

Pnyx: Journal of Classical Studies

Vol 2, No 1 (2023)

Pnyx: Journal of Classical Studies





PNYX

2 Volume 2 1 | 2023

Issue 1



 **ISEGORIA**
Making it Fair for Scholars Everywhere

www.isegoriapublishing.co.uk

2023



PNYX: Journal of Classical Studies

Volume 2 1 | 2023

eISSN: 2754-5725

<https://pnyx.co.uk>

PNYX is a double-blind peer-reviewed journal for Classical Studies (broadly defined). It publishes research papers and reviews of books on any topic relating to the ancient Mediterranean world and its periphery, from the 8th century BCE to the 7th century CE.

Copyright © Isegoria Publishing C.I.C | 2023

Layout: DM Design | Myrto David & ePage Imaging Services | Viswanath Prasanna

Typesetting: ePage Imaging Services | Viswanath Prasanna

Proofreading: Maria Lymperopoulou & Bhavani Gurumurthy



ISEGORIA

Making it Fair for Scholars Everywhere

16 Commerce Square, Lace Market, Nottingham,

NG1 1HS, Nottinghamshire, United Kingdom

Registered in England No. 13517102

Registered Office: 22 Wollaton Vale, Wollaton, Nottingham, NG8 2NR, England

<https://isegoriapublishing.co.uk/>



Articles copyright held by the author(s) and made available under the

Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The current issue is funded by the Diamond Open Access Fund of the University of Groningen, while the journal is hosted under the ePublishing Services of the National Documentation Centre of Greece (www.ekt.gr).



university of
 groningen



NATIONAL DOCUMENTATION CENTRE

Cover image: Adapted version by M. David; Statue of Demosthenes, Vatican Museum. Photograph by Robert Macpherson (1811–1872). Digital image courtesy of Getty's Open Content Program.

Editors-in-Chief

Stefanos Apostolou (University of Nottingham)

Manolis Pagkalos (University of Groningen | Research Centre for the Humanities, Athens)

Advisory Board

Erica Angliker (Institute of Classical Studies, University of London)

Bartosz Awianowicz (Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń)

Sandra Boehringer (University of Strasbourg)

Michel Briand (University of Poitiers)

Camila Condilo (University of Brasília)

Christy Constantakopoulou (National Hellenic Research Foundation, Athens)

Madalina-Claudia Dana (Université Jean Moulin Lyon 3)

Stefania De Vido (Ca' Foscari University, Venice)

Julián Gallego (University of Buenos Aires)

Sven Günther (Institute for the History of Ancient Civilizations, Northeast Normal University, Changchun)

Matthias Haake (Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms University of Bonn)

Etienne Helmer (University of Puerto Rico, San Juan)

Panagiotis Iossif (Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands | Museum of Cycladic Art, Athens)

Yukiko Kawamoto (Nagoya University)

Lynn Kozak (McGill University, Montreal)

Jack Lennon (University of Leicester)

David Lewis (University of Edinburgh)

Jinyu Liu (DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana)

Florian Matei-Popescu (Romanian Academy, Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology, Bucharest)

Jeffrey Murray (University of Cape Town)

Egidia Occhipinti (University of Palermo)

Katarina Petrovićová (Masaryk University, Brno)

Selene Psoma (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens)

Milena Raycheva (National Institute of Archaeology and Museum – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia)

Giacomo Savani (University of St Andrews)

Francesca Spatafore (Museo Regionale A. Salinas, Palermo)

Yannis Stoyas (KIKPE Social and Cultural Affairs Welfare Foundation, Athens)

Ivo Topalilov (Institute of Balkan Studies – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia)

Miriam Valdes Guía (Complutense University of Madrid)

Christina Williamson (University of Groningen)

External Reviewers (Current Issue)

Isaías Arrayás Morales (Autonomous University of Barcelona)

Jan Willem Drijvers (University of Groningen)

Dirk Uwe Hansen (University of Greifswald, Greifswald)

Table of Contents

Manolis E. Pagkalos

Editorialvii

Articles

Giorgos Mitropoulos

Krinagoras and Imperial Glory: An Interplay Between Irony, Mockery, and Flattery 1

Reviews & Author Profiles

Christian Ammitzbøll Thomsen

A Review of: Mauro, Chiara Maria, Chapinal-Heras, Diego, and Valdés Guía,

Miriam (eds.) 2022. *People on the Move Across the Greek World*. Sevilla: Editorial

Universidad de Sevilla 23

Stefanos Apostolou, Manolis E. Pagkalos, Amanda Marley, Chiara Maria Mauro,

Diego Chapinal-Heras, and Miriam Valdés Guía

An Interview with Chiara Maria Mauro, Diego Chapinal-Heras, and Miriam Valdés Guía

on the Occasion of the Edited Volume, *People on the Move across the Greek World* (Sevilla:

Editorial Universidad de Sevilla, 2022)..... 29

Editorial

The current issue denotes the second year of *PNYX: Journal of Classical Studies*, the digital-only, double-blind, peer-reviewed, Open Access journal of *Isegoria Publishing C.I.C.* As such, we think this is a proper time to reflect on the previous year and discuss new beginnings.

In Retrospect

In our inaugural issue, we discussed why, in our view, the discipline needs another journal. We argued that we operate an ‘innovative model, a service provided by scholars to scholars’ to address critical areas of academic research dissemination: fairness and inclusivity while working collaboratively with our authors and reviewers, both internal and external. We believe we have stayed true to this, and we hope that we already made a small mark in Open Access publishing in Classical Studies, at the very least for our authors and (some of our) audience.

Since our inaugural issue and the call for contributions, we have proclaimed that we welcome contributions from members or groups currently under-represented in Classical Studies (widely defined). In the first two issues, seven articles were published with authors originating from six countries, namely (in order of appearance): Greece, Colombia, Spain, the United Kingdom, Croatia, and Mexico. Three of these articles are authored by female colleagues working outside of anglophone academia. All papers are published in English but offer an extended abstract (or a short overview) in the author’s language of choice, delivering a message to international and national audiences. The network of collaborators for the academic review of the papers is further expanded with the external reviewers, who are acknowledged for their service in the respective issue. Our dual-stage, blind peer review approach, an internal (editors and Advisory Board Members) and an external (topic specialists), has benefited the works under publication and has been well-received by all parties – authors, editors, internal and external reviewers alike. The articles are published under a Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0, with authors retaining full copyright and being able to share their work freely on all institutional, professional, social, and private platforms. Finally, metrics from our platforms indicate a stable number of visitors and downloads of the papers, with a clear preference for the PDF format and healthy numbers for the HTML/XML and EPUB files, demonstrating that offering those options was a great decision from the outset.

Overall, when we look back at the first year of the life of *PNYX*, we are grateful for the support received by colleagues for our decisions and approach. Along with our (free) language editing, we have created a simple workflow that benefits the outcome while keeping the author at the very core of the procedure. Whereas this is a welcome reflection, we are constantly moving forward, planning the next moves while not being afraid to take risks. We rely on our community for feedback and support; thus, we look forward to your communication and comments.

New Beginnings

To further the aims of *PNYX* to provide a service to the community beyond costs and style, we transformed its parent publisher, *Isegoria Publishing*, into a not-for-profit organisation, a Community Interest Company, under British Law. We proceeded to do so because we understand that as a guarantee for our audience, readers, and (potential) authors. We define our Community as scholars and students of the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Classical Studies (broadly defined), members of the public with similar interests, and any institution, organisation, and company aligned to similar aims.

To further solidify our academic quality and cover sub-fields of Classical Studies, we expanded our Advisory Board, which comprises 30 members from 18 countries worldwide. These numbers (and countries) grow even more if we consider the number of our reviewers. More so, aligning with our objectives, as discussed above, we have been expanding our connections and collaborations. We are formally Part Ancient Partners of the Saving the Ancient Studies Alliance (SASA), and we are moving forward to several projects, from outreach and discussions on the ways forward for the Humanities (on the upcoming SASA Annual Conference 2023, for example) to further supporting the dissemination of scholarly work by publishing papers and special volumes.

The second year also marks the move to the National Documentation Center of Greece (EKT),¹ which welcomed our international initiative and currently hosts our journal's site, utilising the Open Journal System developed by the Public Knowledge Project (PKP). While this meant a slow and tedious move from our previous host (PKP) to the new one, which impacted the number of published papers on this issue, it offered *PNYX* the opportunity to demonstrate its collaborative nature. As a parent publisher, *Isegoria*, a British Publisher, is documented by the EKT, a national, public, Greek infrastructure that has supported 'Access to Knowledge' since 1980. This move also synergises well with our two forthcoming volumes by *Isegoria*, to appear in *Isegoria's* Open Monograph Press, hosted by EKT, too. Things have now settled, and we expect to return to producing academic papers and a series of targeted publications currently under work.

Despite the limited publication of articles in this issue of *PNYX*, it introduces a key section that we will be populating looking forward: a (academic) 'Reviews' section with a twist. The Reviews section is what is often found in academic journals; it provides a (peer-reviewed) evaluation of scholarly production in terms of monographs, edited volumes, conference proceedings, etc., to alert the audience to new publications, but also to provide a critical overview and a discussion of the main strengths and weaknesses of the academic work under review. We wish to move a step forward by giving a voice to the author(s) or editor(s) of books under review to discuss the journey towards the book's creation. Thus, we introduce an Interview (i.e., for *PNYX*, this is the 'Reviews & Authors Profile' section) element to the book reviews to provide a humane, sometimes out of the specifically 'academic' perspective, profile of our colleagues. We intend to shed some light on the other side of the coin: if the book review focuses on the academic impact of the work, then the Authors' Profile offers a glimpse at the people behind it. This is a short space to discuss the joys and pitfalls of working towards such a milestone (for academic production, professional development, or personal achievement – most often altogether). Along with the voice of the authors or editors discussing their journey towards the publication of the(ir) work, we offer their short biographies and profile pictures so that the

¹ <https://www.ekt.gr/>.

audience who may read the book manages to connect the authoritative voice with an actual person, not just a name among others in the scholarly stage. We find this even more important for early career researchers and non-anglophone colleagues, both of whom we wish to support in their academic journey. In our minds, the two sections work *in tandem* to promote the work of the community we serve and support.

Our call remains open: we look for like-minded colleagues, within or outside strict academic structures, who work on any aspects of the Classical World and its Reception. Our Advisory Board members and editors offer a collaborative environment that aims to make the authoring process enjoyable while working towards improving arguments and research. We also look forward to the community's feedback – your views and suggestions shape our initiatives; this is how we develop and transform. Thus, we invite you to visit our websites,² contact us or our team members, or submit your manuscripts; we look forward to working with you.

With collegial regards and wishes to enjoy reading this issue,

Manolis E. Pagkalos

Nottingham,

June 2023

² PNYX: *Journal of Classical Studies*: www.pnyx.co.uk; Isegoria Publishing: www.isegoriapublishing.co.uk.

Articles

Krinagoras and Imperial Glory: An Interplay Between Irony, Mockery, and Flattery

Giorgos Mitropoulos

Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation | National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

gmitro@eie.gr

Submitted	03/09/2022
Accepted (Internal Review)	07/11/2022
Revised (External Review)	28/12/2022
Published	30/06/2023

Abstract

This paper examines two epigrams of the Mytilenean poet Krinagoras (AP 9.562 and 9.224), traditionally interpreted as court flattery examples. Krinagoras was a poet close to the Augustan court, and many of his epigrams praised members of the imperial house. However, a closer examination of these epigrams reveals a discreet dose of irony towards the glory of Augustus, a seemingly strange choice on the part of a court poet of the Augustan circle. It seems that Krinagoras, who travelled from his native island Mytilene to the westernmost part of the Roman Empire in Tarragona as a member of the embassy to meet Augustus, used irony as a stylistic instrument to insinuate his discontent for the hardships he had suffered. The paper contributes to a growing literature that examines the ways literary works functioned as instruments of flattering the ruler but also concealed resentment or mockery, even against the Roman emperor. Krinagoras' irony is merely one instance among many where subtle mockery and satire of the imperial family were exercised in the early Augustan period.

Keywords

Krinagoras; Augustus; imperial court; court poets; Greek epigrams; irony, flattery; mockery; imperial ideology

Acknowledgements

This paper expands on a reflection expressed by Kostas Buraselis during one of his always thought-provoking lectures at the University of Athens. I want to express my sincere gratitude to him, as well as to Stefanos Apostolou and Manolis Pagkalos for their precious remarks and assistance.

Introduction

Krinagoras, son of Kallippos, was born in Mytilene around 70 BCE to a family of high social rank, as his participation in embassies sent to Julius Caesar and Augustus indicates (see below). He was next in a line of Mytilenaeen elite members and writers associated with Roman power. Before him, Theophanes was an *amicus* of Pompey, and Potamon was an ambassador to Caesar and Octavian and also wrote encomia for Brutus and Octavian.¹ In his lifetime, Krinagoras became one of the poets supported by the *domus Augusta*. His works (he is attributed with the authorship of 51 epigrams in total) span a rich thematic range of themes well-represented in the Hellenistic epigrammatic tradition, including sepulchral (ἐπιτύμβια), erotic (ἐρωτικά), dedicatory (ἀναθηματικά), and epideictic (ἐπιδεικτικά) epigrams.² However, the most characteristic feature of the poetry of Krinagoras is his inspiration from personal experiences and observation as material for his epigrams.³

After his last embassy to Augustus in 26–25 BCE (see below), Krinagoras resided for many years in Rome. Though details of his residence are lacking, it can be presumed from many references in his epigrams that he was connected with the highest social circles in Rome and enjoyed the support of the Augustan family. Indeed, the poet praised and bestowed fame in his epigrams to Augustus and members of the imperial family, such as the future emperor Tiberius, Marcellus, Germanicus, and Antonia the Younger.⁴ Many of his poems celebrate fortunate events in the *domus Augusta*, such as the first shave of Marcellus and the forthcoming birth of a child by Antonia,⁵ while others glorify military victories, like those of Tiberius in Germany and Armenia.⁶ Epigram AP 9.224, which is discussed below, reveals Krinagoras' knowledge of Augustus' private habits when he travelled, while in AP 9.239 the poet offers an intellectual gift to Antonia. Some of these poems were probably written during his residence in Rome and offer insight into his experience of contemporary events during his stay. More specifically, these epigrams reveal his direct knowledge of events associated with the imperial family and his close contacts with many members of the

¹ For Potamon as an ambassador to Caesar, together with Krinagoras in 48 BCE and 46–45 BCE (see below on Krinagoras' embassies): *RDGE*, n. 26, ll. a, 3–5 and b, ll. 13, 16, respectively. To Octavian, together with Krinagoras in 26–25 BCE: *IG XII*, 2, 44, cf. the discussion in Arrayás Morales, 2010: 144–148. *Encomia: FGH II*. B. 147. On the figure of Potamon, see Parker, 1991; Thériault, 2011.

