CHAPTER 2

BUCOLIC HYLAS: IDYLL 13 OF THEOCRITUS

From where do genres come? Why, quite simply, from other genres. A new genre is always the transformation of one or several old genres: by inversion, by displacement, by combination.

Todorov 1976/7, 161

1. Introduction: heroic Heracles vs. tender Hylas

In *Idyll* 13, the heroic qualities of Heracles are downplayed in such a way that the archetypal hero is even made ridiculous.\(^{194}\) Like Polyphemus in *Idyll* 11, a poem which is closely linked to *Idyll* 13, Heracles is not at home in the world of love. This point is immediately made clear at the beginning of the narrative on Hylas and Heracles proper, after the introductory address to Nicias:

άλλα καὶ Αμφιτρύωνος ὁ χαλκεοκάρδιος υἱός,
ὁ τὸν λῖν ὑπέμεινε τὸν ἄγριον, ἤρατο παιδός,
τοῦ χαρίεντος Ὕλα, τοῦ τὰν πλοκαμῖδα φορεῦντος

*Id.* 13.5-7

No, even Amphitryon’s son, whose heart was bronze, and who withstood the savage lion, loves a boy, beautiful Hylas, whose hair was still unshorn.

(tr. Verity)

Heracles is introduced with the epic epithet χαλκεοκάρδιος (“bronze-hearted”),\(^{195}\)

---

\(^{194}\) Cf. van Erp Taalman Kip 1994, 161: “[Theocritus] adopts a slightly mocking view of the superhero Heracles.”

\(^{195}\) The epithet occurs only here, but cf. e.g. *Il.* 2.490: χάλκεον δὲ μοι ἐνείη (“and though the heart within me were of bronze”). Kirstein 1997 and Castro de Castro 2001 argue for an allusion to an erotic, non-epic context in Pindar (fr. 123.3-5 S-M). These contrasting associations make the epithet very apt in the Theocritean context, where an epic hero enters the world of love. In this respect, it is also interesting that the epic ring of the first part of line 6, dealing with Heracles and the Nemean lion, is reinforced by an allusion to *Iliad* 11.480. This epic context is also alluded to in *Id.* 13.58, where Heracles’ cry recalls that of Odysseus, wounded on the battlefield (*Il.* 11.462), but there, on the
and in line 6 his heroic labour of the Nemean lion is mentioned. In this same line, however, it is said that Heracles “loved a boy” (ἦρατο παίδος). The position of these words in the line already suggest that they are contrasted with the heroic feat mentioned before the bucolic diaeresis, but in line 7 this is made even more clear, for the object of Heracles’ love is the boy Hylas, who is described in very un-heroic terms, with χαρίεντος (7) suggesting youth and beauty, and πλοκαμίδα (7) emphasizing the boy’s “almost feminine prettiness”. At the end of the poem, the abducted Hylas is said to have been deified (72); this sets up a further contrast with Heracles, who is scorned as a ship-deserter (λιποναύταν) in the next line. The passage can thus be seen as the climax of the poem’s play with heroics.

This contrast between the heroic Heracles and the tender Hylas has always been interpreted in the light of the anti-heroic dimension of the poem, which has received considerable scholarly attention. Although I find these readings attractive, I consider that the anti-heroic element points to a further, hitherto unnoticed dimension of the poem. In this chapter, I will argue that Idyll 13 can be read on a metapoetic level as an allegory decribing the type of poetry that Theocritus is credited with inventing: bucolic. I will argue that Theocritus treats Hylas as a symbol of his Callimachean, bucolic poetry, which is “defined” by its relationship to the heroic-epic tradition as symbolized by the archetypal hero Heracles.

contrary, the allusion illustrates how far the hero is away from the heroic world in which he is at home (see below).
196 See Gutzwiller 1981, 20, with n. 4.
197 Mastronarde 1968, 276. See his n. 3 for the connotations of the word πλοκαμίδα.
198 Cf. Gutzwiller 1981, 29: “The poem concludes with a reversal of the heroic ethos. Hylas’ tenderness and beauty, which render him helpless and vulnerable in the epic world of the Argonauts, provide the key for his transition to a fantastic realm, which is more appropriate for his delicate nature. Heracles, the prototypic hero, finds his customary use of force ineffectual in preserving a love relationship, and his loss of emotional control is held up to scorn by his companions, as well by the poet.”
199 See in particular Mastronarde 1968; Effe 1978, 60-64; Gutzwiller 1981, 19-29; van Erp Taalman Kip 1994 for the way Heracles’ heroics are downplayed in Idyll 13.
200 I am indebted to the rich commentary of Hunter 1999 for many cues.
201 On the bucolic elements already documented, see Tränkle 1963b, 505; Mastronarde 1968; Hunter 1999, 263; 284 (on Id. 13.64-71); Pretagostini 2007, 51-3, 55-60.
2. Theocritus’ bucolic poetry

Theocritus is traditionally regarded as the inventor of the genre of bucolic poetry, which deals in hexameters with herdsmen, their songs and (unrequited) love in a rustic setting. As Gutzwiller remarks on the term bucolic, however, “it remains unknown just how and when Theocritean poetry came to be so called, and scholars have not been able to explain how the label bucolic defines this set of poetry as a separable and identifiable genre. Collectively, these uncertainties may be said to constitute the ‘bucolic problem’.” This problem, which has received an enormous amount of scholarly attention, is centred around the meaning of Theocritus’ so-called “bucolic terminology”, the adjective βουκολικός (“related to herdsmen) and the verb βουκολιάζεσθαι (“play/behave like a herdsmen”) which occur in some of the Idylls and refer there to songs sung by the herdsmen in the poems. Some scholars have argued that this terminology denotes Theocritus’ newly invented bucolic
genre. More recently, however, scholars have argued that the term bucolic was used later to denote Theocritus’ poetry as a genre, and that Theocritus himself only referred to the songs of the herdsmen in the poems and the Sicilian tradition of herding songs that lies behind them.

Theocritus’ poems that are set in the countryside and deal with herdsmen (Idylls 1, 3-7), however, clearly form a separate class of poetry, which is reflected by the early separate circulation of these poems, from the late third or early second century BC. Although Theocritus may not have used bucolic terminology in a strictly generic sense and in all the poems mentioned, I will argue in the next section that

---

206 Van Sickle 1975, 57-8; 1976, 22-5 (Theocritus’ bucolic refers to “a new subspecies of the Hesiodic species of the epic genus” (1976: 24); Halperin 1983a, 78-9, 249-55 (Theocritus’ bucolic refers to all his hexameter poetry as “a kind of epos that distinguished itself from the heroic and mythological narratives of Homer and Hesiod on the one hand as well as from the discontinuous and didactic epics of Hesiod and the Alexandrians on the other” [p. 254] in theme, form and language); Schmidt 1987, 187 (Theocritus’ bucolic refers to his herding poetry). See also Gutzwiller 1991, 3-9 for the various definitions of Theocritus’ hypothesized genre of bucolic poetry that have been proposed.

207 Nauta 1990, 128-9; Gutzwiller 1996, 121-3. Cf. Hunter 1999, 9, who suggests that the terminology results “from a creative reworking of traditions of Sicilian song-making, which may themselves have been to some extent scholarly constructions.”

208 Cf. Halperin 1983a, x: “Regardless of his specific (and by now unfathomable) intentions, Theocritus somehow endowed a portion of his work with a sufficiently distinctive literary profile to impress its unique qualities on later generations of readers”; Hunter 1999, 5: “(…) the ‘bucolic terminology’ and the poems in which it appeared (particularly Idyll 1, which headed all ancient collections) were presumably felt to represent something distinctive in T.’s work. Moreover, the similarities between all the poems set in the countryside will have been as clear to ancient scholars as they are to us.” Cf. Hunter 2002, xviii: “Idylls 1 and 3-7 are distinguished rhythmically in their hexameters from Theocritus’ other poems, and it is not unreasonable to think that he saw them as a distinct sub-group within his oeuvre. They are also characterized by symmetries of language, structure, and thought, rather than conceal, the artificiality of the ‘natural’ world which they depict”. I cannot believe Halperin’s thesis (on which see also n. 206 above), however, that Theocritus denoted “the great majority of the hexameter Idylls” (p. 254) as bucolic, so including his mythological poems, as the term, in my opinion, still evokes herdsmen. Cf. Gutzwiller 1991, 7: “It is hard to see (…) how Callimachus’ narrative Hymns (…) differ significantly in these respects from Idylls 22, 24, and 26, or how the Hecale can be separated in genre from Theocritus’ mythical narratives. It argues against Halperin’s view that a contemporary and acquaintance of Theocritus was writing similar poetry to which the label bucolic was never applied”.

209 See Gutzwiller 1996, who also argues convincingly that an older third-century edition of Theocritus’ poems (under the collective title εἰδύλλια, “short poems of different types”) can be detected, “which may have been comprehensive and so included the surviving hexameter poems, the lost Berenice, the Aeolic poems, perhaps the epigrams, and perhaps as well some of the other titles listed by the Suda as attributed to Theocritus.” (p. 138).

210 Gutzwiller 1991, 103: “to take ‘bucolic’ as a generic label for some or all of Theocritus’ Idylls remains an act of analogical reconstruction, and so inherently uncertain, unauthorized.”
the poet does self-consciously use this terminology to denote a specific kind of literature, his “bucolic” poetry, in a well-known passage of Idyll 7.

2.1. Idyll 7: a meta-bucolic poem

In Idyll 7, the narrator Simichidas and the mysterious, godlike goatherd Lycidas meet on the island of Cos and exchange songs. As Simichidas’ address to Lycidas shows, Lycidas embodies “the essence of the bucolic”:212

(…) Λυκίδα φίλε, φαντί το πάντες
ήμεν συρικτὰν μέγ’ ύπείροχον ἐν τε νομεύσιν
ἐν τ’ ἀματήρεσι. (…)

Id. 7.27-9

Lycidas, my friend, all men assert that among herdsmen and reapers you are by far the best of pipers. (tr. Verity)

The young city poet Simichidas thinks of himself as a bucolic poet and clearly evokes the poet Theocritus himself.213 After their exchange of songs, Lycidas smiles and

---


212 Hunter 1999, 148. Cf. Fantuzzi & Hunter 2004, 138, who speak of the “bucolic ‘master’ Lycidas”. See also e.g. Hubbard 1998, 24 for the identifications of Lycidas that have been proposed. Associations with Apollo, because of his cult title Λύκιος (Williams 1971) and Philitas’ poetry (Bowie 1985, Hubbard 1998, 24-6) are undeniable, but if Lycidas, as most scholars seem to think, is a kind of personification of bucolic poetry, it is not surprising that (in accordance with Theocritus’ various sources) the poetic associations that Lycidas evokes are manifold.

213 See e.g. Bowie 1985, 68: “(…) εγὼν in line 1 is to be taken as referring to Theocritus. But this impression is undermined at line 21, where Lycidas addresses the narrator as Simichidas (…). It appears, then, that Simichidas both is and is not Theocritus, and that his name Simichidas has been deliberately held back to allow the presumption to develop that the narrator is Theocritus himself.” Cf. Hunter 1999, 146: “(…) there is nothing which forbids some kind of identification between Simichidas and T., and some things positively encourage us to put the two together.” See also Krevans 1983, 219 and Goldhill 1991, 229-30 for the relationship between Theocritus and Simichidas. For a comparison with the identification between Tityrus and Virgil in the Eclogues, see Hunter 2006, 129-30.
gives his staff to Simichidas as “a mark of xenia arising from the Muses”\textsuperscript{214} (129). As R. Hunter interprets the encounter:\textsuperscript{215}

A central irony of Idyll 7 is that a “bucolic” poet, who inevitably works within the social networks of the city and for whom ‘being in the countryside’ is usually part of a code (…), is made to confront a ‘real’ creature of the land. The poem is an exploration of what is at stake in and what are the limits of this metaphorical code. Lykidas’ smile is the poet’s recognition of these limits.

After Lycidas’ song, and before beginning his own song, Simichidas addresses the goatherd thus:

(…) Λυκίδα φίλε, πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα
Νύμφαι κημὲ δίδαξαν ἀν’ ὄρεα βουκολέοντα
ἐσθλά, τά που καὶ Ζηνὸς ἐπὶ θρόνον ἀγαγε φάμα:
ἀλλὰ τόγ’ ἐκ πάντων μέγ’ ὑπείροχον, ᾧ τυ γεραίρειν ἀρξεῦμ’ ἀλλ’ ὑπάκουσον, ἐπει φίλος ὑπείροχον Μοίσαις.

\textit{Id.} 7.91-5

Lycidas, my friend, I too have learned much from the Nymphs as I grazed my cows on the hills: excellent songs, whose fame perhaps has reached the throne of Zeus. This is the best of them by far – so listen, please, while I begin to pay you honour, for you are dear to the Muses. (tr. Verity)

In these lines the (partial) identification of Simichidas with Theocritus is activated, since line 93, in which Simichidas says that Zeus may have heard of his songs, clearly refers to the patronage of Ptolemy Philadelphus, “who was born on Cos and whose assimilation to Zeus was a commonplace of contemporary poetry (e.g. [\textit{Idyll}] 17.131-4)”.\textsuperscript{216} In this context, Simichidas’ words in line 92 are closely connected with the poet Theocritus himself, who ironically comments on himself as a bucolic poet. As Hunter says, “Simichidas sees ‘bucolic’ song as essentially a matter of rustic reference. He therefore ‘hyper-bucolicises’ by echoing Hesiod’s investiture as a poet by the Muses, αἶ νῦ ποθ’ Ἡσίοδος καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἄοιδὴν Ἀρνα’ ἑπάκουσον ἒπει φίλος ἔπλεο Μοίσαις.”

\textsuperscript{214} Hunter 1999, 190 (ad loc.)
\textsuperscript{215} Hunter 1999, 148.
\textsuperscript{216} Hunter 1999, 179 (on \textit{Id.} 7.93). For the association of Ptolemy Philadelphus with Zeus in \textit{Idyll} 17 as well as in Callimachus’ \textit{Hymn to Zeus}, see also e.g. Heerink 2010, 385-99.
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ζαθέοι (Theog. 22-3),217 but changing Hesiod’s Muses into the more obviously rustic ‘Nymphs’ (...).”218 Theocritus here clearly exploits the so-called bucolic metaphor (the herdsman as bucolic poet)219 self-consciously to characterize his bucolic poetry as a distinct type of poetry; we are dealing with learned poetry about herdsmen-poets in which the competitive element in the exchange of song is important, and of which an ancient authority, Hesiod, is claimed as the source.

