

It may be suspected, however, that Diodorus knew nothing about these developments. Ephorus apparently did not concentrate on Athenian affairs in his treatment of the 350s, placing Philip of Macedon instead at center stage,³³ and Diodorus may not have found in Ephorus any discussion of Athenian dealings with Byzantium, Chios, or Rhodes immediately preceding the outbreak of the Social War. As a result, when Diodorus came to Ephorus' account of the Social War itself, which perhaps began with his report of the Athenian attack on Chios, all Diodorus could do by way of explaining the genesis of the war was to refer to those events he did know about that were linked to the Social War: the allied defections precipitated by Epaminondas in 364/3. Ephorus had treated these in an earlier book of his history, and, following him, so had Diodorus. Diodorus therefore may have assumed—incorrectly, it has turned out—that his readers would readily make the connection between his brief notice of the revolts in 16.7.3 and his fuller discussion in 15.79.1.

STEPHEN RUZICKA
University of North Carolina
Greensboro

33. Barber, *The Historian Ephorus*, 40–41.

VENUS OR THE MUSE AS “ALLY” (LUCR. 1.24, SIMON. FRAG. ELEG. 11.20–22 W)

At *De Rerum Natura* 1.24 Lucretius says that he is eager for Venus to be his “ally” in the composition of his poem: *te studeo sociam scribendis versibus esse*. The word *socia* here has drawn little notice from commentators, but a recent suggestion by M. R. Gale and the publication of a papyrus containing portions of a poem by Simonides on the Battle of Plataea enable us to understand much more of the considerable resonance of this line in its context in Lucretius' poem. Scholars working on the new Simonides poem should also take note of the Lucretian borrowing.

Gale, in a book based on a dissertation written before the Simonides papyrus was published, notes that the word Lucretius applies to Venus' desired role here, *socia*, “ally,” would translate into Greek as ἐπίκουρος,¹ and of course it will soon be apparent that the philosopher Epicurus or Ἐπίκουρος is the guiding spirit of the poem to a greater extent than is Venus. The resulting association of Epicurus with a deity, for anyone who notices the bilingual pun, is consistent with and to some extent foreshadows the language later in the poem that more explicitly claims a kind of divine

1. M. R. Gale, *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius* (Cambridge, 1994), 137. Gale also cites the suggestion of J. Snyder, *Puns and Poetry in Lucretius' "de Rerum Natura"* (Amsterdam, 1980), 108 that at 3.1042 *ipse Epicurus obit decurso lumine vitae*, Lucretius' use of the word *decurso* suggests a pun between ἐπίκουρος and *curro*. Cf. also B. Frischer, *The Sculpted Word: Epicureanism and Philosophical Recruitment in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1982), 275–76, for the significance of Epicurus' name meaning “helper,” and the (tentative) suggestion that Epicurus may have chosen the name for himself.

For discussion, either in person or via electronic mail, related to this paper I thank Deborah Boedeker, David Sider, Don Fowler, and Kirk Summers; for careful reading of drafts I thank my colleagues Andrew Szegedy-Maszak and Marilyn Katz; and for numerous helpful comments I thank the Editor and referees of this journal.

status for Epicurus (e.g., 5.8 *deus ille fuit, deus. . .*). With such wordplay, however, I always like to ask what feature of the text might prompt the reader to think of the connection.² The Simonides papyrus now provides a model for Lucretius' calling on a deity to be his "ally" in composition: it also makes it much more likely that readers would have noticed the Epicurus-pun, and shows that the use of the word *socia* may involve a significant and richly suggestive allusion to the Simonides poem.

