Crinagoras of Mytilene: An Outsider's Perspective on Rome

Hefting, Cornelia

Crinagoras of Mytilene

An Outsider's Perspective on Rome

MA Thesis Classics and Ancient Civilizations – Classics
August 2021

Cornelia Hefting

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. C.C. de Jonge
Second reader: Dr. C.H. Pieper
Leiden University, Faculty of Humanities

Word count: 15912

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis I will discuss the poetry of Crinagoras of Mytilene on Lesbos. He lived from about 70 BCE to at least 11 CE, perhaps even 15 CE.[1] He was an ambassador for his home town under the reign of Julius Caesar and Augustus. He went on three embassies: the first to Caesar in 48 or 47 BCE, the second also to Caesar in 45 BCE and the third to Augustus in 26-25 BCE.[2] Besides in his role as ambassador, Crinagoras was mainly known as a poet of epigrams at the Augustan court.[3] 51 epigrams ascribed to him have survived, of which 47 have been passed down through the *Anthologia Palatina* (*AP*) and the remaining four (as well as half of those in *AP*) through the *Anthologia Planudea* (*APl*).[4] Crinagoras was one of the contributors to the *Garland of Philip*, compiled by Philip of Thessalonica. Gow-Page have provided a convenient edition of the Garland, sorted per author.[5] I will use their numbering system, but also provide the *AP* and *APl* numbers.

Literature of the Early Roman Empire (27 BCE – 68 CE) has recently received more attention.[6] Interesting about this period is that Greeks found themselves in a new situation: Rome had gained firm control over the Mediterranean area, and the center of cultural life shifted from Alexandria to Rome. This new situation created a question of identity: local identity of one's home town existed simultaneous with a Roman political identity, as well as a culturally Greek identity.[7]

In this thesis I will add to the discussion of identity and power relations in the field of Greek writers working under Roman rule.[8] My research question will be: how does the Greek writer Crinagoras of Mytilene respond to his Roman environment in his poetry? I will look into three central themes that Crinagoras addresses: warfare and imperialism (using poem 26, 27 and 28), the figure of the emperor (focusing on poem 23 and 24) and Crinagoras' constructed Greek identity (starting from poem 7 and 11).

I will make use of close reading to analyze these poems. Other methods I employ are theory of space, intertextuality, and semantic analysis. Which methods I use differ per theme and per poem, as the epigrams vary greatly in content, structure and intention. My analysis will point out that in all of these poems, a subversive reading is possible. When taken at face value, Crinagoras' poetry seems encomiastic, positive and full of praise. I will argue, however, that we can read a lot of subtle critique of Rome and the emperor throughout Crinagoras' poetry.

---

[1] Gow-Page 1968: 212. For a longer discussion of the poet's life and work, see the monograph on Crinagoras of Ypsilanti 2018.

[2] Inscriptions testify to three embassies: *IG* 12.2.35[A], 12.2.35[B] and 12.2.35[C].

[3] Bowersock 1965: 36.

[4] Gow-Page 1968: 210.

[5] Gow Page 1968[I]. When referencing Gow-Page 1968 in the text, I refer to volume II.

[6] E.g. Bowie 2008, 2011, Höschele 2011, Swain 1996, Whitmarsh, 2010, 2011, 2017.

[7] De Jonge 2020: 3. The 2011 volume by Schmitz and Wiater exemplifies the complexity and richness of this theme.

[8] On the topic of migrant literature, see De Jonge 2020.

1. WAGING WARS AND EXPANDING EMPIRES

Crinagoras frequently addresses war and military victories in his poetry. Warfare is sometimes mentioned in passing, and sometimes it is even the central theme in poems 10, 11, 21, 25-29, and 37. By alluding to the military activity of Rome, Crinagoras directly and indirectly shows his view on Roman imperialism. He praises the victories and army generals, as well as the Roman emperors responsible for defeating other peoples. At the same time, however, I will argue that his poems also appear to question Roman military rule, for instance by drawing attention to the fate of the defeated and subjected people. My reading in this chapter will suggest that Crinagoras' poems could also be read as a critique of Rome's military power. I will zoom in on poems 26, 27 and 28 for this analysis.

Throughout these poems we find some recurring forms, themes and literary devices. First of all, Crinagoras structures the poems clearly and deliberately.[9] The arrangement and the build-up of the epigram does not always have the same effect, so I will look at each poem individually, but the structure is always suggestive and telling. Another feature I will focus on is the perspective within the poems. Whose perspective is voiced and how does this affect our interpretation of what is being said? Moreover, in all three poems that I will discuss, nature and landscape play an essential role. Crinagoras evokes a spatial setting that invites us to think about Rome's impact on the world and the people living in it. Finally, Crinagoras gives attention to the peoples that are conquered by Rome. By laying focus on the victims of war or contrarily by suggestively leaving the people unmentioned, the author invites his audience to think of the effects of war on those whose habitat Rome has just conquered.

Crinagoras 26 (*AP* 9.283)

Οὔρεα Πυρηναῖα καὶ αἰ βαθυαγκέες Ἄλπεις,
αἳ Ῥήνου προχοὰς ἐγγὺς ἀποβλέπετε,
μάρτυρες ἀκτίνων, Γερμανικὸς ἃς ἀνέτειλεν
ἀστράπτων Κελτοῖς πουλὺν ἐνυάλιον.
Οἱ δ' ἅρα δουπήθησαν ἀολλέες, εἶπε δ' Ἐνυώ
Ἄρεϊ 'τοιαύταις χερσὶν ὀφειλόμεθα.'

Pyrenean mountains and Alps with deep valleys,
which look at the floods of the Rhine nearby,
you are the witnesses of the rays, which Germanicus made rise
while flashing great battle against the Celts.
They fell all together with heavy sound, and Enyo said
to Ares: 'to such hands are we indebted.'[10]

[9] See Ypsilanti 2018: 20 for a discussion of the careful construction and structure in Crinagoras' poetry.
[10] Translations are my own, but I have made use of the translations by Gow-Page and Ypsilanti.

It is much contested what historical events this poem might refer to and who this Germanicus is. Several options have been put forward, of which two seem to be favoured.[11] In both cases Germanicus is taken to be Germanicus, son of Drusus and Antonia Minor. The events could refer to his victory in 15-16 CE against the Germans, who would then curiously, though not uniquely, be called Celts here. However, the reference to the Alps and Pyrenees is out of place for a Germanic victory and is more likely to apply to Gaul.[12] Another plausible option would be a Gallic uprising when Germanicus was in Gaul in 13-14 CE, although an important objection is that these events are not recorded anywhere else.[13] Which of these events instigated the writing of this poem does not affect my analysis of it.

The poem consists of three neatly separated couplets. In the first couplet natural and geographical elements are on the foreground. The mountain ranges are described as looking upon the nearby Rhine. This couplet sets the stage for the events witnessed by the mountains. The middle couplet talks of the central event: Germanicus' victory over the Celts. Germanicus is said to raise rays, both of light and of battle, thus combining the natural element of the first half of the poem with the war theme that is central in the second half. The poem ends with a couplet which shifts the focal point yet again. It zooms in on the fallen Celts, the conquered people, followed by a reflection by two gods. Line 4, 5 and 6 all feature one (embodiment of a) war deity: Enyalios, Enyo and Ares. Enyalios is an epithet of Ares, but is also used as a word for battle.[14] The final position of Enyalios and Enyo in lines 4 and 5 adds to the emphasis on warfare, which has an omnipresent or all-important impression in this epigram. In short, the poem builds up by setting the stage, presenting the main action, and reflecting on what happened.

There is a strong epic tone in the poem, especially in the second half. The exchange between the two gods calls to mind many Homeric scenes of gods reflecting on the earthly events just described. On a word level, ἀστράπτων … ἐνυάλιον (l. 4) seems to combine Greek epic imagery with a Latin expression used for conquerors.[15] Several expressions are chosen for their Homeric or epic colour, such as πουλὺν ἐνυάλιον (l. 4) and οἱ … ἀολλέες (l. 5) and the common Homeric formula οἱ δ' ἄρα (l. 5).[16] Moreover, ἀολλέες is always found in this metric position in epic texts.[17]

[11] Ypsilanti 2018: 270-4 discusses and evaluates the different options that have been put forward, supported, and rejected by scholars over time. Gow-Page, Barnes, Gandini favour the events of 13-14 CE, also supported by Bowie 2011: 186. However, Mommsen, Rubensohn, Stadtmüller, Cichorius, the Budé commentators, Beckby, Syme, and Ypsilanti herself favour the other option in 15-16 CE.
[12] Gow-Page 1968: 134; Ypsilanti 2018: 271.
[13] Gow-Page 1968: 235-6; Ypsilanti 2018: 273.
[14] LSJ, "Ἐνυάλιος" A 1 (epithet) and 2 (battle).
[15] Ypsilanti 2018: 275-6.
[16] Gow-Page 1968: 236; Ypsilanti 2018: 276-7.
[17] Ypsilanti 2018: 277.

The Homeric and epic tone in this epigram further foreground the theme of warfare, also accomplished by the mention of a war deity in each of these last three lines.

It is interesting, then, to look at how this war-themed poem is presented. The battle between Germanicus and the Celts is observed by the mountain ranges in the first verse, the personified Pyrenees and Alps. The narrator does not directly relate the events, but addresses the natural entities in the vicinity of the battle as a go-between. Space does not merely function as a backdrop for the scene, but, taking De Jong's theory on space, this personification of nature is a "particular form of semantic loading of space".[18] By employing the mountains as an intermediary, Crinagoras distances himself from what happened and how it happened, and he does not offer a value judgement of it. It is not the poet or the lyrical subject, but the unmoving and unspeaking mountains which witness the military success of the Romans and the heavy loss of the Celts. I would argue that this creates not only a geographical distance (the battle scene is set far away in the outskirts of the empire) but also a moral one (an implicit negative value judgement).

In the last couplet, we see another outside perspective, namely that of the gods Enyo and Ares, who reflect on the battle. Enyo's quote is up for interpretation, due to the different meanings of ὀφειλόμεθα. They either owe *help* to such a successful army leader, or, according to a different interpretation, they owe their *strength* or very *existence* to such a military figure.[19] Both interpretations do not shed a positive light on Germanicus and his victory, for the following reason.

The duo Ares and Enyo had a negative reputation, unlike – and indeed through opposition with – the war goddess Athena. Homer describes Ares as "the personification of the fury of war and of devastation. […] War under the cruel aegis of [Ares] produces the most repellent effects: the untrammelled rage of battle, anarchy, the absence of strategy and self-control."[20] In fact the only passage in Homer's *Iliad* where Ares and Enyo appear together (*Il.* 5.592), shows the two gods fighting on the Trojan side, with Athena and Hera on the Greek side. Because of the great bloodbath created by Ares, Hera and Athena want to stop him, at which they later succeed. When Ares then tries to gain Zeus' pity, he instead receives the following reply:

---

[18] De Jong 2012: 16-7, where she defines the sixth function of space as "*personification* (or *pathetic fallacy*), the projection of qualities normally associated with human beings upon inanimate objects or nature, and animals". Personification is omnipresent in Greek literature and can be either "a literary device or a mode of thought, i.e. a manifestation of the ease with which the Greeks anthropomorphise nature." I would judge this case to be a literary device, employed for its added meaning.

