TELL ME WHAT YOU SEE: AESTHETIC RESPONSES IN HELLENISTIC POETRY

by

BRIAN URRUTIA

(Under the Direction of NAOMI J. NORMAN)

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines how poetry of the Hellenistic period represents visual images. In particular, it examines how aesthetic responses in poetry inform readers of the discussed art. Chapter one investigates the epigrams on Myron‘s Cow. There, I argue that poets tell us about Myron‘s Cow by way of short dramatic vignettes. The reported lifelikeness of Myron‘s Cow deceives its viewers and it‘s this deception which most of the poems take as their focus. The second and third chapters explore how mime poetry handles aesthetic responses. In the second chapter, I argue that Theocritus‘ *Idyll* 15 illustrates how characters display their erudition in their aesthetic response. Chapter three reads Herodas‘ *Mime* 4 as offering readers baser characters reaching for intelligent aesthetic judgments. The goal of the study is to highlight other strategies used by Hellenistic poets to describe art than mere description.

INDEX WORDS: Aesthetic Response, Hellenistic poetry, Mime, Myron‘s Cow

TELL ME WHAT YOU SEE: AESTHETIC RESPONSES IN HELLENISTIC POETRY

by

BRIAN URRUTIA

BA REED COLLEGE 2009

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2013

TELL ME WHAT YOU SEE: AESTHETIC RESPONSES IN HELLENISTIC POETRY

by

BRIAN URRUTIA

Major Professor:	Naomi J. Norman
Committee:	Mark Abbe
	Erika T. Hermanowicz

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2013

DEDICATION

patri et matri

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible with Dr. Norman, Dr. Hermanowicz, Dr. Abbe, and Caitlin Clerkin, all of whom worked with great patience at editing my prose and encouraging my ideas.

I‘d also like to thank Paul McCartney and his ability to make songs that encourage a happy and grateful outlook on life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION

This thesis analyzes the epigrams on Myron's Cow, Theocritus' *Idyll* 15, and Herodas' *Mime* 4 to examine how Hellenistic poetry discusses art and how to view it. The scenes I study depict a character in the poem confronting a piece of art and describing that art and the act of viewing it. Poetic digressions on a work of art are typically called ekphrases, and the case studies I present certainly fall within that definition. In addition, however, they use new techniques for depicting art and talking about it. In Archaic and Classical Greek poetry (eighth century BCE), ekphrases usually include a long, detailed and carefully constructed description of a work of art.[1] Such ekphrases are typical of epic poetry. In the Hellenistic period, however, they are found in more concise works of literature and in other genres. I argue that the Hellenistic period is a point of divergence in the development of ekphrases and that a new kind of ekphrasis emerges in this era. For example, I show that these Hellenistic ekphrases are characterized both by a traditional description of art and by the inclusion of the aesthetic response of the characters in the poem to that art. I chose these three case studies not only because they demonstrated that interest in aesthetic responses ranged across genres of literature, but also because they demonstrated how different poets nuance these new kind of ekphrasis.

In chapter one, I argue that the epigrams on Myron's statue of a cow are less about seeing the art and more about the art of seeing. By this, I mean that the poems draw attention to how learnedly or how foolishly the characters in the epigrams view the cow and respond to it. Before

[1] The most famous *ekphrasis* from Greek literature is the description of Achilles' shield from Homer's *Iliad* (18. 478-608)

it became a subject of poetry for multiple epigrammists, Myron's Cow was a single statue that claimed a single epigram (then called an *epitaph* written on the base of the statue). Later, the epigrams on Myron's Cow were written in sequence over time on a "page" and in so doing, radically transformed the actual experience of reading the epigram on the real statue of the cow. In the place of that experience, the later epigrams placed the image in the mind of the reader and toyed with the viewer's/reader's response. The poems take place in this virtual reality and every additional poem written becomes the "new" epigram on Myron's Cow. Thus, I argue that each poem represents a new challenge for the poet to talk about Myron's Cow. All the epigrams begin with the premise that "Myron's Cow is so real that…" and yet each explores a new ending to that sentence. Occasionally humorous in their nature, all of the epigrams create vignettes where the realism of the cow (which is technically absent from the experience) deceives readers/viewers into thinking the cow in the text is real. The epigrams use text representing a visual image to highlight the deceptive nature of the visual arts.

In chapter two, I argue that the ekphrases within Theocritus' *Idyll* 15 presents a different way to respond aesthetically to Hellenistic art. The two main characters of *Idyll* 15, Gorgo and Praxinoa, are women who venture from the domesticity of their private lives to an Alexandrian religious sanctuary for the festival of Adonis. Because the genre of mime's main concern is character development, I read *Idyll* 15 as a text that experiments with how women, in particular, respond to art. For example, from the beginning of the poem, both women express interest in embroidery; therefore, when they gush over the tapestries on display at the *Adoneia*, the poet is not simply talking about art, he is also exploring issues of gender. When Theocritus puts erudite and educated thoughts about the artwork of the *Adoneia* into the mouths of women, he moves beyond traditional ekphrasis and uses the art to delve into the inner lives of Gorgo and Praxinoa.

In chapter three, I show that Herodas‘ *Mime* 4 pushes the gendered aesthetic responses of Theocritus‘ *Idyll* 15 to more exaggerated ends. Herodean *Mime*s comprise a body literature written about base characters (often female) for a reading public made up of elite men. And so the mixing of high and low culture is always at play. *Mime* 4 is no exception. The two women in *Mime* 4, Kynno and Kokkale, do not exchange the same neat harmonizing comments about art that Gorgo and Praxinoa do. Kynno is a domineering curator of the art on display at the Asklepieion and her friend Kokkale tries to keep up with her throughout the poem. Because the Herodean world deals with characters who are far removed from the Theocritean world, the nature of those characters‘ aesthetic responses are quite different. When the two women enter the Asklepieion, Kynno chides Kokkale for not being able to read the statue of a base and therefore of not knowing who sculpted the image or who dedicated it. At one level, Kynno‘s ability to read contradicts her already established humble origins. Furthermore, when the two women look at and comment on more of the art at the Asklepieion, Kynno‘s responses to Kokkale seem all the more unusual. She at times reaches for the kind of language seen in *Idyll* 15 and at other times she speaks about the art in ways that betray her humble origin. By forcing characters to render aesthetic judgments rather than an omniscient narrating poet, Hellenistic ekphrases broaden the strategies poets use to observe art and physical objects.

My examination of these three case studies opens up the discussion of ekphrasis. I show that in Hellenistic literature ekphrasis moves beyond being just a description—albeit a detailed one—of a work of art to become a means of characterization by examining aesthetic responses to the art. My intent is to read the epigrams against more literary background. The fact that specifically gendered gazes found favor with poets, speaks to the interconnectivity of visuality with other *topoi* in the Hellenistic period. Hellenistic literature with its self-reflexive tendency

then plays with the problems of women wielding the rhetorical power to make deductions about elite pieces of art. Alexandria then gave birth to a new kind of ekphrases that, in turn, demands new questions from scholars.

CHAPTER 1

Phantom of the Cow

Close your eyes and feel it: you will no longer
encounter a form, let alone a beautiful form,
a beautiful shape… for it is ―tooike a cow and yet not a cow,"
that is to say a phantom.
-Friedrich Riedel[2]

In the last quarter of the fifth century BCE, the Athenian sculptor Myron—already then eminent for his *Discobolus*—abandoned the human form as the focus of his artistic skill in favor of a cow.[3] Myron's bronze cow (constructed ca. 420-417 BCE) stood on the Acropolis and captivated the ancient world for centuries. When Pliny the Elder described Myron and his *oeuvre* in the *Natural Histories*, he said (*HN* 34.57):

…*bucula maxime nobilitavit celebratis versibus laudata.*

…he was most famous for his cow, which was praised by some famous poems.

In five hundred years' time, not only had the cow become Myron's most celebrated artistic achievement (*bucula maxime nobilitavit*) but it had become itself the subject of epigrams which then became equally (or perhaps even more) famous.

There are two preliminary points I want to make in order to demonstrate both how remarkable these epigrams on Myron's Cow are and to frame my discussion. First, the dates for

[2] Trans. Herder (2002, p. 54) responding to Riedel (1767, p. 142)

[3] Few scholars have asked what prompted Myron's shift from human to bovine form as his artistic subject. Because Myron sculpts the cow during the Peloponnesian War, Antonio Corso (2004, p. 34) sees Myron's shift from the human to animal form as significant and ―typical for someone who does not accept the idea of humans as the measure of everything, characterizing the Periclean culture and the sophistic one." Regardless of his intention, the shift is significant and at the very least attests a new or renewed interest in the natural world.

the epigrams on Myron's Cow range from the Hellenistic period to the Byzantine period, making it the only piece of art to receive such sustained attention from poets.[4] At the very least, such persistent interest in Myron's Cow as a *topos* for poetry suggests that the epigrams became a kind of tradition unto themselves, engaging the (competitive) attention of many poets. As Goethe puts it, "the named and unnamed authors seemingly try to outdo each other in producing rhythmic pleasantries rather than address themselves seriously to the work itself."[5] In Goethe's reading, then, the real interest of a particular author may have been figuring out how to participate in this tradition on Myron's Cow while still saying something new on the subject. Thus, the second preliminary point to make is that rather than being frustrated by this pattern, as Goethe was, I propose to change the terms of analysis to focus more on what the authors say about Myron's Cow rather than what they neglect to say. What I find particularly striking and will discuss is how the epigrams negotiate the issues of visual representation, especially its potential to deceive.

Goethe's remark, coupled with the placement of the epigrams within the *Greek Anthology,* shows that for both ancient and modern readers these epigrams are not mere *descriptio* teeming with the vividity that gives one the urge to draw the described work. Indeed, in the *Anthology*, thirty-six of the epigrams appear in the last half of the ninth book of the *Anthology*, which includes mostly "declamatory and descriptive" epigrams. Because so many of these epigrams focus on a piece of artwork, they are known popularly as "ekphrastic epigrams." Unlike the other ekphrastic epigrams, which include *descriptio*, the epigrams on Myron's Cow never actually describe what the cow looks like; these epigrams clearly belong to a different kind

[4] As Simon Goldhill (2007, p. 3) puts it, "it's hard to think of any other work of art that is treated by such a coherent and extensive body of poetry by different hands."
[5] Goethe (1811, 2.9-10)

of ekphrasis all together. For example, consider this segment of one of Philippus' epigrams on a bronze horse by Lysippus: the poet states, "Fierce is his glance as he arches his neck and shakes out his wind-tossed mane for the course (*AP* 9. 777)."[6] Philippus' description is the classically vivid ekphrasis readers have come to expect when they hear that rhetorical term invoked. Visualizing the statue is not difficult. The arch of the neck and wind-tossed mane both work together to clearly convey the idea that this statue has dynamism, movement, aggression and ferocity. Recall, for example, the bronze Jockey of Artemision (ca. 140 BCE), which so clearly captures the sense of motion. Now let us contrast that description with the first epigram in the sequence on Myron's Cow (*AP* 9. 713):

βνίδηόλ εἰκη Μῦξσ λνο, ἐπὶ ζηήι ε ο δ' ἀλάθεηκαη.
βνπθόι ε, θελῃήζ αο εἰο ἀγέι ε λ κ' ἄπαγε.

I'm Myron's little cow, laid upon a base.
Lead me away, herdsman, and take me off to the herd.

Aside from the diminutive form of βνῦο, this epigram exhibits nothing like the *descriptio* above. Whereas the poem about Lysippus' statue gives us enough evidence to envision what this statue looks like, the anonymous epigram on Myron's Cow simply tells us that the cow sits on a base (ζηήι ε). In fact, to acknowledge the ζηήι ε is to acknowledge, unambiguously, that the cow is a statue. Such a conceit contrasts with the technique employed in the poem on Lysippus' statue. There, the project of the poem is to blur the line between a real horse and a statue of horse by way of a vivid description. Here, the poet almost immediately acknowledges the cow's base—ζηήι ε is the fifth word—and in doing so, draws our attention to a quality that can only characterize it as art. As far as what this cow might look like, we can only guess. The eye of the poet is far more concerned with the world that Myron's Cow inhabits. This particular epigram—

[6] Trans. W. R. Paton

like many others in the sequence—is addressed to a herdsman (βνπθόι νο), and is spoken from the point of view of the statue itself (βνίδηόλ εἰκη Μῦξσ λνο), which actually commands the reader of the poem to interact physically with the statue (θελῃήζα ο εἰο ἀγέιελ κ᾽ ἄ παγε). All of these facets of the poem imbue the couplet with a sense of drama, which is completely absent from other ―declamatory" poems in the Greek Anthology. We are left to ask ourselves if we should believe a talking cow.

The epigrams on Myron's Cow are not subtle and discrete invitations for readers to imagine the act of seeing art. Rather they are a series of demands placed upon readers to develop the art of seeing. By creating an imagined world in which Myron's statue of a cow speaks to herdsmen, Myron, other cows, strangers, and readers of the epigrams, the epigrams thematize and problematize the act of visual interpretation. What does it mean to mistake a statue for a real cow? How should the reader feel about Myron, the one who created such a deceptive piece of art? Do these epigrams privilege verbal over visual representation or vice versa?

The goal of this chapter is twofold: to define and carry out a satisfactory approach for the study of the collection of poems on Myron's Cow. Thus, I begin by outlining the basic formal qualities of the sequence that ought to raise new questions by scholars. Two of the most helpful scholars working on the epigrams and asking new questions are Simon Goldhill and Michael Squire. Both suggest that the sequence explores ―tropes of verisimilitude."[7] Although I use their models, I draw out a different line of argument that emphasizes visual representation. In addition, I argue that these epigrams are less about seeing art and more about the art of seeing.

[7] See Goldhill (2007) for the first use of his ―tropes of verisimilitude" and Squire (2010) exploration of that term.

There is no question that the epigrams are concerned with the ontology of art and the difficulty of capturing materiality in text. The overall effect, however, is more intelligible if we ground the discussion in terms of visual representation and how these epigrams constantly toy with the reliability of sight. Is seeing really believing?

Questions of Authorship and Chronology

As I mentioned above, the sequence of Myron's Cow occurs in the ninth book of *The Greek Anthology*. There, the epigrams number thirty-six, but with the recent discovery of the new Posidippus papyrus, we now have thirty-seven epigrams, twelve of which are labeled "anonymi epigrammatic." Of the authored epigrams, eight are ascribed to Julian, the Prefect of Egypt, six to Antipater, two to Anacreon, two to Euenus, and one each to Leonidas, Demetrius, Marcus Argentarius, Dioscorides, Philip, and Geminus.[8] According to Squire's reading, the issue of authorship quickly was less important than the content of the epigrams and effect of arranging them in some sequence.[9] As Squire points out, in the fourth century CE, the editors of the *Anthology* make no reference to the authors of the Greek originals.[10] To Squire, that the names of the authors are left out of the collection once it is anthologized suggests that, from early on, "significance evidently lay in the collective content of the poems, not in the individual poets to which each one may have been associated."[11] Thus, for methodological purposes the authors of the sequence serve merely as touchstones for chronology and are not a significant factor in his analysis of the content. For instance, it is clear that the authors span several centuries, from Leonidas in the Hellenistic period to Julian, a sixth century CE Prefect of Egypt. Like Squire, I

[8] For references to scholarship on each author of the epigrams see the list in Squire (2010, pp. 596-597).
[9] *Ibid*, p. 598.
[10] The most extensive work done on this is Cameron (1993).
[11] Squire (2010, p.597)

am not overly concerned with chronology or authorial style and context; rather, my emphasis on the poems is their shared language and concerns when writing about Myron's Cow.

