

Introduction

AMONG THE RECENTLY discovered roll of epigrams that have been attributed to the third-century-BCE poet Posidippus is a votive dedication that narrates an extraordinary journey. The lyre of the Archaic poet Arion migrates from the Archaic Greek world to Posidippus's Alexandria, where it finds itself an object of dedication in the shrine of his queen.¹

VI	18	Ἄρσινόη, σοὶ τή[ν]δε λύρην ὑπὸ χειρ[.....]ῦ	37
	19	• φθεγξαμ[ένην] δελφικῆ ἡγαγ' Ἀριόνιο[ς	
	20	οὔ. . εἰλου[....]ας ἐκ κύματος αλλοτ[
	21	κεῖνος ἀν[....]ς λευκὰ περᾶι πελά[γῃ	
	22	πολλαπο[....]. τητι καὶ αἰόλα τῆι .[
	23	φωνῆι π[....]ακον κανον ἀηδογ[
	24	ἄνθεμα δ', [ᾧ Φιλ]ἀδελφε, τὸν ἤλασεν [.....]ίω,	
	25	— τόνδε δέ[χου, .]υκου μ<ε>ίλια ναοπόλο[υ.	

To you, Arsinoe, this lyre from the hand? (. . .) made to resound, Arion's dolphin brought. (. . .) from the wave (. . .), that one crossed the white sea—and many varied things (. . .)—with voice (. . .). As an offering, Brother(-loving one), receive this (which brought? . . .) gift from the temple guard.

Like other Hellenistic epigrams,² this one gives the reader a biography of the dedicated object and a narrative of journey, and names the person that dedicated it. All this is done in the manner of dedicatory inscription. Archaic lyric here lives on through its preservation, its recollection, and its patronage. But not without alteration. The lyric song is now transposed into the meter appropriate for a dedicatory inscription, elegiac couplets, which come increasingly to subsume much of the compositional space once occupied by lyric. And Archaic song lives on under the protection of a queen. Arsinoe's patronage not only enables new poets but also ensures preservation of the past.

While the text of this epigram has a number of lacunae that limit a conclusive reading, there is a clear contrast between past time and past singer, Archaic setting and Arion, and present time and the preservation of song. Zephyrium, site

¹ I give the text of the electronic version of the CHS site (http://chs.harvard.edu/chs/issue_1_posidippus), which has fewer conjectured readings than either the *editio princeps* of Bastianini and Gallazzi 2001 or the edition of C. Austin and Bastianini 2002.

² See, e.g., Callim. *Ep.* 14 GP (5 Pf.).

of Arsinoe's shrine and of the preservation of the lyre, comes to be the preservation of song. There is even the implicit parallel of Cape Taenarum and Cape Zephyrium, and the image of Arion at the one and his lyre at the other. Even in the poem's damaged state, it is possible to perceive a chiasmus in lines 1 and 2 of object-voice . . . voice-object: that is, lyre-voice . . . songs-lyre.

The epigram showcases the Hellenistic reception of Archaic lyric at multiple levels. This is true from the opening juxtaposition of dedicatee (Arsinoe) and object dedicated (the lyre)³ to the final dedicatory inscription that makes a past instrument of lyric song the object of an elegiac text. The poem can stand on its own. But it is enriched by at least one model. This knowledge renders the text more intelligible and more effective. The model is the tale of Arion's own passage from sure death at the hands of pirates to safety on the back of a dolphin, a tale that ends with a reference to a small bronze statue of Arion at Cape Taenarum.

Herodotus 1.23 narrates Arion's journey from Tarentum to Corinth; Arion's voice and song, the dolphin, Arion's salvation, Arion's patron, Periander tyrant of Corinth, and the final dedication of a votive object are all significant features of the tale. But in Posidippus's poem it is not Arion or his human voice that is preserved, but the lyre. It is not the poet but the object that becomes the focus of attention in Arsinoe's temple. Arion's patron, Periander, plays a significant role in the earlier narrative. Arsinoe, also a ruler, also a patron of the arts, takes this role in Posidippus. The epigram concludes with a discrete reference to the temple guard who also watches over the dedicated lyre.⁴ Herodotus's tale concludes with the figure of the votive object, though the name of the dedicator is absent. The one votive image, the singer riding on a dolphin, is transformed into another, the lyre borne by a dolphin, and the setting of the dedicatory image is transferred from Cape Taenarum to Cape Zephyrium and Arsinoe's shrine.

