

# Commenting Fragments: The Case of Greek Comedy

## Workshop-Sessions: Tuesday, 3 July - Friday, 6 July

- Tuesday, 3 July: Benjamin Millis, Anaxandrides fr. 4, 5, 9 and 10
- Wednesday, 4 July: Athina Papachrysostomou, Sopater fr. 18 and 19
- Thursday, 5 July: Andrea Codispoti, Pherekrates fr. 5
- Friday, 6 July: Kostas Apostolakis, Timokles fr. 12 and 14

**Benjamin Millis (Oxford),  
Anaxandrides fr. 4, 5, 9 and 10**

## Ἀγχίσης (*Anchises*, 'Anchises')

**Date:** 349(?)

Eubulus is the only other poet to have written a play with this title. Plays named for heroes of mythology/early epic are common in the 4th century generally but seem to have been particularly favoured by Anaxandrides (e.g. *Achilleus*, *Herakles*, *Theseus*, *Lycourgos*, etc.).

Anchises is mentioned already in the *Iliad* (e.g. 2.819–20) but is seldom referred to outside his role as the father of Aeneas. Related is his depiction as the lover of Aphrodite, in which the disparity in status between the goddess and the mortal can be heightened by portraying him as a rustic: e.g. H. *Il.* 5.313 ἦ (Aphrodite) μιν (Aeneas) ὕπ' Ἀγχίση τέκε βουκολέοντι; *hVen.* 54–5; cf. Paris as rustic at Luc. *Iud. Deor.* 13–4. At *Il.* 5.268–9 there is reference to Anchises 'stealing' the divine horses of Laomedon by secretly mating mares with them; this may point to the existence of stories in which Anchises played the role of a trickster (cf., for example, Odysseus, Sisyphus, and others).

The obvious possibility for the plot is that it concerned some aspect of Anchises' affair with Aphrodite. Discussing Eubulus' play of the same name, Hunter presumes as much, comparing Plautus, *Truculentus* for 'meeting of an unsophisticated peasant and a beautiful lady' and suggesting that 'any comic version of the meeting of Anchises and Aphrodite probably made the goddess behave like a hetaira'. The surviving fragments from this play offer little guidance; the only substantial fragment (fr. 4) discusses the role of Fortune in changing circumstances, a generic observation applicable to a variety of situations. It is very unlikely that the play had any connection with the Athenian eponymous archon of

488/7 (PA 182), the only known example of an Anchises other than the father of Aeneas and one of a tiny number of examples in which a human bore the name of a god.

For the possibility that the play placed fourth at the City Dionysia in the archonship of Apollodorus (349), see on *Agroikoi*; test. 5.8. Some slight support for this date might be its apparent coincidence with the renewed working of the silver mines at Laurium; see on line 5.

4 (4 K.)

Ath. 6.263b καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης δὲ ἐν Ἀγχίση φησὶν (A : φησὶν Ἀναξανδρίδης post verba poetae CE).

οὐκ ἔστι δούλων, ὧγάθ', οὐδαμοῦ πόλις,

Τύχη δὲ πάντα μεταφέρει τὰ σώματα.

πολλοὶ δὲ νῦν μὲν εἰσιν οὐκ ἐλεύθεροι,

εἰς αὖριον δὲ Σουνιεῖς, εἴτ' εἰς τρίτην

5 ἀγορᾷ κέχρηνται· τὸν γὰρ οἶακα στρέφει

δαίμων ἐκάστω.

habent ACE

2 πάντα ACE : πάντη Bothe 4 εἰς (1) CE : εἰς τ' A

Also Anaxandrides in *Anchises* says:

There is no city of slaves anywhere, friend;



instead, Fortune transforms all bodies.

Many are not free now,

but tomorrow are Sounians, then on the next day

5        are for sale in the agora; for a god turns the tiller  
for each man.

**Metre:** iambic trimeter

### **Bibliography:**

**Citation context:** This fragment is quoted in Athenaeus as part of a belated answer to the earlier question (6.228d) of whether people in the past had owned as many slaves as people did in Athenaeus' day. The quotation from Anaxandrides is adduced as the second item, following Pherecrates fr. 10 and preceding Posidonius *FGrHist* 87 F 8 (= fr. 60 Edelstein-Kidd), in a discussion providing a general background of slavery, its nomenclature, and its origins.

**Interpretation:** The fragment as a whole has a generalizing, expository tenor that may make it appropriate for a prologue or, perhaps less plausibly, an epilogue. The content is a commonplace assertion of the unpredictability of life and the overarching control of Fate over it (cf. on lines 2, 5–6). Although one can imagine applicable events in Anchises' life (e.g., a 'rustic' suddenly having an affair with a goddess, the unexpected fall of Troy and Anchises' subsequent death in poverty and exile), the thought seems more appropriate for a comedy hinging on mistaken identity than for a mythological travesty. This fragment may, therefore, like others in plays with mythological titles, indicate that such plays are not necessarily to be understood as straightforward mythological parodies; see introduction.

**1 δούλων ... πόλις:** The phrase appears in two proverbs: *CPG* App. Prov. 2.84 ἐστὶ

καὶ δούλων πόλις (cf. Crat. fr. 223.2; Eup. fr. 212; CPG App. Prov. 3.91 μὴ ἔνι δούλων πόλις) and CPG Plut. 1.22 οὐκ ἔστι δούλων πόλις (cf. com adesp. (?) ap. CPG ap. prov. 3.91 οὐκ ἔστι δούλων οὐδ' ἐλευθέρων πόλις [O. Crusius, *Philologus* 46 (1888) 611 attributed the line, probably incorrectly, to Anaxandrides; later, at CPG sup. 5.81, he left it anonymous]). The first proverb is said ἐπὶ τῶν πονηρῶς πολιτευομένων, the latter διὰ τὸ σπάνιον; for discussion of these proverbs, see Crusius, CPG sup. 5.79–82 (cf. Newman on Arist. *Pol.* 1280a32–4).

Δούλων πόλις or Δουλόπολις was often considered a real city and was variously located in Libya (e.g. Hecat. *FGrH* 1 F 345; Ephor. *FGrH* 70 F 50), Crete (e.g. Sosicr. *FGrH* 461 F 2), Egypt (Olympianus ap. St. Byz. p. 237.15–6 [A. von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* I (Leipzig 1889) 46 equates this city with the one in Libya]) or Caria (Plin. *Nat.* 5.104 [where it is given as another name for Acanthus]); cf. G. Cousin, *De urbibus quarum nominibus vocabulum ΠΟΛΙΣ finem faciebat* (Nancy 1904) pp. 79–80. Newman on Arist. *Pol.* 1280a32–4 reaches the obvious, and surely correct, conclusion that these are all merely attempts to place a proverbial site; cf. O. Crusius, *Untersuchungen zu den Mimiamben des Herondas* (Leipzig 1892) 72–3 (in the context of the place where οἱ μῦς ὁμοίως τὸν σίδηρον τρώγουσιν [Herod. 3.76; cf. Sen. *Apoc.* 7.1 with Eden ad loc.]).

Arist. *Pol.* 1280a32–4 καὶ γὰρ ἂν δούλων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζώων ἦν πόλις, often cited in connection with the ‘city of slaves’, is of doubtful relevance. Aristotle is here using ‘slave’ not in its ordinary meaning but in his specialized sense, i.e. φύσει δοῦλος (cf. 1254b14–23). Similarly irrelevant is 1295b21–2 γίνεται οὖν δούλων καὶ δεσποτῶν πόλις, where the philosopher is describing in quasi-metaphorical terms the result of a state composed of the extremely rich and the extremely poor. ὦγαθ(έ): In comedy at least, ὦ is always present with ἀγαθέ, a seemingly neutral

form of address, neither especially friendly nor unfriendly (cf. Dickey, *Address* pp. 119, 120), although Dickey (139) claims that in Menander, as also often in Plato, the speaker is in a position of dominance. This form of address, very common in Plato and used occasionally by other prose authors, occurs in poetry only in comedy and is therefore probably colloquial (cf. T. Wendel, *Die Gesprächsanrede im griechischen Epos und Drama der Blütezeit. Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 6 [Stuttgart 1929] 106).

**2 Τύχη:** In general, cf. G. Herzog-Hauser, *RE* ser. 2 7 (1943) 1643–89 (1657–9 for τύχη in comedy); Nilsson, *GGR*<sup>3</sup> 200–10; Wilamowitz, *Glaube* 298–309; E. G. Berry, *The History and Development of the Concept of ΘΕΙΑ ΜΟΙΡΑ and ΘΕΙΑ ΤΥΧΗ Down to and Including Plato* (diss. Chicago 1940); H. Strohm, *Tyche* (Stuttgart 1944); more recently, G. Vogt-Spira, *Dramaturgie des Zufalls. Tyche und Handeln in der Komödie Menanders. Zetemata* 88 (Munich 1992) esp. 58; for the fourth century, J. Mikalson, *Athenian Popular Religion* (Chapel Hill 1983) pp. 58–62. Τύχη does not appear in Homer and is mentioned in Hesiod only as a daughter of Tethys and Ocean (Hes. *Th.* 360; cf. *hCer.* 420); for her appearance in comedy, see Men. *Asp.* 97–148 (cf. Beroutsos 14–15). The earliest occurrence of the sentiment expressed here, a commonplace in Greek thought, is Archil. fr. 16 πάντα Τύχη καὶ Μοῖρα, Περικλέες, ἀνδρὶ δίδωσιν; cf. trag. adesp. *TrGF* fr. 700b.28–9 (= S. fr. 575 Pearson), and G. Zuntz, *Persephone* (Oxford 1971) 320, where for Hdt. 1.107.2 read 1.207.2.

**πάντα:** πάντῃ is used occasionally by Aristophanes, but then disappears from comedy, possibly to resurface in Menander (fr. 70, but note Körte [fr. 64] ad loc.; [Men.] *Mon.* 688), and Bothe's πάντῃ thus seems unlikely.

**μεταφέρει:** Cf. [Men.] *Mon.* 734 τάχισθ' ὁ καιρὸς μεταφέρει τὰ πράγματα.

**3–4 μέν ... δέ ... εἴτ(α):** cf. Eub. fr. 89; Philemo fr. 127 (μέν ... εἴτα).

**3 δέ:** Explanatory; cf. Denniston, *GP* pp. 169–70.

**οὐκ ἐλεύθεροι:** While ἐλεύθερος is sometimes opposed to δοῦλος (e.g. Eub. fr. 25.4; Alex. fr. 150.3; E. *Alcmaeon* [= com. adesp. fr. 210 K]), οὐκ ἐλεύθερος is rarely used as a periphrasis for δοῦλος (Arist. *Pol.* 1290b10; Pl. com. fr. 182.5; [Men.] *Mon.* 282 [cf. Alex. fr. 150.3]). Given the following contrast between those who possess wealth (and thus status) and those who do not, it is possible that here οὐκ ἐλεύθεροι, while primarily meaning δοῦλοι, may suggest as well the lowest rungs of society or those suffering severe economic hardship (cf. the use of terms for freedom and slavery in Solon, e.g. fr. 4.18; 9.4; 37.7; 36.15). Despite the reference to δούλων πόλις (1), therefore, the contrast in lines 3–5 is not solely between slave and free *per se*, but is couched in terms of differing levels of social status and prosperity.

**4 Σουνιεῖς:** Cf. E. *Cyc.* 293–4 ἡ τε Σουνίου / δίας Ἀθάνας σῶς ὑπάργυρος πέτρα, which suggests that the main point is an equation of Sounion with Laurion and its rich silver mines and, by extension, the personal wealth of its demesmen. Almost certainly correct, even if largely ignored, is the conclusion of Kordellas, *MDAI(A)* 19 (1894) 243 (discussing *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1180) that Anaxandrides was ‘μεταχειρίζων τὴν λέξιν Σουνιεῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ βαθύπλουτος’; cf. B. Haussoullier, *La vie municipale en Attique* (Paris 1883) p. 197 who, on the basis of this fragment, suggested that ‘la richesse des habitants de Sunium était proverbiale’.

Silver mining at Laurium was revived at this period, thus suggesting that the deme of Sounion was flourishing economically and so could have been readily associated with wealth. Evidence that at least some of the wealth extracted from the mines stayed in the area is provided by *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1180, which indicates that a building program of some sort was in progress in the deme in the mid-4th century. Kordellas had used this inscription as evidence for placing the deme centre at Laurium (a

conclusion reiterated by Stanton, *ABSA* 91 [1996] 342–353); if true, this might ease the use of the demotic *Sounieis* to refer to the wealth derived from the mines.

Unfortunately, the stone was not found *in situ*; cf. Goette, *MDAI(A)* 110 (1995) 171–174, who places the deme centre on the Sounion promontory. The standard older discussions of the silver mines at Laurium are E. Ardaillon, *Les mines du Laurion dans l'antiquité* (Paris 1897); Hopper, *ABSA* 48 (1953) 200–54; 63 (1969) 293–326; for more recent work, see C. Conophagos, *Le Laurium antique et la technique grecque de la production de l'argent* (Athens 1980); Photos-Jones and Jones, *ABSA* 89 (1994) 307–358. Much of relevance and further bibliography (particularly in the accompanying bibliography of the honorand) can be found in N. Sekunda, ed., *Ergasteria: works presented to John Ellis Jones on his 80th birthday* (Gdansk 2010).

The interpretation of this line has proven strangely problematic and a fundamental misconception has remained prevalent. Although providing no supporting evidence, Casaubon claimed that the men of Sounion are here mentioned ‘*ceu nobilissimos inter Athenienses cives*’, to which suggestion Schweighäuser offered a lengthy but ultimately unconvincing rebuttal. Bothe, following Casaubon, adduced H. *Od.* 3.278 (ἀλλ’ ὅτε Σούνιον ἱρὸν ἀφικόμεθ’, ἄκρον Ἀθηνέων) and Ar. *Nu.* 401, neither of which is helpful, while Blaydes, *Adversaria* 2.121 simply did away with the problem through his irresponsible emendation to δεσπότηι, κᾶτ’. Far more damaging has been Meineke’s conjectural remark (in part anticipated by Casaubon in an alternative, but rejected, explanation of these lines) that ‘*haud inepte coniicias Sunienses in admittendis civibus admodum faciles fuisse*’. This interpretation presumably relies on an overly literal reading of the fragment as describing the fortunes of a single man who was first a slave, presumably foreign, but then became an Athenian citizen. Regardless, it has been uncritically accepted by subsequent

scholars (*pace* Edmonds, *Luc. Nec.* 16 is irrelevant): e.g. Frazer on Pausanias 1.1 ('[Sounion] had the reputation of admitting run-away slaves to the rights of burgesses without inquiring too nicely into their antecedents'); E. Cohen in G. Thür and J. Vélissaropoulos-Karakostas, edd., *Symposion 1995* (Cologne 1997) 84 n.176 ('Some demes were infamous for repetitive liberality in their acceptance of new *politai*, even of former slaves. Hence (for example) the saying, "today a slave, tomorrow a demesman of Sounion!" (Anaxandr. fr. 4.3–4)'); similarly, D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica 508/7 B.C.–ca. 250 B.C.* (Princeton 1986) pp. 257, 292 takes Haussoullier (see above) to task for understanding the line as a reference to the wealth of the Sounians. It is unfortunate that unthinking repetition of a mistaken interpretation has so infected discussions of Athenian citizenship and studies of Athenian legal and constitutional history.

**εἰς τρίτην:** Cf. Ar. *Lys.* 612; contrast X. *Cyr.* 6.3.11 ἐχθὲς δὲ καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν.

**5 ἀγορᾷ κέχρηνται:** In reference to slaves, the phrase must mean 'be for sale' in light of Men. *Sik.* 7 ἐχρῶντ' ἀγορᾷ (Gomme-Sandbach ad loc. correctly interpret that line but misunderstand this one); contrast X. *An.* 7.6.24 ἀγορᾷ ἐχρήσθε ('used the market,' i.e. 'bought [sc. goods]'). Like the previous line, this one has also been subject to persistent misinterpretation. The correct interpretation was originally proposed by Dalechamp ('stant inter vaenales in foro,'), followed until recently only by Blaydes, *Adversaria* 2.121 ('venerint'), but now also by Kassel-Austin and Olson in his edition of Athenaeus. Much more pervasive has been the nonsensical understanding 'rem publicam administrant' suggested by Schweighäuser and followed by Bothe, Meineke, Kock, and Edmonds (if I understand his translation rightly). H.-Chr. Günther, reported by G. Vogt-Spira (see on line 2 above) 58 n. 153, translates 'um auf dem Markt Sklaven zu kaufen,' while Webster, *SLGC* 48 is

noncommittal ('they use the agora'). Occasionally cited in reference to this fragment, although in fact irrelevant, is a Latin proverb, *scisti uti foro* (Ter. *Ph.* 79; cf. Dziatzko-Hauler *ad loc.*), which, according to Donatus *ad loc.*, means *scisti quid te facere oportuerit*; cf. A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig 1890) 145–6 (with R. Häussler, ed., *Nachträge zu Otto* [Hildesheim 1968] 165; add also Σ Juv. 7.221).

5–6 A common image, e.g. A. *Th.* 2–3 ἐν πρύμνῃ πόλεως / οἴακα νωμῶν; Antipho 1.13 δίκη δὲ κυβερνήσειεν; for the literal expression, cf. E. *Hel.* 1591 σὺ δὲ στρέφ' οἴακ(α). The helmsman (κυβερνήτης) was of the utmost importance for the governance of a ship; cf. J. Kromayer and G. Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer. HAW 4.3.2* (Munich 1928) 188; J. S. Morrison and J. F. Coates, *The Athenian Trireme* (Cambridge 1986) 112. For the steering oars. see Morrison and Coates 174–176. K-A compare Philemo fr. 152 κυκλοῖ γὰρ ὁ χρόνος τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὸν βίον / ἡμῶν ἐκάστω; for this fr. and the so-called wheel of fortune in general, see R. Kassel, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 15–21.

5 (5 K.)

Poll. 9.59 καὶ εἰ μὲν χρυσοῦς εἴποις, προσυπακούεται ὁ στατήρ, εἰ δὲ στατήρ, οὐ πάντως ὁ χρυσοῦς. Ἀναξανδρίδης δ' ἐν Ἀγχίση καὶ ἡμιχρύσους λέγει.

habent F, ABCL

Ἀλλεξανδρίδης F ἐν Ἀγχίση om. AB

6.161 ἡμιχρύσους δ' Ἀναξανδρίδης.

9.59 And if one says ‘golden’, ‘stater’ is understood; but [if one says] ‘stater’, ‘golden’ is not always [understood]. Anaxandrides in *Anchises* mentions ‘half-gold’ (coins) as well.

6.161 Anaxandrides (uses the word) ‘half-gold’.

**Metre:** unknown

**Citation context:** The word is cited twice by Pollux. The first occasion (6.161) is in the midst of a list of compound words that begin ἥμι- and so offers little help for the interpretation of this fragment. Pollux’s examples are drawn mostly from comedy but also include a number of examples from tragedy as well as one from oratory (Dinarchus). The second occurrence (9.59) is as part of a digression about staters within a larger discussion of coins more generally. After relating the names of different staters, all of which are purportedly (solid) gold, this fragment is adduced as evidence that not all staters are so and thus that the word stater used without qualification cannot be taken always to imply a gold one. Theopompus fr. 22 follows.

**ἥμιχρύσους:** The adjective appears nowhere else, but cf. (τὸ) ἥμιχρυσον at *Agora* XVI 296.36, 48, 49 in a list of dedications from the Athenian agora (161/0 B.C.). Gold staters are mentioned occasionally in comedy (e.g. Ar. *Pl.* 816; Eup. fr. 123), although not as Athenian coins; so Dover on Ar. *Nu.* 1041, ‘στατήρ is not used of any Attic coin in documentary inscriptions, but it is used of foreign coins.’ It is possible that the word is used here to describe a debased coinage, conceivably as a metaphor, although reference to the use of an alloy is equally possible.

Ἀμπρακιῶτις (*Amprakiōtis*, ‘Ambracian Woman’)



**Date:** 340's(?)

This play is the only known example of this title, although titles of this sort are common; Webster, *SLGC* p. 77 compares *Samia* (Anaxandrides; Menander), *Olynthia* (Alexis), *Boiotis* (Theophilus) and *Milesia* (Alexis). Plays with ethnics as titles seem to have formed only a small portion of Anaxandrides' output; in addition to this play and his *Samia*, he wrote a *Locrides* and a *Thettaloi*.

Ambracia was a Corinthian colony founded ca. 625 in southern Epirus, just north of the modern Gulf of Arta; in the fourth century, it seems not to have been involved to any significant degree in the politics of the Greek world as a whole, although fear of Philip II's expansionist tendencies forced it to ally itself with Athens in the late 340's before becoming a Macedonian dependency following Chaeroneia. In general, cf. Hirschfeld, *RE* 1 (1894) 1805–7; N.G.L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford 1967) *passim*. For the spelling, cf. St. Byz. p. 85.4 εἴρηται καὶ διὰ τοῦ π ἀντὶ τοῦ β, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ Ἀμπρακιώτης κτλ.

The title is known only from the fragmentary list of Anaxandrides' plays, *IGUR* 218.3 (test. 5); the play seems to have been his last to receive second place at the Lenaia, possibly in the 350's, more probably in the 340's.

Γερωντομανία (*Gerontomania* 'Old Men's Madness')

**Date:** unknown

**Bibliography:** Breitenbach (1908) 122; Schiassi, *RFIC* 79 (1951) 220; Webster (1970)

Presumably the title refers to the madness or infatuation of old men ('nempe senum insania nil aliud est nisi pulchrarum meretricum amor,' Breitenbach (1908) 122), rather than a lust for old men (i.e. similar to a subjective rather than objective genitive), as parallel forms would suggest (e.g. Amphis, Γυναικομανία [fr. 9–11]; Ar. *Th.* 576 γυναικομανῶ; Chrysipp. *Eth.* fr. 667; Athen. 11.464d–e).<sup>1</sup>

Breitenbach's interpretation of the title as referring to the lust of old men for prostitutes depends upon fr. 9 being indicative of the plot as a whole. Aside from the potential pitfalls in making generalizations about the plot from a single fragment, note the use of the past tense in fr. 9: the speakers are reminiscing about courtesans of the past. Nevertheless, the plot probably involved old men living to excess in general (as, e.g., Philocleon at the end of Ar. *V.*); fr. 10 may be part of a defense of their seemingly luxurious lifestyle.

The date is uncertain. Aristotle's report (*Rh.* 1413b21; see below, fr. 10, 13) that Philemon (Stephanis 2485) used a certain performance style when acting in the play probably implies that Aristotle saw it in person (*pace* Hunter, *Eubulus* p. 140 n. 1). Philemon took the actor's prize twice at the Lenaia, first in the late 370's, and the reference to him at Aeschin. 1.115 shows that he was still alive in the late 340's, but neither fact helps date this play. The dates that have been proposed, 367–365 (Schiassi), 370–360 (Breitenbach), and 360–350 (Webster) are all plausible, but none is more than guesswork or does more than place the play in the central part of Anaxandrides' career. Since the speakers of fr. 9 are presumably old men reminiscing about their youth, or at least their younger days, by recalling courtesans

<sup>1</sup> In his Oxford Text of Arist. *Rh.* (see below on fr. 10), Ross gives the title as Γεροντομαχία but has no note in the apparatus. Since this does not seem to be a variant reading (it is recorded by no editor), one can only assume that it is a typographical error that has on occasion been followed uncritically, for example by H. Lawson-Tancred in his Penguin translation (London 1991).

active in the earlier part of the 4th century, the play is perhaps best placed at late as possible.

9 (9 K.)

Ath. 13.570d–e μνημονεύει δὲ τῆς Λαΐδος καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Γερωντομανίᾳ καὶ ἄλλας ἐταίρας διὰ τούτων·

τὴν ἐκ Κορίνθου Λαΐδ' οἶσθα; (B.) πῶς γὰρ οὔ;

τὴν ἡμετέρειον. (A.) ἦν ἐκείνη τις φίλη

Ἄντεια. (B.) καὶ τοῦθ' ἡμέτερον ἦν παίγνιον.

(A.) νῆ τὸν Δί' ἦνθαι τότε Λαγίσκη † ἦν δὲ τότε

5 καὶ Θεολύτη μάλ' εὐπρόσωπος καὶ καλή,

ὑπέφαιν' ἐσομένη δ' Ὠκιμον λαμπρὰ πάνυ

Epit. (CE) συνήκμαζον δὲ Λαΐδι Λαγίσκη, Νεολύτη (Νεαλύτη E) καὶ Ὠκιμον, φησὶν Ἀναξανδρίδης.

habet A

2 ἡμετέρειον Abresch : ημεριον A : Ὑκκαραίαν Schweighäuser : ἱμερόεσσαν Bothe :

ἡμετέρειον <γ'> Kaibel ἦν δ' Olson φίλη Musurus : φιαλη A 4 Λαγίσκιον· τότε Jacobs :

-σκιον, τότ' ἦν Meineke : -σκη γ', ἦν τότε Bothe : -σκ', ἦνθαι τότε Kaibel : fort. -σκη (vel -σκα ?)

καὶ Φίλα (καὶ e – Olson) 5 Νεολύτη C : Νεαλύτη E 6 λαμπρά Dobree : -όν A

Anaxandrides in *Old Men's Madness* also mentions Lais and other hetairai in the following verses:

Do you know the one from Corinth, (namely) Lais? (B.) How could I not?

I knew her as my own. (A.) She had a friend,  
Anteia. (B). She too was my plaything.

(A.) Yes, by Zeus, Lagiske was flowering then [corrupt]

5 and Theolyte was quite comely and fair,  
while Okimon gave indication that she would be utterly lovely

Epit. (CE) Lagiske, Neolyte and Okimon were in their prime at the same time as Lais, according to Anaxandrides.

**Metre:** iambic trimeter

**Bibliography:** Breitenbach (1908) 121–122; Webster (1970) 63

**Citation context:** This passage occurs in the course of a very long discussion (Ath. 13.567a–594b) of prostitutes and the like. It follows Epicrates fr. 2 (from his *Antilais*) and is adduced as additional evidence for Lais. Similarly, this quotation may have suggested the one that follows, Philetaerus fr. 6, which advises an old man to abstain from sex for the sake of his health (thus Athenaeus' text; for the correct text see K.-A.).

**Interpretation:** The speakers, presumably the old men of the title, are discussing various *hetairai* whom they knew (or are claiming to have known) when they were younger. The dialogue is clearly cast as a reminiscence, but the precise bearing it has on the present state of the speakers is uncertain: for example, they may be

attempting to relive past glories or they may be lamenting the present in comparison with the past. A possible reading of the exchange is as an example of one-upmanship, in which each speaker tries to outdo the other in terms of the number, fame or beauty of his previous sexual conquests.

