

ARTEMON OF PERGAMUM (*FGrH* 569): A HISTORIAN IN CONTEXT*

We know very little about Artemon of Pergamum, who lived in the mid-second century B.C. He is mentioned six times in the Pindar scholia, and his fragments show that he was interested in historical, geographical and mythological problems in Pindar's victory odes addressed to Sicilian personalities. The designation 'from Pergamum' indicates that he must have worked in the Attalids' library, which possessed one of the most important book collections of the ancient world and was the rival of the leading cultural centre of the Hellenistic world, Alexandria. Artemon's fragments have been edited and commented upon in Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (*FGrH* 569); Luke Pitcher recently published a new edition of this material in Brill's *New Jacoby*, with an English translation and notes.¹

We do not know the titles of Artemon's works. The small number of the extant fragments makes it difficult for us to decide whether he wrote a commentary or a historical work (or possibly both); our sources describe him with the epithet of *ιστορικός* (*FGrH* 569 F 3 and 4), which led Jacoby to think that he was not strictly a commentator (see comm. on *FGrH* 569, vol. IIb, 597). Leaving this issue aside, it might be more fruitful to explore the contents of his extant fragments in order to place him more firmly within the context of contemporary historical and philological research.

First of all, two of Artemon's interpretations of Pindar's text disagree with Aristarchus (F 1 and 2 Jacoby; see my discussion below). This is not surprising: Carl Müller, who in 1851 published Artemon's fragments in the *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (vol. IV, 340), noted that his interpretative approach bore the influence of Crates of Mallus, the most influential intellectual active at the library of Pergamum in the second century B.C.: scholars who worked on Artemon, however, have not provided evidence in support or against his link with Crates, preferring to focus on the historical contents of his fragments (see Jacoby and Pitcher), rather than on his idiosyncratic and unorthodox approach to Pindar's text. In this article I would like to analyse Artemon's extant material in order to explore his connection not only to the work of Crates but also to that of other scholars active in Pergamum in the second century B.C.; more generally, it would be useful to assess Artemon's positions within the frame of Hellenistic research on Pindar's victory odes. It will be apparent that Artemon's unconventional opinions are linked to his interpretative strategies, and that these have evident connections with Crates' method, so that Artemon can confidently be counted among his pupils.

* I should like to thank this journal's anonymous referee for his kind and judicious comments on an earlier draft of this article.

¹ L.V. Pitcher, *Artemon of Pergamon* (569), in *Brill's New Jacoby* (2007), available online at <<http://www.brillonline.nl/public/>>. On Artemon, see also L. Pagani, *Artemon* [1] (2004), in F. Montanari, F. Montana and L. Pagani (edd.), *Lessico dei grammatici greci antichi*, <<http://www.aristarchus.unige.it/lgga/>>, with the text of the fragments, introduction and full bibliography.

As a start toward putting Artemon's work in a wider context, it is useful to note that his interest in the families of tyrants and in the names of Sicilian cities, rivers and lakes finds a significant parallel in the work of the earlier antiquary Polemon of Ilium, who lived in the first half of the second century B.C. and travelled throughout the Greek world, from Asia Minor to Sicily, pursuing his interest in antiquities, in particular monuments and inscriptions. Among his works we find titles on the foundation of Greek colonies in Italy and Sicily, on the marvels of Sicilian rivers, and an extensive work against the Sicilian historian Timaeus.² Polemon was born in Ilium, and therefore was a subject of the rulers of Pergamum, the Attalids; he wrote a *Letter to Attalus*, probably one of the kings with this name (fr. 70–2 Preller).³ In all probability, therefore, Polemon had been acquainted with the Attalids, and it is quite possible that Artemon had read his works.

