

IBYCUS AND POLYCRATES

LEONARD WOODBURY†

IN 1922 B. G. GRENFELL AND A. S. HUNT published in volume 15 of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* a long fragment from a papyrus of the second century B.C., amounting to forty-eight verses of an unattributed poem in a decorated, archaic style.¹ The dialect, which is epic, overlaid by Doric with some Aeolic, is evidently a literary amalgam in the style of choral lyric, and the metre, which is a triadic structure made up largely of dactyls, was judged unsuitable for Pindar and Bacchylides, and so by implication for Simonides. Of the choral lyricists only Stesichorus and Ibycus remained as possibilities, and here the editors' choice fell on Ibycus, chiefly because of the mention of Polycrates at the end, for a notice in the *Suda* (s.v. Ibycus) tells us of the arrival of the poet at Samos, whereas Anacreon, who was also present at the court, is excluded on grounds of style, metre, and dialect. The attribution

¹The bibliography of the poem includes the following works: B. G. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 15 (1922) no. 1790, pages 508–513 and 17 (1927) no. 208, pages 80–81; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "Die neuen Texte aus Oxyrhynchus," *DLZ* 43 (1922) 312–317 and *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 508–513 = Wilamowitz (1922); C. M. Bowra, "Polycrates of Rhodes," *CJ* 29 (1934) 375–380 = Bowra (1934), *Greek Lyric Poetry*¹ (Oxford 1936) 251–269 = Bowra (1936), and *Greek Lyric Poetry*² (Oxford 1961) 249–253 = Bowra (1961); B. Snell, "Miszellen 9," *Philologus* 96 (1944) 290–292; F. M. Pontani, "Ibico," *GiornItFil* 2 (1949) 307–317; H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (New York 1951) 372–376, 3rd ed. (Munich 1969) 327–330, tr. by M. Hadas and J. W. Willis as *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy* (New York 1975) 287–290 = Fränkel (1975); D. L. Page, "Ibycus' Poem in Honour of Polycrates," *Aegyptus* 31 (1951) 158–172 = Page (1951); M. White, "The Duration of the Samian Tyranny," *JHS* 74 (1954) 36–43; B. A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque in VerhdkonNederlAkaddWetenschafdLetterk.* NR, Deel 65, no. 2 (1958) 186–188; J. P. Barron, "The Son of Hyllis," *CR* ns 11 (1961) 185–187 = Barron (1961); B. Snell, *Poetry and Society* (Bloomington, Indiana 1961) 54–55 = Snell (1961), in German edition, *Dichtung und Gesellschaft* (Hamburg 1965) 119–121 = Snell (1965); J. Labarbe, "Un décalage de 40 ans dans la chronologie de Polycrate," *AntCl* 31 (1962) 153–188; G. Lanata, *Poetica Pre-Platonica* (Florence 1963) 58–59; H. Maehler, *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars* (Göttingen 1963) 75–77; J. P. Barron, "The Sixth-Century Tyranny at Samos," *CQ* ns 14 (1964) 210–229 = Barron (1964); F. Mosino, *Ibico: Testimonianze e frammenti* (Reggio Calabria 1966); F. Sisti, "Ibico e Policrate," *QUCC* 2 (1966) 91–102 = Sisti (1966), and "L'ode a Policrate: Un caso di recusatio in Ibico," *QUCC* 4 (1967) 59–79 = Sisti (1967); D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (London 1967) 305–310; J. P. Barron, "Ibycus: To Polycrates," *BICS* 16 (1969) 119–149 = Barron (1969); M. Robertson, "Ibycus: Polycrates, Troilus, Polyxena," *BICS* 17 (1970) 11–15; M. L. West in *CQ* ns 20 (1970) 206–209; D. E. Gerber, *Euterpe* (Amsterdam 1970) 207–213, 424; G. Schmidt, "Heraion von Samos: Eine Brychon-Weihung und ihre Fundlage," *AthMitt* 87 (1972) 165–185; G. F. Gianotti, "Mito e encomio: Il carne di Ibico in onore di Policrate," *RFIC* 101 (1973) 401–410; D. L. Page, *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* (Oxford 1974) no. S151, pages 44–46; B. M. Mitchell, "Herodotus and Samos," *JHS* 95 (1975) 75–91; G. Arrighetti in *SCO* 25 (1976)

was provisionally approved almost at once by Paul Maas in *Philologische Wochenschrift* 42 (1922) 577–579 and was thereafter accepted by most scholars in the English-speaking world, notably by Sir Maurice Bowra, Sir Denys Page, and Professor J. P. Barron.²

Though the discovery promised to be an important addition to our meagre collection of surviving fragments of the poet's work, the poem was generally held to be disappointing or worse, and the distinguished scholar and critic, Hermann Fränkel, found its style, thought, and structure so "banal and conventional" that the attribution seemed to him doubtful.³ But more recently Barron has strongly re-asserted the case for Ibycus' authorship: the similarity of diction between Ibycus and Stesichorus may be used to convert arguments for Stesichorus into arguments for Ibycus; Ibycus' reputation for erotics (ap. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.71; cf. *Suda* s.v. Ibycus) makes him a more suitable candidate than Stesichorus, who had no such reputation,⁴ for the authorship of the poem's praise of Polycrates' beauty; then, a likely parallel is offered with a poem attributed in antiquity to Ibycus, in which the myth of the rape of Ganymede was used in a poem for one Gorgias (fr. 8: 289 *PMG*); finally, the notice from the *Suda* that connects Ibycus with the Samian court and Polycrates is not matched by any such evidence for Stesichorus.

The main attack on the literary value of the poem was mounted by Page in a characteristically incisive and vivid style. The theme of the Trojan epic has been "debased," he wrote, in order to praise "a pretty face." The treatment of the theme is no better, for the figure of *praeteritio* is used only to intro-

276–279; B. Gentili, "Poeta-Committente-Pubblico: Stesicoro e Ibico," *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni* 1 (Rome 1978) 393–401; A. Gostoli, "Osservazioni metriche sull' encomio a Policrate di Ibico," *QUCC* ns 2 (1979) 93–99; L. Simonini, "Il Fr. 282P. di Ibico," *Acme* 32 (1979) 285–298; E. D. Floyd, "Kleos aphthiton: An Indo-European Perspective in Early Greek Poetry," *Glotta* 58 (1980) 133–157, especially 151–152; B. M. Palumbo Stracca, "La preterizione in Alcmane e in Ibico," *Bollettino dei Classici* ser. 3, fasc. 2 (1981) 150–157; G. Nagy, "Another Look at κλέος ἀφθιτον," *WürzJbb* NF 7 (1981) 113–116; S. Nannini, "Lirica greca arcaica e recusatio augustea," *QUCC* ns 10 (1982) 71–78; J. Péron, "Le poème à Polycrate: Une 'palinodie' d'Ibycus?," *RevPhil* 56 (1982) 33–56; A. J. Podlecki, *The Early Greek Poets and their Times* (Vancouver 1984) 163–165. When cited, these works may be given in short form or by the name of the author alone. I have been indebted, in writing this paper, to assistance given by Professors D. E. Gerber, E. Robbins, and M. B. Wallace, and by the anonymous readers of *Phoenix*.

²Page (1951) 166–168, Bowra (1961) 230, Sisti (1967) 64–74, and Barron (1969) 132–133.

³Fränkel (1975) 288. Campbell judges the poem so "insipid" that "we must either regard Ibycus as unhappy in his role of court flatterer or conclude that the work belongs to his school rather than to him" (306). A similar judgment in A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature* (London 1966) 183, A. E. Harvey in *CQ* ns 7 (1957) 222–223, and Podlecki 165.

⁴For a fuller statement of the evidence, see Sisti (1967) 59 and n. 1. Cf., however, Athenaeus, who, claiming to draw upon Archytas of Tarentum by way of Chamaeleon (fr. 25 *Sch. d. Arist.* Wehrli), says (13:601a) καὶ Στησίχορος δ' οὐ μετρίως ἐρωτικός γενόμενος συνέστησε καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τῶν ἁσμάτων (i.e., ἐρωτικῶν).

duce "a series of perfunctory phrases," or of "Epic formulae, rather pinned on than painted in . . . , uprooted, unadapted, substitutes for thought." The poet's own phrases are "singularly offensive," being "ungainly" or "inarticulate," and exhibit an "excessive accumulation of epithets." The poem is "a cento of Homeric formulae hung on a feeble framework, loosely bound together with tedious repetitions and odious turns of phrase." "Yet it is not to be doubted that this poem was included in the ancient books of Ibycus." If it is not by Ibycus himself, "it is certainly courtier-verse of the Ibycean type."

Page's description of the poem's style and diction were based on acute observations, accurately reported, and were difficult to refute directly. But his appraisals of the features that he recognised, although they were uniformly pejorative, were not supported by argument: it seems evident that he was content with an immediate and intuitive judgment that such poetic practices are bad. But a judgment of a poem's value must be dependent on an apprehension of the poem's purpose or function. Features of style may properly be judged bad if the end that they serve is bad, or if they serve badly an end that is approved.

It is by the light of this principle that Bowra's interpretation may be seen to offer a possible way of proceeding to an appraisal of the poem's form and purpose.⁵ For the old view of F. G. Schneidewin, published in 1833 in his edition of the poet, almost a century before the publication of our text, had held that there were two distinct periods in Ibycus' literary career.⁶ The first was passed in Sicily (for the poet's native Rhegium may count as part of the Sicilian cultural ambit), where he composed lyric heavily influenced by the epic, like the poetry of Stesichorus, his fellow-Sicilian and older contemporary. The second began when he migrated to the court of Polycrates at Samos, where he found erotic themes to be more acceptable. Using such a scheme, Bowra read the poem as marking a turning-point in the poet's literary career, whereby he said farewell, not without "a cheerful and playful mockery" to his traditional subjects, which were drawn from epic, and embraced instead the praise of love and beauty.⁷ On this reading of the poem, when the poet says that it is "not now" (νῦν) to his mind to celebrate Paris, Cassandra, and the rest (10 ff.), he means in effect "no longer" or "from now on."

The general theory put forward by Schneidewin is attractive and may well be right. Certainly, we are at present without a preferable alternative to it.

⁵Bowra (1961) 252–257. A similar interpretation in W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* 1.1 (Munich 1959) 491. See also Sisti (1967) 76–77, Gentili 397.

⁶F. G. Schneidewin, *Ibyci Rhegini Carminum Reliquiae* (Göttingen 1833) 38 ff. Bowra, however, makes no reference to Schneidewin.

⁷G. Vallet, however, cautions against assuming too sharp a break between Ibycus' Sicilian, and his Samian, mode (*Région et Zancle* in *BEFAR* 189 [1958] 292–293).