The papyrus *POxy* 3965, when joined with *POxy* 2327 (previously anonymous but now securely identified as Simonidean), offers parts of forty-five verses on the battle of Plataea, including a proem (perhaps to the whole poem, perhaps only to a section of it), in which Simonides, after apparently discussing the role of Homer in bringing fame to the race of heroes, seems to call on the Muse to be his ἐπίκουρος, his "ally" or "foreign military auxiliary" (frag. 11.20–22 West):³

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ[
κικλήσκω] σ' ἐπίκουρον ἔμοι, π[ολυώνυμ]ε Μοῦσα,
εἴ περ γ' ἀν[θρώπων] εὐχομένω[ν] μέλειαι·

Scholars have been quick to offer useful comment on the interesting features of this call for inspiration from an ἐπίκουρος, which seem to place the Muse and the poet on a more equal footing than do some calls for inspiration.⁴ But I have not seen a reference pointing out the resemblance between Simonides and Lucretius, which is unlikely to have been purely coincidental. The Simonides poem seems to have been well known at Rome at least a few years later, for A. Barchiesi has pointed out a likely allusion to it in Horace.⁵ I cannot point to evidence of Lucretian familiarity with Simonides, but deliberate allusion or borrowing is consistent with Lucretian practice and with his apparently broad knowledge of Greek poetry.⁶

2. Cf. R. Maltby, "The Limits of Etymologising," *Aevum Antiquum* 6 (1993): 257–75; J. J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1996), 5–7 and passim.

3. Cf. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. LIX, ed. E. W. Handley, H. G. Ioannidou, P. J. Parsons, J. E. G. Whitehorse (London, 1992); M. L. West, "Simonides Redivivus," *ZPE* 98 (1993): 1–14; id., *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*², vol. 2 (Oxford, 1992); and *The New Simonides*, ed. D. Boedeker and D. Sider, *Arethusa* 29 (1996): 155–66. Comments on the supplements in West's text appear below.

4. I. Rutherford, "The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary," *Arethusa* 29 (1996): 169–92, 182, and esp. E. Stehle, "Help Me to Sing, Muse, of Plataea," *ibid.* 205–22, who offers extensive discussion of Greek texts using the term ἐπίκουρος; cf. too D. Obbink, "The Hymnic Structure of the New Simonides," *ibid.* 193–203, esp. 197–99, where he, however, casts doubt on the notion that Simonides seeks "to demote [the Muse] to the position of mere helper" (p. 199).

5. A. Barchiesi, "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*," *CA* 15 (1996): 5–47 (see his caveats at p. 11, n. 9), and "Simonides and Horace on the Death of Achilles," *Arethusa* 29 (1996): 247–53.

6. For Lucretius' extensive knowledge of and allusions to Greek poetry cf. Gale, *Myth and Poetry*; E. J. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," *Mnemosyne* 23 (1970): 366–92; R. D. Brown, "Lucretius and Callimachus," *ICS* 7 (1982): 77–97 and *Lucretius on Love and Sex: A Commentary on "De Rerum Natura" IV, 1030–1287* (Leiden and New York, 1987), 127–43; J. K. Newman, *The Classical Epic Tradition* (Madison, 1986), 108–14; on the likely allusion at *De Rerum Natura* 3.152–56 to Sappho 31 L-P, one of the few allusions to Greek lyric to which we might point, see C. Segal, *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety: Poetry and Philosophy in "De Rerum Natura"* (Princeton, 1990), 84–85; on Lucretius and Sappho frag. 1 see below pp. 70–71 and E. A. Hahn, "Lucretius' Proemion with Reference to Sappho and Catullus," *CW* 60 (1966): 134–39. For Epicurean attitudes to poetry more broadly see now also E. Asmis, "Epicurean Poetics," D. Sider, "Epicurean Poetics: Response and Dialogue" and "The Epicurean Philosopher as Hellenistic Poet," M. Wigodsky, "The Alleged Impossibility of Philosophical Poetry," and D. Obbink, "How to Read Poetry about Gods," all in *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*, ed. D. Obbink (Oxford, 1995).

