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PHILITAS AND THE PLANE TREE

I. A Coan Mouseion

Hellenistic Cos boasted a vigorous intellectual life. It was the seat of a distinguished school of medicine. It produced a historian and a few scholars. It also produced poets and musicians, and sent them abroad to compete in festivals. The Coans extended competitive hospitality through their own festivals, the Dionysia and the panhellenic Asclepieia Megala. And as might be expected, the festivals entailed businesslike contact with the Hellenistic tekhêntai, the guilds of Artists of Dionysus. Cos also attracted poets for extended sojourns. In the third century, Theocritus and Herodas spent time on the island, and left permanent memorials in their poetry; and later, at the end of the second century, Meleager settled in Cos. Why did they come, and what professional milieu might they have found when they arrived?

Cos’ Ptolemaic connections, in particular the birth there of Ptolemy Philadelphus in 309/308, will have been a focal point for foreign interest. In the literary sphere, the international reputation of Philitas of Cos as poet, scholar and teacher will no doubt have attracted personal adherents from other cities. Philitas tutored Philadelphus himself. The Homeric scholar Zenodotus was his pupil; and it may well have been on Cos that Philitas instructed the poet Hermesianax of Colophon, recorded as his ‘friend and pupil’ in a scholium on Nicander (Ther. 3). At any rate, it is from Hermesianax (fr. 7.75–78 P.) that we learn that the Coans set up, under a plane tree, a bronze statue to Philitas. Before Philitas, Cos had no poetic pedigree that we know of, and the statue will have stood as testimony to Coan pride in him, and to the benefits which his achievements conferred on the island.

One centre of Cos’ wide-ranging Coan intellectual life will have been the theatre. Some activity will doubtless have been informal, capable of being carried on in various locations, as for example the teaching of the Chaldaean astrologer Berosus, in the early third century. Berosus was later honoured at

---

* My thanks are due to Matthew Dickie and Peter Knox for comments and improvements on successive drafts. For the final version, and for remaining errors, I alone am responsible.

1 The school is associated with the Coan doctor Hippocrates: S. M. Sherwin-White, Ancient Cos (Hypomnemata Heft 51; Göttingen, 1978) 256–89; P. M. Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria (Oxford, 1972) I.342–44.
2 Historian: Macareus, who wrote about local history (FGrH 456); Fraser (n. 1) II.791 (n. 8) suggests that he may have been a contemporary of Philitas. Scholars: Sisyphus (FGrH 50); Socrates (Diog. Laert. 2.47); Nicanor (commentator on Philitas: Σ Theocr. Id. 7.6).
3 W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, The Inscriptions of Cos (Oxford, 1891) no. 137 (C. III/II B.C.: dedication to Apollo and the Muses by victor in boys’ lyre-playing); 59 (C. II/I B.C.: citharistai are chosen for a second century B.C. festival of Nike); 58 (C. I B.C./I A.D.: festival victory by poet Delphis. A. Maiuri, Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos (Florence, 1925) no. 441.25 (flute player, victorious in Argos, dedicates a statue of Bacchus to Apollo and Bacchus).
4 Dionysia: Paton and Hicks (n. 3) 13.16 (C. III/II B.C.); Sherwin-White (n. 1) 315. Asclepieia Megala: Sherwin-White (n. 1) 111–12; 315; 357–58.
5 Sherwin-White (n. 1) 315–17.
6 Theocritus: Id. 7, with Σ Id. 7 Arg.: A. S. F. Gow, Theocritus (Cambridge, 1950) I.xxvi. Herodas: Mimes 2, 4.
8 Sherwin-White (n. 1) 83–85; 90–102.
9 Suda φ 332, s. v. Φίλιτας. Fraser (n. 1) 308–9.
11 Referred to by Antigonus of Carystos in the second half of the third century: Sherwin-White (n. 1) 25; Paton and Hicks (n. 3) no. 10 a25; Call. fr. 407.161.
Athens with a public statue in a gymnasion.\textsuperscript{12} His work on Cos could have taken place in a comparable environment. However, certain attestation for a third century Coan gymnasion is lacking. Indeed the history of the gymnasia of Cos is poorly attested and very imperfectly understood.

The first known archaeological remains, with associated inscriptions, point to the construction of an imposing gymnasion in the early–mid second century.\textsuperscript{13} A gymnasion calendar survives from the second century B.C., but probably derives from a different institution. It testifies to Ptolemaic and Attalid patronage of the gymnasia.\textsuperscript{14} The calendar also mentions a ‘procession of the Muses’ (ποιμνή Μουσών).\textsuperscript{15} From this precious entry, it can be inferred that the gymnasion housed a Mouseion, a shrine of the Muses, the statues of which were paraded on special occasions. Elsewhere, the evidence suggests a pattern of links between Mouseta/Muses and educational institutions and gymnasia. Athenian evidence from the fourth century is particularly rich, extending to the Academy and the Lyceum (see below); gymnasia and Muses are also linked in literary cult in neighbouring Asia Minor, for example at Mylasa.\textsuperscript{16} Similarly, at Cos, a first century A.D. inscription associates a priest of the Muses with gymnasion activity; and a decree from the second or first century B.C. contains a reference to Muse cult: ὁ πριάμενος τῶν ἀνών τῶν Μουσῶν (‘he who has the contract for gathering the revenue of the Muses’). This may have to do with revenue from land dedicated to a Coan Muse cult.\textsuperscript{17}

It can be assumed that the second century gymnasia were not the first such institutions on Cos. But the lack of clear testimony to an earlier gymnasion (and/or Mouseion) is a considerable loss, for such evidence would have value not simply for the history of education on the island, but for wider patterns of Coan intellectual activity. The institutional settings for such activity, and associated cults, were an essential part of the working environment of Hellenistic poets.\textsuperscript{18} It is known from other cities that public displays by itinerant professional poets were a feature of gymnasion activity.\textsuperscript{19} So far as concerns popular perceptions, we can only speculate on the impact created by the gymnasion ‘procession of Muses’. But herein lies a key area of modern uncertainty: we may recognise that literary cults (whether of the Muses, Apollo or Dionysus) had some place in the practice of literature in the Hellenistic world; but to define the public and professional impact of that religious dimension, and its role in particular localities, is a more challenging proposition.

\textsuperscript{12} Berosus: Fraser (n. 1) II.728 nn. 95 and 96; on his teaching, Vitr. 9.6.2: primasque Berosus in insula et civitate Coo consedit ibique aperuit disciplinam; statue: Plin. Nat. 7.123 (below, n. 54).


\textsuperscript{14} Sherwin-White (n. 1) 20. A. Hardie, Callimachus and his critics (Princeton, 1995) 24–70, has now given a full exposition.

\textsuperscript{15} Paton and Hicks (n. 3) 98; SIG\textsuperscript{3} 1028.16.


\textsuperscript{18} This professional milieu was first documented by M. Guarducci, ‘Poeti vaganti e conferenzieri dell’età ellenistica: ricerche di epigrafia greca nel campo della letteratura e del costume’, Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei 6.2 (1929) 627–65; cf. A. Hardie, Status and the Silvae: poets, patrons and epideixis in the Graeco-Roman world (Arca 9, Liverpool, 1983) 15–36; A. Cameron, Callimachus and his critics (Princeton, 1995) 24–70, has now given a full exposition.