² These categories were already established by Meleager, although more existed; Argentieri, 2007: 153; discussion in Ypsilanti, 2018: 3–6. Cogitore (2010: 257) adds a category she styles as 'imperial epigrams' ('épigrammes impériales') and estimates that around 40 epigrams of this kind exist in the 'Garland'.

³ On an introduction to Krinagoras' life, works and style, Ypsilanti, 2018: 1–14, cf. Cichorius, 1888: 47–61; Bowersock, 1965: 36–37; Labarre, 1996: 99. On the poets' inspiration from personal experiences, Bowersock, 1964: 255; 1965: 36–37; Ypsilanti, 2018: 13.

⁴ *AP* 61 (Tiberius), *AP* 6.161 (Marcellus), 9.283 (Germanicus), 9.239 (Antonia).

⁵ *AP* 6.161 and 6.244 respectively. According to Cogitore (2010: 255, 266–268) such epigrams demonstrate Krinagoras' closeness to certain members of the Julio-Claudian family and single him out from the other court poets by his proximity to the imperial court. The praise of rulers was rooted firmly in the Hellenistic tradition of kings' flattery by court poets, and especially the Alexandrian one, where poets like Kallimachos flattered the Ptolemies with their works, e.g., the famous *Lock of Berenike* and the *Deification of Arsinoe* (Clayman, 2014 on Berenike; Carney, 2013 on Arsinoe, both with detailed discussions of the poems). For an examination of Krinagoras' poetry against the backdrop of flattery to Hellenistic rulers by writers, but in new imperial contexts, Buraselis, 2020: 4–6. On the influence of Kallimachos' *Hecale* in Krinagoras' poem addressed to Marcellus (*AP* 9.545), Bowie, 2008: 231; Höschele, 2019: 479–482.

⁶ *AP* 61, cf. Bowie, 2008: 232.

Augustan house and Augustus himself. Therefore, some researchers have reasonably concluded that Krinagoras was a *cliens* of the imperial court.⁷

Krinagoras' case can be compared to other Greek writers who stayed in Rome close to the Augustan house and other powerful Romans of the time. Presumably, he became acquainted with some of them, for example Parthenios of Nicaea, a freedman of Cinna who was also active in Rome during that time and wrote an elegy entitled *Κριναγόρας* (Krinagoras). As one of the most famous members of a large circle of Greek writers and poets who lived in Rome and enjoyed the benefits coming from a court that appreciated highly the various fruits of the rich Greek literary and epigrammatic tradition, Krinagoras influenced in various ways the poets Antipatros, Philip (the anthologist of the 'Garland'), the later Leonidas of Alexandria, even the Latin epigrammatist Martial.⁸

However, in epigrams AP 9.562 and 9.224, Krinagoras seems to have employed a curiously ironical tone to negotiate Augustan glory. This paper examines these two epigrams and investigates the reasons behind this seemingly strange choice on the part of a 'court poet' of the Augustan circle and interprets Krinagoras as a talented poet who employed both irony and flattery when addressing imperial glory.⁹ The sense of irony in these two epigrams has been noticed but not studied by other researchers,¹⁰ but, most importantly, the interpretation of these epigrams as extremes of flattery remains prevalent.¹¹ Therefore, a thorough analysis of these poems is necessary to challenge this view.

My elaboration on the skillful deployment of those two instruments, that is, irony and flattery, supplements earlier and recent analytical works of others and aims at exploring the reasons behind this stylistic choice by Krinagoras.¹² The present paper discusses some aspects of Krinagoras' life and works going beyond his interpretation as merely an Augustan court poet or flatterer. The aim is to contribute to a growing literature that examines the ways literary works function as instruments of flattering the ruler that also concealed resentment or mockery, even against Augustus himself.¹³ Indeed, scholars now acknowledge the complexity in the interpretation of Augustan poets that was previously lost

⁷ Dimopoulou-Pelioune, 2015: 519; Ypsilanti, 2018: 8–9. Bowersock (1965: 36) thinks that he took residence in Rome immediately after his journey to Tarragona. Bowie (2008: 232) remarks that Krinagoras' stay in Rome perhaps was not uninterrupted. On the relationship between epigram and 'political power' in the ancient Greek and Roman world, see the assessment of Coleman, 2019.

⁸ On the numerous Greek poets and writers who were active in early imperial Rome, Syme, 1978: 107; Bowie, 2008; Cogitore, 2010; Ypsilanti, 2018: 6, 8–14 (with a discussion of similarities between the poetry of Krinagoras, Archias, and Philodemos, the acquaintance of Krinagoras with Parthenios and the influence of Krinagoras on other poets). Notably, among others, was Nicolaos of Damascus, who enjoyed the patronage of Augustus; Strabo, who was protected by Aelius Gallus; Dionysios of Halicarnassos, favoured by Q. Tubero; Antipatros of Thessalonica, who was under the protection of L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi. According to Gow and Page (1968: 210), the impact of Krinagoras' personality is marked more than that of any other epigrammatist since Kallimachos.

⁹ It seems that Krinagoras used poignant *double entendres* in his poems. For example, in an epigram dedicated to Marcellus (AP 6.161), the phrase *ἄνδρα λαβεῖν* [s.c. ἡ Ἰταλία] means that Italy will receive Marcellus as an adult, but may also signify that the *patria* will take him as husband in a symbolic union between Italy and the heir-apparent of Augustus; cf. Höschele, 2019: 476–477.

¹⁰ Ypsilanti, 2018: 10, 243; Buraselis, 2020: 5. Likewise, Bowie (2008: 234–235; 2011: 194–195) expressed doubts over the interpretation of these poems as solely products of flattery.

¹¹ E.g., Albiani, 2002: 943; see also Cogitore, 2010: 265, n. 43.

¹² The epigrams of Krinagoras have been analysed by Gow and Page, 1968: 210–260; Bowie, 2008: 230–235; 2011: 186–195; Ypsilanti, 2018.

¹³ Ahl, 1984; Pittore, 2004 (who discusses irony in the epigrams of the *Anthologia Palatina*, but not Krinagoras); Bertini Conidi, 2012 (on Juvenal's third Satire); Pandey, 2018. Case-studies of irony in Greek and Latin literature are collected in Reinhold, 2009; among them, Hamm (2009) discusses the use of irony by poets in the Ptolemaic court, such as Kallimachos. In contrast to Krinagoras, Ovid is often labelled as an anti-Augustan poet, mainly because of his exile at the orders of Augustus, but modern research has revealed the intricacies of his case, Philips, 1983; Pandey, 2018.

because of simplistic dichotomies and designations as pro- or anti-Augustan poets.¹⁴ In this way, new interpretations can be ventured beyond those focusing on mere flattery or opposition to the *princeps*.

In the next section, I discuss an important event in the life of Krinagoras, namely his embassy to Augustus in 26–25 BCE, in which he travelled from Mytilene to the other edge of the Mediterranean Sea, to the remote community of Tarragona in Spain. I argue that this mission was a significant event for Krinagoras because the reasons behind his stylistic choices in the two epigrams lie in the many hardships he had experienced. Finally, in the third section, I examine the two epigrams of Krinagoras together with AP 9.419, where irony and flattery of the Augustan glory intermingle and illustrate the intricate negotiation of imperial glory in the poems of Krinagoras, essentially an interplay between mockery, irony, and admiration.

Reaching for the Emperor across the Mediterranean Sea

In this section, emphasis will be placed on Krinagoras' journey to Augustus in Tarragona as a member of the Mytilenean embassy and the personal sufferings he endured on his long journey. I argue that the poet's experiences significantly influenced his conscious decision to employ irony in two epigrams that treated Augustan glory. In contrast, otherwise and elsewhere, he had nothing but praise for the emperor and his family. Indeed, the journey to Spain served as inspiration for Krinagoras to compose several other poems, such as AP 7.376 (the death of Seleukos), 9.516 (a practice of Ligurian bandits), and 9.419 (on the Baths of Augustus at the Pyrenees).¹⁵ Arguably, his journey across the Mediterranean Sea left him a lasting impression, which is worth analysing in depth here.

The connection of Krinagoras with Roman power began in the period of the first triumvirate when he was a member of the embassy sent by Mytilene to bestow honours upon Caesar after his victory at Pharsala (September 48 BCE).¹⁶ He also participated in a second embassy to Caesar, which succeeded in renewing *φιλία* and *συμμαχία* between Mytilene and Rome (between April 46 and January/February 45 BCE).¹⁷ However, as illustrated below, the most challenging embassy in terms of distance and hardships was undoubtedly the third one of 26–25 BCE, concerning the seal of the *foedus aequum* between Mytilene and Rome.¹⁸ Krinagoras and his last embassy travelled from the far eastern side of the Mediterranean Sea to the westernmost, to Tarragona—an undoubtedly long and harsh adventure.¹⁹ The ambassadors made their way there because Augustus was in Hispania at that time, personally commanding the Roman legions in the war against the Cantabri and the Astures (25 BCE); he had to withdraw to Tarragona to recuperate from a severe illness.²⁰

In AP 9.559, Krinagoras asks for the professional help of a renowned geographer to ensure safety for his trip to Italy. The epigram reveals parts of the itinerary of the third embassy: the ambassadors sailed through the Cyclades and Corcyra (“περίπλοον”, ὅς μ' ἐπὶ νήσους Κυκλάδας ἀρχαίην τ' ἄξει ἐπὶ

¹⁴ For example, Philips, 1983: 780–782; Griffin, 1984; and especially Miller (2009: 5): ‘In response to the language of Augustanism, poets of the stature of Horace and Ovid not only mirror or incorporate that language but also, if to varying degrees, contest it in their private visions of the world. [...] (Augustan) [p]oets both collaborate and resist’.

¹⁵ The first two poems will be commented in the present section, while the last one in the following one, cf. also Ypsilanti, 2018: 3 for the connection of these poems with the journey to Spain.

¹⁶ IG 12.2.35a.

¹⁷ IG 12.2.35b.

¹⁸ On this treaty, RDGE, n. 26; Labarre, 1996: n. 20D; Arrayás Morales, 2010: 138–140.

¹⁹ Cf. Gow and Page, 1968: 211–212; Labarre, 1996: 105; Cogitore, 2010: 255; Dimopoulou-Pelioune, 2015: 542; 2017: 407; Ypsilanti, 2018: 9.

²⁰ Suet. *Aug.* 26.3, 59, 81.1; Plin. *HN* 25.38, 29.5; Hor. *Carm.* 3.14; Flor. *Epit.* 2.33.51; Cassius Dio 53.25.5–7.

Σχερίην). He then must have landed at Brundisium and continued to Rome.²¹ The two *senatus consulta* connected with the treaty between Mytilene and Rome are dated between May and June 25 BCE,²² so we can assume that the Mytilenean ambassadors travelled to Rome in the late spring of 25 BCE. Then, they continued their journey to the remote Tarragona in Spain to reach the emperor, either because they decided to submit their request to Augustus himself before the decision of the Senate or to thank him for his approval.²³ According to calculations on ORBIS,²⁴ the journey from Mytilene to Rome via Corinth, Corcyra, and Brundisium in early spring could take about 20 days, and the second part of the embassy's itinerary, from Rome to Tarragona seven days (seaborne) or 25 days (on land and by horse). The entire journey, therefore, must have comprised a total of 27 to 45 days of travel time alone, excluding rest periods, dead times, and possibly a stay in Rome.

Around the same period, another embassy to Augustus in Tarragona left from Asia Minor led by a person named Chaeremon. Ambassadors from Tralleis reached the emperor to petition support in ameliorating the damages inflicted on the *polis* by an earthquake; the later historian Agathias stressed the difficulties of such a long journey. It is worth citing his testimony in full because it allows us a glimpse into the hardships Krinagoras may have faced on his trip to Tarragona:

² οὕτω δὲ τοῦ ἄστεος οἰκτρότατα κειμένου, ἄγροικόν τινά φασι τούτων δὴ τῶν γεηρόνων, Χαϊρήμονα τοῦνομα, σφόδρα τὴν ψυχὴν ἀλῶναι τῷ πάθει, καὶ οὖν οὐκ ἐνεγκόντα θαυμάσιόν τι ἠλίκον καὶ ἄπιστον ἔργον ἀνύσαι. ³ μήτε γὰρ τῆς ὁδοῦ τὸ μήκος ἢ τῆς πρεσβείας τὸ μέγεθος κατορρωδῆ σαντα μήτε ὅτι μεγίστοις, ὥσπερ εἰκός, ὀμιλήσειν ἡμελλε κινδύνοις, καὶ ταῦτα ἐπ' ἀδήλω τῇ τύχῃ, μήτε τῶν οἴκοι τὴν ἐρημίαν μήτε ἄλλο τι τῶν ὁπόσα διανοοῦμενοι ἄνθρωποι μεταμανθάνουσι τὰ δοκηθέντα, ἀφικέσθαι μὴ ὅτι ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἐς τῶν Κανταβαρηνῶν τὴν χώραν ἀμφ' αὐτὰς δὴ πού τὰς τοῦ Ἰωκεανοῦ ἡϊόνας (ἐτύγχανε γὰρ αὐτοῦ που ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐν τῷ τότε πρὸς τι τῶν ἐθνῶν διαμαχόμενος).

