

## BEAUTY, FAME AND POLITICS IN IBYCUS S151 *PMGF*

Ibycus S151 *PMGF* = POxy 1790 + 2081 (f) (henceforth S151) is generally regarded as an encomium of Polycrates<sup>1</sup>, an assessment which can hardly be questioned since its penultimate line (καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς, 47) addresses Polycrates and assures him of eternal fame<sup>2</sup>. But, despite the clarity of line 47, the final three lines of S151 (46-8) have been translated in two conflicting ways, and the conflict remains unresolved. Since the translation currently favoured by scholarship is, I believe, based on an unsafe assumption, Section I of this paper will challenge it. Section II will then sketch an alternative account of Ibycus' eulogistic strategy in S151; and Section III will offer a brief answer to the question whether the mythological figures of S151 are vehicles for a contemporary political message.

### I. *Beauty and Polycrates*

S151 contains strong emphasis on beauty and erotic desire<sup>3</sup>. Ibycus stresses that the Trojan war was fought over the “lovely form of fair-haired Helen” (Ξα|γθαῖς Ἑλένας περὶ εἶδει, 5), and that Aphrodite was responsible for Troy's destruction (Πέρ|γαμον δ' ἀνέ|β]α ταλαπεῖριον ἄ]τα/ χρυ|σοέ-θειραν δ[ι]ᾶ Κύπριδα, 8-9). His further pronouncements on the Trojan War include mention in passing of Cassandra's attractiveness (11-12)<sup>4</sup> before his real concerns emerge in his descriptions of the lovely young Trojans and Greeks: Cyanippus, the very beautiful youth from Argos (κάλλι]στος ἀπ' Ἄργεος/ ..... Κυάνι|ππ[ο]ς, 36-7), Zeuxippus of Sicyon (40-1), and the Trojan Troilus, admired for his attractive physique (ἐρό|ε]σαν/ μορφάν, 44-5) by both warring sides (41-5).<sup>5</sup> Ibycus then (in the interpretation which I

<sup>1</sup> The most convenient starting-point for the study of S151 is Hutchinson 2001, 40-3 (Text of S151) and 228-56 (Introduction to Ibycus and Commentary on S151); earlier bibliography is noted at 228 n. 1 and 235 n. 13. Among the most recent papers Giannini 2004, Bonanno 2004, Bowie 2009 and Hardie 2013 are particularly worth consulting for the issues treated here. Wilkinson 2015, 49-87 reports earlier work. Ink used to be spilled over whether S151's Polycrates is the tyrant. I take this as self-evident, as I assume Ibycus' authorship.

<sup>2</sup> Some further aspects of S151, such as its interplay of Homeric and Hesiodic elements, including its relationship with the Hesiodic *nautilia*, on which see Rosen 1990 and Steiner 2005, and its treatment of the Muses, on which see esp. Hardie 2013, have been extensively and satisfactorily handled in earlier scholarship, and so will not be discussed here.

<sup>3</sup> To the items listed here may be added the probable allusion detected by Steiner 2005, 352 to the beauty contest of the three goddesses judged by Paris; see also Hardie 2013, 14-16, elaborating on Steiner's perception.

<sup>4</sup> A later, fleeting female erotic element is Hyllis' golden breastband (χρυσεόστροφο[ς/ Ὕλλις, 40-1).

<sup>5</sup> Some scholars, e.g. Hutchinson 2001, 251-3, Bonanno 2004, 74, and Steiner 2005, 352-3 believe that Ibycus is classing Troilus as more beautiful than Zeuxippus. But, despite gold's

follow: see below) explicitly associates beauty (κάλλεος, 46) with these latter heroes before declaring that Polycrates will possess eternal fame (κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς, 47), and placing that fame in the context of Ibycus' song and (?)fame (48).

S151's emphasis on beauty has led the majority of commentators (influenced by the assumption that the fragment praises Polycrates for his beauty) to print the text of lines 46-7 in a way which supports that assumption, and then to translate them accordingly<sup>6</sup>:

τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰὲν	46
καὶ σὺ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς	47

Some typical translations are:

"Among them [i.e. the beauties Cyanippus, Zeuxippus and Troilus of lines 36-45] you too, Polycrates, will always have immortal fame for beauty" (Nicholson 2000, 255).

"Assieme a loro sempre, per la tua bellezza, anche tu avrai, Policrate, fama perenne" (Bonanno 2004, 71).

"Along with these you too, Polycrates, will always have deathless renown for beauty" (Bowie 2009, 125 n. 41)<sup>7</sup>.