But it may be doubted whether it provides a key by which this poem's meaning may be unlocked, for two reasons. First, it seems generally unlikely that Greek poets of the archaic age, with their public and occasional commitments, were concerned to commemorate in their verses the turning-points of their own literary careers. The self-consciousness shown by the Greek poet in his poems is a slowly-developing phenomenon. So far as we can see, it had not yet grown to this point of self-absorption.⁸ Secondly, the temporal contrast drawn in the text of our poem appears to be one, not between a preceding and a following age, but between the present moment and other moments. The poet tells us what he is disinclined to do "now" (10) and then promises everlasting renown for Polycrates' beauty (46–48). There is nothing, I think, to indicate that his present inclination is opposed to all his previous practice, nor that he intends to devote the rest of his career to the praise of his patron's beauty. The interpretation is therefore intrinsically unlikely, and so cannot be used to explain the peculiarities of the poem's style and diction.

Another attack upon the problem of the poem's form was made in 1967 by the Italian scholar, Professor Franco Sisti. By a useful study of the poem's diction and style he was able to show how much the poem owes to the language of surviving epic, and to lost epic or to analogies with epic, including interesting fusions of different epic phrases. He argued that the resemblances are of the most superficial and conventional kind. On the other hand, the abundant use of epithets and the placing of names between two adjectives are typical of the style of Ibycus himself. The analysis thus provides a partial glimpse of Ibycus at work.

Sisti then proceeds to divide the poem into three parts: (1) a refusal to sing of the heroes and events of Troy; (2) a confession of the poet's incapacity to tell of "each fact" concerning the ships of the Greek fleet; (3) a proposal to sing of the beauty of Polycrates by association with the most beautiful of the heroes of the epic. Sisti then adopts the hypothesis that Bowra had founded upon Schneidewin: the poem is programmatic, in that the poet declares that he excludes certain themes from his verse and points out the new course of his poetry. This theory then has the merit of explaining the presence of so much uninspired imitation of the epic, for it is just this that the poet is renouncing. Finally, Sisti compares the form of the poem with that of Horace's *Scriberis Vario* (*Odes* 1.6), which he joins other critics in calling a *recusatio*.⁹ The form implies the declining of an invitation, which must be

⁸See, e.g., my "The Seal of Theognis" in *Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood* (Toronto 1952) 20–41, especially 21, 25, 30, 33–34.

⁹On the form, see G. Pasquali, *Orazio Lirico* (Florence 1920, reprint 1966) 301 ff. Cf. also W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* in *Hermes Einzelschriften* 16 (1960), and R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace's Odes* 1 (Oxford 1970) 81–83. The interpretation of Ibycus' poem as a *recusatio* is maintained by Gentili (396–397), by Gostoli (94), and by Nannini (73).

often convenient for a poet who composes for occasions at court and in Horace's poem entails the imitation of epic phrases that are rejected from the lyric. Again, we may see that the form is held to explain the strangeness of the diction.

But this explanation also fails, for more than one reason. However old the recognition of the form of *recusatio* may be, this name does not go back explicitly to ancient Greece, and the form to which modern scholars give that name seems not to be older than Callimachus. Giorgio Pasquali, who interested himself in this question, could trace it no further backwards, though he speculated that it was possible that similar occasions might have arisen in the relations between archaic poets and the Deinomenids of Syracuse and the Aleuads of Thessaly.

The analogy with Horace, which is at first sight interesting, fails altogether in its comparison of lines 23–26 with the second part of Horace's ode, in which he confesses, or proclaims, the inability of his Muse (*imbellisque lyrae Musa potens*) to deal with the epic. For the early or archaic poet, in contrasting his own weakness with the power of the Muse, does not disparage or excuse himself.¹⁰ The Muse is his Muse, and it is his boast that her power has been, or may be, given to him. The point is made clear in the passage from the Homeric Catalogue of the Ships (*Il.* 2.484–493; cf. Pindar *Paeans* 6.51–58 and 7b.10–20 Snell-Maehler) in which the bard makes a similar distinction between the knowledge of the Muses and the mere hearing of men. To tell of all the warriors of the Greeks, he says, would be quite beyond his merely human powers, unless the Muses were to put him in mind of them

¹⁰At 25–26 θνατός δ' οὐ κεν ἀνὴρ / διερός τὰ ἕκαστα εἴποι may stand. διερός (cf. *Od.* 6.201, 9.43) is, apparently, "moist," with the implication "alive:" see R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*² (Cambridge 1954) 254–255, P. Ramat, "ΔΙΕΡΟΣ: 'Umido' o 'Veloce'?", *QIG* 7 (1963) 22–33, G. E. R. Lloyd in *JHS* 84 (1964) 100–101 = *Studies in Presocratic Philosophy*, eds. D. J. Furley and R. E. Allen, 1 (London 1970) 271–272, P. Chantraine, *DELG* 1 (Paris 1968) 281, s.v., A. Zinato in *BollIstFilGrdPadova* 1 (1974) 173–179, F. Williams in *QUCC* 19 (1975) 136–139, *Callimachus, Hymn to Apollo: A Commentary* (Oxford 1978) 34, and "ΔΙΕΡΟΣ: Further Ramifications," *MusPhilLond* 5 (1981) 84–93, M. G. Bonanno in *MusCrit* 13/14 (1978/1979) 143–146, Péron 35, 52 ("rapide," "assez vite"). The epithet then overlaps with θνατός, but there is similar overlapping in *Od.* 6.201: οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ διερός βροτός; abundance of epithets is characteristic of this poem, and the order (with the epithets framing the noun) is also paralleled (cf. 1–2, 14–15, 17–18, 20 ff.). M. L. West in *Philologus* 90 (1966) 152–153 proposed αὐτός for θνατός, in order to shorten the final syllable of λόγῳ in the preceding line. The change yields excellent sense ("unaided"), but the process of corruption amounts to a complex shift from a marginal or interlinear comment on διερός below (in which case we might expect rather θνητός). Further, θνατός is nearer to Homer's use of βροτός in *Od.* 6.201 (above), and it may be our understanding of the metre that needs improvement (for λόγῳ is supported semantically by Tyr. fr. 11. 15 *IEG*: οὐδεὶς ἂν ποτε ταῦτα λέγων ἀνύσειεν ἕκαστα). See Wilamowitz (1922) 509–510. West's proposal is rejected by Gentili in *QUCC* 4 (1967) 177–178 and by Gianotti (404, n. 1); but cf. West's reply in *CQ* ns 25 (1975) 307 and the latest metrical argument, offered by Gostoli. Barron proposes tentatively οὐκ αἰδῆς δέ κ' ἀνὴρ / διερός τὰ ἕκαστα εἴποι (Barron [1969] 128–129). This gives a sense similar to West's text, but it is even further from what the papyrus offers.

all. Now, he concludes triumphantly, "I shall tell you of the ships' commanders and of the ships too, *one and all*."¹¹ But Ibycus, relying on the inspiration of his Muse to supply his bodily human deficiencies, pleads incapacity no more than Homer, and his poem cannot be a *recusatio* made on that ground.

More recently, the study of Barron, which is the most important treatment of the poem since its first publication, has successfully refuted the *recusatio*-theory of Sisti and deflected the force of much of Page's attack. His alterations of the text, in which he had the assistance of the physical papyrology of Mr W. E. H. Cockle, were mostly to be accepted by Page in his *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* and so removed the basis of some of the criticisms. In general, he offered a reading of the poem that was more persuasive, as well as more sympathetic, than Page's.

The subject of the poem, Barron perceives, is the power of poetry to confer immortality. The abundance of epithets and phrases chosen from the epic and the preference for the conventional and banal have their explanation in this purpose: the poet is showing what his poetry can do, displaying, as it were, the resources of his art and inspiration. If the language often seems inorganic and ill-adapted, as Page complained, this is because it is not now his inclination, as the poet says, to use them for their proper purposes in the fashion of epic narrative. Instead, one might say, he hangs them before our eyes or rings them in our ears, for their own sake alone, to show what means he has at his disposal.¹² The words and phrases are not put to their proper use; they are, as Bowra and Barron say, "in inverted commas," and the poet's repeated use of *praeteritio* makes abundantly plain that he is foregoing putting to use the richness of diction that he has in store. The promise of literary immortality, which is made here and was to become one of the

¹¹Homer's νῆας τε προπάσας picks up his confession of inability, without the help of the Muses, to relate the πλεθὺν (488) of the Greeks. Ibycus' τὰ ἕκαστα (26) makes the same point, the need of inspiration if all the facts are to be known and told. On this, see E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1951) 80–81 and P. Murray in *JHS* 101 (1981) 90–92. The idea that omniscience comprises knowledge of a very large number of facts is traditional (e.g., as the number of the leaves, of the sands, or of the stars) and characteristic of archaic thought. See B. Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind* (New York 1953) 17.

¹²E.g., at 20–22 Ibycus has κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων ἄρχε Πλεισθενίδας βασιλεὺς ἀγὸς ἀνδρῶν / Ἀτρεὺς ἑσθλοῦ πάς ἐκγονος, where the titles and epithets accumulate in more than royal abundance. The display shows what the poet has in store, but he has been criticised for including two rival, and mutually incompatible, genealogies, as when Bowra (1961) 254 finds an "apparent indifference to nice points of mythology." I suppose that only the last phrase is a true patronymic, while "Pleisthenid" is a dynastic name, like "Tudor" or "Hapsburg;" see A. Lesky in *RE* 21.1 (1951) 204, s.v. Pleisthenes 1, and Wilamowitz (1922) 510. Barron's argument ([1969] 128), following E. Handley, that the last phrase signifies "true son," implies that "Pleisthenid" is not properly a patronymic. In *CQ* ns 14 (1964) 224–225 he pointed out that Homer calls Achilles both "Aeacides" and "son of Peleus," though not in the same passage; and in 19 (1969) 145, n. 31 he adduced also Bacch. 15.6 and 48.

common conventions of poetry, makes its first explicit appearances in the sixth century, in Sappho (fr. 55 L-P, Voigt) and in Theognis (237–254). It is relevant that the poem has been described as Ibycus' "prospectus" upon his arrival at the Samian court. The recognition of this purpose in the poem has the effect, I believe, of explaining the presence of the peculiarities of style and of providing the correct appraisal of Page's observations.

Barron's study has then, in my judgment, had the effect of re-orienting our understanding of the poem. But it is still possible, I believe, to supplement and even to emend it in some particulars.