² The story goes that, when the city [sc. Tralleis] lay in a tragic heap of ruins, a certain rustic, a tiller of the soil by the name of Chaeremon was so deeply moved by the calamity that he could bear it no longer and so set out to accomplish an incredible and extraordinary feat (θαυμάσιόν τι ἠλίκον καὶ ἄπιστον ἔργον ἀνύσαι). ³ Deterred neither by the distance involved (τῆς ὁδοῦ τὸ μήκος), nor by the magnitude of his petition, nor by the dangers he was likely to face (ὅτι μεγίστοις, ὥσπερ εἰκός, ὀμιλήσειν ἡμελλε κινδύνοις), nor indeed by his doubtful chances of success, nor, for that matter, by the fact that he would be leaving his family to fend for themselves, nor by any of the other considerations that lead men to change their minds, he went not just to Rome but to the land of the Cantabri on the very shores of the Ocean. For Caesar was there at that time conducting a campaign against some of the local tribes.²⁵

Agath. *Hist.* 2.17.2-3 (Trans. by Frenndo, 1975: 50)

²¹ On the connection of this epigram with the third embassy, Gow and Page, 1968: 243; Ypsilanti, 2018: 328–329. Eilers (2009) collects essays that discuss aspects of embassies to the emperor and diplomacy in the Roman world. On the sea route from the Aegean Sea to Italy via Corinth, Steinhauer, 2009: 722–723; cf. Strab. 8.6.20 on the importance of Corinth for maritime trade and communications. Bowie (2008: 233–234; 2011: 190) thinks that Krinagoras took the route Corinth – Corcyra – Brundisium. The route Corinth – Buthrotum (opposite to Corcyra) – Brundisium is depicted in the Antonine and Bordeaux Itineraries, Cuntz, 1990.

²² *RDGE*, n. 26, p. 155.

²³ Dimopoulou-Pelioune, 2015: 542, cf. *RDGE*, n. 26, pp. 156–157; Arrayás Morales, 2010: 147–148.

²⁴ <https://orbis.stanford.edu/>

²⁵ My italics for emphasis. The testimony of Agathias is partly based on the 'traditional history' (*patria*) of the city, as Jones (2011: 109) argues.

Krinagoras himself described the difficulties and dangers he went through in his quest to find Augustus. During the journey from Italy to Spain (or vice versa), the embassy made its way through Liguria and over the Alps. In *AP* 9.516, Krinagoras reproaches a common practice of Ligurian bandits to evade watchdogs while stealing sheep. The poet likely learned of this practice on his way to meet Augustus in Tarragona, as Liguria lay on the main land route from Italy to Spain, or at least heard about it while travelling through the land.²⁶ Indeed, this trick of Ligurian bandits is otherwise unknown, so it can be presumed that knowledge of it was not diffused enough for Krinagoras to have known about it indirectly. By describing the ferocity of the Ligurians, whose territories he most likely traversed, the poet implicitly enhances the dangers of the trip.

Moreover, in the course of the long journey to meet the emperor, Krinagoras lost one comrade, Seleukos, to whom he dedicated a moving epigram, the first of the three I discuss in detail.²⁷

δείλαιοι, τί κεναῖσιν ἀλώμεθα θαρσῆσαντες
 ἐλπίσιν, ἀτηροῦ ληθόμενοι θανάτου;
 ἦν ὄδε καὶ μύθοισι καὶ ἤθεσι πάντα Σέλευκος
 ἄρτιος, ἀλλ' ἤβης βαιὸν ἐπαυρόμενος
 ὑστατίοις ἐν Ἰβηρσι, τόσον δίχα τηλόθι Λέσβου
 κεῖται ἀμετρήτων ξείνος ἐπ' αἰγιαλῶν

Poor fools, why do we wander thus heartened by empty
 hopes, forgetful of baneful death?
 Once there existed Seleukos, so perfect in speech and character,
 yet partaking in youth's prime for brief,
 among the outermost Iberians he lies, sundered so far from Lesbos,
 a stranger on uncharted shores

AP 7.376 (Trans. by Gow-Page, with emendations)²⁸

In the epigram, Seleukos, most likely one of the Mytilenean ambassadors to Tarragona,²⁹ is buried on a coast far away from Lesbos, to the 'outermost Iberians' in Spain and Krinagoras vividly expresses his sorrow and pain for losing one charismatic young compatriot in this remote place, far away from their πατρίς ('a stranger on untrodden shores'). The poem's emphasis lies precisely on the fact that the death

²⁶ Gow and Page, 1968: 211, 241; Ypsilanti, 2018: 307. Gow and Page (1968: 241) suggest that it was a result of personal observation, while Ypsilanti finds it more likely that Krinagoras heard about this practice while travelling through Liguria. The embassy probably travelled through Marseille, as discussed below. The Ligurians are otherwise mentioned in Roman contexts as opponents in Roman campaigns (e.g., Liv. 40.27.9–13).

²⁷ On the connection of the epigram with the third embassy, Gow and Page, 1968: 224; Labarre, 1996: 105; Dimopoulou, 2015: 542; 2017: 407. On the dangers of embassies on their way and back, Arrayás Morales, 2010: 147, n. 67. Pawlak (2020: 185) unnecessarily rejects the connection between the epigrams of Krinagoras that mention Iberia and this particular journey. It is much more likely that Seleukos passed away during this journey and not in an otherwise unknown trip to Spain.

²⁸ I chose Patton's translation over that of Gow and Page in two cases. 'Speech and character' in line 3 is closer to the original Greek (μύθοισι καὶ ἤθεσι) than Gow and Page's 'words and ways'. The same reasoning led to the selection of 'uncharted' (l. 6) over 'untrodden', as the adjective ἀμέτρητος means 'unmeasured' and 'uncharted' conveys this on geographical terms too, since Krinagoras had an interest in geography (cf. *AP* 9.559).

²⁹ Gow and Page (1968: 224) observe that the pairing of μύθοισι καὶ ἤθεσι (words and ways) in l. 3 implies the skills of Seleukos as a diplomat and likely a member of the embassy who died either on his way to meet Augustus in Tarragona or on the way back.

of the young diplomat occurred far from Lesbos.³⁰ In my view, the first two lines of the poem, and specifically the wanderers trusting in empty hopes, refer to the embassy itself, that long wander across the Mediterranean when the hope to gain benefits from the emperor led to simply ‘let aside’ the fact that death lies everywhere in such a perilous journey. Indeed, Krinagoras uses the first plural person, referring obviously to his companions in the embassy (ἀλώμεθα, θαρσήσαντες, ληθόμενοι). In fact, it may not have been the first time Krinagoras lost a travel companion during state service. Twenty years earlier, during the second embassy of Krinagoras to Caesar at Rome, a boy named Eros, probably the servant of a fellow ambassador, also passed away and was buried on an island east of Ithaca. The poet dedicated a moving epigram to his honour (AP 7.628). Therefore, Seleukos was at least the second casualty of a Mytilenaeon embassy in which Krinagoras participated, but the epigram dedicated to him has a much more personal and dramatic tone.

Krinagoras does not elaborate on the circumstances of Seleukos’ death. However, the phrase κείται ... ἐπ’ αἰγιαλῶν is attested in sepulchral epigrams after losses in shipwrecks.³¹ If a shipwreck did indeed occur and Krinagoras did not simply employ a common expression, then we must presume that the embassy travelled partly by sea from Rome to Tarragona.³²

The philosophical introduction in the first two lines is a common motif in funerary poems preserved in the *Anthologia Palatina*, and it has been interpreted as an expression of Krinagoras’ pessimistic approach to life.³³ However, it is clear that this one draws on his personal experiences. The wanderers’ futile trust in potentially empty imperial assurances, ‘forgetful of ruinous death’ is a lesson Krinagoras painfully experienced in this adventure. He employed a common *topos* to express his suffering, the death of Seleukos on the way to Tarragona. Indeed, the reference to personal experiences is a characteristic feature of the poetry of Krinagoras.³⁴ The poet gave prominence to subjects deriving from his everyday experiences and often coloured his poems with his sentiments, even at the expense of traditional *topoi* of the genre.³⁵ Therefore, Krinagoras effectively brings out the sadness of the death of a young Greek in a distant land that has only been introduced into Mytilenean horizons not simply by Roman conquest but by the search for the emperor himself.³⁶ All the hardships endured by the embassy and the death of Seleukos were unfortunate events on their way to the emperor. This is an important point to bear in mind for what follows.

³⁰ Krinagoras makes this clearer by calling Seleukos ξείνος, not the land which is more usual (κείται ἀμετρήτων ξείνος ἐπ’ αἰγιαλῶν). Death away from the fatherland is a common topic in sepulchral poems, as also seen in these of Krinagoras (AP 7.371, 7.628, 7.645).

³¹ E.g., Antipatros, AP 7.286 (l. 2), cf. Xenokritos, AP 7.291 (l. 6). On travel in the Roman period, Casson, 1974: 115–329, cf. the contributions in Niehoff, 2017 on travel in literary works of Roman-period writers.

³² According to Ypsilanti (2018: 187–188), ‘shores’ (ἐπ’ αἰγιαλῶν) stand here for ‘land’ generally, so it essentially means that Seleukos is lying in a foreign country. But this interpretation does not agree with the overall context of line 6 (ἀμετρήτων ... αἰγιαλῶν) that states clearly that Seleukos was buried ‘at the shores’, most likely on a shore of Tarragona, cf. rightly Dimopoulou-Pelioune, 2015: 542.

³³ Ypsilanti, 2018: 180–181. Similar introductions appear in AP 7.420 (Diotimos, in which the motif of ‘light hopes’ also appears), 7.519 (Kallimachos), 7.534 (Automedon). Krinagoras’ AP 9.516 also opens up with a *gnome*, presumably referring again to the events during the trip of the third embassy (Ypsilanti, 2018: 306). Δεῖλαιος and κενὴ ἔλπις are also attested in 9.234, l. 1, again in a personal context (Krinagoras addresses his heart). More examples in Ypsilanti, 2018: 182.

³⁴ Bowersock (1964: 255) notes that most of his poems are inspired from real-life events and refers to named or nameable personalities, e.g., AP 9.559 (preparations for Krinagoras’ trip to Italy), 9.560 (an earthquake stroked his new house), 6.161 (Marcellus), 9.283 (Germanicus), 9.239 (Antonia), 9.81 (the tyrant Nikias of Kos).

³⁵ Ypsilanti, 2018: 13.

³⁶ Here, I adapt Bowie, 2008: 234: ‘Krinagoras effectively brings out the sadness of the death of an ephebic Greek in a distant land that has only been brought into Greek horizons by Roman conquest’.

Eventually, the *foedus aequum* ('equal treaty') between Rome and Mytilene was agreed.³⁷ After the return of the embassy, a decree was issued, according to which divine honours were bestowed upon Augustus.³⁸ Copies of the decree were set up at the temple of Augustus in Pergamon, Actium (the site of the emperor's victory against Mark Antony and Kleopatra), but also in Brindisium, Marseille, and Tarragona (ll. 12–14). The only reason these copies were set up in Brindisium and Marseille could have been because the embassy travelled through these cities.³⁹ The great honours of Mytilene to the benevolent emperor were proclaimed at important stations along the route of the embassy and at its final destination.

There can be little doubt that Krinagoras participated in the shared joy for imperial favour and divine honours. Indeed, he resided afterwards in Rome, composed many epigrams in honour of numerous members of the imperial family, and became one of the most important Greek poets in the Augustan court. How is it then explained that a pair of his poems express irony against Augustus?

Mocking Flattery: The Parrot and the She-goat⁴⁰

After examining the difficulties Krinagoras experienced in his embassy to Augustus, we can proceed with the analysis of the irony and mockery against the imperial glory that manifest subtly in two Krinagorean poems, and the role the journey to Tarragona may have played in the poet's stylistic choices. These poems stand in contrast to another epigram of Krinagoras that celebrates the glory of Augustus, also dated after the journey and making reference to Spain. The analysis reveals the literary relationship of the Mytilenean poet with Augustan glory as a complex interplay between irony and flattery.

An elegant tone of satirical irony can be traced in the elegiac poem AP 9.562 that Ypsilanti dates after 25 BCE, during the residence of the poet in Rome (that is, after his embassy to Augustus in Tarragona), but attributes it to Philip, the anthologist of the 'Garland', *except* if humour was the purpose of the poem.⁴¹ As I argue below, humour and irony are traced in the epigram, and thus, the ascription to Krinagoras can be maintained:

Ύιττακὸς ὁ βροτόγηρυς ἀφείς λυγοτευχέα κύρτον
ἦλυθεν ἐς δρυμοὺς ἀνθοφνεῖ πτέρυγι,
αἰεὶ δ' ἐκμελετῶν ἀσπάσμασι Καίσαρα κλεινόν
οὐδ' ἄν' ὄρη λήθη ἤγαγεν οὐνόματος·
ἔδραμε δ' ὠκυδίδακτος ἅπας οἰωνός ἐρίζων 5
τίς φθῆναι δύναται δαίμονι 'χαῖρ'' ἐνέπειν.
Ὅρφευς θῆρας ἔπεισεν ἐν οὔρεσιν, ἐς σὲ δέ, Καῖσαρ,
νῦν ἀκέλευστος ἅπας ὄρνις ἀνακρέκεται.

A parrot, who speaks in human voice, left its wickerwork cage
and came to the forest with flower-like wings.

As he was always practising ways to embrace glorious Caesar,

³⁷ IG 12.2.35c.

³⁸ IG XII 2, 58, a.1 (ca. 25 BCE).

³⁹ Rightly, Dimopoulou-Pelioune, 2015: 543, n. 317.

⁴⁰ Texts and English translations of the poems in this section are derived from Ypsilanti, 2018, with emendations.

