

# Poetry and Handcrafts in Epic and Pindaric Scholia: ἀναπλάττω in Context

Roser Homar

THE CONNECTION between poetry and craftsmanship, whether in painting or sculpture, has a long-standing tradition in ancient Greek literature, with clear roots in the Archaic period.<sup>1</sup> Given this long tradition, it is not surprising that the scholia assert connections between poets and craftsmen,

<sup>1</sup> The relationship can be seen as far back as the sixth century B.C. with Xenophanes, and continues into Classical, Hellenistic, and Imperial times, in which a literary work is often assimilated to a painting. Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* is perhaps the most paradigmatic example, though certainly not the only one. The connection between poetry and handcrafts has been the object of study by modern scholars, who have sought to understand its nuances. It is impossible to cite the entire bibliography on the relationship between poet and artist. We mention, therefore, the already-historic works of T. B. L. Webster, "Greek Theories of Art and Literature Down to 400 B.C.," *CQ* 33 (1939) 166–179, and J. Svenbro, *La parola e il marmo. Alle origini della poetica greca* (Turin 1984). More recently, for the relations between poet and craftsman in literature as well as in art, see e.g. J. I. Porter, *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge 2010) 134–136, 179–183, 490–512; G. M. Hedreen, *The Image of the Artist in Archaic and Classical Greece: Art, Poetry, and Subjectivity* (Cambridge 2016); E. McGowan, "The Poet as Artisan: A Hellenistic Bronze Statuette in the Metropolitan Museum of Art," in J. M. Daehner et al. (eds.), *Artistry in Bronze: The Greeks and their Legacy* (Los Angeles 2017) 123–133; G. Fanfani, "Craftsmanship and Technology as Chorality: The Case of Weaving Imagery in Archaic and Classical Choral Lyric," *Dionysus ex Machina* 9 (2018) 6–40; A. L. Ford, *The Origins of Criticism* (Princeton 2002) 116–139, 161–182; A. Encuentra, "Craftsmanship and Meta-poetical Reflection (I): The Engraver's Lathe and Choral Imagery from Pindar to the New Dithyramb," *Dionysus ex Machina* 12 (2021) 1–31.

---

*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 64 (2024) 600–625

ISSN 2159-3159

Article copyright held by the author(s) and made available under the  
Creative Commons Attribution License

CC-BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

but it is relevant inasmuch as the scholia represent a further link in the chain of ancient literary criticism and ancient scholarship.<sup>2</sup>

In examining the relationship between poetry and craftsmanship, scholars highlight that considering the poem as an object similar to an artifact of handcraft helps confer upon it a kind of materiality.<sup>3</sup> This relationship can also reveal the poet's creative capacity in a manner analogous to that of craftsmen. Both aspects of this relationship can be found in the scholia, where such creativity can be conceived as intertextuality as well as innovation.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, in some scholia a key term can be found

<sup>2</sup> F. Montanari, "Ancient Scholarship and Classical Studies," in S. Matthaios et al. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts* (Berlin 2011) 11–24, offers an overview of textual material defined as ancient scholarship and the relevant scholia. See also F. Montanari et al. (eds.), *From Scholars to Scholarship: Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Berlin 2011). For canonical studies of the theories of literary criticism found in the scholia see N. J. Richardson, "Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia," A. Laird (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism* (Cambridge 2005 [1980]) 176–210; R. Meijering, *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia* (Groningen 1987); R. Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge 2009). Cf. D. M. Schenkeveld, "Unity and Variety in Ancient Literary Criticism," *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992) 1–8; A. Garzya, "Éléments de critique littéraire dans les scholies anciennes à la tragédie," *La parola e la scena: studi sul teatro antico da Eschilo a Plauto* (Naples 1997) 97–106; Th. Papadopoulou, "Tradition and Invention in the Greek Tragic Scholia: Some Examples of Terminology," *StIt* 16 (1998) 202–232, and "Literary Theory and Terminology in the Greek Tragic Scholia: The Case of *πλάσμα*," *BICS* 4 (1999) 203–210; R. Nünlist, "Narratological Concepts in Greek Scholia," in J. Grethlein et al. (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin 2009) 63–83.

<sup>3</sup> For the tradition of considering the poem as an object, especially in Archaic and Classical poetry, see Ford, *Origins of Criticism* 58, 93–134, 161–182; Porter, *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought* 455–456; T. Philips, *Pindar's Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts* (Oxford 2016) 72, 86–92.

<sup>4</sup> On the Pindar scholia, with observations on the intertextuality between his poems and the Homeric texts, Philips, *Pindar's Library* 177–192, 207.

which entails these two aspects of the assimilation of the poet to the craftsman: ἀναπλάττω, compounded on the root of πλάττω.

Despite considerable interest in the terms πλάττω and πλάσμα as literary concepts, ἀναπλάττω has been frequently overlooked as a term for literary creation.<sup>5</sup> Studying the context of the scholiasts' uses of the verb can deepen and extend our understanding of the relationship between poetry and the arts or craftsmanship. The purpose of this paper is to review some scholia in which ἀναπλάττω, in reference to the poet's activity, entails an assimilation with the fine arts or other types of craftsmanship.

Since the verb occurs in a variety of contexts, the corpus has been limited to a selection of epic and Pindaric scholia. The focus is on the epic scholia, as certain passages are particularly valuable in showing how they mean the process of poetic creation to be understood. Furthermore, Homer and also Hesiod were regarded as common sources of inspiration for subsequent poets and writers.<sup>6</sup> In this context, the verb is understood to encompass both intertextuality and innovation. In addition, a selection of Pindaric scholia is treated here, because in this context ἀναπλάττω is paradigmatically associated with materiality. These passages allow examination of the verb as a technical term in the context of artistic creation. My aim is to elicit the point of view of these scholia in order to gain insight into their understanding of the nature of poetic activity and the role of the poet in relation to his work.<sup>7</sup>

It is acknowledged that there are difficulties in studying certain

<sup>5</sup> There are however some very interesting comments on a scholium in which the action of the poet is designated by this verb. Thus e.g. Porter's commentary on schol. Hom. bT *Il.* 7.445: *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought* 517–519, and “Making and Unmaking: The Achaean Wall and the Limits of Fictionality in Homeric Criticism,” *TAPA* 141 (2011) 1–36, at 12–13.

<sup>6</sup> In the corpus of scholia, Homer or Hesiod is often cited as the primary reference from which subsequent works are derived, either through direct imitation or through the introduction of new elements.

<sup>7</sup> On the value of the scholia on Pindar see Philips, *Pindar's Library* 60–62.

terms in the scholia. First, the scholiasts provide an admittedly partial insight into the perspective of the erudite reader, who accesses classical texts and reflects on issues that might be considered typical of literary criticism. Second, dating the scholia is not definitively ascertainable, given the inherent complexity of the corpus of texts under consideration.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the information provided by this corpus is often incomplete and lacks the level of detail and analysis expected by modern scholars.<sup>9</sup> For these reasons, passages from the scholia can often be linked with other texts in order to gain insight into the context and the concepts they present. In this paper, it seems appropriate to examine the uses of ἀναπλάττω in these scholia in the light of some passages of Lucian of Samosata. This is because the verb appears frequently in some of his works<sup>10</sup> and, although we are not dealing with a theorist of rhetoric or ancient literary criticism, Lucian often reflects on literary creation and considers it an artistic activity.<sup>11</sup> Consequently, an examination of some passages of Lucian will prove beneficial in elucidating the meaning of the term in some scholia.

This analysis highlights ἀναπλάττω as a technical term for

<sup>8</sup> For general and up-to-date references to the corpus of scholia and its complexities see E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007); F. Montana, “The Making of Greek Scholia Corpora,” in *From Scholars to Scholarship* 105–161.

