# NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

## NAUTICAL MATTERS: HESIOD'S *NAUTILIA* AND IBYCUS FRAGMENT 282 *PMG*

In a 1969 article, John Barron documented the striking echoes between Ibycus' Ode to Polykrates (frag. 282 *PMG*) and the so-called σφραγίς (646–62) from the *Nautilia* portion of Hesiod's *Works and Days*.[1] For Barron, Ibycus turns to the σφραγίς because it both anticipates and fulfills the lyric poet's agenda here. Just as Hesiod, by means of his pointed references to his victory in a song contest and to his tutelary Muses, emphasizes his poetic credentials and authority,[2] so, hitching himself to Hesiod's already-established reputation, Ibycus succinctly achieves the same end. The no-less-pronounced Iliadic borrowings throughout the fragment reinforce that declaration of authority, preparing us for Ibycus' closing affirmation concerning the undying κλέος that he can, following the Homeric example, confer on his patron (47–48).[3] I want to return to Barron's account and to suggest that authority is not Ibycus' only or even chief preoccupation here. Instead, if we restore the Hesiodic "citations" to their original context, the programmatic character of Ibycus' composition first proposed by Schneidewin in his 1833 commentary becomes much plainer and more incontestable than previous discussions have allowed.[4] But setting Hesiod's σφραγίς alongside Ibycus' ode does more than resolve an old scholarly debate; it can also illuminate each work on a second score. Both texts, similarly replete with the agonistic devices that inform so much early Greek song culture, combine declarations of their authors' respective literary agendas with demonstrations of their ability to match and surpass an acknowledged master in the rejected poetics and genre. Programmatic self-definition turns out not to be the only name of this game as each poet strives simultaneously to win first place in an ἀγὼν σοφίας.

Initially any Hesiodic presence seems surprising in a poem so studded with Iliadic expressions and conceits that commentators agree that the borrowings must be purposeful.[5] Nothing else could account for what Sisti calls "l'artificiosa e convenzionale omericità dello stile,"[6] a style that some also dismiss as "banal and conventional"[7]

1. Barron 1969, 134. Péron (1982, 43 and 53) also observes the Hesiodic parallels, but assigns no particular significance to them.

2. As also argued by Griffith 1983, 62.

3. Barron 1969, 135.

4. Schneidewin 1833. The same argument reappears in Bowra 1961, 255 (without reference to Schneidewin's discussion), and is taken up by Sisti 1967, 76–77.

5. The standard treatments include Bowra 1961, Sisti 1967, Barron 1961 and 1969, Péron 1982, and Woodbury 1985. For a good review of the different positions taken by critics on the reasons for Ibycus' use of Homeric conceits, see Péron 1982, 41–43.

6. Sisti 1967, 70.

7. Woodbury 1985, 198.

and others try to explain away. The debts become particularly marked in lines 23–35, where in addition to the multiple epic formulae, the poet introduces a statement patently modeled on an Iliadic precedent. Ibycus' declaration of a man's inability to enumerate the ships that came from Aulis to Troy, and the evocation of the superior powers of the Muses to do the job, recalls *Iliad* 2.484–93, where the Homeric poet similarly summons the Muses at the outset of the Catalogue of Ships to aid him in his task of listing the "lords of the ships and their ships' numbers." As Barron comments, "Ibycus' technique, in this part of the poem, is to use Homeric phrases . . . to draw the audience's attention to the *Iliad* generally. Thus prepared, they would in what follows recognize the 'Catalogue of Ships.' The effect of the passage is to emphasize the nautical element even beyond the plain meaning of the words."[8]

But no less apparent is the debt to the Hesiodic σφραγίς, and here too the echoes come thick and fast.[9] Ibycus follows Hesiod in using the term σεσοφισμένος (23, *Op.* 649), and also retains the very rare, non-Homeric epithet of the ships πολύγομφος (18, *Op.* 660). Unlike the Homeric Muses, who hail from Olympus, Ibycus' Muses are styled Ἑλικωνίδες (24), thus signaling their affinity with the exclusively Hesiodic goddesses who initiate Hesiod into his poetic craft at the start of the *Theogony,* and who are reintroduced in the σφραγίς at *Op.* 658. The final link noted by Barron is the fact that Ibycus, like Hesiod at 651, focuses on the moment of embarkation from Aulis, rather than following Homer in locating the ships to be enumerated already at Troy.