\textsuperscript{19} Hardie (n. 18) 20. Gymnasia and schools, and Muses: below, n. 77.
The *Mouseion* at Alexandria was the most prominent religious-intellectual institution of its kind and of its age. But *Mouseia* had long existed in mainland Greece, Macedonia and Greek Italy, embracing a wide variety of functions. The important centres of Muse cult include Thespiae (Mt. Helicon), Croton (the Pythagorean *Mouseion*), Delphi and Athens. *Mouseia* were associated with educational activity, with performance and competition, with literary and philosophical studies, and sometimes with individual poets and their posthumous reputations. Ptolemy Soter’s establishment of the Alexandrian *Mouseion* seems to have drawn on these traditions, through the influence of Demetrius of Phaleron and the Athenian *Mouseia-gymnasia* in the Academy and the Lyceum. Ptolemaic patronage of the Heliconian *Mouseion* (possibly initiated by Arsinoe Philadelphus) ensured a third century renaissance of that ancient institution, linked with the *Mouseia* festival. Ptolemaic patronage of the Greek cults of the Muses helps underline the relevance of the Hellenistic literary cults to the work of the third century poets.

The central sections of this article will focus on a local, Coan aspect of these phenomena: I shall postulate the existence of an early third century *Mouseion/gymnasion* on Cos. I hope to establish grounds for associating such a Coan institution with the poet Philitas and his work in the early third century. The primary evidence to be presented and analysed will be Hermesianax’ reference to the poet and his public statue. Specifically, I shall try to show that Philitas’ statue was dedicated, under a plane tree, to the Muses in a Coan *Mouseion*.

**II. Hermesianax and the *Leontion***

Hermesianax’ reference to Philitas occurs in the *Leontion*, an elegiac catalogue poem, addressed in three books to the poet’s mistress. The *Leontion* listed the love affairs of well-known figures; and in the longest surviving fragment (98 verses from the third book) it deals with the loves of poets and philosophers, particularly those who suffered for love. Twelve poets are arranged in six pairs: Orpheus and Musaeus (i.e. legendary figures); Hesiod and Homer (epic); Mimnermus and Antimachus (elegy); Alcaeus and Anacreon (lyric); Sophocles and Euripides (tragedy); and finally Philoxenus and Philitas. Leontion’s assumed familiarity with some of these poets suggests that she is herself learned, a *docta puella*. Drawing on a variety of ‘biographical’ sources, including the poets’ own works, Hermesianax presents a fantastic concoction of tales (Hesiod in love with ‘Ehoie’, Homer with Penelope, Alcaeus and Anacreon with Sappho, Philoxenus with Galatea). The poems’ contents and workmanship have attracted some sharply critical comment. But in a more favourable recent assessment, Peter Bing has persuasively argued that Hermesianax is actually satirising contemporary scholarship about poets’ lives.

---

20 On the Alexandrian *Mouseion*, see Fraser (n. 1) 312–19.


24 Helicon and patronage by Arsinoe III Philopator: Schachter (n. 22) 160; 164. M. Feyel, *Contribution à l’épigraphie béroitienne* (Le Puy, 1942) 88–117. For the interesting hypothesis of patronage by the first Arsinoe (i.e. early C. III), Cameron (n. 18) 141–42.


27 Most recently from Cameron (n. 18) 318–19; 383.

28 Bing (n. 26).
The organising principle behind most of the poet-pairings is clearly generic (epic, elegy, lyric, etc.). In some cases, this is underpinned by verbal or conceptual interplay: Orpheus’ Argiope recovered from Hades (2–3) and Musaeus’ Antiope ‘known in Hades’ (20); Hesiod and Homer in love with the subjects of their own poetry, and ‘suffering much’;29 Anacreon and Alcaeus interlinked through the ‘scholarship’ of Chamaeleon, which Hermesianax parodies.30 Only in one case is the pairing-rationale unclear, and this is the one of greatest immediate interest, Philoxenus and Philitas. The former was a fifth/fourth century dithyrambic poet, and the latter a fourth/third century elegist. Both names start with ‘Phil-’, but there is no other obvious connection between them. Now, if one were to take the view that Hermesianax was simply a slapdash hack, this apparent incoherence might be reckoned typical of him, and not worth further investigation. On the other hand, Philitas was Hermesianax’ friend and teacher, and the sole contemporary figure to feature in his catalogue of poets;31 he stands, in a prominent and honorific position, as its final item; and Hermesianax, like Philitas, is writing learned elegiac poetry to his mistress. It is scarcely to be believed that he would have devoted less care to arrangement and internal coherence at this point than elsewhere. I suspect that in pairing Philoxenus and Philitas, Hermesianax may have been posing a learned challenge to his reader(s), inviting them (her) to work out the connection for themselves (herself). A suggested connection will be put forward later (V).

The date of the Leontion is not known, and is the subject of lively debate. My own view, which is argued in detail in the Appendix, is that Fraser’s suggested dating, between 280 and 270, is likely to be correct, and that attempts to place it before 295 are based on a misreading of the text and of the external evidence.

III. Hermesianax fr. 7.75–78 P.: Text, Translation and Sources

οἴσθα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀοίδον ὅν Εὐρυπύλου πολιήται
Κώιοι χάλκειον θήκαν ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ
Βιττίδα μολπάζοντα θοίην, περὶ πάντα Φιλίταν
ῥήματα καὶ πάσαν (τ)ριώμενον λαλίην.

76 θήκαν A; στήσαν Hecker, Meineke.

The passage may provisionally be translated as follows: ‘you know the singer whom the Coan citizens of Eurypylus placed, in bronze, under a plane tree, singing of his nimble Bittis – Philitas, worn out [in his research] on all words and all dialect’. This takes together all the information from ὅν (75) to θοίη (77), and separates it from that set out in περὶ πάντα . . . λαλίην (77–78). The separation reflects two aspects of Philitas’ activity, his love poetry (i.e. the Bittis) and his scholarly lexicon.32 It may be supposed that Hermesianax has highlighted the two activities, because both were reflected in his statue; so that Philitas will have been depicted not only as a singer, but also as ‘worn out’.

But several features of this reading are open to debate. Some scholars have suggested that the statue depicted Philitas singing of Bittis under a plane tree (i.e. that the tree was part of the statue-scene).33

29 Thus πόλλα ἐκάθεν (25, Hesiod); πολλὰ ποθῶν (31, Homer); doubtless influenced by Od. 1.4.
30 Bing (n. 26) 626–27.
31 Σ Nic. Ther. 3, Pfeiffer (n. 23) 89: ‘. . . the only post-classical poet found worthy by Hermesianax of being added to the series of illustrious earlier poets starting with Orpheus’. ‘Contemporary’ in the sense of being known personally to the poet (Philitas may have been either alive or dead at the time of the statue award: below, VII).
33 M. Pohlenz, ‘Die hellenistische Poesie und die Philosophie’, in ὈΡΙΣΤΕΣ Friedrich Leo zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht (Berlin, 1911) 111 (cited by Dickie [n. 10] 379 n. 19); cf. also T. B. L. Webster, Hellenistic poetry and art (London, 1964) 42.
This is frankly implausible, and was rightly rejected by Wilamowitz and others as a departure from the ‘conventions of honorific statues for literary figures’. No implausibility attaches to the statue being understood to depict Philitas ‘singing of Bittis’, and this is how the phrase is generally taken.

However, a radically new translation has been proposed by Latacz, taking \(\text{Bitt} \otimes \text{da molpãzonta}\) with \(\text{o‰sya d¢ ka‹ tÚn éoidÒn}\), rather than as an extension of the relative clause, with \(\text{..}\). On this reading, in syntactical terms, \(\text{tÚn éoidÚn}\) would be an accusative and participle governed by \(\text{o‰sya}\) as a verb of ‘knowing’. The translation would be ‘you know that the poet whom the Coan citizens . . . set up in bronze sings of Bittis . . .’. Given the present tense of \(\text{molpãzonta}\) this might be taken to imply, first, that Philitas is still alive and, second, that he currently and habitually sings of Bittis (Hermesianax speaks of the loves of other poets, and associated actions, in the past tense). But a problem of logic arises in Leontion knowing that Philitas ‘sings’ of Bittis when that knowledge must relate to her familiarity with a poem (the \(\text{Bittis}\)) written sometime in the past. One solution would be to take the singing of the \(\text{Bittis}\) as an explanation of the statue, so that the present tense would suggest Philitas, \(\text{qua}\) statue, singing of Bittis in perpetuity. This would lead pretty much to the same overall sense as the traditional reading, but by a different syntactical route. And if Latacz is correct in drawing attention to the alternative syntax, this seems the most natural way to take the sentence, rather than separating statue and \(\text{Bittis}\) and making them carry two quite distinct frames of literary reference.