<sup>9</sup> Philips, in relation to the Pindar scholia, offers very pertinent reflections on their value and their limitations: *Pindar’s Library* 61–70, 167–172.

<sup>10</sup> In the whole of Lucian’s work, the verb without the prefix ἀνα- appears 15 times, but with the preverb 33 times.

<sup>11</sup> On the literary concepts and textual references in Lucian, suffice it here to cite the following, in which an abundant bibliography can be found: G. Anderson, *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic* (Leiden 1976); N. Wilshere, *Homerus ubique: Lucian’s Use of Homer* (diss. Nottingham 2015); R. B. Branham, *Unruly Eloquence. Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1989); A. Camerotto, *Le metamorfosi della parola. Studi sulla parodia in Luciano di Samosata* (Pisa 1998); O. Karavas, *Lucien et la tragédie* (Berlin 2005); M. Deriu, *Mixis e poikilia nei protagonisti della satira. Studi sugli archetipi comico e platonico nei dialoghi di Luciano di Samosata* (Trento 2017).

literary activity and offers a basis for future examination of other scholia in which the term appears. With these objectives, the study is divided into three sections, each focused on a specific aspect of the concept: §2 is devoted to those passages where the poetic or literary activity is related to a creative act that, through the use and manipulation of materials, generates a tangible product; §3 examines the relationship between the poet and other craftsmen; §4 considers the concept of literary creation as an artisanal activity in which a new product is constructed on the basis of previous materials. These sections are preceded by an introduction (§1) to studies of *πλάττω* and *πλάσμα* in reference to the scholia, and are followed by some conclusions (§5). The review of previous studies will facilitate the study of analogy and difference regarding *ἀναπλάττω* in the following sections. Moreover, since in some scholarship *ἀναπλάττω* has been sporadically included as partially synonymous with *πλάττω*, knowing how the term has been explained will offer a basis for our arguments and for assessment of those scholarly views.

1. *πλάττω* and *πλάσμα* in current studies on the scholia

The verb *πλάττω* and especially the noun *πλάσμα* are key terms in the agenda of ancient literary criticism. The verb has an obvious origin in the sphere of craftsmanship, but very early on authors used these terms to designate certain poetic and literary productions, and even to assign them certain pejorative features, with the value of falsehood or lie, reflecting the idea of deception.

The noun appears already in Xenophanes, *πλάσματα τῶν προτέρων* (fr.22.1 West), and scholars have interpreted it in different ways. Ford convincingly sets the famous expression in the context of oral traditions and the symposium.<sup>12</sup> The connotations and reflections constructed on the basis of *πλάσμα*-terms came to permeate both prose fiction and rhetorical theories in the Imperial age.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Ford, *The Origins of Criticism* 46–58, 98.

<sup>13</sup> There is a large body of literature on these concepts, e.g. B. Cassin, “Du

Scholarly work on the meaning and context of the appearance of these terms in ancient literary theories shows a weakening of the connection between poetry and craft. This weakening resulted in the concept being used as a basis for comparison with inventing or, with the noun, with fiction. For example, Nünlist translates *πλάσμα* (*πλάττω*) as ‘fiction’, ‘invention’ in his “Glossary of Greek terms.”<sup>14</sup> He also remarks: “critics could simply state that he [a poet] ‘invented’ (*πλάττειν*) his version.”<sup>15</sup> Papadopoulou devoted two articles to the notion of invention in the scholia:<sup>16</sup> the terms *πλάττω* and *πλάσμα* are central. In the first of the two, she draws a distinction between verb and noun. She notes that *πλάττειν* “is the standard term to denote invention.”<sup>17</sup> She also introduces considerations that are particularly relevant to the analysis of *ἀναπλάττειν*. For example, some scholia make it explicit that poetic invention originates from an element of factual reality, and therefore such invention is not based on mere imagination, does not arise out of nothing. And she suggests that “the verb *πλάττειν* in its meaning ‘to form’, ‘to shape’, might imply the sense of creating something from materials which already

faux ou du mensonge à la fiction. De ‘pseûdos’ à ‘plásma,’” in *Le plaisir de parler: études de sophistique comparée* (Paris 1986) 3–29; J. J. Flinterman, “‘... largely fictions...’: Aelius Aristides on Plato’s Dialogues,” *AncNarr* 1 (2000) 32–54; S. Halliwell, *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus* (Oxford 2011), and “Fiction,” in P. Destrée et al. (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics* (Newark 2015) 341–353; Ch. Ciampa, “Sicily between Literature and Philosophy: Pindar and Xenophanes at the Court of Hieron of Syracuse,” in H. L. Reid et al. (eds.), *Pindar in Sicily* (Sioux City 2021) 75–96. Papadopoulou, *BICS* 4 (1999) 203–205, goes through a diachronic journey with *πλάσμα*, looking at those cases in which the term is associated with, among others, falsehood or carries a negative evaluation.

<sup>14</sup> Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work* 380.

<sup>15</sup> Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work* 260. Despite this statement, the verb does not appear in all the scholia to which he refers.

<sup>16</sup> Papadopoulou, *StIt* 16 (1998) 202–232 and *BICS* 4 (1999) 203–210.

<sup>17</sup> Papadopoulou, *StIt* 16 (1998) 208.

exist.”<sup>18</sup> For Meijering, “πλάττειν is the technical term, which refers to the author’s creativeness, to what Aristotle calls ποιεῖν.”<sup>19</sup>

In these studies, when ἀναπλάττω is used in the scholia, it is considered a virtual synonym of the verb without ἀνα-.<sup>20</sup> It is true that, in certain contexts, such as when reference is made to names that the poet creates, the formula ὀνόματα πεπλασμένα / ὀνόματα ἀναπεπλασμένα,<sup>21</sup> which corresponds to the πεποιημένα ὀνόματα of the *Poetics*,<sup>22</sup> it appears indifferently. In my opinion, however, it is necessary to examine ἀναπλάττω in its exact context in order to clarify whether there is a difference in meaning or they simply function as synonyms.

## 2. *Water, earth, and creativity: Lucian’s Prometheus and some Pindaric scholia*

In order to focus the investigation of artistic creativity as expressed by ἀναπλάττω, it is first necessary to examine texts in which the verb is used in reference to one of the most iconic examples of mythological artistic and artisanal creation, Prometheus’ fashioning men from clay. In *Prometheus* Lucian employs both πλάττω and ἀναπλάττω to describe the action of the titan, but the latter appears more frequently<sup>23</sup> and, as will be demonstrated, in contexts that are significant for the type of action described. This is a creative act that, through the use and manipulation of materials, generates a tangible product.

In Lucian’s version of the myth, the artistic act of creating human beings is the responsibility of Prometheus, and the em-

<sup>18</sup> Papadopoulou, *StIt* 16 (1998) 210.

<sup>19</sup> Meijering, *Literary and Rhetorical Theories* 64.

<sup>20</sup> Nünlist, *Ancient Critic at Work* 369. In the corpus of scholia selected by Papadopoulou, it appears only sporadically.

<sup>21</sup> E.g. schol. Ar. *Eq.* 67 ὕλαν· ὡς ὄνομα οἰκέτου πέπλακεν; schol. Ar. *Eccl.* 293 ἀναπλάττει ὀνόματα.

<sup>22</sup> Arist. *Poet.* 1451b19–22. See Meijering, *Literary and Rhetorical Theories* 64 n.28.

