

is a clarification: contrary to common interpretations, Socrates *is* claiming that after a pain stops, one is merely perceiving the quietude from pain and *believes* it to be pleasant when, in fact, it is not pleasant at all.

CONCLUSION

The Levels Analogy, as I interpret it, is less complicated than commentators typically suppose: on my view both movements ‘upwards’ and objects and activities which cause pleasure are completely absent from the analogy.¹⁴ Thus, there is no need to be equivocal in the translation of *ἄνω* and *κάτω*; we should consistently translate *ἄνω* as ‘above’ as opposed to ‘upwards’, *κάτω* as ‘below’, as opposed to ‘downwards’. Then, by representing the feeling of pleasure as the level ‘above’, pain as the level ‘below’ and the quietude as a middle state between them, the analogy suggests the following: just as one might mistake being at the middle (having come to the middle from below) for the above, one often mistakes the quietude from pain as a pleasant feeling.

If correct, my clarification of the Levels Analogy should put us in a better position to understand how the just life is happier than the unjust life. For Socrates’ argument that the non-intellectual’s pleasures are ‘not altogether true’ depends on the fact that we can sometimes be wrong in thinking that we are pleased.

Department of Philosophy and Religion, Berea College

JAMES BUTLER

jim_butler@berea.edu

doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh063

¹⁴ Although pleasures and pains are said to be movements of the soul (583e9–10), on my view their particular movements are not represented in the analogy.

AN EPIGRAM OF NOSSIS (8 GP = AP 6.353)

*Αὐτομέλιννα τέτυκται ἴδ', ὥς ἀγανὸν τὸ πρόσωπον
ἀμέ ποτοπτάζειν μελιχίως δοκέει
ὥς ἐτύμως θυγάτηρ τῇ μητέρι πάντα ποτώκει.
ἦ καλόν, ὅκκα πέλη τέκνα γονεῦσιν ἴσα.*

Melinna-Herself (the real Melinna) has been made. See, how the gentle face seems to look sweetly at us.

How truly the daughter resembles her mother in all respects.

A good thing, when children are like their parents.

The ‘daughter’ is, of course, the painting.

This seems so obvious that I am somewhat embarrassed to point it out, but all commentators and translators read the epigram as simply expressing how much Melinna looks like her mother. The problem is that it is difficult to see the *point* of such an epigram. That a daughter resembles her mother is hardly of note and with this reading the poem is unbelievably flat. It is also strange that Melinna’s mother has no name.¹ On the other hand, it is quite easy to see what Nossis might have done, if the similarity of mother and daughter were the actual subject: ‘In this portrait you can see

¹ Contrast Nossis 3 (AP 6.265), whatever the naming practices of the Locrians might have been; for which see A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965), II.437 on 3 GP (AP 6.265.4); M. Skinner, ‘Greek women and the metronymic: a note on an epigram by Nossis’, *Ancient History Bulletin* 19 (1987), 39–42.

both mother and daughter'; 'Why paint two portraits when one will do?'; If you've seen Melinna, you've see her mother'; or more cruelly 'Once Melinna's mother looked like this.'

Gow and Page comment: 'ἐτύμως: similarly Theocr. 15.82 ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐστάκαντι, καὶ ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐνδινεῶντι ['how truly they stand and how truly they turn about'] of figures in a tapestry, though here the resemblance is between the portrait and the sitter's mother, not the sitter herself'.² Exactly so, and Gow's own note on this line of Theocritus shows the correct way out: 'ἔτυμα: of verisimilitude in works of art', comparing *AP* 9.593,³ to which add Meleager 32 (*AP* 5.149), also about a portrait. Herodas' description of the various works of art in *Mime* 4 uses very similar language: cf. especially 4.35–38:

τὸν Βατάλης γὰρ τοῦτον οὐκ ὀρήϊς, Κυννοί,
ὅπως βέβηκεν ἀνδρ[ι]άντα τῆς Μύττω;
εἰ μή τις αὐτὴν εἶδε Βατάλην, βλέψας
ἐς τοῦτο τὸ εἰκόνημα μὴ ἐτύμης δέισθω.

Kynno, don't you see how this statue of Batale,
daughter of Myttes, stands?
Anyone who has not seen Batale herself
would not need the real woman after looking at this likeness.

Manakidou on this passage also notes the use of ἐτύμης to express verisimilitude as the highest quality that a work of art can have.⁴ Realism is, naturally, the most common form of praise for artworks in epigrams and much of Hellenistic poetry.⁵ So for example, the endless variations on Myron's Heifer (*AP* 9.713–42, 793–8, and now Posidippus 66; cf. *AP* 6.175), and fidelity to the original is praised (*AP* 16.120–1 on Lysippus' Alexander; cf. Leonidas of Tarentum 39 GP [*AP* 6.355]: an apology for a cheap painting; Posidippus 63, 65: Hecataeus' statue of Philitas, and Lysippus' statue of Alexander).⁶

All the other epigrams by Nossis on portraits are about how closely the painting resembles the sitter, not some unnamed person offstage. So 7 (*AP* 9.604): Thaumareta's dog would think the painting was its mistress;⁷ 9 (6.354, immediately following the epigram under discussion): I can judge Sabethis' beauty and majesty from her picture and can surmise (ἐλπομ' ὀρὺν) her sweetness. Note the similarities of language, in particular the use of ἴσος and πάντα, in Nossis 6 (9.605).⁸

² Gow and Page (n. 1), II.440.