In general, see H. Hauschild, *Die Gestalt der Hetäre in der griechischen Komödie* (Leipzig 1933) esp. pp. 14–22; M. Henry, *Menander's Courtesans and the Greek Comic Tradition* (Frankfurt am Main 1985) esp. pp. 33–40, 47–8; for lists of *hetairai*, cf. Ar. *Eq.* 765; Anaxil. fr. 22; Philetaer. fr. 9; Timocl. fr. 27; Spyropoulos, *Accumulation* p. 82 n. 10.

<sup>1</sup> E. Fraenkel, *De media et nova comoedia quaestiones selectae* (diss. Göttingen 1912) pp. 55–8, esp. 56) finds this question and answer formula common in Euripides (he compares, *inter alia*, Ba. 462–3 [Δι.] τὸν ἀνθεμώδη Τιμῶλον οἶσθα που κλύων / [Πε.] οἶδ', ὅς...) and suggests it was taken over from him by the comic poets (he traces the development in comedy particularly through Terence); cf. Ar. *Th.* 28–35. Fraenkel later returned to the theme (*MH* 25 [1968] 238): 'die, wie es scheint von Euripides, um eine stichomythie in Gang zu bringen oder in Gang zu erhalten, ausgebildete Formel, A. οἶσθα...; B. οἶδα, ihren Weg in die mittlere und neue Komödie und von da auch in die Palliata gefunden hat.'

The text as printed reflects the traditional division of speakers; however, S. *El.* 1307 ἀλλ' οἶσθα μὲν τ' ἀνθένδε, πῶς γὰρ οὔ; provides a closer parallel for the wording than the examples given by Fraenkel and suggests an alternate possibility:

τὴν ἐκ Κορίνθου Λαΐδ' οἶσθα, πῶς γὰρ οὔ,  
τὴν ἡμετέρειον. (B.) ἦν ἐκείνη τις φίλη  
Ἄντεια. (A.) καὶ τοῦθ' ἡμέτερον ἦν παίγνιον.  
(B.) νῆ τὸν Δί' κτλ.

With this division the phrase πῶς γὰρ οὐ becomes an aside, and so the objection against the absence of strong punctuation between it and τὴν ἡμετέριον (see below on lines 1–2) is no longer relevant.

**ἐκ Κορίνθου:** Corinth was notorious for its prostitutes, including sacred prostitutes attached to the cult of Aphrodite, already in the time of Periander (Hermipp. hist. FHG 3.40, fr. 16). Ar. fr. 928 οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐς Κόρινθον ἔσθ' ὁ πλοῦς, explained by Hsch. o 1799 as διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐταιρῶν γοητείαν and by Phot. p. 360.18 (= S o 924 = Apost. XIII 60) as ἐπεὶ πολλὰ ἦσαν ἐταῖραι, apparently reflects a popular proverb (cf. K–A ad loc.; Panofka, AZ 5 (1847) 21\*–2\*; Renehan, *Studies*, pp. 105–6; Anderson in M. Del Chiaro, ed., *Corinthiaca* [Columbia, Mo. 1984] 44–9; Ar. *Pl.* 149–52 with Σ<sup>RVMErecc.</sup>). Note also Steph. Byz. p. 374.5 (= Ar. fr. 370) κορινθιάζομαι· τὸ ἐταρεῖν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ ἐταιρῶν, ἢ τὸ μαστροπεύειν; S ε 3266 and see J. B. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth* (Oxford 1984) pp. 398–400; Williams in Del Chiaro (above), 12–24.

**Λαΐδα(α):** There were at least two well-known *hetairai* by this name; see F. Geyer, *RE* 12 (1925) 513–16; Holzinger on Ar. *Pl.* 179; Breitenbach, *Titulorum* pp. 141–56. The one referred to here is the second, often known as the younger. This *Lais* is said (Σ<sup>RVEMMatr</sup> Ar. *Pl.* 179) to have been from Hykkara in Sicily (hence Schweighäuser's conjecture in line 2), but was enslaved when Nicias captured the city (Th. 6.62.3–4) and ended up in Corinth. She was also apparently the defendant in a suit (Lys. fr. 59 Thalheim Πρὸς Λαΐδα [Ath. 13.592e; Harpocr. λ 1 Keaney] or Κατὰ Λαΐδος [Ath. 13.586e]); the nature of the suit is unknown, but one might most obviously compare [D.] 59, where the *hetaira* Neaira is prosecuted for living as a married woman with an Athenian citizen. The single surviving fragment of the prosecution speech mentions Anteia and Lagiske as well and seems to imply that *Lais* was faulted (*inter*

*alia*) for not abandoning prostitution at an early age. She was mentioned as well by Ar. Byz. *de Meretricibus* (fr. 366) and her name was seemingly used archetypically of *hetairai* (e.g. Eriph. fr. 6 [cf. Schiassi, *RFIC* 79 (1951) 229]; cf. the plays entitled Ἀντιλαΐς by Cephisodorus and Epicrates).

**1–2** Punctuating πῶς γὰρ οὐ / τὴν ἡμετέρειον; is possible, but normal usage seems to weigh against it; cf. E. *Ba.* 612; *Rh.* 759; Antidot. fr. 3; Men. fr. 210; contrast E. *HF* 280 (but cf. Wilamowitz ad loc.).

**2 τὴν ἡμετέρειον:** Abresh's ἡμετέρειον, though widely accepted and printed here, is problematic, since the meaning of the word is not entirely clear. The word appears elsewhere only at Anacr. *PMG* 392 (quoted by *EM* p. 429.50 = Hdn. 2.517.17) οὐτε γὰρ ἡμετέρειον οὐτε καλόν, where it seems to be simply a possessive adjective (at Hdn. 1.137 no distinction is made between ἡμέτερος and ἡμετέριος); for a similar pair of adjectives which are equivalent in meaning, cf. καθαρός and καθάρειος.<sup>2</sup> Lobeck's assertion (*Paralipomena*, p. 322) that in Anaxandr. the word 'nostratem potius significat quam nostrum' cannot be supported despite the claims of grammarians (e.g. *EM* p. 429.50; Choerobosc. ap. An. *Ox.* 2.216.16) that it σημαίνει δὲ τὸν τοῦ ἡμετέρου. Further, claiming that Lais originates from the same locality as oneself is hardly an emphatic, or even expected, manner in which to assert sexual knowledge of a prostitute. One would expect an expression of beauty or desirability (thus Bothe's ἡμερόεσσαν) or, more likely, an assertion of having had some sort of sexual encounter with her (it is possible, however, to understand the latter as implicit in Lobeck's interpretation of the word). For this reason, understanding ἡμετέρειον as a possessive used as a euphemistic expression for having experienced someone sexually is probably the best solution; cf. the use of ἔχειν (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 787;

---

<sup>2</sup> For a brief discussion of such adjectives, cf. P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms in Grec ancien* (Paris 1933) p. 53.

Men. *Epir.* fr. 1.2; Ter. *And.* 85; Henderson, *MM*, p. 156; J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* [Baltimore 1982] pp. 187–8). If the punctuation of K-A is followed (making τὴν ἡμετέρειον an exclamation), then reading <γ> after ἡμετέρειον, a suggestion of Kaibel, is effective and may be right (cf. Denniston, *GP*, pp. 126–8).

**2–3 ἦν ἐκείνη τις φίλη / Ἄντεια:** The historical Anteia seems to have been a contemporary of Lais (Lys. fr. 59 Thalheim) and *hetairai* do fairly often seem to be thought of in groups. [D.] 59.18–19 reports that Anteia was owned by Nikarete, a freedwoman of Charisius of Elis who presumably acted as a madame, along with six other girls, including Neaira; Ath. 13.593f, on the other hand, states that the seven of them, along with Nikarete, were the slaves of Casius of Elis.<sup>3</sup> Whether the name ought to be spelled Ἄντεια or Ἄνθεια was disputed in antiquity (Harp. α 141 Keaney; Phot. α 1946; S α 2501); possibly the latter results from an attempt to have a name suggesting her beauty (cf. for example ἦνθει in line 4 below). She was apparently the subject of comedies by Eunicus, Philyllius, Antiphanes, and possibly Alexis (cf. Arnott ad loc. [pp. 817–18]); see further Kapparis on [D.] 59.19.

**τοῦτ(ο):** For the attraction of the gender of the subject to that of the predicate, cf. K-G 1.74; Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, §§ 127–8.

**παίγνιον:** Cf. Ar. *Ec.* 922; *HE* 4266 with Gow–Page ad loc; Henderson, *MM* p. 157 on παίζειν, where note that the translation ‘tricks’ for παίγνια is misleading and clearly does not work here.

**4 νῆ τὸν Δί(α):** A common trimeter line-initial formula (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 811; Eub. 105.1; Alex. fr. 100.3; Men. fr. 397; cf. Eup. fr. 286 νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ; Nicostrat. fr. 29.2 νῆ τὸν Ἀθηνᾶν; Sophil. fr. 7.3 νῆ τὸν Διόνυσον). It seems not to occur elsewhere in the line (doubtfully at Strato fr. 1.9), although both νῆ Δία and μὰ τὸν Δία do so

---

<sup>3</sup> Almost certainly, Casius is an error for Charisius; Carey on [D.] 59.18 attributes this and similar errors in Athenaeus to his ‘confused recollection’ of the speech.



regularly; for a study of where these various oaths occur within a line see Dover, *G&G*, pp. 48–53.

**ἦνθαι**: Commonly used of the flower of youth; e.g. Phryn. fr. 3.3 ἄνθος ἥβης; Timocl. fr. 32.2 ἀνθοῦσι τοῖς νέοισι; Pl. *R.* 475a τῶν ἀνθούτων ἐν ὥρᾳ; cf. [Men.] *Mon.* 92 ἀκμὴ τὸ σύνολον οὐδὲν ἄνθους διαφέρει; Ar. *Eq.* 530 with Blaydes ad loc.; Olson-Sens on Archestr. fr. 16.4 (*SH* 146); Borthwick, *JHS* 96 (1976) 1–7.

**Λαγίσκη**: Associated with Anteia in Lysias' speech against Lais (fr. 59 Thalheim [where spelled Λαγίσκα]) and reputedly the mistress of Isocrates (Strattis fr. 3.1 καὶ τὴν Λαγίσκαν τὴν Ἰσοκράτους παλλακὴν with Orth ad loc.; Lys. ap. Ath. 13.592b; Hermipp. fr. 65 Wehrli). She is presumably also a Corinthian; the Attic form of her name as given by the mss. may reflect the usage of the speaker or may be a scribal error. For prostitutes named after animals, see Headlam-Knox on Herod. 2.73.

† **ἦν δὲ τότε**: The received text is impossible both because of the hiatus before ἦν and, more importantly, the final syllable of an iambic trimeter can not be resolved (White, *Verse* § 67); the phrase is probably an intrusive marginal variant of ἦνθαι τότε which has ousted the true text and thus indicates hopeless corruption.

Nevertheless, most emendations that have been suggested are predicated upon the less likely notion that the echo (ἦνθαι τότε ~ ἦν δὲ τότε) is intentional. More plausibly, Olson suggests emending to καὶ followed by the name of another *hetaira*. If true, the obvious choice is Φίλα, one of the very few names that fits metrically; cf. Philetaer. fr. 9 which mentions her together with Lais, Theolyte, and other hetaerae; [D.] 59.19 with Kapparis ad loc. The ousting of καὶ Φίλα here may have been aided by the similar line ending τις φίλη two lines above.

**5 Θεολύτη**: Apparently another famous prostitute of the same period, known only from here and Philetaer. fr. 9.3, although she is occasionally, but probably wrongly,

identified with the old woman at Theopomp. Com. fr. 33.5 (so, for example, Pape-Benseler s.v.; Edmonds ad loc.). C's Νεολύτη and E's Νεαλύτη are scribal errors which manufacture otherwise unattested names.

**εὐπρόσωπος καὶ καλή:** K-A compare Ar. *Pl.* 976 εὐπρόσωπον καὶ καλόν. For the generalizing force of καί (specific followed by general), see K-G 2.247; cf. Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 7 (1954) 38.

**ὁ ὑπέφαιν(ε):** For the meaning of the verb here, cf. X. *An.* 3.2.1 ἡμέρα τε σχεδὸν ὑπέφαινε; D. 19.123 ὑπεφήνατ' ἐλπίδα; *P.Cair.Zen.* 59329.12–13 τὸν καρπὸν καλῶς ὑποφαίνοντα; generally a prosaic word, it occurs at H. *Od.* 17.409 (in a literal sense) and elsewhere in comedy only at Alex. fr. 263.10. Although the construction with a participle seems unremarkable, the only parallel appears to be Ael. *NA* 5.19; this fact, together with the postponed δέ, might give rise to some suspicion of the text, although it is not obviously corrupt nor is any improvement immediately forthcoming.

**ῥῶκιμον:** Apparently also from Corinth (Eub. fr. 53) and mentioned together with Lais at Hyp. fr. 13 Jensen. For prostitutes named after plants (ῥῶκιμον = 'basil'), see Headlam-Knox on Herod. 2.76; cf. B.L. Gildersleeve, *Selections from the Brief Mention* (Baltimore 1930) p. 79 on carm. pop. *PMG* 852.

**λαμπρό:** Often used of physical beauty, e.g. S. *Tr.* 379; Ar. *Pax* 859; Demetr. Com. Vet. fr. 1.4; Th. 6.54.2; cf. Schadewalt, *WS* 79 (1966) 77; note, however, [D.] 59.26 (of Neaira, 'at the peak of her career', Kapparis).

γενέσθαι Ῥαδάμανθυν καὶ Παλαμήδην, λέγων οὕτως·

καίτοι πολλοὶ γε πονοῦμεν.

τὸν ἀσύμβολον εὗρε γέλοια λέγειν Ῥαδάμανθους καὶ Παλαμήδους

Epit. (CE) εὐρετὰς δὲ γελοίων Ἀναξανδρίδης Ῥαδάμανθυν καὶ Παλαμήδην φησίν.

Arist. *Rh.* 1413b21 ἀνάγκη δὲ μεταβάλλειν τὸ αὐτὸ λέγοντας· ...οἷον καὶ Φιλήμων ὁ ὑποκριτὴς ἐποίει ἔν τε τῇ Ἀναξανδρίδου Γερωντομανίᾳ, ὅτε λέγει Ῥαδάμανθους καὶ Παλαμήδους, καὶ ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ τῶν Εὐσεβῶν τὸ ἐγὼ (fr. 13).

habet A

1 καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς (vel -οῖσι) γε Kaibel 2 τὸν A : τὸ δ' van Herwerden ηὔρε van Herwerden

Anaxandrides in *Old Men's Madness* says that Rhadamanthys and Palamedes were inventors of jests, speaking as follows:

And yet many of us work hard.

Rhadamanthys and Palamedes discovered (the idea of) parasites making jests

Epit. (CE) Anaxandrides says that Rhadamanthys and Palamedes were inventors of jests.

Arist. *Rh.* 1413b21 It is necessary when saying the same thing to vary it...As for example Philemon the actor used to do in Anaxandrides' *Old Men's Madness*, when he says 'Rhadamanthys and Palamedes' and in the prologue of *The Pious 'I'* (fr. 13).

**Metre:** catalectic anapaestic tetrameter

**Bibliography:**

**Citation context:** Athenaeus cites this fragment as part of a discussion of jokes, laughter, etc.; Semus *FGrHist* 396 F 10 (a certain Parmeniscus is cured of his inability to laugh) precedes and Xenophon *Symposium* 1.11 (about Philippos the *gelōtopoios* [Stephanis 2498]) follows. Far more important is the citation by Aristotle, who uses the actor Philemon's (Stephanis 2485) delivery of this fragment and of fragment 13 as examples of the sort of *variatio* that is desirable in public speaking. He not only provides a hint about the context (the phrase 'Rhadamanthys and Palamedes' was repeated with some sort of variation) but also offers one of the very few contemporary reports concerning (a part of) an ancient dramatic performance.

**Interpretation:** If Athenaeus' claim that Anaxandrides presents Rhadamanthys and Palamedes as the inventors of jests relies solely on this passage, it must be based upon a misunderstanding or at least a sloppy paraphrase of it, unless Athenaeus means to imply that Rhadamanthys and Palamedes were the first to discover the value of parasites for making jests. In this fragment, Rhadamanthys and Palamedes probably ought to be associated (as archetypal examples of old men?) with the speakers of line 1, and explain one way in which old men do work hard (i.e. by producing discoveries or inventions), although one might note the paradoxical equation of work with the actions of parasites.

Since Aristotle explicitly states that the lines are spoken by the actor Philemon (presumably the protagonist), the speaker, therefore, is probably one of the old men of the title. Given this assumption, it is easier to imagine them defending themselves (presumably on a charge that old men are a burden to society)

than acting as the mouthpiece of the poet, as suggested by Kaibel ('loquitur poeta de suo officio' [reported by K-A]). Nonetheless, support for Kaibel's view could be found in the use of *πονοῦμεν*; even if the language is difficult to parallel, but the sense is not (e.g. *Ar. Nu.* 523–4, 526). If Kaibel's interpretation were to be accepted, serious consideration must be given to his καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς. Although catalectic anapaestic tetrameters can be used in the parabasis, thus seemingly supporting Kaibel's view, their most common use, at least in the extant plays of Aristophanes, is in debates (778 of 1235 lines as tabulated by White, *Verse* § 305), which fits well with the more plausible reading of this fragment. See U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin 1921) p. 367 n.1 for the general absence of tetrameters in this period.

Aristotle's citation of the phrase 'Rhadamanthys and Palamedes' seems to imply that it was repeated at least several times in succession, since he claims that variation in delivery is necessary when repeating the same phrase. It remains difficult, however, to see how the phrase could have been used repeatedly (much more so than Aristotle's second example, ἐγώ [fr. 13]); cf. Meineke ad loc.; Burkert, *MH* 32 (1975) 69–70. Edmonds' suggestion that the names were simply reversed is possible but offers a less effective presentation in addition to failing to account for how ἐγώ might be repeated with variation. Nevertheless, the alternate interpretation of the Aristotelian passage found, for example, in G. Kennedy's translation (Oxford 1991), 'it is necessary to speak the same thought in different words', is doubtful; while this does work with the imaginary example Aristotle provides, the phrases 'Rhadamanthys and Palamedes' and 'I' can only with great difficulty be imagined as expressing the same thought as a previous phrase. Cope–Sandys, in their edition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, attempt to remove the difficulty by understanding

‘Rhadamanthys and Palamedes’ and ‘I’ not as specific phrases to which Aristotle is referring, but as well-known points in the play at which the repetition occurred; this is, however, to stretch both ingenuity and Aristotle to the breaking point. For these reasons, it seems clear that the phrase was repeated and that Philemon varied his delivery each time, although it remains difficult to understand exactly what the variation entailed (possibly polyptoton?). Possibly the repetition of ‘Rhadamanthys and Palamedes’ involved the attribution of several more inventions or discoveries to them (cf. A. fr. 182); cf. Ar. *Pax* 185–7 for the repetition of μαρώτατος as the answer to a series of questions (for which Epich. 123 is adduced as a parallel by Σ<sup>v</sup> ad loc.).

**1 καίτοι ... γε:** καίτοι is most often adversative, frequently offering an objection to the previous statement (Denniston, *GP* p. 556). The line of thought was thus most likely ‘We have a reputation for idleness. And yet many of us in fact do work.’

**πονοῦμεν:** Probably ‘work’ rather than ‘suffer’ (so Gulick); physical work can often be seen as a prerequisite for achieving success, particularly in love (cf. Arnott on Alex. fr. 236), and something of the sort may be at work here. If the speaker is equating himself on some level to a parasite, the claim may be to forestall an argument similar to Philisc. fr. 4 dub. οὐκ ἔστιν, ὧ μάταιε, σὺν ῥαθυμίᾳ / τὰ τῶν πονούντων μὴ πονήσαντας λαβεῖν.

**2 τὸν ἀσύμβολον:** Literally, one who has not made the expected contribution to a meal (συμβολή Hegesand. fr. 31 [*FHG* 4.419]); more commonly in plural, e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 1211; Eub. fr. 72; cf. LSJ s.v. IV.1.a; Arnott on Alex. fr. 15), and thence simply a synonym for parasite (Dromo fr. 1.2; Timocl. fr. 10.4; Diph. fr. 74.8; cf. Anaxandr. fr. 34.8; Arnott on Alex. fr. 259.2; Nesselrath, *Parasitendialog* p. 66). The figure of the parasite first appears in drama in Epicharmus (fr. 31–3) and is common throughout comedy and related literature, both Greek and Roman; in general, see Nesselrath,

MK pp. 309–17; C. Damon, *The Mask of the Parasite* (Ann Arbor 1997) esp. pp. 23–36; Arnott’s introduction to Alex. Παράσιτος; Fisher in Harvey and Wilkins, *Rivals* pp. 371–8.

The lack of a connective in this line has troubled some, hence van Herwerden’s τὸ δ’, although the lack of a parallel for the abstract weighs against his conjecture (for this use of the abstract, see K-G 1.10–11; Gildersleeve, *Syntax* § 41). More likely, the asyndeton is explanatory; cf. K-G 2.344.

**εὔρε:** ‘was the πρῶτος εὔρετής’. A compound subject with a singular verb is relatively common throughout Greek literature; see Cooper, *Syntax*, 63.4.2. Here the phenomenon is probably best explained by Cooper’s category C, i.e. that the two (Rhadamanthys and Palamedes) form a single concept, rather than that the verb simply agrees with the closest subject (his category A). Alternatively, the verb may go with Rhadamanthys alone, and Palamedes may be the subject of a verb in the lost next line.

**γέλοια λέγειν:** To make jests and otherwise provide entertainment or amusement was a standard means for parasites to justify their apparent freeloading (see Nesselrath, *Parasitendialog* pp. 26–7; Arnott on Alex. fr. 188; Damon [above], p. 29; Fisher [above] pp. 372–3; Olson-Sens on Matr. fr. 1.8; 5; adesp. parod. fr. 1 Brandt [fr. 3 Olson-Sens]); for the use of this phrase to describe a parasite’s activity, Alex. fr. 188; 229; X. *Smp.* 1.14; cf. Ar. *Ra.* 6. The accentuation of γέλοιος (proparoxytone or properispomenon) was disputed already in antiquity, with some claiming that γέλοιος = καταγέλαστος, while γελοῖος = γελωτοποιός (e.g. Ammon. *Diff.* 119; Aelius Dionysius γ 4; cf. above on Ἄγροικοι). Et. *Gud.* p. 303, however, makes the opposite claim, and others asserted that the difference was merely dialectal (e.g. Moer. γ 4; Σ Ar. *Ra.* 6 [adding that the meaning is the same for both

forms]); see Arnott on Alex. fr. 188.2; Chandler, *Accentuation* §384–5; Dyck on *Epim. Hom.* γ 22.

**Ῥαδάμανθους καὶ Παλαμῆδης**: Rhadamanthys, son of Zeus and Europa and brother of Minos and Sarpedon (H. *Il.* 14.322; Hes. fr. 141.13–4), was generally thought to be one of the judges in the underworld, along with his brother Minos and Aiaikos (Pl. *Ap.* 41a; *Grg.* 523e; cf. D. 18.127), although he appears in Homer merely as an inhabitant of Elysium (*Od.* 4.563–5); in general, see Roscher, *Lexikon* 4.77–86. While his fairness and justice are continually remarked upon, he is seldom, if ever, referred to as an inventor (contrast Palamedes below), and so his place here may rely upon the notion of equity implicit in the parasite performing some task in place of a contribution to the meal. Roscher, *Lexikon* 4.79 suggests a connection with the ὄρκος Ῥαδαμάνθυος (e.g. Cratin. fr. 249 with test. and K-A ad loc.; Σ Pl. *Ap.* 22a; cf. Ar. *Av.* 521 with Dunbar ad loc.), which means to swear by a dog, goose or other animal rather than by the gods, but any relationship between this method of swearing and Rhadamanthys' appearance here must remain tenuous; of uncertain relevance is Theopomp. Com. fr. 31.3–4 οἶον δ' οὐ κήλησε δέμας λεπτόν Ῥαδάμανθον / Λύσανδρον κώθωνι, πρὶν αὐτῷ δῶκε λεπαστήν.

Palamedes, on the other hand, is much more natural in this context. A student of Cheiron (X. *Cyn.* 1.2), he first appears in literature in the *Cypria* (fr. 30) and was the subject of tragedies by all three major tragedians (cf. Ar. *Th.* 769–84 for parody of Euripides' play), an epideictic speech of Gorgias, and possibly a comedy by Philemo. Known for his wisdom and inventiveness (cf. Eup. fr. 385.6 Παλαμηδικόν γε τοῦτο τοῦξευρημα καὶ σοφόν σου [concerning the use of chamber-pots in the midst of symposia]), he was killed by Odysseus, in some versions in collusion with Diomedes, out of jealousy (e.g. *Cypria* fr. 30; X. *Mem.* 4.2.33; Pl. *Ap.*



41b); in general, see Roscher, *Lexikon* 3.1264–73; A. Kleingünther, *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ*. *Philol. Suppl.* 26.1 [Leipzig 1933] pp. 78–84. Palamedes' primary reputation was as an inventor or discoverer (for a list of inventions attributed to him, see Roscher, *Lexikon*, 3.1268–71), although many of his inventions seem to consist of the realization of something's proper arrangement, e.g. of letters, months and years, troops, meals (cf. Kleingünther, above, p. 28); his discovery here perhaps fits best with the inventions characterized by Roscher, 1270–1 as 'Brettspiel' and 'Würfel'. In general, see G. Zographou-Lyra, *Ο μύθος του Παλαμήδη* (Ioannina 1987).

**Athina Papachrysostomou (University of Patras)**  
**Sopater fr. 18 and 19**

## SOPATER'S LENTIL-SOUP: THE BEGINNINGS OF A PHLYACOGRAPHER'S

### CAREER

*Φακῆ* (fr. 18-19, K-A vol. I, pp. 284-285)

#### Introduction

The title translates as *Lentil-soup* or *Dish of lentils*. As we shall see, this is a thought-provoking case, when it comes to interpretation and plot reconstruction.

This is not the single time that Sopater deals with lentils. In fr. 1 the speaker (probably a cook) speaks with distaste about bread made of lentils (*φάκινον ἄρτον*). In fr. 13 the proverbial expression *τούπι τῇ φακῇ μύρον* is used, in order to portray Odysseus as an alleged hedonist. Besides, Sopater himself is called *Φάκιος παρρωδός* by Athenaeus (4.158d), either simply as a resourceful pun on his ethnic (*Πάφιος*) or on account of his love for lentils and his long stay in Alexandria, where lentil-dishes were very popular (Ath. 4.158d: *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς καλῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ... σύντροφοί ἐστε τῷ φακίνῳ βρώματι καὶ πᾶσα ὑμῶν ἡ πόλις πλήρης ἐστὶ φακίνων*).