Another epigram of Posidippus, this one preserved in the *Greek Anthology*, details exactly such a transition from Archaic Greek past to Alexandrian present and a similar preservation of song. This is Posidippus 17 GP (122 AB), his epigram on the courtesan Doricha. Here the poet uses the fiction of sepulchral epigram to recall Sappho and highlight her poetry as text. Doricha (or Rhodopis, as we know her from the narrative of Herodotus 2.134–35), the *hetaira* who detains Sappho's brother Charaxus in Egypt and who figures in several of Sappho's extant fragments,⁵ here occasions recall of Sappho and of her poetry:⁶

Δωρίχα, ὅστέα μὲν σὰ πάλαι κόνις ἢ δ' ἀναδυσμός
χαίτης ἢ τε μύρων ἔκπνοος ἀμπεχόνῃ,

³ This configuration is itself emblematic of the place Arsinoe II comes to have in the contemporary reception of lyric.

⁴ Much of this part of the text is unsure; see Laudenbach 2002–3: 122.

⁵ Fr. 15.11, 252, 254 (includes Hdt. 2.135); suppl. fr. 7.1.

⁶ Text of line 1 after U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin, 1913) 20. See further M. Albrecht, *The Epigrams of Posidippus of Pella* (Dublin, 1996), 73–74. The text

ἢ ποτε τὸν χαρίεντα περιστέλλουσα Χάραξον
 σύχρους ὀρθρινῶν ἦψαο κισσυβίων·
 Σαπφῶαι δὲ μένουσι φίλης ἔτι καὶ μενέουσιν 5
 ῥῶδης αἱ λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες
 οὔνομα σὸν μακαριστόν, ὃ Ναύκρατις ὧδε φυλάξει
 ἔστ' ἂν ἴη Νείλου ναῦς ἐφ' ἄλός πελάγη.

Doricha, your bones are long dust, and the band of your hair, and your perfume-breathing robe, with which you once wrapped lovely Charaxus, and, one body, you took hold of the wine bowls in the morning. But Sappho's clear columns of lovely song remain and will still remain, giving voice to your blessed name, which Naucratis will so preserve as long as ship from the Nile sails on the high sea.

Here the lyric voice, and subject matter, of Sappho are recalled to Egypt as “voice-giving” physical texts that are inscribed, in turn, in epigram.⁷ The first quatrain, with its movement from imagery of death to life and love, is paralleled in the second with progression from song to text to journey. Here the journey from Egypt replaces the image of the journey to the world of Archaic lyric, which is a standard conceit in Hellenistic poetry for signaling evocation of an Archaic poet.⁸ This reflects both the onetime progress of Charaxus and, as P. A. Rosenmeyer has noted, the journey of the papyrus, the material setting of the φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες.⁹ Posidippus applies the imagery of physical luxury, or *habrosynē*, for which Sappho's poetry was renowned, to the courtesan who once figured in Sappho's poetry. Μύρων ἔκπνοος is itself a matrix of Sappho's erotic imagery.

These short poems show the complexity of the reception of Archaic lyric in Hellenistic poetry. Its presence is at once the result of poetic imitation, the physical treatment of texts, and the creation of cultural memory in a new setting. The temple of Arsinoe-Aphrodite at Zephyrium is a construction of the third century. The dedication of Arion's lyre to Arsinoe brings Archaic song to the poet's Alexandria and sets Arsinoe within a much older patron-poet relationship. The preservation of Sappho's songs in papyrus columns ensures the continued singing of Charaxus and Doricha, both by Sappho and by the poet who now sings of her in epigram, Posidippus. Moreover, in both cases, a fifth-century prose author serves as an intermediate intertext for the reception of Arion and Sappho.

preserved in Athenaeus is σ' ἀπαλὰ κοιμήσατο δεσμών; C. Austin, in his edition coauthored with G. Bastianini (Milan, 2002), 158, conjectures σὰ πάλοι κόνις ἦν ὃ τε δεσμός. Punctuation and subsequent translation of line 6 follow C. Austin and Bastianini 2002: 158.

⁷Cf. Barchiesi 2000: 290–91 n. 7.

⁸Krevans 1983: 213–15.