Since in archaic Greece beauty was an attribute of young rather than mature men, such translations imply that Polycrates was a youth when S151 was composed. In the early days of its popularity this understanding of the text inspired much discussion of the chronologies of the fragment and the life of Polycrates<sup>8</sup>. Hypotheses about S151's genesis and date – already for the most part disposed of by Martin West in 1970<sup>9</sup> – ranged from an early visit by Ibycus to Samos at the invitation of Polycrates' father Aiaces, who seems to have been a man of power on the island, to the notorious "two Polycrateses" theory (founded on a textual corruption at *Suda* ι 80 Adler) which allowed Ibycus' honorand to be either the homonymous father or son

normal superiority, the gold/orichalc comparison may give them equal standing, as does (*pace* Harder 2012, II.610) Callimachus' comparison of Acontius and Cydippe to electrum and gold at *Aet.* fr. 75.31 Pf./Harder = 174.31 Massimilla; see also below Section III.

<sup>6</sup> For earlier adherents and opponents see Woodbury 1985, 203-5, who himself adopted the majority view. For more recent treatments of S151 exemplifying the current consensus in favour of the majority opinion cf., e.g., Hutchinson 2001, 232 and 253 on lines 46-8; Bonanno 2004, 74-5; Bowie 2009, 125; Hardie 2013, 17. For discussions of other early lyric passages in which beauty and erotic allure are certainly or probably attributed to a *laudandus* see Rawles 2011; 2013.

<sup>7</sup> The latter two translations, however, do not fully reflect their authors' views.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. esp. Barron 1964; 1969; Woodbury 1985 with summaries of earlier views; Nicholson 2000, 254-5.

<sup>9</sup> West 1970, 206-9.

of the tyrant<sup>10</sup>, to the opinion that Ibycus' Polycrates was just an unknown boy of that name<sup>11</sup>. These hypotheses then fed into treatments of the overall chronology of sixth-century BC Greece, but without much effect.

The motivation for the current majority translation of lines 46-7 and the *petitio principii* which gave rise to it emerge clearly from Bonanno's explanation of why she adopted it:

“Seguiamo l'interpretazione di Wilamowitz, ripresa e puntualizzata da Tammaro 1970-72, 81 ss. Cfr. anche Gentili 1984, 180 ss.: non sarà da accogliere il segno di interpunzione del papiro in fine v. 46, per cui la frase significherebbe: «essi (*scil.* i bei giovani eroi appena nominati) parteciperanno sempre della bellezza. Anche tu, Policrate, avrai fama perenne... », ma in tal modo «verrebbe a mancare l'esplicito riferimento alla bellezza di Policrate», cfr. Cavallini 1997, 116” (Bonanno 2004, 74 n. 33 – my underlinings)<sup>12</sup>.

The influence of the *magna nomina* cited here, and the assumption on which Bonanno's translation is based, are both patent. But that assumption is unfounded: Polycrates is nowhere in lines 1-45 of S151 described as beautiful, unlike the three Iliadic heroes introduced in lines 36-45; and the last three lines do not characterise him as beautiful. The current majority translation of lines 46-7 which creates such a characterisation achieves its effect by separating *πέδα* from *κάλλεος*, by taking it as equal to *μέτα* in anastrophe with *τοῖς*, and by understanding *κλέος* (47) as governing *κάλλεος*<sup>13</sup>. *καί* therefore becomes emphatic, not copulative. This is a strained procedure, and it results in rather woeful Greek: it leaves *μέν* unpaired either with a *δέ* or its equivalent, and the emphatic *καί* is semi-redundant<sup>14</sup>.

Worse still, it ignores the fact that the papyrus' scribe placed a stop after *αἰέν*, and accented *πέδα* thus to produce the following text:

τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰέν· 46

καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς. 47

By so punctuating and accenting the scribe indicated that he understood *πέδα* as *πέδεστι* = *μέτεστι*. If, instead of spurning the scribe's knowledge of Greek, we accept the papyrus' text, then a different translation emerges. West 1993, 97 almost represented it, although his “too” is misleading:

“Their beauty is for ever;

and you too shall have fame undying, Polycrates.”

Bowie 2009, 125 caught it more literally: “These men have forever a

<sup>10</sup> On these hypotheses and their chronological links see also Giannini 2004, 52-4; Orna-ghi 2008, 30-5 (with earlier bibliography).

<sup>11</sup> So Maas: cf. Nicholson 2000, 255 n. 89.

<sup>12</sup> Woodbury 1985, 204 exhibits the same *petitio principii*.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Hutchinson 2001, 253 on lines 46-8.

<sup>14</sup> A point already made by Gianotti 1973, 407.

share in beauty, and you, Polycrates, will have deathless fame”<sup>15</sup>. Other scholars have also understood lines 46-7 in this way<sup>16</sup>. It allows μέν to pair with καί, which is now fully functional and stands in place of δέ<sup>17</sup>. In addition the antithesis between the mythical *paides kaloi* and Polycrates, which is inherent in the two penultimate lines, now emerges, along with a set of remarkably neat verbal parallelisms between lines 46 and 47.

τοῖς μὲν	πέδα	κάλλεος	αἰέν	46
καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες	ἐξεῖς	κλέος	ἄφθιτον	47

On this rendering beauty is not associated with Polycrates: instead he is promised eternal κλέος (47) (see below).

