



2808945607

REFERENCE ONLY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON THESIS

Degree *PhD*
PhD Year *2006* Name of Author *PAPACHRYSSOS*
Tomou, Atina

COPYRIGHT

This is a thesis accepted for a Higher Degree of the University of London. It is an unpublished typescript and the copyright is held by the author. All persons consulting the thesis must read and abide by the Copyright Declaration below.

COPYRIGHT DECLARATION

I recognise that the copyright of the above-described thesis rests with the author and that no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.

LOANS

Theses may not be lent to individuals, but the Senate House Library may lend a copy to approved libraries within the United Kingdom, for consultation solely on the premises of those libraries. Application should be made to: Inter-Library Loans, Senate House Library, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

REPRODUCTION

University of London theses may not be reproduced without explicit written permission from the Senate House Library. Enquiries should be addressed to the Theses Section of the Library. Regulations concerning reproduction vary according to the date of acceptance of the thesis and are listed below as guidelines.

- A. Before 1962. Permission granted only upon the prior written consent of the author. (The Senate House Library will provide addresses where possible).
- B. 1962 - 1974. In many cases the author has agreed to permit copying upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.
- C. 1975 - 1988. Most theses may be copied upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.
- D. 1989 onwards. Most theses may be copied.

This thesis comes within category D.

This copy has been deposited in the Library of _____

This copy has been deposited in the Senate House Library, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

**“A COMMENTARY ON SELECTED FRAGMENTS
OF MIDDLE COMEDY”**

ATHINA PAPACHRYSTOMOU

**A thesis submitted for the fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classics**

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

UMI Number: U593095

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U593095

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

The period of Middle Comedy comprises more than fifty poets and more than one thousand fragments. In my thesis I study six of these poets; Amphis, Aristophon, Dionysius, Mnesimachus, Philetaerus, and Theophilus. The study takes the form of a commentary on the more substantial fragments of these poets. The commentary deals with philological and textual issues. Through the use of antecedents and parallels where available, it also places the fragments within the context of the surviving corpus for each author and the comic tradition in order to trace the main motifs, trends, and patterns of this period. In many cases Old Comedy stands as the antecedent, and often Middle Comedy appears to pave the way for Menander and New Comedy. The picture that emerges is that of simultaneous continuity and change of Greek Comedy. Wherever possible I attempt to reconstruct at least the theme and on occasion the plot outline of the plays.

My commentary is preceded by an introduction, where I deal with the question of the validity of the term “Middle Comedy”, look briefly into the recent research relating to Middle Comedy, discuss questions of sources and their problems, and lay out the methodology that I deploy throughout the commentary.

Statement of Authenticity

This dissertation is the result of my own work, includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration, and does not exceed the permitted length of 100000 words (including footnotes and references but excluding bibliography).

Athina Papachrysostomou

Table of Contents

• Abstract.....	2
• Statement of Authenticity.....	3
• Table of Contents.....	4
• Acknowledgements.....	5
• Abbreviations.....	6-8
• General Introduction.....	9-28
• Amphis.....	29-99
• Aristophon.....	100-148
• Dionysius.....	149-181
• Mnesimachus.....	182-219
• Philetaerus.....	220-246
• Theophilus.....	247-280
• Bibliography.....	281-302

Acknowledgments

For the completion of this thesis I feel greatly thankful to my supervisor, Professor Chris Carey. He constantly supported me throughout, giving me valuable feedback, guiding my research and saving me from many wrong turns. I would like to thank him for his incessant assistance, from answering instantly – but still comprehensively – to my e-mails, to arranging frequent meetings to discuss my work, despite his busy schedule. His help to me has been priceless, and there are no words to express my gratitude.

I would also like to thank my second supervisor, Mr Alan Griffiths, for his help during the early stages of my thesis, and also Professor Cornelia Roemer, for her support whenever I needed some advice. I also owe many thanks to the staff of the library of the Institute of Classical Studies, for their valuable help that extended even beyond their duties.

But the completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the financial support of the “Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation (Greek Section of Scholarships and Research)”, who generously granted me a scholarship for a 48 months period. This proved absolutely vital, for I was able to concentrate exclusively on my research, without having to work to sustain myself.

I would also like to express my deep gratitude to the lecturers of University of Athens Dr. Vassilis Lentakis and Dr. Elli Filokyrou, for their genuine friendship, and extremely valuable help and guidance.

Special thanks are due to my fiancé, Dr. Georgios Vlachos, for his emotional support and encouragement during the final – and most critical – stages of my thesis.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my parents, Christophoros and Antonia, who supported me throughout, both financially and emotionally, and to whom I dedicate this thesis.

Abbreviations

For ancient authors and works this thesis follows the abbreviations used by *LSJ* (ninth edition 1940, with new supplement added 1996). The comic fragments are cited according to the numbering of Kassel-Austin's edition, unless otherwise stated. The following abbreviations are also used:

- *CAH: The Cambridge Ancient History*
- *CGFP: Comiorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta*
- *CIG: Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*
- *DK: Diels-Kranz, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*
- *EpGF: Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*
- *Fasti: Fasti Hellenici*
- *FGrH: Die Fragmente der Griechischer Historiker*
- *FHG: Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*
- *GG: Grammatici Graeci*
- *GGM: Geographi Graeci Minores*
- *IG: Inscriptiones Graecae*
- *LGPN: A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*
- *LIMC: Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*
- *PA: Prosopographia Attica*
- *PMG: Poetae Melici Graeci*
- *PMGF: Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*
- *PPF: Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta*
- *SEG: Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
- *SH: Supplementum Hellenisticum*
- *SVF: Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*
- *TGF: Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*
- *V.: Voigt, Sappho et Alcaeus*

- *Arnott: Alexis: The Fragments: A Commentary*
- *Baiter & Sauppe: Oratores Attici*

- Beazley, *Paralipomena: Paralipomena: Additions to "Attic Black-figure Vase-painters" and to "Attic Red-figure Vase-painters"*
- Bechtel, *Spitznamen: Die einstämmigen männlichen Personennamen des Griechischen, die aus Spitznamen hervorgegangen sind*
- ——— *Frauennamen: Die attischen Frauennamen*
- ——— *Personennamen: Die historischen Personennamen der Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*
- Bekker *Anecdota: Anecdota Graeca*
- Bieber *HT: History of the Greek and Roman Theater*
- Breitenbach *Titulorum: De genere quodam titulorum comoediae Atticae*
- Denniston *GP: Greek Particles*
- Edmonds: *Elegy and Iambus with the Anacreontea*
- Herwerden *Collectanea: Collectanea critica, epicritica, exegetica sive Addenda ad Theodori Kockii opus Comicoorum Atticorum Fragmenta*
- Hunter: *Eubulus: The Fragments*
- Jacobs *Additamenta: Additamenta animadversionum in Athenaei Deipnosophistas, in quibus et multa Athenaei et plurima aliorum scriptorum loca tractantur*
- Kassel-Austin (or K.-A.): *Poetae Comici Graeci*
- Konstantakos: *A Commentary on the Fragments of Eight Plays of Antiphanes*
- Kühn: *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia* (cited by volume and page number)
- Kühner-Blass: *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Erster Teil: Elementar- und Formenlehre*
- Kühner-Gerth: *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*
- Madvig *Adversaria: Adversaria critica ad scriptores graecos et latinos*
- Meineke (or FCG): *Fragmenta Comicoorum Graecorum*
- ——— *Analecta: Analecta critica ad Athenaei Deipnosophistas*
- Millis: *A Commentary on the Fragments of Anaxandrides*
- Nesselrath *MK: Die Attische Mittlere Komödie*
- Nesselrath, *Parasitendialog: Lukians Parasitendialog*
- Palombi-Santorelli: *Gli animali commestibili dei mari d' Italia*

- Pickard-Cambridge *Dithyramb: Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*
- ——— *Festivals: The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*
- Ribbeck *CRF³: Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta, II: Comicorum Romanorum praeter Plautum et Syri quae feruntur sententias Fragmenta*
- Smyth: *Greek Grammar*
- Strömberg *Fischnamen: Studien zur Etymologie und Bildung der griechischen Fischnamen*
- Thompson *Birds: A Glossary of Greek Birds*
- ——— *Fishes: A Glossary of Greek Fishes*
- Webster, SM: *Studies in Menander*
- ——— *SLGC: Studies in Later Greek Comedy*
- ——— *IM: An Introduction to Menander*
- West: *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*

General Introduction

Is there a “Middle Comedy”?

Unlike *Old* and *New Comedy*, which are rarely contested,¹ the term *Middle Comedy*, though widely used, has been much debated. The term itself is a relatively late coinage. It does not appear in the ancient texts before Hadrian’s era (first half of second century A.D.),² though there is sufficient evidence to allow us to trace the actual threefold division of Comedy back to the Hellenistic period, and we have good reason to believe that we particularly owe it to Aristophanes of Byzantium.³

The ancient and medieval writers speak categorically of three distinct phases of Comedy; cf. Platonius: *γεγόνασι δὲ μεταβολαὶ κωμωδίας τρεῖς· καὶ ἡ μὲν ἀρχαία, ἡ δὲ νέα, ἡ δὲ μέση* (III.7-8 Koster). It is evident that our ancient sources considered *Middle Comedy* to be both a descriptive and a chronological period, since they acknowledge the presence of certain distinguishing features, which justify the use and endorse the validity of the term. A prominent feature noted by many is the diminution of personal mockery and the attenuation of obscenity; cf. Platonius: *οὐ γὰρ ἦν τινα προφανῶς σκώπτειν δίκας ἀπαιτούντων τῶν ὑβριζομένων παρὰ τῶν ποιητῶν* (I.16-18 Koster); Tzetzes: *τῆς μέσης δὲ καὶ δευτέρας ἦν γνώρισμα τὸ συμβολικοτέρως, μὴ καταδήλως λέγειν τὰ σκώμματα* (XIa I.70-71 Koster); sch. on Dion. Thrax.: *τρεῖς διαφορὰς ἔδοξεν ἔχειν ἡ κωμωδία· καὶ ἡ μὲν καλεῖται παλαιά, ἡ ἐξ ἀρχῆς φανερώς ἐλέγχουσα, ἡ δὲ μέση ἡ αἰνιγματωδῶς, ἡ δὲ νέα ἡ μὴδ’ ὄλως τοῦτο ποιῶσα πλὴν ἐπὶ δούλων ἢ ξένων* (XVIIIa.37-39 Koster). *Tractatus Coislinianus* similarly distinguishes Old Comedy (*παλαιά*) as *ἡ πλεονάζουσα τῷ γελοίῳ* from New (*νέα*) as *ἡ τοῦτο μὲν προἰεμένη, πρὸς δὲ τὸ σεμνὸν ῥέπουσα*, and from Middle (*μέση*) as *ἡ ἀπ’ ἀμφοῖν μεμιγμένη* (XV.55 Koster).⁴ Another Middle Comedy feature that Platonius singles out is the loss of the parabasis and choral parts (I.29-31 Koster). The ancient authors also attempt to group

¹ However, all periodisation oversimplifies to some degree. Csapo notes the potential of the focus on Aristophanes and Menander to distort perceptions of generic evolution and argues plausibly that Athenian Comedy is far more variable throughout its history than conventional generalisations suggest (“From Aristophanes to Menander? Genre Transformation in Greek Comedy”, in Depew & Obbink, *Matrices of Genre*, 115-133).

² Fielitz, *De Atticorum comoedia bipartita*, 2-3, 15-36.

³ Körte *RE* XI.1 1257. Cf. Nesselrath *MK* 180-187.

chronologically certain poets into the three periods of *ἀρχαία*, *μέση*, and *νέα*; cf. Platonius III Koster, sch. on Dion. Thrax XVIIIa.39-46.⁵

None the less, some modern scholars have questioned the validity of the term *Middle Comedy*. Some argue for accepting only two phases, Old and New Comedy. At one extreme Sidwell suggests that we should eliminate the term *Middle Comedy* altogether, and assign to Old Comedy what are generally regarded as fragments of Middle Comedy.⁶ Based on Arist. *EN* 1128a22-5, he argues that “Aristotle divides Comedy into only *two* types”.⁷ The Aristotelian passage runs as follows: ἴδοι δ’ ἄν τις καὶ ἐκ τῶν κωμῳδιῶν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν καινῶν· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἦν γελοῖον ἢ αἰσχρολογία, τοῖς δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπόνοια· διαφέρει δ’ οὐ μικρὸν ταῦτα πρὸς εὐσχημοσύνην. Nevertheless, I would question the assumption that Aristotle here is concerned with the precise periodisation of Comedy. Rather than creating exclusive and comprehensive categories, so that all Comedy would necessarily belong to one or the other period, Aristotle talks about broad tendencies, and it would be hasty to reify these as sub-genres. Though he recognized evolutionary developments,⁸ Aristotle nonetheless treats tragedy and comedy (in what survives of his work) each as a single coherent genre. There is no firm evidence he recognized any sub-genres, rather than trends.⁹

On the other hand, Fielitz argues that we should assign to New Comedy the material now referred to as *Middle*, discard the term *Middle Comedy*, and acknowledge as valid only two comic eras, Old and New, with the possibility of discerning within the latter an earlier and a later period.¹⁰ Fielitz is apparently willing to accommodate under this earlier period of New Comedy the material that we have traditionally been assigning to Middle, an option that practically brings us back to a tripartite division of Comedy; all that has changed is the terminology.

⁴ For an attempt to demonstrate the Aristotelian origin of this tract see Janko, *Aristotle on Comedy*, 91-104, 242-250.

⁵ For a comprehensive synopsis of ancient views concerning Middle Comedy see Nesselrath *MK* 1-187.

⁶ “From Old to Middle to New? Aristotle’s *Poetics* and the History of Athenian Comedy”, in Harvey & Wilkins, *The Rivals of Aristophanes*, 247-258.

⁷ *o.c.* 251.

⁸ Such as the intervention of individual writers to redirect the genre (e.g. *Po.* 1449b5-9) or broad changes in the use of individual elements (e.g. decline in the role of the choral ode in tragedy, *Po.* 1456a25-31).

⁹ Cf. *Po.* 1450b8, 1456a29 for the same broad “current / past” antithesis.

¹⁰ *o.c.* 14-15.

A more moderate line is taken by Konstantakos, who in the introduction to his thesis¹¹ questions the existence of Middle Comedy as a distinct kind of play / genre, and sees it as lacking defining characteristics. But, unlike Sidwell and Fielitz, he is not seeking to absorb it into either of the other two periods. Instead, he regards Middle Comedy as a merely chronological distinction and an indeterminate period of transition.¹²

In a far more radical re-reading of Greek Comedy altogether Csapo *l.c.* casts doubt on the whole process of periodisation (Old and New, as well as Middle). He particularly questions the credibility of the ancient sources on Comedy as creating the evidence they needed to fit pre-constructed theories. He speaks instead of both a synchronic and a diachronic genre transformation of Greek Comedy consisting of shifts of the dominant style as giving identity to different periods. He considers these shifts as being caused and shaped basically by the tastes of the audience, and mostly by the fluctuation of the power / influence of the upper social Athenian class over time. Arguably, he overstates the case for fluidity, for he concentrates so much on *ὀνομαστικὴ κωμωδεῖν* to the exclusion of other aspects of the plays (whereas other features – e.g. plot, character, language, metre, use of the chorus – need to be kept in view¹³). But his paper is a useful reminder of the distortions caused both by our evidence and by the accident of survival, and of the fluidity of Comedy at all periods in its history.

However, the traditional division has its defenders. Nesselrath acknowledges Middle Comedy as an essential stage in the evolution of Greek Comedy, rather than a merely chronological designation, and explains that what particularly distinguishes this period is an interesting *Merkmalkombination* (*o.c.* 331-340).¹⁴

¹¹ *A Commentary on the Fragments of Eight Plays of Antiphanes*, Cambridge 2000.

¹² Dover (in Platnauer (ed.), *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship*, 144-149) and Arnott (*Alexis: The Fragments*, 18) also take this view, which – in the modern era – was first advanced in the sixteenth century by Scaliger, *Poetices libri*, I.7.

¹³ For these features see “Main trends of Middle Comedy” and “Metres of Middle Comedy” below.

¹⁴ While scholars like Nesselrath and Lever (*The Art of Greek Comedy*, 160-185) currently defend the concept of Middle Comedy, others continue to treat it as a category without making their position clear on the question whether it is a chronological or a classificatory term; e.g. Handley in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, 398-414; Webster *SLGC passim*, etc. For an analysis of the views of modern scholarship on Middle Comedy see Nesselrath *o.c.* 1-28.

The existential status of Middle Comedy will remain contentious. Like Nesselrath, I believe, however, that the terminology is useful for more than chronological purposes; it is useful as a hermeneutic tool. There is a good case to be made for this phase as showing distinctive characteristics. Though not every single play of Middle Comedy has all the characteristics associated with the term,¹⁵ the plays of Middle Comedy share not just the accident of chronology, but also a number of common features, and the development of identifiable trends; change and limitation of the role of chorus, diminution of the political element, contraction of the personal mockery (*ὀνομαστικὴ κωμωδεῖν*), refinement of the obscene language, focus on certain stereotyped figures (the braggart soldier, the arrogant cook, the hetaira, the parasite, the philosopher), as well as simpler metrical schemes; these are the major traits associated with Middle Comedy (cf. “Main trends of Middle Comedy” below). The era of Middle Comedy reveals itself as a period of unusually intense experimentation. Of course, all Athenian Comedy can be considered a period of transition and experimentation, since, as it evolved, it underwent some startling changes.¹⁶ Arguably, our evidence obscures the true level of experimentation, and creates an artificial impression of stability in late fifth and late fourth centuries. But it can still be maintained that during the period of Middle Comedy the experimentation reaches its peak. This period, positioned between two extremes (Old and New Comedy), witnessed a quantum leap in the level of experimentation, and this in turn made possible the remarkable evolutionary changes that took place in the one hundred years or so that separate Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* from Menander’s *Dyscolus*, a very short period relative to the nature of the changes.¹⁷

In accepting the usefulness of the nomenclature, we should avoid taking the further step of imagining Comedy as a series of hermetically sealed sub-genres, but

¹⁵ Even the age of New Comedy shows features we associate with Old Comedy; cf. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy*, 223-224 (see further below p. 18). Csapo (*o.c.* 116-119) particularly stresses the fact that some of Aristophanes’ fifth-century rivals appear to have written plays which could be considered Middle Comedy.

¹⁶ See for instance what Aristotle says on Crates: τὸ δὲ μύθους ποιεῖν τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ Σικελίας ἦλθε, τῶν δὲ Ἀθήνησιν Κράτης πρῶτος ἤρξεν ἀφέμενος τῆς ἰαμβικῆς ἰδέας καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μύθους (*Ρο.* 1449b.5-9). This passage suggests a major change in Comedy by Crates, probably the introduction of fictive plots presented in a more coherent way. See Sommerstein on *Ar. Eq.* 537.

instead acknowledge that the borders between periods and types are porous. It is difficult to draw absolute boundaries. Though it takes different forms at different stages, there is a fundamental continuity that runs throughout Greek Comedy; no element ever disappears completely, and everything seems to have a more or less obvious antecedent. Comedy evolves constantly in a competitive environment and proceeds by leaps forward; at the same time it always keeps open the possibility of reviving elements of the past.

However, most attempts to make sense of the fourth century material are frustrated by loss of so much of the output. Unlike late fifth and late fourth centuries, for which whole plays (even if by single dramatists) survive, we have no mid fourth century comedy and no whole plot (unlike e.g. Cratinus' *Dionysalexandrus*). But close study can still be revealing and can allow us to observe the complex dynamics at work in the comic theatre.

Understanding Middle Comedy

Körte (*RE* XI.1 1266) offers a list of fifty one Middle Comedy poets from the period 400-320 B.C. However, this list needs to be treated with some caution. Poets are only loosely to be classified in this way. In a competitive environment playwrights will inevitably experiment with new forms and, since successful experiments will be imitated, we would expect even established playwrights to be influenced by emerging trends. Hence the tendency of scholars to treat Aristophanes' *Plutus* and *Ecclesiazusae* as Middle Comedy; cf. Theophilus' handling of a New Comedy motif in fr. 12 (see *ad loc.*). But provided that we avoid the assumption that poets only practised one kind of Comedy, we can reasonably examine the works of these poets together as showing further affinities. The surviving material from each poet varies in extent and value. From some only their name has come down to us; from others we possess only mere play-titles. But in total more than one thousand fragments survive, with Alexis and Antiphanes being represented with the most. The length of the surviving fragments varies; from a single word to seventy one lines, which is the longest fragment we have (Anaxandrides fr. 42).

¹⁷ This is especially true if one considers the relative conservatism of Greek literary forms, including tragedy.

Middle Comedy was until recently under-researched. The fragmentary nature of the remains, along with the fact that it followed a period marked by the genius of Aristophanes, made it look little worthy of any attention. It was only in 1950, when Webster published his *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*,¹⁸ that Middle Comedy was placed under the scholarly lens again. Particularly, the last two decades have seen a renewed interest in Middle Comedy. In 1990 Nesselrath gave us *Die Attische Mittlere Komödie*, while a number of commentaries on Middle Comedy fragments were also produced. Hunter's commentary on Eubulus' fragments in 1983, and Arnott's on Alexis in 1996, were followed by two doctoral theses: Konstantakos' commentary on Antiphanes (Cambridge 2000), and Millis' on Anaxandrides (Illinois 2001). In my commentary I chose to study six Middle Comedy playwrights, Amphis, Aristophon, Dionysius, Mnesimachus, Philetaerus, and Theophilus. I believe that this material deserved to be studied, since the number, the extent, and the content of the surviving fragments of these poets have the potentiality to clarify (at least in part) the lacunose puzzle that bears the name Middle Comedy, and help us improve our existing knowledge concerning e.g. the trends followed and the motifs used. With careful scrutiny the fragments yield interesting insights.

I have not analysed all the surviving fragments of these six poets, but only the larger and most informative ones. I have left out the fragments from unknown plays, some tiny fragments that consist of either a single word or one line or two, as well as any minor ones where the discussion would not yield any information which might illuminate author, period or trends. Given the space limitation, I had to select from the existing material those fragments that looked promising either to reveal the most about this comic era, or to give us a rough idea of the basic plot / content of the play they belong to (though we are not always in a position to pursue the whole plot with certainty).

In my commentary I address fifty four fragments, which are all preserved as quotations within the corpus of a later author – and not, say, on papyrus or parchment. All but eight of these fifty four fragments are preserved by Athenaeus, in the *Deipnosophistae*. Four are preserved by Stobaeus, three by Diogenes Laertius, and one by the Scholiast of *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax.

¹⁸ Second edition in 1970.

Athenaeus and Middle Comedy

The majority of Middle Comedy fragments survive through Athenaeus. This inevitably has implications for the content of what is preserved. All excerpts in florilegia reflect the excerpter's principles of selection. In a work that describes a symposium, as *Deipnosophistae*, it was only natural that many quotations would be from a similar or a parallel context. Unlike work preserved on papyrus, what survives of Middle Comedy is not – for the most part – what accidentally happened to survive underneath the sand of Egypt, but reflects what Athenaeus thought worthy of inclusion in a work set in a fictitious dinner party. Food, drink and sex are Athenaeus' main interests, though he does not confine himself entirely to these. Since he is not writing a history of Comedy or seeking to characterise any given author he cites, he is not concerned to give the plots or to describe the immediate dramatic situation in detail; so the citations survive in a vacuum, and plot reconstruction becomes difficult.

Athenaeus is writing in the second century A.D. and therefore at a remove of four centuries from the genesis of the texts he cites. He is also writing at a time when (as his own work testifies) collections of excerpts were readily available. Inevitably this raises the question of his sources and of his use of them. Did Athenaeus actually read personally the works that he cites? Did he consult the original work at the time he was making the quotation or did he simply use a compilation of excerpts? It is vital to understand Athenaeus' methods, for this has implications for his reliability on a range of issues, from details of text to questions of context e.g. when he identifies the speaker of a cited text.

His home city was Naucratis, a renowned place for Greek intellectuals;¹⁹ while there, and given the wide extent of his reading,²⁰ it is highly likely that Athenaeus actually had first hand knowledge and access to the originals of most of the works that he quotes from, though first hand knowledge is no guarantee of consultation for

¹⁹ Founded in the seventh century B.C. by Miletus, Naucratis was granted a number of privileges in the next century by Amasis, and continued to stand out during the Ptolemies' era. It drew together people from various Greek cities, and was considered a centre of an early panhellenism. Some famous Naucratices are Theomnestus, Pollux, Apollonius (known as *of Rhodes*), and Proclus. See Thompson in Braund & Wilkins, *Athenaeus and His World*, 77-84.

²⁰ His reading was not limited to the ancient texts, but also extended to the previous scholarship that had already dealt with them; cf. Sidwell in Braund & Wilkins *o.c.* 140. See also pp. 536-538.

specific purposes of citation.²¹ As well as texts from the classical period, he will have had access to the works of Alexandrian scholarship. With particular relation to Comedy, Athenaeus appears to have had at his disposal Callimachus' *Pinakes*, and also a number of other works by Lycophron, Eratosthenes, Antiochus of Alexandria, etc.²² Athenaeus was not deprived of books in Rome either, where the public libraries – promoted particularly by the emperors who were eager to boost their popularity²³ – were well equipped to satisfy his voracious reading habits. In addition Larensis, the host of the dinner described in *Deipnosophistae*, must have granted Athenaeus access to his private library, which is much praised at the beginning of the text (cf. I 3a). While excerpting material directly from the original works, Athenaeus must have also used a number of intermediary sources, such as previous collections, compilations, glossaries, compendia, etc., which were particularly popular and enjoyed a wide circulation in Rome at the time of the Second Sophistic.²⁴ In general, Athenaeus gives us good reason to believe that he made every effort to assure the authenticity and correctness of his quotations.²⁵ Accordingly we cannot simply dismiss his contextualising statements. Nevertheless, given that we cannot determine in any individual case whether the citation is from a primary or a secondary source, it is perhaps wiser and safer to draw our information directly from the content of a fragment itself, and rely less on the context ascribed to it by Athenaeus; this is the method that I follow in my commentary.

The manuscript tradition of Athenaeus has been meticulously covered most recently by Arnott in his article “Athenaeus and the Epitome: Texts, Manuscripts, and Early Editions” in Braund & Wilkins *o.c.* 41-52. The text of Athenaeus we possess today depends on two traditions; the Marcianus and the Epitome. The codex Marcianus (*Venetus Marcianus* 447) was written sometime in the early tenth century A.D., probably by John the Calligrapher. Several copies of Marcianus survive, but they have no value whatsoever for the construction of the text. Though Marcianus is

²¹ For a thorough discussion see Jacob in Braund & Wilkins, *o.c.* 85-110. For a different approach see Sidwell in Braund & Wilkins *o.c.* 136-152.

²² Cf. Jacob in Braund and Wilkins *o.c.* 94, 98. For a full list of works relating to Comedy that are cited by Athenaeus see Sidwell in Braund & Wilkins *o.c.* 152.

²³ See Reynolds & Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, 23-25.

²⁴ Cf. Jacob in Braund & Wilkins *o.c.* 102-110.

²⁵ Cf. Arnott in Braund & Wilkins *o.c.* 41, and Jacob *ibid.* 89, 98.

mutilated (books I and II, as well as the beginning of book III are missing), it is most important for us, since it is our only source for the unepitomised version of the text. Indeed, the Epitome, the second tradition of Athenaeus' text, is by far inferior to the Marcianus. Writing in the tenth or eleventh century, the scribe removed all the titles of the works cited, and also removed, paraphrased or abridged several citations. The Epitome does, however, have some value, since it preserves the parts lost from Marcianus. Internal evidence from both traditions suggests that the epitomiser, though relying greatly on Marcianus, must have also consulted another manuscript now lost. Today four copies of the Epitome survive.

Main trends of Middle Comedy

The triad of food, wine, and sex²⁶ seems to have formed the core of Middle Comedy. At the same time a further number of trends, motifs, and patterns, which constituted the trademarks of the Aristophanic, and generally the Old Comedy, experience an intermittent persistence and keep re-emerging during the entire duration of Middle Comedy and even beyond (politics, obscenity, etc.; cf. below). Simultaneously, Middle Comedy is marked by a process of experimentation that leads to the kind of Comedy represented by Menander. Middle Comedy's surviving fragments testify to a coexistence of Old and New Comedy elements, which are equally balanced within the dramatic output as a whole, though the mixture differs significantly from play to play. It appears that there is not one dominant mode of writing, but rather a complex interplay of trends, broadly characteristic of either Aristophanes or Menander. This little-bit-of-everything recipe that seems to form the quintessence of Middle Comedy can be considered the soundest proof of the continuity of Greek Comedy.

Firstly, it is interesting to see that Old Comedy's favourite practice of political satire, as well as political themes in general, are present in Middle Comedy.²⁷ There are several instances of personal mockery against politicians, army officials, etc. (*ὀνομαστί κωμωδεῖν*).²⁸ Here are some representative examples: Mnesimachus named

²⁶ The ideal of *ἡδέως ζῆν*, cf. introduction to Philetaerus.

²⁷ Cf. Nesselrath *MK* 218-221, 225; Webster *SLGC* 37-56.

²⁸ For trenchant discussion of this practice and bibliography, see Halliwell, "Ancient interpretations of *ὀνομαστί κωμωδεῖν* in Aristophanes", *CQ* 34 n.s. (1984) 83-88. See also Reckford, *Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy*, 461-482.

one of his plays after the Macedonian king Philip II (cf. introduction to *Φίλιππος*); Aristophon mocks the thinness of the pro-Macedonian politician Philippides (fr. 10); Amphis mocks Plato more than once (fr. 6, 13), Ehippus lampoons Alexander of Pherae (fr. 1), etc. This agrees with the evidence that we find in Plato *Lg.* 935e that mockery was still practised: ποιητῆ δὴ κωμωδίας ἢ τινος ἰάμβων ἢ Μουσῶν μελωδίας μὴ ἐξέστω μήτε λόγῳ μήτε εἰκόني μήτε θυμῷ μήτε ἄνευ θυμοῦ μηδαμῶς μηδένα τῶν πολιτῶν κωμωδεῖν. This phenomenon continues even into what is commonly thought of as the period of New Comedy: we know that Archedicus (fr. 4) attacked Demochares, a politician of the late fourth / early third century B.C.,²⁹ Philippides (fr. 25) targeted Stratocles, the henchman of Demetrius Poliorcetes,³⁰ Philemon satirized Magas of Cyrene (fr. 132), etc.

In comparison with Old, Middle Comedy features less obscenity. But there are still a fair number of instances where the sexual puns, the scatological references, etc., are so explicit and so intense, that if such a passage were unidentified, we would not have hesitated much before attributing it to Aristophanes or one of his fifth century rivals. I am thinking particularly of Amphis fr. 20, which features sexual incapacity and male masturbation. Additionally, a cursory search of *TLG* yields some interesting facts about the frequency of coarse and indecorously erotic language in Middle Comedy and beyond: the verb *βινεῖν* occurs in Xenarchus (fr. 4.23), Philetaerus (fr. 6.2, 9.4), Machon (fr. 18.455 Gow), and even Menander (fr. 138.8 Austin, fr. 351.11 K.-A.), whereas a number of scatological references (*σκατ-*, *πρωκτ-*, *χεζ-*) are present in Antiphanes, Crobylus, Eubulus, Anaxandrides, and Menander.³¹

Furthermore, the feasting motif too traces back to Old Comedy; one only needs to recall the feasting scenes towards the end of – and also elsewhere in – Aristophanic plays; e.g. *Ec.* 834-852, as well as other instances within Old Comedy; e.g. Hermippus fr. 63 is a “catalogue of goods”,³² an antecedent of Middle Comedy’s much loved theme of food lists. Another theme of intermittent frequency is the father-

²⁹ Cf. *Suda* a 4083. See Dover *l.c.*

³⁰ See Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, 13, n. 31.

³¹ Cf. Mnesimachus fr. 4.55, Xenarchus fr. 4.22, Machon fr. 18.455 Gow, Philetaerus fr. 6.2, Menander fr. 351.11, Id. fr. 138.8 Austin, Antiphanes fr. 124.4, Crobylus fr. 7.2, Men. *Dysc.* 488, Eubulus fr. 106.6, Anaxandrides fr. 42.68, Eubulus fr. 52.4, Men. *Phasm.* 42, etc.

³² See Gilula, “Hermippus and his catalogue of goods (fr. 63)”, in Harvey & Wilkins *o.c.* 75-90.

and-son pattern; it runs from Aristophanes' *Clouds* and *Wasps* to Aristophon fr. 8 (cf. introduction *ad loc.*), to Menander's *Dyscolus* (Knemon-Gorgias).

Middle Comedy is also characterised by the emergence of stereotyped characters, such as the arrogant and / or pilferer cook, the unworldly philosopher, the hetaira, etc. The figure of the cook is an early arrival in Comedy; in fact, it can be traced back to Doric farce.³³ Although Aristophanes did not assign a stereotyped status to the role of the cook, he still stands as a groundbreaking ancestor for the later evolution of this figure. Some preliminary stages are to be discerned particularly in *Pax* 922-1126, and to a lesser extent in *Av.* 848-1057.³⁴ From this aspect Middle Comedy differs from Old mainly – but significantly – in extent. Especially in the periods of Middle and New, the cook figure becomes stereotyped as a self-important, boastful, and arrogant character, prone to stealing; this is also true for most Latin adaptations.³⁵

Philosophers had become one of the favourite targets of Comedy by the late fifth century. Aristophanes seems to have shared his fondness of satirising Socrates (cf. *Clouds*) with at least Amipsias (cf. fr. 9). Several sophists were also mocked; cf. the derision of Protagoras in Eupolis' *Kolakes*.³⁶ The parody of the philosopher figure is one of the favourite subjects of Middle Comedy too. The new *enfant terrible* is Plato, who “succeeds” Socrates as the primary philosophical figure to be mocked.³⁷ This mockery is directed against both his individual and his philosophy.³⁸ For parody of other philosophers and philosophical schools / currents see Webster *SLGC* 50-56, and Helm, *Lucian und Menipp*, 375-386. Nevertheless, during the period of Middle

³³ See Berthiaume, *Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 70 (1982) 74.

³⁴ See Dohm *o.c.* 30-55, and introduction to Dionysius fr. 2.

³⁵ See Dohm, *Mageiros*, 67-275; Nesselrath *MK* 297-309; Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef*, 387-408; Dalby, *Siren Feasts*, 121-124; Arnott's introduction to Alexis fr. 24.

³⁶ For further comic references to both Socrates and the sophists, see Carey in Harvey & Wilkins *o.c.* 419-436.

³⁷ Cf. Weiher, *Philosophen und Philosophenspott in der attischen Komödie*, *passim* but esp. pp. 37-55; Imperio in Belardinelli et al., *Tessere*, 124-129; Webster *SLGC* 53; Arnott on Alexis fr. 1.2. Echoes from Plato's comic treatment can also be detected in later authors, e.g. D.L. 6.25 (allegedly referring to Plato's gluttony), etc. For an exhaustive list of anecdotes concerning Plato see A. S. Riginos, *Platonica: The Anecdotes concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*, Leiden 1976.

³⁸ For a list of some comic references to Plato, see comm. on Amphis fr. 13.1; cf. Webster *SLGC* 50-56.

Comedy we seem to be witnessing a great change in the essence of the parody of the philosopher figure and the way in which this parody is being formulated. The comic plays do not convey the same anxiety and hostility against philosophy, as the Old Comedy plays did. The reasons for this are not difficult to find. The fourth century sees an increased interest in philosophy and the philosophical tenets themselves. By a “trickle down” process, philosophy becomes part of the fabric of the society, to the point where playwrights writing for mass audiences can expect their public to know certain basic concepts, without having necessarily read e.g. their Plato from the original.³⁹

The hetaira is another character that existed already in Old Comedy, but only becomes central in the period of Middle.⁴⁰ The titles of three plays by the Old Comedy poet Pherecrates are names of hetairai: *Θάλαττα*, *Κοριαννώ*, *Πετάλη*; it is reasonable to assume that the plays evolved around these characters. In Middle Comedy such titles become abundant; *Ἄγκώ* and *Καλλιστώ* by Amphis, *Κλεοβουλίνη* by Alexis, *Νεοττίς* by Anaxilas, Antiphanes, and Eubulus, *Μαλθάκη* by Antiphanes, *Φίλινα* by Axionicus, etc. Additionally, several other fragments mention a number of hetairai;⁴¹ e.g. Anaxandrides fr. 9, Philetaerus fr. 9, Theophilus fr. 11, etc. Reaffirming the element of continuity in Comedy, the hetaira figure appears in New Comedy too; cf. the play-titles *Θαῖς* and *Φάνιον* by Menander, *Παλλακίς* by both Menander and Diphilus, as well as a number of hetaira characters, e.g. *Θαῖς* in Menander's *Eunuch*, *Ἀβρότονον* in *Epitrepontes*, etc.; cf. Diphilus fr. 42.38-40: οὔ δὲ νῦν σ' ἄγω, / πορνεῖόν ἐστι, πολυτελεῶς Ἀδώνια / ἄγουσ' ἑταίρα μεθ' ἑτέρων πορνῶν. There are certain stereotyped presentations of hetairai in Comedy; one consists on fights over their possession and disputes about the dangers they entail; cf. Amphis fr. 23, Alexis fr. 103, Theophilus fr. 11, etc.; in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* even the origin of the Peloponnesian war is reduced down to a dispute over a Megarian hetaira (ll.

³⁹ See Imperio *o.c.* 120-130. In p. 121 she particularly notes how the comic playwrights are well aware of the philosophical currents, as well as of the particular writings / precepts that they choose to parody; cf. the satire of Pythagoreans' asceticism and vegetarianism in Aristophon fr. 9 and 10 (cf. Arnott's introduction to Alexis fr. 203), Arnott's introduction to Alexis' *Φαῖδος*, and his commentary on fr. 177.2 and 31. 3-7, 6-7.

⁴⁰ See Nesselrath *MK* 318-324, Webster *SLGC* 63-64, Hauschild, *Die Gestalt der Hetäre in der griechischen Komödie*, 10-22.

⁴¹ The majority of them are historical hetairai, but there is also a small percentage of fictitious names.

524ff.). Another pattern features addiction to the charms of hetairai; e.g. Antiphanes fr. 101, Theophilus fr. 12; cf. also the final scene in Aristophanes' *Wasps* where the rejuvenated Philocleon steals a flute-girl (ll. 1341ff.). Relevant to hetairai is the love motif. Being already present in Middle Comedy (cf. Theophilus fr. 2 and 12), it becomes central during the period of New; e.g. it is present in Menander's *Kolax*, *Perinthia*, and in all those plays, which Webster calls "plays of social criticism"⁴² (in contrast, Old Comedy celebrates sex but not love).

Another stock character of Middle Comedy is the flattering parasite. The parasite figure – in various guises – has a long pedigree in Greek literature. The first free-loaders we meet are Penelope's suitors in Homer (e.g. *Od.* 1.91-92, 2.50-59). Within Comedy the first instance of a parasite's self-presentation occurs as early as Epicharmus (fr. 32), though the tone of the fragment and the way the parasite sees himself are noticeably different from what we come across in Attic Comedy (in all eras). Within Old Comedy the parasite figures particularly in Eupolis' *Κόλακες* (esp. fr. 172), Cratinus fr. 46, etc.; during this period the term denoting the *parasite* was not *παράσιτος*, but *κόλαξ* (cf. Ath. VI 236e, Polemon fr. 78 Preller). However, according to the ancient scholion on Homer P 577b Epicharmus had already used the term *παράσιτος* (fr. 33). Alexis wrote a play entitled *Παράσιτος*, while two Middle Comedy fragments, Antiphanes fr. 193 and Aristophon fr. 5, feature – with all probability – a pompous parasite speaking. The parasite character also survives into the period of New Comedy; cf. Diphilus' play *Παράσιτος*. See further Arnott's introduction to Alexis' *Παράσιτος*, Nesselrath, *Parasitendialog*, 93-96; Id. *MK* 309-317; Webster *SLGC* 64-65; Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes*, 242.

As to the chorus, since it was central to both tragedy and comedy (to the extent that the standard expression for the archon granting permission to compete was "give a chorus"), and since religion is a notoriously conservative area (and the dramatic competitions remained religious events), understandably it survives physically; cf. i) the notes *χοροῦ* or *κοιμμάτιον χοροῦ* in manuscripts of Aristophanes' last plays, and on papyri of Menander; ii) the presence of lyric metres (e.g. Anaxilas fr. 13), iii)

⁴² *SM* 59ff.; cf. 164-166.

archaeological evidence.⁴³ Nevertheless, its role undergoes some fundamental changes beginning from Aristophanes' last two plays.⁴⁴ The parabasis disappears, and the internal relation between the identity of the chorus and the plot of the play loosens. The poets adjust the role of the chorus, as well as the emphasis that had been assigned to it until then. Its importance and nature within Middle Comedy may be variable. If play-titles such as Eubulus' *Στεφανοπώλιδες*⁴⁵ and Theopompus' *Καπήλιδες* are anything to go by, the chorus, while heading towards the *entr' acte* function it has in Menander, may have been more or less involved / integrated into the action (cf. Aristotle's comments on chorus and on *ἐμβόλιμα*, *Po.* 1456a 25-32). See Heniochus fr. 5, Alexis fr. 239, with Arnott's introductions to Alexis' *Τροφώνιος* and *Κουρίς*.

Thus it becomes clear, and will become even clearer from the analysis of the individual fragments, that there is a visible continuity throughout the history of Comedy. For not only does Middle Comedy inherit both themes and motifs from Old Comedy, but also New Comedy tends on various occasions to pick up on previously established subjects and figures; e.g. the feasting motif, the braggart soldier, the cantankerous old man. Middle Comedy looks simultaneously backward and forward. It draws on stock material, which it re-works, thus paving the way for New Comedy; continuity is never lost. The parameters that define the essence of Comedy simply reshape. Operating within a dynamic environment, Comedy maintains its unity through change. However contradictory may it sound, evolution and continuity are conjoint notions and co-exist harmoniously within the comic genre.

Methodology

I have chosen the commentary as the format of my dissertation in preference to a discursive or thematic monograph, not only because this method has already proved fruitful, given the four commentaries produced so far, but also because the commentary allows us to examine as closely as possible the text. Given that the text

⁴³ E.g. marble relief fragments from the third quarter of the fourth century B.C. featuring a comic chorus. See Webster & Green, "Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy", *BICS* Suppl. 39, 118-119, AS 3-4.

⁴⁴ See *RE* XI.1 1258-1260; Webster *SLGC* 58-63; Maidment, "The Later Comic Chorus", *CQ* 29 (1935) 1-24; Hunter, "The Comic Chorus in the Fourth Century", *ZPE* 36 (1979) 23-38; Rothwell, "The Continuity of the Chorus in Fourth-Century Attic Comedy", *GRBS* 33 (1992) 209-225, etc.

⁴⁵ Cf. Hunter *ad loc.*

available is fragmentary in itself, the commentary becomes an even more appropriate tool to approach it. The fragment is by definition isolated from its original context; therefore, a close reading that gives careful attention to the surviving words is probably the best method towards a fuller understanding. It can be – and has been – objected to the commentary format that by concentrating on minutiae one loses the bigger picture.⁴⁶ I would answer that the bigger picture can only emerge as the result of an analysis of the details; the comprehension of the whole cannot be achieved prior to the comprehension of the part. It may be true that the commentary format dismantles the text into pieces; but this is a necessary preliminary procedure, for it leads to the comprehension of these pieces, which are in fact vital details. Only after we have dismantled the text, after we have understood it as *pieces*, only then can we reassemble it, and try to understand it as a *whole*. It is of course essential that the text *is* reassembled. I have tried to do this in the current work through the various levels of introduction; to the individual poet, to the play, to the specific fragment, and also by cross-referencing within the treatment of individual fragments.

As a basis for the text of my commentary I have used the excellent Kassel-Austin text. My focus throughout is primarily literary, rather than textual. However, I do discuss textual matters, where the competing readings are significant for our understanding of the fragment. To this end, for those fragments that present major problems I supply a select critical apparatus that is primarily based on Kassel-Austin. I have, however, reduced my apparatus in scale by removing some of the less plausible conjectures, and I have always checked my information against the primary sources. Given the quality of Kassel-Austin's text I inevitably find myself agreeing with them in most cases, though I have also departed from their text on several occasions. Not all the textual issues mentioned in the apparatus are discussed in full in the main text. Since I needed to be selective, I only discussed the cases that I considered to be of particular importance.

When dealing with fragments one is bound to take certain risks. The fragmentary nature of the text constitutes a slippery surface for the commentator to tread on. A small number of lines that are forever cut off from their original context

⁴⁶ E.g. Most (*The Measures of Praise*, 36-41) notices three major drawbacks within the commentary procedure; *atomisation*, *monofunctionalism*, and *restrictive privileging*. Kraus also describes

are open to more than one possible interpretation. The content of the fragments is not always enlightening as to the play's plot, nor does it always bear any obvious relation to the play's title. What must the commentator do in such a case? How far can they go in their conjectures? How plausible can their conjectures be? How legitimate is the process of applying conjecture to such slender evidence? There can be neither certainty nor one definitive answer in these cases. However, bearing in mind that one fragment or two are probably all that we will ever get to know from a certain play,⁴⁷ I believe that it is the commentator's task to press and squeeze every single fragment as meticulously as possible; this is the strategy that I endeavoured to follow in this commentary. Wherever possible I attempt to reconstruct the plot, and to this end I try to use as effectively as possible our knowledge of any antecedents, of later material, and generally of any parallels. Occasionally I resort to possible parallels outside Greek Comedy, which can illuminate either an important aspect or a small detail of a given fragment; e.g. Ovid and Horace (on Philetaerus fr. 6.2 and 7.5), Lucian (on Amphis fr. 13.2-3, 23.4), etc. Spotting the possible sources of a fragment and discerning its potential influences on later literature can sometimes help render a meaningful sense out of a small number of lines, which at first sight might have seemed rather obscure.

One problematic area, where a commentator's imagination risks seriously outstripping the evidence of the text, is myth. Middle Comedy poets can be very original and innovative in the way they treat the mythical tradition; and expectedly so, for this is comedy and there would be no comic effect, if the myth was re-enacted in its traditional version, as in tragedy. The comic playwrights distort myth, to make it funny and full of twists. We get an idea of the extent that myth distortion might have taken from Aristotle *Po.* 1453a37-39: οἱ ἂν ἔχθιστοι ὦσιν ἐν τῷ μύθῳ, οἷον Ὀρέστης καὶ Αἴγισθος, φίλοι γενομένοι ἐπὶ τελευτῆς ἐξέρχονται, καὶ ἀποθνήσκει οὐδεὶς ὑπ' οὐδενός. Due to the fragmentary nature of the surviving material, it is difficult to establish with certainty how the myth was exploited; how the characters' behaviour deviated from the traditional version, which elements were kept intact, how the plot changed and in what direction, and also in what degree, if any, the real world intruded myth. The

commentaries as “funny things”, whose nature can be parasitic on the primary text (in Gibson & Kraus, *The Classical Commentary*, 1).

current scholarly belief is that myth and reality were inextricably intertwined, and that anachronism was a prevalent feature in Middle Comedy.⁴⁸ My own study supports this view. It appears that the comic world is located half way between myth and contemporary reality, with the rate of possible interactions between the two realms fluctuating from play to play and from poet to poet. The contemporary and the mythical elements can operate together within the comic world. Contemporary people can be discerned lurking behind mythic characters, and contemporary socio-political structures can be detected beneath mythic events. In numerous cases poets take a grim theme and give it a humorous twist. Nevertheless, not all the plays that involve mythical elements share the same plot construction. Instead, myth burlesque may operate in a variety of ways.⁴⁹ Mythical figures can be transferred from the heroic world into a world that resembles the everyday life of fourth century Athens. They can also be given a comic twist, so that they behave and look like ordinary Athenians; cf. Alexis' *Γαλάτεια* (see Arnott *ad loc.*), Plato's *Φάων* (see Webster *SLGC* 18-19), etc. Equally, what we may often have is an intrusion of contemporary elements into mythic plot. Thus, the plot remains "heroic" in time, but details of fifth / fourth century life invade the plot, either as blatant anachronism (e.g. *ὀνομαστί κωμωδεῖν*) or as surreptitious anachronism. There are many cases, where, although the title suggests at first sight a mythical content, the play itself may actually have had a contemporary setting (characters, place, time); e.g. Anaxandrides' *Πρωτεσίλαος* (cf. Millis *ad loc.*), Theophilus' *Νεοπτόλεμος* (cf. introduction *ad loc.*), etc. Here becomes relevant the issue of continuity again, for this type of plot does not occur only in Middle Comedy. A glance at fifth century titles suggests that mythic themes were common much earlier; cf. Aristophanes' *Kokalos* and *Aiolosicon*. Another piece of evidence for the existence of this trend in Old Comedy is Aristophanes' criticisms of the way his contemporaries and rivals allegedly relied on hungry Heracles as a source of humour;

⁴⁷ Unless we prove lucky to have some new papyri discovered, inscribed with Middle Comedy fragments.

⁴⁸ See Nesselrath *MK* 188-241; Webster *SLGC* 16-19, 82-85; Hunter 22-30; Meineke I.278-285. Both anachronism and myth travesty are features that Comedy in general shares with the satyr play; cf. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, 134ff.

⁴⁹ Euripides' *Cyclops* (cf. Seaford's introduction *ad loc.*), and the satyr fragments of both Sophocles and Aeschylus can provide us with a fuller idea of how myth can be treated in a comic way. See Sutton *o.c.*

cf. *Pax* 741ff. Even if we suppose that he exaggerates both the extent of his rivals' repetition and his own distinctiveness, the overall impression of mythic themes recurring in comedy agrees with our other evidence. It is worth bearing in mind that Euripides (and even Sophocles) can introduce elements of contemporary social reality into their tragedies.⁵⁰ So perhaps comic plays with mythic plots could do the same.⁵¹ The allegory in Aristophanes' *Knights* may prove particularly useful in helping us understand better how mythic themes work in Middle Comedy.⁵² Just as in *Knights* there is a constant shift from the domestic to the political context and back (e.g. ll. 55-57), likewise in Middle Comedy myth and reality can merge continuously into one another and run side by side.

Metres of Middle Comedy

The fifty four fragments included in this thesis throw up forty eight examples of iambic trimeters, five of trochaic tetrameters, and one of anapaestic dimeter. The iambic trimeter is in general the predominant metre of Middle Comedy; other metrical forms are also used, but in a very limited scale. Therefore, Körte considers Middle Comedy to be "ärmer und eintöniger"⁵³ in comparison with the metrical variety of Old Comedy. Having scrutinised myself the surviving fragments of Middle Comedy, I can confirm, along with Körte, the presence of various other metres. We have iambic tetrameters (e.g. Antiphanes fr. 26), dactylic hexameters (e.g. Antiphanes fr. 192), elegiac distichs (e.g. Antiphanes fr. 147), eupolideans (Alexis fr. 239), choerileans (Alexis fr. 137), glyconics (e.g. Anaxilas fr. 13); cf. also Axionicus fr. 4 that features a combination of anapaests, iambs, bacchics, choriamb, cretics, dactyls, and hipponacteans.⁵⁴ The rarity of lyric metres is explained by the decline of the role of

⁵⁰ Cf. the democratic spirit of Theseus in E. *Supp.* 403-408.

⁵¹ Cf. the interplay between myth and contemporary politics in Cratinus' *Dionysalexandrus*. See Körte, *Hermes* 39 (1904) 481-498; Luppe, *Philologus* 110 (1966) 169-193; Ameling, *QC* 3 (1981) 383-424; Tatti, *Métis* 1 (1986) 325-332.

⁵² Paphlagon corresponds to Cleon, Demos to the Athenian people, slave one to Nicias, and the household itself is a miniature of the city of Athens; cf. Dover *o.c.* 93-94, and Silk, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, 143-144.

⁵³ *RE* XI.1 1265.

⁵⁴ There is also some scanty evidence of anapaestic tetrameter; cf. Nesselrath *MK* 335.

chorus. The choral songs, no longer integrated within the plot, were left out from the manuscripts, and have therefore left no trace on the secondary tradition.⁵⁵

The next most popular metre – after the iambic trimeter – is the trochaic tetrameter. As I mention above, there are five fragments in trochaic tetrameters in this thesis; they are Amphis fr. 8, Aristophon frs. 5 and 13, Philetaerus fr. 9, and Theophilus fr. 4. Often used by Epicharmus,⁵⁶ the trochaic tetrameter was the standard metre for the Aristophanic epirrhematic syzygy, where topical issues are discussed.⁵⁷ After Aristophanes it occurs sporadically. In Middle Comedy it tends to be used for a special effect, and particularly in relation with general reflection and programmatic statements; cf. (apart from the five fragments included in this thesis) Anaxilas fr. 22, and Alexis fr. 103 with Arnott's introduction to Alexis' *Ἰσοστάσιον*.⁵⁸ Although the usage of trochaic tetrameter within Middle Comedy is reminiscent of the epirrhematic syzygy, the scale of the existent evidence does not allow us to say with certainty whether this structure survived to any extent during this period. This is unfortunate, since one would like to know if the tight forms of Old Comedy, already disappearing in late Aristophanes, experienced any resurrection in Middle Comedy. A cursory survey by myself unearthed no firm example.

As to the anapaestic dimeter, in Middle Comedy this is the metre *par excellence* for food catalogues; cf. Alexis fr. 167, Anaxandrides fr. 42, Antiphanes frs. 130, 131, Ehippus fr. 13, Eubulus fr. 63 (cf. Hunter *ad loc.*), etc. See Meineke I.302-303, Nesselrath *MK* 267-280.⁵⁹

The overall picture that we get is that poets of Middle Comedy are considerably less adventurous in their use of metre than their predecessors of Old Comedy. Featuring less metrical variety than Old and more variety than New,⁶⁰

⁵⁵ See Körte *RE* XI.1 1260, 1265; Handley *o.c.* 399-402.

⁵⁶ E.g. frs. 9, 40, 51, 66, 79, etc.

⁵⁷ E.g. *Ach.* 676-691, 703-718, *Eq.* 565-580, 595-610, etc.; cf. Dover *o.c.* 50ff.; West, *Greek Metre* 77ff.

⁵⁸ As to New Comedy see Men. *Dysc.* 708-783; cf. Dedoussi, "The Trochaic Tetrameter in Menander", *Πλάτων* 13 (1961) 59-66.

⁵⁹ West in *BICS* 24 (1977) 89-94 challenges (as also Wilamowitz first did) the metrical reality and validity of the anapaestic dimeters (and monometers). But see Parker, *The Songs of Aristophanes*, 56.

⁶⁰ Cf. Körte *RE* XI.1 1272-1273.

Middle Comedy seems once more to be located in the *middle* indeed between Old and New, at least on the basis of the current evidence.

AMPHIS

Amphis must have flourished towards the middle and in the second half of the fourth century B.C., to judge from the references he makes to both Plato (fr. 6 and 13) and the hetaira Phryne (fr. 24). According to *Suda* α 1760, he was an Athenian. But there is a decree of 332/1 B.C. (*IG* II² 347) that mentions a certain Ἄμφις from the island of Andros. Either these are two different persons or this is our Amphis, who, although originating from Andros, moved to Athens where he wrote his plays, and subsequently he may have been given citizenship. The latter is quite likely, given first the internationalisation of Attic drama at this date, and the tendency of non-Athenian writers to move to Athens,¹ and secondly the fact that the name Ἄμφις is otherwise unattested in Attica.² In fact, it is a hypocoristic of Ἀμφικράτης. Though the latter is a common Attic name (cf. the numerous entries in *PA* and *LGPN*), the hypocoristic was probably not widely used; cf. *RE* s.v. *Amphis* nr. 2. See further *PA* Add. 785; Pickard-Cambridge, *Festivals*, xxiii.

Ἀθάμας (fr. 1)

The title suggests a mythological theme.³ Athamas was son of Aeolus and ruled over Boeotia.⁴ A number of tragic poets, both Greek and Latin, dealt with the tragic fate of Athamas and his family. According to tradition, he had three wives, Ino, Nephele, and Themisto, all of whom gave him many sorrows. Ino bid the community women to parch the wheat seeds, so that no crops were yielded. This forced Athamas to send for an oracle, whose outcome was forged by Ino, who wanted to see Nephele's children, Phrixus and Helle, sacrificed. Nephele, in her turn, in order to avenge her children, plotted against Athamas, who was led to the sacrificial altar, but saved by Heracles. Themisto, wishing to take vengeance on Ino, who had deprived

¹ See Handley in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, 1.398-399; Sifakis, *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama*, 142-145; Xanthakis-Karamanos, *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy*, 3-6.

² Apart from the decree mentioned above, the only other evidence about the name comes from the island of Tenos, and dates from the late third century B.C.; cf. *LGPN* vol. I s.v.

³ Out of the twenty eight play-titles of Amphis that have come down to us a total of nine appear to be mythological.

⁴ Cf. Apollod. 1.9.1-2, 3.4.3.

her from her husband, conspired to kill Ino's children; but by mistake she killed her own.⁵ Aeschylus, Sophocles, Xenocles, Astydamos, Ennius, and Accius, all wrote homonymous plays.

The fragment below seems at first sight to suggest a contemporary context dealing with the everyday (Athenian) life. Hetairai are said to be far preferable to wedded wives, whose fixed indoor location takes away any possible element of excitement. But, as mentioned above, the title implies a mythological plot. The name *Ἀθάμας* is unlikely to have been used of a contemporary fictional character.⁶ Unless we have a play with the heroon of Athamas as its *mis-en-scène* (cf. Menander's *Dyscolus*), it is difficult to avoid the assumption that we have a mythic plot. But Comedy can exploit myth in various ways; twist it, mix it with reality, even manufacture implausible happy endings.⁷ Here the legendary king may have been presented in a bourgeois (possibly Athenian) setting, acting like a fourth century citizen.⁸ Possibly he is the one who speaks in the fragment below. It is a possibility that the actor is alone on stage, and delivers a soliloquy. If so, he could either be expressing his thoughts aloud or addressing the audience.⁹

Hetairai, though not absent from fifth century Comedy, become prominent in Middle Comedy (cf. General Introduction pp. 20-21), though there is some fluctuation in vocabulary. Although there is some overlap in the use of the terms, a hetaira is *not* a common prostitute (*πόρνη*). A hetaira is hired and paid primarily for her company (hence her name – *ἑταίρα*). She is supposed to provide men with all kinds of pleasures; she is expected to eat and drink merrily with them, and of course flirt, and eventually have sex with them, either on a single occasion (e.g. at a symposion) or for a longer period (e.g. when hired as an escort).¹⁰ Here it is important to note that the prostitutes

⁵ Cf. Apollod. 1.9.1, Tz. *ad Lyc.* 22, sch. on Ar. *Nu.* 257, Hygin. *Fab.* 1-4, etc. The tradition is not unanimous; the various versions differ as to the details of the myth.

⁶ Usually the comic playwrights use either invented or stock names e.g. for slaves.

⁷ See General Introduction pp. 24-26.

⁸ Cf. Cratinus' *Plutoi* where the Titans come to fifth century Athens (fr. 171). Nesselrath *MK* 209-212 argues for the possibility of Laomedon being presented as an Athenian bourgeois father in Antiphanes' *Γανυμήδης*.

⁹ Communication with the audience and acknowledgement of its presence are common features of Comedy of all eras; cf. Bain, *Actors and Audience*, 102 n. 1, 185ff; Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy*, 49ff., 55ff.

¹⁰ See Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes*, 92ff.

– both those who were walking the streets and those who belonged to a brothel and were under the ownership of a pimp (*πορνοβοσκάς*) or a madam – were obliged to have sex with anyone who wanted them. Brothels were generally despised and dreaded even by the prostitutes themselves, and life in them was considered wretched.¹¹ Whereas the prostitutes were only paid with money for selling their bodies for sex, the hetairai were attracted and seduced by gifts too – not just by money;¹² this too differentiated them from the common prostitutes. This also meant that the hetairai enjoyed the privilege to choose for themselves their lover; in accordance, the latter did not *buy* sex sessions from a hetaira, but he rather tried to *persuade / seduce* her, though he could never be certain of her availability.¹³

Under this prism, the fragment below may seem paradoxical at first sight, in the sense that here it is the hetaira who needs to “buy” a man’s affection. However, we know of a number of occasions where a hetaira was kept permanently by a man within his household, without being married to him; this situation is well attested in Comedy.¹⁴ In such a case, it is understandable that the status of the hetaira was rather fragile and vulnerable; the man could send her away at any time (cf. l. 5: *πρὸς ἄλλον ἀπιτέον*), if she showed any bad behaviour. Thus, the sense of the fragment below becomes clearer; the hetaira should be accommodating and courteous, in order to maintain this relationship, which kept her away from the streets and the brothels (cf. on l. 4 below).

The fragment dwells on the issue of the inferiority of wives to courtesans.¹⁵ It is perhaps to be seen as an exercise in sophistic oratory (see on l. 1b). Antiphanes also wrote a comedy entitled *Athamas*, but the evidence from the one surviving fragment does not suffice to establish any relation with Amphis’ play.

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIII 559a-b.

¹¹ Cf. Davidson *o.c.* 83ff.

¹² It does not follow, however, that the hetairai did not accept money for their services, far from that; cf. the so-called *μεγαλόμισθοι* hetairai (see Davidson *o.c.* 104). For the high prices charged by the hetairai see Aristophon fr. 4.

¹³ See Davidson *o.c.* 120ff.

¹⁴ See Davidson *o.c.* 102ff.

¹⁵ Cf. Philetaerus fr. 8, [D.] 59.122 (see Kapparis, *Apollodoros: “Against Neaira”* [D. 59], 4-8, 422-424).

εἶτ' οὐ γυναικίος ἐστὶν εὐνοϊκώτερον
 γαμετῆς ἑταίρα; πολὺ γε καὶ μάλ' εἰκότως.
 ἢ μὲν νόμῳ γὰρ καταφρονοῦσ' ἔνδον μένει,
 ἢ δ' οἶδεν ὅτι ἢ τοῖς τρόποις ὠνητέος
 5 ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ἢ πρὸς ἄλλον ἀπιτέον

And so, is not a hetaira more well-disposed
 than a wedded wife? Very much so and reasonably enough.
 For a wife through disdain stays indoors, according to custom,
 while a hetaira knows that she should either buy
 5 a man with her manners or make her way to another one

1a εἶτ' οὐ: Cf. on Aristophon fr. 11.1a.

1b εὐνοϊκώτερον: The neuter *εὐνοϊκώτερον* refers to the courtesan. The use of neuter complement with masculine or feminine subject is common; cf. Kühner-Gerth I §360.

The passage is arguing a paradox, i.e. that hetairai are more loving than wives. Hetairai are normally grasping, and their affection is for hire. This kind of reversal of normal perspectives is part of the sophistic tradition; there is a sub-genre of epideictic oratory devoted to praise of seemingly unpraiseworthy subjects, exemplified for instance by Gorgias' *Helen*.¹⁶ The term *παίγνιον* is often applied to this arguing of a seemingly unwinnable case. It finds its way into Comedy with the speech of Penia in Aristophanes' *Plutus*.¹⁷ It is possible that apart from being an exercise in paradox the argument may particularly reflect Athamas' personal experience. Amphis may have used the misfortunes inflicted upon Athamas by his three wives (see introduction), as the basis for an argument against the idea of having a wedded wife. In such a context one understands more easily why courtesans are described as being more kindly, well-disposed and more favourable than wedded wives. The same idea of preferring courtesans to wives recurs in Philetaerus fr. 8 (cf. *ad loc.*). This may suggest that this comparison that paradoxically favours the courtesans was a topos in Comedy.

¹⁶ Cf. on Amphis fr. 8.1-2, and introduction to Theophilus fr. 12.

¹⁷ See Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, 167-173; Papageorgiou, *A study in the Aristophanic Agon*, 19-34, 196-205.

The enmity towards wives expressed by the speaker belongs to a misogynistic trend within the Greek literary tradition. There is a pronounced trend against women that manifests itself as early as Hesiod; cf. *Th.* 570ff., *Op.* 54ff. Semonides' caustic poem on women (fr. 7 West) is another major sample of this attitude: *Zeὺς γὰρ μέγιστον τοῦτ' ἐποίησεν κακόν, / γυναῖκας* (ll. 96-97); cf. Gerber, *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, 72-78; Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 187-191; Osborne, *PCPhS* 47 (2001) 47-64. This pattern is also present in tragedy; cf. *E. Hipp.* 616-668 (see Barrett *ad loc.*). For the reverse position see *E. Med.* 410-430; cf. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves*, 103-112.

2 μάλ' εἰκότως: This phrase confirms the validity of what has been said before. A brief justification of this validity often follows, as happens in the present fragment. It can appear both at the end of a period (e.g. Anaxippus fr. 1.18, Plb. 10.33.3), and also in the middle (e.g. Pl. *R.* 414c, D. *De Corona* 16 – see Wankel *ad loc.*).

3a νόμῳ: The dative is modal / causal. Gulick in his edition of Athenaeus translates it as “(protected) by the law”. But there was no law that kept women indoors; so “custom” looks more appropriate (cf. on l. 3c).

3b καταφρονοῦσ': This is again part of the comic *παίγνιον* that runs throughout the fragment; cf. on l. 1b. Disdain and contempt are presented here as the reason why a wife stays indoors, as if *she* was the one who chose this lifestyle, whereas this was culturally determined. Social pressure – rather than volition – was the force that dictated female comportment.

3c ἔνδον μένει: The seclusion of wives at home was a primary feature within the system of male and female relations, at least for the propertied classes; cf. X. *Oec.* 7.30, Stob. 4.23.61, [D.] 59.122, E. fr. 521 *TGF*, Plu. *Mor.* 139c, etc. See Headlam on Herod. 1.37, Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, 95-98, 209-213; Gould, *JHS* 100 (1980) 38-59; Pomeroy *o.c.* 57-148. For a critique of the traditional view about women's seclusion see Cohen, *Law, Sexuality, and Society*, 133-170.

4 *τοῖς τρόποις ὠνητέος*: According to the hypothesis adopted above, the speaker probably refers to those cases where a man has a permanent relationship with a hetaira and keeps her in his own house,¹⁸ just as he would do with a wedded wife. A man who cohabits with a hetaira can be considered more privileged than a husband, because the hetaira is well aware of the fact that, in order to prolong this relationship and avoid being sent away (*πρὸς ἄλλον ἀπιτέον* – l. 5), she must continually please her man. She also knows that she should be thoughtful and considerate, take care and look after him, have complaisant manners and compliant conduct. These are the *τρόποι*, through which a hetaira tries to keep her lover.

Ἀμπελουργός (fr. 3)

This fragment is cited by Stobaeus 4.18.1, within a chapter entitled *Περὶ τεχνῶν*, where Stobaeus anthologises a number of passages pertaining to the value of art / craft. Given the title, one can assume that the art that gave rise to this discussion must have been the art of vintage. It appears that the manual professions in particular attracted the interest of Amphis. This is what seems to emerge from his play-titles; cf. *Ἀλείπτρια*, *Ἐριδοί*, *Κονιατῆς*, *Κουρίς*. A reasonable assumption would be that these plays were neither mythological nor political (in the widest sense), but they rather reflected contemporary daily life.

Alexis too wrote a play with the same title. Arnott *ad loc.* notes that Amphis and Alexis share the same eleven or twelve play-titles. It is possible that Amphis was influenced by – or borrowed from – Alexis or vice versa. In a modern writer one might speak of plagiarism. Comedy, however, is a genre where much is copied and imitated. The available evidence attests to a mutual imitation and influence among the comic playwrights, and allows us to say with confidence that the recycling of titles, plots, incidents and even lines¹⁹ was a common phenomenon. Popular themes recur regularly within the work of several poets.²⁰ It is only natural that the poets, seeking

¹⁸ Antiphanes fr. 210 refers to another case of cohabitation of a man with a hetaira.

¹⁹ For line-borrowing see Arnott's introduction to Alexis fr. 284, and Hunter on Eubulus fr. 67.4.

²⁰ E.g. Dionysus seems to have been an extremely popular comic character, and as such is the title-figure of plays by Epicharmus, Aristophanes, Aristomenes, Crates, Cratinus, Magnes, and Polyzelus. *Ἀταλάντη* (or *-αι*) is a play-title shared by Epicharmus, Alexis, Callias, Euthycles, Philetærus,

both recognition and victory, would readily comply with the audience's observed preferences.

What is also noteworthy in the present fragment is the tendency towards generalisation in argument (cf. introduction to Philetaerus fr. 6). It is a reasonable, though unprovable, conjecture that this is the opening monologue of the play (see below), that the speaker is the eponymous *ἀμπελουργός*, and that he refers to his own sorrows.

οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν ἀτυχίας ἀνθρωπίνης
 παραμύθιον γλυκύτερον ἐν βίῳ τέχνης·
 ἐπὶ τοῦ μαθήματος γὰρ ἐστηκὼς ὁ νοῦς
 αὐτὸν λέληθε παραπλέων τὰς συμφορὰς

In life there is no sweeter assuagement
 for a human ill-luck than skill;
 for the mind, firmly positioned on knowledge,
 becomes absorbed in itself, as it sails past the misfortunes

1 οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν ἀτυχίας ἀνθρωπίνης: This structure is a stylistic topos in both tragedy and comedy, and suggests that this is probably the beginning of a monologue. This is how Electra begins her speech in E. *Or.* 1: οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν δεινόν. A long soliloquy of Orestes within the same play also starts likewise: οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κρεῖσσον ἢ φίλος σαφής (l. 1155). We also learn from Aristophanes (*Ra.* 1215-1219, and sch. on l. 1219) that Euripides used the same style for the prologue of *Stheneboia* (fr. 661 *TGF*). Cf. the opening words of Tecmessa's monologue in Sophocles' *Ajax* (ll. 485-486). This structure is also popular within Comedy; cf. Ar. *Av.* 1342, Antiphanes fr. 159.1, Diphilus fr. 87.1, Damoxenus fr. 2.9, Men. *Asp.* 424, etc.²¹

This style serves to present an opinion as an introductory statement, which the character justifies, explains, and builds upon further in the subsequent speech. It also lets the speaker lend an air of authority and undeniability to his case; e.g. "there is

Philyllius, Phormis, and Strattis; an *Ἀντιλαΐς* was written by both Cephisodorus and Epicrates; finally, Antiphanes, Alexis, Clearchus, Sophilus, Theophilus, Diphilus, Apollodorus, Anaxippus, and Nico, all wrote a *Κισσαρωδός*.

²¹ See Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, 186-187.

nothing better than art / dying while having sex / listening to the flutes"; cf. Philetaerus fr. 6 and 17.

2a παραμύθιον: The meaning is *consolation, assuagement*; cf. Poll. 3.100, *LSJ* s.v. 2. It appears that Amphis is the only comic poet who used this word. It is found once in surviving tragedy (S. *El.* 129). Here it contributes to the elevated tone of this fragment, which recalls tragic (mainly Euripidean) contemplations over human fate; e.g. E. *Med.* 1018 κούφως φέρειν χρεὴ θνητὸν ὄντα συμφοράς, Id. fr. 504 *TGF*, etc.

2b τέχνης: τέχνη and μάθημα (cf. on ll. 3-4) have parallel meaning here, both denoting *knowledge, the possession of a skill*. The importance of τέχνη, as a means that can protect people against the misfortunes of life, is also praised by other comic poets; cf. Philemo fr. 178.6-7 κὰν μὲν ὀρμισθῆ τις ἡμῶν εἰς λιμένα τὸν <τῆς> τέχνης, / ἐβάλετ' ἄγκυραν καδάψας ἀσφαλείας εἵνεκα; Hipparchus fr. 2.1-2 πολὺ γ' ἐστὶ πάντων κτήμα τιμιώτατον / ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποισιν εἰς τὸ ζῆν τέχνης; Menander fr. 68 βίου δ' ἔνεστιν ἀσφάλει' ἐν ταῖς τέχναις.

3-4 ἐπὶ τοῦ μαθήματος ... συμφοράς: Here the comic character employs a metaphor that visualises his conception of knowledge. The preposition ἐπί makes one think of knowledge as a vessel, on which the mind positions itself firmly. Safe on this vessel, the mind avoids the treacherous shore, the reefs, and the rocks, as it sails past them. The metaphor suggests that knowledge / skill is valuable both as a means of equipping the mind to sustain and / or avoid misfortune, and also as a welcome distraction from misfortune. The use of the perfects ἐστηκώς and λέληθε is particularly significant here, for they express stability of state; i.e. *position* and *absorption* respectively.

Images of sea are a commonplace within Greek literature; cf. Hom. *Il.* 15.381ff., Alcaeus fr. 208 V., A. *Th.* 2-3, S. *OT* 22-23, 922-923, etc.²² In the present fragment the image of ship stands not for e.g. the state as in Alcaeus *l.c.*, but for skill / knowledge; this is an original conception. The speaker's point is to underline the value of skill / knowledge.

²² See Musurillo, *The Light and the Darkness*, 81.

Ἀμφικράτης (fr. 6)

The identity of the title figure cannot be established with certainty. He could well have been an invented character. In favour of this hypothesis is the fact that there is another play by Amphis that features a fictional person in its title, i.e. *Δεξιδημίδης* (cf. *ad loc.*). Nevertheless, if this is the case, it becomes impossible to recover the theme of the play with confidence. The mention of Plato (l. 3) offers one possible line of reconstruction; it could suggest that the play centred on an individual who sought to study philosophy, in which case the ultimate model could be Aristophanes' *Clouds*. However, we have no indication that the reference to Plato was anything more than a passing mention. Besides, the name *Ἀμφικράτης* seems rather opaque, if (as one would suppose) this was a "speaking name". Unless of course this is a poetic disguise for Amphis himself, given that – as stated above in the introduction to the poet – the name Amphis is a hypocoristic of *Ἀμφικράτης*. Cratinus' portrayal of himself in *Πυτίνη* would be the obvious antecedent;²³ Amphis could have similarly put himself on stage. Another line of enquiry would be to identify Amphicrates with a real person other than the poet. If so, this could be the architect / ship builder Amphicrates, who lived in the mid fourth century B.C.; cf. *IG II² 1618.120, PA 769*. If so, it is possible, but not provable, that the play dealt with the maritime troubles and the concerns of the Athenian democracy at the time.²⁴ Edmonds (II.315) offers an alternative interpretation, though not an entirely convincing one; i.e. that the reference is to the sculptor Amphicrates of the sixth-fifth century B.C.²⁵ Nevertheless, the only surviving fragment offers no conclusive basis for choice between these possibilities.

Below (on l. 3) I suggest that this play relates to the lecture *On the Good* that Plato gave late in his life;²⁶ it must have been composed after the delivery of this lecture, since the reference to *Plato's Good* (l. 3) obviously intends to ring a bell to

²³ See also Aristophanes' passing references to himself; e.g. *Ach.* 377-382.

²⁴ In 356 B.C. the defeat of the Athenian fleet at Embata marked the end of the Social war, but naval operations kept going on (cf. general Chares' attempts against Chersonese and Sestus). War was a daily theme of discussion, cf. Isoc. *On the Peace* (355 B.C.), and D. *On the Navy-boards* (354 B.C.). See *CAH VI² 736ff.*

²⁵ This sculptor had made a statue of the courtesan Leaina, who was killed by the tyrants Hippias and Thessalus (cf. Pliny *HN* 34.19.72). Edmonds believes that this event, and Amphicrates, became topical again, because of the assassination of the tyrant Jason of Pherae in 370 B.C.

²⁶ For Plato in Middle Comedy see on Amphis fr. 13.1, and General Introduction pp. 19-20.

the audience, by recalling recent memories and experiences. Given the date of Plato's death, i.e. 348/7 B.C., one would conjecture that the *Ἀμφικράτης* must have been produced sometime between *ca.* 350 and 330 B.C.; cf. Webster *CQ* 2 n.s. (1952) 21.

The following fragment is cited by Diogenes Laertius 3.27, within a series of fragments that target Plato. It is a possibility that the whole part on Plato and Comedy, i.e. from 3.26 to 3.28, is an excerpt from Heraclides. It is however uncertain as to which Heraclides Diogenes refers; Ponticus or Lembus. In the composition of his *Vitae* Diogenes made extensive use of excerpts gathered by himself, and used his numerous sources both directly and indirectly. Mistakes and confusion among homonymous sources come as a natural result.²⁷

Our fragment is a part of a dialogue between a slave and his master (cf. *ᾧ δέσποτα*). The subject is probably a woman (cf. *ταύτην*), either a hetaira or a maiden (cf. on l. 2). The master is about to act, in order – understandably – to ensure this woman for himself. The slave however has reservations, which the master offers to allay. The juxtaposition of master and slave is a linking thread between Middle and Old Comedy; cf. Chremylus and Carion in Aristophanes' *Wealth*, Dionysus and Xanthias in *Frogs*.²⁸

τὸ δ' ἀγαθὸν ὅ τι ποτ' ἐστίν, οὐδὲ τυγχάνειν
μέλλεις διὰ ταύτην, ἥττον οἶδα τοῦτ' ἐγώ,
ᾧ δέσποτ', ἢ τὸ Πλάτωνος ἀγαθόν. (B.) πρόσεχε δὴ

And as for whatever benefit you are likely
to get through her, I know less about that,
master, than about Plato's Good. (B.) Just watch

τα τὸ δ' ἀγαθόν: Outside Plato *ἀγαθόν* usually refers to practical or material benefit,²⁹ and this is what is meant here, probably with some additional connotations of sexual pleasure. Aristophanes too often uses this term with a non-philosophical sense.³⁰ The

²⁷ On the controversial issue of Diogenes' sources see the detailed discussion by Mejer in the first part of his monograph in *Hermes Einzelschr.* H. 40 (1978).

²⁸ For the slave figure in Middle Comedy see Nesselrath *MK* 283-296.

²⁹ E.g. Th. 3.68, X. *Cyr.* 5.30.20, Lys. 13.92, etc.

³⁰ E.g. *Ec.* 426, *Pl.* 236, etc; cf. Eubulus fr. 52.

meaning of ἀγαθόν as a purely worldly good is even more emphasised by the following contrast with the Platonic Good. The slave cannot understand the good to be expected from this woman any better than he understands Plato's philosophy. See Weiher, *Philosophen und Philosophenspott in der attischen Komödie*, 48.

1b ὅ τι ποτ' ἐστίν: For the use of ποτέ with interrogatives to give an emphatic tenor to the speech, see Smyth § 346c. In the present fragment the combination of ποτέ with the indefinite relative pronoun ὅ τι results in a rather dismissive way of speaking, which emphasises the very indeterminacy meant by the slave.

2 διὰ ταύτην: To the audience the reference will have been obvious; either it refers to someone or something visible to them or it resumes an antecedent noun previously mentioned. Nesselrath (*MK* 294, n. 24) believes that this deictic pronoun refers to a woman, who has been occupying the master's mind. This could be either a hetaira or a free young lady, whom the master would like to marry. But Kock (II.237) offers an alternative interpretation; he thinks that ταύτην refers to Philosophy. If so, this might suggest that philosophy played a significant role in the plot of the play. Though certainty is impossible, I would opt for Nesselrath's rather than Kock's interpretation, given the increased interest of Middle Comedy in hetairai and women in general (cf. General Introduction pp. 20-21). Besides, the issue of advantage / benefits to be expected from a hetaira is also the topic of Amphis fr. 1 (cf. *ad loc.*).

3a τὸ Πλάτωνος ἀγαθόν: Refers to a central notion in Plato's philosophy, that is, the notion of the Good;³¹ cf. Imperio in Belardinelli et al., *Tessere*, 127. For a discussion of how philosophy penetrated the fourth century Athenian society see General Introduction pp. 19-20.

The slave of the present fragment has apparently no idea of what the Platonic Good is, and employs this phrase in a proverbial way to express his overall ignorance

³¹ Cf. R. Lodge, *Plato's Theory of Ethics*, London ²2000; Shorey, in Tarán, *Selected Papers*, vol. 2, 28-79; Irwin, *Plato's Ethics*, 318-319, 332-337; Hobbs, *Plato and the Hero*, 220-230; Dorter, *Form and Good in Plato's Eleatic Dialogues*, 24-26, 231-235, 238-243.

of the matter that he is discussing with his master.³² A further reference to Plato's Good recurs in *Philippides* fr. 6, where it is given a peculiar interpretation, since it appears to equal celibacy and carefree life.

The concept of τὸ ἀγαθόν in Plato is complex and multifaceted, as Protagoras admits in *Prt.* 334b. Actually, the real nature of τὸ ἀγαθόν is under constant discussion and meticulous examination throughout the Platonic corpus, cf. *Phlb.* 65a, *Crat.* 412c, etc., while Parmenides declares his uncertainty in *Parm.* 134c. In some passages τὸ ἀγαθόν appears to equal ἡδονή (*Phlb.* 11b), σοφία (*Euthd.* 281e), etc.³³ Despite the vast number of references to it in the surviving works of Plato, one cannot easily discern Plato's own conviction about this notion, since the relevant passages provide us with the views of either Socrates or his collocutors. It is likely that Plato's own view was presented in a lost lecture, entitled *Περὶ τὰγαθοῦ*, given by him late in life, and to which the phrase τὸ Πλάτωνος ἀγαθόν must refer.³⁴ Gaiser³⁵ argues that Plato's *Seventh Letter* composed ca. 355 B.C. is unaware of this lecture (cf. 341d-e); therefore, he suggests the years between 355 and Plato's death as the date for its delivery. This lecture must have dazzled and confused the majority of the listeners, who were unprepared for its content, as Aristoxenus confirms in *Harm.* 2.30-31: καθάπερ Ἀριστοτέλης ἀεὶ διηγεῖτο τοὺς πλείστους τῶν ἀκουσάντων παρὰ Πλάτωνος τὴν περὶ τὰγαθοῦ ἀκρόασιν παθεῖν. προσιέναι μὲν γὰρ ἕκαστον ὑπολαμβάνοντα λήψεσθαι τι τῶν νομιζομένων τούτων ἀνθρωπίνων ἀγαθῶν οἷον πλοῦτον ὑγίειαν ἰσχὺν τὸ ὅλον εὐδαιμονίαν τινὰ θαυμαστήν. ὅτε δὲ φανείησαν οἱ λόγοι περὶ μαθημάτων καὶ ἀριθμῶν καὶ γεωμετρίας καὶ ἀστρολογίας καὶ τὸ πέρασ ὅτι ἀγαθόν ἐστὶν ἓν, παντελῶς οἶμαι παράδοξόν τι ἐφαίνετο αὐτοῖς. εἶθ' οἱ μὲν κατεφρόνουσιν τοῦ πράγματος οἱ δὲ κατεμέμφοντο. See Arist. *MM* 1182a25-30, Simplicius *in Ph.* 151.8-11, 453.27-30. The dominant opinion of modern scholars is that Plato used to deliver regular lectures on the Good *within* the Academy, in front of his disciples only; this is the reason why Simplicius speaks in plural of λόγοι (*in Ph.* 453.28, 503.12) and συνουσίαι (*ibid.* 542.10, 545.24). But there must have been a single occasion, when Plato gave a public lecture that left a lasting impression

³² Fenk notes: "Τὸ Πλάτωνος ἀγαθόν paulatim apud Athenienses proverbii loco celebratur pro obscuris quibusdam et remotis rebus, quas accuratius definire nolebant aut non poterant" (*Adversarii Platonis quomodo de indole ac moribus eius iudicaverint*, 45).

³³ Cf. *Grg.* 495a-b, 499e, *HpMa.* 297b, *Lys.* 222d, etc.

³⁴ See Riginos, *Platonica*, Anecdote 79, pp. 124-126.

³⁵ *Phronesis* 25 (1980) 17-19.

on the Athenians.³⁶ Themistius 245c mentions Piraeus, as the exact location where this lecture supposedly took place. Gaiser argues (*o.c.* 9) that if this was an internal discourse within the Academy, Plato's students would have understood their teacher's tenets, and would not have been confused to the degree described by Aristoxenus *l.c.*

3b δῆ: Cf. Denniston *GP* 204, 214-218. The position of δῆ here is emphatic, and so is its meaning. Denniston notes its particular connection with certain verbs, especially in Plato. These verbs are ὄρα (as in ὄρα δῆ; e.g. Pl. *Phlb.* 11a, *Phd.* 105a), and ἔχε (as in ἔχε δῆ; e.g. Pl. *R.* 353b, *Grg.* 460a). Another imperative, which occurs frequently in Plato in connection with δῆ, is πρόσεχω; the usual phrase is πρόσεχε δῆ τὸν νοῦν (e.g. *Plt.* 259d, *Men.* 82b, *Lg.* 809e, and once πρόσεχέτω δῆ ... τὸν νοῦν in *Lg.* 783e). Since the phrase πρόσεχε δῆ does not occur anywhere on its own,³⁷ i.e. without τὸν νοῦν, I would suggest that in the present fragment the next line began with τὸν νοῦν, which scans correctly too (– –). The master's πρόσεχε δῆ is already a response to the slave's perplexity; he is about to explain to the slave, i.e. an argument will follow (again not unlike Plato). The acquaintance of Amphis with Plato is not limited to the reference to τὸ ἀγαθόν, but subtly extends to the Platonic style. Thus, we are led to assume that Amphis expected at least some of his audience to know their Plato and discern this element of Platonic diction. The parody of Platonic style is consistent with the level of interest in philosophical ideas, and, although unprovable, it is possible that this is a reference to a *written* text.

Γυναικοκρατία (fr. 8)

This fragment consists of two catalectic trochaic tetrameters. This is the only time that Amphis employs this metre. Here the trochaic tetrameter is used for general moralising.³⁸

³⁶ Cf. Ross, *Plato's Theory of Ideas*, 147-149; Gaiser *o.c.* 8-11, 25.

³⁷ Outside Plato the phrase πρόσεχε δῆ occurs only twice; in Alexis fr. 274, and in Galen *De dieb. depr.* 9.808.15. In both passages it is accompanied by τὸν νοῦν.

³⁸ For the use of the trochaic tetrameter for special effects as a means of inviting particular audience attention see General Introduction p. 27.

This is another shared play-title between Amphis and Alexis.³⁹ Both Böttiger (*Kleine Schriften*, I.300ff.) and Meineke (I.398ff.) believe that both *Γυναικοκρατία*-plays must have been either adaptations or imitations of Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*. However, Arnott considers all this as surmise.⁴⁰ And he is right to be cautious; for a title like *Γυναικοκρατία* could mean either “regime of women” or “control by a woman / women”. So, the connection with *Ecclesiazusae*, though highly probable, remains uncertain. If the title meant indeed the latter, the play may have focused on just a couple, featuring e.g. a henpecked husband and an authoritarian wife.

The fragment is cited by Athenaeus VIII 336c.

πῖνε, παίξε· θνητὸς ὁ βίος, ὀλίγος οὐπὶ γῆ χρόνος·
ἀθάνατος ὁ θάνατός ἐστιν, ἂν ἅπαξ τις ἀποθάνῃ

Drink! Play! Life is mortal, short is the time on earth.