2.2. Callimachean poetics in Idyll 7

In the passage discussed above (Idyll 7.91-5), Theocritus’ bucolic poetry is also implicitly associated with Callimachean poetics. In line 95, Simichidas says that Lycidas is “dear to the Muses” (φίλος ... Μουσαίς), an expression which is intertextually connected to the prologue of Callimachus’ Aetia, where the poet declares that his literary adversaries, the Telchines, are “no friends of the Muse” (Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι, 2).220 By implication, Callimachus is a friend of the Muses. This is reinforced at the end of the prologue, where the poet declares that although he is old, the Muses still favour him:

For if the Muses have not looked askance at one in his childhood, they do not cast him from their friendship when he is grey. (tr. Trypanis)

217 “One time, they [the Muses] taught Hesiod beautiful song while he was pasturing lambs under holy Helicon.” (tr. Most)
218 Hunter 1999, 178-9 (on ld. 13.91-2). The underlinings are mine.
219 See Gutzwiller 2006b on the history of this metaphor in Greek poetry.
220 See also Ch. 1, pp. 29-30 for a discussion of the problematic relative chronology of Hellenistic poetry in general, and that between Apollonius and Callimachus in particular. The intertextual contact between Callimachus and Theocritus is, in my opinion, undeniable (pace Köhnken 2001). Although I will regard Theocritus as alluding to Callimachus’ poetological statements, I would like to stress again that with regard to the poetry of Apollonius, Callimachus and Theocritus I endorse the “work in progress hypothesis”. Accordingly, the direction of influence can be reversed – as Callimachus reading Theocritus metapoetically and making his statements explicit – without any implications for the metapoetical dimension of either intertext.
In this context, Lycidas also recalls the patron of Callimachus’ poetry, Lycian Apollo, who gave the poet advice on the kind of poetry he should write:

καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
γούνασιν, Ἀπόλλων εἶπεν ὃ μοι Λύκιος:
“.......[...] οὐκέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅτι πάχιστον
θρέψαι, τὴν Μοῦσαν δ’ ἀγαθὴ λεπταλέην.” 

Aet. fr. 1.21-4 Pf.

For, when I first placed a writing-tablet on my knees, Lycian Apollo said to me:
“... poet, feed the victim to be as fat as possible, but, my friend, keep the Muse slender.”   (tr. Trypanis)

So Lycidas, the personification of bucolic poetry, resembles Callimachus’ Apollo, a connection that is reinforced by the etymological connection of their names, as derived from Apollo’s epithet Λύκ(ε)ιος,221 and their similar expression of Callimachean poetical ideals, not only in the Aetia, but also at the end of the Hymn to Apollo. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Apollo there advocates the same poetic principles, but in relation to Homer and neo-“Homeric” poetry.222

Similarly, Lycidas supports Callimachean poetics by reference to Homer in Idyll 7: one should not slavishly imitate the great poet from Chios:223

ὦς μοι καὶ τέκτων μέγ’ ἀπέχθεται ὅστις ἐρευνῇ
ἰσον ὄρευς κορυφὰ τελέσαι δόμον Ὠρομέδοντος,
καὶ Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀοιδόν
ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἔτωσια μοχθίζοντι.

Id. 7.45-8

I hate the craftsman who strives to build his house as high as the topmost peak of Mount Oromedon, and I hate those Muses’ cockerels who crow vainly to no effect against the singer who comes from Chios.   (tr. Verity)

---

221 For the possible meanings of this epithet, see e.g. Harder 2010, II, on Aet. fr. 1.23.
222 The term is borrowed from Hopkinson 1988, 86, who uses it to denote τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικὸν (“the ‘cyclic’ poem”), which Callimachus declares himself to hate in Ep. 28.1. See Ch. 1, par 2.5 for the text and interpretation, which follows Koster 1970, 119 and Williams 1978, 89.
223 As Dr Cuypers suggests to me, the meta-bucolic statement in these lines is underlined by the framing lines 35-6 and 49, which employ “bucolic terminology” (on which see p. 71 above).
And there are more elements in this passage that associate Lycidas with Callimachus. Lycidas’ polemic stance, and in particular his expressed hatred of the wrong kind of poetry, brings Callimachus’ famous programmatic statement in *Epigram* 28 Pf. to mind: Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν. “I hate the ‘cyclic’ poem.”224 Lycidas’ use of the poetical metaphor of the craftsman (τέκτων) for the poet would recall another Callimachean passage, *Iamb* 13, if we had it intact, for the *Diegesis* states:225

Ἐν τούτῳ πρὸς τοὺς καταμεμφομένους αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολυειδείᾳ ὧν γράφει ποιημάτων ἀπαντῶν φησιν ὅτι Ἰωνα μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν ἄλλ’ οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονα τις μέμφεται πολυειδῆ σκεύη τεκταίνομεν.  
*Dieg.* 9.33-8 (Pfeiffer 1949-53, I, 205)

In this poem Callimachus responds to those who criticize him for the formal variety (polyeideia) of his poetry by saying that he is following the example of Ion the tragic poet; he adds that no one faults a craftsman for fashioning various articles. (tr. Nisetich, adapted)

Furthermore, as we have seen in the previous chapter, Erysichthon’s plan to build an “epic” banqueting hall in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Demeter*, with its metapoetical dimension, is opposed to Callimachus’ poetics.226 Despite its implicit character, the passage thus provides a striking parallel with Lycidas’ poetological statement.

A final point of contact concerns the ugly-sounding animals to denote literary opponents, which recalls the prologue to the *Aetia*, where Callimachus rejects the sound of asses.227

---

225 Cf. Hunter 1999, 164 (on *Id.* 7.45-6).
226 See Ch. 1, Section 3.2.1, where the metapoetical interpretations of Callimachus’ hymn by Müller 1987 and Murray 2004 are discussed.
227 Although the example of the long flight of the cranes in the *Aetia* prologue (13-4) is in first instance used by Callimachus to renounce long poetry, the passage may also suggest criticism of the style of long (mythological and/or historical) poems, because of the ugly sound that cranes produce, and thus provide an interesting parallel to Lycidas’ words. See Harder 2010, II, on *Aet.* fr. 1.13-6, for this interpretation and for the interesting parallel in Lucr. *DRN* 4.176ff., “where the short songs of swans are contrasted with the ugly shouting of the cranes”.
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(...) ἐνὶ τοῖς γὰρ ἀείδομεν οἳ λιγὺν ἦχον
tέττιγος, θόρυβον δ’ οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων.
θηρὶ μὲν οὕατόεντι πανείκελον ὀγκήσαιτο
ἄλλος, ἐγὼ δ’ εἶπν σύλἱαχις, ὁ πτερόεις.

Aet. fr. 1.29-30 Pf.

For we sing among those who love the shrill voice of the cicada and not the noise of asses. Let others bray just like the long-eared brute, but let me be the small, the winged one. (tr. Trypanis, adapted)

When Lycidas hands over his staff, the suggestion is that he invests Simichidas as a poet. Although Lycidas here again resembles Apollo, whose role in the Aetia prologue is somewhat similar, there is a more obvious connection with the Aetia. Although our information concerning the text of this poem after the prologue is scanty, the fragments and scholia seem to suggest that Callimachus described how he was invested as a poet on Mount Helicon by the Muses, who communicated the Aetia to him. Callimachus is obviously imitating his famous predecessor Hesiod here, who, as we saw, had a similar experience in the Theogony (22-3), to which Callimachus explicitly refers:

ποιμένι μῆλα νέμοντι παρ’ ἴχνιον ὀξέος ἵππου
Ἡσιόδῳ Μουσέων ἑσμὸς ὅτ’ ἠντίασεν
μέν οἱ Χάεος γενεσ[ ] ἐπὶ πτέρνης ὑδα[ ]

When the Muses swarmed up to Hesiod the shepherd, grazing his flock where the swift horse left its print … [they told him] … of Chaos born … […] water [bursting] at heel … and that “Evil devised against another eats the heart of its deviser”. (tr. Nisetich)

228 For Hesiod as Callimachus’ model, see e.g. Reinsch-Werner 1976; Fantuzzi & Hunter 2004, 51-60. Callimachus’ Aetia seems to have Hesiod’s Theogony as a model for an alternative to heroic poetry because of its aetiological interest in the Olympian pantheon, for the Aetia can be seen as “a kind of sequel to Theogony, which takes the story to the next stage” (Fantuzzi & Hunter 2004, 54), by dealing with the aetiology of the cults and rites of these same gods. Theocritus’ bucolic poetry, on the other hand, by modelling itself on Hesiod as a herdsman, seems to achieve the same anti-heroic objective in a different way.
Because of the already established intertextual contact between *Idyll 7* and the beginning of the *Aetia*, the fact that the encounter between Lycidas and Simichidas is based on the same passage from Hesiod is very suggestive. We have already seen that Simichidas portrays himself as a bucolic poet and follower of the shepherd-poet Hesiod (91ff.), and now, when he is given Lycidas’ staff, Simichidas recalls Hesiod again:229

ὡς ἔφασαν κοῦραι μεγάλου Διὸς ἀρτιέπειαι,
καὶ μοι σκήπτρον ἔδον δαφνίταις ἐριθηλέος ὄζον
δρέψασαι, θηητόν· ἐνέπνευσαν δὲ μοι αὐθήν
θέσπιν, ἵνα κλείσομεν τὰ τ’ ἐσσόμενα πρὸ τ’ ἐόντα,
καὶ μ’ ἐκέλονθ’ ὑμεῖν μακάρων γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων,
σφᾶς δ’ αὐτάς πρῶτον τε καὶ ὑστατον αἰὲν ἀείδειν.  

So spoke great Zeus’ ready-speaking daughters, and they plucked a staff, a branch of luxuriant laurel, a marvel, and gave it to me; and they breathed a divine voice into me, so that I might glorify what will be and what was before, and they commanded me to sing of the race of the blessed ones who always are, but always to sing of themselves first and last. (tr. Most)

Simichidas is now, just like Callimachus in the *Aetia* prologue, a friend of the Muse, invested as a bucolic poet by Lycidas, who resembles both Callimachus’ Apollo and his (Hesiodic) Muses. The identification between Simichidas and the poet Theocritus himself, which was already adumbrated at the beginning of the poem, is thus reinforced by the link created between Simichidas and the poet Callimachus. At the same time it is made clear that Theocritus’ bucolic poetry is Callimachean.

---

229 See also Hunter 1999, 149f. on this allusion.
2.3. Heroic vs. bucolic poetry in *Idyll 1*: the ivy cup

In *Idyll 7*, Theocritus’ bucolic poetry is characterized as Callimachean. Just like Callimachus, Theocritus (through Simichidas) aligns his poetry with that of the shepherd-poet Hesiod. The other major ancient authority also comes into play when Lycidas warns Simichidas not slavishly to follow Homer: the Homeric diction of the poem\(^{230}\) and the allusions to Homer\(^{231}\) show that Homer is also an important model. This attitude towards Homer resembles that of Callimachus at the end of his *Hymn to Apollo*, where Homer was regarded as the pure source of all poetry, the quality of which should be emulated, but the nature of which should not be slavishly followed in every respect. The Callimachean alignment with Hesiod and stance with regard to Homer are expressed differently, but no less clearly, by Theocritus in the other important programmatic passage in his oeuvre: the description of the ivy cup in *Idyll 1*. 2.7-61. Since ecphrasis involves the description of a work of art in art, the phenomenon is *a priori* very susceptible to metapoetical reading as a *mise en abyme*, a representation in miniature, of the work which contains it.\(^{232}\) Moreover, apart from the ecphrasis, *Idyll 1* is already considered a very programmatic, “meta-bucolic” poem by scholars. “In particular, the form of the poem – a dialogue between two herdsmen – has been seen as paradigmatic of Theocritus’ representation of shepherds’ song”.\(^{233}\) Furthermore, the greater part of the poem (64-145) consists of a song by the shepherd Thyrsis on the βουκόλος Daphnis, “variously the first ‘bucolic’ singer and the original subject of ‘bucolic song’”.\(^{234}\) The song also clearly defines itself as bucolic through the varied one-line refrain featuring bucolic terminology, for example at the beginning of the poem:\(^{235}\)

---

\(^{230}\) Cf. e.g. Hunter 1999, 150, who notes that “the style of Idyll 7 is more ‘Homeric’ than almost any other ‘bucolic’ poem”.

\(^{231}\) See e.g. Ott 1972, 134-49; Goldhill 1987, 3-4; Hunter 1999, 150 (with 199, on *Id.* 7.156): “The journey of Idyll 7 ends with an evocation of the promised end of Odysseus’ wanderings.”

\(^{232}\) See also Introduction, p. 9 with n. 30 and Ch. 1, Section 2.4 for this phenomenon.


\(^{234}\) Hunter 1999, 60. For the programmatic dimension of Thyrsis’ song in *Idyll 1*, see also e.g. Halperin 1983a, 161-7; Cairns 1984; Goldhill 1991, 240-6; Hunter 2006, 60-8.

Begin, my Muses, begin the herdsman’s song. (tr. Verity)

The ivy cup is the prize for Thyrsis’ song, and as Hunter comments: “In the bucolic world of reciprocal exchange rather than financial transaction, cup is to be exchanged for song; both are of an equal value.” Because of this parallelism between Thyrsis’ meta-bucolic song and the ivy cup, the ecphrasis is very likely to be a *mise en abyme* of Theocritus’ bucolic poetry in general, and it has often been interpreted as such. As in *Idyll 7*, bucolic poetry is defined in relation to the epic genre, to which it formally belongs because of the metre, the ancient criterion to define epic, and as in *Idyll 7* this relationship to epic is very Callimachean. First of all, Theocritus again aligns himself with Hesiod, the paradigmatic Callimachean shepherd-poet, for the cup, given to Thyrsis in exchange for a song, brings to mind the tripod Hesiod won in a poetry competition (*WD* 656).