A textual issue which is central to the arguments put forward in this paper is raised by \(\text{yÆkan}\). This word has been rejected as a corruption, on suspicion of influence from \(\text{mhle¤oiw yÆkay' ÍpÚ progÒnoiw}\) (74) and also on the alleged grounds that \(\text{xãlkeion tiy°nai}\) cannot mean ‘set up a statue in bronze’. But the first point carries little weight, since repetition of vocabulary is a prominent feature of Hermesianax’s style in this passage; in this instance, there would be a nice variation of sense between \(\text{yÆkay' ÍpÚ}\) (Galatea, contemptuous of Philoxenos) and \(\text{yÆkan ÍpÚ}\) (the Coans, honorific of Philitas). The second point does not take account of the contemporary use of \(\text{χάλκειον óνατιθέναι}\) in the sense ‘dedicate a bronze statue of . . .’ at \(\text{AP}\) 9.600 (Theocritus on Epicharmus): \(\text{χάλκεον νιν άντ' ἀλαθηνιού / τίν ὁδ' άνέθηκαν / τοι Συρακούσαις ένίδρυνται ('for you, Bacchus, those who live in Syracuse have set him up in bronze here in place of the true man . . .').

Now, \(\text{όνατιθέναι}\) and the simple \(\text{τιθέναι}\) are regularly used of the act of dedication without the dative of the deity to whom the object is dedicated. A third century example (c. 225 B.C.) occurs in the will of Lyco, head of the Lyceum, who directs that his designated successor should ‘dedicate a statue of me’ (\(\text{άνδριθα τηύν μον άνταθητω} (\text{in a convenient spot of his own choosing (sc. in the Lyceum)}; previous wills make it certain that statues of heads of school were dedicated to the Muses, even when not specifically stated, and this can be assumed to be the case with Lyco’s projected statue. The two verbs can also be used as above, with the addition of a description of the place where the dedication is

---

34 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Sappho and Simonides (Berlin, 1913) 289 n. 4; Dickie (n. 10) 379–80.
35 Thus Knox (n. 32) 66: ‘These lines refer to a statue which represents the poet singing of . . . Bittis’.
37 For the present tense in a comparable statue description, cf. e.g. \(\text{AP}\) 1. 306.7; 307.5; 310.8.
39 The grounds for doubt are succinctly summarised by Powell (n. 25) 103 ad loc. Some scholars retain \(\text{θηκαν}\) (e.g. von Blumenthal, RE XIX.2165; Cameron [n. 18] 68 n. 283 [but contrast 316]). Most read \(\text{στήριξαμε}\), without reference to the fact that it is an emendation.
40 Cf. e.g. 14 with 36 (\(\text{μαλακοË pneËma}\)); also \(\text{πολλ' ¶payen}\) / \(\text{pollå pay≈n}\) (31); in the area of Philoxenus, there is tam¤hn (66, 70).
41 \(\text{τιθέναι}: \text{e.g. AP 6.49.2; 6.126.2; άνατιθέναι: 6.166.1; 6.175.2; 6.213.2; 6.214.2; 6.216.1; 6.339.2; cf. 6.194.}
42 Diog. Laert. 5.71.
In one instance known to me, there is a puzzling, even cryptic, quality about the designation of the place of dedication, as if the reader is being challenged to work out, first, who the dedicatee might be and, second (when this is clarified), in which of her temples: this is *AP* 5.202.2 (dedication of a whip): Πλαγγὸν ἑνίππον θησαυρὸν ἐπὶ προθύρων (‘Plaggon dedicated [the whip] at the well-horsed porticoes’ . . .); the fact that the context is partially clarified by address to Aphrodite (5) does not remove the allusive quality of the dedication-place. I would suggest that something similar is involved at Herm. fr. 7.76 P., and that readers are required to infer the place of dedication for themselves. I conclude that the arguments for emending θησαυρὸν are groundless; that the word should be retained, in the sense ‘set up as a dedication’; and that ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ may be seen as an allusive designation of the (sacred) place of dedication. The plane tree and its sacral associations will be considered below (IV).

With the original text thus restored, one candidate for Hermesianax’ information about the statue comes into focus. He might well have been familiar with whatever inscription adorned Philitas’ statue, and lines 75b–77a are themselves reminiscent of the typical content and wording of anathematic epigrams. A near-contemporary example is *AP* 9.600 (Theocritus), cited earlier, which states that the Syracusans dedicated to Dionysus a bronze statue of Epicharmus, their fellow citizen; it stresses that he was Dorian, and claims that he was the inventor of comedy; and it praises Syracusan mindfulness of their debt to his educative precepts. *AP* 1.306 (Leonidas of Tarentum) gives a detailed description of a statue of Anacreon as an old, drunk poet, as he ‘sings either of delightful Bathylus or of Megistes, lifting in his hand his lyre, disastrous in love’. Both epigrams have points in common with Hermesianax fr. 7.75–78 P., including local patriotism (and the relationship between poet and *polis*), information about who set up the statue, its material (and possibly its location), and the subject of the ‘singer’s’ imaginary song. This last feature is of particular interest, since the imagined subject of Philitas’ song will not have been readily apparent to anyone viewing the statue (and cannot, given the known/suspected range of Philitas’ oeuvre, have been assumed): Leonidas plays on just this ignorance on the part of the viewer in suggesting two possible subjects for Anacreon’s statue ‘performance’. I would suggest, therefore, that among Hermesianax’ sources is the statue epigram, and that it specified Bittis as Philitas’ subject.

If Philitas was alive at the time of the statue award, it is possible that he wrote his own statue-epigram. It has long been recognised that Hermesianax alludes in fr. 7P. to the work of the poets he names. It has also been argued that Philitas himself made some programmatic statement in which he spoke of the public honours he had received (or hoped to receive) in Cos. If so, it might be that programme poem and statue-epigram were one and the same. But there are other possibilities (and it is not wholly certain that Philitas lived to see his own statue). These issues will be considered below (VII), as will (VI) a further important piece of evidence (fr. 14 P., θρήσοσθαι πλατάνῳ γραφῇ ὅπως ‘to be seated under an old plane tree’).

---

43 AP 6.127.3; 6.184.2; 6.201.6; 6.211.6–7; 6.254.8; 6.259.1; 6.297; cf. 6.266. Plat. *Phaedr.* 235d εἰκόνα . . . εἰς Δελφοὺς ἀναθῆκεν (i.e. dedicate to Apollo at Delphi); Ath. 19b: Ἐστιαίως . . . θεοδιάρου . . . ἐν θεάτρῳ χαλκῆς εἰκόνα ἀνέθηκεν (presumably a dedication [to Dionysus], either in the theatre or in a gymnasium with a theatre/auditorium [cf. the prominent reference to ‘children’, 9]).

44 On the interpretation of this epigram, see Cameron (n. 18) 239–44.

45 Location: *AP* 1. 306.2 has a difficult and possibly corrupt location indicator: δινηστὶ στρεπτῶν ὑπὲρθε λίθου.


47 For examples and earlier bibliography, A. S. Hollis, ‘Heroic Honours for Philitas?’, *ZPE* 110 (1996) 56–62 at 58; *Bing* (n. 26) 630.