Nor does Barron's ample list exhaust the glances back to the *Nautilia.* Ibycus' Muses not only select Helicon for their home, but additionally assert their Hesiodic heritage by virtue of the Aeolic dress they wear for their appearance here (Μοίσαι, 23). The same Aeolic flavor returns with the form πέδα (46), as the lyric poet again tips his hat towards Hesiod, whose father, the *Nautilia* reveals (636), originally came from Aeolian Kyme, and whose song becomes particularly rich in Aeolisms when he speaks of his father's enterprise of choice, seafaring.[10] Also like Hesiod, who twice describes himself as victorious with a ὕμνος (657, cf. 662), Ibycus uses the term ὑμνῆν of his own poetic activity (12). And more strikingly, following his didactic predecessor, Ibycus deploys the topos of setting out on a voyage in both its literal and metaphoric senses. Hesiod describes how the Muses "embarked (ἐπέβησαν) him on shrill song" (659), using an expression which, as lines 679–81 make clear, spans the realms of poetic composition and seafaring.[11] Ibycus still more closely conflates the two ideas when he describes the Muses as "embarking (ἐμβαίεν) on a story" (24).[12] On this basis, it is tempting to adopt the conjecture ἐπελεύσομαι proposed by Wilamowitz for the missing verb in line 15;[13] with its double meaning of "traverse" and "recount," the term anticipates the description of the ships that immediately follows and will link Ibycus' activity with that of the Muses.

8. Barron 1969, 134.

9. See Barron 1969, 134, for the points that follow.

10. For the proliferation of Aeolic forms in the *Nautilia,* see West 1978, 30. For Martin (1992, 27), Hesiod deliberately introduces such "foreign" forms into his diction as a way of asserting his outsider status. This would also serve to differentiate Hesiodic song from its Homeric counterpart.

11. See Rosen (1990, 110) whose larger argument demonstrates the use of seafaring as a metaphor for poetry.

12. For the nautical metaphor here, and its frequent occurrence in Pindar, see Péron 1982, 53–54.

13. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1922, 508.

But what is the point of this twofold set of allusions? For Barron, as already noted, Ibycus wishes to underscore his poetic credentials as he makes a pitch to his (perhaps new) patron Polycrates. But what Barron fails to note is Hesiod's own agenda in this portion of the *Nautilia*. As the discussions by Nagy and Rosen persuasively demonstrate, Hesiod is here engaged in an act of self-differentiation and self-definition and in a pointed disavowal of the model of Iliadic poetry.[14] As Nagy writes, "Hesiod's only sea voyage is ostentatiously brief, with the distance between Aulis and Euboea amounting to some 65 meters of water. There is a built-in antithesis here with the long sea-voyage undertaken by the Achaeans when they sailed to Troy. . . . Moreover, the strong Homeric emphasis on navigation as a key to the Achaeans' survival . . . is in sharp contrast with the strong Hesiodic emphasis on the poet's personal inexperience in navigation. . . . Perhaps, then, this passage reveals an intended differentiation of Hesiodic from Homeric poetry."[15] Rosen, building on Nagy's argument, views both the σφραγίς and the two surrounding passages of the tripartite *Nautilia* as Hesiod's demonstration of his novel poetics in distinction to the epic, martial model that he rejects. Creating "a poem of the earth," he associates composition according to the Iliadic paradigm with dangerous, extended voyages on the high seas while his own poetry stays at home, or hugs the shore.[16] Anticipating these two recent readings are the scholia to the passage, which correctly catch its underlying spirit of polemic, but typically recast that spirit in a biographical mode.[17] Thus the ancient commentators cite a variant to line 657 in which Hesiod does not simply announce his victory at the competition in the funeral games at Chalcis, but declares that there he defeated Homer.[18] The polemical impulse that the scholia discerned behind the σφραγίς must also inform Ibycus' borrowings. The Hesiodic echoes, embedded within the triple *praeteritio* that structures the central portion of the song where the poet declares his disinclination to sing on the very themes that occupy the *Iliad,*[19] reiterate and reinforce the "poétique du refus" that Ibycus practices here.[20]

