

M. N. Kazanskaya

Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS / St. Petersburg State University,
St. Petersburg, Russia. maria.kazanskaya@gmail.com; m.kazanskaya@spbu.ru

DORIEUS' EPIGRAM ON MILO OF CROTON (ATHEN. 10, 412F–413A)

The paper studies Dorieus' epigram on the renowned Greek wrestler Milo of Croton, about how he had carried a steer on his shoulders in Olympia and then sacrificed it at the altar of Zeus and ate the animal whole all by himself. Athenaeus preserves the epigram in his passage on extraordinary appetites of athletes, with reference to the historian Phylarchus who had cited the poem in his *Histories* (Athen. 10, 412f–413a). Nothing is known about the poet Dorieus, and this is the only text that has come down to us that is ascribed to him. The epigram (and the whole passage from Athenaeus) is regularly mentioned as source for the anecdote of Milo and the steer, but it has not received much scholarly attention as a poetic text (with the exception of a very short commentary in Page's *Further Greek Epigrams*). The paper presents an extensive linear commentary on the epigram. It is shown that it was a work of an extremely well-read and intelligent poet, whose references to Alexandrian scholarship show that he was either an Alexandrian himself, or at the very least well versed in Homeric scholarship of his time. He was not afraid to invent new expressions (as *θηπόλιον* for the Altar of Zeus, v. 6), nor to engage in poetic experiment, as in the case of the highly unusual tmesis in v. 8. In his description of Milo, he visibly plays with the iconography of Moschophoros and Kriophoroi statues, inviting his readers to imagine a statue of the athlete with the steer on his shoulders.

Keywords: Dorieus, Milo of Croton, Athenaeus, Phylarchus, Hellenistic epigrams, steer, Moschophoros, Hermes Kriophoros, *θηπόλιον*, Altar of Zeus in Olympia, *πομπή*, tmesis, *θαῦμα*, paradoxography.

M. N. Казанская

Институт лингвистических исследований РАН / СПбГУ,
Санкт-Петербург, Россия. maria.kazanskaya@gmail.com; .kazanskaya@spbu.ru

Эпиграмма Дориея о Милоне Кротонском (Athen. 10, 412f–413a)

Статья посвящена эпиграмме Дориея о том, как Милон Кротонский после победы на одной из олимпиад поднял на плечи быка, принес его к алтарю Зевса, где принес в жертву, а потом съел его целиком. О Дориее ничего не известно, и кроме этой эпigramмы ни один его текст не сохранился. В статье предлагается построчный комментарий эпigramмы. Показывается, что поэт был прекрасно

знаком с александрийской филологией, что он тщателен в выборе слов и не боится поэтических экспериментов.

Ключевые слова: Дорией, Милон Кротонский, Афиней, Филарх, эллинистическая эпиграмма, бык, Мосхофор, Гермес Кριοфор, θηπόλιον, алтарь Зевса в Олимпии, πομπή, тмесис, θαῦμα, парадоксография.

In book 10 of *Deipnosophistae* Athenaeus cites some instances of athletes' extraordinary appetites, focusing in particular on one the most famous ancient wrestlers, Milo of Croton¹. Referring to a treatise on athletic competitions (Περὶ ἀγώνων) by Theodorus of Hierapolis, Athenaeus says that Milo was able to eat twenty minas of meat and twenty minas of bread a day, accompanying them by three measures (*choai*) of wine; and, probably referring to the same Theodorus, he recounts the anecdote of Milo carrying a four-year old bull on his shoulders to the stadium in Olympia, and then eating it all by himself in one day (Athen. 10, 412 e–f). He then cites an alternative account from Alexander Aetolus, according to which Alexander's own fellow Aetolian, Titormos, ate an ox in competition with Milo for breakfast (= Alex. Aetol. fr. 10 Lightfoot). The section concludes with a reference to the historian Phylarchus who had, apparently, recounted the same anecdote of the bull carried around the stadium in Olympia and then eaten by Milo, as Theodorus of Hierapolis, accompanying it by an epigram by an otherwise unknown poet Dorieus (Athen. 10, 412f–413a):

Φύλαρχος δέ φησιν ἐν τῇ γ' τῶν ἱστοριῶν τὸν
Μίλωνα ταῦρον καταφαγεῖν κατακλιθέντα πρὸ τοῦ
βωμοῦ τοῦ Διός· διὸ καὶ ποιῆσαι εἰς αὐτὸν Δωριέα
τὸν ποιητὴν τάδε·
τοῖος ἔην Μίλων, ὅτ' ἀπὸ χθονὸς ἦρατο βρῖθος,
τετραέτη δαμάλην, ἐν Διὸς εἰλαπίνας,
ᾧμοις δὲ κτήνος τὸ πελώριον ὡς νέον ἄρνα
ἦνεγκεν δι' ὄλης κοῦφα πανηγύρεως.
καὶ θάμβος μὲν, ἀτὰρ τοῦδε πλέον ἦνυσε θαῦμα 5
πρόσθεν Πεισαίου, ξεῖνε, θηπολίῳ·
ὄν γὰρ ἐπόμπευσεν βοῦν ἄζυγον, εἰς κρέα τόνδε

¹ Milo of Croton was one of the most renowned athletes of antiquity: he won the Olympic games six times (first time as πᾶς, and then five times as περιδοδίκης), and was victor six times at Delphi, nine times at Nemea, ten times at the Isthmian games (Sext. Afr. *ad Ol.* 52 p. Rutgers). Ancient sources on Milo are assembled in Mordze (1932); see also Ghisellini (1988: 48), Antonaccio (2014: 194–195), Decker (2000) with references.

κόψας πάντα κατ' οὔν μοῦνος ἑδαΐσατό νιν
(Athen. 10, 412f–413a = 10, 4 Kaibel)².

6 Πεισαίου Α: Πισαίου Μ Ρ Mus 7–8 cf. Eustath. in Od. 206, 38: περι δὲ Μίλωνος τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου φησὶ Δωριεὺς, ὅτι ὄν ἐπόμπευσε βοῦν εἰς κρέα τὸνδε κόψας, πάντα κατ' οὔν μοῦνος δαΐσατό νιν. 8 πάντα κατ' οὔν κόψας com. Wackernagel

“Phylarchus says in the third book of his Histories that Milo ate a steer before the altar of Zeus: and for that reason the poet Dorieus composed on him the following poem: ‘Such was Milo, as he lifted the weight from the earth, a four-year old bullock, and carried this monstrous livestock on his shoulders lightly as a newborn lamb all around the assembly. And that in itself was stunning, but he accomplished an even greater wonder by the altar of Pisa: for that bull, yet untouched by yoke, that he had ceremoniously conveyed, having cut him up into pieces of meat, he ate him up all on his own’.”

Athenaeus' introduction of the quotation by means of *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction (διὸ καὶ ποιῆσαι εἰς αὐτὸν Δωριέα τὸν ποιητὴν τάδε) shows unequivocally that the poem had been cited by Phylarchus (or at the very least would have been mentioned by him), which would place the *terminus ante quem* for Dorieus at the end of 3rd century BCE: Polybius tells us that Phylarchus was contemporary of Aratus of Sicyon who died in 213 BCE³. Phylarchus had a reputation for sensationalism and exaggeration both in presenting historical facts (cf. Polybius' reproach for his love of *τεράτεια*⁴), and for including sensational and untrustworthy material in his *Histories*⁵. If Athenaeus' presentation

² The text follows Olson's Teubner edition of Athenaeus (Olson 2020: 156–157). The short critical apparatus accompanying the text of poem is compounded by me (the manuscripts in the note on the variant readings Πεισαίου and Πισαίου follow Olson's edition).