<sup>23</sup> πλάττω appears two times, while ἀναπλάττω five.

phasis is placed on this act and not so much on the distribution of capacities, as had been the case in the version in Plato's *Protagoras* (320D–322A). Moreover, it can be inferred from another work of Lucian (*You are a Literary Prometheus*) that the figure of Prometheus is portrayed in his aspect as craftsman, creator, which includes both craftsmanship and literary ability.<sup>24</sup>

In Lucian's work, ἀναπλάττω serves in three contexts: it refers to the action of Prometheus in modelling men and living beings (as can be seen in the passages quoted below), to the action carried out by sculptors,<sup>25</sup> and to literary creation.<sup>26</sup> Taking these contexts into account, then, the relationship between craftsmanship and literature, in terms of creativity, is evident.<sup>27</sup>

In the first passage, Prometheus uses two verbs to denote creative action, συνίστημι and ἀναπλάττω (*Prometheus* 12):

ἐνενόησα ὡς ἄμεινον εἶη ὀλίγον ὅσον τοῦ πηλοῦ λαβόντα ζῶά  
τινα συστήσασθαι καὶ ἀναπλάσαι τὰς μορφὰς μὲν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς  
προσεοικότα.

it occurred to me that it would be a good idea to take a little bit  
of clay and create a few living things, making them like us in  
appearance. (transl. Harmon, Loeb)

The first verb, συστήσασθαι, designates the action as creation through systematisation, putting in order and assembling. The verb is used in this same dialogue to describe the action by which the gods came into existence (16):

<sup>24</sup> For the relationship between Prometheus the craftsman and Prometheus the craftsman of words in Lucian's work as a sophist, see S. D. Cooper, "The 'Modern' Prometheus in Antiquity: Aristophanes and Lucian," *AJP* 140 (2019) 579–611. For Lucian as sculptor, J. Romm, "Wax, Stone, and Promethean Clay: Lucian as Plastic Artist," *CLAnt* 9 (1990) 74–98. For the assimilation of Prometheus and Lucian, M. Baumbach et al. (eds.), *Ein literarischer Prometheus. Lukian aus Samosata und die zweite Sophistik* (Heidelberg 2017).

<sup>25</sup> E.g. *Imagines* 3, *Ver.Hist.* 2.44.

<sup>26</sup> E.g. *Imagines* 23, *Ver.Hist.* 2.17, *Vit.Auct.* 17.

<sup>27</sup> Cooper, *AJP* 140 (2019) 600–602.



καὶ οὐ δῆπου διὰ τοῦτο αἰτιάσαιτ' ἄν τις τὸν Οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν Γῆν, ὅτι ἡμᾶς συνεστήσαντο.

Yet, of course, one could not on this account blame Heaven and Earth for creating us.

Here ἀναπλάττω is not used, which is relevant. In my view, ἀναπλάσαι τὰς μορφάς should be considered in close connection with ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς προσεικότα: that is, the prefix ἀνα- has a strong sense in that it denotes the activity of shaping or creating something, using as reference the forms of the gods as models. This relationship between creation and model suggested by ἀναπλάσαι is specified by ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς προσεικότα. It is noteworthy that in the scholia on the creation of Pandora in *Works and Days* (60–82) either ποιέω (schol. Hes. *Op.* 60–61) or πλάττω (schol. 60a) is used to designate the action of Hephaestus, never ἀναπλάττω although the similarity of Pandora's appearance to the goddess is made explicit.<sup>28</sup>

On the other hand, for the creation or generation of the gods, συνίστημι suffices because there is no model which the generative or creative action takes up.<sup>29</sup> It should also be said, however, that συνίστημι is a key term in Aristotle's *Poetics* insofar as it defines a part of poetic activity (1447a8–10):

Περὶ ποιητικῆς αὐτῆς τε καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν αὐτῆς, ἢν τινα δύναμιν ἕκαστον ἔχει, καὶ πῶς δεῖ συνίστασθαι τοὺς μύθους εἰ μέλλει καλῶς ἔξειν ἢ ποιήσιν

We are to discuss both poetry in general and the capacity of each of its genres; the canons of plot construction needed for poetic excellence (transl. Halliwell, Loeb)

For Meijering, in the *Poetics* this verb “like *poiesis*, indicates that mimesis is a creative work. The poet himself must organize and

<sup>28</sup> Schol. Hes. *Op.* 62: διὸ καὶ τὴν ζωτικὴν ἔχει πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁμοιότητα καὶ δύναμιν ἀνθρωπικὴν καὶ τὰς ἀθανάταις δὲ θεαῖς ἔοικε κατὰ τὸ εἶδος.

<sup>29</sup> Ford, *The Origins of Criticism* 132, analysing the origin of the word “poet”: “when singing (*aoide*) or ‘song’ (*hymnos*) became an object, a *poiēma* ... Language in turn was conceived in rhetorical terms as if it were inert raw materiel that the poet ‘put together’ (commonly συν-τιθέναι) ... and shaped by artistic skill.”

put together the *pragmata*. The term emphasizes that the depicted action is a composite unity.”<sup>30</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses συντίθημι to refer to Pindar’s poetry via an architectural image in which “the original design of its architect is defined,” in Steiner’s words.<sup>31</sup>

Finally, another term that links poetry and creative activity in the first of the Lucian passages is τὰς μορφάς. Verdenius has described the principles of Greek literary criticism: “The main tendencies of Greek literary criticism seem to be based on five principles, which may be called the principle of Form, the principle of Skill, the principle of Authority, the principle of Inspiration, and the principle of Contemplation.”<sup>32</sup> In considering literature as a work of art, he quotes from the *Odyssey* to explain the importance of literary form (11.367–369):

σοὶ δ’ ἔπι μὲν μορφή ἐπέων, ἔνι δὲ φρένες ἐσθλαί,  
μῦθον δ’ ὡς ὄτ’ ἀοιδὸς ἐπισταμένως κατέλεξας,  
πάντων Ἀργείων σέο τ’ αὐτοῦ κήδεα λυγρά.

Your story has both grace and wisdom in it.  
You sounded like a skillful poet, telling  
the sufferings of all the Achaeans, including  
what you endured yourself.<sup>33</sup>

The importance of form as an element common to poetry and craft is emphasised in Lucian’s *Essays in Portraiture Defended*,<sup>34</sup> adding further that the form that is modelled has an archetype or

<sup>30</sup> Meijering, *Literary and Rhetorical Theories* 100–102.

<sup>31</sup> *Comp.* 22; D. Steiner, *Choral Constructions in Greek Culture* (New York 2021) 355–356. On Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the conceptualization of literary texts in terms of their materiality see Porter, *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought* 490–509, and Philips, *Pindar’s Library* 72, 86–92.

<sup>32</sup> W. J. Verdenius, “The Principles of Greek Literary Criticism,” *Mnemosyne* 36 (1987) 14–59, at 15–16.

<sup>33</sup> Transl. E. Wilson, *Homer, The Odyssey* (New York 2017).

<sup>34</sup> *Pro imaginibus* 18: τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅτι τῆ ἐν Κνίδῳ καὶ τῆ ἐν κήποις καὶ Ἡρα καὶ Ἀθηνῶ τὴν μορφήν ἀναπλάττων εἴκασα.

model of resemblance: the form of the gods. This same idea of modelling from a divine archetype is found in *Prometheus* 17:

Ἄλλ' ἐχρῆν μὲν, ἴσως φήσεις, ἀναπεπλάσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους,  
ἄλλον δέ τινα τρόπον, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἡμῖν εἰκότας· καὶ τί ἂν ἄλλο  
παράδειγμα τούτου ἄμεινον προεστησάμην, ὃ πάντως καλὸν  
ἠπιστάμην;

Perhaps, however, you will say that men should have been made, but in some other form and not like us. What better model could I have put before myself than this, which I knew to be beautiful in every way?