Death is immortal, once one dies

r: The line is asyndetic. The imperative *παίξε* is probably an urge to “make love” (Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, 157); indeed, this is the usual meaning of the verb *παίζω* in Comedy; cf. on Mnesimachus fr. 4.52-55. However, it does not follow that *παίζω* here refers exclusively to sex; it can also be interpreted as a general advice to enjoy all aspects of life and to indulge in all kinds of pleasure; of course, part of this enjoyment is sex, but there are also other things (e.g. food and wine). In fact, the double imperative (*πῖνε, παίξε*) is quite arresting, and the whole line is another instance of a well-known cliché, exemplified particularly by Horace *Od.* 1.11.6-8: “sapias, vina liques, et spatio brevi / spem longam reseces. dum loquimur, fugerit invida / aetas: carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero”; cf. Alcaeus fr. 38a.⁴¹ A similar saying was said to have been inscribed on the tomb of Sardanapalus; ἔσθιε, πῖνε, παίξε (or ὄχευε), as an instigation to the passers-by to enjoy life.⁴²

³⁹ See introduction to Amphis' *Ἀμπελογράς*.

⁴⁰ Cf. Arnott's introduction to Alexis' play, with bibliography on gynaecocracy.

⁴¹ See on Philetærus fr. 7.2 and on Theophilus fr. 12.3-4.

⁴² Cf. Aristoboulos 139 F 9 and Apollodoros 244 F 303 *FGrH*.

1-2: These lines are arguing a paradox; life is said to be mortal and death immortal; cf. Lucretius 3.869: “mortalem vitam mors immortalis ademit”. Life is matched with mortality, and death with immortality. This conceptual paradox is emphasised even more through the verbal echo ἀθάνατος – θάνατος, and the parechesis of the letters π and θ. Both the conceptual antitheses and the verbal echoes are major features of the sophistic artillery (see on Amphis fr. 1.1b). See Gorgias’ *Ἐλένης ἐγκώμιον* (cf. §§7, 20, 21), and *ὑπὲρ Παλαμήδους ἀπολογία* (cf. §§ 3, 5, 22, etc.); both speeches abound in language twists and plays. This kind of riddling language is reminiscent of Heraclitus too; cf. fr. 50: γενητὸν ἀγένητον, θνητὸν ἀθάνατον; fr. 62: ἀθάνατοι θνητοί, θνητοὶ ἀθάνατοι, ζῶντες τὸν ἐκείνων θάνατον, τὸν δὲ ἐκείνων βίον τεθνεῶτες.⁴³

2: Here we have a run of seven short syllables (ἀθᾶνᾶτῶς ὃ θᾶνᾶτῶς), resulting from the resolution of the second and third longa. West observes that “the frequency of resolution (in trochaic tetrameters) is in tragedy somewhat higher, but in comedy somewhat lower than in the same authors’ trimeters” (*Introduction to Greek Metre*, 29). Amphis’ rate of resolution in iambic trimeters is rather high; in the surviving total of his one hundred and twenty seven iambic trimeter lines he practises resolution (of ancipitia, longa, and brevia) one hundred times, often twice within the same line. Still, the resolution of two consecutive longa, and the resulting sequence of seven short syllables is a rare and noteworthy case.

Γυναικομανία (frr. 9, 10)

The title is reminiscent of the *Γυναικοκρατία*-plays by both Amphis and Alexis, and also of Anaxandrides’ *Γεροντομανία*. It is possible that in the *Γυναικοκρατία*-plays women transcended (to an irrecoverable extent) the boundaries of their traditional roles and duties. The term *γυναικομανία* grammatically allows for two possible interpretations; i.e. either lust *for* women (i.e. objective genitive) or madness *of* women (i.e. subjective genitive). Elsewhere the word has the former sense.⁴⁴ If we adopt this meaning for the present play too, a number of plot-possibilities present

⁴³ For death as unending cf. Catullus *Carm.* 5.4-6.

⁴⁴ E.g. Plu. 769b, Ath. XI 464d, etc.

themselves: a) a man may have a passion for a particular woman; b) a man may be in pursuit of women in general; c) several men may be after one or more women.

Nevertheless, the sense “madness of women” cannot be ruled out. In Anaxandrides’ *Γεροντομανία* the idea of *madness*, rather than that of *lust*, seems more plausible.⁴⁵ If *γυναικομανία* denotes indeed the madness of women, such madness can be understood in two different ways. Firstly, given the existence of both *Ecclesiazusae* and the two *Γυναικοκρατία*-plays, one is tempted to discern in *Γυναικομανία* a roughly parallel pattern, i.e. some kind of female domination; women going awry and misbehaving, in disaccord with the socio-political status traditionally assigned to them. Besides, the heavenly situation described below is interestingly paralleled by the programmatic statements of Praxagora in *Ec.* 605-607 and 689-710; with women being in charge of the public affairs, the men are left with nothing but a life consisting of merely eating, drinking, and copulating. Although ultimately unprovable, still it is not inconceivable that the present fragment of Amphis fitted into a parallel context. It may be important that the word *βίος* is present (l. 1); i.e. what we are presented here with is not to be perceived as an isolated occasion (e.g. a usual symposion), but rather as a description of a permanent situation that is a preposterous *modus vivendi*. A further assumption would be that the speaker A might actually be a woman instructing and introducing an ignorant male into the “rules” of the new way of life.

The second possibility is to suppose a mythical play, and explain this madness as a divinely inspired one, i.e. a ritual madness, possibly bacchic, parallel to the one described in Euripides’ *Bacchae*.⁴⁶ This hypothesis gains further support, if we accept that the Eurybatos mentioned in fr. 10 is indeed the mythical character (see *ad loc.*). However, it is difficult to imagine the kind of mythical plot that could accommodate both frenzied women and Eurybatos as one of the Cercopes, and it would be a mere conjecture to try to reconstruct any further details. Whatever the myth elements, they

⁴⁵ It is hard to imagine how old men can be sexually attractive. Millis *ad loc.* also understands the title as “madness or infatuation of old men rather than a lust for old men”. But this is comedy and we cannot rule out the idea that someone had a passion for old men; it is however less likely, especially since senility was a phenomenon as familiar to the ancient Greeks as to us.

⁴⁶ On maenadism see the introductions of both Dodds and Seaford in their editions of the play. In general, Greek (male) mentality conceived women as particularly prone to becoming possessed by daemonic passion; cf. Padel, in Cameron & Kuhrt, *Images of Women in Antiquity*, 3-19.

must have been given a comic twist, allowing again for a mixture of myth with contemporary, fourth century life (cf. General Introduction pp. 24-26).

The fragment below is cited by Athenaeus XIV 642a, within a series of fragments that are meant to provide evidence about the nature and the content of both *ἐπιδορπίσματα* and *δεύτεραι τράπεζαι*.

Fr. 9

ἤδη ποτ' ἤκουσας βίον

ἀλληλεμένον; (B.) ναί. (A.) τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν' ἐστὶν σαφῶς·

ἄμμητες, οἶνος ἠδύς, ψά, σησαμαῖ,

μύρον, στέφανος, αὐλητρίς. (B.) ὦ Διοσκόρω,

5 ὀνόματα τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν διελήλυθας

Have you ever heard of a ground-grain

life? (B.) Yes. (A.) This is exactly what it is all about;

milk cakes, sweet wine, eggs, sesame-seeds cakes,

unguent, wreath, a flute-girl. (B.) O Dioskouroi,

5 you have gone through the names of the Twelve Gods

1 ἤδη ποτ' ἤκουσας: This forceful way of introducing a question is one of many possible variations of a standard pattern that aims to draw on the collocutor's experience. A verb signifying *hear, listen, see, perceive*, and the like is combined with *ἤδη*, sometimes followed by another adverb of time (if so, then preferably by either *ποτέ* or *πώποτε*), to form a forceful question. Cf. Ar. *Nu.* 346, Amphis fr. 27.4-5, Hermippus fr. 37, Magnes fr. 2, Pl. *R.* 493d, etc.

1-2 βίον ἀλληλεμένον: This expression has the sense of *profusion of goods* (cf. *Suda* s.v. *ἀλληλεμένον*: ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν ἀφρονίᾳ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ὄντων).⁴⁷ Here the speaker goes through a real abundance of requisite provisions for a complete banquet.

The passive perfect of *ἀλέω* (*grind, bruise*; cf. *LSJ* s.v.) can be either *ἀλήλεμαι* (as here) or *ἀλήλεσμαι* (used more frequently, e.g. Hdt. 7.23.20). This kind of

⁴⁷ See Bernays, *Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit*, 53-54.

reduplication is called *Attic*; cf. Smyth § 446; Lautensach, *Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern und Komikern*, 113-114.

2 τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν': Colloquialism, particularly frequent in Comedy and Plato; cf. Dover on Ar. *Ra.* 1342, and Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 354. Here it is used to add emphasis and draw the collocutor's attention on what follows.

3-4 ἄμμητες ... αὐλητρίδες: Here we have – on a small scale – a stylistic feature typical of Comedy, i.e. the list. Aristophanes is full of them; e.g. *V.* 676-677, *Ec.* 838-852, *Ach.* 1085-1093, etc. This is a pre-comic motif, examples of which can be found in iambos, e.g. Hipponax fr. 26a West, as well as in elegy, e.g. Solon fr. 38-40 West.⁴⁸ This is not just a Greek tendency – Rabelais is also very fond of them.⁴⁹

ἄμμη and σησαμῆ are types of cakes. ἄμμη was made of milk (sch. on Ar. *Pl.* 999, Poll. 6.77); σησαμῆ was made of sesame seeds and was offered at wedding ceremonies, as a symbol of fertility (sch. on Ar. *Pax* 869, Men. *Sam.* 74, 125).

Unguent was a *sine qua non* of a proper symposion; cf. Poll. 6.104-105, Ar. *Ach.* 1091, *Ec.* 841-842, Machon fr. 16.267 Gow, etc. According to the physician Philonides, the custom of anointing one's head with perfume had a practical aim, i.e. to reduce the strength of wine and to prevent it from being drawn upwards to the head, since it was believed that a dry head attracted anything that was taken into the stomach (cf. Ath. XV 692a-b).

The garlanding of the banqueters with wreaths was another typical feature of the standard procedure of a symposion; cf. sch. on Ar. *Ec.* 133, *Ach.* 1005-1007, 1089-1093, *Ec.* 838-852, Pl. *Smp.* 212d-e, D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 19.8.1, etc.

Flute-girls were commonly present at symposia; cf. on Philetaerus fr. 17.4. Comedy abounds in references to flute-girls and similar female artists (all of whom might double as hetairai), who entertained the banqueters; e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 1091-1093, *V.* 1219, *Ra.* 513ff, Antiphanes fr. 233. Cf. Pl. *R.* 373a,⁵⁰ X. *Smp.* 2.1, etc.

⁴⁸ Cf. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, 31-32; Noussia, *CQ* 51 n.s. (2001) 353-359.

⁴⁹ Cf. the list of foodstuffs in *Gargantua* 35.53-70.

⁵⁰ Vahlen defends the reading ἐταῖραι *ad loc.* (*Opuscula Academica*, 1.7-12).

4 ὦ Διοσκόρω: Invocations to Dioskouroi are relatively rare in Comedy. In fact, there are only three: Ar. *Pax* 285, *Ec.* 1069, and Men. *Dysc.* 192. The scholiast on *Pax* 285 notes: διὸ νῦν αὐτῶν μέμνηται, ὅτι Βρασίδου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου ἐμνήσθη. Ussher on *Ec.* 1069 believes that this is simply a prayer originating from the quality of Dioskouroi as protectors of the travellers. Nevertheless, it is not inconceivable that the Dioskouroi, as specifically Spartan patrons, might have looked as the most appropriate deities to be invoked within *Ecclesiazusae*, a play with a particularly Spartan flavour.⁵¹ If we accept the hypothesis made in the introduction about the possible resemblance of the present play to *Ecclesiazusae*, then it is possible that the invocation to Dioskouroi is not accidental, but rather relates to the play's context.

5 δώδεκα θεῶν: The present exclamation, combined with the previous apostrophe to the Dioskouroi, denotes heightened emotion and excitement. With comic exaggeration the speaker equates the various foodstuffs with the Olympian gods. In addition, what he brands as the twelve gods, are actually not twelve but seven symposion essentials. So the joke is double; the twelve gods are substituted with seven items of pleasure. The euphoria of the speaker must be overwhelming; he is in complete heaven.

The mentions of the Twelve Gods in Comedy can be either simple references (as in the present fragment) or invocations. But they are not particularly frequent; the only ones are: Ar. *Av.* 95, Aristophon fr. 11.2, adesp. fr. 362 Kock (references); Ar. *Eq.* 235, Men. *Kol.* 127, *Sam.* 306, adesp. fr. 1013 K.-A. (invocations).⁵² See Lehrs, *Populäre Aufsätze aus dem Alterthum vorzugsweise zur Ethik und Religion der Griechen*, 246.

Fr. 10

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus IX 386e. The words κνισολοιχός and ὀλβιογάστωρ imply a gastronomic context, parallel to that of fr. 9.

⁵¹ Praxagora champions the establishment of a communist society, where private property would be abolished (590ff.), and the women generally assume unprecedented – for the Athenian society – liberties and rights. For parallels within the Spartan regime, see Arist. *Pol.* 1269b 32ff., X. *Lac.* 1.4, 6, 11.1, Plu. *Lyc.* 10. See also Willetts, *Hermes* 87 (1959) 501.

⁵² An altar dedicated to the Twelve Gods existed in the Athenian agora from the second half of the sixth century; cf. Th. 6.54.6-7 (see Gomme *ad loc.*), and Crosby, *Hesperia*, suppl. 8 (1949) 97ff.

Εὐρύβατε κνισολοιχέ, <-> οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως
οὐκ ὀλβιογάστῳ εἶ σύ

1 <μὰ Δί'> Meineke: <χαῖρ'> idem *Anal. Ath.* p. 169: <νῦν> Kock

Fat-licking Eurybatos, it is definitely
in your belly that you find happiness

1a Εὐρύβατε: Eurybatos was a mythical figure; he was one of the Cercopes. This would fit a mythical plot for the play (see introduction).⁵³ However, the name Eurybatos was also used as a nickname for a cunning person, after the notorious traitor Eurybatos, who betrayed Croesus in favour of Cyrus (cf. D.S. 9.32, *Suda l.c.*, Ephorus 70 F 58 *FGrH*, Eustathius *Comm. Od.* 2.202.12ff.). Aristophanes uses this name as a nickname of Zeus (fr. 198). Likewise, in the present fragment the speaker could be simply targeting the cunning of another character (not necessarily named Eurybatos).

1b κνισολοιχέ: “Licker of fat”. The speaker employs this adjective to satirise the gluttony of the person he is addressing. This is either a comment with an immediate relation to a particular scene (i.e. the person addressed has just indulged in food or is about to do so), or a more generalised statement on the eating habits of this person.

The usage of both the adjective *κνισολοιχός* and the noun *κνισολοιχία* are limited to Comedy: Antiphanes fr. 65, Sophilus fr. 6 and 8. Generally, compounds with *κνισο-* are common mocking characterisations; e.g. *ταγνημοκνισοθήρας* (Eupolis fr. 190), *κνισοτηρητής* (fr. adesp. 1042 Kock = Phryn. *PS* 84.20), *κνισοκόλαξ* (Asius fr. 14.2 West) *κνισοδιώκτης* (v.l. in *Batr.* 232); see K.-A. on Eupolis fr. 190.

⁵³ According to one tradition, the Cercopes were two brothers, notorious for plundering, robbing, and killing travellers. The ancient sources are not unanimous about their names (they are named as either Eurybatos and Hōlos, or Sillos and Trivalos). As a punishment for their crimes Zeus transformed them into apes; cf. Diotimus fr. 2, Ovid *Met.* 14.88-100. But according to a different tradition, the Cercopes were a whole tribe of villains (some sources describe them as monkey-like), who were subdued by Heracles; cf. D.S. 4.31.7, Apollod. 2.6.3. See *RE* XI.1 s.v. *Kerkopen*, and III A1 s.v. *Σίλλος* nr. 1. Cf. Hunter's introduction to Eubulus' *Κέρκωπες*.

ιϵ (-): Cf. crit. app. From the conjectures made so far *νῦν* looks rather flat and its only advantage is that it scans. *χαῖρ'* is possible, but there is no obvious reason to suppose that a character has just entered, as the supplement would suggest. But *μὰ Δί'* seems a promising suggestion, since the particle *μὰ* plus the accusative occurs frequently – in both poetry and prose – before or after a negation as a way of adding extra emphasis; e.g. Chionides fr. 4.1, Cratinus fr. 128.1, Hermippus fr. 68.1, Alexis fr. 63.4, Eubulus fr. 97.1, Ar. *Av.* 24, *Th.* 567, *Ec.* 1085, D. L. 3.10, etc. For further examples and bibliography see Arnott on Alexis fr. 233.1-2.

2 ὀλβιογάστωρ: This word was probably invented by Amphis. It occurs only here and in Athenaeus IX 386c, where the relation with this fragment is obvious (see 386e). Combining the notions of *ὄλβος* and *γαστήρ*, the word is a comic formation that very graphically describes as glutton someone who finds happiness and bliss in his belly / in eating. There is a paratragic tone generated by *ὀλβιογάστωρ*, for it alludes to adjectives such as *ὀλβιοδαίμων* (*Il.* 3.182), *ὀλβιόδωρος* (*E. Hipp.* 750), *ὀλβιόμοιρος* (*Orph. H.* 26.6), etc.

Δεξιδημίδης (fr. 13)

This name is not attested anywhere else as a personal name. However, there is a considerable number of names ending in *-δημίδης* from both the fifth and the fourth centuries B.C. The evidence comes from Athens but also from Thessaly, Boeotia, Euboea, and the island of Thasos.⁵⁴ Breitenbach admits that “nullam inventionis causam video” (*Titulorum* 50-51). The first component of the name is the stem *δεξ-* for *δέξασθαι*, commonly attested in names beginning with *Δεξ-*, *Δεξε-*, *Δεξι-*.⁵⁵ The second component must apparently be *δῆμος*. The antecedent here is Aristophanes, who often engages into a word play of creating names and words out of *δῆμος*. Apart from the person named *Δῆμος* in the *Knights*, Aristophanes invents the comic diminutives *δημακίδιον* (*Eq.* 823), and *δημίδιον* (*Eq.* 726, 1199). Additionally, in *V.* 699 he creates the verb *δημίζω* to refer to demagogues (*δημιζόντων*). Another instance of a

⁵⁴ Cf. the reverse indexes in *LGPN* vols. I, II, and III.B.

⁵⁵ See Fick, *Die griechischen Personennamen*, 91; Bechtel, *Personennamen*, 118; *PA* 3209-3241.

name created after *δήμος* is the figure of *Βλεψίδημος* in *Plutus*, whose name implies a “realistic political man” (Webster *SLGC* 15).

It may be significant that Plautus in *Bacch.* 284-285 treats the name *Archidemides* as being a *Redende Name* (“cum mi ipsum nomen eius Archidemides / clamaret dempturum esse...”). A *speaking* (alias *significant*) name is exactly what *Δεξιδημιδης* must be. Given its two constituents (i.e. *δέχομαι* and *δήμος*), *Δεξιδημιδης* might allude to a wealthy person who entertained and treated the people with *hestiasis* and other liturgies. Any attempt to identify this person would be without further evidence.

The fragment below features a negative portrait of Plato and forms part of a wider tradition that presents Plato as arrogant. None the less, this image of Plato is counterbalanced by another branch of the tradition (e.g. Diogenes Laertius, Plutarch, Stobaeus, etc.) that sees him favourably as a moderate, benevolent, and dignified philosopher; cf. Riginos *o.c.* 160-164. Our fragment is cited by both D.L. 3.28 (immediately after and within the same context as fr. 6 above), and *Suda* σ 706.⁵⁶ It is a direct address to Plato. This suggests that Plato may have appeared as a character in the play and had a speaking part.⁵⁷ Of course, we cannot rule out the possibility that the speaker is addressing an absent Plato, just as the speaker in *Amipsias* fr. 9 can be addressing either a present or an absent Socrates.⁵⁸ Whatever the case was, either present (*εἰκόνι*) or absent (*λόγω*), Plato is satirised in the very way that he himself condemns in the *Laws* 935e.

ὦ Πλάτων,
ὥς οὐδὲν οἶσθα πλὴν σκυθρωπάζειν μόνον,
ὥσπερ κοχλίας σεμνῶς ἐπηρκῶς τὰς ὀφρῦς

2 οἶσθα Diog. F: ἦσθα Diog. BPVΦ, *Sud.*: ἦσθα edd. Basil. 1907 et Marcovich 1999

O Plato,

⁵⁶ *Suda* here is copying from Diogenes Laertius' text, which is one of *Suda*'s numerous sources; cf. *RE* s.v. *Suidas*, esp. pp. 709-710.

⁵⁷ Plato must have also had a speaking part in Aristophon's play entitled *Plato* (so Meineke III.360; cf. Webster *SLGC* 63, Arnott 51).

⁵⁸ There is a much later example of a speaker addressing an absent Plato; this is Ps.-Luc. *Amor.* 24.

you know nothing but scowling,
raising solemnly your eyebrows like a snail

1 ὦ Πλάτων: The technique of ὀνομαστικὴ κωμωδεῖν, characteristic of Old Comedy, is being used here by a Middle Comedy playwright.⁵⁹ The present gibe against Plato is personal, but elsewhere in Middle Comedy Plato's philosophy is also targeted; cf. Amphis fr. 6. No stereotype of Plato's presentation can be established. His fondness of definitions, usually trivial ones, is parodied both in Alexis fr. 1 (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*) and Epicrates fr. 10.⁶⁰ Alexis mocks Plato's habit of walking up and down while pondering (fr. 151), and also his idle talk (fr. 185).⁶¹ Several aspects of his philosophy are also targeted; the theories about the soul and its immortality are parodied in Alexis fr. 163 and Cratinus Junior fr. 10; the ἀγαθόν-doctrine in Alexis fr. 98; the theory about the one and indefinite dyad in Theopompus fr. 16.⁶² Anaxandrides fr. 20 satirises Plato's habit of eating the Academy's sacred olives (cf. D.L. 6.25). The members of the Academy in general are also parodied; they are said to be soft and effeminate (Antiphanes fr. 35),⁶³ to corrupt the youths through the manoeuvres of logos (Alexis fr. 99), and to cultivate the appearance of austerity and solemnity (Ephippus fr. 14). The latter agrees with the way Plato is treated in our fragment. In fact, some aspects of Plato's treatment are longstanding commonplaces – *alazoneia* (Socrates in Ar. *Clouds*, Protagoras in Eupolis' *Kolakes* and in Plato), concern to present an intellectual façade (Protagoras again *ll.c.*), hunger and / or impiety (Socrates in Amipsias' *Konnos*).

2 οὐδὲν οἶσθα: Cf. crit. app. The confusion of the tradition may be partly due to the fact that by the Byzantine period οἶσθα and ἦσθα will have sounded the same. The codices

⁵⁹ There is good evidence as to the intermittent persistence of the ὀνομαστικὴ κωμωδεῖν not only during the fourth century B.C., but also down to the beginnings of the third; cf. General Introduction pp. 17-18.

⁶⁰ Socrates is parodied for the same reason in Ar. *Nu.* 144ff.

⁶¹ Within Old Comedy the same accusation is cast against both Socrates (Ar. *Nu.* 1480ff. with scholia, Eupolis fr. 386) and the sophists (Ar. fr. 506, Eupolis fr. 388); cf. Arnott on Alexis fr. 185.

⁶² Similarly, Aristophanes parodies what he presents as the essential elements of Socrates' philosophy; cf. *Nu.* 95-97, 225ff., etc.

⁶³ On the contrary, in Old Comedy Aristophanes and Amipsias parody the negligent looking of both Socrates and his associates; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 103, 835-837, Av. 1281-1282 with scholia, and Amipsias fr. 9.

of Diogenes Laertius offer limited help. The reading ἤσθα is preserved in the codices B (Burbonicus), and P (Parisinus), as well as in the fragmentary codices V (Vaticanus gr. 1302), and Φ (an excerpt in codex Vaticanus gr. 96). It is also preserved in *Suda*. On the other hand, the reading οἶσθα is preserved only in codex F (Laurentianus). In the introduction of his 1999 *Teubner* edition of the text Marcovich considers codex B as the best of all codices, despite being written by an illiterate scribe, and codex P as an excellent one too (p. XII). But when it comes to codex F, Marcovich regards it as inferior, written by a neglectful scribe (p. XIV).

None the less, the study of some parallels weakens the case for ἤσθα, despite being favoured by the manuscript tradition, and favours the case for οἶσθα. With the verb ἤσθα, the predicate tends to be a noun; cf. Ar. *Lys.* 139 οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐσμεν πλήν Ποσειδῶν καὶ σκάφη; *Ra.* 227 οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐστ' ἄλλ' ἢ κοάξ; S. fr. 945.2 TGF ὡς οὐδὲν ἐσμεν πλήν σκιαῖς ἐοικότες; E. fr. 25.2-3 TGF γέροντες οὐδὲν ἐσμεν ἄλλο πλήν ὄχλος / καὶ σχῆμ'. On the other hand, with the verb οἶσθα the predicate tends to be an infinitive (with or without an article); cf. Ar. *Ra.* 740 ὅστις γε πίνειν οἶδε καὶ βινεῖν μόνον; Alexis fr. 217.2 ὁ δὲ Διόνυσος οἶδε τὸ μεθύσαι μόνον. Accordingly, the presence of the infinitive σκυθρωπάζειν in our fragment tells for the reading οἶσθα.

An additional element that may tell against the reading ἤσθα could be the absence of the particle ἄρα. Denniston, in what he calls “idiomatic usage”,⁶⁴ notes that sentences that contain imperfect, particularly of εἰμί, and give the impression of acknowledging something that has long been the case, are often reinforced by the particle ἄρα. Though not compulsory, ἄρα might have been expected.

The reading ἤσθα, first proposed by Breitenbach, Buddenhagen, Debrunner, and von der Muehll in their 1907 edition (*Diogenis Laertiis Vita Platonis*), and recently adopted by Marcovich, though palaeographically close, is unparalleled.

The choice is difficult; all the more that both readings οἶσθα and ἤσθα are offered by the tradition. On balance, I am inclined to accept οἶσθα along with Kassel-Austin. But whichever reading is adopted, this passage is hostile to Plato, and this is certainly typical (cf. on l. 1).

⁶⁴ See *GP* 36-37 and *LSJ* s.v. ἄρα.

2-3 *σκυθρωπάξειν* - *ἐπηρκῶς τὰς ὄφρῦς*: Lifting the eyebrows in a grimace was generally associated with haughtiness,⁶⁵ and with being in a sullen and / or angry mood.⁶⁶ Because of this, it was commonly associated particularly with philosophers, as a way of expressing their deep meditation and arrogance.⁶⁷ Such an attitude is much parodied by Lucian in *Nec.* 5, where the philosophers are presented as not practising what they solemnly preach.⁶⁸ Indeed, “you know nothing but scowling” suggests that Plato is a mere appearance, a hypocrite. This feature of the philosophers constituted a good laughter source for Comedy, cf. Menander fr. 37 and 349 (*οἱ τὰς ὄφρῦς αἴροντες*), Bato fr. 5.13 (*οἱ γὰρ τὰς ὄφρῦς ἐπηρκότες*). Additionally, Hegesander in Book VI of his *Hypomnemata* (FHG IV.413) quotes an epigram mocking philosophers in general (e.g. *ὄφρυνασπασίδαί*). See Weiher *o.c.* 47.

There are lots of expressions that denote the lifting of the eyebrows,⁶⁹ but the verb *ἐπαίρω* is rare. In fact, it is used only here, in Euripides fr. 1040, and Bato fr. 5.13 (always in perfect).

Διδύραμβος (frr. 14-15)

The title is open to multiple interpretations. It could indicate Dionysus himself, since *Διδύραμβος* was one of the epithets of the god (cf. *E. Ba.* 526). Alternatively, it may denote dithyramb the song, possibly with particular allusions to the innovations that this song underwent during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. (see below).⁷⁰ There is also a slight possibility that the title refers to a Satyr with that name from among the thiasos of Dionysus.⁷¹ This hypothesis receives some support from Aeschylus fr. 355 *TGF* (*μειξοβόαν πρέπει / διδύραμβον ὀμαρτεῖν / σύγκωμον*

⁶⁵ Cf. Poll. 2.49 *ὁ ὑπερήφανος*, Hsch. and Phot. s.v. *ὄφρῦοντες*: *ὑπερήφανοι*.

⁶⁶ Cf. Ar. *Eq.* 631, *Lys.* 7-8, Ar. *Pl.* 756 (all three with scholia), Antiphanes fr. 217.2-3, Phot. τ 595.3, *EM* 762.7, *Suda* τ 772.3, etc.

⁶⁷ See Koster, *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*, 227, n. 756. Outside Comedy the *σκυθρωπασμός* of the philosophers did not always meet a negative treatment; cf. Plu. *Mor.* 43f-44a.

⁶⁸ There are hints of this already in the treatment of the sophists in Old Comedy; e.g. Eupolis' *Kolakes* fr. 157 (satirising Protagoras).

⁶⁹ See *LSJ* s.v. *ὄφρῦς*, van Leeuwen on Ar. *V.* 655, and Pearson on S. fr. 902.

⁷⁰ See *RE* I.2 s.v. Amphis nr. 2.

⁷¹ So Webster *SLGC* 83.

Διονύσω), as well as from a vase fragment (CIG 7464), where the name Διδυράμοφος is assigned to a Satyr. Nevertheless, I would be rather cautious regarding these two pieces of evidence, since in both cases we could simply be presented with a personification of the song itself.⁷²

Dithyramb the song was particularly associated with Dionysus (cf. Poll. 1.38, Pl. *Lg.* 700b, etc.). Archilochus (fr. 120 West) is the first to establish this relationship between the god and his song. A foreign origin was generally assigned to Dionysus, either Lydian / Phrygian (cf. E. *Ba.* 13ff., 86, etc.), or Thracian (cf. E. *Hec.* 1267, Hdt. 7.111, etc.). Similarly, the dithyramb was also held to be of a Phrygian rhythm / metre; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1342b. The poet Arion was allegedly the first one who, between the years 625 and 585 B.C., produced such a song, accompanied by dance and Satyrs.⁷³ Lasos of Hermione is generally credited with the establishment of dithyrambic contests in Athens under the tyrant Hipparchus; cf. *Suda* λ 139.

But the changes in dithyramb during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. made the genre highly controversial.⁷⁴ The mixture of different modes, the interchange of melodies, as well as the excessive elaboration of both music and diction⁷⁵ were the main characteristics of the nature of the New Dithyramb.⁷⁶ Melanippides was the first to launch a sequence of changes and innovations in the composition of the dithyrambs with the introduction of *anabolai* / lyric solos,⁷⁷ resulting in the omission of antistrophes; cf. Arist. *Pr.* 19.15, *Rhet.* 1409b. A number of poets, and among them

⁷² Crusius (*RE* VI.1204) also understands Aeschylus' fragment as denoting the homonymous song, while he believes that the vase figure derives its name again from the song. See also *RE* VI s.v. *Dithyrambos* nr. 2.

⁷³ Cf. Hdt. 1.23, *Suda* α 3886, *Fasti* I.208-211.

⁷⁴ For a thorough discussion see Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos*, 117-147; Imperio, *o.c.* 75-95; Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb*, 1-58; Barker, *Greek Musical Writings*, vol. I, 93ff.; Hordern, *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*, 17-33.

⁷⁵ Nesselrath *MK* 253 notices the use of "dithyrambische Sprache" in a number of Middle Comedy fragments; cf. introduction to Aristophanes' *Φιλωνίδης*.

⁷⁶ Cf. Pl. *Lg.* 700d-e πάντα εἰς πάντα ξυνάγοντες, D.H. *Comp.* 19 οἱ δὲ γε διδυραμβοποιοὶ καὶ τοὺς τρόπους μετέβαλλον Δωρίου τε καὶ Φρυγίου καὶ Λυδίου ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ᾄσματι ποιῶντες.

⁷⁷ Cf. *Suda* s.v. *Μελανιππίδης*: ὅς ἐν τῇ τῶν διδυράμβων μελοποιᾷ ἐκαινοτόμησε πλεῖστα.

Philoxenus and Timotheus in particular,⁷⁸ carried on with the changes launched by Melanippides. In Pherecrates already, there is evidence about these changes: *ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἤρξε τῶν κακῶν Μελανιππίδης* (fr. 155.3). Aristophanes attacked the New Dithyramb on a regular basis, particularly with relation to the genre's elaborate and bombastic style; cf. *Av.* 904-957, 1372-1409, *Nu.* 331-338,⁷⁹ *Pax* 828-831,⁸⁰ *Pl.* 290ff.,⁸¹ etc. Striking is the hostility of Plato (cf. *Lg.* 700d-e, *R.* 397a), while Xenophon seems to have admired the dithyrambic poets, and Melanippides in particular; cf. *Mem.* 1.4.3.

In this fragment of Amphis the flute, and in particular a foreign kind of flute called *giggras*, is the subject of the discussion. Indeed, the flute could not be missing from a play entitled *Dithyramb*, for it was the very instrument that normally accompanied dithyrambs.⁸² Gulick (on *Ath.* IV 175a) argues that the speaker A is probably Dionysus himself. Not only does this seem a rather logical assumption that finds support in the text itself (see further below), but it also has generic implications, in that it makes Dionysus a character in a comic play,⁸³ portrays him as the god of the theatre, and presents him in a quintessentially Athenian way.

We could well be situated in a divine environment, e.g. on Olympus. If in particular on the Olympus' slopes, this would be an ideal parallel to the physical structure of the theatre. In fact, the very mention of the location of Athens (*Ἀθήνησιν*), and the way it is mentioned, makes one feel that the two speakers are somewhere

⁷⁸ See sch. on *Ar. Pl.* 290 about Philoxenus' *Cyclops* (fr. 815-824 *PMG*). Cf. Timotheus fr. 796.1-2 *PMG*: οὐκ αἰδῶ τὰ παλαιά, καινὰ γὰρ ἀμὰ κρείσσω. For a comprehensive discussion of Timotheus' style, innovations, etc., see Hordern *o.c.* 33-62.

⁷⁹ Cf. sch. on *Nu.* 335: ταῦτα δὲ εἰς Φιλόξενον τὸν διδυραμβοποιόν ... ἐπεὶ οὖν συνδέτοις καὶ πολυπλόκοις οἱ διδυραμβοποιοὶ χρῶνται λέξεσιν. For a discussion of the passages from both the *Birds* and the *Clouds* see Zimmermann *o.c.* 118ff.

⁸⁰ Cf. sch. on *Pax* 831: τὰ προοίμια τῶν διδυραμβοποιῶν ὡς ἐπιτοπλεῖστον ἀπάδοντά ἐστι καὶ οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα δηλοῖ.

⁸¹ See Zimmermann *o.c.* 127-128.

⁸² Cf. *Ps.-Plu. de Mus.* xxix 1141b-c, Pratinas fr. 1 *PMG*, also Pickard-Cambridge *Dithyramb l.c.*, and Wilson, in *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, 58-95 (esp. 75ff.).

⁸³ Comedy loved staging Dionysus. Apart from Aristophanes' *Frogs*, there are several fragmentarily surviving plays featuring Dionysus; cf. Cratinus' *Διονυσαλέξανδρος* and *Διόνυσοι*; Eupolis' *Ταξίαρχοι*; Aristophanes' *Βαβυλώνιοι* and *Διόνυσος Ναυαγός*, *Διόνυσος* by Eubulus, Alexander, Magnes, and Timocles; *Διονύσου Γοναί* by Demetrius I, Anaxandrides, and Polyzelus; *Διόνυσος Ἀσκητής* by Aristomenes.

away from Athens.⁸⁴ However, it is a possibility that the drama did not take place entirely on Olympus, but the action was split between Olympus and earth.⁸⁵ The following fragment could possibly be a dialogue between Dionysus and another god. A legitimate conjecture would be to identify Dionysus' interlocutor with Poseidon, given the key-word *ἀνατριάινώσει* (l. 8). This word is obviously derived from *τρίαίνα*, Poseidon's symbol *par excellence*, and Dionysus possibly employs it on purpose; that is, Dionysus tries to use terms that are familiar to Poseidon, and speak *his* language, in order to make him understand better how revolutionary this new invention is meant to be. Poseidon appears as a rather unlearned character, who needs to be carefully taught about this new device.⁸⁶

The following fragment is cited by Athenaeus IV 175a-b, within a discussion about wind-, string-, and percussion instruments that started at 174a, after the hearing of the sound of a *hydraulis* (water-organ).

Fr. 14

ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν γίγγραν γε τὸν σοφώτατον.

(B.) τίς δ' ἔσθ' ὁ γίγγρας; (A.) καινὸν ἐξεύρημά τι

ἡμέτερον, ὃ θεάτρῳ μὲν οὐδεπώποτε

ἔδειξ', Ἀθήνησιν δὲ κατακεχρημένον

5 *ἐν συμποσίοις ἤδη 'στί. (B.) διὰ τί δ' οὐκ ἄγεις*

εἰς τὸν ὄχλον αὐτό; (A.) διότι φυλὴν περιμένω

σφόδρα φιλονικοῦσαν λαχεῖν τιν'. οἶδα γὰρ

ὅτι πάντα πράγματ' ἀνατριάινώσει κρότοις

1 *γίγγραν γε* Jacobs *Addit.* p. 113: -αντε A

And as for me, the most cleverly devised giggras.

⁸⁴ We do not normally expect Athens to be designated, unless it is *not* the play's setting; cf. Diphilus fr. 67.

⁸⁵ Cf. Aristophanes' *Peace* (Olympus and earth), and *Frogs* (Underworld and earth).

⁸⁶ There are interesting convergences with Poseidon's presentation by Lucian in both *Dialogues of the Sea-Gods* and *Dialogues of the Gods*. Lucian presents Poseidon asking questions, as if he were either ignorant of the current divine affairs or slightly naïve. Such an impression is conveyed by most Lucian's dialogues, in which Poseidon is a speaking character (e.g. *DDeor.* 12, *DMar.* 3, 8, etc.).

(B.) But what is the *giggras*? (A.) A new invention of mine, which I have never yet presented at any time at the theatre, although in Athens it has already become fashionable at banquets. (B.) Why don't you bring it forth then to the mass? (A.) Because I am waiting to be allotted a tribe that is really fond of victory. For I know that it will shake with applause everything as with a trident

τα γίγγρασαν: It is for this very word that Athenaeus cites the whole fragment. According to both Pollux 4.76 and Athenaeus IV 174f, *γίγγρας* was a small pipe with a high-pitched and plaintive tone, of Phoenician origin.⁸⁷ It was named after Adonis, who was called *Γίγγρας*⁸⁸ by the Phoenicians. Both the specific kind of flute-playing and the accompanying dance, were also called *γίγγρας*, after the pipe itself (Tryphon apud Ath. XIV 618c, Poll. 4.102). Although Athenaeus tells us that Antiphanes (fr. 107), and Menander (fr. 203) mentioned the *giggras* too, their own words do not survive. This makes the present fragment of Amphis the only surviving text of literature where this kind of pipe is being mentioned in context.⁸⁹ Barker⁹⁰ suggests that possibly the *giggras* “was in some way related to instruments of the organ family, being perhaps a small bellows-blown device”, like the *hydraulis*. It is easy to understand why Dionysus claims the *giggras* to be his own invention. Either a Phoenician or a Carian invention, this strange pipe has eastern associations and connotations that suffice for the comic poet to establish a connection with an equally eastern originated god (cf. introduction). The fact that *giggras* is associated with Adonis allows us to assume that it is probably a late fifth century arrival in Athens. This may explain the date of our earliest references to it (i.e. Middle Comedy). If so, it may well have been still perceived as a recent development, which might explain why a character can be presented as ignorant of it.

⁸⁷ Or Carian (Phot. γ 116). Hesychius records the alternative form *γίγγρος* (γ 559).

⁸⁸ Or *Γίγγρης* (Ath. IV 175a).

⁸⁹ Apart from the lexicographical entries already mentioned. There is also Axionicus (fr. 3), who refers to *μέλη γιγγραυτά*, and the information provided by Athenaeus IV 174f that Xenophon speaks of the *giggras* flutes as used by both Phoenicians and Carians. However, no such account is to be found in the corpus of Xenophon.

⁹⁰ *o.c.* I 263, n. 13.

1b γε: This reading was suggested by Jacobs *Additamenta* 113: “Vereor, ut aposiopesis locum habeat. Verbum ex praecedentibus subaudiendum. Pro τε mallem γε”. Indeed, the confirmatory force of γε is an appropriate match for the antithesis introduced by ἐγὼ δέ. Another possibility would be to read γίγγραντα (as if it were of third declension stem in a dental, instead of first declension stem in *ā*). However, the word does occur in the accusative case, and this is γίγγραν (cf. Poll. 4.76: ἡ δὲ Φοινίκων γλῶττα Γίγγραν τὸν Ἄδωνιν καλεῖ, καὶ τούτῳ ὁ αὐλὸς ἐπωνόμασται).

2a τίς δ' ἔσθ'... : The mention of the unfamiliar word *giggras* generates the following question about the nature of this object. There are a number of structurally similar parallels, featuring words that – whether familiar or not – are not immediately intelligible. This is the case in two fragments of Philemo; in fr. 45, where the word *ναβλᾶς* is employed (= the player of the musical instrument *νάβλα*), and in fr. 130, where the character uses the word *βουνός* (Cyrenaic word for the *hill*). A similar pattern also appears in Strato fr. 1.34 (*οὐλοχύται*).

2b καινὸν ἐξεύρημά τι: Here Dionysus, the supposed inventor of this special kind of pipe, calls his invention *καινὸν ἐξεύρημα*. Pherecrates (fr. 84) had already characterised with the same phrase an actual invention of his, i.e. the Pherecratean verse (– – – ∪ ∪ – –). A boastful cook in Alexis fr. 178 calls *θαυμαστὸν ἐμὸν ἐξεύρημα* the Lydian pilaf *κάνδαυλος* (obviously an absurd allegation).⁹¹

Apart from serving metrical needs, the indefinite pronoun *τι* has a self-deprecating force, in the sense that it softens the assertion and makes the statement sound more modest.

3a ἡμέτερον: This is one of the cases, where *ἡμέτερος* is used instead of *ἐμός* (cf. *LSJ* s.v. II). The present such usage of the word constitutes a further piece of evidence that the speaker is indeed Dionysus himself, using the “royal we” and speaking on behalf of all the comic poets and producers, as the patron deity. Such a hypothesis seems more plausible, if one compares Eubulus fr. 93, where the speaker Dionysus employs

⁹¹ An idea that strikes Iphigeneia is also called *καινὸν ἐξεύρημα* in E. *IT* 1029.

again the pronoun *ἡμέτερος* instead of *ἐμός* (see Hunter *ad loc.*).⁹² This phenomenon first appears in Homer, e.g. *Od.* 4.101, 9.93, 11.33, etc. Furthermore, the presence of the possessive pronoun here, along with *ἐξεύρημα*, gives the speaker both a proprietary interest in the object and a claim to its invention. This severely restricts the number of candidates for the speaker of this sentence. The obvious contenders are Marsyas (unlikely – no connection with the theatre whatsoever), Athena (possible but again not connected with the theatre and rarely found in Comedy⁹³), a human connected with the Athenian theatre, e.g. playwright, musician (possible but difficult therefore to see why he says *Ἀθήνησιν* instead of e.g. *ἐνθάδε*).

3b οὐδεπώποτε: “never yet”. As *LSJ* note, this adverb is usually employed with reference to the past, as it is here. In Aristophanes (e.g. *Pl.* 193, 404, *V.* 1266, etc.) this adverb seems to possess an extra emphasising and confirmatory force, which makes it sound stronger than its synonym *οὐδέποτε*.⁹⁴

4 κατακεχρημένον: This perfect participle is employed here absolutely and in passive sense, in what seems to have been a rather unusual usage.⁹⁵ I would argue that in the present case, the participle is not simply equivalent to the simplex *καταχράομαι*, but it has further connotations, e.g. “heavily / frequently used”, or even “used until it is worn out / hackneyed”. The use of the perfect is significant in that it emphasises the impression that *this has long been the case*.

6-7 φυλήν ... λαχεῖν: Dithyrambic contests took place during not only the Dionysia, but also during the festivals of Thargelia, Prometheia, and Hephaesteia; in all cases the contest was tribal. The Scholiast on *Ar. Av.* 1404 tells us that *ἐκάστη γὰρ φυλή Διονύσου τρέφει διδυραμβοποιόν*. The poets were assigned to the tribes by lot; cf.

⁹² Bain (*o.c.* 198-200) examines a number of cases, where the plural is used instead of the singular; the reason is not always the aim for an elevated tone.

⁹³ Within the surviving comic material only Hermippus' *Ἀθηναῖς Γοναί* seems to have dealt with Athena in some considerable extent.

⁹⁴ For example, Chremylus in *Plutus* 193 is absolutely sure that no one ever got their fill of wealth, while Blepsidemus is equally sure that he has never been rich himself (l. 404).

⁹⁵ Cf. *Plu.* 818b *ἢ τοῦ νουθετεῖν ... δύναμις ... μὴ κατακεχρημένη μῆδ' ἔωλος*.

Antiphon 6.11, though it appears that the lot's verdict was not always conclusive, and that the tribes could bear a certain influence on this issue.⁹⁶

This may have been the role assigned to Dionysus in this play; a *διδάσκαλος*, a trainer of a dithyrambic chorus for a dithyrambic contest.⁹⁷ Though we have no exact parallel, this kind of metadramatic content, where Comedy takes as its theme – in whole or in part – the staging of a dramatic performance, can be paralleled by those cases where comedy stages tragedy. A certain example is Aristophanes' *Proagon* that staged the performance of tragedy and probably featured Euripides as one of his characters.⁹⁸ Taplin offers a persuasive argument for a similar context lying behind an Italian vase, known as the *Choregoi* vase.⁹⁹

For Dionysus' presence on stage the obvious antecedent is Aristophanes' *Frogs*,¹⁰⁰ where Dionysus gets actively involved with the dramatic affairs of the Athenians, judging the poetic style of both Aeschylus and Euripides.¹⁰¹

8a κρότοις: This word is generally used as a sign of approval; cf. D.C. *Hist. Rom.* 54.27.1 (*κρότοις καὶ ἐπαίνοις αὐτὸν ἐτίμησαν*), Heliod. *Aeth.* 10.41.3, etc. However, it can also denote disapproval, e.g. Pl. *La.* 184a (*γέλως καὶ κρότος*).

8b ἀνατριαινώσει: Dionysus employs this strong verb, in order to underline how enormous a success this new invention of his is going to be. This word is a *hapax*, whose usage here makes better sense if the collocutor is Poseidon (see introduction). The preposition *ἀνα-* perhaps suggests upheaval,¹⁰² and given Poseidon's connection

⁹⁶ See Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb*, 35ff.; Wilson, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia*, 51ff., 68; Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 1403-4.

⁹⁷ Cf. Schmidt, *Diatribē in Dithyrambum*, 248.

⁹⁸ Kock *ad loc.* notes: “videtur igitur Aristophanes prolusionem quandam spectaculi tragici spectatoribus repraesentavisse et inprimis Euripidem traduxisse”; cf. sch. on Ar. *V.* 61. For the ceremony of *proagon* see Pickard-Cambridge, *Festivals*, 67-68.

⁹⁹ For discussion and further parallels see Taplin, *Comic Angels*, 55-66.

¹⁰⁰ And before that the *Taxiarchs* of Eupolis, and the *Dionysalexandrus* of Cratinus (though neither dealt with the theatre).

¹⁰¹ This was not however the first play to have Dionysus on stage. Tragedy had already dealt extensively with this god, with Euripides' *Bacchae* being our best surviving evidence; cf. Dodds' introduction *ad loc.* (pp. xxv-xxx) for evidence about other dionysiac plays.

¹⁰² Cf. Anaxandrides fr. 3.3 (*ἀνακεχαίτικεν*, meaning *to have overthrown*).

with earthquakes, this may be a very strong metaphor. That is, the noise of the applause will have a force equivalent to an earthquake. There is only one other composite verb with *τρίαινα* as the second component; this is *συντριαινῶ*. It occurs twice: in Plato fr. 23, and in E. *HF* 946. As to Plato's fragment, Meineke (I.170) reckons that Poseidon is the speaker. This makes even more plausible the interpretation suggested above, i.e. that Dionysus tries to be intelligible to his collocutor by using his own linguistic terms.

Fr. 15

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIII 563c, as part of a general discussion on the subject of love that began at 561a.¹⁰³

It is highly probable, though not certain, that this is another fragment that deals with Plato (cf. frs. 6, 13). If so, then here we have a mis-presentation of his theory of Love as a spiritual friendship, devoid of any sexual desire. The frequency of the mockery of Plato suggests that such jokes found appropriate appeal and response from the audience, which was acquainted with the Platonic theories, even in a popularised version. Within the frame of a mentality where love has always been a broad notion, and where traditionally there has always been a link between Eros and sexual desire, the Platonic ideas must have been somehow influential, and also rapidly disseminated – still not in their pure form. A certain degree of popularisation of Plato, along with a kind of dilution, resulted in a certain modification of his ideas.¹⁰⁴ The essence of “Platonic love” is that what begins as *eros* in the conventional sense becomes a shared search for a higher truth. See Halperin in Halperin, Winkler & Zeitlin, *Before Sexuality*, 265; Gould, *Platonic Love*, chaps. 2, 3, 4.

One could reasonably wonder how fr. 14, dealing with Dionysus, could ever be accommodated into the same play with fr. 15 that parodies Plato's theory of Love. The answer would be that Dionysus and love were considered closely associated.¹⁰⁵ In fr. 15 a character speaks against the case of any spirituality involved in love, as championed by Plato (and others, e.g. the Stoics, cf. Ath. XIII 561c); but we have no

¹⁰³ It is within the same context that both Theophilus fr. 12 and Aristophon fr. 11 are also cited.

¹⁰⁴ For the kind and the degree of acquaintance of poets and the public with not only Plato but with philosophy in general, see General Introduction pp. 19-20.

¹⁰⁵ See Gould *o.c.* 39-40 for textual and artistic evidence.

evidence as to whom these words are addressed or who the speaker is (perhaps Dionysus again?).

τί φής; σὺ ταυτὶ προσδοκᾷς πείσειν ἐμέ,
 ὡς ἔστ' ἐραστής ὅστις ὠραῖον φιλῶν
 τρόπων ἐραστής ἐστι, τὴν ὄψιν παρῆς,
 σώφρων τ' ἀληθῶς; οὔτε τοῦτο πείδομαι
 5 οὔδ' ὡς πένης ἄνθρωπος ἐνοχλῶν πολλάκις
 τοῖς εὐποροῦσιν οὐ λαβεῖν τι βούλεται

2 ὠραῖον φιλῶν Jacobs *Addit.* p. 297: ὠραίων φίλων ACE: ὠραίων φίλου Mus.: ὠραίου φίλου Blaydes *Adv.*
 II p. 140 3 post παρῆς interpunxi ego

What are you talking about? Do you expect to persuade me of this very thing,
 that there is any lover, who loving a youth in the prime of life,
 is in love with his character, disregarding his appearance,
 and is truly moderate? I am persuaded neither of this
 5 nor that a poor man, who often gives trouble
 to the wealthy ones, does not want to receive something

2 ὡς ἔστ' ἐραστής ὅστις ὠραῖον φιλῶν: This line seems to have been constructed upon the Euripidean line οὐκ ἔστ' ἐραστής ὅστις οὐκ ἀεὶ φιλεῖ (*Tr.* 1051). Both lines scan as iambic trimeters, and feature parechesis of the letter complex -στ-. For ὠραῖον see on Mnesimachus fr. 4.5.

The reading ὠραῖον φιλῶν was suggested by Jacobs *Additamenta* 297; cf. crit. app. This suggestion is the most plausible in context. Its advantages against the rest of the readings are: a) the presence of a participle that here is syntactically easier and less clumsy (than a noun); b) the singular number (“X loves Y”, a typical case / an example). Jacob’s conjecture receives further support not only from the Euripidean line above, but also from Alexis fr. 70: ὡς ὅστις αὐτῆς τῆς ἀκμῆς τῶν σωμάτων / ἐρᾷ.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ It is obvious (from the rest of Alexis’ fragment) that the similarity is merely structural, since the sense is exactly the opposite to the one meant by Amphis.

3 τρόπων ἐραστής: This is a hint that could possibly be directed against Plato. There are certain passages in Plato, where character values are rated more highly than external beauty;¹⁰⁷ cf. *Smp.* 182d: κάλλιον τὸ φανερώς ἐρᾶν ... καὶ μάλιστα τῶν γενναιοτάτων καὶ ἀρίστων, κἂν αἰσχίους ἄλλων ὦσι; *ibid.* 183d: πονηρὸς δ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐραστής ὁ πάνδημος, ὁ τοῦ σώματος μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐρῶν; cf. *Lg.* 837b-c. Being attracted only by one's manners seems rather foolish and impossible to the speaker of Amphis' fragment. So it does to the speaker of Bato fr. 7, who states his indignation against the hypocrisy of those pretending to love one's character: μάλιστ' ἐμοὶ δῆπουθε κινουῦσιν χολήν / οἱ τῶν τρόπων φάσκοντες ἐπεικῶς ἐρᾶν (ll. 3-4). The target, at least in Bato's fragment, seems to be a more widespread hypocrisy, rather than just Plato.¹⁰⁸

4a σώφρων: In Aristophanes both *σώφρων* and *σωφροσύνη* often have moral and / or political connotations; e.g. *Nu.* 529, 1006, *Av.* 1540 (cf. Dunbar *ad loc.*), etc. See North, *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature*, 97-100; Neil, *The Knights of Aristophanes*, 204; Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, 57.

Likewise, in Amphis' fragment *σώφρων* means *moderate, chaste, self-restrained*. Correlated with *τρόπων ἐραστής*, it refers to resistance to the physical attractions of the boy.

4b ἀληθῶς: *Truly, actually, really*; used by the speaker to emphasise his point; i.e. "is he *truly* moderate the one who pays no attention to physical beauty?" The presence of this adverb raises the question between semblance / hypocrisy and reality.

5 ἐνοχλῶν: This is a well chosen verb that helps draw the two parallels together (the lover and the pauper), for it can occasionally bear sexual connotations (*pester, importune*); cf. *Pl. Alc.* I 104d: τί ποτε βούλει καὶ εἰς τίνα ἐλπίδα βλέπων ἐνοχλεῖς με, ἀεὶ ὅπου ἂν ὦ ἐπιμελέστατα παρών (Alcibiades addressing Socrates); *Luc. DDeor.* 10.5: ἐνοχλήσω γὰρ σε συνεχῶς στρεφόμενος. —Τοῦτ' αὐτό μοι τὸ ἥδιστον ποιήσεις, εἰ ἀγρυπνήσαιμι μετὰ σοῦ φιλῶν πολλάκις καὶ περιπτύσσω (dialogue between Ganymedes and Zeus); *DMeretr.* 4.2: πόσα οἶε ἐπὶ τούτῳ μεμηχανῆσθαί με περιλαμβάνουσαν, ἐπιστρέφουσαν, φιλοῦσαν ἀπεστραμμένου το μετὰφρνον; ὁ δ' οὐδ' ὀπωστιοῦν ὑπεμαλάχθη,

¹⁰⁷ See Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, 60ff., 81ff.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. the case of a youth described in *X. Cyr.* 5.1.15.

ἀλλ' εἴ μοι, φησὶν, ἐπὶ πλέον ἐνοχλήσεις, ἄπειμι ἤδη, Aeschin. 1.135: ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις ὀχληρὸς ὢν καὶ πλείστων ἐραστῆς γεγυῖας.

5-6: The analogy with the poor man is worth of some attention, since it could constitute a link with Plato's *Symposion*, and in particular with what Socrates says about Love being the son of Poverty, and sleeping on doorsteps; ἀεὶ ἐνδεία σύννοικος (203c-d). This may be an indication that indeed the fragment does target primarily Plato.

Ἔριδοι (fr. 17)

The title signifies the *day-labourers*, the *hired servants* (cf. *LSJ* s.v.), and as such it forms part of the “banausic” plays of Amphis; it is also one of his shared titles with Alexis (see introduction to *Ἀμπελουργός*). In Homer (e.g. *Il.* 18.550) the word ἔριδος denotes the farmer; cf. Poll. 1.221. However, it appears that it was later used to denote specifically a female worker; either a reaper (Poll. 7.141) or a wool-worker (*Suda* ε 2990, Phot. ε 1913). That free women could also be employed as ἔριδοι is confirmed by D. 57.45, where however this is considered undignified for a citizen. It might naturally attract metics, since metics could not own land and therefore would rarely be engaged in farming, and even perhaps slaves.

The possibility that we may be dealing with wool-workers is interesting, since we have evidence that wool-working and prostitution were in certain contexts interchangeable activities in antiquity.¹⁰⁹ Brothels as places of work were known as ἐργαστήρια, and sometimes served as ἐργαστήρια in another sense, being used indeed as textile factories, as the evidence from the excavations in the area of Ceramicus suggests, for both the fifth and the fourth century.¹¹⁰ Besides, there is a number of vases, perfume bottles, and cups, which feature female wool-workers approached by men. These women, known as the “Spinning Hetairai”, are believed to reflect a real phenomenon; i.e. a number of prostitutes, during their free time, practised wool-working as a second job. Hence, under the title ἔριδοι there may be hiding a play about hetairai who made their living through both prostitution and wool-working.

¹⁰⁹ See Davidson *o.c.* 83-91, 112-113.

¹¹⁰ Over one hundred loom-weights have been found in a building believed to have been a brothel.

In his introduction to Alexis' *Παννυχίς ἢ Ἐριδοί* Arnott discusses the possibilities about the role of *ἔριδοί* within the play: either the chorus or a group of minor people or a pair of unrelated women. But he does not reach a definite answer. The uncertainty is even greater in the case of Amphis, where much less text survives.

The fragment below, cited by Stobaeus 4.15.4, praises the country life, as opposed to life in town. The speaker, probably a farmer, claims the former to be far better. It is possible that an event, proving the truth of his statement, has just taken place. In fact, the text as it stands allows for two possibilities. The speaker either left the countryside for the town and is now dreaming of it or fled the town for the country and is now expressing his relief. Either in town or in the country, it is rather unlikely that there was a change of venue at any point of the play.

In Greek Comedy, there is an intermittent idealisation of the countryside. In Aristophanes there is frequently a countryside-good vs. city-bad contrast, in the sense that the latter is needlessly sophisticated and bothersome; e.g. *Av.* 32ff., *Ach.* 28ff.,¹¹¹ or the prologue of *Clouds*, where Strepsiades compares his country up-bringing to the city sophistication of his wife.¹¹² There is also the celebration at the end of *Peace*, which suggests that in the countryside (provided there is no war) we have the natural opposite to the poverty contained in Amphis' fragment. The same motif appears later in Menander (cf. fr. 1, 301), and can also be considered a forerunner of the Hellenistic bucolic.¹¹³

εἴτ' οὐχὶ χρυσοῦν ἐστὶ πρῶγμ' ἐρημία,
ὁ πατήρ γε τοῦ ζῆν ἐστὶν ἀνθρώποις ἀγρός,
πενίαν τε συγχρῦπτειν ἐπίσταται μόνος,
ἄστου δὲ δέατρον {ἐστὶν} ἀτυχίας σαφοῦς γέμον

4 ἐστὶν SMA: del. Grotius *Dict.* p. 215 σαφοῦς A: -ῶς SM: del. Edmonds: verba σαφοῦς γέμον florilego attribuit Hense: possis ἐστὶν ... σαφοῦς {γέμον} (vix / γέμον) K-A

Is not then isolation golden?

¹¹¹ Cf. sch. on ll. 32-36.

¹¹² See Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes*, 82ff.

¹¹³ The pastoral descriptions of landscapes, flocks, and labourers in Theocritus reveal the same nostalgia and love for the countryside; e.g. *Idyll* 25.

Indeed, for humans the country is the father of life,
and is the only one that knows to cover up poverty,
while town is a theatre full of clear ill-luck

1a εἶτ' οὐχί: Cf. on Aristophon fr. 11.1 and Amphis fr. 1.1.

1b χρυσοῦν: This adjective is used here metaphorically, meaning *splendid, marvellous, grand*; cf. Alexis fr. 131.4-5: νόμον τινὰ / χρυσοῦν. This metaphorical sense can sometimes be ironical too. See Arnott on Alexis *l.c.*, and *LSJ* s.v. III.

1 *sqq.*: The speaker praises the self-sufficiency, the peace, and the quiet of rural life. An obvious antecedent is Dicaeopolis; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 32-36.¹¹⁴

3 πενίαν συγκρύπτειν: The speaker claims that poverty can be more easily hidden in the countryside than in the town; but he does not explain the reason why. A possible explanation is because the countryside is less densely populated than the town; hence, less people get to know an individual's financial situation. Nevertheless, in Lysias 7.18 we hear how neighbours manage to find out about nearly everything: ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὧν ἀποκρυπτόμεθα μηδένα εἰδέναι, καὶ περὶ ἐκείνων πυνθάνονται; cf. 7.28.¹¹⁵

The desire to hide one's misfortune is also present in Men. *Georg.* 76-89 (cf. Men. fr. 299); for an explanation see Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, 239, 110. For poverty as a major problem of the Attic countryside see Strauss, *Athens after the Peloponnesian War*, 42-45, 53-55; Mossé, *Athens in Decline*, 12-17; Ehrenberg *o.c.* 93; *CAH* VI 558-564.

4a ἀτυχίας: ἀτυχία is hardly flattering to the theatre and its audience. Abuse of the spectators – to a much greater degree and often in a more direct way – is common in Old Comedy, and particularly in the parabasis; cf. Eupolis fr. 392, Ar. *Nu.* 518ff., *V.* 1015ff., *Ach.* 366-384, etc. See Heath, *Political Comedy in Aristophanes*, 21-24;

¹¹⁴ Knemon's longing for loneliness (cf. Men. *Dysc.* 169) has a completely different motivation; he is a misanthrope and a disagreeable character.

¹¹⁵ Cf. the proverb ὀξύτερον οἱ γείτονες βλέπουσι τῶν ἀλωπέκων (adesp. fr. 435 Kock = App. prov. IV 31).

Henderson in Winkler & Zeitlin, *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?*, 294-313;¹¹⁶ Hubbard, *The Mask of Comedy*, 13-15.

4b (ἔστιν) ... σαφοῦς γέμον: The text is problematic; cf. crit. app. The different possible readings allow for different interpretations, each one of which produces a slightly different metatheatrical effect. Unlike *γέμον* and *σαφοῦς*, *ἔστιν* is completely unnecessary, for its presence or absence makes no difference to the sense; it is also a word which is often interpolated. Therefore, I would choose to delete *ἔστιν* and keep in the text both *σαφοῦς* (or *σαφῶς*) and *γέμον*.

Whichever reading we accept, the general sense is unaffected. The town is assimilated to a theatre, in a manner reminiscent of Shakespeare's line "all the world's a stage" (*As You Like It*, 2/7). This metaphor adds a metatheatrical element to the scene; the speaker *is* in the theatre when he recites these lines; cf. Kokolakis, *The Dramatic Simile of Life*, 19. The "town like a theatre" theme finds itself especially at home in Athens, a town that resembled very much a theatre, not only because of the abundance of dramatic performances, but also from a socio-political point of view. Throughout the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Athens was the arena of every kind of *performance* – in the widest sense of the word. The speeches delivered in the law courts and the Assembly, the songs sung at symposia, the athletic activities taking place in the gymnasia or at athletic contests, the philosophical debates, all were types of *performance*, which made Athens look like a vibrant venue of various civic activities, where the roles of actors and spectators were constantly interchangeable among the Athenian citizens.¹¹⁷

Ἰάλεμος (frr. 20-22)

The title of the play allows for more than one plot reconstructions. To begin with, *ἰάλεμος* means *lament*, *dirge*. Ialemos is also a mythical figure, the son of Apollo and Calliope. He stands as the personification of the dirge himself (just as his

¹¹⁶ For a discussion of both Heath's and Henderson's views from a different perspective see Silk, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, 304ff.

¹¹⁷ See Goldhill & Osborne, *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, *passim*, esp. 1-29, 257-289.

supposed brother Hymenaeus is the personification of the wedding song).¹¹⁸ Zenobius (4.39) records the proverb *Ἰαλέμου ψυχρότερος*, which he explains as originating from the excessively melancholic and frigid character of Ialemos. Hence, the word *ιάλεμος* can also be employed substantively to denote the *cold-hearted, indifferent*, or even *worthless* person;¹¹⁹ cf. Men. fr. 177. It also has an adjectival use, which occurs quite rarely, and in rather later texts, apart from E. *HF* 109. As an adjective, its meaning is either *woeful / miserable* (as in Euripides *l.c.*, Ps.-Caesarius *Quaest.* 205.12, Th. Prodromus *Catomyomachia* 193) or *stupid / tedious* (cf. Luc. *Pseudol.* 24.11, Gal. 14.617.15 Kühn). See *LSJ* s.v.

The fourth century comic poet Ophelio also wrote a homonymous play; however, the one surviving fragment is not instructive at all as to the play's subject. Still, if the theme was mythic, it would not have been an isolated case within Ophelio's work, cf. the play-titles *Deucalion* and *Kentauros*. The same applies to Amphis; cf. the myth-related titles *Athamas*, *Alkmaion*, *Epta epi Thebas*, *Kallisto*, *Odysseus*, *Ouranos*, and *Pan*. None the less, given the content of fr. 21 below, it is also possible that Amphis' play had a contemporary theme and dealt with a melancholic, dullard, and bad-tempered man resembling Knemon in Menander's *Dyscolus*, without any relation to myth whatsoever. Another alternative is to assume a combination of myth and reality.¹²⁰ Anachronistic elements from real life may have been inserted into the mythical world of Ialemos, or else Ialemos may have been presented in a context resembling the fourth century world.¹²¹

Fr. 20

The following fragment is cited by Athenaeus II 69b-c within a discussion about the anti-aphrodisiac effects of the lettuce (68f-70a). Athenaeus tells us that Callimachus records a myth about Aphrodite hiding Adonis in lettuce plants (fr. 478

¹¹⁸ See Ar. Byz. fr. 27 Slater, Pindar *Thren.* fr. 128, sch. on Pi. *P.* 4.313, sch. on [E.] *Rh.* 895, etc.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Hsch., *Suda*, and Phot. s.v., Moeris p. 199, 11-12 Bekker.

¹²⁰ Cf. General Introduction pp. 24-26.

¹²¹ In a different interpretation Kaibel (*RE* s.v. Amphis nr. 2) suggests that *Ialemos* might have dealt with modern music, whereas Breitenbach would rather include *Ialemos* in a group of titles that consist of humorous nicknames, e.g. Phrynichus' *Monotropos*, Plato's *Perialges*, etc. (*Titulorum* 105; see also pp. 71-72).

Pfeiffer),¹²² and that the poets used to relate the consumption of lettuce with sexual deficiency. The following fragment exhibits graphically such a male sexual impotence.¹²³ However, the fragment begins in the middle of the sentence, and any attempt to define its context would be a piece of guesswork. It could be that the speaker curses someone to end up in lettuces and suffer the consequences (cf. the phrase *κάκιστ' ἀπολουμέναις*, with comm. *ad loc.*). Here, as elsewhere, certainty is impossible. As to the identity of the speaker, I think that we find ourselves in a position of less guesswork only after we have considered all the three fragments of this play; cf. introduction to fr. 22.

ἐν ταῖς θριδακίταις ταῖς κάκιστ' ἀπολουμέναις,
 ἄς εἰ φάγοι τις ἐντὸς ἑξήκοντ' ἐτῶν,
 ὁπότε γυναικὸς λαμβάνοι κοινωνίαν,
 στρέφοιθ' ὅλην τὴν νύκτ' ἂν οὐδὲ ἐν πλέον
 5 ὧν βούλεται δρῶν, ἀντὶ τῆς ὑπουργίας
 τῇ χειρὶ τρίβων τὴν ἀναγκαίαν τύχην

In the god-damned lettuces,
 which if anyone eats who is less than sixty years old,
 whenever he has sex with a woman,
 he twists all night long without managing to perform
 5 anything of what he wants, but, instead of any service,
 he rubs with his hand the fate that must be

1a θριδακίταις: Lettuce as related to impotence is also mentioned by Eubulus in fr. 13 (cf. Hunter *ad loc.*). Hippocrates testifies to the cooling effects of the lettuce, and admits that it can sometimes cause physical weakness (*Vict.* 2.54.24-26). Pliny identifies a particular variety of lettuce, called *ἀστυτίδα*, known to mitigate the sexual instincts (“maxime refragetur veneri”; *HN* 19.127).

¹²² For further myth details, see Hunter on Eubulus fr. 13.3.

¹²³ For the recurrence of the theme of impotence in both elegy and mime, see McKeown, *PCPS* 25 n.s. (1979) 79.

ιβ κάκιστ' ἀπολουμέναις: Headlam (on Herod. 3.14) has gathered a large number of examples, where epithets expressing commiseration and the like are applied to inanimate objects. Likewise, here the participle ἀπολουμέναις defines the lettuces. However, this phenomenon is still in use in modern Greek language.

The combination of the future participle of ἀπόλλυμαι with either κακῶς or κάκιστα, forms a pattern of a curse, which recurs frequently; cf. Pherecrates fr. 22, Ar. *Pax* 2, *Ach.* 865, Alexis fr. 16, Antiphanes fr. 159, Men. *Dysc.* 208, etc.

2 ἐντὸς ἐξήκοντ' ἐτῶν: One reasonably wonders why particularly *sixty* years. The idea is presumably that after sixty male sexuality is terminated, and that only sexually active people are affected. Regarding the duration of male potency, there is a number of passages that might prove illuminating: in Aeschines 1.11 we read that a chorus producer (*choregos*) should be over forty years of age (cf. Fisher *ad loc.*);¹²⁴ in Archilochus fr. 48 West an old man is tempted by a young woman's breast; in Aristophanes' *Wasps* 1341-1387 a reversal of age typology is part of the general role-reversal between father and son, i.e. the rejuvenated Philocleon, perfectly potent, desires to have sex with a slave girl.

3α γυναικός: Either a wedded wife or a courtesan may be meant here. The text is deliberately imprecise; it focuses on the gender, not status, of the sexual partner and is more interested in the man's impotence than any aspect of the woman.

3β κοινωνίαν: The occurrences of the word κοινωνία meaning *sexual intercourse* are relatively rare. Here it seems to be employed rather euphemistically.¹²⁵ *LSJ* s.v. mention the example of E. *Ba.* 1276. See also Pl. *Lg.* 636c, and Poll. 3.44: ὁ δὲ γάμος καλοῖτ' ἂν καὶ ... σύνοδος ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ... καὶ κοινωνία ἐπὶ παίδων σπορῶ. Neither the simplex κοινωνέω is used very often with that sense; see *LSJ* s.v. II.

4α στρέφοιθ' ὄλην τὴν νύκτ': Twisting and turning around has being considered a sign of insomnia since Homer; cf. *Il.* 24.5. See sch. on Ar. *Nu.* 36, Men. *Kith.* fr. 1.3

¹²⁴ The meaning is apparently that after forty a man can control his natural desires, and not that he becomes impotent; cf. Aeschin. 1.24 and Dover *Greek Popular Morality* 102ff.

¹²⁵ Cf. πλησιάζειν = *have sex*; see *LSJ* s.v. II.3.

Arnott, *Epict. Diss. Arr.* 4.10.31, etc. However, the point goes presumably beyond this. It is rather improbable that the character here tries to sleep. I would suggest that he is either desperately trying to ejaculate or changing sexual positions. It could also be a wrestling metaphor; i.e. he is doing his outmost to manage sexual gratification.

4b οὐδέ ἐν ... δρῶν: The verb δρᾶω is here charged with sexual connotations; i.e. it implies the notion of performing successfully a sexual intercourse to its completeness; cf. *Ar. V.* 1381, *Strattis* fr. 41.2, and sch. on *Ar. V.* 1346. Van Groningen argues for a similar interpretation of *Theognis* 1.954 (*Theognis, le premier livre, ad loc.*).

It is worth noting that no elision of the final epsilon is made here. The hiatus between οὐδέ and either εἶς or ἔν (in any case) recurs frequently in Comedy. Apart from serving metrical convenience, it also emphasises the nihility in question. See *Ar. Pl.* 138, *Cratinus* fr. 335, *Alexis* fr. 27.3 (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*), *Men. Asp.* 234, etc. This phenomenon is not limited in Comedy; cf. *Theognis* 1.529,¹²⁶ *Herodas* 1.48 (cf. Headlam *ad loc.*), *Theoc.* 23.3,¹²⁷ etc. See further Kühner-Blass I §48.3, and Moorhouse *CQ* 12 n.s. (1962) 245ff.

4-5 πλέον ... δρῶν: The adverb πλέον is usually combined with verbs meaning *to do*, without any comparison being drawn, to express the notion of success, fulfilment, accomplishment, and the like. Such verbs include ποιέω (mainly), πράττω, and ἐργάζομαι. It is in this way that δρᾶω appears to be used in the present fragment, although no many parallels can be recorded with certainty.¹²⁸ For the other verbs, see *Pl. Phd.* 115c, *Crit.* 54d, *Plu. Thes.* 35.2, etc. See *LSJ* s.v. πλείων.

5 ἀντὶ τῆς ὑπουργίας: ὑπουργία is the “service rendered”. The sense is clearly obscene and refers to sexual intercourse.¹²⁹ This use of the noun ὑπουργία has no parallels; cf. Plato’s use of the verb ὑπουργέω for offering sexual gratification (*Smp.* 184d).¹³⁰

¹²⁶ Nevertheless, the reading is not certain; cf. van Groningen *ad loc.*

¹²⁷ Gow *ad loc.* notes that “it is not common in serious poetry”.

¹²⁸ A limited number of passages that could be regarded as the closest parallels are still quite different, in that they convey a rather clear sense of comparison; e.g. *E. Andr.* 698, *Plu. Ant.* 42.1, *D.C. Hist. Rom.* 38.45.5.

¹²⁹ Cf. Henderson, *o.c.* 160.

¹³⁰ Cf. *Anaxilas* fr. 21, *Hipponax* fr. 114a West.

However, in the present fragment there is no *ὑπουργία*, no proper intercourse. The male lover has been left impotent (because of the lettuces), and cannot get an erection. Therefore, the man resorts to masturbation in an attempt to get an erection, so that he can have sex. Here there is a thematic kinship with Aristophanes, where masturbation features regularly as a comic topos, being particularly – but not exclusively – associated with slaves; cf. *Nu.* 734 (Strepsiadēs), *Ra.* 753 (slaves), *Eq.* 24-25 (slaves).¹³¹ Old and Middle Comedy share once again the same interest in obscene humour; see General Introduction p. 18.

For the idiom in *ἀντὶ τῆς ὑπουργίας* see Kassel, *Maia* 25 (1973) 100.

δα τῆ χειρὶ: The obscenity escalates. The “victim” of the lettuces eventually turns to masturbation. Cf. *AP* 12.232 for another explicit reference to masturbation.

ὅβ ἀναγκαίαν τύχην: The elevated register introduces an element of paratragedy. The serious notion of implacable Fate is inserted amidst the comic context, which here is mostly obscene. Impotence is thus made look like a cruel and inescapable destiny for one eating lettuce. Amphis’ inspiration must have been the numerous passages from (mainly) tragedy dealing with the notion of fate imposed by compulsion; see *S. Aj.* 485, 803, *El.* 48, *Ph.* 1317, *E. IA* 511, *Pl. Lg.* 806a, *Plu. Comp. Dem. Ant.* 2.2, etc. However, it seems that there is a further joke here. The verb *τρίβειν* means *rub*, hence here *masturbate*; but the object comes as a surprise, since one would expect e.g. *τὸ πέος*. The poet substitutes the expected concrete object with an abstract notion. This is a case of *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, with the language fluctuating from a graphic and indecorous level (*τρίβων*) to a non-graphic and decorous one (*ἀναγκαίαν τύχην*). For *ἀναγκαία* / *ἀνάγκη* in a sexual context referring to natural urges cf. Philemo fr. 3.6 (*ἀναγκαίαν φύσιν*), *Ar. Nu.* 1075 (*τὰς τῆς φύσεως ἀνάγκας*), etc.¹³²

Concerning the fragment as a whole, it is noteworthy that, despite dealing with the physiology of sex, its language, though erotic, is not completely obscene. Combining allusion with wordplay, the language becomes relatively evasive. The obscene meaning is concealed under terms that in a different context would not necessarily allude to sex (*κοινωνία*, *ὑπουργία*, *ἀναγκαία τύχη*, etc.). Flourishing in the

¹³¹ Cf. the ancient scholia for all these passages.

¹³² See Henderson *o.c.* 5, 76-77, 218.

same milieu that encouraged the continuity of *ὀνομαστί κωμωδεῖν* (cf. General Introduction pp. 17-18), obscenity is also present in other fourth century poets (cf. Philetaerus fr. 6, 9, Strattis fr. 41, Theophilus fr. 6, 12, etc.; cf. General Introduction p. 18). Nevertheless, the degree of indecency varies from poet to poet. The diversity that is operative in such a dynamic culture means that we should not expect a linear progress of any detected trends. Middle Comedy finds itself in the very middle of this theatrical melting pot, where trends and motifs retreat and re-emerge at intervals. There is a constant fluctuation both backwards, towards Aristophanes, and his indecorously coarse language, and forwards, towards Menander, and his more refined theatrical taste.

Fr. 21

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus VIII 336c, and is one of a series dwelling on the subject of pleasure, as related to both mortality and the brevity of human life. It fits well into the reconstruction that I suggested above; in fact, here we could have a champion of hedonism¹³³ criticising Ialemos' lifestyle, which must have been presented so far in the play as monotonous, melancholic, and unhappy. One could easily imagine Ialemos avoiding any kind of pleasure. Alternatively, this speech could also be delivered in a form of a programmatic statement quite early in the play (possibly by a prologue figure), before even the appearance of Ialemos himself, so that the audience be preoccupied against Ialemos and his behaviour.

The main idea expressed in the fragment is no other than the “*ζῆν ἡδέως*, for life is short”, which Philetaerus also has extensively dealt with (see especially commentary on fr. 7 and 13).

*ὅστις δὲ θνητὸς γενόμενος μὴ τῷ βίῳ
ζητεῖ τι τερπνὸν προσφέρειν, τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἔῤ,
μάταιός ἐστιν ἔν γ' ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς σοφοῖς
κριταῖς ἅπασιν ἐκ θεῶν τε δυστυχῆς*

Anyone who, being mortal, does not seek to
add any enjoyment to life, and let everything else be,

¹³³ For other possibilities as to the speaker's identity, see introduction to fr. 22.

is a foolish both in my eyes and in the eyes of all the
wise judges, and doomed by the gods

1 ὅστις ...: This ὅστις clause serves to introduce a general statement that must have originally derived from the play's situation, but can also stand on its own as a philosophised view of human affairs, a humorous evaluation of a situation, etc. Cf. S. *OC* 1211, E. fr. 285.11 and 1063.9 *TGF*, Antiphanes fr. 261, etc. In Amphis alone this rhetorical pattern appears four more times; in fr. 22, 26, 39, and 42. Characters in Amphis' plays appear particularly fond of making humorous and comic comments on various issues, pretending to be serious. The tendency to have characters philosophise is a feature shared with – and perhaps influenced by – Euripides. This trend of exercising (fake) philosophy within Comedy is later picked up by Menander; cf. the speech of Onesimos in *Epitrepontes* 1087-1099, as well as the vast number of *gnomai* preserved under his name.¹³⁴

3 μάταιος: When this adjective is used of a person (as it is here), it normally means *foolish, empty*, and the like (see *LSJ* s.v. I.2). Cf. Ar. *V.* 338, Amipsias fr. 9.1, E. fr. 1063.11 *TGF*, etc.

3-4 ἐν ... ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς ... κριταῖς: The preposition ἐν is regularly used with a noun in dative to express the notion of *in the presence of* (see *LSJ* s.v. A.I.5b). This noun is regularly in plural. However, when the meaning is closer to *in one's judgement*, the singular can also be used to speak of one's personal opinion / judgement, as it happens here. Still, this is a relatively rare phenomenon; cf. Ar. fr. 278, S. *OC* 1214, E. fr. 347.3 *TGF*, and (possibly) *Hipp.* 1320 (cf. Barrett *ad loc.*). See Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, II.243.

4α κριταῖς ἄπαντι: These are probably all the sensible people; anyone who could judge the situation, and would give their opinion on the matter if asked to. However, the mention of the word κριτής within a theatrical context brings to mind the dramatic judges of the plays. Though unprovable, this could be a metatheatrical reference to them, possibly made clear with an accompanying gesture towards them. The point of

¹³⁴ Cf. the recent commented edition by V. Liapes, Athens 2002.

such a reference would be to dispose them positively towards both the play and the poet; cf. the address to the judges in the parabasis of Aristophanes' *Birds* 1102ff. It is important that they are called "wise" judges (l. 4), i.e. they judge justly; this characterisation recurs in Ar. *Ec.* 1155. The judges were ten in number, though the final verdict depended upon just five of them; cf. Epicharmus fr. 237 ἐν πέντε κριτῶν γούνασι κεῖται, Hsch. π 1408, etc.¹³⁵ References to them are quite common in Comedy; e.g. Ar. *Av.* 445, Cratinus fr. 171.6, Eupolis fr. 192.32, Pherecrates fr. 102, etc. These are references to the world outside the play's fictive situation, which momentarily interrupt the dramatic illusion. Such breaks (not only referring to the judges, but also addressing the spectators, pointing to the theatre's structure, etc.), are a characteristic feature of Comedy;¹³⁶ see Ar. *Nu.* 326, fr. 403, Alexis fr. 113, Men. *Asp.* 113, etc.

4b ἐκ θεῶν τε δυστυχής: This is the second time within the same play (cf. ἀναγκαίαν τύχην above, fr. 20.6) that Amphis employs the language of divinely imposed destiny to speak mundane matters. In tragedy the idea of gods governing the human lives is an omnipresent one,¹³⁷ but here divine determinism is exploited comically.¹³⁸

Fr. 22

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus VII 309a, within a discussion about the fish species κορακίνος.

The speaker says that he prefers the delicacy of a kind of grey-fish instead of the cheap ravenfish. This could be a way one can add some pleasure to everyday life, as fr. 21 urges. Perhaps fr. 22 is accommodated within the same context as fr. 20, i.e. this is either a gourmet or a guru of gastronomy issuing guidelines about the art of eating and living well. As in fr. 21, the language is exaggerated as a judgement on the choice between fishes. Given the similarity of style and the parallel content it is possible, though unprovable, that the speaker in all three fragments of this play is the same.

¹³⁵ See Pickard-Cambridge, *Festivals*, 95-98.

¹³⁶ See Bain *o.c.* 98 n. 2, 185-207, and Austin on Men. *Mis.* 464 (in *CGFP*).

¹³⁷ E.g. A. *Pers.* 373, *Th.* 23, S. *Ph.* 1316, E. *Andr.* 680. See Headlam, *On Editing Aeschylus*, 117.

¹³⁸ However, gods judging negatively a sombre lifestyle is not a totally comic conception; Aphrodite's hostility towards Hippolytus in Euripides' homonymous play derives partly from his obsession with purity and abstention from sex.

Regarding gourmets, one recalls Aristophanes and his frequent attacks upon Cleonymus for gluttony and obesity; cf. *Eq.* 1293, *Av.* 289, etc.¹³⁹ As to food-gurus, one recalls Horace's satire 2.4, where Catus is hurrying home to make a record of what he learnt in a gastronomy lecture he has just attended.¹⁴⁰ This satire by Horace is perhaps influenced by Archestratus' *Ἡδυπάθεια*¹⁴¹ (Rudd *o.c.* 204-206).

ὅστις κορακῖνον ἐσθίει θαλάττιον
 γλαύκου παρόντος, οὗτος οὐκ ἔχει φρένας

Anyone who eats sea ravenfish,
 when there is some grey-fish by, has no brain

1a κορακῖνον: The present fragment implies that this type of fish was held in a relatively low esteem; cf. *Ar. Lys.* 560, Anaxandrides fr. 34.11, 28.1 (cf. Millis *ad loc.*), Alexis fr. 18 (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*). The major ancient references are gathered by Athenaeus VII 308d sqq. Thompson (*Fishes* 122-125) discerns four different kinds of this fish; cf. Strömberg *Fischnamen* 70, 78, 114-115; for an illustration see Palombi-Santorelli 46ff., 50ff.

1b ὅστις ... : See on Amphis fr. 21.1.

2a γλαύκου: This kind of fish cannot be identified with certainty; cf. Thompson *Fishes* 48, and Strömberg *Fischnamen* 23. However, it was considered a delicacy, as it is implied by both the present fragment and several other passages; e.g. Cratinus fr. 336, Eubulus fr. 43, Archestratus *SH* 151, etc.; cf. *Ath.* VII 295b-297c.

Eubulus fr. 43 has *θαλαττίου γλαύκου*. Though change is possible in the present passage, there is no obvious reason to reject the manuscript reading.

¹³⁹ Aristotle is also being sarcastic towards the gourmets; cf. *EE* 1231a 15-16.

¹⁴⁰ Though it may be argued that Horace treats Catus with subtle irony, Rudd believes that Horace is not actually against luxury (*The Satires of Horace*, 213).

¹⁴¹ For this treatise on gastronomy see on Dionysius fr. 2.24.

2b παρόντος: Choosing a cheap / simple food or drink item to either consume or buy, when better quality alternatives are available, is a recurrent motif in Comedy. Cf. Amphis fr. 26, Axionicus fr. 4.16-17, Eubulus fr. 35, Eupolis fr. 355, etc.

Κουρίς (fr. 23)

This title falls into the category of the manual professions (see introduction to *Ἀμπελοργός*). Pollux 7.165 explains *κουρίς* as the female of *κουρεύς*, and Arnott must be right in his interpretation that *κουρίς* was used of “a woman working independently as a hairdresser” (introduction to Alexis’ *Κουρίς*). Alexis and Antiphanes also wrote homonymous plays, and Naevius wrote a *Commotria*. The role of the title figure cannot be established with certainty in any of these plays. Arnott attempts a parallelism with Plautus’ *Truculentus*, where a hairdresser acts as a go-between (ll. 389ff.). Schiassi suggests the years between 345 and 340 B.C. as the date for Amphis’ play, mainly based on the references to courtesans,¹⁴² whereas Webster opts for the early forties (*CQ* 2 n.s. [1952] 21). Though ultimately unprovable, it is possible that this was a recognition play, and a forerunner of New Comedy,¹⁴³ and that the title-figure of the hairdresser was eventually found to be a citizen.

The present fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIII 567f within a discussion about famous hetairai. Two points are particularly interesting here. First, the mention of Plutos. Though one cannot rule out the possibility that the latter was a speaking character who appeared on stage (in which case the *dramatis personae* probably featured a mixture of divine and human elements, as in Aristophanes’ *Plutus*), there is no obvious reason to suppose anything more than a comment about unfair distribution of wealth; cf. Hipponax fr. 36 West.