³ Polyb. 2, 56, 1; cf. Gow, Page (1965: II, 364).

⁴ On the term *τεράτεια* in Polybius' criticism of Phylarchus, see Sacks (1981: 162–170); Eckstein (2013: 328–329).

⁵ Eckstein assembles an amusing gallery of anecdotes on human-animal interactions, including Milo and the bull, that Phylarchus had told (Eckstein 2013: 324–325), pointing out that their presence would contribute to

of Dorieus' quotation in Phylarchus is accurate, the historian would have quoted the poem to corroborate the anecdote.

Except for Athenaeus (citing Phylarchus) no other source mentions Dorieus: it has been suggested, purely on the coincidence of names, that he might be same as the glutton by name of Dorieus in one of the epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum (also 3rd century BCE). This identification, apparently first suggested by A. Hecker, is repeated in several works on Hellenistic epigram⁶. Although absolutely impossible to prove, the suggestion seems to have a double appeal to modern scholars: (a) it would make Dorieus the contemporary of both Leonidas and Phylarchus, and (b) it would make Dorieus that Leonidas derides for gluttony the author of a poem on Milo's extraordinary appetite. While at our present state of knowledge it is not possible to identify the author of the poem quoted by Phylarchus (and from him, by Athenaeus)⁷, I would like to show that not enough attention has been given to the text itself, which has only received a brief commentary in Denys L. Page's *Further Greek Epigrams*. I will try to show that Dorieus' text,

Polybius' low opinion of Phylarchus as a historian: "It is not merely the far-fetched nature of these stories, though that is important; it is the inappropriateness of their inclusion in what purports to be a serious history".

⁶ Hecker formulated the identification of Dorieus the poet and Dorieus the glutton as a probability: "Caeterum non improbable videtur Leonidam haec scripsisse in Dorieum poetam, cuius epigramma Milonis statuae inscriptum ex Phylarchi libris descripsit Athenaeus X, 413A" (Hecker 1852: 9); it was endorsed by Reitzenstein (1893: 150), and then by Gow, Page (1965: II, 364); the tentativeness of this suggestion is noted by Page (1981: 45): "there is not close point of contact, and the identification, though quite attractive in itself, remains a mere guess". Wilamowitz however rejected the identification, mocking the reasoning behind it: "Ist es nicht lächerlich, daß ein alter schlechter Einfall dauernd Glauben findet: da soll dieser Dorieus der Dichter sein, von dem Phylarchos (Athen. 412f.) Verse, vielleicht ein Epigramm (nötig ist es nicht), anführt, das von Milon erzählt, er habe einen Ochsen durch die ganze olympische Festversammlung getragen und hinterher aufgegessen. Also ist Milon ein Schlemmer, was er nicht war, und Dorieus, weil er von ihm erzählt, auch" (von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1962: 142 n. 3).

⁷ I agree with Wilamowitz in thinking that this identification Dorieus the poet with Dorieus the glutton is unlikely; as for the bearing of this identification on Dorieus' date, I will show that there is sufficient intratextual evidence to place Dorieus in the 3rd century BCE.

despite appearances, is in fact far from evident, and that the poet is engaging in a highly erudite play. The poem is deliberately deceptive, eluding categorization and shifting between genres. To highlight these points of shift, I will start by giving a linear commentary on the epigram, and then summarize what can be extracted from the text.

1 τοῖος ἔην Μίλων. The very first words of the text place us on an unfirm ground: the pronoun τοῖος would seem to suggest that the text concludes an account (description) of Milo, or, if one imagines an inscription, refers to a sculpted image that readers could look at. And this raises at once the question of whether this was the beginning of the poem, and also what kind of poem are we dealing with⁸. Athenaeus in his summary of Phylarchus gives no indication of whether this was a complete poem, nor does he mark its genre, designating the poem simply with the pronoun τάδε. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983: 182) print the sign ⊗ at v. 1, identifying it as the beginning of the poem. Page (1981: 45) admits to excluding at first Dorieus' poem from his Oxford edition of epigrams (Page 1975) because of the uncertainty whether it is a fragment of a longer elegy or an epigram; but seeing that the address ξεῖνε in v. 6 suggests that it was in fact an epigram, Page ultimately included it in his *Further Greek Epigrams*⁹.

While Page treats the question of the poem's genre largely as an editor's problem, I would argue that Dorieus is in fact deliberately playing with his reader. The words τοῖος ἔην suggest an account of a glorious figure from the past, as e.g. in the conclusion of

⁸ Naturally, Athenaeus is not obligated to quote the poem he is using for illustration in full: right before discussing Milo's eating of the bull at Olympia, Athenaeus recounts (412e) that Theodorus of Thasos had eaten a steer as well, citing Posidippus' epigram (120 Austin, Bastianini = 14 Gow, Page); the beginning of the quotation is difficult to interpret, and while Gow and Page (1965: I, 170; cf. their commentary on the epigram in II, 493) place the first two verses in *crucis*, Austin and Bastianini (2002: 154) note that beginning of the epigram is missing (Casaubona was the first to suggest this idea, "non interim affertur epigramma, sed quattuor hi tantum versus", quoted by Austin and Bastianini in their *apparatus criticus*).

⁹ "The lines may come from a relatively long poem, not epigram but elegy, and Dorieus was for that reason excluded from my *Epigrammata Graeca*; but the address to the reader, ξεῖνε, inclines the balance the other way, and as the lines tell a complete anecdote they may as well be included in a collection of epigrams" (Page 1981: 45).

Agamemnon's rebuke to Diomedes in *Iliad* 4: after recounting Tydeus' bravery in slaying forty-nine of fifty Thebans, and contrasting it to perceived Diomedes' lingering, Agamemnon concludes,

τοῖος ἔην Τυδεὺς Αἰτωλῖος· ἀλλὰ τὸν υἱὸν
 γείνατο εἶο χέρεια μάχη, ἀγορῇ δέ τ' ἀμείνω
 (Il. 4, 399–400).

“Such was Tydeus the Aetolian: but he fathered a son (i.e. Diomedes himself — M. K.) who is worse than him in battle, and better <only> in public speeches”.

It is also worth noting that τοῖος without a corresponding οἶος at the beginning of epigrams is untypical. It is fairly certain that the ancient reader, when first confronted with this text, would have been guessing whether he was dealing with an excerpt and had missed a depiction of Milo, or this was a complete text that started *in medias res*. The ancient reader, just as we, would have been redirected by the address ξεῖνε in v. 6 towards second solution, identifying the genre of the poem as an epigram. But at the same time, the vocative ξεῖνε opens a new question of who the speaker is, and of the context of their interaction. For the ancient epigram, the vocative ξεῖνε is typically associated with epitaphs¹⁰, but nothing in the text of the poem points to a funerary context. I would suggest that ξεῖνε here points to another type of situation, that of a guide giving a tour of his city to a tourist: the address ξένε (ξεῖνε) and the corresponding Latin *hospes* (*hospites*) is attested for this pragmatic context¹¹. Thus,

¹⁰ This is the only context highlighted by Dickey (1996: 149): “In poetic inscriptions on tombstones ξένε can be used (like ὁδίτα or παριών ‘traveler’) as an address to an unknown reader”. The foreigner may be asked to carry news of the death to the homeland of the dead person (as, famously, in Simonides’ epitaph for Spartans fallen at Thermopylae), or the defunct (especially in later epigrams) may engage with him in a dialogue (series of questions and answers about his life (e.g. Antipater Sidonius 21 Gow, Page = *Anth. Pal.* 7, 164). See Bing (2009: 118–119, and chap. 7 *passim*).

