In his wide-ranging and always sensitive studies of Classical literature, Manuel Fernández-Galiano pays particular attention to the relations between different texts and to the poetic resonances created by those relations. This brief examination of some possible echoes between two of the subtlest poems of Hellenistic literature may, I hope, add to his pleasure in receiving this warm tribute from his many friends, admirers, and well-wishers.

In the second part of Idyll 2, the abandoned Simaetha turns from practising her magical spells against Delphis to going over the beginnings of her passion. First she describes how she caught sight of Delphis on a procession to the grove of Artemis, fell madly in love, and managed to invite him to her house (65-101). Then she relates their fateful meeting. When she saw Delphis crossing the threshold, she suffered the familiar symptoms of desperate love (106-110; cf. Sappho frag. 31.7-13 LP). As she recreates the scene from memory, she recalls the *ipsissima verba* that Delphis spoke to her as he sat on her couch (114-16):

- Η ρά με, Σιμαίθα, τόσον ἐφθασας, ὅσον ἐγώ θην
  πρῶν ποια τὸν χαρίεντα τράχων ἐφθασα Φιλίνον,
  ἐς τὸ τεῦν καλέσασα τόδε στέγος ἢ μὲ παρῆμεν.

Commentators have noted the connection between τὸν χαρίεντα Φιλίνον here and τὸν ἰμερόεντα Φιλίνον, the hard-to-get boy-love of Aratus who is the subject of Simichidas' song in the Seventh Idyll. In this paper I wish to explore some further ramifications of this connection.

Simaetha goes on to quote Delphs' promise, sworn to «sweet Eros», that he would have come himself in few days, with the «apples of Dionysus», the garland of white poplar sacred to Heracles, and axes and torches in case the door was bolted against him (118-28). We cannot be certain whether the elaboration of these details reflects Delphs' strategy or Simaetha's exaggeration as she views the event through the lenses of her past desires and hopes. In either case the lines contrast her inexperience and Delphs' thorough familiarity with the erotic conventions of pursuit and seduction.

Delphis’ lines refer to the κόμος in which the courting lover pays his attentions to his beloved. As Steven Walker has recently noted, the inversion of the usual male-female roles of this courtship—the girl pursuing the boy—brings as a consequence the omission of the comastic activity at the house of the girl. Delphis «would have come», he says (118), but in fact he never has. On the contrary, Simaetha learns later that he performed the comastic revel at the house of a rival (cf. 153).

The associations of Philinus with the κόμος in Idyll 7 cast light on Simaetha’s situation in Idyll 2. In 7.121-25 Simichidas refers to the comastic honors of which Philinus had been the scornful recipient:

αιαί, φαντί, Φιλίνε, το τοι χαλόν ἄνθος ἀπορρεῖ.
μηκέτι τοι φρουρέομες ἐπὶ προθύροιν, Ἀρατε,  
μηδὲ πόδας τρίβωμες ὦ δ’ ὀρθρίος ἄλλον ἀλέκτωρ
κοκκάσδουν νάρκασιν ἀναραϊσι διδοῖν.  
eἰς δ’ ἀπὸ τάσδε, φέριστε, Μόλων ἄγχοιτο παλαιστρας...

To readers familiar with the Seventh Idyll or with the Philinus to whom it refers, Delphis’ reference to the κόμος would suggest both his erotic experience and also his involvement in homosexual love-affairs. His simile about getting ahead of Philinus in 115 may also be an allusion to the athletic associations where such affairs among young men often had their beginnings. In 7.125 Simichidas alludes to a rival «from this palaestra», and the palaestra or gymnasium recurs throughout Simaetha’s account of her love for Delphis (8, 51, 80, 97; cf. 156).

Simaetha’s later information that Delphis is in love with someone else includes the possibility that it may be either a boy- or girl-love (150 f.)

κεῖτε νῦν αὐτε γυναικός ἤχει πόθος εἴτε καὶ ἀνδρός,  
oὐκ ἔφατ’ ἀτρεκές ἰδμεν, ὁτάρ τόσον...