⁹P. Rosenmeyer 1997: 132; T. Hawkins suggested to me that the image of the ship's repeated journey at the poem's end may also may be meant to recall the familiar Egyptian image of the bark of the Sun.

This prose narrative underlines the role that earlier reception—whether through historical narrative (e.g., Herodotus), poetic biography (e.g., Chamaeleon), or even philosophical discussion—comes to play in the reception of this earlier poetic art in the Hellenistic period.¹⁰

The study of Hellenistic poetry has long been taken up with poetic allusion, but recent decades have seen a more methodologically consistent and nuanced approach to reading Hellenistic poetry in terms of its models. In part this development is due to the influence of intertextual studies in Latin poetry in the later twentieth century. Latin poets consciously associated their poetry with the poets of third-century Alexandria and later. Hence a better understanding of the poetics of imitation in Augustan Rome can shed light on the interrelations among the Alexandrians, who are the artistic models of the Romans. Similarly, an enhanced understanding of how the Romans use poetic models, and of the relationship of model text to later creation, puts the Hellenistic poets' varied and constant use of earlier poems in a far more creative light.

Intertextuality as a method in reading Latin poetry is a large subject. It is not the purpose of this introduction to provide a full-scale summary. Still, a few words are in order before we turn to some of the specific challenges of the present study in using intertextual reading for understanding Hellenistic poetry in the context of its lyric models.¹¹ Intertextuality, the systematic study of the interrelations between texts, came to prominence in the Anglophone world in the early 1980s through the work of, in particular, G. B. Conte, D. Fowler, S. Hinds, and A. Barchiesi. The modern theoretical discourse on intertextuality is a way of comprehending perceived phenomena, whether in literary text, film, music, or other media. The work of Conte and others brought the literary method of intertextuality to what had been no more than the compilation of parallels in texts. In other words, scholars have come to recognize that imitation is an art in itself, with its own dynamics of preservation, variation, and recreation. This leads to a refined understanding of ancient composition, one perhaps best first voiced by G. Pasquali in his pioneering study *“L'arte allusiva”* (1951) and encapsulated in the final line of that work, *“l'allusione è il mezzo, l'evocazione il fine”*: allusion is the means; evocation, the end.¹² The Roman poets, as one critic has

¹⁰ Plato and Aristotle, who discuss lyric poets and whose works serve, perhaps surprisingly, as both collection and commentary of some lyric fragments, figure here.

¹¹ Hubbard (1999: 7–18) provides one of the best brief surveys of the components that now constitute intertextuality as a method for reading ancient poetry. The confluence in Hubbard's approach of intertextuality with what Hubbard terms “literary filiation” (an author's engagement with a specific precursor in the tradition in which he is himself an artist: e.g., Catullus with Sappho qua lyric poet) is especially helpful in approaching a tradition like that of the Hellenistic poets, who engage their poetic tradition both as poetry-art and as poetry-text.

¹² For an excellent short introduction to the evolution of intertextuality as a method in Latin poetry studies, see Fowler in Hinds and Fowler 1997. Kristeva's original definition of intertextuality (1980: 69), which encompassed a broader definition of text(s) than what we would term “literary,”

put it, are composing in a tradition “that involves reading and reworking an earlier tradition.”¹³ To understand the product of their composition, one needs a sense of the components out of which they are creating their poetry—including their models and their approach to their models. Subsequently this line of criticism has benefited from related approaches in treating literary imitation, especially the structuralist criticism of G. Genette and M. Riffaterre, as well as the work of the Yale critic H. Bloom on the relational tension between artists and their models.¹⁴ As an interpretive approach, intertextuality is particularly effective in understanding how texts are read in light of one another. For example, Virgil’s “inventus, regina, tuo de litore cessi” (“unwillingly, Queen, I left your shore”), addressed to Dido by Aeneas in *Aeneid* 6, is affected by a reader’s hearing the lament of Berenice’s lock in Catullus 66.39: “invita, o regina, tuo de vertice cessi” (“unwillingly, Queen, I left your head”). The act of recall does not end with these two, but comes to involve other texts and relations of texts. These include the severing of a lock of Dido’s hair just before her death at the conclusion of *Aeneid* 4, and Catullus’s treatment of both Sappho and Callimachus, and the heritage, as it were, of one text’s recurring in another.¹⁵ The allusion is Virgil’s recall of a line of Catullus, brought to our attention in standard commentaries as “Cf. Catull. 66.39.” As an intertext, Catullus’s poem brings to the reader a longer tradition of lament, and of the severed lock, which incorporates that of Dido at the moment of her death at the end of *Aeneid* 4, a passage that is linked to this one in *Aeneid* 6 through the recall of Berenice’s severed lock in Catullus’s poem.