¹¹ Thus, most famously in Catullus 4, 1: *Phasellus ille quem videtis, hospites...*, “that yacht that you are looking at, o guests...”, parodied in a poem on Sabinus the muleteer in the *Catalepton* (*Sabinus ille quem videtis, hospites...*, *Appendix Vergiliana, Catalepton* 10, 1). For Greek, cf. *Anth.*

after seeing the address $\xi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon$ in v. 6, Dorieus' reader is able to reconstruct, in retrospect, that the opening words $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma \xi\eta\nu \text{Μ}\acute{\iota}\lambda\omega\nu$ in v. 1 must have belonged to a speech of guide, commenting on a depiction of Milo, probably a statue¹². For a much more straightforward presentation of this kind, cf. an epigram by Alcaeus from Messene, also on a wrestler, Cleitomachus of Thebes, commemorating his entering the competition both in pancratium and in wrestling in the same Olympic games¹³:

Οἶον ὀρῆς, ὦ $\xi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon$, τὸ χάλκεον εἰκόνι λῆμα
 Κλειτομάχου, τοίαν Ἑλλάς ἐσεῖδε βίαν·
 ἄρτι γὰρ αἱματόεντα χερῶν ἀπελύετο πυγμᾶς
 ἔντεα καὶ γοργῶ μάρνατο παγκρατίῳ·
 τὸ τρίτον οὐκ ἐκόνισεν ἐπωμίδας, ἀλλὰ παλαίσας
 ἀπτῶς τοὺς τρισσοὺς Ἴσθμόθεν εἴλε πόνους.
 μοῦνος δ' Ἑλλάνων τόδ' ἔχει γέρας· ἐπτάπυλοι δὲ
 Θῆβαι καὶ γενέτωρ ἐστέφεθ' Ἑρμοκράτης

(Anth. Pal. 9, 588).

“That courage depicted in bronze that you see in this image of Clitomachus, o foreigner, such was the might that Greece observed: for he had only just untied the bloody fighting gear from the fist of his hands, and <already> he fought in the fierce pancratium; and the third time, he did not dirty <even> the point of his shoulders with dust, but wrestling without taking a fall he won triple exertions (i.e. contests) from the Isthmus. He alone among the Greeks holds this honor: and the seven-gated Thebes, and his father Hermocrates was crowned¹⁴”.

2 τετραέτη δαμάλην. The weight ($\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\varsigma$) that Milo picked up for his victory lap in Olympia was a four-year old bullock that had

Pal. 9, 588 cited below). V. V. Zelchenko drew my attention to this use of $\xi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and *hospes* several years ago.

¹² It will soon become evident that the statue was an imaginary one: in fact, the point of the epigram is that it is impossible to be sure of how it looked. There is thus no need to try and reconstruct the place where it might have stood. On the real statue of Milo by his fellow citizen, Dameas of Crotona, in Olympia, see n. 24 below.

¹³ Cleitomachus is mentioned by Pausanias in his passage on statues for Greek athletes (see Paus. 6, 15, 3–5).

¹⁴ The verb $\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\epsilon\tau\omicron$ refers to $\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, term that designated a recognized and uncontested victory in the crown games (cf. Yanzina, Korneev 2020: *passim*); the custom of the athlete crowning his father in celebration of his own victory is attested elsewhere (cf. *ibid.* 915).

never been yoked (βοῦν ἄζυγον v. 6). The word δαμάλης (‘yearling’ or ‘stirk’) is used by Aristotle (*H.A.* 632a) as he discusses castration of cattle and differentiated from μόσχος (‘weaner’), a term applicable to calves until they reach one year of age. The fact that Milo’s bull is four years old is significant for the epigram: four years is not an important stage in the life of a δαμάλης who would have become a grown bull at the end of second year. The adjective clearly refers to the four years between the Olympic games that Milo had used for his extraordinary power lifting routine that is mentioned in the proverb quoted by Quintilian: *Milo quem vitulum adsueuerat ferre, taurum ferebat* “that calf that Milo got accustomed to carrying, he later carried as a steer” (Quintil. *I.O.* 1, 9, 6)¹⁵. By using the adjective τετραέτης, Dorieus is hinting that Milo at some point in his career began training for the next Olympic games by picking up a newborn calf and carrying it around for a certain amount of time every day; as the calf grew, the weight that Milo had to lift would increase by day; by the time the next competition came around, he would have been accustomed to carrying a full-grown steer on his shoulders for significant stretches of time¹⁶. Dorieus seems to suggest that Milo took his training gear (the steer) with him to Olympia and, after showing off his strength by carrying it around

¹⁵ This has been correctly interpreted by Mordze (1932: col. 1674): “[Quintilian] berichtet dagegen, daß [Milo] seine Kraft durch systematisches Training steigerte: er trug jeden Tag ein Kalb auf den Schultern, so daß er auch noch zu schleppen vermochte, als es zum Stier geworden war”.

¹⁶ For reference, newborn calves weigh around 25–30 kg and increase their weight at a rate of 0,75–1 kg per day. The weight of a mature modern bull starts at around 180 kg (average weight is 360 kg); it is probable that figures for ancient cattle were slightly smaller. I am grateful to D. M. Ivanov for helping me with searching for figures on calves’ growth rates. The weight that an athlete is able to lift is dependent on his own physique and body mass. Modern athletes in the category over 105 kg lift over 200 kg (figures are lower for snatch, and higher for clean and jerk; currently the world record is 267 kg in clean and jerk for athletes in the weight category over 109 kg). Given Milo’s appetite, it is safe to suppose that he was in the higher range of body mass. I am grateful to P.N. Kazansky for consulting me on modern Olympic weightlifting. For ancient records, besides the anecdote of Milo carrying his steer, and also an anecdote of his carrying his own statue to Olympia, we can mention Bybon’s stone (143,5 kg) in Olympia with the inscription that Bybon had raised it with one hand.

the assembly, sacrificed the animal. The combination of the proverb cited by Quintilian (1, 9, 6) and Dorieus' τετραέτης δαμάλης present Milo's feat of carrying the bull as a result of long deliberate training; other sources either mention only the fact of lifting a bull at Olympia (see Luc. *Char.* 8), or actually present it as a one-off lifting of an extreme weight (for this reason, Galenus criticized Milo's feat as ἄνοια)¹⁷.

