UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Ancient Greek ekphrasis: Between description and narration

Koopman, N.

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.
5. The Goatherd's Cup (Theoc. Id. 1.27-60)

5.1 Introduction

The next ekphrasis of this study is that of the goatherd's cup in Theocritus' first Idyll. In this poem, a shepherd by name of Thyrsis and an unnamed goatherd meet and start exchanging compliments. Thyrsis asks the goatherd to play the σῦριγξ. The goatherd declines, but asks Thyrsis to sing his famous song about Daphnis, offering him a goat and a cup in return. The decoration of the cup is described in detail by the goatherd (27-60). Thyrsis agrees and sings his song about Daphnis (64-145). When the song is finished, the goatherd compliments Thyrsis and hands him the cup.

The first Idyll differs in one important respect from the other poems of this study, in that it consists of speeches only. It thus belongs to the so-called 'mimetic' poems of Theocritus. I regard the first Idyll as a narrative poem with a suppressed primary narrator and suppressed primary narratees. This makes Thyrsis and the goatherd secondary narrators and at the same time, since they talk to each other, secondary narratees. Of the five ekphraseis of this study, the goatherd's cup is the only one not in the mouth of the primary narrator, but of a secondary one. I elaborate on this observation below.

This chapter focuses on the ekphrasis of the goatherd's cup, and aims to establish which prototypically narrative and/or descriptive elements are present (section 5.3). I am not the first to address this question; section 5.2 therefore contains a brief overview of scholarship that deals with the descriptivity and narrativity of the ekphrasis. After the conclusion (section 5.4), I briefly touch upon the visualization of the cup in section 5.5.

---

1 The ekphraseis of this study are investigated in chronological order. This presents some difficulties when it comes to Theocritus and Apollonius Rhodius. I follow Köhnken [2001] 2008 in placing Theocritus before Apollonius Rhodius.


5.2 The Goatherd’s Cup: Description, Narration, or Both? A Brief State of the Art
As in the other ekphraseis of this study, the goatherd in the first *Idyll* focuses largely on the *res ipsae*. As a result, the ekphrasis contains a number of elements which are, strictly speaking, alien to a work of visual art (e.g. thoughts, emotions, movement). In this respect, the ekphrasis does not differ from the shield ekphraseis in *Iliad* 18 or the *Shield*. There is a difference, however, in the way these elements have been interpreted. In the case of Theocritus’ first *Idyll*, scholars take it for granted that the goatherd describes static images. As a result, the descriptive elements in the ekphrasis have received little to no attention; it is those elements that are regarded as narrative to which most attention has been devoted.

Because scholars consider the images on the cup to be static, they regard most narrative elements as inferences by the goatherd from what is depicted on the cup. Zanker, for example, writes regarding the first scene (32-8) that “motion is implied” and that “[t]he moment when the proceedings are captured also leaves room for a denouement”. Regarding the second scene (39-44), he notes that “the moment at which the artist has captured the old man (…) is anticipatory to the culminating act of the net-cast. The artist and, through him, the Goatherd thus invite the audiences to do some work and supply the climactic moment in their imagination. As in the wooing scene [32-8], narrative can be, and is meant to be, extracted from the visual clues”. Regarding the third and last scene (45-54), Zanker speaks of “(…) the narrative that can be (…) reconstructed from the moment of representation which anticipates the inevitable outcome”. Thus, the snapshot images on the cup allow for the

---

4 See e.g. Gallavotti 1966: 421: “la descrizione del disegno istoriato sul nappo non è statica e ferma, ma raccontata e interpretata, cioè animata come una scena viva, seconda uno spirito di osservazione che è naturale in sé, e secondo un’ esigenza artistica già fissata nella tradizione poetica dal primitivo modello omerico dello scudo di Achille” (emphasis mine).

5 This could be due to the fact that most scholars regard ekphrasis as description (see section 1.3.2), which makes any descriptive element self-evident.

6 With “motion is implied”, Zanker refers to the temporal adverbs in 36-7 (ἀλλ’ ὅκα μὲν … / ἀλλ’ ὅκα δ’ αὖ…).

7 Zanker 2004: 12-4. He concludes that “the cup description (…) demonstrates a fascination with presenting a moment in a narrative, which can in turn be supplemented to include events before and after the moment depicted. Here the audience’s or viewer’s imagination is shown at work in the interpretative commentary offered by the describer, who is made to see to it that the person for whom he is describing the art object becomes integrally involved not only in the object but also in the process of its interpretation” (ibid. 15-6).
reconstruction of parts of a larger narrative. Some of this work is done by the goatherd; the narratees – both the secondary and the primary – must follow his lead and further supplement the goatherd’s words.

Whereas Zanker emphasizes the narrative potential of the cup, to be fulfilled by the goatherd or narratees, Payne stresses the fact that it is the goatherd who is creating this narrative. Regarding the first scene, he notes that “[t]he goatherd is making a story out of a picture; he introduces time into the visual representation and constructs a ‘back story’ to explain what he has seen: the men are hollow-eyed ‘from love,’ and have been so ‘for a long time.’ Finally, his description also hints at the likely outcome of the scene: ‘they labor in vain.’”. Payne draws attention to the fact that the goatherd supplies more than is depicted on the cup. In the case of the first scene, he finds this excess puzzling, since the narratee cannot compare the goatherd’s interpretative response to the cup with the cup itself. In the other two scenes, such a conflict between “visual representation and narration” is absent.

---

8 For the idea that the scenes on the cup are snapshots, see e.g. Palm 1965-6: 144 (“Zustandbilder”), Ott 1969: 135 (“Die Becherzüge sind zwar Wiedergabe plastischen Bildwerks, aber dennoch nicht statuariisch, sondern Momentbilder aus Handlungsabläufen”, emphasis mine), and Schmale 2004: 122 (“[ä]hnlich wie in der apollonischen Beschreibung [A.R. 1,730-68] handelt es sich meist um Momentaufnahmen ohne große narrative Ausschweifungen. (…) Die Beschreibungen reflektieren hier also auch, was die (bildende) Kunst zu leisten vermag, und zeigen ihr narratives Potential (…)”, emphasis mine).

9 Payne 2007: 32. Similarly Klooster 2012: 112: “[t]he dynamization of the description turns static images into little narratives: the men are contending, the woman apparently looks to both sides alternately. A psychological interpretation is provided by the goatherd: the men are in love; the woman does not care for them. Thus a narrative is created, whose details remain obscure, though its outcome for the men is revealed: they labour in vain” (emphasis in the original).

10 Following Hunter 1999: 63.


12 Payne 2007: 34, 36 (ad lines 39-44: “[h]ere, there is no conflict between visual representation and narration (…)”; ad lines 45-54: “(...) his imagination seems to harmonize with the visual information; it does not create the puzzles of the first scene”). Klooster 2012: 113 notes regarding the second scene that “[a]lthough the depiction is again more or less dynamic (the net is about to be cast), there is no real narrative: it is a ‘snapshot’ of a man working” (emphasis in the original); she states regarding the third scene that “[i]t once more contains elements of narration: one fox ravages the vines; the other preys on the boy’s lunch, its intentions are even described”.

Petrain has addressed the narrativity of all the scenes taken together. He argues that the three scenes on the goatherd’s cup, which would represent the three stages of human life – maturity (32-8), old age (39-44), and childhood (45-54) – form a fabula when taken together. The story, however, does not follow the temporal order of the fabula, since the first element of the fabula (childhood) comes last in the story.

In the next section, the narrativity of the images will be discussed in detail. As in the other chapters, I will make a distinction between the text that represents the image, and the image itself. However, in the case of a secondary narrator, a distinction between text and image presents a number of problems, which first need to be addressed (section 5.3.3). After having discussed the images separately, I will address the question whether one can speak of a fabula in connection with the goatherd’s cup.

5.3.1 The Goatherd’s Cup: Its Descriptivity and Narrativity. Text and Translation

This is a view that is widely held; see the references in Petrain 2006: 257, note 25.

Petrain 2006: 257.

Text and translation based on Gow [1950] 1952a: 6-9; the translation has been adapted, for which I have made use of Hunter 1999: 74-86, Verity and Hunter 2002: 1-3, and Payne 2007: 28-40. In line 30, I read κεκονισμένος instead of κεκονιμένος (see Gutzwiller 1986: 253, note 1). For the tense analysis, only main clauses are taken into consideration.
(...), come, let us sit under the elm, opposite [the statue of] Priapus and the spring, where [is] that shepherd's seat and the oaks. And if you will sing as once you sang in the match with Libyan Chromis, I will give you a goat that has borne twins for milking three times, which, though having two kids, produces two pails of milk in addition, and [I will give you] a deep cup, sealed with sweet wax, two-handled, newly fashioned, still smelling of the knife. High towards its lip curls ivy, ivy intertwined with helichryse; along it [the helichryse] winds the ivy-tendril, rejoicing in its golden fruit. (32) And within [the frame of the plants] is wrought a woman, some ornamental work of the gods, curiously wrought with a cloak and a headband. And beside her two men, with fine long hair, alternately, one from this side, the other from that side, are contending with words; these things are not touching her mind; but at one time she looks at this
[τῆνον] man, smiling, at another time again she turns her mind to the other; and they, for a long time hollow-eyed from love, are labouring in vain. (39) Near them is wrought an old fisherman and a rock, jagged, on which he is eagerly hauling a big net for a catch, the old man, looking like a man who is working hard. You would say that he is fishing with all the strength of his limbs, so have his sinews swollen all over his neck, even though he is grey-haired; his strength is worthy of youth. (45) And a little way off from the sea-worn old man a vineyard is beautifully laden with dark clusters, which some little boy is guarding, sitting on a dry-stone wall; and on either side of him [are] two foxes; one is roaming among the vine rows, plundering the [grapes] ripe for eating; the other, fashioning every scheme against the wallet, is thinking to herself that she will not let the boy alone until [she has raided his breakfast-bread]. But he is weaving a pretty trap for locusts with asphodel stalks, joining [the asphodel] to rush; and he has no concern at all for his wallet or the plants so much as he is rejoicing in his weaving. (55) Everywhere around the cup is spread the pliant acanthus, a marvel of the goatherd’s world; it would amaze your heart as a wonder. For it I gave to a ferryman from Kalydna a goat as a price and a great cheese of white milk; and never at all has it touched my lips, but it is still unstained. With it I would very gladly please you, if you, my friend, will sing me that delightful song.

5.3.2 The Goatherd’s Cup: Its Descriptivity and Narrativity. Overview of Tenses

In this section, I will establish which discourse modes are found in this passage (21-61); as usual, the lines surrounding the ekphrasis are also taken into account. Because the first Idyll is a mimetic poem, the present tense is the main tense used in the poem.¹⁶ In the lines which refer to the images on the cup, the tense most used is the present, too. Presents as well as perfects occur, which can both be appropriately used for the representation of images on cup. The present tense is mainly used for the rendering of the res ipsae in the text, as it characterizes an action as ongoing; the perfect tense designates a state. As such, the presents and perfects equal the imperfects and pluperfects used in the ekphrases of Homer and pseudo-Hesiod.¹⁷

¹⁶ Predecessors of ekphrases in the present tense are found in tragedy. See e.g. E. Ion 184-218 (the ekphrasis of the pedimental sculptures of Apollo’s temple in Delphi by the chorus). In connection with this temple ekphrasis, Gutzwiller 1991: 90 speaks of the mimetic-dramatic tradition of ekphrasis. Ekphrases of this tradition are characterised by the presence of dialogue, as well as the inclusion of reactions to the work of art by the characters. She contrasts this tradition with the epic-narrative tradition, which she does not define but which is represented by the shields of Achilles and Heracles. The cup would evoke both traditions: Theocritus’ first Idyll is a dialogue, but its scenes find their models in the Homeric and Pseudo-Hesiodic shields.