A further parallel for Artemon's geographical interests (first pointed out by Jacoby, comm. on *FGrH* 569, p. 597) is the first century B.C. historian and grammarian Alexander Polyhistor: among Alexander's historical works we find a title on geographical names in Alcman's poems. The Byzantine lexicon Suidas links Alexander to the school of Crates; for chronological reasons, Alexander can hardly have been a pupil of Crates, but he certainly could have taken his method as a model.⁴

An analysis of Artemon's unusual and often erroneous interpretations of Pindar's text will show, in my opinion, that they are not the result of mere eccentricity on his part, but are directly linked to his interpretative agenda. Let us consider his discussion of the beginning of *Olympian* 2, dedicated to Theron of Acragas (Artemon F 1 Jacoby). In the passage in question, Pindar mentions the city of Acragas, won by Theron's ancestors with much effort (Pi. *O.* 2.5 = 8 ss.):

Θήρωνα δὲ τετραορίας ἔνεκα νικαφόρου
γεγωνητέον, ὅπι δίκαιον ξένων,
ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος,
εὐνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωντον ὀρθόπολιν·

καμόντες οἱ πολλὰ θυμῷ
ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἶκημα ποταμοῦ, Σικελίας τ' ἔσαν
ὀφθαλμός,

But Theron, because of his victorious four-horse chariot,
must be proclaimed – a man just in his regard for guests,
bulwark of Acragas,
and foremost upholder of his city from a line of famous ancestors,

who suffered much in their hearts

² Polemon wrote *Κτίσεις Ἰταλικῶν καὶ Σικελικῶν πόλεων* (fr. 37 Preller; see also fr. 37 bis in H.J. Mette, 'Die "Kleinen" griechischen Historiker heute', *Lustrum* 21 [1978], 5–43 at 40–1); *Περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ θαυμαζομένων ποταμῶν* (fr. 82 and 83 Preller); *Τὰ πρὸς Τίμαιον* (fr. 39–46 Preller), comprising at least twelve books.

³ On Polemon see R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), 247–9.

⁴ See Su. a 1129 Adler: *Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μιλήσιος ... ἦν δὲ γραμματικὸς τῶν Κράττητος μαθητῶν ...* (*FGrH* 273 T 1). Alexander's fragments were published by Jacoby (*FGrH* 273); we only have two fragments of the work *Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἀλκμᾶνι τοπικῶς εἰρημένων* (*FGrH* 273 F 95 and 96).

to win a holy dwelling place on the river, and they were
the eye of Sicily ...

(tr. W.H. Race)

The 'holy dwelling place on the river' mentioned in these lines is evidently the city of Acragas, on the river of the same name, as Aristarchus noted (sch. ad Pi. *O.* 2.16 *a*). Artemon thought otherwise (sch. ad Pi. *O.* 2.16 *b*):⁵ in his opinion, Pindar here is not referring to Acragas but to Gela, also built on a river. His interpretation is based on historical data: Acragas, he writes, was a sub-colony of Gela, which was founded by Theron's ancestors. He argues that this interpretation would tally with the reference to the founders' efforts in Pindar's text: the foundation of Acragas was easy, while the founders of Gela suffered much hardship in their enterprise – they had difficulties in gathering men from the Peloponnese, Rhodes and Crete, then suffered an arduous journey and later had to fight against the inhabitants of the place. The scholia go on to mention the opinion of Aristarchus' pupil Menecrates, who sided with his teacher and harshly criticized Artemon's view, accusing him of speaking like a fool (sch. ad Pi. *O.* 2.16 *c*).

Artemon's understanding of the passage is manifestly forced and unconvincing. What is at stake here, however, is a historical rather than an interpretative issue: the reconstruction of the history of the family of the tyrant Theron, the Emmenidai, and whether they had come to Acragas from Gela or had arrived directly from Rhodes. Our sources for the genealogy of Theron's family offer us a sketchy and contradictory account, based on the information found in Pindar's and Simonides' poems dedicated to members of the family; these poets' references to Theron's past must obviously present traditions favourable to his political agenda. Theron apparently supported the version that his ancestors had arrived directly from Rhodes.⁶ We know that the Sicilian historian Timaeus opted for this story,⁷ followed by the prevailing tradition, represented by the Alexandrian scholars. Artemon, on the contrary, as we have seen, thought that they came from Gela: we (possibly) find

