

**The New Posidippus:
realism in Hellenistic sculpture, Lysippus, and Aristotle's
aesthetic theory (P. Mil.Vogl. VIII.309, Pos. X.7-XI.19
Bastianini = 62-70 AB)**

MARY FRANCES WILLIAMS

ABSTRACT: The new Posidippus papyrus, a third century poetry book, contains in its fifth section nine epigrams on bronze sculpture (Pos. X.7-XI.19 Bastianini = 62-70 AB). The epigrams are linked together by persons, style of sculpture, and vocabulary, and are unified by the topic of artistic realism. Posidippus' fundamental theme is the importance of realism in sculpture, and he is particularly impressed by the style of the sculptor Lysippus. But Posidippus also echoes and apparently follows Aristotle's theories on fine art. Posidippus' epigrams on sculpture as a whole form an important statement of aesthetic theory for Hellenistic sculpture.

1. Introduction

The new Posidippus papyrus, a third-century poetry book,¹ contains in its fifth section nine epigrams 'on bronze sculpture' (ἀνδριαντοποιϊκά) (Pos. X.7-XI.19 Bastianini = 62-70 AB).² Since the epigrams are linked together by persons, style of sculpture, and vocabulary, and are unified by the topic of artistic realism, it is appropriate to regard them as being collected in the order that the poet intended and to interpret them as a whole.³ The poems, which deal with statues of such diverse subjects as the poet Philitas of Cos, Alexander the Great, the god Helios, Myron's famous cow, and a miniature chariot, communicate the typical Hellenistic literary preoccupation with undercutting the noble with the low, but this is subordinated to Posidippus' fundamental theme of the importance of realism in sculpture. A statue of Philitas is remarkable for its realism and its 'character', and it seems so alive that it appears 'about to speak'. A statue of Idomeneus is praised for being so lifelike that the viewer may hear its words.⁴ Other realistic statues include Myron's cow and the self-depiction by the sculptor Theodorus. Posidippus' poems are similar to an art collection; the reader is a

¹ Gutzwiller (2002a) 1.

² Gutzwiller (2002a) 6-8. Parsons (2001) 116-17, 124.

³ For discussion about whether the poems are all by Posidippus, see Ferrari (2004). Two of the poems are so fragmentary that they are not discussed here (69, 70 AB), but it should be noted that the content of epigram 70 AB is consistent with the other poems. The fifth epigram (66 AB) mentions Myron's famous statue of a cow while the eighth epigram (69 AB) deals with Myron's statue of Tydeus; the first and ninth poems (62, 70 AB) mention the sculptor Polycleitus; and the fourth and ninth epigrams (65, 70 AB) refer to Lysippus' famous statue of Alexander the Great. The epigrams are not similar to Callimachus' epigrams (Parsons (2001) 124).

⁴ Gutzwiller (2002a) 7, 9.

‘viewer’ of each statue, as if in a museum.⁵ The poems are on statues that range from sixth- to third-century, but Posidippus unites them by the theme of artistic realism.

All of the poems deal with bronze statues.⁶ The poems are further connected through the fourth-century sculptor Lysippus (370-310 BC), who was the most influential Hellenistic artist and whose school dominated Greek sculpture in the third century.⁷ Lysippus is mentioned three times, as is his realistic style and also one of his pupils, Chares of Lindos (fl. 280).⁸ Posidippus’ topics, such as portraiture, the Colossus of Rhodes, and miniatures, also fit in with his focus on Lysippus since Lysippus was known for his colossal sculptures, which he apparently made popular,⁹ his miniatures, his realism, and his portraits.¹⁰ Lysippus adhered to some traditional aspects of style, such as a canon of proportions, while incorporating innovations like detail and changing proportions to fit his statues into space.¹¹ Posidippus’ statues, from the archaic self-portrait of Theodamus to works by Lysippus’ pupils, are all examples of realism, are models for Lysippus or follow Lysippus’ artistic rules, and are consistent with Lysippean style.

Posidippus’ epigrams on sculpture are unusual because they collectively form an important statement of aesthetic theory for Hellenistic sculpture. The first poem begins with a direct address to sculptors: ‘Mimic these works, sculptors, and leave aside ancient rules for larger-than-life-size statues’ (μιμήσασθε τὰδ’ ἔργα, πολυχρονίους δὲ κολοσσῶν, / ὧ̂ ζῶι]οπλάσται, ν[αί.] παραθεῖτε νόμους, Pos. X.8-9 = 62.1-2 AB).¹² This programmatic statement applies to all the poems that follow and promulgates an artistic theory that focuses on new rules for realism in sculpture. As will be shown in detail in subsequent sections, Posidippus’ use of the word μιμήσασθε (‘imitate’) in the context of setting forth rules for realistic sculpture is an echo of Aristotle, particularly the *Poetics* where sculpture is included within *mimesis* (*Poet.* 1, 1447a18-19) and where Aristotle makes a direct parallel between poetry and fine art (*Poet.* 15, 1454b9-10; 25, 1460b8-11). But Posidippus’ poetic appreciation of excellence in the plastic arts is not merely an expression of his own aesthetic preferences and an acknowledgement of contemporary artistic trends. Posidippus uses technical vocabulary to express artistic theory, and his language suggests that he may have been particularly influenced by Aristotle’s ideas. Since Aristotle states that ‘art imitates nature’ (*Phys.* 2.2, 194a21)¹³ and says that the pleasure taken in a depiction of a human

⁵ Hellenistic rulers collected paintings and sculpture by ‘old masters’ (Stewart (1990) I, 63).

⁶ E.g. χρ[α]λκόν Pos.X.16 = 63.1 AB; χάλκεος Pos. X.23 = 63.8 AB; χάλκειον Pos. X.26 = 64.1 AB; χρ[α]λκός Pos. X.31 = 65.2 AB; ἐχαλκούργει Pos. XI.11 = 68.6 AB; χάλκεια Pos. XI.12 = 69.1.

⁷ Stewart (1990) I, 14-15, 186-7, 289-94, 297-300. Richter (1970) 226-9.

⁸ For Chares and the school of Lysippus see Pollitt (1986) 55; Stewart (1990) I, 297-300.

⁹ Pollitt (1986) 49. Stewart (1990) I, 292; T126 = Plin. *NH* 34.40.

¹⁰ Cf. Stewart (1990) I, 292-3; Richter (1970) 226-9.

¹¹ E.g. Plin. *NH* 34.65. Pollitt (1986) 47. Edwards (1996) 153. Stewart (1990) I, 35, 186-7, 291; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5; T3 = Quint. 12.7-9.

¹² Gutzwiller (2002a) 7; Gutzwiller (2002b) interprets the poems as a whole and finds that they express Posidippus’ artistic theory. Cf. Bernardini and Bravi (2002) 149-50.

¹³ Arist. *Phys.* 2.2, 194a21: ἡ τέχνη μιμεῖται τὴν φύσιν. Atkins (1934) 81-2.

form is similar to that from a real body (*Pol.* 8.5, 1340a23-5), he implies that the mimetic aspect of sculpture and painting is ‘iconic’ and requires a direct correspondence of likeness.¹⁴ Aristotle also believed that realistic *mimesis* provides more pleasure than abstract art.¹⁵ Posidippus echoes Aristotle throughout his poems on sculpture in his interest in realism, his distinction between the heroic and the realistic; the relation between action and character; the importance of realistically depicting ‘better people’; interest in idealized realism; linkage between form and material, and emphasis on the visual.¹⁶

Posidippus’ reference to *mimesis* in poetry in relation to fine art is unique in Hellenistic poetry since *mimesis* never denotes poetic realism, or ecphrastic poetry, or fine art in Alexandrian poetry, and the word is not used in Hellenistic poetic theory. Zanker remarks, ‘the important thing ... is that *mimesis* and its congeners are never used to denote literary pictorialism [in Hellenistic authors]’. Zanker also declares that Aristotle’s form of *mimesis* is not important for Alexandrian poetic realism.¹⁷ Posidippus’ poetry, however, contradicts this statement. His first poem is programmatic for the rest of the poems on sculpture in its emphasis on realism and its interest in rules with respect to fine art.¹⁸ Posidippus’ reference to *mimesis* is also programmatic since all of the poems are concerned with accurate artistic representations.

Posidippus’ epigrams on sculpture are some of the first surviving expressions of art theory in the Hellenistic period and the first that are presented in verse.¹⁹ The use of a series of interconnected epigrams to formulate a coherent aesthetic theory for Hellenistic sculpture is exceptional. No treatises on art survive from before the first century BC,²⁰ and critical writings on art were rare: the fifth-

¹⁴ Cf. Arist. *EN* 6.4, 1140a10. Halliwell (2002) 162-3. Butcher (1898) 124-7, 153.

¹⁵ Arist. *Poet.* 6, 1450b1-4; Webster (1952) 14.

¹⁶ Lysippus and Aristotle had a similar artistic outlook. See Stewart (1990) I, 81, 187 and Schweitzer (1934) 291 on the relationship between Lysippus and Aristotle.

¹⁷ Zanker (1987) 39. Although Halliwell (2002) 264-5 declares that ‘by the Hellenistic period the vocabulary of mimeticism had become part of the lingua franca of Greek criticism and philosophical aesthetics’, he insists that the *Poetics* was little known in the Hellenistic period. It is possible that, instead of having direct knowledge of Aristotle’s theories, Posidippus was influenced by a broader tradition of which we have no first-hand evidence. However, Aristotle’s ideas about art are contained in a number of his works. Halliwell acknowledges the influence of Plato and Aristotle on Hellenistic mimeticism (*ibid.* 289), and Goldhill is open to a relationship between *mimesis* and Hellenistic literature, although he says that the relation between Hellenistic philosophy and literature has been ‘regrettably marginalised in the scholarly literature’ (Goldhill (1994) 207). I have found no examples of μιμίωμαι in archaic or classical inscriptional epigrams and only one instance in a fourth-century sepulchral inscription, where it does not refer to artistic *mimesis* (P.A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculi IV a. Chr. n.* (Berlin & NY 1989), 553 (ca. 350 Attica)).

¹⁸ Gutzwiller (2002a) 7.

¹⁹ Gelzer (1985) 99, 109-10 argues that some art theory is present ‘in disguise’ in Herondas *Mim.* 4 (see pp.8, 13, 15 below).

²⁰ Pollitt (1974) 9. But there were probably discussions among the sophists about *mimesis* and visual art in the fifth century (Halliwell (2002) 120-1). In the early Hellenistic period Duris of Samos apparently wrote on *mimesis* in historiography and art history (Duris *FGrH* 76F1; Duris *FGrH* 76 F89; Halliwell (2002) 289-91 & ns.11-13; Jex-Blake and Sellers (1896) xlvi-xlvii; Fornara (1983) 124-30).

century sculptor Polycleitus was the first known artist to write a treatise on art; he apparently wrote on the mathematical proportionality of the body in sculpture (the *Canon*, which was also the name of an illustrative statue).²¹ Polycleitus' *Canon* (which is now lost) dominated Greek sculpture for a century,²² although ca. 350 Euphranor wrote treatises on *symmetria* and altered Polycleitus' proportions.²³ Silanion also published treatises on sculpture that differed from Polycleitus'.²⁴ But in the early third century the sculptor Xenocrates wrote a work on art,²⁵ apparently praising Lysippus²⁶ for his techniques of *symmetria* (commensurability),²⁷ *rhythmos* (composition), and *akribeia* (accuracy of detail). Xenocrates' writings are now lost, but according to Stewart, his work was the 'first true art history of antiquity'.²⁸ Biographies of artists were also first composed in the third century, and some biographies, such as those of Duris of Samos (ca. 280) and Antigonus of Carystus (ca. 240), contained artistic criticism along the lines of Xenocrates.²⁹ These biographers may have popularized Xenocrates' thoughts and may also have influenced Posidippus. But the loss of their writings makes Posidippus' poems even more fascinating. Posidippus systematically echoes the aesthetic theories of Lysippus,³⁰ particularly in his highlighting of proportionality and accuracy.

Most scholars assume that ties between poetry and art in the Hellenistic period are limited. Hutchinson, for example, asserts that the complexities of Hellenistic poetry, such as the combining of elements, are foreign to third-century art and that the features of poetry are not paralleled in Hellenistic art.³¹ Although Pollitt believes that there was a tradition of literary and rhetorical criticism that developed in the Hellenistic period and used analogies to art,³² in the third century

²¹ Stewart (1990) I, 14, 160-2, 264, T64 = Plin. *NH* 34.55-6; T69 = Galen, *De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* 5. Stewart (1978b). Borbein (1996) 69, 84-7. Webster (1939) 166.

²² Stewart (1990) I, 21; Pollitt (1974) 10-11, 14-21; Richter (1970) 189-91. Borbein (1996) 70 says Pheidias' influence is comparable and that the *Canon* had only slight influence (Ibid, 87).