¹⁷ For the value of the imperfect in ekphrasis see section 3.3.3.1.
In lines 21-61, three discourse modes are found: the descriptive discourse mode (lines 29-35; 39-41; 43-55), the diegetic discourse mode (36-8), and the discursive discourse mode (21-8; 42; 56-61).\(^a\) As in the ekphraseis of Homer and pseudo-Hesiod, the bulk of the ekphrasis consists of the descriptive discourse mode (lines 29-35; 39-41; 43-55). In these lines, only present and perfect tenses occur. Textual progression is mainly spatial. For example, the main parts of the ekphrasis are all connected spatially (ποτὶ μὲν, 29; ἐντοσθὲν δὲ, 32; τοῖς δὲ μετά, 39; τυτθὸν δὲ δοσσὸν ἄπωθεν, 45; παντὶ δὲ ἀμφὶ δέπας, 55). Within the images, progression is spatial, too. The diegetic discourse mode (36-8) is also found in connection with the images; it is characterised by temporal adverbs (Ἀλλ’ ἔκα μὲν..., ἀλλ’ ἄλλα, 36-7; δηθά, 38).

The discursive discourse mode occurs when a narrator explicitly addresses his narratee.\(^b\) Either the primary narrator addresses the primary narratee, or a secondary narrator (a character) addresses a secondary narratee (also a character). Here, the latter is the case: the goatherd addresses Thyrsis.\(^c\) Since the ekphrasis is part of a dialogue, there is no pause. In fact, by having a character speak of an object a narrator avoids a so-called descriptive pause.\(^d\) The words of the characters are, after all, part of the fabula.

As in the case of the other discourse modes, the discursive discourse mode is characterised by a number of linguistic features. We find pronouns referring to the second person (τοι, 25; το, 56, 60, 61) and second-person verbs (φαίης κεν, 42; κέ...ἀτύξαι, 56). In the discursive discourse mode, all tenses and moods may occur. We find an adhortative subjunctive (ἑσδώμεθα, 21), a future tense (δωσῶ, 25), and two indicative aorists (ἔδωκα, 57; θίγεν, 59); second-person optatives are found in 42 (φαίης κεν) and 56 (κέ...ἀτύξαι), a first person optative in 60 (κά...ἀρεσάμαι). All three optatives are

\(^a\) See for the descriptive and diegetic discourse modes section 2.2.2. I will deal with the discursive discourse mode below.

\(^b\) See Allan 2009: 181-5 and 2013: 384-8. It should be noted that “[a]lthough the discursive mode is a common ingredient of narratives, it is clearly non-narrative in character. Likewise, the linguistic features of the discursive mode diverge strongly from the modes discussed so far [the diegetic modes and the descriptive mode]” (Allan 2009: 183).

\(^c\) The discursive discourse mode is also found in the ekphrasis of Jason’s cloak (A.R. 1.725-6 and 765-7). There, however, the primary narrator addresses the primary narratee. See further section 6.2.2.

\(^d\) See note 64 in section 2.4.1.

\(^e\) These aorists are not part of a sequence of events, but relate individual facts from the past. On the aorist in the discursive discourse mode, see Allan 2013: 386.
potential. That the discursive discourse mode occurs is no coincidence: the goatherd's words have a rhetorical goal, namely to persuade Thyrsis to sing his song.\(^{23}\)

I want to stress that a discourse mode analysis only uncovers the textual structure or organization of a passage. This structure is mainly determined by the occurring tenses. I reiterate here that descriptive details may also be found in modes other than the descriptive discourse mode.\(^{24}\) For example, lines 27-8, though belonging to the discursive discourse mode on account of the main verb δωσῶ in 25, consist wholly of descriptive details.

5.3.3 The Goatherd's Cup: Its Descriptivity and Narrativity. Preliminaries

In the previous chapters, two ekphraseis that occur in epic poems were investigated. These ekphraseis concerned shields, objects appropriate in a martial context. Both shields are huge, and made for a hero of superhuman qualities. They contain a multitude of images that depict a multitude of figures. The bucolic world of Theocritus' first *Idyll* – a Hellenistic poem – is different. The cup, not a very big object, contains but three images that depict at most three figures.\(^{25}\) It is not made of expensive metals, but of wood, and is owned by a goatherd. Though a rustic object, its elaborate decorations are such that are found on “the finest works of Greek art”.\(^{26}\)

The cup is described by a secondary narrator, the goatherd, an inhabitant of the bucolic world. At the same time, scholars agree that the ekphrasis also communicates Theocritus' literary programme.\(^{27}\) The question thus arises whether the goatherd describes the cup as a goatherd would, or whether he functions as a mouthpiece of the suppressed primary narrator ("Theocritus").\(^{28}\) Gutzwiller has suggested that “[t]he...
inseparability of goatherd as character from goatherd as narrator and so projection of the poet’s voice suggests that herdsman and poet speak, if not on the same level of meaning, at least with a compatibility of sentiment. In connection with other secondary-narrator ekphraseis, such as Herodas’ fourth Mimiamb or Theocritus’ fifteenth Idyll, scholars have asked similar questions. The communis opinio seems to be that in those ekphraseis, the characters represent, to a certain extent, the voice of the poet, too.

On the other hand, a secondary narrator is not the primary narrator. Klooster has suggested that by relegating the ekphrasis to a character, the ekphrasis focuses the attention of the narratee on the creative activity of the author, but most ekphraseis work this way. According to Miles, the goatherd’s view of the cup is as one might expect from an inhabitant of the bucolic world. He also suggests that the primary

---

Squire 2010: 601, note 53 (where see for bibliography): “[f]or Theocritus and Herodas, as numerous scholars have now shown, the ‘accuracy’ of the art so self-referentially described (...) reflects the acumen of the poet describing it”. In connection with Herodas’ fourth Mimiamb, Zanker 2006: 358 argues for the position that “the women’s responses may be presented ironically for comic effect, but that their opinions, which are expressed at times in the technical terminology of Hellenistic art-criticism, are ultimately serious and typical of the period, and have bearing on Herodas’ view of his own poems”; similarly Zanker 2009: 128-9.

Klooster 2012: 111, the ekphrasis ‘fulfils the same function as the ekphrases [of Achilles’ shield or Jason’s cloak]: it maintains many implicit thematic relationships with elements both of the poem per se and the bucolic Idylls as a collection. In the last instance this ekphrasis focuses the narratees’ attention on the creative activity of the author: he creates a character who describes an artefact which symbolizes the poetic creation he is himself a part of (the bucolic corpus).”

Miles 1977: 147: “[w]e are not actually shown the bowl. We are presented a version of it as seen through the eyes of an inhabitant of the bucolic world. This is important, because in retrospect we can see that the goatherd has imposed his own interpretation on the bowl (...)”.

---

Gutzwiller 1991: 93, who continues: “[t]here are among Theocritus’ pastoral Idylls (...) more purely mimetic poems that do give a sense of ironic distance between poet and character. But here, in this poem that seems the most typical of all pastorals, the fountainhead of the genre, the viewpoint of the herdsman, if not identical to Theocritus’, is still to be appreciated as in some sense analogous to it”; see further ibid.: 90-4.

Squire 2010: 601, note 53 (where see for bibliography): “[f]or Theocritus and Herodas, as numerous scholars have now shown, the ‘accuracy’ of the art so self-referentially described (...) reflects the acumen of the poet describing it”. In connection with Herodas’ fourth Mimiamb, Zanker 2006: 358 argues for the position that “the women’s responses may be presented ironically for comic effect, but that their opinions, which are expressed at times in the technical terminology of Hellenistic art-criticism, are ultimately serious and typical of the period, and have bearing on Herodas’ view of his own poems”; similarly Zanker 2009: 128-9.
narrator does not agree with the goatherd’s interpretation of the scenes. Indeed, the primary narratee may start to wonder whether the goatherd’s interpretation of – or imaginative response to – the images of the cup is “right”, and whether a different response could be possible. Thus, by putting the ekphrasis in the mouth of a secondary narrator, the primary narrator foregrounds the interpretative nature of ekphrasis.

Following this line of thought, it would seem possible to separate text and image. The goatherd’s words – the text – represent a cup with images depicted on it. Through the goatherd’s words, the narratee can “see” the cup as it is, i.e. as the primary narrator wants it to be. At the same time, however, the text allows the narratee to disagree with the goatherd’s vision: because the narratee has access to the cup as it is, he can distinguish between the “actual” cup and the goatherd’s “interpretation” of the cup. Payne, on the other hand, argues regarding the first scene (32-8) that the narratee does not have access to the cup itself. In the case of the second and third scenes, the

---

33 See for a brief summary of Miles’ argument Gutzwiller 1991: 93, and Payne 2007: 39, note 43 (“the bowl depicts grim scenes of Hesiodic realism that are systematically misread by the goatherd”).

34 As Burton 1995: 95 notes regarding Herodas’ fourth Mimiamb and Theocritus’ fifteenth Idyll, “(...) the exploration of subjectivity through ekphrasis, by representing fictive characters describing works of art, is an important contribution of Hellenistic literature to later Greek and Latin writers”; cf. also Goldhill 1994: 216.

35 According to Payne 2007: 29, “(...) the ekphrasis is more a response to a work of art than a description of one”. Payne seems to suggest that other ekphraseis are descriptions of works of art. Yet as I have argued in section 1.3.1, any ekphrasis is necessarily interpretation.

36 This is especially clear from Miles 1977: 148, who writes regarding the second scene: “[e]ven within the few lines which describe the old fisherman, we can see the goatherd’s own perspective asserting itself and modifying the stark realism of the scene on the bowl” (emphasis mine).

37 Payne 2007: 33: “[t]he goatherd’s description of the scene supplies “more than is actually there” (the thoughts and emotions of the figures for example).” [Hunter 1999: 63] Yet this excess is puzzling; it is an interpretative response that we cannot compare with the object itself” (emphasis mine; see also section 5.2 above). Payne further complicates the picture when he states that “[a]fter the first scene there are two bowls in the audience’s mind: the one the goatherd describes, and the one we picture on the basis of his description. The two are bound to be different, since the second cannot incorporate all the information included in the first” (ibid.: 35).
narratee does seem to have "direct" access to the images. In the case of the second and third scene, Payne seems to allow for a distinction between text and image, in that he can "check", so to speak, the goatherd's words against the image itself.

5.3.4 The Goatherd's Cup: Its Descriptivity and Narrativity. The Lines surrounding the Images (25-31 and 55-60)
As we have seen in section 5.3.2, the passage as a whole (21-61) shows clear signs of narrator-narratee interaction. This interaction is located at the beginning (21-8), in the middle (42), and at the end (56b; 60b-61). This comes as no surprise: the primary goal of the goatherd is to persuade Thyrsis to sing his famous song. The passage is characterised by two references to singing, which form a ring (αἰ δέ κ' ἀείσῃς, 23; αἰ κά...ἀείσῃς, 61). Both are conditional clauses, which accompany a promise of the goatherd (δωσῶ, 25; ἀρεσαίμαν, 57). The goatherd promises (τοι δωσῶ, 25) two gifts to Thyrsis: a goat to milk, and a cup (αἶγα τε .../ καὶ βαθὺ κισσύβιον, 25-7). These objects go closely together (τε...καί): the κισσύβιον, which is characterised as deep (βαθύ) and thus capacious, is clearly meant to be used to collect the milk from the goat. At the end of the ekphrasis, the goatherd refers to the cup alone when he says that he would gladly please Thyrsis with it (τῷ κά τυ μάλα πρόφρων ἀρεσαίμαν), if he sings his delightful song (60-1). The ekphrasis, then, has a persuasive function within the conversation between the two characters. This means that the ekphrasis functions on the level of the fabula, too.