Here we have an entire play entitled after this humble and most contemptible fare. Sopater proves innovative (just like elsewhere in his work), since this is the only surviving example of a comic play featuring a foodstuff in its title. Nevertheless, there is a good possibility that behind this cheap foodstuff there hides a real person's nickname. Indeed, according to Athenaeus, *Φακῆ* was

the nickname of Hegemon,<sup>1</sup> an Old Comedy playwright and writer of parodies:<sup>2</sup>

Ἡγήμων ὁ Θάσιος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Φακῆ, ὃν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ κωμωδίᾳ τινὲς ἐντάττουσιν (1.5b); and

elsewhere: Ἡγήμων ὁ Θάσιος < ὁ > τὰς Παρωδίας γράψας Φακῆ ἐπεκαλεῖτο (9.406e).

Further down Athenaeus first quotes a fragment from Hegemon's parodies (where the poet calls himself Φακῆ βδελυρή) and then recounts an incident in the theatre where Hegemon stood up for lentil in front of his audience and declared: ἀγαθὸν δὲ κὰν χειμῶνι κὰν θέρει φακῆ (Ath. 9.406e-407a). Later on Athenaeus returns to this subject and quotes another, lengthy, fragment of Hegemon's parodies (15.698c-699a).

Hence, it is possible that the title Φακῆ was meant to point to Hegemon, that the play featured this gourmand as its central figure, and that the plot evolved accordingly around Hegemon's gastronomic adventures. The only hindrance is the large chronological gap that separates Hegemon and Sopater; the former flourished in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, whereas the latter some one hundred years later.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a singular testimony by Athenaeus (4.158d) that Odysseus' sister was also named Φακῆ. However, this is an unfounded and a highly suspicious testimony, which is contradicted by other sources; e.g. her name is recorded as Καλλιστώ in Mnaseas fr. 3 Capp. (also acknowledged by Athenaeus *l.c.*) and as Κτιμένη in Od. 15.363.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Teubner's edition by P. Brandt, *Parodorum epicorum Graecorum et Arcestrati reliquiae*, Leipzig 1888.

<sup>3</sup> We can confidently date Sopater's *floruit* during the last quarter of the 4<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC; cf. Ath. 2.71b: Σώπατρος ὁ Πάριος γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατ' Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Φιλίππου ἐπιβιούς

The chances are that Hegemon's gluttony and his nickname had already lost their topicality by Sopater's time. On the other hand, Hegemon's case might have stuck to people's minds, particularly after his solo act at the theatre (cf. above Ath. 9.406f-407a), to the point that a late-fourth – early-third century audience could easily recall this incident and enjoy a play featuring this character. Besides, Athenaeus' quasi-obsession with Hegemon's nickname (he cites it thrice, plus he narrates the theatre incident) might be indicative of the extraordinary impression that Hegemon's case made on people, on account not so much of his gluttony but of his special fondness for a largely unpopular food.

Nonetheless, recognising Hegemon as the title-figure of Sopater's *Φακῆ* may still be considered a far-fetched interpretation. By way of alternative, we may opt for an entirely different plot reconstruction. The nickname *Φάκιος* that Athenaeus attributes to Sopater (4.158d) may have had more to do with the poet's gourmandism and less with his origin from Paphos. It is plausible that whilst in Alexandria Sopater adopted the local lifestyle and the dietary habits of the natives. As mentioned above, the inhabitants of the city of Alexandria were known – and mocked – for their fondness for lentils, which they also used as ingredient in various dishes; cf. Ath. 4.158d: ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς γε ... οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς καλῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ... σύντροφοί ἐστε τῷ φακίνῳ βρώματι καὶ πᾶσα ὑμῶν ἡ πόλις πλήρης ἐστὶ φακίνων· ὧν καὶ

---

δὲ καὶ ἕως τοῦ δευτέρου τῆς Αἰγύπτου βασιλείας. Alexander the Great reigned during the years 336-323 BC and Ptolemy II's reign began in 285 BC.

Σώπατρος ὁ Φάκιος παρωδῶς μέμνηται ἐν δράματι Βακχίδι (there follows Sopater fr. 1 about bread made of lentils).

Thus, it is conceivable that it was himself that Sopater chose to deride in his play *Φακῆ*, just like Cratinus made fun of himself more than a hundred years before in his *Πυτίνη* (produced in 423 BC).<sup>4</sup> Having borrowed from Cratinus the concept of a poet being subdued by his weakness (drunkenness in Cratinus' case), Sopater could have produced a play of self-presentation, where he dramatised his own strong liking for lentils. In that case we can presume that the title *Φακῆ* was meant as a sobriquet for the playwright himself, while the play dealt at some extent with Sopater's eating habits (better say, *disorders*), which featured either exclusive or immense consumption of lentils and lentil products. The play could be taking place either in Alexandria, the city of lentils *par excellence*, or somewhere else (probably Athens), where the protagonist's obsession with lentils would be most conspicuous, controversial, and – above all – a cause for mockery. It is equally likely that the play's protagonist either was called Sopater or had some other name but kept all the defining attributes of the real-life Sopater, i.e. he was a comic playwright originating from Paphos in Cyprus, who would go into raptures about lentils and would consume unthinkable quantities of them.

On balance, although I consider the Hegemon scenario relatively likely, I find myself having a preference for the latter interpretation with Sopater putting a

---

<sup>4</sup> See E. Bakola, *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*, Oxford 2010, 59-63, 275-281.

caricature of himself onstage, for I reckon this was what the audience least expected and what must have generated the most enthralling and the most comic effect.

Though not instructive plot-wise, the two surviving fragments are fascinating in other ways (see comm. below). Besides, fr. 18 also provides us with a *terminus post quem*, that is the death of Thibron in 322 BC (cf. comm. *ad loc.*). Sopater must have produced the current play soon afterwards, so that the reference to the Spartan commander would still be topical. This chronological clue is useful in allowing us to classify *Φακῆ* among the early works of Sopater. An early production date of *Φακῆ* is an important piece of information that bears significant implications upon the play's plot and content. It is logical that in the early stages of his career Sopater may have wished to present himself to his audience through his work. In fact, bearing in mind Sopater's lifespan (he was born during the years 336-323 BC; cf. n. 3), we may even reasonably assume that *Φακῆ* was the first ever play that Sopater produced. Of course, Cratinus did not dare to satirise himself onstage until the very end of his career. However, Sopater demonstrates in general such an amazingly innovative spirit that we may assume that he did not need to have imitated Cratinus in anything else other than the idea of self-presentation and self-satire. And this gives us another good reason to believe that it was him,

Sopater, rather than Hegemon, the epicure devoted to lentils, designated by the play's title.<sup>5</sup>

### Fragment 18 : Ath. 6.230e

This fragment is quoted by Aemilianus, immediately after Sopater fr. 14, as part of the ongoing discussion about silverware used in banquets.

ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ δράματι Φακῇ φησιν·

ἀλλ' ἀμφὶ δειπνοῖς ὅξιδ' ἀργυρεῶν ἔχει

δρακοντομίμοις ὀργάνων τορεύμασιν,

οἷαν ποτ' ἔσχε καὶ Θίβρων ὁ Ταντάλου

μαλακὸν ταλάντοις ἐκταλαντωθεὶς ἀνὴρ

2 ὀργάνων ACE: ἡμενῆν Kaibel 4 μαλακὸν A: μαλακὸς CE: "quod olim numerale velut ἑκατόν exspectabam, vereor ne species felleferit" Kaibel ἐκταλαντωθεὶς A: ἐκτανταλωθεὶς CE

And in the play entitled *Lentil-soup* he says:

But as to dinner-parties he has a silver vinegar-cruet

---

<sup>5</sup> Arguably, Aristophanes also practised the technique of self-presentation through his plays, to a certain extent, namely in the anapaests of the parabases (though without any element of self-satire). What Aristophanes essentially does in passages such as *Ach.* 628-658, *Eq.* 507-550 *Nu.* 518-562, etc., is deliver a descriptive personal statement, an explanatory exposition of himself, where he elucidates his beliefs and outlines the reasoning behind his artistic / aesthetic decisions.



embossed with serpent-like relief figures,  
like the one Thibron once owned, a man who was  
rocked to his death, in an ignoble manner, for his Tantalos-size wealth

In this fragment the subject of discussion is a specific character, known to the speaker but presently absent from stage. The speaker informs his collocutor (and / or the audience) about a particular dining habit of this character (cf. comm. on v. 1). The fact that the nickname *Φακῆ* is indicative of the protagonist's epicurism matches perfectly the present reference to someone's (probably the protagonist's) dining practices. Hence, it is reasonable to believe that the character under discussion is the title-figure and that these lines belong to the play's prologue scene (cf. comm. on fr. 19).

**1a** ἀμφὶ δείπνοις: "As far as dinner-parties are concerned", "regarding his dinner-parties". The preposition ἀμφί plus dative is a syntactical pattern that occurs frequently in poetry and can have various connotations. Here it denotes a "general connection or association", meaning *about, as to, a propos, concerning*; cf. *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v. B.III with examples: *Il.* 7.408: ἀμφὶ δὲ νεκροῖσιν κατακαίεμεν οὐ τι μεγάλῳ, *Pi. N.* 2.17: ὅσσα δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισι, etc.

**1b** ὀξύδ' ἀργυροῦν: A silver vinegar-cruet.<sup>6</sup> Silver was already known in antiquity for its quality to retain longer the purity of certain liquids, such as water, vinegar, etc.;

---

<sup>6</sup> For the (élite) connotations attached to the usage and display of silverware see M. J. Vickers & D. Gill, D., *Artful Crafts: Ancient Greek Silverware and Pottery*, Oxford 1994, 107-108, 105-154.

therefore, silver vessels were ideal for storing these liquids, especially during long voyages; e.g. Herodotus describes how Cyrus had water carried with him in silver vessels throughout his campaigns (1.188).

Silverware occurs periodically in the literary evidence (cf. ἀργυροῦς πίναξ in Sopater fr. 14). Nonetheless, this is the only reference to a silver vinegar-cruet. Cruets were commonly earthen.<sup>7</sup> In fact, all culinary vessels were normally made out of clay (cf. Axionicus fr. 7). To put Sopater's current fragment into perspective, we only need to recall Carion's exuberance in Aristophanes' *Wealth* when the household equipment turns into bronze, upon Plutos' rehabilitation: ὅξϊς δὲ πᾶσα καὶ λοπάδιον καὶ χύτρα / χαλκῇ γέγονε (vv. 812-813). If the presence of bronze is already considered a welcome surprise and a luxurious deviation from humdrum routine, then the regular display of silverware at dinner-parties not only must have stupefied the actual guests each and every time, but it must have also generated gossip and been the subject of some serious discussion in upper as well as lower social circles. It is in such a context that the speaker's preoccupation with this cruet is to be understood. Needless to say, that such a display was definitely not a one-off event. The present tense ἔχει translates as "he has", "he presents", "he brings in", meaning that the rich owner of this cruet *always* puts it on display (presumably along with other silverware), whenever he entertains guests at dinner-parties.

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. sch. on Ar. Eq. 1304a: ὀξίνην Ὑπέροβον· ὀξίδες ... τινὲς δὲ τὰ κεράμεα, ἃ ἐστὶν ὄξους δεκτικά, κεραμεὺς δὲ ὁ Ὑπέροβος; and o.c. 1304c: ὀξίνην· τὰς ὀξίδας ποιοῦντα· κεραμεὺς γὰρ ἦν.

By definition, the display of silverware at dinner-parties is a sign of wealth and prosperity. The play's protagonist and owner of this highly-wrought cruet must have been conspicuously rich and also possessed the necessary expert knowledge regarding silver's properties, so that he could appreciate the importance of spending money on a relatively small silverware item, which required, however, a substantial amount of silver to be made, given the embossed works that were carved on it. That is, the silver sheet needed to have a certain degree of thickness, so that any relief figures could be effectively designed and engraved on it (see next note). On the contrary, the occasional thinness and cheapness of silverware turned into common laughing stock; cf. Nicostratus fr. 8: *λοιπή τις ὅξϊς ἐστὶ καὶ ψυκτήριον / τῆς εὐπαρύφου λεπτότερον* (ap. Ath. 6.230d), accompanied by Athenaeus' comment *ad loc.*: *ἐξήλουν γάρ τινες τὸν ἄργυρον καὶ τότε εἰς ὑμένους ἰδέαν.*

**2a δρακοντομίμοις:** The adjective *δρακοντόμιμος* (< *δράκων* + *μιμέομαι*) is a hapax and another one of Sopater's imaginative coinages. The singularity of this vinegar cruet does not rest simply with the fact that it is silver but it also extends to its eye-catching embellishment. Its silver outer surface is decorated with embossed designs (*τορεύματα*), which represent serpents / snakes.

It has been suggested<sup>8</sup> that Sopater coined the adjective *δρακοντόμιμος* by analogy to *γυναικόμιμος*, which is exclusively used in tragedy and only in the

---

<sup>8</sup> E. Sommerbrodt, *De phlyacographis Graecis*, Breslau 1875, 39.

following four passages: A. Pr. 1005 (γυναικομίμοις ὑπτιάσασιν χειρῶν), S. fr. 769 R. (γυναικομίμοις ἐσθήμασιν), E. Ba. 980 (γυναικομίμῳ στολᾷ), and E. fr. 185 N. (γυναικομίμῳ μορφώματι). However, I do not consider it necessary to adopt this hypothesis. On the one hand, there are several other compound adjectives with the verb μιμέομαι as the second component, e.g. ἀνδρωπόμιμος (Ps.-Plu. Fluv. 11.4), ἀντίμιμος (Ruf. Anat. 1), φωνόμιμος (Vit. Aes. G 6), etc., and I do not see the reason why we should assume that the formation of any of these was interdependent.

On the other hand – and this is my main objection against Sommerbrodt’s assumption – there is no semantic correlation between the two adjectives, γυναικόμιμος and δρακοντόμιμος. The mere fact that they are both compound with the verb μιμέομαι does not suffice to equate them semantically, for this verb has a wide range of meanings. The adjective γυναικόμιμος, as shown by its usage, is meant to describe something that evokes women; it may be an object used by women (γυναικομίμοις ἐσθήμασιν / γυναικομίμῳ στολᾷ), a gesture performed by women (γυναικομίμοις ὑπτιάσασιν χειρῶν), or a female appearance (γυναικομίμῳ μορφώματι). Hence, something that is γυναικόμιμον is something – material or abstract – that appertains to the female world; for in this case the verb μιμέομαι can mean *to imitate, represent, portray* – in every possible sense.<sup>9</sup> On the contrary, the adjective δρακοντόμιμος entails a diametrically different – and much narrower, much more targeted – semantic analysis. The adjective δρακοντόμιμος has only one intrinsically

---

<sup>9</sup> LSJ<sup>9</sup> interpret γυναικόμιμος rather infelicitously as “aping women”.

inherent definition: it is meant to signify something that *resembles a serpent*; for in this case, unlike *γυναικόμιμος*, the verb *μιμέομαι* specifically means *to represent in art*. Sopater coined the adjective *δρακοντόμιμος* *ad hoc*, because he needed to express verbally an artistic structure. He could have never coined *δρακοντόμιμος* upon *γυναικόμιμος* for the simple reason that, for a Greek language native speaker (just like Sopater was), it goes without saying that there is no notional/semantic thread linking the two adjectives.<sup>10</sup> The fact that they are both compound with the verb *μιμέομαι* is so little important as the fact that they are both adjectives of two endings. Therefore, it is my belief, concretely sustained by Sopater's performance so far, that he was perfectly capable of coming up with the formation of *δρακοντόμιμος* himself, because he felt it to be exactly the term he needed at the time, and not because he was influenced by tragedy's *γυναικόμιμος* or wished to allude to it.

**2b τορεύμασιν:** The most common meaning of the verb *τορεύω* is *work (metal)* and hence (if appropriate) *produce a representation in this way* (cf. *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v. *τορεύω* II).<sup>11</sup> This (artistic) representation is called *τόρευμα*, which translates as *embossed work*,

---

<sup>10</sup> Not to mention that the four occurrences of *γυναικόμιμος* among the thousands of the tragic verses is such a minimal percentage that Sopater would have needed *TLG* access to locate them. Nor is it credible that he practised such a time-consuming task as going manually through the entire tragic corpus in search for a single line's inspiration.

<sup>11</sup> See H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, Hildesheim 1969 (repr. ed. of vol. I Leipzig <sup>2</sup>1912, and vols II-IV Leipzig 1879-1887), IV.233.

work in relief. In the current fragment the *embossed works* (τορεύματα) that decorated the vinegar-cruet were representations of serpents / snakes (δρακοντόμιμα).<sup>12</sup>

**2c ὀργάνων:** Objective genitive to τορεύμασιν (τορεύω ὄργανα). The current meaning of ὄργανον is “work”, “product” (cf. *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v. II). It is noteworthy that the noun ὄργανον occurs twice more within Comedy and has always this meaning: in Antiphanes fr. 172.2: Διὸς σωτήρος ἦλθε Θηρίκλειον ὄργανον (“a work by the craftsman Thericles”), and in Men. fr. 188.5: ἀλλ’ ἔστι τόλμης καὶ βίας ταῦτ’ ὄργανα (“products of recklessness and violence”).

Although the manuscript tradition unanimously preserves the reading ὀργάνων, Kaibel suggested the alternative reading ἡρμένην (cf. crit. app.). Kaibel’s discomfort with ὀργάνων, though not justifiable, is explicable; for in that particular position in the sentence, between δρακοντομίμοις and τορεύμασιν, a textbook syntactical choice would be an adjective or a participle (e.g. ἡρμένην) designating the ὄξιδ’, instead of an objective genitive. However, Greek syntax is acclaimed for its flexibility and adaptability; besides, Sopater has repeatedly evinced his dexterity in handling language efficiently and in ways that best serve the text’s needs (cf. comm. on Sop. fr. 17.2). Likewise, in the present fragment, what looks like a syntactical “deviation” is essentially a conscious choice that has a concrete aim.

---

<sup>12</sup> Elsewhere, the plural τορεύματα is sometimes used through synecdoche instead of the objects that bear the embossed works; e.g. Str. 8.6.23: ὀστρακίωνων τορευμάτων πλήθη.

Sopater wishes to establish an analogy between the elaborate vinegar-cruet itself and the words employed to describe it. The only way Sopater could do justice to such a highly ornate piece of art (a silver vinegar-cruet embossed with snake figures) was indeed by an equally highly sophisticated and syntactically innovative speech. Sopater's choice is logical and impressive, once again.

3 *Θιβρων*: On Thibron see the relevant entries by I. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, Berlin 1901, J. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens*, Toronto 1994-2005, and P. Poralla, *A Prosopography of Lacedaemonians: from the earliest times to the death of Alexander the Great (X - 323 B.C.)*, Chicago <sup>2</sup>1985 (rev. by A. S. Bradford).

Thibron was a Spartan commander who lived in the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC. Diodorus Siculus (18.19.2-18.21.9) provides us with a detailed account of his actions, military and other (cf. Arr. *FGrH* 156 F 9.16-18). In 324 BC Thibron murders Harpalus, in order to seize the 5000 talents (at least what was left of these), which Harpalus had embezzled from Alexander's funds. With Harpalus' money, army, and fleet in his possession, Thibron attacks Cyrene, proves victorious, and compels the Cyrenaeans to pay him upon surrender 500 silver talents. But his luck soon deserts him, when one of his officers, Mnasicles, betrays him and joins the Cyrenaeans. After a long series of military operations, Thibron is eventually captured and handed over to Ptolemy's general Ophellas, who has him hanged at Cyrene's port (322 BC).

Thibron's story revolves around one core element; the extreme fluctuations of fortune that he experienced before meeting his final fall and inglorious death. Both Diodorus' and Arrian's reports do not fail to stress this point; e.g. D.S. 18.20.1: *ἡ τύχη ταχὺ μεταβαλοῦσα ἐταπείνωσεν αὐτόν*, and 18.21.1: *ὁ δὲ Θίβρων τηλικαύτη συμφορᾷ περιπεσὼν ὅμως ἀντείχετο τοῦ πολέμου*; Arr. FGrH 156 F 9.16: *πολλαῖς μὲν μάχαις πολλαῖς δὲ ἐπιβουλαῖς ἄλλοτε μὲν κρατῶν ἐνίοτε δὲ ἡττώμενος*, etc. Of course, the other paramount parameter that defined Thibron's life and stigmatised him was the colossal amounts of money that came into his possession, first through the murder of Harpalus and then through the truce he imposed upon the Cyrenaeans. It is as surprising as overwhelming to realise that these two characteristics (wealth and fortune's volatility) are captured by Sopater and communicated in less than a line and a half: *ὁ Ταντάλου / μαλακὸν ταλάντοις ἐκταλαντωθεὶς ἀνὴρ* (see next note).

**3-4 ὁ Ταντάλου / ... ταλάντοις ἐκταλαντωθεὶς:** To define a personality like Thibron, who not only did he acquire wealth, but whose course of life was literally determined by thousands of talents, Sopater comes up with a most apposite proverb about riches, i.e. one that specifically speaks of innumerable talents. But even when using a proverb, which is meant – by nature – to be set and fixed, Sopater does not miss out on an opportunity to experiment; so, he dismantles the proverb and then rearranges the terms independently, whilst making all necessary grammatical and syntactical adjustments, so that the text's needs are best served. Sopater gives an additional twist to the proverb through an unprecedented twofold case of



hyperbaton; the first hyperbaton (ὁ [Ταντάλου μαλακὸν ταλάντοις] ἐκταλαντωθεὶς ἀνὴρ) encases a second one (Ταντάλου [μαλακὸν] ταλάντοις).

The original proverb<sup>13</sup> derives from the legendary wealth owned by Tantalus, the well-known ancestor of the Pelopids and son of Zeus.<sup>14</sup> Tantalus' association with riches is already prefigured in his mother's – strikingly appropriate – name, Πλουτώ; cf. Apostol. 16.16 (CPG II). The proverb's classic structure is either *Ταντάλου τάλαντα τανταλίζεται* or simply *Ταντάλου τάλαντα*; cf. Zen. 6.4 (CPG I): *Τάλαντα Ταντάλου: διεβεβόητο ὁ Τάνταλος ἐπὶ πλούτῳ, ὥς καὶ εἰς παροιμίαν διαδοθῆναι. Διπλῆν δὲ συμβέβηκεν εἶναι τὴν παροιμίαν, καὶ τὴν μὲν, Ταντάλου τάλαντα τανταλίζεται· τὴν δέ, Ταντάλου τάλαντα*. The proverb – in either form – is preserved in several sources and authors; e.g. Diogenian. 8.23 (CPG I), Phot. τ 570.12, *Suda* τ 81 and 147, Aristophanes fr. 963, Men. fr. 218.6, Plu. 759f, etc.

However, in most cases where the proverb occurs in its extended version (i.e. with the verb), the manuscript tradition is divided between *τανταλίζεται* and *ταλαντίζεται*. Either option contains a pun; *τανταλίζεται* puns with *Tantalus*, whereas *ταλαντίζεται* puns with *talents*.

---

<sup>13</sup> On this proverb see F. C. Theiss, *De proverbio Ταντάλου τάλαντα vel Ταντάλου τάλαντα τανταλίζεται*, Diss., Nordhausen 1855.

<sup>14</sup> Apart from his huge wealth, Tantalus was notorious for sacrificing his son Pelops and offering him to gods at dinner; cf. e.g. Pi. O. 1.36-51. Infamous was also Tantalus' eternal punishment in Hades; cf. e.g. Od. 11.582-592, Apollod. 2.1, Tz. H. 5.10.

The question about the verb is crucial, as it pertains to the interpretation of our fragment as well (cf. crit. app.), where metrical reasons dictate the adoption of the reading *ἐκταλαντωθείς*. The metre is iambic trimetre, and the fourth line analyses as  $\cup \cup - \cup - | - - \cup - | - - \cup -$ . The participle *ἐκταλαντωθείς* covers the three final positions of the second foot and the two first positions of the third foot ( $- \cup - | - -$ ). On the contrary, the reading *ἐκτανταλωθείς* would not fit in the second foot, for it analyses as  $- - \cup | - -$ . Thus, the correct reading for our fragment is unquestionably *ἐκταλαντωθείς*, which makes for another hapax by Sopater. This is indeed the only occurrence of the verb *ἐκταλαντόομαι*, which *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> translate as *to be stripped of money*. Nonetheless, with close scrutiny, a better case can be argued and an altogether different interpretation can be applied both to the hapax *ἐκταλαντόομαι* and to the meaning of the whole fragment.

To begin with, the hapax *ἐκταλαντόομαι* is compound with the preposition *ἐκ* and the simple verb *ταλαντόομαι*, which means *be balanced* or *sway / oscillate*; see Pl. Ti. 52e: *ἀνωμάλως πάντη ταλαντουμένην σείεσθαι*, and Timaeus' cognate explanation: *ταλαντοῦσθαι· ἑτεροφορεῖσθαι* (*Lex.* τ 1003b.13); cf. Ach. Tat. *Leuc.* 1.12.4. Given that the simple *ταλαντόομαι* means *sway*, the addition of the preposition *ἐκ* cannot alter that dramatically the verb's sense, so that the compound *ἐκταλαντόομαι* ends up meaning *to be stripped of money*, as *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> suggest. Instead, the current function of the preposition *ἐκ* is to intensify the meaning of the simple verb *ταλαντόομαι*; cf. e.g. *ἐκκόπτω* (*extirpate*), *ἐκπέρω* (*destroy utterly*), *ἐκδιδάσκω* (*teach thoroughly*), etc. That is to say, the compound *ἐκταλαντόομαι* simply bears a much more intense meaning

than the simple verb; *ἐκταλαντόμαι* means *oscillate uncontrollably, fluctuate chaotically, rise and fall*. The intensification of the verb's sense effectuated by *ἐκ* combines with the finite meaning of the first aorist passive participle, so that Sopater dexterously succeeds in communicating to his audience – through a single word – a tangible picture of Thibron's fortunes; he experienced some extreme (*ἐκ*) ups and downs (*ταλαντόμαι*), before meeting his death (*-θείς*) > *ἐκταλαντωθείς*.