ἐν Διὸς εἰλαπίναις. The reference here, as noted by Gow (1981: 46), is to the banquet at the conclusion of the Olympic games¹⁸. The word εἰλαπίνη, chosen by Dorieus, is an old one, with an unclear etymology. Already in Homer it tends to appear in combination with another word for feast: αἰεὶ δ' ἐν δαίτησι καὶ εἰλαπίνησι παρέσται "he will always be present at feasts and banquets" (*Il.* 10, 217); ἐν τῇ μὲν ῥα γάμοι τ' ἔσαν εἰλαπίνοι τε "depicted on [the shield] were wedding feasts and banquets" (*Il.* 18, 490; cf. the same pairing in *Od.* 1, 226 and 11, 415); ἐν δαιτὶ καὶ εἰλαπίνῃ τεθαλυίῃ "in feast and flourishing banquet..." (Hes. fr. 274, 1 Merkelbach, West); cf. Theognis' famous promise that Cynrus will be present at all the banquets (θοίνης δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνησι παρέσση, Theogn. 239). It should be noted that Dorieus obliquely reproduces this practice of juxtaposing εἰλαπίνη with another word for feast in his choice of verb δαίνυμαι in v. 8. We also find an attempt at popular etymology for this word in Homer, in the jingle εἰλαπινάζουσιν πίνουσί τε αἴθοπα οἶνον... "they feast and drink scintillating wine" (*Od.* 2, 57; 17, 536). In poetry of Hellenistic and Roman times the word carries manifest epic connotations¹⁹, appearing alongside recognizably

¹⁷ ἀλλὰ νῆ Δία τῶν ἱερουργημένων ἓνα ταύρων ἀναθέμενος τοῖς ὄμοις ὁ Μίλων ἐκεῖνος ὁ Κροτωνιάτης διεκόμισέ ποτε τὸ στάδιον. ὃ τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης ἀνοίας, ὡς μηδὲ τοῦτο γινώσκειν ὅτι πρὸ βραχέος τὸ βαρύτερον τοῦτο σῶμα τοῦ ταύρου ζῶντος ἐβάσταζεν ἢ ψυχή τοῦ ζῴου, καὶ πολλῶ γ' ἀκοπώτερον ἢ ὁ Μίλων, εἴ γε καὶ θεῖν ἠδύνατο βαστάζουσα· ἀλλ' ὅμως οὐδενὸς ἦν ἀξία, παραπλησίως τῇ Μίλωνος (Gal. *Protr.* 13). Galen then recounts the legend of Milo's death, noting ἐδήλωσε δὲ καὶ ἡ τελευτὴ τάνδρὸς ὅπως ἦν ἀνόητος.

¹⁸ Page (1981: 46) notes: "at the feast on the evening of the fifth day of the Games, when the victors were entertained". For a fuller discussion of both the banquet at the Prytaneum and procession see Miller (2004: 87, 124–125).

¹⁹ Cf. Schmitt Pantel (1997: 271) on εἰλαπίνη: «Ce terme désigne un 'festin bruyant'. Il est employé dans une inscription métrique à Stratonicee à l'époque impériale. Un prêtre du sanctuaire de Lagina dit n'avoir rien

Homeric forms (e.g. εὔαδεν εἰλαπίνη, *Anth. Pal.* 9, 644, 10; περί σοι εὔαδον εἰλαπίνας, *Anth. Pal.* 16, 183, 2).

The exact meaning of εἰλαπίνη (especially as distinguished from other words for ‘feast’, δαίς and θοῖνη) seems to have been discussed by Alexandrian scholars, as shown by one of the fragments of Aristophanes of Byzantium: εἰλαπίνη (*var. lect.* εἰλαπινή)· ἐστὶ θυσία καὶ παρασκευὴ λαμπροτέρα τίς “it is a sacrifice and a rather outstanding festive arrangement”²⁰. In view of other references to Homeric scholarship in Dorieus’ poem, it seems to be no coincidence that Dorieus chooses to use the expression ἐν Διὸς εἰλαπίνας in strict accordance with the definition endorsed by Aristophanes (whether it was Aristophanes’ own or not): the situation that Dorieus is describing is both a θυσία (as the athletes were expected to offer a sacrifice to Zeus) and a banquet to celebrate the end of the games.

3 κτήνος τὸ πελώριον ὡς νέον ἄρνα. From the stylistic point of view, the two parts of the comparison are in stark contrast. The word κτήνος (not used in epic) was specifically associated with livestock (see Chantraine, *DELG* 1966–1980: 590 s.v. κτάομαι). The adjective that qualifies it, πελώριος, is distinctly associated with epic style, here emphasizing the enormous weight, lifted by Milo. The words ὡς νέον ἄρνα point not only to a light weight, but also to the gentleness of the animal (there is thus a double opposition to πελώριος).

épargné de sa dépense dans les banquets et les festins. Comme nous l’avons vu à propos du terme *dais*, il s’agit d’une citation homérique. Le terme *eilapiné* n’était pas utilisé pour nommer le banquet public à cette époque ».

²⁰ Aristophanes seems to have based his definition of εἰλαπίνη on an examination of Homeric contexts, in particular, of *Il.* 17, 535 where the sacrifice of bulls and smaller cattle is distinctly mentioned (βοῦς ἱερεύοντες καὶ οἷς καὶ πίονας αἶγας). The same definition of εἰλαπίνη is repeated in Athenaeus: τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς λαμπροτέρας παρασκευὰς ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ εἰλαπίνας καὶ τοὺς τούτων μετέχοντας εἰλαπιναστάς, “for the ancient poets called sacrifices and outstanding feasts εἰλαπίνας, and their participants εἰλαπινασταί” (*Athen.* 8, 362e; the same definition appears in Eustathius’ commentary, *in Il.* 17, 578 = IV, 95 van der Valk). It has been shown that Aristophanes’ discussion of εἰλαπίνη was taken independently by Athenaeus and Eustathius from Seleucus (see Slater 1986: 95, with references to earlier discussions).

But it should also be noted that the expression ὡς νέον ἄρνα suggests that the statue that Dorieus is describing is related to the Kriophoros (Ram-bearer) type, fairly well attested for 7th–6th centuries BCE²¹. Statues of this kind represent a male figure, holding a ram, either on the shoulders or in the arms. The sculptural type was particularly associated with Hermes the Ram-bearer (Κριοφόρος), although not all such statues may be identified with the god²²: to name a few, the bronze image of Kriophoros with a ram on his shoulders from Crete, *ca.* 620 BCE (Berlin 7477; see Boardman 1978: plate 45); the stone image of Ram-bearer from Thasos holding the ram in his hands as an offering, *ca.* 580 (see Boardman 1978: plate 69); a plaque from Athens depicting Hermes with a Ram on his shoulders, end of 5th century BCE (Athens, Mus. Nat. 54; see LIMC V(2): 224, Hermes 289); etc. A statue of Hermes Kriophoros with a lamb in his arms by Onatas of Aegina (6th century BCE) in Olympia is described by Pausanias²³:

ὁ δὲ Ἑρμῆς ὁ τὸν κριὸν φέρων ὑπὸ τῆ μασχάλη καὶ ἐπικείμενος τῆ κεφαλῇ κυνῆν καὶ χιτῶνά τε καὶ χλαμύδα ἐνδεδυκῶς οὐ τῶν Φόρμιδος ἔτι ἀναθημάτων ἐστίν, ὑπὸ δὲ Ἀρκάδων <τῶν> ἐκ Φενεοῦ δέδοται τῷ θεῷ· Ὀνάταν δὲ τὸν Αἰγινήτην, σὺν δὲ αὐτῷ Καλλιτέλην ἐργάσασθαι λέγει τὸ ἐπίγραμμα, δοκεῖν δέ μοι τοῦ Ὀνάτα μαθητῆς ἢ παῖς ὁ Καλλιτέλης ἦν, “as for Hermes, the one that is carrying a

²¹ There are also some images of Hermes carrying a ram on vases: see Siebert (1990: 313–314), images 294–297 in his catalogue: two vases, both dating back to the end of 6th century BCE, depict Hermes with a ram on his shoulders (Paris, Louvre F151; Brussels, Musée Royal A1378).