⁴¹ Ypsilanti, 2018: 3, 250, 254, If so, that 'would make it comparable to the epigram on the goat' (see immediately below on the latter), cf. Bowie, 2008: 235. The ascription to Krinagoras remains prevalent, cf. also Gow and Page, 1968: 232.

he did not forget them even while living in the mountains.
 And all birds, newcomers to this art, hurried to quarrel 5
 over who would be the first to say 'hail' to the god.
 Orpheus bid beasts obey him in the mountains; but to you, Caesar,
 now all birds, unbidden, squawk their addresses.

AP 9.562

Krinagoras narrates the adventures of a parrot with a human voice: having learnt to repeat the salutation *Ave Caesar* (χαῖρε Καῖσαρ), the bird escaped from its cage and taught the exact phrase to all the other birds who then repeated it enthusiastically. The parrot functions as an apostle of Augustan divinity to the natural world.⁴² The animal kingdom is a simile for humankind, further elevated because it participates in the glorification of Augustus.⁴³

Except for the apparent flattery and glorification of the emperor by Krinagoras, a hint of satirical irony traverses this epigram. Firstly, the parrot is described as a person who speaks in a human voice, has studied extensively and did not forget its learnings (βροτόγηρυς; αἰεὶ δ' ἐκμελετῶν; οὐδ' ἀν' λήθη ἤγαγεν οὐνόματος). It left its cage and escaped to the mountains but still pays allegiance to the emperor. It stands in a superior position to the rest of the birds but remains a servant. A paradoxical interplay is formed between lofty and base, human and animal, that imbues the poem with a dose of fascinating levity.⁴⁴ The parrot stands in the middle between the human and the animal world and between pomposity (e.g., ἀνθοφυεῖ πτέρυγι) and servility. Furthermore, the adjectives employed for the description of the use of the parrot and its cage are unique or rare (βροτόγηρυς, λυγοτευχής, ἀνθοφυής).⁴⁵ The use of flowery language for them emphasises the underlying satire. It should also be underlined that the talking parrot became a symbol of the flattering court poet in Latin literature, to describe those who merely recited whatever may benefit them.⁴⁶ Therefore, another irony of Krinagoras can perhaps be traced to poets of the imperial court, possibly even to himself.

Moreover, there is a clear antithesis between the parrot with the human voice (βροτόγηρυς) as described in the first line of the poem and the final en-masse cries of all birds (ἅπας ὄρνις ἀνακρέκεται) that supposedly repeated the salutation addressed to Augustus, that is, in imitation of the Roman people who performed the morning *salutatio* to the emperor.⁴⁷ Indeed, ἀνακρέκειν, a unicum and a compound of the verb κρέκω, is used to describe the sharp noise ('squawk').⁴⁸ That said, the word was intentionally coined to mock the rest of the birds that merely reproduced (ἀνα-κρέκειν) the initial salutation to the emperor taught to them by the parrot with the human voice. The use of this verb explicitly sets the rest of the birds in an inferior position to the parrot. Opposite the leading

⁴² Analysis in Buraselis, 2020: 4–5. This is the earliest example of what later became a *topos* in Latin literature, the theme of birds saluting the emperor. Cf. Whitmarsh, 2013: 152, n. 49 with examples.

⁴³ Ypsilanti, 2018: 253. Augustus is characterised as κλεινός ('glorious', l. 3) and in 9.419 as πωλυσεβαστος ('most eminent', l. 3; see below), a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον.

⁴⁴ Cf. the similar remarks in Newlands, 2005: 162 on the parrot in Statius, *Silvae* 2.4. Similar to Krinagoras, Statius has also been characterised as mere court flatterer, but the poem *Silvae* 2.4 in which a parrot features again reveals a more complex poetic personality, see Newlands, 2005.

⁴⁵ Βροτόγηρυς and λυγοτευχής do not appear elsewhere, while ἀνθοφυής once more in an inscription from Chalkis, *IG* 12, 9, 954 (l. 13). Ypsilanti, 2018: 252–253, also observes the infrequency of the adjectives.

⁴⁶ Dietrich, 2002: 105–108 (for the parrot in Statius' *Silvae* 2.4); Newlands, 2005: 162–165.

⁴⁷ Buraselis, 2020: 9, n. 12 (comment of Massimo Nafissi); Whitmarsh (2013: 152–153), who also spots irony in the poem and finds it 'a perfect embodiment of the conflicted approach to the poetic gift dramatised in the patronal poetry of the late Republic and early Empire', but he did not elaborate on the causes of this stylistic choice.

⁴⁸ *LSJ*, s.v. κρέκω, esp. AP 7.191: κίσσα κρέξασα (Archias); Aristoph. *Orn.* 772: βοῖον πτεροῖς κρέκοντες, cf. the verb κράζω.

parrot stands a multitude of birds of unspecified species competing with each other in repeating and crying their salutations to Augustus, a mocking simile of the imperial *clientes*.⁴⁹ Therefore, it seems that the poem is intended to satirise the flattery and flatterers of Augustus. The use of lofty language for the birds (ὠκυδίδακτος, ἀνακρέκεται) mocks those new students of high praise taught by a parrot. The poem was composed after the third embassy, in which Krinagoras travelled to Spain to reach the emperor. Arguably, Krinagoras employs irony as a stylistic instrument to insinuate his discontent with the hardships he suffered. The glory of Augustus stretched across the entire natural world, but imperial omnipresence had certain practical drawbacks, as Krinagoras had to chase Augustus to the westernmost part of the Roman Empire.

An underlying sense of irony can also be discerned in AP 9.224, a poem about the favourite she-goat of Augustus:

Αἶγά με τὴν εὐθῆλον, ὅσων ἐκένωσεν ἀμολγεὺς
 οὐθατα πασῶν πούλυγαλακτοτάτην,
 γευσάμενος μελιθεῖς ἐπεὶ τ' ἐφράσσατο πῖαρ
 Καῖσαρ, κὴν νηυσὶν σύμπλοον ἠγάγετο.
 "Ἢξω αὐτίκα που καὶ ἐς ἀστέρας· ᾧ γὰρ ἐπέσχον
 μαζὸν ἐμὸν, μείων οὐδ' ὄσον Αἰγιόχου. 5

Me, the goat with the heavy udders, of all whose breast
 the dairy-pail has drained, the richest in milk,
 Caesar, after tasting and praising my honey-sweet cream,
 took me on his ship as his shipmate.
 Soon I shall perhaps reach the stars; for he to whom I offered 5
 my breast is no lesser to the Aegis-bearer.

AP 9.224

The poem demonstrates that Krinagoras knew about the private habits of Augustus when travelling. The Mytilenean poet had personal knowledge that the emperor took his she-goat with him in his travels outside Rome, even onboard his vessel, always to enjoy her milk.⁵⁰ Hence, also considering that most of Krinagoras' poems derive from his personal experiences, it is very likely that the poet accompanied Augustus on this trip (see below for possible destinations).⁵¹

The emperor's affection for the animal is impressive, and Krinagoras has her claiming (in the first person) that she will become a constellation at the order of her divine companion.⁵² Perhaps the

⁴⁹ Whitmarsh (2013: 152–153) views AP 9.562 as an allegory of patronage. The *salutationes* by *clientes* became a target of mockery in Greek and Latin writers, as for example Plut. *Mor.* 814D, where it is stated that provincials who sought offices in Rome 'grew old haunting the doors of other men's houses' (οἱ πολλοὶ γηράσκουσι πρὸς ἀλλοτρίαις θύραις); cf. Saller, 1982: 129 for more passages. Other Latin authors sometimes described *clientes* as parasites, e.g., Juv. *Sat.* 1.139, 5.1–5; cf. Damon, 1995.

⁵⁰ Cf. Buraselis, 2020: 5. Bowie (2008: 235; 2011: 194) traces similarities with Kallimachos' *Lock of Berenike*, another famous case of court flattery, in which the lock of queen Berenike II was also catasterised and spoke in the first person (frag. 110), cf. Ypsilanti (2018: 242–243), who also takes note of the similarity. On Kallimachos' poem, Clayman, 2011; 2014: 97–104.

⁵¹ Bowersock (1965: 36 with n. 5) argues that Krinagoras wrote AP 9.224 and 9.419 (on the Baths of Augustus at the Pyrenees) when accompanying the emperor on his travels and Ypsilanti (2018: 9, 243) regards it highly probable for 9.224 too, accordingly; Buraselis, 2020: 5.

⁵² The she-goat compares her master with the Aegis-bearer, who is Zeus himself.

most striking element of the epigram is that the favourite animal of the *princeps* will follow him in his ascension to heaven; a telling example of court flattery and homage to the emperor's affection to the she-goat, which will provide him with milk even in the divine world.⁵³ However, a subtle irony is also detected in this animal *apotheosis*.⁵⁴ The image of a she-goat 'reaching for the stars' cannot but cause amusement to some readers of the poem, both ancient and modern. Irony towards divine honours for the emperor can be detected here, and this should not confuse modern researchers, as the criticism of ancient authors against ruler worship was an already established tradition since the Hellenistic age.⁵⁵ Moreover, even the later imperial-age writers and Roman emperors themselves satirised the imperial cult.⁵⁶ One recalls the famous satire *Apocolocyntosis* of Claudius, written by Seneca, or the famous last words of Vespasian in his dying bed: *Vae, puto deus fio*.⁵⁷

Moreover, as Ypsilanti justly remarks, the excessive boasting of the goat in different parts of the poem (e.g., 'I am the goat with the heavy udders, the richest in milk of all whose breast the dairy-pail has drained', ll. 1–2) 'slyly subverts the ostensible purpose of the epigram, that is court flattery'.⁵⁸ Indeed, the goat lays claims to a life parallel to that of Augustus in several ways: she will follow him to heaven; she is superior to any other (πασάων, l. 2) in terms of the richness of her milk, as Augustus excels everyone else in superiority; she is πούλυγαλακτοτάτην (l. 2), which is ironically close to Augustus πούλυσέβαστος in Krinagoras' AP 9.419 (l. 3);⁵⁹ she is a σύμπλοος (fellow shipmate) of Augustus, a term which implies equality with the emperor in an ironical tone.⁶⁰

Ypsilanti notes that both poems AP 9.224 and 9.562 involve an animal whose activities are suggestive of the divinity of the emperor.⁶¹ In my view, these affinities between the poems and the interpretation offered here for the causes of Krinagoras' irony are sufficient for the attribution of AP 9.562 to Krinagoras. This pair of epigrams constitutes an elegant embroidery of irony, mockery, and flattery, prompted by the sufferings of the poet on his long trip to Tarragona.

Unfortunately, the epigram of the she-goat cannot be dated with certainty, and the voyage of Augustus mentioned in this poem cannot be identified. However, suppose Krinagoras accompanied the emperor on this trip, as I argue. In that case, it must have occurred most probably after 25 BCE, when he resided in the imperial court in Rome. Indeed, earlier scholarship identified this journey with the emperor's visit to Greece and Asia Minor in 21–19 BCE. This would have been interesting, as Krinagoras would have returned to familiar places in this case. Krinagoras may have been reminiscent of his hardships during the long journey to Tarragona that claimed the life of a young comrade, Seleukos, while the emperor enjoyed all comforts in this voyage, including the milk of his favourite

⁵³ Likewise, the lock of Berenike ascended to heaven in Kallimachos' poem, as did the goat that fed Zeus, the lion of Nemea, and the golden ram that carried Phrixos and Helle, Ypsilanti, 2018: 242–243. The catheterisation of Augustus himself was described by the Augustan poets, Hor. *Od.* 1.2.45 (*serus in caelum redeas*), cf. Virg. *Georg.* 4.562 (*viamque adfectat Olympo*).

⁵⁴ Buraselis (2020: 5) characteristically ended his analysis on the poem with this remark: 'One is tempted to comment: an apotheosis of and on four legs.'

⁵⁵ E.g., Plut. *Mor.* 360D on the witty retort of king Antigonos Gonatas to claims of his divine nature from his courtier Hermodoros. Plutarch (*Alex.* 28) also records Lysippos' accusation against Apelles, because he painted Alexander the Great holding a thunderbolt, an attribute of Zeus. Alexander the Great was also said to have expressed irony and concerns over his own divinity on various occasions (Ath. 6.251C).

⁵⁶ Buraselis, 2020 on approaches to the imperial cult by Greek intellectuals.

⁵⁷ Suet. *Vesp.* 23.4.

⁵⁸ Ypsilanti, 2018: 243; cf. 245, 247.

⁵⁹ Cf. above, n. 43.

⁶⁰ 'Σύμπλοος' as 'fellow-voyager' in Hdt. 2.115, 3.41; Ephor. 27J, Plut. *Mor.* 2.148a.

⁶¹ Ypsilanti, 2018: 254, n. 6.

animal. The she-goat would have followed him in the stars after death, while the body of Seleukos was buried on a beach in a foreign place far away from his homeland (κείται ἀμετρήτων ξείνος ἐπ' αἰγιαλῶν).

It should be underlined here that the ironic tone in both poems is subtle and tactful. These epigrams served to flatter and praise the patron of Krinagoras, and the poet exalted the emperor's superiority and divinity in these literary works.⁶² Crucially, another poem (AP 9.419), also inspired by the journey of the third embassy (25 BCE) as the reference to the waters of the Pyrenees in Spain illustrates (Πυρήνης ὕδατα μαρτύρια), Krinagoras used nature again (the aforementioned waters) to praise Augustus.⁶³

Κῆν μυχὸν Ὀρκυναῖον ἢ ἐς πύματον Σολόεντα
 ἔλθη καὶ Λιβυκῶν κράσπεδον Ἑσπερίδων
 Καῖσαρ ὁ πολυσέβαστος, ἅμα κλέος εἶσιν ἐκείνω
 πάντη· Πυρήνης ὕδατα μαρτύρια.
 Οἷσι γὰρ οὐδὲ περίξ δρυτόμοι ἀπεφαιδρύναντο
 λουτρὰ καὶ ἠπείρων ἔσσειται ἀμφοτέρων. 5

Whether to the depths of Ercynaeen nooks or to the outermost Soloeis
 and the fringes of Libyan Hesperides should
 most august Caesar travel, glory follows him
 everywhere; the waters of Pyrene are my witness.
 These, wherein not even the native woodcutters ever bathed,
 will become baths of both continents. 5

AP 9.419

The poem conveys the remoteness of the places where Octavian travelled – and of which Krinagoras had personal knowledge – as among the places mentioned are the baths in the Pyrenean mountains, close to Tarragona where Augustus withdrew to be cured from his illness.⁶⁴ No sense of irony is detected in this testimony and praise of the long-reaching glory of Augustus. Krinagoras draws again on his experiences from his journey, but this time to glorify the emperor without any shade of irony. So, how should we interpret the discreet employment of irony and humourous skepticism in Krinagoras' poems AP 9.562 and AP 9.224 in relation to Augustan glory and divinity?

