition of Homer: on Plato and Antimachus, see Plut. *Lys.* 18.6, Cic. *Brut.* 191; see further Wyss (1936), ii-iii, xl, Vessey (1971), 1, Serrao (1979), Matthews (1979a), (1996), 16-18, 33-34. On Antimachus as an editor of Homer, see Antim. F 165-188 Matthews, and further Wyss (1936), xxix-xxxi, Del Corno (1962), 58, Pfeiffer (1968), 93-95, Matthews (1987), (1996), 373-403.

with general consistency, that Antimachus was active at the end of the 5th Century, and that he hailed from Colophon.[400] An author of both epic and elegiac poetry, fragments remain of several of Antimachus' works, principally the *Thebaid*, which recounted the story of the Seven Against Thebes, and - as noted - the *Lyde*, comprised of at least two books,[401] which took as its subject the ἡρωικαὶ συμφοραί, "misfortunes of heroes" ([Plut.] *Cons. ad Ap.*106b).[402] From what remains of Antimachus' poems (though it must be noted that this is scant), it does not appear that Asclepiades' epigram utilises his predecessor's work as a direct model for imitation. However, the narrative of the epigram evokes a clear parallel with that of the *Lyde* in functional terms, through their comparable status as memorialising texts:[403] while the *Lyde* honours its titular figure, Asclepiades' epigram honours the composer of the *Lyde* through praise of that poem, by having it take voice and speak said praises directly. More than this, however, it is not simply that the poem speaks: rather, Lyde the woman and the work *Lyde* are elided, in a process which recalls the elision of Erinna and her work in *AP* 7.11.

The voice of Lyde is easily detectable in the first two lines, but that it is simultaneously the voice of the *Lyde* which speaks is unveiled as the epigram progresses, particularly with the remark τίς οὐκ ἀνελέξατο Λυδήν (9.63.3) and the revelation that Λυδήν is a γράμμα (9.63.3, 4). It is in the final line that the epigram's true purpose - to praise Antimachus - becomes apparent, with the full acknowledgement that Lyde is also *Lyde,* and it is in this moment that the reader becomes aware that the epigram is engaging in a reversal of Antimachus' original act of memorialisation. Whereas Antimachus sought to honour Lyde through the medium of the *Lyde*, Asclepiades has the subject of the *Lyde* - and the *Lyde* itself - honour the author, merging the subject and the medium of praise in order to create a composite (and inherently bookish) memorial to Antimachus.

As also observed in *AP* 7.11, Asclepiades reiterates the *raison d'être* of the epigram both at the level of content and form: the narrative progression of the epigram, and the merging of Lyde and the *Lyde*, encapsulates Antimachus' own memorialising act, and this process is further

---

[400] Apollod. *FGrHist* 244 F74 = D.S. 13.108.1, Plut. *Lys.* 18.6, Heraclid.Pont. F6 Wehrli = Procl. in Plat. *Tim.* 21c., *Sud*.s.v. Ἀντίμαχος (A 2681 Adler). See further Wyss (1936), i-v, Matthews (1996), 15-20, particularly on the alternate association of the poet with Claros.
[401] See Antim. F85 Matthews, καὶ Ἀντίμαχος ἐν β΄ Λύδης· φεύγοντας γαίης ἔκτοθι Δωτιάδος. See further Matthews (1996), 26-27.
[402] The extent to which Antimachus spoke of Lyde in the *Lyde* is unclear: it has been proposed, plausibly, that the poet framed the subsequent mythological laments with an account of his love for Lyde in an introductory section; West (1974), 170, Cairns (1979), 219, Matthews (1996), 32-33, cf. Antim. F93 Matthews, Hermesian. fr.7.41-46 Powell = Ath. 13.598a-b. On Antimachus' other works, see Matthews (1996), 39-46.
[403] Cf. Sens (2011), 213, who suggests that the epigram praises the *Lyde qua* poem primarily, rather than its author.

evoked through the evolving depiction of Lyde/*Lyde*'s reception within the poem. As an elegiac composition of multi-volume length, the *Lyde* would have been unsuitable for presentation in its entirety at a symposium, and, while it might recall public catalogue poetry in its scope, its personal content would have made it less suitable for public recitation within a festival context.[404] Jackie Murray remarks, on this basis, that Antimachus "reckoned with readers as well as listeners," while West goes further in positing that the *Lyde* "was surely not composed for the symposium or the λέσχη, but as a permanent contribution to Literature."[405] It seems that, as Antimachus at least partially paved the way for later elegists in the production of a new form of narrative elegy in the *Lyde*,[406] he was equally a key figure in the adaptation of elegy to the medium of the book-roll: that elegies were written down prior to Antimachus and his contemporaries is not contested, but these texts appear to have been aides to performance, as 'transcripts' or 'scripts', rather than received as documents independently, as 'scripture', to employ Gregory Nagy's tripartite distinction of texts, in light of their performative application (or lack thereof).[407] While collections of elegies may have circulated from the 5th Century, or perhaps even earlier,[408] it appears that only for Antimachus and the authors of the late 5th and early 4th Centuries did the book-roll became a primary, rather than supplementary, medium of transmission, and that reception in performance was no longer a *fait accompli* for elegiac compositions (though it remained a central aspect of the genre).

I suggest that Asclepiades alludes to the novel bookish form of Antimachus' poetry by encapsulating the developing reception-context of elegy, in the manner of reception envisaged

---

[404] Hunter (2005), 259-264, Murray (2010), 112-114. On the performance context of early Elegy, see particularly Bowie (1986).

[405] Murray (2010), 113, West (1974), 18.

[406] The *Scholia Bobiensia* on Cicero's *Pro Archia* reports that Aristotle listed Antimachus alongside Archilochus, Mimnermus and Solon as exemplar elegists; schol. Bob. in Cic. *Pro Arch.*25 = Aristot. F676 Rose. See further Benecke (1896), Vessey (1971), 2, Matthews (1996), 32-34; see particularly Krevans (1993), 154 and Cameron (1995), 382 on the formal influence of the *Lyde* on the *Aetia*.

[407] Nagy (1996), 112: "By transcript I mean the broadest possible category of written text: a transcript can be a record of performance, even an aid for performance, but not the equivalent of performance. We must distinguish a transcript from an inscription, which can traditionally refer to itself in the archaic period as just that, an equivalent of performance. As for script, I mean a narrower category, where the written text is a prerequisite for performance. By scripture I mean the narrowest category of them all, where the written text need not even presuppose performance." See further, on the use of texts as transcript/script, Immerwahr (1964), Herrington (1985), 45-47, 201-206. On the circulation of elegiac collections in a symposiastic context, Maltomini and Pernigotti (2002), and more generally Bowie (2007), Gutzwiller (2007b), 314. See further the bibliographic items in n.20.

[408] Bowie (2007), 109-111. The editorial role played by the authors of these collections is ambiguous: see West (1974), 72-76 on Mimnermus' Hellenistic reception through text, and particularly 75-76, wherein he suggests Antimachus played a key editorial role in shaping Mimnermus as a bookish author. Cf. Bowie (1986), 28, (2007), 110, who prefers the suggestion that Mimnermus edited his own collection. See further Allen (1993), 9-29, Cameron (1995), 303ff.

by Lyde/*Lyde*. The question, τίς γὰρ ἔμ᾽ οὐκ ἤεισε, (9.63.3) situates Lyde/*Lyde* in an oral, performative context: Sens proposes that we should read this as a metaphorical reference to readers 'singing' the poem's praises,[409] but there is no good reason to wholly discard the literal connotations of the word, and interpret this as an allusion to a symposiastic performance, in which Lyde/*Lyde* would, literally, be sung. The verb which stands between the evocations of oral and written reception, ἀνελέξατο (9.63.3), acquires a particular significance in light of the play with media which Asclepiades' epigram evinces. Indeed, this poem is reckoned as one of the first uses of this verb to mean 'read',[410] but I suggest it is possible that the author here also evokes oral performance in the presentation of the reception act. In the famous 5th Century inscribed law from Teos, the so-called Teian imprecations (*SEG* 31.985), the text seemingly relates that officials and scribes who μὴ ʼναλέξεε|ν τὰ γεγραθ|μένα ἐν τῇ | [σ]τήλῃ "do not read out/recite the writing on the stele" (31.985 D. 14-17) to the best of their faculties will receive punishment for their improper action.[411] Whether the precise act represented is one of recitation from memory or direct reading from the stele itself,[412] what is definite is that the inscription envisages a combined presentation of textual and oral record, a written artefact operating in conjunction with a spoken performance, both of which preserve the same information, and achieve the same aim - the dissemination of the law's contents. This usage, while singular in evidence which predates Asclepiades,[413] foreshadows the medial duality which runs throughout the epigram. Furthermore, the position of the activity within the text - halfway between "singing" and "writing" - alludes to the multivalent applications of the term in such a context. The concluding depiction of Lyde/*Lyde* as γράμμα emphasises Antimachus' transposition of elegy from the context of performance and the symposium to that of the book-roll: Asclepiades' employment of the Muses as a legitimising entity to retroactively validate

---

[409] Sens (2013), 218.

[410] E.g., Gow and Page (1965), II.139, Sens (2011), 218. See Call. 53 *GP* = *AP* 7.471.4, τὸ περὶ ψυχῆς γράμμ᾽ ἀναλεξάμενος. Compare later examples which connect the verb to the reception of written work, e.g., Isidor. *h*.4.18 (Bernand, Inscr.Métr. 175.IV.18), τῶν ἱερῶν γράμμ᾽ ἀναλεξάμενοι; D.H. 1.89.1, ἃ μὲν οὖν ἐμοὶ δύναμις ἐγένετο σὺν πολλῇ φροντίδι ἀνευρεῖν Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ Ῥωμαίων συχνὰς ἀναλεξαμένῳ γραφὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ τῶν Ῥωμαίων; D.H. 9.17.1-2, ἡ δὲ βουλὴ τῆς πρεσβείας ἀκούσασα καὶ τὰ τοῦ ὑπάτου γράμματ᾽ ἀναλεξαμένη; Plu. *Lys*.19.2, δεξάμενος δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἄλλως μὲν οὐδὲν ἀναλέξασθαι δύναται τῶν γραμμάτων συναφὴν οὐκ ἐχόντων; Plu. *Mor*.579a, ἀναλεξάμενος βιβλίων τῶν παλαιῶν παντοδαποὺς χαρακτῆρας; Agath. *AP* 11.354.7, αὐτὰρ ὃ τὰς βίβλους ἀνελέξατο τῶν μετεώρων.

[411] I give here the full text of what remains of face D of the stele (SEG 31.985 D.1-30); Ἀνθ[εστη]ρ[ί]|οισιν : καὶ Ἡ|ρακλέοισι|ν : καὶ {ι} Δίοι|σιν : ἐν Ἀβδ[ή]|ρο[ι]σιν : Ἀν[θ]|εστηρίοι[σ]|ιν : καὶ Ἡρα[κ]|λέοισιν : κ[α]|ὶ Ζηνὸς : ἑορ|τῇ : ὅστις δ|ὲ τιμοχέων | ἢ ταμιεύων | μὴ ʼναλέξεε|ν : τὰ γεγραθ|μένα : ἐν τῇ | [σ]τήλῃ : ἐπὶ | μνήμῃ : καὶ | δυνάμει : ἢ [φ]|οινικογρα|φέων : κελευ|[ὸ]ντων τιμό|χων : κεῖνον... (remainder lost). See further Hermann (1981), Lewis (1982), Merkelbach (1982), Thomas (1996), 28, Youni (2007), Carawan (2008), 170-171.

[412] The precise meaning of ἐπὶ μνήμῃ καὶ δυνάμει is contested: see Thomas (1996), 23, Papakonstantinou (2015), 79, who posit "to the best of their memory and power", but cf. Youni (2007), 731, who suggests "for the purpose of reminder and reinforcement". See further Hermann (1981), 12-13, Carawan (2008), 171.

[413] For later examples, cf., e.g., D.C. 37.43.2, 53.11.1.

Antimachus' efforts is notable, but in characteristically Hellenistic fashion, those Muses are now writers, not singers.[414]

Assessing both *AP* 7.11 and *AP* 9.63 together, we are able to detect a clear degree of comparability between them: structurally, both epigrams conclude with rhetorical questions which serve to emphasise the fame of Erinna and Antimachus, but more than this, both epigrams demonstrate a remarkable play with the conceptual delineation between an author, their work, and the characters of their work as a means for representing and aggrandising poets. In considering both poems, we are able to observe that Asclepiades' employment of narrative encapsulation is here not simply a feature carried over from inscribed epigram with some minor alterations, but rather a significant aspect of his own bookish endeavours, and one that directly influences his engagement with poetic predecessors. The compression of Erinna's biographical details, and the elision of her persona with her work, result in a densely-packed epitome of the poet that evokes far more detail than is related within the epigram itself. Equally, it manages to encapsulate Asclepiades' reflections on the biographical reading of poetry, and also the ambiguities surrounding the speaking voice in epigram. These issues are also present in *AP* 9.63: Lyde as a character becomes indistinguishable from the *Lyde* and, in so doing, Asclepiades enacts a wholesale compression of Antimachus' elegiac poetic activity into a single evocative figure.

Asclepiades himself is absent from these epigrams as a character, but a number of aspects obliquely aggrandise the author, despite this absence. In these elements, we can observe a further emergence of the editorial persona, as a figure constructed between - rather than just within - individual epigrams. In *AP* 7.11, the reader is encouraged to recognise the author's role through the potential interpretative ambiguity of the first line, specifically the initial assertion that ὁ γλυκὺς Ἡρίννας οὗτος πόνος: while the epigram eventually reveals that οὗτος refers to the roll of Erinna's poetry envisaged by the text, the expression simultaneously aggrandises the more substantive deictic referent of ὁ γλυκὺς οὗτος πόνος, read within the context of Asclepiades' collection: Asclepiades' epigram itself. Similarly, in *AP* 9.63, Asclepiades implicitly situates himself within the company of Antimachus and the Muses, as the third 'writer' of Lyde/*Lyde*, a latter-day participant in the ξυνὸν γράμμα enacted through his production of the epigram, which continues the memorialisation of Lyde. Indeed, in the act

---

[414] Compare the conjunction of singing and writing as acts of the Muses in Posidippus' *Seal*, and the transformation from song to tablet to roll in the *Batrachomyomachia* (1-3), discussed in the Introduction.

of composing both epigrams, Asclepiades' activity mirrors his predecessors' own acts of memorialisation, as the author performs for Erinna and Antimachus the service that they performed for Baucis and Lyde. The author is thus the final link in a chain, in which all other links (both authors and their subjects) are aggrandised and memorialised once more, through Asclepiades' writing. The presentation of the author which emerges from these epigrams is thus in keeping with their content and form, and commensurate with the authorial persona detected in Asclepiades' erotic epigrams: here, Asclepiades is absent as a character - recalling the patterns of pre-Hellenistic inscribed epigram - but present through the evocation of the act of memorialisation and writing, which recalls the author's self-representation in the form of the editorial persona in *AP* 12.50.

Asclepiades thus undertakes a complex process to project his authorial role, a process which utilises both self-representation and the representation of predecessors. Connecting the various elements of this process is a central motif, the evidence of which fluctuates between implicit and overt. The centrality of the book-roll, and Asclepiades' role as producer and reader of text, is readily apparent in Asclepiades' engagement with Erinna and Antimachus: I have proposed that it is equally significant, as a programmatic theme, in *AP* 12.50, distinguishing the subjective voice of the poet-lover from the professional, authorial character embodied by the editorial persona. Asclepiades' authorial persona is thus, like that of Nossis, a composite creation of intertextual reading, whose existence owes everything to the medium of the book-roll. That he engages with his predecessors through (and, in the case of Erinna, as) book-rolls, is testament to his awareness of the significance of his medium.

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

The book-roll provided a fundamentally new means for authors to conceptualise and present their authorial activity, as a process which extended beyond the confines of any individual work, and instead underpinned their oeuvres. In the poems of Nossis and Asclepiades, we observe the results of this medial shift with particular clarity. I have argued that, for Nossis, the form of the collection allowed the author to lead the reader through the process of her authorial development, emphasising her poetic heritage and her debt to Sappho, while also celebrating her own authorial skill and the ultimate novelty of her poetry. Asclepiades is similarly engaged in the process of demonstrating his abilities via the context of the book-roll: in the cumulative reading of his erotic poems, two personae emerge, each complementing the other as a facet of Asclepiades' poetic activity, and as an expression of his generic innovations. In representing his predecessors, he equally emphasises the editorial, bookish aspect of his authorial persona: much as Callimachus memorialised Simonides by 'building' him into the *Aetia*, so Asclepiades preserves and memorialises his predecessors and their work, in a process which elides the one with the other to create composite personae which mirror his own.

Part II
Mockery and Merriment, Laughter and Pain: Herodas' Invention of the Mimiambic Poet

Authorial Persona and Poetic Programme in *Mimiamb* 8

Introduction

As has readily been observed in Part I, numerous authors rework traditional aspects of poetry in order to provoke a response born of novelty, surprise and the rupture from the expected on the part of the reader. Knowledge of poetic tradition - and moreover, recognition of purposeful breaks from said tradition - became an essential facet in the Hellenistic reader's interpretive arsenal, as the authors of the period fashioned themselves as both traditional and innovative in scope and activity. This duality typifies the Hellenistic poetic milieu, but alongside it emerged a second dyad which we find consistently in acts of self-representation, that being the twin processes of introspection and self-aggrandisement.

Authors like Posidippus, Callimachus, Nossis and Asclepiades engaged in the critical self-analysis of the form of their poetry, their activity as authors, and their purpose in writing, as well as the celebration of those same features. The combination of tradition and innovation which so marks their work results in a persistent double-awareness, which pervades the process of composition and the reader's act of reception: authors are self-conscious of their place within the milieu, but are equally intent on demonstrating how they stand apart from the crowd, and thus acts of self-representation evince a sustained negotiation of past and present, whole and individual, old and new. One author's corpus demonstrates the almost dichotomous nature of the process of self-representation in the early Hellenistic period particularly well: Herodas is often mentioned on the fringes of investigations into the representation of the author, but, as I demonstrate in Part II of this thesis, the complex nature of his process of self-representation - which occurs both within individual works and across his poetry as a whole - justifies special attention, and recognition as a quintessentially Hellenistic production.

An author of the early 3rd Century,[415] the primary source for Herodas' poetry is a papyrus containing seven poems (*P.Litt.Lond.*96 = *P.Egerton* 1) which are mostly complete (*Mimiambs*

---

[415] The dating of Herodas is approximate, gleaned from internal features of his poetry. In *Mimiamb* 1, the mention of the θεῶν ἀδελφῶν τέμενος (1.30) places the work no earlier that 272-1, if we follow the first attested date for the office of the priest of Alexander and the *Theoi Adelphoi* (see *P.Hibeh* 199.16-17). Cunningham (1966), 17-18 and (1971a), 128 suggests that *Mimiamb* 4 can be dated between c.280 and c.265 on the basis that Apelles, referred to in past tense at 4.72-78, must have died before 280, while the sons of Praxiteles must have died by c.265. Zanker (2009), 105 posits that Coccale's wish that Paieon look favourably on the sculptors suggests they were still alive when the poem was composed, leading him to propose that the poem was not written later than 265. In

1-7). One other is fragmentary but readable (*Mimiamb* 8), and - of a further - only a handful of lines survive (*Mimiamb* 9). The papyrus itself dates from the 2nd Century AD.[416] Fragments of Herodas' poetry have been found on other papyri: *P.Oxy.*2326 contains the ends of lines 67-75 of *Mimiamb* 8, and also dates to the 2nd Century AD.[417] These two papyri have recently been joined by a third; *P.CtYBR* (inv. 457r) contains lines 69-83 of *Mimiamb* 2 and dates to either the late 1st Century, or early 1st Century AD.[418] Prior to the publication of the London Papyrus in 1891, Herodas was known from a handful of quotations in Athenaeus and Stobaeus, which, when taken with the poems preserved in the papyrus, brings the total number of known mimiambs up to thirteen.[419] As the Lodon Papyrus lacks a colophon, later sources have been adduced in an attempt to determine exactly what the author's name was: Athenaeus calls him Ἡρώνδας, Stobaeus offers Ἡρώδας, Zenobius submits Ἡρώδης and Pliny the Younger transliterates his name as *Herodes*.[420] This plurality has led to the author being called Herodas by some scholars and Herondas by others;[421] that this division persists into the present day exemplifies the scarcity of evidence we have regarding his life.[422] However, in contrast to the

---

Mimiamb 2, the reference to the city of Ake (2.16) suggests it was written before 266: the city, originally Phoenician, came under Ptolemaic control in 290 and was renamed Ptolemais during the period 286-266, leading Reinach (1909), Cunningham (1971a) and Zanker (2009) to suggest 266 as the *terminus ante quem* for the mimiamb's composition. Herzog (1927), 39-40 argues that Ake might be used over Ptolemais for its metrical convenience, a view which Di Gregorio (1997), 134 follows; he further argues that name might have persisted in local usage, possibly beyond 266. Though we cannot categorically delineate Herodas' period of operation, it seems extremely likely he was writing at the same time and in the same milieu as the other authors considered in this thesis.

[416] See Kenyon (1891).

[417] Barigazzi (1955), 113-114, Cunningham (1971a), 18.

[418] Ast (2013). Notably, the papyrus has text on both verso and recto. The lines from *Mimiamb* 2 appear on the recto while *Iliad* 6.232-248 appears on the verso, in a different (and later, posits Ast) hand. Whether this papyrus contained all the *Mimiambs* or only the second - or simply an excerpt - is indeterminable.

[419] Ath. 86b; Stob. 4.23.14, 4.24d.51, 4.34.27, 4.50b.55, 56.

[420] Zen. 6.10, Leutsch-Schneidewin (1839) 1 164. 6, Plin. *Ep*.3.4.4

[421] Zanker (2009), 1 posits the Doric form Ἡρώδας employed by Stobaeus as the most likely form, on the basis that Herodas "lived in the Doric-speaking are of Cos and perhaps the mainland off which it lies". On the scholarly debate surrounding the poet's name, see further Cunningham (1971a), 2.

[422] The author's origins are more uncertain than his period of operation. It has been suggested that Herodas might be a Coan by birth: if not a native, he likely resided on the island for a time, given the familiarity which he demonstrates with Coan customs and locations. Features which appear distinctly Coan can be identified in a number of the *Mimiambs*: In *Mimiamb* 1, Mandris, the name of Metriche's erstwhile paramour, is attested twice in inscriptions from Calymnos (*TCal* 85.38, 86.2) the island directly to the northwest of Cos, dating from c.200, and once in an inscription from Cos itself (*IDorIns* 97 III, 14): see also *LGPN* vol.1 and 5a s.v. Μάνδρις.The only other epigraphic attestations of the name come from Samos (*IG* XII 6, 245) dating to the 4th Century, on which see Dunst (1972), 162, and from an Ionic vase from the 5th or 4th Century, on which Lazzarini (1973-4), 352, no. 21. See also Sherwin-White (1978), 106.n.122, who notes only the Calymnos inscription, arguing against Cunningham (1971a), 64, who believed that the name is otherwise unattested. It has been posited that the oath μὰ τὰς Μοίρας, "by the Fates" (1.11, 1.66) and similarly ἃ πρός Μοιρέων (4.30) are evocations particular to Cos, based on the fact that their usage does not serve a particular religious purpose in its context; the oath also appears at Theoc. *Id*.2.160, the setting of which has also been identified as Coan. Headlam and Knox (1922), 17-18 were first to note that, in Herodas, the invocation never serves a petitionary, exhortative function, in contrast to other cases (cf. Aesch. *Pr*.895, Aesch. *Chr*.306, Theoc. *Id*.2.160). This led them to conclude that the oath is a vernacular or colloquial expression particular to Cos. See further Weil (1891), 671, Gow (1965), xx, Sherwin-White (1978),

lack of external biographical information, the *Mimiambs* contain a wealth of information regarding Herodas' self-constructed poetic existence, particularly *Mimiamb* 8, and it is this poem which is the focus of the present chapter. Prior to considering Herodas' engagement with the medium of his poetry, and his usage of the book-roll format in the act of self-representation, it is necessary to unpack this densely allusive work, in order to better grasp Herodas' own representation of his poetic practice.

Mimiamb 8 sees Herodas delineating the nature of his poetry and considering its reception, simultaneously displaying and defending his poetic *techne* through the constructing of an authorial persona. The work is a polemic statement encapsulating the author's perception of his poetry, revealed through the narration and interpretation of a dream: a monologue delivered by Herodas' persona, the narrative begins upon his awakening.[423] Within the Hellenistic period, a growing number of authors use the dream as a narrative frame for the construction of authorial personae.[424] In doing so, they establish their poetic credentials by forging connections with predecessors and divine figures, utilising the liminal spatio-temporal context of the dream to interact with figures notionally impossible to encounter within the historical reality they themselves inhabited (in much the manner that tombs and statues of poets provided a similarly

---

321-322. Sherwin-White (1978), 350-352 makes the strongest case for identifying the Asclepieion represented in *Mimiamb* 4 as the Coan Asclepieion, expanding on Headlam and Knox (1922), 175 who note that the epithet γλῦκειαν, "sweet" (4.2) is applied only to Cos, not Tricca or Epidauros (both of which are prominent Asclepieian cultic centres) suggesting, however slightly, that Cos has a special importance in the context of the mimiamb. Zanker (2009), 104-131, particularly 106, 119-120, suggests that the τρώγλην…τοῦ δράκοντος, "hole of the serpent" (4.90-91), into which offerings are placed, could be referring to an offering box with a serpent effigy atop it. Such an offering box, the use of which is not persistently attested in the worship of Asclepius, was found by Rudolph Herzog in his excavations of the Coan Asclepieion; see Herzog and Schazman (1932), illustration 16, Zanker (2009), 121. The assertion that this Asclepieion is the Coan Asclepieion is not universally accepted: cf. Cunningham (1966), particularly 115-117, (1971), 128. *Mimiamb* 2 is definitively set on Cos, as can be determined by Battarus' appeal that the jury demonstrate the strength of particularly Coan heroes and deities, notably Cos and Merops (2.95-98).

[423] Though the mimiamb is fragmentary, I posit that Herodas conceived of it as having one principal speaker alone: though the persona addresses his narrative to another character (the slave Annas) there is no evidence to suggest this was a speaking role, and I address this character's silence further in chapter 5.2. The monologue form alone does not definitively prove that the narrator of *Mimiamb* 8 must be the author's persona: I do not suggest that the primary speaker of *Mimiamb* 2, which is almost a monologue barring a brief, three-line interlude, must also be a persona of the author. The two mimiambs, however, differ with regards the identification of their narrators, as the speaker of *Mimiamb* 2 repeatedly names himself as Battarus (2.5, 49, 75, 82, 93) and gives his paternal lineage (2.75-77), while the speaker of *Mimiamb* 8 never identifies himself, and indeed is the only speaker of *Mimiambs* 1-8 not to be named in the text: all other speakers are either named by interlocutors or by themselves. Neither does he give any personal details, beyond the fact that he is a composer of poetry with a seemingly mimiambic character (8.73-79). Given that this is the only significant personal detail we glean from the mimiamb (the fact that the speaker seems to be a smallholder, as suggested by his commanding of slaves to undertake various agricultural tasks in the opening lines of the mimiamb (8.1-13), does not lead easily to identification), an interpretation of the speaker as a persona of the poet seems inevitable. No alternative identifications of the speaker have been posited.
[424] There is debate over whether Hesiod's meeting with the Muses should be interpreted as a dream encounter, though it has generally been argued that it was not conceived in this manner; see further discussion in Chapter 4.2.

liminal setting for epigrammatic engagement with figures of the past). Authors such as Callimachus, and later Ennius and Propertius, utilised the dream in a programmatic fashion: while this is equally true for Herodas, in contrast to those authors' dream-narratives (all of which are related directly to the reader) Herodas establishes a fictional setting (seemingly a small farmhouse, inhabited by the persona and a number of slaves), from within which the dream is narrated and interpreted by the persona. As a result of this, Herodas constructs his persona not only as an voice, but as a dramatic character,[425] and this observation is crucial to an analysis of the programmatic and self-representative aspects of *Mimiamb* 8 - and to Herodas' poetry as a whole, as will be discussed further in Chapters 5 and 6. Herodas' authorial self-representation is noteworthy for his integration of numerous facets into one overarching process of poetic reflection: the *Mimiambs* are characterised by hybridity of both genre and medial form, and this hybridity is exhibited in Herodas' construction of his authorial persona.

That Herodas' authorial representation is a staged figure, and not just a voice, carries with it the seemingly innocuous consequence that his persona has physical and material characteristics, such as a costume, props and the like. Far from being inconsequential, however, these attributes form the backbone of Herodas' programmatic self-definition within the mimiamb, and the consideration of their usage forms the first section of this chapter. I here begin by assessing how the characterisation of the persona functions as an encapsulation of Herodas' poetic programme, and as a legitimation of the author's activity of generic mixing. I posit that Herodas' persona can be seen, over the course of the mimiamb, to adopt attributes - whether physical, vocal or indeed elements of costume - possessed by other figures of poetic significance who are presented within the mimiamb, and suggest that this adoption of characteristics reinforces the persona's claims of legitimacy, authority and fame. In the second section, I consider the programmatic context of Herodas' self-representation, and demonstrate that the author casts his programmatic poem as a variation of two significant poetic *topoi*: the heaven-sent dream, and the scene of poetic initiation.

---

[425] Hutchinson (1988), 238.

4.1   *Persona, predecessor and guarantor in Mimiamb 8*

In terms of narrative structure, *Mimiamb* 8 can be divided into three parts, with two shorter opening and closing sections bookending the longer account of the dream. In the first section (8.1-15), Herodas' persona awakens, rouses two slaves (Psylla and Megallis) with typical mimic vulgarity and calls another (Annas) to listen as he recounts his dream. The central section of the work, which consists of the dream's retelling (8.16-64), begins with the persona describing how he was dragging a goat from a dell: the goat, however, was snatched up by goatherds, who proceed to rip it apart and consume it.[426] Frustratingly much of the central section of the mimiamb is highly fragmentary, but from what can be pieced together, we learn that the persona became involved in the goatherds' celebrations (8.36ff.), and won the game of *askoliasmos,* successfully being held up by an inflated skin (8.46-47).[427] Present during the celebrations was a person dressed in saffron clothing and wreathed with ivy (8.28-32), later referred to as the νεην[ίην (8.63). A second figure named with comparably allusive non-specificity appears within the dream-narrative: the πρέσβυς (8.59) argues with the persona - the precise cause behind this is lost - and his aggression prompts the latter to call the young man to witness (8.63). This presumably settles the disagreement, as the persona later speaks of sharing success with the old man (8.75ff.). The interpretation comprises the entirety of the last section of the mimiamb, the text of which is also difficult to reconstruct (8.65-79):[428]

65   καὶ τοῦτ' ἰ[δ]ὼν ἔληξα. τὸ ἔνδυ[τον
       Ἀν]νᾶ δ[ὸς] ὧδε. τὠναρ ὧδ' ἰ[
     .....]ν αἶγα τῆς φ[άραγγος] ἐξεῖλκον
     .... κ]αλοῦ δῶρον ἐκ Δ[ιων]ύσου
     .... αἰ]πόλοι μιν ἐκ βίης [ἐδ]αιτρεῦντο
70   τ]ὰ ἔνθεα τελεῦντες καὶ κρεῶ[ν] ἐδαίνυντο,
     τὰ μέλεα πολλοὶ κάρτα, τοὺς ἐμοὺς μόχθους,
     τιλεῦσιν ἐν Μούσῃσιν. ὧδ' εγὼ [το]ῦτο.
     τὸ μὴν ἄεθλον ὡς δόκευν ἔχ[ει]ν μοῦνος
     πολλῶν τὸν ἄπνουν κώρυκον πατησάντων,
75   κὴ τῷ γέροντι ξύν' ἔπρηξ' ὀρινθέντι
     .] κλέος, ναὶ Μοῦσαν, ἥ μ' ἔπεα κ[

---

[426] That this occurs in these lines has been retroactively inferred from the interpretation in the final section of the mimiamb: αἰ]πόλοι μιν ἐκ βίης [ἐδ]αιτρεῦντο / τ]ὰ ἔνθεα τελεῦντες καὶ κρεῶ[ν] ἐδαίνυντο, "the goatherds violently carved up the goat, performing the rites, and feasted on the meat" (8.69-70). Headlam and Knox (1922), 383 raise the possibility that the goat may have eaten the bark or leaves from a number of oak trees which led the goatherds to destroy it, based on the mention of ἄλλης δρυὸς [, "of another oak" (8.23) adducing Nonn. *D.*46.145 as evidence of the connection between Dionysus and the oak tree. Veneroni (1971), 226 argues stridently for this interpretation, but as noted by Rist (1997), 356 and Fountoulakis (2002), 310-311, the papyrus is too damaged to subscribe fully to this line of thought.
[427] Latte (1957) examines the phenomenon of *askoliasmos* in detail. See also Pickard-Cambridge (1988), 45.
[428] The text of Herodas used throughout follows Cunningham (2004), with deviations noted.

。εγ’ ἐξ ἰάμβων, ἤ με δευτέρη γν[
ἐ]μ[οῖ]ς μετ’ Ἱππώνακτα τὸν παλαι[
τ]ὰ κύλλ’ ἀείδειν Ξουθίδης †επιουσι[[429]

<div style="text-align:center">65</div>

    On seeing this I stopped (dreaming). Give the cloak
    here, Annas. [I interpret] dream thus [
    ]I dragged the goat from the gully
    ] a gift from handsome Dionysus.
    ] the goatherds violently carved up the goat,

70   performing the rites, and feasted on the meat,
    very many will pluck at my corpus,[430] my labours,
    among the Muses. Thus I interpret this.
    Since I seemed to be the only one to have the prize
    among the many who had trodden on the air-tight skin bag,

75   and since I shared success with the angry old man
    ]fame, by the Muse, who/either […] me verses [
    from iambs, who/or me as a second[
    ] after Hipponax of old [
    to sing limping verses to [my own] Xouthids.

I discuss the meaning of these lines in detail in Chapter 5: at present, it suffices to say that, in this closing section, we observe Herodas' persona interpreting the dream as an encapsulation of his poetic programme, reflecting the dual-natured, mimic-iambic poetry that the author has brought into being. In the course of his interpretation, the persona names two figures of import for his own endeavours: the god Dionysus and the poet Hipponax. The presence of these two within the programmatic narrative of *Mimiamb* 8 is, however, far more significant than a simple name-check in the concluding lines of the poem. Rather, Herodas establishes both as characters within the dream, occupying the roles of the young and old man, and these figures function as embodiments of the two genres which he combines to form his own mimiambic creation. Furthermore, I posit that Herodas' persona can be seen to adopt attributes possessed by these characters, over the course of the mimiamb. Ultimately, I argue that Herodas emphasises the validity of his persona's programmatic assertions by demonstrating that the character allegorically possesses the authority and legitimacy of both his predecessor and divine guarantor, in the form of the characteristics drawn from the personae of those figures.[431]

---

[429] In l.66, Cunningham (2004) gives ..]ναδ[..] ὦδε, omitting the Ἀν of Ἀν]νᾶ , but this can be partially read on the facsimile of the papyrus, *P.Litt.Lond.*96 = *P.Egerton* 1, fr.4. Also in l.66, δ[ὸς] is supplemented by Knox and Headlam (1922), Zanker (2009). In l.72, Cunningham (2004) gives ωδεγω[ ]το; Barigazzi (1955), on the basis of the reading of *P.Oxy.*2326, proposes the supplement ὦδ’ εγὼ [το]ῦτο, which he interprets with the meaning "cosi io interpreto questo punto"; Cunningham (1975a) proposes ὦδέ γ’ ὄ[ισ]το or ὄ[λλυ]το. In l.78, Cunningham (2004) gives 。μ.. ς ; Herzog (1924) and Zanker (2009) supplement ἐ]μ[οῖ]ς.
[430] Zanker (2009), 232 suggests "corpus" to translate τὰ μέλεα, to capture some sense of both limbs and verses with the pun.
[431] On the notion of the divine guarantor of poetry, see particularly Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 4-5.

I turn first to the role played by Hipponax. In the closing lines of the interpretation, Herodas' persona connects the allegorical success shared with the old man to a corresponding shared success with the choliambic poet, envisaging the achievement of comparable fame from τ]ὰ κύλλ' with his own audience of Ξουθίδης (8.79), an evocation of Hipponax' contemporary Ionian audience.[432] The persona's seeming interpretation of shared victory with the old man as an allegory of his own success echoing that of Hipponax at first appears baseless, until one considers the manner in which the old man is depicted within the dream. Two attributes are repeatedly emphasised regarding this figure: his age, and his irascibility. The persona describes the character generally as the γέροντι ὀρινθέντι,[433] "angry old man" (8.75) in his interpretation and, within the dream itself, the character is consistently identified by reference to his age.[434] His wrathfulness is equally clear in the threat which the persona reports the old man aimed at him: ἔρρ' ἐκ προσώπου μή σε καίπερ ὢν πρέσβυς / οὔλη κατ' ἰθὺ τῇ βατηρίῃ κό[ψω, "get out of my sight as, though I'm an old man, I'll strike you down flat with the whole length of my stick", (8.59-60). The sparseness of this characterisation is at odds with what we observe throughout Herodas' other poems, in which characters - though perhaps redolent of a stock type - are nevertheless fleshed-out with additional details, significant names and genealogies.[435] The paucity of attributes ascribed to this character could be explained through the reasoning that the persona is the primary focus of the mimiamb, leading to a more reduced depiction of his supporting players (as seems the case with the hard-to-identify goatherds). However, I would instead suggest that Herodas deliberately keeps his characterisation of the old man brief in order to emphasise the centrality of wrath and agedness to that character. Agedness is a common characteristic applied to poetic predecessors,[436] and here encourages a reader to interpret this character as significant from a programmatic perspective. While the character's age leads to a general identification of a predecessor, the emphasis on anger leads to a specific figure. In the character of the angry old man, Herodas evokes a poet who, by the Hellenistic period, had become renowned for his irascibility: Hipponax.

---

[432] Cunningham (1971a), 203 posits ἐ]μ[οῖ]ς, following Herzog (1924), as the likeliest reading of the start of 8.78, but is unsure why Herodas would contrast his Xouthids with any others, a question I believe can be resolved by reading - as I have - an implicit contrast with Hipponax' audience. See also Hdt. 8.44.2.

[433] The word ὀρινθέντι denotes anger rather than fear as at Hom. *Od.*17.261, on which see Cunningham (1971a), 203, Esposito (2010). See further Sext.Emp. *Adv. Math.*1.298 (= T57 Degani).

[434] Ὁ γέρων (8.62), referred to by the persona; πρέσβυς (8.59), a self-definition by the old man himself, as reported by the persona.