IV. The Plane Tree and the Muses

Philitas’ statue was dedicated by the citizens of Cos (Herm. fr. 7.75 P.: πολιταί / Κώινοι χάλκειν θήκαιν). It follows that it will have been placed in an honorific public position. But where? One attractive suggestion is a standard place for the display of statues of benefactors, the agora.49 Two pieces of evidence have been cited in support: the first is Poseidippus’ later wish that his statue should be set up in the agora at Pella (below, VII); and the second is an anecdote in Plutarch (Dem. 31.2), connecting a plane tree in the Athenian agora with a statue of Demosthenes.50 As an illustrative parallel for Philitas, however, the Demosthenes statue has only limited value. Plutarch’s narrative makes clear that it did not stand underneath the plane but some little way from it (the tree’s leaves were carried to it, perhaps by the wind). Evidently the choice of statue location was not determined by the plane tree (as it clearly was in the case of Philitas). A more general point might be that although plane trees are well attested for the Athenian agora, explicit evidence for planes in agoras elsewhere seems pretty sparse.51 This is not (of course) to assert that plane trees did not grow in other agoras: the point is that there seems to be no evidence that the plane was emblematic of agoras, or that it could be deployed, by itself, as a way of alluding to location in an agora.

Locations other than agoras are regularly attested for honorific statues of literary figures, both living and dead. Statues of poets (Menander and Astydamax) were set up in the Athenian theatre; and a later statue (of Statius’ father) was set up in the sacred enclosure at Eleusis.52 Some Mouseia housed statues of eminent poets and philosophers: the evidence for our period relates mostly to dead figures, but Bacchiadas of Sicyon dedicated a statue of himself in the Heliconian Mouseion at around this time, and Accius later placed a statue of himself in the Aedes Herculis Musarum at Rome.53 Gymnasia, too, are known to have been locations of statues. Many will have been erected to benefactors of the gymnasium by groups associated with the institution itself, but statues were also set up in gymnasia by public decree, consistent with their status as public places: at Halicarnassus, a third century benefactor was awarded a public statue in the gymnasium; and in Athens, the third century Chaldaean astrologer Berosus was similarly honoured (above, I).54

Self-evidently, the plane tree and such emblematic associations as it had require closer scrutiny. It is a recurring element in certain sacro-idyllic loci amoeni, and it had a range of local religious associations in different places in the Greek world.55 However the only sacral association which is consistently

---

49 Dickie (n. 10) 380; Cameron (n. 18) 68.
50 Dickie (n. 10) 378; 380.
53 Diog. Laert. 3.25 (Academy: statue of Plato dedicated to the Muses by Mithridates); 5.51 (Lyceum:Aristotle) and 52 (Nicomachus); 5.71 (Lyco, by his own instructions); Paus. 9.30.2 (Helicon). Bacchiadas: above, n. 46. Accius: (late C. II): Plin. *Nat.* 34.19.
attested in antiquity is that with the Muses and their shrines. The background lies in the physical characteristics of gymnasia, of which plane trees were a regular feature. As a shade tree, it afforded a natural environment for repose from physical activity and for discourse at such times, that is, the σχολή from which schools and scholarly activity were to derive their name. Plane trees are attested in two Athenian gymnasia, the Academy and the Lyceum. And in both places, philosophical schools were organised as religious societies based on the cult of the Muses, that is as Mouseia. From this Athenian phenomenon may derive the later emblematic linkage of plane, Muses and Mouseia.

A seminal text was Plato’s Phaedrus, a dialogue which has a carefully delineated topography: a plane tree marks its sacro-idyllic location, beside a tributary of the Ilissus (229a; 230bc), and Socrates and Phaedrus lie underneath it. This spot is referred to (278a) as τὸ Νυμφόν νάμα τε καὶ μουσείον (‘the stream and mouseion of the Nymphs’), a designation which links nympha with Muses, and the θείος τόπος (238cd: ‘holy place’) of the discussion with areas sacred to the Muses (i.e. Mouseia). Plato’s nympha and Muses play prominent parts in ‘inspiring’ Socrates’ speeches. A further, pedagogical, feature is the ‘myth’ of the origins of the cicadas (258e–259d) and their association with the Muses, the purpose of which is to demonstrate the importance of sustaining discourse in middle-of-the-day heat and σχολή, and not falling asleep (a passage which will doubtless have raised smiles in the gymnasia). These features, and the notable promotion of Calliope and Urania as Muses of philosophy (259d), show that Plato is not indulging some poetic fantasy, entirely disconnected with reality. I would suggest that he is representing a ‘Socratic’ precursor of the Academic Mouseion, and the association of the Muses with the study of philosophy. Thus, the plane tree may well connect with the sacred grove in the Academy. One further feature of the Phaedrus topography requires notice here. When Plato speaks of ‘descending to the nympha’s stream and mouseion’, with reference to the the fountain below the plane tree and the associated images of the nympha and Achelous, he may be thinking of an arboreal ‘cave’, more particularly of a cave of the Muses.

The Phaedrus was profoundly influential on later literary topography, especially in the context of musical or philosophical activity. Plutarch refers to it at the start of the Eroticos (set in the Mouseion at Thespiae), as does Lucian at the start of the de Oeco. The plane tree itself is recalled by Cicero in

III.161. Cf. the grove of planes at the shrine of Zeus Stratios at Labraunda (Herod. 5.119); a plane at Gortyn in Crete which was the reputed site of Zeus’ liaison with Europa (Plin. Nat. 12.11); and Agamemnon’s plane at Delphi (Plin. Nat. 16.238; RE Suppl. IV.1340–41).

56 Gymnasia and planes: Delorme (n. 13) 333, citing i.a. Paus. 6.23.1 (Elis); Theophr. Plant. 4.5.6 (Rhegion); Vitruv. 5.2.4; cf. Meiggs (n. 51) 273; RE VII.2022; add Σ Theocr. Id. 18.39.


59 Nympha: 238b–d; 241e; 262d; 278b, cf. 279b. Muses: 237a; cf. 262d (nympha and cicadas [as inspirational ‘prophets of the Muses’] linked).


setting the scene for the *de Oratore* at Crassus’ Tuscanian villa, and the dialogue takes place *sub platano*. Again, the tree is tellingly recalled by Philostratus at *Vita Apollonii* 7.11, where Apollonius and the philosopher Demetrius converse in a Campanian villa which had belonged to Cicero, sitting *ópó πλατάνον*; Demetrius addresses the cicadas as having been taught their song by the Muses; and he later speaks of *τὰ αὐτῶν [sc. the cicadas’] μουσεία*. These phrases help to show that later readers picked up the connection of plane and *μουσεία*, and the philosophical associations.