But it is not enough for a poet simply to distance himself from the Iliadic paradigm and give his audience a taste of his new poetics. In the agonistic context that surrounds the composition and performance of poetry in much of the Archaic and Classical ages,[21] success depends on defeating a real or imagined rival, on exposing the blemishes and faults of the opposing model. As I suggest, this competitive impetus and agonistic stance generate many of the expressions, conceits, and rhetorical devices that Hesiod's and Ibycus' compositions both include. Whether Ibycus consciously

14. Nagy 1982, 66; Rosen 1990. See too Griffith (1983, 60–62), whose correction of the previously biographical reading of Hesiod proves crucial here, and Thalmann 1984, 152–53.

15. Nagy 1982, 66.

16. So Rosen 1990, 100 and 113, summarizing his reading.

17. Here I follow the formulation of Graziosi 2002, 171.

18. The variant line reads "beating divine Homer in song at Chalcis" and is included at *Certamen* 213 as part of the inscription placed by Hesiod on the tripod he offered to the Muses in thanks for his victory. As commentators agree, the entire tradition of a competition between Homer and Hesiod stems from *Op*. 656–57.

19. The triple "denials" are at 10–12 ("now I am not minded to sing"), 15 ("nor shall I narrate"), and 25–26 ("no mortal man could say each thing"). On the *praeteritio,* see n. 29 below.

20. For the expression, see Péron 1982, 48.

21. Here I rely on the arguments cogently presented in Griffith 1990; as Griffith emphasizes, the majority of Greek poetry of the Archaic and Classical ages would have been performed within the context of an ἀγών (188).

takes his cue from the *Nautilia,* or whether, more probably, he and Hesiod simply draw from a common set of conventions informing competitive poetic encounters, the moves that they make to discredit and devalue their chosen foil overlap to a striking degree.

We can begin with the slanted redeployment of the Iliadic material. Both Hesiod and Ibycus perform the standard agonistic stratagem of confronting the opposing composition or genre, repeating (with a difference), modifying, correcting, and critiquing the canonical account. Lines 650–53 of the *Works and Days* perform the task with elegance and economy. Using his own brief voyage from Aulis by way of peg, Hesiod mentions, as though in passing, the gathering of the Achaeans there as they waited out the winter to cross the sea to Troy. Not only does he modify/emend the Iliadic story by introducing an episode all but missing from the Homeric account (and in so doing perhaps remind us of Homer's awkward displacement of the muster to Trojan soil in the Catalogue of Ships),[22] but the alteration additionally draws an implicit contrast between that ill-fated venture (presaged by the fact of delay) and Hesiod's remarkably successful but limited travels overseas. Included in that contrast (the far as opposed to the near)[23] may be a dig at the outsized dimensions of martial epic—which Hesiod nicely redresses by summarizing the essential plot of the Trojan tale in three rapid lines.[24] At the risk of making Hesiod a Callimachean *avant la lettre,* we might read this endorsement of local as opposed to extended travel together with the poet's earlier "praise"[25] of the "small ship" (643)[26] and his warnings against overloading the "poetic" vehicle at sea and on shore (690–93).[27] Finally, Hesiod no sooner evokes the topic of the most famed martial epic than he plays fast and loose with its hallowed terms. If his description of "sailing the broad sea" has any number of Homeric parallels and shows, along with other epic conceits, his mastery of the genre, the two further Iliadic epithets are strikingly reversed and mismatched. In the Homeric songs, Greece, not Troy, is the "land of fair women" (καλλιγύναιξ), and ἱερός is typically used of Troy, not Greece.[28]

Ibycus' composition is no less marked by the dubious compliment of skewed mimicry, much of it bracketed within the triple *praeteritio*.[29] This rhetorical figure,

22. *Il*. 2.303 merely mentions the gathering at Aulis but gives no details. The *Cypria* (Procl. *Chrestom*./ Apollod. *Epit*. 3.21) has the Greeks delayed by stormy weather.