First, at 27 Barron has now provided us with a much-improved text in ναῶν ὁ[σσοσ ἀρι]θμός. But the phrase ἀπ' Αὐλίδος still overlaps badly with the following Αἰγαῖον διὰ [πό]ντον ἀπ' Ἄργεος / ἡλύθο[ν ἐς Τροίαν] / ἵππο-τρόφο[ν] (with Hunt's supplement in 29). The voyage of the Greek fleet was, as we see at 3–9, from Greece/Argos to Troy, and the same opposition appears to be present in 36–37. We have then no need in the context of 28–30 for the support of the preceding ἀπ' Αὐλίδος of 27. Where a reference to Aulis is relevant and convenient is in regard to the "muster" of the fleet that occurred there and we require a phrase that is capable of serving in an adjectival relation with ναῶν ἀριθμός. When we notice in addition that the suspected ἀπ' Αὐλίδος stands directly above ἀπ' Ἄργεος in the following line, the suspicion must arise that the upper line has been affected by what is written just below it. The smallest change is to ἐπ' Αὐλίδος. If the corruption arose from a jump made by the copyist's eye from one line to another, the similarity of letters is of minor importance in the process, and palaeography is of little help in restoring the original text. But the sense is likely to have been (roundly) "at Aulis," "Aulidean," and the construction, a prepositional phrase functioning as an attributive adjective. Parallels are offered by passages such as Pindar *Ol.* 8.9: ὦ Πίσας εὐδενδρον ἐπ' Ἀλφεῷ ἄλσος ("Alphean") and *Ol.* 9.16–18: θάλλει δ' ἀρεταῖσιν / σόν τε, Κασταλία, πάρα / Ἀλφεοῦ τε ῥέεθρον ("Castalian and Alphean"), and fr. 122.1–2 Snell-Maehler: ἀμφίπολοι Πειθοῦς ἐν ἀφνειῷ Κορίνθῳ ("Corinthian"), as well as in *Carm. Pop.* fr. 20: 867 *PMG*: τὸν Ἑλλάδος ἀγαθέας / στραταγὸν ἀπ' εὐρυχόρου Σπάρτας / ὑμνήσομεν.¹³

The phrase in line 27 is then a syncopated lyric version of the Homeric ὅτ' ἐς Αὐλίδα νῆες Ἀχαιῶν ἠγερέθοντο (*Il.* 2.303–304) and combines easily with what follows to yield the sense, "how large was the muster of the ships at

¹³See also *Ol.* 7.93–94, 9.13–14, and Aesch. *Suppl.* 236–237 (where ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος τόπων is the equivalent of "Greek of any sort"), Soph. *El.* 61 (σὺν κέρδει is "profitable;" cf. *OT* 495) and 1283 (σὺν βοᾷ is "voiced"), *OT* 55 (ἐν ἀνδράσιν is "populated"), and *OC* 586 (ἐν βραχεῖ is "small"), and even in prose, as in Thuc. 6.90.3 (ἐκ γῆς ἐφορμαῖς is "landward assaults"). For discussion with more examples of the construction, see E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* 2 (Munich 1959) 417 and B. A. van Groningen, "Quelques exemples d'adverbes ou de locutions adverbiales employés comme adjectifs," *Mnemosyne*³ 13 (1947) 236.

Aulis that passed across the Aegean sea from Argos to horse-rearing Troy." If this alteration is correct, we are rid of another of the features that struck Page as offensive,¹⁴ and his distaste receives confirmation from the discovery of corruption.

Then, at 23 the Muses are most unusually called *σεσοφισμένοι*. It is, of course, a staple of Greek belief and a convention of Greek poetry that the poet owes his *σοφία* to his Muse.¹⁵ It is hers in that she gives it, but his in that he acquires it. But, though the possession of *σοφία* is thus shared between the poet and the Muse, the practice of *σοφία* seems to be attributed to the poet only, if we judge by the usage of *σοφίζεσθαι*. Thus, for example, "Pigres" (fr. 1 *IEG*) can attribute to the Muse the possession of the *πείρατα σοφίης*, and even the songs, in addition to the Muse and the poet, may be *σοφαί* (Pindar *Nem.* 4.2), but *σοφίζεσθαι* is used of the practice of the poet alone (Theognis 19, in a moment of self-awareness and self-confidence). The Muse, by implication, needs no practice, being herself the source of the power by which the poet is moved to act. In the case of the participle, *σεσοφισμένος*, Greek poetic usage holds even further aloof from the Muse, for, in its only occurrence in early or archaic verse, the word implies the more general and humble sense of "(practical) skill," when it is used by Hesiod (*Op.* 649: *ναυτιλίας σεσοφισμένος*) of the craft of the seaman. The related noun *σοφιστάς* is introduced into poetry, with reference to the craft of poetry, by Pindar at about the time of Xerxes' invasion (*Isth.* 5.28; cf. also *Pyth.* 3.113 just a little later). If our evidence is sufficient to judge, poetry is not commonly and explicitly recognised as a craft until late in the archaic age (*τέχνη* is used of the Muses by Pindar in *Paeans* 9.39 of 463), and the analogy is never applied to the Muse herself. If some one is said to be *σεσοφισμένος*, "practised," "expert," "clever," it is likely to be a human attribute that is meant, and one derived from the use of some practical skill. If our poet uses this word of the Muses, it must be that he wishes to say something unusual concerning them. One may compare here Pindar's reference to the mercenary Muse (*Isth.* 2.1 ff.), for there also the Muse is brought down to a very everyday level of activity, namely the practices of contemporary patronage. Indeed, the comparison is valid, for on Barron's interpreta-

¹⁴So Bowra found that Ibycus had expressed himself in (the traditional text of) 27–30 with "remarkable clumsiness," so that "by this appearance of vagueness he seems to say that he has lost touch with his subject" (Bowra [1961] 254–255).

¹⁵See G. B. Kerferd in *CR* 64 (1950) 8–10, W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* 3 (Cambridge 1969) 27 ff., B. Snell in *JHS* 93 (1973) 178–179 (with further bibliography), and G. F. Gianotti, *Per una poetica pindarica* (Turin 1975) 85 ff. On the status of the Muse, see my "Pindar and the Mercenary Muse: *Isthm.* 2.1–13," *TAPA* 99 (1968) 527–542; and cf. Plat. *Rep.* 10.607a: *τὴν ἡδυσμένην Μοῦσαν*. Gianotti, though recognising that *σοφία* is here applied exceptionally to the Muses, believes that the word signifies their comprehensive, factual knowledge ("un sapere universale" [above, n. 1] 405–406).

tion of Ibycus' poem the poet calls on his Muse, not to tell a story in the usual way, but to exhibit her "clever" skills and resources. The Muses are invited, as it were, to open their work-box and to display their tools and products, not to say their union-cards, in order to prove that they are skilled workwomen who know their job. The uncommon use of the participle is thus seen to reinforce the general interpretation offered by Barron.

In what follows we learn of the men who sailed with the fleet: first, in the epode, of the greatest warriors, who are, as tradition held, Achilles and Ajax; then, in the scanty remains of the following strophe, of two obscure figures of the myth, whose identity Barron has been able to determine:¹⁶ they are Cyanippus of Argos, the son or grandson of Adrastus, and Zeuxippus of Sicyon, the son of Apollo and the Argive nymph, Hyllis.¹⁷ According to Pausanias (2.30.10), those who led the Argives to Troy served as guardians of Cyanippus, son of Aegialeus. On this account, then, Cyanippus was a minor at Troy and so, if he is called κάλλιστος at 36, as appears to be the case, the praise is appropriate. As Zeuxippus is to be compared in the antistrophe with Troilus, the son of Priam, in regard to beauty,¹⁸ it seems that this is the purpose of his mention in the strophe, as it was for that of Cyanippus just before. Those of the Greeks picked out for attention in 30–41, therefore, are the chief warriors and beauties who went over to Troy. The values celebrated in the Muses' song, we infer, are two.

In the last antistrophe we learn first that Hyllis of the golden girdle was Zeuxippus' mother. There follows a comparatively long and complex sentence that occupies four and a half lines (41–45). It tells of a comparison made by Trojans as well as by Greeks, the terms of the comparison being introduced in the opening words (τῷ δ' [ἄ]ρα Τρωϊλῶν) while the action of the close comparison is postponed to the period's ending (μάλ' ἐύσκον ὁμοιον). Between beginning and ending are two lines that require attention:

ώσεϊ χρυσὸν ὀρει-
χάλκῳ τρις ἄπεφθο[ν] ἦδη.

The words have been thought by some to signify a difference between the two young heroes, like the difference between gold and orichalc, the

¹⁶Barron (1969) 130–131, (1964) 224–226, and (1961) 185–187.

¹⁷See especially Steph. Byz. s.v. Hyllis (Callim. fr. 712 ff. Pfeiffer), Paus. 2.6.7, Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.13, Paus. 2.18.4–5 and 2.30.10, Triphiod. 159–161.

¹⁸Unlike Cyanippus and Zeuxippus, Troilus is known to the Homeric epic (*Il.* 24.257), as to the *Cypria* (Page 169 and n. 1), and he was to become an erotic figure, as we see from Phrynichus fr. 13 Nauck²: 3 F 13 *TrGF*: λάμπει δ' ἐπὶ πορφυρέαις παρῆσι φῶς ἔρωτος. He is therefore better suited, presumably, to serve as an accepted model of beauty than either of the other two. In a version of the myth that we know only from later sources (Schol. Lycophr. 307, Serv. *Aen.* 1.474) but which may well go back much further, Troilus was the ἐρώμενος of Achilles. If Ibycus knew this, he had reason to rank Troilus first in beauty, as Achilles is first in valour (32).

“mountain-bronze,”¹⁹ but by others to refer to a similarity, if the two metals are equally beautiful.²⁰ Neither interpretation seems to me sufficient. The order of words in 42–43 is significant, for the beginning juxtaposes gold and orichalc, balancing them in the scales as it were, but the words that follow have the effect of adding weight to the gold and the accusative, so that this is felt to preponderate by the end of the phrase. Orichalc indeed was recognised as a precious metal, but gold, especially if “thrice-refined in advance,” is surely the standard by which the relevant beauty and value are measured.²¹ The lines seem therefore to make two points: that gold is the standard and that orichalc will bear to be measured by that standard. The reader may be reminded of a passage from the Louvre Partheneion of Alcman (fr. 1.58–59 *PMG*) in which two girls are compared with two swift horses:

ἀ δὲ δευτέρα πεδ' Ἀγιδῶ τὸ φείδος
ἵππος Ἰβηνώι Κολαξαῖος δραμήται.

The Ibenian is first, but the Colaxaeon is worthy to be second in competition with the best.²²

The comparison between Zeuxippus the Greek and Troilus the Trojan, which is made in respect of beauty (ἐρόεσσαν μορφάν), is “very like,” as is that between orichalc and the purest gold.²³ If the sentence is construed in this way, full account is taken of its form, and the climax of the period, which has given much offence, is vindicated. “Between him and Troilus then (on the field of Troy), as between orichalc and gold that has completed three purifications (in the fire), Trojans as well as Greeks (who had made their own judgments of beauty in the fleet), in respect of lovely shapeliness, drew a comparison of close likeness.”

The point made in the passage is then that the beauty of these three young heroes of the Trojan story is of the highest kind, as was the martial prowess

¹⁹See Page (1951) 168, Bowra (1961) 251, Barron (1961) 185 and n. 3, Wilamowitz (1922) 511.

²⁰As by Page ([1951] 160), Campbell (309), Barron ([1969] 131, n. 41).