²² The group of Kriophoroi images were studied by Veyries (1886) tends to identify most archaic Greek ram-bearers with Hermes. It is now recognized that ram-bearer images can be Hermes or a human dedicator: see Siebert (1990: 311) who emphasizes that not all statues of male figures carrying a ram may be identified with Hermes, and that some are kouroi. In his list of statues and images of Hermes Kriophoros (Siebert 1990: 311–314) he takes care to include only images that may be identified as Hermes, principally by wings on the figure's feet (the caduceus in his hand is practically never preserved).

²³ A copy of Onatas' Hermes Kriophoros was identified in 1895 by Babelon and Blanchet in a bronze statuette preserved in the Cabinet des Médailles in Paris (no. 313 in their catalogue; I have only been able to consult a later edition of the catalogue, where it carries the same number and identification: Babelon, Blanchet 1924: 212). Dörig (1977: 15–21) has argued this identification extensively.

ram under his arm, and wearing a helmet on his head, and a chiton and chlamys, he is not one of Phormis' offerings, but was presented by the Arcadians of Pheneus. The inscription says that Onatas of Aegina made it, and together with him, Calliteles: it seems to me that Calliteles was either pupil or son of Onatas" (Paus. 5, 27, 8).

Pausanias also mentions a statue of Hermes Kriophoros with a ram on his shoulders by Calamis (5th century BCE) in Tanagra in Boeotia, and even describes an associated apotropaic rite involving an ephebe carrying a lamb on his shoulders around the walls of Tanagra²⁴:

ἐς δὲ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ τὰ ἱερὰ τοῦ τε Κριοφόρου καὶ ὄν Πρόμαχον καλοῦσι, τοῦ μὲν ἐς τὴν ἐπίκλησιν λέγουσιν ὡς ὁ Ἑρμῆς σφισιν ἀποτρέψαι νόσον λοιμώδη περὶ τὸ τεῖχος κριὸν περιενεγκών, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ Κάλαμις ἐποίησεν ἄγαλμα Ἑρμοῦ φέροντα κριὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων· ὃς δ' ἂν εἶναι τῶν ἐφήβων προκριθῆι τὸ εἶδος κάλλιστος, οὗτος ἐν τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ τῇ ἑορτῇ περίεισιν ἐν κύκλῳ τὸ τεῖχος ἔχων ἄρνα ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων, "the temple dedicated to Hermes the Ram-bearer and the one that they call the Protector. Concerning the former epiclesis they say that Hermes averted a pestilential illness from the city by carrying a ram around its walls; to commemorate this, Calamis created an image of Hermes carrying a ram on his shoulders; and <also in commemoration> during the festival of Hermes, whoever of the ephebes is chosen as the most handsome, goes around the walls, carrying a lamb on his shoulders" (Paus. 9, 22, 1).

But more significantly still, there is the famous Moschophoros (Calf-bearer) statue from the Athenian Acropolis (Ac. 624), dating from *ca.* 560 BCE: the male figure holds a calf on his shoulders

²⁴ On this statue, see Siebert (1990: 313, no. 293) who surmises that Pausanias' account would suggest that Hermes was presented in motion, as the Kriophoros from the Cahn collection; see also Dörig (1965: 226–229). Pausanias connects the rite to the legend of Hermes protecting the city: it is probable that the rite of carrying a sacrificial animal around a territory to protect it from harm was very ancient one (and that the legend of Hermes the protector was actually invented to explain it): cf. Roman *suovetaurilia* which, according to Cato the Elder, involved leading a grown animal (*suovetaurilia maiora*) or carrying a suckling (*suovetaurilia lactentia*) around the grounds to protect them, *sive circumagi sive circumferenda uti censeas* (Cato, *De agr.* 141, 1). I thank V. P. Kazanskiene for suggesting this parallel to me.

(there are bumps on the animal's forehead, indicating the place where his horns will bud, which places its age at under two months). Although the Moschophoros statue is unique (among preserved sculptures), there may have been a variation on the Kriophoros type, involving a calf instead of a ram²⁵, and it is possible that the whole anecdote of Milo's power lifting routine might have been born of a sculpture of a calf-bearer, rightly or wrongly associated with his name²⁶. Returning to Dorieus' poem, it should be noted that, given the elusiveness and subversiveness of the text, we cannot automatically assume that a statue of a man carrying a full-grown bull (κτῆνος τὸ πελώριον) ever existed. It is much more probable that this is an ekphrasis of an imaginary statue, and that Dorieus is playing with his reader, inviting him to imagine a statue that would transgress in an exaggerated manner the well-known iconographical type of archaic and classical sculpture²⁷.

²⁵ Veyries (1886: 4) considered the Moschophoros statue an image of Hermes; however, there is nothing specifically linking it to the god, and Siebert (1990: 311) states specifically that Moschophoros cannot be considered an image of Hermes.

²⁶ Similarly, it has been reconstructed that Milo's statue in Olympia (presenting the athlete with a pomegranate in his hand and standing on an unusual base) was the source of other anecdotes about Milo's extraordinary capacities. Pausanias tells us that Milo could hold a pomegranate with such force that no one could wrestle it from him, and yet without crushing the fruit; and that he could stand on an oiled disk, and no one could make him lose his balance (Paus. 6, 14, 6–7), and Philostratus in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (4, 28) says that there was a statue of Milo with these characteristics in Olympia. Scherer suggested that Philostratus was building off Pausanias, whereas Pausanias' account of Milo's prowess was an interpretation of the statue in Olympia: "dubitari autem non potest, quin Pausanias ex habitu statuae, quam Olympiae viderat, narratiunculam illam aut ipse sibi finxit aut ab interprete suo audierit" (Scherer 1885: 24). Scherer's reconstruction is largely accepted (cf. Mordze 1932: 1675; Herrmann 1988: 144 n. 39; Decker 2000: 191). For the reconstruction of the statue (with comparison with preserved sculptures with similar posture), see Ghisellini (1988: 45–49).

²⁷ It is worth noting that there was some variation in the size and age of the animal in Kriophoros statues. Cf. Dörig's analysis of the copy of Onatas' Hermes Kriophoros: "The ram is no longer shown as a thin little animal which the god proudly and almost playfully shows off on his raised left arm. The ram here is larger, heavier and rounded out more fully. The animal rests more heavily on the left arm, which is bent almost at a right

4 δι' ὄλης κοῦφα πανηγύρεως. Prose renderings of the anecdote about Milo and the bull state clearly that he carried the animal around the stadium: cf. καὶ τοῦτον περιενέγκας τὸ στάδιον... (Athen. 10, 412f, summarizing Theodorus of Hierapolis); τὸν ταῦρον ἀράμενος φέρει διὰ τοῦ σταδίου μέσου (Luc. *Char.* 8); διεκόμεσέ ποτε τὸ στάδιον (Gal. *Protr.* 13). However, Dorieus' choice of word πανήγυρις might be pointing to the procession through Altis to the Altar of Zeus (cf. Miller 2004: 124–125; see also below, on πομπεύω in v.7). The adverb κοῦφα highlights the fact that Milo carried this enormous weight as if it were light. In sculptural terms, it would suggest that the (imaginary) statue described by Dorieus presented the athlete standing tall and square (cf. the posture of Moschophoros and of the Kriophoroi listed above), and possibly even with one leg advanced, suggesting movement: cf. the Cahn Kriophoros is presented in motion (see Siebert 1990: 312 and 313, on no. 279 and no. 293, respectively).