23. Nagy (1982, 66) observes the opposition in the citation given above.

24. Péron (1982, 52), without reference to the Hesiodic passage, notes many places in Pindar where metaphors of limited travel signal a desire to abridge a too-long-drawn-out story. For the "summary," see Graziosi 2002, 170.

25. Ford (2002, 3) observes the use of "praise" and "blame" as the terms that Archaic and Classical sources deploy to assess the merits of a singer/composer's performance.

26. While Hesiod goes on to recommend placing cargo in a larger one, a qualification concerning the ship's resulting vulnerability to the winds immediately follows (644–45).

27. For other terms with programmatic/aesthetic significance, see Rosen 1990, 103–4, 109. I would add to his list πολύγομφος (indicative, perhaps, of magnitude and weight), and the final injunction concerning καιρός (694), which figures as a key aesthetic criterion in the late Archaic and Classical ages (see, most recently, Ford 2002, 16–17, 18–20; Griffith 1983, 61, also flags as "key words" the terms ὡραῖος, μέτρον, and καιρός). The overlap between the language of Hesiod here and the terms that occur in the ἀγών between Aeschylus and Euripides ("Homer" and "Hesiod" respectively, as O'Sullivan 1992, 66–79, has proposed) in Aristophanes' *Frogs* is an issue I plan to take up elsewhere.

28. Edwards (1971, 80) observes the switch, and finds the strategy indicative of Hesiod's humor. My reading echoes that of Graziosi (2002, 170), who cites the "competitive stance" motivating the poet here.

29. For the *praeteritio* here, see Barron 1969, 135, and Péron 1982, 47–48, with other lyric examples. For the use of the device as part of the "agonistic mannerisms" adopted by Greek poets, see Griffith 1990, 194.

deployed in such actual song contests as the one that frames Alcman's *Partheneion* (frag. 1.2, 12 *PMG*), allows the poet both to appropriate and to dismiss the material treated by a predecessor or rival, to show his awareness of and facility in the road not taken. As many readers complain, Ibycus scatters his epic formulae with a more-than-liberal hand. The effect is not only to display what the poet could have done had he chosen to write in this mode. By virtue of sheer excess and Ibycus' choice of the most commonplace of phrases (imagine the audience hearing "swift-footed Achilles" yet again), he seems out to reveal the now-hackneyed quality of the Homeric vocabulary.[30] Much like Hesiod, Ibycus also muddles Iliadic contexts and alters the value of the epic conceits. As Péron observes, lines 8–9 are a rewrite of *Iliad* 24.699–700, but in this instance "ruin," rather than Cassandra (mentioned just a few lines on, as though Ibycus wishes to alert his audience to his cleverness), mounts to the citadel.[31] Completely novel is the application of the pejorative epithet ὑπεράφανον (17) to the Iliadic quality of ἀρετή.[32] As this modification shows, Ibycus, like Hesiod with his evocation of the difficulties in sailing that beset the armada, is in the business of dwelling on the darker sides of the Trojan venture, even questioning the celebration of martial virtues in the earlier song. "Tearful war" (7)[33] and the "unmentionable day of the capture" (14–15) are the thrust of his account. Poetic competitions are as much about the ability correctly to pass moral and ethical judgments on the material at hand as they are about aesthetics,[34] and Ibycus' new reading "corrects" the earlier account.