Besides, the fragment makes a far better sense, if we translate *ἐκταλαντόμαι* as *oscillate wildly*. First, let us attempt to comprehend the speaker's point. The marvelous cruet reminds the speaker of Thibron, who owned a similar vessel. Speaking now of Thibron, the speaker laconically epitomizes this person's existence using a proverb about riches combined with a hyperbaton (the article *ὁ* in v. 3 goes with *ἐκταλαντωθείς ἀνὴρ* – not with *Ταντάλου*,<sup>15</sup> which is a genitive of possession depending on *ταλάντοις*). The most essential part of Thibron's story (cf. comm. on v. 3) is undoubtedly Thibron meeting his death after experiencing a series of ups and downs in the battle field. The fact that Thibron also lost his immense wealth on the way was nothing more than a collateral damage. Now, if one were to bring up Thibron, what would matter the most and what would be worth mentioning, would logically be his ultimate annihilation – and not the fact that he lost his money, no matter how much it was. Hence, the verb *ἐκταλαντόμαι* cannot mean “to be stripped of money”, for this piece of information, i.e. that

---

<sup>15</sup> Olson (Ath. 6.230e) erroneously translates “Thibron son of Tantalus”.

Thibron lost his money, is not the most important news that one would choose to share about a person who had also lost his life! Instead, *ἐκταλαντόομαι* must have meant to signify Thibron's final disorderly defeat and death.

Further support to my argument bears the case of the verb *τανταλόομαι*, which – quasi-similarly to *ταλαντόομαι* – means *be balanced* or *swung*, and is employed by Sophocles in the first aorist passive participle *τανταλωθείς* (*Ant.* 134): *ἀντιτύπα δ' ἐπὶ γὰρ πέσε τανταλωθείς*.<sup>16</sup> The participle *τανταλωθείς* is explained by the Scholiast *ad loc.* as *διατιναχθείς, διασεισθείς*.

To sum up, taking into consideration all the above data, i.e. that

- (i) both *ταλαντόομαι* and *τανταλόομαι* communicate the parallel notions of *swing*, *oscillation*, and *instability*,
- (ii) the preposition *ἐκ* in composition could never change radically a simple verb's basic meaning (e.g. make “sway” mean “strip of money”),
- (iii) the Sophoclean coinage *τανταλωθείς* conveys a solid sense of shakiness and fluctuation,
- (iv) Sopater's fragment yields a more satisfactory sense with *ἐκταλαντωθείς* meaning “oscillated wildly”, “rocked to death”,

I confidently believe that the right interpretation for *ἐκταλαντόομαι* and *ἐκταλαντωθείς* is precisely *to (cause to) sway to such an extreme and unprecedented*

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. H. Lloyd-Jones & N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea: Studies on the text of Sophocles*, Oxford 1990, 121.

extent that ultimately lead to one's death. Sopater's familiarity with the aforementioned Sophoclean usage of *τανταλωθείς* is an unprovable possibility. But the fact that both Sophocles' *τανταλωθείς* and Sopater's *ἐκταλαντωθείς* closely coincide in meaning is striking and a sufficient indication to consider this possibility quite probable.

Furthermore, against *LSJ*<sup>9</sup>'s interpretation of *ἐκταλαντόομαι* as "to be stripped of money", there also stands Eustathius' elucidation of Sopater's fragment: *ἐκ τοῦ ... Ταντάλου καὶ τανταλίζεσθαι παρὰ τραγικοῖς τὸ σαλεύεσθαι καὶ σείεσθαι. ὅθεν τὸ ταλάντοις ἐκταλαντωθείς παρὰ Σωπάτρω, σκώπτειν βούλεται τίνα ὡς ἐκ πλούτου κατασσεισμένον εἰς νοῦν διὰ τρυφῆν* (*Comm. Od.* v. 1, p. 437.7-9). Eustathius emphatically identifies twice Thibron's wealth as the origin of his misfortunes (*ἐκ πλούτου* and *διὰ τρυφῆν*). Additionally, Eustathius discerns in *ἐκταλαντωθείς* an element of mental disturbance and bedazzlement that riches caused Thibron (*κατασσεισμένον εἰς νοῦν*); a bedazzlement that generated his erratic and reckless behaviour in the military field that eventually cost him his life. Theoretically, this is a possibility, although – strictly speaking – the fragment itself does not imply any emotional / mental involvement.

**4a ταλάντοις:** There is no doubt that Thibron's wealth constituted the ultimate cause of his catastrophe. Although the term *ταλάντοις* is crucial for the fragment's understanding, we cannot be categorical about its exact syntactical role. If we follow Eustathius' analysis above in recognising some emotional and / or mental

implications in ἐκταλαντωθεῖς, we should accordingly interpret ταλάντοις as dative of cause, since this dative usually accompanies verbs of emotion.

But since emotion is not a given in the current use of ἐκταλαντόομαι, an alternative solution needs to be sought. A different construal would be to take ταλάντοις as an instrumental dative proper. This would be a rather moderate and neuter interpretation for our fragment (“he was destroyed through / because of his money”), which would allow for further readings (including the one above and the one below) to remain open / applicable.

The fact that Thibron was destroyed *because* of his money is a given; what it needs to be additionally specified is *how* exactly money brought about his destruction. I believe that we should understand ταλάντοις as a concrete case of dative of purpose. The dative of purpose occurs very rarely in Greek (cf. Smyth §§ 1473, 1519<sup>17</sup>), but this harmonises perfectly with Sopater’s penchant for the unusual. Thibron’s wealth caused his military fortunes to fluctuate and eventually meant his death not because Thibron was bedazzled by money and did not know what he was doing (after all, he knew what he bargained for when he murdered Harpalus), but because other people (e.g. Mnasicles; cf. comm. on v. 3) were –

---

<sup>17</sup> Smyth (H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, Cambridge MA 1956) §1519 cites the following representative example: Ἀθηναῖοι γὰρ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ὤρμηνται, πρόφασιν μὲν Ἐγεσταίων ξυμμαχίᾳ καὶ Λεοντίων κατοικήσει (Th. 6.33.2). See also Th. 3.82.1: πολεμουμένων δὲ καὶ ξυμμαχίας ἅμα ἑκατέροις τῇ τῶν ἐναντίων κακώσκει καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ προσποιεῖται ῥαδίως αἱ ἐπαγωγαὶ τοῖς νεωτερίζειν τι βουλομένοις ἐπορίζονται.

understandably! – after his money, so they turned against him and joined his enemies, hoping that – upon Thibron’s elimination – they would eventually secure a (chunky) share of his immense treasure. Accordingly, the precise translation of *ὁ ταλάντοις ἐκταλαντωθεὶς ἀνὴρ* should be “a man who was rocked to his death for his wealth”.

**4b μαλακόν:** Although Kaibel would have wished to see a numeral adjective in this place (cf. crit. app.), I believe that the text makes perfect sense as it is, since *ταλάντοις* stands absolutely and abstractly for “money”, “wealth”, and does not need to be defined by a specific numeric.

Instead, *μαλακόν* has a clear syntactical role as an adverbial accusative of manner (i.e. *μαλακὸν τὸν τρόπον*), which depends on *ἐκταλαντωθεὶς* and highlights an additional parameter of the action revealed by this participle; “he was rocked to his death *in an ignoble / contemptible manner*”. This detail may correspond to the information we get from Arrian’s report that Thibron was tortured before handed over for execution: *οἱ δὲ Τευχειρίζται Ὀφέλλα τὴν ἐξουσίαν δόντος ἠκίσαντό τε τὸν Θίβρωνα καὶ εἰς τὸν τῶν Κυρηναίων ἔπεμψαν κρεμασθῆναι λιμένα* (FGrH 156 F 9.18). Whatever the case, Thibron’s death constituted an ignominious finale to a glorious career.

### Fragment 19 : Ath. 15.702b

Since 15.701f (μετὰ ταῦτ' ἤδη μελλόντων καὶ ἡμῶν ἀνίστασθαι) Athenaeus' account exits the second narrative level (i.e. the conversation among the banqueters) and enters the first narrative level, i.e. Athenaeus' conversation with Timocrates. The character of Athenaeus has begun bringing his account to a closure; and within his concluding remarks he quotes this fragment by Sopater, which also happens to be the penultimate fragment cited in the *Deipnosophists*. Despite the fact that the text immediately preceding this fragment is substantially lacunose, this does not prevent us from establishing the general context and the reason why Athenaeus felt that this particular fragment was suitable for quotation. Just before the fragment's quotation, the information we can derive from the text is roughly the following; someone recites a hymn to Health, then greets kindly the banqueters as they wipe their mouths clean, and after another lacuna the phrase οἶδασιν οἱ παλαιοί comes up, which sounds like an axiom ("the elderly know better"). Directly after this Athenaeus – by way of explaining, emphasising, or otherwise correlating what has been previously said with what follows next (γάρ) – quotes Sopater's fragment. The two cognitive verbs (οἶδασιν in the text and ἐπίσταμαι in the fragment) are the clue that links together the fragment and its context. It is apparent that Athenaeus quotes Sopater as an authority, in order to reinforce the (missing) argument – i.e. what / why / how the elderly know – just stated in the main text. Needless to say, the corroboration Athenaeus is seeking in Sopater's words is of a comic nature.



Σώπατρος γὰρ ὁ φλυακογράφος ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ δράματι Φακῇ λέγει οὕτως·

κρεανομοῦμαι καὶ τὸν ἐκ Τυρρηνίας

οἶνον σὺν ὀκτὼ λαμβάνειν ἐπίσταμαι

For Sopater the phlyacographer in his play entitled *Lentil* says as follows:

I cut up the meat and help myself to it and I am also well-versed

in receiving Tyrrhenian wine with eight other fellows

Admittedly, this is one of Sopater's most intricate pieces. The speaker is obviously a gourmet, since he boasts about his conversancy with food and wine. He is probably the play's title-figure, the gourmand *Lentil*. It is possible that the play's prologue featured a monologue spoken by the protagonist and that this fragment is part of his self-presentation to the audience. Such a hypothesis does not annul the possibility of the fr. 18 also originating in the prologue (cf. comm. *ad loc.*). The prologue scene could have accommodated first the protagonist's monologue and then (after the latter's departure) another person's view / comments about him – always by way of introduction.

But what strikes the reader most is the convoluted nature of this fragment. The usage of *κρεανομοῦμαι* in first person singular is paradoxical (and a hapax), Tyrrhenian wine is nowhere else mentioned, the infinitive *λαμβάνειν* is a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* choice, whilst the phrase *σὺν ὀκτώ* is almost enigmatic (cf. comm. *ad loc.*). This bizarre style and atypical language, put in the mouth of a gourmet who is to

be identified with the title-figure, can be neither unintentional nor meaningless. Arguably, such a distinctive register, i.e. one that abounds in unprecedented usages of verbs, meanings of words, and syntactical patterns, is characteristic of Sopater himself. If Sopater's character speaks like Sopater himself does in his entire (surviving) work, this eventually strengthens the hypothesis stated in the play's introduction, i.e. that the title *Φακῆ* is a dramatic persona for Sopater himself (rather than for Hegemon or any other glutton), whose aim for writing this play is to introduce himself and his *modus scribendi* to his (prospective) audience.

It is also noteworthy that the present fragment evokes – to a certain degree – Archilochus fr. 1: εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίοιο ἄνακτος / καὶ Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος. In particular, both fragments (i) emphatically conclude with the verb *ἐπίσταμαι*, thus communicating the speaker's pride of being an expert in something; (ii) consist of two paratactically connected main sentences, with verbs in present indicative; i.e. this syntactical pattern (parataxis plus present tense plus indicative mood) typically asserts a *statement* or a *fact*, hence the speaker's self-confidence is in both cases substantiated not only by what he says but also by how he says it. In the present fragment Sopater echoes Archilochus' pride in being versed in poetry; *prima facie* the comic hero takes pride in being well-versed in gastronomical issues. But if we apply a metatheatrical interpretation (cf. comm. *ad loc.*), we can discern – behind the comic hero – the comic poet playfully winking to his audience for himself too, just like Archilochus, possesses the gift of the Muses; only that instead of explicitly declaring it (like Archilochus does), Sopater provides solid

evidence for this gift. Not only is Sopater generally capable of composing ground-breaking dramatic poetry (which is a palpable reality throughout his work), but also the sophisticated lines of this particular fragment verify that Sopater too possesses and cultivates the Muses' gift.

But there is yet another parameter that seems to strengthen the case for intertextuality between Archilochus' and Sopater's fragments: Archilochus masters the gift of the (nine) Muses and Sopater's character drinks his wine in the company of eight other associates, which gives us nine fellow-drinkers including the speaker. Remarkably, the ideal number of banqueters for a *comme il faut* symposium was nine; cf. comm. *ad loc.*

**κρεανομοῦμαι:** In active voice the verb *κρεανομέω* (< *κρέας* + *νέμω*) means *cut up and deal out meat* (cf. *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v.). But when this verb occurs in middle voice, the subject is always in plural number; e.g. Theoc. 26.24 αἱ δ' ἄλλαι τὰ περισσὰ κρεανομέοντο γυναικες; Clearchus fr. 47 (ap. Ath. 12.541e) τὰ μὲν ὅστ' αὖ κατέκοψαν ἐν ὄλμοις, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ κρεανομησάμενοι ἐπηράσαντο πάντες τοῖς μὴ γευσασμένοις αὐτῶν. Naturally, in middle voice the verb's meaning is *to distribute among themselves*. However, in Sopater's fragment the subject is first person singular (ἐγώ). This is a hapax usage for the middle voice that at first sight could puzzle the reader as to how it should be translated, since the notion of *distribute* requires either a plural subject when in middle voice or an active voice verbal form. Apparently, Sopater's inventive intellect is at work again. Sopater intentionally deviates from the norm, because he

needs his comic hero to voice his peculiarity. In just a single word, that is the briefest possible, the comic hero reveals to the spectators an important aspect of his personality; he is self-assertive and self-confident, and perhaps a little conceited too. What Kaibel saw here was someone *bragging in a silly way* (“gloriarī videtur aliquis ridicule”).

**Ι-2 τὸν ἐκ Τυρρηνίας οἶνον:** Tyrrhenian wine is nowhere else mentioned as an outstanding variety. Yet, paradoxically, the speaker of this fragment takes demonstrable pride in knowing how to receive wine from Tyrrhenia. Such an enigmatic claim can easily explained if analysed not literally but metaphorically, and in particular metatheatrically. As mentioned in the play’s introduction, it is highly probable that Sopater designed *Φακῆ* to be a play of self-presentation, destined to introduce himself and his *modus scribendi* to his audience early in his career. It is within this metatheatrical interpretation that we need to accommodate and comprehend the – otherwise obscure – assertion made by the speaker in the present fragment. In other words, the “wine from Tyrrhenia” is not to be understood as real wine; I strongly believe that “wine” here is meant to stand for “influence” and “inspiration”. What the comic poet surreptitiously wishes to convey to the spectators is the fact that he derives his poetic inspiration and exemplars from Italy. However, it would be difficult to specifically pin down the individual antecedents meant here by Sopater. In any case, Rhinton of Taras is definitely not one of them for simple reasons of chronology. According to *Suda*’s

testimony,<sup>18</sup> Rhinton was born during the reign of Ptolemy I, i.e. 303-285 BC (ὁ 171 γέγονεν ἐπὶ τοῦ πρώτου Πτολεμαίου), so he was roughly one generation younger than Sopater. The comic production that must have constituted Sopater's source of inspiration is the one that immediately antedates Rhinton. Although our literary record for the period is simply inexistent, we do have the so-called (after Heydemann, *JDAI* 1 [1886] 260-313) "*phlyax*-vases", originating from South Italy and Sicily and dating from c.380-340. We know now (thanks fundamentally to the works of Webster, Trendall, and Taplin<sup>19</sup>) that these vases depict scenes from Athenian plays of Old and Middle Comedy, which either were re-performed in Magna Graecia or were originally destined to be performed there exclusively.<sup>20</sup> Sopater, who was largely based in Alexandria, must have had indirect contact with Attic Comedy through the mediation of Magna Graecia. Whether Attic Comedy underwent a generic transformation there, e.g. into *phlyaces* (meaning that the "Tyrrhenian wine" that Sopater inherited consisted not of pure Athenian Comedy but of its local, italicised version), this is an issue that should constitute an entirely different chapter in itself. For the moment, suffice it to recapitulate that, rather than indulging in wine-drinking, Sopater receives his poetic muse from Italy.

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. E. Rhode, *Γέγονε in den Biographica des Suidas* (Kleine Schriften I), Leipzig – Tübingen 1901.

<sup>19</sup> T. B. L. Webster, "South Italian Vases and Attic Drama", *CQ* 42 (1948) 15-27; A. D. Trendall, *Phlyax Vases*, *BICS Suppl.* 19, London 1967; O. Taplin, *Comic Angels*, Oxford 1993.

<sup>20</sup> See S. D. Olson, *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy*, Oxford 2007, 13-16.

**2 λαμβάνειν ἐπίσταμαι:** In relation with the previous note, the vocabulary Sopater employs here unambiguously points to a direction other than the literal one. The verb ἐπίσταμαι, “to know well”, “to have expertise in something”, rather than describing someone’s wine connoisseurship, relates more and better with issues of the intellect. Not to mention the learned intertextual allusion to Archilochus’ fr. 1 (cf. above). Similarly, the verb λαμβάνειν is a παρὰ προσδοκίαν choice, as a (comic character’s perception of an) erudite substitute for πίνειν or μειγνύναι. That this is a παρὰ προσδοκίαν figure, and a successful one indeed, is made evident by the fact that λαμβάνειν translates aptly as “receiving”, “inheriting” (rather than “drinking”, of course) and thus complements the notion of the poet receiving poetic legacy and inspiration from elsewhere.

**2 σὺν ὀκτώ:** This is another enigmatic phrase. In an elliptical manner the speaker probably refers to himself along with eight other fellow banqueters as participating in the symposion. Nine members were considered to be an ideal number for a convivial atmosphere, according to Varro (*Men.* fr. 333 B.), as quoted by Aulus Gellius (NA 13.11.1-3): “convivarum numerum incipere oportere a Gratiarum numero et progredi ad Musarum, id est proficisci a tribus et consistere in novem, ut, cum paucissimi convivae sunt, non pauciores sint quam tres, cum plurimi, non plures quam novem”. Cf. Callix. fr. 1.109 (*ap.* Ath. 5.205d) συμπόσιον ἐννεάκλινον.

Alternatively, Gigante<sup>21</sup> thought the reference was not to eight participants but to eight loaves of bread (cf. Alexis fr. 125, Luc. *DMeretr.* 14.2).

Considering this fragment as a whole, it is remarkable how Sopater manages to achieve and maintain a continuous transcendence between the literal chronotope of a symposium, where the comic character brags in elevated language about his versatility and connoisseurship with food and wine, and the metatheatrical chronotope where the comic poet avows his poetic inheritance and background.

---

<sup>21</sup> M. Gigante, *Rintone e il teatro in Magna Grecia*, Napoli 1971, 94.

**Andrea Codispoti (University of Chieti)**  
**Pherekrates fr. 5**



## ***PHERECR. 5 K-A***

(A) Ἡ μὴν σὺ σαυτὸν μακαριεῖς < x - > ὅταν

οὗτοί σε κατορύττωσιν.

(B) Οὐ δῆτ', ἀλλ' ἐγὼ

τούτους πρότερον, οὗτοι δὲ μακαριοῦσί με.

Καίτοι πόθεν ληνοὺς τοσαύτας λήψομαι;

**Poll. X, 150** (codd. ACL): Σοροποιοῦ σκεύη σορός, πύελος, κιβωτός, ληνός. Οἱ τε γὰρ περὶ Ἑραστον καὶ Κορίσκον Πλάτωνι ἐπιστέλλοντες γράφουσι "ληνὸν Ἀσσίαν τῆς σαρκοφάγου λίθου", καὶ ἐπάγουσι περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες "σορῶ". ὁ τε Φερεκράτης ἐν τοῖς Ἀγρίοις ἔφη· "ἦ μὴν – λήψομαι;"

**1** σαυτὸν L : σαυτὸ C : αὐτὸς A | ὦ τάν metri causa suppl. Bentley 1842, p. 288 : μακάρι' Conti Bizzarro 1987, p. 29 n. 23 || **2** αὐτοί σε κατορύττουσιν C || **3** με A : ἐμέ CL

**Bentley 1842, p. 288:** "Cum laudasset ille nescio quis fortunas suas, tum ob alia, tum ob firmam, credo, valetudinem, etsi strenue nepotaretur. Hunc alter excipiens, Ita vero, ait εἰρωνικῶς, Tum fortunas tuas laudabis, cum cognati tui te mox sepelient. Non, non, subjungit ille, Equidem eos omnes componam, et μακαριοῦσι με superstitem et sanum." **Bothe 1855, p. 86:** "Dixerat aliquis se velle emigrare et ad feros istos secedere : cui respondens alter ironice, occisum eum iri ab illis

significans, ἡ μὴν, etc.” **Kaibel ap. Kassel-Austin 1989, pp. 107-8:** “irridebat aliquis male sanam  
Ferorum vitam victumque; cui alter *tibi etiam superstites erunt et gratias ages si te sepeliant.*”

Gli strumenti del fabbricante di bare sono la bara, il sarcofago, la cassa, il feretro. Gli allievi di Erasto e Corisco, scrivendo a Platone, citano “la bara di Asso in pietra sarcofaga” e continuano chiamandola “σοφοῖ”; e Ferecrate nei *Selvaggi* diceva:

(A) Certo, beato te < ... > se

questi ti seppelliscono!

(B) Certo che no, anzi

li seppellirò prima io, e loro mi chiameranno “Beato!”

Ma dove troverò tante bare?

**Metro:** trimetri giambici

## 1. LA TRADIZIONE DEL TESTO

Il frammento è tramandato nell'Ὄνομαστικόν di Giulio Polluce (X, 150), in un passo in cui il grammatico sta elencando gli strumenti propri di alcune professioni. Tra i nomi presenti nella lista vi è il anche fabbricante di bare, qui chiamato σοροποιός (in luogo del più comune σοροπηγός).

Il passo chiarisce che ἡ ληνός, termine che designa genericamente un oggetto di forma concava (e quindi perlopiù diversi tipi di recipiente)<sup>1</sup>, può assumere anche il significato di ἡ σορός nella sua accezione di "bara"<sup>2</sup>. A conferma di ciò Polluce cita una lettera indirizzata a Platone probabilmente da alcuni allievi di Erasto e Corisco (οἳ τε ... περὶ Ἑραστον καὶ Κορίσκον)<sup>3</sup>, in cui una bara di pietra sarcofaga (un tipo particolare di calcare) è chiamata in un primo momento ληνός Ἀσσία e in seguito σορός<sup>4</sup>; e un brano di Ferecrate (ὅ τε Φερεκράτης), in cui il significato di "bara" si evince dal contesto dei quattro versi citati. È la correlazione τε ... τε a suggerire che Polluce impieghi entrambe le citazioni per dimostrare l'esistenza di un significato evidentemente inusitato per ληνός. Il nostro commediografo è quindi citato come fonte autorevole per quanto riguarda la questione lessicale in esame.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v., p. 1045: «*anything shaped like a tub or trough ... wine-vat in which the grapes are pressed ... trough, for watering cattle, watering-place for them ... = κάρδοπος, kneading-trough ... socket into which the mast fitted, = ἵστοπέδη ... coffin ... part of the brain, the meeting point of the sinuses of the dura mater ... hollow of a chariot ... in pl., the lower parts of the nose*».

<sup>2</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v., p. 1621.

<sup>3</sup> Discepoli di Platone originari di Scepsi (nella Misia) che nel 347 a.C. fondarono, insieme ad Aristotele e Senocrate, una scuola filosofica proprio ad Asso (cf. Diog. Laert. III, 46 e Reale 1986<sup>4</sup>, pp. 34-36).

<sup>4</sup> Per la ληνός Ἀσσία cf. LSJ s.v. σαρκοφάγος, pp. 1584-1585: «λίθος σ. a limestone (of which the best kind was quarried at Assos in the Troad), remarkable for *consuming the flesh* of corpses laid in it». Sull'interpretazione del testimone cf. Bentley 1842, pp. 287-288.

## 2. L'ASSETTO TESTUALE

Il testo del frammento è trådito in maniera sostanzialmente unitaria ma non integra dai codici A (Paris, Biblioth que Nationale, Gr. 2670), C (Heidelberg, Universit tsbibliothek, Palat. gr. 375) ed L (Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 56.1), le cui lezioni sono in alcuni casi discordi tra loro.

Non   presente la suddivisione delle battute tra due personaggi A e B: questa si deve a Bentley<sup>5</sup> ed   basata sia sulla correlazione     μ ν ... ο  δ τα, sia e soprattutto sulla contrapposizione tra ο το   ε κατορύττωσιν e ο  δ τ ,  λλ   γ  τουτους π  τερον.

Lo stesso Bentley ha ordinato la citazione in quattro trimetri giambici dei quali il primo risulta lacunoso di un piede, proponendo di integrare    τ ν scomparso nella tradizione manoscritta a causa della vicinanza con  τ ν (un'aplografia sarebbe quindi all'origine della lacuna)<sup>6</sup>; il terzo *metron* sarebbe cos  composto da *spondeo + giambo*. Proposte successive non ve ne furono se non quella di Conti Bizzarro di integrare μακ  ρι , «con una migliore resa sul piano del *Wortspiel*» nonostante «i poeti comici, in questi giuochi di parole, premettono a μακ  ρι  la interiezione   »<sup>7</sup>; avremmo allora nel terzo *metron* la sequenza *tribraco + giambo*. Bentley e Conti Bizzarro ragionano

<sup>5</sup> Bentley 1842, p. 288 (anche per quanto riguarda la suddivisione in versi e la proposta di integrazione della lacuna).

<sup>6</sup> La maggior parte degli editori accoglie nel testo l'integrazione di Bentley, ognuno variando la scrittura dei segni diacritici: cf. Meineke 1839, p. 260 (  τ ν); Bothe 1855, p. 86 (  τ ν); Kock 1880, p. 146 (  τ ν); Edmonds 1957, p. 210 (  τ ν); Conti Bizzarro 1987, p. 29 (  τ ν); Quaglia 2001, p. 90 = Quaglia 2005, p. 121 (  τ ν). Diversamente, Runkel 1829, p. 13 ( τ ν) e Kassel-Austin 1989, p. 107 (  τ ν) la accolgono in apparato segnalando la lacuna nel testo; Storey 2011, p. 424, invece, segnala la lacuna nel verso senza menzionare alcuna proposta d'integrazione in apparato. Da notare che il Liddell-Scott nulla dice sull'eventualit  di un apostrofo davanti a τ ν o τ ν (cf. LSJ s.v., p. 1755) o dopo   (cf. LSJ s.v., p. 2029). Interessante infine lo studio di De Vries 1966, che riconosce nella locuzione   τ ν una forma colloquiale usata, anche ironicamente, da chi si sente in una posizione di superiorit  rispetto all'interlocutore e che   possibile tradurre con "mio caro".