²³ Stewart (1990) I, 21, 287-8, T117 = Pliny *NH* 35.128-9.

²⁴ Stewart (1990) I, 21, 288-9, T119 = Pliny *NH* 34.81-2; Vitruvius 7 praef.14.

²⁵ Stewart (1990) I, 21; T145 = Plin. *NH* 1.34; T146 = Plin. *NH*. 34.83.

²⁶ Stewart (1990) I, 21 (who believes that Xenocrates' writings are preserved in Pliny), 291, 299-300; T145 = Plin. *NH* 1.34; T146 = Plin. *NH* 34.83; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5. Cf. Edwards (1996) 132-3: *symmetria* means 'proportional distortion'.

²⁷ Stewart (1990) 21 (who believes that Xenocrates' writings are preserved in Pliny), 291; T124 = Plin. *N.H.* 34.61-5.

²⁸ Stewart (1990) 21, 63, 255-6, 299, T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5, T145 = Plin. *NH* 1.34; T146 = Plin. *NH* 34.83; T43 = Plin. *NH* 34.57-8. Edwards (1996) 132 notes that some believe that Lysippus wrote a treatise on art and that his ideas were contained in Xenocrates, but there is no evidence for this.

²⁹ Stewart (1990) I, 21, 291, 299; T124 = Pliny *NH* 34.61-65 (Duris) (Stewart attributes the Pliny passage that cites Duris as a source to Xenocrates); T145 = Plin. *NH* 1.34 (Duris, Antigonus, and Xenocrates).

³⁰ So also Gutzwiller (2002b) 59.

³¹ Hutchinson (1988) 4.

³² Pollitt (1974) 12. According to Pollitt, there were four types of criticism of art in ancient Greece: the artist's tradition concerned with form and design; a philosophical tradition concentrating on the moral value of art; literary and rhetorical criticism using analogies to artistic style; and a popular tradition that dealt with the 'marvelous and magical' qualities of art (Pollitt (1974) 11-12). Posidippus combined the first two of these.

there is no specific evidence for this besides Aristotle's writings of the previous century. The word *enargeia* becomes a technical term, meaning pictorialism in literature in combination with visual accuracy and realism in art, only in the second century,³³ and Philodemus' poetic references to visual realism³⁴ are also later than Posidippus. Although Zanker hypothesizes that poets in the later fourth century were inspired by new developments in art to attempt realistic visual effects in their poetry and to describe works of art in verse,³⁵ the Alexandrian poets did not express theories of art,³⁶ only an interest in verisimilitude and *ecphrasis*. It also was not until the first century BC when Dionysius of Halicarnassus finds similarities between classical prose style and the art of Polycleitus and Pheidias through their 'holiness, dignity, and grandeur' that there was a parallelism in style between the fine arts and literature.³⁷ But Posidippus' epigrams on sculpture show that he was innovative because he used concise and descriptive poetry that contains technical artistic terminology in order to express his preference for realistic art. He also indicates familiarity with philosophical interpretations of art and expresses a coherent aesthetic theory throughout his poems on sculpture.

In sum, Posidippus' epigrams on sculpture, which form a coherent whole, should be interpreted as belonging to the third-century trend of Alexandrian poetry that described fine art. But Posidippus surpasses other Alexandrians through his incorporation of aesthetic theory that is based not only on Lysippus but also on Aristotle. Examination of Aristotle's aesthetic theories shows many interesting parallels with Posidippus' epigrams on sculpture.

2. Art in Alexandrian Poetry

Alexandrian poetic realism, primarily practised by Callimachus, Theocritus, and Apollonius Rhodius,³⁸ includes detailed description of familiar things, being faithful to the credible, and connecting the past to the present.³⁹ Poetic realism also elevated the everyday and the low, and broke rules about separation of genres.⁴⁰ Posidippus belonged to this tradition: his poems on the Pharos (3100-9 (11) G-P) and on Lysippus' statue of Alexander (3150-4 (18) G-P) are examples of

³³ Zanker (1987) 39-41, 47; Zanker (1981) 297, 305. But Aristotle uses *enargeia* ('vividness') with the meaning of visualization through narrative or oratory (Arist. *Poet.* 17, 1455a22-6; cf. *Rhet.* 2.8, 1386a28-b8; Halliwell (2002) 168 & n.45).

³⁴ Philodemus (first c. BC) attacks the idea that visual realism is the aim of poetry (*On Poetry* 5 col.3.12-31; cf. *On Poetry* 5 col.27.17-25; Zanker (1987) 41; Zanker (1981) 304-7).

³⁵ Zanker (1987) 47.

³⁶ But Gelzer (1993) 145 believes that the Alexandrians were familiar with contemporary art theories. Cf. Gelzer (1985).

³⁷ Stewart (1990) 19; T61 = Dion. Hal. *Isocrates* 3; Halliwell (2002) 293-6. In the first century BC, a tradition developed of literary and rhetorical criticism using analogies to artistic style (Pollitt (1974) 11-12).

³⁸ Zanker (1987) 29; Zanker (1981) 305-7. Cf. Webster (1964) 174-5 on Apollonius and 154-7 on Moschus.

³⁹ Zanker (1987) 5-7.

⁴⁰ Zanker (1987) 7.

realism.⁴¹ But the Alexandrians mainly practiced what Zanker calls ‘pictorial realism’: the detailed description of a scene, place, or object with such realism that the reader visualizes it.⁴² Realistic poetry includes ecphrastic descriptions of works of art like Theocritus’ cup (Theoc. 1.27-56) and Europa’s basket (Mosch. *Eur.* 28-36). But poetic depictions of works of art are only a less common subgroup of ‘pictorial realism’.

Nevertheless, most Hellenistic poems on objects of art do not describe the works in detail and are not the best examples of pictorial realism; and Hellenistic poets, despite their interest in art, rarely describe statues even if they do mention them. For example, the series of epigrams on Myron’s cow⁴³ never describe the statue, only its realism.⁴⁴ Zanker asserts:

What is important to note here, however, is that, although these poems are invaluable indexes of the Alexandrian admiration of *trompe l’oeuil*, they in general only actually describe the works of art in sufficient detail to identify them for the reader.⁴⁵

Some poems on art even avoid both description and interest in whether the art is realistic:

[W]hy, at a time when virtuosic descriptions of *trompe l’oeuil* sculptural realism were very much current, does Theocritus make so little of the quality of the artistic representation, of its verisimilitude? Indeed, far from emphasizing the lifelike qualities of the statues, the poet avoids characterizing the figures at all; they remain mere statues with no significant features to speak of.⁴⁶

Several Hellenistic poems deal with Apelles’ famous painting of Aphrodite, the *Anadyomene*.⁴⁷ But these poems merely emphasize Aphrodite’s beauty.

⁴¹ Zanker (1987) 94-5.

⁴² Zanker (1987) ch.3. Visualization is later connected with the Stoic concept of *phantasia* (cf. Imbert (1980).

⁴³ *AP* 9.713-742, 793-798. The sequence includes an epigram by Leonidas: *AP* 719 = 2508-9 (88) G-P.

⁴⁴ Goldhill (1994) 205. Other epigrams about statues include: a poem on Myron’s bronze Ladas, which is ‘just as you were in life, Ladas’ (*AP* 16.54 (date unknown)); Anyte on a statue of Pan (*AP* 16.231 = 19 G-P); Anyte on a relief of a goat (*AP* 6.312 = 13 G-P); and Alcaeus of Messene (*AP* 16.226 = 20 G-P) on a statue of Pan. Alcaeus of Messene’s poem on Eros bound (*AP* 16.196 = 19 G-P) focuses on his bow, quivers, and arrows. Erinna admires a portrait of Agatharcis (*AP* 16.352 = 3 G-P); Nossis (third c. BC) wrote poems about portraits of women (*AP* 9.604-5, 6.353-4 = 6-9 G-P); Simonides wrote on a statue of Pan (*AP* 16.232). For ecphrastic epigram, see Gutzwiller (2002c); Benndorf (1862); Friedländer (1912); Palm (1965-1966); Gross (1992), 139-146; Krieger (1992), 15-16.

⁴⁵ Zanker (1987) 94-5.

⁴⁶ Bing (1988) 118. Theoc. *Ep.* 17, 18, 21, 22 = *AP* 9.599, 600, 7.664, 9.598 = 15, 17, 14, 16 G-P. Cf. Theodoridas on bronze cows by the fifth-century sculptor Phradmon (*AP* 9.743 = 17 G-P); and also an epigram by Alcaeus of Messene on a statue of Clitomachus the pancratisist (*AP* 9.588 = 17 G-P = P. Tebt. 3.13-20).

⁴⁷ *SH* 974 (anon.); *AP* 16.178-182. This sequence includes epigrams by Antipater of Sidon (*AP* 16.178 = 470-5 (45) G-P) and Leonidas of Tarentum (*AP* 16.182 = 2098-106 (23) G-P). Leonidas says only that Apelles’ Aphrodite is ‘not painted but alive’ (οὐ γραπτόν, ἀλλ’ ἔμψυχον 4). A third-century papyrus, BKT v.1 77, contains two epigrams on statues: the first emphasizes the artist’s skill and the second is on the *Anadyomene* of Apelles (*SH* 974). Cameron (1993) 9 & n.30;

Leonidas of Tarentum's epigram on Praxiteles' *Eros* only comments on Praxiteles' love.⁴⁸ And although Callimachus wrote about statues,⁴⁹ he only mentions their attributes and his interest is in antiquity and aetiology rather than in artistic theory.⁵⁰ In Callimachus' poetic dialogue with a statue of Apollo (fr. 114 Pf.),⁵¹ Callimachus is more attracted by the god's words than he is by theories of sculpture or by description of the statue.

Hellenistic poets were disinclined to describe sculpture in detail because of the essential difference between poetry, which involves speech, and sculpture, which is silent. Bing notes that statues are 'fundamentally inanimate objects—fixed forever to a single spot (so Pindar, N. 5.1ff.), immutably and eternally mute'.⁵² Yet the fondness of Hellenistic epigrammatists for writing poems in a dialogue form, usually between a passerby and the stone monument,⁵³ indicates their fascination with the juxtaposition of speech and stone and how an inscriptional epigram enables the mute stone to 'speak'.

The relationship between epigram and funerary and dedicatory monuments provides another reason for epigram's lack of description of art. Since many epigrams originated as inscriptions on tombs designed to inform viewers about the deceased, the poems were linked with stone but were intended to speak about the deceased rather than the grave monument. Although some inscriptional epigrams mention the tomb's decoration,⁵⁴ since inscriptions are necessarily brief, decoration is subordinated to the deceased's life; and most funerary epigrams do not describe the tomb's art, which was in any case often generic.⁵⁵ Moreover, since the inscriptions on some tombs address the passerby in the voice of the statue,⁵⁶ the poetic tradition of talking sculpture that can only communicate through poetry gives primacy to verse over stone. Likewise, a dedicatory epigram has no need to describe the work on which it is inscribed.

Posidippus' epigrams on sculpture are similar to other Alexandrian poems on art because he does not describe statues; he only mentions objects the statues hold and the statues' size, and it is difficult to understand their pose or overall

Gronewald (1973); *APF* 13 (1974) 255. But there is *SH* 988 = P. Tebt. 3.1-12, a poem of a work depicting the death of Phaethon, which showed his skin burning, and was 'like one living' (ζωοῖσι γὰρ εἴκελα τεύξεν (11)).

⁴⁸ *AP* 16.206 = 2510-13 (Leonidas 89) G-P.

⁴⁹ Olympian Zeus (*Iambi* 6 = fr. 196 Pf); the oldest Hera at Samos (*Aetia* fr. 100 Pf. (Trypanis (1978) 75)); cf. fr. 101 Pf.); Delian Apollo (fr. 114 Pf.); Hermes (*Iambi* 7); a small hero (*Ep.* 24 Pf. = 1317-20 (60) G-P).

⁵⁰ Webster (1964) 109.

⁵¹ Zanker (1987) 57.

⁵² Bing (1988) 118. Gutzwiller (1998) 7 & n.23: Roman paintings sometimes depicted the content of epigram.

⁵³ Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2002) 413-23. Literary epigrams do not differ from inscriptional ones (Gutzwiller (1998) 7).

⁵⁴ E.g. Erinna *AP* 7.710 = 1781-8 (1) G-P.

⁵⁵ Couat (1931) 189-90 and Webster (1964) 51-4 on Alexandrian dedicatory epigrams. Since Greek tomb sculpture was idealized and avoided realistic portraiture (Stewart (1990) I, 49, 62), such art was not of interest to epigrammatists who wrote about specific deceased individuals.

⁵⁶ Webster (1939) 177. Cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 39-40.

appearance. Posidippus instead stresses how the statues appear to be either alive, full of character, about to speak, or actually speaking. Posidippus adheres to tradition in not describing Myron's cow (Pos. X.34-37). Yet Posidippus is also innovative since he is not only interested in realism and the sculptors' skill but also in the visual impact of the art on the viewer and the artistic theory behind it.