[435] Ussher (1985), 66-67, and see further Chapter 6.

[436] This is particularly notable in the case of statues of poets, e.g., in the depictions of Anacreon by Leonidas (31 *GP* = *APl* 306, 90 *GP* = *APl* 307) and Philitas by Posidippus, (*AB* 63), as discussed in Chapter 2.1.

The biographical figure Hipponax had, by the Hellenistic period, largely been elided with the persona of the author ('Hipponax'),[437] and as a result, the vituperation which characterised the poet's work was perceived as an expression of the personality of the man himself.[438] As discussed in the introduction to Chapter 2 this tendency to present a biographical narrative based upon the reception of poetry is one which the Hellenistic poets frequently engage with, and in the case of Hipponax this trend is exemplified by the sepulchral epigrams written by Leonidas, Theocritus and Alcaeus of Messene.[439] Each of the epigrams evoke a comparable impression, that being that the dead poet is restless in his grave, liable at the slightest provocation to resume his invective attacks: both Leonidas and Alcaeus subvert a common trope of sepulchral epigram by warning all passers-by to stay away, rather than stop and pay homage,[440] while as discussed, Theocritus' epigram avoids the more stereotypical presentation, redirecting the poet's anger to those of bad character and warning that εἰ μὲν πονηρός, μὴ προσέρχευ τῷ τύμβῳ, "if you're wicked, don't approach the tomb" (Theoc. 13 *GP = AP* 13.3.2). Such is the power of Hipponax' spite that Alcaeus' epigram relates that no vines will grow on his tomb, only brambles and the bitter wild pear.[441] It is notable that Alcaeus withholds Hipponax' name until the penultimate line of his epigram, instead identifying the deceased at first only as ὁ πρέσβυς (13 *GP = AP* 7.536.1): given the description of the grave's plant-life, the ultimate identification of the deceased can hardly be a surprise to an astute reader. In utilising the stock tropes ascribed to Hipponax through the biographical reading of his poetry, Herodas capitalises upon the malleable historicity of such representations, utilising the stereotypical characteristics of his choliambic predecessor as shorthand through which to obliquely identify the old man of his persona's dream.[442]

---

[437] A reading encouraged by the repeated occurrence of a figure named Hipponax in the poet's own work, e.g., fr.42 Degani (= 32 West), fr.44 Degani (= 36 West), in which Hipponax is given as the name of the speaker.

[438] This characterisation persists into the Roman period and beyond; see, e.g., T7, T8, T9b, T12a, T17a, T25, T57 Degani. See further Degani (1991), 3-8, 12, 20, and also Acosta-Hughes (1996), 210-213, Kivilo (2010), 121-134.

[439] Leon.Tarent. 53 *GP = AP* 7.408, Alc.Mess. 13 *GP = AP* 7.536, Theoc. 13 *GP = AP* 13.3. Philip, writing in the 1st Century AD, composed a comparable piece (Phil. 34 *GP = AP* 7.405), particularly evocative of Leonidas' epigram.

[440] Leon.Tarent. 58 *GP = AP* 7.408.1-2: ἀτρέμα τὸν τύμβον παραμείβετε, μὴ τὸν ἐν ὕπνῳ / πικρὸν ἐγείρητε σφῆκ' ἀναπαυόμενον, "go quietly past the tomb, do not waken the spiteful wasp that lies at rest in sleep"; Alc.Mess. 13 *GP = AP* 7.536.5-6: ἀλλά τις Ἱππώνακτος ἐπὴν παρὰ σῆμα νέηται / εὐχέσθω κνώσσειν εὐμενέοντα νέκυν, "but he who passes by the tomb of Hipponax should pray his corpse mercifully to rest." On this phenomenon, see further Tueller (2008), 65-94.

[441] Alc.Mess. 13 *GP = AP* 7.536.1-4: οὐδὲ θανὼν ὁ πρέσβυς ἑῷ ἐπιτέτροφε τύμβῳ / βότρυν ἀπ' οἰνάνθης ἥμερον, ἀλλὰ βάτον, / καὶ πνιγόεσσαν ἄχερδον, ἀποστύφουσαν ὁδιτῶν / χείλεα καὶ δίψει καρφαλέον φάρυγα.

[442] Rist (1997) suggests that the character might be Archilochus, but this interpretation seems implausible, as shall be proven directly.

A further proof of this character's identity comes from the wording of the threat which the persona relates the old man aimed at him: ἔρρ' ἐκ προσώπου μή σε καίπερ ὢν πρέσβυς / οὔλη κατ' ἰθὺ τῇ βατηρίῃ κό[ψω, "get out of my sight as, though I'm an old man, I'll strike you down flat with the whole length of my stick", (8.59-60). This threat partially quotes a Hipponactean line, δοκέων ἐκεῖνον τῇ βακτηρίῃ κόψαι (fr.8 Degani), and in this appropriation of Hipponax' voice, the 'old man' is further implied to be a persona of the choliambic poet. The justification in claiming the joint honour of shared success with Hipponax is, however, still unclear, based upon a reading of the interpretation alone: however, I suggest that Herodas provides this justification much earlier in the poem, by characterising his persona after the stereotypical representation of Hipponax. While waking his slaves, the persona threatens Psylla, saying τ]όνθρυζε καὶ κνῶ, μέχρις εὖ παραστά[ς σοι / τὸ] βρέγμα τῷ σκίπωνι μαλθακὸν θῶμα[ι, "go on muttering and scratching yourself till I stand over you and soften up your head with my stick" (8.8-9). The language is not a direct quotation of Hipponax, but the intention behind the persona's words is unmistakably reminiscent of Herodas' predecessor, and thus the old man's threat to deal out violence with his stick echoes this earlier threat. Furthermore, the word σκίπων and the equivalent σκῆπτρον have resonant poetic connotations: the σκῆπτρον is consistently employed by messengers, kings and priests as a symbol of command and, significantly for Herodas' usage, Hesiod receives a σκῆπτρον from the Muses at the moment of his inspiration (*Theog*.30).[443] Hellenistic uses of the word continue to evoke the context of wisdom and power, with Callimachus mentioning a σκίπων in connection with two of the Seven Wise Men: Pittacus possesses one, described as γεροντικὸν ὅπλον, "the old man's weapon" (54 *GP* = *AP* 7.89.7), while Thales uses his to draw mathematical diagrams in the dust (*Iamb*.fr.191.69 Pf.).[444] The staff is therefore evocative of age, wisdom and power, and through its usage, Herodas imbues his persona with these attributes.

Herodas' persona, wielding the σκίπων, is symbolically elderly, a characterisation we observe repeatedly in the construction of other authorial personae, as well as poetic predecessors.[445] More than just a symbol of age, however, this characterisation serves to elide Herodas' persona with that of Hipponax, implying, by their comparable attributes and personalities, that the claims of Herodas' persona as to the shared success between himself and the old man (and thus, between Herodas and Hipponax) at the close of the poem have substance. Herodas adopts the

---

[443] See also Hom. *Il*.2.101, 2.186-206, 2.265, 6.159, 9.38, 9.156, Hom. *Od*.11.569 Aesch. *PB*.172, 761, Hdt. 7.52.
[444] Compare Ar. *V*.727, Hp. *Art*.52, E. *Hec*.65.
[445] See e.g., Call. *Aet*.fr.1.6, 21-22, 35-38 Pf., Posidipp. *AB* 118.5, 22.

voice and behaviour of Hipponax, through the usage of the choliambic metre and of Hipponactean language and characteristics.[446] Indeed, though the threat to Psylla seems to foreshadow that of the old man (in the development of the narrative), in actuality, the persona's threat is an echo of that of the old man, as the events of the dream directly precede the onset of the mimiamb. Thus, on waking from the dream, Herodas' persona immediately adopts the voice of his poetic model, thereby foreshadowing and legitimising his later claim at sharing the fame of said model.

This technique - the 'resurrection' of a poetic forebear in order to imbue poetry with their particular essence - is immediately reminiscent of Callimachus' *Iambs* where, as discussed in Chapter 2, Hipponax is made to speak again, in service of the programmatic delineation of Callimachus' poetic *techne*. Benjamin Acosta-Hughes has emphasised the remarkable poetic effect achieved by the opening to the *Iambs*; ἀκούσαθ᾽ Ἱππώνακτος· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ᾽ ἥκω / ἐκ τῶν ὅκου βοῦν κολλύβου πιπρήσκουσιν, "listen to Hipponax, for indeed I have come from the place where they sell an ox for a penny" (*Iamb*.191.1-2 Pf.). Hipponax, who attests his own posthumous status, nevertheless speaks out from the text, and the audience is at once confronted by a multi-layered poetic voice, in which Hipponax and Callimachus are indistinguishable.[447] The choliambicist returns from the dead, but not unchanged, as Callimachus reworks the poet for his own Hellenistic setting, shifting his forebear's ire from his traditional opponents to the *philologoi* of Alexandria.[448] The author adopts the guise of his predecessor, though not absolutely: 'Hipponax' remains for only a short time before he must return to the depths,[449] implying that - while the choliambicist might infuse his Hellenistic descendant for a while - Callimachus does not see himself as Hipponax *redivivus* in perpetuity. Indeed, in *Iamb* 13, a defence of Callimachus' *polyeideia*, as much as a continuation of the themes of *Iamb* 1, the author's persona, responding to the criticism that he has not gone to Ephesus to become inspired, responds that indeed no, he has not gone to Ephesus. Rather, Callimachus has had Ephesus come to him.

---

[446] On Hipponactean words in Herodas, Ussher (1980), particularly 73.

[447] Acosta-Hughes (2002), particularly 37-43, 47. See, on the opening lines of the *Iamb*, Kerkhecker (1999), 28-30.

[448] 191.3-4; Hipponax will no longer direct his iambic songs at Bupalus, one of the original targets of his scorn; see Plin. *H.N.*36.12, *Sud*.s.v. Ἱππώναξ (I 588 Adler). Though the text is fragmentary, that his new opponents are the scholars of Alexandria is unsurprising, and is attested in the *Diegesis* (*Dieg*.6.3). See further Acosta-Hughes (2002), 32-35.

[449] See 191.34-35.

Hipponax' *anabasis* and predicted *katabasis* in *Iamb* 1 imbues Callimachus with the legitimacy of his forebear, without attaching him to that forebear in totality. In Herodas' persona's adoption of Hipponactean language and props, I posit that we observe a markedly similar approach to the issue of reviving Hipponax as that of Callimachus. Callimachus reveals the identity of the poem's speaker by the close of the first line of the poem, but then subtly demonstrates that this is not the Hipponax of old, but rather a nuanced iteration, reformed (or perhaps, rehabilitated) for a Hellenistic audience, aesthetic and polemic. With a similar degree of artful ambiguity, Herodas never explicitly reveals that the old man is Hipponax, only illuminating the persona's perceived connection between his poetic activity and the choliambicist in the final lines of the mimiamb. The identity of the old man is never absolutely stated, but through language and characterisation, and the persona's Hipponactean-style intimidation, a savvy reader is prepared for the infusion of the persona with Hipponactean poetics. It is particularly telling that, in the old man's threat, he seemingly reveals that he is aware of the persona's uptake of his attributes: while one can read ἔρρ' ἐκ προσώπου (8.59) as meaning "get out of my sight",[450] it would not be implausible to read this more metaphorically as implying "get out of my character".

As with Callimachus, Herodas does not make his persona a second Hipponax *tout court*. Crucially, by establishing and resolving an agonistic relationship between the two figures within the mimiamb, Herodas is able both to suggest that his persona is an able adversary for the old man, and one worthy of the task of refashioning choliambic in a new form, for the Hellenistic period. Both Callimachus and Herodas evoke Hipponax as a poetic model, without becoming Hipponax *redivivus* in full. Their activity is legitimised through their engagement with Hipponax, but this sanctioning does not necessitate slavish adherence to tradition, but rather a validation of their activities of adaptation and reformation.

While Hipponax provides authority for the choliambic element of his poetry, Herodas equally desires legitimisation for his dramatic endeavours, and he receives this legitimacy from Dionysus.[451] Much as with Hipponax, Dionysus appears as a character within the dream and, though he is never named overtly, is easily identified by his attributes. When the 'young man' is introduced, he is described wearing a σχ[ιστὸν] κροκωτ[ὸν, "saffron-hued [dress]",[452]

---

[450] As it has been by Headlam and Knox (1922), 375, 393, Cunningham (in Rusten and Cunningham (2002) and Zanker (2009), 321.

[451] See further Hutchinson (1988), 237.

[452] Cunningham (2004) does not offer a supplementation for σχ[…..]κροκωτ[. Poll. *On.*4.116 attests the κροκωτός as the *himation* of Dionysus specifically. See Headlam and Knox (1922), 384, Zanker (2009), 229.

σ[τικτῆ]ς νεβοῦ χλαν[ι]δίῳ, "a cloak of [dappled] fawnskin",[453] a κύπα[σσι]ν ἀμ[φ]ὶ τοῖς ὤμοις, "tunic about his shoulders",[454] and having κό[ρυμβα δ'] ἀμφὶ κρ[ητὶ κ]ίσσιν' ἔστεπτο "ivy [?fruit clusters] wreathed around his head" (8.28-32). When the persona later calls upon the young man to adjudicate the argument between the old man and himself (8.63), revealing the character's authority within the agonistic context of the dream, the identification of the young man as the god is strongly asserted. Dionysus has personal importance for Herodas, particularly as his poetry is a gift from the god (8.68); within the dream it is Dionysus who, by settling the disagreement between the old man and the persona, legitimises Herodas' combination of the dramatic context and characters of mime with Hipponax' metre, allaying the old man's stereotypical rage at the adulteration of his genre by supporting the author's activity (via support for the persona) with divine authority.[455] This, however, is not the full extent of Dionysian presence in the mimiamb:[456] I propose that Herodas utilises the context of the dream to imbue his persona with Dionysian attributes, in order to claim Dionysus' legitimising role for himself in the world outside the dream.

On completing his narration, Herodas asks Annas to give him an ἔνδυ[τον], "cloak" (8.65-66), and I argue that Herodas has clear purpose in choosing the word ἐνδυτόν here, owing to the specific Dionysian context the dream evokes.[457] It has been posited that Herodas requests a cloak in a desire to ward off the cold, either generated by the fear of awaking from a dream,[458] or due to the setting of the mimiamb during winter,[459] or more generally to emphasise the transition back to the dramatic setting,[460] but I posit that the word acquires particular significance in the Dionysian context established by the dream. Ἐνδυτόν is used for garments worn by the gods,[461] and garments gifted by the gods to mortals,[462] but it is particularly the use of the word in Euripides' *Bacchae* which has significance for our interpretation of *Mimiamb* 8. The tragedian uses ἐνδυτόν in several works, but most often in the *Bacchae*; it is not, however,

---

[453] Cunningham (2004) gives σ.[….]ς; Headlam and Knox (1922) and Zanker (2009) supplement σ[τικτῆ]ς.
[454] A possibly Hipponactean borrowing; see Hipp. fr.42B.1 Degani.
[455] We can compare the role Apollo plays in Call. *Aet*.fr.1Pf., or A.R. 1.1ff., or Erato in A.R. 3.1ff.
[456] Cf. Rosen (1992), Fountoulakis (2002), Fernández (2006b).
[457] Headlam and Knox (1922) suggest τοὔνδυτον, while both Cunningham (1971a), (2004) and Zanker (2009) accept ἔνδυ[τον] in this line.
[458] See Call. fr.742 Pf., Ov. *Am*.3.5.45-6, Zanker (2009), 231, Headlam and Knox (1922), 395, Cunningham (1971a), 201.
[459] See Rist (1997), Zanker (2009), 231.
[460] See Kutzko (2008), 151-153.
[461] χρύσεα τὠπόλλωνι τό... ἐνδυτὸν, Call. *Ap*.32.
[462] As with the description of Achilles wearing the armour made by Hephaestus at E. *IA*.1071-1073; περὶ σώματι χρυσέων / ὅπλων Ἡφαιστοπόνων / κεκορυθμένος ἔνδυτ'.

the frequency of the word which we should note, but rather the context in which it is deployed, as it is a context with clear similarity to that of Herodas' dream.

In the tragedy, the Chorus encourage all Thebes to adorn their στικτῶν… ἐνδυτὰ νεβρίδων, "garments of dappled fawnskin" (111), with soft sheep wool in preparation for the games and dances of Dionysus (111-114), and further describe how Dionysus himself is νεβρίδος ἔχων / ἱερὸν ἐνδυτόν, ἀγρεύων / αἷμα τραγοκτόνον, "wearing the sacred garment of fawnskin, hunting the blood of slaughtered goats" (137-139).[463] Finally, the Messenger refers to the carcass of an animal killed by the Bacchants metaphorically as a σαρκὸς ἐνδυτὰ, "garment of flesh" (746) which is torn apart. Taking into account the Dionysian context of the dream, Herodas' request for an ἐνδυτόν as his first action upon concluding the dream-narrative is significant. The garment allows the persona to adopt the raiment of the dream's participants, and that of the god himself, despite his return to the waking world. Furthermore, in donning traditional Bacchic clothing, the persona imitates the figure of Dionysus in the dream, the only other character whose physical appearance is described in detail, and who has a correspondingly Bacchic style. In doing so, Herodas presents his persona outside the dream as an analogue of Dionysus within the dream, adopting the latter's role as a legitimising force with which to impart his interpretation with authority. The command for an ἐνδυτόν separates the narration of the dream and its interpretation: Herodas jolts the reader from their immersion in the dream-narrative by alluding to the mimetic setting which frames the narrative, speaking once more to the slave Annas. Putting on the ἐνδυτόν makes the persona's change from narrator to interpreter explicit, and it is the ἐνδυτόν which proactively legitimises the prophesised fame from Herodas' dual-natured poetics.

There is one other aspect of the ἐνδυτόν to consider: how it connects to the goat, the allegory of Herodas' poetry. In the dream, Herodas creates an echo of Bacchic chaos in the destruction of his goat, reminiscent of a ritual *sparagmos* (8.20, 69-70).[464] The revelation that the goat is the persona's poetry, and that the rending of the goat's limbs is akin to what his critics and imitators will do to his poetry, surprisingly fails to evoke despair or concern on his part - for indeed, just as the goat continued to serve him well despite its destruction (owing to its origins as the gift of Dionysus) so will his poetry, as it likewise possesses the blessing of the god.[465]

---

[463] Compare Herod. 8.30.
[464] Compare Herod. 8.40. See further Rosen (1992), Crane (1986), Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 4-5, Fountoulakis (2002), 314-319.
[465] See Fountoulakis (2002), 316.

The goat's skin, once flayed off, reappears as the ἄπνουν κώρυκον, "air-tight skin-bag" (8.74) which holds the persona aloft (8.47):[466] the persona is the only one to win the prize from treading upon the bag because it is his goat remade in a new form,[467] and thus his 'poetry', though now mutilated, continues to bring him alone fame. The persona's lament that τὰ μέλεα πολλοὶ κάρτα, τοὺς ἐμοὺς μόχθους, "many will pluck at my corpus, my labours" (8.71) is thus rather disingenuous, given that Herodas' work requires a degree of interpretive mauling in order to reveal the extent of the author's cleverness.

From the usage of ἐνδυτόν, however, I believe we can deduce that the bag is not the final form of Herodas' poetry. Its last role is to become, symbolically, the garment which the persona dons following his awakening from the dream, representing the persona's uptake of the legitimising power of his poetic guarantor. The usage of ἐνδυτόν in the *Bacchae* is connected to ritual destruction of animals (734-747) and specifically the destruction of goats (136-139) and moreover, in the first case the ἐνδυτόν is the destroyed animal, and I posit that Herodas has in mind the metaphorical dimension of the 'garment of flesh' when considering his own ἐνδυτόν. Herodas' allegoric goat possesses the incredible ability to retain its power when mutilated, as the persona demonstrates through his victory at *askoliasmos*. The reader, receptive to the notion that the author's poetry takes multiple forms, and aware of Herodas' allusion to the Dionysian revels of the *Bacchae*, could therefore interpret the persona's wearing of the ἐνδυτόν, a garment made from skins (like the ἄπνουν κώρυκον) as the author symbolically garbing himself in his own poetry.[468] This notion is further supported by the overall programmatic character of the mimiamb: Herodas seeks to defend his work within his poetry, and in having his persona wear the ἐνδυτόν, a garment which symbolises the adoption of Dionysus' legitimising role, he presents himself as utilising his poetry to legitimise itself.

In choosing to depict the adoption of Dionysus' attributes through the usage of a costume, Herodas tellingly employs the techniques of drama, symbolising the mimic genre through its performative mode. Equally, however, I would argue finally that the persona's donning of a

---

[466] See Crane (1986), 89-90 on the meaning of ἄπνουν as "air-tight" rather than "breathless".

[467] This transformation from goat to bag might be explained in the fragmentary τὸν αἶγ᾽ ἐποίευν [....]π[(8.25), or λῶπο[ς...][πε]ποιῆσθαι at (8.36).

[468] The notion that the goat (and thus the skin-bag) are representative of poetry may well have been only a small test of the imagination for Herodas' readers, as Herodotus reports that τὰς βύβλους διφθέρας καλέουσι ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ οἱ Ἴωνες, ὅτι κοτὲ ἐν σπάνι βύβλων ἐχρέωντο διφθέρῃσι αἰγέῃσί τε καὶ οἰέῃσι· ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐς τοιαύτας διφθέρας γράφουσι, "the Ionians have since ancient times called papyrus sheets skins, as, with the lack of papyrus sheets at the time, they used the skins of goats and sheep: and still to my day many foreigners write on such skins" (5.58.3): longstanding medial interchangeability between αἴγεος and βίβλος may thus further support the notion that the persona's goat is Herodas' book-poetry transfigured.

150

cloak is a means by which Herodas depicts his persona as perhaps not only the equal, but the better of his poetic predecessor Hipponax. In a number of Hipponax' poems - crucially, one in which the speaker identifies himself as Hipponax by name - the speaker laments his lack of clothing to protect against the cruelties of winter:

Fr. 42 Degani (= 32 West)

A   Ἑρμῆ φίλ᾽ Ἑρμῆ, Μαιαδεῦ, Κυλλήνιε,
      ἐπεύχομαί τοι, κάρτα γὰρ κακῶς ῥιγῶ
      καὶ βαμβαλύζω

B   δὸς χλαῖναν Ἱππώνακτι καὶ κυπασσίσκον
      καὶ σαμβαλίσκα κἀσκερίσκα καὶ χρυσοῦ
      στατῆρας ἑξήκοντα τοὐτέρου τοίχου

A   Hermes, dear Hermes, Maia's son, Cyllenian,
      hear thou my prayer, for I am bloody frozen,
      and my teeth are chattering

B   give Hipponax a cloak and a nice tunic,
      and some nice sandals and fur boots,
      and sixty gold sovereigns to balance me up[469]

Fr. 43 Degani (=34 West)

      ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔδωκας οὔτε κω χλαῖναν
      δασεῖαν ἐν χειμῶνι φάρμακον ῥίγεος
      οὔτ᾽ ἀσκέρῃσι τοὺς πόδας δασείῃσιν
      ἔκρυψας, ὥς μοι μὴ χίμετλα ῥήγνυται.

      For you've never given me a cloak
      thick in the winter to cure me of the shivers,
      nor have you wrapped my feet in thick fur boots,
      so that my chilblains not burst.[470]

The irascibility of Hipponax' persona here is caused by unluckiness with regards to divine providence, a theme echoed in other poems in which the poet uses his own name as that of the speaker,[471] but the specific request for a χλαῖναν (fr.42 B.1 Degani), and the assertion that Hipponax' persona has never received such an item, seems particularly significant when considering Herodas' response to his poetic forebear. Herodas' persona, in contrast to that of Hipponax, does receive his cloak which is, as shown, the final form of the divine gift of the goat. The ἐνδυτόν, therefore, not only symbolises the persona's adoption of Dionysus'

---

[469] Trans. West (1993).
[470] Trans West (1993), adapted.
[471] E.g., fr.44 Degani.

legitimising power, but equally suggests that the persona is more highly favoured by the divine than his choliambic predecessor.

In conclusion, in the engagement between Herodas' persona, his poetic predecessor Hipponax, and his divine guarantor Dionysus, we observe the author constructing a multi-layered statement of poetic authority, founded upon the implication that, in the adoption of the characteristics of the other two, the claims of mimiambic success which the persona makes are substantiated. Herodas' persona stands as a unification of his predecessor and guarantor, a depiction which reflects the author's unification of mimic and iambic poetry within the *Mimiambs*: Herodas thus exhibits a highly novel - and quintessentially Hellenistic - means of authorising his programmatic message.

From an analysis of Herodas' engagement with Hipponax and Dionysus, and the construction of his authorial persona, it is apparent that the delineation of his poetic programme incorporates a thorough exploration of his own compositional act: the mixing of genres - the fundamental process at work in Herodas' activity - is a central motif of *Mimiamb* 8, permeating the presentation of the characters within the dream, and the author's persona. However, that Herodas' persona encapsulates the qualities of his predecessor, divine guarantor, and the respective genres which he implies they represent is not the extent of Herodas' presentation of *Mimiamb* 8 as an authoritative programmatic statement. The narrative *topoi* which the author engages with - particularly the tropes which surround the receipt of a heaven-sent dream, and those attached to narratives of poetic initiation - also play a significant role in Herodas' attempt to legitimise his poetry, and it is the usage of these models which form the subject of my assessment in this section.

Beginning with an analysis of the dream as a narrative device, I assess the role of dreaming in other instances of programmatic importance, considering its usage particularly in the narratives surrounding the outset of poets' careers, or their inspiration. By utilising the dream as a means through which to showcase his poetic skill, I argue that Herodas engages with a powerful conceptual signifier: the perceived ability of dreams to predict the future - and to enable personal communication with the divine - makes the dream a potent means through which to establish authority, whether poetic or otherwise. By presenting his persona as a recipient of a heaven-sent dream, I propose that Herodas subtly asserts the divinely authorised nature of his imagined success. I then assess Herodas' dream in comparison to other narratives of poetic initiation, and argue that - in contrast to cases in which poets are divinely inspired or tutored by a god or poetic predecessor - Herodas eschews the suggestion that another figure provides the skill which elevates his poetry, instead presenting himself as divinely authorised to practice poetry, while simultaneously maintaining that his abilities are entirely his own.

Narratives of poetic inspiration, initiation and programmatic delineation become increasingly complex with the onset of the Hellenistic period: new initiations echo those of prior poets, and poets such as Herodas, Callimachus and Theocritus manipulate the stock narrative elements found in their forebears' initiations (and the biographical narratives recounted about them) to create representations which, though rooted in tradition, are fundamentally their own creations. This quest for novelty extends to the very medium of communication between the god,

predecessor and poet: the mechanics of how poets encountered their predecessors and guarantors becomes as significant, from a programmatic perspective, as the encounter itself. Increasingly, poets choose to represent their initiation through the medium of the dream: Herodas aside, Callimachus, Ennius and Propertius all recorded programmatic dreams, which they themselves recount. There is equally a growing tradition of poets having initiative dreams ascribed to them. For example, Isocrates relates that some of the Homeridae tell how Homer was inspired to compose his great works by a visitation from Helen in a dream (*Hel.*65), and Pausanias relates how Aeschylus, while asleep in a vineyard, was visited by Dionysus who ordered him to compose tragedy (1.21.2):[472] the author reports that this was attested by Aeschylus himself, although no such testimony survives.[473] While the dream evokes a markedly similar situation to that which occurs in 'waking' initiations,[474] one overt difference can be detected at the conceptual level. The removal of the initiation from everyday reality problematises the interpretation of the episode's meaning, given the intrinsically personal and non-verifiable (though often implicitly trusted) character of dreaming.[475] The employment of the medium of dreaming, however, equally prompts a reader to expect an episode of significance from the outset. Dreaming is repeatedly utilised in as a signifier of importance, or

---

[472] Notably, Pausanias' retelling of the outset of Aeschylus' poetic career follows directly after the report that, when the Spartans invaded Attica, their commander had a dream in which Dionysus bade him honour τὴν Σειρῆνα τὴν νέαν, "the new Siren", which he interpreted as an order to provide honours for Sophocles, who had recently died (1.21.1). In these two reports, one can observe the strength of the connection the dream has to poetic composition and fame within the zeitgeist: the dream of the Spartan commander is mirrored in Aeschylus' dream, and between these two instances the entire lifecycle of poet and poetry, from inception to death and memorialisation, is mapped out, within the frame of the dream.

[473] Though this is the only account of the Dionysiac, inspirational origins of Aeschylus' poetry, there are a number of reports that the tragedian composed while drunk, e.g., Plut. *Quaest. Conv.*1.5.1, 622e, [Luc.] *Dem.Enc.*15; furthermore, he was supposedly rebuked by Sophocles for not knowing (οὐκ εἰδώς) what he was creating due to his drunken state (Plut. fr.130 Sandbach, Ath. 10.428). This lack of knowledge is particularly reminiscent of the state of madness which falls upon poets when inspired, as depicted by Plato; see Plat. *Ap.*22b-c, *Phaedr.*245a, *Laws* 4.719c, *Ion,* particularly 532c-b, 536a-e. Pausanias' version of the outset of Aeschylus' poetic career therefore seems to unite aspects of the tragedian's biographical tradition (namely, his drunkenness, as signified by the vineyard and the prominence of Dionysus) with a common feature of the onset of poetic action (divine inspiration resulting in poetic ability) within the single narrative of the dream. See further McKinlay (1953), Kambylis (1965) ,118-119, Knox (1985).

[474] As noted by West (1997), 287 in the confusion over whether Hesiod's encounter with the Muses was a dream: see further below.

[475] This could be seen as a modern concern, to an extent, though some sources testify to a more sceptical position on whether dreams which lacked any external proof of their content should be held as prophetic: in only a few cases are such proofs reported, and these are usually items relating to the dream's content, e.g., Bellerephon receiving a girdle (Pind. *O.*13.65ff.), Anyte receiving a tablet from Asclepius (Paus. 10.38.13). Artemidorus does hold to the prophetic ability of dreams, but - in his definition of the ὄνειρος (1.6, 4.3) - suggests a physiological origin for such dreams, largely skirting the question of the gods' role in dreaming. Aristotle holds that dreams cannot be considered divinely sent apart from in a circumspect manner, it being the case that all nature is divinely ordained: he posits that, if dreams were truly heaven-sent, only the best and most intelligent of men would dream, and dreams would occur during the day as well as at night, Arist. *Div.Som.*1.462b 20-22, 2.463b 12-15, 2.464a 20-22. See further Harris (2009), 127ff.

as an *aition* of a particularly renowned undertaking. Tacitus reports Ptolemy I Soter introduced the worship of Serapis to Alexandria following a dream (*Hist.*4.83-84),[476] and Alexander supposedly founded the same city in its given location as a result of dream in which a figure - almost certainly conceived of as Homer - appeared to him and quoted the Odyssean lines regarding the island of Pharos (Plut. *Alex.*26.1-5),[477] and this is but one of the many divine dreams which Plutarch records as having occurred to Alexander (and those around him) which prompted significant action.[478] Dreams were held as a suitable motivator for a major undertaking, and were accounted with significance on a conceptual level, by the great and ordinary alike.[479] That there was a generally held belief in the capacity for dreams to originate from the gods, and that such dreams could have substantive ramifications upon the life of the dreamer or others is attested, for example, in the collection of the Epidaurian *Iamata*, the records of those cured by the visitation and ministration of the god Asclepius in dreams, or by the wealth of votive inscriptions erected as a result of a dream.[480] Theophrastus depicts one character - the 'Superstitious Man' - who, when waking from a dream, visits not only dream-interpreters but also augurs to learn to which god or goddess he should pray (Theophr. *Char.*26); the implication is that the man sees in every instance of dreaming the possibility of a divine pronouncement.[481]

As depicted in the ancient sources, dreams fall broadly into one of two categories: as put by Martin West, they are either 'message' dreams, or 'symbolic' dreams, the former offering straightforward information, the latter - as with the dream of Herodas' persona - requiring a degree of interpretation.[482] That dreams were interpreted by specialists is attested from the

---

[476] See further Pelling (1997), 205-206.

[477] See Hom. *Od.*4.412.

[478] E.g., Olymipas' and Philip's dreams on the birth and origins of Alexander (Plut. *Alex.*2.2-5); Darius' dream wrongly interpreted by the Magi (Plut. *Alex.*18.6-8, cf. QCR. *Hist.Alex.Mag.*3.3.2-5); Alexander's dreams of the siege of Tyre (Plut. *Alex.*24.5-9, cf. QCR. *Hist.Alex.Mag.*4.2.17-18, Arr. *An.*2.18.1); Alexander's dream regarding the death of Cleitus (Plut. *Alex.*50-52.2). See further King (2013).

[479] Though notably Artemidorus holds that the dreams of important men are, by their nature, more important that the dreams of the ordinary (1.7).

[480] On the *Iamata*, Edelstein and Edelstein (1945), and compare *Mimiamb* 4; the reason behind the women's visit to the Asclepieion seems likely to have been the result of a cure, possibly through dreaming, given the god's particular *modus operandi*. See further the comic representation of the ritual of incubation and cure in Aristophanes' *Wealth*. The Greek and Latin inscriptions erected as a result of a dream are catalogued by Renberg (2003). See further Deubner (1900), Herzog (1931), Harris (2009), 123-228.

[481] Theophr. *Char.*26 is perhaps a representative case of generally held belief, albeit an extreme case: the possibility that dreams could be sent from an external source, rather than simply a manifestation of internal feeling is discussed by Artemidorus (see 1.2-5, 1.8-9, 2.36, 4.1). See further Kessels (1969) and (1978), Price (1990), particularly 371-372, Cox Miller (1994), 39-91, Pelling (1997), Harris (2009), particularly 274ff.

[482] West (1997), 185: see further Kessels (1978).

Homeric epics onwards,[483] and, by the Hellenistic period, professionals such as Aristander - Alexander's dream interpreter - were accorded great prominence for the importance of their skills.[484] The wealth of material and literary evidence attesting to the notion that dreams were accorded with significance, and moreover authority, is important for our understanding of Herodas' dream, and poetic dreams in general. There existed, at a cultural level, a belief which held dreams to be inherently significant, and poets capitalised upon this notion in order to authorise their activity, and further enrich their self-representations.

As noted, a prominent aspect of the poetic, initiative dream is the removal of the need to ground events in plausible reality. The context which the author creates is not restricted by conformity to modes of realism, given that the dream does not occur in an actual spatial or temporal context, but rather in an imagined context constructed by the author for the furtherance of poetic effect. Consequently, we can observe authors utilising the context established as a poetic device in and of itself. Herodas stages his persona's dream within a rural setting: due to the damage to 8.18-40 is is difficult to reconstruct more that the general impression that the persona encounters the goatherds - and the young and old men - within a woodland glade, suggested by τῆς βήσσης, "wooded glen" (8.18) and the mention of ἄλλης δρυὸς, "another oak" (8.23).[485] This speculative forest setting is made more likely by the nature of the festival which the persona stumbles upon. The goatherds' games, and the persona's likening of the festivities to those of Dionysiac choruses (8.40), suggest that the festivities are analogous to a Rural Dionysia.[486] The scene is, therefore, conspicuously removed from the ordinary setting of the town,[487] and is much more akin to Hesiod's rural encounter with the Muses in the *Theogony*. Indeed, a stock element of initiation scenes is their occurrence in liminal spaces. Comparably, in Theocritus' *Idyll* 7, Simichidas encounters Lycidas on the road, and similarly the tradition of Archilochus' poetic beginnings note that he encountered the Muses in transit.[488]

---

[483] Achilles, when considering how best to divine the anger of Apollo, suggests summoning an ὀνειροπόλος, "dream-interpreter", καὶ γάρ τ᾽ ὄναρ ἐκ Διός ἐστιν, "for the dream is also from Zeus", Hom. *Il.*1.63. See also *Il.*5.148ff.

[484] On Aristander, see Plin. *NH.*17.243, Plu. *Alex.*2, 14, Arr. *An.*1, 12, 2. See further King (2004). Artemidorus utilises the work of many prior dream interpreters, including Aristander, in his own interpretation of dreams; on Aristander, see 1.31, 4.23-24; on Panyasis of Halicarnassus (c.6th Century), see 1.2, 1.64, 2.34; on Antiphon of Athens (c.5th-4th Century), see 2.14; on Demetrius of Phalerum (c.350-280), see 2.44.

[485] See above n.426 on the possibility that the goat's nibbling of the oaks caused the goatherds' ire, and further Headlam and Knox (1922), 383, Zanker (2009), 228.

[486] Compare Plut. *Mor.*527d, Ver. *G.*2.371-396, Ar. *Pl.*1129. See further Headlam and Knox (1922), 381ff., and Latte (1957).

[487] Notably, it is one of only two of Herodas' extant works which alludes to a setting other than urban, *Mimiamb* 4 being the other (though this takes place within the confines of the Asclepieion complex and is thus unlike the overtly rural situation of the dream).

[488] See further Dodds (1955), 117.

Callimachus' dream survives only in fragments, but a later epigram of the *Palatine Anthology* preserves its content (adesp. *AP* 7.42):

> ἇ μέγα Βαττιάδαο σοφοῦ περίπυστον ὄνειαρ,
>   ἦ ῥ' ἐτεὸν κεράων οὐδ' ἐλέφαντος ἔης.
> τοῖα γὰρ ἄμμιν ἔφηνας, ἅτ' οὐ πάρος ἀνέρες ἴδμεν
>   ἀμφί τε ἀθανάτους ἀμφί τε ἡμιθέους,
> 5   εὖτέ μιν ἐκ Λιβύης ἀναείρας εἰς Ἑλικῶνα
>   ἤγαγες ἐν μέσσαις Πιερίδεσσι φέρων·
> αἱ δέ οἱ εἰρομένῳ ἀμφ' ὠγυγίων ἡρώων
>   Αἴτια καὶ μακάρων εἶρον ἀμειβόμεναι.

> Great and celebrated dream of the wise Battiad,
>   truly you were made of horn and not of ivory.
> For you showed us such things regarding gods
>   and heroes as before we men did not know,
> 5   when you lifted him up from Libya and transported him
>   to Helicon, and brought him amidst the Pierides;
> they told him, in answer to his questions,
>   about the *Aetia* of primal heroes and the blessed ones.