The most important model for the cup is the famous description of Achilles’ shield in *Iliad* 18. Through his engagement with this ecphrasis, Theocritus again defines his poetry in relation to Homer, the source of (heroic) epic. Theocritus – and the same can be said for Callimachus – focuses on Homeric leftovers, on the non-heroic material that Homer touched upon, but which was not hackneyed in the subsequent epic tradition. As Hunter puts it: “The world of the bucolic poems is, from one

---

236 Hunter 1999, 76. See especially Halperin 1983a, 163-7 for the relation between the ecphrasis of the cup and Thyrsis’ song (“Whether the relation of cup to song is interpreted as one of parallelism, expansion, or contrast, there can be no doubt that Theocritus intended each artefact to be set against the other as complementary illustrations of the bucolic ‘genre’. ”)

237 See e.g. Goldhill 1987, 2: “Each of the scenes on the cup has been thought indicative both of the nature of the pastoral world described by Theocritus and of the *λεπτός* style of his Hellenistic poetry – especially in the way that the depiction of the cup (in contrast with the shield of Achilles) offers a series of small-scale, unheroic fragments with no pretensions to a holistic picture of the world”. For the programmatic aspects of the ecphrasis, see also e.g. Lawall 1967, 28-30; Segal 1974a; Halperin 1983a, 167-89; 218-9; Cairns 1984; Goldhill 1991, 243-4; Seiler 1997, 217-29; Hubbard 1998, 21-2; Hunter 1999, 76 (on *Id. 13*.27-61); extensive earlier bibliography at Halperin 1983a, 161, n. 50.

238 Hunter 1999, 76 (on *Id. 1*.27-61).
Accordingly, Theocritus’ ecphrasis is on the one hand clearly based on Homer’s Shield, as the three scenes depicted on the cup “all have analogues on the Shield of Achilles”. On the other hand, however, Theocritus describes a κισσύβιον, an “ivy cup” (27), a rare word which only occurs twice in Homer, in the Odyssey, referring to the cups of the herdsmen Polyphemus (Odyssey 9.346) and Eumaeus (Odyssey 16.52). Thus, “it is clear that the cup is to be seen as a ‘bucolicisation’ of the Shield, where the first ‘bucolic poets’ of literature appear”. From Theocritus’ point of view, the Shield can be read as creating a contrast between heroic and bucolic epic, for in the description of the city at war (Iliad 18.509-40), the besieged inhabitants, who leave the city armed in an attempt to ambush the besiegers, are contrasted with the shepherds encountered by their scouts:

\[\begin{align*}
oi d' & \ \text{D} \ \text{D}, \ \text{o} \ \text{a} \ \text{K} \ \text{a} \ \text{n}, \ \text{D} \ \text{D} \ \text{S} \ \text{S} \ \text{S}, \ \text{E} \ \text{I} \ \text{K} \ \text{H} \ \text{K} \ \text{S}, \\
ev \ \text{P} \ \text{O} \ \text{T} \ \text{A} \ \text{M} \ \text{W}, \ \text{D} \ \text{D} \ \text{T} \ \text{A} \ \text{R} \ \text{D} \ \text{M} \ \text{S}, \ \text{E} \ \text{N} \ \text{V}, \ \text{D} \ \text{D} \ \text{A} \ \text{R} \ \text{A} \ \text{S}, \ \text{I} \ \text{D} \ \text{E} \ \text{D} \ \text{O} \ \text{I} \ \text{O} \ \text{I} \ \text{K} \ \text{E} \ \text{K} \ \text{W}, \\
\end{align*}\]

But when they had come to the place where it seemed good to them to set their ambush, in a riverbed where there was a watering place for all herds alike, there they sat down, clothed about with ruddy bronze. Then two scouts were by them set apart from the army, waiting till they should have sight of the sheep and sleek cattle. And these came soon, and two herdsmen followed with them playing on pipes; and of the guile they had no foreknowledge at all. But the ambushers, when they saw them coming on, rushed out against them and speedily cut off the herds of cattle and fair flocks of white-fleeced sheep and slew the herdsmen. (tr. Murray & Wyatt)

239 Hunter 2002, xvi.
240 Hunter 1999, 76 (on Id. 1.27-61).
241 Hunter 1999, 76 (on Id. 1.27-61).
This passage can be read as an aetiology of Theocritus’ poetry, which is on the one hand contrasted with Homer’s heroic epic (as the city at war can thematically be seen as a mise en abyme of the Iliad), but on the other hand licensed as an alternative kind of epic by Homer, who does incorporate the herdsmen in his Iliad.242

The way Theocritus deals with Homer’s Shield can be described as Callimachean, because it resembles Apollo’s programmatic statement concerning his relationship with Homer at the end of the Hymn to Apollo, but also because Callimachus alludes to the Shield in a similar fashion. After the cities of peace and war, more poetical worlds are depicted on Homer’s Shield, which can be seen as alternatives to Homer’s epic on war. In particular the description of a boy making music amidst people working on a vineyard is susceptible to metapoetical reading:243

\[
\text{τοῖσιν δ’ ἐν μέσσοισι παῖς φόρμιγγι λιγείη}
\text{ἱμερόεν κιθάριζε, λίνον δ’ ύπὸ καλὸν ἀείδε}
\text{λεπταλέη φώνῃ}
\]

Il. 18.569-71

And in their midst a child made pleasant music with a clear-toned lyre, and to it he sang sweetly the Linos song with his delicate voice. (tr. Murray & Wyatt)

Callimachus reads these lines metapoetically. Stephens interprets the clear intertextual contact between this passage and the Aetia prologue (marked in bold) as follows:244

We (…) find compressed into these three lines the values most often associated with Callimachean aesthetics as adumbrated in the Aetia prologue: a child or youth as bard (fr. 1.6 Pf.: \(\piαις \acute{α}τε\));245 delicacy of sound whether of instrument

243 This metapoetical dimension is reinforced by the mention of “woven baskets” (πλεκτοῖς ἐν ταλάρουσι) a line earlier (Il. 18.568), as weaving is a common poetical metaphor (on which see Introduction, n. 31). Cf. Hunter 1999, 82 (on Id. 1.45-54).
244 Stephens 2002/3, 13; 16; the bold markings are mine.
245 Cf. Stephens 2002/3, 16: “(…) Homer’s singer, the light-voiced \(\piαις\), conforms to Callimachus’ formulation of his poetic persona as child-like, or young in the face of his critics, the old-fashioned Telchines (fr. 1.16Pf.). As the prologue unfolds, the importance of the child’s voice is underscored by the moment of poetic initiation – childhood (fr. 1.21-22 Pf.) – when Callimachus first ‘sings’. The small voice of the child, like the ‘slender Muse’ and the thin-voiced and disembodied cicada that is the essence of song (fr. 1.29-34 Pf.), is an emblem of Callimachus’ poetics.”
or voice (fr. 1.24 Pf.: λεπταλέην; fr. 1.29 Pf.: λιγύν); and the description of the creative action as singing (fr. 1.1: ἀοιδῇ; 23: ἀοιδέ; 33: ἀείδω). In fact, these three Homeric lines provide not only a distillation but also a validation of Callimachean aesthetics: they set out a poetic agenda that runs counter to epic, while at the same time appearing side-by-side with and in epic, and it thus seems authorized by Homer himself. (…)

In Callimachus these elements of Homer’s vignette have been elaborated and diffused throughout the prologue; and their Homeric context – the Trojan war – is no longer visible. In this way, Callimachus reverses Homer’s original gesture as he adapts ‘Homer’ to fit his own poetic space.

So the boy on Homer’s Shield resembles Callimachus’ own poetic persona and the Linus song of the boy accords with Callimachus’ poetics. In relation to the interpretation of Theocritus’ Hylas poem, it is interesting that Callimachus deals with the Linus song himself later in the first book of the Aetia, in the context of the adventures of Heracles (fragments 22-25 Pf./24-27 M). A farmer from Lindus reproaches Heracles for killing his ox, but the hero does not listen:

```
ὡς ὁ μὲν ἔνθ’ ἠρᾶτο, σὺ δ’ ὡς ἁλὸς ἦχον ἀκούει
Σελλὸς ἐνὶ Τμαρίοις οὔρεσιν Ἰκαρίης,
ἡθέων ὡς μάχαλα φιλήτορος ὑτα πενιχροῦ,
ὡς ἄδικοι πατέρων υἱέες, ὡς σὺ λύρης
‒ ἐσσι γὰρ οὐ μάλ’ ἐλαφρός, ἃ καὶ Λίνος οὔ σ’ ἔχει λέξαι –
λυγρῶν ὡς ἐπέων οὐδὲν ὀπιζόμενος
Aet. fr. 23.2-7 Pf./25.2-7 M
```

So he [the farmer] cursed then, but you [Heracles] did not listen, as the Selloi on Mt. Tmarus hear the sound of the Icarian sea, as the wanton ears of youth hear needy lovers, as unjust sons their fathers, as you the lyre – for you were not easy and Linus could not tell you anything – respecting not at all the dire words …

(tr. Stephens 2002/3, 20)

Linus occurs here in his role as Heracles’ musical instructor, to whom the hero did not listen.247 In lines 5-6, Callimachus seems to refer to the “proverbial example of the lack of musicality – an ass listening to the lyre”.248 This reminds us of the prologue of

246 Pfeiffer 1949-53 prints the end of line 6 as λι ος ουσεχελέε..—, but approves of the restoration of Wilamowitz in his apparatus; Massimilla (1996) prints the text with restoration, as it stands here.
247 Stephens 2002/3, 20. See p. 17 of this article for the several identities of Linus.
the *Aetia*, where Callimachus associates his own poetry with the “clear sound of the cicada” (λιγύν ἦχον | τέττιγος, 29-30), which he contrasts with the braying of asses (θόρυβον ... ὄνων, 30). Heracles is thus associated with the un-Callimachean sound of asses, heroic poetry, which is reinforced by his characterization as οὐ μάλ' ἐλαφρός (6), the opposite of the Callimachean poetical ideal λεπτότης.249 By analogy, Linus is a Callimachean singer, a message reinforced by the intertextual nexus that connects the passage to the *Aetia* prologue (λιγύν, 29) and *Iliad* 18.569, where the Callimachus-like boy was playing a “clear-toned lyre” (φόρμιγγι λιγείῃ).

Theocritus reacts to the boy on Homer’s *Shield* in similar metapoetical fashion. The third scene on the ivy cup depicts a small boy guarding a vineyard:250

Not far from this sea-beaten old man there is a vineyard, heavily laden with dark ripe grape-clusters. A little boy watches over it, perched on a drystone wall. Two foxes lurk nearby; one prowls down the vine rows, stealing the ripe fruit, while the other pits all her cunning against the boy’s satchel. No respite for him, she reckons, till he has nothing left for breakfast but dry bread. But he is twisting a pretty trap for grasshoppers of asphodel, plaiting it with rushes, with never a thought for satchel and vines, absorbed as he is in his weaving task. (tr. Verity, adapted)

Through an “unusually close reworking”,251 Theocritus immediately makes clear that Homer’s vineyard scene with the boy making music is his main model:

---

250 For the programmatic aspects of this scene in general, see Ott 1969, 99-109; Halperin 1983a, 176-81; Goldhill 1987, 2-3; Hubbard 1998, 22; Hunter 1999, ad loc.
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ἐν δὲ τίθει σταφυλῆσι μέγα βρίθουσαν ἀλωήν καλὴν χρυσείην ... II. 18.561-2

On it he [Hephaistos] set also a vineyard heavily laden with clusters, a vineyard fair and golden ... (tr. Murray & Wyatt)

Just as Callimachus did, Theocritus has interpreted Homer’s boy in a metapoetical way and has made him a symbol of the bucolic poet/himself. Whereas Callimachus’ poetical persona became Homer’s παῖς, however, singing the same kind of refined song, Theocritus does something different. By depicting the boy as engaged in “weaving” (πλέκει, 52), Theocritus activates the potential poetical metaphor of weaving in Homer, where the boy’s bystanders were carrying fruit “in woven baskets” (πλεκτοῖς ἐν ταλάροισι, II. 18.568).252 Probably, the fact that the boy is making a trap for grasshoppers is in this context metapoetically significant as well, for in Idyll 7.41 Simichidas, speaking to Lycidas about his own poetic qualities, associates this insect with good poets:

καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Μοισᾶν καπυρὸν στόμα, κῆμε λέγοντι πάντες άοιδὸν ἄριστον· ἐγὼ δέ τις οὐ ταχυπειθής, οὐ Δᾶν· οὐ γάρ πω κατ’ ἐμὸν νόον οὔτε τὸν ἐσθλὸν Σικελίδαν νίκημι τὸν ἐκ Σάμω οὔτε Φιλίταν ἄειδων, βάτραχος δὲ ποτ’ ἀκρίδας ὡς τις ἐρίσδω. Id. 7.37-41

I have a clear voice too, you know, the gift of the Muses. Men call me the best of singers, though I’m not one to be quickly persuaded, I assure you. I certainly don’t believe I am yet a rival to mighty Sicelidas of Samos in song, not to Philitas. I’m but a frog competing with grasshoppers. (tr. Verity)

Moreover, this poetical association of the small animal also brings to mind the cicada, with which Callimachus explicitly associates himself in the Aetia prologue (29-32), and to which Thyrsis is compared later in Idyll 1 by the anonymous goatherd because

251 Hunter 1999, 82 (on Id. 1.46).
252 Segal 1974a, 3 already noticed that the boy constructing the grasshopper trap is an image for a poet. For weaving as a common poetical metaphor, see Introduction, n. 31 above.
of his archetypically bucolic song about Daphnis.253

The grasshopper-trap that the boy is making can be seen as a “symbol of the poem”254 and, as a further mise en abyme, as an emblem of Theocritus’ bucolic poetry. For the basket is made in part of reed (σχοίνῳ, 53),255 the same material of which that other symbol of Theocritus’ poetry, Daphnis’ panpipe is made.256 The programmatic dimension of the boy’s basket is reinforced later by Virgil, who clearly uses weaving a basket as a symbol for the writing of a bucolic poem:257

haec sat erit, divae, vestrum cecinisse poetam,
dum sedet et gracili fiscellam texit hibisco,
Pierides …

Ecl. 10.70-2

To have sung of these things, goddesses, while he sat and wove | a frail of slim hibiscus, will suffice your poet. (tr. Lee)

To speak through Hunter, “the boy on the cup is an image of the bucolic poet, constructing something beautiful from ‘natural materials’ (52-3)”,258 and Theocritus’ poetical persona is thus, like that of Callimachus, a playing child.259