Although the Alexandrian poets occasionally do describe art, epichastic poems are rare and poets are more interested in artifice than realism (for example, Epicharmus's statue was 'in bronze, not in the flesh').⁵⁷ But a few poetic references to sculpture, painting, and tapestry focus on how lifelike the image is. In Herondas' *Fourth Mime*, two women observe the lifelike beauty of statues and remark, 'if it were not stone, the work would speak',⁵⁸ and that one image seems to be the real woman.⁵⁹ One declares that someday men will be able to make stones be alive.⁶⁰ The other says Apelles painted the flesh of a boy so that it seems warm with life.⁶¹ Leonidas of Tarentum says Apelles' *Aphrodite* is 'not painted but alive'.⁶² The tapestries in Theocritus *Idyll* 15 appear to be alive.⁶³ There is also Theocritus' epigram on a statue of a drunken Anacreon (3440-5 (15) G-P); Leonidas' epigram on a statue of Anacreon singing while holding a lyre,⁶⁴ and Jason's cloak on which Phrixus is depicted as listening to the speaking ram (Ap. Rhod. 1.763-7). Callimachus describes the size, throne, and footstool of a statue of Zeus.⁶⁵ The *Greek Anthology* includes descriptions of sculpture and painting:⁶⁶ Posidippus describes Lysippus' statue of Kairos;⁶⁷ and Nossis mentions an accurate portrait.⁶⁸ But while Zanker proposes that the eye of the Alexandrian

⁵⁷ Theoc. *Ep.* 17.3-4 G-P = *AP* 9.600: *χάλκεόν νιν ἀντ' ἀλαθινοῦ / τιν ᾧδ' ἀνέθηκαν*. Cf. Bing (1988) 119-20, 122.

⁵⁸ Herond. 4.32-3: *εἶ τι μὴ λίθος, τοῦργον, / ἔρεις, λαλήσει*.

⁵⁹ Herond. 4.37-8: *βλέψας / ἐς τοῦτο τὸ εἰκόνισμα μὴ ἐτύμης δεῖσθω*; cf. 4.27-9, 59-71.

⁶⁰ Herond. 4.33-4: *μᾶ, χρόνοι κοτ' ὄνθρωποι / κῆς τοὺς λίθους ἔξουσι τὴν ζοὴν θεῖναι*. Bing (1988) 117. Zanker (1987) chs. 2-3; Webster (1964) 156-77.

⁶¹ Herond. 4.72-78. Zanker (1987) 43-4. Cf. Körte (1929) 345.

⁶² Leonidas of Tarentum, *AP* 16.182 = 2098-106 (23) G-P. Cf. Gelzer (1985) 101.

⁶³ Theocr. 15.82-3: *ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐστάκαντι καὶ ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐνδινεῦντι, / ἔμψυχ', οὐκ ἐνυφαντά* ('How true they stand and how true they move about; they're alive, not woven'); cf. Gow *ad loc.* Bing (1988) 117-18; cf. Gelzer (1985) 101.

⁶⁴ *AP* 16.306 = 2151-60 (Leonidas 31) G-P; cf. *AP* 16.307 = 2514-20 (Leonidas 90) G-P. Bing (1988) 117 & n.2. Webster (1964) 221.

⁶⁵ Call. *Iambus* 6 = fr. 196 Pf. Zanker (1987) 64-5 & n.39.

⁶⁶ Bing (1988) 117-23. Cf. Asclepiades or Posidippus on a statue of Cypris (*AP* 16.68 = Asclepiades 39 G-P).

⁶⁷ The Kairos stands on top-toe with wings on its feet, holding a razor, with hair over its face and the back of its head bald (*AP* 16.275 = 3154-65 (19) G-P). Posidippus' description of the statue was apparently accurate (Gow and Page (1965) II, 499). Stewart (1990) I, 187-8 believes that Lysippus' Kairos allegorically expressed Lysippus' theory of style and exemplified his *symmetria*, *rhythmos*, and accuracy by combining detail with balance. Lysippus' Kairos is also evidence of his interest in allegory (Pollitt (1986) 53-4). Some argue that Lysippus intended his Kairos to express his artistic theory, perhaps that he dealt with the temporal ('things as they appeared') while his predecessors dealt with timeless things ('things as they are') (Pollitt (1986) 54). Cf. Stewart (1978a). Webster (1964) 58.

⁶⁸ *AP* 9.604 = 2815-18 (7) G-P. Cf. Gelzer (1985) 103. Another epigram by Nossis says that Callo's portrait was a close likeness (*AP* 9.605 = 2811-14 (6) G-P).

poets ‘had actually been trained by the artists of the fourth-century revolution’,⁶⁹ this ‘training’ resulted in appreciation of realistic art rather than understanding of artistic theory.

3. Posidippus’ epigrams

3.1 Posidippus X.8-15 = 62 AB

μιμ[ή]σασθε τάδ’ ἔργα, πολυχρονίους δὲ κολοσσῶν,
 ὧ ζ[ω]οπλάσται, ν[αί,] παραθεῖτε νόμους·
 εἴ γε μὲν ἀρχαῖαι [.].πα χέρες, ἢ Ἀγελάιδης
 ὁ πρὸ Πολυκ<λ>εῖτο[υ πά]γχυ παλαιότεχνης,
 ἢ οἱ Διδυμίδου σκληροῖι τύποι εἰς πέδον ἔλθειν,
 Λυσίππου νεάρ’ ἦν οὐδ[ε]μία πρόφασις
 δεῦρο παρεκτεῖναι βασάνου χάριν· εἴ[τα] δ’ ἐὰ<ν> χρῆι
 καὶ πίπτει <ῶ>θλο<ς> καινοτεχνέων, .ε.σηι

Imitate these works, sculptors, and leave aside ancient rules for larger-than-life-size statues, for if the ancient hands of [...]pas or of Hagelaides, who was a craftsman long ago before Polycleitus, or if the rigid forms of Didymides were to be brought forward, there would be no reason for the novelties of Lysippus to lay out and be put to the test. But then if it were necessary and a contest occurred among new craftsmen, he would surpass them all.⁷⁰

When Posidippus signals his intention to speak about art with his vocative address to sculptors (ζ[ω]οπλάσται Pos. X.9) and by his very first word, ‘imitate’ (μιμ[ή]σασθε X.8), he suggests Aristotle, who called poetry, fine art (including sculpture), and most music kinds of representation or *mimesis*.⁷¹ Aristotle employed art and artists as analogies to drama to illustrate his remarks about *mimesis*; in fact, he drew a direct parallel between poetry and fine art (*Poet.* 15, 1454b9; 25, 1460b8-11),⁷² and he believed that his theories applied to all forms of

⁶⁹ Zanker (1987) 46. According to Goldhill (1994) 205-6, Alexandrian poetry frequently used a technical vocabulary from art criticism in its poems about art and many epigrams ‘promote and project a way of viewing the monuments, literature, events of the past and present’. But Goldhill does not identify these poems.

⁷⁰ The translation is adapted from that of Kosmetatou and Papalexandrou (2003), 53.

⁷¹ See Arist. *Poet.* 1, 1447a13-b28. Sculpture is included within *mimesis* at 1447a18-19: ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ χρώμασι καὶ σχήμασι πολλὰ μιμῶνται τινες ἀπεικάζοντες (‘just as by the use both of colour and form people represent many objects’). *Mimeisthai*, *mimetikos*, and *mimetes* with this meaning of realistic representation are first found in the late fifth and early fourth century, in Aristophanes (*Th.* 155-6), Plato (*Rep.* 595b, 597e, 601a, 605a), and Xenophon (*Mem.* 3.10.1); and *mimema* is in Euripides (*Hel.* 71; Webster (1939), 167-8). Cf. Butcher (1898) 121-4; Else (1957) 18-21; Halliwell (2002) 15-22. In classical literature, *mimesis* often refers to performing a myth (Lysias 6.51; cf. Theognis 367-70). In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (193), it means to imitate voices (Kennedy (1989) 47-8). Halliwell (2002) 15 gives five pre-Platonic meanings: visual resemblance, behavioral emulation; impersonation, including drama; musical production; and a Pythagorean belief in metaphysical conformity (i.e., the world is a *mimesis* of numbers). Else (1958) 73-90 has three meanings of *mimesis*: imitation through speech, song, or dance; general imitation; and replication of a person or thing in material form. Cf. Sörbom (1966) 13-40; Pollitt (1974) 37-8.

⁷² Arist. *Poet.* 15, 1454b9: [ποιητὰς] δεῖ μιμεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς εἰκονογράφους (‘poets must imitate the good portrait-painters’); 25, 1460b8-11: ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἔστι μιμητῆς ὁ ποιητῆς ὡσπερᾶνε

mimesis. Aristotle is primarily interested in representational *mimesis*;⁷³ he uses the verb *mimēsthai* so that it has an aesthetic meaning (i.e., ‘likeness-making’)⁷⁴ as well as the meaning, ‘imitate artistic good practices’ (*Poet.* 15, 1454b9-10). He declares that art imitates nature (*Phys.* 2.2, 194a21-22), and also says that realistic portraiture is an important form of *mimesis*.⁷⁵ Posidippus places himself firmly within the Aristotelean tradition through his use of *mimēsthai* in relation to sculpture.⁷⁶

When Posidippus encourages modern sculptors to ‘disregard the style of archaic artists’ (πολυχρονίους... παραθείτε νόμους Pos. X.8-9;⁷⁷ ἀρχαίαι... χέρες X.10; παλαιοτέχνης X.11) and to ‘abandon the stylistic rules of those who predated the Canon of Polycleitus’ (ὁ πρὸ Πολυκ<λ>εῖτου πάλλυ παλαιοτέχνης X.11) in favor of ‘Lysippus’ new style’ (Λυσίππου νεάρ’ X.13; καινοτεχνέων X.15; cf. XI.16-19), he expresses a major trend in late fourth- and third-century art. The sculptor Polycleitus (ca. 460-410) was one of the two most influential classical sculptors; he was famous for his sculpture of humans⁷⁸ and was the first artist to write a treatise on his art. Polycleitus’ *Canon*, a mathematical treatise on proportion that is ‘the first known *professional criticism* in sculpture’, was influential for more than a century.⁷⁹ Polycleitus emphasized proportionality of the body (*symmetria*) and absolute beauty.⁸⁰ The fourth-century Lysippus and his school were influenced by Polycleitus;⁸¹ they advocated realism in portraiture and subjective vision, and they were influential throughout the Greek world.⁸² Pliny remarks:

Lysippus is said to have contributed much to the art of sculpture, by rendering the hair in more detail, by making the heads of his figures smaller than the old sculptors used to do, and the bodies slenderer and leaner, to give his statues the appearance of great height. Latin has no word for the *symmetria* which he most scrupulously preserved by a new and hitherto untried system that modified the foursquare figures of the ancients; and he used to say publicly that while they had made men as they were, he made them as they appeared to be. A

ζωγράφος ἢ τις ἄλλος εἰκονοποιός (‘since the poet represents life, as a painter does or any other maker of likenesses’). Webster (1952) 22-3; in *Poet.* 25, 1460b8-11 Aristotle links poetry and art and introduces historical standards for both.

⁷³ Gallop (1999) 79. *Arist. Poet.* 4, 1448b5-12; *Pol.* 8.3, 1338a40-b2.

⁷⁴ Sörbom (1966) 177-9.

⁷⁵ *Arist. Poet.* 6, 1450b2-3; 15, 1454b9-18; Webster (1952) 14, 19.

⁷⁶ Halliwell (2002) 152-3: for Aristotle, the subject of *mimēsthai* can be a work, a genre, an artist, or a performer.

⁷⁷ Kosmetatou and Papalexandrou (2003) 53-6 argue that *kolossoi* means statues without regard to size. But Posidippus’ later poem on the Colossus of Rhodes indicates that he refers to huge statues (Pos. XI. 6-11 = 68 AB).

⁷⁸ Stewart (1990) I, 14, 21, 80, 160-2; Richter (1970) 189-95.

⁷⁹ Stewart (1990) 21, 80, 160-2; 261-5; T69 = Galen, *De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* 5.448; Stewart (1978b) 125. Pollitt (1974) 14-21; Richter (1970) 189-91.

⁸⁰ Stewart (1990) 21, 80, 160-2; 264-6; T68 = Galen, *De Temperamentis* i.566; Stewart (1978b) 125. Pollitt (1974) 14-16. Plin. *NH* 34.55-6.

⁸¹ Richter (1970) 190 & n.50; Cic. *Brut.* 296.