---

38 See note 12 above.
39 The very first thing Thyrsis says after he has finished his song is καὶ τύ δίδου τάν αἶγα τό τε σκύφος, ὥς κεν ἀμέλξας / σπείσω ταῖς Μοίσαις, "and do you give me the goat and the bowl, so that I may milk her and make libation to the muses" (143-4); after the goatherd has handed Thyrsis the cup (ἡνίδε τοι τὸ δέπας..., "see, here is the cup", 149) he exhorts Thyrsis to milk the goat (...τοῦ δ’ ἐμπλύτ νυ..., "and do you milk her", 151). Manakidou 1993: 52-4 emphasises the bucolic nature of the cup; Lawall 1967: 27, on the other hand, regards the cup as an alien intrusion into the simple world of the rustics.
40 We may contrast the shield of Achilles, the decorations of which do not play any role in the narrative: the narrator describes the images for the primary narratee alone. Heracles' shield is a different case, as the apotropaic sections do have a function, namely to scare Heracles' enemies.
The lines referring to the cup itself (27-60) can be divided into three parts. The middle part can itself further be divided into three, which gives the ekphrasis the following structure:41

1. Introduction (27-31): its smell, shape, and newness (27-8); plant motifs (29-31)
2. Three images (31-54):
   1. Woman and two men (32-8)
   2. Old fisherman (39-44)
   3. Boy and two foxes (45-54)
3. Closing (55-60): acanthus motif (56); its wondrous nature (57), value and history (58-60)

Line 27 introduces the main theme of this ekphrasis: the κισσύβιον. The precise nature of the κισσύβιον is debated. The word is also found in the *Odyssey*, where it refers to a large rustic vessel for holding liquid.42 The text of the first *Idyll* offers the following clues: (shape) it is deep (βαθύ, 27),43 and it has two handles (ἀμφῶες, 27); (material) it is made of wood (as is clear from κεκλυσμένον ἁδέι κηρῷ, 27; and ἔτι γλυφάνοι ποτόσδον, 28); (decoration) it is decorated with ivy (29-31), acanthus (55), and three images (32-54); (use) it must be large enough to contain two pails of goat milk (δύο πέλλας, 26), and it can be used to make a libation to the muses (σπείσω ταῖς Μοίσαις, 144). The κισσύβιον is called σκύφος (143) by Thyrsis, and δέπας by the goatherd (55 and 149). This

41 Lawall 1967: 28 draws attention to the symmetrical arrangement of the images: “[t]he lone fisherman forms a central panel beside which the other two scenes are set. The two outer scenes correspond, so that the pattern is A B A. Correspondence of the outer scenes is achieved by their parallel internal arrangement. In the first scene two men stand opposite sides of a woman and woo her; the pattern is again A B A. In the third scene the boy is seated in the center, and two foxes flank him: A B A pattern again”. It should be noted, however, that this structure concerns the text: a cup, being round, does not have a central section.
42 *LfgrE* s.v. κισσύβιον B. Hoekstra 1990: 198 (ad Od. 14.78) notes that “[o]n its size and shape already the Alexandrian poets and scholars disagreed (…)”; he quotes a scholion who defines it as “a rustic drinking vessel” (ἄγροικο ἐκπώματι).
43 According to Gow [1950] 1952b: 6, a κισσύβιον is a shallow bowl, which he infers from the fact that the scenes are said to be on the inside (ἐντοσθεν, 32). He thus concludes that βαθύ ‘must be understood in a comparative sense – it is deep as a saucer may be said to be deep, not as a tumbler’. Both interpretations are unlikely, for which see Dale 1952: 132.
information tallies with that of the *Odyssey*. Thus, one can assume that the word κισσύβιον refers to a more or less similar object in the *Odyssey* and the first *Idyll*.

According to Hunter, a κισσύβιον is a rustic wooden bowl or pail, which can also be used as a drinking vessel (the κισσύβιον is called a δέπας in 55 and 149). Drinking is thus not its primary use: if it is large enough to contain two pails of goat milk (δύο πέλλας, 26), it could be that drinking from it is somewhat difficult. Its primary use is as a container of milk, from which a libation to the muses can be made. In addition, it could well be the case that the goatherd tries to increase the desirability of the κισσύβιον by calling it a δέπας, thereby slightly modifying “reality”. It should be noted that the cup is not produced until line 149, which means that Thyrsis cannot check the goatherd’s words against the object itself. If anything, the κισσύβιον is more like a pail than a cup.

After having introduced the κισσύβιον, the goatherd focuses on the *opus ipsum* in lines 28-8, thereby giving Thyrsis an overview of the cup’s basic qualities. Two things stand out in comparison with other ekphraseis. First, the attention that goes out to smell is striking: the cup is sealed with sweet wax (κεκλυσμένον ἁδέι κηρῷ, 27), and still

---

44 Hunter 1999: 78. Cf. however ibid.: 84 (ad δέπας in 55), where it is noted regarding the three names for the κισσύβιον that “such use of synonyms is a common feature of Hellenistic poetry, which always sought variety rather than sameness”. According to Frangeskou 1996: 28, “Theocritus gives three different, and, to a certain extent, contradictory names to the cup (…), simply because, I think, he seems not to be particularly interested in any one type, but in the cup in general”.

45 Dale 1952: 130 emphasizes its size, too: “[t]he κισσύβιον in Homer, in fact, appears to be a sizeable vessel, no mere cup in the ordinary sense, even though it could be used for deep drinking. Size and rusticity are its certain characteristics, and it is at least not impossible that to Homer it meant something that could be used as a small milking-pail. (N.B. Thyrsis milks the goat into his κισσύβιον 143)”. Bruns 1970: 44 notes that the Homeric κισσύβιον is large, and its shape is unknown.

46 Cf. Hoekstra 1990: 198: “[t]hat the same vessel is called a δέπας in l. 149 of Theocritus’ poem is not surprising, because there its proud owner is speaking”.

47 In fact, not at any point during the ekphrasis does the goatherd invite Thyrsis to look at the κισσύβιον, as Payne 2007: 29 has noted. He further states that this is always the case in other mimetic-dramatic (in Gutzwiller’s terminology, for which see note 16) ekphraseis. Payne refers to E. Ion 190 (δοῦ…ἀθρησον, “look...see”; cf. 201, 206, 209); Theoc. *Id.* 15.78 (τὰ ποικίλα πράτον ἀθρησον, “look first at the tapestries”), and Herodas 4.23 (ζῶ ψέκή..., “do you not see...”; similarly 4.27 and 35; see also Zanker 2009: 125-6).
smelling of the knife (ἐπὶ γλυφάνοιο ποτόσδον, 28). Focus on smell is appropriate for a newly-made wooden object, and perhaps the cup – somewhere hidden in the goatherd’s mantle? – can be smelled by Thyrsis. Second, the smell of the cup (ἐπὶ γλυφάνοιο ποτόσδον) is connected to its newness: the cup is νεοτευχές (28), “newly fashioned”. This adjective might allude to the fact that this is the first ekphrasis of a decorated κισσύβιον in the literary tradition. At the same time, the qualification is reminiscent of the shield of Achilles, which is the most famous “newly fashioned” object in the history of ekphrasis.

Even though the goatherd emphasises the newness of the cup, it does have a history. In this sense, it is similar to the other objects in the ekphrases of this study. The history of these objects, all made by gods, is usually related at the beginning of the ekphrasis. The goatherd, however, only relates its history after he has described the images on the cup: “for it I gave to a ferryman from Kalydna a goat as a price and a great cheese of white milk; and never at all has it touched my lips, but it is still unstained” (57-60).

The previous owner of the cup was not a mythical hero or heroine, but a ferryman from Calydna, an island or small set of islands off the northwest coast of Cos. This piece of information clarifies and at the same time mystifies the origin of the cup, since it triggers a number of questions. Who was this ferryman? Did he make the κισσύβιον himself? If not, where did he get the cup from? Might it be a passenger who gave him the cup, and could this passenger be a god? And why did the ferryman sell the object

---

48 Another ekphrasis in which smell plays a role is that of Hypsipyle’s robe, which is offered as a gift to Apsyrtus in A.R. 4.430-1: τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀμβροσίη ὀδμὴ πέλεν ἐξέτι κείνου, / ἐξ οὗ ἄναξ αὐτὸς Νυσήιος ἐγκατελεκτο, “and it had an ambrosial fragrance, lasting from the time when the Nysean king [Dionysus] himself lay down on it”.

49 For a metapoetical interpretation of these lines, see Cairns 1984: 95-9 and Hunter 1999: 78. Because this line of interpretation is not relevant for my argument, I will not further refer to it.

50 See e.g. Halperin 1983: 173: “nowhere in the foregoing literary tradition is an ivy-vessel described as decorated in any way”.

51 Sc. 139-40 (history of Heracles’ shield in battle); A.R. 1.722-4 (Athena handing over the cloak to Jason); Mosch. Eur. 39-42 (pedigree of previous owners of Europa’s basket).

52 Hunter 1999: 85. The manuscripts read Καλυδωνίῳ (of Calydon), a reading which is also possible (see Dover 1971: 82).

53 So Hunter 1999: 85, who compares Aphrodite and the ferryman Phaon.
to the goatherd? Thus, it could well be that the cup has a distinguished ancestry, too. At any rate, the genealogy of this cup is in statu nascendi: If Thyrsis – a celebrated singer – acquires it, he might hand it to whomever he likes, etc.

The reason why the goatherd has saved the history of the cup for last can be explained from his rhetorical goal. It is to his advantage to create an image of the cup which is as positive as possible, so as to turn it into an object worth having. First, the goatherd promises Thyrsis a cup that is brand new (27-8). Next, he describes the beautiful carvings (29-56), thereby making the κισσύβιον even more worthy of possession. Only in lines 57-8 does the goatherd touch upon its history. The goatherd then hastens to add, emphatically (οὐδέ τί πω, 59), that it has never touched his lips (59-60). I assume that the price that the goatherd has paid, a goat and a great cheese (58-9), is not a small sum in the bucolic world.

In lines 29-31 (the ivy decoration) and 55-6 (the acanthus and the cup’s wondrous nature) the goatherd further focuses on the opus ipsum. In both shield ekphraseis, the Randstücke are described after the images, but the goatherd starts with the rim. Lines 29-31 are difficult to interpret. In the text and translation in section 5.3.1 above, I have followed Gutzwiller: “high towards its lip curls ivy, ivy intertwined with helichryse; along it [the helichryse] winds the ivy-tendril, rejoicing in its golden fruit”. Line 55 refers to the cup as a whole: “everywhere around the cup is spread the pliant acanthus”. As in other ekphraseis, the goatherd remains vague on the precise shape of the cup.