Woodbury offered the most complete and detailed defence of the unpunctuated interpretation<sup>18</sup>, but every one of the points which he made against the punctuated version fails to convince. He noted that the construction producing the meaning “they have a share in beauty forever” is “unknown to choral lyric or to any verse before the Persian wars” (203). Given that most pre-490 BC choral lyric and much other early verse has not survived, this is an unimpressive argument<sup>19</sup>: we can hardly suppose that Herodotus and the Attic dramatists conspired to invent a new Greek construction without precedent. Woodbury’s similar attempt to make something of the absence of αἰεί from other extant examples of the construction (203 n. 25) is equally weak, as is his suggestion that those interpreting the line as “they have a share in beauty forever” are post-Platonists and post-Keatsians (203). All that is assumed by the punctuated translation is that αἰέν is the equivalent of ἄφθιτον: the permanent association of these heroes with beauty is due to their beauty having been celebrated by poets whose works have survived, just as Polycrates’ κλέος will be eternal through the poetry of Ibycus. Woodbury’s further points (204) are nugatory and can be set aside: they amount to the *petitio principii* criticised above, a justification of the (on his view) unpaired μέν, and a suggestion that κατ’ αἰοιδάν (48) implies a κάλλεος κλέος for Polycrates.

<sup>15</sup> But Bowie nevertheless still wanted to believe that Polycrates’ beauty is the subject of praise, and hedged his bets accordingly: “The praise of Polycrates’ κάλλος, ‘beauty’, in S151.46-8 Davies is delicate but insistent” (125); and “It is even more insistent and direct if we translate ‘Along with these you too, Polycrates, will always have deathless renown for beauty’, as argued for e.g. by Hutchinson 2001: 253-4, perhaps correctly” (125 n. 41).

<sup>16</sup> E.g. Labarbe 1962, 186-7 n. 126; Gerber 1970, 213; Peron 1982, 38-40; Campbell 1982, 307; 1991, 225; for further adherents of both sides see Wilkinson 2015, 84.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Denniston 1954<sup>2</sup>, 374 (2) (i) for parallels and meaning.

<sup>18</sup> Woodbury 1985, 203-5.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. also Hutchinson 2001, 253, who, although agreeing with Woodbury’s conclusion, nevertheless jibbed at this argument.

Some scholars have proposed that the lines are ambiguous<sup>20</sup>, but they do not take account of the fact that S151 was performed, either monodically by Ibycus or (more probably) by a chorus of *paidēs* trained by Ibycus. In either case the phrasing and emphasis of the performer(s) will have made the poet's meaning unmistakable<sup>21</sup>. There is thus no escape from a choice between the two translations of lines 46-7.

Since the source of Polycrates' κλέος ἄφθιτον is not said to be beauty in the translation preferred here, what then is it? As far as anything can be concluded from the difficult final line (48), it seems to be linked with song – either Ibycus' poetry in general, or this particular poem. Moreover, if the repetition of κλέος in lines 47-8 can be tolerated, Polycrates' κλέος is also associated with Ibycus' own (poetic) κλέος<sup>22</sup>. But a man's κλέος cannot be based solely on a poet's song and reputation: he must have achievements in the real world – although of course he still needs a poet capable of writing memorable songs to immortalise them. The first thirty-five surviving lines of S151 treat the standard source of κλέος in Homeric epic, i.e. martial feats, appropriately in this case the Iliadic feats of the major Greek warriors who came to Troy, two of whom, Ajax and Achilles, were, as Bowie acutely observed<sup>23</sup>, probably claimed by Polycrates' family as ancestors. Moreover, as Hardie pointed out, “the prediction of κλέος ἄφθιτον (47) recalls Thetis' prediction for the Homeric Achilles (*Il.* 9.413)”<sup>24</sup>. This Homericising context suggests that Polycrates' eternal fame will be assured by his prowess as a warrior lauded in song by Ibycus<sup>25</sup>. Polycrates' naval predations (which some described as piracy) might fall under this heading, as will his seizure of power in Samos by military means, his sea-battles with the Lesbians, and his land-battles with Miletus, rebel Samians, Spartans, Corinthians, and Cyrus (to the extent that these events actually took place)<sup>26</sup>. It is unclear whether Ibycus means that Polycrates' fame will be acquired through future feats or because of past accomplishments, but the latter is more likely since a mere prediction would have been too risky.

The interpretation offered here, which denies that Polycrates' own beauty is praised in S151 and sees his future κλέος as deriving from his exploits as a warrior, has consequences. It means that the only chronological conclusion

<sup>20</sup> Goldhill 1991, 117-19; Nicholson 2000, 254-6; (in effect) Bowie 2009, 125; Hardie 2013, 17 n. 2.

<sup>21</sup> The point is made by Wilkinson 2015, 84.

<sup>22</sup> But see Appendix below.

<sup>23</sup> Bowie 2009, 127.

<sup>24</sup> Hardie 2013, 10 n. 1 following earlier scholars.