We must also consider other possible “models” for Lucretius: Empedocles, Timotheus, Sappho, and Pindar. Empedocles surely influenced Lucretius, but does not provide an exact model for his use of the word *socia*, Timotheus does use the word ἐπίκουρος, but seems overall an unlikely model, and Sappho and Pindar provide interesting but less precise parallels. The influence of Empedocles’ Περὶ Φύσεως on Lucretius’ like-named poem, and of the earlier poet’s proem upon the later poet’s, has been well established; one of the most helpful of recent studies, that of Sedley, also reminds us that in Cicero’s famous brief reference to Lucretius the *De Rerum Natura* is favorably compared to the *Empedoclea* of one Sallustius.⁷ Empedocles B 131 D-K offers an address to the Muse that somewhat resembles that of the new Simonides, as commentators have noted,⁸ but Empedocles merely calls upon Calliope to “stand by” (παρίστασο) the poet:

εἰ γὰρ ἐφημερίων ἔνεκέν τινος, ἄμβροτε Μοῦσα,
 ἡμετέρας μελέτας (ἄδε τοι) διὰ φροντίδος ἐλθεῖν,
 εὐχομένην νῦν αὖτε παρίστασο, Καλλιόπεια,
 ἅμφι θεῶν μακάρων ἀγαθὸν λόγον ἐμφαίνοντι.

Gale rightly suggests that these lines have influenced Lucretius’ notion of Venus as *socia*,⁹ but παρίστασο does not point with any precision to *socia*, and Simonides provides a more precise model. Could Simonides’ poem have influenced Empedocles, and could knowledge of this influence have been what led Lucretius to Simonides? Would it be too much to suggest that Lucretius’ use of the word *socia* involves the kind of “double allusion” or allusion to both an earlier poet and that poet’s model, as described by Thomas, Clausen, and McKeown in studies of Virgil and Ovid?¹⁰

The other possible models may be discussed briefly. In Timotheus *Persae* 215ff., in lines also likely to have been influenced by Simonides,¹¹ the poet calls upon Apollo to be his ally as he composes his poem: ἑμοῖς ἔλθ’ ἐπίκουρος ὕμνοις. Little else about the context seems relevant to Lucretius, and this passage calling on Apollo near the end of Timotheus’ poem seems unlikely to have influenced the *De Rerum Natura*. At Sappho 1.25–28 the poet calls upon Aphrodite to come as her “ally” or σύμμαχος:

7. Cf. Gale, *Myth and Poetry*, 50–75; D. Furley, “Variations on Themes from Empedocles in Lucretius’ Proem,” in *Cosmic Problems: Essays on Greek and Roman Philosophy of Nature* (Cambridge, 1988), 172–83; D. Sedley, “The Proems of Empedocles and Lucretius,” *GRBS* 30 (1989): 269–96; G. B. Conte, “Instructions for a Sublime Reader: Form of the Text and Form of the Addressee in Lucretius’ *De rerum natura*,” in *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny’s Encyclopedia* (Baltimore, MD, 1994), 1–34. Sedley aptly cites the comparison of Lucretius and Sallustius at Cic. *Ad QFr.* 2.9.4, of which the first sentence is often quoted without the second: “Lucreti poemata ut scribis ita sunt, multis luminibus ingeni, multae tamen artis. sed cum veneris, virum te putabo si Sallusti Empedoclea legeris; hominem non putabo.”

8. Cf., e.g., Obbink, “The Hymnic Structure,” 198; cf. too Obbink, “The Addressees of Empedocles,” in *Mega nepios: il destinatario nell’epos didascalico*, ed. A. Schiesaro, P. Mitsis, and J. S. Clay, *MD* 31 (1993): 51–98.

9. *Myth and Poetry*, 68.

10. R. F. Thomas, “Virgil’s *Georgics* and the Art of Reference,” *HCSP* 90 (1986): 171–98; J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: “Amores,” Vol. I: Text and Prolegomena* (Liverpool, 1987), 37–45; W. Clausen, *Virgil’s “Aeneid” and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1987), index s.v. Virgil, imitates two or more poets simultaneously.

11. Obbink, “The Hymnic Structure,” 202; cf. Rutherford, “The New Simonides,” 182.

ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, χαλέπαν δὲ λῦσον
 ἐκ μερίμναν, ὅσσα δέ μοι τέλεσσαι
 θῦμος ἰμέρρει, τέλεσον, σὺ δ' αὐτὰ
 σύμμαχος ἔσσο.