Such powers of moral and ethical discrimination fall very much under the rubric of poetic σοφία—at once wisdom and technical skill. As Griffith has shown, σοφία is *the* quality that song contests are designed to demonstrate, put to the test, and evaluate,[35] and it comes as no surprise that Hesiod and Ibycus both claim superiority over their rival in this domain. Hesiod begins the σφραγίς with the claim that (with Perses as silent audience and judge) he will make a performative display (δείξω, 648) of his knowledge concerning the sea, and follows this up with the surprising admission that he lacks σοφία in the business of seafaring (648–49). Nothing would better get an audience's attention (and sympathy) than this seeming self-denigration and modesty on Hesiod's part, a suggestion that one of the two competitors does not even have the wherewithal to compete—at least not on the grounds that his rival has defined.[36] Of course, as Rosen demonstrates, it turns out by line 660 that Hesiod has all the σοφία that poetic success requires,[37] and nothing better proves the point than the incident-free and victorious sea journey he did perform. In contrast to the

30. See, for example, Most 1982, 86, although he eventually rejects the idea of a deliberate excess of Homericisms.

31. Péron 1982, 44.

32. Péron 1982, 44.

33. Note Anac. frag. *Eleg.* 2 W, who uses exactly the same formula in his rejection of the theme for a sympotic occasion.

34. For this see Griffith 1990, 188.

35. Griffith 1990, 188. Σοφία is explicitly at stake in the *Certamen* (65) and in the contest between Aeschylus and Euripides in Ar. *Ran*. 766, 882 (ἀγὼν σοφίας), 1413. For the argument that the links between the *Certamen* and *Frogs* are much closer than hitherto perceived, see Rosen 2004. See too the discussions of σοφία by Rosen (1990, 101–2) and Gladigow (1965, 9–15).

36. Cf. Aeschylus' reluctance to compete with Euripides at the start of the poetic ἀγών in Ar. *Ran*. 866.

37. See Rosen 1990, 102–3, and Griffith 1983, 62, who points out the role of the father as the individual lacking in the wisdom his Muse-blessed son enjoys.

detained Achaeans (whose poet(s) did not have the requisite σοφία to have them avoid gathering at a time when no right-minded individual would think of seafaring, which Hesiod strenuously counsels against), Hesiod's σοφία guaranteed him smooth passage and a prize.

Σοφία is also very much at stake in the poetic victory Ibycus achieves. Pivoting from his account of the sack of Troy to the Greek armada, he remarks "on these subjects the skilled (σεσοφισμέναι) Muses of Helicon could well embark in story, but no mortal man (untaught?) might tell each thing, what was the number of ships that came from Aulis" (23–27). Commentators wonder at the attribution of σοφία to the Muses, a property that elsewhere in Archaic and early Classical poetry belongs exclusively to men.[38] But Ibycus' reassignment of poetic skill makes perfect sense within his larger agonistic frame. By locating the wisdom/technical ability that characterizes the poet in the divine sphere, Ibycus necessarily portrays his rival as wholly dependent on the Muses' instruction for his tour de force in the Catalogue of Ships. By contrast, Ibycus' choice not to detail ship numbers, but instead to broach the very different topic of beauty, allows him to display a σοφία that depends on no such external, higher authority and is exclusively his own.[39]

Final proof for the agonistic impetus complementing the programmatic element in each text belongs with each poet's emphatic deployment of the theme of contest itself. Much as some lyric poems and later dramas include ample references to competitive encounters so as to remind audiences of the real contest in which the composer/performer was engaged,[40] so Hesiod uses the previous agonistic occasion described in lines 655–57 to anticipate the present moment. His victory at the funeral games of Amphidamas additionally serves as predictive of the happy outcome of this second ἀγών. Ibycus also foregrounds the theme of competition, constructing a miniaturized contest within the larger poetic struggle that he wages. Introducing the theme of beauty at 36 (a property that already figured in the "contested" beauty of Helen at 5–6 and in the rapid evocation of Paris' judgment at 9), the poet poses the question of which Greek hero should carry off the prize in a putative beauty contest. Included within this embedded ἀγών is a fresh rewriting and emendation of the Homeric account. Whereas Homer's Catalogue of Ships, the very passage already recalled, gave first place to Nireus of Syme (2.673), Ibycus names Zeuxippos of Sicyon victor instead.[41] More terms evocative of competition, ranking, and evaluation follow. The Sicyonian hero stands to the Trojan Troilus as thrice-refined gold to orichalc (42–43).[42] As the celebrated priamel to Pindar's first *Olympian* shows (1–7), gold regularly figures in lists concerning estimations of what is best, and the hierarchy of

