A THEOPHANY IN THEOCRITUS

IN a masterly study of the language and motifs of Theocritus' *Thalysia*, Dr. G. Giangrande has demonstrated that what the poem relates is the mock-investiture of Simichidas, the naïve young townsman and *littérateur*, performed with almost malicious irony by the goatherd Lycidas, who sees through, and ridicules, Simichidas' rustic and poetic pretensions.[1] My object in this paper is to examine, in the light of Giangrande's findings, some aspects of the presentation of Lycidas; this examination will, I believe, enable us to bring the poem into still sharper focus.

The question of Lycidas' identity is certainly not a new one;[2] but attempts at identification of the goatherd with actual contemporaries of Theocritus have tended to be too narrowly prosopographical in conception, and even if they had been convincing, they would have added little to our understanding of the poem as a whole. More recent studies have observed that numerous features of the scene between Simichidas and Lycidas recall the epic motif of the Divine Encounter, where a deity, suitably disguised, manifests himself to the mortal under his care.[3] These resemblances have been variously interpreted, but in the light of Giangrande's analysis, the view that Theocritus was depicting in serious terms an occasion in his own life when his status as a poet was formally acknowledged has lost any plausibility it may previously have had.[4] As the investiture is a parody, the theophany must be ironic, as indeed one would expect from an Alexandrian poet and above all from Theocritus: and the evidence provided by the poem itself, when exposed to scrutiny,[5] points to the conclusion that Lycidas is none other than the god of poetry, Apollo himself, in pastoral guise.

Apart from the important fact that he is represented as a typical goatherd in dress and stench—a fact I shall return to later—we are given three obvious clues to Lycidas' identity: his name itself, Lycidas (v. 12); his place of origin, Cydonia (v. 12); and his destination, Pyxa (v. 130);[6] as will become apparent

[1] 'Théocrite, Simichidas, et les *Thalysies*', *Antiquité Classique* xxxvii (1968), 491–533; the contrast between the two main characters is admirably summed up on 531 ff.

[2] Selective bibliographies will be found in Gow's commentary (vol. ii, 565 ff.), and in G. Lawall: *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals* (Washington, 1967), 129–30; see also Q. Cataudella, 'Lycidas', in *Studi Paoli* (Florence, 1955), 159–69, for a review of the controversy.

[3] e.g. M. Puelma (*Mus. Helv.* xvii (1960), 144–64); Archibald Cameron (*Miscellanea Rostagni* (Turin, 1963), 291–307); G. Luck (*Mus. Helv.* xxiii (1966), 186–9); Giangrande, art. cit., 529–30. Echoes of the Hesiodic investiture were recognized also by B. A. van Groningen (*Mnem.*, ser. iv, xii (1959), 24–32), and G. Lohse (*Hermes*, xciv (1966), 421); cf. M. L. West *ad* Hesiod *Th.* 22–34.

[4] As already seen by Cameron, art. cit., 303, 306. Similarly the traditional equation of Simichidas and Theocritus, which goes back at least as far as the scholia and the *Syrinx*, is highly suspect: cf. Gow's characteristically canny note on Simichidas (*Theocritus*, ii. 127–9) and his remarks in *CQ* xxxiv (1940), 47.

[5] Luck, art. cit. 188, would rule such inquiries out of court: 'Es wäre müssig zu fragen, welcher Gott oder Dämon hier erscheint.' I do not understand this summary dismissal of such an obvious and important question.

[6] These particulars—name, provenance, destination or business—were the essential information a stranger was expected to provide in epic, as in Polyphemus' inquiry:

> Ὦ ξεῖνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα;
> ἦ τι κατὰ πρῆξιν ἢ μαψιδίως ἀλάλησθε,

later, the mention of Mt. Oromedon (v. 46) is another important, though less obvious, piece of evidence. I now examine these in turn.