54 The κισσύβιον is also different from other objects in ekphraseis in that it was not donated to the new owner, but bought.
55 If the ekphrasis of the cup is a metaphor for bucolic poetry, the fact that the genealogy of the cup is in statu nascendi can be understood as a reference to the bucolic genre, the tradition of which is in in statu nascendi, too.
56 So Palm 1965-6: 144: “[d]ies [die Geschichte des Gegenstandes] ist ein traditioneller Zug (…), aber so geschmeidig eingefügt, dass man ihn kaum bemerkt”.
57 Bühler 1960: 104, note 1. He further remarks that the description of the decoration (i.e. the non-narrative images) is divided between the beginning (29-31) and the end (55) of the ekphrasis.
58 See for an extensive overview of the problems involved Manakidou 1993: 54-8.
60 Scholars tend to locate the acanthus at the base of the cup, but this is mere conjecture. See e.g. Dover 1971: 79: “(…) the description [is] methodical: rim, main surface, base”; and Hunter 1999: 79: “[b]oth sides of the bowl (as defined by the two handles) carry a pattern of interwoven ivy and helichryse rising from the base and running around the top to form a frame closed at the
The cup, then, is decorated all over (παντὰ δ’ ἀμφὶ δέπας περιπέταται, 55) with acanthus; furthermore, it contains a pattern of interwoven ivy and helichryse, which is rising up towards the lip.

Though the goatherd remains vague on the precise location of the decorative patterns on the cup, he is specific about the kind of plants that make up this decoration. This is, of course, fitting for an inhabitant of the bucolic world. It might seem strange that the goatherd refers to the saffron colour of the fruit of the ivy (χαρπτῶ...κροκόεντι, 31), considering the fact that the cup is made of wood. It could be that these flowers are painted on the cup. Alternatively, the goatherd might refer to the res ipsea, i.e. to what these wooden flowers represent. Further, Gutzwiller has noted that the goatherd describes the ivy (κισσός) as if it is alive and has animate feeling: “[t]he verb μαρύεται is a middle, indicating that the ivy ‘twines itself,’ and εἱλεῖται also connotes self-propelled motion. ἀγαλλομένα is generally used of persons or animals and suggests that the ivy feels joy in its saffron-coloured fruit”. By personifying the ivy, the goatherd endows the decoration with a certain amount of narrativity: the ivy acquires agency and feeling.

base by an acanthus pattern (55). On the cup, as in the text, the two flower patterns frame the asymmetrical carves scenes (29-31, 55).

For the emphasis on κισσός, cf. Hunter 1999: 78: “[t]he most common etymology [of the κισσύβιον] was ‘a bowl made of ivy-wood (κισσός)’ (…), but such bowl are technically improbable (…). T[h]eocritus] might wish to etymologise as ‘decorated with an ivy pattern’”. Gutzwiller 1991: 89 draws attention to the alliteration of the κ’s, which might reinforce either interpretation.

Dubel 2010: 18 argues that “il est en réalité clair que Théocrite décrit ici en philologue plutôt qu’en botaniste: l’hélix est à son tour prétexte à une dérivation étymologique avec l’expression ἓλιξ εἱλεῖται (…); or l’insistance sur la racine attire l’attention sur le terme ἑλιχρύσῳ du vers précédent, qui semble ainsi se dédoubler en ἐλιξ et κροκόεντι (…)” (emphasis mine).

Cf. Gutzwiller 1991: 91, who states regarding πολιῷ, “grey-haired”, in line 44 that “[w]e may dismiss the problem by assuming that the cup is painted. But if we are unwilling to make this unsupported assumption, there remain two ways of accounting for the suggestion of color. It may be attributed to the poet’s imitation of the Homeric manner, or to the imagination of an overly naive character who sees carved figures as living beings”. See further my remarks below.

Gutzwiller 1986: 254. According to Dubel 2010: 18, ἀγαλλομένα is reminiscent of ἄγαλμα; the participle thus emphasises that the decorations are works of art.

ἄγαλλομένα is echoed in Mosch. Eur. 59: δρινς ἄγαλλόμενος πτερύγων πολυανθέι χροή. There, the decorative motif is part of the story of Io (see section 7.2.5.3).
In line 56, the goatherd addresses Thyrsis: the cup is “a marvel of the goatherd’s world; it would amaze your heart as a wonder”. The words are reminiscent of Sc. 318 (δεόμενος Ζηνί βαρυκτύπῳ, “a wonder to see even for deep-thundering Zeus”), which likewise provides closure. The mention of δεόμενος is standard in ekphrasis, but here the phrase also has a rhetorical function, in that it emphasizes the cup’s singular nature, and thus turns it into an object worthy of Thyrsis’ possession. At the same time, the line also contains a humorous note: the cup is a marvel, but one of the bucolic world (αἰπολικὸν θάημα).

Before moving on to the images on the cup (32-54), the text of lines 25-31 and 55-61 merits discussion. I start with lines 25-31. Lines 27-31 are full of descriptive details, some of which are of a visual nature (βαθύ, 27; ἀμθῶες, 28; lines 29-31 as a whole); other details appeal to smell (ἁδέι, 27; ποτόσδον, 28). In lines 25-28, the text proceeds by enumeration: the two gifts are connected with τε… / καί (25, 27); lines 27-8, which enumerate the cup’s various qualities, are characterised by asyndeton. In lines 29-31, textual progression is spatial (ποτί… ὑψόθι, 29; κατά, 30). As for lines 55-61, only line 55 relates to the appearance of the cup: we find three spatial markers (παντᾷ δ’ ἀμφὶ δέπας περι, 55) and one visual detail, ὑγρός. As for the occurrence of details in lines 56-61, line 57 contains a geographical indication (Καλυδνίῳ); the cheese (τυρόεντα) is large and white (μέγαν λευκῶν γάλακτος, 58); the cup is still unstained (ἄχραντον, 60); and the song is delightful (ἐφίμερον, 61) – just as the foregoing ekphrasis.

5.3.5 The Goatherd’s Cup: Its Descriptivity and Narrativity. The Images (32-54)

Three images have been carved on the cup. They are all introduced with a spatial indicator: ἕντοσθεν δέ (“and within”, 32), τοῖς δὲ μετά (“by these…”, 39), and τυτθὸν δ’.

--

66 On αἰπολικὸν θάημα, see Hunter 1999: 84; on the line as a whole, see also Halperin 1983: 82-3.
67 According to Hunter 1999: 84, “[t]he expression of admiration refers to the acanthus, but colours the description of the whole cup, to which it forms the conclusion; after the section-by-section account, we learn that the whole cup is a τέρας, as acanthus surrounds the whole cup" (emphasis in the original). I would argue that it is not so much the acanthus, as the images (or the cup as a whole) that are wondrous. Therefore, it would be better to punctuate with a semicolon or even a full stop after line 55, which turns line 56 into an apposition to the whole foregoing description; with αἰπολικὸν θάημα, ἐστίν should be supplied.
68 For the occurring discourse modes in these lines, see 5.3.2 above.
69 Meaning and text of τυρέστεα are uncertain (see Hunter 1999: 85).
ὅσσον ἄπωθεν (“and a little way from”, 45). “Ἐντοσθεν has sparked a debate.” 70 Two major interpretations are found. 1. Some scholars locate the images inside (ἐντοσθεν) of the cup. 71 However, the cup is deep, which would seem to exclude any decoration on the inside. 72 2. The carvings are on the outside of the cup, which means that ἔντοσθεν means either a) within the area bounded by the rim, i.e. below the rim; or b) between the rim-pattern and base-pattern, i.e. within the frame of the plants.73 In my view, interpretation 2a is the most obvious, in that the goatherd has not yet introduced the acanthus. In addition, the acanthus is not explicitly located at the base of the cup by the goatherd.74

Unlike the Homeric narrator, the goatherd does not introduce the images together before he describes them individually.75 At the beginning of the Homeric shield ekphrasis, the narrator places the various images on the object as a single subtheme: αὐτὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ / ποίει δαίδαλα πολλὰ ἰδυίησι πραπίδεσσιν, “on it he made many richly ornamented things through his skilful craftsmanship” (Il. 18.481-2). The figurative images, the δαίδαλα πολλὰ, are first announced in toto, as a separate subtheme, after which the narrator proceeds image by image.76 The shield of Heracles lacks such an introductory phrase. In addition, the images in the Homeric shield ekphrasis are placed, individually, on the shield: ἐν μέν (18.483), ἐν δέ (490), etc.77 The shield of Heracles proceeds partly by this procedure (lines 144-237a), but switches halfway (237b) to another procedure in which the images are spatially located vis-à-vis each other.

70 For an overview of the debate see Manakidou 1993: 64-6.
72 See e.g. Petrain 2006: 258.
73 Both interpretations in Dover 1971: 79. Hunter 1999: 79 opts for the latter interpretation (2b), which is now the consensus (see Petrain 2006: 258).
75 Although a phrase like δαίδαλα πολλὰ is lacking, the narrator has nevertheless kept the δαίδαλα by relegating it to the appositional phrase τι θεῶν δαίδαλμα (32).
76 A similar procedure is found in the two other Hellenistic ekphraseis of this study: A.R. 1.728-9 (ἐν δ’ ἄρ’ ἑκάστῳ / τέρματι δαίδαλα πολλὰ διακριδὸν εὖ ἐπέπαστο); Mosch. Eur. 43 (ἐν τῷ δαίδαλα πολλὰ τετεύχατο μαρμαίροντα).
The goatherd focuses directly on the first image. He also locates the images spatially vis-à-vis each other. The goatherd thus describes the images on the cup from close by; the minutiae of the res ipsae are more important than the opus ipsum. This way of proceeding can be contrasted with that of the Homeric narrator, who after having described an image steps back, as it were, and looks again at the shield as a whole. The goatherd’s way of proceeding is partly reminiscent of the pseudo-Hesiodic shield ekphrasis. Such reminiscences might indicate that the ekphrasis has at least as much to do with the pseudo-Hesiodic shield ekphrasis as the Homeric shield ekphrasis.78

All three images are introduced by a spatial indicator, followed by a perfect tense. The first figures of images one and two are introduced by τέτυκται (32 and 39). Such perfects of verbs of making draw attention to the opus ipsum, as they indicate that the figures are part of a made object. The perfect βέβριθεν (46) in the third image does not refer to the opus ipsum. It does refer to a state. Thus, by employing the perfect tense in the introductory lines of each image, the goatherd makes clear that he is describing static images.

1. One Woman and Two Men (32-8)
The first image depicts three figures, one woman surrounded by two men. I first discuss the text. As we have seen in section 5.3.2, both the descriptive discourse mode (32-5) and the diegetic discourse mode (36-8) are found. The text in lines 32-5 has a prototypically descriptive textual organization; three spatial markers occur (ἔντοσθεν δέ, 32; πὰρ δέ, 33; ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος, 34), as well as one adverb of manner (ἀμοιβαδίς, 34). These lines contain the following visual details: the woman is ἀσκητὰ πέπλῳ τε καὶ ἄμπυκι (33), and the men are καλὸν ἐθειράζοντες (34).79 As for lines 36-8, these have a temporal textual organization, which means that the text features a sequence of events. This is

78 According to Ott 1969: 101, however, “(...) der Gesamtaufbau unserer Ekphrasis [erinnert] an die homerische Schildbeschreibung, weniger stark auch an die von Homer abhängige pseudohesiodeische Aspis” (emphasis mine).

79 According to Payne 2007: 29-30, there are several levels at which the epithet ἀσκητά (33) may function. Put differently, the adjective could refer to the opus ipsum (“curiously wrought”) or the res ipsae (“adorned with”). In the other two Hellenistic ekphrases of this study, the pluperfect ἑσκητά is found in reference to the opus ipsum (A.R. 1.742 and Mosch. Eur. 56). In addition, τέτυκται at the end of line 32 refers to the opus ipsum. Thus, it is likely that ἀσκητά also refers to the opus ipsum.
made clear by the temporal adverbs in 36-7: ἀλλ' ὅκα μὲν ... / ἄλλοκα δ' αὖ .... The temporal adverb δηθά in 38 modifies a participle (κυλοιδιόωντες). As for visual details, I note γέλασα (36) and κυλοιδιόωντες (38).