[19] The interpretation that Enyo and Ares owe their strength to Germanicus is not favoured by either Gow-Page 1968: 238 or Ypsilanti 2018: 278, the latter saying it "would make a rather flat and unsophisticated piece of flattery". This evaluation discards the critical reading that I here suggest, based on the intertextual reference to the Homeric episode discussed below.

[20] Witthaus 2011: A.

ἔχθιστος δέ μοί ἐσσι θεῶν οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν:
αἰεὶ γάρ τοι ἔρις τε φίλη πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε.
μητρός τοι μένος ἐστὶν ἀάσχετον οὐκ ἐπιεικτὸν
Ἥρης:

"To me, you are the most hateful of the gods that inhabit the Olympus;
for strife and wars and battles are always dear to you.
You have the unmanageable and intolerable spirit of your mother Hera."[21]

The strong Homeric sphere in poem 26, the mention of both Ares and Enyo – a duo that in Homer only appears in the negative passage above –, perhaps along with a smaller intertextual reference to δούπησεν in the same battle scene,[22] make it likely that Crinagoras indeed refers to this passage. He alludes to a negative story about Ares, which Zeus himself strongly disapproves of. This does not cast a positive light on the battle between Germanicus and the Celts either. Germanicus is compared to Hector and both are helped by Ares, whom Hera in the *Iliad* calls a madman that does not obey the law.[23] Are the Celts then compared to the Greeks who stood no chance in the face of Hector and Ares in the violent and unfair battle?

The Celts are mentioned by name in line 4. In line 5 the author zooms in on these victims, either to glorify the military power of the Romans or to evoke sympathy for the fallen people. Certainly in light of the Homeric passage evoked here, it seems likely that the latter is the case. It is noteworthy that the Celts are said to be all together (ἀολλέες), against Germanicus who seems to operate on his own – his troops are nowhere mentioned. The interpretation is not unambiguous. It could magnify Germanicus' military prowess (one man slays hundreds of people), or in a more negative light it might lay blame on Germanicus for waging an unfair war that leaves a mass of victims.

In short, this poem focusses on warfare, through the narrative itself, the structure of the poem which stages the battle as the main event in the middle couplet, the epic and Homeric references, and the strong presence of Greek war deities. The poem includes ambiguous and ambivalent notions, which can serve opposite purposes. At first sight the poem seems to praise Germanicus' great victory, but the audience is also invited to look at the other side of the coin. By focussing on the environment of the battle – the mountains and rivers in the first verse and the Celts, the victims of this war, in the last verse – Crinagoras sheds light on the negative side of war, the impact of warfare on the world. The battle and Germanicus' victory are presented through the lens of unspeaking natural elements in the region concerned, which detaches the historical events from the author and audience. Is Crinagoras thereby casting doubt on the war acts or their legitimacy?

[21] Hom. *Il.* 5.890-3.
[22] Hom. *Il.* 5.617, mirrored by δουπήθησαν in line 5 of Crinagoras' current epigram.
[23] ἄφρονα … ὃς οὔ τινα οἶδε θέμιστα, Hom. *Il.* 5.761.

A further argument for this interpretation is the intertextual reference to the Homeric episode. Ares helps Hector on a trail of destruction and is called the most hateful of the gods by Zeus himself. Crinagoras may thus frame the current battle as equally unfair and illegitimate.

Crinagoras 27 (*AP* 9.291)

Οὐδ' ἢν Ὠκεανὸς πᾶσαν πλήμυραν ἐγείρῃ,
    οὐδ' ἢν Γερμανίη Ῥῆνον ἅπαντα πίῃ,
Ῥώμης δ' οὐδ' ὅσσον βλάψει σθένος, ἄχρι κε μίμνῃ
    δεξιὰ σημαίνειν Καίσαρι θαρσαλέη.
Οὕτως καὶ ἱεραὶ Ζηνὸς δρύες ἔμπεδα ῥίζαις
    ἑστᾶσιν, φύλλων δ' αὖα χέουσ' ἄνεμοι.

Not even if Ocean would stir up the whole flood,
    not even if Germany would drink the whole Rhine,
not in the least would it hurt the might of Rome, so long as she stands
    confident in Caesar, that he gives right orders / favourable omens.
Even so the holy trees of Zeus stand steadfast with roots,
    and the winds scatter the dry leaves.

The events alluded to – a flood or storm (πλήμυραν) and a Germanic uprising that may be referred to in line 2 – cannot be tied to specific historical events with certainty. Of the several suggestions put forward, Gow-Page and Ypsilanti conclude that events in 15-16 CE are among the most plausible.[24] In that case, the poem alludes to Germanicus' forces struggling against Arminius near the Rhine in 15 CE and Vitellius almost losing two legions to a flood on the North Sea soon after. A year later Germanicus' fleet suffered losses in a sea storm. Rome did win a victory against the Germans that same year. Several or all of these events could well have been Crinagoras' inspiration for the current poem.

This poem, too, has an epic and Homeric flavour. The simile is perhaps most telling, reminding the audience of Homeric similes. Other examples are the use of κε for ἄν in line 3 and the Homeric words θαρσαλέη (l. 4), ῥίζαις (l. 5), and αὖα (l. 6).[25] The relation or connection between humans and gods may likewise call to mind Homeric scenes. All these Homeric allusions again increase the epigram's focus on heroism and war.

In this poem it is harder to establish through which lens we see the events. In fact, we do not see anything happening in reality, as this poem portrays an impossible reality. Most of the poem is set in the natural world, at the edges of the empire and in the divine domain, which distances the writer and audience from what is actually described. The central couplet is about Caesar and

[24] Gow-Page 1968: 237-8; Ypsilanti 2018: 281-2.
[25] Ypsilanti 2018: 287, 290.

Rome, but in quite an abstract way. The citizens of Rome are not mentioned except through the collective of Rome. The same applies to the people in Germany, who are also only referred to with a geographical name.

The structure in this epigram is careful and clear. The first couplet states the impossible conditions for an impossible situation, an adynaton.[26] This rhetorical device seeks to present a situation as impossible or absurd by juxtaposing it with natural impossibilities.[27] The two negative conditions are stated in parallel sentences in lines 1-2, structured by the identical start of the lines, with the words οὐδ' ἢν. Each line ends with a subjunctive form (ἐγείρῃ, πίῃ). The conditions concern potential threats, both of which are geographical and natural, namely the Ocean stirring up a flood and Germany drinking the Rhine. Drinking from a river may simply denote inhabiting that region, but in this case it seems more likely that an actual threat is meant. Several translations would suit this interpretation. Drinking *all* of the Rhine could imply the Germans grew massive in number, posing a threat to Roman power. It may also imply "an enormous [German] invasion across the Rhine", a sense that is also present in Herodotus.[28]

The second part of the adynaton is found in the second couplet: the statement that Rome will remain invincible. The adynaton is used to affirm Rome's power: not even if the impossible threats in lines 1-2 should happen, will Rome be overthrown.[29] The statement in line 3 is accompanied by a positive condition: as long as Rome trusts Caesar. This condition also ends with a subjunctive (μίμνῃ), further connecting it to the first two lines. Rome (l. 3) and Caesar (l. 4) are each the subject of one full line. They embody the city and imperial power.

The third couplet reaches a conclusion by a comparison. It takes the audience back to the natural realm, featuring elements of trees (δρύες) and winds (ἄνεμοι). Through this composition, the power of Rome is surrounded by natural elements. At the same time this last couplet elaborates on and amplifies the urban power, elevating it to a divine dimension by the comparison with Zeus' unweathering power. The comparison takes up line 5, with an ambiguous appendix in line 6, which can be read in different ways. The winds that scatter the dry leaves of Zeus' trees can

[26] Ypsilanti 2018: 279, 282-3.

[27] Rowe 1965: 387, 395, who makes use of the definition of Ernest Dutoit.

[28] Gow-Page 1968: 236-7; Ypsilanti 2018: 284-5. Hdt. 7.21: κοῖον δὲ πινόμενόν μιν ὕδωρ οὐκ ἐπέλιπε, πλὴν τῶν μεγάλων ποταμῶν; The meaning is here that the rivers are drunk dry by Xerxes' invading troops.

[29] I say 'impossible' threats here, although we have seen that there is a range of suggested historical events that these lines could allude to. However, the dangers are phrased in an exaggerated way: Ocean stirring up the *whole* flood, Germany drinking the *whole* Rhine. It is the magnitude of the threats that makes them impossible. See also Cichorius 1922: 309: "Deren näheren Charakter ist aus den beiden vom Dichter aufgestellten, aber von ihm selbst für gänzlich ausgeschlossen betrachteten hypothetischen Annahmen zu entnehmen, daß nämlich der Ozean all seine Sturmflut aufpeitschen sollte, und daß Germanien den ganzen Rhein trinken sollte." He also argues that something grave must have happened, "nicht gerade in dem Maße, wie es der Dichter hier als undenkbar hinstellt, aber doch immerhin bis zu einem gewissen Grade."

be seen as an affirmation of his power (even though it blows away part of the trees, they still stand firm), as an amplification of power (without dry leaves a tree can blossom more and grow stronger), or as a possible threat (they now scatter the dry leaves, so might they do more damage later?). Ypsilanti notes that the last word of the poem, ἄνεμοι, "recalls the Ocean's πλήμυραν of the first line … so that the poem opens and closes with the idea of similar and akin fierce natural elements."[30] Thus the city and imperial power are surrounded not just by natural elements, but also by potential threats.

To zoom in on the role of nature, I want to go back to De Jong's distinction of functions of space. We can ascribe a symbolic function to the current epigram, in which space "becomes semantically charged and acquires an additional significance on top of its purely scene-setting function. Notions, often oppositionally arranged, such as […] city versus country […] become negatively or positively loaded".[31] The nature described in the first and last couplet is not just meant to set the scene, but through the build-up of the epigram it functions as a contrast with the city and imperial power. Whitmarsh, too, argues that "[i]n the more controlled, contained world of epigram, the submission of the natural world occurs in more managed contexts: particularly significant is the space of the Roman arena, as a circumscribed site of confrontation between imperial power and the natural order".[32] To be more precise, the contrast is not simply between city and nature, but the power of Rome is juxtaposed with the frontiers of the empire in the first couplet and with the divine realm in the last. References to a Roman victory in an area such as Germany, just outside the empire's borders, can be seen as praise of Rome's military power. However, by encircling Rome and Caesar within a natural environment, Crinagoras connects the first and last couplet, thus suggestively placing the natural forces in enemy territory on par with the divine power of Zeus.

Of course it is Caesar who is explicitly compared with Zeus. The comparison is multi-layered. The two are the heads of their respective (supposedly) infallible hierarchical power structures, one in the human realm, the other in the divine. In addition, he simile focuses on divination. The holy trees of Zeus (ἱεραὶ Ζηνὸς δρύες, l. 5) are the oaks in Dodona, an ancient oracle of Zeus.[33] Caesar's prophetic capacities are alluded to by using the ambivalent phrase δεξιὰ σημαίνειν in line 4, which carries both the meaning of giving right orders and giving favourable omens.[34] It has been suggested that this phrase might intertextually refer to δεξιὰ σημαίνει in Aratus.[35] This would strengthen the hypothesis that the present Caesar is Germanicus, who translated Aratus'

[30] Ypsilanti 2018: 280.
[31] De Jong 2012: 15.
[32] Whitmarsh 2011: 203.
[33] LSJ, "δρῦς" A; Ypsilanti 2018: 289.
[34] Gow-Page 1968: 238.
[35] Aratus, *Phainomena*, l. 6. This was first suggested by Stadtmüller 1906: 242.