That the addressee here is Aphrodite is of considerable interest for the Lucretian proem, and commentators should cite this passage;¹² I think, however, that it does little to detract from the possible link to Simonides. At Pindar *Olympian Ode* 13.96–97, we find the word ἐπίκουρος used in a slightly different context: Μοῖσαις γὰρ ἀγλαοθρόνοις ἐκὼν / Ὀλυνθιδαισὶν τ' ἔβαν ἐπίκουρος.¹³ Here the poet (or each of the performers) describes himself as the willing “ally” of both the Muses and the objects of his praise; the word again is ἐπίκουρος, but there is little further resemblance between the two poets’ verses or contexts.

That the hymn to Venus in Lucretius’ proem offers deliberate allusion to the new Simonides proem is made more likely, and potentially much more interesting, when we look more closely at the lines in Simonides in which the appeal to the Muse is made (11.20–22). Much in these lines, of course, represents editorial conjecture. In line 22 (εἴ περ γ’ ἀν]θρώπων εὐχομένω[ν μέλεια) I have given West’s suggestions, which would mean something like, “if you care at all about praying mortals”; Parsons originally proposed εἴ τι ποτ’ . . . αἰεὶς, “if you ever listen to,” and notes that εὐχομένω[ν could easily be dative singular εὐχομένω[ι. But enough is clear: in line 21 Simonides asks the Muse to be his ἐπίκουρος. Then the next line says something like “if the prayers of mortals are a concern to you.” Lucretius’ borrowing from Simonides is the type of allusion that demands consideration of the context of the original, the type in which the poet “intends that the reader recall the context of the model and apply that context to the new situation; such reference thereby becomes a means of imparting great significance, of making connections or conveying ideas of intense subtlety.”¹⁴ Here Lucretius’ calling upon Venus to be his ally (*socia*) alludes to the passage in which Simonides calls upon the Muse to be his ally (ἐπίκουρος), thus confirming the reference to the name Epicurus contained in the use of the word *socia*. Then it is important to note that the next line in Simonides says, “if you have any concern for mortal prayers.” Simonides’ εἴ περ γ’ ἀν]θρώπων εὐχομένω[ν μέλεια, of course, is couched in the formulaic rhetoric of prayer language,¹⁵ but whether or not the gods care about mortals’ prayers or any human activity is a question at the heart of both Epicurean doctrine and Lucretius’ poem. Lucretius’ allusion to the Simonides poem brings out the potential implications of Simonides’ use of the ritual formula, since at the very moment Lucretius uses the word *socia*, the question of whether or not the gods care about human affairs is being problematized by the whole proem of the *De Rerum Natura*. For this proem offers praise and a prayer to, as well as a request for assistance from, the goddess Venus, but the poem will eventually establish that Venus, like all deities, is completely uninterested in human

12. Cf. Hahn, “Lucretius’ Prooemion” (I thank Kirk Summers for directing me to this article). For the martial and (to some extent) epic connotations of Sappho’s own use of the term σύμμαχος, cf. K. Stanley, “The Role of Aphrodite in Sappho Fr. 1,” *GRBS* 17 (1976): 305–21, esp. 319, and L. Rissman, *Love as War: Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho* (Königstein/Ts., 1983), 1–29, esp. 1 and p. 25, n. 36.

13. Cf. Stehle, “Help Me to Sing,” 209.

14. Thomas, “Virgil’s *Georgics*,” 177, speaking of Virgil.

15. Cf. too, as commentators note, Empedocles B 131, quoted above in text.

affairs. I say “eventually” because the poem’s treatment of Venus will be long and complex,¹⁶ but of course almost immediately the proem itself will complicate assessment of the invocation of Venus in verses that offer “a translation of the first and most important of Epicurus’ *Kyriai doxai*,”¹⁷ and stress the gods’ lack of interest in human affairs (1.44–49):

omnis enim per se divum natura necessest
immortali aevo summa cum pace fruatur
semota ab nostris rebus seiunctaque longe;
nam privata dolore omni, privata periclis,
ipsa suis pollens opibus, nihil indiga nostri,
nec bene promeritis capitur nec tangitur ira.

The story of attempts (by emendation, excision, or explanation) to deal with the apparent conflict between these lines and the proem, and between the plain surface of the whole invocation to Venus and basic tenets of Epicurean philosophy, is a long one, and need not stop us here.¹⁸ But the issue is made more complex by the realization that with the word *socia* in line 24 Lucretius alludes both to the name Epicurus, and to lines in Simonides that both contain the word ἐπίκουρος, and in some sense ask a question at the heart of Epicureanism.