²¹A similar interpretation is offered by Péron (38), and by M. Robertson in *BICS* 17 (1970) 12, who combines it, however, with other theories (references to Ibycus' career and to his postulated Sicyonian sojourn, as in Bowra): “the songs I made for the Sicyonians were as orichalc, the immortality of pure gold shall be yours . . .”

²²The parallel between Ibycus and Alcman is noted, and used to serve the interpretation of the latter, by M. Puelma in *MusHelv* 34 (1977) 31.

²³Plato says of orichalc: πλὴν χρυσοῦ τιμώτατον ἐν τοῖς τότε ὄν (Crit. 114e). Servius indeed, on Virg. *Aen.* 12.87, holds a different view, that *apud maiores orichalcum pretiosius metallis omnibus fuisse*. On orichalc, see A. Jacob in Daremberg-Saglio 4.235–236, A. Schramm in *RE* 18.1 (1939) 938–941, H. Michell, “Oreichalkos,” *CR* ns 5 (1955) 21–22; E. R. Caley, *Orichalcum and Related Ancient Alloys* (New York 1964), R. Halleux, “L’orichalque et le laiton,” *AntCl* 42 (1973) 64–81, O. Szemerényi in *JHS* 94 (1974) 151–152; D. K. Hill in *The Muses at Work*, ed. C. Roebuck (Cambridge, Mass. 1969) 61–62 calls attention, in this connection, to bronze-vessels from Gordion, made of copper with a high proportion of zinc, that are “bright yellow” in colour.

of the redoubtable Achilles and Ajax, who were praised in 32 ff. Bravery and beauty alike, which are the values of song, are both jewels of the purest water. The Muses sing of the best of the brave and the beautiful. But the best, like gold, is incorruptible and the image looks forward to the promised κλέος ἄφθιτον.

Lines 46–48 conclude the epode and the poem, as is indicated by the presence of the *coronis* in the margin of the papyrus. Our written text also puts a stop at the end of 46, dividing the passage into two sentences. This punctuation was questioned by the first editors and removed by Wilamowitz, and most subsequent editors and commentators have agreed that there is a single sentence here. These include Page, Fränkel, Lesky, Sisti, Schmid, Gentili. But recently Barron has defended the stop and West agrees, while Bowra, Campbell, and Gerber substitute a comma, and the matter has become a question for debate.

Here the meaning of πέδα is crucial. The preposition is the Aeolic counterpart of the familiar Attic μετά and is found in Sappho, Alcaeus, Stesichorus, and Ibycus, as well as in later poets.²⁴ The accent in the manuscript may be attributed to anastrophe with the preceding τοῖς, though μέν intervenes. If the first words then mean, “among them,” the genitive κάλλεος is left to the governance of κλέος in the following line and the stop must be deleted.

If, on the other hand, the stop is retained, it becomes necessary to find a different syntax for both the genitive κάλλεος and the dative τοῖς, and this is supplied by reading πέδα as the equivalent of the Attic μέτεστι, which governs both cases in a construction that is remembered from Herodotus and Attic literature. The meaning thus acquired is, “they have a share in beauty forever.” But this construction is unknown to choral lyric or to any verse before the Persian wars.²⁵ The meaning given here, although reminiscent of Plato, also seems not to be archaic, for the poets of the lyric, unlike Keats, do not say, “Forever wilt thou love, and she be fair!” and certainly do not contemplate, as Plato might, a participation in beauty as the gift of poetry. What the poets do promise is what the first construction offers, κλέος or the like, which will preserve their names, deeds, and attributes.²⁶ It seems clear

²⁴Sappho fr. 55.4 etc., Alc. fr. 50.4 etc. L-P, Voigt, Stesich. ap. POxy 2619: S 109 SLG, fr. 21.3, and Ibyc. fr. 40:321.3 PMG.

²⁵Nearest, perhaps, is the use of παρέμμι in Mimn. fr. 8 IEG, 2 Gentili-Prato: ἀληθείη δὲ παρέστω / σοὶ καὶ ἐμοί. Cf. also Sim. fr. 8.4–5 IEG. But, apart from the different verb, the critical “always” is lacking in these passages.

²⁶The formula κλέος ἄφθιτον has long been recognised as very ancient, deriving in fact from Indo-European: see now R. Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1967) 1–2, 6, 61–69, J. E. Caeryn-Williams in *ProcBritAc* (1971) 108–109, G. Nagy, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Cambridge, Mass. 1974), Floyd 133–157, especially 151–154, and now Nagy in *WürzJbb* NF 7 (1981) 113–116. In Ibycus and in Theognis (245–246), Floyd argues, κλέος ἄφθιτον is first “clearly connected with a reference to poetry,” but cf. Floyd’s discussion (148–151) of *Il.* 9.412–416.

that the preposition serves their purpose better than the verb and is more evidently at home in the archaic age.

A second argument confirms this conclusion against the punctuation. If the stop is retained, Polycrates, though promised imperishable fame, is not explicitly praised for his beauty. His fame is at best set beside the everlasting beauty of the young heroes. But on the alternative punctuation, the point is clearly made, for the fame that is promised is for beauty. Explicitness in this regard seems to be desirable because this is just the point, I believe, to which the poem has been tending. The poet has been showing that his Muses possess, among their familiar treasures of praise for the great warriors of Troy, also celebrations of much younger but pre-eminent figures, who are lauded for their beauty instead of their valour. The coherence of the poem depends on a clear connection between this development and the promise of fame.²⁷ The connection is crisply made, if the stop is removed, but only indirectly suggested, if this is preserved.

The μέν of 46 is then the familiar emphatic particle, used with pronouns. Here the particle appears to take on a concluding and summarizing function, or (alternatively) what Denniston calls "a quasi-connective, progressive, force."²⁸ Compare also the occurrences in 20, 23, and 32.

Finally, the last line, in which the repetition of κλέος has been faulted. But the repetition, is, I believe, studied and pointed. The κλέος of the poet is compared with the κλέος promised to Polycrates. This is done because the promise of fame is guaranteed by the fact of the poet's reputation: he points to his own fame as proof of what he and his Muses can do. The κλέος that is promised to the youth is therefore as sure as the κλέος that the poet actually enjoys. His κλέος, however, is κατ' αἰδάν, "in respect of song,"²⁹ whereas Polycrates' is to be a κάλλεος κλέος, "for beauty." The variation in the

²⁷But cf. Labarbe (1962) 186 and n. 128, and Péron 38–39, with denials that the promised fame is for beauty. Contrast also van Groningen, who recognises the concluding lines as the poet's personal "seal," which is superimposed on the organic structure of the poem.

²⁸See J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 360, and W. H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden 1982) 53, n. 52.

²⁹I follow Page who renders, "even as is my fame also in song" (Page [1951] 160). Others construe similarly, except that they supply the future tense of the verb εἶμι: Wilamowitz (1922) 511, van Groningen 187, Bowra (1961) 251, Labarbe (1962) 186, n. 126, Sisti (1967) 74, Gerber 213, Gianotti 406, and Gentili 396. This gives a weaker sense, in that one promise is set beside another, whereas, if the present is understood, the affirmation is a warranty for what has just been promised. Snell however, has κατὰ govern both nouns (54 [120–121 of German edition]), giving "as far as that depends upon my song and upon my fame;" so also Schmid (above, n. 5) 1.1.491, Barron (1969) 135, and Gianotti 408, n. 2. As Campbell's commentary shows (307), Snell's rendering would better suit the rejected punctuation in 46 and makes 41–45 "no more than a parenthesis at the end of the catalogue of Greeks." Moreover, though a sixth-century poet might say that his song has power to confer fame, it seems doubtful that he would say that his own κλέος would confer κλέος on another ("as song and my fame can give it," in Campbell's version of the construction).

antithesis between genitive and preposition allows the poet to suggest that song is the cause as well as the subject of his fame. But this point requires the dependence of κάλλεος upon κλέος, and so supports the removal of the attested stop.

This interpretation of the poem, if it is correct, may be seen to enhance our understanding of its occasion. The poet speaks as one whose reputation is assured, and we think of the *Suda*'s notice concerning Ibycus' arrival at Samos, together with Schneidewin's construction of his literary career. The skill of the Sicilian poet is presented to the taste of the Samian court.

The model-theme of his verse, he implies, is the traditional Trojan story from the epic.³⁰ But he adds, surely surprisingly, that the values celebrated by his powers are both bravery and beauty, and by implication those of youth as well as those of maturity, and this leads him to the promise of fame to Polycrates. It must seem likely, to those who believe that the archaic lyric was rooted in its occasions, that the poem is composed for a setting in which the young are present as well as their elders. This perception, in turn, gives support to those scholars who recognise in the poem a reference to that "young Polycrates" of whom the *Suda* and Himerius speak darkly.³¹ If he is present, in a more modest position than his father and the captains of the ships,³² we may see more clearly the point of the poet's comparison of the beautiful with the brave, by which the youthful obscurities are lifted to the level of the exemplary heroes. The young man is picked out of the company and judged to be comparable with the best.

The poet, for his part, makes his appearance before the court, wearing his past glories as it were, and singing, not of his usual themes, but of his power to sing them. His power, indeed, is more extensive than might have been believed, for it encompasses beauty as well as bravery. As a praise-poet, he can celebrate and commemorate whomever he values, and he makes his introduction to the court by offering to praise present men as well as past heroes, and the young Polycrates on this occasion in preference to the rulers and the powerful of the island. The poem implies a celebration of the power

³⁰On Ibycus' treatment of the Trojan myth, see Sisti (1967) 60–63.

³¹Cf., e.g., Bowra (1961) 251. Barron argues that the recipient is the earlier Polycrates, at the height of his power at Samos, pointing out that "the main comparison is with Zeuxippos, himself already a king at the time referred to" (Barron [1964] 226, n. 4, cf. 228). Mitchell suggests that the Polycrates of the poem "was already tyrant and the poet's patron, but still relatively young" (80, n. 23). But beauty is prominent in this part of the poem, whereas kingship is, so far as we can tell, absent.