Phaenomena himself.[36] In Aratus' work the passage refers to Zeus, so alluding to it here would suggest another connection between Caesar and the highest god.

The comparison is ambivalent. If an earthly emperor is said to be as good or authoritative a leader as Zeus is in the divine realm, that is indeed a great compliment. Of course, when making use of a comparison, the reader is invited to think of the applicability and fittingness of that simile. As Whitmarsh has noted, "the idea of a providentially governed cosmos could of course easily be co-opted as an analogy for the benign functioning of empire, but it could just as well function as a counterpoint, indicating by contrast just how unstable and capricious mortal governance is."[37] Here we might indeed have one example of how the cosmos can be used for discursive critique. Caesar is equated with Zeus, but the audience is implored to question this equation. Can anyone truly be Zeus' equal?

Moreover, Rome's wellbeing relies on her trust in Caesar giving favourable omens or right orders. This is not a secure position. In the case of giving omens, these could easily change if the gods are no longer benevolent towards the imperial leader. Earthly and imperial fate will always depend on the gods. Besides, the city's trust is not taken for granted here. Cichorius notes the precariousness of this trust as well (taking δεξιὰ σημαίνειν to mean 'commanding what is right'): "Diese ernste Mahnung, Rom solle fest im Vertrauen darauf verharren, daß der Kaiser Rechtes befehle, nötigt zumal bei einem Dichter wie Krinagoras, wo alles und jedes in den Gedichten seinen realen Hintergrund und seine reale Grundlage hat, unbedingt zu der Annahme, daß im damaligen Augenblicke jenes Vertrauen auf die Gerechtigkeit und die Richtigkeit der kaiserlichen Anordnungen eben nicht unbedingt und nicht in allen Kreisen bestanden hat."[38] Cichorius tentatively suggests that the political climate was at the time not in favour of Rome's regime.[39] Whether dissent was indeed felt "in weiten Kreisen" or this was a sentiment of a smaller scale, Crinagoras acknowledges – or even plants – a seed of doubt in his poem.

At first sight the poem seems to praise and acknowledge beyond doubt the might of Rome: nothing can stand in her way. However, Crinagoras also seems to shed light on possible critique and uprising throughout the poem. The first couplet immediately shows two possible threats to Rome. One is a great natural force, the flood of the Ocean.[40] The other is presumably a human threat, mentioned metonymically under its country's name. We should certainly keep its inhabitants in mind here; they are the ones drinking the Rhine, and – it may be suggested –

[36] Gow-Page 1968: 238; Hurka 2012: C1.3; Ypsilanti 2018: 287.
[37] Whitmarsh 2013: 68.
[38] Cichorius 1922: 311.
[39] Cichorius 1922: 311-2.
[40] Just like Germany drinking the Rhine, the Ocean's flood could be used metaphorically too, "implying a 'flood' of enemies, presumably in a coastal area", Gow-Page 1968: 236. However, even if that is the case, Crinagoras deliberately presents the threats as natural forces.

potentially invading the empire. In the second couplet these threats are denied their power to overthrow Rome, but one can wonder how innocent these scenarios really are. Besides, Rome is only invincible as long as the city keeps faith in Caesar. This formulation invites a critical reading, perhaps it was even the reflection of a popular political sentiment in Rome. Crinagoras' words imply that as soon as Caesar does not act right anymore or as soon as Rome loses her trust, the city may falter and fall after all. Finally, the wind scattering dry leaves from Zeus' trees can be seen as a potential threat: it does have *some* effect on the steadfast trees. Especially in connection with the first couplet, the reader is made to wonder how powerless the natural forces at play truly are. The city of Rome and the imperial power are enclosed by brutal natural forces. In this way, the space may be used to present the threats looming over the empire. One last remark is to note that Ocean as well as the winds can also be seen as gods – and no human empire is ever completely safe from the power of gods.

Crinagoras 28 (*API* 61)

ἀντολίαι δύσιες κόσμου μέτρα· καὶ τὰ Νέρωνος
ἔργα δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἵκετο γῆς περάτων.
ἥλιος Ἀρμενίην ἀνιὼν ὑπὸ χερσὶ δαμεῖσαν
κείνου, Γερμανίην δ' εἶδε κατερχόμενος.
δισσὸν ἀειδέσθω πολέμου κράτος· οἶδεν Ἀράξης
καὶ Ῥῆνος δούλοις ἔθνεσι πινόμενοι.

Sunrises and sunsets are the limits of the world; and the deeds
of Nero passed through both boundaries of the earth.
As it rose, the sun saw Armenia subdued under his hand,
and as it set, it saw Germany.
Let us sing of the twofold victory of war; the Araxes
and the Rhine know, being drunk by enslaved peoples.

The events related in this poem, one Roman victory in Armenia and one in Germany, can almost certainly be attributed to Tiberius, called Nero here. His victory in Armenia can be dated to 20 BCE, the year in which this future emperor asserted Roman control over Armenia. As for the victory in the other part of the empire, there are multiple options, as Tiberius fought in the West on several occasions. However, the poem suggests that the victories took place not long after each other, so the most likely option would be the campaign of 16-15 BCE to Gaul and to the Rhine valley.[41]

[41] Gow-Page 1968: 239 and Ypsilanti 2018: 292 discuss the possibilities and conclude that this is the most likely historical basis.

The epigram is neatly divided into three couplets. The first couplet emphasizes the broad range of the Roman empire, as Nero's victories go beyond the bounds of the world: from sunrise to sunset, from East to West. This is underlined by starting the poem with a juxtaposition of the two extremities in an asyndeton, ἀντολίαι δύσιες (l. 1), as well as by ἀμφοτέρων in line 2. The two opposites are called the ends of the world twice: κόσμου μέτρα in line 1 and γῆς περάτων in line 2. Nero's deeds, mentioned in the first couplet, are explicated in the second couplet: the subduing of Armenia and Germany. The motive of the sun is taken up again, figuring here as the agent seeing these countries and victories. Ἀρμενίην in line 3 is the land subdued in the East, Γερμανίην in line 4 the land in the West. Again, the two extremes are mentioned in opposition to each other, the one being seen by the rising sun (ἥλιος … ἀνιὼν, l. 3), the other by the setting sun (κατερχόμενος, l. 4). In the third and last couplet, this theme of doubleness and polarity is amplified by the first word of line 5, δισσὸν: a double, twofold victory. Moreover, two rivers, one in each end of the empire, are called as witnesses of what has happened. Once again each side of the world is mentioned in a separate line: the Ἀράξης in the East in line 5, the Ῥῆνος in the West in line 6. Thus the "idea of doubleness and geographical extremity recurs in every single sentence of the poem".[42] In this last couplet the subdued and enslaved people (δούλοις ἔθνεσι) also make an appearance.

Space is omnipresent and all-important in this epigram on Nero's victories. It is "one of the main ingredients in [the] narrative", giving space a symbolic function in the current poem.[43] Every line contains spatial notions: the geographical names Armenia, Germany, Araxes, and Rhine, as well as the broader East and West, and words denoting space (κόσμου, γῆς), and spatial movement (ἵκετο, ἀνιὼν, κατερχόμενος). Whitmarsh comments on this poem: "Here we have political and cosmic space as coterminous, marked by major military defeats".[44] The borders of the empire indeed become one with the limits of the world, or even surpass them, making the empire bigger than the world. Again, Crinagoras dedicates a lot of attention to the world that is impacted by the imperialism of Rome.

It comes as no surprise that the epigram has been called "straightforwardly encomiastic".[45] At first glance it seems to praise and sing (ἀειδέσθω, l. 5) of Nero's victories on both sides of the earth and empire. However, there is reason to question this positive interpretation. Not least of all, we should examine the emphasis on duality, that is accented through the structure of the poem. The current poem is "[p]articularly significant" for Whitmarsh' analysis that the "sense of balanced control, of imperial equipoise between East and West, is replicated in the epigrammatic form

[42] Ypsilanti 2018: 291.
[43] De Jong 2012: 14, this is one of the functions of space that she distinguishes.
[44] Whitmarsh 2011: 205.
[45] Bowie 2008: 231.

itself."[46] Every line is thematized by doubleness or focuses on one of the two extremes. The asyndeton in line 1 (ἀντολίαι δύσιες) and the words ἀμφοτέρων (l. 2) and δισσὸν (the first word of line 5) add to this theme. It is important to note here the additional meaning of δισσός: 'doubtful, ambiguous'.[47] Does the repeated mention of the two geographical extremes merely emphasize the empire's size and twofold accomplishment? Or are we also invited to see the doubleness and dubiousness of the exploits? I would suggest the latter, as an analysis of the perspective and semantic roles in the poem will further show.

This poem mostly presents the perspective of the sun. Sunrises and sunsets are the subject of the first line, and the audience goes from East to West, travelling along with the sun. We then see Armenia and Germany through the eyes of the sun (ἥλιος), the subject of εἶδε in lines 3-4. After the first four lines the perspective zooms out to a general addressee of ἀειδέσθω and then turns to the two rivers, the subjects of οἶδεν in lines 5-6. These natural forces – the sun and the rivers – gain human traits, in that they are capable of perception and knowledge. This is a personification similar to the one in poem 26.[48] The effect is also similar: by telling the story from the perspective of nature, Crinagoras distances himself and his audience from what happened. This distance is continually emphasized by referring to the geographical extremities. Crinagoras can refrain from directly voicing his opinion on the situation by making nature the intermediary. At the same time, by laying emphasis on the battle arena, he shifts attention from the great military accomplishment to the effects and consequences they have on the areas concerned.

Additionally, the semantic roles in the poem are telling for the agency of the different participants.[49] The sun and rivers, subject of εἶδε and οἶδεν are both experiencers. They perceive the actions described in the poem, which is the lens through which we see the victories. In line 2 we find the verb ἵκετο, whose agent is not Nero himself, but his deeds (τὰ Νέρωνος / ἔργα, ll. 1-2). Next, the agent of δαμεῖσαν in line 3 would again be Nero, but he is not mentioned. Instead Crinagoras circumvents this by mentioning his hand, under which (not *by* which) Armenia and Germany are subdued. The subdued countries themselves are the patients here. They do not have agency in a semantic sense, nor – it is implied – in a political sense. This is reinforced in line 6, where the enslaved peoples (δούλοις ἔθνεσι) are in fact the agent of πινόμενοι, but it must be observed that this is grammatically stated in the passive sense. In conclusion, none of the humans that play a role in the narrative – Nero and the enslaved peoples – are agent of an active verb.

[46] Whitmarsh 2011: 205.
[47] LSJ, "δισσός" A III 2.
[48] See note 18.
[49] For an overview of semantic or thematic roles (agent, patient, experiencer), see e.g. Dowty 1986: 340, and more recently Payne 2011: 134-9.