The study of allusion has traditionally been central to the interpretation of Hellenistic poetry, in part because of the perception that the newly systematized practice of scholarship at Alexandria and other Hellenistic *mētropoleis* allowed poets a more focused, sustained, and critical understanding of Archaic text.¹⁶

is of particular interest today for readers working increasingly on the interpretation of ancient poetry in its setting(s). E.g., to what extent does the actual presence of statuary and other monuments in the world of both poet and audience affect a reading of poetry replete with references to that statuary?

¹³ Thomas 1999: 53.

¹⁴ C. Cusset’s *La muse dans la bibliothèque: Réécriture et intertextualité dans la poésie alexandrine* (Paris, 1999) is an application of Genette’s subclasses of “transtextualité,” particularly “hypertextualité,” to reading Hellenistic poetry. See further Genette 1982: 7–14. Genette’s *Palimpsestes* (Paris, 1982) has a particular appeal to classicists, as Genette himself makes extensive use of models drawn from ancient literature.

¹⁵ Cf. Barchiesi 1997: 211: “Un rapporto che lega un testo a un modello coinvolge l’interpretazione di due testi, non di uno solo. Entrambe le interpretazioni sono perennemente sub iudice e si influenzano reciprocamente. Il nuovo testo rilegge il suo modello. Il modello a sua volta influenza la lettura del nuovo testo (se viene riconosciuto, spesso ha abbastanza forza da farlo).” This example of Catullus and Virgil is one that is a classic in discussing allusion in ancient literature; my own reading (see below, Chap. 2.1.2, “‘Unwillingly I left’”) differs from many in highlighting the earlier texts implicated here, esp. Sappho.

¹⁶ These *mētropoleis* included Pergamum and also Antioch. The poet Euphorion, among others, was active at the Seleucid court.

However, this has been, for the most part, the study of allusion for the purpose of recovering either lost texts or variants of existing ones: that is, with an eye to the model rather than the new artwork. There have of course long been scholars who considered the rapports of Hellenistic poets with one another and one another's work. (G. Serrao is an important pioneer here.) But traditionally there has been less interest in considering the cultural dynamics of imitation than in the reconstruction of the texts imitated. This approach was reinforced by a long-held perception of the Hellenistic as a derivative artistic period, if not one in decline. Today much has changed. In the last twenty years the work of such scholars as M. Fantuzzi, R. Hunter, R. Pretagostini, and R. Thomas has created an interest in the art of imitation in Hellenistic poetry itself, imitation both of its poetic past and of contemporary art forms. At the same time, Hellenistic poetry, which was long seen as set apart from contemporary political culture, has come into its own as an expression of imperial politics. For example, our understanding of the selection of court poets of Archaic Samos as models is now enhanced by our recognition of Samos as a place of Ptolemaic interests overseas. Similarly, the poetry of Sappho takes on a new light as a model when we consider the need of Alexandrian male poets to celebrate powerful women, queens who were assimilated to Aphrodite and whose interests included contemporary Lesbos. Here too, in its recognition of the realities of the political world of the early Ptolemies, the study of Hellenistic poetry has benefited greatly from the parallel study of the evolution of Roman imperial poetry.

What does necessarily distinguish Hellenistic poetics, however, from its Roman relative is the contemporary large-scale evolution of philological work in Alexandria, the collection, compilation, and editing of texts in the cultural setting of these later poets, in some cases by these poets themselves. Whereas in the study of much Roman poetry the modern critic might strive for a (loosely) defined distinction between allusion and intertext,¹⁷ the study of Hellenistic poetry must take into account concurrent scholarship on the texts of earlier poets themselves, the editing, interpreting, and later reading of one poetic culture by another. Let's consider two brief examples (both treated more extensively later in this study). Dioscorides 18 GP (*AP* 7.407) is one of several of this epigrammatist's poems celebrating lyric poets in terms of the well-known language and imagery of their poetry:¹⁸

ἦδιστον φιλέουσι νέοις προσανάκλιμ' ἐρώτων,
Σαπφῶ, σὺν Μούσαις ἦ ῥά σε Πιερίη

¹⁷ "Allusion" being narrowly understood as an author's conscious evocation of an earlier author as an embellishment or enhancement of his text; "intertext" being narrowly understood as a poem's interaction with other poems, a rapport of texts as received rather than produced by authors and one that is partly the result of a system of language.