<sup>25</sup> As perhaps implied by Gianotti 1973, 409.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Carty 2015, 13-15.

that can be drawn from S151 is that Polycrates was not a *pais kalos* when it was written but an adult, and one old enough to have achieved sufficient military success to assure his future κλέος. Hence it is unnecessary to discuss in connection with S151 and Polycrates whether or not beauty could be fittingly attributed to a ruler in the archaic age<sup>27</sup>.

## II. *The eulogistic function of the theme of beauty*

Section I argued that there is no mention of Polycrates' beauty in S151. It might, then, reasonably be asked why there is such concentration on beauty in S151 if this theme is not intended to reflect credit on Polycrates by highlighting his own beauty? S151's foregrounding of beauty does indeed enhance Polycrates' standing, but not in the way understood by past scholarship. Later sources (including Hellenistic and later epigrammatists and scholars) which record Ibycus' (and more frequently Anacreon's) contributions to the ambience of Polycrates' court lay particular stress on the poetry celebrating beautiful boys written by them on Samos<sup>28</sup>, indubitably at the commission of Polycrates himself<sup>29</sup>. These sources name the boys as Smerdis<sup>30</sup>, Bathyllus<sup>31</sup>, Kleobulus<sup>32</sup> and Megistes<sup>33</sup>. The poets (Anacreon in particular but also Ibycus) sometimes claimed that they themselves were in love with these boys rather than praising them on behalf of, and to the advantage of, Polycrates, and the ancient sources generally accepted such claims. Some modern scholars have also trusted the poets' assertions<sup>34</sup>, although a moment's thought should inspire doubt. How likely is it that a wealthy and powerful patron like Polycrates would have tolerated genuine competition for his boy-friends by poets such as Ibycus and Anacreon? These poets may have been aristocrats in their own cities, but in Samos they were guests, and indeed the guests of a powerful tyrant; even more pertinently they were the recipients of

<sup>27</sup> Hutchinson 2001, 232 and Hardie 2013, 10 n. 1 discuss this point, drawing different conclusions. The Iliadic lines sometimes cited in this connection (Νηρέυς, ὃς κάλλιστος ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ ἴλιον ἦλθε/ τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα, 2.673-4) should not be made too much of: presumably all Homeric kings were καλοί, but it is not an issue in Homer.

<sup>28</sup> For details see Hutchinson 2001, 231.

<sup>29</sup> The curious story of Polycrates burning and demolishing palaestras to deter homosexual relationships which might be problematic for his tyranny (Athen. 13.602d) is either a misunderstanding of a poetic text, or pure invention.

<sup>30</sup> AP 7.31.1 (Dioscor.); AP 7.27.6 (Antip. Sidon); AP 7.29.3 (Antip. Sidon); AP 7.25.8 ([Simonid.]); Aelian *Var. Hist.* 9.4; Maxim. Tyr. *Diss.* 18.9; 20.1 (ter): 29.2; 37.5; Philostr. *Epist.* 8; Sueton. *Περὶ Βλασφημιῶν* 14.

<sup>31</sup> AP 7.31.3 (Dioscor.); AP 7.30.3 (Antip. Sidon); Maxim. Tyr. *Diss.* 18.9; 37.5.

<sup>32</sup> Maxim. Tyr. *Diss.* 18.9; 21.2 (bis); 37.5.

<sup>33</sup> AP 7.27.5 (Antip. Sidon); AP 7.25.7 ([Simonid.]).

<sup>34</sup> E.g. Bowie 2009, 127-30 (on Anacreon), also usefully summarising the poetic remains.

Polycrates' material generosity. It is much more credible, then, that the poets' declarations of love for their patron's beautiful male concubines were intended as assurances of the boys' beauty, and so were really vehicles for the indirect praise of their patron. He and he alone had the status and wealth to attract and retain the affections of these beautiful boys whom the likes of Ibycus and Anacreon could only admire and desire from afar. All this will have been well understood in the sixth century BC, particularly if, as one view holds, a similar convention enabled Sappho to declare her passion for numerous young virgins in her care as an attestation of their desirability and value on the marriage market.

In the pederastic atmosphere of Samos, then, the tyrant's possession of beautiful boys was yet another proof of his power, and the poets' affectations of love for them provided 'sincere' testimony to their beauty. Such a life-style with access to attractive boys was a widespread aspiration among Greek aristocrats in the sixth century BC. The Theognidean corpus bears eloquent testimony to this; one passage, the first couplet of which is also attributed to Solon (fr. 23 W.<sup>2</sup> = 17 G.-P.<sup>2</sup>), sums up the constituents of the life of the elite male, and declares that without boys and horses a man has no εὐφροσύνη, a term associated with aristocratic well-being:

Ὀλβιος, ὃ παῖδές τε φίλοι καὶ μώνυχες ἵπποι  
 θηρευταί τε κύνες καὶ ξένοι ἄλλοδαποί.  
 ὅστις μὴ παῖδᾶς τε φιλεῖ καὶ μώνυχας ἵππους  
 καὶ κύνας, οὐποτέ οἱ θυμὸς ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ. (Theogn. 1253-6)