In *Prometheus*, then, the creation of human beings is considered an action linked to craftsmanship in which something is taken as a model for the new creation. Characteristics of the paradigm or archetype are used for a creation that therefore is not *ex nihilo* but essentially artisanal.

Coincidentally or not, in the scholia to Pindar<sup>35</sup> there are comments to *Ol.* 5 in which the verb ἀναπλάττω is used of the action performed by the water of the river Hipparis in contact with the earth (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 5.20e):

καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος βούλεται οὕτω, θαλάμων κατασκευὰς τὸν Ἴππαριν τῇ Καμαρίνῃ παρέχειν· φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι διὰ μέσης ῥέων τῆς Καμαρίνης τῇ πλημμυρία ἀναπλάσσει γῆν, ἀφ' ἧς πλινθεύοντες οἱ Καμαριναῖοι οἰκοδομοῦσι τὰς οἰκίας.

Aristarchus means thus, the Hipparis to furnish Camarina the building of houses: for he says that the Hipparis, flowing through the middle of Camarina in its flood, shapes the earth, out of which the Camarinans make bricks and build their houses.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>35</sup> For an overview of scholarship on the scholia see M. R. Lefkowitz, “The Pindar Scholia,” *AJP* 106 (1985) 269–282, and “The Influential Fictions in the Scholia to Pindar,” *CP* 70 (1975) 173–185, at 173; B. K. Braswell, “Reading Pindar in Antiquity,” *MusHelv* 69 (2012) 12–28.

<sup>36</sup> The same idea is mentioned in schol. Pind. *Ol.* 5.27b: Ἀρίσταρχος παρίεναί φησὶ τὸν Ἴππαριν τὴν πόλιν καὶ προσχωννύντα ἰλὸν ἀναπλάσσειν αὐτῇ γῆν, καθάπερ τὸν Ἀχελῶν ταῖς Ἐχινάσι νήσοις καὶ τὸν Νεῖλον τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, “Aristarchus says that the Hipparis passes by the city and, by flooding it, forms its land in the form of clay, as Acheloo does with the Echinades Islands and the Nile in Egypt.”

This scholium is significant because the verb appears in a context easily comparable to that of Lucian's *Prometheus*. In the scholia, it is the river that works the earth with its water and turns it into mud: ἀναπλάττω indicates the process by which the water transforms or gives new characteristics to the dry earth, which thus becomes mud. The creation of mud, as described by ἀναπλάττω, is a process in which, out of separate elements, something different is created or, rather, new characteristics are incorporated into it. The river is presented as the agent to ἀναπλάσσειν the earth; the river, then, gives a specific form to the earth, turning it into something different. This mirrors Lucian's *Prometheus*, where the titan works the clay to give it certain characteristics, a form—that of living beings.

Furthermore, the constant idea of the materiality of the creation of the new form is noteworthy. In fact, this verb also appears in another scholium to Pindar, on the epithet κελαινῶπις applied to a cloud (schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 1.13a):

ἦτοι κατ' αὐτῆς τῆς νεφέλης τὸ ἐπίθετον, ἵνα σωματικώτερον ἀναπλάσῃ τὴν νεφέλην τὴν μέλανα, ἔχουσαν ὀφθαλμούς, ἢ τὴν μελαινοῦσαν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς νεφέλην.

The epithet for the cloud, so that he shapes the cloud more corporeally, as having black eyes; or the cloud that blackens the eyes.

The scholiast considers that applying this epithet<sup>37</sup> to a cloud confers on it more corporeality. It seems that the epithet not only endows an ethereal element with anthropomorphic characteristics, but also gives it more materiality. The poet, by introducing this epithet, does not turn the cloud into a new, totally different thing, but gives it new characteristics, modifies it, simply remodels it. So once again the verb appears in a context in which the materiality (σωματικώτερον) of artistic creation is emphasised.

<sup>37</sup> On epithets in Pindar see P. Hummel, *L'épithète pindarique. Étude historique et philologique* (Bern 1999).

These passages show that the verb brings out particular facets of the creative process. In the instances where Prometheus or Pindar is the subject, an artisanal dimension of the creative action is evident. This artisanal activity is carried out by material means in which Prometheus or the river is the agent. This same creative act results in a tangible, corporeal outcome, as is evidenced by the passages of Lucian and the scholia to Pindar. Moreover, in the case of Prometheus, the preverb explicitly points to a model as a reference or starting point for the new creation.

### 3. *The poet and other craftsmen in epic scholia*

This section analyses those scholia in which the verb is applied to the action carried out by the poet and which also contain allusions to other types of artistic creation. These scholia are of interest because they demonstrate that ἀναπλάττω often retains a craft or artisanal connotation, emphasising the concept of form and materiality in poetry, as in other artisanal disciplines.

The first scholium to be examined addresses Hesiod's *Theogony* 120, ἡδ' Ἔρος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι. The scholiast identifies Eros with the element of fire, an allegorical interpretation.<sup>38</sup> Moreover, identifying fire with Eros is perceived by the scholiast as affecting how the poet presents the divinity:

<sup>38</sup> The identification of Eros as fire would seem to come from Zeno: schol. Ap. Rhod. 44.4–7: καὶ Ζήνων δὲ τὸ παρ' Ἡσιόδῳ χάος ὕδωρ εἰναί φησιν, οὗ συνιζάνοντος ἰλὸν γίνεσθαι, ἧς πηγνυμένης ἡ γῆ στερεμνιοῦται· τρίτον δὲ ἔρωτα γεγονέναι καθ' Ἡσιόδον, ἵνα τὸ πῦρ παραστήσῃ· πυρωδέστερον γὰρ πάθος ὁ ἔρωσ. For Eros as third element and the assimilation with fire see K. Algra, “Comments or Commentary? Zeno of Citium and Hesiod's *Theogonia*,” *Mnemosyne* 54 (2001) 562–581, at 567–569. But according to K. Gutzwiller, the depiction of Eros with torch becomes commonplace in the late fourth century: “Eros and Amor: Representations of Love in Greek Epigram and Latin Elegy,” in D. L. Cairns et al. (eds.), *Emotions between Greece and Rome* (London 2015) 23–44, at 27, “In the Hellenistic period, erotic desire is imaged, poetically and visually, through the figure of the winged boy Eros wielding arrows and fire.” For the metaphor of Eros and fire see also M. Kanellou, “Eros and the Erotes: From the Archaic Erotic Poetry into Hellenistic Epigram and Beyond,” in A. Harder et al. (eds.), *Past and Present in Hellenistic Poetry* (Leuven 2017) 137–159.

ἡδ' Ἔρος· ... ἔνιοι δὲ τὸ πῦρ· τὸ πυρῶδες γὰρ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας. ἢ οὕτως. ἐπειδὴ λυμαίνεται τῷ ζωογονικῷ τὸ πῦρ, διὰ τοῦτο Ἔρωτα αὐτὸ ἀνέπλασε. προσφόρως δέ· ἢ ὅτι μετὰ λαμπάδων γράφεται, ἢ ὅτι ἐκ θερμότητος γίνεται ... καὶ οἱ πλάσται γὰρ ἄνευ πυρὸς οὐ γράφουσιν Ἔρωτας.

Eros: ... Some, fire; for it is the inflaming of desire. Or in this way: since fire maims its begetter, for this reason he has shaped it [fire] as Eros—and appropriately. Or because depicted with torches, or because generated from heat ... And because artists do not depict Erotes without fire.