¹⁸ Translation in part inspired by Barbantani 1993: 34.

ἢ Ἑλικῶν εὐκισσος ἴσα πνείουσαν ἐκείναις
 κοσμεῖ τὴν Ἐρέσω Μοῦσαν ἐν Αἰολίδι,
 ἢ καὶ Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναιος ἔχων εὐφεγγέα πεύκην 5
 σὺν σοὶ νυμφιδίων ἴσταθ' ὑπὲρ θαλάμων
 ἢ Κινύρεω νέον ἔρνος ὀδυρομένη Ἀφροδίτῃ
 σύνθρηνος μακάρων **ἱερὸν ἄλσος** ὀρήσ.
 πάντῃ, **πότνια**, χαῖρε **θεοῖς ἴσα**· σὰς γὰρ αἰοιδὰς
 ἀθανάτας ἔχομεν νῦν ἔτι θυγατέρας. 10

Sweetest pillow of loves for enamored young men, with the Muses, Sappho, your breath their own, Pieria or ivied Helicon adorns you, you the Muse of Aeolian Eresus, whether Hymen Hymenaeus with radiant torch stands with you over bridal beds or with mourning Aphrodite you lament the young son of Cinyras and behold the holy grove of the Blessèd. In all ways I salute you, lady, as the gods' equal. For even now we preserve your songs, your immortal daughters.

Sappho fragment 2.2: ἄγνον ὄππ[αι] | χάριεν μὲν ἄλκος
 Sappho fragment 1.4: πότν[ι]α, θῦ[μ]ον
 Sappho fragment 31.1: φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἴκος θεοῖσιν

In the Greek text above I give in boldface characters several of the allusions to Sappho's poetry and beneath the translation the Sappho texts as we now have them. Note that these are all from the first book of Sappho. In lines 7 and 8, Ἀφροδίτῃ | σύνθρηνος is a clever juxtaposition that recalls Ἀφρόδιτα . . . κύμμαχος, the opening and closing images of Sappho fragment 1. The first book of Sappho, which contained only poems in Sapphic stanzas, was a creation of the Alexandrian period, or perhaps of an even earlier period, but was emphatically not of Sappho's seventh-century Lesbos. This epigram has the conceit, as do other epigrams like it, of celebrating the Archaic poet herself in the first verses and in terms of her poetry in the last. The poet predominates at the beginning; her poetry, at the end. Particularly outstanding is the role of the collected first book of Sappho in the poems that Dioscorides evokes—that is, his recollection of Sappho is not only of the poet and her poetry but also of the edition of Sappho's work compiled early in the Alexandrian period or even before. The poems of Sappho that Dioscorides evokes here are all from the first book of Sappho and come to have this association with one another as a result of a book edition. Dioscorides' Sappho is a text, or collection of texts, that is now Sappho, though the poet herself had nothing to do with its compilation. In Dioscorides' epigram, Sappho is historical figure, song, text, and even material on which the text is written down.

Let me give a more controversial example, one that I will discuss in greater detail later in this study. In Sappho fragment 31, line 9, γλώσσα ἔαγε ("my tongue is broken") is a textual crux that continues to trouble Sappho scholars

who must confront the hiatus that the sequence of the two words inevitably effects. Whatever Sappho's original may have been, the recollection of this text at Apollonius Rhodius's *Argonautica* 3.954, ἡ θαμὰ δὴ στηθέων ἔαγε κέαρ ("frequently the heart in her breast was shattered")—in a passage that carefully recreates in the now enamored Medea the effects of Sappho's torment in her poem—suggests both that Apollonius knew the Sappho text with ἔαγε and, in his avoidance of hiatus in his imitation, that he was aware of the textual problem. This is exactly the way Apollonius operates as a reader of Homer. His own poetic creation preserves rare usages and highlights textual problems. A close reading of Apollonius's rapport with Sappho shows something very similar. He clearly knows the text very well.

