

## ΚΛΕΟΣ AND POETRY IN SIMONIDES FR. 11 W<sup>2</sup> AND THEOCRITUS, IDYLL 16

In recent scholarly work on Theocritus' Id. 16 the poem has been viewed as a statement of poetics that involves patronage rather than as a lament on the state of contemporary poetry, an idiosyncratic encomium to Hiero II or an advertisement to reluctant prospective patrons<sup>1</sup>. The poem deals extensively with patronage, the only aspect of the poetic enterprise very obliquely, if at all, touched upon in Id. 7, Theocritus' main programmatic piece<sup>2</sup>. Despite multiple shifts of tone and relative opaqueness in its transitions<sup>3</sup>,

---

1) See R. Hunter, *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge 1996) 77–109, M. Fantuzzi, *Theocritus and the 'Demythologizing' of Poetry*, in: M. Depew and D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge, Mass. 2000, 142–45 and O. Vox, ἀγαθὸν κλέος; poeta e committente nelle *Cariti* (Theocr. 16), *Kleos* 7 (2002) 193–209. See also the earlier contributions of A. Horstmann, *Ironie und Humor bei Theokrit* (Meisenheim am Glan 1976) 119–37, F. T. Griffiths, *Theocritus at Court* (Leiden 1979) 9–50 and K. Gutzwiller, *Charites or Hiero: Theocritus' Idyll 16*, *RhM* 126 (1983) 212–38. N. Austin, *Idyll 16: Theocritus and Simonides*, *TAPA* 98 (1967) 1–21, read the poem as a testimony to the problem of poetry's justification in Alexandria.

2) The reference to Zeus' throne at 7.93 may imply Ptolemaic patronage or a prospect thereof; see A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* (Cambridge<sup>2</sup> 1952) on Id. 7.93 and Griffiths (above, n. 1) 3. Patronage is an important theme in the epinician poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides. They present the patron-poet exchange in the guise of the guest-friendship relationship, the free exchange of gifts and favors by like-minded social equals who select each other freely on the basis of their excellence; see e. g. K. Crotty, *Song and Action* (Baltimore 1982) 74–78, T. K. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind* (Leiden 1985) 156–58 and L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise* (Ithaca 1990) 135–59. Kurke 135 cites scholars who correctly cautioned that the guest-friendship relationship may not have been a mere fiction but may have reflected the contractual exchange. Cf. also G. Nagy, *Pindar's Homer* (Baltimore 1990) 247. The *Odyssey* mentions bards as hired artisans (17.385) and presents Phemius and Demodocus as bards attached to the courts of Ithaca and Scheria. Although bards enjoy meals and presumably other benefits as well as honor in the communities or palaces where they entertain, there is no indication that they sing to praise their audience, the king or the royal family. Thus Homeric kings never function as patrons in the later sense of the term. For epic bards cf. B. K. Gold, *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome* (Chapel Hill 1987) 15–17.

3) A major part of the elusiveness of Id. 16 may be attributed to its various generic affiliations, especially to mime and children's songs, and to echoes of anecdotes about Theocritus' poetic predecessors; see most recently Vox (above, n. 1) 194.

Id. 16 purports to stand on a crudely simple syllogism: poetry confers κλέος and poetry can be bought for money, so money can buy κλέος. The poem also purports to be an attempt to persuade contemporary men of means to patronize the poet. The success of this enterprise depends on the presentation of κλέος as the only imperishable and thus most valuable asset a wealthy man can acquire and as the most valuable prize that all famous poetic laudandi, including the heroes of the past, acquired. The entire poem then largely revolves around κλέος, which functions as one of the poem's main links to the epic and the encomiastic lyric tradition. Nevertheless, scholars have mostly tended to disregard this pivotal motif or consider it a conventional topos. In this paper I will explore the poet's view of κλέος conferred by poetry on past and present laudandi as well as the connection of κλέος with the Muses and with the rewards reaped by the epic poet and the lyric laudator. Because of the prominence of patronage in Id. 16 the affiliations with encomiastic lyric are very conspicuous in the poem and the appeal to this tradition is the foundation of the poet's exhortation for patronage (22–57). The epic tradition is equally important because of the hexameter medium, the references to epic poetry and heroes (48–57, 74–75), the explicit mention of Homer (57) as well as the possible allusions to Homeric biography. The fusion of the two traditions, which results in the promise of an epic encomium, progressively upsets the audience's familiarity with the notion of κλέος: the poetry of the past is the model of contemporary poetry not because they both deal with κλέα ἀνδρῶν but because heroes of the past needed poets to confer κλέος on them and secure the survival of their memory, as contemporary men do. The benefits of poetry can come about through patronage of poets. Thus, instead of presenting modern poetry as the new counterpart of past poetry, Id. 16 presents past poetry as the old counterpart of modern poetry in a reversal of roles that necessitates a substantial reworking of the older view of κλέος.

The idea that only poetry ensures the posthumous survival of one's name became eventually a commonplace<sup>4</sup> but it was not cur-

---

4) See e.g. Pi. O.10.91–96, P.3.112–15, N.7.10–16, I.7.16–19, Bacch. 3.90–94, 9.82–86, 10.10–14 and other passages cited by Gow (above, n.2) on Id. 16.30f. In extant prose the motif occurs first in Herodotus' proem. On the historian's difference from Homer in the treatment of κλέος see T. Krischer, *Herodots Prooimion*, *Hermes* 93 (1965) 164–65; for the opposite view see Nagy (above, n.2)

rent in archaic Greek epic or indeed in Greek poetry before the 5th century BC. Until then the danger of obliteration of one's κλέος was never an explicit or implicit concern. Since κλέος was in no need of a secure repository, poetry was not viewed as such. κλέος, including apparently the κλέος of singers, was won chiefly because of divine favor toward its carriers and/or as a reward for their moral excellence; once won, κλέος spread immediately far and wide by word of mouth and provided the subject of present and especially future songs (e.g. Od. 1.95, 283, 298, 3.200, 203–4, 8.496–98, 9.20, 264, 19.108, 333–34, 24.92–94, 196–98; cf. also e.g. h. Hom. Ap. 156, Ibyc. fr. S 151.48 Davies, Ar. R. 1035, Theocr. 22.214–15 and epigram 21)<sup>5</sup>. When memorials of deceased heroes are mentioned in the epic, they are tombs and not songs (Il. 7.86–91, Od. 4.584, 24.80–84; cf. Il. 23.245–48, Od. 1.239–40, 24.32–33). It is easy to draw the conclusion that the κλέα of previous generations live on, and future generations learn of them, by means of poetry but this conclusion is never drawn explicitly in archaic Greek poetry, at least with regard to heroes and poetry about them<sup>6</sup>.

---

217–25. Even in the 4th century, though, when Plato (Symp. 208c–209e) suggests that love of immortality in the form of κλέος is the motive force behind all noteworthy deeds and especially those of heroes such as Achilles and poets such as Homer, he does not explicitly attribute the immortality of the heroes to the poets.

5) Simonides fr. 20.13 ff. W<sup>2</sup> may also have contained a reference to the immortality or κλέος of Homer's song; see D. Sider, 'As Is the Generation of Leaves' in Homer, Simonides, Horace and Stobaeus, in: D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides. Contexts of Praise and Desire* (Oxford 2001) 280. Songs are said to have κλέος already in Homer (Od. 8.74; cf. 1.351–52), although this κλέος may be thought to belong primarily to the heroes, whose deeds and sufferings gain wide popularity, and only secondarily to the songs that celebrate them. Songs and especially those sung by gods to honor mortals, e.g. by Apollo and the Muses at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (Il. 24.59–63, Aeschylus fr. 284 Radt, Pindar P. 3.89–92, N. 5.22–25) or by the Muses at the funeral of Achilles (Od. 24.60–62), are a major sign of divine favor toward the mortals in question and thus part of the κλέος which is the imperishable result of this favor. Notoriety is also attributed to divine hostility toward mortals and commemorated in song; see Il. 6.357–58, Od. 24.199–202, both involving adulterous women, Helen and Clytaemestra (cf. 11.436–39) but neither divine agency nor κλέος are mentioned in this connection.