The assimilation of Eros to fire implies a reflection on art in a broad sense. This is evidenced by the scholiast's assertion that the relationship between Eros and fire manifests itself both in poetic/literary form and in the plastic arts. Furthermore, in asserting that the poet portrays fire in the form of Eros, the scholiast sees the procedure as follows: Hesiod personifies fire, shaping it with the characteristics or the form of the divinity Eros. The idea that the poet has conceived a formal or material representation is made evident by the reference to painters, designated with the generic οἱ πλάσται.

Here the phrase ἢ ὅτι μετὰ λαμπάδων γράφεται becomes particularly relevant as it can refer generally to artistic representations, both literary and pictorial. Therefore, whether it is literature or visual representation, the scholiast counts them as artisanal production and does not consider it necessary to specify.

The use of ἀναπλάττω in this scholium indicates how the scholiast conceptualised the poetic process. He employs this verb to signify that the poet has not invented a deity, but rather has represented or modelled an element with the characteristics of another entity. He also considers that poetry and painting employ the same techniques and procedures.

Another scholium in which the verb appears in an artistic/literary consideration comments on the description of Agamemnon (*Il.* 2.478–479):

ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἵκελος Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ,  
Ἄρει δὲ ζώνην, στέρνον δὲ Ποσειδάωνι.

in eyes and head like Zeus who delights in the thunderbolt, like Ares in girth, and with the chest of Poseidon. (transl. Green)<sup>39</sup>

In the scholium, the ambiguity between artistic fields is so evident that the textual variants give a precise account of it (schol. Hom. AbT II. 2.478–479a):

γραφεῖς<sup>40</sup> μὲν τὸ ἀληθὲς μεταδιώκουσι, τραγικοὶ δὲ τὸ σεμνότερον, κωμικοὶ δὲ τὸ ἔλασσον, ἅπερ ἅπαντα παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ ἔστι, κωμωδία μὲν ὡς ἐπὶ Θερσίτου, γραφικὴ δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “τῷ δ’ ἔχεν Αὐτομέδων, τάμνεν δ’ ἄρα διὸς Ἀχιλλεύς,” ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος νῦν καλλίων τῆς ἀληθινῆς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεστέρα ἢ ὅσιν ἀναπέπλασται.

Painters/writers pursue the truth; tragedians, what is more worthy; comic writers, what is less. All these things are found in the Poet: comedy in Thersites, the graphic style in his “He chopped the meat skillfully, spitted it on the skewers” [II. 9.210], and here, of Agamemnon, the appearance has been shaped more beautiful than in reality and worthier.

In the glossary that Nünlist draws up for the collection of scholia he analyses, γραφικὴ τέχνη is translated as ‘painting’, while γράφω as ‘to write, represent’.<sup>41</sup> In the scholium, the terms γραφεῖς, with the variant συγγραφεῖς, and γραφικὴ<sup>42</sup> appear without any kind of explanation. Considering that the other artistic agents put in relation here are τραγικοὶ and κωμικοί, it seems that we are

<sup>39</sup> P. Green, *Homer. The Iliad: A New Translation* (Oakland 2015).

<sup>40</sup> συγγραφεῖς b.

<sup>41</sup> Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work* 371.

<sup>42</sup> For the tricolon involving different artistic fields, including poetry and painting, see Arist. *Rh.* 1371b5–7: “Again, since learning and wondering are pleasant, it follows that such things as acts of imitation must be pleasant—for instance, painting [γραφική], sculpture [ἀνδριαντοποιία], poetry [ποιητική]—and every product of skilful imitation” (transl. W. Rhys Roberts [New York 1954]). For γραφική as a literary style see *Rh.* 1413b ἔστι δὲ λέξις γραφικὴ μὲν ἢ ἀκριβεστάτη (“the most exact”) and 1414a ἢ μὲν οὖν ἐπιδεικτικὴ λέξις γραφικωτάτη· τὸ γὰρ ἔργον αὐτῆς ἀνάγνωσις (“It is epideictic oratory that is most graphic, for it is meant to be read”). On λέξις γραφικὴ as written style in Aristotle see R. Graff, “Reading and the ‘Written Style’ in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31 (2001) 19–44.

dealing with a tripartition of literary styles that consists in representing an object in different ways so that the created result has an ἀληθές, σεμνότερον, or else ἔλασσον (σεμνόν) appearance.<sup>43</sup> It is also possible that the terms γραφεῖς and especially γραφική evoke what Graff calls the written style. However, that the graphic style is undoubtedly related to pictorial art is an easy deduction from LSJ. The first meaning for γραφεύς is ‘painter’ and the third is ‘writer’. As for the adjective γραφική, which in the scholium does not accompany any noun, it is worth noting a passage of Lucian rendered by LSJ as ‘able to describe’.<sup>44</sup>

In fact, in *How to Write History*, Lucian comments on the same verses as does the scholiast and makes a literary evaluation in which he distinguishes the enterprise and the rules of historiography in comparison to poetry (*Hist.conscr.* 8):

ἀλλὰ κὰν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐπαινέσαι θέλωσιν, οὐδεὶς ὁ κωλύσων Διὶ μὲν αὐτὸν ὅμοιον εἶναι τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὰ ὄμματα, τὸ στέρνον δὲ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ τῷ Ποσειδῶνι, τὴν δὲ ζώνην τῷ Ἄρει, καὶ

<sup>43</sup> On the three forms of poetic narrative see schol. Hom. *Il.* bT 14.342–344: τρεῖς δὲ εἰσι τρόποι, καθ’ οὓς πᾶσα ποίησις θεωρεῖται· ὁ μιμητικὸς τοῦ ἀληθοῦς, φιλοπάτωρ, μισογύνης, ἄπιστος, παρρησιαστής· ὁ κατὰ φαντασίαν τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃν δεῖ μὴ κατὰ μέρος ἐξετάζειν, οἶον, ὅτι ψυχαὶ γεύονται καὶ λαλοῦσι, πάντως ἔρεῖ τις καὶ γλῶσσαν ἔχουσι καὶ βρόγχον· τρίτος δὲ ὁ καθ’ ὑπέρθειν ἀληθείας καὶ φαντασίαν, Κύκλωπες, Λαιστρυγόνες καὶ ταῦτα τὰ περὶ θεῶν. On this scholium see Richardson, in *Oxford Readings* 185.

<sup>44</sup> *Alex.* 3, πρότερον δέ σοι αὐτὸν ὑπογράψω τῷ λόγῳ πρὸς τὸ ὁμοίωτον εἰκάσας, ὡς ἂν δύνωμαι, καίτοι μὴ πάνυ γραφικός τις ὢν. Harmon’s translation of γραφικός, “I am not particularly good at drawing,” precisely maintains the ambiguity between pictorial art and literary style, an ambiguity that may also be present in the scholium, which is why family b has συγγραφεῖς, which serves to clarify this ambiguity and specify the artist as a writer. In fact, Lucian himself, far from compartmentalising the different artistic dimensions, plays in his works to confuse the terms. Thus e.g. Homer is considered the best of the famous γραφεῖς of antiquity (*Imagines* 8). On γραφεύς applied to Homer as well as to Socrates in *Imagines* see E. Vintró et al., *Luciano. Obras VII* (Madrid 2021) 177. On the ambiguity of γράφειν see J. Jouanna, “ΓΡΑΦΕΙΝ, ‘écrire’ et ‘peindre’: Contributions à l’histoire de l’imaginaire de la mémoire en Grèce ancienne,” in *La littérature et les arts figurés de l’Antiquité à nos jours* (Paris 2001) 55–77.