Similarly to the dream of Herodas' persona, the dream which Callimachus experienced occurs in a liminal space. In Callimachus' account, moreover, we can see the poet specifically alluding to Hesiodic poetics, and establishing his connection to that forebear through the setting of the dream itself.[489] Propertius' dream can be seen to continue this tradition of reoccupying former initiative contexts. The author receives initiation and guidance from the Muses on the slopes of Helicon (Prop. 3.3.31-52), as Callimachus had in his dream. In further comparison to his Alexandrian predecessor, Propertius hijacks the context of his antecedent's initiation in order to connect himself with that antecedent. What is notable is that Propertius does not simply allude to Callimachus' dream, but also to the *Aetia* prologue and prevalent Callimachean programmatic motifs, imitating as he does the appearance of Apollo as a poetic mentor, and liberally employing the imagery of pure water and the road less travelled. Herodas does not employ the setting of the dream in precisely the same manner as Callimachus and Propertius, but constructing the setting is no less important for his programmatic purpose. While these authors seek to evoke a specific poetic context already established within the work of antecedent, Herodas attempts to establish an agonistic, performative and Dionysian scene within the dream, in order to represent - at the level of narrative - the hybrid character of his

---

[489] Call. *Aet.*fr.2 Pf., particularly fr.2e. See Harder (2012) I.126-134, II.93-117. Hesiod is particularly important to Callimachus as an authoritative voice within his poetry but, concurrent with the notion that Callimachus presents himself as an equal of Hesiod by their shared experiences of indoctrination, Hesiod's voice is never presented without Callimachean emendations; see Kambylis (1965), 58, Cusset (2011), Fantuzzi (2011).

poetry. By situating his persona's encounter with his poetic predecessor and legitimising divinity within a setting defined by its dramatic, performative associations, Herodas subtly depicts the meeting of choliambic and mime at a structural level.

In order to possess authority, a dream must possess some inherently divine characteristic, which demarcates it as divine,[490] normally involving the appearance of the god - or a representative of the divine - to the dreamer. However, the manner in which the relationship between dreamer and divinity is conceptualised is not consistent. Particularly, we see a divergence in the relationship as presented in the Homeric epics, the narratives of initiation presented by Isocrates and Pausanias, and the account of Herodas' persona. Returning to the dreams of Homer and Aeschylus as reported by Isocrates and Pausanias, we find that the dreams render the dreamer into an entirely passive role. The encounter between dreamer and initiator is constructed similarly in both cases: a divine personage visits the poet-to-be and stands by him,[491] suggesting a physical proximity between dreamer and dream-apparition which emphasises the concrete presence of the divine figure, and subtly reinforcing the authority of the dream's content as a result of its divine source.[492] A consequence of this authoritative origin is, however, that it robs the poets of their own innate authority: this can be observed in the physical situation of both Aeschylus and Homer. Both poets are emphatically stationary, sleeping while their initiator visits, and stands over them. This is common of divinely originating dreams, particularly those in the Homeric poems, where the dreamer receives a visitation which is either sent by the god, or the god disguised.[493] The static, passive nature of the dreamer in these episodes encapsulates the perceived relationship of dreamer and dream-apparition, with the case of Rhesus being an exemplary episode (*Il*.10.496): Athena sends an evil dream which, standing beside the sleeping king's head, prevents him from waking, leading

---

[490] As argued by Artemidorus (1.6).

[491] Aorist participles of ἐφίστημι are used in both cases: λέγουσι δέ τινες καὶ τῶν Ὁμηριδῶν ὡς ἐπιστᾶσα τῆς νυκτὸς Ὁμήρῳ προσέταξε ποιεῖν περὶ τῶν στρατευσαμένων ἐπὶ Τροίαν (Isocr. *Hel*.65); ἔφη δὲ Αἰσχύλος μειράκιον ὢν καθεύδειν ἐν ἀγρῷ φυλάσσων σταφυλάς, καί οἱ Διόνυσον ἐπιστάντα κελεῦσαι τραγῳδίαν ποιεῖν (Paus. 1.21.2).

[492] Compare also Persephone standing by Pindar when she proclaims he will compose a hymn to her following his death, and Pindar standing by the unnamed Theban women to whom he sings his posthumously composed Hymn to Persephone (Paus. 9.23.3-4). This is a common feature of many divine appearances in dreams, e.g., Hom. *Il*.2.19, where Dream is said to στῆ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς, and particularly in Herodotus, e.g., 1.34.1, 2.139.1, 2.141.3, 5.56, 7.12. Deubner (1900), 11 collects many other instances of this phenomenon of dream-apparitions 'standing' by dreamers to impart their message. See further Dodds (1951), 105-106, West (1997), 187-188. Harris (2009), 80 notes the continuation of the close proximity of dream-apparition to dreamer (particularly to the dreamer's head) beyond antiquity; e.g., in the 12th Century *Song of Roland* ll.2525-2569, wherein the angel Gabriel stands close beside Charlemagne's head, leading Charlemagne to trust the dream's message implicitly.

[493] E.g., Zeus sends Dream to Agamemnon in the guise of Nestor (Hom. *Il*.2.5ff.); Athena disguised visits Nausicaa during a dream (Hom. *Od*.6.15ff.); Athena sends a phantom to Penelope (Hom. *Od*.4.798ff).

to his death at the hands of Diomedes.[494] The dreamer is powerless in the grip of the dream when it is prompted by the divine, and this domination is equally made clear in the content of Homer and Aeschylus' dreams. In both cases, the divine figure does more than simply inspire the poet - rather, they command the creation of poetry. Helen appears and Ὁμήρῳ προσέταξε ποιεῖν περὶ τῶν στρατευσαμένων ἐπὶ Τροίαν, "ordered Homer to compose a work about those who went in armies to Troy", (Isocr. *Hel*.65) while Dionysus κελεῦσαι τραγῳδίαν ποιεῖν, "bade (Aeschylus) to write tragedy" and we are further told that, when day came, Aeschylus immediately took action (Paus. 1.21.2). This emphasises that the relationship between the poet and initiator is one of passivity on the part of the former; the sudden presence of the divine - combined with the lack of response on the part of the poet until the dream's end - brooks no question as to the nature of the relationship between the two. Following their dreams, the poets created great works, and in both cases, the greatness of their works is seemingly attributed to the dream. Isocrates reports that the Homeridae attest that, though the magnificence of the *Iliad* is due partly to τὴν Ὁμήρου τέχνην, it is μάλιστα δὲ διὰ ταύτην οὕτως ἐπαφρόδιτον καὶ παρὰ πᾶσιν ὀνομαστὴν αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι τὴν ποίησιν, " mostly through (Helen) that this poem has such charm and has become so famous amongst all", while Pausanias reports of Aeschylus that ὡς δὲ ἦν ἡμέρα πείθεσθαι γὰρ ἐθέλειν ῥᾷστα ἤδη πειρώμενος ποιεῖν, "as soon as it was day, convinced by the vision to obey, he made an attempt, and already found it easy to compose" (1.21.2-3). The suddenness with which Aeschylus follows Dionysus' prompting evokes the rapidity with which Homeric dreamers respond, such as Nausicaa who, waking from her dream in which she was visited by Athena, follows the goddess' commands immediately: upon awaking ἄφαρ δ' ἀπεθαύμασ' ὄνειρον, "straightaway she marvelled at her dream" (*Od*.6.49) before making haste to the shore as instructed (*Od*.6.50ff). We observe cases wherein dreamers trust their dreams because of an assertion within the dream of its divine origins, such as Agamemnon's dream, in which Dream, disguised as Nestor, proclaims Διὸς δέ τοι ἄγγελός εἰμι "I am the messenger of Zeus" (*Il*.2.26) leading Agamemnon to describe it as a θεῖός… ὄνειρος, "divine dream" (*Il*.2.56). Penelope's first dream is of a similar nature (*Od*.4.798ff.), in that she too recognises its divine origins, acknowledging that the phantom she speaks with is heaven-sent during the course of the dream itself (*Od*.4.831). Upon awaking, Penelope is freed from the anxiety which had gripped her: φίλον δέ οἱ ἦτορ ἰάνθη, / ὥς οἱ ἐναργὲς ὄνειρον ἐπέσσυτο νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ, "her heart was warmed, as so clear a dream had hastened to her in the dead of

---

[494] See further Kessels (1978), 30-33 who suggests that the subject of Rhesus' dream was, cruelly, his imminent death at the hands of Diomedes.

night" (*Od.*4.840-841). The special character of divine dreams is asserted either directly by the god within the dream, or by a more indefinable, yet nevertheless trustworthy apprehension - as in the case of Nausicaa. Crucially, the dreams which appear in the Homeric poems attest to an established notion that divine dreams were self-certifying: Nausicaa, Penelope and Agamemnon trust their dreams without question, owing to their internal, self-evidently divine origins. Likewise, the dreams which Homer and Aeschylus purportedly experienced are authorised by the appearance of a divine figure and, furthermore, by their subsequent activity of composition. Given that the expected result of an inspirational dream is the creation of superlative poetry, the ascription of heaven-sent, initiative dreams to literary greats of the past would appear to be a natural consequence of the formation of biographical traditions regarding famous poets.[495]

The passivity which defines the dreams of Homer and Aeschylus is, however, entirely at odds with Herodas' narrative, and he defines his persona*'s* relationship with both Dionysus and Hipponax not as one of subjugation, but equality. In judging his performance, the young man legitimises his poetic activity, but it is the performance itself which leads to the persona*'s* fame. This is reflective of Herodas' programmatic approach more generally: rather than asserting that his poetic *techne* is a result of divine inspiration, the author demonstrates that his excellence is primarily a product of his own ability. By employing the motif of the dream, Herodas creates a powerful underpinning narrative structure for his programmatic delineation. The *topos* of the dream as a method of divine communication imbues the mimiamb - and its message - with implicit authority. However, the author does not utilise the motif after the manner of others. Rather, by making his persona an active participant in the development of the dream-narrative, and interpreting the dream without aid from another, he avoids the passivity of the heaven-sent dreams ascribed to Homer and Aeschylus, emphasising his own role in the development of his renown. Herodas, therefore, capitalises upon the associations of the dream as a concept, particularly its divine, self-legitimising aspect, without suggesting his ability is the result of another, whether divine or mortal.

---

[495] Pindar is a particularly interesting case in this regard: Pausanias relates how the poet, when an old man, dreamed that Persephone stood by him and told how, though he had not yet composed a hymn to the goddess, he would do so once he had come to her (9.23.3). He died within 10 days of this pronouncement, and then appeard in a dream to a Theban woman, whom he was related to, in order to perform and thus spread the prophesised hymn amongst the living (9.23.4). Dreams thus become both the method by which poetry is instigated, and the method by which it was propagated.

The dreams ascribed to Homer and Aeschylus, and those of Callimachus, Propertius and Herodas, are a subset of a further poetic *topos*, that being the scene of a poet's initiation. From Hesiod's encounter with the Muses on the slopes of Helicon in the *Theogony*, innumerable poets have themselves represented the outset of their poetic careers through the depiction of an encounter with the divine, or with a poetic predecessor, who inducted them into the ways of poetry.[496] One might consider Hesiod's encounter the archetypal scene of the *Dichterweihe* - poetic initiation - as echoes of this encounter resonate throughout the tradition, and much of the manner in which later poets depict their origins evokes the Hesiodic model, whether in structural form or content.[497] Typically, initiation narratives serve a programmatic purpose, with the form of the encounter between poet and initiator reflecting - to a varying extent - the character of their work. Equally, they function as an emphatic statement of the poet's legitimacy to practice poetry:[498] by the Hellenistic period, numerous poets can be observed utilising narratives of initiation in this dual programmatic/authorising fashion, and Herodas is, as discussed, no exception. There is, however, a distinction between the sub-type of initiation narrative which poets utilise (or are attributed by later tradition, as is the case with Archilochus, Aeschylus and Homer). Initiations are, to a greater or lesser extent, elaborations on one of three archetypal narratives: uniformly, the poet-to-be encounters either a god and/or poetic predecessor, and as a result of this meeting, one of three occurrences take place. The poet is either:

1) Inspired (divinely gifted the ability to compose poetry)

2) Instructed (guided in the creation of poetry, though not in receipt of direct inspiration)

3) Validated (justified in their prior activity, and/or marked out as a poet *par excellence*)

---

[496] Whether Hesiod's meeting with the Muses was, in fact, conceived of as a dream seems unlikely, although there is some evidence that such an interpretation was entertained in antiquity. Fronto implies Marcus Aurelius subscribed to this belief in a letter to the same: *hinc ad Hesiodum pastorem, quem dormientem poetam ais factum*, "from him let us to Hesiod the shepherd, who, as you say, became a poet during sleep" (Front. *Ad.M.Caes.*i.4). On Fronto's letter see further Kambylis (1965), 55.n.1, van den Hout (1988), 7, van den Hout (1999), 19-20. On the wider discussion of whether Hesiod dreamed his encounter with the Muses, see Latte (1946), Kambylis (1965), particularly 57-58, Calame (1995), 58-59, Klooster (2011), 7.n.17. It would not be implausible to suggest that, given the prevalence of other dreamed encounters with the gods, a later tradition may have been retroactively applied to Hesiod: West (1997), 287 notes, crucially, that the poet's encounter with the Muses had the same pattern as those reported in the case of dreams, including the leaving of a material token to 'prove' the truth of the occurrence.

[497] This does not necessarily imply that all other scenes of initiation purposefully alluded to the *Theogony* passage: rather, Hesiod's initiation comprised a template upon which other poets loosely styled their own initiations. Some initiations do purposefully evoke Hesiod, notably Theocritus in the initiation of Simichidas in *Idyll* 7, or the dream of Callimachus (*Aet.*fr.2 Pf., particularly fr.2e) and perhaps, by extension, Propertius' initiation, as discussed.

[498] See particularly Kambylis (1965), 17ff.

This final grouping is perhaps the most controversial, as it could be said that the validation narrative is not strictly an initiation *per se*, in that the poet may well have been practicing their craft prior to the encounter with the initiator. I suggest, however, that the label 'initiation' is still applicable for these instances, given that it is through the encounter with a divinity or a predecessor that the poet is truly legitimised in their activity, and established as a presence within poetic tradition. In short, the moment of validation and legitimisation serves as a second, emphatic initiation of a poetic career.[499] I posit that *Mimiamb* 8 can be read as a variation of this type-3 group. That the poem should be read as an initiation in general is attested by the elements present in the work which one can observe recurrently in other narratives, such as the appearance of a poetic predecessor and a divinity whose relevance to Herodas' poetry is readily apparent, and the presence of objects of poetic symbolism which, by the conclusion of the work, are in the possession of the persona. That the mimiamb is specifically a variant of the type-3 initiation becomes clear from an analysis of these elements.

Firstly, let us return once more to the roles of Hipponax and Dionysus in the mimiamb, in the guises of the old and young man. The relationship between the persona and his two potential initiators is not depicted with a straightforwardly tutelary dynamic, nor is it suggested that the author is divinely inspired through the presence or actions of the god. Indeed, the relationship between Herodas' persona and Hipponax is marked by the latter's antagonism, rather than any instructive action. Equally Dionysus, while vital for the establishment of Herodas' poetic authority, is depicted in an adjudicatory role, rather than that of an inspiring deity. In contrast, instances of type-1 or type-2 narratives rely upon the relationship between poet and initiator being interpreted as cordial, in order to lend credence to the implicit claim that it is due to this relationship that the poet is legitimised. The friendship of the initiator also occurs in type-3 narratives, as we shall see, but in contrast to the other two groups it is not a prerequisite. We can compare the old man's vituperative attack on the persona with the relationship between Apollo and Callimachus in the *Aetia* prologue, wherein Callimachus emphasises that his legitimacy in practicing poetry in the manner that he does stems from a close working relationship with the god. Apollo's tutelary role in Callimachus' poetic career can be readily contrasted with the relationship the Telchines have with divine patrons of poetry, when they are described as νήιδες οἳ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι, "ignorant, and no friends of the Muse" (1.2). Though type-1 and type-2 initiations may include moments where the initiator rebukes

---

[499] Kambylis (1965), 17.

or insults the poet, such as the Muses' damning indictment of Hesiod and his fellow shepherds as κάκ᾽ ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον, "dreadful things of shame, mere stomachs" (*Theog.*26), or Apollo's description of Propertius as a *demens* for attempting to drink from the 'wrong' fount of inspiration (Prop. 3.3.15), the relationship is nevertheless revealed - eventually - to be one of patronage, and aid. While the young man does apportion success to both the persona and the old man, there is never the implication that he intervenes to secure the persona's victory: instead, the persona is entirely reliant on his inherent skills at jumping.[500] As a result of this, I posit that we should not read either the old man or the young man as occupying an instructive or inspirational role.

The initiation of Herodas' persona shares more in common with that of Simichidas of Theocritus' *Idyll* 7, or the initiation of Archilochus, as related in the Parian Mnesiepes Inscription. In both cases, the poets take part in an event recognisable as an initiation, but not within the standard formats of inspiration or initiation. As discussed in Chapter 2, as a boy on Paros, Archilochus had made fun of a group of women he thought were travelling to the city, who laughed with him and asked to buy the cow which he was bringing back from the fields for his father. Upon agreeing, cow and women vanished, and lying at the boy's feet was a lyre. Archilochus realised that the women were the Muses and that the lyre was their gift to him, and the events prompted his father Telesicles to travelled to Delphi to decipher the events, where he received an oracular pronouncement declaring that his son would be ἀθάνατος (*SEG* 15.517.col.II.50).While we might read this as a type-1 narrative, I propose that we should instead categorise it as type-3, not only from the addendum of the explanatory oracle, but also by the fact that Archilochus already displays his inherent poetic abilities prior to the receipt of the lyre. In insulting the women, and evoking laughter from his insults, Archilochus foreshadows his iambic verses, demonstrating his nascent poetic talent. The lyre is thus primarily a signifier of poetic excellence, rather than divine inspiration in material form.

Simichidas, a figure long reckoned to be a persona of Theocritus,[501] enters into a poetic contest with the goatherd Lycidas, a character who, like Simichidas, is probably a persona - most

---

[500] The one potential caveat to this is the role Dionysus plays in providing the persona with the goat, thus facilitating his victory, a point which I address below.

[501] The precise links between Simichidas and Theocritus have been much debated: the *scholia* held that Simichidas was a patronymic (schol.21a, b) a reading followed by the *Vita* which gives Theocritus' father's name as Simichus. This is seemingly refuted by the epigram Gow 27 = *AP* 9.434 which gives Theocritus' father as Praxagoras: Hunter (2006), 91 suggests this epigram was probably prefixed or appended to a collection of Theocritus' poems, though its authenticity remains in question, on which see Gow (1950), 549, Gutzwiller (1996), 138, Rossi (2001), 343-347, and further Van Groningen (1959), Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 133-135. Despite this, it has been universally accepted that Simichidas is at least a persona of the poet, on which see further the Introduction.

plausibly of a suitable poetic predecessor.[502] Following their respective efforts, Lycidas rewards Simichidas with a λαγώβολον, a bucolic variation on the Hesiodic σκῆπτρον (7.128-129; Hes. *Theog.*30),[503] and the gift is described as ἐκ Μοισᾶν ξεινήιον, "friendship's gift of the Muses" (7.129), reinforcing the initiative character of the scene by further evoking the tone of the Hesiodic narrative, by reference to his initiators.[504] This is, however, not Simichidas' first initiation, as prior to his performance, he remarks that πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα / Νύμφαι κἠμὲ δίδαξαν ἀν' ὥρεα βουκολέοντα / ἐσθλά, "many other fine things the Nymphs have taught me as I tended cattle upon the hills" (7.91-93). This reinforces the notion that the contest between Simichidas and Lycidas - and moreover, the act of gift-giving - should not be read as the inception of a poetic career, but as a shift in the course of that career. Marco Fantuzzi has suggested that Simichidas, primarily a 'town' poet,[505] is being initiated into the ways of bucolic by Lycidas, the quintessential goatherd.[506] I would suggest, however, that we should not read this episode solely as a legitimisation of Simichidas' (and thus Theocritus') new poetic form, but as a validation of his poetry in its entirety. The inclusion of the previous initiation narrative functions partially as a validation for his statement καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Μοισᾶν καπυρὸν στόμα, κἠμὲ λέγοντι / πάντες ἀοιδὸν ἄριστον, "for I am also a clear-sounding voice of the Muses, and all call me best of singers" (7.37-38), but equally emphasises that the poet has, up to this point, been operating already with a degree of legitimacy. This reinforces that Simichidas, though he might only now be being invested with the legitimacy of bucolic, is certainly already sanctioned to practice poetry, and thus the meeting with Lycidas functions as a further validation, rather than an initial inspiration.[507]

For both Archilochus and Simichidas, the receipt of an item which encapsulates the poets' respective traditions symbolises the ascension to the status of an extraordinary poet, sanctioned by tradition and the divine to practice their poetry. Though Simichidas and Archilochus are at

---

[502] On which see Klooster (2011), 195-208, particularly 199.n.85.

[503] Theocritus directly connects the λαγώβολον to bucolic poetry in and epigram (Gow 2 = *AP* 6.177), where it is one of the items dedicated by Daphnis to Pan; the staff is also dedicated to that god in an epigram of Leonidas of Tarentum (4 *GP* =*AP* 6.188). See further Goldhill (1991), 232.

[504] The word ξεινήιον is utilised primarily to denote the gift given by host to guest, as at Hom. *Il.*10.269, 11.20, *Od.*8.389, 9.267.

[505] Implied by his coming ἐκ πόλιος (7.2) and Lycidas' inquiry whether the Simichidas and his companions are travelling to τινος ἀστῶν λανὸν, "some townsman's winepress" (7.24-25).

[506] Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 134-135 See also 7.13-14; οὔνομα μὲν Λυκίδαν, ἦς δ' αἰπόλος, οὐδέ κέ τίς νιν / ἠγνοίησεν ἰδών, ἐπεὶ αἰπόλῳ ἔξοχ' ἐῴκει, "his name was Lycidas, and he was a goatherd - nor could one who saw him fail to recognise him, as he looked so like a goatherd". On the over-emphasis of Lycidas' goatherdish quality, see further Gow (1950), II.135, Bowie (1985), Goldhill (1991), 228-229, Gutzwiller (1991).

[507] See further Krevans (1983), 212 and Hunter (2003), 227-228 on the contrasting presentations of Lycidas and Simichidas as products of different poetic contexts.

different stages of their career - Simichidas being already a fully-fledged poet, while Archilochus is still only an insolent youth - the outcome of their encounters are comparable;[508] both are marked out, as a result of their meetings, as poets *par excellence*. In the case of Archilochus, we are fortunate to be able to situate his initiation within the biographical narrative of his poetic career. The meeting with the Muses serves as the first indication of his renown, later reiterated by the oracular pronouncement from Delphi and, on an extra-textual level, by the honours done to the poet by the people of Paros, such as the establishment of the Archilocheon, and as recorded in the inscriptions of Mnesiepes and Sosthenes.[509] Simichidas' narrative is curtailed with the close of the *Idyll*, leaving readers to speculate on his future. That he (or rather, the author behind his persona) will be famous, however, has been established through the narrative of initiation: at a conceptual level, the employment of the narrative frame of an initiation signifies the inevitable renown of the poet in question.

Returning to *Mimiamb* 8, with the wider tradition of initiative scenes in mind, it is now clear that the narrative serves not as an *aition* for Herodas' activity, but rather stands as a validation of it. The agonistic relationship of Herodas' persona and the old man discounts the possibility that the latter serves in an instructive or inspirational capacity: the persona is not taught to compose poetry, but rather defends his activity, and triumphs in spite of the animosity of both the goatherds and the old man (indeed, winning the former group over). The role of symbolic objects within the mimiamb particularly denotes that Herodas' narrative serves a legitimising, laudatory function, but not in the manner we have observed in cases of Archilochus or Simichidas (or, indeed, that of Hesiod). The persona's wielding of the σκίπων and wearing of the ἐνδυτόν is an encapsulation of Herodas' poetry and his activity of generic hybridisation. These items, however, are never directly given to the persona, but are rather acquired covertly, through allusion and poetic legerdemain. In contrast to Simichidas, Archilochus and Hesiod, all of whom are legitimised through the direct receipt of objects from their initiators, Herodas emphasises his poetic innovativeness through the indirect assumption of the material symbols of predecessor and divinity. For the old man to hand over his staff to the persona directly*, after the manner of Lycidas, would be counter to Hipponax' stereotypical irascibility. This anger is an essential aspect of his characterisation, given that it echoes the wrath of the persona displayed in the first few lines of the mimiamb, thus highlighting their similar natures and vocal

---

[508] We might well interpret the insults with which Archilochus taunts the Muses as symbolic of his first ever verses.
[509] See in general Clay (2004).

parity. Equally, the acquisition of the ἐνδυτόν is depicted in such a manner so as to emphasise the novelty of Herodas' activity, as well as providing evidence of the divine legitimacy of his craft. Were the goat to emerge unscathed at the end of the persona's narration of the dream, one might be tempted to class the dream as a type-1 initiation, as we are told explicitly that the goat represented Herodas' poetry at 8.68-73, and it would not be implausible to conceive of the goat as a symbol of Dionysian inspiration, given its description as a δῶρον (8.68). The destruction of the goat and the repeated reuse of the goat's skin in various forms, however, suggests that this divine gift is equally not analogous to the αὐδὴν θέσπιν which Hesiod receives (and uses as-is) from the Muses (*Theog*.31-32): intratextually, Herodas' persona does not make use of Dionysus' gift without alteration as - correspondingly - the author does not adopt the pure dramatic mode in the creation of his poetry, but rather uses it in conjunction with choliambic. A parallel for the hybridising of innovation and tradition found in Herodas' recalibration of the gift-giving scene is found in Callimachus' relationship with Hipponax: the assertion that the poet did not go to Ephesus serves to delineate the nature of his relationship to his poetic forebear, defining it not as a case of inspiration, but rather of learned adaptation.

Herodas' narrative of initiation is, therefore, a quintessentially Hellenistic variant of the stock scene of poetic initiation, and equally a knowing variation upon the *topos* of the heaven-sent inspirational dream. In promoting his persona as validated in poetic activity, Herodas consciously avoids the concept of the poet as 'mad' with inspiration, yet retains the authority invested by that model, much as Theocritus invests Simichidas with authority through the competitive and legitimising presence of Lycidas, without implying the former plays a passive role in said investiture (as Homer and Aeschylus do in their respective narratives). Though not a case of poetic initiation *per se*, there is a parallel to these instances in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*, in that the conclusion of the poem - in which the god asserts his preference for pure drops of dew rather than the deluge of the Assyrian river (*Ap*.105ff.) - functions as a divine defence of Callimachean poetics. That Herodas does not depict his persona as inspired, or even instructed, is thus indicative of the broader context which characterises the Hellenistic milieu. The shift in poets' presentation of themselves as solely mouthpieces of the Muse to more active agents in the production of their poetry and, indeed, to leaders of the Muses is - as Peter Bing has demonstrated - a reflexive response to the changing character of poetry, its production and reception within the period.[510] Poets, no longer content to sit idly and receive divine blessings, conscript the gods and their poetic forebears to the defence of their new poetic forms, and do

---

[510] Bing (1988b).

166

so in contexts which demonstrate their desire to be at once innovative and new, yet also ensconced within (and legitimised by) the broader poetic tradition. In the establishment of a narrative context which draws upon commonplace scenes of dreaming and initiation, yet which equally eschews the norms of either *topos*, Herodas demonstrates this intersection of tradition and innovation precisely.

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

In an unpublished poem of 1892, written the year after the London Papyrus containing the *Mimiambs* was recovered, Constantin Cavafy mourned the damaged state in which Herodas' corpus had reached the modern era:

> How many of the papyri are missing;
> how often a delicate and ironic iamb
> became the prey of foul worms!
> The unlucky Herodas, fashioned
> for mockery and merriment,
> how gravely wounded he came to us![511]

In the course of Cavafy's lament, Herodas the poet is elided with Herodas the corpus, and - on the basis of *Mimiamb* 8 - one can well imagine the author approving, given his construction of an authorial persona which undertakes a similar elision of poet and poetry. *Mimiamb* 8 serves as a comprehensive display of Herodas' mimiambic poetic form: the presentation of his authorial persona and the creation of a programmatically significant narrative context are utilised in tandem, to emphasise the author's authority to compose in his newly minted poetic genre, and to rebuff potential critics of his activity. The context in which Herodas' self-representation takes place ensconces the author within poetic tradition more broadly, but equally serves to further exemplify the novelty of his mimiambic poetry, by drawing upon familiar, well-worn *topoi* of poetic initiation and inspiration and reformatting them to emphasise his own innate talents. Equally, in establishing the relationship between his persona, his divine guarantor and his poetic predecessor, Herodas ensures that a reader cannot fail to recognise that the former plays an equal - if not greater - role in the success of the poetry than the latter two. In doing so, Herodas emphasises that the hybrid genre he has created is entirely his own invention, yet still one legitimised by the divine and embedded within poetic tradition. Expressed in the manner by which the persona adopts the characteristics of Hipponax and Dionysus, through the transference of symbols and characteristics from both, Herodas' persona is depicted as a combination - or unification - of the characteristics of these figures, and in so doing, Herodas embeds the authorisation of his programmatic statement within the poem itself. Furthermore, Herodas subtly depicts the quasi-dramatic mode of the *Mimiambs* by contrasting his usage of Hipponactean voice with the employment of Dionysian costume: the respective mediums of choliambic and mime are thus encapsulated in the representation of Herodas'

---

[511] *The Mimiambi of Herodas,* 29-34*,* Cavafy (1892 unpublished, in Cavafy 1968), trans. Dalven (1972), 258-259.

persona, and that character functions, in turn, as a tripartite encapsulation, authorisation and celebration of Herodas' poetic activity *tout court*.

Chapter 5
Performance, Audience and the Representations of Reception in *Mimiambs* 4 and 8

Introduction

Recent scholarship has recognised that, far from being solely occupied with vulgarity, Herodas displays a self-consciousness - often qualified as 'literary' - typical of the Hellenistic period.[512] Amongst others Claudia Fernández, Irmgard Männlein-Robert, David Kutzko and Graham Zanker have all conducted important studies of the metapoetic aspects of the *Mimiambs*:[513] however, these works have focused primarily on each mimiamb in isolation - barring the acknowledged diptych of *Mimiambs* 6 and 7 - with only Fernández conducting analysis of a number of the poems simultaneously. Considering the possibility of intertextuality between the poems is essential as, throughout *Mimiambs*, Herodas displays a sustained interest in the nature of his poetry and its reception, and expresses this interest through a range of overarching motifs. Considering intertextuality, however, requires a more in-depth assessment of the mode of reception intended for Herodas' work.[514] Given the evidence we currently possess, it is impossible to state categorically whether Herodas ever intended his poems for performance, but this should not preclude us from commenting upon the presence of elements redolent of performance within the *Mimiambs*, considering the implications of their presence in terms of poetic effect, and assessing what emerges from approaching the *Mimiambs* as a 'performative' text.[515]

---

[512] See, e.g., Clayman (1980), 71, Hutchinson (1988). Scholarship on Herodas is, in itself, a fascinating subject, particularly as a record of attitudes to the more *risqué* elements of his work. From the first publication of the *Mimiambs,* a number of scholars dismissed the poet out of hand; Kenyon, in his edition of the text, declares that the work "cannot be said to be of high literary merit"; Kenyon (1891), 1, while an anonymous writer in the Jesuit magazine *La Civiltà Cattolica* considered Herodas and his work typical of Alexandrian moral degeneration, remarking that Herodas "is a true artist (only when) he avoids wallowing in mud", and that he "sadly reflects the corruption of his times"; anon. (1892), 281. This is not to suggest that all early responses to Herodas were so damning: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1896), 221, (1924), I.211-212 and Blass (1892) 230 lauded Herodas as a writer of subtle nuance, engaged in the innovation practiced by his contemporaries, through the lens of the seemingly low-brow world of the mime. See further Orrells (2012), who offers an insightful discussion on the production of Headlam's edition of Herodas, and Knox's editing, and the possible influences of the women's suffrage movement on the result.

[513] Zanker (2004), (2006), (2009), Fernández (2006a), (2006b), Männlein-Robert (2006), Kutzko (2008).

[514] Mastromarco (1984), 1-19 traces the history of this debate prior to his monograph on the subject.

[515] Both Hunter (1993b) and Esposito (2010) note that any assessment argument based on cues in the text to a performed element can be interpreted either as a true dramatic cue or simply a device to imply performance, rendering such arguments circular. For the case of mimiambic reception after the Hellenistic period, see bibliography given in n.525 below.

Giuseppe Mastromarco, in his study on the ancient reception-context of the *Mimiambs*, concludes that the poems were performed, or possibly recited, to small groups of 'elite' listeners who could fully appreciate the metapoetic aspects of the poems,[516] and Zanker asserts that the *Mimiambs* retain vividness when transmitted orally (through recitation), as this negotiates the problems of staging (particularly inherent in *Mimiamb* 4 with its statue-rich and thus visually complex setting) by encouraging the listener to supplement a visual context for the poetry.[517] However, Zanker allows for the possibility of a concurrent literary reception, not restricting Herodas' poetry to recitation alone. Others argue that the works are literary first and foremost: Kutzko advocates for a literary reception of the *Mimiambs*, but stresses the dramatic implications of the presence of the mimic genre should not be discounted in a reading context.[518] Karl-Heinz Stanzel, comparing Herodas' *Mimiambs* and Theocritus' *Idylls*, concludes that a literary reception was intended for both,[519] although Marco Fantuzzi posits that Theocritus was far less concerned with dramatisation than Herodas.[520] Richard Hunter is careful to note the importance of the dramatic overtones to the interpretation of the work, as elements which do not simply reveal the context of its performance - or lack thereof - but as a poetic device.[521] Gregory Hutchinson is resolute in his belief that the *Mimiambs* were never meant for performance, and consequently advocates for an analysis of the *Mimiambs* with regards to the impact of performative elements upon reader-reception.[522]

I concur with the notion that, at the very least, Herodas composed his *Mimiambs* aware of the prospect of a literary reception; he appears to have frequently anticipated such a reception.[523] Herodas extends the treatment of one theme over numerous poems, a technique exhibited particularly in the diptych of *Mimiambs* 6 and 7 but also observable, though more obliquely, at work in *Mimiamb*s 1, 4 and 8. In the case of 6 and 7, the relationship is not purely linear: *Mimiamb* 7 serves as both a continuation and an asymmetrical counterpoint to *Mimiamb* 6, and this intertextuality, while noticeable if the mimiambs were performed in sequence, is most

---

[516] Mastromarco (1979), revised and expanded in an English translation (1984); see particularly 65-97. Mastromarco acknowledges that *Mimiamb* 8 in particular is suited to literary dissemination, (1984), 97. Cf. Matromarco's position in general, Parsons (1981).

[517] Zanker (2009), 4-6; this process of supplementation in poetry and art is further discussed in Zanker (1987) and (2004), particularly 85-86.

[518] Kutzko (2008).

[519] Stanzel (1998), particularly 121-122. See further Stanzel (2010) for an expansion of his earlier analysis, and the consideration of the presence of other literary genres in Herodas, particularly *Mimiamb* 1.

[520] Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 33.

[521] Hunter (1993b), particularly 39, 43-44.

[522] Hutchinson (1988), 241ff.

[523] Cf. Mastromarco (1984), 97 who suggests that Herodas intended that "the publication of his *Mimiamboi* was to be entrusted principally, if not exclusively, to the scenic performance."

clearly perceptible when considering the poems as works to be read (particularly as this would allow for cross-referencing). Whether Herodas edited the *Mimiambs* is an issue of further controversy: Alfred Knox and Anna Rist suggest that *Mimiamb* 8 may have been the prologue to a second volume published by Herodas, which they argue on account of the programmatic subject matter of the poem.[524] This is not implausible, but the notion that a programmatic work must necessarily occur at the head of a collection (and cannot occur at any other point) does not follow, as evidenced by Theocritus' *Idyll* 7, or Callimachus' dream of Helicon - or *Iamb* 13, or the *Hymn to Apollo*. The fact the first poem of the London Papyrus does possess a programmatic character would support an assumption that some editorial arrangement has been exerted over the *Mimiambs*, as does the juxtaposition of *Mimiambs* 6 and 7. In light of these aspects, I suspect that Herodas did play a role in the arrangement of the *Mimiambs* as a collection: the recurrence of thematic elements, and the intertextuality of the poems, implies either a degree of authorial control, or an editor with remarkable sensitivity to overarching programmatic motifs within the poems. In either case, I would suggest that such intertextuality supports the notion that Herodas composed the *Mimiambs* with literary reception in mind.[525]

The argument against a literary reception, advanced primarily by Mastromarco, rests on the belief that aspects of the *Mimiambs* which appear dramatic must necessarily imply a

---

[524] Knox (1925), Rist (1997). Cf. Mastomarco (1984), 97.n.53, Gutzwiller (2007a), 28, 120, 127, Hutchinson (2008), 15, 256.

[525] Parsons (1981) notes that, on the London Papyrus, *Mimiamb* 1 has been punctuated in part by a second hand, apparently to aid in reading. Herodas was received in literary form in the Roman period: Pliny the Younger, writing to his friend Arrius Antoninus to compliment him on the excellence of his poetry, remarks *nam et loquenti tibi illa Homerici senis mella profluere et, quae scribis, complere apes floribus et innectere videntur. Ita certe sum adfectus ipse, cum Graeca epigrammata tua, cum mimiambos proxime legerem. Quantum ibi humanitatis, venustatis, quam dulcia illa, quam amantia, quam arguta, quam recta. Callimachum me vel Heroden vel si quid melius tenere credebam; quorum tamen neuter utrumque aut absolvit aut attigit,* "when you speak, the honey of Homer's ancient man seems to flow from your lips, while the bees fill your writings with sweetness from interwoven flowers. Certainly these were my impressions when I recently read your Greek epigrams and mimiambs. Their sensitivity and grace, their charm and warmth of feeling, their wit which never wants virtue, made me imagine I held Callimachus or Herodas in my hands, or even some greater poet; though neither of them excelled in both types of verse, nor even attempted them." (*Ep.*4.3.3) It is necessary to note that the word *mimiambos* is transmitted in only one MS., γ (as opposed to *iambos* in MS. group αβ) but is the reading accepted by Skutch (1892), and Schuster (1952), 108. Equally there is the matter of logical consistency: if Pliny complemented Antoninus on his ability to write epigrams and iambics, the statement that neither excelled in both types of poetry would be odd, given Callimachus' output in both epigrammatic and (straight) iambic genres: see particularly on Callimachus' reception at Rome, Hunter (2006). Beyond this connection between Herodas and his Roman descendants, precise engagements with Herodas by later mimiambographers is uncertain: Courtney (1993), 106 posits that Matius (c.1st Century AD), author of the first choliambic works at Rome, may have translated Herodas into Latin, but the fragments we possess do not bear this out, an assessment made by Hunter in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 463 and Panayotakis (2014), 386-390. See further Courtney (1993), 104-106, Panayotakis (2010), 21-22. On the level of allusion and the adoption of phraseology, however, Herodas can be detected: on Ovidian adaptations of Herodan language, Courtney (1969), 82-83, (1988), 17-18. On Herodas in Seneca and Petronius, Panayotakis (2014), 391-392. On the occurrence of Herodan themes in Propertius, McKeown (1979). On Plautus and Herodas, Hunter (1995). Panayotakis (2014), 392 also gives further, less secure cases of potential Vergilian engagements with Herodas.

performative context. This position is flawed: Herodas' usage of the dramatic conventions of the mimic genre are equally significant as a poetic device utilised to add depth and vividness to the *Mimiambs* which, in the case of literary reception, enriches the unreal poetic landscape through the implication of a performance context. Herodas' uptake of the mimic genre is not a straightforward reissue of extant themes and features - rather, the author builds upon the work of his generic antecedents, blending elements found in both performative and literary genres in the creation of a new, hybrid form of poetry.