6) Pace G. Nagy, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Cambridge, Mass. 1974) 244–52 and *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore 1979) passim, esp. ch. 1, 6 and 14, who thinks that the epic poet uses κλέος self-referentially to designate his song and the fame conferred to the heroes by this song; cf. Nagy (above, n. 2) passim, esp. ch. 6 and 7 and C. Segal, *Kleos and Its Ironies in the Odyssey*, AC 52 (1983) 26–27. Epic poetry is definitely one of the most important means of

In his complaint to Cynrus Theognis (237–54) stresses both the fame his favorite has won and the immortality he will enjoy through Theognis' poetry; the reference to this immortality is couched in terms that recall the immortality of epic figures such as Achilles and Helen<sup>7</sup>. Cynrus, though, had no distinction other than being Theognis' beloved and the poet precisely presents his service to the young man as something exceptional. The female addressee of Sappho fr. 55 Voigt, where the word κλέος does not appear, is unknown: even if she is not a poet, as may be implied by some sources (Stob. 3.4.12, Plut. Quaest. Conv. 646e), but a woman not sung by poets (Plut. Coniug. Praec. 145f–46a; cf. Aristid. Or. 28.51), whose name is bound to perish with her, she is presented as a negative Cynrus. In Ibycus fr. S 151.46–48 Davies (τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰὲν/καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔξειξ/ὡς κατ' ἀοιδὰν καὶ ἔμὸν κλέος) the κλέος of Polycrates and the poet are connected and Polycrates' beauty seems to be associated with that of the heroes of old (41–45). Still, Polycrates, too, is probably not much different from Cynrus<sup>8</sup>. Epinician poets are the first to draw an explicit connection between poetry and survival of one's achievements. On the one hand, they build on the epic tradition in that they stress the favor of the gods toward the laudandi and associate the victory to be celebrated with past heroic exploits, often by stressing the genealogical connections of victors to heroes. On the other hand, they not only claim that the present victory needs

transmitting and propagating κλέος but it is not the only means; see e.g. Od. 19.333–34, a reference to the κλέος of a worthy man spread to all mankind by his guest-friends, but associated by Nagy (1979) 257 with praise poetry; cf. also Od. 17.418 (ἐγὼ δέ κέ σε κλείω κατ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν), the disguised Odysseus' promise to Antinous. More importantly, poetry and κλέος do not stand in a cause and effect relationship: epic heroes are not said in epic poetry to owe their κλέος to songs. Epic poets use the language of κλέος to designate their own activity, often by using the verb κλείω (e.g. H. Od. 1.338, h. Hom. 32.19, Hes. Th. 44, 67, 105; cf. AR Arg. 1.18, 59). Nevertheless, κλέος won by excellence is independent of poetry and gives rise to it rather than vice versa: epic poets 'sing' (ἀείδουσιν) or 'celebrate/extol' (κλείουσιν) acts of gods and men that already enjoy κλέος. Because of the prominence of κλέος in the epic tradition the distinction between celebration and generation of κλέος may seem overly subtle and of no consequence but, as will appear below, it is important in the context of later poetry and especially Theocritus' reception of Homer.

7) Cf. Theogn. 245–47 and Od. 24.93–94 (cf. also Il. 9.413); Theogn. 251–52 and Il. 6.357–58. The same Homeric passages are echoed by Simonides in fr. 11 W<sup>2</sup>; see below n. 12 and 17.

8) See L. Woodbury, Ibycus and Polycrates, Phoenix 39 (1985) 206 on the probable lack of achievements of the young Polycrates.

their song in order to be properly celebrated and to survive the victor's death, but also imply that posterity would not know of the heroes of the past without epic poetry, which also lent glamour to heroic exploits<sup>9</sup>. Still, κλέος of achievements is nowhere openly said to be or to have been conferred by poetry<sup>10</sup>. The only extant exception is found in the work of a poet who is mentioned explicitly in Id. 16, Simonides, and specifically in a poem Theocritus alludes to in Id. 16 (44–47), the elegy for the Plataea fighters (fr. 11 W<sup>2</sup>). An important theme in this fragment is the immortality conferred by poetry on epic and contemporary heroes<sup>11</sup>.

### *Κλέος and the Muses in Simonides' Plataea elegy*

Simonides associates his own tribute to the heroes of Plataea with Homer's celebration of the heroes of the Trojan war. In the surviving portion of the hymnic proem, addressed to Achilles, κλέος is mentioned only in connection with Homer's poetry<sup>12</sup>. Homer is said

9) See above, n. 4 and cf. next note.

10) In O. 10.91–96 and P. 3.110–15 (cf. Bacch. 3.91–92) Pindar does not openly attribute the κλέος of laudandi and heroes to poetry; he rather stresses the importance of poetry in immortalizing and passing on to posterity the achievements of the laudandi (Bacch. 1.181–84 emphasizes the importance and durability of ἀρετά for the laudandus' εὐκλεία but the connection with poetry is oblique, although it is possible that the invocation of the Muses at the beginning touched on the topic). N. 7.61–63 (ξείνός εἰμι· σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον./ ὕδατος ὅτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων/ κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω) does not mean that Pindar will bring genuine κλέος to the laudandus (cf. Gutzwiller [above, n. 1] 223 and Nagy [above, n. 2] 147–48) but that he will praise the genuine κλέος of the laudandus. Pindar's praise will of course diffuse and immortalize the laudandus' κλέος but this κλέος exists because fate favored the laudandus (N. 7.58–60). Similarly, Pindar's references to Homer (N. 7.20–23, I. 4.55–57) make no mention of Homer's being responsible for the κλέος of his heroes, although they stress the epic poet's exceptional place in the poetic tradition: Homer glorified Odysseus' adventures and properly honored Ajax.

11) Other Simonidean poems also influenced Id. 16; see Vox (above, n. 1) 194–98. The discovery of the Plataea elegy has as much revealed one of Theocritus' sources as shown the probable, and often forgotten, importance of the loss of others.

12) The qualifications of the city of Troy, the probable περικλεές (9) and four lines below the certain αἰοιδίμων (13), are not used directly in connection with Homeric poetry. Nevertheless, the emphasis on Homer as the source of heroic immortal κλέος a few lines below (15–18) leaves little doubt about the source of Trojan κλέος too and, as I. Rutherford, *The New Simonides: Toward a Commentary*, in: Boedeker and Sider (above, n. 5) 44 n. 54, points out, αἰοιδίμων recalls Il. 6.357–58 and marks a realization of Homer's prediction. It is probably significant that in

to have poured immortal κλέος on the sackers of Troy and to have made the short-lived race of demigods famous to posterity (15–18):

οἷσιν ἐπ' ἀθά]νατον κέχυται κλέος ἀν[δρὸς] ἔκητι  
 ὃς παρ' ἰοπ]λοκάμων δέξατο Πιερίδ[ω]  
 πᾶσαν ἀλ]η]θείην, καὶ ἐπώνυμον ὀπ[λοτέρ]οισιν  
 ποίησ' ἥμ]ιθέων ὠκύμορον γενεή[ν].

It is plausible that the two claims do not represent two distinct Homeric contributions to the fame of the heroes but explain each other: Homer poured immortal κλέος on the heroes because he made them famous to posterity or he made the heroes famous to posterity because he poured immortal κλέος on them. Although 5th century lyric emphasized the role of epic poetry in ensuring that posterity would learn of past heroic exploits, Simonides' reference to Homer does more than merely imply the epic poet's importance as a source of historical information. First, it attributes to Homer, quite possibly for the first time in Greek poetry, the κλέος that in the epic tradition belongs to the heroes by virtue of their worth alone, spreads by word of mouth and is sung by poets. Second, it completely glosses over pre-Homeric and generally non-Homeric poetry that dealt with the heroes of the Trojan war. This exclusive focus on Homer facilitates the upcoming parallelism between Homer and Simonides as the old and the modern purveyors of κλέος by eliminating all associations that might obscure the direct line that connects the two poets. I will elaborate on this parallelism below. Here it suffices to say that the presentation of Homer as a model for Simonides and the failure to place Homer in any other poetic tradition results in the downplaying of the fact that Homer sang of heroes of old. Thus Simonides' presentation of Homer brings in line not only the function of Homer and Simonides as purveyors of κλέος to heroes but also the chronological relationship of the two poets to their heroes.

fr. S 151 Davies Ibycus uses περικλεές to qualify Troy (2). This is the only extant occurrence of the adjective before Simonides and four lines below (6) Ibycus calls the struggle of the Trojan war πολύμνον. The two poems share several themes and possibly not by accident: both mention the great Trojan saga, the Muses in connection with poems about this saga and poetic κλέος; they pass over the old stories and turn to modern laudandi. A further indirect indication that Simonides echoed Ibycus is that in Id. 16 Theocritus also possibly echoes Ibycus' poem (see below, n. 23) and may have chosen it as part of his multi-tiered intertextual references.