Kathryn Gutzwiller has recently argued that an overlooked chronology is the one that the collection makes up itself.[12] That is to say that when we read the poems in their anthologized form, the first poem acts as a kind of original or perhaps even programmatic poem for the subsequent additions. Consider the first epigram in the sequence *AP* 9. 713 (see above) and the second, *AP* 9.714, both of which are anonymous:

ηίπηε, Μύξσλ, κὲ ηὸ βνίδηνλ ἐλαπζνῖ παξὰ βσκνῖο
ἕζηαζαο; νὐθ ἐζέι εηοεἰζαγέκελ κέγαξνλ;

Myron, why did you set me, a little cow, here by the altars?
Won't you lead me into the house?

Like Gutzwiller, I am not convinced that discovering who wrote the earliest epigram could serve as a hermeneutic key; rather, I am struck by the pattern that has already emerged in the first two poems in the sequence. Not only does the cow speak for itself in both, but we have the repeated use of the diminutive form βνίδηνλ. Additionally, the poet uses a compounded form of the verb of ἄγσ to describe the action to be done to the cow. Note that in both instances this cow does not want to be a work of art; it wants to be real cow, and real cows are driven / lead (ἄγσ in the passive sense). This point may seem small, but because the form of epigram is so condensed, the repetition of words and themes takes on greater significance. It also supports the notion that the sequence and act of writing on Myron's Cow cultivated a tradition in which poets share vocabulary as they rework the common theme of how real Myron's Cow looks.[13] There certainly was a real chronology to the poems, but as that is difficult and perhaps impossible to

[12] Gutzwiller (1998, pp. 244-246)
[13] Consider how in the first epigram the mood of compounded form of ἄγσ is in the imperative whereas the second epigram is actually comprised of two questions. Both a command and a question cause the reader of the epigram to entertain the idea of interacting with a statue.

prove, the more important chronology could be this pseudo-chronology set up by the of editors of the epigrams and the editors of *Greek Anthology*. As illustrated by these first two epigrams, reading the collection as a serial publication better situates us to answer questions regarding themes that run throughout the collection. Consequently, the sequence constantly forces readers to renegotiate the limits and effects of visual and verbal representation.

Poetics of Representation

Simon Goldhill argues that the epigrams work by –offering tropes of verisimilitude," that they toy with the language of art history to achieve this. Consider these two epigrams by Euenus (*AP* 9. 717, 718 trans. Goldhill):[14]

ἢ ηὸ δέξαο ράι θεηνλ ἄ νλ βνὶ ηᾷδ᾽ ἐπίθεηηαη
ἔθηνζελ, ἢ ς πρὴλ ἔλδνλ ὁ ραι θὸο ἔρεη.

Either a complete bronze hide lies on this cow
On the outside, or the bronze has a soul in it.

αὐηὸο ἐμεῖηάρα ηνῦην Μύξσ λ —Θθ ἔπι αζ α ηαύηαλ
ηὰλ δάκαι ηλ,ηαύηαο δ᾽ εἰθόλ᾽ ἀλεπι αζά κε λ."

Perhaps Myron himself will say this: –I did not fashion
this heifer, but I fashioned the image of her."

For Goldhill, both these epigrams play with the –inside/outside game around bronze casting." Goldhill's main project is to relate these epigrams to the highly intellectualized Hellenistic tradition epitomized, for example, in Antipater of Sidon's epigrams that contain riddling rebus-like signs.[15] In the epigrams on Myron's Cow, however, the notion of a –game" being played between the readers and the poet is more difficult to substantiate. There is no real riddle here for

[14] Goldhill (2007,p. 16)
[15] For more on Goldhill's treatment of Antipater as well as other authors of Hellenistic epigram, see his now classic chapter in *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture (*1994, pp. 201-223).

the readers to solve. In fact, these poems represent possible answers to the implied riddle –How does this cow look so lifelike?" Regardless of their different answers, the poems alert the reader to the deceptive pitfall of believing the cow is real. For instance, in the second epigram, it is Myron who is deceived by his own art, not the reader. Indeed, because the reader is a reader of Euneus' epigram, he knows that the cow is a statue. In some sense then, the poet and the reader become greater experts on Myron's Cow than Myron himself, its creator. This epigram is better read as indicating the extent to which the deceptive nature of Myron's Cow is explored, even as far as to fool its own creator.

One effect of verisimilitude that the poems explore at length is this theme of deception. Consider the epigrams discussed above, all of which to some degree explore the idea that the statue looks so real that it must be a real cow. In order for the poets to dramatize that moment of mistaking the statue for the cow, a character in the brief epigram must be deceived. As mentioned earlier, the character types depicted in the poems are vast, ranging from a stranger who stumbles upon the epigram to a small calf who stumbles upon the cow. A clever parallelism emerges here: just like the calf mistakes the bronze cow for a real cow, so too may the reader mistake this poem in the anthology for an actual epigram on the statue. Even though we read these epigrams as anthologized poems, they all pretend to be *the* epigram on Myron's actual statue, demonstrating the multiple levels of deception on which the epigrams work.

Consider the effect of the verisimilitude on the character of the calf and how deception ties into the drama of the epigram in *AP* 9. 733:

> ηὰλ βνῦλ ηάλδε Μύξσ λ, μεῖλ', ἔπι αζε λ, ἃλ ὅδε κόζρν ο
> ὡο δῶζ αλ ζα ίλεῃ καηέξα δεξθόκελνο.
>
> Myron forged this cow, Stranger, which this small calf
> disturbs as if it were living, seeing clearly its mother.

Much like other poems in the series, this anonymous poet gives us a number of characters, thereby creating a hierarchical system of viewership, in which some viewers realize the cow is a statue and others do not. At first, the cast seems to include the cow, Myron, the calf and the stranger. The line position of certain characters suggests what role they serve in the poem. First, the poet mentions the cow and Myron, both of who ultimately are deceivers. Secondly, we have the victims of that deception, the stranger and calf. Thus, atop this group of viewers sits the deceivers while the deceived occupy the lower ranks of the hierarchy. The hierarchy gets further complicated, however, if we consider the poet. After all, it is the poet who has the authority to literally point out—note the deictic pronouns—that this cow (ἠὰλ βνῦλ ἡάλδε) is a statue. The poet has the knowledge that enables him both not to be deceived like the calf and to clarify to the stranger which is the real animal (the calf) and which is the product of Myron. Thus, he assumes the highest position in the hierarchy of viewers, a position of authority.

An ability to explain the complexity of the situation to the stranger fits nicely with Goldhill's model of a ―poet as seeing subject." In this model, the poet displays the critical gaze of an art historian.[16] In accounting for the lifelikeness (ὡο δῶζαλ) of Myron's Cow, the poet uses language shared with the mimes of the Hellenistic period, specifically with Theocritus' *Idyll* 15 and Herodas' *Mime 4.*[17] In those instances, we have women admiring the lifelikeness of a series of famous sculptures in religious festivals and temples. Zanker, in *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry*, demonstrates that literature in Alexandria expressed great interest in the vividness

[16] Goldhill (1994, p. 205): Hellenistic culture is where ―art history" as a discipline first develops—with implications for the relations between a viewer and art. It is where museum and the collection start to become the privileged space for viewing,and it is where the ―professional viewer" and exegete develop as a caste.

[17] Many scholars have noted this point of resonance, most importantly Goldhill (1994, pp. 216-23), Burton (1995, pp. 93-122), Zanker (2006), DuBois (2007, pp. 47-45), and Squire (2010a, pp. 601).

(*enargeia*) or pictorial realism of the era in contrast to the idealized forms of the Classical period.[18] In this epigram on Myron's Cow, however, lifelikeness is not just a rhetorical concept, but becomes a tool of deception. The phrase ―tool of deception" seems appropriate here because the poets often characterize Myron as a liar—later the word ς εύδσ is repeatedly attributed to him. In order to heighten the sense of deception—and perhaps to add some comedy—the poet of epigram 733 describes the calf's action with words of high poetic ancestry.

A good example of this kind of diction is δεξθόκελνο in the second line of the epigram which was a favorite of Aeschylus, notably in the early lines of the *Eumenides*.[19] There, the Pythia uses it to describe the calamitous events of the preceding plays (ῆ δεηὰ ι έμαη, δεηὰ δ' ὀθζ αι κνῖο δξαθεῖλ Ae. *Eu.* 34). The word has the specific meaning of ―seeing clearly" or, specifically, ―having sharp sight." And so, through a turn of acute irony, the poet describes the calf as ―seeing clearly" although the reader knows this not the case. It is the stranger who ―sees clearly," but only because the poet tells him (and us) that the cow is merely ὠο δῶζ αλ. Again, the poet has created a hierarchical system in which some characters—reader/stranger—know that ―Myron forged this cow" while the calf mistakenly believed that it sees its mother. The effect is that the ironic play elevates, not just the poet—as Goldhill's model suggests—, but also the reader to the status of *sophos theates* because the reader is not deceived like the calf. Thus the poet builds a relationship with the reader in which they share privileged knowledge regarding the verisimilitude of Myron's Cow.[20]

[18] Zanker (1987, pp. 35-50)
[19] Sophocles also uses the word at *OT. 454* in Teiresias' description of himself as a blind man who can see.
[20] See Goldhill (1994) for more on Hellenistic poet as *sophos theates*. Here, Goldhill reserves the title for the poet alone.

The characterization of Myron as a deceitful artist becomes less subtle elsewhere in the series. Dioscorides writes in the next epigram (*AP* 9.734):

> ηωῦξε, κάηελ ἐπὶ κόζρνλ ἐπείγεαη: ἔζηη γὰξ ἄπλνπο.
> ἀι ι ὰ ζ᾽ ὁ βνπ πι άζηαο ἐμαπάηεζε Μύ ξσ λ.
>
> Bull, you hurry up to this calf in vain, for it is lifeless.
> Myron, that cowmodeller cheated you.

Here, we have a similar scenario played out: Myron's Cow looks so lifelike that bulls approach it. Note that Myron himself is seldom left out of the epigrams. Even though the poem is no doubt about the sculpted cow, Myron often occupies a nominative case and in doing so, carries out the action of the verb. One effect of this is that the poems always cast Myron as a kind of victimizer and the cow as a kind of victim. Previously I discussed how the cow desperately does not want to be a work of art and how Myron dragged the cow from the field. Here, Dioscorides makes a point to bring Myron into the story and to cast him into the role of deceiving the bull. This strongly suggests that the poets may have an antipathy for material representation and its deceptive nature.

Dioscorides further complicates the characterization of Myron by giving him the epithet of "cowmodeller" (βνππι άζηαο). This is the only attested use of βνππι άζηαο and so we can assume that Dioscorides created the compound precisely for this instance. The compound word derives from βνῦο and πι άζηεο. The word πι άζηεο has the specific meaning of modeler—as opposed to πνηεήο, which simply means any kind of "maker"—and is often used by Plato when he talks about a "cunning modeler" (δεηλνο πι άζηεο Pl. *Rep.* 588d). This usage complements Goldhill's suggestion that these poems toy with the technical language of art history. Dioscorides, however, associates that term with its own unique kind of deception. The noun form also comes from the verb πι άζζσ , which epigram 733 used to describe Myron's process of

actually forging the cow. In contrast to epigram 733, Dioscorides has reserved the indicative verb to add another layer of characterization to Myron. Here, Myron carries out the action of ~~-c~~heating" or ~~-b~~eguiling" the young calf (ἐμαπάηεζε). There is additional irony here because, unlike the lifelikeness emphasized in epigram (717-8), the explanatory γὰξ clarifies that the cow is, in fact, ἄπλνπο, ~~-li~~feless." Not only does he model cows, but Myron himself ~~-c~~heats you" (ζε). The ζε has the playful double meaning of referring both to the vocative ~~-b~~ull" (ηαῦξε), and also to the reader of the poem. Here again, the poet aligns himself with the reader—oddly with the bull as well—against Myron, cheater and fraud.

Julian, Prefect of Egypt, composed eight epigrams on the cow. He emphasizes the deceptiveness of Myron by introducing a thief as a character (*AP* 9.796):

> Πι άζηα Μύξσ λ, ζέν π όξηηλ όδνηπόξνο ἦι ζελ ἐι άζζσ λ
> ραι θνῦ δὲ ς αύζα ο, θὼξ θελὸο ἐμεθ άλε:
>
> Sculptor Myron, a wayfarer came intending to drive off your cow,
> and touching the bronze, was revealed to be a futile thief.

Rather than emphasizing sight, as in other epigrams, Julian's thief is deceived until the moment of touch. Because Julian initially calls him a ~~-w~~ayfarer," he seems to imply that Myron's Cow revealed his true identity. It is only once he touches (ςαύζ αο) the bronze that the wayfarer (όδνηπόξνο) is revealed to be a thief (θὼξ).

This mention of the sense of touch exposes another favorite trope in the epigrams, that they were said to have accompanied the actual artwork. Prior to the Hellenistic period, which saw for the first time whole anthologies of ekphrastic epigrams, reading an epigram would have accompanied seeing and touching the actual statue of the cow. By contrast, if you asked someone from the Classical period if he had read the epigram about Myron's Cow, he would have assumed that you meant the actual epigram written on the statue. Because epigrams

circulate as anthologies on a scroll, however, the act of touching the real statue is no longer a likely possibility. In the Hellenistic period, probably the most common way for one to experience Myron's Cow was through reading these epigrams, and not seeing the actual statue. In these epigrams, that reality of physically experiencing Myron's Cow becomes virtual or imagined. For the reader of the epigrams, it is only through *reading* about Myron's Cow—not seeing it nor, like the thief, touching it—that we realize the cow is a fake. Essentially, another hierarchy emerges in which reading poetry about the cow becomes less deceptive than seeing the cow.

The seeing/touching dichotomy becomes a favorite trope of Julian's (*AP* 9.738):

> ἐλ βνὶ ηᾷδ' ἐκάρνλην Φύζηοθαὶ πόηληαΤέρλα:
> ἀκθνηέξαηοδὲ Μύξσ λ ἶζνλ ὅπαζζε γέξαο:
> δεξθνκέλνηοκὲλ γὰξ Φύζ ηνοθξάηνο ἥξπαζε Τέρλα:
> αὐηάξ ἐθ απηνκέλνηοή Φύζηοἐζηὶ θύζηα

> Nature and august Art fought in the case of this cow:
> and Myron awarded both a prize equal in value:
> For when you look closely, Art snatches away the strength of Nature:
> but when you touch it, Nature is nature.

This epigram—twice the length of the normal couplets—brings up a number of interesting elements that points to the agonistic nature of these epigrams. Immediately, we are told that *Phusis* and august *Technē* have fought it out (ἐκάρνλην) over this cow.[21] The idea of *Phusis* and *Technē* opposing one another in the matter of artistic representation becomes *de regueir* in the Imperial period, as is seen in the ekphrasis of the preface to *Daphnus and Chloe* (1.1). Thus, we can see this epigram participating in a sophisticated and intellectualized cultural debate regarding the respective powers of *phusis* and *technē*. Julian links their powers here to another powerful

[21] Elizabeth Steiner's *Images in Mind* (2001, pp.74-120) pursues this touching/seeing dichotomy in the Archaic and Classical period.

dichotomy in representative rhetoric, that of seeing/touching. Note that the word for seeing (δεξθνκέλνηθ) harkens back to the kind of seeing that the young calf performs in *AP* 9.733. Just as with the young calf, seeing has the tendency to deceive one into thinking that the cow is real. In fact, Julian goes so far as to say that the act of looking closely at the cow—of course impossible for the reader of the poem—robs nature of her natural strength (θξάηνο). The ―strength of Nature" suggests that, for Julian, there is indeed another hierarchy atop which Nature sits. That hierarchy is not so clear until one uses the sense of touch. This fact, contained in the last line, points to the difficulty of representing seeing in words, as touch is a sense only imagined in the poems.