253 Id. 1.148: τέττιγος ἐπεὶ τύγα φέρτερον ἄδεις, “for you sing more sweetly than the cicada” (tr. Verity).
254 Cairns 1984, 104.
255 See Goldhill 1987, 3-6 for the possible metapoetical associations of the word through the intertextual contact with Callimachus’ Aetia prologue, where σχοῖνος occurs in the sense “land-measure” in a poetological context.
256 Cairns 1984, 102.
257 Cairns 1984, 103, who also adduces Servius’ comment (on gracili): allegoricos significant se compossuisse hunc libellum tenuissimo stilo. “He allegorically says that he has composed a poetry booklet in the most refined style.” See also Ch. 3, Section 5.2 for the metapoetical significance of Virgil’s basket.
258 Hunter 1999, 82 (on Id. 1.45-54).
259 Cf. Halperin 1983a, 181: “The playful child came to be a fitting figure for the Alexandrian poet dedicated to upholding standards of artistic modesty and avoiding the grand themes of ‘serious’ literature. The most famous instance is Callimachus’ self-characterization in the Aetia prologue (…). The import of Theocritus’ miniature was not lost on Virgil, who portrays himself at the end of his Bucolics engaged in an occupation resembling that of the boy on the ivy-cup – similarly combining πόνος and παιγνίον, meditari and ludere, work and play – and almost as irresponsibly absorbed (10.71)”. See also Halperin 1983a, 181 for other aspects of the passage that are programmatic for Theocritus’ poetry, such as the “concentration on a single humorous incident” and the “sense of unencumbered delight”. An interesting question, which I cannot address here, is whether the foxes, who steal away the boy’s food while he is weaving, can also be interpreted metapoetically as rival poets.
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So in the ecphrasis of the ivy cup Theocritus describes his bucolic poetry in very Callimachean terms as playful, refined, sophisticated and original with regard to the heroic epic tradition by means of a “technique of inversion”, as Halperin calls it, through which he turns heroic epic inside-out.260

3. Bucolic Hylas, epic Heracles

In Idylls 1 and 7, Theocritus defines, or comments on, his own bucolic poetry in very Callimachean terms. But the poems differ in their approach. Idyll 7 deals more clearly and explicitly with poetry than the ecphrasis in Idyll 1, which is only implicitly about poetry. I will now argue that Theocritus’ Hylas also defines bucolic poetry in Callimachean terms, in yet another way, for Idyll 13 is not a bucolic poem. Whereas in Idylls 1 and 7 the “technique of inversion” is used to define bucolic in relation to heroic poetry from within a bucolic poem, Idyll 13 does so from outside, for the story that Theocritus tells Nicias is not about a herdsman, but about the epic hero Heracles participating in the epic expedition of the Argo. At first sight, the poem thus seems a mythological, heroic-epic episode. Accordingly, the poem is generally denoted as an epyllion, a “little epic” in Hellenistic fashion.261 This is reinforced by the occasional epic language262 and the fact that it summarizes half an epic Argonautica in lines 16-24.263 Apart from the problems with the modern concept “epyllion” itself, which is

260 Halperin 1983a, 219: “a heroic theme is inverted when it is detached from the heroic world and set instead amid the prosaic activities and humble personages of daily life.” Cf. Bing 1988, 47; DeForest 1994, 25: “[Theocritus’] Idylls are essentially epic poems turned inside-out.”
261 E.g. Crump 1931; Gutzwiller 1981; 1996, 132-3; Hunter 1999, 262, who, however, also notes on ld. 13 that “in length and scope […] it is well short of what are traditionally regarded as Hellenistic ‘epyllia’, poems such as Moschus’ Europa and the Megara …”. Cf. Hollis 1990, 23-4, who doubts “whether ‘Hylas’ should be considered an epyllion” (24, n. 4).
263 In fact, as e.g. Hunter 1999, 271 (on Id. 13.16-24) points out, these lines correspond to the first half of Apollonius’ Argonautica. See also Section 3.3.1 for this intertextual contact.
not used in antiquity as a technical term and is quite vague, it is misleading to call *Idyll* 13 an epyllion, because the poem contains elements that can be called bucolic, such as the motif of the echo, to which I will turn first.

3.1. Reading Hylas’ echo

As we have seen in Chapter 1, the answer of Theocritus’ Hylas to Heracles’ cry (59-60) resembles an echo, and it has interpreted as such by Virgil, Propertius and Valerius Flaccus. As was also pointed out, and as the underlinings below indicate, line 59, describing Hylas’ answer, “echoes” line 58 on a textual and phonic level:

\[ \text{τρὶς μὲν Ὕλαν ἄυσεν, ὅσον βαθὺς ἤρυγε λαιμός:} \]
\[ \text{τρὶς δ’ ἀο’ ὁ παις ὑπάκουσεν, ἀραιὰ δ’ ἵκετο φωνά} \]
\[ \text{ἐξ υδατος, παρεὼν δὲ μάλα σχεδὸν εἰδέτο πόρρω} \]

“Hylas!” he bellowed, as loud as his deep throat could cry, three times. Three times the boy replied, but his voice rose faint from the pool; though close, it sounded far away. (tr. Verity)

---

264 The use of the term epyllion to denote a short mythological narrative in hexameters was invented in the 19th century (see Reilly 1953 for this origin). Allen 1940 has convincingly argued that ἐπύλλιον was not used to denote a literary category in antiquity, and he also shows that the characteristics commonly ascribed to the modern concept of epyllion (long speeches, dreams, prophecies, digressions, ephrasis), do not appear in all the epyllia and, furthermore, occur in other genres. Although Gutzwiller 1981 still thinks the term can be useful to denote “short mythological poems”, length remains a problematic criterion, particularly in the case of *Id.* 13, because both poems of 1000 or more lines (Callimachus’ *Hecale*) and poems of about 100 lines (such as *Id.* 13: 75 lines; *Id.* 25: 84 lines) are usually regarded as epyllia. The modern term thus conceals the fact that in antiquity the word *epos* was used to denote a hexameter poem or hexameter verse, which could vary from a small poem to a full-blown epic. Nevertheless, with respect to those poems labelled “epyllia” by scholars, I agree with Hollis 1990, 25 that “the category is a genuine one. Roman poets who composed such works as Catul. 64 or the pseudo-Virgilian *Ciris* (…) must surely have believed that they were using a recognizable form inherited from the Greeks; and the traces of Callimachus’ *Hecale* which may be found in both these works, as well as in several episodes of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, suggest that our poem [*the Hecale*] was given an honoured place in the evolution of the genre”. As with bucolic poetry as a genre, however, for which Virgil was crucial, may it not be the case that epyllion (or whatever one would like to call it) became a strictly demarcated literary category, which comes closer to what we understand as a genre, in Roman times?

265 See Introduction, Section 2 for a survey of the echo motif in these authors.
But the echo phenomenon also features in another way in these lines, through an allusion to three lines from the *Iliad*, which deal with a wounded Odysseus:266

αὐτὰρ ὃ γ’ ἐξοπίσω ἀνεχάζετο, αὖε δ’ ἑταίρους.
τοῖς μὲν ἐπειτ’ ἔσεν ὅσον κεφαλῇ χάδε φωτός
τοῖς δ’ ἄειν ἰδόντος ἀρήφιλος Μενέλαος.
*Il.* 11.461-3

But he [Odysseus] gave ground, and shouted to his comrades; thrice then he uttered a shout as great as his head could hold, and thrice did Menelaos, dear to Ares, hear his call.  (tr. Murray & Wyatt)

As the underlinings show, this allusion is triggered by words which also constitute the textual echo within Theocritus’ text. This suggests that Theocritus, like the Latin poets who read and interpreted him, used the phenomenon of echo as a trope to describe the intertextual relationship with his predecessor: Theocritus “echoes” Homer.267 There is yet another intertextual echo involved, as Hylas’ reply in line 59 alludes to Menelaus’ reaction to Odysseus’ cry (as the bold markings in the Theocritean text above show):268

αἶψα δ’ ἄρ’ Αἴαντα προσεφώνεεν ἐγγὺς ἐόντα
·
·
·
“Aἴαν διογένες Τελαμώνιε, κοίρανε λαῶν,
ἀμφί μ’ Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασιφρόνος ἰκέτο φωνή*,
τῷ ἰκέλη ὡς εἴ ἑ βιῶτο μοῦνον ἐόντα
Τρώες ἀποτμήζαντες ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ύσμίνῃ.”
*φωνή vulg.: αὔτη Aristarchus

Il. 11.464-8

And immediately he [Menelaus] spoke to Aias who was near at hand: “Aias, sprung from Zeus, Telamon’s son, lord of men, in my ears rang the cry of Odysseus of the steadfast heart, as though the Trojans had cut him off in the mighty combat and were overpowering him alone as he is.”  (tr. Murray & Wyatt)

---

266 See also Gow 1950, II, 242 (on *Id.* 13.58); Hunter 1999, 282-3 (on *Id.* 13.58-60) for this and the following allusion.

267 See Hinds 1998, 5-8 and Barchiesi 2001, 139-40 for the echo as a “trope of intertextuality”. See Introduction, Section 2 for this phenomenon in the Hylas versions of Virgil, Propertius and Valerius Flaccus.

268 Hunter 1999, 283 (on *Id.* 13.58-60).
Theocritus seems to allude to the “vulgate” text of Homer, which reads φωνή in line 466. However, Aristarchus’ “emendation” ἀὑτή – it “echoes” ἤὑσεν in 462 – is very seductive, as this word is echoed in Theocritus’ poem as well. The origin and status of Aristarchus’ reading (which postdates Theocritus) cannot be determined, and so we do not know if Theocritus was familiar with it. If he was, he could be reflecting a scholarly debate on the correct reading of a line of the Iliad. In typically playful Hellenistic fashion, Theocritus would then reject the variant, but at the same time Idyll 13 would reproduce the echoing effect (ἀὑσεν – ὑπάκου σεν) that the text of the Iliad would have with this reading (ἤὑσεν – ἀὑτή) if it were to be adapted.

I think, however, that there is another, metapoetical explanation for Theocritus’ use of φωνά. Through the allusion to Iliad 11, Theocritus clearly associates Heracles with Odysseus, who is involved in a typically epic situation on the battlefield:

\[
\text{τρὶς μὲν Ὅλαν ἄὑσεν, ὀσον βαθὺς ἤρυγε λαιμός} \quad \text{Id. 13.58}
\]

\[
\text{τρὶς μὲν ἐπειτ' ἤὑσεν ὀσον κεφαλὴ χάδε φωτός} \quad \text{Il. 11.462}
\]

We are reminded of the archetypically heroic status of Heracles, but the difference of the situation in Idyll 13 is immediately made clear in the next line, for it is not a Homeric hero who replies to Heracles’ epic roar, as Menelaos reacts to Odysseus’ cry, but a boy with a thin voice. The epic associations of Heracles, both in general and in these lines specifically, already suggest that the contrast between him and Hylas has a metapoetical dimension, but this is reinforced by the terminology associated with Hylas. His voice is described as ἀραιά (“thin, faint”), a word which is regularly glossed as λεπτή (“slender, refined”), one of the keywords of Callimachus’ poetical programme. But ἀραιά itself also occurs in a metapoetical context in Callimachus’
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Hymn to Delos. As scholars have argued, the small island celebrated in this poem, the birthplace of Callimachus’ patron deity Apollo, can be seen as a symbol of his poetry. Line 191 is one of the elements that constitute the “partial allegory”:

\[ \varepsilon\alpha\tau\iota\delta\varepsilon\iota\iota\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\varepsilon\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \nu\delta\alpha\tau\iota\\nu\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma \quad \text{H. Delos 191} \]

There is an island on the water, shining, slender. (tr. Nisetich)

As S. Slings has pointed out, the application of the word to an island suggests a metapoetical meaning, for the island is not particularly “slender”, and \( \alpha\rho\alpha\omega\iota \) is not elsewhere in Greek literature applied to an island. Furthermore, the island is also called \( \delta\iota\epsilon\iota\iota\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\ \) “clear”, “shining”, an allusion to the etymology of the name of the island (< δήλος). In this context it is interesting that Callimachus calls Antimachus’ Lyde, a work which he also seems to attack in his Aetia prologue, “both fat and not clear” (καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν (fr. 398 Pf.). The two characteristics mentioned here are diametrically opposed to the characterization of Delos, in terms that are each other’s antonyms. So \( \alpha\rho\alpha\omega\iota \), which at first sight seems a somewhat strange combination with \( \nu\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma \), has a strong metapoetical dimension.

In Idyll 13 the metapoetical dimension of \( \alpha\rho\alpha\omega\iota \) is reinforced through the combination with \( \phi\omega\nu\alpha \) (59), which recalls the already discussed Callimachean boy allegiance is widespread. See e.g. Virg. Ecl. 6.8 (in a Callimachean context): agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam (“I now will meditate the rustic Muse on slender reed”; tr. Lee); cf. Ecl. 1.2, also in a programmatic position (cf. also n. 257 above, on Servius’ interpretation of Ecl. 10.71). Hor. Epist. 2.1.224-5 makes the poetological metaphor very explicit and parodies its hackneyed use by Callimachus-followers: cum lamentamur non apparere labores | nostros et tenui deducta poemata filo. “When we complain that that men lose sight of our labours, and of our poems so finely spun.” (tr. Fairclough) Cf. Feeney 1991, 323, n. 34 on this quotation: “the last phrase is, as it were, in inverted commas.” See also e.g. Reitzenstein 1931, 34-7; Clausen 1964; 1987, 3; Schmidt 1972, 21-6; Ross 1975, 26-7; Hubbard 1998, 101 on tenuis as translation of λεπτός.

See notably Slings 2004 (what follows takes a cue from his discussion at pp. 283-4). See also notably Bing 1988, 110-28 on the metapoetical aspects of Callimachus’ Hymn to Delos.

The term (on which see also Introduction, Section 3) is borrowed from Slings 2004.

Slings 2004, 283.

See Harder 2010, II, on Aet. fr. 1.9-12.

See Slings 2004, 283 for an example from Homer.

As with other aspects of Callimachus’ poetics, the poetological dimension of \( \alpha\rho\alpha\omega\iota \) may go back to Philitas, who seems to have used the word in a poem (fragment 17 P’), in which a man is described on which, as Hubbard 1998, 25-6 suggests, Theocritus could have based his Lycidas.
(παῖς) on Homer’s Shield, singing the Linus song with “delicate voice” (λεπταλέη φώνη; see p. 83 above). Callimachus had made Homer’s boy his own poetic persona, and in the ecphrasis of the ivy cup, the boy became a symbol for Theocritus’ Callimachean bucolic poetry, indeed for Theocritus himself. Hylas, who is of course also a παῖς (and described as such in the same line in which ἀραιά φωνά features), becomes a similar symbol for Callimachean poetry. As in Idyll 1, this poetry is characterized in relation to Homer, for Hylas resembles Homer’s boy, the symbol of the poetical alternative to heroic epic, licensed by the master himself. The allusions to the Iliad in lines 58-60 underline this: whereas Heracles resembles Odysseus, Hylas’ Callimachean φωνά (59) reply is unlike Menelaus’ epic φωνή (I. 11.466).279

3.2. The bucolic echo

But Hylas is not just Callimachean. Apart from its other meanings, Hylas’ echo also touches upon an essential feature of Theocritus’ bucolic poetry, because of its natural and musical associations.280 Already in the first lines of Theocritus’ programmatic first Idyll an essential link is created between bucolic song and the sound of nature: both are “sweet” (άδυ):281

άδυ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἁ πίτυς αἰπόλε τήνα ἃ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι μελίσδεται. ἁδὺ δὲ καὶ τὺ σύρισδες. (…)   

Id. 1.1-3

There is sweet music in that pine tree’s whisper, goatherd, there by the spring. Sweet too is the music of your pipe. (tr. Verity)

This link also lurks behind the metaphors of, for instance, the cicada and the grasshopper for the bucolic poet, which are so prominent in Theocritus’ poetry.