Sentiments such as this were clearly commonplace in the archaic period, as two variations on the theme from the same corpus attest: Ὀλβιος ὅστις παιδὸς ἐρῶν οὐκ οἶδε θάλασσαν,/ οὐδέ οἱ ἐν πόντῳ νύξ ἐπιῦσα μέλει (Theogn. 1375-6); Ὀλβιος ὅστις ἐρῶν γυμνάζεται οἴκαδε ἐλθὼν/ εὐδεῖν σὺν καλῷ παιδὶ πανημέριος (Theogn. 1335-6). Solon, in a longer fragment with a more balanced and moralistic attitude to wealth (fr. 24 W.<sup>2</sup> = 18 G.-P.<sup>2</sup>), equates possession of a boy or women of prime age with having silver, gold, land, horses and mules<sup>35</sup>. These passages are openly hedonistic: they imply that the good aristocratic life must include access to the sexual favours of prime objects of love. It is in keeping with this ethos that in fr. 584 *PMG* Simonides introduced the idea of a *tyrannis* into such a context, although the fragment's brevity leaves it unclear what kind of 'pleasure' he had in mind:

τίς γὰρ ἄδονᾶς ἄτερ θνα-  
 τῶν βίος ποθεινὸς ἢ ποί-  
 α τυραννίς;  
 τᾷσδ' ἄτερ οὐδὲ θεῶν ζηλωτὸς αἰών.

<sup>35</sup> On Solon frs. 23 and 24 W.<sup>2</sup> (= 17 and 18 G.-P.<sup>2</sup>) see Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010, 343-56.

As a wealthy tyrant, Polycrates had ample access to the favours of beautiful boys. When Ibycus and Anacreon praised those boys by name in other poems and gave their eulogies extra credibility by claiming to be in love with them they were directly addressing the fact that Polycrates possessed *paides kaloi*, and were thus openly boosting his prestige and reputation as a rich and powerful ruler. In S151 Ibycus eulogises Polycrates indirectly by praising mythological *paides kaloi*; just as the martial exploits of the warriors at Troy in S151 will have brought Polycrates' military achievements to their hearers' minds, so Troilus and the Greek beauties who came to Troy will have evoked thoughts of Polycrates' beautiful boy-friends and his great good fortune as their possessor. It may even be that one of Polycrates' boy-friends was named and praised in the lost initial portion of S151,<sup>36</sup> along the lines either of Ibycus fr. 288 *PMGF*<sup>37</sup> or fr. 289(a) *PMGF*, the latter of which exploited the myth of the rape of Ganymede to praise a beautiful boy, Gorgias<sup>38</sup>.

Ibycus was well-known in antiquity as the writer of eulogies of *paides kaloi*; one might conjecture that such poems were performed by choruses of boys, and fell into the class of lyrics known in antiquity as *paideia* or *paidika*.<sup>39</sup> Hardie proposed<sup>40</sup> that this particular ode was composed for public performance on an occasion linked to the temple of Hera, citing Mosino 1977 for evidence of choric performances by *paides* at Rhegium. Gentili had earlier thought it to be a banquet piece<sup>41</sup>. Both scenarios are possible. An elite banquet, an appropriate setting for both choric and monodic performance, would have afforded Polycrates the chance to impress Samian fellow-aristocrats and important foreign visitors. On the other hand a public and choric performance would have given Ibycus' piece and its praise of the tyrant maximum exposure to the entire citizen body, which perhaps makes it the more likely alternative<sup>42</sup>.

<sup>36</sup> Opinions vary on how much is missing from the beginning: e.g. Hutchinson 2001, 237 thinks that a great deal has gone astray, while Hardie 2013, 14-19 holds, on the basis of the fragment's organisational structure, that only the first strophe has perished.

<sup>37</sup> Εὐρύαλε γλαυκῶν Χαρίτων θάλος < >/ καλλικόμεν μελέδημα, σὲ μὲν Κύπρις/ ἃ τ' ἀγανοβλέφαρος Πει-θῶ ροδέουσιν ἐν ἄνθεσι θρέψαν.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Barron 1984, esp.16-19.

<sup>39</sup> On such pieces cf. Cairns 2011, 28-31. Athen. 13.601b-c implies that Ibyc. fr. 286 *PMGF*, which it quotes, is pederastic, in which case it may be part of a *paidikon*, and 13.603c-d mentions Ibycus as the source of a homosexual myth which might have been included in another *paidikon*. See also the fragments of Ibycus supplemented by West 1984.

<sup>40</sup> Hardie 2013, 9 n. 1.

<sup>41</sup> Gentili 1988, 129.

<sup>42</sup> So already, tending similarly, Cingano 1990, 222.



### III. *Politics in S151?*

Early commentators on S151 rightly wondered whether its mythological content might carry political messages, as myth often does in poetry written for important men. The quest for such messages in this fragment is not made easier by the uncertainty about the dates of Ibycus and of many historical events of the sixth century BC; and, if what has been argued above is correct, S151 itself has little chronological information to give since it cannot be dated more precisely than to Polycrates' maturity. Hence any proposals about political reference in S151 must be speculative. Nevertheless a pattern of sorts emerges from its mythical material, and it might be meaningful.