What is the effect of this lack of human active agency? It seems to create a distance from what happened, it zooms out from Nero's or the Roman perspective and instead looks at the battles from the perspective of nature, entities incapable of human speech. Crinagoras may (invite his audience to) question what happened, or how these victories came about. More likely however is that he questions the legitimacy or justifiability of these actions. In the last line he zooms in on the victims, the enslaved peoples. Their lack of semantic agency clearly mirrors their political agency. The focus is not on Nero's successes but on what his conquests mean for the world (the natural elements in the poem) and for the people subdued by him.

Although enslavement was not unique at the time, it is notable that Crinagoras explicitly mentions it here. It may be a device to evoke sympathy for the victims of this war. The Armenians and Germans are said to drink from the rivers, an expression also used in poem 27. In that case it probably meant a certain (human) threat. The question then is whether the current passage also invokes a potential threat, or merely denotes that the peoples live near those rivers. Both options are possible. Crinagoras focusses on the impact of Roman imperialism in the areas newly under Roman control. If the additional sense of a potential invasion is invoked here, it may function to warn the future emperor or to voice the victims' dissent.

This epigram sings of a twofold victory. It praises the deeds of Nero, who surpassed even the earth's boundaries. However, this praise may be veiling a critical view on Roman warfare. The theme of doubleness and duality permeates the poem, accented by the emphatic position of the word διισσός in line 5. This suggests that we should see the victories not only as 'twofold', but also as 'ambiguous'. Crinagoras uses the spatial elements throughout the poem to focus on the natural and geographical environment of the battles, which is where the real impact of Rome's expansion practices is seen and felt. Moreover, Crinagoras pays explicit attention to the less positive side of war and the suffering of the victims, by mentioning their enslavement. Their subsequent lack of political agency is underlined by their lack of semantic agency. All of this could be read as praise of the heroic, powerful deeds of Nero. However, I have argued that this poem may subtly voice critique of the Roman oppression of other peoples.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have looked into three examples of Crinagorean poetry surrounding the topic of warfare and imperialism. All poems above can be read with a positive interpretation, as praise of imperialistic victories. However, Crinagoras undermines this praise and the power of Rome by paying attention to the other side of the battlefield. Important features underlining this second interpretation are the clear structures in each of the poems, the use of space and a strong presence of natural elements, the perspective of the narrative, attention to the conquered lands and people, and intertextuality, mainly in the form of epic and Homeric language.

The composition of the poems forms a clear structure. This causes the narrative in each poem to be short but complete, as well as complex and deep. Crinagoras uses the structure to question the power and imperialism of Rome. The clearest example of this is in poem 27, in which the city and imperial power (Rome and Caesar) are encircled by and contrasted with natural domains and fierce natural powers, potential threats even. In poem 28 the idea of doubleness is found in each line and set of lines, highlighted by the word διισσός in its initial position. This all adds to the centrality of duality and ambiguity.

By taking the perspective of outside entities, often natural ones such as mountains or rivers, Crinagoras seems to distance himself somewhat from the arena. Often the witness called upon is not capable of human speech, which invites the audience to question the deeds or a judgement of them. He uses the space as a shield between himself or the audience in Rome and the acts of war concerned. The poet thus shifts the attention from the military feats to their impact on the world.

Other techniques used to shed an ambivalent light on Roman warfare and imperialism are comparisons and intertextual references. The application of epic and Homeric language is used to strengthen the idea of warfare and can amplify the war general's heroic deeds. However, the specific Homeric passage that poem 26 seems to allude to portrays a divinely condemned war episode of Ares and Enyo. This also casts doubt on Germanicus' war acts. In poem 27 Caesar is compared to Zeus, a comparison which invites the reader to question its applicability. Which human can be truly equal to Zeus?

On top of that, Crinagoras emphatically draws attention to the conquered peoples. He sometimes does so explicitly by highlighting their defeat (δουπήθησαν ἀολλέες, 26.5) or enslavement (δούλοις ἔθνεσι, 28.6). Sometimes, on the other hand, the people themselves are remarkably absent in the text and are alluded to through collective names or metaphors.[50] Furthermore, in two of the three poems interpreted in this chapter, we were able to detect potential threats, like the phrase of drinking rivers in poems 27 and 28, or the precarious conditions for Rome's safety in poem 27.

By such devices Crinagoras elucidates a less popular and less positive side of war and imperialistic behaviour. He subtly casts doubt over actions taken by the war generals concerned. He seems less concerned with praising the imperial acts of war and more with their negative impact on the world and its people. He sometimes even hints at opposition – or divine reprimand – to the seemingly invincible power of Rome.

[50] An example of a possible metaphor for subdued people is the flood, πλήμυρα, in poem 27.1.

2. ENCOMIA OF THE EMPEROR

As an ambassador, Crinagoras came in contact with Caesar and Augustus. Through association with the latter, he managed to climb his way up the social ladder. He took up a more or less permanent position as "court versifier" who wrote about Augustus and his family and friends.[51] Crinagoras found himself in the middle of important Roman families, as demonstrated by the addressees of several of his poems.[52] He addresses Antonia Minor, daughter of Mark Antony and Octavia and niece of Augustus in poems 7 and 12, Augustus' nephew Marcus Claudius Marcellus in poems 10 and 11, and Nero Claudius Germanicus in poem 26. In poems 23, 24, 27 and 36 he mentions Caesar, referring to Augustus and once to Germanicus. Poem 25 is dedicated to Cleopatra-Selenê, daughter of Marcus Antonius and Cleopatra, and Juba II, King of Mauretania. Nero, referring to Tiberius Claudius Nero, features in poem 28, and Augustus in poem 29.[53]

I will examine poems 23 and 24, both addressed to Augustus, under the name of Caesar. They have been read as examples of extreme flattery, but recently, more critical readings have taken over. Bowie, for instance, doubts "if it is right to see these poems as a product of time-serving flattery."[54] Indeed, Crinagoras does not seem to intend either encomium seriously. The animals' perspective, exaggerated notions, intertextual references and the poems' build-up, as well as positioning of certain words undercut the praise and invite the audience not to take the praise too seriously. The question remains whether this is merely a light-hearted, funny form of encomiastic poetry, or whether it voices critique of the emperor. As so often in Crinagorean poetry, behind the initial impression of praise, we may find a secondary meaning that is more critical.

Crinagoras 23 (*AP* 9.224)

Αἶγά με τὴν εὔθηλον, ὅσων ἑκένωσεν ἀμολγεύς
οὔθατα πασάων πουλυγαλακτοτάτην,
γευσάμενος μελιηδὲς ἐπεί τ' ἐφράσσατο πῖαρ
Καῖσαρ, κήν νηυσὶν σύμπλοον ἡγάγετο.
ἤξω δ' αὐτίκα που καὶ ἐς ἀστέρας· ᾧ γὰρ ἐπέσχον
μαζὸν ἐμὸν, μείων οὐδ' ὅσον Αἰγιόχου.

I am the goat with good udders, richest of milk
of all those whose udders the milk-pail has emptied.
Caesar, having tasted and noticed the honey-sweet cream,
led me as a shipmate even on his ship.
I will soon go, I think, even to the stars: for the one to whom I offered
my breast is not the least lesser than the Aegis-bearer.

[51] Bowersock 1965: 36.
[52] Bowie 2008: 230.
[53] See Gow-Page 1968: 217, 220-1, 231-9, 246 for all these identifications.
[54] Bowie 2011: 194.

This poem is about a goat who is taken by Caesar on a travel across the sea and expects to soon be catasterized and make her way to the stars. Caesar likely refers to Augustus, and the journey mentioned here may refer to his trip to Greece and Asia in 22-19 BCE.[55] A smaller, undocumented trip across the sea is also a possible occasion for the poem. The goat may be a metaphor for Crinagoras, who Bowersock suggested may have been a "companion of the Emperor on his travels".[56]

The poem is divided into three couplets, each with its own topic. The first couplet is about the goat and her sublime milk. Her milk is compared to that of all other goats and hers is superior. The second couplet is about Caesar, who drinks this goat's milk. He likes it so much that he takes the goat with him as his travelling companion. The third couplet talks of a different kind of journey of the goat, to the stars. Caesar may make her travel to the sky, like Zeus (the Aegis-bearer) did with the goat that nursed him.[57] This last couplet serves to compare Caesar with Zeus and thus praise the emperor, stating that he is no less than the supreme god.

What is also remarkable about the structure of this poem is the position of certain words. The epigram starts with Αἶγά με, "me, the goat", indicative of the central role of the goat in this poem. The final word of the epigram is Αἰγιόχου (l. 6), echoing Αἶγά in the beginning and enclosing the poem in a ring composition. Both the goat and Zeus are emphasized by these notable positions. The final position of Αἰγιόχου in line 6 also forms the climax of the poem, which builds up from the goat, through Caesar to Zeus. Moreover, by using this epithet to denote Zeus, the god is linked with the goat. Through this "etymological pun" the goat magnifies her pride, "since to the honour of her feeding the emperor she adds the honour of her lending her name to Zeus".[58] Caesar, the other important figure in this poem, likewise is named at an emphatic position, in an enjambement at the beginning of line 4. The delay of the subject as well as the main verb (ἠγάγετο, l. 4), is typical for Crinagorean structure. It "stimulates the reader's curiosity, builds up tension and emphasizes the importance of the action presented in it."[59] Crinagoras plays with the expectations of his audience: in a poem framed around a boasting goat from the first word on, it comes as a surprise that in fact we are dealing with an encomium of the most important man in the empire. This delayed attention paid to Caesar creates a humorous effect.

Perhaps the most peculiar aspect of this poem is the fact that the first-person narrator is a goat. She is the one who talks, we see the world and Caesar through her eyes. She is a proud goat, boasting about her milk with the very rare compound πουλυγαλακτοτάτην, which is only used in

[55] Gow-Page 1968: 231.
[56] Bowersock 1965: 36.
[57] See below, note 62.
[58] Ypsilanti 2018: 250.
[59] Ypsilanti 2018: 20.

Aristotle before and is never attested in poetry except in the present case.[60] This adjective, here even in the superlative, takes up the full second hemistich of this pentameter.[61] The goat then places herself on one level with Caesar, by calling herself a σύμπλοον (l. 4), suggesting their roles are equal travelling companions. The goat prides herself in feeding none other than the emperor himself and amplifies this honour in the last stanza by comparing herself to the goat nursing Zeus.[62] What is more, she expects her merits to be rewarded with catasterism. This extreme level of boasting on behalf of a goat, makes it hard to regard the poem in a purely serious way.

This also applies to the flattery of the emperor. Caesar is compared to the highest of gods, and is ascribed the same power: to catasterize his nursing goat. The comparison is already dubious in itself. Caesar is said to be μείων οὐδ' ὅσον, "not the least lesser" than Zeus (l. 6). Often, a comparison between a human with a god would be stated as being "only lesser than" a certain god.[63] By equating Caesar to Zeus, the reader is invited to cast doubt on the praise. As Whitmarsh, in a discussion of a poem by Antipater, remarks, "Similes are always provocations: how, the poem asks us to speculate, is the mortal-immortal hierarchy 'like' the poet-patron one? And – conversely – in what respects are the two unlike?"[64] Similarly, we should question whether Caesar can be equal to Zeus and how much alike their powers to catasterize their respective goats are.