279 Perhaps we can see Theocritus metapoetically summing up his relationship to Homer when he describes Hylas’ (intertextual) echo as παρεὼν δὲ μάλα σχεδὸν εἴδετο πόρρω, “though close, it sounded far away” (60).
280 Cf. Hunter 1999, 282 (on Id. 13.58-60), who points out that “the origins of Echo, the extreme case of a ‘natural’ sound requiring human agency and thus a mythic model for bucolic poetry, is one of the central bucolic myths”.
281 For more examples of this link, see Hunter 1999, 68-70.
Hylas’ echo can be seen to symbolize this harmony between bucolic song and nature. This conception of echo is further developed by Virgil in his *Eclogues*, “where echo is the sign of nature’s sympathy with man”, and the later pastoral tradition, where the origin of the natural phenomenon becomes one of the central myths. Virgil, for instance, makes it very clear that for successful bucolic poetry, an echo of the woods, *silvae* – with which Hylas is associated because of his name – is essential as a kind of “sounding board”. The beginning of *Eclogue I*, which reworks the beginning of Theocritus’ first *Idyll* quoted above, is a very clear and programmatic example of this bucolic echo, which is emphasized by the textual echo *Amaryllida silvas*:

(...*) tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas.

*Ecl. 1.4-5

(...*) you, Tityrus, cool in shade, are teaching woods to echo lovely *Amaryllis.*
(tr. Lee)

282 Hardie 1998, 11. On the importance of “pastoral echo” in the *Eclogues*, see also Desport 1952, 63-9; Damon 1961, 281-90; Boyle 1977; Hardie 2002, 123-4. See also Ch. 3, Section 7.2 for an interpretation of Hylas’ echo in *Ecl. 6.43-4* as an aetiology of bucolic poetry, and Ch. 4, n. 539 for other ways in which nature expresses its sympathy with man in the bucolic world of Virgil’s *Eclogues.*

283 See e.g. Longus, *D&C* 3.23, where the aetiological myth of Echo is told, which closely associates the echo with bucolic poetry. The bucolic patron god Pan, jealous of Echo’s music, is responsible for the nymph’s death (by letting herdsmen rip her to pieces), and thus for creating imitative music (note the etymological play on μέλη, both “limbs” and “melodies”): καὶ τὰ μέλη Γῆ χαριζομένη Νύμφαις ἐκρυψε πάντα καὶ ἐτήρεσε τὴν μουσικὴν καὶ γνώμῃ Μουσῶν ἀφίησι φωνὴν καὶ μιμεῖται πάντα καθάπερ τότε ἡ κόρη, ἀνθρώπους, θηρία, θηρίων, ὄργανα, θηρίων ἀνθρώπων, ὄργανα, θηρίων: μιμεῖται καὶ αὐτὸν συρίττοντα τὸν Πάνα. “For love of the nymphs, Earth hid all her limbs, still singing and kept their music, and now, by will of the Muses, she emits a voice and mimics everything, just as the girl once did: gods, men, musical instruments, animals. She even mimics Pan playing his pipes.” (3.23.4-5; tr. Morgan) The bucolic association is reinforced by the close parallels between Echo and Syrinx (2.33.3-34), another victim of Pan, who will transform into the bucolic instrument par excellence (καὶ ἡ τότε παρθένος καλὴ νῦν ἐστὶ σὺριγξ μουσική. “And what was once a beautiful girl is now these tuneful pipes” (tr. Morgan). See also Borgeaud 1988 on the close affinities between the myths of Echo and syrinx. This parallel also suggests that the myth of Echo/echo (as told by Longus) concerns the origin of bucolic poetry. See further e.g. Damon 1961, 291-8 on the “pastoral echo” in the later pastoral tradition.

284 See Introduction, Section 2.

285 Damon 1961, 283, who also discusses examples.

286 Clausen 1994, ad loc. See also Hardie 2002, 204 for the programmatic dimension of the lines: “Amaryllis’ name embodies ‘love in the woods, love in the pastoral world’; she is almost a personification of satisfied pastoral desire.”
Just like the boy on the ivy cup, Hylas, who is transformed into an echo and thus produces a natural sound, becomes a symbol of the bucolic poet, in fact of Theocritus himself. As Hylas’ transformation is the aetiology of the echo phenomenon, *Idyll 13* can also be read as an allegory of the emergence of bucolic poetry, and that of Theocritus in particular. As I will argue in the next chapter, Virgil takes Theocritus’ cue in *Eclogue 6*, employing Hylas’ echo to describe the origin of his own bucolic world.\(^{287}\)

### 3.3. Hylas and Daphnis

The connection between Hylas and Theocritus himself is reinforced by the parallels between Hylas and the Daphnis, “variously the first ‘bucolic’ singer and the original subject of ‘bucolic song’”,\(^ {288}\) whose fate is sung by Thyrsis in *Idyll 1*.\(^ {289}\) It is hard to see what exactly is happening to Daphnis, which is at least in part due to the impression given by Theocritus that the story about Daphnis is well-known.\(^ {290}\) What is clear is that Daphnis in *Idyll 1* is wasting away with a violent passion for a girl, who is called Xenea by Lycidas in *Idyll 7.73*, where a similar situation is described.\(^ {291}\) As the words of Aphrodite, who visits Daphnis in his agony, seem to suggest, Daphnis’ passion was instilled in him by the goddess as punishment (for his rejection of her?):

---

\(^ {287}\) Ch. 3, Section 7.2.
\(^ {288}\) Hunter 1999, 60.
\(^ {289}\) See also Section 2.3 above.
\(^ {290}\) Id. 1.19: ἀλλὰ τὸ γὰρ δή, Θὐρσι, τὰ Δάφνιδος ἄλγε' ἀείδεις. “But look, Thyrsis, you have sung of The Sufferings of Daphnis.” (tr. Verity). See Hunter 1999, 61 on these and other ways in which a “sense of tradition is written into the poem”.
\(^ {291}\) Id. 1.66: πᾷ ποκ’ ἄρ’ ἦσθ’, ὅκα Δάφνις ἐτάκετο, πᾷ ποκα, Νύμφαι; “Where were you, Nymphs, when Daphnis wasted away, where were you?” (tr. Verity); *Id*. 1.77-8 (Hermes addressing Daphnis): Δάφνι, | τίς τυκατατρύχει; τίνος, ὤγαθε, τόσσον ἔρα σαι; “Daphnis, who is it that torments you? Who do you long for so much?” ~ *Id*. 7.72-7: (…) ο δὲ Τίτυρος ἔγγυθεν ἀισει | ὡς ποκα τὰς Ξενέας ἄρασσατο Δάφνις ὁ βούτας (…) κατετάκετο … “Nearby Tityrus will sing how once Daphnis the cowherd fell in love with Xenea (…). He was wasting away …” (tr. Verity).
And Cypris too came to see him, laughing with delight, but laughing in secret, feigning a heavy heart. She said: “Did you really boast that you could give Love a fall? Is it not your yourself who are thrown by cruel Love?” (tr. Verity)

Daphnis’ proud answer to the goddess shows that instead of giving in to his love – which would be easy, as Priapus tells Daphnis that the girl he loves is looking for him and wants to be with him – Daphnis has decided to resist his passion, and thus Aphrodite, at the expense of his own life:

Then Daphnis answered: “Hard Cypris, vengeful Cypris, Cypris hated by mortals; so you really believe that my last sun has set? I tell you, even from Hades Daphnis will prove to be a source of painful grief to Love.” (tr. Verity)

So what about the parallels between Hylas and Daphnis? Love, an important theme in Theocritus’ bucolic poetry, of course plays an essential role in the stories about both Hylas and Daphnis, but the latter’s death, as described in Idyll 1, specifically recalls that of Hylas:

---

292 Id. 1.81-3; 85: (…) ἦνθ’ ὁ Πρίηπος | κῆφα “Δάφνυ τάλαν, τί τύ τάκεαι ἡ δέ τυ κώρα | πάσας Ἀφροδίτα | ηθελ’ ἀνορθώσαι τά | ἐκ Μοιρᾶν, χω δάφνις ἔβα ῥόον. ἔκλυσε δίνα | τόν Ἐρωτα, τόν οὕτως φίλον ἄνδρα, τόν οὐ Νύνφαισιν ἀπεχθῆ.

---

293 See e.g. Halperin 1983a, 121-4; 129-31; 178f.; 233-5.
So much he [Daphnis] said, and ended; and Aphrodite would have raised him up again, but all the thread the Fates assigned was run, and Daphnis went to the stream. The waters closed over him whom the Muses loved, nor did the Nymphs mislike him. (tr. Verity)

These lines are much discussed. Generally speaking, there are two interpretations. According to the first (which is also that of the scholiast), Daphnis goes to the river (ῥόον) of the Underworld. The lines would thus metaphorically present Daphnis as dying. According to the other explanation, Daphnis literally drowns. I agree with Hunter, however, that the two interpretations of these mysterious lines do not exclude each other: “The emphasis on the watery nature of his end – whether it is understood literally or metaphorically (...) – seems to point to a specific narrative and not simply to be an elaborate way of saying ‘went to the Underworld’, though the words must also evoke such an idea.” So lines 140-1 at least suggest that Daphnis drowns, and the combination of love, death and water brings to mind Hylas’ rape.

The link with Hylas is reinforced by a further suggestion in Apollonius’ version of the story that Daphnis drowns in Hylas’ spring. There Hylas is also said to go to a ρόος: τόφρα δ’ Ὕλας χαλκέῃ σὺν κάλπιδι νόσφιν όμίλου | δίζητο κρήνης ἱερὸν ρόον. “In the meantime, Hylas went off from the crew with a bronze pitcher in search of a spring’s sacred flow.” (Arg. 1.1207-8; tr. Race). A few lines later another parallel with Daphnis’ account in Theocritus presents itself, for δίνη (“whirlpool”) is the word used by Apollonius to describe the water into which Hylas is pulled by the nymph: μέσῃ δ’ ἐνικάββαλε δίνῃ. “And she [the nymph] plunged him into the midst of the swirling water.” (Arg. 1.1239; tr. Race)

Another parallel between Hylas and Daphnis is provided by the girl who loves Daphnis (Xenea), for in her search she resembles Theocritus’ Heracles, whose “crazed search and wandering place him in the role (...) of the κώρα in Priapos’

---

294 See e.g. Gow 1950, II, ad loc.; van Erp Taalman Kip 1987 for arguments in favour of this view.
295 See e.g. Prescott 1913; Ogilvie 1962; Williams 1969; White 1977; Segal 1974b, 23-4; Halperin 1983b, 193 for this interpretation.
296 Segal 1974b, 27.
297 Segal 1974b, 24.
account of Daphnis’ situation at 1.82-85”\textsuperscript{298}. This link and the intertextual connections between \textit{Idylls} 1 and 13 in general are further developed by Bion, whose account of Aphrodite’s search for the wounded Adonis drew up on both poems.\textsuperscript{299}

Although the precise extent to which Theocritus’ Hylas and Daphnis, the archetypal bucolic poet, resemble each other cannot be determined, it is clear that there is intertextual contact between the two characters, which strengthens the identification of Hylas with the bucolic poet Theocritus and his conception of bucolic poetry – regardless of the priority of the two poems involved.\textsuperscript{300}

3.4. The bucolic landscape of \textit{Idyll} 13

Hylas’ echo of Heracles’ cry can, then, be read metapoetically as a metaphor describing the Callimachean relationship between Theocritus’ bucolic poetry and the heroic, epic tradition, the \textit{Iliad} in particular. In what follows I will argue that the elaborately described landscape in which Hylas disappears contributes to the opposition between the heroic Heracles and the tender, Callimachean Hylas, allowing the poem to be read as a metapoetical allegory of Theocritus’ bucolic poetry.

3.4.1. The landing in Mysia: Theocritus and Apollonius

Already at the beginning of the mythological episode, it is suggested that Mysia, where the Argonauts land, is a metapoetical landscape, for it is contrasted with the heroic world of the Argonautic expedition, half of which is summarized in only one sentence in lines 16-24.\textsuperscript{301} The sentence also corresponds to the first half of

\textsuperscript{298} Hunter 1999, 284 (on \textit{Id}. 13.64-71). See n. 292 above for the text and translation of these lines.

\textsuperscript{299} See e.g. Hunter 1999, 92 (on \textit{Id}. 1.82-3).

\textsuperscript{300} Cf. Hunter 1999, 263: “T.’s version of Herakles and Hylas is (…) assimilated to the story of Daphnis, as part of the bucolicisation of epic”.

\textsuperscript{301} \textit{Id}. 16-24: ἀλλ’ ὅτε τὸ χρύσειον ἔπλει μετὰ κῶας Ἰάσων Ἀἰσονίδας, οἱ δ’ αὐτῷ ἀριστῆεσ συνέποντο | πασὰν ἐκ πολίων προελεγμένοι ὄν ὄφελος τι, | ἵκετο χὠ ταλαεργὸς ἀνὴρ ἐς ἀφνειὸν Ἰωλκόν, Ἀλκμήνας υἱὸν Μιδεάτιδος ἡρωίνας, | σὺν δ’ αὐτῷ κατέβαινεν Ὕλας εὔεδρον ἐς Ἀργώ, ἅτις κυάνεᾶν οὐχ ἅψατο Συνδρομάδων ναῦς, ἀλλ’ δ’ εἰσέδραμε Φᾶσιν, αἰετὸς ὥς, μέγα λαῖτμα, ἀφ’ οὗ τότε χοιράδες ἔσταν. “And so, when Jason, son Aeson, sailed in
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Apollonius’ *Argonautica*, which suggests intertextual contact.\(^{302}\) Already the first line (16) makes an allusion very likely, as it closely resembles the fourth line of Apollonius’ epic:\(^{303}\)

\[\text{ἀλλ' ὅτε τὸ χρύσειον ἔπλει μετὰ κῶας Ιάσων} \quad \text{Id. 13.16}\]

And so, when Jason sailed in search of the Golden Fleece (tr. Verity, adapted)

\[\text{χρύσειον μετὰ κῶας ἐὔζυγον ἠλάσαν Ἀργώ.} \quad \text{Arg. 1.4}\]

They sailed the well-benched Argo in search of the Golden Fleece.