³²Snell recognised in the praise of the Greek fleet a compliment to the naval power of Polycrates ([1961] 54–55, [1965] 119–121); he is followed by Gentili (397–398). Cf., however, the objections of Sisti ([1967] 76). It remains possible that the two orders of Greeks praised in 30–41 correspond with two similar groups at the Samian court. Earlier Snell had argued for a reading between the lines of our text with a view to its effect upon the Samian audience: see *Philologus* 96 (1944) 290–292.

of his poetic practice, very much as Theognis (19 ff.), also in a poem for a youth, speaks of his art to make his own name immortal, and in another poem (237–254) promises world-wide immortality in song to a beloved youth. The poet's self-consciousness has become a theme of his own work, as he begins the transition from traditional epic and lyric to the new occasional verse of the professional poet. The poem, like others from the sixth century, marks, it seems, an important change of taste and style, which, like other similar revolutions, exposed the poetic tradition to new dangers as well as to new opportunities. In this case, the dangers arose from freeing the devices of poetry from their organic contexts in society and its institutions, while the opportunities lay in the opening to lyric poetry of a new and more individual world.³³

It turns out that Hermann Fränkel's reading of the poem, though it includes a bold reconstruction of its mutilated beginning, is in principle on the right lines. The poem's thrust has been from the traditional celebration of bravery to the present celebration of beauty, and the promised praise of the beauty of Polycrates, as guaranteed by the fame of the poet, is the climax of the poem's course. The recipient of the poem, on this reading, is likely to have been youthful, presumably still beardless, and untried in war or kingship. Like the obscure young heroes, Cyanippus and Zeuxippus, who are unknown to the Homeric epic, Polycrates is appropriately assumed to be as yet unknown. The power of poetry to extol them as all-but-equal to the famous Troilus is an assurance for the fledgling, but ambitious, Polycrates. If Trojans as well as Danaans are said to have made this comparison, this may be seen as an instance of the poet's reading into the heroic past the judgments of his own age, as in 6 the strife at Troy is said to be πολύνυμος, "often told in song," and as in the *Iliad* (6.357–358) Helen is aware that she is to be the subject of future celebration. The praise that is now offered is not only praise by one's own kind; it is the praise of all men, including those whose praise is most precious, like the purest gold. For Polycrates the praise of the Trojans is promise of praise that spreads beyond Samos and the waters commanded by the Samian ships, to every region bearing the Greek name and hearing the Muses' songs.

If this, or something like it, is the situation implied by the poem, it becomes desirable to consider an external question, viz., who the young Polycrates was.

³³On the erotic atmosphere of the court of Polycrates, see Athen. 15:540e, Ael. Var. Hist. 9.4, Apul. Flor. 15.54, Philostr. Ep. 8.1. The poet's praise of the young Polycrates is therefore likely to have been to the taste of his hearers, but this is not to say, as was said in the *Suda*, that the poet was ἐρωτομανέστατος, much less that he himself had an erotic relationship with the youth. Rather, youthful beauty is the subject of his public praise. See Wilamowitz (1922) 512, Bowra (1961) 256–257, P. Von der Mühl in *MusHelv* 21 (1964) 170–171 = *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* (Basel 1975) 234–236.

The evidence that has survived to us from antiquity concerning the days of Ibycus and Polycrates presents to the first glance a tangled and disorderly appearance, but upon inspection and consideration a certain pattern is visible in the confusion.

First, the *Suda*'s notice dates Ibycus in Ol. 54 (νδ') or 564–561, and Anacreon (according to "some") in 55 (νε') or 560–557, while Jerome's version of Eusebius gives Ol. 61 or 536–533 to Ibycus, and 62.2 or 531 to Anacreon. In both cases Ibycus is earlier than Anacreon, and the interval between them, which we cannot fix exactly, is a matter of a single Olympiad, though the difference in years varies from one to eight. The critical years to which the dates of the two poets are referred are ca 561–560 and ca 532: in each case Ibycus precedes, and Anacreon follows, the critical date. Between the two critical years there is an interval of ca 30 years.

The *Suda* knows also an alternative date for Anacreon, which is synchronised with "Polycrates, tyrant of Samos." The manuscripts give this date as Ol. 52 (νβ') or 572–569, but this is often altered to Ol. 62 (ξβ') or 532–529, in order to give a traditional date for the tyranny of Polycrates.

In all three passages from the *Suda*, however, there is a method of double dating that uses both Olympiads and the "reigns" of great eastern rulers. For Ibycus is synchronised with the age of Croesus, and Anacreon either with that of Cyrus and Cambyses or with that of Polycrates. It is worth noticing that Athenaeus (13:599c) combines the last pair of dates by synchronising Anacreon with Cyrus and Polycrates.

This observation suggests the possibility that the dating depends on the three synchronisms and that the dates in Olympiads have been read from the dates of the great rulers. The possibility is hardened into something firmer when it is noticed that the two critical dates are important for the history of the rulers.

It was widely agreed in antiquity that the kingdom of Croesus fell, by the capture of Sardis, in the fourteenth or fifteenth year of the king's reign; this implies a date, ca 560, for his accession.³⁴ The traditional dates, on the other hand, for the tyranny of Polycrates were ca 532 to ca 522.³⁵ It is a question for consideration, therefore, whether the ancient scholars had reason to set Ibycus and Anacreon before and after these dates, respectively.

Anacreon's presence at the tyrant's court at Samos is recorded by Herodotus (3.121), Strabo (14:638), Himerius (*Or.* 5.3, 30, 31.4) and Maximus of

³⁴See R. Van Compernelle, *Etude de chronologie et d'historiographie siciliotes* (Brussels and Rome 1959, *Et. de phil. d'arch. et d'hist. anc. L'Inst. Hist. Belge de Rome* 5) 104–119; Weissbach in *RE* Suppl. 5 (1931) 457.

³⁵But earlier dates are sometimes now put forward for the institution of the tyranny. E.g., ca 538 by J. Labarbe, "Un putsch dans la Grèce antique: Polycrate et ses frères à la conquête du pouvoir," *AncSoc* 5 (1974) 22–41, and by T. Lenschau in *RE* 21.2 (1952) 1728; not long after 540, by Mitchell 81; cf. White 37 and n. 10. See also H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (Munich 1967) 1.107–114 and 2.582–588.

Tyre (37.5), while the *Theologumena Arithmeticae* (14 A 8 VS) thinks of the two as contemporaries.³⁶ If then Anacreon was conventionally dated by synchronism with Polycrates, that would produce, on the most usual dating of the tyrant, a period after about 532 for his poetic activity. This observation receives some confirmation when it is noticed that, although one date given by the *Suda* is a synchronism with Cyrus and Cambyses, the reign of Cambyses (530–522) is recognised as closely contemporary with the tyranny of Polycrates.³⁷ Cambyses might then have appropriately replaced Polycrates in the scheme of some one who preferred Persian regnal years. We then notice that Athenaeus' synchronism for Anacreon is with Cyrus and Polycrates, and we have some reason for believing that some one did, in fact, make the substitution. But if Cambyses came to replace Polycrates in the synchronism, there was then reason to lower the date of the *terminus post quem* from ca 532 to ca 530.

For the earlier critical date our best evidence is the *Suda*'s notice concerning Ibycus: ἐνθένδε (sc., from Rhegium) εἰς Σάμον ἦλθεν ὅτε αὐτῆς ἦρχεν ὁ Πολυκράτης τοῦ τυράννου πατῆρ· χρόνος δέ οὗτος ὁ ἐπὶ Κροίσου, ὀλυμπιάς νδ' (Ol. 54, i.e., 564–561). Our texts are unfortunately unclear on a crucial point, for we can read that Ibycus found at Samos either "Polycrates the father of the tyrant" (Πολυκράτης ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατῆρ) or, by an easy alteration, "the father of the tyrant Polycrates" (ὁ Πολυκράτους τοῦ τυράννου πατῆρ).³⁸ The position of the article before the proper name in our manuscript-text seems to support the latter version, as does the reflection that "Polycrates the father of the tyrant" is not a clear or natural way of saying "Polycrates the father of the tyrant of the same name," which is the meaning that the phrase, on this construction, must bear.

More certain than this is the information that the father held power before the son. It is true that νδ' may be altered to ξβ' (Ol. 62 or 532–529) in order to achieve a more conventional date for Polycrates, but this does nothing to remove ἐπὶ Κροίσου, which implies a date not later than ca 546 and possibly as early as 560. Nor can it remove the implication, if the implication is found here, that Polycrates' father was tyrant before him. Both facts are then concordant with the unemended numeral. The notice therefore testifies, rightly or wrongly, to a government directed by the father of Polycrates, about 30 years earlier than the traditional date of the rule of Polycrates

³⁶On this last passage, see my remarks in *Phoenix* 15 (1961) 153.

³⁷Hdt. 3.44, 120 and Thuc. 1.13.6; R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.–A.D. 45* (Chicago 1942) 12. Thuc. 1.13.6 puts Ionian naval power (including no doubt, the Samian) in both reigns. On the dating of early Greek poets by eastern kings, see Barron (1969) 148, n. 75.

³⁸Schmid (above, n. 5) 1.490, n. 2 and A. von Gutschmid ap. H. Flach, *Geschichte der griechischen Lyrik* (Tübingen 1884) 524, n. 4. For other alterations of the text, see Sisti (1966) 92, n. 6.

himself. It is with the earlier generation that Ibycus is connected in this tradition.

Against this view Bowra raised three objections:³⁹ (1) that Polycrates' tyranny, with which Jerome's dating of Ibycus synchronises the poet, is not to be dated earlier than 536; (2) that the name of the tyrant's father, on the authority of Herodotus (2.182.2, 3.39.1) was "Aeaces," not "Polycrates;" and (3) that Herodotus' account of Polycrates' seizure of power (3.39.1: ἔσχε Σάμον ἐπαναστάς; cf. 3.120.3) indicates a revolution, not succession by inheritance. To these objections the following reply may be briefly made: (1) recent scholarship, some of it later than the second edition of Bowra's book, has argued powerfully for an earlier generation of the "tyranny" at Samos, before the middle of the century; (2) Herodotus' testimony concerning the name of the father is compatible with the notice in the *Suda*, provided that we read there "the father of the tyrant Polycrates," which seems, in any case, to be the more likely reading; (3) as the *Suda* says nothing of a peaceful succession to power, it is possible to reconcile its statement with that of Herodotus on the hypothesis that the *régime* was interrupted for a time, but afterwards regained by Polycrates. Certainly, the part played by Polycrates' brothers in the *coup* and the difficulties that he subsequently had with them (Hdt. 3.39.2) are readily understandable if their power was regarded as a family-possession. The objections may then be dismissed.

Thus far we have two generations of political power, but only one Polycrates. Bowra and Page found another of that name, but in a later, rather than an earlier, generation.⁴⁰ Himerius of Prusias, a rhetorician of the fourth Christian century, has an oration addressed to one Privatus, the mentor of the son of the proconsul, P. Ampelius, of which a part has survived in a mutilated condition. The relevant portion is as follows:

ἦν Πολυκράτης ἔφηβος, ὁ δὲ Πολυκράτης οὗτος οὐ βασιλεὺς Σάμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀπάσης θαλάσσης, | ἐφ' ἧς γαῖα ὀρίζεται. ὁ δὲ γοῦν τῆς Ῥόδου Πολυκράτης ἦρα] μουσικῆς καὶ μελῶν, καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔπειθε συμπράξει αὐτῷ πρὸς | τὸν τῆς μουσικῆς ἔρωτα, ὁ δὲ Ἀνακρέοντα τὸν μελοποιὸν μετα]πεμψάμενος δίδωσι τῷ παιδί τούτῳ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας διδάσκαλον, | ὑφ' ᾧ τὴν βασιλικὴν ἀρετὴν ὁ παῖς διὰ τῆς λύρας πονῶν τὴν Ὀμηρικὴν
 ἔμελλε πληρῶσειν εὐχὴν τῷ πατρί

Πολυκράτει πάντα	} κρείσσων ἐσόμενος.
Πολυκράτης πάντων	

 (Him. Or. 29.22–31 Colonna)

The jumbling to which the text has evidently been subjected may leave us in some doubt on the vital point: does the rhetorician, in speaking of the Samian father and son, give the same name to both? Thus, Page, though

³⁹Bowra (1961) 248–249. Cf. the refutation of Bowra by Sisti ([1966] 98).