I now turn to the image. The goatherd starts with the woman – τι θεῶν δαίδαλμα, "some ornamental work of the gods" – and her dress (32-3). He next spatially locates the men, with beautiful long hair, vis-à-vis this woman: they are beside her (πὰρ δὲ οἷ, 33), one on each side (ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος, 34). The narratee thus has enough information at his disposal to form a basic idea of what the image on the cup looks like. This information is further supplemented by the goatherd in 36 (the woman is smiling, γέλασα) and 38 (the men are hollow-eyed, κυλοιδιόωντες). These details are part of the res ipsae.

As in all other ekphraseis, the goatherd focuses on the actions in which the figures are engaged. He states that the two men are, alternately, contending with words. These words do not touch the woman’s mind – she is unaffected by what the men say. This is clear from her actions in 36-7: now she looks at one of them, smiling, and then she shifts her thoughts to other. The goatherd then revisits the two men: the words they speak – being hollow-eyed on account of love – are spoken in vain. The goatherd regards the image as one of erotic rivalry: two men are competing for the love of one woman – unsuccessfully, because she interested in neither of them.

The first element of narrative, event sequencing, is present in the text. The men are contending with words, alternately (ἀμοιβαδίς, 34). This means that the men speak in turn, one after another. The woman is likewise involved in actions which necessarily follow after each other, signalled by the adverbs ἀλλ' ὅκα μὲν ... / ἄλλοκα δ' αὖ ... (36-7). Both cases concern a sequence of two consecutive events, a sequence that is, furthermore, iterative. In I.18.599-602, a similar iterative sequence of two consecutive events is found; similar adverbs occur, too (ὁ δ' ὁτὲ μὲν ... / ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ... 599, 602). On the shield of Achilles, two phases of a dance are described. The dancing figures are

80 With τι θεῶν δαίδαλμα, the goatherd indicates the supreme craftsmanship and quality of the carved woman. See for extensive discussion of this phrase Payne 2007: 29-31. Manakidou 1993: 71 regards it as an exaggeration typical of the naive herdsman.

81 LSJ translate ἀμοιβαδίς ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος as “one after another” (s.v. ἀμοιβαδίς).

82 Differently Ravenna 1974: 45: “[i] momenti non sono necessariamente successive, è detto solo ‘ora...ora’.”
probably depicted in two groups in two different positions, which signal two different phases of the dance.\textsuperscript{83}

On the goatherd’s cup, the woman can only be depicted in one position. It is the presence of the two men, then, which suggests this iterative sequence of two events.\textsuperscript{84} Thus, ἀμοιβαδίς seems to be an inference of the goatherd from the spatial location of the two men, who are positioned ἀλλοθεν ἀλλος. The position of the woman can also be inferred. We might expect the goatherd to say that she first looks at man A, and then looks at man B, but this is not what is in the text: she looks at man A, but then turns her mind to man B. As such, the narratee can infer her position: her head is turned towards man A (τῆνον ποτιδέρκεται ἄνδρα). By making use of the spatial clues, the narratee can connect these events to a single, static image.\textsuperscript{85} I conclude that the image suggests a sequence of events, rather than that it depicts one.

The goatherd also places the depicted action of the image in a wider temporal frame: the men are “for a long time hollow-eyed on account of love” (οἳ δ’ ὑπ’ ἔρωτος δηθὰ κυλοιδιόωντες, 37-8). According to the goatherd, the men have bags under their eyes on account of love (ὑπ’ ἔρωτος). He thus provides a reason or cause for the way the men are carved on the cup. In addition, the goatherd adds the temporal adverb δηθά to the participle: the men have been in this state for a long time. This can be understood in two ways. It could be that the bags under their eyes are caused specifically by what is happening in the image, which would mean that the depicted action is already going on for a long time. Alternatively, the men have been in love for a long time, and this is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{83} See further my discussion of these lines in 3.3.3.3, 8.
\item \textsuperscript{84} Cf. Gow [1950] 1952b: 9 ad ἀμοιβαδίς: “(…) a work of art can only suggest, not depict, successive actions on the part of the figures”.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Cf. Laird 1993: 22, who speaks of an obedient ekphrasis (for which see note 52 in section 1.3.2): “[t]he idea of two men speaking in competition for a woman’s attention could find an equivalent in illustration: the males could be depicted with open mouths as they make emphatic gestures. The woman could be depicted as she is described – glancing at one man but evidently giving her attention to the other. Overall, Theocritus’ ekphrasis seems to me to be obedient: we can go on reading it and continue to have the impression that everything put before us could be translated into a visual medium”. As Wolf 2005: 432 notes, in pictures with more than one character, causality and chronology can be especially suggested by “(…) body language, such as emotionally charged facial expressions or gestures, in particular when this has a visible effect on other characters”.
\end{itemize}
what has caused the bags under their eyes.\textsuperscript{86} In both cases, the goatherd refers to an earlier moment in time, which is the cause of the state in which the men are depicted. Some scholars have argued that the goatherd also refers to a moment in the future, by hinting at the likely outcome of the scene: the men “are labouring in vain”\textsuperscript{87}. I am more inclined to regard ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι as referring to what is depicted on the cup: the men are labouring in vain, because their words do not have any effect on the woman (τὰ δ’ οὐ φρενὸς ἁπτεται αὐτᾶς, 35). Indeed, their words cannot have any effect, because, as the scholion notes, “who could persuade a statue?”.\textsuperscript{88} As such, ἐτώσια can also be regarded as a self-conscious remark of the primary narrator about the nature of ekphrasis.\textsuperscript{89}

Herman’s second element of narrative, world disruption, is present. We should ask ourselves, first, what kind of world this image depicts. The location or setting of the first image is not specified: the action could take place anywhere.\textsuperscript{90} The figures are anonymous. According to the scholia, some identify the woman as Pandora;\textsuperscript{91} Miles has followed suit.\textsuperscript{92} It is better to say that the woman is \textit{like} Pandora, in that she brings

\textsuperscript{86} So Hunter 1999: 80, who translates with “with bags under their eyes” and notes that this is “presumably caused by the sleeplessness typical of those in love”.

\textsuperscript{87} Zanker 2004: 12; Payne 2007: 32.

\textsuperscript{88} See Hunter 1999: 81. The scholion reads μάτην κάμνουσι. τίς γὰρ έν ἄγαλμα πεῖσαι δυνήσεται; (Wendel 1914: 42), “they labour in vain: for who could persuade a statue?”.

\textsuperscript{89} Cf. \textit{Il}. 18.583-4, οἱ δὲ νομῆεν αὐτῶς ἐνδίεσεν ταχέα κύνας ὀτρύνοντες, “and they, the herdsmen, were \textit{vainly} setting the swift dogs on, while exhorting [them]” (discussed in section 3.3.3.3, 6). Männlein-Robert 2007: 304 interprets this phrase metapoetically: “[n]icht zuletzt die im Streit der werbenden Männer verwendete Phrase (… ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι) darf als metapoetischer Hinweis auf die vergebliche Bemühung der bildenden Kunst gegenüber der Dichtung verstanden werden”.

\textsuperscript{90} Hunter 1999: 66 speaks of the “contemporary or at least timeless setting” of the scenes.

\textsuperscript{91} τινὲς τὴν Πανδώραν φασί (Wendel 1914: 40), “some say she is Pandora”; on the reasons for this identification, see Payne 2007: 30-1.

\textsuperscript{92} Miles 1977: 147: “[t]he woman is Hesiod’s Pandora and her presence evokes a harshly pessimistic view of the human condition: Like Zeus’ creation of vengeance, she is beautiful and a work of the gods (…). She brings conflict (…), emaciation (…), toil (…), and the certainty of disappointment (…)” (emphasis mine).
hardships for men.  

This similarity is not, however, made explicit by the goatherd. On account of the appearance of the figures, it has been suggested that they are city-dwellers. They have also been regarded as country people, which would fit in with the other two images. All these identifications are possible, since the woman and men are not particularized, but generic figures: they can stand for any man or woman.

The presence of one woman and two men has enough potential for world disruption: two men are contending for the love of one woman. Yet she is interested in neither of them: τὰ δ’ οὐ φρενὸς ἅπτεται αὐτᾶς (35). The goatherd clearly expects that a woman will at least listen to what (one of) them says, since he uses οὐ to emphasize that she does not listen. She seems to regard love as a game only, as she enjoys (γέλαισα, 36) to keep the men dangling. The men suffer, as is clear from the bags under their eyes (37-8). Love, when unfulfilled, is disruptive. The element of ‘what-it’s-like’ is

---

93 Hunter 1999: 80 notes that the phrase γυνα, τι θεῶν δαίδαλμα “(...) here evokes Pandora, the most famous ‘fashioned’ woman of Greek story, an emblem of women’s power to cause ‘grievous desire and body-devouring cares’ (Hes. WD 66) for men”.

94 According to Cairns 1984: 102, the images “offer visions of other, non-bucolic sections of the imaginary world of the present in which Theocritus’ poetry is found. The first scene comes from an urban milieu of the type found in Idylls 2 and 15: the well-dressed woman and the men with fine hairstyles are not rustics”.

95 Zanker 2004: 14: “[t]he young woman and her two suitors are not easily placed on any specific social level at all: the woman’s circlet need not denote luxury, and may be as much a part of the idealizing tendency of the description as the men’s graceful long hair. But they are probably to be seen as young country people, given the cup’s stated overall designation. They would then fit in with the fisherman and the country boy in the other scenes, for these would have been unhesitatingly placed low on the social scale in Hellenistic times”.

96 Negations are rare in ekphraseis: in the shield of Achilles, only two occur (533, 526); in the shield of Heracles, two negations accompany a verb (170, 310), four an adjective (144, 161, 230, 259).

97 Cf. Zanker 2004: 12: “[t]he woman, who as we are explicitly told (35) is not at all concerned with the rivals’ claims and counterclaims (34-35), is rather enjoying herself and her suitors’ discomfiture: the smile with which she graces the men at various times is ambiguous. Her game-plan is indeed to appear come-hitherish, but any encouragement that her smile might give the men is illusory, since, as we are told, their lovelorn efforts are ‘in vain’ (38)”.

98 Of course, the primary narratee may think lightly of what is happening. Yet in the image as described by the goatherd, love is a serious business.
also present. In this image, this element underscores the disruptiveness of what is going on: the smiling woman, the men who are labouring in vain (ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι, 38), while having bags under their eyes.

I conclude. The narrativity of the image is high. Though the figures are anonymous, the focus on three individuals makes narrativity possible. The image contains, to a certain extent, all three basic elements of narrative. It suggests an iterative sequence of two events, which is made explicit by the goatherd in the text. The nature of the events is disruptive. This disruptiveness is further strengthened by the element of 'what-it's-like'. The primary narratee need not, of course, regard the events as disruptive. Yet the way the figures are depicted in the image and perceived by the goatherd indicate that the events are disruptive for the figures involved in the action.

According to Payne, the narratee cannot check the goatherd's words against the object itself. He further notes that the goatherd's words leave open a number of questions regarding what is precisely happening on the cup. I disagree with both propositions. First, as I have argued above, the goatherd makes the spatial arrangement of the figures clear; he also provides information regarding the appearance of the figures. His view on what is happening is derived, then, from the spatial arrangement and appearance of the figures. As for the questions that would remain, I agree with Zanker that the goatherd “has effectively told the whole story.”