<sup>7</sup> Conti Bizzarro 1987, p. 29, in part. n. 23 in cui vengono citati come *loci similes* Ar. *Vesp.* 1275, *Av.* 1271-1273 e Men. *Dysc.* 103. Da notare che il frammento   stampato comunque con   τ ν a integrazione della lacuna.

entrambi per aplografia, il primo appoggiandosi a ὅταν, il secondo a μακαριεῖς. Né sembra probabile proporre congetture altrettanto appropriate: la frase ha senso compiuto nonostante la lacuna e l'inserimento di un vocativo non ne modifica la struttura Soggetto-Oggetto-Verbo che è quella comune in greco: ὦ τῶν ε μακάρι', inoltre, permettono di spiegare perfettamente la genesi dell'errore. Tuttavia, vorrei segnalare la possibilità di un ulteriore punto d'incisione dopo σαυτὸν, in cui potrebbe situarsi la lacuna originaria. Il primo verso assumerebbe così la forma:

ἦ μὴν σὺ σαυτὸν < - ~ > μακαριεῖς ὅταν<sup>8</sup>.

Sebbene i quattro versi non siano particolarmente danneggiati, sono stati tuttavia oggetto di qualche intervento da parte della critica. Al verso 2 Bentley scrive la lezione del codice C αὐτοί; Runkel sceglie invece αὐτόν, istituendo un chiasmo tra σαυτὸν al verso 1 e αὐτόν σε al successivo; diversamente Meineke si appoggia alla lezione di A ed L οὔτοι (che però legge nell'edizione dell'Ὀνομαστικόν curata da Seber)<sup>9</sup>, preferibile per la correlazione οὔτοι ... τούτους e perché ripresa nel verso successivo da οὔτοι<sup>10</sup>. Il congiuntivo κατορύττωσιν, lezione dei codici A ed L, è comunemente accettato dagli studiosi, con la sola eccezione di Edmonds che scrive la

<sup>8</sup> Il verso andrebbe letto allora secondo la seguente scansione metrica: - - ~ - x < - ~ > ~ ~ ~ - ~ - . Il secondo *metron*, anziché composto da *dattilo* + *giambo* risulterebbe formato da *spondeo/giambo/anapesto* + *tribraco*. Ipotizzando una sequenza *spondeo* + *tribraco*, assisteremmo a un regolarizzarsi dell'andamento ritmico dei quattro versi, nei quali ogni *metron* verrebbe realizzato come *spondeo* + *giambo*, *spondeo* + *tribraco*, o *giambo* + *giambo*, per condurre alla conclusione dello scambio di battute, al verso 4, con il ripetersi insistito (per ben tre volte) della sequenza *spondeo* + *giambo*.

<sup>9</sup> Seber 1608, *Ad Iulii Pollucis Onomasticon notae*, pp. 146 e 1. Il codice da cui Seber legge οὔτος (München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 564) è annoverato da Bethe tra i numerosi codici derivati da una pessima epitome dell'Ὀνομαστικόν, mentre ai codici A ed L è attribuita una maggiore autorità; cf. Bethe 1900, pp. IX-XI.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Conti Bizzarro 1987, p. 30.

lezione del codice C κατορύττουσιν (all'indicativo)<sup>11</sup>. Al verso 3 Bentley propone inizialmente di leggere μακαριοῦσί σφε, in base alla prima delle due interpretazioni da lui avanzate; poco oltre una nuova lettura del frammento gli permette di mantenersi più fedele al testo trådito e di scrivere μακαριοῦσ' ἐμέ (seguito da Runkel, Bothe, Kock, Edmonds e Conti Bizzarro)<sup>12</sup>. Tuttavia, la presenza in tutti e tre i codici di iota non eliso in μακαριοῦσι induce a propendere per μακαριοῦσί με. Bisogna inoltre aggiungere che la preferenza di alcuni filologi per ἐμέ può essere dipesa dalla predilezione per un trimetro giambico non terminante con un monosillabo; ad ogni modo μακαριοῦσί με costituisce un'unica parola metrica polisillabica ed è in ogni caso accettabile anche in conclusione di verso<sup>13</sup>. Infine, al verso 4, è irrilevante scrivere καίτοι ο, con Bentley, καί τοι, in quanto le due lezioni sono omofone: è quindi preferibile mantenere il trådito καίτοι (che è anche la forma più comune dell'avverbio).

### 3. IL BEATO NELL'ALDIQUÀ: UN GIOCO DI PAROLE NELL'USO DI MAKAPIZΩ

Centrale nell'interpretazione del frammento è il gioco di parole costruito attorno al verbo μακαρίζειν. La radice da cui è ricavato il verbo è la stessa dell'aggettivo μάκαρ,

<sup>11</sup> Meno probabile perché ὅταν < ὅτε + ἄν predilige il congiuntivo.

<sup>12</sup> Bentley 1842, p. 288; Runkel 1829, p. 13; Bothe 1855, p. 86; Kock 1880, p. 146; Edmonds 1957, p. 210; Conti Bizzarro 1987, p. 29.

<sup>13</sup> Cf., per il concetto di parola metrica, Maas 1979, p. 114; per l'impossibilità del monosillabo finale di verso, Snell 1977, p. 15; e, per il monosillabo in posizione finale di verso nel trimetro giambico ferecrateo, Pherecr. 6,2 (B) <'Ο> Πεισίου Μέλῃς. (A) Μετὰ <τὸν> Μέλῃτα <δ'> ἦν; 7,2 τῶν γὰρ προτενθῶν ἐσμεν· ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶσθα σύ; 43,1 κίθαρος γεγενῆσθαι κἀγοράζειν κίθαρος ὦν; 66 ἀνέπλησα τῷφθαλμῷ πάλης φουσῶν τὸ πῦρ; 156,6 νῦν δ' ἄρτι μοι τὸ γῆρας ἐντίθησι νοῦν; 164,2 ἀνὴρ ἀπασῶν τῶν γυναικῶν ἐστι νῦν; e, tra i *Dubia*, Pherecr. 283,1 ὃ γῆρας, ὥς ἐπαχθεῖς ἀνθρώποισιν εἶ.

di etimologia incerta<sup>14</sup>. Μάκαρες sono gli dèi, che al contrario degli uomini conducono una vita beata; μάκαρ è l'uomo che ha la fortuna di vivere una vita felice, nella ricchezza, lontano dalle disgrazie; μάκαρες, infine, sono gli uomini che hanno vissuto secondo giustizia, a cui è concesso il privilegio (soli tra tutti i mortali) di trascorrere dopo la morte una vita felice, priva degli affanni che tormentano l'esistenza terrena, nelle Isole dei Beati<sup>15</sup>.

L'unione di questo aggettivo con il suffisso -ιζω, molto produttivo in greco per la formazione di presenti denominativi e perciò privo di particolari significazioni<sup>16</sup>, crea la forma verbale che troviamo nel frammento, coniugata al futuro attico, che Kassel e Austin così commentano: «verbo μακαρίζειν ambigue uti videtur poeta», segnalando il frammento 504 dai Ταγηνιστάι (i "Friggitori") di Aristofane<sup>17</sup>. Ed effettivamente vale la pena di leggere con attenzione il frammento, che al verso 9 recita: Διὰ ταῦτα γάρ τοι καὶ καλοῦνται μακάριοι. Chi sono costoro che vengono chiamati μακάριοι? E perché spetta loro questo nome? La risposta è nel frammento stesso. Aristofane scherza sul nome di Plutone (Πλούτων), ritenendolo adattissimo: il piatto della bilancia, quando è pieno, scende verso il regno dei morti, quando è vuoto, sale verso il regno degli dèi. Non è preferibile allora il regno di Plutone a quello di Zeus? E per quale altro motivo, ancora, i defunti vengono profumati e inghirlandati se non per iniziare un simposio

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Boisacq 1916 s.v. μάκαρ, pp. 601-602; Hofmann 1950 s.v. μάκαρ, p. 188; Frisk 1970 s.v. μάκαρ, pp. 162-163; e Chantraine 1974 s.v. μάκαρ, p. 659.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. μάκαρ, p. 1073.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Chantraine 1961<sup>2</sup>, pp. 234-236.

<sup>17</sup> Kassel-Austin 1989, p. 108. Il testo del frammento, l'apparato e il commento si trovano alle pp. 107-108.

appena scesi negli Inferi?<sup>18</sup> Insomma: il dio dell'Aldilà ha il *physique du rôle* per impersonare la "ricchezza" (πλοῦτος). E i morti sono in tutto e per tutto beati, a vivere in un regno del genere!

A partire da un *Witz* di questo tipo bisogna interpretare a mio avviso il *jeu de mots* sotteso al doppio uso di μακαρίζω. Il personaggio A afferma che B si riterrà beato (σὺ σαυτὸν μακαριεῖς) se il gruppo designato da οὔτοι, pericolosamente vicino, lo avrà seppellito<sup>19</sup>. B risponde che sarà lui a seppellire gli altri e saranno loro a ritenerlo beato (οὔτοι δὲ μακαριοῦσί με). Ma come è possibile, nelle parole di A, che B possa ritenersi beato nel caso in cui venga seppellito? È qui presente un corto-circuito di senso che è possibile districare seguendo due direzioni: la prima, secondo un criterio collettivo, riguarda un valore che il personaggio B condivide con il pubblico ateniese; la seconda fa leva su un criterio individuale, relativo alle pulsioni interiori manifestate da B consapevole di trovarsi a rischio della vita.

L'affermazione del personaggio A, che B si riterrà beato se verrà seppellito, può rischiararsi alla luce dell'ipotesi che l'alternativa ad essere seppellito fosse rimanere insepolto e diventare preda per le bestie<sup>20</sup>. Il locutore mostra quindi di provenire da un ambiente civilizzato perché si pone il problema della sorte del corpo dopo la morte. La

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Henderson 2007, p. 349 n. 123: «Garlanding and anointing were preparations both for funerals and for dinner-parties»; ma anche, per il vino come la bevanda che allietta i μάκαρες, Velasco López 1992, pp. 212-213: «Aristophane ... dans les Ταγηνιστάι [= fr. 504 K-A], fait allusion à l'obligation de boire après être descendu dans l'autre monde, bien qu'il ne précise pas s'il s'agit de vin ou d'un autre liquide; mais, puisqu'il en fait la cause de l'expression μακάριοι attribuée aux défunts, il serait difficile de la comprendre s'ils bouvaient de l'eau».

<sup>19</sup> La battuta di A è introdotta da ἡ μὲν che, secondo Denniston 1954<sup>2</sup>, p. 350, «introduces a strong and confident asseveration ... most frequently employed in oaths and pledges ... the Aristophanic examples are mostly with the future indicative, and threatening in tone», anche se qui il tono di A, più che minaccioso, sembra provocatorio. La vicinanza dei nemici è stata rilevata da Conti Bizzarro 1987, p. 30.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Ceccarelli 2000, p. 465 n. 15, commentando i versi 343-365 degli *Uccelli* aristofanei: «Being left to be eaten by birds and beasts is a traditional horror (*Iliad* 1.5, *Soph. Ajax* 1065 etc.), to which the birds had alluded earlier (348)».



scelta di μακαρίζω in questo contesto è già carica di ironia perché fa leva sul doppio senso dell'aggettivo μάκαρ, oscillante tra il designare una felicità temporanea, nella vita terrena, e la felicità eterna che spetta ai giusti dopo la morte. Nel contesto in cui si trova, e in una situazione di pericolo mortale, essere seppelliti sarebbe già una conquista! La risposta di B, d'altra parte, è coerente con questi presupposti. Invece di controbattere a quanto affermato da A, dà per assodata la sua asserzione e prosegue ribaltandone i termini: non sarà lui ad essere seppellito ma i suoi avversari; e nonostante ciò sarà comunque beato. Il meccanismo comico fondato sul doppio senso nasce proprio qui: secondo il punto di vista civilizzato di B, i Selvaggi lo riterranno beato perché, sotterrando i loro corpi, insegnerà loro l'usanza dell'inumazione e il valore di civiltà insito nella sepoltura dei morti; pur se i morti in questione sono paradossalmente essi stessi...

A proposito di questo frammento alcuni studiosi hanno ipotizzato che i Selvaggi, oltre a non interrare i morti, praticassero anche l'antropofagia<sup>21</sup>. Conti Bizzarro segnala il frammento 6 Sn-K del tragico Moschione, vissuto nel IV o più probabilmente nel III secolo a.C., in cui il poeta narra il graduale passaggio dell'uomo da uno stato semiferino al grado di civilizzazione che caratterizzava la società greca di allora. In un primo momento, quindi, θηρσί<ν> διαίτας εἶχον ἐμφερεῖς βροτοί ... Βοράι δὲ σαρκοβρώτες ἀλληλοκτόνους / παρεῖχον αὐτοῖς δαῖτας ... ὁ δ' ἀσθενὴς ἦν τῶν ἀμεινόνων βορά; in seguito il tempo cambiò il modo di vivere degli uomini, che fosse

---

<sup>21</sup> Kraus 1975, col. 729; Conti Bizzarro 1987, pp. 30-31; Ceccarelli 1992, p. 27; Ceccarelli 2000, p. 456; Farioli 2001, pp. 178-180; Quaglia 2001, pp. 93-97; Quaglia 2005, p. 122; più cauto Melero 2008, pp. 251-252.

per merito di Prometeo, per spinta della necessità o grazie al frutto dell'esperienza, e  
εὐρέθη δὲ Βακχίου / γλυκεῖα πηγὴ ... τὸν ἡγριωμένον / εἰς ἡμέρον δίαιταν ἡγαγον βίον. /  
Κάκ τοῦδε τοὺς θανόντας ὥρισεν νόμος / τύμβοις καλύπτειν κάπιμοιρᾶσθαι κόνιν /  
νεκροῖς ἀθάπτοις, μηδ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἔαν / τῆς πρόσθε θοίνης μνημόνευμα δυσσεβές<sup>22</sup>.

La vita selvaggia, l'ἡγριωμένον βίον nelle parole dello stesso Moschione, è quindi simile a quella delle bestie, caratterizzata dal vigore della legge del più forte, del cannibalismo e dall'incuranza del corpo dei defunti, tutte caratteristiche che potremmo analogicamente (e quindi arbitrariamente) assegnare agli Ἄγριοι di Ferecrate<sup>23</sup>; mentre il passaggio al vivere civile è segnato primariamente dall'uso della sepoltura e dalla tabuizzazione dell'«empio banchetto di un tempo». Questa ipotesi sembra avvalorata dalle ricerche di Lana, il quale ritiene che la descrizione della vita selvaggia dell'uomo presente in questi versi dipenda in qualche modo dal pensiero di Protagora<sup>24</sup>: anticamente l'uomo viveva in povertà di mezzi e si distaccò da questa condizione grazie all'aiuto di Prometeo, che donò la sapienza tecnica insieme al fuoco, e di Zeus, che successivamente concesse αἰδώς e δίκη e la possibilità per l'uomo di aggregarsi in πόλεις<sup>25</sup>; e sembra proprio che la dottrina di Protagora sottostia all'impalcatura concettuale degli Ἄγριοι, se un posto centrale nell'impianto dell'opera

---

<sup>22</sup> Per il frammento di Moschione cf. Gallo 1998, da cui cito i versi nel testo e riporto la traduzione: «i mortali vivevano una vita simile a quella delle fiere ... Prede di carne umana fornivano loro un cibo frutto di reciproco macello ... e il debole era pasto dei più forti» e «fu scoperta la dolce fonte di Bacco ... mutarono la vita selvaggia in maniera civile di vivere. E da allora una consuetudine stabilì che si riponessero in tombe i morti, che si assegnasse un pugno di polvere ai cadaveri insepolti e che non si lasciasse alla vista il ricordo del precedente empio banchetto».

<sup>23</sup> Significativo al riguardo il confronto con il frammento 14 K-A di Ferecrate, proveniente anch'esso dagli Ἄγριοι, in cui qualcuno è paragonato ad un polipo che di notte rosicchia i suoi stessi tentacoli, per cui cf. *comm. ad loc.*

<sup>24</sup> Lana 1973, p. 165, in part. n. 46: «I primi due versi [di Moschione] ... alludono allo scritto di Protagora περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως».

<sup>25</sup> Cf. il mito di Protagora in Plat. *Prot.* 320 c-322 d, considerato specchio fedele del pensiero del sofista circa l'origine della società umana in Lana 1973, p. 175.

è occupato dalla derisione del mito della fuga dalla civiltà nel paese di Cuccagna, in cui la natura avrebbe offerto senza fatica i suoi frutti alla mano dell'uomo<sup>26</sup>. Tutto ciò avvicina Ferecrate, tramite Protagora, a Moschione. Ulteriori deduzioni su un eventuale cannibalismo dei Selvaggi possono trovare ugualmente appoggio sulle rappresentazioni che i Greci offrivano a se stessi delle popolazioni non civilizzate e periferiche rispetto alla loro cultura; a queste tipiche figurazioni, come quelle che leggiamo in Erodoto<sup>27</sup>, potrebbe essersi conformata l'immagine che Ferecrate diede ai suoi ἄγριοι; per non parlare del divertente motivo del cannibalismo ben attestato e sfruttato in commedia<sup>28</sup>. Ma al di là di tutto ciò dobbiamo tener presente che i quattro versi del frammento ferecrateo, l'unico dato certo a nostra disposizione, non permettono di affermare con sicurezza altro che i Selvaggi, se avessero ucciso B, non l'avrebbero seppellito.

È possibile, a mio parere, che anche un'altra interpretazione, complementare alla precedente, connoti il frammento. L'ironia di A potrebbe far leva sulla convinzione di B, di derivazione orfica e forse menzionata nei versi precedenti, che i morti continuino a vivere felicemente una vita ultraterrena nella dimora di Ade o nelle Isole dei Beati. Se quindi dovesse morire, in verità non sarebbe un problema: continuerebbe a trascorrere la vita nell'Aldilà, Beato tra i Beati (μάκαρ, appunto) in un eterno

---

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Dupréel 1948, p. 34 n. 1; Lana 1973, pp. 164-165, 187-188 e 194; Dodds 1973, p. 10 n. 1; Farioli 2001, p. 184 (con qualche dubbio); Melero 2008, p. 246-254; e Plat. *Prot.* 327 d, in cui Protagora accenna proprio agli ἄγριοι messi in scena da Ferecrate come esempio di assoluta mancanza di civiltà al di fuori della πόλις: altro che paese di Cuccagna!

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Hdt. III, 38; IV, 26; per la gerontofagia I, 216 e III, 99; ma soprattutto IV, 106, in cui gli Androfagi ἀγριώτατα πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἔχουσι ἥθεα ... ἀνθρωποφαγέουσι δὲ μόννοι τούτων.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Telecl. 2 K-A, Athenio 1, 4-8 K-A, Men. *Dysc.* 122-125 e 467-468, segnalati in Conti Bizzarro 1987, p. 31.

simposio, come descritto nel frammento 504 di Aristofane e soprattutto nel frammento 113 K-A di Ferecrate. B dovrà ritenersi davvero Beato allora, se rischia di tuffarsi in una tal graziosa sorte, migliorando – ironicamente, si intende – la qualità della propria vita. Di nuovo, B risponde alle affermazioni di A rilanciando, senza abbattersi di fronte al pericolo imminente: sarà lui a seppellire gli avversari ma... a questo punto i Beati sarebbero gli altri. Questo costituisce un problema per B, che ribalta la prospettiva profilata da A: οὗτοι δὲ μακαριοῦσί με. Vediamo come è possibile risolvere l'*impasse*.

La scena ricorda da vicino, come notano Kassel e Austin nel commento, i versi 393-394 degli *Uccelli* aristofanei, a cui dobbiamo affiancare i versi 352-363 della stessa opera segnalati da Long<sup>29</sup>: in realtà si tratta di un'unica scena (vv. 336-405), quella dell'incontro di Pisetero ed Evelpide, l'eroe comico e la spalla, con il coro degli Uccelli, subito dopo il canto della parodo: dapprima il coro è ostile ai due ateniesi e si prepara ad attaccarli; ma in seguito, dietro le istanze di Upupa, trattiene la sua bile e si dispone ad ascoltare i nuovi ospiti. La scena si suddivide in tre fasi:

- vv. 336-365 – Pisetero ed Evelpide si preparano ad affrontare l'attacco degli Uccelli con espedienti comici quanto ridicoli. In particolare, Evelpide rimprovera Pisetero di averlo spinto a lasciare Atene (vv. 339-340: Αἴτιος μέντοι σὺ νῦν εἰ τῶν κακῶν τούτων μόνος. / Ἐπὶ τί γάρ μ' ἐκείθεν ἦγες;);

---

<sup>29</sup> Long 1978, pp. 381-382.

- vv. 366-382 – Upupa cerca di trattenere gli Uccelli dall’attaccare i due uomini e, dopo un battibecco serrato, li convince, perché dai nemici si impara molto più che dagli amici (con una γνώμη, quindi);
- vv. 383-405 – Pisetero ed Evelpide, sospettosi, iniziano ad abbassare la guardia. Il pericolo non è ancora scongiurato, cosicché Evelpide offre il destro a Pisetero per una battuta (vv. 393-395): Ἐτεὸν ἦν δ’ ἄρ’ ἀποθάνωμεν, / κατορυχισόμεσθα ποῦ γῆς; / (Pi.) Ὁ Κεραιμεικὸς δέξεται νό.

Ritengo interessante in proposito il commento di Grilli ai versi 393-399 sulla figura di Pisetero<sup>30</sup>: davanti a un pericolo mortale come l’attacco degli Uccelli, l’eroe comico menziona prima la spedizione del 416 contro Ornee, una località dell’Argolide (ma qui Ὀρνειαί è la “Città degli Uccelli”) presso la quale non ci furono né scontri né morti, poi invoca il funerale di Stato. La fantasia del personaggio richiama una battaglia in cui non è morto nessuno; ma nel caso estremo, se proprio fosse inevitabile soccombere, che almeno si possa approfittare del denaro pubblico grazie a un bel funerale di Stato! Ciò che muove la battuta è «l’idea di poter bilanciare l’involontaria erogazione della vita approfittando in qualche modo delle risorse pubbliche»; il tratto dell’eroe comico che Grilli evidenzia con maggior cura, infatti, è proprio la «resistenza all’erogazione», una pulsione irresistibile a cercare di avere (possibilmente secondo le regole, ma preferibilmente contro) senza dare... niente. La figura di Pisetero si oppone così al gruppo degli Uccelli, che si comportano da bravi soldati (v. 402) come il buon cittadino ateniese, e spicca come volontà di travalicare ogni limite imposto dalla vita comunitaria, cittadina e sociale, oltre ogni ragionevolezza, fino all’assurdo – e quindi, al

---

<sup>30</sup> Grilli 2006, pp. 56-57; ma tutto il paragrafo, alle pp. 47-58, merita di essere letto.

comico. La mia impressione è che il personaggio di Ferecrate si opponga in ugual misura tanto al morire quanto al fatto che μάκαρ possa essere qualcun altro oltre che lui. Non importa che quella di A possa essere solo una battuta; come Pisetero, B vuole tutto: nella scelta tra essere morto tra i Beati e vivo nella sciagurata condizione umana (non dimentichiamo che i personaggi sono a rischio di κατορύττεσθαι), pretende – a parole, si capisce – di essere vivo e μάκαρ. La sua risposta sorprenderebbe quindi παρ' ἀπροσδοκίαν tanto lo spettatore quanto l'altro personaggio e condivide quello spirito di vitalità originaria che permea la fisionomia letteraria dell'eroe comico e lo spinge, all'inizio di ogni commedia, a imbarcarsi in un'impresa titanica, che di regola coinvolge altri personaggi, per un puro e semplice interesse personale. Negli *Uccelli*, Evelpide rinfaccia a Pisetero di essere stato il motore dell'azione, trascinandolo quasi contro la sua volontà in un'avventura che non sta avendo un lieto fine (vv. 339-340); nel frammento di Ferecrate, A sembra riconoscere il pericolo, mentre B si pavoneggia con la sbruffoneria tipica dell'eroe comico e, probabilmente, sarà lui a spingere avanti l'intreccio della commedia (infatti, al verso 4, già si domanda come procurarsi bare adeguate ai suoi avversari). Sembra ragionevole, a mio avviso, riconoscere nei personaggi B ed A una coppia simile a quella composta da Pisetero ed Evelpide, l'eroe comico e il βωμολόχος<sup>31</sup>; o almeno una coppia di personaggi legati da una relazione non paritaria, dei quali l'uno ha un atteggiamento propositivo, combattivo, e l'altro è più restio, gli si oppone, dando luogo al battibecco registrato in questi versi.

In sintesi:

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf., in accordo, Quaglia 2001, p. 97 = Quaglia 2005, p. 122.

1. Una prima interpretazione si concentra su un criterio collettivo, il valore che la sepoltura ha per ogni cittadino ateniese. Nelle parole di A, B sarebbe beato già solo a venir seppellito, date le usanze autoctone con cui entrambi si confrontano. B ritiene invece che i Selvaggi finiranno per chiamarlo beato per aver insegnato loro l'usanza della sepoltura... seppellendoli.
2. Un'altra proposta interpretativa riguarda la sfera dell'autopercezione di B e si sovrappone alla prima. Nelle parole di A, se B morisse sarebbe Beato perché, raggiungendo i Μάκαρες, trascorrerebbe con loro la vita eterna in un mondo di abbondanza e privo di stenti, tutti i giorni banchettando a simposio. Secondo B, invece, che segue la spinta della propria pulsione alla vita, saranno i Selvaggi a morire e lo chiameranno comunque beato... in quanto vivo.

#### **4. LA MALIZIOSA SFUMATURA DI KATOPYTTΩ**

Un ulteriore legame tra il nostro frammento e la scena degli *Uccelli*, a dire il vero la ragione per cui Kassel e Austin citano la commedia aristofanea nel commento, è la ricorrenza, in entrambi, del verbo κατορύττω, forma attica di κατορύσσω. I due editori intendono segnalare l'analogia delle due scene, ma nel frammento di Ferecrate il verbo si presta ad assumere un'ulteriore sfumatura assente nel passo di Aristofane.

Henderson ritiene che ὀρύττειν e i suoi composti nascondano spesso doppi sensi di natura sessuale, come in *Nuvole* 714 (τὸν πρωκτὸν διορύττουσιν), *Pace* 372 (ταύτην ἀνορύττων), 898 (ὀρύττειν, πῶς ὁμοῦ καὶ τῷ πέει) e *Uccelli* 442-443 ((ΠΕ.) μήτ' ἄνορύττων).