Despite the novelty of his view of Homer, Simonides tiptoes carefully around epic conventions, mainly when he passes to his own tribute to the heroes of Plataea (20–24). Simonides then calls upon the Muse to be his ally and assist him with the fashioning of his song (20–24):

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ[  
 κικλήισκω] σ' ἐπίκουρον ἐμοί, π[ολυώνυμ]ε Μοῦσα,  
 εἴ πέρ γ' ἀν]θρώπων εὐχομένω[ν μέλαια.  
 ἔντυνο]ν καὶ τόνδ[ε μελ]ίφρονα κ[όσμον ἀ]οιδῆς  
 ἤμετ]έρης ...

The metaphor of the Muse as ally has received scholarly attention<sup>13</sup>. ἐπίκουρος is used in Homer for non-Trojan allies and nowhere for the Muses. It is plausible that, following the mention of the Muses' fundamental role in Homer's glorification of the heroes and before the Plataea battle narrative, which possibly included references to deployment of troops and military alliances, Simonides chose a metaphor that portrayed the poet as a warrior or military leader and accorded to him a more prominent role than Homer was granted in relation to the Muses. There is, however, no implication that Homer needed information from the Muses because he sang of events much older than his own time whereas Simonides required no information because he was a contemporary of the Plataea battle<sup>14</sup>. Poets address similar appeals to the Muses no matter whether they sing of recent or past events and the goddesses operate in a similar manner in both cases. The Muses are involved in the songs of Demodocus as well as in those of Pindar and Bacchylides who sing of events that took place in their own time (cf. e.g. Od. 8.73–83, 487–98, Pi. O. 10.3–6 and 95–105, P. 1.58–60, N. 3.1–12, Bacch. 3.1–4, 12.1–8). Besides, if Simonides downplays Homer's chronology, as suggested above, then Homer's lack of personal knowledge of the Trojan war becomes even more irrelevant.

Simonides' appeal to the Muse is not based on the distinction between form and content, either<sup>15</sup>. κόσμος ἀοιδῆς is not the orna-

13) See E. Stehle, A Bard of the Iron Age and his Auxiliary Muse, in: Boedeker and Sider (above, n. 5) 108–14 and cf. below n. 16.

14) For this view see A. Aloni, The Proem of Simonides' Plataea Elegy and the Circumstances of Its Performance, in: Boedeker and Sider (above, n. 5) 95.

15) See Stehle (above, n. 13) 110–11.

ment of the song but the orderly song in its entirety, just as Pindar's *πυρσὸς ὕμνων* (I. 4.61–62) or *ἄνθεα ὕμνων* (O. 9.48) are vivid metaphors for his song. The ideal epic song is an accurate, detailed, truthful narrative of events, such as an eyewitness or participant would provide, with the added god-given charms of poetic elaboration that can beguile the audience (Od. 8.487–98). The epic poet relies on the Muse to supply him with a song, irrespective of whether he himself knows the facts or not. Knowledge of the facts, even if they are narrated attractively, does not amount to a song: Odysseus narrates his adventures to the Phaiakes and his supposed adventures to Eumaeus like a singer (Od. 11.367–69, 17.518–21) but he is not a singer himself. Since the appeal to the Muse is a prayer and *ἐπίκουρος* could be used without connotations of foreignness for human rescuers (Eur. El. 138, IA 1027) and divine helpers (Hdt. 7.189), it is likely that Simonides' appeal contains one of the first extant occurrences of the metaphor of the helper god as military ally/auxiliary. Archilochus and Sappho had already invoked Hephaestus and Aphrodite respectively as *σύμμαχος* (fr. 1.28 Voigt, fr. 128 W) and at O. 13.96–97 Pindar (or the chorus) refers to himself as *ἐπίκουρος* to the Muses (and the family of the laudandus): this striking metaphor, from a poem dated to 464 and thus not much later than Simonides' elegy, presents the goddesses in need of a mortal ally who cannot possibly be thought of as a foreign auxiliary.

More importantly, Simonides' two references to the Muses and their help to Homer and Simonides himself may be thought to reflect on each other. If so, then the appeal to the Muse for assistance is meant as much to distance Simonides from Homer as to reinforce the similarity between the two poets. *καί*, virtually the only secure word in 23, has not received much attention in discussions of Simonides' appeal to the Muse but it indicates that the Muse is asked to do something in addition to something else, most probably to fit out Simonides' present song, too. The only song mentioned in the fragment so far has been Homer's praise of the Trojan war heroes. Thus *καί* may be plausibly assumed to connect Simonides' present song with that of Homer. This connection does not exclude other possibilities: *καί* may, for instance, also imply other songs by Simonides himself composed with the help of the Muse. If Homer's song is (also) intended, then the Muses may be thought of as the allies of Homer, who helped him glorify the heroes with his orderly song by offering him something crucial,

most probably the truth, and Simonides' Muse will offer him the same thing, the truth encapsulated in an orderly song<sup>16</sup>. The emphasis on the importance of his poem for the preservation of the memory of the Plataea exploit notwithstanding (24–26), Simonides stresses the fame the brave fighters won with their victory and their undying κλέος among men (27–28) but avoids to connect it directly with (his) poetry. It is true that after the statement about Homer and the invocation of the Muse there can be little doubt concerning the role of Simonides' elegy in the preservation of the fighters' glory for posterity. Still, it is not accidental or trivial that, after he has made his view of poetry's function clear, the poet chooses to step back and echo the epic view of κλέος exactly before he launches into the narrative of the exploit<sup>17</sup>.

16) If e.g. a divine voice, recalling Hes. Th. 31–32 (cf. H. Od. 8.498), or another divine gift was bestowed on Homer, the parallel between Homer and Simonides remains unaffected: the Muses help both poets and bestow the song on them. For the Muse's importance cf. also D. Obbink, *The Genre of Plataea: Generic Unity in the New Simonides*, in: Boedeker and Sider (above, n. 5) 70–71, who compares the change of addressee and mid-poem appeal to the Muse in Simonides and Empedocles (DK 31 B131). The Muse does not lack a master narrative on Plataea to fall back on, as Stehle (above, n. 13) 110 thinks, because she is the source or the crucial ally from which Simonides' master narrative will originate.

17) If there is an echo of Tyrtaeus 12.31–32 W (οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἔσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ./ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γῆς περ ἔων γίνεται ἀθάνατος) in Simonides' κλέος ... ἀθάνατο(ν) (fr. 11.28 W<sup>2</sup>), as Stehle (above, n. 13) 116–18 suggests, then this reminiscence also includes the Homeric Achilles, the heroic addressee (and epic model for the fighters) of the poem, through Tyrtaeus' echo of Od. 24.93–94 (ὡς σὺ μὲν οὐδὲ θανὼν ὄνομ' ὄλεσας, ἀλλὰ τοι αἰεὶ/πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους κλέος ἔσσειται ἔσθλόν, Ἀχιλλεῦ). These lines are probably an echo of Il. 9.413 (see A. T. Edwards, Achilles in the Odyssey [Königstein 1985] 83), the famous reference to κλέος ἄφθιτον (on which see most recently K. Volk, κλέος ἄφθιτον Revisited, CP 97 [2002] 61–68): the honors that Tyrtaeus promises to the brave fighters who fall on the battlefield (12.27–34 W) overlap significantly with the honors the Achaeans bestowed on the dead Achilles (Od. 24.61–84) and their κλέος matches his. Thus the Plataea dead will receive similar honors to those bestowed on previous generations of (Spartan) dead who were honored like Achilles. The echo of Tyrtaeus may have been intended as a tribute to the Spartans, especially if they or Pausanias had commissioned the elegy (see next note), but the association with Achilles was probably of paramount importance in the context of the elegy. Whether Tyrtaeus or Simonides implies cultic honors for the dead (see C. Fuqua, Tyrtaeus and the Cult of Heroes, GRBS 22 [1981] 215–26 and D. Boedeker, Paths to Heroization at Plataea, in: Boedeker and Sider [above, n. 5] 148–163) does not affect my point.