In my view, the primary narrator has provided enough information to the primary narratee to make a distinction between the cup itself and the goatherd’s interpretation of the cup. As such, the primary narratee can see ekphrasis at work: the primary

99 Zanker 2004: 12 notes that this image displays “a remarkable interest in the psychology of love and its symptoms. (...) The contrast of emotional states it typical of Hellenistic poetry and art alike”.

100 Payne 2007: 32-3 notes 1) that the goatherd does not spell out that the men are in love with the woman; 2) that we cannot be sure what the men are doing (“chiding, quarrelling, or competing?”); and 3) that due to the absence of pronouns we do not know whether their words are directed at each other or the woman.

101 Zanker 2004: 12, emphasis mine. As for Payne’s questions (see previous note), I would answer ad 1) that the presence of two men and one woman can only lead to this interpretation; ad 2) that the verb makes clear what is going on: the men are quarrelling (νεικείουσ’, 34); this interpretation is strengthened by the fact that the scene “rewrites the ‘legal’ νείκες of the Homeric shield (Il. 18.497-508)” (Hunter 1999: 81); ad 3) that ἀμοιβάδις indicates that they talk after and thus to each other; at the same time, their words are meant to be heard by the woman.
narrator has a character engaging with a static work of art; this character endows the image on the cup with meaning by teasing out the narrative. As I have argued, the image on the cup contains all three basic elements of narrative. Of course, it requires a viewer – in this case the goatherd – to understand the pictorial narrative, and to turn it into words. Nevertheless, the image possesses narrativity, and it would be wrong to deny the image its narrative potential.

Although the primary narratee has access to the cup and the goatherd’s interpretation of it, his view on the cup is limited, because the goatherd is selective in his description. Yet the primary narratee may still ask himself – even on the basis of this limited information – whether the goatherd’s view on the actions in the image is “right”, i.e. whether his response is justified on account of what is depicted. I, for my part, have not been able to find an indication that the goatherd has misread what is going on in the image. Of course, the primary narratee – a learned Hellenistic reader – may use his knowledge to put the image in a wider perspective. For example, by looking at the woman as Pandora – the archetypical woman – the image acquires a kind of universal meaning, one which probably eludes the goatherd.

2. An Old Fisherman (39-44)
The next image depicts one figure only, an old fisherman. The text has a descriptive textual organization in lines 39-41 and 43-4. Two perfects occur, designating states (τέτυκται, 39; ἀδήκαντι, 43); only one present tense refers to an ongoing action (ἐλκεῖ, 40). Though spatial markers occur (τοῖς δὲ μετά, 39; ἐφ’, 40; κατ’ αὐχένα πάντοθεν, 43), progression is enumerative. I note the following visual details: the rock is jagged (λεπράς); line 43 as a whole refers to his swollen sinews; the fisherman is grey-haired (πολιῷ, 44, but see below) and his net is big (μέγα, 40). As for other details, the narrator twice emphasizes that the fisherman is old (γέρων, 39; πρέσβυς, 41). Line 45, which connects this image with the next one, also refers to the age of the fisherman, and adds

---

102 Cf. Zanker 2004: 10 (and passim), who writes that “the cup description is a potentially valuable source of verbally articulated evidence for Hellenistic viewing (...)


104 As Payne seems to do (see section 5.2 above).

105 Cf. Miles (quoted in note 32 above).

106 This ties in with the idea that the ekphrasis reflects the views on art of the primary narrator (see note 30 above).
that he is sea-worn (ἁλιτρύτοιο γέροντος). Line 43 contains the discursive discourse mode, to which I return below.

The image contains one figure, which means that its potential for narrativity is low. There are no other human figures (or animals with human-like intentions, as in the next image) to interact or to come into conflict with. In comparison with the previous image, the setting is more important: the jagged rock (πέτρα … / λεπράς, 40-1) is introduced together with the fisherman (τε…τε, 39) as a separate subtheme.107

The image does not contain a sequence of events, but it does suggest a future event. Only one action of the fisherman is described, who “is eagerly hauling a big net for a catch” (σπεύδων μέγα δίκτυον ἐς βόλον ἑλκεί, 40).108 As I have translated the words, (1) the fisherman is hauling his net through the water, in order to catch fish (ἐς βόλον).109 Most scholars, however, translate ἐς βόλον with “for a cast”, i.e. in order to make a cast.110 In that case, the net could (2a) either be in the water and empty – otherwise he would not venture another cast, I presume – or it could (2b) be still on dry land.111 In both cases, the immense effort of the old man is harder to explain, as it seems that an empty net – on land or in the water – would not take that much effort to move.112 In addition, the

---

107 Cf. Zanker 2004: 13: “[t]he scenery is filled in sufficiently both to situate him in space – a rugged rock (39-40) is obviously the ideal place from which to make an effective cast – and to emphasize his solitariness, as contrasted with the three-figure groups which flank him on the cup”.

108 For this meaning of βόλος, see LSJ s.v. βόλος A 2.

109 I follow Meineke, cited in Fritzsche and Hiller 1881: 45: “[f]ingendus est senex in litore stans et rete per fluctus trahens ad capturam piscium”.

110 Gow [1950] 1952b: 9 allows for both interpretations of ἐς βόλον (“the cast of the net” or “a catch of fish”; he translates ἐς with “with a view to”), but prefers the former on account of the parallel with Sc. 215. Hunter 1999: 40 tentatively prefers the former interpretation, too (“perhaps ‘for [i.e to make] a cast’ rather than ‘for a catch’”), on account of the fact that “[s]uch an interpretation suits the uncertainty and chanciness of the fisherman’s life”.

111 LSJ translate the phrase with “draws it back for a cast” (s.v. βόλος A). Others translate ἑλκεί with “gather up” (Gow [1950] 1952a: 7; Verity and Hunter 2002: 3).

112 Legrand 1946: 21-2 translates with “le vieillard tire laborieusement un grand filet pour ramener ce qu’il a pu prendre”. He notes that one could also translate with “pour le jeter”, but adds that his original translation better explains the effort of the old man (“[l’]autre m’a paru expliquer mieux l’effort du vieux pêcheur, bien qu’un grand filet, même vide, puisse être lourd à trainer (...),” ibid.: 22, note 1; emphasis in the original).
goatherd states that the man is fishing (ἐλλοπεύειν), which would point towards interpretation (1).

On account of interpretation (1), ἐς βόλον refers to the goal of the current action of the fisherman. The goatherd refers to a future event (the catching of the fish), but one that is part of and naturally arises from the current action of the fisherman. Following interpretation (2), ἐς βόλον refers to a future action (the throwing of the net) that is not a part of the current action, but that is an altogether new one. Though in both cases the goatherd refers to something that is not depicted on the cup, interpretation (1) is easier to imagine as being carved on a cup than interpretation (2): a man who is fishing with his net in the water is naturally aiming for a catch, but how can the goatherd know that the dragging of a net will be followed by a cast?113

World disruption is absent from the image; the element of 'what-it's-like' is present. As the goatherd states, "you would say that he is fishing with all the strength of his limbs (γυίων…ὅσον σθένος), so have his sinews swollen all over his neck" (42-3). The goatherd regards the way the fisherman’s body is depicted on the cup (the opus ipsum) as an indication of the immense effort he is making. His labour is further emphasized by σπεύδων ("eagerly", 40), and the fact that his net is big (μέγα δίκτυον, 40). Two comparisons (41, 44) make clear that although the fisherman is old, he has strength normally associated with the young.

I conclude the discussion of the narrativity of the image. Event sequencing is absent, but the image does suggest a future event. The image depicts a single action only. Its execution requires great effort, which is made clear by the presence of 'what-it’s-like'. World disruption is absent. This means that even though the image depicts intense action, its narrativity is low.115

113 Scholars have also speculated whether the fisherman’s net will be full of fish, or whether it will remain empty. Lawall 1967: 28-9 sees a contrast between this image and the next ("[h]is sole preoccupation is action; (...) He stands in sharp contrast with the two men who woo the woman, for they labor in vain"). Ott 1969: 103, note 290 believes that the fisherman will not be successful, because in the other two images failure (Erfolglosigkeit) is foregrounded. According to Payne 2007: 35-6, note 36, the phrase τὸ δὲ σθένος ἄξιον ἅβας (44) may point to success.

114 Cf. Lawall 1967: 28-9: "[t]he old gray-haired fisherman (...) [is] caught in a moment of intense physical activity. His sole preoccupation is action; he makes great haste and labors with all his might. Every muscle and sinew of his body is intent on his action, and nothing distracts him".

I want to discuss two remaining issues. First, a similar image of a fisherman is found in Sc. 213-5: ...ἀὐτὰρ ἐπ’ ἀκταῖς / ἥστο ἀνὴρ ἁλιεὺς δεδοκημένος, εἶχε δὲ χερσὶν / ἰχθύσιν ἀμφίβληστρον ἀπορρίψοντι ἐοικώς, "on the shore a fisherman was sitting, watching, and in his hands he was holding a casting-net for fish, looking as though he was just about to cast it". Comparisons between both images have often been made, but I want to look specifically at the represented moment of both images. In the image on the shield, the fisherman is watching the fish (which have been described in the preceding lines), net in his hand, which he is just about to cast. The phrase ἀπορρίψοντι ἐοικώς (215) looks forward to a future event. The throwing of the net is not depicted on the shield. Following interpretation (1), the image on the cup clearly depicts a moment that comes after the moment depicted on the shield: the net has been thrown, and the fisherman is now hauling it in order to catch fish. Following interpretation (2b), the moment depicted on the cup precedes the moment depicted on the shield: the fisherman is still busy with his net. Following interpretation (2a), the image on the cup comes after the image on the shield: the fisherman has made a cast, but unsuccessfully, and is now hauling in his net for another cast.

In my view, interpretation (1) results in an image which comes naturally after that of the shield of Heracles: waiting to throw the net (shield) – throw of the net (not depicted) – hauling of the net in order to catch the fish (cup). Following interpretation (1), it is clear that the cup contains an image that comes after the image on the shield – just as the ekphrasis of the cup comes after that of the shield. The contrast between the stillness of the fisherman (before the throw) on the shield and his immense efforts (after the throw) on the cup reinforces this interpretation. Of course, on account of interpretation (2a) the image on the cup also comes after, but in that case the moment does not directly follow after that on the shield.

The second issue I want to address is the narrator-narratee interaction. In line 42, the goatherd uses φαίης κεν, "you would say". Strictly speaking, the goatherd addresses the secondary narratee, Thyrsis. Payne, however, argues that φαίης κεν primarily addresses the primary narratee, Thysir. In light of the other addresses to Thyrsis (21-5, 56, 60-1), I would argue that he is the main addressee. The phrase is Homeric, but in all its

---


118 Payne 2007: 34-5.
occurrences “a contrast is indicated between what you would expect and what was really the case”. This is not the case here: Thyrsis would say that the old fisherman was fishing with all his strength. In my view, by using φαίης κεν the goatherd makes explicit that he is interpreting what he sees.

Apart from φαίης κεν, there are other signs of the goatherd’s interpretation in these lines. First, the goatherd uses a form of ἐοικώς (ὁ πρέσβυς, κάμνοντι τὸ καρτερὸν ἄνδρι ἐοικώς, 41). In my view, the phrase does not compare art with reality. Rather, it compares the effort of the old man to that of a younger. Hence, it is a comment on the nature of the action. Second, line 44 contains a concessive phrase (καὶ πολιῷ περ ἑόντι) as well as another comparison (τὸ δὲ σθένος ἀξίον ἅβας). The line makes clear that the goatherd regards the strength of the old man as worthy of youth.