Perhaps even more importantly, what is the value of such praise when uttered by a goat? This perspective of course changes the tone of the poem drastically. It makes the praise less serious; the voice of a goat adds an ironic and subversive layer to the poem, as several scholars have already noted. Ypsilanti observes that the "tone of the present poem is light, and gentle shades of irony can be discerned throughout", and later that the "goat's exaggerated boasting […] slyly subverts the ostensible purpose of the epigram, that is court flattery."[65] Bowie, likewise, remarks about this poem that "may be read as gross flattery could equally be seen as a humorous scepticism on the matter of the emperor's divinity."[66] The discursive critique can be seen in the exaggerations in the poem, both in the goat's pride and in the compliments to Caesar. The poem can thus certainly be read in a humorous, sceptic or even subversive way. The emperor himself

[60] Gow-Page 1968: 231 note the rarity of the compound. Ypsilanti 2018: 244 adds that it is normally used in prose. A TLG search of πολυγάλακτος shows that all other attestations indeed are prose.
[61] Ypsilanti 2018: 244 makes the same observation about the metric position.
[62] Gow-Page 1968: 232, who mention two intertextual references. The first is Homer, *Il.* 22.83, μαζὸν ἐπέσχον, spoken by Hector's mother to her son to appeal him not to chase after Achilles. The second, more explicit reference is to Aratus' *Phaenomena* 163, αἴξ ἰερή, τὴν μέν τε λόγος Διὶ μαζὸν ἐπισχεῖν, a passage about Amalthea, the "Olenian Goat" who fed Zeus and was catasterized afterwards; Mair 1921: 221, n. a.
[63] Such a comparison is found in Horace' *Od.* 1.12,51 for instance, as Ypsilanti 2018: 250 has noted: *tu secondo Caesare regnes*, "may you reign with Caesar as your second", addressed to Jupiter.
[64] Whitmarsh 2011: 200-1.
[65] Ypsilanti 2018: 243.
[66] Bowie 2008: 234.

must have noticed the witty and seemingly insincere tone of this encomium. How does Crinagoras get away with this? This has to with self-mockery through the figure of the goat.

It would be good to delve a little deeper into this persona. Why is a goat the narrator of the poem? Is it possible that she represents the author of the poem, Crinagoras? Indeed, both the goat and the poet are travelling the (Mediterranean) sea with Augustus, and the milk that the goat feeds the emperor can be seen as the poetry that Crinagoras feeds him.[67] A further indication for this identification is that the goat's milk is called honey-sweet: metaphors of poets as bees and their poetry as honey are widespread.[68] The first two words of the poem, Αἶγά με, "I (am) the goat", support the equation of the goat with Crinagoras. This would yield yet another perspective on the poem: Crinagoras would be boasting about his own poetry and suggest the highest reward, that of catasterism or deification, by his presumably soon-to-be deified emperor. The pride and praise are exaggerated, and unlikely equations are made, undermining the hierarchy, "which will have amused both the emperor and the (Greek and Roman) audience."[69] Because Crinagoras mocks himself through the figure of the goat, he can also safely ridicule the emperor.

The relation between the poet and the emperor is undermined or reframed. Crinagoras was the court poet of Augustus' household, who "turned out a steady stream of short poems commemorating the vicissitudes of Augustus' relatives and friends."[70] The precise nature of the relation between Augustus and Crinagoras is difficult to pinpoint and was not exactly that of a patron and his client. However, "[it] can be plausibly suggested that Crinagoras enjoyed the favour of the Augustan family, probably also expressed with gifts, in cash or kind, which ensured him further social distinction, support and protection. In return, the poet could offer praise and contribute to the poetic immortality of Octavian and his family." [71] Crinagoras was under protection of the imperial family, but still had enough freedom to also write poetry critical of Rome.[72] Whitmarsh' model of gift-giving and patronal poetry may partly apply here: "Gift-giving is a cultural technology, an attempt to impose power, or at least to limit the other's, by defining the nature of the relationship. This goes all the more for a gift that is freighted with cultural self-definition, a present from (in effect) Greek culture to Roman power. This poetry cannot afford to give away too much: while praising, it needs to reserve some critical distance, some bite." [73]

[67] De Jonge 2020: 6.
[68] See e.g. Liebert 2010: 97-8: "The synaesthetic attribution of sweetness to poetry pervades Greek poetics from its inception. […] It is only a matter of time before the poet himself adopts the persona of the bee, culling his songs from the Muses' gardens". This article is also full of examples of these metaphors in or on Greek poetry.
[69] De Jonge 2020: p. 6.
[70] Bowersock 1965: 36.
[71] Ypsilanti 2018: 9.
[72] Ypsilanti 2018: 10.
[73] Whitmarsh 2011: 208.

Crinagoras really does seem to redefine the power relation between him and Augustus through his poetry, the only means available to him. Their relation is still hierarchical, but by putting the goat in poem 23 – and thus himself if we are to read the goat as a manifestation of Crinagoras – on the same level as the emperor, the poet undermines this power structure. He recreates the narrative and by doing so subverts Augustus' position of power. Yet he does so discreetly, layering the poem with the perspective of the goat and by praising the emperor on a superficial level.

The catasterization of the goat calls to mind that of the Lock of Berenice in Callimachus' *Aetia*.[74] The Hellenistic poet starts and ends the second half of his work with a tale on queen Berenice II of Egypt, whose husband was Ptolemy III Euergetes. The *Aetia* thus ends with the story of the Lock of Berenice. It is told from the point of view of the lock itself, who reflects on how the queen dedicated it as a votive offering after her husband's safe return. The lock was then catasterized and has grieved its departure from Berenice's head ever since.[75] The similarities between the Lock of Berenice and Crinagoras' epigram on the goat seem quite clear. Both poems see an unusual persona relating a story about their (hoped for) catasterization, while talking full of praise of their royal owner or close associate. The ring composition of Crinagoras' poem (Αἶγά … Αἰγιόχου) may even reflect the ring composition of Callimachus' *Aetia* books 3-4 with Berenice's tales.

Harder comments that the lock's promotion to the divine realm "may foreshadow the fate of Berenice, who approximately two years later acquired divine status when Ptolemy included her and himself in the Alexandrian ruler cult".[76] In this light, we may indeed expect that Crinagoras' epigram also plays with the idea of divinization of emperors. "The leading men of Greco-Roman society who received divine honours – and these included Crinagoras' older Mytilenean contemporary Theophanes, as well as Caesar Augustus – did not always regard the procedure with utter seriousness."[77] This supports a subversive reading of the poem as a whole.

Crinagoras 24 (*AP* 9.562)

Ψιττακὸς ὁ βροτόγηρυς ἀφεὶς λυγοτευχέα κύρτον
ἤλυθεν ἐς δρυμοὺς ἀνθοφυεῖ πτέρυγι·
αἰεὶ δ' ἐκμελετῶν ἀσπάσμασι Καίσαρα κλεινόν
οὐδ' ἀν' ὅρη λήθην ἤγαγεν οὐνόματος·
ἔδραμε δ' ὠκυδίδακτος ἅπας οἰωνὸς ἐρίζων,
τίς φθῆναι δύναται δαίμονι 'χαῖρ'' ἐνέπειν.
Ὀρφεὺς θῆρας ἔπεισεν ἐν οὔρεσιν, ἐς σὲ δέ, Καῖσαρ,
νῦν ἀκέλευστος ἅπας ὄρνις ἀνακρέκεται.

[74] Ypsilanti 2018: 242-3.
[75] Harder 2012 provides elaborate commentary on the *Aetia*; see e.g. Clayman 2011 for a shorter discussion and summary of the Lock of Berenice. Catullus has translated the story into Latin in his *Carmina* 66.
[76] Harder 2012: 798.
[77] Bowie 2008: 235.

The parrot with human voice left the wicker bird-cage
and went to the woods on particoloured wing;
always practising with greetings of the famous Caesar,
not even in the mountains did it forget the name;
and each bird, quickly taught, ran in strife,
who could be the first to say 'hail' to the deity.
Orpheus persuaded the wild animals in the mountains, but to you,
Caesar, each bird now tunes its voice unbidden.

This poem tells of a parrot who escapes its cage into the wild and keeps repeating its greeting of Caesar, which other birds then learn and echo too. Authorship of the poem is debated: the Palatine Anthology ascribes it to Crinagoras, but Planudes attributes it to Philip.[78] No definitive conclusion can be made, but I here treat it as a Crinagorean poem, as do many scholars.[79]

In many ways the epigram is similar to poem 23. This poem, too, tells the story of an animal persona, who is closely associated with Caesar. In both cases, the animals are foregrounded by their prime position at the start of the epigram. The theme of birds praising an emperor is more common and recurs often in Latin literature.[80] As with the goat in the previous poem, we can identify the parrot with the author. The birds' words in turn are a metaphor for encomiastic poetry.[81] Reasons for this identification will be explicated below. Another similarity between poems 23 and 24 is the hint at the emperor's divinity (the comparison with Zeus in poem 23, the word δαίμονι in 24.6).[82] Besides, both epigrams end with a mythological reference.[83] On top of that, the two poems resemble each other in their interpretation. On the one hand they praise Caesar and have been read as uttermost flattery.[84] On the other hand, Crinagoras employs various devices to undermine the encomium. Several scholars have noted the humorous and ironic tone of the epigram.[85]

There are many indications that we should see the parrot and its fellow birds as an allegory for encomiastic poets. First, the birds are ascribed human qualities. The parrot in line 1 is called βροτόγηρυς, 'with human voice', a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in Greek literature. The birds in line 5 are

[78] Gow-Page 1968: 232.
[79] E.g. Bowie 2008 and 2011, Gow-Page 1968, Stadtmüller 1906, Whitmarsh 2011, Ypsilanti 2018.
[80] See Gow-Page 1968: 232, McKeown 1998: 136 and Ypsilanti 2018: 253 for lists of texts figuring this theme. They include authors like Martial, Persius, Statius. Birds greeting and connecting with other birds also appear more often, such as in Ovid, see McKeown quoted above.
[81] Whitmarsh 2011: 211: "the poem itself participates in an encomium of Caesar".
[82] Ypsilanti 2018: 249-50, 254, including n. 6.
[83] Ypsilanti 2018: 254 n. 6.
[84] See e.g. Albiani 2006, who says "His flattering intention at times acquires grotesque traits", with the examples of poems 23 and 24.
[85] E.g. Ypsilanti 2018: 254: "humour may be at work in the present poem, as well, which would make it comparable to the epigram on the goat (23)."

attributed "adjectives … appropriate for human behaviour": ὠκυδίδακτος ('quickly taught', l. 5, another ἅπαξ λεγόμενον) and ἀκέλευστος ('unbidden', l. 8).[86] The greetings in line 3 and 6 and the sound made by the birds in the last line (ἀνακρέκεται, also a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον) further stress the idea of birds attaining human speech.[87] These allusions give the birds human proportions, but not yet poetic ones. The poetic component is mainly obtained by the encomiastic behaviour the birds participate in (saying 'hail' to Caesar, l. 6), and the reference to Orpheus in line 7.[88] In addition, weaving and baskets are emblematic for (writing) poetry, and I would argue that the reference to the wickerwork cage in line 1 is meant to evoke this connotation.[89] This bird cage further serves as "a Romanised version of the Hellenistic birdcage of the Muses, the 'competition' (line 5) now no longer for philological accuracy […] but for adulation".[90]

It is thus highly likely that we should interpret the birds as an allegory for poets. What then is the image that this poem projects on poetry, patronage and the person honoured by them? The poem "is a version of the pancosmic submission theme […]: Caesar's magnitude is such that the natural order becomes docile, even humanised".[91] The praise of Caesar is enormous, through this suggestion that nature submits to the imperial power. This recalls the dichotomy between city or empire and nature which we encountered in poem 27.[92] The submission of nature, "animals who willingly submit to a higher power", is used as an encomiastic device.[93] For indeed, the fact that the birds praise Caesar on their own volition is the summum of worship. This is emphasized in the last couplet, where Caesar is compared to Orpheus and appears superior.[94] That comparison again serves as dubious praise. In the realm of poetics, no one would be more popular than the most famous mythical singer, the son of a Muse, who was known for charming even nature. To be compared to Orpheus, specifically in this aspect, is either very flattering or, more plausibly, illustrative of the subversive layer in the poem.