Krinagoras was a skilful master of the Greek language and knew well how to express complex notions elegantly. Accordingly, he employed his poetic talents to praise the imperial house, including Augustus, 'without becoming cheap in his praise'.⁶⁵ But at the same time, deeply embodied in the Greek cultural tradition, Krinagoras did not hesitate to compose poems expressing an almost anti-Roman spirit, melancholy, and nostalgic glory of Greek independence. In AP 9.284, Krinagoras expresses sorrow for the settlement of Italian *libertini* (παλίμπρητοι, 'slaves') in Corinth, the ancient city of the Bacchiadai. Elsewhere (AP 9.235, ll. 5–6), hope is expressed that the kingdom of Cleopatra

⁶² For example, the elegant ironic tone of this poem does not preclude another function as imperial praise; the *apotheosis* of the she-goat can also refer to Augustus' sign, *capricornus* (Αἰγόκερως) and Augustus is compared explicitly to Zeus in the last lines.

⁶³ AP 9.419, dated c. 25 BCE: Ypsilanti, 2018: 300, 303.

⁶⁴ Suetonius (*Aug.* 81.1) states that Augustus tried first hot and then cold baths, most likely those mentioned in the poem; cf. Cassius Dio (53.25.7) for Augustus' retirement in Tarragona due to an illness.

⁶⁵ Buraselis, 2020: 4.

will rise again through the adverb *πάλι* (again);⁶⁶ resentment against the Romans through the adjective *ὄθνεῖοι* (foreign) for them (AP 7.645, l. 5); and there is also the ironic tone in AP 9.224 and 9.562 analysed here. The poetic world of Krinagoras is decisively Greek, as his poems are full of references to the geography, myth, and history of Greece and his topics are derived mainly from the Greek cultural tradition, for example, the Eleusinian Mysteries (AP 11.42); the poems of Anakreon that Krinagoras offers as a gift to Antonia (AP 9.239); or Kallimachos' *Hecale* that he offers to Marcellus (AP 9.545).⁶⁷

However, in the two epigrams discussed here that subtly mock specifically the Augustan glory and divinity, except for whatever role the poet's 'patriotic' sentiments may have played (if any) and the wish to display an independent artistic spirit, the hardships Krinagoras personally suffered in the long and dangerous journey to Tarragona and the loss of a young countryman while wandering 'κεναῖσιν ἐλπίσιν' could also be an important factor for his choice to adopt this seemingly strange style. The influence of sufferings when travelling for long, from one side of the Mediterranean Sea to the other, and through unknown and perilous lands in search of the emperor should not be underestimated. A talented poet like Krinagoras, who largely anchored his writings on personal experience, would take advantage of topics, such as the praise of Augustan glory even in the animal world (AP 9.562) and the luxuries Augustus indulged during his travel – in which Krinagoras probably accompanied him (AP 9.224) –, to formulate a distinct, yet subtle ironic tone. Surely, then, it is not a coincidence that both epigrams seem to have been composed after the events of 25 BCE.

We must keep in mind that being a keen supporter of Augustus, as Krinagoras was, did not mean obsequious flattery (*adulatio*): praise does not necessarily imply servility, and irony does not equal opposition or to an 'anti-Augustan' stance.⁶⁸ The poet could praise the emperor, but he could also subtly, skilfully, and carefully insinuate irony for his glory; epigrams were useful for both purposes, especially scoptic epigrams.⁶⁹ Indirect irony and wordplay could express complaints and bitterness elegantly. Indeed, many passages of Latin poets, especially Ovid, on the Augustan monuments and symbols (such as the *sidus Iulium*, the Danaids of the portico on the Palatine Hill, and the triumph) are ambiguous and often on the knife's edge between flattery and criticism (including irony as a technique of criticism). In this eloquent way, the poets elicited sympathy from like-minded readers while avoiding retaliations from the imperial house.⁷⁰ Moreover, Augustan court poets encouraged their readers to apply critical thinking to symbols linked to Augustus to allow some discussion and reflection on aspects that the fear of retaliation, or excessive respect for Augustan authority, might otherwise exclude.⁷¹ For example, the paradox, which we have already pinpointed in Krinagoras' epigrams (the talking parrot or the she-goat ascending to the heavens), was consciously used by poets

⁶⁶ AP 9.235, ll. 5–6: Ἐκ πατέρων εἴη παισὶν πάλι τοῖσιν ἀνάκτων | ἔμπεδον ἠπειροῖς σκῆπτρον ἐπ' ἀμφοτέραις (trans. Let the children of kings hold from their fathers a strong rule over both lands again).

⁶⁷ For the Greek poetic world of Krinagoras, Bowie, 2011.

⁶⁸ Clearly, flattery served to the glorification of Augustus and his achievements, as is the case, more straightforwardly, with Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*, excerpts of which were even inscribed on marble. However, open *adulatio* was viewed negatively by contemporaries (Griffin, 1984: 205–213). Ahl (1984: 187–208) discusses figured speech as a way to safely and effectively express veiled criticism of tyrants in terms that rely on reader conclusions, e.g., through double-edged discourse (cf. Pandey, 2018: 28 with a collection of ancient sources). Ahl discusses figured speech in Roman poetry and oratory, although with a different focus (mainly Quintilian against the 'tyrant' Domitian). In his opinion, figured speech is an intermediate stage between direct criticism and flattery. There were surely many more intermediate stages, such as the elegant combination of irony and flattery in these epigrams of Krinagoras.

⁶⁹ Coleman, 2019: 65–69.

⁷⁰ Pandey, 2018: 27–29. Pandey supports that Ovid encouraged his audience to read his texts and search for veiled meanings that criticized Augustus, Pandey, 2018: 24–26, with analysis of specific Ovidian passages.

⁷¹ Contemporary audiences, both Greek and Roman, were educated in the critical study of literature, Konstan, 2006.

as a tool to engage the readers actively with the poem and encourage them to interpret it as they wished.⁷²

Roman writers were keen to use satire and irony in their works; one example is Horace in his *Satires* and *Ode 2.4*.⁷³ Ovid is also a typical case. Many passages can equally be read as flattering or ironic. For example, it has been argued that *Ars Amatoria* 1 parodies the Augustan militaristic values espoused by the *Forum Augustum*, and that Ovid gently satirises Augustan legislation on morality in *Amores* 2.2. Moreover, it is stated that the description of the deification of Caesar in *Metamorphoses* 15.745–851 almost parodied Augustus' hegemony.⁷⁴ In many passages of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid compares Augustus to Jupiter and insists that he is a 'god on earth', presumably intending to flatter the emperor.⁷⁵ Yet, some of the very ideas satirised by Ovid continued to be circulated, precisely because these passages could equally be understood as 'pro-Augustan' as well as ironic.

Therefore, the epigrams of Krinagoras contain a long-lasting literary *topos*, where animals provide a humourous, subtle, and safe way to convey social and political criticism.⁷⁶ By using animals and their relationship to the emperor, their undisputable master, Krinagoras comments indirectly and carefully on the omnipresent imperial glory and the unequal power relations between emperor and subjects, matters that surely dramatically came into his mind during the embassy to Tarragona and the death of Seleukos. Krinagoras, like many other poets and orators of the imperial age, could tweak imperial noses as much as they liked so long as what was said could be interpreted in another, safer way.⁷⁷ Indeed, the line between flattery and irony is sometimes very thin, and this explains sufficiently why the epigrams treated are still interpreted as 'extremes of flattery'. After all, the line between flattery and irony sometimes confused even ancient writers.⁷⁸

On his part, Augustus generally demonstrated tolerance against verbal criticism coming from his political opponents so that he would have accepted the indirect and well-hidden irony in a pair of epigrams of one of his court poets.⁷⁹ More than that, many anecdotes illustrate the emperor's good sense of humour, even his ability and tendency for self-mockery.⁸⁰ After all, Augustus himself does

⁷² Cf. Pittore (2004: 15, 33–35, esp. 35), who argues that the world created by writers distorts reality in ways that correspond and react to the existing social system. Among literary texts, the ironic one possesses most this characteristic attribute of systematic re-invention of facts and values. For example, it assigns people and objects functions that are not normally theirs. In the fictitious world of the ironic text, the atypical, the unexpected, the unorthodox, appears as normal. On their part, readers can decide whether and how much they will accept of the new image of reality the text offers.

⁷³ Hejduk, 2018 and Pelliccia, 2018, respectively.

⁷⁴ Pandey, 2018: 31, 116 and 74–75, respectively. Cf. also Pandey, 2018: 77–78 on the treatment of the Julian paternity of Augustus by Ovid.

⁷⁵ Feeney (1991: 219–224) collects and discusses the relevant passages of *Metamorphoses*, and comments that the comparisons between Augustus and Jupiter elegantly criticised the absolute power of Augustus (Feeney, 1991: 222–223).

⁷⁶ Newlands, 2005: 153–157 on animal fable, among which features Aesopos in a prominent position.

⁷⁷ As Pittore (2004: 14) puts it, the ironical discourse 'è così costruito per essere ambiguo'. Pittore (2004: 50–52) discusses the role of ambiguity in ironical discourse and argues that ambiguous irony can be more effective than direct language. In this regard, characteristic is the flattery of the fisherman who suggested to Domitian that the fish he caught purposefully swam in his net to honour the emperor's table, an obvious irony to the rest of us (Juv. 4.69–71; Ahl, 1984: 197–198).

⁷⁸ See for example the assessment of the so-called Demetrius on the treatment of Aeschines on Telauges as being poised ambiguously between praise and irony, Demetr. *Eloc.* 291: *πᾶσα γὰρ σχεδὸν ἢ περὶ τὸν Τηλαυγῆ διήγησις ἀπορίαν παρέχει, εἴτε θαυμασμός εἴτε χλευασμός ἐστὶ. Τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον εἶδος ἀμφίβολον, καίτοι εἰρωνεία οὐκ ὄν, ἔχει τινὰ ὁμῶς καὶ εἰρωνείας ἔμφασιν.* According to the author, this ambiguity cannot be defined exactly as irony, but it possesses a clear affinity to it.

⁷⁹ Sources collected in Yavetz, 1990: 34–35, as for example Augustus' advice to Tiberius to tolerate criticism in Suet. *Aug.* 51.3. According to Pandey (2018: 27–28), Augustus allowed a certain degree of freedom of speech to writers that ultimately confirmed his domination (what Herbert Marcuse termed 'repressive tolerance').

⁸⁰ E.g., Suet. *Aug.* 85.2; Macrobian *Sat.* 2.4.1,14; and characteristically Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.77 on his reaction for the neglect of his cult in Tarragona (cf. Yavetz, 1990: 36–38 for a discussion of Augustus' sense of humour).

not play an active role in these poems. He is praised in the epigram of the parrot, and in the she-goat epigram he merely boards the she-goat on his vessel to enjoy her milk while travelling. He is a distant figure that appears to be glorified and revered by the natural world. Therefore, also considering his intensive contact with Greek and Latin writers and poets and his affinity with poetry,⁸¹ he might have enjoyed the elegantly satirical pun in those epigrams of Krinagoras.⁸² The fact that Augustus took no issue with that ambiguity of flattery and irony adds him to the list of Hellenistic rulers who oscillated between indulgence and realisation of absurdity – but they did indulge in those praises nonetheless.

Conclusions

In this paper, I argue that Krinagoras drew inspiration from and anchored his epigrams on his personal experiences. The long and hazardous trip from his native home in Mytilene to Tarragona and the death of a young compatriot along the way would have profoundly impacted him. Something evident in numerous epigrams that can reasonably be associated with this journey and convey the sufferings Krinagoras and the other ambassadors endured.

Having established this as a starting point, I interpret the distinct but delicate tone of irony in two epigrams of Krinagoras addressing Augustan glory as a poetic way of conveying criticism. In this regard, it is important to note that the epigrams of the parrot and the she-goat were written after the embassy, and the latter perhaps when the poet accompanied Augustus in one of his travels. The parrot and the she-goat represent flatterers of the emperor, animal symbols that revere Augustus willingly and disseminate his glory. At the same time, both poems undoubtedly praise the emperor. Especially Krinagoras' epigram of the talking parrot seems to be the earliest exemplar of a tradition of talking birds praising emperors, an eager poetic attempt to flatter them via nature's indisputable acknowledgement of and submission to their greatness. However, Krinagoras differentiated his work from courtly and slavish speech. The two epigrams provide a form of 'safe speech' in which Krinagoras could subtly satirise the excessive efforts of others to flatter Augustus. Though light-touch and discreet, there is an underlying tone of irony in these epigrams; not everyone was meant to understand it fully, and this probably offered sufficient self-protection.