⁸² Stewart (1990) I, 14-15, 289-94, 297-300. See Stewart (1978a) on the relationship between Lysippus’ *Kairos* and Polycleitus’ *Canon*.

distinguishing characteristic of his is seen to be the scrupulous attention to detail maintained in even the smallest particulars. (Plin. *NH* 34.61-5; trans. Stewart).⁸³

Lysippus followed the system of Polycleitus to some extent; he made *symmetria* the basis of his art, although he modified proportionality.⁸⁴ Posidippus understands the influence of these two major artists: he firmly takes the side of Lysippus, dismissing most artists before Polycleitus, but he still acknowledges that Polycleitus is an important model for Lysippean sculpture.

A new sculptural trend developed in the third century that was interested in novelty and baroque style, and the viewer's reaction to art.⁸⁵ Posidippus seems aware of this change when he encourages the Lysippean school by advocating realism. There was also a fourth-century interest in optical illusion—artists altered proportions to make their art 'more beautiful' (*eurhythmia*) (Plat. *Sophist* 235e-236c).⁸⁶ This may be what Lysippus meant when he asserted that while others depicted men as they were, he depicted them as they appeared to be (Plin. *NH* 34.65).⁸⁷ Lysippus transformed *symmetria* by taking into account 'appearance' (ὄψις, φαντασία),⁸⁸ and he practiced an 'idealized' realism that blended realism with beauty.⁸⁹ Another fourth century trend was an interest in character (*ethos*) and suffering (*pathos*); Xenophon's Socrates says that the artist can depict the soul 'through the face and the positions of men standing' (*Mem.* 3.10.1-5).⁹⁰ Lysippus was famous for his psychological portraiture.⁹¹ He was the first who 'deliberately set out to capture the character of his subjects', particularly in his portraits.⁹² The realistic portrait 'incorporate[d] enough of the idiosyncratic, aberrant, or irregular feature of their subject's appearance to make him or her seem unique and familiar'.⁹³ Lysippus's idealised realism, 'was flexible to a degree, allowing varying degrees of idealization'.⁹⁴

Posidippus' 'new style' of Hellenistic realism that was indebted to expressive and realistic earlier artists like Polycleitus, refers to the art of Lysippus, who based himself on Polycleitus and who combined grand subject matter with accurate realism and character.

⁸³ Stewart (1990) I, 291; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5.

⁸⁴ Pollitt (1974) 14, 22. Stewart (1990) I, 80, 186-7, T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5; T3 = Quint. 12.7-9.

⁸⁵ Pollitt (1974) 28. Stewart (1990) I, 197-8. Pliny remarks that 'sculpture ceased in 292' (Stewart (1990) I, 69; T1 = Plin. *NH* 34.49-52. Van Straten (1993) 253: Athenian votive reliefs ceased around 300 BC, possibly as a result of the prohibition of grave reliefs by Demetrius of Phalerum (Pollitt (1974) 27). Stewart (1990) I, 197: 'dogged conservatism, unbridled virtuosity, bombastic magniloquence, light-hearted playfulness, and sheer bad taste begin to jostle each other'.

⁸⁶ Pollitt (1974) 28-9. Cf. Diod. 1.98.7.

⁸⁷ So Pollitt (1974) 29.

⁸⁸ Pollitt (1974) 29.

⁸⁹ Stewart (1990) I, 80, 186-7; T3 = Quint. 12.7-9. Stewart calls Lysippus' work 'individual, but just as much an artful construct' (Id., 187).

⁹⁰ Pollitt (1974) 30; Stewart (1990) I, 83; Halliwell (2002) 122-4.

⁹¹ Pollitt (1986) 59. Richter (1970) 228-9.

⁹² Pollitt (1986) 65-6. Stewart (1990) I, 190. Richter (1970) 228-9.

⁹³ Pollitt (1986) 62-3. The psychological portraits of the third century by artists such as Polyuctus were detailed and portray the psychological makeup rather than public role of the subject (*ibid*).

⁹⁴ Stewart (1990) I, 191.

3.2 Posidippus X.16-25 = 63 AB

τόνδε Φιλίται χ[αλ]κὸν [ἴ]σον κατὰ πάν<θ>’(α) Ἐκ[α]ταῖος
 ἀ[κρ]ιβῆς ἄκρους [ἔ]πλασεν εἰς ὄνυχας,
 καὶ με]γέθει κα[ὶ] σα]ρκὶ τὸν ἀνθρωπιστὶ διώξας
 γνώμο]ν’, ἀφ’ ἠρώων δ’ οὐδὲν ἔμειξ’(ε) ιδέης,
 ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀκρομέριμον ὄλ[η] κ]ατεμάξατο τέχνη
 πρ]έσβυν, ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν [ἔ]χων] κανόνα·
 αὐδῆ]σοντι δ’ ἔοικεν, ὅσῳ ποικίλλεται ἦθει,
 ἔμψυχος, καίπερ χάλκεος ἐὼν ὁ γέρων·
 ἐκ Πτολε]μαίου δ’ ᾧδε θεοῦ θ’ ἅμα καὶ βασιλ<ῆ>ος
 ἄγκειτ]αι Μουσέ]ων εἵνεκα Κῶιος ἀνήρ.

Hecataeus, working with great accuracy right down to the extremities of the nails, following the human measure as to both size and skin, fashioned this bronze statue equal in size to Philitas in every detail, and mixed in nothing from the type of heroes. Rather, he has brought to completion with the entirety of his art and holding the real canon of truth, the elder who devoted himself to perfection. And although the old man is made of bronze, such is the subtlety of character with which he is depicted that he looks like one alive, as if about to speak. And the Coan man is set up here by the grace of Ptolemy, at once god and king, for the sake of the Muses.⁹⁵

Posidippus praises Hecataeus’ bronze sculpture of Philitas of Cos for its realistic accuracy (Pos. X.17) and he also notes the statue’s ‘size and flesh’, intelligent expression, human proportions, and character (X.18-22). The statue seems to be alive (X.23) and even appears ‘about to speak’ (X.22). Posidippus distinguishes between modern art and older artists: the statue ‘owes nothing to the heroic’ (i.e., idealized) style (ἀφ’ ἠρώων δ’ οὐδὲν X.19).

Posidippus indicates his familiarity with the technical vocabulary of sculpture by his mention of ‘accuracy’ (ἀκρ]ιβῆς X.17). *Akribeia* was a technical term in fourth-century art criticism,⁹⁶ and Lysippus was praised for his *akribeia*.⁹⁷ Accuracy was prized by Polycleitus, who said, ‘the work is hardest when the clay comes to the fingernail’,⁹⁸ a phrase Posidippus echoes when he mentions fingertips (ἄκρους [ἔ]πλασεν εἰς ὄνυχας Pos. X.17).⁹⁹ Posidippus’ emphasis on Hecataeus’ interest in human proportions (τὸν ἀνθρωπιστὶ διώξας γνώμο]ν’ Pos. X.18-19) suggests the proportionality of both Polycleitus and Lysippus.¹⁰⁰ Also, Posidippus’ stress on the finish of bronzes (σα]ρκὶ Pos. X.18; cf. σάρκινα Pos. XI.17) refers to sculptural practice since sculptors, particularly Polycleitus and

⁹⁵ Translated Hardie (2003) 27. Cf. Scodel (2003) 44.

⁹⁶ Arist. *Poet.* 4, 1448b10-12. Pollitt (1974) 22. Polycleitus was also noted for his *akribeia* (Galen, *De Temperamentis* i.566; Stewart (1978b) 125).

⁹⁷ Stewart (1990) 21, 63, 299; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5.

⁹⁸ Stewart (1990) I, 25, 161; T67 = Plut. *Mor.* 86a, 636b-c; 40B1 Diels-Kranz.

⁹⁹ So also Hardie (2003) 35.

¹⁰⁰ Lysippus’ new style of bronze sculpture was characterized by attention to detail, great height, and *symmetria* of the human body (Stewart (1990) I, 291; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5, who infers that Xenocrates was Pliny’s source).

Lysippus,¹⁰¹ took great interest in the finish of bronze statues. All of this indicates that Hecataeus adhered to Lysippus' artistic theories.

The statue seems alive (ἔμψυχος Pos. X.23) and 'about to speak' (αὐδήσονται δ' ἔοικεν Pos. X.22), which is a motif found in Alexandrian poems on realistic statues.¹⁰² In Herondas' fourth *Mime*, two women remark about a sculpture, 'if it were not stone, the work would speak' (4.32-3)¹⁰³ and declare that someday men will make stones be alive (4.33-4).¹⁰⁴ One says that a portrait seems to be a real woman (4.37-8);¹⁰⁵ the other declares that a painted girl will 'perish' if she does not get an apple (4.27-9); cf. 4.59-71). The painted flesh (σάρκες 4.59-62) seems warm, and Apelles' hands are 'true in all his lines' (ἀληθιναί 4.72-3).¹⁰⁶ This is particularly close to Posidippus' remark that Hecataeus 'holds the straight rod of truth' (ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν [ἔχων] κανόνα Pos. X.21-3) because his statue seems to speak and be alive (cf. σαρκί, 'flesh' Pos. X.18). The word 'canon' (κανόνα) refers to both Polycleitus and his artistic theory, and to Lysippus, who improved upon Polycleitus' Canon.¹⁰⁷

Posidippus' phrase 'holding the straight standard of truth' also has a Platonic connotation. Plato asserted that the standards of judging art should be 'correctness' or fidelity to the thing depicted (*orthotes*), usefulness, and charm (*Laws* 667b; for *orthotes* cf. *Crat.* 432a-d).¹⁰⁸ Plato also derided artists for only producing images (*Rep.* 598b) but not the 'true reality of things' (ἀλήθεια, *Rep.* 596e).¹⁰⁹ But Aristotle said that response to mimetic works, including sculpture and painting, is 'close to being equivalently disposed towards "the truth" or "the real thing"' (πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, *Pol.* 8.5, 1340a23-5)¹¹⁰ and that all art is the same 'as a rational quality, concerned with making, that reasons truly' (μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς, *EN* 6.4, 1140a10). Posidippus sets forth a standard of excellence based on truth and fidelity of representation through his emphasis on truth and correctness (ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν Pos. X.21). Posidippus' focus on truth indicates an Aristotelean basis for his concept of *mimesis* since he approves of realistic art that forms a 'true' model.

¹⁰¹ Stewart (1990) I, 40-1; T67 = Plut. *Mor.* 86a, 636b-c; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5.

¹⁰² Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001) 188; Hardie (2003) 31; Scodel (2003) 44 notes the parallel with *AP* 16.120.3 = Asclepiades 1013 (43) G-P. Cf. Leonidas of Tarentum's epigram on Apelles' *Aphrodite Anadyomene* (*AP* 16.182.4 = 2100 (23) G-P; Theoc. 15.83). According to Hardie (2003) 31, Hecataeus' statue depicted Philitas in the act of speech.

¹⁰³ Herond. 4.32-3: εἴ τι μὴ λίθος, τοῦργον, / ἔρεῖς, λαλήσει.

¹⁰⁴ Herond. 4.33-4: μᾶ, χρόνῳ κοτ' ὄνθρωποι / κῆς τοὺς λίθους ἔξουσι τὴν ζοὴν θεῖναι.

¹⁰⁵ Herond. 4.37-8: βλέψας / ἐς τοῦτο τὸ εἰκόνημα μὴ ἐτόμης δέισθω.

¹⁰⁶ Herond. 4.72-3: ἀληθιναί, Φίλη, γὰρ αἱ Ἐφεσίου χεῖρες / ἐς πάντ' Ἀπελλέω γράμματ'.

¹⁰⁷ Stewart (1990) I, 160; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-4. Cf. Stewart (1978a) and Hardie (2003) 35 on Lysippus and Polycleitus. Gutzwiller (2002b) 47-8 connects 'truth' in this poem to Lysippus' sculptural realism.

¹⁰⁸ Pollitt (1974) 45, 48. Halliwell (2002) 46-7: Socrates did not require the correctness (*orthotes*) of an image to be mathematically correct or to contain all features of its object (Pl. *Crat.* 432a-d).

¹⁰⁹ Pollitt (1974) 43.

¹¹⁰ Halliwell (2002) 162-3. Aristotle was more flexible than Plato but still thought that *mimesis* should be based on 'believable human experience' (Halliwell (2002) 154-5; Arist. *Poet.* 9, 1451a37-8).

Posidippus' comments on the 'character' (*ethos*) of the statue (ἤθει X.22) and its 'intelligent expression' (τὸν ἀκρομέριμον... πρέσβυν X.20-1) suggest Socrates' remarks in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* about how painters imitate the 'character of the soul' and how painters and sculptors are interested in character (*ethos*) and emotion (*pathos*) revealed through facial expression. Artists show 'grandeur and liberality, as well as lowliness and illiberality, moderation and thoughtfulness as well as insolence and vulgarity' (*Mem.* 3.10.1-5). Pollitt believes that Pliny's critical terms such as *ethe* and *pathe* (*NH* 35.98) are technical terms developed by Xenocrates¹¹¹ and used by Lysippus, who was famous for his depiction of character.¹¹² If this is the case, then Posidippus expresses Lysippus' artistic philosophy both through his emphasis on character and by his technical vocabulary.