With this passage we may compare another reference to the pursuit of Philinus in the Seventh Idyll. There Simichidas prays Pan to bring Aratus’ beloved to him (7.103-5):

tὸν μοι, Πάν, Ὀμόλας ἔρατον πέδον ὄστε λέλογχας,
ἀχλήτων τήνοιο φίλας ἐς χείρας ἐρείσαις,
ἐὰν’ ἐστ’ ἄρα Φιλίνος ὁ μαλθακός εἴτε τις ἄλλος.

2 For the conventions of the κόμος in the courting of a girl or boy see F. O. Copley, Exclusus Amator (APA Monographs 17), 1956, 1-27; F. Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry, Edinburgh, 1972, 144-47, 202-4. Idyll 3 is a humorously bucolic variation on the motif: see GOW vol. 2, p. 64.

3 S. Walker, Theocritus, Boston, 1980, 97 f.

4 The possibility of Delphis’ interest in both sexes may be hinted at in the poem’s opening lines, where Simaetha complains that both Eros and Aphrodite have carried off his fickle heart (6 f.).
As in 2.150, the motif of the unknown lover takes the form of a disjunctive conditional clause, ἢτε ... ἢτε (7.105). We may also compare Simaetha’s remark earlier (2.44), where she prepares her magic against the unfaithful Delphis, ἢτε γυνὰ τῆνῳ παρακέλιται ἢτε καὶ ἄνήρ. More important is the ἀκλήτος motif of 7.104. In Idyll 2 the reversal of male and female roles in pursuing the beloved consists precisely in the fact that Delphis has not been ἀκλήτος: Simaetha took the initiative and «called» him first (2.116): ἐς τὸ τεὸν καλέσασα τόδε στέγος ἢ μὲ παρῆμεν.

The mention of Philinus in 2.114-16, then, suggests that Delphis has been carrying on an active love-life of which Simaetha is ignorant and also that his predilections are not of the sort that she can compete against. While she has thoughts only of Delphis, he has an erotic range far beyond her ken, and her ignorance enhances the pathos of her betrayal.

This interpretation of the relation between Idylls 2 and 7 requires that Theocritus intended the two works to illuminate one another, a position that has been argued by a number of scholars. It also implies that Idyll 2 was written later than Idyll 7, although it is also possible that Theocritus reworked the two passages with a view to one another after he had completed more or less finished versions of the two poems. A third possibility is that both poems draw upon what may have been common knowledge about Philinus and his affairs. In any case, the readers familiar with both poems would be expected to grasp the distance between Simaetha and Delphis when the latter begins to talk of Philinus. To the knowing reader Delphis’ mention of «graceful Philinus» in 2.115 suggest that he has had ample opportunities to develop his expertise in the paraclausithyron. When Simaetha’s informant later tells her that he is in fact making use of those arts of seduction elsewhere (καὶ φάτο οἱ στεφάνοις τὰ δόματα τῆνα πυκαζείν, 2.153), she confirms the suspicions raised by the allusion to «graceful Philinus» and to the komos some forty lines before.

The reader familiar with both poems, then, enjoys a perspective on the situation not available to Simaetha. This double perspective enhances the pathos of Simaetha’s plight; but it also contributes to the sophisticated irony that distances us from the event in an attitude of


6 On Philinus’ dates and athletic activities see Gow ad 2.115.
amused, if compassionate, observation. It reminds us of the artificial, literary quality of this narrative: Simaetha exists not as a living person (however realistic her immediate surroundings may look) but as the creation of a literary text\(^7\), and this text is more or less consciously interwoven with other texts, in this case the comastic involvements of the figure of Philinus in the Seventh Idyll.
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\[^7\text{On the limits to the realism of the Second Idyll, especially in the matter of language, see Gianfranco Fabiano, «Fluctuation in Theocritus' Style», GRBS 12, 1971, 535 f.}\]