⁵ Sch. ad Pi. *O.* 2.16 *b*: Ἀρτέμων δὲ ὁ ἀπὸ Περγάμου τὴν Γέλαν οἶεται δεῖν ἀκοῦεν. καὶ γὰρ ταύτην ὁμώνυμον εἶναι Γέλα τῷ ποταμῷ, τοὺς δὲ Ἀκραγαντίνους Γελῶνων εἶναι ἀποίκους· ὥστε τὸ πατέρων αὐτῶν ἐν Γέλα ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ Θήρωνος προγόνων συντεταχθῆναι. κεφαλαιώσει δὲ χρῆται τῇδε· τὸ καμώντες ἔφη προσήκειν μᾶλλον ἀκοῦεν ἐπὶ τῶν τὴν Γέλαν ἐκτικόντων, ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν Ἀκράγαντα. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥάστου συνωκίσθησαν, οἱ δὲ χαλεπῶς καὶ μόλις. Ἀντίφημος γὰρ ὁ Ῥόδιος καὶ Ἐντιμος ὁ Κρήσις, οἱ τὴν εἰς Γέλαν στείλαντες ἀποικίαν, πρῶτον μὲν περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν ἔκαμον οὐ μετρίως, συναθροίζοντες τοὺς ἐκ Πελοποννήσου καὶ Ῥόδου καὶ Κρήτης, εἶτα περὶ τὸν διάπλουν, εἶτα περὶ τὸν κατοικισμόν, καὶ πάλιν διαγωνισάμενοι πρὸς τοὺς Σικανούς.

⁶ Pindar's lost encomium to Theron apparently endorsed this story (fr. 118 and 119 Sn.–M.): see in particular M.G. Fileni, 'Una pagina di storia agrigentina: Pind. fr. 118 e 119 Sn.–Maehl.', in R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili* (Rome, 1993), 2.427–40, with ample bibliography. See also, in general, the discussion in Jacoby's commentary on Hippostratus (*FGrH* 568 F 2 and 3). A wide-ranging reconstruction of ancient scholarship on this complex problem is in M. Miller, *The Sicilian Colony Dates* (Albany, NY, 1970), 53–9, with a detailed discussion of the scholia on Pi. *O.* 2.15, 16 and 70, our main sources on the question. On the importance of Theron's self-advertising, see A.M. Buongiovanni, 'Una tradizione filo-emmenide sulla fondazione di Akragas', *ASNP* 15 (1985), 493–9. For a lucid discussion of our sources on the foundation of Akragas and the history of Theron's family see D. Musti, 'Le tradizioni ecistiche di Agrigento', in L. Braccisi and E. De Miro (edd.), *Agrigento e la Sicilia greca* (Rome, 1992), 27–45; N. Luraghi, *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia* (Florence, 1994), 262–72; also C. Caserta, *Gli Emmenidi e le tradizioni poetiche e storiografiche su Akragas fino alla battaglia di Himera* (Palermo, 1995), 47–80.

⁷ See the sch. ad Pi. *O.* 2.15 *a* = *FGrH* 566 F 92, with Jacoby's commentary.

a similar position in a fragment of Hippostratus, a local historian who had worked on the genealogy of the Emmenidai (*FGrH* 568, probably datable to the third century B.C.),⁸ but Artemon seems to have been otherwise isolated in the Hellenistic tradition. However, his detailed account of the difficulties met by the founders of Gela has a historical basis: the Greeks did fight against the local populations, as the testimony of Xenagoras (*FGrH* 240 F 12; he was possibly a contemporary of Callimachus) and of Pausanias (8.46.2) indicates.⁹

To sum up, the beginning of the second *Olympian*, with the reference to the ancestors of Theron in Acragas, did not agree with Artemon's reconstruction of the family's history, and this makes us understand why he tried, with little success, to find an alternative explanation to the passage and make it fit with his theory. It is possible to hypothesize that Artemon, who worked in the library in Pergamum, was using different sources on Sicilian history; this would explain his unusual views on the lineage of Theron's family. In a hypothetical scenario, the most obvious name that comes to mind is Polemon of Ilium: as we have seen, he was the author of a work on the foundations of Italian and Sicilian towns, had written a substantial work against Timaeus and had probably been connected to the Attalids' court just a few decades earlier.¹⁰