The second noteworthy point is the connection / parallelism of courtesans to traps, and consequently to the imagery of hunting. Considering both Theophilus fr. 11, and the possibility of a similar conception implied by the title of Philetaerus’ *Κυναγίς* (see introduction *ad loc.*), it appears that the use of hunting terms to refer to

¹⁴² *RFIC* 29 n.s. (1951) 231, 234. His evidence are D. 22.56 (for Sinope’s birth before 380 B.C.), and both Anaxilas fr. 22.13 and Antiphanes fr. 27.12 (for Sinope’s longevity).

¹⁴³ For this type of plot in New Comedy see Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, 130-136; Webster *SLGC* 74-82.

the courtesans' rapacity acquired the dimensions of a comic trend, and that the treatment of courtesans as hunters became stereotypical.¹⁴⁴

We have no sound evidence as to who the speaker might have been.

τυφλὸς ὁ Πλοῦτος εἶναί μοι δοκεῖ,
 ὅστις γε παρὰ ταύτην μὲν οὐκ εἰσέρχεται,
 παρὰ δὲ Σινώπῃ καὶ Λύκῃ καὶ Ναννίῳ
 ἑτέροις τε τοιαύταισι παγίσι τοῦ βίου
 5 ἔνδον κάθητ' ἀπόπληκτος οὐδ' ἐξέρχεται

I think Plutos is blind,
 for he does not enter the house of this girl,
 but he sits senseless in the homes of Sinope, Lyca,
 and Nannion, and other similar traps of
 5 life, and he never comes out

1 τυφλὸς ὁ Πλοῦτος: Generally Plutos is thought to be blind, because he favours randomly the good and the bad people alike. This conception can be traced back at least to Hipponax fr. 36 West.¹⁴⁵ In Aristophanes' *Plutus* the whole plot is built upon this visualisation,¹⁴⁶ and we are also told that Plutos' blindness was inflicted by Zeus because of his ill-will towards the mankind (l. 87). Cf. van Leeuwen on Ar. *Pl.* 13. For a list of references to Plutos' blindness see Diggle on E. *Phaëth.* 166.

2a ὅστις γε ... οὐκ εἰσέρχεται: A relative clause of cause; cf. Smyth §2555. The particle *γε*, usually present in such clauses, serves to reinforce the causal meaning of the relative pronoun, and subsequently of the whole sentence. For the metaphor, which maintains the personification, cf. E. *Ph.* 532-534.

2b ταύτην: Probably a reference to the female title-figure of the hairdresser.

¹⁴⁴ Once we accept that the hetairai were notorious for their rapacity, there begins to look less paradoxical the idea that *they*, and not their lovers, are the ones who literally fight to get a partner; cf. Amphis fr. 1.4.

¹⁴⁵ The blind Plutos is said to have visited the house of Hipponax, but still he never granted him wealth.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Newiger, *Metapher und Allegorie: Studien zu Aristophanes*, 167ff.

3a Σινώπη: This was a famous hetaira, whose name occurs frequently in Comedy and elsewhere; cf. Alexis fr. 109 (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*), Antiphanes fr. 27.12 (cf. Konstantakos *ad loc.*), Callicr. fr. 1, D. 22.56. She must have been born *ca.* 380 B.C.; cf. Schiassi *o.c.* 232-234, and Coppola *RFIC* 5 n.s. (1927) 459. In a play produced some time in the forties (cf. introduction), Sinope must have been presented as an old woman, either still practising or having retired, but being rich whatever the case (Plutos has settled in her house). Theopompus tells us (115 F 253 *FGrH*) that Sinope originated not from the town Sinope, as one would normally expect (cf. Bechtel, *Frauenamen*, 59-60), but from Thrace; from there she moved to Athens, after passing from Aegina. Her excessively indecent behaviour became proverbial and gave rise to the verb *σινωπίζω*; cf. *Suda* s.v. *Σινώπη*, and Phot. s.v. *Σινωπίσαι*.

3b Λύκα ... Ναννίω: These two hetairai are mentioned again together in Timocles' *Ὀρεσταυτοκλειδῆς* fr. 27, where they are characterised as *γῤῥᾶες*. Hunter dates Timocles' play to the 330s or 320s (*ZPE* 36 [1979]), though Breitenbach (*Titulorum* 33-36) and Schiassi (*o.c.* 230-231) suggest the mid to late 350s for both *Ὀρεσταυτοκλειδῆς* and *Κουρίς*; this latter date would make Lyka and Nannion equally *γῤῥᾶες* in *Κουρίς* too.¹⁴⁷ But the way that the speaker talks about them implies anything but their old age. Plutos is left speechless and paralysed at the sight of them, and he would not leave their places. Therefore, the assumption that they were still in their prime (even their late prime), or else that they were not *γῤῥᾶες* yet, seems more plausible; this favours Hunter's suggestion for a later date of *Ὀρεσταυτοκλειδῆς*.

The present fragment of Amphis along with Timocles fr. 27 are the only references to the hetaira Lyca. As to Nannion, see Hunter's thorough note in his introduction to Eubulus' homonymous play.

4 παγίσι: For the hunting connotations see introduction to the play. Phrynichus *PS* 30.3 tells us that Aristophanes (fr. 869) employed this word to describe metaphorically the decorations and the clothes used by women to beautify themselves,

¹⁴⁷ However, references to courtesans' age can be exaggerated and therefore are not always the safest criterion to date a comic play.

while in Luc. *DMeretr* 11.2 *Παγίς* stands as a nickname for a courtesan. See Marx on Lucil. 990 for further parallels, mainly Latin, and also *LSJ* s.v. 2.

5a ἔνδον κάθητ': Plutos is said to be sitting dumbfounded in the courtesans' houses. The verb *κάθηται* contrasts his permanent residence in the home of the undeserving (the courtesans) with his failure to visit the deserving (the title-figure). *κάθημαι* often connotes inactivity, idleness; see *LSJ* s.v. 3 with examples.

There is a paradox here that is against the expectations of the audience, since it is Poverty the character that traditionally figures in literature as an inhabitant in people's houses. This visualisation of Poverty is as old as Theognis 351. It recurs in Ar. *Pl.* 437, Men. *Dysc.* 209-211, Pl. *Smp.* 203d, Porph. *Abst.* 3.27, etc.

5b ἀπόπληκτος: See *LSJ* s.v. Plutos is left astounded and utterly astonished; for the metaphor see Plato fr. 138 The reason is understandably the beauty and charm of the courtesans, who know how to ensnare a lover.

Λευκαδία (fr. 26)

This title falls into the category of those that Amphis shares with Alexis (see introduction to *Ἀμπελουργός*). It is an ethnic name that denotes a girl / woman / courtesan, originating from the Ionian island of *Leucas*. Play-titles that designate a girl originating from a place other than Athens are relatively common in both Middle and New Comedy.¹⁴⁸ In such cases, the play normally evolves around the adventures of this foreign girl away of home, preferably in Athens.¹⁴⁹ However, this is the only title of this kind within Amphis' work. Diphilus and Menander also wrote a play entitled *Λευκαδία*, Antiphanes wrote a *Λευκάδιος*, and the Latin poet Turpilius probably imitated Menander in his *Leucadia* (cf. Ribbeck *CRF*³ 97ff.). As is the case with Alexis too (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*), it is difficult to establish how the title could have related to the remains of the play. Concerning the play's location, rather than being the island Leucas, it is more possible that the play narrated the adventures of a

¹⁴⁸ Cf. *Ἀτθίς* by Alexis (cf. Arnott's introduction to the play), *Βοιωτία* by Antiphanes, Theophilus, and Menander, *Κορινθία* by Antiphanes and Philemo, *Σαμία* by Anaxandrides and Menander, etc.

¹⁴⁹ See Arnott's introductions to Alexis' *Ἀτθίς* and *Μιλήσιοι* (or *-ησία*).

Leucadian woman who moved to e.g. Athens. One recalls Menander's *Samia*, where the Samian courtesan Chrysis lives in Athens, as a concubine (*παλλακή*) of an Athenian citizen. Likewise, this Leucadian girl might be a *παλλακή*, either a free or a slave one. If not a *παλλακή*, then she could be a hetaira of free status, who chose to make career in Athens. Another possibility is that the heroine of this play was a captive girl from Leucas, who was brought to Athens, where she turned into either a hetaira or a servant attached to a lady, or simply a member of the slaves' staff of an Athenian house. In fact, most courtesans in Athens were of foreign origin.¹⁵⁰

Another possibility, which however I consider much less probable, is to understand the title as referring to Sappho; that is, the play could possibly constitute a myth parody dealing with the love affair of the poetess with Phaon.¹⁵¹ We are told that Phaon rejected the love of Sappho, who therefore committed suicide by throwing herself from the rocks of Leucas into the sea.¹⁵² Of course, the myth must have been given a comic twist, as it is the norm in similar cases (cf. Webster *SLGC* 82ff.). Still, the plot could have been a mixture of mythic and real elements, another topos of Middle Comedy itself (cf. General Introduction pp. 24-26). Accordingly, the love-struck Sappho could have been placed in a contemporary context, with her final suicide obviously being altered.¹⁵³ It is noteworthy that Amphis wrote a play entitled *Sappho*. This fact could be used as an argument either for or against the hypothesis for a Sappho-related plot for the current play. That is, either Amphis re-worked the same subject later in his career, just as Aristophanes did with *Peace*, *Clouds*, and *Thesmophoriazousae*, or the existence of a play apparently dedicated to Sappho could eliminate the possibility of another play having a similar subject.¹⁵⁴

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus twice; in II 57b as an evidence of radishes' humbleness, and in VII 277c, as an introduction to a discussion about

¹⁵⁰ Cf. the case of the Younger Lais (cf. on Philetaerus fr. 9.4), of Sinope (cf. on Amphis fr. 23.3), etc.

¹⁵¹ Such a plot was first suggested for Menander's play by Ribbeck, *JCP* 69 (1884) 34ff. (*teste* Arnott, introduction to Alexis' *Λευκαδία*). For a different, non-mythical, plot reconstruction see Webster *IM* 161ff.

¹⁵² Cf. Serv. on Virg. *Aen.* 3.274, Ovid *Her.* 15, etc. For the fictive nature of the story of her death see Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, 37.

¹⁵³ Aristotle in *Po.* 1453a 35ff. provides an example of such comically distorted happy ends.

¹⁵⁴ Another argument against the Sappho-related reconstruction of the plot is of course that the title suggests someone who originates from Leucas, and not simply an incident that took place there.

various kinds of fish. The tenor of this fragment is similar to Amphis fr. 22. According to the speaker below, only a fool would prefer radishes to fish, provided one can afford it. Though the passage is most easily understood as a straightforward statement about foodstuffs, we cannot rule out the possibility that the taste for radishes is offered as an exemplum for uncultivated taste in a context which deals e.g. with the choice of courtesans.

ὅστις ἀγοράζων ὄψον – ὕ – ὤ –
 ἔξ' ὄν ἀπολαύειν ἰχθύων ἀληθινῶν,
 ῥαφανίδας ἐπιθυμεῖ πρίασθαι, μαίνεται

2 ἀληθινῶν codd.: Φαληρικῶν Kock

Anyone who, shopping for a relish in the market,
 longs to buy radishes,
 when it is possible to enjoy true fish, is crazy

1a ὅστις ... : See on Amphis fr. 21.1

1b ὄψον: See on Mnesimachus fr. 7.3.

1c – ὕ – ὤ – : The sense is syntactically complete; therefore, it is difficult to arrive to a plausible supplement for this lacuna. Obvious supplements which suggest themselves are:

- i) a parenthesis meaning “in my opinion”; e.g. ὡς ἔμοι δοκεῖ.
- ii) a comment about the financial condition of the purchaser; e.g. εἰ μὴ ἔστιν πένης.

However, the uncertainties are too many to justify choosing any conjecture.

2 ἀληθινῶν: True or genuine fish is not an easily comprehensible notion; cf. Meineke *Analecta* 29. Therefore, Kock suggested the reading Φαληρικῶν (cf. Antiphanes fr. 204.7). However, there are two parallels for the manuscripts' reading: Macho fr. 5.29 *καράβων ἀληθινῶν*,¹⁵⁵ and *Ptochopr.* 4.319: ἀληθινὰ παγούρια. Therefore, we should

¹⁵⁵ Gow's note *ad loc.*, “genuine fish is either a technical term or nonsense”, is not of much help.

probably accept the manuscripts' reading in each case, for three seem too many a times for the same mistake to occur. Still, one might suggest the reading ἀληθινῶς, which would define ἀπολαύειν ("truly enjoy"). Alternatively, ἰχθύων ἀληθινῶν could be a colloquialism; the usage of ἀληθινός might be idiomatic, designed to emphasise the high quality of the fish, i.e. "fish worth the name" or, as opposed to radishes, fish is "the real thing", it is "real / solid food".

3 ῥαφανίδας: The Scholiast on Ar. *Pl.* 544 gives a fanciful etymology: παρὰ τὸ ῥαδίως φαίνεσθαι. λόγος γὰρ ὡς σπειρομένη θᾶπτον ἄνεισιν. Apparently, radishes were not an outstanding relish; cf. Ar. *Pl.* 544, Diodorus fr. 2.35ff., etc.¹⁵⁶ Here they look even less tasty, as they are compared to fish.

Ὀδυσσεύς (fr. 27)

Odysseus was a very popular figure in both Sicilian and Attic Comedy.¹⁵⁷ His adventures, repeatedly treated by tragedy,¹⁵⁸ were also suitable for comic elaboration. Odysseus is the title-figure of plays by Epicharmus, Cratinus, Dinolochus, Alexis, Anaxandrides, Eubulus, and Theopompus.¹⁵⁹

Although the evidence that we get from the only surviving fragment below does not suffice, it is a possibility that the play consisted of myth travesty and anachronistic transfer of the plot to the contemporary era (cf. General Introduction pp. 24-26). This is what happens in Alexis fr. 159 (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*, and Webster *SLGC* 57). Similarly, Millis suggests "an amalgam of legend and reality" for Anaxandrides fr. 35, with Odysseus addressing the Athenians.

The present fragment is cited by Athenaeus XV 691a. The first speaker could be either the master or the foreman (cf. on l. 4). He is apparently giving orders to a number of slaves. The second speaker must be one of these slaves, who is puzzled by the mention of a particular unguent that is unknown to him. The content of the orders

¹⁵⁶ Though they were considered to be an aphrodisiac; cf. sch. on Ar. *Nu.* 981.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. also archaic iambos, Hipponax fr. *74 West.

¹⁵⁸ *Nausica* or *Plyntriae*, and *Niptra* by Sophocles, *Penelope* by Aeschylus and Philocles.

¹⁵⁹ For a study of all the plays relating to Odysseus, see Schmidt, *Jb. Cl. Ph.*, suppl. 16 (1887-88) 375-403.

implies that a distinguished guest is expected. The master tells his slaves to decorate the room, anoint the guest with this rare unguent, and scent the air by burning some special kind of incense. It is worth bearing in mind that decorating a room with various garments (coverlets, carpets, rugs, etc.), and anointing the guests with unguent were two characteristic features of the symposion (see on Amphis fr. 9.3-4). Could this be a preparation for a symposion? Certainty is impossible. Due to the fragmentary nature of our evidence, the range of possibilities is endless. Although ultimately unprovable, it is possible that the expected guest is Odysseus himself.¹⁶⁰ Keeping his traditional identity as a shipwrecked sailor, *he* is possibly the one to be hosted and for whom these arrangements are about to take place. In such a case, his host – and the speaker of this fragment – could be either the king Alcinous¹⁶¹ or the Cyclops.¹⁶² The obvious assumption is that, if Alcinous appeared, he was the host, not the guest. However, we cannot rule out a reversal of roles; given the freedom with which Comedy treats myth, one cannot exclude the possibility of a completely fictitious incident, based on the established myth; e.g. Alcinous could be the shipwrecked sailor, who ends up cast on the shores of Ithaca, and finds hospitality into Odysseus' royal palace. With Odysseus as the affectionate host another scenario is also possible; i.e. the expected guest could possibly be Cyclops. If so, Odysseus would be returning the “hospitality” that he received from him.

But the opportunities for a comic result seem better if Cyclops was the host. Odysseus and Cyclops could have possibly appeared as good friends.¹⁶³ If so, a further comic twist would be the conversion of the Cyclops from an anti-social man-eating monster to a diligent host with social graces and servants, his cave having being metamorphosed into a grand dwelling. The taming of his legendary cannibalism could have either taken place extra-theatrically or constituted one of the main themes of the play itself.

¹⁶⁰ The vocative *δέσποτ'* tells against Kock's suggestion (II.244) that the speaker is Penelope.

¹⁶¹ Cf. the plays *Ὀδυσσεύς Ναυαγός* by Epicharmus, and *Ἀλκίνοος* by Phormis. There is also a contemporary vase painting portraying Arete and Alcinous welcoming the shipwrecked Odysseus (Bieber *HT* 136).

¹⁶² A stay of both Odysseus and his comrades at the Cyclops' place traces most possibly back to Epicharmus, Cratinus, and Theopompus; cf. Schmidt *o.c.* 381ff., and Bergk, *Commentationum de Reliquiis Comoediae Atticae Antiquae*, 413.

¹⁶³ Cf. what Aristotle says about a comic presentation of Orestes and Aigisthos (*Po.* 1453a 35ff.).

A totally different scenario is to imagine that this is the cleaning up scene after the killing of the suitors by Odysseus; i.e. Odysseus orders the slaves to clean the room, decorate and polish the walls, and scent the air, so that Penelope is prevented from seeing the massacre;¹⁶⁴ cf. on l. 2a.

ἐρίοισι τοὺς τοίχους κύκλω Μιλησίοις,
ἔπειτ' ἀλείφειν τῷ Μεγαλλείῳ μύρω,
καὶ τὴν βασιλικὴν θυμιάτε μίνδακα.

(B.) ἀκήκοας σύ, δέσποτ', ἤδη πώποτε
5 τὸ θυμίαμα τοῦτο;

... the walls all around with Milesian wool,
then polish off with the Megalleian unguent,
and burn the royal incense.

(B.) My master, have you ever heard before of
5 this kind of incense?

The speaker gives orders for three arrangements, but only two imperative expressions are present (*ἀλείφειν* and *θυμιάτε*). A further imperative, dealing with walls' decoration, must have been left out. Meineke (*Analecta* 337) suggested that the verb *ἐμπεταννύναι* probably preceded the first line of our fragment (cf. Ath. IV 147f).

1 ἐρίοισι ... Μιλησίοις: Wool produced in Miletus is the first luxurious item that is ordered for this exceptional guest. Milesian wool was of high quality and had a great reputation, particularly for its softness (Ael. *NA* 17.34). Suffice to say that the clothes of the Sybarites were said to be made out of it (Ath. XII 519b). See sch. on Ar. *Lys.* 729, on *Ra.* 542, and Gow on Theoc. 15.126f. This high quality wool is accompanied by some expensive unguent, and some rare royal incense (see below).¹⁶⁵ There is obviously an accumulation of exceptional products here, all contributing to a special treatment for this eminent guest.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Odysseus' orders to the slaves to cleanse and purify the house in *Od.* 22.437ff., 22.481ff.

¹⁶⁵ Milesian wool and Megalleian unguent are mentioned again together in Eubulus fr. 89; cf. Hunter *ad loc.*

2a ἀλείφειν: This infinitive, standing for imperative, does not have an object. Although it is people who are normally smeared,¹⁶⁶ and so *him*, i.e. the expected guest, is probably the missing object, one cannot exclude the possibility that the *walls* are meant here instead, in line with the previous order about decorating the walls with precious wool. If so, ἀλείφω is to be interpreted as *polish*;¹⁶⁷ this strengthens the hypothesis that this is perhaps the scene just after the killing of the suitors; cf. introduction to the play.

2b Μεγαλλείω μύρω: This was a luxurious, strongly perfumed unguent (Thphr. *Od.* 42, 55). It was named after its alleged inventor Megallos (Ar. fr. 549, Strattis fr. 34). Information about its manufacture is given in Thphr. *Od.* 29-30, Dsc. 1.58.3, and Plin. *HN* 13.13. It is also mentioned by Anaxandrides fr. 47, Eubulus fr. 89, and Pherecrates fr. 149. There has been much confusion in the transmission of both the perfume's name and its inventor; Renehan¹⁶⁸ discusses the corrupt readings *μεγαλειῶν* (e.g. Ath. XV 690f codex A), and *μετάλλειον* (e.g. Hsch. s.v.).

3 μίνδακα: This is a hapax, which Hesychius (μ 1392) explains as *δυμίαμα ποιόν*, and *LSJ* s.v. as *a kind of Persian incense*. Although μίνδαξ is elsewhere unattested, there are a number of passages that mention a certain βασιλειον μύρον; e.g. Crates fr. 2, Poll. 6.105, Hsch. s.v. βασιλειον, Plin. *HN* 13.18 (*regale unguentum*), Sapph. fr. 94.18-20 V. (cf. apparati *ad loc.*). This must have indicated a particular type of perfume preferred by royal households (cf. *LSJ* s.v. 3), and as such it could have been the same with any of those already known by a certain name. It is a reasonable assumption that the term βασιλειον might have gradually replaced the perfume's original name, to an extent where the latter ceased being used, and was consequently forgotten. My suggestion is that here Amphis employs the original term, which he additionally defines by the adjective βασιλικήν, so that he makes clear the connection / identification with the perfume widely known as βασιλειον μύρον.

¹⁶⁶ In Eubulus fr. 89 Megalleian perfume is used to anoint one's feet. Cf. Crates fr. 16.10, Ar. *Ach.* 999, V. 608, etc.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Diphilus fr. 75.2 ἀλείψας τὴν τράπεζαν. See *LSJ* s.v. ἀλείφω.

¹⁶⁸ *Greek Textual Criticism*, 13.

4 ἀκήκοας ... πώποτε: For the style of the question, see on Amphis fr. 9.1. Regarding the content, this exchange is rather odd, if there are two speakers. A says: “Use the royal incense”. Then B says: “Have you ever heard of this incense, master?” Yet, A has just mentioned it. The conversation becomes more meaningful, if we assume that there are more than two persons on stage. Given the plural number of the imperative *θυμιᾶτε*, the following reconstruction is possible: present on stage are the foreman, a group of slaves, and the master. The foreman addresses the slaves, and assigns them certain tasks. One of them (person B) is unaware of the incense called *μίνδαξ*, and therefore he addresses the master expressing his puzzlement.

Πλάνος (fr. 30)

The term *πλάνος* can denote a swindler; cf. *LSJ* s.v., Hsch. π 2454. But it can also signify the “wanderer”, the “juggler”, the “wandering juggler”, someone who goes around performing tricks, for which he possibly gets paid by the excited passers-by, i.e. something very much like busking. With all probability this is the meaning of the term in Nicostratus fr. 25, Theognetus fr. 2, and Dionysius fr. 4 (Ath. XIV 615e – 616a).

This fragment, cited by Athenaeus VI 224d-e, is a satire of fishmongers, and presents striking similarities with Alexis fr. 16. In both fragments the speaker compares the attitude of the fishmongers to that of the generals, and cites a sample dialogue. For a treatment of this convergence see Arnott on Alexis *l.c.*, and Nesselrath *MK* 294.

The fragment is seriously corrupted in places and the text cannot be restored with certainty.

πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγούς ῥᾶόν ἐστιν μυρίαῖς
μοίραις προσελθόντ' ἀξιωθῆναι λόγου
λαβεῖν τ' ἀπόκρισιν <ῶν> ἂν ἐπερωτᾷ τις ἢ
πρὸς τοὺς καταράτους ἰχθυοπώλας ἐν ἀγορᾷ.
5 οὐς ἂν ἐπερωτήσῃ τις † λαβῶν τι τῶν
παρακειμένων, ἔκυψεν ὥσπερ Τήλεφος
πρῶτον σιωπῇ (καὶ δικαίως τοῦτό γε·
ἅπαντες ἀνδροφόνοι γὰρ εἰσιν ἐνὶ λόγῳ),

ὡσεὶ † προσέχων δ' † οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἀκηκοῶς
 10 ἔκρουσε πολὺπουν τιν'· ὁ δ' ἐπρήσθη ὤ –
 ὦ – ὤ – ὦ καὶ τότε οὐ λαλῶν ὄλα
 τὰ ῥήματ', ἀλλὰ συλλαβὴν ἀφελῶν “τάρων
 βολῶν γένοιτ' ἄν.” “ἢ δὲ κέστρα;” “κτὼ βολῶν.”
 τοιαῦτ' ἀκοῦσαι δεῖ τὸν ὀψωνοῦντά τι

3 ὦν ἄν Porson *Misc.* 237: ἄν A 5 ἄν Mus.: ἐάν A ἐπερωτήσῃ τίς λαβῶν A: ἐρωτ- τις (ἀνα)λαβῶν Kock:
 ἐπερωτήσῃς (ἐδέλω) λαβεῖν Kassel 9 προσέχων δ' A: τε προσέχων Meineke *Men. et Phil.* 186: δὲ
 προσέχων Dindorf: προσήκον δ' Kaibel 10 ὁ δ' ἐπρήσθη A: ὁ δ' ἐπρίσθη Meineke, dentibus frendere
 piscarium opinatus: ‘corruptum; iratus emptor iterum quaerit’ Kaibel: del. Kock:

It is ten thousand times easier

to come before the generals and obtain a hearing

and receive an answer to whatever one inquires about, than

it is to approach the accursed fishmongers in the market.

5 Whenever someone, picking up something of the wares on display, asks them
 a question, he hangs his head like Telephus
 in silence first (and they do this with reason;
 for, to put it in a word, they are all murderers),
 and, as if he was neither paying any attention, nor had he heard a word,
 10 he pounds an octopus; the other is burning with rage ...
 ... and then, without pronouncing his words entire,
 but clipping some syllables, “It would
 cost you fo’ obols”. “And this barracuda?” “Eigh’ obols”.

This is what a buyer must hear

1 στρατηγούς: The institution of the generals was first introduced in Athens in 501
 B.C. This board numbered ten officials, who were elected annually (*Arist. Ath.* 22.2).
 During the fifth century the generals wielded both political and military power. They
 were, along with the ῥήτορες, equivalent to the modern notion of “politicians” or
 “political leaders”.¹⁶⁹ The generals presided over the People’s Court in military cases

¹⁶⁹ See Hansen *GRBS* 24 (1983) 37-42. Hansen also draws an inventory of both the orators and the
 generals of fourth-century Athens (*o.c.* 151-180).

(Lys. 15.1-4), enjoyed the privilege of addressing the Council and proposing motions without prior leave from the prytaneis (*SEG* 10 86.47, *IG* II² 27), and represented the city of Athens in the case of a treaty (*IG* II² 124.20-23). They also commanded the army and the fleet (Hdt. 6.103.1, X. *Hell.* 1.7.5), and appointed the trierarchs (D. 39.8). However, in the fourth century the status of the generals was modified to simply military commanders in chief, and a division of military duties was also introduced among them (Arist. *Ath.* 61.1). Military and state duties gradually ceased being performed by the same man, as in the cases of e.g. Pericles and Cimon; cf. Isocrates 8.54-55. The split though was not definite.¹⁷⁰ For a comprehensive discussion about the generals and their role see Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, 34ff., 233ff., 268ff.

The present reference to “the generals”, generic as it is, does not allow for any particular identification with certain persons. Although the fishmongers are the main target of this satire, the generals are also attacked, at least indirectly, for both arrogance and unwillingness to consent to a hearing; cf. on l. 2. The same applies to Alexis fr. 16 (see introduction to the play). The comic jibe against the generals traces back to Old Comedy, where it appears even sharper; e.g. Eupolis fr. 219, 384, Ar. *Ach.* 572ff., *Eq.* 355 with scholia, Plato fr. 201.

1-2 *μυρταῖς μοῖραις*: *μοῖρα* here means *degree*; cf. *LSJ* I.5. Using language reminiscent of astronomical texts,¹⁷¹ the speaker emphasises how much easier it is to have a word with the generals than with the fishmongers.

2 *ἀξιοθῆναι λόγου*: This phrase means *to be assigned the right of speaking or of a hearing*, especially (but not exclusively) at a law-court; cf. D. 45.6.

This *λόγος* could refer to a number of situations. One possibility – that is also compatible with the reference to the generals – is a complaint about conscription. The generals had the responsibility to produce call-up lists for military service; cf. Lys. 14.6, D. 39.8. We know of a particular instance, where an enrolled soldier did come

¹⁷⁰ See Hansen *GRBS* 24 (1983) 49-55.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Hipparch. 1.8.17, Gem. 1.6, etc.

before the generals to complain about being called in the army again after hardly two months from the previous time; this is Lysias 9, *Ἐπὲρ τοῦ στρατιώτου*.¹⁷²

4 καταράτους: A term of abuse. Here the target are the fishmongers, who below (l. 8) are also described as *ἀνδροφόνοι* (cf. Ath. VI 228c). Elsewhere the indignation and rage of the speaker can be directed against either a human or an inanimate object. This abuse is frequently employed by comic poets of all eras; cf. Pherecrates fr. 76.3, Ar. V. 1157, Epicrates fr. 8.1, Philemo fr. 65.3, etc. Menander uses the more intense compound *τρισκατάρατος*, e.g. *Epit.* 1080, fr. 71, etc.¹⁷³

5a: Here the metron is incomplete; cf. crit. app. Of the suggestions offered Kock's is marginally preferable for a number of reasons; a) it is closest to the received tradition, hence it requires less change; b) it is easily explicable: loss of *ἀνά* by haplography, and interpolation of *ἐπί*; prepositions, just like prefixes and other small words, are easily and frequently inserted into texts;¹⁷⁴ c) the meaning is also preferable, for *ἀναλαβών* ("picking up") suits the context (the customer picks up a fish and asks for its price).

5b τῶν: The definite article is here placed at the end of the line. This phenomenon recurs not only in Comedy of all eras (though more often in Middle and New), but also in tragedy, particularly in Sophocles. For parallels see van Leeuwen on Ar. *Pl.* 752, and Arnott on Alexis fr. 20. Arnott *ad loc.* suggests that this happens "presumably as part of an attempt to make the iambic trimeter less stichic and more flexible".

5-6 οὗς ... ἔκλυψεν: Here the syntax is loose. Fishmongers are mentioned in the plural in the subordinate clause, but in the following principal clause the number is switched to singular. The sequence of singulars continues during the rest of the dialogue, with only one plural instance in the parenthetical phrase. The peculiarity can easily be

¹⁷² See MacDowell in *Symposion 1993: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, 153-164.

¹⁷³ Demosthenes too uses this word quite often; see Wankel on D. 18.209.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, 24.

explained: the singular is indispensable for the construction of the dialogue, which focuses on a representative *instantané* (a single customer buys from and speaks to a single seller). Everywhere else the fishmongers are considered collectively, as a generalized group. A parallel crossing of numbers occurs in Ar. *V.* 552-558, *Nu.* 973-975, etc. See Kühner-Gerth, I §371.5; Maas, *Textual Criticism*, §36.

6a ἔκυψεν: This gesture is described elsewhere in parallel terms; e.g. ἔκυπτον (Euphr. fr. 1.27), κάτω βλέποντας (Alexis fr. 16.6), κάτω κεκυφώς (Thphr. *Char.* 24.8). The reasons why one gazes downwards vary.¹⁷⁵ *LSJ* s.v. 2 consider *sorrow* to be the reason in the present fragment, but I doubt it, for there is no sign in the text to suggest it. This is a very graphic scene, and I would argue that the fishmonger looks down out of arrogance and contempt towards the customer.¹⁷⁶ It could be that he affects to be preoccupied as an excuse for ignoring his customer, or that he ignores the customer while leaning over to concentrate on his task, as if the customer was irrelevant. He is rude and uninterested, and pretends to be very busy to see the customer; later (10ff.) he is working on the octopus while answering.

The aorist ἔκυψεν is gnomic. It expresses a general truth, a notion of regularity and recurrence (cf. Smyth §1931). There is an accumulation of gnomic aorists (cf. ἔκρουσε, ἐπρήσθη; l. 10), which gives the audience the impression that this is a typical and recurrent kind of dialogue between a fishmonger and a client.

6b παρακειμένων: *LSJ* explain it as *dishes on table*, which I doubt, for it is obvious that the dialogue takes place over the fishmonger's stand in the market. Meineke *ad loc.* interpreted παρακείμενα as the fishmonger's professional instruments, i.e. knives, etc. However, it is inconceivable that a customer could have been interested in the fishmonger's professional tools (instead of the fish themselves), or could have ever messed with them. The most appropriate interpretation seems to be Kock's *ad loc.*, who understood παρακείμενα as the fish laying nearby on the fishmonger's stand.

6-8 Τήλεφος ... σιωπή ... ἀνδροφόνοι: Cf. Alexis fr. 183.3 ἄφωνος Τήλεφος (see Arnott *ad loc.*). The speechlessness of Telephus is a motif that originates from Aeschylus' lost

¹⁷⁵ See Arnott on Alexis *l.c.*

¹⁷⁶ This is how Arnott interprets a similar behaviour by the fishmongers in Alexis *l.c.*

play *Mysoi*,¹⁷⁷ where the mythic hero is bound to silence as a consequence of killing his mother's brothers; cf. Arist. *Po.* 1460a 32, Hygin. *Fab.* 244.2.

For the Aristophanic comic exploitation of the myth the model was Euripides' *Telephus*.¹⁷⁸ But a speechless Telephus could not have come through Aristophanes. Instead, the satire of Telephus' silence by both Amphis and Alexis may reflect fourth century revivals of the Aeschylean play. Aeschylus' plays appear to have been re-performed from the 420s.¹⁷⁹ Generally, the association of speechlessness with murder is common; cf. A. *Eum.* 448, sch. on A. *Eum.* 276, E. fr. 1008 *TGF*. See Parker, *Miasma*, 371.

It is typical for Comedy to play between metaphorical and literal. In the present fragment the word *ἀνδροφόνους* is used metaphorically as a term of abuse, meant to portray the fishmongers as being cunning, deceptive, and voracious. The term is not used by Aristophanes or by any other Middle Comedy poet apart from Amphis; it is employed though in New Comedy. In Philippides fr. 5.3 a gluttonous hetaira is said to be *ἀνδροφόνος*, in Euphro fr. 9.10 the term refers to the stealing abilities of a cook, and in Men. *Dysc.* 481 Knemon, being mad with Getas, uses the phrase *ἀνδροφόνου θηρία*. Additionally, Philemo and Bato wrote plays entitled *Ἀνδροφόνος*. With reference to Euphro's fragment Meineke interprets the term as *fraudentem et rapacem* (*Menandri et Philemonis Reliquiae* 360), and accordingly presumes the same meaning for Philemo's and Bato's title-figures, as well as for the fishmongers in Amphis' fragment.¹⁸⁰

7-8 καὶ δικαίως ... ἐνὶ λόγῳ: These words are placed in parenthesis by Kassel-Austin, as a side comment by the same speaker. However, it is also possible that this is a case of *antilabe*, and these words actually belong to a second speaker (cf. Meineke, *Menandri et Philemonis Reliquiae*, 186). It is common for extended speeches to be interrupted for the purposes of variation; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 598, 607.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Radt's scholia *ad loc.* (*TGF* III).

¹⁷⁸ Cf. *Ach.* 303-593, *Th.* 466-519, 689-759. See Handley & Rea, *BICS*, Suppl. 5 (1957) 30-39.

¹⁷⁹ In addition, we know that from 387/6 B.C. onwards an old tragedy was re-performed in the City Dionysia; cf. the entry of *Fasti* for this year (col. VIII.201-204). See Pickard-Cambridge, *Festivals*, 72, 99-100.

¹⁸⁰ Other such extreme expressions occur elsewhere in Comedy; e.g. *θειοσεχθρία* (Ar. *V.* 418 – see van Leeuwen *ad loc.*, Archippus fr. 37.3).

9: Another corrupt line; cf. crit. app. Here I adopt Meineke's conjecture (*τε προσέχων*), which I consider more plausible, since it retains the tradition and at the same time gets rid of the awkwardly postponed *δέ*, and also heals the metre. Kaibel's suggestion (*προσῆκον δ'*) is farther from the manuscripts, and less obviously at home within the context of the fragment, where the emphasis is on the fishmonger's refusal to pay attention.

10a ἔχρουσε πολύπουν: See Thompson *Fishes* 204-208. The octopus is beaten in order to become tender and soft; cf. *Suda* δ 1267, Phot. δ 668, Ephippus fr. 3.10.

10b ἐπρήσθη: This is the aorist of both *πρήσθω* and *πίμπρημι*; the meaning of the text depends on which one we choose. Kuses¹⁸¹ and Marx¹⁸² argue in favour of *πρήσθω*, in which case the reference is to the octopus. However, in my translation above I follow Kaibel, who understood *ἐπρήσθη* to be the aorist of *πίμπρημι* instead. In this case the reference is to the purchaser.¹⁸³ This is *ira incendi*; the purchaser is burning with rage, as a result of the fishmonger's attitude. *ἐπρήσθη* is a gnomic aorist; cf. on l. 6a.

10-11: A possible supplement for this lacuna could be <ὁ δ' αἶ / μόλις ἀνακύπτει>. This gives a satisfying meaning – the fishmonger finally looks at the customer and starts paying attention to him, before answering his question in ll. 12-13.

12-13: These lines feature both *aphaeresis* (*κτῶ βολῶν*) and syllable dropping (*τάρων* for *τετάρων*). This is possibly a sample of the slang language of either the era in general or the market people in particular. Elsewhere in Comedy the words *ὀκτῶ ὀβολοί* are found together in unelided form; cf. Crates fr. 22,¹⁸⁴ Lynceus fr. 1.20. Thraette notes that *aphaeresis* is uncommon in Attic inscriptions.¹⁸⁵ As to the syllables that are dropped, they share two characteristics; they are unaccented and

¹⁸¹ *Αθηνᾶ* 2 (1890) 341.

¹⁸² On Plaut. *Rud.* 1010.

¹⁸³ Meineke and Taillardat thought that the reference is to the fishmonger; cf. crit. app.

¹⁸⁴ Here, however, we have *synecphonesis*; cf. West, *Greek Metre*, 12-13.

¹⁸⁵ *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, I.426.

short: (τε)τάρων, (ὄ)βολῶν, (ὄ)κτώ. The dropping of unaccented and short syllables reccurs on some vase inscriptions;¹⁸⁶ on these grounds, Kretschmer *l.c.* suggests that this may have been a feature of the colloquial language of the era. Regarding τετάρων, the omission of one of two syllables featuring the same or similar letters facilitates the pronunciation and makes the speech quicker. See Lobeck, *Paralipomena Grammaticae Graecae*, 43; Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, 103.

The usage of such an informal and colloquial language can probably be interpreted as a further indication of the fishmonger's dismissive attitude; cf. on l. 6a.

12-13 τάρων ... κτώ βολῶν: Not only is the fishmonger rude (cf. on l. 6a), but he is expensive too. The high cost of fish is part of the attack against the fishmongers in a number of comic passages, and this presumably reflects reality; cf. Alexis fr. 76, 130, 204, Diphilus fr. 32, etc. In Alexis fr. 16 the fish dealer charges eight obols for a single mullet, which the customer refuses to pay, considering this price quite extortionate. Davidson notes (*o.c.* 186), "it is worth remembering that a good wage for a skilled labourer around the end of the fifth century was one drachma (six obols) a day". By and large fish was considered a luxurious food item. Its conspicuous consumption understandably suggested a wealthy lifestyle, and could even bear connotations of political power.¹⁸⁷

13 κέστρα: See Thompson *Fishes* 108, 256-257. This is an Attic appellation of the fish otherwise known as σφύραινα (cf. *LSJ* s.v.); cf. Strattis fr. 29, Antiphanes fr. 97, Ath. VII 323b. Both names probably derive from the body-shape of this fish, which resembles a hammer.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶ E.g. ΕΠΟΙΕΣΝ, ΑΘΕΝΕΘΝ; cf. Kretschmer, *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach Untersucht*, 124.

¹⁸⁷ For a comprehensive discussion of fish consumption and its implications on both social and political level see Davidson, "Fish, sex and revolution in Athens", *CQ* 43 n.s. (1993) 53-66.

¹⁸⁸ Both κέστρα and σφύρα mean *hammer*; cf. *LSJ* s.vv., and Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, s.v. σφυρόν.

Φιλιάδελφοί (fr. 33-34)

Plays entitled *Φιλιάδελφοί* were also produced by Apollodorus Gelous, Diphilus (in singular, possibly), Phillipides, Sosicrates, and Menander. Two fragments of the Amphis' play survive, but neither is enlightening as to the play's plot. Although ultimately unprovable, it is possible that it was parallel (to an unknown degree) to Menander's homonymous play, which we have come to know through Plautus' adaptation in *Stichus*,¹⁸⁹ where two brothers marry two sisters. I would suggest that it is within this frame that the notions of *love* and *brother / sister*, implied by the title, should be understood. The plot's axis of Amphis' play could possibly be a simultaneous marriage of two brothers to two sisters. If so, Amphis' play might have stood as a source of inspiration for Menander.

Fr. 33

This fragment, cited by Athenaeus X 448a, could possibly come from a prologue speech,¹⁹⁰ where a character addresses the spectators, whom he considers sober in contrast with the play's characters.¹⁹¹ The latter are said to be fond of drinking, and we can imagine that they are going to be presented as pursuing a hedonistic lifestyle, similar to the one propagated by e.g. Amphis fr. 21 and Philetaerus fr. 7. The speaker could be informing the audience about the prehistory of the events that they are about to see on stage; likewise in Menander's *Epitrepontes* a divinity is believed to have delivered a delayed prologue-speech providing the audience with background information (see Gomme & Sandbach on *Epit.* fr. 6).

This fragment gives the impression that hastiness is in the origin of events related to the play, and that somebody must have done something while drunk. It is possible that a rape took place while someone was drunk during a festival. If so, this would be an early example of a typical New Comedy plot; cf. Men. *Sam.* 35ff. (Plangon is raped during the Adonia), *Epit.* 450-479 (Pamphile is raped during the Tauropolia).

¹⁸⁹ See Webster *IM* 112-114, Id. *SM* 112, 139-145.

¹⁹⁰ Webster *IM l.c.* believes that the original play by Menander did have a prologue scene, which Plautus cut out.

¹⁹¹ Another possibility is that this fragment is an address to a group of people in the play, though I consider it less plausible.

κατὰ πόλλ' ἐπαινῶ μᾶλλον ἡμῶν τὸν βίον
τὸν τῶν φιλοποτῶν ἢπερ ὑμῶν τῶν μόνον
ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ νοῦν ἔχειν εἰωθότων.
ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ συντετάχθαι διὰ τέλους
5 φρόνησις οὔσα διὰ τὸ λεπτῶς καὶ πυκνῶς
πάντ' ἐξετάζειν δέδιεν ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα
ὀρμᾶν προχείρως, ἢ δὲ διὰ τὸ μὴ σαφῶς
τί ποτ' ἀφ' ἐκάστου πράγματος συμβήσεται
διαλελογίσθαι δρᾶ τι καὶ νεανικὸν
10 καὶ θερμόν

On many accounts I praise the life
of the drink-lovers more than the life of you,
who are used to have only wit in your head.
This kind of sense, being always engaged in getting
5 matters organised, because it scrutinises
all things deeply and carefully, fears to rush hurriedly upon
business, whereas the other kind of sense, as a result of
not having calculated exactly what may ever come out of every
single action, accomplishes something that is both splendid
10 and daring

2-3 φιλοποτῶν ... νοῦν ἔχειν εἰωθότων: The speaker juxtaposes two distinguished groups of people, the drink-lovers and the sedate ones. As one might expect, the comic character prefers the former to the latter, because their *modus vivendi* is more spontaneous, and therefore more exciting. Being a φιλοπότης is normally not considered a vice within comic mentality; cf. Ar. *V.* 80 with scholia, Eupolis fr. 221, Alexis fr. 285, Diphilus fr. 86, etc.

3 ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ νοῦν ἔχειν: Here the seat of the intellect is located in the head.¹⁹² But there was a controversy throughout antiquity (down to at least the sixteenth century A.D.) about this issue. The opposite opinion favoured heart as the centre of

¹⁹² Cf. Hp. *Gland.* 10, *Id. Morb. Sacr.* 17, *Pl. Ti.* 73c-d, etc.

intelligence; cf. Empedocles 31 B105 DK, Arist. *MA* 703a13ff., etc. See Longrigg, *Greek Rational Medicine*, 56, 60; Id., *Greek Medicine*, 62-63, 73, 76-77.

4 *διὰ τέλους*: Cf. Alexis fr. 131.6, Hegesippus fr. 2.3, Menander fr. 236.16, Philemo fr. 92.4. See *LSJ* s.v. *τέλος* II.2.c.

4 sqq. *ἐπὶ τοῦ συντετάχθαι...*: The speaker refers to the sober people, as the opposite of the drink-lovers. He considers them to be indecisive, always engaged in needless examinations of minutiae, while their mind is continuously absorbed in getting things in order. As a result of this exaggerated deliberation and pre-planning, they refrain from acting spontaneously. Therefore, their life lacks excitement and interest.¹⁹³

What is particularly noteworthy is the quasi-visualisation of how the mind concentrates on the task of organising everything, and how it becomes absorbed in this procedure; cf. Amphis fr. 3.3-4, Aeschin. 1.179.

5 *λεπτῶς καὶ πυκνῶς*: The sedate persons are said to analyse their future actions with great attention to the details (*λεπτῶς*), and with careful thought (*πυκνῶς*). For this notion of *λεπτός* cf. *Av.* 318, sch. on *Ar. Nu.* 359, etc. For *πυκνός* denoting deep thought see sch. on *Ar. Nu.* 702, *Eq.* 1132 with scholia, *Th.* 438, etc. This usage traces back to the Homeric phrase *πύκα φρονεόντων* (e.g. *Il.* 9.554). Both notions occur together in *Ar. Ach.* 445 *πυκνῆ γὰρ λεπτὰ μηχανᾷ φρενί.*

7 *προχείρως*: “Readily, without much consideration”; cf. Alexis fr. 257.5.

9 *διαλελογίσθαι*: Cf. Diphilus fr. 42.15. The use of perfect is important, in that it emphasises further the notion expressed by the verb itself; i.e. that any actions are the result of careful calculation that took some time to come to fruition.

9-10 *νεανικὸν ... θερμόν*: Exciting deeds are the outcome of the lively lifestyle, in favour of which the speaker argues. His point is that without a rigorous calculation of the risks involved in a particular course of action, one can achieve outstanding things.

¹⁹³ The scheme drawn here, i.e. promptness vs. hesitation to act, is parallel to the comparison that Thucydides 1.69-70 makes between the Athenians and the Spartans.

The incentive is of course the wine; under its effect people tend to act more spontaneously, without considering in advance the possibility of negative results.

Both *νεανικόν* and *θερμόν* are treated here as positive terms. However, *θερμόν* is meant to be a negative characterisation in Ar. *Pl.* 415; cf. sch. *ad loc.* Stevens notes about *νεανικόν*, “is not used at all, literally or metaphorically, in serious poetry, apart from Euripides, and in the fifth century is apparently confined to Euripides and Comedy” (*Hermes* 1976, Einzelschriften 38); cf. Barrett on E. *Hipp.* 1204, and Arnott on Alexis fr. 193.2. I would suggest that in the present fragment *νεανικόν* has more than one meaning; it denotes something that is *high-spirited* and *impetuous*, and at the same time *vigorous* and *vehement* (see *LSJ* s.v.). These characteristics could – either individually or collectively – describe a youth and his behaviour; cf. Neil on Ar. *Eq.* 611; Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, 103; Björck, *EPMHNEIA*, 66-70.

Fr. 34

This fragment is cited by Stobaeus 4.35.16. The speaker comments on the behaviour of a grieved man. This grief could be e.g. a lover’s unhappiness. The speaker might be a slave, friend, well-wisher or adviser (even a brother) entering to comment on events indoor. A parallel scene is perhaps Men. *Epit.* 878ff., where the slave Onesimos comes out of the house and, addressing the spectators, comments on the state of his master Charisius who is going mad.

Ἄπολλον, ὡς δυσάρεστον ἔστ’ ἀνιώμενος
ἄνθρωπος ἐφ’ ἅπασιν τε δυσχερῶς ἔχει

O Apollo, how cantankerous is a distressed
man, and how gets irritated with everything

1 *δυσάρεστον*: Someone here is described as bad-tempered and irritable; cf. Ar. *Ec.* 180, Diphilus fr. 63, E. *Or.* 232 (= Men. *Asp.* 432). See *LSJ* s.v.

1-2 *δυσάρεστον* - *δυσχερῶς*: Interesting rhetorical repetition of *δυσ-*, referring to a man who is apparently *δύσ-κολος* in his manners.

2 ἐφ' ἅπασιν: Such is the irascibility of a man in plight that he is ready to be angry at literally everything; even minor details will call forth his anger. For parallel cases where the preposition ἐπί takes the dative of πᾶς see Headlam on Herod. 3.20.

ARISTOPHON

Hanow¹ and Kaibel² locate Aristophon's floruit period around the mid fourth century B.C. This agrees with the evidence that we get from the inscription *IG II² 2325.151*, according to which Aristophon won his first Lenaian victory sometime between 358 and 350 B.C.³ It has however been suggested that Aristophon composed his *Φιλωνίδης* before 366 B.C. (cf. introduction to the play). If so, he must have been active in the theatre a decade or more before his first victory. He probably remained active during the second half of the fourth century as well, for we have good reason to believe that he wrote his *Πυθαγοριστής* between 345 and 320 B.C. (cf. introduction to the play); see Webster *CQ* 2 n.s. (1952) 22, and Nesselrath *MK* 312.

Ἰατρός (frr. 4-5)

The doctor is a common title-figure in Comedy. Homonymous plays were written by Dinolochus (*CGFP* 78), Antiphanes, Theophilus, and Philemo, while Pomponius wrote a *Medicus*. Although we cannot hope to recover with certainty the plot of Aristophon's play, the doctor figure must have been a major character with a central role. Neither of the surviving fragments seems to bear any apparent relation to the title, and so they allow little insight into the larger plot. Both suggest an amatory theme. The character in fr. 4 comments on the high prices that prostitutes charge to their customers, and therefore they have gone beyond the financial reach of poor men. In fr. 5 the speaker (a parasite) emphasises his skills in helping others to succeed in amatory affairs. One may speculate that a brothel featured in the plot, and that the young man's love interest lay with a courtesan, whom he could not win because of his poverty. One may reasonably wonder how the doctor figure fits into this scenario. It is interesting that in *Phoenicides* fr. 4.12-13 a courtesan complains about her relation with a poor doctor. Likewise, a poor doctor may be in love with a courtesan in the present play. Another – still more speculative – possibility is that the “doctor” was not

¹ *Exercitationum criticarum in comicos Graecos liber primus*, 29.

² *RE* s.v. Aristophon nr. 7.

³ This inscription is a catalogue of the victorious comic poets at the Lenaia. It records the poets by chronological order of their first victory, and also supplies the total number of their victories. Capps (*AJPh* 28 [1907] 188) offers a very useful chronological table.

a real doctor, but instead the young man in love used a doctor's identity as a disguise, so that he could be allowed into the house / brothel. For the use of disguise to win the beloved we may compare Menander's *Dyscolus*, where Sostratos is persuaded to pretend to be a labourer in order to win over Knemon (ll. 366-392). Finally, we cannot rule out the possibility that the mention of prostitutes in fr. 4 is tangential to the main plot; in which case it is possible that there was a real doctor, and he was the father of the girl. There is no way of knowing for sure.

Fr. 4

This fragment is cited by Stobaeus 3.6.10. The speaker employs solemn diction (*διοπετεῖς, ἄβατοι*), in order to comment sarcastically upon the high cost of the hetairai.⁴ With comic hyperbole he compares their houses to holy places, not to be trodden by the public. From what he says one may infer that he himself is one of "those who have not one possession" (l. 2). His identity cannot be established with certainty; he may be the title-figure of doctor (a real or a fake one; cf. introduction), a slave (possibly a slave of the young man in love), some other character of modest circumstances, or even the parasite who speaks in fr. 5 below.

αἱ τῶν ἐταιρῶν γὰρ διοπετεῖς οἰκίαι·
γεγόνασιν ἄβατοι τοῖς ἔχουσι μηδὲ ἔν

The houses of the courtesans are surely taboo;
they have become places unapproachable to those who have not a thing

διοπετεῖς: Etymologically – and in most contexts – the adjective *διοπετής* means *fallen from Zeus / heaven* (see *LSJ* s.v.);⁵ cf. Photius δ 643 and Ps.-Zonaras δ 526.17: *διοπετές: ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατερχόμενον*. See E. *IT* 977-978 (*διοπετές ... ἄγαλμα*), D.H. 2.66.5 (*διοπετές Παλλάδιον*),⁶ Plu. *Num.* 13.1-2 (*χαλκῆν πέλτην ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταφερομένην εἰς τὰς*

⁴ On hetairai see introduction to Amphis fr. 1.

⁵ Oenomaus fr. 13 (ap. Eus. *PE* 5.36) uses the adjective *Ποσειδωνοπετής* (*coming from Poseidon*) that is formed by analogy like *διοπετής*.

⁶ On *διοπετή ἀγάλματα* see Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie*, II 774².

Νομᾶ πεσεῖν χειῖρας ... διοπετοῦς), Luc. *Icar.* 2.3 (Μένιππος ἡμῖν διοπετήης πάρεστιν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ;), etc.

Objects believed to have fallen from Zeus / heaven were considered sacred and taboo; cf. Herodianus *Ab exc. divi Marci* 1.11.1 (ἄγαλμα διοπετές ... οὐδὲ ψαυστὸν χειρὸς ἀνθρωπίνης), Plu. 309f (Ἴλος τὸ διοπετές ἤρπασε παλλάδιον καὶ ἐτυφλώθη· οὐ γὰρ ἐξῆν ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς βλέπεσθαι).

The term *διοπετήης* (*fallen from Zeus / heaven*; cf. *LSJ* s.v.) is infrequent in the surviving texts from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.; it is commoner in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, and beyond. In Comedy it occurs only here. Here, however, the presence of the term *ἄβατοι* in the next line suggests a location, not an object, therefore not literally *fallen from Zeus / heaven*. The term *ἄβατος* is used among other things of places struck by lightning – sent by Zeus; such places were considered *sacred* and *taboo* (cf. Dodds on E. *Ba.* 6-12). In combination with *ἄβατος*, the term *διοπετήης* is probably used in an extended sense meaning “struck by lightning”. This transfer of meaning from *ἄβατος* to *διοπετήης* is effected through the intermediary notion of *lightning* that is sent by Zeus (*διοπετήης*) and renders a place hallowed (*ἄβατον*).

2 ἄβατοι: This is the second solemn term, which in combination with *διοπετεῖς* helps create an elevated style that is in total disaccord with the subject, i.e. the courtesans and the high prices they charge. Hence, the fragment acquires a grotesque dimension; with the houses transformed into taboo *ἐνηλύσια*,⁷ the courtesans themselves become the deities that dwell in these sacred places. Used here with reference to sex, the adjective *ἄβατος* is also present in Anaxippus fr. 3.5, within a context relating to another major materialistic notion, that is food (*ἀβάτους ποιεῖν γὰρ τὰς τραπέζας*).

Fr. 5

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus VI 238b-c, within a lengthy discussion about the nature of the *παράσιτος*. Athenaeus quotes many fragments from all eras of Comedy, as well as other, non-comic authors in order to illuminate both the role and

⁷ See *EM* s.v., and Dodds on E. *Ba.* 6-12.

the nature of the parasite. For further on the parasite figure see General Introduction p. 21.

The speaker in Aristophon's fragment is a self-important parasite. After proudly declaring his parasitic nature, he brags in length about his ability to take risks and undertake difficult tasks. To make his intention of readiness to act more vivid, the parasite utilises military terminology (*προσβαλεῖν, κριός, κλιμάκιον, Καπανεύς*), which gives a grotesque dimension to his speech. An apparent antecedent is the chorus of *kolakes* in Eupolis' homonymous play; in fr. 175 they describe themselves in military terms.

In Aristophon's fragment the speaker's opening claim about getting to dinners first is specifically about his regular activities as a parasite. He then goes on to speak about his transferable skills and qualities, which can be redeployed in other contexts, bragging like the parasite in Men. *Dysc.* 57-68 ("if anyone needs my help..."; cf. further below). What our parasite is actually doing is providing excessive encouragement for his patron's projects in order to demonstrate his commitment.⁸ The use of the trochaic tetrameter here for a programmatic statement is consistent with the trend in Middle Comedy to use this metre for a special effect.⁹

The parasite's speech shares some features with other parasite-related fragments. Antiphanes fr. 193 features a very similar parasite's speech: introductory phrase / parasite's self-presentation, followed by some potential tasks and risks, which are stated in a peculiar syntactical pattern, i.e. an infinitive sentence plus a single-worded (or an as brief as possible) apodosis.¹⁰ Door breaking in particular is present in both speeches as a feat of bravery (see on l. 5). This and other features must be generic, but given the similar structure shared by Aristophon and Antiphanes, one suspects influence of one on the other, though we cannot say with certainty which came first.¹¹ A major defining attribute of a parasite, namely being the first to arrive at the dinner table, features again in both Middle and Old Comedy (see on l. 2). Furthermore, Timocles fr. 8 is a eulogy of parasites; it is acknowledged that a parasite helps his patron with everything (l. 7), and supports his master in his love affairs (l. 6), an idea that also appears in Aristophon's fragment below (ll. 5-6). Similar kind of

⁸ Cf. Plu. *Mor.* 51c-e.

⁹ For the use of the trochaic tetrameter cf. General Introduction p. 27.

¹⁰ Aristophon employs the same structure in fr. 10 too (see on l. 9).

help is what the parasite Chaireas declares he is ready to offer in Men. *Dysc.* 57-68 (snatching courtesans, burning doors down, etc.). It is a possibility that either all or some of the above Middle Comedy parasite-featuring fragments influenced Menander in the composition of Chaireas' speech.

In the fragment below the parasite boasts that he has the nickname *Broth* (l. 3). Nicknames are regularly attached to parasites, and they are nearly always fashioned upon their gluttony. Arnott (introduction to Alexis' *Παράσιτος*) notes that this feature takes the form of a formula and recurs regularly in Comedy. The youths in particular are usually (but not always, cf. Anaxippus fr. 3.3) identified as the ones who give the nickname to the parasite; cf. Antiphanes fr. 193.10, Alexis fr. 183.1, Plaut. *Capt.* 69, Id. *Men.* 77. The habit of giving nicknames in order to highlight a peculiar aspect of someone's character was more generally practised; cf. Ar. *Av.* 1290-1299,¹² Anaxandrides fr. 35 (cf. Millis *ad loc.*), Alexis fr. 102 and 173 (cf. Arnott's notes), Hdt. 6.71, D.L. 7.168, etc. See also Headlam on Herod. 2.73.

Apart from the nickname *ζωμός*, the following fragment abounds in common and proper nouns that encapsulate other aspects of the parasite's personality: *παλαιστήν Ἀργεῖον, κριός, Καπανεύς, ἄμμων, Τελαμών,* and *καπνός*. Though these could be nicknames, it is better to regard them as metaphors. Although people do get mythical nicknames (cf. Is. 8.3 *τὸν Ὀρέστην ἐπικαλούμενον*), Aristophon's fragment seems more like Antiphon 1.17, where a woman is described as "this Clytemnestra", presumably not a nickname (i.e. there is no reason to believe that she was ever called Clytemnestra), but a metaphor. The speaker in our fragment uses the pattern "consider me X" or "I am X"; parallels are to be found elsewhere either with proper noun (e.g. Ar. *Av.* 716 *ἔσμεν δ' ὑμῖν Ἄμμων, Δελφοί, Δωδώνη, Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων,* and *ibid.* 722 *ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν ἔσμεν μαντεῖος Ἀπόλλων*) or with common noun (e.g. Pl. *Chrm.* 154b *λευκὴ στάθμη εἰμί πρὸς τοὺς καλοῦς*). The same applies to Aristophon fr. 10; e.g. in l. 3 the sense is "I am a frog" (not "I am Frog").

*βούλωμαι δ' αὐτῷ προειπεῖν οἷός εἰμι τοὺς τρόπους.
ἂν τις ἐστιῶ, πάρεμι πρῶτος, ὥστ' ἤδη πάλαι*

¹¹ On Antiphanes' date see Konstantakos, *Eikasmos* 11 (2000) 173-196.

¹² Dunbar *ad loc.* believes that at least some of these were actual nicknames with which the Athenians were already familiar.

– ὤ – ζῶμός καλοῦμαι. δεῖ τιν' ἄρασθαι μέσον
 τῶν παροινούντων, παλαιστὴν νόμισον Ἀργεῖόν μ' ὄραν.
 5 προσβαλεῖν πρὸς οἰκίαν δεῖ, κριός· ἀναβῆναί τι πρὸς
 κλιμάκιον ὤ – ὤ Καπανεύς· ὑπομένειν πληγὰς ἄκμων·
 κονδύλους πλάττειν δὲ Τελαμών· τοὺς καλοὺς πειρᾶν καπνός

3 <παρὰ νέων> ζ. Grotius *Exc.* p. 839, <τοῖς νέοις> ζ. Bailey p. 59 sq.: <πανταχοῦ> ζ. Blaydes *Adv.* I p. 101: <Πρωτεσί>ζῶμος Crusius *Phil.* 46 (1888) 616: <εἰκότως> Stephanopoulos *ZPE* 68 (1987) 1 6 κλιμάκιον Καπανεύς ACE: κλ. Καππανεύς εἰμί Eust.: κλιμακιδίον εἰμί Καπ. Meineke: τεῖχος ἐπὶ κλιμακίδα (coll. Men. fr. 607) vel εἰς κλιμακίδα (coll. Eur. *Suppl.* 729) Καπ. Headlam *JPh* 23 (1895) 280: κλιμακιδιον αὐτοκαπανεύς Headlam *Herodas* p. 304² (coll. vix apte Alciph. III 34,2 αὐτοσκαπανεύς, vid. Gow-Page ad *HG Epigr.* 2819)

I want to tell him in advance what kind of person I am in my ways.

If anyone gives a feast, I am the first to arrive, so that I have long already been ...called Broth. If there's a need to grab by the waist and lift someone of those who have drunk too much, think you are watching an Argive wrestler.

5 If it is to make an attack upon a house, I am a battering ram. At climbing up a scaling ladder, I am a Capaneus; at enduring strokes I am an anvil; at fashioning punches I am a Telamon, at tempting the handsome boys, smoke.

1 αὐτῷ: Meineke *ad loc.* interprets: “ei cui se mancipaturus est is qui loquitur”. I see several obvious possibilities here:

- i. This could be the apodosis of a complex sentence: “if someone wishes to invite me to dinner, I wish to tell him...”. (i.e. αὐτῷ stands for an imaginary / hypothetical host).
- ii. The parasite could be speaking to an interlocutor about a prospective host: “I want to tell him what sort of a guest he's going to get...”.
- iii. He could be speaking in general terms about the qualities of a parasite, which can be redeployed in other contexts with αὐτῷ designating not specifically a host but more generally a patron.

All are compatible with Meineke's interpretation.

2 πάρεμι πρώτος: For the parasite's habit of being the first to arrive for dinner; cf. Alexis fr. 259.8, Cratinus fr. 47. A parasite in Libanius *Decl.* 28.6 supplies a

rhetorical justification: *τοῖς ἐπὶ δεῖπνα πρώτοις ἀπηνητήκοσιν ὃ τε νοῦς σωφρονεῖ καὶ ὁ τόπος εὐτρεπής*. Of course, the real reason why parasites come early is to have the maximum food and drink. In the present fragment the speaker wishes presumably to provide further evidence of his initiative and of his right conception of the notion of *καιρός*, in order to sound more convincing in his following claims (i.e. he knows the perfect timing for climbing a ladder, bringing down a house door, etc.).

3a – ∪ – : The person(s) who call the parasite Broth may have been mentioned here. Elsewhere (cf. introduction to fr. 5) the persons who appear to be giving nicknames to parasites are the youths. It is a possibility that the present fragment follows the same pattern. Though both Grotius' and Bailey's suggestions satisfy this need, I am more inclined to adopt the latter, for it leaves unresolved the first longum (*τοῖς*) of the trochaic tetrameter.¹³ Resolution in the trochaic tetrameter is generally not so common in Comedy; cf. West, *Introduction to Greek Metre*, 29.

3b ζωμός: Broth, soup, gravy; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 386, *Eq.* 357, Teleclides fr. 1.8, etc. In the present fragment the word is used as a nickname, as it is also the case in Anaxandrides fr. 35.5, where *ζωμός* features within a list of derisive soubriquets.¹⁴ In Alexis fr. 43.2 someone is called *ζωμοτάριχος*, Arnott *ad loc.* and *LSJ* s.v. 2 consider *ζωμός* to be appropriate for a "fat, greasy fellow". In our fragment the meaning is made obvious from what precedes (l. 2); the point here is the extreme greed of the parasite.

3c δεῖ: Also in l. 5. In both cases the tone is hypothetical; i.e. *δεῖ* actually means *ἐὰν δέη*. In each case the hypothesis combines with what follows (*νόμισον...* and *κρίος* respectively), to create the impression of liveliness and readiness for action, which are the very qualities that the parasite wishes to demonstrate. A similar case recurs in Ar. *Av.* 78-79: *ἔτνουσ' δ' ἐπιδυμεῖ, δεῖ τορύνης καὶ χύτρασ, / τρέχω 'πί τορύνην*.¹⁵

¹³ The dative of the agent is not confined to the perfective; cf. Kühner-Gerth I §423.18c.

¹⁴ However, Millis *ad loc.* believes that the reason lies with the excessive use of oil to anoint oneself. Bechtel also associates this nickname with fragrant ointments (*Spitznamen* 74-76).

¹⁵ See Schmidt, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas*, 122.

3d ἄρασθαι μέσον: This is a wrestling term. Grabbing someone by the waist (*μέσον*), and lifting him up was a wrestling move that signalled the near victory of the person who managed it (the reason being that it is preparatory to a throw); see Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 274-5. Cf. sch. on Ar. *Nu.* 1047: ἡ μεταφορά ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιστῶν τῶν λαμβανομένων εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ ἠττωμένων; cf. Hdt. 9.107. The same metaphor occurs in Ar. *Ach.* 571, *Eq.* 388, *Ra.* 469, and *Ec.* 260. Following the Greek model, Terence has “medium primum arriperem” (*Ad.* 316), and Plautus “mediam arripere simiam” (*Rud.* 608).¹⁶ What the parasite wishes to emphasise here is that he can restrain or even eject a drunk. This role as “bouncer” is part of the services he supplies to his host.

4a παροινούντων: The original meaning of *παροινέω* is *to misbehave through wine*, and by extension *to mock, act violently, insult physically*, without drunkenness always being necessarily the reason (see *LSJ* s.v.); cf. Ar. *Ec.* 143, Men. *Dysc.* 93, Plu. *Luc.* 35.6, etc. But it never just means “drink too much”; it always refers to misbehaviour.

4b παλαιστήν Ἀργεῖον ὄραῖν: Either an otherwise unknown wrestler called Argeios or a wrestler originating from Argos is meant here. Despite the fact that Argeios was a very common name,¹⁷ which makes the former alternative look quite possible, I would rather opt for the latter alternative, for Argive wrestlers enjoyed a distinctive reputation. Similar comments implying their excellence in this field occur in *AP* 1427, Theoc. 24.111, etc. Gow-Page (on *AP l.c.*) infer that Argive wrestlers must have “relied on skill and manoeuvre”. Crusius (*Phil.* 46 [1888] 616) suggested that Aristophon seized upon the Sophoclean fragment 201h *TGF* καὶ γὰρ Ἀργείους ὄραῖ.¹⁸ The line reappears in Alexis fr. 157 (see Arnott *ad loc.* for further discussion); cf. Philonides fr. 11.

5a προσβαλεῖν: The verb *προσβάλλω* is charged with military connotations; cf. X. *Cyr.* 7.2.2 *προσβαλῶν πρὸς τὸ τεῖχος*, Id. *HG* 6.5.32, Plb. 4.18.6, etc. Here there is an element of bathos; the target is not a castle, not a fortress, but a simple *οἰκία*. An

¹⁶ Cf. Marx *ad loc.*

¹⁷ Kirchner has seven entries under this name (*PA* 1580-1586), and *LGPN* a total of sixty two.

¹⁸ This is supposed to be a proverb. See Miller, *Mélanges de littérature grecque*, II.46 (p. 363), and Radt *ad loc.*

interesting parallel is Dionysius fr. 3, where the speaker, a hired cook, uses military terminology, as if he intended to storm the house; cf. comm. *ad loc.* (esp. ll. 5, 16, 17). Language reminiscent of war is also used by the parasites in Eupolis fr. 175 (cf. introduction to the present fragment).

5b κριός: This is the battering ram; an important item of military machinery, and particularly of siege equipment; cf. X. *Cyr.* 7.4.1. In the present fragment the boastful parasite employs this military term, along with *προσβαλεῖν* (see s.v.) on purpose, i.e. in an attempt to present himself as being robust and brave.¹⁹ Bringing doors down (*θυροκοπεῖν*) is a topos in Comedy and elsewhere. It was mainly considered a symptom of drunkenness; cf. Ar. *V.* 1254. In Antiphanes fr. 193.6 it features as a major feat in a parasite's speech again (cf. introduction to the present fragment); cf. Id. fr. 236.3. It recurs in Thphr. *Char.* 27.9 (an old man fighting over a courtesan), Lucilius 839,²⁰ etc. This kind of behaviour was primarily employed by a lover, who wished to attract a woman's attention; cf. Ael. *NA* I.50: *οἶονεὶ κωμαστῆς σὺν τῷ αὐτῷ θυροκοπεῖ, οὕτω τοὶ καὶ ἐκεῖνος συρίσας τὴν ἐρωμένην παρακαλεῖ.*²¹ Presumably in Aristophon's fragment, the reason why the parasite would storm into a house is to aid his patron's efforts towards winning the heart of a lady.²² Likewise, in Terence's *Adelphoi* 88ff. we hear how after breaking into a house ("fores effregit"), the young Aeschinus abducted a girl. Elsewhere in Comedy characters seeking to recover a girl resort to laying a siege outside the girl's house; e.g. Men. *Pk.* 467-485, Ter. *Eun.* 771-816, Ovid *Am.* 1.9.19-20 (cf. McKeown *ad loc.*).

5-6 ἀναβῆναί τι πρὸς κλιμάκιον: Climbing up a ladder is to be understood in combination with door smashing (cf. previous note), and within the same context of women wooing. The readiness of the parasite to help his patron in his love affairs is a standard feature of a parasite's profile; cf. Timocles fr. 8.6: *ἐρᾶς, συνεραστῆς*

¹⁹ Cf. introduction to fr. 5. Here *κριός* is not a nickname, but another metaphor. Elsewhere we do hear of the nickname *Κριός*, but this has a totally different meaning; cf. Bechtel *o.c.* 37², 65.

²⁰ See Marx *ad loc.*, and Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, 155.

²¹ For further discussion and references, see Headlam on Herod. 2.34-37.

²² Conceivably, the parasite could be saying (like Eupolis' *Kolakes*, fr. 175) that no house can keep him out if he wants a free meal. However, the phrase taken as a whole along with the similar structure of l. 3, suggests that this is supposed to be a service rendered to his patron.

ἀπροφάσιτος γίγνεται. Interestingly, the archetype for ladder climbing is Zeus himself. On a vase depicting a phlyax scene, Zeus carries a ladder, in order to climb up to the window of his beloved.²³

Here the military analogy continues; one can climb up a ladder to get to a woman's window, but also to attack a city wall.

6a Καπανεύς: The archetype for climbing up a scaling ladder. According to the legend, Capaneus was one of the Seven Argive army leaders who headed the expedition against Thebes. In his determination to storm Thebes he defied the gods, even Zeus himself (cf. A. *Th.* 427-8). He attempted to climb the city wall using a scaling-ladder, but Zeus sent a thunderbolt that killed him; cf. A. *Th.* 423-446, E. *Supp.* 496-499, D.S. 4.65.7-8, etc. By comparing himself to Capaneus, the parasite stresses his determination to serve his patron with absolute dedication and also with reckless boldness.

Regarding the lacuna in l. 6, none of the proposed conjectures (cf. crit. app.) is entirely satisfactory. The addition of an extra *εἰμί* breaks the sequence of the single-word apodoses (*κρίος, ἄκμων, Τελαμών, καπνός*), while all the suggestions by Headlam alter the text radically (*κλιμακίδα* or *κλιμακίδιον* instead of *κλιμάκιον*; *αὐτοκαπανεύς* or *αὐτοσκαπανεύς* instead of *Καπανεύς*). Perhaps a graphic word like *ἄνωθε* stood there.

6b ἄκμων: The anvil typifies endurance. A similar metaphor is employed by Antiphanes fr. 193.3: *τύπτεσθαι μύδρος*. Generally, bearing blows and being beaten formed an essential part of a parasite's lot; cf. Nicolaus fr. 1.28-29. The parasite speaking in Axionicus fr. 6 explains the reasoning behind this lifestyle; on balance, the profit of being a parasite outmeasures the humiliation incurred at certain moments (ll. 6-8). Parasites seem to have received a similar treatment in Latin Comedy too; e.g. Ergasilus in Plautus' *Captives*, in a meta-theatrical comment, calls himself and the other parasites *plagipatidas* (l. 472); but Gnatho in Terence's *Eunuch* refuses to adapt to this humiliating *modus vivendi* (ll. 245-246).

²³ In Trenkner, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*, 130. Another phlyax vase depicts a comic character reaching his beloved's window on a ladder (British Museum no. 1438).

7a κονδύλους πλάττειν: Here *κόνδυλος* has the meaning of *blow / punch*; cf. Hsch. s.v. *κόνδυλος*: ἕτερόν τι τοῦ κολάφου.²⁴ The parasite is capable of beating and punching others (just as well as he can bear blows himself; l. 6). This is another standard talent that a parasite was expected both to possess and to practise; cf. Antiphanes fr. 193.4: τύπτειν κεραυνός.

The combination of words is peculiar enough. The act of punching is defined by the verb *πλάττειν*, whose primary meaning is *form / mould soft substances*, or even *knead bread*; cf. *LSJ* s.v. Herwerden (*Collectanea* 117) reckoned that this is a pun on *κονδύλους* (or *κονδαύλους*), a luxurious Lydian dish (either a cake or a stew / pilaff; cf. Arnott on Alexis fr. 178.1); cf. Ar. *Pax* 123 (see scholia and Olson *ad loc.*). Herwerden's suggestion is perhaps favoured by the choice of the verb *πλάττειν*; regularly used for giving form to soft materials, like dough, clay, etc., here it could be seen as making easier the transition from the notion of *punch* to the notion of *cake*.

7b Τελαμών: Though it is not recorded in any paroemiographical corpus, Hesychius preserves the phrase *Τελαμώνιοι κόνδυλοι* (τ 394), which he explains as *οἱ προσδεόμενοι τῶν τελαμώνων. ἢ μεγάλοι, χαλεποί*. The second half of Hesychius' gloss is relevant here (i.e. *big punches*).

7c πειρᾶν: “τὸ προσβάλλειν γυναικί περὶ ἀφροδίτης” (sch. on Ar. *Eq.* 517). In Attic²⁵ the standard meaning of *πειράω* when used with personal accusative is to *make a pass at a woman* (e.g. Ar. *Pl.* 150, Theopompus fr. 33.8, etc.), or a boy (e.g. Ar. *Pax* 763). See van Leeuwen on Ar. *Eq.* 517. The same goes for the present fragment too, especially since with a word for sexual approach (*πειρᾶν*), the word *καλός* is most naturally taken to refer to handsome boys as objects of desire. If the parasite is adept at seducing boys himself, he is presumably good at helping others achieve sexual success as well. This claim of the parasite combines with what he says in ll. 5-6; he is capable of helping his patron get both a woman- and a boy-lover.

7d καπνός: The Scholiast on Ar. *Av.* 822 tells us that *Καπνός* was the nickname of a certain Theagenes, the reason being ὅτι πολλὰ ὑπισχνούμενος οὐδὲν ἐτέλει; cf. Eupolis fr.

²⁴ *κόνδυλος* can also denote the *knuckle*, of any joint; e.g. Arist. *HA* 493b 28, cf. *LSJ* s.v.

²⁵ Cf. Moer. 207.2.

135. It is possible that *καπνός* denoted people of talk but no action during the period of Middle Comedy too.²⁶ However, this cannot be the meaning intended by the parasite here, where he outlines his regular stream of *actions* in favour of his patron. There is a good case to be made for the view of Kock; “Aristophontem similitudinem inde petivisse arbitror, quod fumus per foramina omnia rimasque facile penetrat”. The point is that the parasite claims for himself the penetrating qualities of smoke.²⁷ He finds his way in anywhere, he climbs up ladders easily, he squeezes into small spaces, etc. Like the quasi-unsubstantial smoke, the parasite can act lightly and use delicate techniques. It is particularly noteworthy the way he moves from anvil (l. 6) to smoke; this is indicative of the chameleonic nature of the parasite, in the sense that he can adjust his behaviour to the circumstances. He can be either tough and enduring like an anvil or light and permeating like smoke.

There may perhaps be an additional element of irony lurking here, in that despite his assertions he could in fact be *καπνός* like the parasite in Menander’s *Dyscolus*, who, after bragging (ll. 57-68), rushes off and avoids the help he had so grandiloquently promised (ll. 129-138), thus proving himself literally insubstantial like smoke.

Καλλωνίδης (fr. 6)

The title figure is otherwise unknown. Meineke (I.410) thought that it could be *Φιλωνίδης* instead, a misreading for Aristophon’s homonymous play. On the contrary, Breitenbach suggested that one could replace *Φιλωνίδης* with *Καλλωνίδης*. If change were needed, I would opt for Meineke’s suggestion, for we can easily identify Philonides,²⁸ whereas we do not know anything about any contemporary Kallonides.²⁹ However, there is no obvious reason to change either title. Kallonides is either a

²⁶ In Anaxandrides fr. 35.9, a fragment recording the major Athenian nicknames, Schweighäuser and Kaibel reconstructed the text in a way that it would allude to both Aristophon’s fragment and Theagenes the *Smoke*; in a line reading *εἰς τοὺς καλοὺς δ’ ἄν τις βλέπη, καινὸς θεατροποιός*, Kaibel suggested *Θεαγένειος* for *θεατροποιός*, and Schweighäuser proposed *καπνός* for *καινός*.

²⁷ As a physical property, like Philocleon in Ar. *V.* 144, 324 with scholia.

²⁸ *PA* 14907; cf. below introduction to *Philonides*.

²⁹ There is only one entry in *PA* under Kallonides (no. 8241), corresponding to the year 459/8 B.C.

totally fictitious character³⁰ or a comic disguise for a real, contemporary person; cf. Aristophanes' *Knights* where Paphlagon stands for Cleon, and Eupolis' *Marikas* where Hyperbolus is targeted under the disguise of Marikas.

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIII 559d, within a series of fragments that attack women, and mostly wives. This is a locus communis not only in Comedy,³¹ but also in Greek literature in general.³² The following fragment is almost identical with Eubulus fr. 115.1-5. This cannot be a mere coincidence. Kann³³ suggests that Aristophon copied the idea from Eubulus. However, one cannot exclude the possibility of a common source.³⁴ It is possible that some members of the audience were able to recognise and appreciate such echoes and imitations, through either a recent performance or their knowledge of quotable misogynistic *gnomai*.³⁵

The fragment below is a passionate diatribe against wives. It is a possibility that this was a play concerned, in a certain degree, with relationships – in the manner of New Comedy.³⁶ The speaker may be a married person, living unhappily, who either regrets having being married himself or objects to the potential marriage of another character in the play. Possibly he went on to say: “just as now ...” or the like.

κακὸς κακῶς γένοιθ' ὁ γήμας δεύτερος
 θνητῶν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος οὐδὲν ἠδίκει·
 οὐπω γὰρ εἰδὼς οὗτος οἶον ἦν κακὸν
 ἐλάμβανεν γυναῖχ'· ὁ δ' ὕστερον λαβῶν
 5 εἰς προὔπτον εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἐνέβαλεν κακόν

1 γένοιτο A: ἀπόλοιθ' Cobet *Nov. lect.* p. 118 (γ' ὄλοιθ' Jacobs *Exercit.* I p. 12), fort. recte

To hell with the wretched mortal who became
 the second one to marry. For the first one did no wrong;

³⁰ So *LGPN* vol. II s.v. 2.

³¹ See Athenaeus XIII 558e-560a for more comic fragments.

³² See Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the Species*, 25-29.

³³ *De iteratis apud poetas antiquae et mediae comoediae atticae*, 66-67.

³⁴ Cf. Hunter *JHS* 104 (1984) 225.

³⁵ For the misogynistic tradition see on Amphis fr. 1.1b.

³⁶ Cf. the speech of Demeas in *Men. Sam.* 325-356, featuring his anxieties about his relation with both his son and his partner Chrysis.

since he took a wife without knowing what kind of
 evil thing it was; but the one who took a wife afterwards,
 5 hurling himself, though he knew, into manifest evil

ια κακὸς κακῶς: “Vigorous, colloquial Attic Greek” (Renehan, *Studies in Greek Texts*, 114). This curse is particularly common in both comedy and tragedy; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 554, Men. *Sicyon.* fr. 11.5 Sandbach, S. *Aj.* 1177, E. *Med.* 1386 etc. See further Renehan *o.c.* 114-115.

ιβ γένοιθ’: Cf. crit. app. This is the reading preserved by the manuscripts. However, Cobet suggested ἀπόλοιθ’, which Kassel-Austin consider as possibly right; and with good reason. Lobeck³⁷ cites a number of examples, where copulative verbs (mainly γίγνεσθαι and εἶναι) combine with adverbs denoting *place*, *time*, and *quality*; however, Meineke (*Analecta* 257) observes that no such instance occurs in Attic poetry. In favour of Cobet’s conjecture is the fact that the verb ἀπόλλυμι frequently accompanies the κακὸς κακῶς curse; e.g. S. *Ph.* 1369, Ar. *Eq.* 2-3, *Pl.* 65. Jacob’s reading γ’ ὄλοιθ’ is also worth considering. Not only is it palaeographically easier, but also the simple verb accords with the fact that this is paratragedy; the simple verb also occurs in Diphilus fr. 74.9, a line that quotes verbatim E. *IT* 535. However, the otiose γε is a problem.

ιc δεύτερος: The curse on the *second* is παρὰ προσδοκίαν, one would expect this kind of curse to be directed against the πρώτος εὐρετής.³⁸ There are numerous passages dealing with the motif of the πρώτος εὐρετής, cf. Anaxandrides fr. 31, Alexis fr. 190, Eubulus fr. 72 (cf. Hunter *ad loc.*), etc. The same formula reappears later in Menander fr. 119, and also in Latin Comedy (e.g. Plaut. *Men.* 451-452). See Arnott on Alexis fr. 27.1-2.

5 προῦπτον: The idea of throwing oneself into some kind of manifest evil recurs in a number of passages; e.g. D. 3.13 (εἰς προῦπτον κακὸν αὐτὸν ἐμβαλεῖν), Theophilus fr. 11.1 (cf. comm. *ad loc.*), Phoenicides fr. 4.18, Ath. XIII 559f, etc. The verb also suggests ruin as a pit, another common idea; cf. the Homeric formula αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος

³⁷ *Paralipomena grammaticae Graecae*, 150-151.

³⁸ Cf. Kleingünther, “Πρῶτος εὐρετής”, *Philologus*, Suppl. 26.1 (1933) 1-155.

(e.g. *Il.* 11.174), *Pi. O.* 10.37 (βαδὺν εἰς ὄχετόν), *S. OT* 877 (ἀπότομον ὄρουσεν εἰς ἀνάγκαν), *E. Alc.* 118, etc.

Πειρίθους (fr. 7)

Peirithous was a Thessalian hero, married to Hippodameia. Their wedding ceremony was marked by the assault of the Centaurs upon the bride and the other women. During the battle that followed the attack, Theseus is said to have helped Peirithous against the Centaurs. The two became close friends, and, according to legend, they later descended to Hades, in order to abduct Persephone. Their attempt failed, and they remained trapped in the Underworld, until Heracles arrived. The latter managed to free Theseus, but failed to save Peirithous, who remained forever in Hades.³⁹

Plays entitled *Πειρίθους* were also written by the tragic poets Achaeus (*TGF* I, 20 F 36), and Critias (*TGF* I, 43 F 1-14), in the fifth century B.C. From the latter play we also possess the hypothesis, which tells us that the main action took place in the Underworld. So far so good for a tragic play. What we have here is a single fragment from a comic play with the same title. I explain in the General Introduction (pp. 16-17) how Middle Comedy tends to deal with mythological themes; burlesque and anachronism are recurrent elements.

The fragment below suggests a banquet context; bearing in mind the mythological tradition about Peirithous, the obvious assumption is that we are at his wedding. The fragment is probably to be situated immediately after the battle. The speaker, possibly a cook hired by Peirithous to look after the wedding feast, feels sorry about the spoiling of the fish. If we accept his identity as a cook, then his sorrow appears especially appropriate, since *he* was the one who took the trouble to prepare the dish. The fish could have been spoiled for various reasons, but it is tempting to assume that the tables were overturned during the fighting between the Lapiths and the Centaurs.⁴⁰ Within the context of Centauromachy the presence of the cook figure

³⁹ D.S. 4.70, 4.63, Apollod. 2.5.12, etc. However, according to Hyginus *Fab.* 79, Heracles saved both friends. For a totally different version of the story see Plu. *Thes.* 31.4, 35.1-2, and Paus. 1.17.4.

⁴⁰ Centauromachy features in various artistic illustrations: on the Parthenon's south metopes, a mural in Theseion, the west pediment of Zeus' temple in Olympia, and numerous vases; cf. *LIMC* VIII Suppl.

constitutes an anachronism in itself. This is a typical professional cook, and the world of fourth century Athens is made perceptible through him (see further on ll. 1 and 2). Once again we find ourselves situated mid-way between myth and reality. If the Centauromachy was part of the plot, it is inconceivable that there was an actual staging of the fight. The safest assumption is that both the battle and the food spoiling took place off stage, and now the cook appears on stage, delivers a narrative, converses with the second character, and informs the audience about what happened.

A possible alternative would be to suppose an Underworld setting for the play, similar to Critias' one (see above), with the tunny dish probably intended for Heracles, arriving in Hades to save Peirithous and Theseus. The pattern of dinner preparations in Hades, intended particularly for Heracles, appears already in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (ll. 503ff.). The present play of Aristophon could be drawing directly on *Frogs*; in both plays Heracles descends to Hades to retrieve someone, and in both plays he is presented with a dinner. Nevertheless, this interpretation leaves the frustration of the feast more obscure.⁴¹ Therefore, in the commentary below I always assume the former reconstruction of the plot (though one cannot absolutely rule out the latter).

In the fragment below, cited by Athenaeus VII 303a-b, there is a pun upon the word *κλειῖδες*, which can mean both *shoulder-bones* and *keys*. The cook gives the word the former meaning, whereas the second speaker understands the latter. Despite being ignorant of the terminology, which means that he is probably not the cook's assistant, the second speaker must have tasted tunny shoulder-bones before, since he comments positively on the food's quality, as soon as he understands what his collocutor means. He could possibly be Peirithous himself, or perhaps Theseus, or any other guest.