The inclusion of a plane in an epigrammatic description by Thyillus of a spring sacred to Pan (*AP* 6.170) is directly influenced by the *Phaedrus*, and illuminates the process by which the Platonic plane gained wider currency within sacro-idyllic descriptions. As it happens, the plane tree did not form part of conventional pastoral topography (it does not feature in Theocritean idyllic landscapes or in the *Eclogues*). But the connection between the Muses and plane trees was consciously sustained. In an inscription datable to around the end of the first century A.D. and found at Lubicum outside Rome, a herm bids the passer-by (1–2):

> ἀλλὸς μὲν Μούσαις ἵερον λέγε τοῦτ’ ἀνακείσθαι,
> τὰς βύβλους δείξας τὰς παρὰ ταῖς πλατάνοις

(‘say that this grove is sacred to the Muses, pointing out the books which are located by the plane trees . . .’). The inscription relates to a villa—*Mouseion*, with a library and a grove of plane trees. A later inscription, describing a fourth century A.D. *Mouseion* on the island of Aegina, is still more specific (5–6):

> ἐνθα κε Μούσαι
> ἱστασθαι τερπόμενον πλατάνοις καὶ ύδατίον

(‘where stand the Muses who delight in plane trees and rivulets’). In discussing Juvenal’s reference to *Frontonis platani* (*Sat.* 1.12: poetry recitations in a luxury villa), von Premerstein suggested that the *Labicum Mouseion* (which he wrongly identified with the villa of ‘Fronto’) represents a conventional

---

62 *de Or.* 1.28: ‘*cur non imitamur, Crasse, Socratem illum, qui est in Phaedro Platonis? Nam me haec tua platanus admonuit, quae non minus ad opacandum hunc locum patulis est diffusa ramis, quam illa, cuius umbram secutus est Socrates, quae mithi videtur non tam ipsa acula, quae describitur, quam Platonis oratione crevisse . . .’; the speaker suggests lying down, but Crassus counters with the provision of cushions, *et omnes in eis sedibus, quae erant sub platano, consedisse.*

63 Later references to the *Phaedrus* topography are made at *Lib. Decl.* 2.1.26; *Them.* 32c; 246a.

64 *AP*. 6.170.2: *ἱερὰ κυμφιλαφίς πλατάνος*. Page (n. 46) 96 compares *Phaedr.* 230b *πλατάνος ὑμφιλαφίς*. Pan is part of the sacred context in the *Phaedrus* (263d; 279b) cf. *AP* 6.106.1 (late); Page also notes *AP* 9.220 (Thallus) on a plane tree ‘sacred’ to Aphrodite. Cf. *AP* 1.227, an appeal by a herm to the passer-by to rest and, *inter alia*, listen to the cicadas and to the sound of a shepherd piping beside a fountain, under a plane tree. In *AP* 12.142 (Rhiatus), a ‘sacred [song] bird’ is caught under a plane. At *AP* 1.11.1 (an appeal by a herm to the passer-by to sit and rest *ὑπὸ σκιέρων πλατάνου*). Hermes is also found in explicit conjunction with *Mouseia* at *IG* XIV.1011 (Rome) and *Inscr.* Knidos I no. 301; for Hermes and the Muses, Otto (n. 21) 55.

65 Its appearance at Calp. Sic. 4.2 (below, n. 87) is the more intriguing for this lack of a bucolic background: the passage (address to a silent poet, sitting still, *minaci vultu* and handling a book roll), reads very like a statue description humorously applied to a living poet in the process of composition (the ‘threatening countenance’ has analogues in the furrowed brow expression in plastic art, signifying concentration: Smith (n. 52) 38–39; cf. esp. G. M. A. Richter, *The portraits of the Greeks* (London, 1965) II fig. 1656 (Aratus)).


67 *IG* IV.53; Kaibel no. 271; for an illuminating discussion, L. Robert, ‘*Épigramme d’Égine*’, *Hellenica* IV (Paris, 1948) 6–34.

68 Planes and water: *Il.* 2.307 [cf. *Cic. de Div.* 2.63]; Theogn. 882; *Plat. Phaedr.* 230b; *Theocr. Id.* 25.19–20; *Theophr. Plant.* 1.7.1; *Hor. Odes* 2.11.13; 20; *Calp. Sic.* 4.2; *Stat. Silv.* 2.3.1–5; 39; Paus. 4.34.4.
re-creation of the Platonic Academy. Juvenal’s programmatic text involves particular complexities which cannot be elaborated here: but a playful etymological nexus around Frontonis has direct bearing on the subject: the word *platanus* was recognised to derive from *πλατώς* (‘broad’); Plato’s name was similarly etymologised (from either his ‘broad forehead’ or the ‘breadth of his interpretation’ (Diog. Laert. 3.4); and fronto can refer to ‘a prominent forehead’ (cf. Cic. N. D. 1.80). ‘Frontonis platani’ (= ‘Forehead’s planes’) can thus allude to *Platonis platani*.

The long association of plane trees and Muses suggests that the tree could be emblematic of a *Mouseion* not simply in Plato’s imagined scene by the Ilissus, but in the reality of cult topography. The sacred gardens sometimes incorporated in *Mouseia* will have provided a natural context for trees. The phrase θήκαν ὑπὸ πλατᾶνων could, therefore, carry a reference, readily intelligible to a Hellenistic readership, to a *gymnasion/Mouseion* as the site of Philitas’ public statue, and to the Muses as its dedicatees.

V. Philoxenus and the Muses

Hermesianax does not mention the Muses in the Philitas passage. But in the preceding lines, on Philoxenus (and only there), he gives them notable prominence. They are described (in the ambiguous terms of Hermesianax’ syntax) as the ‘nurses [of Dionysus] who reared and taught Philoxenus to be the most faithful steward [of Dionysus and] of the flute’. This ‘nursing’ terminology seems to derive from Muse cult, and not simply from conventional, literary or metaphorical ways of describing the Muses. A tradition that Muse-nymphs nursed Dionysus is preserved in Eustathius (1816.5); and it has a corollary in Delphian cult traditions about nymph-nurses of Apollo. In the later iconography of Roman sarcophagi, the Muses’ role in a child’s education is regularly juxtaposed with the role of the nurse. And it is a reasonable inference that Hermesianax too alludes to the institutional association of Muses with education, the schoolroom and the *gymnasion*.

---

69 von Premerstein (n. 66) 329, noting the conjunction of Muse cult, library, Hermes (cf. Paus. 1.30.2) and plane trees.

The combination of elements is important, for plane trees, and plane groves, are conventional features of Roman estates at this time: Meiggs (n. 51) 276–77. For Roman re-creations of the Academy, cf. SHA Hadr. 26.5; Vitr. de Arch. 6.7.3.


71 Cicero (de Or. 1.28, above, n. 62) plays with the sound similarity in *platanus/Platonis*. In the intertextual background to Sat 1.1 ff. is Hor. Epp. 2.2.91–108 (on recitation and the search for poetic honours): with *inpupe* (4) cf. 105; with 3–4, cf. 91; with *diem consumpserit*, cf. 97–98; with *vatibus* (18) cf. 102: it may therefore be significant for Juvenal that Horace earlier refers to his Athenian philosophy studies *inter silvas Academi* (45).


74 For the background, Boyancé (n. 21) 278–80; to the evidence cited there, add AP 1.217; cf. also Pind. *Ol*. 1.112, with Gerber.


77 Aeschin. 1.10 for Μούσεια ἐν τοῖς διδασκαλίαις; Herodas 3 (schoolroom and Muses) supplies a wonderful portrayal of the downmarket exploitation of Muse cult at the rough end of the trade; Athen. 348d; Diog. Laert. 6.69; SIG* 577; cf. AP 6.308 (Asclepiades) and 6.310 (Callimachus) with Gow-Page (n. 7) *ad loc*. Lynch (n. 21) 115–16; A. Queyrel, ‘Les Muses à l’école: images de quelques vases du Peintre de Calliope’, *AK* 31 (1988) 87–102; Hardie (n. 18) 20. The later Mimnermeion at Smyrna was attached to a *gymnasion*: *CIG* 3376; Fraser (n. 1) II.468 (n. 57).
In highlighting Philoxenus’ relationship with the Muses, Hermesianax seems, again, to have been drawing on the poetry of his subject, as well as on the biographical tradition. In the *Galatea*, Philoxenus had portrayed the Muses as healers (of the distress caused by unrequited love), a motif which was taken up, in direct imitation, by Theocritus in *Idyll* 11.78 A fascinating insight into what the third century made of Philoxenus and his Muses is vouchsafed by Machon (who worked in Alexandria around 250 B.C.):79 Machon envisages a deathbed scene in which Philoxenus dictates his will to his doctor; speaking of his dithyrambs, Philoxenus says (79f. Gow) ἀνατίθημι ταῖς ἐμοίωτοι συντρόφοις / Μοῦσαις – Ἀφροδίτην καὶ Δίόνυσον ἑπιτρόπους (‘I dedicate them to my foster sisters, the Muses – with Aphrodite and Dionysus as trustees’). Machon evidently names deities who were prominent in Philoxenus’ poetry and/or his biographical tradition. That he should select Dionysus and the Muses, both named by Hermesianax, may not be coincidental; and that the Muses are termed συντρόφοι (literally, ‘nurtured together with’) might have some bearing on Hermesianax’ reference to the Muses’ ‘nurturing’ of Philoxenus.80 In any case the testamentary act of dedication to the Muses carries, *ipso facto*, comic reference of some kind to Muse cult.81 Machon’s pastiche of Philoxenus’ will is intriguingly reminiscent of the published wills of the heads of the Lyceum (starting with Theophrastus), with their dispositions as to the school *Mouseion*, the ἀναθήματα therein, and their own books.82 Whether the proximity is deliberate or coincidental lies beyond the scope of this article; but Machon’s further joke, that Charon does not permit him σχολάζειν (literally ‘to hang around’, but with possible reference to school activity [LSJ s. v. III.3]) might suggest some cross-fertilisation between the Muse cults – and collective institutions – of philosophy and of poetry.83