Artemon's interest in the local history of Sicily has in this case a paradoxical consequence, because his use of sources external to the text led him to misunderstand the lines he was trying to explain. Aristarchus, relying only on the information Pindar himself provided, attained much more convincing results. We find a similar situation in another fragment (F 2 Jacoby) that discusses the beginning of *Olympian* 5: here Artemon's knowledge of philosophical speculations on the physical world led him to defend a paradoxical and obviously wrong interpretation. The fifth *Olympian* was written for Psaumis of Camarina, a colony of Syracuse in Sicily; the town was named after the nymph Camarina and had the same name as the nearby lake. Let us read first Pindar's lines (*O.* 5.1–4):

Ἰφιγλᾶν ἀρετᾶν καὶ στεφάνων ἄωτον γλυκύν
τῶν Οὐλυμπία, Ὠκεανοῦ θύγατερ, καρδίᾳ γελανεῖ
ἀκαμαντόποδός τ' ἀπήρας δέκευ Ψαῦμός τε δῶρα·
ὃς τὰν σὰν πόλιν αὔξων, Καμάρινα, λαοτρόφον,

⁸ See Hippostratus *FGrH* 568 F 3. On Hippostratus' genealogy of the Emmenidai see Miller (n. 6), 56–8.

⁹ See M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (edd.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford, 2004), 192. The historical authenticity of Artemon's account is convincingly defended by C. Raccuia, 'La fondazione di Gela', *Kokalos* 38 (1992), 273–302, at 289–92; R. Van Compernelle, *Étude de chronologie et d'historiographie siciliotes* (Brussels and Rome, 1959), 378–80, on the contrary, thought that Artemon's position was merely the result of a misinterpretation of Pindar's text. The names of the two founders of Gela, Antiphemus and Entimus, mentioned by Artemon, are already in Thucydides (6.4.3): this information is generally considered to derive from the local historian Antiochus of Syracuse (*FGrH* 555); for all questions related to the passage, see S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. III (Oxford, 2008), 289–90.

¹⁰ Artemon had a heterodox position on another detail regarding Theron's lineage, i.e. the identity of Xenocrates, whose victory is celebrated in the second *Isthmian*: Artemon speculated that he was Theron's kinsman, not his brother, as earlier commentators (correctly) thought (sch. ad Pi. *I.* 2, inscr. a, p. 212.12 Drachmann = F 6 Jacoby). As we may note, Artemon's position is again both inaccurate and isolated.

Daughter of Ocean, with a glad heart receive this finest
 sweet reward for lofty deeds and crowns won at Olympia,
 gifts of the tirelessly running mule car and of Psauimis,
 who, exalting your people-nourishing city, Kamarina ... (tr. W. H. Race)

The scholium on the passage reports the opposing interpretations of Aristarchus and Artemon of the epithet 'daughter of Ocean': according to Aristarchus (and to the unequivocal run of the sentence), the 'daughter of Ocean' is Lake Kamarina; Artemon, on the contrary, thought the 'daughter of Ocean' was Arethusa, the famous spring in Syracuse, arguing that Kamarina was subject to Syracuse and that all fresh water has its origin from the Ocean: the 'daughter of Ocean' therefore had to be a spring.¹¹

Artemon's explanation is absolutely indefensible, for the simple reason that two lines below, in line 4, Pindar addresses Kamarina with the vocative. Why then did Artemon resort to such an unnecessarily complex explanation, remarking that fresh water originates from the Ocean?

We can answer this question if we remember the exegetical tendencies in vogue at Pergamum in his time. In the mid-second century B.C. the most important personality at the Attalids' court, the grammarian Crates of Mallus, based his work on the assumption that ancient poets had a correct understanding of the physical world and possessed widespread learning and up-to-date scientific knowledge. A theory going back to Presocratic philosophy stated that the Ocean was the source of both fresh and salt water; Crates notably exploited it to defend the authenticity of a much-discussed Homeric line, taking for granted that Homer must have been aware of this fact.¹² Artemon, as our fragment shows, was most probably a pupil of Crates; eager to follow his teacher's interpretative approach, he found that Pindar, too, was aware of the fact that fresh water derived from the Ocean: hence 'the daughter of Ocean' had to be a spring. As in *Olympian* 2, Artemon uses evidence external to the text, in this case a scientific theory, to explain Pindar's words, this time with even more improbable results.¹³

The connection between the fragment and Crates' theories certainly helps us to understand Artemon's bizarre reasoning. All the same, his argument remains puzzling: why does he state that Kamarina was subject to Syracuse? The affirma-