ὄλως σύνθετον ἐκ πάντων θεῶν γενέσθαι δεῖ τὸν Ἀτρέως καὶ Ἀερόπης· οὐ γὰρ ἱκανὸς ὁ Ζεὺς οὐδὲ ὁ Ποσειδῶν οὐδὲ ὁ Ἄρης μόνος ἕκαστος ἀναπληρῶσαι τὸ κάλλος αὐτοῦ.

If they want to praise Agamemnon there is no one to prevent his having a head and eyes like Zeus, a chest like Zeus' brother Poseidon, and a belt like Ares and in general the son of Atreus and Aerope must be a compound of all the gods for not Zeus nor Poseidon nor Ares alone is adequate to give the fullness of his beauty. (transl. Kilburn, Loeb)

It appears that Lucian's view, though less explicit than that of the scholiast, aligns with it in terms of the ideas presented. Poetry of tragic style, according to the scholiast, and poetry of praise, according to Lucian, need not be limited simply to a description of the ἀληθινόν. Furthermore, Lucian emphasises that the portrayal of Agamemnon in the *Iliad* draws upon a multitude of models, with each aspect evoking the archetype of a particular deity. It thus appears that the proverb of ἀναπλάττω in the scholium points to the idea that the poetic creation is carried out from previous models.

This section will conclude with a scholium in which the scholiast infers from the context that the poet himself conceives his activity as in the sphere of artisanal production and that his task is therefore that of an artisan. In Book 3 of the *Iliad* Iris, taking the form of one of Priam's daughters, comes to Helen, who is weaving scenes depicting the battles between Achaeans and Trojans (schol. Hom. *Il.* bT 3.126–127):

ἀξιόχρεων ἀρχέτυπον ἀνέπλασεν ὁ ποιητὴς τῆς ἰδίας ποιήσεως. ἴσως δὲ τούτῳ τοῖς ὁρῶσιν ἐπειρᾶτο δεικνύναι τὴν Τρώων βίαν καὶ τὴν Ἑλλήνων δικαίαν ἰσχύν.

The poet fashioned a worthy archetype of his own poetry. In this way he sought to show the audience the violence of the Trojans and the equal strength of the Greeks.

In the second part of the scholium, introduced by ἴσως, the subject must be the poet, and the indirect object, the audience

(the readers) of the poem.<sup>45</sup> However, it can be interpreted that the subject can also be Helen, and τοῖς ὀρῶσιν those internal characters who eventually see what Helen has woven (the internal viewers). Helen in the *Iliad* was identified as the character who motivates metaliterary reflections about poetry,<sup>46</sup> and thus the scholiast's comment is part of this tradition. In fact, this scholium has been interpreted as equating the character and the poet, or marking the poet's self-referential nature.<sup>47</sup>

For this paper, however, it is more interesting to emphasise the assimilation between poetry and the art of weaving,<sup>48</sup> as works of craftsmanship. For according to the scholiast, the poet confects an archetype (ἀρχέτυπον) of his own artistic activity: the

<sup>45</sup> Nünlist considers that in the scholia οἱ ὀρῶντες are the readers (*The Ancient Critic at Work* 379). I prefer to translate "audience" to preserve the image of a group of persons listening to or reading a book.

<sup>46</sup> On this passage see G. A. Kennedy, "Helen's Web Unravelling," *Arethusa* 19 (1986) 5–14; I. E. Holmberg, "Euripides' Helen: Most Noble and Most Chaste," *AJP* 116 (1995) 19–42, at 26–28; R. Blondell, "Bitch that I Am: Self-Blame and Self-Assertion in the *Iliad*," *TAPA* 140 (2010) 1–32, at 20. For Helen as the voice of the poet see N. Worman, "This Voice Which Is Not One: Helen's Verbal Guises in Homeric Epic," in A. Lardinois et al. (eds.), *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (Princeton 2001) 19–37; D. F. Elmer, "Helen Epigrammatopoiος," *CLAnt* 24 (2005) 1–39. On Helen's voice see D. De Sanctis, *Il canto e la tela: le voci di Elena in Omero* (Pisa 2018); J. Carruesco, "Helen's Voice and Choral Mimesis: From Homer to Stesichorus," in X. Riu et al. (eds.), *Approaches to Archaic Greek Poetry* (Chieti 2012) 149–172.

<sup>47</sup> Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work* 132 n.51: "The notion that characters 'represent' the poet is not limited to their speeches: schol. bT *Il.* 7.214b ex. argues that the poet transferred his own feelings to the characters. The case of characters who are said to represent the poet explicitly should be kept separate from the instances where an implicit self-referentiality is detected: e.g. schol. Ab. *Il.* 1.249a ex., bT *Il.* 3.126–127 ex."

<sup>48</sup> For a study on the relationship between the weaving art and choral performance see Fanfani, *Dionysus ex Machina* 9 (2018) 6–40, who also studies the relationship between poetry and sculptural art.

scenes woven by Helen.<sup>49</sup> It is noteworthy, moreover, that ἀρχέτυπον and παράδειγμα are synonymous concepts and that precisely this second noun is used in Lucian's *Prometheus* (17) in relation to ἀναπλάττω to refer to the titan shaping human beings from clay, using the gods as a model for his creation. As in the scholium on the description of Agamemnon, in which the importance of the visual element is made evident by allusion to the γραφική, the tapestry as archetype has also an important visual dimension, expressed by ἴσως δὲ τούτῳ τοῖς ὀρώσιν ἐπειρᾶτο δεικνύναι.

This notion of the poet's task as craftsmanship inspired by an archetype or paradigm seems to be conveyed by synonyms in Aristophanes' *Clouds*. At 995 the manuscripts differ as to the verb: the BC reading is ἀναπλάσσειν, while Δ reads ἀναπλάσειν and RVΘ ἀναπλήσειν.<sup>50</sup> The late scholia of Eustathius, Thomas Magister, and Triclinius give as synonyms for ἀναπλάσσειν: τυπώσειν, ἐργάσεσθαι. In this scholium, then, the synonyms belong to the field of craftsmanship: τυπώω 'form, mould, model';<sup>51</sup> ἐργάζομαι, though not so directly, 'work, labour, esp. of husbandry, but also of all manual labour' (LSJ). Precisely this verse of Aristophanes is quoted by LSJ ἀναπλάσσω to exemplify the meaning 'model, mould, fashion'.

<sup>49</sup> Porter counts this tapestry among the objects called by him poetic (constructed) objects. He significantly states: "All these are truly poetic objects in that they point to their own manufacture while simultaneously betokening the *poiesis* of Homer's epic" (*TAPA* 141 [2011] 18).

<sup>50</sup> See N. G. Wilson, *Aristophanis Fabulae* I (Oxford 2007). Wilson accepts the RVΘ ἀναπλήσειν, while F. W. Hall et al. (eds.), *Aristophanis Comoediae* (Oxford 1906), gave ἀναπλάττειν, an editorial conjecture.

<sup>51</sup> LSJ. As to synonymy between τυπώω and (ἀνα)πλάττω, Halliwell in his commentary on Gorgias' *Encomium to Helen* highlights the precise manner in which the sophist establishes the relationship between these verbs in reference to *logos*: "Later on, however, the work will characterize all *logos*—including poetry, oratory, and philosophy—as having a psychological power both quasi-magical and drug-like in its capacity to 'shape' or 'manipulate' (πλάττειν) the forms of language and thereby 'mould' or 'imprint' (τυποῦν) the minds of its hearers": *Between Ecstasy and Truth* 267.

As is demonstrated in the scholia reviewed in this section, the verb in question designates the poet's action and places it in the wider context of artisanal and craft activity. It thus appears that the scholia consider the poet to operate with codes and techniques analogous to those of the plastic artists.