Krinagoras took the opportunity to make a personal, not overly positive, comment on the omnipresent Augustan glory and divinity, contemplating and acknowledging his hardships during the long and calamitous journey to the remote Tarragona and the loss of a young compatriot in his task to meet the emperor. There is no reason to interpret these epigrams exclusively as flattery *or* as covert irony – both apply, as they do in other passages of Augustan poets. Therefore, the paper offers new perspectives on the differentiated interpretations of Augustan glory and the interplay between irony and flattery in the approach of imperial grandeur by a renowned Greek epigrammatist who lived in the imperial court. From this aspect, it would be interesting to examine how far and in which contexts Greek writers of the imperial period employed irony when they referred to Roman *principes*. Krinagoras' irony is merely one instance among many where subtle mockery and satire of the imperial family were exercised in the early Augustan period.

⁸¹ Suet. *Aug.* 85.2 (on the composition of poems by Augustus), 89.1 (on his affinity with Greek poetry), cf. Griffin, 1984: 204 on the emperor's affinity with poetry.

⁸² Cf. the remark in Hamm (2009: 103–104) that irony in the right mixture and dose in literary works gave the ruler a certain freedom to react and ensured that he could still laugh, and maybe he even had to laugh ('der Herrscher trotzdem lachen konnte, ja vielleicht lachen musste').

Bibliography

- Ahl, F. 1984. The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome. *The American Journal of Philology*, 105(2), 174–208.
- Albiani, M.-G. 2002. Krinagoras. In: Cancik, H., Schneider, H., and Lanfester, M. (eds.) *Der Neue Pauly*, 3, 943.
- Argentieri, L. 2007. Meleager and Philip as Epigram Collectors. In: Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden: Brill, 147–164.
- Arrayás Morales, I. 2010. Diplomacy in the Greek *Poleis* of Asia Minor: Mytilene's Embassy to Tarraco. *Classica & Medievalia*, 61, 127–149.
- Bertini Conidi, R. 2012. *Giovenale: un intellettuale nella Roma imperiale: introduzione, traduzione e commento della Satira*. Milano: Prometheus.
- Bowersock, G. 1964. Anth. Pal. VII 638 (Crinagoras). *Hermes*, 92, 255–256.
- Bowersock, G. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bowie, E. 2008. Luxury Cruisers? Philip's Epigrammatists between Greece and Rome. *Aevum Antiquum*, 8, 223–258.
- Bowie, E. 2011. Men from Mytilene. In: Schmitz, T. and Wiater, N. (eds.) *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 181–195.
- Buraselis, K. 2020. On Greek Intellectuals and the Roman Emperor Cult. *Mythos*, 14, 1–12.
- Carney, E. 2013. *Arsinoe of Egypt and Macedon: A Royal Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Casson, L. 1974. *Travel in the Ancient World*. Toronto, ON: Hakkert.
- Cichorius, C. 1888. *Rom und Mytilene*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Clayman, D. 2011. Berenice and her Lock. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 141(2), 229–246.
- Clayman, D. 2014. *Berenice II and the Golden Age of Ptolemaic Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cogitore, I. 2010. Crinagoras et les poètes de la couronne de Philippe: la cour impériale romaine dans les yeux des Grecs. In: Savalli-Lestrade, I. and Cogitore, I. (eds.) *Des Rois au Prince. Pratiques du pouvoir monarchique dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain (Ive siècle avant J.-C.-Iie siècle après J.-C.)*, Grenoble: ELLUG, Université Stendhal, 253–269.
- Coleman, K. 2019. Epigram, Society, and Political Power. In: Henriksen, C. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Epigram*, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 59–75.
- Cuntz, O. 1990. *Itineraria Romana, vol. I: Itineraria Antonini Augusti et Burdigalense; accedit tabula geographica; conspectum librorum recentiorum adiecit Gerhard Wirth*, Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Damon, C. 1995. Greek Parasites and Roman Patronage. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 97, 181–195.
- Dietrich, J. 2002. Dead Parrots Society. *The American Journal of Philology*, 123(1), 95–110.
- Dimopoulou-Pelioune, A. 2015. *Λεσβίων πολιτεία. Πολίτευμα, θεσμοί και δίκαιο των πόλεων της Λέσβου*. Athens: Eurasia.
- Dimopoulou-Pelioune, A. 2017. Lesbos sous Auguste. Du renouveau des traités à l'apothéose. In: L. Cavalier, L., Ferriès, M. C. and Delrieux, F. (eds.) *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux: Ausonius, 399–412.
- Eilers, C. (ed.) 2009. *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*. Leiden: Brill.
- Feeney, D. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Frendo, J. 1975. *Agathias: The Histories*, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae – Series Berolinensis 2A. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. 1968. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip, and Some Contemporary Epigrams*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Griffin, J. 1984. Augustus and the Poets: 'Caesar qui cogere posset'. In: Millar, F. and Segal, E. (eds.) *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 189–218.
- Hamm, U. 2009. Zum Phänomen der Ironie in höfischer Dichtung oder: Ironie ist, wenn der Herrscher trotzdem lacht. In: Reinhold, G. F. (ed.) *Ironie. Griechische und lateinische Fallstudien*, Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 80, Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 77–105.
- Hejduk, J. 2018. Saepe stilum uertas: Moral and Metrical Missteps in Horace's Satires. In: Knox, P. E., Pelliccia, H. and Sens, A. (eds.) *They Keep it All Hid: Augustan Poetry, its Antecedents and Reception*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 63–73.
- Höschele, R. 2019. Greek Epigram in Rome in the First Century CE. In: Henriksen, C. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Epigram*, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 475–490.
- Jones, C. 2011. An Inscription Seen by Agathias. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 179, 107–115.
- Konstan, D. 2006. The Active Reader in Classical Antiquity. *Argos*, 30, 7–18.
- Labarre, G. 1996. *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale*. Paris: de Boccard.
- Miller, J. 2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Newlands, C. 2005. Animal Claquers: Statius *Silv.* 2.4 and 2.5. In: Batstone, W. W. and Tissol, G. (eds.) *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature: Essays Presented to William S. Anderson on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, Lang Classical Studies 15, New York: Lang, 151–173.
- Niehoff, M. R. (ed.) 2017. *Journeys in the Roman East: Imagined and Real*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Pandey, N. 2018. *The Poetics of Power in Augustan Rome: Latin Poetic Responses to Early Imperial Iconography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, R. W. 1991. Potamon of Mytilene and his Family. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 85, 115–130.
- Pawlak, M. N. 2020. Theophanes, Potamon and Mytilene's Freedom. *Electrum*, 27, 173–188.
- Pelliccia, H. 2018. The Reception of Horace *Odes* 2.4 in Horace *Odes* 2.5. In: Knox, P. E., Pelliccia, H. and Sens, A. (eds.) *They Keep it All Hid: Augustan Poetry, its Antecedents and Reception*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 75–88.
- Philips, C. R. 1983. Rethinking Augustan Poetry. *Latomus*, 42, 780–817.
- Pittore, M. 2004. *L'ironia negli epigrammi dell'Anthologia palatina: tra manipolazione linguistica e allusività*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Reinhold, G. (ed.) 2009. *Ironie: griechische und lateinische Fallstudien*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Saller, R. 1982. *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steinhauer, G. 2009. *Ιστορική γεωγραφία του αρχαίου κόσμου: Ελλάδα – Ρώμη*. Athens: Papadimas.
- Syme, R. 1978. *History in Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Thériault, G. 2011. Honneurs culturels et évergétisme: le cas de Potamôn de Mytilène. In: Daviault, A. (ed.) *Mélanges offerts à Pierre Senay*, Cahiers des études anciennes Supplément 1, Trois Rivières: Société des études anciennes du Québec, 55–64.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2013. Greek Poets and Roman Patrons in the Late Republic and Early Empire. In: Whitmarsh, T. (ed.) *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 137–153.
- Yavetz, Z. 1990. The Personality of Augustus: Reflections on Syme's *Roman Revolution*. In: Raaflaub, K. A., and Toher, M. (eds.) *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 21–41.
- Ypsilanti, M. 2018. *The Epigrams of Crinagoras of Mytilene: Introduction, Text, Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Abstract (Greek) | Περίληψη

Ο Κριναγόρας και η αυτοκρατορική δόξα: Μια αλληλεπίδραση μεταξύ ειρωνείας, σάτιρας και κολακείας

Ο Κριναγόρας ήταν ένας Έλληνας ποιητής που καταγόταν από την Μυτιλήνη (γεννήθηκε γύρω στο 70 π.Χ.). Έζησε επομένως κατά την Αυγούστεια περίοδο και ήταν μέλος επιφανούς οικογένειας. Του έχουν αποδοθεί συνολικά 51 επιγράμματα που χωρίζονται σε διάφορες κατηγορίες, όπως «ἐπιτύμβια», «ἐρωτικά», «ἀναθηματικά» και «ἐπίδεικτικά». Όμως, το πιο χαρακτηριστικό στοιχείο της ποίησης του Κριναγόρα είναι η έμπνευσή του από προσωπικές εμπειρίες και παρατηρήσεις, που συχνά χρησιμοποιεί ως υλικό για τα επιγράμματά του.

Ο Κριναγόρας συμμετείχε ενεργά στα δημόσια θέματα που απασχολούσαν τη Μυτιλήνη. Χαρακτηριστικά, πήρε μέρος σε συνολικά τρεις πρεσβείες προς Ρωμαίους πολιτικούς ηγέτες: δύο στον Καίσαρα (κατά τα έτη 48 και 46/5 π.Χ.) και μία στον Οκταβιανό – Αύγουστο το 26/5 π.Χ. προκειμένου να επισφραγιστεί το *foedus aequum* μεταξύ της Μυτιλήνης και της Ρώμης. Μετά από την τρίτη πρεσβεία, ο Κριναγόρας έμεινε στη Ρώμη για πολλά χρόνια, όπου συνδέθηκε στενά με τον αυτοκρατορικό κύκλο και ίσως έγινε ποιητής της αυλής του Αυγούστου. Πράγματι, σώζονται πολλά επιγράμματά του, τα οποία είναι αφιερωμένα σε μέλη της αυτοκρατορικής οικογένειας, όπως στον Τιβέριο, τον Μαρκέλλο και την Αντωνία.

Σε αυτό το άρθρο, επιχειρώ να ερμηνεύσω ένα παράδοξο φαινόμενο. Ενώ τα περισσότερα επιγράμματα του Κριναγόρα που απευθύνονται ή σχετίζονται με τον Αύγουστο και την οικογένειά του χαρακτηρίζονται προφανώς από έπαινο και κολακεία των αναφερόμενων προσώπων, δύο επιγράμματα φαίνεται να διέπονται από έναν διακριτικό και λεπτό τόνο ειρωνείας. Πιστεύω πως αυτή η ειρωνική χροιά ερμηνεύεται βάσει των δυσχερειών που αντιμετώπισε ο Κριναγόρας κατά την πρεσβεία του προς τον Οκταβιανό, όταν ταξίδεψε από τη Μυτιλήνη στην άλλη άκρη της Μεσογείου, στην Ταρραγόνα της Ισπανίας, όπου βρισκόταν ο αυτοκράτορας. Στη διάρκεια αυτού του μακρινού και δύσκολου ταξιδιού, ο Κριναγόρας έχασε έναν συμπατριώτη του, τον Σέλευκο, τον οποίο θρήνησε σε ένα επίγραμμα. Επομένως, αντλώντας έμπνευση από τις δύσκολες συνθήκες του ταξιδιού, ο Κριναγόρας προχώρησε στη συγγραφή δύο επιγραμμάτων στα οποία στοιχεία ειρωνείας και κολακείας της αυτοκρατορικής δόξας και θειότητας συμπλέκονται στενά.

Στο πρώτο μέρος του άρθρου εξετάζω το ταξίδι της πρεσβείας από τη Μυτιλήνη στην Ταρραγόνα. Γνωρίζουμε από επιγράμματα του Κριναγόρα πως η αποστολή διέσχισε τις Κυκλάδες και τη «βάρβαρη» περιοχή της Λιγυρίας, όπου ο Κριναγόρας συνάντησε ή πληροφορήθηκε για μια πρακτική των ντόπιων ληστών, την οποία επίσης περιέγραψε σε ένα επίγραμμα. Κατά τη διάρκεια του ταξιδιού ή στην επιστροφή, πέθανε ο Σέλευκος, την απώλεια του οποίου θρήνησε ο Κριναγόρας. Σύμφωνα με το κείμενο, ο νεαρός άντρας τάφηκε σε μια παραλία της Ισπανίας, «πολύ μακριά από τη Λέσβο» (τόσον δίχα τηλόθι Λέσβου). Έτσι, παίρνουμε μια εικόνα των κινδύνων και των δυσχερειών που αντιμετώπισε η πρεσβεία. Μάλιστα, γνωρίζουμε ότι περίπου την ίδια περίοδο μια πρεσβεία από τις Τράλλεις στάλθηκε στην Ταρραγόνα και ο ιστορικός Αγαθίας (*Ιστορία* 2.17.2–3) επίσης ανέλυσε τις δυσκολίες ενός τέτοιου ταξιδιού προς αναζήτηση του αυτοκράτορα.

Στο δεύτερο μέρος του άρθρου αναλύω τα επιγράμματα AP 9.562 και 9.224 του Κριναγόρα. Το πρώτο επίγραμμα περιγράφει έναν παπαγάλο που αφήνει το κλουβί του και διδάσκει στα πουλιά του δάσους πώς να απευθύνουν χαιρετισμό στον Αύγουστο, ενώ στο δεύτερο επίγραμμα η αγαπημένη κατσίκα του Αυγούστου αναφέρει περήφανα ότι αυτή προμηθεύει τον αυτοκράτορα με γάλα ακόμα

και κατά τη διάρκεια των ταξιδιών του και εκφράζει την ελπίδα της ότι σύντομα θα αποθεωθεί, ακολουθώντας τον στον ουρανό. Τα δύο επιγράμματα χρονολογούνται μάλλον μετά από το ταξίδι της τρίτης πρεσβείας (25 π.Χ) και έχει υποστηριχθεί ότι ο Κριναγόρας μπορεί να συνόδευε τον Αύγουστο στο ταξίδι που περιγράφει η κατσίκα του επιγράμματος AP 9.224.