Moreover, since Aristotle prized accuracy in sculpture and particularly mentioned Polycleitus in this regard (*EN* 6.7, 1141a9-12 τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις),¹¹³ Posidippus' interest in accuracy may be Aristotelean. Posidippus' references to character also suggest Aristotle. Aristotle believed that character is important in *mimesis*; he particularly notes drama and painting as similar.¹¹⁴ He insisted that good portrait artists depict individual character while also showing men as 'better than they are'.¹¹⁵ But Aristotle recognized that some artists depicted more character than others. He declares, 'Polygnotus was good at depicting character, but there is nothing of this in Zeuxis's painting'.¹¹⁶ Hecataeus apparently excelled at depicting character.

But Aristotle subordinated character to action, insisting that the *actions* of people are the proper subject of all *mimesis* (*Poet.* 2, 1448a1-2).¹¹⁷ Aristotle also declared that just as in art where the figure is preferable to abstract colors, so in drama the representation of action and the plot is more important than character (*Poet.* 6, 1450b1-4). Posidippus agrees with Aristotle's interest in action in this epigram since character, although mentioned, is of less importance than the fact that the statue seems about to speak and therefore able to 'act'.

In addition, Halliwell points out that Aristotle developed a 'dual-aspect mimeticism' that took into account 'methods, vocabularies, and criticism' of a work of art and not only its outward appearance but also 'the artifact and its meanings, the "materials" and the "object" of *mimesis*'.¹¹⁸ Aristotle declares that just as the 'builder must know what the house is to be like and also that it is built of bricks and timber', so the artist must in regard to his discipline 'study its own distinctive aspect of things and likewise (up to a point) the material in which the

¹¹¹ Pollitt (1974) 24: terms based on ἰσχρός and λεπτός.

¹¹² Pollitt (1986) 65-6. See below, Pos. X.30-3 = 65 AB (*AP* 16.119 = 3150-3 (Posidippus 18) G-P).

¹¹³ Cf. Gelzer (1985) 105.

¹¹⁴ Arist. *Poet.* 6, 1450b1-4; 25, 1460b8-11.

¹¹⁵ Arist. *Poet.* 15, 1454b8-15; Webster (1952) 19.

¹¹⁶ Arist. *Poet.* 6, 1450a26-9.

¹¹⁷ Arist. *Poet.* 2, 1448a1-2: ἐπεὶ δὲ μιμοῦνται οἱ μιμούμενοι πράττοντας. Subordination of character to action: *Poet.* 6, 1450a16-b4. Gallop (1999) 81-2.

¹¹⁸ Halliwell (2002) 172, 181-2.

same is manifested' (*Phys.* 2.2, 194a21-8; cf. 194b10-12).¹¹⁹ All arts require knowledge of both the form and the material (*Phys.* 2.2, 194b1-6). Since Posidippus' epigram includes technical vocabulary, materials, and the underlying theory of the statue, Posidippus apparently aimed at truly Aristotelean form of poetic mimetic representation that acknowledged the artifact and its materials and recognized its realistic craftsmanship in addition to its appearance.

3.3 Posidippus X.26-29 = 64 AB

αἴ|νεέ γ'εἰ Ἰδομεν<ῆ>α θέλων χάλκειον ἐκεῖν|ον
 Κρησίλ<α>· ὡς ἄκρωσ ἠργάσατ' εἶδομεν εἶ·
 γ|αρύ|ει] Ἰδομενεύς· ἄλ|λ' ᾧ ἴγαθὲ Μηριόνα, θεῖ,
] πλάσται δ' ἄν [ἀδό]νητος ἕων'.

Praise without hesitation that bronze statue of Idomenus of Crete. We know how accurately it has been fashioned. Idomeneus shouts, "hurry, dear Meriones, even though you have been fabricated and unmoving for a long time".¹²⁰

Posidippus' third epigram praises Cresilas' bronze statue of Idomeneus of Crete both for its 'realistic accuracy' (ὡς ἄκρωσ ἠργάσατ' Pos. X.27) and because the statue actually does speak (γ|αρύ|ει] Ἰδομενεύς Pos. X.28). Posidippus records its words to another statue: 'hurry, dear Meriones, even though you have been fabricated and unmoving for a long time' (Pos. X.28-9). Cresilas' sculpture is not only realistically accurate but is represented as actually speaking.

This poem is a remarkable change from the few other Alexandrian poems about the lifelike nature of sculpture. In Herondas' fourth *Mime*, two women observe statues and paintings and remark that 'if it were not stone, the work would speak' (4.32-3); they declare that one image seems to be the real woman (4.37-3).¹²¹ Apollonius Rhodius says that Phrixus was depicted on Jason's cloak 'as if he were actually listening to the ram which looked as if it were speaking. Looking at them you would fall silent and delude your mind with the hope of hearing some wise speech from them' (1.763-7).¹²² Theocritus' *Idyll* 15 ascribes to figures in tapestries the ability to 'move', which is what indicates to spectators that the images are 'alive' (15.82-3).¹²³ Nevertheless, all of these poems acknowledge the artificiality of the images; although the statues all seem about to speak and move, they do not actually do so. Likewise, several epigrams deal with realistic art and potential speech: Asclepiades declares that Lysippus' statue of Alexander seems 'about to speak'.¹²⁴ Epigrams on Myron's cow say that the

¹¹⁹ Translated by Wicksteed and Cornford.

¹²⁰ The translation is mine.

¹²¹ Herond. 4.32-3: εἴ τι μὴ λίθος, τοῦργον, ἐρεῖς, λαλήσει; 4.37-8: βλέψας / ἐς τοῦτο τὸ εἰκόνισμα μὴ ἐτύμης δεῖσθω.

¹²² Ap. Rhod. 1.763-7: ἐν καὶ Φρίξος ἔην Μινυήτος, ὡς ἐτεόν περ / εἰσαΐων κριοῦ, ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἐξενέποντι εἰοικῶς. / κείνους κ' εἰσορόων ἀκέοις ψεύδοιό τε θυμόν, / ἐλπόμενος πυκινήν τιν' ἀπὸ σφείων ἐσακοῦσαι / βάζιν.

¹²³ Theoc. 15.82-3: ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐστάκαντι καὶ ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐνδινεῦντι, / ἔμψυχ', οὐκ ἐνυφαντά, 'How true they stand and how true they move about; they're alive, not woven'.

¹²⁴ AP 16.120 = Asclepiades 1010-13 (43) G-P. Although Callimachus' poem on a statue of Delian Apollo depicts the statue as speaking (Call. fr. 114 Pf.), in that case the statue becomes the god.

bronze cow would have spoken if Myron had made entrails for it (*AP* 9.727)¹²⁵ and that Myron's cow seems about to speak (δοκέω, μυκήσεται *AP* 9.728).¹²⁶ Like Posidippus (πλάσται Pos. X.29), Leonidas uses ἔπλασεν ('mould') to refer to Myron's art in an epigram in which the cow declares: 'Myron did not mould me; he lied; but driving me from the herd where I was feeding, he fixed me to a stone base.'¹²⁷ But while both Posidippus and Leonidas play with movement and immobility; artifice and the animate, only Posidippus' poem describes true artistic realism since Cresilas' statue is represented as actually speaking and encouraging movement by another statue.

Posidippus' epigram also recalls a fragment of Aeschylus' *Theoroi* or *Isthmiastai*¹²⁸ in which a chorus of satyrs carry painted images of themselves. They ask whether any image could be more like theirs, this *mimema* of Daedalus. They state that the resemblance, which lacks only a voice, is so close that it would terrify their own mother. It is the voice that brings the final degree of realism to Aeschylus' image; it is the voice that would fully convince that the image is reality. Therefore, when Posidippus represents a statue as actually speaking and quotes its words, he is depicting the truly life-like image through his interjection of voice. But this very realism humorously hints at Aristotle, who asserted that 'all art deals with bringing something into existence, that to pursue an art means to study how to bring into existence a thing which may either exist or not' (*EN* 6.4, 1140a10-14), and that the operation of the arts is analogous to the working of nature (*Phys.* 2.8, 199a8-21). The statue of Idomeneus was so skillfully 'brought into existence' that it is indistinguishable from a human being.

Posidippus says that the statue of Idomeneus is not only so lifelike that it actually speaks, but it speaks to another statue, encouraging it to run.¹²⁹ This cleverly introduces both actual speech and 'action' or *praxis* into Posidippus' discussion of artistic theory. Aristotle emphasized *praxis* and plot as the essential elements of *mimesis*:

For tragedy is not a representation of men but of a piece of action ... and the end aimed at is the representation not of qualities of character but of some action; and while character makes men what they are, it is their actions and experiences that make them happy or the opposite. They do not therefore act to represent character, but character-study is included for the sake of the action. It follows that the incidents and the plot are the end at which tragedy aims, and in everything the end aimed at is of prime importance. Moreover, you could not have a tragedy without action, but you can have one without character-study. Indeed the tragedies of most modern poets are without this, and, speaking generally, there are many such writers, whose case is like that of Zeuxis

¹²⁵ *AP* 9.727: καὶ χαλκῆ περ ἐοῦσα λάλησεν ἄν ἅ κερατὴ βοῦς.

¹²⁶ In an anonymous epigram (*AP* 9.729) the cow declares that if someone will attach it to a plough, it will plough as far as Myron's art enables it (εἵνεκα γὰρ τέχνας σεῖο, Μύρων, ἀρόσω).

¹²⁷ *AP* 9.719 = 2508-9 (88) G-P.: οὐκ ἔπλασέν με Μύρων, ἐψεύσατο βοσκομένην δὲ / ἐξ ἀγέλας ἐλάσας δῆσε βάσει λιθίνῳ.

¹²⁸ P. Oxy. XVIII.2162 = Aes. fr. 78a Radt. Cf. Halliwell (2002) 19-20.

¹²⁹ Stewart (1990) I, 73: the statues of the mythical Daedalus walked (T10-11 = Eur. *Eurystheus Satyrikos* fr. 372 Nauck²). Stewart sees the animism of ancient sculpture as 'quasi-magical' (*ibid.* 74).

compared with Polygnotus. The latter was good at depicting character, but there is nothing of this in Zeuxis's painting. (Arist. *Poet.* 1450a16-29, trans. Fyfe)

Aristotle believed that his general theories applied to all forms of *mimesis*. We have already observed (pp.9-10) his use of art and artists as analogies to drama, and the parallels he drew between poetry and fine art. Since according to Aristotle, tragedies aim at the 'actions and plot', it is probable that he preferred the depiction of action in art, just as he does for tragedy,¹³⁰ especially since he states that the actions of people are the subject of all *mimesis* (ἐπεὶ δὲ μιμοῦνται οἱ μιμούμενοι πράττοντας, *Poet.* 2, 1448a1-2). Aristotle also reportedly advised Protogenes to paint the deeds of Alexander 'because of their undying quality'.¹³¹ This highlights the importance that Aristotle attributed to action ('deeds') in fine art. Posidippus cleverly depicts a statue 'aiming at' and encouraging 'action' as the ultimate purpose of its speech (and the 'end' or purpose of Posidippus' epigram). Posidippus presents Aristotelean ideas: Cresilas is more interested in depicting realism by movement than through character. Just as Aristotle believed that action is essential in drama, so Posidippus thought that action is important in sculpture since he illustrates this precise moment of action and speech.¹³²

3.4 Posidippus X.30-33 = 65 AB

Λύσιππε,] πλάστα Σικυώ[νιε, θαρσ]αλέα χεῖρ,
 δάϊε τεχνί]τα, πῦρ τοι ὁ χα[λκὸς ὄρ]ηι,
 ὄν κατ' Ἄλεξά]νδρου μορφῶς ἔθεν· οὐ τί γε μεμπτοί
 Πέρσαι· συγγνώ]μα βουσι λέοντα φυγεῖν.

Lysippus, sculptor of Sicyon, bold hand, cunning craftsman, fire is in the glance of the bronze which you made in the form of Alexander. In no way can one blame the Persians: cattle may be forgiven for flying before a lion.¹³³

The fourth epigram (also in the *Greek Anthology* (AP 16.119 = 3150-3 (18) G-P)) deals with Lysippus' bronze of Alexander the Great¹³⁴ (a statue mentioned again at Pos. XI.18-19).¹³⁵ Since Xenophon's Socrates believed that sculptors represent the soul when they depict the 'threatening look in the eyes of fighters' and 'the triumphant expression on the face of conquerors' (*Mem.* 3.10.8), Posidippus indicates that Lysippus reveals Alexander's soul by depicting his form and face so that the viewer understands how the Persians could have fled from him.