(i) *Λυκίδας*

The name is of course patronymic in form, as also are the names Simichidas and Sicelidas (v. 40); the latter is taken, on the scholiasts' authority, as equivalent to Asclepiades, but there is no evidence to suggest that either form was patronymic in meaning, and one at least cannot have been. The patronymic form of the name Simichidas has not deterred scholars from accepting the scholiasts' equation of Simichidas with Theocritus, whose father was in fact called Praxagoras, as *A.P.* ix. 205 and the *Suda* show;[1] and even the scholiasts offer the non-patronymic sense 'one who is snub-nosed (*σιμός*)' as well as 'son of Simichus'. Ample evidence has been collected by Gow to show that Theocritus' contemporaries, like earlier poets, applied to themselves names which were patronymic in form, but not literally patronymic in meaning.[2] Even where there is genuine patronymic force, as probably in Callimachus' use of *Βαττιάδης* (*ep.* 35 Pf.), the archaic form would still lend a flavour of artificiality to the expression.

If the echoes of the Divine Encounter motif have led us to look for a specific god clothed in the disguise of Lycidas, then the name compels us to consider Apollo; for *Λυκίδας* does not merely recall Apollo's title *Λύκιος*, but is also formally equivalent to it; in Debrunner's words:

> An Personennamen angehängt bedeutet —*ιος* auch 'Sohn des —': *Τελαμώνιος Αἴας* (Hom.); freilich ist diese Art von Patronymikon fast überall durch —*ίδης*, -*(ι)άδης* verdrängt worden.[3]

Given this equivalence, of which there are numerous examples,[4] the substitution of *Λυκίδας* for *Λύκιος*, converting the god's title into a fashionably poetic *alias*, would be a touch of scholarly humour typical of the Alexandrian poets, clear enough to the learned reader (and, of course, flattering to his erudition), but, within the poem, a sufficiently thick cloak to conceal from the naïve and egocentric Simichidas the true nature of his companion.

The choice of the name has a precise point.[5] Not only was *Λύκιος* one of the titles under which Apollo was, it seems, worshipped in Cos;[6] it denoted to the ancients (whatever modern etymologists may make of it and its by-form *Λύκειος*) a specifically pastoral function of Apollo, the killing of wolves.[7] For

> *οἷά τε ληϊστῆρες ὑπειρ ἄλα, τοί τ' ἀλόωνται ψυχὰς παρθέμενοι, κακὸν ἀλλοδαποῖσι φέροντες;* (ι 252–5)

Cf. α 180–4; γ 71 ff.; η 24–5 (a simplified version, because addressed to a child), 237–9; ι 260–2; ξ 186 ff.; *Hom. hymn.* 3. 468–70. A similar motif occurs in Attic tragedy (e.g. Aesch. *Ch.* 674 ff., Soph. *Phil.* 220–54, Eur. *Ion*, 258 ff., *I.T.* 499 ff., *Phoen.* 278 ff.); cf. also *Book of Judith*, 10. 12.

[1] See Gow, *Theocritus*, i, pp. xv ff.

[2] *C.Q.* xxxiv (1940), 47–8. Cf. *Φήμιος Τερπιάδης* (χ 330). Pindar's use of *Ἐννοσίδας* for *Ἐννοσίγαιος* (*Pyth.* 4. 33, *Pae.* 4. 37) is similar; see Jebb *ad* Soph. *Aj.* 880.

[3] *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg, 1917), p. 142, §283. Cf. P. Chantraine, *La Formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris, 1933), 38.

[4] As well as *Τελαμώνιος* / *Τελαμωνιάδης*, cf. *Κρονίδης* / *Κρονίων* / *Κρόνιος* (Eur. *Tr.* 1288), *Νηληιάδης* / *Νηλήιος*, *Γαιήιος* (η 324), *Ποιάντιος* (γ 190), *Βάκχιος* / *Βάκχειος* / *Βακχίδης* / *Βακχιάδης*, *Καλαμώνιος* (cited by *Et. Magn.* s.v. *Τελαμώνιος*), etc. Cf. Leaf on A 1, B 566.

[5] For a further possible significance, see p. 144 below.

[6] *RE* xi. 2. 1478.