We do not know whether Philoxenus himself engaged in teaching. Yet the poet’s profession, particularly in dithyrambic and dramatic poetry, frequently involved the instruction of choruses.84 Sophocles himself is supposed to have established a *thiasos* to the Muses, perhaps from among his pupils, depending on the sense of ταῖς . . . Μοῦσαις θίασον ἐκ τῶν πεπαθιμένων συναρτησέων: *Vita 6*: the context suggests specific reference to ‘educated persons’ who were, or had been, Sophocles’ χορευταί.

So far as concerns Philitas, the question prompted by Hermesianax’ statements about Philoxenus’ Muses is whether they carry any relevance for the Coan and his statue, within the catalogue ‘pairing’. Might the explicit reference to Muse cult be intended discreetly to complement an implicit reference to Muse cult in θήκαιν ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ? If it is correct to think that Hermesianax’ pairing of Philoxenus and Philitas presents a challenge to the reader(s), requiring them to identify the grounds for associating the two poets, then the implicit association may plausibly be found in the Muses, and specifically in the Muses’ role in education.

---


79 On Machon, and his approximate dates, A. S. F. Gow, *Machon* (Cambridge, 1964) 5–7; Fraser (n. 1) II.844 n. 322.

80 In an educational context, see the ‘decree for Ptolemais’ at L. and J. Robert, *Claros I*: décrets hellénistiques fasc. 1 (Paris, 1989) 11 line 3–4 τὴν μὲν νομον τοῖς καλλίστοις συντρέφον μοθήμασίν.

81 For something approaching literal dedication of ‘musical’ work to the Muses, cf. *Inscr. Knidos* I 301.5–6 (the *Mouseion*-memorial for an Antigonos at Cnidus in the context of a gymnastic and musical festival): Μοῦσαι δι σοι ἐτ' τι νέμομεν / ἐκθόν. ἀπάρχεσθαι διήμοιν ἐκ με[λ]ῆτις.

82 Diog. Laert. 5.51–57 (Theophrastus: esp. 51–52 on the *Mouseion*, the offerings and the books); 5.61–64 (Strato: esp. 62, on the books); 5.69–74 (Lyco: esp. 73 on published/unpublished books).

83 Cf. Boyancé (n. 21) 312–16.

VI. Fr. 14 P.: The Chair and the Old Plane Tree

That fr. 14 P. θηρήσσαθαι πλατάνῳ γραφή ὡσ; (‘to be seated under an old plane tree’), is related to Herm. fr. 7.76 P. has long been suspected. Commentators sense that a connection is likely, but in the absence of proof, the verdict of non liquet by and large remains.85 However, there is a neglected angle, in θηρήσσαθαι (‘to sit’).

Athenaeus, citing fr. 14 P., suggests that θρόνος (‘chair’) derives etymologically from θρόμαι:86 there is therefore a fair chance that θηρήσσαθαι (attested only here, and evidently one of Philitas’ rare lexical usages) signifies not simply the sitting posture, but the state of sitting on a chair. Now, while the poet/singer ‘sitting under the plane’ is paralleled in later bucolic,87 and sitting under other trees is a regular feature of that genre, the chair does not regularly appear in pastoral or idyllic landscape. It is missing from (for example) the sacro-idyllic scene in Plato’s Phaedrus (230b), where Phaedrus and Socrates lie under a plane tree (though chairs do feature in Cicero’s imitation of that scene in the de Oratore).88 This suggests that fr. 14 P. does not refer to some imagined sacro-idyllic scene (such as a bucolic musical performance). Some other scenario is being evoked. The (implicit) chair may in fact connect with Hellenistic representations of the seated poet in plastic art, where a chair is often a prominent feature.89 Most such representations suggest the process of composition, sometimes coupled with Muse-inspiration.90 However, at least one seated statue depicts a poet (Moschion) in the act of performing (though not sitting on a θρόνος); and there is good evidence, from a slightly later period, of Hellenistic iconography of the seated poet, on a chair, in declamatory posture (below, VII).91 If fr. 14 P. were itself to evoke plastic art, then there would be stronger grounds than hitherto postulated for associating the line with the statue of the singing Philitas, and thus, directly or indirectly, with Herm fr. 7.76 P. It would follow that Philitas was depicted in a seated posture. It would also follow, with a fair degree of probability, that Hermesianax’ statue-locator ὅπο πλατάνῳ derives (directly or indirectly) from whichever Philitan poem contained fr. 14 P.

γραφή (‘old’) may suggest an appropriate location for an old person, as do old trees in Roman bucolic: at Eclogues 9.9, the ‘old beech trees’ (veteres . . . fagos) are part of a landscape inhabited by veteres coloni (4) and by the aged poet Moeris; and a pairing of old tree with old ‘judge of poetry’ is found at Calp. Sic. 2.21–22 and 98. As a representation of ‘age’, then, fr. 14 P. could be aligned with programmatic self-presentation by an ‘old poet’.

Among the new epigrams of Poseidippus found in a recently discovered papyrus, there is, I understand, one which describes the statue of Philitas. Assessment of its relevance for the arguments put forward in this paper must clearly await eventual publication. While on currently available evidence it cannot be assumed that Philitas was depicted as an old man, fr. 14 P. certainly points in that direction;

85 Hollis (n. 47) 58; Dickie (n. 10) 380 n. 22.
86 Athen. 192e ἐντοθὲν αὐτὸν ὀνόμασαν θρόνον τοῦ θηρήσασθαι χάριν, ὢπερ ἐκ τοῦ καθέζεσθαι τάσσομαι, ὢς Φιλίτας.
87 Calp. Sic. 4.1–3: quid tacitus, Corydon, vultuque subinde minaci / quidve sub hac platano, quam garrulus astrepit umor, / i insuetu statione sedes?
88 Above, n. 62 (chairs and cushions, probably combining nature and civilisation): contrast Sen. Epp. 94.70 quis sub alicuius arboris rusticae proiectus umbra luxuriae suae pompam solus explicuit? The choice between sitting on the grass and lying is presented by Phaedrus (229b), and Socrates later chooses to lie (230c). Cf. Calp. Sic. 6.70–71; pastoral characters may variously choose to sit or lie (Theocrit. Id. 7.132; 144; Virg. Ecl. 1.1; cf. esp. Hor. Odes 2.11.13–14: sub alta . . . platano . . . iacentes).
89 Richter (n. 65) figs. 1514, 1515, 1524, 1526, 1527 (Menander); 1647 (Poseidippus); 1656–57 (Aratus); 1661, 1663 (Theocritus?); 1664 (Lycophron?); 1666–69 (Moschion). Smith (n. 52) 39.
90 Thus Richter (n. 65) figs. 1515, 1524, 1526, 1527, 1647, 1656, 1657.
91 Richter (n. 65) figs. 1666–67. For seated poet in declamatory posture, see also LIMC s. v. Mousa, Mousai 271 (below, VII).
and we will not go far wrong in reading Hermesianax’ description of Philitas ‘worn out [in his research] on all words and all dialect’ as interpretative of a statue showing the poet near the end of his life.