Furthermore, Apollonius’ ἐὔζυγον ... Ἀργώ (“well-benched Argo”) is paralleled by Theocritus’ εὔεδρον ... Ἀργώ (“well-benched Argo”) a few lines later (21). I cannot but read these parallels as an allusion of Theocritus to Apollonius,\(^{304}\) and the implications of this become clear in what follows.

Immediately after Theocritus’ epic, Argonautic sentence, the narrative is restarted. The reader is taken back to the beginning of the expedition, but this time the pace and thematic focus are quite different, which suggests that Theocritus will now start a different kind of “epic”:

search of the Golden Fleece, and noble heroes from every city went with him, a picked company with skills to offer, there also came to wealthy Iolcus the man of many labours, the son of Alcmena, who was princess of Midea, and with him Hylas went down to the strong-benched Argo, the ship which sped past the gloomy crashing rocks ungrazed, and shot between to the huge expanse of the deep gulf of Phasis, just like an eagle, and from that day till now the rocks have stood unmoved.” (tr. Verity, adapted). Cf. Mastronarde 1968, 282, who speaks of an “epic tenor” in the passage. See also van Erp Taalman Kip 1994, 161-2 for the epic language of the passage, created by allusions to Homer. See, however, Gutzwiller 1981, 22-3, who denies the epic tone and argues for a “lyric tint”, through allusions to Pindar’s *Pythian Ode* 4. The arguments that she mentions, however, do not undercut the clear heroic-epic tone of these lines, ironic as it may be.

\(^{302}\) Hunter 1999, 271 (on *Id.* 13.16-24): “These lines take the Argonautic expedition all the way to the Phasis, i.e. they offer one Theocritean sentence to match the whole of *Arg. 1-2*.”

\(^{303}\) This allusion is strengthened by the significance of Apollonius’ line as one of the few iterated formules in the entire epic (Fantuzzi 1988, 24, n. 35).

\(^{304}\) Cf. Cuypers 1997, 24-5. Di Marco 1995 interestingly suggests that Theocritus’ ὡς ἐδοκεῦμες (“as once we thought”; tr. Verity) in *Id.* 13.1 already triggers the intertextual contact with the *Argonautica* at the start of the poem (cf. the paraphrases of Hunter 1999, 266: “before we read *Argonautica* 1”). See Ch. 1, pp. 29-30 and n. 220 above for the problematic relative chronology of the poetry of Apollonius, Callimachus and Theocritus. Although I generally endorse the “work in progress hypothesis”, I find it very hard to see Apollonius as alluding to *Id.* 13 here (contra e.g. Köhnken 2001).
It was at the Pleiads’ rising, at the time when lambs graze on the margin land and spring has turned into summer, that the godlike band of heroes turned their minds to their voyage. They took their seats in the hollow Argo, and with three days’ south wind astern reached the Hellespont, and anchored in Propontis, where the Cianian people’s oxen trace broad furrows with the bright ploughshare. (tr. Verity)

As is suggested by the almost immediate arrival of the Argonauts in Mysia after their start suggests, Theocritus’ “epic” is about Hylas and Heracles. Furthermore, the seemingly unchanged rural landscape seems an essential part of Theocritus’ story. As Gutzwiller has shown, this landscape, and in fact the passage as a whole, describing the time of the year when the Argonauts set sail and arrived in Mysia, clearly recalls Hesiod.305 Not only do the shepherds and farmers recall the Works and Days, but the language also points in the direction of the Boeotian poet. The expression ἦμος ... τῆμος , for instance, “is common in Hesiod to express the proper season for a certain task or natural occurrence”, line 25 recalls fr. 290 (τῆμος ἀποκρύπτουσι Πελειάδες), and the genitive absolute construction, which Theocritus uses in line 26 (εἴαρος τετραμμένου), points in the direction of Hesiod, where this type frequently occurs (e.g. Theogony 58-9: περὶ δ’ ἔτραπον ὡραι, μηνῶν φθινόντων), whereas this construction is very rare in Homer.

As we have seen, Hellenistic poets recognized in Hesiod an alternative to Homer’s heroic, epic poetry. Accordingly, Theocritus also aligned himself with the herdsman-poet, whom he regarded as archetypal for his bucolic poetry. The allusions to Hesiod

305 See Gutzwiller 1981, 23-4, from whose detailed analysis much of what follows is derived. Cf. van Erp Taalman Kip 1994, 162; Hunter 1999, 273 (on Id. 13.25-8), who refers to the “Hesiodic flavour of both form and substance”.

in this passage, and in particular the emphasis on the rural scenery, thus immediately give Theocritus’ version of the Argonautica, the Hylas episode, a bucolic ring, which contrasts it with the traditionally epic narrative in the preceding lines (16-24).

But that is not all. Theocritus’ “restart” of the Argonautica clearly recalls Apollonius’ beginning of the Hylas episode, which also uses the ἦμος ... τῆμος construction, but to describe the time of the day when the Argonauts arrive in Mysia.

At the hour when a gardener or plowman gladly leaves the field for his hut, longing for dinner, and there on the doorstep, caked with dust, he bends his weary knees and stares at his worn-out hands and heaps curses on his belly, then it was that they reached the homesteads of the Cianian land near the Arganthonian mountain and the mouth of the Cius river. (tr. Race)

The most important difference between the two beginnings is that Apollonius’ passage constitutes the beginning of his Hylas episode, whereas that of Theocritus marks the beginning of the Argonautic expedition, and the almost immediate transition to Mysia suggests that Theocritus’ “bucolic” Argonautica is about Hylas and Heracles.

As I have argued in the previous chapter, Apollonius used the Hylas episode, crucially placed at the end of the first book, to distance himself from the heroic-epic tradition, as symbolized by Heracles whose presence dominated the first book, and to align himself with Callimachean poetics, as symbolized by Hylas, thus revealing

---

the way the epic was destined to go. As Theocritus’ bucolic poetry, which is also symbolized by Hylas, is Callimachean as well, the contrast between lines 16-24, dealing with Apollonius’ *Argonautica*, and Theocritus’ own version of the *Argonautica* in what follows does not, in my opinion, reveal an opposition, but rather a difference in focus between the two poets: Theocritus and Apollonius both have a Callimachean attitude towards heroic-epic poetry, but although the paths of both poets are “untrodden”, they are nevertheless different, just as Apollonius’ *Argonautica* and Callimachus’ *Aetia* had different ways of obtaining the same goal.\(^{307}\) This interpretation of the intertextual contact between Apollonius’ Hylas episode and *Idyll* 13 also explains why Theocritus would want to write a metapoetical commentary on his bucolic poetry in the form of a mythological “little epic”, and not a bucolic poem: Theocritus shows his colleague and poetic rival Apollonius another way of writing Callimachean poetry by rewriting his Hylas episode and revealing its bucolic potential.\(^{308}\)

3.4.2. The bucolic preparations

Theocritus’ focus on landscape persists in the lines following the landing, which describe the preparation of the Argonauts for the night:

\[
\text{ἐκβάντες δ’ ἐπὶ θῖνα κατὰ ζυγὰ δαῖτα πένοντο}
\text{δειελινοὶ, πολλοὶ δὲ μίαν στορέσαντο χαμεύναν.}
\text{λειμὼν γάρ σφιν ἔκειτο μέγα στιβάδεσσιν ὀνειαρ,}
\text{ἐνθὲν βούτομον ὀξὺ βαθύν τ’ ἐτάμοντο κύπειον.}
\]

*Id.* 13.32-5

They disembarked, and made their evening meal on the beach in pairs; but they prepared one sleeping-place for all, because there was a great store of stuff for their beds: a meadow, where they cut sharp sedge and ample galingale.

(tr. Verity)

\(^{307}\) See Ch. 1, Section 3.5.

\(^{308}\) The intertextual contact between *Id.* 22 and Apollonius’ Amycus episode, which opens *Arg.* 2 and immediately follows the Hylas episode, may point to a similar metapoetical dimension, especially because both passages are intertextually connected with both Apollonius’ Hylas episode and *Id.* 13 (see Cuypers 1997, 22-8 for a survey). I hope to pursue this metapoetical dimension of *Id.* 22 elsewhere.
As Tränkle has shown, the meadow as a place to rest recalls passages from Theocritus’ bucolic poems. In *Idyll 5*, Lacon proposes a meadow as the site for a singing competition to Comatas:

(…) ἄδιον ἀσή
τείδ’ ύπο τάν κότινον καὶ τάλσεα ταύτα καθίξας.
ψυχόν ἱδίον τούτει καταλεῖβεται ὥδε πεφύκει
ποιά, χὰ στιβάζ ᾂδε, καὶ ἀκρίδες ὥδε λαλεῦντι.

*Id.* 5.31-4

Come and sit here in this grove, under this olive tree, and sing in more comfort. Here water drips cool, there is grass for our couch, and grasshoppers sing.

The *locus amoenus* where Simichidas and his friends arrive at the end of *Idyll 7* also features a meadow:

(…) αὐτάρ ἐγὼν τε καὶ Εὐκρίτος ἐς Φρασιδάμῳ
στραφθέντες χὰ καλὸς Ἀμύντιχος ἐν τε βαθείᾳς
ἀδείας σχοίνοιο χαμευνίσιν ἐκλίνθημεν
ἐν τε νεοτμάτοις γεγαθότες οἰναρέοισι.

*Id.* 7.131-4

Eucritus and I and pretty Amyntas turned aside to the farm of Phrasidamus, where we sank down with pleasure on deep-piled couches of sweet rushes, and vine leaves freshly stripped from the bush.

So the scene is very reminiscent of Theocritus’ bucolic poems, and the narrative so far suggests that Theocritus has read the epic *Argonautica* through a bucolic lens. The metapoetical significance of this move will reveal itself in the following scene, where Heracles and Hylas are brought into contact with the meta-bucolic landscape.

---


310 See also below for the metapoetical landscape at the end of *Idyll 7*, which, incidentally, resembles the passage in *Id.* 5, as they both feature meadows (see above), trees (*Id.* 5.32 ~ *Id.* 7.135-6), water from a spring (*Id.* 5.33 ~ *Id.* 7.136-7) and singing insects (ἀκρίδες … λαλεῦντι, *Id.* 5.34 ~ τέττιγες λαλαγεῦντες, *Id.* 7.139).
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3.4.3. Hylas, Heracles and the bucolic landscape

When Hylas dips his pitcher in the spring, the nymphs grab him by the hand. The expression used to describe this event is noteworthy: ταὶ δὲ ἐν χερὶ πᾶσαι ἔφυσαν, “they grew upon his hand” (47). Hunter remarks that although the phrase is a common epicism, Theocritus, triggering an etymological play between Ὑλας and ὕλη (“wood”), “gives a literal weight to the verb”, evoking “rationalising interpretations” of the myth, according to which Hylas is not really abducted by nymphs, but, for instance, lies “concealed in the vegetation”.

Theocritus’ phrase thus suggests that Hylas lives up to his etymology and becomes part of a world in which he is very much at home. This is underlined at the end of the poem, where it is stated that Hylas’ drowning has made him divine (72). So is Hylas again contrasted with Heracles, who is not at all at home in the world of Idyll 13. This becomes painfully clear when, after Hylas has been abducted, transformed into a bucolic echo, the crazed Heracles wanders through the countryside in search of him:

νεβροῦ φθεγξαμένας τις ἐν οὔρεσιν ὠμοφάγος λίς
ἐξ εὐνάς ἔσπευσεν ἐτοιμοτάταν ἐπὶ δαίτα:
Ἡρακλέης τοιοῦτος ἐν ἀτρίπτοισιν ἀκάνθαις
παῖδα ποθῶν δεδόνητο, πολὺν δ’ ἐπελάμβανε χῶρον.
σχέτλιοι οἱ φιλέοντες, ἀλώμενος ὅσσ’ ἐμόγησεν ὅσσ’ ἔσπευσεν
οὐρέα καὶ δρυμοὺς, τὰ δ’ Ἰάσονος ὕστερα πάντ’ ἦς.

Id. 13.62-7

The flesh-eating lion hears a fawn calling in the hills and bounds from its lair to seek out a ready feast; so did Heracles rampage through untrodden thorn-brakes, covering vast tracts of land, in longing for the boy. How reckless lovers are! How he suffered, as he roamed over hills and through forests, and Jason’s expedition went clean from his mind. (tr. Verity)

In the light of the Callimachean context of these lines, the wording of this passage suggests that the landscape inhospitable to Heracles is also a metapoetical landscape.

---

311 See also Introduction, Section 2 for this etymological play on Ὑλας and ὕλη.
312 Hunter 1999, 279 (on Id. 13.47), who mentions as a parallel for this kind of rationalisation of the myth the version of the story by a certain Onasos (FGrHist 41) which triggered the common metonymy of νύμφη for “water” by making Hylas literally drown.
Bucolic Hylas: Idyll 13 of Theocritus

The untrodden thorns, for instance, recall the prologue to the Aetia, where Apollo concludes his advice to the young poet Callimachus with an appeal for originality and the hard work which it requires:

\[
\text{δίφρον ἐλ\[άν μηδ' οἰμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους}
\]
\[\text{\[ότοιτο\[ις, εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις.} \]

Aet. fr. 1.27-8 Pf.

Do not drive your chariot upon the common tracks of others, nor along a wide road, but on untrodden paths, though your course be more narrow.

(tr. Nisetich)

Apollo here combines the metaphor of the easy versus the difficult road with that of the paths of (original) poetry to characterize Callimachus’ poetic aesthetics. This combination of metaphors can also be found in Idyll 13. Although Heracles there takes the untrodden path of original, Callimachean poetry, he is also having a hard time, albeit not in the Callimachean sense: Heracles’ path consists of thorns, which cause him pain and only emphasize his incongruity with Theocritus’ poetical world. This metapoetical dimension is underlined at the end of the description of Heracles’ suffering, where it is stated that he should be somewhere else, helping Jason on his epic quest (67). A similar contrast was created a few lines earlier:

\[
\text{Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας δὲ ταρασσόμενος περὶ παιδί}
\]
\[\text{ώχετο, Μαιωτιστὶ λαβὼν εὐκαμπέα τόξα}
\]
\[\text{kai ἄπολαλον, τό οἱ αἰεν ἔχανδαν δεξιτερὰ χείρ.} \]

Id. 13.55-7

---

313 See Harder 2010, II, on Aet. fr. 1.25-8, who also discusses Callimachus’ model, Pindar’s Paean 7b 11ff., where Pindar may use the metaphor to claim originality by reference to Homer (see also Rutherford 2001, 247-9), which would imply that Callimachus, in accordance with the end of the Hymn to Apollo, is doing the same.