[7] On Apollo as a *deus pastoralis*, see pp. 140–1 below.

example, the scholiast on Aristophanes, *Aves* 369, observes: *τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα λύκειον καὶ λυκοκτόνον φασί*. A better-known instance occurs in the prologue of Sophocles' *Electra*:

> *αὕτη δ', Ὀρέστα, τοῦ λυκοκτόνου θεοῦ*
> *ἀγορὰ Λύκειος . . .* (vv. 6–7)

Aristarchus (cited by Hesychius s.v. *λυκοκτόνου θεοῦ*) explicitly connected this aspect of the god with his other pastoral responsibilities:

> *Ἀρίσταρχος διὰ τὸ τὸν θέον νόμιον εἶναι, καὶ τῶν βοσκημάτων φυλακὴν ποιούμενον τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ἀναιρεῖν τοὺς ἐπιβούλους αὐτῶν.*[1]

It is clear too from Pausanias' account of the temple of Apollo *Λύκιος* at Sicyon that the epithet implied the killing of wolves.[2] Festus even seems to connect the name of Lycia with Apollo's lupicidal feats.[3]

(ii) *Κυδωνικὸς ἀνήρ*

This phrase has caused difficulty to the commentators, since there is no obvious reason why a goatherd from any known Cydonia should be wandering in the by-ways of Cos. Gow even toyed with the possibility of postulating a town of that name in Cos (for which there is no evidence whatever) in addition to the four Cydonias attested in other parts of the Greek world.[4] The solution is, I suggest, much simpler. Gow himself quotes this entry from Stephanus of Byzantium:

> *Κυδωνία· πόλις Κρήτης, ἡ πρότερον Ἀπολλωνία· ἀπὸ Κύδωνος τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἀκακαλλίδος τῆς Μίνωος θυγατρός· δευτέρα πόλις Σικελίας, τρίτη Λιβύης. ὁ πολίτης Κυδωνιάτης καὶ Κύδων καὶ Κυδώνιος καὶ Κυδωναῖος . . . καὶ Κυδωνικὸς ἀνήρ.*[5]

By far the best-known of these towns was of course the one in Crete, which is associated with Apollo and his sister Artemis, both in its own right[6] and, by synecdoche, for Crete in general.[7] Stephanus' note explains the god's predilection for Cydonia: the town was originally named after himself, and subsequently after one of his sons.[8]

The first and second clues, *Λυκίδας* and Cydonia, suggest and support the

[1] Cf. Kaibel, *E.G.* 821, 6–8.

[2] Paus. 2. 9. 7. Cf. Servius *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4. 377: 'Apollinem Lycaeum appellari dicunt . . . quod pastoralis deus lupos interemit.'

[3] Festus p. 119: 'Lycii Apollinis oraculum in Lycia maximae claritatis fuit, ob luporum interfectionem.'

[4] *Σ*, who are well informed on Coan topography, mention only the Cretan town. One must protest against the readiness of commentators to make a *μικρόκοσμος* of a small island by importing Cydonia, Castalia, and Acharnae. Cf. J.-H. Kühn (*Hermes*, lxxxvi (1958), 70).

[5] Steph. Byz. 10. 145 B. Gow unfortunately omits the words *ἀπὸ Κύδωνος . . . θυγατρός*.

[6] e.g. Apollo's bow is *Κυδώνιον* at Call. *h.* 3. 81. (See Bornmann, ad loc.) Coins from Cydonia dated to the period 200–67 B.C. bear a wreathed head of Apollo: Head, *Historia Numorum*[2] (Oxford, 1911), 464.

[7] For Apollo's connections with Crete, see *Hom. hymn*, 3. 388 ff.; R. F. Willetts, *Cretan Cults and Festivals* (1962), chapter 11; L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, iv. 147, note (e).

[8] M. Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae*, ii. 105, regards Stephanus' statement on the town's earlier name as erroneous, but admits that the error would have arisen from the closeness of Apollo's links with the town: such an error (if it is) would confirm rather than weaken my argument.

Apollo-identification without, it may be felt, proving it conclusively. There is still little to connect Apollo with the actual setting of the poem, the hinterland of Cos. Such a connection is provided by the third clue, one for which the reader has to wait until the very end of the encounter scene.

(iii) *τὰν ἐπὶ Πύξας εἶρφ' ὁδόν*

The scholiasts, profiting presumably from Nicanor's work on the topography of Cos, report two meanings of *Πύξα*:

> *οἱ μὲν τὸν ἐν Κῷ δῆμον· οἱ δὲ τόπον ἐν ᾧ ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος, ἀφ' οὗ Πύξιος λέγεται.* (Wendel, p. 109.)