First, we must supply the cow as the accusative object of the touch, which again draws attention to the virtual reality that epigram embodies. Secondly, the dictum ―nature is nature" is not entirely clear on its own. Taken closely with the participle touching (ἐθαπηνκέλνηθ), it seems that Julian is implying that touching the cow reveals that it is indeed made of bronze. Touching the cow also reveals that the fight between *Phusis* and *Technē* that took place on the *inside* of the cow (ἐλ βνὶ ηᾧδ') can be resolved by the cow's *outside* feel. Here, we have Julian crystallizing an earlier hierarchy in which simply seeing the statue is the most deceptive way to think about Myron's Cow. An earlier epigram in the anthology may shed light on how the *phusis/technē* dichotomy closely relates to the outside/inside dichotomy.

Unlike Julian, Euenus makes clear what is at stake in the inside/outside dichotomy. Because the cow does looik real, art potentially has endowed this cow with a soul on the inside. As Goldhilll notes, this is the lure of realism, is a trope that goes back to Xenophon's *Memorabilia.*[22] In Xenephon's work, the point is that a soul (ς πρὴ) cannot be seen and so artists

[22] Goldhill (2007, p. 16)

cannot represent this invisible entity as visible. Myron's Cow, however, poses an interesting problem by way of possibly hiding, or perhaps trapping, the soul on the inside of the statue. Since we cannot see what is on the inside, we must learn that internal truth by way of touching the outside, which we know to be bronze. Thus, the art of seeing has come to rely on other senses. Confusingly, the art of seeing can only be explicated by reading about touching.

Conclusions

In this chapter I have drawn out two lines of argument. First, we needed to reconsider some of the basic ideas about Myron's Cow. By understanding the strange kind of ekphrasis featured in the epigrams, which focus less on *descriptio* and more on the problematics of visual representation, we understand the need to bring a new set of questions to bear on the poems. I began by considering Goldhill's and Squire's models that emphasize how these poems explore ~~"t~~ropes of verisimilitude." The authors of the epigrams, however, often negotiate these tropes in terms of visual representation and so we considered how these epigrams developed the reader's art of seeing. What does it mean to see the image of Myron's Cow if these epigrams are anthologized text?

My second point was to answer this question by developing what it meant to have an art of seeing. One answer to this question was that readers of these epigrams can and should be highly suspicious of seeing the visual arts in the first place. The most popular way the epigrams engage the reader in developing the art of seeing is to dramatize the moment when a calf, shepherd, or Myron himself mistakes the statue as a real cow. Hierarchies of viewership then emerged. Often times, the epigrams read like dramas in which the reader alone knows the cow is a statue and that Myron is ultimately a deceptive artist. In other epigrams, we saw how this characterization of Myron as deceiver informed how the poems talked more generally about art

and the senses by which art is experienced. By grounding our discussion in terms of verbal representation of visual images, we explored the more theoretical question that these epigrams ask, namely how does verbal representation capture and subsume a visual image.

I began with a contrast between the first epigram on Myron‘s Cow and a more standard ekphrasis on Lysippus‘ statue, but I never considered what such a contrast might mean. In my subsequent analysis, it quickly became clear that the epigrams on Myron‘s Cow always contain content from both the high and low register: the use of Aeschylean vocabulary to describe a foolish calf, the recurring motif of a talking cow that unwillingly has been made a statue, or the many invocations of the readers to interact with the statue (despite that invocation coming from a poem). These moments, indeed, are what make these epigrams so remarkable, but they also suggest that the epigrams represent a counter, perhaps satirical, voice to the more serious and conventional ekphrasis like that on Lysippus‘ horse. To develop the idea that there are two types of ekphrases written during the Hellenistic period, the next two chapters will compare two mimes which seemingly mirror each other in content but differ in form: Theocritus‘ *15th Idyll* and Herodas‘ fourth *Mime*. The formal differences between these two mimes will demonstrate that Herodas lampoons the serious hexametric ekphrasis featured in Theocritus‘ *15th Idyll,* much in same the way that the collection on Myron‘s Cow toys with the conventional ekphrasis found elsewhere in the *Greek Anthology.*

CHAPTER 2

Two Women Walk Into a Sanctuary…

In the last chapter, I demonstrated that the epigrams on Myron‘s Cow are not epigrams that explore seeing art, but rather the art of seeing. The difference here lies in the subject of the poetry and the nature of the ekphrases. Instead describing Myron‘s Cow itself, the poets concern themselves much more with describing the effects that Myron‘s Cow has on its viewers (i.e., an aesthetic response). One of the most popular *topoi* explored was that of deception. In particular, I looked at how involving a number of different imagined viewers evaluating art quickly generated strange and peculiar dramas: Myron himself forgetting his cow is a statue, a talking bronze cow cursing Myron, and the poor calf who mistakes the statue‘s teat for its mother‘s. Thus, one of the characteristic features of the ekphrases on Myron‘s Cow is that the poets explore notions of viewing and connoisseurship as a poem‘s central theme, as its *raison d'art*.

In the third century CE, art connoisseurship features as the theme of two mimes by Theocritus and Herodas. In both mimes, women attend a religious event and marvel at the artwork on display. At a cursory glance, the two poems seem obviously similar because of their shared interest in gender issues, the eclectic and eccentric religiosity of the Hellenistic period, and the art of seeing. Upon closer examination, however, the poems bear remarkable formal differences: the religious festivals, the meter and dialect of the poems, and the natures of the described art, as well as the resulting banter about the artwork all differ. Because of the poems‘ ambivalent relation to one another, scholars often analyze the two poems in tandem. Such an

approach has been particularly well suited to tease out the dynamism of gender and religious issues.[23] I am interested in exploring the differences in aesthetic response. Because the two poems have such a nuanced relationship to each other, *Idyll* 15 and *Mime* 4 help us see how the poets of the Hellenistic period negotiate the limits and effects of verbally representing visual images.

In this chapter, I analyze how Theocritus' *Idyll* 15 thematizes seeing art rather like the epigrams on Myron's Cow did. Will deception again play a key role in creating a scene? Or, does the extended form of mime allow for characters to be depicted as erudite critics? Will such characters be cast in a positive or negative light? And why does the form of mime lend itself as appropriate ground for negotiating these ideas? To answer these questions, my analysis falls into two parts: First, I highlight how the form of the mime (which exists as a written text) implies an actual performance. Mime poetry's imagined viewing of a performance neatly parallels the virtual reality of Myron's Cow that the epigrams explore. Thus I argue that we should read *Idyll* 15 as a text experimenting with different ways of visualizing images—sometimes with visual verbs and particles and at other times through intertexts and appeals to the language of art criticism. This experiment becomes particularly interesting if we also consider mime's generic concern with development of character (e.g. Gorgo and Praxinoa of *Idyll* 15). In the second part of my analysis, I argue that, like the ancients themselves, we believe that *Idyll* 15 shares mime's generic interest in character development. Scholars have already pointed out how the characters in mime exhibit points of contact with other cultural issues in Alexandria—patronage, gender roles, and religious issues. I offer a character analysis that moves beyond this view and places

[23] Burton (1995, pp. 93-123), Zanker (2004), Hunter (2004)

their interest in viewing at the foreground. Thus, Gorgo and Praxinoa represent different ways to approaching viewing in a text.

So, what is a mime poem, anyway?

Theocritus' *Idyll* 15 and Herodas' *Mime* 4 are both part of the third century BCE revival and development of the mime: a revival because writers of the fifth century like Sophron of Syracuse[24] wrote mimes in a rhythmic prose; a development because Herodas and Theocritus are among the first to write mimes in verse, which fundamentally changes the nature and effect of the poetry. One feature of Sophron's mimes that Theocritus and Herodas adopt is an attention to gender. *Idyll* 15 and *Mime* 4 are both about two women, accompanied by a mute slave, who walk into a religious setting and gawk at the opulent works of art there. Even in antiquity, the scholia noted Sophron's influence on Theocritus, especially in *Idyll* 15 as well as *Idyll* 2.[25] More obvious than the Hellenistic poet's debts, however, is the visible (and audible) point of divergence and development: Herodas and Theocritus write in verse.

When Herodas and Theocritus began writing their mimes in verse, they opened up new avenues for fifth century poetry to influence their own work. A scene in which religious adornments awe female viewers has its roots in the fifth century, as in the parodos of Euripides' *Ion* when Athenian *parthenoi* visit the Temple at Delphi (Eur. *Ion* 193-224). There, the women exclaim (193-197, trans. Zeitlin):

---

[24] Because Theocritus, too, comes from Syracuse, some scholars have taken his interest in mime as reflective of his literary and ethnic heritage, which reflects a sense of internationalism and mobility. See Hunter (1999, pp. 10-18) and Burton (1995, pp. 8-10).

[25] For more on their similarities in dialect morphology see Gow (1952, pp. 33-35, 265-266), Hunter (1996 pp. 116-123), and Burton (1995, pp. 8-14). The scholia also suggest that Theocritus may have modeled (παξέπι αζε) *Idyll* 15 after Sophron's "The Women at the Isthmian Festival."

Χορός
— ούκ έν ταῖς ζαθέαις Ἀθά-
ναις εύκίονες ἦσαν αύ-
λαὶ θεῶν μόνον, ούδ᾽ ἀγυι-
άτιδες θεραπεῖαι:
ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ Λοξίᾳ
τῷ Λατοῦς διδύμων προσώ-
πων καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς.
— ἰδοὺ τάνδ᾽, ἄθρησον,
Λερναῖον ὕδραν έναίρει
χρυσέαις ἅρπαις ὸ Διὸς παῖς:
φίλα, πρόσιδ᾽ ὅσσοις.

Chorus
Not only in holy Athens after all
Are there courts of the gods
With Fair columns, and herms to watch the street.
Here too by Loxias, son of Leto,
Is the beautiful-eyed radiance of twin facades.

Euripides, however, does not use the opulence and art of Delphi to explore how viewing art informs his character's development. As Zeitlin has shown, the art, rather, ―serves as a means to bridge the distance between Delphi and Athens in what will prove to be a wholly Athenian drama."[26] The clear purpose of this ekphrasis is to adumbrate the larger plot points of the *Ion,* a tragedy concerned with the difficult process Ion has in figuring out his relation to Delphi and Athens. The plot of the play subsequently moves the setting to Athens, and the *parthenoi* never reappear on stage. In fact, the brief ekphrasis accounts for a mere 31 lines of the play. The discussion of the religious artwork is not the *raison d'etre* of the scene.

How, then, does the mime form change the focus of the poetry? What we can adduce from what little we know about Sophron is that his main interest was in the development of

[26] Zeitlin's (1994) ―Ecphrasis and Spectacle Euripides" in the Osborne and Goldhill *Art and Text in Ancient Greece* also considers similar ekphrases in other Euripidean tragedies (e.g. *Iphigenia in Aulis* and *Phoenissae*). Though not mentioned in her study, Euripides' tragedy *Electra* also features another fascinating ekphrasis on Achilles' armor that recounts his journey to Troy. As Burton (1995, p. 95) points out, ―Euripides anticipates the Hellenistic practice of using ekphrases to enrich psychological characterizations."

character (*ēthopoiia*).[27] The titles of Sophron's mimes suggest plots based around simple people: "The Fisherman and the Countryman," "The Women at the Festival," and "The Tuna-Fisherman." Such an interest in the mundane and ordinary figures of society squares nicely with the characters of *Idyll* 15 and *Mime* 4. In these two poems, Theocritus' Praxinoa and Gorgo and Herodas' Kokkale and Kynno belong to the lower ranks of society. When Herodas and Theocritus adapt the mime form into verse, scenes from works of poetry like Euripides' *Ion* are able to exert a more obvious influence. Whereas Euripides allowed for only a single scene of women viewing art as a digression in his thousand-line tragedy, Theocritus and Herodas can center their poetry on this *topos*. Moreover, the baser origins of mime poetry's characters present a bottom-to-top reading when they respond to pieces of art. Epic literature hosts many scenes of elite men viewing art; in these mimes, however, our characters are women from the urban life.

Although Theocritus' *Idyll* 15 is only 145 lines long, much in those lines is devoted to the two women imploring each other to look and see dresses, notional works of art, as well as the crowds of Alexandria. These particular mime poems become an admixture of high and low society—non-elite women beholding elite works of art—and, in doing so, both display that Alexndrian irony we associate with the literature but also allow us to see a different social stratum and gender interact with art. The thinking here is that members of the *petite bourgeoisie* will exhibit a significantly different kind of aesthetic response than will characters of epic poetry where elite men confront art.

[27] Some believe that Plato admired Sophron's development of character and used the fifth century mime as inspiration for his Socratic dialogues (Hunter 1996, p. 11). See also A. S. Riginos (1976), *Platonica. The anecdotes concerning the life and writings of Plato.*

Questions about the presentation of these poems are myriad: Were they only meant to be read privately or performed publically? Were they performed solo or by an ensemble of actors? Where were they performed? For our purpose, the most germane question is whether the poems were read privately or performed publically. Possible answers to this question have always been highly speculative.[28] There is something about mime poetry that resists easy classification. After all, in manuscript form mimes look rather like the poetry of the stage, with its multiple speaking characters.[29] Yet elsewhere in the Theocritean corpus, especially *Idyll* 1 and 8, we see such overt literary conceits that it is clear that there is a reading public. The question as to how these mimes were presented may well have two answers: read (imagined as performed) and genuinely performed.

As Hunter, who most recently tackled the question, puts it, "[the] poems [are] composed for the most part in a mode which strongly *suggests*, and was intended to suggest, performance by more than one actor, rather than solo recitation."[30] Given these details, what is clear is the suggestive nature of mime poetry's form. Therefore we do well to consider this matter another of the characteristic features of mimes: they are simultaneously and consciously a visual performance, audible narrative, and a readable text.

The Poem

[28] Mastromarco's *The Public of Herondas* (1984 Amsterdam) was the first attempt to answer the question regarding mime poetry's presentation in a systematic way. His book gives a detailed account on the history of this debate. Mastromarco concludes that it is not possible on internal grounds to definitively say that the poems are genuinely dramatic texts.

[29] Not to mention that, as far as our evidence suggests, other than the comedies of Menander, poetry of the third century becomes less popular in favor of more philosophical prose writings. It is curious, also, that much of this third century philosophical writing took aesthetic reception as its topic (Burton 1995, p. 93; Hunter 2004, p. x-xi).

[30] Hunter (1993, p. 32)

When analyzing *Idyll* 15's interest in seeing art, most scholars begin with the moment that Praxinoa and Gorgo enter the palace and begin admiring the artwork, a moment that happens some eighty lines into the poem.[31] To start here, however, is to leave unexplored the rich character development of Praxinoa and Gorgo that the beginning of the poem offers. Therefore, I stress mime's important generic interest in character and argue that Praxinoa and Gorgo are characters interested in the process of seeing and viewing images right from the beginning of the poem.