It is wise to be cautious about building a complex structure on an uncertain foundation, but more can be said here, in a tentative way, about resemblances that might suggest more extensive influence of the Simonidean poem on the Lucretian, especially in respect to each poet’s conception of his relationship to his subject matter. Perhaps more can also be said later, by those other than me. Here we may note that Simonides’ poem links his own treatment of the Battle of Plataea with Homer’s poetry on the Trojan War, and that Lucretius’ poem, of course, begins with an allusion to Rome’s Trojan heritage: *Aeneidum genetrix*. . . . Since Simonides is describing a great battle, and since his word ἐπίκουρος seems to carry the connotation not only of “ally” but more specifically of “foreign military auxiliary,” Lucretius’ word *socia* in line 24 may also prepare us for the mention of Mars and warfare soon to follow in Lucretius’ proem (*fera moenera militai*, 29; *belli fera moenera Mavors / armipotens regit*, 32–33), and for his depiction of Epicurus’ struggle against *religio* in quasi-military language in 62–79.¹⁹ Lucretius’ request in line 28 that Venus confer eternal charm on his verses (*quo magis aeternum da dictis, diva, leporem*) could echo Simonides 11.23–24, with Parsons’ extensive and uncertain restorations: ἔντυπο]ν καὶ τόνδ[ε μελ]ίφρονα κ[όσμον ἀο]ιδῆς / ἤμετ[ε] ἔρης.²⁰ To speak more broadly, since the whole Simonidean proem seems to deal with the question of the role of poets like

16. Cf. D. Clay, *Lucretius and Epicurus* (Ithaca, NY, 1983), 82–95, 226–34; M. C. Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (Princeton, 1994), 140–91; Gale, *Myth and Poetry*, 67–70 and index s.v. Venus.

17. Clay, *Lucretius and Epicurus*, 94.

18. Cf. Clay, *Lucretius and Epicurus*, 212–38; P. M. Brown, *Lucretius: “De Rerum Natura” I* (Bristol, 1988), 43–44; Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 164, 251; Gale, *Myth and Poetry*, 215–17. I have discussed this problem briefly in “They Might Be Giants: Inconsistency and Indeterminacy in Vergil’s War in Italy,” in *Studies in Roman Epic*, ed. H. Roisman and J. Roisman, *Colby Quarterly* 30 (1994): 206–32, at 210–12, and hope to treat it at greater length in the context of a longer study of inconsistency in Roman epic.

19. Cf. Gale, *Myth and Poetry*, 117–19, P. R. Hardie, *Virgil’s Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986), 194–95, both with further references to other passages in Lucretius using military language and to earlier bibliography.

20. On Simonides here cf. Rutherford, “The New Simonides,” 182–83, Stehle, “Help Me to Sing,” 211.

Homer, and by implication Simonides, in memorializing great deeds,²¹ allusion to Simonides may also dovetail with the way in which *De Rerum Natura* 1.1–135 is much concerned with Homer, Ennius, Lucretius' relationship to the Greco-Roman epic tradition, and his own role in memorializing the accomplishments of Epicurus.²² It may be tempting to suggest that Simonides' poem had as much influence on the first several dozen lines of the *De Rerum Natura* as did, say, Empedocles as described in Sedley's fine article, but this temptation should probably be resisted. But it seems likely that we have in Lucretius' evocation of Venus as "ally" in 1.24 at least a significant and effective allusion to the newly discovered Simonides poem, and perhaps evidence of a more extensive intertextual relationship.

JAMES J. O'HARA
Wesleyan University

21. Cf. esp. Stehle, "Help Me to Sing," and Barchiesi, "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage," who discusses the complexity of how the relationship between Simonides and Homer is viewed in Theoc. *Id.* 16 and Hor. *Odes* 4.8 and 4.9.

22. Cf. Gale, *Myth and Poetry*, 107–9; Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid*, 17–18, 79–80; and J. Farrell, *Virgil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History* (Oxford, 1991), 305–7.