314 Cf. Mastronarde 1968, 279. See Seiler 1997, 19-20 for the Callimachean ideal of poetic πόνος in general, and 146 for an example in Theocritus (Id. 7). This metapoetical interpretation of Heracles’ (ironically Callimachean) suffering is reinforced by the fact that the hero is the prototypical example of someone making the choice between the easy and the difficult road. See e.g. Harder 2010, II, on Aet. fr. 1.25-8, discussing Xen. Mem. 2.1.21ff., the story of Heracles at the cross-roads. Heracles seems to make a similarly painful, metapoetical journey at the beginning of Aetia 3, by seemingly passing through “a wilderness of thorns” (SH 257.13: σκῶλος μοι ...; tr. Nisetich) to reach Molorcus’ farm, in an episode that can be seen as very “Callimachean”, as it constitutes the climax of Heracles’ gradual transformation into a Callimachean hero (see Ambühl 2004, quoted on p. 67 above). This interesting parallel was brought to my attention my Professor Harder.
But Amphitryon's son, disturbed at the boy's delay, set off holding his bow with the Scythian curve and the club he always grasped in his right hand.

(tr. Verity)

Immediately after the abduction of Hylas, Heracles, introduced with the epicsounding epithet/patronymic Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας, arms himself for his usual kind of epic fight, but the weapons will be of no avail in this world.315

As with Hylas himself, the landscape in which Heracles is suffering is not only Callimachean, but also more specifically bucolic. The thorns (ἀκάνθαις, 64), as well as the spring and the nympha, recall the description of the locus amoenus at the end of Idyll 7, which can be read as an allegory of Theocritus’ bucolic poetry:316

πολλαὶ δ’ ἄμμιν ὑπέρθε κατὰ κρατὸς δονέοντο αἰγεῖοι πτελέαι τε· τὸ δ’ ἐγγύθεν ιερὸν ὕδωρ Νυμφᾶν ἔξ ἀντροι κατειβόμενον κελάφυζε. τοῖ δὲ ποτὶ σκιαραῖς ὀροδαμνίσιν αἰθαλίωνες τέττιγες λαλαγεῦντες ἔχον πόνον· ἀ δ’ ὀλολυγών τηλόθεν ἐν πυκιναῖσι βάτων τρύζεσκεν ἀκάνθαις· ἀειδοὶ κόρυδοι καὶ ἀκανθίδες, ἐστενε τρυγών, πωτῶντο ξουθαὶ περὶ πίδακας ἀμφὶ μέλισσαι.

Id. 7.135-42

Above us was the constant quiet movement of elm and poplar, and from the cave of the Nymphs nearby the sacred water ran with a bubbling sound as it fell. Soot-black cicadas chattered relentlessly on shady branches, and the muttering of tree-frogs rose far off from the impenetrable thorn bush. Lark and finches were singing, the turtle-dove moaned, and bees hummed and darted about the springs. (tr. Verity)

This landscape features animals, trees, a spring and nympha with clear Callimachean and bucolic associations through allusion to programmatic passages elsewhere in Theocritus and Callimachus.317 Because of their presence in this metapoetical

---

315 As Dr. Cuypers suggests to me, the patronymic here emphasizes Heracles’ mortality by reference to his mortal father. Thus, although the epic word associates him with the heroic world in which he is at home, in this context it also ironically reveals that Heracles is not his heroic self in this poem, but has become an ordinary human being.

316 See e.g. Pearce 1988; Hunter 1999, 192-3.

317 Animals: For the cicada (139) as an emblem of the Callimachean poet, see n. 245 above. The standard interpretation of ἀ ὀλολυγών (139) is that it concerns a frog (see Gow 1950, II, 165, ad loc.). For frogs
landscape, the thorns (ἀκάνθαις, 140) also acquire a metapoetical meaning, which is underlined by the etymological play with the ἀκανθίδες (“finches” or “linnets”) in the next line, which evoke Callimachean poetics. The meta-bucolic ring of the thorns in *Idyll 13* is further reinforced by their presence – along with the mountains (οὔρεα, 67) and thickets (δρυμούς, 67) through which Heracles is wandering – in another landscape with similar metapoetical associations, that of the dying Daphnis in *Idyll 1*:

> ὦ λύκοι, ὦ θῶες, ὦ ἀν’ ὄρεα φωλάδες ἄρκτοι, χαίρεθ’· ὁ βουκόλος ἑμίν ἐγὼ Δάφνις οὐκέτ’ ἀν’ ὡλαν, οὐκέτ’ ἀνὰ δρυμώς, οὐκ ἄλσος, χαίρ’, Ἀρέθοισα, καὶ ποταμοῖ τοι χείτε καλὸν κατὰ Θυβρίδος ὠδῷ.

(...) νῦν ἱα μὲν φορέοιτε βάτοι, φορέοιτε δ’ ἀκανθαι ἅ δὲ καλὰ νάρκισσος ἐπ’ ἄρκευθοις κομάσαι

*Id.* 1.115-8; 132-3

in a programmatic context, see also *Id.* 7.41 (discussed on p. 86 above). See, however, White 1979, 9-16 and Hunter 1999, 194 (on *Id.* 7.139), who argue that by ὄλολυγών a nightingale is meant, a bird which is associated with beautiful sound and is thus probably a better candidate in this Callimachean context. The song of the κόρυδος, “(crested) lark”, is usually not commented on in a positive way, but Marcellus Empiricus (quoted by Gow 1950, II, ad loc.) says that the corydalus avis “pleases people’s minds with the sweetness of its voice” (*animos hominum dulcedine vocis oblectat*). For the ἀκανθίς (“finch”/“linnet”), see the next note. *Trees*: The poplar is a symbol of Callimachean poetics in Call. *H. Dem.* (Müller 1987; Murray 2004, discussed in Ch. 1, Section 3.2.1). *Springs and bees*: The ἱερὸν ὕδωρ (136), πίδακας (142) and μέλισσαι (142) acquire metapoetical meaning through the intertextual contact with Callimachus’ poetic manifesto at the end of the *Hymn to Apollo* (μέλισσαι, 110), πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς, 112). For the nymphs who are invoked a few lines later (148) and who act as Theocritus’ “bucolic Muses”, see Section 3.4.4 below. See also e.g. Lawall 1967, 102-6, Kyriakou 1995, 216-31 and Seiler 1997, 145-51 for the metapoetical dimension of the scene.

318 The voice of the ἀκανθίς, “finch”/“linnet” is λιγυρά according to Aristotle (*HA* 616b32), a word which also has Callimachean associations (cf. pp. 83-5 above). The metapoetical dimension of the thorns may be reinforced by a poem (*AP* 11.321) of Philip of Thessalonica (1st or 2nd cent. AD), in which he attacks learned grammaticoi, “picking up Callimachus’ literary terms and images and hammering them into weapons” (DeForest 1994, 33). The poem, for instance, parodies the *Aetia* prologue, by denoting the “Callimachean” grammaticoi as Telchines and describing them as “grumbling” at the works of others (κατατρύζοντες, 7 – ἐπιτρύζουσιν, *Aetia*, fr. 1.1 Pf.), but also associates them with thorns: γραμματικοὶ Μώμου, στυγιαί τέκνα, σῆτες ακανθῶν, ἐς τελχίνες βιβλίων … (“Grammatikoi, children of Stygian Momus, worms feeding on thorns, Telchines of books.”; tr. DeForest 1994). As DeForest 1994, 33 explains: “Callimachus likens his poetry to the the song of the cricket (*Ait.* 1.29), which was proverbially sweet. His contemporary, Leonidas of Tarentum, describes the cricket as ‘treading on the thorn’ (*AP* 7.198). Philip changes the insect from cricket to book-worm and gives it the diet of thorns because scholars busy themselves with ‘thorny’ problems.”
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Farewell you wolves and jackals, farewell you bears that lurk in the mountains. No more will Daphnis the cowherd haunt your thickets, woods and groves. Farewell, Arethusa, and you streams whose bright waters pour down Thybris’ side. (...) Now, you thorns and brambles, bring forth violets, and let the lovely narcissus flower on the juniper. (tr. Verity)

These similarities in landscape and the parallels between Hylas and Daphnis already discussed reinforce the intertextual contact between *Idylls* 1 and 13, through which the mention of ὕλαν (1.116) becomes very suggestive. Has what was only hinted at in *Idyll* 13 here reality? Is Hylas actually a piece of wood and thus part of Theocritus’ bucolic landscape? This interpretation is supported by the mention of the narcissus in line 133. The mythological figure with the same name is very similar to Daphnis in his self-absorption, and his myth is a subtext in Thryrsis’ song in *Idyll* 1.319 The flower mentioned thus clearly evokes its mythological counterpart. This context suggests that ὕλαν a few lines earlier evokes Hylas, a figure similar to both Daphnis and Narcissus.320

3.4.4. Bucolic nymphs and Callimachean springs

The nymphs in *Idyll* 13 can also be read in a metapoetical way, although there are no allusions to any programmatic passage to support this. In Theocritus’ bucolic *Idyll* 7, however, as we have already seen, Theocritus’ poetical alter ego Simichidas replaces Hesiod’s Muses with “rustic” nymphs (92). A few lines later in the same poem, in the metapoetical locus amoenus, Simichidas again regards the nymphs as his (and Theocritus’) “bucolic Muses”, by invoking the nymphs of the Castalian spring in Delphi because of their association with Apollo (148).321 Given the status of the Nymphs in this meta-bucolic poem as well as in *Idyll* 1,322 and given the bucolic

319 See Zimmerman 1994 for the way in which *Idyll* 1 evokes the Narcissus myth.
320 See Ch. 3, Section 6.2 for Propertius’ Narcissus-like Hylas, and Ch. 4, Section 5.1 for the similarities between Valerius’ Hylas and Ovid’s Narcissus.
321 Hunter 1999, 197 (on *Id*. 7.148). See also Fantuzzi 2000 for the way in which Theocritus associates his mythological poetry with the Muses and his bucolic poetry with the nymphs.
322 See Hunter 1999, 87-8 on *Id*. 1.66-9. See also p. 106 with n. 317 above.
character of the landscape of *Idyll* 13 already established by the intertextual contact with these poems, it is reasonable to extend the metapoetical dimension of the landscape of *Idyll* 13 to the nymphs. That these goddesses also function as Muses of Theocritus’ poetry in the Hylas poem is reinforced by their rural designation as δειναὶ θεαὶ ἀγροιώταις (“feared by countryfolk”, 44).323

As in the case of the nymphs, there are no obvious allusions to suggest a metapoetical reading of the abode of the nymphs, i.e. the spring. Nevertheless, in the context of the anti-heroic, Callimachean character of the landscape already established in lines 25-35 (see above), no further hint is needed to associate the water of the secluded spring, inhabited by bucolic nymphs, with Callimachean poetics, for the association of water with poetry is very common in antiquity, and Callimachus had of course famously symbolized his poetics in terms of the pure water from a secluded spring in his *Hymn to Apollo* and *Epigram* 28.324 A hint is to be found, however; for in the *locus amoenus* of *Idyll* 7, with which the meta-bucolic landscape of *Idyll* 13 is intertextually connected, Theocritus clearly associates the water (and the nymphs) with Callimachean poetics.325 The ἱερὸν ὕδωρ (“holy water”) that flows from the cave of the nymphs (136-7, quoted above),326 as well as the bees flying round the springs a few lines later (πωτῶντο ξουθαὶ περὶ πίδακας ἀμφὶ μέλισσαι, 142) recall the already discussed programmatic ending of Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo*:327

Δηοῖ δ’ οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
ἀλλ’ ἤτις καθαρῆ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον.

*H. Ap.* 110-12

---

323 The name of only one of the three nymph, Μαλίς (“apple-tree”) also fits the bucolic landscape. As Hunter 1999,278 (on *Id.* 13.45) notes, “It is not unlikely that T. had some source for these three names”. Could this be Callimachus’ *On Nymphs*?

324 See Ch. 1, Section 2.5 for text, translation and interpretation of Callimachus’ *H. Ap.* and *Ep.* 28.

325 See also pp. 106-7 with n. 317 above.

326 Cf. *Idyll* 1.66-9, where ἱερὸν ὕδωρ (69) is also associated with nymphs, as a place where they are used to dwell.

327 Cf. also Hunter 1999, 195 (on *Id.* 7.142): “this unparalleled use of the double preposition both evokes the apparently random darting of the bees around the spring, and again calls attention to its own artifice”.
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The bees bring water to Deo not from every source but where it bubbles up pure and undefiled from a holy spring, its very essence. (tr. Nisetich)

The suggestion of remoteness of the spring in *Idyll* 13 (ἡμένῳ ἐν χώρῳ, “in a low-lying place”, 40) in this context also recalls the holy spring from the *Hymn to Apollo*, but in particular Callimachus’ rejection of the public fountain in *Epigram* 28.3-4: οὐδ’ ἀπὸ κοήνης | πίνω (“and I do not drink from the public fountain”). This implicit metapoetical significance seen in the spring in *Idyll* 13 is supported by at least one ancient reading, which will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.328 In his elegiac Hylas poem, which is modelled on *Idyll* 13, Propertius clearly alludes to Callimachus’ “pure” and “undefiled” water/poetry in the *Hymn to Apollo* (compare the underlinings), as well as to the secluded spring preferred by Callimachus, particularly in *Epigram* 28.3-4 (cf. sepositi, in bold below),329 interpreting Theocritus’ spring as symbolic of Callimachean poetics:

\[
\text{at comes invicti iuvenes processerat ultra} \\
\text{raram sepositi quaerere fontis aquam.} \\
\] Prop. 1.20.23-4

The squire of the invincible hero had gone further afield, to seek the choice water of a secluded spring. (tr. Heyworth)

The Callimachean nature of Theocritus’ spring is reinforced by the way Hylas’ fall in the spring is described:

\[
(\ldots) \text{kατήριπε δ}’ \text{ ἐς μέλαν ὕδωρ} \\
\text{αθρόος, ὡς ὅτε πυρσὸς ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἤριπεν} \text{ ἀστηρ} \\
\text{αθρόος, ἐν πόντῳ (\ldots)} \\
\] *Id*. 13.49-51

Down he fell with a rush into the dark pool, just as a shooting star falls with a rush into the sea. (tr. Verity)

---

328 Ch. 3, Section 7.1. Cf. Ch. 1, Section 3.3.
329 Petrain 2000, 413-4.
This passage seems to allude to a Homeric simile that occurs twice in the *Iliad*, comparing the deaths on the battlefield of Asius and Sarpedon respectively:

\[ \text{ἦριπε} \delta', \ \text{ὡς \ ὅτε \ τις \ δρῦς \ ἤριπεν} \ \text{ἦ \ ἀχερώις} \\
\text{ἡ \ πίτυς \ βλωθη,} \ \text{τὴν \ τ' \ οὐρεί \ τέκτονες} \ \text{ἄνδρες} \\
\text{ἐξέταμον \ πελέκεσι \ νεήκεσι \ νηῖον \ εἶναι.} \]

And he fell, as an oak falls or a poplar or a tall pine, that among the mountains shipwrights fell with wetted axes to be a ship’s timber. (tr. Murray & Wyatt)

As Hylas’ abduction can be regarded as a kind of death, the allusion at first sight seems very apt. As with the allusions to the *Iliad* a few lines later (58-9; see Section 3.1 above), however, which associate Heracles with Odysseus, wounded on the battlefield, the allusion only highlights the difference between the Homeric and the Theocritean situations. Contrary to the dying epic warriors, the unheroic, bucolic Hylas, who is united with the Callimachean spring, is deified.