The deme of Pyxa lay between the *πόλις* deme, from which Simichidas and his friends had set out, and the deme of Haleis, where the festival was taking place.[1] They had therefore been walking through the territory of the Pyxa deme, and they are either still within it, or, if not, they have only just left it behind them. But when Lycidas leaves Simichidas, he turns *left* for Pyxa (*ἀποκλίνας ἐπ' ἀριστερά*, v. 130); one must conclude that here Pyxa must be the village where there was a shrine of Apollo sufficiently famous to confer the title *Πύξιος* on the god.[2] This third clue therefore corroborates the earlier hints, and attaches Apollo–Lycidas firmly to the Coan context. His business done, the deity departs, as Cameron pointed out in his study of the Encounter motif; and Lycidas' destination, his own shrine, is exactly parallel to that of Athene in *η* 78 ff., which he cited.[3] There the goddess, disguised as a child, has escorted Odysseus to Alcinous' palace; her mission completed, she leaves Scherie for her temples at Marathon and Athens. Here, Lycidas–Apollo accompanies Simichidas as far as his hosts' estate, and then turns away in the direction of his local shrine.

To sum up: the three clues, consisting of the essential information of name, provenance, and destination, all lead us to Apollo. The goatherd, described and presented in a manner reminiscent of the epiphanies of gods in epic, uses a name equivalent to one of Apollo's pastoral titles, is said to come from a town closely associated with Apollo, and is bound for a village which is the local cult-centre of Apollo.

The identification of Lycidas with Apollo, which I have deduced from the poet's carefully planted clues, must now be tested against the poem as a whole. In particular, we must ask whether the identification is consistent with the ironic tone which, as Giangrande has shown, pervades the idyll. First, however, I wish to tackle a basic question: is it reasonable even to consider the identification? Lycidas is dressed as a goatherd, and he smells. Nothing, one might think, could be less like Apollo, who is normally depicted in poetry as a sleek and elegant figure.[4] But he was frequently worshipped, as we have already seen, as a pastoral god and killer of wolves. One of his *Beinamen* was

[1] See W. R. Paton (*CR* ii (1888), 265), and the maps in Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos* (1891), and A. N. Modena, *L'Isola di Coo nell' antichità classica* (Rhodes, 1933).

[2] Paton and Hicks (op. cit. 213) condemn the *Σ* mentioning the temple of Apollo as 'obviously, quite unreliable'; but their discussion has been superseded by the new evidence published by R. Herzog in *Heilige Gesetze von Kos* (*Abh. Pr. Ak. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, 1928) and, in summary form, in *Verhandlungen der Versammlung Deutscher Philologen* (1929), 46. See further, pp. 142–3 below.

[3] Art. cit. 305.

[4] e.g. *Hom. hymn*, 3. 449–50; Call. *h.* 2. 32–40; A.R. 2. 674 ff.; Tibullus, 2. 5. 7–10.

Νόμιος: still more relevant to our purpose was another—*Γαλάξιος*.[1] Literature too is familiar with Apollo the herdsman. In a striking passage of a poem which has several interesting points of contact with *Idyll* 7, Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*,[2] the origin of the cult of Apollo *Νόμιος* is traced to the famous episode of the god's period of serfdom to Admetus:

> *Φοῖβον καὶ Νόμιον κικλήσκομεν ἐξέτι κείνου,*
> *ἐξότ' ἐπ' Ἀμφρυσσῷ ζενγίτιδας ἔτρεφεν ἵππους*
> *ἠιθέου ὑπ' ἔρωτι κεκαυμένος Ἀδμήτοιο.*
> *ῥεῖά κε βουβόσιον τελέθοι πλέον, οὐδέ κεν αἶγες*
> *δεύοιντο βρεφέων ἐπιμηλάδες, ᾗσιν Ἀπόλλων*
> *βοσκομένῃσ' ὀφθαλμὸν ἐπήγαγεν· οὐδ' ἀγάλακτες*
> *οἶιες οὐδ' ἄκνθοι, πᾶσαι δέ κεν εἶεν ὕπαρνοι,*
> *ἡ δέ κε μουνοτόκος διδυμητόκος αἶψα γένοιτο.*

There is an exact parallel to the description of Lycidas' appearance in Ovid's allusion to the same period in the god's career:

> illud erat tempus, quo te pastoria pellis
> texit, onusque fuit baculum silvestre sinistrae
> alterius dispar septenis fistula cannis. (*Met.* 2. 680–2.)[3]

In short, Lycidas' appearance, unsavoury as it may seem to the town-bred Simichidas, is so impeccably and essentially Apolline that we should not even regard it as a disguise. Consequently, lines 13–14:

> *ἦς δ' αἰπόλος, οὐδέ κέ τίς νιν*
> *ἠγνοίησεν ἰδών, ἐπεὶ αἰπόλῳ ἔξοχ' ἐῴκει—*

so problematic for almost all previous attempts to identify Lycidas, present no difficulty at all for the Apollo-hypothesis: Apollo *was* a goatherd, and therefore he looked exactly like a goatherd.

Given this tradition of Apollo the herdsman, it is typical of Alexandrian poetry, and of Theocritus in particular, to exploit the ironic possibilities of the situation, stressing the absurd and grotesque elements rather than glossing over them. If legend says Heracles strangled two serpents when he was only ten months old, then Theocritus presents the great hero as a baby, being bathed, fed, put to bed, and rocked to sleep.[4] When Polyphemus is in love, Theocritus emphasizes his Homeric monstrosity, even though the pictorial tradition concedes him two eyes.[5] Here, too, Apollo the goatherd stinks like a goatherd, and sings a song of homosexual love—exactly what one would expect of a goatherd:[6] whereas Simichidas, in the opening lines of his song, proves that he is no goatherd himself, for all his pastoral turns of phrase—he is having an affair with a girl.

[1] Farnell, iv. 123 ff. Cf. Macrobius, 1. 17. 43.

[2] Cf. Lycidas' comments on pretentious poets (vv. 45–8) with those of the Callimachean Apollo (*h.* 2. 106–12); cf. also v. 142 with *h.* 2. 110. The word *ἐσθλός* might be a further link: see p. 143 n. 3.

[3] Cf. Seneca, *Hippolytus*, 296–8:

> Thessali Phoebus pecoris magister
> egit armentum, positoque plectro
> impari tauros calamo vocavit,

and Colluthus, *Rapt. Hel.* 311–12.

[4] *Id.* 24. 1–10. On this tendency, see G. Huber: *Lebensschilderungen u. Kleinmalerei im Hellenistischen Epos* (Diss. Basel, 1926).

[5] See W. G. Arnott (*Gnomon*, xli (1969), 820).

[6] See *J.H.S.* lxxxix (1969), 122 n. 5, and the article cited there.

Once we have seen that the obvious echoes of the Divine Encounter motif are hints designed to lead the alert reader to a specific conclusion, the recognition of Lycidas as Apollo manifested in a form quintessentially Theocritean in its fusion of irony and realism,[1] the idyll as a whole becomes more pointed and amusing, and a number of its previously obscure details are revealed as having a clear and precise meaning. Not only does the self-assured pseudo-pastoral poet Simichidas, insulated from reality by his Pindaric boasts,[2] and confident of his ability to manipulate the reactions of others (*ἐπίταδες*, v. 42), fail to appreciate Lycidas' sarcasm (as Giangrande has so convincingly shown):[3] he does not even recognize the god of poetry appearing in his pastoral form. He proclaims himself the god's equal in singing (*ἰσοφαρίζειν ἔλπομαι*, vv. 30–1) before he has even answered his questions, but with a show of modesty disclaims comparison with Sicelidas and Philetas (v. 40): small wonder that Lycidas is moved to acid comment on presumptuous poets:

> *ὥς μοι καὶ τέκτων μέγ' ἀπέχθεται ὅστις ἐρευνᾷ*
> *ἶσον ὄρευς κορυφᾷ τελέσαι δόμον Ὡρομέδοντος*
> *καὶ Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀοιδόν*
> *ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.* (vv. 45–8)

These lines can now be more forcefully interpreted.[4] Oromedon, or Horomedon (the breathing was uncertain to the scholiasts),[5] was the name of the highest mountain in Cos.[6] It would presumably have been visible to Simichidas and Lycidas on their left throughout their conversation and walk, as Gow points out. At the foot of the highest mountain in Cos lies the modern village of Asphendiù, identified with some certainty as the site of the ancient Pyxa, Lycidas' destination.[7] It was at Asphendiù that the discovery was made of a fragmentary sacrificial calendar attesting a cult of *Ἀπόλλων Ὡρομέδων*.[8] The title *Ὡρομέδων* is found in two other places:[9] one is a hymn to Apollo, the other an oracle of Apollo, and *Ὡρομέδων* is on both occasions an epithet