¹¹ Sch. ad Pi. O. 5.1 b Drachmann: Ὑψηλᾶν ἀρετᾶν ὁ νοῦς λέγει πρὸς τὴν Καμάριναν τὴν Ὠκεανοῦ, ἣ ὁμώνυμος ἡ πόλις καὶ ἡ λίμνη, ... Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ ἀκούει Ὠκεανοῦ θυγατέρα Καμάριναν τὴν λίμνην, ἀφ' ἧς καὶ τὴν πόλιν ὠνομάσθαι. Ἀρτέμων δὲ (FGH 569 F 2) πρὸς τὴν Ἀρέθουσαν τὸν λόγον εἶναι φησιν. αὕτη δὲ ἐν Συρακούσαις κρήνη ὑποτέτακται δὲ ἡ Καμάρινα ταῖς Συρακούσαις. ἔχει δὲ ἡ Ἀρέθουσα καὶ πᾶσα κρήνη τὰς πηγὰς ἀπὸ Ὠκεανοῦ. βέλτιον δὲ ὡς Ἀρίσταρχος.

¹² Il. 21.195, with the scholium Ge ad loc. (= Crates fr. 29 Broggiato); Crates quoted a fragment of the Presocratic philosopher Hippon (38 B 1 D.-K.). On this fragment, see my article 'Su un frammento di Artemone di Pergamo (FGH 569 F 2 Jacoby)', *SemRom* 11 (2008), 129–34. On Crates' interpretive approach to Homer, see J.I. Porter, 'Hermeneutic lines and circles: Aristarchus and Crates on the exegesis of Homer', in R. Lamberton and J.J. Keaney (edd.), *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes* (Princeton, NJ, 1992), 67–114, and my introduction to the edition of the fragments of Crates, *Cratete di Mallo: i frammenti* (La Spezia, 2001), paragraphs 5.1–5.4. On Il. 21.195 see now G.B. D'Alessio, 'Textual fluctuations and cosmic streams: Ocean and Acheloiros', *JHS* 124 (2004), 16–37.

¹³ It is worthwhile noting that Pindar himself apparently stated in another passage that springs derived from the Ocean: see fr. 326 Sn.–M. (Ὠκεανοῦ πέταλα κράναι), quoted in *POxy.* 221 col. 9.17, in the context of a discussion of the authenticity of Il. 21.195 (on this see D'Alessio [n. 12], 16–20).

tion is unnecessary to his argument, and in any case incorrect, for at the time of Psauis' victory Camarina was independent, not subject to Syracuse (see Jacoby's and Pitcher's notes on the fragment, *FGrH* 569 F 2).

The only solution that I can offer, on a purely hypothetical basis, is that he was using a text that was different from ours. If we look at the apparatus of line 4 in Snell and Maehler's edition of Pindar, we find that the vocative *Καμάρινα* in our text is an emendation by the Byzantine philologist Manuel Moschopoulos, accepted by modern editors, while the older manuscripts have an (unmetrical) accusative, *Καμαρίναν*.¹⁴ Let us suppose that Artemon read an accusative, not a vocative, in line 4: the resulting text would be *τὰν σὰν πόλιν αὔξων Καμαρίναν*, 'making greater your city, that is Camarina'. This would explain why Artemon states that Camarina was subject to Syracuse, where the spring Arethusa was: the statement gives a reason for the possessive *σὰν*, which would otherwise make no sense if we assume, as Artemon did, that Pindar was addressing Arethusa. In our version of the text, the poet addresses Camarina, daughter of Ocean, the nymph after whom the city was named, stating that with his victory Psauis brought glory to her town (*τὰν σὰν πόλιν*); in Artemon's hypothetical version, the poet addresses Arethusa, the daughter of Ocean, and says that Psauis with his victory brought glory to her (Arethusa's) town, Camarina (*τὰν σὰν πόλιν ... Καμαρίναν*). Note that the vocative seems to be presupposed in Aristarchus' interpretation of the passage; we shall have to assume either that there were two concurrent readings or that Aristarchus corrected the accusative into a vocative.¹⁵