(A.) καὶ μὴν διέφθαρταί γε τοῦψον παντελῶς·

κλειῖδες μὲν ὄπται δύο παρεσκευασμένοι

(B.) αἶς τὰς θύρας κλείουσι; (A.) θύννειοι μὲν οὔν.

(B.) σεμνὸν τὸ βρωῖμα. (A.) καὶ τρίτη Λακωνική

s.v. *Kentauroi et Kentaurides*, 382, 384, 404, etc.; Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases, The Classical Period*, figs. 50, 185, 186, etc. See further Gantz, *Early Greek Myth*, 1.277-282.

⁴¹ Still, the misunderstanding of *κλειῖδες* as *keys* (cf. next paragraph) could have fitted well into a plot featuring the imprisonment of Peirithous (and Theseus) in Hades.

forti. 3-4 (A.) θύνν. μὲν οὖν, σεμνόν τι βρωῖμα. (B.) καὶ τρ. Λακ.; *vel* (A.) θύνν. μὲν οὖν. (B.) σεμνόν τὸ βρωῖμα. καὶ τρ. Λακ.; *coquus ludibrio habetur K.-A.*

(A.) And besides, the dish is utterly spoiled;

two roast keys all prepared.

(B.) Those with which they lock the doors? (A.) Tunny-keys, of course!

(B.) A noble dish. (A.) And a third, Laconian key.

ι καὶ μὴν ... γε: Denniston calls this use of *καὶ μὴν progressive*, often introducing “a new argument, a new item in a series, or a new point of any kind” (*GP* 351-352). The accompanying *γε* serves to emphasise the following word or phrase, in this case the verb *διέφθαρται*. Such an interpretation of the particles could shed some light as to the immediate context of the fragment (always with reference to the first hypothetical reconstruction above); i.e. before turning to food, there must have been a conversation about something else, most probably the battle, and the consequent casualties. Having spared a word about this, the cook now turns to another “victim” of the battle, i.e. the food; what really matters to him is what is to be done now with his food. Such behaviour is normal from a cook figure. Comedy loves to portray cooks as self-important and arrogant characters, who consider cookery to be the core of life; cf. introduction to Dionysius fr. 2, and General Introduction p. 11.

za διέφθαρται: This perfect tense leads us to assume that the cook expresses his sadness about the ruination of the food. He sadly ponders not upon the killed Centaurs and Lapiths, who – on the most likely reconstruction – just fought, but (and this is *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*) upon what happened to the dish that *he* cooked and prepared! It is obvious that the cook’s interest is focused on the food more than anything else. The battle affected negatively the right timing (*καιρός*) for serving and eating the dish.⁴²

zb ὀπταί: Apart from *κλειῖδες*, Casaubon noticed a second pun in this fragment, upon the word *ὀπταί*, which can also have a double meaning. It can denote something either *roast* or *visible*. Given that the *Laconian* key is also referred to as *κρυπτή* (see below s.v.), Casaubon discerned a clever juxtaposition of the notions of *visible* and *hidden*.

⁴² For the importance of *καιρός* in relation to food see on Dionysius fr. 2.35.

However, Kassel-Austin *ad loc.* have serious doubts about this interpretation, and so do I. Though conceivable, this joke seems rather forced. It is hard to imagine how the audience could have proceeded through these complicated, successive steps of thought, in order to get the joke. The ancient listener, who had less time to stop and think than the modern reader, had to relate the word *όπται* not with another word present in the text (*Λακωνική*), but with a word sometimes used to refer to it (*κρυπτή*). The connection is even less obvious, because of the rarity of the references to this lock; one in the *Iliad* 14.168 (*κλήϊς κρυπτή* – the word *Λακωνική* is not mentioned), and one in Aristophanes, *Th.* 421-423: *οί γάρ ἄνδρες ἤδη κληθῖα / αὐτοὶ φοροῦσι κρυπτὰ, κακοηδέστατα, / Λακωνικ' ἄττα*. If Casaubon is right in detecting this pun, I consider it highly improbable that this was detectable by many in the original audience of the play.

3a αἶς τὰς θύρας κλείουσι: The second speaker seems unaware of the formal term that denotes the shoulder-bones; he misinterprets the word *κλειῖδες* as *keys*. This can be either a genuine misunderstanding or a deliberate mockery. Certainty is impossible, but we know at least that misunderstandings are a common type of humour, deployed already in Old Comedy; cf. the scene towards the end of *Wasps*, where Bdelycleon tries to teach Philocleon how to recount impressive stories at a symposion, but the latter cannot understand what kind of stories is supposed to tell (ll. 1174ff.). This trend runs through Middle to New Comedy; cf. Amphis fr. 14, 27 (with comm. *ad loc.*), Philemo fr. 45, 130, Strato fr. 1.34-35, etc.

3b θύννιοι: Ἐπὶ γούρου δὲ τῶν θύννων καὶ τὰς κλειῖδας καλουμένας; this is how Athenaeus VII 303a introduces the present fragment. The so-called *keys*, or *shoulder-bones*, of the tunny, along with the belly-pieces (*ὑπογάστρια*), were considered major delicacies (see Ath. 302d-303b). This is why the dish is called *σεμνόν* (see below s.v.).

4a σεμνόν ... βρωῖμα: Here the adjective *σεμνόν* is used metaphorically to qualify *βρωῖμα*. The point is to emphasise the excellent taste and quality of tunny-keys. The dish is so delicious, that only an adjective usually used with reference to gods, divine objects,

etc.⁴³ could convey its supremacy. For similar exaggerated language, cf. Eubulus fr. 14.4 *σεμνὰ δελφάκων κρέα*, Mnesimachus fr. 4.60 *ὄσμη σεμνή μυκτῆρα δονεῖ*, etc.

4b Λακωνική: “A regione ubi primum usu venerunt” (van Leeuwen on Ar. *Th.* 423). The keys called *Laconian* were not actually a Laconian invention. Based on archaeological findings, Diels shows that this locker system originated in Egypt, in the time of Ramses II (1292-1225 B.C.).⁴⁴ Their complex structure provided increased security by preventing the door opening neither from the inside nor with any other key. Robinson calls this type of key “the Yale lock of antiquity”, and describes it as consisting “of a shaft or handle with a ring at one end and at the other end a ward set at right angles to the handle and provided with three or four or more prongs or teeth”.⁴⁵ Within the Greek world such keys were found at Olynthus. The earlier reference in Greek literature is *Iliad* 14.168, where we hear of a *κλήϊς κρυπτή*, fixed by Hephaestus to a door, which only Hera was able to open. Aristophanes mentions these keys in *Th.* 421-428, where a woman complains that the wives can no longer enter the larders and help themselves with food and drink supplies, because the men now use a new kind of keys, the *Laconian* ones, for which no pass-key works. A similar locking mechanism is mentioned by Thucydides 2.4.3. Cf. Plaut. *Most.* 404-406: “Clavem mi harunc aedium Laconicam / iam iube efferri intus: hasce ego aedis occludam / hinc foris”. See also Men. *Mis.* fr. 8, with Sandbach *ad loc.*

There are three possible readings of lines 3 and 4, depending on how one distributes the words between the cook (A) and his interlocutor (B). In the text, as I edit it above, we have *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* from the cook, who throws in a joke (“two tunny-keys ... and a real key”), keeping up, as if it were, with B’s misunderstanding. The second possibility is to attribute the first half of line 4 to A (he explains the sense of *κλειῖδες* and comments on the quality of the dish), with B still not getting the meaning and going on speaking about keys in the second half of l. 4. The third possibility is to attribute the whole of line 4 to B. In this case, though B understands the present meaning of *κλειῖδες* (hence his comment in the first half of l. 4), he continues the pun on keys; cf. crit. app.

⁴³ E.g. Ar. *Eq.* 1312, *Av.* 853, etc.

⁴⁴ *Antike Technik* 52-55; Id. *Parmenides Lehrgedicht* 131-132, 141-145.

⁴⁵ *Excavations at Olynthus*, Part X, 506-508; cf. pl. 165: nos. 2577, 2578, 2582.

Πλάτων (fr. 8)

Bergk⁴⁶ dates the play soon after Plato's death in 347 B.C.⁴⁷ In such a case, a parallel would be Lucian's portrayal of Socrates teaching in *Νεκρακαδημία* (cf. below on l. 3). Certainly a dead Plato provides some interesting plot possibilities; e.g. he could be teaching in the Underworld, or waiting to be reincarnated. However, though the term *νεκρούς* (l. 3) appears at first sight to favour Hades as the play's setting, line 3 taken as a whole (especially the phrase *νεκρούς ποιεῖς*) suggests that all the participants are among the living. The idea that Plato's philosophy kills people makes more sense if said by a living person, a father probably (see below), worried about entrusting his son into Plato's hands. The case for a living Plato is made by Breitenbach, who argues that one would more easily excuse both the poet for attacking Plato and the audience for laughing at him, if the philosopher was still alive (*Titulorum* 33). Breitenbach is plausible on this. Though certainty is impossible, Comedy prefers live targets, and tends by and large to deal more positively with people after their death; cf. sch. on Ar. *Pax* 648 (referring to the dead Cleon) οὐκ ἦν ἐξὸν τεθνηκότας κωμωδεῖν. Although Olson calls lines 648-649 (παῦε ... μὴ λέγε, / ἀλλ' ἕα τὸν ἄνδρ' ἐκεῖνον οὐπὲρ ἐστ' εἶναι κάτω) a "thoroughly hypocritical expression", the attack against Cleon in *Peace* is generally much milder than in *Knights*, when the demagogue was still alive.

This fragment, cited by Athenaeus XII 552e, falls into the large category of Middle Comedy fragments that parody Plato; see General Introduction p. 12, and comm. on Amphis fr. 13.1.

In the absence of any indication to the contrary, the first speaker is likely to be Plato himself (so Meineke III.360). A father and a son must also be present on stage; presumably, the father accompanies his son, who is about to become a new disciple of Plato. Yet again, Middle Comedy develops themes first found in Old Comedy. Indeed, the scene below greatly resembles that passage in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, where Strepsiades hands over his son Phidippides to Socrates (ll. 868-887).⁴⁸ Some

⁴⁶ *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* IV 167.

⁴⁷ There is also Treves' suggestion that all comic references to Philippides (cf. l. 2) should be dated after 336/5 B.C. (but see on Aristophon fr. 10.2).

⁴⁸ The father-and-son pattern survives through Middle to New Comedy; cf. the relationship between Knemon and his stepson Gorgias in Menander *Dyscolus*.

seventy years after Aristophanes' *Clouds* we find ourselves in front of the same type of plot. Plato addresses the father, but his promise to him about the son's future progress is an instance of *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. One would expect him to promise that the son will very soon become an expert and talented youth; instead, we hear that he will be made thinner than Philippiades.

*ἐν ἡμέραις τρισὶν
ἰσχνότερον αὐτὸν ἀποφανῶ Φιλίππιδου.
(B.) οὕτως ἐν ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις νεκρούς ποιεῖς;*

Within three days
I will make him thinner than Philippiades.
(B.) Do you make corpses in so few days?

Ι ἐν ἡμέραις τρισὶν: In modern terms one would speak of intensive courses. The philosopher guarantees visible results within only three days. This is an obvious exaggeration, meant to emphasise the effectiveness and the quality of the lessons. His promise resembles Posidippus fr. 16: *ὥστ' ἐν ἡμέραις δέκα / εἶναι δοκεῖν Ζήνωνος ἐγκρατέστερον*. Meineke (IV.519) considered the speaker in Posidippus' fragment to be either a philosopher or a pedagogue, but without attempting any further identification with any known philosophical school. Bearing in mind the apparent plot similarities with *Clouds* (see introduction), one may be justified in discerning a particular meaning behind the reference to an exact number of days. In *Clouds* 1131ff. Strepsiades anxiously counts the days remaining until his creditors sue him in court; there are only five days left. One is tempted to extend the similarities between the two plays and consider the possibility of a similar time pressure being behind the haste of the philosopher in this fragment. Whatever the case, quick and visible results featured as the major achievement of the sophists; Protagoras, in Plato's homonymous dialogue, promises that the newcomer Hippocrates will notice a difference even from the very first day of his lessons, and that he will keep improving daily (*Prt.* 318a). Just like Aristophanes presents Socrates assuming the research interests of the sophists in *Clouds*,⁴⁹ Aristophon presents Plato as a professional sophist, who

⁴⁹ Mainly cosmological and meteorological knowledge; e.g. ll. 225-234, 376-380, etc.

reassures his client that there will be fast results. Plato's portrait here is generic; he is not the individual with the distinct philosophy that we meet in other fragments, e.g. in Amphis fr. 6; see also comm. on Amphis fr. 13.1.

2 Φιλιππίδου: Comedy quite likes to mock physical defects, and Philippides is often satirised for his extreme thinness (see on Aristophon fr. 10.2). However, this particular joke is modelled upon Ar. *Nu.* 500-504, where Socrates promises to his new disciple Strepsiades that, as for his *φύσις*, he will come to resemble Chaerephon, an intimate friend of Socrates. Meant by Socrates as a mental similarity but understood by Strepsiades as a physical one, this promise terrifies Strepsiades, who fears that he will be made *ἡμιθνής*, since Chaerephon was widely known for his skinniness. In the present fragment the joke has advanced a step further. Plato promises that the newcomer will be starved, if not to death, at least to extreme slimness. Such will be his dedication to both philosophy and the learning procedure, that he will get used to disregard his physical needs.⁵⁰ It is this situation that the Scholiast on Ar. *Nu.* 504 sarcastically describes, with reference to Chaerephon: *ἰσχνὸς καὶ ὠχρὸς τὴν ἰδέαν ὁ Χαιρεφῶν ἦν, ἅτε φιλοσοφία συζῶν, καὶ ἐκ ταύτης συντετηκὸς ἔχων τὸ σῶμα*. The idea returns in *Nu.* 1112, where Phidippides fears, like his father did before, that Socrates' school will make him *ὠχρόν* and *κακοδαίμονα*.

3 νεκρούς ποιεῖς: Fenk⁵¹ discerned an intertextual relation with Luc. *VH* 2.23, where Socrates receives as reward a piece of land, calls it *Νεκρακαδημία*, and uses it to discuss with his fellows. Fenk seems to suggest a similar interpretation of the present reference to *νεκρούς*, i.e. as a sarcastic allusion to Plato's theories about the soul, its immortality, and how the true philosopher should not be sorry for dying (cf. *Phaedo*). However, there is nothing in the immediate context here to suggest ideas about the soul.

⁵⁰ Absolute dedication to philosophical contemplation without secular distractions is best exhibited in an apocryphal anecdote about some students of Plato, who were said to blind themselves to avoid distractions from philosophy; cf. Riginos, *Platonica*, Anecdote 83, p. 129.

⁵¹ *Adversarii Platonis quomodo de indole ac moribus eius iudicaverint*, 32.

Πυθαγοριστής (fr. 9-12)

The satire of the school of Pythagoreans is a favourite subject of both Middle and New Comedy; cf. Weiher, *Philosophen und Philosophenspott in der attischen Komödie*, 55-68.⁵² Both Alexis and Cratinus Junior⁵³ wrote a *Πυθαγορίζουσα*.⁵⁴ See also Alexis fr. 201, 27, 223; Antiphanes fr. 133, 158, 166, 225; Mnesimachus fr. 1.⁵⁵ Pythagorean beliefs were already sufficiently distinctive and peculiarly exotic to attack mockery in the archaic period.⁵⁶

Based mainly on the mention of the parasite Tithymallos in fr. 10.2, Webster⁵⁷ suggests that Aristophon's play was produced between 345 and 320 B.C., a date that is compatible with the evidence from fr. 11 (cf. on l. 1b).

It is conceivable that the play was entirely dedicated to Pythagoreanism; both the title and the evidence provided by the fragments allow for such an assumption. The plot could possibly be parallel to Aristophanes' *Clouds*. Given that the title denotes a dabbler in the beliefs of the sect (see below), not an expert, we may deduce that the story revolved around the "initiation" of one or more new adherents into the Pythagorean precepts. The play has generic antecedents in initiation scenes and plots in Old Comedy. The motif of training to adapt to a new way of life occurs late in *Wasps* (1122-1264). But closer to our play is Strepsiades' initiation into the Socratic mysteries in *Clouds* (see esp. ll. 140, 143).

In Aristophon's play the main figure was perhaps the initiator himself, whom we may imagine as running an institution similar to Socrates' *φροντιστήριον* in the

⁵² For the philosopher figure see General Introduction pp. 19-20.

⁵³ Arnott (579, n. 1) would ascribe this to the elder Cratinus.

⁵⁴ Iamblichus (*VP* 36.267) lists seventeen female Pythagoreans. There is some considerable Neopythagorean literature ascribed to female authors; cf. the conspectus of writings in Thesleff, *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*, 7-29. Women were a distinctive feature of the sect; indeed, the Pythagorean school is possibly the first that promoted the pursuit of philosophy among the women. Though generally treated as an oddity, the figure of the woman philosopher (rejected only by Aristotle as incapable of philosophising) is regularly found throughout antiquity; cf. R. Hawley, "The Problem of Women Philosophers in Ancient Greece", in L. J. Archer, S. Fischer & M. Wyke, *Women in Ancient Societies. An Illusion of the Night*, 70-87.

⁵⁵ Cf. Theoc. 14.3-6, Artem. *Onir.* 2.69.

⁵⁶ Cf. the story reported by Xenophanes (fr. 7 *PPF*) that once Pythagoras asked a man to stop beating a puppy, because he had recognised in it the soul of an old friend.

⁵⁷ *CQ* 2 n.s. (1952) 22.

Clouds. Alternatively, we may have the would-be initiate as the main figure (like Strepsiades), with the “expert” as a prominent but secondary figure (like Socrates in the *Clouds*). I think both possibilities need to be kept open. The mention of both the parasite Tithymallos and the politician Philippides in fr. 10.2 is a helpful indication for dating the play in the second half of the fourth century B.C.; cf. *ad loc.*

Outside Comedy the Pythagorean pupils and adherents are called either *Πυθαγόρειοι* or *Πυθαγορικοί*.⁵⁸ But the comic playwrights use almost exclusively⁵⁹ the term *Πυθαγοριστής*. It is in Middle Comedy that this term appears for the first time. What emerges from the ancient sources⁶⁰ is that there were two different types of Pythagoreanism; the *Πυθαγόρειοι* / *Πυθαγορικοί*, who were the actual pupils / members of the sect, and the *Πυθαγορισταί*, who were the zealous admirers (*ζηλωταί*). The former (also known as *μαθηματικοί* or *ἔσωτετικοί*) were the sophisticated ones, whereas the latter (also known as *ἀκουσματικοί*) practised a number of abstinences (e.g. from meat, beans) avoided baths, believed in metempsychosis, etc.⁶¹ See Arnott on Alexis fr. 201.3; Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, 166-208; Kingsley, *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic*, p. 126, n. 48. Despite the persistent attempt to ignore the existence of the *Πυθαγορισταί*,⁶² the fragments of Middle Comedy confirm their existence during at least the fourth century B.C. Of course, it does not follow that the *Πυθαγορισταί* of real life are to be equated with those described in the comic plays, since both exaggeration and distortion of reality are standard features of Comedy. The comic poets do not discern two separate groups; for them the term *Πυθαγοριστής* is a (pejorative) designation of all followers of Pythagoras. The reason for this is presumably that either the comic poets were only interested in behaviour which had comic potential (hence the people who pursued the outward semblance were more useful to them) or the difference was of little significance for most Athenians, including the theatre audience. One reason why Pythagoreanism allowed this kind of differentiation between inner and outer is that, unlike most philosophical

⁵⁸ E.g. Hdt. 2.81, Pl. *R.* 530d, D.L. 8.7, Phot. *Bibl.* 249.439a, Ath. VII 308c, Plu. *Mor.* 116e, Porph. *VP* 49, etc.

⁵⁹ Except for three cases: Antiphanes fr. 158, Alexis fr. 201, 223.

⁶⁰ E.g. Iamb. 18.80, *Suda* π 3124, sch. on Theoc. 14.5 (cf. Gow *ad loc.*), Phot. *Bibl.* 249.438b.

⁶¹ Cf. Porph. *VP* 37, Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.9.59, Iamb. *VP* 18.81, 18.87-89, Hippol. *Ref.* 1.2.4-5.

⁶² The polemic originates from Aristoxenus, who willingly ignores this different type of Pythagoreanism; cf. fr. 18 (= Iamb. *VP* 251), and fr. 19 (= D.L. 8.46). See Burkert *o.c.* 198-205.

movements, it was a way of life, and one which was visibly different in many respects from that of most people in any Greek state.

Fr. 9

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus IV 161e-f. It targets the peculiar lifestyle of Pythagoreans, their abstention from meat, and their veiled gluttony.

The speaker may be a sceptical associate of the would-be initiate attempting to dissuade him. He could also be a buffoon (*βωμολόχος*), possibly the same character who interrupts the Pythagorean guru in fr. 12.5. The *bomolochos* is a common comic figure, whose role goes back at least to Aristophanes; cf. Strepsiades in *Nu.* 135-426 (particularly 165-168, 188-190), Philocleon in *V.* 1153-1264.⁶³ The initiate is presumably going to be attracted to the sect. The speaker strongly refuses to regard the practise of asceticism as being pure and genuine, since what *he* discerns behind the many pretensions is sheer hypocrisy.⁶⁴

πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, οἴομεθα τοὺς πάλαι ποτέ,
 τοὺς Πυθαγοριστὰς γινομένους, ὄντως ῥυπαῖν
 ἐκόντας ἢ φορεῖν τρίβωνα ἠδέως;
 οὐκ ἔστι τούτων οὐδέν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ.
 5 ἄλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης, οὐκ ἔχοντες οὐδὲ ἓν,
 τῆς εὐτελείας πρόφασιν εὐρόντες καλὴν
 ὄρους ἔπηξαν τοῖς πένησι χρησίμους.
 ἐπεὶ παράδες αὐτοῖσιν ἰχθῦς ἢ κρέας,
 κὰν μὴ κατεσθίωσι καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους,
 10 ἐθέλω κρέμασθαι δεκάκις

2 post *γινομένους* interpunxi ipsa

In the name of the gods, do we think that those early
 Pythagorean followers really went dirty of their own will

⁶³ Cf. Arist. *EN* 1108a24ff. See Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef*, 88-90; Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb*, 174-178; Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, 53-54.

⁶⁴ It is for the same reason that Eupolis parodies Protagoras in fr. 157, and Eubulus satirises the Cynics in fr. 137 (see Hunter *ad loc.* and Webster *SLGC* 50-53).

or wore threadbare cloaks happily?

Neither of these holds true, as it appears to me.

5 But of necessity, since they had literally nothing,
having found a good pretext for their frugality,
they established measures useful for the poor.

For, lay before them fish or meat,

and, if they do not devour it, along with their fingers,

10 I am willing to be hung ten times

1 *πρὸς τῶν θεῶν*: This oath occurs frequently in Comedy, mostly in questions; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 95, *Nu.* 200, *V.* 484, Apollodorus Caryst. fr. 5, Theophilus fr. 12, etc. See Arnott on Alexis fr. 91.3, 177.11. It is also common in oratory; cf. D. 21.98, Is. 2.47, etc.

2 – 3 *ῥυπαῖν - τρίβωνας*: A *τρίβων* is a worn garment, a threadbare cloak (LSJ s.v.). Describing the Pythagoreans as wearing dirty and shabby clothes is another piece of comic exaggeration, since there are testimonies referring to their cleanness and hygiene; cf. D.L. 8.19, *Suda* π 3124, Iamb. *VP* 21.97-8.

Frugality, severity, and physical negligence were recognised as characteristic features of most philosophers: e.g. Socrates (Ar. *Nu.* 102-104, 835-837, Amipsias fr. 9, Pl. *Smp.* 219b, *Prt.* 335d); Zeno (test. 5.20-21, fr. 277 *SVF*); the Stoics in general, as well as the Cynics (Eubulus fr. 137, Luc. *Nec.* 4,⁶⁵ *Suda* τ 958, Crates test. 16 *PPF*). See also Ar. *Av.* 1281-2, *Suda* τ 954.

5 *ἐξ ἀνάγκης*: The speaker wishes to emphasise the misery of the Pythagoreans (cf. *ἐκόντας*, l. 3). Their frugal lifestyle is not a conscious choice, but the only way they can afford to live.

6 *εὐτελείας πρόφασιν*: The contrast between stated and real reason expresses mere hypocrisy.⁶⁶ The would-be hedonism of these people is deliberately concealed behind

⁶⁵ See MacLeod *ad loc.*

⁶⁶ Diogenes Laertius 8.13 and Porphyry *Abst.* 1.13, 2.14 approach and explain frugality from a different – non comic – point of view.

a mask of austerity (cf. again the depiction of Protagoras as a hypocrite in Eupolis' *Kolakes*, esp. fr. 157, 158).

7 ὄρους ἔπηξαν: The metaphor is presumably derived from the fixing of marker stones. πήγνυμι is used metaphorically in the sense “fix, establish” (*LSJ* s.v. IV). The phrase ὄρους πήγνυμι is common, but always outside Comedy (e.g. Th. 4.92.4, Flavius *AJ* 6.28, Lycurgus *Leocr.* 73, Lycophron *Alex.* 1343, etc.); a certain solemnity / formality is implied in most such cases. The metaphor suggests either portentous solemnity or specious fixity (or perhaps both).

8 ἰχθῦς ἢ κρέας: Pythagoreanism, when it comes to dietary habits, is mostly associated with abstention from meat, fish, and generally from everything animate. Nevertheless, the tradition is at some points self-contradictory, i.e. there are testimonies that Pythagoras both allowed and forbade the consumption of animate creatures. According to Iamblichus (*VP* 3.13, 24.108), at least Pythagoras himself abstained from the consumption of meat. Iamblichus (*VP* 28.150), Diogenes Laertius (8.20), and Porphyry (*VP* 36), all testify about Pythagoreans making occasional animate offerings to gods. But Aristoxenus (fr. 28, 29) speaks explicitly about Pythagoreans eating meat.⁶⁷ Iamblichus (*VP* 24.107-109) claims that the consumption of meat depended on one's degree of membership.⁶⁸ For a detailed treatment of the issue see Burkert *o.c.* 180-182.

Fish seems to have been only seldom consumed by the Pythagoreans; cf. Iamb. *VP* 21.98, *Suda* π 3124. Red mullet and blacktail in particular are said to have been forbidden; cf. D.L. 8.19, Iamb. *VP* 24.109.

What is at issue in the present fragment is the hypocritical readiness to eat both meat and fish, if occasion arises. The strict Pythagorean rules are represented yet again as a mere pretension.

⁶⁷ There is also Arist. fr. 194 (μήτρας καὶ καρδίας ... καὶ τοιούτων τινῶν ἄλλων ἀπέχεσθαι ... χρῆσθαι δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις); however the meaning of τοῖς ἄλλοις remains obscure.

⁶⁸ According to Diogenes Laertius 8.12, Pythagoras introduced a diet of meat for athletes, who previously used to eat dried figs and cheese. Arnott (on Alexis fr. 201.1-3) uses – by mistake, apparently – the same passage to argue for the opposite.

9 κατεσθίωσι καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους: This boorish behaviour points to an obvious greediness that openly contradicts Pythagoras' call for restraint; cf. D.L. 8.9: *πλησμονὴν πᾶσαν ἀποδοκιμάζει, λέγων μὴ παραβαίνειν μήτε τῶν ποτῶν μήτε τῶν σιτίων μηδένα τὴν συμμετρίαν.* To set the example, Pythagoras was said to practise a strict self-restraint himself, cf. D.L. 8.19.

The metaphor of eating one's fingers recurs in Alexis fr. 178 (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*), Hermippus fr. 23, and Plaut. *Pseud.* 881-884. In the present fragment the aim is to satirise both the greediness and the feigned self-restraint of the Pythagoreans. Cf. Euphro fr. 9.14: *κατεσθίοντα καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρακας* (a cook exhorts his pupil to eat up everything during the forthcoming wedding feast).

10 ἐθέλω κρέμασθαι δεκάκις: For parallel cases where a repeated death is required in expiation of wrongs done see Van Leeuwen on Ar. *Pl.* 483. The context can be either comic (e.g. Ar. *Pl.* 483, Men. *Dysc.* 291-293) or serious (e.g. Lys. 28.1, Pl. *R.* 615b). But still the present fragment is different from all the passages cited by van Leeuwen, since here the proposal for multiple deaths is made not by an angry interlocutor or an outraged third party, but by the very person who would suffer these peculiar deaths, if this was possible. What we have is a bet, where the speaker names a self-punishment, in case his views on the Pythagoreans are proved wrong. No crime has been committed here, as is the case in the above passages. I was able to find only one other passage, where the supposed penalty would be self-imposed; this is Pl. *Smp.* 179a: *ἐρῶν γὰρ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ παιδικῶν ὀφθῆναι ἢ λιπῶν τάξιν ἢ ὄπλα ἀποβαλῶν ... πρὸ τούτου τεθάναι ἂν πολλακίς ἔλοιτο.*⁶⁹

Fr. 10

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus VI 238c-d, as part of a lengthy treatment of the word *παράσιτος*.

If one supposes (see above) a single initiand, this would be the eponymous hero speaking. He is probably talking to his future master, trying enthusiastically to prove his suitability for both undergoing the initiation procedure and being a proper Pythagorist. For, as he enumerates the Pythagorean challenges, he describes himself as being more than capable to undertake every single of them. To this end, he uses a

⁶⁹ Solon fr. 33 is vaguely similar to Plato.

number of metaphors,⁷⁰ and assimilates himself to persons, animals, etc., known particularly for the excess that he mentions on each occasion. The argument that the character here speaks of himself gains further support when compared to Aristophon fr. 5, where the speaker clearly refers to himself using the same syntactical pattern.

πρὸς μὲν τὸ πεινῆν ἐσθίειν τε μηδὲ ἐν
νόμιζ' ὄρα̃ν Τιθύμαλλον ἢ Φιλιππίδην.
ὑδωρ δὲ πίνειν βάτραχος, ἀπολαῦσαι θύμων
λαχάνων τε κάμπη, πρὸς τὸ μὴ λοῦσθαι ῥύπος,
5 ὑπαίθριος χειμῶνα διάγειν κόψιχος,
πνίγος ὑπομεῖναι καὶ μεσημβρίας λαλεῖν
τέττιξ, ἐλαίῳ μήτε χρῆσθαι μήτε ὄρα̃ν
κονιορτός, ἀνυπόδητος ὄρθρου περιπατεῖν
γέρανος, καθεύδειν μηδὲ μικρὸν νυκτερίς

In eating nothing at all when hungry,
think that you are looking at Tithymallos or Philippides.
In drinking water, I am a frog, in enjoying thyme
and greens, a caterpillar, in not having a bath, a real dirt,
5 in staying outside in winter time, a blackbird,
in bearing the burning heat and prating at midday,
a cicada, in neither using anointing-oil nor looking at it,
a dust storm, in taking walks barefoot in dawn,
a crane, in not getting any sleep at all, a bat.

2a νόμιζ' ὄρα̃ν: Cf. Aristophon fr. 5.4: νόμισον ... ὄρα̃ν.

2b Τιθύμαλλον ἢ Φιλιππίδην: Tithymallos was a well known parasite.⁷¹ If the comic passages gathered by Athenaeus VI 240c-f are anything to go by, then his floruit must

⁷⁰ For the interpretation of the names and nouns that he uses as metaphors (rather than nicknames), see introduction to Aristophon fr. 5. Cf. also Bechtel (*o.c.* 79) who considers the occurrence of βάτραχος in Aristophon's fragment not as a nickname, but as a helpful indication of the meaning of a number of actual nicknames: Βάτραχος, Βράταχος, Βρόταχος, and Βατραχίων.

⁷¹ This is also a name of a plant; the *Euphorbia Peplus* (LSJ s.v.).

have occurred during the second half of the fourth century B.C.; cf. Arnott's introduction to Alexis' *Μιλῆσιοι*. What is parodied here is Tithymallus' ability to bear hunger, until he is offered a free meal. He is satirised for the same reason in Timocles fr. 20.

Philippides was a politician (cf. Ath. XII 552d, *PA* 14351),⁷² with pro-Macedonian sympathies, as it becomes obvious from Hyperides' speech *Against Philippides*, delivered in 336/5 B.C. Treves suggests this year as a *terminus post quem* for all the comic references to Philippides (*RE* XIX.2, s.v. Philippides nr. 1, 2199.45ff.). However, Treves' generalisation has a major weakness: here, as elsewhere, Philippides is parodied for his extreme slimness, not for his political beliefs, so we need no particular topical background. In fact, he is a recurring figure throughout the plays of both Middle and New Comedy.⁷³ He is always parodied for his thinness, never for his political views on Macedon. Even Alexis, whom we can possibly identify as an anti-Macedonian,⁷⁴ targets solely his skinniness.

3 ὕδωρ δὲ πίνειν βάτραχος: Diogenes Laertius 8.13 testifies to the importance of water for the Pythagorean diet. A reference to this habit recurs in Aristophon fr. 12.8 and Alexis fr. 202.

The syntax that Aristophon uses here and below to describe the habits of the Pythagoreans is noteworthy. A laconic infinitive phrase is followed by a matching noun (e.g. ὕδωρ δὲ πίνειν – βάτραχος, καθεύδειν μηδὲ μικρὸν – νυκτερίς, etc.). This structure is very effective, since it epitomises the facts and labels them appropriately. Aristophon employs again the same kind of syntax in fr. 5 (e.g. ὑπομένειν πληγὰς – ἄκμων, τοὺς καλοὺς πειρᾶν – καπνός, etc.).

4 ῥύπος: A similar accusation is made above in fr. 9.2-3; cf. *ad loc.* for testimonies to the opposite.

⁷² Antiphanes is wrongly mentioned by Kirchner *ad loc.*

⁷³ Cf. Aristophon fr. 8, Alexis fr. 2.8, 93, 148, Menander fr. 266.

⁷⁴ Cf. Alexis fr. 57, 102, 249. See Webster *SLGC* 44-47.

5 κόψιχος: An alternative term for *κόσσυφος*, cf. Hsch. κ 3893, Hdn. *Περὶ Ὄρθογραφίας* 537.15 GG. It is this term, *κόψιχος*, that the comic playwrights always prefer; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 970, *Av.* 306, Antiphanes fr. 295, Nicostratus fr. 4.

The parallelism drawn in this fragment is based on the real habits of the blackbird; cf. Arist. *HA* 544a26ff.: *δὲς τίκτει καὶ κόττυφος. τὰ μὲν οὖν πρῶτα τοῦ κοττύφου ὑπὸ χειμῶνος ἀπόλλυται (πρωϊαίτατα γὰρ τίκτει τῶν ὀρνέων ἀπάντων)*; and Dionys. *Av.* 1.27. See also Thompson *Birds* s.v. *κόσσυφος*.

7 τέττιξ: Both the midday song and the ability to bear extreme heat have always been the major features of cicadas; cf. Ar. *Av.* 1091-6 with scholia, Pl. *Phdr.* 258e, etc. See Davies & Kathirithamby, *Greek Insects*, 113-133; Beavis, *Insects and other Invertebrates in Classical Antiquity*, 91-103.

8a κονιορτός: *Cloud of dust*. But this is also a nickname that Demosthenes assigns to the politician Euctemon (21.103, 139).⁷⁵ Euctemon must also be meant under the same nickname in Anaxandrides fr. 35.⁷⁶ However, the context here does not favour such an allusion. What we have here is a satire of the weird habits of the Pythagoreans; the context is completely different from the fragment of Anaxandrides, which is an enumeration of nicknames. The Pythagorean assimilates himself to a cloud of dust, for he never uses oil. This is a reference to the practice of anointing oneself with oil and then scratching off the dirt with the *στλεγγίς*, as a way of cleansing oneself in the bath or after exercising – particularly after wrestling in the *palaestra*; cf. Gal. 6.406-407 Kühn, Poll. 10.62, Philostr. *Gym.* 18, etc.

8b ἀνυπόδητος ὄρθρου περιπατεῖν: This is a reference to another habit of the Pythagoreans, i.e. the early morning walks, to which Iamblichus testifies again (*VP* 11.96): *τοὺς μὲν ἑωθινούς περιπάτους ἐποιοῦντο οἱ ἄνδρες οὗτοι κατὰ μόνας τε καὶ εἰς τοιούτους τόπους ἐν οἷς συνέβαινεν ἡρεμίαν τε καὶ ἡσυχίαν εἶναι σύμμετρον*. For the lack of shoes cf. Theoc. 14.5-6 (*τοιούτος πρῶαν τις ἀφίκετο Πυθαγορικτάς, / ὠχρὸς κἀνυπόδητος*), Ar. *Nu.* 103, etc.

⁷⁵ Cf. sch. *ad loc.*: *καὶ ὁ κονιορτὸς διὰ τοῦτο κέκληται, οἷον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ πειθόμενοι· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἡ κόψιχος εὐκόλως ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνέμου ῥιπίζεται*.

⁷⁶ See Webster *SLGC* 40 and Millis *ad loc.*

9a γέρανος: For the association between cranes and dawn cf. Thphr. *Sign.* 3.38; according to Theophrastus, cranes flying in the early morning were considered a sign of forthcoming bad weather. See also sch. on Hes. *Op.* 679a, and sch. on Aratus 1010.7-8. Cf. Kidd on Aratus *Phaenomena* ll. 1010, 1031, 1075.

9b καθεύδειν μηδὲ μικρόν: Sleeping only as little as needed was said to be first pursued by Pythagoras himself; cf. Iamb. *VP* 3.13: ὀλιγοῦπνίαν καὶ εὐάγειαν καὶ ψυχῆς καθαρότητα κτησάμενος, cf. 16.69.

9c νυκτερίς: This was the nickname of Chaerephon, a close friend of Socrates.⁷⁷ Again, as with the case of *κονιορτός* above, I do not think we should interpret this as an allusion to Chaerephon. Not only because he had already been dead for some fifty years by the time Aristophon's play was produced,⁷⁸ but also because this is an instance within a stream of similes meant to parody Pythagorean practises. The point here is to mock the sleeplessness of the Pythagoreans, and the bat is obviously the most appropriate creature to draw a parallelism with.

Perhaps it is not a coincidence that the majority of the metaphors used in this fragment to satirise the Pythagoreans are comparisons with animals, birds, and insects: a frog, a caterpillar, a blackbird, a cicada, a crane, and a bat. This could possibly be a veiled mockery of the Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis.⁷⁹ There might be a hidden implication that the only way in which the Pythagoreans could ever look like such creatures is not through metempsychosis, but through the foolish habits of vegetarianism, excessive consumption of water, etc. The name Tithymallos could also be part of this pattern, given its meaning as *spurge* (cf. on l. 2b). Tithymallos the person, as well as tithymallos the plant, could serve as the connecting link between human and animal clothing of the soul. Given that the spurge is a kind of bush,

⁷⁷ Cf. Ar. *Av.* 1296 and 1564 (both with scholia), sch. on Ar. *Nu.* 104 and 144. See *PA* 15203.

⁷⁸ In Plato's *Apology* (supposed to be taking place in 399 B.C.) Socrates speaks of Chaerephon as being already dead (cf. 21a).

⁷⁹ I.e. that the human soul can be transmitted not only to other human beings, but also to animals, plants, and everything animate; see Burkert *o.c.* 120-122, 133. This doctrine is mocked at length in Lucian's *The Dream, or The Cock*.

Empedocles fr. 117 PPF may be relevant: ἤδη γάρ ποτ' ἐγὼ γενόμενῃ κοῦρός τε κόρη τε /
θάμνος τ' οἰωνός τε καὶ ἕξαλος ἔλλοπος ἰχθύς.

Fr. 11

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIII 563b-c, within a discussion about love. Here we have an analysis of a myth by someone who sounds like an expert, a guru. Operating in a sophistic mode, he expatiates on a myth about Eros, and tries to rationalise it. Such a passage could form part of the teachings of a Pythagorean master to his pupils.⁸⁰ Another possibility is to imagine a gathering of intellectuals,⁸¹ where a Pythagorean convert delivers a speech of a scientific tenor. We may also be able to get a rough idea of what preceded this scene. Given that the nature of the opening *εἶτα* is both inferential and concluding,⁸² it is possible that there preceded a catching episode (an *instantané*), or an account of one, involving a love-blunder of a supposedly sophisticated hero.

εἶτ' οὐδ' ἀδικαίως ἔστ' ἀπειρησμένος
ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν τῶν δώδεκ' εἰκότως <τ'> Ἔρωσι;
ἐτάραττε κάκεινους γὰρ ἐμβάλλων στάσεις,
ὅτ' ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν. ὡς δὲ λίαν ἦν θρασὺς
5 καὶ σοβαρός, ἀποκόψαντες αὐτοῦ τὰ πτερά,
ἵνα μὴ πέτηται πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν πάλιν,
δεῦρ' αὐτὸν ἐφυγάδευσαν ὡς ἡμᾶς κάτω,
τὰς δὲ πτέρυγας ἃς εἶχε τῇ Νίκῃ φορεῖν
ἔδοσαν, περιφανὲς σκῦλον ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων

2 τ' add. Porson *Adv.* p. 135

Well, was not Eros rightly and reasonably
disfranchised by the twelve gods?

⁸⁰ Cf. Socrates' rationalising of Zeus in *Ar. Nu.* 367ff.

⁸¹ Similar to the one taking place in the house of Callias in Eupolis' *Kolakes* (cf. esp. fr. 174 and test. ii-viii), or to that of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*.

⁸² See *LSJ* s.v. *εἶτα* II, and below on l. 1a.

For he used to agitate even those, causing quarrels between them,
 when he was among them. So, because he was very insolent
 5 and pompous, after they had cut off his wings,
 so as not to fly back towards heaven,
 they banished him down towards us.
 As for the wings that he had, they gave them
 to Nike to wear, as a splendid spoil from the enemies.

ια εἶτ' οὐ δικάίως: The phrase *εἶτ' οὐ* is common and usually marks “the beginning of an angry tirade” (Arnott on Alexis fr. 44.1).⁸³ The phrase *εἶτ' οὐ δικάίως* recurs only in Antiphanes fr. 101. 1, Menander fr. 508.1-2, Luc. *Cat.* 13, and Libanius *Decl.* 12.31. All these instances are rhetorical questions; they are emotional outbursts of the speaker, who seeks to confirm his opinion. There is a certain degree of exaggeration in all cases. Although the speaker takes for granted that his collocutor would naturally agree with him and answer “yes”, still a sober third part might well answer negatively.

Reinhardt⁸⁴ notes that not all the *εἶτα*-clauses are the same. Here – and elsewhere (e.g. Men. *Dysc.* 153ff.) – the speaker sets off with a mythological example drawing on the sanction of the mythological tradition, whereas in e.g. Amphis fr. 1 the speaker begins with a generic statement / a personal belief.

ιβ ἀπεψηφισμένος: The verb *ἀποψηφίζεσθαι* is a political term. It is the *terminus technicus* for the deprivation of one’s franchise and the removal from the deme’s register (cf. Phot. *a* 2730, Phryn. *PS* 13).⁸⁵ It is usually employed by orators and other authors in a political context.⁸⁶ In the present fragment it is used *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, and this is the only occurrence of this term in Comedy. Eros is made look as a real *παρέγγραπτος*; this is another instance of the phenomenon defined by Nesselrath as “Atticization”.⁸⁷

The use of this verb may also be important for dating. We know that in 346/5 B.C. Demophilos (*PA* 3664) successfully proposed a *διαψήφισις* (i.e. a revision of the

⁸³ Cf. Handley on Men. *Dysc.* 153.

⁸⁴ *Mythologische Beispiele in der Neuen Komödie*, 106-109.

⁸⁵ See Wankel II.716 on D. 18.132.

⁸⁶ E.g. D. 18.132, 57.11, Aeschin. 1.114, Hyp. fr. 29, D.H. *Is.* 16, Arist. *Ath.* 42.1, Plu. *Phoc.* 28, etc.

⁸⁷ See *MK* 204-235.

citizen lists), which required all deme members to be scrutinised, in order to test their qualifications for citizenship.⁸⁸ It is tempting to assume that the present usage of the term ἀπεψηφισμένος is not coincidental. Given the additional evidence that suggests a production date for the play after 345 B.C. (cf. introduction to the play), it is highly probable that the term ἀπεψηφισμένος was meant to allude to the recent διαψηφισις, and that the play was indeed produced soon after its conduction.

2 ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν τῶν δώδεκα: See on Amphis fr. 9.5.

2 - 5 Ἔρως - τὰ περὰ: The archaeological evidence we possess from as early as the end of the sixth century B.C. is unanimous⁸⁹ in depicting Eros with wings.⁹⁰ This accords with the literary evidence from the archaic period; cf. Anacreon fr. 34 *PMG* (ὑποπόλιον γένειον χρυσοφαέννων, / εἰ βούλεται πετερύγων...).⁹¹ The ancient sources abound in explanations as to the winged nature of Eros; cf. Alexander Aphr. *Pr.* 1.87, Prop. *Eleg.* 2.12, Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.3, etc., the emphasis always being on the volatile and fluctuating feelings of the lovers.

The pain caused by Eros to gods (apart from humans whom we expect to be vulnerable), for which he is banned from the divine household in the present fragment, had already been treated before; cf. S. *Ant.* 787-790 (καὶ σ' οὔτ' ἀθανάτων φύξιμος οὐδεὶς / οὔθ' ἀμερῶν σέ γ' ἀνθρώπων, ὁ δ' ἔχων μέμνηεν), Hes. *Th.* 120-122 (... Ἔρως ... / ... πάντων δὲ θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων / δάμναται ...), E. fr. 136.1 *TGF* (σὺ δ' ὦ θεῶν τύραννε τε κἀνθρώπων Ἔρως), etc.⁹² The fourth century B.C. saw a renewed interest in Eros in both art and literature. Since the second half of the fifth century, artistic representations of Aphrodite and Eros together began to become

⁸⁸ Cf. sch. on Aeschin. 1.77, Androtion 324 F 52 *FGrH*, and Philochorus 328 F 52 *FGrH*. We know that there were many people expelled by their demes; this emerges from Aischines 1, Demosthenes 57, and also Hyperides fr. 30 (he treats the expelled as a significant category along with metics, etc.)

⁸⁹ Reinhardt *o.c.* 93 n. 8 cites both Bernert *RE* s.v. *Nike* nr. 2, 288-290, and Bulle, *Myth. Lex.* III,1 (1897-1902) 316, 28ff, as sources referring to presentations of a wingless Eros. However, what Bernert refers to is depictions of a wingless Nike, not of a wingless Eros. I have not been able to locate Bulle's work.

⁹⁰ See Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, i 1350-1351.

⁹¹ In sch. on Ar. *Av.* 574 νεωτερικὸν τὸ τὴν Νίκην καὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα ἐπτερωσθαι, the phrase καὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα has been identified as an interpolation; cf. Roscher *l.c.*

established as a recurrent motif. During the fourth century, Eros begins to be the dominant figure in the arts, expelling Aphrodite.⁹³ This tendency in art parallels that in literature during the same period. Rohde⁹⁴ notes the increased interest of most philosophical schools in the nature of Eros during the fourth century. This resulted in a production of many works titled *περὶ ἔρωτος, ἐρωτικοί, ἐρωτικαὶ τέχναι*.⁹⁵ Contemporary comedy does not let this trend pass unattended. Along with Aristophon, Eubulus (fr. 40) and Alexis (fr. 20) treated the subject of Eros. Surprisingly, all the three poets focus on his winged nature. Unlike Aristophon, the two others blame the painters for ignorance and for wrongly depicting Eros winged.⁹⁶ It is noteworthy that Alexis fr. 20 comes from a play entitled *Ἀποκοπτόμενος*. Commenting on this title, Kock (II.305) thought: “Amor ... τὰ πτερὰ ἀποκοπτόμενος ὑφ’ ἐταίρας”. However, given the precedent of Aristophon, the plot might have been similar to the present fragment, i.e. the gods, and not the courtesans, could have been the ones punishing Eros. Whatever the case may be, the condemnation of Eros by Aristophon, in a passage supposedly spoken by a Pythagorean master, matches perfectly with the beliefs of Pythagoras regarding sexual intercourse; cf. D.L. 8.9 (*ἀφροδίσια ... βαρέα δὲ πᾶσαν ὄρην καὶ ἐς ὑγιείην οὐκ ἀγαθά*), and 8.19 (*οὐδέποτε ἔγνωσθη ... ἀφροδισιάζων*).

3 γάρ: This is the simple confirmatory and causal *γάρ*; cf. Denniston *GP* 58: “It is commoner in writers whose mode of thought is simple ... (*sc.* these) tend to state a fact before investigating its reason”.

4-5 θρασύς - σοβαρός: Some nine centuries later the rhetor Procopius employs the same two epithets to describe Eros: *ἵνα καὶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην τιμήσωμεν. οὐ γὰρ αὕτη διαφυγεῖν ἠδυνήθη τὸν ἔρωτα: σοβαρὸν γὰρ τὸ παιδάριον καὶ θρασύ, καὶ κατὰ τοῦ τυχόντος ὀπλίξεται* (*Decl.* 4.57-60).

⁹² The theme of love-tricks among gods is also present in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*.

⁹³ See Metzger, *Les Représentations dans la Céramique Attique du IVe siècle*, 41-58.

⁹⁴ *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, 60.

⁹⁵ Both the Socratic Euclides and Theophrastus wrote an *Ἐρωτικός*.

⁹⁶ Still, the winged nature of Eros was not denied even in a later age, cf. Meleager *AP* 12.76.

5 *αὐτοῦ*: Either separative genitive (governed by *ἀποκόψαντες*) or possessive genitive (governed by *τὰ πτερά*).

7 *ἐφυγάδευσαν*: The affairs within the divine household are here presented in a humanised way. The gods exile Eros from Olympus, just as Greek communities imposed exile as a political penalty.⁹⁷ In the present fragment Eros is banished for life; for before expelling him from Olympus the gods cut off his wings, thus preventing him from ever returning. Instead the wings are offered permanently to Nike, like victory offerings.

8 *Νίκη*: Nike, the goddess and personification of Victory, is mostly portrayed with wings, though there is a small number of wingless representations; e.g. *LIMC* VI nos. 374, 375, with commentary on p. 902. Cf. Bernert in *RE* s.v. *Nike* nr. 2. The Scholiast on *Ar. Av.* 574 notes: *νεωτερικὸν τὸ τὴν Νίκην καὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα ἐπτερωῖσθαι. Ἄρχεννον γὰρ φασι, ... οἱ δὲ Ἀγλαοφῶντα, τὸν Θάσιον ζωγράφον, πτηνὴν ἐργάσασθαι τὴν Νίκην;* cf. *LIMC* VI 1, p. 896.

In the present fragment the offer of Eros' wings to Nike by the gods can be interpreted not only as a victory dedication, but also as an attempt by the speaker to present a witty aetiological myth as to how Nike first got his wings.

9 *σκῦλον*: It is perhaps significant that it is the word *σκῦλον*, and not *λάφυρον*, that is used here. The latter term denotes spoils taken from living enemies, the former spoils taken from the dead; cf. *Suda* λ 158, *Phot.* λ 121. If Eros' wings are a *σκῦλον*, then the natural assumption is that not only has he been expelled from Olympus, but he has also been killed by the twelve gods. Of course this is at most a metaphorical death, but it still creates a burlesque atmosphere (an immortal god is put to death by his peers), in harmony with the humanization / atticisation of the gods elsewhere in the fragment.

⁹⁷ One major example is the exile of Thucydides for the loss of Amphipolis during the Peloponnesian war (cf. *Th.* 5.26.5). Numerous other cases of exile are recorded by both Thucydides (e.g. 4.65.3) and Xenophon (e.g. 5.4.19). See Roberts, *Accountability in Athenian Government*, 117-120; Balogh, *Political Refugees in Ancient Greece*, *passim*.

Fr. 12

This fragment is cited by Diogenes Laertius 8.38, within a series of passages deriding either Pythagoras himself or his disciples. The fragment consists of two parts. The wording of Diogenes Laertius is not clear about their textual proximity – if any; ἔτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ could well mean *later in the same play*, but also *later in the same scene / passage*. Kassel-Austin, whom I follow below, edit the text as a single fragment, whereas Kock as two. Against Kassel-Austin’s presentation is the fact that ll. 7-10 have a matter-of-fact nature and present a factual description with certain elements of negativity. This contrasts with the aggrandising treatment we get in ll. 1-6. Besides, ll. 7-10 can also stand independently, as a summing up of the basic Pythagorean habits (a synopsis of fr. 10). None the less, in favour of Kassel-Austin’s editing choice is the fact that ll. 7-10 can be considered relevant to ll. 1-6, in the sense that λάχανα and ὕδωρ (l. 8) may correspond to συσσιτεῖν (l. 4), while φθειράς, τρίβωνα, and ἀλουσίαν (l. 9) may correspond to ῥύπου μεστοῖσιν (l. 6); in such a case the fragment as a whole would be a description of a Pythagorean “feast” in Hades.⁹⁸ The different tone of ll. 7-10, which actually starts from the change of speaker in l. 5, may indeed be due to this second person speaking, who has a low esteem about the Pythagoreans, in contrast with the first speaker.

The eschatological account given below refers to a supposed Katabasis of Pythagoras himself in the Underworld.⁹⁹ The first speaker is interrupted by a person who behaves like a βωμολόχος (see introduction to fr. 9).

ἔφη καταβάς εἰς τὴν δίαιταν τῶν κάτω
 ἰδεῖν ἐκάστους, διαφέρειν δὲ πάμπολυ
 τοὺς Πυθαγοριστὰς τῶν νεκρῶν· μόνοισι γὰρ
 τούτοισι τὸν Πλούτωνα συσσιτεῖν ἔφη
 5 δι’ εὐσέβειαν. :: εὐχερῆ θεὸν λέγεις
 εἰ τοῖς ῥύπου μεστοῖσιν ἥδεται συνών

ἔσθίουσί τε
 λάχανά τε καὶ πίνουσιν ἐπὶ τούτοις ὕδωρ·

⁹⁸ Similar eschatological scenes showing the blessed souls feasting occur in the first half of Aristophanes’ *Frogs*.

⁹⁹ Cf. Helm, *Lucian und Menipp*, 381.

φθειρας δὲ καὶ τρίβωνα τὴν τ' ἄλουσίαν
 10 οὐδεὶς ἂν ὑπομείνειε τῶν νεωτέρων

7 ἐσθίουσί τε Diog. FP³: om. Diog. BP, *Sud.* (defectus indicatur in G et M): falsum esse supplementum, aliorum ciborum nomina ante λάχανά τε excidisse censet Von der Muehll ap. D.-Kr. 8 τε om. Diog. F, del. P³

He said that, when he descended, he looked at every one of the Underworld habitants, as to their life-style, and that the Pythagorisers were far better than the other dead. For he said that only with them does Pluto dine because of

5 their piety. (B.) What an easy-going god you are speaking of, since he finds pleasure in keeping company with people full of filth

And not only do they eat vegetables,
 but they also drink water afterwards.

As for the lice, the threadbare cloak and their unwashed state,

10 none of the younger ones could bear them.

1 καταβάς: In Comedy downward journeys to Hades had previously been brought to the stage by both Pherecrates (in *Crapataloi*) and Aristophanes (in *Frogs* and *Gerytades*). The subject was still comically exploitable by the time of Lucian, cf. *Cataplous* (and also *Dialogues of the Dead*).¹⁰⁰ A story about Pythagoras descending to Hades must have had its origins into real events from Pythagoras' own life. Diogenes Laertius (8.41) tells us how he spent much time in an underground dwelling, while he had told his mother to record all the happening events. When he ascended, he went to the Assembly claiming that he had just returned from Hades, and recounted what had supposedly happened. Pythagoras was generally believed not only to have lived several lives, but also to have retained a clear memory of all of them (cf. D.L. 8.5, Iamb. *VP* 14.63). This privilege was said to have been granted to him by Hermes; cf. D.L. 8.4.

¹⁰⁰ Rohde (*o.c.* 280-281) supplies an account of all stories and myths, which recount a descent to Hades.

3a τῶν νεκρῶν: Meineke (III.363) thought that “verba τῶν νεκρῶν fortasse rectius cum sequentibus coniunguntur”. Kassel-Austin disagree with him, and edit the half stop after τῶν νεκρῶν. Indeed, τῶν νεκρῶν is best taken as a separative genitive governed from διαφέρειν.¹⁰¹ If we transfer the half stop before τῶν νεκρῶν, as Meineke suggests, we have to supply another τῶν νεκρῶν or of τούτων or τῶν κάτω, in order to complete the meaning.¹⁰² Since the text is complete in itself, I cannot see the reason why we should alter it.

3b μόνοισι: The idea of privileged positions near the gods in the Underworld is a commonplace in eschatological descriptions. In particular, the term *μόνος* is commonly used in mystic contexts to designate the privileges of the initiates; cf. Philetaerus fr. 17, where the music experts are said to be the only ones who have the right to revel in love affairs in Hades.¹⁰³

The long (Ionic) form *-οισι* is commonly used within Middle Comedy;¹⁰⁴ cf. Amphis fr. 27.1, Anaxandrides fr. 6.2, Anaxilas fr. 18.6, Antiphanes fr. 1.3, Dionysius fr. 1.1, Eubulus fr. 6.3, etc. At times it serves to elevate style, but it can also be used simply for metrical convenience. One cannot always say with certainty whether and, if so, in what degree the comic poets sought the solemnity and grandeur generated by this form. Its accumulated presence in this fragment (τούτοις, l. 4; and μεστοῖσιν, l. 6)¹⁰⁵ may have some further significance. Either this is a parody of the epic style *per se*, simply to raise laughter, or the *βωμολόχος* is being ironical and implies that epic diction is the only appropriate style to speak about the (supposed) solemnity of the Pythagoreans. The recurrence of this form in fr. 9.8 may tell in favour of the latter alternative.

¹⁰¹ A partitive genitive is possible but less likely and does not affect the meaning.

¹⁰² This transfer produces an oddly postponed γάρ (though this is not uncommon in Comedy; cf. Denniston *GP* 96-97).

¹⁰³ For other passages conveying the same notion of preferential treatment see on Philetaerus fr. 17.2.

¹⁰⁴ Aristophanes too opts for *-οισι* nine times in total (or ten, depending on whether we accept, along with MacDowell, the reading *μόνοισι* in Ar. *V.* 1272); cf. Hermippus fr. 25.2 (see K-A *ad loc.*).

¹⁰⁵ Nevertheless, contrast τούτοις (l. 8). Though there is always the possibility that the last four lines come from a different part of the play; cf. introduction to the fragment.

4 συσσιτεῖν: Pythagoreans alone are said to enjoy the table-company of Pluto, because of their piety and virtue. This image is parallel to the Orphic “symposium of the saints” (*συμπόσιον τῶν ὁσίων*), described by Plato in *R.* 363c-d. Reporting on the Orphic gurus Mousaeus and Eumolpus, Plato reports on the Orphic belief that the righteous dead were feasted in Hades and given wine forever. A fragment of Empedocles records a similar reward for righteousness: the humans who escape the circle of re-incarnations become table-companions with gods: *ἀθανάτοις ἄλλοισιν ὁμέστοι, αὐτοτράπεζοι* (fr. 147.1 DK); cf. Graff, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, 98-100. The belief that drinking bouts took place in Hades is parodied in *Ar.* fr. 504.8, and Pherecrates fr. 113.30-31.

There might be an additional resonance in the use of *συσσιτεῖν*. Dining at the *πρυτανεῖον* featured among Athenian honours. It was a major civic honour that was granted to ambassadors (called either *ξένια* or *δεῖπνον*), and for life to victors of the Panhellenic Games, as well as to prominent individuals such as Cleon (called *σίτησις*).¹⁰⁶

5-6 εὐχερῆ ... λέγεις ... συνών: With this (slightly) irreverent reply, the speaker (a *βωμολόχος*¹⁰⁷), prevents the whole situation from getting serious. One possibility is that he is genuinely naïve. If not, then his aim is to ruin the argument of the previous speaker, and ridicule the Pythagorean doctrines. The latter possibility seems more likely. As for *λέγεις*, its present use has many parallels; e.g. *Ar. Nu.* 204, *Av.* 1691, *Pl.* 705, 992, Alexis fr. 223.12, 224.4, *Men. Dysc.* 116, etc.¹⁰⁸

Here Pluto is treated in a rather light-hearted way. The maltreatment of gods is another *locus communis* of Comedy, and a linking thread between Old and Middle. Throughout Aristophanes gods are treated with a certain degree of irreverence. Particularly in *Birds* the gods are brought to their knees; not only is Zeus accused of snatching the authority away from the birds (467ff., 480, 1600ff.), but also the gods are finally forced to submit to birds' power (1685), so that the chorus can later celebrate (1750-1753). See also *Pl.* 87: *ὁ Ζεὺς με ταῦτ' ἔδρασεν ἀνθρώπους φρονῶν*

¹⁰⁶ Cf. *Ar. Eq.* 709, sch. on *Ar. Eq.* 167, 766, Timocles fr. 8.15-19, D. 19.31, 234, *Pl. Ap.* 36d, *Plu.* 970b, etc. See Miller, *The Prytaneion*, 4-11.

¹⁰⁷ See introduction to Aristophon fr. 9.

¹⁰⁸ For *λέγεις* with accusative see Headlam on Herod. 6.95, and Oguse *REA* 67 (1965) 131ff.

(Ploutos speaking of his blinding by Zeus), *Ra.* 740: ὅστις γε πίνειν οἶδε καὶ βινεῖν μόνον; (referring to Dionysus). See further Sutton, *Self and Society in Aristophanes*, 35-45; Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, 19.

7-8 ἐσθίουσί τε / λάχανά τε καὶ πίνουσιν: The sequence τε ... τε καὶ is unparalleled.¹⁰⁹ A more natural sequence would be either “ἐσθίουσί τε λάχανα καὶ πίνουσιν” (first solution) or “blank (i.e. ἐσθίουσι deleted) λάχανά τε καὶ πίνουσιν” (second solution). A closer look at the manuscripts of Diogenes Laertius,¹¹⁰ shows that codex B, which is considered “the best”, preserves the second solution. In this case Von der Muehl’s argument seems reasonable; cf. crit. app. On the other hand, codex P, which is also excellent, preserves – in its third correcting hand – the first solution. However, although both solutions are syntactically correct, none of them satisfies the metre. The syntactical awkwardness remains, and Professor Carey suggested to me the alternative reading ἐσθίουσι τοι, which removes the first τε.

On balance, I am inclined not to change the manuscript text. Though the sequence of particles is unparalleled, it satisfies metre and yields good sense; the first τε is connective, and the following τε καὶ mean both / and.

10 τῶν νεωτέρων: This collective – and somewhat indefinite – reference to a group of young people is a recurring motif within both Middle and New Comedy, and also in some Latin adaptations by Plautus. See Anaxandrides fr. 34.6, Antiphanes fr. 193.10, Xenarchus fr. 4.2, Alexis fr. 183.1, Philemon fr. 3.5, Plaut. *Capt.* 69 and *Men.* 77. The νεώτεροι are also mentioned once by Aristophanes (*V.* 1101). The very first reference to a company of youngsters (νέοι) is made by Homer, *Od.* 18.6. Two patterns are discernible here: in Homer, Antiphanes, Alexis, and Plautus, the νεώτεροι are said to assign a nickname to a person, while in the other cases, as well as in the present fragment, it is their habits and practices that are in focus. The first attempt to interpret this term was made in 1886 by van Herwerden, who recognised here some “iuvenes elegantiores (i giovanotti), qui genio indulgentes convivia et lupanaria frequentarent,

¹⁰⁹ The cases noted by Denniston *GP* 512-515 are close but essentially different.

¹¹⁰ For a discussion of the manuscripts of Diogenes Laertius see on Amphis fr. 13.2.

non tantum aetate iuniores sed imprimis spiritu, qui omnibus iis fruerentur quae iuvenili aetate congruerent".¹¹¹ Millis p. 135 agrees; see also Arnott p. 543.

In the present fragment the *νεώτεροι* may be a reference to a younger generation of Pythagoreans, who refuse the weird practices of the older. A comparison between younger and older is not impossible given the reference to the *πάλαι ποτέ* Pythagoreans in fr. 9.1.¹¹² Though not entirely impossible, I consider this interpretation less likely, given that in all the passages mentioned above (apart from Homer) the term *νεώτεροι* appears to have the same meaning, the one noted by van Herwerden *l.c.* In Comedy and elsewhere¹¹³ *νεώτεροι* implies the generational gap (which stands out as a marked feature of Athenian society from *ca.* the 420s onwards), and in turn the common cultural assumption – at least among the old – that the young are lazy, self-indulgent, or pampered.¹¹⁴ This idea probably underlies the use of the term *νεώτεροι* in the present fragment as well. It is only natural that young people prone to indulgence would despise the pretentious and ascetic Pythagorean lifestyle.

Φιλωνίδης (fr. 13)

A certain Philonides is repeatedly parodied throughout Comedy; e.g. *Ar. Pl.* 303-305 (with sch. *ad loc.*), Theopompus fr. 5, Plato fr. 65, Nicochares fr. 4, and Philyllius fr. 22. Both the ancient commentators and the modern scholars agree that this is the rich man Philonides of Melite (*PA* 14907). Hanow was the first to identify this Philonides with the title figure of Aristophon's play.¹¹⁵ In Comedy Philonides is portrayed as swinish and gluttonous, patron to a number of parasites, also known to

¹¹¹ *Mnemosyne* 14 (1886) 183-184.

¹¹² The only evidence for marked chronological shifts in the nature of Pythagoreanism comes from Aristoxenus fr. 18, 19 (see introduction to the play). However, this evidence suggests exactly the opposite; for Aristoxenus it is the younger generation of Pythagoreans who practise superstitious abstinences, and not the older ones, as the present fragment suggests.

¹¹³ E.g. Th. 6.12.2, Isoc. *Areop.* 48, etc.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Strauss, *Fathers and Sons in Athens*, 136-148.

¹¹⁵ *Exercitationum criticarum in comicos Graecos liber primus*, 29; cf. Bergk, *Commentationum de Reliquiis Comoediae Atticae Antiquae*, 400ff.

have had an affair with the famous courtesan Lais¹¹⁶ (cf. sch. on Ar. *Pl.* 179). Hanow (*o.c.* 30) dates Philonides' lifetime between *ca.* 420-17 and 352-49 B.C. Breitenbach notes that Philonides' death is set so late by Hanow because of Aristophon's present play, given that the latter is known to have won his first victory sometime between 358 and 350 B.C. (cf. introduction to Aristophon). Breitenbach (*Titulorum* 30) traces some vital evidence in Demosthenes 30 *Against Onetor*, where on several occasions (§§4, 7, 33) we hear that Onetor, Philonides' son, is now in possession of his father's property and was supposed to supply his sister with a dowry upon her marriage that took place in the month of Skirophorion of the year 366 B.C. (§15). Based on this evidence Breitenbach concludes that Philonides must have died and the present play must have been composed before 366 B.C.¹¹⁷ I consider Breitenbach's arguments to be convincing.

Bon viveurs, like Philonides, are often satirised in Comedy; cf. the mockery of Morychus in Ar. *Ach.* 887, *Pax* 1008, *V.* 506, 1142, Plato fr. 114, and Teleclides fr. 12. What is particularly interesting in the case of Aristophon's *Φιλωνιδης* is that the whole play seems to have been dedicated to this individual. Of course, there are plays that revolve around a single figure, and this is particularly common during the period of Old Comedy; e.g. Aristophanes' *Knights* (satire of Cleon), Plato's *Cleophon* (satire of the homonymous Athenian general; cf. test. iii K.-A.), etc.¹¹⁸ Kallias, satirised by Eupolis in *Kolakes* as wealthy and extravagant, is perhaps the closest parallel to Aristophon's satire of Philonides. Still, the latter case is different, in that the targeted individual becomes the title figure. If, as widely supposed, this Philonides is identical with the historical rich man (see above), then this is the only known play that is named after and deals with a real-life glutton, or, to put it in Sommerstein's words, with an "*idol of the dinner-table*".¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ See on Philetaerus fr. 9.4.

¹¹⁷ As to the long chronological interval between this date and Aristophon's first victory, Breitenbach (*o.c.* 31) supplies the parallel case of Timocles, first mentioned as victorious in 322/1 but being already active before 340 B.C. Cf. also the case of Isocrates (probably already writing around 410 B.C., and still writing in 338 B.C.).

¹¹⁸ Sommerstein lists thirteen cases where a play deals throughout – or in most part – with a particular individual (*CQ* 46 ii n.s. [1996] 334-335).

¹¹⁹ *o.c.* 330-331.

The fragment below is cited by Athenaeus XI 472c-d, within a discussion about a specific kind of a wine cup called *θηρίκλειος*.¹²⁰ Kassel-Austin *ad loc.* suggest that the speaker is a female ex-slave, recently granted her freedom. This act was sanctified by wine consumption, and not by the traditional ritual of drinking from the so-called “water of freedom” (*ἐλευθέριον ὕδωρ*). Pausanias 2.17.1 tells us that this appellation, *Water of Freedom*, was given to a stream that flowed by the Heraeum, the temple of Hera, fifteen stades away from Mycenae. Pausanias does not say whether freed slaves used to drink from this water, as part of an established ritual. We are lucky to possess additional information about a spring in Argos, from where the freed slaves used to drink: ἐν Ἄργει ἀπὸ τῆς Κυνάδρας πίνουσι κρήνης <οἱ> ἐλευθερούμενοι τῶν οἰκετῶν (Hsch. s.v. ἐλευθέριον ὕδωρ; cf. Eust. *ad Od.* 13.408, and Pausanias Attic s.v. Κυνάδρα). The existence of a comparable ritual at Athens is attested by Antiphanes fr. 26, where a female slave swears by this water. In the present fragment the element of *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is at work. The comic poet replaces the traditional water with wine, with reference to women’s passion for drinking, a motif that Middle Comedy inherited from Old. Aristophanes calls women *ποτίσται* (*Th.* 735), and there are several other passages where women are satirised for their fondness for wine; e.g. *Ec.* 132-133, *Lys.* 114, etc. In Middle Comedy the same motif reappears in Xenarchus fr. 5, where a female slave’s wish is to drink the *ἐλευθέριον οἶνον* before dying.

In the absence of any evidence to the opposite, a reasonable assumption is that the ex-master of the speaking character is the title-figure of Philonides. The woman seems to be conversing with another person, to whom, according to Kassel, belongs the second half of l. 4. She speaks in trochaic tetrameters, i.e. in a metre not particularly common in Comedy after Aristophanes. Aristophon employs this metre twice in the surviving fragments; here and in fr. 5. Whereas in fr. 5, as well as in other comic passages, it is easy to discern the reason why the trochaic tetrameter is used,¹²¹ the reason that calls for trochaic tetrameter here is not detectable at first sight. None the less, I would like to suggest that here the trochaic tetrameter combines with what Nesselrath calls “dithyrambische Sprache”,¹²² to communicate the heightened

¹²⁰ See on Theophilus fr. 2.2.

¹²¹ Generally for a special effect; cf. General Introduction p. 27.

¹²² *MK* 253; cf. introduction to Amphis’ *Διδύραμβος*.

emotional state of the speaker. The slave celebrates her release, and does so in a most exuberant way.

– ὤ τοιγαροῦν ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀρτίως ὁ δεσπότης
 δι' ἀρετὴν τῶν θηρικλείων εὐκύκλωτον ἀσπίδα,
 ὑπεραφρίζουσαν, τρυφῶσαν, ἴσον ἴσω κεκραμένην,
 προσφέρων ἔδωκεν :: οἶμαι, χρηστότητος οὔνεκα. ::
 5 εἴτ' ἔλευθέραν ἀφῆκε βαπτίσας ἐρρωμένως

4 dist. Kassel, verba interlocutoris ironice assentientis seiungens

For that very reason my master lately, because of my
 excellence, gave me the beautifully rounded shield of thericleians;
 he brought it to me foaming over the brim, dainty,
 mixed half-and-half. (B.) As a reward for honesty, I suppose.

5 (A.) He then let me go free, having soused me overwhelmingly in wine

2, 4 δι' ἀρετὴν - χρηστότητος οὔνεκα: The virtue of slaves is sometimes commemorated on stelai; e.g. *IG II.3 3111*: (Ἐ)νθάδ(ε) γῆ κατέχει τίτθην παίδων Διογείτου ἐκ Πελοποννήσου τήνδε δικαιοτάτην. *Μαλίχα Κυθηρία*; *ibid.* 4050: Παιδευσίς τίτθην χρηστή; *ibid.* 4109: Πυρρίχη τροφός χρηστή.

2 τῶν θηρικλείων εὐκύκλωτον ἀσπίδα: The “well rounded shield” is a metaphor for the wine cup. The spherical form was not a standard characteristic of the Thericleians, for the latter came in a variety of shapes.¹²³ The metaphorical use of military terms to designate symposion equipment is a recurring motif in Comedy. From early on in Greek literature there has been a tendency to compare / contrast the spheres of feasting and war; cf. Archilochus fr. 2 West: ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μᾶζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ' οἶνος / Ἰσμαρικός· πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος. Both Xenophanes (fr. B1 West) and Anacreon (fr. 116 Edmonds) disapprove of recounting battles and violent fighting stories at a symposion. Theognis uses the verb *θωρήσσειν* (lit. *to arm oneself*) with the sense of *getting drunk* (ll. 413, 470 *Theognidea*, West). The verb recurs with the same

¹²³ Cf. Dionysius fr. 5, Alexis fr. 124, Dioxiippus fr. 5.

metaphorical meaning in Pindar (fr. 72.1), and also in Aristophanes (*Ach.* 1135, *Pax* 1286). Within Middle Comedy the most outstanding passage is probably Mnesimachus fr. 7, where foodstuffs and other symposion items are grotesquely substituted with weapons (see comm. *ad loc.*); cf. Dionysius fr. 3.5. The trend is later picked up by Latin Comedy.¹²⁴ In the present fragment, the particular substitution of a drinking cup with a shield could be interpreted as belonging to this motif, and is apparently based on the assumption that the audience knew their tragedies too; cf. *A. Th.* 489 ἀσπίδος κύκλον λέγω, *ibid.* 642 εὐκύκλον σάκος, etc. It seems that there is a particular connection and a semantic interrelation between shields and wine cups in several texts. Aristotle, within his analysis of “metaphors by analogy”, gives this interchange of equipment as an example: ἐρεῖ τὴν φιάλην ἀσπίδα Διονύσου καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα φιάλην Ἄρεως (*Po.* 1457b 21); cf. *Id. Rh.* 1407a 16, 1412b 35. In lyric poetry Timotheus (fr. 797 *PMG*) and in comedy Antiphanes (fr. 110) and Anaxandrides (fr. 82), all use this metaphor.¹²⁵ It could be argued that the shield, standing for manliness, and the drinking cup, symbolising the joys of peace, encapsulate the contrasting worlds of war and feasting.

It is interesting that εὐκύκλωτος appears only here and in Eubulus fr. 56.4. Instead, the usually employed adjective is εὐκύκλος, e.g. *X. Cyn.* 9.12.3, *Ar. Th.* 968, etc. Wilamowitz (on *E. HF* 290) notices a certain tendency within poetry to form secondary adjectives ending in -τος, parallel to the genuinely verbal ones that end in either -ος or -ής. Indeed, there is a remarkably long list of such doublets; e.g. καλλίπυργος (*E. Ba.* 1202) and καλλιπύργωτος (*ibid.* 19); ἄφοβος (*E. Ph.* 236) and ἀφόβητος (*S. OT* 885), etc.¹²⁶ Apart from the apparent metrical requirements, Wilamowitz discerns a decorative function (“schmuck”) in the formation of these *pseudo-verbal* adjectives, as Pearson calls them.¹²⁷

3a ὑπεραφρίζουσαν: The image of wine foaming over the brim of a Thericlean cup is paralleled several times in Middle Comedy; see further on Theophilus fr. 2.3. But see also Hunter on Eubulus fr. 56.

¹²⁴ See introduction to Mnesimachus fr. 7.

¹²⁵ Cf. Nesselrath *MK* 277-278.

¹²⁶ See Wilamowitz *l.c.* for more examples of such doublets.

¹²⁷ On *S.* fr. 819 *TGF*. See also his notes on *frr.* 249, 825, 970, and 1014.

3b τρυφῶσαν: *dainty, delicate*; a sign of luxuriousness and sumptuousness that adds to the idea that the master has really pampered his slave. Cf. Antiphanes fr. 55.8-10 (ἄρομβον ... τρυφῶντα), Alcaeus fr. 2.2 (ἄρτοι τρυφῶντες).

3c ἴσον ἴσῳ κεκραμένην: A mixture containing water and wine in equal proportions was considered a rather strong blend; cf. sch. on Ar. *Pl.* 1132: ζωρότερον τὸ τοιοῦτο κραῖμα. Indeed, there is a relevant warning by the doctor Mnesitheus: ἐὰν δ' ἴσον ἴσῳ προσφέρῃ, μανίαν ποιεῖ (com. adesp. fr. 101.12 K.-A.). When the blend is specified, there is often a point (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 75, with reference to the Persian habits). Here the reason for such a strong blend must be the occasion of the slave's release; the changing of her status is a cause for real celebration; cf. the use of the trochaic tetrameter (see introduction to the fragment).

The Scholiast on Ar. *Eq.* 1187 claims that the best mixture is two parts of wine with three parts of water (see van Leeuwen's thorough note *ad loc.*). Athenaeus (426b-427c, 430d-431b) cites several fragments, mainly from Comedy, which tell us of a wide range of possible mixtures, varying in strength; cf. Plu. *Mor.* 657b-d. Hesiod (*Op.* 596) recommends a rather sober mixture consisting of three parts of water and one part of wine, which Plutarch calls a νηφάλιος καὶ ἀδρανῆς κραῖσις (657c). This, along with the five parts water and two parts wine mixture, were considered the most temperate blends; cf. Ath. X 426e: ἢ γὰρ δύο πρὸς πέντε πίνειν φασὶ δεῖν ἢ ἓνα πρὸς τρεῖς. See Wilkins *o.c.* 216-218.

4 οἶμαι, χρηστότητος οὔνεκα: Here Kassel discerned a change of speaker, who comments ironically upon the freedwoman's words. It is true that οἶμαι is sometimes used with some irony; e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 1111-1112: κομιεῖ τοῦτον σοφιστήν δεξιόν. / ὥχρὸν μὲν οὖν οἶμαί γε καὶ κακοδαίμονα. However, elsewhere οἶμαι seems to be more of a genuine comment, e.g. Ar. *Pax* 1286, *Av.* 75, Eupolis fr. 385, etc. Hence, it is not inevitable that the present remark is ironic; instead, it could be that the second speaker genuinely acknowledges the fact that the freedwoman is being rewarded for her virtue, cf. δι' ἀρετήν (l. 2); the repetition may be emphatic. Some support for Kassel's evaluation may be found in the phrase χρηστότητος οὔνεκα, which recurs three more times: in Timocles fr. 8.17, a dedicatory epigram of the mid-third century A.D. (χ.

εἴνεκεν, 953.1 Kaibel = *IG* II² 3767), and *Lib. Ep.* 1123.3 (χ. εἴνεκα). In Timocles' fragment the reference is to parasites and one might suggest that the remark is ironic. But with the context lost the tone remains ambiguous for us.

Whether ironical or not, the choice of this particular noun (*χρηστότης*) in our fragment may bear some further relation to the status of this woman as an ex-slave. Schulze (*Kleine Schriften* 420-421) shows that in Attic inscriptions the epithet *χρηστός*, -ή occurs exclusively when the person described as such either is a slave or was born as one.

5a βαπτίσας: *βαπτίζω* is used here metaphorically. The meaning is that the master gave the slave so much wine, that he got her completely drunk; cf. *LSJ* suppl. s.v. The image of someone being drenched in wine, as a means of expressing the status of drunkenness, is elsewhere also generated with either *βαπτίζω* or *βρέχω*; cf. Eubulus fr. 123.2 (*βεβρεγμένος ἦκω καὶ κεκωθωνισμένος*), *Pl. Smp.* 176b (*ῥαστώνην τινὰ τῆς πόσεως· καὶ γὰρ αὐτός εἰμι τῶν χθὲς βεβαπτισμένων*), *Anacreont.* fr. 6.4 Edmonds (*ἐβάπτισ' εἰς τὸν οἶνον*), *Ath.* V 221a (*βεβαπτίσθαι τε τῷ ἀκράτῳ*), etc.

5b ἐρρωμένως: *ἰσχυρῶς*, *εὐσθενῶς* (*Suda* ε 3066). Elsewhere this adverb is used with verbs such as *προβαίνω* (*Ar. V.* 230), *λοιδορῶ* (*Men. Ep.* 899), *ἔσθίω* (*Critias* fr. 32 DK), etc. In the present fragment it is innovatively used with reference to *βαπτίσας*, the point being that the master got the slave utterly drunk (see on previous note).

DIONYSIUS

Dionysius lived and flourished in the early second half of the fourth century B.C. He originated from the Greek town of Sinope in the Euxine Sea.¹ He won his first victory at the Lenaia between the years 339 and 332 B.C.; cf. *IG II*² 2325.153; Capps, *AJPh* 28 (1907) 188; *RE V* 1 s.v. Dionysios nr. 105.

Ἀκοντιζόμενος (fr. 1)

The title denotes a person *hit / wounded by a javelin* (ἀκόντιον). Antiphanes wrote an Ἀκοντιζομένη, and Naevius may have used Dionysius' play as a model for his *Acontizomenos*. If the present title is anything to go by, Dionysius' play probably dealt with an incident involving someone being hit and wounded by a javelin.² However, the context of such an accident remains unknown. It could be either athletics,³ hunting, or a war campaign. If I am correct below to recognise a link with Egypt, the latter possibility starts looking the most promising one. A good parallel is Anaxandrides fr. 40, which echoes the Satraps' revolt and the military support provided by the Athenian general Chabrias to the king of Egypt Tachos against the Persians in 360 B.C.⁴ (see Webster *SLGC* 40, and Millis *ad loc.*). It is a possibility that Dionysius' play too related to these events.⁵ If so, this is another instance where Middle Comedy retains the political interest of Old Comedy.⁶

The following fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIV 664d, who tells us that the speaker is a cook; this of course is obvious from the text itself (cf. ποιῶν).

¹ Alexis (cf. Arnott pp. 11-13), Apollodorus of Carystus, Diodorus, Philemon, etc. were also non-Athenians. See introduction to Amphis.

² See Konstantakos pp. 63-64 for plays with participial titles.

³ Cf. Antiphon's *Second Tetralogy*, and Plu. *Per.* 36.3.

⁴ See *PA* 15086; cf. D.S. 15.92.2ff., Plu. *Ages.* 37.

⁵ The fact that these events came earlier than Dionysius' prime (see introduction), should not detain us long. Timocles, a contemporary of Dionysius (cf. *IG II*² 2325.153), also parodies the Egyptian superstitions (fr. 1). It is possible that after the exploitation of the theme by both Anaxandrides (fr. 40) and Antiphanes (fr. 145), the satire of the Egyptians became a stock joke, which the comic playwrights felt free to re-use.

⁶ See General Introduction pp. 17-18.

Kassel-Austin mark lines 2 and 3 as *obscura*.⁷ Indeed, at first sight it is difficult to understand what the cook is talking about, since the symposion context makes a strange combination with the reference to a dead person. A possible means of resolution is offered by ancient evidence about an Egyptian custom. Allusions to Egyptian superstitions and generally to aspects of Egyptian culture that sounded paradoxical to the Athenians recur frequently and even acquire the dimensions of a topos within Middle Comedy; cf. Anaxandrides fr. 40, Antiphanes fr. 145, Timocles fr. 1. I would argue for a parallel case in the present fragment. It is my conviction that the cook refers to the Egyptian custom described at Hdt. 2.78, according to which at the end of a rich symposion, a wooden image of a corpse⁸ was carried around in a coffin, as a reminder to the banqueters of their mortality: ἐν δὲ τῆσι συνουσίησι τοῖσι εὐδαίμοσι αὐτῶν (i.e. the Egyptians), ἐπεὰν ἀπὸ δείπνου γένωνται, περιφέρει ἀνὴρ νεκρὸν ἐν σορῶ ξύλινον πεπονημένον ... δεικνύς δὲ ἐκάστῳ τῶν συμποτέων λέγει "Ἐς τοῦτον ὀρέων πῖνέ τε καὶ τέρπευ· ἔσσει γὰρ ἀποθανῶν τοιοῦτος." Plutarch (*Mor.* 148a-b, 357f) and Lucian (*Luct.* 21) also testify to the practise of this custom by the Egyptians; cf. Petr. *Sat.* 34. See Montet, *Everyday Life in Egypt in the Days of Ramesses the Great*, 98.

The following scenario is probable: the cook, satirising this Egyptian habit, is describing his own experiences; having been hired by some Egyptians in the past, he would sometimes present this image of a dead with a dish of food. He implies that it was very easy to mistake this statue for a living person, since it was placed among them, as if it were a real banqueter. Indeed, Lucian *l.c.* testifies that these images were not only carried around and exhibited to the banqueters, but they were also made actual guests at table: τὸν νεκρὸν σύνδειπνον καὶ συμπότην ἐποίησατο.⁹

The cook is being boastful,¹⁰ in a manner reminiscent of the Ambassador in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* 68-89; cf. Hdt. 1.133. Both the present cook and the Aristophanic Ambassador are reporting tall tales that are meant to sound quite

⁷ Cf. Giannini, *Acme* 13 (1960) 162.

⁸ Or a mummified body; cf. Luc. *Luct.* 21: ξηράνας τὸν νεκρὸν.

⁹ This procedure is perhaps parallel to the custom of *θεοξένια* (*lectisternium*), where gods were hosted at symposia. Reliefs and / or vase paintings of gods made the divine presence felt, and also a couch was reserved empty especially for the god hosted; cf. sch. 67c on Pi. *O.* 3. See Farnell on Pi. *O.* 3.1, and Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 107.

¹⁰ This is a typical trait of the cook-figure in Comedy; cf. General Introduction p. 19, and introduction to Dionysius fr. 2.

implausible to Greek ears. A parallel passage is Mnesimachus fr. 7 (see introduction *ad loc.*).

The cook is addressing either the audience or another comic character. Whatever the case, the pronoun *τούτοισι* does not necessarily mean that any Egyptians were present on stage (see further below).

Nevertheless, this is not the only possible interpretation of this fragment. Some further possibilities present themselves:

- i. The word *νεκρόν* could simply be a joke about someone who is lethargic or pale or skinny or stylistically frigid (if a writer), and who is therefore presented as dead. Cf. the case of Chairephon in Ar. *Nu.* 503-504: (Σω.) οὐδὲν διοίσεις Χαιρεφώντος τὴν φύσιν. / (Στ.) οἴμοι κακοδαίμων, ἡμιθνής γενήσομαι; cf. *ibid.* 103-104. See also the mockery against the frigidity of Theognis' style in Ar. *Th.* 170, and *Ach.* 138-140.
- ii. A feast at a funeral where the dead person is present might be another possibility, which however I consider less likely. We know that the *περίδειπνον*, i.e. the meal that marked the end of mourning, took place at home, not at the grave, after the dead had been buried.¹¹ Still, the fragment might refer to a region, presumably a non-Greek one, where the dead person is present while the mourners feast.