[1] The completeness and precision of the *Umkehrung* (for this term cf. Giangrande, art. cit. 522 n. 72, 530) of the epic motif can be seen by comparing the serious use of it in A.R. 2. 674 ff. The time is dawn (*ἀμφιλύκη* 671), like noon, a 'witching hour'; the heroes are exhausted by *καμάτῳ πολυπήμονι* (673), just as Simichidas and his friends are finding their hot journey hard going (Lycidas' words in vv. 20 ff. are surely sarcastic). The three essential facts about Apollo are given, name (*Λητοῦς υἱός* 674), provenance (*ἀνερχόμενος Λυκίηθεν* 674), and his destination (*τῆλ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα δῆμον Ὑπερβορέων ἀνθρώπων* 675)—both places being centres of Apolline worship. A full description is given of the god's hair (676–7), of what he is carrying (678–9), and of his eyes (682). His epiphany is marked by a celebration which includes a song from Orpheus (705–19).

[2] vv. 37–8 ~ Pi. *O.* 6. 91 ff.

[3] Art. cit. 508 and n. 39.

[4] As Gow observed (*Theocritus*, i, p. xxii, and ii. 144), these lines as usually interpreted, are not very relevant. Commentators have perhaps concentrated for too long on extracting from them some suggestion of Theocritus' opinions on Callimachus' opinions on Apollonius, or the like, instead of trying to understand them in their context.

[5] As is shown by the explanation in GPT: *οἱ δὲ τὸν ἥλιον ὡς βασιλεύοντα τῶν τεσσάρων ὡρῶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ* which implies a rough breathing. Cf. Höfer in Roscher's *Lexicon*, s.v. Oromedon.

[6] Wendel 90–1. In view of his own topographical speculations (e.g. *ad* vv. 12, 71, 148) it is a little harsh of Gow to suggest that *Σ* are guessing here—they are in fact well informed on Coan place-names; but cf. his remarks in *CQ* xxxiv (1940), 52.

[7] See Gow, *ad* v. 130.

[8] Herzog, *Gesetze* (see p. 140 n. 2), 17.

[9] I omit the problematic occurrence at P. Schubart, 7. 6 which has yet to be satisfactorily explained: see R. J. D. Carden, *B.I.C.S.* 16 (1969), 36.

[10] Kaibel, *E.G.* 1025, 3; 1036, 2. In the former (a hymn from Tenos) *ὡρομέδων* is, intriguingly, juxtaposed to *μουσηγέτης*.

of the god.[10] The conclusion is clear: Apollo has special rights over Mt. Horomedon (as we should now spell the name), just as he has over poetry, and the builder who tries to erect a house as high as the mountain incurs his hatred because the mountain is sacred to him.[1] The builder's literary counterparts are guilty of a similar blasphemy.

Undeterred by this rebuke, Simichidas continues to condescend. Unlike even the sharp-tongued Milon in similar circumstances (*Id.* 10. 38–9), he has no time to spare for compliments to his rival, so anxious is he to insist that his own songs are good enough to have come to the notice of Zeus.[2]

In his contribution to the singing-match, Simichidas commends the poet Aristis in the words:

> ἐσθλὸς ἀνήρ, μέγ' ἄριστος, ὃν οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς ἀείδειν
> Φοῖβος σὺν φόρμιγγι παρὰ τριπόδεσσι μεγαίροι. (vv. 100–1)

—an excellent joke for the reader who has realized that the remark is addressed to none other than αὐτὸς Φοῖβος.[3] The piquant humour of such a situation, where a disguised deity is referred to as a third party in his own presence by a mortal who has failed to recognize him, is frequently exploited by poets: the best-known example is of course Plautus' *Amphitruo*, where the joke is played with both Jupiter and Mercury. It occurs also in the *Odyssey* (ν 221 ff.) when Odysseus, failing to recognize either his native land or his protectress Athene (disguised as a shepherd), appeals to her ὡς θεῷ (v. 231). Ovid uses the conceit twice in the same book of the *Metamorphoses*: first (at 2. 417 ff.) when Jupiter, wishing to seduce the huntress Callisto, adopts the enterprising plan of disguising himself as Diana, and presents himself to her:

> de caespite virgo
> se levat et 'salve, numen, me iudice,' dixit,
> 'audiat ipse licet, maius Iove.' ridet et audit
> et sibi praeferri se gaudet et oscula iungit
> nec moderata satis, nec sic a virgine danda. (vv. 427–31)

and again in the story of Mercury and Battus (vv. 676–707):

> 'me mihi, perfide, prodis?' (v. 704)[4]

Lycidas' characteristic smile, mentioned three times (vv. 19–20, 42, 128–9),

[1] Herzog, loc. cit., has the attractive suggestion that Apollo Ὡρομέδων and Zeus Ὄριος were worshipped jointly: 'Das Bergmassiv hat zwei Gipfel, von denen je einer dem Zeus und dem Apollon heilig sein konnte.' Cf. his remarks on p. 54. This might add point to v. 93 (see next note).

[2] The notion that v. 93 means that Theocritus had won favour with Ptolemy II (= Zeus) seems unnecessary and inappropriate; it depends on the last surviving remnant of the masquerade theory, the equation Simichidas = Theocritus, which I feel should be discarded. Herzog's suggestion (see last note) offers a more fitting interpretation. It is of course true that recondite Coan allusions would not be lost on the king, a native of the island and the pupil of Philetas.

[3] Even the word ἐσθλός may have Apolline overtones: it occurs five times in this idyll, but in no other of T.'s Doric poems, and it is used in literary contexts (v. 4 of patrons, v. 12 of Lycidas, v. 39 of Sicelidas, v. 93 of Simichidas' output, v. 100 of the poet Aristis; cf. *Id.* 16. 14, 30; 17. 117, 22. 215). Cf. Call. *h.* 2. 9:

> ὠπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαείνεται, ἀλλ' ὅ τις
> ἐσθλός.

[4] Cf. the scene between Aeneas and his mother, Virg. *Aen.* 1. 305–409, esp. 327–35. The narrative of the meeting on the road to Emmaus affords a striking parallel, Luke 24: 13–35.

has frequently been taken simply as a token of divinity.[1] With his usual penetrating acumen, Giangrande has seen that the smile is a pointer to the satirical nature of the *Dichterweihe*.[2] The recognition of Lycidas as Apollo the herdsman gives a more precise point still: his smile is now doubly appropriate, as the outward expression of the goatherd's mockery of the townsman's gullibility, and also as the normal reaction of the unrecognized god.[3] Once again, Theocritus has fused the two elements, the ironic reversal of the epic motif and the realistic portrayal of a rustic scene.

The elucidation of these details is a welcome by-product of the Apollo-identification, but its most signal advantage is that it enriches still further the complex irony of the idyll's central theme, the mock-investiture. This parody of Hesiod's initiation by the Muses, which Simichidas takes seriously,[4] performed in the Muses' name (v. 129), is perpetrated by—supreme irony—the *Μοισαγέτας* himself.

One further point calls for discussion. Once Lycidas is recognized as Apollo, striking analogies emerge between the functions of the god in *Thalysia* and in the prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*. In both passages the god of poetry manifests himself to a would-be poet, and issues authoritative edicts on how poetry should and should not be written; in both instances he vigorously condemns the fault of over-ambition in poets.[5]

This similarity of roles would be remarkable enough in itself, but there are several other connections between the two poems.[6] Most importantly, the god appears to Callimachus as Apollo *Λύκιος* (*Aetia*, I, fr. 1. 22); as we have seen, it is Apollo *Λύκιος* who is to be detected, his title slightly (but pointedly) varied, in *Idyll* 7. Since the title, as far as we can tell, has no intrinsic connection with Apollo's specifically poetic functions,[7] the coincidence is all the more remarkable. Callimachus in using the epithet may have been alluding to either of two legends: Pfeiffer, in his note on the line,[8] recalls that Apollo 'transfiguratus in lupum cum Cyrene concubuit', which would be relevant because Callimachus' poetic career began in his birthplace, Cyrene; but more apposite is the story that Apollo 'in lupi habitu Telchinas occidit'.[9] Theocritus too, as we have seen above, had good reasons of his own for alluding to the title *Λύκιος* in a pastoral context.[10] One must therefore acknowledge the theoretical

[1] Puelma, art. cit. 148–50 and n. 17. (Add to his list of examples Sappho fr. 1, 13–15, and Theoc. *Id.* 1. 96 as explained by G. Zuntz in *CQ* x (1960), 37–40); Cameron, art. cit. 305 n. 64; Luck, art. cit. 188.