5 θάμβος μὲν, ἀτὰρ τοῦδε πλέον ἤνυσε θαῦμα. The placement of θάμβος and θαῦμα at the beginning and at the very end of this hexameter appears deliberate. The term θαῦμα was obviously associated with Herodotus²⁸, but also with the tradition of paradoxography. Furthermore, there are traces of a discussion of semantics of θάμβος (θαμβέω) and θαῦμα (θαυμάζομαι) in the ancient scholia and lexicographers, placing them in the same semantic field, however, θάμβος visibly referring to a stronger emotion (closer to awe)²⁹. In one scholium on the *Iliad* from the *Venetus A* (remounting to Aristonicus) we find a discussion of the

angle. It snuggles up to Hermes' left flank, 'gentle as a lamb'" (Dörig 1977: 17).

²⁸ On θαῦμα as part of reception of Herodotus in antiquity, see Priestley (2014: chap. 2; and especially 75–78, about Herodotus' influence on paradoxographical tradition).

²⁹ E.g. θαμβάλεον· φοβερόν, θαυμαστόν (Hsch. θ 74); θάμβος· θαῦμα. ἐκπληξίς (Hsch. θ 74); σέβας· τιμή. θαῦμα. θάμβος, ἐκπληξίς. αἰδώς (Hsch. σ 312). The noun θάμβος was connected with the verb θήπω and the isolated participle ταφών: cf. ταφών· θαμβήσας, ἐκπλαγείς, ἢ θαυμάσας. ἔστι δεύτερος ἀόριστος ἐκ τοῦ θήπω ἔθαπον καὶ ἔταφον καὶ ταφών (schol. in *Il.* 16, 12); θήπω, τὸ ἐκπλήττομαι, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τάφος. καὶ ταφών δ' ἀνόρουσεν Ἀχιλλεύς, καὶ τὸ, τεθηπότες ἤύτε νεβροὶ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκπλαγέντες. καὶ εἰς τὸ θάμβος (*Etym. Gud.* p. 261 de Stephani); ταφών. θαμβηθεὶς. ἐκπλαγείς. ἢ θαυμάσας (*Zon. Lex.* p. 1715).

verb θαυμάζομαι in *Il.* 2, 320 as insufficient for the degree of awe that would have been experienced by the spectators at the sight of snake turned to stone (*Il.* 2, 317–319, cf. below, on v. 8):

ἡμεῖς δ' ἑσταότες θαυμάζομεν: ὅτι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξεπληττόμεθα, οὐχ ὡς ἐνίοτε τίθησιν ἀντὶ ψιλοῦ τοῦ θεάσασθαι, “<it is shown that> θαυμάζομεν is used for ἐξεπληττόμεθα (we were astounded), and not as sometimes <Homer> places the verb instead of a simple θεάσασθαι (look at)” (schol. A in *Il.* 2, 320a).

It seems that Dorieus as well acutely aware of the discussion surrounding θάμβος and θαῦμα in Homer: he places the two words in the same verse, levelling out their semantics (θάμβος and τοῦδε πλέον... θαῦμα, where θάμβος designates Milo's carrying the steer, and θαῦμα anticipates that he will also eat the animal). Incidentally, we find reflections of the same discussion in other Hellenistic poets: e.g., when Apollonius Rhodius contaminates and transforms two Homeric formulas θαῦμα ιδέσθαι “wonder to see” (*Il.* 5, 725; 10, 439; 18, 83; 18, 377; *Od.* 6, 306; 7, 45; 8, 366; 13, 108; etc.) and μέγα θαῦμα (*Il.* 13, 99; 15, 286; 20, 344; 21, 54; *Od.* 19, 36) into μέγα θάμβος ιδέσθαι “a great awe to behold” (Apoll. Rhod. 1, 220), using the expression to characterize Boreads' wings.

6 πρόσθεν Πεισαίου... θηηπολίου. One of Athenaeus' main manuscripts (*Marcianus* 447, ms. of late 9th – early 10th century) gives the reading Πεισαίου, while the remaining manuscripts give Πῖσαίου; Olson (2020: 157) prints Πεισαίου (probably as the *lectio difficilior*³⁰). The choice of the epithet, while frequently used to simply refer to Olympia (cf. LSJ 1996: 1407, s.v. Πῖσα), in this particular case may carry not only topographical, but also chronological associations: Olympic games were initially organized by Elis, however, a century later (in 676 BCE) Pisa took over; this lasted for around a century, until Elis occupied Pisa and took back control over the games. Given Dorieus' accuracy in his choice of words, as seen in other cases, by choosing the epithet Πισαῖος he may be referring to the antiquity of the Altar of Zeus.

³⁰ The spelling Πεῖσα for ῖ (the long vowel in Πῖσα is due to digamma, cf. Myc. pi-swa) is frequent in inscriptions of Roman times: e.g. *SEG* 23:113, 15, and many of the inscriptions cited by Gouw (2009).

The altar itself is designated by a hapax *θυηπόλιον*³¹: this word occurs only here in Greek literature³², and was probably coined by Dorieus. It was derived from the compound *θυηπόλος* “(priest) offering / celebrating sacrifices”, which is well attested since the classical age (e.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 202; Eur. *I.T.* 1359; *I.A.* 746), as well as its cognates *θυοπολέω*, *θυηπολία*). The word is an extraordinarily apt designation for the Altar of Zeus which, as Pausanias tells us, was not a typical altar. It was conical in shape and was made up of ashes of previous sacrificial offerings; according to the figures given by Pausanias, by his time it was around seven meters high³³:

πεποιήται δὲ ἱερείων τῶν θυομένων τῷ Διὶ ἀπὸ τῆς τέφρας τῶν μηρῶν, καθάπερ γε καὶ ἐν Περγάμῳ [...] τοῦ βωμοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ κρηπίδος μὲν τῆς πρώτης, προθύσεως καλουμένης, πόδες πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐστὶ περίοδος, τοῦ δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ προθύσει περίμετρος ἑπακτοῦ πόδες δύο καὶ τριάκοντα· τὸ δὲ ὕψος τοῦ βωμοῦ τὸ σὺμπαν ἐς δύο καὶ εἴκοσιν ἀνήκει πόδας. αὐτὰ μὲν δὴ τὰ ἱερεῖα ἐν μέρει τῷ κάτω, τῇ προθύσει, καθέστηκεν αὐτοῖς θύειν· τοὺς μηροὺς δὲ ἀναφέροντες <ἐς> τοῦ βωμοῦ τὸ ὑψηλέστατον καθαγίζουσιν ἐνταῦθα, “it has been made from the ash of the thighs of the sacrificial victims sacrificed to Zeus, as is also the altar at Pergamon [...] Of the first level of the altar, called *πρόθυσις*, the perimeter is 125 feet; and of the level above the *πρόθυσις*, the perimeter is 32 feet; and the total height of the altar rises to 22 feet. It is customary to sacrifice the victims in the lower part, on the *πρόθυσις*; but they carry the thighs to the very top of the altar and burn them there” (Paus. 5, 13, 8–10).