VII. Heroic Honours for Philitas

Adrian Hollis has suggested (on the basis of Herm. fr. 7.75–78 P., and later references in Propertius 3.1 and 3.9 and in Statius, Silvae 1.2), that Philitas received heroic honours, and that the statue may have been connected with them.92 This suggestion is in fact strengthened by the arguments outlined earlier. Hollis does not address the question of whether Philitas was alive or dead at the time of the statue award. But the question itself allows of no certain answer, tied up as it is with the disputed dating of the Leontion (above, II). Of two points, however, we can be confident: Hermesianax’ text can be read as a tribute either to a living poet or to a dead poet; and the statue award might, similarly, have honoured the living Philitas or have been dedicated as a posthumous honour.93 In our present state of understanding, no conclusive choice seems possible. Yet choice may not be strictly necessary. The setting up of a statue of an old poet was not simply an honour to the living figure and his life’s work, but also the guarantee of posthumous honour. The ‘Seal’ of Poseidippus (Suppl. Hell. 705) expresses a wish for a statue which can be read as an honour both for the living and for the dead poet;94 there is no suggestion that the statue should be delayed until the poet’s eventual death; on the other hand, the poet is talking of old age, is anticipating his death as an event not to be long delayed, and in that context gives instructions as to the manner in which funerary/honorific observance is to take place at his statue.95 In contemplating his own γήρας (‘old age’, 5) and approaching death, Poseidippus aspires to heroic immortality, articulated in a request for a statue which will be the focal point of his cult, but which may yet be set up in his lifetime. A comparable situation is perhaps envisaged in Enn. Var. 15–16 Vahlen, ap. Cic. Tusc. 1.34: quid? poetae nonne post mortem nobilitari volunt? unde ergo illud: ‘Aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam:/hic vestrum panxit maxima facta patrum (the poet speaks of his imago as senex, before death, set up in public to win posthumous glory). And from a very different source, there is the story of the statue voted to the old (but living) ‘Homer’ at Argos (Certamen 302–14), together with regular ‘sacrifice’ (θυσία) to him.96

Poseidippus’ remarkable poem seems to reflect a situation common in life and literature, where a living man, anticipating death, gives instructions for the handling of post mortem matters.97 A statue might feature in such mandata morituri: the philosopher Lyco made provision in his will for a statue of himself to be set up in the Lyceum, on the model of the statues of Aristotle and others already set up there.98 If the main argument of this article is correct, and Philitas’ statue was indeed set up in a Mouseion, whether before his death or after, it would have been a powerful focal point for posthumous

---

92 Hollis (n. 47).
95 Lloyd-Jones (n. 94) 91–92 suggests that the poet may ask ‘his fellow citizens to pour wine through his ‘kindly mouth’, i.e. over the mouth of his statue’. This seems very plausible: στόμα can scarcely be the mouth of the corpse, before burial (the comparison with Archilochus at 18 suggests continuing offerings, and not simply a funeral ritual).
96 For later worship of Homer at his statue, cf. [Lucian] Enc. Dem. 1–2 (an epic poet prays to a statue of Homer for abundance of verse, and makes offerings of poetry on Homer’s birthday; the statue is in a stoa dedicated to the Ptolemites, close to the temple of the Ptolemaic a significant juxtaposition, arising from Ptolemaic patronage of the cult of Homer)).
98 Diog. Laert. 5.71.
honours. This is because the cult of the Muses had a central role in the commemoration and heroisation of the dead. One influence in this context will have been the heroisation of Plato, at the Academy, sanctioned (it would seem) by a Delphic oracle. In the same Platonic tradition is the hero cult of Arideikes, linked with offerings to the Muses who nurtured the philosopher during his life. In the private sphere, the provisions made by Epikteta for a heroic cult of her son and husband in a late third century Mouseion on Thera illustrate the trend.

The signal honour of a public statue in a gymnasium/Mouseion could reasonably have prompted the expectation of similar cult for Philitas. Civic recognition and sacral location would thus work together in a highly honorific way: the location of his statue in the Mouseion would mark Philitas as one beloved of the Muses, the recipient of their protection in his lifetime, and for that reason guaranteed heroic immortality.

Whether such ‘heroic immortality’ was reflected in the statue itself is quite another question. A statue portraying Philitas as old and ‘worn out’ is unlikely to have carried any heroic characterisation. But Muse/poet iconography may help to illustrate some of the concepts evoked in Herm. fr. 7.75–78 P. A round piece of ceramic datable to the late first century B.C., but deriving from an earlier Hellenistic model, shows a poet sitting on a chair under the branch of a tree. He faces a Muse holding a dramatic mask, and a second Muse is visible in the background. A companion piece shows a poet, again seated on a chair in the presence of two Muses, but in a declamatory posture and with a young man, perhaps a goatherd, listening in the background. The same scenes are represented in later vase decoration.

They seem to represent the inspiration of a dramatic poet by the Muses, in a pastoral setting; but the presence of an altar in the later (vase-decoration) version underlines the sacral dimension. On one interpretation, this altar reflects the cult of the poet himself. If that were correct, the iconography might relate to a well known pattern of motifs whereby a poet’s sacred initiation by the Muses is associated with the heroic status he attains on his death. In a later age, this concept is very clearly represented on Roman sarcophagi, where persons who have been (in the broadest sense) disciples of the Muses in life achieve heroic status, under the protection of the Muses, after death. But another, and perhaps more plausible, explanation is that the altar is that of the Muses themselves. This reading is supported by what look like classical forerunners of the Hellenistic iconography, in a series of vase

99 Boyancé (n. 21) 277–351; Marrou (n. 76) 231–57.
100 Anon. Vita Platonis p. 9 Westermarck; Boyancé (n. 21) 272–75; RE I.1134.
102 IG 3.330; Boyancé (n. 21) 330–44.
103 Cf. esp. Marrou (n. 76) 231–57.
104 LIMC Mousa, Mousai, no. 272. O. Kurz in J. Hackin (ed.), Nouvelles recherches archéologiques à Begram. Mémoires de la délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan XI (Paris, 1954) 134–36. Kurz suggests that the poet may be Sophocles, and that it is related to Sophocles’ appearance as lyre player in the Thamyris and to a painting of him in this role in the Stoa Poikile (cf. Vit. Soph. 5); this suggestion gains further support from a forerunner of the ceramic iconography, a late fifth century vase painting showing Thamyris playing his lyre under a tree, listened to by two Muses: LIMC Mousa, Mousai, no. 81.
105 LIMC Mousa, Mousai, no. 271. Kurz (n. 105) ibid.
107 So Mandel (n. 107) 147 (with reference to Kurz’ suggestion that the poet is Sophocles); Sophocles’ reported thiasos of the Muses (above, V) may well be relevant in this context. For Sophocles’ heroisation, Vita 15–17; M. R. Lefkowitz, The lives of the Greek poets (London, 1981) 86–87.
109 Marrou (n. 76) 231–57, esp. 246–47, on the representation of Muses with readers or speakers.
paintings dealing with the subject of Thamyris and the Muses. In one, Thamyris is shown seated under a tree, playing his lyre to a listening Muse; but in a Crater by Polion depicting Thamyris, the Muses and Apollo, we find in addition Thamyris’ mother Argiope praying in front of an altar above which are nine xoana (images of the Muses) and behind which is a laurel tree. Here, then, the Thamyris legend is plainly related to a Muse cult which is itself Apolline in character (as indicated by the emblematic laurel). Whichever interpretation of the altar is correct, these vase decorations, when taken together with the evidence of fr. 14 P. that Philitas was depicted sitting (above, VI), help relate Hermesianax’ statue description to an established tradition of poet iconography, and to associate the seated poet under the tree with the Muses.