Τα δύο επιγράμματα έχουν χαρακτηριστεί ως «αποκορύφωμα της κολακείας», αλλά υπάρχουν ευδιάκριτα, αν και λεπτά, ίχνη ειρωνείας. Ειδικότερα, δεν σατιρίζεται άμεσα ο ίδιος ο Αύγουστος, αλλά ο Κριναγόρας χρησιμοποιεί δύο ζώα για σχολιάσει με ασφάλεια την πανταχού παρουσία και δόξα του Αυγούστου. Αυτό το γεγονός δεν πρέπει να μας παραξενεύει. Υπάρχουν και άλλοι ποιητές, όπως ο Οράτιος και ο Οβίδιος που χρησιμοποίησαν έντεχνους τρόπους για να ειρωνευτούν πτυχές της ιδεολογίας του Αυγούστου χωρίς να θέσουν σε κίνδυνο τόσο το έργο τους όσο και τους ίδιους. Επιπλέον, γνωρίζουμε πως ο ίδιος ο Αύγουστος ήταν γενικά ανεκτικός με την σάτιρα και πολλές ανεκδοτολογικές αφηγήσεις μαρτυρούν την αίσθηση χιούμορ που τον διακατείχε, ακόμα και τον αυτοσαρκασμό του.

Επομένως, δεν θα πρέπει να ερμηνευτούν τα επιγράμματα AP 9.562 και 9.224 είτε ως απόπειρες κολακείας του Αυγούστου, είτε ως προσεκτική ειρωνεία. Ισχύουν και τα δύο ταυτόχρονα, όπως συμβαίνει και σε άλλα έργα Αυγούστειων ποιητών. Συνεπώς, το άρθρο αυτό προσφέρει νέες οπτικές πάνω στην διαφοροποιημένη ερμηνεία της Αυγούστειας δόξας και την αλληλεπίδραση μεταξύ ειρωνείας και κολακείας στην προσέγγιση του αυτοκρατορικού μεγαλείου από έναν φημισμένο Έλληνα ποιητή που έζησε στην αυτοκρατορική αυλή. Η ειρωνεία του Κριναγόρα αποτελεί μόνο ένα παράδειγμα μεταξύ πολλών όπου χρησιμοποιούνταν ο διακριτικός σαρκασμός και η σάτιρα της αυτοκρατορικής οικογένειας σε έργα της πρώιμης Αυγούστειας περιόδου.

Reviews & Author Profiles

A Review of: Mauro, Chiara Maria, Chapinal-Heras, Diego, and Valdés Guía, Miriam (eds.) 2022. *People on the Move Across the Greek World*. Sevilla: Editorial Universidad de Sevilla

Christian Ammitzbøll Thomsen

Saxo Institute, University of Copenhagen

cammt@hum.ku.dk

Submitted	14/07/2023
Accepted (Internal Review)	16/07/2023
Published	25/07/2023

Book Details

Mauro, Chiara Maria, Chapinal-Heras, Diego, and Valdés Guía, Miriam (eds.) 2022. *People on the Move Across the Greek World*, Estudios Helénicos 4. Sevilla: Editorial Universidad de Sevilla. pp. 356. ISBN: 9788447223664. 19,00€

Review

People on the Move Across the Greek World collects 22 papers on various aspects of ancient Greek history and archaeology, all joined by their consideration of movement as key to understanding their subjects.* The volume opens with a short introduction that sets out the agenda, to which I will return below. Here follows a brief overview of the 22 papers, divided into four Sections that comprise the volume.

I

The first Section presents four papers under 'Society, Economy and Knowledge'. Aida Fernández Prieto begins by taking a lexical approach to the question of the relationship between movement and poverty in literature. Though the pauper did not necessarily wander, and the wanderer was not necessarily destitute, there was often a blurry line between the two who met on the margins of Classical Greek society.

Next, Domingo Plácido presents a number of somewhat disjointed observations about travel and movement as it manifested itself in the works of those 'professionals' who contributed to the Homeric corpus and classical literature and relates them to long-term developments in literature. It is an interesting idea; the usefulness of this contribution, however, is severely limited by a very economical use of references to both scholarly literature and ancient evidence.

Luckily, Gabriella Ottone picks up on the theme of literature and place with a careful analysis of the importance of travel for the first historians. On the one hand, travel was an essential part of the

*Authors and titles are listed at the end of this review.

historical method; historians had to acquaint themselves with events, people, peoples (ethnography remained an essential part of history), and places and the historian's reputation, to a considerable extent, depended upon their familiarity with the people and places they treated. On the other hand, the historians, as a kind of itinerant craftsmen, travelled to find new audiences for their work, for instance, at the Olympic games. The decision to place the lesser-known fourth-century historian Theopompos of Chios at the centre of the analysis, rather than, say, Herodotos or Polybios, is in itself a treat for a reader only vaguely familiar with that historian, but it also broadens the analysis and makes for a greater historical anchorage of the results.

Nerea Terceiro Sanmartín traces an outline of the life of the speechwriter Lysias as a metic of Athens (and briefly Megara) and citizen of Thourioi and Syracuse. She discusses his relationship with his adopted home city of Athens and the democracy that he helped restore in 403 BCE, but which seems – so it is argued – never to have embraced him fully with Athenian citizenship. Lysias belongs among the best-attested metics of Classical Athens. Therefore, his case is exciting since it holds the promise of a clear and direct insight into what David Whitehead called the 'ideology of the Athenian metic'. In this reading, Lysias is a devout but disappointed democrat against Azoulay and Ismard's more ideologically flexible Lysias.¹ A lynchpin of the analysis is Lysias' failure – despite his support for the restoration of democracy – to secure citizenship. However, the matter is controversial, and the nature of the evidence seems to preclude any hard conclusions (given our fairly extensive knowledge about Lysias, this is in itself an interesting fact). Similarly, though Lysias 12 and 31 (with Bakewell)² can be read to reflect Lysias' support for democracy, if, as here, they are read in isolation, one might wonder about Lysias' apparent willingness to look past some clients' questionable democratic credentials?

Next follows a note by Filippo and Innocenza Giudice, which points to the disruption of Peiraeus' trade in connection with the reign of the Thirty at Athens as an explanation for the wide chronological distribution of pottery assemblages in the *El Sec* shipwreck.

For the section's final contribution, Marco Serino considers recent developments in the study of the mobility of potters and painters in late-fifth-century Sicily and South Italy. The traditional interpretation that Athenians sent pottery, which was eventually imitated by local craftspeople, has given way to interpretations that emphasise the mobility of especially painters. First steps have been taken, argues Serino, but more work – combining various disciplines – is needed for a fuller picture.

Section Two, 'Travellers and Borders', opens with Angiolo Querci tracing the ancient sea passage from (Minoan) Crete to Egypt and back again. The discussion departs from Odysseus' tale (in Hom. *Od.* 14) of such a voyage and early evidence of a connection between Minoan Crete and eighteenth-dynasty Egypt, but also draws on meteorological data to establish the most likely route: an open-sea 'jump' from eastern Crete to the mouth of the Nile and a land-hugging return trip up the Levantine coast and west along the South Anatolian coast and into the Aegean. Querci's questions, approach (especially the use of wind charts), and results closely mirror those of L. Casson in his classic article on the Roman grain fleets of Alexandria, and a discussion would have been worthwhile.³

Chiara Maria Mauro continues the focus on the technology of seafaring with a discussion of scholarship on the construction of vessels and means of navigation in early Iron Age Greece, drawing on both literary and iconographic evidence. Next, Unai Iriarte traces the overseas connections of

¹ Azoulay and Ismard, 2020.

² Bakewell, 1999.

³ Casson, 1950.

Peisistratos to emphasise how the Athenian tyrant's hold on power depended on his relationship with especially the Eretrian and Argive elites and his military exploits in Thrace.

The section concludes with two papers on Pausanias' *Description of Greece* (Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις), Book 8. The myths and traditions of Arkadia are the subject of Maria Cruz Cardete Del Olmo's contribution. Following Pretzler, she argues that Pausanias aimed to conjure up an eternal, traditional, and mythical Arkadia to stand against the shifting of time. Sotiria Dimopoulou concentrates on Pausanias' description of Despoina's sanctuary in Lykosoura, which she reads against the archaeological remains and Pausanias' interests as a religious tourist with a preference for mysteries.

Section Three, "Colonization" and Politics, begins with Elena Duce Pastor's study of 'mixed marriages' between Greek settler men and local women in the foundations of Miletos, Cyrene, and Massalia, which finds that women typically did not participate in colonising ventures and therefore had to be drawn (violently) from among the native populations. The contribution takes a very optimistic view of the foundation myths reported by Herodotos and Aristotle, and a discussion of their evidentiary value would have been most welcome (the reader may consult the following contribution for a brief discussion of the methodological issues, or indeed Hall's discussion, to which Mac Sweeney's should now be added).⁴

Alfredo Novello and Annalisa Savino reflect on the aspects of travel in the foundation myths of the Greek *poleis* of Asia Minor as they are preserved in fragments of the Aristotelian *politeiai*. That origin stories were of interest to Aristotle and his students seems straightforward enough, but scarcity and, above all, the fragmentary nature of the evidence inhibit further conclusions. In a fascinating account of the migration history of the Sicilian city of Zankle (Messene), Elena Santagati traces the different waves of migration that contributed to the rise of that city, from the Middle Neolithic (through the quasi-mythical Dark Age foundation) to the mid-fifth century BCE. In Santagati's reading, the capture of the *polis* by Samian exiles drove the development towards a new shared sense of civic identity, even as the memory of previous times lingered with some members of the community.

Next, Natia Phiphia traces an outline of the Greek settlement of the Black Sea in the sixth century BCE and the consolidation of the *poleis* there, which involved increased contacts between the cities of the region in the fourth century BCE and the incorporation of neighbouring territories and the establishment of satellite settlements. For the section's final contribution, Carlo De Mitri presents an overview of the evidence for the migration of the Messapians to Rome and the Greek East in the centuries following their integration into the Roman Empire in the third century BCE.

The final Section, 'Religion and Mythology', kicks off with András Patay-Horváth's discussion of the first visitors to Olympia who are argued, based on the early votive gifts from the sanctuary, to have been hunters – or 'sports hunters' from whose activities the sanctuary and its festival eventually arose. In a well-argued paper, Javier Jara and César Fornis analyse Herodotos' account of the Spartan Dorieus' failed attempt at establishing a colony in North Africa. The narrative – and in particular, the role of Apollo's oracle in Delphoi – is set against the dynastic and political struggles that characterised Sparta at the time. Herodotos, it is argued, parroted the version of events preferred by the victorious Spartan faction, which drew on the rising importance of Delphoi in the affairs of the Greek states.

Next, Miriam Valdés Guía reconstructs the *theoria*, or sacred embassy to Delphoi, of the Thyiads, a band of Athenian women, discussing the group's composition, route, and participation in rites at Delphoi. The evidence is fragmented and scattered over centuries, but Valdés Guía puts it to good

⁴ Hall, 2008; Mac Sweeney, 2017.

use in offering several plausible hypotheses. Diego Chapinal-Heras provides an overview of the sanctuaries of Macedonian Dion and asks whether any of them might have been healing sanctuaries. The evidence, however, is inconclusive and supports only ‘conjecture.’ Aitor Luz Villafranca examines aspects of mobility in the Macedonian origin story preserved in Book 8 of Herodotos’ Histories. Herodotos tied the Macedonian king Alexandros I closely to the cause of opposing the Persians in 480 BCE and claimed – echoing Macedonian sources – a Peloponnesian origin for the royal house that drew on available foundation myths for its basic template. For the section’s and the volume’s final contribution, Kerasia A. Stratiki examines three foundation stories involving displacement preserved by Pausanias and finds that traditions of expulsion were kept alive in civic rituals and priesthoods.

II

As should be evident at this point that the *People on the Move* volume covers an impressive amount of ground in terms of subjects (economy, technology, society, emotions, politics, identity, religion, architecture, history, and literature), from one end of the Mediterranean to the other, and into the Black Sea, from the middle of the second millennium BCE to the first centuries CE.

In their introduction, the editors outline the ideas that provide the gravitational pull to keep all these papers together: movement, or rather ‘being on the move.’ The editors opt for what might be called a minimalist definition, pulled from the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which captures ‘the process of moving from one place to another, travelling, moving about’⁵ and which captures, if not quite everything, then undoubtedly many things.

Interestingly, when the editors, in their introduction, survey the field of previous research, they point precisely to approaches that embed movement (or perhaps better, mobility) within a broader framework: ‘mass mobility’, ‘pilgrimage’, ‘displacement’, ‘settlement’, ‘connectivity’⁶ – one might add ‘migration’, ‘diaspora’, ‘insularity’ and indeed more. Movement or mobility, of course, is an essential component of, say, connectivity and, in a sense, permeates it. Still, connectivity implies more than movement, patterns, networks, reciprocity, anchorage, and more that structure an investigation.

Against this, it might – and with justification – be objected that movement indeed pervades every one of these concepts and that these additional aspects can be left to the individual papers to develop. As the editors clearly say in their introduction, the aim is to provide ‘a selection of approaches, themes and contexts that reflect the importance of being on the move in ancient Greece.’⁷ However, a consequence of the approach is that papers become somewhat disjointed. One more important consequence is that ‘movement’ on occasion quietly slips away from the analysis after a dutiful invocation in the opening lines, while the analysis then proceeds to tackle the context of movement. It is at this point that a reader might be forgiven for asking if there is, in fact, anything that is not somehow a context for movement. Still, there is something to be said about the diversity the volume contains, and each reader can surely meander through the papers guided by their own interests.

I conclude this review with a small note on language. Though most authors are native writers of Spanish and Italian, languages with long-standing and living traditions in Classical scholarship,

⁵ Mauro, Chapinal-Heras, and Valdés Guía, 2022: 13.

⁶ Mauro, Chapinal-Heras, and Valdés Guía, 2022: 14–15.