Asclepiades' epigram on the same statue of Alexander is very different. Although Asclepiades also limits his description of the statue (it is bronze, captures Alexander's 'daring and whole form', and seems 'about to speak'), he

¹³⁰ Butcher (1898) 123-4. Cf. Gomme (1954) 63-5 who compares Aristotle's remarks on plot to those he makes on the importance of an outline in contrast to mere colors (*Poet.* 6, 1450a20-b4).

¹³¹ *propter aeternitatem rerum*, Plin. *NH* 35.106. Pollitt (1986) 3.

¹³² Halliwell (2002) 168-9 discusses how in Aristotle the 'enactive mode is iconic' because action and speech create immediacy and therefore greater realism.

¹³³ Translation by Austin and Bastianini (2002).

¹³⁴ Cf. Gow and Page II, 498 and Gutzwiller (2002c), 92.

¹³⁵ Pos. XI.18-19 = 70 AB. On the popularity of Lysippus' Alexander see Pollitt (1986) 3; Stewart (1990) I, 188.

focuses not on realism but on Alexander's divine-like power. He records Alexander's intended words: 'I hold the earth; you, Zeus, rule Olympus'¹³⁶ and indicates how Alexander seems immortal.¹³⁷ Asclepiades admires the idealized style, but Posidippus concentrates on the sculptor's realistic craftsmanship and how Lysippus' portraiture reveals Alexander's fierce character. Posidippus' admonition that sculptors should avoid the 'heroic' style (Pos. X.19) is also suggested in this poem since Lysippus only combined some heroic or idealized elements within a realistic depiction that reveals Alexander's character. In Lysippus' other works, heroic elements were merely allowed to contribute to an accurate portrait: Lysippus reportedly faulted Apelles because he depicted Alexander with a thunderbolt (i.e., as an immortal). Lysippus instead gave Alexander a spear, which was 'a true and proper attribute'¹³⁸ because of Alexander's military prowess. For Lysippus, the heroic must be realistically accurate, and he subordinated heroic elements to realism.

According to Pollitt, 'the Hellenistic age was the first period in the history of western art in which a serious attempt was made to probe, capture, and express through the medium of portraiture the inner workings of the human mind'.¹³⁹ Lysippus was famous for his portraits and he was the first artist who 'deliberately set out to capture the character of his subjects'. In his Alexander portraits he combined the traditional role portrait with the new 'personality-portrait' and stressed Alexander's *ethos* more than his position.¹⁴⁰ The realistic portrait incorporated features of the subject's appearance so that the portrait was lifelike and idiosyncratic, yet still heroic and idealized.¹⁴¹

This interest in idealized realism in art is also found in Aristotle, who believed that mimetic artists show people as better or worse than they are:¹⁴²

¹³⁶ AP 16.120 = Asclepiades 1010-13 (43) G-P: τόλμαν Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ ὅλαν ἀπεμάξατο μορφὴν / Λύσιππος· τίς ὁδὶ χαλκὸς ἔχει δύναμιν. / ἀυδάσοντι δ' εἰκεν ὁ χάλκεος ἐς Δία λεύσσω· / Ἔγαν ὑπ' ἐμοὶ τίθειαι, Ζεῦ, σὺ δ' Ὀλυμπον ἔχε" ('Lysippus modeled Alexander's daring and his whole form. How great is the power of this bronze! The brazen king seems to be gazing at Zeus and about to say, "I set Earth under my feet; thy self, Zeus, possess Olympus"', trans. Paton). Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 335a-b; Scodel (2003) 44. Another epigram that may be Hellenistic is AP 16.121 = Page *FGE* 1384-1387: αὐτὸν Ἀλέξανδρον τεκμαίρεο· ὦδε τὰ κείνου / ὄμματα καὶ ζῶν θάρσος ὁ χαλκὸς ἔχει, / ὅς μόνος, ἦν ἐφορῶσιν ἀπ' αἰθέρος αἱ Διὸς ἀυγαί, / πᾶσαν Πελλαίῳ γῆν ὑπέταξε θρόνον.

¹³⁷ Couat (1931) 190. Sens (2002) 7-8.

¹³⁸ Plut. *De Iside et Osiride* 34 (*Mor.* 360d).

¹³⁹ Pollitt (1986) 59.

¹⁴⁰ Pollitt (1986) 65-6. Stewart (1990) I, 190; Richter (1970) 228-9. Alexander the Great reportedly permitted only Lysippus to make his portrait since only Lysippus brought out his 'real character' and his excellence (Plut. *De Alexandri Fortitudine seu Virtute* 2.2.3 (*Mor.* 335a-b)). Cf. Plut. *Alex.* 4.1: only Lysippus captured with precision Alexander's features. Stewart (1990) I, 188 believes that the story is fiction.

¹⁴¹ Pollitt (1986) 62-3. Stewart (1990) I, 188-9. Cf. Smith (1993) 208-10: Hellenistic ruler portraits drew upon divine and heroic portraits but included individuality. Lysippus' art is known for its 'theatricality': his portraiture expressed inner drama and personality, and his large statue groups captured moments of crisis (Pollitt (1986) 7).

¹⁴² Arist. *Poet.* 2, 1448a1-7 (tr. Fyfe). Butcher (1898) 230-2 interprets this as both morally and socially better.

Since living persons are the objects of representation, these must necessarily be either good men or inferior—thus only are characters normally distinguished, since ethical differences depend upon vice and virtue—that is to say either better than ourselves or worse or much what we are. It is the same with painters. Polygnotus depicted men as better than they are and Pauson worse, while Dionysius made likenesses.

Lysippus' depiction of Alexander falls within Aristotle's category of 'men better than ourselves'. But since Aristotle not only says that Polygnotus depicted 'better' men but also that Polygnotus was good at depicting character (*Poet.* 6, 1450a27-8), he associates some heroic depictions with the realistic and approves of art that both depicts those who are 'better' and realistically shows character. Furthermore, Aristotle says that the good portrait artists render realistic likenesses, yet 'paint people better than they are'.¹⁴³ Therefore, although the heroic style in sculpture, according to Stewart, was indicated by poses, physiques, and expressions,¹⁴⁴ heroic poses and expressions could also be realistic.

Aristotle also argued that mimetic poets and painters should depict 'things as they once were or now are; things such as men say and believe that they are; or things such as they ought to be'.¹⁴⁵ Therefore, he gave equal weight to both the realistic and the ideal¹⁴⁶ in fine art as well as poetry. Lysippus' declaration that others represented men 'as they really were, but he represented them as they appeared to be'¹⁴⁷ is consistent with Aristotle because Lysippus does not claim to make exact likenesses, although he does strive for realism.¹⁴⁸ Posidippus indicates that Lysippus depicted Alexander's essential character—both as he was and as he appeared (i.e., as heroic), and this is evidence of Lysippus' 'idealized' realism that included bits of the subjective.¹⁴⁹ Perhaps even Posidippus' hope that a statue of himself holding a book (i.e., his 'essential character') be set up in Thebes and that he might die 'longed for by the demos and people' (*SH* 704),¹⁵⁰ further indicates his interest in artistic, 'idealized' realism.

¹⁴³ Arist. *Poet.* 15, 1454b9-11; Webster (1952) 19.

¹⁴⁴ Stewart (1990) I, 176. Cf. Butcher (1898) 134.

¹⁴⁵ Arist. *Poet.* 25, 1460b8-11: 'Since the poet is a mimetic artist like a painter or any other image maker, he must use *mimesis* to portray, in any particular instance, one of three objects: things as they once were or now are; things such as men say and believe that they are; or things such as they ought to be'. Stewart (1990) I, 186 suggests that Aristotle is referring to Demetrius, Lysippus, and Polycleitus.

¹⁴⁶ So Halliwell (2002) 310: 'Aristotle ... expressly allows for artistic idealism'. Cf. Butcher (1898) 167-70.

¹⁴⁷ Plin. *NH* 34.61-5.

¹⁴⁸ So also Stewart (1990) I, 81, 186.

¹⁴⁹ Stewart (1990) I, 186-7; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5; T3 = Quint. 12.7-9. Sens (2002) 7-8: Posidippus is more interested in ordinary individuals rather than the heroic.

¹⁵⁰ In Posidippus' epigram on his old age (preserved on two wood tablets from Egypt), he summons the Muses to Thebes and hopes that his statue might be set up in the agora (Fraser (1972) I, 557-8 & n.46 (II, 797); Lloyd-Jones (1963). Page (1941) no.114).

3.5 Posidippus X.34-37 = 66 AB

± 13 ἐδόκησε τὸ βοίδιον ἄξιον ὀλκῆς
 ± 14]καὶ τρισεπαργύριον
 ± 13] χεῖρα, σοφὸν χρέος εἶδ' ἐπ' ἀδόξου
 ± 11 ἀλλ' ἄλλὰ Μύρων ἐπόει.

To the oxherd, the cow seemed worthy to pull the plough, and thrice covered in silver. (But when he stretched out his) hand, he unexpectedly saw a remarkable thing: it was not a real cow but Myron's creation.¹⁵¹

The fifth, fragmentary epigram deals with Myron's fifth-century sculpture of a cow.¹⁵² Myron was an important predecessor of Lysippus and he, like Lysippus, both embraced *symmetria* and differed from the Canon of Polycleitus.¹⁵³ Myron was known for depiction of 'movement' (*rhythmos*),¹⁵⁴ as was Lysippus.¹⁵⁵ Posidippus' epigram is consistent with a series of poems on Myron's cow in the *Greek Anthology*,¹⁵⁶ which also stress artistic realism. In all the epigrams the cow is only described indirectly by its lifelike realism: the cow is able to fool both humans and animals into believing that it is alive.¹⁵⁷ But Posidippus differs slightly because he provides a small amount of detail, saying that the statue is 'triple-covered in silver' (τρισεπαργύριον Pos. X.35). The silver patina indicates that the statue, although realistic, is an artificial creation (and the poet's highlight of artifice weakens the statue's realism), as does Posidippus' concluding declaration that the cow is 'Myron's creation' (Μύρων ἐπόει Pos. X.37). This language similar to an anonymous epigram in which Myron's cow declares that if someone will attach it to a plough, it will plough as far as Myron's art enables it.¹⁵⁸ The cow's speech and movement is undercut by the epigram's acknowledgement that the cow is merely bronze, the result of Myron's craftsmanship. Posidippus highlights artistic realism but also acknowledges that sculpture is something created and artificial.

¹⁵¹ The conjecture is from Austin and Bastianini. The translation is mine.

¹⁵² Plin. *NH* 34.57-8. Gutzwiller (1998) 246.

¹⁵³ Stewart (1990) I, 255-6; T43 = Plin. *NH*.34.57-8. Myron reportedly was *numerosior in arte* than Polycleitus (Plin. *NH* 34.55, 57-8) which apparently means that he followed different sets of proportions (Pollitt (1974) 27).

¹⁵⁴ Stewart (1990) I, 81, 256; T43 = Pliny *NH* 34.57-8. Pliny (Plin. *NH* 34.58) and Cicero say that Myron's art was not fully natural (Cic. *Brut.* 70).

¹⁵⁵ Stewart (1990) I, 291; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5. Lysippus' large statue groups captured moments of crisis (Pollitt (1986) 7).

¹⁵⁶ *AP* 9.713-742, 793-798. Gutzwiller (1998) 245-50; Stewart (1990) I, 257; cf. Stewart *ibid.*, 148-9; Fraser (1972) I, 605.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. *AP* 9.721a; 9.722 = Antipater 432-3 (38) G-P; 9.725. Not only Prometheus can 'mould living creatures' (πλάττεις ἔμπνοα *AP* 9.724 = Antipater 436-7 (40) G-P). Myron 'did not mould' his cow but gave birth to it (οὐ πλάσεν *AP* 9.726). Anacreon says Myron's cow 'appears to breathe' (ἔμπνοον *AP* 9.715 = Page *FGE* 528-9). Myron 'pretended' (ψεύσατο) that his cow was bronze (*AP* 9.716 = Page *FGE* 530-1). Leonidas' cow says, 'Myron did not mould me; he lied' (*AP* 9.719 = 2508-9 (88) G-P). Myron's cow 'deceived' a bull (ἐξαπάτησε *AP* 9.734 (Dioscorides)). Cf. Gorgias' *Helen* 17-19 (Stewart (1990) I, 81).

¹⁵⁸ *AP* 9.729 (anon.). Cf. *AP* 9.723 = Antipater 434-5 (39) G-P; *AP* 9.727.

Posidippus' balance between artistry and realism is similar to the 'idealized' realism of Lysippus.¹⁵⁹ It also suggests Aristotle, who believed that there was pleasure in the contemplation of both the material artifact and what it represents, and that all arts require knowledge both of a work of art's appearance and its constituent materials (*Phys.* 2.2, 194b1-6).¹⁶⁰ Posidippus, likewise, gives weight both to the artifact's craftsmanship and to the quality of the representation. Moreover, Posidippus' linkage between realistic art and nature through his statement that the cow seemed alive recalls Aristotle's declaration that in any human art, the stages leading to final development are the same in art as in nature and that the 'relation of antecedent to consequent is identical in art and in nature' (*Phys.* 2.8, 199a8-20).