If we ground our reading of *Idyll* 15 in the development of character (*ēthopoiia)*, then we see that Gorgo and Praxinoa are women of moderate means (not meager) who have the day to themselves. Their choice to attend the *Adoneia*, a private festival that parades around statues and other visually arresting objects, indicates that they share an interest in seeing spectacle. The two Syracusean (like Theocritus) women meet in Alexandria at the house of Praxinoa and intend to go out and ~~s~~ee the *Adoneia*/ In rich King Ptolemy's palace." Much of their early dialogue (1-19) consists of their complaints about their husbands, who waste money on the wrong groceries, and about housing that is more a ~~h~~ovel" than a home. It has, perhaps, always been too easy to see Gorgo and Praxinoa as simply disgruntled housewives created for merely comedic purposes whose complaints about their husbands have little substance. It seems that once scholars gloss their characters as members of the *petite bourgeoisie*, they ignore how these complaints square with the larger themes of the poem. The argument seems to be that the audience can feel superior to Gorgo and Praxinoa because they are poor and that their poverty causes the women to respond outrageously to anything beyond their normal experience.[32] Gorgo, however, comforts Praxinoa by mentioning her own husband's extravagance, saying, ~~Y~~esterday he spent seven

[31] E.g. Burton (1995); Hunter (1993) and (1996); Gow (1965)
[32] E.g. Zanker (1986); Hunter (1993); Goldhill (1994, especially pp. 222-223)

drachmas on …total rubbish… And all extra work for me. Anyway, come on, get/ Your dress and wrap (18-20)." The dress, however, is no ordinary dress. It is extraordinarily beautiful and cost Praxinoa –more than two hundred drachmas/ in hard cash. I put my heart and soul into the embroidery (36-37)." There is a strong contrast here between Gorgo's classification of her husband's purchases as "total rubbish" (ἅπαλ ῥύπνλ) and Praxinoa's pricey dress (ηὠκπέρνλνλ), which cost not only money but also her time and talent with the needle. Clearly, then, the two women do have taste and disposable income. In particular, they have taste for the visually opulent, a point made clear by the fact that they dress themselves up for a festival for which Gorgo states –I hear that the queen/ is planning something splendid (ἀθνύσ ρξῆκα θαι όλ ηη/ θνζκ εῖλ ηὰλ βαζίιηζζ αλ, 22)." The opening scene stages an agonistic exchange, peculiar to women.

This taste for the visually opulent is the first thing we learn about Gorgo and Praxinoa. This makes us wonder how we know what this visual opulence looks like in mime poetry. In a typically Alexandrian self-reflexive way, Gorgo's and Praxinoa's own discourse strongly suggests that they are aware of this question as well. Once Gorgo mentions the –something splendid (ρξῆκα θαι όλ ηη) the queen is expected to wear, the following exchange occurs (24-26):

Πραχινόα
ἐλ ὀι βίσ ὅι βηαπάληα.
Γοργώ
ὦλ ἴδεο, ὦλ εἶπεο θαὶ ἰδνῖζα ηὺ ηῷ κὴ ἰδόληη.
ἔξπεηλῶξα θ᾽ εἴε.

Praxinoa
Everything is rich in the places of rich folks.
Gorgo
The things you've seen though, you can talk about once you've seen them, to someone who hasn't seen them. It's time to go!

The superabundance of verbs having to do with seeing in Gorgo's response (ἴδεο, εἶπεο, ἰδνῖζα, ἰδόλῃ) stresses the importance of seeing during their trip to the *Adoneia*. But seeing "something splendid" at the *Adoneia* is, in fact, only a part of the project. Gorgo also stresses the importance of describing the *Adoneia* to those who have not seen it. Indeed, the position and repetition of syntax (ὦλ ἴδεο, ὦλ εἶπεο…) suggests the shared importance of these two processes: the seeing followed by the reporting. But who are those who haven't seen (κὴ ἰδόλῃ)? On the one hand, they include the women's husbands and other friends with whom Gorgo and Praxinoa discuss matters of their day-to-day life. On the other hand, if we treat the comment as one of the many meta-poetic moments in *Idyll* 15, a different picture emerges.

Hunter has discussed how *Idyll* 15 hosts a number of meta-poetic moments: how Gorgo and Praxinoa share their Syracusean heritage with Theocritus, how Gorgo and Praxinoa's struggle to enter the temple doors at the *Adoneia* mirrors literary mime's struggle to vie for popularity in Alexandria, and how "the effect of this is that the literary mime itself inscribes possible models of its own reception in the text."[33] The benefit of Hunter's analysis is that he does not ignore the voice of Gorgo and Praxinoa. For Hunter, the two women act as "embodiments of the poetic voice… [who] guide us as we are usually guided by the poet."[34] In Hunter's reading then, Gorgo and Praxinoa, despite their poverty and occasional absurdity, have the potential for not only embodying meta-poetic elements—the Syracusean mime genre come to

[33] Hunter (1996, p. 117).
[34] *Ibid* p. 118

Alexandria—but also giving voice to meta-poetic qualities of that poetry. With her comment that Praxinoa can ―tell the others who haven't seen [the *Adoneia*]," Gorgo's comment speaks to the readers of mime poetry. Indeed, without a set of visual cues, readers of mime poetry are themselves often among those who have not seen the visual spectacle of the *Adoneia*. Moreover, if Gorgo and Praxinoa speak as the authoritative poetic voice, then this comment is programmatic for the genre of mime more generally. The subsequent and incessant appeals to seeing that make up much of the dialogue between Gorgo and Praxinoa, especially as they walk the streets of Alexandria, acutely draw attention to mime poetry's position between verbal readable text and imagined visual performance and, as Hunter puts it, ―acknowledge and exploit the problem of their own ―performance status.'"[35]

With their appeals to seeing, marked both by the verbs used as well as the abundance of exclamatory and pronominal adjectives, the Syracusean women enact the programmatic comment by Gorgo as they walk to through the streets of Alexandria. In a very real sense, readers of *Idyll* 15 represent ―those haven't seen," and it is up to Gorgo and Praxinoa to paint a picture of the street in Alexandria for them. Most of the scholarly work on *Idyll* 15 leaves the Alexandrian street scene untouched; but what is interesting—and what gets lost if we neglect this scene—is that the techniques Gorgo and Praxinoa use to discuss the visual appeal of the art inside the palace are at play as they describe their way through the streets. The street, then, serves a part in the larger visual project of the poem.

The visual focal point of the street scene is the large crowd gathered in front of the palace doors. Praxinoa's comment, ―You Gods, what a crowd (ὦ ζενί, ὅζζνο ὅρι νο)!" stresses the visually arresting nature of the crowd with the pronominal adjective ὅζνο. The formidable

[35] Hunter (1993, p. 199)

crowd has interposed itself between the palace, which hosts the *Adoneia*, and the chaotic street of Alexandria. For Gorgo and Praxinoa, the task is to wade the crowd and make it into the serene palace sanctuary where they can see the aforementioned "something special (ρξῆκα θαι όλ ηη)." That task, however, is made difficult because the streets of cosmopolitan Alexandria—especially on festival day—teem with hustle and bustle. Within the poem Gorgo and Praxinoa capture the movement of the street which nearly sweeps them away through their use of particles and verbs with visual and deictic force. For example, Praxinoa warns Gorgo to "Look at the king's horses! (ηνὶ πνι εκηζηὰ/ἵππνη ᾧῶ βαζηι ῆνο, 51). Soon after, Gorgo uses ηνὶ to notify Praxinoa that the horses have passed and the two women are safe: "Buck up Praxinoa. Now we're behind them; look, they've moved on to their station" (56-57). But if Gorgo and Praxinoa are imagined to be close to each other as their frequent use of first person plural verbs suggest, why must Gorgo insist that Praxinoa behold their safety? The particle ηνὶ, although devoid of specific visual implications, carries with it a deictic and visual force. According to Denniston, it can be used to "direct a person's eye or ear to sight or sound."[36] Thus, Praxinoa's audience could extend far beyond Gorgo.

Praxinoa's denotative addressee is Gorgo, who must watch out for the king's horses, but the connotative addressee is the reader. Much like when Gorgo tells Praxinoa that she can "tell those who haven't seen" about the *Adoneia*, the particle ηνὶ is equally effective when aimed at the individual reader or directed by a performer at one of the audience members.[37] Indeed, Denniston also notes that the particle ηνὶ "strictly speaking implies an audience."[38] A similar technique, then, is at play when shortly after Praxinoa implores both Gorgo and the reader to

[36] Denniston (1959, p. 542)
[37] Mastromarco (1979, pp. 95-96) notes a similar technique at play in Herodas' *Mime* 2, where the γει ᾶηο (Do you laugh? 2.74) has the potential for extratextual resonance.
[38] Denniston (1959, p. 537)

—look how wild it is (ἴδ᾽ ὡς ἄγξηνο).” The verb ἴδ᾽, a second person imperative form of the verb εἶδνλ, represents yet another instance where the reader could stand in as the verbal addressee.

The scene that Gorgo and Praxinoa have painted is relatively simple: the king‘s large horses and a crowd surrounding the doors to the temple. In comparison to other instances of what Hunter calls —scene-setting,” *Idyll* 15 offers little in the way of elaboration and detail.[39] That difference—between elaborate detail and a more reserved and terse description featured in the street scene—prepares the reader for the more overt evocation of viewing that occurs when Gorgo and Praxinoa enter the sanctuary and view art. That is, once Gorgo and Praxinoa make it into the sanctuary at line 79, readers will have already come to know Gorgo and Praxinoa as visual reporters, and in particular, not expository ones. Rather than a single account detailing what they see, a verbal exchange and its highly suggestive appeals to seeing characterize their report. Praxinoa and Gorgo represent two key variables in Theocritus‘ experiment of how character and the act of viewing relate to one another. How their exchange proceeds tells much about how they view art.

When Gorgo and Praxinoa enter the temple, the tapestries on display immediately catch their attention. Gorgo describes them as ἠὰ πνηθῖι α, which is often rendered as —multi-colored.” There is evidence to suggest the phrase has a wider semantic field, however. Homeric in its origin, the phrase most famously occurs when we find Andromache laboring at her own loom before she hears of Hector‘s death. She —weaves variegated flowers” into a purple fabric (ἐλ δὲ ζξόλα πνηθῖι ᾽ ἔπαζζε *Il.* 22.441).[40] Gregory Nagy has argued that the word in Homer, rather than meaning —multi-colored” or referring to —embroidery” rather comes from the root *peik*-,

[39] Hunter (1993, pp. 200-201). We can think of in particular, the first *Idyll* (The Goatherd‘s Cup) in which the amount of detail —works against any simple ‗mimetic‘ or ‗realist‘ representation and instead foregrounds its artifice.”
[40] Cf. *Il.* 5. 734-36, where the term is used to describe Athena‘s great *peplos*.

which simply means to make ―varied" and refers to the technique of pattern-weaving.[41] The idea is that the pattern is always changing.[42] In the fifth century BCE, Pindar takes this meaning of ―variegation" and applies it to the verbal arts.[43] For Pindar, one of the qualities of song that men adore, and likewise are fooled by, is its ability to make the great deeds of athletes ―πνηθίι α." Part of that process must be how Pindar's odes constantly interweave the stories of athletes with stories from Greek myth. Gorgo's use of the phrase then conjures up both connotations of the word, the visual and the verbal: visual, because the tapestries are indeed meant to be imagined as having a multi-colored pattern woven into them; verbal because the phrase also refers to Gorgo's oratorical action. For just after she describes the tapestries as ηὰ πνηθίι α, she herself weaves in a Homeric intertext in her conversation.

Gorgo's response to and assessment of the tapestries—how fine and lovely they are (ι επηὰ θαὶ ὠο ραξίελη α)—constitutes an intertextual moment that transports the reader's imagination elsewhere. The phrase, taken from the *Odyssey* (10.223), occurs in the description of Circe's own tapestries and the alluring effect they have upon Odysseus' men. It is only after the men see the tapestries and hear the voice of Circe that Polites thinks it a good idea to investigate the situation—an idea which famously leads to Circe turning them into pigs. The remarkable thing is that Circe's tapestries differ from the ones on display in the *Adoneia* temple. In particular, Circe's tapestries are not described as ηὰ πνηθίι α, but rather as ―a great immortal web, the kinds of things from gods" (ἰζηὸλ … κέγαλ ἄκβξνηνλ, νἷα ζεάσλ, 10. 222). The word for web here, ἰζηόο, simply refers to the web of material on the loom. However, the word ―web"

[41] Nagy (2009, p. 275)
[42] *Ibid*. ―Each flower is different than the next, and the sequence of flowers become a variety of love songs within one single sustained narrative, one single love story, which is the pattern woven web in its entirety."
[43] Cf. P. *Py*. 9.77; *Ol*. 1.29, 6.87; *Ne* 4.14

carries with it the duplicitous meaning of a spider web. Even the ancients picked up on this duplicity inherit in the word. In the fifth century, Bacchylides uses the word to describe ―spider webs" (ἀξαρλᾶλ ἰζηνί) found on men's shields (B. *Fr.* 3.7).[44] A similar premise is at work in the two tapestry scenes: both represent a point in a text when the reader can assess the aesthetic response of the characters in the poetry. The web image poses multiple inferences. One is that Theocritus could be developing how his audience thinks about women and embroidery. On this reading, *Idyll* 15 then becomes a kind of set piece in this tradition of scenes involving women and embroidery. The biggest difference between *Idyll* 15 and the Homeric tradition must be that Gorgo and Praxinoa's erudite exchange gets it right, where the Homeric characters got it wrong. Whereas Polites and other Homeric characters never recognize that ι επηὰ θαὶ ὠο ραξίελη α tapestries spell doom for them, Gorgo and Praxinoa realize that their ι επηὰ θαὶ ὠο ραξίελη α tapestries are part of the *Adoneia* festival. Put simply, Gorgo and Praxinoa contextualize the tapestries correctly. Because Gorgo and Praxinoa's erudite exchange is apt, the second inference to make here is that Theocritus may be inviting us to refigure our prejudices toward women, specifically in regards to pieces of art work with which they are, domestically, closely associated.