*Κλέος and the Muses in Theocritus, Id. 16*

Theocritus' treatment of previous poetry, mainly Homer's and Simonides', in Id. 16 is similar, and probably indebted, to Simonides' presentation of Homer as purveyor of κλέος and his model. Theocritus, though, also negotiates a longer and more multifarious tradition than Simonides does and deals at length with patronage<sup>18</sup>, turning κλέος conferred by poetry into the main theme of the poem. To successfully make the case that κλέος may be conferred by the encomiastic poet to virtually anyone who has the means to hire him Theocritus associates present encomia with the epic and lyric poetry of the past. To this end he makes extensive use of two of Simonides' main stratagems in the Plataea elegy, the failure to stress distinctions and the implication that the relationship between poets and Muses does not conform exactly to the traditional model, but he expands substantially and ironically the interplay between traditional motifs and their modern instantiation. Although Simonides' elegy appears to be quite innovative in terms of genre and especially in terms of its relation to epic poetry<sup>19</sup>, in Id. 16 the fusion of epic and lyric draws attention to itself because of the simultaneous emphasis on patronage and κλέος. The presentation of lyric praise in epic guise becomes more prominent in the second part of the poem where Hiero II emerges as the preferred prospective patron (80–103) but it is signaled already in the poem (1–4) where patronage is not mentioned:

Αἰεὶ τοῦτο Διὸς κούραις μέλει, αἰὲν ἀοιδοῖς,  
ὕμνεῖν ἀθανάτους, ὕμνεῖν ἀγαθῶν κλέα ἀνδρῶν.

18) The Plataea elegy may have been commissioned too, possibly by Sparta and/or Pausanias; see e.g. A. Schachter, Simonides' Elegy on Plataia: The Occasion of Its Performance, ZPE 123 (1998) 25–30, Aloni (above, n. 14) 102–4 and P.-J. Shaw, Lords of Hellas, Old Men of the Sea: The Occasion of Simonides' Elegy on Plataea, in: Boedeker and Sider (above, n. 5) 178–81. On the question of the poem's commission and occasion cf. also D. Boedeker, Simonides on Plataea: Narrative Elegy, Mythodic History, ZPE 107 (1995) 223–24 and Rutherford (above, n. 12) 39–40. Even if the elegy was commissioned, the glory of the Plataea victory would dwarf all possible achievements of the majority of Theocritus' prospective patrons. Nevertheless, a commission, especially one by Pausanias, would provide a background that would facilitate the associations between Theocritus, Simonides and Homer upon which the presentation of patronage in Id. 16 relies.

19) For the generic affiliations of the elegy see Obbink (above, n. 16); cf. Aloni (above, n. 14) and Stehle (above, n. 13).

Μοῖσαι μὲν θεαὶ ἐντί, θεοὺς θεαὶ ἀείδοντι·  
ἄμμες δὲ βροτοὶ οἶδε, βροτοὺς βροτοὶ ἀείδωμεν.

Though brief, this proem touches on several major aspects of the poetic enterprise that the poem deals with, in a remarkable feat of poetic suggestiveness. It does not openly or polemically challenge conventions but uses seemingly traditional language and relies on ambiguity to signal difference, a strategy that will be pursued to the end of the poem. The proem begins with an image of perennial poetic stability that recalls the proem of Hesiod's *Theogony* (44–50, 100–1; cf. Ar. Pax 774–80): Muses and poets sing in harmonious coordination the praises of gods and ἀγαθῶν κλέα ἀνδρῶν (1–2), presumably the goddesses on Olympus and the poets on earth. The elegant clarity of this seemingly traditional picture becomes obfuscated in the next two lines. 3–4 seem to direct the audience toward a different interpretation of the previous two lines by indicating that the Muses sing the praises of gods whereas the poet(s) should sing the praises of mortals (βροτούς). At the same time, though, 3–4 fail to provide a clear answer to two important questions: are the Muses involved in the praises of mortal men, in other words do or can poets sing of mortals without the inspiration of the Muses, and are the preferred mortal subjects at 4 identical with ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες at 2? Without an answer to these questions the nature and import of the praeteritio<sup>20</sup>, on which the poet's choice of subject is founded, cannot be determined.

I will start with the comparatively less complicated second question. It has been argued that ἀγαθῶν κλέα ἀνδρῶν at 2 points to heroic poetry and that the proem involves a tripartition of poetic subjects, into divine, heroic and mortal; according to this reading the praeteritio rejects heroic and divine in favor of mortal subjects for song<sup>21</sup>. On this view Theocritus distinguishes himself from the αἰοιδοί of 1–2, who sing of heroes, because he implicitly attributes to them inappropriate choice of subject. As I will argue

20) The praeteritio is cast in the mold of a preference or recognition of appropriateness, as is indicated by the subjunctive ἀείδωμεν, rather than an outright rejection. This lack of rigidity is probably meant to allow for the considerable variety of subjects that will appear in the poem (cf. Griffiths [above, n. 1] 21–22) and thus leaves all channels of association with previous poetry open.

21) See S. Koster, *Antike Epostheorien* (Wiesbaden 1970) 114–15 and Gutzwiller (above, n. 1) 218–19.

below, however, in the rest of Id. 16 Theocritus collapses distinctions between himself and other poets, especially epic poets such as Homer, and between Simonides and Homer and thus a distinction between himself and epic poets in the proem would serve little purpose. On the assumption of a tripartition, moreover, Theocritus implicitly equates heroes and gods. If he suggests that heroic subjects are unsuitable for him as a mortal singer, in the light of the distinction he draws between the subjects of Muses and poets at 3–4 he must imply that heroic poetry belongs to the provenance of the Muses: since the Muses are said to sing of gods, heroes and gods have to be virtually identical because otherwise there is no stated basis for Theocritus' preference of mortal over heroic subjects. The identification of gods and heroes is not impossible per se, given that heroes are usually demigods and honored in cult, but it effectively annuls the tripartition. It is thus preferable to abandon the idea of the tripartition in favor of the view that Theocritus operates with a bipartition of poetic subjects into gods and mortals, be they heroes of old or contemporary men<sup>22</sup>. This bipartition is more germane to the concerns of the poem. Theocritus announces his intention to sing an epic encomium of the κλέα of mortal men, as opposed presumably to more intimate mortal themes, e. g. love, beauty, wine, banquets or loss, sorrow, misfortune, etc.<sup>23</sup> The identification of the ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες at 2 and the βροτοὶ at 4, the poet's preferred subjects, foreshadows the eventual erasure of distinctions between epic and commissioned lyric poetry. It also heightens the effect of the surprise that ensues from the audience's imminent realization that the poet faces a patronage problem and that he does

22) Vox (above, n. 1) 196–98 suggests that the praeteritio is ambiguous as to the rejection of heroic subjects. Cf. below, n. 44. Hunter (above, n. 1) 103 observes that the insistence on βροτοὶ at 4 points to Theocritus' version of the equality between poet and patron.

23) Qua praeteritio the proem probably recalls Ibycus fr. S 151 Davies (cf. M. Fantuzzi, *Heroes, Descendants of Hemitheoi: The Proemium of Theocritus 17 and Simonides 11 W<sup>2</sup>*, in: Boedeker and Sider [above, n. 5] 240 n. 28 and Vox [above, n. 1] 195–96), the encomium to Polycrates, which echoes both Homer and Hesiod; see Woodbury (above, n. 8) 200–201 and B. MacLachlan, Ibycus, in: D. E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, Leiden 1997, 193–94. Ibycus, though, passes over martial heroic themes in favor of a non-heroic one. Theocritus proposes to sing ἀγαθῶν κλέα ἀνδρῶν or to compose epic encomia praising the deeds of his contemporaries. For the κλέος of Polycrates see above, n. 8. For the import of Ibycus' reference to the Heliconian Muses (fr. S 151.23 ff. Davies) see below, n. 25.

not necessarily or primarily select subjects on the basis of their worth (5–21). I will return to patronage below.

Concerning the first question, the heroic epic associations evoked by the reference to κλέα ἀνδρῶν, the traditional subject of Muse-inspired epic poets, and the Hesiodic view of the Muses, even if the poet immediately chooses a non-Hesiodic role for himself, complicate the question about the role attributed to the Muses in the praeteritio. At 3 the Muses appear as singers rather than inspirers of song or patronesses of poets: as singers, the Muses choose divine subjects, presumably because as goddesses they are the only ones fully qualified to. Their capacity as singers, though, is not incompatible with their role as inspirers of human poets who sing of human subjects. 4 does not imply a complete disjunction of poets and Muses, as if the Muses had nothing to do with the mortal subjects preferred by Theocritus<sup>24</sup>. If such a disjunction obtained, it would be tantamount to a radical break with the traditional conception of the Muses' role in poetry<sup>25</sup>. The attribution of so revisionist an attitude to Theocritus has no adequate support in the poem (or elsewhere in Theocritus' poetry). As suggested already, though, the interaction of Muses and poet in Id. 16 does not exactly conform to the traditional view of the poet as mouthpiece of the Muses. The poem does not explicitly reject the help of the Muses in encomia for mortal laudandi. Still, the poet does not request or otherwise mention the help of the Muses to poets. This choice raises questions about the coordinates of the new song in relation to a tradition otherwise apparently endorsed in the poem.