³ A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* (Cambridge, 1950), 288.

⁴ F. Manakidou, *Beschreibung von Kunstwerken in der hellenistischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart, 1993), 26. Many examples collected by G. Luck, 'Die Dichterinnen, der griechischen Anthologie', *Museum Helveticum* 11 (1954), 184, n. 71. Cf. Posidippus' phrase 63.6 (col. X.21): ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν [ἔχων] κανόνα; Posidippo di Pella. *Epigrammi* (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309), ed. Guido Bastianini and Claudio Gallazzi, with Colin Austin (Milan, 2001), 86. See Kathryn Gutzwiller, 'Posippus on statuary', in Guido Bastianini and Angelo Casanova (edd.), *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo* (Florence, 2002), 42–60, esp. 43, 48, 58.

⁵ 'The standard is realism': T. B. L. Webster, *Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (New York, 1964), 256, and see 158; J. J. Pollitt, *The Ancient View of Greek Art* (New Haven, 1974), 63–4, P. Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry* (London, 1987), 47.

⁶ Cf. Cornelius Lorgus II (*AP* 16.117), *AP* 9.593.

⁷ For the innocent eye, see Ael. *VH* 2.3, Plin *HN* 35.65.

⁸ So too Posidippus 63 (col. X.16): τόνδε Φιλίται χαλκὸν [ἔ]σον κατὰ πάνθ' 'Εκ[α]ταῖος / ἀ[κ]ρ[ε]βίς ἄκρους [ἔ]πλα[σεν] εἰς ὄνυχας. (This bronze, like Philetas in all respects, Hecataeus molded right down to the fingernails.)

Τὸν πίνακα ξανθᾶς Καλλὼ δόμον εἰς Ἀφροδίτας
 εἰκόνα γραψαμένα πάντ' ἀνέθηκεν ἕσαν.
 ὥς ἀγανῶς ἔστακεν· ἴδ', ἃ χάρις ἀλίκον ἀνθεῖ.
 χαιρέτω· οὐ τίνα γὰρ μέμψιν ἔχει βιοτᾶς.

Kallo set up her painting in the temple of blonde Aphrodite,
 a painted image like the original in all respects.
 How gently she stands. See how much her grace flowers.
 Blessing on her, for she has no fault in her life.

The poem immediately preceding Nossis 8, Erinna 3 (6.352), is also about how lifelike a portrait is, using *ἐτύμως*:

Ἐξ ἀταλᾶν χειρῶν τάδε γράμματα· λῶστέ Προμαθεύ,
 ἔντι καὶ ἄνθρωποι τὴν ὁμαλοὶ σοφίαν·
 ταύταν γοῦν ἐτύμως τὴν παρθένον ὅστις ἔγραψεν,
 αἱ καὺδ' ἀν ποτέθηκ', ἥς κ' Ἀγαθαρχὶς ὅλα.

This painting comes from tender hands. Good Prometheus,
 there are even humans your equal in skill.
 At any rate, whoever painted this girl so accurately,⁹
 if he had only added a voice, it would be completely Agatharchis.

So too here. Nossis uses a tidy chiasmus: A. Melinna, B. portrait, B. daughter, A. mother, and further equates the portrait with the daughter by repetition of language: ὥς ἀγανὸν τὸ πρόσωπον . . . ὥς ἐτύμως θυγάτηρ. Thus she sets up a simple set of ratios: Subject is to Painting as Original is to Copy as Parent/Mother is to Child/Daughter. This interpretation also solves the obvious problem that Gow and Page pointed out: 'For the common sentiment that it is good for children to resemble their parents see Gow on Theocr. 17.47, but, as Jacobs noted, it concerns the resemblance between father and children which is evidence of their legitimacy and has little relevance to the resemblance between daughter and mother.'¹⁰

Nossis has thus created a witty *variatio* on the common metaphor of the work as the child of the artist, and a new twist on the theme of realism in art.¹¹

University of Cincinnati

HOLT N. PARKER

holt.parker@uc.edu

doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh064

⁹ Gow and Page (n. 1), II.284 gloss *ἐτύμως* 'to the life'.

¹⁰ F. Jacobs, *Anthologia Graeca* (Leipzig, 1794–1814), ad loc.

¹¹ For example, *AP* 9.726 (Antipater on Myron), 16.83 (painting by Timomachus), 16.292 (*Iliad* and *Odyssey* as the daughters of Homer).

A GREEK INSCRIPTION ON THE MEMNON COLOSSUS: THE MYSTERIOUS 'MISTER T'

A curious series of ancient graffiti exists inscribed on the legs of one of the so-called Memnon colossi in Egypt. Roman tourists—government functionaries, professional poets, and private citizens—flocked to Egyptian Thebes to hear the famous stones speak, a phenomenon now understood to be the result of the early morning sun warming and expanding the stone base, which had cracked in an earthquake c. C.E. 29, according to Strabo (17.1.46). Visitors to the site began arriving under Tiberius, peaked in Hadrian's reign, and trailed off in the late second and early third