We do not know with certainty what text Artemon was reading, but he certainly interpreted it using an approach very similar to that of Crates. This is confirmed by another short annotation of Artemon, this time on a well-known myth. In the first *Pythian*, Pindar mentions the story of Zeus and the fire-breathing monster Typhon. Zeus overcomes Typhon and blasts him down into Tartarus, deep under the shores between Cuma and Sicily: Mount Aetna crushes him with its weight, and from there he still belches out fire (Pi. P. 1.15 ff.). The scholia discuss the problem of the location of Typhon's prison, as its setting in the Greek West is an innovation of Pindar, who is celebrating Hieron's victory in Cuma and his foundation of the town of Aetna: Homer had placed Typhon 'among the Arimoï' (*Il.* 2.783), a tribe or a mountainous area of uncertain location; ancient writers and scholars, following local traditions, connected Typhon with different lightning-blasted or volcanic regions in the Greek world.¹⁶

Artemon offered an unorthodox solution to the problem of the monster's whereabouts: in his opinion, Typhon was found under all active volcanoes, for his name was connected to the verb *τύφειν*, 'to burn' (sch. on Pi. P. 1. 31 c = Artemon

¹⁴ On Moschopoulos' edition of Pindar, see J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris, 1952), 270–86; on his knowledge of Pindaric metre in particular, see A. Tessier, 'Il testo pindarico prima di Triclinio: una tradizione "astrofica"?', *QUCC* n.s. 64 (2000), 117–20; id., 'Filologi bizantini di epoca Comnena', in L. Cristante and A. Tessier (edd.), *Incontri triestini di filologia classica* 3 (2003/4), 1–14.

¹⁵ See the discussion in C.I.T. Mommsen, *Annotationis criticae supplementum ad Pindari Olympias* (Berlin, 1864), 51, who unconvincingly suggests that Artemon's interpretation may have influenced the whole of our manuscript tradition.

¹⁶ See Kirk's note on *Il.* 2.781–4 (G.S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary, Books 1–4* (Cambridge, 1985), and the detailed discussion in M. L. West, *Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), note on line 304.

F 4 Jacoby).¹⁷ The shortness of the scholiast's report conceals, in my opinion, an interesting approach on Artemon's part to the problem of the different versions of the story. Artemon here is using etymology as a tool to find a rationalizing explanation of the myth: the explanation that Typhon was found under all mountains sending out fire means, in his view, that the story of the monster under the mountain was not to be taken literally but was an accessible and simplified way to explain volcanic activity. Etymology allows Artemon to link the name of the monster to the verb 'to burn', uncovering the natural phenomenon – volcanic eruptions – that lies behind the story.

This approach to myth – reading it as we would read ethnographic material – was typical of Stoic philosophy, which saw traditional narratives as evidence of how early people interpreted the world. They combined this reasonable assumption, however, with less sound beliefs, such as that the first generations of mankind understood some basic truths about nature; this knowledge had been lost over time but the truths had come down to us encoded in mythological narratives and in the names and epithets of gods. Allegory and etymology were the interpretative means that the Stoics used to recover the ancients' correct intuitions about the nature of the world; these intuitions, not surprisingly, happened to coincide with the teachings of the Stoic school.¹⁸ This mode of reading is close to that of scholars in Pergamum, above all Crates, who, as we have seen, assumed that ancient poets had an up-to-date and correct understanding of the physical world.¹⁹

Crates interestingly applied a similar rationalizing approach to ancient myths to the story of Zeus overthrowing Cronus, his father: according to Crates, Cronus had been an ancient and cruel king; he had been deposed by his son Zeus, who was such a benevolent ruler that he had been honoured as a god by his grateful subjects.²⁰

I would like to conclude with a few reflections. It is clear that Artemon's extant interpretations of Pindar compare unfavourably with the explanations offered by Aristarchus. Aristarchus was probably the first to write a systematic commentary on the poet and his name appears in the scholia more often than any other ancient scholar; however, his work on Pindar has only found lukewarm approval in modern times. Although his annotations on matters of verbal scholarship are usually of a very high standard, he shows serious limitations when he deals with matters of fact and problems of history or mythology, where Didymus often shows him to be at

¹⁷ Sch. ad Pi. P. 1.31 c: ... Ἀρτέμων δέ τις ἱστορικὸς πιθανώτερον λογοποιεῖ. καθάπαξ γὰρ φησι πᾶν ὄρος ἔχον πυρὸς ἀναδόσεις ἐπὶ Τυφῶνι καίεσθαι (καλεῖσθαι propos. Jacoby). ἔστι δὲ τὸ πιθανὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος ἱστορίας· τύφειν γὰρ τὸ καίειν.