3.6 Posidippus X.38-XI.5 = 67 AB

+14 [.i..]. ἀντυγος ἐ<γ>γύθεν ἄθρει
 τῆς Θεωδορείης χειρὸς ὅσος κάματος·
 ὄψει γὰρ ζυγόδεσμα καὶ ἠνία καὶ τροχὸν ἵππων
 ἄξονα <θ>[ε] ἠνιό]χου τ' ὄμμα καὶ ἄκρα χερῶν·
 ὄψει δ' εὖ [± 12]... εος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶιδε
 ἐζομέν[ην ἀν ἴσην ἄρματι] μύϊαν ἴδοις.

See how hard the hand of Theodorus has worked when you observe the chariot closely. For you will see the yoke, the reins, the bit of the horses, the axle, the driver's eye and the tips of his fingers. You will see well... and you might see sitting on it a fly the size of the chariot.¹⁶¹

Posidippus' sixth epigram describes a self-depiction by the sixth-century sculptor Theodorus of Samos, who was one of two Samian sculptors who first cast bronze statuary in a mold¹⁶² and who was known for 'calculating the commensurability (*symmetria*) of statues not according to the appearance (*phantasia*) presented to the eye' but by dividing the body into parts (Diod. 1.98).¹⁶³ Posidippus' description of Theodorus' artwork is corroborated by Pliny, who says that the sculpture was famous for its realism (*similitudo*) and fineness (*subtilitas*); it held a little chariot and four horses, and a fly could cover the chariot and charioteer with its wings (*NH* 34.83).¹⁶⁴ Stewart remarks, 'Pliny's use of similitude or "likeness" here links Theodorus with Demetrius of Alopece and

¹⁵⁹ Stewart calls Lysippus' work 'individual, but just as much an artful construct' (Stewart (1990) I, 187). For Lysippus' idealized realism: Stewart (1990) I, 186-7, 191; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5; T3 = Quint. 12.7-9. Myron was also not completely realistic in his depictions of the human body (Plin. *NH* 34.58).

¹⁶⁰ Arist. *Phys.* 2.2, 194a22-8; 194b10-12. Halliwell (2002) 181-2.

¹⁶¹ The conjecture is from Austin and Bastianini. The translation is adapted from Austin and Bastianini (2002).

¹⁶² Gutzwiller (200a) 7-8; Hdt. 3.41, 60; 7.27; Stewart (1990) I, 244-6; T20 = Paus. 10.38.6-7.

¹⁶³ Cf. Stewart (1990) I, 245; T21 = Diod. 1.98.

¹⁶⁴ Plin. *NH* 34.83: *destra limam tenet, laeva tribus digitis quadrigulam tenuit, tralatam Praeneste, parvitatibus ut miraculum: pictam eam currumque et aurigam integeret alis simul facta musca*. Cf. Gutzwiller (2002a) 7-8 & n.8. Stewart (1990) I, 245-6; T22 = Plin. *NH* 34.83.

Lysistratus, brother of Lysippus'.¹⁶⁵ But it also suggests Lysippus, who was concerned with proportionality, who fashioned chariot groups,¹⁶⁶ and who possibly made a miniature Heracles for Alexander the Great.¹⁶⁷

Posidippus' poem on Theodorus is consistent with his interest in Lysippus' realism. Although the archaic Theodorus invented certain techniques, Posidippus makes no mention of Theodorus' technical innovations. Unlike Callimachus, Posidippus has no antiquarian artistic interests and does not explain the origin of artistic techniques: Posidippus is only attracted by Theodorus' realism on the miniature scale and because Theodorus was a forerunner of Lysippus.

Posidippus emphasizes the visual (ὄψει Pos. XI.2, 4, ἄθρει X.38; cf. εἶδομεν εἶδ' X.27, εἶδ' X.36), and this language alludes to Lysippus, who transformed *symmetria* by taking into account appearance (ὄψις, φαντασία).¹⁶⁸ But Posidippus also hints at Aristotle, who recognized the power of the visual both in drama and through language that causes the reader to visualize a scene. One of Aristotle's six parts of tragedy is the 'spectacle' (ὄψις) or 'means' of *mimesis*.¹⁶⁹ Aristotle said that the orator should aim at vividness: he should set things 'before the eyes' of his audience (*Rhet.* 3.10, 1410b33-5) and he declared that the cognitive process as a result of perception is integral to *mimesis* (*Poet.* 4, 1448b12-19).¹⁷⁰ Since Aristotle says that the poet should 'put the actual scenes as far as possible before the eyes', (*Poet.* 17, 1455a 22-26; cf. 14, 1453b9 διὰ τῆς ὄψεως) he undoubtedly believed that the fine artist should do the same: he declares that fine art provides pleasure to the 'spectator' (*Poet.* 4, 1448b8-13),¹⁷¹ and that pleasure is derived from viewing pictorial imitations (*Part. Anim.* 1.5, 645a12-13).¹⁷² When Posidippus uses ὄψις with respect to the perception of Theodorus' art, he indicates his awareness of the visual impact of mimetic works on the viewer.

3.7 Posidippus XI.6-11 = 68 AB

ἦθελον Ἡέλιον Ῥώδιοι περιμάκε]α θεῖναι
 δις τόσον, ἀλλὰ Χάρης Λίνδιο[ς] ὠρίσατο
 μηθένα τεχνίταν ἔ<τ>ι μείζονα [τ]οῦδε κ[ο]λοσσόν
 θήσειν· εἰ δὲ Μύρων εἰς τετράπ[η]χ]ον ὄβρον
 σεμνὸς ἐκεῖνος ἀνήκε. Χάρης πρῶ[τον] μετὰ τέχνα[ς]
 ζῶ<ι>ον ἐχαλκούργει γὰς μέγ[α] θαῦμ' ἐ]πέό]ν.

¹⁶⁵ Stewart (1990) I, 245-6 on T22; T3 = Quint. 12.7-9. Lysistratus was the first to create life portraits from a mold (Stewart (1990) I, 293; T133 = Plin. *NH* 35.153). Cf. Pollitt (1974) 430-4. Lysippus was also known for his chariot groups (Stewart (1990) I, T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5).

¹⁶⁶ Stewart (1990) I, 186-7; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5.

¹⁶⁷ Mart. 9.44; Stat. *Sil.* 4.6.32-47. Richter (1970) 229-31.

¹⁶⁸ Pollitt (1974) 29.

¹⁶⁹ Arist. *Poet.* 6, 1450a.8-10. Silk (1994) 109.

¹⁷⁰ Heath (2001) 9-10; Halliwell (2001).

¹⁷¹ Arist. *Poet.* 4, 1448b8-13: καὶ τὸ χαίρειν τοῖς μιμήμασι πάντας... τούτων τὰς εἰκόνας τὰς μάλιστα ἠκριβωμένας χαίρομεν θεωροῦντες. Butcher (1898) 204-5.

¹⁷² Arist. *Part. Anim.* 1.5, 645a12-13: τὰς μὲν εἰκόνας αὐτῶν θεωροῦντες χαίρομεν ὅτι τὴν δημιουργήσασαν τέχνην συνθεωροῦμεν.

The Rhodians wished to dedicate (a statue of) the [gigantic] sun twice as big, but the Lindian Chares made sure that no artisan would ever create a larger *kolossos* than this one; if Myron was modest enough to reach the limit of four cubits, Chares through craft made the first statue in bronze more imposing than the earth, a great marvel.¹⁷³

The seventh epigram describes the Colossus of Rhodes built by Chares of Lindos (fl. 280), a pupil of Lysippus.¹⁷⁴ The epigram focuses solely on the size of the statue, not its aesthetic qualities. But Posidippus thought that appropriate size was an important aesthetic principle: he proclaims that artists should follow modern rules for ‘larger-than-life statues’ (κολοσσῶν Pos. X.8; cf. κ[ο]λοσσόν Pos. XI.8)¹⁷⁵ and notes the size of Hecataeus’ statue (με]γέθει Pos. X.18). Posidippus also states that although the Rhodians wanted a statue twice as large, Chares made sure that none would be larger than his (Pos. XI.6-7, 8). Since Philo says that Chares kept *symmetria* in mind even when creating a statue of such great height,¹⁷⁶ Chares’ apparently followed Lysippean proportionality since Lysippus was known for his interest both in the proportionality of the human body and in making tall statues still appear realistic.¹⁷⁷ Moreover, since Lysippus made colossal statues fashionable¹⁷⁸ and created a colossal bronze Heracles (Strabo 6.3.1), Posidippus’ interest in huge statues suits his Lysippean theme.

But Chares’ refusal to create an overly-large statue also hints at Aristotle since Aristotle praised appropriate size in art, saying that beauty consists of magnitude and order with an appropriate arrangement of parts. Aristotle declares that an object or creature should neither be minuscule nor too large, saying that it should be able to be ‘taken in by the eye’: i.e., not too small or large to be seen (Arist. *Poet.* 6, 1450b34-1451a6).

Posidippus seems to echo Aristotle since although he praises Chares for his skill (Χάρης πρῶ[τον] μετὰ τέχνα[ς] XI.10), he calls Myron, an important forerunner of Lysippus, ‘revered’ (Μύρων... σεμνός ἐκεῖνος XI.9-10), although Myron did not create sculptures greater than four cubits.¹⁷⁹ Posidippus adheres to Lysippian principles, expressing interest in the Colossus of Rhodes for its size, but he also follows Aristotle, praising Myron because his realism has more artistic value¹⁸⁰ and apparently because Myron eschewed colossal statues. Mention of

¹⁷³ Translation based on Kosmetatou and Papalexandrou (2003) 56, with changes from Angio (2003) in lines 10-11: Χάρης πρῶ[τον]...] ζῶ<ι>ον ἐχαλκούργει γὰς μέγ[α] θαῦμ’ ἐπ[ι]εό]ν.

¹⁷⁴ For Chares and the school of Lysippus see Pollitt (1986) 55; Stewart (1990) I, 297-300, T142 = Plin. *NH* 34.41, T144 = *Rhet. ad Herennium* 4.6.9. For the Colossus, see Haynes (1957) and Maryon (1956).

¹⁷⁵ Although Kosmetatou and Papalexandrou (2003) 53-6 argues that *kolossoi* refers to statues in general without regard to size, in this poem it does mean huge statues (cf. Fraenkel. (1950), on Aesch. *Ag.* 416; Webster (1939) 166).

¹⁷⁶ Stewart (1990) I, 298-9; T143 = Philo, *On the Seven Wonders of the World* 4.

¹⁷⁷ Stewart (1990) I, 291; T124 = Plin. *NH* 34.61-5.

¹⁷⁸ Pollitt (1986) 49. Stewart (1990) I, 292; T126 = Plin. *NH* 34.40. Jex-Blake and Sellers (1896) 31. Angio (2003) 215.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. pseudo-Simonides *AP* 16.82 (τὸν ἐν Ῥόδῳ κολοσσὸν ὀκτάκις δέκα / Χάρης ἐποίει πῆχεων ὁ Λίνδιος); Plin. *NH* 34.41; Philo, *On the Seven Wonders of the World* 4.

¹⁸⁰ Kosmetatou and Papalexandrou (2003) 56-7.

Myron links this epigram to Myron's cow in the sixth epigram;¹⁸¹ reference to colossal sculpture provides a link to the first poem (κολοσσῶν Pos. X.8) and to the epigram on Hecateus' large statue (μεγέθει Pos. X.18), and also provides balance to the collection by providing contrast with Theodamus' miniature work.¹⁸²

4. Conclusion

Posidippus' poems on sculpture are important statements of aesthetic theory in which he both expresses Lysippean principles and echoes Aristotle. Posidippus' emphases on accuracy, proportionality, and character refer to Lysippus' artistic philosophy. But Posidippus' balance between realism and artistry and his interest in idealized realism and in the visual suggest both Lysippus and Aristotle. Furthermore, Posidippus' attention to iconic realism, his distinction between the heroic and the realistic, his interest in 'dual-aspect mimeticism', his emphasis on understanding both appearance and constituent materials, his interest in appropriate size, the relation between action and character, the importance of action and speech and of realistically depicting 'better people', and his incorporation of truth into *mimesis* are all Aristotelean.