ὥστ' ἐνίστ' ἂν τούτοισι ποιῶν ματτύην
 σπεύδων ἄμ' εἰσήνεγκα διαμαρτῶν μίαν
 ἄκων περιφορὰν τῶν νεκρῶν ὡς τὸν νεκρόν

So that sometimes, while preparing a mattýê for these people,
 in my haste and by mistake, I brought in
 unintentionally a dish of dead to the dead

1a τούτοισι: The pronoun could refer to people who appeared on stage or simply to people already mentioned.¹² If these people were Egyptians (see introduction), I do not consider it necessary that they actually appeared on stage. What the pronoun does presumably is refer back to people previously identified by the speaker. Although

¹¹ See Kurtz & Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs*, 146; Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, I.306. Cf. Hegesippus fr. 1.11ff., *Men. Asp.* 233, *Id.* fr. 270.4.

¹² Cf. *LSJ* s.v. *οὔτος* C.

Meineke (III.181-182) suggests that the scene in Anaxandrides fr. 40 was probably preceded by the appearance of Egyptian ambassadors on stage, in the present fragment the situation seems different; the speaker refers to this event as happening in the past from time to time (*ἐνίοτε*). Cf. also Ar. *Nu.* 560, where *τούτοισι* refers to Aristophanes' rivals, who are not present on stage.¹³

As to the long (non-Attic) form *-οισι*, see on Aristophon fr. 12.3b.

1b ματτύην: This was a dessert dish. Most of what we know about it comes from the passages cited by Athenaeus XIV 662f-664f. According to Artemidorus, this was a common term that denoted any kind of rich delicacy (*κοινὸν πάντων ὄνομα τῶν πολυτελῶν ἐδεσμάτων*; ap. Ath. XIV 663d). It had no standard ingredients; instead, it could consist of any kind of food (fish, meat, poultry, vegetables, etc.). It was particularly distinguished for its spiciness, and was served as a dessert at the end of the main festive meal (*ἐπιδόρπισμα*; cf. Sophilus fr. 5.5). It was presumably of a Thessalian origin,¹⁴ and became popular in Athens possibly during the Macedonian domination.¹⁵ Cf. the thorough note of Arnott on Alexis fr. 208, and Gow on Macho fr. 19.463 (= fr. 1 K.-A.). The fact that this is a dessert dish served at the end of the dinner favours my interpretation, since it coincides with the time that the carrying of the corpse took place, that is towards the end of the banquet.

2a εἰσήμεγα: Unless Athenaeus is mistaken in identifying the speaker as a cook, not a servant, this line indicates that cooks not only cooked dishes, but at times could also lay the table and serve the courses. Athenaeus must be right, for there is also internal evidence that the speaker actually cooked the dish (cf. *ποιῶν*; l. 1). Similarly, in Sosipater fr. 1.45ff. a cook is expected to serve the food as well.

2b διαμαρτών: The cook mistakes the image of the dead for a living person.

¹³ Cf. Smyth §1241.

¹⁴ Pollux 6.70 records the variant reading *ματίλλη*, which he calls *Μακεδονικὸν εὔρεμα*; cf. Hsch. μ 412, and Macho fr. 1 K.-A.

¹⁵ If we accept Bentley's conjecture *ματτυλοικός* in Ar. *Nu.* 451 (cf. Dover *ad loc.*), it follows that *ματτύη* was already known in Athens during the fifth century.

2c μίαν: Above I translate *μίαν* as an indefinite article, “a dish”. Though not the commonest meaning, this is still a valid one; cf. *LSJ* s.v. 4.

3a ἄκων: This is a pleonasm, since the speaker has already stated that his gesture was unintentional (*διαμαρτών*).

3b περιφοράν: The present meaning of *περιφορά* is a relatively rare one; that is, a *course / dish, carried round* at a dinner table (cf. *LSJ* s.v.). Cf. Poll. 6.55: τὸ δὲ περιφέρεισθαι τὰς μερίδας περιφορὰν Ξενοφῶν ὠνόμασεν (*Cyr.* 2.2.4); cf. Id. 6.107, Ath. VII 275b, and Heraclid. Tarent. ap. Ath. III 120c (in plural). This is an ingenious pun between *περιφορά* the dish, and *περιφορά* the carrying of the dead.

3c τῶν νεκρῶν: These *corpses* are certainly not to be understood literally. I would argue that what this dish consists of is actually *fish*. Fishmongers were widely known for selling dead and decayed fish, and Comedy had already exploited the subject. In the following passage, we probably experience the same pun, with the words *τῶν νεκρῶν* denoting *fish*: (Ath. VI 225d-e) ὅτι δὲ καὶ νεκροὺς πωλοῦσι τοὺς ἰχθύς καὶ σεσηπότας ἐπισημαίνεται ὁ Ἀντιφάνης ἐν Μοιχοῖς (fr. 159) διὰ τούτων·

οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν θηρίον τῶν ἰχθύων
 ἀτυχέστερον· ...
 ...
 τοῖς ἰχθυοπώλαις τοῖς κακῶς ἀπολουμένοις
 σήπονθ', ἔωλοι κείμενοι δὺ' ἡμέρας
 ἢ τρεῖς. μόλις δ' ἔάν ποτ' ὠνητήν τυφλὸν
 λάβωσ', ἔδωκαν τῶν νεκρῶν ἀναίρεσιν
 τούτῳ· ...

3d ὡς τὸν νεκρὸν: The preposition *ὡς* is regularly used with verbs of motion, meaning *to*; cf. *LSJ* s.v. C.III. The meaning is that the cook, having mistaken the image of a dead for a living banqueter, passes him a dish. Here comes the pun, for this dish is a dish of *dead* (i.e. dead fish, see previous note), which the cook serves to the most appropriate recipient, the dead (the image of a dead person).

Θεσμοφόρος (fr. 2)

The title suggests that Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* could possibly be an antecedent; if so, there is no way to know what the plot / context resemblance was. The only surviving fragment is a long speech delivered by a proud cook, and does not seem to correspond in any way to the title.

Θεσμοφόρος was a cult epithet mainly of Demeter, but it could also apply to Dionysus and perhaps to Hestia; cf. D.S. 1.14.4, *RE* VI A1 s.v. *Thesmophoros*. The Scholiast of Lucian makes an interesting equation between the festivals of *Thesmophoria* and *Arrephoria*: *Θεσμοφόρια ... τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ Ἀρρητοφόρια καλεῖται* (275.23-276.13 Rabe). Deubner (*Attische Feste*, 41ff.) agrees with Robert (*Hermes* 20 [1885] 370ff.) that the Scholiast does regard these festivals as two different ones, but what he meant by this equation was probably that these festivals (along with *Σκιροφόρια*) shared similar rituals and parallel ways of performance. This structural similarity makes *Thesmophoria* and *Arrephoria* look much alike in their basic format. Despite the claims of Lucian's Scholiast (276.25-28 Rabe) that the *thesmoi* denoted the laws (*νόμους*) laid down by Demeter, modern scholars¹⁶ have repeatedly argued in favour of the hypothesis that the term *thesmoi* must have also meant – at least within the context of the festival of *Thesmophoria* – the miscellaneous objects that women threw into pits (*μέγαρα*), and then retrieved and carried to the altars of Demeter and Persephone (these included piglets, models of snakes and of male genitalia, etc.).¹⁷

The similarity suggested by the ancient Scholiast and accepted by the modern scholars between the *Thesmophoria* and the *Arrephoria* opens the possibility that here the term *θεσμοφόρος* denoted the woman who carried the *thesmoi*, just as *ἀρρηφόρος*¹⁸ referred to the young maiden who, during the festival of *Arrephoria*, carried the *sacra* from the Acropolis down to the sanctuary of *Aphrodite in the Gardens* (Paus. 1.27.3). Such a use for *θεσμοφόρος* may have simply not survived in our sources. In favour of my hypothesis tells the fact that an isolated cult epithet is unparalleled for a comic play's title. Judging from the available evidence, the title of plays that seem to have

¹⁶ See Deubner *o.c.* 44, 40ff.; Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians*, 84.

¹⁷ For further on the festival of *Thesmophoria* see Deubner *o.c.* 50-60; Parke, *o.c.* 82-88; Brumfield, *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and their Relation to the Agricultural Year*, 70-103; Burkert *o.c.* 242-246.

¹⁸ Parker notes that the early term was *ἐρρηφόρος* (*Athenian Religion*, 271, n. 66).

dealt with a particular god consists of either the god's name alone or the god's name along with a supplement; cf. Ehippus' Ἄρτεμις, Philemo's Απόλλων, Aristomenes' Διόνυσος ἀσκητής, Antiphanes' Ἀφροδίτης γοναί, Plato's Ζεὺς κακούμενος, etc. There are also some play-titles that look like interesting parallels to the present one; these are titles that denote a female related to religion: Ἰέρεια by Apollodorus (either Gelous or Carystius), Θεοφορουμένη and Ἰέρεια by Menander.¹⁹ Further support to my argument comes from the Calendar Frieze (cf. Deubner *o.c.* 248-256, pl. 34-40). On this frieze the festival of Thesmophoria is represented by a woman carrying a basket on her head (pl. 35, no. 4). Deubner calls this figure a “θεσμοφόρος oder ἀντλήτρια” (*o.c.* 250).

Despite the preference for participial titles for plays based on festivals (Aristophanes' Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι, Philippides' Ἀδωνιάζουσαι, Timocles' Διονυσιάζουσαι), it should be stressed that such titles are tendencies, not rules, and it does not follow that Dionysius was bound to follow the same pattern. In fact, the title Θεσμοφόρος, as referring to a female participant of the festival, could indeed reflect Dionysius' desire to remind the audience of Aristophanes' title, while varying it.

On balance, I suggest that the title of the present play was not meant to signify Demeter (or even less Dionysus or Hestia), but rather a woman carrying the *thesmoi* at the Thesmophoria.

In the fragment below, cited by Athenaeus IX 404e-405d, the speaker is an arrogant cook. The cook figure is a recurring stereotype of Middle Comedy. The professional cooks were freemen,²⁰ who were normally hired on special occasions.²¹ However, there were others – of servile status – who were permanently attached to a particular household.²² One of their tasks was to preside over sacrifices, and their role grew to be regarded as quasi-sacral;²³ this may well explain their pompous nature in

¹⁹ Cf. Gomme & Sandbach *ad loc.* See also Arnott on Alexis' Θεοφόρητος.

²⁰ Rankin argues convincingly against Athenaeus' claim (XIV 658f) that Posidippus' plays featured cooks of servile status (*The Role of the ΜΑΓΕΙΠΟΙ in the Life of the Ancient Greeks*, 21).

²¹ This could be a private occasion (cf. Posidippus fr. 1), or a public festivity (cf. Ath. IV 172f of the sacred rites in Delos; see Rankin *o.c.* chap. vii).

²² See Berthiaume, *Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 70 (1982) 74-76.

²³ Cf. Ath. XIV 659b, 660a, and also IV 172f sqq. (quoting Apollodorus 244 F 151 *FGrH*). In Men. *Kol.* fr. 1 a cook undertakes the duties of a priest. And the cook in Men. *Dysc.* 646 boasts: ἱεροπρεπής πῶς ἐστὶν ἡμῶν ἢ τέχνη (cf. Gomme & Sandbach *ad loc.*). For the procedure followed in case of a sacrificial feast, see Blake on Men. *Dysc.* 548-549. Cf. Berthiaume *o.c.* 17-43.

Comedy. However, they did not escape sharp mockery on the grounds of stealing the sacrificial meat (cf. Euphro fr. 1). Generally, the presentation of cooks in Comedy features certain recurrent patterns; e.g. enlisting their shopping (Alexis fr. 115), instructing their assistants (Antiphanes fr. 221), boasting (Alexis fr. 177, Posidippus fr. 28).²⁴

The cook of the present fragment engages in a forensic analysis of the essence of the cookery art. His interlocutor is a certain Simias (on his identity see on l. 1). The opening of his speech looks like a response to a private tip-off about the identity of an expected guest, who is described as someone with a cultivated palate, with much experience of good dinners, and who will therefore be a discerning and demanding guest. This awaited guest could be an ambassador, a returning soldier, a friend who travelled the world and tried all kinds of delicacies, etc.;²⁵ the possibilities are many, but we have no way of knowing the answer. Although the surviving fragment is long enough, the plot of the play remains highly elusive; for the hire of a cook to prepare a dinner is a self-contained pattern, an independent unit, which would fit in literally any kind of plot featuring a case for celebration.

The speaker, being a professional cook himself, targets the lower-status relish-makers (*ὄψοποιοί*), whom he describes as nearly amateurs. The case is parallel, he says, to the difference between a general and a mere leader. A proper chef like him should always be well aware in advance of some vital information; that is, the identity of both the host and the guests, the place and the time of the dinner.²⁶

Below we have a preparation for a feast. Aristophanes uses regularly the motif of (sacrificial) feast toward the end of his plays; cf. *Ach.* 1085ff., *Pax* 1016ff., *V.* 1299ff. This motif occurs occasionally in Menander too; cf. the end of *Dyscolus* where Getas and Sikon try to persuade Knemon to join the wedding celebrations. This is yet another piece of evidence of both the internal continuity and the coherence of the comic genre.

*σφόδρα μοι κεχάρισαι, Σιμία, νῆ τοὺς θεούς,
ταυτὶ προείπας· τὸν μάγειρον εἰδέναι*

²⁴ See General Introduction p. 19.

²⁵ A feast to entertain a person coming from abroad constitutes a recurring motif in Roman Comedy; cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 768-900.

²⁶ The cook in Diphilus fr. 17, 18 and 42 has similar concerns.

- πολύ δεῖ γὰρ αἰεὶ πρότερον οἷς μέλλει ποιεῖν
τὸ δεῖπνον ἢ τὸ δεῖπνον ἐγχειρεῖν ποιεῖν.
- 5 ἂν μὲν γὰρ ἔν τις τοῦτ' ἐπιβλέψῃ μόνον,
τοῦψον ποιῆσαι κατὰ τρόπον πῶς δεῖ, τίνα
τρόπον παραδεῖναι δ' ἢ πότ' ἢ πῶςσκευάσαι
<ὑ> μὴ προῖδῆται τοῦτο μηδὲ φροντίσῃ,
οὐκέτι μάγειρος, ὄψοποιός ἐστι δέ.
- 10 οὐ ταῦτό δ' ἐστι τοῦτο, πολὺ διήλλαχεν.
<ὡς γὰρ> στρατηγὸς πᾶς καλεῖθ' ὅς ἂν λάβῃ
δύναμιν, ὁ μέντοι δυνάμενος κἂν πράγμασιν
ἀναστραφῆναι καὶ διαβλέψαι τί που
στρατηγός ἐστιν, ἡγεμὼν δὲ θάτερον,
- 15 οὕτως ἐφ' ἡμῶν σκευάσαι μὲν ἢ τεμεῖν
ἠδύσμαθ' ἐψῆσαί τε καὶ φυσαῖν τὸ πῦρ
ὁ τυχεῶν δύναται ἅν' ὄψοποιός οὖν μόνον
ἐστὶν ὁ τοιοῦτος, ὁ δὲ μάγειρος ἄλλο τι.
συνιδεῖν τόπον, ὥραν, τὸν καλοῦντα, τὸν πάλιν
- 20 δειπνοῦντα, πότε δεῖ καὶ τίν' ἰχθὺν ἀγοράσαι,
ὑ — ὁ — ὑ πάντα μὲν λήψει σχεδὸν
αἰεὶ γὰρ οὐκ αἰεὶ δὲ τὴν τούτων χάριν
ἔχεις ὁμοίαν οὐδ' ἴσην τὴν ἡδονήν.
Ἄρχεστρατος γέγραφέ τε καὶ δοξάζεται
- 25 παρὰ τισιν οὕτως ὡς λέγων τι χρήσιμον.
τὰ πολλὰ δ' ἠγνόηκε καὶδὲ ἐν λέγει.
μὴ πάντ' ἄκουε μηδὲ πάντα μάνθανε
τῶν βιβλίων· ἐστ' ἐνίοτε τὰ γεγραμμένα
κενὰ μᾶλλον ἔτι τῶν οὐδέπω γεγραμμένων·
- 30 οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν περὶ μαγειρικῆς, ἐπεὶ
εἴπ' ἀρτίως < >
ἔρον γὰρ οὐκ ἔσχηκεν οὐδὲ κύριον
αὐτῆ δ' ἑαυτῆς ἐστὶ δεσπότης. ἐὰν δ'
εὔ μὲν σὺ χρῆσῃ τῇ τέχνῃ, τὸν τῆς τέχνης
35 καιρὸν δ' ἀπολέσῃς, παραπόλωλεν ἡ τέχνη.
(Σι.) ἄνθρωπε, μέγας εἶ. (Α.) τουτονὶ δ', ὃν ἀρτίως
ἔφησ' ἔχοντα πείραν ἤκειν πολυτελεῶν
πολλῶν τε δεῖπνων, ἐπιλαθῆσθαι, Σιμίαι,

πάντων ποιήσω, θεῖον ἂν δείξω μόνον
 40 παραθῶ <τε> δεῖπνον ὅσον αὔρας Ἀττικῆς.
 ἐξ ἀντλίας ἤκοντα καὶ γέμοντ' ἔτι
 φορητικῶν μοι βρωμάτων κἀγωνίας
 τῆμῃ ποιήσω νυστάσαι παροψίδι

8 init. δεῖ, Meineke ap. Dind.: ἂν Edmonds 11 <ὡς γὰρ> στρ. Kock, Madvig *Adv.* III p. 64: στρ. A:
 13 τί που Mus.: τι ποῦ A: τὸ πᾶν Bothe: 21 <οὐ τοῦ τυχόντος> suppl. Dobree: <μόνος πέφυκεν> Kock: <εἶ
 οἶδε· ταύτᾳ> Richards p. 88 28 obelion posuerunt K.-A.: τῶν βιαίων A: τῶν βιβλίων Valck. (teste
 Peppink *Obs.* p. 59), Madvig: τῶν ἡλιθίων Emperius p. 349: <ᾶ> τῶν ἰδιωτῶν Meineke (ᾶ addiderat
 Villebrune; ᾶ τῶν βεβήλων Nauck *Phil.* 6 [1851] 420) ἔστ' ἐνίοτε τὰ γεγραμμένα Madvig: ἔστ' ἐνίοτε τὰ
 γεγρ. Iacobi ap. Meineke V I p. 93: ἐστ' ἐνεκα τὰ γεγραμμένα A 29 obelion posuerunt K.-A.: ἢ ὅτε ἦν
 οὐδέπω γεγραμμένα A: κενὰ μᾶλλον ἔτι τῶν οὐδέπω γεγραμμένων· Iacobi: ἔστιν ἢ οὐδ. γεγρ. Meineke ed.
 min. 32 obelion posuerunt K.-A.: οὐ ὁ καιρὸς A: οὐδὲ κύριον Meineke: οὐδ' ὁ κύριος Dindorf (ὁ κύριος iam
 Schweigh.) 42 κἀγωνίας Fritzsche 1857/58 p. 8: ἀγωνιαίς A (ἀγωνίαις K.-A.): -ας Meineke *Men. et*
Phil. p. xvii ("possis etiam -ai"): ἀηδίας Herw. *Mnem.* 19 (1891) 210: καὶ ναυτίας Blaydes *Adv.* II p.
 173 νυστάσαι A: ποπύσαι "vel aliquid eiusmodi" Kock

- You have done me a great favour, Simias, by the gods,
 by warning me on this very issue; for the cook must always
 know for whom is about to prepare the dinner well in advance
 before he undertakes preparing the dinner.
- 5 If one concentrates only at this one aspect,
 how he should prepare the dish duly,
 but he neither takes thought of nor is concerned about
 how he should serve it up, or when, or how to dress it,
 then he is no longer a cook, but rather a relish-maker.
- 10 This is not the same thing, it is far different.
 For just like everyone can be called a general, if he receives
 authority, but only he who is able to rally even in
 difficulties, and see clearly some [strategem/way/means] somehow
 is a general, whereas the other is a leader,
- 15 likewise, concerning our profession, any chance person could
 prepare some food, carve, boil sauces,
 and blow the fire; only that such a person is a relish-maker,
 while the cook is something different;

this is knowing well the place, the season, the host, and again
 20 the guest, when and which fish to buy,
 for you can get everything nearly
 always; but not always will you get the same delight
 from these (dishes) nor the equal pleasure.
 Archestratus has written on this subject and is held in honour
 25 by some people so much, as if he was saying anything useful.
 Instead, he is ignorant of most things, and speaks nonsense.
 Neither do listen to everything, nor do learn everything that is written
 in the books; sometimes what has been written down
 is even more void than what has not yet been written.
 30 No, you can't talk about cookery, for
 recently said
 For cookery has experienced no limits and no authority,
 but is the master of itself. If now
 you carry on the art well, but you miss
 35 the critical time of it, the art perishes along.
 (Sim.) Man, you are great! (A.) And as for that one, who,
 as you said, has just arrived having experience of many
 and costly banquets, I will make him forget them all,
 Simias, if only I display a stuffed fig leaf,
 40 and serve up a dinner smelling Attic scent.
 Coming to me from the bilge, and still full
 of cargo ship provisions and fretfulness,
 I will leave him gaping in surprise with my side-dish

ἰα Σμῖα: The name Simias seems to have been reserved for slaves. A slave with this name is mentioned in Plautus' *Pseudolus* (act IV).²⁷ A certain Simias is also mentioned in Men. *Epit.* 630, and Webster (*SM* 36) convincingly argues that this character too must have been a slave.²⁸ Likewise, in the present fragment Simias is probably not the master himself, not only because of his name, but also because he is

²⁷ Of course, it is possible that Plautus simply copied a slave's name that he found in Menander.

²⁸ The cook Simias in Men. fr. 409.5 could be a freedman (cf. crit. app. *ad loc.*).

presented as a rather naïve figure, who is easily impressed by the braggadocio of the cook (cf. l. 36). But there is a number of other possibilities regarding his identity. He could be the cook's either assistant or pupil, or else a household slave. It has been observed that a scene presenting a conversation between the cook and the hirer – or the hirer's slave(s) –, as they first enter the hirer's house is a topos in Middle and New Comedy.²⁹ Accordingly, Simias could be the slave of the master who hired the cook. If the cook is responding to a tip-off (cf. introduction to the play), this would suggest indeed a household slave.³⁰

1b νή τούς θεούς: This oath constitutes the third metron of the iambic trimeter, and provides a convenient ending to the line. Indeed, its occurrence at line-end is not uncommon; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 1272, Heniochus fr. 4.1, Men. *Dysc.* 592, etc. For the word-order of oaths in general, see Dover *CQ* 35 n.s. (1985) 328ff.

2 προείπας: Second aorist stem *εἶπ-* combines with first aorist termination *-ας* to form the participle *εἶπας*. Despite being long used in non-comic texts, it occurs only two more times in Comedy: Demonicus fr. 1.3 and Philemo fr. 43.3. See Lautensach, *Die Aoriste bei den attischen Tragikern und Komikern*, 112-113.

3 γάρ: The normal position of *γάρ* in a clause is the second. However, here it occupies the sixth position, while in l. 22 *γάρ* is the last word of the clause. In Comedy, and particularly in Middle and New, the postponement of *γάρ* becomes a common phenomenon; cf. Antiphanes fr. 210.7, Diphilus fr. 60.3, Men. *Dysc.* 332, etc. See Dover *o.c.* 338-339 for a fuller list, and also Denniston *GP* 95-98.

3 ff.: The style of these lines is particularly elaborate. The cook is setting himself up as a guru of the cookery art. He employs a pompous style and seeks to establish himself as an erudite and a big expert in this field. His language is so exact, and the terms that he uses are so specific, that one could perhaps argue that they recall the passion of the sophist Prodicus for *ὀρθότητα ὀνομάτων* and *ὀρθόπειαν*, i.e. the use of

²⁹ Cf. Alexis fr. 177 (with Arnott *ad loc.*), Men. *Dysc.* 393ff., and Dohm, *Mageiros*, 137ff.

³⁰ For friendly relations between cook and slave see Men. *Epit. init.*

accurate words.³¹ It is not surprising that a comic poet makes one of his characters speak like a sophist (all the more that it is a character claiming to be an expert), for the sophists' style had a great impact on a number of authors.³²

7a παραδεῖναι: παρατίθειμι is the standard verb normally used with reference to food serving. It appears already in Homer with this meaning; e.g. *Il.* 23.810, *Od.* 1.192 (cf. *LSJ* s.v. 1b). In Comedy it occurs as early as Epicharmus (fr. 158.4); cf. *Ar. Ec.* 675, Pherecrates fr. 125, Aristophon fr. 9.8, etc. See also the thorough notes by Olson on *Ar. Ach.* 85, and by Arnott on Alexis fr. 98.2.

7b πότε': For the sense of the right time see on l. 35.

7c σκευάσαι: In food contexts the verb σκευάζω has the technical meaning of *preparing* or *dressing* the food (cf. *LSJ* s.v.); cf. *Ar. Eq.* 53, Alexis fr. 153.6, Philemo fr. 82.2, etc.

8 <ῦ> ... φροντίση: As to the first syllable, I prefer Edmonds' suggestion (ᾶν) to Meineke's (δει). The former not only corresponds to l. 5, but also introduces the hypothesis of l. 8, whereas the latter refers back to σκευάσαι and supplies the text with a second, semantically unnecessary, δεῖ (there is already one in l. 6). Instead of ᾶν, one could perhaps suggest καῶν, which I consider better, since it gives a connective.

The verb φροντίζω takes here the accusative. Priscianus (*Inst. Gramm.* 18.305) testifies to the multiple syntax possibilities of this verb in the Attic dialect; with genitive, accusative, or with prepositions. However, with the current meaning (i.e. *to be concerned about*) accusative is less frequent (see *LSJ* s.v. II.2); cf. Eupolis fr. 386.3, Cratinus fr. 355, Men. fr. 241.

9 μάγειρος - ὄψοποιός: The speaker rates the status of a professional chef far above that of a simple cook. He shows a certain contempt towards the latter, as if he was an amateur, without any knowledge at all about the cookery art. This terminological

³¹ Cf. *Pl. Cra.* 384b. See Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, III.205 n. 2, 274-280.

³² Even Cleon's speech in *Th.* 3.37-40 features the influence of the sophists; cf. Guthrie *o.c.* III.273-274.

distinction reflects a competitive spirit that is reminiscent yet again of the sophistic tradition (see on ll. 3ff.).

The distinction probably reflects actual hierarchies that existed in fourth century Athens. There were various categories of cooking related personnel, each one charged with different duties regarding the preparation of a dinner; e.g. *ἄρτοκόπος* (Hdt. 9.82), *ἄρτοποιός* (X. Cyr. 5.5.39), *σιτοποιός* (Pl. Grg. 517d), *τραπεζοποιός* (Antiphanes fr. 150), etc. Plato (R. 373c) distinguishes between a *μάγειρος* and an *ὄψοποιός*. In Comedy the mutual denigration among the different categories constitutes a recurring motif; e.g. Men. *Dysc.* 647.³³

It appears that the *ὄψοποιός* was the person charged with cooking / preparing the *ὄψα*, i.e. the fish.³⁴ This is exactly the task that Alexis assigns to him: *τὸν ὄψοποιὸν σκευάσαι χρηστῶς μόνον / δεῖ τοῦψον, ἄλλο δ' οὐδέν* (fr. 153.6-7; cf. Arnott *ad loc.*). However, a note of caution is in order, for “in ordinary life the demarcations were not strictly drawn” (Arnott p. 313), and the two terms, *μάγειρος* and *ὄψοποιός*, could be employed interchangeably; cf. Poll. 7.26. See further Berthiaume *o.c.* 76-77, Arnott’s introduction to Alexis’ *Κράτεια*, and his commentary on Alexis fr. 140.15-16.

ΙΟ διήλλαχεν: The verb *διαλλάσσω* is used here absolutely. The active pluperfect is scarcely used; it occurs rarely and only in later texts; e.g. Posidonius fr. 127.4 Theiler, D.S. 33.28b.4, etc. Its usage by Dionysius in the present passage seems to be the earliest surviving testimony of the form.

ΙΙ <ὡς γάρ> ... στρατηγός: This is a *σύγκρισις* / *comparatio*³⁵ between a general and a cook. The focus is placed on the extra abilities that constitute the defining attributes of both a real general and a real cook (as opposed to a leader and a relish-maker respectively). The use of military terms with reference to cooks recurs in Dionysius fr. 3, where the cook and his assistant are presented as if they were about to invade an enemy terrain (cf. on Dionysius fr. 3.16). In the present passage a cook is remarkably paralleled to a general.³⁶ The major comic precedents are the duo of Dicaeopolis and

³³ See fuller list in Arnott p. 314.

³⁴ Though not exclusively fish; cf. on Mnesimachus fr. 7.3.

³⁵ Cf. McKeown’s introduction to Ovid *Am.* 1.9.

³⁶ This tells in favour of my interpretation of Dionysius fr. 3.

Lamachus in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (ll. 1095-end). Fragment 7 of Mnesimachus constitutes another example of this pattern (weapons stand for foodstuffs at a soldiers' banquet; see comm. *ad loc.*). A similar idea re-emerges in Horace *Sat.* 2.8.73-74, while in Ovid's *Amores* 1.9 a soldier is paralleled not to a cook, but to a lover (l. 1: "militat omnis amans").

As to the beginning of line 11, many conjectures have been made; cf. crit. app. Above I followed Kassel-Austin in adopting the reading *ὡς γάρ*. The obvious alternative *οὐ γάρ* is less likely, for it takes away from the text the necessary *ὡς*, which is needed to correspond to the following *οὕτως*.

12 *πράγμασιν*: Gulick (on Ath. *ad loc.*) translates it as *trouble*. However, the political context of ll. 11-14 can equally allow for the meaning *state-affairs* (cf. *LSJ* s.v. *πρᾶγμα* III.2). Besides, this is the normal sense of the word in parallel cases; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 130, Archippus fr. 14, Isocr. 4.121, etc.

13 *διαβλέψαι τί που*: *To see / perceive something (some potential, some opportunities) somewhere*. This reading is Musurus' suggestion, as an alternative to *τι ποῦ* preserved by codex A; cf. crit. app. However, despite giving a satisfying meaning and being palaeographically close to the manuscript, *τί που* is very rare and not used in this way.³⁷ Therefore, one is led to suspect that the corruption in the manuscript may be deeper. An alternative solution could be Bothe's suggestion *τὸ πᾶν*,³⁸ which sounds as a more fitting supplement of *διαβλέψαι*, as it helps to round up the eulogy of the genuine general, i.e. "he is able to perceive everything". This reading is also supported by the comprehensiveness of ll. 18ff. that refer to the cook. The analogy between the real general and the proper cook having been established, here we get another similarity between the two; i.e. they both try to take account of and have control over everything that relates to their jobs. Cf. Arist. *Insomn.* 462a 13: *πάμπαν διαβλέπουσιν*.

³⁷ Although it is not uncommon for *που* to be the last word of the line, its attachment to *τί* is extremely rare. In fact, the phrase *τί που* occurs only twice more, in Ar. *Nu.* 1260 and *Av.* 442, where however the usage is different. For the usual usage of *που* see Denniston *GP* 493-495.

³⁸ *Poetarum Comiorum Graecorum Fragmenta, ad loc.*

Professor Carey suggested to me an alternative conjecture; i.e. *διαβλέψαι τόπον*. This reading stays palaeographically close to the manuscript, while at the same time creates a nice correspondence with the upcoming reference to the cook's ability to get to know the place (*τόπον* – l. 19, see *ad loc.*), where a symposium is about to take place. The real general is the one who knows the battlefield, the real cook is the one who knows the dinner space.

On balance, I am inclined to follow Musurus' reading, as presenting a satisfactory sense while remaining as close as possible to the manuscript tradition.

14 στρατηγός ... ἡγεμών: Here the speaker distinguishes between a general and a leader. Within the reality of the Athenian polis these two titles are distinct from each other, but they also overlap. A *στρατηγός* is automatically a *ἡγεμών*, but a *ἡγεμών* is not automatically a *στρατηγός*. For the latter is an Athenian institution, a formal title conferred to particular individuals following elections. All that a *ἡγεμών* is authorised to do is to lead the army, whereas this is merely one of the duties of a *στρατηγός*, among his many others; cf. on Amphis fr. 30.1. The speaker of this fragment acknowledges a greater esteem to the status of the general. However, elsewhere the distinction between a general and a leader is not always clearly defined (just like the distinction between a cook and a relish-maker; cf. on l. 9). There are passages where the differentiation is clearly drawn (e.g. X. *Cyr.* 5.3.47 *ὁ δὲ στρατηγός ... οὐκ εἴσοιτο τῶν ὑφ' ἑαυτῷ ἡγεμόνων τὰ ὀνόματα*; D.S. 13.88.8 *οἱ στρατηγοὶ μετὰ τῶν ἐφ' ἡγεμονίας τεταγμένων διέγνωσαν ἐξετάσαι*), but there are also other passages where a *στρατηγός* is also called *ἡγεμών*, i.e. the two titles are attributed to the same person, presumably for emphasis (e.g. X. *Cyr.* 6.2.9 *ἡγεμών καὶ στρατηγός πάντων*; Hdt. 7.158 *στρατηγός τε καὶ ἡγεμών τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔσομαι πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον*; Plu. *Alc.* 26.4 *δυνάμειωσ τηλικαύτης ἀποδείξασιν ἡγεμόνα καὶ στρατηγόν*).

In general, pressing near synonyms at the cost of forcing the distinction is not foreign to this kind of semantic play, and has its roots in the sophistic movement in the fifth century, especially Prodicus; see Guthrie, *The Sophists*, 275-277, 333-340. Cf. Cleon's distinction between *ἐπανίστημι* and *ἀφίστημι* in Th. 3.39.2.

16 ἡδύσμαθ': This was a common appellation for a wide range of seasonings and condiments. Most of them are mentioned by Alexis fr. 132 and 179 (cf. Arnott *ad*

loc.). Erotian tells us that *ἡδύσματα* was a particularly Attic word referring to *χλωροῖς καὶ ξηροῖς ἀρτύμασι* (74.H.4 Nachmanson). Indeed, in plural the word normally means *spices* (cf. sch. on Ar. *Eq.* 678), or *aromatic herbs* (cf. Ar. *V.* 496). However, here *ἡδύσματα* is the object to *ἐψῆσαι*; therefore the sense seems better, if we understand *ἡδύσματα* as either *sauces* or *relishes*, i.e. items that can be subject to the action of *cooking*.³⁹

17-18 ὁ τυχῶν ... μάγειρος: The speaker gives an example of an easy piece of work that any given person with a little experience in cookery could carry out. Only that this person does not deserve to be called a *cook*, but simply a *relish-maker*. A parallel thought is expressed by the speaker in Nicomachus fr. 1.8-11. In both cases, there follows an example of what it takes to be a real cook.

19 συνιδεῖν τόπον, ὥραν: The speaker names what constitutes for him the *sine qua non* of a proper cook. This is some basic / preliminary knowledge regarding an upcoming dinner. Here we could perhaps notice the development of a parallel between the required skills of both a general and a cook. Just like the general must be able to throw himself into the political arena (*κἂν πράγμασιν ἀναστραφῆναι*), and have a sharp instinct of the future (*διαβλέψαι τι πού*), the cook must be aware of some essential technicalities, indispensable for his own profession, such as the place and the time of the dinner, the temper and the taste of both the host and the guests, etc.

It is interesting that the cook resembles not only a general, as this fragment suggests, but a doctor too. The introduction to [Hp.] *Aër.* stresses the importance of both the season and the place for a doctor (e.g. seasons' peculiarities, various winds, properties of the waters, and how these combine and interact with reference to a particular place). A second point of convergence between the comic and the medical text is that both the cook and the doctor should acquire *in advance* this vital information, so that they can cope effectively with the given situation; cf. [Hp.] *Aër.* 2 *ταῦτα πρότερον εἰδὼς προφροντίση...* ~ present fragment ll. 2-4.

The term *τόπον* apparently denotes the location where the symposium is taking place. It is essential for a considerate cook to know in advance the place, so that he can familiarise himself with the house and the room layout, make the most of the

³⁹ Though not usual, this meaning is not unknown; cf. X. *Mem.* 3.14.5.

facilities and the space available to him, etc. A talented cook is one who is able to adapt the area to his needs, in order to serve the guests in the best possible way. The location matters for a general too. Location in military terms translates into both topography and suitability of a terrain for battle. A competent general / cook is someone who handles these issues efficiently.

Additionally, just like the model doctor above in [Hp.] *Aër.*, the real cook too must be well aware of the *ῥα*. That is, it is important for a cook to know how the seasons affect foods, what foods are particularly suitable for each season, etc. For a general *ῥα* does not simply have the notion of season, i.e. knowing the appropriate time of year for military endeavours; most importantly an efficient general should be able to discern the right time for engaging into military action.

19-20 τὸν καλοῦντα ... ἀγοράσαι: It is crucial for a cook to know who the host and the guests will be; it is also vital that he makes the right purchases of foodstuffs, so that he tailors the dinner to the needs and the taste of the participants, as well as to the requirements of his hirer.

The concept of caring about and the need to know the identity of the prospective recipients of a cook's services is highly reminiscent of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, where the orator thinks carefully about the nature of his audience, chooses the right style, etc. The concern about the potential audience is present throughout *Rhetoric*; cf. esp. 1356a, 1357a, 1409b, 1415b, 1419a, etc.

21 \bar{u} – \cup – \bar{u} : For possible supplements see crit. app. There is no objective way to choose between them.

21-22: Kock suggested that the meaning of *λήψει* should be “emere poteris”. Although this is a possible interpretation, I think that *λήψει* here can also mean *to get*, and in particular *to be served*. The speaker seems to say “a guest can be presented with practically the same dishes everywhere, only that the taste and quality vary depending on the cook who prepared them”. The meaning of *τούτων* is subsequently dependent upon how we understand *λήψει*. In Kock's interpretation *τούτων* refers to the purchases, whereas according to my hypothesis *τούτων* should stand for the different kind of dishes.

22 χάριν: Here the word has the meaning of delight that derives from food and feasting; it is the pleasure that one is supposed to get from the various dishes (τούτων – objective genitive). Cf. Ar. *Lys.* 868-9 ... τοῖς δὲ σιτίοις / χάριν οὐδεμίαν οἶδ' ἐσθίων, Pi. *O.* 7.5 συμποσίου τε χάριν; cf. *LSJ* s.v.

23 ἡδονή: Just like the case with χάρις above, ἡδονή too denotes here specifically the pleasure / gratification derived from food; cf. Pl. *R.* 389e: περὶ ἐδωδᾶς ἡδονῶν.

24 Ἀρχέστρατος: The cook is very dismissive of Archestratus, and the whole passage testifies to fierce rivalry. Archestratus was a mid fourth century poet, originating from Gela. He was considered a culinary authority, and enjoyed a great reputation. He was known as ὁ τῶν ὀψοφάγων Ἡσίοδος ἢ Θεόγνις (Ath. VII 310a). He wrote a cookery poem in hexameters, which was known by more than one titles; *Γαστρονομία*, *Ἡδυπάθεια*, *Δειπνολογία*, *Ὀψοποιία* (cf. Ath. I 4e, IV 162b, III 104f, etc.). This poem was supposed to be a gastronomic trip around the world, but in essence it parodied a number of culinary treatises and authors. Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* is our single source for the some sixty surviving fragments from this work. We now have two modern editions of Archestratus' fragments, both with a comprehensive introduction and a commentary; one by J. Wilkins & S. Hill, *Archestratus: The Life of Luxury*, Totnes 1994, and the most recent one by S. D. Olson & A. Sens, *Archestratos of Gela: Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE*, Oxford & New York 2000. See also Dalby, *Siren Feasts*, 116-121; *RE* III s.v. Archestratos nr. 16.

25 παρά τισιν: Here the pronoun is dismissive; the cook disagrees with the views of other people, who have a high regard for Archestratus. He may be referring to other cooks, culinary authors, or even to non-experts. For using τις in a bad sense and in allusions see *LSJ* s.v. A.3, and Smyth §1267.

26α τὰ πολλά: Gomme & Sandbach (on Men. *Dysc.* 333) wonder whether this phrase could be adverbial in Dionysius too, as it definitely is in Men. *Dysc.* 334, as well as in Anaxandrides fr. 35.8, and Eupolis fr. 172.4. Although Kassel-Austin support the adverbial usage in the present fragment, we get a better sense if we take τὰ πολλά as

object to ἡγνόηκε. This interpretation gives a nice contrast with the second half of the line κούδ' ἐν λέγει; i.e. “he ignores *most things*, and says *nothing*”.

26b κούδ' ἐν λέγει: This is an idiomatic phrase that means *to speak nonsense*; cf. Ar. *V.* 75, *Th.* 625, Antiphanes fr. 122.3, etc.; see *LSJ* s.v. λέγω (B) III.6.

28: Here I adopted Madvig’s reconstruction for the whole line (*Adversaria* III.64); cf. crit. app. The basic advantage of this reading is that it eases the syntax; βιβλίων stands as a partitive genitive to πάντα, which is the object of μάνασθε (l. 27). This makes good sense as a piece of advice (“don’t learn everything that is in the books”). Besides, as a concept it refers back to l. 24, where we have the dismissal of both Arcestratus and his writings. Accordingly, in ll. 28-29 there comes a stronger recommendation against all written material.⁴⁰

29: For this line I have adopted Jacoby’s suggestion; cf. crit. app. The manuscript’s reading is unsatisfying, for it is unmetrical and has a hiatus (ἦ ὄτε).⁴¹ Meineke’s conjecture also produces a hiatus.

The cook, starting from Arcestratus’ treatise, generalises and subsequently rejects all written material for being void and less trustworthy than the orally transmitted wisdom. Similar feelings are expressed by another cook in Sotades fr. 1.34-35, who arrogantly declares that he does not need to consult anything written in order to excel in his profession ... τοῦτ’ ἔσθ’ ἢ τέχνη, / οὐκ ἐξ ἀπογραφῆς οὐδὲ δι’ ὑπομνημάτων.

This enmity towards writing is not just another caprice of the typically arrogant cook figure. These comic lines allude to a contemporary debate about the usefulness of writing, its effects on people and society, etc. One major representative of this debate is Plato, who in the *Seventh Letter* makes the case against writing.⁴² Plato fears that one’s credos may get *badly stated* (γεγραμμένα κακῶς, o.c. 341d), and finally end up muddled up because of the envy and the stupidity of the ignorant public

⁴⁰ The alternative readings define the supposed authors of the γεγραμμένα; i.e. the violent (βιαιῶν), the stupid (ἡλιθίων), those with no professional knowledge (ιδιωτῶν), the impure (βεβήλων).

⁴¹ Hiatus after ἦ is common elsewhere but not in Comedy; cf. West, *Introduction to Greek Metre*, 16.

⁴² Cf. on Amphis fr. 6.3a.

(344c). The other major attack on writing comes from Alcidamas' speech *Περὶ τῶν τοῦς γραπτῶν λόγους γραφόντων ἢ Περὶ σοφιστῶν*, where he presents a number of arguments against writing, with particular reference to the rhetoric art.⁴³ Within this debate the written material is always contrasted to the oral speech.

30: Cookery cannot be taught; it is not a theoretical discipline. It is an art that can be mastered only by practising. Any attempt to write it down would destroy it. There is a certain solemnity in the way the cook speaks about the big and complicated art that cookery is. Cookery for him is as indefinable, as it is fine and noble; it is like a mystery that one cannot describe, but only experience (see introduction to the fragment).

It is interesting to observe how in a different context Socrates in Plato's *Gorgias* uses the notion of cookery⁴⁴ for his own purposes, i.e. in his attack against rhetoric and the sophists (462d-465e). Unlike the speaker of Dionysius' fragment, Socrates denies cookery the title of *τέχνη*, and instead he prefers to use the terms *ἐμπειρία* and *τριβή* (463b). He considers both cookery and rhetoric to be forms of *κολακεία*,⁴⁵ the former with reference to the body and the latter to the soul (*ἀντίστροφον ὀψοποιίας ἐν ψυχῇ, ὡς ἐκεῖνο [i.e. ῥητορικῆ] ἐν σώματι*, 465d), in the sense that they are each a spurious counterpart of a real *τέχνη*, that is of medicine and justice respectively. Cookery and rhetoric are not a *τέχνη*, but an *ἄλογον πρᾶγμα* (465a).

31: There have been no other suggestions as to what might have stood in the lacuna, apart from Kaibel who thought that it must have been the name of an author ("alius aliquis artis auctor nominatus fuerit"). This sounds reasonable enough, and it is possible that Arcestratus was mentioned again. But apart from the name of Arcestratus more syllables are needed to fill in the lacuna, and we cannot be sure as to what these other words were.

32 οὐδὲ κύριον: The manuscript has *οὐδὲ ὁ καιρός*, which is unmetrical and gives no sense. The following line (l. 33 *αὐτὴ δ' ἑαυτῆς ἐστὶ δεσπότης*) appears to demand either

⁴³ Cf. e.g. §§3, 10, 15, 34-35.

⁴⁴ Though Socrates, instead of *μαγειρικῆ*, uses the terms *ὀψοποιία* and *ὀψοποιική*.

⁴⁵ For a translation wider than a simple *flattery* see Dodds on 463b1.

Meineke's conjecture (οὐδέ κύριον) or that of Dindorf (οὐδ' ὁ κύριος), the meaning being that the cookery art "knows no master" / "cannot be mastered comprehensively by anyone". This continues the attack against Arcestratus' treatise (l. 24), keeps in line with the cook's view that the cookery art cannot be put into words nor explained (l. 30), and also coheres with the first half of l. 32 ὄρον γὰρ οὐκ ἔσχηκεν.

33 δ': The elision at line-end (ἐπισυναλοιφή) is a rare phenomenon. Van Leeuwen (on Ar. Ra. 298) has a list of parallel cases (elisions of δέ, τε, με) in both Aristophanes and Sophocles; e.g. Ar. Av. 1716, S. Ant. 1031, etc. See also Maas, *Greek Metre*, §139.

35 καιρόν: Knowing how to handle time, i.e. when to serve the courses and when to remove them, is crucial for a cook (cf. πότ', l. 7). The right timing appears to be quintessential, not only for the present cook, but also for the cook in both Alexis fr. 153.7ff. (cf. Arnott's introduction *ad loc.*), and Sosipater fr. 1.48ff. However, there is a major difference here. That is, the cook in both Dionysius and Sosipater refers to a cook's own ability of time-management, i.e. how to serve the courses at the right time adapting himself to the guests' pace.⁴⁶ On the other hand, the cook in Alexis' fragment refers to the guests' punctuality, i.e. how *they* can contribute to a successful dinner by arriving on time, so that the cook does not need either to reheat the food or hasten up the cooking.

36 μέγας εἶ: The phrase recurs in Euphro fr. 1.30, and is extended to μέγας εἶ τεχνίτης in Hegesippus fr. 1.28. In the latter case, it is apparently said rather ironically, for it triggers off the anger of the addressee (a boastful cook), cf. ll. 28-30. In the present passage one cannot be sure about the tone of this expression. It is possible that Simias is really astounded by the erudite cook, rather than being ironical. This is the first time that he interrupts him, and after this the cook continues his braggadocio and does not seem to have been offended by Simias' remark, unlike the cook in Hegesippus *l.c.*

38 Σιμία: This is the second time that Simias is mentioned by name within less than forty lines. This is not uncommon; in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* the slave Xanthias is called by Dicaeopolis twice by name, in ll. 243 and 259. In the *Knights* Demos is

⁴⁶ Cf. Sosipater *l.c.* l. 50 πότε δεῖ πυκνότερον ἐπαγαγεῖν καὶ πότε βιάδην.

addressed by Paphlagon three times by name within some forty lines, in ll. 732, 747, and 773. The same goes for Menander; in *Dyscolus* Sostratos is called by Chaireas twice by name, in ll. 51 and 57, and then again in l. 127.

39 *Θρίον*: An Athenian delicacy. It was a mixture of lard, semolina, milk, cheese, and egg-yolk, wrapped in fig-leaves, and boiled in honey (cf. sch. on Ar. *Ach.* 1101, on *Ra.* 134,⁴⁷ and on *Eq.* 954). The cooking method is described by the Scholiast on Ar. *Eq.* 954; cf. Neil *ad loc.*, and Olson on *Ach. l.c.* It must have been considered an indulgence, as far as one can judge from the testimonies of two fourth century historians; cf. Clitarchus 137 F 1 *FGrH*: μικρόψυχοι ἦσαν καὶ περὶ τὴν τροφήν λίχνοι, παρασκευάζοντες ἐν τοῖς δεῖπνοις θρία καὶ ἐψητούς ... and Dioscurides 594 F 8 *FGrH*: οὐ θρία καὶ κανδύλην ... μελίπηκτά τε τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἐξαιρετα παρατίθησιν Ὅμηρος, ἀλλ' ἀφ' ὧν εὖ ἔξειν ἔμελλον τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν. See also *Suda* and Hsch. s.v. *θρία*, and Poll. 6.57.⁴⁸

40 *ὄζον αὔρας Ἀττικῆς*: For the present meaning of *αὔρα* as *scent*, see Antiphanes fr. 216.22, and Pearson on S. fr. 314.89 *TGF*. The speaker uses a metaphor to emphasise how typically Attic will be the dinner that he is going to prepare. However, *Attic breeze* is not a definite, but a highly elusive smell. This phenomenon recurs in Ar. *Nu.* 50-52: ὄζων περιουσίας, / ἢ δ' αὖ ... / δαπάνης, λαφυγμοῦ; Dover *ad loc.* speaks of “smells” by association. The fact that the dinner will be particularly *Attic* suggests that the new-comer is a foreigner, either a non-Attic or even a non-Greek. Nevertheless, Attic meals generally enjoyed a bad reputation for consisting of poor quality foods, being served in tiny portions. In Comedy Attic dinners are repeatedly ridiculed and treated with contempt; cf. Lynceus fr. 1, Eubulus fr. 9, 11 (see Hunter *ad loc.*), Alexis fr. 216 (see Arnott *ad loc.*), etc. But since the cook in the present fragment is so openly bragging about the dinner he is about to prepare, one would assume that this is going to be quite an exceptional dinner, far above the Attic

⁴⁷ The scholia on *Ach.* and *Ra.* mention a variation of this titbit consisting of brain.

⁴⁸ Elsewhere *θρίον* might have an obscene *double entendre*; cf. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* 61, 113, 118.

standards. A similarly outstanding – yet Attic – dinner is the one described in Matro's *Attic Dinner-Party* (ap. Ath. IV 134d-137c).⁴⁹

41-42 ἀντλίας ... φορτηγικῶν βρωμάτων: According to the scholia on Ar. *Eq.* 434, ἀντλία is τόπος τις τοῦ πλοίου εἰς ὃν τὸ ὕδωρ σωρεύεται εἰς τὴν ναῦν (cf. sch. on *Pax* 17). See Carey *CQ* 32 n.s. (1982) 465-466. The meaning is that the expected guest is coming straight from a ship, with the foul smell of bilge, and has been eating ship's rations, but he will now be treated to the cuisine of a master.

The phrase φορτηγικῶν βρωμάτων is a *hapax* that denotes the provisions used in freight ships. Elsewhere the adjective φορτηγικός applies only to ships (πλοῖα φορτηγικά); its occurrences are only the following: Th. 6.88.9, X. *HG* 5.1.21, and Poll. 1.83. See *LSJ* s.v. φορτηγικός.

42 κάγωνίας: Unease and apprehension are understandable and expected feelings after a ship trip. The reading was suggested by Fritzsche; cf. crit. app. The reason I preferred this one is because it gives the most meaningful sense, while staying palaeographically close to the manuscripts (ἀγωνίας). Besides, the genitive suits the text from a syntactical point of view as well; ἀγωνίας is object to γέμοντ', and is paratactically connected to βρωμάτων that is also object to γέμοντ'.

43a νυστάσαι: The sense is metaphorical. The meaning is not that the guest will get bored and fall asleep at the sight of the entrée, but rather that he will be so much satisfied, that he will be left gaping in surprise, his mouth wide open, as if yawning. Kock suggested ποπύσαι (cf. crit. app.); i.e. smacking his lips. In either case (νυστάσαι or ποπύσαι) the infinitive is designed to convey the guest's wonder at the perfection of the dish.

43b παροψίδι: The ancient lexicographers disagree about the meaning of παροψίς, i.e. whether it denotes solely a spicy side-dish (Phryn. *PS* 103.10) or also the plate on which such a dish was served (Ath. IX 367b). In the present fragment it is quite obvious that the meaning is *side-dish*, rather than anything else. Athenaeus overtly

⁴⁹ See the introduction in Olson & Sens' edition of the text (*Matro of Pytine and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE*).

champions the additional sense of a plate, but Arnott (on Alexis fr. 89) shows that he is mistaken; the word has the meaning of *side-dish* in all the comic fragments that Athenaeus cites in IX 367b-368c. Along with Athenaeus, Pollux (10.87-88), Hesychius (λ 571) and Photius (π 399.22) acknowledge the meaning of plate as well. But Phrynichus condemns twice this usage (*Ecl.* 147 F. and *PS* 103.10).

Ὁμώνυμοι (fr. 3)

Though the evidence from this fragment is not very helpful, one can conjecture that the play might have turned on confusion of identity arising from similarity of name.⁵⁰ Antiphanes too wrote a play called *Ὁμώνυμοι*, but the content of the single surviving fragment is not informative enough about the play's plot. The possibility of any similarities (of plot, subject, heroes, etc.) between the two plays cannot be further explored.⁵¹

What emerges in this fragment of Dionysius is the figure of the pilferer cook.⁵² This aspect of cooks is a recurring comic topos, with which other comic poets have also dealt. In *Euphro* fr. 1 a cook boasts for having invented the art of pilferage (l. 14: *εἶδρον τὸ κλέπτειν πρῶτος*). In *Euphro* fr. 9 a cook scolds his disciple for failing to distinguish when stealing is strongly recommended and when it is not. In Menander's *Aspis* 228-231 a cook is so vexed at his assistant's incompetence to steal that he compares him to the just Aristides (cf. Austin *ad loc.*). The opportunity to carry meat out of the house without being caught is what a cook in Posidippus fr. 2 considers as great luck. As to the Latin comedy, Plautus points to the pilfering habit of the cooks in various instances, e.g. *Aul.* 321-322, *Pseud.* 790-791, *Merc.* 741-746, etc.

The fragment is a conversation between a cook and his pupil / assistant, as they are heading for a banquet, for which they have been apparently hired. Such a

⁵⁰ Similar confusion of identity also features in Plautus' *Menaechmi*.

⁵¹ It appears that the issue of homonymity received some interest in antiquity. There have existed a certain work, now lost, called *Περὶ Ὁμωνύμων Ποιητῶν τε καὶ Συγγραφέων*, by Demetrius of Magnesia (*FHG* iv 382). Diogenes Laertius refers many times to this work, and also ends several of his *Lives* with a section of *homonymoi*; cf. 1.38, 1.79, 8.84, etc. See Mejer, *Hermes Einzelschr.* H. 40 (1978), 38-39. Other authors also refer sporadically to this work; e.g. Ath. XIII 611b. See *RE* s.v. Demetrios nr. 79.

⁵² On cooks see introduction to Dionysius fr. 2, and General Introduction p. 19.

preliminary dialogue, usually between the cook and the hirer, constitutes a recurring motif in Comedy.⁵³ As they walk, the cook gives his disciple some last minute instructions about subtle stealing. The mention of the booty seller / doorkeeper allows the hypothesis that the latter is already visible, and that the couple is about to enter the house.

Within Athenaeus' text the fragment is quoted by the cook and is introduced with the following words: *τὴν δ' ἐξαίρεσιν, ὦ καλέ μου Οὐλπινέ, Διονύσιος ὁ κωμωδιοποιὸς ἐν τοῖς Ὀμωνύμοις τῷ δράματι οὕτως εἴρηκε ποιήσας τινὰ μάγειρον πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς διαλεγόμενον* (IX 381d). Although we hear of *μαθητὰς* (plural), the person who speaks in the fragment addresses a single person, Dromon. This oddity allows for two possible explanations:

- i) This could be a mistake of Athenaeus.⁵⁴
- ii) It is possible that the cook had indeed many disciples with him, whom he addressed one by one giving different instructions and assigning different tasks to each one of them. From this series of speeches Athenaeus, despite having in mind the wider context (hence the plural), preserves only one, and this is the address to Dromon, which seems to have been the last one, given that at the end master and pupil make their way into the house. In favour of this interpretation tells a scene from Plautus' *Pseudolus*. This is ll. 157-229, where a pimp first addresses his slaves one by one allotting them various tasks, and then calls his prostitutes each one by her name, and assigns to them different responsibilities.⁵⁵

ἄγε δὴ Δρόμων νῦν, εἴ τι κομψὸν ἢ σοφὸν
 ἢ γλαφυρὸν οἶσθα τῶν σεαυτοῦ πραγμάτων,
 φανερὸν ποιήσον τοῦτο τῷ διδασκάλῳ.
 νῦν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς τέχνης αἰτῶ σ' ἐγώ.
 5 εἰς πολεμίαν ἄγω σε· θαρρῶν κατὰτρεχε.
 ἀριθμῶ διδῶσι τὰ κρέα καὶ τηροῦσί σε·

⁵³ See on Dionysius fr. 2.1a.

⁵⁴ Mistakes are not an unusual phenomenon within the text of Athenaeus. There are several cases where Athenaeus cites passages that are tangential to his purpose; cf. III 99f (Cratinus fr. 149), III 105f-106a (Anaxandrides fr. 28, 38, and Eubulus fr. 110), and IX 381d (Dionysius fr. 3). See Oellacher, *WS* 38 (1916) 152-153.

⁵⁵ See Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, 144ff.

τακερὰ ποιήσας ταῦτα καὶ ζέσας σφόδρα
 τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν, ὡς λέγω σοι, σύγχεον.
 ἰχθὺς ἀδρὸς πάρεστι· τάντός ἐστι σά.
 10 καὶν τέμαχος ἐκκλίνης τι, καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ σόν,
 ἕως ἂν ἔνδον ὤμεν· ὅταν ἔξω δ', ἐμόν.
 ἐξαιρέσεις καὶ τᾶλλα τὰκόλουθ' ὅσα
 οὔτ' ἀριθμὸν οὔτ' ἔλεγχον ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν ἔχει,
 περικόμματος δὲ τάξιν ἢ θέσιν φέρει,
 15 εἰς αὔριον σε κάμῃ ταῦτ' εὐφρανάτω.
 λαφυροπώλη παντάπασι μεταδίδου,
 τὴν πάροδον ἴν' ἔχῃς τῶν θυρῶν εὐνουστέραν.
 τί δεῖ λέγειν με πολλὰ πρὸς συνειδότα;
 ἐμὸς εἶ μαθητής, σὸς δ' ἐγὼ διδάσκαλος.
 20 μέμνησο τῶνδε καὶ βιάδιζε δεῦρ' ἅμα

16 λαφυροπώλη A: τὰ λάφυρα· πυλωρῶ Emperius *Opusc.* p. 160: “velut τῶ δ' αὖ θυρωρῶ” Kaibel: λάφυρα·
 κωλῆς Kock

Come on now, Dromon, if you have any smart or clever
 or subtle knowledge of your own profession,
 reveal it to your teacher.

Now I am asking from you a proof of your skill.

- 5 I am driving you into enemy territory; charge in with courage!
 They give you the meat pieces, all counted, and they are watching you.
 After tenderising and giving them a good hard boil,
 mix up their numbers, as I tell you.
 There it is a huge fish. The insides are yours.
- 10 And if you embezzle any slice, this is also yours,
 as long as we are inside; but once outside, it's mine.
 As to entrails and associated bits, which
 by nature can be neither counted nor checked,
 but have the state and status of trimmings,
- 15 let us both of us cheer on them tomorrow.
 As to the booty seller, you should absolutely favour him with a share,
 in order to get a more benevolent exit out of the doors.

- But why do I need to expatiate before an expert?
 You are my true disciple, and I am your teacher.
 20 Keep these in mind and walk hither with me.

τ Δρόμων: According to Athenaeus IX 381c, the person addressed here with this name is one of the cook's pupils. Kock (II.425) believes that Δρόμων is the cook himself, addressed by the doorkeeper of the house. However, the evidence favours Athenaeus' claim. This name occurs quite often throughout Comedy and comic texts in general, and is mostly assigned either to a slave⁵⁶ or to a cook's pupil / assistant. In Menander's *Sicyonius* Δρόμων is clearly a slave; actually, a slave born and grown up in the house, cf. l. 78: [οἰ]κότριψ Δρόμων. In Euangelus fr. 1 Δρόμων must be the cook's boy, since he is addressed by the cook himself as παῖ Δρόμων (l. 8). In Lucian's *DMeretr.* 10 the figure of Δρόμων seems to be a slave, since he is sent to deliver a letter to the courtesan on behalf of his master (§2). Another slave must also be meant under this name in *DMeretr.* 12.3. As far as Latin Comedy is concerned, the name of Dromo appears in Terence's *Andria*, *Heauton Timorumenos* and *Adelphoe* as a slave's name. This is also the case in Plautus' *Aulularia* (cf. l. 398). Outside Comedy too Δρόμων appears as a slave's name in D.L. 5.63. There is only one single instance where Δρόμων is a noble figure; in Euphro fr. 9 the name exceptionally belongs to a nouveau-riche (so Gulick *ad loc.* in Ath. IX 377d).

The fact that Dromon is named by the master cook might be revealing of further plot elements. There are two possible explanations; either this scene came early in the play, and the characters need to be introduced to the audience by their names (cf. *V.* 1, *Pax* 190), or this is the first entry of these two persons, so again the spectators need to be informed of their identity (cf. *Ach.* 575).

ζ γλαφυρόν: Cf. *Suda* γ 283: ἠδύ, κοῖλον, βαθύ, σοφόν, ἔμπειρον, ἀκριβές, λαμπρόν. The meaning of κοῖλον is particularly eminent in epic texts; cf. *Il.* 2.454, 8.180, Hes. *Th.* 297, etc. In the present fragment, the adjective acquires one of its metaphorical meanings; it denotes something *subtle* and *exact* (see *LSJ* s.v. III). van Leeuwen (on *Ar. Av.* 1272) argues that this is how the adjective starts being used in Attic informal

⁵⁶ Not surprisingly, both because slaves run on errands and because the running slave is himself a comic stereotype (cf. Men. *Dysc.* 81, Ter. *Heauton.* 37, etc.).

speech from approximately that period onwards (i.e. 414 B.C.). Though this is the usual meaning assigned to *γλαφυρός* in a number of later texts (cf. Anaxippus fr. 1.35, Machon fr. 15.237, Luc. *Symp.* 15.5), it seems that this change in meaning is not catholic among the later authors; e.g. Epigenes in fr. 4 speaks of *hollowed cups*.

5a πολεμίαν: This is a military term, normally used within a military context. The epithet here stands substantively, and the noun to be understood is *χώραν*,⁵⁷ cf. X. *An.* 4.7.19, *Cyr.* 3.3.10, D.S. *Bibl.* 18.47.2, etc. Concerning the use of this epithet in Comedy, the antecedents would be Ar. *Ach.* 820-918, and, to a lesser extent, *V.* 1161-1163. The present use of this term conveys a strong impression of an alert military spirit.

5b κατάτρεχε: *κατατρέχω* is another military term; cf. *Suda* κ 831 *κατατρεχόντων: ληϊζομένων, πορθούντων*.⁵⁸ It is rather rare in Comedy; it reappears only twice: Ar. *Ec.* 961-962 (*καὶ σύ μοι καταδραμοῦ/σα τὴν θύραν ἄνοιξον*), and Men. *Sam.* 38 (*ἐξ ἀγροῦ δὴ καταδραμών*). Nevertheless, in the present fragment the verb has its literal warfare connotations of charge and attack – with an added, of course, comic flavour. On the contrary, in both Aristophanes and Menander the meaning is simply that of *running down*. As a military term the verb is used a fair number of times mainly, but not exclusively, in historic texts; e.g. Hdt. 7.219 (*οἱ ἡμεροσκόποι καταδραμόντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἄκρων*), Th. 2.94.3 (*καταδραμόντες τῆς Σαλαμῖνος τὰ πολλά*), X. *Cyr.* 6.3.9, Luc. *Alex.* 2, D.C. *Hist. Rom.* 22.74.1, etc.

6, 9, 12, 16: ἀριθμῶ διδάσσι ... ἰχθὺς ἀδρός ... ἐξαιρέσεις καὶ τᾶλλα ... λαφυροπώλη: The beginnings of these lines create an asyndeton. Here we get four unities, each one dealing with a different subject (i.e. meat, fish, guts, booty merchant), without having any connective among them. Apart from the evident *grammatical* asyndeton, one could also speak of a *rhetorical* asyndeton (cf. Smyth §2165), since both liveliness and rapidity particularly characterise the cook's speech (cf. on l. 16 about the possibility of gesturing).

⁵⁷ Or perhaps *πόλιν*, cf. X. *Cyr.* 1.6.43.

⁵⁸ Cf. *Suda* κ 832, Hsch. δ 2042.

8 ὡς λέγω σοι: “As I am telling you to do”. Here the verb λέγω bears apparently the meaning of κελεύω. This is an instruction to the pupil to confuse the numbers of the meat portions. The tense could be either a frequentative or a simple present. In the former case it would indicate that this instruction is regularly delivered by the master to the disciple, possibly every time they are hired for a dinner. In the latter case the instruction would apply particularly to the present occasion. There is a close parallel to this phrase, S. Ph. 107: δόλω λαβόντα γ', ὡς ἐγὼ λέγω. It is interesting that in Sophocles too the instruction relates to a trick, as it is the case in the fragment of Dionysius.

12 ἐξαιρέσεις: This is the very word for which Athenaeus cites the whole passage. According to *LSJ*, its primary meaning is “taking out the entrails of victims”, cf. Hdt. 2.40 (ἐξαιρέσεις τῶν ἱρῶν). It also means extraction of several other things, e.g. weapons (cf. Gal. 2.283 Kühn: βελῶν ἐξαιρέσεις), a baby (cf. Hp. Mul. I-III.249: ἐξαιρέσεις τοῦ ἐμβρύου), teeth (cf. Paul. Aeg. Epit. Med. 6.28t: Περὶ ἐξαιρέσεως ὀδόντων), etc. Nevertheless, in the present fragment ἐξαιρέσεις denotes the offal, the entrails themselves, and not the act of extracting them. In other words, Dionysius here employs the word with an extremely rare meaning, which recurs only once more, in Men. fr. 539: ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνδρακα ἐξαιρέσεις ῥιπτοῦντες.⁵⁹ This must be the reason why the cook is at great pains to convince the banqueters about the correctness of the word that he uses (Ath. IX 381b). In order to justify himself for assigning such a meaning to the ἐξαιρέσεις, he cites Dionysius as an authority. It is worth noticing that in both Athenaeus and Dionysius the speaker is a cook. Perhaps we are meant to see this as obscurantist, or as an encoded term meant to be understood only by those who share the same profession. There is generally a tendency for cooks to be rather self-important and self-satisfied. Menander’s cook in *Dyscolus* constitutes a brilliant example on this aspect; his pompousness reaches its climax in ll. 644-645: οὐδὲ εἷς / μάγειρον ἀδικήσας ἀθῶος διέφυγεν; cf. ll. 398-399.

⁵⁹ For two possible interpretations of this fragment see Tsantsanoglou, *New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius*, 135.

14a περικόμματος: This is the trimmings of meat; cf. sch. on Ar. *Eq.* 372: *περικόμματα τὰ ἐκ τῶν μαγειρῶν περιαιρούμενα τῶν κρεῶν ... ὡς μάγειρος δὲ λέγει*. See also sch. on Ar. *Eq.* 770. For the Latin equivalent “minutal”, see Juvenal *Sat.* XIV 129.

14b τάξιν ἢ θέσιν: These two words appear rather frequently together (in conjunction rather than in disjunction as here) in philosophical texts, mathematical treatises and the like, in what seems to have been a scientific (in its widest sense) *terminus technicus*; e.g. D.L. 10.48: *σώζουσα τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ στερεμνίου θέσιν καὶ τάξιν τῶν ἀτόμων*, Plu. 927d, Ptol. *Alm.* vol. 1.2, p. 211.16-17 Heiberg, Alex. Aphr. *In Metaph.* p. 427.20 Hayduck, etc. The unexpected transfer of such a term into a comic context clearly aims to further raise laughter.

16 λαφυροπώλη: The occurrence of the term *booty seller* within a comic fragment that deals with food and the trickeries of house-servants seems, at first sight, to be completely out of context. The booty-dealers were public officials, who followed the army in expeditions and were responsible for the selling of the spoils, while the income was directed into the public treasury;⁶⁰ cf. Poll. 1.174: *λάφυρα συναθροῖσαι. οἱ δὲ ταῦτα πιπράσκοντες, λαφυροπῶλαι*. This is the only occurrence of the term in Comedy. Outside Comedy the word is used in any sort of texts that relate somehow with war; from X. *An.* 7.7.56 to Polyæn. *Strateg.* 6.1.7.⁶¹

In the present fragment, Kaibel proposed reading *τῷ δ' αὖ θυρωρῷ* (cf. crit. app.). This is reasonable in itself, since the meaning is in harmony with the context. If Athenaeus is right in recognising a cook teaching his pupil, the meaning makes perfect sense: the cook, being aware of the weaknesses of the doorkeeper, instructs his pupil to give him a share straightaway. Further support for Kaibel's reading is supplied by the words *τῶν θυρῶν* of the next line. But *δ' αὖ* seems to be problematic, since it interrupts the asyndeton (see on l. 6). Emperius' suggestion *τὰ λάφυρα· πυλωρῷ* is rather implausible. The doorkeeper is described as *πυλωρός*, which is mainly an epic term for the gatekeeper of a wall; cf. *Il.* 21.530 (of the Trojan wall) and 24.681 (of the Achaean wall). Instead, Kaibel's *θυρωρός* is a more suitable term for a

⁶⁰ For a thorough discussion see Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, I, 90-92.

⁶¹ For further references see Pritchett *l.c.*

household doorkeeper; cf. A. *Ch.* 565 (referring to Agamemnon's house), Pl. *Phlb.* 62c (referring metaphorically to a house), Luc. *DMeretr.* 12.3, etc.

Since none of the suggested solutions so far is entirely satisfying, I would like to explore the possibility of retaining *λαφυροπώλη*, as preserved in codex A. In this fragment there are four terms that create the impression of a military atmosphere: *πολεμίαν*, *κατάτρεχε*, *λαφυροπώλη*, and *πάροδον* (see on l. 17).⁶² A legitimate assumption would be that the cook and his disciple conceive the house that they are about to enter as a hostile territory. They imagine that they are about to *invade* (*κατάτρεχε*) the enemy's *terrain* (*πολεμίαν*), and then bribe the *booty seller* (*λαφυροπώλη*), so that they get a potential ally, who will provide them with a secure *pass* (*πάροδον*) outside.⁶³ In fact, if they are at the door, the reference could be accompanied by a gesture. If my interpretation is correct, then out of the military connotations of this passage we get a comic presentation of the cooks as raiders.

17 πάροδον: This is a term that can also bear a military meaning. It can denote a "narrow entrance or approach, mountain-pass" (*LSJ* s.v. II), and therefore it usually (but not exclusively) occurs with such a meaning in military accounts; e.g. Th. 3.21.3, X. *HG* 6.5.51, D.S. 17.67.5, etc. If we ascribe this meaning to the present use of *πάροδος*, then the interpretation that I suggested above (see on l. 16) becomes even more plausible, and even more exciting. As if there were soldiers guarding a strategic passage, the raiders / cooks bribe the booty seller, in order to pass through this passing without being caught.

18 λέγειν με πολλά πρὸς συνειδῶτα: Saving words before someone aware of the facts or someone capable of acting as recommended is a pattern of speech, which reappears in Th. 2.36.4 (*μακρηγορεῖν ἐν εἰδόσιν*) and 4.59.2 (*ἐν εἰδόσι μακρηγοροίη*); cf. also 2.43.1. The same structure occurs in later authors, e.g. Herodian *Ab exc. divi Marci* 5.1.2 (*ἐν εἰδόσι ... περιττὸν νομίζω μακρηγορεῖν*), and Cyril of Alexandria *Comm. in XII Proph. Min.* 1.426 (*ἐν εἰδόσι μακρηγορεῖν*). One could trace the beginnings of this speech

⁶² Two of these terms are found together in a real military context, D.S. *Bibl.* 37.16.1: *τὴν πολεμίαν χώραν κατέτρεχε*.

⁶³ The metaphorical use of the word *λαφυροπώλη* is made clear by the following *θυρῶν*.

pattern back to *Od.* 13.296-297 (*ἀλλ' ἄγε μηκέτι ταῦτα λεγόμεθα, εἰδότες ἄμφω / κέρδε*).

19 *ἐμὸς εἶ μαθητής*: The tone is again self-satisfied. This phrase reappears in Euphro fr. 9.11. An interesting parallel is the comic adesp. fr. 1073, featuring a cook speaking. The cooks of either fragment raise a couple of similar points: firstly, the trickery about the number of meat pieces (fr. 1073.5-6: *ἀπηρίθμησάν μοι κρέα· / ἐποίησ' ἐλάττω ταῦτα, τὸν ἀριθμὸν δ' ἴσα*; cf. Dion. fr. 3.6-8); secondly, how they keep for themselves the inner parts of the fish (fr. 1073.10-11: *ἰχθὺν ἀπέδωκ' αὐτοῖσι, τὴν δὲ κοιλίαν / ἐμέρισ' ἐμαυτῶ*; cf. Dion. fr. 3.9-10). See also adesp. fr. 1093.225-229.

20 *μέμνησο τῶνδε*: The urge of the cook to his pupil to keep in mind and stick to his trickery instructions recurs in Posidippus fr. 28.24: *μέμνησο καὶ σὺ τοῦτο*. Cf. also Mnesimachus fr. 4.21: *μέμνησ' ἃ λέγω, πρόσεχ' οἷς φράζω* (cf. *ad loc.*).

MNESIMACHUS

Mnesimachus is mentioned by *Suda* (μ 1164) as a Middle Comedy poet; cf. *IG* II² 2325.147. As with most Athenian playwrights of the classical period, nothing is known of his background or biography. His first Lenaian victory must have occurred between the years 365 and 359 B.C.¹ The middle of the fourth century looks like the most likely date for his play *Ἰπποτρόφος* (cf. on fr. 4.7), but evidence from his play *Φίλιππος* allows us to infer with some certainty that he continued writing after 346 B.C. (cf. introduction *ad loc.*). See *RE* XV.2 s.v. *Mnesimachos* nr. 2.

Δύσκολος (fr. 3)

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus VIII 359c-d, who informs us that the speaker is the *bad-tempered* man of the title.

In the scene below we have an uncle and a nephew (cf. l. 3). The fact that the uncle is paying for his nephew's expenses leads us to assume that the uncle must be the adoptive father of the youth. It is possible that the uncle was a childless old man, who adopted one of his brother's sons, in order to prevent the extinction of his *οἶκος*.² In Terence's *Adelphoi* we are presented with a parallel situation; Micio is the adoptive father of his nephew Aischinus. While Aischinus greatly resembles the youth of this fragment in being indulgent and immoderate, Micio is the exact opposite of the present uncle; Micio is happy to provide plentifully for Aischinus' extravagant lifestyle, whereas the present uncle is a miser.

In the fragment below the uncle complains about the costly lifestyle of his spendthrift nephew, for which he, the uncle, has to pay. So he asks his nephew to use at least the diminutive form of words when asking for things, so that he can fool himself with the idea that the expenses are lesser. However, we do not know how extravagant the young man really is. The obvious assumption is that he is a real spendthrift (it is important that fish, l. 5, is an item particularly associated with luxury). The possibility remains that he is frugal and moderate, and the old man simply overreacting. In fact, his response in ll. 3-4 suggests that he is being moderate

¹ So Capps *AJPh* 28 (1907) 188.

² On adoption see MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*, 99-101; Rubinstein, *Adoption in IV. Century Athens*, *passim* – esp. 68-86.

and that the excess (i.e. excessive frugality) is on the part of the uncle. Since they are talking about foodstuffs and about cost, it is possible that they are preparing to entertain. If so, the young man could be trying to socialise the old man; cf., though with a different kind of character, Philocleon and Bdelycleon in Aristophanes' *Wasps* (ll. 1122-1264), or the vigorous attempts to make Knemon join the party in Menander's *Dyscolus* (ll. 932-end).

It is possible that Mnesimachus' present play influenced Menander in the composition of his own *Dyscolus*; this grumpy uncle seems to be an ancestor of Knemon. The figure of the misanthrope is a recurring one within Greek literature; cf. Phrynichus' *Μονότροπος* (especially fr. 19, 20). See further Ireland on Men. *Dysc.* pp. 14-15. However, Mnesimachus' cantankerous man is stingy above all, whereas Knemon's bad temper relates to his solitary lifestyle and his obsession with self-sufficiency (ll. 713-714). Of course, Mnesimachus' character may have had other aspects too, which simply are not present in this single surviving fragment. If my suggestions in the preceding paragraph are right, our play could be a link between *Wasps* and *Dyscolus*.

Plautus also wrote a play entitled *Dyscolus*; one may imagine a similar grumpy character being the main figure there too.

ἀλλ' ἀντιβολῶ σ', ἐπίταπτε μοι μὴ πόλλ' ἄγαν
 μηδ' ἄγρια λίαν μηδ' ἐπηργυρωμένα,
 μέτρια δέ, τῷ θείῳ σεαυτοῦ. (B.) πῶς ἔτι
 μετριώτερ' ὦ δαιμόνιε; (A.) πῶς; σύντεμνε καὶ
 5 ἐπεξάπατα με. τοὺς μὲν ἰχθῦς μοι κάλει
 ἰχθυῖδι· ὄψον δ' ἂν λέγῃς ἕτερον, κάλει
 ὀψάριον. ἥδιον γὰρ ἀπολοῦμαι πολὺ

But I entreat you, don't make too many
 nor too cruel nor silver-plated demands to me, your own uncle,
 but moderate ones. (B.) Good Heavens, man, how
 could they be even more moderate? (A.) How? Understate and
 5 deceive me yet more. When talking to me about fish, call them
 fishies, and if you speak of some other dainty, call it
 a daintikin. For thus I will perish far more happily

1 ἀντιβολῶ: Common mode of entreaty in Comedy; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 582 ἀλλ', ἀντιβολῶ σ', ἀπένεγκέ μου τὴν μορμόνα; *Eq.* 960, Plato fr. 207.1 Men. *Dysc.* 362, etc.

2a ἄγρια: *cruel, harsh* (cf. *LSJ* s.v. II.3). In other passages it refers metaphorically to severe pain, etc.; cf. Ar. *Th.* 455 (ἄγρια κακά),³ Id. fr. 365.1-2 (ἄγριον / βάρος), S. *OT* 1073-4 (ἀγρίας λύπης), Id. *Tr.* 975 (ἀγρίαν ὀδύνην), Id. *Ph.* 173 (νόσον ἀγρίαν). In our passage it is a hyperbolic way of expressing the old man's horror at the expense.

2b ἐπηργυρωμένα: The perfect participle of the verb ἐπαργυρόμαι occurs only once more; on the inscription IG II² 1485.48-49 ([Λ]ΑΒΗ ΕΥΛΙΝΗ ΕΠΗΡΓΥΡ[ΩΜΕ]ΝΗ), where it has the literal sense of “coated / covered with silver”. By extension in the present fragment it means “silver-plated”, “costly”. Though not a hapax, this is surely an uncommon term; see on l. 5 below.

3 τῷ θεῖφ σεαυτοῦ: The reflexive pronoun ἐμαυτοῦ is normally placed between the article and the noun; cf. Kühner-Gerth I §464.4. However, at times the pronoun can also be found either before or after the article-noun complex; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 905 τὸν πατέρ' αὐτοῦ, Id. fr. 605.2 τῇ κεφαλῇ σαυτοῦ, Philemo fr. 178.2 σεαυτοῦ τὸν βίον, etc. This transfer sheds more emphasis, since the pronoun is released from the article-noun enlacement, and is let heard on its own.

4a ὦ δαιμόνιε: This mode of address is as old as Homer (but without the ὦ); cf. *Il.* 13.810, *Od.* 14.443, etc. This is the only time it occurs in Middle Comedy, though it is quite common during the period of Old; e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 860, *Ra.* 44, Pherecrates fr. 85.1, etc. Kirk notes (on *Il.* 1.561): “derivation from δαίμων is obvious, but the precise development of different nuances of meaning, as with many colloquialisms, is not”.⁴ The meaning of this address ranges, in Homer already, from affection (*Il.* 6.407) to reproach (*Il.* 4.31). In the present fragment it expresses a mixed feeling of irritation and bewilderment.

³ Though here ἄγρια is part of a word-play on Euripides' origin; cf. Austin & Olson *ad loc.*

⁴ Cf. Brunius-Nilsson, *Daimonie, an inquiry into a mode of apostrophe in old Greek literature*, 135-142, 82-97.

4b σύντεμνε: This verb brings together three notions. Literally here it refers to the use of diminutives. But the verb is often used in a financial sense with reference to cutting expenses; cf. *LSJ* s.v. I.3.⁵ So here the uncle asks his nephew to *cut* the (perceived) expenses, though paradoxically by *lengthening* the words. But the verb can also be used literally of cutting up food (as *ἰχθῦς* and *ὄψον*, following in ll. 5-6).

4c καί: A prepositive at verse end is a common phenomenon not only in Comedy, but also in Sophocles; see Maas, *Greek Metre* §136. For a list of similar cases in Comedy see Van Leeuwen on Ar. *Pl.* 752.

5 ἐπεξάπατα: This is a hapax; Mnesimachus seems to have been fond of them; cf. fr. 4.16-17, 10.2. Here the addition of the preposition *ἐπί* as a prefix intensifies the meaning of the simplex verb.

6-7 ἰχθῦδι' ... ὀψάριον: This is what Pepler defines as *meiotic* diminutives: “employed in making a request in order that the thing asked for may seem as small as possible, and that the favour may therefore be more readily granted” (*Comic Terminations in Aristophanes and the Comic Fragments*, 9). See further Sandbach on Men. *Dysc.* 472. The use of diminutives is also a characteristic feature of shopping lists that recur regularly in Comedy; cf. Eubulus fr. 109 and 120 (with Hunter’s notes), Ehippus fr. 15, Nicostratus fr. 4. See also Ar. *Pl.* 984-985.

7 ἥδιον ... ἀπολοῦμαι: Imitation of tragic diction; cf. E. *Ion* 1121 ἥδιον ἂν θάνοιμεν. The paratragedy underlines the exaggeration; the uncle is so mean and miserly, that he equates expense with destruction.

Ἱπποτρόφος (fr. 4)

It is clear from the title that the focus of the play must have been a horse breeder. Affordable only by the wealthy, horse breeding was an important area for

⁵ Kassel-Austin consider wrong the citation of Mnesimachus’ fragment by *LSJ* s.v. II, where it is stated that in this case the noun *λόγον* is being omitted.

elite competition. Chariot races featured in both the major Panhellenic festivals and the local contests. The esteem and honour generated thereby, often serving as a base for claims to political power, is best exhibited in Th. 6.16.1-4: *προσῆκει μοι μᾶλλον ἑτέρων ἄρχειν ... ἄρματα μὲν ἑπτὰ καθῆκα ... νόμῳ μὲν γὰρ τιμὴ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δρωμένου καὶ δύναμις ἅμα ὑπονοεῖται*. See Davies, *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*, 97ff.

The play can be dated to the mid fourth century, on the basis of the mention of Pheidon (cf. on l. 7). The single surviving fragment consists of a detailed description of a feast. It is possible that the play dealt with the conspicuous consumption of wealth by an aspirational knight, possibly a nouveau riche, who lived his life very expensively. There might have also been a focus on a particular event (e.g. a gaffe) in the life of this person.

The speaker could be either the master or a cook. Despite the third person in l. 26 (cf. *ad loc.*), I would argue for the latter, for he seems to have a certain familiarity not only with the foodstuffs, but also with a number of rare spices and incenses (cf. on ll. 61-63). Such an account fits better in the mouth of a cook who prepared – or supervised the preparation of – everything. In fact, the way he speaks makes him fit the stereotype of the cook-figure in Comedy (grandiloquence, showing-off, etc.).⁶

The cook addresses a person called Manes, probably a slave (see s.v.), to whom he lists all the constituents of the banquet, starting from food and moving down to drink, sex, and incense.⁷ The party is already afoot; a number of guests have arrived and they are already enjoying all these pleasures. But the cook wants Manes to summon a further group of guests; these are a team of young knights, a group of horsemen, whom the horse breeder wishes apparently to impress with a luxurious display of wealth. A rich person who squanders his money makes for a nice parallel with Callias, parodied in Eupolis' *Kolakes*.

⁶ See introduction to Dionysius fr. 2, and General Introduction p. 19.

⁷ Symposium scenes appear regularly in pottery from ca. 600 B.C. onwards. See Boardman, *The History of Greek Vases*, 217-226, Beazley, *Archive Pottery Database* nos. 567, 573, 10869 (fourth century representations), and also most representations in Kilmer, *Greek Erotica on Attic Red-Figure Vases*.

There is disagreement among modern scholars as to whether the expected groups of knights formed a chorus.⁸ If they eventually arrived (cf. Hunter *l.c.*), they would probably appear as loud revellers and banqueters. Maidment *l.c.* discerns here “a κῶμος in embryo” that paves the way for the Menandrian κῶμος. However, even if this was the origin of the Menandrian κῶμος, it would differ in that here the horsemen are integrated into the plot; they are invited to join the on-going party, whereas in Menander the revellers are always explicitly segregated from the plot. Their role, if any, would seem more Aristophanic than Menandrian, bringing to mind the chorus of knights in Aristophanes’ *Knights*.⁹

The fragment below is in anapaestic dimeters, i.e. the metre mostly preferred by Middle Comedy playwrights, when it comes to food lists.¹⁰ Here the anapaestic dimeters are interspersed with eight monometers (ll. 3, 8, 22, 34, 42, 51, 58, 62). Four of these monometers are simply there for variety (ll. 34, 42, 58, 62), while it could be argued that the other four are there for a reason: in l. 3 the speaker emphasises the location of the Herms; in l. 8 he pauses to phrase his question with emphasis; in l. 22 he pauses again to reproach the slave; finally, in l. 51 the monometer marks a break within the run of the list. Another feature of this fragment is the tendency to break up the dimeter into four disyllables, often with rhyme (ll. 28, 53-55, 57, 63). This feature, though not particularly common, is not unique to our fragment; cf. Anaxandrides fr. 42 (ll. 40, 64), Antiphanes fr. 130 (ll. 2, 8), 131 (ll. 7-9). Synapheia¹¹ and asyndeton are present throughout our fragment (cf. ll. 10ff., 30ff.). The style is for the most part elaborate, and the language is grand, often suggestive / reminiscent of tragedy (cf. the Doric dialect in ll. 57-59). The speaker has an air of self-aggrandisement.