Given the singular character of this altar, it is worth noting that Dorieus picked with outmost care (or possibly, even created) a rare word to designate it – *θυηπόλιον*, as both the place of sacrifice, but

³¹ As noted by Page (1981: 46), Athenaeus’ summary of Phylarchus (ταῦρον καταφαγεῖν κατακλιθέντα πρὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Διός) shows beyond any doubt that both he and Phylarchus understood *θυηπόλιον* as the altar.

³² See *LSJ* (1996: s.v. *θυηπόλιον*). Page (1981: 46) only notes that *θυηπόλιον* is not found elsewhere, but does not comment on the reasons for the coinage.

³³ See also Miller (2004: 89), who mentions that, while due to its organic nature, the βῶμος cannot be located, traces of the earlier altar may be preserved.

also the result of sacrificial offerings of olden days (θηηπολῖαι); as a result, the word expresses succinctly what Pausanias described in a whole phrase, πεποιήται ἱερείων τῶν θυομένων τῷ Διὶ ἀπὸ τῆς τέφρας τῶν μηρῶν, and it might also evoke obliquely the unique designation of the first level of the Altar of Zeus as πρόθυσις. It is also possible that Dorieus was influenced by Apollonius' descriptions of make-shift altars by the Argonauts on their journey:

ἐνθ' οἷγ' Ἐκβασίῳ βωμὸν θέσαν Ἀπόλλωνι,
εἰσάμενοι παρὰ θίνα, θηηπολῖς τ' ἐμέλοντο, “there they built an altar to Apollo insurer of debarkation, setting it on the shore, and concerned themselves with sacrifices” (Apoll. Rhod. 1, 966–967).
βωμὸν δ' αὖ χέραδος παρενήνεον. ἀμφὶ δὲ φύλλοις
στεψάμενοι δρυῖνοισι θηηπολῖς ἐμέλοντο,
Μητέρα Δινδυμῖν πολυπότνιαν ἀγκαλέοντες..., “and they piled an altar from pebbles. And, crowning themselves with oak leaves, they busied themselves with sacrifices, calling to the much revered Dindymian Mother...” (Apoll. Rhod. 1, 1123–1125)

7 ἐπόμπευσεν βοῦν ἄζυγον. Vv. 7–8 are cited by Eustathius (*in Od.* 206, 38), but his quotation does not differ from Athenaeus' text, and it is fairly certain that his source was Athenaeus himself (see Olson 2022: 293–462 for the large list of citations from Athenaeus in Eustathius). The banquet in honor of the victors was preceded by a procession (πομπή) around the Altis, which involved a hecatomb being led to the altar of Zeus and slaughtered there (cf. description in Miller 2004: 124–125). The verb πομπεύω, chosen by Dorieus, would suggest that Milo carried his steer as part of the πομπή, and then sacrificed it with a hecatomb; naturally, only the thighs would be burnt as an offering to Zeus, the rest of the steer would have been roasted.

7–8 εἰς κρέα τόνδε / κόψας πάντα κατ' οὔν μοῦνος ἐδαΐσατό νιν. The expression εἰς κρέα shows beyond doubt that the verb κόπτω is used here of cutting³⁴. Normally the cutting up of the

³⁴ Incidentally, Solinus' rendering of the anecdote about the steer with the unparalleled detail that Milo slayed the animal with one stroke of his fist (*etiam hoc proditur quod ictu nudae manus taurum fecit victimam eumque solidum qua mactaverat die absumpsit solus non gravatim*, Solin. 76) may reflect Dorieus' text, but with a misunderstanding (κόψας taken in the sense “to strike”).

sacrificed bull would be the task of a μάγειρος³⁵; however, Dorieus omits both the presence of the cook (so that Milo is made to butcher the animal himself), and the cooking of the meat altogether. This simplification of the realia, however, allows Dorieus to create what is one of the most extraordinary tmeses in Greek poetry. Page notes that the tmesis by οὖν between the verb is reminiscent of Herodotus³⁶, understanding κατά as pertaining to the second verbal form (κατεδαίσατο). Wackernagel, however, preferred κατά to go with κόψας, which even made him suggest an emendation for the transmitted text:

“In all these passages, ὄν (οὖν) immediately precedes the verb; in the epigram of Dorieus, we should certainly read τόνδε | πάντα κατ’οὖν μοῦνος ἐδαίσατό νιν (‘even this [ox] he [Milo of Croton] cut up and ate all on his own’) – as at Herodotus 2. 172.3, quoted above – rather than the transmitted τόνδε | κόψας πάντα κατ’ οὖν μοῦνος ἐδαίσατό νιν” (Wackernagel 2009: 616 = Wackernagel 1924–1928: II, 174).

I would suggest that both interpretations are right, and that Dorieus is in fact engaging in elaborate play with contemporary Homeric scholarship by placing κατά so that it can go both with κόψας (in anastrophe, it would have to be stressed κάτα³⁷) and with ἐδαίσατο, creating a (highly artificial!) ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction. We know that Homeric scholars sought stylistic effects in Homer’s use of tmesis (their term for the phenomenon is ὑπερβατόν), in particular, (a) in contexts of violent separation (or cutting up), and

³⁵ See Schmitt Pantel (1997: 334–336) on the role of μάγειρος, and the two ways of preparing the sacrificial meat (by roasting on spits, and by cooking in cauldrons).

³⁶ Page (1981: 46): “the placing of οὖν between the pre-verb and the verb is a mannerism of Herodotus”; as a typical trait of Herodotus’ style, it is noted by Powell (1960: 388 s.v. ὄν.IX), Denniston (1954: 429), the *LSJ* (1996: 1272, s.v. οὖν II.2). There is, however, a fair amount of tmeses with οὖν in Hellenistic and later poetry (see Harder 2012: II, 518 on *Aet.* 64, 5). For a study of tmeses with οὖν in Herodotus, see Priestley (2009: 120–148; type 1 in her classification of Herodotean tmeses).

³⁷ We find some exceptions to this rule (especially for the preverb διά): see, e.g., the bT scholium on *Il.* 15, 522 that notes specifically that there is no change in accent of διά, despite its placement behind the verb τάμη: οὐκ ἀναστρέφεται δὲ ἡ διά, ἵνα μὴ συνεμπέση τῇ Δια αιτιατικῇ.

(b) in contexts of devouring³⁸. Thus, the scholia note, with regard to the tmesis ἵνα τάμη διὰ πᾶσαν “he severs [the bull’s] neck completely” (*Il.* 17, 522): καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐξῆς ἐστὶ διατάμη, τῇ δὲ διακοπῇ τῆς λέξεως μεμίμηται τὸ γινόμενον, “the right order is διατάμη, but the poet, by cutting up the word, created an imitation of the action” (schol. bT *in Il.* 17, 522a)³⁹. And only some twenty lines later, with regard to what became one of the stock examples of tmesis in ancient scholarship, ὡς τίς τε λέων κατὰ ταῦρον ἐδηδῶς “as some lion that had devoured a steer” (*Il.* 15, 542), the scholia explain: ἡ διακοπή τῆς λέξεως τὸν εἰς πολλὰ διεσπασμένον παρέστησε ταῦρον, οὐ τοῦ μέτρου ἀπαιτοῦντος· παρῆν γὰρ φάναι ‘ταῦρον κατεδηδῶς’, “the cutting up of the word represents the steer torn apart into many pieces, whereas the meter did not require it: for it was possible to say ταῦρον κατεδηδῶς” (schol. T *in Il.* 17, 542). It is significant that the scholiast follows up with parallels from Anacreon involving tmesis of verbs of violent separation (διὰ δὲ δειρὴν ἔκοψε μέσην “he severed the neck right in the middle”, Anacr. 441 PMG).