Indeed, while the question of the performance status of Herodas' work has aroused considerable scholarly attention, it is only comparatively recently that assessments of Herodas' engagement with the concept of performance within his work have been undertaken.[526] Though critics of Mastromarco's performance-exclusive conception of the *Mimiambs* have emphasised that the presence of elements traditionally found in performed works need not necessarily imply actual staged performance,[527] this conclusion remains underdeveloped: if we accept that such elements are not only effective when a work is performed - and are thus reflective of a conscious attempt to evoke the quality of performance - it follows to ask to what end Herodas does so. In his appraisal of the presentation of the *Mimiambs*, Hunter notes the repeated invitations made by speakers across the corpus to 'see' objects or persons, and suggests that far from such instances implying an actual stage-context, Herodas subtly acknowledges the ambiguous state of the performative dimension of the *Mimiambs*, playing upon a reader's inability to see while simultaneously compensating for the absence of visual information through description.[528] Such aspects strongly suggest that Herodas' evocation of performance, the employment of the tropes of staged presentation and theatricality serve a purpose beyond - for example - adherence to the conventions of mime: the foregrounding of the performed quality of the *Mimiambs*, juxtaposed with more overtly 'literary' elements, becomes yet

---

[526] E.g., Hunter (1993b), 38-40, Puchner (1993), Kutzko (2008), (2012).

[527] E.g., silent characters, the use of deictic pronouns, and objects alluded to during the course of speech. See e.g., Cunningham (1971a), 161-162, Hunter (1993b), Puchner (1993), Zanker (2009), 4-6, 122-124.

[528] Hunter (1993b), 38-40. The simultaneous evocation of a visual context and compensation for its absence is particularly apparent in Coritto's description of the dildos she saw and touched to Metro (6.66-73), a case in which the reader's lack of visual perception is echoed in Metro's own inability to behold the works Coritto describes. Similarly, there is the case of *Mimiamb* 4, which is concerned throughout with visual perception and aesthetic appreciation: noteworthy is Cynno's question to Coccale as to who sculpted and dedicated the statuary under consideration, and Coccale's response οὐχ ὁρῇς κεῖνα / ἐν τῇ βάσι γραμματ'; - "can't you see the writing on the base?" (4.23-24) a question which subtly highlights the role of visual supplementation in the literary reception of Herodas' work, but which equally emphasises the work's existence as a text. See further Zanker (2004).

another means by which Herodas explores his poetic activity, and an essential aspect of his programmatic endeavours in *Mimiamb* 8.

It is to *Mimiamb* 8 which I return in the first section of this chapter: I consider the manner in which Herodas' persona is represented as a successful performer, in dramatic and ritual terms. I argue that the evocation of performance throughout the work serves to reinforce the persona's claims of success in the closing interpretation and, correspondingly, attests to Herodas' own asserted mastery of the quasi-dramatic mode of his poetry. Secondly, I consider the various depiction of embedded audiences and acts of reception within *Mimiambs* 4 and 8: I propose that the presentation of embedded audiences serve a variety of functions, but that all operate within an overarching process of poetic self-reflection. Equally, in showcasing acts of reception, I argue that Herodas creates situations which are presented as analogous to the reception of his own corpus, and thus serve as models for the external, reading audience of his *Mimiambs*.

Andreas Fountoulakis, Richard Hunter and Ralph Rosen have argued persuasively that, within *Mimiamb* 8, Herodas acknowledges the dramatic underpinnings of his oeuvre, and uses the poem to reflect upon the presence of dramatic elements within his poetry.[529] This argument is elaborated by David Kutzko, who suggests that one can observe Herodas developing his programmatic agenda over the course of the mimiamb, through a nuanced engagement with dramatic models and the performative mode,[530] and it is from this conclusion that I begin here. I propose that Herodas employs performance as a theme with which to enhance the authority of his persona, through his presentation as a successful dramatic performer and as a successful ritual performer, both of which further reinforce the programmatic overtones established by the narrative context of the mimiamb. Furthermore, I suggest that particular moments of overtly performative character serve to embed Herodas' activity within the tradition of dramatic poetry, by recalling a specific model drawn from old comedy, that being Aristophanes' *Clouds*.

The first section of the mimiamb (8.1-15) sets the scene, establishing a physical setting,[531] an approximate time,[532] and a cast of characters, as well as immediately establishing the persona in a position of authority (albeit only over his small household). Herodas evokes a sense of place, implying a 'staged' context,[533] and creates bawdy humour through the persona's admonishments of his underlings: the berating of slaves is a recurrent motif of Herodas' work, occurring as an introductory scene in *Mimiambs* 6 and 7 (6.1-17, 7.4-14), and also employed throughout *Mimiambs* 4 and 5.[534] Kutzko and James Hordern have noted that such a scene is a

---

[529] Rosen (1992), Hunter (1993b), Fountoulakis (2002).

[530] Kutzko (2012), 379.

[531] A farmhouse, suggested by the repeated mention of farm animals which require tending, e.g., τ]ὴν ἄναυλον χοῖρον ἐς νομὴν πέμψ[ο]ν, "send the noisy sow to pasture" (8.7).

[532] Sometime before daybreak, given that the persona asks Psylla to ἅψον...λύχον, "light the lamp" (8.6.). It has been suggested by Cunningham (1971a) that the remark that αἱ δὲ νύκτες ἐννέωροι, "the nights are nine years long" (8.5) may be indicative of long winter nights, a season which would be appropriate if the dream-festivities are likened to the Rural Dionysia, although it is by no means certain that this is the festival depicted; see Latte (1957). See Brown (1994) further on this, and on the "Latmian sleep" mentioned at 8.10.

[533] Hunter (1993b), 39-44 compares the manner in which Theocritus sets the scenes of his poems with that of Herodas, noting that the former dwells on details to such a level as to emphasise their artificial nature as texts, rather than performed pieces. By contrast, Herodas offers only the necessary essentials of scene-setting, though I argue the author is equally as interested in highlighting the artificial performative quality of his poetry, as I discuss below. See further Hutchinson (1988), 241ff., Puchner (1993), 21ff.

[534] Brown (1994), 99 notes the particularly close correspondence between the opening of *Mimiamb* 6 and *Mimiamb* 8, comparing Coritto's description of her slave as τάλαινα (6.3) with the persona's description of Megallis as δει]λὴ, (8.10) meaning "wretch" in both cases, and further the description of the slave in *Mimiamb* 6 as τονθορύζουσαν (6.7) with the persona's comparable remark to Psylla to τ]όνθορυζε, "go on muttering" (8.8). See Herod. 7.77, where the verb is used of Cerdon, and Ar. *Ra.*747, of a slave that cannot speak freely.

staple of mimic and comic works,[535] but we can equally detect allusions to a specific comedic opening in Herodas' scene-setting - Aristophanes' *Clouds* - to which I will return momentarily. Both structurally and at the level of content, the opening of the mimiamb is thus redolent of genres rooted in the performative mode: in employing a scenario typical of mime, and echoing the settings of old comedy, Herodas evokes a performative context for his own work, attempting to establish, through imitation and allusion, a staged dimension to the poem. However, the artificiality of this staged dimension is gradually made apparent by the lack of voices besides that of the persona. Despite the references to Psylla, Megallis and Annas, none of these characters ever join the persona in dialogue: the entirety of the scene-setting occurs through the persona's words alone, and the absent characters, props and set are all evoked through description and allusion. Herodas, therefore, does not present his work as a staged performance *per se*, but rather as an imitation of such a performance. The mimetic frame established in the introduction is shown, with the onset of the central section of the mimiamb and the narration of the dream, to be just that, a frame that is separate from the narrative, which remains the principal focus of the mimiamb. In doing so, Herodas reflects the medial ambiguity of his mimiambic genre, an amalgam of dramatic and non-dramatic poetry which need not be restricted to the stage to capture the sense of drama.

The central section contains the dream-narrative, and at the heart of this narrative is the game of *askoliasmos*, a practice intrinsically connected to festivals of Dionysus and the revels of the Bacchants.[536] The persona's description of the game highlights its agonistic, aggressive dimension (8.41-47):

χοὶ μὲν μετώποις ἐ[ς] κόνιν κολυμβῶ[ντες
ἔκοπτον ἀρνευτῆρ[ε]ς ἐκ βίης οὖδας,
οἱ δ' ὕπτι' ἐρριπτεῦντο· πάντα δ' ἦν, Ἀνν[ᾶ,
εἰς ἓν γέλως τε κἀνίη [......]εντα.
45 κἀγὼ δόκεον δὶς μοῦ[νο]ς ἐκ τόσης λείης
ἐπ' οὖν ἀλέσθαι, κἠλάλαξαν ὤνθρωπ[οι
ὥς μ' εἶδ[ον ..] τὴν δο[ρὴ]ν πιεζεῦσαν.[537]

Some, plunging into the dirt on their foreheads,
struck the ground with force, like divers,
while others were thrown onto their backs. Everything, Annas,
was a [mixture] of laughter and pain.

[535] E.g., Sophr. fr.10, 14, 15, 16, Hordern (2004), 180-181, Kutzko (2012), 374; see also Hutchinson (1988), 238-240.
[536] Latte (1957), Pickard-Cambridge (1988), 45 and Rosen (1992), 209 all note that there was a confusion over the use of the term ἀσκωλιασμός even in antiquity, but that by the Hellenistic period an association had been formed between *askoliasmos* and Attic dramatic festivals. See also Ver. *G.*2.380-384, schol. Ar. *Plu.*1129.
[537] In l.45, Cunningham (2004) gives μ .. [..]. ; Herzog (1924) and Zanker (2009) supplement μοῦ[νο]ς.

45   It seemed that I alone among so large a rabble twice leapt
        on to the skin-bag, and the men hollered
        when they saw the skin bearing me aloft.

The persona vividly captures the spectacle of the game, the emotion of the participants and the thrill of success, and thus the imitation of performance continues, though now in an overtly diegetic manner, as opposed to the faux-mimetic mode of the introductory section. The interactions between the persona, the young man and the old emphasise the agonistic tone of the dream: the persona's cry to the young man to bear witness to his struggle with the old man (8.63) places that character in an adjudicatory role,[538] and his appeal for aid to the goatherds, addressing them as ὦ παρεόν[τες (8.61), implies that they now occupy the role of an audience of onlookers,[539] already imparted by the remark that κἠλάλαξαν ὤνθρωπ[οι / ὥς μ’ εἶδ[ον ..]ως τὴν δο[ρὴ]ν πιεζεῦσαν, "the men hollered when they saw the skin bearing me aloft" (8.46-47).[540] Equally, the persona's statement that the situation of the festivities is ὥσπερ τελεῦμεν ἐν χοροῖς Διωνύσου, "as we perform in the choruses of Dionysus" (8.40), further establishes the dramatic, Dionysian character of the revels.[541] This remark is particularly significant for the analysis of the performative dimension of the poem: Fountoulakis notes the dual interpretations of χορός as both dramatic chorus and ritual dance, but argues that the meaning here is restricted to the latter alone.[542] However, Kutzko argues that the persona does not make a strict delineation as to the nature of the revels, preferring a multifaceted reading of τελεῦμεν ἐν χοροῖς Διωνύσου which encapsulates both ritual and dramatic performance.[543] I am inclined to follow Kutzko's assessment: the ritual dimension of the revels are echoed in the persona's interpretation, where he relays that the goatherds destroyed the goat and τ]ὰ ἔνθεα τελεῦντες, "performed the rites" (8.70),[544] but this does not preclude an allusion to dramatic performance also, particularly, as Kutzko notes, given the use of the conjunction ὥσπερ, which he suggests

---

[538] Compare Ar. *Ra*.809-813, 871-874.

[539] See further Fountoulakis (2000b).

[540] The verb ἀλαλάζω is used to describe the shout of Dionysus and the Bacchae at E. *Ba*.593, 1133.

[541] The persona's possession of a goat at the opening of the dream has been suggested by Vogliano (1906), 41 as indicative of prior success in a dramatic *agon* (though whether the goat was indeed such a reward is not determinable from the text in its fragmented state), a situation which the dream undeniably evokes. However, Rosen (1992) raises the problem that Vogliano interprets the goat as a reward for the persona's victory at *askoliasmos,* which does not follow from the text; further I would add that such a case is narratively implausible, given that the goat (or rather its remains) plays a central part in the proceedings of the games, as discussed in Chapter 4.1.Whether the goat was actually given as a prize in dramatic festivals is unclear but, much as with *askoliasmos*, the phenomenon was rightly or wrongly considered to have been practiced by the Hellenistic period and beyond, as shown by e.g., *Marm.Par*.A.43 (= *FrGHist* 239 A.43), Diosc. 20 *GP = AP* 7.410, Hor. *Ars*.220-224. See further Burkert (1966), Pickard-Cambridge (1962), 69, 123-124, Rist (1997), 356-357.

[542] Fountoulakis (2002), 314. Compare E. *Ba*.215-220, 485, Ar. *Ra*.354-357. See further Seaford (1981), 253.

[543] Kutzko (2012), 376-377 and 377.n.39. See further Headlam and Knox (1922), 389-390.

[544] Compare E. *Ba*.40, 73, Ar. *Ra*.357. On τελεῖν, see Burkert (1987), 9-10.

"leaves the semantic ambiguity of (χοροῖς) intact".[545] A comparable case can be observed at Aristophanes' *Frogs,* 354-357:

εὐφημεῖν χρὴ κἀξίστασθαι τοῖς ἡμετέροισι χοροῖσιν,
355   ὅστις ἄπειρος τοιῶνδε λόγων ἢ γνώμην μὴ καθαρεύει,
ἢ γενναίων ὄργια Μουσῶν μήτ᾽ εἶδεν μήτ᾽ ἐχόρευσεν,
μηδὲ Κρατίνου τοῦ ταυροφάγου γλώττης Βακχεῖ᾽ ἐτελέσθη

Let him be silent and stand aside from our sacred choruses,
355   he who has no experience of such utterances, nor purified his mind,
he who has never seen and never has danced in the rites of the noble Muses,
nor ever has been inducted into the Bacchic mysteries of bull-eating Cratinus

Kenneth Dover, in his commentary on these lines, has noted the persistent ambiguity as to whether the reference is made to the procession of initiates enacted within the dramatic action of the comedy, or to the external comic chorus which enacts it,[546] and he further suggests that this ambiguity encapsulates the dual role of the god Dionysus, as presider over both Dionysiac mysteries and theatrical performance.[547] I posit that Herodas evokes a similar ambiguity, for a similar purpose: while strongly asserting the religious character of the dream, the author equally allows for the interpretation of the events as representative of a dramatic performance, thereby evoking Dionysus' interconnected roles in both cult and theatre.[548] In the establishment of this dual-natured aspect, Herodas represents the dream-narrative as both religiously and dramatically significant. Both elements have a clear importance for Herodas' delineation of his poetic programme, as the ritualistic context which the dream-narrative suggests reinforces the notion that the dream itself possesses a divine origin. The reiteration of the ritual dimension of the dream - within the dream-narrative itself - therefore reinforces the assumption that the persona's dream possesses an inherent heaven-sent and authorised quality. The evocation of dramatic performance is, as the interpretation of the dream shows, a critical aspect of Herodas' assertion of the success of his hybrid poetic form, an assertion to which I now turn.

The persona first demands a cloak from Annas (8.65-66) - the significance of which I have discussed - then proceeds to interpret the dream's meaning, revealing its allegorical character in the process. The goat, a gift from Dionysus (8.68), represented the poetry of Herodas'

---

[545] Kutzko (2012), 377.n.39.
[546] Dover (1993), 239.
[547] Dover (1993), 239, 242. See further Lada-Richards (1999), 224-225.
[548] Cf. Fountoulakis (2002), 314 who argues that the lack of an explicit acknowledgement of a dramatic festival discounts the possibility of the evocation of dramatic performance. This reading seems narrow-minded, particularly given that, as Fountoulakis himself notes, the mimiamb is rife with ambiguity, particularly where the intersection of ritual and dramatic performance are concerned; Fountoulakis (2002), 317-318.

persona and the goatherds ripped it apart and feasted upon it, as their extra-narrative counterparts will attempt to carve up his poetry for their own gain (8.68-72). The persona affirms the ritual dimension of the dream in the description of these figures' destruction and consumption of his goat, evoking the ritual practices of *sparagmos* and *omophagia* that are intrinsically connected to Dionysian cult and myth.[549] Equally, however, he re-emphasises the performative dimension of the dream-narrative in the reference to the goatherds performing the rites (8.70), echoing the earlier likening of events to a performance for Dionysus ἐν χοροῖς (8.40). Recognition of the repeated allusions to performance is particularly important for the interpretation of the final lines (8.73-79):

> τὸ μὴν ἄεθλον ὡς δόκευν ἔχ[ει]ν μοῦνος
> πολλῶν τὸν ἄπνουν κώρυκον πατησάντων,
> 75 κὴ τῷ γέροντι ξύν᾿ ἔπρηξ᾿ ὀρινθέντι
> .] κλέος, ναὶ Μοῦσαν, ἤ μ᾿ ἔπεα κ[
> .εγ᾿ ἐξ ἰάμβων, ἤ με δευτέρη γν[
> ἐ]μ[οῖ]ς μετ᾿ Ἱππώνακτα τὸν παλαι[
> τ]ὰ κύλλ᾿ ἀείδειν Ξουθίδης †επιουσι[[550]

> Since I seemed to be the only one to have the prize
> among the many who had trodden on the air-tight skin bag,
> 75 and since I shared success with the angry old man
>]fame, by the Muse, who/either […] me verses [
> from iambs, who/or me as a second[
>] after Hipponax of old [
> to sing limping verses to [my own] Xouthids.

The damage to these lines renders a clean translation impossible. We can, however, reconstruct their meaning by considering them in the context of Herodas' activity of generic mixing, and particularly with regards the evocation of dramatic performance within the dream. The persona begins by reiterating how he alone won the prize from jumping on the air-tight bag in the game of *askoliasmos*, and Rosen has argued that Herodas connects this victory with the dramatic, mimic character of his work, which he suggests is exemplified by Herodas' statement that fame will come ἐξ ἰάμβων (8.77), reading this as an allusion to the 'straight' iambs of comedy.[551]

---

[549] See further Henrichs (1978), particularly 143-152.
[550] In l.66, Cunningham (2004) gives ..]ναδ[..] ὧδε, omitting the Ἀν of Ἀν]νᾶ , but this can be partially read on the facsimile of the papyrus, *P.Litt.Lond.*96 = *P.Egerton* 1, fr.4. Also in l.66, δ[ὸς] is supplemented by Knox and Headlam (1922), Zanker (2009). In l.72, Cunningham (2004) gives ωδεγω[ ]το; Barigazzi (1955), on the basis of the reading of *P.Oxy.*2326, proposes the supplement ὧδ᾿ εγὼ [το]ῦτο, which he interprets with the meaning "cosi io interpreto questo punto"; Cunningham (1975a) proposes ὧδέ γ᾿ ὤ[ισ]το or ὤ[λλυ]το. In l.78, Cunningham (2004) gives . μ.. ς ; Herzog (1924) and Zanker (2009) supplement ἐ]μ[οῖ]ς.
[551] Rosen (1992), 214. What ἰάμβων refers to here is contested: Rist (1997), 359 suggests it may be a reference other poems Herodas may have composed in iambics, taking a reference to Herodas as an author of hemiambs in the scholiast on Nicander as evidence, while Kutzko (2012), 379 follows the view that ἰάμβων is taken alongside τ]ὰ κύλλ᾿ as generally representative of Herodas' genre. Furthermore, Rosen (1992), 214-215 reads ἤ... ἤ... of

179

This usage of iambs to encapsulate the entirety of the dramatic influences on Herodas' work is, however, tenuous: Kutzko notes, as a parallel, that Callimachus calls Hipponax' poems both ἴαμβον (*Iamb*.fr.191.3 Pf.) and χωλὰ (*Iamb*.fr.203.14, 66 Pf.).[552] While this does not discount the possibility that Herodas takes ἰάμβων to encapsulate the dramatic mode *tout court*, it seems unwise to make the absolute opposition between them and τ]ὰ κύλλ᾽. A more concrete connection between the mimic genre and the persona's victory at *askoliasmos* is found in the manner in which the events of the dream evoke an agonistic context. The persona's victory at *askoliasmos* - a winning performance - is evocative of his successful usage of the dramatic context of mime, an ability that the author demonstrates, metapoetically, in the opening section of the mimiamb. By primarily basing his persona's assertion of fame in the usage of the dramatic mode, and simultaneously demonstrating his own authorial aptitude at employing the tropes of mime and comedy within the mimiamb itself, Herodas metatextually validates the persona's claim. However, it is made clear that it is not only the dramatic aspect of his work that brings him success, as the persona's remark that he shared success with the old man - thus suggesting that Herodas conceives of himself as an equal of Hipponax - reiterates that it is both in the usage of mimic and choliambic elements which will lead to his fame. Notably, the persona delineates the mode of his future poetry as song: though the final lines are fragmentary, the persona's clearly plans τ]ὰ κύλλ᾽ ἀείδειν, "to sing limping verses" (8.79). In characterising his poetic production after the traditional mode of poetic performance, Herodas evokes the tradition with which his work engages but, by so closely adjoining the reference to sung poetry to a description of more dramatic performance, he equally emphasises the novelty of its hybrid form. Indeed, I suggest that Herodas looks also to the tradition of dramatic poetry for a narrative model to further authorise his poetic activity. This becomes apparent with a closer consideration of the first lines of the mimiamb alongside the opening verses of a comic intertext mentioned above, Aristophanes' *Clouds*:

(Ar. *Nu.* 1-5) ἰοὺ ἰού.
          ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τὸ χρῆμα τῶν νυκτῶν ὅσον.
          ἀπέραντον. οὐδέποθ᾽ ἡμέρα γενήσεται;
          καὶ μὴν πάλαι γ᾽ ἀλεκτρυόνος ἤκουσ᾽ ἐγώ.
    5   οἱ δ᾽ οἰκέται ῥέγκουσιν.

---

l.76-77 as disjunctives, with the sense that the dual possibilities of fame offered either from iambic or choliambic poetry echoes the resolution of the dream. Cunningham, in Rusten and Cunningham (2002), 276 notes that ἤ... ἤ…might be either the feminine pronoun (the reading which Zanker (2009), 233 follows) or the disjunctive adverb.

[552] Kutzko (2012), 379.n.49. See also Ar. *Ra.*661.

Alas, alas!
O Zeus the king, the nights are so long!
Interminable. Will it never be day?
I did hear a cockerel, ages ago, but
5   the slaves snore.[553]

(Herod. 8.1-7) ἄστηθι, δούλη Ψύλλα· μέχρι τέο κείσῃ
ῥέγχουσα; τὴν δὲ χοῖρον αὐονὴ δρύπτει·
ἢ προσμένεις σὺ μέχρις εὖ ἥλιος θάλψῃ
τὸ]ν κῦσον ἐσδύς; κῶς δ᾽, ἄτρυτε, κοὐ κάμνεις
5   τὰ πλ]ευρὰ κνώσσουσ᾽; αἱ δὲ νύκτες ἐννέωροι.
ἄστη]θι, φημί, καὶ ἄψον, εἰ θέλεις, λύχνον,
καὶ τ]ὴν ἄναυλον χοῖρον ἐς νομὴν πέμψ[ο]ν

Rise, slave Psylla: how long are you going to lie
snoring? Drought tears the sow:
are you waiting until the sun crawls
up your fanny and warms it? Tireless worker, how have you avoided tiring
5   your ribs with snoring? The nights are nine years long.
Rise I say, and light the lamp if you please,
and send the discordant sow to the pasture.

In the opening of *Mimiamb* 8, Herodas recapitulates the Aristophanic scene. Both Herodas'
persona and Strepsiades dwell on the length of the nights (Ar. *Nu.*1; Herod. 8.5), the laziness
of their slaves - specifically their snoring and oversleeping (Ar. *Nu.*5; Herod. 8.2, 4-5) - and
make a request that a lamp to be lit (which occurs later in *Clouds*: Ar. *Nu.*18; Herod. 8.6).[554]
The evocation of Aristophanes here serves a dual purpose. Taken in conjunction with the
recurrent appearance of scenes in which masters berate their slaves within the *Mimiambs*, we
can recognise that Herodas is broadly grounding the mimiamb within the dramatic sphere, as
noted above.[555] However, I suggest that, in styling his persona's introductory lines after the
opening of *Clouds*, Herodas also subtly foreshadows the agonistic narrative of the mimiamb,
the conflict between Herodas' persona and Hipponax, and the ultimate triumph of the former.

At the climax of Aristophanes' comedy, and having received an education in conniving
arguments, Strepsiades' son Phidippides beats his father, and proceeds to debate with him the
relative merits of the act (1321ff.). Strepsiades relates the events which led up to this: the two
quarrelled over poetry, with the son preferring the novelty of Euripides to Simonides or
Aeschylus, much to the father's chagrin (1369-1372), at which point, Strepsiades εὐθέως

---

[553] Text and trans. Henderson (1998), adapted.
[554] Zanker (2009), 226 notes the recurrence the verb ῥέγκειν, "to snore" in both passages. On the correspondences
between *Mimiamb* 8 and *Clouds*, see further Mastromarco (1984), 78-80, Miralles (1992), 173-182 and Kutzko
(2012). More generally on echoes of comedy in Herodas, see Veneroni (1973).
[555] See also Kutzko (2012) on Herodas' engagement with *Lysistrata* as an intertext in *Mimiamb* 7.

ἀράττω / πολλοῖς κακοῖς καἰσχροῖσι, "straightaway struck with many bad and shameful words" (1373-1374) and the two fell to fighting (1375-1376). Phidippides relishes the chance to argue with his father now he is equipped with sophistry, remarking ὡς ἡδὺ καινοῖς πράγμασιν καὶ δεξιοῖς ὁμιλεῖν / καὶ τῶν καθεστώτων νόμων ὑπερφρονεῖν δύνασθαι, "how fine it is to be *au fait* with novel, clever things, and to have the power to disregard established customs" (1399-1400), and in short order triumphs over Strepsiades through cunning speech. The implement Phidippides uses to beat his father is not mentioned, but Aristophanes foreshadows the conclusion of the play during the *parabasis*, in which he outlines typical comic scenes which the first version of *Clouds* did not possess (and which, it can be assumed, the present version does):[556] οὐδὲ πρεσβύτης ὁ λεγων τἄπη τῇ βακτηρίᾳ / τύπτει τὸν παρόντ᾽, ἀφανίζων πονηρὰ σκώμματα, "nor did an old man strike a bystander with his staff, concealing his bad jokes" (541-542). The Aristophanic depiction of the stock-scene of the πρεσβύτης[557] beating a παρόντα[558] with a βακτηρίᾳ[559] clearly resonates in Herodas' description of the old man's threatened attack upon his persona, but - more than this - we can detect a comparable development in the narrative structure of both Aristophanes' comedy and Herodas' mimiamb. The *parabasis* of *Clouds* seems to foreshadow the climax of the action, with the allusion to beating and harsh language, but in truth the situation is reversed: it is not the old man who delivers a beating, but rather he who receives one at the hands of a younger man, one who's cleverness - and willingness to move beyond established custom - ensures his victory. Similarly, on detecting the true identity of the old man, a reader might assume his triumph, given Hipponax' stereotypical propensity for abuse and violence. However, this is not the case, as Herodas' persona succeeds in the game of *askoliasmos*. This victory is emblematic of the author's successful incorporation of dramatic material into choliambic verse (thus, an upheaval of customary generic boundaries), and this is legitimised through the persona's alignment with the young man, Dionysus.[560] By depicting his persona's contest with the old man using language and a narrative that recalls an Aristophanic model, Herodas emphasises - at yet another level - his authority in composing poetry with a hybrid dramatic and choliambic form.

---

[556] On the versions and revisions of *Clouds*, see Hubbard (1991), 88-112, Rosen (1997), Biles (2011), 176ff.

[557] Cf. Herod. 8.59.

[558] Compare the persona's appeal to his fellow *askoliasmos*-participants as παρεόν[τες] at Herod. 8.61.

[559] Cf. Herod. 8.60.

[560] Compare the opening of the *parabasis*: ὦ θεώμενοι, κατερῶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθέρως / τἀληθῆ, νὴ τὸν Διόνυσον τὸν ἐκθρέψαντά με, "spectators, I'll freely declare the truth to you, by Dionysus who raised me" (518-519).

The employment of performance as a motif in *Mimiamb* 8 is, therefore, multifaceted. The allusion to mime and comedy in the opening section serves to proactively validate the persona's claim to be successful in his usage of the dramatic mode, complementing the allegorical meaning of the dream contest. However, this also evokes the ambiguous medial position of the *Mimiambs*, between literary and performed reception, as well as grounding the narrative in dramatic tradition through the use of a recognisable model. The persona's performance in the game of *askoliasmos* further emphasises the dramatic aspect of the work, but equally highlights the ritual dimension of the dream, subtly asserting the divine quality of the narrative and foreshadowing the persona's programmatic and self-legitimising interpretation of events. Throughout the mimiamb, it is the persona's engagement in performance, and with the theme of performance, which establishes that character's authority. In the interpretation of the dream, the authorising force of performance is revealed, retroactively imbuing the performance the persona has been engaged in throughout the mimiamb - that is, as the speaking voice of the mimiamb - with a similarly authoritative quality. The authority of the persona's performance is, however, not solely implied from the interpretation. Rather, it is also demonstrated in the engagement between persona and audiences within the mimiamb, and this forms the focus of my analysis in the following section.

5.2 *Models for readers (good and bad): representations of audience reception in Mimiambs 4 and 8*

Over the course of *Mimiamb* 8, Herodas' persona interacts with two different audiences, one being the slave Annas, the other being the goatherds that populate the dream-narrative. In the engagements between the persona and these audiences, we can observe the author taking steps to prefigure the reception of his mimiambic poetry by the (external) reading audience of the *Mimiambs*. I suggest that, by embedding an addressee for the persona's narrative within the mimiamb, Herodas attempts to curtail the possibility of later biographical misinterpretation: Annas is employed as a cipher for the reader, allowing Herodas to guide the reader in their interpretation, just as his persona guides Annas. We can observe Herodas establishing the authority of his persona at a structural level, and I suggest further that, in embedding Annas within the poem, the author provides a model of reception to which the reader of the *Mimiambs* should adhere. This activity finds a parallel in another mimiamb, *Mimiamb* 4. Graham Zanker has argued that this mimiamb is exemplar of Herodas' adaptation of the process of viewer-supplementation in Hellenistic art to his poetry:[561] the poem is notable for the tension it evokes between the experience of its characters, engaged in the viewing of various artworks, and the audience's inability to directly experience that viewing act.[562] I here consider another aspect of the act of viewing within the mimiamb, and assess how the principal characters of the *Mimiamb* - Cynno and Coccale - serve as another model for reader-reception, as a result of their perceptual engagement with their surroundings. However, in contrast to Annas, I propose that the women are intended as negative *exempla*, evincing the wrong sort of response to the objects of their perception, and that it is this failure or reception which Herodas encourages the audience of his poetry to avoid.

Within the *Mimiambs* as a collection, *Mimiamb* 4 most clearly displays Herodas' aptitude for undertaking aesthetic criticism within the everyday setting of his mimiambic world and, indeed, employing that mundane scene as an element of said criticism. Cynno, Coccale, and Cynno's slave Cydilla visit the Coan Asclepieion, and undertake a tour of the art on display. Comparisons have been made between *Mimiamb* 4 and Theocritus' *Idyll* 15, in which two women - Gorgo and Praxinoa - attend a festival of Adonis and offer commentary on tapestry and song, acts which mirror Cynno and Coccale's rapturous examinations of sculpture and

---

[561] Zanker (2004), 85ff.
[562] See particularly Zanker (2004).

painting in Herodas' poem. Both works may look back to Sophron's mime that took as its subject women viewing the Isthmian games, though the extent to which either Hellenistic author used this poem as a model is not fully clear, particularly given our near-total lack of the mime in question.[563] Richard Hunter has noted the correspondence between the two poems as comparable explorations of *mimesis*, and reflections upon the quality mimetic realism: furthermore, his suggestion that Theocritus' presentation of Gorgo and Praxinoa (and particularly their reception of the various aesthetic products which they encounter) holds up a mirror to the reader's own process of reception might equally be applied to Herodas' presentation of Cynno and Coccale in *Mimiamb* 4.[564] However, I propose that there is a distinction to be made between the presentation of both groups of women. Hunter's argument follows that Gorgo and Praxinoa occupy the conceptual, narrative space normally occupied by the voice of the author, with the *Idyll* functioning as a miniaturised, comically distorted rendering of Theocritus' own arrival on the scene in Alexandria.[565] By contrast, I suggest that Herodas does not wish us to read Cynno and Coccale as mouthpieces for his own voice or persona, but rather as embodiments of 'wrong' readers - that is, as negative *exempla* of readers who fail to grasp the poetic artifice of Herodas' work, particularly its penchant for hybridity (in this case, the intermingling of high and low elements). This is revealed in part through the aesthetically-minded responses of Cynno and Coccale to the art of the Asclepieion, but only becomes fully apparent when juxtaposed with their responses to the other ever-present yet silent character of the mimiamb, the slave Cydilla.

In order to perceive the usage of Cynno and Coccale as negative readerly *exempla*, we must first consider how it is that Herodas invites us to interpret their responses as analogous to reception of his poetry. That the author does prompt such an interpretation is revealed in the manner that the artwork is described within the poem. Claudia Fernández and Zanker have persuasively argued that the art scattered about the Asclepieion is an allegory for Herodas' work, and thus that Cynno and Coccale's response is correspondingly a covert poetic reception,[566] and their argument is bolstered by the occurrence of a prominent Herodan programmatic motif in the description of the artworks. Fernández astutely notes that Herodas

[563] The scholia to *Id.*15 (15.arg.7-8 Wendel) reports that Theocritus παρέπλασε δὲ τὸ ποιημάτον ἐκ τῶν παρὰ Σώφρονι Ἴσθμια θεμέων: see further Gow (1965) II.265, Hunter (1996a), (1996b), 118, Hordern (2004), 145-146. On Herodas' engagement with Sophron, see further Chapter 6.1.
[564] Hunter (1996b), 117.
[565] A notion which seems guaranteed by the women's proud avowal of their Syracusan origins (15.90); see Hunter (1996b), 118.
[566] Zanker (2009), 124-131, Fernández (2006b), 33-35.

repeatedly presents his poetry in the metaphorical guise of 'beautiful things',[567] and in *Mimiamb* 4, the artwork is consistently identified as such: we have the καλῶν ἀγαλμάτων (4.20-21), καλῶν ἔργων (4.26), τὰ καλά (4.58), and one of the pieces being described as καλόν… / πρῆγμ᾽ οἷον οὐχ ὥρηκας ἐξ ὅτευ ζώεις, "a beauty, such as you've not seen in your life" (4.39-40). In *Mimiamb* 6, Metro describes a dildo - an item of metapoetic symbolism, as I discuss in Chapter 6 - as a καλόν δώρημα (6.21), and the same character later refers generally to the craftsman Cerdon's wares (dildos, now allusively masquerading as shoes) as καλῶν ἔργων in *Mimiamb* 7 (84).[568] In *Mimiamb* 8, the programmatic significance of the motif is revealed, as the goat is interpreted as the symbol of poetry (8.71), and is similarly given a description which emphasises its visual beauty. At the opening of the persona's narration of the dream, he comments that the goat was ὁ δ᾽ εὐπώ[γω]ν τε κεύκερως [, "well bearded, and beautifully horned" (8.17), and later comments that the goat was a κ]αλοῦ δῶρον ἐκ Δ[ιων]ύσου, "gift of handsome Dionysus" (8.68). While this final instance differs - as it is not the goat but the god whom is described as beautiful - this description recalls Metro's description of the dildo as a beautiful gift and, furthermore, emphasises another recurrent characteristic of the represented forms of Herodas' poetry, that being its divine origin. The dildos of *Mimiamb* 6 and 7 are likened to the divine handiwork of Athena a number of times and, in *Mimiamb* 4, the artworks are also compared to divinely handiwork, and once again Athena is named as craftsman. On viewing the works, Coccale remarks οὐκ ὁρῆς, φίλη Κυννοῖ; / οἷ᾽ ἔργα κεῖ ᾽νῆν· ταῦτ᾽ ἐρεῖς Ἀθηναίην / γλύψαι τὰ καλά, "don't you see, friend Cynno? What works are here; you'd say that Athena made these beautiful things" (4.56-58). This remark is echoed by Coritto's assessment of the seemingly divine quality of the dildo's craftsmanship: ἀλλ᾽ ἔργα, κοῖ᾽ ἐστ᾽ ἔργα· τῆς Ἀθηναίης / αὐτῆς ὁρῆν τὰς χεῖρας, οὐχὶ Κέρδωνος, / δόξεις, "but his work, what work it is! You'll believe you see the craftsmanship of Athena, not Cerdon" (6.65-67). This multitude of objects - qualified as beautiful things with seemingly-divine provenance - function as symbolic representations of Herodas' poetry. This representative trend is equally apparent in the work of Herodas' peers, and so the equation of the artwork of *Mimiamb* 4 with Herodas' poetry finds precedent both elsewhere in the *Mimiambs*, and in the work of others.[569] The explicit identification of these objects (thus, the poems they represent) as both καλός and

---

[567] Fernández (2006b), 38.

[568] It is equally significant that Cerdon lavishes detail on the colour and appearance of his 'shoes', further emphasising their aesthetic excellence: see 7.20ff.

[569] We can compare, for example, the description of the tapestries in Theoc. *Id.*15.78-79 (τὰ ποικίλα πρᾶτον ἄθρησον, / λεπτὰ καὶ ὡς χαρίεντα· θεῶν περονάματα φασεῖς), or the role of the statues in Posidippus' *Andriantopoiika*, as discussed in Chapter 2.1.

θεῖος further implies their high status, and when read in the context of Herodas' corpus as a whole, this further reinforces the claim made in *Mimiamb* 8 that Herodas' poetry possesses the elevated quality his detractors would seek to deny. In the context of *Mimiamb* 4, however, I propose that this purely high-status quality is problematised through an immediate reminder of the low influences which also permeate Herodas' work: in opposition to the aesthetic splendour of the artworks, the base character of the mimic genre is present in the slave Cydilla.