The subsequent references to the Muses seem to reestablish the connection between poets and goddesses. The poets are called

---

24) Gutzwiller (above, n. 1) 219 and 230 suggests that Theocritus considers mortal subjects amenable without the help of the Muses; cf. next note.

25) Ibycus' reference to the Muses as the only competent authorities to provide information about the Trojan expedition (fr. S 151.23 ff. Davies) does not imply that the goddesses are not involved in the fashioning of the song about Polykrates or that the poet does not need their help for this song: no mortal man can give an account of the Trojan war without the help of the Muses; a song about any subject, though, requires the inspiration of, although not necessarily information from, the Muses. In the two other pre-Simonidean poems that deal with immortality conferred by poetry the favor of the Muses is explicitly mentioned; see Sappho fr. 55.2–3 Voigt and Theognis 249–250. Epinician poets regularly include references to the Muses in the praise of their laudandi; see e. g. Pi. O. 1.111–12, 3.4–10, 7.7–9, 9.80–81, P. 1.58.59, 4.1–3, 11.41–45, N. 3.1–3, 6.28–30, 7.77–79, 9.1, I. 4.61–62, Bacch. 2.11, 3.1–4, 9.3, 13.221–31, D. 19.1–14.

‘sacred interpreters of the Muses’ (Μοισάων ... ἱερὸς ὑποφήτας) at 29 where the goddesses are indirectly associated with praise poetry. The association becomes more explicit at 58 (ἐκ Μοισῶν ἀγαθὸν κλέος ἔρχεται ἀνθρώποισι). At 101–3 (εἷς μὲν ἐγὼ, πολλοὺς δὲ Διὸς φιλέοντι καὶ ἄλλους/θυγατέρες, τοῖς πᾶσι μέλοι Σικελὴν Ἀρέθουσαν/ὑμνεῖν σὺν λαοῖσι καὶ αἰχμητῆν Ἴερόνα) the traditional language of the Muses’ favor to poets reappears in the context of the prospective encomium to Hiero II, now sycophantically said to be sung by a multitude of singers. The most intriguing references occur at two pivotal points, the transition to the prospective encomium to Hiero II (δίζημα δ’ ὅτινι θνατῶν κεχαρισμένος ἔλθω/σὺν Μοῖσαις· χαλεπαὶ γὰρ ὁδοὶ τελέθουσιν αἰδοῖς/κουράων ἀπάνευθε Διὸς μέγα βουλευόντος, 68–70) and the end of the poem (ἀκλήτος μὲν ἔγωγε μένοιμί κεν, ἐς δὲ καλέωντων/θαρήσας Μοῖσαισι σὺν ἀμετέραισιν ἴοιμ’ ἄν, 106–7). In the former the poet seeks a suitable patron to visit in the company of the Muses; in the latter he similarly announces that he will respond to the invitation to visit a patron, i. e. to compose praise poetry on commission, in the company of his Muses, or by taking his Muses with him, since he goes on to say that he will not leave behind his Graces either (καλλεῖψω δ’ οὐδ’ ὕμμε· τί γὰρ Χαρίτων ἀγαπητόν/ἀνθρώποις ἀπάνευθεν; ἀεὶ Χαρίτεσσιν ἄμ’ εἶην, 108–9). In the light of 106–7, 68–70 may also be thought to imply that in his visit to the prospective suitable patron the poet will take his Muses with him. The attribution of a choice to the poet cannot be accounted for by the traditional-sounding explanations that away (ἀπάνευθε) from Muses and Graces the poet faces a difficult journey and lacks all loveliness (69–70 and 108–9). It is indeed part of the traditional view that inspiration and loveliness come from the goddesses but on this view a poet cannot choose to take or not take the Muses and Graces with him in his journeys: a poet cannot be a poet without the favor of the goddesses and it is they who choose their favorites, not vice versa<sup>26</sup>. Theocritus’ non-traditional claims may be taken as an answer to the

26) Epinician poets often suggest that they surpass their rivals in sophistication because they enjoy the Muses’ special favor (see e. g. Pi. O. 1.111–12, 2.86–89, P. 4.247–48, N. 3.80–82, fr. 52h.11–22, 70b.23–25, Bacch. D. 16.2–4, 19.8–14) but there can be no poet completely lacking divine favor. The “learners” Pindar refers to cannot compete with a poet (or athlete) endowed with inborn talent, i. e. enjoying divine favor; see e. g. Hubbard (above, n. 2) 107–24 and 150–52. These learners, though, are not poets but mere poetic aspirants with no real potential.

question about the Muses' role raised by the proem. This answer has two sides because the repetition of the poet's intention not to pay a visit unaccompanied by his Muses as well as the other references to the goddesses after the proem work on two levels.

Qua tokens of the connection between poet and Muses, they indicate the poet's allegiance to the tradition and thus may increase, or at least may be presented as meant to increase, his chances of securing patronage. The promise to take the goddesses with him is a variation of the common encomiastic motif of the poet's praise of his own skill or superiority over his colleagues. To an extent this indirect appeal to the lyric tradition makes up for the quite remarkable lack of emphasis on Theocritus' poetic skills in a poem that purports to extol the value of (his) poetry to patrons: the claim at the end of the prospective encomium to Hiero II that the Muses favor a multitude of singers, all intent on praising Arethusa, the people of Syracuse and Hiero II (101–3), is meant to be a compliment to the prospective patron and a show of modesty that might attract him. On the other hand, it is a declaration of allegiance to the epic tradition, which can be another enticement to a patron who has been pronounced the equal of the heroes of old, a new Achilles or Ajax (73–81): the epic Muse loves the entire race of singers (Od. 8.477–81, Hes. Th. 94–97; cf. Theocr. 22.215–17). Besides, the reference to the favor of the Muses also points to Hesiod who had asserted that poets, beloved by the Muses, share with kings the favor of the goddesses (Th. 81–103). Thus an extra link between poets and Hiero II is pointed out: he is a god-beloved king, or at least as powerful as a king, and thus likely to show his favor, i. e. to grant patronage, to fellow favorites of the Muses, the daughters of king Zeus, the patron of kings.

Despite the echoes of the epic and, to a lesser extent, the lyric tradition, the references to the Muses and especially the poet's promise to take the goddesses with him suggest new possibilities for him that seem to undermine his connection with the tradition. The epic poet depends on the Muses who act of their own volition as sources and inspirers of his song; the lyric encomiast assures his patron that he, the laudator, is the favorite of the Muses and eagerly crafts and dispatches an exquisitely graceful song. Theocritus declares that he, apparently of his own accord, will take Muses and Graces with him: his song will be god-inspired and graceful not because the Muses and Graces favor him but because he chooses to

take with him the goddesses of music and the goddesses of grace. The poet cannot apparently perform his task without the goddesses but it is he who takes the crucial initiative that will result in the acquisition of κλέος by the patron and, implicitly, by the poet himself<sup>27</sup>. This cannot be meant to imply that the poet can handle the celebration of non-heroic mortals by himself but needs the assistance of the Muses when he sings of mortals of heroic stature such as Hiero II<sup>28</sup>. Such a claim would end up severely limiting the pool of patrons as no patron would presumably accept a lesser encomium. If all worthy or willing patrons are assured of the presence of the Muses in their encomium, then the distinction between non-heroic and heroic subjects becomes void. As will be argued below, the poem collapses distinctions because it hinges on the suggestion that κλέος may be acquired by any man willing to patronize a poet who takes the Muses with him. The promise to take the goddesses along does not amount to a simple assurance that a poet cannot travel without his inspiration<sup>29</sup>: it is not the presence or absence of inspiration but the choice to travel in the company of the goddesses that cannot be accounted for in traditional terms. One could dismiss the references to the Muses as Theocritus' idiosyncratic nod to the venerable but irrelevant poetic tradition, especially since the goddesses play a relatively minor role in the rest of his poetry<sup>30</sup>. But this tradition, represented by named poetic predecessors and their subjects, is so prominent in Id. 16 that an allusion to its fossilization through references to the Muses seems very unlikely. It is more plausible that Theocritus' promise to take the Muses with him harks back to his exhortation to the rich to patronize poets (22–57). As Simonides called on the Muse to assist him as his auxiliary not primarily because he meant to distance himself from Homer but because he composed a poem about a glorious battle, so Theocritus attributes the initiative to the poet not primarily in

---

27) Vox (above, n. 1) 203 correctly points out that at 58 all mortals, i. e. not only patrons but also poets, owe their κλέος to the Muses. It is significant too that by their designation as Ἐτεόκλειοι (104) at the end of the poem the Graces too are associated with κλέος; see Gutzwiller (above, n. 1) 234–35.