At this point, we are on familiar ground. Recall that most of the epigrams on Myron's Cow begin with the premise that some person (or calf) happened upon a piece of art and had an aesthetic response. For the epigrams on Myron's Cow, I argued that one of the qualities that the series of aesthetic responses explored was that of deception. There, the key deceiver was

[44] N. B. the adjective ι επηὰ occurs elsewhere in the *Odyssey* (10.544) where it describes actual spider webs (ἀξάρλη). The two adjectives occur together: *Od.* 5.231, 10.223, 10.544, and at *Il.* 22.511. All scenes share two characteristics: they are about women and weaving. What is more is that each scene features a Homeric woman wearing her weaving. The inference to make here is that Gorgo evokes an epic tradition of women wearing weaving as a way to elevate and address the otherworldliness of her experience at the *Adonis*.

occasionally the work of art itself but more commonly Myron, the creator and sculptor of the bronze heifer. Gorgo and Praxinoa share a different aesthetic response to a work of art. Whereas the epigrams on Myron's Cow rely on discussion of the artist to characterize an aesthetic response, Theocritus takes a different route. To describe Gorgo's and Praxinoa's aesthetic response to the image of the tapestry—"how lovely and fine they are"—he relies on a text, hence inter*text*. Thus, Theocritus represents yet another step in the experiment that poets undertake when they dramatize the observation of art. Theocritus' strategy emphasis the artifice of the poetry instead of the artist of the tapestries.[45]

Both Hunter and Burton gloss Gorgo's description as simple "allusion" and "echoes" to Homer.[46] The existence in the poem of these intertexts, however, illuminates the dynamism and difficulty of moving between a text and image, especially by way of another text. The key idea with intertextuality is that a poem's significant meaning derives from the reader's knowledge and recognition of quotations of other texts, which occur as discrete phrases or quotations. For example, the intertext of Gorgo's aesthetic response is the phrase "how lovely and fine they are" (ι επηὰ θαὶ ὠο ραξίελη α). Why the case for considering this phrase an intertext—as opposed to a mere allusion—is particularly strong is because it comes at the beginning of a hexameter line which is exactly where the phrase appears in the *Odyssey.* Thus, not only do the Theocritean and Homeric phrases share the same position on a piece of papyrus but they also scan the same and so would sound the same to the Hellenistic ear. Alexandria's renowned library represents the culture's imperialistic attitude toward literature, seeking to gather all texts of Greek literary history. Additionally, there is strong evidence to suggest that Hellenistic readers and writers

[45] Chapter 3 argues that Herodas *Mime* 4 features an alternative strategy of talking about art. Herodas' strategy is similar to the strategies of Myron's epigram, where the aesthetic response are discussed in terms of the artists.
[46] Cf. Burton (1995 pp. 102-110) and Hunter (1996 pp. 118-120).

obsessed and competed over how obscure, small, and erudite their texts could be: note, for example, Callimachus' famous "Big Book, Big Evil" quip as well as both his and Apollonius' predilection for Homeric "once-said words" (*hapax legomenon)*. If there was a culture in which readers and authors would stop at Gorgo's aesthetic response, think of the Homeric instance in which they previously encountered the phrase, then read the following scene against that Homeric backdrop, Hellenistic Alexandria was it. But then how does the intertext affect our reading of Gorgo and Praxinoa's further aesthetic responses?

One possible—albeit unpopular—inference is that the Homeric intertext elevates the discourse of Gorgo and Praxinoa. As Hunter notes, the tendency is to see Gorgo and Praxinoa as "having only one register for admiration and use it across widely different categories."[47] Part of the thinking behind Hunter's comment is that we are meant to read Theocritus, not Gorgo, as being erudite. Burton poses a similar question: "Is Gorgo meant to be perceived as herself alluding to the Circe passage? Such Homeric allusions entail would be appropriate for the poet Theocritus, but strangely omniscient for the fictional character Gorgo."[48] Neither critic, however, reveals how we should discern author from character or vice versa.[49] Rather, if we read the intertext as genuinely Gorgo's, then we imbue her with an ability to have a learned aesthetic response to the art she sees.

Recall that I framed the discussion of *Idyll* 15 by highlighting mime's generic concern with characterization and stressed the importance of both Gorgo's and Praxinoa's taste for the visually opulent. But we can delineate those tastes even further. Gorgo's interest in the visually

[47] Hunter (1996 p. 116)
[48] Burton (1995 p. 102)
[49] An instructive parallel to consider may be the "Socratic Problem," which refers to the impossibility of determining what in Plato's writings is an accurate portrayal of Socrates' thought and what is thought of Plato with Socrates as a literary device.

opulent manifests itself especially in her concern with embroidery. In particular, she comments on her husband's inability to buy proper fabric (18-20), instructs Praxinoa what to wear to the *Adoneia* (21), admires the dress she chooses (34-35), and then admires it again before they embark to the street (38). We can read the intertext then as Gorgo's quintessential comment regarding embroidery. In this light, Gorgo uses the intertext to make a much more precise and learned aesthetic response, one that reflects her ongoing interest in beautiful embroidery. Gorgo's character then comes across as an erudite critic, weaving bits of the epic into her everyday life in a way that reflects her own interests. Indeed, her following comment that, "you'd say they are clothes fit for the gods (ζεῶλ πεξνλάκαηα θαζεῖο)," suggests that she makes the connection between the quality of the tapestries and their association with divinity, which is the very connection Polites makes that seals his fate. More germane to Gorgo's own life is the way πεξνλάκαηα—an adjective meaning "fit for"—bears a close linguistic resemblance to the word Gorgo uses to describe Praxinoa's embroidery (e.g. πεξνλεηξίῳ, 21; ἐκπεξόλεκα, 34). Gorgo's vocabulary, carefully chosen from the *Odyssey* and then fitted to describe Praxinoa's very own tapestry, makes Gorgo's dialogue a kind of woven textile which fits the nature of the palace tapestries.[50]

Gorgo's Homeric vocabulary—ιεπηὰ θαὶ ὠο ραξίεληα—also belongs to the world of Hellenistic art criticism. The phrase comes as an exclamatory plea to Praxinoa to put on her art criticism hat and participate in a discourse dense with jargon. While Gorgo's response to the tapestry achieves an elevated level mainly by way of Homeric intertexts, Praxinoa's response picks up and develops this art historical facet of her speech. To Gorgo's invitation to view the tapestries, Praxinoa responds (80-86):

[50] The very word "intertext" comes from the Latin *intertexo,* meaning "interwoven."

πόηλη ᾽Αζαλαία, πνῖαί ζθ ᾽ ἐπόλαζα λ ἔξηζνη,
πνῖνη δῳνγξάθνη **τἀκριβέα γράμματ᾽ ἔγραψαν.**
ὡο **ἔτυμ**᾽ ἐζηάθαληη, θαὶ ὡο **ἔτυμ**᾽ ἐλδηἐῦληη,
ἔμψυχ᾽, **οὐκ ἐνυφαντά**. **σοφόν τοι χρῆμ**᾽ **ὥνθρωπος**.
αὐηὸο δ᾽ ὡο ζαε ηὸο ἐπ᾽ ἀξγπξέαο θαηάθεηηαη
θι ηζκῶ, πξᾶηνλ ἴνπι νλ ἀπὸ θξνηάθσ λ θαηαβάι ι σλ,
ὁ ηξηθί ενο ῞Αδσληο ὃ θὴλ ᾽Αρέξνληη θηιεῖηαη.

Lady Athena! What excellent women have woven the tapestries,
what excellent artists, who drew the drawings.
How realistically the figures stand; How realistically they twirl.
They have life in them and are not woven in—A clever thing man!
Oh and Adonis himself, how splendid he is, reclining on a silver couch,
with the first youthful down spreading from his temples,
thrice-loved Adonis, loved even in Acheron.

As Goldhill observes "The women utilize the privileged terms of Hellenistic evaluative discourse—ζνθ όο, ι επηόο, πνηθι νο, ραξείο, ἔηπκνο, ἀθξηβήο, 'intelligent', 'fine', 'subtle', 'pleasant', 'true', 'accurate' each of which is commonly associated with contemporary poetics and art criticism."[51] Such reliance on critical language to discuss art should not come as a surprise. Recall that in the epigrams on Myron's Cow, the poems would often make use of similar vocabulary. The reaction unifying the aesthetic responses in those epigrams and Praxinoa's is the emphasis on the lifelikeness of the art. In particular, Praxinoa shares both vocabulary with the epigrams on Myron's Cow (e.g. ἔηπκα, ἔκς πρα) and the appeal to the artists (δῳνγξάθνη, here literally "painters of living things"). The density of critical vocabulary, as well as the appeals to the artist who made the tapestries, make clear that we are in the language of art criticism. But what is not so clear is how we are to read our art critic, Praxinoa.

The popular opinion regarding Praxinoa as art critic is that she and Gorgo are intellectually over their heads and that their poverty marks them as too stupid to be part of the Hellenistic intellectual elite (*sophoi*). In Greek literature, some art confuses less intelligent

[51] Goldhill (1994) p. 218

characters and often occasions a scene in which they misapprehend the meaning of the art.[52] The Homeric scene conjured by the intertext provides an instructive parallel. There, Polites correctly determines that the voice and the tapestries must belong to a goddess, but does not acknowledge that such an inference may give rise to misfortunes for him and his men. Unlike Polites, Praxinoa correctly reads the tapestries as part of the larger experience at the *Adoneia*. Here, appeals to the lifelike quality of the tapestries, how they have life in them (ἔκς πρα) and are not woven in, draw her into the religious context of the ceremony. As Burton puts it, ―By admiring the life in the tapestries, by imaginatively and sympathetically experiencing Adonis's coming to life *in the tapestries*, the viewer recreates for that brief moment the magic of the resurrection of Adonis."[53] Praxinoa's use of critical language, then, can be read at the level of religious ceremonial language as well. That is to say, Praxinoa uses erudite language of art criticism to make a point about the art and to say how those same qualities of the art evoke qualities of the surrounding festival, specifically the way the tapestries capture the vitality of Adonis. Additionally, that Praxinoa becomes so moved to speak in such elevated terms about the tapestries reflects the actual qualities of Adonis himself, specifically the love he inspires. Unlike Polites in the *Odyssey*, Praxinoa's aesthetic response makes clear that she interprets art correct to the context in which she experiences.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have made two main claims. The first is that mime poetry has two characteristics that merit our attention when we speak of its relevance to visual and verbal

[52] This theme features large in much of the literature following third century Alexandria poetry. Consider Aeneas. In lieu of a description of what Aeneas actually looks like, about which Vergil remains curiously reticent, the *Aeneid* instead hosts passages where Aeneas is unable to apprehend pieces of art work. Thus, much of how we characterize Aeneas stems from his aesthetic responses rather than what he actually looks like.
[53] Burton (1995 p. 101).

representations. One is that the presentation of mime poetry combines visualized performance, readable text, and audible recitation. As scholars, the fact that we have little evidence to suggest that one form of presentation was favored over the other may not be such a problem. Like the epigrams on Myron‘s Cow, which all are imagined to be the single true epitaph on the statue base of the actual Myron‘s Cow, mime enjoys and plays with virtual reality. *Idyll* 15 is a text that experiments with the various ways of viewing art, clothing, and the streets of Alexandria. It is this virtual reality of mime that drives the experimental nature of visual representation in the poem. In short, mimes complicate rather than elucidate mimesis.

My second claim is that the key to tracing that experiment was to see Gorgo and Praxinoa in a more developed sense. While what we know about mime‘s form of presentation is at most suggestive, we have it on good evidence that mime poetry was concerned with the idea of character development (*ēthopoiia*). To that end, I carried out a character analysis of Gorgo and Praxinoa in which I placed their concern with viewing. Scholars have often noted the meta-poetic relevance of the two women‘s characters in expressing ideas about the reception of mime poetry as well as Theocritus‘ own struggle to bring his poetry to Alexandria. It is my contention that issues of viewing could be counted among those meta-poetic qualities the characterizations of Gorgo and Praxinoa explore. The portrait of Gorgo and Praxinoa that I presented was a positive one. Rather than focus on their status as members of the *petite bourgeoisie*, I offered an analysis that looked to viewing as a way for Gorgo and Praxinoa to reveal themselves to be more than competent when seeing art. Gorgo and Praxinoa represent characters who are part of an experiment that *Idyll* 15 carries whereby we hear elite attitudes from women. That they are women as well as art critics is the main source of the *Idyll’s* irony, though it‘s not the only way Hellenistic poets treated female aesthetes.

CHAPTER 3

Herodean Revisions

In the last chapter, I argued that Theocritus' *Idyll* 15 experimented with the ways that characters use their visual faculties. I was most keenly interested in how Gorgo and Praxinoa related visual information to one another. At times the women described dresses and the crowds of Alexandria with a variety words such as visual particles and imperative verbs of looking. When Gorgo and Praxinoa passed through the crowd in front of the palace and found themselves actually in front of pieces of artwork—a place where they might be expected to make use of those same visual strategies—instead used Homeric intertexts and the vocabulary of art criticism to talk about the tapestries. Once in front of the tapestries, the two women employed different techniques to relate the experience of viewing art in the palace: Gorgo and Praxinoa used erudite intertexts and vocabulary borrowed from the Hellenistic art critical circle to establish themselves as *ex tempore* art critics. My analysis read this *ex tempore* art critique as the apex of a whole poem of character development, a characteristic quality of mime poetry.

The present chapter looks to Herodas' *Mime* 4 as an instructive comparandum regarding, specifically, how mime's concern with character development conditions the art connoisseurship that occurs in the poem. Unlike Gorgo and Praxinoa who deserved to be taken seriously as art critics, Herodas' *Mime* 4 develops its characters along more satirical lines. The aesthetic responses of Kokkale and Kynno demonstrate that Herodas' interest in viewing art, as well as in physical objects more generally underscore the base origins of the characters and their situations.

Oddly, Herodas debases Kokkale and Kynno only then to put them in a position to make key deductions about the art of the Asklepion. In fact, my reading of Kokkale and Kynno in *Mime* 4 is informed by the traditional reading of Gorgo and Praxinoa. As Richard Hunter observes, "We might not naturally choose them (i.e. Gorgo and Praxinoa) as models for ourselves, and their reactions might seem 'unsophisticated,' but the poem forces us to consider the basis and validity of our own critical judgments."[54] In this chapter, I argue that Herodas uses *Mime* 4 to force his readers to question the aesthetic responses of Kokkale and Kynno and I examine how Herodean aesthetic response differs with Theocritean specifically because Kynno dominates the aesthetic response and in so doing pushes a more acerbic female character to the foreground to observe the art.

The Herodean World

With the 1891 publication of a second-century C.E. papyrus containing eight and a fragmentary ninth mime, our understanding of Herodas' poetry dramatically increased.[55] The papyrus revealed that the entirety of the Herodan corpus was mime poetry of a rather different kind than Theocritus' *Idyll* 15. In chapter two, I read the aesthetic responses of Gorgo and Praxinoa as erudite and part of the characters' ongoing interaction with the visually arresting. Their tone was comedic and their insights clever. That pleasant comedic tone of *Idyll* 15 squares neatly with the rest of the Theocritean corpus, in which the shepherds who star in the bucolic poems seldom endure the hardships of real work (always playing lyres and singing songs) and even the famous

[54] Cf. Hunter (1996 p. 117) and Goldhill (1994 p. 218-223).
[55] The man himself, however, still remains a bit of a mystery. As Zanker (2009, p.1) puts it, "We have evidence that Herodas lived during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphos (282-247 BCE). The fourth poem (*Mime* 4) can be dated between 282 and 265 BCE, the first to after 272-271 BCE, with the second to be placed after 266 BCE. He was therefore a contemporary of the greatest of the Hellenistic poets, Callimachus, Theocritus, and Apollonius. And that is the sum total of our knowledge of Herodas' life."

love song of Polyphemus in *Idyll* 7 has a sweetness to its plea. The Herodean world of mimes, by contrast, is a nasty inverse of the idyllic Theocritean one. Some have gone so far as to call it para-comedy for its overt handling of and incessant relying on stock characters (e.g. crooks, slaves fit for abuse, and prostitutes).[56] Peter Green, in concluding that, "it is all very Hellenistic, and, ultimately, very depressing,"[57] noted how Herodas reserved his realism (*enargeia*) for the lowest strata of society. For example, the second *Mime* focuses on a pimp on trial, displaying his prostitute for the court to see, while the sixth *Mime* is about women shopping for dildos with their slaves. The focus of Herodas' mimes never strays far from subjects and people traditionally thought to be unfit for poetry.[58] Not only are these mimes full of characters plucked from a stratum of society that poets rarely devote time to, but the mimes also feature the very act of viewing.

While the nature of Herodean aesthetic responses differ from Theocritean ones in the severity of its characters, within his own corpus Herodas has those characters engaging in view physical objects as a common source of the "grotesque humor" that came to define how scholars regarded his mimes.[59] A brief consideration of how scenes of viewing range across some of Herodas' mimes will inform my reading of *Mime* 4 as well as strengthen the case that visuality is a principal interest of the genre.