That we are encouraged to view the art and Cydilla as the encapsulation of the two tonal facets of Herodas' work is made apparent through the contrasting and ironic characteristics which each possess; indeed, what is notable is that the artwork becomes a character in its own right. While the artwork is personified, bestowed with human traits through Cynno and Coccale's descriptions,[570] Cydilla is explicitly dehumanised, mocked by Cynno for ὀρεῦσα καρκίνου μέζον, "staring more than a crab" (4.44).[571] A painting of a boy is so lifelike that Coccale wonders with trepidation, τὸν παῖδα δὴ ‹τὸν› γυμνὸν ἢν κνίσω τοῦτον / οὐχ ἕλκος ἕξει, Κύννα; - "if I scratched this naked boy, would he not get a wound, Cynno?" (4.59-60), yet Coccale's fear that she might harm the 'flesh' of the painting is juxtaposed with Cynno's utter disregard for damaging Cydilla, threatening as she does that ἔσσετ᾽ ἡμέρη κείνη / ἐν ᾗ τὸ βρέγμα τοῦτο τὠσυρὲς κνήσῃ, "there'll come that day when I give you real cause to itch your disgusting head" (4.50-51).[572] These two instances, both using future indicative verbs with corresponding meaning,[573] further invite a comparison of Coccale and Cydilla's activity. While Coccale is motivated by the 'high' themes of art appreciation, so lifelike is the artwork that she fears scratching could break the skin of the painted boy, Cydilla will itch at the wounds inflicted by her mistress's beatings, imparted due to her purported vulgar, low behaviour.

The artworks and Cydilla are further contrasted in their respective abilities to speak. Cynno rails against Cydilla for gawping and staring wordlessly while she commands her to fetch the attendant (4.41-51), and this vacant gawping recalls the limited attention span traditionally ascribed to the comic slave;[574] Cynno's rhetorical question - οὐ σοὶ λέγω, αὕτη "you, aren't I speaking to you?" (4.41) - is also redolent of comic phrasing.[575] But it is not just Cydilla's

---

[570] The statue of Battale is so realistic that seeing it is akin to seeing Battale herself (4.35-38). Coccale summarises her wonder at the statues by marvelling οὐχὶ ζοὴν βλέπουσι χἠμέρην πάντες; - "don't they have the look of life and day?" (4.68).
[571] See further Xen. *Symp*.5.5, Plut. *Mor*.54d.
[572] At l.51, Cunningham (2004) gives †τωυσυρες †; Blass (1891) and Zanker (2009) read τὠσυρὲς.
[573] κνήσῃ from κνάω, see *LSJ* s.v. κνίσω from κνίζω (and cf. *LSJ* s.v. κνίζω) both meaning to scratch or itch.
[574] Compare Ar. *Lys*.426-427, Men. *Dys*.441.
[575] Compare Ar. *Pl*.926-927, Men. *Epit*.718-19.

gawping, but also her silence that is an important marker of her allegorical function. Directly preceding her remonstrations, Cynno remarks, on viewing the remarkably lifelike statuary (4.32-34):

> πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν γοῦν εἴ τι μὴ λίθος, τοὔργον,
> ἐρεῖς, λαλήσει. μᾶ, χρόνῳ κοτ᾽ ὤνθρωποι
> κῆς τοὺς λίθους ἕξουσι τὴν ζοὴν θεῖναι.
>
> Well, if it weren't a stone in front of our feet,
> you'd say it's about to speak. By heaven, given time men
> will even be able to put life into stones.

This is a typically Hellenistic appreciation of sculpture in poetry.[576] Herodas, however, emphasises the miraculous ability of the sculptors almost to bestow speech and life upon objects by immediately presenting a contrast, depicting a human character who should be able to speak and act, but is unable. Cynno's command to Cydilla to fetch the attendant to open the temple is never carried out, which we can determine as it is only the breaking of a new day - and the subsequent opening of the temple - which allows the ladies a view inside, rather than any action on the part of Cydilla, so transfixed is she by the artwork (4.54-56). Cydilla and the work which enraptures her seem almost alike in their implied physical stillness and ambiguous silence, yet this similarity is in stark contrast to the conflicting reactions each receives from their 'audience', Coccale and Cynno. Herodas subtly pokes fun at the women who, when confronted with the demonstrably similar presentation of Cydilla and the artwork, react so differently. In so doing, the author pre-empts a reaction from an audience who are - perhaps - unaccustomed to the combination of refined aesthetics and lowlife themes which his work dwells upon. By establishing that the perceived aesthetic gulf between Cydilla and the artwork is fundamentally constructed on the part of the receiver, rather than as a result of any inherent quality of the viewed subject, Herodas invites his readers to question their own responses to his activity of generic and tonal hybridisation (particularly if those responses tend towards the negative).

The issue of wrong-headed poetic criticism raised by the antagonistic behaviour which Coccale and Cynno show towards Cydilla is reiterated in the attitudes demonstrated towards the

---

[576] Compare Theoc. *Id.*15.80-83, which provides a striking parallel: πότνι᾽ Ἀθαναία, ποῖαί σφ᾽ ἐπόνασαν ἔριθοι, / ποῖοι ζωογράφοι τἀκριβέα γράμματ᾽ ἔγραψαν. / ὡς ἔτυμ᾽ ἐστάκαντι καὶ ὡς ἔτυμ᾽ ἐνδινεῦντι, / ἔμψυχ᾽, οὐκ ἐνυφαντά. σοφόν τι χρῆμ᾽ ἄνθρωπος. This comment equally finds a Herodan parallel in *Mimiamb* 7, in the shoemaker Cerdon's praise of his customer Metro's remarkable 'vocal' abilities: I discuss this further in Chapter 6.1.

persona's activity in *Mimiamb* 8, in which the old man and the audience of goatherds seek to destroy the persona, and the allegorical representation of his poetry respectively (8.59-60, 67ff.). The goatherds play the role of instigators in the mimiamb, with their act of destroying the goat providing the impetus for the events of the dream-narrative as a whole. To which real-world figures these characters correspond is much debated: their ambiguous description as ἐν Μούσῃσιν (8.72) has been read alternatively as "among the Muses", taken to be a reference to the Mouseion in Alexandria, or more generally as metaphorically meaning "in poetry".[577] In either case, an audience of rapacious critics is alluded to, though their precise identities are (perhaps purposefully) unclear.[578] The ambiguous representation of an author's critics in the course of delineating a poetic programme is equally found in Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue:[579] similar to the manner in which Herodas disguises his critics as goatherds, Callimachus casts his as the Telchines, emphasising their dearth of intelligence, and telling lack of friendship with the Muses (*Aet.*fr.1.2 Pf.). As Jacqueline Klooster notes, the Telchines serve as a foil, a model of bad readership presented in order to guide the external reader towards a favourable (and thus, correct) interpretation of Callimachus' poetic practice, aligned with the author's own views on his work.[580] Herodas' goatherds perform a comparable, though not necessarily identical role. The interpretation of the dream suggests that the goatherds initiated the contest,[581] but further shows that they were ultimately unable to best the persona in the game (8.69ff.): this can be taken, fairly straightforwardly, as representative of Herodas' own triumph over his critics, despite their attempts to bring him low. However, the manner in which the goatherds behave towards the persona is not statically antagonistic. Though these characters demonstrate their aggression at the outset, they display a far more positive disposition during the persona's attempts at leaping, as denoted by the Dionysian cry they raise at his success (κἠλάλαξαν ὤνθρωπ[οι, 8.46). Similarly, his address to them as ὦ παρεόν[τες] (8.61) supports the notion that the crowd has transformed from destructive critics to a more receptive audience of onlookers, watching and celebrating the persona's success (and thus also the author's). The persona's performative skill is such that he is able to win over even his most ardent opponents:

---

[577] On the variant interpretations of this phrase see particularly Headlam-Knox (1922), 395-396, Hunter (1993b), 35-36. Zanker (2009), 232 notes the comparable comment offered in Timon of Philus' epigram, πολλοὶ μὲν βόσκονται ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πολυφύλῳ / βιβλιακοὶ χαρακῖται ἀπείριτα δηριόωντες / Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ (*SH* 786).

[578] Zanker (2009), 233-235 and Simon (1991), 127-144 raise the possibility that Herodas may have in mind the rustic characters of Theocritus' *Idylls* by designating his critics goatherds; however, as noted by Hunter (1993b), 36, the herdsman is equally a typical guise for a poet to appear in (e.g., Hesiod, Archilochus, as discussed above, Chapter 4.2).

[579] One can also identify the *philologoi* whom Hipponax targets in *Iamb* 1 as similarly vague poetic opponents.

[580] Klooster (2011), 131.

[581] Through the destruction of the goat, which becomes the skin-bag used in the game of *askoliasmos*.

much as he eventually shares success even with the old man - his most aggressive antagonist - so his initial aggressors are ultimately mollified, and even cheer him on in his attempts. Likewise, Herodas seemingly suggests that his skill is such that his critics will, in time, come to praise him in his mimiambic pursuits. In this sense, the goatherds can be seen as an evolution of Cynno and Coccale. Herodas repeatedly demonstrates the success of his mimiambic endeavours through the fusion of form and narrative, and thus, as the *Mimiambs* demonstrate their successful combination of mime and choliambic *qua* their existence as mimiambic poems, so too does their author reinforce this success by having his characters - particularly those engaged in acts of reception - reflect this triumph with their words and deeds. The negative *exempla* of Cynno and Coccale gives way to the goatherds, who transition from opponents to proponents of Herodas' activity: the final embedded audience represents the paradigm of 'good' readership, that audience being the slave Annas.

Annas is shown to be subservient to Herodas' persona through her character-role within the dramatic setting, as one of his slaves. She is, however, distinguished from her fellow slaves by Herodas comment, οὐ γὰρ νη[πία]ς φρένας βόσκεις, "for at least the mind you're nourishing isn't stupid" (8.15). Ultimately, though, this compliment is a false lead for any who might think that Annas will be developed as a character: she is never given the chance to demonstrate the quality of her mind within the poem, as she never speaks. That Annas has as little authority over her actions as her fellow slaves becomes apparent when we consider Herodas' usage of the phrase εἰ θέλεις, "if you are willing" (8.14): though this implies that Annas has some freedom of choice as to whether she listens to the persona's dream, his previous usage of the phrase to order Psylla to ἄστη]θι... καὶ ἄψον, εἰ θέλεις, λύχνον, "get up and light the lamp, if you please", (8.6) coupled in that instance with the threat of a beating if not obeyed (8.8-9), clarifies that the phrase has more akin to the usage of the English 'if it's not too much trouble', to imply expected acquiescence while maintaining at least a veneer of faux-politeness.[582]

As noted, though it is implied Annas is present throughout the narration and interpretation of the dream, her presence is only denoted through references made by the persona. However, unlike the other present-but-silent characters that populate Herodas' poems,[583] Annas' silence

---

[582] Compare Herod. 7.67, 7.92 and Soph. *El.*585. Degani (1984), 54 notes that εἰ θέλεις may have a Hipponactean origin, but its commonality makes this difficult to determine.

[583] These characters are almost exclusively slaves, e.g., Threissa in *Mimiamb* 1, the hetaira Myrtale in *Mimiamb* 2, Cydilla in *Mimiamb* 4, an unnamed slave in *Mimiamb* 6, Drimylus and Pistus in *Mimiamb* 7. Euthies, Coccalus and Phillius in *Mimiamb* 3 - instructed by Lampriscus to hoist the errant Cottalus in order for the former to administer a beating - may be slaves, but might equally be schoolboy-companions of the latter. The presence of

serves a particular programmatic role, comparable to that of Cydilla in *Mimiamb* 4. Just as Cydilla functioned as an element of a broader metapoetic process of reflection, so Annas is more than set-dressing (thus, unlike Psylla and Megallis). I suggest that Herodas uses Annas in an attempt to prefigure the correct form of reader-reception: the reception process places the reader into the role of Annas, as both Annas and the reader are the recipients of the persona's narrative, and Annas is never defined as a character with autonomy by which the reader might differentiate themselves from her. In this way, Herodas prompts the reader to assume a persona within the world of the poem (as he has), in much the same manner that we observed in epigram, particularly those poems which prefigure an internalised response. Moreover Herodas, by placing the reader into a prepared role, establishes a relationship with them through the fictionality of the shared history of his persona and Annas. Thus the differentiation of Annas from the other slaves - and the compliment the persona pays to her - serves to flatter the reader obliquely, suggesting they are, on account of their superior intelligence, able to comprehend the full import of the persona's dream (once suitably interpreted). Equally, however, Annas' silence is telling of how Herodas desires his reader to respond to the text. The presentational mode of the dream establishes that the persona holds sole command over the content of what he relates, and the interpretation of the dream further enforces the programmatic message already present in the content. Annas' is given no chance to interrupt the monologue, or offer opinion following the dream's interpretation, and similarly the reader is encouraged not to question the meaning of the dream, which the persona has interpreted for greatest benefit to himself. Annas' lack of characteristics, and lack of a voice, allows Herodas to address the reader directly though the pretence of addressing a character within the mimiamb, dictating the meaning of the dream to his audience covertly through the mouthpiece of his persona.

With the start of the persona's narration of his dream, the *mise en scène* established in the first lines of the mimiamb recedes, with Annas the only feature to remain at all prominent, referred to directly twice in the remainder of the work (8.43, 66). As discussed above, while the first section of the mimiamb make pretence of a staged context, the central and final parts shift the focus of the narrative to events removed entirely from that context, to the dreamscape of the persona's account. The persona's adoption of an overtly narrating role, acting as an intermediary between the events described and the reader, is a notable break from the conventions exhibited throughout the other *Mimiambs*. While other characters report on events,

---

such a character is, therefore, a standard feature of Herodas' poems, but none, save Cydilla, play such a prominent role in their respective works as Annas.

or provide descriptions of things seen and felt, those descriptions are ultimately supplementary to the events which the reader accesses first-hand; that is, unfolding before the reader in the real-time of their act of reception. This break from established practice encourages the reader to perceive (or, to be precise, believe they perceive) the author's own voice speaking directly to them as an addressee - through the cipher of Annas - more so than at any other point in Herodas' corpus.[584] In part, this change in mode of address can be read as an attempt on the part of Herodas to assert his authority, making explicit his role as "the controlling force behind the words of the text".[585] This is not, however, to suggest definitively that Herodas addresses the audience directly throughout, and indeed the author is careful to maintain distance, utilising the persona as an intermediary between audience and author.[586] This dichotomy of simultaneous authorial absence and presence is maintained through the concurrent employment a seemingly direct address to the reader, in conjunction with the mimetic frame and internal audience.

Herodas' efforts to maintain a distance from the reader through the usage of an embedded addressee serves a dual purpose: firstly, it characterises the persona's narration as a form of performance in which Annas, the notional recipient of the narrative, serves as a cipher for the external audience, allowing the latter to partake in the reception of that performance indirectly. Secondly, it forms part of a broader strategy which suggests that, while the reader detects the presence of the author's voice due to the directness of address (particularly when contrasted to the other *Mimiambs*), the 'Herodas' they encounter within the mimiamb is nevertheless a persona, a character not wholly dissimilar to any of the others who populate the *Mimiambs*, who is purportedly engaging other characters within the poem, first and foremost.[587] This subtle assertion of the fictitious quality of the persona encourages the reader to interpret the figure as

---

[584] A suggestion advanced by Hutchinson (1988), 239 regarding 8.41-47, but equally applicable to the entirety of the mimiamb following the onset of the dream-narrative. The notion that the persona addresses the reader is particularly exhibited in the remark that the festivities are ὥσπερ τελεῦμεν ἐν χοροῖς Διωνύσου (8.40), the use of the first person plural establishing the shared experiential background shared by the reader and the persona, through Annas. Compare the similar establishment of a shared perception between author and reader in Call. 45 *GP = AP* 7.271, discussed above, Chapter 1.1.
[585] Hunter (1993a), 101.
[586] On this technique of distancing, see Seeck (1976), Goldhill (1986), particularly 30-32, Morrison (2007), particularly 15-18.
[587] Further aspects of this strategy can be observed in the evocation of performance, as discussed above, and equally in the unusual dialect employed throughout the *Mimiambs*, a version of Eastern Ionic which emphasises its artificiality; see further Cunningham (1971a), 209-211, Zanker (2009), 3-4, 7-11. See, on the similar trend in Theocritus, Hunter (1996b), 120-123, Hunter in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), 371-377.

a poetic creation, whose attributes reflect the design of the author, rather than adherence to historical fact.

Herodas thus employs a manner of self-representation not unlike that of Callimachus in the *Hymn to Apollo*: the narrator of the hymn, though seemingly at first speaking directly to the reader, alludes to a mimetic frame which establishes the speaker in his own right, thereby asserting the disjunction between historical author and persona.[588] However - though divorced from the historical Callimachus - the narrator of the hymn makes statements of programmatic import for the reading of the author's oeuvre. Likewise, Herodas here creates a mouthpiece, a cipher which enables him to speak about himself and his poetry without suggesting that he is making straightforwardly autobiographical statements. By masking the extent to which the persona represents the author, and embedding his representation within a fictional setting, Herodas insulates himself from direct criticism of his mimiambic programme, and from the persona's claims to be a second Hipponax: as Andrew Morrison puts it (illustrating his point with the example of Simichidas in *Idyll* 7, but readily applicable to Herodas' persona in *Mimiamb* 8), "the author has a delegate within the text, to whom concerns about authority and status are deflected."[589]

The structure of *Mimiamb* 8, dominated by the persona's narration of the dream and its subsequent interpretation, is carefully constructed in order to reinforce Herodas' broader polemic assertion regarding his character as an author, and the character of his work, and further to minimise the possibilities that any reader might miss or (disastrously) misinterpret his programmatic statement. Herodas can therefore be observed prefiguring the process of reader-reception on three levels: firstly, and most overtly, Herodas shapes the form of narrative as its author. Secondly, Herodas casts his persona as the dreamer, the sole character who can report on the content of the episode. Finally, by making his persona the interpreter of the dream, Herodas limits the process of interpretation which might be undertaken by a reader. By embedding an interpretation at the point of reception, Herodas denies the reader the opportunity to engage in the exegetic action of decoding the dream's allegorical content without pre-existing bias. By first obfuscating his programmatic message through allegory, and then positioning his persona as a figure with the knowledge to interpret it correctly, he defines the parameters by which his persona (and thus also his programmatic assertion) is received.

---

[588] See particularly Morrison (2007), 123-137, Fantuzzi (2011).
[589] Morrison (2007), 315.

To conclude, within *Mimiamb* 8, Herodas' usage of embedded audiences complements his persona's assertion of poetic fame, and is a critical aspect of his attempt to present the persona as authoritative. Utilising Annas as a cipher for the reader, Herodas is able to transgress the mimetic limitations of his poetry and seemingly speak directly to the reader, while simultaneously maintaining the fictive dimension of the work, thus inoculating himself from direct criticism of the persona's claims. However, Herodas equally presents the propagators of criticism - both the goatherds, and the old man (though perhaps to a lesser extent) - as converts to his hybrid poetic form: ultimately, his critics only foster his predicted fame. In *Mimiamb* 4, the author offers an allegory of failed poetic reception which foreshadows the reception of generic hybridity in *Mimiamb* 8. Specifically, he depicts an audience that fails to celebrate his mimiambic poetry in full, by discounting the value of its lowbrow aspect and focusing solely on the high. Accustomed to the rarefied quality of the Asclepieion's collection, Cynno and Coccale refuse to acknowledge the aesthetic potential inherent in the realism of the ordinary world which surrounds them (despite the fact that the art they rhapsodise about has, as its subjects, ordinary people, children and farmyard animals), preferring to celebrate *l'art pour l'art*. Herodas positions Cydilla and the artworks at either end of the perceived aesthetic spectrum, but suggests - by consistently attributing them with similar characteristics, and presenting the actions of those who respond to them as comparable - that the distinction between the two is wholly a matter of audience perception, rather than any absolute opposition in formal terms. In this manner, he suggests that there are no barriers to the success of his activity of hybridisation, beyond the possibility of incorrect reception on the part of his readers.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

By way of a conclusion to this chapter, I hope the notion that one is able to make bald statements regarding the absolutely performative or literary character of the *Mimiambs* can now be put to bed. From this survey of representative elements which are evocative of, or associated with 'real' performance, it is clear that said aspects are more than simply consequences of their medium, and extend beyond a cursory adherence to dramatic and mimic protocols: instead, allusions to performance - and usage of the tropes and context which attend performance - consistently underpin Herodas' process of self-representation and reflection upon his poetic form, whether in the immediate context of *Mimiamb* 8 or in the *Mimiambs* more broadly.

This conclusion in turn leads on to a more nuanced concept of the capacity of a work to be qualitatively performative, particularly when this pertains to issues of self-representation. Herodas' authorial persona is a performance, in all senses of the word: as observed in the previous chapter, the mechanics of performance form the basis of Herodas' self-representation, and, reinforcing this performance, the context and narrative form of *Mimiamb* 8 are likewise infused with performative elements. Moreover, recognising the centrality of performance leads to the realisation that Herodas' programmatic activity extends beyond *Mimiamb* 8 and, furthermore, that the process is itself fundamentally intertextual. Cynno and Coccale stand as forerunners to the goatherds, and, when viewed as elements of a greater whole, the overarching nature of Herodas' process of poetic self-reflection is revealed. My final chapter builds upon this recognition, and continues to explore Herodas' programme as a composite process, emerging from the apprehension of the *Mimiambs* as a unified collection.

Generic and Tonal Hybridity in *Mimiambs* 1, 6 and 7

Introduction

Principally on account of Stobaeus' usage of the term, Herodas' poems have come to be known as the *Mimiambs*, and his poetry has been classed, generically, as 'mimiambic'.[590] Despite the lack of direct authorial identification of the poems as μιμίαμβοι, the label is fitting: the so-called *Kreuzung der Gattungen*, or intersection of genres at play within Herodas' poetry - particularly the juxtaposition of supposedly opposing generic elements for poetic effect - is one of its most distinctive features.[591] In *Mimiamb* 8, Herodas' persona remarks πάντα δ' ἦν, Ἀνν[ᾶ, / εἰς ἓν γέλως τε κἀνίη [......]εντα, "everything, Annas, was a [mixture/combination] of laughter and pain" (8.43-44).[592] At first glance, this is simply a description of the revels in which the persona engages but, considering the comment from a metapoetic perspective, this mixing of laughter and pain perfectly encapsulates Herodas' poetic activity: the combination of choliambic and mime in the invention of his new hybrid genre.[593]

As we have already seen, Herodas purposefully capitalises upon the hybridity of his genre for poetic effect. By employing generic hybridity as a theme within his work, rather than solely as the framework for the production of his poetry, Herodas invites the reader to consider his poetic activity and its results, exhibiting his innovations through the content and structure of his work. I argue that we should interpret the unity of genre in Herodas' poetry as the process by which the author engages in poetic innovation, and as the culmination of that poetic innovation: Herodas presents the unity of genres as the quintessential feature of his work, emphasised by the prominence of the motif in the construction of his authorial persona. It must be noted, however, that Herodas never comments upon the intersection of genres explicitly. The theme is treated persistently, but obliquely, utilising allegory and allusion to conduct a metapoetic

---

[590] Stob. 4.23.14, 4.24d.51, 4.34.27, 4.50b.52, 55, 59. Hordern (2004), 28 remarks that Herodas himself identifies his poems as μιμίαμβοι, citing Cunningham (1971a), 3 who comments that "(Herodas' poems) are described as μιμίαμβοι, i.e. μῖμοι and ἴαμβοι". The generic classification of the *Mimiambs* by their author, however, remains at best a plausible hypothesis, as there currently exists no evidence that Herodas himself named his poems as μιμίαμβοι; their first identification by their generic form seems to come from Pliny the Younger (*Ep.*4.3.3), on which see above, n.525.

[591] On the *Kreuzung der Gattungen,* see particularly Kroll (1924), Stanzel (1998).

[592] Either [᾽ναμιχθ]έντα (Headlam and Knox (1922), Cunningham (in Rusten and Cunningham 2002), Zanker (2009) or [κερασθ]έντα (Herzog (1924) has been posited as the lacunose word here; given the context, a verb denoting some form of mixing or intersection seems highly probable.

[593] Rosen (1992), 210 notes that γέλοιον and ἀνίη are given as terms applicable to comedy and tragedy respectively; compare Arist. *Po.*1449a34-35, 1452b11-12.

analysis of the nature of his work within a number of the mimiambs. Indeed, Herodas' consideration of his poetic activity transcends the delimitating bounds of individual works, making reflective use of the book-roll format in much the same manner as the authors considered in Part I. By masking the appraisal of his poetic activity, utilising characters and objects as representatives of his poetry, its predecessors, influences and reception, I argue that Herodas constructs an overarching programme which complements his authorial self-representation in *Mimiamb* 8.

In this chapter, I thus consider instances beyond *Mimiamb* 8 in which Herodas utilises two methods already observed - characterisation and 'objectification' (the symbolic representation of poetry as an object, such as in the case of the goat, and its reformation into the ἐνδυτόν) - to reflect upon his poetic endeavours, and posit that said instances form part of a sustained, collection-spanning undertaking which frames the author's act of self-representation in *Mimiamb* 8. I begin by considering *Mimiambs* 6 and 7: long recognised as a diptych, with continuous themes and recurring characters, *Mimiamb* 6 features women chatting in private, while *Mimiamb* 7 focuses on women - particularly Metro, a primary figure of *Mimiamb* 6 - interacting with men in the public sphere. The narrative action of both poems is driven by Metro's quest for a particular object, that being the βαυβών, "dildo". I posit that Herodas juxtaposes male and female characters in an evocation of the work of a poetic forebear - the mimographer Sophron - whose practice is an important model for Herodas' own, while simultaneously depicting the βαυβών and its craftsman as emblematic encapsulations of his poetry. I then turn to *Mimiamb* 1, perhaps the work with the closest connection to *Mimiamb* 8 in terms of programmatic significance: I argue that within the poem Herodas depicts, through the interaction of two characters, a failure of generic hybridisation, which serves as both counterpoint and forerunner to the overt success of the process in *Mimiamb* 8.

Within Herodas' corpus, *Mimiambs* 6 and 7 offer the only definitive instance of the same character appearing multiple works.[594] Metro is first seen chatting with her friend Coritto in *Mimiamb* 6, before reappearing as a customer in Cerdon's shop in *Mimiamb* 7, and her driving motivation in both poems is to come into possession of a βαυβών: in *Mimiamb* 6, she has learnt that Coritto possesses quite a remarkable specimen, and wants to know who made it, and how she can acquire one for herself. Coritto, after some protestation, reveals the manufacturer's name - Cerdon - before rhapsodising about the quality of his workmanship. At the close of *Mimiamb* 6, Metro leaves to hunt down another friend who can tell her more about Cerdon. *Mimiamb* 7 opens with Metro arriving at Cerdon's shop, surrounded by a gaggle of friends. The craftsman launches into his sales patter, and the range of wares he has on offer are lavishly - and allusively - described.[595]

The everyday scenes of women chatting and shopping contrasts with the *risqué* themes which Herodas treats. The frankness with which the women discuss sex, men and pleasure in *Mimiamb* 6, along with the purpose of the shopping trip undertaken in *Mimiamb* 7, has resulted in these poems (along with *Mimiamb* 5)[596] being taken as evidence that Herodas is chiefly concerned with - and indeed most at home when writing about - vulgarity. The assertion, however, that a comprehensive depiction of vulgarity and 'low life' is the culmination of the author's efforts in producing these works, thus discounting any possibility that said vulgarity may serve a purpose beyond titillation, is unadvised. The salacious flavour of these mimiambs doubtless enriches what could otherwise be rather pedestrian scenes but, simultaneously, it serves an important metapoetic function, which I outline here. Firstly, I explore the notion that Herodas utilises the interaction of male and female characters, within a sexually provocative

---

[594] There are a number of other possible instances of a character appearing in multiple mimiambs, though none as assured as the case of Metro: both *Mimiamb* 4 and *Mimiamb* 5 include a character named Cydilla, who is, in both cases, a slave girl. The two Cydillas, however, have different mistresses (Cynno in *Mimiamb* 4, Bitinna in *Mimiamb* 5) and it therefore seems unlikely that the two are in fact one and the same. A number of other names recur; a certain Gryllus is mentioned in both *Mimiamb* 1 (though the character never plays a direct part in the narrative) and in the scant lines of *Mimiamb* 10, but the dearth of evidence precludes a judgement on whether these are identical. Myrtale is given as the name of a hetaira in *Mimiamb* 2, and a like-named character is mentioned by the procuress Gyllis in *Mimiamb* 1, though as noted by Cunningham (1971a), 80 and Zanker (2009), 31, this is not an uncommon name for characters of that profession, at least as attested in later sources; see, e.g., Hor. *Carm.*1.13.14, Mart. 5.4.

[595] On the range of allusion at play in the description of the wares, see Sumler (2010), Anagnostou-Laoutides (2015).

[596] Entitled 'A Jealous Woman', described fittingly by Arnott (1971), 124 as "a sordid minor masterpiece".

context, as a means to reflect upon the work of one of his generic antecedents, the mimographer Sophron. Secondly, I posit that Herodas depicts the βαυβών as an allegorical representation of his activity of poetic mixing: the object's functional dissolution of the distinction between male and female sexual roles serves as a symbolic representation of Herodas' generic hybridisation. I further posit that, in light of the metapoetic role the βαυβών plays, the craftsman Cerdon stands as a counterpart to Herodas' authorial persona. Finally, I consider the significance of the famous female poets who appear in various guises in the two poems and suggest that they, along with the goddess Athena, undergo a process of 'profanisation'. Herodas casts these women, mortal and immortal, into various insalubrious roles, which I argue is a further example of the author's penchant for creating poetic tension through the juxtaposition of high and low themes.

When assessing the influence of mime on Herodas, a major issue is that the genre, both prior to and within the Hellenistic period, seems to have been rarely written down in a complete form, barring a few exceptions.[597] The interaction between the so-called 'literary' mime as represented by Herodas and Theocritus, and what has been termed popular mime, is difficult to trace.[598] The latter seems to have included a degree of improvisation, performed by either one or a group of actors,[599] but the distinction made between the two forms is not entirely a distinction of media or performative mode. The former is suggested to be of a higher register, employing allusions and other 'literary' devices for poetic effect, whilst the latter is considered to be baser, in its usage of crude humour and vulgarity.[600] Written iterations of mime originally performed in the popular vein are rare, and those which we do possess are fragmentary, with the first postdating Herodas by approximately 100 years. We can, however, observe thematic similarities between Herodas and the fragments of popular mime. *Mimiamb* 5, on the jealousy

---

[597] Among others, Cunningham (2004) presents the 15 fragments of Greek popular mime, the origins of which span from the Hellenistic period to the 5th Century AD. The foremost representative of mimic poetry in the Hellenistic period (besides Herodas) is Theocritus, as noted in the previous chapter. On similarities between the two poets in their engagement with mimic antecedents, see particularly Stanzel (1998), Ypsilanti (2006), Kutzko (2008), (2012). On Theocritus' engagement with Sophron and popular mime, see Hunter (1996a), Hordern (2004).

[598] There have been numerous studies undertaken on the nature of mime in the Hellenistic and later periods; Panayotakis (2014) provides a rich overview of mime in the Hellenistic period, and its subsequent development at Rome; Panayotakis (2010) and Tsitsiridis (2011) provide further exploration of the interaction between Roman and Greek mime. Wüst (1932), Mastromarco (1991), Esposito (2002), (2005) and Wiseman (2008) are further valuable studies.

[599] The extent to which non-literary mimes present a complete script when transcribed varies; *P.Grenf.* 1 v, a monologue by a girl bereft in love, is in verse, offering slim opportunities for improvisation; Cunningham (in Rusten and Cunningham 2002), 359 suggests *P.Oxy.* 413 col.4, commonly called *Charition,* is a summary rather than a full script, which would be expanded upon in performance. See further Tsitsirdis (2011). On the performers of mime, see particularly Fountoulakis (2000a).

[600] See Diom. 1.491 Keil, Ath. 14.621d-f; see further Hordern (2004), 4-11. On the perceived distinctions between so-called literary and popular forms of mime amongst the Romans, see Panayotakis (2010), 1-16.

of a mistress over her slave's lecherous habits - a slave whom she has been sleeping with - is redolent of the core conceits found in popular mimic poetry: jealousy, sex and violence.[601] Ultimately, the extent to which these works were an influence upon Herodas is problematised by scarcity of evidence of the form prior to Herodas' period of writing. We are better able to analyse Herodas' connection to pre-existing mimic tradition by assessing the *Mimiambs* in conjunction with the poetry of Sophron, a 5th Century Syracusan poet, and one of the first authors of mime.[602] Contrasting Herodas' work to the fragments we possess of Sophron, points of similarity can be observed in the two authors' comparative employment of themes, and in their characterisation of the men and women who populate their poems. Herodas' characters are preoccupied with much of the same cares displayed by Sohpron's people, such as food, money and - most prominently - sex, which is also a staple of popular mime, as has been noted (and indeed likewise of Hipponactean choliambic).[603] More than this, however, Herodas responds to structural aspects of Sophron's work within his poems, and this is readily apparent in the diptych of *Mimiambs* 6 and 7.

David Kutzko suggests that Herodas follows Sophron in the establishment of distinctly male and female scenarios within each of his poems:[604] *Mimiamb* 1, 4 (barring 4.79-85, during which a male temple attendant briefly appears) and 6 feature multiple female characters in discussion, while *Mimiamb* 2 is spoken almost entirely by one male character (the other speaker, also a man, speaks only for three lines out of the 102 lines of the work) and *Mimiamb* 8 is a monologue delivered by the author's persona. Sophron's mimes have been divided into male and female categories, at least from the 2nd Century, if not by the author himself.[605] Herodas, however,

---

[601] The situation of the jealous mistress punishing a lecherous is exactly replicated in *P.Oxy.* 413 col.1-3, which dates from the mid-2nd Century AD.

[602] A number of ancient authors give Sophron's genre as mimic; Aristotle compares Plato's Socratic dialogues with τοὺς Σώφρονος καὶ Ξενάρχου μίμους ("the mimes of Sophron and Xenarchus", Arist. *Poet.*1447a28-1447b13). Plato supposedly introduced Sophron's mimes to Athens, and Sophron's characterisation was apparently influential upon the dialogues; Ath. 11.504b, D.L. 3.18. To what extent Sophron began the literary form of mime, or simply continued it, is unclear: Hordern (2004), 6-7 and Kutzko (2012), 372-373 note the similarities between Sophron and Epicharmus' non-mythological fragments, the production of which also took place in Syracuse, and which could not have predated Sophron by more than a few decades.

[603] Notably *Mimiamb* 9, of which only the title and scant fragments remain, shares its theme with one of Sophron's poems, fr.14-17 *PCG*; both treat the issue of women breakfasting together. Furthermore, fr.10 *CPG*, 'Women viewing the Isthmian festival', may have provided a model for *Mimiamb* 4, as it might have for Theoc. *Id.*15, according to the scholia (15.arg.7-8 Wendel), as noted above. See further Nairn (1904), xxv. Dildos are a recurrent theme in both authors: Sophron employs shellfish as euphemisms for them in fr.23-25 *PCG*, while Herodas' usage is discussed below. See further Henderson (1991), 221-222, Hordern (2004), 157-160, Sumler (2010), 471.

[604] Kutzko (2012).

[605] Kutzko (2012), 380ff. Apollodorus classifies Sophron's works into male and female sections (Ath. 89a, 281e, 309c-d). The *Suda* reports that Sophron wrote separate male and female mimes, *Sud.*s.v. Σώφρων (Σ 893 Adler). See further Ussher (1980), 66-68.

does not adapt this Sophronic categorisation without revision. Indeed, the author seemingly plays with expectations engendered by the division of mimes into male and female types with diptych of *Mimiambs* 6 and 7. *Mimiamb* 6 is overtly female in character: Metro and Coritto rhapsodise about the dildo, with the latter reassuring both her friend and herself that αὐταὶ γάρ εἰμεν, "we're alone" (6.70) after a particularly scandalous comment, subtly emphasising the exclusive, women-only nature of this discussion. Men are almonst entirely absent from the mimiamb: the primary masculine figure of the work, the craftsman Cerdon, is described entirely *in absentia* (6.58-67):

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀλλ' οὗτος οὐκ οἶδ' ἢ ‹'κ› Χίου τις ἢ 'ρυθρέων
ἥκει, φαλακρός, μικκός· αὐτὸ ἐρεῖς εἶναι

60   Πρηξῖνον οὐδ' ἂν σῦκον εἰκάσαι σύκῳ
ἔχοις ἂν οὕτω· πλὴν ἐπὴν λαλῇ, γνώσῃ
Κέρδων ὀτεύνεκ' ἐστὶ καὶ οὐχὶ Πρηξῖνος.
κατ' οἰκίην δ' ἐργάζετ' ἐμπολέων λάθρη,
τοὺς γὰρ τελώνας πᾶσα νῦν θύρη φρίσσει.

65   ἀλλ' ἔργα, κοῖ' ἐστ' ἔργα· τῆς Ἀθηναίης
αὐτῆς ὀρῆν τὰς χεῖρας, οὐχὶ Κέρδωνος,
δόξεις.

</div>

<div style="text-align:center">

But this one comes from Chios or Erythrae,
I don't know which; bald, small, you'd say he was

60   Prexinus, you couldn't compare fig to fig as well -
when he speaks, however, you'll know
it's Cerdon and not Prexinus.
He works at home and sells illicitly,
for every door now trembles at the tax collector.

65   But his work, what work it is!
You'll believe you see the craftsmanship of Athena, not Cerdon.

</div>

This description, and Metro's parting declaration that she will find Cerdon, encourages the reader to expect a complementary masculine-orientated poem, focused on Cerdon, in balance with the more feminine work.[606] That a reader is prompted to continue through the book-roll with Metro on her quest for Cerdon is also evident from the arrangement of the *Mimiambs* on the manuscript. It is not simply that, within the *Mimiambs*, these works occur in sequence: examining the London Papyrus, it is notable the *Mimiamb* 6 ends two thirds of the way down column 34, and *Mimiamb* 7, with its title [Σ]ΚΥΤ[Ε]ΥΣ, "The Shoemaker" and first word

---

[606] See Kutzko (2012), 388.