The prime location of S151's myths is Argos, and the central figure in them is Agamemnon. Argos appears near the beginning of the extant narration as the starting-point of the expedition against Troy (Ἀργ]οθεν, 3), and the same theme, again stressing Argos, crops up in lines 28-9 (ἀπ' Ἀργεος/ ἡλύθο[ν ἐξ Τροία]ν). In the meantime Agamemnon, as leader of the expedition, has occupied the last three lines of the second epode:

τῶν] μὲν κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων  
 ἄρχε Πλεισθ[ενί]δας βασιλ[εὺς] ἀγὸς ἀνδρῶν  
 Ἀτρεὸς ἐσ[θλοῦ π]αίς ἔκγ[ο]νος (20-2).

S151 thus clearly implies an analogy between Agamemnon and Polycrates (who also occupies the last lines of an epode, the fourth and final one, 47-8). The heroes mentioned in the third epode (Achilles and Ajax, 32-4) also function as analogues of Polycrates, probably because he claimed them as ancestors (see above n. 23). They are not, however, elevated above Agamemnon, who was the supreme king (as Ibycus strongly stresses in βασιλ[εὺς] ἀγὸς ἀνδρῶν, 21), and hence the best fit for an analogue of Polycrates *qua* ruler. Agamemnon is described in lines 21-2 as the son of Atreus, but also as a Pleisthenid. This might be seen as Ibycus' reconciliation of the Homeric (Argive) and Hesiodic (Spartan) versions of Agamemnon's paternity. But, by making the Spartan Pleisthenes merely a forebear of Agamemnon and by doubly emphasising that Agamemnon was the true son of the Argive Atreus (Ἀτρεὸς ἐσ[θλοῦ π]αίς ἔκγ[ο]νος, 22)<sup>43</sup>, Ibycus confirms that Agamemnon was an Argive. Significantly Agamemnon's brother, the Spartan Menelaus, does not feature in S151.<sup>44</sup>

When it comes to the three mythical Trojan War beauties, Troilus, being a Trojan, could carry no relevant political charge. But Ibycus has passed over Homer's most beautiful Greek, Nireus of Syme (*Iliad* 2.673-4, quoted

<sup>43</sup> See Barron 1969, 128, reporting Handley's observation on this point.

<sup>44</sup> He appeared in line 27 of the first publications of S151, but then rightly vanished: see Barron 1969, 129.

above n. 27), and has instead introduced two relatively unknown beauties, Cyanippus and Zeuxippus (36-41). Cyanippus (36-7) was a king of Argos, and he is linked elsewhere with various other members of the Argive royal family<sup>45</sup>. Significantly Ibycus stresses Cyanippus' ethnicity in ἀπ' Ἀργεος (36). Zeuxippus was a king of Sicyon, but Sicyon is unlikely to be politically meaningful here. A link between Zeuxippus and Argos exists, although it is highly questionable: Zeuxippus is introduced by Ibycus as the son of Hyllis (χρυσόστροφος/ Ὑλλις ἐγήνατο, 40-1), and Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Ὑλλεῖς (v 27 Billerbeck - Neumann-Hartmann) seems to characterise Hyllis, albeit in unacceptable Greek, as an Argive nymph, attributing the information to Callimachus: καὶ παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ Ὑλλίς Ὑλλίδος, ἀπὸ Ἀργείας μιᾶς τῶν νυμφῶν. Meineke proposed rearranging the text to read καὶ παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ Ὑλλίς ἀπὸ Ὑλλίδος Ἀργείας, μιᾶς τῶν νυμφῶν, which would establish the link; but Wilamowitz more plausibly emended Ἀργείας to Αἰγείας, thus bringing Stephanus into accord with Apollonius Rhodius<sup>46</sup>. Nevertheless the remote possibility remains that a local Argive tradition associated the Dorian tribe 'Hylleis' with the nymph Hyllis. If Zeuxippus did have an Argive link, it would reinforce the idea that Ibycus' orichalc-gold comparison of him to Troilus (41-5) is a comparison of equals.

Even if Zeuxippus' Argive association is set aside as dubious, the remaining Argive emphases must be judged significant. In particular Ibycus' strong support for the Homeric version of Agamemnon's ancestry and residence is at least a public rejection of the alternative version in which Agamemnon's palace was located at Sparta<sup>47</sup>. Ibycus' attitude can easily be related to the sixth-century BC history of Samos. Material as well as historical evidence has led to the conclusion that during Polycrates' tyranny (?early 540s BC-522 BC<sup>48</sup>) there was a split between Sparta and one party on Samos (that of Polycrates), and a consequent alliance between Sparta and the other party (his adversaries). Polycrates' tyranny coincides with the period during which the volume of Laconian deposits in the Samian Heraion fell away while they continued at the same level in the Samian Artemision. The eventual combined attack on Polycrates around 525 BC by the Spartans and Samian exiles, and the destruction of the Artemision in the 520s BC has caused the Heraion to be identified with Polycrates' supporters and the Artemision with his ad-

<sup>45</sup> I.e. a descendant of Bias, brother of Melampous (Pausan. 2.18.4); son or grandson of Adrastus king of Argos. Cyanippus and Zeuxippus are well discussed by Barron 1961; 1964, 224-5; he believed that Ibycus was polemicising against Cleisthenes, tyrant of Sicyon.