To what degree contemporary scholars' treatment of earlier lyric is implicated in Hellenistic poetry's recreation of this earlier poetry is a feature impossible to quantify, and indeed, to do so is probably the wrong critical path to follow. The Alexandrians knew these poets in the process of their being collected, assembled, and edited as texts at the same time as they knew them as poets in a long tradition of Greek song. And as cultural models: Anacreon and Ibycus, for example, singers from different parts of the Greek world at the court of the tyrant Polycrates of Samos, take on a new significance as precursors of court poets drawn from many parts of the Greek world to Alexandria. In the case of each poet treated in this study, we are dealing with a composite of factors that a recall of that poet in Alexandrian verse may evoke.

This work sets out to consider Hellenistic interaction with Archaic lyric, and necessarily faces certain challenges. Almost all the extant Archaic lyric poetry treated in this study, whether preserved on papyrus or from citations, is fragmentary. Indeed in this study, with the exception of Sappho's ποικιλόθρον' ἄθανατ' Ἀφρόδιτα (fr. 1) and possibly some Anacreon, it is all fragmentary. We cannot read these poems as the Alexandrians read them. Further, some preserved lines have a peculiar, even perhaps enhanced value for us simply because they are extant. In some cases extant lines of verse may have had a less or differently significant role in their settings in complete poems. The final lines of Sappho fragment 44 provide a good example here. Alternatively, a poem that is largely extant—for instance, Sappho fragment 31—and is known to have been widely imitated in extant Hellenistic poetry may not necessarily be typical of the standard situation of later imitation.¹⁹ This poem does in fact appear to have enjoyed an unusual popularity for a long time. The fact that this is the only lyric work that appears at all in the treatise *On the Sublime* (*Περὶ ὑψους*) might suggest that this poem is an exception rather than the rule. Nor are all the Hellenistic poems considered in this study wholly extant. Apollonius's *Argonautica* and most of Theocritus are extant, but much of the Callimachus considered in the

¹⁹ Cusset 1999: 332.

following pages—for example, the *Aetia*—is fragmentary as well. The scattered remnants of Archaic lyric, though, are the main issue. Here I am often limited to offering the suggestive possibility of an intertextual reading rather than its certainty. Some readers may find some, or much, of the result too speculative; in response I would say that we have to work with whatever material we have, that the imitations that we can attest are well worth the frustration of working through sometimes (very) tenuous traces, and that the understanding that we attain of both Hellenistic poetry and its reading of Archaic poetry is vastly the richer for the effort expended. Apollonius's *Argonautica* is an apt example. The Homeric poems that it closely reads and, for that matter, one lyric model, Pindar's fourth *Pythian* ode, are extant. We are able to make a close assessment of Apollonius's treatment of these models in the composition of the *Argonautica*, of the manner in which they inform Apollonius's poem, and of his own reading of these models. But we know something too of his other lyric models. The resonance of Sappho's extant poetry is clear. Its appreciation is of great importance to understanding Apollonius's portrayal of a female heroic figure in love. And this resonance has been the subject of a fair amount of scholarly work. The resonances of the poetry of Simonides and Ibycus in the *Argonautica* are, however, also discernible. A significant proportion of the fragments of both poets comes from the Apollonius scholia. An assessment of these fragments in themselves and in terms of their place in the Apollonius scholia allows us a closer awareness of the lyric influences on Apollonius's poem, and of how these lyric poets were read in the third century, in an activity that, as we will see, has come to be a moment not only of reception but also of preservation.

Arion's Lyre consists of five chapters and a short epilogue. The studies of individual poets all follow a similar plan: an introduction, readings of Hellenistic recreations of individual poems or poetic fragments, and a concluding appendix laying out what we know of the Alexandrian text or texts of each author. Still, there is considerable variation in the studies themselves. Sappho's reception in Alexandria is the subject of the first two chapters. In Sappho's case, partly because of the larger number of extant fragments of her poetry, and partly because of her importance in Alexandrian poetics, there is a larger amount of material to consider. Chapter 1 is devoted to Theocritean and Apollonian variations of Sappho, particularly of the famous φαίνεται μοι κῆρυξ, and also to Theocritus's use of Sappho in *Idyll* 18. This is now of special interest given its echoes of the recently recovered Sappho Tithonus poem, which was published while this work was in progress. Chapter 2 centers on imitations of Sappho by Callimachus and in epigram. Here I focus on the use of Sappho in two areas that developed especially in Alexandria, encomiastic poetry celebrating Ptolemaic queens and literary epigram, a genre with which Sappho, not originally an epigrammatic author, becomes closely associated. The subject of chapter 3 is Alcaeus. Here there is less material to hand, partly because Alcaeus's political

