

inserted a different, less unflattering version of Julian's decision upon the journey home.

The identity of this source is uncertain. One might suggest the Seleucus who had been on the expedition and whom Libanius (*Ep.* 1508, ed. Foerster) urged to write an account of it, which he did if the Seleucus mentioned by the *Suda* as the author of a *Parthica* is the

same man.³ If this were so, Festus and Sozomen would have used the *Parthica* itself, but for *Or.* 18, which seems to have been written in A.D. 365 (the same year as the letter to Seleucus), Libanius would have used notes supplied by his correspondent.⁴

R. C. BLOCKLEY

CARLETON UNIVERSITY, OTTAWA

3. So O. Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 273.

4. From *Ep.* 1220. 7-9 it is clear that Libanius did seek information from friends who had been on the expedition.

MYRRHA'S NURSE: THE MARATHON RUNNER IN OVID?

In an article published in 1967,¹ J. Suolahti discusses the story of the Marathon runner who died after delivering the news of the Greek victory in the words, "Rejoice, we have conquered!" Suolahti suggests that the story in this form may be fictitious and in fact a creation of Lucian, whose *Pro lapsu inter salutandum* 3 appears to be the earliest source for it. The first surviving mention of the Marathon runner occurs in Plutarch's *De glor. Ath.* 347C, including the information that Heracleides Ponticus disagrees with "most" as to the runner's name. According to Plutarch, before he expired the runner cried, *Chairete kai chairomen*—"Rejoice, and we rejoice!" Cobet emended this, substituting the words found in Lucian, *Chairete, nikomen*. The emendation had no real justification, however, since there did not seem to be any evidence before Lucian for these words of the runner. The story itself, however, is plainly older than Lucian; Heracleides wrote in the fourth century B.C. Is it possible that the tradition for the cry, "Rejoice, we have conquered!" is also earlier than it has seemed?

These words do in fact occur before Lucian, and in a most unlikely source. In *Metamorphoses* 10 Ovid tells the unsavory story of Myrrha, who develops a passion for her own father. As soon as Myrrha's old nurse finds this out, she hurries off to her master to offer him the favors—under cover of darkness—of an anonymous but willing beauty. The father accepts readily and bids the old woman bring him the girl. The nurse returns to her mistress

and cries (*Met.* 10. 442 f.): "Rejoice, my child, we have conquered!" ("utque domum rediit, 'Gaude, mea' dixit 'alumna: vicimus!'").

The nurse's expression seems somehow incongruous. Editors have been puzzled by it and have felt obliged to comment. In 1822 in his notes to G. Gierig's edition of Ovid (IV, 196), N. Lemaire wrote, "Vicimus, formula exsultantis propter spem certam," but he gave no further examples. M. von Albrecht's 1966 edition of Haupt-Korn-Ehwald repeats the note of previous editions, "der Ausdruck wie 4,356," and B. van Proosdij, in his edition of D. Bosselaar published in 1959, compares 6. 513.

In these passages, however, the word *vicimus* is used as a triumphant exclamation by the nymph who succeeds in tricking the future Hermaphroditus into her fatal pool, and by Tereus once he succeeds in getting Philomela aboard the ship that will carry them both to the privacy he has planned for her rape. In both cases considerable effort and suspense have preceded the "victory"; two contests of wills and wits have been won, and *vicimus* is not at all incongruous in the mouths of the winners.

In *Met.* 10. 442 f., on the contrary, the expression is excessive, as all editors sense. Rather than the long descriptions of deceit and maneuver practiced by the nymph and Tereus, we have five lines in which the nurse makes her proposal to Myrrha's father and he accepts at once (437-41). There is no reluctance, no contest, no suspense. Is her announcement, even as *Ausdruck*, appropriate?

1. J. Suolahti, "The Origin of the Story about the First Marathon-runner," *Arctos*, V (1967), 127-33.

Her words can be better understood as an impudent parody by the poet of a historic remark from the context of a well-known (supposed) historic event. Unlike either the nymph or Tereus, the nurse is returning home from the scene of the action. Her remark is not merely an exclamation like theirs, but information addressed to the interested party who has remained at home. The words *gaude, vicimus*, addressed to a single person, translate Lucian's words *chairete, nikomen*, addressed to a group.¹ (The reading of MSS recentiores is *gaude, vincimus*.) Ovid's fondness for parody of the characters of gods and other received

dignities is well known: cf. Apollo's ludicrous pursuit of Daphne, *Met.* 1. 504 ff., with its hints of parody of Vergil's Second Eclogue.

The story of the Marathon runner is older than Lucian, but does not seem to occur before him in a form including the best-known words of the runner. The curious announcement of Myrrha's nurse in *Metamorphoses* 10 may be evidence in the form of parody that the story with these words was known, though it has not survived in writing, as early as the end of the first century B.C.

W. M. CLARKE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

1. When the present tense of the verb *nikan* expresses an enduring result, it may be translated by the perfect. Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, § 1887, with examples.

FORMAL ASPECTS OF THEOCRITAN COMPARISONS

If one leaves aside the quasi-Homeric similes in Theocritus' *epyllia* (e.g., 13. 49–52; 25. 247–53), few affinities remain between Homeric and Theocritean comparisons. One need not dwell on the difference in their usual length in the two authors, nor on the fact that, while 'Homer's similes normally occur in narrative passages, Theocritus' are most often found in speech—the new genre suffices to account for these changes. This article is confined to an examination of the diversity of form in Theocritus, which is not foreshadowed by the stereotyped Homeric simile, and it will be seen that this diversity of form is coupled with a much closer integration of context and simile than is found in Homer.

At the opening of the Theocritean corpus stands a comparison achieved by means of anaphora: 'Αδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἅ πίτυς, αἰπόλε, τήνα, / ἅ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι, μελίσσεται, ἄδν δὲ καὶ τύ / συρίσδες (1. 1–3). It may be that anaphora is favored by the rhythmic lilt of the pastoral song, but in order to accommodate it and throw the point of comparison into relief Theocritus has caused his readers' minds to sway hopelessly from one false interpretation of the grammatical interrelationship of the words to another. These are

impressionistic lines in which the poet relies on suggestion and sound to convey his meaning. One may note incidentally that, as Theocritus prefers variety to a monotonous balancing of constructions, the goatherd replies with the first of the many quantitative comparisons in the *Idylls*: ἄδιον, ὦ ποιμήν, τὸ τεὸν μέλος ἢ τὸ καταχές / τῇν' ἀπὸ τᾶς πέτρας καταλείβεται ὑπόθεν ὕδωρ (7–8). It is not difficult to see that the unsophisticated mind would favor this type of comparison, and the special effect of other instances will be studied below. Anaphora occurs, again with notable poignancy, as a means of contrast in Simaetha's incantation (2. 38–39). She has been going about her acts of magic with fierce determination. Silence is a necessary condition for their success, and the reader thinks she is heartened by it—ἡνίδε σιγῇ μὲν πόντος, σιγῶντι δ' ἄηται—but suddenly she breaks off with ἅ δ' ἐμὰ οὐ σιγῇ στέρνων ἔντοσθεν ἀνία. The postponement of οὐ σιγῇ from the head of the line makes it less rhetorical and more heartfelt; it is encompassed by Simaetha's personal pain. The reader has been unexpectedly transferred from the macrocosm to the microcosm in the most intimate way possible.¹

Paratactic similes are, thanks to their con-

1. The pathos of Simaetha's situation is, moreover, enhanced by the very sound of the line, with its assonance of

α and ε, alliteration of σ, and hint of a rhyme in ἅ δ' ἐμὰ . . . ἀνία.