---

[56] Hunter (1996); Burton (1995)

[57] Green (1990, p. 246). See there his excellent though brief description of the subject of most of Herodas' mime. The cast of characters include pimps, prostitutes, dildo craftsmen and buyers, women reminiscent of "Aunt Ednas," sadistic mistresses, slaves who get beaten for their promiscuity, and rowdy sailors, to name a few. Such characters feature in some Theocritean works: Theocritus lets his readers out of that world to retire to the bucolic countryside. Herodas' world, however, only offers us one view of society: from the bottom-up.

[58] Indeed, the entirety of Herodas' *Mimes* is written in the very un-hexametric choliambs, an iambic verse with a long syllable in place of the last expected short syllable. The meter is a revival of Hipponax's meter, whom Callimachus also invokes in the beginning of his book the *Iambs.*

[59] Zanker (2009, p. 176).

Mime 6 centers on two women, Metro and Coritto, discussing the merits of Kerdon, a dildo craftsman. Immediately then, the situation and characters—two women discussing craftsmanship—parallels Theocritus' *Idyll* 15.[60] There is, however, a key difference between discussing the craftsmanship of tapestries fit to adorn a sanctuary in a religious festival financed by royalty, on the one hand, and the craftsmanship of a gentleman who makes dildos, on the other. Additionally, while the tapestries were, I argued, only part of Gorgo and Praxinoa's story, the dildos are the sole terms of the discussion for Metro and Coritto. Metro and Coritto mention neighbors and friends, but only to follow the paper trail back to the friend who first had Kerdon's handiwork. So when, after sixty-four lines of gossip about who owns the dildos, the women begin to discuss the actual products themselves, Herodas arrives at that familiar place in mime poetry, an evocation of seeing (63-68)[61]:

> **Co:** He works at home, doing his sales in secret,
> for every door fears the tax-collectors these days.
> But his workmanship, what workmanship it is!
> You'd think you're looking at the handiwork of Athena herself, not
> Kerdon's
> (ἀι ι᾽ ἔξγ᾽, ὀθνῖ ἐζη᾽ ἔξγα· ηῆο Ἀζε λαίεο/ αὐηεο ʽνξῆλ ηὸο ρεηξαο, νὐρη Κξδσλνο)
>
> But I—he came with two, Metro—
> when I saw them my eyes nearly popped out of my head with
> eagerness.[62]

[60] Again, the evidence for dating here is tenuous and so we can only speculate as to which poet is paralleling or lampooning the other.
[61] All translations of Herodas are done by Zanker (2009)
[62] The word for "eagerness" (ἀκηι η) is taken from Gorgias' *In Praise of Helen* (19) where Gorgias states that it is an "ἀκηι αλ εξσηνο" that seizes Paris at the sight of Helen.

Here Herodas uses the act of viewing and the report of that act as the ―punch-line," and rather like I argued in chapter 2, mime poetry can often pose questions to its characters as well as the reader simultaneously.[63] What is uncustomary, however, is that the reader and a character, Metro, share the same amount of knowledge. Said differently, Metro—like the reader—has not seen the dildos to which Coritto refers. At the level of the reader, Corrito's description of the dildos creates a tension because, much like in Theocritus' *Idyll* 15, we cannot see the object that Coritto describes. And so we are forced to rely on Coritto's speech, not only to let us know how she feels, but also what she sees. We have to rely on a narrator who is characterized as base and dim-witted. But the tapestries from the *Adoneia* are not the same as dildos. While the tapestries come from the tradition of epic poetry, the subject of dildos calls to mind the images seen on the stages of Old Comedy.[64] Herodas' debt to Old Comedy situates his *Mimes* in that tradition and in doing so elevates the status of his own literature. That sense of realism gets heightened and that irony sharpened in mime poetry where readers/hearers of poetry always imagine, instead of see, the images. So when Coritto gushes that, upon seeing them, her ―eyes nearly popped out of [her] head," the statement teases at the reader's and Coritto's inability to use their own eyes.

That Metro, who has also not seen the dildos, also relies on Coritto's aesthetic response as a way of ―seeing" (read: imagining) them draws more attention to Coritto's elliptical explanation. The only real descriptive words Coritto uses about the pieces is that the workmanship of Kerdon (ἔξγα) looks like the ―handiwork of Athena, not Kerdo" (ηῆρ Ἀζε λαίο ηόο ρεῖξαο, νὐρὶ Κεξδσλνο). But what good does this description do? What would a dildo crafted by the very hands of Athena even look like? Moreover, why would a virgin goddess

[63] E.g. Gorgo's comment to Praxinoa that ―things you've seen, you can talk about, once you've seen them, to someone who hasn't seen them" (Th. *Id*. 15. 25-26).
[64] We might also imagine that poems about dildos with occasional slave beatings are what so depressed Peter Green above.

make dildos? Recall, too, that Praxinoa cries out to "Lady Athena" when she first sees the tapestries at the Adoneia (Th. *Id.* 15, 80). Her evocation of Athena makes sense there because of the goddess' association with the crafts and the arts. When Critto associates "the hands of the Athena" with dildos, however, the reference operates like bad a intertext, incongruous and inappropriate. The phrase tries to build a connection between the goddess Athena and Kerdon, not by saying that their quality of work is similar, but that the Olympian and the city salesmen both craft dildos. In *Idyll* 15, when Gorgo spoke of the tapestries, the intertext worked because of the congruity of tapestries in the sanctuary to the tapestries in Homer. Both ideas are part of elite culture. Herodas, however, tries to mix the elite culture with low culture by associating Athena and Kerdon. The idea of a goddess making tapestries has its appropriateness established by literary history. Critto's statement, however, lacks such congruity and thus becomes more marked and significant.

In *Mime* 2, Battaros, a pimp, finds himself before a jury where he accuses the sailor, Thales, of ruining his brothel and abusing his prostitutes. While the characters (pimps and sailors) are from comedic literature, Herodas writes *Mime* 2 as if it were a courtroom speech.[65] Thus, Battaros addresses the men of the courtroom as "gentlemen of the jury (*Andres dikastai*)" and the rest of his speech bears the markings of Attic oratory.[66] The crucial piece of evidence is the body of one of his prostitutes, Myrtale. Battaros summons her to the floor (65-71):

δεῦξν, Μπξηάιε, θαὶ ζύ·
δεῖμνλ ζεσπ ηὴλ πᾶζη· κε δέλ αἰζρπλεπ·
λόκηδε ηνύηνπο νὺο όξῆο δηθάδνληαο
παηέξαο ἀδεη θνὺ ο ᾽εκβι έπεηλ. όξῆ᾽ ἄλδξεο,
ηὰ ηίι καη᾽ αὐηῆ θαὶ θάησζ ελ θἄλσζελ

[65] By the Hellenistic period, the pimp has become a stock character in New Comedy (Zanker 2009, p. 68)
[66] See Zanker (2009, pp. 50-59) for an excellent commentary on *Mime* 2's debt to Attic oratory.

ὠο ι εῖα ηωῖη᾽ ἔηηι ελ ὡλαγὴο νῦ̃ηνο,
ὅζ᾽ εἶι θελ αὐηὴλ θἀβηάζε᾽η᾽

Myrtale, you must come here, too.
reveal yourself to all; don‘t be ashamed before anyone;
consider that in the jurymen whom you see judging this case
you are looking upon your fathers, your brothers. Gentlemen, look
at her plucked skin, above and below,
how smooth this ‗innocent‘ plucked it
when he dragged her and forced her.

Here again we see Herodas underscoring the importance of viewing at the exact moment when it cannot be done by his readers. What exactly are we supposed to see in our mind‘s eye? In Old Comedy, when naked women appeared on stage it was by men wearing bodysuits and padding.[67] It is not known if this custom remained in Middle and New Comedy of the Hellenistic world. If it did, it would merely present another moment of situational irony for Herodas because Battaros‘ evidence would be posing as something it is not (man dressed as woman). Perhaps more interesting, however, is the confusing traffic of looking that occurs here. Myrtale, the prostitute is instructed to gaze up on the gentlemen of the jury as her ―fathers [and] brothers.‖ Yet, those same jurymen, in all likelihood, gaze upon Myrtale as a prostitute and not their own ―daughter‖ or ―sister.‖ For the reader then, the imposition of looking points to multiple types of view points, one from the prostitute and another from the jury. Another inference, which is rooted in the Hellenistic period rather than Attic Old Comedy, is that the exposition of Myrtale‘s naked body could be an early example of Hellenistic artists‘ interest in the naked female body, as in the so-called Praxiteles‘ ―Knidia.‖[68] Moreover, the oratorical setting does not elucidate how

[67] Sommerstein (2009, p. 239n. 10) and Hunter (1995, p. 198n. 43). See also Aristophanes plays for instances where dress is referred to (*Wasps* 1326, *Peace* 846, *Lys.* 1114).
[68] Praxiteles was the first artist to portray women, in particular goddesses, in the nude. His ―Aphrodite of Cnidus‖ generated such a hubbub that Antipater of Sidon wrote the epigram:

we are to view Myrtale. It is true that the jury could view her as evidence, but it is also just as likely that Battaros is ―displaying his wares to potential clients."[69] The key here is that the act of viewing is used by Battaros to clarify his case in the poem; however for the reader that very same act of viewing indexes many different meanings. Do we imagine the body of Myrtale is battered and bruised like Battaros claims? If that is the case, then do we read on believing the stammering pimp?[70] Or do we assume that Battaros is portraying that same body as sexual enticement for the jury? Herodas' technique here is to write about viewing in such way as to complicate what is exactly being viewed, as opposed to clarify. The language is suggestive, not descriptive.

Herodas returns to the visuality *topos* throughout his *Mimes*. Hunter states:

> This appeal to vision is then a central technique of the *Mimes*, and one which is not unreasonable to link with the whole mimic tradition…it may be argued that this knowing game of ―revealing" and ―not revealing" would carry particular force in a written literature which always asks us to ―see" what we cannot actually see.[71]

Hunter is not arguing that the sole purpose of mime poetry is to play on this dichotomy. The tone of the *Mimes* and *Idyll* 15 is certainly comedic; the favorite mechanism of that comedy (specifically the situational irony), however, comes from the appeals to vision. Nowhere is this more apparent than *Mime* 4.

Mime 4

While the majority of *Mime* 4 bears close resemblance to *Idyll* 15, there are certain crucial differences. First, *Mime* 4 begins in the religious setting of the Asklepion on the island of Kos,

---

―Paris, Adonis, and Achises saw me naked/ Those are all I know of/ but how did Praxiteles contrive it?" (*AP*. 16. 168).

[69] Hunter (1995, p. 198)

[70] Battaros comes from the Greek βαηπξίδεηλ (to stammer).

[71] Hunter (1996, p. 199)

as opposed to the domestic setting of Praxinoa's house.[72] Thus, Kynno and Kokkale are not so elaborately characterized within a domestic setting, and there is little in the way of scene changing. Kynno's opening prayer asks forgiveness for the meagerness of her offering: "For we don't draw water from a well that's at all abundant or ready, since we might perhaps have been offering an ox or a sow heaped with lots of crackling, not a cockerel, as offerings from sickness (νὺ γάξ ηη πι ι ὴλ νὺδ0 ἔηνηκνλ ἀλη εῦκελ, ἐπεὶ ηάρ' ἄλ βνῦλ ἢ λελε κελεκ ρνηξνλ/ πνι ι ῆο θνξ ίλεο, θνὺθ ἀι έθηνξ', ἴεηξα/ λνύζσ λ ἐπνηεύκεζζα η ὰο ἀπες ε ζ αο (14-17)." Kynno then instructs Kokkale where to place a votive tablet (18-20) and how to offer some coins properly (87-95). At one level, Kynno's apology for the meager offering of a cockerel suggests her poverty, as she herself emphasizes. Yet, on another, Socrates' last order before his execution is to offer a cockerel to Asclepius (*Phaedo* 118a). In this way, Herodas complicates the characterization of Kynno, who is simultaneously poor and versed apparently in the literary tradition generally considered to be inaccessible to the poor. The dissonance between her gender and economic status, on the one hand, and her style of speech, on the other, will become a source of irony in the poem. Suffice it to say at this point that her ability to evoke a particularly dramatic scene from the Platonic corpus and take the lead role governing the action within the Asklepion, while espousing her own poverty, seem contradictory. Indeed characterization resists easy classification.

[72] It is generally agreed that the Asklepion the women visit is the one on the island of Kos. The believed date of the poem (280-265 BCE) is thought to have coincided with the first major building phase of the Koan Asklepieion, which occurred in the first half of the of the third century. Zanker (2009, p. 106-107) makes a strong case that *Mime* 4 may have been composed to celebrate the sanctuary and cult.

As Zanker observes, "Kokkale is in fact probably one of the most sympathetic characters in Herodas."[73] Not only does Kokkale follow direction from Kynno without any backtalk, but she also mediates between Kynno and Kydilla, a mute slave (41-51). Kokkale's deference to Kynno reflects the power relationship between the two women. Throughout *Mime* 4, this hierarchy is at play, where Kynno guides the attention of Kokkale. It may seem logical as Kynno has more experience in the religious setting but when the characters discuss the art works there, Kynno's overbearing nature becomes the source of a crude comedy.

The vocabulary Kynno uses for viewing (πακπεάι ασ, which means to gaze with excitement) the art stresses the intensity of her action (76-78):

> And whoever does not gaze (κὴ πακθαι ήζ αο ὀξώξεθ ελ) on the artist or his works in excited astonishment (as is just),
> may he hang by the foot in a fuller's shop.

The participle πακθαι ήζα ο and the reduplicated form of ὁρ*ά*ω underscore the excitement of Kynno's aesthetic response. Such emotions in an aesthetic response differ from the one featured in *Idyll* 15.[74] In *Idyll* 15, Praxinoa frequently uses the verb ζεάνκαη which means, "to be hold with wonder", to describe her response and the way in which she hopes Gorgo will respond.[75] Kynno, however, invests more in how other people look at the art. Here, we see how vocabulary (πακπεάι ασ as opposed to the more reverent ζεάνκαη) for gazing at art highlights the difference between aesthetic responses Herodas and Theocritus' characters.