Lastly, the adjective πολιῷ, “grey-haired”, is striking, in that the cup is not painted. A number of explanations have been proposed: πολιῷ means “old”, the ekphrastic mode (as known from Homer and Hesiod) allows the goatherd to “see” colours, or the overly naive goatherd imagines the carved figures as living beings. I want to rephrase the last interpretation: the goatherd can be said to focus on the res ipsae, which means that he

---

119 de Jong [1987] 2004: 56; this contrast is often made explicit by a negation. Φαίης ἄν/κε occurs five times in the Iliad, and once in the Odyssey. The primary narrator may address the primary narratee (Il. 4.429, 15.697, 17.366), or a character may address another character (Il. 3.220, 3.392; Od. 3.124).

120 According to Zanker 1987: 81, the “address to the reader” makes the picture as a whole much more immediate.

121 I thus disagree with Payne 2007: 35, who writes that “[t]he first scene gives us the goatherd’s interpretative narration of whatever clues he has picked up from the images on the bowl. The second gives us just the images, and so lets us find clues of our own”. The second scene does not just give us the images. There are also signs of interpretation, though of a different nature.

122 Hunter 1999: 81, who notes regarding this phrase that “[a]ll such figures are merely ‘like’ because they are not ‘real’, but the phrasing also foregrounds the rôle of the interpreter in literary ekphrasis” (italics in the original).


124 See also my remarks on καρπῷ…χροκέντι (31) in section 5.3.4 above.

125 First two interpretations in Hunter 1999: 82, last two interpretations in Gutzwiller 1991: 91.
looks at what the figure represents. As such, an old man will have grey hair.\textsuperscript{126} This adjective, then, also draws attention to the role of the goatherd as interpreter.

3. One Boy and Two Foxes (45-54)

The last image on the cup receives the most attention (9 lines). It depicts three figures, just as the first image, one boy flanked by two foxes. The foxes have humanlike intentions, on account of which the image can acquire narrativity.\textsuperscript{127} I first discuss the text. Only the descriptive discourse mode is found in this passage. Textual progression is mainly enumerative; only in lines 48 does the text progresses spatially (ἀμφί, ἀνά).

One other spatial marker is found in 47 (ἐπί); a temporal adverb followed by a subordinate temporal clause occurs in 50-1 (οὐ πρὶν... / ἐπὶ πρὶν ἤ). Two visual details occur: the clusters are dark (περκναῖσι, 46);\textsuperscript{128} the boy is small (ὀλίγος, 47). Two other details refer to the beauty of the image (χαλόν, 46; χαλόν, 52);

The goatherd first introduces the scenery of the image. Whereas the goatherd directly focused on a human figure in the first image (32), a human figure and an element of the setting in the second image (39-40), he now introduces the setting on its own: a vineyard beautifully laden with clusters of dark grapes (46). This emphasis on the setting betrays the importance of the location for the action of this image. Other elements of the setting are a dry-stone wall, upon which the boy is sitting (ἐφ’ αἵμασιαῖσι, 47) and a row of vines (δρῆς, 48). Objects found within this setting are grapes that are ripe for eating (τὰν τρώξιμον), the boy’s wallet (πήρᾳ, 49), and asphodel stalks and rushes, with which the boy is weaving a trap (52-3). All objects play a role in the action.

The image does not contain a sequence of events. The goatherd first introduces the boy as guarding (φυλάσσει, 47) the vineyard. He next describes the actions of the two foxes, who are on either side of him (48-51). This is all happening simultaneously. The goatherd then returns to the boy in 52-4, where he uses three verbs (πλέκει, 52; μέλεται, 53; γαθεῖ, 54) to refer to actions of the boy. He is now is said to be weaving (πλέκει, 52). From this activity, the goatherd deduces the boy’s state of mind: he does not at all care for his wallet or plants (μέλεται δὲ οὐτὲ τι πήρας / οὔτε φυτῶν, 53-4), but is wholly

\textsuperscript{126} The first interpretation is attractive too, but unnecessary; the second is based on a false analogy, because the shields have coloured sections.

\textsuperscript{127} Cf. my remarks ad Sc. 168-77 in section 4.3.2, 4-5.

\textsuperscript{128} περκναῖσι (printed by Gow) is a conjecture; the manuscripts read πυρναίαις. See for discussion Gow [1950] 1952b: 10 and Hunter 1999: 82.
absorbed in his weaving. The negations make clear that the goatherd expects the boy to care about his guarding job. This expectation was earlier created by the the goatherd’s statement that the boy is guarding the vineyard (47).

The goatherd refers to a static image, which means that the boy is carved in one, fixed position. It is thus unlikely that the boy is involved in two different actions (guarding and weaving). If these actions are viewed as mutually exclusive, then the narratee must conclude that the goatherd was not telling the whole truth in line 47. Perhaps by not giving away at the beginning that the boy is not guarding the vineyard, the goatherd tries to create a certain tension. The narratee may wonder during lines 48-51 whether the boy is actually watching these foxes. On the other hand, the guarding and the weaving need not be mutually exclusive actions. Perhaps τὰν…φυλάσσει should be interpreted as “was on guarding duty in the vineyard”.

It could be that the boy is taking his guarding job seriously. He is weaving an ἀκριδοθήραν (52). The word has been variously interpreted, the reason of which is the meaning of the words that make up this compound, 1) ἀκριδ-, and 2) -θήραν. Ad 1: an ἀκρίς may refer to either a grasshopper, a locust, or a cricket. Ad 2: scholars debate whether this refers to a trap or a cage. Most scholars have the word refer to a cage in which ἀκριβεῖς were kept as pets, because they produced a pleasurable sound. On the other hand, in Id. 5.108-9, ἀκριβεῖς pose a threat to grapes: ἀκριβεῖς, αἱ τὸν φραγμὸν ύπερπαδήτε τὸν ἁμόν, / μή μευ λωβάσησθε τὰς ἀμπέλος· ἐντὶ γὰρ αὖαι, which Gow

---

129 Φυλάσσω with direct object means “to watch, guard, defend” (LSJ s.v. φυλάσσω B); without a direct object it means “to keep watch and ward, keep guard” (LSJ s.v. φυλάσσω A).
131 According to Gow [1950] 1952b: 12-3, reference is made to a cage. Although he notices that -θήραν technically refers to a trap, he writes that ἀκριδοθήραν may have acquired the meaning cage. The reason why Gow prefers cage is that “it seems unlikely that trapping them would be of much use”. Hunter 1999: 83 glosses as “a trap for crickets” and notes that traps may also function as cages. Dover 1971: 82 prefers the alternative reading ἀκριδοθήκας, which he translates as “grasshopper-cage”. He finds ἀκριδοθήραν unattractive, because “the easiest way to catch grasshoppers is simply to walk into the grass and pounce on them (...).”
132 E.g. Gow [1950] 1952b: 12: ἀκριβεῖς (…), like cicadas, were kept in cages for the pleasure their notes gave (A.P. 7.189, 190, 192-195, 197, 198) and it seems certain that what the boy is making is such a cage”, similarly Hunter 1999: 83-4. This interpretation ties in with a metapoetical interpretation of the cup, as the cicada is an explicit symbol for the singer (see Cairns 1984: 104, who refers to line 148, where the τέττιξ is mentioned).
translates with "locusts that hop over our fence, hurt not my vines, for they are dry".\textsuperscript{133} It could also be, then, that the boy is making a trap to catch locusts.\textsuperscript{134} Alternatively, he could be making a cage to keep the locusts which he catches by some other means.\textsuperscript{135} We should not forget that the goatherd is an inhabitant of the bucolic world, and as such probably interprets the image from a functional perspective.

In addition, in \textit{Idyll} 5 Comatas – who is a goatherd, too – is speaking, who immediately after having brought up locusts talks of foxes that destroy a vineyard: "I hate the foxes with their bushy tails that come ever at evening and plunder Micon's vineyard."\textsuperscript{136} In conclusion, if the boy is weaving a cage or trap for locusts, he could be taking his guarding job seriously. At the same time, this interpretation also creates a sense of irony: one of the foxes is exactly doing what the boy is trying to prevent, viz. damage to the grapes.

In line 49, the goatherd uses the verb form φοίτη. This verb suggest repeated motion.\textsuperscript{137} It is combined with the preposition ἀνά (48), which indicates motion throughout. The words of the goatherd thus suggest that the first fox is involved in an iterative action. The second fox "is thinking to herself that she will not let the boy alone until [she has raided his breakfast-bread]" (οὐ πρὶν ἀνησεῖν / φατὶ πρὶν ή ἀκράτιστον ἐπι
The intentions of the fox involve a future state of affairs, the raiding of the boy's wallet. Hence, the image suggests a future event. Lastly, the boy's weaving a pretty trap for locusts (καλὰν πλέκει ἀκριδοθήραν, 52) also suggests a future event. The trap itself cannot yet be finished, as the boy is still working on it. In conclusion, the image does not contain a sequence of events. It does suggest two future events, as well as an iterative action.

The second element of narrative, world disruption, is present. The boy and the foxes have conflicting interests. Foxes pose a real threat to grapes, as is clear from the words of Comatas in *Id.* 5.112-3. One fox is eating the grapes. Her action is characterised as deliberate mischief, as is clear from σινομένα, "plundering". The fox that is after the boy's food is a cunning creature: she is "fashioning every scheme against the wallet" (ἐπὶ πήρᾳ πάντα δόλον τεύχοισα, 49-50). The word δόλος, though here used in its concrete sense of trick or stratagem (on account of τεύχοισα), also means craft, cunning, or treachery. Her determination is stressed by the negation and the repetition of πρίν (50-1). The goatherd expects that she, too, will succeed in her evil designs, which means that the boy will lose his food. The primary narratee may, of course, think lightly of what is happening, but the eating of grapes seems to be a disruptive event for

---

138 As Hunter 1999: 83 notes ad 50-1, "[t]he textual and interpretative problems in these verses have as yet found no satisfactory solution"; see also Gow [1950] 1952b: 11-2 and Dover 1971: 81. I have used the translation in Gow [1950] 1952a: 7.
139 Cf. Palm 1965-6: 144-5 ("Der eine Fuchs gibt sich den Anschein – so ist das φατί (51) zu verstehen (…) – nicht aufzugeben, bevor er den Jungen seines Frühstücks beraubt hat", emphasis mine) and Payne 2007: 36 ("There is no conflict between visual representation and narration as there is in the first scene; the grapes and the wallet are easily pictured as objectives of the foxes' actions", emphasis mine).
140 Payne 2007: 36, who refers to *LSJ* s.v. σύνομα I, who list pirates, Cyclopes, Scylla and marauding armies as subjects of this verb.
141 *LSJ* s.v. δόλος A, respectively A b, and A 2. This word also occurs in the shield of Achilles: the herdsmen are killed τερπόμενοι σύριγξι: δόλον δ’ οὔ τι προνόησαν, "delighting in their pipes; and they foresaw in no wise the stratagem" (18.526). There, too, we find a bucolic world that is disrupted, though far more brutally; see my discussion in section 3.3.3.2, 2b.
142 Cf. Zanker 2004: 14, who speaks of the inevitable outcome: "the one fox will continue eating the grapes to her heart's content, while the other will have her way with the little boy's food, such is his absorption in his play".
inhabitants of the bucolic world (note μισέω τὰς δασυκέρκος ἀλώπεκας, “I hate the foxes with their bushy tails”, Id. 5.112). \[143\]

The element of 'what-it's-like' is present, too. It does not, however, have such a prominent role as in the previous two images. The two foxes have human-like intentions; one of them is bent on stealing the boy's food. The boy is enjoying himself immensely in his weaving (54). I conclude that the narrativity of the image is mainly due to the element of world disruption. In addition, it suggests two future events, as well as an iterative action.