28) Cf. above, n. 24.

29) For this view see Gow (above, n. 2) on Id. 16.69 f. and 107 ff.

30) Griffiths (above, n. 1) 48–49, and Fantuzzi (above, n. 1) 145–47 suggest that Theocritus gave the role of the Muses to other divinities as a statement of poetic innovation.

order to distance himself from the tradition but in order to indicate his superiority over the miserly contemporaries who choose not to grant patronage to the poet. Even if the choice to part company with the Muses can only be a theoretical one for a poet because it entails the erasure of his poetic identity, Theocritus indicates that the misers make a truly miserable choice: they condemn themselves to eternal lack of κλέος while he makes the right choice, to be forever, whether invited or uninvited, in the company of the patronesses of poetry who confer honor, κλέος and all lovely things to mortals.

### *Κλέος and Patronage in Id. 16*

Theocritus' poetic assertiveness eminently involves κλέος and develops gradually in the poem. It first becomes evident in the exhortation to the reluctant patrons where Theocritus reviews the relationship of his poetic predecessors to their subjects (34–57). The relationship serves as foil and suggested model for the relationship of Theocritus to prospective patrons, which is tackled immediately after the proem (5–21). As the poet explains his own situation, epic, evoked by 1–2, recedes to the background in favor of encomiastic lyric but the traditional image of the honored noble encomiast undergoes a double reversal. On the one hand, the poet appears to seek the patronage of wealthy instead of worthy men, although this does not become entirely clear until Simonides' Thessalian patrons are mentioned<sup>31</sup>. On the other hand, all prospective patrons deny him their patronage: contemporary men do not care for encomiastic poetry and are content with the poetry of the past, especially Homer (14–21). In the exhortation to these men that follows (22–57) the poet tries to shock them out of their attitude and coax them to imitate worthy models by painting the consequences of the stingy man's failure to patronize poets in particularly dark colors: a wealthy man unwilling to hire poets will have no benefit in Hades but will weep in miserable oblivion (29–31): Μοισάων δὲ μάλιστα

31) Already at 15, though, the use of *νεκίηται* implies not only that the poet's contemporaries are misers but also that they lack victories to be praised in poetry; see Hunter (above, n. 1) 104.

τίειν ἱεροὺς ὑποφίτας, ὄφρα καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο κεκρυμμένος ἐσθλὸς ἀκούσης, / μηδ' ἀκλεῆς μύρηαι ἐπὶ ψυχροῦ Ἀχέροντος<sup>32</sup>. This is the second reference to κλέος in the poem and the first hint that κλέος is generated by poetry. The poet locates a worthy predecessor for his encomiastic persona in Simonides and admonishes his prospective patrons to imitate this poet's Thessalian patrons whom he immortalized, along with their horses (34–47)<sup>33</sup>. The hint provided by the reference to the miser's lack of κλέος in Hades is reinforced by a radical and unexpected reversal, the assimilation of Simonides' praise of the Thessalians to epic poetry.

This assimilation appears first implicitly and then explicitly at two crucial points of the exhortation, the end of the section on Simonides (45–46) and the end of the exhortation (51–57). At 45–46 (ἐν ἀνδράσι θῆκ' ὀνομαστούς / ὄπλοτέροις) is probably an echo of Simonides fr. 11.17–18 W<sup>2</sup> (καὶ ἐπώνυμον ὄπ[λοτέρ]οισιν / ποίησ'

32) The unsung man weeping for his lack of praise in Hades is likened to a poor farm laborer lamenting his inherited lack of means (32–33): ὡσεὶ τις μακέλα τετυλωμένος ἔνδοθι χεῖρας / ἀχὴν ἐκ πατέρων πενήνην ἀκτιήμονα κλαίων. The simile has been considered an echo of Od. 11.488–91, the declaration of Achilles' unconditional preference of life over death; see Horstman (above, n. 1) 126 n. 55 and cf. Griffiths (above, n. 1) 30. This is possible, although only as a way of stressing the wretchedness of death: Achilles, the best of the Achaeans and Agamemnon's object of envy in the second Nekyia for his undying κλέος (Od. 24.93–97), is particularly unsuitable as a model for the forgotten dead, unless the contrast with Achilles is supposed to be the point of the echo. If Sappho fr. 55 Voigt is echoed in 42–43, then this simile may share the same model because the two passages, 30–34 and 40–43, deal in similar language with the prospective posthumous fate of Theocritus' stingy contemporaries and the eternal happiness of the Thessalians who escaped eternal oblivion through the poetry of Simonides. A reminiscence of a Sapphic poem associating poetry with posthumous remembrance would reinforce the exhortation. Be that as it may, the simile, immediately followed by the reference to the servants of Simonides' Thessalian patrons, probably emphasizes the plight of the forgotten dead by conjuring up an image that the tightfisted living rich are bound to find particularly unpleasant: if their name is not immortalized in poetry, they will be reduced for all eternity to the status of the men that served them on earth, spending eons in harsh deprivation and lament thereof. The lords will be as miserable in death as their servants were in life. No lord is likely to find this situation acceptable and the fright it must have generated in Theocritus' wealthy addressees is calculated to coax them to avoid it by patronizing poets.

33) The anecdotes about the fraught relationship of Simonides and some of his patrons indicate the precarious situation of the encomiastic poet but also his power over men who saw him as their hireling. On Simonides and the Thessalians see Gow (above, n. 2) on Id. 16.18 ff.; cf. J. H. Molyneux, *Simonides. A Historical Study* (Wauconda 1992) 124–26 and the next two notes.

ἤμ]ιθῶν ὠκύμορον γενεή[ν]). Theocritus identifies the service that according to Simonides Homer rendered to the heroes of the Trojan war and that Simonides himself will render to the Plataea heroes with the service Simonides rendered to his Thessalian patrons, known and celebrated only for their wealth in cattle and sheep, and to their victorious horses<sup>34</sup>. The hyperbolic association of Plataiomachoi and Thessalian lords signals a collapse of the distinction between heroic κλέος or epic κλέα ἀνδρῶν, which will come into focus very soon with the reference to epic poets and especially to Homer as purveyors of κλέος to epic heroes (48–57), and the immortality conferred by encomiastic poetry in the context of patronage. The echo of a Simonidean poem that associates the heroes of the Trojan war and Homer with Simonides' contemporary war dead and Simonides respectively provides an ironic perspective, which exploits Simonides' reputation for venality: Theocritus implies that Simonides fashioned immortal κλέος of the Homeric kind not only for the brave fighters of Plataea, as Simonides himself suggested in the Plataea elegy, but also for Thessalian herd owners; these lords were not only much less distinguished than the Plataea heroes but also traitors of Greece in the very war the Plataea heroes fought and in which several died<sup>35</sup>.

Despite the echo of Simonides' reference to the Homeric Achilles and his glorious colleagues, the heroes Theocritus mentions next have nothing to do with the best of the Achaeans on the Trojan battlefield. The first catalogue of epic heroes includes Cyc-

---

34) The attribution of the victories to the horses downplays the fact that the owners gained the victories and presents Simonides as a laudator of men and beasts, albeit worthy beasts. Aristotle relates the anecdote that Simonides was reluctant to celebrate victorious mules but overcame his reservations upon offer of a more generous fee (Rhet. 1405b23–28).