#### 4. *On the traditional version and the poet's invention*

Papadopoulou has discussed the degree of fidelity of the tragic poet to prior tradition and, in turn, the scholiasts' comments on the poet's creativity with respect to the tradition. Among the verbs used by the scholia to comment on such innovativeness (e.g. *αὐτοσχεδιάζειν*), *ἀναπλάττω* is a key term.<sup>52</sup> Thus schol. Hom. *Od.* 11.134:

οἱ νεώτεροι τὰ περὶ Τηλέγονον ἀνέπλασαν τὸν Κίρκης καὶ Ὀδυσσέως, ὃς δοκεῖ κατὰ ζήτησιν τοῦ πατρὸς εἰς Ἰθάκην ἐλθὼν ὑπ' ἀγνοίας τὸν πατέρα διαχρήσασθαι τρυγόνος κέντρον.

The *neoteroi*<sup>53</sup> *remodelled/invented* the account of Telegonus, the son of Circe and Odysseus, who, it seems, came to Ithaca in search of his father and killed him in ignorance with a sting-ray spear. (transl. Papadopoulou)

Papadopoulou states that the scholiast used the verb to remodel or simply to invent, and continues: "Telegonus was not of course an invention of the *neoteroi*, he is mentioned in Hesiod's *Theogony* 1014. His implication in Odysseus' death was also mentioned in the Cyclic epic *Telegoneia*."<sup>54</sup> Thus if Telegonus is not an invention of the *neoteroi*, we can assume that the scholiast does not use the verb *ἀναπλάττω* in the sense of 'invent', but rather to identify a starting point to develop, in this case, the adventures of this character. It is rather a matter of developing a motif, of making

<sup>52</sup> On Pindaric scholia commenting on the poet's reworking of Homeric antecedents see C. Muckensturm-Pouille, "L'énonciation dans les scholies de la *Sixième Olympique*," *DHA* Suppl. 2 (2009) 77–91, at 88–90; Phillips, *Pindar's Library* 179–192.

<sup>53</sup> Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work* 14 and 258, holds that νεώτεροι can be the cyclic poets or Euripides.

<sup>54</sup> Papadopoulou, *StIt* 16 (1998) 228.

up a story using previous material.

Regarding the poet's invention and creativity, Nünlist and Papadopoulou have each compiled a corpus of scholia to illustrate the evaluations that scholiasts made of tradition vs. innovation; the terms are more varied in the case of the scholia that Nünlist cites.<sup>55</sup> Both, as well as Meijering,<sup>56</sup> focus on those scholia where innovation or poetic licence<sup>57</sup> (ἐξουσία) is pointed out with respect to what the scholiast considers the traditional myth (ιστορία, παραδεδομένα, γνώριμα).

It is noteworthy that when ἀναπλάττω is said of a literary elaboration of an earlier work, the scholiast does not see the connection in terms of opposition between a traditional or accepted version and the invention of the poet. Rather, ἀναπλάττω designates the act of creating a new literary work using previous literary material as a starting point. Some examples will illustrate this.

In the first, the scholiast considers that Aesop elaborated the fable of men and lions from the simile at *Iliad* 22.262, ὡς οὐκ ἔστι λέουσι καὶ ἀνδράσιν ὄρκια πιστά (schol. Hom. *T II*. 22.262):

ἐντεῦθεν τὸν περὶ λεόντων καὶ ἀνθρώπων μῦθον Αἴσωπος ἀνέπλασεν.

From here Aesop shaped the fable concerning lions and men.

In the second, the scholia specify that Xenophon and Telesilla took as a reference for their respective female characters the verses of the *Odyssey* in which Athena takes the form of a woman, ὡς φάτο, μείδησεν δὲ θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, / χειρὶ τέ μιν κατέρεξε· δέμας δ' ἦϊκτο γυναικὶ / καλῇ τε μεγάλῃ τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ ἔργα ἰδυίη (schol. Hom. *Od*. 13.288 and 289):

ἐντεῦθεν Ξενοφῶν τὴν Ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν Κακίαν ἀνέπλασεν.

Xenophon used this passage to shape the characters of Arete and Cacia.

<sup>55</sup> Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work* 174–184.

<sup>56</sup> Meijering, *Literary and Rhetorical Theories* 63–64.

<sup>57</sup> For the same concept of poetic license in the scholia to Pindar see Lefkowitz, *AJP* 106 (1985) 277; Braswell, *MusHelv* 69 (2012) 15.

καλῆ τε μεγάλη· ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ὄψιν κοσμιότητος καὶ αἰδοῦς καὶ τοῦτο ὑπονοεῖν δίδωσι, καθὰ καὶ Ξενοφῶν καὶ Τελέσιλλα ἢ Ἀργεῖα διαγράφουσιν Ἀρετῆς καὶ Καλοκαγαθίας εἰκόνα.

It is conceded to understand this from the propriety of her appearance and her reverence, just as both Xenophon and Telesilla of Argos depicted the image of Arete and Calocagathia.

If we compare the first scholium, with its ἀναπλάττω, and the second, with διαγράφουσιν, the first verb designates the artistic (literary) action carried out. This artistic action involves using a model to create something new. The second emphasises even more the assimilation of literature with pictorial art, by using both the verb διαγράφουσιν and the noun εἰκόνα.

The sculptor, therefore, works with stone or clay as a starting point and the creation is the result of a process that follows a model as reference. Similarly, poets and writers work with the received tradition, incorporating modifications to create a new work of art that is also based on a reference model.

Thus, in the scholia studied here, the agent of the verb under consideration, except in the two scholia to Pindar concerning the river Hipparis, is the poet or writer. However, in the scholium quoted below, the subject of ἀναπλάττει is ὁ μῦθος and the action it performs is opposed to an agent, which is the poet (ὁ ποιητής) who speaks (φησίν). The context is a comment on Hera's wrath against the Trojans in *Iliad* 4. The scene is set in the assembly of the gods: Zeus and Hera argue over the proposal to make peace between the two sides by having Menelaus take Helen away so that Troy will not be destroyed (schol. Hom. bT *Il.* 4.51–52):

ἤτοι ἐμοὶ τρεῖς—Μυκῆνη) διὰ τί ὁ μὲν Ζεὺς μίαν, ἡ δὲ Ἥρα τρεῖς φησιν ἔχειν πόλεις φιλτάτας, καὶ ἡ μὲν Ἑλληνίδας, ὁ δὲ βάρβαρον; ἔδει γὰρ τὰς κρείσσονας τὸν βασιλέα τῶν θεῶν ἔχειν φιλτάτας. ῥητέον δὲ ὅτι εὐπρεπῆ βουλόμενος περιθεῖναι αὐτῇ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ὀργῆς ὁ ποιητής, καὶ οὐχ ἦν ὁ μῦθος ἀναπλάττει, ὡς ἄρα διὰ τὸ μὴ προτιμηθῆναι τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἐπὶ τῇ κρίσει τοῦ κάλλους τοῖς Τρωσὶν ἐχαλέπαινε, ἐπίτηδες ταύτας φησὶν αὐτὴν τὰς πόλεις φιλεῖν, περὶ ἃς τὸ ἀδίκημα τὸ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλένην γέγονεν, Ἄργος τε Σπάρτη (τε).

Why does Zeus have only one as most beloved city while Hera has three? And hers are Greek while his is barbarian? It was necessary for the king of the gods to have the more powerful cities as the most beloved. But it must be said that the Poet, with the intention of making more plausible the cause of Hera's anger, and not the one that the myth shapes (that she was angry with the Trojans because she was not preferred over Aphrodite in the judgment of beauty) says suitably that she loved those cities on which the injustice done to Helen fell, Argos and Sparta.