VIII. Conclusion

If, as I have postulated, there existed in early third century Cos a gymnasium/Mouseion with which Philitas was prominently associated, would this bring us any closer to understanding the professional milieu of the poets who worked in Cos, then and later? A century ago, Reitzenstein argued for the existence of a cult circle of Coan poets. This suggestion, which was put forward as part of a wider theory about the cultic associations of bucolic poetry, had only flimsy support in Coan evidence and attracted little scholarly assent. There is no requirement to re-open the controversy here. However, Reitzenstein also referred, without elaboration, to a Coan ἀναγομένος. In doing so, he may indeed have touched on a focal point for collective literary activity. Elsewhere in the Greek world, Mouseia were centres for such collective ‘musical’ activity, in particular for literary competitions, from at least the fifth century onwards. It would be unsurprising if the same pattern of activity appeared on Cos. A Coan Mouseion would very likely have been a focal point for poets and their epideictic performances.

Might a Coan Mouseion reflect the influence of the Ptolemaic Mouseion, a cult-institutional link between Alexandria and Cos? Here we are on very speculative territory. But again, the plane tree may be relevant: if, as was suggested by von Premerstein (above, IV), the tree could evoke the Academy and Lyceum, and their respective Mouseia, it could equally have acquired an extended symbolism in respect of Mouseia founded in the same cult tradition. In other words, Philitas’ plane tree could have been emblematic of a Coan Mouseion founded under Ptolemaic patronage, and under the influence of the Alexandrian Mouseion, itself a linear descendant of the Academy and the Lyceum. This would certainly be consistent with the known facts of Ptolemaic association with Cos, with Ptolemy Philadelphus’ birth there, with the extensive interchange between Cos and Alexandrian science and literature, and above all with Ptolemy Soter’s choice of Philitas as his son’s tutor and with Philitas’ distinguished career at Alexandria. Ptolemaic influence in Cos was re-established in the later 280s, and this would be a plausible period for a Mouseion on the Alexandrian model, if such were indeed instituted; and the new Hellenistic monarchies, including Philetaritus of Pergamum and (probably) Arsinoe Philadelphus

\[\text{110 LIMC Moua, Mousai, no. 810}\]
\[\text{111 LIMC Moua, Mousai, no. 92; cf. nos. 87, 88.; R. Harriott, Poetry and criticism before Plato (London, 1969) 28–30.}\]
\[\text{112 Mandel (n. 107) 148 well notes the parallel between Hermesianax’ description of the Philitas statue and these artistic scenes.}\]
\[\text{114 Competitions: Vitruv. 7 praef. 4 (Alexandria); Cnidus: above, n. 81; Mouseia festival at Thespiae (Helicon): Schachter (n. 22) 163–79. In gymnasia: L. and J. Robert (n. 80) 19–20 (Pergamum and Priene). For an auditorium (or odeion) in a later private Mouseion, Robert (n. 67) 32 (Aegina). For \(\muουσεία\) as places for ‘gatherings devoted to music and song’, by the fifth century B.C., see esp. the figurative \(\chiελικον\ μουσεία\) at Aristoph. Frogs 93, with Dover’s note; for the metaphor cf. also Eur. Hel. 174, 1107.}\]
\[\text{115 Cos and Alexandria: Sherwin-White (n. 1) 102–107}\]
\[\text{116 Ptolemy and Cos: Sherwin-White (n. 1) 83–85; 90–102.}\]
were taking an active interest in patronage of Muse cult in Greece. A Coan gymnasium would have been an appropriate focus for Ptolemaic benefaction; and Philitas, teacher, scholar and poet, sitting under the plane, would have been a fine adornment of a Coan institution dedicated to the Muses and symbolising their patronage of education.

Appendix: The Date of the Leontion

Fr. 7.72 P. (Philoxenus ‘came through this city on his way to Ortygia [Ephesus]’) has been cited as a primary piece of evidence. Hermesianax’ home town was Colophon, and given the proximity of Colophon and Ephesus it was a natural assumption that he was here referring to Colophon. On that basis, it has been argued that the poem must have been written before the capture of Colophon by Lysimachus, its reported destruction, and the transfer of its inhabitants to Ephesus. These events probably took place by 294, and seem certainly to have done so by 289/8. There is therefore a case of sorts for dating the Leontion to the period 300–295 (that is, roughly to the period when Philitas will have been chosen to be Philadelpus’ tutor). But it ignores evidence for the re-establishment of Colophon by 281 B.C., as well as an important discussion by L. and J. Robert who argue that although the destruction of Colophon took place as reported, the city was refounded relatively quickly, following the probable intervention of Lysimachus’ general, Prepelaus. Moreover, ‘this city’ may not refer to Colophon at all. A recurring motif in Hermesianax’ catalogue is the poet who leaves home in pursuit of love. Orpheus journeyed from Thrace to Hades (1–3); Hesiod left his Boeotian home for Ascra (21–23); Homer left his native land for Ithaka (29; 32); Antimachus pursued Lyde to the Pactolus and then returned ‘to high Colophon’ (41–46 [n. b., not to ‘this city’]); Anacreon left his home to visit Lesbos (53–55); Sophocles left Colonus (57–58); Philoxenus himself had left Cythera (69). It is therefore quite possible that Hermesianax pursued the fleeing Leontion from his home city to some other city (named at an earlier point in the poem); and that he draws a parallel between himself and Philitas, both journeying through ‘this city’ – whichever it was. In my view, the Leontion was written substantially later than 295. This view gains some support from evidence (VI) that the statue depicted Philitas as an old man. Fraser’s dating, between 280 and 270, is quite plausible.

118 Dating: Fraser (n. 1) II.883 n. 61 (arguing for 280–270); Bing (n. 26) 624 n. 17 (arguing for pre-295). The terminus ante quem for the fall of Colophon, and the transfer of its citizens to the refounded Ephesus (renamed Arsinoeia) is established by SIG3 368.24 (289/8, using the new name). For 294, Fraser refers to the argumentation of D. Magie, Roman rule in Asia Minor (Princeton, 1950) II.921 n. 13. Pausanias’ assumption (1.9.7) that Hermesianax must have died before the fall of Colophon, since he does not refer to it in his poetry (as did Phoenix) has no evidential authority for the poet’s life.
119 L. and J. Robert (n. 80), 77–85 (noting the relevance of a hero cult of Prepelaus referred to in the newly published ‘decreed for Menippus’; for the 281 evidence, see Inschr. Priene 57 (discussed by the Roberts at 82).
120 Fraser (n. 1) II.883 n. 61. A feature of Fr. 7 P. is the appearance of terminology which overlaps with that of Alexandrian literary debate/polemic: for example, in the Orpheus passage, μακρόν (5), μεγάλον (6), ἵππον ὀφρύσι (9; cf. AP 7.109.2; also Aristoph. Frogs 925; Cameron [n. 18] 333); and the reference to λεπτότης in the Homer passage (29). The subject might repay systematic treatment, which lies well beyond present purposes. It is not a necessary inference from fr. 7.75–78 P. that Philitas is dead (as von Blumenthal, RE XIX.2165, Fraser [ibid.] and others): see Bing (n. 26) 624 n. 17. For Philitas’ birth (c. 340): Fraser (n. 1) II.464 n. 19.