3.5. Heracles and Polyphemus

The meta-bucolic reading of *Idyll* 13 proposed here is reinforced by the clear intertextual contact between this poem and the other love poem addressed to Nicias, *Idyll* 11. On the one hand, the love song of the shepherd-singer Polyphemus has clear affinities with Theocritus’ bucolic poems. On the other hand, the poem, which did not feature in the early ancient collections of Theocritus’ bucolic poems, does not use bucolic terminology and deals with an epic mythological character. Theocritus’ focusing on the “bucolic” aspects of Homer and taking a Homeric element out of the heroic-epic context and placing it in the bucolic world of love is

330 See also Campbell 1990, 115-6; van Erp Taalman Kip 1994, 164-5 for this allusion.
331 See e.g. Gutzwiller 1991, 107-8 on this contact.
332 Cf. Hunter 1999, 218: “(...) many aspects of the poem (e.g. the claim to skill on the syrinx in 38, the remarkable mixture of animals in 40-1) gain added point if viewed in the light of ‘bucolic conventions’, and Damoitas and Daphnis in *Idyll* 6 treat Polyphemus and Galateia as a mythical story with parallels to their own situation.”
333 See Gutzwiller 1996 for a thorough analysis of the evidence for ancient collections of Theocritus.
characteristic of his Callimachean bucolic poetry. In Theocritus’ bucolic poems, however, this “heroic inversion” is handled in an allusive way from within the bucolic world, which is sealed off from the heroic-epic world of Homer. The elaborately described ivy cup in Idyll 1, for instance, clearly alludes to the Iliad, but the object belongs to the bucolic world in which it features. The Cyclops in Idyll 11, however, is clearly not part of the bucolic world. As in Idyll 13, the poem’s protagonist is torn out his usual epic context and placed in an unfamiliar, bucolic context of love. It is therefore appropriate enough that the displaced heroic characters of Heracles and Polyphemus are intertextually related, and that the points of contact highlight the contrast with their poetic context. When Heracles, for instance, is said to love a boy (ήρατο παιδός, 6), the contrast with his usual, heroic activities is immediately made clear, because the first part of the line mentions the hero defeating the Nemean lion (ὁς τὸν λίν ὑπέμεινε τὸν ἀγριον). At the beginning of Idyll 11, something similar occurs. Polyphemus is said to love a girl (ήρατο τᾶς Γαλατείας, 8), which is at odds with the behaviour of Polyphemus “of old times”, as is stated in the first part of the line (ὡρχαῖος Πολύ φαμος). Later in Idyll 13, the presence of Heracles in an unfamiliar poetical world is emphasized by the mention of his neglected epic duties (ὕστερα πάντ', 67). Similarly, the Cyclops is also not fulfilling his usual duties in this new poetic context: ἀγεῖτο δὲ πάντα πάρεργα (“he regarded everything as secondary”, 11).

---

336 It seems somewhat ironic that by the very neglect of his activities as a shepherd, Polyphemus resembles a bucolic poet. This only serves to underline the difference between Theocritus’ Callimachean bucolic poetry and Homer’s bucolic elements, however, which are just “leftovers” of his heroic poetry. Cf. Ch. 1, Section 3.2.3, where Heracles is also associated with Polyphemus to reveal that he does not fit Apollonius’ Callimachean epic.
337 Heracles is also associated with the Polyphemus of the Odyssey through allusion. In line 58, for instance, ἤρυγε, recalls Polyphemus, who after his final meal “vomited in his drunken sleep” (ὁ δ’ ἐρεύγετο οἰνοβαρείων, Od. 9.374). As Hunter 1999, 283 (on ld. 13.58) argues: “Lexica distinguish two senses of ἐρεύγεσθαι, ‘belch’, ‘disgorge’ and ‘bellow’, ‘roar, but here both are relevant: Herakles’ glutonous throat was notoriously deep (...), and although the verb is not necessarily coarse in Hellenistic Greek, here it may suggest a likeness between Herakles and the Cyclops (...).” See also Hunter 1999, 276 (on ld. 13.36), 282 (on ld. 13.56-7), 283 (on ld. 13.58) for parallels. It is interesting, incidentally, that Simichidas mentions both Heracles and Polyphemus when addressing the nymphs.
So, both poems seem to comment metapoetically on Theocritus’ bucolic poetry. The fact that both poems are framed by addresses by Theocritus’ poetic persona to his fellow poet Nicias also suggests that two poets are discussing poetry in these two poems. That this metapoetical similarity between these poems has escaped the attention of scholars, is probably due to the different narratological situations of the poems, and the different effects these create.\textsuperscript{338} Because Polyphemus’ song, the main part of \textit{Idyll} 11, is presented in direct speech, the effect that the poem creates is dramatic irony. The mythological narrative of Heracles and Hylas, however, is told entirely by Theocritus’ poetical persona. Although Heracles is also made ridiculous in this poem because of his unfamiliarity with love, the humour has a different, less prominent, but more mordent in tone.

3.6. Hylas, Polyphemus and Theocritus

Through the direct speech in \textit{Idyll} 11, the personae of the bucolic poets Theocritus and Polyphemus merge; Polyphemus’ song, with its ironical allusions to the \textit{Odyssey}, is also Theocritus’ song, and this identification can also be read metapoetically:

(...) [T]he Cyclops is trapped in the language, not just of Homer, but of Odysseus. T.’s creation is forced to express himself with words and phrases which prove already loaded against him, even where they do not refer specifically to \textit{Odyssey} 9 (...). He is a pathetic victim of poetic tradition, who functions as a (comic) paradigm for the position of the dactylic poet in a post-Homeric world; T. too is ‘trapped’ by the weight of tradition which accompanies his verse, and he too is bound to ‘lose’ to Homer, as Polyphemus does to Odysseus.\textsuperscript{339}

\textsuperscript{338} See Payne 2007, 82-91 for an analysis of the different narratological strategies in these poems.

\textsuperscript{339} Hunter 1999, 219.
Although the metapoetical messages of *Idylls* 11 and 13 are similar in many respects, the different narratological situation of the Hylas poem creates a different identification of poet and character. Through the allusions to the *Iliad*, Heracles is associated with Homer, or rather his heroic-epic poetry, and the unfamiliar, bucolic situation in which the hero ends up symbolizes the distance between Theocritus’ bucolic poetry and Homer’s heroic epic. But whereas *Idyll* 11 suggests a comical identification between Theocritus and the Cyclops, Theocritus associates himself with the Callimachean, bucolic παῖς Hylas in *Idyll* 13. As in *Idyll* 11, however, the contrast set up between Homer and Theocritus does not imply opposition. Theocritus’ bucolic poetry has its origin in Homer, which seems to be acknowledged early in the poem:

καί νιν πάντ’ ἐδιδασκε, πατὴρ ὡσει φίλον υίόν,
όσα μαθὼν ἀγαθός καὶ ἄοιδιμος αὐτὸς ἔγεντο
χωρὶς δ’ οὐδέποκ’ ἦς, οὔτ’ εἰ μέσον ἄμαρ ὄροιτο,
οὐθ’ ὀπόχ’ ἁ λεύκιπποι ἀνατρέχοι ἐς Διὸς Αώς,
οὔθ’ ὁπόκ’ ὁρτάλιχοι μινυροὶ ποτὶ κοῖτον ὁρῷεν,
σεισαμένας πτερὰ ματρὸς ἐπ’ αἰθαλόεντι πετεύρῳ,
ὡς αὐτῷ κατὰ θυμὸν ὁ παῖς πεποναμένος εἴη,
αὐτῷ δ’ εὖ ἕλκων ἐς ἀλαθινὸν ἄνδρ’ ἀποβαίη.

*Id.* 13.8-15

Just as father to son, Heracles taught him the lessons which had brought him nobility and renown in song. They were never apart, neither at noonday nor when Dawn’s white horses flew up into the sky, or when clucking chickens looked to their rest while their mother shook her wings on her soot-black perch. Thus he hoped they boy would be trained after his own mind, and by his efforts reach the state of true manhood. (tr. Verity)

The relationship between Heracles and Hylas is like that between a father and a son, a teacher and a pupil. A metapoetical reading of these lines is not just made possible after a complete reading of the poem, for, as we have seen, the preceding lines 5-7 (quoted in Section 1) already set up a contrast between Heracles and Hylas, which opens the meta-bucolic dimension of the poem. But the passage itself also suggests a
metaliterary interpretation of the relationship. As Hunter comments, ἀοίδιμος (9) “suggests that Herakles’ intention was to make Hylas the ‘subject of song’, as he himself was; (...) T. showed that, in this at least, Herakles was successful, though not in the way he planned”. Heracles wants Hylas to become an epic hero, like himself, but in fact, by virtue of being deified, he will become an at least not inferior, bucolic hero.

The possibility of reading these lines in terms of the relationship between Theocritus and Homer is strengthened by an allusion to Iliad 6.358, the only occurrence of ἀοίδιμος in Homer, where Helen speaks of Paris and herself as ἀοίδιμοι, “subjects of song”. As the scholia note, Homer here “subtly glorifies his poem”. Theocritus aptly uses the same word (Id. 13.9) to express the wish of Heracles (≈ Homer) for Hylas (≈ Theocritus), but although heavily influenced by the great epic poet, the bucolic poet will in fact go his own way.

3.7. From heroic to bucolic: the separation of Heracles and Hylas

Theocritus’ statement that Heracles and Hylas were never apart (Id. 13.10), is elaborated in a tricolon that, from a metapoetical point of view, undercuts the statement itself. Whereas the lengthy division of the day into three parts, as well as the wording of the first two parts, sounds very epic, and Homeric in particular, the un-Homeric longest third part, describing a rustic scene with the hen and her chickens, comes as a surprise and constitutes a separation from Homer’s heroic

---

340 Cf. Ch. 4, Sections 6 and 7, where I argue that Valerius Flaccus and Statius also use the relationship of Hylas and Hercules metapoetically to describe their own poetry in relation to a great epic predecessor, in this case the Roman Homer: Virgil.
341 Hunter 1999, 269 (on Id. 13.9).
342 Ibidem.
343 This interpretation is strengthened by the pervasive importance of the theme of “poetic succession” in Theocritus’ bucolic poetry, on which see Hubbard 1998, 19-44 (Ch. 1: “Poetic succession and the genesis of Alexandrian bucolic”).
344 Cf. e.g. ll. 21.111f.: ἔσσεται ἢ ἦς ἢ δείλη ἢ μέσον ἢμαρ, 1 ὁππότε … (“There shall come a dawn or eve or midday, when…”). See also Hunter 1999, 269-70 (on Id. 13.10b-13).
world.\textsuperscript{345}Ironically, the words χωρὶς δ’ οὐδὲποκ’ ἦς (“and he was never separated from him”, 10) thus already suggest that Heracles and Hylas will not be together much longer.

Hylas/Theocritus’ separation from the heroic world continues in the rest of the poem. After describing half of Apollonius’ Argonautica in lines 16-24, Theocritus continues to write his own Callimachean, bucolic “epic” in what follows; it culminates in Hylas’ abduction by the nymphs, which ends his relationship with Heracles. Although this relationship is described as one between father and son, and teacher and pupil, the poem also clearly suggests that Heracles loves Hylas as an erastes, which, of course, also includes the roles of parent and teacher. This love can also be interpreted metapoetically. In his meta-bucolic Idylls 1 and 7, Theocritus, following Callimachus, states that he wants to write un-heroic poetry that distances itself from Homer, but is nevertheless sanctioned by the poet (see Sections 2.2 and 2.3 above). Homer can thus be said to love his poetic “offspring”. But the difference between the two kinds of poetry is great. It would only become greater as it developed, and there comes a moment when a pederastic relationship has to end. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Apollonius associated the pederastic relationship between Heracles and Hylas with Achilles and Patroclus, and thus with the Homeric world, which he regarded as outdated. Theocritus seems to take over this idea from his Callimachean colleague. When Hylas is metamorphosed into an echo, is deified and has left his heroic erastes Heracles behind for good in exchange for bucolic nymphs, and when the heroic Heracles is mocked as a “ship deserter”,\textsuperscript{346} the separation between Heracles and Hylas is complete. So the poem, which can be

\textsuperscript{345} Cf. Gow 1950, II, 234 (on \textit{Id}. 13.13): “The homely picture of the hen settling for the night and the chickens about to follow her to roost has charm, but is consorts somewhat oddly both with its heroic setting and with the chariot of Dawn in the preceding line.”

\textsuperscript{346} Cf. Hunter 1999, 288 (on \textit{Id}.13.74): “The word-play Ἡρακλέην ... ἡρωες ... ἠρώησε seems to ‘mock’ Herakles, just as the Argonauts did”. According to my interpretation, this play would also mock the incongruity of the heroic poetry that Heracles stands for within Theocritus’ Callimachean bucolic world.
read as Hylas’ initiation into manhood,\textsuperscript{347} can also be seen as an allegory of Theocritus’ origin and development as a bucolic poet, finding his own poetic, Callimachean niche in relation to Homer’s heroic-epic poetry.

\textsuperscript{347} See Introduction, 2, with n. 5.