In commenting on the issue raised in the scholium, Kirk offers a justification also based on plausibility and contrasts it also with the version about the judgment of Paris.<sup>58</sup>

It is surprising, to say the least, that in this case, where it seems that the poet does not follow the best-known version, ἀναπλάττει describes the cause that the traditional story cited. In fact, these scholia to lines 51 and 52 make the claim explicit that Homer was unaware of the contest in which Paris acted as judge.<sup>59</sup>

Although Homer is typically the traditional reference for assessing the versions used or elaborated by the tragedians and those categorised as *neoteroi*, the scholiast seems here to assume that Homer does not follow the best-known version, that of the judgment of Paris. Instead he deems the reason given by Homer for Hera's wrath to be more fitting.

That Homer, as a poet, acts freely with respect to the received tradition is clear from the schol. Hom. AbT *Il.* 8.428–429:

τῶν ἄλλος μὲν ἀποφθίσθω· ὅταν εἰς τὴν ἀξίαν ἀτενίσῃ τῶν θεῶν,  
τότε φησὶν αὐτοὺς μὴ κινεῖσθαι περὶ θνητῶν ὡς οὐδὲ ἂν ἡμεῖς

<sup>58</sup> G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary* I (Cambridge 1985) 336: "Quite apart from the Judgement of Paris ... as cause of Hera's hatred of Troy, her cult was deeply rooted in the Peloponnese, especially at the Argive Heraion and Argos, but also at Sparta. Aristarchus ... is no doubt right that this by itself would explain her support of the Achaeans, as it also justifies her mention of three cities as especially dear to her."

<sup>59</sup> Schol. Hom. T *Il.* 4.51: ἐκτίθεται τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς περὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας σπουδῆς· ἀγνοεῖ οὖν τὴν κρίσιν. 4.52 Ariston. ὅτι τούτων τῶν πόλεων ἕνεκα συνεμάχουν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, οὐ διὰ τὸ ἀποκεκρίσθαι ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου τὸ κάλλος αὐτῶν, ὅπερ οὐκ οἶδεν Ὅμηρος.

περὶ μυρμήκων. ὅταν δὲ ἐπιλογίσηται τὴν ποιητικὴν, ἔπεται τοῖς μύθοις καὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐκτραγωδεῖ, συμμαχίας καὶ θεομαχίας παράγων.

When he considers the dignity of the gods, then he says that they are not moved by concern for mortals, just as we should not be concerned about ants; but when he is thinking about the poetic effect, he follows the myths and represents his theme in a tragic way, introducing alliances and battles of the gods. (transl. Richardson)

Richardson offers this explanation: “Poetic invention obeys its own laws, as Aristotle had observed, and the Scholia are aware of this. They defend poetic freedom to ‘follow the myths’ however shocking or odd these may seem later.”<sup>60</sup> But in the case of Hera’s wrath, Homer deviates from the myth and, according to the scholiasts, provides a more plausible reason.

In contrast to how the poet explains Hera’s wrath in Book 4, where he does not explicitly indicate that he differs from tradition, Pindar in *Olympian* 1.36 expresses frank opposition to the earlier versions of the Pelops myth (σέ δ’ ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι).<sup>61</sup>

Scodel, for her part, relates Pindar’s assessment of the tradition and the way he presents his own version to Xenophanes fr. 1 and to Hesiod’s famous lines in the *Theogony* (26–28).<sup>62</sup> This interpretation aligns with that of the scholia. There Pindar’s

<sup>60</sup> Richardson, in *Oxford Readings* 185.

<sup>61</sup> Pind. *Ol.* 1.36. On the structure and the version of the myth shaped by Pindar see Philips, *Pindar’s Library* 176; F. Cairns, “‘ΕΡΩΣ in Pindar’s First Olympian Ode,” *Hermes* 105 (1977) 129–132; G. Nagy, *Pindar’s Homer. The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore 1990) 126–135; cf. A. Köhnken, “Pindar as Innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the Relevance of the Pelops Story in *Olympian* 1,” *CQ* 24 (1974) 199–206, at 200–201; C. M. J. Sicking, “Pindar’s First Olympian. An Interpretation,” *Mnemosyne* 36 (1983) 60–70; R. Drew Griffith, “Pelops and Sicily: The Myth of Pindar *Ol.* 1,” *JHS* 109 (1989) 171–173, at 171.

<sup>62</sup> R. Scodel, “Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition in Hesiod and Pindar,” in J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes. Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden 2001) 109–137.



version is evaluated in terms of its contrast to the tradition, as the poet himself explains. The verses are paraphrased in a similar manner, associating deceit and falsehood with the earlier versions of the myth.<sup>63</sup> For instance, in scholium 58a, these concepts are concretized with the expression τῶν προτέρων δόξαις.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, the verb used in the scholia of *Olympian* 1 is πλάττω (48c) and not ἀναπλάττω. This is significant and consistent with the use of the latter verb in those passages that describe a literary creation in terms of intertextuality and not in terms of opposition.

With regard to the scholia reviewed in this section, it can be argued that ἀναπλάττω typically indicates intertextuality, and that it serves to reinforce the notion that it evokes a point of departure in previous works for the poetic creation. Nevertheless, in certain instances, such as the scholium on Hera's wrath, the use of this verb, owing to a lack of further context, remains somewhat opaque.

##### 5. *Some concluding remarks*

From the scholia examined here, it can be concluded that ἀναπλάττω should be considered a technical term for poetic or literary activity. In the passages analysed, the verb is used to highlight concrete aspects of poetic activity in terms analogous to the arts and handcraft.

Firstly, it can be argued that ἀναπλάττω is used to describe the creative process of literary modelling, whereby the poet or writer works with existing materials to produce a new form.

Secondly, we see that the artistic creation is based, in certain contexts, on a preceding literary element or work, while in others it is emphasised that poetry and literature use the same techniques or procedures as other fine arts. It can be proposed that the preverb ἀνα- evokes the reference that serves as starting point for the poet or writer's creation.

Thirdly, in the passages under consideration, in contrast to

<sup>63</sup> So e.g. schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.44a, 44b, 44d, 51a.

<sup>64</sup> Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.58a; otherwise, schol. 1.58b has οἱ πρότεροι ποιηταί.

passages where *πλάττω* is used, the notion of a lie or *ἀπάτη* is not developed or implied regarding the poetic or literary creation. Likewise, *ἀναπλάττω* is not used to imply that the new literary creation stands in opposition to another which is prior or which is judged to be traditional or generally accepted.

In regard to the scholia in the third and fourth sections, it can be concluded that literary creativity or invention is conceived in the context of a broad artisanal tradition in which the artist is supplied with a variety of materials. The poet or writer uses these freely in order to articulate something new. Creativity is therefore associated with intertextuality not only in a literary sense, but also in artistic/artisanal sense. This means that the poet or writer can use different types of reference models, such as painting, pottery, or sculpture, as well as literary works, to create something new.

Finally, a provisional conclusion can be proposed that will require confirmation through a review of further contexts where *ἀναπλάττω* is used. When the verb refers to literary activity, the concept does not imply a mimesis of factual reality or a simple invention or fabrication. Rather, it refers to an artisanal process that generates a literary creation from a pre-existing model or point of departure.<sup>65</sup>

July, 2024

Dept. of Classical, Romanic  
and Semitic Philology  
University of Barcelona /  
Institut Català d'Arqueologia  
Clàssica, Tarragona  
rhomar@ub.edu

<sup>65</sup> This work is part of the research of the project *La construcción del pasado en la Grecia arcaica y clásica: mecanismos compositivos, genealogías y catálogos*, directed by Jesús Carruesco and Xavier Riu, and financed by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (PID2019-110908GB-I00).