Κέρδων, directly follows the final lines of the previous poem, alerting a reader to the continuation of the theme and characters of *Mimiamb* 6.[607]

Mimiamb 7 has, at first glance, a distinctly masculine nature. The work focuses upon the character of Cerdon, and he speaks for the majority of the poem, launching into a 60-line monologue after Metro's opening words (a departure from the more balanced dialogue of Metro and Coritto in *Mimiamb* 6). The setting has undergone a transformation, from the private, female-only sphere to the public, masculine-dominated venue of Cerdon's shop. The mimiamb focuses upon Cerdon's salesmanship and products, and his character is seemingly depicted principally through his own words, rather than the descriptions of others, much as the pimp Battarus engages in self-characterisation in the decidedly masculine *Mimiamb* 2.[608] In contrast to *Mimiamb* 2, and the expectation of the male-dominated scenario seemingly foreshadowed by *Mimiamb* 6, *Mimiamb* 7 is not, however, a wholly masculine piece. Kutzko sees in the diptych a reinvention of Sophron's gendered mimes, arguing that in *Mimiamb* 7 we see the clash of male and female mime-types.[609] Metro, formerly so bold, now attempts to act respectably in public, balanced against the masculine lasciviousness of Cerdon. Herodas subverts the expectation encouraged by *Mimiamb* 6 of a corresponding Cerdon-focused masculine poem, playing with the Sophronic structural division of genders by presenting a work which is neither wholly male not female in character. Herodas reflects this innovation within the content of the mimiamb itself, emphasising his creation of a simultaneously male and female form through the object which prompts the narrative action of the two mimiambs: the βαυβών.

Though βαυβών is, linguistically, a masculine noun, conceptually the dildo is neither wholly masculine nor feminine. Rather, it facilitates the feminine adoption of the masculine sexual role, a situation echoed in the subversive presence of the feminine in what a reader *au fait* with Herodas' generic antecedent might expect to be a wholly masculine poem.[610] The dual-natured aspect of the dildo is in harmony with the character of Herodas' poetry, and there are a number of prompts within the poem to encourage a reader to interpret the βαυβών as symbolic of poetry

---

[607] *P.Litt.Lond.*96 = *P.Egerton* 1, col.34.

[608] As does the persona in *Mimiamb* 8, though through less direct means. We might also compare the contrasting modes of self-representation employed by Nossis and 'Rhinthon' in the epigrams of the former, as discussed in Chapter 3.1.

[609] Kutzko (2012).

[610] That Sophron served as a point of reference for Theocritus also gives credence to the notion that the mimographer enjoyed popularity amongst the Hellenistic literati, and thus would be likely known to Herodas' audience. See Hordern (2004), 1, 9, 27, Kutzko (2006).

in general, and the author's hybrid mimiambic compositions specifically. When considering the βαυβών in *Mimiamb* 6, Metro exclaims rapturously, μᾶ, καλόν τι δώρημα, "my, what a beautiful gift!" (6.21) and, as discussed in the previous chapter, Herodas recurrently symbolises his poetry as beautiful objects, immediately situating the βαυβών within the constellation of objects-*qua*-poetry which we find in throughout the *Mimiambs*.

A further aspect of the βαυβών which reinforces its identification as Herodas' poetry comes from its etymology. Jacob Stern posits that the usage of the βαυβών has a religious allusion, owing to the mythological narrative which gives rise to the term itself:[611] 'βαυβών' is derived from the name of Baubo, a figure associated with the narrative of Demeter's search for Persephone.[612] Baubo is attested as a later equivalent of Iambe, the figure who first managed to draw a laugh from the goddess, and traditionally given as the mythological originator of the iambic genre.[613] Stern posits that the names of Metro (from Μήτηρ) and Coritto (from Κόρη) have an addition humorous connotation as a variation on the mythological narrative of Demeter and Persephone. Equally, however, the identification of the βαυβών with Baubo is significant owing to that figure's narrative role. Baubo is a variant of Iambe, much as Herodas' poetry is metrically choliambic, that is, a variant of iambic poetry, and the βαυβών is, therefore, etymologically and conceptually representative of Herodas' poetry on multiple levels.

It follows to consider the role that Cerdon, craftsman of the βαυβών, plays within the diptych, given the allegorical function which I propose is ascribed to his wares. At 7.74, Cerdon calls upon Ἑρμῆ τε Κερδέων καὶ σὺ Κερδείη Πειθοῖ, "Hermes of Profit, and you Profitable Persuasion" to aid him in his salesmanship, with a play upon the pun of Cerdon and κέρδος, "profit". The shoemaker repeatedly demonstrates that his name's meaning is particularly apt: at the outset of the work he welcomes Metro happily, remarking οὐ μάτην, Μητροῖ, / ἐγὼ φ[ι]λ‹έ›ω σε "Not in vain do I love you, Metro" (7.3-4) because, of course, she brings such good custom to his shop,[614] and throughout the mimiamb he is shown to be obsessive over wealth.[615] The presentation of Cerdon as profit-obsessed is not, however, the full extent of his characterisation. Indeed, much as with the representation of the βαυβών, Herodas uses the

---

[611] Stern (1979), 249-251. See further Nelson (2000).

[612] Much of the sources attesting to Baubo's character are late, e.g., Clem.Al. *Protr.*2.16-17, Eus. *PE.*2.3.30-35; Arnob. *Advers.Nat.*5.25-26.

[613] *H.Cer.*195ff.; see further Richardson (1973), 213-217, Olender (1990), 86ff., Stern (1979), Nelson (2000), 81-82.n.26.

[614] See further Headlam and Knox (1922), 304 and Kutzko (2012), 386.

[615] The majority of Cerdon's lines revolve around the acquisition or possession of money, e.g., 7.34-49, 67-76, 79-82, 91-92, 99-107, 122-123.

characterisation of the craftsman as an opportunity to explore the interaction of genders, primarily through a pair of analogies in which the craftsman is likened to divinities.

The first is a favourable comparison (from Cerdon's perspective at least!) between the shoemaker and Athena in their relative skills of craftsmanship (6.65-67). Herodas highlights this association of cobbler and goddess by placing it at the climax of a string of false identifications, in which Metro and Coritto torturously eliminate candidates, until it is emphatically clear exactly which Cerdon the latter means. Straightaway upon Coritto announcing that it was Cerdon that stitched the dildo (6.47), Metro hurriedly demands further knowledge; there are two Cerdons, she says, and gives descriptions of them both, despite acknowledging that the Cerdon she seeks could be neither of these (6.49-56). Coritto respond by identifying the correct Cerdon (6.58-67), but not before another mistake, with the craftsman's appearance now the cause of confusion: αὐτὸ ἐρεῖς εἶναι / Πρηξῖνον ουͺδ᾽ ἂν σῦκον εἰκάσαι σύκῳ / ἔχοις ἂν ουͺτῳ, "you'd say he was Prexinus, you couldn't compare fig to fig as well" (6.59-61). Luckily, Coritto relates, Cerdon and Prexinus can be determined by one attribute alone: their voices (6.61-62). Following this cavalcade of false-Cerdons and doppelgängers, it seems the identification of the cobbler is finally secure, only for Coritto to throw out one final case of 'mistaken identity'; ἀλλ᾽ ἔργα, κοῖ᾽ ἐστ᾽ ἔργα· τῆς Ἀθηναίης / αὐτῆς ὀρῆͺν τὰͺς χεῖρας, οὐχὶ Κέρδωνος, / δόξεις, "but his work, what work it is! You'll believe you see the craftsmanship of Athena, not Cerdon" (6.65-67). In contrast to the previous cases, where either Coritto or Metro presents a secure proof as to why the false identification was demonstrably incorrect, this final case goes unresolved, despite being the least plausible instance of all. Thus, through his work, Cerdon is - incredibly - put on a par with the goddess. Herodas' break from the pattern of mistake and correction, subverting the reader's expectation of a swift resolution to the confusion, serves to highlight the juxtaposition of Cerdon and Athena, over-emphasising this most unlikely of mistakes and reinforcing the irony inherent in such a mismatched comparison.

Initially, we can note that Herodas' employment of Athena as Cerdon's analogue is designed to provoke in a reader a certain scandalised frisson at the incongruity of likening the famously chaste goddess with a peddler of sex-toys whom - as Coritto reports in *Mimiamb* 6 and Metro alludes to in *Mimiamb* 7 - is easily given to fornication and debauchery.[616] Leaving aside this

---

[616] See 6.75ff., 7.93ff.

'profanisation' of the goddess for a moment, Herodas' choice of Athena is further significant from the perspective of gender, specifically in her conceptual associations with masculinity and femininity. As one of three eternally virginal goddesses (the others being Artemis and Hestia), Athena does not partake in child-bearing, an archetypal feminine act.[617] Equally, though the child of Metis and Zeus, Athena was famously born, not from her mother, but her father. Following Athena's conception - so the story goes - Zeus swallowed Metis and, consequently, gave birth to the goddess from his head.[618] That the goddess was perceived as possessing a masculine quality is attested in Aeschylus' *Eumenides,* wherein the goddess proclaims (736-738):

> μήτηρ γὰρ οὔτις ἐστὶν ἥ μ᾽ ἐγείνατο,
> τὸ δ᾽ ἄρσεν αἰνῶ πάντα, πλὴν γάμου τυχεῖν,
> ἅπαντι θυμῷ, κάρτα δ᾽ εἰμὶ τοῦ πατρός

> For there was no mother who gave me birth,
> I praise the male in all things - excepting marriage -
> with all my heart, and am entirely of the father

Herodas seems to have Athena's relationship with gender in mind when utilising her as a model for Cerdon. Though Athena is undeniably female in form, she is perceived as subverting expected gender roles, even in the manner of her birth, and blurs the distinction between male and female categorisation.

Cerdon is thus bestowed with a both masculine and feminine aspects in his association with Athena. The divine analogies do not stop there, however: as noted, following Metro's opening three lines, Cerdon delivers a 60-line description of his wondrous crafts and skills, and also entreats his customers to think of his dependents pestering him to put food on the table. What seems to be purely an emotional appeal is, however, coupled with an attempt at self-aggrandisement, as Cerdon suggests that he is akin to the mightiest of the gods in his role of bountiful provider, yet one who goes without thanks for his efforts (7.44-47):

> κοὔπω λέγω, τρισκαίδε[κ...... β]όσκω,
> 45   ὀτεύνεκ᾽, ὦ γυναῖκες, ἀργ[ίη πάντε]ς

---

[617] *H.Hymn.Aphr.*7ff. Notably, Athena was thought to have partaken in child-rearing, though not through the normal process of sexual intercourse. According to Pseudo-Apollodorus' version of the birth of Ericthonius (*Bib.*3.14.6), Hephaestus attempted to seduce Athena but failed to penetrate her, instead ejaculating upon her leg. Athena cleaned herself with wool which then fell upon the ground, whereupon the combination of semen and earth gave rise to Ericthonius, whom Athena then raised.

[618] Hes. *Th.*886-930, Pind. *O.*7.33ff., Ps.Ap. *Bib.*1.20.

οἵ, κἢν ὕῃ Ζεύς, τοῦτο μοῦ[νον ἄιοδουσ]ι
"φέρ' εἰ φέρεις τι"…

   I haven't spoken about the thirteen [whom] I feed,
45   since, ladies, [they are all idleness],
   who, even if Zeus sends rain, [sing] this [alone],
   "bring, if you've anything to bring"…[619]

The association between Zeus and Cerdon is reiterated following the conclusion of Cerdon's sales pitch. Metro reproaches the man, saying with annoyance ἀλλὰ μὴ βροντέων / οὗτος σὺ τρέψῃς μέζον εἰς φυγὴν ἡμέας, "but you, don't you make us flee with greater thundering" (7.65-66). This activity of thundering is intrinsically associated with Zeus,[620] notably by Callimachus in his *Aetia* prologue, where it is stated that βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ Διός, "thundering is not for me, but Zeus" (*Aet.*fr.1.20 Pf.). Metro, responding to Cerdon's attempt to liken himself to the god, swiftly derails his efforts at self-characterisation (which, as noted, is how Battarus and Herodas' persona behave in their Sophronically masculine mimiambs).

Metro's admonishment is multi-layered: she reprimands Cerdon for his engagement in such a Zeus-like activity as bombastic and long-winded speech, and simultaneously denies his efforts to practice the masculine activity of self-characterisation, as demonstrated by other men in the *Mimiambs*.[621] Later, Metro's rather sarcastic encouragement to Cerdon to πάλιν πρήμηνον ἀξίην φωνήν σεωυτοῦ, "once more blow out another utterance worthy of yourself" (7.98) - that is, resume his sales-patter - seems to emphasise the point, both to Cerdon and the reader, that the craftsman's speech is not the kingly pronouncement he might hope, but rather the pompous wittering of a blow-hard. Furthermore, Herodas re-emphasises Cerdon's similarity to Athena by having the cobbler himself make the association: Cerdon characterises himself as Athena-like in the closing moments of the mimiamb, reaffirming the association made by Coritto when he remarks of his work that αὐτὴν ἐρεῖς τὸ πέλμα τὴν Ἀθηναίην / τεμεῖν, "you'd think that Athena herself had made the sole" (7.116-117).[622] This, however, is unlike the self-characterisation undertaken by Battarus or Herodas' persona, as it is a characterisation which

---

[619] At l.45, Cunnignham (2004) prints ἀργ[.......]ς, Headlam and Knox (1922) propose ἀργ[ίη πάντε]ς. At l.46, Cunningham (2004) prints μοῦ[νον ….], Crusius (1892) supplements μοῦ[νον ἄιοδουσ]ι.
[620] E.g., Hom. *Il.*8.133, 13.796, 21.199, *Od.*14.305, 20.121.
[621] Following Metro's introductory words (7.1-3) and Cerdon's first, long speech (7.4-63), the dialogue becomes far more balanced, with Cerdon never again speaking at such great length.
[622] The distinction between Cerdon's licit and illicit wares is constantly and intentionally ambiguous; Zanker (2009), 214-215 disputes the position of Headlam and Knox (1922), l-lii, Cunningham (1964), 35, (1971a), 174 and Sumler (2010) who propose that the references to shoes play upon the ambiguity of Cerdon's merchandise as established in *Mimiamb* 6; I am inclined to follow Headlam, Knox et al., as ambiguity - in all forms - seems one of the core conceits of *Mimiamb* 7.

206

has already been sanctioned by another (importantly, female) character. Thus Cerdon is represented in a similar fashion to his product, with both becoming - through allegory and allusion - a hybridisation of gendered elements.

There is one aspect of Cerdon which does make Athena a suitable analogue, and that is the methods of craftsmanship employed by both mortal and goddess. Athena is famed as for her skill at weaving,[623] and Cerdon's craftsmanship is consistently denoted by the verb ῥάπτειν, meaning to stich or sew together.[624] Stern notes that a word so evocative of the poet's craft cannot be coincidentally utilised to characterise Cerdon's activity, and argues further that it serves a metapoetic function within the diptych.[625] In particular, he posits that Coritto's dismissal of one of the false-Cerdons, in which she says ἀλλ' οὗτος οὐδ' ἂν πλῆκτρον ἐς λύρην ῥάψαι, "but this one couldn't stitch a plectrum for a lyre" (6.51), has multiple meanings: the πλῆκτρον here metaphorically represents the βαυβών but, simultaneously, the activity of stitching serves as a metaphor for the production of poetry, which further emphasises the metapoetically symbolic role the βαυβών plays in the diptych. With this in mind, it seems natural to read Cerdon not only as an encapsulation of Herodas' poetry, but equally as a creation not unlike the authorial persona in *Mimiamb* 8. The identification of the βαυβών as mimiambic poetry and the repeated usage of the verb ῥάπτειν strongly encourage a reader to interpret Cerdon as a poet-type figure, and the entire diptych as an allegory for the production and reception of poetry. The final words of the mimiamb are particularly supportive of such an interpretation: Cerdon, encouraging Metro to visit again, remarks τὴν γὰρ οὖν βαίτην / θάλπουσαν εὖ δεῖ 'νδον φρονεῦντα καὶ ῥάπτειν, "for truly a right-thinking man must stitch inside the skin-coat which gives warmth" (7.128-129). The precise meaning of this phrase is uncertain, and how the comment relates to Cerdon's previous remark - that Metro should return to pick up her order - is unclear. A possible reading is that the phrase is a maxim, with a meaning akin to "do whatever profits you most", and is perhaps an encapsulation of Cerdon's character as whole. It has been agreed that the βαίτην, the "skin-coat" is metaphorical of the βαυβών, a reading supported by the usage of ῥάπτειν to describe its production.[626] There is,

---

[623] *H.HymnAphr*.8-15. See further Snyder (1981).

[624] E.g., at 6.18, 6.43, 6.47, 6.48, 7.129. See also 7.89 where Metro advises Cerdon to θύλακον ῥάψαι to keep his money from being stolen.

[625] E.g., the etymological origin of the word rhapsode in the verb ῥαψῳδεῖν," to stich song together". Stern (1979), 253.

[626] See Rist (1993), 442, Cunningham (1964), 35, (1971a), 192, (1971b), 24; cf. Schmidt (1968), 125.

however, an important element of intertextuality in this comment which has been overlooked, that reinforces just such an allegorical reading.

The word βαίτη appears in Sophron, as Pollux tells us βαίτας δὲ τὰς τῶν ἀγροίκων διφθέρας ἐν τοῖς γυναικείοις μίμιος ὁ Σώφρων ἐκάλεσεν, "Sophron in the women's mimes calls the jerkins of country-folk βαίτας" (x.175). Given that Herodas adapts structural aspects of Sophronic poetry in the diptych, the use of the term in conjunction with ῥάπτειν is, I argue, a metapoetic comment on the author's process of 'stitching' new poetry from Sophronic materials. This reading is secured by the fact that this is not the only instance in the *Mimiambs* in which Herodas allusively likens his poetry to a cloak made of skins, as we have already seen. In *Mimiamb* 8, the persona's goatskin ἐνδυτόν represents Herodas' poetry - much like the βαυβών - but also encapsulates and legitimises his activity of generic hybridisation. Cerdon's comment, therefore, emphasises the metapoetic motifs of the diptych, and connects *Mimiambs* 6 and 7 to *Mimiamb* 8, within the overarching programmatic self-reflection that Herodas undertakes within his corpus.

My reading of the diptych as part of a self-reflective, poetically critical process is further supported by the names of the women who previously possessed the βαυβών: Nossis, described as the daughter of Erinna, apparently revealed the βαυβών to Metro against Coritto's wishes (6.20, 31), and one cannot help but recognise the significance of these women's names. The allusion to famous female poets (and the subjects of their work) continues as, in the list of his wares, Cerdon names both Νοσσίδες and Βαυκίδες (7.57-58). Anna Rist suggests that Herodas here plays upon the supposition that these poets were lesbians, and proposes that this would make them an apt focus for Herodas' pointedly gendered humour.[627] Equally, their purported homosexuality would make their transfiguration into dildos - seemingly masculine objects which facilitate the exclusion of the masculine sexual role - metapoetically significant with regards to the motif of hybridity. Nossis and Erinna are not, however, the only poets Herodas represents in the diptych, and a play upon their sexuality is not the *raison d'être* of their inclusion, as is revealed when we recognise that a further female poetic voice can be detected in *Mimiamb* 7, occurring through quotation. When supposedly complimenting Metro (7.108-112), Cerdon says:

> δύ]ναιτο μ᾽ ἐλάσαι σὴ ἂν [ἰὴ] τὸν πίσ[υγγον
> ἐόντα λίθινον ἐς θεοὺς ἀναπτῆναι·
> 110 ἔχεις γὰρ οὐχὶ γλάσσαν, ἡδονῆς δ᾽ ἠθμόν.

---

[627] Rist (1993).

ἆ, θεῶν ἐκεῖνος οὐ μακρὴν ἀπ[εσθ᾽ ὠν]ήρ
ὅτεῳ σὺ χείλεα νύκτα κἠμέρην οἴγ[εις.⁶²⁸

Your [voice] could drive me, the shoemaker,
a man of stone, to fly up to the gods;

110   for you have not a tongue but a sieve of pleasure.
Ah, that [man's not] far from the gods
to whom you open your lips to, night and day.

Throughout the *Mimiambs*, voice and speech are repeatedly utilised as a means of identification and characterisation. Within the diptych, this is first alluded to when Coritto relates that Cerdon's voice is his distinguishing feature (6.61) and continues with Metro's admonishment of the cobbler's bluster, thwarting his attempt at self-characterisation (7.64-66, 97-98). This final recurrence of the motif can be perceived as its culmination, within these complementary poems. Cerdon begins by emphasising the miraculous ability Metro possesses to give wings even to a man of stone as a result of her 'voice', an interpretation which takes the tongue as metaphorical of voice and speech, as it is at 7.77-78.⁶²⁹ However, it is not Metro's voice but rather that of Cerdon which gives rise to our final allusive female poet. In his comment, "that man's not far from the gods to whom you open your χείλεα to, night and day" the word χείλεα can mean both the lips of the mouth and of the labia.⁶³⁰ The play on the dual meaning of χείλεα is, however, not the full extent of Herodas' ingenuity: as we might expect by this point, achieving effect through basic vulgarity is not Herodas' aim and, true to form, we can detect a much more sophisticated act of profanisation at work in the passage, if we consider it in light of the work of the most famous female Greek poet of all, Sappho (fr.31.1-12):

φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν
ἔμμεν᾽ ὤνηρ, ὄττις ἐνάντιός τοι
ἰσδάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἆδυ φωνεί-
σας ὑπακούει

5   καὶ γελαίσας ἰμέροεν, τό μ᾽ ἦ μὰν
καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν·
ὡς γὰρ ἔς σ᾽ ἴδω βρόχε᾽, ὥς με φώναι-
σ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἓν ἔτ᾽ εἴκει,
ἀλλά κὰμ μὲν γλῶσσα †ἔαγε†, λέπτον

10   δ᾽ αὔτικα χρῷ πῦρ ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν,
ὀππάτεσσι δ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἓν ὄρημμ᾽, ἐπιρρόμ-
βεισι δ᾽ ἄκουαι

---

⁶²⁸ At l.108, Cunningham (2004) supplements δύ]ναιτο μ᾽ ἐλάσαι σαν[..] τὸν πίσ[υγγον]: Headlam and Knox (1922) and Zanker (2009) propose δύ]ναιτο μ᾽ ἐλάσαι σὴ ἂν [ἰὴ] τὸν πίσ[υγγον. At l.111, Cunningham (2004) gives ἀπ..[..].. .; Blass (1891) supplements ἄπεσ[τ᾽ ὠν]ήρ, Zanker (2009) proposes ἄπ[εσθ᾽ ὠν]ήρ.
⁶²⁹ τί τονθορύζεις κοὐκ ἐλευθέρῃ γλάσσῃ / τὸν τῖμον ὅστις ἐστὶν ἐξεδίφησας; - "why are you grumbling instead of having searched out the price with free tongue?" (7.77-78).
⁶³⁰ See e.g., Arist. *HA*.583a16-25.

He seems to me the equal of the gods
the man who, facing you, is seated
and, close at hand, listens to
your sweet voice,
5   and your charming laugh - it makes my heart
tremble in my breast as,
the moment I look at you,
I can't make a sound,
but my tongue breaks, a delicate fire
10   runs under my skin,
I see nothing with my eyes
and my ears make a roaring

Considering Cerdon's words again, in conjunction with Sappho 31, it seems that Herodas has borrowed his predecessor's love-stricken voice, only to degrade it by having it utter through the mouthpiece of the cobbler, profaning Sappho's verses through a vulgar reiteration. Metro, in the role of the beloved, retains her counterpart's ability to evoke wonder with her oral abilities but, instead of managing this with a charming laugh, she does so with a tongue which is a 'sieve of pleasure'. Given the dual meaning of χείλεα, it seems that 'voice' is not quite the interpretation that Herodas intends for this metaphor, despite what a reader might expect given the earlier, less overtly sexualised usage at 7.77-78. In this way he plays upon a reader's expectations, subverting the innocent meaning suggested by the prior iteration of the metaphor. It is particularly significant that Sappho's words are spoken by Cerdon as, in similar fashion to his association with Athena, the introduction of the poet's voice evokes a hybridisation of male and female. However, at the same moment, the cobbler's adoption of the Sapphic voice creates a tension between high and low poetic influences.

Herodas subverts Sappho's verses, profaning her as he does Nossis, and Erinna, and the goddess Athena. Indeed, Athena's profanisation does not end with her employment as a model for Cerdon: the shock of this comparison is compounded by the suggestion that the goddess might not only craft such wares, but also purchase them. Cerdon, when rebuffing potential attempts at haggling, says (7.79-82):

γύναι, μιῆς μνῆς ἐστιν ἄξιον τοῦτο
80   το ζεῦγος· ἢ ἄνω ’σ‹τ›’ ἢ κάτω βλέπειν· χαλκοῦ
ῥίνημ’ ὃ δήκοτ’ ἐστὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίης
ὠνευμένης αὐτῆς ἂν οὐκ ἀποστάξαι.

Lady, this pair is worth one mina;
80   you can look up or down,
not the slightest sliver of copper would come off

if Athena herself were the customer.

The goddess is thus ultimately reduced to the same level as Nossis and Erinna, all of them grouped together with the σκύτεα γυναῖκες καὶ κύνες τί βρώζουσιν, "women and dogs who eat leather" (7.63) who hanker after Cerdon's wares.[631] The complex motivations behind the poetry of Sappho, Erinna and Nossis - love, longing, lamentation, female experience - is supplanted, in Cerdon's appropriation, with a desire only for monetary gain. His listing of Νοσσίδες and Βαυκίδες amongst the other items he sells implies that he will happily stitch his wares out of any material which comes to hand, regardless of its appropriateness (and indeed, he seems to prefer using material which might be considered inappropriate for the task), as long as he can turn a profit from it. The 'love' he shows Metro at the opening of the mimiamb is similarly not born of affection for her, but rather a desire for her custom, a notion which is re-emphasised in his adoption of the Sapphic voice to achieve his base purposes.

Drawing together the multiple strands which I have outlined here, we can recognise that Herodas engages in a multifaceted representation of hybridity in the diptych of *Mimiambs* 6 and 7. The juxtaposition and intermingling of male and female serves as a reflection on Herodas' innovation on the practice of Sophron in his mimes: no longer strictly divided along gender lines, women and men now mix, and likewise so do masculinity and femininity on a conceptual level. This, however, is not the end of the hybridisation at play in the diptych. Through the introduction of famed female poets in less than salubrious guises, Herodas juxtaposes the high literary poetics of Nossis, Erinna and particularly Sappho with the base, vulgar poetics of mime. In the character of Cerdon and his much-desired creation, the βαυβών, these notionally opposed concepts - masculinity, femininity, high and low poetics - coincide and are reformatted, reissued with a quintessentially Herodan character.

---

[631] See further on this description Zanker (2009), 207, 215.

6.2 *A knock at the door: generic disunity in Mimiamb 1*

Similarities between *Mimiamb* 8 and *Mimiamb* 1 have led some to speculate that the two may have been introductory works for two different books of Herodas' poetry, as discussed in the introduction to Chapter 5.[632] While I would suggest rather that *Mimiamb* 8 achieves greater programmatic impact following after other works which explore Herodas' poetic practice, this does not detract from the correspondences between *Mimiambs* 1 and 8, and the two can readily be approached as complementary programmatic examinations of the same theme, that being Herodas' activity of generic mixing.

In *Mimiamb* 1, Herodas depicts the tensions engendered by the hybrid nature of his poems - namely, the collision of 'low' and 'high' modes - through the representation of two characters, whose interaction simultaneously becomes an allegory for the meeting of the two genres which form Herodas' mimiambic poetry. The existence of these tensions are, however, predicated on the notion that Herodas could well have expected reprisals for his intermingling of mimic and choliambic elements (much as *Mimiambs* 4 and 8 similarly presuppose a degree of hostility towards his efforts). To what extent this generic combination was received as transgressive by Herodas' contemporaries has not been preserved: however, while it is not impossible that the author's activity might have been a target for actual criticism, it seems more likely that such dissenting voices - and particularly their presentation and subsequent refutation within his poetry - functioned principally as a straw-man against which he might define and authorise his activity, much as Callimachus does in the *Aetia* prologue, or *Iamb* 13.[633] The situation of *Mimiamb* 1 is a parallel to these works, and the tension that Herodas creates between the two genres which he combines is, I propose, entirely artificial, and he then utilises this tension to further reflect upon his own poetic activity. In service of his examination of generic hybridisation, he purposefully characterises the representative of choliambic as a morally upright figure, in contrast to the base and vulgar embodiment of mime.[634] The failure of these characters to coexist seems at first to reflect the failure of generic unity but, considering the poem in the context of the overarching programmatic and metapoetic motifs of the *Mimiambs*, it is apparent that Herodas utilises this failure paradoxically to demonstrate his own authorial

---

[632] See above, n.524.

[633] See also Hunter (2003), 228, who suggests that 'low' poetry, which claimed representation of a "popular voice", made it a "paradoxically perfect vehicle for the exploitation of the new possibilities of written poetry and new types of audience."

[634] On the similar establishment of the high literary mode of choliambic in Callimachus' *Iambs*, see Chapter 2.2, and Chapter 4.1: on Theocritus' moral recasting of Hipponax in epigram, see the introduction to Chapter 2.

mastery of the activity of generic unification. Notably, the process of characterisation within *Mimiamb* 1 mirrors what we observed in *Mimiamb* 8, where the genres are comparably embodied by Hipponax and Dionysus. However, there we can note that Herodas advances the process a stage further, and successfully unites the genres within one character, his own authorial persona. In light of this, I propose that *Mimiamb* 1 should be interpreted as a precursor to the programmatic activity of *Mimiamb* 8, as a piece which sets the stage for the overarching activity of intertextual self-reflection which occurs throughout Herodas' corpus.

Mimiamb 1 opens with a knock at the door: the scene is the house of Metriche, a former prostitute,[635] and her visitor is Gyllis, (the titular ΠΡΟΚΥΚΛΙ[Σ] or ΜΑΣΤΡΟΠΟΣ, which we might render as "Procuress"), who attempts to convince Metriche to leave her absentee paramour Mandris for a new lover. Richard Hunter's suggestion that Gyllis' arrival at the outset of the mimiamb "literally 'opens the door' to a new poetic form" is particularly compelling:[636] Gyllis encapsulates the purported lowness of Herodas' poetics, functioning as the mimic genre's *agent provocateur*, seeking to tempt Metriche into corrupting herself by committing adultery, submitting to the character-conventions of mime, and thereby debasing her choliambic nature. Herodas emphasises Gyllis' mimic character - her salaciousness (1.18, 22-25) and her propensity to drink (1.85-89) - which contrasts with Metriche's choliambic origins, evident in her invective assault on Gyllis: Metriche explicitly demonstrates her generic associations when she threatens to χωλὴν δ' ἀείδειν χώλ' ἂν ἐξεπαίδευσα, "teach (Gyllis) to sing her limping songs with a limp" (1.71). The reference to 'limping songs' immediately brings to mind the metre of the *Mimiambs*, and the description is comparable to the manner in which Herodas describes his own verses as τ]ὰ κύλλ' (8.79).[637] Metriche's acknowledgement of the metre Herodas' poetry (the metre of her own speech) pierces the illusion of the scene. In so doing, Herodas illuminates the allegory established through the meeting of these two characters: by emphasising that, while Gyllis is an embodiment of mime, Metriche is correspondingly - and even knowingly - a representative of choliambic.

Herodas further makes the reader explicitly aware that he intends Gyllis and Metriche's clash to be interpreted as an allegory for the meeting of the genres through the genealogies of each character. Metriche identifies herself as the daughter of Pythees (1.74), a name of particular significance in the generic context of the *Mimiambs*, as this name is also attested as that of

---

[635] See further on Metriche's background Esposito (2010), Zanker (2009), 32-39.
[636] Hunter (1993b), 34. See also Ussher (1985), 48-50.
[637] Compare. Call. *Iamb.*203.14 Pf.

Hipponax' father.[638] Contrastingly, Gyllis identifies herself as the mother of Philaenis (1.6), an infamous courtesan and supposed author of a pornographic treatise on love.[639] These familial relations imbue Herodas' characters with the vituperative essence of Hipponactean verse and the titillating vulgarity of the mimic genre respectively.

The allegorical clash of Metriche and Gyllis, with their notable ancestry and progeny, has a parallel in a 3rd Century sepulchral book-epigram of Aeschiron (1 *GP* = *AP* 7.345), written in the choliambic metre and purporting to be the inscription on Philaenis' tomb:

<div style="text-align:center">

ἐγὼ Φιλαινὶς, ἡ 'πίβωτος ἀνθρώποις,
ἐνταῦθα γήρᾳ τῷ μακρῷ κεκοίμημαι.
μή μ', ὦ μάταιε ναῦτα, τὴν ἄκραν κάμπτων
χλεύην τε ποιεῦ καὶ γέλωτα καὶ λάσθην,
5   οὐ γάρ, μὰ τὸν Ζῆν' οὐ μὰ τοὺς κάτω κούρους,
οὐκ ἦν ἐς ἄνδρας μάχλος οὐδὲ δημώδης.
Πολυκράτης δὲ τὴν γονὴν Ἀθηναῖος,
λόγων τι παιπάλημα καὶ κακὴ γλῶσσα,
ἔγραψεν οἷ' ἔγραψ'· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐκ οἶδα.

I, Philaenis, slandered by men,
have been laid to rest here by long old age.
Rash sailor, when rounding my headland,
make jest or joke or insult,
5   for, by Zeus - no, by the Kouroi below -
I was not lewd towards men, nor a prostitute.
Polycrates, an Athenian by birth,
himself the very subtlety of words and an evil tongue,
he wrote, whatever it was he wrote - for I don't know.

</div>

Spoken by Philaenis, the epigram is seemingly a defence against those who would defame her character, claiming another to be responsible for the treatise from which her reputation stems. The epigram, however, is rife with double entendre, heaping further infamy on Philaenis' memory. The double-tongued character of the epigram is alluded to by its metrical form: the reader is metapoetically forewarned that Philaenis will not be able to defend herself successfully, as the choliambic metre of the work prompts a reader to expect slander and invective, anticipating the double meaning of the poem and interpreting Philaenis' words contrary to what she herself intends.[640] In an epigram of Dioscorides (26 *GP* = *AP* 7.450)

---

[638] *Sud*.s.v. Ἱππώναξ, (I 588 Adler). Compare also Ov. *Ibis* 447-448 La Penna, *et quae Pytheides fecit de fratre Medusae / evenianti capti vota sinistra tuo*. On this passage, see further Rosen (1988).
[639] The opening of which is preserved at *P.Oxy*. 2891, fr.1 col.1, 1-4. See also Ath. 8.335e, and further Finnegan (1992), 24, Plant (2004), 45-47.
[640] See further Bruss (2010b), 129-130 who offers a translation which captures the suggestive character of the epigram in full: "I Philaenis, called to by men - here in my long old age, I've been laid. Silly sailor boy, when you

Philaenis has grown bitter, vigorously denying her slanderous reputation, and the epigram ends with Philaenis hoping for the day when she is free of this undeserved notoriety, exclaiming τἀμὰ δὲ λυγρήν / ὀστέα τερφθείη κληδόν᾽ ἀπωσαμένης, "may my bones rejoice when I've shaken off my sorry reputation" (7.450.7-8). Dioscorides' epigram cruelly traps Philaenis in an eternal state of anticipation for a vindication that will never come. In making Gyllis the mother of Philaenis, Herodas subtly characterises Gyllis' crude nature through allusion, and plays upon her infamous relation's reputation as a target of slander. Moreover, slander which she cannot successfully refute. Philaenis' inability to redress insults - or to repel the invective of choliambic verse - is a trait which Herodas reapplies to Gyllis, and Philaenis' daughter is thus similarly unable to counter choliambic attacks.

There is one final allegorical aspect of the characters of *Mimiamb* 1 which foreshadows *Mimiamb* 8. The leitmotif of the poetic dream, which plays a central role in *Mimiamb* 8, makes an appearance here, when Metriche says (1.9-12):

> τί σὺ θεὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους;
> 10   ἤδη γάρ εἰσι πέντε κου, δοκέω, μῆνες
> ἐξ εὖ σε, Γυλλίς, οὐδ᾽ ὄναρ, μὰ τὰς Μοίρας,
> πρὸς τὴν θύρην ἐλθοῦσαν εἶδέ τις ταύτην.
>
> What's a goddess like you doing amongst men?
> 10   I reckon it's about five months Gyllis,
> by the Fates it is, since anyone
> saw you coming to this door - not even in a dream.

Walter Headlam, Alfred Knox and Graham Zanker note that οὐδ᾽ ὄναρ is an idiomatic phrase with the meaning "not at all",[641] but I suggest that here Herodas plays upon the literal meaning of the phrase, "not even in a dream". In comparing Gyllis' visit to that of a god in a dream, and Gyllis herself to a goddess, Herodas parodies the initiative role the gods play in poetic dreams by contrasting that lofty purpose with Gyllis' efforts to tempt Metriche away from Mandris. Understanding the parodic nature of Gyllis' visit lends further credence to Hunter's suggestion regarding the character's entrance, as Gyllis provides the impetus for the narrative action of the mimiamb through her physical incursion of Metriche's home, and further does so through her attempt to instruct the Hipponactean Metriche in the baser side of poetics. This attempt fails: if Gyllis is notionally the god come to instruct a fledgling poet, Metriche's threat that she will

---

wriggle round my headland (if you know what I mean), don't jest or joke or insult. For, by Zeus, no - no, by the boys below! - I was not lewd towards men or loose - but Polycrates, an Athenian by birth, was! A subtle chap with words who gave a bad tongue - he wrote whatever I - or he - wrote. See? I don't know!"
[641] Headlam and Knox (1922), 16-17, Zanker (2009), 24.

teach Gyllis to sing her limping songs with a limp (i.e., provide 'correct' instruction in poetry) is highly ironic, reversing the expected character roles of the dream, and subverting the stock scene of its expected outcome.[642] Both characters are required (by their presence within Herodas' poetry) to use the choliambic metre, but only Metriche, symbolically Hipponactean, has any hope of mastering it. Gyllis, like her daughter Philaenis, is destined to fail in her attempt to turn the limping song to her advantage.

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

---

[642] The closest non-parodic initiation scene is that of Archilochus, as discussed in Chapter 4.2, where the young poet insults his divine visitors: however, that scene still culminates in Archilochus' receipt of the Muses' token, and there is no such unifying resolution to the meeting of Metriche and Gyllis here.

The poems discussed in this chapter are fundamentally intertextual, whether overtly, as in the diptych of *Mimiambs* 6 and 7, or more subtly, as with the relationship between *Mimiambs* 1 and 8. Indeed, all three pave the way for the explicit revelation and celebration of Herodas' poetic programme in *Mimiamb* 8, and further testify to the complex interrelation of the *Mimiambs* as works within a unified collection. In *Mimiambs* 6 and 7, Herodas creates a pastiche of his own poetry through the interaction and juxtaposition of symbolic characters and objects, allegorically representing his activity of generic and tonal hybridisation. The Sophronic division of male and female found in the mimographer's poetry becomes a point of departure for Herodas' own cross-gendered poetics: the distinction is encapsulated in the βαυβών, a conceptually male and female object which transgresses the mono-gendered Sophronic division the two mimiambs recollect, and which reflects the hybridity at play throughout Herodas' corpus. Cerdon is characterised as a melange of male and female, and of high and low poetics: the unity of these disparate elements within a single character serve to encapsulate the leitmotifs of the *Mimiambs* as a corpus, and equally foreshadows the comparably encapsulating role Herodas' persona plays in *Mimiamb* 8.