The feast appears to be a particularly outstanding one, analogous to the nouveau riche status of both the host and the banqueters. The food catalogue includes a number of dishes that must have appeared rather rarely at real-life dinner tables, since either they are not mentioned anywhere else in similar comic lists, e.g. φοξῖνος (l. 33), ἄρκτοι (l. 45), ἀλωπέκιον (l. 49), or they are mentioned only seldom, e.g. κυνός

⁸ Maidment (*CQ* 29 [1935] 22) and Webster (*SLGC* 60) are willing to accept a chorus, whereas Hunter questions even the very possibility of the appearance of the knights on stage (*ZPE* 36 [1979] 38 n. 77).

⁹ Just like other motifs and tendencies, the chorus appears to have survived through the era of Middle Comedy; see General Introduction pp. 21-22.

¹⁰ See General Introduction p. 27.

¹¹ Synapheia is a usual feature in long runs of dimeters; cf. West, *Greek Metre*, 94-95.

οὐραῖον (see on ll. 35-36), βερίγκος and δρακαινίς (see on ll. 31-43). Next to these rare foods, there is also a number of rare spices; see on ll. 61-63.¹²

The fragment is cited in Athenaeus, within a discussion about the presentation of dinners in Comedy: τὰ δὲ παρὰ τοῖς κωμωδιοποιοῖς λεγόμενα δεῖπνα ἡδίστην ἀκοήν παρέχει τοῖς ὡσὶ μᾶλλον ἢ τῇ φάρυγγι (IX 402d). By that Athenaeus' speaker means that for one reason or another one would not eat these meals (for different reasons in each case, e.g. the sheer scale in our case). After Antiphanes fr. 21 and 131, there follows Mnesimachus' present fragment: Μνησίμαχος δ' ἐν Ἴπποτρόφῳ τοιαῦτα παρασκευάζει (IX 402e-403d). Certain lines that feature particular kinds of food, mainly fish, are also preserved either elsewhere in Athenaeus or in Eustathius (cf. crit. app. in K.-A. *ad loc.*).

βαῖν' ἐκ θαλάμων κυπαρισσορόφων
 ἔξω, Μάνη· στεῖχ' εἰς ἀγορὰν
 πρὸς τοὺς Ἑρμᾶς,
 οὗ προσφοιτῶσ' οἱ φύλαρχοι,
 5 τοὺς τε μαθητὰς τοὺς ὠραίους,
 οὓς ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους
 μελετᾷ Φεῖδων καὶ καταβαίνειν.
 οἷσθ' οὓς φράζω;
 τούτοις τοίνυν ἄγγελ' ὀτιή
 10 ψυχρὸν τοῦψον, τὸ ποτὸν θερμόν,
 ξηρὸν φύραμ', ἄρτοι ξηροί·
 σπλάχν' ὀπτάται, χναῦμ' ἤρπασται,
 κρέας ἐξ ἄλμης ἐξήρηται,
 τόμος ἀλλᾶντος, τόμος ἠνύστρου,
 15 χορδῆς ἕτερος, φύσκης ἕτερος
 διαλαιμοτομεῖσθ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἔνδον.
 κρατῆρ' ἐξερροίβδητ' οἴνου·
 πρόποσις χωρεῖ· λέπεται κόρδαξ·
 ἀκολασταίνει νοῦς μειρακίων·
 20 πάντ' ἔστ' ἔνδον τὰ κάτωθεν ἄνω.
 μέμνησ' ἃ λέγω, πρόσεχ' οἷς φράζω.

¹² For an alternative interpretation see on ll. 5, 22a, 24.

- χάσκεις οὔτος;
 βλέπον δειρί· πῶς αὐτὰ φράσεις;
 αὐτίκ' ἐρῶ σοι πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς.*
- 25 *ἦκειν ἤδη καὶ μὴ μέλλειν,
 τῷ τε μαγείρῳ μὴ λυμαίνεσθ',
 ὡς τῶν ὄψων ἐφθῶν ὄντων,
 ὀπτῶν ὄντων, ψυχρῶν ὄντων,
 καθ' ἕκαστα λέγων· βολβός, ἐλαία,*
- 30 *σκόροδον, καυλός, κολοκύνθη, ἔτνος,
 θρίον, φυλλάς, θύννου τεμάχη,
 γλάνιδος, γαλεοῦ, ῥίνης, γόγγρου,
 φοξίνος ὄλος, κορακῖνος ὄλος,
 μεμβράς, σκόμβρος,*
- 35 *θυννίς, κωβιός, ἠλακατῆνες,
 κυνὸς οὐραῖον τῶν καρχαριῶν,
 νάρκη, βάτραχος, πέρηκη, σαῦρος,
 τριχίας, φυκίς, βρίγκος, τρίγλη,
 κόκκυξ, τρυγών, σμύραινα, φάγρος,*
- 40 *μύλλος, λεβίας, σπάρος, αἰολίας,
 θρηῖττα, χελιδών, καρίς, τευθίς,
 ψῆττα, δρακαινίς,
 πουλυπόδειον, σηπία, ὀρφύς,
 κάραβος, ἔσχαρος, ἀφύαι, βελόναι,*
- 45 *κεστρεύς, σκορπίος, ἔγγελυς, ἄρκτοι,
 κρέα τ' ἄλλα (τὸ πλήθος ἀμύθητον)
 χηνός, χοίρου, βοός, ἀρνός, οἴός,
 κάπρου, αἰγός, ἀλεκτρούνος, νήπτης,
 κίττης, πέρδικος, ἀλωπεκίου.*
- 50 *καὶ μετὰ δεῖπνον θαιμαστὸν ὅσ' ἔστ'
 ἀγαθῶν πλήθη.
 πᾶς δὲ κατ' οἴκους μάττει, πέττει,
 τίλλει, κόπτει, τέμνει, δεύει,
 χαίρει, παίζει, πηδᾷ, δειπνεῖ,*
- 55 *πίνει, σκιρτᾷ, λορδοῖ, κεντεῖ [βινεῖ].
 σεμναὶ δ' αὐλῶν ἀγαναὶ φωναί,
 μολπὰ κλαγγὰ θράττει, [νεῖται] πνεῖται*

κούρα κασίας
 ἀπὸ γᾶς ἀγίας ἀλίας Συρίας,
 60 ὀσμὴ σεμνὴ μυκτῆρα δονεῖ
 λιβάνου, μάρου, σμύρνης, καλάμου,
 στύρακος, βάρου,
 λίνδου, κίνδου, κισθοῦ, μίνθου.
 τοιάδε δόμους ὀμίχλη κατέχει
 65 πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἀνάμεστος

55 βινεῖ (AE, Eust., κιν- C) *secl.* Meineke (“videtur interpretationis causa ad κεντεῖ adscriptum fuisse)

57 νεῖται *secl.* Meineke (“ex dittographia ortum sequentis πνεῖται”) 58 κούρα κασίας Meineke (“ut odor casiae filia dicatur”): *fort.* φύρδην, κούρα, Κασίας Wilam.: -αν κασ- A: αὔρα κασίας δ’ Kock

Come forth from chambers ceiled with cypress-wood,
 Manes; go to the market-place,
 to the Herms,
 where the commanders of the cavalry resort,
 5 and to the youthful pupils
 whom Pheidon trains to
 mount and dismount the horses.
 Do you know whom I mean?
 Well then, tell them that
 10 the fish is cold, the wine is warm,
 there is dry dough and crusted loaves;
 the entrails are roasting, a titbit has been snatched away,
 the meat has been removed from the brine;
 a slice of sausage, a slice of tripe,
 15 another of black-pudding, another of sausage,
 all are being butchered by those who are inside.
 Bowls of wine are being gulped down and emptied;
 the drinking is well under way; the cordax is being danced obscenely;
 the lads’ mind is being licentious;
 20 everything indoors is upside-down.
 Remember what I am saying, pay attention to what I am telling you.
 Ho you, are you gaping?

Look this way! How are you going to tell all these?

I will tell you now again from the beginning.

- 25 Tell them to come immediately, without delay,
and not outrage the cook;
since there is fish boiled
fish baked, fish cold;
tell them everything, one by one – bulbs, olives,
30 garlic, cauliflower, gourd, split-pea soup,
stuffed fig-leaf, salad, slices of tunny,
sheat-fish, dog-fish, file, conger-eel;
a whole minnow, a whole crow-fish,
sprat, mackerel,
35 she-tunny, goby, spindle-fishes,
shark tail,
electric ray, fishing-frog, perch, horse-mackerel,
small anchovy, wrasse, brincus, red mullet,
piper, sting-ray, murry, braize,
40 grey mullet, lebias, sea-bream, speckled fish,
Thracian wife, flying-fish, shrimp, squid,
turbot, great weever,
octopus, cuttle-fish, great sea-perch,
crayfish, sole, small fry, pipe-fish,
45 mullet, bullhead, eel, bear-crabs,
and meat as well (the quantity is unspeakably great)
of goose, pig, steer, lamb, sheep,
boar, goat, cock, duck,
magpie, partridge, fox cub.
50 And after dinner, it is to wonder at
the quantity of the good things available.
Everyone in the house is kneading, cooking,
plucking, chopping, cutting up, drenching,
rejoicing, playing, leaping, dining,
55 drinking, frisking, bending backwards, pricking, {having sex}
Holy, mild tones of flutes,

songs and musical instruments are sounding sharply; {comes}, there breathes
< forth

the daughter of cassia

from the sacred, seagirt land of Syria.

- 60 There excites the nostril a solemn odour
of frankincense, sage, myrrh, sweet flag,
storax, barus,
lindus, cindus, rock rose, mint;
such is the cookery steam that is spread over
65 the house, filled full with all good things

1-2: Both the language and the metre (anapaestic dimeter) are reminiscent of the opening anapaests of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*: ὦ πρέσβυ, δόμων τῶνδε πάροιθεν / στεῖχε (ll. 1-2). In both texts we have a master (a general there – a cook here), who addresses his servant in anapaestic dimeters, and calls him out of the house, using the same – more or less – vocabulary (δόμων in *Iphigenia* – θαλάμων in this fragment, στεῖχε in both passages). However, the question of the relationship is complicated by the controversial nature of the Euripidean prologue. For a range of reasons (linguistic, metrical, and structural) modern scholars have questioned the authenticity of the opening anapaests and generally of the entire opening of the play. Given the weight of the evidence, it is difficult to accept that the anapaests were composed by Euripides.¹³ The date for this interpolation cannot be defined with certainty, but Bain believes it took place in the fourth century B.C. (o.c. 20). Mnesimachus' *Ἱπποτρόφος* must have been produced around the middle of the fourth century (cf. introduction to the play). It is entirely possible that we have an actor's interpolation made some time before Mnesimachus' play and consequently that the similarity is not coincidental; Mnesimachus may have been directly influenced by this interpolated opening. Another possibility, which cannot be dismissed, is that both Mnesimachus and Euripides' interpolator independently imitated a now lost model. Either way the style strongly argues for tragic burlesque in Mnesimachus.

¹³ See Bain, "The Prologues of Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis*", *CQ* 27 n.s. (1977) 10-26; Willink, "The Prologue of *Iphigenia at Aulis*", *CQ* 21 n.s. (1971) 343-364; Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy*, 131-140.

1 *κυπαρισσορόφων*: Cypress-wood was appreciated for its durability (Thphr. *HP* 5.4.2). It was also greatly valued as building-timber, for both houses and ships (Thphr. *HP* 5.7.4, Pl. *Lg.* 705c).¹⁴ Moschion tells us of an Aphrodite's shrine, whose walls and ceiling were made of cypress-wood (575 F 1.3.4 *FGrH*), while Callixeinus refers to a roof of a banquet-room made from cypress-wood (627 F 1 *FGrH*). However, the term *κυπαρισσορόφος* itself occurs only here and in E. *Hyps.* fr. 58.10 Bond. The use of this rare and elaborate compound within a line already reminiscent of tragedy (cf. on previous note) elevates the style, but only for a while; it soon becomes clear that this high style is actually used in reference with food and partying (cf. ll. 10ff.).

2 *Μάνη*: This was a common slave-name in Attica (cf. sch. on Ar. *Av.* 523; see Dunbar *ad loc.*). This is also how the name is normally used in Comedy; cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1211 (see van Leeuwen *ad loc.*), *Pax* 1146, Pherecrates fr. 10.1. Strabo 7.3.12, explaining the logic behind slave-naming, notes that the slaves were usually addressed by a name that was popular in their own country of origin. Indeed, Manes was a common name in Phrygia, and *Μανήσιον* was a Phrygian town (cf. Alex. Polyh. 273 F 126 *FGrH*). See Gow on Machon fr. 14.191, and Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, § 858-1.

3 *Ἑρμᾶς*: The *Herms* were square pillars surmounted by Hermes' bust. They were situated at the doorways of both private houses and temples, and they were widely spread throughout Athens (cf. Th. 6.27). *Herms* was also the name of a location at the northwest corner of the Agora, exactly because a great number of these pillars had been accumulated there over the years, under the form of various dedications. Both archaeological findings and inscriptional evidence confirm what Mnesimachus says; the headquarters of the cavalry officers, the *Hipparcheion*, was situated indeed near the Herms, in the northwest corner of the Agora. See Callicrates-Meneclis 370 F 2 *FGrH*; Thompson & Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens*, XIV, 94-96; Camp, *Athenian Agora*, 118-119.

¹⁴ See Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, II 257-258.

4 *φύλαρχοι*: At Athens since the time of Cleisthenes ten *phylarchs* were elected through the means of *χειροτονία*, one from each tribe, charged with the duty of leading the cavalry, and were subordinate to *hipparchs*; cf. Harp. p. 303.14 Dind., Arist. *Ath.* 61.5, Hdt. 5.69.

5 *ώραίους*: *In the prime of life, youthful* (LSJ s.v. III.2). The word denotes a person at puberty, i.e. an age when one reaches both the point of prime sexual attractiveness and sexual maturity, and can become sexually active; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1148, *Ec.* 696, *Av.* 138, Metagenes fr. 4.2, Amphis fr. 15.2, Anaxandrides fr. 34.12, Men. *Kol.* fr. 4, Aeschin. 1.42, etc. See further Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 1147-1149, and Olson & Sens on Arcestratos fr. 39.9-10.

It is difficult to say from the fragment whether these youths were the principle guests or (as suggested by Gilula¹⁵) attractive young men for the pleasure of the more mature / principle guests; either interpretation would cohere with what happens later (ll. 18-19, 52-55 – see further *ad locc.*).

6 *ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους*: A basic skill that a cavalry commander had to possess; cf. X. *Eq. Mag.* 6.5. When the reference is to a horse, *ἀναβαίνω* is normally followed by the preposition *ἐπί*; cf. Zonar. *a* 195.21. But when the reference is to sex, *ἐπί* is omitted in the Attic dialect; cf. Moer. 187.5-6, Ar. fr. 344. Indeed, although at first sight the present fragment seems to refer solely to the training of youths by Pheidon, it is possible to discern an obscene double entendre, given the presence of the term *ώραίους* (cf. on l. 5). It is therefore tempting to interpret *ἀναβαίνειν* as a sexual innuendo, suggesting that Pheidon had a homosexual relationship with his pupils, in which – being older himself – *he* was the active partner (cf. how suggestive the lines 5-6 are: *τούς τε μαθητὰς τοὺς ὠραίους, οὓς ἀναβαίνειν* – as if *οὓς* was object to *ἀναβαίνειν*).

7 *Φεῖδων*: Both Kirchner (*PA* 14178) and Kock (II.440) suggested that Pheidon was one of the phylarchs mentioned in l. 4. There is also some illuminating archaeological evidence that relates to him. Excavations in the Athenian Agora have brought to light twenty five clay sealings bearing Pheidon's name. It is a welcome surprise that these sealings were found at the northwest corner of the Agora, i.e. at the believed location

¹⁵ *Athenaeum* 83 (1995) 149-150.

of the hipparcheion (see on l. 3), and also where Pheidon frequented, according to the present fragment. The date of these sealings is believed to be “shortly after the middle of the fourth century B.C.”¹⁶ The sealings read ἵππαρχον εἰς Λῆμνον Φεῖδωνα Θρι(άσιον).¹⁷ However, instead of the accusative ἵππαρχον, the nominative ἵππαρχος is inscribed on fourteen of the sealings; Kroll & Mitchel consider this to have been a mistake.¹⁸ It is possible that such sealings¹⁹ served as some kind of tokens / credentials that were used for identification purposes by persons who were sent from Athens to meet various officers abroad, and particularly in this case Pheidon in Lemnos.²⁰ It is highly probable that Pheidon the phylarch of the present fragment, and Pheidon the hipparch at Lemnos of the sealings was the same person, who – according to the usual procedure – first served as a phylarch and then was elected hipparch at Lemnos.²¹ If we consider the date of the sealings along with the possibility that these were manufactured before the appointment of Pheidon as a hipparch in Lemnos,²² it results that our fragment (where Pheidon is still a phylarch in Athens) should be dated to – or just before – the middle of the fourth century B.C.

το ψυχρὸν τοῦψον: For ὄψον see on Mnesimachus fr. 7.3. Asking about and / or specifying the temperature of dishes recurs elsewhere in cooks’ speeches;²³ cf. Alexis fr. 177 (with Arnott on l. 2).

Here starts an asyndeton; the party is already afoot with food being prepared and food being consumed at the same time, and with lots of drinking and dancing going on; all this creates an atmosphere of lust and sexual desire.

το-ιι: Chiasmus in both lines, and antithesis in l. 10.

¹⁶ Kroll, *Hesperia* 46 (1977) 84; cf. Shear, *Hesperia* 42 (1973) 178-179, and pl. 39b, f, g.

¹⁷ The letters Θρι indicate Pheidon’s origin, i.e. from the Attic deme of Θριᾶ. Therefore, one should develop the abbreviation in accusative, Θρι(άσιον), to match with Φεῖδωνα, rather than in nominative, Θρι(άσιος), as Shear does.

¹⁸ *Hesperia* 49 (1980) 89.

¹⁹ Though perhaps not the particular ones; Kroll & Mitchel (*o.c.* 90) suggest that these twenty five tokens may have been rejects.

²⁰ Cf. Kroll & Mitchel *o.c.* 95-96, Kroll *l.c.*, Shear *o.c.* 178.

²¹ Cf. Kroll & Mitchel *o.c.* 90-91.

²² Kroll & Mitchel *o.c.* 96.

²³ This strengthens my hypothesis that the speaker is the cook and not the master.

12 *χναῦμα*: Another term for a *titbit*, used especially in Comedy; cf. Poll. 6.62, Hsch. s.vv. *χναῦμα* and *χναύματα*, Ar. fr. 236, Teleclides fr. 1.14. Here we have *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* (a regular feature of comic lists); while giving details of food still being prepared, and of food being ready, the cook, as if he was speaking aside for a second, admits that someone (perhaps himself) has already tasted the food.

14-15: The symmetry in these lines makes for an elaborate style. Different kinds of sausage- and entrails-dishes feature often in Comedy; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 1179, fr. 702, Pherecrates fr. 50.4, 113.8, Dioxippus fr. 1, Eubulus fr. 63, etc. *ἀλλᾶντος*: εἶδος ἐντέρου ἐσκευασμένου (*Suda* a 1076). *ἡνύστρου*: The fourth stomach of ruminating animals; cf. Arist. *PA* 674b 14-15, *HA* 507b 9. The dish made out of it bore the same name; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 356 (see van Leeuwen and Neil *ad loc.*), Alexis fr. 275 (see Arnott *ad loc.*). *χορδῆς*: Stuffed small intestine or other stuffed entrails; cf. sch. on Ar. *Eq.* 214. *φύσκης*: Stuffed large intestine; cf. sch. on Ar. *Eq.* 364.

16 *διαλαιμοτομεῖται*: This is a hapax; see on Mnesimachus fr. 3.5. The verb *λαιμοτομέω*, *-ομαι* occurs simplex several times, but this is the only instance of a compound form with the preposition *διά*. Its literal meaning is *to kill by cutting off the throat*. Here it is used metaphorically with reference to the sausage, tripe, and black-pudding. There are two possible interpretations; these dishes are either being consumed or being prepared. What precedes (*ὀπτάται, ἐξήρηται*) suggests preparation, but what follows (ll. 17ff.) suggests consumption. In favour of the former interpretation, Meineke *ad loc.* cites the parallel of Hor. *Epist.* 1.12.21, where fish, leeks, and onions are said to be butchered. The latter interpretation is paralleled by Plaut. *Stich.* 554: “contruncant cibum”.²⁴ This latter sense conveys a graphic image of how passionately, greedily, and quickly the banqueters devour and gulp down the food; I would rather opt for this interpretation. Still, in either case this is an odd – even grotesque – usage that contributes to the paratragic tone of the fragment (cf. introduction). After all, the ambiguity may be deliberate, as the passage as a whole conveys an atmosphere of simultaneous preparation and eating of food within a house bustling with activity.

²⁴ See Leo, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, I.12.

17 ἐξεροῖβδῆται: Another hapax. This is the perfect tense of the verb ἐκροῖβδέω, which means *to empty by gulping down* (cf. *LSJ* s.v.). Onomatopoeia is possibly at work here; the verb sounds quite like gagging. Two instances of a hapax within two lines cannot be a mere coincidence. As with *διαλαιμοτομεῖται* above (cf. sense of *consumption*), ἐκροῖβδέω gives the impression of complete consumption of the wine. Together they give an idea of the hardly imaginable quantities of food and wine that are being consumed within the house.

18a πρόποσις χωρεῖ: One of the many alternative expressions, employed in both poetry and prose, in order to communicate the idea that the drinking and the toasts at a symposium are afoot and well under way; cf. X. *An.* 7.3.26 (*προυχώρει ὁ πότος*), Hdt. 6.129 (*προϊούσης τῆς πόσιος*); see Gow on Theoc. 14.18. The verb can also be understood as semi-literal, in the sense that one drinks and then hands on the cup, normally rightwards (*ἐπιδέξια*; cf. Ath. XI 463e-f); so the cup actually moves forth (*χωρεῖ*).

18b κόρδαξ: We learn from Aristoxenus (fr. 104 Wehrli) that there were three major types of dancing, each corresponding to one of the three dramatic forms. The tragic dance was called ἐμμέλεια, the satyric σίκιννις, and the comic κόρδαξ. The latter was a vulgar and undignified dance, characterised by indecent movements (cf. sch on Ar. *Nu.* 540). The party described in this fragment is a very lively one; within this context it is natural to expect an analogously vivid dance lacking both any restraint and any sense of decorum. Athenaeus XIV 631d characterises κόρδαξ as φορτικός, cf. Thphr. *Char.* 6.3. Henderson (*The Maculate Muse*, 168) considers κόρδαξ “an obscene dance in which masturbation is featured”. However, the existing evidence does not allow us to say with certainty how exactly κόρδαξ was danced; the gestures appear to be a lot less specific than Henderson suggests. Scholars in the last two centuries have tried to identify cordax-dancers on a number of vases, but such scenes remain ambiguous, for they can equally represent dancing drunkards or demons; cf. *RE* XI.2 s.v. *kordax*. See Schnabel, *Kordax, archäologische Studien zur Geschichte eines antiken Tanzes und zum Ursprung der griechischen Komödie, passim*; Séchan, *La danse grecque antique*, 195ff.; Prudhommeau, *La danse grecque antique*, I §§1097-1098.

18c λέπεται: According to Athenaeus XIV 663d, this verb is used *ἐπ' ἀσελγοῦς καὶ φορτικῆς δι' ἀφροδισίων ἡδονῆς*, cf. Eust. *Comm. Od.* v. 2, p. 62.27. See *LSJ* s.v. III. In Alexis fr. 50.3 this verb has obvious sexual connotations. Arnott *ad loc.* suggests that in Mnesimachus' fragment the reference is to "the provocative and indecent limb movements of a dance whose lewdness was notorious".

19 ἀκολασταίνει νοῦς μειρακίων: The young men are having sexual phantasies with their minds. They could be phantasising about younger boys; alternatively, the object of their desire could possibly be a hetaira (cf. Theophilus fr. 12).

Within Comedy the verb *ἀκολασταίνω* (*to be licentious*; *LSJ* s.v.) occurs only once more, in Ar. *Av.* 1227 (see van Leeuwen *ad loc.*). We have sufficient evidence that the *νεανίσκοι* were generally viewed with a certain suspicion, where the possibility of sex with boys was concerned; see Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*, 17-53. We learn from Aeschines 1.10 that in Athens special care was taken as to the age of the youths that were allowed into the gymnasia. Likewise, a mid second century law of the city of Beroea forbade the *νεανίσκοι* from speaking to *παῖδες* frequenting the gymnasium, for the former were considered as potentially dangerous lovers; cf. Strato *AP* 12.4, Cantarella *o.c.* 28ff.

Though other texts speak of *νεανίσκοι*, it is important to note that the terminology referring to youths was not rigidly fixed. The ancient sources do not distinguish neatly as to the exact age when one would be described as a *μειράκιον*. In certain passages a *μειράκιον* is said to be about twenty years old, one phase ahead of *νεανίσκος*, cf. Ar. *Byz.* fr. 1 Slater, Plu. *Brut.* 27.3, Luc. *DMort.* 9.4. Concerning the evidence from Aristophanes of Byzantium there seems to be a certain contradiction between fr. 1 Slater (where *μειράκιον* appears equivalent to *μείραξ*) and *Nomina Aetatum* p. 275.8-9 Miller (where *μείραξ* is described as the phase after *μειράκιον*, and equivalent to *νεανίσκος* and *νεανίας*). Furthermore, it appears that *μειράκιον* could be used to describe the phase from fourteen to twenty one, as well as be used interchangeably with *νεανίσκος*,²⁵ see Gomme & Sandbach on Men. *Dysc.* 27. Therefore, we may reasonably link the *μειράκια* of the present fragment with the *νεανίσκοι* of other sources.

²⁵ The passage from Aeschines 1.10 cited above testifies further to the blurry terminology: *τούς νεανίσκους ... οὔστινους δεῖ εἶναι καὶ ἄστινας ἡλικίας ἔχοντας*.

20 τὰ κάτωθεν ἄνω: This phrase expresses a completely chaotic situation; cf. Men. fr. 405 (τὸ λεγόμενον τοῦτ' ἔστι νῦν, / τᾶνω κάτω, φασίν, τὰ κάτω δ' ἄνω), Pl. *Tht.* 153d.²⁶ Here it has a clausula effect, since it sums up what precedes.

21 μέμνησ' αἶ λέγω: The instruction from the cook to a slave / assistant / pupil to keep in mind what he has been told or taught constitutes another feature of the stereotype of the cook-figure in both Middle and New Comedy. Similar instructions are delivered by the cooks in Dionysius fr. 3.20, Posidippus fr. 28.24, and Men. *Asp.* 229. This tells in favour of the hypothesis that the speaker is the cook, not the master (see introduction).

The interruption of this line and of the following one is useful, since it breaks up the list, helps avoid tedium and monotony, and adds liveliness.

22a χάσκεις: A similar scolding remark is addressed to another slave in Ar. *Lys.* 426 (cf. Headlam on Herod. 4.42). This fits into the stereotype of slaves as being idle and lazy; cf. the drunk and sleepy Sosias and Xanthias in Ar. *V.* 9-10, Strepsiades' complaints about his slaves in *Nu.* 5, etc.

Gilula (*o.c.* 145) would attribute the gaping to the slave's incredulity at the lavishness of the feast. However, nothing said in ll. 10-20 betokens anything other than a good feast; unlike what follows, there is nothing exceptionally extravagant in the preceding description.

22b οὔτος: Here the demonstrative pronoun is used much like a vocative; cf. *LSJ* s.v. C.I.5; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 240 (οὔτος, τί φεύγεις;), *Nu.* 723 (οὔτος τί ποιεῖς;), *V.* 1, Cratinus fr. 55, etc.

22-24: The colloquial tone of the reproach to the slave divides two passages which are very elaborate in style (cf. preceding asyndeton and following parēchēsis in ll. 27-28). Such mobility in style, i.e. moving from high to low style and then back to high again,

²⁶ For further parallels see Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, s.v. sursum.

is a favourite tactic of Aristophanes; cf. *Pax* 774-795, *Lys.* 954-979, *Nu.* 711-722, etc. See Silk, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, 110ff.

24 *αὐτίκ' ἐρῶ*: Gilula²⁷ rightly stresses the extravagance of the list that follows. Though lists are a quintessential part of Comedy's stock-in-trade,²⁸ she would see the details as fictive and intended to facilitate the process of enticement or seduction of the young cavalymen (cf. on l. 5). Though she is right to note that food can appear as a means of seduction, her case for the details as fictive rests essentially on uniqueness of some details and the ruinously expensive nature of the feast as described. However, given the persistence of comic interest in conspicuous consumption, it is at least as likely that this is meant to be a genuine and prohibitively extravagant feast. Indeed, if the title-figure of *Hippotrophos* is a nouveau riche, as I suggest in the introduction to the play, the extravagance would be intended to win the admiration of the social stratum to which he aspires.²⁹ The rarity of some of the components may be part of the luxuriousness of the feast, irrespectively of the role the young invitees are expected to play.

25 *ἤκειν ... μὴ μέλλειν*: This command is expressed as both a positive and a negative order. As a result it sounds even more obligatory and unavoidable. Cf. *Ar. Ra.* 1508-1509 *ἤκειν ὡς ἐμὲ δευρὶ / καὶ μὴ μέλλειν*.

26 *μαγείρω ... λυμαίνεσθ'*: This may tell against the hypothesis adopted in the introduction that the speaker is the cook himself. Nevertheless, I do not consider this a real problem, for it could be a self-reference, expressed in a self-aggrandizing way. Sikon, the cook in Menander's *Dyscolus*, is similarly self-important; cf. ll. 644-646: *οὐδὲ εἷς / μάγειρον ἀδικήσας ἀθῶος διέφυγεν· / ἱεροπρεπῆς πῶς ἔστιν ἡμῶν ἡ τέχνη*. Self-importance is a feature of cooks in general.³⁰ The cook in Dionysius fr. 2.2-3 also speaks of himself in the third person: *τὸν μάγειρον εἰδέναι / πολὺ δεῖ γὰρ αἰεὶ πρότερον...*

²⁷ *O.c.* 145-146.

²⁸ Cf. Anaxandrides fr. 42, Alexis fr. 84 (cf. Arnott's introduction *ad loc.*), Eubulus fr. 14 (cf. Hunter's introduction *ad loc.*), etc. See also on Amphis fr. 9.3-4.

²⁹ Cf. Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*.

³⁰ Cf. introduction to Dionysius fr. 2, and General Introduction p. 19.

The verb *λυμαίνομαι* takes both the dative and the accusative in the Attic dialect. But dative is usually preferred; cf. sch. on Ar. *Nu.* 928 (with van Leeuwen *ad loc.*).

28 ψυχρῶν ὄντων: This could mean that either the dishes have been ready for a long time, and have already gone cold by now or alternatively that there is also a cold buffet. Cf. on l. 10.

29 βολβός: This is a generic term that denotes the edible bulb of a number of bulbous plants; cf. *LSJ* s.v. and Arnott on Alexis fr. 167.13. Bulbs were believed to be an efficient male aphrodisiac; cf. sch. on Ar. *Ec.* 1092, Heracleides of Tarentum ap. Ath. II 64a, Plato fr. 188.12, Alexis fr. 175. The use of singular to refer to things that are available in quantity is a usual technique in food lists; cf. Alexis fr. 167. Generally, in food catalogues singular and plural are always used in conjunction.³¹

Here starts an asyndetic list that runs over several lines; the point is to emphasise the abundancy and the variety of food. The list also features synapheia, very much in the manner of Aristophanes; e.g. *Nu.* 278-286, 301-309 (cf. Dover *ad loc.*). Lists of foods (and also of other items) are a recurring feature of Greek Comedy in general; for some parallels from Old Comedy see Dohm, *Magiros* 59-61, and for Middle and New see Arnott's introduction to Alexis fr. 84.

30 ἔτνος: A thick porridge (sch. on Ar. *Ra.* 506), made from various pulse: *ἀπὸ φασηλίων* (sch. on Ar. *Ec.* 845), *κυάμινον* (Heniochus fr. 4.7), *πίσινον* (Ar. *Eq.* 1171), etc.

31a θριῶν: Stuffed fig-leave; see on Dionysius fr. 2.39.

31b φυλλάς: Greens; cf. Poll. 6.71.

31-43 θύννου ... ὀρφός: These lines bear a striking resemblance with Ehippus fr. 12.1-7. Though not all the items recur in Ehippus (e.g. the shark's tail is missing), the

³¹ Here the singular predominates, but see l. 44. No stereotype can be established, for elsewhere it is the plural that predominates; e.g. Anaxandrides fr. 42.

order is at certain points similar to Mnesimachus' fragment. As we have noted elsewhere, free recycling of earlier material was frequently practised.³² Bearing in mind that Ehippus practised recycling of his own material (cf. Ath. VIII 347b-c), the case that Ehippus copied Mnesimachus' text, and not vice-versa, gains a slight advantage; certainty, however, is impossible.

35-36 κωβιός, ἡλακατῆνες, / κυνός οὐραῖον: These words form fr. 5 of Menander's *Kolax*. The relation cannot be fortuitous. The shark tail appears only in these two passages, and this may suggest a conscious copying on Menander's part;³³ cf. introduction to Theophilus fr. 12.

The *κωβιός* refers to "any member of a large group of cheap small fish with large heads, prominent eyes and pouting cheeks, abundant in the Mediterranean" (Arnott on Alexis fr. 115.13); cf. Gow on Machon fr. 5.31.

The *ἡλακατῆνες*, described as *κητώδεις* by Hesychius s.v., possibly refer to some kind of conserve or pickle made from that fish (so Thompson *Fishes*, *ad loc.*); cf. Ath. VII 301d.

37a βάτραχος: Frogs were indeed eaten in antiquity as now (at least in some parts of the world); cf. Anaxandrides fr. 42.50, Antiphanes fr. 130.5, Archestratus *SH* 178.

37b σαῦρος: Its preparation procedure is described in Alexis fr. 138; cf. Arnott *ad loc.*

38 βερίγκος: This remains an unidentifiable kind of sea-fish. Its name occurs only here and in Ehippus fr. 12.3 (see on ll. 31-43). Hesychius s.v. glosses it as *ἰχθύς κητώδης*, which Thompson (*Fishes* s.v.) finds it hard to accept because in both fragments this fish comes between *φυκίς* and *τερίγλη*, whose size is rather small. However, this juxtaposition could simply aim to variety or humour. Whatever the case, in absence of any further evidence, we have but to rely upon Hesychius' testimony. Besides, such a long catalogue can understandably lack a systematic order (see on ll. 47-49).

³² Cf. introduction to Amphis fr. 3.

³³ See Arnott on Men. *l.c.*, Webster *SLGC* 60. Sandbach, however, suggests an unconscious copying.

40a μύλλος: According to Dorion (ap. Ath. III 118c), this is one of three alternative appellations attributed to the same fish depending on its age; μύλλοι are called those of medium age, whereas the little ones are called ἀγνωτίδια, and the big ones πλατίστακοι. Thompson (*Fishes* s.v.) thinks that the fish in question is the grey mullet.

40b λεβίας: A kind of lake-fish, but also an appellation for fish preserved along with scales; cf. Hsch. s.v. λεβίαι, and Phot. p. 215.4. See also Thompson *Fishes* s.v.

44: A sequence of four shorts is normally avoided in anapaests (cf. West *o.c.* 95). This is one of the few exceptions: – ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪– (ἔσχαρος, | ἀφύαι).

44 ἀφύαι: The term can denote any species of small fish (Hsch. s.v. ἀφύη), served fried at banquets; cf. Anaxandrides fr. 42.41, Metagenes fr. 6.8, etc. See Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 640.

46 ἀμύθητον: This is the only occurrence of the term ἀμύθητον in Comedy. This is yet another instance of the grand and elaborate style of the cook's speech.

47-49: The dishes are recited without any order; poultry and game are mentioned at random. Similar lists of fowls, both domestic and wild, feature in Antiphanes fr. 295 (in disarray again), and Anaxandrides fr. 42.63-66 (orderly arranged); cf. Poll. 6.52.

47 οἴος: Here the diphthong –οι is shortened. West notes that “correction within the word reflects a general tendency of the Greek language” (*o.c.* 11ff.); cf. *LSJ* s.v. οἴς. See also Hunter on Eubulus fr. 67.5.

49 ἀλωπεκίου: *LSJ* s.v. ἀλωπεκίας II supply the meaning *thresher shark*, and cite the present fragment of Mnesimachus as an example. Gulick in his edition of Athenaeus accepts *LSJ*'s interpretation, but with doubts: “the mention of a fish at this point in the recital seems curious after the long list ending above”; his reservation is reasonable. The problem can be solved, if we understand ἀλωπεκίου as the genitive not of ἀλωπεκίας, but of ἀλωπέκιον, which is the diminutive of ἀλώπηξ, denoting the *little fox*, the *fox cub*. Although we have no other testimony of fox-meat being eaten, Diphilus

of Siphnos (ap. Ath. VIII 356c) takes for granted that the taste of fox-meat is indeed known: ὁ δὲ ἀλωπεκίας (*thresher shark*) ὁμοίος ἐστὶ τῇ γεύσει τῷ χειρσαίῳ ζώῳ, διὸ καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἔτυχε. Besides, this is not the only unusual dish served in this particular symposion; cf. introduction.

52-55: The majority of the verbs mentioned in asyndeton in these lines can be interpreted in two different ways reflecting different aspects of the context; feasting and sex, with the verbs alluding to intercourse and other sexual acts. Perhaps less straightforward at times, the sexual implications are still detectable and, most importantly, can be traced back to Old Comedy.³⁴ Parallel asyndeta of more or less the same verbs recur in Ar. fr. 282 and Pherecrates fr. 197.

52a μάττει: *to knead* (e.g. a barley-cake), but also *to masturbate* or *to stimulate someone manually to orgasm or erection* (so Sommerstein on Ar. *Pl.* 305). See Henderson *o.c.* 194, 200-201 for a different interpretation (scatological reference and allusion to anal intercourse).

52b πέττει: *to cook, to bake*. In a sexual context it can allude to erotic passion, and the burning feeling of intercourse; e.g. from rubbing the phallus (so Henderson *o.c.* 144, 177-178).

53a τῖλλει: *to pluck* (e.g. poultry), but also *to depilate the pubic hair*; cf. sch. on Ar. *Ra.* 516. See also Cratinus fr. 276, Plato fr. 188.14, Ar. *Lys.* 89, etc.

53b κόπτει: *to chop*. We lack evidence as to whether κόπτω is also a sexual term. It could have, but not all the terms need have a sexual nuance.

53c τέμνει: *to cut up*; again, there are no explicit obscene connotations.

³⁴ Cf. Amphis fr. 20, especially comm. on l. 6b.

53d δέυει: *to drench*. This verb does not seem to have obscene implications anywhere else;³⁵ therefore, the case for sexual allusions here seems rather weak. However, it is possible that such allusions can actually hide behind the notion of *wet*, which is inherent in the verb *δέύω*. Getting something / oneself wet (it is important that no object is defined in the text³⁶), can allude to the secretion of juices during sex (or perhaps to ejaculation stimulated by masturbation).

54a χαίρει: *to rejoice*; perhaps because of having sex (cf. sch. on Ar. *Pax* 289).

54b παίζει: It can mean *to dance* or *to play an instrument* (cf. *LSJ* s.v.); both senses fit the symposion context. Nevertheless, *παίζω* often describes euphemistically the acts of flirting and sexual intercourse, even in non-comic texts; e.g. Ar. *Av.* 1098, *Ra.* 414, X. *Smp.* 9.2, etc.; see *LSJ* s.v. I.5, and Henderson *o.c.* 157.

54c πηδά: *to leap*. Someone described as jumping in a party like this one could simply be dancing, possibly the cordax (l. 18).

54-55 δειπνεῖ, πίνει: Food and drink indulgence form, along with sex, the core of a symposion.³⁷

55a σκιρτά: *to spring*. Though the word lacks any explicit sexual denotation, in Comedy *σκιρτάω* occurs next to *πέροδομαι* in Ar. *V.* 1305, and in a high-spirited context in both *Nu.* 1078, and *Pl.* 761; cf. Ehippus fr. 26. As these passages suggest, *σκιρτάω* can entail the notion of *playful skipping*, which is close enough to the meaning of *παίζω* (in l. 54) as *flirting*.

55b λορδοῖ: *to bend oneself supinely* (so as to throw the head back; *LSJ* s.v.; cf. Eust. *Comm. Od.* 1.200.23-24). This can be a description of a sexually suggestive dance

³⁵ We have only four other comic instances: Ar. fr. 282, Eupolis fr. 362, Plato fr. 189.9, and Eubulus fr. 89.4.

³⁶ The same goes for Ar. fr. 282, which is a similar asyndeton of verbs, whereas in the other three fragments mentioned in the previous note the verb *δέύω* always takes an object.

³⁷ See on Theophilus fr. 12.3-4.

movement; cf. Ar. fr. 147 *λορδοῦ κιγκλοβάταν ὀυθμόν*. But it can also be a reference to the sexual position, where “the woman bends backwards and thrusts her hips forwards” (Henderson *o.c.* 178; cf. Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes*, 118); cf. Ar. *Ec.* 10. People dancing obscenely and / or people having sex: both are possible within the context of this vibrant party.

55c κεντεῖ: Lit. *to prick*; but also metaphorically *to insert a penis* (as if it were a *κέντρον*³⁸) *into the vagina*; cf. the following gloss *βινεῖ* (see crit. app.).³⁹ See *LSJ* s.v. 4. Kassel-Austin see the possibility of a similar obscene usage in Eubulus fr. 106.15.

55d [βινεῖ]: The line is unmetrical. Meineke suggested the deletion of *βινεῖ*, which should rather be interpreted as a gloss of *κεντεῖ*; cf. crit. app. It is probable that a later scribe added *βινεῖ* to explain the metaphorical meaning of *κεντεῖ* (see previous note).

The possibility of *βινεῖ* being a fragment of another line is rather remote. This is an extremely obscene word, which occurs very rarely in Middle Comedy and beyond (cf. General Introduction p. 18).

56 sqq.: Highly wrought style featuring Doric dialect.

56 αὐλῶν: A *sine qua non* of a symposion; see Wilson, in Goldhill & Osborne, *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, 82ff. Cf. on Philetaerus fr. 17.4b.

57a κλαγγὰ θράττει: The verb means *ταράττειν ἢ ἐνοχλεῖν* (Did. *De dub. ap. Pl. lect.* 245.17), and *κλαγγά* denotes *any sharp sound* (*LSJ* s.v.). These terms must refer to instruments other than the flutes, whose sound is described as *solemn* and *gentle* in the previous line. These other instruments (perhaps citharis, lyre, etc.) contrast the sound of the flutes by being, if not disturbing, at least of high volume and high pitch.

57b πνεῖται: In my translation I follow Lilja’s understanding that the verb may “refer to the fragrant odours of incense”;⁴⁰ cf. [Arist.] *Pr.* 24.10. On the contrary, *LSJ* s.v.

³⁸ Cf. Henderson on *κέντρον*: “any point or goad was common for phallus” (*o.c.* 122).

³⁹ For a different interpretation see Bornmann, *SIFC* 50 (1978) 30ff.

⁴⁰ *The Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity*, p. 50 n. 2.

πνέω translate “flutes are sounding”. I am sceptical about *LSJ*'s interpretation, for *πνεῖται* is separated by a whole sentence from the flutes.

58 κούρα κασίας: “Daughter of cassia”; a kenning in the manner of tragedy;⁴¹ note especially the epic / lyric form *κούρα* (cf. introduction to the fragment). The manuscript has *κούραν*, which both Kaibel and Gulick adopt in the Teubner and Loeb editions of Athenaeus' text respectively. However, the accusative makes the meaning obscure. Therefore, I preferred to follow Kassel-Austin and adopt the nominative, suggested by both Meineke and Wilamowitz (though each assumes a different interpretation); cf. crit. app.

Cassia is a kind of incense (*cinnamomum iners*; *LSJ* s.v.). In Antiphanes fr. 55.14 cassia appears to be a synonym for myrrh. Herodotus 3.107.1 names Arabia as the place of origin, not only of cassia and myrrh, but also of frankincense, cinnamon, and gum-mastich; cf. Thphr. *HP* 9.4.2. Syria in particular features as the place of origin of cassia also in Melanippides 757.5-7 *PMG*.

59 ἀλίας: Cf. Ehippus fr. 5.3 *τῆς περικλύστου δ' ἀλίας Κρήτης*, *E. Hel.* 148 *ἐς γῆν ἐναλίαν Κύπρον*.

60 δονεῖ: Cf. *Ar. Av.* 1183 with van Leeuwen *ad loc.* Elevated language again. This is the only time that *δονέω* is used with reference to smell. The aim is apparently to emphasise how strong the smell was.

61-63: A list of incenses and spices.⁴² The perfumes that are mentioned here are particularly rare, and give the impression that they were picked up from some kind of lexicon. This dazzling banquet features not only rare dishes, but also distinctive incenses and spices; cf. introduction. The cook sounds again like an erudite professional and a well-versed expert.

⁴¹ Cf. the famous kenning for a thief in Hes. *Op.* 605: *ἡμερόκοιτος ἀνήρ* (see West *ad loc.*). See also *A. Ag.* 494-495 (with Fraenkel's note). For further on kennings see I. Wærn, *Γῆς ὄσπεα. The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry*, Uppsala 1951, *passim* (for Comedy pp. 101-104).

⁴² For perfumes at symposion see on Amphis fr. 9.3-4.

61a μάρον: *μάρον* is a kind of sage (*LSJ* s.v.), originating in Egypt (Plin. *HN* 12.111). As with *κάλαμος* below, *μάρον* is to be found only here and in scientific treatises; cf. Dsc. 3.42, Thphr. *Od.* 33, Hsch. s.v.

61b καλάμου: *Sweet flag* (*LSJ* s.v.); characterised as *ἀρωματικός* and *εὐώδης* by the ancient sources, this species of reed was known to be growing in Syria and India (Dsc. 1.18, Thphr. *HP* 4.8.4). Mnesimachus' fragment is the only instance where this word is used outside a *catalogue raisonné*.

62 βάρου: *βᾶρος* (or *βᾶρον*) is a kind of spice (cf. *LSJ* s.v.). Herodian tells us that the reason for the long *ā* is to distinguish from the neutral (*Π. μον. λέξ.* 2.941.11 Lentz). However, *βᾶρος* does not appear as a lexicographical entry; instead Hesychius has two variants: *βαρύ* that he describes as *δυμίαμα εὐῶδες* (cf. Bekker *Anecdota* β 225.16); and *ἀβαρύ* that he explains as a Macedonian appellation for the *origanum*.

63a λίνδου: This is the only surviving reference to this aromatic plant, along with Eustathius' gloss of it: *ἀνθηρόν τι εὐῶδες ὀμώνυμον Λίνδῳ τῇ Ῥοδία πόλει* (*Comm. Od.* 1.200.24). This may suggest that its origin was perhaps the Rhodian town of Lindus.

63b κίνδου: Another hapax; “fragrant herb” (*LSJ* s.v.).

63c κισσοῦ: *δάμνος ἐστὶν ... πολὺκλαδος, ξυλώδης ... φύλλα ἔχων περιφερῆ, στρυφνά* (Dsc. 1.97.1); cf. Eupolis fr. 13.5.

63d μίνθου: Equivalent here to *μίνθη* (or *μίνθα*), meaning *mint* (cf. *LSJ* Suppl. s.v.).

64 δόμους ὀμίχλη κατέχει: Here *κατέχω* means “to be spread over, cover” (*LSJ* s.v. II.4). This meaning goes back to Homer; e.g. *Od.* 13.269. Cf. Hermippus fr. 77.9 *ὄσμη θεσπεσία, κατὰ πᾶν δ' ἔχει ὑπερφές δῶ*, Ar. *Nu.* 572-573, Cratinus fr. 143.1.

65: The catalectic anapaestic dimeter serves as a clausula rounding off the whole fragment. One has the (ultimately unprovable) impression that this is the whole passage, a speech in its entity, not just a section taken from it. Besides, a full

recitation of a dinner would be just perfect for Athenaeus' purposes, i.e. to show how exactly dinners are narrated by comic poets (IX 402d).

Φίλιππος (frr. 7-10)

As will become clear from the commentary on individual fragments, it is likely that the Philip in the play's title is Philip II of Macedon. It is also likely that Philip appeared in the play, that Demosthenes was also a character, and that there was a confrontation between the two. It is probable, but not provable, that the play was set in Macedon.⁴³ We find other comic plays named after foreign kings. Eubulus wrote a *Διονύσιος*, apparently referring to the tyrant of Syracuse (cf. Ath. VI 260c), and Philemo wrote a *Πύρρος*, probably featuring the king of Epirus.⁴⁴

A testimony by Theopompus (see on fr. 10) can serve as an index for a rough dating of Mnesimachus' floruit in the third quarter of the fourth century. Some forty years after Aristophanes' latest dated play, Mnesimachus still writes *more Aristophaneo*; as I will attempt to show below, there are similarities with particularly the *Acharnians*, and politics are central to the plot.

Fr. 7

This fragment, cited by Athenaeus X 421c, dwells on the speaker's military pugnacity. It is an extended braggadocio, which is even more emphasised by the iterative presents (*δειπνοῦμεν, καταπίνομεν, etc.*). The speaker presents himself and his companions / associates / race as so warlike that they even eat weapons. He is addressing someone, whom he regards as a potential military opponent (*ἐστί σοι μάχη*, l. 1). He is seeking either to intimidate his opponent or reassure himself. Both the speaker and his style are paralleled by several soldier figures from within Middle and New Comedy. Antiphanes, Alexis, Xenarchus, Philemon, Diphilus, all wrote plays entitled *Στρατιώτης* (*Στρατιῶται* by Menander), whereas soldier figures do appear in

⁴³ Macedon must have also been the setting of the play *Macedonians or Pausanias* by Strattis; cf. Kassel-Austin *ad loc.*

⁴⁴ So Dietze, *De Philemone comico*, 10-12. Breitenbach disagrees (*Titulorum* 105-106), but his arguments are not entirely convincing.

other plays as well, cf. Arnott's introduction to Alexis' *Στρατιώτης*.⁴⁵ One strand of the tradition behind this appears to be the *miles gloriosus*, a character that first appears with Lamachus in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (ll. 620-622).⁴⁶ This motif is later picked up by Menander,⁴⁷ and subsequently by Plautus.⁴⁸ The soldier also appears as a stereotyped figure in the plastic arts.⁴⁹

In the present fragment, the speaker is describing a preposterous way of life. What is particularly noteworthy is the thoroughness with which the fantasy is worked out. We are presented with an elaborate metaphor that consists of substituting foods with weapons. It is impressive how closely the speaker follows the typical order of a dinner. He replicates the feast to a remarkable degree, even down to the furnishings. The nearest parallel for this kind of fantasy banquet is possibly Ar. *Ach.* 979ff., where we experience again a combination of feasting and war, and the scene is similarly elaborated down to details.

A reverse procedure is to be found in Plaut. *Bacch.* 69-73, where Pistoclerus imagines that every single item of his fighting equipment will be replaced by a banquet / revelry object, once he enters the house of the courtesan Bacchis.

As antecedent to both passages stands that extensive scene in the *Acharnians* (ll. 1097-1141), where Dicaeopolis ridicules Lamachus' preparation for war; to every single order that Lamachus gives asking for war equipment, Dicaeopolis adds his own order asking for food. Dicaeopolis and Lamachus could be considered as two opposite poles, the former representing the carefree mentality of feast, and the latter the mentality of war. Mnesimachus seems to have brought these two together. It is

⁴⁵ Cf. Webster *SLGC* 64; Id. *SM* 164.

⁴⁶ Hunter argues that the roots of this motif are to be traced as back as tragedy, Archilochus, and Homer (*The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, 66, n. 18).

⁴⁷ Bias is a bombastic soldier in *Kolax* (cf. fr. 2). Elsewhere, however, Menander has rather transformed the bombastic figure of the soldier into a milder one, e.g. in *Misoumenos* and *Perikeiromene*; cf. Hunter *o.c.* 66-68.

⁴⁸ Being present in seven plays of Plautus, the figure of the braggart soldier is most developed in *Miles Gloriosus* (introductory scene), *Truculentus* (ll. 505-511), and *Curculio* (ll. 439-441). The functions of the soldier figure, including the gasconading deliriums, are often undertaken by figures other than an actual soldier. For the soldier figure in general see Hofmann & Wartenberg, *Der Bramarbas in der antiken Komödie*; Wehrli, *Motivstudien zur griechischen Komödie*, 101-113; Ribbeck, *Alazon*, 27ff.; Hanson, "The glorious military", in Dorey & Dudley, *Roman Drama*, 51-85.

⁴⁹ We possess a number of soldier statuettes and a wall painting; cf. Bieber *HT* figs. 368-371.

possible that this particular passage of the *Acharnians* constituted the inspiration source for Mnesimachus (cf. on Aristophon fr. 13.2).⁵⁰

The fragment describes an exotic lifestyle, which recalls the exaggerated claims relating to Persia and Thrace in *Acharnians*,⁵¹ and also the accounts of faraway peoples in Herodotus.⁵² Conceivably, the speaker is someone regarded by the Athenians as a foreigner describing the warlike habits of his barbarian homeland. This could be someone who has come in Athens as an ambassador. There are good comic parallels for excessive bombast from ambassadors; e.g. the introductory scene with the ambassador in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*. The mention of catapults (l. 9) strongly suggests a link with the Macedonians;⁵³ it is possible that this is an ambassador from Macedon.

Both Meineke (III.577) and Webster (*SLGC* 64) believe that the speaker is Philip himself. Indeed, the boast about catapults would fit perfectly into his mouth. However, though certainty is impossible, there is a very good case to be made for the view, first proposed by Breitenbach, that Demosthenes is the speaker, addressing Philip: "Haec verba etiamsi ad unum quendam Atheniensem vel Graecum hominem, legatum vel imperatorem, dicta putantur, tamen ὑμῶν exspecto: σοί pronomine principem significari arbitror ... Philippum ipsum" (*Titulorum* 36-37). In favour of Breitenbach's hypothesis is Timocles fr. 12; in an attempt to satirise the grandiloquent style of Demosthenes, Timocles compares him to Briareos and depicts him as eating catapults and spears (ll. 4-5: ὁ Βριάρεως, / ὁ τοὺς καταπάλτας τὰς τε λόγχας ἐσθίων). We may have here a stereotypical comic portrayal of Demosthenes analogous to the stereotyping of e.g. Pericles or Cleon in fifth century Comedy.⁵⁴ Bombast seems to have been already established, at least by Aischines, as the defining attribute of

⁵⁰ Another parallel is perhaps Alcaeus fr. 140 V., which also features accumulation of warfare equipment.

⁵¹ Cf. the Persian lifestyle (73ff.), and the Thracian soldiers (155ff.).

⁵² E.g. the marvellous customs of the Egyptians (2.35-36), the Thracian *logos* (5.2-10, 5.12-16), etc.

⁵³ It was Philip who undertook – after Dionysius I of Syracuse – the further development of this revolutionary siege equipment, which he introduced to mainland Greece. See Hammond & Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, II 444ff.

⁵⁴ Representation of Pericles as an Olympian, and satire of his head's shape; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 530-531, Cratinus fr. 73, 258, Eupolis fr. 115, etc. On Pericles' parody in Comedy see Schwarze, *Die Beurteilung des Perikles durch die attische Komödie*. For Cleon's satire as a tanner and a foreigner see Aristophanes' *Knights* (e.g. ll. 2, 44 with scholia); cf. V. 1220-1221.

Demosthenes' style.⁵⁵ Aeschines also tells us that Demosthenes went to extremes and behaved rudely (*δεινῶς ἀσχημονεῖν*, 2.39) at a dinner hosted by Philip during the stay of the Athenian embassy in Macedon in 346 B.C. (see below). I would suggest that this is exactly what Mnesimachus depicts in this play, and especially in fr. 7.

Philip or Demosthenes, in the absence of any clear indication, it could be argued both ways. In favour of my choice of Demosthenes are: i. the fact that the speaker does not actually say that he *uses* catapults; ii. the absence of any indication that the speaker is not Athenian. There is a pattern – beginning with Old Comedy and running into Middle Comedy – of giving non-Athenians the dialect of their native state (unlike tragedy, in which everyone speaks the same poetic dialect).⁵⁶ In an exhaustive presentation of the issue of the language of Macedon Hammond⁵⁷ argues convincingly that the native Macedonian dialect was probably a version of Aeolic Greek. Since this is Comedy, one would expect a Macedonian to speak his dialect, especially given Demosthenes' dismissive treatment of Philip and the Macedonians as barbarians.⁵⁸ If the speaker were a Macedonian, dialect would have been a useful way of signalling his otherness. As it is, it is hard to imagine that the comic poet let go of the opportunity to represent the speaker as “other”, as non-Athenian.

As to the date of the play, Breitenbach (*Titulorum* 38) opts for the years between 345 and 340 B.C. However, the only occasion we know for certain that Demosthenes and Philip met was in 346 B.C., when Demosthenes was one of the Athenian ambassadors to Macedon (cf. D. 5.9-10).⁵⁹ This twofold Athenian embassy to Philip resulted in the Peace of Philocrates during the same year. Among others, this peace provided that the small Thessalian town of Halus, currently under Macedonian siege, ceased to be an ally of Athens. Not only does this term help us to comprehend better fr. 8 below, but also constitutes an additional piece of evidence as to the date of

⁵⁵ See Aeschin. 3.72, 3.166-167, 2.110.

⁵⁶ Cf. in Aristophanes the Megarian (*Ach.* 729ff.), the Boeotian (*Ach.* 860ff.), the King's Eye (*Ach.* 100 with scholia), the Laconian (throughout *Lysistrata*; cf. sch. on l. 81), the Scythian (*Th.* 1001ff. with scholia); cf. Eubulus fr. 11. See Colvin, *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature* (however, on p. 276 he seems to consider Eubulus an Old Comedy poet). Cf. Willi, *The Languages of Aristophanes*, 198-225; Id., *The Language of Greek Comedy*, 18-20, 132-149.

⁵⁷ In Hammond & Griffith *o.c.* 39-54 (esp. 46-49).

⁵⁸ Cf. D. 3.17, 9.31, etc.

⁵⁹ However, this is not historical writing; the author is at liberty to create fictitious encounters.

the play; i.e. considering the year 346 B.C. as a *terminus post quem*, the production of this play could not have been much delayed, if the joke was to be still topical.

ἄρ' οἴσθ' ὅτιή πρὸς ἄνδρας ἐστὶ σοι μάχη,
 οἷ τὰ ξίφη δειπνοῦμεν ἠκονημένα,
 ὄψον δὲ δᾶδας ἠμμένας καταπίνομεν;
 ἐντεῦθεν εὐθὺς ἐπιφέρει τραγήματα
 5 ἡμῖν ὁ παῖς μετὰ δεῖπνον ἀκίδας Κρητικᾶς,
 ὥσπερ ἐρεβίνθους, δορατίων τε λείψανα
 κατεαγὸτ', ἀσπίδας δὲ προσκεφάλαια καὶ
 θώρακας ἔχομεν, πρὸς ποδῶν δὲ σφενδόνας
 καὶ τόξα, καταπάλταισι δ' ἐστεφανώμεθα

Don't you know that in us you are going to fight
 against men who dine on sharpened swords,
 and swallow blazing torches as a relish?
 Thereafter, just after dinner, the slave
 5 brings forth a dessert of Cretan arrows
 and relics of broken spears, as if it were
 chickpeas; for cushions we have shields and
 breastplates, slings and bows at our feet,
 and we are wreathed with catapults

1a ἄρ' οἴσθ': This is a stereotypical phrase that recurs several times in all kinds of texts.⁶⁰ In Comedy the addressee is usually scolded for his ignorance; e.g. Ar. *Pax* 371, Alexis fr. 223, Nicostratus fr. 30. In most cases the question is rhetoric; e.g. Ar. *Av.* 668, 1221, *V.* 1336 (but cf. Ar. *V.* 4).

1b ὅτιή: This rare form of the conjunction ὅτι meaning *that* occurs only in Comedy; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 331, *Eq.* 360, *Av.* 1010, Ehippus fr. 21, etc.

⁶⁰ See Denniston *GP* 44-51.

2 ἠκονημένα: The details are important. This group of wild fighters dine not just on swords, but on *sharpened* swords. The impression conveyed thereby is that of intemperate boasting.

3a ὄψον: The term ὄψον could denote any kind of relish eaten with bread; it formed a third category of food, after bread and wine.⁶¹ See Davidson *o.c.* 20-26, Olson & Sens on Arcestratus fr. 9.2, and Arnott on Alexis fr. 47.6. In harmony with the pattern described in the introduction, what is here being consumed as ὄψον is another military item, δᾶδες.

3b δᾶδες: In war torches are used as a means of destruction (i.e. for burning cities); e.g. A. *Th.* 432-434. But for the tough warriors of this fragment torches are merely a relish. They claim they swallow not just torches but *burning* torches (ἠμμένας); the effective use of detail continues (cf. 1. 2: *sharpened* swords). There is also a mild paradox here created by the idea of swallowing (literally drinking) fire.

4 τραγήματα: The dessert. They included various foodstuffs (chickpeas, different kinds of beans, dried figs and other dried fruits, nuts, etc.), which were supposed to soak up alcohol and stimulate thirst (cf. Gal. 6.550 Kühn, sch. on Ar. *Pl.* 190). References to τραγήματα abound throughout Greek Comedy; e.g. Ar. *Ra.* 510, *Ec.* 844, Eubulus fr. 44, Alexis frr. 168.2 (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*), 190, Philemo fr. 158, Menander fr. 194, 409, etc. Cf. also Pl. *R.* 372c. The chickpeas, usually served roasted (Pherecrates fr. 170, Ar. *Pax* 1136) or boiled (Arcestratus *SH* 192.14), were sometimes considered a cheap *τράγημα*; cf. Ath. III 101d, Crobylus fr. 9.

5 ἀκίδας Κρητικός: ἀκίς can denote both the barb of an arrow (Phot. *a* 750, Poll. 1.137), and the arrow itself (Ar. *Pax* 443 with scholia); cf. *LSJ* s.v. The meaning in the present fragment is the latter. The Cretan arrows had an excellent reputation; cf. Poll. 1.149, Plu. *Pyrrh.* 29.4.

⁶¹ Cf. Hom. *Od.* 3.480, Plu. *Them.* 29.11. But ὄψον was also a regular appellation of fish; cf. Plu. *Mor.* 667f, Arcestr. fr. 20.2, Poll. 7.26.

6-7 *δορατίων λείψανα κατεαγότα*: *κατεαγότα* is the passive perfect participle of *κατάγνυμι* that means *break in pieces, shatter* (see *LSJ* s.v.). The end of the main course is paralleled to the end of a battle, when remnants of broken weapons lie all over the battlefield. Here, instead of desserts, these fighters prefer weapons again, which are imagined as broken down to bite-size portions.

7 *προσκεφάλαια*: Again the details matter; the cushions should be soft and comfortable, but for these warriors a hard shield or breastplate suffices. The details are piled up as the speech unfolds (*sharpened swords, burning torches, etc.*) to express the toughness and manliness of the warriors.

The (head-) pillows / cushions were a *sine qua non* of a typical banquet, along with other pieces of essential furniture, such as couches, coverlets, etc. A list of the major banquet essentials is to be found in Ar. *Ach.* 1089-1093 (cf. Olson *ad loc.*). Cf. Ar. *V.* 676-677, and comm. on l. 8 below.

8 *πρὸς ποδῶν*: Since the diners / drinkers took up a reclining position, it was normal that one would find himself lying at another's feet; cf. Ar. *V.* 1236, Clearchus *FHG* II.310. In the present fragment slings and bows replace the normal reclining couches and cushions; cf. Poll. 6.9.

9 *καταπάλλταισι δ' ἑστεφανώμεθα*: Placing garlands on the heads of the banqueters was another typicality of a formal dinner; cf. on Amphis fr. 9.4. The use of catapults instead of wreaths causes a climax of grotesquery. For the link between Philip and the catapults see introduction to the fragment.

Fr. 8

In this fragment, cited by Athenaeus X 418b-c, we find ourselves either at a feast or in a place where a feast will shortly take place. Although it is not inconceivable that we could actually be *at* a feast, this is unlikely, given that indoor scenes are generally avoided in Comedy.⁶² It is probably safer to assume that the scene below depicts a preparation for a feast. Comedy abounds in scenes that relate to

⁶² Though not completely, as the opening scene in *Clouds* shows.

an off-stage feast, whether it is a preparation for or an account of one;⁶³ cf. Ar. *Ec.* 834-852, *Pax* 922-1126,⁶⁴ *V.* 1174ff., 1299ff., etc.⁶⁵

It looks like an international gathering, where Thessalians are welcome. The seeming naturalness of a Thessalian presence to the speaker may suggest that we are in Macedon. This hypothesis is supported not only by the fact that Philip had by the early 340s established control over Thessaly,⁶⁶ but also by our knowledge that the Athenian ambassadors to Macedon were feasted; cf. Aeschin. 2.39, Theopompus 115 F 236 *FGrH*. At the same time, the idea of being omnivorous links this fragment with what precedes (and also with what follows). The speakers are possibly slaves / table attendants.

τῶν Φαρσαλίων

ἤκει τις, ἵνα <καί> τὰς τραπέζας καταφάγη;

(B.) οὐδεὶς πάρεστιν. (A.) εὖ γε δρωῦντες. ἄρά που
ὀπτὴν κατεσθίουσι πόλιν Ἀχαιϊκὴν;

Has anyone of the Pharsalians arrived

to devour even the tables themselves?

(B.) No one is here. (A.) Good for them. Could it

be that they are eating up an Achaean town roasted?

τῶν Φαρσαλίων: Pharsalus was a small town in the region of Thessaly. In antiquity Thessalian gluttony was renowned. There are many passages that satirise the gluttony of e.g. the Boeotians, the Thebans, or the Thessalians collectively.⁶⁷ However, it is noteworthy that no other passage apart from the present fragment singles out the Pharsalians in particular. Therefore, I would suggest that there is an additional topical point in the selection of Pharsalus. It is important that what is being eaten here by the Pharsalians is an Achaean town – and not anything else. We can probably identify this

⁶³ Webster's allegations (*SM* 112) concerning feasts taking place on stage are not entirely convincing.

⁶⁴ See Dohm *o.c.* 37-55.

⁶⁵ The same pattern occurs even in tragedy; cf. E. *Alc.* 747-802.

⁶⁶ See Hammond & Griffith *o.c.* 220-222, 285ff.

⁶⁷ Cf. Ath. X 417b-418e, Plu. *Mor.* 995e. See Roberts & Head, *The Ancient Boeotians and the Coinage of Boeotia*, 1-9.

town with Halus, a town in the south of Thessaly, on the Pagasean Gulf; cf. Strabo 9.5.8: ἡ Ἄλος ... Φθιώτις καλεῖται καὶ Ἀχαϊκή. I believe that what this fragment really does is allude to the current political situation of the time.⁶⁸ The title of the play, as well as the context suggested by fr. 7 and 10, all tell in favour of this hypothesis. Halus, an ally of Athens, had revolted against Pharsalus.⁶⁹ Philip supported the latter against the former. He laid a siege to Halus in the spring of 346 B.C., and finally managed to reduce it to submission to Pharsalus.⁷⁰ Demosthenes discerns in this episode Philip's increasing aggressiveness against Athens, given the existing alliances; cf. his *Answer to Philip's Letter* §1.

2 τὰς τραπέζας καταφάγη: A bold metaphor; cf. l. 4. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 7.116. In order to satirise gluttony, the comic poets employ various metaphorical phrases like this one, all of which include the notion of eating something inedible; cf. Eupolis fr. 99.6-7 δειπνοῦντι πρὸς τὴν καρδίαν / τῶν ὀλκάδων τιν' αὐτοῦ, Aristophon fr. 9.9 κατεσθίουσι καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους; Euphro fr. 9.14 κατεσθίοντα καὶ τοὺς ἄνθρακας.

4 κατεσθίουσι πόλιν: The verb κατεσθίω is often used metaphorically, to highlight the immense consumption and / or usurpation of property, money, etc.; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 258, Anaxippus fr. 1.32, Alexis fr. 128.1-2, etc. Here, however, κατεσθίω designates destruction. Alcaeus uses a synonym of κατεσθίω, i.e. the verb δάπτειν, to express the notion of destruction; cf. fr. 70.7 V.: δαπτέτω πόλιν; and fr. 129.23-24 V.: δάπτει / τὰν πόλιν. For a thorough discussion of transferred uses of κατεσθίω and similar verbs see Arnott on Alexis fr. 110.2.

In the present fragment a whole city is being devoured. Behind the physicality of this bold metaphor (cf. l. 2) lurks the Aristophanic tradition. Bold metaphors and physicality are core elements of the Aristophanic style; e.g. *V.* 925 ἐκ τῶν πόλεων τὸ σκίρον ἐξεδήροκεν. See Silk, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, 121-124, 138-148. There is an interesting possible echo of *Peace* in the idea of eating a city = destroying it in war. In Aristophanes' play *Polemus* makes a salad with the cities of

⁶⁸ On politics in Middle Comedy and beyond see General Introduction pp. 17-18.

⁶⁹ Cf. sch. on D. 19.36 (352,17 Dindorf): αἱ δύο πόλεις αὗται τῆς Θετταλίας (sc. Pharsalus and Halus) ἐστασίαζον πρὸς ἑαυτάς, ἡ μὲν Φάρσαλος φίλη οὖσα τοῦ Φιλίππου, ὁ δὲ Ἄλος τῶν Ἀθηναίων.

⁷⁰ Cf. D. 19.39, Strabo 9.5.8, and Hammond & Griffith *o.c.* 336, 339ff.

Greece (Il. 242-252). Here the idea is transferred to humans (like the metaphors in fr. 7 above).

Fr. 9

This fragment, cited by Athenaeus IX 387b, agrees with fr. 8 in suggesting a milieu related to a feast. Given the context that I suggest above (cf. introductions to fr. 7 and 8), it is possible, though ultimately unprovable, that this dinner table is prepared for Philip and his hosts, the Athenian ambassadors. The rare delicacy of pheasant is appropriate indeed for a royal meal. By birds' milk we are prompted to imagine a plenty of other luxurious dishes (see below). Rare and luxurious, this bountiful meal is reminiscent of the exotic lifestyle reported by the Ambassador in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*. One particularly recalls Ambassador's claim of a whole ox en casserole (Il. 85-87). The speaker might be a slave again; fr. 9 may form part of the same conversation as fr. 8.

καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον
σπανιώτατον πάρεστιν ὄρνιθων γάλα,
καὶ φασιανὸς ἀποτετιλμένος καλῶς

Even the legendary,
rarest birds' milk is here,
and a pheasant nicely plucked.

1 τὸ λεγόμενον: This is a proverbial expression that points out the common talk of this fictional product, i.e. that it is being much talked about, is widely known and famous.

2 ὄρνιθων γάλα: “ἐπὶ τῶν σπανίων” (Diogenianus *Paroem.* 3.92; cf. 2.15); cf. *Suda* γ 19. This imaginary product still stands in modern Greek for something either very rare or very valuable. The phrase also occurs in Aristophanes (e.g. *V.* 508, *Av.* 734); cf. Eupolis fr. 411, Luc. *Merc. Cond.* 13. The comic poets mention two other imaginary kinds of milk; these are *γάλα λαγοῦ* (Alexis fr. 128; cf. Arnott *ad loc.*), and *γάλακτι χηνός* (Eubulus fr. 89.5; cf. Hunter *ad loc.*).

3 *φασιανός*: This is an adjective; the noun implied is ὄρνις. The φασιανός ὄρνις was thus called because of its origin from near the river Φᾶσις (cf. *LSJ* s.v.). It had the reputation of being a rich delicacy and a luxurious, costly titbit, cf. Ptol. *Euerg.* II 234 F 2 *FGrH*. See Thompson *Birds* 176-177.

Fr. 10

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus VIII 338b. Dorion was a flute-player, famous also for his gluttony and particularly for his love of fish; cf. *Ath.* VIII 337b-338a. It looks as though the speaker is answering a question (“Is it X?” “No, but ...”). Perhaps again it can be accommodated in the same context of the description of a feast.

οὐκ ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς νυκτός ἐστι Δωρίων
ἔνδον παρ’ ἡμῖν λοπαδοφουσητήης

Not only, but even at night Dorion
the shell-blower is inside with us.

1 *Δωρίων*: Dorion was a close acquaintance of Philip, whose company joined regularly for drinking and feasting. The testimonies about him also testify to Philip’s prodigality and dissipation; cf. Theopompus 115 F 224 and 236 *FGrH*, D. 2.19.⁷¹

2 *λοπαδοφουσητήης*: A *harax*. This word occurs only here and in Eustathius *Comm. II.* 4.207 with relation to this fragment; see on Mnesimachus fr. 3.5.

The joke consists of a word-play based on the double meaning of *λοπάς*, which can mean both *flat dish / plate*, and *shellfish* (see *LSJ* s.v.). Given that the shell of certain kinds of shellfish is big enough to be used as a pipe, it is possible that this nickname targets both Dorion’s gluttony and his love for piping.⁷²

⁷¹ The validity of Demosthenes’ words could be questioned, since it suits him to malign Philip.

⁷² For a different interpretation see *LSJ* s.v. *λοπαδοφουσητήης*.

PHILETAERUS

Philetaerus' first Lenaian victory must have occurred between the years 372 and 366 B.C.; cf. *IG II² 2325.143*.¹ He was a son of Aristophanes; cf. *Suda* φ 308, *Prolegomena de comoedia XXX*^{ab} Koster, *RE XIX.2* s.v. Philetairos nr. 5.

Most of the fragments that I analyse below have a common dominant theme, that is the motif of ἡδέως ζῆν, i.e. the ideal of hedonism, of a luxurious and materialistic life, whose main features are food, wine, and sex. There is a call to enjoy these pleasures during lifetime, for life is short (cf. fr. 13).

Κυναγίς (frr. 6-9)

The *Suda*'s entry for Philetaerus (φ 308) lists this play as *Κυνηγίας*. None the less, Kassel-Austin, following Björck's remarks,² thought it plausible to amend the title to *Κυναγίς* (cf. K.-A. *ad loc.*). Meineke (I.350) wondered whether a real huntress or a courtesan with this very name is meant. The latter possibility seems more promising, since there is a number of parallel titles featuring courtesans' names – either historical or fictitious.³ If *Κυναγίς* stands indeed for a name of a courtesan, this must be a fictitious one, since we have no other evidence for it. In further support of the possibility of *Κυναγίς* being a proper name is that, given the fourth century B.C. Athenian social norms, no one would expect a *female hunter* to be the leading figure. Unless, of course, this figure turned out to be not a literal but a metaphorical hunter, i.e. a hetaira hunting men. This hypothesis becomes more plausible, if one compares Theophilus fr. 11, where we have another metaphor from the hunting world: the pimps entangle the youths in the *nets* of the courtesans. Since the fragments provide no definite evidence, I would keep both possibilities open.

Atalante could also have been a reasonable candidate for the huntress of the title, if only the evidence from the fragments, and particularly from fr. 8, did not tell against a mythic theme. Of course, anachronism is always a possibility. The mythic figure of Atalante could have been embedded within a mundane contemporary

¹ Cf. Capps, *AJPh* 28 (1907) 188.

² *Das Alpha impurum*, 137-138.

³ E.g. Eubulus' *Χρύσιλλα*, Antiphanes' *Μαλθάκη*, Alexis' *Ἄγωνίς* (cf. Arnott's introduction), etc.

context; alternatively the play's setting could have been the mythical world but with incorporated elements of contemporary life (see General Introduction pp. 16-17).

As a possible date for this play, Breitenbach (*Titulorum* 122-124) suggested the years between 370 and 365 B.C., while Schiassi (*RFIC* 79 [1951] 219) thought more plausible the period 365-360 B.C. Below (fr. 9.2) I suggest a date in the late 340s on the basis of the reference to Diopieithes, a contemporary politician and general of the city of Athens.

Fr. 6

The following fragment is quoted by the Cynic philosopher Cynulcus in Athenaeus XIII 570e-f. Cynulcus has been preaching against both moral corruption and every kind of indulgence since 566e. This fragment (along with Timocles fr. 24 as a counter-example) constitutes his concluding piece of advice to his collocutor, Myrtilus: ταῦτά σοι παραινεῖν ἔχω, ἑταῖρε Μυρτίλε. καὶ κατὰ τὴν Φιλεταίου Κυνηγίδα; and there follows the fragment. However, Kaibel observed that Cynulcus alters the text for his own purposes by inserting an extra οὐκ before ἡδιστον (l. 2), which distorts both the metre and the meaning (cf. crit. app.).

The exhortation of the comic character is of course exactly the opposite of the one meant by Cynulcus above. The addressee must be a young man.⁴ It could be that the speaker tries to convince a sober and modest friend to suppress his hesitations and enjoy himself by having sex. It is equally possible that it is just an argument between a champion of sobriety and a champion of hedonism, or even that this is a character besotted with a hetaira, who is justifying his lifestyle to a more prudish friend. Here it is possible to detect certain links with Old Comedy. Fragments 6, 7, 8, and 9 are consistent with a debate context, and there is an obvious analogy with the Aristophanic *agon* (cf. *Nu.* 889-1114), and to a lesser extent with the clash in *Daitaleis* fr. 205, 233.⁵ What is different in Philetaerus is that we get a moralising argument involving extensive generalisation. Though not prominent, this motif that consists of arguments arising from a character's situation but pursued in a way that turns them into a generalised or abstract discussion about trends in human life, does appear in Old Comedy; cf. Ar. *Pl.* 467-609 (a debate about the role of poverty in

⁴ Otherwise there would be no point in the phrase "elderly in ways", since the elderly are naturally so.

⁵ If these are indeed two young men, *Daitaleis* could be the model.

society), and to a lesser extent *V.* 655-724 (a brief account of the vices of the Athenian political scene); cf. Amphis fr. 3. This pattern is above all heavily reminiscent of tragedy, particularly Euripidean (e.g. *Med.* 214-251: about the helplessness of women; *Hipp.* 373-390: Phaedra's generalisations about what makes people abandon their sense of duty, *ibid.* 176-197), and is further picked up in the plays of Menander (e.g. *Dysc.* 271-298: about the recommended behaviour of both the rich and the poor ones).⁶

παῦσαι γέρων ὦν τοὺς τρόπους. οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτι
ἥδιστόν ἐστιν ἀποθανεῖν βινούνηθ' ἅμα,
ὥσπερ λέγουσιν ἀποθανεῖν Φορμίσιον;

2 ἥδιστόν ἐστιν Toup ap. Warton Theocr. II (1770) p. 403: οὐκ ἔστ(ιν) ἥδιστον ACE Cynulcum dipnosophistam poetae verba ad suam mentem mutasse censet Kaibel

Stop being elderly in ways. Don't you know that
it is most pleasurable to die while screwing,
just as they say Phormisius died?

1 οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτι: A common start of a rhetoric question.⁷ The place of this phrase at the end of the line is not unusual. Particularly in Comedy questions introduced in this way do not usually await an answer; they rather slightly scold the addressee for failing to know the facts that follow; cf. *Ar. Av.* 609, Ehippus fr. 21, Alexis fr. 222, Diphilus fr. 76, Athenio fr. 1, etc.

2 ἥδιστόν ἐστιν ἀποθανεῖν βινούνηθ': On the issue of obscenity in Middle Comedy and for further occurrences of βινεῖν see General Introduction p. 18.

The conception expressed here recurs in Ovid *Am.* 2.10.29-30, 35-36.⁸ Philetaerus produces two examples of persons who supposedly died in this way;

⁶ Such a – not necessarily linear – development of the debate motif is paralleled by the intermittent persistence of the ὀνομαστί κωμωδεῖν (cf. General Introduction pp. 17-18). Both phenomena testify to the continuity of Greek Comedy.

⁷ Cf. Smyth §2640.

⁸ Ovid parodies the theme of the sombre contemplation of death in Latin elegy; cf. McKeown *ad loc.*

Phormisius in the present fragment, and Lais in fr. 9. In fr. 17 Philetaerus employs a parallel formula, i.e. *καλόν γ' ἐστ' ἀποθανεῖν αὐλούμενον*, where the semantic ambiguity of the word *καλόν*, creates a grotesque atmosphere (see comm. *ad loc.*). On the contrary, here Philetaerus is more precise in the choice of his words: *ἡδιστον* points uniquely and undeniably to pleasure, whereas *καλόν* could also allude to ethics.

3 *Φορμίσιον*: Phormisius was an Athenian politician of the late fifth – early fourth century B.C.; cf. Arist. *Ath.* 34.3, D.H. *Lys.* 32; *PA* 14945, *RE* XX1.541-544.

He is mentioned once by Plato (fr. 127) who targets his venality, and twice by Aristophanes (*Ra.* 965, *Ec.* 97) who satirises his thick beard. The joke is particularly obscene in the passage from *Ecclesiazusae*, where Phormisius' beard is paralleled to the female genitalia (i.e. Phormisius' beard = bushy pubic hair; cf. sch. *ad loc.*). The idea of bribery seems remote from the context of the present fragment. Possibly the passage alludes to an otherwise unknown reputation for hedonism on the part of Phormisius. But it may be that Philetaerus, despite mentioning nothing about his beard,⁹ looks back to Aristophanes' treatment of Phormisius. If so, it seems that Aristophanes' joke stuck,¹⁰ so that Phormisius remained associated in people's mind with sex, to the point that years later a comic poet could still claim that he died while having sex.¹¹

Fr. 7

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus VII 280c-d, within a discussion about pleasure (*ἡδονή*). Both this fragment and most of the other passages cited by Athenaeus express the idea that pleasure, and in particular pleasure derived from both eating and sex, is the highest Good. The idea of pleasure as the main goal in life is already present in elegiac poetry (cf. Mimnermus fr. 1, 7 West), and later it receives a philosophic treatment by Plato (e.g. in *Protagoras*, see on Amphis fr. 6.3). In Athenaeus VII 279f and 280b the notion is summarised through the words of Epicurus: *οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε δύναμαι νοῆσαι τὰ γὰρ δὸν ἀφελῶν μὲν τὴν διὰ χυλῶν, ἀφελῶν δὲ*

⁹ Of course, such a reference can simply have not survived.

¹⁰ Cf. Hsch. *a* 7248: *οἱ κωμικοὶ ... ἔλεγον ... Φορμισίους τὰ γυναικεῖα αἰδοῖα.*

¹¹ Ancient biographies like the appropriate death; cf. Ar. *Pax* 700-703 (about Cratinus). See Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, pp. ix, 90, 115-116.

τὴν δι' ἀφροδισίων ἡδονήν (cf. 21.1 (*Reliquiae*) Arrighetti = 67 Usener).¹² Cf. below on ἡδέως ζῆν.

I would suggest that the speaker below is identical with the speaker of fr. 6, since the *credo* expressed here is very much the same. It could be that he continues the “sermon” started in fr. 6, or else that this is a defence from criticism. It seems plausible that the two fragments were quite close within the play. It is possible that here the addressee is the same hesitant individual as in fr. 6, given the *agon*-like environment assumed above (cf. introduction to fr. 6).

τί δεῖ γὰρ ὄντα θνητόν, ἰκετεύω, ποιεῖν
 πλὴν ἡδέως ζῆν τὸν βίον καθ' ἡμέραν,
 εἰς ἃν ἔχη τις ὀπόθεν; ἀλλὰ δεῖ σκοπεῖν
 τοῦτ' αὐτό, τὰνθρώπει' ὀρῶντα πράγματα,
 5 εἰς αὔριον δὲ <μηδὲ> φροντίζειν ὅ τι
 ἔσται· περιεργόν ἐστιν ἀποκεῖσθαι πάνυ
 ἔωλον ἔνδον τὰργύριον

What should a human, being mortal, do, I ask you,
 than live their life pleasantly every single day,
 if one has the means for it? Indeed, one should focus
 on this very thing: contemplating the human conditions,
 5 not to care at all of what might come tomorrow;
 since it is futile to have hoarded money laid
 up without use in store, inside the house

τ *ἰκετεύω*: See *LSJ* s.v. 4. The parenthetic usage of *ἰκετεύω* is quite frequent in both tragedy (e.g. *S. Ph.* 932, *E. Hec.* 97), and comedy (e.g. *Ar. Nu.* 696, *Ra.* 299, Alexis fr. 3). However, in all such cases *ἰκετεύω* is part of a sentence expressing a request / an order, i.e. a verb in imperative is either present or most clearly understood (e.g. *Ar. Ra.* 11). This is not the case in the present fragment. Here the syntax is totally different: the sentence is a rhetorical question, which only seeks to present most

¹² Epicurus here is misunderstood; cf. D.L. 10.131-132 (*Letter to Menoeceus*, 131-132 Arrighetti / Usener), *Plu. Mor.* 1086c ff.

emphatically the speaker's opinion.¹³ *ικετεύω* bears an exclamatory force, and is parenthetically inserted in the flow of the speech, as if it were to challenge for an opposite argument. The only other instance where *ικετεύω* is used in this way is Eubulus fr. 114: *καὶ γὰρ πόσῳ κάλλιον ἰκετεύω, τρέφειν / ἄνθρωπον ἐστ' ἄνθρωπον, ἂν ἔχη βίον...* (cf. Hunter *ad loc.*). Sachtshal¹⁴ attempts a different categorisation of the *ικετεύω* instances; on the one hand, the cases where the personal pronoun *σε* is present, and on the other hand, the cases where for metrical reasons *σε* is omitted, as it happens in both Philetaerus fr. 7 and Eubulus fr. 114.¹⁵

2 *ἡδέως ζῆν*: Living pleasantly is a broad notion that recurs frequently throughout Greek literature. In Comedy the particular pleasures understood thereby are usually eating, drinking, and sex.¹⁶ It is noteworthy that these pleasures tend to figure prominently in the situation enjoyed by the Aristophanic hero after his success; cf. *Ach.* 1037ff., *Pax* 1316ff. The idea also surfaces in the arguments of *Hetton logos* in *Nu.* 1071ff. It is interesting however that in the fourth century there is a marked tendency for Comedy to deal in a more philosophic way with the issue, as Philetaerus here does; cf. Amphis fr. 8, 21, Alexis fr. 273, Apollodorus Carystius fr. 5. Both Menander (fr. 799) and Philippides (fr. 6) equal the conception of *ἡδέως ζῆν* with abstaining from marriage, which of course leaves more space for revelling in numerous love affairs. The *modus vivendi* that Comedy commends is sometimes challenged and disapproved in tragedy (e.g. E. fr. 193 *TGF*), though interestingly adesp. fr. 95 *TGF* (assigned to Euripides by Porson *Adversaria* 101) champions the idea of *ἡδέως ζῆν* with the same zeal as the comic fragments do:

*πᾶσιν δὲ θνητοῖς βούλομαι παραινεῖσαι
τοῦφήμερον ζῆν ἡδέως· ὁ γὰρ θανῶν*

¹³ A parallel to this use of *ικετεύω* is the oath *πρὸς τῶν θεῶν* (cf. comm. on Aristiphon fr. 9.1), since both invocations originate as an attempt to implore someone.

¹⁴ *De comitorum Graecorum sermone metro accommodato*, 38.

¹⁵ In both these cases, it cannot be only metrical reasons that dictate the omission of the pronoun. For here we do not have a personal or a genuine request addressed to a collocutor, but a rather idiomorphic usage of the verb, as I explain above.