---

[86] Ypsilanti 2018: 252-3.

[87] Whitmarsh 2011: 212 connects line 3 to "clamouring poets" within Roman patronage; Ypsilanti 2018: 253 connect the poem's last word to human music making.

[88] DNP-Gruppe Kiel 2006: A: "The core of the [Orpheus] myth is formed by the magical power of his music and song."

[89] Cairns 1984: 103, who says that "weaving is […] a standard Hellenistic symbol for literary composition." Latin works make use of the same imagery, as in the epilogue of Vergil's *Eclogues*, where the weaving of a basket with slender hibiscus (*gracili fiscellam texit hibisco*, *Eclogues* 10.71) "is probably a metaphorical reference, as Servius suggests, to the *gracilitas* (simplicity) of pastoral poetry", Williams 1996: 132.

[90] Whitmarsh 2011: 212.

[91] Whitmarsh 2011: 211.

[92] See the discussion of poem 27 in Chapter 1. See De Jong 2012: 15 on the third, symbolic, function of space, including the usage of opposing notions such as city versus country.

[93] Whitmarsh 2011: 203.

[94] Ypsilanti 2018: 259. Note also the position of the names at opposite ends of the line, Ὀρφεύς at the start and Καῖσαρ at the end.

The tone of the poem is not very serious as we have seen. Gow-Page comment that "[t]he style is pretentious, the language adorned with far-fetched epithets", which is unusual for Crinagoras.[95] With the use of a string of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, rare expressions,[96] and pretentious phrasing[97] – all leading to the "supposed sophistication" of the birds[98] – the poet seems to comment on the language used by encomiastic poets. The praise is superfluous and pompous, making it seem less sincere. This is reinforced by the fact that the praise is uttered by birds, whose speech is described with the word ἀνακρέκεται (l. 8), translated by Whitmarsh with 'squawk': "as so often in the Greek tradition, the assimilation of humans to birds devalues the status of their speech."[99] All that the parrots – the poets writing encomia for emperors and other highly placed Romans – do, is repeat each other. They are "imaged as subhumans, parroting words with phonetic rather than semantic content."[100] In other words, what is the value of the praise of these parrots – or parroting poets – if they only mimic each other's sounds? The words would mean nothing.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have seen that Crinagoras can write an encomium without truly praising the emperor. The two poems center around talking animals, a goat in poem 23 and a parrot in 24. This yields an interesting perspective in the poems. In both cases, the animal seems to represent the author, Crinagoras, and their words are an allegory for encomiastic poetry. Thus Crinagoras comments on the genre while participating in it.

The goat and birds speak highly of the emperor. In both cases, Caesar is attributed superhuman – or indeed divine – powers. He is compared to Zeus in poem 23 and to Orpheus in poem 24. He is even called superior to them, and this is where the praise becomes too much to be taken seriously. The praise is overdone: the goat boasts exaggeratedly and hints at her catasterization and Caesar's divinization. In poem 24 wild birds are turned docile after merely hearing the name of Caesar, an example of pancosmic praise. In addition, the very fact that it is the animals phrasing the praise undermines the adulation. Is there true value in the words of a sailing goat or in the sounds of birds – and thus poets – parroting each other? It must have been obvious to the emperor that the epigrams were heavily ironic.

Crinagoras was able to voice this not too subtle, subversive critique because he framed himself as the animal. By ridiculing himself he provides a safe space to criticize Caesar and the culture of

[95] Gow-Page 1968: 232.
[96] Ypsilanti 2018: 252.
[97] Gow-Page 1968: 232.
[98] Ypsilanti 2018: 252.
[99] Whitmarsh 2011: 212.
[100] Whitmarsh 2011: 212.

encomiastic poetry in adoration of the emperor as a whole. Within this space, Crinagoras redefines the power relation between him and the emperor. Although their relationship was perhaps not patronal, it was still based on gift-giving. Crinagoras' poetic gifts could redefine his relationship with the emperor. He frames the praise and divinization of the emperor as ridiculous. Thus he relativizes and confines the Caesar's power: a comparison to a mythical hero or a god could never be true. Crinagoras "points up the limitations of mortal (including, especially, imperial) boundaries". [101]Even the emperor's power has its limits.

[101] Whitmarsh 2013: 71.

3. CONSTRUCTING AND CONTRASTING IDENTITIES

Crinagoras attaches great value to Greek literature and culture as can be seen from his poetry. In the previous chapters we have already seen some intertextual play on Homer and Aratus for instance. Besides these allusions, he also explicitly mentions several authors: Anacreon in poem 7, Callimachus in poem 11, and Menander in poem 49 (*AP* 9.513). In a more general sense he promotes the art of writing and the gifts of the Muses. Crinagoras encourages Philonides to write pantomimes in poem 39 (*AP* 9.542), and he praises an actor of plays that Menander wrote with help of the Muses or Graces in poem 49. The most explicit instance may be poem 48 (*AP* 9.234), addressed to the author himself, in which he scolds himself for hoping for wealth rather than pursuing the gifts of the Muses. Crinagoras puts the idle hope of riches below (literary) arts.

In this chapter I will first discuss poems 7 and 11 that accompany literary gifts to prominent Roman figures, Antonia and Marcellus. These poems show how Crinagoras values the Greek literary works of the past and how the poet tries to place himself within this tradition. This discussion also looks into the theme of Athens, Attica, and Greece as attested in a range of poems by Crinagoras. The poet firmly places himself in a Greek cultural background and environment. I will argue that he does so as a form of discursive resistance.

Crinagoras 7 (*AP* 9.239)

Βύβλων ἡ γλυκερὴ λυρικῶν ἐν τεύχεϊ τῷδε
πεντὰς ἀμιμήτων ἔργα φέρει χαρίτων
†Ἀνακρείοντος, ἃς ὁ Τήιος ἡδὺς πρέσβυς
ἔγραψεν ἢ παρ' οἶνον ἢ σὺν Ἱμέροις.†
δῶρον δ' εἰς ἱερὴν Ἀντωνίῃ ἥκομεν ἡῶ
κάλλευς καὶ πραπίδων ἔξοχ' ἐνεγκαμένῃ.

The sweet quintet of lyric books in this chest
brings the works of the inimitable graces
– of Anacreon, which the sweet old man from Teos
wrote by wine or with the help of the Desires.
We have come on the holy day as a gift for Antonia,
who is excellent in beauty and mind.

Crinagoras here sends five books as a present to Antonia, on the occasion of a "holy day", probably her birthday.[102] The Antonia concerned may well be Antonia Minor, who was the daughter of Mark Antony and Octavia, Augustus' sister.[103] Poem 12 (*AP* 6.224) is also dedicated to Antonia, a poem

[102] Ypsilanti 2018: 109-10. Other possibilities are her wedding day (which is deemed unlikely as that would have been explicitly mentioned), or public festivities such as the Saturnalia or Maternalia (which is also considered less likely as it seems that the day is particularly special to Antonia).
[103] Gow-Page 1968: 217, 221.

in which the poet prays for her wellbeing while she is expecting a child. She may also be the subject of poem 6 (*AP* 6.345), on the occasion of her birthday shortly before marriage.[104] In the current poem, there is no further indication which might help us deduce the year of composition. She lived from 36 BCE to 37 CE,[105] but the dating can probably be narrowed down to the last quarter of the first century BCE.[106]

The poem starts by naming the gift: books (Βύβλων), a quintet of books to be precise (πεντὰς). These words stand at a prominent position at the beginning of lines 1-2. The literary work that constitutes the gift is written by the Greek lyric poet Anacreon. Lines 3-4 describe the author and composition of the five books. ἠδύς (l. 3) semantically repeats γλυκερή (l. 1), linking the two couplets. The middle couplet is not accepted by most scholars as original, and may instead have been interpolated.[107] One of the reasons to doubt the authenticity of the lines is the different metre, as the lines are iambic rather than elegiac. However, Bowie accepts the change in metre and says it "shows both Crinagoras' virtuosity and his awareness that Anacreon composed in iambic as well as in melic metres."[108] The last couplet describes the recipient, Antonia, who is said to be both very beautiful and very intelligent. These characteristics are reflected in Crinagoras' gift to her, which he describes as ἀμιμήτων ἔργα … χαρίτων, "the works of inimitable graces" (l. 2). He thus starts and ends the poem with the same idea, and connects the gift and recipient.[109]

Antonia seems to have gotten a good education as a child.[110] A literary gift therefore suits her well. Gow-Page note that Anacreon was a popular author among Roman ladies in this period.[111] Anacreon was a poet and musician from Teos, on the Ionian coast, who lived in the 6th and 5th century BCE. In literature, Anacreon was also often portrayed as "the tipsy elderly poet mainly concerned with erotic matters, a friend of Dionysus and the Muses."[112] The middle couplet of the current epigram represents Anacreon precisely like this. Either Crinagoras participates in the tradition of depicting Anacreon in this way, or the couplet is corrupt and a commentator added the standard image of Anacreon. The archaic poet was already celebrated in his own lifetime, and some centuries later, in the Hellenistic period, he became one of the nine canonical lyric poets.[113]

---

[104] Gow-Page 1968: 216; Kokkinos 1992: 11.
[105] Kokkinos 1992: 6, 28.
[106] Gow-Page 1968: 212.
[107] For a discussion of the different views and arguments, see Ypsilanti 2018: 103-4. For an exploration of the metric solutions that this couplet poses, see Ypsilanti 2018: 107-8.
[108] Bowie 2011: 187.
[109] Ypsilanti 2018: 102: "Thus, the gift is presented as particularly appropriate for the recipient and for the occasion, as they all share similar characteristics, *mutatis mutandis*: a sophisticated and excellent present is suitable for a sophisticated (πραπίδων) and excellent lady".
[110] Kokkinos 1992: 10-1.
[111] Gow-Page 1968: 218.
[112] Bernsdorff 2020: 35.
[113] Brinker 2012: A, C.1.1.

Through his gift, Crinagoras can be seen as both acknowledging Antonia's level of education, her *paideia*, and encouraging her literary development.