38. See particularly Woodbury 1985, 200–201, and Péron 1982, 48–52, with additional bibliography.

39. So Péron 1982, 51. Péron 1982, 52, additionally sees in this section a concern with concision.

40. So Alcman's *Partheneion* (frag. 1.58–59 *PMG*). For Euripides' use of the device in his *Helen,* see Downing 1990, 12–14.

41. Ibycus may, according to some commentators, be signaling his intervention in the Homer/Hesiod divide at 22, where he calls Agamemnon both "Pleisthenid" and "son of Atreus." While the Homeric Agamemnon is invariably a son of Atreus, Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* makes both him and Menelaus sons of Pleisthenes and grandsons of Atreus (frags. 194–95 M–W; cf. Apollod. *Bibl*. 3.2.2). For additional discussion, see Barron 1969, 128, and Péron 1982, p. 43, n. 59. The fact that Ibycus here chooses the Homeric genealogy does, of course, tell against my larger reading. The possible allusion to the controversy, however, supports the notion of a confrontation between two rival paradigms.

42. Some commentators think the point is the contrast between the two metals, others, their similarity. See Woodbury 1985, 201–3, for good discussion and persuasive arguments on behalf of the first reading.

metals offers a paradigm for the evaluation of other goods and individuals.[43] The immediate segue into the topic of Ibycus' κλέος-conferring poetry establishes the continuity between "first rank" in other areas, and the poet's own primacy in his chosen sphere.

A poet may find his stalking horse not only in the person of another real or constructed ἀοιδός, but equally well in his former self and earlier poetic oeuvre. As several commentators suggest, when Hesiod refers to the prize song he performed at Chalcis, he may be inviting the audience to think of the *Theogony,* a work concerned with a very different matter and informed by a different poetics from the composition that he now performs. The dedication of the tripod won on that earlier occasion (658–59) would signal not only the success, but also perhaps the closure of that portion of his career. Just as the programmatic passage on the Erides (*Op*. 11–26) involved an initial correction of his earlier work (11–12), and thereby announced a more mature and wiser poet,[44] so now Hesiod again demarcates one poetic persona from another. Ibycus also makes a division of his poetic self. According to Schneidewin, Bowra, and others, fragment 282 marks a turning point in Ibycus' career, the moment when the poet declares his renunciation of epico-lyric works in the manner of the "Homeric" Stesichorus and embarks on the production of more personal poetry on erotic themes.[45] While these earlier discussions overstate their case, and argue on the basis of lacunose evidence and speculative chronology, Ibycus undoubtedly did compose songs on mythical themes drawn from Homer and the Cyclic poets.[46] Here, however, he chooses to pursue a different trajectory, using the νῦν in line 10 to mark the fact that in this instance issues of beauty and immortality through song are his chief concern.

Ibycus' deployment of Hesiod's σφραγίς in the spirit of polemic in which (I have argued) it was originally intended has implications that go beyond fragment 282. By the late fifth century, as O'Sullivan has demonstrated, "Homer" and "Hesiod" had become two distinctive and opposing banners beneath which poets, orators, and critics on opposite sides of contemporary stylistic debates could rally and stake their literary, aesthetic, and rhetorical claims.[47] While Ibycus invokes Hesiod as exemplary not of the *genus tenue,* as these later sources do, but of a nonmartial subject matter and perhaps a non-Iliadic ethical system, his use of the two figures as representative of opposing poetics suggests that some of the battle lines had already been drawn. More speculatively, Ibycus' emphatic self-positioning within the polemic gives further

43. Gold is more generally a standard term in priamels (for whose affinity with the device of *praeteritio,* see Race 1982, 21) and comparisons; see *Od*. 1.165, 6.232, Alc. frag. 1.54 *PMG,* Sapph. frag. 156 LP. For other examples, see Gerber 1982, 11. The reader for this article offers the very attractive suggestion that this portion of the Ode may also look towards the ranking of metals in Hesiod's myth of the races. If we read the lacunose ending of 35 as ἄργυρος, then Ibycus presents the same ranked sequence of bronze-silver-gold found in Hesiod's account.