Aside from the verb for viewing being different, the nature of the exchange between the two characters also bears consideration. Recall that Gorgo and Praxinoa have what we could call a kind of "cooperative discussion" about the tapestries. The idea that they became *ex tempore*

[73] Zanker (2009, p. 107)
[74] Burton (1995, pp. 98-99)
[75] Variations of the word are, in fact, used throughout *Idyll* 15. See also lines 15, 22-23, 65, 84.

critics is not so far-fetched. In a mere fifteen lines, Praxinoa uses the vocabulary of art historians, and Gorgo the Homeric intertext to relate the tapestries of the *Adoneia* to the tapestries of Greek literary history. Their responses are neat, focused, learned, and balanced (both contributing to the discussion in equal measure). Herodas' Kynno complicates the Theocritean paradigm. The call to be an erudite art critic is likewise turned back onto Kynno, however the difference in character informs the aesthetic response. For Kynno, viewing the art becomes not only an opportunity to reach for erudition but also to assert her own estimation violently onto others, a prerogative usually reserved for elite. Just following her gushing comments about the artwork (the handiwork of Apelles of Ephesos) she proposes that anyone of a different opinion should be hanged by their feet outside a fuller's shop. Immediately, we see that punishment again plays a role in how Kynno exercises her authority. The interesting thing about Kyrnno's violent reflex is that all this takes place in a sanctuary for the healing-god Asclepius. And it is not as if Kynno does not realize this. The first twenty lines of *Mime* 4 are a hymn to Asclepius, where Kynno offers the cockerel as ~~–o~~fferings for our cure from sickness which you have wiped away" (16-17). Thus, not only is the setting religious—which alone would demand reverence from its visitors—but the religious offerings are made to a healing god. Kynno is worse than merely ignorant but transgressive in her violent outbursts. That the artwork on display there spurs Kynno into making violent threats does well to underscore the inappropriateness of her response. More interestingly, however, is that it demonstrates her elitist tendency. Violently asserting her own aesthetic judgments on others is how Herodas complicates how we read Kynno's aesthetic judgments. Indeed, she oscillates between taking elite liberties of physical abuse and non-elite language. Kynno's suggestion that the punished be treated like dirty laundry—hung outside of a fuller's shop—introduces an image from the mundane day-to-day existence that some scholars

assume she leads. Zanker states that, ―the significance of the laundry is probably that Apelle's detractors will receive the same treatment as dirty clothing, and will be ignominiously hung up and beaten."[76] The key here is that Kynno's character mixes the language and tendencies of high culture such that as the poem progress her character comes across more partisan to the elite than the poor. The aggressive power play is just one example of this.[77]

As far as being a cooperative interlocutor about the art, Kynno prefers rather to be the pedantic art critic replete with obvious or incorrect insights. Kokkale is the first to recognize the statues (20-25):

> **Ko**: ἆ, θαι ῶλ, θίι ε Κπλλνῖ,
> ἀγαι κάησλ· ηίο ἦξα ηὴλ ι ίζνλ ηαύηελ
> ηέθησλ ἐπνίεη θαὶ ηίο ἐζηὴλ ὁ ζηήζα ο·
> **Κυ**: νἱ Πξε μηηέεσ π αῖδεο· νὐρ ὁξῇο θεῖλα
> ἐλ ῃῇ βάζη γξακκαη'
>
> **Ko**: Oh what beautiful statues, Kynno dear!
> So who was the sculptor who made this marble statue
> and who dedicated it?
> **Ky:** The sons of Praxiteles[78]; can't you see
> the writing on the base (νὐρ ὁξῇο θεῖλα ἐλ ῃῇ βαζη γξακκαη᾽)? And
> Euthies, the son Prexon, dedicated it.[79]

Kynno answers Kokkale's question with her own chiding question, asking Kokkale to read the base of the statue which is precisely where one would look to find answers to the question. That Kynno can read the statue base complicates the earlier characterization. In the ancient world,

---

[76] Zanker (2009, p. 118)

[77] Burton (1995, p. 98) similarly observes that, ―This hyperbolic description, with its imagery from everyday domestic concerns, underscores the inappropriateness of the violence to the offense, as well as to a visit to a shrine of Asclepius, the healer-god."

[78] For information on his sons Timarchos and Kephisodotos see Stewart (1990).

[79] In the fifth century BCE., it was commonplace for private individuals to dedicate temples and cult statues in their name (e.g. Plutarch, *Themistocles* 22). Early work on Herodas (Cunningham 1966 and 1971) speculated that dedicatory inscriptions preclude a reference to cult statues. The architrave on the Pergamon Altar, argued Ridgway (2000, pp. 22-3), provided evidence to the contrary.

literacy was the prerogative of the rich. Kynno's ability to read is yet another quality of hers that demands we reconsider her character. The temptation is to see her as poor woman whose intellectual ability limits her and yet Herodas constantly folds in actions that contradict such easy classification. Herdoas' insistence of mixing cultural signifiers of elite male culture (literacy, issuing physical punishment, and quoting Plato) complicates how we should interpret Kynno. How can one admit to their own poverty but in the same poem claim to read? Moreover, what if this person is a woman?

Kynno's answers to Kokkale (—νὐρ ὀξῆο θεῖλα ἐλ ηῆ βαζη γξακκαη?") is rather like the meta-poetic moment in *Idyll* 15 when Gorgo assures Praxinoa that —things you've seen, you can talk about, once you've seen them, to someone who hasn't seen them." Both questions are equally effective when posed to the reader. And, as per usual in the *Mimes*, the joke is on the reader because we cannot read the stone base of the statues. The case for reading this question as meta-poetic is made stronger as Kynno simply tells Kokkale that, —Ethies, the son Prexon, dedicated it" immediately after she chides her for not reading.[80] Why else pose the question to Kokkale only to have Kynno answer it in the δέ part of the same clause?

The brashness of Kynno's response gives way to enthusiasm as the subject of the statues change. The word Kokkale uses for the first statues is an *agalmaton,* meaning a statue in honor of a god.[81] Next, Kynno directs Kokkale's (and the reader's attention) to the *andrias*, all of

[80] It could also be the case that Kokkale is illiterate and simply cannot read the base. If this is the case, then it represents another example of how Kynno enjoys a position of power over Kokkale.
[81] For similar uses see Hdt.1.131, 2.42,46; Lys.6.15; Aes .*Th*.258; *Eu*.55, So .*OT* 1379, Pl. *Phdr*.251a. See Zanker (2004, pp. 141-3) for analysis of the continued use of the word in the Hellenistic world. See also Zanker (2009, p. 111): —There is a very good example of the usage [of *agalmata* as referring to statue of god] in the sanctuary of Asklepios an Hygieia in Pheneos. The statue base found in situ…contains an inscription which calls the cult-statues of the deities *agalmata.*"

which are votive offerings displayed in the plaza of Greek sanctuaries.[82] The statues include a girl reaching at an apple (27-9), an old man (30), a boy with a goose (30-4), and a portrait of a local prostitute named Batale (35-8). The women devote more attention to some statues than others. For instance, "that old man (θεῖλνλ δέ... ηὸλ γέξνλη', 30)" captures Kokkale's attention for just a moment before she changes her attention to "how that little boy is squashing the goose." Kynno replies, "you'd say that sculpture's about to speak (32)." Scholars have made much of these few lines because there is a "Boy With a Goose" statue that survives, held in the Vatican, that bears resemblance to Kynno's description. The Roman copy of "The Boy with an Egyptian Goose" depicts a boy who reaches up with his right hand demanding that the viewer pick him up, and leans to his left to restore his misplaced balance, squashing his goose just below the neck. His mouth is open as well, suggesting his urge to speech. Kokkale and Kynno, then, have surprisingly given us an accurate description of "real" piece of artwork. If it is indeed true that Herodas has chosen to write about actual pieces of artwork (rather like Myron's Cow) as opposed to pieces of art in fiction (e.g. the tapestries of *Idyll* 15), then Herodas' poetry could be said to have influenced the epigrams on Myron's Cow. *Mime* 4 and Antipater of Sidon's epigram, where the narrator thinks the cow will make a sound, specifically "low,"[83] constitute a point of contact, represent a shared concern of visualizing of art that ranges across genre—epigram to mime—and even a shared strategy of talking about that art.

And even though there is a change from admiring works depicting gods to works depicting a small boy and a goose, Kynno still gushes with excitement. Whereas Kynno praised the *agalmata* for their beauty, she and Kokkale praise the *andrias* for their realism, a quality

[82] Zanker (2009, p. 111)
[83] "I think the cow is going to low; so not only Prometheus but you, too, Myron can fashion living things" (*AP*. 9. 721).

explored in the epigrams on Myron's Cow. The first word Kynno says, "Look!" (ὅξε), constitutes the key ironic moment where the text prods the reader's inability to see. The objects are, of course, of very different characters than gods. The imperative verb no longer demands the reader's of Kokkale's attention be directed to statues of gods, or even tapestries that could be mistaken as the products of gods. Instead, the *andrias* statues are of curiously mundane scenes. Are such *andrias* worth the poetics? One inference to make here is that Herodas plays with the incongruity of desperately needing to see an ordinary scene. Consider how Kynno and Kokkale use deictic pronouns to mark the position of each new statue they encounter: "this (θεῖλα) marble statue"; "this (αὐηήλ) writing on the base"; "that (θείλελ) girl"; "that (θεῖλνλ) old man"; "that (θεῖλνλ) little boy"; "this (αὐηὴλ) statue of Batale." While this seems reasonable—certainly it was the strategy employed in *Idyll* 15's street scene—Kynno and Kokkale use six deictic pronouns to describe just four statues. The overwhelming use of deictic pronouns borders on the absurd but also highlights the sheer number of artwork on display in the Asklepion.

The extraordinary appreciation of art is marked by the imperative verb and deictic pronouns. The art itself takes its subjects from the mundane and ordinary and recalls the epigrams on Myron's Cow. Their insistence on the lifelike quality of the art recalls earlier ekphrases, but their comments on the *andrias* rises to the level of a rather sophisticated aesthetic response. About the girl looking up at the apple, Kynno says "Wouldn't you say she'll faint on the spot if she doesn't reach it?" (νὐθ ἐξεῖο αὐηήλ/ ἤλ κὴ ι άβῃ ηὸ κῆι νλ ἐθ ηορα ς ύμεηλ; 28-29); about the old man, Kynno says, "at the very least, if it weren't a stone in front of our feet, you'd say the sculpture's about to speak. Heavens, given time men will even be able to put life into stones" (πξὸ ηῶλ πνδῶλ γνῦλ εἴ ηη κὴ ι ίζνο, ηνὔξγνλ/ ἐξεῖο, ι αι ήζεη. κᾶ, ρξόλῳ θνη᾽ ὥλζξζπ νη/

θὴο ηνὺο ι ίζνπ ο ἔμνπζη ὴλ δνὴλ ζεηλαη 32-34).[84] Each time the women observe a new *andrias*, they engage in that same kind of competition that marks the epigrams on Myron's Cow. Each new statue demands a new way of discussing the realism, which the women have no trouble of offering. In so doing, Herodas has Kynno and Kokkale participate in the sophisticated play on verisimilitude that underpinned all epigrams on Myron's Cow. Because we see Kynno and Kokkale offer rather sophisticated responses to the *andrias*, it begs the question: what is it about art that Kynno and Kokkale value most?

Kokkale's comments regarding the statue of Batale reveal the appreciation for some artwork's ability to work: "If anybody hasn't seen Batale herself, let him take a look at this likeness and not have any need of the real article (εἰ κή ηηο αὐὴλ εἶδε Βαηάι ελ, βι ές αο/ ἐο ηνῦην ηὸ εἰθλεζκα κὴ ἐηύκεο δεῖζζσ 35-38)."[85] The issue here is that certain pieces of artwork can do actual work. The concept is familiar but I do not speak of pieces of artwork doing work at a cultural level, the kind fit for scholarly analysis (e.g. dialectical materialism). What Kokkale suggests is that this statue of a prostitute could do the work of the real prostitute; It is that real looking. Again, considering the epigrams on Myron's Cow is instructive. Recall the first epigram in the sequence (*AP* 9. 713) where the cow itself begs to be "driven off to the heard"; or Julian's epigram (*AP* 9. 796) where a wayfarer approaches the cow intent to "drive off the cow." The strategy of describing realism by way of trying to put the piece of art to work clearly ranges across genres as well. Other strategies to describe realism—especially the idea of a talking

[84] *Ibid* where Zanker suggests, "Kokkale's self-interruption dramatizes her excitement, and gives more emphatic prominence to the statue of the boy and the goose." See also J.J. Pollitt *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge UP, 1986, pp. 127-150).

[85] That Batale is thought to be a prostitute ironizes the idea that a statue is a worthy facsimile. The particple for the verb "seen" is even a masculine singular participe (βι ές αο). It is also curious that Batale is one of the statues that Kokkale explicity refers to as ἀλδξηάλη. Zanker has argued that this word choice indicates Batale providing a votive portrait to "thank the god for ridding her of some malady (Zanker 2009, p. 113).

statue—occur in the epigrams on Myron's Cow. There, the tone was likewise comedic. The epigrams were like neat little jokes with the "punch line" being "how real looking is the cow this time?" Here, too, the tone is comedic because of the hyperbole in Kynno's and Kokkale's description.

The scene moves into the inner sanctuary of Asclepius' temple, and, rather like Praxinoa who encounters the image of naked Adonis, Kokkale observes the image of young naked boy. Here again, the Theocritean and Herodean characters contrast one another. Earlier, I argued that Praxinoa's aesthetic response to the naked Adonis is not only erudite but also reflects Praxinoa's knowledge of the *Adoneia* festival. Her response to the image adumbrated some of the themes of the rest of the festival. Kokkale's response to the image of a naked boy (also a painting) "exemplifies her obliviousness to the ceremonial context."[86] In the beginning of the poem, Kynno suggested physical punishment to anyone who did not share her superior estimation about the paintings of Apelles and now Kokkale participates in bringing violence into the healing temple (59-62): "Look at this naked boy, if I scratch him/ will he not bleed, Kynno? For the flesh lies on him/ pulsing like a warm liquid in the picture."

There are two inferences I'll draw here. First is that touching as a way of seeing if a piece of art is real recalls a strategy used in the epigrams on Myron's Cow. Julian writes (*AP.* 9.796): "Sculptor Myron, a wayfarer came intending to drive off your cow,/ and touching the bronze, was revealed to be a futile theft." Because Julian writes some hundred years after Herodas, we may read this as Herodas exerting some influence on the ways in which aesthetic responses characterize characters in later poetry. Rather like the wayfarer is the butt of the

[86] Burton (1995, p. 99)

joke—mistaking the bronze cow for a real one—so too is Kokkale caught trying to touch a statue to ensure it is not real.

The second inference to make is that, this scene represents another example of violence in the Asklepion. For Kokkale to suggest violence as a means of a deduction about the art strongly indicate she is unaware of the surrounding festival and the purpose the Asklepion serves, like Kynno has shown to be. As Burton observes, "She shows no interest in the painting's possible religious functions…Thus, Kokkale responds to the realism of a picture in a way that distances her from the ceremonial world of representation and the context of Aklepius' temple."[87] Part of the significance of both of these mimes—*Idyll* 15 and *Mime* 4—happening in religious setting is that sanctuaries demand a certain conduct from its guest. By staging *Mime* 4 in an Asklepion, Herodas makes transgressive acts more visible and easy to detect. Kokkale's idea to hurt a statue in the sanctuary of a healing god illustrates her own ignorance of the contextual power of religious festivals.

Conclusions

This chapter examined the way in which aesthetic responses of characters in mime poetry told us qualities about those characters as well as mime poetry itself. By focusing my analysis to the world of Herodas' *Mimes*, I found some instructive comparisons to Theocritus' *Idyll* 15. As for similarities, I argued that an appeal to vision is central to how the *Mimes* communicate information about its characters. This technique paralleled how we learned about Gorgo and Praxinoa's interest in beautiful weaving by way of their appeals to seeing their own dresses and then finally when they used similar vocabulary to discuss the tapestries on display at the *Adoneia*. When they finally reached those tapestries, their erudite discussion pushed the genre of

[87] *Ibid* p. 101

the poem beyond burlesque comedy. Conversely, Herodas offered a more complex characterization of Kynno, especially, and Kokkale that at once highlighted their stupidity while also underscoring the attempts at intelligent art criticism.

The goal of the *Mimes* is always to tell stories of grotesque humor or comedy. One of the key mechanisms in achieving that goal is dramatizing aesthetic responses. That is, these aesthetic responses are not digressions, but come at moments that are crucial to the character's purpose in the narrative. Thus, the pimp Battaros displays a prostitute who he thinks will bear the signs of abuse and cause the jury to decide the case in his favor when they see the prostitute. Likewise, when Coritto tells her friend Metro about the marvelous dildos of Kerdon, she says that they look like the ~~h~~andiwork of Athena." In both scenes one character explains how another character should view the object of interest. That instruction, however, always ends up telling us less about the object and more about the character. Additionally, both scenes represent those favorite moments of mime poetry when the reader is left on the outside of the text, unable to see what that text implores us to see. Nowhere was that more clear than *Mime* 4, which is a poem full of physical objects apt for viewing.