Bibliography

- Angio, F. (2002a). 'La statua in bronzo di Idomeneo, opera di Cresila (Posidippo di Pella, P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, col. X, ll. 26-29)', *MH* 59, 137-141.
- (2002b). 'Filita di Cos in bronzo (Ermesionatte fr. 7, 75-78 Powel-P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 col. X, ll.16-25)', *APF* 48, 17-24.
- (2003). 'L'epigramma di Posidippo per il Colosso di Rodi (P.Mil.Vol.VIII.309, col. XI, ll.6-11): contributo testuale alle ll.10-11', *SIFC* ser. 4, 1.1-2, 215-217.
- Atkins, J.W.H. (1934). *Literary Criticism in Antiquity. A Sketch of its Development*, vol. 1. Gloucester MA.
- Auerbach, E. (1953). *Mimesis. The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. New York.
- Austin, C. and Bastianini, G. (ed.) (2002). *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*. Milan.
- Bastianini, G. and Casanova, A. (ed.) (2002). *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo*. Firenze.
- Bastianini, G. and Gallazzi, C. (ed.) (2001). *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi (P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*. Papiri dell' Università degli Studi di Milano, 8. Milan.
- Beazley, J.D. and Ashmole, B. (1932). *Greek Sculpture and Painting to the End of the Hellenistic Period*. Cambridge.

¹⁸¹ Pos. X.34-37 = 66 AB.

¹⁸² Pos. XI.1-5 = 67 AB.

- Benndorf, O. (1862). *De Anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae ad artes spectant*. Bonn.
- Bernardini, P. and Bravi, L. (2002). 'Note di lettura al nuovo Posidippo', *QUCC* 70, 147-163.
- Bing, P. (1988) 'Theocritus' epigrams on the statues of ancient poets' *A&A* 34, 117-23.
- Borbein, A.H. (1996). 'Polykleitos', *YCS* 30, 66-90.
- Brunn, H. (1879). 'Die griechischen Bukoliker und die bildende Kunst', *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, philos.-philol.-hist. Klasse. II, 1-20.
- Bulloch, A., Gruen, E.S., Long, A.A. and Stewart, A. (ed.) (1993). *Images and Ideologies. Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*.
- Butcher, S.H. (1898). *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*. 2nd ed. London.
- Bywater, I. (ed.) (1894). *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. Oxford.
- (1909). *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*. Oxford.
- Cameron, A. (1993). *The Greek Anthology: from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.
- (1995). *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.
- (1996). 'Epigram, Greek', in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (ed.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd edition, Oxford & New York), 535-6.
- Clayman, D.L. (1977). 'The origins of Greek literary criticism and the *Aetia* prologue', *WS* 90, 27-34.
- (1982). 'Hellenistic Poetry at Alexandria: the epigrammatists, Callimachus, and Apollonius of Rhodes', in T.J. Luce (ed.) *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome* (New York), 1.449-482.
- Couat, A.E. (1931). *Alexandrian Poetry under the First Three Ptolemies 324-333 BC*. London & New York.
- Cunningham, I.C. (1971). *Herodas: Mimiambi*. Oxford.
- De Angeli, S. (1988). 'Mimesis e Techne', *QUCC* 28, 27-45.
- Edwards, C.M. (1996). 'Lysippos', *YCS* 30, 130-153.
- Else, G.F. (1957) *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument*. Cambridge MA.
- (1958) 'Imitation in the fifth century', *CP* 53, 73-90.
- Falivene, M.R. (2002). 'Esercizi di Ekphrasis delle opposte fortune di Posidippo e Callimao', in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (ed.), *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo* (Firenze), 33-40.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2002). *Muse e modelli. La poesia ellenistica da Alessandria Magno ad Augusto*. Roma & Bari.
- Ferguson, J. (1970). 'The Epigrams of Callimachus', *G&R* 17, 64-80.

- Ferrari, F. (2004). 'Posidippus, the Milan Papyrus, and some Hellenistic Anthologies', *Classics@* 1, 1-14. http://chs.harvard.edu/_/File/_/ferrari.pdf
- Fornara, C.W. (1983). *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Berkeley & Los Angeles.
- Fowler, B.H. (1989). *The Hellenistic Aesthetic*. Bristol.
- Fraenkel, E. (ed.) (1950). *Aeschylus Agamemnon*. Oxford
- Fraser, P.M. (1972). *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Vols. 1-3. Oxford.
- Frede, M. (1983). 'Stoics and skeptics on clear and distinct impressions', in M. Burnyeat (ed.), *The Skeptical Tradition* (Berkeley), 65-93.
- Freese, J.H. (trans.) (1926) *Aristotle. The 'Art' of Rhetoric*. Cambridge MA & London.
- Friedländer, P. (1912). *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius: Kunstbeschreibungen Justinianischer Zeit*. Leipzig.
- Fyfe, W.H. (trans.) (1932) *Aristotle. The Poetics*. Cambridge MA & London.
- Gallop, D. (1999). 'Aristotle: aesthetics and philosophy of mind', in D. Furley (ed.), *From Aristotle to Augustine* (London), 76-108.
- Gelzer, T. (1985). 'Mimus und Kunsttheorie bei Herondas, Mimiambus 4', in C. Schäublin (ed.), *Catalepton: Festschrift für Bernhard Wyss zum 80. Geburtstag* (Basel), 96-110.
- (1993). 'Transformations', in A. Bulloch *et al.* (ed.), *Images and Ideologies* (Berkeley & Los Angeles), 130-151.
- Goldhill, S. (1994). 'The naive and the knowing eye: ecphrasis and the culture of viewing in the Hellenistic world', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (ed.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge), 197-223.
- Gomme, A.W. (1954). *The Greek Attitude to Poetry and History*. Berkeley.
- Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L. (ed.) (1956). *The Greek Anthology; Hellenistic Epigrams* Vols.1-2. Cambridge.
- Gronewald, M. (1973). 'Ein Epigramm-Papyrus', *ZPE* 12, 92-98
- Gross, K. (1992). *The Dream of the Moving Statue*. Ithaca.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. (1998). *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley.
- (2002a). 'A new Hellenistic poetry book P.Mil.Vogl.VIII 309', Papers Presented at the American Philological Association Meeting. January 2002. <http://www.apaclassics.org/Publications/Posidippus/GutzwillerPosidippus.pdf>
- (2002b). 'Posidippus on statuary', in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (ed.), *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo* (Firenze), 41-59.
- (2002c), 'Art's echo: the tradition of Hellenistic ecphrastic epigram', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker, *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Leuven), 85-112.

- Halliwell, S. (2001). 'Aristotelian mimesis and human understanding', in Ø. Andersen and J. Haarberg (ed.), *Making Sense of Aristotle: Essays in Poetics* (London), 87-107.
- (2002). *The Aesthetics of Mimesis. Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton NJ.
- Hansen, P.A. (ed.) (1983-). *Carmina epigraphica Graeca*. Berlin & NY.
- Hardie, A., (2003). 'The statue(s) of Philitas (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 Col. X 16-25 and Hermesianax fr. 7.75-78 P.)', *ZPE* 143, 27-36.
- Harriott, R. (1969). *Poetry and Criticism before Plato*. London.
- Haynes, D.E.L. (1957). 'Philo of Byzantium and the Colossus of Rhodes', *JHS* 77, 311-312.
- Heath, M. (2001). 'Aristotle and the pleasures of tragedy', in Ø. Andersen and J. Haarberg (ed.), *Making Sense of Aristotle: Essays in Poetics* (London), 7-23.
- Hopkinson, N. (ed.) (1988). *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.
- Hutchinson, G. (1988). *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.
- Imbert, C. (1980). 'Stoic logic and Alexandrian poetics', in M. Schofield *et al.* (ed.), *Doubt and Dogmatism* (Oxford), 182-216.
- Jex-Blake, J. and Sellers, E. (1896). *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. London.
- Kassel, R. (ed.) (1965) *Aristotelis de arte poetica liber*. Oxford.
- Kennedy, G. (ed.) (1989). *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, I: Classical Criticism*. Cambridge.
- Körte, A. (1929). *Hellenistic Poetry*. New York.
- Kosmetatou, E., and Papalexandrou, N. (2003). 'Size matters: Poseidippos and the colossi', *ZPE* 143, 53-58.
- Krieger, M. (1992). *Ekphrasis: The Illusion of the Natural Sign*. Baltimore
- Lapini, W. (2003). 'Note Posidippee', *ZPE* 143, 37-52.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1963). 'The Seal of Posidippus', *JHS* 83, 75-99.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P. (ed.) (1983). *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin.
- Mair, G.R. (trans.) (1955). *Callimachus, Hymns and Epigrams*. Cambridge MA & London.
- Maryon, H. (1956). 'The Colossus of Rhodes', *JHS* 76, 68-86.
- McCulloch, J.P. (trans.) (1972). *The Poems of Sextus Propertius*. Berkeley.
- Nicosia, S. (1968). *Teocrito e l'arte figurate*. Palermo.
- Page, D.L. (ed.) (1941). *Select Papyri*, vol. III: *Literary papyri*. Cambridge MA & London.

- (ed.) (1981). *Further Greek Epigrams: Epigrams before A.D. 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources, not included in Hellenistic Epigrams or the Garland of Philip*. Cambridge.
- Palm, J. (1965-1966). ‘Bemerkungen zur Ekphrase in der griechischen Literatur’, in *Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala Arsbok*, 108-211.
- Parsons, P.J. (2001). ‘Callimachus and the Hellenistic epigram’, in F. Montanari and L. Lehnus (ed.), *Callimaque. Sept Exposés suivis de Discussions* (Fondation Hardt Entretiens sur l’Antiquité Classique 48, Genève), 99-141.
- Paton, W. (trans.) (1917-1918). *The Greek Anthology*. Vols. 2-5. London.
- Pfeiffer, R. (ed.) (1949-1953). *Callimachus*. Vols. 1-2. Oxford.
- Pollitt, J.J. (1974). *The Ancient View of Greek Art. Criticism, History, and Terminology*. New Haven & London.
- (1986). *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge.
- (1990). *The Art of Ancient Greece. Sources and Documents*. Cambridge.
- Rackham, H. (trans.) (1934) *Aristotle. The Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge MA & London.
- (trans.) (1944) *Aristotle. Politics*. Cambridge MA & London.
- Richter, G.M.A. (1970). *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*. 4th ed. New Haven & London.
- Ross, W.D. (ed.) (1957) *Aristotelis Politica*. Oxford.
- (ed.) (1960) *Aristotelis Physica*. Oxford.
- Rusten, J., Cunningham, I.C. and Knox, A.D. (ed. & trans.) (1993). *Theophrastus Characters, Herodas Mimes, Cercidas and the Choliambic Poets*. Cambridge MA & London.
- Schweitzer, B. (1934). ‘Mimesis und phantasia’, *Philologus* 89, 286-300.
- Scodel, R. (2003). ‘A note on Posidippus 63 AB (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 X 1625)’, *ZPE* 142, 44.
- Sens, A. (2002). ‘The new Posidippus, Asclepiades, and Hecataeus’ Philitas-statue’, Papers Presented at the American Philological Association (2002). <http://www.apaclassics.org/Publications/Posidippus/SensPosidippus.pdf>
- Smith, R.R.R. (1993). ‘Kings and philosophers’, in A. Bulloch *et al.* (ed.), *Images and Ideologies* (Berkeley & Los Angeles), 202-211.
- Sörbom, G. (1966). *Mimesis and Art*. Stockholm.
- Stewart, A.F. (1978a). ‘Lysippan Studies, I. The only creator of beauty’, *AJA* 82, 163-171.
- (1978b). ‘The Canon of Polykleitos: a question of evidence’, *JHS* 98, 122-131.
- (1990). *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration*. Vol. 1. New Haven.

- Van Straten, F. (1993). 'Images of gods and men in a changing society: self-identity in Hellenistic religion', in A. Bulloch *et al.* (ed.), *Images and Ideologies* (Berkeley & Los Angeles), 248-264.
- Trypanis, C.A. (trans.) (1978). *Callimachus, Aetia, Iambi, Lyric Poems*. Cambridge MA & London.
- Walbank, F.W. (1999). *Hellenistic World*. Revised edition. Cambridge.
- Warry, J.G. (1962). *Greek Aesthetic Theory. A Study of Callistic and Aesthetic Concepts in the Works of Plato and Aristotle*. London.
- Webster, T.B.L. (1939), 'Greek theories of art and literature down to 400 BC', *CQ* 33, 166-179.
- (1952). 'Plato and Aristotle as critics of Greek art', *Symbolae Osloenses* 29, 8-23.
- (1964). *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. London.
- Wicksteed, P.H., and Cornford, F.M. (trans.) (1957, 1934) *Aristotle. The Physics*. Vols. 1 & 2. Cambridge MA & London.
- Zanker, G. (1981). 'Enargeia in the ancient criticism of poetry', *RM* 124, 297-311.
- (1987). *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and its Audience*. London & Sydney.
- (2000). 'Aristotle's *Poetics* and the painters', *AJP* 121, 225-235.
- (2003). 'New light on the literary category of "ekphrastic epigram" in antiquity: the new Posidippus (col. X 7; XI 19 P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)', *ZPE* 143, 59-62.
- Zeitlin, F. (1994). 'The artful eye: vision, ecphrasis and spectacle in Euripidean theatre', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (ed.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge), 138-196.