ὀρύττειν (ΧΟ.) Οὐ τί που / τὸν (ΠΕ.) Οὐδαμῶς. Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τῷφθαλμῷ λέγω). In particolare, «κατορώρυχεν, to dig into the earth, is used autobiographically by the ravished Lady Music at Pherecr. 145,19 [= 155, 19 K-A]»<sup>32</sup>. Ed effettivamente, nel frammento di Ferecrate (tramandato nel Περὶ Μουσικῆς 30 = 1141 d-30, 1142 a dello Pseudo-Plutarco), la Musica è descritta dal testimone ἐν γυναικείῳ σχήματι, ὅλην κατηκισμένην τὸ σῶμα; e nei versi della citazione si lancia in prima persona a raccontare i torti e le ingiustizie subite dagli innovatori musicali del “Nuovo Ditirambo”, che si succedettero tra V e IV secolo, utilizzando espressioni che, «pur appartenendo alla terminologia musicale, tuttavia alludono in modo non ambiguo alla violenza sessuale»<sup>33</sup>. Arrivata a Timoteo, definito spregiativamente Μιλήσιός τις πυρρίας<sup>34</sup>, esclama: μ', ὦ φιλτάτη, κατορώρυχε / καὶ διακέκναικ' αἴσχιστα, lasciandosi andare a un duplice, malizioso doppio senso<sup>35</sup>.

Sulla base di questo confronto è possibile che nel nostro frammento la battuta iniziale di A alluda alla pratica sessuale resa fin troppo esplicita in *Nuvole* 714, a maggior ragione se la composizione con διὰ ο κατὰ risulta in un'intensificazione del valore già ambiguo di ὀρύττω. Se fosse così, l'uso di μακαρίζω al verso 1 da parte di A si vestirebbe di una connotazione del tutto profana, esternando quasi un desiderio di

<sup>32</sup> Henderson 1975, p. 168.

<sup>33</sup> Conti Bizzarro 1999, p. 135; nonché Henderson 1975, pp. 170, 175, 177, 180.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Ballerio 2000, p. 95 n. 202: «l'appellativo *pyrrías*, “dai capelli rossi”, reca una connotazione dispregiativa, in quanto il colore rosso dei capelli caratterizzava gli schiavi, precisamente quelli provenienti dal nord»; nonché lo *Schol. ad Ran.* 730: πυρρίαις· ἀντὶ τοῦ δούλοις. Ὅνομα γὰρ δούλου ὁ Πυρρίας ... ὁ μὲν πυρρὸς ἦν τὴν κόμην, segnalato in Conti Bizzarro 1999, p. 165.

<sup>35</sup> Kaibel, per accentuare la connotazione sessuale del passo, aveva proposto di emendare κατορώρυχε in διορώρυχε sulla base di Ar. *Nub.* 714; cf. Kassel-Austin 1989, p. 181, e Conti Bizzarro 1999, p. 163. Henderson 1975, p. 174, invece, nota la sfumatura erotica di διακναιῶ («referring to cunnilingus»), seguito da Conti Bizzarro 1999, p. 164: «κατορώρυχε e διακέκναικε costituiscono due momenti della *performance* di Timoteo, collocati con elegante *hysteron proteron*: evidentemente il primo verbo si riferisce al θεῖον χρῆμα (Archil., *fr.* 196a,15 West) e il secondo al *cunnilingus*».



κατορύττεσθαι al quale B ribatte pur senza comprendere il doppio senso che soggiace a quel termine<sup>36</sup>. Dobbiamo infatti escludere che la recisa risposta di B (Οὐ δῆτ', ἀλλ' ἐγὼ / τούτους πρότερον) sia volta a ristabilire per sé una posizione sessualmente dominante a causa della presenza, al verso 4, di ληνοὺς<sup>37</sup>. B non può aver inteso κατορύττω che nel suo significato primario di “seppellire”, ma questo, in fin dei conti, non è così importante: il pubblico ateniese sarà stato certo più scaltro di B nel cogliere il valore di malizia nascosto dietro al verbo, e mentre B volgeva la sua mente alla ricerca delle bare stava già scoppiando in una fragorosa risata.

## 5. AI ΛΗΝΟΙ: LE BARE “DIONISIACHE”

Il termine ληνός per indicare le “bare” è un *hapax* semantico in campo letterario e con questo significato compare solo in alcune iscrizioni funerarie di area dorica<sup>38</sup>. Il significato più comune, come abbiamo visto, è quello di “oggetto dalla forma concava”, che si adatta quindi a vari tipi di recipiente tra i quali spicca il torchio per pestare l'uva. Sono i lessicografi ad attestare il significato di “bara” anche per la sfera letteraria e fra questi, oltre al passo di Polluce testimone del frammento, si segnala Frinico, che nella sua Σοφιστική Προπαρασκευή (88, 8-10) spiega la *ratio* che lega i significati di per sé

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Urios Aparisi 1992, pp. 91-93.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. anche LSJ s.v. κατορύσσω, p. 930, in cui gli studiosi, dopo vari significati relativi a “scavare” e “seppellire”, traducono il lemma «*metaph., ruin utterly ... suppress*», segnalando il frammento 155, 19 K-A di Ferecrate. Tuttavia, sempre per la presenza di ληνοὺς al verso 4, tale sfumatura sembra meno pertinente.

<sup>38</sup> IG XIV, 150, 5 (Siracusa) e 871 (Cuma); CIG 1979 e 1981 (Tessalonica).

lontani di “torchio” e “bara”: Ληνούς· οὐ μόνον, ἐν αἷς τοὺς βότρυς πατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς τῶν νεκρῶν σορούς, ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμοιότητος τῆς κατασκευῆς<sup>39</sup>.

È necessario fin d’ora escludere che Ferecrate si riferisse alla ληνὸς Ἀσσία citata da Polluce, come ipotizzato da Conti Bizzarro<sup>40</sup>. Polluce ne parla un attimo prima di introdurre il frammento di Ferecrate e avrebbe specificato che la “bara di Asso” era menzionata *sia* da Erasto e Corisco *sia* da Ferecrate; invece, la correlazione τε ... τε è riferita all’uso di ληνός ed esclude questa possibilità. L’impiego di ληνός non avvalora quindi la tesi dell’allusione nel frammento alla presenza di antropofagi. È possibile, anzi, che al tempo di Ferecrate l’esistenza della ληνὸς Ἀσσία non fosse neanche nota ad Atene: il frammento di Erasto e Corisco citato da Polluce è l’attestazione più antica che abbiamo e costituisce un *terminus post quem* che risale a circa un secolo dopo Ferecrate<sup>41</sup>.

Ciò che colpisce in questo frammento è la somiglianza tra il termine scelto per designare la “bara”, ληνός, e il nome della festa in onore di Dioniso in cui furono rappresentati gli Ἄγριοι, le Λήναια. Viene spontaneo domandarsi se questa somiglianza non sia in qualche modo significativa<sup>42</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. anche Hesych. λ 886, Poll. III, 102 e VIII, 146, segnalati in Kassel-Austin 1989, p. 108, a conferma del significato di “bara”.

<sup>40</sup> Conti Bizzarro 1987, p. 32; possibilista Quaglia 2001, p. 98 = Quaglia 2005, p. 124; scettico Urios Aparisi 1992, pp. 93-94.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Diosc. med. V, 124 (I sec. d.C.): Ἀσσιον δὲ λίθον ... ἐκ τοῦ λίθου ... καὶ σοροὶ σαρκοφάγοι γίνονται; Cels. med. IV, 31, 7 (I sec. d.C.): lapis ... quem σαρκοφάγον Graeci vocant ... lapidi Assio; Plin. HN II, 211 (I sec. d.C.): lapis ... sarcophagus vocatur; e XXXVI, 131: sarcophagus lapis; e Aet. med. VII, 41 (VI sec. d.C.): λίθον σαρκοφάγον; segnalati in LSJ s.v. σαρκοφάγος, pp. 1584-1585.

<sup>42</sup> In quella stessa sede metrica (X -) Ferecrate avrebbe potuto tranquillamente impiegare τάφους o σορούς (~ -).

Bisogna premettere che i due termini non sembrano condividere la stessa radice etimologica: Chantraine ha opportunamente notato che l'*eta* di Ἀῆναι deve essere antica se il titolo dell'idillio XXVI di Teocrito, Ἀῆναι, non presenta l'*alfa* lunga<sup>43</sup>; lo stesso Teocrito infatti si riferisce al torchio per l'uva usando λᾱνός in VII, 25 e XXV, 28. Questo comporta una separazione tra quei termini etimologicamente connessi a Ἀῆναι, tra cui la festa dionisiaca delle Ἀήνια, e il gruppo che fa capo a ληνός: le Lenee non possono essere, quindi, la "festa del torchio". Lo stesso Chantraine vede però la possibilità di una connessione tra i due gruppi per mezzo di un'«*étymologie populaire*»: di fatto i Greci non avevano una scienza linguistica e si lasciavano sedurre dalle paretimologie più affascinanti; consideravano perciò le Lenee, la festa di Dioniso, come la "festa del torchio" e del vino.

Il termine ληνός, dati i suoi significati di "torchio" e "bara", rimanda tanto al vino quanto alla morte, relazione che ricorre come un nesso molto stretto all'interno della tradizione escatologica orfico-pitagorica. Ferecrate stesso, nel frammento 113 K-A, si dilunga per ben trentatré versi a descrivere la vita nell'Ade piena di gustosissimi cibi, vino in abbondanza e graziose fanciulle. La relazione vino-morte caratterizza anche la figura di Dioniso, a cui durante le Antesterie veniva offerto il vino dell'ultimo raccolto (si credeva infatti che le anime dei morti in quel giorno ritornassero sulla terra<sup>44</sup>): e Dioniso è proprio la divinità a cui erano dedicate le Lenee, la festa in occasione della quale furono rappresentati gli Ἀγριοί. Tutto ciò sembra confermare la plausibilità del rapporto tra il frammento ferecrateo, secondo l'analisi proposta per i primi tre versi, e

---

<sup>43</sup> Chantraine 1974, p. 637.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Velasco López 1992, p. 217.

questo tipo di tradizione, nella quale i morti continuano a vivere nell'Aldilà tra ricchi banchetti e delizie di ogni tipo.

Per quanto riguarda la situazione scenica invece, i due personaggi protagonisti del nostro frammento, giunti presso i Selvaggi e constatata la povertà del loro modo di vivere<sup>45</sup>, saranno rimasti piuttosto delusi rispetto alle aspettative che avevano al momento di lasciare Atene. Il vino sarà stato con tutta probabilità assente in quei luoghi remoti e, vista l'importanza che la bevanda di Dioniso riveste in alcune descrizioni di αὐτόματος βίος presenti in commedia<sup>46</sup>, questa sarà stata causa di grande delusione per i due ateniesi. È quindi possibile giustificare l'impiego di ληνός ipotizzando che B, deluso dalla mancanza di vino che sperava di trovare αὐτομάτως presso gli Ἄγριοι, lo desiderasse al punto da invocarlo tramite i ληνοί con cui intende seppellire i Selvaggi. La citazione di Polluce si conclude quindi con un verso in cui B si volge alla ricerca di bare per seppellire i suoi avversari; ma il termine che usa richiama alla mente un suo bisogno più intimo, una necessità più impellente: procurarsi del vino, al più presto.

Due ultime considerazioni riguardo al verso 4. Secondo Denniston, l'avverbio καίτοι «introduces an objection (often couched in interrogative form) of the speaker's own, which tends to invalidate, or cast doubt upon, what he has just said, or to make it

---

<sup>45</sup> Cf. in part. i frammenti 13-14 K-A e Kaibel *ap.* Kassel-Austin 1989, pp. 107-108.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Pherecr. 113, 30-31 e 137, 6; e Telecl. 1, 3-4 K-A, segnalati in Velasco López 1992, pp. 212-213; ma anche Crates 16, 7 K-A. Da notare che in Telecl. 1, 15 K-A gli uomini che vivevano nell'Età dell'Oro sono descritti come μέγα χρήμα γιγάντων; i Selvaggi di Ferecrate potrebbero aver condiviso questa caratteristica nonostante l'azione della commedia si svolgesse in una dimensione contemporanea all'Atene del V secolo.

appear surprising : or is, in general, opposed to it in tendency»<sup>47</sup>. B sembra quindi rendersi conto che la sua idea di seppellire i Selvaggi non è così semplice da realizzare (non è casuale, infatti, la presenza dell'attributo *τοσαύτας* accanto a *ληνοῦς*) e tende a ridimensionare la forza della propria convinzione<sup>48</sup>.

L'aggettivo *τοσοῦτος*, invece, sembra avere a che fare con la quantità più che con la qualità delle bare; quest'ultima sarebbe stata definita in maniera più accurata da *τηλικαύτας*. I Selvaggi con cui si scontrano A e B sono quindi numerosi, come gli Uccelli che si schierano contro Pisetero ed Evelpide, e nulla possiamo dedurre sulle loro dimensioni<sup>49</sup>.

## 6. LA COLLOCAZIONE DEL FRAMMENTO

L'analogia di quanto possiamo leggere nel frammento con i versi 336-405 degli *Uccelli*, in particolare con la terza fase della scena aristofanea (vv. 383-405), insieme alla inquietante vicinanza dei Selvaggi e alla possibilità di uno scontro dal quale i personaggi A e B potrebbero non uscire vivi, induce ad ipotizzare, negli *Ἄγριοι*, un contesto scenico simile a quello degli *Uccelli*, in cui l'eroe comico e la sua spalla (i

---

<sup>47</sup> Denniston 1954<sup>2</sup>, p. 556.

<sup>48</sup> Il suo intervento infatti era iniziato al verso 2 con οὐ δῆτα, che introduce «emphatic negative answers»; cf. Denniston 1954<sup>2</sup>, p. 274.

<sup>49</sup> Cf., sulla stessa linea, Bentley 1842, p. 288; Bothe 1855, p. 86; Conti Bizzarro 1987, p. 30; Ceccarelli 1992, p. 27 = Ceccarelli 2000, p. 456; Farioli 2001, p. 179; Melero 2008, p. 251; Storey 2011, p. 425. In disaccordo Quaglia 2001, pp. 91, 95 e 97 = Quaglia 2005, pp. 121-122, che traduce *τοσαύτας* con "tanto grandi"; mentre Edmonds 1957, p. 211, omette di tradurre il termine («Where to find 'em coffins is a mystery»).

personaggi B ed A) affrontano per la prima volta i Selvaggi. Il frammento 5 deve quindi essere ascritto ad una scena post parabatica, prima del vero e proprio agone<sup>50</sup>.

## 7. BIBLIOGRAFIA

### 7.1 EDIZIONI DEI FRAMMENTI DI FERECRATE

RUNKEL 1829

Martin Runkel, *Pherecratis et Eupolidis fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1829

MEINEKE 1839

August Meineke, *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*, vol. II, 1, *Fragmenta poetarum comoediae antiquae*, Berolini 1839

BOTHE 1855

Friedrich Heinrich Bothe, *Poetarum comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Parisiis 1855

KOCK 1880

Theodor Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*, vol. I, *Antiquae comoediae fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1880

---

<sup>50</sup> Difficile poter parlare di una vera e propria “*scène de bataille*” secondo la definizione di Mazon 1904, p. 174 (“*proagone*” in Zanetto 1987, p. 212), perché i versi del nostro frammento sono trimetri giambici che non si prestano alla struttura epirrematica che caratterizza l’agone e generalmente anche le *scènes de bataille*.

EDMONDS 1957

John Maxwell Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, vol. I, Leiden 1957

KASSEL-AUSTIN 1989

Rudolf Kassel e Colin Austin, *Poetae comici Graeci*, vol. VII, *Menecrates-Xenophon*,  
Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1989

STOREY 2011

Ian C. Storey, *Fragments of Old Comedy*, vol. II, *Diopithes to Pherecrates*,  
Cambridge (Massachusetts)-London (England) 2011

## 7.2 STUDI SU FERECRATE E LA COMMEDIA ANTICA

CECCARELLI 1992

Paola Ceccarelli, *Le monde sauvage et la cité dans la comédie ancienne*, "Études  
de Lettres" 1, 1992, pp. 23-37

CECCARELLI 2000

Paola Ceccarelli, *Life among the Savages and Escape from the City*, in D. Harvey e  
J. Wilkins (curr.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*,  
London 2000, pp. 453-471

CONTI BIZZARRO 1987

Ferruccio Conti Bizzarro, *Sugli Ἄγριοι di Ferecrate*, in U. Criscuolo (cur.), *Ταλαρίσκος. Studia Graeca Antonio Garzya sexagenario a discipulis oblata*, Napoli 1987, pp. 25-32

CONTI BIZZARRO 1999

Ferruccio Conti Bizzarro, *Poetica e critica letteraria nei frammenti dei poeti comici greci*, Napoli 1999

FARIOLI 2001

Marcella Farioli, *Mundus alter. Utopie e distopie nella commedia greca antica*, Milano 2001

GRILLI 2006

Alessandro Grilli, *Del falso in bilancio come chiave del successo*, in Aristofane, *Gli Uccelli*, a cura di A. Grilli, Milano 2006, pp. 7-108

HENDERSON 1975

Jeffrey Henderson, *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New Haven-London 1975

HENDERSON 2007

Aristophanes, *Fragments*, a cura di J. Henderson, Cambridge (Massachusetts)-London (England) 2007



KRAUS 1975

Walther Kraus, *Pherekrates*, in K. Ziegler e W. Sontheimer (curr.), *Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike*, vol. IV, *Nasidius-Scaurus*, München 1975, coll. 728-729

LONG 1978

Timothy Long, *Pherecrates' Savages: a Footnote to the Greek Attitude on the Noble Savage*, "The Classical World" 71, 1978, pp. 381-382

MAZON 1904

Paul Mazon, *Essai sur la composition des comédies d'Aristophane*, Paris 1904

MELERO 2008

Antonio Melero, *Los Salvajes (Ἄγριοι) de Ferécrates. ¿Eco de doctrinas sofísticas?*, in J. V. Bañuls, F. De Martino e C. Morenilla (curr.), *Teatro y sociedad en la Antigüedad Clásica. Las relaciones de poder en época de crisis*, Bari 2008, pp. 239-254

QUAGLIA 2001

Riccardo Quaglia, *Studi sulle commedie di Ferecrate*, diss. Genova 2001

QUAGLIA 2005

Riccardo Quaglia, *Studi su Ferecrate: I. Vita, opere, μῦθοι; II. Gli Ἄγριοι: un commento ai frammenti*, "Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Bari" XLVIII, 2005, pp. 99-170

URIOS APARISI 1992

Eduardo Urios Aparisi, *The Fragments of Pherecrates*, diss. Glasgow 1992

ZANETTO 1987

Aristofane, *Gli Uccelli*, a cura di G. Zanetto, introd. e trad. di D. Del Corno,  
Milano 1987

### 7.3 ALTRI STUDI CONSULTATI

BALLERIO 2000

Plutarco, *La Musica*, a cura di R. Ballerio, Milano 2000

BENTLEY 1842

Richard Bentley, *The Correspondence of Richard Bentley*, a cura di Ch.  
Wordsworth, London 1842

BETHE 1900

Erich Bethe, *Pollucis Onomasticon*, vol. I, libri I-V, Lipsiae 1900

BOISACQ 1916

Émile Boisacq, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque*, Heidelberg-  
Paris 1916

CHANTRAINE 1961<sup>2</sup>

Pierre Chantraine, *Morphologie historique du grec*, Paris 1961<sup>2</sup> (1945)

CHANTRAINE 1974

Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des mots*, vol. III, Α-Π, Paris 1974

DENNISTON 1954<sup>2</sup>

John Dewar Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954<sup>2</sup> (1934)

DE VRIES 1966

G. J. De Vries, *Remarks on a Greek Form of Address (ᾠ τᾶν)*, "Mnemosyne" XIX, 1966, pp. 225-230

DODDS 1973

Eric Robertson Dodds, *The Ancient Concept of Progress*, Oxford 1973

DUPRÉEL 1948

Eugène Dupréel, *Les Sophistes. Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus, Hippias*, Neuchâtel 1948

FRISK 1970

Hjalmar Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. II, Κρ-Ω, Heidelberg 1970

GALLO 1998

Italo Gallo, *Il fr. 6 Sn.-K. di Moschione: una teoria 'laica' dell'umano progresso nella tragedia ellenistica*, "Eikasmos" IX, 1998, pp. 107-119

HOFMANN 1950

Johann Baptist Hofmann, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen*, München 1950

LANA 1973

Italo Lana, *Le dottrine di Protagora e di Democrito intorno all'origine dello Stato*, in *Studi sul pensiero politico classico*, Napoli 1973, pp. 157-194

MAAS 1979

Paul Maas, *Metrica greca*, a cura di A. Ghiselli, Firenze 1979<sup>2</sup> (1976); trad. di *Griechische Metrik*, Leipzig-Berlin 1929<sup>3</sup> (1923)

REALE 1986<sup>4</sup>

Giovanni Reale, *Introduzione a Aristotele*, Roma-Bari 1986<sup>4</sup> (1974)

SEBER 1608

Wolfgang Seber, *Iulii Pollucis Onomasticon*, Francofurti 1608

SNELL 1977

Bruno Snell, *Metrica greca*, a cura di F. Bornmann, Firenze 1977; trad. di *Griechische Metrik*, Göttingen 1962<sup>3</sup> (1955)

VELASCO LÓPEZ 1992

Maria de Henar Velasco López, *Le vin, la mort et les Bienheureux (à propos des lamelles orphiques)*, "Kernos" 5, 1992, pp. 209-220, <http://kernos.revues.org>

**Kostas Apostolakis (University of Kreta)**  
**Timokles fr. 12 and 14**

## TIMOCLES

### Ἡρώες (*Hērōes*, “The Heroes”)

Date: 341 B.C.

Bibliography: Meineke 1839-57 II.1: 396; Kock 1880-88: II:457; Bevilacqua 1939:57; Edmonds 1959:611; *PCG* VII 1989: 764-6 ; Harding 1994:210-18; Nesselrath 1997:275-6; Hajdu 2002:40; Henderson 2007:257; Worman 2008:231-74; Bers 2009: 52-3; MacDowell 2009:354; Konstantakos 2011 (forthcoming); Apostolakis 2012 (forthcoming)

Plays with the same title were written by Chionides, Crates, Aristophanes and Philimo. Diphilus and Menander wrote Ἡρώα, Epigenes Ἡρώϊνν. Unlike, however, the aristophanic play (frs. 310-330 K-A), where “the Chorus consisted of heroes, perhaps separately identified” (Henderson 2007:257), the title in Timocles’ comedy does not seem to denote a Chorus in such a late period. In the survived fragments two Athenian politicians, Demosthenes and Aristomedes, are satirized. The political context is that of late 340s in Athens, where the prevailing controversies between pro- and anti-Macedonians occurred in the Assembly. It has been suggested, therefore, that eminent contemporary orators/politicians are presented as ‘heroes’: cf. Kock (1884: 457): “fortasse Heroes dicit viros tum in administranda republica primarios”.

In order to interpret this resurgence of political satire around 340’s in Timocles poetry, we should take into account that this was a period of a major conflict between pro- and anti-Macedonians inside Athens. In many ways, the political ambiance was similar to that in the final decades of the fifth century, when the Peloponnesian War and the associated controversies enriched comedy. Timocles’ times were thus highly suited to a type of satire not very

different from the spirit of Aristophanic Comedy.<sup>1</sup>

As concerns the material of Timocles' satire, he appears to draw on the inexhaustible riches of contemporary oratory. Whereas personal abuse declines in the comedy of the fourth century, it still remains in forensic and political controversies. In late fourth century speeches of political interest, rivals are systematically pilloried and their private lives held up to scrutiny by the voracious Athenians. It seems that the strongest abuse occurs in forensic speeches which perpetuate a political dispute.<sup>2</sup> The leaders of the pro-Macedonians and the anti-Macedonians, Aeschines and Demosthenes respectively, were the best known and apparently the most abusive orators of their time. Particularly in the speeches *On the Crown* (Dem.18.256-66) and *On the False Embassy* (Aeschin.3.168-76), the vitriolic attacks they launch against each other are not inferior to analogous comic methods in their inventiveness and fantasy.<sup>3</sup> One could therefore suppose that dramatists like Timocles came under the influence of contemporary oratory, which provided them with rich material and offered various opportunities for immediate iambic abuse and parody. Aeschines, in particular, the leader of pro-Macedonian orators, seems to have inspired Timocles in some of his vitriolic attacks against Demosthenes.

---

<sup>1</sup> It would also appear that the interest in Old Comedy was rekindled in the same period; we have evidence that an 'old comedy' (παλαιὸν δράμα) was reproduced in the City Dionysia in 339. It has been suggested that the revival of personal abuse (ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν) in the age of Timocles, though sporadic, may be connected with a possible 're-discovery' of Old Comedy in this late era. I. Konstantakos (2011, forthcoming), believes that dramatists such as Mnesimachos and Timocles discovered Aristophanes' texts in some way, and experimented with his techniques. Moreover, the same author suspects that this imitation of Old Comedy inspired the idea of producing original works from that time at the Dionysia.

<sup>2</sup> See Bers 2009:52-3; cf. also the 'iambic' abuse launched against Aristogeiton, Worman 2008, 230-1.

<sup>3</sup> See especially Worman 2008: 231-74; Harding 1994: 210-8.



Moreover, Timocles includes in his satire not only straight out shots against anti-Macedonians orators, but also a kind of more subtle and more implicit satire, with innuendos, political allegories, and meta-theatrical plays. This kind of satire may be explained by an eclectic relationship between himself, who as a comic poet was familiar with theatrical effects, and the major orators of his time, who were distinguished in the rhetorical delivery (*hypokrisis*). Demosthenes' appreciation of delivery and relevant artistry is well attested through different sources.<sup>4</sup> It is also said that he improved his voice and other parameters of his *hypokrisis* by daily practice and special exercises (Plut. *Dem.*7), and that he was a student of the actors Satyros (Plut.*Dem.* 7.6) and Andronikos (Plut. *Vit. or.*845 A-B, cited below; Quint.*Inst.Or.* 11.7.3). Aeschines, on the other hand, Demosthenes' major rival, was a natural performer, with an excellent voice, and an actor from his beginnings (cf. *Dem.*18.180).<sup>5</sup> He was fond of comparing the forensic podium with stage; in a famous passage he invites the audience to imagine that they are not in court but in a theater (Aeschin.3.153). Besides, he mocks repeatedly Demosthenes' 'bewitching rhetoric', as Timocles does in *Heroes* (see below). It seems therefore that Timocles' satire is in tune with contemporary pro-Macedonian rhetoric, especially that of Aeschines.

In *Heroes* it is possible to trace some hints of Demosthenes' *hypokrisis*. The first is in his description as a Briareos, who swallows spears and catapults and has a fighting look (fr.12); the second in the fr.14, where apparently Demosthenes' attack on Aristomedes is parodied. Timocles obviously felt that the transference from the oratorical podium and parody on stage of recognizable rhetorical and theatrical effects of the current oratory would

---

<sup>4</sup> Plut. *Vit.or.*845 A-B καὶ δὴ πιστεύσαντα τὸν Δημοσθένη παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῷ Ἀνδρονίκῳ. ὅθεν ἐρομένου αὐτὸν <τινος> τί πρῶτον ἐν ῥητορικῇ, εἶπεν 'ὑπόκρισις'· καὶ τί δεύτερον 'ὑπόκρισις'· καὶ τί τρίτον 'ὑπόκρισις'. Cf. Cic. *De Orat.* 3.213.