¹⁶ See comm. on Theophilus fr. 12.3-4. As to the popular basis of such notions in Aristophanes see Dover's introduction to Ar. *Clouds* pp. lxiv-lxvi.

τὸ μηδὲν ἔστι καὶ σκιά κατὰ χρόνός·
 μικροῦ δὲ βίτου ζῶντ' ἐπαυρέσθαι χρεών.

5 εἰς αὔριον ... μηδὲ φροντίζειν: The ideal of *carpe diem*, i.e. to enjoy the present without thinking of what the future might bring, occurs early on in sympotic contexts as a topos; cf. Alcaeus fr. 38 V. It is later championed by Heracles in E. *Alc.* 779ff., and Horace appears to echo Philetaerus in *Od.* 1.9.13: “quid sit futurum cras, fuge quaerere”. For parallels see Nisbet & Hubbard on Hor. *l.c.* Cf. also the famous saying εἰς αὔριον τὰ σπουδαῖα (Plu. *Pel.* 10.4, *Mor.* 596f).¹⁷

7 ἔωλον: See *LSJ* s.v. The word originally denotes bread, and any further kind of food, left from the previous day; cf. sch. Luc. 29.3, 34.31, sch. Ael. Arist. *Pan.* 148.5.6. *Suda* (ε 1884) gives a metaphorical meaning: τὸ ψυχρόν, μάταιον, ἀνωφελές, ἀνίσχυρον. Although the occurrences of the word characterising nouns other than food are numerous (e.g. of a corpse in Luc. *Cat.* 18, and *Philops.* 31), this is the only instance where the word is used in relation to money. The idea conveyed hereby is that storing wealth is pointless. There is an interesting parallel at Pi. *I.* 1.67 (εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον – justifying the athlete’s life); cf. Id. *N.* 1.31-2.

Fr. 8

The following fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIII 572d. These two lines seem to confirm the contemporary context of the play (but see introduction to the play). Additionally, when this fragment is taken into consideration, a debate context for all the surviving fragments becomes even more plausible. The champion of the hedonistic lifestyle is again the speaker; here he gives a rather fanciful justification to his preference of courtesans to a wife (cf. on Amphis fr. 1.1b).

This fragment is a shorter (by one line) version of Philetaerus fr. 5. It is Athenaeus again who cites fr. 5 (XIII 559a), and assigns it to a different play of Philetaerus called *Κορινθιαστής*. The meaning is not altered by this extra line: ὡς τακερόν, ὦ Ζεῦ, καὶ μαλακὸν τὸ βλέμμα' ἔχει. The reference to a courtesan is beyond any doubt. This looks like a genuine repetition, not merely a misattribution. However,

¹⁷ Said by Archias, who continued revelling, when he was warned of the conjuration of the Theban exiles to overthrow the pro-Spartan regime in Thebes, in 379 B.C.

without further information we cannot say whether this is a recycling or a self-quotation. The antecedent for the former is Aeschylus (*Pers.* 811 ~ *Ag.* 527),¹⁸ while for both phenomena Aristophanes (cf. *Th.* 472 ~ *Ach.* 504, *Pax* 752-759 ~ *V.* 1030-1037). We also have the testimony of Athenaeus VIII 347b-c that Ehippus as well practised recycling; i.e. he reused the lines of fr. 5 from *Geryones* into another play of his, the *Peltastes*.

οὐκ ἐτὸς ἑταίρας ἱερὸν ἐστὶ πανταχοῦ,
ἀλλ' οὐχὶ γαμετῆς οὐδαμοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος

No wonder that there is a temple of Hetaira everywhere,
but none of wife anywhere in Greece.

ἡ ἑταίρας ἱερὸν: There is a pun here on the double meaning of the word *ἑταίρα*; it can mean *courtesan*, but it was also a cult epithet of Aphrodite in Athens, as the patron deity of courtesans; cf. Hsch. ε 6481, Ath. XIII 571c, etc. In l. 1 the character seems to be referring to Aphrodite herself and her numerous shrines; in l. 2 an element of *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is introduced, since the character shifts from Aphrodite's epithet to *courtesan*. Though within modern printing conventions the cult title requires a capital letter, in performance it would be impossible to distinguish between the common noun and the cult epithet.

Fr. 9

The following fragment (like fr. 6) comes from Book XIII (*Περὶ γυναικῶν*) 587e-f of Athenaeus, where the discussion revolves around women, both married and courtesans. The figure of the courtesan receives a renewed interest during the period of Middle Comedy, and becomes a stock character.¹⁹

The metre is trochaic tetrameter; used normally for a special effect; here it probably relates to the sermonising nature of the fragment.²⁰ Courtesans are presented

¹⁸ Denniston and Page *ad loc.* defend the case against the rejection of the line as an interpolation.

¹⁹ See General Introduction pp. 20-21.

²⁰ Trochaic tetrameter and sermonising against the courtesans recur in Anaxilas fr. 22. See General Introduction p. 27.

in a way that suggests a degree of distaste; this could be an argument against dedication to their pursuit. The speaker is possibly an old man, who has seen – and most possibly enjoyed – the flourishing prime of these courtesans, and now he realises that all of them have grown old and ugly.²¹ What he tries to stress is presumably the vanity of temporary pleasures, since both the prime and the charms of a woman disappear with time. His words are marked by vigour, created by the two questions containing negation, where the negative word is emphatically placed first (*οὐχί*, ll. 1, 4).

The fragment below suggests that courtesans usually had a long-running career, and did not leave their profession until late in life.²² The motif is found elsewhere, cf. Aristophanes fr. 148.1, Xenarchus fr. 4.9, Philetas *AP* 6.210; see Hunter's introduction to Eubulus' *Νάννιον*. It is difficult to know how literally to take this motif. It may be that many courtesans continued to practise their profession beyond their prime (however we determine that), but since Comedy has a tendency both to literalness and to exaggeration it may be this (rather than the precise arithmetic of years) which makes the comic poets present the courtesans as actually old.

*οὐχὶ Κερκώπη μὲν ἤδη γέγον' ἔτη τρισχίλια,
 ἢ δὲ Διοπείδους ἀηδῆς Τέλεσις ἕτερα μυρία;
 Θεολύτην δ' <οὐδ'> οἶδεν οὐδεὶς ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον ἐγένετο.
 οὐχὶ Λαῖς μὲν τελευτῶσ' ἀπέθανεν βινουμένη,
 5 Ἴσθμιάς δὲ καὶ Νέαιρα κατασέσηπε καὶ Φίλα;
 Κοσσύφας δὲ καὶ Γαλήνας καὶ Κορώνας οὐ λέγω.
 περὶ δὲ Ναῖδος σιωπῶ· γομφίους γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει*

2 *Τέλεσις* A: *Τελέσιλλα* CE 3 *οὐδ'* Meineke: om. ACE: *οὐκ* Jacobs *Att. Mus.* III 2 (1800) p. 241

Has not Kerkope already become three thousand years old,
 and the disgusting Telesis of Diopeithes another ten thousand?
 As for Theolyte, no one knows when she was first born.

²¹ An old man's reminiscences of his youth are also the context of Anaxandrides fr. 9.

²² "Late" is a relative term with different meanings according to context; the joke may not be literally true.

Did not Lais end up dying while screwing,
 5 and have not Isthmias, Neaira, and Phila rotten away?
 And I say nothing of all the Kossyphes and Galenes and Korones.
 As for Nais, I keep silent, for she has no molars.

1a Κερκώπη: The noun *κερκώπη* signifies the *μικρὸν τεττίγιον τὸ καλαμαῖον λεγόμενον* (Hsch. κ 2342; cf. Speusippus fr. 10). As a woman's name it recurs on the inscriptions *IG II² 11833* and *SEG 26.289.1*, and in *Lexica Segueriana, Gl. Rhet. κ 271.21*. We could conjecture that the reason for naming a woman after a cicada species is to emphasise the woman's either incessant loquacity or talent in singing. Alexis fr. 96 supports such an interpretation; a woman's relentless chattering is said to overpass that of a *κερκώπη*, a magpie, a nightingale, etc. (see Arnott *ad loc.*). As to the lexicographical entry, it goes as follows: ὄνομα ἑταίρας, καλουμένης οὔτω διὰ κακοήθειαν. κέρκωπες γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ κακούργοι ἄνθρωποι. This is rather suspicious; we do not know whether the lexicographer had in mind a real hetaira, or whether Philetaerus' fragment was his only source for this name, which he interpreted according to his knowledge of the *Cercopes*.²³ If the latter, then we are obviously dealing with a fictitious hetaira. Still, the lexicographical entry may be right as to the origin of the name; *Κερκώπη* can allude to either the *πανουργία* or the loquacity of a woman (cf. Bechtel, *Frauennamen*, 83-84, 93).

1b ἔτη τρισχίλια: A wild exaggeration, capped by the greater exaggeration in the next line (ἔτερα μυρία).

2a Διοπείδους: A certain Diopeithes was a popular target of Old Comedy. He was an orator (sch. on Ar. *V.* 380), and a seer (*χρησμολόγος*; sch. on Ar. *Av.* 988). His oracular frenzy along with his crippled hand provided the comic poets with enough reasons to satirise him; cf. Ar. *V.* 380, *Av.* 988, Amipsias fr. 10, Phrynichus fr. 9,²⁴ Eupolis fr. 264, etc. See *PA* 4309, and Connor *CIPh* 58 (1963) 115-117. Nevertheless, the

²³ The mythic *Cercopes* were notorious for robbing and plundering; see on Amphis fr. 10.1a.

²⁴ The Diopeithes mentioned by Phrynichus is once identified with (sch. on Ar. *Av.* 988), and once disassociated from (sch. on Ar. *V.* 380) the character meant by Aristophanes.

numerous records show that the name was not uncommon,²⁵ so it need not be the man mocked by Aristophanes and the other Old Comedy poets. A more likely target for fourth century Comedy is the Athenian politician and general (*PA* 4327), who was particularly active from 343 B.C. onwards, when he led new Athenian cleruchs to the Chersonese and later held a command in Thrace; during this time his policy towards Philip was mostly aggressive and provocative.²⁶ It is probable that this is another example of *ὀνομαστί κωμωδεῖν*²⁷ against a politician. It is more likely that Philetaerus picked up on a recognisable contemporary figure, rather than he resorted to the Old Comedy's favourite Diopeithes. This hypothesis is crucial to dating the play. If I am correct, the play should consequently be dated in the late 340s, within the period of Diopeithes' heightened involvement in the Athenian politics and affairs with Macedon (or perhaps shortly after, but not too late, so that the reference could still be topical).

2b Τέλεισις: This is the only surviving reference to this courtesan. Only codex A has this reading, whereas codices C and E preserve the unmetrical *Τελέσιλλα*. At first sight the genitive *Διοπείδου* seems to suggest either a parental or a marital relationship.²⁸ But if Diopeithes was an Athenian citizen (cf. previous note), it is most unlikely that his daughter would be a hetaira, since hetairai were normally foreigners. Besides, the rules of comic decorum did not generally allow for free and respectable Athenian women to be mentioned on stage by name.²⁹ Therefore, the genitive *Διοπείδου* should rather signify that Diopeithes had a long-term love affair with Telesis; cf. the case of Neaira and Apollodorus in [D.] 59.³⁰ Alternatively, Diopeithes could be a pimp and Telesis a hetaira enslaved to him (like Habrotonon in Men. *Epitrepontes*).

2c ἀηδής: This adjective can be used to characterise a person (e.g. Thphr. *Char.* 20, Arist. *EN* 1108a30), foods and drinks (e.g. Arist. *Pr.* 873b24ff.), etc. However, the

²⁵ Both in Athens and elsewhere in the Greek world; cf. *LGN s.v.*, *PA* 4308-4330.

²⁶ See Hammond & Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, II 379, 563-565.

²⁷ See General Introduction pp. 17-18.

²⁸ Cf. Smyth §1301.

²⁹ Cf. Sommerstein, *Quaderni di Storia* 11 (1980) 393-418.

³⁰ Cf. *ὁ Διός ... Γανυμήδης* (E. *Cyc.* 585); Seaford *ad loc.* understands the genitive as meaning "Zeus' cup-bearer or catamite".

present context is different. What makes the hetaira Telesis unpleasant is merely her old age. The idea of becoming disgusting, as one gets older, appears only rarely in Greek literature, but is already present in Archilochus fr. 188 West. Apart from the present fragment, I was able to detect the following instances: Alexis fr. 280, D.H. *Rh.* 6.5.25-26, and Mich. *in EN* 464.12-13.

3a Θεολύτην: This courtesan is mentioned once again in Anaxandrides fr. 9; cf. Millis *ad loc.*

3b <οὐδ'>: Meineke's addition to complete the metre, better than Jacobs, for it creates an emphatic parechesis; cf. the almost similar beginning of the following *οἶδεν* and the similar *οὐδεῖς*.

4 Λαῖς: The ancient sources refer to two different, both famous, hetairai bearing the name *Λαῖς* (possibly meaning *lion* in Semitic), both flourishing in Corinth, but without being always easy to discern which one is meant; cf. *RE* XII.1 s.v. *Lais* nr. 1 and 2. The one mentioned here must be the younger one. Her mother was the hetaira Timandra, who originated from the Sicilian town of Hyccara.³¹ Alcibiades is said to have had a relationship with Timandra (Plu. *Alc.* 39.1). *Lais* was *ἐπτέτις*, when Nicias brought her as a captive from Hyccara to Corinth in 415/414 B.C. (sch. on Ar. *Pl.* 179, Plu. *Nic.* 15, Paus. 2.2.5, etc.).³² As to the elder *Lais*, she must have originated from Corinth (Strattis fr. 27).³³

The details about the lives of the two homonymous hetairai are so much intertwined, that we are often presented with contradictory information, which one can hardly attribute with certainty to either *Lais*. Nevertheless, Breitenbach (*Titulorum* 141-149) believes that there was only one *Lais*, and that the confusion of the tradition is due to a wrong interpretation of Plato fr. 196.

³¹ Cf. Plu. *Alc.* 39.7-8, sch. on Ar. *Pl.* 179, Ath. XII 535c (but in XIII 574e we read *Damasandra*).

³² See Schiassi *o.c.* 224-230, 244. But Holzinger (on Ar. *Pl.* 179) attempts a different interpretation of the sources and believes that the younger *Lais* was born between 400 and 390 B.C., and that her father was Alcibiades.

³³ Schiassi places her birth after 430 B.C., and believes that *she* is the one meant by Plato fr. 196, both Cephisodorus' and Epicrates' plays called *Ἀντιλαῖς*, and Philetaerus fr. 9. To avoid repetition of already stated material, I would refer the reader to the lemma in *RE*.

5 Ἴσθμιάς – Νέαιρα – Φίλα: This triad appears again in both [D.] 59.19 and Ath. XIII 593f. In [D.] these three courtesans are said to have belonged to a madam named Nikarete, a freedwoman of a certain Charisius of Elis (otherwise unknown), while Athenaeus makes them (along with Nikarete) slaves of Casius of Elis.³⁴ [Demosthenes'] speech *Against Neaira* was probably delivered between 343 and 340 B.C.,³⁵ and treats in length the life of Neaira. A detail may be significant for dating Philetaerus' play more precisely: we are told (§37) that in 371 B.C. Neaira had relations with Stephanos. Given that she was attractive to men by that date,³⁶ the later we date the present play, the more appropriate the verb *κατασέσηπε* sounds. This favours even further my hypothesis for dating the play in the late 340s (cf. introduction and comm. on l. 2).

It is possible that the name Ἴσθμιάς derives from the Isthmian Games.³⁷ But the exact connection with the Games cannot be established with certainty. A freeborn woman called Ἴσθμιάς could have been thus named either in memorable honour of the Games, or because her father (or a member of her family) was a winner at the Games. But when the name belongs to a hetaira, the meaning is possibly that she can give her lovers equal pleasure to the one that the Panhellenic Games give to the participants (Bechtel *Frauennamen* 53, 126-127).³⁸ Alternatively, the reference could possibly be to the word ἰσθμός, alluding to the perineum; cf. Ar. *Pax* 879-880 with scholia (see Henderson *The Maculate Muse* 137-138, Bechtel *Frauennamen* 127).

As to Φίλα, we hear that the orator Hyperides kept a courtesan named Φίλα (Ath. XIII 590d). Given Hyperides' lifetime (389-322 B.C.), it is probable that his Φίλα is the same with the one mentioned in our fragment. This interpretation favours further my suggestion for dating the play in the late 340s (cf. on l. 2); i.e. it looks rather impossible that Hyperides, born in 389, was attracted to a courtesan who was

³⁴ Probably an error for Charisius, cf. Carey, *Apollodoros, Against Neaira: [Demosthenes] 59, ad loc.*

³⁵ Cf. Carey *o.c.* 3; Kapparis, *Apollodoros: "Against Neaira" [D. 59]*, 28.

³⁶ Carey (*o.c.* 3) places her birth between 400 and 395 B.C.

³⁷ There were female names derived from the other three Panhellenic Games too. We know of at least one hetaira called Πυθιάς, and one αἰλητρις called Νεμεάς, see Bechtel, *Frauennamen*, 52-53.

³⁸ However, Polemon (Preller p. 38) tells us of a regulation that forbade both courtesans and slaves to be named after such glorious festivals. Still, this was a later regulation (*ca.* 317-315 B.C.), introduced by Demetrius of Phaleron, and remained in force only temporarily (so Bechtel, *Frauennamen*, 53, n. 1).

described as *κατασέσηπε* by the 360s (either Breitenbach's or Schiassi's dating – cf. introduction).

6a Κοσσύφας: This name appears only in inscriptions (see Bechtel *Frauennamen* 92, n. 1). Bechtel also thinks that the name alludes to the skinny legs of its bearer, as the fr. 22 of Anaxilas implies (l. 21: *βλέμμα καὶ φωνὴ γυναικός, τὰ σκέλη δὲ κοψίχου*). Nevertheless, given the allusion to either female loquacity or dexterity on singing (cf. *Κερκώπη*), we could legitimately discern the same joke here, since we read in *Cyranides* 3.24.2 that the blackbird is *ἠδύφωνον τῷ θέρει πολλά λαλοῦν*. A further possibility presents itself, if we accept that *Κοσσύφα* bears some kind of relation not to the blackbird, but rather to the homonymous fish, one of the species of rockfishes; see Thompson *Fishes* s.v. *κόσσυφος*. We are told that *ὁ σαργὸς καὶ ὁ κόσσυφος πολλάς γαμετὰς ἔχουσιν* (Anon. in Opp. *Hal.* 365.a.8-9). This “habit”, transferred to its human version, would perfectly suit the activities of a courtesan.

As to the plural (*Κοσσύφας, Γαλήνας, Κορώννας*), this usage is fairly common in Aristophanes; cf. *Av.* 558-559: *τὰς Ἀλκμήνας ... / καὶ τὰς Ἀλόπας καὶ τὰς Σεμέλας*.

6b Γαλήνας: Despite Hesychius' assertion that *Γαλήνη* is an *ὄνομα κύριον ἐταίρας* (γ 99), this is the only reference to a hetaira with this name. Instead, we have sufficient evidence that this name was borne by a number of free Athenian women.³⁹ *Γαλήνη* is one of the Nereids in Hesiod *Th.* 244 (cf. West *ad loc.*). One can see the sense in the Nereid name, since the word means “calm”. This could also be the basis for the female name, i.e. referring to a placid and compliant temperament. Alternatively, it could be a euphemistic joke for a girl with a fiery temper. For a fanciful etymology of this name see *Et. Gud.* γ 295.5-8.

6c Κορώννας: *Κορώννη* was a common nickname for courtesans, though it could also be borne by free Athenian women (cf. *LGPN* vol. II s.v.). Athenaeus XIII 583e tells us of a hetaira called Theocleia, who was given the nickname Corone. Corone is also the nickname of a courtesan mentioned in Machon 18.435 (cf. Gow *ad loc.*).⁴⁰ However,

³⁹ Cf. *LGPN* vol. II s.v.; see also vol. III.A for evidence from Corinth, South Italy, and Sicily.

⁴⁰ In Archilochus fr. 331 West the word *κορώννας* looks like a generic term for hetairai (on the most obvious interpretation of this fragment, given the context in which it appears – ap. Ath. XIII 594d).

there are some other cases, where it is not clear whether Corone is a real name or a nickname. These are, apart from the present fragment of Philetaerus, Ehippus fr. 15, Men. *Kol.* fr. 4 Arnott, and Antiphanes 349 F 2 *FGrH*.⁴¹

A hetaira nicknamed *Κορώνη* can either be as noisy as a crow,⁴² or resemble crow's proverbial longevity.⁴³ The latter fits the context better, given that the current subject is about courtesans who have always been exercising their profession, indifferently of their old age. Alternatively, such a nickname could allude to a woman's dark complexion and / or hair colour. Finally, it could denote rapacity, given crow's predatory nature and the fact that it lives on carrion. Irrespectively of its primary associations, this name can have further sexual connotations that would be equally appropriate to the status of a courtesan; cf. *Suda* κ 2105: *διάφορα σημαίνει· καὶ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ αἰδοίου*.

6d οὐ λέγω: Praeteritio ("I leave unsaid"); cf. Headlam *JPh* 23 (1895) 279-280. This phrase usually (but not always) occurs at the end of the line, as it does here; cf. A. *Ag.* 871, S. *Tr.* 500, *El.* 1467, E. *Ba.* 367, Eupolis fr. 99.96, Men. *Epit.* 128, etc. The syntax can vary, but the most common cases are either an accusative (as in the present fragment) or a subordinate relative clause.

7a Ναῖδος: The name of the courtesan Nais does not appear much in the texts, but when it does, it causes many troubles to the scholars. Since antiquity there has been much confusion and controversy as to whether *Nais* or *Lais* is the right reading in Ar. *Pl.* 179; palaeographical error between ΛΑΙΣ and ΝΑΙΣ can most easily occur. Although the Scholiast *ad loc.* takes for granted the correctness of the codices for the

⁴¹ Hunter (introduction to Eubulus' *Nannion*) believes that in this case "*Κορώνη* was a real, not a professional name". See further Gomme & Sandbach on Men. *Kol.* fr. 4 Arnott, and also Hunter *l.c.*, for a possible reconstruction of the relationship between the courtesans Corone, Nannion, and Nannarion.

⁴² Cf. *Et. Gud.* 340.17-18: *παρὰ τὸ κρώζω*.

⁴³ This is also the opinion of Bechtel, *Frauenamen* 92-93; cf. Hes. fr. 171 Rzach³. Bechtel records this name as occurring in Nicostratus (ap. Ath. 587e). However, the name *Κορώνη* does not exist anywhere within the corpus of Nicostratus, whereas the fragment quoted in Ath. XIII 587e belongs to Menander (*Kol.* fr. 4 Arnott, see above).

reading *Lais*, both Athenaeus (XIII 592d) and Harpocration (ν 1)⁴⁴ think that *Nais* should be read instead; cf. Lysias 375 Thalheim.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, all four major editions of *Plutus* (*OCT*, *LOEB*, *Belles Lettres*, and *Teubner*) adopt the reading *Lais*.⁴⁶

Nais is also mentioned by Aristophanes in *Gerytades* (fr. 179).⁴⁷ There is also an encomium for her by Gorgias' pupil Alcidas (Baier & Sauppe II.155).

γβ γομφίους γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει: As with three and ten thousand years of age (ll. 1-2), this is presumably a grotesque exaggeration. Likewise, Aristophanes in *Pl.* 1056-1059 parodies the single molar of the Old Woman; cf. sch. *ad loc.*⁴⁸ Meanwhile, the possession of fine teeth by a courtesan is considered praiseworthy by Alexis in fr. 103.20-21.

Outside Comedy toothlessness – and particularly the lack of molars – is recorded as a result of old age; cf. Phot. *a* 247. Female toothlessness is mentioned again with distaste in Lysias fr. 1 Thalheim: ἥς ῥᾶον τοὺς ὀδόντας ἀριθμηῆσαι [ὄσω ἐλάττους ἦσαν] ἢ τῆς χειρὸς τοὺς δακτύλους.⁴⁹

Οἰνοπίων (frr. 13-14)

Οἰνοπίων was the son of Dionysus and Ariadne.⁵⁰ He was believed to have reigned over Chios, where he introduced the cultivation of vines.⁵¹ It is a possibility that the play dealt with this person, who must have also had a speaking part. If so,

⁴⁴ Cf. *Suda* ν 16.

⁴⁵ See *RE* I.2, 2863.24-42.

⁴⁶ Schiassi (*o.c.* 224-226) concludes that *Nais* is the correct reading for the rewriting of *Plutus* in 388 B.C., while in the first version of the play in 408 it must have been *Lais* along with a different male lover. Schiassi places the birth of *Nais* in 410 B.C. and her floruit around 388, whereas Holzinger (on Ar. *Pl.* 179) assumes that she must have reached her forties by 388 B.C. The reading *Nais* is also adopted by both van Leeuwen and Sommerstein.

⁴⁷ Produced in 408 B.C., according to Geissler (*Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*, 61), or in the second decade of the fourth century B.C., according to Raubitschek (*RE* XX.1, 61.49-52). Cf. K.-A. III.101.

⁴⁸ See also sch. on Ar. *Pl.* 673, and on *V.* 165.

⁴⁹ The reference in Lysias is to a woman aged seventy years old.

⁵⁰ A different branch of the tradition makes Theseus the father of Oenopion; cf. Plu. *Thes.* 20.2.

⁵¹ Cf. Theopompus 115 F 276 *FGrH*, D.S. *Bibl.* 5.79.1, sch. on Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 244.25ff., etc.

then Oenopion must have been the speaker in the following fragment. What he says sounds rather programmatic and generic; therefore, it might be argued that this is part of the play's prologue.⁵² A different interpretation of the title is also possible; either a witty *speaking name* (i.e. "the one who drinks wine")⁵³ or derived from *οἶνος*,⁵⁴ the name *Οἰνοπίων* would perfectly describe any comic character set to defend the legitimacy of wine drinking, and generally of a carefree lifestyle full of pleasures, just like the one Philetaerus suggests in the fragments above. Indeed, the emphasis on food in the two surviving fragments might at first sight tell against a mythic theme. But this should not keep us long; for in Middle Comedy contemporary reality and myth can intertwine in many ways.⁵⁵ One possibility is that Oenopion kept his mythical identity, was transferred into a contemporary context, and was portrayed behaving like a fourth century Athenian, particularly indulgent in wine drinking. There are good parallels to support such a plot reconstruction; e.g. the role of Dionysus in Amphis' *Dithyrambos* as possibly a modern choral producer (see introduction to fr. 14 and comm. on ll. 6-7), the case of Aristomenes' *Dionysus Asketes* (cf. Kaibel on fr. 13).⁵⁶

Οἰνοπίων might well have been the title figure of a play by Nicostratus, if we accept the emendation of *Suda's* mss from *Οἰνοποιῶ* to *Οἰνοπίωνι* proposed by Meursius.⁵⁷ Additionally, a father in Alexis fr. 113 parallels his drunkard son to *Οἰνοπίων*.⁵⁸

Fr. 13

The following fragment is quoted by Athenaeus VII 280d, immediately after Philetaerus fr. 7, within the long running treatment of the variant meanings and applications of *pleasure*.

⁵² A number of Middle Comedy plays featuring mythic figures in their titles had presumably these figures delivering a prologue speech; see Webster *SLGC* 83ff.

⁵³ Though the short iota in *Οἰνοπίων* makes this etymology less likely.

⁵⁴ So Welcker, *Die Aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus und die Kabirenweihe zu Lemnos*, 549, n. 848.

⁵⁵ Cf. General Introduction pp. 24-26.

⁵⁶ In Old Comedy Dionysus appears as Phormion's disciple in Eupolis' *Taxiarchoi*. Cf. sch. on Ar. *Pax* 347, with Meineke's correction of *Διονύσιος* to *Διόνυσος*.

⁵⁷ In Gronovius, *Thesaurus Graecarum antiquitatum* 10, 1585A.

⁵⁸ Arnott *ad loc.* examines in details the figure of Oenopion.

What we could possibly have here is another guru giving a lesson on pleasure, just like the speaker in fr. 6 and 7. In all three fragments, what captures the reader's / listener's attention is the maximum self-confidence, with which these words are spoken, as if they were not to be denied.

θνητῶν δ' ὅσοι
 ζῶσιν κακῶς ἔχοντες ἄφθονον βίον,
 ἐγὼ μὲν αὐτοὺς ἀθλίους εἶναι λέγω·
 οὐ γὰρ θανῶν δήπουθ' ἂν ἔγγελλυν φάγοις,
 5 οὐδ' ἐν νεκροῖσι πέττεται γαμήλιος

All those mortals who live miserably,
 although they have plentiful means of living,
 I for one consider to be wretched;
 for once you die, you can hardly eat eels,
 5 nor is a bride-cake cooked among the dead

2 ζῶσιν κακῶς: The opposite of *ἡδέως ζῆν*; cf. fr. 7.2. This attitude of contempt against those living wretchedly, despite having the financial means for a better / luxurious life, is the same to the one already expressed by Philetaerus in fr. 7.6-7, and is also present in Apollodorus fr. 16. Antiphanes is also explicit in stating that *ζῆν κακῶς* is a major factor of depression and sadness (fr. 98). Of course, the adverb *κακῶς* in all these cases is to be understood – within the comic milieu⁵⁹ – as meaning *without luxuries and pleasures*. A *bad* life, i.e. a life without materialistic pleasures, is exactly what the speaker in Anaxandrides fr. 2 means, when he says that he has not been living *χρηστῶς*.

4a δήπουθ': The indefinite adverb *δήπουθεν*⁶⁰ is mainly used before a vowel, although there are also some instances where it is used before a consonant (e.g. Pl. *Ion* 534a, Luc. *Lex.* 21.4, Plu. *Mor.* 556f, etc.). In the latter cases it does not drop the final *nu*,

⁵⁹ In other contexts *κακῶς* can be a synonym of *ταπεινῶς*, denoting humiliation, and lack of dignity, and can also mean *immoral*.

⁶⁰ See *LSJ* s.v.

except from Bato fr. 7.3: *δήπουθε κινούσι*. As to the form *δήπουθ'*, this is a *harax* one that occurs only in the present fragment.

The force of this adverb consists in the implications of certainty that conveys. The speaker expresses their view that happens to be, in most of the cases, a sentence of a (relatively) catholic truth, whose validity – however comic it may be – is potentially acknowledgeable by many. Absent from the vocabulary of the three tragedians,⁶¹ this adverb appears quite frequently in Comedy; e.g. Ar. *Pax* 1019, Bato fr. 5.7-8, Philemon fr. 109.1, etc.

4b ἔγγελυν: See *RE* I.1 s.v. *Aal*, Olson & Sens on Archestratus fr. 10.1, Thompson *Fishes* 58-61. It cannot be a mere coincidence that Philetaerus chose specifically the eel as a representative gastronomical pleasure not available to the dead.⁶² Eels were considered a luxurious dish that was highly priced; cf. Antiphanes fr. 145.5: *δραχμᾶς τουλάχιστον δώδεκα*.⁶³ The association of eels with luxury is already prominent in Aristophanes; e.g. *Ach.* 880-894, *Pax* 1005, *Lys.* 35-36, etc. Within the text of Athenaeus eels are praised twice for their exceptional taste. In VII 298b we are told that according to Hicesius *αἱ ἐγγέλεις εὐχυλότεραι πάντων εἰσὶν ἰχθύων καὶ εὐστομαχία διαφέρουσι τῶν πλείστων*, while in 298d eels are described as *ἡ τῶν δείπνων Ἐλένη*. Herodotus (2.72), Anaxandrides (fr. 40),⁶⁴ and Antiphanes (fr. 145), provide us with a piece of otherwise unattested information: that the Egyptians considered the eel to be sacred.

5 γαμήλιος: ὁ εἰς τοὺς γάμους πεσσόμενος πλακοῦς (Hsch. γ 119; cf. *LSJ* s.v.) *γαμήλιος* is an adjective that is employed here substantively to denote the wedding cake (i.e. the noun *πλακοῦς* is to be understood). As an adjective, *γαμήλιος* is attributed to a wide range of nouns relating to marriage, such as a song (Ar. *Th.* 1034-1035), a dance (Nonn. *Dion.* 47.457), a dinner (Phot. *Bibl.* 73.50b.4), even gods (Hsch. δ 2184). In nearly all the cases both *γαμήλιος* and the noun are present in the text. However, in this fragment of Philetaerus *γαμήλιος* is used differently; not only is *γαμήλιος* being

⁶¹ Sophocles only uses the synonym *δήπου* once, *OT* 1042.

⁶² For the superiority of eels among fish see Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes*, 8, 10.

⁶³ In Ar. *Ach.* 962 we hear of an eel priced at three drachmas. This statement is taken literally by both Oder (in *RE l.c.*) and Davidson *o.c.* 186-187. But Starkie (on *Ach. l.c.*) disagrees.

⁶⁴ Cf. Millis *ad loc.*

used substantively, but also this is the only instance where *γαμήλιος* is used as a substantive to denote the wedding cake.

The reference to *γαμήλιος* the wedding cake combines nicely two of the three fundamental notions that we meet continuously in Comedy, i.e. food and sex.⁶⁵ But what is particularly important here is that *γαμήλιος* is not a random food item; it is the food eaten at weddings, a wedding cake. The choice of a word with explicit marital connotations points beyond mere food and sex to a life of marriage and family.

Fr. 14

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus IV 169e, within a discussion about the different kinds and names of cooking utensils. After the citation of various fragments (Anaxippus fr. 6, Antiphanes fr. 95, Alexis fr. 24, etc.), Athenaeus introduces the present fragment in the simplest way: *Φιλέταιρος Οίνοπίωνι*, after which line 1 is quoted. Athenaeus resumes with *καὶ πάλιν*, after which lines 2 and 3 are quoted. There is no way to know for sure how close in the original text line 1 was to lines 2 and 3. Though both parts mention the cook Patanion, it does not follow that they were originally close to each other. On the contrary, the fact that the name Patanion, instead of a pronoun (deictic or personal), is mentioned again in line 3 suggests strongly that the two parts were not close. If they were, the second mention of the cook's name would be needless and pleonastic.

ὁ μάγειρος οὗτος Πατανίων προσελθέτω

*πλείους Στρατονίκου τοὺς μαθητὰς μοι δοκεῖ
ἔξειν Πατανίων*

Let this cook Patanion come forward

I think that Patanion will have more disciples
than Stratonikos

⁶⁵ The third is wine; cf. on Theophilus fr. 12.3-4.

1 Πατανίων: Though not certain (*οὔτος* can merely be anaphoric), the line suggests that the cook appeared in the play. For the cook figure in Comedy see General Introduction p. 19, and introduction to Dionysius fr. 2.

Pollux (10.107) tells us that *πατάνιον* is a kind of dish, an *ἐκπέταλον λοπάδιον* (cf. Hsch. and Phot. s.v. *πατάνια*). It is obvious that Philetaerus derives the proper name *Πατανίων* out of *πατάνιον*, creating thus, apart from a *haraX*, an appropriate name for a cook.⁶⁶ For the spelling of the term *πατάνιον* (i.e. either with an initial *π* or a *β*), see Arnott's discussion on Alexis fr. 24.3, and Hunter's on Eubulus fr. 37.1.

2 Στρατονίκου: A musician, a music teacher, and a music innovator of the fourth century B.C.;⁶⁷ cf. Machon fr. 11 (cf. Gow *ad loc.*), and Ath. VIII 347f-352d. The information about him is for the most part stories and anecdotes, ascribed by Ath. VIII 350d to a lost treatise by the historian Callisthenes, entitled *Στρατονίκου ἀπομνημονεύματα* (124 F5 *FGrH*). Stratonicus apparently ran his own music school. The character in this fragment reckons that the cook Patanion will end up with more students than Stratonicus. The natural assumption is that Stratonicus must have had a great number of students, but this is inconsistent with what Athenaeus reports in VIII 348d: *ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῷ διδασκαλείῳ εἶχεν ἐννέα μὲν εἰκόνας τῶν Μουσῶν, τοῦ δὲ Ἀπόλλωνος μίαν, μαθητὰς δὲ δύο, πυνθανομένου τινὸς πόσους ἔχοι μαθητὰς, ἔφη “σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς δώδεκα”*. However, this is obviously an anecdote, meant to display Stratonicus' readiness in repartee.⁶⁸ Therefore, I would be very cautious about its credibility. The truth may be with the comic fragment, which to be effective needs a music teacher with many pupils as an example, upon which to build and demonstrate the image of the self-important cook Patanion, and thus comply with the established stereotype of the cook figure in Comedy.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ However, Meineke expresses his hesitations as to the originality of Philetaerus: “vereor ne ut alibi coqui nomen *Πατανίων* obscuratum sit” (*Analecta* 171), all the more that he has gathered himself (*FCG* III.298) two further parallels: *Λαγγνίων* (Ath. XIII 584f), and *Πυθακνίων* (Alciph. *Epist.* 2.15, 16 Schepers).

⁶⁷ Maas (*RE* IV.A1 s.v. Stratonikos nr. 2) dates him roughly between 410 and 360 B.C.

⁶⁸ If historical at all, which I doubt, it either may reflect an instance when only two pupils were present in the class or may have occurred at the very beginning of Stratonicus' career, when he really had only two students.

⁶⁹ See introduction to Dionysius fr. 2, and General Introduction p. 19.

2-3 *δοκεῖ ἔξειν*: Hiatus at a pause is allowable; cf. Maas *Greek Metre* §§45, 66.

Φιλαυλος (fr. 17)

The title denotes someone who loves the music of the *aulos*, the flute. Theophilus too wrote a *Φιλαυλος* (cf. comm. *ad loc.*). An interesting parallel is to be found in ceramic; the word *ΤΕΡΠΑΥΛΟΣ* (a synonym of *Φιλαυλος*), is inscribed on a red-figure amphora,⁷⁰ and refers to a satyr playing the *aulos*. In view of the associations of the *aulos* with the symposion, especially in Athens (see below on l. 4b), the title may suggest a play that embraced not just love of music but hedonism more widely.

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIV 633e-f. The speaker delivers a praise of music, and is probably the flute-lover himself.⁷¹ Still, this praise of music is not straightforward, as the hearer may imagine at first; Philetaerus has a joke about sex to make, but he keeps it to line 3, thus achieving a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. The content of the fragment implies an atmosphere related to a banquet. It is possible that a symposion either is being prepared or has just taken place.

ὦ Ζεῦ, καλόν γ' ἐστ' ἀποθανεῖν αὐλούμενον·
 τούτοις ἐν Ἅδου γὰρ μόνοις ἐξουσία
 ἀφροδισιάζειν ἐστίν. οἱ δὲ τοὺς τρόπους
 ὄυπαροὺς ἔχοντες μουσικῆς ἀπειρία
 5 εἰς τὸν πίθον φέρουσι τὸν τετραμένον

By Zeus, it is really a noble thing to die listening to the music of flutes.
 For only these persons do have the right to have
 sex in Hades, while those whose manners
 are uncultured, because of their want of music skills,
 5 carry (water) to the perforated jar.

⁷⁰ Beazley *Paralipomena* 323.

⁷¹ Cf. Theophilus fr. 5.

1 καλόν γ' ἐστ' ἀποθανεῖν αὐλούμενον: Interestingly, a parallel to this phrase is to be found in Philetaerus again, in fr. 6: ἡδιστόν ἐστιν ἀποθανεῖν βινοῦνθ' ἅμα (see comm. *ad loc.*). If we agree with Pearson that Philetaerus alludes to Sophocles in line 2 (see below), it could also be the case that here he alludes to passages such as Pl. *Mx.* 234c: καλόν εἶναι τὸ ἐν πολέμῳ ἀποθνήσκειν (a phrase followed, as here, by a justification of its validity), or Tyrtaeus fr. 10.1-2 West: τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα / ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἧ πατρίδι μαρνάμενον. Even if Philetaerus did not have any particular passage in mind, he could still be referring to this notion, i.e. dying bravely in battle.⁷² This kind of battle vs. party parallel / transposition traces back to martial elegy; cf. Archilochus fr. 2 West: ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μᾶζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ' οἶνος / Ἴσμαρικός· πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος, cf. Id. fr. 1.

It is important that here Philetaerus employs the adjective *καλόν* instead of *ἡδιστόν*. The former is ambiguous, since it can also have a moral meaning (whereas the latter alludes exclusively to pleasure). Thus, self-indulgence and pleasure are raised to a heroic level. Through the transposition of the spirit of martial elegy into the comic context Philetaerus achieves the justification of a particular life style, i.e. the *ἡδέως ζῆν*.

2 μόνους: Pearson considers this as a parody of Sophocles fr. 837 TGF: ὡς τρισόλβιοι / κεῖνοι βροτῶν, οἳ ταῦτα δερχθέντες τέλη / μόλωσ' ἐς Ἅδου· τοῖσδε γὰρ μόνους ἐκεῖ / ζῆν ἔστι, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πάντ' ἐκεῖ κακά.⁷³ The preferential treatment in Hades of those initiated into the Mysteries also features in a number of other passages; e.g. Ar. *Ra.* 154-158, 455-459, *h.Cer.* 480-482 (cf. Richardson *ad loc.*), E. *Ba.* 72-82, Pi. fr. 137 Maehler, etc. It is interesting that in Aristophanes' *Frogs* the flute-music is present along with torchlight and dance in several scenes that reflect aspects of a real mystic / initiatory *telete* (e.g. Il. 154-158, 313-353, etc.).⁷⁴ The music of the *auloi* is depicted as being part of the afterlife happiness of the initiates, who continue the celebration of rites and the worship of Bacchus in Hades. As a chorus of mystes, they still perform the sacred procession from Athens to Eleusis.

⁷² This virtue has been variously expressed from Homer onwards; cf. *Il.* 12.243: εἰς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης. Particularly, it has been exemplified in Pericles' Funeral Speech (Th. 2.35.1-46.2, especially §42.1). Cf. also Pl. *Crit.* 51a-b.

⁷³ See further Pearson *ad loc.*

⁷⁴ See Lada-Richards, *Initiating Dionysus*, *passim* – esp. 205-206, 98-100.

The notion of two distinct categories in Hades also appears on the famous gold plates / lamellae, found buried in tombs all over the Greek world. Their dating ranges from the middle – or late – fifth century B.C. down to the mid third century A.D.⁷⁵ The depiction of the blessed initiates is most explicit in the Hipponium tablet ll. 15-16, and in the Pelinna tablet l. 7.⁷⁶ The initiated in any kind of mystery cults were thought to enjoy an eternal bliss in Hades. A parallel idea is conveyed in Aristophon fr. 12, where Pluto dines only with the disciples of Pythagoras (cf. comm. *ad loc.*). *Ra.* 154, 212, 313, 513, 1302, 1317. Wegner, *Das Musikleben der Griechen*, 52-8, pls. 4-6

In the present fragment, there is *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, the blessed ones are not the initiates, but those who have musical skill. And of course the blessed life after death turns out to be sex. In *Plu. Mor.* 761f one finds another category, the lovers, as the ones receiving preferential treatment in the Underworld.

4a ῥυπαρούς: This adjective, literally meaning *filthy, dirty*, is used here metaphorically to denote the *uncultured / rustic* manners of the uninitiated in music.⁷⁷ Although ῥυπαρός, when used metaphorically, can be a characterisation of – among others – a person (Eupolis fr. 329, Zeno fr. 242, etc.), or a lifestyle (Arist. *VV* 1251b12-13), it is not frequently used to describe one's manners (*τρόποι*). In fact, there are only two such instances, the scholia on *Ar. Nu.* 449 and on *Eq.* 357.

4b μουσικῆς ἀπειρία: Pseudo-Plutarch in the essay *On Music* notes: *φανερὸν οὖν ἐκ τούτων ὅτι τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰκότως μάλιστα πάντων ἐμέλησε πεπαιδεῦσθαι μουσικῆν. τῶν γὰρ νέων τὰς ψυχὰς ὄοντο δεῖν διὰ μουσικῆς πλάττειν τε καὶ ῥυθμίζειν ἐπὶ τὸ εὐσχημον, χρησίμης δηλονότι τῆς μουσικῆς ὑπαρχούσης πρὸς πάντα καιρὸν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐσπουδασμένην πράξιν* (1140b-c). Indeed, training in music was an essential part of the Athenian education.⁷⁸ The freeborn Athenian children of the better off, *ἐκ παίδων σμικρῶν ἀρξάμενοι* (*Pl. Prt.* 325c), were regularly sent to music-masters (*κιθαρισταί*), where they learnt both to sing and to play the lyre and the aulos (the latter probably

⁷⁵ Cf. Zuntz, *Persephone*, 293; Segal *GRBS* 31 (1990) 412.

⁷⁶ For a reconstruction of these two tablets see Janko *CQ* 34 n.s. (1984) 91-97, and Segal *o.c.* 411 respectively.

⁷⁷ See *LSJ* s.v. and Hsch. *ρ* 507, 508.

⁷⁸ On the Athenian educational system see *Pl. Prt.* 325c-326e, *Arist. Pol.* 8.4.3ff., *Plu. Mor.* 7c.

ceased being taught after the fourth century B.C.).⁷⁹ Though education was private and confined to relatively few, the various Athenian festivals that featured either music contests (e.g. the Panathenaia) or dithyrambic performances (e.g. the City and Rural Dionysia) provided the entire corpus of citizens with the opportunity to access and experience musical culture; all the more that the delivery of the theoric money made affordable even to the poorer the attendance of the festivals.⁸⁰ Hence, the possibility of finding among the Athenian citizens someone illiterate in music was rather diminished.⁸¹

Some ground-breaking views on music were already voiced as early as the beginnings of the fifth century B.C. by the musician Damon, who in his lost treatise *Ἀρεσπαγικὸς* discussed in length the importance of music, its moralising and paedagogical effects – particularly upon the youths, its potential influence on politics, its structural features (*harmoniae* and rhythms), as well as the need for the music to be widely taught and practised. His views are echoed and can be discerned – more or less easily at times – in the works of Plato, Aristotle, Aristoxenus, Aristides Quintilianus, etc.⁸²

However, playing the *aulos* was an altogether different case.⁸³ Within the Athenian society the profession of the flute-player was largely confined to foreigners, females, and slaves.⁸⁴ It was considered an unbecoming occupation for a freeborn citizen;⁸⁵ Alcibiades was said to have refused to play the *aulos*, for he considered it

⁷⁹ See Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 36-45, 134-137.

⁸⁰ Cf. Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, 98.

⁸¹ It was not exceptional to be able to sing to the lyre (*κισσαρφδία*), and this probably extended beyond the elite; cf. Ath. IV 176e.

⁸² See Lasserre, *Plutarque: De la musique*, 53-95; Barker, *Greek Musical Writings*, I 168-170; Wallace in Wallace & MacLachlan, *Harmonia Mundi*, 30-53.

⁸³ For a detailed account about the *aulos* see Wilson, in Goldhill & Osborne, *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, 58-95, and West, *Ancient Greek Music*, 81-109.

⁸⁴ Though the situation appears to have been different during the early fifth century (e.g. there is evidence of *khoregoi* who also stood as *auletai* for the poets they funded); cf. Wilson, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia*, 130-131.

⁸⁵ Aristotle calls *aulos* an *ὀργιαστικόν* instrument, whose practise has the disadvantage of *κωλύειν τῷ λόγῳ* (*Pol.* 1341a20-25). Therefore, he disapproves its introduction into education.

ἀγεννές and ἀνελεύθερον (Plu. *Alc.* 2.4-6).⁸⁶ Being present in almost every single occasion of both the public and the private life of the Athenians,⁸⁷ the *aulos* was also a quintessential part of the symposion.⁸⁸ This was one of the few occasions when freeborn Athenians exercised flute playing, along of course with the *ad hoc* hired αὐλητριῶδες. Such a sympotic milieu may also form the background of the present fragment of Philetaerus. Indeed, dying while listening to the music of the *aulos* is mostly imaginable in a symposion context. Besides, the verb ἀφροδισιάζειν indicates that there is more at issue here than love of music. Given the connection of sex with the music of the *aulos*, it is interesting how Wilson establishes a relation between the musical and the sexual, with reference to the *auletrides*, who understandably provided both musical and sexual services.⁸⁹ Philetaerus clearly refers to this musical (and other) entertainment taking place at the symposia and carried out by courtesans, who acted as flute- / lyre- / and harp-players (αὐλητριῶδες, κιθαρίστριες, ψάλτριες). In Philetaerus' language then, those "uncultured and lacking music skills" were the ones who did not revel in banquets, or, as Anaxandrides would say, "did not live a real life" (fr. 2.4: χρηστῶς οὐκ ἔζων).

5 πίδαρον ... τετραμένον: The word ὕδωρ is to be understood here. Carrying water in a leaky jar was the punishment inflicted upon the Danaids in the Underworld for having killed their husbands; cf. sch. on Luc. 77.21.4.⁹⁰ Apart from the Danaids, the ancient sources name two additional categories, namely the *impious* and the *uninitiated*, as the ones suffering this punishment in Hades. As to the impious, cf. Pl. *R.* 363d: τοὺς δὲ ἀνοσίους αὖ καὶ ἀδίκους ... κοσκίνῳ ὕδωρ ἀναγκάζουσι φέρειν (cf. *Suda* εἰ 321). Of course, the impious may be the uninitiated (but certainly not only them). In Plato again one

⁸⁶ See Wilson in Goldhill & Osborne *o.c.* 58, 74, 87-95. Such an attitude of contempt may originate from the rejection of the *aulos* by Athens' patron goddess, Athena. Wilson discusses this myth in pp. 60-69.

⁸⁷ In most festivals, in sacrifice, in weddings, in funerals, etc.; cf. Wilson in Goldhill & Osborne *o.c.* 58, 76-85.

⁸⁸ Wilson discusses thoroughly the role of the *aulos* at the symposion (Goldhill & Osborne *o.c.* 82-85).

⁸⁹ In Pratinas fr. 708 *PMG* the description of the *aulos* may have sexual connotations (l. 14: τρυπάνῳ δέμας πεπλασμένον); cf. Wilson in Goldhill & Osborne *o.c.* 69, n. 46.

⁹⁰ See also Zenobius 2.6, [Plu.] *De Prov. Alex.* 7, *Suda* α 3230, εἰ 315, and Hor. *Od.* 3.11.25-28. In D.S. 1.97.1-2 we hear of an Egyptian custom, according to which priests carried water daily to a perforated jar.

reads (*Grg.* 493b): ἀθλιώτατοι ἂν εἶεν, οἱ ἀμύητοι, καὶ φοροῖεν εἰς τὸν τετραγμένον πίθον ὕδωρ ἐτέρῳ τοιούτῳ τετραγμένῳ κοσκίνῳ.⁹¹ This conception is also present in a painting of Polygnotus, which is described by Pausanias 10.31.9ff. The depicted figures carry water in broken pitchers (although the jar is not referred to as being *leaky*). Pausanias identifies these figures as uninitiated women (10.31.9, 10.31.11).

The unhappy fate of the uninitiated is a recurring motif, and the contrast between the two groups, the blessed and the damned, is clear and sharp.⁹² In the present fragment Philetaerus modifies this motif, gives it a comic twist, and exploits it for his own poetic purposes. According to his new version, the privileged ones are those who have undergone a different kind of initiation, that is an initiation into the music culture. These, like the proper initiates, can enjoy a blissful afterlife. Forseeably, Philetaerus, being a comic poet, assigns to this bliss his own interpretation, which is of course a permit to orgies and revels.

In view of the reference to sex in this passage, the mention of the Danaids may have further connotations, since their crime was exactly the rejection of sex, as well as the rejection of marriage, which led them to kill their husbands. *Mutatis mutandis* and with a comic adaptation, those who do not practise music, and hence have no permission to sex, are condemned to suffer the same punishment as the original sinners.

⁹¹ In [Plu.] *De prov. Alex.* 7 both the souls of the uninitiated and the Danaids are said to suffer this punishment.

⁹² See Richardson on *h.Cer.* 480–482 for a thorough discussion.

THEOPHILUS

As I point out in the General Introduction,¹ Middle Comedy is a contentious category; there is fluidity at both ends. Theophilus wrote toward the end of our period and may have written not only plays which we could categorize as Middle Comedy, but also plays which might reasonably be designated New Comedy. Körte (*RE* V.A2 s.v. Theophilus nr. 10) traces his floruit in the period of Philip II and Alexander the Great of Macedon. He is first recorded as a winner at the Dionysia of 329 B.C. (*IG* II² 2318.354). In the Dionysia of 311 B.C. he competed with the play *Παγκρατιαστής* and won fourth place (*IG* II² 2323a.49). He came fourth again in either the Dionysia or the Lenaia of an unknown year (*IG* II² 2322). Cf. *Suda* § 195.

Ἀπόδημοι (fr. 1)

The title presents an interesting case. It denotes *emigrants, people who are abroad, away from their place of origin*. But although both the verb *ἀποδημέω* and the noun *ἀποδημία* are commonly used in fifth and fourth century Attic texts, the noun *ἀπόδημος* is rare.² This may be relevant to Moeris' claim (195.34) that the Attic word was *ἐκδημος*, instead of *ἀπόδημος*; his claim is accepted by *LSJ* (s.v. *ἀπόδημος*), though Gomme & Sandbach suggest *ἀπόδημος* as a supplement of a lacuna in *Men. Georg.* 6. It may be that Theophilus chose this (in Attic Greek) uncommon word as a title for a play which apparently dealt with non-Attic people, i.e. with emigrants?

The only surviving fragment of this play is cited by the Scholiast of *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax, p. 159.23-26 Hilgard. His aim is apparently to emphasise the importance of the *τέχνη γραμματική*. He claims that this kind of knowledge is more useful to life than it is music or astronomy, and, therefore, not even slaves were left illiterate by their masters.

It is clear from the fragment that the speaker is a slave, and particularly a non-Greek one. This is one of the rare instances, where the content of an isolated fragment seems directly relevant to the play's title. Meineke (III.626) suggests that he must be a

¹ pp. 12-13.

² Within Comedy it occurs only once more, *Men. Mis.* 231. A cursory search of *TLG* showed that outside Comedy too it occurs rarely and only in later authors (e.g. Diodorus Siculus, Herodian, Artemidorus, etc.).

freedman, who still lodged in the house of his previous master, and remained part of his clientele. The suggestion has much to recommend it. A slave going abroad without his master seems implausible, unless, of course, he was a run-away, which seems again rather improbable, given the obvious affection for his master. The fact that he is not Greek becomes evident from what he says about having been introduced into the Greek culture by his master (ll. 3-4). If Meineke is right, perhaps the slave has been granted his freedom just recently, and now resolves to return to his country of origin, along with other freedmen; hence the plural in the title. During their stay in Athens, these slaves were *emigrants* (*ἀπόδημοι*). This forthcoming departure, however, troubles the speaker, who must have become intimately close to his master. Therefore, he goes on to deliver the speech below, a monologue apparently, where he expresses his hesitation to act the way he has planned. He evidently finds himself in a state of agitation and internal debate; cf. *τί φημι* (see on l. 1b). This style of language bears a tragic quality; what comes to mind particularly as a precedent is Medea's hesitation speech in *E. Med.* 364-409 (cf. particularly ll. 386-388: *καὶ δὴ τεθναῖσι· τίς με δέξεται πόλις; / τίς γῆν ἄσυλον καὶ δόμους ἐχεγγύους / ξένος παρασχὼν ῥύσεται τοῦμὸν δέμας;*)

*καίτοι τί φημι καὶ τί δρᾶν βουλεύομαι;
προδοῦς ἀπιέναι τὸν ἀγαπητὸν δεσπότην,
τὸν τροφέα, τὸν σωτήρα, δι' ὃν εἶδον νόμους
Ἑλληνας, ἔμαθον γράμματ', ἐμυήθην θεοῖς;*

3 εἶδον cod.: εἶχον Meineke, ἔγνω id. ed. min.: ἤδειν vel ἤδη Richards p. 68

But what am I talking about and what do I resolve to do?

Depart having betrayed my beloved master,

my foster father, my saviour, thanks to whom I learnt the Greek

laws, I learnt to read, I was initiated in the gods?

1a καίτοι: Here the compound article *καίτοι* has an adversative sense, meaning *but*, *and yet*. Denniston notes that it is “used by a speaker in pulling himself up abruptly” (*GP* 557). This helps us understand better the context; i.e. the speaker must have been debating with himself, without being able to reach a final resolution.

1b καίτοι τί φημι: This self-addressed question recurs in *A. Pr.* 101, *Luc. Rh. Pr.* 11.13, etc.; cf. also some variations: *S. OC* 1132 (*καίτοι τί φωνῶ;*), and *Ar. Ec.* 299 (*καίτοι τί λέγω;*). The speaker seems to be having second thoughts on what he has just said, as if he were doubtful about the present situation. Likewise, in the present fragment the speaker seems to face a profound dilemma, and sounds very close to changing his mind about leaving.

1c τί δρᾶν βουλεύομαι: Here the verb *βουλεύομαι* means *resolve to do something*; cf. *LSJ* s.v. B.4. Both this particular question and the overall style bear a tragic overtone, as it is also the case in a number of parallels; cf. *Ar. Th.* 71 (*ὦ Ζεῦ, τί δρᾶσαι διανοεῖ με τήμερον;*), *Pax* 58 (*ὦ Ζεῦ, τί ποτε βουλεύει ποιεῖν;* – see Olson *ad loc.*), *Ach.* 466 (*καίτοι τί δράσω;*), *Pl. Tht.* 164c (*καίτοι τί ποτε μέλλομεν ... δρᾶν;*), etc.

2 προδοῦς: The verb *προδίδωμι* and its derivatives are often used in both comedy and tragedy within a serious context, the meaning being that of betrayal, unfaithfulness, disloyalty, and the like, concerning a vital issue; cf. *Ar. Ach.* 290: *ὦ προδότα τῆς πατρίδος* (the chorus of Acharnians to Dicaeopolis about making peace with Sparta), *A. Ch.* 894-895: *φιλεῖς τὸν ἄνδρα; τοιγὰρ ἐν ταύτῳ τάφῳ / κείσῃ θανόντα δ' οὔτι μὴ προδοῖς ποτε* (Orestes to Clytaemnestra alluding to her conjugal infidelity towards Agamemnon), *S. Ant.* 45-46: *τὸν γοῦν ἐμὸν, καὶ τὸν σὸν, ἦν σὺ μὴ θέλῃς, / ἀδελφόν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ προδοῖς ἀλώσομαι* (Antigone to Ismene about accomplishing her duty of burying her dead brother). Similarly here *προδοῦς* stands out as a particularly strong term, bearing serious moral implications of a tragic quality.

3 τροφέα: The tragic tone introduced by *τί φημι* (l. 1), and continued by *προδοῦς* (l. 2), is here reasserted by *τροφέα*. This is the only occurrence of this word within Comedy. The elevated style and diction are unlikely to be paratragic, but probably reflect the seriousness of the anxiety of the speaker.

The short final *ᾱ* is noteworthy; cf. Gow on *Theoc.* 8.87. Moeris 187.11 gives some examples of accusative of words in *-ευς*, and notes that the Attics maintain a long final *ᾱ*, whereas the other Greeks a short one. Within Comedy this short-alpha accusative recurs in *Euphro* fr. 3, where the speaker juxtaposes *ψυγέα* to *ψυκτηρίαν*, *τευτλίον* to *σεῦπλα*, and *φακέαν* to *φακῆν*, in his attempt to distinguish between familiar

and less familiar / non-Attic words and formations. Athenaeus quotes Euphro's fragment (XI 503a-b) to support the assertion of Heracleon of Ephesus that ὃν ἡμεῖς ψυγέα καλοῦμεν, ψυκτηρίαν τινὲς ὀνομάζουσιν. τοὺς δ' Ἀττικοὺς καὶ κωμωδεῖν τὸν ψυγέα ὡς ξενικὸν ὄνομα (Ath. XI 503a).³ The non-Attic word forms unsurprisingly a non-Attic accusative. The word ψυγέα is also supposed to have been used once by Alexis, according to Athenaeus XI 502d: Ἄλεξις ἐν Εἰσοικιζομένῳ φησὶ "τρικότυλον ψυγέα" (fr. 65).⁴

In the present fragment the non-Attic form τροφέα is put in the mouth of a non-Attic speaker within a play that has for a title a not particularly Attic word (cf. introduction). I think this is all too much to be a coincidence. Besides, it is remarkable that the form τροφέα does not occur anywhere else in poetry.⁵ So, not only is the short final *ā* a sign of a non-Attic dialect, but also the formation τροφέα is uncommon in itself. Could this be a foreigner who despite speaking very well Greek (he admits he learnt the language; cf. l. 4), still reveals his origin? This would parallel (in an attenuated form) the use of non-attic and non-Greek dialects in earlier Comedy; cf. introduction to Mnesimachus fr. 7.

3-4 εἶδον νόμους Ἑλλήνας: The speaker names three benefactions made to him by his master. His tone is grateful, his words are loaded with Greek ideology, and he speaks in the way the Greeks liked to hear someone non-Greek speaking of them, i.e. acknowledging their cultural superiority. Laws, education, and religion are cultural fields of which the Greeks felt particularly proud.

The first benefaction has been his introduction to the Greek legal system. This advanced aspect of the Greek civilisation is already mentioned in Hdt. 7.102 through the mouth of Demaratus, who, in his address to Xerxes, attributes the Greek quality of virtue (ἀρετῆ) to the effective Greek laws. There is also a famous passage in

³ Though it is possible that Heracleon is simply drawing on Euphro, and therefore is not telling us very much, still Euphro's fragment shows that the form ψυγέα was not a familiar fourth-century Attic word.

⁴ Arnott *ad loc.* acknowledges that the word did not sound Attic. However, the words τρικότυλον ψυγέα survive isolated and that is all we get for a fragment; hence Arnott reasonably argues that "there is no need to assume that this phrase was necessarily written in the accusative case".

⁵ Particularly in tragedy, although other cases of the noun τροφεύς are used (e.g. A. *Ag.* 729 τροφεῦσιν, S. *Ph.* 344 τροφεύς), in the accusative it is the form τροφόν that is used instead; cf. S. *OT* 1092, E. *El.* 409, etc. It is only in later prose that we find τροφέα; e.g. D.S. 4.4.3, Philo 3.177, Dion. Byz. 24.2, etc.

Euripides' *Medea*, where Jason boasts about the Greek legal system and claims to have saved Medea, having taken her away from the barbarians (ll. 534-538).

Also in Aeschin. 1.5 democracy is said to be underpinned by νόμος: τὰ μὲν τῶν δημοκρατουμένων σώματα καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν οἱ νόμοι σώζουσι. The importance of law is also emphasised by Demosthenes in a number of passages; e.g. 21.34, *ibid.* 225, 25.20, etc. See further Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, 74-75, 86.

The reading εἶδον is preserved by the codices, but several alternative conjectures have also been made; cf. *crit. app.* If we choose to alter the text, both conjectures by Richards seem promising, since they are palaeographically close to the preserved text (unlike Meineke's ἔγνω), and also convey the meaning of *learning* that we need. But if we accept εἶδον as correct, then we should understand it metaphorically, i.e. meaning *to learn, to be shown, to be introduced into*. It is possible that here εἶδον anticipates the metaphor in ἐμνήσθη. See e.g. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, pp. 274-278 for ἐποπτεία (*beholding*) of the secret objects as the climax of the Mysteries. One might argue that Greek culture (here its laws and religion) are treated as a mystery closed to barbarians, who can be initiated into this knowledge only by becoming part of Greece.

4a γράμματ': Writing was introduced into the Greek world in the early eighth century B.C. Though it is the Phoenicians who are to be credited with the invention of a basic alphabet and the principle elements of writing, Greeks have gradually grown to appropriate the invention of writing, on the basis of the number of features they added and / or modified to make it fit for the Greek language.⁶ This is reflected in the myth of Palamedes, who was believed to have invented certain letters of the alphabet; cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 277.1.

4b ἐμνήσθη θεοῖς: Introduction into the Greek religion. This may be a metaphor – the Greek gods are exclusive to Greece; cf. on ll. 3-4. The speaker came to know and worship the Greek gods. But the presence of μύεω may call for a more specific interpretation, since μύεω is the *terminus technicus* for the initiation into the mystery cults. It is possible that the master provided for his slave to become a *mystes*, an

⁶ Cf. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, 52ff.

initiand, and thus gain an insight into the privileged world of the mysteries (cf. belief in a blessed afterlife, etc.).⁷

Here *μνέω* takes the dative (*θεοῖς*). This is a rather uncommon syntax that recurs, rarely again, in later texts; cf. Alciphro 1.4 *μνεῖσθαι γάμω*, *Corp. Herm.* fr. 23.46.2 *τῷ τῆς ἀλυπίας ἀγαθῷ μνηθῶσι*.

Βοιωτία (fr. 2)

The title denotes a Boeotian girl / woman. Homonymous plays were also produced by Antiphanes and Menander, whereas Diphilus wrote a *Βοιώτιος*. Either Plautus or Aquilius is the author of a Latin play *Boeotia*. Webster (*IM* 127) suggests a recognition plot for Menander's play, and implies the same for Theophilus' case (*SLGC* 77). Nevertheless, the existence of possible parallel case(s) does not suffice to support such an assumption; all the more that the evidence from the fragment itself is too scanty, and does not point to any particular plot threads. Given the frequently recurring motif of titles denoting a foreign girl,⁸ this play could possibly narrate an event from the life of a Boeotian girl in Athens. *She* is probably the subject of the discussion in this fragment. The speaker describes – probably to a friend – how nicely a person mixes the wine. Since there is nothing that obliges us to understand a male subject, the Boeotian girl could well be meant here. She could have been a hetaira, entertaining the guests at symposia; if so, one of her duties would be to mix and pour the wine.⁹ Alternatively, she could simply be a slave in someone's – not necessarily the speaker's – house.

The fragment below is cited by Athenaeus XI 472d. The speaker expresses his enthusiastic admiration; he has probably fallen in love with this girl. The present case is paralleled by Theophilus fr. 12 (cf. introduction to the fragment).

τετρακότυλον δὲ κύλικα κεραμεῶν τινα
τῶν Θηρικλείων, πῶς δοκεῖς, κεραννύει
καλῶς, ἀφρῶ ζέουσιν· οὐδ' ἂν Αὐτοκλῆς

⁷ See Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, 5, 9, 22-24, etc.

⁸ See introduction to Amphis' *Λευκαδία*.

⁹ This would be another instance of a narrated symposion (cf. introduction to Mnesimachus fr. 8).

οὕτως μὰ τὴν γῆν εὐρύθμως τῇ δεξιᾷ
 5 ἄρας ἐνώμα

1 κεραμεῖν Iacobi ap. Mein. V I p. ccxxvii : -έαν A

She mixes thoroughly a one litre wine-cup, an earthen one,
 one of those Thericleans, wonderfully,
 fermenting with foam. Not even Autocles,
 by Mother Earth, could lift it with his right hand and
 5 distribute it so gracefully

1a τετρακότυλον κύλικα: This κύλιξ is large enough to hold four κοτύλαι. A drinking cup of a similar capacity is mentioned in Alexis fr. 181 (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*). The κοτύλη was a liquid measure (and also a dry one); cf. sch. on Ar. *Pl.* 436: κοτύλη δέ ἐστὶν εἶδος μέτρου, ὃ λέγομεν ἡμεῖς ἡμίξεστον. See *LSJ* s.v. 3. It was approximately equal to a quarter of a litre (half a pint); cf. Hultsch, *Griechische und römische Metrologie*, 101-108. A compound epithet consisting of a number plus the noun κοτύλη was regularly used to describe the capacity of drinking vessels; e.g. δικότυλος λήκυθος (Sotades fr. 1.33); γάλαι δικότυλοι, τρικότυλοι (Dionysius fr. 5.2); λήκυθον ἑπτακότυλον (Aristophanes fr. 487.1-2).

By metonymy the word κύλιξ stands for the wine itself (instead of the wine-cup); cf. Eubulus fr. 148.8 (see Hunter *ad loc.*), Ar. *Pl.* 1132.

1b κεραμεῖν: The specification that this is a *terracotta* cup could have been left out and still the text make sense. However, this detail is important, for not only does it make the text more pictorial, but it also underlines the fact that the cup was heavy, and still the girl was able to handle it gracefully.

The reading κεραμεῖν was suggested by Jacoby; cf. crit. app. The codices' reading is κεραμέαν; cf. Pl. *Ly.* 219e, Polemon fr. 75 Preller, Ath. XI 494c, etc.

2a Θηρικλείων: See Daremberg & Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines*, s.v. *Thericlea Vasa*. This type of drinking-cup was allegedly named after

the craftsman who first made it.¹⁰ His name was *Θηρικλήης*; he originated from Corinth but moved to Athens, and, according to Athenaeus, was a contemporary of Aristophanes; cf. Ath. XI 470e-472e. Nevertheless, Arnott (on Alexis fr. 5) is very sceptical as to the validity of Athenaeus' dating; instead he convincingly argues that Thericles' floruit must be placed between 380 and 370 B.C. The Thericlean cups were considered an item of luxury, designated primarily for the wealthiest among the Athenians; cf. Ath. XI 469b. What particularly differentiated the Thericleans from the rest of the cups was the black shiny polish,¹¹ with which they were completely covered, and which made them particularly lustrous; cf. Theopompus fr. 33, Eubulus fr. 56 (see Hunter *ad loc.*). See Arnott's thorough note on Alexis fr. 5.

2b πῶς δοκεῖς: This is an idiomatic phrase, a colloquialism, which occurs frequently in both comedy and tragedy in varied forms. It serves to intensify the speech and add liveliness. Cf. Ar. *Ra.* 54 (*πῶς οἶε σφόδρα* – cf. van Leeuwen *ad loc.*), *Ec.* 399 (*πόσον δοκεῖς*), E. *Heracl.* 832 (*πόσον τιν' ἀλχεῖς*), etc. It can either form part of the syntax (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 12) or be parenthetical and possess an adverbial / exclamatory force, as it happens here, and also in Diphilus fr. 96, etc. See further Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1497, Pearson on S. fr. 373.5 *TGF*, and Hunter on Eubulus fr. 80.7-8.

3a ἀφροῦ ζέουσιν: “The ‘foaming’ Thericlean is a commonplace” (Hunter on Eubulus fr. 56); cf. Alexis fr. 5, Antiphanes fr. 172.4, Aristophanes fr. 13, Eubulus fr. 56.2, etc. This notion of the foaming cup of wine is at least as old as Pindar *O.* 7.1-2: *φιάλαν ... / ἀμπέλου καχλάζοισαν δρόσω*; cf. Philostr. *VA* 3.25.

In the present fragment the bubbling wine adds texture to the scene, and provides the listener (both the speaker's collocutor and the audience) with a visual description.

3b Αὐτοκλήης: A certain Autocles is also mentioned by Timocles fr. 19. Although Diels & Schubart¹² consider him *unbestimmbar*, they still cite as parallel the present

¹⁰ For an alternative – linguistically implausible – etymology see Ath. XI 471b.

¹¹ We also possess evidence of some gilt Thericleans too; cf. Ath. XI 478b.

¹² *Didymos Kommentar zu Demosthenes* 10.70, col. 10.3.

fragment of Theophilus; cf. *PA* 2718. Bergk¹³ suggests a further identification with the Autocles mentioned by Heraclides Ponticus fr. 58 Wehrli. According to Heraclides, Autocles was a spendthrift who squandered the family fortune, and then committed suicide by taking hemlock. Although Kock refrains from attempting any identification (II.474), I would be willing to accept that Theophilus, Timocles, and Heraclides refer to the same Autocles. In fact, Heraclides uses a rhetorical question to introduce Autocles, i.e. “who was that wasted the riches...? Wasn’t it Autocles...?”. This suggests that Heraclides presupposes that the persons and the facts that he mentions are well known to everyone. Likewise, both Theophilus and Timocles content themselves with mentioning Autocles simply by name (cf. *ὀνομαστί κομωφδεῖν*), and expect their audience to identify him; this suggests that Autocles was a widely known person. If we combine the information from the three sources above about Autocles, then we get a picture of a *bon-vivant*, a person who knew how to live the good life, and enjoyed indulging in pleasures.

4a *μὰ τὴν γῆν*: This is an oath that emphasises the preceding negation. Generally, the particle *μὰ* is most commonly used to reinforce a negation; cf. *LSJ* s.v. *μὰ* III.1. Arnott (on Alexis fr. 128) notes that in Comedy this oath is spelt solely by male characters; cf. Ar. *Pax* 188, Ehippus fr. 11.2, Men. *Dysc.* 908, etc.

4b *εὐρόθμως*: “Rhythmically, gracefully”. This adverb denotes a subtlety in movements and a certain dexterity, as in Anaxandrides fr. 16, Plato fr. 47, and E. *Cyc.* 563.

5 *ἐνώμα*: Here the verb *νομάω* means *to distribute* (the wine).¹⁴ The verb appears with this sense already in Homer; e.g. *Il.* 9.176, *Od.* 21.272, etc. Cf. Pi. *N.* 9.51, Antimachus fr. 20.4 Wyss, etc.

¹³ *Commentationum de Reliquiis Comoediae Atticae Antiquae*, 251.

¹⁴ However, *LSJ* cite Theophilus’ fragment under the meaning II.1: “of weapons, implements, etc., handle, wield”.

Ἰατρός (fr. 4)

On the title see introduction to Aristophon's homonymous play.

The fragment below is cited by Athenaeus VIII 340d-e, within a series of fragments that satirise the politician Callimedon, who had the nickname *Crayfish* (κάραβος – see below, l. 3f). Arnott (introduction to Alexis' *Δορκίς ἢ Ποππύζουσα*) locates his active period in Athenian politics between the years 345 and 318 B.C.; cf. Webster *CQ* 2 n.s. (1952) 22.¹⁵ These rough limits are compatible with Theophilus' career (see introduction). It is worth bearing in mind that *Ἰατρός* is the first play listed by *Suda* § 195 under Theophilus' name. This could be a mere coincidence, although it could perhaps indicate that *Ἰατρός* was either the first play produced by Theophilus or his first victorious play. Whatever the case, it should be assigned to a date before 318 B.C., when Callimedon was condemned to death *in absentia*, and subsequently left Athens for ever; cf. Plu. *Phoc.* 35. See Droysen, *Histoire de l' hellénisme*, II.1.209, Webster *o.c.* 21.

In the fragment below, a son appears taking care of his father's diet. We know that doctors / physicians acknowledged the importance of a healthy diet, to the point that some even wrote cookery books;¹⁶ it is therefore a possibility that the doctor is the son himself (though this cannot be established with certainty).

The fragment is in trochaic tetrameters. In general, the trochaic tetrameter is reserved for a special effect; e.g. one regular use is to make programmatic statements about lifestyle.¹⁷ Our fragment is an indirect dialogue, reported by a third party, and refers to a youth held up as a model because of his concern for his father.

πᾶς δὲ φιλοτίμως πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν νεανίσκων ὤ –
 – ὤ – ὦ ἐγγέλειον παρατέθεικε τῷ πατρί.
 "τευθίς ἦν χρηστή, πατρίδιον. πῶς ἔχεις πρὸς κάραβον;"
 "ψυχρός ἐστίν, ἄπαγε", φησί· "ἐητόρων οὐ γεύομαι"

¹⁵ Nevertheless, Davies (*Athenian Propertied Families*, 279) believes that his public career did not begin until the late 320s (still, he allows an early date during the 340s for the comic references to him).

¹⁶ Cf. Hp. *Acut.* 28. See Dohm, *Magēiros*, 180, Arnott's introduction to Alexis *Κράτεια* (esp. p. 314), Hunter on Eubulus fr. 6.

¹⁷ See General Introduction p. 27.

1 fin. ἔχει add. Kock, ἔχων Herw. *Anal.* p. 42 2 <τέμαχος ἔλαβεν> ἐγγέλειον Kock ἔγγ. παρατ., <κᾶτ' ἐρωτᾶ> "πότερον ἦ / Tucker *ClQu* 2 (1908) 195

Every one of the youths vies emulously with him.

... Suppose he has served a small eel to his father.

"The squid was wholesome, papa. How do you feel about some crayfish?"

"He is frigid; begone", he says; "I am not tasting public speakers"

1 φιλοτίμως: Kock suggested the verb ἔχει as an appropriate filling of the lacuna; cf. crit. app. Indeed, there is a stereotyped phrase that goes φιλοτίμως πρὸς τινα ἔχειν (e.g. Pl. *Chrm.* 162c), or φιλοτίμως ἔχειν πρὸς τι (e.g. [D.] *Erot.* 38.3); cf. *LSJ* s.v. The point of the fragment is apparently to establish the speaker as a good son, and as a model for other young men. The idea is not new; in Pi. *P.* 6.28-42 Antilochus sacrificed his life to save his father.

2a ἐγγέλειον: This is the diminutive of ἔγγελος (*eel*); cf. Thompson *Fishes* 58-61. No pejorative sense seems to be attached to the diminutive form of this noun, neither here or in other comic fragments; e.g. Ar. fr. 333.7, Pherecrates fr. 50.3, Antiphanes fr. 221.4, etc. Hicesius (ap. Ath. VII 298b) tells us that eels are highly nutritious and wholesome (see further on Philetaerus fr. 13.4). This is in accord with the hypothesis made in the introduction, i.e. that the speaker is a trained doctor, who arranges a healthy diet for his father. Nevertheless, the other items offered (squid and crayfish) are not attested elsewhere as having any particular healthgiving properties; this might tell in favour of an alternative interpretation, i.e. that the son is not an expert, but he simply tries to tempt his father to eat.

2b παρατέθεικε: This is an example of the use of the perfect in hypothesis (i.e. "let's suppose..."). In such cases the perfect tense is usually preceded by the words καὶ δῆ; e.g. E. *Med.* 386: καὶ δῆ τεθναῖσι τίς με δέξεται πόλις; However, according to Kühner-Gerth (I § 391.1) καὶ δῆ can sometimes be omitted and still the meaning be that of envisaging a hypothetical situation in the future; e.g. E. *Andr.* 334-335: τέθνηκα τῇ σῆ θυγατρὶ καὶ μ' ἀπώλεσεν / μαιφόνον μὲν οὐκέτ' ἂν φύγοι μύσος.

3a τευδίς: The squid. See Thompson *Fishes* 260ff.; Palombi-Santorelli 295ff. In Alexis fr. 84 we hear of some instructions about the stuffing and cooking of the squid; cf. Arnott *ad loc.* for further details and bibliography.

3b χρηστή: This adjective has usually the meaning of *wholesome*, when it refers to a food item; cf. *LSJ* s.v. But it can also mean *tasteful* and / or *of good quality*; cf. *χρηστόν ταρίχιον* (Ar. *Pax* 563), *χόνδρος χρηστός* (Antiphanes fr. 36), *πλακοῦντα χρηστόν* (Antiphanes fr. 143), etc. Wholesome, tasteful, or of good quality, the squid could be any of those. But I suppose that the adjective *χρηστός* could have been chosen on purpose to prepare for the reference to the crayfish (given that crayfish alludes to the politician Callimedon, see below), since this is an epithet often used of citizens who contribute to the state, e.g. by political activity. See Dover *o.c.* 296-299.

3c ἦν: The son uses the imperfect to refer to the squid, because apparently the squid exists no more; his father has already eaten it.

3d πατριδίον: This is a diminutive of *πατήρ*; cf. Ar. *V.* 986. Comedy abounds in diminutives; e.g. *Nu.* 223 (*ὦ Σωκρατίδιον*), *Ra.* 582 (*ὦ Ξανθίδιον*), *Men. Dysc.* 499, etc. The tone of such addresses is that of coaxing and cajolery, the aim being to entice or persuade someone about something, here to eat.

3e πῶς ἔχεις πρὸς: This is colloquial / idiomatic language. The meaning is “what do you think about...” or “how do you feel about...”. This way of beginning a question occurs once more in Comedy (Antiphanes fr. 138.2), and rarely elsewhere (e.g. *Pl. Prm.* 131e, *Id. Smp.* 174a, *Epict. Diss. Arr.* 1.20.12, etc.).

3f κάραβον: “Crayfish, spiny lobster, langouste”; for a detailed description cf. Arist. *HA* 525a 30 sqq. See Thompson *Fishes* 102ff.; Palombi-Santorelli *o.c.* 369ff.; *RE* XI.2 s.v. *Krebs*. It seems that crayfish was considered a dainty dish. Athenaeus III 104e says that its consumption was much sought after (*περισπούδαστος*). It is also once recorded as an aphrodisiac (Alexis fr. 281).

However, the present mention of crayfish has less to do with the gastronomical indulgences of the Athenians than to prepare for a pun satirising the

politician Callimedon, who was nicknamed *Κάραβος* (see introduction). For further details about his life and his political career, see *PA* 8032, and *RE* X.2 s.v. *Kallimedon* nr. 1. His fondness for crayfish is the reason given by Athenaeus III 104d for the nickname *Κάραβος*; cf. Alexis fr. 57 (cf. Arnott's introduction to the fragment). He is also parodied for gluttony in Eubulus fr. 8 (cf. Hunter *ad loc.*). See also Arnott's introduction to Alexis' *Ἴσοστάσιον*. Bechtel suggests that this nickname targeted his terrible squint,¹⁸ since oblique movement of the eyes is a characteristic of crayfish; cf. Aristotle *HA* 526a 8ff. Callimedon's squint is also parodied elsewhere; cf. Alexis fr. 117, Timocles fr. 29. This is another instance of *ὀνομαστί κωμωδεῖν*, which we have repeatedly seen emerging throughout Middle Comedy, e.g. Amphis fr. 6, Aristophon fr. 10, etc.¹⁹ The two preceding seafoods (*ἐγγέλειον* and *τευδίσ*), carefully build up to the punchline (*κάραβον*), giving us two features of Old Comedy here: mockery of politicians and puns. Aristophanes is full of puns;²⁰ it is interesting to see the same kind of humour continued by Theophilus, a poet of the last quarter of the fourth century.

4a ψυχρός: What the father describes as *frigid* is the politician Callimedon (see above), having misunderstood his son's question about a crayfish dish. This interpretation is favoured by the second half of the line, where the father refers explicitly to *public speakers*. When applied to persons the adjective *ψυχρός* has the meaning of *boring*, or *unemotional, cold-hearted*; cf. *LSJ* s.v. In particular Aristophanes (*Th.* 170), Alexis (fr. 184), and Machon (fr. 16.258ff. and 280ff. Gow) use it to satirise the *modus scribendi* of Theognis, Araros, and Diphilus respectively.²¹ The point of mockery of Callimedon here is probably a stylistic critique of his speaking abilities (the father calls him a *ῥήτωρ*), i.e. that his speeches are boring and unemotional, and they lack enthusiasm.

¹⁸ *Spitznamen* 23ff.

¹⁹ Cf. General Introduction pp. 17-18.

²⁰ E.g. *Ach.* 1131 (*Γοργάσων*; pun on *γοργών* on Lamachus' shield), *Nu.* 156 (*Σφήττιος*; pun on *σφήξ*), *V.* 573 (*χοιριδίους*), etc. In MacDowell's words "in fifth-century Athens, to judge from Aristophanes, they (*sc.* the puns) were as popular as in Victorian England" (introduction to *Ar. Wasps*, p. 14).

²¹ Cf. sch. on *Ar. Ach.* 11 and 140. See also Arnott's thorough note on Alexis *l.c.*, and Gutzwiller, *Psychros und onkos*, 16ff.

There is another pun here. An orator can be *ψυχρός*, i.e. boring, but a dish can also be *ψυχρόν*, i.e. cold; cf. Alexis fr. 177.4, Mnesimachus fr. 4.10, etc.

4b ἄπαγε: The father rejects the dish of crayfish that his son places in front of him. Zagagi²² draws a parallelism with Plaut. *Trin.* 258, 266: “apage te, Amor”.

4c ῥητόρων: The term usually refers to those who make a habit of addressing the Assembly, the Council or the courts; e.g. statesmen, generals, etc. Yet it seems that anyone doing so on any given occasion would be referred to as a *ῥήτωρ*; cf. *IG I³* 46.25. See Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 38, and Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, 268ff. Here, although the father refers collectively to the *public speakers*, he has a specific target, i.e. the politician Callimedon.

4d οὐ γεύομαι: The metaphorical meaning of *γεύομαι* as *to experience, to feel*, etc. is common (see *LSJ* s.v.); cf. Ar. *Ra.* 462 *γεύσει τῆς θύρας*, Theopompus fr. 66 *ἐλευθερίας γεύσαντες*, etc.

Κιθαρωδός (fr. 5)

The title denotes the musician who played the cithara and sang in accompaniment at the same time.²³ He is a common title figure in both Middle and New Comedy; cf. the plays *Κιθαρωδός* by Antiphanes, Alexis, Clearchus, Sophilus, Diphilus, Apollodorus, Anaxippus, and Nico.

Although less than three lines survive from Theophilus' play, we are lucky in that they are relevant to the play's title. With all probability, the speaker must be the musician himself praising music, to which, given his profession, he must be devoted. However, the context is beyond recover. It could be a symposium; but it could also be an introductory monologue of the protagonist addressing the audience.

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIV 623f, and forms part of a lengthy section dealing with music.

²² *Tradition and Originality in Plautus*, p. 100, n. 144.

²³ He is therefore to be distinguished from the *κιθαριστής*, who only played the cithara. See Gow on Machon fr. 2.6 and fr. 11.141, and *RE XI 1* s.v. *κιθαρωδία*.

μέγας
 Δησαυρός ἐστὶ καὶ βέβαιος (ἢ) μουσικὴ
 ἅπασιν τοῖς μαθητοῖσι παιδευθεῖσιν τε

1 “Theophilus scripserat μέγας δ’, ὦ μακάριοι” Kaibel 2 ἢ ACE : del. Grotius *Exc.* p. 984

A great
 treasure, and a durable one, is music
 for all those who studied it and are educated in it

1: Athenaeus introduces the fragment with the following words: μέγας γάρ, ὦ μακάριοι, κατὰ τὸν Θεοφίλου Κιθαρῳδόν, Δησαυρός ἐστίν... Kaibel suggested that the address ὦ μακάριοι belonged to the original text of Theophilus, whereas Kassel-Austin edit the fragment without it; cf. *crit. app.* Though certainty is impossible, I would agree with Kassel-Austin. The position of the phrase is odd, if it is meant to come from Theophilus, but no more so than μέγας. That the text needs to be amended if we include the words in the quotation is not in itself a problem. Though elsewhere in Comedy persons are addressed as μακάριοι,²⁴ the present address seems more like a parenthetical insertion by Athenaeus. In favour of attributing (along with Kassel-Austin) the words ὦ μακάριοι to the speaker of Athenaeus, the musician Masurius, tells the preceding address ἄνδρες φίλοι (Ath. XIV 623e), which Masurius uses to introduce another fragment (Eupolis fr. 366). Rather than being part of the fragments quoted, both ὦ μακάριοι and ἄνδρες φίλοι are said by Masurius who seeks to reengage with his audience by apostrophising them.

2 Δησαυρός: Despite the multitude of passages praising music (most gathered by Ath. XIV 623e-633f), nowhere else is music paralleled to a Δησαυρός. The speaker has a passion about music. He employs the metaphor of the treasure to emphasise the value that music has for him. For the metaphor cf. Pi. P. 6.7-8 (ὑμνων Δησαυρός).

²⁴ Cf. Ar. V. 1275 (ὦ μακάρι’ Αὐτόμενες), Eq. 147-148 (ὦ μακάριε ἀλλαντοπῶλα), etc.