⁷ Mauro, Chapinal-Heras, and Valdés Guía, 2022: 15.

all contributions are written in English. I realise that language in the domain of scholarship is a contentious issue, and I raise this point only to make this one observation: many of the bibliographies collected in this volume draw on Spanish and Italian (and other languages, of course) works that one does not necessarily come across in anglophone scholarship. Only now, one does.

People on the Move: Contents

Abbreviations and (Main) Latin Expressions Used in this Work

Introduction, *Chiara Maria Mauro, Diego Chapinal-Heras and Miriam Valdés Guía* [pp. 13–18].

Section 1: Society, Economy and Knowledge

1. '[...] and tell no man of them all nor any woman that thou hast come back from thy wanderings' (Hom. *Od.* 13.309–310). Beggary and Vagabondage in the Ancient Greek World, *Aida Fernández Prieto* [pp. 21–38]
2. Professional Travel, Between Archaism and Classicism, *Domingo Plácido* [pp. 39–52]
3. Individual Mobility and Circulation of Knowledge: The 'Itinerant' Historian in the 4th Century BC, *Gabriella Ottone* [pp. 53–70]
4. Lysias: From a Wandering Metic to an Unsuccessful Candidate for Citizenship, *Nera Terceiro Sanmartín* [pp. 71–84]
5. *Naukleroi, Emporoi*, Pottery Workshops and the Historical Context: The Case of the *El Sec* Wreck, *Filippo Giudice and Innocenza Giudice* [pp. 85–90]
6. Some New Perspectives on the Study of Craftspeople Mobility in the Red-Figure Pottery Production of Magna Graecia and Sicily, *Marco Serino* [pp. 91–108]

Section 2: Travellers and Borders

7. The Minoans Abroad: A Discussion of the Existence of a Direct Sear Route Linking Crete to Egypt during the Late Bronze Age, *Angiolo Querci* [pp. 111–122]
8. Sailing the Wine-Dark Sea: Maritime Travel during the Geometric Period, *Chiara Maria Mauro* [pp. 123–140]
9. Ο ΕΞΧΑΤΙΟΝ ΑΝΗΡ: The Paths to Peisistratos's Tyranny, *Unai Iriarte* [pp. 141–152]
10. Travelling and the Construction of Tradition: Pausanias and Arcadia, *M^a Cruz Cardete del Olmo* [pp. 153–170]
11. Pausanias: Traveller, Pilgrim, Journalist or Researcher of Antiquity? The Case of Lycosura and the Visit to the Temple of Despoina in Arcadia, *Sotiria Dimopoulou* [pp. 171–186]

Section 3: 'Colonisation' and Politics

12. Mixed Identities in the First Generations of Archaic Greek Colonies: The Female Contribution, *Elena Duce Pastor* [pp. 189–208]
13. Journeys and Foundations in Aristotle's *Politeiai* of Asia Minor, *Alfredo Novello and Annalisa Savino* [pp. 209–224]
14. Zancle/Messene: A Tale of *Lestai, Apoikoi*, Fugitives and Undesirables, *Elena Santagati* [pp. 225–238]
15. Greeks on the East Coast of the Black Sea Littoral: Settlement and Migration Patterns, *Natia Phiphia* [pp. 239–246]
16. Messapians beyond Messapia: Mobility and Trade Networks in the Late Hellenistic Age (Late 3rd-1st Centuries BC), *Carlo De Mitri* [pp. 247–256]

Section 4: Religion and Mythology

17. Visitors to Early Olympia: Greedy Farmers, Pious Pilgrims or Aristocratic Hunters?, *András Patay-Horváth* [pp. 259–266]
18. Delphi in the Colonial Ventures of the Spartans in the Archaic Period, II. The Oracle's Influence on the Voyages of Dorieus, *Javier Jara and César Fornis* [pp. 267–286]
19. Travelling to Delphi: The *Theoria* of Athenian Women to the Oracle, *Miriam Valdés Guía* [pp. 287–306]
20. Travelling for Healing. Dion in Macedon, a Place for Recovery, *Diego Chapinal-Heras* [pp. 307–322]
21. The Legend of Perdiccas: Patterns of Mobility in Macedonia Before Philip, *Aitor Luz Villafranca* [pp. 323–340]
22. Human Mobility and Heroic Cults in Pausanias *Periegesis*, *Kerasia A. Stratiki* [pp. 341–356]

Bibliography

- Azoulay, V. and Ismard, P. 2020. *Athènes 403: une histoire chorale. Au fil de l'histoire*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Bakewell, G. 1999. Lysias 12 and 31: Metics and Athenian Citizenship in the Aftermath of the Thirty. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 40, 5–22.
- Casson, L. 1950. The Isis and Her Voyage. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 81, 43–56.
- Hall, J. 2008. Foundation Stories. In: Tsetschladze, G. R. (ed.) *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, Volume II, Mnemosyne Supplements 193, Brill: Leiden, 383–426.
- Mac Sweeney, N. 2017. Separating Fact from Fiction in the Ionian Migration. *Hesperia*, 86(3), 379–421.
- Mauro, C. M., Chapinal-Heras, D., and Valdés Guía, M. (eds.) 2022. *People on the Move Across the Greek World*. Sevilla: Editorial Universidad de Sevilla.

An Interview with Chiara Maria Mauro, Diego Chapinal-Heras, and Miriam Valdés Guía on the Occasion of the Edited Volume, *People on the Move across the Greek World* (Sevilla: Editorial Universidad de Sevilla, 2022)

Conducted | 18/04/2023
Published | 30/06/2023

Book Reference

Mauro, C. M., Chapinal-Heras, D., and Valdés Guía, M. (eds.) 2022. *People on the Move across the Greek World*. Sevilla: Editorial Universidad de Sevilla.

A Short Profile of the Editors



From left to right, the editors of the volume: Chiara Maria Mauro, Diego Chapinal-Heras, and Miriam Valdés Guía. Courtesy of the editors.

Chiara Maria Mauro (CMM)

After a BA and a MA in Classical Archaeology (University of Pisa, Italy) and a PhD in Studies on the Ancient World (Complutense University of Madrid, Spain), Chiara Maria Mauro has worked, first, as Postdoctoral Researcher at the University College Dublin (Ireland) and, then, at the Haifa Center for Mediterranean History (Israel). She is currently an Assistant Professor of Ancient History at the Complutense University of Madrid (Spain). Her main scientific interests are related to the maritime sphere, which she has widely published. Particularly, she draws her attention to harbour areas in the Greek world and their evolution between the Archaic and the Classical periods.

Diego Chapinal-Heras (DCH)

Ramón y Cajal Postdoctoral Researcher at Autonomía University of Madrid. His current project focuses on the Macedonian sanctuary of Dion and its evolution, which is linked to the historical development of the kingdom of Macedonia and, more specifically, the territory of Pieria. Previously, he was a Postdoctoral Researcher at Complutense University (2020-2022) and at Harvard University through Real Colegio Complutense (2018-2020). His PhD (with FPU Grant, 2013-2017) was entitled “*Epirus and Dodona: Paths and Communications around the Sanctuary*”. His main line of research is the analysis of politics and religion, primarily in cult spaces. A secondary line of study is Digital Humanities and its use in research and teaching.

Miriam A. Valdés Guía (MVG)

Professor of Ancient History since 2021 (Senior Lecturer since 2009). Miriam received her PhD from the Complutense University of Madrid (1999), enjoyed a pre-doctoral fellowship (1995–1998) and two postdoctoral fellowships in France and Italy (2000–2002), as well as a “Ramón y Cajal Contract” (2003-2005) at the UCM. She has directed several research projects and is currently leading a project titled “*Poverty, Marginalization and Citizenship in Classical Athens*” (PID2020-112790GB-I00). Since 2013, Miriam is Director of the Research Group “*Eschatia. Delimitación territorial y fronteras: el papel de la religión en los conflictos entre poleis*” (GI: 930100). Her research began with studying the relationship between politics and religion in Archaic Greece from the social and cultural history perspective. She has also researched women and religion in the ancient Greek world.

The Interview

Are you yourself a traveller like the topics in the volume?

DCH | Indeed. I have travelled a lot during my entire life. Everything began when I started to study at the university; it was then that I travelled more broadly, with trips to different countries. Interrail or hiking in the mountains are two of my favourite travel methods. Most of my trips have been focused on leisure, although I have done it too as a researcher.

CMM | I guess, for me, it is the same. I have always enjoyed travelling. When I was younger, I travelled mostly for leisure. Still, then, when I decided to follow the academic path, travel became an intellectual and professional necessity: I travelled to visit sites, attend conferences, and learn new things. Although I travel quite frequently nowadays, I must confess that I have not yet lost the excitement that I had during my first experiences: I always pack my small cabin luggage with few clothes and a good dose of genuine curiosity.

MVG | As for me, I am not a traveller right now, at least not regularly, but I was one, especially during my doctoral and postdoctoral studies in France and Italy.

How did you come up with the idea for this volume? Was it part of a research project and a natural outcome of it? Was it a case of shared interests aligning to make this volume happen?

CMM | The idea arose in 2019 when I landed as a postdoctoral researcher at the Complutense University of Madrid. At that time, I had just finished working on the revised version of my PhD thesis (“*Archaic and Classical Harbours of the Greek World*”, published by Archaeopress), and I was eager to begin a new project. When I joined the Research Group *Eschatia*,¹ based at Complutense University, I started to cherish the thought of a collective project capable of putting together the scientific interests of the different members of the group. Since both Diego Chapinal-Heras, who at that time was working at Harvard, and Miriam Valdés work on religion-related topics, we thought that “mobility” could be an interesting field of discussion and debate. Starting from there, we involved other members of *Eschatia* in this project –Domingo Plácido Suárez, M^a Cruz Cardete del Olmo and Aida Fernández Prieto–, sure that they would have contributed to fostering the discussion around movements and mobility in the ancient Greek world. Soon we realised that the topic was extremely multifaceted, so we shared a call for proposals to bring together different specialists. The idea was to provide the readers with a fresh and heterogeneous approach to the various facets of “movements”.

Was it synergy or independent work that delivered the volume? How did you work?

Group | We think both. Each scholar worked independently on their research; then, we worked together to shape the volume layout.

What were the pivotal moments in the process?

Group | At the beginning, we must confess that we did not know how to approach the topic of “mobility” satisfactorily. We soon realised that, given the complexity of the subject, we needed to aim for a representative (rather than exhaustive) study of the “movements around the ancient Greek world”. As soon as we realised that we wanted to offer the readers the opportunity to become acquainted with the various activities that prompted ancient Greeks to move from one place to another, the book’s structure spurred quite naturally. In other words, the pivotal moment was when we decided on the volume’s aim and layout.

Were there any surprises you encountered during research or assumptions you had to revise?

Group | We were already acquainted with the idea that movement was quite familiar in Antiquity and that the Greek world was not an exception in this sense. However, after having shared the call for proposals amongst other scholars and reviewed them, we realised how many shapes movement could take. As we tried to explain in the “Introduction” of *People on the Move across the Greek World*, movement was part of daily life and could vary in duration, be done in different ways or for different reasons; it could be individual or communitarian, voluntary or imposed, be recurrent or occur only once.

What is the most important thing you learned?

Group | We learned quite a lot of things. From a scientific perspective, we probably realised through the preparation of this volume that a more dynamic and socially integrated way of looking at mobility in Ancient Greece is needed. With this publication, we hope to have offered food for thought, but we

¹ <https://www.ucm.es/eschatia>.

are aware there is still much work to do. Additionally, regarding the editorial project, we learnt how to sketch, carry out, and bring to light a collective volume. For two of us – Chiara M. Mauro and Diego Chapinal-Heras – this was our first time as editors, so the entire process has been pivotal to realise how much hard work and patience lay behind the preparation of a collective volume.

What is the one thing you will remember the most?

MVG | I have particularly appreciated the teamwork with my fellow editors and the different and varied perspectives and themes from which to approach mobility in ancient Greece.

DCH | When we received the notification from the Press that the book was well received by the Press' reviewers.

CMM | I agree with my colleagues. If I had to choose a moment, I would certainly pick up the instant when we received the acceptance of the manuscript on behalf of the publisher. If I had to select an experience, I would undoubtedly remember the relaxed atmosphere in which we worked and prepared the publication.

The geography of contributors: the contributors are mostly scholars based in the Mediterranean. Was that coincidental? How did it happen? Did it work?

Group | Purely coincidental. We aimed to answer specific research questions so that we focused on the topics rather than on the scholars' workplace. Maybe the reason could be related to the fact that the main network of contacts of the three editors falls in the Mediterranean area, but this would not fully explain the situation. As we have said before, we launched a call for contributors, and the geography of the volume is primarily the result of the selection of the proposals we received. Better use of social media and other resources to disseminate the call for submissions could have probably mitigated this bias.

What would you want to go back and change?

Group | There is nothing in particular that we would like to go back and change. We know that every volume, every publication, is not an ultimate product but the reflection of one's research and consideration when the manuscript is submitted. However, since you drew our attention to it, having the opportunity, we would have tried to involve scholars from all continents.

What is the coolest place you sat and worked on the volume?

CMM | While I enjoy travelling a lot, I prefer writing and doing editorial work at home, where I have time and space to think and organise my thoughts. I have an office with a large desk to spread out all my working documents and notes. The light is perfect all year, and I always have a Moka pot at hand.

MVG | My desk in my summer house by the sea.

DCH | The final review of the last proofs: I did it during my stay at the Hardt Foundation in Geneva. This is an amazing place for scholarly work, one of the best for accomplishing the last step of the publication of a book.

What would you do if you were not a Classicist?

MVG | I do not know; maybe I would be a historian of another period or focus on literary studies (?). However, I do know what I am going to do when I retire: travel.

DCH | Surely a history teacher at a high school, although journalism has always seemed intriguing.

CMM | Tricky question. I have always dreamt of being a Classicist and working in Academia, so I have not considered other options. However, I am a thirsty reader, and I enjoy the writing process, so –even if I am aware that it is another kind of writing– I would have probably ended up being a novelist.