<sup>46</sup> *Argon.* 4.538-43, 1149; for further details see Callim. fr. 712 Pf.; Pausanias gives her name as Syllis (2.6.7), which looks like a textual error for Hyllis.

<sup>47</sup> See Davies - Finglass 2014, 27-9, 159 (fr. 177), 501.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Shipley 1987, 68-99 = Chh. 4-5.

versaries. Since Argos was engaged in hostilities with Sparta from the mid-sixth century on, Ibycus' emphases on Argos in his myths can reasonably be seen as a compliment to the enemy of Polycrates' enemy Sparta.

One is of course tempted to go further and to speculate that Polycrates might at some point have hoped to ally himself with Argos against Sparta, and that Ibycus' boosting of Argos in his eulogy of Polycrates was part of that process. There is, however, no evidence of contacts between Argos and Samos in this period. An east Ionian statuette of c. 570 BC dedicated by a 'Polycrates', perhaps in the Argive Heraion, has sometimes been cited as showing such contact<sup>49</sup>. But Polycrates is a not uncommon Argive name<sup>50</sup>, so the dedicator was more probably home-grown. Argos was not a sea-power, and in any case it had troubles enough at home; if there was an attempt by Polycrates to enlist Argos on his side, it led nowhere.

To sum up: I argued in Section I that lines 46-7 of S151 mean "These men have forever a share in beauty, and you, Polycrates, will have deathless fame", i.e. that in S151 beauty is not attributed to Polycrates but to the mythical youths listed in it. Hence Ibycus praises Polycrates not for his beauty but as the future possessor of eternal κλέος, presumably for his martial exploits; Polycrates was therefore a mature man when S151 was composed. In Section II I proposed that the emphasis on beauty in S151 instead by implication eulogises Polycrates for being able to engage the affections of the beautiful contemporary boys praised by poets at his court. Such praise enhanced Polycrates' status because it portrayed him as enjoying an essential ingredient of the ideal life-style of an aristocratic male in the archaic age. In Section III I confronted the slippery question whether the mythological content of S151 might have a political colouring or intent. I pointed out the prominent presence of Argos within the myths, and wondered whether this might have meaning beyond the obvious downgrading of Polycrates' enemy, Sparta. But there is no independent evidence that Polycrates ever reached out to Argos as a potential ally, or that Argos responded.

*Appendix: The repeated κλέος of lines 47 and 48.*

Hutchinson 2001, 254 comments on the assertiveness of the repeated κλέος of lines 47 and 48. Poets are a boastful crew, and professional arrogance on Ibycus' part would not be surprising. But in fact line 48 can be translated with more or less emphasis on Ibycus: either he is claiming (eternal) fame for himself – or for his song – as well as for Polycrates<sup>51</sup>; or he is

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Shipley 1987, 74, accepting the identification.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *LGPN* IIIA s.v.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Goldhill 1991, 118 (assuming hendiadys?): "as too is my fame for song".

more modestly foregrounding Polycrates' eternal fame and thinking of the fame of his own poetry as the vehicle for it<sup>52</sup>.

But anyone unable to tolerate the repetition of κλέος might consider reading νόον instead in line 48 (κλέος could easily have replaced νόον if the scribe's eye slipped a line). Ibycus uses νόον at fr. S192a.10 *PMGF*, and the entire phrase κατ' ἐμὸν νόον/νοῦν ("in my estimation") is found in archaic Greek poetry and elsewhere, viz.: Theogn. 350; *Carm. Conv.* 908.2 *PMG* = 25.2 Fabbro (also at line and fragment-end); Theocritus *Id.* 7.30, 39; Philostratus *Vita Apolloni* 8.41 Jones; Vettius Valens *Anth.* 334.14 Pingree; [Hippocrates] *De corde* 11.13. This would result in a translation like "as my song proclaims and as I reckon"<sup>53</sup>.

The Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

FRANCIS CAIRNS

#### BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- J. P. Barron, *The Son of Hyllis*, "CR" 11, 1961, 185-7  
 J. P. Barron, *The Sixth-Century Tyranny at Samos*, "CQ" 14, 1964, 210-29  
 J. P. Barron, *Ibycus: to Polycrates*, "BICS" 16, 1969, 119-49  
 J. P. Barron, *Ibycus, Gorgias and other poems*, "BICS" 31, 1984, 13-24  
 M. G. Bonanno, *Come guarire dal complesso epico. L'Ode a Policrate di Ibico*, in Cavallini 2004, 67-96  
 E. Bowie, *Wandering poets, archaic style*, in R. Hunter - I. Rutherford (edd.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, Cambridge 2009, 105-36  
 F. Cairns, *Money and the Poet: the First Stasimon of Pindar Isthmian 2*, "Mnemosyne" 64, 2011, 21-36  
 D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of early Greek lyric, elegiac and iambic poetry*, Bristol 1982  
 A. Carty, *Polycrates, Tyrant of Samos. New light on archaic Greece*, Stuttgart 2015  
 E. Cavallini (ed.), *Samo: storia, letteratura, scienza. Atti delle giornate di studio, Ravenna 14-16 novembre 2002*, Pisa-Roma 2004  
 E. Cingano, *L'opera di Ibico e di Stesicoro nella classificazione degli antichi e dei moderni*, "Ann. ist. univ. orient. Napoli" 12, 1990, 189-224  
 M. Davies - P. J. Finglass, *Stesichorus: the poems*, edited with introduction, translation and commentary, Cambridge 2014  
 J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954<sup>2</sup>  
 B. Gentili, *Poetry and its Public in ancient Greece: From Homer to the fifth century*, (trans. A. T. Cole), Baltimore-London 1991  
 D. E. Gerber, *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*. Amsterdam 1970  
 P. Giannini, *Ibico a Samo*, in Cavallini 2004, 51-64

<sup>52</sup> For bibliography cf. Wilkinson 2015, 86.

<sup>53</sup> I am grateful to Douglas Cairns, Ian Duquesnay and J. Gordon Howie for advice on this paper. All errors and opinions are mine.

- G. F. Gianotti, *Mito ed encomio. Il carme di Ibico in onore di Policrate*, "RFIC" 101, 1973, 401-10.
- S. Goldhill, *The Poet's Voice: Essays in Poetics and Greek literature*, Cambridge 1991
- B. P. Grenfell - A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XV, London 1922
- A. Harder, *Callimachus Aetia*, Introd., text, translation, and commentary, 2 vols, Oxford 2012
- A. Hardie, *Ibycus and the Muses of Helicon*, "MD" 70, 2013, 9-36
- G. O. Hutchinson, *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on selected larger pieces*, Oxford 2001
- J. Labarbe, *Un décalage de 40 ans dans la chronologie de Polycrate*, "AC" 31, 1962, 153-88
- F. Mosino, *Lirica corale a Reggio: una notizia trascurata*, "QUCC" 26, 1977, 117-19
- N. Nicholson, *Pederastic Poets and Adult Patrons in Late Archaic Lyric*, "CW" 93, 2000, 235-59
- M. Noussia Fantuzzi, *Solon the Athenian. The poetic fragments*, Leiden-Boston 2010
- M. Ornaghi, *I Policrati ibicei. Ibico, Anacreonte, Policrate e la cronografia dei poeti della 'corte' di Samo*, "Annali Online di Ferrara - Lettere" 1, 2008, 14-72
- J. Peron, *Le poème à Polycrate: Une «palinodie» d'Ibycus?*, "Rev. Phil." 56, 1982, 33-56
- R. Rawles, *Early epinician: Ibycus and Simonides*, in P. Agócs - C. Carey - R. Rawles (edd.) *Reading the Victory Ode*, Cambridge 2012, 3-27
- R. Rawles, *Eros and praise in early Greek lyric*, in L. Athanassaki - E. Bowie (edd.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination*, Berlin-Boston 2011, 139-59
- R. M. Rosen, *Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's Works and Days*, "Cl. Ant." 9, 1990, 99-113
- G. Shipley, *A History of Samos: 800-188 BC*, Oxford 1987
- D. Steiner, *Nautical matters: Hesiod's Nautilia and Ibycus Fragment 282 PMG*, "CP" 100, 2005, 347-55
- M. L. West, *Melica*, "CQ" 20, 1970, 205-15
- M. L. West, *New fragments of Ibycus' love songs*, "ZPE" 57, 1984, 23-32
- M. L. West, *Greek lyric poetry*, Oxford 1993
- C. L. Wilkinson, *The Lyric of Ibycus*, introduction, text and commentary, Berlin 2015
- L. Woodbury, *Ibycus and Polycrates*, "Phoenix" 39, 1985, 193-220

## ABSTRACT:

§I argues that in Ibycus S151 Polycrates is not praised for his beauty but for his fame as a warrior; hence the Polycrates of S151 was a mature man. §II proposes that S151's emphasis on mythical beauties implicitly eulogises Polycrates for his contemporary boy-friends, an essential element of the ideal archaic life-style of an aristocratic male. §III asks whether the prominence of Argos in the myths of S151 is politically significant, but notes the lack of evidence of contacts between Polycrates and Argos. Finally the possibility that in line 48 Ibycus wrote *vóov* rather than repeating *κλέος* is canvassed.

## KEYWORDS:

Ibycus, Polycrates, beauty, fame, archaic aristocratic male life-style.