<sup>5</sup> See Worman (2008: 239).

both support his artistic success and at the same time invalidate the content and the mainstream messages of the anti-Macedonian propaganda.

The fr. 12 contains a clear reference to ‘Halonnese debate’, which had been conducted at Athens in 342. The fr. 14 alludes to Demosthenes’ attack against Aristomedes in the Fourth Philippic, a speech which most probably was delivered early in 341, since it is said that the Athenians had not intervened at Oreos against Philip, and the Athenians finally liberated Oreos at the end of 342 (see Hajdu 2002:40; MacDowell 2009:354). This is, therefore, our *terminus post quem*. Bevilacqua (1939: 57) believes that the whole fragment and especially the polemical expressions «ὁ τοὺς καταπάλλας ἐσθίων» and «Ἄρη βλέπων» fit well with the “l’influenza dell’ energica violenza che infiamma la Terza Filippica”, and dates the play in 340. It seems to me that the parody of Demosthenes and Aristomedes in this play is compatible with the events and the political ambiance of early 341, and therefore I would date *Heroes* in the spring of this year, shortly after the delivery of the Fourth Philippic. See also Edmonds (1959: 611) and Nesselrath (1997: 275-6), who does not rule out 340.

The overall theme of the play is difficult to reconstruct. It seems, however, that Timocles often uses mythological figures allegorically, as a vehicle for his political satire. Cf. fr. 19 K-A (CGFP 222<sup>b</sup>) from the play *Icarian Satyrs*, where the satire of the same Aristomedes includes a pun to Tereus and Prokne, and also Autocles is called Marsyas; cf. also the title *Demosatyroi*, (fr.5 K-A), where contemporary submissive demagogues are satirized (cf. Meineke 1839: 396). For a possible reconstruction of the scene in fr. 14, see below.

#### 12 K-A (=12 K)

(A.) οὐκοῦν κελεύεις νῦν με πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ  
τὰ προσόντα φράζειν. (B.) πάνυ γε. (A.) δράσω τοῦτό σοι.

καὶ πρῶτα μὲν σοι παύσεται Δημοσθένης  
 ὀργιζόμενος. (B.) ὁ ποῖος; (A.) +ὁ Βριάρεως,  
 ὁ τοὺς καταπάλτας τάς τε λόγχας ἐσθίων,  
 μισῶν λόγους ἄνθρωπος οὐδὲ πώποτε  
 ἀντίθετον εἰπὼν οὐδέν, ἀλλ' Ἄρη βλέπων.

1 με Elmsey ad Ar. Ach. 963: μετὰ A    2 φράζειν; Cobet qui personas dist.  
 De arte interpr. p.64    3 καὶ om. CE    μὲν σοι ACE: μέντοι Elmsey:  
 μὲν δὴ Kaibel    Δημοσθένης ACE: σοι Βριάρεως Elmsey    4 ὁ ποῖος;  
 ::ὁ ποῖος; ὁ Meineke Cur. Crit. P.24, ὁ ποῖος, :: ὁποῖος; ὁ Dobree Adv. II p.309  
 (recepit Meineke ed. Min.) : ὁ ποῖος οὗτος Elmsey    Βριάρεως    ACE:    ως;  
 Elmsey (vid. ad 3): βριαρός Dindorf    5 καταπάλτας    Herw. Mnem. 19  
 (1891) 207: -πέλτας ACE (vid. ad Mnesim. Fr. 7,9)    6    βλέπων    AE:  
 κλέπτων C (sic punctis supra λ positis)

(A). *I see what you mean; you ask me to tell anything except what is appropriate.*(B.)*Just the thing!* (A).*I will do it for your sake. This is the first: Demosthenes will stop being angry with you.* (B). *Who Demosthenes?* (A) *Briareos, who swallows catapults and spears, this hater of discourse, who never used a single antithesis, this sort with the martial stare.*

Athen. VI p.223D ἀποδίδομέν σοι τὰ τῶν δειπνοσοφιστῶν λείψανα καὶ οὐ δίδομεν, ὡς ὁ Κοθωκίδης φησὶ ῥήτωρ Δημοσθένην χλευάζων, ὃς Φιλίππου Ἀθηναίοις Ἀλόννησον διδόντος συνεβούλευε μὴ λαμβάνειν, εἰ δίδωσιν ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀποδίδωσιν . ὅπερ Ἀντιφάνης ἐν Νεοττίδι παιδιὰν θέμενος ἐρεσχηλεῖ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον · (fr. 167 K-A) ... Ἀλεξίς δὲ ἐν Στρατιώτῃ· (fr. 212 K-A) ... καὶ ἐν Ἀδελφοῖς (fr. 7 K-A) ... Ἀναξίλας δὲ ἐν Εὐανδρίᾳ (fr. 8 K-A) ... Τιμοκλῆς δ' ἐν Ἡρώσιν (T. πού φησι CE, om. V.1-2) · οὐκοῦν – βλέπων.

*I am giving back the leftovers of the deipnosophists to you, Timocrates, and not simply giving them to you, as the orator from Cothoce says, deriding Demosthenes, who admonished the Athenians not to deny Philip's offer, if he is simply giving it to them and not giving back. Antiphanes in The Nestling in a playful manner jokes that way (fr. 167 K- A); also Alexis Brothers (fr. 7 K-A)..., Anaxilas in Manliness (fr.8 K-A)... and Timocles in Heroes; I see-martial stare.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Casaubon 1612: 249; Schwighaeuser 1802:279; Meineke 1839-57, II.1, 396; Dindorf 1855: 1434,62 ; Pickard-Cabridge 1900:102; Breitenbach 1908: 36-7; Coppola 1929, 454; Denniston 1934:371 ; Bevilacqua 1939: 57; Edmonds 1959:612-3; West 1966:210; Webster 1970, 45; Davies 1971: n.2108; Wankel 1976: 410-11; Tsitsirides 1998: 146-7; Casolari 2003: 98-112; Olson 2008a:11; Worman 2008:213-56; MacDowell 2009: 354; Papachrysostomou 2008, 210-6 ; Papachrysostomou 2009, 189; Konstantakos 2000:140-4; Apostolakis 2012 (forthcoming).

Athenaeus cites the fragment in a convivial context, where the reference to the slogan *dounai-apodounai* appears as a sympotic reciprocal offer to the fellow-dinner Timocrates.<sup>6</sup> This rhetorical effect inspired Timocles and three more playwrights of his time, Antiphanes, Alexis and Anaxilas.<sup>7</sup> The story, however, is totally political and may also be indicative of Timocles' inclination for political satire, since he is the only poet who exploits this emblematic formulation in a political context, more generally critical of Demosthenes' bellicose rhetoric, whereas the remaining poets allude to this in

---

<sup>6</sup> See Whitmarsh (2000: 304-15).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Eust. *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* 1.83 ( 1434,62 Dindorf) τοῖς μέντοι κωμικοῖς οἷα ἐχορήγησε παίγνια τὸ Δημοσθενικὸν ἀποδοῦναι, ἱστορεῖ σὺν ἑτέροις καὶ ὁ Ἀθήναιος. See Konstantakos (2000:140-4).

recognition contexts, typical of Middle (and New) Comedy.<sup>8</sup>

As is to be expected, the lion's share of Timocles' satire against orators goes to Demosthenes, the most influential orator of the anti-Macedonian party. Demosthenes was probably first satirized by Timocles on account of the so-called Halonnesos affair, concerning a small island formerly belonging to Athens that had been overrun by pirates. In 342 Philip expelled the pirates and offered to give the island to the Athenians, in a possible attempt to dispel the discontent arising from the terms of the peace that Philocrates achieved a few years earlier (346). It would seem that Philip's offer was announced in a letter delivered to the Assembly by his envoys. In the ensuing discussion, Demosthenes rejected the offer as hypocritical, claiming instead that Philip should not give (δοῦναι) the island but return it (ἀποδοῦναι), since it belonged to Athens *de iure*. It is quite possible that this rhetorical invention, formulated in a rhetorical figure known as *epanorthosis*, became a slogan among anti-Macedonian orators, but Demosthenes was obviously credited with coining it.<sup>9</sup> Though the dispute was primarily a matter of prestige, it certainly did have a political dimension to it, since satisfaction of Demosthenes' demand could have triggered similar claims over territories that previously belonged to Athens (most notably Amphipolis), leading to a Macedonian defeat in the political arena.

The fragment includes a dialogue between two characters. The two interlocutors are here participating in a peculiar game whose basic premise is

---

<sup>8</sup> Timocles also seems to parody this expression in another non-political context from the play *Καύνιοι*, in reference to the parasite Tithymallos (fr. 20 K-A οὐκ ἀπεκαρτέρησε γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ' ἐκαρτέρησ' ὧ φίλτατε, πεινῶν).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. [Dem.] 7.6-7 ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδ' ἐκεῖνό γε λανθάνει αὐτόν, ὅτι δι' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ὀνομάτων, ὅποτέρῳ ἂν χρῆσθε, ὑμεῖς ἔξετε τὴν νῆσον, ἂν τε λάβητε ἂν τ' ἀπολάβητε. τί οὖν αὐτῷ διαφέρει, μὴ τῷ δικαίῳ ὀνόματι χρησάμενον ἀποδοῦναι ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ δωρεὰν δεδωκέναι, τῷ ἀδίκῳ; Cf. Aeschin. 3.83; Plut. *Dem.* 9.6; Dem. 18.69; see Wankel (1976:410-11).

to describe a subject (here a person), using qualities which are the very opposite of those it actually possesses. This is the kind of ironic device classified in some rhetorical handbooks as κατ' ἀντίφρασιν (Quint. *Inst. or.* 9,2,47).<sup>10</sup> Demosthenes is here described as a warlike giant (Βριάρεως), who hates speech (μισόλογος) and rhetorical figures. But in the context of the play of irony, the spectator is invited to substitute the elements of the description with their opposites, in order to arrive at the true qualities of the orator. Demosthenes, then, this fervent champion of war, is in fact a false Briareos, a battle-dodger, a coward and a braggart *miles gloriosus*, who exhausts his combative spirit by uttering warlike cries against the Macedonian king.<sup>11</sup>

This particular fragment recalls a scene by Mnesimachos, another Middle Comedy playwright, in which a character boasts of his tough military training by claiming that he eats sharpened swords for dinner, swallows live firebrands, chews shattered javelin fragments and wears catapults as garlands: *Philippos* fr. 7 K- Α ἄρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι πρὸς ἄνδρας ἐστὶ σοι μάχη, οἱ τὰ ξίφη δειπνοῦμεν ἡκονημένα, ὄψον δὲ δᾶδας ἡμμένας καταπίνομεν; / ἐντεῦθεν εὐθύς ἐπιφέρει τραγήματα / ἡμῖν ὁ παῖς μετὰ δεῖπνον ἀκίδας Κρητικάς, ὥσπερ ἐρεβίνθους, δορατίων τε λείψανα / κατεαγόντ', ἀσπίδας δὲ προσκεφάλαια καὶ θώρακας ἔχομεν, πρὸς ποδῶν δὲ σφενδόνας / καὶ τόξα, καταπέλταισι δ' ἐστεφανώμεθα. According to Meineke, the character speaking is Philip.<sup>12</sup> If this stands, Timocles takes the image of a hardened warrior and ironically applies it to Demosthenes. But it seems more fruitful to follow Breitenbach's opinion that the words are spoken by Demosthenes

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Anaximenes, *Rh. Al.* 21 Εἰρωνεία δὲ ἐστὶ λέγειν τι μὴ λέγειν προσποιούμενον ἢ ἐν τοῖς ἐναντίοις ὀνόμασι τὰ πράγματα προσαγορεύειν. See Anderson (2000 :23, s.v. ἀντίφρασις). Cf. also in this comedy one more word-play, typical of Middle Comedy, in fr. 13, where a *trapeza* is described with periphrasis.

<sup>11</sup> According to Plutarch (*Dem.* 9.5), a comic poet called Demosthenes ῥωποπερηγήθραν ("empty braggart talk"). See Webster (1970: 45, n.3), who notes that this peculiar word is "in Timocles' manner".

<sup>12</sup> See also Webster (1970: 45; Coppola (1929: 454); and recently Konstantakos 2011.

himself, who boasts on stage that he has for an appetite Philip's military innovations like catapults.<sup>13</sup> This explanation, I think, is corroborated by the expression "this (i.e. well-known) warlike Briareos", an expression which recalls the equivalent scene in the Mnesimachos' play. It is noteworthy that in [Lucianus] *Dem. Enc.* 38, Demosthenes' anti-macedonian rhetoric is compared with battering rams and catapults which overpower Philip's plans: ...Δημοσθένους, οὗ γε καὶ τοὺς λόγους ὥσπερ κριοὺς ἢ καταπέλτας Ἀθήνηθεν ὀρμωμένους διασείειν αὐτοῦ καὶ ταράττειν τὰ βουλευόμενα.

Timocles' satire also has something of the flavor of Old Comedy, bringing to mind a fragment by Hermippos in which warlike rhetoric is ascribed to Pericles. He is portrayed as being an advocate of war against the Peloponnesians, though in fact he was a proverbial coward who avoided any battle: Hermipp. fr. 47 K –Α βασιλεῦ σατύρων, τί ποτ' οὐκ ἐθέλεις / δόρυ βαστάζειν, ἀλλὰ λόγους μὲν περὶ τοῦ πολέμου δεινοὺς παρέχεις, / ψυχὴ δὲ Τέλητος ὕπεστιν; This passage is considered as an intertextual comment in Cratinos' *Dionysalexandros* (see *Hypothesis* v. 31-33 and fr. 45 K-A), where Dionysos (Pericles' persona) is transformed into a ram, in order to save his skin during the Achaean invasion.<sup>14</sup>

The expression ἀντίθετον εἰπὼν οὐδὲν is a transparent allusion to the debate concerning the Halonnesos issue and the relative rhetoric, mainly launched by Demosthenes. However this passage does not seem to exhaust its satirical vigor in this particular matter. Specifically, this fragment is a satirical comment not only on the content of the Demosthenic rhetoric, but also on the performance (*hypokrisis*), a crucial parameter of which is eyes, in the sense that they reveal orator's feelings.<sup>15</sup> In v.7 Demosthenes' warlike and passionate

<sup>13</sup> Breitenbach (1908, 36-7); see also Papachrysostomou (2008: 210-6 and 2009: 189).

<sup>14</sup> For the play *Dionysalexandros* see Casolari (2003: 98-112), with additional bibliography.

<sup>15</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 3.222 oculi sunt, quorum tum intentione, tum remissione, tum coniectu, tum hilaritate motus animorum significemus apte cum genere ipso orationis.

rhetoric is in tune with his martial stare (*ἄρη βλέπων*). This supposedly warlike face is indeed suitable for theatrical effect, and may have been portrayed by the mask of Lamachos in Ar. *Ach.* 566 *ἀστραπὴν βλέπων*, “whose eyes flash lightning”; cf. Ar. *Birds* 1169 *πυρρίχην βλέπων* “he has a fighting look”).

Voice is another element of *hypokrisis*. In this fragment Demosthenes is said that he swallows spears and catapults. This special ability recalls a conjurer who uses skill to impress and deceive his spectators. As the conjurer’s main instrument is in this instance his mouth, by which he swallows Philip’s weapons, so Demosthenes uses his voice to utter warlike and rabble-rousing speeches.<sup>16</sup>

But why Demosthenes is described by Timocles as a coward politician? We should not consider that this fragment alludes to the usual slander against Demosthenes about his desertion from Chaeroneia in 338 (Aeschin.1.152; Plut. *Dem.* 20.2), since the expression *ἀντίθετον εἰπὼν οὐδὲν* would not be relevant. We must take into account the historical and political conjuncture and the contemporary oratory around 342 (the *terminus post quem* for the staging of *Heroes*) Specifically, in the summer of 343, Demosthenes indicted Aeschines, in an attempt to dissociate himself from the disastrous results of the Philocratean peace agreements. For this trial he composed his speech *On the False Embassy* (Dem.19), and Aeschines defended himself with a homonymous speech preserved in his corpus (Aeschin.3). In this speech Aeschines castigates Demosthenes for provocative intransigence and prejudice against Philip’s proposals, arguing that he is not genuinely interested in the city, but only in rhetorical pyrotechnics: Aeschin. 3.83 *Ἀλόννησον ἐδίδου (Φίλιππος) · ὁ δ' (Δημοσθένης) ἀπηγόρευε μὴ*

---

<sup>16</sup> Cic. *De Or.*3.224 Ad actionis autem usum atque laudem maximam sine dubio partem vox obtinet. See Worman (2008:213-56).



λαμβάνειν, εἰ δίδωσιν, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀποδίδωσι, περὶ συλλαβῶν διαφερόμενος. Moreover, he argues that Demosthenes exercises an irresistible and deceptive influence on the Athenian audience, calling him 'a magician and a charmer' (μάγον καὶ γόην), a characterization which recalls Timocles' description as a conjurer. This is in line with Demosthenes' description by the pro-Macedonians orators: cf. Aeschin. 2.4 Ἐφοβήθη μὲν γάρ, καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν τεθορύβημαι μὴ τινες ὑμῶν ἀγνοήσωσί με ψυχαγωγηθέντες τοῖς ἐπιβεβουλευμένοις καὶ κακοήθεσι τούτοις ἀντιθέτοις.<sup>17</sup>

The pro-Macedonian rhetoric also includes an incident which is of special interest. According to Aeschines, when came Demosthenes' turn to speak in front of Philip, all expected to hear a masterpiece of eloquence, since his excessive and arrogant promises had already been reported to Macedonian king. But, against all expectations, Demosthenes managed only to stammer out a few introductory words and then collapsed. Philip attempted to encourage him, telling that he was not an actor, so his collapse was not an irretrievable catastrophe, but Demosthenes broke down again.

Aeschin.2.34-5 οὕτω δὲ ἀπάντων διακειμένων πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν, φθέγγεται τὸ θηρίον τοῦτο προοίμιον σκοτεινόν τι καὶ τεθηγκὸς δειλία, καὶ μικρὸν προαγαγὼν ἄνω τῶν πραγμάτων, ἐξαίφνης ἐσίγησε καὶ διηπορήθη, τελευτῶν δὲ ἐκπίπτει τοῦ λόγου. Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Φίλιππος ὡς διέκειτο, θαρρεῖν τε παρεκελεύετο καὶ μὴ νομίζειν, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις, διὰ τοῦτο οἶσθαί τι πεπονθέναι...

It is quite possible, in my opinion, that Timocles' fragment is a comment of this incident, which would have been fresh in the minds of spectators, and

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. 3.137 Ἀλλ' οἶμαι οὔτε Φρυνώνδας οὔτε Εὐρύβατος οὔτ' ἄλλος οὐδεὶς πώποτε τῶν πάλοι πονηρῶν τοιοῦτος μάγος καὶ γόης ἐγένετο; Din. 1.66 ... ἐάν, ὃ μὴ γένοιτο, παρακρουσθῇθ' ὑπὸ τῆς τούτου γοητείας; 1.92 οὐ προετέον ἐστὶν ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι ταῖς τοῦ μαροῦ καὶ γόητος τούτου δεήσεσιν, οὐδὲ προσδεκτέον τοὺς οἴκτους καὶ τοὺς φενακισμοὺς <τοὺς> τούτου;

therefore suitable for satire one year later.

Demosthenes /Briareos, therefore, who supposedly swallows Philip's catapults, within the play of irony is implicitly understood as a coward diplomat, who was overcome by fear before the real king (τεθνηκώς δειλία). If this connection stands, then the satire of Demosthenic *hypokrisis* is influenced by Aeschines and the way the latter represents Demosthenes. It is noteworthy that, according to Aeschines, Philip himself attempts to encourage Demosthenes by telling him that he is not at theater (ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις). Here also we have another allusion by Aeschines to a (deceitful) theatrical performance of his political opponent, which has so a strong influence on Athenians. In conclusion, through the play of contradictions, this particular fragment of Timocles alludes on the one hand to the theatrical and deceptive rhetoric of Demosthenes before his fellow citizens, and on the other to his failure at crucial moments of his diplomatic missions. Demosthenes, therefore, is neither a trustworthy orator, nor an effective diplomat.

**Metre:** iambic trimeter.

**2 πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ προσόντα]** It seems like a parody of a rhetorical exercise, which derives from the epideictic oratory. Here the προσόντα ("quae ad rem proxime pertinent", Schweighaeuser 1802: 279) should be excluded, and only τὰ μὴ προσόντα be included. Cf. Gorgias *Hel.* 82 B 6 p.285, 10 D-K. τί γὰρ ἀπὴν τοῖς ἀνδράσι τούτοις ὧν δεῖ ἀνδράσι προσεῖναι; τί δὲ καὶ προσῆν ὧν οὐ δεῖ προσεῖναι; Pl. *Menex.* 235A, οἱ οὕτως καλῶς ἐπαινοῦσιν, ὥστε καὶ τὰ προσόντα καὶ τὰ μὴ περὶ ἐκάστου λέγοντες ... γοητεύουσιν ἡμῶν τὰς ψυχάς; Isoc. 11.4 δεῖ τοὺς μὲν εὐλογεῖν τινὰς βουλομένους πλείω τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀγαθῶν αὐτοῖς προσόντ' ἀποφαίνειν, τοὺς δὲ κατηγοροῦντας τὰναντία τούτων ποιεῖν; 12.85;

Anaximenes *Rh. Al.* 3,1 συλλήβδην μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἐγκωμιαστικὸν εἶδος προαιρέσεων καὶ πράξεων καὶ λόγων οἰκείωσις καὶ μὴ προσόντων συνοικείωσις. Cf. also *Ar. Ach.* 373-4 ἐάν τις αὐτοὺς εὐλογῇ καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀνὴρ ἀλαζών καὶ δίκαια κᾶδικα. See Tsitsirides (1998: 146-7).

πάνυ γε] cf. *Ar. Eccl.* 760.

δράσω τοῦτό σοι] cf. *Ar. fr.* 661 K-A τί δὲ σοὶ δράσω;

4 ὁ ποῖος; (A.) +ὁ Βριάρεως] The text is corrupt. Olson (2008a: 11), in translating ‘the son of Briareos’, obviously adopts the text ‘ὁ Βριάρεω’ (genitive). This could be right, if the particular orator is compared in some way but not identified with the giant.

Here also it seems that the orator Demosthenes is described in an aristophanic way, like the bellicose Lamachos in *Ar. Ach.* 960-3 Λάμαχος ... ὁ ποῖος οὗτος Λάμαχος; / ὁ δεινός, ὁ ταλαύρινος...; Elmsey’s correction ὁ ποῖος οὗτος demands the unnecessary correction of the transmitted Δημοσθένης into Βριάρεως in line 3, as the cited passage indicates; cf. also *Thesm.* 29-30 Ἀγάθων... ποῖος οὗτος Ἀγάθων; *Pherecr.* 155. 19-21 K-A ὁ δὲ Τιμόθεος... ποῖος οὗτος ὁ Τιμόθεος; *Eur. IT* 1318 sq Ὁρέστην .../... τὸν ποῖον; It seems slightly better Dobree’s ὁ ποῖος:: ὁποῖος,, printed by Pickard-Cabridge (1900:102). But, in any case, the passage remains a *locus desperatus*.

Briareos was a giant, who had a hundred hands and fifty heads. He was born by *Ouranos* and *Gaia*. His name probably derives from *βριαρός* “strong”; cf. *Hesiod. Theog.* 147-9 ἄλλοι δ’ αὖ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο/ τρεῖς παῖδες μεγάλοι <τε> καὶ ὄβριμοι, οὐκ ὀνομαστοί,/ Κόττος τε Βριάρεώς τε Γύγης θ’, ὑπερήφανα τέκνα. It is said that this was his divine name, the human being Aigaion. See West (1966:210). It is also said that when Juno, Neptune and Minerva attempted to dethrone Zeus, Briareos assisted his father by ascending the heavens, sitting beside him and terrified

the conspirators by his horrifying look (Hom. *Il.* 1.404-7). It seems, therefore, that, in describing Demosthenes as Briareos, the speaker in this fragment emphasizes on the supposed warlike and bellicose rhetoric of Demosthenes and the influence it had on the audience.

**5 ὁ τοὺς καταπάλτας τὰς τε λόγχας ἐσθίων]** Casaubon (1612: 249;cf.

Schwighaeuser 1802:279) notes: “vel praestigiator fuit de genere eorum, qui enses fingebant se vorare, ... vel, quod potius putem, Thraso aliquis et miles gloriosus”. Cf. Plut. *Lycurg.* 19.2 ... τὰς Λακωνικὰς μαχαίρας εἰς τὴν μικρότητα, ... ῥαδίως αὐτὰς οἱ θαυμαστοποιοὶ καταπίνουσιν ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις,

**6 μισῶν λόγους ἄνθρωπος]** ‘the hater of discourse’ is of course ironically said of Demosthenes, who is considered the most gifted orator of his time.

Μισόλογοι is connected with μισάνθρωποι in Plato (*Phaedo* 89d) and with ἄγροικοι in Plutarch (*Her. Mal.* 864 B). See especially Pl. *Laches* 188c καὶ γὰρ ἂν δόξαιμί τῳ φιλόλογος εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸν μισόλογος.

**7 ἀντίθετον εἰπὼν οὐδέν]** Timocles ironically alludes to the famous formulation δοῦναι -ἀποδοῦναι; cf. Aeschin. 2.4 Ἐφοβήθη μὲν γὰρ, καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν τεθορύβημαι μή τινες ὑμῶν ἀγνοήσωσί με ψυχαγωγηθέντες τοῖς ἐπιβεβουλευμένοις καὶ κακοήθεσι τούτοις ἀντιθέτοις. Demosthenes, however, unlike Isocrates, was not fond of pedantic symmetrical antithesis and he prefers to vary the word order; see Denniston 1934:371, who, however, has taken at face value Timocles’ comment and does not notice the irony of the comment; cf. K-A ad loc: per ironiam dicta, quam non sensit Denniston. The expression δοῦναι -ἀποδοῦναι is not *stricto sensu* an *antithesis* (like λαβεῖν-δοῦναι; cf. the typical example in Zonaeus, *Fig. III* 169,23 sqq. Sp. = Anon. *Fig. III* 186, 16 sqq Sp. ‘σὺ μὲν ἔλαβες δῶρα, ἐγὼ δ’ οὐκ ἔλαβον; cf. also [Hermog.] *Meth.* 15, who cites another famous antitheton, «ἐδίδασκες γράμματα, ἐγὼ δ’

ἐφοίτων· ἐτέλεις, ἐγὼ δ' ἐτελούμην· τριταγωνίστεις, ἐγὼ δ' ἐθεώρουν· ἐγγραμμάτευες, ἐγὼ δ' ἐκκλησίαζον· ἐξέπιπτες, ἐγὼ δ' ἐσύριπτον, from Dem. 18.265), but an *epanorthosis* (correctio, see [Cic.] *Rhet. Her.* 4.36). Timocles' description is not therefore accurate, and it is more relevant Aeschines' reference *περὶ συλλαβῶν διαφερόμενος* (3.83); cf. Plut. *Dem.* 9.6.