poetry has survived in greater measure than has his erotic verse. In many cases the most a close analysis of our extant material can provide is hypothesis. Chapter 4 treats the court lyric poets Anacreon and Ibycus together. As court poets who celebrate powerful patrons, they serve as a specifically appropriate model for the Alexandrians, as does also their erotic, largely nonpolitical verse. Chapter 5 is devoted to Simonides, a poet who, like Pindar, composed in multiple poetic genres and whose poetry is often already a complex act of artistic reception, and in whom the Alexandrians found a model for some of the poetics that they were then to take up and elaborate.

This work is not meant to be an exhaustive treatment of all the extant poetry of any of these figures by poets of a later generation. Rather this is a selective study of poetic reception. It works at two levels. Alexandrian reception not only informs our own but is in many ways directly responsible for it. The Alexandrians knew these earlier poets both as poetry and as physical texts, texts that were collected, collated, edited, and preserved. Indeed it is largely through these activities that much of our extant fragmentary lyric has survived. Hence theirs was a layered reception; an allusion to Sappho's ποικιλόθρον' ἄθανάτ' Ἀφρόδιτα (Sappho fr. 1) may have been to a performance of this poem, to the tradition of performance of this poem, to this poem as a written text, to this poem as the opening poem of the first book of the Alexandrian edition of Sappho, to later imitation of this poem, or to a combination of any of these factors. An Alexandrian allusion may also refer to the poem's original or current context, or both. Features that indicate such a context here might be Lesbos itself, which falls under Ptolemaic influence, or associations of young girls that celebrate Aphrodite. The Egyptian queen was associated in cult with Aphrodite, and the queen's girlhood also figured in celebrations of her. Featured too might be the Aeolic dialect and its regional expanse. At the same time such an allusion may evoke the physical displacement of the poem's text to Alexandria, to a new significance that it had in its Egyptian setting (where "deathless Aphrodite on your many-colored throne" might take on a different valence given an enthroned Ptolemaic queen seen as avatar of Aphrodite), to the poem's current popularity, or to other current recreations of the poem in contemporary song. The song is Sappho's, but its rendition belongs to Alexandria.

The texts used in this study are the editions that were standard when it was being completed. A new edition of Anacreon that has recently been published in Athens (Rozoko 2006) has not yet replaced B. Gentili's of 1958. This use of standard editions has determined some variations in presenting the Greek. I have chosen to keep the lunate sigma [c] in all cases where the standard editions do so. This is particularly relevant for the texts of Sappho, Alcaeus, and Callimachus, as well as for the new Simonides and the new epigrams attributed to Posidippus. This is also important in the discussion of fragmentary papyrological texts, as, in some cases, exact readings of the text are either discussed or

questioned. For Sappho and Alcaeus, the text is E.-M. Voigt's edition (1971) unless otherwise noted; I have chosen to omit the abbreviation V. after each fragment. I have been able to take considerable advantage of G. Liberman's Budé edition of Alcaeus (2002). The text of Anacreon is Gentili's (1958), and the text of Ibycus is M. Davies, ed., *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, volume 1 (Oxford, 1991). For Simonides, the situation is slightly more complex. For the lyric poems I have used D. L. Page, ed., *Poetae Melici Graecae* (Oxford, 1962); for nonlyric fragments, M. L. West, ed., *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (2nd ed.: Oxford, 1992). The text of the new Simonides is that of Boedeker and Sider (2001). For the major Hellenistic poets, unless otherwise noted, the text of Callimachus is that of R. Pfeiffer (1949, 1953), that of Theocritus A.S.F. Gow's (1962), and that of Apollonius F. Vian's Budé edition (1996), though I have not always chosen to follow his orthography. The text of any Hellenistic epigram, unless otherwise noted, is that of Gow and Page (1965).

For the *en-face* layout of text(s) and translations on pages 19, 21–24, and 32–34, space restrictions necessitated representing some lines of Greek text in a manner other than that customarily required by their colometry. In these cases indented lines are to be understood as continuing previous lines.

The second (2008) edition of the New Sappho (*P. Köln* 429) only became available to the author after this volume had gone into production. As it happens, the new edition does not impact the treatment of this poem in this study.