35) For the Aleuads' collaboration with the Persians see Hdt. 7.6, 130, 172 and 9.58. The Thessalians' patronage to Simonides most probably anteceded the Persian wars (see Molyneux [above, n. 33] 132–45) but such details, even if known at the time Theocritus composed Id. 16, would hardly affect the associations suggested by the poem. If, as cannot be ruled out, in some now lost poem(s) Simonides himself had associated his Thessalian patrons with Homeric heroes and especially with Achilles, an athletic fellow Thessalian, in language similar to that used in the Plataea elegy, the irony of Theocritus' echo, which reveals the inappropriateness of Simonides' comparison, becomes even more acute; cf. below, n. 38. On the other hand, if Pausanias and/or the Spartans commissioned the elegy (cf. above, n. 18), Theocritus would ironically reveal Simonides' poetic strategy: Simonides conferred κλέος of the Homeric kind on all his patrons irrespective of whether they deserved it or not.

nus, the Priamids and the Lycian leaders (48–50). These characters either do not appear in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* or are featured in other epics too. None is among the victors of the Trojan war<sup>36</sup>. The second catalogue (51–57) includes figures from the *Odyssey*, Odysseus, Eumaeus, Philoetius and Laertes, but only one major hero. These choices cannot be unrelated to the presentation of Simonides and the Thessalians as models for Theocritus and his patrons and especially to the upcoming presentation of Homer as a poet benefiting his subjects (57) the way a hired encomiast does (23–24). Since, as noted above, the majority of Theocritus' prospective patrons were probably not brave warriors or victors, the choice of defeated epic and minor Homeric characters, including Odysseus' herdsmen (54–56)<sup>37</sup>, facilitates the identification of Homer, Simonides and Theocritus as encomiasts of men not known for victories in battle<sup>38</sup>. This identification, though, is not the primary purpose of the exhortation. Following up on the echo of Simonides' Plataea elegy, the exhortation takes a more subversive direction with the attribution, in the almost exact middle of the poem, of Odysseus' κλέος, whose sky-high reach is mentioned explicitly in the *Odyssey* (9.20; cf. 19.108), to Homer's song (51–54; cf. below, n. 40). Not only did Simonides grant Homeric κλέος to heroes and wealthy (and traitorous) herd owners alike but Homer also benefited his heroes as Theocritus promises to benefit his prospective patrons and as Simonides benefited the Thessalians, the models of Theocritus' prospective patrons. Homeric heroes, then, at least the Odyssean ones, needed Homer as the Thessalians needed Simonides and as Theocritus' contemporaries need him in order to secure κλέος. Epic poetry's celebration of heroic κλέος becomes

---

36) Cf. Griffiths (above, n. 1) 31.

37) The emphasis on these herdsmen as well as the references to the herds of the Thessalians (36–39) and the rural peace in Sicily after Hiero's victory (90–96) are to be attributed to Theocritus' bucolic vein; see Fantuzzi (above, n. 1) 145.

38) A. Barchiesi, *Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's Odes*, CA 15 (1996) 27, suggests that Theocritus presents Homer not as a panhellenic bard, the model of Simonides' Plataea elegy, but as a singer of much less illustrious characters in order to mark discontinuity in the vision of Homer. This is possible (and not mutually exclusive with my reading) but it is also possible that the choice of Homeric characters was indebted to Simonides himself and intended a more complex or a different play of intertextual references: some or all of the Odyssean figures mentioned in Id. 16 may have featured in Simonides' poems for the Thessalians; cf. above, n. 35.

identical with lyric poetry's creation of κλέος for men who could be less than worthy. From there it is but a small step to viewing Homer not only as a singer contemporary with the heroes he glorified and made known to posterity but also as one patronized by them<sup>39</sup>. This erasure of distinctions<sup>40</sup> leads into the next section where a different kind of patron with different epic models will appear.

39) A similar technique is employed in Id. 17, the encomium to Ptolemy (whose proem and quite possibly end are indebted to Simonides; see Fantuzzi [above, n. 23] 237 and Barchiesi [above, n. 38] 27). Theocritus concludes his list of Ptolemy's beneficiaries with poets whom the king rewards with gifts receiving praise poetry in return for his generosity (112–16). The patronage relationship is cast in terms of this mutually satisfying exchange that evokes the reciprocity binding older praise poets such as Pindar and Bacchylides to their patrons, especially to rulers such as Hiero I of Syracuse. The best thing that a happy man can acquire is κλέος ἐσθλόν among men (116–17): τί δὲ κάλλιον ἀνδρὶ κεν εἴη/ὄλβιφ ἢ κλέος ἐσθλὸν... ἀρέσθαι. It is a common encomiastic motif that praise is the eternal prize of the doer of worthy deeds (cf. above, n. 5) but the choice of the epic formula κλέος ἐσθλὸν... ἀρέσθαι (Il. 17.16) is significant: it collapses the distinction between the κλέος one wins for his bravery on the battlefield (or for other epic exploits) and the poetic praise of the κλέος of such exploits. It also collapses the distinction between epic heroes and royal patrons, although in Ptolemy's case there is no suggestion that he had not performed praiseworthy deeds; cf., though, Fantuzzi (above, n. 23) 239 n. 25. It is significant that the common version of the formula is κῦδος ἀρέσθαι (e.g. Il. 12.407, 16.88, 17.288, 20.502, 21.543, Od. 22.253, Hes. fr. 75.19) but the unique variation is chosen because κλέος is associated with epic poetry and Theocritus means to attribute Ptolemy's κλέος exclusively to poetry. The example of the Atreids that concludes the section (118–20) leaves no doubt about the poet's perspective: he chooses the rulers of the Greeks at Troy and the men who acquired the lion's share of the spoils (Agamemnon was the wealthiest among the Greek leaders to begin with anyway); this booty is now covered by the mists of destruction with no hope of return. The transience of worldly possessions is underscored by the image of the mist and the reference to the impossibility of νόστος (120), particularly poignant in the case of men who went on an overseas expedition, that recall Hades and thus the transience of mortal existence itself. This is neatly contrasted with the permanence of poetic κλέος and the motif is given here a very unconventional twist: epic poets are the purveyors of κλέος to the Atreids, wealthy rulers who enjoyed a good relationship with poets and secured ever-lasting κλέος in return for their generosity.

40) Id. 16.50 (εἰ μὴ φυλόπιδας προτέρων ὕμνησαν ἄοιοδοί) possibly initiates the identification of epic poets who celebrate the heroes of old and encomiasts of contemporary laudandi: προτέρων may be used from the point of view of the singers ("if [later] singers had not hymned the battles of old") or from the point of view of Theocritus ("if singers [of old] had not hymned [their contemporary] battles"). Cf. Hunter (above, n. 1) 75 n. 97, who suggests that the choice of ὕμνεῖν in both Id. 16.50 and 22.219 is meant to create an analogy between the activity of archaic epic poets and Theocritus himself. For Theocritus' view of the Homeric tradition at the end of Id. 22 see Fantuzzi (above, n. 1) 146–47.

In the transition (58–67) the Muses are explicitly proclaimed to be the dispensers of κλέος to mortals (ἐκ Μοισῶν ἀγαθὸν κλέος ἔρχεται ἀνθρώποισι, 58), although the reference to the squandering of fortunes by the heirs of the deceased (59) is a thread that connects this section with the previous one. The poet's realization that stingy patrons cannot be persuaded to part with their wealth even in return for eternal κλέος (60–63) has also been viewed as a throwback to the beginning of the poem, with the poet in the same hopeless situation, as his paraenetic excursus goes, by his own admission, virtually unheeded. This is to an extent true but the reference to the Muses as providers of κλέος at the beginning of the transition and the rejection of material possessions in favor of honor at its end (66–67) signal the difference and function as the stepping stone for the shift in the poet's attitude that launches the second part of the poem and will inform it to the end. There is no further explicit reference to wealthy patrons, whether eager or reluctant to provide patronage, and to the remuneration of poets. The reference to the Muses as the exclusive dispensers of κλέος to mortals leads to the poet's first confident statement, that someone will eventually need his poetic services (71–73) and not just any wealthy patron but a modern counterpart to the paradigmatic Iliadic heroes, Achilles and Ajax (74–75). In view of the previous associations between Homeric heroes and lyric laudandi the last association strongly implies that the two heroes 'needed' Homer to sing their deeds at Troy: while in the previous section only wealthy herd owners and Odyssean heroes appeared, now the best of the Achaean warriors at Troy are implied to have required the services of a poet in order to acquire κλέος. The reference to the martial glory of the two heroes completely demolishes the distinction, already undermined since 45–57, between heroic epic poetry of old and modern encomium. Every man, mythical or contemporary, hero of many wiles (51–54) or loyal oxherd (55–56), young warrior (49, 74–75) or old father (56), needs the poet and every poet deals in κλέος and is rewarded for his services.