In *Mimiamb* 1, Herodas sets allegorical representations of mimic and choliambic poetry at odds: Gyllis fails to tempt Metriche with her Hipponactean heritage to commit adultery, while Gyllis herself flounders when confronted with invective and abuse. Herodas presents an allegorical failure of generic unification, with each genre remaining distinct. However, this purported failure is, paradoxically, representative of the wholesale success of Herodas' hybridising endeavors. The clash of Gyllis and Metriche allows Herodas to exhibit his skill at generic hybridisation. The failure of unity within the mimiamb is in contrast to the success which the reader perceives in the poem's reception, as the allegorical disunity of genre provides fertile ground for Herodas to demonstrate his innovativeness, creating tension between high and low modes and capitalising on the supposed incongruity of the juxtaposition of mime and choliambic. The key to interpreting the mimiamb as a multi-layered consideration of generic interaction lies in the implication that Gyllis' visit is like a poetic dream. This emphasises that the mimiamb has an allegorical and programmatic quality, and further suggests the outset of a poetic career, reminiscent of the beginnings of Hesiod, Archilochus and others, and foreshadowing Herodas' own dream in *Mimiamb* 8. The reader is therefore invited to interpret the work as an encapsulation of Herodas' poetic activity and, in doing so, appreciate the generic unity and disunity at play within the *Mimiambs* as a triumphant exhibition of Herodas' poetic skill.

217

In these poems, the figure of the author is elusive but, much as with Asclepiades' authorial-editorial manifestation within his collection, or Callimachus' ambiguous yet pervasive presence within the *Tomb of Simonides*, Herodas permeates the *Mimiambs* as an organising, authorising figure. Though *Mimiamb* 8 exhibits this figures overtly, I have demonstrated in this chapter - and within Part II of this thesis as a whole - that for Herodas, as for the authors considered in Part I, the process of authorial self-representation was composite, modulated between the overt and the elusive. The representation of Herodas the author is therefore not solely the product of a single poem, but rather an aggregate figure, perceptible within the reception of the book-roll as a whole.

Conclusion

From my analysis of the personae of Erinna, Callimachus and Posidippus, Nossis and Asclepiades, and lastly Herodas, a picture of the self-representative habit in the early years of the Hellenistic period has emerged, illuminating the complexity of authorial engagement with the book-roll medium. Fundamentally, this investigation has shown that the process was multifaceted, and that authors found many and varied ways to engage with the bookish form of their work in the act of self-representation. This being said, I have emphasised the centrality of two underpinning aspects which attend all these self-representations, and I will draw my investigation to a close by summarising them here.

Firstly, I have shown that the authors of book-poetry in the early Hellenistic period persistently encouraged readerly reflection upon the medial dimension of their work (particularly the divergence between the presumed setting of a poem, and the reader's reception situation) and utilised this reflective process as a means through which to substantiate their own authorial presence, within their poems. We can observe this with clarity in book-epigram: the epitaphs for Baucis play with the artificiality of the material context the texts evoke and, in so doing, re-materialise Erinna in the process of reception; Nossis emphasises her own epigrammatic materiality as a means of asserting her authorial individuality; Asclepiades' epigrams on Erinna and Antimachus (and their poetry) play with the very distinction between an author and their work, and evince a comparable reintroduction of the author as a presence within the text as that which occurs in the epigrams ascribed to Erinna. However, epigram is not the sole venue in which we see reflection on medial form utilised for self-representative purposes. Numerous other examples of book-poetry acknowledge their existence as texts, requiring a reader to suspend their disbelief - to ignore that they are reading, not hearing, nor seeing - while those texts simultaneously emphasise their written character. "Can't you see the writing on the base?", asks Coccale of Cynno in Herodas' *Mimiamb* 4 (23-24): the reader, unacknowledged, but still addressed by this question implicitly, can in fact see the writing, but will never 'see' the base. This disjunction between the perception expected within the text, and what the reader perceives, is also an integral facet of Herodas' presentation of his authorial persona. The author depicts a festival in which poetic genres, his critics, poetic predecessor and guarantor come together, but this is ultimately removed from the reader's perception, sealed within the dream and behind his persona's act of its retelling. In detaching the reader from the moment of the narrative, the author asserts his control - and that of his persona - over events, and the textual format of the *Mimiambs* thus becomes a key facet of Herodas' programmatic strategy.

Likewise, in Callimachus' *Tomb of Simonides*, the author utilises the subversion of medial conventions as a means of encapsulating his own authorial activity. In the presentation of Simonides' tomb, a sepulchre obliterated - yet now also remade and rebuilt into the new commemorative edifice of the *Aetia* - the memorial retains its original function (the aggrandisement of Simonides) but with an addendum (the covert celebration of Callimachus) which emphasises the author's innovative renegotiation of the material associations of epigram, within the bookish context of his work.

Secondly, and I would suggest most significantly, my analysis has demonstrated the extent to which authorial self-representation became an intertextual process, on a number of levels, as a direct result of the book-roll format. The aggregate context which the roll establishes gives rise to authorial personae that are themselves composite, which emerge from a collective reception of poems - works that refer, not only to poetry at-large, but to one another. These recurrent processes of inter and intra-referral are a testament to the symbiotic relationship between an authorial persona and the collection within which they occur, and moreover, their recurrence demonstrates the widespread recognition of the book-roll as a medium through which an author could engage in a dynamic form self-representation. This is a demonstrable facet of the processes undertaken by Nossis and Asclepiades, instances in which we find authorial personae responding to their authors' other works, and indeed to their own alter-incarnations. We find a similar process in Posidippus' *Seal*, wherein the author demonstrates the superior skill of his persona and his craft through the recollection of his own representation of Philitas. Utilising his predecessor as a foil, and recalling the programmatic treatment of realism, truth and representation undertaken in his wider corpus, I have demonstrated that Posidippus undertakes a comparable instance of composite self-representation, wherein the epigrams of the *Andriantopoiika* serve as a frame for the programmatic statement of the *Seal*. Equally, Callimachus knowingly recalls Camarina at the outset of the *Tomb of Simonides*, situating the work within the *Aetia* more broadly, while also framing his presentation of Simonides within the tradition of that poet's work. In so doing, I have shown how the author encapsulates the dual contexts of his poem, at once located within the *Aetia*, but also embedded within Simonidean poetics, in a process which establishes Callimachus himself as a memorialiser *par excellence*. Analysing Herodas' poetry, I have highlighted the intricate and sustained degree of intertextuality his collection exhibits, and how the author's overt act of self-representation is intimately connected to the process of poetic reflection undertaken across the *Mimiambs*. The generically allegorical clash of Metriche and Gyllis in *Mimiamb* 1 sets the stage for the

symbolic unification of genres embodied by Herodas' persona in *Mimiamb* 8, but the hybrid nature of mimiambic poetry finds further exploration in the diptych of *Mimiambs* 6 and 7, and in *Mimiamb* 4. *Mimiamb* 8, and the creation of Herodas' authorial persona, thus serves as the culmination of a process which runs throughout the *Mimiambs*, framing the self-representative act.

In this thesis, endeavouring to move beyond the basic assessment that the book-roll was an important influence on notions of authorship (and upon the place of the author in their work) in the early Hellenistic period, I have offered a more nuanced consideration of precisely how this influence can be observed in authors' acts of self-representation. In closing, it is my hope that this investigation has demonstrated the subtlety and skill of the authors of the bookish turn, and that it will provide a starting point for further exploration of issues of self-representation, and the role of media, in one of the most fascinating and poetically vibrant periods of the ancient world.

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, B., 1996. 'Callimachus, Hipponax and the Persona of the Iambographer', in *MD* 37, pp.205-216

- 2002. *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* (Berkeley)
- 2010. *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry* (Princeton)
- 2011. 'Epilogue', in *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus and S. Stephens (Leiden), pp.587-601
- 2012. 'Outlines of Theatrical Performance in Theocritus', in *Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy,* (ed.) K. Bosher (Cambridge), pp.391-408

Acosta-Hughes, B., Angiò, F., Cuypers, M. and Kosmetatou, E. (eds.), 2016. *New Poems of Posidippus*, version 13 (January 2016), http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/1341 (last accessed June 2016)

Acosta-Hughes, B. and Barbantani, S., 2007. 'Inscribing Lyric', in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.429-457

Acosta-Hughes, B., Baumbach, M. and Kosmetatou, E., 2004. 'Introduction', in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.1-7

Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S., 2012. *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets* (Cambridge)

Aicher, P., 1989. 'Ennius' Dream of Homer' in *AJPh* 110, pp.227-232

Alexiou, M. 2002. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, second rev. edition, (eds.) D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos (Oxford)

Allen, A., (ed.) 1993. *The Fragments of Mimnermus: Text and Commentary* (Stuttgart)

Allport, G.W., 1937. *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (London)

Anagnostou-Laoutides, E., 2015. 'Herodas' *Mimiamb* 7: Dancing Dogs and Barking Women', in *CQ* 65, pp.153-166

Angiò, F., 1997. 'Posidippo di Pella e la Vecchiaia (a Proposito di PBerol inv. 14283)', in *PapLup* 6, pp.7-13

- 2002. 'La Statua in Bronzo di Idomeneo, Opera di Cresila (Posidippo di Pella, P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, col. X, ll. 26-29)', in *MH* 59, pp.-41
- 2011. 'Da un Epilogo all'altro (Posidipp. 118 A.-B. e Call. Aitia, fr. 112 Pf. = 215 M.)', in *PP* 66, pp.47-9.

Argentieri, L., 1998. 'Epigramma e Libro. Morfologia delle Ravvolte Epigrammatiche Premeleagree', in *ZPE* 121, pp.1-20

- (ed.) 2003. *Gli Epigrammi degli Antipatri* (Bari)

Arnott, W.G., 1971. 'Herodas and the Kitchen Sink', in *G&R* 18, pp.121-132

Arthur, M.B., 1980. 'The Tortoise and the Mirror: Erinna PSI 1090', in *CW* 74, pp.53-65

Ast, R., 2013. 'A New Fragment of Herodas' Mimes and a Snippet of Homer (P.CtYBR inv.457)' in *MH* 70, pp.145-156

Athanassakis, A.N. and Wolkow, B.M., (eds.) 2013. *The Orphic Hymns* (Baltimore)

Austin, C. and Bastianini, G., (eds.) 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae Supersunt Omnia* (Milan)

Austin, C. and Kassel, R., (eds.) 1983-. *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin)

Bagnall, R.S., 2002. 'Alexandria: Library of Dreams', in *TAPhS* 146, pp.348-362

Barbantani, S., 1993. 'I Poeti Lirici del Canone Alessandrino nell'Epigrammatistica', in *Aevum Antiquum* 6, pp.5-97

- 2010. *Three Burials: Ibycus, Stesichorus, Simonides* (Alessandria)

Barchiesi, A., 2001. 'The Crossing', in *Texts, Ideas and the Classics*, (ed.) S.J. Harrison (Oxford), pp.142-163

Barigazzi, A., 1955. 'Un Nuovo Frammento di Eroda' in *MH* 12, pp.113-114

- 1968. 'Il Testamento di Posidippo di Pella', in *Hermes* 96, pp.190-216
- 1975. 'Saghe Sicule e Beotiche ne Simposio delle Muse di Callimacho', in *Prometheus* 1, pp.5-26

Barthes, R., 1968. 'La Mort de l'Auteur', in *Mantéia* V; trans. S. Heath in Barthes, R., 1977. *Image-Music-Text* (London)

- 1977. *Image-Music-Text*, trans. S. Heath (London)

Bassi, K., 1998. *Acting Like Men: Gender, Drama and Nostalgia in Ancient Greece* (Ann Arbor)

Bastianini, G. and Gallazzi, C. (eds.) with C. Austin, (2001). *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi (P.Mil.Vogl.VIII 309), Papiri dell'Università degli Studi di Milano* (Milan)

Baumbach, M., 2000. '"Wanderer, kommst du nach Sparta…": Zur Rezeption eines Simonides-Epigramms', in *Poetica* 32, pp.1-22

Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A. and Petrovic, I., 2010. 'Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram: An Introduction', in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, (eds.) M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.1-19

- (eds.) 2010. *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge)

Belloni, L., 2008. 'Il 'Vecchio' Filita nel Nuovo Posidippo: la Verità, le Muse, il Re (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, col. X 16-25 = 63 A.-B.),' in *ZPE* 164, pp.21-27

Benecke, E.F.M., 1896. *Antimachus of Colophon and the Position of Women in Greek Poetry* (London)

Benedetto, G., 1993. *Il Sogno e l'Invettiva; Momenti di Storia dell'Esegesi Callimachea* (Florence)

Bergk, T., (ed.) 1853. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (Leipzig)

Bernabé, A. and Jiménez San Cristóbal, A.I., 2008. *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets* (Leiden)

Bettenworth, A., 2006. 'Die Darstellung Nonverbaler Handlungen bei Herondas', in *Beyond the Canon*, (eds.) M. A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven), pp.1-20

- 2007. 'The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram' in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.69-94

Biles, Z.P, 2011. *Aristophanes and the Poetics of Competition* (Cambridge)

Bing, P., 1988a. 'Theocritus' Epigrams on the Statues of Ancient Poets', in *A&A* 34, pp.117-123

- 1988b. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen)
- 1993. 'The Bios-Tradition and Poets' Lives in Hellenistic Poetry', in *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honour of Martin Oswald*, (eds.) R.M. Rosen and J. Farrell (Ann Arbor), pp.619-631
- 1995. '"Ergänzungsspiel" in the Epigrams of Callimachus', in *A&A* 41, pp.115-131
- 1998. 'Between Literature and the Monuments', in *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, (eds.) A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Groningen), pp.21-43
- 2001. 'Text or Performance / Text and Performance. Alan Cameron's Callimachus and His Critics', in *Greek Literature in the Hellenistic Period*, (ed.) G. Nagy (New York), pp.75-84
- 2002. 'The Un-Read Muse? Inscribed Epigram and its Readers in Antiquity', in *Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven), pp.38-66
- 2003. 'The Unruly Tongue: Philitas of Cos as Scholar and Poet', in *CPh* 98, pp.330-348
- 2005. 'The Politics and Poetics of Geography in the Milan Posidippus, Section One: On Stones (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, Col. I-IV 6)', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.119-140
- 2009. *The Scroll and the Marble* (Ann Arbor)

- (forthcoming). 'Homer in the Σωρός', in *Traditions Épiques et Poésie Épigrammatique. Présence des Épopées Archaïques dans les Épigrammes Grecques et Latines*, (ed.) Y. Durbec, (Leuven)

Bing, P. and Bruss, J.S., (eds.) 2007. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden)

Blass, F., 1892. 'Review of F. Bücheler, Herondae Mimiambi', in *GGA*, pp.230-237

Blum, R., 1991. *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, trans. H.H. Wellisch (Madison)

Bourguet, É., et al., (eds.) 1929-. *Fouilles de Delphes, III. Épigraphie* (Paris)

Bowie, E.L, 1985. 'Theocritus' 7th Idyll, Philetas and Longus', in *CQ* 35, pp.67-91

- 1986. 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', in *JHS* 106, pp.13-35
- 1996. 'The Theognidea: A Step Towards a Collection of Fragments?', in *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente Sammeln*, (ed.) G.W. Most (Göttingen), pp.53-66
- 2007. 'From Archaic Elegy to Hellenistic Sympotic Epigram?', in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.95-112

Bowman, L., 1998. 'Nossis, Sappho and Hellenistic Poetry', in *Ramus* 27, pp.39-59

- 2004. 'The "Women's Tradition" in Greek Poetry', in *Phoenix* 58, pp.1-27

Bowra, C.M., 1936. 'Erinna's Lament for Baucis', in *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray* (Oxford), pp.325-342

- 1964. *Pindar* (Oxford)

Bravi, L., 2006. *Gli Epigrammi di Simomide e le Vie della Tradizione* (Rome)

Brown, C.G., 1988. 'Hipponax and Iambe', in *Hermes* 116, pp.478-481

- 1994. 'The Big Sleep: Herodas 8.5' in *ZPE* 102, pp.95-99

Bruss, J.S., 2004. 'Lessons from Ceos: Written and Spoken Word in Callimachus', in *Callimachus II*, (eds.) M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven) pp.49-70

- 2005. *Hidden Presences. Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram* (Leuven)
- 2010a. "Ecphrasis in Fits and Starts? Down to 300 BC" in *Archaic and Classical Epigram*, (eds.) M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.385-403
- 2010b. 'Epigram', in *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, (eds.) J.J. Claus and M. Cuypers (Oxford), pp.117-135

Burke, S., 1992. *The Death and Return of the Author* (Edinburgh)

- 1995. *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader* (Edinburgh)

Burkert, W., 1966. 'Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual', in *GRBS* 7, pp.87-121

- 1987. *Ancient Mystery Cult* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Burzacchini, G., 1977. 'Ἔσχατον δύεται κατὰ γᾶς (= Simon. 89 P.)', in *QUCC* 25, pp.31-41

Burzachechi, M., 1962. 'Oggetti Parlanti nelle Epigrafi Greche', in *Epigraphica* 24, pp.3-54

Cairns, F., 1979. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge)

Calame, C., 1995. *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca and London)

- 2005. *Masks of Authority: Fiction and Pragmatics in Ancient Greek Poetics*, trans. P.M. Burk (Ithaca)

Calvino, I., 1981. *If on a Winter's Night a Traveller*, trans. W. Weaver (London)

Cameron, A., 1993. (ed.) *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford)

- 1995. *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton)

Cameron, A. and Cameron, A., 1969. 'Erinna's Distaff', in *CQ* 19, pp.285-288

Campbell, C., 2013 (diss.). *Poet and Poetics in Greek Literary Epigram* (Cincinnati)

Carson, A., 1993. 'Simonides Painter', in *Innovations of Antiquity*, (eds.) R. Hexter and D. Selden (New York), pp.51-64

- 1999. *Economy of the Unlost: Reading Simonides of Ceos with Paul Celan* (Princeton)

Casey, E., 2004. 'Binding Speeches: Giving Voice to Deadly Thoughts in Greek Epitaphs', in *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*, (eds.) I. Sluiter and R.M. Rosen (Leiden), pp.63-90

Caspers, C., 2005. 'Hermesianax Fr. 7.75-8 Powell: Philitas, Bittis... and a Parrot?', in *Mnemosyne* 58, pp.575-581

Casson, L., 2001. *Libraries in the Ancient World* (New Haven)

Cavafy, C.P., 1968. *Anekdota: Poiemata,1882-1923*, (ed.) G.P. Savvides (Athens)

Cavallini, E., 1991. 'Ancora su Nosside A.P. V 170', in *Eikasmos* 2, pp.191-196

Cherniss, H., 1943, 'The Biographical Fashion in Literary Criticism', in *CPCP* 12, pp.272-291

Clay, D., 1998. 'The Theory of Literary Persona in Antiquity', in *MD* 40, pp.9-40

- 2004. *Archilochos Heros: The Cult of Heroes in the Greek Polis* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Clayman, D.L., 1980. *Callimachus' Iambi* (Leiden)

Cooper, C., (ed.) 2007. *Politics of Orality* (Leiden)

Corso, A., 2007. 'The Portraiture of Archilochus', in *Hyperboreus* 13, pp.11-30

Courtney, E., 1969. 'Three Poems of Propertius', in *BICS* 16, pp.70-87

- 1988. 'Some Literary Jokes in Ovid's Amores', in *BICS* 35, pp.18-23
- 1990. 'Greek and Latin Acrostichs', in *Philologus* 134, pp.3-13
- (ed.) 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford)

Cox Miller, P., 1994. *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture* (New Jersey)

Crane, G., 1986. 'Three Notes on Herodas 8', in *HSPh* 90, pp.85-90

Crusius, O., (ed.) 1892. *Untersuchungen zu den Mimiamben des Herodas* (Leipzig)

Crusius, O. and Herzog, R., 1924. 'Der Traum des Herondas', *Philologus* 79, 387-433

Cunningham, I.C., 1964. 'Herodas 6 and 7', in *CQ* 14, pp.32-35

- 1966. 'Herodas 4', in *CQ* 16, pp.113-125
- (ed.) 1971a. *Herodas: Mimiambi* (Oxford)
- 1971b. 'Review of Schmidt, Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas', in *CR* 21, pp.22-24
- (ed.) 2004. *Herodas Mimimabi, cum Appendice Fragmentorum Mimorum Papyraceorum* (Leipzig)

Cusset, C., 2011. 'Other Poetic Voices in Callimachus', in *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus and S. Stephens (Leiden), pp.454-473

D'Alessio, G., (ed.) 1996. *Callimaco. Inni; Epigrammi; Ecale; Aitia; Giambi e Altri Frammenti*, 2 vols. (Milan)

Dachs, H., 1913. *Die Lysis ek tou Prosopou: ein Exegetischer und Kritischer Grundsatz Aristarchs und seine Neuanwendung auf Ilias und Odyssee* (Erlangen)

Day, J.W., 1989. 'Rituals in Stone. Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual', in *JHS* 109, pp.16-28

- 1994. 'Interactive Offerings: Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual', in *HSPh* 96, pp.37-74
- 2000. 'Epigram and Reader: Generic Forces as (Re-)activation of Ritual', in *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, (eds.) M. Depew and D. Obbink (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.37-57, 248-54
- 2007. 'Poems on Stone: The Inscribed Antecedents of Hellenistic Epigram', in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.29-47
- 2010. *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance* (Cambridge)

De Stefani, C. and Magnelli, E., 2011. 'Callimachus and Later Greek Poetry', in *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, S. Stephens and L. Lehnus (Leiden), pp.534-565

De Vos, M., 2014. 'From Lesbos She Took Her Honeycomb: Sappho and the 'Female Tradition' in Hellenistic Poetry', in *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World*, (eds.) C. Pieper and J. Ker (Leiden), pp.410-434

Degani, E., (ed.) 1977. *Poeti Greci Giambici ed Elegiaci* (Milan)

- 1981. 'Nosside', in *Giornale Filologico Ferrares* 4, pp.43-52
- (ed.) 1991. *Hipponactis Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Leipzig)

Del Corno, D., 1962. 'Ricerche Intorno alla Lyde di Antimaco', in *Acme* 15, pp.57-95

Dell'Oro, F., 2014. '"Anacreon, the Connoisseur of Desires": An Anacreontic Reading of Menecrates' Sepulchral Epigram (1Kyzikos 8, 520)' in *Imitate Anacreon! Mimesis, Poiesis and the Poetic Inspiration in the Carmina Anacreontea*, (eds.) M. Baumbach and N. Dümmler (Göttingen), pp.67-93

Derrida, J., 1967. *De la Grammatologie* (Paris), trans. G. Chakravorty Spivak, in Derrida, J., 1997. *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore)

Deubner, L., 1900. *De Incubatione* (Leipzig)

Di Benedetto, V., 2005. 'Da Posidippo (Epigr. 91, 118, 139 a.-b.) a Saffo (fr. 35 v.) w Catullo (36) e Orazio (Carm. I 30)', in *RCCM* 2, pp.249-264

Di Gregorio, L., (ed.) 1997. *Eronda: Mimiambi (I-IV)* (Milan)

- (ed.) 2004. *Eronda: Mimiambi (V-XII)* (Milan)

Dickie, M.W., 1995. 'The Dionysiac Mysteries in Pella', in *ZPE* 109, pp.81-86

- 1994. 'Which Posidippus?', in *GRBS* 35, pp.373-383
- 1998. 'Poets as Initiates in the Mysteries: Euphorion, Philicus and Posidippus', in *A&A* 44, pp.49-77

Dignas, B., 2004. 'Posidippus and the Mysteries. Epitymbia Read by the Ancient Historian', in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.177-186

Dodds, E.R., 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley)

Domingo-Forastè, D., (ed.) 1994. *Claudii Aeliani Epistulae et Fragmenta* (Leipzig)

Dover, K.J., (ed.) 1993. *Aristophanes' Frogs* (Oxford)

Dunst, G.,1972. 'Archaische Inscriften und Dokumente der Pentekontaetie aus Samos' in *MDAI(A)* 87, pp.99-163

Edelstein, E.J and Edelstein L., (eds.) 1945. *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies* (Baltimore)

Edmunds, L., 1997. 'The Seal of Theognis', in *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*, (eds.) L. Edmunds and R.W. Wallace (Baltimore), 136-143

- 2001. 'Callimachus *Iamb* 4: From Performance to Writing', in *Iambic Ideas*, (eds.) A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi (Lanham), pp.77-98

El-Abbadi, M., 1990. *The Life and Fate of the Ancient Library of Alexandria* (Paris)

Elliott, R.C., 1982. *The Literary Persona* (Chicago)

Erbse, H., 1998. 'Zu den Epigrammen des Simonides', in *RhM* 141, pp.213-230

Esposito, E., 2002. 'Il Pubblico del Mimo Popolare nell' Egitto Tolemaico: Dryton e il Grenfellianum', in *Eikasmos* 13, pp.199-214

- 2005. *Il Fragmentum Grenfellianum (P.Dryton 50): Introduzione, Testo Critico, Traduzione e Commento* (Bologna)
- 2010. 'Herodas and the Mime' in *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, (eds.) J.J. Claus and M. Cuypers (Oxford), pp.267-281

Fantuzzi, M., 1993. 'Il Sistema Letterario della Poesia Alessandrina nel III Sec. a.C', in *Lo Spazio Letterario della Grecia Antica I.2*, (eds.) G. Cambiano, L. Canfora and D. Lanza (Rome), pp.31-73

- 2002. 'La Tecnica Versificatoria del. P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309', in *Il Papiro di Posidippo un Anno Dopo*, (eds.) G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (Florence), pp.79-97
- 2005. '"Posidippus" at Court: The Contribution of the Ἱππικά of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 to the Ideology of Ptolemaic Kingship', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.249-268
- 2006. 'Callimaco, l'Epigramma, il Teatro', in *Callimaco: Cent'Anni di Papiri. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Firenze, 9-10 giugno 2005*, (eds.) G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (Florence), pp.69-87
- 2007. 'Epigram and the Theater' in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.477-495
- 2009. 'Review of M. Tueller, Look Who's Talking', in *BMCR*, 09.54, http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-09-54.html (last accessed June 2016)
- 2011. 'Speaking with Authority: Polyphony in Callimachus' Hymns', in *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus and S. Stephens (Leiden), pp.429-453

Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R., 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge)

Fearn, D., 2013. 'Kleos versus Stone? Lyric Poetry and Contexts for Memorialization', in *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, (eds.) P. Liddel and P. Low (Oxford), pp.231-253

Fernández, C.N., 2006a. 'Modelo Literario, perfil Psicológico, y Significado Alegórico en los Personajes del Mimo I de Herondas', in *Synthesis* 13, pp.95-111

-      2006b. 'Herondas por Herondas: Autoficción en el Mimo Helenístico' in *AC* 75, pp.23-39

Fernández-Galiano, E., (ed.) 1987. Posidipo de Pela (Madrid)

Ferrari, F., 2004. 'Posidippus, the Milan Papyrus, and Some Hellenistic Anthologies', in *Classics@* 1, http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/1341 (last accessed April 2016)

Finnegan, R.J., 1992. 'Women in Herodian Mime', in *Hermathena* 152, pp.21-37

Fittschen, K., 1992. 'Zur Rekonstruktion Griechischer Dichterstatuen 2: Die Statuen des Posidipp und des Ps.-Menander', in *AthMit* 107, pp.229-271.

Fonterose, J.E., (ed.) 1978. *The Delphic Oracle, Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses* (Berkeley)

Ford, A., 1985. 'The Seal of Theognis: The Politics of Authorship in Archaic Greece', in *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, (eds.) T. Figueria and G. Nagy (Baltimore), pp.82-95

-      2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton)

Foucault, M., 1977. 'What is an Author?', in *Language, Counter-Memory Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews, M. Foucalut*, (ed.) D. Bouchard, trans. D. Bouchard and S. Simon (Ithaca)

Fountoulakis, A., 2000a. 'The Artists of Aphrodite', in AC 69, pp.133-147

-      2000b. ''Ωπαρεόν[τες in Herondas 8.61', in *ZPE* 131, pp.27-28
-      2002. 'Herondas 8.66-79: Generic Self-Consciousness and Artistic Claims in Herondas' Mimiambs', in *Mnemosyne* 55, pp.201-319

Fränkel, H., 1975. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, trans. M. Hadas and J. Willis (New York)

Fraser, P.M., 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols. (Oxford)

Fraser, P.M. and Matthews, E. (eds.), 1987-2010. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, 6 vols. (Oxford)

Friedländer, P., 1909. 'Persona', in *Glotta* 2, pp.164-168

Furley, W.D., 2010. 'Life in a Line: A Reading of Dedicatory Epigram from the Archaic and Classical Period', in *Archaic and Classical Epigram*, (eds.) M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.151-166

Gabathuler, M., 1937. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter* (St. Gallen)

Gaisford, T., (ed.) 1848. *Etymologicon Magnum* (Oxford)

Gallavotti, C., 1971. 'L'Epigramma Biografico di Nosside come Esempio di Critica Testuale', in *Studi Filolgici e Storici in Onore di Vittorio De Falco* (Naples), pp.241-250

Gallop, J., 2011. *The Deaths of the Author: Reading and Writing in Time* (Durham, NC)

Gardner, P., Head, B.V. and Poole, R.S. et al., (eds.) 1873-. *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum* (London)

Garrison, D.H., 1978. *Mild Frenzy: A Reading of Hellenistic Love Epigram* (Wiesbaden)

Gärtner, T., 2006. 'Kritische Überlegungen zum "Siegelgedicht" Poseidipps (epigr. 118 Austin-Bastianini = SH 705)', in *SemRom* 9, pp.243-54

- 2007a. 'Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Erotischen Epigrammen der Anthologia Palatina', in *SCI* 26, pp.1-18
- 2007b. 'Überlegungen zu den Theognideen', in *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 8, pp.1-74

Garulli, V., 2014. 'Stones as Books: The Layout of Hellenistic Inscribed Epigrams', in *Hellenistic Poetry in Context*, (eds.) M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven), pp. 125-170

Gauly, B.M., 2005. 'Poseidipp und das Gedichtbuch. Überlegungen zur Sphragis und zum Mailänder Papyrus', in *ZPE* 151, pp.33-47

Gerber, D.E., 1997. 'Elegy', in *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, (ed.) D.E. Gerber (Leiden), pp.89-132

- (ed.) 1999. *Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Giangrande, G., 1973. 'Interpretation of Herodas', in *QUCC* 15, pp.82-98

- 2000. 'Dreams in Apollonius Rhodius', in *QUCC* 66, pp.107-123

Gibson, W., 1980. 'Authors, Speakers, Readers and Mock Readers', in *Reader-Response Criticism*, (ed.) J.P. Tompkins (Baltimore), pp.1-6

Gigante, M., 1974. 'Nosside', in *PP* 24, pp.22-39

- 1981. 'Il Manifesto Poetico di Nosside', in *Letterature Comparate: Problemi e Metodo: Studie in Onore de Essore Paratore*, (eds.) V. Ussani et al. (Bologna), pp.243-245

Given, J., 2007. 'The Agathon Scene in Aristophanes' Thesmophoriazusae', in *SO* 82, p.35-51

Goldhill, S., 1986. 'Framing and Polyphony: Readings in Hellenistic Poetry', in *CCJ* 32, pp.25-52

- 1991. *The Poet's Voice* (Cambridge)

Gow, A.S.F., (ed.) 1950. *Theocritus*, 2 vols. (Cambridge)

Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L., (eds.) 1965. *The Greek Anthology*, 2 vols. (Cambridge)

- 1968. *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip*, 2 vols. (Cambridge)

Graf, F., 2009. 'Serious Singing: The Orphic Hymns as Religious Texts', in *Kernos* 22, pp.169-182

Graziosi, B., 2002. *Inventing Homer* (Cambridge)

- 2013. 'The Poet in the *Iliad*', in *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, (eds.) J. Hill and A. Marmodoro (Oxford), pp.9-38

Gutzwiller, K.J., 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre* (Madison)

- 1996. 'The Evidence for Theocritean Poetry Books', in *Theocritus*, (eds.) M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven), pp.119-148
- 1997. 'Genre Development and Gendered Voices in Erinna and Nossis', in *Dwelling in Possibility: Women Poets and Critics of Poetry*, (eds.) Y. Prins and M. Shreiber (Ithaca), pp.202-222
- 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley)
- 2002. 'Posidippus on Statuary', in *Il Papiro di Posidippo un Anno Doppo*, (eds.) G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (Florence), pp.41-60.
- 2004. 'A New Hellenistic Poetry Book: P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309', in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.84-93
- 2005a. 'Introduction', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.1-16
- 2005b. 'The Literariness of the Milan Papyrus, or 'What Difference a Book?'', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.287-319
- 2007a. *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature* (Oxford)
- 2007b. 'The Paradox of Amatory Epigram', in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.313-332
- 2014. 'Anacreon, Hellenistic Epigram and the Anacreontic Poet', in *Imitate Anacreon! Mimesis, Poiesis and the Poetic Inspiration in the Carmina Anacreontea*, (eds.) M. Baumbach and N. Dümmler (Göttingen), pp.47-66.

Hagen, H. and Thilo, G. (ed.), 1878-1902. *Servii Grammatici qui Feruntur in Vergili Carmina Commentarii*, 3 vols. (Leipzig)

Hägg, T., 2012. *The Art of Biography in Antiquity* (Cambridge)

Halim, H., 2013. *Alexandrian Cosmopolitanism: An Archive* (New York)

Handley, E.W., 1996. 'Two Epigrams by Asclepiades (XXV, XVI G.-P.)', in *MH* 53, pp.140-147

Hanfmann, G.M.A., 1973. 'Personality and Portraiture in Ancient Art', in *PaPhS* 117, pp.259-285

Hanink, J., 2008. 'Literary Politics in the Euripidean Vita', in *PCPS* 54, pp.115-135

Hansen, P.A., (ed.) 1983, 1989. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 2 vols. (Berlin)

Harder, M.A., 1992. 'Insubstantial Voices: Some Observations on the Hymns of Callimachus', in *CQ* 42, pp.384-394

- 1996. ''Generic Games' in Callimachus' Aetia', in *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, (eds.) M.A. Harder, R.F Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven), pp.95-113
- 2007. 'Callimachus', in *Time in Ancient Greek Literature*, (eds.) I.J.F. de Jong and R. Nünlist (Leiden), pp.81-96
- (ed.) 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia*, 2 vols. (Oxford)
- 2013. 'From Text to Text: The Impact of the Alexandrian Library on the Work of the Hellenistic Poets', in *Ancient Libraries*, (eds.) J. König, K. Oikonomopoulou and G. Woolf (Cambridge), pp.96-108

Hardie, A., 1997. 'Philitas and the Plane Tree', in *ZPE* 119, pp.21-36

- 2003. 'The Statue(s) of Philitas (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 col. X. 16-25 and Hermesianax fr. 7.75-78 P.)', in *ZPE* 143, pp.27-36
- 2004. 'Muses and Mysteries', in *Music and the Muses: The Culture of 'Mousike' in the Classical Athenian City*, (eds.) P. Murray and P. Wilson (Oxford), pp.11-38
- 2016. 'Callimachus at the Mouseion (the Hymn to Delos)', in *PLLS* 16, pp.39-154

Harris, W.V., 1989. *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.)