⁴⁰Bowra (1934) 375–380, (1961) 249–250; Page (1951) 170–172; Lesky, *History* (above, n. 3) 183–184; F. Preisshofen ap. G. Schmidt, *AthMitt* 87 (1972) 183 (above, n. 1).

admitting that at the beginning one might suppose that the “‘youth Polycrates’ was the same person as the ‘Samian King Polycrates’,” concluded that “it is however clear from the sequel that father and son of the same name are being mentioned, that the Rhodian is the son, and therefore that the ‘youth Polycrates’ is the Rhodian, not the Samian.” Bowra presumably read the passage similarly, for he wrote that the text “shows that the tyrant Polycrates had a son with the same name” and translated the final words as “the boy . . . seemed likely to fulfil the prayer of which Homer speaks, by surpassing his father in all accomplishments.”⁴¹ Bowra did not print a Greek text, but his translation would render accurately Πολυκράτους πάντα κρείσσων ἐσόμενος. It is less clear that this is a reliable version of our current printed text.

The beginning of the passage, which has given much difficulty, has been well explained by Barron as being an instance of a well-known formula for the first words of a story, as in *Il.* 6.152–153:⁴²

ἔστι πόλις Ἐφύρη μυχῷ Ἀργεὺς ἵπποβότοιο,
ἐνθα δὲ Σίσυφος ἔσκεν, ὃ κέρδιστος γένετ’ ἀνδρῶν,

and in other passages of Himerius himself (27.5, 29.1, 33.14 ff. Colonna). In the last of these the parallel is striking: ἦν παῖς Εὐαγόρα τῷ Κυπρίων τυράννῳ . . . τοῦτον ὁ πατήρ . . . , for the reference of the demonstrative pronoun is certainly to the immediately-preceding noun. Himerius then is beginning a new example of his theme of teacher and pupil, as in the case of Solon and Anacharsis and that of Phoenix and Achilles whom he has just mentioned, and his point is that the famous tyrant Polycrates also was once a youthful pupil. The result is that we have no reason in the early part of the passage to distinguish between two persons bearing the name “Polycrates.” The Polycrates who was once a youth and a pupil was later to become tyrant of Samos.

The main problem has its focus in the words, ὁ δὲ γοῦν τῆς Ῥόδου Πολυκράτης. Bowra and Page took it as identifying one “Polycrates of Rhodes,” whom they assumed to be the young son of the famous tyrant of the same name.⁴³ But the postulated Greek construction, where one might expect ὁ Ῥόδιος or the like, is doubtful at best,⁴⁴ and the combination δὲ γοῦν appears to be one that is unknown to our grammarians. The words

⁴¹Barron (1964) 219–220, however, argues well that the ephebe is the same man as the Samian tyrant.

⁴²Barron (1964) 219–220.

⁴³Here the silence of Herodotus is an embarrassment, for the historian knows (3.124) of a daughter of the tyrant.

⁴⁴H. Schenkl in *Hermes* 46 (1911) 422, n. 7 and A. Colonna in his edition of Himerius (Rome 1951) wished to take τῆς Ῥόδου with μουσικῆς and thus to attribute to Polycrates a love of Rhodian music, but the order of words is difficult and the sense obtained is strange (what has Anacreon to do with “Rhodian music”?).

that precede immediately have been seen to be almost equally suspect, for γαῖα is a poetic form that is foreign to the rhetorician's usage. It is therefore attractive to follow the Belgian scholar, J. Labarbe, who noted these difficulties, conjectured Ἀσία for γαῖα,⁴⁵ and read ὁ δὲ [ἤγουν τῆς (ἄνω or ἀπὸ τῆς) 'Ρόδου] Πολυκράτης ἦρα . . . Polycrates is described in this text as lord of Samos and of the Greek sea, by which the coast of Asia is bounded. But the words that follow ὁ δὲ, or ὁ δὴ, are denounced as an intrusive gloss (identified by the use of the introductory ἤγουν), which, on this view, was added to define the limits of the waters of which Polycrates' ships' captains had made him the master. The alterations remove the difficulties and give excellent sense, though the corruption of Ἀσία into γαῖα is unexplained and it would be simpler to assume that ἤγουν τῆς 'Ρόδου was originally a marginal comment intended to supplement Σάμου. ἤγουν is recognised by LSJ ("sts. introduced into the text") and by Kühner-Gerth as frequently used to introduce a gloss and by J. D. Denniston as yielding the sense, "namely."⁴⁶ Read in this way, the text shows that some reader has wished to specify Polycrates' command of "the Greek sea" by indicating that he was lord, not only of Samos, but also of Rhodes.⁴⁷ The result that is most pertinent to our purpose is that we are rid of "Polycrates of Rhodes."⁴⁸

We are left with the words at the end, whereby the boy is said to have studied the excellence of royalty upon the lyre to the point of being about to fulfil the Homeric prayer for his father—Πολυκράτει (R) / Πολυκράτης (Nc) πάντα (R) / πάντων (Nc) κρείσσων ἐσόμενος. The Homeric allusion is evidently to Hector's wish for Astyanax at *Il.* 6.476–481:⁴⁹

"Ζεῦ ἄλλοι τε θεοί, δότε δὴ καὶ τόνδε γενέσθαι
παῖδ' ἐμόν, ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ περ, ἀριπρεπέα Τρώεσσι,
ὥδε βίην τ' ἀγαθόν, καὶ Ἰλίου ἴφι ἀνάσσειν·"

⁴⁵Barron, however, recognises in ἐφ' ἧς γαῖ' ὀρίζεται an unannounced quotation from the Anacreontic poem that was Himerius' source in the passage (Barron [1964] 222). This explains very well the occurrence of γαῖα but one wonders how the rhetorician's purpose was served by the insertion of this vague quotation. If we accept the reasonable suggestion that we have a quotation here, it would be preferable to postulate an original such as Ἀχαιῖς (γαῖα), though I do not venture to restore the original poetic text, in the epic style. If the original had the epithet only, without the noun, as sometimes in Homer, it would be a natural gloss to add γαῖα in order to complete the Homeric phrase. The quotation would then serve to explain the unusual "Greek sea" and to define more precisely the limits of the Samian thalassocracy.

⁴⁶See LSJ s.v. ἤγουν, Kühner and Gerth, *Ausf. Gramm.* (above, n. 13) 163, J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 459.

⁴⁷On the extent of Polycrates' possessions beyond Samos itself, see Hdt. 3.39.4. But cf. 3.12 and Barron, who doubts that Polycrates achieved "an established dominion on the mainland" (Barron [1964] 218, n. 8). Mitchell puts Polycrates' conquest of "many of the islands and cities of the mainland" in "the earlier phase" of Polycrates' career, "when he was active in the whole Aegean" (82).

⁴⁸Barron accepts Labarbe's ἤγουν and the consequence for "Polycrates of Rhodes" (Barron [1964] 220); so also, by implication, West 207. But contrast Preisshofen (above, n. 40).

⁴⁹Cf. the similar, but differentiated, prayer of Ajax at Soph. *Aj.* 550–551.

καὶ ποτέ τις εἴποι 'πατρός γ' ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων'
 ἐκ πολέμου ἀνιόντα· φέροι δ' ἔναρα βροτόεντα
 κτείνας δῆϊον ἄνδρα, χαρεῖή δέ φρένα μήτηρ."

It is clear that Hector's prayer has two moments: that his son be eminent as he himself has been in war and in state, and that the popular voice exalt him above his father. Bowra's version indicates that he found in the second the point of Himerius' allusion, and readers generally seem to agree at least to the extent that, by preferring the dative to the nominative, they divide the name from the words that follow it. But that the allusion is of a more general kind is shown by an unnoticed device of style. The phrase πάντα / πάντων κρείσσων ἐσόμενος, which follows immediately upon the name, is in effect an explanatory formula,⁵⁰ and, that being the case, πάντων, the reading of Nc, seems preferable, as being nearer to the name's meaning. Poly-crates is "he whose might extends over all (others)," πάντων κρείσσων, if the name is interpreted by the Homeric standard of pre-eminence.⁵¹ The prayer, then, is for the future might and eminence of the youth, such that the truth that his name reveals should be realised. Hector's wish clearly contains the first part of Himerius' prayer and it may very well have seemed to ancient readers of both texts that it contained the second part as well, for the Trojan child's name means, "Lord of the City" (*Il.* 6.402–403) and Hector's wish is, in essence, that this name prove a true fate. Himerius's etymology may well be an echo of Anacreon himself.

If this is the explanation of the Homeric allusion, then "Polycrates" can only be the name of the son, whose name and fate are alone in question. The nominative must then be preferred to the dative, and the reading of Nc to that of R: the father's prayer is that "Polycrates be mightier than all (others)," an ambition appropriate to "princely virtue." This is in close parallel to Hector's wish that Astyanax become (by implication) "lord of the city" and (explicitly) like himself in greatness, but better still in reputation.⁵²

If this is correct, there is only one person called "Polycrates" in the passage of Himerius. He is the ephebe who was to become lord of Samos and of the islands of the sea, and who in his youth persuaded his father to indulge his love of music. The father who was persuaded and summoned Anacreon to be tutor to his son and prayed for the fulfilment of the fate

⁵⁰Glaucus' words at *Il.* 6.207–210 (especially αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων) and Peleus' similar injunction to Achilles at 11.783–784 illustrate well the competitive aspect of heroic and royal excellence. Pre-eminence is more important than versatility or omnipotence.

⁵¹West also prefers the nominative, but reads it as an adjective, to which he adds καὶ, "showing that Polycrates' name was appropriate to his life." I find the name more impressive than the adjective, prefer not to alter the text, and suspect that the formula is an echo of Anacreon's verse.

⁵²Hector's words at *Il.* 6.444–446 in the same speech are also relevant: ἐπεὶ μάθον ἔμμεναι ἐσθλὸς / αἰεὶ καὶ πρῶτοισι μετὰ Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι, / ἄρνιμνος πατρός τε μέγα κλέος, ἦδ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ.

promised in his son's name is, by analogy with Hector, in a position of power like that to be occupied by his son, who is set to study "royal virtue," but his name is withheld. The only Polycrates known here is the famous Samian tyrant who bore that name, whereas the person once called "Polycrates of Rhodes" has proved an illusion and the father, who is certainly a real presence, is not here given any right to the name "Polycrates."

Finally, four supplementary matters have been brought into our question. None of them, I think, is sufficiently strong to bear the weight of construction, but it is reasonable to ask whether they are compatible with constructions raised on other foundations.