The imminent victory of Hiero II over the Carthaginians and Theocritus' future praise of it are modeled on the exploits of Achilles or Ajax and to the praise of these exploits in Homeric or other epic poetry. Nevertheless, distance from heroic epic is marked

---

41) For references see Gow (above, n. 2) esp. on 82, 83, 96 and 97; cf. Hunter (above, n. 1) 86–89.

prominently with the bucolic coloring of the benefits of peace that the victory of Hiero II will bring about (90–97). The praise of peace includes several references to previous poetry<sup>41</sup> but the focus on the countless herds of sheep and cattle brings to mind again the wealth of Simonides' Thessalian patrons (34–48) as well as perhaps Odysseus' cowherd Philoetius (55–56): the implication is that Theocritus is able to offer a praise that associates his laudandus with a long list of previous and very different among themselves counterparts. The result will be high κλέος for Hiero spreading to the ends of the earth (98–103):

ὕψηλὸν δ' Ἰέρωνι κλέος φορέοιεν ἄοιδοὶ  
καὶ πόντου Σκυθικοῖο πέραν καὶ ὄθι πλατὺ τεῖχος  
ἀσφάλτῳ δῆσασα Σεμίραμις ἐμβασίλευεν.  
εἷς μὲν ἐγώ, πολλοὺς δὲ Διὸς φιλέοντι καὶ ἄλλους  
θυγατέρες, τοῖς πᾶσι μέλοι Σικελὴν Ἀρέθοισαν  
ὕμνεῖν σὺν λαοῖσι καὶ αἰχμητῆν Ἰέρωνα.

Given the prominence of κλέος in the poem so far, it is not unexpected that the outline of the prospective encomium would include a reference to Hiero's κλέος at the end: the prospective preferred patron will naturally enjoy a fine variety of the reward offered and promised to all previous and prospective patrons. It is noteworthy, though, that the poet refrains from stating openly that Hiero's high κλέος will be due to songs. The promise of high κλέος is phrased ambiguously because ὕψηλόν may be attributive or predicative and Hiero's advantage, implied in the dative of advantage Ἰέρωνι, may be that poets will only spread to the ends of the earth the high κλέος that Hiero will win with his victory or that they will both create and spread it, making it high. The prospective patron may easily interpret the line to his advantage and thus not be alienated by excessive poetic arrogance but the ambiguity points to the importance of song for his κλέος.

As a matter of fact, one of the possible poetic models of 98 points to non-poetic dissemination of κλέος but the others come from contexts where the importance of song is implied. Od. 19.333–34 (τοῦ μὲν τε κλέος εὐρὺ διὰ ξεῖνοι φορέουσι/πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, πολλοὶ τέ μιν ἐσθλὸν ἔειπον) is a reference to the dissemination of a worthy person's κλέος to all mankind: the identity of the disseminators, the person's guest-friends, and the genitive at

the beginning are the main markers of difference from Theocritus' promise of κλέος to Hiero II. On the other hand, by alluding to this passage Theocritus hints at the guest-friendship relationship between poets and patrons that was an important motif in archaic encomiastic poetry: modern poets are not explicitly said to be the guest-friends of their patrons but offer the service of Homeric guest-friends to their patrons. Guest-friendship and high κλέος occur at two passages of Pindar's Pythian 3 (68–71 and 111–15), a poem addressed to Hiero I. P. 3.111 (ἐλπίδ' ἔχω κλέος εὐρέσθαι κεν ὑψηλὸν πρόσω) is echoed by Id. 16.98 and Pindar's reference to the importance of poetry for the preservation of the memory of one's excellence is certainly relevant to the concerns of Theocritus and his prospective patron. As suggested above in n.10, though, Pindar does not state that poetry will confer κλέος to his laudandus, although he clearly implies it, but that it will preserve the memory of his excellence<sup>42</sup>. Simonides had done something very similar in the Plataea elegy and the ambiguity at the end of Theocritus' prospective encomium to Hiero II is perhaps the last trace of influence of Simonides' poem on Id. 16. As argued above, Simonides implied, but refrained from stating openly, that the κλέος of the Plataea fighters would be due to his own poem and that without his poem posterity would not know of the heroes of Plataea. As a compliment to Hiero II, the modern counterpart of the heroes of old, Theocritus does not state that Hiero's κλέος will be due only to poetry but he has made this point abundantly clear in order to secure Hiero II as his patron<sup>43</sup>.

42) At P. 3.114–15, ἃ δ' ἀρετὰ κλειναῖς ἀοιδαῖς/χρονία τελέθει, κλειναῖς may be interpreted as 'glorifying' or 'glorious'. Since Pindar is so vocal about the excellence of his poetry (cf. above, n. 26) the adjective implies that the κλέος of the excellent song guarantees the posthumous κλέος of the laudandus' excellence.

43) The end of the passage, τοῖς πᾶσι μέλοι ... ὑμνεῖν (102–3), refers unambiguously to singers and song and harks back to 1–2 in ring-composition indicating that the hymns to Hiero II are the modern counterparts of old epic poetry. The Odyssean models of these lines, though, refer to universal fame only implicitly linked to poetry: Argo is famously called πᾶσι μέλουσα (Od. 12.70) and Odysseus claims πᾶσι δόλοισιν/ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει (9.19–20), in a passage also relevant to 54, as argued above. For the parallel between the two Odyssean passages see Segal (above, n. 6) 24–25.

*Conclusion*

Id. 16 thus seems to have traveled a considerable distance from beginning to end in order to paradoxically reject the image of the itinerant/mendicant poet. The relationship of poet and prospective patron has been transformed from one of unilateral dependency to one of mutual benefit in the framework of which patrons need the poet even if they are poised to become the modern counterparts of heroes such as Achilles or Ajax. Instead of simply suggesting that the parity between patrons and poets of the archaic age obtained, *mutatis mutandis*, in the modern age, Theocritus takes a more far-reaching view of the poet-subject relationship. In order to suggest that modern realities can be traced all the way back to heroic times, he ironically points to a close relationship and parity between epic poets and epic heroes, which, in its turn, is suggested to have informed the parity between archaic age patrons and poets. Id. 16 reviews and negotiates a long poetic tradition that stretches from Homer to Bacchylides. This is intended to bring into line the poetry of the present with the poetry of the fairly recent and more distant past but primarily the figures of the respective poets. Unsurprisingly for a third century poet using dactylic hexameter, the association involves above all the figures of Homer and Theocritus himself but, because of the importance of patronage in the poem, also the icon of archaic venality, Simonides.

It has been claimed that Homer was viewed in antiquity as the paradigm of the disinterested poet unwilling to attach himself to a patron<sup>44</sup>. If this was indeed the common perception of Homer, then Theocritus' ironic presentation of Homer as a contemporary purveyor of κλέος to his heroes, the model of Simonides' glorification of Thessalian herd owners and of Theocritus' own prospective praise of the bucolic peace and prosperity that will follow the victory of Hiero II, is a more ambitious and radical move than is commonly assumed. Rutherford, for instance, has argued that in the Plataea elegy Simonides implied that great exploits need the poet while in Id. 16, a critical reading of Simonides' poem, Theocritus presented himself as an indigent poet in need of great exploits to celebrate<sup>45</sup>. Theocritus'

---

44) See Barchiesi (above, n. 38) 27 and Vox (above, n. 1) 205. According to Pausanias 1.2.3, Hesiod was also disinterested but for different reasons.

45) Rutherford (above, n. 12) 45 n. 59.

reading of Simonidean and Homeric poetry is more complex. He presents himself in need of a patron; any man willing to pay, whether a doer of great deeds or simply a man of means, could fit the bill. As argued above, Theocritus seeks to secure patronage by persuading his contemporaries that all men enjoying κλέος, including the greatest heroes, owe it to poets and specifically to poets they patronized. In the Plataea elegy Simonides had already suggested that Homer poured κλέος on the Trojan war heroes and had avoided indicating that the Trojan war heroes were older than Homer. In Id. 16 Theocritus suggests that Simonides is not a new Homer because he sang of contemporary victorious heroes and fashioned Homeric κλέος for them but because he fashioned Homeric κλέος for heroes and much less illustrious figures alike. This view of Simonides presupposes a new view of Homer. Theocritus mentions the κλέος of both Iliadic and Odyssean, major and minor, figures, and suggests that Homer was not different from Simonides: not only did both poets celebrate contemporaries but both also benefited their contemporaries by fashioning κλέος for them, as Theocritus himself proposes to benefit his own patrons. Not only then is Theocritus a new Simonides and a new Homer but Homer is an old Simonides and an old Theocritus. The success of this re-vision of the poetic past with its erasure of distinctions in attracting patrons cannot be gauged but it is beyond doubt that Theocritus chose and managed to combine a thoroughly contemporary concern, patronage, with the oldest and most revered subject of Greek poetic tradition, κλέος, in order to suggest that the newest song, an epic and bucolic encomium, is literally well worth hearing and worthy of κλέος.

Komotini

Poulheria Kyriakou