[2] Art. cit. 523 and n. 73.

[3] *ν* 287, Ovid, *Met.* 2. 429, 704 (cited above).

[4] Giangrande, art. cit. 521 and nn. 71, 72, 73.

[5] Call. *Aetia*, I, fr. 1. 21 ff.; cf. Theoc. *Id.* 7. 45 ff.

[6] e.g. *Aetia*, fr. 1. 2 ~ *Id.* 7. 95, *Aetia*, fr. 1. 29 ~ *Id.* 7. 139; Asclepiades and Philetas were both mentioned in the *Aetia* prologue (see Schol. Flor. 11. 5, 14): is the fact that Simichidas approves of both meant as a sign of his gaucheness? More speculatively: Apollo orders Callimachus to take the 'unworn paths' (*Aetia*, fr. 1. 27–8): Lycidas encounters Simichidas on the otherwise deserted, stony road out of town (*Id.* 7. 1–2, 26).

[7] The *argumentum ex silentio* is strong here: if *Λύκιος* had been a cult-title of Apollo *quâ* inspirer of poets, one might reasonably expect some evidence to that effect in poetry; in fact, no use of the epithet in extant Greek poetry suggests this. The use of *Lycius* at Propertius 3. 1. 38, in a programmatic poem full of Callimachean allusions, is rightly taken by Camps, ad loc., as an echo of the *Aetia* prologue.

[8] Pfeiffer and Trypanis both cite Servius *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4. 177; the correct reference is *Aen.* 4. 377.

[9] Servius *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4. 377. Schol. Lond. offer further, inferior, explanations.

[10] See pp. 138–9 above.

possibility that the two passages, each containing an epiphany of Apollo Λύκιος, each reporting Apollo's literary judgements, each occurring in the context of a poetic initiation, are completely independent of each other, and that the various resemblances between them are fortuitous.

Anyone who is aware of the close web of allusion and counter-allusion between the two poets[1] will, however, find it easier to accept that we have here yet another instance of deliberate, pointed allusion by one poet to the diction and motifs of the other. In such cases it is normally difficult to determine which of the two poets is echoing the other; here, however, the criterion of comparative earnestness is sufficient to suggest the priority of the *Aetia* prologue.[2] Though not without humour, the prologue reflects the high seriousness with which Callimachus viewed his art,[3] whereas Theocritus' poem is ironic throughout. It seems likely therefore that Theocritus is consciously echoing the famous passage of his contemporary Callimachus which was to be imitated so often by Latin poets in Augustan Rome.[4] That he was able to do so in a poem of such genuine originality and freshness as *Idyll* 7 is a mark of his own artistry.[5]

University of Southampton FREDERICK WILLIAMS

[1] See Gercke, *Rh. Mus.* 42 (1887), 595, G. Schlatter, *Theokrit u. Kallimachos* (Diss. Zürich, 1941), and the important paper by Giangrande, 'Hellenistic Poetry and Homer' (*Antiquité Classique*, 1970, pp. 46 ff.), esp. pp. 65 ff., where the instructive example of Theoc., *Id.* 26. 30 ~ Call. *h.* 3. 14 is elucidated.

[2] I am reluctant to make more than this brief sally into the minefield of Alexandrian chronology; but I know of no *fact* which tells against my placing of the *Aetia* prologue (in a version not radically different from the one we have) before *Idyll* 7.

[3] Cf. Giangrande, *Eranos* 69 (1969), 41.

[4] See W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (*Hermes*, Einzelschrift 16 (1960)).

[5] I am grateful to Professor W. G. Arnott and to Dr. R. M. Ogilvie for their valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper; I must acknowledge a heavy debt to Dr. G. Giangrande, who has most generously placed his precious time and unmatched erudition at my disposal. For the faults which remain, only I am responsible.