At the level of characterization, *Mime* 4 is a more complex version of *Idyll* 15. In *Idyll* 15, there are only two pieces of artwork in the *Adoneia*: the tapestries and the painting of Adonis. In *Mime* 4, there are nearly a dozen pieces of artwork: paintings, votive offerings, *agalamta*, and *andrias*. And if the characters were Gorgo and Praxinoa in the Asklepion on Kos, then we may have overheard some constructive discourse about those pieces of art. Praxinoa may have been able to see themes of the healing god's festival in the paintings and Gorgo may have made some incisive comments about how the statues of gods recall Homeric scenes. Herodas—in a way that has come to characterize his execution—uses the aesthetic responses from Kynno and Kokkale

to push his acerbic characters into elite scenes of poetry: the ekphrasis. For example, Kynno, by her own account, came from poverty yet she directed Kokkale's gaze throughout the poem as well as suggested punishments be administered to anyone who disagreed with her opinions of the art. Both these qualities would be the prerogative of elite men. Thus, when we imagine the audience of *Mime* 4 (most of who, no doubt, are elite men) we must imagine Kynno and Kokkale's comments having an eerie and ironic resonance. While their insights on the art may seem unintelligent, they very fact that they speak with the power and authority of an elite male to make those comments, gives *Mime* 4 its teeth.

CONCLUSION

This thesis argues that both epigram and mime poetry underwent fundamental changes by becoming written texts during the Hellenistic period. During the fifth century, for example, epigrams were originally *epitaphs* written on gravestones. The most famous of which is Simonides's epigram for the Spartans who died at Thermopylae. Believed to be written on a stone atop the very hill on which the last Spartan died, it said, "Stranger, announce to the Lacedaimonians that here/ we lie, having fulfilled their orders" (Ὦ μεῖλ', ἀγγέι ιεηλ Λαθεδαηκλίνηοῦηη ᾗδε/ θείκεζα, ηνῖοθείλσλ ῥήκαζη πεηζόκελνη.) The language of the poem and its meaning are simple: the stranger must hike to Sparta and tell the countrymen what their brothers accomplished. The poem and its instruction are grounded in the real world. Furthermore, the very monumentality of the epigram ensures that all Greek-reading "Strangers" see the same stone, at the same place, from the same vantage point. The very tangibility of the stone bearing the epigram gave its message potency. Far into the future, until that stone eroded, there would Strangers who would hear the instruction to tell the Lacedaimonians of their valor. What happened to epigram in the Hellenistic period, however, is that the poets separated the poems from their monuments and put them on a piece of papyrus. In short, the Hellenistic period transformed epigram into a literary genre.

When the poets wrote epigrams on Myron's Cow, they created a virtual reality where the reader would imagine reading the texts on Myron's statue of a cow, which was a very real statue on top of the Athenian Acropolis. The separation between the text and the image generated various dramatic scenarios because the cow that the epigram spoke of was not on the page but in

the imagination (or perhaps sometimes the visual memory) of the reader. It was primarily a literary exercise, not a commemorative one. Moreover, this new form of writing epigrams meant that multiple poets could write on Myron's Cow, each one competing with the preceding one in the sequence to say in a more clever way, "I'm the real epigram on Myron's Cow and I'm so real that…" The epigrams then made for a poetic *agon* that captivated audiences and poets for centuries. We can call this strategy a new type of ekphrasis, one in which the aim is to mobilize texts to describe an image rather than simply describing that image itself.

The paucity of literary remains makes generalizing about the Hellenistic literary milieu notoriously difficult. Central to much of the discussion are the so-called "Callimachean Aesthetics," which include—among other things—an appreciation of the miniature, a high amount of erudition, and a revitalization of antiquated meters and authors. I contend that the separation of text from image that characterize the epigrams on Myron's Cow is another *topos* that is as important as Callimachus' program: who could be the most clever about toying with, commenting on, and writing in this space between an actual visualized image and a readable text. I also contend that the competition—or at the very least discourse—between poets to toy with the verbal and visual found its way into other Hellenistic genres as well.[88]

Much like the virtual reality at play in the epigrams on Myron's Cow, the Hellenistic mime was a written text that staged an imagined performance. The two mimes I analyzed, Theocritus *Idyll 15*[89] and Herodas' *Mime 4*, both took the shape of their story—women viewing religious artwork—from the Euripides' *Ion*. And as such, the poets allowed themselves an entire poem to explore at least three different ideas: how to depict the art itself, the act of viewing, and

[88] The most famous of all being in Apollonius' epic the *Argonautica*, where Athena weaves for Jason a cloak with seven mythological scenes on it (1. 730-67).
[89] Though *Idylls* by name, *Idyll* 4, 15, and 16 are considered the "urban mimes" of Theocritus.

the intellectual stance of the women as art critics. To emphasis the importance of these goals is to recognize how interconnected the verbal/visual idea is to other *topoi* in the Hellenistic literary circle, such as the points of contact to gender issues and the eclectic religiosity of the Hellenistic period.

In chapters two and three, I argued that the texts of Theocritus and Herodas demonstrate how complex the strategies for addressing the visual became. In Theocritus, on the one hand, Gorgo and Praxinoa drew on Homeric intertext and the vocabulary of the emerging field of art history to comment on the art of the *Adoneia*. Moreover, their comments on the tapestries displayed in that festival reflected their ongoing interest in embroidery work, an ―art" that adorns their own wardrobes. Thus, when Gorgo builds a connection between the tapestries of the *Adoneia* and the tapestries of Homer's Circe, Theocritus is toying with the idea of what erudition sounds like coming out of a woman's mouth. The importance of this scene to the act of visualization is that it used a text to mobilize an image. The technique is similar to that used in the epigrams on Myron's Cow, where instead of describing what the statue looked like, the poets described certain characters' responses with Aeschylean vocabulary. The difference in *Idyll* 15 is the heavy reliance on Homer and art historical language ―τεπηὰθαη ὠῳραξίεληα." Thus erudition grounded in text allusions (both Homeric and art historical) characterized Gorgo's and Praxinoa's diction.

In Herodas' *Mime 4*, on the other hand, Kokkale and Kynno, who demonstrated a similar interest in talking about the visual, used different strategies. The mutual contribution to the aesthetic response witnessed in *Idyll 15* is nowhere to be found in *Mime 4*. For Herodas, the mixing of elite and non-elite culture took place at the level of gender. Thus, as in Theocritus, women discuss art, though in a less cooperative way toward each other. Part of the humor of

Mime 4 came from Kynno's overbearing nature. Often threatening and always interrupting, she simultaneously played the role of an over-bearing female comedic trope and a kind of pedantic museum curator. Indeed, the characterization of Kynno as a domineering female informed the strategy Herodas used for talking about the art works on display, which were much more wide-ranging than the tapestry and painting of Adonis from *Idyll* 15. To include a variety of pieces of art was the vehicle that elicited multiple intelligent deductions about viewing from Kynno. The competition to say something more intelligent about the next statue was constantly turned back onto Kynno because Herodas (and Kynno) so minimalized Kokkale's voice. And so *Mime 4* obviated the cooperative conversational tone seen in *Idyll* 15 in favor of having a power dynamic between women drive the nature of his aesthetic discussion.

The fact that *Mime* 4 and *Idyll* 15 have women as their main characters also points to the Hellenized world's expanded cast of characters in both literature and art. Humble characters, such as fishermen, jockeys, and market women, have always had a place in Greek literature, but it is not until the Hellenistic period that they appear as monumental statues.[90] In literature, moreover, these kinds of characters often are used to emphasize the power, standing, or status of more elite characters. The confrontation between Odysseus and Thersites in the *Iliad* is illustrative; Thersites, commonly recognized to be a non-elite member of the Greek force suggests the Greeks leave Troy; in response to this insubordination, Odysseus beats him into silence with a scepter (*Il.* 2. 243-264). In this episode with Thersites, there is a hint of what the Hellenized world would appreciate. Although Thersites' suggestion to leave Troy sounds much like Achilles' own speech to Agamemnon in Book 1, Odysseus' ability to silence him and thus

[90] Pollitt (1986) sees such subjects as ~~c~~hief examples of rococo sophistication in Hellenistic art.

restore the normal social order is the point of the scene.[91] In the Hellenized world, by contrast, the focus shifts from an Odyssean (i.e., elite) world view to a world view that makes room for non-elite characters. In the Hellenistic world, artists and poets push characters like Thersites to the fore and build whole narratives around them. Moreover, they often toy with the idea that non-elite characters can speak or act like elite ones. Thus, we have Kynno in *Mime* 4 imposing physical violence, directing the gaze of Kokkale, and using the language of ekphrasis to discuss modest votive offerings that depict the everyday rather than mythology. The interest in visuality, as displayed in aesthetic responses, dovetails nicely with the Hellenistic world's interest in non-elite characters and their lives.

Because I was interested in the history of the idea of visuality in Hellenistic poetry as a whole, as opposed to one single author, I chose to present case studies that ranged across genres. As much as the thesis valued the importance of the authors examined, my analysis also demonstrated how different poets took an interest in playing with text and image and in exploring connections between the readability of a text when that text tried to capture the visuality of an image. While the dates of the *Mimes* and the epigrams are not exact, it is safe to say, given the widespread interest, that capturing visuality in a poem captivated authors and audiences for centuries. The Roman literature that follows the Hellenistic literature is replete with characters responding to visual images. This interplay between text and image is where humor in Plautus comes from, our doubt in Aeneas' ability to read signs is crystallized, and the demise of Ovid's Pygmalion happens.[92] The goal of thesis, specifically, was to explore the

[91] Fellow Greek soldiers exclaim (*Il.* 2.270-4) –Come now: Odysseus had done excellent things by the thousands/ bringing forward good counsels and ordering armed encounters;/ but now this is far the best thing he has ever accomplished/ among the Argives, to keep the thrower of words, this braggart/ out of the assembly."
[92] Vg. *Ae.* 1.464-493; Ov. *Met*. 10.243

poetics of visualization, but, more generally, it was to consider such visualization as an agonistic poetic locus in one of the most exciting yet confusing bodies of literature ancient Greek has to offer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnott, W.G. 1971. ―Herodas and the Kitchen Sink.‖ *Greecce Adn Rome* 18: 121–32

———. ―The Women in Herodas, _Mimiamb 4'.‖ *Corolla Londiniensis* 4: 10–12

Burton, J.B. 1995. *Theocrtius' Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender and Patronage.* Berkeley

Cameron, A. 1993. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton

Corsom Antonio. 2004. *The Art of Praxiteles.* Vol. 1. Rome: Bretschneider

Crane, G. ―Three Notes on Herodas 8.‖ *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90: 85–90

Cunningham, I.C. 1964. ―Herodas 6 and 7.‖ *Classical Quarterly* 14 (33)

———. 1966. ―Herodas 4.‖ *Classical Quarterly* 16: 113–125.

———. 1971. *Herodas: Mimiambi*. Oxford.

———. *Herodas: Mimiambi*. Munich and Leipzig.

Denniston, John. 1996. *The Greek Particles*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing

Elsner, J. 2000a. ―Between Mimesis and divine power: Visuality in the Greek and Roman world‖ in *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text*. Princeton

———. 2000b ―Introduction: The genres of ekphrasis‖, *Ramus* 31: 1-18

Esposito, Elena. 2010. ―Herodas and the Mime.‖ A Companion to Hellenistic Literature: 266–281

Goldhill, S. 1994. ―The Naive and Knowing Eye: Ekphrasis and the Culture of Viewing in the Hellenistic World.‖ In *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge

Goldhill, S. 2007. ―What Is Ekphrasis For?‖ *Classical Philology* 102 (1) (January 1): 1–19

Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP

Gow, A.S.F. and D.L. Page. 1965 *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams.* Two volumes. Cambridge

———. 1968. *The Garland of Philip*. Two volumes. Cambridge

Green, Peter. 1990. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*. University of California Press; First Edition edition

Gutzwiller, Kathryn J. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Heffernan, J.A.W. (ed.) 1991. "Ekphrasis and Representation", *New Literary History* 22.2: 297-316

———. 1993. *The Museum of Words: The Poetics of Ekphrasis from Homer to Ashberry.* Chicago

———. 1999. "Speaking for pictures: The rhetoric of art criticism', *Word & Image* 15: 19-33

Hunter, R.L. 1993. "The Presentation of Herodas' 'Mimiamboi'." *Antichthon* 27: 31–44

———. 1995. "Plautus and Herodas." *Plautus Und Die Tradition Des Stregreifspiels: Festgabe Fur E. Lefevre Zum 60. Geburtstag*: 155–69

———. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP

———. 1999. *Theocritus: A Selection.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP

———. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP

Livingstone, N. and G. Nisbet (2010) *Epigram*. *G&R* New Surveys in the Classics, no. 34. Cambridge

Mastromarco, Giueseppe. 1984. *The Public of Herodas*. Brill Academic Pub.

Pollitt, J.J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP

Ridgway, B.S. 2000. *Hellenistic Sculpture II: The Styles of ca. 200-100 B.C.*. Madison, Wisconsin

Squire, Michael 2009. *Image and Text in Graece-Roman Antiquity*. Cambridge

———2010a. ―Making Myron's Cow moo? Ekphrastic epigram and the poetics of siumlation', *AJPh* 131: 589-634

———2010b. ―Reading a view: Poem and picture in the *Greek Anthology*", *Ramus* 39: 73-103

Savile, A. 1987. *Aesthetic Reconstructions: The Seminal Writings of Lessing, Kant and Schiller.* Oxford

Schmiel, R. 1993. ―Structure in Meaning in Theocritus 11", *Mnemosyne* 46: 229-34

Sens, A. 2005. ―The art of poetry and the poetry of art: The unity and poetics of Posidippus' statue-poems", in Gutzwiller 2005b, pp. 206-25

Shapiro, A. 1994 *Myth into Art: Poet and Painter in Classical Greece*. London and New York

Smith, R.R.R. 1991 *Hellenistic Scultpure: A Handbook*. London

———. 2002 ―The Use of Images: Visual History and Ancient History" in T. P. Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome,* pp. 59-102. Oxford

Steiner, D.T. (2001) *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought.* Princeton

Stewart, A. 1990. *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration.* 2 vols. New Haven, Conn.: Yale UP

Webster, T.B.L. 1964. *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. London

Webb, Ruth 1999. ―Ekphrasis ancient and modern: The invention of a genre", in *Word and Image* 15: 7-8

Sommerstein, Alan. 2009. *Talking About Laughter and Other Studies in Greek Comedy*. Oxford University Press: Oxford

Stewart, A.F. 1990. *Greek Sculpture: an Exploration*. New Haven and London

Zanker, G. 1987. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and Its Audience*. London

———. 1998. "Genre-Making in Hellenistic Poetry and Art." *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* 3: 225–38

———. 2004. *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. Madison, Wisconsin

———. "Pictorial Description as a Supplement for Narrative: The Labour of Augeas' Stables in 'Heracles Leontophonos'." *American Journal of Philology* 117: 411–23

———. "Poetry and Art in Herodas, 'Mimiamb 4'." *Beyond the Canon* 11: 357–77

———. 2009. *Herodas:* Mimiambs. Art & Phillips Classical Text, Oxford: Oxbow Books