His choice of gift, however, does not merely say something about Antonia, but also about Crinagoras himself. As Bowie observes, "the choice of a canonical Greek poet, in what may well be the standard Alexandrian edition, both aligns Crinagoras with earlier sympotic poets and gives him a place in a respected Greek tradition."[114] The poet does not only give Anacreon's canonical work as a gift, but adds to it the current poem written by himself. Crinagoras thus places himself within the literary tradition and shows his background as a cultural Greek. As Swain states, "the stability of intention to seem Greek and to be Greek with the past constantly in mind has a clear underlying political significance."[115] After all, (Greek) identity is not something permanent or innate, but it is constructed and fluid.[116] "In literary terms, 'becoming Greek' meant constructing one's own self-representation through and against the canonical past."[117] Crinagoras uses many devices to emphasize the Greek cultural past and position himself in the literary tradition, thus constructing his own Greek identity. Seeing as cultural identity is relative and based on difference, his construed identity also counter-identifies him against his Roman environment.[118]

Crinagoras 11 (*AP* 9.545)

Καλλιμάχου τὸ τορευτὸν ἔπος τόδε· δὴ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ
ὠνὴρ τοὺς Μουσέων πάντας ἔσεισε κάλους·
ἀείδει δ' Ἑκάλης τε φιλοξείνοιο καλιήν
καί Θησεῖ Μαραθὼν οὓς ἐπέθηκε πόνους.
Τοῦ σοι καὶ νεαρὸν χειρῶν σθένος εἴη ἁρέσθαι,
Μάρκελλε, κλεινοῦ τ' αἶνον ἴσον βιότου.

This chiselled poem is of Callimachus; for over it
the man shook all the sail reefs of the Muses;
it sings of the hut of hospitable Hecale
and the labours which Marathon set for Theseus.
May it be for you to gain the youthful strength of his hands,
Marcellus, and praise equal to his renowned life.

In this poem Crinagoras gives Marcellus a work by Callimachus, the *Hecale*.[119] Marcellus can be identified as Marcus Claudius Marcellus, son of Augustus' sister Octavia from her first marriage,

[114] Bowie 2011: 187.
[115] Swain 1996: 89. Admittedly, he speaks of the Second Sophistic, but the theory can be applied to the Augustan era as well.
[116] Whitmarsh 2001: 17-29.
[117] Whitmarsh 2001: 27.
[118] Whitmarsh 2001: 24, Hall 1992: 313.
[119] This work has only been transmitted fragmentarily, but quite a lot is still known of its plot.

making Marcellus the half-brother of Antonia Minor.[120] Besides Augustus' nephew Marcellus also was his son-in-law, being married to the emperor's daughter Julia.[121] Marcellus was popular in Rome, but died at a young age in 23 BCE.[122] This provides us with a *terminus ante quem*: the current poem must have been written in or before 23 BCE.

In the first couplet, Crinagoras presents the poem by Callimachus and talks of its composition. In the following two lines Crinagoras presents the two main themes of Callimachus' work, each taking up one line: hospitable Hecale and heroic Theseus (ll. 3-4). Crinagoras ends by wishing Marcellus the strength and fame of Theseus.

To a certain extent, the poem as a whole may be divided in two parts, with an emphasis on literature and civil values in lines 1-3 and the theme of virility and heroism in lines 4-6. The two overlap of course, with both themes pervading the poem. Virility and strength may be detected in the prominent position of ὠνὴρ in line 2, although it is here applied to the poet Callimachus. The two names that make up the literary theme are Καλλιμάχου at its prominent position at the poem's start, and Ἑκάλης in line 3. One can detect a repetition of the sound (ε)-καλ throughout the poem: Καλλιμάχου (l. 1), ἔσεισε κάλους (l. 2), Ἑκάλης, καλιήν (l. 3), Μάρκελλε, and κλεινοῦ (l. 6).[123] The last two diverge somewhat, but the combination of κ and λ at least is present. This may be done to lay the focus on these two prominent names representing the literary side of the poem – and of Marcellus.[124] For Marcellus' strength and courage were praised, but so were his spirit and intelligence.[125]

Crinagoras' choice for this literary gift is interesting. Callimachus' *Hecale* was popular and many authors – Greek and Roman, Christian and pagan – imitated, referenced or were influenced by it.[126] The work was "not an ordinary epic but a Hellenistic poem whose true protagonist is an old woman living in a humble hut".[127] Callimachus subverts the principle of old that epic was about "great deeds of great men" and instead focuses more on "an obscure pauper" and "the reminiscences of a 500-year-old crow".[128] Hence Marcellus is indeed modelled after Theseus in the poem, but the emphasis lies (at least as much) on the hospitality and the civil virtues of

[120] Kokkinos 1992: 10.
[121] Ypsilanti 2018: 137.
[122] Gow-Page 1968: 220; Höschele 2019: 475.
[123] Höschele 2019: 482 similarly notes the repetition of the καλ-sound.
[124] It should be added that the epigram was presumably performed, so through the way of expression, the poet may have additional effect on the audience. See Bowie 2002: 198: "In many human contexts of exchange […] a very small proportion of verbal acts can be seen as totally neutral."
[125] Ypsilanti 2018: 138.
[126] See Hollis 2009: 26-35.
[127] Höschele 2019: 480.
[128] Cameron 1995: 443.

Hecale.[129] The epyllion is a literary *exemplum* for Marcellus.[130] In addition Hecale's hospitality may hint at the bond between Crinagoras and Marcellus, appealing for Marcellus' hospitality or his visiting the poet.[131]

Crinagoras ties into and comments on several literary debates through this poem.[132] I will not go into detail about these disputes, but the epigrammatist's engagement in them frames him as a learned man who is part of the Greek literary tradition. Moreover, by setting Theseus as a model for Marcellus, Crinagoras seems to imply that Callimachus in turn is an example for himself.[133] Crinagoras "characterizes Callimachus as someone sparing no effort in his poetic undertaking" through the use of the expression (τοὺς Μουσέων) πάντας ἔσεισε κάλους, "he shook all the sail reefs (of the Muses)", meaning that he used every effort, specifically of the Muses in this case.[134] As this phrase often refers to writing epic poetry, Crinagoras here uses it to emphasize how Callimachus' epic was in fact distinct from earlier epics.[135] This could also reflect on Crinagoras' own poetry. Whereas Callimachus reduced the size and scope of traditional epic, Crinagoras scales down even more by conveying the story's essence into six lines.[136] In every way, Crinagoras frames himself within this line of tradition: a "reaffirmation of cultural 'roots'", which is "one of the most powerful sources of counter-identification".[137] Crinagoras' emphasis on his Greek cultural identity simultaneously creates a counter-Roman identity. He sets himself apart from the recipient of his gift.

Of special interest, moreover, is the Attic focus in the epigram, as observed by Bowie: "its second couplet brings together the eponym of the Attic deme, Hecale, the name of the greatest Attic hero, Theseus, and the historically resonant toponym Marathon."[138] The *Hecale* itself already had an "Attic colour and vocabulary".[139] Crinagoras intensifies this Attic idea by condensing it into one couplet.

I will now dive deeper into this aspect of Crinagoras' construction of his Greek identity. For the focus on Athens, Attica and Greek history and culture pervades much of Crinagoras' poetry, as

[129] Callimachus dedicates far less of his work to Theseus than to Hecale and her hut.
[130] Höschele 2019: 480.
[131] Bowie 2011: 188.
[132] For these disputes, which revolve around Antimachus' *Lyde*, see Höschele 2019: 480-2 and Ypsilanti 2018: 138-9.
[133] This was also suggested by Bowie 2008: 231 and 2011: 188.
[134] Höschele 2019: 481. For the meaning of this expression, see LSJ, "κάλως" A I.
[135] Campbell 2013: 206.
[136] Campbell 2013: 206.
[137] Hall 1992: 313.
[138] Bowie 2008: 231.
[139] Hollis 2009: 8-9.

Bowie has shown.[140] Crinagoras touches on Greek epic through reference of a story about Achaeans returning from Troy (poem 2, *AP* 9.429). Another literary reference is found in poem 49 (*AP* 9.513), where he praises an actor of Menander. The epigrammatist also refers to Greek political history: poem 13 (*AP* 6.350) seems to allude to the famous rhetorician Demosthenes and poem 21 talks of famous Greek soldiers of the past.[141] Several cults feature in Crinagoras' poetry: the Athenian cult of Prometheus (poem 8, *AP* 6.100), the Mysteries of Demeter in Eleusis, Attica (poem 35, *AP* 11.42),[142] as well as the cult of Pan in Arcadia (poem 43, *AP* 6.253).[143] In poem 32 (*AP* 9.559) the geographer Menippus of Pergamon is asked to guide Crinagoras on a culturally interesting route through several Greek areas on his way to Italy. The poet laments the death of Greek youths far from home, "in a distant land that has only been brought into Greek horizons by Roman conquest" (poems 15, *AP* 7.371, and 16, *AP* 7.376).[144] Most notable may be poem 37 (*AP* 9.284), in which Crinagoras laments the destruction of Corinth and the resettlement of it by Italians. It is a clear example of the poet's glorification of the Greek past in opposition to the Roman present.

Greek writers looked back at and admired the illustrious past, most significantly classical Athens.[145] They position and define themselves by reclaiming their local identity.[146] Besides contents this can be seen in the use of Greek names for places that were "deep in the Latin half of the empire".[147] Examples in Crinagoras' poetry are the use of Κελτοί for Gauls or Germans in poem 26 and Ἴβηρ for a person in Hispania in poem 16 (*AP* 7.37). Many of these poems are "not so markedly Hellenic" when standing on their own, but they do add to and reinforce his presentation of a Hellenic rather than a Greco-Roman culture.[148] The sum of mythical, historical, cultic, geographic, literary and political references all contribute to the idea of Crinagoras' strong Greek background and living environment.

Interestingly, Crinagoras seems to employ a "regionally unmarked Hellenism".[149] Many Greek regions receive his attention, his own homeland of Lesbos perhaps even least of all, being mentioned just once (poem 16 on the death of a Lesbian youth). For all these sites he adds local

[140] Bowie 2008: 231-3 and mainly Bowie 2011: 186-195. The overview of texts with Attic or Greek flavour is taken from these articles, to which I have occasionally added some remarks or an extra poem.
[141] Interesting about poem 13 is also the comparison of the threefold victory of the addressee from Miletus to the double victories of Etruscans: the Greek trumpeter does better than the 'Roman' ones.
[142] Moreover, Attica in poem 35 is referred to by the name Κεκροπίης, derived from the mythical king of Athens Cecrops, thus further highlighting the ancient history of the city. See Scherf 2006.
[143] The description of the Arcadian landscape in poem 43 is elaborate and receives the most attention.
[144] Bowie 2011: 189-90 on poem 16.
[145] Bowie 1970: 28.
[146] Whitmarsh 2010: 3.
[147] Bowie 1970: 33.
[148] Bowie 2008: 232. The example given here is a prayer to Hera and Zeus in poem 12 (*AP* 6.244).
[149] Bowie 2011: 195.

knowledge of historical, mythical and religious importance.[150] This may highlight a "vision of Greece as a space of apparently limitless heterogeneity [which] can be seen as a deliberate attempt to contest the image of a seamlessly unified, non-diverse empire".[151] He thus employs localism as a site for resistance.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have looked at two epigrams that accompanied a literary gift from Crinagoras to Antonia Minor and Marcellus, respectively. The poet chooses his presents carefully and writes well structured, thought-through epigrams to accompany them. Antonia receives five lyric works of Anacreon, a canonical poet that was popular at the time. This quintet is intended to further develop her literary experience and intelligence. Marcellus is presented with Callimachus' *Hecale*, an epyllion about civility and heroism. These are two sides that this popular young man was praised for. Through alliteration Crinagoras seems to interweave the literary aspect throughout the poem, thus highlighting its importance. Both recipients are exposed to the Greek tradition that Crinagoras supports throughout his oeuvre, be it through gift-giving, allusions or exhortations. It presents the addressees with a piece of tradition that Crinagoras belongs more to than they do. This at least appears to be how the poet seeks to manifest himself. After all, the presents may tell more about Crinagoras than about the recipients.