3 *μαθούσι παιδευθεῖσι*: It is understandable that the benefits derived from music are only made available to certain people, i.e. those who have studied the secrets of this art. The double participle stresses the connection of music with *paideia*. The role of music in Greek education is discussed in my note on Philetaerus fr. 17.4b.

Νεοπτόλεμος (fr. 6-7)

Nicomachus Alexandrinus wrote a homonymous tragedy; cf. *Suda* ν 396, and *TGF* I.286. There is also an adespoton from another tragedy entitled *Νεοπτόλεμος*; cf. *TGF* II fr. 6b.

Neoptolemus was the son of Achilles. He was summoned to Troy after his father's death.²⁵ The natural assumption is that Theophilus' play dealt with his story in an extent that justified the play's title. What we cannot recover is the way in which Theophilus treated myth; i.e. whether he retained the mythical setting, and simply inserted contemporary allusions and anachronisms, or alternatively, whether he transferred the mythical figure of Neoptolemus into the contemporary era.²⁶

Fr. 6

The following fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIII 560a, as a piece of advice to old men not to marry young women. It is almost a replica of Thgn. *Eleg.* 1.457-460, which immediately precedes Theophilus' fragment within Athenaeus' text. It is obvious that Theophilus deliberately put Theognis' words into the mouth of the comic actor, aiming presumably to make him speak in an elevated style, and sound solemn. Kassel (*ZPE* 42 [1981] 12ff.) noted that the elegiac couplets of Theognis are turned into iambic trimeters. But Theophilus did not need to resort to Theognis in search for elevation – a few tragic words would do that. This is apparently a piece of ostentatious artistry on the part of Theophilus, who possibly wished to engage into *emulatio* with Theognis by transferring his words into iambs. At the same time Theophilus appeals to the intelligence of the audience, expecting them to recognise

²⁵ Parts of his life were treated by Sophocles in *Philoctetes*, and by Euripides in *Orestes* and *Andromache*. Cf. Proclus' summary of Lesches' *Little Iliad* (*EpGF* 36-37), Hom. *Il.* 19.326, Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.13.8, etc.

²⁶ For the dual possibility of myth manipulation in Comedy, see General Introduction pp. 24-26.

the allusion, and appreciate his artistic manoeuvre. However, Theophilus was not the first who attempted this. Sophocles (fr. 356 *TGF*) had already paraphrased Theognis 255ff. (*Delian Epigram*) into iambic trimeters; cf. Radt *ad loc.*, and Kassel *l.c.* We know that there existed a collection of Theognidean elegies, which enjoyed a considerable circulation in fifth and fourth century Athens. It is probable that this collection also served as a schoolbook.²⁷

The reference in this fragment to the old man could be irrelevant to Neoptolemus' legend. However, if we were to relate this fragment to the play's title, Peleus might be meant here. We know that in the *Nostoi* Neoptolemus went home and was recognised by Peleus;²⁸ it is not inconceivable that Peleus was about to remarry, after being abandoned by Thetis. Such a twist of the mythical tradition would be at home within Comedy, all the more that myths had already been treated with some freedom by tragedy; cf. the marriage of Electra to a peasant in Euripides homonymous play.

οὐ συμφέρον νέα 'στὶ πρεσβύτη γυνή·
ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄκατος οὐδὲ μικρὸν πείθεται
ἐνὶ πηδαλίῳ, τὸ πείσμι' ἀπορρήξασα <δὲ>
ἐκ νυκτὸς ἕτερον λιμέν' ἔχουσ' ἐξευρέθη

3 δὲ add. Mus.

It is not expedient for an old man to have a young wife;
for, like a ship, she does not respond even a little
to one rudder, but having broken the stern-cable,
at night is found inhabiting another harbour

2sqq. ὥσπερ ... : A simile. The young woman is paralleled to a light vessel. Just as the vessel breaks off the cable that holds it fast to the land, and gets carried by the sea to

²⁷ See Carrière's introduction to Theognis' edition (*Belles Lettres* ²1975) 7-27; Id. *Theognis de Mégare: étude sur le recueil élégiaque attribué à ce poète*, 124-125; West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, 55-59.

²⁸ See Proclus' summary of *Nostoi* in *EpGF* 52-53.

another bay, likewise a young wife tears herself away from an aged husband, and finds refuge into the arms of a lover.

3a ἐνὶ πηδαλίῳ: Apart from *steering-paddle*, the word *πηδάλιον* can have an additional, obscene meaning, that is *penis*; cf. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, 123. Aristophanes uses the word with this sense in *Pax* 142; cf. sch. *ad loc.* Likewise, here too the obscene meaning could have been made clear with a gesture. If this is indeed obscene, it is interesting to find that a playwright flourishing in the last quarter of the fourth century (cf. introduction) is closer to Aristophanes than much of the fourth century Comedy is. This shows again the intermittent persistence of the element of indecency, which never disappears, but re-emerges constantly, even to a degree comparable to Aristophanes.²⁹

3b πείσμα: “The *stern-cable* by which the ship was made fast to the land” (*LSJ* s.v.); cf. *E. Hipp.* 762, *A.R. Arg.* 4.523, etc.

3c <δέ>: Musurus added a postponed *δέ* here to complement the metre. This conjecture complies with the strong tendency of fourth century comedy to postpone this particle. See Dover in *CQ* 35 (1985) 338, 341-343.

4a ἐκ νυκτός: The night time is commonly associated with sex. It is during this time that a young woman is most likely to prove disloyal to an aged husband; for an old man cannot offer sexual gratification to a woman in the way a younger man is capable to.

4b ἕτερον λιμένα: Within the metaphor explained above (see on ll. 2ff.), the harbour symbolises the bed of another man; just like the harbour welcomes a boat, the younger man receives the woman into his bed. The imagery of the erotic harbour is not uncommon; cf. *S. OT* 420-423, 1208-1210 (cf. Bollack *ad loc.*), Empedocles fr. 98 DK, *AP* 5.235 etc.

²⁹ *Amphis* fr. 20 is another outstanding passage from the same point of view; cf. comm. *ad loc.* and General Introduction p. 18.

4c ἔχουσα: Here the verb ἔχω means *inhabit, haunt* (cf. *LSJ* s.v. A.I.3). Its current use is one of the components that create an impression of an overall elevated diction (see introduction); for such a use is frequent in both epic (e.g. *Il.* 2.484) and tragedy (e.g. *A. Eum.* 24), and often refers to places related to either gods or heroes (cf. *Pl. Lg.* 917d).

4d ἐξευρέθη: The verb is unaugmented, and the manuscripts are unanimous as to this reading. Although the omission of the augment tends to occur more frequently from the period of the Koine onwards, there seems to be no reason to suspect the originality of this unaugmented form in Theophilus. The same verb in unaugmented form occurs already in authors earlier than Theophilus; e.g. *Hdt.* 4.44, *Hippias* fr. 1 D-K.

Fr. 7

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIV 635a, within a discussion about the musical instrument called *μάγαδις*. Dobree (*Adversaria* III.128) suggests that the speaker is a slave (cf. on l. 2b); in reply to someone's threats, he implies that any torture will be in vain, for nothing will be disclosed (for a different interpretation see below). The slave must be a member of the family described in l. 1, possibly the son, since he uses the personal pronoun ἡμῶν (l. 3). He is presumably addressing his master, who must have threatened to torture not only him, but also both of his parents. The purpose of the imminent torture, the secret to be revealed, and generally the wider context of this conversation remain utterly obscure, and again (as in fr. 6), without any linking thread to the play's title.

πονηρὸν υἱὸν καὶ πατέρα καὶ μητέρα
 ἔστιν μαγαδίξειν ἐπὶ τροχοῦ καθήμενους·
 οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν ταῦτόν ᾄσεται μέλος

2 καθήμενους A: στρεβλουμ- Blaydes *Adv.* II p. 181: κατακειμ- Herw. *Coll.* p. 141

It is wicked that son, father, and mother
 play the magadis sitting on the wheel;
 for none of us will chant the same song

1 *πονηρόν*: We cannot be sure about the exact sense of the present usage of *πονηρός*, since the adjective is interrelated to the meaning of the whole fragment, which is highly elusive. Above I translated it as *wicked*; i.e. the speaker accuses someone of being ethically bad, villainous. But *πονηρός* can also mean *wretched* (in such a case the speaker would be saying “this is a miserable situation”). Yet, the sense *wicked* seems more likely, if we rely on the accentuation. In the antiquity the accentuation of *πονηρός* was a controversial issue among the lexicographers and the grammarians. One side argued that both *πονηρός* and *πόνηρος* should have the same meaning, the other that the former meant *wicked* and the latter *wretched*; see Arnott’s introduction to Alexis’ *Πονήρα* for a thorough presentation of the debate (cf. *LSJ* s.v. *μοχθηρός* fin.).

2a *μαγαδίξιν*: “Play the *magadis*”. Athenaeus’ text testifies to the existence of a controversy as to the very kind of instrument that the *magadis* was; *πότερον αὐλῶν εἶδος ἢ κιθάρας ἐστίν* (XIV 634c). It seems that the *magadis* was a stringed instrument (cf. Anacreon fr. 374 *PMG*), which was sometimes accompanied by a specific kind of flute (cf. Ion fr. 23 *TGF*). Hence, this kind of flute was called *μάγαδις αὐλός*. Howard³⁰ thinks of the *μάγαδις αὐλός* as a sub-category of the flutes called *κιθαριστήριον*, which accompanied the lyre; cf. Poll. 4.81, Hsch. s.v. *μαγάδεις*.

2b *ἐπὶ τροχοῦ*: This may be a reference to torture (so Dobree *o.c.* II.348); cf. sch. on Ar. *Pl.* 875: *τροχός τις ἦν, ἐν ᾧ δεσμούμενοι οἱ οἰκέται ἐκολάζοντο*.³¹ However, the verb *κάθημαι* is never used to describe one’s position on the rack. Instead, the usual expressions are *ἐπὶ τοῦ τροχοῦ γ’ ἔλκοιτο* (Ar. *Pax* 452), *ἐπὶ τροχοῦ στρεβλούμενον* (Ar. *Lys.* 846), etc. (cf. *LSJ* s.v. *τροχός* I.4); hence, the proposed corrections by both Blaydes and Herwerden (cf. *crit. app.*).

Kassel-Austin doubt that the passage refers to torture. There is some evidence for performing tricks on wheels as they turn; cf. X. *Smp.* 7.3: *τό γε ἐπὶ τοῦ τροχοῦ ἅμα περιδινουμένου γράφειν τε καὶ ἀναγιγνώσκειν θαῦμα μὲν ἴσως τί ἐστιν*; and Pl. *Euthd.* 294e: *ἐς μαχαίρας γε κυβιστᾶν καὶ ἐπὶ τροχοῦ δινεῖσθαι τηλικούτος ὢν*. Conceivably what is

³⁰ *HSCP* 4 (1893) 40.

³¹ See Sommerstein on Ar. *Pax* 452.

being described here could perhaps be a similar trick, performed by members of the same family,³² which included singing while being whirled on a wheel.³³

Παγκρατιαστής (fr. 8)

Παγκρατιαστής was the athlete who practised the *παγκράτιον*, a violent contest that combined boxing and wrestling. Philostratus (*Imag.* 2.6.3) provides us with a detailed account of it. See also *RE* XVIII.3 s.v. *Pankration*, and Poliakoff, *Combat Sports in the Ancient World*, 54ff.³⁴

This play was produced in 311 B.C., and won its writer the fourth place at the Dionysia (see introduction to Theophilus). From the three homonymous plays known to us, the present one by Theophilus comes chronologically second. It is preceded by Alexis' play (cf. Arnott's introduction *ad loc.*), and followed by Philemo's one (cf. *Suda* φ 327). Ennius also wrote a *Pancratiastes*. Generally, athletes appear frequently in Comedy as title figures. Apart from the three *Παγκρατιαστής* plays, Alexis wrote an *Ἀποβάτης*, while both Eubulus and Xenarchus wrote a *Πένταθλος*.

The natural assumption is that the *Παγκρατιαστής* of Theophilus centred on a pancration athlete. Arnott *l.c.* suggests that all the athletes-related plays shared some stock characteristics, e.g. the athlete's gluttony. Indeed, Athenaeus X 417b cites this fragment³⁵ as part of a long-running discussion (since the beginning of Book X) about the gluttony of the athletes, starting with Heracles.³⁶ Among the fragments dwelling on athletes' gluttony, there is a long one from a satyr play by Euripides, that is fr. 282 *TGF*. Euripides describes the athlete as a *γιάδου τε δούλος νηδύος* δ' ἡσσημένος (l. 5); the closeness between comedy and satyr play is further confirmed (cf. General Introduction p. 16).

I would consider this fragment as a most representative one of Middle Comedy; for one of the quintessential elements of this era is the detailed description

³² As it often happens in modern circus, i.e. a family business.

³³ Nevertheless, I would keep open the possibility that this is a reference to torture, which is metaphorically presented.

³⁴ For further bibliography see Arnott's introduction to Alexis' *Παγκρατιαστής*.

³⁵ Athenaeus cites the first three lines of this fragment once more, in III 95a; cf. introduction to Philetaerus fr. 8.

³⁶ Given his legendary labours, Heracles could legitimately be considered as the archetype athlete.

of dinners, as well as the endless catalogues of food items; cf. Anaxandrides fr. 42, Mnesimachus fr. 4, Webster *SLGC* 6, 22, 65ff.

The speaker A is most probably the *Παγκρατιαστής* himself, narrating to a friend (possibly to his slave, see below on ll.3-6) what he has eaten at a dinner / symposion. His collocutor is so astonished by the Gargantuan quantity of food and wine that the *Παγκρατιαστής* has devoured, that he calls thrice upon gods (ll. 3, 4, 6).

ἐφθῶν μὲν σχεδὸν
 τρεῖς μναῖς. (B.) λέγ' ἄλλο. (A.) ῥυγχίον, κωλήν, πόδας
 τέτταρας ὑείους. (B.) Ἡράκλεις. (A.) βοὸς δὲ τρεῖς,
 ὄρνιθ'. (B.) Ἄπολλον. λέγ' ἕτερον. (A.) σύκων δύο
 5 μναῖς. (B.) ἐπέπιες δὲ πόσον; (A.) ἀκράτου δώδεκα
 κοτύλας. (B.) Ἄπολλον, Ὡρε καὶ Σαβάζιε

6 Ἄπολλον Ὡρε Valck. *Epist. ad Ernesti*, ap. Tittmann, *Ruhnkenii epist.* (1812) p. 50: ἀπολλόδωρε A Σαβάζιε Mus.: σεβ- A, “fort. recte” Kaibel, sed vid. *RE I A 2* (1920) 1541, 31-39

Of boiled dishes, a weight of a value of nearly
 three hundred drachmas. (B.) Say, what next? (A.) A muzzle, a thigh, four
 swine’s trotters. (B.) Heracles! (A.) Three ox-trotters
 and a cock. (B.) Apollo! Say on! (A.) Figs of a weight of two hundred
 5 drachmas. (B.) And how much did you drink afterwards? (A.) A dozen
 half-pints of unmixed wine. (B.) Apollo, Horus and Sabazius!

1 ἐφθῶν: This adjective means *boiled*, and it can refer to either meat (Ar. *Eq.* 1178, Pherecrates fr. 50.5), fish (Metagenes fr. 6.4), or vegetables (Antiphanes fr. 6). In the present fragment, the adjective stands substantially, and the content of the dishes could be anyone of the above three.

2a μναῖς: Ἡ Ἀττικὴ μναῖ ἔχει δραχμὰς ἑκατόν (Poll. 9.59). *Mina* was also a weight unit, of a value equal to one hundred drachmas; cf. Poll. 9.86, D. 22.76.

2b λέγ' ἄλλο: Both here and in line 4 the second speaker urges his collocutor to speak forth and enumerate one by one what he has eaten. Such expressions calling for

further details, instructions, etc. must have been common within the spoken / informal language; cf. λέγοις ἂν ἄλλο (Ar. Pax 958), λέγ' ἕτερον (Alexis fr. 15.4), λέγ' ἄλλο τι (Eubulus fr. 119.2).

2c ῥυγχίον, κωλῆν, πόδας: The present food items are cited asyndetically, as it is generally the comic norm when it comes to food lists; cf. Mnesimachus fr. 4.29-49, Anaxandrides fr. 42.37ff., Alexis fr. 115.12-13. The ῥυγχίον is the diminutive of ῥύγχος, which is the swine's *snout*; cf. sch. on Ar. Av. 348, Pherecrates fr. 107, Anaxilas fr. 11. The κωλῆν is the *thigh* of either an animal (as here) or a human; cf. sch. on Ar. Nu. 1018, Eupolis fr. 54.

It appears that animals' extremities (snout, trotters, etc.) were a main delicacy in dinners and symposia; cf. Alexis fr. 115.15-16, Anaxilas fr. 19.4, Axionicus fr. 8, Ecphantides fr. 1, etc.

3d υείους: This adjective denotes anyone of swine's edible bodyparts; cf. Ar. Eq. 356, Philetaerus fr. 10, Alexis fr. 194, etc. Pork meat was considered particularly nutritious, and, therefore, appropriate for the athletes' diet (Gal. 6.661 Kühn). Cf. D.L. 6.49, and Jüthner on Philostr. Gym. 44.18.

3-6 Ηράκλεις, Ἄπολλον, Ὡρε, Σαβάζιε : The speaker invokes Heracles, Apollon, Horus and Sabazius. This is a means of expressing his wild amazement and deep surprise at the hearing of all the food and wine that his collocutor has consumed. Although Heracles and Apollon are frequently called upon in Comedy,³⁷ this is the only invocation to Horus and to Sabazius. Herodotus testifies twice (2.144, 156) that Horus is the Egyptian equivalent to Apollon, whom the Egyptians consider to be the son of the river Nile and the goddess Isis (cf. Plu. 366a-b).³⁸ For the possibility of an invocation to Apollo Horus (with Horus being a cultural epithet of Apollo) see Valckenaer in Tittmann, *D. Ruhnkenii, L. C. Valckenaerii et aliorum ad J. A. Ernesti Epistolae*, 50 (cf. crit. app.).

³⁷ Cf. Ar. Ach. 94, Pax 238, Cratinus fr. 198, Alexis fr. 173.3, Antiphanes fr. 27.1, Eubulus fr. 89.4,5, etc. See also Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, II 33.

³⁸ Cf. the frequent addresses to him within the *Corpus Hermeticum*, e.g. fr. 23.5, 24.14.9, etc.

Sabazius was a foreign god, who was brought in Attica from Thrace and Phrygia during the last quarter of the fifth century B.C. He was associated to – and at times even identified with – Dionysus; cf. Ar. *V.* 9-10 (see MacDowell *ad loc.*), Av. 873, *Lys.* 388, with scholia; cf. also Ar. fr. 578.³⁹ His cult became quickly popular in Athens, particularly among women and slaves, and by the fourth century it had already acquired a certain repute.⁴⁰ Demosthenes 18.259 provides a description of Sabazius' ritual ceremonies (see Wankel *ad loc.*); cf. Kaibel on Eupolis fr. 94. Considering all this information, as well as the comic parallels, I would suggest that the second speaker is the athlete's slave, who, because of the Dionysiac attributes of Sabazius, thinks particularly of this god at the hearing of how much wine his master has drunk.

4 ὄρνιθα: As far as poultry is concerned, ὄρνις can denote either the *cock* (cf. sch. on Ar. *V.* 815: τί τὸν ὄρνιν: ὡς καὶ ἀλεκτρούνα ἐξαγαγόντος) or the *hen*; (cf. Men. fr. 132). I would argue that the speaker of this fragment means a *cock*, for a cock's size is bigger than a hen's; therefore, eating a whole cock, being extraordinary in itself, would make greater impression to the listener.

5a ἐπέπιες: The commonest meaning of ἐπιπίνω (prompted by the preposition ἐπί) is *drink afterwards*, and, understandably, *after eating* (cf. *LSJ* s.v.);⁴¹ cf. Ar. *Eq.* 354, 357, Men. *Kol.* fr. 2.3, Philemo fr. 88.3, Pl. *R.* 372b, etc. There is an interestingly close parallel for the gourmet of the present fragment; this is the figure of the Aristophanic Paphlagon in *Knights*, who brags about gobbling down a huge quantity of neat wine on top of his meal: κᾶτ' ἐπιπιῶν ἀκράτου / οἴνου χοᾶ (ll. 354-5).

5b ἀκράτου: The epithet is used here substantially, the noun οἶνος having been left out. The ellipse of οἶνος is a common phenomenon, not only in Comedy; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 105, Menander fr. 735, D.L. 4.44, E. *Cyc.* 149, Theoc. 14.18, etc. These and parallel passages present the consumption of neat wine as an excess. Characteristically, Theophrastus tells us that the Epizephyrian Locrians would even deliver the death

³⁹ See Picard, *RA* 2 (1961) 129-176.

⁴⁰ For evidence from contemporary pottery see Metzger 148-150, 377.

⁴¹ Though not always; see Eupolis fr. 385.3.

penalty to anyone drinking unmixed wine, without doctor's instruction (fr. 117 Wimmer). However, limited consumption of neat wine took place regularly at the end of a symposion, as a symbolic act, i.e. a toast in honour of *ἀγαθὸς δαίμων*; cf. Thphr. fr. 123 Wimmer, Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 5a. Generally, drinking neat wine was thought to be a barbaric habit; indeed, this was regularly the norm among the non-Greeks, as well as the non-Attics; cf. Ath. X 427a: *καὶ προελθῶν (scil. Anacreon) τὴν ἀκρατοποσίαν Σκυθικὴν καλεῖ πόσιν* (fr. 356b *PMG*); Alexis fr. 9.8-9: *Ἑλληνικὸς / πότος* (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*). See also Ath. IV 153e, Pl. *Lg.* 637e, Ar. *Ach.* 73-75, etc.

Φίλαυλος (frr. 11-12)

At first sight an addiction to music seems a reasonable interpretation of the title, but given that the flute has sympotic associations,⁴² it is possible that pleasure more generally was a pronounced theme within the play, and that the title figure was a hedonist. This could be a young man, whose love revels with a number of flute-girls / hetairai trouble his father (cf. on fr. 11). The speaker in fr. 12 declares his love for a lyre-girl; therefore, one may assume that *he* is the son, i.e. the Flute-lover himself. Philetaerus also wrote a *Φίλαυλος*, and again the evidence from the surviving fragment strongly suggests a context of pleasure, and in particular pleasure derived from sex (cf. *ad loc.*).

The date of the play remains unknown. The reference to the Theoric Fund (fr. 12.8) could possibly indicate towards the period 349 to 339 B.C. (or shortly afterwards), when the Theorikon was highly controversial;⁴³ certainty, however, is impossible.

Fr. 11

This fragment, cited by Athenaeus XIII 587f, may be part of a lengthy account reporting on a person's behaviour. The speaker could be either a father of a young man expressing his worries about his son's contacts with hetairai (so Meineke), or a slave, perhaps a paedagogus, informing the audience about these issues. The young man, identified as *αὐτόν* (l. 1), is possibly the title figure of Flute-lover. The syntax of

⁴² See on Philetaerus fr. 17.4.

⁴³ Cf. Hammond, *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.*, 565.

the fragment (τοῦ μή plus infinitive) indicates that someone either is taking or has taken action to prevent the boy from falling into the clutches of a hetaira.⁴⁴ There is no way of knowing whether the attempt was successful or not.⁴⁵

A parallel setting is to be found in Ar. *Nu.* 8-16, where Strepsiades complains about the idleness of his son. Likewise, Alexis fr. 103 is a tirade of either a paedagogus or a father addressed to his son alerting him about the dangerous tricks of the hetairai.⁴⁶ This kind of plot prefigures the love theme that we often find in both New Comedy (in numerous variations) and Latin Comedy; cf. Terence's *Phormio* and *Adelphoi*; see especially in *Adelphoi* the speeches of Micio (ll. 35ff.), Demea (ll. 355-364) and the slave (ll. 962-963).⁴⁷

A particularly interesting aspect of the fragment below is the way in which the poet mixes real and fictitious hetairai. We know that Lais and Malthake were real persons, but this is the only time we hear about the hetairai Meconis, Sisymbriion, Barathron, Thallousa, and (possibly) Nausion; this might suggest that these are fictitious. It is noteworthy that these names (apart from Nausion; cf. below) are *Redendennamen*, i.e. they reveal certain characteristics of the personality of the hetairai.

τοῦ μή ποτ' αὐτὸν ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς Λαῖδα
 φερόμενον ἢ Μηκωνίδ' ἢ Σισύμβριον
 ἢ Βάραθρον ἢ Θάλλουσαν ἢ τούτων τινὰ
 ὧν ἐμπλέκουσι τοῖς λίνοις αἱ μαστροποί,
 5 † ἢ ναυσιον † ἢ Μαλθάκη

5 ναυσιον A: Νάννιον Mus.: Ναυνάριον Meineke: "fort. Ἡλύσιον" Kaibel

To save him from falling with a rush into the hands
 of Lais or Meconis or Sisymbriion
 or Barathron or Thallousa or anyone of those (women),

⁴⁴ On hetairai see General Introduction pp. 20-21, and introduction to Amphis fr. 1.

⁴⁵ A similar attempt proves unsuccessful in Plaut. *Bacch.* 109-169.

⁴⁶ See Arnott *ad loc.* and Webster *SLGC* 63.

⁴⁷ For a discussion of the relations between fathers and sons, see Hunter *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, 95-109.

in whose nets the brothel-keepers entangle you,
5 ... or Nausion or Malthake

1a τοῦ μή ... ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς: The verb ἐμπίπτω, when followed by the preposition εἰς, is commonly used to denote entry into a negative situation (cf. *LSJ* s.v.); e.g. εἰς ἄτας (*S. El.* 216), εἰς βάρβαρα φάσγανα (*E. Hel.* 864), εἰς ἐνέδραν (*X. Cyr.* VIII.5.14), εἰς νόσον (*Antiphon* 1.20). An interesting passage is Antiphanes fr. 232.3 that reads εἰς ἔρωτά τ' ἐμπεσών. Love is indeed imagined as a net as early as archaic lyric; cf. Ibycus fr. 287 *PMGF*: Ἔρως αὐτέ με ... ἐς ἄπειρα δίκτυα Κύπριδος ἐσβάλλει.

Falling headlong into evil as if in a pit is a topos; cf. on Aristophon fr. 6.5. Here, with comic hyperbole, the hetairai themselves are the pit; they are the ruin personified. For the syntax see Kühner-Gerth II §478.4c.

1b Λαῖδα: See on Philetaerus fr. 9.4. From the two courtesans named Lais, here the younger one must be meant; cf. Schiassi, *RFIC* 29 n.s. (1951) 225.

2a Μηκωνίδ': This name is attested only once more, in *IG* II² 12108. According to Bechtel it alludes to the skin colour of the hetaira (*Frauenamen* 104-105). Apart from this, given that μῆκων is the *opium poppy* (*LSJ* s.v.), I would suggest that the name Μηκωνίς can refer to the enticing charms of the hetaira, which can seduce a man's mind, and make it incapable to function properly, just as the somniferous effects of poppy disable and dull one's senses.⁴⁸ Perhaps those seduced by the hetaira are imagined as being like the lotus-eaters. The narcotic power of the poppy was already recognised in antiquity, cf. sch. *Luc.* 14.33.1-3, *Plu. Mor.* 652c.

2b Σισύμβριον: As a woman's name, it is not attested anywhere else, although in Herodas 2.76 there occur two male versions of it, Σισυμβραῖς and Σισυμβρίσκος; see Headlam *ad loc.* As a noun, σισύμβριον means "bergamot-mint" (*LSJ* s.v.). Because of its smell, the σισύμβριον was used to produce a perfume (*Thphr. HP* 6.6.2, *Od.* 27). It was also popular as a coronary plant (*Dsc.* 3.41, *Thphr. HP* 6.1.1), particularly for garlanding the newly married (sch. on *Ar. Av.* 160). Additionally, Headlam *l.c.* stresses the erotic connotations of this plant, and especially its connection with

⁴⁸ Poppies were also associated with Aphrodite; see *Ar. Av.* 160, and van Leeuwen *ad loc.*

Aphrodite.⁴⁹ Henderson lists *σισύμβριον* under the agricultural terms that allude to the female sex organs (*o.c.* 136).

3a Βάραθρον: *Βάραθρον* is not attested anywhere else as a personal name; unless it is a nickname, probably this is another fictional hetaira. This name is a most speaking one, and also revealing of the hetaira's nature. And this is because we know that the *βάραθρον* was a *χάσμα τι φρεατώδες καὶ σκοτεινὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, ἐν ᾧ τοὺς κακούργους ἔβαλλον* (*Suda* β 99).⁵⁰ Hence the imprecatory formula that was used to curse or dismiss someone; cf. *Ar. Eq.* 1362 (*εἰς τὸ βάραθρον ἔμβαλῶ*; cf. sch. *ad loc.*), *Ra.* 574, *Pl.* 1109, *Alexis fr.* 159, *Men. Dysc.* 394, *Plaut. Rud.* 570, etc. Like the case with *Μηκωνίς* above, *Βάραθρον* too possibly alludes to the influence exercised by the hetaira to her lovers; namely, committing in love with the hetaira *Βάραθρον* could suffice to cause one's devastation, as if he was thrown into the real *βάραθρον*; cf. Bechtel, *Frauenamen*, 118.

3b Θάλλουσαν: This name alludes to youth, abundance, and attraction, and these connotations make it appropriate for a hetaira (cf. Bechtel *Frauenamen* 44). This fragment is our only testimony of a hetaira with this name, and this suggests that this is probably a fictional person. However, this name is not exclusively erotic / hedonistic; it can also allude to the notion of fecundity, which makes it entirely proper for a free-born woman. Indeed, it appears as such on a number of inscriptions.⁵¹

4: This is an interesting metaphor. Pimps are hunters who use the hetairai as baits, in order to catch in the nets their victims, i.e. the young ones, like the youth about whom the speaker worries in this fragment. This conception is possibly present in the title of Philetaerus' play *Κυναγίς*, which may denote a hetaira hunting her lovers (see introduction *ad loc.*). For the metaphor of love as a net cf. on l. 1a.

⁴⁹ Ovid (*Fast.* 4.863ff.) tells us that courtesans offered mint to Aphrodite during the Roman festival of Vinalia.

⁵⁰ Cf. X. *HG* 1.7.20, *Hdt.* 7.133, *Pl. Grg.* 516d, etc. See also *RE* II.2 s.v. *Βάραθρον*, Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*, 140.

⁵¹ See *LGPN* s.v.

4 αἱ μαστροποί: “δύστροπος, πανούργος, ἀπατεών. ὁ τὰς γυναῖκας ἢ ἄνδρας προσκαλῶν καὶ μαυλίζων, ἢ προαγωγός” (Hsch. μ 370). This noun can be both masculine (e.g. Luc. *Symp.* 32), and feminine (e.g. Epicrates fr. 8); cf. *LSJ* s.v., and van Leeuwen on Ar. *Th.* 558. Orion *Etym.* μ 101.30-31 gives the following etymology: παρὰ τὸ μαίεσθαι τοὺς τρόπους τῶν πορνεουσῶν γυναικῶν.

Generally, brothel-keepers, also known as πορνοβοσκοί, enjoyed a bad reputation; cf. Diphilus fr. 87.1-2: οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν τεχνίον ἐξωλέστερον / τοῦ πορνοβοσκοῦ; cf. Aeschin. 1.188, Arist. *EN* 1121b 31-33, Chrysippus fr. 152 *SVF*, Plu. *Mor.* 236b, etc. See Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes*, 94.

5a † ναυσιον † : According to Bechtel (*Frauenamen* 28) this name is derived from ναῦς, but what – if anything – this name means remains obscure. It recurs only on the inscription *IG* II² 11797. The present line is unmetrical; the problem is solved with either Meineke’s suggestion *Ναννάριον* (cf. Men. *Kol.* fr. 4) or Kaibel’s *Ἡλύσιον*; the latter, though palaeographically clever, does not occur anywhere as a woman’s name. Musurus suggested *Νάννιον*, the name of a real and famous hetaira;⁵² though this reading is palaeographically the closest to *ναυσιον*, the metrical inconvenience remains. Therefore, if we are to change the text, *Ναννάριον* looks like the best alternative.

5b Μαλθάκη: This was a contemporary courtesan, after whom Antiphanes’ play *Μαλθάκη* was named. She is also mentioned in Luc. *Rh. Pr.* 12. *Μαλθάκη* is also the name of a mistress in Menander’s *Sicyonius*. This name must allude to a woman’s white texture; cf. Bechtel, *Frauenamen*, 45.

Fr. 12

This fragment is cited by Athenaeus XIII 563a-b within a discussion about lovers, and is ascribed to Theophilus. However, Stobaeus 4.20^a12 assigns the first four lines⁵³ to Antiphanes (fr. 318). Hense notes (on Stob. *l.c.*): “Theophilum poetam ignorat pinacographus Photi”. As we saw elsewhere,⁵⁴ copying and borrowing of

⁵² Cf. Hunter on Eubulus’ *Νάννιον*.

⁵³ Line 4 is slightly different: καταλείπετ’ οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ τεθνηκέσαι.

⁵⁴ Cf. on Mnesimachus fr. 4.31-43, and introduction to Amphis fr. 3.

lines, ideas, etc., among poets was a common practice. Antiphanes began writing in the 388/7-385/4, and was still writing until his death, i.e. in the late 310s.⁵⁵ This means that there was a good period of overlap between Antiphanes and Theophilus;⁵⁶ therefore, we cannot say with certainty who wrote these lines first.

It is possible that this fragment was the opening scene of the play (see on ll. 1ff.). The context is sympotic and seems parallel to that of Philetaerus fr. 17. The speaker is probably the Flute-lover himself (cf. introduction to the play and to fr. 11). He admits unreservedly his passionated love for a lyre-girl. The love motif is particularly characteristic of New Comedy; its treatment here and elsewhere in Middle Comedy are interesting cases of overlap between Middle and New Comedy.⁵⁷ What is also noteworthy here is that the speaker is arguing a paradox: he claims that he has got his wits despite being in love with a lyre-girl. Arguing either a paradox or the impossible was a particularly popular motif during the fourth century B.C.⁵⁸ Although the madness of Eros is a truism,⁵⁹ the speaker refutes it in the manner of the *παίγνια* of the late fifth and the fourth century (e.g. Gorgias' *Helen*).

τίς φησι τοὺς ἐρῶντας οὐχὶ νοῦν ἔχειν;
 ἢ πού τις ἐστὶ τοὺς τρόπους ἀβέλτερος.
 εἰ γὰρ ἀφέλοι τις τοῦ βίου τὰς ἡδονάς,
 καταλείπετ' οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν τεθνηκέναι.
 5 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν καὶ τὸς κισσαριστρίας ἐρῶν,
 παιδὸς κόρης, οὐ νοῦν ἔχω πρὸς τῶν θεῶν;
 κάλλει καλῆς, μεγέθει μεγάλης, τέχνη σοφῆς·
 ἦν ἐστ' ἰδεῖν ἡδίου ἢ τὸ θεωρικόν
 ἔχουσιν ὑμῖν διανέμειν ἐκάστοτε

⁵⁵ Cf. Konstantakos diss. p. 7, and Id. *Eikasmos* 11 (2000) 177, 183.

⁵⁶ Theophilus was a late Middle Comedy playwright; cf. introduction to the poet.

⁵⁷ See General Introduction p. 21.

⁵⁸ Such *singularum rerum laudes* (Cic. *Brut.* 47) include encomia of death (e.g. by Alcidamas; cf. Men. Rh. III.346 Spengel), of hetairai (e.g. of Nais by Alcidamas, and of Lagis by Cephalus; cf. Ath. XIII 592c), of mice, etc. Cf. on Amphis fr. 1.1b, 8.1-2.

⁵⁹ Cf. the madness inflicted upon Hippolytus and Phaedra (E. *Hipp.*), as well as Deianeira (S. *Tr.*); see also the third stasimon of Sophocles *Antigone* (esp. ll. 790-792).

9 ἔχουσιν A: αἰτοῦσιν Dalec.: ἐκ- Emperius *Opusc.* p. 161: ἐλθ- Kaibel: ἔχουσαν Richards p. 90: verbi χάσκειν formam requirit Peppink *Obs.* p. 77, coll. Ar. *Vesp.* 695

Who says lovers are out of their wits?

Certainly, it must be someone of foolish ways.

For if one takes away the pleasures from life,
there is nothing left but to die.

5 So, let us say me, because I love a lyre-girl,
a little maid, does this mean I have no sense, for gods' sake?
In beauty beautiful, in stature tall, in art skilled;
and it is sweeter to see her than to distribute the theoretic
money to you, rich men, regularly

1ff.: This is a case of *refutatio sententiae*. The young man argues against the maxim that lovers are out of their minds, the evidence being his personal experience and the girl's worth (l. 7). The rejection of an opinion shared by many makes a case more forceful.⁶⁰ The structure is so close to the opening of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, that one wonders if this fragment could have been the opening speech of the play. It is interesting that the speaker starts with the generalisation, and then comes round to himself, which may suggest that he is introducing the theme, not responding to a criticism. If not the opening scene of the play, it could well be the first entry of this character, though it is unprovable. The characters in Menander tend to speak likewise either in the prologue or upon their first appearance, but this is not a rule; cf. Thrasonides' opening speech in *Misoumenos* (ll. 1ff.), Knemon's words upon his first appearance in *Dyscolus* (ll. 153ff.), etc. On the other hand, Kleainetos in *Georgos* utters such generalising statements at points other than his first appearance; e.g. fr. 2 Arnott.

2 ἀβέλτερος: This is one who is ἀνόητος καὶ εὐήθης μετὰ χαυνότητος (Ael. Dion. a 4, cf. *Suda* a 32). Despite Millis' claim (on Anaxandrides fr. 22) that "it occurs predominantly in comedy", there are also many non-comic instances, which suggest that ἀβέλτερος is neither exclusively nor predominantly a comic word; e.g. Pl. *HpMa*.

⁶⁰ The effects of *refutatio sententiae* are discussed by Easterling on S. *Tr.* 4-5.

301d, Arist. *Phgn.* 811d, D. *Phil.* 3.14, Anaximen. *Ars Rhet.* 4.2, Zeno fr. 313 *SVF*, Plu. *Rom.* 28.7, Epictet. *Ench.* 25.5, Hermog. *Id.* 2.3, Aristides *Apol.* fr. 12.1, Gal. *UP* 3.327, Liban. *Or.* 11.2, etc.

3-4 εἰ γὰρ ... τεθνηκένοι: The idea is a commonplace. It occurs as early as Mimnermus fr. 1.1-2 West: *τίς δὲ βίος, τί δὲ τερπνὸν ἄτερ χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης; / τεθναίην, ὅτε μοι μηκέτι ταῦτα μέλοι.* Cf. Alexis fr. 273.4-5: *τὸ πιεῖν τὸ φαγεῖν τὸ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης τυγχάνειν / τὰ δ' ἄλλα προσθήκας ἅπαντ' ἐγὼ καλῶ.* In this fragment Alexis names the three pleasures that give life its meaning. Arnott *ad loc.* notes that “sex, as the third pleasure commonly linked with eating and drinking (and often following them at *συμπόσια*) in popular thought is sometimes named specifically in such triads as these”.⁶¹ Likewise, in mentioning *τὰς ἡδονάς* Theophilus might well mean the same three pleasures (though the primary pleasure that he emphasises in the following lines is obviously love / sex).

5 κιθαριστρίας ἐρῶν: Lyre-girls, along with flute-girls, were a common presence at symposia; cf. the abduction of a flute-girl out of a symposion by Philocleon in Aristophanes' *Wasps* 1341ff. (see on *Amphis* fr. 9.3-4). The speaker of this fragment has obviously fallen in love with such a girl. A similar story is to be found in Terence's *Phormio* and *Adelphoi* (cf. introduction to fr. 11).

6 παιδὸς κόρης: This pleonasm stresses the girl's tenderness and charms, while at the same time suggests a special affection on behalf of the lover. Cf. Ar. *Lys.* 595, E. *IT* 1114-1115, *Lys.* 3.7, D. 21.79,⁶² etc.; in all these parallels the girl is a free young maiden, whereas in the present fragment she is a slave, a lyre-girl, who entertains men at symposia. Understandably, the speaker is aware of this, but the fact that he insists on presenting her as an innocent maiden indicates his tender feelings towards her.

This expression serves as an elaborate stylistic tool that combines nicely with the emphatic repetition of *νοῦν ἔχειν* (l. 1) – *νοῦν ἔχω* (l. 6). The refutation introduced in l. 1 is brought to the fore again, and the following attributes (l. 7) substantiate the speaker's claim that it is good sense to love this girl.

⁶¹ See further Arnott on Alexis fr. 273.

⁶² The effect of this phrase is noticed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Dem.* 58.

7α κάλλει ... σοφῆς: Cf. the Homeric formula *καλή τε μεγάλη τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ ἔργα ἰδυῖα* (e.g. *Od.* 13.289). It is obvious that the attributes *καλής* and *μεγάλης* refer to the girl's appearance and beauty. But in which *art* is the girl skilled? Two possibilities present themselves. Firstly, given the amatory context of the fragment, the phrase can bear sexual connotations and refer to the sexual dexterity of the hetaira. Secondly, the speaker may refer to her ability to play the lyre (*κιθαριστορία*; l. 5). The reference to the *ἠδονάς* (cf. on ll. 3-4) tells for the former interpretation, but the play's title, indicative of the hero's love of music, tells for the latter. I would leave both possibilities open.

The style in this line is very elaborate. We have three datives of respect (*κάλλει, μεγέθει, τέχνῃ*), which create a tricolon of parallel structure with alliteration that ends in variation.⁶³ What is also noteworthy are the *figurae etymologicae* (*κάλλει καλής* and *μεγέθει μεγάλης*), which respectively highlight – through duplication – the beauty and the height of the girl. This feature, as a means of extra emphasis, recurs commonly in both poetry and prose; cf. van Leeuwen on *Ar. Ach.* 177.

7β μεγέθει μεγάλης: Height – within limits – was often considered desirable in women. In Alexis fr. 103 we hear of some tricks (e.g. thickening the shoes' soles, wearing flat shoes, etc.) used to either raise or lower a hetaira's height to make her desirable; cf. Arnott *ad loc.* Both the hetairai and the free women alike were generally concerned with their height. The interest in a woman's height is expressed in various passages from both the Greek and the Latin literature; e.g. *AP* 5.76.2, Catullus 86, *Hor. Sat.* 1.2.123-124, etc.

8 τὸ θεωρικόν: This was the money distributed by the polis of Athens to its citizens, so that they could afford to attend the dramatic performances during festivals. This practice was probably introduced in the early fourth century, but it seems that it was only Euboulos in the 350s who reorganised this institution and strengthened its role; cf. Harp. and *Suda* s.v. *θεωρικά*, Aeschin. 3.25, etc. Carey and Kapparis deal with this issue in their commentaries on [D.] 59, pp. 6 and 176-177 respectively. However, Hansen maintains that no such distributions were made before Euboulos (*The*

⁶³ For the double repetition see van Leeuwen on *Ar. Ach.* 177.

Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes, 98, 160, 263-4). See also Buchanan, *Theorika*, along with its review by de Ste Croix in *CR* 14 (1964) 190-192.

9a ἔχουσιν: The text has been suspected and several conjectures have been suggested; cf. crit. app. Kassel-Austin adopt the manuscript's reading ἔχουσιν; if genuine, the meaning is probably *rich men*; cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἔχω A.I. However, this interpretation gives no satisfying sense. ἔχουσιν would only make sense of the audience as recipients of the theorikon. But in that case the active infinitive διανέμειν is surprising (the middle is generally used for recipients⁶⁴). If the text is sound, the answer may be that the addressees – as Athenian citizens – are simultaneously *donors*, as members of the sovereign demos, which is responsible (through its officials) for the theoretic distributions, and at the same time *beneficiaries* (i.e. “than for you to distribute and possess the theoretic money”).

If we choose to alter the text, one possibility is ἐκοῦσιν (“to distribute gladly”, i.e. as beneficiaries). Alternatively, following Peppink, one might read χάσκουσιν (“to gape eagerly in anticipation”). Professor Carey suggested to me two further readings: a) τρέχουσιν, which conveys the same sense of anticipation and eagerness as χάσκουσιν; b) τυχοῦσιν (“when you get it”).⁶⁵

9b ὑμῖν: Though an address to the chorus is possible, the reference to the Theoric money, which everyone in the audience had received, makes a direct address to the audience far more likely. This kind of breach of the dramatic illusion is particularly associated with Old Comedy,⁶⁶ but here as elsewhere Middle Comedy proves itself heir to the conventions of Old Comedy. For similar audience addresses see Alexis fr. 233.3 and 63.7 (cf. Arnott *ad loc.*). See Bain, *Actors and Audience*, 102, 190 n. 4, and Silk, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, 138, 215.

⁶⁴ Cf. *LSJ* s.v. διανέμω Med.

⁶⁵ A less plausible suggestion is Richards' ἔχουσαν, which is already considered “far-fetched” by Richards himself (*Aristophanes and the Others*, 90).

⁶⁶ Cf. Ar. *Ach.* 416-417, *Pax* 149-153, *Ra.* 1ff., etc.

Bibliography

Editions

The following editions are used in this dissertation:

- Alpers, K., 1981. *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros*, Berlin & New York.
- von Arnim, H. F. A., 1903-1924. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, 4 vols, Leipzig.
- Arnott, W. G., 1979-2000. *Menander*, 3 vols, Cambridge-Massachusetts & London.
- Arrighetti, G., 1960. *Epicuro Opere*, Torino.
- Austin, C., 1969-1970. *Menandri Aspis et Samia*, 2 vols, Berlin.
- ———. 1973. *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta*, Berlin & New York.
- Bailey, J., 1840. *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Cambridge.
- Baiter, J. G. & Sauppe, H., 1839-1850. *Oratores Attici*, 2 vols, Zürich.
- Bekker, I., 1814-1821, *Anecdota Graeca*, 3 vols, Berlin.
- ———. 1833. *Harpocraton et Moeris*, Berlin.
- Bothe, F. H., 1855. *Poetarum Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Paris.
- Carrière, J., ²1975. *Théognis: poèmes élégiaques*, Paris.
- Clinton, H. F., 1834. *Fasti Hellenici*, Oxford.
- Davies, M. (post D. L. Page) 1991. *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Oxford.
- Diels, H., 1901. *Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta*, Berlin.
- Diels, H. & Kranz, W., ⁶1952. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 3 vols, Berlin.
- Dindorf, W., 1853. *Harpocratonis Lexikon in Decem Oratores Atticos*, 2 vols, Oxford.
- ———. 1973. *Demosthenes. Scholia Graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata* (reprint of v. 8-9 [1851] of Dindorf's edition of Demosthenes' works, published 1846-51 under title: *Demosthenes*), New York.
- Dübner, Fr., 1877. *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem cum Prolegomenis Grammaticorum*, Paris.
- Edmonds, J. M., 1954. *Elegy and Iambus with the Anacreontea*, London & Cambridge-Massachusetts.

- ———. 1957-1961. *The Fragments of Attic Comedy after Meineke, Bergk, and Kock*, 3 vols, Leiden.
- Gow, A. S. F. & Page D. L., 1965. *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge.
- Hayduck, M., 1891. *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, Berlin.
- Heiberg, J. L., 1898-1919. *Claudii Ptolemaei Opera quae exstant omnia*, Leipzig.
- Hilgard, A., 1901. *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, Leipzig.
- Hondius, J. J. E., Woodhead, A. G., Pleket, H. W. & Stroud, R. S., 1923-1982. *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, 28 vols, Leiden, Alphen, Amsterdam.
- Jacoby, F. et al., 1923-1999. *Die Fragmente der Griechischer Historiker*, Berlin & Leiden.
- Kaibel, G., 1878. *Epigrammata Graeca ex Lapidibus Collecta*, Berlin.
- ———. 1958. *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Berlin.
- Kassel, R. & Austin, C., 1983-2001. *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 vols, Berlin & New York.
- Kinkel, G., 1877. *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- Kock, T., 1880-1888. *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, 3 vols, Leipzig.
- Kühn, K. G., 1821-1833. *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, 20 vols, Leipzig.
- Lentz, A., 1965 (Reprografischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe 1868/70). *Grammatici Graeci*, pars III, vol. II, Hildesheim.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. & Parsons, P., 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Berlin & New York.
- Maehler, H. (post B. Snell), ⁸1987-1989. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, 2 vols, Leipzig.
- Marx, F., 1904-05. *C. Lucilii Carminum reliquiae*, 2 vols, Leipzig.
- Meineke, A., 1839-1857. *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum*, 5 vols, Berlin.
- ———. 1847. *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum*, editio minor (2 vols), Berlin.
- Müller, K., 1855-82. *Geographi Graeci Minores*, Paris.
- ———. 1878-1885. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, 5 vols, Paris.

- Nachmanson, E., 1918. *Erotiani vocum Hippocraticarum collectio cum fragmentis*, Göteborg.
- Page, D. L., 1962. *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford.
- Pearson, A. C., 1963. *The Fragments of Sophocles*, Cambridge.
- Pfeiffer, R., 1949-1953. *Callimachus*, Oxford.
- Preller, L., 1964 (Nachdruck der Ausgabe Leipzig 1838). *Polemonis Periegetae Fragmenta*, Amsterdam.
- Rabe, H., 1906. *Scholia in Lucianum*, Leipzig.
- Ribbeck, O., ³1897-1898. *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta, II: Comico- Romanorum praeter Plautum et Syri quae feruntur sententias Fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- Rzach, A., ³1913. *Hesiodi Carmina*, Leipzig.
- Schepers, M. A., 1905. *Alciphronis rhetoris epistularum libri IV*, Leipzig.
- Slater, W. J. (post A. Nauck) 1986. *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, Berlin & New York.
- Snell, B. & Kannicht, R. & Radt, S., 1971-2004. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 5 vols, Göttingen.
- Spengel, L., 1853-1856. *Rhetores Graeci*, 3 vols, Leipzig.
- Thalheim, T., ²1913. *Lysiae Orationes*, Leipzig.
- Theiler, W., 1982. *Poseidonios. Die Fragmente*, 2 vols, Berlin & New York.
- Usener, H., 1887. *Epicurea*, Rome.
- Voigt, E.-M., 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus*, Amsterdam.
- Wehrli, F., ²1967. *Aristoxenos (Die Schule des Aristoteles vol. 2)*, Basel / Stuttgart.
- ———. 1969. *Herakleides Pontikos (Die Schule des Aristoteles vol. 7)*, Basel / Stuttgart.
- West, M. L., ²1989-1992. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, 2 vols, Oxford.
- Wimmer, F., 1854-1862. *Theophrasti Eresii opera quae supersunt omnia*, 3 vols, Leipzig.
- Wyss, B., 1936. *Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae*, Berlin.

Secondary Literature

- Ameling, W., 1981. "Komödie und Politik zwischen Kratinos und Aristophanes. Das Beispiel des Perikles", *QC* 3, 383-424.
- Arnott, W. G., 1996. *Alexis: The Fragments: A Commentary*, Cambridge.
- Austin, C. & Olson, S. D., 2004. *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae*, Oxford.
- Bain, D., 1977. *Actors and Audience*, Oxford.
- ———. 1977. "The Prologues of Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis*", *CQ* 27 n.s., 10-26.
- Balogh, E., 1943. *Political Refugees in Ancient Greece*, Johannesburg.
- Barker, A., 1984. *Greek Musical Writings*, 2 vols, Cambridge.
- Barrett, W. S., 1978 (reprinted from corrected sheets of the 1964 edition). *Euripides Hippolytos*, Oxford.
- Beavis, I. C., 1988. *Insects and other Invertebrates in Classical Antiquity*, Exeter.
- Beazley, J. D., ²1971. *Paralipomena: Additions to "Attic Black-figure Vase-painters" and to "Attic Red-figure Vase-painters"*, Oxford.
- Bechtel, F., 1898. *Die einstämmigen männlichen Personennamen des Griechischen, die aus Spitznamen hervorgegangen sind*, Berlin.
- ———. 1902. *Die attischen Frauennamen*, Göttingen.
- ———. 1917. *Die historischen Personennamen der Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle.
- Bergk, W. T., 1838. *Commentationum de Reliquiis Comoediae Atticae Antiquae Libri Duo*, Leipzig.
- Bergk, W. T., et al., 1872-94. *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, 5 vols, Berlin.
- Bernays, J., 1866. *Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit*, Berlin.
- Berthiaume, G., 1982. "Les rôles du mágeiros", *Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 70, Leiden.
- Bieber, M., ²1961. *History of the Greek and Roman Theater*, Princeton.
- Björck, G., 1950. *Das Alpha impurum und die tragische Kunstsprache: Attische Wort- und Stilstudien*, Uppsala.
- ———. 1952. "Das Tragikomische und das Wort νεανικός", in *EPMHNEIA (Festschrift Otto Regenbogen)*, Heidelberg, 66-70.
- Blake, W. E., 1966. *Menander's Dyscolus*, New York.

- Blaydes, F., 1890-1896. *Adversaria in Comicatorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Hall.
- Blomfield, C. J. & Monk, J. H., ²1814. *Adversaria Ricardi Porsoni*, Leipzig.
- Blümner, H. *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, vol. I Leipzig & Berlin ²1912, vols II-IV Leipzig 1879-1887.
- Boardman, J., et al., ²1982-2000, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 14 vols, London & Cambridge & New York.
- ———. 1989. *Athenian Red Figure Vases, The Classical Period*, London.
- ———. 2001. *The History of Greek Vases*, London.
- Boisacq, E., ⁴1950. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Heidelberg.
- Bollack, J., 1990. *L' Oedipe roi de Sophocle. Le texte et ses interprétations*, Lille.
- Bond, G. W., 1969 (reprint with corrections of the 1963 edition). *Euripides Hypsipyle*, Oxford.
- Bornmann, F., 1978. "Su alcuni passi di Procopio", *SIFC* 50, 27-37.
- Böttiger, C. A., 1837-38. *Kleine Schriften archäologischen und antiquarischen Inhalts*, Dresden & Leipzig.
- Braund, D. & Wilkins, J., 2000. *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, Exeter.
- Breitenbach, H., 1908. *De genere quodam titulorum comoediae Atticae*, diss. Basil.
- Brumfield, A. C., 1981. *The Attic festivals of Demeter and their Relation to the Agricultural Year*, New York.
- Brunius-Nilsson, E., 1955. *Daimonie, an inquiry into a mode of apostrophe in old Greek literature*, Uppsala.
- Buchanan, J. J., 1962. *Theorika. A Study of Monetary Distributions to the Athenian Citizenry during the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.*, New York.
- Burkert, W., 1962. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, Nürnberg (transl. by E. L. Minar, Jr., 1972, Cambridge-Massachusetts).
- ———. 1985. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical* (transl. by J. Raffan), Oxford.

- ———. 1987. *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge-Massachusetts & London.
- Calder, R. & Screech, M. A. (eds.) 1970. *François Rabelais, Gargantua*, Genève.
- Camp, J. M., 1986. *The Athenian Agora: Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens*, London.
- Campbell, D. A., ²1982. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*, Bristol.
- Cantarella, E., 1992. *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*, (transl. by Cormac Ó Cuilleain) New Haven & London.
- Capps, E., 1907. "Epigraphical Problems in the History of Attic Comedy" *AJPh* 28, 179-199.
- Carey, C., 1982. "Notes on Aristophanes' *Peace*", *CQ* 32 n.s., 465-467.
- ———. 1992. *Apollodoros, Against Neaira: [Demosthenes] 59*, Warminster.
- ———. 2000. "Old Comedy and the sophists", in D. Harvey & J. Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, London, 419-436.
- Carrière, J., 1949. *Théognis de Mégare: étude sur le recueil élégiaque attribué à ce poète*, Paris.
- Casaubon, I., 1796-1843. *Isaaci Casauboni animadversionum in Athenaei Deipnosophistas libri quindecim*, 3 vols, Leipzig.
- Cohen, D., 1991. *Law, Sexuality, and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.
- Colvin, S., 1999. *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford.
- Connor, W. R., 1963. "Two Notes on Diopieithes the Seer", *ClPh* 58, 115-117.
- Coppola, G., 1927. "Per la storia della commedia greca (Timocles ateniese e Difilo di Sinope)", *RFIC* 5 n.s., 453-467.
- Crisp, R., 2000. *Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics*, Cambridge.
- Crosby, M., 1949. "The Altar of the Twelve Gods in Athens", *Hesperia*, suppl. 8, 82-103.
- Crusius, O., 1888. "Coniectanea ad comicorum Graecorum fragmenta", *Philologus* 46, 606-631.

- Csapo, E., 2000. "From Aristophanes to Menander? Genre Transformation in Greek Comedy", in M. Depew & D. Obbink (edd.), *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge – Massachusetts & London, 115-133.
- Dalby, A., 1995. *Siren Feasts: A History of Food and Gastronomy in Greece*, London.
- Daremberg, C. V. & Saglio, E., 1877-1919. *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines d'après les textes et les monuments*, Paris.
- Davidson, J. N., 1993. "Fish, sex and revolution in Athens", *CQ* 43 n.s., 53-66.
- ———. 1997. *Courtesans and Fishcakes*, London.
- Davies, J. K., 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford.
- ———. 1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*, New York.
- Davies, M. & Kathirithamby, J., 1986. *Greek Insects*, London.
- Dedoussi, C., 1961. "The Trochaic Tetrameter in Menander", *Πλάτων* 13, 59-66.
- Denniston, J. D. & Page, D. L. (eds.), 1957. *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, Oxford.
- Deubner, L., 1932. *Attische Feste*, Berlin.
- Diels, H., 1897. *Parmenides Lehrgedicht: griechisch und deutsch, mit einem Anhang über griechische Thüren und Schlösser*, Berlin.
- ———. ²1920. *Antike Technik. Sieben Vorträge*, Leipzig & Berlin.
- Diels, H. & Schubart, W., 1904. *Didymos Kommentar zu Demosthenes (Papyrus 9780) nebst Wörterbuch zu Demosthenes' Aristocratea (Papyrus 5008)*, Berlin.
- Dietze, A., 1901. *De Philemone comico*, diss., Göttingen.
- Diggle, J., 1970. *Euripides Phaethon*, Cambridge.
- Dobree, P. P., 1883. *Adversaria*, 5 vols, London.
- Dodds, E. R., 1959. *Plato Gorgias*, Oxford.
- ———. ²1960. *Euripides Bacchae*, Oxford.
- Dohm, H., 1964. *Mageiros: die Rolle des Kochs in der griechisch-römischen Komödie*, München.
- Dorter, K., 1994. *Form and Good in Plato's Eleatic Dialogues*, California.

- Dover, K. J., 1968. *Aristophanes Clouds*, Oxford.
- ———. 1972. *Aristophanic Comedy*, Berkeley – Los Angeles.
- ———. 1974. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford.
- ———. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge-Massachusetts.
- ———. 1985. “Some types of abnormal word-order in Attic Comedy”, *CQ* 35 n.s., 324-343.
- ———. 1993. *Aristophanes Frogs*, Oxford.
- Droysen, J. G., 1883-5. *Histoire de l' hellénisme*, (transl. from German with the collaboration of E. Legrand, P. P. Huschard, and A. M. Chuquet), 3 vols, Paris. (the references are to the French edition)
- Dunbar, N., 1995. *Aristophanes Birds*, Oxford.
- Easterling, P. E., 1982. *Sophocles: Trachiniae*, Cambridge.
- Easterling, P. E. & Knox, B. M. W. (eds.) 1985. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Cambridge.
- Ehrenberg, V., 1943. *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*, Oxford.
- Emperius, A., 1847. *Opuscula philologica et historica*, Göttingen.
- Farnell, L. R., 1930-1932. *The works of Pindar*, 3 vols, London.
- Fenk, R., 1913. *Adversarii Platonis quomodo de indole ac moribus eius iudicaverint*, diss., Ienae.
- Fick, A., 1894. *Die griechischen Personennamen*, Göttingen.
- Fielitz, W., 1866. *De Atticorum comoedia bipartita*, diss., Bonn.
- Fisher, N., 2001. *Aeschines against Timarchos: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Fraenkel, E., 1922. *Plautinisches im Plautus*, Berlin.
- ———. 1950. *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, 3 vols, Oxford.
- Fritzsche, F. V., “De comoediae Graecae fragmentis”, in *Index lectionum in Academia Rostochiensi semestri hiberno a. 1857/58*, Rostock.
- Gaiser, K., 1980. “Plato’s enigmatic lecture «On the Good»”, *Phronesis* 25, 5-37.
- Gantz, T., 1996 (originally published in a one-volume edition, 1993). *Early Greek Myth*, 2 vols, Baltimore & London.

- Geissler, P., 1925. *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*, Berlin.
- Gerber, D. E., 1997. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, Leiden & New York & Köln.
- Giannini, A., 1960. “La figura del cuoco nella commedia greca”, *Acme* 13, 135-216.
- Gilula, D., 1995. “Food – an effective tool of amatory persuasion: a commentary on Mnesimachus fr. 4 K-A”, *Athenaeum* 83, 143-156.
- ———. 2000. “Hermippus and his catalogue of goods (fr. 63)”, in D. Harvey & J. Wilkins (eds.). *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, London, 75-90.
- Goldhill, S., & Osborne, R., (eds.) 1999. *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge.
- Gomme, A. W., 1945-1981. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford.
- Gomme, A. W. & Sandbach, F. H., 1973. *Menander, A Commentary*, Oxford.
- Gould, T., 1963. *Platonic Love*, London.
- Gould, J., 1980. “Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens”, *JHS* 100, 38-59.
- Gow, A. S. F., ²1952. *Theocritus. Edited with a Translation and Commentary*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- ———. 1965. *Machon. The Fragments*, Cambridge.
- Graff, F., 1974. *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, Berlin & New York.
- Grenfell, B. P. & Hunt, A. S., 1898. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, London.
- van Groningen, B. A., 1966. *Theognis, le premier livre*, Amsterdam.
- Gronovius, J., 1697-1702. *Thesaurus Graecarum Antiquitatum*, 13 vols, Leiden.
- Grotius, H., 1623. *Dicta Poetarum quae apud Ioannem Stobaeum exstant*, Paris.
- ———. 1626. *Excerpta ex tragoediis et comoediis graecis tum quae exstant, tum quae perierunt*, Paris.
- Gruppe, O., 1906. *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, München.

- Guthrie, W. K. C., 1971. *The Sophists*, Cambridge. (trans. in Greek by D. Tsekourakis, Athens ²1991 – references are made to the Greek edition).
- ———. 1978. *A History of Greek Philosophy*, Cambridge.
- Gutzwiller, K., 1969. *Psychros und onkos: Untersuchungen zur rhetorischen Terminologie*, diss., Basel.
- Hall, E., 1988. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-definition Through Tragedy*, Oxford.
- Halliwell, S., 1984. “Ancient interpretations of *ὀνομαστί κωμωδεῖν* in Aristophanes”, *CQ* 34 n.s., 83-88.
- Halperin, D. M., 1990. “Why is Diotima a Woman? Platonic *Erōs* and the Figuration of Gender”, in D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler & F. I. Zeitlin, (eds.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton, 257-308.
- Halperin, D. M., Winkler, J. J. & Zeitlin, F. I., (eds.), 1990. *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton.
- Hammond, N. G. L., ³1986. *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Hammond, N. G. L. & Griffith, G. T., 1979. *A History of Macedonia*, vol. II (550-336 B.C.), Oxford.
- Handley, E. W., 1965. *The Dyskolos of Menander*, London.
- Handley, E. W. & Rea, J., 1957. *The Telephus of Euripides*, *BICS*, suppl. 5.
- Hanow, R. 1830. *Exercitationum criticarum in comicos Graecos liber primus*, Halle.
- Hansen, M. H., 1983a. “The Athenian ‘Politicians’, 403-322 B.C.”, *GRBS* 24, 33-55.
- ———. 1983b. “*Rhetores* and *Strategoi* in Fourth-Century Athens”, *GRBS* 24, 151-180.
- ———. 1991. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, (transl. by J. A. Crook), Oxford.
- Hanson, J. A., 1965. “The glorious military” in T. A. Dorey & D. R. Dudley (eds.), *Roman Drama*, London, 51-85.
- Hartung, J. A., 1828. *Commentatio de part. δή et ἦδη*, Erlangae.
- Harvey, D. & Wilkins, J., (eds.) 2000. *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, London.

- Hauschild, H. 1933. *Die Gestalt der Hetäre in der griechischen Komödie*, Leipzig.
- Hawley, R., “The Problem of Women Philosophers in Ancient Greece”, in L. J. Archer, S. Fischer & M. Wyke, *Women in Ancient Societies. An Illusion of the Night*, Basingstoke & London 1994, 70-87.
- Headlam, W., 1891. *On Editing Aeschylus: A Criticism*, London.
- ———. 1895. “Various conjectures III”, *JPh* 23, 260-323.
- ———. 1922. *Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments*, Cambridge.
- Heath, M., 1987a. “Euripides’ *Telephus*”, *CQ* 37 n.s., 272-280.
- ———. 1987b. *Political Comedy in Aristophanes*, Göttingen (*Hypomnemata* 87).
- Helm, R., 1906. *Lucian und Menipp*, Leipzig & Berlin.
- Henderson, J., 1975. *The Maculate Muse*, New Haven & London.
- ———. 1990. “The *Dēmos* and the Comic Competition”, in J. J. Winkler & F. I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?*, 271-313.
- van Herwerden, H., 1886. “De fragmentis comicorum Graecorum commentatio altera”, *Mnemosyne* 14, 158-196.
- ———. 1903. *Collectanea critica, epicritica, exegetica sive Addenda ad Theodori Kockii opus Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, Leiden.
- Hicks,
- Hobbs, A., 2000. *Plato and the Hero: Courage, Manliness, and the Impersonal Good*, Cambridge.
- Hofmann W. & Wartenberg G., 1973. *Der Bramarbas in der antiken Komödie*, Berlin.
- Holzinger, K., 1940. *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zu Aristophanes’ Plutos*, Wien.
- Hordern, J. H., 2002. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*, Oxford.
- Howard, A. A., 1893. “The *Αὐλός* or Tibia”, *HSCP* 4, 1-60.
- Hubbard, T. K., 1991. *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis*, Ithaca & London.
- Hultsch, F., ²1882. *Griechische und römische Metrologie*, Berlin.
- Hunter, R. L., 1979. “The Comic Chorus in the Fourth Century”, *ZPE* 36, 23-38.

- ———. 1983. *Eubulus: The Fragments*, Cambridge.
- ———. 1984. *Comici* = Review of *Poetae Comici Graeci* (ed. R. Kassel & C. Austin) vol. 4, *JHS* 104, 224-225.
- ———. 1985. *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, Cambridge.
- Imperio, O. “La figura dell’ intellettuale nella commedia greca”, in A. M. Belardinelli, O. Imperio, G. Mastromarco, M. Pellegrino, P. Totaro (edd.). *Tessere. Frammenti della Commedia Greca: Studi e Commenti*, Bari 1998, 43-130.
- Ireland, S., 1995. *Menander, The Bad-tempered man (Dyskolos)*, Warminster.
- Irwin, T., 1995. *Plato’s Ethics*, Oxford.
- Jacobs, F., 1809. *Additamenta animadversionum in Athenaei Deipnosophistas, in quibus et multa Athenaei et plurima aliorum scriptorum loca tractantur*, Jena.
- Janko, R., 1984a. *Aristotle on Comedy. Towards a reconstruction of Poetics II*, London.
- ———. 1984b. “Forgetfulness in the Golden Tablets of Memory”, *CQ* 34 n.s., 89-100.
- Jebb, R. C., ²1893. *The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus*, 2 vols, London.
- Judeich, W., ²1931. *Topographie von Athen*, München.
- Jüthner, J., 1909. *Philostratos über Gymnastik*, Leipzig & Berlin.
- Kann, S., 1909. *De iteratis apud poetas antiquae et mediae comoediae atticae*, diss. Giessen.
- Kapparis, K. A., 1999. *Apollodoros: “Against Neaira” [D. 59]*, Berlin & New York.
- Kassel, R., 1973. “Zum Euripideischen Kyklops”, *Maia* 25, 99-106.
- ———. 1981. “Dichterspiele”, *ZPE* 42, 11-20.
- Kennedy, G. A., 1963. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, London.
- Kidd, D. A., 1997. *Aratus Phaenomena. A Commentary*, Cambridge.
- Kilmer, M. F., 1993. *Greek Erotica on Attic Red-Figure Vases*, London.
- Kingsley, P., 1995. *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition*, Oxford.
- Kirchner, I., 1901. *Prosopographia Attica*, Berlin.
- Kirk, G. S., et al., 1985-1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*, 6 vols, Cambridge.

- Kleingünther, A., 1933. “Πρώτος εὔρετής. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung”, *Philologus* suppl. 26.1, 1-155.
- Kokolakis, M., 1960. *The Dramatic Simile of Life*, Athens.
- Konstantakos, I. M., 2000. *A Commentary on the Fragments of Eight Plays of Antiphanes*, diss., Cambridge.
- ———. 2000. “Notes on the Chronology and Career of Antiphanes”, *Eikasmos* 11, 173-196.
- Körte, A., 1904. “Die Hypothese zu Kratinos *Dionysalexandros*”, *Hermes* 39, 481-498.
- Koster, S., 1980. *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, Hain.
- Koster, W. J. W., 1975. *Prolegomena de comoedia. Scholia in Aristophanem*, I 1A, Groningen.
- Kraus, C. S., 2002. “Introduction: Reading Commentaries / Commentaries as Reading”, in R. K. Gibson & C. S. Kraus, *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, Leiden, 1-27.
- Kretschmer, P., 1894. *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach Untersucht*, Gütersloh.
- Kroll, J. H., 1977. “An Archive of the Athenian Cavalry”, *Hesperia* 46, 83-146.
- Kroll, J. H. & Mitchel, F. W., 1980. “Clay tokens stamped with the names of Athenian military commanders”, *Hesperia* 49, 86-96.
- Kühner, R. & Blass, F., ³1890-1892. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Erster Teil: Elementar- und Formenlehre*, 2 vols, Hannover.
- Kühner, R. & Gerth, B., ⁴1955. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*, 2 vols, Hannover.
- Kurtz, D. C. & Boardman, J., 1971. *Greek Burial Customs*, London.
- Lada-Richards, I., 1999. *Initiating Dionysus. Ritual and Theatre in Aristophanes' Frogs*, Oxford.
- Lasserre, F., 1954. *Plutarque: De la musique / Texte, traduction, commentaire, précédés d' une étude sur l' éducation musicale dans la Grèce antique*, Lausanne.

- Lautensach, O., 1899. *Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern und Komikern. Augment und Reduplikation*, Hanover & Leipzig.
- ———. 1911. *Die Aoriste bei den attischen Tragikern und Komikern*, Göttingen.
- Lefkowitz, M., 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, London.
- Lehrs, K., ²1875. *Populäre Aufsätze aus dem Alterthum vorzugsweise zur Ethik und Religion der Griechen*, Leipzig.
- Leo, F., ²1912. *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*, Berlin.
- ———. (edited by E. Fraenkel) 1960. *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, Rome.
- Lever, K., 1956. *The Art of Greek Comedy*, London.
- Liapes, V., 2002. *Μενάνδρου Γνώμαι Μονόστιχοι*, Athens.
- Lilja, S., 1972. *The Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity*, Helsinki.
- Lloyd-Jones, H., 1975. *Females of the Species: Semonides on Women*, London.
- Lobeck, C. A., 1837. *Paralipomena Grammaticae Graecae*, Leipzig.
- Lodge, R., ²2000. *Plato's Theory of Ethics: The Moral Criterion and The Highest Good*, London.
- Longrigg, J., 1993. *Greek Rational Medicine: Philosophy and Medicine from Alcmaeon to the Alexandrians*, London.
- ———. 1998. *Greek Medicine: From the Heroic to the Hellenistic Age*, London.
- Luppe, W., 1966. "Die Hypothese zu Kratinos Dionysalexandros", *Philologus* 110, 169-193.
- Maas, P., 1958. *Textual Criticism* (transl. by B. Flower), Oxford.
- ———. 1962. *Greek Metre* (transl. by H. Lloyd-Jones), Oxford.
- MacDowell, D. M., 1971. *Aristophanes Wasps*, Oxford.
- ———. 1978. *The Law in Classical Athens*, London.
- ———. 1993. "The case of the Rude Soldier (Lysias 9)", in *Symposion 1993: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Graz-Andritz, 12.-16. September 1993)*, hrsg. von Gerhard Thür, 153-164.
- MacLeod, M. D., 1991. *Lucian. A Selection*, Warminster.

- Madvig, J. N., 1871-84. *Adversaria critica ad scriptores graecos et latinos*, 3 vols, Copenhagen.
- Maidment, K. J., 1935. "The Later Comic Chorus", *CQ* 29, 1-24.
- Marrou, H. I., 1982. *A History of Education in Antiquity*, (trans. by G. Lamb) Wisconsin.
- Marx, F., 1928. *Plautus Rudens*, Leipzig.
- McKeown, J. C., 1979. "Augustan Elegy and Mime", *PCPS* 25 n.s., 71-84.
- ———. 1987-1998. *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena, and Commentary in four volumes*, Liverpool & Wolfboro-New Hampshire-U.S.A. & Leeds.
- Meineke, A., 1823. *Menandri et Philemonis Reliquiae*, Berlin.
- ———. 1867. *Analecta critica ad Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, Leipzig.
- Mejer, J., 1978. "Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic background", *Hermes Einzelschr.* H. 40.
- Metzger, H., 1951. *Les Représentations dans la Céramique Attique du IVe siècle*, Paris.
- Miller, E., 1868. *Mélanges de littérature grecque: contenant un grand nombre de textes inédits*, Paris.
- Miller, S. G., 1978. *The Prytaneion. Its Function and Architectural Form*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, & London.
- Millis, B. W., 2001. *A Commentary on the Fragments of Anaxandrides*, diss., Illinois.
- Montet, P., 1958. *Everyday Life in Egypt in the Days of Ramesses the Great* (transl. by A. R. Maxwell-Hyslop and M. S. Drower), London.
- Moorhouse, A. C., 1962. "Εἴ οἶδα and οὐδέῃ εἶς: Cases of Hiatus", *CQ* 12 n.s., 239-247.
- Mossé, C., 1973. *Athens in Decline 404-86 B.C.* (transl. by J. Stewart), London & Boston.
- Most, G., 1985. *The Measures of Praise*, Göttingen.
- Musurillo, H., 1967. *The Light and the Darkness*, Leiden.
- Mylonas, G. E., 1961. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton – New Jersey.
- Nauck, A., 1851. "Zu den fragmenten der griechischen komiker", *Philologus* 6, 412-426.

- Neil, R. A., 1901. *The Knights of Aristophanes*, Cambridge.
- Nesselrath, H.-G., 1985. *Lukians Parasitendialog: Untersuchungen und Kommentar*, Berlin & New York.
- ———. 1990. *Die attische Mittlere Komödie*, Berlin & New York.
- Newiger, H.-J., 1957. *Metapher und Allegorie: Studien zu Aristophanes*, München.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. & Hubbard, M., 1975 (reprint with corrections of the 1970 edition). *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 1*, Oxford.
- North, H., 1966. *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature*, Ithaca.
- Noussia, M., 2001. "Solon's Symposium (Frs. 32-4 and 36 Gentili – Prato² = 38-40 and 41 West)", *CQ* 51 n.s., 353-359.
- Oellacher, H., 1916. "Zur Chronologie der altattischen Komödie", *WS* 38, 81-157.
- Oguse, A., 1965. "Sur une édition récente du *Dyscolos* de Ménandre", *REA* 67, 126-141.
- Olson, S. D., 1998. *Aristophanes Peace*, Oxford.
- ———. 2002. *Aristophanes Acharnians*, Oxford.
- Olson, S. D. & Sens, A., 1999. *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Atlanta-Georgia.
- ———. 2000. *Archestratos of Gela: Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford & New York.
- Osborne, R., 2001. "The use of abuse: Semonides 7", *PCPhS* 47, 47-64.
- Otto, A., 1962. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Hildesheim (Reprografischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Leipzig 1890).
- Padel, R., "Women: Model for Possession by Greek Daemons", in A. Cameron & A. Kuhrt, *Images of Women in Antiquity*, London²1993, 3-19.
- Page, D. L., 1934. *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy: Studied with special reference to Euripides' Iphigeneia in Aulis*, Oxford.
- Palombi, A. & Santorelli, M.,²1960. *Gli animali commestibili dei mari d'Italia*, Milan.

- Papageorgiou, N., 2000. *A Study in the Aristophanic Agon. Clouds, Wasps and Plutus*, diss., London.
- Parke, H. W., 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*, London.
- Parker, L. P. E., 1997. *The Songs of Aristophanes*, Oxford.
- Parker, R., 1983. *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in early Greek Religion*, Oxford.
- ———. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford.
- Peppink, S. P., 1936. *Observationes in Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, Leiden.
- Peppler, C. W., 1902. *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes and the Comic Fragments*, Baltimore.
- Picard, C., 1961. “Sabazios, dieu thraco-phrygien: Expansion et aspects nouveaux de son culte”, *RA* 2, 129-176.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A., 1962 (2nd ed., rev. by T. B. L. Webster). *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, Oxford.
- ———. ²1968. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, Oxford.
- Platnauer, M. (ed.), ²1968. *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship*, Oxford.
- Poliakoff, M. B., 1987. *Combat Sports in the Ancient World*, New Haven.
- Pomeroy, S. B., 1975. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*, New York.
- Pritchett, W. K., 1971. *The Greek State at War*, part I: *Ancient Greek Military Practices*, Berkeley – Los Angeles & London.
- Prudhommeau, G., 1965. *La danse grecque antique*, 2 vols., Paris.
- Rankin, E. M., 1907. *The Role of the ΜΑΓΕΙΠΟΙ in the Life of the Ancient Greeks*, Chicago.
- Reckford, K. J., 1987. *Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy*, London.
- Reinhardt, U., 1974. *Mythologische Beispiele in der Neuen Komödie (Menander, Plautus, Terenz) I*, diss. Mainz.
- Renehan, R., 1969. *Greek Textual Criticism*, Cambridge-Massachusetts.
- ———. 1976. *Studies in Greek Texts: Critical Observations to Homer, Plato, Euripides, Aristophanes and other authors*, Göttingen.
- Reynolds, L. D. & Wilson, N. G., ³1991. *Scribes and Scholars*, Oxford.

- Ribbeck, O., 1882. *Alazon. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Ethologie und zur Kenntniss der griechisch-römischen Komödie nebst Übersetzung des Plautinischen Miles Gloriosus*, Leipzig.
- Richards, H., 1909. *Aristophanes and Others*, London.
- Richardson, N. J. (ed.), 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford.
- Riginos, A. S., 1976. *Platonica: The Anecdotes concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*, Leiden.
- Robert, C., 1885. "Athena Skiras und die Skirophorien", *Hermes* 20, 349-379.
- Roberts, J. T., 1982. *Accountability in Athenian Government*, Wisconsin.
- Roberts, W. R. & Head, B. V., 1895. *The Ancient Boeotians and the Coinage of Boeotia*, Cambridge.
- Robinson, D. M., 1941. *Excavations at Olynthus, Part X: Metal and Minor Miscellaneous Finds*, Baltimore.
- Rohde, E., ⁴1960. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Hildesheim.
- Roscher, W. H., 1884-1937. *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, (Bd. U-Z und Nachträge unter Redaktion von K. Ziegler), Leipzig.
- Ross, W. D., 1951. *Plato's Theory of Ideas*, Oxford.
- Rothwell, K., 1992. "The Continuity of the Chorus in Fourth-Century Attic Comedy", *GRBS* 33, 209-225.
- Rubinstein, L., 1993. *Adoption in IV. Century Athens*, Copenhagen.
- Rudd, N., 1966. *The Satires of Horace*, Cambridge.
- Sachtshal, B., 1908. *De comicorum Graecorum sermone metro accommodato*, diss., Breslau.
- Scaliger, J. C., 1561. *Poetices libri*, Lyon.
- Schiassi, G., 1951. "De temporum quaestionibus ad atticas iv saeculi meretrices et eiusdem comicas fabulas pertinentibus", *RFIC* 29 n.s., 217-245.
- Schmidt, I. O., 1887-88. "Ulixes Comicus", *Jb. Cl. Ph.*, suppl. 16, 375-403.
- Schmidt, M., 1845. *Diatriben in Dithyrambum*, Berlin.
- Schmidt, V., 1968. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas*, Berlin.
- Schnabel, H., 1910. *Kordax, archäologische Studien zur Geschichte eines antiken Tanzes und zum Ursprung der griechischen Komödie*, München.
- Schulze, W., 1933. *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen.

- Schwarze, J., 1971. *Die Beurteilung des Perikles durch die attische Komödie und ihre historische und historiographische Bedeutung (Zetemata)*, München.
- Seaford, R. A. S., 1984. *Cyclops of Euripides*, Oxford.
- ———. 2001 (reprinted edition with corrections). *Euripides Bacchae*, Warminster.
- Séchan, L., 1930. *La danse grecque antique*, Paris.
- Segal, C., 1990. "Dionysus and the Gold Tablets from Pelinna", *GRBS* 31, 411-419.
- Shear, T. L. Jr., 1973. "The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1971", *Hesperia* 42, 121-179.
- Shorey, P., "The Idea of the Good in Plato's *Republic*" in Tarán, L., 1980, *Selected Papers*, 2 vols, New York, 2:28-79.
- Sidwell, K., 2000. "From Old to Middle to New? Aristotle's *Poetics* and the History of Athenian Comedy", in D. Harvey & J. Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, London, 247-258.
- Sifakis, G. M., 1967. *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama*, London.
- Silk, M., 2000. *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, Oxford.
- Smyth, H. W., 1956. *Greek Grammar* (revised by G. M. Messing), Cambridge-Massachusetts.
- Sommerstein, A. H., 1980. "The Naming of Women in Greek and Roman Comedy", *Quaderni di Storia* 11, 393-418.
- ———. 1980-2002. *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, Warminster.
- ———. 1996. "How to avoid being a *komodoumenos*", *CQ* 46 (ii) n.s., 327-356.
- Starkie, W. J. M., 1909. *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*, London.
- de Ste Croix, G. E. M., 1964. "Theorika", *CR* 14, 190-192.
- Stevens, P. T., 1976. "Colloquial Expressions in Euripides", *Hermes* (Einzelschriften) 38.
- Strauss, B. S., 1986. *Athens after the Peloponnesian War*, London & Sydney.
- ———. 1993. *Fathers and Sons in Athens: Ideology and Society in the Era of the Peloponnesian War*, London.
- Strömberg, R., 1943. *Studien zur Etymologie und Bildung der griechischen Fischnamen*, Göteborg.

- Sturtevant, E. H., ²1940. *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, Philadelphia.
- Sutton, D. F., 1980. *Self and Society in Aristophanes*, Washington.
- ———. 1980. *The Greek Satyr Play*, Meisenheim am Glan.
- Taillardat, J., 1965. *Les Images d'Aristophane: Études de Langue et de Style*, Paris.
- Taplin, O., 1993. *Comic Angels*, Oxford.
- Tatti, A., 1986. "Le *Dionysalexandros* de Cratinos", *Métis* 1, 325-332.
- Thesleff, H., 1961. *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo.
- Thomas, R., 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.
- Thompson, D' Arcy W., ²1936. *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, London.
- ———. 1947. *A Glossary of Greek Fishes*, London.
- Thompson, H. A. & Wycherley, R. E., 1972. *The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape, and Uses of an Ancient City Centre*, vol. XIV, Princeton.
- Threatte, L., 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, 2 vols, Berlin & New York.
- Tittmann, J. A. H., 1812. *D. Ruhnkenii, L. C. Valckenaerii et aliorum ad J. A. Ernesti Epistolae. Accedunt D. Ruhnkenii observationes in Callimachum, L. C. Valckenaerii adnotationes in Thomam Magistrum, et J. A. Ernesti Acroasis inedita*, Leipzig.
- Trenkner, S., 1958. *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*, Cambridge.
- Tsantsanoglou, K., 1984. *New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius*, Athens.
- Tucker, T. G., 1908. "Emendations in Athenaeus", *CQ* 2, 184-209.
- Ussher, R. G., 1973. *Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae*, Oxford.
- Valckenaer, L. C., 1767. *Diatribes in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias*, Leiden.
- Wackernagel, J., ²1926-28. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, 2 vols, Basel.
- Wærn, I., 1951. *Γῆς ὄστρακα. The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry*, Uppsala.
- Wallace, R. W., 1991. "Damone di Oa ed i suoi successori: un' analisi delle fonti", in R. W. Wallace & B. MacLachlan, *Harmonia Mundi: Musica e Filosofia nell' antichità*, Rome, 30-53.

- Wankel, H. 1976. *Demosthenes, Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz*, Heidelberg.
- Webster, T. B. L., 1952. "Chronological Notes on Middle Comedy", *CQ* 2 n.s., 13-26.
- ———. ²1960. *Studies in Menander*, Manchester.
- ———. ²1970. *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, Manchester.
- ———. 1974. *An Introduction to Menander*, Manchester.
- Webster, T. B. L. & Green, J. R., ³1978. "Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy", *BICS*, suppl. 39, London.
- Wehrli, F., 1936. *Motivstudien zur griechischen Komödie*, Zürich.
- Weiher, A., 1914. *Philosophen und Philosophenspott in der attischen Komödie*, diss. München.
- Welcker, F. G., 1824. *Die Aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus und die Kabirenweihe zu Lemnos*, Darmstadt.
- West, M. L., 1966. *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford.
- ———. 1973. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart.
- ———. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin & New York.
- ———. 1977. "Tragica I", *BICS* 24, 89-103.
- ———. 1982. *Greek Metre*, Oxford.
- ———. 1992. *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff von U., ²1895 (neuer Abdruck 1909). *Euripides Herakles*, Berlin.
- ———. 1931-2. *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 vols, Berlin.
- Wilkins, J., 2000. *The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy*, Oxford.
- Wilkins, J., & Hill, S., 1994. *Archestratus: The Life of Luxury / translated with Introduction and Commentary*, Totnes.
- Willetts, R. F. 1959. "The servile interregnum at Argos", *Hermes* 87, 495-506.
- Willi, A., 2002. *The Language of Greek Comedy*, Oxford.
- ———. 2003. *The Languages of Aristophanes*, Oxford.
- Willink, C. W., 1971. "The Prologue of *Iphigenia at Aulis*", *CQ* 21 n.s., 343-364.

- Wilson, P., 1999. "The *aulos* in Athens" in S. Goldhill & R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge, 58-95.
- ———. 2000. *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: the Chorus, the City and the Stage*, Cambridge.
- Xanthakis-Karamanos, G., 1980. *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy*, Athens.
- Zagagi, N., 1980. *Tradition and Originality in Plautus: Studies of the Amatory Motifs in Plautine Comedy*, Göttingen.
- Zgusta, L., 1964. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, Prague.
- Zimmermann, B., 1992. *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung*, Göttingen.
- Zuntz, G., 1971. *Persephone. Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia*, Oxford.