4. The Images Together

In the previous sections, I have focused on the narrativity of the separate images. I now briefly want to discuss the issue whether the images can be connected, and, if so, what this means for the narrativity of the images when taken together. In the case of the shields of Achilles and Heracles, a direct connection between the images is difficult to establish, since both shields contain many different images with many different subjects. On Theocritus' cup, only three images are depicted. On account of this restriction, a connection between the images is easier to perceive. I want to emphasize that any connection between the images must be made by the primary narratee, as the goatherd only spatially links the images.

As we have seen in section 5.2 above, Petrain speaks of the fabula of the cup. Whereas the cup may well represent the three stages of human life, I think that the word fabula should not be used in connection with the cup. Petrain writes that Theocritus portrays “the chronological sequence par excellence, the span of a human life. No temporal progression is more familiar or more basic (…)”. \[144\] However, all images contain different figures and have their own setting. Although the images may have a

---

\[143\] Miles 1977: 149, on the other hand, writes that “[w]e have been assured by the goatherd, moreover, that the foxes’ depredations will have no serious consequences. All that is at stake is the boy’s lunch, and he is so absorbed in his weaving that he has lost interest in it anyway”; earlier he stated that “[i]n bare outline this scene has the elements of Hesiodic realism: It shows human folly in a world where man must struggle vigilantly against the degenerative forces of nature’ (ibid.: 148).

\[144\] Petrain 2006: 257, italics in the original.
temporal order, there is no sequence of events: we do not find the same figure involved in consecutive actions.\footnote{145} In such cases, it seems better not to use the term fabula.\footnote{146}

The images on the cup do not depict specific figures involved in specific events. Rather, the images can be regarded as typical scenes which illustrate certain aspects of human life.\footnote{147} Lawall writes that “the cup pictures nonheroic, commonplace, homely scenes of everyday experience”, and Hunter speaks of the “timeless and generic quality” of the figures on the cup.\footnote{148} To a certain extent, then, the cup resembles the shield of Achilles, insofar as both objects illustrate events which may happen in the life of human beings. In the images on the shield of Achilles, the communal aspect of life is emphasized. The images on the cup focus on individuals. The cup also devotes more attention to the feelings (‘what-it’s-like’) of these individuals.\footnote{149}

Scholars have generally perceived a temporal connection between the three images, which would represent the three ages of man (maturity, old age, childhood).\footnote{150} According to Lawall, “Theocritus has (...) presented a kind of panoramic picture of real life through symbolic scenes which capture the essential psychological condition of the three ages of man. Childhood is the age of happy innocence; manhood is preoccupied with the vain labour of love, as man, having lost the innocence of childhood, turns to the world outside and seeks an unattainable happiness in love of women; old age has

\footnote{145} Cf. also Ott 1969: 107, who writes that "aber durch die Darstellung in Einzelbildern und die natürlichen Ablauf widersprechende Anordnung wird nicht der chronologische Lebenslauf einer Einzelperson, sondern jede Lebensstufe für sich (...) vorgeführt", emphasis mine.

\footnote{146} On the terms fabula (and story) in connection with visual narrativity, cf. further Kafalenos 1996: 56-7.

\footnote{147} See e.g. Ott 1969: 107 ("Als Hauptpartie des Ziegenhirten paßt die Ekphrasis zu seinem bisherigen Auftreten: Seiner Anonymität, welcher die Namhaftigkeit des Partners gegenübersteht, entsprechen die namenlosen Gestalten und eher typischen als individuellen Szenen der Becherbilder") and Gutzwiller 1991: 92 ("(...) the figures on the cup are nameless and so seem to represent types").


\footnote{150} E.g. Gutzwiller 1991: 92-3 ("The three scenes rather obviously represent three ages of man (...). The three ages of man are easily observed").
learned the folly of lovers and turns to practical affairs and action, where labor is given a just reward".\textsuperscript{151} Hunter notes three types of labour that are associated with each age: “emotional (the lovers) and physical (the fisherman) πόνος give way to a labour (the boy’s weaving) which suggests poetic πόνος”.\textsuperscript{152} However, I find the idea that each age has its own emotional state or activity too restricted. For example, physical labour is associated with the young by the goatherd’s comparison in line 41.

The nature of the images allows the primary narratee to perceive various connections between them. If one wants to perceive a temporal connection between them, one could argue that the images illustrate events which may, but need not, happen in the life of human beings. In that case, the individual figures lose their individuality, in that they stand for any human being. In addition, although the separate images may feature world disruption, the events they depict become less disruptive when viewed from the perspective of a whole life. Thus, the images together are low in narrativity. Because they illustrate events which ordinarily happen in the life of human beings, the images also possess descriptivity. Here, the difference between the goatherd and the primary narratee comes to the fore, too: for the primary narratee, the events depicted on the cup may not be as disruptive as they are for the goatherd.

5.4 The Goatherd’s Cup: Its Descriptivity and Narrativity. Conclusion

The text which represents the goatherd’s cup is a mixture of three discourse modes: the diegetic, the discursive and the descriptive discourse mode. The descriptive discourse mode takes up the largest part of the text, as is expected in ekphraseis. In the corpus of this study, the discursive discourse mode is found first here. The signs of narrator-narratee interaction in this discourse mode are to be related to the fact that the ekphrasis is part of a conversation between two characters. As I have argued, the ekphrasis has a rhetorical goal, to persuade Thyrsis to sing his famous song. It also foregrounds the goatherd as interpreter. The diegetic discourse mode occurs once: in lines 36-8, the goatherd creates a sequence of iterative events as a response to the static image.

The text largely has a prototypically descriptive structure. The amount of descriptive detail varies: the lines referring to the non-narrative decoration of the cup (25-31 and 56) are full of details, some of which are of a visual nature; others appeal to

\textsuperscript{151} Lawall 1967: 29-30 (emphasis mine), approved of by Ott 1969: 108. In a similar vein Edquist 1975: 106, who speaks of “the totality of significant human experience from childhood to old age”.

\textsuperscript{152} Hunter 1999: 77.
smell. Lines 32-44, which represent the first and second image, contain a number of visual details, all of which play an important role in conveying what is happening in the picture. Lines 45-54, which represent the third image, contain two visual details. In contrast with the shields of Achilles and Heracles, the text that represents the goatherd’s cup contains fewer details. I postpone discussion of this observation until the following chapter, since the same phenomenon is also to be seen in the ekphrasis of Jasons cloak.153

The images have various degrees of narrativity. The images do not contain event sequencing. Images one and three suggest a sequence of iterative events; images two and three suggest future events. World disruption is present in the first and third image. ‘What-it’s-like’ is present in all three images, but most strongly conveyed by images one and two. If I were to order the images according to their amount of narrativity, I would say that image one has the highest degree of narrativity, followed by image three; image two comes last, because world disruption is absent. On account of this absence, image three also has a certain amount of descriptivity. When the images are taken together as illustrative of events which may happen in the life of any human being, they lose their disruptive nature and acquire descriptivity.

5.5 Coda: Visualizing the Goatherd’s Cup
The discussion regarding the visualization of the goatherd’s cup resembles to a certain extent the discussion regarding the visualization of the shield of Achilles. On the one hand, scholars argue that the cup cannot be visualized. Manakidou, for example, writes:

Warum es dennoch dem Bild an Genauigkeit fehlt, was die technische Seite betrifft, warum letztlich keine ἐνάργεια und σαφήνεια, bedeutsame Qualitäten einer Ekphrasis, erreicht werden, läßt sich folgendermaßen erläutern: Theokrit selbst beabsichtigt nicht, eine allzu klare Vorstellung von dem beschriebenen Objekt zu geben. Da er kein pedantischer Betrachter ist, zeigt er kein Interesse an einer genaueren Darlegung, sondern legt Wert auf die poetischen Eigenschaften bzw. Dimensionen der Rede, auf die Dichtung als wörtliche Realisierung seiner bildenden Phantasie.154

153 See section 6.4.
154 Manakidou 1993: 73. Manakidou seems indebted to Friedländer 1912: 14, who states that it is clear that “der Dichter eine Vorstellung vom Ganzen besitzt und dem Leser übermittelt. Allein diese Vorstellung ist alles andere als exakt. Das Gefäß heißt ‘zweihenklig’, aber es wird mit
On the basis of the fact that the arrangement of the images on the cup is not clear – in other words, because the *opus ipsum* does not receive enough attention – scholars conclude that the cup as a whole cannot be visualized, or can only be visualized with difficulty. On the other hand, scholars are agreed that the separate images can be visualized.155

As Petrain notes, ancient readers do not seem to have felt any reluctance to visualize objects described in poetry.156 In this matter, I can only agree with the ancients.157 Thus, even though the text remains silent on certain matters – matters that some scholars consider essential – the narratee should certainly try to visualize the cup. The arrangement of the images on the cup – the precise nature of which is also unclear – must remain uncertain (cf. sections 5.3.4-5 above), but the many reconstructions indicate that the text offers enough clues to come to some sort of arrangement.158

The separate images are inspired by examples of Hellenistic art.159 As Hunter notes, “relief work on pottery and metal will have been the principle influence”.160 However, influences from the ekphrastic tradition (e.g. the fisherman on Heracles’ shield) or other types of art (e.g. statues) cannot be ruled out.161 Any narrative elements that are, strictly speaking, alien to the visual arts are commonly regarded as *suggested* by the

einem homerischen Kunstwort (*κισσύβιον*) benannt, das keine bestimmte Form vor das Auge stellt*. Payne 2007: 37 agrees.

155 See e.g. Nicosia 1968: 23-4: “[l]e singole descrizioni non presentano difficoltà di interpretazione. Le difficoltà sorgono quando si tenti di ricostruire l’opera nel suo complesso, e di stabilire in essa la disposizione delle tre scenette; (...) insomma, dal complesso della descrizione, è impossibile farsi un’idea chiara della coppa, ricostruirla cioè come opera d’arte, che è come tale appunto vuol presentarcela il poeta”.


157 See further section 3.5.

158 For possible reconstructions, see e.g. Gow [1950] 1952b: 14 (= Gow 1913: 213), Morley in Verity and Hunter 2002: 2, and Petrain 2006: 258-9. Arnott 1978: 133, after having discussed the ekphrasis alongside John Flaxman’s reconstruction of the cup, concludes that “[c]areful reading of Theocritus’ text indicates that the poet’s imagined arrangement of the three pictures on the goatherd’s cup must have been similar to that of Flaxman’s design (...)**.

159 See the references in Hunter 1999: 77. See also Fowler 1989: 5-15.


161 Cf. the brief overview in Gow 1913: 207.
carvings. The cup is indeed a marvel of the goatherd's world – a wonder which amazes one's heart (αἰπολικὸν θάημα· τέρας κέ τι θυμόν ατύξαι, 56).

---

62 E.g. Schmale 2004: 122: “[w]enn in der ersten Szene auf den ersten Blick ein bildlich nicht darstellbares Nacheinander, nämlich das Hin und Her von Rede und Blicken, angesprochen wird, kann auch dies als Reflex auf besondere Leistungen hellenistischer Kunst gedeutet werden, denn es gibt tatsächlich Statuengruppen von besonderer naturalistischer Qualität, die den Eindruck einer lebendigen Unterhaltung wiedergeben (...); similarly Fowler 1989: 7 (“(...) the achievement of Hellenistic sculpture and painting was to heighten suggestion; to make obvious a casting of the mind, a give-and-take of conversation”).