**ἀλλ' Ἄρη βλέπων]** This proverbial expression, which refers to Demosthenes' martial stare, imitates Ar. *Wealth* 328 θάρρει · βλέπειν γὰρ ἄντικρυς δόξεις μ' Ἄρη ; cf. *Ach.* 566 Ἰὼ Λάμαχ', ὦ βλέπων ἀστραπάς, where a bellicose general is satirized; *Birds* 1169 εἰσθεῖ πρὸς ἡμᾶς δεῦρο πυρρίχην βλέπων; 1671 αἵκειαν βλέπων. As Sommerstein (2001: on *Wealth* 328) points out, this formulation is a variant of expressions where somebody is supposed to look at some acrid herb or fluid; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 254 βλέπουσα θυμβροφάγον; *Knights* 631 κάβλεψε νᾶπυ; *Wasps* 455 βλεπόντων κάρδαμα; *Peace* 1184 βλέπων ὀπόν ; *Frogs* 603 βλέποντ' ὀρίγανον; *Eccl.* 292 βλέπων ὑπότριμμα; *Knights* 855 βλέψεως ὀστρακίνδα; Com. *Adesp.* 633 K-A ὄμφακας βλέπειν. See Taillardat (1965: 165, 216-8).

#### 14 (CGFP 222<sup>a</sup>) (1 Dem.)

Ἑρμῆς δ' ὁ Μαΐας ταῦτα συνδιακτορεῖ  
 ἂν ἢ π[ρ]όθυμος· καταβέβηκεν ἄσμενος  
 χαριζόμενός γ' Ἀριστομήδη τῷ καλῷ,  
 ἵνα μηκέτ' αὐτὸν ὁ Σάτυρος κλέπτῃν λέγῃ

1 δ' ὁ Μαΐας Bücheler: δρομαίως Wil.: δ[ε]ομαίω pap.: συνδιακτορεῖ  
 Wil.: -κτονει pap.: -κονεῖ Koerte RhM 60 (1905)411, coll. Posid. fr.28,1 2  
 ἂν ἢ πρόθυμος Wil. apud ed.pr. (vid. Schiedsg. p.152°): αντιπ[ρ]οθυμῶς

pap., frustra def. Koerte 3 γ' Wagner Symb. p.26 : γ' pap. (=γὰρ, def. Wendland GGA 168, 1906, 366)

*Hermes, the son of Maia, aids in conducting these affairs, on the condition that he is eager to do so. He has descended with pleasure, showing favor to Aristomedes the Handsome, so that Satyros will not anymore call him a thief.*

Didym. in Dem. 10,70, col. 9,70 (ed. Pearson-Stephens) Ἐτερος δ(ἐ), πρὸς ὃν ν(ῦ)ν ὁ Δημοσθένης διέξεισιν, Ἀθηναῖος ὁ Χαλκοῦς λεγ(ό)μενος, περὶ οὗ ἄλλοι τε κ(αὶ) Δείναρχος ἐν τῇ Δοκίμου Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἵππου φησὶν οὕ(τω)ς) · «Ἐπεὶ δ' ὑπ' Ἀριστομήδους τοῦ Χαλκοῦ κ(αὶ) Χαιρεστράτου τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ θείου προήχθης οὐ δίκ(αι)α ποιῶν ἐγκαλεῖν ἐμοί, τῆνικαῦτα δ(ἐ) κ(αὶ) τῷ μ(έν) δίκην ἔρημον ἀπεγράψατο κατ' ἐμοῦ ἀποδημοῦντος κ(αὶ) ταῦτ' ἐν Θετταλία.» κ(αὶ) οἱ κωμικοὶ δ' αὐτοῦ μνημονεύουσι, καθάπερ Φιλήμων μ(έν) ἐν Λιθ[ο]γλύφῳ (41 K-A=CGFP 206), Τιμοκλῆς δ' ἐν Ἡρώσιν · Ἐρμῆς – λέγει. Sequitur fr.19

*There is one more Aristomedes, to whom Demosthenes is assailing here. His was an Athenian with the nickname 'Brazen'. About this Aristomedes others have written and Dinarchus in particular, who in the Defence of Dokimos, regarding the Horse, speaks as follows: Since you were persuaded by Aristomedes the Brazen and his uncle Chaerestratos to act unjustly and formulate an accusation against me, and at that time through one of them he brought against me a suit that he won by default, since I was out of the city, and, at that, in Thessaly. Comedians mention him, for example Philemo in Sculptor (fr.41 K-A= CGFP 206) and Timocles in Heroes;*

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Koerte 1905: 400, 411; Wendland 1906: 366; O'Connor 1908: 429; Demianczuk 1912:88; Bevilacqua 1939: 57-8; Page 1941:240-1; Edmonds 1959:612-3; West 1978:160; Pearson-Stephens: 1983; Στεφανής 1988:n. 235; Whitmarsh 2000: 304-15; Anderson 2000:23; Sommerstein 2001: on *Wealth* 328; Gibbson 2002:122; Hajdu 2002: 44-8; 425- 438; Harding 2006:202, 204; Apostolakis 2012 (forthcoming)

This fragment is transmitted by Didymus, in his comment on Dem.10.70 καίτοι λοιδορίας εἶ τις χωρὶς ἔροιτο 'εἰπέ μοι, τί δὴ γινώσκων ἀκριβῶς, Ἀριστόμηδες, (οὐδείς γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτ' ἀγνοεῖ) τὸν μὲν τῶν ιδιωτῶν βίον ἀσφαλῆ καὶ ἀπράγμονα καὶ ἀκίνδυνον ὄντα, τὸν δὲ τῶν πολιτευομένων φιλαίτιον καὶ σφαλερὸν καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἀγώνων καὶ κακῶν μεστόν, οὐ τὸν ἡσύχιον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις αἰρεῖ· τί ἂν εἴποις; Didymus also cites fr. 19 K- A (=CGFP 222<sup>b</sup>) , from *Ikarioi Satyroi* , where the speaking character connects Aristomedes with the legendary figures Tereus and Procne, in order to make a pun with τηρεῖν and κνᾶσθαι, both alluding to Aristomedes' notorious habit. Also Aristomedes is referred to as 'the Brazen' in the otherwise unattested Dinarchus' speech *Defence of Dokimos, regarding the Horse* (frs. VXXI-VXXII n.4 Konomis), <sup>18</sup> and in Philimon's *Sculptor* (41 K- A= CGFP 206).<sup>19</sup>

Though Timocles most frequently targets anti-Macedonians, he does not exclude even professed pro-Macedonian politicians from his satire, if they leave themselves open to abuse on account of some moral vice.<sup>20</sup> Such a case is Aristomedes the orator. As Dem. 10.70 indicates, Aristomedes was a politician, a contemporary of Demosthenes and obviously a pro-Macedonian, since he had proposed that the Assembly should not take any action against Philip. It is noteworthy that he is recognized as such by Davies (1971: n.2108).

<sup>18</sup> But it is almost certain that the titles *Concerning the Horse* (Dion. Hal. *Din.*12) and *Against Antiphanes, Concerning the Horse* (Harpocration s.v. ὀχεῖον) refer to the same speech. See Harding (2006:204) with more bibliography.

<sup>19</sup> πρὸς τῷ μυροπωλίῳ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων τινῶν / ἤκουσα Χαλκοῦν περιπατεῖν κλέπτην τινά· / ἄπειρος ὢν δὲ τοῦ λεγομένου πράγατο[c] / Ἀριστομήδην ἡρόμην παριόνθ' ὁρῶν. / ὁ δ' ἐνήλατ' εὐθύς μοι παραστὰς τῷ κλέπτι / παῖει τε λάξ πύξ, ὥστε μ' ἐκθανεῖν· ἐπεὶ / μόλις γε φεύγων ἐξέπεσον ἄλλη λή[θη]α. Cf. Plut. *Dem.* 11.7 πρὸς δὲ τὸν κλέπτην ὃς ἐπεκαλεῖτο Χαλκοῦς καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς τὰς ἀγρυπνίας αὐτοῦ καὶ νυκτογραφίας πειρώμενόν τι λέγειν· „οἶδα” εἶπεν „ὅτι σε λυπῶ λύχνον καίων. ὑμεῖς δ' ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι μὴ θαυμάζετε τὰς γινομένας κλοπὰς, ὅταν τοὺς μὲν κλέπτας χαλκοῦς, τοὺς δὲ τοίχους πηλίνους ἔχωμεν.”

<sup>20</sup> Another example is Callimedon 'the Karabos', though he is satirized on account of a physical defect (being cross-eyed), not for his political action (fr.29 K-A).

Therefore, both his alleged thievish action and the nickname 'the Brazen' should rather be connected with the typical abuse (*loidoria*),<sup>21</sup> which was prevalent both in the Old Comedy (e.g. 'Paphlagon' and 'Sausage-Seller' in Aristophanes' *Knights*) and in the Athenian political oratory. Concerning the nickname 'the Brazen', in particular, there is no convincing answer. Given, however, that Aristomedes is always described as a corrupt politician, one could think the famous comparison between citizens and coins in the Parabasis of Aristophanes' *Frogs* (718-37), where the poet complains that the Athenians do not turn the honest citizens to their advantage, but prefer the inferior bronze ones instead (τούτοις τοῖς πονηροῖς χαλκίοις), minted with the basest stamp. We would believe that the contemporary comedy, by representing him on stage as a professional thief, exaggerated this slander.<sup>22</sup>

The most difficult question concerns Aristomedes' identity. In *LGN* n.59 fifteen such names are listed. It was usually believed that this person is Aristomedes Azanieus, who followed in the footsteps of his father Aristophon. But when in Fourth Philippic Demosthenes attacks both Aristomedes and his father, the latter is described as if dead (σοὶ μὲν ἦν κλέπτης ὁ πατήρ). The problem is that Aristophon was still alive at that time and, besides, Demosthenes both in *The False Embassy* (19.291,297), delivered in 333 and in *The Crown* (18. 70,162, 219), delivered in 330, refers with respect to him. Therefore it seems better to accept Koerte's suggestion (1905:400; cf. Davies, 1971: n.2108) that this person is Aristomedes from Kollytos (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1924.9). Hajdu (2002: 438) also pointed out that in IG.II<sup>2</sup>1541.3 an Archestratos from Kollytos is mentioned, who could be the uncle of Aristomedes in

---

<sup>21</sup> Pace Gibbson (2002:122), who takes Aristomedes rather as a professional thief: "a well-known thief, who is nicknamed 'Brazen'".

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Harding (2006:202), who notes that this nickname reflects "the standard charge that he was dipping into the public purse".



Dinarchus' fragment.<sup>23</sup>

Aristomedes had proposed that the Assembly should take no action against Philip, which earned him a lambasting in the *Fourth Philippic* (10.70-74). Although the authenticity of that speech is a matter of some controversy, its historical and rhetorical value is beyond doubt.<sup>24</sup> The most interesting part of the particular fragment of Timocles is the final verse, where the well-known comic actor Satyros is said to call Aristomedes a thief.<sup>25</sup> Satyros was a highly skilled actor who was specialized in delivery (*hypokrisis*), and who was credited with teaching Demosthenes the importance of this art: Plut. *Dem.* 7.4 εἰπόντος δὲ τοῦ Δημοσθένους, μεταλαβόντα τὸν Σάτυρον οὕτω πλάσαι καὶ διεξελεῖν ἐν ᾗθει πρόποντι καὶ διαθέσει τὴν αὐτὴν ῥῆσιν, ὥστ' εὐθύς ὅλως ἑτέραν τῷ Δημοσθένει φανῆναι. πεισθέντα δ' ὅσον ἐκ τῆς ὑποκρίσεως τῷ λόγῳ κόσμου καὶ χάριτος πρόσσεστι, μικρὸν ἡγήσασθαι καὶ τὸ μηδὲν εἶναι τὴν ἄσκησιν ἀμελοῦντι τῆς προφορᾶς καὶ διαθέσεως τῶν λεγομένων.<sup>26</sup>

It is possible, therefore, that Timocles is here parodying an onstage attack by Satyros on Aristomedes, which would have been emblematic on

<sup>23</sup> Harding (2006: 204) prefers Aristomedes the son of Meton, the astronomer who is satirized as an impostor in Aristophanes' *Birds*; but since this Aristomedes is listed as Councilor in 371 (SEG 28, 148.29), it is difficult to be the same person represented by Timocles in late 340s as still desirable.

<sup>24</sup> The authenticity of the *Fourth Philippic* has been questioned by nineteenth century scholars, on the grounds that the speech contains certain parts which are quite similar to a relevant part from the speech *On Affair in the Chersonese*. However, since the discovery in the twentieth century of the papyrus fragment of Didymus' work *On Demosthenes*, where Didymus seems not to doubt about the authenticity of the speech, most scholars accept that this speech is authentic, and either Demosthenes included in the speech *On Affairs in Chersonese* parts of the *Fourth Philippic*, a speech which was not planning to publish, but was published after his death, or delivered the same material to Assembly twice, or Demosthenes had not deliver the whole text from the speech *On Affairs in the Chersonese*, and decided to include some chapters from this manuscript later in the *Fourth Philippic* (so MacDowell 2009: 355). For the authenticity of this speech and the relevant discussion see Hajdu 2002: 44-8; MacDowell 2009: 354-5.

<sup>25</sup> Satyros was a comic actor who participated in the banquet laid on by Philip after the fall of Olynthos; he is said to have requested that Philip release the two daughters of Apollonophanes of Pydna, one of the assassins of Philip's brother (Dem.19.193; cf. Aeschin. 2.156-7).

<sup>26</sup> Other sources, however, report that Demosthenes' teacher on this matter was Andronikos (Plut. *Vit. or.* 845 A-B; Quint. *Inst. or.* 11.7.3).

account of his masterly delivery. We may go a step further and hypothesize that it was Demosthenes, Satyros' student, who inspired the performers to launch the attack. Such a suggestion is supported by considerable evidence from the Fourth Philippic (Dem.10.73), a speech which belongs in early 341 (see the discussion above). In this speech the orator, using the rhetorical figure of *apostrophe*, calls Aristomedes a thief who maintains his family traditions: τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχει σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἦν κλέπτῃς ὁ πατήρ, εἵπερ ἦν ὅμοιος σοί. This passage must have been especially famous, since Hermogenes (*Inv.* p.195 ff Rabe and *Id.* 261,15 ff Rabe) cites it as a model of *circle* (κύκλος).<sup>27</sup> This rhetorically colored formulation was well tailored for the impressive delivery with which Demosthenes himself was credited.<sup>28</sup>

We may therefore suspect that, by ridiculing Aristomedes, Timocles is here parodying Demosthenes' rhetorical skills on stage, in a manner that would have been especially effective if Satyros impersonated Demosthenes. This possibility would have one more consequence: given that Satyrus was a comic actor specialized in slave roles (Aeschin.2.156-7 καὶ Σάτυρον τὸν κωμικὸν ὑποκριτὴν ... τοὺς Καρίωνας καὶ Ξανθίας ὑποκρινόμενον)<sup>29</sup> it would mean that Timocles alludes to the slander, mainly launched by Aeschines, that Demosthenes was not a real citizen, since his mother was a foreign woman's daughter, indeed of Scythian origin. Timocles, therefore, may be in tune again with Aeschines in satirizing Demosthenes. If so, then the

---

<sup>27</sup> For a rhetorical analysis of the passage see Hajdu (2002:425- 438).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Plut. *Vit. or.* 845B; *Dem.* 7.6. Demosthenes' *hypokrisis* is once more –at least- parodied by Timocles, in the famous invocation μὰ γῆν, μὰ κρήνας, μὰ ποταμούς, μὰ νάματα (fr. 41 K-A, a parody attributed by Athenaeus both to Timocles and Antiphanes, fr. 288 K-A) which reminds the famous oath to the Marathonians (Dem.18.208 μὰ τοὺς Μαραθῶνι προκινδυνεύσαντας τῶν προγόνων).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Aeschin.2.156-7 καὶ Σάτυρον τὸν κωμικὸν ὑποκριτὴν προσεπαινέσας, ...ὅτι ξένους τινὰς ἑαυτοῦ αἰχμαλώτους σκάπτοντας ἐν τῷ Φιλίππου ἀμπελῶνι καὶ δεδεμένους παρὰ πότον ἐξητήσατο παρὰ Φιλίππου, ταῦθ' ὑποθεὶς ἐπεῖπεν ἐντεινόμενος ταύτην τὴν ὀξεῖαν καὶ ἀνόσιον φωνήν, ὡς δεινόν, εἰ ὁ μὲν τοὺς Καρίωνας καὶ Ξανθίας ὑποκρινόμενος οὕτως εὐγενὴς καὶ μεγαλόψυχος γένοιτο, ἐγὼ δ' ...

initial rhetorical invective feeds comic abuse on stage, which, in turn, diffuses and multiplies it via parody. To conclude, that way, Timocles kills two birds with one stone. He both satirizes Demosthenes' theatrical and hypocritical anti-Macedonian warlike policy, and at the same time he does not favor the notorious thief Aristomedes, whose conduct is a discredit to pro-Macedonian rhetoric.

It has been suggested that in this fragment two characters participate; cf. Demianczug (1967: 88): "Versus inter duas personas distribuerunt editors;" Koerte suggested that there is only one character, who narrates Hermes' erotic affairs, but it seems better to follow Edmonds (1959:612-3), who suggests that this scene is conducted in the Underworld and the speaker is Charon, on the basis that he refers to Hermes as 'fellow conductor' (συνδιάκτορος), who conducts the ghosts, one of whom is Aristomedes.

**Metre: iambic trimeter.**

**1 συνδιακτορεῖ]** this is Wilamowitz's correction of the pap. συνδιακτονεῖ. Koerte (1905:411) prefers συνδιακονεῖ, citing the Posidipp. fr.28 K-A συνδιάκονοι. But Wilamowitz's correction is certain, since διάκτορος is a stereotype for Hermes in the Iliad (mainly in the formula διάκτορος Ἀργειφόντης), and συνδιάκτορος is used for Hermes in a similar context by Lucian, *Charon* 1,22 καὶ ταῦτα ἐταῖρος καὶ σύμπλους καὶ συνδιάκτορος ὢν; The epithet διάκτορος is obscure. West (1978: 160) notes that Hesiod, and also later poets, may have understood it as "messenger" (διάγω ἀγγελίας).

**ἄν ἧ πρόθυμος]** is Wilamowitz's correction of the papyrus' unmetrical ἀντιπ[ρ]οθύμως. Koerte attempted to defend the transmitted writing on the ground that -ι before the mute and liquid -πρ can be long in later comedians, but it seems improbable in such a context which has an archaic color. Also Page (1941:240-1) retains the transmitted text and translates " an eager

enemy”; cf. Bevilacqua (1939:57): “esser premuroso a rovescio”, and Gibbson (2002:92), who translates ‘however he wishes’.

**καταβέβηκεν ἄσμενος]** sc. ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. Cf. Charito *Chaer.* 6.3.5 πλὴν εἰ μή τις ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκε τῶν ἄνωθεν ἢ ἐκ θαλάττης ἀναβέβηκεν ἄλλη Θέτις.

**3 χαριζόμενος γ’ Ἀριστομήδη τῷ καλῷ]** γ’ is Wagner’s correction (cf. Blass) of the transmitted γάρ, a product of dittography. γε here is intensive; Denniston (1934: 115-8); cf. Harding (2006:206), who translates “a real favor to Aristomenes”. Wendland (1906: 366), followed by Demianczuk (1912:88), defended the transmitted γάρ, the so-called ‘pleonasticum’.

This language alludes to an erotic relation between the patron Hermes and the protégé Aristomedes. The formulation may suggest that Aristomedes is still young (cf. Pl. *Prot.* 362a ἀλλὰ Καλλία τῷ καλῷ χαριζόμενος παρόμεινα, where Kallias must be very young at the dramatic time of *Protagoras*), unless the reference is ironical.

**4 Σάτυρος]** Bevilacqua (1939: 57-8) suspects that we can read σάτυρος, and in that case Timocles alludes to a satirical drama, but this suspicion should be dismissed; Satyros is definitely the known comic actor. Cf. Dem. 19.192 ff; Aeschin. 2.56-7; Plut. *De laude ipsius* 545e; Σάτυρος *Mette*, V C col.3 v.1 (p.179)= *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2325 V.190. He is included in the list of victors in Lenaia before Philemo and Kallistratus. See O’Connor, (1908: 429); Στεφανής (1988: n. 235 Σάτυρος Ὀλύνθιος (;)). Aeschines mocks Demosthenes and alludes that Satyros was expert in presenting slave-roles (2.157 ὁ μὲν τοὺς Καρίωνας καὶ Ξανθίας ὑποκρινόμενος). In Dem. 19.193-5 Satyros is introduced as κωμικὸς ὑποκριτής, who, according to Demosthenes, asked Philip to release the daughters of a dead friend and his request was accepted. Aeschines on the

other hand narrates that Satyros requested the release some captives who were working in Philip's vineyards (Aeschin.2.156-7).<sup>30</sup>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson,R.D. 2000. *A Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, Leuven
- Apostolakis, K. 2012. "In the twilight of Political Satire: Timocles and Orators", in M. Ταμιωλάκη (ed.) *Νέες τάσεις στην έρευνα της Αρχαίας Κωμωδίας* (forthcoming).
- Bevilacqua, V. 1939. "Timocle", *Dioniso* 7, 25-62
- Breitenbach, H. 1908. *De genere quodam titulorum Comoediae Atticae*. Basel
- Casaubon,I. 1621.*Animadversionum in Athenaei Deipnosophistas Libri XV*. Lugduni.
- Casolari.F. 2003. *Die Mythentravestie in der griechischen Komödie*, Münster
- Constantinides, E. 1969. "Ikarioi Satyroi: A Reconsideration", *TAPhA* 100, 49-61
- Coppola, G. 1927. "Per la Storia della Commedia Greca: Timocles Ateniese e Difilo di Sinope", *RFIC* 55.5, 453-67
- Davies, J.K.. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C*. Oxford
- Demianczuk,I.1912. *Supplementum Comicum*. Krakau.
- Denniston, J.D.1934. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford.
- Dindorf,G. 1855. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*. Oxford.

---

<sup>30</sup> For these two divergent accounts of the incident see Carey, on Aeschin. 2. 156 (147, n.201), who suspects that either Demosthenes altered the details before publication or Aeschines exaggerates on purpose Demosthenes' appeal for pity.

- Edmonds, J.M. 1959. *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*.II. Leiden.
- Gibson, C.A. 2002. *Interpreting a Classic. Demosthenes and his Ancient Commentators*. Berkeley
- Hajdu, I. 2002. *Kommentar zur 4.Philippischen Rede des Demosthenes*. Berlin-New York
- Hansen, M.H. 1983. "The Athenian Politicians 403-322 B.C.", *GRBS* 24, 33-55
- Harding, P. 1994. *Comedy and Rhetoric*, in I.Worthington (ed.), *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. London, 196-221.
- Harding, P. 2006. *Didymos: On Demosthenes*. Oxford
- Kassel, R., Austin, C. 1989- . *Poetae Comici Graeci*, I-VIII. Berlin
- Kock, Th. 1884. *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*.II. Lipsiae.
- Koerte, A.1905. "Zu Didymos' Demosthenes-Kommentar." *RhM* 60, 388-416.
- Koerte, A. 1936. "Timokles nr.3", *RE* VI A 1 1260-2
- Konstantakos, I. 2000. *A Commentary on the Fragments of Eight Plays of Antiphanes*. Cambridge
- Konstantakos, I. 2011. "Conditions of Playwrights ant the Comic Dramatist's Craft in the Fourth Century", *Logeion* [forthcoming]
- MacDowell, D.M. 2009. *Demosthenes the Orator*. Oxford
- Meineke, A. 1839. *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum*. II.1. Berlin
- Nesselrath, H.G. 1990. *Die attische Mittlere Komoedie. Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte*. Berlin-New York
- Nesselrath, H.G. 1997. *The polis of Athens in Middle Comedy*, in Dobrov, G.W. (ed.) *The City as Comedy. Society and Representation in Athenian Drama*. North Carolina, 271-88
- O'Connor, J.B. *Prosopographia Histrionum Graecorum*. Chicago 1908
- Olson, D. 2008a 6-9. *Athenaeus. The Learned Banqueters*.vol. III (Books 6-7). Harvard
- Olson, D. 2008b. *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy*. Oxford

- Page, D.L. 1941. *Greek Literary Papyri*. Cambridge
- Papachrysostomou, A. 2008. *Six Comic Poets. A Commentary on Selected Fragments of Middle Comedy*. Tübingen
- L.Pearson-S.Stephens(eds.). 1983. *Didymi in Demosthenem Commenta*. Stuttgart.
- Pickard-Cabridge, A.W. 1900. *Select Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets*. Oxford
- Schweighaeuser, I. 1802. *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas post Isaacum Casaubonum*. vol. II. Argentorati
- Taillardat, J. 1965. *Les Images d'Aristophane: études de langue et de style*. Paris
- S.Tsitsirides 1998. *Platons Menexenos : Einleitung, Text und Kommentar*. Stuttgart
- Webster, T.B.L. 1952. "Chronological Notes on Middle Comedy", CQ 46.2, 13-26
- Webster, T.B.L. 1970. *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*. Manchester
- Wendland, P. 1906. *Göttinsche Gelehrte Anzeigen* 168, 366.
- I. Στεφανής. 1988. *Διονυσιακοί Τεχνίται*, Ηράκλειο.
- T. Whitmarsh, T. 2000. "The Politics and Poetics of Parasitism. Athenaeus on Parasites and Flatterers" in D.Baund/J.Wilkins (eds) *Athenaus and his World*, 304-15.
- West, M.L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*, Oxford.
- West, M.L. 1978. *Hesiod. Works and Days*. Oxford
- Worman, N. 2008. *Abusive Mouths in Classical Athens*. Cambridge
- Worthington, I. 1992. *A Historical Commentary on Dinarchus. Rhetoric and Conspiracy in Later Fourth Century Athens*. Michigan
- Worthington, I. (ed.) 2000. *Demosthenes. Statesman and Orator*. London, New York