- 2009. *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Headlam, W., 1922. *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments*, (ed.) A.D. Knox (Cambridge)

Hedreen, G., 2016. *The Image of the Artist in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge)

Henderson, J., 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy* (Oxford)

- (ed.) 1998. *Aristophanes II* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- (ed.) 2007. *Aristophanes, Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Henrichs, A., 1978. 'Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina', in *HSPh* 82, pp.121-160

Hermann, P., 1981. 'Teos und Abdera im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Ein Neues Fragment der Teiorum Dirae' in *Chiron* 11, pp.1-30

Herrington, J., 1985. *Poetry into Drama. Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley)

Herzog, R., 1901. 'Das Heiligthum des Apollo in Halasarna', in *SPAW.PH* 21, pp.470-494

- 1931. *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros* (Leipzig)

Herzog, R. and Schazman, P., 1932. *Kos: Ergebnisse der Deutschen Ausgrabungen und Forschungen: Asklepieion: Baubeschreibung und Baugeschichte* (Berlin)

Higbie, C., 1999. 'Craterus and the Use of Inscriptions in Ancient Scholarship', in *TAPA* 129, pp.43-83

- 2010. 'Epigrams on the Persian Wars: Monuments, Memory and Politics' in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, (eds.) M Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.183-201

Hill, J. and Marmodoro, A., (eds.) 2013. *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity* (Oxford)

Hodkinson, O., 2010. 'Some Distinguishing Features of Deliberate Fictionality in Greek Biographical Narratives', in *Phrasis* 51, pp.11-36

Hollis, A.S., 1996. 'Heroic Honours for Philetas?', in *ZPE* 110, pp.56-62

Hondius, J.J.E., et al., (eds.) 1923-. *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (Leiden)

Hordern, J.H., (ed.) 2004. *Sophron's Mimes* (Oxford)

Höschele, R., 2007. 'The Traveling Reader: Journeys Through Ancient Epigram Books', in *TAphA* 137, pp.333-369

- 2010. *Die Blütenlesende Muse: Poetik und Textualität Antiker Epigrammsammlungen* (Tubingen)

Hubbard, T.K., 1991. *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis* (London)

- 2006. 'Theognis' Sphrêgis: Aristocratic Speech and the Paradoxes of Writing', in *Politics of Orality*, (ed.) C. Cooper (Leiden), pp.193-215

Hunter, R., 1992. 'Callimachus and Heraclitus', in *MD* 28, pp.113-123

- 1993a. *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge)
- 1993b. 'The Presentation of Herodas' Mimiamboi', in *Antichthon* 27, pp.31-44
- 1995. 'Plautus and Herodas', in *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels: Festgabe für Eckard Lefèvre zum 60. Geburtstag*, (eds.) L. Benz, E. Stärk and G. Vogt-Spira (Tübingen), 155-169
- 1996a. 'Mime and Mimesis: Theocritus' Idyll 15', in *Theocritus*, (eds.) M. A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven), pp.149-169
- 1996b. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge)
- 1997. '(B)ionic man: Callimachus' Iambic Programme', in *PCPS* 43, pp.41-52
- 2001. 'The Poet Unleaved. Simonides and Callimachus', in *The New Simonides*, (eds.) D. Boedecker and D. Sider (Oxford), pp.242-254

- 2003. 'Reflecting on Writing and Culture: Theocritus and the Style of Cultural Change', in *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*, (ed.) H. Yunis (Cambridge), pp.213-234
- 2005. 'The Hesiodic Catalogue and Hellenistic Poetry', in *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions,* (ed.) R. Hunter (Cambridge), pp.239-265
- 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus* (Cambridge)
- 2010. 'Language and Interpretation in Greek Epigram', in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram,* (eds.) M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.265-288

Hutchinson, G.O., 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford)

- 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford)
- 2008. *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry* (Oxford)

Immerwahr, H., 1964. 'Book Rolls on Attic Vases', in *Classical, Medieval and Renaissance Studies in Honour of Berthold Louis Ullmann*, (ed.) C. Henderson (Rome), pp.17-48

- 1973. 'More Book Rolls on Attic Vases', in *AK* 16, pp.143-147

Jacob, C., 2013. 'Fragments of a History of Ancient Libraries', in *Ancient Libraries*, (eds.) J. König, K. Oikonomopoulou and G. Woolf (Cambridge), pp.57-81

Jacoby, F., et al., (eds.) 1923-. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Berlin)

Johnson, W.A., 2004. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto)

- 2005. 'The Posidippus Papyrus: Bookroll and Reader', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.70-80

Johnson, W.A. and Parker, H.N., (eds.) 2009. *Ancient Literacies* (Oxford)

Kambylis, A., 1965. *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik: Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius* (Heidelberg)

Keesling, C. and Sens, A., 2004. 'Posidippus on Rhodian Statue-Making (68.6 Austin-Bastianini, P.Mil.Vogl. VII 309 XI 11)', in *ZPE* 148, pp.75-76

Kegel, W.J.H.F., 1962. *Simonides* (Groningen)

Keil, B., (ed.) 1898. *Aelius Aristidis Smyrnaei quae Supersunt Omnia* (Berlin)

Keil, H., (ed.) 1855-1880. *Grammatici Latini*, 7 vols. (Leipzig)

Kenyon, F.G., (ed.) 1891. *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum* (London)

Kerkhecker, A., 1999. *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford)

Kessels, A.H.M., 1969. 'Ancient Systems of Dream-Classification' in *Mnemosyne* 22, pp.389-424

- 1978. *Studies on the Dream in Greek Literature* (Utrecht)

Kimmel-Clauzet, F., 2013. *Morts, Tombeaux et Cultes des Poètes Grecs. Étude de la Survie des Grands Poètes des Époques Archaïque et Classique en Grèce Ancienne* (Bordeaux)

King, C.J., 2004 (diss). *Dreams, Omens and Aristander of Telmessus in the Alexander Historians* (Providence)

- 2013. 'Plutarch, Alexander and Dream Divination' in *ICS* 38, pp.81-111

Kirstein, R., 2002. 'Companion Pieces in the Hellenistic Epigram (Call. 21 and 35 Pf.; Theoc. 7 and 15 Gow; Mart. 2.91 and 2.92; Ammianos AP 11.230 and 11.231)', in *Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven), pp.113-135

Kivilo, M., 2010. *Early Greek Poets' Lives: The Shaping of the Tradition* (Leiden)

Klein, F., 2010. 'Une Réponse Ovidienne à Asclépiade? Hypotèse d'une Allusion à l'Épigramme sur la Lydé d'Antimaque (AP IX, 63) dans le Certamen de Pallas et Arachné', in *Dictynna* 7

Klooster, J., 2011. *Poetry as Window and Mirror: Positioning the Poet in Hellenistic Poetry* (Leiden)

Knöbl, R., 2010. 'Talking about Euripides: Paramimesis and Satyrus' Bios Euripidou', in *Phrasis* 51, pp.37-58

Knox, A.D., 1925. 'The Dream of Herodas', in *CR* 39, pp.13-15

Knox, P.E., 1985. 'Wine, Water and Callimachean Polemics', in *HSCP* 89, pp.107-119

Köhnken, A., 1993. 'Gattungstypik in Kallimacheischen Weihepigrammen', in *Religio Graeco-Romana: Festschrift für Walter Pötscher (Grazer Beiträge Supplementband 5)*, (Graz), pp.119-130.

König, J., Oikonomopoulou K. and Woolf, G., (eds.) 2013. *Ancient Libraries* (Cambridge)

Kosmetatou, E. 2004a. 'Constructing Legitimacy. The Ptolemaic "Familiengruppe" as a Means for Self-Definition in Posidippus' Hippika', in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.225-246

- 2004b. 'Vision and Visibility. Art Historical Theory Paints a Portrait of New Leadership in Posidippus' *Andriantopoiika'*, in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.187-211

Kranz, W., 1961. 'SPHRAGIS: Ichform und Namensiegel als Eingangs- und Schlußmotiv Antiker Dichtung', in *RhM* 104, pp.3-46

Krevans, N., 1983. 'Geography and the Literary Tradition in Theocritus 7', in *TAPhA* 11, pp.201-220

- 1984 (diss.). *The Poet as Editor* (Princeton)
- 1993. 'Fighting against Antimachus. The *Lyde* and the *Aetia* reconsidered', in *Callimachus*, (eds.) M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Groningen), pp.149-60
- 2005. 'The Editor's Toolbox: Strategies for Selection and Presentation in the Milan Epigram Papyrus', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.81-96
- 2007. The Arrangement of Epigrams in Collections' in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.131-146

Krevans, N. and Sens, A., 2006. 'Language and Literature', in *The Cambridge Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, (ed.) G.R. Burgh (Cambridge), pp.186-207

Kroll, W., 1924. 'Die Kreuzung der Gattungen' in *Studien zum Verständis der römischen Literatur*, (ed.) W. Kroll (Stuttgart), pp.202-224

Kruger, K.S., 2001. *Weaving the Word: The Metaphorics of Writing and the Female Textual Tradition* (Selinsgrove)

Kutzko, D., 2008. 'All the World's a Page: Imitation of Metatheater in Theocritus 15, Herodas 1 and Virgil Eclogues 3', in *CJ* 103, pp.141-161

- 2012. 'In Pursuit of Sophron' in *Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy*, (ed.) K. Bosher (Cambridge), pp.367-390

Kwapisz, J., 2010. '118.15 A.-B. (SH 705.14): The Nile, not the Isles', in *ZPE* 172, pp.27-28

La Penna, A., (ed.) 1957. *Publi Ovidi Nasonis Ibis* (Florence)

Lada-Richards, I., 1999. *Initiating Dionysus: Ritual and Theatre in Aristophanes' Frogs* (Oxford)

Lamb, W.R.M., 1930. *Lysias* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Lardinois, A.P.M.H., Blok, J.H. and van der Poel, M.G.M., (eds.) 2011. *Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy and Religion* (Leiden)

Latte, K., 1946. 'Hesiods Dichterweihe', in *A&A* 2, pp.152-63

- 1957. 'ΆΣΚΩΛΙΑΣΜΟΣ', in *Hermes* 85, pp.385-391

Lazzarini, M.L., 1973-1974. 'I Nomi dei Vasi Greci nelle Iscrizioni dei Vasi Stessi', in *ArchClass* 25-26, pp.341-375

Leader, R.E., 1997. 'In Death Not Divided: Gender, Family, and a State on Classical Athenian Stelai', in *AJA* 101, pp.683-699

Lefkowitz, M. R., 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore)

- 1978. 'The Poet as Hero: Fifth-Century Autobiography and Subsequent Biographical Fiction', in *CQ* 78, pp.459-469
- 1983. 'Patterns of Fiction in Ancient Biography', in *The American Scholar* 42, pp.205-218
- 1991. *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic 'I'* (Oxford)

Lelli, E., 2011. 'Proverbs and Popular Sayings in Callimachus', in *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus and S. Stephens (Leiden), pp.384-403

Leutch, E.L von, and Schneidewin, F.G., (eds.) 1839. *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum, vol.1: Paroemiographi Graeci: Zenobius, Diogenianus, Plutarchus, Gregorius Cyprius cum Appendice Proverbiorum* (Göttingen)

Levaniouk, O., 2008. 'Lament and Hymenaios in Erinna's Distaff', in *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond*, (ed.) A. Sutter (Oxford), pp.200-232

LeVen, P.A., 2014. *The Many-Headed Muse* (Cambridge)

Levin, D., 1962. 'Quaestiones Erinneanae', in *HSPh* 66, pp.193-204

Lewis, D.M., 1982. 'On the New Text of Teos', in *ZPE* 47, pp.71-72

- 1987. 'Bowie on Elegy: A Footnote', in *JHS* 187, p.187

Liddel, P. and Low, P., (eds.) 2013. *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford)

Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R., et al. (eds.) 1843-. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. and augmented by H.S. Jones (Oxford)

Lindsay, W.M., 1913. *Sexti Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatu quae Supersunt cum Pauli Epitome* (Leipzig)

Livrea, E., 1992. 'L'Epitafio Callimacheo per Batto', in *Hermes* 120, pp.291-298

- 2006. 'La Tomba di Simonide da Callimaco a S. Saba', in *ZPE* 156, pp.53-57

Lloyd-Jones, H., 1963. 'The Seal of Posidippus', in *JHS* 83, pp.75-99

- 2003a. 'All by Posidippus?' in *Des Géants à Dionysos: Mélanges de Mythologie et de Poésie Grecques Offerts à Francis Vian*, (eds.) D. Accorinti and P. Chuvin (Allessandria), pp.277-280
- 2003b. 'Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi (P.Mil.Vogl.VIII 309), ed. Guido Bastianini e Claudio Gallazzi con la Collaborazione di Colin Austin, ser. Papiri dell'Università degli Studi di Milano (Milano, 2001)', in *IJCT* 9.4, pp. 612-616

Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P., (eds.) 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin)

Lorenz, K., 2010. '"Dialectics at a Standstill": Archaic Kouroi-cum-Epigram as I-Box', in *Archaic and Classical Epigram*, (eds.) M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.131-148

Lucht, B., 2014. 'Flash Fiction: Literary Fast Food or a Metamodern (Sub)Genre with Potential?', in *HASACC - Human and Social Sciences at the Common Conference 2*, pp.222-225

Luck, G., 1954. 'Die Dichterinnen der Griechischen Anthologie', in *MH* 11, pp.170-187

Mackay, E.A., (ed.) 1999. *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden)

- (ed.) 2008. *Orality, Literacy and Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World* (Leiden)

Mackie, C.J., (ed.) 2004. *Oral Performance and its Context* (Leiden)

MacQueen, J.G., 1982. 'Death and Immortality: A Study of the Heraclitus Epigram of Callimachus', in *Ramus* 11, pp.48-56

Maehler, H. and Snell, B., (eds.) 1980-1984. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis,* 2 vols. (Leipzig)

Maltomini, F. and Pernigotti, C., 2002. 'Morfologie ed Impieghi delle Raccolte Simposiali: Lineamenti di Storia di una Tipologia Libraria Antica', in *MD* 49, pp.53-84.

Männlein-Robert, I., 2006. '"Hinkende Nachahmung." Desillusionierung und Grenzüberspielungen in Herodas' Viertem Mimiambos', in *Beyond the Canon*, (eds.) M. A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven), pp.205-28.

- 2007a. 'Epigrams on Art: Voice and Voicelessness in Hellenistic Epigram', in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.251-271
- 2007b. *Stimme, Schrift und Bild: Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtung* (Heidelberg)
- 2009. 'Klage im Kontext oder Allegorie Hellenistischer Spolienpoetik: Überlegungen zu Kallimachos' Sepulchrum Simonidis (frg. 64 Pf.)', in *A&A* 55, pp.45-61

Manwell, E., 2005. 'Dico Ergo Sum: Erinna's Voice and Poetic Reality', in *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome*, (ed.) E. Greene (Oklahoma), pp.72-90

Martino, F. de, 1987. 'Saffo ed Esiodo, fr.21-24, Voight', in *GFRF* 10, pp.51-55

Massimilla, G., 2006. 'Il Sepolcro di Simonide (Callimaco, fr.64 Pf.)', in *Callimachea 1*, (eds.) A. Martina and A.-T. Cozzoli (Rome), pp.33-52

Mastromarco, G., 1979. *Il Pubblico di Heronda* (Padova)

- 1984. *The Public of Herondas* (Amsterdam)

- 1990. 'Eine Alexandrinische Kupplerin', in *WJA* 6, pp.87-98
- 1991. 'Il Mimo Greco Letterario', in *Dioniso* 61, pp.169-92

Matthews, V.J., 1979a. 'Antimachean Anecdotes', in *Eranos* 77, pp.43-50

- 1979b. 'Antimachos in the Aitia prologue. A New Supplement', in *Mnemosyne* 32, pp.128-137
- 1987. 'Kaukonian Dyme: Antimachos and the Text of Homer', in *Eranos* 85, pp.91-97
- (ed.) 1996. *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary* (Leiden)

Mayer, R.G., 2003. 'Persona Problems', in *MD* 50, pp.55-80

McCann, G.A., 1971 (diss.). *The Persona: Its Development in English Criticism* (Ohio and Miami)

McKeown, J.C., 1979. 'Augustan Elegy and Mime', in *PCPhS* 25, pp.71-84

Merkelbach, R., 1956. 'Boukoliastai. Der Wettgesang der Hirten', in *RhM* 99, pp.97-133

- 1982. 'Zum dem Neuen Text aus Teos', in *ZPE* 46, pp.212-213

Meyer, D., 1993. 'Die Einbeziehung des Lesers in den Epigrammen des Kallimachos', in *Callimachus*, (eds.) M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Groningen), pp.161-175.

- 2005. *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen: Das Inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos* (Stuttgart)
- 2007. 'The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram' in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.187-210

Minchin, E., (ed.) 2012. *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World* (Leiden)

Molyneux, J.H., 1971. 'Simonides and the Dioscuri', in *Phoenix* 25, pp.197-205

- 1992. *Simonides: A Historical Study* (Wauconda)

Morrison, A.D., 2007. *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge)

- 2013. 'Speaking from the Tomb? The Disappearing Epitaph of Simonides in Callimachus, *Aetia* Fr. 64 Pf.', in *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, (eds.) P. Liddel, P. Low (Oxford), pp.289-301

Most, G.W., 1995. 'Reflecting Sappho', in *BICS* 40, pp.15-38

Mullach, F.G.A., (ed.) 1881. *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum* (Paris)

Müller, F.M., 1888. *Biographies of Words* (London)

Murray, J., 2010. 'Hellenistic Elegy: Out from Under the Shadow of Callimachus', in *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, (eds.) J.J. Clauss and M. Cuypers (Chichester), pp.106-116

Murray, J, and Rowland, J.M., 2007. 'Gendered Voices in Hellenistic Epigram', in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.211-232

Nagy, G., 1985. 'Theognis of Megara: A Poet's Vision of his City', in *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, (eds.) T. Figueria and G. Nagy (Baltimore), pp.22-81

- 1996. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge)
- 2004. 'Homeric Echoes in Posidippus', in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.57-64
- 2010. 'Ancient Greek Elegy' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Elegy*, (ed.) K. Weisman (Oxford), pp.13-45

Nelson, M., 2000. 'A Note on the Ὄλισβος', in *Glotta*,76, pp.75-82

Neri, C., (ed.) 2003. *Erinna: Testimonianze e Frammenti* (Bologna)

Nisetich, F., 'The Pleasure of Epigram: "New" and "Old" Posidippus', in *IJCT* 12, pp.245-268

Obbink, D., 2004. 'Posidippus on Papyri Then and Now', in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.16-28

Oldfather, C.H., (ed.) 1950. *Diodorus Siculus: Library of History, Volume V: Books 12.41-13* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Olender, M., 1990. 'Aspects of Baubo: Ancient Texts and Contexts', in *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, (eds.) D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin (Princeton), pp.83-113

Olson, D., 2009. 'Why Literacy Matters: Then and Now', in *Ancient Literacies*, (eds.) N.H. Parker and W.A. Johnson (Oxford), pp.385-404

Orrells, D., 2012. 'Headlam's Herodas: The Art of Suggestion', in *Expurgating the Classics: Editing out in Latin and Greek*, (eds.) S.J. Harrison and C. Stray (London) pp.53-72

Page, D.L., 1962. *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford)

- (ed.) 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams*, rev. R.D. Dawe and J. Diggle (Cambridge)

Panayotakis, C., (ed.) 2010. *Decimus Laberius: The Fragments* (Cambridge)

- 2014. 'Hellenistic Mime and its Reception at Rome' in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, (eds.) M. Fontaine and A.C. Scafuro (Oxford), pp.378-396

Papakonstantinou, Z., 2015. *Lawmaking and Adjudication in Ancient Greece* (London)

Parsons, P.J., 1981. 'Review of G. Mastromarco's Il Pubblico di Heronda', in *CR* 31, p.110

- 2002. 'Callimachus and the Hellenistic Epigram', in *Callimaque: Sept Exposés Suivis de Discussions*, (eds.) L. Lehnus and F. Montanari (Geneva), pp.99-136

Patton, W.R. and Hicks, E.L., (eds.) 1891. *The Inscriptions of Cos* (Oxford)

Peek, W., (ed.) 1955. *Griechische Vers-Inschriften I, Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin)

- (ed.) 1969. *Inschriften von den Dorischen Inseln (AbhLeipzigAk 62 (I)* (Berlin)

Peirano, I., 2013. 'Ille Ego qui Quondam: on Authorial (An)onymity', in *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, (eds.) J. Hill and A. Marmodoro (Oxford), pp.251-286

- 2014. '"Sealing" the Book: The Sphragis as Paratext', in, *The Roman Paratext*, (ed.) L. Jansen (Cambridge), pp.224-242

Pelling, C., 1997. 'Tragical Dreamer: Some Dreams in the Roman Historians', in *GR* 44, pp.197-213

Petrovic, A., 2005. '"Kunstvolle Stimme der Steine sprich!" Zur Intermedialität der Grieschen Epideiktischen Epigramme', in *A&A* 51, 30-42

- 2007a. 'Inscribed Epigram in Pre-Hellenistic Literary Sources' in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.49-68
- 2007b. *Kommentar zu den Simonideischen Versinschriften* (Leiden)
- 2009. 'Epigrammatic Contests, Poeti Vaganti and Local History', in *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*, (eds.) R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (Cambridge), pp.195-216
- 2013. 'Inscribed Epigrams in Orators', in *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, (eds.) P. Liddel, and P. Low (Oxford), pp.197-213

Petrovic, I., 2014. 'Posidippus and Achaemenid Royal propaganda', in *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts*, (eds.) R. Hunter, A. Rengakos and E. Sistakou (Berlin), pp.273-300

Pfeiffer, R., (ed.) 1949, 1953. *Callimachus,* 2 vols. (Oxford)

- 1968. *A History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford)

Pickard-Cambridge, A.W., 1927, second ed. 1962. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, rev. T.B.L. Webster (Oxford)

- 1968, second ed. 1988. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (Oxford)

Pinto, P.M., 2013. 'Men and Books in Fourth Century BC Athens', in *Ancient Libraries*, (eds.) J. König, K. Oikonomopoulou and G. Woolf (Cambridge), pp.85-95

Plant, I.M., 2004. *Women Writers of Ancient Greece and Rome* (London)

Podlecki, A.J., 1979. 'Simonides in Sicily', in *PP* 34, pp.5-16

- 1984. *Early Greek Poets and their Times* (Vancouver)

Pomeroy, S.B., 1978. 'Notes on Erinna', in *ZPE* 32, pp.17-22

Powell, B.B., 2002. *Writing and the Origins of Greek Literature* (Cambridge)

Powell, J.U., (ed.) 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina: Reliquiae Minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae 323-146 A.C.: Epicorum, Elegiacorum, Lyricorum, Ethicorum. Cum Epimetris et Indice Nominum* (Oxford)

Pratt, L., 1994. 'Odyssey 19.535-50: On the Interpretation of Dreams and Signs in Homer', in *CPh* 89, pp.147-152

- 1995. 'The Seal of Theognis, Writing and Oral Poetry', in *AJPh* 116, pp.171-184

Price, S.R.F., 1990. 'The Future of Dreams: From Freud to Artemidoros' in *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World,* (eds.) D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin (Princeton), pp.365-87

Puchner, W., 1993. 'Zur Raumkonzeption der Mimiamben des Herodas', in *WS* 106, pp.9-34

Puelma, M., 1957. 'Kallimachos-Interpretationen, I. Philetas und Antimachos im Aitienprolog', in *Philologus* 101, pp.90-100

- 1997. 'Epigramma: Osservazioni sulla Storia di un Termine Greco-Latino', in *Maia* 49, pp.189-213

Raubitschek, A.E., 1968. *L'Epigramme Greque* (Geneva)

Rauk, J., 1989. 'Erinna's Distaff and Sappho Fr.94', in *GRBS* 30, pp.101-116

Rayor, D.J., 2005. 'The Power of Memory in Erinna and Sappho', in *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome*, (ed.) E. Greene (Oklahoma), pp.59-71

Reinach, T., 1909. 'La Date du Mime II d'Hérodas', in *Mélanges Offerts a Louis Havert* (Paris), pp.451-6

Reitzenstein, R., 1893. *Epigramm und Skolion, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Alexandrinischen Dichtung* (Giessen)

Renberg, G., 2003 (diss.). *'Commanded by the Gods': An Epigraphical Study of Dreams and Visions in Greek and Roman Religious Life* (Durham, NC)

Rheinfelder, H., 1928. *Das Wort 'Persona'* (Halle)

Rhyholt, K. 2013. 'Libraries in Ancient Egypt', in *Ancient Libraries*, (eds.) J. König, K. Oikonomopoulou and G. Woolf (Cambridge), pp.23-37

Richardson, N.J., (ed.) 1973. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford)

Richter, G.M.A., 1965, *Portraits of the Greeks,* 3 vols. (London)

Rist, A., 1993. 'That Herodean Diptych Again', in *CQ* 43, pp.440-444

-   1997. 'A Fresh Look at Herodas' Bucolic Masquerade', in *Phoenix* 51, pp.354-363

Rose, V., (ed.). 1863. *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* (Leipzig)

Rosen, R.M., 1988. 'Hipponax and his Enemies in Ovid's Ibis', in *CQ* 38, pp.291-296

-   1992. 'Mixing of Genres and Literary Program in Herodas 8', in *HSph* 94, pp.205-216
-   1997. 'Performance and Textuality in Aristophanes' Clouds', in *YJC* 10, pp.397-421

Rosenmayer, P.A., 1992. *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition* (Cambridge)

Rossi, L., 1996. 'Il Testamento di Posidippo e le Laminette Auree di Pella', in *ZPE* 112, pp.59-65

-   2001. *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach* (Leuven)

Rotstein, A., 2010. *The Idea of Iambos* (Oxford)

Rourke, L., 2011. *A Brief History of Fables: From Aesop to Flash Fiction* (London)

Russo, A., 2001. 'Iambic Presences in Ennius' Saturae', in *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, (eds.) A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi (Oxford), pp.99-116

Rusten, J.C. and Cunningham, I.C., (eds.) 2002. *Theophrastus, Characters; Herodas, Mimes; Sophron and other Mime Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Sandbach, F.H., (ed.) 1969. *Plutarch, Moralia; Volume XV, Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Santin, E., 2009. *Autori di Epigrammi Sepolcari Greci su Pietra Firme di Poeti Occasionali e Professionisti* (Rome)

Santin, E., and Tziafalias, A., 2013. 'Épigrammes Signées de Thessalie', in *Topoi* 18, pp.251-282

Savu, L.E., 2009. *Postmortem Postmodernists: The Afterlife of the Author* (Cranbury)

Sberna, D., 2015. 'Λιγύς Swan and Intratextual Unity in Callimachus's Aitia prologue', in *MD* 74, pp.207-223

Scheid, J. and Svenbro, J., 1996. *The Craft of Zeus: Myths of Weaving and Fabric* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Schmidt, V., 1968. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas* (Berlin)

Schmitz, T.A., 2010a. 'Epigrammatic Communication in Callimachus', in *GRBS* 50, pp.370-390

- 2010b. 'Speaker and Addressee in Early Greek Epigram and Lyric', in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, (eds.) M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.25-41

Scholz, U.W., 1973. 'Erinna', in *A&A* 18, pp.15-40

Schröder, S., 2004. 'Skeptische Überlegungen zum Mailänder Epigrammpapyrus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)', in *ZPE* 148, pp.29-73

Schuster, M., (ed.) 1952. *Plinius Minor* (Berlin)

Scodel, R., 2003. 'A Note on Posidippus 63AB (P Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 X 16-25)', in *ZPE* 142, p.44

- (ed.) 2014. *Between Orality and Literacy: Communication and Adaptation in the Antiquity* (Leiden)

Seaford, R., 1981. 'Dionysiac Drama and the Dionysiac Mysteries', in *CQ* 31, pp.252-275

Segre, M., 1952. 'Tituli Calymnii', in *ASAA* 22-23, pp.1-248

Seidensticker, B., 2015. 'Andriantopoiika', in *Der Neue Poseidipp: Text - Übersetzung - Kommentar*, (eds.) B. Seidensticker, A. Stähli and A. Wessels (Darmstadt), pp.247-282

Sens, A., 2002. 'The New Posidippus, Asclepiades and Hecataeus' Philitas-Statue', paper presented at APA January 2002, available at www.apaclassics.org/publications (last accessed June, 2012)

- 2003. 'Asclepiades, Erinna and the Poetics of Labor', in *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C.J. Putnam on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, (eds.) P. Thibodeau and H. Haskell (Afton), pp.78-87
- 2005. 'The Art of Poetry and the Poetry of Art: The Unity and Poetics of Posidippus' Statue-Poems', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.206-225
- 2006. '"τίπτε γένος τοὐμὸν ζητεῖς;" The Batrachomyomachia, Hellenistic Epic Parody, and Early Epic', in *La Poésie Épique Grecque: Métamorphoses d'un Genre Littéraire*, (eds.) E.J. Bakker, F. Montanari and A. Rengakos (Geneva), pp.215-248
- 2007. 'One Thing Leads (Back) to Another: Allusion and the Invention of Tradition in Hellenistic Epigrams', in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.373-390
- 2011. *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments* (Oxford)
- 2015. 'Hedylus (4 and 5 Gow-Page) and Callimachean Poetics', in *Mnemosyne* 68, pp.40-52

Serrao, G., 1979. 'La Struttura della Lide di Antimaco e la Critica Callimachea', in *QUCC* 32, pp.91-98

Sherwin-White, S., 1978. *Ancient Cos: An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period* (Göttingen)

Sider, D., 2004. 'Posidippus Old and New', in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309),* (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.29-41

- 2007. 'Sylloge Simonidea', in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, (eds.) P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (Leiden), pp.113-130

Simon, F-J., 1991. *Τὰ Κύλλ Ἀείδειν; Interpretationen zu den Mimiamben des Herodas* (Frankfurt)

Skinner, M.B., 1982. 'Briseis, the Trojan Women, and Erinna', in *CW* 75, pp.265-269

- 1989. 'Sapphic Nossis', in *Arethusa* 22, pp.5-18
- 2002. 'Aphrodite Garlanded: Eros and Poetic Creativity in Sappho and Nossis' (rev. edition of Skinner, M.B., 1991.' Aphrodite Garlanded: Eros and Poetic Creativity in Sappho and Nossis', in *Rose di Pierra*, (ed.) F. de Marino, (Bari), pp.76-96), in *Among Women: from the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World*, (eds.) N.S. Rabinowitz and L. Auanger (Austin), pp.60-81
- 2005. 'Nossis Thêlyglôssos: The Private Text and the Public Book', (rev. edition of Skinner, M.B., 1991. 'Nossis Thêlyglôssos: The Private Text and the Public Book', in *Women's History and Ancient History*, (ed.) S. B. Pomeroy (Chapel Hill and London), pp.20-47), in *Women Poets of Ancient Greece and Rome*, (ed.) E. Greene (Oklahoma), pp.112-138

Skutsch, F., 1892. 'Der Jüngere Plinius über Herodas', in *Hermes* 27, pp.317-318

- 1908. 'Persona', in *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie* 15, pp.145-146

Skutsch, O., (ed.) 1985. *The Annales of Q. Ennius* (Oxford)

Slater, N.W., 1996. 'Literacy and Old Comedy', in *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*, (ed.) I. Worthington (Leiden), pp.99-112

Small, V.G., 1984 (diss.). *The Literary Persona: A Truth-Conditional Account* (Cantebury, NZ)

Snyder, J.M., 1981. 'The Web of Song: Weaving and Imagery in Homer and the Lyric Poets', in *CJ* 76, pp.193-196

- 1989. *Women and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome* (Carbondale and Edwardsville)

Sourvinou-Inwood, C., 1996. *Reading Greek Death* (Oxford)

Spanoudakis, K., 1998. 'Callimachus fr.1.9-12 Again', in *ZPE* 121, pp.59-61

- 2001. 'Poets and Telchines in Callimachus' Aitia-Prologue', in *Mnemosyne* 54, pp.425-41
- 2002. *Philitas of Cos* (Leiden)

Stanzel, K.-H., 1998. 'Mimen, Mimpen und Mimiamben' in *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, (eds.) M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Groningen), pp.143-165

- 2010. 'Neuer Wein in Neuen Schläuchen? Kallimachos' Iambik, die Mimepen Theokrits und die Mimiamben des Herodas' in *Alexandreia und das Ptolemäische Ägypten: Kulturbegegnungen in Hellenistischer Zeit*, (ed.) G. Weber (Berlin), pp.187-207

Stehle, E., 2001. 'The Good Daughter: Mothers' Tutelage in Erinna's Distaff and Fourth-Century Epitaphs', in *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*, (ed.) A.P.M.H. Lardinois (Princeton), pp.179-200

- 2002. 'The Body and its Representations in Aristophanes' Thesmophoriazousai: Where Does the Costume End?', in *AJPh* 123, pp.36- 406

Steiner, D., 1999. 'To Praise, not to Bury: Simonides fr.531P', in *CQ* 49, pp.383-395

Stephens, S., 2002. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Berkeley)

- 2004. 'For you, Arsinoe', in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, (eds.) B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (Cambridge, Mass.), pp.161-176
- 2005. 'Battle of the Books', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.229-248

Stern, J., 1979. 'Herodas Mimiamb 6', in *GRBS* 20, pp.247-254

Stewart, A., 2005. 'Posidippus and the Truth in Sculpture', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.183-205

- 2007. 'Alexander, Philitas and the Skeletos: Poseidippos and Truth in Early Hellenistic Portraiture', in *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context*, (eds.) P. Schultz and R. von den Hof (Cambridge), pp.123-138

Svenbro, J., 1988. 'J'Écris, donc je M'Efface: l'Énonciation dans les Premieres Inscriptions Greques', in *Les Savoirs de l'Écriture: en Grèce Ancienne*, (ed.) G. Camassa (Lille), 459-479

- 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. J.E. Lloyd (Ithaca)
- 1999. 'Archaic and Classical Greece: The Invention of Silent Reading', in *A History of Reading in the West*, (eds.) G. Cavallo and R. Chartier (Cambridge), pp.37-63

Szemerényi, O., 1975. 'The Origins of Roman Drama and Greek Tragedy', in *Hermes* 103, pp.300-332

Tarán, S.L., 1979. *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden)

Thomas, R., 1989. Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens (Cambridge)

- 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge)
- 1996. 'Written in Stone? Liberty, Equality, Orality and the Codification of Law', in *Greek Law in its Political Setting: Justifications not Justice*, (eds.) L. Foxhall and A.D.E. Lewis (Oxford), pp.9-31

Thompson, D.J., 1994. 'Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt', in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, (eds.) A.K. Bowman and G. Woolf (Cambridge), pp.67-83

- 2005. 'Posidippus, Poet of the Ptolemies', in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (ed.) K.J. Gutzwiller (Oxford), pp.269-283

Too, Y.L., 2010. *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World* (Oxford)

Tsagalis, C.C., 2004. *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad* (Berlin)

- 2008. *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-Century Attic Funeral Epigrams* (Berlin)

Tsantsanoglou, K., 2013. 'Critical Observations on Posidippus' Testament (118 A.-B.)', in *ZPE* 187, pp.122-131

Tsitsirdis, S., 2011. 'Greek Mime in the Roman Empire: (P.Oxy.413: Chariton and Moichuteria)', in *Logeion* 1, pp.184-232

Tueller, M., 2008. *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram* (Leuven)

- 2010. 'The Passer-by in Archaic and Classical Epigram', in *Archaic and Classical Epigram*, (eds.) M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.42-60

Turner, E.G., 1952. *Athenian Books in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered at University College London* (Edinburgh)

- 1968. *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Princeton)
- 1987. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, second edition rev. and enlarged, (ed.) P.J. Parsons (London)

Ussher, R.G., 1980. 'The Mimiamboi of Herodas', in *Hermathena* 129, pp.65-76

- 1985. 'The Mimic Tradition of 'Character' in Herodas', in *QUCC* 21, pp.45-68
- 1989. 'Herodas Re-Edited: Herodas, Mimiambi. Cum Fragmentorum Mimorum Papyraceorum by I.C. Cunningham; Herodas', in *CR* 39, pp.17-19

Van den Hout, M.P.J., (ed.) 1988. *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae* (Leipzig)

- 1999. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto* (Leiden)

Van Groningen, B.A., 'Quelques Problèmes de la Poésie Bucolique Grecque', in *Mnemosyne* 12, pp.24-53

Van Straten, F.T., 1981. 'Gifts for the Gods', in *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, (ed.) H.S. Versnel (Leiden), pp.65-151

Veneroni, B., 1971. 'Ricerche su due Mimiambi di Eroda [8, 2]', in RIL 105, pp.223-42

- 1973. 'Allacciamenti Tematici tra la Commedia Greco-Latina e il Mimo de Eroda', in *RIL* 107, pp.760-772

Vessey, D.W.T.C., 1971. 'The Reputation of Antimachus of Colophon', in *Hermes* 99, pp.1-10

Vestrheim, G., 2010. 'Voice in Sepulchral Epigrams: Some Remarks on the Use of the First and Second Person in Sepulchral Epigrams, and a Comparison with Lyric Poetry', in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, (eds.) M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.61-78

Vetter, E., 1938. '"Persiphnai" et "Phersu"', in *RE* 19.2, pp.2057-2058

Vogliano, A., 1906. *Ricerche sopra l'Ottavo Mimiambo di Heroda* (Milan)

Volkman, H., 1975. 'Die Inschriften im Geschictswerk des Herodot', in *Endoxos Duleia. Kleine Schriften zur Alten Geschchte*, (ed.) H. Volkman (Berlin), pp.43-64

Wachter, R., 2010. 'The Origin of Epigrams on 'Speaking Objects'', in *Archaic and Classical Epigram*, (eds.) M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (Cambridge), pp.250-260

Walde, C., 2001. *Die Traumdarstellungen in der Griechisch-Römischen Dichtung* (Leipzig)

Walsh, G.B., 1990. 'Surprised by Self: Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry', in *CPh* 85, pp.1-21

- 1991. 'Callimachean Passages: The Rhetoric of Epitaph in Epigram', in *Arethusa* 24, pp.77-105

Waszink, J.H., 1974. *Biene und Honig als Symbol des Dichters und der Dichtung in der Griechisch-Römischen Antike* (Opladen)

Watson, J., (ed.) 2001. *Speaking Volumes* (Leiden)

Webster, T.B.L., 1954. 'Personification as a Mode of Greek Thought', in *JWI* 17, pp.10-21

- 1965. 'The Poet and the Mask' in *Classical Drama and its Influence*, (ed.) M.J. Anderson (London), pp.3-14
- 1970. *Greek Theatre Production* (London)

Weil, H., 1891. 'Review of F.G. Kenyon, Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, including the newly discovered poems of Herodas (London 1891), and W.G. Rutherford, ΗΡΩΝΔΟΥ ΜΙΜΙΑΜΒΟΙ (London 1891)', in *JS*, pp.655-673

Wendel, C., (ed.) 1914. *Scholia in Theocritum Vetera* (Stuttgart)

West, M.L., 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin)

- 1977. 'Erinna', in *ZPE* 25, pp.95-119
- (ed.) 1989. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, 2 vols. (Oxford)
- 1993. *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford)
- 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford)
- (ed.) 2003. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer* (Cambridge, Mass.)

West, S., 1985. 'Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests', in *CQ* 33, pp.114-135

White, S.A., 1999. 'Callimachus Battiades', in *CPh* 94, pp.168-181

Whitmarsh, T., 2013. 'An I for an I: Reading Fictional Autobiography', in *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, (eds.) J. Hill and A. Marmodoro (Oxford), pp.233-247

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, 1913. *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchen über Griechische Lyrike* (Berlin)

- 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* (Berlin)
- 1929. *Plato: Sein Leben und Seine Werke* (Berlin)

Williams, M.F., 2005. 'The New Posidippus: Realism in Hellenistic Sculpture, Lysippus, and Aristotle's Aesthetic Theory (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, Pos. X.7.-XI.19 Bastianini = 62-70 AB)', in *Leeds International Classical Studies* 4, www.leeds.ac.uk/classics/lics/2005/200502.pdf (last accessed: June 2016)

Wiseman, T.P., 2008. ''Mime' and 'Pantomime': Some Problematic Texts', in *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, (eds.) E. Hall and R. Wyles (Oxford), pp.146-153

Wöhrle, G., 2002. 'Auf der Suche nach der Verlorenen Kindheit. Die Grabepigramme von Anyte und Erinna oder: vom Telos eines Mädchens', in *Gender Studies in den Altertumswissenschaften: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen*, (eds.) B. Feichtinger and G. Wöhrle (Trier), pp.41-48

Worthington, I., (ed.) 1996. *Voice into Text* (Leiden)

Worthington, I. and Foley, J.M., (eds.) 2002. *Epea and Grammata: Oral and Written Communication in Ancient Greece* (Leiden)

Wüst, E., 1932. 'Mimos', in *RE* 15:2, pp.1727-1764

Wyss, R., (ed.) 1936. *Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae* (Berlin)

Yatsuhashi, A.V., 2010 (diss.). *In the Bird Cage of the Muses: Archiving, Erudition and Empire in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Durham, NC)

Youni, M.S., 2007. 'An Inscription from Teos Concerning Abdera', in *Thrace in the Graeco-Roman World: Proceedings of the 10th International Congress of Thracology*, (ed.) A. Iakovidou (Athens), pp.724-736

Ypsilanti, M., 2006. 'Mime in Verse: Strategic Affinities in Theocritus and Herodas', in *Maia* 58, pp.411-431

Zanker, G., 1987. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry* (London)

- 2004. *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Art and Poetry* (Madison)
- 2006. 'Poetry and Art in Herodas' Mimiamb 4', in *Beyond the Canon*, (eds.) M. A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (Leuven), pp.357-77
- 2009. *Herodas: Mimiambs* (Oxford)

Anon., 1892. 'Il Giambografo Eroda e i Suoi Nuovi Carmi', in *La Civiltà Catolica* 43, pp.272-287