While Homer’s expression λέων κατὰ ταῦρον ἐδηδῶς is a rather evident (though obviously apt) analogy to Milo singlehandedly eating his steer, Dorieus, building on remarks of Homeric scholars, experiments with the limits of tmesis by creating a double tmesis, with two verbs sharing one preverb, that incorporates two types of mimetic tmesis – tmesis of violent division (κόψας... κάτα), and the tmesis of devouring (κατά... ἐδαίσατο). It is worth noting that the emphatic and rare placement of the monosyllabic pronoun *viv* at the end of the pentameter (cf. Page 1981: 46) contributes to the effect of the double tmesis, suggesting that the steer was eaten to the very last little piece.

A detailed study of the epigram on Milo and his steer preserved in Athenaeus shows that it was a work of an extremely well-read and intelligent poet. We may never know, whether Dorieus was a glutton or not, but we can tell that he was a person of great learning, and very probably an Alexandrian (or at the very least, someone

³⁸ For an overview of all the contexts in which the scholiasts perceive mimetic purpose in Homer’s use of tmesis, see Beck (2023: 82–86).

³⁹ This particular tmesis may have been imitated by Callimachus: τάμοι δ’ ἄπο μῆκος ἀοιδῆ (fr. 57, 1 Pfeiffer = *Aet.* fr. 54h, 1 Harder).

intimately acquainted with Alexandrian scholarship of his time): incidentally, the parallels and allusions to Hellenistic poetry and scholarship in the poem support the traditional date of Dorieus' life as 3rd century BCE. His choice (or invention) of the word *θηρόλιον* for the Altar of Zeus (v. 6), and the reference to the *πανήγυρις* rather than the stadium (v. 4) suggest a first-hand knowledge of Olympia and its ceremonies. At the same time, he acts as a typical Hellenistic poet, playing with his reader. What at first appears to be an account of the olden days (*τοῖος ἔην Μίλων*, v.1), turns out to be a description of an imaginary statue of the Moschophoros type: however, instead of a calf, the reader is invited to imagine Milo with a full-grown steer on its shoulders. And in the last pentameter Dorieus engages in a poetic experiment, creating a unique double tmesis coupled with an unusual placement of the monosyllabic pronoun *viv* at the end of the line, prompting his readers to visualize how the eating of the steer might have looked like.

Bibliography

- Antonaccio, C. M. 2014: Sport and Society in the Greek West. In: P. Christensen, D.G. Kyle (eds.) *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Malden MA, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley–Blackwell, 192–208.
- Austin, C. Bastianini, G. (eds.), 2002: *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*. Milano: LED, Edizioni universitarie di Lettere, economia, diritto.
- Babelon, E. Blanchet, J. A. 1924: *Le catalogue des médailles et antiques de la Bibliothèque Nationale : notice historique et guide du visiteur. I. Les antiques et les objets d'art*. Paris : Ernest Leroux.
- Beck, B. 2023: Homer's Verbal Mimesis in the *Iliad's* Exegetical Scholia. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 63, 78–102.
- Bing, P. 2009: *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Decker, W. 2000: s.v. Milon [2]. *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Bd. 8. Stuttgart; Weimar: J.B. Metzler, Sp. 191–192.
- DELG — Chantraine, P. 1968–1980: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Denniston, J. D. 1954: *The Greek Particles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dickey, E. 1996: *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dörig, J. 1965: Kalamisstudien. *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 80, 138–265.
- Dörig, J. 1977: *Onatas of Aegina*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

- Eckstein, A. M. 2013: Polybius, Phylarchus, and Historiographical Criticism. *Classical Philology* 108(4), 314–338.
- Erbse, H. (ed.) 1969–1977: *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. Vol. 1–7. Berolini: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ghisellini, E. 1988. La statua di Milone di Crotona ad Olimpia. *Xenia* 16, 43–52.
- Gouw, P. 2009: *Griekse atleten in de Romeinse Keizertijd (31 v. Chr. – 400 n. Chr.)*. Amsterdam: Vossiuspers UvA–Amsterdam University Press.
- Gow, A.S.F. Page, D.L. (ed.) 1965: *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigram*. Vol. I–II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harder, A. (ed., comm.) 2012: *Callimachus, Aetia: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Vol. I–II. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hecker, A. 1852: *Commentationes criticae de Anthologia Graeca*. Pars I. Lugduni Batavorum : E.J. Brill.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. Parsons P. (eds.) 1983: *Supplementum Hellenisticum / indices confecit H.-G.-Nesselrath*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- LSJ — Liddell H. G. Scott, R. 1996: *A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented by H. G. Jones, with the assistance of R. McKenzie and the cooperation of many scholars*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Miller, S. G. 2004: *Ancient Greek Athletics*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.
- Mordze, A. 1932: s.v. Milon 2. *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Altertumswissenschaft* XV.2, Sp. 1672–1676.
- Olson, S. D. (ed.) 2020: *Athenaeus Naucratis, Deipnosophistae*. Vol. III.A: Libri VIII–XI. Berlin; Boston: de Gruyter.
- Olson, S. D. (ed.) 2022: *Athenaeus Naucratis*. Vol. V: *Testimonia et indices*. Berlin; Boston: de Gruyter.
- Page, D.L. (ed.) 1975: *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Page, D.L. (ed., comm.) 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' / revised and prepared for publication by R.D. Dawe, J. Diggle*. Cambridge; London; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Powell, E. J. 1960. *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Priestley, J. 2009: Tmesis in Herodotus. *Glotta* 85, 118–178.
- Priestley, J. 2014: *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reitzenstein, R. 1893: *Epigram und Skolion: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*. Giessen: J. Ricker.
- Sacks, K. S. 1981: *Polybius on the Writing of History*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press.
- Scherer, Chr. 1885: *De olympionicarum statuis: Dissertatio philologica*. Göttingen: Officina academica Dieterichiana.

- Schmitt Pantel, P. 1997: *La cité au banquet : histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques*. Rome: École française de Rome, Palais Farnèse.
- Siebert, G. 1990. s.v. Hermes. *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*. Bd. V.1. Zürich; München: Artemis Verlag, 285–387.
- Slater, W. J. (ed.) 1986: *Aristophanis Byzantii fragmenta*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Veyries, A. 1886. *Figures criophores dans l'art grec, l'art gréco-romain et l'art chrétien*. Paris: Ernest Thorin.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. 1962: *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. 2 Aufl. Hildesheim: Weidmann.
- Wackernagel, J. 1924–1928: *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Bd. I–II. Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Wackernagel, J. 2009: *Lectures on Syntax, with Special Reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic* / ed. with notes and bibliography by D. Langslow. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yanzina, E. V. Korneev, O. V., 2020: [Στεφανοῦσθαι, ἡττᾶσθαι, ἱερὸν ποιεῖν: Some features of the attitude of ancient Greeks towards athletic victories and defeats]. *Indoeuropeiskoe yazykoznanie i klassicheskaya filologiya [Indo-European linguistics and classical philology]* 24(2),
- Янзина, Э. В. Корнеев, О. В. 2020: Στεφανοῦσθαι, ἡττᾶσθαι, ἱερὸν ποιεῖν: о восприятии древними греками спортивных побед и поражений. *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология* 24, 913–929.