Since the Hellenistic period, *paideia* became a way of "creating cultural continuity".[152] For a people that was no longer unified in a geographical sense, it comes as no surprise that identity was instead based on a shared culture and history. Certainly in the imperial period, when Rome had political power over the Mediterranean area, Greeks may have reinforced their cultural identity. As true for the Augustan era as it is for modern times, "[c]onsciousness of local identity in the global era has of course been largely produced (and contorted into new shapes) by the very process of globalisation itself, but that does not prevent local identity from being reclaimed as a site of resistance."[153] In other words, especially in the face of a pluriform society, and more so in opposition to imperial Rome, the one big 'other', local identity solidifies and can become a place of resistance.

It is the question then "how far Crinagoras presents himself as a poet who just happens to be writing in Greek, and how far he makes moves that might be seen as emphasizing his Greek identity."[154] The gifts that Crinagoras presents Antonia and Marcellus with are meaningful. The

[150] See Whitmarsh 2013: 65-6 on the power of local tradition and knowledge.
[151] Whitmarsh 2013: 63.
[152] Whitmarsh 2001: 9.
[153] Whitmarsh 2010: 3.
[154] Bowie 2011: 186.

poet gives them works by canonical Greek authors, a tradition in which he seeks to position himself in. As a Greek in a Roman environment, Crinagoras finds himself at the borders of identities and it is precisely "at the margins, that 'Greekness' is most clearly articulated".[155] His manifold references to Attica and Greece strongly amplifies his Greek identification. Crinagoras' self-identification as a cultural Greek can be seen as a way of resistance against his Roman environment. His "awareness of Greek traditions and recurrent use of them in his epigrams" [156] moreover formed site of local resistance: "local spaces could become a site for symbolic resistance to Roman power".[157] In emphasizing this localism, Crinagoras reclaims his Greekness in the face of his Roman environment

[155] Whitmarsh 2001: 24.
[156] Bowie 2011: 195.
[157] Whitmarsh 2013: 68.

CONCLUSION

The question that I sought to answer through an analysis of Crinagoras' poetry was: how does the Greek poet Crinagoras respond to his Roman environment. More specifically, I have looked into the themes of Roman warfare and imperialism (Chapter 1, poems 26, 27 and 28), the figure of the emperor (Chapter 2, poems 23 and 24), and Crinagoras' constructed Greek identity (Chapter 3, poems 7 and 11).

We can distinguish some common features in Crinagoras' response to his Roman environment. All poems seem to project a positive image of Roman rule and society at first glance. However, Crinagoras voices subtle and subversive critique in each of his poems.

War victories are praised in poems 26, 27 and 28, as were the military leaders and emperors responsible for them. However, the poet focuses a lot on the negative side of warfare, the impact that waging wars has for the world around the battlefield and the people living there. This criticism is subtle, but through a meaningful build-up of the poems, negative intertextual references, telling perspectives, and ambiguous comparisons, Crinagoras invites his audience to question the legitimacy of Roman imperialism. The epigrammatist voices potential threats to Roman military power, a way to limit this imperial behaviour. Roman war generals should not and will not keep expanding the empire at the cost of the local people at the edges of the empire.

The Roman emperor in turn is greatly praised by the goat and birds in poems 23 and 24. These animals allegorically represent (encomiastic) poets. The praise of these animals can hardly be taken seriously, not least of all because of their animalistic utterance, decreasing the value of the praise. Moreover, the flattery is exaggerated and extravagant, hinting at the divinization of Caesar and placing him even above the mythical Orpheus and divine Zeus. These questionable and stretched comparisons are not to be taken seriously. Instead Crinagoras uses this hyperbolic 'praise' as a way to redefine his relation with the emperor, signifying that Caesar can in fact *not* be the equal of a god. He limits the power and authority of the emperor. Crinagoras was only able to voice this hardly covert critique, which the emperor himself must have noticed, because he also ridicules himself in the form of the goat and parrot.

Lastly, Crinagoras presents Antonia and Marcellus with literary gifts that particularly suit them in poems 7 and 11. This shows Crinagoras admiration for and consideration of his Roman addressees. He promotes Greek literary works, a cultural tradition that he positions himself in. He uses this as a site of resistance. Through his Greek cultural identification he opposes Roman imperial rule. Crinagoras distinguishes himself from his Roman environment by emphasizing his Greek cultural background and tradition. With the use of localism, he emphasizes that Greece – present in many of his poems – still stands independently, at least in a cultural respect. This shows a limit to Roman influence and power. Rome will never fully control Greece.

In short, on a surface level, Crinagoras praises his Roman environment, including its imperialism, the emperor, and the elite. However, through several devices, he wittily and subtly voices critique. He defines himself as well as his environment. Of course, there is a lot of ambiguity involved here, and Crinagoras will truly have admired certain aspects of Roman culture, identity and life. After all, identity is fluid and Crinagoras will have had "contradictory identities, pulling in different directions".[158] However, we can distinguish a general line of political subversive critique of all aspects of Roman society. In the little space that Crinagoras has within his poetry, he limits Roman control and omnipotence.

[158] Hall 1992: 277.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albiani, M.G. 2006. "Crinagoras" in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's New Pauly*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e623150> 10-08-2021.

Bernsdorff, H. 2020. *Anacreon of Teos: Testimonia and Fragments Vol. I: Introduction, Text, and Translation.* Oxford.

Bowersock, G.W. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World.* Oxford.

Bowie, E.L. 1970. "Greeks and Their Past in the Second Sophistic", *Past & Present* 46, 3-41.

Bowie, E.L. 2002. "Sympotic Praise", *Gaia: revue interdisciplinaire sur la Grèce Archaïque* 6, 169-199.

Bowie, E.L. 2008. "Luxury Cruisers? Philip's Epigrammatists between Greece and Rome", *Aevum Antiquum* 8, 223-258.

Bowie, E.L. 2011. "Men from Mytilene", in T.A. Schmitz and N. Wiater (eds.), *The Struggle for Identity*. Stuttgart, 181-195.

Brinker, W. 2012. "Anacreon" in M.H. Wibier (ed.), *Brill's New Pauly Supplements I – Vol. 5: The Reception of Classical Literature*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-8647_bnps5_e119810> 13-08-2021.

Cairns, F. 1984. "Theocritus' First Idyll: The Literary Programme", *Wiener Studien* 97, 89-113.

Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics.* Princeton, NJ.

Cichorius, C. 1922. *Römische Studien.* Leipzig/Berlin.

Clayman, D.L. 2011. "Berenice and her Lock", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-2014)* 141.2, 229-246.

DNP-Gruppe Kiel. 2006. "Orpheus" in H. Cancik and H. Schneider, *Brill's New Pauly.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e901260> 10-08-2021.

Dowty, D.R. 1986. "Thematic Roles and Semantics", *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 340-354.

Gow, A.S.F. and D.L. Page. 1968. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and some contemporary epigrams* I: *Introduction, Text and Translation*. Cambridge.

Gow, A.S.F. and D.L. Page. 1968. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and some contemporary epigrams* II: *Commentary and Indexes.* Cambridge.

Hall, S. 1992. "The Question of Cultural Identity", in S. Hall, D. Held and T. McGrew (eds.), *Modernity and its Futures*. Cambridge, 273-325.

Harder, M.A. 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary,* Vol. 2. *Commentary.* Oxford.

Hollis, A. 2009. *Callimachus Hecale: Second Edition with Introduction, Text, Translation, and Enlarged Commentary.* Oxford.

Höschele, R. 2019. “Greek Epigram in Rome in the First Century CE”, in C. Henriksén (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epigram*. Hoboken, 475-490.

Hurka, F. 2012. “Aratus and Aratea” in M.H. Wibier (ed.), *Brill’s New Pauly Supplements I – Vol. 5: The Reception of Classical Literature*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-8647_bnps5_ID_0010> 07-08-2021.

Jong, I.J.F. de (ed.) 2012. *Space in Ancient Greek Literature.* Leiden/Boston.

Jonge, C.C. de 2020. “Greek Responses to Rome: Migrant Literature in the Early Roman Empire”, Grant application full proposal form 2020: NWO Talent Programme – Vici Scheme.

Kokkinos, N. 1992. *Antonia Augusta: Portrait of a Great Roman Lady*. Londen/New York.

Liddell, H.G., R. Scott, H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie. 1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford. (online dictionary) <https://philolog.us/lsj/>

Liebert, R.S. 2010. “Apian Imagery and the Critique of Poetic Sweetness in Plato’s *Replublic*”, *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-2014)* 140.1, 97-115.

McKeown, J.C. 1998. *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes* III: *A Commentary on Book Two.* Leeds.

Pantelia, M. (director). 2014. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae.* University of California, Irvine. (digital library of Greek literature) <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>

Payne, T.E. 2011. *Understanding English Grammar: A Linguistic Introduction.* New York.

Rowe, G.O. 1965. “The Adynaton as a Stylistic Device”, *The American Journal of Philology* 86.4, 387-396.

Scherf, J. 2006. “Cecrops” in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill’s New Pauly*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e611670> 14-08-2021.

Stadtmüller, H. 1906. *Anthologia Graeca: Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea* III. Leipzig.

Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*. Oxford.

Whitmarsh, T.J.G. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation.* Oxford.

Whitmarsh, T.J.G. 2010. “Thinking Local” in T.J.G. Whitmarsh (ed.), *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*. Cambridge, 1-16.

Whitmarsh, T.J.G. 2011. “Greek Poets and Roman Patrons in the Late Republic and Early Empire”, in T.A. Schmitz and N. Wiater (eds.), *The Struggle for Identity*. Stuttgart, 197-212.

Whitmarsh, T.J.G. 2013. “Resistance is Futile? Greek Literary Tactics in the Face of Rome”, in: L. van der Stockt, *et al*. (eds.), *Les Grecs Héritiers des Romains.* Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 57-78.

Williams, R.D. 1996. *Virgil: The Eclogues & Georgics*. Bristol.

Witthaus, J-H. 2011. “Ares” in D. van Eijndhoven, C. Salazar and F.G. Gentry (eds.), *Brill’s New Pauly Supplements I – Vol. 4: The Reception of Myth and Mythology*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-8647_bnps4_e133780> 05-08-2021.

Ypsilanti, M. 2018. *The Epigrams of Crinagoras of Mytilene*. Oxford.

Editions

Callimachus, Lycophron, Aratus, *Hymns and Epigrams. Lycophron: Alexandra. Aratus: Phaenomena*: ed. A.W. Mair and G.R. Mair. Loeb Classical Library 129. Cambridge, MA, 1921.

Homer. *Iliad, Volume I: Books 1-12*: ed. A.T. Murray and W.F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library 170. Cambridge, MA, 1924.

Homer. *Iliad, Volume II: Books 13-24*: ed. A.T. Murray and W.F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library 171. Cambridge, MA, 1925.

Horace. *Odes and Epodes*: ed. N. Rudd. Loeb Classical Library 33. Cambridge, MA, 2004.