¹⁸ See A.A. Long, 'Stoic readings of Homer', in Lamberton and Keaney (n. 12), 41–66, esp. 64–6, and G.R. Boys-Stones, 'The Stoics' two types of allegory', in id., *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions* (Oxford, 2003), 189–216; on Stoicism and allegory in general, see the survey in I. Ramelli and G. Lucchetta, *Allegoria. I: L'età classica* (Milan, 2004).

¹⁹ Artemon's preoccupation with truthfulness is apparent also in his note on Pindar's *Pythian* 3.29, where he praises the poet for presenting a more rational version of the myth of Apollo and Coronis than Hesiod (fr. 60 M.–W.): according to Hesiod, a raven had told Apollo that Coronis had been unfaithful to him, while in Pindar Apollo is aware of what has happened, as befits the god of prophecy (sch. ad Pi. P. 3.52 b = Artemon fr. 5 Jacoby; see also Pitcher's note on the fragment).

²⁰ Quoted in John the Lydian, *De mens.* 4.71, p. 123 Wünsch = Crat. fr. 129 Broggiato. This clearly shows the influence on Crates of Euhemerus, who thought that the gods had originally been men who lived in ancient times.

fault; modern scholars consider Aristarchus' notes on Pindar generally unworthy of his reputation, especially if we compare them with his work on Homer's poems.²¹ Deas interestingly underlines that, whereas the Pindar scholia are riddled with quotations from ancient historians, not one of them seems to be connected with Aristarchus' name: it is possible that Aristarchus did not realize that Pindar's text could be better understood with the help of the works of historians.²² The principle of 'explaining Homer by Homer' that Aristarchus so successfully applied to the epics shows his limitations when used to interpret a text, such as Pindar's, that is so closely associated with contemporary events and with the towns and family circles of the poet's patrons.

Artemon, on the contrary, compares Pindar's text with the information that he can draw from other sources, whether historical, philosophical or mythological. As Deas observes, he might have been the first to recognize that Pindar deserved to be commented upon and illustrated as a historical author.²³ We might note that, in this respect, Artemon appears to be completely in tune with Crates, who, in overt polemic against his rival in Alexandria, had defined himself a *κριτικός*, someone whose task was the judgement (*krisis*) of poems: this exercise required the knowledge of all 'logical science', that is, all of philosophy and intellectual achievement. A 'grammarian', on the contrary, was only able to deal with matters of verbal scholarship, such as the explanation of difficult words and the discussion of prosodical problems. A pupil of Crates, a certain Tauriscus, accordingly divided the art of *κριτική* into three parts, one of which was the *historikon*, comprising the content of a literary work, its story and the people, places and facts to which it refers.²⁴ This method could only too easily lead to unsound results, as we have seen. This happened when the presumption of the factual correctness of the ancient poet encouraged Artemon to use interpretation to make the poems consistent with historical or scientific facts as he reconstructed them. This accounts for the bizarre explanations we find in his fragments, which are linked not so much to his intellectual quirkiness but to the interpretative practices that he applied to the text.

Università di Roma 'La Sapienza'

MARIA BROGGIATO
maria.broggiato@uniroma1.it

²¹ See Irigoin (above, n. 14), 54–6; H. T. Deas, 'The scholia vetera to Pindar', *HSPH* 42 (1931), 1–78, at 5–11.

²² Deas (n. 21), 9.

²³ Ibid., 12–13.

²⁴ Crates is quoted in Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* 1.79 (= Crat. fr. 94 Broggiato); the division of Tauriscus is in Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* 1.248–9 (= Crat. test. 20 Broggiato). On both passages see *Sextus Empiricus: Against the Grammarians (Adversus mathematicos I)*, transl. with an Introduction and Commentary by D. L. Blank (Oxford, 1998), 140–1 and 259–62.