44. Here I follow the reading of Most (1993, 77–80), with its demonstration of how the expression οὐκ ἄρα at 11 signals an emphatic self-emendation. It should also be noted that this earlier programmatic passage similarly enters into close dialogue with, and critique of, Iliadic ethics and concerns (as the very theme of *eris,* and references to a competitive song encounter at 26 further emphasize). For discussion of the anti-Iliadic stance here, see Rousseau 1993, 48–54.

45. Schneidewin 1833; Bowra 1961, 252–57; Sisti 1967, 76–77. For a reasoned critique of their views, see Woodbury 1985, 195–96.

46. For documentation of Ibycus' use of epic material, see Sisti 1967, 60–62. For Stesichorus as Ὁμηρικώτατος, see [Longinus] 13. 3.

47. O'Sullivan 1992, 66–95.

weight to the argument that versions of the *Certamen* were already circulating in the Archaic period and that its arguments could already provide matter on which contemporary poets might draw.[48] When the *Certamen*'s Panedes famously decides in Hesiod's favor, "saying that it was right for the one who encouraged farming and peace to win, rather than the one who recounted wars and slaughter" (207–10), he reiterates a verdict extant in much earlier times and already incorporated into Ibycus' agonistic song.[49]

DEBORAH STEINER
*Columbia University*

48. See particularly Richardson 1981 for the existence of a pre-Alcidamantine tradition and, most recently, Rosen 2004, 299–300.

49. This article owes a large debt to Ralph Rosen, who read and commented on an early version, and to the reader of this journal for a painstaking and helpful reading.

## LITERATURE CITED

Barron, J. P. 1961. The Son of Hyllis. *CR,* n.s., 11:185–87.

_____. 1969. Ibycus: To Polycrates. *BICS* 16:119–49.

Bowra, C. M. 1961. *Greek Lyric Poetry*[2]. Oxford.

Downing, E. 1990. *Apate, Agon,* and Literary Self-Reflexivity in Euripides' *Helen*. In *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer,* ed. M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde, 1–16. Atlanta.

Edwards, G. P. 1971. *The Language of Hesiod in Its Traditional Context*. Oxford.

Ford, A. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton, N.J.

Gerber, D. E. 1982. *Pindar's "Olympian" I: A Commentary.* Toronto.

Gladigow, B. 1965. Sophia *und* Kosmos*: Untersuchungen zur Frühgeschichte von* σοφός *und* σοφίη. Spudasmata, 1. Hildesheim.

Graziosi, B. 2002. *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*. Cambridge.

Griffith, M. 1983. Personality in Hesiod. *ClAnt* 2:37–65.

_____. 1990. Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry. In *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer,* ed. M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde, 185–207. Atlanta.

Martin, R. P. 1992. Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics. *Ramus* 21:11–33.

Most, G. W. 1982. Greek Lyric Poets. In *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome,* ed. T. J. Luce, 1:75–98. New York.

_____. 1993. Hesiod and the Textualization of Personal Temporality. In *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina: Atti del Convegno, Pisa, 16–17 maggio 1991,* ed. G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari, 73–92. Pisa.

Nagy, G. 1982. Hesiod. In *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome,* ed. T. J. Luce, 1:43–73. New York.

O'Sullivan, N. 1992. *Alcidamas, Aristophanes and the Beginnings of Greek Stylistic Theory.* Stuttgart.

Péron, J. 1982. Le poème à Polycrate: Une "palinodie" d'Ibycus? *RPhil* 56:33–56.

Race, W. H. 1982. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*. Mnemosyne Suppl. 74. Leiden.

Richardson, N. J. 1981. The Contest of Homer and Hesiod and Alcidamas' *Mouseion. CQ* 31:1–10.

Rosen, R. M. 1990. Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's *Works and Days*. *ClAnt* 9:99–113.

_____. 2004. Aristophanes' *Frogs* and the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod. TAPA* 134:295–322.

Rousseau, P. 1993. Un héritage disputé. In *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina: Atti del Convegno, Pisa, 16–17 maggio 1991,* ed. G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari, 41–72. Pisa.
Schneidewin, F. G. 1833. *Ibyci Rhegini Carminum Reliquiae*. Göttingen.
Sisti, F. 1967. L'ode a Policrate: Un caso di recusatio in Ibico. *QUCC* 4:59–79.
Thalmann, W. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic*. Baltimore.
West, M. L., ed. 1978. *Hesiod: "Works and Days."* With prolegomena and commentary. Oxford.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin.
Woodbury, L. 1985. Ibycus and Polycrates. *Phoenix* 39:193–220.

## CICERO'S *PRO CAELIO* 33–34 AND APPIUS CLAUDIUS' *ORATIO DE PYRRHO*

Discussions of Appius Claudius the Blind in the *Pro Caelio,* from at least Quintilian on, have tended to focus on the technique of Cicero's *prosopopoeia*—its tone and its rhetorical purpose within the larger speech.[1] Its tone, Quintilian states, places it in the grand style, while its purpose is to "rebuke her [that is, Clodia's] vices" (3.8.54). More recent discussions have also considered the humor of Cicero's impersonation, and the role of humor in the *Pro Caelio* as a whole.[2] This note contributes a point to the discussion of the tone and the rhetorical purpose of the *prosopopoeia* by exploring a largely unnoticed aspect of the passage's comedy.[3] Specifically, I argue that Cicero's Appius Claudius alludes to the most famous speech he ever gave—a purported copy of which survived in the late Republic—to strengthen his appeal, and to add humor to it.

Cicero's use of the ancient Appius Claudius Caecus (censor in 312 B.C.E., consul twice, in 307 and 296, and builder of the Via Appia and the Aqua Appia) against Clodia in general made good sense; as R. G. Austin noted in the third edition of his authoritative commentary, it was appropriate to call upon "this fine old Roman gentleman to rebuke a flighty descendant, to whom his ways would no doubt seem curiously fusty."[4] But in addition to the vast gulf that separated the blind censor from the "Medea of the Palatine," there was a second, more precise reason for Cicero's choice. Appius Claudius was well known for appearing before Rome's senators in

I would like to thank to my colleague Charles McNelis for reading a draft of this note, as well as the journal's anonymous reader.

1. Quintilian makes over twenty references to the speech, the most important of which concern Cicero's *prosopopoeia*. See especially *Inst*. 3.8.54 (on the purpose of invoking Appius and Clodius) and 12.10.61 (on the tone of the passage in which Appius appears). For modern discussions of tone and purpose, see, e.g., Geffcken 1973, 18; Classen 1973, 79–80; Stroh 1975, 280–81; Wiseman 1985, 84; and Dufallo 2001, 119–42.

2. See especially Geffcken 1973, but also, e.g., May 1988, 105–16, and Riggsby 1999, 100–105.

3. The idea presented here is briefly hinted at by Dufallo in a footnote, but not fully explored: see Dufallo 2001, p. 133, n. 34.

4. Austin (1960) on *Cael*. 33.2. Discussions of Appius Claudius Caecus include *RE,* s.v. "Claudius" (91) (Münzer), with references to the sources, and Cornell 1995, 373–77, with references to earlier studies. A particularly important source for his career and the place it held in the Romans' conception of their history is his *elogium* from the Forum of Augustus, a full copy of which survives from Arles, and fragments from the original in Rome (see *Inscr. Ital.* 13.3, nos. 79 and 12, respectively). The Arles text mentions *pacem fieri cum [P]yrrho rege prohibuit*.