First is the life of Anaximander of Miletus, which has been adduced as relevant, because of a passage in Diogenes Laertius (2.1.2).⁵³ Diogenes reports from the *Chronica* of Apollodorus of Athens of the second century B.C., who, he says, no doubt came across the summary version of the philosopher's doctrine. Anaximander, according to Apollodorus, was sixty-four in the second year of the 58th Olympiad (547/6) and died not long afterwards, having thus reached his *akme* at about the time of Polycrates of Samos.

John Burnet argued, with considerable plausibility, that the date offered here is unlikely to be one of the very approximate calculations that are familiar in early chronology.⁵⁴ Its particularity and the importance of its year suggest that Apollodorus found in the book of Anaximander an autobiographical statement, which he recorded. Anaximander may then have answered the question that was to be asked by Xenophanes (fr. B22 VS), "How old were you when the Mede came?" The following year, 546/5, is the epoch-year of the fall of Sardis, when Croesus was overthrown by Cyrus. It seems possible, then, that Apollodorus may have fixed Anaximander's reference at 547/6, when Croesus was first threatened from the east, and have assumed that his life ended with the epoch of Croesus, or at the least very soon after the last-known event of his life.

We have then a life from ca 610 to ca 545, which implies an *akme* at ca 570. This cannot be reconciled with our usual dates for Polycrates, and it is somewhat early for "Polycrates, the father of the tyrant," if we were to be justified in finding him in the notice of the *Suda* beside the date Ol. 54 or 564–561, particularly if we take into account also ἐπὶ Κροίσου (not before 560). It is therefore usual to follow H. Diels and F. Jacoby⁵⁵ in excising the words ἀκμάσαντά πη μάλιστα κατὰ Πολυκράτην τοῦ Σάμου τύραννον as be-

⁵³See White 42, Barron (1964) 222–223. Labarbe suggests that Diogenes Laertius or his source (not Apollodorus) mistakenly put the *akme* of Polycrates 40 years early ([1962] 157).

⁵⁴J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*⁴ (London 1930) 51. Cf. W. A. Heidel in *ProcAmAcad-ArtsandSc.* 56 (1921) 253–255.

⁵⁵F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* in *PhilUnters.* (1902) 191–192 and 215–216 and *FGrHist* 2D (1930) 726–727; H. Diels in *RhM* 31 (1876) 25–26.

longing properly to Pythagoras.⁵⁶ As Professor G. S. Kirk concedes, "the possibility cannot be entirely excluded that Apollodorus' dating of Anaximander was arbitrarily hinged to his Polycrates-Pythagoras system."⁵⁷ For the gap of ca forty years between the two *akmai* is certainly suggestive that the chronologist has assumed a teacher-pupil relationship. And we know of no other way of linking Anaximander of Miletus with Polycrates of Samos, if not by way of Pythagoras.

Next, the life of Pythagoras has been held to be relevant to our question, because Herodotus (4.95.1) knew that he was son of Mnesarchus and a Samian, while Aristoxenus (fr. 16 *Sch. d. Arist.* Wehrli) in the fourth century relates that at the age of forty years he observed the tyranny of Polycrates becoming more stringent and so withdrew to Italy.⁵⁸ But there was also in antiquity a tradition that Pythagoras conducted extensive travels abroad, in Egypt and in the orient. The earliest source known to us that speaks of these is Isocrates in his *Busiris* (28; but cf. Hdt. 2.81.1), not necessarily a work of sober reliability in matters of fact, as the author himself appears to admit (9, 33). Isocrates speaks of travels to Egypt, and later Diogenes Laertius (8.3) and Iamblichus (*Vit. Pyth.* 7) are able to report, from the work of one Antiphon, that Polycrates sent to him in Egypt a letter of introduction to the Pharaoh Amasis. The legend grew, for Iamblichus claims that Pythagoras spent twenty-two years in Egypt and twelve years in Babylon. We need not go so far in incredulity as to doubt any Pythagorean interest in Egypt, but the elaborations of the story, and in particular its chronology, are not credible. They are doubtless a product of the Greek interest in oriental lore and its influence on their own culture.⁵⁹

Strabo (14.1.16:638) has a passage that probably derives, as has been argued by Professor Kurt von Fritz,⁶⁰ from Timaeus in the third century, stating that Pythagoras, when he saw the tyranny of Polycrates growing, left the city and departed for Egypt and Babylon for curiosity's sake; upon his return to find the tyranny continuing, he took ship for Italy, where he passed the rest of his life.⁶¹ As it has been held that Timaeus' date for the

⁵⁶Cf. e.g., Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.65.2, who synchronises Pythagoras with the tyrant Polycrates in the 62nd Olympiad.

⁵⁷G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers*² (Cambridge 1983) 101, n. 1.

⁵⁸White 42–43, Barron (1964) 226–227.

⁵⁹See, e.g., Burnet, (above, n. 54) 88, J. A. Philip, *Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism* (Toronto 1966) 190.

⁶⁰K. von Fritz, *Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy* (New York 1940) 54–55, and in *RE* 24.1 (1963) 181–182.

⁶¹Labarbe finds a gap of 40 years between the first and the second exile of Pythagoras from Samos and attributes this to the existence of two different dates for the tyranny of Polycrates standing at the same interval (Labarbe [1962] 157 ff.).

migration to Italy was Ol. 62 or 532–529, and probably 529,⁶² there is, in fact, insufficient time for the alleged thirty-four years of travel between ca 532, the conventional date for the beginning of the tyranny, and the removal of 529. Timaeus' date for Polycrates, it has been argued, must have been much earlier than ca 532, perhaps forty years earlier. The argument rests on a very doubtful structure and is too fragile to stand alone without external support. One may, however, observe that the crowding of the chronology is just the result that one would expect to find, if an independently-expanded legend of oriental travel had at some later time to be inserted somewhere into the existing scheme of the philosopher's life.⁶³

Third is the notice of the *Suda* on Anacreon: Ἀνακρέων γέγονε κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τύραννον ὀλυμπιάδι νβ' (572–569). The dating is so different from the pattern elsewhere exhibited in regard to this poet (above, page 207) as to appear aberrant.⁶⁴ Otherwise Anacreon is dated just after the two critical dates, ca 560 and ca 532, as Ibycus is placed just before them. But in the present case, the critical dates are ignored, Ibycus is either not in question or is later, and Anacreon is exceptionally synchronised with Polycrates alone.

The traditional synchronism of Anacreon with Polycrates is sufficient to explain the date 531, which we find in Eusebius/Jerome. But at some time the synchronism was extended to include the reign of Cyrus, as we see in Athenaeus. This involved a little overlapping between the end of Cyrus' reign and the beginning of Polycrates' tyranny. It may have seemed tidier and more consistent to make the synchronism one with Cyrus and Cambyses, and in fact this is what we find in the *Suda*'s first dating of Anacreon. The extension may have been made because of a reference to Cyrus made by the poet, but it seems equally possible that this has been done under the influence of the second critical date, ca 560. If Ibycus was, by agreement, a little earlier than Anacreon and could be dated in the reign of Croesus, which began ca 560, it would be reasonable to put Anacreon just after that year. That would place him at the beginning of the reign of Cyrus, which began in 559.

The aberrant dating of Anacreon in the *Suda* shows no sign of this extended development, nor of a long and unmediated leap backwards in time. The synchronism is with Polycrates alone, and only the Olympiad number indicates a very early date. The most attractive explanation is that we have here another example of the ambiguity of γέγονε (either "was born" or "flourish-

⁶²A. Rostagni in *AttiTor* 49 (1914) 373 ff., reported by Barron (1964) 226, n. 7, with further bibliography.

⁶³Cf., however, the argument of Barron (1964) 226–227.

⁶⁴Hence the proposed alteration from νβ' to ξβ' (Ol. 52 to 62). See Sisti (1966) 94, n. 12.

ed") in such notices, which was pointed out long ago by Erwin Rohde in a famous article.⁶⁵

Between the year of birth and the *akme* ancient chronology conventionally posited an interval of forty years, and it is most suggestive that the difference between the eccentric date in the *Suda* (572–569) and the date of Eusebius/Jerome (531) is of this order. If the *Suda* derived from two sources, of which one used γέγονε in the sense "flourished," in connection with Polycrates, and the other had the same word in the sense "was born," in connection with Ol. 62, it would have been possible to produce from a conflation of these two reports the single notice that the *Suda* now appears to offer. It seems then, on this argument, that we find here, not a third date for Anacreon, but a corruption of the later of his two accepted datings. The result is that the conventional date of Polycrates is left undisturbed.

The last of the supplementary arguments is the weakest of all. Bowra held that Ibycus had had relations with Sicyon, very possibly on his way from Sicily to Samos,⁶⁶ and he found allusions to this incident in certain niceties of mythology, as when Ibycus made the eponymous hero Sicyon a son of Pelops instead of an Athenian, or caused the Sicyonian stream Asopus to flow beneath the sea from Phrygia.⁶⁷ In the two variations Bowra found anti-Argive propaganda, favouring not only Sicyon's attachment to Sparta, but also Spartan claims, both ancient and modern, to an eastern connection. It is strange that he put forward this argument, for elsewhere he found Ibycus "irresponsible in matters of mythology," though he "enjoyed tinkering with old tales," and in the poem for Polycrates he found the poet guilty of "unusual confusion," in conferring on Agamemnon both the Spartan title of Pleisthenid and the Argive and Mycenaean name of Atreid.⁶⁸

Barron very properly rejected Bowra's political interpretation but substituted another of his own.⁶⁹ He argued that the implications of the mythology are rather pro-Argive, though hostile to the alliance of the tyrant Cleisthenes of Sicyon with the Alcmaeonids of Athens by the marriage of his daughter Agariste to Megacles (Hdt. 6.126–130). So, in the poem for Polycrates, Zeuxippus was the most beautiful of the Greeks at Troy, and not Nireus of Syme as Homer had said (*Il.* 2.673). This was to be interpreted as a compliment to Argos, because Zeuxippus' mother was an Argive nymph.⁷⁰ The outcome is to date the political controversy in the 560s, after the wedding of Agariste, in harmony with the *Suda*'s date for the arrival of Ibycus at Samos.

⁶⁵E. Rohde, "Γέγονε in den Biographica des Suidas," *RhM* 33 (1878) 161–220, 638 and 34 (1879) 620–622, especially 190.

⁶⁶Bowra (1961) 246–247, 254–255.

⁶⁷Ibycus fr. 27: 308 *PMG*; Paus. 2.6.5, cf. 2.1.1.; fr. 41: 322 *PMG*; Strabo 6.2.4:271.

⁶⁸Bowra (1961) 114, 254.

⁶⁹Barron (1964) 224–226, (1969) 137–138.

⁷⁰Callim. fr. 112 Pfeiffer and Steph. Byz. s.v. Ὑλλεῖς.

It is not to be denied that nice points of mythology sometimes had political implications in Greek affairs, but it is very probable that this was not always, nor even generally, the case, so that the occurrence of such variants cannot, without external support, prove a political tendency. In this case we know nothing else of Ibycus's interests in Peloponnesian politics, nor even of a stay at Sicyon. Above all, it is most obscure what interest Polycrates and the members of his Samian court might have taken in these questions, or why the poet should have thought to commend himself to them by the use of "barbs aimed at the tyrant of Sicyon, now at a safe distance overseas." I do not think that Ibycus's alleged Sicyonian allusions shed any light on the poem nor on his career before his arrival at Samos.

The upshot of the argument is to find reason to believe in a Samian family-*régime* early in the century, in the generation before the famous Polycrates.⁷¹ There is insufficient ground for believing that the name of the earlier ruler was also "Polycrates," and Aeaces, whom Herodotus knows as Polycrates' father, is not said by him to have become ruler. But the *Suda*'s notice on Ibycus is evidence that the father held power and Himerius presents the youthful Polycrates studying "royal virtue" on the lyre, as might befit a ruler's son. It was, it appears, the society of this ruler and his young son that drew Ibycus from the west and provided a new audience, and a new taste, for his Sicilian verse. The date given for that translation was Ol. 54, or 564–561, and that agrees well enough with the synchronism, reported by the *Suda*, with Croesus of Lydia, whose reign began ca 560.

The lower date for Ibycus (Ol. 61 or 536–533), which is offered by Eusebius/Jerome, is the result of a synchronism with Polycrates, conventionally dated. In both cases Anacreon follows, at the interval of an Olympiad

⁷¹But there is no agreement concerning the names and dates of earlier tyrants. E. Homann-Wedeking, in "Syloson der Altere," *ArchEph* 1953–1954 part 2 (1958) 185–191, maintained that there was a tyranny at Samos early in the century, held by Syloson the son of Calliteles (Polyaenus 6.45). White argued for the establishment of the tyranny in the early 560s under Aeaces the father of Polycrates. Barron offered a more elaborate construction, with two successive tyrants, father and son, both named "Polycrates" (Barron [1961]). Sisti accepted the argument that there were two bearers of the name, "Polycrates," agreed that the elder held great political power, but denied that he was ever tyrant of Samos (Sisti [1961]). West, though conceding "that there is indeed some slight evidence that elder members of Polycrates' family held the reins of power in the earlier part of the sixth century," dismissed out of hand the arguments for two tyrants named "Polycrates" (West [1970]). Mitchell rejected both the tyranny of Aeaces and the doubling of Polycrates, while advancing the beginning of the tyranny of Polycrates to a date "not long after 540." See also Berve (above, n. 35) 1.107 and 2.582–583. A Samian inscription of doubtful date records the dedication of a marble statue by one Aeaces, son of Brychon, κατὰ τὴν ἐπίστασιν: no. 16 *GHI* Meiggs-Lewis. Both statue and inscription are dated by the Oxford editors at ca 500. But a more-recently discovered inscription (*AthMitt* 87 [1972] 165–185) recording a dedication by Brychon, son of Timoles, which the editor dates early in the century, may give some encouragement to those who prefer an earlier dating for no. 16 M-L and for the ἐπίστασις.

We infer that Ibycus was commonly held to be earlier than Anacreon, and that being the case, it was possible to date either poet by the other. But Anacreon's relation with Polycrates is better attested than Ibycus' connection, so that Ibycus may have been placed in Ol. 61 in order to have him precede Anacreon, who was firmly fixed just below. The higher date, on the other hand, seems to depend on the synchronism with Croesus in the *Suda's* notice of Ibycus, and this is likely to come from a reference in the poet's work.⁷² In this case, then, the reverse relation holds, and Anacreon has presumably been dated by his relation to Ibycus.

APPENDIX

An especial approach to the problem of the sojourn of Ibycus and Anacreon on Samos has recently been made by A. D. Mosshammer in his *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, Pa. 1979) 290–303. This new approach requires separate consideration.

Mosshammer reveals that, although Schoene's edition of Eusebius reports, from the Berne manuscript, that Ibycus was entered under Ol. 61 (536–533), better testimonies are now known to place him higher, in Ol. 60 or 59. This discovery, by increasing the gap between Ibycus and Anacreon in Eusebius, makes it likely that the corresponding gap in the *Suda* was of comparable length, more like the upper limit of eight years than the lower limit of one year (above, 207). It is now clearer, then, than it was that both traditions assume an interval of about two Olympiads.

He argues that Apollodorus dated Ibycus earlier than Anacreon because Ibycus had praised Polycrates' youthful beauty, while Anacreon was recognised as a companion of Polycrates (Hdt. 3.121) as well as his teacher. He accepts the *Suda's* report that Ibycus also came to Samos while Polycrates was still young enough to be under his father's guidance; but he rejects without argument, as Byzantine invention, the statement in the same source that the father "ruled" on the island. He does not, however, attempt, on this same hypothesis, to reject equally Himerius' mention, in the fourth century, of Polycrates' practice, at the direction of Anacreon and by his father's commission, of royal excellence upon the lyre. There seems no good reason to reject, on chronographic grounds, despite Mosshammer's claims, the *Suda's* testimony concerning the father's political power.

⁷²We do not know what this reference may have been, but it is possible to guess that it was an allusion such as the one made by the poet in fr. 39: 320 *PMG* to Κυάρας, "the general of the Medes," if this was taken to refer to Cyrus (and not to Cyaxares) upon his first appearance in the east as a threat to the kingdom of Lydia. That event is, of course, more than a decade too late to provide direct support for the *Suda's* date, but it might provide a synchronism with Croesus, and so, by the usual methods, an approximate date in the earliest Olympiad to which that ruler could be assigned. On the identification of Cyrus here, see Bowra (1934) 375–380 and (1961) 264. All of this merely *exempli gratia*, in answer to the question: how *could* this have happened?

But Himerius' report is likely to be based upon one of Anacreon's poems, as is agreed by Mosshammer (298), which might have been available to Apollodorus. If he knew the poem, he had reason to make Anacreon, the tutor, older than Polycrates, the pupil, and this argument coheres well with Mosshammer's conjecture (299), though it cannot prove it, that Apollodorus made Anacreon 40, but Polycrates only 25, in 533/2.

The testimony concerning Ibycus that we find in the *Suda* is very likely to depend on our surviving poem, and perhaps on other such poems. If Apollodorus found the name of the young Polycrates there, he was justified in dating Ibycus in the father's generation. But the date provided by the notice in the *Suda* is Ol. 54 (564–561), about a 30-year generation earlier than the date assigned to Polycrates. The date of Ibycus' arrival on Samos might have been reached in this way, without use of a reference in a poem to Croesus of Lydia.

Mosshammer has two possible explanations of the dating.

He finds it possible on two grounds to fix on 542/1 as Eusebius' date for Ibycus. First, it is given by one of the new readings, that of M. Secondly, he forms the hypothesis that Apollodorus made Polycrates 25 years of age in 533/2, the date of his rise to power, and calculates that he might have been 16 when it was found appropriate for him to receive from Ibycus praise of his youthful beauty. The combination would have yielded a date of 542/1 for the occasion, and this was used to determine the *akme* of the poet. He was therefore deemed to be 40 in that year, when Polycrates was 16, whereas Anacreon, who was synchronised with Polycrates, was held to have reached that age only in 533/2, the year of the tyrant's assumption of power.

Alternatively, Apollodorus may have reckoned from either of two traditions: that Ibycus composed for Polycrates when the latter was young, or that he was held to be older than Anacreon. But Polycrates and Anacreon were fixed at 533/2, synchronised with the reign of Cyrus, and it was necessary, on either argument, to put Ibycus a generation earlier, in the time of Cyrus and Croesus. This time might be fixed, for chronographic purposes, at 547/6 in Ol. 58, the year of the death of Croesus, and the sources of Eusebius therefore gave Ol. 58 (548–545), but Eusebius and Jerome made the entry too low, possibly because of crowding of entries around the fall of Sardis. The sources of the *Suda*, on the other hand, gave a different interpretation of "the time of Croesus" and reported instead the date of his accession, Ol. 54 (564–561). It is, however, a hindrance to this scheme that the accession of Croesus fell, not in Ol. 54, but in the next following Olympiad.

Mosshammer speaks also of Apollodorus' use of a "theoretical age" of 64, as well as 25 and 40, as here. Presumably, he refers, if I understand him, to Diog. Laert. 2.2, who fixes for Anaximander an *akme* of 40 years at the date of Polycrates and his death in 547/6 at the age of 64. But on this testimony, if it is to be made consistent, Polycrates is dated before 570. That seems impossible, and excision of the synchronism with Polycrates seems neces-

sary (above, 214). If that is done, Anaximander's life of 64 years has nothing to do with the Apollodoran *akme* at 533/2, and it is useless for Mosshammer's argument. Moreover, his assumption, that Apollodorus had mentioned Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Pythagoras in connection with the epoch of the fall of Sardis in 547/6, is improbable. On Apollodorus' reckoning, Pythagoras, who was 40 in 533/2, could have been no more than 26 when Sardis fell, an unlikely age for commemoration in the great chronology. But, if Pythagoras was entered at that point, Mosshammer conjectures, Apollodorus would have felt moved to add a proleptic reference to the *akme* 14 years below, with the result that, when Pythagoras' name fell out, his *akme* was transferred to Anaximander. The suggested mechanism must seem unlikely, though a confusion with Pythagoras is the most likely explanation of the erratic dating of Anaximander. If it is necessary to propose a hypothetical mechanism, Jacoby's proposal is more convincing: Anaximander was identified as the teacher of Pythagoras (Mosshammer 276).

It is Mosshammer's conclusion that the chronographic evidence is not sufficient to overthrow the authority of Herodotus, who is silent about an earlier Samian tyranny. The variant testimonies of Diogenes, Eusebius, and the *Suda* are products of those late sources that make use, each in its own way, of the Apollodoran tradition. But this conclusion appears to undervalue Himerius, and it seems equally possible, without any more liberal use of hypothesis, to reconstruct the process that led to dating Ibycus' arrival in the '60s. Whether we are to date this so early or about 15 years later, as Mosshammer prefers, positive evidence for a "tyranny" at the time is still lacking, though nothing excludes it and a powerful government seems to be implied.

A chronographic tradition, then, seems to have dated, for whatever reason, Ibycus earlier than Anacreon at an interval of about two Olympiads. There are two absolute datings, a generation apart, at ca 561/0 and ca 532 (above, 215). This duplication appears to have arisen because the poets might be dated either by Polycrates himself or by his father: Anacreon was often connected with Polycrates and Himerius seems to know a poem in which the tyrant's father figured, while Ibycus certainly composed in praise of the youthful Polycrates and may very well be the ultimate source of the *Suda's* notice concerning the father. In the event, Ibycus was dated earlier, by the father, and Anacreon later, by the son. No attempt seems to have been made to make this interval consistent with the other interval of two Olympiads, and the latter was invoked to date Anacreon by means of Ibycus and also Ibycus by means of Anacreon, thus producing the duplications of datings provided by our sources.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO