









filiis carissimis

JWM

TEM

GFM

ἡμῖν δ' αὖ τρεῖς παῖδες ἀμύμονες ἐξεγένοντο



## Contents

Preface . . . . .	11
Introduction . . . . .	13
Commentary . . . . .	26
Testimonia . . . . .	26
Ἄγροικοι ( <i>Agroikoi</i> )	
('Rustics') . . . . .	34
Ἀγχίσης ( <i>Anchisēs</i> )	
('Anchises') . . . . .	49
Αἰσχρά ( <i>Aischra</i> )	
('The Ugly Woman' [?]) . . . . .	58
Ἀμπρακιώτις ( <i>Amprakiōtis</i> )	
('Ambracian Woman') . . . . .	62
Ἀντέρως ( <i>Anterōs</i> )	
('Anteros') . . . . .	63
Ἀχιλλεύς ( <i>Achilleus</i> )	
('Achilleus') . . . . .	65
Γεροντομανία ( <i>Gerontomania</i> )	
('Madness for Old Men') . . . . .	66
Δίδυμοι ( <i>Didymoi</i> )	
('Twins') . . . . .	78
Διονύσου γοναί ( <i>Dionysou gonai</i> )	
('Birth of Dionysus') . . . . .	80
Ἑλένη ( <i>Helenē</i> )	
('Helen') . . . . .	82
Ἐρεχθεύς ( <i>Erechtheus</i> )	
('Erechtheus') . . . . .	86
Εὐσεβεῖς ( <i>Eusebeis</i> )	
('The Pious') . . . . .	87
Ζωγράφοι ἢ Γεωγράφοι (vel -οι) ( <i>Zōgraphoi ē Geōgraphoi</i> )	
('Painters' or 'Geographers') . . . . .	88
Ἡρακλῆς ( <i>Hēraklēs</i> )	
('Herakles') . . . . .	93
Θετταλοί ( <i>Thettaloi</i> )	
('Thessalians') . . . . .	100

Θησαυρός ( <i>Thēsauros</i> ) (‘Treasure’) . . . . .	102
Θησεύς ( <i>Thēseus</i> ) (‘Theseus’) . . . . .	109
Ἴώ ( <i>Iō</i> ) (‘Io’) . . . . .	114
Κανηφόρος ( <i>Kanēphoros</i> ) (‘Kanephoros’) . . . . .	115
Κέρκιος (?) ( <i>Kerkios</i> ) (‘Kerkios’) . . . . .	117
Κιθαρίστρια ( <i>Kitharistria</i> ) (‘The female kithara-player’) . . . . .	121
Κυνηγέται ( <i>Kynēgetai</i> ) (‘Hunters’) . . . . .	124
Κωμωδοτραγωδία ( <i>Kōmōidotragōidia</i> ) (‘Comoedotragoedia’) . . . . .	127
Λοκρίδες ( <i>Lokrides</i> ) (‘Locrian Women’) . . . . .	130
Λυκοῦργος ( <i>Lykourgos</i> ) (‘Lycurgus’) . . . . .	133
Μαι[ - - - ] ( <i>Mai[ - - - ]</i> ) (‘Mai[ - - - ]’) . . . . .	139
Μελίλωτος ( <i>Melilōtos</i> ) (‘Melilotus’) . . . . .	140
Νηρεύς ( <i>Nēreus</i> ) (‘Nereus’) . . . . .	145
Νηρηίδες ( <i>Nērēides</i> ) (‘Nereids’) . . . . .	152
Ὀδυσσεύς ( <i>Odysseus</i> ) (‘Odysseus’) . . . . .	155
Ὀπλομάχος ( <i>Hoplomachos</i> ) (‘Hoplomachos’) . . . . .	177
Πάνδαρος ( <i>Pandaros</i> ) (‘Pandaros’) . . . . .	181
Πόλεις ( <i>Poleis</i> ) (‘Cities’) . . . . .	186



Πρωτεσίλαος ( <i>Prōtesilaos</i> ) (‘Protesilaos’) . . . . .	194
Σαμία ( <i>Samia</i> ) (‘Samian Woman’) . . . . .	238
Σατυρίας ( <i>Satyrias</i> ) (‘Satyrias’) . . . . .	240
Σώσιππος ( <i>Sōsippos</i> ) (‘Sosippus’) . . . . .	242
Τηρεύς ( <i>Tēreus</i> ) (‘Tereus’) . . . . .	245
Υβρις ( <i>Hybris</i> ) (‘Hybris’) . . . . .	255
Φαρμακόμαντις ( <i>Pharmakomantis</i> ) (‘Soothsaying Druggist’) . . . . .	258
Φιαληφόρος ( <i>Phialēphoros</i> ) (‘Phiale-bearer’) . . . . .	264
Incertarum fabularum fragmenta . . . . .	267
Fragmenta dubia . . . . .	325
Bibliography . . . . .	329
Indices . . . . .	365



## Preface

The present commentary began as a dissertation submitted to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 2001. I had originally planned to publish it quickly, but other commitments intervened and it remained a low priority. Several years ago, Douglas Olson urged me to consider publishing the commentary, but again other commitments ensured that I never gave it my full attention. Revision has thus been fitful, often hasty and not as thorough going as I had intended. Many hallmarks of the commentary's origin remain, but I have nevertheless often revised my opinion on a particular passage, sometimes radically. Since the dissertation has found its way into the hands of various libraries and scholars over the years and is occasionally cited, I would urge everyone with access to a copy to be aware that I no longer necessarily agree with all that it contains. I now think some opinions put forward in the dissertation are demonstrably wrong, and the present commentary always represents a more considered opinion in the case of discrepancies between the two documents.

The dissertation was supervised by David Sansone; the other members of the committee were Douglas Olson, Maryline Parca and the late Michael Browne. I learned a great deal from all four and remain profoundly grateful to them all, but I should note that Olson in particular offered far more help, criticism and support than his position as a committee member might imply. Portions of the dissertation were written in the library at the University of Illinois, but the bulk was written in the Blegen Library at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, where I was a student for three years. I am grateful to the staff of both libraries, all of whom work very hard to maintain first-rate research facilities. I would also like to reiterate my gratitude to a number of people who helped when I was writing the original version of the commentary, namely the late Judith Binder, Michael Dixon, Catharine Keesling, Eran Lupu and Ronald Stroud. Stroud was Mellon Professor at the American School for my first two years there and used that position to offer material support; more important in many ways, he consistently led by example and offered an example of scholarship and humanity that is difficult to match.

More recently, Douglas Olson was instrumental in introducing me to Bernhard Zimmermann, who graciously arranged for several visits to Freiburg, invited me to contribute to the series *Fragmenta Comica* and facilitated material support via the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences. In addition to Zimmermann, Stylianos Chronopoulos, Christian Orth and Anna Novokhatko

all made visiting Freiburg a wonderful experience and offered help in various ways.

Portions of the commentary were revised in the Penrose Library of the British School at Athens, and I am grateful to the staff of both the library and the British School in general; I can imagine few places more welcoming and more congenial for research. The bulk of the revision was done far from a research library, and thus I am sure to have missed much that might have profitably been included. At a late stage after my move to Niedersachsen, Heinz-Günther Nesselrath very kindly facilitated my use of the seminar library and central library at the University of Göttingen, and his efforts have proved invaluable to my work.

A note about bibliography. For each fragment, I have endeavoured to offer as complete a bibliography as possible, although I am sure to have missed much. My rationale is twofold. For anyone interested, there is little point in duplicating work that I have already done; more important, this enables one to form an impression of the critical history of any given fragment at a glance. I do not necessarily think all the references I have given are equally worthwhile, but anyone who bothers to peruse them might avoid unknowingly repeating the suggestion of an earlier scholar, a phenomenon I found shockingly common in reading through several centuries of scholarship. Conjectures and suggestions of four scholars occasionally appear in the commentary without a bibliographic reference. Those of David Sansone and Douglas Olson were made in reference to the original dissertation or, in the case of Olson, sometimes subsequently. A dozen years ago I briefly thought of publishing the commentary elsewhere; James Diggle and the late Eric Handley were the readers on that occasion and both made a number of worthwhile suggestions.

To all of the above, I find it difficult to adequately express my gratitude. While it is invidious to single out anyone in particular, I should note that it is unlikely that the commentary would have ever been published were it not for the constant support of Douglas Olson; his friendship, scholarship and help in every way have been invaluable. The only people to whom I owe a greater debt are my family: my wife Sara Strack, who in addition to much else showed uncommon patience during the final revision of the book, our sons James and Thomas, who endured the loss of much playtime and think it normal to inform the neighbours that their father has gone to Göttingen to look at a book, and our son George, who was born as the book was going to press.

10 August 2015  
Elze / Hann.

## Introduction

### 1. Name and Identity

Little is known of Anaxandrides' (PAA 126725) life. His father is said to have been named Anaxandros (test. 1), although this may be a deduction from Anaxandrides' own name.<sup>1</sup> He apparently originated from Camirus (test. 1–2), on the northwest coast of Rhodes, although test. 1 adds the conflicting report that according to some (κατὰ δέ τινας) he was from Colophon, on the Ionian coast northeast of Samos. The testimonia thus agree that Anaxandrides was not an Athenian and that he came from the eastern Mediterranean. But the likely cause of the discrepancy is that one or both of these assertions is based on a false deduction from one of Anaxandrides' plays or, less likely, a play by a rival;<sup>2</sup> even the claim that he was not Athenian thus cannot be made with complete confidence.<sup>3</sup> Over the course of the fourth century, foreigners competed in increasing numbers in the major Athenian dramatic festivals; if Anaxandrides was a foreigner, he will have been among the earliest of these.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kaibel 1894. 2078 suggests that the father's name may be 'eine billige Fiction.'

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Ar. *Ach.* 652–4 led to the claim that Aristophanes (test. 10) was Aeginetan. Alternatively, the deduction could have been made from a play of a rival poet who slanderously attacked Anaxandrides as a non-Athenian. Ancient scholarship was capable of uncertainty regarding the nationality of even so well-attested a figure as Aristophanes (e.g. Ar. test. 2 lists several possibilities, including the Rhodian cities of Camiros and Lindos); cf. Antiph. test. 1 (several possibilities, including Rhodes); Lefkowitz 1981. 112.

<sup>3</sup> The name Anaxandrides is rare at Athens, with only two other attested examples (PA 802 = PAA 126735 [ca. 425–406 BC]; PA 801 = PAA 126730 [ca. 330–320 BC]). *LGPN* II s.v. #3, however, lists the poet Anaxandrides as possibly Athenian. The name is no more common on Rhodes, for which *LGPN* I s.v. records only two examples (both third century) aside from the poet. Anaxandros, on the other hand, while equally rare at Athens (only PA 803 = PAA 126745, the father of Anaxandrides [PA 801 = PAA 126730]), is more common on Rhodes (excluding the father of the poet, *LGPN* I s.v. list ten examples, including two from Camiros). But the Rhodian examples, with the exception of a man from Kamyndioi dated ca. 325 BC (*IG* XII (1) 761.3), all are third century or later. If the poet is taken to be an Athenian, he may be a relation of [Ἀναξανδρ]ίδης [Ἀ]ναξανδρου of Eleusis (PA 801, where dated to the end of the fourth century; *LGPN* II s.v. #1 dates him to ca. 330–320 BC), but the restoration of this man's name is little more than guesswork; possibly relevant is the fact that he was apparently a tax farmer who collected the *metoikion*.

## 2. Chronology and Career

Test. 2 suggests that Anaxandrides wrote dithyrambs as well as comedies. Although the writing of dithyrambs is occasionally attested for tragedians (e.g. Ion of Chios [*TrGF* 19]; Hieronymus [*TrGF* 31]; Dicaeogenes [*TrGF* 52]), it is not otherwise attested in the case of comic poets. Aside from Anaxandrides, the only possible example is Nicostratus, but the latter name is exceedingly common, and there is no reason to identify the dithyrambic poet and the comic poet. Although it is possible that Anaxandrides in fact wrote dithyrambs and thus that he was an almost unique example of this sort of genre crossing, far more likely test. 2 refers to a feature within a comedy; cf. fr. 6 (quotation of Timotheus); Cratin. fr. 20 Κρατῖνος ἀπὸ <δι>θυράμβου ἐν Βουκόλοις ἀρξάμενος (ἀρ<πα>ξάμενος Rutherford).<sup>4</sup>

The evidence for Anaxandrides' output, success and general chronology is greater and less open to skepticism.<sup>5</sup> There is no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the assertion that he wrote 65 plays and took first 10 times (test. 1);<sup>6</sup> that three of his victories were at the Lenaia, and thus the remaining seven presumably at the Dionysia, is certain (test. 6). His first victory at the Dionysia occurred in 377/6 (test. 3), his second the following year (test. 4). He remained active until at least 349, but probably not for more than a few years after that.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Scholars have generally accepted uncritically the apparent claim that Anaxandrides was also a dithyrambic poet; e.g. Sutton includes him without comment as #50 in his corpus of dithyrambic poets.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Dittmer 1923. 48–53.

<sup>6</sup> Although Anaxandrides' productivity is high compared, for example, with Aristophanes, who wrote 44 plays in a career of approximately the same length, it pales beside the other major poets of later comedy: Antiphanes (280 [or 365]); Alexis (245); Menander (108); Eubulus (104). Alexis' great productivity can be attributed in part to a lengthy career; on the other hand, Menander wrote 75 % more plays than Anaxandrides in a shorter career. The vastly increased levels of production over the course of the fourth century are clear evidence for the explosive growth in non-Athenian venues for the performance of new plays. As for victories, Anaxandrides seems to have been at least as successful as his rivals in terms of the ratio of victories to plays (Lenaian victories: Anaxandrides 3 [4.6%]; Antiphanes, 8 [2.9%]; Eubulus, 6 [5.8%]; Alexis, 2–4 [0.8–1.6%]; Menander, 3 [2.8%]).

<sup>7</sup> Test. 5.8 records that in 349 BC he took fourth place at the Dionysia with the play Ἀγ[ - - - ]; the available space at the end of this line and the beginning of the following, where the entries switch to the Lenaia, seems too great to allow only for the restoration of this title even if the name of a producer is also restored at the

This basic chronology seems to be reflected in a confused form in test. 1. As has long been recognized, ‘the games of Philip of Macedon’, however interpreted, cannot have taken place in the 101st Olympiad (376/2 BC). Meineke thus plausibly interpreted the games as those celebrated by Philip at Dion after the sack of Olynthus in 348 BC (D.S. 16.55) and accordingly emended the text of the *Suda* from Ὀλυμπιάδι ρα΄ to Ὀλυμπιάδι ρη΄.<sup>8</sup> Although superficially convincing, the emendation creates problems for the chronology of Anaxandrides by introducing the claim that he ‘flourished’ (γεγονώς) in the 340s BC, at the very tail-end of his career. Since the transmitted date corresponds to Anaxandrides’ first victory and floruit dates in these biographies are commonly taken to refer to first victories, a better solution is to assume a somewhat greater corruption in the text of the *Suda*, coupled with the loss of a few words: ‘he flourished [i.e. won his first victory] in the 101st Olympiad (376/2 BC) (sc. and remained active) until the games of Philip of Macedon in the 108th Olympiad (348/4 BC).

Test. 5 dates three of Anaxandrides’ plays precisely,<sup>9</sup> in addition to providing relative dates for seven others. Assuming that his first victory did not coincide with his first play, Anaxandrides’ working life lasted from the late 380s or early 370s into the 340s, a career of somewhat more than thirty years; in the absence of evidence to the contrary, all his plays are presumably to be taken as performed at the Lenaia or Dionysia. By 311 BC, they were considered παλαιαί and suitable for revival at the Dionysia (test. 7).<sup>10</sup>

Two other facts of lesser significance are known about Anaxandrides’ plays from external evidence. First, Aristotle (test. 8) recalls two performances by the comic actor Philemon (Stephanis 1988 #2485), presumably as protagonist, in plays by Anaxandrides. The references say little about the comedies

---

beginning of line 9. Anaxandrides must thus have produced at least one play, which took fourth place at the Dionysia, after 349 BC. Since his other dateable plays are concentrated from the 370s to the 350s BC, and 349 BC is the latest date extant for any of his plays, his career probably did not last much into the 340s BC.

<sup>8</sup> Gutschmid’s emendation to Ὀλυμπιάδι ρια΄ (336/2 BC, apparently thinking of funeral games for Philip) seems impossibly late for Anaxandrides. Another possibility might be Ὀλυμπιάδι ρς΄ (356/2 BC), when Philip was victorious at Olympia.

<sup>9</sup> *Mai* [ - - ] (a. 364; probably at the Lenaia); *Erechtheus* (a. 368; at the Dionysia); *Io* (a. 374; probably at the Dionysia); a fourth play, either *Anchisēs* or *Agroikoi* was performed in 349, probably at the Dionysia.

<sup>10</sup> Revivals of comedies at the Dionysia began some three decades earlier in 340/39 BC (IG II<sup>2</sup> 2318.316–18 = 1563–5 M–O), but Anaxandrides’ play is the earliest specific example known.

or Anaxandrides, since Aristotle finds the occasions memorable primarily for their virtuoso delivery; they are thus more important for the history of acting and performance than for the plays of Anaxandrides in particular. Second, test. 5.9, as restored, suggests that Anaxandrides used someone else to produce his plays on at least one occasion. The phenomenon is well-attested (cf. Pickard-Cambridge 1968. 84–6) and now seems less noteworthy than it once did, although this is the only known instance involving Anaxandrides. Since this occasion dates to sometime after 349 BC and thus late in his career, this might have been a posthumous production produced by a son or other close relation. In any case, both Bergk's [Ἀνα]ξίππου<sup>11</sup> and Wilhelm's [Διω]ξίππου (tentatively but implausibly identified by Wilhelm as the homonymous comic poet) are mere speculation; a number of other names are equally possible, although names in [ - - - ]ξίππος are relatively uncommon in Athens (Dexippos, with 10 examples, is the most common). Alternatively, [ - - - ]ξίππου might be the end of a title, although this seems unlikely.<sup>12</sup>

Test. 2a, much of which is patently false, may contain a grain of truth regarding the play *Poleis* (cf. on fr. 66). Similarly, its assertion that Anaxandrides' plays were publicly burnt may represent an independent but distorted version of the equally implausible claim in test. 2 that the poet himself gave his plays to the frankincense market to be destroyed.<sup>13</sup> The details of this story (e.g. the frankincense market, the refusal to revise plays) may suggest a deduction from one of Anaxandrides' own comedies (e.g. he threatens to destroy his work if it is not well received, or claims that he always presents something completely new [cf. Ar. *Nu.* 545–7]) or one by a rival (e.g. claiming that Anaxandrides' plays are so bad that they deserve to be destroyed).

The text of at least one play (*Thēsauros*; cf. test. 7) survived, presumably in the state archives, until 311 BC, which was probably after the poet's death. Beyond this isolated incident, there is little or no evidence that the comedies were known much after the early Hellenistic period, and probably only a few

<sup>11</sup> Bergk does not defend or explain [Ἀνα]ξίππου; presumably, he meant the first element of the name to suggest a son of Anaxandrides, unless he was thinking of the late fourth century comic poet of that name.

<sup>12</sup> The suggestion was first raised and then discarded as unlikely by Dittmer 1923. 52. Even more unlikely is an error by the stone-cutter (e.g. the sequence of archon date followed by title was reversed or the name of the play was mistakenly omitted).

<sup>13</sup> Presumably the papyrus would be used for packets in which the frankincense was sold, but it is not entirely clear why the frankincense market (otherwise unknown) is specified in particular; cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.269–70; Pers. 1.43.



copies survived in libraries.<sup>14</sup> Anaxandrides' work was being excerpted for use in anthologies at least by the second century BC (cf. on fr. 71); such anthologies were undoubtedly the source for the relatively large number of fragments preserved by Stobaeus, which may indicate that Anaxandrides had an aptitude for the well-turned platitude. He is also quoted extensively by Athenaeus, as well as by a number of grammarians, lexicographers, and the like, although all these likely also drew on excerpts and lacked first-hand familiarity with complete texts of the comedies. Despite Anaxandrides' apparent fame and success in his own day, as well as his influence on the development of the comic genre, his plays seem to have been little read or performed much past the end of the fourth century, and it seems unlikely that many, if any at all, could still be found complete after the Hellenistic period.

### 3. Transmission and Reception

The fragments of Anaxandrides survive in a surprisingly wide variety of sources, sixteen in all,<sup>15</sup> including the works of his contemporary Aristotle, who quotes him five times. In addition, nine fragments survive in whole or in part in multiple sources (fr. 3; 10; 12; 14; 15; 51; 58; 71; 75);<sup>16</sup> in at least half of these instances, however, one source is probably dependent on the other or there is a common source, so that this is not a question of independent survival. The variety of sources is roughly equivalent to that for the leading poets of Middle Comedy.

Aristotle quotes Anaxandrides in his *Rhetoric* (fr. 10; 13; 65; 67) and *Nicomachean Ethics* (fr. 66); as might be expected from a contemporary, he refers to the fragments in a manner that assumes his readers' familiarity with them (cf. especially fr. 10; 13). Significantly, the only other comic poets quoted

<sup>14</sup> If at test. 5.10 [ - - - σ]ώτοι (i. e. a copy survived in the Alexandrian library; cf. *IGUR* 215.7; 216.9) is read, this may suggest that most of his plays had already been lost by the Roman period.

<sup>15</sup> This figure does not include Eustathius, demonstrably dependent on Athenaeus, nor Trypho, apparently quoted by Athenaeus as quoting Anaxandrides, nor lexicographers whose entries record words without attribution but known from other sources to have been used by Anaxandrides.

<sup>16</sup> These do not include fragments known from the sources excluded in the previous note.

by Aristotle in these two works are Epicharmus and Aristophanes,<sup>17</sup> and in general he does not refer often to comic poets aside from brief mention in the *Poetics* of figures important for the history of the genre. This may indicate the popularity of Anaxandrides during or shortly after his own lifetime, or at least the esteem in which Aristotle held him. Aristotle presumably had access to complete texts of the comedies, but in quoting what are apparently well-known lines (he describes fr. 65 as ἐπαινούμενον) he likely relied on his memory.

The single papyrus find relating to Anaxandrides is *BKT* V(2). 9773, a second-century BC fragment of an anthology that includes the beginning of fr. 71. Although the papyrus offers a slightly better text of the fragment than does Stobaeus, who also quotes it, its chief importance is as evidence that Anaxandrides' work was excerpted for use in anthologies at an early date, suggesting that this may have been the conduit through which many fragments survived (cf. Section I above for the suggestion that his works largely perished at an early date). The paucity of papyrus finds is unexceptional; a handful of poets (Epicharmus, Aristophanes, Eupolis, and Menander) overwhelmingly dominate the finds of identifiable comic fragments, and most other authors are poorly represented.<sup>18</sup>

After this isolated occurrence of a fragment of Anaxandrides in the second century BC, there is no mention of him again until the second century AD. Pollux quotes Anaxandrides six times (frr. 5; 14; 24; 68; 70; 79); of these, part of fr. 14 is also cited by the Antiatticist. Pollux shows little evidence of general familiarity with the comedies, citing Anaxandrides primarily as an authority for the usage of various words, and his knowledge of him is presumably derivative. For Pollux as a source of comic fragments, cf. Nesselrath 1990. 79–102.

As is the case for the fragments of many authors and of comic poets in particular, Athenaeus is the most important source.<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, the absence of a systematic study of Athenaeus' sources and methodology prohibits detailed conclusions regarding his quotation of now lost authors or works.<sup>20</sup> The case has been made that his quotation of tragedy is all or mostly

<sup>17</sup> Arist. *Rhet.* 1376a10 may be a reference to Plato Comicus (fr. 219 K); Kassel-Austin (*PCG* 7.808) assign it to Plato the philosopher.

<sup>18</sup> For discussion of which comic poets survive on papyrus, cf. Sidwell 2000; for finds from 1973 to 2010, see Bathrellou 2014.

<sup>19</sup> Athenaeus quotes Anaxandr. frr. 1–4; 6–7; 10; 16; 18–19; 23; 25; 28–31; 33–6; 38; 40–4; 46–52; 55; 58; 60; 72–3; 80. Of these, frr. 3; 10; 51 and 58 are also known from elsewhere.

<sup>20</sup> For discussion of what is known, cf. Nesselrath 1990. 65–79.

at second-hand;<sup>21</sup> the same is likely true for comedy, despite assertions such as that by Pearson 1917. Ivi that ‘a considerable portion of the numerous passages taken from the plays of the comic poets was undoubtedly due to his own researches.’ In the case of Anaxandrides, Athenaeus once (fr. 36) seems to use Trypho as a source for a quotation, and elsewhere acknowledges Chamaileon as his source for information about Anaxandrides’ life (test. 2); nowhere else is it evident precisely what his sources were or if he knew any of the plays at first hand.

Diogenes Laertius cites fr. 20 as part of a list of quotations from comedy that mock Plato; there is no reason to assume that he had any broader familiarity with Anaxandrides’ work.<sup>22</sup>

Macrobius provides a heavily corrupt version of fr. 3. He is unlikely to be an independent witness and is probably dependent on Athenaeus; cf. Wissowa 1913. In any case, Macrobius adds little of value concerning either the text of Anaxandrides or its survival in late antiquity.

Stobaeus is responsible for the survival of a substantial number of fragments (frr. 22; 53; 54; 56; 57; 61; 62; 64; 69; 71); only in the case of fr. 22, however, is the play to which the fragment belongs recorded. The fact that fr. 71 also survives in a substantially earlier anthology (second century BC; cf. above) suggests that Stobaeus relied at least in part on earlier anthologies as the basis for his own, meaning that he need have had no knowledge of Anaxandrides’ plays as a whole. As expected, his quotations of Anaxandrides serve to illustrate various moral or ethical positions, and alterations may on occasion have been introduced into the text.

The remaining sources for the fragments are grammarians and lexicographers. By far the most important of these is the Antiatticist (second century AD), who preserves twelve fragments (frr. 8; 11; 14; 15; 17; 21; 26; 27; 32; 37; 63; 74); only two of these are known from elsewhere (frr. 14 [Pollux, who cites a slightly fuller version]; 15 [Choeroboscus]). The substantial number of citations combined with apparent independence from the rest of the lexicographical tradition may suggest that the Antiatticist or his source(s) had a reasonably substantial acquaintance with the text of Anaxandrides. Although the grammarians and lexicographers who cite Anaxandrides tend to be late and thus will have known his work only at second hand, they are likely ultimately dependent on Alexandrian scholarship, which presumably had access to complete texts.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Wilamowitz 1889. 176; Pearson 1917. Ivi.

<sup>22</sup> For discussion of Diogenes’ sources and his use of them, see Mejer 1978.

#### 4. Themes and Motifs

From Anaxandrides' total output of 65 plays (test. 1), 41 titles (63%) are known from literary or epigraphical sources or both; the known titles should thus form a representative sample. Unfortunately, the one piece of external evidence about the content of the plays (πρῶτος οὗτος ἔρωτας καὶ παρθένων φθορὰς εἰσήγαγεν ['he was the first to introduce on stage love-affairs and seductions of maidens'; test. 1]), while not necessarily offering conflicting testimony, does not correspond well with what little can be deduced about Anaxandrides' plots from the titles and fragments themselves.

Anaxandrides was obviously not the first to put on stage plays involving the seduction of girls. Aside from examples in the extant tragedies of Euripides (e.g. *Ion*), Satyrus in his *Life of Euripides* attributes to Euripides the introduction of βιασμοὺς παρθένων among other hallmarks of later comedy; the anonymous *Life of Aristophanes* (Ar. test. 1) claims much the same thing for that poet and maintains that Aristophanes introduced φθοράν (sc. παρθένων) in his *Kokalos*. These apparently conflicting claims can be reconciled without rejecting any of them, since they all seem to rely ultimately on late Hellenistic scholarship and a fairly detailed familiarity with the work of the authors in question, by positing that Euripides was the first dramatic poet to introduce such stories, but was soon followed by Aristophanes, who adapted such plots into mythological comedies; and that he in turn was followed by Anaxandrides, who transferred these plots from comedies based on mythological parody to ones set in contemporary society.<sup>23</sup> The issue is simplified, however, if the *Suda*'s statement is applicable only to comedy, in which case Euripides is irrelevant. In addition, *Kokalos* is late enough that it may have coincided with the beginning of Anaxandrides' career; conceivably, the chronological dispute represents two distinct scholarly issues, one concerned with Aristophanes as a precursor of later comedy, the other with establishing Anaxandrides as a starting point for a period of comedy.

The extant titles and fragments add only minimal support to the claim that plots based on seduction were a notable part of Anaxandrides' work. Five titles (*Amprakiōtis*, *Samia*, *Kanēphoros*, *Phialēphoros*, and possibly *Kitharistria*) might suggest such plots, although the scanty fragments of the comedies

<sup>23</sup> This interpretation is in essence a simplification of that proposed by Nesselrath 1993. Nesselrath was preceded by Webster 1970. 77 (cf. Webster 1960. 169ff.), whose arguments Nesselrath 1990. 195 n. 29 at first rejected, but subsequently (1993. 192) hesitantly accepted, although with the reservation that Webster's 'solution is too neat and simple to be possibly true.'

add little.<sup>24</sup> Since these plays form only a small part of Anaxandrides' output (12 % of the known titles; 8 % of the total 65) and such plots seem to have been among the most memorable or at least most influential features of his plays, it seems likely that this sort of plot or other plots viewed as stereotypical of later comedy were more prevalent than the extant titles suggest.

Fifteen of the titles (37 % of the known titles; 23 % of the total 65 plays), the largest group of plays with apparently similar subject matter, suggest a mythological topic as the basis of the plot.<sup>25</sup> The majority of these (thirteen of fifteen) revolve around a central hero, usually male but occasionally female (*Helenē*; *Iō*), and normally mortal but once a minor divinity (*Nēreus*). In the majority of these cases, little of substance can be said about the plot.<sup>26</sup> Of the two remaining plays with mythological titles, one (*Dionysou gonai*) is perhaps some sort of mythological travesty (but see Winkler 1982 for a different interpretation of all such plays), while the plot of the other (*Nērēides*) is uncertain and may have little mythological content (cf. *ad loc.*). Scholars generally assume on the basis of the titles that most if not all of these plays are mythological travesties (whatever that might mean, and the point has not often been addressed in detail), but there is no reason why this should be true. The fragments of *Helenē*, for example, suggest that much of the plot may have been a parody of Euripides' homonymous play.<sup>27</sup> Finally, although passing reference to a contemporary figure is possible in an apparently mythological play (e.g. Plato in fr. 20 [from *Thēseus*]; Polyeuktos in fr. 46.3 [from *Tēreus*]), at least two plays seem to have a greater than usual involvement with contemporary Athens. Fr. 35 (from *Odysseus*) may be addressed to a group of Athenians or the Athenians at large, while frs. 41 and 42 (from *Prōtesilaos*) suggest a concern with contemporary politics and political maneuvering. Since the fragments of most of the plays with mythological titles are too scanty to allow even tentative reconstruction of the subject matter, and some of those plays seem to have a considerable

<sup>24</sup> Fr. 22 (from *Kanēphoros*) suggests confusion about someone's identity, which may indicate a plot that hinges on mistaken social status (cf. *ad loc.*); perhaps similar is *Melilotos*, in which the title possibly refers to a token of recognition (cf. *ad loc.*).

<sup>25</sup> Some of the plays with a mythological plot were probably based on an earlier tragic treatment of the same story, but this need not always have been the case. Similarly, parody of an earlier tragedy necessarily revolved around a mythological plot, but the primary focus must have been parody of the tragedian's handling of the myth, not the myth itself.

<sup>26</sup> Almost certainly the plot of *Hēraklēs* is set prior to the hero's apotheosis.

<sup>27</sup> *Erechtheus*, *Hēraklēs*, *Thēseus*, and *Prōtesilaos* are also titles shared with Euripides; fr. 66 is a parody of a Euripidean line, but is perhaps more likely to have come from *Poleis* than from a mythological play (cf. *ad loc.*).

degree of involvement with contemporary society, it is thus unsafe to conclude that many or even most of these plays were straightforward mythological parodies. Rather than having plots similar to Plautus' *Amphitryo*, they may have been more akin to Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros* or Aristophanes' *Frogs*.

A number of other titles are suggestive of aspects of Anaxandrides' drama. One group of titles (*Agroikoi*, *Eusebeis*, *Zōgraphoi* (?), *Kynēgetai*, *Thettaloi*, *Lokrides*, and possibly *Nērēides*) presumably refers to eponymous choruses; the titles tell us little about the content of the plays, but they do suggest the continued importance of the chorus in the fourth century.<sup>28</sup> Both the title and sole fragment of *Poleis* indicate a plot that exploited the relationship between Athens and other cities and so perhaps looked back to the concerns of Old Comedy. *Didymoi*, *Hoplomachos*, and *Thēsauros*, on the other hand, indicate affinities with New Comedy. Finally, *Kōmōidotragōidia* perhaps suggests a metatheatrical interest or at least an interest in self-reflection.

Although the interests of individual poets of Middle Comedy naturally vary somewhat (e.g. nearly half of Eubulus' titles suggest a mythological plot), in general they seem very similar, and Anaxandrides is no exception. His predilection for titles based on mythology, professions (in the broadest sense) or descriptive characteristics, names (normally not of recognizably famous individuals), or titles suggestive of New Comedy is very much in keeping with other poets of this period.

## 5. Kōmōidoumenoi

The testimonia show that Anaxandrides' career extended from the 380s or 370s to the 340s BCE and provide more exact dates (or ranges of dates) for a number of individual comedies; see Section 2. The references to historical individuals in the fragments do not contradict these dates but are of no assistance in dating the plays more precisely.

The following individuals are referred to by name in the fragments:

- The Corinthian *hetaira* Anteia, a contemporary of Lais 'the younger' and thus presumably active in the early 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, at fr. 9.3 (from the undated *Gerontomania*).
- Antigeneidas of Thebes the musician (Stephanis 1988 #196), active from at least the mid-380s (Cotys' wedding) to 353 BC, at fr. 42.16 (from *Prōtesilaos*, mid to late 370s BC?).

---

<sup>28</sup> See Rothwell 1995; cf. Webster 1970. 62.

- Argas the musician (PAA 160525; Stephanis 1988 #292), active in the first half of the fourth century BC, in fr. 16.4 (from *Hēraklēs*, perhaps before 375 BC) and fr. 42.17 (from *Prōtesilaos*, mid to late 370s BC?).
- Callistratus son Callistratus of the deme Aphidna (PA 8157 [with suppl.] = 8129 = 8130; PAA 561575), active in Athenian politics from at least 392/1 BC until the 360s BC, at fr. 41.3 (from *Prōtesilaos*, mid to late 370s BC?).
- The well-oiled but otherwise unknown Democles (PA 3485; PAA 315565), at fr. 35.5 (from *Odysseus*, between 374 and either 365 or 357 BC).
- Euripides the drunk (PAA 444547), known only from the fragments quoted at Ath. 11.482c–d, in fr. 33.3 (from the undated *Nērēides*).
- Iphicrates son of Timotheus of the deme Rhamnous (PA 7737; PAA 542925), active in Athenian politics from at least 393/2 BC until shortly before his death in 352 BC, at fr. 42.3 (from *Prōtesilaos*, mid to late 370s BC?).
- The otherwise unknown Cephisodotus of Acharnae the *kitharistēs* (Stephanis 1988 #1393; PA 8326; PAA 567705), at fr. 42.17–18 (from *Prōtesilaos*, mid to late 370s BC?).
- Cotys, king of Thrace ca. 384–359 BC (PAA 583219), at fr. 42.12 (from *Prōtesilaos*, mid to late 370s BC?).
- The Corinthian *hetaira* Lagiske, a contemporary of Lais ‘the younger’ and Anteia, and thus presumably active in the early fourth century BC, at fr. 9.4 (from the undated *Gerontomania*).
- The Corinthian *hetaira* Lais (‘the younger’), active in the early fourth century BC, at fr. 9.1 (from the undated *Gerontomania*).
- Melanopus (PA 9788; PAA 638765), active in Athenian politics from at least 372/1 BCE until perhaps as late as 355/4 BC, at fr. 41.2 (from *Prōtesilaos*, mid to late 370s BC?).
- The Corinthian *hetaira* Okimon, a contemporary of Lais ‘the younger’ and thus presumably active in the early fourth century BC, at fr. 9.6 (from the undated *Gerontomania*).
- Peron the perfume-seller (PAA 772900), active in the first half of the fourth century BC, at fr. 41.1 (from *Prōtesilaos*, mid to late 370s BC?).
- Plato the philosopher (PA 11855; PAA 775000), ca. 429–347 BC, in fr. 20 (from the undated *Thēseus*).
- The handsome Polyeuctus (PAA 778017), in fr. 46.3 (from *Tēreus*, undated).
- The Corinthian *hetaira* Theolyte, undated but generally taken to be another contemporary of Lais, Anteia, and Lagiske, at fr. 9.5 (from the undated *Gerontomania*).
- Timotheus of Miletus (PAA 886670) the dithyrambic poet, active in Athens from ca. 420–360 BC, in fr. 6.3 (from the otherwise undated *Aischra*).

## 6. Language

In contrast to the late fifth-century comedies of Cratinus, Aristophanes, and Eupolis, the fragments of Anaxandrides contain few overt obscenities or wild comic coinages, and elevated poetic style is mocked at fr. 6.1–2; 31.1–3; 82. For possible paratragedy, see Introductions to *Helenē*, *Iō*, and *Komōidotragōidiai*, and fr. 55 n.

The fragments contain only two oaths (fr. 1.6; 12.2). Sententiae are common (e.g. fr. 4.1, 5–6; 18.1–4), although this may be more informative about the preoccupations of our sources than about the character of Anaxandrides' plays themselves. Figurative language appears at e.g. fr. 23; 36; 57.4; 59.3; 60; and probably fr. 70.

## 7. Metrics and Form

Of the 64 fragments whose meter can be determined with a tolerable degree of certainty, 57<sup>29</sup> (89 %) are in iambic trimeter. These 57 fragments contain a total of 151 complete lines.

- In the 140 complete lines (92.7 % of 151) with penthemimeral or hepthemimeral caesura, penthemimeral caesura predominates by a ratio of 109:31 (~ 78 % vs. 22 %, or 72 % vs. 20.5 % of all complete iambic trimeter lines).
- In the 11 complete lines (7.3 % of 151) with neither penthemimeral nor hepthemimeral caesura, medial caesura is found in fr. 29.2; 38.2; 40.6; 48.2; 57.2; either medial or tetrahemimeral caesura is found in fr. 16.5; 18.1; 34.18; 40.7, 13; 53.13; tetrahemimeral caesura is found in fr. 16.2; 56.1; and either tetrahemimeral or octhemimeral caesurae is found in fr. 34.6; 53.2.
- There are two perfect lines (i. e. — — — — — — — — — —, with no resolution or substitution of long for short): fr. 16.1; 57.3.
- Anapaestic metra appear at fr. 18.5; 20; 50.3 (all first foot).

The meters of the other seven fragments (in the order of number of verses preserved) are:

- (1) Anapaestic dimeter (72 lines, = 32 % of total lines preserved): fr. 28 (four lines); 42 (68 fully preserved lines from a total of 71, including five paroemiacs (5, 22, 26 [restored], 29, 69) and three monometers (19, 45, 50),

<sup>29</sup> Fr. 1–4; 7; 9; 12; 14; 16; 18–23; 25; 29; 31; 33–4; 36; 38; 40–1; 43; 46–50; 52–71; 73; 81; 83.



White's anapaestic hypermeter; see metrical n. *ad loc.*). Of the 66 fully preserved anapaestic dimeters, all have caesura (diaeresis) between the first and second foot. Anapaestic dimeters pronounced by a single actor are common in fourth-century comedy and are used frequently for lists, especially of foodstuffs, as here; see in general Arnott 1996. 20, 479–80.

- (2) Iambic tetrameter catalectic (ten lines): fr. 35. See metrical note *ad loc.* Eight of the lines have caesura (diaeresis) between the second and third foot.
- (3) Trochaic tetrameter catalectic (five lines): fr. 6 (three complete lines); 72 (two fragmentary lines).<sup>30</sup> All lines have caesura (diaeresis) between the second and third foot. Two of the fully preserved lines are purely trochaic (fr. 6.1–2), as is the preserved portion of one of the other three lines (fr. 72.2). Fr. 61.3 contains a single trisyllabic foot, as does the preserved portion of fr. 72.1. See in general White 1912 §244–69
- (4) Dactylic hexameter (two lines), used in comedy mainly for riddles, oracles, and mock-epic: fr. 51 with metrical n. *ad loc.* Both lines have feminine caesura.
- (5) Anapaestic tetrameter catalectic (one complete and one partial line): fr. 10. Both lines have caesura (diaeresis) between the second and third foot.

## 8. Anaxandrides and Other Comic Poets

Test. 6 shows that Anaxandrides was a rough contemporary of Philippus and Choregus (both victorious for the first time before him, in that order), on the one hand, and of Philetaerus, Eubulus, Ephippus, and Antiphanes (all victorious for the first time after him, in that order). Nothing is known of his relations with any of these men, although the information contained in test. 2 (n.) is perhaps to be traced to onstage criticism of him by one of his rivals. The actor Philemon (Stephanis 1988 #2485) seems to have performed in several of Anaxandrides' plays (test. 8).

## 9. Literature

Meineke 1839 I.367–74; Bergk 1887 IV.158–60; Kaibel 1894

---

<sup>30</sup> Naber takes fr. 19 as the beginning of a catalectic trochaic tetrameter, but it is more easily understood as iambic trimeter. Garrod 1922. 68 suggests that fr. 36 as well could be trochaic tetrameter.

## Commentary

### Testimonia

#### test. 1 K.-A.

*Suda* α 1982

Ἀναξανδρίδης, Ἀναξάνδρου, Ῥόδιος ἐκ Καμείρου, γεγονὼς ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι Φιλίππου τοῦ Μακεδονίας, Ὀλυμπιάδι ρα' (a. 376/2)· κατὰ δέ τινας Κολοφόνιος, ἔγραψε δὲ δράματα ξε', ἐνίκησε δὲ ι'. καὶ πρῶτος οὗτος ἔρωτας καὶ παρθένων φθορὰς εἰσήγαγεν

habent AGITFSM

1 Καμήρου FSM      2 ρη' (a. 348/4) Meineke: ρια' (a. 336/2) Gutschmid

Anaxandrides, son of Anaxandros, a Rhodian from Kameiros, flourished in (the time of) the contests of Philip of Macedon, in the 101st Olympiad (a. 376/2). According to some a Kolophonian. He wrote 65 plays and was victorious 10 times. In addition, he was the first to introduce on stage love-affairs and seductions of maidens

**Interpretation** Both test. 1 and test. 2 seem to draw on the same source (thus already Kaibel), most likely Hesychius of Miletus' life of Anaxandrides.

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.367–9; 1857 V.clxxix; Kaibel 1894

#### test. 2 K.-A.

*Ath.* 9.373f–4b

ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ κωμικοῦ τούτου ἐμνήσθην καὶ οἶδα τὸ δρᾶμα τὸν Τηρέα αὐτοῦ μὴ κεκριμένον ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ἐκθήσομαι ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες φίλοι, εἰς κρίσιν ἃ εἴρηκε περὶ αὐτοῦ Χαμαιλέων ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν ἔκτῳ περὶ κωμωδίας γράφων ὧδε (fr. 43)· Ἀναξανδρίδης διδάσκων ποτὲ διθύραμβον Ἀθήνησιν εἰσῆλθεν ἐφ' ἵππου καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν τι τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἄσματος. ἦν δὲ τὴν ὄψιν καλὸς καὶ μέγας καὶ κόμην ἔτρεφε καὶ ἐφόρει ἀλουργίδα καὶ κράσπεδα χρυσᾶ. πικρὸς δ' ὢν τὸ ἥθος ἐποίει τι τοιοῦτο περὶ τὰς κωμωδίας· ὅτε γὰρ μὴ νικῶν, λαμβάνων ἔδωκεν εἰς τὸν λιβανωτὸν κατατεμεῖν καὶ οὐ μετεσκεύαζεν ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοί. καὶ πολλὰ ἔχοντα κομπῶς τῶν δραμάτων ἠφάνιζε, δυσκολαίνων τοῖς θεαταῖς διὰ τὸ γῆρας. λέγεται δ' εἶναι τὸ γένος Ῥόδιος ἐκ Καμείρου. θαυμάζω οὖν πῶς καὶ ὁ Τηρεὺς περιεσώθη μὴ τυχὼν νίκης καὶ ἄλλα δράματα τῶν ὁμοίων τοῦ αὐτοῦ

Since I mentioned this comic author and I know that his play *Tēreus* was not among those awarded first place, I will set out for your judgement, my friends, the things that Chamaeleon the Herakleote has said about him in the sixth book of his *On Comedy*, writing as follows (fr. 43). ‘Anaxandrides, once when he was producing a dithyramb at Athens, entered on horseback and recited something from the song. In appearance he was handsome and tall and grew his hair long and wore a purple robe with a golden border. Since he was spiteful in character, he did some such thing (as follows) concerning his comedies. When he did not win, he took (the play) and gave it to the frankincense-market (for the people there) to cut up and he did not revise it as most do. And so he destroyed many clever plays, being peeved at the audience because of his old age.’ In nationality, he is said to have been a Rhodian from Kameiros. Therefore I am amazed that both *Tēreus*, although it did not receive a victory, was preserved and his other plays which are similar to it [i.e. in not winning].

**Citation Context** Athenaeus cites this excerpt from Chamaeleon (fr. 43) as a short digression immediately after quoting Anaxandr. fr. 48 (see *ad loc.*).

**Interpretation** The source for this story is presumably the same as that for the biographical information given in test. 1; see *ad loc.* But the ultimate source is most likely a comedy by a rival of Anaxandrides, or perhaps one of his own comedies or a conflation of the two. The story says little about the historical Anaxandrides, but offers insight into the sorts of claims made by one comic poet about another or by a comic poet about his audience. As such, it provides important evidence that abuse of comic rivals and assertions of originality and an insufficiently appreciative audience, all familiar from fifth-century comedy, continued to be made by comic poets at least through the middle of the fourth century BC. The story has been taken seriously by a number of modern scholars (e.g. Gataker 1659. 77; Koraes 1822 on Arist. *EN* 7.1152a; Bergk 1872 I.251 n. 163), who connected it with Anaxandrides’ apparent criticism of the Athenians in fr. 66 (see *ad loc.*), which modern readers have tended to view as a result of Anaxandrides’ failure to win in a dramatic competition.

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.368, 373–4; Meineke 1857 V. clxxix; Bergk 1872 I.251 n. 163; 1883 II.534; 1884 III.56; Sutton 1989. 90 (#50)

## test. 2a K.-A.

Σ<sup>53</sup> Ov. *Ib.* 523

Anaxandrides, non Menius, ut multi retulerunt. hunc enim Anaxandridem Eustachius refert, quom Athenienses bonas leges habere diceret, sed malis uti eos praedicaret, enumeraretque ceteras nationes quae aut sine lege essent aut non in condendis legibus tantum salis habuissent, usui venirent tamen melius, coniectus in carcerem est inediaque extinctus et eius opus publice concrematum est

Anaxandrides, not Menius, as many have reported. For Eustachius reports that this is Anaxandrides; when he said that the Athenians have good laws, but proclaimed that they use bad ones, and enumerated other states that either were without law or had not shown much wit in making laws, but nevertheless used them better, he was thrown into prison and died from starvation, and his work was publicly burned

**Citation Context** Σ<sup>53</sup> Ov. *Ib.* 523 (*utque parum stabili qui carmine laesit Athenin*) purports to identify the *qui* in that line, but the explanation is predicated on the textual corruption *Athenas* for *Athenin*.<sup>31</sup> The identification of Anaxandrides as the poet referred to here is attributed to a certain Eustachius, whom La Penna 1959 *ad loc.* identified as Eustachius of Arras, otherwise known as Eustachius Atrebatensis or Nemetacensis, a thirteenth-century Franciscan bishop; Eustachius presumably derived (or deduced) the information from commentaries on Aristotle (cf. on fr. 66; 83).

**Interpretation** The statement that Anaxandrides died from starvation in prison is clearly drawn from the text of Ovid (*Ib.* 524 *invisus pereas deficiente cibo*; cf. Σ<sup>n1</sup> on 523, where the same fate is given to a certain poet Phedymus); on the assertion that his work was publicly burned, see test. 2. Gataker 1659. 77, whence Barnes 1694 on E. *Ph.* 392 (= 396 Barnes), took the claim seriously and asserted that criticism of Athens had deadly repercussions for Anaxandrides ('quod illi dicterium [misprinted as dicterinm] fatale fuisse perhibet in commentariis ad Aristotelem Eustratius'); Meineke 1839 I.368 rightly noted that there is no evidence whatsoever for this assertion, the appeal to Eustratius, i. e. Eustachius, notwithstanding.

**Discussion** Gataker 1659. 77; Barnes 1694 on E. *Ph.* 392 (= 396 Barnes)

<sup>31</sup> Athenis is the brother (?) of Boupalos and one object of Hipponax' invective (cf. Hippon. fr. 70.11; *Suda* ι 588 [= Hippon. test. 7 Degani]); *Ib.* 523–4 are thus a reference to Hipponax, not Anaxandrides.

**test. 3 K.-A.**

Marm. Par. *FGrHist* 239 A 70

ἀφ' οὗ Ἀναξανδρίδης ὁ κωμ[ιδοποιὸς ἐνίκησεν Ἀθήνησιν, ἔτη ΗΔΙΙΙ,  
ἄρχοντας] Ἀθήνησι Καλλέου (a. 377/6)

suppl. Palmerius et Prideaux

From when Anaxandrides the com[ic poet won at Athens, 113 years, in the  
archonship] of Kalleas (a. 377/6) at Athens

**Citation Context** The entry in the Marmor Parium doubtless records the first victory of Anaxandrides, almost certainly at the City Dionysia. The precise year in which he began competing is unknown, but this victory must have fallen within the first half-dozen years or so of his competitive career. The victory was followed by another the next year (test. 4).

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.367; Jacoby 1929–1930 *ad loc.*

**test. 4 K.-A.**

*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 2318.241 (1150 Millis–Olson) (certamen Dionysiorum a. 375)

[Ἀνα]ξανδρί[δης ἐδίδασκε]

suppl. Reisch

[Ana]xandri[des was the (comic) poet]

**Citation Context** *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 2318, the so-called Fasti, provides an annual account of the victors at the City Dionysia in the boys' and mens' choruses, tragedy and comedy, together with the choregos for each; from *ca.* 450 BC the victorious tragic actor is included as well. The list seems to have begun within a few years of the beginning of the fifth century BC, apparently the date at which the contests were institutionalized, and presumably ran until the abolition of the choregia near the end of the fourth century BC; the extant portions include discrete sections between 473/2 and 329/8 BC. The extant part of the entry for 376/5 BC records that Anaxandrides was the victorious comic poet that year and that his choregos was a certain [3–4]gnētos, who is not further identifiable. Since test. 3 appears to attest that Anaxandrides' first victory (*sc.* at the City Dionysia) was in 377/6 BC, the victory recorded here was his

second at that festival, and his first two victories at the City Dionysia were in successive years.

**Discussion** Millis–Olson 2012. 5–8 and *ad loc.*

**test. 5 K.-A.**

*IGUR* 218.1–14 (= *IG* XIV 1098) (poetarum comicorum successus)

[ - - - ] ἐπὶ Χίωνος (365/4) Μαι[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]ς Διονύσου γοναί[ς - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] Ἀμπρακιώτιδι Γ ἐν [ἄστει - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] Λυσισ[τράτου (369/8) Ἐρεχθεῖ ἐ[πὶ - - - ]  
 5 [ - - - ] Ἡρακ[λεῖ ἐπὶ Χαρισάνδρο[υ (376/5) - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] ἐπὶ Ἰπ[ποδάμαντος (375/4) Ἰοῖ ἐ[πὶ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] Ὀδυσσεῖ ἐπὶ Κηφισοδ[ότου (358/7) - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] ἐπὶ Ἀπολλοδώρου (350/49) Ἀγ[ροίκοις - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] διὰ Ἀνα]ξίππου Λήναια ἐπ[ὶ - - - ]  
 10 [ - - - ] οἴωι ἐπὶ Ναυσιγένου[ς (368/7) - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] Ε ] ἐν ἄστει ἐπὶ Χίωνος[ (365/4) - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] τεῖ ἐπὶ Ἀγαθοκλέου[ς (357/6) - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] ἐπὶ Θουδήμου (353/2) Ἀ[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] ου Ἀντέρωτι ἐ[πὶ - - - ]

1 Μαι[νομένωι Oderico: -μένωις Bergk: -μένηι Kock: -μέναις Edmonds: Μαι[νάδι Kaibel 3 suppl. Boeckh 4 suppl. Sandrius 5 Ἡρακ]λεῖ Sandrius: Ἀχιλ]λεῖ Oderico 6 ἐπὶ Ἰπ] suppl. Sandrius cet. suppl. Dittmer 7 Κηφισοδ[ώρου (a. 365) Sandrius: Κηφισοδ[ότου (a. 357) Körte 8 Ἀγ[ροίκοις vel Ἀγ[χίσηι Boeckh 9 δι' Ἀνα]ξίππου Bergk (διὰ ... Boeckh): διὰ Διω]ξίππου Wilhelm 10 ]οἴωι leg. Oderico unde λουτροπ]οἴωι vel λυροπ]οἴωι suppl. ipse: ]οἴωι leg. Sandrius unde Ὡῶι Bergk, Ἀχελ]ώωι Moretti, fort. σ]ώωι 12 Φαρμακομάν] τεῖ Wilamowitz

[ - - - ] in the archonship of Chion (a. 364) with Μαι[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] in the archonship of - - -]s with *Dionysou gonai* [ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] with *Amprakiōtis*. Third in [the City Dionysia - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] in the archonship of Lysis]tratus (a. 368) with *Erechtheus*, i[n the archonship of - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] (fragment of title), in the archonship of Charisandro[s (a. 375) - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] Fourth in the City Dionysia in the archonship of Hip]podamas (a. 374) with *Iō*, i[n the archonship of - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] with *Odysseus*, in the archonship of Cephisod[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] in the archonship of Apollodorus (a. 349) with Ag[ - - - ]

[ - - - produced by (?) - - ]xippus. At the Lenaea in the archonship of  
 [ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] (fragment of title?), in the archonship of Nausigene[s (a. 367)  
 - - - ]  
 [ - - - Fifth] in the City Dionysia in the archonship of Chion (a. 364)  
 [ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] (fragment of title), in the archonship of Agathocle[s (a. 356)  
 [ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] in the archonship of Thoudemos (a. 352) with A[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - in the archonship of] (fragment of name) with *Anterōs*, i[n the  
 archonship of - - - ]

**Citation Context** The inscription is one of the few extant fragments of what must have been an extraordinarily large document giving the agonistic history of the Greek comic poets; it was erected in Rome, where it may have decorated the walls of one of the Imperial libraries. Other poets listed on the surviving fragments include Callias, Lysippus, Telecleides and Xenophilus.

**Interpretation** The fragment detailing the career of Anaxandrides is the largest fragment to survive. Like the other fragments, it lists the poet's victories at the City Dionysia followed by his victories at the Lenaea, then his second place finishes at each festival, then his third, and so forth. Each entry records the name of the relevant archon and the name of the play; in one instance (*IGUR* 218.9), a producer (for an unknown play) appears to be included. The names or partial names of twelve comedies by Anaxandrides survive; the document includes titles not attested elsewhere and is the only source that offers a precise date for any of Anaxandrides' comedies.

**Discussion** Millis–Olson 2012. 223–4, 229

#### test. 6 K.-A.

*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.142 (= 2325E.37 Millis–Olson) (poetae Lenaeis victores)  
 Ἀναξᾶ[νδρί]δης III  
 Anaxa[ndri]des 3 times

**Citation Context** *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325, the so-called Victors List, is composed of eight separate lists that record the victorious poets and actors for both tragedy and comedy at both the City Dionysia and the Lenaea; each list is arranged

chronologically in the order in which each competitor won his first victory; the names are followed by the total victories of the individual at that festival.

**Interpretation** *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2325.142* (= 2325E.37 Millis–Olson) records that Anaxandrides was victorious at the Lenaea three times; Philippus (with two victories) and Choregus (with one victory) precede him in the list, while Philetaerus (with two victories), Eubulus (with six victories), Ehippus (with one victory), Antiphanes (with eight victories), Mnesimachus (with one victory), Nausicrates (with three victories), Euphanes, Alexis (with at least two victories), and Aristophon follow. The relevant portion of the list for the City Dionysia is not extant, but Anaxandrides must have won seven times at that festival, since he took the prize three times at the Lenaea and ten times in total (test. 1).

**Discussion** Millis–Olson 2012. 133–4, 178–9 and *ad loc.*

#### test. 7 K.-A.

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2323a.39–40* (= 2323a Col. I.5–6 Millis–Olson) (comoediae Dionysiis actae)

[ἐπὶ Πολέμ]ωνος (312/1) παλαιᾷ  
[ ca. 6 ]Θησαυρῶι Ἀναξαν(δρίδου)

suppl. Wilhelm

[in the archonship of Polem]on (a. 312/1) with an old (comedy)  
[ ca. 6 the] *Thēsauros* of Anaxan(drides)

**Citation Context** ‘Old’ comedies had been revived at the City Dionysia since 340/39 BC (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2318.318–19* = 2318.1564–5 Millis–Olson); revivals of tragedies had begun a generation or so earlier in 387/6 BC (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2318.202–3* = 2318.1010–11 Millis–Olson). In the so-called Didascaliae (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2319–2323a*), an account of all the competitors in the dramatic contests at the Lenaea and City Dionysia each year, together with names of their plays and the protagonist in each, each annual entry began with the name of the relevant archon and, for the City Dionysia, information about that year’s revival. The entry here is the earliest to survive and records that Anaxandrides’ *Thēsauros* was revived in the archonship of Polemon (312/1 BC); the name of the protagonist is lost.

**Discussion** Millis–Olson 2012. 59–60, 70 and *ad loc.*



**test. 8 K.-A.**

Arist. *Rh.* 3.1413b25

Φιλήμων ὁ ὑποκριτῆς (Stephanis 1988 #2485) ... ἐν τε τῇ Ἀναξανδρίδου  
Γεροντομανίᾳ (fr. 10) ... καὶ ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ τῶν Εὐσεβῶν (fr. 13)

Philemon the actor (Stephanis 1988 #2485) ... in Anaxandrides' *Gerontomania*  
(fr. 10) ...and in the prologue of *Eusebeis* (fr. 13)

**Citation Context** Aristotle refers in passing to the delivery of fr. 10 and 13 by the actor Philemon in order to provide an example of the sort of *variatio* that is desirable in public speaking

**Interpretation** The actor Philemon (Stephanis 1988 #2485) was active from the 370s to 340s BC and took first prize twice at the Lenaea (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325.191 = 2325F.36 Millis–Olson); he thus seems to have been a slightly younger contemporary of Anaxandrides.

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.369; see on fr. 10; 13.

**Ἄγροικοι** (*Agroikoi*)  
(‘Rustics’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.369; 1840 III.161; Bothe 1944. 34–5; Meineke 1847. 574; Bothe 1855. 418; Kock 1884 II.135; Ribbeck 1885. 9–10; Breitenbach 1908. 76 n. 198; Edmonds 1959 II.44–5; Webster 1970. 56, 178; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.238; Fisher 2000. 357; Wilkins 2000. 222–3; Konstantakos 2005; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 238; Rusten 2011. 463

**Title** Anaxilas, Antiphanes, Augeas, Menander and Philemo all wrote an Ἄγροικος; Plautus an *Agroecus*; Pomponius a *Rusticus*. Anaxandrides is the only comic poet who certainly wrote an Ἄγροικοι; Antiphanes may have as well (cf. Antiph. fr. 3 (?); 4; 7; 69), although the references may be to more than one play entitled Ἄγροικος (cf. Breitenbach 1908. 76 n. 198; Konstantakos 2004. 9–13).

Ancient grammarians distinguished between ἄγροϊκος, one who lives in the countryside, and ἄγροικος, one who is backwards in his manners (e.g. Ammon. 6 [cf. Valckenaer *ad loc.* (= 3 Valck.); Poll. 9.12; Hdn. Gr. 1.151.13); for similar pairs, cf. αἰσχρος/αἰσχροῦς; γέλοιος/γελοῖος; μόχθηρος/μοχθηρός; πόνηρος/πονηρός. In comedy, however, there is little reason to make the distinction, since the two senses are often blurred and one rarely exists without some suggestion of the other. Ancient grammarians also explained the different accentuations of this and similar words as a dialectal distinction: see Chandler 1881 §387–8, citing *inter alios* Thomas Magister p. 40 Ritschl (quoted by Fix at Stephanus 1831–1865 s.v. ἄγροικος [1.495d]) to the effect that the adjective is always proparoxytone in Attic, although he had earlier (§260–1) claimed that the substantive is generally properispomenon; Probert 2006. 74–5, 260, 263.

The character of the ἄγροικος appears in fifth-century comedy (e.g. Strepsiades in Ar. *Nu.*), but the evidence of titles suggests that it came to the fore only in the fourth century. The ἄγροικος is described at Thphr. *Char.* 4 as an ignorant boor; for the view that Theophrastus’ *Characters* was derived from a treatise on comedy, see Rostagni 1920; Navarre 1924. 207–11; Ussher 1977. In comedy, the dominant characterization is more a lack of sophistication due to ignorance (e.g. Men. *Georg.* fr. 5 Sandbach [fr. 3 Kō.] εἰμὶ μὲν ἄγροικος, καὺτὸς οὐκ ἄλλως ἐρῶ, / καὶ τῶν κατ’ ἄστὺ πραγμάτων οὐ παντελῶς / ἔμπειρος [‘I am a rustic; I don’t deny it and am completely unfamiliar with city affairs’]), perhaps combined with forthrightness (cf. Ar. dub. fr. 927 [= adesp. com. fr. 227 K.] ἄγροικος εἰμὶ· τὴν σκάφην σκάφην λέγω [‘I am a rustic; I call a spade a spade’]); MacLeod 1978. 508 n. 5 tentatively assigns this fragment to a

fourth-century *Agroikos/oi*). Aristophanic parallels (e.g. Strepsiades, Trygaios [esp. *Ar. Pax* 190–191]) suggest that the figure can be used to attack supposed urban vices or non-traditional behaviour as much as to mock the rustic himself. In general, see Ribbeck 1885; for comedy in particular, Legrand 1910. 72–80; Konstantakos 2005.

The plural title probably refers to the chorus; in this play, the main character (or at least the addressee of fr. 1 and the speaker of fr. 2 and 3) seems to belong to the same group (cf. on fr. 1.4). Other possible examples of titles denoting the main character together with the chorus include *Eusebeis* and *Zōgraphoi ē Geōgraphoi*; cf. *Ar. Ec.* and see introduction.

**Content** As has long been recognized, the three surviving fragments from this play can produce an intelligible narrative (thus their traditional numbering, which disrupts the order of presentation in Athenaeus): participation in a symposium (fr. 1), subsequent description of a feast/symposium, usually assumed to be that of fr. 1 (fr. 2), recollection of heavy drinking (fr. 3). Fr. 59, describing a cure for hangovers, might belong as well; the fragment is transmitted without title by the epitome of Athenaeus, and the absence of a title probably reflects the activity of the epiminator rather than evidence that Athenaeus himself did not know it. Fr. 72, likewise transmitted without title by the epitome, might also belong (see *ad loc.*); if so, its narration of a past event suggests associating it with fr. 2. Nonetheless, since the same scene is unlikely to have been both acted out on stage and then subsequently described, fr. 1 and 2 are best taken as referring to separate events. Moreover, if both fragments are connected to the structure of the plot, their order is better inverted. Fr. 2 belongs to an exposition by the rustic, in which he narrates a past sympotic experience; possibly this event took place in the countryside and motivated a sojourn in the city (see *ad loc.*). Fr. 1 belongs to an (unsuccessful) attempt on the rustic's part (inspired by the symposium of fr. 2?) to act out the part of the host. The latter fragment probably belongs to a scene in which a variety of drinking methods were tried or discussed (see *ad loc.*). Less likely, fr. 2 might be embedded within the scene to which fr. 1 belongs or could be a recollection of the event that grossly mischaracterizes it (e.g. a simple affair described as a magnificent banquet). That there were probably several scenes portraying or recounting symposia may suggest that symposia formed a structural element of the play, but more likely the contrast between the rustics and urban sophisticates that runs through these fragments (cf. Konstantakos 2005. 11–13) was explored in various settings, perhaps resulting in the rustics adopting an extreme version of urban manners or, conversely, rejecting them entirely.

**Date** Test. 5.8 includes among the plays of Anaxandrides that placed fourth at the City Dionysia an Ἄγ[ - - - ], i. e. Ἄγ[ροίοις] or Ἄγ[χίσηι] (fr. 4–5), performed in the archonship of Apollodorus (349 BC). See on *Anchisēs*.

## fr. 1 K.-A. (1 K.)

(A.) τίνα δὴ παρεσκευασμένοι  
 πίνειν τρόπον νῦν ἐστε; λέγετε. (B.) τίνα τρόπον;  
 ἡμεῖς τοιοῦτον οἶον ἂν καὶ σοὶ δοκῇ.  
 (A.) βούλεσθε δήπου τὸν ἐπιδέξι', ὦ πάτερ,  
 5 λέγειν ἐπὶ τῷ πίνοντι; (B.) τὸν ἐπιδέξια  
 λέγειν; Ἄπολλον, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τεθνηκότι;

habet A

2 νῦν ἐστε Meineke: ἐστὲ νυνὶ A 2–3 λέγετε. :: τίνα τρόπον; ἡμεῖς Bothe: λέγετε.  
 :: τίνα τρόπον ἡμεῖς; Dobree: λέγετε· τίνα τρόπον πίνειν ἡμεῖς A 4 δήπου A: δῆτα  
 Cobet 6 ὥσπερ ἐπὶ Schweighäuser: ὥσπερ εἰ A

(A.) In what way then are you ready  
 to drink now? Tell me. (B.) In what way?  
 We (will drink) in whichever way seems best to *you*.  
 (A.) Perhaps you wish, father, that the man to the left  
 5 speak in praise of the one drinking? (B.) That the one to the left  
 speak? By Apollo, just like over a dead man?

Ath. 11.463f

τοῦ δ' ἐπιδέξια πίνειν μνημονεύει καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Ἀγροίοις οὕτως. —

Anaxandrides also mentions drinking from left to right as follows in *Agroikoi*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x—υυ⟩υ υ—|υ— —υ—  
 —υ— —υ—|υ υυυ—  
 —υ— υ—υ|— —υ—  
 —υ— —|υυ— υ—υ—  
 5 υ—υ— —υ—|υ υ—υ—  
 υ—υ— υ—|—υυ —υ—

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 111; Jacobs 1809. 246; Dobree 1833 II.330; Meineke 1884 III.161; 1847. 574; Bothe 1855. 418–19; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvi, 80; Cobet 1858. 19–20; Kock 1884 II.135–6; Madvig 1884. 67; Ribbeck 1885. 10 n. 2; Kock 1888 III.736; Blaydes 1890a. 81; Meinhardt 1892. 32; Reitzenstein 1893. 40; Blaydes 1896. 121; Richards 1907. 160 (= 1909. 79); Edmonds 1959 II.44–5; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.238; Olson 2007. H11; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 238; Rusten 2011. 463

**Citation context** At the beginning of Book 11, Athenaeus touches on various preliminaries before proceeding to the lengthy catalogue of drinking vessels that comprises the remainder of the Book. In this introductory section, he includes a brief account of drinking practices in various cities, citing Critias 88 F 33, who remarks on the Chians and Thasians, Athenians, Thessalians and Spartans; the fragment of Anaxandrides is adduced as further evidence for the custom of drinking from left to right (as the Chians, Thasians and Athenians do, and the Thessalians do not).

**Text** Dobree's τίνα τρόπον / ἡμεῖς; (adopted by K.-A.) in 1–2 is awkward but possible. In the absence of a compelling reason to punctuate thus (as at e.g. Ar. *Av.* 997; *Ra.* 296), Bothe's τίνα τρόπον; / ἡμεῖς κτλ. is better.

ἐπιδέξια (6) is often printed and written in mss. *separatim* ἐπὶ δεξιᾶ, and there is no clear rule as to which form is to be preferred; Darbishire 1890 suggested ἐπὶ δεξιᾶ when understood syntactically (e.g. Ar. *Pax* 957) and ἐπιδέξια when adverbially (as here).

**Interpretation** Speaker B is apparently one of the eponymous rustics, accompanied at least notionally by the chorus (note the plurals; see on 4), although they take no overt part in the action of this fragment. The same man is most likely the speaker of fr. 2 and Speaker B in fr. 3. Speaker A is a more sophisticated person, and thus presumably a city-dweller.

The setting is prior to drinking at a symposium and involves discussion of the precise drinking arrangements to be followed (see on 1–2). The manner discussed here (see on 4–5) is that of a single cup passed around from left to right; each man drinks and then, after passing it to the next man, speaks in praise of the latter while he drinks. The humour lies in the standard trope that exploits not simply unfamiliarity with a custom, often a common one, but misinterpretation of it. For the knowledge and experience of symposia and the associated practices an ordinary Athenian might have possessed, cf. Fisher 2000. 356–69 (357 for Anaxandr. fr. 1–3).

That Speaker A inquires for what manner of drinking the arrangements are made implies that Speaker B is the host or at least in charge at the moment. That Speaker B, despite having made the arrangements, seems to have had no

particular drinking method in mind reinforces the impression of his ignorance of symposia. The question of what manner of drinking the group addressed are now prepared for suggests that other manners had just been employed and thus that the larger scene contained a series of different sorts of drinking arrangements.

**1–2 τίνα ... / ... τρόπον** The wide separation, though unusual, is not unparalleled; cf. Bato fr. 7.7 τίνα γὰρ ἔχει, πρὸς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, διαφοράν. For the suggestion that hyperbaton can reflect ‘the language of everyday use’, see Handley 1965 on Men. *Dysc.* 223f.; Gomme–Sandbach 1973 on Men. *Dysc.* 235 offer further examples in which the associated words are first and last in the clause. The question itself is apparently typical; cf. Pl. *Smp.* 176a τίνα τρόπον ῥᾶστα πιόμεθα;

**παρεσκευασμένοι / ... νῦν** Phrasing the question in terms of completed preparation rather than desire (e.g. ‘How might you wish to drink?’) together with the temporal particle (implying a contrast with what has preceded) suggests that Speaker B has been making some sort of arrangement on stage immediately before this fragment. παρασκευάζω is primarily prosaic/colloquial vocabulary, rare in high poetry (e.g. A. *Ag.* 353; [A.] *PV.* 920); in comedy it is often used of preparing for meals or symposia; e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 1089; Pherecr. fr. 183; Alex. fr. 145.10; Philippid. fr. 28.1.

**λέγετε** A mark of impatience; e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 812; Nu. 786; Pl. *Com.* fr. 204.1; Strato *Com.* fr. 1.6; Antiph. fr. 200.1 with Olson 2007. C13 *ad loc.* (where for H12.2 read H11.2).

**2–3 (B.) τίνα τρόπον** Speaker B echoes the interrogative used by his interlocutor. An interrogative may be repeated either at the end of a lengthy or complex question (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 351) or when the speaker is in a state of high emotion (e.g. Ar. *V.* 166; *Ec.* 1065); since neither is the case here, the repetition indicates a second speaker. Such echoes often entail a switch to the indefinite (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 677; *Av.* 164), but the definite may be retained (e.g. Ar. *Pax* 847 with Olson 1998 *ad loc.*; Antiph. fr. 21.1); cf. Uckermann 1888; Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.517.

The tone of the statement (ἡμεῖς κτλ.) is deferential and reinforces Speaker B’s lack of expertise.

**4–5** The reference is to a single cup (φιλοτησία κύλιξ [‘loving cup’]; cf. Olson 2002 on Ar. *Ach.* 983; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 59.1; Shilleto 1874 on D. 19.128) being passed around the circle. Each man drinks and then passes the cup to the man on his right; after passing the cup, he speaks in honour of the man now drinking. Praise of the drinker is a common feature of symposia and underscores the extent to which drinking was conceived of as a ritualized communal activity. E.g. Critias fr. B 6.2–7; Pl. *Smp.* 214c, 222e; Men. *Dysc.* 948

with Handley 1965 *ad loc.*; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 55; Murray 1990 *passim*; also e.g. Schmitt-Pantel 1990. 24–5; Cooper and Morris 1990. 77–9; Schmitz 1978. 293–4.

The suggestion is phrased as a question for the sake of politeness. δῆπου (‘I suppose’; predominantly late fifth/fourth-century ‘colloquial’ vocabulary) has a suggestion of tentativeness, but implies an affirmative answer; cf. Denniston 1954. 267. Cobet’s δῆτα is common in comedy (esp. Ar. *Av.* 1689; *Ra.* 416 [both adduced by Cobet]), but is too strong for the tone here.

τὸν ἐπιδέξι(α) ἐπιδέξια is properly ‘from left to right’, with a secondary sense of ‘correctly, dexterously, cleverly’ (cf. esp. Hdt. 2.36.4 with Lloyd 1975–1988 *ad loc.*); see Darbishire 1890 [= 1895. 65–87]; Braunlich 1936. The directional sense is operative here, although the second sense is evoked, in that the man speaking is expected to do so cleverly (cf. Pl. *Tht.* 175e for the simultaneous use of both senses). The latter contrasts with the evident ignorance of Speaker B and his failure to understand its use. The noun to be supplied with τὸν ἐπιδέξια is ἄνδρα, as at Pl. *Smp.* 214c καὶ τοῦτον (sc. εἰπεῖν) τῷ ἐπιδέξια καὶ οὕτως τοὺς ἄλλους, 222e, although this has been needlessly disputed. Schweighäuser suggested the superficially obvious τρόπον, but this would mean that λέγειν ... πίνοντι must be in apposition to the understood τρόπον, a construction occurring only in Homer and prose (see Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.4 for examples). Reitzenstein 1893. 40 preferred λόγον, comparing Eup. fr. 354 ὅταν δὲ δὴ πίνωσι τὴν ἐπιδέξια (sc. κυλικὴν Reitzenstein, although Schweighäuser’s πόσιν or even his πρόποσιν deserve mention). Aside from other difficulties, it is difficult to understand λόγον before hearing λέγειν, since ellipses of this sort immediately precede the verb and are unambiguous (e.g. H. *Il.* 2.379 ἔς γε μίαν βουλεύσομεν; cf. Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.558).

ὦ πάτερ Dickey 1996. 78–81 claims that when πάτερ used for non-relatives, it is ‘a general polite address for older men, one which certainly indicates some respect and/or affection’ (p. 79). This is generally true for Homer (e.g. *Od.* 7.28) and tragedy (e.g. A. *Ag.* 1305; S. *OC* 1700) but less so for comedy, and Dickey’s own examples from Aristophanes (*Eq.* 725, 1215; *V.* 556) are better understood in light of Gomme–Sandbach 1973 on *Epitr.* 231: ‘Common as an ingratiating form of address by slaves to an elderly man, ... but not confined to slaves’ (cf. esp. Men. *Dysc.* 492–7; for further examples, Headlam–Knox 1922 on Herod. 1.60; Handley 1965 on Men. *Dysc.* 494). For the voc. sing. with pl. verb (βούλεσθε) used to address the representative of a group, e.g. Ar. *Ra.* 1479; Men. *Sam.* 252; Herod. 3.87 with Headlam–Knox 1922 *ad loc.*; cf. Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.85; Diggle 1994. 506. For ὦ with the vocative, see Dickey 1996. 199–206 (with earlier bibliography), who suggests that its use reached a highpoint in the late fifth/early fourth century (Ar. uses

it with 80 % of his vocatives) before declining in popularity over the course of the fourth century (Men. 12 %).

ἐπὶ τῷ πίνοντι For this use of ἐπί, see LSJ s. v. B.I.1.b.

5–6 (B.) τὸν ἐπιδέξια / λέγειν The repetition from 4–5 is colloquial and indicates ‘an indignant or incredulous question’; see Diggle 1981. 50–1 for examples and bibliography; Stevens 1976. 38–9; López Eire 1996. 114.

Ἄπολλον Henderson on Ar. *Lys.* 296 notes that ‘Herakles, like Poseidon and Apollo, was invoked (only by men) in reaction to a sudden, extraordinary or frightening event’; e.g. Ar. *Ra.* 659; Amphis fr. 34.1; Eub. fr. 89.4; Alex. fr. 177.6 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Meinhardt 1892. 28–33; Wright 1911. 16–21.

ἐπὶ τεθνηκότι The reference to speaking in honour of the dead refers to the περίδειπνον, a poorly documented part of Greek funerary custom; e.g. Poll. 8.66; *EM* p. 699.43; *CPG* 1.130–131.28 (cf. Leutsch–Schneidewin 1839 *ad loc.*; *Suda* ο 874; Phot. π 656); Pfister 1937. 720–4; Kurtz–Boardman 1971. 146; Garland 1985. 146. The περίδειπνον took place in the home and thus is to be distinguished from the θρήνος or any other graveside lament or praise of the dead. This fragment is perhaps the earliest literary evidence for the rite, followed by D. 18.288 (cf. Wankel 1976 *ad loc.*); Anaxipp. Com. fr. 1.42; Hegesipp. Com. fr. 1.11; Men. *Asp.* 233 (cf. Beroutsos 2005 *ad loc.*); fr. 270, although all refer to it only in passing. Accounts of dining expenses (*PTebt.* I 118.1; 120.117; 177; 209) attest to the continued existence of the custom in Egypt at least into the first century BC; cf. also Cic. *Leg.* 2.63. The περίδειπνον also gave its name to a literary genre, apparently related to the encomium, which arose in the fourth(?) century (cf. D.L. 3.2 [Speusippus]; 9.115 [Timo]); see Martin 1931. 162–6.

#### fr. 2 K.-A. (2 K.)

ὥς δ' ἔστεφανώθην, ἢ τράπεζ' ἐπήγετο  
τοσαῦτ' ἔχουσα βρώμαθ' ὅσα μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς  
καὶ τὰς θεὰς οὐδ' ἔνδον ὄντ' ἦδιν ἐγώ·  
οὕτως παρέζων † χρηστῶς οὐκ ἔζων τότε

habet A

1 ἐπήγετο A: εἰσήρετο K–A (ex ἐσήρετο Kock): εἰσήγετο Meineke 2 τοσαῦτ' Musurus: σαυτ A 3 οὐδ' ἔνδον ὄντ' A: οὐδ' εἰ γέγονεν Hirschig 4 παραζῶν Olson χρηστῶς οὐκ A: e.g. ὥς κακῶς ... / ἀχάριστος Millis: ὥσπερ οὐκ Handley: χρηστός, οὐκ Villebrune: χρηστὸς οὐδ' Olson: Χρηστέ, κούκ Dobree (Χρήστε Meineke)



When I had been garlanded, the table was brought in  
 with more food, by the gods  
 and goddesses, than I had ever seen inside.  
 Thus I was merely existing † I was not truly living then

Ath. 14.642b

Ἀναξανδρίδης Ἄγροίκοις: —

Anaxandrides in *Agroikoi*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —

**Discussion** Jacobs 1809. 340; Dobree 1833 II.349; Meineke 1840 III.162; Bothe 1944. 34–5; Meineke 1847. xv, 574; Hirschig 1849. 4; Bothe 1855. 419; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvi–clxxvii; Cobet 1858. 107; Nauck 1862. 186 n. 1; Nauck 1866. 732; Kock 1875. 399–400; Kock 1884 II.136; Ribbeck 1885. 10 n. 2; Blaydes 1890a. 81; Nauck 1894. 92–3; Blaydes 1896. 121; Herwerden 1903. 96; Legrand 1910. 75; Headlam–Knox 1922. 120 n. 2; Edmonds 1959 II.46–7; Webster 1960. 140–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.239; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 239; Rusten 2011. 463

**Citation context** Athenaeus quotes these lines in the course of a lengthy discussion (639b–643d) of the so-called δεύτεραι τράπεζαι (Poll. 6.83 suggests the existence also of τρίται τράπεζαι) that followed a δεῖπνον and consisted of snacks such as fruit, nuts, and small game (e.g. Amphis fr. 9; Antiph. fr. 172; Philippid. fr. 20; Pl. *R.* 372c; Ath. 14.641f). The δεύτεραι τράπεζαι were a separate event rather than a second course of the δεῖπνον (Arist. fr. 104), and the food was not so much a dessert as a stimulant or complement to the wine that usually accompanied it (Arist. *Pr.* 930b12–14; Gal. VI.550 Kühn [*CMG* V.4(2) 259]); in general, see Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.111 (*SH* 534); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 168.2.

**Text** In 1, K–A print εἰσῆρτο in place of the paradosis ἐπήγετο, accepting Kock’s lengthy argument that neither the simplex nor compounds of ἄγω are not used for the serving or removal of food and drink at banquets and that parallels exist only for εἰσφέρεται (Ar. *V.* 1216; fr. 545.1; Pherecr. fr. 73.1; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 1165), παρατίθεται (Crates Com. fr. 16.5; Alex. fr. 176), παράκειται (Diod. Com. fr. 2.10) and ἐσαίρεται (Ar. *Ra.* 520); cf. the use of αἶρω at Ar. *Pax* 1; *Th.* 254; Pl. Com. fr. 46.4. Despite Kock’s demonstration that a different word

could have been used, emendation is uncalled for, since the transmitted text makes sense, the alleged corruption is difficult to account for, and a parallel is provided by Antiph. fr. 172.5 εἴτ' ἐπεισῆγεν χορείαν ἢ τράπεζαν δευτέραν (although the latter is conceivably an example of zeugma). Possibly relevant is the use of συνήγετο in fr. 72, but the obscurity of that fragment hinders its usefulness here. The choice of an unusual word may contribute to the characterization of the speaker as someone with little experience of elite dining/symposiastic practice.

In 3, Hirschig's οὐδ' εἰ γέγονεν was accepted in place of the paradosis οὐδ' ἔνδον ὄντ(α) by Cobet 1858. 107 (who described the received text as an 'absurdam scripturam') and enlarged upon by Nauck 1866. 732; cf. D. 18.70; 21.78; Isoc. 9.6; 12.70; Artemo Cass. *FHG* 4.342 fr. 12. The emendation is unnecessary and more trite than the received text.

In 4, the transmitted χρηστῶς οὐκ does not scan. Suggested emendations have focussed primarily on the metrical fault and have ignored one or more of the following points: (1) coordination between the two verbs (παρέζων, ἔζων) is lacking; (2) the meaning of χρηστος, whichever form is used and however accented, remains difficult; (3) Plu. *Mor.* 13b (quoted in Interpretation) notwithstanding, in comedy at least it is difficult to parallel ζάω without modification meaning anything other than simply 'live'. All these problems can be corrected by assuming that χρηστῶς οὐκ is intrusive and has ousted a phrase such as ὡς κακῶς which scans, provides a correlative for οὕτως and supplies modification for ἔζων. χρηστῶς may represent a corruption of the beginning of the next line, in which case reading ἄχρηστος (e.g. Men. fr. 315.3; Diph. fr. 37.3) there is possible, but emendation to ἀχάριστος (e.g. Ar. V. 451; Antiph. fr. 235.4; Alex. fr. 267.6) is preferable; for confusion between ἄχρηστος and ἀχάριστος, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 267.6. If οὐκ is not simply a misguided attempt to rectify an already corrupt line 4, it may be a remnant from the badly truncated next line, in which case οὐκ begins a new sentence following a stop after ἀχάριστος.

Of the various emendations, Handley's ὥσπερ is the best, but it provides no modification for ἔζων and no explanation for the intrusion of χρηστῶς. Olson's suggestions provide coordination between the two parts of the sentence but likewise do not help with ἔζων and the meaning of χρηστός. Villebrune's χρηστός, the simplest change, fixes only the metre and requires that the word be understood sarcastically (thus Jacobs 1809. 340; cf. Ruhnken on Tim. *Lex.* s. v. ἡδύς p. 132). Such a sense is possible (e.g. Pl. *Phdr.* 352b; *Thet.* 124c; D. 18.30, 89, 318; Men. *Asp.* 75 with Beroutsos 2005 *ad loc.*) but is difficult without some sort of marker. There is little force to Meineke's objection that either the definite article or ὢν is necessary; see Headlam-Knox 1922 on Herod.

3.5. Dobree's Χρηστέ, κοῦκ (Χρήστε, κοῦκ Meineke) is implausible, since in Attica, at any rate, the name is unknown before the first century BC (*Agora* XXI, F 243 [cf. F 244]; it remains rare until the second century AD), although it is known somewhat earlier elsewhere (e.g. *P.Hib.* II 208.5 [c. 270–50 BC]).<sup>32</sup> χρηστέ, κοῦκ is possible (cf. Anaxandr. fr. 34.5; D. 18.30 with Wankel *ad loc.*) but unlikely without ὦ (cf. Eibel 1893. 21; Loewe 1925. 128).

**Interpretation** The speaker is generally identified with Speaker B of fr. 1, and the feast/symposium in the two fragments is assumed to represent the same occasion. The identification of speakers is plausible; that of the occasion is not (see above on the content of the comedy). The feast described here was magnificent by the standards of the speaker, but this may be a reflection of his ignorance and is thus not necessarily to be taken at face-value. In any case, the extravagance (real or presumed) of the event caused him to recognize the poverty of his life to date (4) and so may have led to a resolve to experience more such feasts, presumably in the supposedly more luxurious city. In contrast to fr. 1, where Speaker B is part of a group, here he speaks only for himself. Since the chorus of fellow countrymen is not obviously involved, this fragment may belong early in the play before their arrival on stage. This placement supports the notion that the fragment is part of an expository monologue that provides the background and motivation for the character's later actions. The focus is squarely on the food, particularly what is taken to be its enormous quantity, and its impact on the speaker; the host and the servers are invisible in the narrative.

**1 ἐστεφανώθην** The donning of garlands often coincides with the arrival of the δεύτεραι τράπεζαι; e.g. Alex. fr. 252; Nicostr. Com. fr. 27; Dicaearch. fr. 19; contrast Eub. fr. 111 (112K) with Hunter 1983 *ad loc.* (on garlands worn earlier, during the δεῖπνον). For garlands in general, see Blech 1982; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 4.2; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 60.1 (*SH* 192); Austin–Olson 2004 on Ar. *Th.* 447–8.

**2 βρώματ(α)** Prosaic vocabulary for 'food' in general from the fifth century onward (e.g. Th. 4.26.5), although the word most often refers to something cooked (e.g. Anaxandr. fr. 31; Aristopho fr. 7; Sosip. fr. 1.30), rarely to fresh fruit or vegetables (Eub. fr. 13); the only occurrence in Ar. (fr. 347.1) is metaphorical. The prosaic tenor of the word contrasts with the awe the food elicits.

<sup>32</sup> Meineke's correction of χρηστήν to Χρήστην at Philem. dub. fr. 198 is implausible for the same reason.

2–3 **μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς / καὶ τὰς θεάς** Oaths by τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τὰς θεάς are uncommon; cf. Pl. *Smp.* 219c; *Ti.* 27c; D. 19.67; 42.6; Numen. fr. 26.88 (with the phrase perhaps taken from comedy; cf. Hirzel 1883. 14); cf. A. *Th.* 93–4 τίς ... / θεῶν ἢ θεᾶν; Wills 1996. 279. In official contexts, the usual form is that used at e.g. D. 18.1 πρῶτον μὲν, ὧς Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχόμεαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις (cf. Wankel 1976 *ad loc.*). The πάντες θεοί are commonly invoked, often in decrees, after a list of other gods as an apparent attempt not to omit any relevant deity. See in general, Ziegler 1949. 697–729; Kleinknecht 1937. 30–1, 37–8; Meinhardt 1892. 14–17; for inscriptional evidence, Küttler 1909. 46 n. 2; Jacobi 1930. Frequent in oaths swearing to do no harm to the state (cf. Ar. *Av.* 864–7; *Th.* 331–4), the πάντες θεοί are sometimes mentioned also in domestic situations (Men. *Kol.* fr. 1.3–4; *Sam.* 399–400). θεά occurs occasionally in inscriptions (e.g. *IG I*<sup>3</sup> 76.39; *II*<sup>2</sup> 112.9) in place of the normal ἡ θεός, but is primarily poetic vocabulary (e.g. H. *Od.* 1.44; A. *Eu.* 224; E. *Alc.* 984).

3 The speaker's amazement is not just at the quantity of food but also at the fact that so much could be indoors and thus at a private event; he also seems surprised a single individual could have access to such enormous resources. The contrast is with a large outdoor public festival or the like, which would have comprised the normal person's experience with large quantities of food. Possibly the speaker knows the place in question, and the incongruity of seeing such a quantity of food there adds to his awe. If so, the location may be the house of a fellow countryman (who perhaps learned city customs from a recent trip?).

For the use of ἔνδον, cf. Ar. *Pax* 1150; Cratin. fr. 204 as emended by Stephanopoulos 1987. 5.

**ἦδεν** Around the middle of the fourth century, ἦδεν replaced ἦδη as the Attic form for the 1st person sg. pluperf. of οἶδα (cf. Moer. η 3 ἦδη Ἀττικῶς· ἦδεν Ἑλληνικῶς). This is the earliest metrically guaranteed instance of the newer form (cf. Macho 298). Demosthenes is generally assumed to be among the first preserved authors to use the newer forms for this and the other persons (Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 II.242), although editors often arbitrarily deny them to ps.-Demosthenes and others roughly contemporary. Manuscript evidence offers no assistance, since the newer forms commonly replace the older (examples collected at Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 II.242; Cobet 1858. 212–22); the fundamental discussion remains Dawes 1817. 232–3; cf. Rutherford 1881. 229–38.

4 Textual corruption obscures the precise wording, but the sense is clear. The line articulates the speaker's realization in the past that his life at that time was merely a shadow of what it could be. This recognition was the result of participation in the feast described in 1–3. Comparison between merely

existing and truly living is a commonplace: e. g. S. *Ant.* 1165–7 καὶ γὰρ ἡδοναὶ / ὅταν προδῶσιν ἀνδρός, οὐ τίθημι ἐγὼ / ζῆν τοῦτον, ἀλλ’ ἔμψυχον ἡγοῦμαι νεκρόν (‘When a man’s pleasures desert him, I judge him not to be alive but consider him a living corpse’); Pl. *Cri.* 48b οὐ τὸ ζῆν ... ἀλλὰ τὸ εὔ ζῆν; *Ap.* 28b; *Phd.* 65a; *R.* 329a; *Mart.* 6.70.15; *Sen. Ep.* 123.10 (paraphrased by Stephanus 1831–1865 s. v. παραζῶω 6.253b); cf. Simon. *PMG* 584; *Mimn.* fr. 1.1. For the particular expression used here, cf. Plu. *Mor.* 13b (στιγμὴ ... βίος = adesp. com. fr. 1392 K. [not accepted by K.-A.]) ‘στιγμὴ χρόνου πᾶς ὁ βίος’ λέγοντες: ‘ζῆν οὐ παραζῆν προσῆκε’ (‘“All life is a moment of time,” they say; it is right to live, not merely to exist’).

**παρέζων** The verb occurs only here prior to Plutarch, unless adesp. com. fr. 1392 K. is accepted as genuine (for another possible example, cf. *Philem.* fr. 144.1 as emended by Gesner). Anaxandrides may have coined the word, but the compound is obvious.

## fr. 3 K.-A. (3 K.)

(A.) μεγάλ’ ἴσως ποτήρια  
προπινόμενα καὶ μέστ’ ἀκράτου κυμβία  
ἐκάρωσεν ὑμᾶς; (B.) ἀνακεχαίτικεν μὲν οὖν

habent A, *Macr. Sat.* 5.21.8 (codd. NP): (cymbia) Anaxandrides etiam comicus in fabula Ἄγροικοις (Camerarius : a grecis codd.): ΩΟ ΚΥΜΒΙΑ ΠΡΟΠΙΝΟΜΕΝΑ (MPONINOMHNA N) KAI (KPAY N) METTA (METPA N) AKPATOY (AKPA P) EKAKΩΣEMYMAΣ

1 ποτήρια A: secl. Naber: κυμβία *Macr.* 2 κυμβία A: om. *Macr.* 3 ἐκάρωσεν A: ἐκάκ- *Macr.* ἀνακεχέτικεν A: corr. Musurus

(A.) Perhaps the great cups  
that were pledged and the *kymbia* full of unmixed wine  
overcame you? (B.) Well, they certainly threw us

Ath. 11.481f

(κυμβία) καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Ἀγροίκοις: —

Anaxandrides as well (mentions *kymbia*) in *Agroikoi*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x—υ— —⟩|υ—υ— —υ—  
υ—υ—υ— —|—υ— —υ—  
υ—υ—υ— —|υ—υ— υ—υ—

**Discussion** Dobree 1831. 351; Meineke 1840 III.162; 1847. 574; Bothe 1855. 419; Naber 1880. 54; Kock 1884 II.136–7; Ribbeck 1885. 10 n. 2; Blaydes 1896. 121, 333; Blaydes 1898. 186; Edmonds 1959 II.46–7; Webster 1970. 44; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.239; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 239; Rusten 2011. 463

**Citation context** Athenaeus cites this fragment together with others mentioning *kymbia* as part of the long catalogue of cups that comprises most of Book 11. In a similar context, Macrobius adduces this and other fragments as evidence for *kymbia* in the course of his discussion (*Sat.* 5.21) of Vergil’s use of Greek cup names (cf. *Aen.* 3.66 for *cymbia*). The text of the fragment in Macrobius is lacunose and corrupt; this is largely due to unfamiliarity with Greek on the part of Latin-speaking scribes, but Macrobius himself may have cited only an abridged form of the fragment (see on 1). In any case, Macrobius likely depends on Athenaeus, so his value as a witness for the text is limited.

**Text** Macrobius offers only the final metron in 1, with κυμβία in place of Athenaeus’ ποτήρια. Naber 1880. 54 mistakenly took this as evidence that Athenaeus’ ποτήρια is an interpolation and thus deleted the word. The text of Macrobius is better explained the result of the accidental omission of -του (< ἀκράτου; cf. AKPA P) κυμβία, and its mistaken insertion at the beginning of the fragment (thus Jan). κυμβία may thus have ousted ποτήρια, or more likely Macrobius cited only 2–3 (thus Willis).

**Interpretation** Speaker A is addressing a group or more likely its representative (Speaker B), presumably the rustic of fr. 1–2. This fragment may be part of the same scene as fr. 1, in which case the two speakers here are probably to be identified with those in that fragment. But this could instead be a subsequent recounting of the symposium in fr. 1; in that case, Speaker B is probably identical in the two fragments, but Speaker A need not be. Regardless, reference is made again to the rustic’s inexperience with the niceties of symposiastic etiquette: he has been drinking unmixed wine (2) and became so drunk that he fell off his couch (3).

1 **μεγάλ(α) ... ποτήρια** ποτήριον is the generic word for a drinking cup, although its size, when noted, is uniformly large (e.g. Antiph. fr. 81; Eub. fr. 42; Timocl. fr. 22; cf. Pherecr. fr. 152). In comedy, the material, if specified, is usually metal (e.g. Alex. fr. 60.2 [gold]; Philippid. fr. 28 [silver]), but in real life ceramic must have been more common (Ath. 11.464a). Men. fr. 438 (ποτήριον τορνευτὸν [‘turned on a lathe’] καὶ τορευτὰ) is odd, lending support to Körte’s suggestion there of ποτήριον τορευτὸν (‘chased’) καὶ τορευτὰ (e.g. κυμβία).

**ἴσως** Softens the claim by adding tentativeness (here false); cf. fr. 1.4–5, where Speaker A likewise phrases a suggestion as a claim. Contrast the response with μὲν οὖν (3).

**2 προπινόμενα** Making pledges to fellow drinkers at a symposium is attested as early as Homer (*Il.* 4.3–4; cf. *Ath.* 1.13f–14a). Participants were toasted by name (e.g. Critias fr. B 6.3, 6–7; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.96) as the cup was passed around; cf. on fr. 1.

**μεστ(ᾶ) ἀκράτου** *Sc.* οἶνου (Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.265–6; Gildersleeve 1900–1911 §32; cf. Ussher 1973 on *Ar. Ec.* 1123; contrast Arnott 1996 on *Alex.* fr. 5.1). According to ancient scholarship, wine was commonly consumed in a mixture of two parts wine to three parts water (cf. Σ<sup>VEΓΘMLh</sup> *Ar. Eq.* 1187a; *Plu. Mor.* 657d), although other ratios (esp. equal parts wine and water; e.g. *Cratin.* fr. 196; *Ar. Pl.* 1132; *adesp. com.* fr. 101.12) were known; in general, see van Leeuwen 1900 on *Ar. Eq.* 1187sq. Drinking unmixed wine, on the other hand, was typically considered barbarous (e.g. *Anacr. PMG* 356b.3; *Ar. Ach.* 75 with Olson 2002 *ad loc.*; *Pl. Lg.* 637d) and was generally reserved for toasts dedicated to the ἀγαθὸς δαίμων (e.g. *Ar. Eq.* 85; *Pax* 300 with Olson 1998 *ad loc.*; *Philoch. FGrHist* 328 F 5b; *Philonides ap. Ath.* 15.675b; cf. Arnott 1996 on *Alex.* fr. 9.3–4; Komornicka 1996. 169–72).

**κυμβία** A drinking cup apparently named after a boat (e.g. *Hsch.* κ 4542; *Suda* κ 2683; *Phot.* κ 1199 [cf. κ 1207]), although Haupt 1848. 411–14 (= 1875–1876 I.230–3) argues that in fact the boat is named after the cup. As Macrobius notes, such names are common, e.g. ἄκατος (*Antiph.* fr. 3; *Theopomp. Com.* fr. 4.2); τριήρης (*Antiph.* fr. 223.4; *Epin.* fr. 2.8); κἀνθαρος (*Phryn.* *Com.* fr. 15; cf. *Ar. Pax* 143 with Olson 1998 *ad loc.*); cf. English ‘schooner’; Wilkins 2000. 238–41. Like most similar cup-names, κυμβίον first occurs in the late fifth/fourth century, e.g. fr. 33; *Theopomp. Com.* fr. 32; *Ephipp.* fr. 9.2; *Alex.* fr. 100.1. The name of the boat does not occur before the fifth century (first at *S.* fr. 127), although seemingly related words occur as early as Homer (e.g. *Il.* 16.379 ἀνεκυμβάλιαζον). The word itself appears to be non-Greek (thus Beekes).

The κυμβίον seems to have been long and narrow (ἐπίμηκες καὶ στενόν; cf. the lexicographers cited above; *Did.* p. 75 fr. 40) and could be ornamented with chasing (*Simaristos ap. Ath.* 11.481d τὰ κοῖλα ποτήρια καὶ μικρά [Kaibel’s emendation τὰ ποτήρια καὶ πλοῖα μικρά is misguided; for the meaning of κοῖλα, cf. *Arist. Oec.* 1350b23; Pearson on *S.* fr. 378]); cf. *Alex.* fr. 100.1–2 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*, although his difficulty with the passage, like Kaibel’s, is mistaken; *Men.* fr. 438 with Körte’s emendation (cited on 1 above). Unless the shape of the cup can be used as evidence for the shape of the boat, little about the latter is known other than that it was small and the name could be used generically for any small vessel (cf. Casson 1971. 329–30).

**3 ἐκάρωσεν** A quasi-technical term for the action of a strong agent and its ability to ‘stupify’ or ‘render unconscious’, the word and its cognates occur rarely in poetry (*Theoc.* 24.59) and only here in comedy. For its use to



describe the effects of heavy drinking, Antipho Soph. 87 B 34; Ath. 1.33a; LXX *Je.* 28 (51):39; Hsch. κ 850, 954; cf. Philonides ap. Ath. 15.675b οἱ δὲ (sc. those drinking unmixed wine) νεκροῖς ἐώκεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς καρώσεως ('Because of their stupor, they resembled the dead.'). Cf. on ἀνακεχαίτικεν.

**ἀνακεχαίτικεν** Properly of a horse throwing back its mane (χαίτη) and thus rearing up (e.g. [E.] *Rh.* 786), the verb developed the extended meaning 'to throw (sc. a rider)', i.e. the result of such an action. More commonly, it is used metaphorically, both in poetry (e.g. E. *Ba.* 1072; Timoth. *Pers.* 18 [*PMG* 791.17–8]; Men. *Sam.* 209 with Gomme–Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.*) and prose (e.g. D. 2.9; Plu. *Demetr.* 34); cf. Harp. p. 37.1 Dindorf (α 139 Keaney); Phryn. *PS* p. 32.8; Pearson 1917 on S. fr. 179. Webster 1970. 44 understands Anaxandrides' use of the word as a reference to D. 2.9, but the metaphor is common (similarly dubious is his supposition of a connection between Antiph. fr. 188.15 and D. 4.33; contrast Anaxil. fr. 8; Antiph. fr. 167; Alex. fr. 7; 303; Timocl. fr. 20, all of which do refer to Demosthenes' distinction between δίδωμαι and ἀποδίδωμαι regarding Philip's offer to 'give' Halonnesus to the Athenians). The subject here is normally assumed to be the large quantity of wine consumed, and the verb taken to mean 'incapacitate'. More likely, the verb retains a literal sense, and drunkenness caused the speaker to fall to the floor. He may have done this by upending his couch, possibly as a result of sitting astride it like a horse; the subject may have thus been the couch itself, presumably specified in the next, now missing line. In any case, the notion of action inherent in this verb contrasts with and corrects the use by Speaker A of ἐκάρωσεν to imply that the effect of the wine was primarily soporific.

**μὲν οὖν** Indicates general agreement with the previous speaker, but introduces a stronger expression offered as a correction (Denniston 1954. 475–476); cf. Ar. *Ra.* 612; Pherecr. fr. 76.2.



Ἀγχίσσης (*Anchisēs*)  
(‘Anchises’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.369; 1840 III.162; 1847. 575; Bothe 1855. 419; Kock 1884 II.137; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.240; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 240

**Title** Eubulus is the only other poet known to have written a play with this title. Plays named for heroes of mythology/early epic are common in the fourth century (e.g. Eubulus *Ganymēdēs*; Antiphanes *Oinomaos*; the various Helen plays of Alexis; etc.) but seem to have been particularly favoured by Anaxandrides (e.g. *Achilleus*, *Hēraklēs*, *Thēseus*, *Lykourgos*, etc.). See Introduction.

Anchises appears in early epic primarily as the lover of Aphrodite and the father of Aeneas (e.g. *H. Il.* 2.819–21; 5.311–13; *Hes. Th.* 1008–10); the affair with Aphrodite is given extended treatment in the Homeric hymn to her. Although a member of the Trojan royal family, Anchises (like Aeneas [*H. Il.* 20.188–9]; cf. Paris at *Luc. Iud. Deor.* 13–14) is often depicted as a rustic cowherd (e.g. *H. Il.* 513; *hVen.* 54–5); see Olson 2012. 2–4. The allusion at *H. Il.* 5.268–9 to Anchises ‘stealing’ the divine horses of Laomedon by secretly mating mares with them may point to the existence of stories in which Anchises played the role of a trickster (like e.g. Odysseus and Sisyphus). Perhaps relevant in light of fr. 4 are Anchises’ wild changes of fortune (from cowherd to lover of a goddess; from Trojan royalty to refugee). In general, see Wörner in Roscher 1884–1937 I.337–9; *LIMC* I.1.761–2.

Very unlikely is any connection between the title and either of the other known holders of the name: (1) the father of Echepolus of Sikyon, known only from *H. Il.* 23.296, and (2) the Athenian eponymous archon of 488/7 (*PA* 182; *PAA* 107680), one of a tiny number of examples of a human bearing the name of a hero.

**Content** The obvious possibility for the plot is that it concerned some aspect of Anchises’ affair with Aphrodite, and it may have exploited the hero’s apparent rustic background. Hunter 1983 *ad loc.* presumes as much for Eubulus’ play of the same name, comparing Plautus, *Truculentus* for the ‘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’. Plautus, *Amphitryo* might be a better parallel, or Anaxandrides’ play may have not involved Aphrodite at all. The surviving fragments offer little guidance. Fr. 4, the only substantial fragment, discusses the role in Fortune in changing circumstances, a generic observation applicable to a variety of situations but perhaps particularly appropriate for Anchises.

Fr. 5, the single word ‘half-gold (staters)’, might be an allusion to Aeneas’ mixed parentage or could indicate that the play is set in Athens or at least in the contemporary world. Fr. 58, spoken by Ganymedes, Anchises’ great-uncle or cousin, depending on the genealogy, may also belong to the play (from the prologue?); see *ad loc.* For the content of Anaxandrides’ mythological plays generally, see Introduction.

**Date** For the possibility that the play placed fourth at the City Dionysia in the archonship of Apollodorus (349 BC), 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 5.

## fr. 4 K.-A. (4 K.)

οὐκ ἔστι δούλων, ὦγάθ', οὐδαμοῦ πόλις,  
 Τύχη δὲ πάντα μεταφέρει τὰ σώματα.  
 πολλοὶ δὲ νῦν μὲν εἰσιν οὐκ ἐλεύθεροι,  
 εἰς αὔριον δὲ Σουνιεῖς, εἴτ' εἰς τρίτην  
 5 ἀγορᾷ κέχρηνται· τὸν γὰρ οἶακα στρέφει  
 δαίμων ἐκάστῳ

habent ACE

2 πάντα ACE: πάντη Bothe  
 ἐκάστοτε Herwerden

4 εἰς αὔριον CE: εἰς τ' αὔριον A

6 ἐκάστῳ ACE:

There is no city of slaves anywhere, friend;  
 instead, Fortune changes everybody.  
 Many are not free now,  
 but tomorrow are Sunians, then on the next day  
 5 are sold in the agora; for a god turns the tiller  
 for each man

Ath. 6.263b

καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης δὲ ἐν Ἀγχίση φησὶν (A: φησὶν Ἀναξανδρίδης post verba poetae CE). —

Also Anaxandrides in *Anchisēs* says: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

---υ-- -|---υ-- υ--υ--  
 ---υ-- υ|---υ-- υ--υ--  
 ---υ-- υ--υ|--- υ--υ--  
 ---υ-- υ|---υ-- ---υ--  
 5 υ--υ-- υ|---υ-- υ--υ--  
 ---υ-- -|---(υ-- x--υ-->

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 110; Grotius 1626. 638–9; Meineke 1840 III.162–3; Bothe 1844. 35; Meineke 1847. 575; Bothe 1855. 419; Herwerden 1855. 54; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvii, 80; Herwerden 1876. 305; Kock 1884 II.137; Schmidt 1886–1887 III.49; Kock 1888 III.737; Crusius 1888. 611–12; Blaydes 1890a. 81; Blümner 1891. 165–6; Kordellas 1894. 243; Blaydes 1896. 121; Pickard-Cambridge 1900. 53, 186; Herwerden 1903. 96; Crusius 1910. 80–1 (= Latte 1961 5.80–1); Edmonds 1959. 46–7; Webster 1970. 48; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.240; Vogt–Spira 1992. 58; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 240; Rusten 2011. 463

**Citation Context** The fragment is quoted in Athenaeus as part of a belated answer to an earlier question (6.228d) as to whether people in the past owned as many slaves as they did in Athenaeus' own day. The quotation from Anaxandrides is adduced as the second item, following Pherecr. fr. 10 and preceding Posidon. *FGrHist* 87 F 8 (= fr. 60 Edelstein–Kidd), in a discussion offering a general background to slavery, its nomenclature, and its origins.

**Text** In 3, Bothe's πάντη in place of the paradosis πάντα is unlikely; the word is used occasionally by Aristophanes, but then disappears from comedy aside from Men. fr. 70 (where conjectured by Meineke; note Körte 1959 [fr. 64] *ad loc.*); [Men.] *Mon.* 688.

**Interpretation** The fragment as a whole has a generalizing, expository tenor, but the vocative (1) indicates that it is part of a dialogue. The content is a commonplace assertion of the unpredictability of life and of Fate's overarching control of it (cf. on 2, 5–6). The passage can be read as a philosophical meditation urging acceptance of the working of Fate and one's lot, but could also be understood as lamenting the potential insability of the individual's place in the world. A third possibility is that this is meant as a warning to someone who feels more secure in his position than is warranted. In any case, the passage is best read as a response, whether in agreement or correction, to a previous speaker's comment on his place in life, possibly by adducing the proverbial city of slaves (see on 1). Although the subject is applicable to various events in Anchises' life (e.g., a 'rustic' suddenly having an affair with a goddess, the unexpected fall of Troy and the hero's subsequent death in poverty and exile),

discussion of swings of fate is equally appropriate to a plot revolving around e.g. a child sold into slavery or something far more trivial.

**1 δούλων ... πόλις** The city of slaves is a proverbial location, best interpreted here as a utopia where slaves rule or at least enjoy complete freedom. It appears in two proverbs. *CPG App. Prov.* 2.84 ἐστὶ καὶ δούλων πόλις (cf. Cratin. fr. 223.2; Eup. fr. 212; *CPG App. Prov.* 3.91 μὴ ἐνὶ δούλων πόλις) is explained as referring to those who are governed badly. *CPG Plu.* 1.22 οὐκ ἐστὶ δούλων πόλις (cf. the anonymous trimeter ap. *CPG App. Prov.* 3.91 οὐκ ἔστι δούλων οὐδ' ἐλευθέρων πόλις [Crusius 1888. 611 attributed the line, probably incorrectly, to Anaxandrides; later, at 1910. 80–1 (= Latte 1961 5.80–1), he left it anonymous]) is apparently said in regard to rarity. For discussion of both proverbs, see Crusius 1910. 79–82 (= Latte 1961 5.79–82); cf. Newman 1887–1902 on Arist. *Pol.* 1280a32–4. For the use of proverbial expressions in comedy, see Tzifopoulos 1995.

Δούλων πόλις or Δουλόπολις was often considered a real city and variously located in Libya (e.g. Hecat. *FGrHist* 1 F 345; Ephor. *FGrHist* 70 F 50), Crete (e.g. Sosicr. *FGrHist* 461 F 2), Egypt (Olympianus ap. St. Byz. δ 117 [Gutschmid 1855. 530 = 1889. 46 equates this city with the one in Libya]) or Caria (Plin. *NH* 5.104 [where it is given as another name for Acanthus]); cf. Cousin 1904. 79–80. Newman 1887–1902 on Arist. *Pol.* 3.1280a32–4 reaches the obvious, and surely correct conclusion that these are all merely attempts to place a proverbial site; cf. Crusius 1892. 72–3 (in the context of the place where the mice eat iron [Herod. 3.76; cf. Sen. *Apoc.* 7.1 with Eden 1984 *ad loc.*]).

Arist. *Pol.* 3.1280a32–4 καὶ γὰρ ἂν δούλων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζώων ἦν πόλις ('For there would be a city of slaves and of other animals'), often cited in connection with the 'city of slaves', is of doubtful relevance. Aristotle is using 'slave' not in its ordinary meaning but in his specialized sense, i.e. φύσει δοῦλος (cf. 1.1254b14–23). Similarly irrelevant is 4.1295b21–2 γίνεται οὖν δούλων καὶ δεσποτῶν πόλις ('it becomes a city of slaves and masters'), where the philosopher is describing in quasi-metaphorical terms what happens when a state is composed of only the extremely rich and the extremely poor.

**ῶγαθ(έ)** In comedy at least, ῶ is always present with ἀγαθέ, a seemingly neutral form of address, neither especially friendly nor unfriendly (cf. Dickey 1996. 119–20), although Dickey 139 claims that in Menander, as often in Plato, the speaker is in a position of dominance. This form of address, very common in Plato and found occasionally in other prose authors (e.g. Pl. *Ap.* 24d; *R.* 344e; X. *Mem.* 1.4.17), occurs in poetry only in comedy and is therefore probably colloquial (cf. Wendel 1929. 106).

**2** The earliest occurrence of the sentiment expressed here, a commonplace in Greek thought, is Archil. fr. 16 πάντα Τύχη καὶ Μοῖρα, Περικλεες, ἀνδρι

δίδωσιν ('Fortune and Fate, Pericles, give all things to man'); cf. adesp. trag. *TrGF* fr. 700b.28–9 (= S. fr. 575 Pearson), and Zuntz 1971. 320, where for Hdt. 1.107.2 read 1.207.2.

**Τύχη** Τύχη does not appear in Homer and is mentioned in Hesiod only as a daughter of Tethys and Ocean (*Th.* 360; cf. *hCer.* 420); for her appearance in comedy, see Men. *Asp.* 97–148 (cf. Beroutsos 2005. 14–15; Gomme–Sandbach 1973 on 147–8); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 121.11. In general, see Vogt-Spira 1992, esp. 58; Nilsson 1967–1974 I.200–10; Strohm 1944; Herzog-Hauser 1943 (1657–9 for τύχη in comedy); Berry 1940; Wilamowitz 1931–1932. 298–309. In Athens, the cult of Agathe Tyche seems to have arisen only in the second half of the fourth century; see Parker 1996. 231–2; Mikalson 1983. 58–62.

**μεταφέρει** Cf. [Men.] *Mon.* 734 τάχισθ' ὁ καιρὸς μεταφέρει τὰ πράγματα ('Time swiftly changes things.'). Posidippus *Metapheromenoi*; Timotheus Comicus *Metaballomenos ē Metapheromenos*.

**σώματα** Best taken here as 'persons', despite the context of slavery; cf. Men. *Sic.* 3. The word is used with this sense from the fifth century in both poetry (e.g. S. *Ai.* 758) and prose (e.g. X. *HG* 2.1.19); to refer to a specific class of people, modification is necessary (e.g. Plb. 2.6.6 τὰ μὲν ἐλεύθερα σώματα ..., τὰ δὲ δουλικά). By the third century, it could be used without modification to mean 'slaves'; e.g. *P.Hib* I 54.20 (245 BC); cf. Poll. 3.78; Phryn. *Ecl.* 356; Gomme–Sandbach 1973 on Men. *Sic.* 3; Renehan 1976. 81–2. In any event, the point is that Fortune governs all people, not merely one subset.

3–4 **μὲν ... δέ ... εἴτ(α)** For the combination of particles, cf. Eub. fr. 89; Philem. fr. 127 μὲν ... εἴτα.

3 **δέ** Explanatory; cf. Denniston 1954. 169–70.

**οὐκ ἐλεύθεροι** While ἐλεύθερος is sometimes opposed to δοῦλος (e.g. Eub. fr. 25.4; Alex. fr. 150.3; E. fr. 953e.11 [= adesp. com. fr. 210 K.]), οὐκ ἐλεύθερος is rarely used as a periphrasis for δοῦλος (Arist. *Pol.* 4.1290b10; Pl. *Com.* fr. 182.5; [Men.] *Mon.* 282 [cf. Alex. fr. 150.3]); similar is the rarity of ἀνελεύθερος in this sense (Pherecr. fr. 131; cf. Renehan 1976. 82; Taillardat 1965. 13). Given the following contrast between those who possess wealth (and thus status) and those who do not, οὐκ ἐλεύθεροι here likely suggests society's lower rungs, both cultural and economic (cf. Taillardat 1965. 13; 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 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 **εἰς αὖριον** Synonymous with the adverb without preposition. Found already in early epic (e.g. H. *Od.* 11.351; Hes. *Op.* 410) and occasionally in tragedy (e.g. S. *OC* 567; E. *Alc.* 320) and prose (e.g. Pl. *Mx.* 234b), the phrase is

relatively common in comedy (e.g. Nicoch. fr. 18.1; Philetaer. fr. 7.5; Dionys. Com. fr. 3.15; Alexand. Com. fr. 3.3 [all line initial followed by δέ, με or σε]); cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 243.3. For the conjunction with εἰς τρίτην, cf. E. Alc. 320 with Dale 1954 *ad loc.*

**Σουνιεῖς** Cf. E. Cyc. 293–4 ἢ τε Σουνίου / δίας Ἀθάνας σῶς ὑπάργυρος πέτρα ('And safe is divine Athena's silver-veined rock of Sunium'), which suggests that the main point is an equation of Sunium 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 1894. 243 (discussing IG II<sup>2</sup> 1180) that Anaxandrides used Σουνιεῖς to mean 'extremely wealthy'; cf. Haussoullier 1884. 197, who on the basis of this fragment suggested that the wealth of the Sunians was proverbial. For a real-life instance of a rich mine-owner losing his wealth, see [D.] 42 (probably dating to the 320s; see Usher 1999. 268 n. 84).

Silver mining at Laurium was revived in this period, suggesting that the deme of Sunium was flourishing economically and thus could easily have been 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-fourth century. Kordellas used this inscription as evidence for placing the deme centre at Laurium (a conclusion reiterated by Stanton 1996. 342–53); if true, this might ease the use of the demotic *Sounieis* to refer to the wealth derived from the mines. But the stone was not found *in situ*, and Goette 1995. 171–4 locates the deme centre on the Sunium promontory. For the mines and their exploitation, see X. Vect. 4; D. 37 (cf. Finley 1985. 32–5) offers a glimpse into how financing may have worked. For modern literature, see esp. Kakovogiannes 2005; much of relevance and further bibliography (particularly in the accompanying bibliography of the honorand) can be found in Sekunda 2010. Standard older discussions include Photos–Jones and Jones 1994; Conophagos 1980; Hopper 1953; Hopper 1968; Ardaillon 1897.

The interpretation of this line has proven strangely problematic and a fundamental misconception remains prevalent. Although providing no supporting evidence, Casaubon made the essentially correct claim 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 ['But when we came to holy Sunium, the tip of Athens']) and Ar. Nu. 401, neither of which is relevant, while Blaydes 1896. 121 simply did away with the problem through irresponsible emendation to δεσπότηι, κῆτ'. Far more pervasive 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 seems to rely 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) and, though mistaken, continues to be repeated in discussions of Athenian citizenship and studies of Athenian legal and constitutional history: e.g. Frazer 1913 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’); Cohen 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)’); Lambert 2004. 335 n. 23 (= 2012. 329 n. 23); similarly Whitehead 1986. 257, 292, where he takes Haussoullier 1884 to task for understanding the line as referring to the wealth of the Sunians.

**εἰς τρίτην** Cf. *Ar. Lys.* 612; *E. Alc.* 321; contrast *X. Cyr.* 6.3.11 ἐχθὲς δὲ καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν. Cf. on εἰς αὐριον above.

**5 ἄγορᾷ κέχρηνται** In reference to slaves, the phrase must mean ‘be for sale’ (lit. ‘experience the market’) in light of *Men. Sic.* 7 ἐχρῶντ’ ἄγορᾷ (‘use the market’, i.e. ‘sell’; Gomme–Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.* correctly interpret that line, but misunderstand this one); contrast *X. An.* 7.6.24 ἄγορᾷ ἐχρήσθη (‘used the market’, i.e. ‘bought [sc. goods]’). The same phrase is used to refer to participation in a commercial transaction regardless of point of view, i.e. selling, buying or, in the case of slaves, being sold. Like the previous line, this one has been subject to persistent misinterpretation. The correct interpretation was originally proposed by Dalechamp (‘stant inter vaenales in foro’), followed until recently only by Blaydes 1896. 121 (‘venerint’), but now also by Kassel–Austin and Olson in his edition of Athenaeus. Much more common 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 1992. 58 n. 153, translates ‘um auf dem Markt Sklaven zu kaufen’, while Webster 1970. 48 is noncommittal (‘they use the agora’). Occasionally cited in reference to this fragment, although irrelevant, is a Latin proverb, *scisti uti foro* (*Ter. Ph.* 79; cf. Dziatzko–Hauler 1913 *ad loc.*), which according to Donatus *ad loc.* means *scisti quid te facere oportuerit*; cf. Otto 1890. 145–6 (with Häussler 1968. 165; add *Σ Juv.* 7.221).



5–6 Kassel–Austin compare Philem. fr. 152 κυκλοῖ γὰρ ὁ χρόνος τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὸν βίον / ἡμῶν ἐκάστῳ (‘Time whirls around the character and life of each of us.’); for this fragment and the so-called wheel of fortune in general, see Kassel 1979; Blümner 1891. 165–6.

The image of a helmsman steering a ship is a common metaphor in a variety of circumstances, e.g. A. *Th.* 2–3, 62–4 (ship of state); Ag. 1617–18 (rulers); Antipho 1.13 (justice); S. fr. 869; for Fortune as helmsman, cf. Τύχης δ’ οἶακι at IG VII 3226.5 (Orchomenus; second/first c. BC; = Peek 1955 #1516). For the use of στρέφω as the governing verb, E. *Hel.* 1591; cf. οἰακοστρόφος at P. I. 4.71; A. *Th.* 62; E. *Med.* 523. The two steering oars were mounted, one on each side, near the rear of a ship in either a permanent housing or looped thongs that allowed them to pivot and thus turn the ship; see Morrison and Coates 1986. 174–6; Casson 1971. 224–8. For the helmsman (κυβερνήτης), see Morrison and Coates 1986. 112; Casson 1971. 302.

δαίμων i.e. Tyche.

#### fr. 5 K.-A. (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 ἡμιχρυσοῦς λέγει

habent F, ABCL

Ἀλλεξανδρίδης F ἐν Ἀγχίση om. AB

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

Poll. 6.161

ἡμιχρυσοῦς δ’ Ἀναξανδρίδης

Anaxandrides (uses the word) ‘half-gold’

**Metre** Uncertain (the word itself is trochaic).

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.163; 1847. 575; Bothe 1855. 419; Kock 1884 I.137; Edmonds 1959 II.46–7; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.240; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 241

**Citation context** The word is cited twice by Pollux. The more extensive discussion (9.59) is part of a digression about staters within a larger discussion of coins generally. After relating the names of different staters, all of which are purportedly (solid) gold, Anaxandrides is adduced to show that not all staters



are thus and so that the word ‘stater’ used without qualification cannot be taken always to imply gold. Theopompus fr. 22 follows. Pollux’s other citation (6.161) is in the midst of a list of compound words that begin ἡμι- and offers little help for the interpretation of the fragment. His examples are drawn mostly from comedy, but include a number of references to tragedy and one to oratory (Dinarchus).

**ἡμιχρύσους** The adjective appears nowhere else, but cf. (τὸ) ἡμίχρυσον at *Agora* XVI 296.36, 48, 49 in a list of dedications from the Athenian agora (161/0 BC). Pollux presumably understood the word as referring to electrum staters, in which case the coins are foreign, since the Athenians neither used electrum for coins nor minted staters. Electrum staters appeared in Asia Minor (e.g. Gordium, Ephesus) in the Archaic period and continued to be minted until the fourth century, predominantly in the eastern Aegean but not exclusively so (e.g. Phocaea, Syracuse). The so-called ‘Athenian Standards Decree’ (*IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1453; cf. Stroud 2006. 18–26 for discussion and recent bibliography) regulating the coinage of fifth-century Athen’s subject cities apparently exempted staters (or at least did not mention them), and Cyzicene staters continued to be common. In general, see Kraay 1976. 20–30; Figueira 1998. 92–109, 273–79. For gold staters in comedy, e.g. *Eup.* fr. 123; *Ar. Pl.* 816; cf. Dover 1968 on *Ar. Nu.* 1041.

Since staters were widely used for exchange between Athens and cities of the Hellespont/Black Sea, they might be appropriate for Anchises, who has perhaps come to Athens or at least is placed in the ‘real’ contemporary world. Alternatively, the word possibly refers to the use of alloy, conceivably as a metaphor (e.g. Aeneas’ mixed human/divine parentage?), or could describe a debased coinage (perhaps cf. Hsch. φ 1085 ‘Phocaeans: the name of a people. Also the worst gold’).

**Αἰσχρά (*Aischra*)**  
(‘The Ugly Woman’[?])

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.369; 1840 III.163; 1847. 575; Bothe 1855. 419; Kock 1884 II.137; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.241; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 241

**Title** Euphro’s play is the only other of the same name, although in both cases the meaning is disputed (see below). For Anaxandrides’ comedies named after a non-mythological person, cf. *Kerkios* (?); *Satyrias*; *Sōsippus*; in general, see Breitenbach 1908. For his plays named for a characteristic of a person, cf. *Eusebeis*; *Mai[omenos vel –oi]* (?).

Αἰσχρά or Αἴσχροα? Meineke and Edmonds both hesitantly (‘nisi malis Αἴσχροα’ Meineke) accept Αἰσχρά (‘Ugly Woman’ [or ‘Ugly Girl’]), as they do for Euphro’s play of the same name; Kock and Kassel–Austin prefer Αἴσχροα (a woman’s name [9 exx. in *LGPN*; none Athenian]; cf. Breitenbach 1908. 167–8; Bechtel 1902. 49–51 for Αἴσχροον and Αἴσχροιον; adesp. com. fr. 1152.7 with K–A *ad loc.* for the man’s name Αἴσχρων), although Kassel–Austin print Αἰσχρά for the name of Euphro’s play. The name occurs at Asclep. *AP* 5.181.9 (*HE* 928) and Call. *Epigr.* 50.1 (*HE* 1261), where Gow–Page 1965 claim that it is descriptive in the case of slaves but perhaps otherwise apotropaic. For the difference in accentuation and meaning, cf. on *Agroikoi* above; Alex. Πονήρα with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* (Meineke 1839 I.402 is mistaken to claim that Πονήρα is also a woman’s name.)

In the absence of further information about the play, the best solution is to accept the adjective Αἰσχρά; cf. Anaxandr. fr. 53.9 ἀλλ’ ἔλαβεν αἰσχράν (‘but he took [i. e. married] an ugly woman’); Philippid. fr. 29.1 αἰσχράν γυναικ’ ἔγνημας, ἀλλὰ πλουσίαν (‘You married a woman ugly but rich’).

**Content** Regardless of whether the title is a personal name or an adjective, the feminine suggests that the play concerned a romance, presumably culminating in a marriage. Various scenarios are conceivable: e. g. pursuit of a woman, rightly or wrongly considered ugly and possibly a real or presumed heiress; confusion engendered by mistaking the proper name Αἴσχροα for the adjective αἰσχρά (‘ugly’); or a comic inversion in which women pursue men or ugly women become desirable. All are sheer speculation. The single fragment offers little help other than suggesting that the action included a feast, perhaps as part of a wedding, although there are numerous other appropriate occasions as well.

**Date** Unknown. The quotation from Timotheus (fr. 6) might suggest that the play is best dated relatively soon after the performance of that poem. But the chronology of Timotheus’ works is unknown, and the date of his death

(ca. 360) merely places Anaxandrides' play in the first half or two-thirds of his career.

## fr. 6 K.-A. (6 K.)

ἀρτίως διηρτάμηκε, καὶ τὰ μὲν διανεκῇ  
σώματος μέρη δαμάζετ' ἐν πυρικτίτοισι γῆς·  
Τιμόθεος ἔφη ποτ', ἄνδρες, τὴν χύτραν οἶμαι λέγων

habet A

1 διηρτάμηκεν A διανεκῇ (η supra α) A 2 δαμάζετε A πυρικτίτοισι  
γας (η supra α) A: πυρικτίτω στέγγα (στέγη van Herwerden) Kock: περικτίτοισι γαῖς  
Dobree 3 οἶμαι Boeckh: εἶναι A

He has butchered (the victim) properly and is subduing  
the chine-pieces of the body in the fire-built product of earth.  
Timotheus said this once, gentlemen, meaning, I suppose, his cookpot

Ath. 10.455f

Ἀναξανδρίδης Αἰσχροῖα: —

Anaxandrides in *Aischra*: —

**Metre** Trochaic tetrameter catalectic.

—υ—υ —υ—υ | —υ—υ —υ—  
—υ—υ —υ—υ | —υ—υ —υ—  
—υ—υ—υ —υ—υ | —υ—υ —υ—

**Discussion** Jacobs 1809. 243; Dobree 1833 II.328–9; Meineke 1840 III.163–4; Emperius 1847. 311; Meineke 1847. 575; Bothe 1855. 419–20; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvii; Kock 1884 II.137–8; Schulze 1892. 503; Blaydes 1896. 122; Herwerden 1903. 96; Dupréel 1922. 203 n. 2; Edmonds 1959 II.46–7; Nesselrath 1990. 248–9, 298–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.241; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 241; Rusten 2011. 464

**Citation Context** Athenaeus cites this fragment in the course of the long digression (10.448b–59b) on riddles (γρίφοι) that concludes his Book 10. Much of the ancient scholarship on riddles, including that of Athenaeus, seems to be derived from Clearchus, *On Riddles* (fr. 84–95; cf. Wehrli 1948 *ad loc.*), which offers a typology of seven different kinds (fr. 85; cf. Poll. 6.107). For riddles at symposia, see Starkie 1897 on Ar. V. 20; in general, Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr.

242; Hunter 1983 on Eub. fr. 106 (107 K); Nesselrath 1990. 263–6 (riddles as dithyrambic parody); Schultz 1914 (99–101 for the riddle in comedy); Ohlert 1912; Schultz 1909–1912.

**Text** Despite claims such as Dupréel 1922. 203 n. 2 ‘ce fragment est tout en dorien’, δια- (as opposed to διη-) is the correct Attic form; cf. Thraette 1980 I.132; Mahlow 1926. 173–5; Moer. δ 36 διανεκεῖ λόγῳ, ὡς Πλάτων Ἰππία, Ἀττικῶς, διηνεκεῖ Ἑλληνικῶς. It is possible, however, that Anaxandrides is accurately quoting Timotheus, so διηνεκεῖ should be read in 1 (see, e.g., Kugelmeier 1996. 23–7 for the ‘normalization’ of dialect forms).

ἐν πυρικτίοισι γῆς in 2 has been much doubted, and Kock’s περικτίτῳ στέγῃ (van Herwerden’s στέγη is necessary; cf. above on διανεκεῖ) is often accepted by editors, including Page and Wilamowitz in their editions of Timotheus. Parallels for the emendation are difficult to find, although στέγη is used of a kiln at Antiph. fr. 55.3. The received text, while difficult, is not impossible; cf. Schulze 1892. 503. The genitive can be explained as of material (Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.333); the plural πυρικτίοισι is more difficult to account for. Dobree’s γαῖς solves nothing, since the plural of γῆ, although it can be paralleled, is very rare.

**Interpretation** As 3 makes clear, 1–2 are a direct quotation of the fifth/fourth-century dithyrambic poet Timotheus of Miletus (fr. 22, *PMG* 798). In its original context, the lines were presumably part of a self-consciously poetic description of a feast or similar occasion. The use of compounds, high-flown language and overly poetic metaphors is typical of Timotheus; cf. Stanford 1936. 133–4; Wilamowitz 1903. 43–55. In comedy, such elaborate language is often associated with cooks, and one may have been the speaker here; cf. Wilkins 2000. 380–1; Nesselrath 1990. 249, 298–9; Handley 1965 on Men. *Dysc.* 946–53. For quotation of Timotheus, Antiph. fr. 110 (= Tim. fr. 21, *PMG* 797); Macho fr. 9.81–84 (= Tim. fr. 10, *PMG* 786); cf. Theopomp. com fr. 4 (quotation of Telest. fr. 7, *PMG* 811); Nesselrath 1990. 248–9. For another riddling description of a *chytra*, Antiph. fr. 55.1–6.

1–2 Both are perfect tetrameter lines.

1 **διηρτάμηκε** The verb occurs elsewhere only at [A.] *PV* 1023 διαρταμήσει σώματος μέγα ῥάκος (‘it will butcher the great strip of your body’); διαρταμώντες, cited by LSJ as a conjecture at Ph. 2.564 (= *Leg. Gaium* 131 [6.179 Cohn–Wendland]), is not to be accepted). The simplex is slightly more common (e.g. E. *Alc.* 494; *El.* 816; fr. 612) and seems to be tragic vocabulary, although cognates are prosaic (e.g. *IG VII* 2426.15 ἀρτάμησις; X. *Cyr.* 2.2.4 ἄρταμος). The word may originally have been a quasi-technical term from cooking or butchery (used metaphorically in A.; cf. S. fr. 1025); cf. *EM*

p. 149.55 ἄρταμος· ὁ μάγειρος ... παρὰ τὸ διατάσαι, ὃ ἐστι μερίσαι ... ἄρταμος οὖν, ὁ διαρτῶν τὰ κρέα; *Synagoge* B α 2157 (= Phot. α 2886); Hsch. α 7480; Berthiaume 1982. 98 n. 69.

**διανεκῆ** The adjective is found only here in drama (but διανεκῶς [or διη-; cf. below] at adesp. com. fr. 382 K [rejected by K.-A.] and A. Ag. 319), but is otherwise relatively common (predominantly in poetry). LSJ's citation of Pl. *Hp. Ma.* 301b, where the word is used in an abstract, metaphorical sense, together with this line is misleading; cf. instead H. *Il.* 7.321 νώτοισιν δ' Αἶαντα διηνεκέεσσι γέραιπεν (cf. *Od.* 14.437); V. *Aen.* 8.183 *perpetui tergo bovis*.

**2 δαμάζετ(αι)** Not uncommonly used in a metaphorical sense, e.g. H. *Od.* 9.516; Hes. *Th.* 865 (cf. E. *Alc.* 980); Sapph. fr. 102; Ar. *Pax* 584. Probably accidentally, the word is rare in comedy, found only here and at fr. 34.15; Ar. *Pax* 584; Pl. Com. fr. 189.9.

**ἐν πυρικτίτοισι γῆς** The text could be taken literally: there really are multiple pots, perhaps in preparation for a feast. The better solution is to assume the use of the poetic plural, particularly appropriate in a quotation of Timotheus; cf. Jones 1910. 35–7 for household items; Bers 1984. 57–9 (where note the dominance of paratragedy or tragic quotation). For other compounds in -κτιτος, cf. ἐύκτιτος (H. *Il.* 5.592); ὀρείκτιτος (Pi. fr. 313); θεόκτιτος (Sol. fr. 36.8). For γῆ (i.e. clay) as a building material, e.g. Pi. *N.* 10.35 γαίῃ δὲ καθύεισθαι πυρί; Antiph. fr. 55.3 πλαστόν ἐκ γαίης; fr. 180.3; Semon. fr. 7.21 (cf. Hes. *Op.* 60–1); X. *An.* 7.8.14.

**3 Τιμόθεος ἔφη** Cf. Antiph. fr. 110 φιᾶλην Ἄρεος / κατὰ Τιμόθεον (= Tim. fr. 21, *PMG* 797; cf. Anaxandr. fr. dub. 82); Antiph. fr. 1.6 τραγωδίαν περαίνω Σοφοκλέους; Nesselrath 1990. 248–9; Kugelmeier 1996. 263. For Timotheos' work and influence, cf. van Minnen 1997; West 1992. 361–4.

**χύτραν** The mainstay of the Greek kitchen, the χύτρα is a terracotta pot for heating or boiling water, soup or the like. In Athens, lidded versions begin to appear ca. 500. In general, see Sparkes 1962. 130; *Agora* XII 1.224–6; 2 pls. 93–4; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.48–9 (*SH* 534).

**Ἀμπρακιώτις** (*Amprakiōtis*)  
(‘Ambracian Woman’)

**Discussion** Kock 1884 II.138; Edmonds 1959 II.48–9; Webster 1970. 77; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.241; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 242

**Title** This play is the only known example of the title, although titles of this sort are common; Webster 1970. 77 compares *Samia* (Anaxandrides; Menander), *Olynthia* (Alexis), *Boiōtia* (Theophilus; Webster follows Kock in reading *Boiōtis*) and *Milēsia* (Alexis). Plays with ethnics as titles seem to have formed a small portion of Anaxandrides’ output; in addition to this play and *Samia*, he wrote a *Locrides* and a *Thettaloi*.

Ambracia was a Corinthian colony founded *ca.* 625 BC in southern Epirus, just north of the modern Gulf of Arta; in the fourth century, it seems not to have been much involved 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 340s BC before becoming a Macedonian dependency following Chaeroneia. In general, cf. Hirschfeld 1894. 1805–7; Hammond 1967. For the spelling, cf. St. Byz. α 265 εὔρηται καὶ διὰ τοῦ π ἀντὶ τοῦ β, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ Ἀμπρακιώτης κτλ.

**Content of the comedy** Like most similarly titled comedies, the obvious assumption is that the plot bore some general resemblance to Menander’s *Samia*; such speculation can be neither proven nor disproven.

**Date** The title is known only from the fragmentary list of Anaxandrides’ plays in test. 5; it seems to have been his last to take second place at the Lenaia, perhaps in the 350s or early 340s BC.

**Ἀντέρως** (*Anterōs*)  
(‘Anteros’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.369; 1840 III.164; 1847. 575; Bothe 1855. 420; Kock 1884 II.138; Edmonds 1959 II.48–9; Webster 1970. 83; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.241; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 242

**Title** Antiphanes and Nicostratus both wrote an Ἀντερῶσα. For the correct form of the title (ἐν Ἀντερῶντι A), see test. 5.14.

Ἀντέρως is ‘reciprocated love’ at Pl. *Phdr.* 255d (cf. the use of the verb at A. Ag. 544; Bion fr. 12.1), and Paus 1.30.1 reports a statue of it in Athens as a lover’s avenger (cf. *Suda* μ 497). More common in art, at least, is the depiction of Eros and Anti-Eros as battling foes, like the relief Pausanias saw in Elis (6.23.5; cf. *LIMC* s. v. Eros [III.1.935–6 with pls. 388–95]). The latter accords well with the use of the verb at [E.] *Rh.* 184 and with ἀντεραστής (‘rival in love’) at Ar. *Eq.* 733; Pl. *R.* 521b; Arist. *Rh.* 1388a14, and is probably what is meant here. Of uncertain relevance is Ἀντέρως inscribed on a cup of the early fourth quarter of the fourth century found in the South Stoa at Corinth (*Corinth* VII, iii, 438); other cups from the same context bear dedications to personifications (e. g. Love, Pleasure, Health) and to gods (Dionysus, Zeus Soter) associated with drinking (cf. Green and Handley 2000. 369 with n. 10).

**Content of the comedy** The title might suggest a plot concerned with rival lovers or perhaps with a character torn between two loves (e. g. love for his wife or state vs. some predeliction).

**Date** One of the last plays of Anaxandrides mentioned in test. 5, it took fifth place, probably at the Lenaia, at least two years after 352 BC. It thus almost certainly belongs in the 340s BC, perhaps well into that decade.

fr. 7 K.-A. (7 K.)

περιστέρια γὰρ εἰσάγων καὶ στρουθία

habet A

Ἀντερῶντι A

presenting pigeons and sparrows

Ath. 14.654b

Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Ἀντέρωτι. —

Anaxandrides in *Anterōs*: —





**Ἀχιλλεύς (Achilleus)**  
(‘Achilleus’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.369–70; 1840 III.164; 1847. 575; Bothe 1855. 420; Kock 1884 II.138; Edmonds 1959 II.48–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.242; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 242

**Title** Philetaerus is the only other comic poet to write an Ἀχιλλεύς, although there were at least six tragedies by this name.

The title refers to the famous hero of the Trojan War. Anaxandrides’ penchant for mythological plays is clear (see introduction), as is his preference for plays involving a hero, as here, rather than a deity. A notable subset of these plays concern some aspect of the Trojan myth cycle and are evenly divided between major figures (Achilleus, Helen, Odysseus) and minor ones (Anchises, Pandarus, Protesilaus).

**Content of the comedy** The play could have concerned Achilleus’ disguise as a girl on Scyros or perhaps his education, but the possibilities are legion; the single fragment from Philetaerus’ play simply mocks the name Peleus.

**Date** The title may appear at test. 5.5 ([ - - - ]λει), which suggests a third-place finish at the Lenaia prior to 375 BC, or at test. 5.13 (A[ - - - ]), which was a fifth-place finish in 352 BC, probably at the City Dionysia.

**fr. 8 K.-A. (8 K.)**

Antiatt. p. 104.17

κακομαθής · Ἀναξανδρίδης Ἀχιλλεῖ

Ill-educated. Anaxandrides in *Achilleus*

**Metre** Unknown.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.164; 1847. 575; Bothe 1855. 420; Kock 1884 II.138; Edmonds 1959 II.48–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.242; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 242

**κακομαθής** The word is attested only here. LSJ gloss it as ‘bad at learning’ (Edmonds adds ‘slow at learning’), but this gives the sense of δυσμαθής. For the difference between κακο- and δυσ-, cf. Schmidt 1876–1886 IV.413–17; Austin–Olson 2004 on Ar. *Th.* 229 (discussion of κακοδαίμων [colloquial] vs. δυσδαίμων [high-style]). Perhaps the word occurred in reference to Achilleus’ education by Chiron.

**Γεροντομανία (Gerontomania)**  
(‘Madness for Old Men’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.370; 1840 III.164; 1847. 576; Bothe 1855. 420; Kock 1884 II.138; Breitenbach 1908. 122; Schiassi 1951. 220; Edmonds 1959 II.48–9; Webster 1970. 65; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.242; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 243; Rusten 2011. 464

**Title** Cf. Amphis, *Gynaikomania*. The title is generally taken to refer 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), but parallel forms indicate that this is unlikely (e.g. Amphis, Γυναικομανία [fr. 9–11]; Ar. *Th.* 576 γυναικομανῶ; *Synagoge* B α 1236 = Hsch. α 4760 ἀνδρομάνης· ἐπιμεμνηυῖα τοῖς ἀνδράσι; Chrysipp. *Eth.* fr. 667; Ath. 11.464d–e).<sup>34</sup>

**Content of the comedy** The apparent reference of the title to lusting after old men implies an inversion of normality, in that old men (and old people of both sexes in general) are seldom viewed as sexually attractive in comedy; for the depiction of old people in comedy, see Oeri 1948; Hubbard 1989. The plot could have born a resemblance to certain Aristophanic plays, especially the so-called ‘women’ plays, in which a disenfranchised group staged some sort of coup and overturned the existed order. Here, perhaps the old men, disgusted by the fact that they were overlooked in favour of young men, somehow managed to invert this situation. Fr. 9 and 10 could then be read as (self-) justifications: they had once been desirable sexual partners, sc. and so there is not reason why they should not still be (fr. 9), and they do in fact continue to contribute to society (fr. 10). Alternatively, the old men could be the foil in some sort of coup staged by women; rather than a sex-strike as in Aristophanes *Lysistrata*, the women have abandoned young men in favour of the old. If women were the main actors in the play, fr. 9 might then be best read as a conversation among women (see *ad loc.*).

**Date** The date is uncertain. Aristotle’s report (*Rh.* 3.1413b21; see below, fr. 10, 13) that Philemon (Stephanis 1988 #2485) used a certain performance style when acting in the play probably implies that Aristotle saw it in person (*pace*

<sup>34</sup> In his Oxford Text of Arist. *Rh.* (see 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, e.g. by H. Lawson-Tancred in his Penguin translation (London 1991).

Hunter 1983. 140 n. 1). Philemon took the actor's prize twice at the Lenaia, first in the late 370s BC, and the reference to him at Aeschin. 1.115 shows that he was still alive in the late 340s BC, but neither fact helps date this play. The dates that have been proposed, 367–365 BC (Schiassi), 370–360 BC (Breitenbach), and 360–350 BC (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 probably old men reminiscing about their youth, or at least their younger days, by recalling courtesans active in the earlier part of the fourth century, the play is perhaps best placed at late as possible.

## fr. 9 K.-A. (9 K.)

τὴν ἐκ Κορίνθου Λαΐδ' οἶσθα; (B.) πῶς γὰρ οὐ,  
τὴν ἡμετέρειόν γ'; (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,  
ὑπέφαινε' ἐσομένη δ' Ὀκίμον λαμπρὰ πάνυ

habet A

2 ἡμετέρειον Abresch: ἡμεριον A: Ὑκκαραΐαν Schweighäuser: ἡμερόεσσαν Bothe γ'  
add. Kaibel ἦν δ' Olson φίλη Musurus: φιάλη A 4 Λαγίσκιον· τότε  
Jacobs: -σκιον, τότε ἦν Meineke: -σκη γ', ἦν τότε Bothe: -σκ', ἦνθαι τότε Kaibel: fort.  
-σκη (vel -σκα ?) καὶ Φίλα (καὶ υ - Olson): -σκη καὶ τότε Handley 5 Νεολύτη C:  
Νεαλύτη E 6 λαμπρὰ Dobree: -όν A

Do you know the one from Corinth, Lais? (B.) How could I not  
know my own? (A.) She had a friend,  
Anteia. (B.) She too was my plaything.  
(A.) Yes, by Zeus, Laiske was flowering then [corrupt]  
5 and Theolyte was quite comely and fair,  
while Okimon gave indication that she would be utterly lovely

Ath. 13.570d-e

μνημονεύει δὲ τῆς Λαΐδος καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Γερντομανίᾳ καὶ ἄλλας ἐταίρας διὰ  
τούτων· —

Anaxandrides in *Gerontomania* also mentions Lais and other hetairai in the following  
verses: —

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

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

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

--υ-- -|--υ-- υ--υ--  
 --υ--υ-- υ|--υ-- --υ--  
 --υ-- -|--υ--υ-- --υ--  
 --υ-- -|--υ--υ-- --υ--υ--  
 5 --υ--υ-- υ|--υ-- --υ--  
 υ--υ--υ-- -|--υ-- --υ--

**Discussion** Abresch 1755. 489–90; Toup 1760. 161; Jacobs 1809. 304–5; Dobree 1833 II.344; Meineke 1840 III.164–5; 1847. 576; Bothe 1855. 420; Meineke 1857 V.80; Kock 1884 II.138–9; Kaibel 1887. 501; Kock 1888 III.737; Blaydes 1890a. 81; Blaydes 1896. 122; van Leeuwen 1902b. 355; Herwerden 1903. 96–7; Breitenbach 1908. 121–2; Hauschild 1933. 21–2; Edmonds 1959 II.48–9; Webster 1970. 63; West 1987. 289; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.242; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 243; Rusten 2011. 464

**Citation Context** This passage occurs in the course of a very long discussion (Ath. 13.567a–94b) 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.).

**Text** Fraenkel 1912. 55–8, esp. 56 finds the question-and-answer formula at the beginning of the fragment to be common in Euripides (he compares *inter alia* Ba. 462–3 [Δι.] τὸν ἀνθεμώδη Τρωῶλον οἷσθ' ἄ ποῦ 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 (1968. 238): 'die, wie es scheint von Euripides, um eine stichomythie in Gang zu bringen oder in Gang zu erhalten, ausgebildete Formel, A. οἷσθα...; 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, but S. *El.* 1307 ἀλλ' οἷσθα μὲν τ' ἀνθένδε, πῶς γὰρ οὐ; provides a closer parallel for the wording than the examples given by Fraenkel and suggests an alternate possibility:

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

The fragment is traditionally punctuated as a dialogue between two speakers, but it is also possible that only the first three lines are a two-person dialogue and that a third speaker then enters the conversation, speaking 4–6 (Γ.) νῆ τὸν Δί' ἦνθαι κτλ. The interjection would be an effective culmination: after Speaker B has been acknowledging having known various courtesans one by one in a relatively matter of fact manner, Speaker C interrupts and in a rush claims knowledge of three (or four).

In 2, 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) οὔτε γὰρ ἡμετέρειον οὔτε 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 καθάριος (cf. Chantraine 1933. 53 for a brief discussion of such adjectives). Lobeck's assertion (1837. 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 ἡμέτερον. 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; Men. *Epir.* fr. 1.2, 681–2; *Kolax* fr. 4; Ter. *And.* 85; Henderson 1991. 156; Adams 1982. 187–8).

Whether the name ought to be spelled Ἄντεια or Ἄνθεια in 3 was disputed in antiquity (Harp. p. 37.5–6 Dindorf [α 141 Keaney]; Phot. α 1946; *Suda* α 2501); possibly the latter results from an attempt to have a name suggesting her beauty (cf. for example ἦνθαι in 4). She was apparently the subject of comedies by Eunicus, Philyllus, Antiphanes, and possibly Alexis (cf. Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* [pp. 817–18]); see further Kapparis 1999 on [D.] 59.19.

In 4, the received text ἦν δὲ τότε is impossible both because of the hiatus before ἦν and, more importantly, the final syllable of an iambic trimeter can

not be resolved (White 1912 §67); the phrase is probably an intrusive marginal variant of ἦνθει τότε which has ousted the true text and thus indicates hopeless corruption. Nevertheless, most emendations that have been suggested are predicated on the less likely notion that the echo (ἦνθει 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 1999 *ad loc.* The ousting of καὶ Φίλα here may have been aided by the similar line ending τις φίλη two lines above.

Lagiske in 4 is presumably another 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.

Although the construction of ὑποφαίνω with a participle in 6 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.

**Interpretation** The speakers, presumably the old men of the title but perhaps instead women (courtesans?) talking among themselves, 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 out do the other in terms of the number, fame or beauty of his previous sexual experiences.

For *hetairai* in comedy in general, see Hauschild 1933 esp. 14–22; Henry 1985 esp. 33–40, 47–8; Krieter-Spiro 1997 43–54; Auhagen 2009 for lists of *hetairai*, cf. Ar. Eq. 765; Anaxil. fr. 22; Philetaer. fr. 9; Timocl. fr. 27; Spyropoulos 1974 82 n. 10.

**1 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 III.40, fr. 16). Ar. fr. 928 οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐς Κόρινθον ἔσθ' ὁ πλοῦς, explained by Hsch. ο 1799 as διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐταιρῶν γοητείαν and by Phot. ο 667 (= Suda ο 924 = Apost. XIII 60) as ἐπεὶ πολλὰ ἦσαν ἐταῖραι, apparently reflects a popular proverb (cf. K–A *ad loc.*; Panofka 1847. 21\*–2\*; Renehan 1976. 105–6; Anderson 1986; Ar. Pl. 149–52 with Σ<sup>RVM<sup>E</sup>recc.</sup>). Note also St. Byz. p. 374.5 (= Ar. fr. 370) κορινθιάζομαι· τὸ ἐταιρεῖν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ ἐταιρῶν, ἢ τὸ μαστροπεύειν; Suda ε 3266 and see Salmon 1984. 398–400; Williams 1986.

**Λαΐδ(α)** There were at least two well-known *hetairai* by this name, and separating them is not easy; see esp. Orth 2009 on Stratt. fr. 27; in addition, Geyer 1925. 513–16; Holzinger 1940 on Ar. *Pl.* 179; Breitenbach 1908. 141–56. The one referred to here is the second, often known as the younger. This Lais is said (Σ<sup>RVEEMatr</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; Harp. p. 189.5 Dindorf (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 1951. 229]; cf. the plays entitled Ἀντιλαΐς by Cephisodorus and Epicrates).

2 γ’ Cf. West 1987. 289 (on E. *Or.* 1184): he ‘is not simply showing that he does indeed know what the question is about ... but adding a reason why he certainly should know’.

2–3 ἤν ἐκείνη τις φίλη / Ἄντεια The historical Anteia seems to have been a contemporary of Lais (Lys. fr. 59 Thalheim) and *hetairai* seem to be thought of in groups fairly often. [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>35</sup>

τοῦτ(ο) For the attraction of the gender of the subject to that of the predicate, cf. Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.74; Gildersleeve 1900–1911 §§127–8.

παίγνιον Cf. Ar. *Ec.* 922; *HE* 4266 with Gow–Page 1965 *ad loc.*; Plu. *Ant.* 59.8; Henderson 1991. 157 on παίζειν, where note that the translation ‘tricks’ for παίγνια is misleading and clearly does not work here.

4 νή 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 νή τὸν Ποσειδῶ; Nicostrat. fr. 29.2 νή τὸν Ἀθηνᾶν; Sophil. fr. 7.3 νή τὸν Διόνυσον). It seems not to occur elsewhere in the line (doubtfully at Strato fr. 1.9), although both νή

<sup>35</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.

Δία and μὰ τὸν Δία do so regularly; for a study of where these various oaths occur within a line, see Dover 1987. 48–53.

**ἤνθει** Commonly used of the flower of youth; e.g. Phryn. fr. 3.3 ἄνθος ἥβης; Timocl. fr. 32.2 ἀνθοῦσι τοῖς νέοις; Pl. R. 475a τῶν ἀνθούντων ἐν ὥρᾳ; cf. [Men.] *Mon.* 92 ἀκμὴ τὸ σύνολον οὐδὲν ἄνθους διαφέρει; Ar. *Eq.* 530 with Blaydes 1892 *ad loc.*; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 16.4 (*SH* 146); Borthwick 1976.

**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 Λαγίσκην τὴν Ἰσοκράτους παλλακὴν with Orth 2009 *ad loc.*; Lys. ap. Ath. 13.592b; Hermipp. fr. 65 Wehrli). For prostitutes named after animals (Λαγίσκη < λαγῶς ‘hare’), see Headlam–Knox 1922 on Herod. 2.73.

**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 1884 s.v.; Edmonds *ad loc.*). C’s Νεολύτη and E’s Νεαλύτη are scribal errors which manufacture otherwise unattested names.

**εὐπρόσωπος καὶ καλή** Van Leeuwen 1902b. 355 compares Ar. *Pl.* 976 εὐπρόσωπον καὶ καλόν. For the generalizing force of καί (specific followed by general), see Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.247; cf. Verdenius 1954.

**6 ὑπέφαινε** 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.

**Ὠκιμον** Apparently also from Corinth (Eub. fr. 53) and mentioned together with Lais at Hyp. fr. 13 Jensen. For prostitutes named after plants (Ὠκιμον = ‘basil’), see Pherecr. *Koriannō*; *Petalē*; Alex. *Rhodion* (but cf. Arnott 1996 176–8 [on *Dorkis*]); Headlam–Knox 1922 on Herod. 2.76; cf. Gildersleeve 1930. 79 on *carm. pop.* *PMG* 852.

**λαμπρά** Often used of physical beauty, e.g. S. *Tr.* 379; Ar. *Pax* 859; Demetr. Com. Vet. fr. 1.4; Th. 6.54.2; cf. Schadewaldt 1966. 77; note, however, [D.] 59.26 (of Neaira, ‘at the peak of her career’, Kapparis 1999 *ad loc.*).



## fr. 10 K.-A. (10 K.)

καίτοι πολλοί γε πονοῦμεν.  
τὸν ἀσύμβολον εὔρε γέλοια λέγειν Ῥαδάμανθους καὶ Παλαμίδης

habet A

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

And yet many of us work hard.  
Rhadamanthys and Palamedes discovered (the idea of) free-loaders  
making jests

Ath. 14.614c

Ἀναξανδρίδης δ' ἐν Γεροντομανίᾳ καὶ εὐρετὰς τῶν γελοίων φησὶ γενέσθαι Ῥαδάμανθον  
καὶ Παλαμίδην, λέγων οὕτως: —

Anaxandrides in *Gerontomania* says that Rhadamanthys and Palamedes were inventors  
of jests, speaking as follows: —

Epit. (CE) εὐρετὰς δὲ γελοίων Ἀναξανδρίδης Ῥαδάμανθον καὶ Παλαμίδην φησὶν

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

Arist. *Rh.* 3.1413b21

ἀνάγκη δὲ μεταβάλλειν τὸ αὐτὸ λέγοντας: ...οἷον καὶ Φιλίμων ὁ ὑποκριτὴς ἐποίει ἐν  
τε τῇ Ἀναξανδρίδου Γεροντομανίᾳ, ὅτε λέγει Ῥαδάμανθους καὶ Παλαμίδης,  
καὶ ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ τῶν Εὐσεβῶν τὸ ἐγώ (fr. 13)

It is necessary when saying the same thing to vary it...As for example Philemon the  
actor used to do in Anaxandrides' *Gerontomania*, when he says 'Rhadamanthys  
and Palamedes' and in the prologue of *Eusebeis* 'I' (fr. 13)

**Metre** Anapaestic tetrameter catalectic.

⟨υυ—υυ— υυ—υυ—⟩ | ——— υυ—  
υυ—υυ— υυ—υυ— | υυ— υυ—

**Discussion** Jacobs 1809. 328; Meineke 1840 III.165–6; Bothe 1944. 35; Meineke  
1847. 576; Bothe 1855. 420; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvii; Herwerden 1878. 64; Kock  
1884 II.139; Blaydes 1896. 122; Herwerden 1903. 97; Edmonds 1959 II.48–51;  
Burkert 1975. 69–70 with n. 15; Nesselrath 1990. 269, 335; Kassel–Austin 1991  
II.243; Milanezi 2000. 402–3; Handley 2002. 167; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 244;  
Rusten 2011. 464

**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 1988 #2498]) follows. Far more important is the citation by Aristotle, who uses the actor Philemon's (Stephanis 1988 #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.

**Text** The lack of a connective in 2 has troubled some critics, hence Herwerden's τὸ δ', although the lack of a parallel for the abstract weighs against his conjecture (for this use of the abstract, see Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.10–11; Gildersleeve 1900–1911 §41). More likely, the asyndeton is explanatory; cf. Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.344.

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; Ael. Dion. 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 1996 on Alex. fr. 188.2; Chandler 1881 §384–5; Dyck 1995 on *Epim. Hom.* γ 22.

**Interpretation** If Athenaeus' claim that Anaxandrides presents Rhadamanthys and Palamedes as the inventors of jests relies solely on this passage, it must be based on 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 ought probably to be associated (as archetypal old men?) with the speakers of 1 and explain one way in which old men 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 were spoken by the actor Philemon (presumably the protagonist), the speaker is probably one of the old men of the title. If so, it is easier to imagine them defending themselves (e.g. on a charge that old men are a burden to society) than acting as the mouthpiece of the poet, as Kaibel suggested ('loquitur poeta de suo officio' [reported by K–A]). Nonetheless, support for Kaibel's view might be found in the use of πονοῦμεν; even if the language is difficult to parallel, the sense is not (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 523–4, 526). If Kaibel's interpretation is accepted, serious consideration

must be given to his καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς. Although catalectic anapaestic tetrameters can be used in the parabasis, 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 1912 §305), which fits well with the more plausible reading of this fragment; see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1921. 367 n.1 for their general absence in this period.

Aristotle's citation of the phrase 'Rhadamanthys and Palamedes' seems to imply that it was repeated several times in succession, since he claims that variation in delivery is necessary when repeating the same phrase. It remains difficult 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 1975. 69–70; Handley 2002. 167. 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 e.g. in Kennedy 1991, 'it is necessary to speak the same thought in different words', is doubtful; while this works 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 1877 *ad loc.* 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; but this is 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. fr. 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 1954. 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 1996 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, ὃ 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 the plural, e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 1211; Eub. fr. 72; cf. LSJ s. v. IV.1.a; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 15), and thence a synonym for parasite (Dromo fr. 1.2; Timocl. fr. 10.4; Diph. fr. 74.8; cf. Anaxandr. fr. 34.8; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 259.2; Nesselrath 1985. 66). The figure of the parasite first appears in drama in Epicharmus (fr. 31–3) and is common in comedy and related literature, both Greek and Roman. See in general Nesselrath 1990. 309–17; Damon 1997, esp. 23–36; Arnott 1996’s introduction to Alex. Παράσιτος; Fisher 2000. 371–8.

**εὔρε** ‘was the πρῶτος εὔρετής’. A compound subject with a singular verb is relatively common throughout Greek literature; see Cooper 1998–2002 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 line that followed.

**γέλοια λέγειν** To make jests and otherwise provide entertainment or amusement was a standard means for parasites to justify their apparent free-loading (see Nesselrath 1985. 26–7; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 188; Damon 1997. 29; Fisher 2000. 372–3; Milanezi 2000; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.8 [*SH* 534]; 5 [*SH* 538]; 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. Cf. Pl. *Smp.* 189b6 οὐ τι μὴ γελοῖα εἶπω (Aristophanes at the start of his speech).

**Ῥαδάμανθος καὶ Παλαμίδης** Rhadamanthys, son of Zeus and Europa and brother of Minos and Sarpedon (H. *Il.* 14.322; Hes. fr. 141.13–14), was generally thought to be one of the judges in the underworld, along with his brother Minos and Aiakos (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 1884–1937 IV.77–86; *LIMC* VII.1.626–7. While his fairness and justice are continually remarked upon, he is seldom if ever referred to as an inventor (contrast Palamedes below), so his place here may rely on the notion of equity implicit in the parasite performing some task in place of a contribution to the meal. Roscher 1884–1937 IV.79 suggests a connection with the ὄρκος Ῥαδαμάνθους (e.g. Cratin. fr. 249 with test. and K.-A. *ad loc.*; Σ Pl. *Ap.* 22a; cf. Ar. *Av.* 521 with Dunbar 1995 *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 λεπτὸν Ῥαδάμανθυν / Λύσανδρον κώθωνι, πρὶν αὐτῷ δῶκε  
λεπαστήν.

Palamedes, on the other hand, is far 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 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 1884–1937 III.1264–73; Kleingünther 1933. 78–84; *LIMC* VII.1.145. Palamedes' primary reputation was as an inventor or discoverer (for a list of inventions attributed to him, see Roscher 1884–1937 III.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 1933. 28); his discovery here perhaps fits best with the inventions characterized by Roscher, 1270–1 as 'Brettspiel' and 'Würfel'. In general, see Zographou-Lyra 1987.

**Δίδυμοι** (*Didymoi*)  
(‘Twins’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.370; 1840 III.166; 1847. 576; Bothe 1855. 420; Kock 1884 II.139; Edmonds 1959 II.50–51; Webster 1970. 72; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.243; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 244

**Title** A Δίδυμοι or Δίδυμαι was written also by Aristopho, Antiphanes, Xenarchus, Alexis, Menander, Euphro, and possibly Antiphanes II (cf. Naevius *Gemini*; Laberius *Gemelli*; Antiphanes, Ephippus, Posidippus, Metrodorus ‘Ὅμοιοι or ‘Ὅμοια; Alexis, Antidotus ‘Ὅμοία; Afranius *Aequales*).

**Content of the comedy** Perhaps a play resembling, at least in its basic concept, Plautus *Menaechmi* (cf. Usener 1912–1914 III.24–6; Webster 1970. 68). Who first used a plot revolving around twins, and thus presumably mistaken identity, is unknown, but this play must belong to the first generation of what became a very popular subject (cf. Katsouris 1976. 34); see Introduction.

fr. 11 K.-A. (11 K.)

Antiatt. p. 85.19

β ρ έ τ α ς · ό άναίσθητος. Άναξανδρίδης Διδύμοις

Wooden statue: an oblivious person. Anaxandrides in *Didymoi*

**Metre** Unknown.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.166; 1847. 576; Bothe 1855. 420; Kock 1884 II.139; Herwerden 1903. 97; Edmonds 1959 II.50–1; Killeen 1973. 60; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.243; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 244

**βρέτας** Properly signifying a cult-image of a god, the word is fairly common in tragedy (e.g. A. *Pers.* 809; *Eu.* 80 (olive wood Athena Polias); E. *El.* 1254; *IT* 1040; not in Sophocles (unless restored at fr. 10c.8 βρε[ - - - ]) or *tragici minores*) but rare in comedy, attested elsewhere only at Ar. *Eq.* 31, †32; *Lys.* 262. On this basis, van Leeuwen 1900 suggested that the occurrence at *Eq.* 31 was paratragic (cf. Rau 1967. 187); his further claim (1902a on *Av.* 1128) that, unless accompanied by further qualification, βρέτας means the image of Athena Polias, overstates the evidence. Pollux 1.7 disallows this word and δείκηνλον (‘in Attic prose presumably’, Neil 1901 on Ar. *Eq.* 31, following Kuhn; contrast *Et. Gen.* quoted by Wendel 1935 on Σ A.R. 4.1672) in favor of

ἀγάλματα, ξόανα and the like, but that seems to be only his personal opinion (οὐκ ἔγωγε προσίεμαι). In general, see Donohue 1988, esp. 25–6, 33–7, 169–71.

The word is used here as a metaphor for one insensitive or unperceptive; cf. Alex. fr. 207.1–2 ἐλάνθανον / πάλαι περιπατῶν ἀνδριᾶς with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Ar. *Nu.* 1202–3 with Dover 1968 *ad loc.*; Kassel 1983. 1–2. Herwerden 1903. 97 compares the similar use of ἄγαλμα, ξύλον and Latin *stipes*; Killeen 1973. 60 compares Plaut. *Pseud.* 915 and *Capt.* 951 (with Lindsay 1900 *ad loc.*). The further information at AB p. 223.4 (whence EM p. 213.6) Κυρηναῖοι δὲ τὸν ἀναίσθητον βρέτας could derive from this play but is of little help. The only play known to have been set in Cyrene is Plaut. *Rudens* and possibly its model, usually thought to have been by Diphilus (cf. Marx 1928. 273–4; Webster 1970. 154); for the men of Cyrene and their reputation, see Eup. fr. 202; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 242.

**Διονύσου γοναί** (*Dionysou gonai*)  
(‘Birth of Dionysus’)

**Discussion** Kock 1884 II.139; Edmonds 1959 II.50–1; Winkler 1982. 138 with n. 8; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.243 (cf. 1989 VII.556); Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 245

**Title** Α Διονύσου γοναί was also written by Polyzelus and possibly Demetrius I (for tragedies involving Dionysus, see Dodds 1960. xxviii–xxxiii); for a list of other variations of this title-formula, see Kassel–Austin on Hermipp. Ἀθηναῖος γοναί.

For the birth of Dionysus, see *LMC* III.1.417 with plates 664–707. Nesselrath 1995 localizes this subgenre of comedy to roughly 410 to 380–370 BC, with Hermippus being an earlier exception, possibly tied to a politically motivated restriction of comic license (an exception noted already by Meineke, I.261). Nesselrath apparently overlooks the date assigned to this play,<sup>36</sup> which is later than the limit he sets for the flourishing of the theme, although not late enough to seriously affect his general argument. In addition, Nesselrath sees the γοναί-plays, with the possible exception of Hermippus, as an attempt to look beyond the typical themes of Old Comedy and use the portrayal of myth in tragedy and older poetry as the raw material for comedy.<sup>37</sup> In accord with this view, this play, although a late example, along with others of the same type, would mark an important transition in the shift to Middle Comedy; note, however, that Nesselrath’s comments, particularly on dating, pertain only to so-called γοναί θεῶν plays. Anaxandrides seems to have been concerned with mythological parody or comic treatment of myth throughout his career, as were other mid-fourth-century comic poets; see Introduction.

**Content** A story about the birth of Dionysus would presumably concern itself generally with the story of the immolation of Semele and the concealment of Dionysus in Zeus’ thigh. Within this framework, there are any number

<sup>36</sup> Nesselrath 1995. 26–7 wishes to place this play earlier in Anaxandrides’ career on the assumption that public interest in mythological comedies soon waned; this dating ignores both the extant didascalic information as well as the preponderance of mythological comedies apparently throughout Anaxandrides’ career.

<sup>37</sup> Nesselrath 1995. 2–3 views this use of tragedy and epic for source material as imitating the similar procedure of satyr-play; in this regard it is perhaps significant that Timesitheus’ (*TGrF* 214) Ζηνὸς γοναί is probably satyric (cf. Sutton 1974. 118 [cf. also p. 113], but note that Meineke I.280 had suggested that the title was mistakenly included in the list of Timesitheus’ plays [and instead belongs to a comic poet?]).



of possibilities for a comic adaptation, e.g. Dionysus is mistakenly placed elsewhere or Zeus gives birth (suggested by Nesselrath 1995. 5, comparing Luc. *DDeor.* 12). Other possibilities include the seduction of Semele, with the birth of Dionysus being the culmination of the story (Nesslerath 1995. 5 compares *hBacch.* 6–7 and suggests a plot involving Zeus’ infidelity and Hera’s jealousy), or the story of the infant Dionysus being cared for by nymphs at Nysa (variously located; cf. Richardson 1974 on *hCer.* 17), where a vine, seemingly dripping with wine, grew in a single day (cf. S. fr. 255 with Pearson 1917 *ad loc.*; E. *Ph.* 229–31 with Mastronarde 1994 *ad loc.*), suggesting a utopian fantasy.

**Date** The play probably took second place at the Lenaia sometime after 364 BC; see on test. 5.

**Ἑλένη** (*Helenē*)  
(‘Helen’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.370; 1840 III.167; 1847. 577; Bothe 1855. 420; Kock 1884 II.140; Edmonds 1959 II.50–1; Webster 1970. 84; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.244 (cf. 58); Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 245

**Title** Ἑλένη was also written by Philyllus, Alexis (possibly to be identified with one of his other plays about Helen; cf. Arnott 1996. 197–201), and doubtfully Alexander Comicus (see on fr. 12a), as well as by the tragedians Euripides, Theodectas and Diogenes. Other plays, both comedies and tragedies, focusing on different parts of the Helen-myth are common.

For Helen and her place in Greek literature and myth generally, see Austin 1994; Pantelia 1987; Homeyer 1977, esp. 1–63; *LIMC* IV.1.498–501.

**Content of the comedy** Although the bare title offers little help, the surviving fragment suggests that Anaxandrides’ play was based on Euripides’, as already noted by Webster 1970. 84; cf. the extensive parody of E. *Hel.* in Ar. *Th.*, and see Rau 1967. 53–65. For an assertion of the broader influence of E. *Hel.* on comedy, see Katsouris 1976. 34. For parody of Euripides, particularly by Anaxandrides, see Nesselrath 1993. 191; Xanthakis–Karamanos 1980. 32–3.

**Date** Unknown.

**fr. 12 K.A. (12 K.)**

(A.) ἄγκυρα, λέμβος, σκεῦος ὃ τι βούλει λέγε.

(B.) ὦ Ἡράκλεις, † ἀβελτηρίου τεμενικοῦ †.

ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ἄν εἰπεῖν τὸ μέγεθος δύναιτό τις

1 λέγε S: λέγειν Phot.      2 ἀβελτηρίου Phot, S (AGTB): -τερίου S (F): -τερείου Dindorf      τεμενικοῦ S: τεμνικοῦ Phot.

(A.) Anchor, skiff, mention any sort of equipment you like.

(B.) By Herakles, † what religious nonsense †

But no one could express the magnitude.

Phot. α 36 = *Suda* α 32

ἀβέλτερος ... λέγουσι δὲ καὶ † ἀβελτήριον τὴν ἀβελτηρίαν † (ἀβελτέρειον τὴν ἀβέλτερον Dindorf). Ἀναξανδρίδης Ἑλένη. —

Simpleminded. ... And people also use the neuter adjective (ἀβελτήριον) in place of the noun (ἀβελτηρίαν). Anaxandrides in *Helenē*. —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

--- --- -|--- ---  
 --- --- † --- --- †  
 --- --- -|--- ---

**Discussion** Toup 1760. 1–3; Meineke 1840 III.167; 1847. xvi, 577; Bothe 1855. 420–1; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvii; Herwerden 1878. 65–6; Kock 1884 II.140; Blaydes 1890a. 81; Blaydes 1896. 122; Edmonds 1959 II.50–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.244; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 245

**Citation Context** A lexicographical notice illustrating the use of ἀβέλτερος (Men. *Perinth.* fr. 3) and ἀβελτήριον (this fragment).

**Text** In 2, the transmitted ἀβελτηρίου τεμενικοῦ is unmetrical and has been much emended, particularly τεμενικοῦ, although not convincingly; for a selection of emendations, see Kock *ad loc.* The easiest solution is to read ἀβελτερείου with Dindorf, leaving τεμενικοῦ alone, which restores the meter but leaves a sense that many have found objectionable. ἀβέλτερος ('simple-minded') and the noun ἀβελτερία are fairly common (see on fr. 22.1); for the form ἀβελτέρειος, cf. fr. 9.2 (ἡμετέρειον), although note Lobeck 1837. 322, who states that 'nihil decerni potest' regarding the form of this word. The neuter is used here as a substantive, as both Photius and the *Suda* assert (λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ἀβελτέρειον τὸν ἀβέλτερον [accepting Dindorf's emendations]).

**Interpretation** Assuming that this play is modeled on that of Euripides, there are several possibilities for the context. Speaker B is almost certainly a man (see on 2 ὦ Ἡράκλεις) and seems unfamiliar with the surroundings; Speaker A seems to be acting as his guide. The most obvious possibility is that B is Menelaos, with Theonoe or Helen (A) showing him about. The catalogue of equipment in 1 suggests that Menelaos has none of his own, i. e. that he has arrived shipwrecked, as at the beginning of E. *Hel.*; Speaker A's evident access and familiarity with the collection suggests that she may be a priestess, like Iphigeneia in E. *IT*. Naval equipment was regularly dedicated, and the items listed here are perhaps dedications from sailors who survived previous wrecks or, more likely, spoils taken by the hostile Egyptians from shipwreck victims; cf. Pritchett 1974–1991 III.240–8, 279–85.

**1 ἄγκυρα** Anchors are known from a very early period and occur in a variety of shapes and materials; see in general Mercanti 1979; Morrison and Williams 1968. 302–3.

**λέμβος** A skiff towed or carried by a larger ship, usually if not exclusively a merchant ship rather than a warship, and used to communicate with the shore or to facilitate escape in case of emergency (e. g. D. 32.6; 34.10; Plaut.

*Rud.* 75); cf. fr. 35.7 ὅπισθεν ἀκολουθεῖ κόλαξ τῷ, Λέμβος ἐπικέκληται. The vessel is not to be confused with the fast, easily-maneuverable light warship of the same name that was developed in the third century; see Morrison 1996. 263–4; Casson 1971. 162; Torr 1894. 103, 116.

**σκεῦος ὃ τι βούλει λέγε** Given that an anchor and a skiff are hardly similar, Edmonds' translation, 'call it what you will', must be mistaken, unless one accepts his claim that an indistinct object is being viewed from a distance. Better is Bothe's 'quodcunque vis, dicito' which suggests that Speaker B is picking out equipment.

**2 ὦ Ἡράκλεις** Cf. fr. 1.6n. (Ἄπολλον); like Apollo, Herakles was invoked in comedy and prose only by men (thus ensuring that the speaker here is male) in reaction to a surprising and unforeseen circumstance, here the unexpected quantity, or less likely simply the appearance of nautical equipment.

**† ἀβελτηρίου τεμενικοῦ †** Prior to the first century BC, τεμενικός appears elsewhere only as the title of a speech of Isaeus (ap. Harp. p. 26.1 Dindorf [α 91 Keaney] and Houtsma 1870 20.23) and after that only very rarely; cf. adesp. com. fr. 1146.15–16 for similar coinages. In any case, the meaning of the adjective ('having to do with a *temenos*') is clear; for the meaning of *temenos*, see Parazarkadas 2011. 3–4. Note that at E. *Hel.* 1350 the dockyard of the Egyptians is called a περίβολος. For adjectives in -ικός, see Dover 1997. 118–19; Peppler 1910. 428–44; Ar. *Eq.* 1378–80 with Neil 1901 *ad loc.*

Dedications of a wide variety of objects are common in temples, and it is unsurprising to find maritime equipment here. For extant dedications of maritime equipment, including anchors, see *Délos* XVIII, pp. 197–200 (cf. *I.Délos* 442.167 [ship's ram], 168, 171 [anchors]). For sanctuary offerings in general, Rouse 1902, esp. 342–93; Aleshire 1989, esp. 37–52; Harris 1995.

**3 τὸ μέγεθος** What it is, the size of which is being referred to, is uncertain; presumably the *temenos* (note the size and apparent number of items it contains) rather than some specific object, perhaps concerned with seafaring, within it.

#### fr. 12a (Alexander Com. fr. 2 K–A)

Antiatt. p. 96.33

εὐορκισία· Ἀναξανδρίδης Ἑλένη

εὐορκισία cod.: corr. Bekker: εὐοργησία Valckenaer

Ἀναξανδρίδης Meineke:

Ἀλέξανδ<sup>δ</sup> cod.: Ἀλεξίς Kaibel

Loyalty to one's oath: Anaxandrides in *Helenē*

**Metre** Unknown.

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.370; 1841 IV.553; 1847. 1163; Bothe 1855. 705; Kock 1888 III.372; Edmonds 1961 IIIA.310–11; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.19

**Citation Context** Meineke's (I.370) emendation to Ἀναξανδρίδης here, although fairly consistently reported, has never been accepted into the text, despite cogent reasons for doing so. The same error occurs at fr. 10, 67 and 71, although not elsewhere in the Antiatticist, who has only the similar error Ἀλεξανδρίδης (fr. 15 from Antiatt.; similar errors in other sources at fr. 5; 12; 22; 36; 39; 45; 56; 61; 75). More important, Alexander (second–first c.) is later than any other comic poet cited by the Antiatticist; Timostratus (second c.) is the only other poet later than the third.<sup>38</sup> In addition, the Antiatticist cites Timostratus five times (fr. 1; 3; 4; 5; 7), following his usual practice of repeatedly relying on the same authors for examples (e.g. citing Anaxandrides twelve times). He cites Alexander, on the other hand, nowhere else, nor is there any other evidence for Alexander having written a *Helen*. The same arguments can be adduced in favor of Kaibel's suggested attribution of this fragment to Alexis (reported by K.-A. *ad loc.*), although confusion between Ἀλεξίς and Ἀλεξανδρός occurs only at Alex. fr. 8 (where only Zenob. 6.11 is in error); cf. on fr. 21 for possible similar corruptions at Antiatt. pp. 84.13; 96.1; 108.17.

**Interpretation** εὐορκησία occurs only here in Greek literature (inexplicably termed a *vox nihili* by Barrett 1964 on E. *Hipp.* 1039); other compounds from the same roots, esp. εὐορκέω and εὐορκος, though not uncommon in literature generally, are rare in drama, occurring only at Ar. *Pl.* 61 (εὐόρκου), E. *Med.* 495 (εὐορκος) and Or. 1517 (εὐορκοῖμι). The word need not refer strictly to the keeping of oaths; cf. Holzinger 1940 on Ar. *Pl.* 61 'Die εὐορκία oder εὐορκησία ist ein Ausfluss der όσιότης und der δικαιοσύνη und kann als Teilerscheinung für die ganze όρετή gesetzt werden.' For oaths generally, see Sommerstein–Torrance 2014; Sommerstein–Bayless 2012; Sommerstein–Fletcher 2007; Dover 1974. 248–50; Hirzel 1902. One obvious context for the word in a play based on E. *Hel.* is that Helen has, contrary to appearances, remained faithful to Menelaos; others might be Helen's and Menelaus' deception of Theoclymenus (thus lack of εὐορκησία), Theonoe's betrayal of her brother, or the oath upheld by the suitors of Helen when they went to Troy to reclaim her.

<sup>38</sup> Ruhnken 1828b. 356 had already made much the same observation in passing; cf. also Latte 1915. 373 n. 1 (= 1968. 612 n. 1).

Ἐρεχθεύς (*Erechtheus*)  
(‘Erechtheus’)

**Discussion** Kock 1884 II.140; Edmonds 1959 II.50–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.244; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 245

**Title** Although there are no other comedies of this name, Euripides wrote an *Erechtheus*, as did Ennius, possibly using Euripides’ play as a model. Euripides’ version was concerned with Erechtheus’ sacrifice of his daughter when Eumolpus and the Thracians invaded Athens. The extensive fragments of that play are fr. 349–70; cf. Collard *et al.* 1995. 148–94, and for the iconography of the myth, Connelly 1996. 67–80; in general, *LIMC* IV.1.923–8.

**Content of the comedy:** It is difficult to imagine a comic treatment of this part of the myth, but an extended parody of Euripides’ play is possible (cf. Nesselrath 1993. 191).

**Date** According to test. 5.4, *Erechtheus* (otherwise unknown) took third place at the City Dionysia in the archonship of Lysistratos (368 BC).

**Εὐσεβεῖς (*Eusebeis*)**  
(‘The Pious’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.370; 1840 III.167; 1847. 577; Bothe 1855. 421; Kock 1884 II.140; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.244; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 246

**Title** There is no other play with this title, although one might compare Antiphanes Εὐθύδικος.

**Content of the comedy** The plural title implies an eponymous chorus, but the single word that survives from the comedy offers no help in understanding the plot.

**Date** Unknown.

**fr. 13 K.-A.**

Arist. *Rh.* 3.1413b25

Φιλήμων ὁ ὑποκριτὴς ... ὅτε λέγει ... ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ τῶν Εὐσεβῶν τὸ ἐγώ

Philemon the actor...when he says...‘I’ in the prologue of *Eusebeis*

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.167 (cf. 166); 1847. 576; Bothe 1855. 421 (cf. 420); Meineke 1857 V.80; Kock 1884 II.140; Edmonds 1959 II.50 (cf. 48–9); Burkert 1975. 69–70 with n. 15; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.244; Handley 2002. 167; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 246 n. 501; Rusten 2011. 464

**Citation Context** According to Aristotle (cf. fr. 10n.), ἐγώ was repeated several times in the course of the prologue, but Philemon presumably changed the inflection or tone. Aristotle’s claim is easier to understand in this instance than in his other example ‘Rhadamanthys and Palamedes’ (fr. 10.2; see *ad loc.*).

**Ζωγράφοι ἢ Γεωγράφοι (vel -ος) (*Zōgraphoi ē Geōgraphoi*)**  
(‘Painters’ or ‘Geographers’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.370–1; 1840 III.167; 1847. 577; Bothe 1855. 421; Kock 1884 II.140; Edmonds 1959 II.50–1; Long 1986. 173 n. 1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.244; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 246

**Title** Although the alternate titles have the look of orthographic variants, Pollux’ statement suggests otherwise (see fr. 14). In this instance, the double title obviously did not result, as often is the case, from using both the chorus and the main character for the name (e.g. Eubulus Λάκωνες ἢ Λήδα). Perhaps there were two plays, one of them a revision of the other, like e.g. Antiph. Ἄγροικος ἢ Βουταλίων (cf. Ath. 8.358d [Antiph. fr. 68]), despite the fact that no such assertion is made in the testimonia (but note test. 2, which claims that Anaxandrides destroyed unsuccessful plays). The final possibility is that the double title results from two important characters, or in this case perhaps two groups of characters<sup>39</sup>, like Diphilus Εὐνοῦχος ἢ Στρατιώτης (although that instance is complicated); cf. E. *Hipp.*, called Φαίδρα in L. As none of these solutions seem satisfactory, the best explanation is perhaps that Pollux has misunderstood the alternatives, presumably found in his source, as a true double title rather than evidence for uncertainty about the correct reading; cf. Meineke 1839 I.370. The Antiatticist cites the play once by the title Γεωγράφος (fr. 15; for the variation in number from Pollux, see below), but seems to cite it a second time as Ζωγράφος (cf. fr. 14n.), although these might merely be the result of the abbreviated condition of the Antiatticist. For concise discussion of double titles and the problems associated with them, see Hunter 1983. 146–8. Of further relevance is Kock’s claim that ‘geographiae quae proprie dicitur geographorumque nomen...non ante Eratosthenem exstitisse consentaneum est’; the only possible exceptions are [Arist.] *Mu.* 393b20, if the work is taken as genuine, and Democr. *FVS* 68 B 28a (the title of one of his works as given by D.L. 9.48). Most important, both fragments strongly suggest a concern with painting

<sup>39</sup> Two groups of characters could suggest a divided chorus (cf. Taplin 1993. 57–8); although painters are common enough, however, that they could presumably have been stereotyped, that is much more doubtful in the case of geographers. Furthermore, the common modern opposition between art and science was not felt as strongly if at all in antiquity, nor would geographers be a natural choice for representing such a group aside from the similarity of their name to that of painters, which is a weak basis for the plot of a play.



rather than geography; of the two titles (orthographic variants), therefore, Γεωγράφοι ought to be rejected.

The second problem, and one less easily solved, is whether the title ought to be singular or plural. The confusion is common in citations of poets and may arise not only from scribal error but from unresolved abbreviations, on occasion perhaps originating with official records; see Hunter 1983. 95. Antiphanes, Hipparchus and Diphilus all wrote a Ζωγράφος, which suggests that the singular should be preferred here,<sup>40</sup> but Pomponius wrote a *Pictores*, supporting the plural. Since *Pictores* is not without problems (it may be instead *Pistores*; cf. Ribbeck 1897 *ad loc.*), the evidence slightly favors the singular.

Figural painting is known from at least the Bronze Age, but the term ζωγράφος is relatively late, appearing first at Hdt. 2.46 (cf. Democr. 28c Περὶ ζωγραφίης ap. D.L. 9.48) and sporadically thereafter; cf. Chadwick 1996. 81. Reinach 1921 offers a useful collection of the ancient testimonia concerning painters and painting; for painting in the fourth century, see Keuls 1978, esp. 59–87; Swindler 1929, esp. 265–304. For more recent surveys, see Scheibler 1994; Rouveret 1990.

Although Kock may be correct that the term ‘geography’ did not exist prior to Eratosthenes, the subject itself did. Maps were reportedly produced already in the sixth century by Anaximander (*FVS* 12 A 6; cf. Hdt. 5.49), and the subject was well-known enough to be comic fodder at Ar. *Nu.* 206–16 (cf. Starkie 1911 *ad loc.*). For ancient geography generally, see Olshausen 1991; older but more informative are Bunbury 1883, esp. 379–404 for the fourth century; Berger 1887–1893, esp. Abt. 2.

**Date** Unknown.

fr. 14 K.-A. (13 K.)

πυξίον λαβὼν κάθου

Take a tablet and sit down

Poll. 10.59

εἴρηται μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ ζωγράφου τοῦνομα (sc. πυξίον) ἐν Ἀναξανδρίδου Ζωγράφοις ἢ Γεωγράφοις (ἐκατέρως γὰρ ἐπιγράφεται τὸ δρᾶμα). —

<sup>40</sup> Alternatively, the dominance of the singular elsewhere could account for corruption to the singular here and does make the plural the *lectio difficilior*.

The word (sc. tablet) is also used in the case of a painter in Anaxandrides' *Zōgraphoi ē Geōgraphoi* (the play goes by both titles): —

Antiatt. p. 113.1

πυξίον· ὅπου οἱ ζωγράφοι γράφουσιν. Ἀναξανδρίδης Ζωγράφῳ

Ἀναξανδρίδης Meineke: Ἀγίας cod.

Tablet. Where painters draw. Anaxandrides in *Zōgraphoi*

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x—υ— x⟩|—υ— υ—υ—

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.167–8; 1847. 577; Bothe 1855. 421; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvii, 80; Kock 1884 II.140–1; Blaydes 1896. 122; Edmonds 1959 II.50–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.245; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 246

**Citation Context** The designation of the author in the Antiatticist is clearly corrupt. Having previously suggested Augeas (I.370) or Amphis (I.416), Meineke 1840 III.168 eventually settled on Anaxandrides, tracing the corruption to ΑΓΙΑΣ from the abbreviation [?] ANAΞ. Augeas is inherently implausible; cf. above on fr. 12a. Amphis is possible, but is not known to have written a Ζωγράφος, nor is the corruption as easy to trace. In addition, πυξίον is itself a rare word, occurring elsewhere in comedy only at Ar. fr. 879. (The citation of Amphis in LSJ is a reference to the Antiatticist entry under discussion here.) Since the word does occur in Anaxandrides and he did write a Ζωγράφος (*vel sim.*), Meineke's Ἀναξανδρίδης ought probably to be accepted and the citation referred to this fragment.

**πυξίον** A tablet made of boxwood (πύξος) used for writing or drawing on, presumably after having been whitened; see Blümner 1875–1887 II.253–4 n. 9 for further examples. Pritchett 1996. 27–30 offers a useful collection and discussion of the evidence for such boards and their white coating.<sup>41</sup> In Ar. fr. 879, the word or its diminutive is equated with a δελτίον in the case of those in the office of a γραμματιστής, but the verb πυξογράφω seems to refer to the process of painting on a tablet. The famous paintings displayed in the Stoa Poikile in the agora seem to have been on wood (see *Agora* III, pp. 42 [89], 43–4 [93–4]; Wycherley 1953. 24–5), although in the testimonia the panels are referred to as σανίδες or πίνακες. Examples of portraits on wood are extant, although from the first and second centuries AD; e. g. Doxiadis 1995; Walker

<sup>41</sup> See also Olson 1998 on Ar. *Pax* 1179–81; cf. Stroud 1998. 99–100 for the similar use of white plaster to create a suitable writing surface on stone.

1997. For extant Hellenistic painting, though on stone, e.g. Petsas 1966, esp. pls. 6–10. See also the general surveys cited above (Introduction to this play) for further bibliography and examples.

**κάθου** For the form, cf. Ar. fr. 631; Alex. fr. 226; Diph. fr. 8; Orus fr. A 57 with Alpers 1981 *ad loc.*; Σ<sup>T</sup> H. Il. 2.191a<sup>1</sup> κάθησο· κάθου Ἀττικῶς; Σ<sup>b</sup> H. Il. 2.191a<sup>2</sup>; *Epim. Hom.* κ 82 with Dyck 1995 *ad loc.*; cf. Ar. V. 209 σοῦ with MacDowell 1971 *ad loc.* The form is most common in comedy but occasionally occurs elsewhere (e.g. A. *Eu.* 226; E. fr. 337.1; see Veitch 1887. 347 for examples from late prose); in general, see Lautensach 1917. 87–9.

fr. 15 K.-A. (14 K.)

Antiatt. p. 104.32

κιννάβαρις ἄρσενικῶς Ἀναξανδρίδης Ζωγράφῳ

Γεωγράφῳ cod. (see above on introduction to this play)

Cinnabar. Masculine. Anaxandrides in *Painter*

Choerob. in Theodos. *Can.* 4.344.1

τὸ δὲ κιννάβαρι καὶ ἄρσενικῶς εὐρέθη ὁ κιννάβαρις, εὔρηται γὰρ παρὰ Ἀναξανδρίδῃ  
ἡ αἰτιατικὴ τὸν κιννάβαριν

habent CV

Ἀναξάνδρῳ V: Ἀλεξανδρίδι C

Cinnabar was also found in the masculine form *kinnabaris*, for the masculine accusative *kinnabarin* is found in Anaxandrides

**Metre** Unknown (word is — ∪ ∪ ∪).

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.168; 1847. 577; Bothe 1855. 421; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvii; Kock 1884 II.141; Blaydes 1896. 122; Edmonds 1959 II.50–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.245; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 246

**Citation Context** The Antiatticist's Γεωγράφῳ probably does not represent a corruption in the manuscript tradition (unless from Γεωγράφοις) but reliance on a faulty tradition (cf. Introduction to this play) or abbreviation of a version that gave both alternatives. Nevertheless, emendation restores what is probably the correct title.

**Interpretation** Cinnabar, or mercury sulfide, was used as a red pigment in antiquity; for its manufacture, see Thphr. *Lap.* 58 with Eichholz 1965 *ad loc.*;

in general, Forbes 1993 III.216–21. Traces of cinnabar have been found on a fourth-century lekythos from the Pnyx and on sixth-century statues from the Athenian acropolis, as well as in a bowl, seemingly used for mixing or storing it, from the agora (see Caley 1945. 152–6; Caley–Richards 1956 on Thphr. *Lap.* 58); cf. Dsc. 5.94 χρῶνται δὲ αὐτῷ (sc. cinnabar) οἱ ζωγράφοι εἰς τὰς πολυτελεῖς τῶν τοίχων κοσμήσεις. Cinnabar was apparently not found in Greece, although Thphr. *Lap.* 58 (cf. Plin. *NH* 29.25; 33.117) reports that it was found in Spain, Colchis and near Ephesus, and all the samples that have been discovered must thus have been imports. The masculine is attested only here.

Ἡρακλῆς (*Hēraklēs*)  
(‘Herakles’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.168; 1847. 577; Bothe 1855. 421; Kock 1884 II.141; Edmonds 1959 II.50–1 (cf. 1957 I.930–931); Webster 1970. 18 n. 1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.245 (cf. 1986 V.77); Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 246

**Title** Herakles appeared as the title-character also in plays by Epicharmus, Archippus, Philyllius, Diphilus, Nicochares and Novius (cf. Pherecr. *Anthropherakles* and *Pseuderakles*), and had a part in numerous other plays (e.g. Ar. *Ra.*; Cratin. *Busiris*; Ephipp. *Busiris*; Nicoch. *Centaurs*; Stratt. *Callippides*; for further examples of fifth-century comedies in which Herakles figures, see Woodford 1966. 93–102, 108–9).

Herakles as a comic figure is well-known, to such an extent that Galinsky 1972. 81 can assert that ‘it is in this role that he was best known to the Greeks of both the mainland and the western colonies.’ His comic persona, however, was not confined to comedy (e.g. his behavior in E. *Alc.*), and Galinsky 1972. 81 reasonably claims that he was the most popular character of the satyr play (for a list of the satyr plays involving him, see Woodford 1966. 107–8). For the comic treatment of Herakles in general, see Galinsky 1972. 81–100. For Herakles the glutton in comedy and satyr play, see Wilkins 2000. 90–7. For the hero in general, *LIMC* IV.1.728–31.

**Content of the comedy** Although mythological parody is an obvious possibility for the plot (Webster 1970. 18 n.1 expresses caution about seeing a direct tragic predecessor), the stories involving Herakles are too many and varied for speculation to be useful. The sole fragment does suggest that at least part of the play dealt with his musical education under Linus (recognized by Schenkl 1891. 327); cf. Alex. Λίνοϛ with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* For Herakles as musician, see Schauenburg 1979.

**Date** This may be the comedy that took third place at the Lenaia prior to 375 BC; see test. 5.5 ([ - - - ]λεῖ) and above on *Achilleus*.

## fr. 16 K.-A. (15 K.)

ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐφυῆς τις εἶναι φαίνεται·  
 ὥς δ' εὐρύθμως λαβὼν τὸ μελετητήριον  
 εἴτ' ἐσχεδίασε δριμέως † ενπαπαι †  
 μεστὸς γενόμενος πρὸς τὸν Ἀργᾶν βούλομαι  
 5 κωδωνίσας πέμψαι σ' ἀγωνιούμενον,  
 ἵνα καὶ σὺ νικᾷς τοὺς σοφιστάς, ὦ φίλε

habet A

1 fort. 'φαίνετο 2 εὐρύθμως Schweighäuser: εὐρυθμος A 3 ενπαπαι A: ἔν-  
 παπαπαπαῖ Olson: παπαῖ παπαῖ Casaubon: εὐ μάλα παπαῖ Meineke: 'εὐγ', εἶπα, 'παῖ'  
 Edmonds

For he seems to be someone with natural talent.  
 And after taking up his instrument gracefully,  
 he then improvised piercingly. † enpapai †  
 Sated after testing you, I wish to send  
 5 you to compete against Argas,  
 so that you also might defeat the sophists, my friend

Ath. 14.638c-d

(de Arga) καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Ἡρακλεῖ. —

Also Anaxandrides in *Heraklēs*: —**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

υ—υ— υ—υ|— υ—υ—  
 ——υ— υ—|υ—υ— ——υ—  
 ——υ— υ—|—υ— ——υ—  
 ——υ— —|—υ— ——υ—  
 5 ——υ— ——|υ— υ—υ—  
 υ—υ—υ— —|—υ— ——υ—

1 is a perfect trimeter; cf. fr. 57.3.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.168; Bothe 1944. 35–6; Meineke 1847. 577–8;  
 Bothe 1855. 421; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvii, 80; Kock 1884 II.141; Schenkl 1891.  
 327; Blaydes 1896. 122; Herwerden 1903. 97; Edmonds 1959 II.50–3; Renehan  
 1976. 147–8; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.245–6; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 246–7

**Citation Context** Within a long section on music and musicians (14.631e–  
 639a), Athenaeus alleges that Argas wrote indecent tunes and quotes two  
 fragments referring to him (Alex. fr. 19, followed by this fragment).

**Text** Disruptions in the syntax and thought can be explained by assuming that this passage is in fact two fragments (1–3 and 4–6) which have been conflated. There might simply be a lacuna after 3 (cf. on 1 ὁ μὲν). But more likely these are unrelated fragments, and an attribution after line 3 has fallen out of the text. In that case, 1–3 are from Anaxandrides’ *Herakles* but are presumably spoken about Argas himself, whereas 4–6 are from an unknown play by an unknown author who mentions Argas.

The change from present in 1 to past in 2–3 is awkward; one obvious solution is to emend to (ἐ)φαίνετο (for the prodelision, cf. Platnauer 1960. 143–4).

In place of the unmetrical jumble *ενπαπαῖ* in 3, one iambic metron is needed. Casaubon’s *παπαῖ παπαῖ* seems flat (for the repetition, cf. *Ar. Nu.* 390 *παππᾶξ παππᾶξ*; *V.* 235 *ἀππαπαῖ παπαῖάξ*) and fails to account for the intrusion of *εν*. Meineke’s *εὖ μάλα, παπαῖ* is better, and his comment that ‘in talibus omnia sunt incerta’ is true enough. Edmonds 1933. 5, ingeniously suggested *Εὖ<γ>, εἰ<π>α, παῖ* which places the whole fragment in the context of a narrative of a past event; nevertheless, while useful as an *exempli gratia* reconstruction, it ought not to be accepted in the absence of clearer evidence for the context. Note as well the slight difficulty of having both *παῖ* and *ὦ φίλε* addressed to the same person in the same sentence. The best solution is Olson’s *ἐν· παπαπαπαῖ* (cf. *Ar. Th.* 1191) *vel sim.*, which provides the requisite sense and satisfactorily accounts for the corruption (via haplography).

**Interpretation** According to Kock *ad loc.*, ‘videntur duo pueri artis musicae magistro in disciplinam tradi, quorum alter ei magnopere probatur. alter fortasse Hercules fuit.’ Schenkl 1891. 327 (see above) suggests that the speaker is Linus and the other student Thamyras or Orpheus. There do seem to be two students, the first talked about in 1–3, the second addressed in 4–6, unless Edmonds’ emendation (*vel sim.*) is accepted, making the whole fragment a narration of a past event concerning a single student.

**1 ὁ μὲν** In the text as transmitted, the contrast is with the addressee of 4–6, and indeed *μὲν* without answering *δέ* or another particle is unproblematic (*δ(ἐ)* in 2 is continuative). If the fragment is lacunose between 3 and 4, the sense might be: ‘The one (ὁ μὲν) had a good appearance but played badly, <and so the other (ὁ δέ) won. And so> after testing you, I will send you also (καὶ σὺ) off to defeat the sophists.’

**εἶναι φαίνεται** Normally, *φαίνομαι ὧν* means ‘be manifestly so,’ while *φαίνομαι εἶναι* means ‘have the appearance of being so’ (Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.53; Goodwin 1890 §914.5). There do seem to be exceptions, however, notably *Hdt.* 7.137.1; *Th.* 4.47.1 (although Kühner–Gerth state that here the participle appears ‘vielleicht um den Zusammenstoß zweier Partizipe zu vermeiden’; cf. Krüger on *Th.* 4.38.1). In the absence of compelling evidence

to the contrary, it is best to retain the normal meaning for the construction and assume that the person discussed only gives the appearance of proficiency, while lacking talent.

**2–3 εὐρύθμως** ‘Gracefully,’ referring to physical movement, as at E. *Cyc.* 563; Pl. *Com.* fr. 47; *Theophil.* fr. 2.4–5, although given the context some musical connotation may be felt as well, via a reference to ῥυθμός.

**λαβῶν ... εἴτ(α)** A participle followed by a temporal conjunction and finite verb is common in comedy and, to a lesser degree, in other genres exhibiting colloquial language; cf. *Antiph.* fr. 152.2 λαβοῦσαν εἴτα; *Ar. Th.* 556–7; E. *Cyc.* 563; van Leeuwen 1898 on *Ar. Nu.* 624; Dover 1987. 28–9; Renehan 1976. 147–8.

**τὸ μελετητήριον** Cf. *Hsch.* μ 681 μελετητήριον· οἶκος, ἢ ὄργανον, ἐν ᾧ τις μελετᾷ; the second definition probably refers to this passage, as it is the only surviving instance in which the word has this meaning, and the first possibly to *Plu. Dem.* 7 and 8, the only other occurrences of the word. Although the formation in -ήριον is more common in place names, whether comic coinages (e.g. φροντιστήριον) or normal vocabulary (e.g. δικαστήριον), Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 II.281 adduce ποτήριον and σημαντήριον as parallels for the formation used of an instrument, and Smyth 1956 §842.4 adds θελκτήριον. If Linus is involved, the musical instrument is probably a cithara.

**ἔσχεδιάσε** This is among the earliest occurrences of a generally late word, with possible contemporary examples depending on the date of [Pl.] *Sis.* 387e and the attribution of *P.Hib.* I 13 and *P.Mich.* inv. 2754 (Winter 1925). Although αὐτοσχεδιάζω is far more common in the Classical/Hellenistic period, late (and modern) attempts to formulate a chronological distinction between the words are mistaken: instead, forms of σχεδιάζω are used in preference to augmented or reduplicated forms of αὐτοσχεδιάζω. For details, see Renehan 1971. 93–9; cf. Renehan 1976. 147–8. Although the word and its cognates are not elsewhere used of musical improvisation, σχεδιάζω is used of poetic improvisation at *P.Mich.* inv. 2754.1 (a fragmentary life of Homer); cf. LSJ s. vv. σχέδιος II.1; αὐτοσχεδιάζω (and cognates). σχεδιάζω also appears in a musical treatise (*P. Hib.* I 13 col. 1, 12–3), where it does not seem to refer to playing music, although the context may have suggested its use if this was a normal meaning of the word.

**δριμέως** The word seems here to have a negative sense. It is used of sound elsewhere only at E. *Cyc.* 104 οἶδ’ ἄνδρα, κρόταλον δριμύ, Σισύφου γένος, presumably in a similar sense.<sup>42</sup> δριμύς can be used in a positive sense,

<sup>42</sup> Seaford 1984 *ad loc.* compares E. *Hel.* 1308–9 κρόταλα δὲ βρόμια διαπρύσιον / ἰέντα κέλαδον.



referring to fierceness or perhaps piercing intellect; see e. g. Kock 1894b on Ar. Av. 255. That seems not to be the case, however, at E. Cys. 104 (cf. Odysseus' reply, Cys. 105 λοιδόρει δὲ μή) or here (cf. on 1 above). The normal field of the word is better defined by its use to describe a bitter or biting taste (Pl. Com. fr. 169; Diph. fr. 18.4), the sting of smoke in the eyes (Ar. V. 146), or the sting of a blow (Ar. Pax 257; cf. Taillardat 1965 §602); cf. Ar. Ra. 652 ἔβλεπεν εἷς με δριμύ with Dover 1993 *ad loc.*; Taillardat 1965 §§356–7. Ar. Byz. fr. 31 reports that Euripides used δριμύ in the sense of συνετόν, which is regularly taken as a reference to the occurrence in Cys. The gloss may refer to a secondary sense, as Seaford 1984 *ad loc.* suggests; more likely, it is based on a misunderstanding due to mispunctuating of the line κρόταλον, δριμύ Σισύφου γένος (printed by Prinz–Wecklein; apparently accepted by Nauck 1848 on Ar. Byz. fr. 31 [but not in his third ed. of Euripides] and Kock).

† **ἐνπαπαι** † παπαῖ has a range of meanings (e. g. Ar. Ach. 1214; Lys. 215; Pl. 220; Alex. fr. 15.16; Anaxipp. fr. 4.22), as do related words (e. g. Ar. V. 235, 309; Lys. 924; Ar. Th. 1191), generally dependent on the context. In general, cf. Labiano Ilundain 2000. 275–86; Headlam–Knox 1922 on Herod. 3.79 for ταταῖ (an expression of pain) and on the accentuation παπαῖ as opposed to παπαί. If I understand the fragment correctly, here the word is an expression of distress or discomfort, as the speaker recalls the playing of the student or competitor mentioned in 1–3.

4–6 The speaker turns from narration of the past and directly addresses his interlocutor, whose cithara playing has probably just been contrasted with that of the person described in 1–3.

4–5 For a verbal resemblance, although of doubtful relevance, cf. Plu. Mor. 150c τοῦ θεοῦ μεστός γενόμενος μὴ ἄθαρσέστερον ἀγωνίσωμαι.

4 **μεστός γενόμενος** 'Canticis plenus,' Dalechamp; LSJ is misleading. Aside from the occasional negative qualification (e. g. Alex. fr. 150.5 μεστήν γυναικείας χολῆς; Diph. fr. 17.15 μεστοὶ λάπης), μεστός seems generally to invoke a pleasing image.

**πρὸς τὸν Ἀργᾶν** Argas (PAA 160525; Stephanis 1988 #292) was a musician of the first part of the fourth century (Edmonds' assertion that he flourished *ca.* 365 is based on no evidence); see Crusius 1896; Nesselrath 1990. 198 n. 48; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 19. This fragment may imply that he was a κιθαριστής, and fr. 42.16–18 states that he was a singer (αὐλεῖν δ' αὐτοῖς Ἀντιγενείδαν / Ἀργᾶν δ' ᾄδειν καὶ κιθαρίζειν / Κηφισόδοτον); elsewhere he seems known only as a poet.

The testimonia (with the possible exception of Anaxandrides) reflect a uniformly negative opinion of him and his music; it is possible that an additional exception occurs at Arist. Po. 1448a15 (cf. Vahlen 1885 *ad loc.*). He

is called a poet *μοχθήρων νόμων vel sim.* (Phainias of Eresus fr. 10; Plu. *Dem.* 4.8; Hsch. α 7013), his name is used as a mocking nickname for Demosthenes (Aeschin. 2.99 with Σ *ad loc.* [221 Dilts]; Plu. *Dem.* 4.8), and he is mocked at Alex. fr. 19. Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* asserts that the opinion expressed by Phainias, and possibly hence by Plutarch and Hesychius, was based on a comic or hostile philosophical source; his evidence is that Argas would not have performed at the wedding between Iphicrates and the daughter of Cotys, king of Thrace (cf. fr. 42), if he had a poor reputation as a musician. The description of the wedding is not necessarily straightforward and the appearance of Argas there may be part of its outlandishness (cf. *ad loc.*), and Argas' apparent inclusion among the sophists here is hardly meant as a compliment. Arnott's point is nonetheless well taken and is most likely correct. In addition to the mockery often directed by comic poets toward musicians and other performers, Neil 1901 on Ar. *Eq.* 534 connects the termination -ᾶς in terms of abuse and men's names, suggesting that such names were originally derogatory, so the formation of Argas' name may have made him an especially easy target.

4–5 **βούλομαι ... πέμψαι** For the force of the aorist infinitive, cf. Goodwin 1890 §96.

**κώδωνίσας** From κώδων ('bell'), the word meant to test the authenticity of coins on the basis of the sound produced by striking them on a hard surface (presumably derived from the actual testing of bells), although its sense became more generalized; cf. van Leeuwen 1896 and Stanford 1963b on Ar. *Ra.* 79; Σ Ar. *Ra.* 79 ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν νομισμάτων; Blümner 1891. 148; Pease 1904. 56. Here the notion of testing by sound is particularly appropriate.

**ᾄγωνιούμενον** Regularly used of dramatic competition (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 140; V. 1479; cf. *Th.* 1061), the verb can also be used of actors (D. 19.246; Teles p. 5.3), rhapsodes (Hdt. 5.67) and choruses (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 617 [Delos, 189 BC]). The usage is thus not remarkable, even if the word does not refer to musicians elsewhere. For musical contests both in Athens and elsewhere in Greece in general, see Shapiro 1992; Kotsidu 1991; Reisch 1885. For a set of rules for musical contests (second/third AD?), see Pearl 1978.

6 **καὶ σύ** The use of καί here strongly implies that the addressee is being sent to defeat the sophists, just as a previous person defeated them; see above on introduction to this play.

**τοὺς σοφιστάς** In reference to poets, the word occurs first at Pi. *I.* 5.28 (cf. Σ *ad loc.*); cf. O. 1.8–9 ὕμνος ... σοφῶν with Gerber 1982 *ad loc.* It is commonly used of musicians as well, especially in the latter part of the fifth century, e.g. Cratin. fr. 2 with Kassel–Austin *ad loc.*; Eup. fr. 483; Pl. Com. fr. 149; S. fr. 906; cf. Phryn. Com. fr. 74; Σ<sup>T</sup> H. *Il.* 15.412b<sup>1</sup>; such references are generally not complimentary (cf. Pearson on S. fr. 101 [adesp. trag. *TGrFF* 1b(a)]).

For a collection of instances of the word, and the occupations to which it is applied, see Kerferd 1950.

**ὦ φίλε** For ὦ with the vocative, see fr. 1.4n. While ὦ φίλε (i. e. the substantive) is common for example in Plato, it occurs elsewhere in comedy only at Ar. *Ach.* 568 (said by the chorus to Lamachus); adesp. com. fr. 156 (cf. Meineke 1841 IV.620 *ad loc.*), [Men.] *Mon.* 248 (cf. 697 [φίλε]; possibly 102, 451 [cf. Jäkel 1964 *ad loc.*]), and perhaps at *Mon.* append. 3.4 (cf. Jäkel 1964 *ad loc.*). In Plato, use of such terms seems generally to be restricted to the character in the dominant position (Dickey 1996. 113–17); this is not the case at Ar. *Ach.* 568, but the restriction is a tendency, not a rule. Nevertheless, this pattern does fit the apparent relationship between teacher and student here.

**Θετταλοί (*Thettaloi*)**  
(‘Thessalians’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.169; 1847. 578; Bothe 1855. 421; Kock 1884 II.141; Edmonds 1959 II.52–53; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.246; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 247

**Title** Titles derived from local adjectives are not uncommon (e.g. Aristophanes *Acharnians*; Crates *Samioi*; Alexis *Thesprōtoi*; *Thēbaioi*; *Tarantinoi*; Antiphanes *Aigyptioi*; Menander *Halaeis*); perhaps slightly more common is the use of the singular (e.g. Antiphanes *Byzantios*; *Zakynthios*; Anaxandrides *Amprakiōtis*; Alexis *Kyprios*; Anaxandrides, Menander *Samia*; Antiphanes *Boiōtia*; Menander *Thettalē*). The plural suggests an eponymous chorus, although that cannot always have been the case, especially in later plays; see on *Agroikoi*; introduction.

Since Thessalians are most notably stereotyped as gluttons (e.g. Ar. fr. 507 [cf. Hsch. κ 688; Xenarch. fr. 11]; Antiph. fr. 249; Eub. fr. 87; Alex. fr. 216; Eriph. fr. 6), a suitable subject for comedy, this trait might be the point here. Thessalian women had a reputation as witches (cf. Kassel–Austin on Men. *Thettalē*, which apparently dealt with the matter; Cazeaux 1979), although the same is not true for the men; perhaps Θετταλαί should be read, but it would be rash to introduce the change arbitrarily.

If the play had political overtones, one basis might be the treaty between Athens and Thessaly of 361 BC (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 116); cf. Rhodes–Osborne 2003 *ad loc.* (#44); Helly 1995. 53–4. This treaty, however, was broken off after only a few years, and Philip II of Macedon soon began interfering directly in Thessalian affairs before eventually absorbing the state into Macedonia; cf. Walbank 1957–1979 on Plb. 9.28.3; Westlake 1935. Either occasion could provide scope for political satire.

**Date** Unknown.

fr. 17 K.-A. (16 K.)

Antiatt. p. 106.10

λ ι θ ᾶ ζ ε ι ν · οὐχὶ λεύειν καὶ καταλεύειν. Ἀναξανδρίδης Θετταλοῖς

Ἀναξινδρί<sup>δ</sup> cod.: corr. Bekker

To s t o n e. Not ‘to throw stones at’ or ‘to stone to death.’ Anaxandrides in *Thettaloi*

**Metre** Unknown.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.169; 1847. 578; Bothe 1855. 421; Kock 1884 II.141; Edmonds 1959 II.52–3; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.246; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 247

**Citation Context** The occasion for the citation of the word in the Antiatticist is unclear. The concern of the collection is usually to defend words condemned by Atticists rather than to make condemnations, but cf. Antiatt. pp. 77.12; 86.14; 88.24 (disputes about the proper form, not choice of vocabulary). Unlike λιθάζειν, moreover, both λεύειν and καταλεύειν have good classical examples. It thus seems likely that the entry either is corrupt or has been abbreviated past the point of comprehension, and that the original entry defended λιθάζειν against condemnation by an Atticist. In addition, καί is difficult, and one would expect οὐδέ. Emending οὐχί (only five occurrences in the Antiatticist, at least three of them probably corrupt) to οὐ μόνον solves both difficulties.<sup>43</sup> The entry could also be normalized by reading e. g. ἀντὶ τοῦ λεύειν ἢ καταλεύειν, but the corruption would be difficult to account for. Finally, as often in the Antiatticist, the text is so abbreviated that the precise relation between the constituent parts of the entry is no longer clear, and thus it cannot be assumed with absolute certainty that Anaxandrides used the word λιθάζειν.

**λιθάζειν** The verb in the sense ‘to stone’ occurs first here; Arist. *Pr.* 881b1, where it means simply ‘to throw stones’, may be contemporary. The word is otherwise late, a not infrequent happenstance in Anaxandrides and comedy generally; cf. fr. 16.3 ἐσχεδίασε. For stoning, normally a spontaneous group action against an individual deemed to have violated basic community norms, see Pease 1907; Hirzel 1909; Olson 2002 on Ar. *Ach.* 236; Rosivach 1987.

<sup>43</sup> The same emendation probably ought to be made at Antiatt. pp. 79.18 and 89.4; the repetition of the identical corruption suggests a persistent misunderstanding of an abbreviation or the like. At p. 84.7, οὐχί can perhaps stand in the phrase οὐχί φάσι δεῖν λέγειν, although elsewhere in the Antiatticist οὐ is always used in this set phrase. οὐχί is probably correct at p. 79.24 (condemning the existence of ἀστράγαλος as a feminine noun) if the entry is understood as a reaction to Phryn. *PS* pp. 86.12 and 117.12; for the existence of a feminine form, cf. Σ<sup>AT</sup> H. *Il.* 23.88 (cf. Σ<sup>BT</sup> on 18.551). For the probable insertion of <μόνον> after οὐ, e. g. Antiatt. pp. 86.14 (Antiph. fr. 48); 87.18.

**Θησαυρός (*Thēsauros*)**  
(‘Treasure’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.169; 1847. 578; Bothe 1855. 421; Kock 1884 II.142; Edmonds 1959 II.52–53; Arnott 1974; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.246 (cf. 1986 V.45); Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 248

**Title** A Θησαυρός was written by Archedicus, Menander, Philemo and Diphilus; a *Thesaurus* by Luscius Lanuvinus (possibly modeled on Anaxandrides’ play; cf. Arnott 1974); and an *Aulularia* by Plautus. The only earlier comedy with this title is that of Crates II (doubted by Meineke I.58, 64).

**Content of the comedy** If the title is indicative of subject-matter, this seems to have been a popular theme in later comedy. Fragment 18 expresses sentiments suitable for a miser, although play need not bear much similarity to that of Plautus. The plot could also easily revolve around a person (not necessarily a miser as in *Aulularia*) who discovers a treasure and unexpectedly becomes rich; cf. Ar. Av. 599–602. Fragment 19, referring to a wedding, is appropriate for either.

**Date** The original date of production is unknown, but the play was revived in 311 BC (test. 7, where it is designated as παλαιά; see introduction). It may be significant that this play rather than e.g. one of the mythological parodies was chosen for revival, suggesting that it was congenial to the tastes of the next generation; note that the four other authors of plays by this name all date to the late fourth/early third century.

**fr. 18 K.-A. (17 K.)**

ὁ τὸ σκόλιον εὐρὼν ἐκεῖνος, ὅστις ἦν  
τὸ μὲν ὑγιαίνειν πρῶτον ὡς ἄριστον ὄν  
ὠνόμασεν ὀρθῶς· δεύτερον δ’ εἶναι καλόν,  
τρίτον δὲ πλουτεῖν, τοῦθ’ ὀρθῶς, ἐμάνετο.  
5 μετὰ τὴν ὑγίαν γὰρ τὸ πλουτεῖν διαφέρει·  
καλὸς δὲ πεινῶν ἐστὶν αἰσχρὸν θηρίον

habent ACE

2 ὄν Bergk: ἦν ACE      3 δεύτερον ... καλόν om. CE      4 ὀραῖς ACE: ὀρίσας  
Richards      6 πεινῶν Canter: πίνων ACE



**Interpretation** To value the possessions here enumerated is a commonplace; cf. Dodds 1959 on Pl. *Grg.* 451e for further examples. Dodds sees these values as reflecting aristocratic opinion, but is rightly sceptical of the attempt of Wilamowitz 1931–1932 II.255 to read καλόν (3) as shorthand for καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν. But it would be a mistake to understand Anaxandrides' reworking of the relative importance of these possessions as a reaction to the changing political or social realities of the fourth century; cf. on 5–6. A possible precursor to such a formulation is the oft-quoted (cf. Rzach 1902 *ad loc.*) Hes. *Op.* 293–7; for additional examples, see Spyropoulos 1974. 85 n. 5.

**1 ὁ τὸ σκόλιον εὐρών** Cf. fr. 31 ὁ πρῶτος εὐρών with n. εὐρίσκω in the sense 'discover' or 'invent' is common (e.g. fr. 10.2; 30.1). Used of poetry with the sense 'compose', it is far rarer, and LSJ cite no examples; cf. Pi. fr. 122.14 τοιάνδε μελίφρονος ἄρχαν εὐρόμενον σκολίου; Ar. *Th.* 546–7 ἐπίτηδες εὐρίσκων λόγους ὅπου γυνὴ πονηρὰ / ἐγένετο, Μελανίππας ποῶν Φαίδρας τε (of Euripides); Ec. 882–3 Μοῦσαι, ... / μελύδριον εὐροῦσαι τι τῶν Ἰωνικῶν; [Men.] *Mon.* 713 σοφοῦ παρ' ἀνδρὸς πρῶτος εὐρέθη λόγος. The locution may owe its origin to the notion that a poet does not create poetry out of nothing but from an outside source, an idea present already in Homer (*Il.* 1.1; *Od.* 1.1) and common in Aristophanes (e.g. *Ach.* 665–75; *Pax* 775–81 with Olson 1998 *ad loc.* for further examples). In this instance, however, the speaker may be thinking less of the act of creating poetry than of the discovery or recognition of the truism the poetry presents (despite his subsequent disavowal of it).

**ἐκεῖνος, ὅστις ἦν** For ἐκεῖνος referring to a vague, unknown person, e.g. H. *Il.* 9.63 (quoted at Ar. *Pax* 1097); Antiph. fr. 207.5–6.

**2 τὸ μὲν ὑγιαίνειν πρῶτον ὡς ἄριστον ὄν** Health is commonly (and not unreasonably) valued highly in such formulations;<sup>44</sup> cf. Philem. fr. 150 αἰτῶ δ' ὑγίαν πρῶτον; [Epich.] fr. 250 ἀνδρὶ δ' ὑγιαίνειν ἄριστόν ἐστιν; [Men.] *Mon.* 562 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὑγείας κρεῖττον οὐδὲν ἐν βίῳ; Thgn. 255; Simon. *PMG* 604; carm. pop. *PMG* 882; Critias fr. B 6.20; Maced. *Pae.* 21; Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 604–5; Cope–Sandys 1877 on Arist. *Rh.* 1394b13. S. fr. 356, on the other hand, appears to rank health second, after possessing what one loves. At Hdt. 1.30–2, Solon dispenses with such ranking and values only dying happy, although he does acknowledge (1.32) that benefits such as health and wealth will naturally be enjoyed by one who is thus blessed. Note also that ὑγιαίνειν has a wider semantic range than English 'to be in good health' and includes mental as well as physical health, and perhaps has moral connotations in addition; see Dover 1974. 126–9; Taillardat 1965 §473.

<sup>44</sup> The most famous example is Sapph. fr. 16.1–4; cf. Page 1955. 55–7. For the form in general, Race 1982.



For ὥς with the participle, see Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.95.

3 **δεύτερον δ' εἶναι καλόν** Although the adjective καλός can refer to more than simple physical beauty (cf. Dover 1974. 69–73), the limited sense is at issue here, as the text of the *skolion* shows (*PMG* 890.2 καλὸν φῦάν; see Dodds 1959 on *Pl. Grg.* 451e). Admiration of physical beauty is a commonplace (e.g. καλός-inscriptions); for an extreme view, see *Mimn.* fr. 1; 3 (contrast between the beauty of the young and the ugliness of the old).

4 **τρίτον δὲ πλουτεῖν** Wealth in itself, especially as a guarantee of future security, is often highly valued (although sometimes cynically, as at *Thgn.* 928 ἐν δὲ τοιῷδε γένει χρήματ' ἄριστον ἔχειν); cf. *Pi. P.* 2.56 τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ σὺν τύχῃ πότμου σοφίας ἄριστον; *Ar. Pl.* 128–30, 144–97. It is not uniformly praised, however, especially in regard to the behavior of the rich; cf. *Ar. Pl.* 564 τοῦ πλούτου δ' ἐστὶν ὑβρίζειν; *Timocr.* fr. 5, *PMG* 731; Dover 1974. 110–12. Placing it third, as in the *skolion* discussed in this fragment, presumably reflects an older, aristocratic outlook on the part of those sure of their position in society; contrast 5. For the order health, beauty, wealth, cf. *Gal. Protr.* 9–14. For wealth and health, cf. *Plu. Mor.* 693f.

**ὀργῆς** For parenthetic ὀργῆς, cf. *Alex.* fr. 9.8; *Ar. Nu.* 355 with Kock 1894a and Teuffel 1887 *ad loc.*; *Th.* 490; *Alex.* fr. 9.8 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; *Men. Pk.* with Gomme–Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.*; Wackernagel 1955. 785; Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.353–4. Starkie 1911 on *Ar. Nu.* 355 makes the point that it is used ‘generally where there is a touch of malice.’

**ἐμαίνετο** Cf. *E. IT* 1300 μαίνῃ· τί δ' ἡμῖν τῶν ξένων δρασμοῦ μέτα; fr. 640 (where Schmidt’s emendation reflects a failure to recognize this sense of the word); *Antiph.* fr. 230.1 ὁ διδοὺς τὸν ὄρκον τῷ πονηρῷ μαίνεται; the use of μανικόν at *Anaxandr.* fr. 29; English ‘crazy’ as a strong form of ‘mistaken.’<sup>45</sup> LSJ do not document the word in this sense.

5 One obvious possibility is that this line was spoken by a miser, if the plot of the play was similar to that of Plautus *Aulularia*. Note that the miser tends to be an old man, who presumably no longer has much interest in being καλός in the physical sense, an attribute primarily of the young. It is equally likely, however, that the speaker was someone of humble circumstances with newly acquired wealth (i.e. the treasure of the title). He might understandably be celebrating his gain with a drinking-party (hence the occasion for the *skolion*) and would value wealth highly (knowing keenly the consequences of its lack).

<sup>45</sup> Worth noting as well are *E. Ba.* 399, 887, 999, although the emphasis on μανία throughout the play may have some influence in these instances.

μετὰ τὴν ὑγίειαν γάρ For the postponement of γάρ, cf. Denniston 1954. 95–6; Dover 1987. 61–3.

6 καλὸς δὲ πεινῶν ἐστὶν αἰσχροὺς θηρίον The gnomic character of the line (note the lack of resolution) is an effective conclusion to the argument. Here πεινῶν is essentially synonymous with πένης; cf. *EM* p. 667.47–8 τὸ δὲ πεινῶ, παρὰ τὸ πένω πένομαι· ὃ παρέπεται πολλάκις τοῦτο. The same word-play may be behind Antiph. fr. 226.6–7. Expressing poverty in terms of hunger is not extraordinary, in view of comedy’s preoccupation with food and the tendency to praise wealth in terms of the security it provides (cf. on 4 above), but especially because of the reality that the two were often synonymous and the poor did go hungry.

αἰσχροὺς, although functioning mainly as a general term of derision, has overtones of ‘ugly’ here, given its juxtaposition with καλός. For the two words and their antithetical relationship, see Dover 1974. 69–73; cf. the contrast between αἰσχρά and ὡραία at fr. 52.9–11. For the ability of poverty to make a person αἰσχυρός, cf. Thgn. 649–50 ἃ δειλὴ Πενίη, τί ἐμοῖς ἐπικειμένη ὥμοις / σῶμα κατασχύνεις καὶ νόον ἡμέτερον (cf. 1061–2); Pl. *Smp.* 203c, where Eros, as the child of Πενία, πολλοῦ δεῖ ἀπαλός τε καὶ καλός. For the use of θηρίον here, Schmidt 1876–1886. II.434–5 compares Aeschin. 2.34; Pl. *R.* 591c; *Cra.* 394e. For the contrast between men and beasts generally, see Schmidt 1876–1886 II.434. Beasts and hunger are associated already in Homer; e.g. *Od.* 6.133–4, where hunger (γαστήρ) drives a lion to attack even a closely guarded sheepfold; 7.216 οὐ γάρ τι στυγερῇ ἐπὶ γαστέρι κύντερον ἄλλο.

#### fr. 19 K.-A. (18 K.)

ἀναλαβὼν  
μόναυλον ἤϋλουν τὸν ὑμέναιον  
after taking up  
a monaulos I played the wedding song

Ath. 4.176a

Ἀναξανδρίδης δ’ ἐν Θησαυρῷ. —

Anaxandrides in *Thēsauros*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x—υ— x—υ— x⟩υ—υ—  
υ—υ— —|υ—υ— υ—υ—

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.170; 1847. 578; Bothe 1855. 421; Naber 1880. 54; Kock 1884. 142; Blaydes 1896. 333; Edmonds 1959 II.52–3; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.247; Mathiesen 1999. 195; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 249

**Citation Context** Within a larger discussion of musical instruments generally (4.174b–85a), Athenaeus cites this fragment together with a handful of others as evidence for the monaulos (4.175f–6a). S. fr. 241 and Arar. fr. 13 precede; Anaxandr. fr. 52 and Sopat. fr. 2 follow.

**Text** Naber takes the verse as the beginning of a catalectic trochaic tetrameter and supplies αὖ πάλιν *exempli gratia* at the end; while this is possible, there is no particular reason to understand the line as trochaic, especially since iambic trimeters are far more common.

**Interpretation** The obvious place in the play for a wedding is near the end, although the fragment might instead be reporting a previous, extra-dramatic event (note tense of ἡλουν). Plaut. *Aul.* offers one model for how a wedding can be incorporated into a play based at least in part on the actions of a miser. A wedding could also take place as part of a general celebration of the main character's newfound wealth and general success (cf. Ar. *Pax*). Note that the piper speaks these lines (and thus reports the wedding as a whole?), which is perhaps unexpected if he is a professional musician; for this reason, the speaker is better regarded as somehow connected with the main (free) characters (e.g. one of their slaves; less likely one of them<sup>46</sup>).

1 ἀναλαβών Cf. fr. 16.2 λαβών τὸ μελετητήριον.

2 μόναυλον The aulos is a reed instrument similar to the modern oboe (not the flute; cf. West 1992. 1–2, 82–5); see West 1992. 81–109 (92–3 for the monaulos); Anderson 1994. 183–4; Schlesinger 1939; Vetter 1933. 74–5; Wilson 1999. Poll. 4.75 claims that it was used especially for wedding songs (μόναυλος ... αὐλεῖ δὲ μάλιστα τὸ γαμήλιον), although this fragment may be the source of his information; cf. Sapph. fr. 44.24 αὐλος δ' ἄδυ[μ]έλος[ ]τ' ὀνεμίγνυ[το]

<sup>46</sup> Although learning to play the lyre was a common component of an aristocratic education in the archaic and classical periods, that was apparently not the case for the aulos; cf. West 1992. 25–7. The only real evidence to the contrary is Alcibiades' famous refusal to learn to play the aulos (Duris *FGrHist* 76 F 29; [Pl.] *Alc.* I.106e; Plu. *Alc.* 2.5); against this story, cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1341a18–28, where the philosopher harshly criticizes the effects of aulos-playing on the youth and explicitly states that οἱ πρότερον had forbidden its inclusion in the education of free-born youth (Newman 1887–1902 *ad loc.* cites Ar. fr. 232 and Phryn. Com. fr. 3 as support for the existence of such education in the mid-fifth century, but the fragments in fact suggest that such instruction was anomalous).

(see below for this fragment as a possible example of a ὑμέναιον). According to West 1992. 92–3, the term monaulos is used to distinguish the single aulos from the more normal double aulos, thus implying an instrument with sufficient holes to occupy both hands (in contrast to the double aulos). Although the single aulos is found in artistic representations beginning in the archaic period, the word μόναυλος does not occur until S. fr. 241, where Pearson 1917 claims that it is used to distinguish the σῦριγξ μονοκάλαμος from the σῦριγξ πολυκάλαμος ('pan-pipe'). Despite the occasional occurrence of the word later, the small cluster of instances appearing in the early to mid fourth century (here; fr. 52; Arar. fr. 13; Sopat. fr. 2) suggests that the instrument was in vogue at this time; note, however, the fragments of a monaulos found in Egypt and dated to *ca.* 15 BC (cf. Anderson 1994. 180, 184). West 1992. 97–8 offers a catalogue of known fragments of auloi from the archaic and classical periods.

**ἤλουν τὸν ὑμέναιον** 'Played the music that accompanies the wedding song.' There were songs at the banquet, the ceremony, and during the procession to the groom's house and the wedding chamber. Which of these is alluded to here is uncertain, although most literary references are to the latter. Cf. Men. *Sam.* 125–6 for the groom practicing the wedding song (or at least humming it to himself).

For possible fragments of wedding songs, see Sapph. fr. 27; 30; 44; 104–17 (cf. Page 1955. 71–4, 119–26); for literary adaptations, Ar. *Pax* 1332–66 (cf. Olson 1998 *ad loc.*); E. *Tr.* 308–41; *Phaëth.* 227–44; Theoc. 18; Catullus 61; 62; 64.323–81; cf. E. *IA* 1036–79. In general, see Maas 1914. 130–4; Schmidt 1886; Contiades–Tsitoni 1990; a succinct account at Smyth 1900. cxii–cxx. For the wedding itself, see Hermann–Blümner 1882. 268–78; Oakley–Sinos 1993.

**Θησεύς (*Thēseus*)**  
(‘Theseus’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.170; 1847. 578; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.142; Edmonds 1959 II.52–3; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.247; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 249

**Title** A *Thēseus* was written also by Aristonymus, Diphilus, and Theopompus. There were possibly three tragedies of this name as well, by Sophocles (disputed by Welcker; cf. Radt 1999 *ad loc.*), Euripides and Achaëus I.

In the course of the fifth century, Theseus replaced Herakles as the great Athenian hero (cf. the ephebic oath [SEG XVI 140]), although he was never as well or as variously represented in literature; in general, see Ward 1970. 143–74; LIMC VII.1.922. In central Athens there was a shrine to Theseus that is probably to be located in an unexcavated part of the city east of the Tower of the Winds, north-east of the Acropolis; see Travlos 1971. 234; Agora III pp. 113–19.

**Content of the comedy** Euripides’ play certainly handled Theseus’ adventures on Crete; the two fragments of Achaëus refer to Artemis Saronia (< the Saronic Gulf) and the Marathonian bull. Theseus also appeared in other tragedies in a more peripheral role, e.g. E. *Hipp.*; comic potential might be found in the hero as cuckolded husband. For Theseus in tragedy, see Mills 1997, although she concentrates on extant plays, not necessarily those in which Theseus has a primary role. In addition, one or more epics had Theseus as a central character, and a Diphilus of unknown date wrote a choliambic poem about him. The plots of the comedies are unknown, although Kaibel (reported by Kassel–Austin *ad loc.*) suggested that the surviving fragment from Aristonymus’ play belonged to a description of a meal with Hecale. Possibly relevant is the observation of Hollis 1990. 6 that ‘Sciron and Cercyon, overcome by Theseus, were also thought fit subjects for satyr plays and comedies’ (cf. Hollis on Call. *Hec.* fr. 59–60; 62.1–2). Although there is no solid evidence for the focus of Anaxandrides’ play, fr. 20 (see *ad loc.*) suggests a connection with Hecale.

**Date** Unknown.

## fr. 20 K.-A. (19 K.)

ὅτε τὰς μορίας ἔτρωγεν ὥσπερ <καὶ> Πλάτων

μορίας BP: μωρίας F<sup>2</sup>      ὥσπερ καὶ Hermann: ὥσπερ εἰ Meineke: ὥσπερ BPF<sup>2</sup>

when he ate the sacred olives just like Plato

D.L. 3.26

ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Θησεϊ· —

But also Anaxandrides in *Thēseus*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

uu-uu- u-uu|- --u-

**Discussion** Hemsterhuis 1811. 323–4 (on Ar. *Pl.* 926); Hermann ap. Hübner 1828–1831 I.212 n. h; Meineke 1840 III.170; 1847. 578; Bothe 1855. 422; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvii; Kock 1884 II.142; Edmonds 1959 II.52–5; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.247; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 249

**Citation Context** Book 3 of Diogenes is devoted to Plato; a long section (3.25–28) is given over to listing quotations from comic poets that mention, and ostensibly mock, the philosopher. The fragments show no discernible order, but this one appears second, after Theopomp. Com. fr. 16 and before a dozen others.

**Text** A long syllable is lacking before Πλάτων. Hermann's <καί> offers better sense than Meineke's ὥσπερ<sup>εἰ</sup>, but for possible examples of ὥσπερ<sup>εἰ</sup> corrupted to ὥσπερ, cf. Antiph. fr. 227.5; Eub. fr. 62.

**Interpretation** Theseus was served, or at least offered, olives by Hecale at Call. *Hec.* fr. 36 (cf. *Iamb.* 4.77); this fragment may allude to a similar context.

τὰς μοριάς Sacred olives that belonged to and were protected by the state and fell under the jurisdiction of the Areopagus; they were thought to be descended from the olive tree planted by Athena on the Acropolis. These olives originally provided the oil for the Panathenaea (*Suda* μ 1248; Σ<sup>E</sup> Ar. *Nu.* 1005; Σ S. *OC* 701), but eventually it was furnished from any trees on the land where the sacred olives grew (Arist. *Ath.* 60.2 with Rhodes 1981 *ad loc.*). For the sacred olives and laws pertaining to them, see Papazarkadas 2011. 260–84; Arist. *Ath.* 60.2 with Rhodes 1981 *ad loc.*; Carey 1989 114–15 (on Lys. 7). Although the term could be applied to any such olives, those in the Academy were particularly well-known (Ar. *Nu.* 1005; Σ S. *OC* 701, 705), suggesting the comparison with Plato (*PA* 11855; *PAA* 775000); for a general account of the Academy and its topography, see Travlos 1971. 42–51.

**ἔτρωγεν** In comedy, at least, τρώγω and its compounds seem to be used exclusively of nibbling on foods such as fruits, nuts, and the like, with the exception of metaphorical uses (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 924) or other atypical situations (e.g. Ar. *V.* 164); cf. K.-A. on Eup. fr. 335; Taillardat 1965 §132; Chadwick 1996. 288–9.

**〈καὶ〉 Πλάτων** Aside from the association of Plato and the Academy, and thus its olives, the reason for mentioning the philosopher remains obscure (see D.L. 6.25 for another anecdote concerning Plato and olives, though not *moriai*). Brock 1990. 41 takes this fragment and D.L. 6.25 to indicate that Plato had a fondness for olives notorious enough to be mocked, but the evidence is slight. The inclusion of this line in a catalogue of comic references (D.L. 3.26–8) in which Plato was mocked (ἐσκώφθη) suggests that the remark may be more pointed than it appears. Plato and the Academy are mentioned frequently in fourth-century comedy, e.g. Antiph. fr. 35; Ephipp. fr. 14; Alex. fr. 151 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Aristopho, *Plato* (cf. Breitenbach 1908. 32–3); cf. Riginos 1976. 68, 114; Helm 1906. 376–9; Brock 1990.

## fr. 21 K.-A. (20 K.)

παρθένοι

παίζουσιν 〈— ≡〉 πρὸς ἐλάφρ' ἐξαλλάγματα

2 παίζουσι Bekker negligenter: παίζουσι〈ν εὐθὺς〉 Meineke: -ουσ' 〈ιοῦσαι〉 Edmonds: παίζ〈ειν φιλ〉οῦσι van Herwerden ἐλάφρ' Bekker: ἐλάφρα cod.

girls

play 〈   〉 at trivial amusements

Antiatt. p. 96.4

ἐ ξ α λ λ ά γ μ α τ α . Ἀναξανδρίδης Θησεῖ. —

A m u s e m e n t s. Anaxandrides in *Thēseus*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

〈x—υ— x—υ— x〉—υ—  
—υ〈— x〉|υυ— —υ—

or trochaic tetrameter catalectic

—υ— —υ〈—〉υ υ— —υ—

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.170; 1847. 578; Bothe 1855. 422; Herwerden 1878. 66; Kock 1884 II.143; Schmidt 1886–1887 III.49; Blaydes 1896. 122; Edmonds 1959 II.54; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.248; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 249

**Text** Although the meter is uncertain, there is clearly a lacuna. The line could be made into (1) a trochaic tetrameter, if a long syllable followed by an anceps is inserted after παίζουσιν, or (2) an iambic trimeter, if a line-break is introduced between παρθένοι and παίζουσιν, and a long and an anceps added after παίζουσιν or a long and a short added after ἐλάφρ'. A trimeter is more likely than a tetrameter;<sup>47</sup> see above on fr. 10. Of the proposed supplements, none is more than a guess. Meineke's εὐθύς has the advantage of retaining the manuscript's παίζουσιν (presumably unwittingly, since no one seems aware that Bekker misrepresented the ms. reading), while van Herwerden's suggestion recalls the alliteration of π and λ elsewhere in the line.

**Interpretation** Neither the citation context nor what little is known about the play offer much help in interpreting the fragment. Equally uncertain is whether the girls in the fragment are specific characters in the play or are meant to represent women generally. Nevertheless, there seem to be three possible interpretations: (1) the fragment is meant literally and perhaps is part of a description of a carefree scene; (2) it is part of a comparison (e.g. girls play, *sc.* while men work *vel sim.*); (3) it is a pointed condemnation (girls play games, i. e. scheme).

**2 παίζουσιν ... πρὸς** For παίζω with πρὸς, cf. Pl. Com. fr. 46.1; more commonly, the verb governs a simple accusative (e.g. Crates Com. fr. 27; Cratin. fr. 61; Ar. Th. 947; Antiph. fr. 278).

**ἐλάφρ' ἐξαλλάγματα** ἐλαφρός can have the sense 'easy', as at A. PV 263 (not 265 as LSJ); Ar. Ach. 218; Theoc. 22.212; a better parallel, though late, is Hsch. ε 1919 ἐλαφρία· μωρία, taken by Latte 1966 *ad loc.* as a reference to 2 Ep. Cor. 1:17, the only occurrence of the stem with this sense. ἐξαλλάγματα occurs elsewhere only at Parth. 24.1, where it is used of inducements made by a (potential) lover (cf. Ellis 1886. 227 'by constant changes of presents'); possibly the context is similar here. The cognate verb with the sense 'amuse' or 'divert' is better attested but nevertheless frowned on by the Atticists; cf. Phryn. Ecl. 341 ἐξαλλάξαι· τὸ τέρψαι καὶ παραγαγεῖν εἰς εὐφροσύνην. χρὴ φυλάττεσθαι οὕτω λέγειν, οὐ γὰρ χρώνται οἱ δόκιμοι. Φιλίππιδης (fr. 36) δὲ καὶ Μένανδρος (fr. 540; cf. Suda ε 1523; Phot. ε 1086) αὐτῷ χρώνται. The

<sup>47</sup> The practice of the Antiatticist offers no help, since on occasion the work does cite the end of one line and the beginning of the next (e.g. pp. 85.3–4 [Cratin. fr. 219]; 93.3–4 [H. Il. 23.465–6]).



Antiatticist appears to react against this sentiment, p. 96.1 ἐξαλλάξαι· ὡς Ἀλεξανδρεῖς, ἀντὶ τοῦ τέρψαι. Μένανδρος (fr. 540 follows). Bast 1809. 241 suggested emending Ἀλεξανδρεῖς to Ἀλέξανδρος, but Ἀναξανδρίδης is far more likely if emendation is warranted; see above on fr. 12a; Antiph. fr. 71 (where, as here, Ἀλεξις followed by a corrupt title is another possibility); contrast Latte 1915. 384–5 (= 1968. 622), who would retain Ἀλεξανδρεῖς.

Ἴώ (*Iō*)  
(‘Io’)

**Discussion** Kock 1884 II.143; Edmonds 1959 II.54–5; Webster 1970. 18 n. 1; Kassel–Austin 1884 II.248; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 249

**Title** Plays with this title were written by Sannyrio, Plato Comicus and the tragedian Chaeremon.

**Content of the comedy** Since the play is known only from the list of Anaxandrides’ victories, little can be said about the plot. Webster 1970. 18 suggested that it follows the expected formula of the divine being portrayed as a common mortal; there is also comic potential in the portrayal of Io as a βούκερως παρθένος (see Griffith 1983 on A. *PV* 588). Müller 1986. 154 views the *Iōs* of Sannyrio and Plato as paratragedy, and Anaxandrides’ play may have been as well; for Io in tragedy, note the inclusion of *Io vaga* at Hor. *AP* 124 in a catalogue of typical tragic subjects.

**Date** Test. 5.6) lists *Iō*, performed in the archonship of Hippodamas (374 BC), among the plays of Anaxandrides that took fourth place at the City Dionysia. *Io* thus fell close to the beginning of his career.

**Κανηφόρος (*Kanēphoros*)**  
(‘Kanephoros’)

**Discussion** Grotius 1626. 638–9; Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.143; Edmonds 1959 II.54–55; Webster 1970. 77; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.248; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 250

**Title** Menander also wrote a Κανηφόρος and Turpilius a *Canephorus*, seemingly based on Menander’s play (see Ribbeck 1897 *ad loc.*); cf. Ephippus Ὅμοιοι ἢ Ὀβελιαφόροι; Menander Ἀρρηφόρος ἢ Αὐλητρίς; Menander and Apollodorus Carystius Ἰέρεια.

The *kanēphoros* in public festivals was a girl of good family, at least at the Panathenaia (e.g. Σ<sup>REF</sup> Ar. *Ach.* 242 αἱ εὐγενεῖς παρθένοι ἐκανηφόρουν; Ar. *Lys.* 646 κἀκανηφόρουν ποτ’ οὕσα παῖς καλή; Th. 6.56.1; Arist. *Ath.* 18.2 with Rhodes 1981 *ad loc.*), who carried the κανοῦν, or ritual basket, containing offerings (Σ<sup>REF</sup> Ar. *Ach.* 242) and/or the sacrificial knife, garlands, and barley (Σ<sup>RV</sup> Ar. *Pax* 948). For general accounts, including the festivals for which *kanēphoroi* are attested, see Roccas 1995; Schelp 1975, esp. 15–21; Mittelhaus 1919; Humbert 1924. Sparkes 1975. 131 and pl. 15 a–c offers a brief discussion with illustration of the κανοῦν.

**Content of the comedy** The one fragment represents little more than a commonplace religious sentiment. Most likely the *kanēphoros* in question was the object of a young man’s affection (cf. test. 1), and a festival is a possible setting for at least part of the play; for festivals as a standard place for meeting girls and the stereotypical location for one-night stands, e.g. E. *Ion* 545–54; Men. *Epir.* 451–4; *Sam.* 38–49; cf. *Lys.* 1.20. Fr. 22 may offer limited support for this notion; cf. *ad loc.* This play might therefore be one of those concerning παρθένων φθοράς; see Introduction.

**Date** Unknown.

fr. 22 K.-A. (21 K.)

ἅπαντές ἐσμεν πρὸς τὰ θεῖ’ ἀβέλτεροι,  
κούκ ἴσμεν οὐδέν

Ἀναξανδρίδ L: Ἀλεξανδρίδου P: Ἀλεξανδρίδης F      Κανηφόρῳ om. L  
1 θεῖα βέλτεροι L

We are all fools before the divine,  
and we know nothing

Stob. 2.1.3

Ἀναξανδρίδου Κανηφόρω ---

Anaxandrides' *Kanēphoros*: ---**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

υ-υ-    -| -υ-    υ-υ-  
 ---υ-    x| <-υ-    x-υ->

**Discussion** Grotius 1623 I.170–1, 191; Meineke 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Meineke 1857 V.clxxvii, 80; Kock 1884 II.143; 1888 III.737; Pickard-Cambridge 1900. 54; Edmonds 1959. 54–5; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.248; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 250

**Citation Context** Included in Stobaeus' chapter Περὶ τῶν τὰ θεῖα ἐρμονευόντων, καὶ ὡς εἴη ἀνθρώποις ἀκατάληπτος ἢ τῶν νοητῶν κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ἀλήθεια. Numerous parallels for the sentiment are found there; Pearson 1917 on S. fr. 919 adds more. The commonplace is expressed as early as Hes. *Op.* 42 and thence continuously through antiquity, including in Christian sources (e.g. *Rom.* 11:33).

**Interpretation** Despite the apparent ordinariness of the expression, it suggests some confusion over identity and/or status, a typical feature of the sort of plot, best known from New Comedy, in which a child is lost or a slave or person of similarly low status turns out to be well-born and free.

**1 πρὸς** For the force of the preposition, see LSJ s.v. C.I.6.b.

**τὰ θεῖ(α)** 'The acts of the gods', as at e.g. Alex. fr. 269.3; Philem. fr. 357 K. (= *Comp. Men. Phil.* 2.16–17); adesp. com. fr. 881; contrast Alex. fr. 31.4 'heavenly bodies.'

**ἄβέλτεροι** Not found before the late fifth century, ἄβέλτερος occurs predominantly in comedy (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 1201; *Ra.* 989<sup>48</sup>; Amphis fr. 41; Alex. fr. 247.7 [opposed to ἔμφορων]; Men. *Epitr.* 450; *Sam.* 126; cf. fr. 12.2 with n.), as well as in some prose authors (e.g. Pl. *R.* 490c; Hyp. *Lyc.* 7 Μαργίτης ὁ πάντων ἄβελτερώτατος; D. 34.41; Aeschin. 1.71), and is presumably colloquial language.

<sup>48</sup> In the note in Dover 1993 *ad loc.*, for *Ec.* 297 read *Th.* 290.

**Κέρκιος (?) (*Kerkios*)**  
(‘Kerkios’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.143; Breitenbach 1908. 168; Edmonds 1959 II.54–55; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.248; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 250

**Title** The title is uncertain. The generally accepted form is Κέρκιος (Meineke; Bothe; Kock; Kassel–Austin without certainty). There is minor support for Κέρκιον (Kaibel 1894. 2079; Breitenbach 1908. 168), while Edmonds wavered between Κέρκιος and τὸ κέρκιον (‘little tail’; seemingly otherwise unattested before the second century AD), presumably with an obscene sense, although he makes no explicit statement to that effect.

Aside from the possible example here, several claims have been made for the existence of a personal name Κέρκιος, but none are convincing (other names from the same stem do exist; cf. Fick–Bechtel 1894. 161, 316). Pape–Benseler 1884 s. v. assert its existence in *CIG* 5126 (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1.1 [LSJ s. v. καθύπερθε print *Syll.* 1.3 in error]), a sixth-century inscription from Abu Simbel, and Edmonds repeats their claim; the word in question, however, is the genitive of the place–name Κέρκις (Pape–Benseler do include it as such in addition to the false entry). Κέρκιος is also included in *LGPN* II as a name from Athens ca. 500–475 BC. This occurrence, however, is a graffito (the text reads ΚΕΡΚΙΩ[ . ]) directly above the phallic spout of an *aidoion* vase from the Pnyx (Davidson and Thompson 1943. 159 #114), and its status as a personal name is dubious. The only real evidence for the use of Κέρκιος as a name are several late references (Solin. 15.17; Amm. Marc. 22.8.24) to the Spartans Amphitus and Cercius, the charioteers of the Dioscuri, as the founders of the city Dioscurias (for the Dioscuri themselves as the founders, cf. den Boeft *et al.* 1995 on Amm. Marc. 22.8.24). Even in this instance, the name is not certain, since this person is not uniformly called Cercius; cf. Str. 11.2.12 (C 496) (Πέκας mss. : Κρέκας Valesius); Plin. *NH* 6.16 (*Telcio* vel *Thelcio* vel *Thelgio*); Iust. 42.3 (*Erygium* Seel : *frigium* vel *frudium* vel *fraudium* vel *ericam* mss.).

Although mythological plays were popular and a favorite of Anaxandrides in particular (see Introduction), the Dioscuri seem to have been used rarely if at all as a topic. Furthermore, two late references to an otherwise obscure mythological figure lends little support to this position. If Κέρκιος is retained, therefore, it must be a descriptive term rather than a real name, and be understood as referring to a *homo impudicus*, although overt obscenity is difficult to parallel in a title, especially at this period. For the connotation of the word, cf. especially Ar. *Th.* 239; Eup. fr. 471; van Leeuwen 1901 on Ar. *Ach.* 785;

Headlam–Knox 1922 on Herod. 5.45; Radt 1999 on S. fr. 1078; Henderson 1991 §92. The alternative is to follow Kaibel in understanding the title as Κέρκιον, probably the name of a prostitute, although the name is difficult to parallel and a slang term for male genitalia seems inappropriate for a prostitute. Breitenbach 1908. 168 inappositely compared the prostitute Κερκούριον found at *AP* 5.44 (= Rufin. 17), but, as Page 1978 *ad loc.* rightly notes, the name Κερκούριον, like that of her companion Λέμβιον, is derived from the name of a ship. Nevertheless, plays named for prostitutes are known; e.g. Menander and Hipparchus both wrote a Θαΐς, and Cephisodorus and Epicrates an Ἀντιλαΐς. Unlike these examples, however, Κέρκιον is not a famous prostitute but otherwise unknown. Since Κέρκιος and Κέρκιον, whether either is a proper name or not, both present major difficulties, therefore, emendation to Κερκύων deserves serious consideration. For Cercyon in comedy, cf. above on the introduction to *Thēseus*.

**Date** Unknown.

fr. 23 K.-A. (22 K.)

ἐρυθρότερον καρίδος ὀπτῆς σ' ἀποφανῶ

habent ACE, Eust.

ἐρυθρότερον CE, Eust.: -ώτερον A ὀπτῆς C, Eust.: -ῶν (superscr. ῆς) E: -ῶν A

I will make you redder than a broiled shrimp

Ath. 3.106a

(post fr. 38) ἐν δὲ Κερκίῳ —

Κερκυῶνι Sansone (Κερκύονι iam Reinesius)

And in *Kerkios*: —

Eust. *II*. 1220.54

εἴρηται γοῦν ἐκτεταμένως τὸ [Arar. fr. 8.3–4] καὶ [Ophel. fr. 1] καὶ —

[Sc. the *iota*] is long: [Arar. fr. 8.3–4] and [Ophel. fr. 1] and —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

υ—υυ— υ—υ|— —υυ—

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.143; Edmonds 1959 II.54–5; Nesselrath 1990. 284; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.249; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 250

**Citation Context** A brief account of crayfish (3.104d–f) in Athenaeus segues into a longer discussion of shrimp (3.104f–6e). The central part of this discussion (3.105e–6c) illustrates and purports to explain the differing length of the *iota* in the word *καρίς* ('shrimp'). Examples offered for long *iota* (but see on fr. 38) are Arar. fr. 8.2–4; Eub. fr. 78; Anaxandr. fr. 28; 38; this fragment; Eub. fr. 110; Ophel. fr. 2; 1, for short *iota* Eup. fr. 2; 120. Eustathius offers an abbreviated version of the same discussion, quoting only three fragments (Arar. fr. 8.3–4; Ophel. fr. 1; this fragment), none with attribution.

**Text** The spelling ἐρυθρότερον (CE) is metrically necessary, as at Dromo fr. 1.4, whereas the expected form ἐρυθρώτερον (A) is found as a variant at, e.g., Pl. *Ti.* 83b, and parallel forms are metrically guaranteed at, e.g., E. *Hec.* 581; cf. Choerob. in *Theod.* 2.76.33–6 (≈ Cramer, *Anec.* 4.414.14–6). LSJ claim that the variation in this and parallel forms (e.g. ἐλαφρότερος/ἐλαφρώτερος) is largely a distinction of date, but the prominence of such variation in Euripides suggests that metrical convenience is at work; cf. Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 I.558; Mastronarde 1994 on E. *Ph.* 1345.

**Interpretation** There appear to be two possible interpretations for this line. Turning red is a sign of embarrassment (Dromo fr. 1 [failing to contribute to a dinner]) or humility (Antiph. fr. 261; Men. fr. 750; 751 [cf. Ter. *Adelph.* 84–5]); similarly, the failure to blush indicates brazenness (Ar. *Nu.* 1216; Apollod. Com. fr. 13.10). That blushing is ordinarily represented as originating from within rather than as caused by a second party is hardly an insurmountable objection. More plausibly, Kock (followed by Nesselrath 1990. 284) suggested that a slave is being threatened; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 112 ἵνα μή σε βάψω βάμμα Σαρδιανικόν with ΣΡΓ ἵνα μή σε ἐρυθρόν ποιήσω τῷ βάμματι μαστίξας, οἶονεῖ ἵνα μή σε φοινίξω, 320; Plaut. *Ep.* 626; *Pseud.* 229; *Rud.* 1000.

Comparing Eup. fr. 120 (see on *καρίδος*), Thompson 1947. 104 claims the phrase 'redder than a broiled shrimp' as a proverb, although there is little evidence to support the assertion.

**καρίδος** The shrimp or prawn; see Thompson 1947. 103–4; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 26.2 (*SH* 156); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 115.13; Dohm 1964. 106. For the red colour of cooked *καρίδες*, cf. Cratin. fr. \*314 = Eup. fr. 120 ἔχων τὸ πρόσωπον καρίδος μασθλητίνης. The *ι* is long, as is usual after the fifth century (e.g. Arar. fr. 8.3; Eub. fr. 78; contrast e.g. Ar. *V.* 1522; Cratin. fr. 314; Eup. fr. 120); for further examples of both quantities, see LSJ s. v. and Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 115.13.

**ὀπτῆς** ‘Broiled’ or ‘roasted’, i. e. cooked with dry heat, as opposed to boiling (ἔψω; for the distinction, see Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 11.8 [*SH* 140] and p. 42), apparently the normal method of cooking shrimp.

**ἄποφανῶ** The word here must mean ‘render’ or ‘make’, as at Ar. *Eq.* 817; Aristopho fr. 8.2 (cf. LSJ s. v. IV.1).



**Κιθαρίστρια** (*Kitharistria*)  
(‘The female kithara-player’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.143; Edmonds 1959 II.54–5; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.249; Wilson 2002. 62; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 250

**Title** Anaxandrides is the only comic poet known to have written a Κιθαρίστρια, although Antiphanes and Menander both wrote a Κιθαριστής and numerous poets a Κιθαρωδός (e.g. Clearchus; see K.-A. *ad loc.* for a complete list); cf. Αὐλητρίς (Antiphanes; Menander; Diodorus); Αὐλητρίδες (Phoenicides); Ὀρχηστρίς (Alexis; see Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*); Ποιήτρια (Alexis; but see Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* for the suggestion that this refers to a contriver rather than a poetess). Wilson 2002. 62 sees these titles as indicating a contemporary ‘thematic fascination with music and its practitioners.’

The κιθαριστής, and thus presumably the κιθαρίστρια as well, differs from the κιθαρωδός in that the former is a musician only, while the latter sings to his own accompaniment; cf. Ammon. 271 (citing Aristox. fr. 102 as his authority); Σ Aeschin. 1.89a, b (on 41). *Kitharistria*i are generally assumed to have been hired for performances at symposia, where they may also have performed sexual favours; see Power 2010. 59–60 with n. 136 for speculation on whether they actually performed music and, if so, on what instrument. Goldhill 2005. 276 characterizes the *kitharistria* as ‘a cheap, hired entertainer on the edge of, if not actively engaged in, what we would call prostitution’; cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 80–84; Wilson 1999. 83–5 (on *aulētrides*). For the prostitutes (however designated) commonly present at symposia, see Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.121 (*SH* 534); 6.2 (*SH* 539); Gomme–Sandbach 1973 and Furley 2009 on Men. *Epitr.* fr. 1.2; J. Davidson 1997. 81–2, 92–7. The employment of *kitharistria*i, at a rate of not more than two drachmas (not a small sum), fell under the jurisdiction of the *astynomoi* ([Arist.] *AP* 50.2). Stephanis 1988 offers five known examples of female cithara-players, three of them in religious contexts, although the anonymous Rhodian of Din. 1.23 may simply be attending the Eleusinia rather than playing a formal role there. For female *kitharodoi* (eight examples in Stephanis 1988), see Goldhill 2005 (arguing that nearly all are slaves or *hetairai*); Power 2010. 57–71.

A cithara had two arms projecting from a sound-box and joined at the top by a crossbar; strings of equal length ran from the crossbar down over a bridge on the sound-box and were fastened at the base. The normal number of strings may have been seven, but greater numbers are occasionally attested (e.g. Ar. fr. 467; Pherecr. fr. 155.25). The normal function of the cithara was to

accompany song, but there were also specialized versions for solo music. See in general West 1992. 49–56, 62–4 (pl. 11–17 for illustrations); Maas and Snyder 1989. 53–78, 165–78; Vendries 1999. 55–67; Snyder 1979. 75–95.

**Content of the comedy** The sole fragment may indicate a musical performance by a character (or a reference to a performance), but that is already implied by the title. Wilson 2002. 62 noted a fourth-century efflorescence of similar titles as a sign of contemporary interest in musicians, but little substantial can be said about the plots of any of them. Moreover, the feminine forms should probably be set apart, since the difference between *kitharistēs* and *kitharistria*, for example, is not merely one of gender but of status and connotation. Some plays with feminine titles may have concerned a free-born girl wrongfully sold into slavery and prostitution, but other possibilities (e.g. the woman was the centre of a dispute) can not be excluded.

**Date** Unknown.

#### fr. 24 K.-A. (23 K.)

Poll. 10.172

βύσμα ... τοῦτο δὲ βύστρα νῦν ἕτεροι κεκλήκασιν, ὡς Ἀναξανδρίδης Κιθαριστρία καὶ Ἀντιφάνης Ὀρφεῖ (fr. 178)

‘Busma’ (‘plug’) ... others call this ‘bustra’, as Anaxandrides in *Kitharistria* and Antiphanes in *Orpheus* (fr. 178)

**Metre** Unknown.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884. II.143; Latte 1953 on Hsch. β 1348; Edmonds 1959 II.54–5; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.249; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 250

**Citation Context** Pollux offers examples in which the name for an object has multiple forms, usually the normal form and its diminutive (e.g. θύλαξ/θυλάκιον). The citation of *busma/bustra* is preceded by a discussion of various words for ‘sack’ or ‘pouch’; discussion of parts of roofs and pegs follows. Pollux cites this fragment and Antiph. fr. 178 for the form *bustra* as opposed to *busma*, for which he cited Ar. fr. 310.2.

**Interpretation** The only two occurrences of βύστρα are in plays concerning musicians; conceivably the word had some technical meaning pertaining to music (e.g. part of an instrument), but more plausibly it indicates a hostile reaction to the music and refers to plugs for the ears. For the stopping up of

ears, cf. Luc. *Lex.* 1 (with wax); S. fr. 858.2 (through old age) with Pearson 1917 *ad loc.*

Neither βύσμα nor βύστρα is common. In comedy, the former appears only at Ar. fr. 24; 310.2; Sophil. fr. 3 (= Diph. fr. 23K), while the latter occurs only here and in Antiph. fr. 178. Elsewhere, there are several references to both forms in the lexicographers, and βύσμα appears three times in the medical writers. At Ar. fr. 310 βύσμα is apparently simply a plug or stopper for an amphora and at fr. 24 for an anus, while at Sophil. fr. 3 it is used metaphorically but still seemingly as a stopper. At Antiph. fr. 178 a βύστρα is made of leaves; cf. Hp. *Mul.* 2.114 (VIII.246 Littré) φλόμου ('sage') βύσματα; Hsch. β 1348 (βύστραι are 'insertions of herbs. But some (say they are) bits of herbs'). Latte 1953 *ad loc.* labels the Hesychius entry a gloss on this fragment and Antiph. fr. 178; in the case of the Antiphanes fragment this is plausible, but for Anaxandrides much less so.

**Κυνηγέται** (*Kynēgetai*)  
(‘Hunters’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.144; Capps 1910. 6; Edmonds 1959 II.54–55; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.249; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 250

**Title** No other play bears this title; cf. Sophocles Ἰχνευταί (‘Trackers’) and Menander Ἀλιεῖς (‘Fishermen’; see K–A *ad loc.* for plural versus singular). The plural presumably indicates an eponymous chorus of hunters (Capps 1910. 6 suggested a similar chorus for Men. *Her.*; for doubts, see Hunter 1979. 24 n. 5); see Introduction and on Ἀγροικοί. The word itself appears elsewhere in comedy only at Pl. Com. fr. 188.16; Men. *Dysc.* 42; *Her.* fr. 1.2.

Hunters with dogs (or hunters generally) as a group have no stereotypical characteristics in Greek literature or mythology, although well-known stories involving hunting (e. g. the myth of Actaeon; Caledonian boar hunt; etc.) abound. According to Apollod. *FGrHist* 244 F 138, Asclepius was found by hunters while being nursed by a dog. Presumably alluding to this story, hunters (κυνηγέται) are included in a list of sacrifice recipients at *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4962.9–10 (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1040 = *LSCG* 21 A), an early fourth-century inscription from Piraeus that sets out the regulations of an apparently newly founded Asclepius cult there. These are the hunters referred to at Pl. Com. fr. 188.16, whether or not the sense is obscene (cf. Pirrotta 2009 *ad loc.*). For the evidence for Asclepius cult at Piraeus and the association of hunters with it, see Pirrotta (above); Parker 1996. 181–3.

For hunting with dogs, see Hull 1964 (includes translations of X. *Cyn.* and Arr. *Cyn.*); Sachs 2012. 62–79; for hunting in general, see Anderson 1985. For explorations of the social context of hunting, including its aristocratic connotations and use in erotic discourse, see Barringer 2001; Schnapp 1997; Trinquier and Vendries 2009; Seyer 2007.

**Content of the comedy** Hunters indicate a setting in the countryside. The elite connotations of the sport together with the content of the sole fragment suggest a group (chorus and hero?) of wealthy young men, perhaps from the city (cf. Men. *Dysc.* 39–42; *Her.* fr. 1). The plot may have revolved around interaction and/or conflict between townsmen and countrymen. Alternatively, fr. 25 may indicate precisely what the addressee is not, suggesting that the plot concerns a son living beyond his means, like Pheidippides at the beginning of Aristophanes’ *Clouds*.

If the hunters are those associated with Asclepius, the play may have dealt with the birth of the god and was in essence an Ἀσκληπιοῦ γοναί (cf. above

on Διονύσου γονά). In this case, Κυνηγέται is perhaps originally an alternate title. For Asclepius in comedy, cf. the Asclepius of Antiphanes and Philetaerus; Aristophanes' *Plutus*.

Least likely is Edmonds' suggestion that the title refers to the Cynics Antisthenes and Diogenes. Philosophers certainly were mocked in comedy (notably in Aristophanes' *Clouds*; cf. fr. 20 with n. above), but it is not certain when the term 'Cynic' was introduced, nor is it an easy inference from hunters with dogs. κυνικός referring to a Cynic is attested first at Men. fr. 114.2, and Diogenes is called ὁ Κύων at Arist. *Rh.* 1411a24. D.L. 6.60 represents Diogenes as referring to himself as ὁ Κύων, but the accuracy of the claim is difficult to ascertain.

Date Unknown.

fr. 25 K.-A. (24 K.)

υἱὸς γὰρ οἰκόσιτος ἡδὺ γίγνεται

habet A

γίγνεται Porson: γίν- A

For a son who provides for himself is a pleasant thing

Ath. 6.247e-f

μνημονεύει δὲ τοῦ μὲν οἰκοσίου Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Κυνηγέταις. —

And Anaxandrides in *Kynēgetai* mentions ‘one who provides for himself’: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

---v--- v-v|--- ---v---

**Discussion** Grotius 1626. 640–1; Porson 1812. 85; Meineke 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.144; Edmonds 1959 II.54–5; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.249; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 250

**Citation Context** In a discussion of parasites, Athenaeus adduces a number of other words compounded from -σιτος, for some of which he provides a quotation. The quotation from Anaxandrides is followed by a further definition of οἰκόσιτος: 'one who serves his city not for a wage but as a gift.' This definition is expanded by one directly relevant example, Antiph. fr. 198, as well as two others, Men. *Cith.* fr. 6 and fr. 98.

**Interpretation** The line is most naturally spoken by or to a father in reference to a son who is also a character in the play. The comment could describe the son's behaviour or, just as easily, could reflect behaviour he should display but does not.

**οικόσιτος** The most likely meaning here is 'self-sufficient' (cf. Wilkins 2000. 81 n. 125). The word does not occur before the fourth century, when it appears in the four fragments cited by Athenaeus; Anaxil. fr. 38; Men. fr. 340; Thphr. *Char.* 22.4, and two inscriptions from Eleusis. Thereafter, it is attested in a number of late prose authors and several lexicographers. The supposed literal sense 'eating at home' is found seldom if ever (*pace* LSJ [a confused entry]); perhaps better is 'fed from home'. The most common sense is 'eating at private, i.e. not public, expense': e.g. Antiph. fr. 98 ἐκκλησιαστής οἰκόσιτος. Similarly, the οἰκόσιτοι of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.29, etc. (= *IEleusis* 177) are slaves hired by the state from their master, who nevertheless undertakes to provide their food; cf. Clinton *ad loc.* (*IEleusis* II.150); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1673A (= *IEleusis* 150); Thphr. *Char.* 22.4. The same usage is applied to soldiers whose provisions are provided by their general (e.g. Plu. *Crass.* 19.2). An extension of this sense is the use at Men. fr. 340 to describe a wedding where the guests, not the host, provide the food. The word acquired an extended meaning of 'self-sufficient, not burdensome'; cf. Men. fr. 98; *Cith.* fr. 6 (metaphorical). The apparent exception is Luc. *Somn.* 1, where it appears to mean 'burdensome' (of a grown son dependent on his father); presumably Lucian is using the word as it was applied to slaves and soldiers, i.e. dependents who must be fed.

**γίγνεται** For γίγν- vs. γίν-, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 37.7; cf. fr. 53.7.

**Κωμωδοτραγωδία (*Kōmōidotragōidia*)**  
(‘Comoedotragoedia’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.247–8, 371; 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.144; Kaibel 1899a. 149 (on Dinol. fr. 3); Latte 1915. 376–7 (= 1968. 614); Wackernagel 1916. 96; Edmonds 1959 II.54–5; Webster 1970. 88–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.249 (cf. 9); Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 251

**Title** Alcaeus wrote a comedy of the same name; one has been attributed to Dinolochus as well, but Kaibel was rightly sceptical (cf. Latte 1915. 376–7 [= 1968. 614]; Wackernagel 1916. 96), and the attribution should be rejected.<sup>49</sup>

Aside from the comic titles, the word occurs in two passages in Porphyry (one of them quoted by Stobaeus) to refer to the ‘comicotragedy’ of the life of the unenlightened; cf. Plato’s description at *Phlb.* 50b of pain and pleasure mixed not only in tragedies and comedies on stage, but also in τῇ τοῦ βίου ξυμπάσῃ τραγωδίᾳ καὶ κωμωδίᾳ (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1–16 for the pleasures and pains of life described in terms of reactions to dramatic performances).

In the prologue to *Amphitryo*, Plautus discusses the nature of that play (50–63), finally determining that it is best described as a *tragicocomoedia* (59, 63), since it contains the actions of gods and kings as well as of slaves. The point is that the play adapts tragic material as the basis of comedy; cf. Stewart 1958, esp. 367–8 for the rejection of any relation between Plautus’ use of the word and the titles. For discussion of Plautus’ term, see Lefèvre 1982. 23–4; Webster 1970. 88–9; Schwering 1916/1917. A similar formation is ἰλαροτραγωδία, found in the biographical notice of Rhinton at *Suda* ρ 171 (= Rhint. test. 1): Rhinton is ‘the founder of ἰλαροτραγωδία, which is burlesque (φλυακογραφία).’ The same source credits Rhinton with 38 plays that are κωμικὰ τραγικά (κωμικοτραγικά Kaibel). For ἰλαροτραγωδία and the argument that it corresponds to Plautus’ use of *tragicocomoedia*, see Stewart 1958. 365–7.

**Content of the comedy** The abstract title suggests a meta-theatrical plot concerned with the production of comedy, perhaps comparing it to the pro-

<sup>49</sup> Dinolochus fr. 3 is from Antiatt. p. 112.29 and reads πέπαινται τὸ πλεθυντικόν. ὁ αὐτὸς Κωμωδοτραγωδία. The attribution to Dinolochus relies on the fact that the previous lemma quotes Dinolochus (fr. 7), but the Antiatticist does not refer to previous entries in this way. The fragment probably belongs instead to Anaxandrides or Alcaeus, the only known authors of a play with this title (which almost certainly indicates a comedy), but in the absence of evidence either way, it would be best placed among the *adespota*. The confidence of Latte 1915. 377 (= 1968. 614) in assigning the fragment to Anaxandrides is unwarranted.

duction of tragedy or presenting it somehow as a tragedy. Alternatively, the title could refer to a figure in the play, whether a speaking character (e.g. Comoedia in Cratinus' *Pytine*; see below) or a silent character (e.g. Peace in Aristophanes' *Peace*). In that case, Comoedotragoedia might be presented as a figure providing inspiration for both genres or perhaps judging between them in some sort of contest.

The sole fragment is uninformative regarding the plot, but Alc. Com. fr. 19–20 (both from his *Komōidotragōidia*) suggest that a festival and music were involved there; so too, of the two fragments of Aristophanes' *Poiēsis*, fr. 466 may imply a festival and fr. 467 refers to music. More helpful is Antiph. fr. 189, the only fragment from his *Poiēsis*, which preserves a defence of comedy compared to tragedy (Edmonds suggested that Comoedia is speaking); cf. Cratinus' *Pytinē* and the use there of Comoedia as a character (cf. Rosen 2000. 23–39 [21 for a possible illustration of the character]; Bakola 2010. 275–85. For the personification of 'poetry' and the like as female characters, see Hall 2000.

Plautus' designation of *Amphitryo* as a *tragicocomoedia* suggested to Webster 1970. 88–9 that the *Komōidotragōidiai* of Anaxandrides and Alcaeus ought to be mythological burlesque or paratragedy (Bowie 2000. 324 speaks of Alcaeus' play in the context of paratragedy, but without taking a clear stand). In a manner analogous to Plautus' play, in which stereotypically tragic characters acted out a comedy of manners, Anaxandrides and Alcaeus might have written plays in which stereotypically comic characters acted out a tragic plot. In such a case, however, the abstract title is problematic, since the expected title would be that of the tragic plot being parodied.

**Date** Unknown.

#### fr. 26 K.-A. (25 K.)

Antiatt. p. 87.23

γ ε λ α σ ί μ η ν · τήν πολλὰ γελῶσαν. Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Κωμωδοτραγωδία

γελασίμην Olson: γελασίνην Bekker: γελασιήδην cod.

Full of laughter (fem.): a woman who laughs a lot. Anaxandrides in *Comoedotragoedia*

**Metre** Uncertain (word is ∪∪∪—).

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.171; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.144; Edmonds 1959 II.54–5; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.250; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 251



**Citation Context** The Antiatticist probably cited this example against a general condemnation of the word; cf. the condemnation of γελάσιμον (in favour of γελοῖος) at Phryn. *Ecl.* 403 (= Stratt. fr. 83); 199. That the dispute concerned the use of the word in metonymy is less likely, since such poetic usages seem not normally to have entered into Atticist disputes. These disputes concerned primarily the correctness of particular forms and occasionally the grammatical use of a certain word or form; for an example of the latter, see fr. 63. The use of the feminine is unlikely to have been the point at issue, unless secondarily, although the entry in the Antiatticist may be a remnant of a larger discussion that included multiple examples, including the masculine at Stratt. fr. 83.

**Text** The transmitted text is clearly corrupt, and Bekker's γελασίην has been universally accepted; in that case, the issue must be the use of the word in metonymy. Better is Olson's γελασίμην, which situates the debate within the normal Atticist parameters of the correctness of a form and finds an exact parallel in Phrynichus' condemnation of γελάσιμον (*Ecl.* 199; 403).

**Interpretation** γελασίμη occurs nowhere else, but the masculine is found at Stratt. fr. 83 (cf. Orth 2009 *ad loc.*) and as the name of a parasite in Plautus' *Stichus*, while the neuter plural is attested at Luc. *Somn.* 5. Fraenkel 1922. 36 n. 2 (= 2007. 297 n. 24) characterized the parasite's name as a 'komische Augensblicksbildung.' This example and that in Anaxandrides may be dependent on the earlier occurrence in Strattis, but are just as likely to have been independent comic inventions. For the form, see Chantraine 1933. 204, who notes the tendency for such forms to be used as 'sobriquets'; Kuhner-Blass 1890–1892 II.288 §332.5; Wirth 1880. 53–6; Lobeck 1820. 226–8.

If Bekker's γελασίην is accepted, the word is a comic feminine form of the normal word for 'dimple' used in metonymy; for comic feminine forms of masculine nouns, cf. Ar. *Nu.* 666 ἀλεκτρύαινα, 678 καρδόπη. LSJ (accepting Bekker's emendation) misleadingly gloss this occurrence and that at Ael. *VH* 4.20 (the philosopher Democritus is called Γελασίνο; cf. *Suda* γ 108) as a distinct sense 'laughter' rather than as simple metonymy. The word clearly means 'dimple', although the attestations are late, e.g. Mart. 7.25.6 *nec grata est facies cui gelasinus abest*; Jo. Mal. *Chron.* 5 p. 106; Rufin. 11.3 (= *AP* 5.35.3); Alciph. 4.14.5 (the last two of dimples on the buttocks); cf. Choerob. *An.Ox.* 2.188; *EM* p. 793.48–50; *Suda* γ 108. The only anomalous usage is at Poll. 2.91, where the word is referred (probably in error) to the front teeth that are exposed when smiling. In addition to Aelian's report of Γελασίνο; as a nickname for Democritus, *LGPN* report five examples of the proper name, all from the second or third century AD; Solin 1996. 424 adds several more of the same date from Rome.

**Λοκρίδες (*Lokrides*)**  
(‘Locrian Women’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.172; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.144; Edmonds 1959 II.54–5; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.250; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 251

**Title** Posidippus wrote a Λοκρίδες and Alexis and Menander Λοκροί, although none of these are sufficiently well-preserved to give any indication of the plot. adesp. trag. *TGrFF* 5f is a putative tragedy of this name, based on the story of the Locrian maidens (see below) combined with evidence from vase-painting (see *ad loc.* for references). For a title formed from an ethnic, see above on Θετταλοί. For the character Locris in Plautus *Persa*, see Fontaine 2010. 624.

Locris was divided into two distinct territories: the coastal plains along the Euboean strait north of Lake Copais (Epicnemidian Locris to the north and Opuntian Locris to the south) and the region along the northern edge of the Corinthian Gulf between Aetolia to the west and Phocis to the east (Ozolian Locris). The Locrians allied themselves with Boeotia during the period of Theban hegemony (371–362 BC), and in the middle of the century were heavily involved in the Third Sacred War (357–346 BC), during which they suffered two serious defeats at the hands of the Phocians; an alliance with Athens followed. The basic account of the region remains Oldfather 1926. For eastern Locris, see Nielsen in Hansen and Nielsen 2004. 664–73; Fossey 1990. For western Locris, see Rousset in Hansen and Nielsen 2004. 391–8; Pharaklas 2004.

In terms of mythology, Locris is the home of Oilean Ajax (the ‘lesser’ Ajax), known for his rape of Cassandra; see Gantz 1993. 651–5. The Locrians, faced with a plague, received an oracle instructing them to send maidens every year to the shrine of Athena in Ilium in expiation for the rape (e.g. Aen. Tact. 31.24; Timae. *FGrHist* 566 F 146; Apollod. *epit.* 6.20–2 [see Frazer 1921 *ad loc.* for further references]). The practice apparently ceased in 346 at the end of the Third Sacred War (thus Apollod.; Timae. *FGrHist* 566 F 146b), but was revived (if it ever ceased) by the early third century (cf. *IG IX*<sup>2</sup>.1 706 [= *StV* 472]). For more on the Locrian maidens, together with the allegation that the Locrians were a matrilinear society, see Plb. 12.5.6–9 with Walbank 1957–1979 *ad loc.*

**Content of the comedy** An obvious possibility is that the plot concerned the Locrian maidens, but the choice of topic might be more pointed if the play dates to *ca.* 346 BC, the end of the Third Sacred War, when the custom of sending girls to Ilium ceased. The action may have involved a conflation of myth and present day reality, perhaps drawing parallels between the Trojan

War and the Third Sacred War. For other apparent conflation of myth and the contemporary situation, see on *Thēseus*; *Odysseus*; *Protesilaos*; Introduction. The sole fragment consists of two commonplace financial terms.

**Date** If the play can be connected with the end of the Third Sacred War, it must date to *ca.* 346 BC or shortly thereafter. In that case, it would belong near the end of Anaxandrides' career (the latest securely dated play being from 350/49 BC; see on *Agroikoi*).

fr. 27 K.-A. (26 K.)

Antiatt. p. 106.25

λῆμμα καὶ ἀνάλωμα· Ἀναξανδρίδης Λοκρίσιν

ἀνάλωμα Bekker: ἀνήλωμα cod.: fort. <τὸ> λῆμμα κἀνάλωμα

Receipt and expenditure. Anaxandrides in *Lokrides*

**Metre** Iambic trimeter?

e.g. <x>—υ— υ—υ|<— x—υ—>

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.172; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.144; Edmonds 1959 II.54–55; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.250; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 251

**Citation Context** Why the Antiatticist cites these two words (or phrase?; see below) is obscure, since both are unexceptional. Possibly a figurative use had been censured, but more likely the criticism concerned the use of technical accounting terms rather than more general words for 'income' and 'expenses' (e.g. δαπάνη and πρόσδοξ; cf. Phot. δ 52 for a distinction between δαπανᾶν and ἀναλίσκειν). Crönert's suggestion (see below) that the entry reflects a dispute between ἀνήλωμα and ἀνάλωμα is anachronistic.

**Interpretation** Kassel–Austin (like earlier editors, Kock excepted) take only λῆμμα and ἀνάλωμα as the words of Anaxandrides; but λῆμμα κἀνάλωμα is metrical and seems (without crasis) to be a set phrase (Lys. 32.20; Pl. *Lg.* 920c [twice]; *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 477.2–3 [= II<sup>2</sup> 1655; 407–405 BC]; II<sup>2</sup> 1174.5–6 [λῆμμα restored; 367/6 BC]). The words 'receipt' and 'expenditure' belong to the world of finance and are the general headings in an account book or the like; both are well attested in Attic financial inscriptions of the classical period and later (e.g. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.173–4, etc. [= *IEleusis* 177; 329/8 BC]). A clear example, though not from Athens, is an account of a Boeotian hipparch (*IG* VII 2426 [= Bogaert

1976. 23; 180–150 BC]), which lists under the appropriate headings amounts of money received and spent. If the words were used figuratively, it is possible that they were applied to the ‘taking’ of Cassandra and the ‘expending’ of the Locrian maidens.

Crönert 1903. 286 n. 4 contended from the occurrence of ἀνήλωμα in papyri that Bekker was mistaken to emend to ἀνάλωμα and that the reason for the Antiatticist’s entry is that the form ἀνάλωμα was disputed when ἀνήλωμα became dominant. He did acknowledge the discrepancy, however, between the dates of Anaxandrides and the apparent introduction of ἀνήλωμα (second century BC). Inscriptions show conclusively that ἀνάλωμα was the only form used in Attica until at least the second century; see Threatte 1996 II.499–501. Moreover, Threatte 1984. 273 plausibly ascribed three of the four examples (two of the noun, two of the wrongly augmented verb) that do occur in the second century to orthographic errors by a single cutter. For the distinction between λῆμα and λῆμμα, see Moer. λ 8 with Hansen 1998 *ad loc.* (cf. Pierson 1830–1831. 246); Ammon. 299 with Nickau 1966 *ad loc.*

**Λυκοῦργος (*Lykourgos*)**  
(‘Lycurgus’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840. III.172; 1847. 579; Bothe 1855. 422; Kock 1884 II.144; Edmonds 1959 II.56–7; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.250; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 251

**Title** There are no other comedies of this name, but Aeschylus wrote a satyr play *Lycurgus* (cf. Ar. *Th.* 134–5 with Austin–Olson 2004 *ad loc.*), as did Timocles (exhibited at the Dionysia in 341/0 BC [*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2320.16–17 (= 19–20 M–O)]). Polyphrasmon wrote a Lycurgan tetralogy, and Naevius a tragedy *Lycurgus*.

The story of Lycurgus, Thracian king of the Edonians, is recounted already in Homer (*Il.* 6.130–40), where he drives Dionysus into the sea at Nysa and is blinded by the gods as punishment. This basic outline was embellished and eventually included other punishments as well: e.g. S. *Ant.* 955–65; D.S. 3.65.4–7; Apollod. 3.5.1; Hyg. *Fab.* 132. See in general Farnoux in *LIMC* V.1.309–19; Gantz 1993. 113–14; Nilsson I 1967–1974 I.580–1; Rapp in *ALGRM* 2.2191–2204; see on Διονύσου γοναί for other plays involving Dionysus.

Kock stated the obvious in noting that the play concerned ‘Thraciae regem, non Lacedaemonium neque Atheniensem’; cf. Breitenbach 1908. 97–8, who added that Lycurgus the orator seems not to have been mocked in comedy (although his homonymous grandfather, a *hellenotamias*, had been; cf. Ar. *Av.* 1296 with Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.*). Edmonds’ assertion that the play conflated the orator with the Thracian king necessitates a date of 338–326 BC, well beyond Anaxandrides’ attested career; the idea can thus be safely rejected.

**Content of the comedy** The sole fragment apparently refers to Dionysus after he has been driven into the sea by Lycurgus; since this and the subsequent punishment are the central elements in Lycurgus’ story, the play as a whole might have closely followed the myth, presumably as travesty. The plot need not, however, have followed the myth literally; e.g. fr. 28 could describe a fishmarket as easily as the sea. Dionysus might have been presented as an underling, perhaps a slave, and may have suffered a series of abuses, as in Aristophanes’ *Frogs*; perhaps the play concluded with a recognition of Dionysus’ divinity and him not being driven into the sea but feted at a feast of seafood. Alternatively, Lycurgus’ treatment of Dionysus might have served as the pretext for a play revolving around the former’s various punishments.

**Date** Unknown.

## fr. 28 K.-A. (27 K.)

καὶ συμπαίζει κορακινιδίοις  
 μετὰ περκιδίων καὶ θραττιδίων,  
 καὶ ψητταρίοις μετὰ καριδίων  
 καὶ σκινδαρίοις μετὰ κωβιδίων

(1) [1–4] 3.105f habet A (2) [1–2] 7.329e habent ACE  
 1 συμπαίζει A (1) : συμπλιάζειν A (2): om. CE (2) κορακινιδίοις ACE (2):  
 καριδαρίοις A (1) 3 ψητταρίοις Lobeck: ψιτταδίοις A (1) καριδίων Olson:  
 κωβιδαρίων A (1): κωθαρίων Schweighäuser 4 κωβιδίων A (1): καριδίων Bothe:  
 καρκινίων Meineke

And he enjoys himself with raven-fish  
 together with little perches and *thrattai*,  
 and with flatfish together with little shrimp,  
 and with *skindarioi* together with little gobies

[1–4] Ath. 3.105f  
 Ἀναξανδρίδης Λυκούργῳ. —  
 Anaxandrides in *Lykourgos*: —

[1–2] Ath. 7.329e  
 ὅτι δὲ θραττον ἔλεγον τὸ θαλάττιον ἰσχύδιον καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης παρίστησιν ἐν  
 Λυκούργῳ λέγων οὕτως. —  
 Anaxandrides also shows that they called the little sea fish a *thratta* when in *Lycurgus*  
 he speaks as follows: —

**Metre** Anapaestic dimeter.

— — — — | — — — —  
 — — — — | — — — —  
 — — — — | — — — —  
 — — — — | — — — —

**Discussion** Lobeck 1820. 74; Meineke 1840 III.172–3; Lobeck 1843. 354;  
 Meineke 1847. 579–80; Lobeck 1853. 281; Bothe 1855. 422–3; Meineke 1857  
 V.clxxvii, 80; 1867. 47–8; Kock 1884 II.144–5; Blaydes 1896. 122; Herwerden  
 1903. 97; Edmonds 1959 II.56–7; Nesselrath 1990. 267 n. 71, 271–2; Kassel–  
 Austin 1991 II.250–1; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 251–2

**Citation Context** Athenaeus quotes the fragment twice: at 3.105f all four lines are included in a discussion of shrimp (3.105d–6e; see on fr. 23), while at 7.329e only the first two lines appear in a discussion of *thraittai* (7.329b–e). The text of the first line differs significantly between the two citations.

**Text** The context of Ath. 3.105f makes it clear that a word for shrimp must appear somewhere in the fragment, as it does in 1; at Ath. 7.329e, however, the line has κορακινιδίους ('little raven-fish') instead of καριδάριους. 3 begins with a corrupt word, but that has no larger ramifications and is discussed below. More seriously, the endings of 3 and 4 seem to be variants of one another, implying that the true reading has been ousted in one line or the other: κωβιδάρων (3; unmetrical) and κωβιδίων (4). Most solutions retain καριδάριους in 1 and emend the final word in 3 or 4; this leaves unexplained the corruption at 7.329e (unless influenced by Pherecr. fr. 62, quoted at 7.309a, or Archipp. fr. 27, quoted at 7.329b) and, a lesser matter, the length of the quotation at 3.105f. Perhaps better is retaining κορακινιδίους in 1 and emending either 3 or 4 to a form of the word for shrimp. The obvious word to replace is the unmetrical κωβιδάρων of line 3 (thus Olson), which might have been written as a variant above κωβιδίων in 4 and thus intruded on 3. Alternatively, this pair of variants could have belonged to 3 and ousted the text of 4; this would explain the length of Athenaeus' quotation (from the verb until the key word). The corruption can be reconstructed as follows: κωβιδάρων/κωβιδίων, variants in 3 or 4, ousted καρίδων/καριδίων from 4 or 3. Once the fragment no longer mentioned shrimp (the reason for quoting it), a reference was introduced by emendation in the first available place (perhaps aided by the similar beginnings κορ- and καρ-). A similar conclusion was reached by Bothe, although with different choices as to what to read in 3 and 4. Meineke suggested, but did not print, καὶ συμπαίζει / καριδάριους μετὰ περκιδίων / κορακινιδίους μετὰ θραυτιδίων / κτλ, thus explaining the variants in 1; Kock objected with some force to the asyndeton in light of the connectives in 3–4. None of the suggestions are without difficulties, and much about the text remains uncertain.

In 3, Lobeck's emendation (1820. 74; cf. 1843. 354; 1853. 281) of the transmitted ψιτταδίοις to ψητταρίους is commonly and probably rightly accepted (although not by K–A, who obelize all of 3–4). ψιττ- is almost certainly simply an example of iotacism that ought to be changed to ψηττ-; Phot. p. 655.9 ψίτται-ιχθύων εἶδος is the same. The more difficult problem is the diminutive in -αδίων. The form is far more prevalent in late antiquity than in the Classical or even Hellenistic and Roman periods; further, the examples from the Classical period are formed from third declension nouns in -ας (e.g. ἰσχύαδιον [Ar. *Pl.* 798]; λαμπάδιον [Ar. *Ach.* 1177]; λοπάδιον [Ar. *Pl.* 812]). ψηττάδιον is possible

(e.g. κρεῖζδιον [Ar. *Pl.* 227; fr. 606 (where add *iota* ad/subscript)<sup>49a</sup>]; ἐλᾶδιον [Sotad. Com. fr. 1.7; Arched. fr. 2.11]), but requires a long *alpha*.

The ι in καρίς is generally long after the fifth century (see on fr. 23), but acceptance of Olson's emendation in 4 requires that it be short in the diminutive; the only other occurrence of καρίδιον, Arist. *HA* 547b17, sheds no light on the quantity. Even if placed early in Anaxandrides' career, this would be the latest example of short *iota* in the word. Nevertheless, the quantity of vowels, especially ι, can vary; cf. Dover 1993 on Ar. *Ra.* 674–85; Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 I.307–8 (§75.5). At 3.105e–f, Athenaeus quotes Arar. fr. 8.2–4 specifically for καρίς with a long *iota*; this is followed by Eub. fr. 78; Anaxandr. fr. 28 (this fragment with a crucial variant in 1); 38; 23; Eub. fr. 110; Ophel. fr. 2; 1. He then quotes Eup. fr. 2 for the word with a short *iota*, followed by fr. 120. This might be taken as support for reading καριδαρίους in 1 or for reading καριδών (with long *iota*) here, but there is no complying reason to read Athenaeus' catalogue as a strict twofold division between examples of the word with long *iota* and with short *iota*.

If κωβιδίων is read in 4, the quantity of the first ι in κωβιδίων is short, unlike at Sotad. Com. fr. 1.22 (the only other occurrence); in addition, the formation of the word, from κωβιός and the diminutive suffix -ιδιον, normally requires a long ι. The short *iota* might be possible if the suffix was assumed to be -διον (cf. Petersen 1910. 204 [§280], 207–8 [§§287–8]) or by (false) analogy with καριδίων in the line above (if that is read there).

Schweighäuser's emendation of κωβιδαρίων to κωθαρίων in 3 is widely accepted on the assumption that the two are synonyms; cf. Hsch. κ 4789 κῶθος· κωβιός; Ath. 7.309c. But Nic. fr. 141 and Apollod. ap. Ath. 7.309c claim that κῶθος is the Sicilian word for κωβιός; if this is true (although note κωβιοί at Epich. fr. 59), the emendation is more difficult, since there is no obvious reason why Anaxandrides would use a Sicilian dialectal form here.

**Interpretation** Following Meineke's comparison (1867. 48) with Homer's account of Lycurgus (see above), this fragment has been understood as referring to Dionysus after he has been driven into the sea by Lycurgus, who may be the speaker; Nesselrath 1990. 272 aptly compared Nonn. 20.272–93. While the connection with Dionysus is likely correct, the location could well be a fishmarket or banquet instead of the sea. A banquet is perhaps the best interpretation, given the tendency for runs of anapaestic dimeters to be used in catalogues of food, 'doubtless continuing a tradition of celebratory finales' (Arnott 1996. 20, comparing *inter alia* Ar. *Pax* 974–1015). For the use of ana-

<sup>49a</sup> A point made already by Dobree 1820 on Ar. *Pl.* 227 but widely ignored by subsequent editors; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 27.5.



paestic dimeters in catalogues, especially of food, e. g. fr. 42; Mnesim. fr. 4; Eub. fr. 63; in general, Nesselrath 1990. 267–80, esp. 273–6; Introduction.

A related interpretative issue is whether the diminutives signal endearment or contempt. Meineke commended Dalecamp's suggestion of the latter and adduced Ar. fr. 92, although its relevance is doubtful. Only the larger context could resolve the issue; in the absence of that, the decision rests on whether the fragment is interpreted as exultation at Dionysus' flight or as describing a banquet *vel sim.* Even if the fragment does describe Dionysus in the sea, a tone of gentle mocking might be better understood than scorn; in any case, the diminutives remove the grandeur normally appropriate for a divinity and place Dionysus on a mundane level. Note, however, that with the marginal exception of the flatfish, and possibly the unknown *skindarion*, all the fish mentioned are small to begin with, and even the flatfish, like the others, is generally considered commonplace and inexpensive; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 144.

1 **συμπαίζει** See Dover 1993. 57–9; with reference to deities, Kock 1894 on Ar. Av. 1098.

**κορακινιδίους** The raven-fish, a small, inexpensive and relatively undesirable fish; e. g. fr. 34.10–12; Amphis fr. 22; Alex. fr. 18 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Archestr. fr. 20.3 (*SH* 150) with Olson–Sens 2000 *ad loc.*; Thompson 1947. 122–3; Micha-Lampaki 1984. 90–1. The diminutive is found also at Pherecr. fr. 62 (in the same metrical position as here). The raven-fish is mentioned with the perch at Philyll. fr. 12.3, and with the goby, perch, *thratta*, shrimp, and flatfish at Mnesim. fr. 4.33–42.

2 **περκιδίων** Although the diminutive occurs only here, *πέρκη* itself is common enough (e. g. fr. 42.50; Antiph. fr. 192.2, 4; Alex. fr. 115.13; Henioch. fr. 3.3). Apparently named for its speckled appearance (cf. Arist. fr. 295 Rose [231 Gigon]; Strömberg 1943. 24–5; Frisk 1954–1972 s. v. *περκνός*), the perch, a small fish, has both fresh and saltwater varieties, although here the context demands the saltwater one; see Thompson 1947. 195–7; Micha-Lampaki 1984. 113–14; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.51 (*SH* 534).

**θραττιδίων** As with *περκιδίων*, the diminutive occurs only here, and *thratta* only at Antiph. fr. 209.3; Mnesim. fr. 4.41; Arist. *GA* 785b23; *SEG* XXXII 450.B3 (tariff on fish prices from Hellenistic Boeotia); cf. Archipp. fr. 27. Little is known about the *thratta* other than it is a small seafish, unless it is to be regarded as essentially equivalent to the *thrissa* (a type of herring; cf. Thompson 1947. 77–8), as Thompson 1947. 77 claims; cf. Micha-Lampaki 1984. 85–6. Dorotheos ap. Ath. 7.329d calls it a *θέττα*, which Athenaeus regards as either the product of reliance on a faulty text or Dorotheus' own invention, while Strömberg 1943. 86 explains this as a dialectal variant. The name simply

means ‘Thracian’ (note that Lycurgus [see Introduction above] is from Thrace); cf. Strömberg 1943. 85–6 for this and similar formations.

**3 ψητταρίοις** A flatfish resembling sole or flounder; cf. fr. 42.51; Antiph. fr. 130.7; Alex. fr. 115.13 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 33 (*SH* 163) (where it seems to be a bigger fish than here); Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.27 (*SH* 534); Thompson 1947. 294–5; Micha-Lampaki 1984 74. The *psitta* is apparently one of the smaller flatfish (Hsch. ψ 156; *Suda* ψ 78; cf. Ael. *NA* 14.3; Opp. *H.* 1.102–5) and relatively common. For diminutives in -αριον, cf. Ar. fr. 92 (Arist. *Rh.* 1405b28); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 144. Starkie 1909 on Ar. *Ach.* 517 provides examples from comedy other than Ar. (pp. lv–lvi for Ar.).

**καριδίων** For shrimp, see on fr. 23.

**4 σκινδαρίοις** This otherwise unknown fish is mentioned only here; possibly the word is corrupt. Thompson 1947. 243 understood it as a diminutive of σκινίς, but see Chantraine 1968–1980 s. v (note that the article by Taillardat referred to as forthcoming in *RP* seems never to have appeared). The context suggests that the *skindarion* was most likely small and relatively inexpensive.

**κωβιδίων** The goby, another small and relatively inexpensive fish; cf. Alex. fr. 115.13 (together with *psitta*, shrimp, and perch) with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Macho 31 with Gow 1965 *ad loc.*; Thompson 1947. 137–9; Micha-Lampaki 1984. 91–2.

**Μαι[ - - - ]** (*Mai[ - - - ]*)  
 ('Mai[ - - - ]')

**Discussion** Kock 1884 II.145; Edmonds 1959 II.56–7; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.251 (cf. 1986 V.29); Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 252

**Title** The only known titles that begin Μαι[ - - - ] are Μαινόμενος, used by Diphilus and Diodorus, and a putative Μαινόμενοι as the model for Naevius' *Dementes*. Other possibilities include a proper noun (*LGPN* record 40 names in Mai-, none common except locally) or an ethnic (e.g. *Maiōtēs*); even if a form of Μαινόμενος is preferred, neither the gender nor the number can be known. For the possible connotations of the latter word, see on Γεροντομανία; fr. 18.4.

**Date** The play was performed in 364 BC and probably took second place at the Lenaea (test. 5.1).

**Μελίλωτος** (*Melilōtos*)  
(‘Melilotus’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.371; 1840 III.173; 1847. 580; Bothe 1855. 423; Kock 1884 II.145; Edmonds 1959 II.56–7; Masson 1986. 178–9 (= 1990 II.502–3); Kassel–Austin 1991 II.251; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 252

**Title** The title is probably a personal name derived from the name of a plant; cf. Pherecrates’ *Petalē*, *Koriannō*. For the use of names as titles, cf. *Sōsippos*; Breitenbach 1908. If the title connotes only the flower, it is unparalleled unless it refers to some sort of token (e.g. *Daktylios* by Alexis and others; cf. Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*) or an object crucial for the dénouement (e.g. Plautus’ *Rudens*).

Masson’s suggestion (at 1986. 178–9 = 1990 II.502–3) that the title is a proper name is likely correct. His main evidence, the use of the word as a Roman cognomen at *IEph* VII 1687 (14).4 (first century BC) and *CIL* VI 26939 (first century AD; cf. Solin 1996 II.519; 2003 II.1197), is sufficient to establish the existence of the (masculine) name, even if it sheds little light on fourth century Athenian practice. For a possible feminine form, see Bechtel’s derivation (1917. 596) of the name Μελώτα from \*Μελιλώτα in an inscription from Tanagra (*IG* VII 1200; Hellenistic). Nevertheless, names derived from plants are a standard feature of Greek onomastics in all periods and places; see Bechtel 1902. 100–10; 1917. 592–7 (595–7 for women’s names); Solin 1996 II.511–26; 2003 II.1152–1200. Since the name of a plant is unparalleled as a comic title, while the use of a name is well paralleled, the latter is preferable here. *Hetaira* names derived from plants are a well established group (cf. fr. 9.6 Ὠκμιον with n.); worth considering is emending the title to Μελιλωτώ (i.e. emending the two citations in Athenaeus from Μελιλώτω to Μελιλωτοῖ).

Arnott 1985 conclusively demonstrated that μελίλωτος is to be identified with one of the species of modern melilot as opposed to *trigonella graeca* (so e.g. LSJ following Hort’s Loeb edition of Thphr. *HP*). Melilot is an herb (Hsch. μ 712) known for its sweet smell (e.g. Thphr. *CP* 6.14.8, 11; Dsc. 3.40; cf. Pherecr. fr. 138.2 and its use for garlands at Cratin. fr. 105; Alex. fr. 119) and medicinal qualities (e.g. Hipp. *Ulc.* 19 [VI.422 Littré]; Gal. XII.70 Kühn; Dsc. 3.40); see in general Arnott 1985 (concise summary at Alex. fr. 119). Pace Bothe’s assertion that the neuter must be read here because the masculine is ‘nomen viri, qui nullus fuit’, the masculine is well attested from an early date (e.g. Sapph. fr. 96.14; Thphr. *HP* 7.15.3), while the neuter is not (*Peripl.M.Rubr.* 49; first century AD).

**Content of the comedy** Of the two fragments, one comments on extravagant expenditure, the other mentions a piece of household furniture. The

first could suggest wasteful living, possibly by the title character, but need be no more than an offhand remark. If the title is emended to a feminine name, or if it refers the plant, presumably used as some sort of token, the play might have concerned a mistaken identity or a girl wrongfully sold into prostitution. Alternatively, the title and fragments might suggest a plot revolving around the home.

**Date** Unknown.

**fr. 29 K.-A. (28 K.)**

οὐ μανικὸν ἔστ' ἐν οἰκίᾳ τρέφειν ταῶς,  
ἐξὸν τοσούτουι δὴ ἀγάματ' ἀγοράσαι;

- 1 οὐ μανικὸν ἔστ' Meineke: οὐχὶ μανικὸν ἔστιν ACE οἰκίαι CE: οἰκιδαι A  
2 τοσούτουι δὴ Dobree: τοιούτουσιδου A: τουτοισι δὴ CE

Isn't it crazy to raise peacocks in a house,  
when it's possible to buy two statues for the same price?

Ath. 14.654f

ὅτι δὲ καὶ τιθασοὺς εἶχον αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις Στράτις παρίστησιν ἐν Πανσανίᾳ διὰ τούτων· (fr. 28) ... Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Μελιλωτῷ. —

That they kept tame ones (i.e. peacocks) in the house Strattis shows in this passage from *Pausanias* (fr. 28) ... and Anaxandrides in *Melilotos*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

—υ—υ— υ|—υ— υ—υ—  
—υ—υ— υ—|—υ— υ—υ—υ—

**Discussion** Dobree 1833 II.349–50; Meineke 1840 III.173; Bothe 1844. 36; Emperius 1847. 351; Meineke 1847. 580; 1855. 423; Meineke 1857 V.clxxviii; Naber 1882. 267; Kock 1884 II.145; Herwerden 1893. 157; Blaydes 1896. 122; Herwerden 1903. 97; Edmonds 1959 II.56–7; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.251; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 252

**Citation Context** Athenaeus segues seamlessly from a short discussion of pheasants (14.654b–d) to one about peacocks (14.654d–5b). Antiph. fr. 203; Alex. fr. 128; and Stratt. fr. 28 precede this fragment; Anaxil. fr. 24; Menodot.

*FGrHist* 541 F 2; and Antiph. fr. 173 follow it. Most of the quotations concern the rarity and expense of the bird.

**Text** Naber was troubled by the metre, but it is unproblematic, and his own proposal (οὐ μανικόν ἐστ' ἐν οἰκίᾳ / τρέφειν ταῶς, ἔξδ' οὐ τοσούτου δῦο / ἀγάλματ' ἀγοράσαι;) is worse.

**Interpretation** These lines were presumably spoken in condemnation either of someone living extravagantly or of extravagant living in general; they may also contain a secondary swipe at impiety (see on 2 ἀγάλματ(α)). For a similar sentiment, cf. Alex. fr. 128. The fragment is best interpreted as an assertion that instead of spending money on a frivolous and ultimately worthless display of wealth, the individual(s) in question would do better to purchase statues for dedication, presumably in a public space. The absence of any statuary from the Attic Stelae, for example, suggests that such items were not used to adorn private residences, but were confined to display in civic or religious areas; the justifiable caution of Amyx 1958. 205 concerning the lack of valuable or luxury items in these lists applies only to easily portable objects.

**1 μανικόν** For the force of the word, see on fr. 18.4 ἐμαίνετο.

**ἐν οἰκίᾳ τρέφειν ταῶς** The possession of peacocks, introduced to Athens around 440 BC, was a symbol of ostentatious extravagance; other than their conspicuous plumage, the birds themselves seem to have had little inherent value (Stratt. fr. 28; cf. Eup. fr. 41; Anaxil. fr. 24 for the irritating nature of their cries) and were apparently not eaten (a practice unattested before the Roman period; cf. Ael. *NA* 5.21, designating Hortensius as the first to do so; Thompson 1947. 279; Alex. fr. 128 is not to be taken seriously in this regard). Those belonging to Demos (*PA* 3573; *PAA* 317910) son of Pylilampes (*PA* 12493; *PAA* 795965), the probable original importer of peacocks to Athens from the East, brought sightseers from around Greece and must thus have been regarded as a great rarity (Antipho fr. 57). Antiph. fr. 203 has been taken as evidence for the birds' relative commonness in the fourth century, but is probably more a comment on the spending habits of the rich (or *nouveaux riches*) than on the abundance of peacocks in the city. This rarity must have been responsible for their enormous cost; in addition to this fragment, cf. Antipho fr. 58, where the male and female (presumably sold as a pair) are valued at 10,000 drachmas; Alex. fr. 128.3. For the birds in general, as well as their introduction to Athens, see Olson 2002 on Ar. *Ach.* 62–63; Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 102 (cf. on *Av.* 68 for the similar introduction of the pheasant as a luxury item); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 115.14; Orth 2009 on Stratt. fr. 28; Thompson 1947. 277–81.

The internal rough breathing, a representation of ταῤῷς (cf. Lat. *pavo*), is attested for Attic by Trypho ap. Ath. 9.397e; cf. the interjections εἶέν, εὐοῖ, εὐαῖ

and εὐᾶν. For the phenomenon, see Kühner–Blass I.113 (§23.2) with addenda at I.639; Lehrs 1882. 318–25.

**2 τοσουτουί** A formation of the fourth century; cf. Ar. *Pl.* 427; fr. 622; Pl. *Hp. Ma.* 292c; D. 18.279; [D.] 43.39.

**ἄγαλματ(α)** Kannicht 1969 on E. *Hel.* 262 glosses the word ‘entweder “Götterstatue” oder einfach “Statue”’ and goes on to say that ‘denn seit dem ausgehenden 5. Jh. werden auch profane ἀνδριάντες durch “ἄγαλμα” bezeichnet’; for the earlier semantic evolution of the word, see Bloesch 1953. 30–6. Despite Kannicht, it is not at all certain that the word, when it means ‘statue’, can refer to anything other than a statue of a god, although by the end of the fifth century if not before it is certainly used widely in metaphorical contexts. Wilamowitz 1895 on E. *HF* 49 gives a concise synopsis; note also the common use as a synonym for ‘empty-headed person’ (e.g. Ar. *V.* 314; E. *El.* 388). For further discussion, with bibliography, of the word and the uses of *agalmata*, see Pritchett 1998. 61–6.

Statues were normally made either of stone (presumably marble; cf. X. *Vect.* 1.4) or bronze (read adesp. trag. *TGrFF* 618.6 [= S. fr. 1126 Pearson] θεῶν ἄγαλματ’ ἐκ λίθων ἢ χαλκέων) and could vary greatly in size, making cost comparisons problematic. In the middle of the fourth century, two statues could be bought for less than 16 minae (Pl. *Ep.* 13.361a–b [Loomis 1998 #12]), while in the second half of the century a bronze statue could be had for 3000 drachmas (D.L. 6.35 [Loomis 1998. 93 #15]; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 555.9–16 [Loomis 1998. 94–5 #18]); for a speculative breakdown of the costs for bronze statuary, see Stewart 1990. 66–7. In at least two of the three cases, these prices do not appear far out of line with the 10,000 drachmas suggested for (presumably) a pair of peacocks at Antipho fr. 58 (see above).

#### fr. 30 K.-A. (29 K.)

Ath. 11.460e

(κ υ λ ι κ ε ῖ ο ν) ἔστι καὶ παρὰ Ἀναξανδρίδῃ ἐν Μελιλωτῷ

(S i d e b o a r d) also occurs in Anaxandrides in *Melilōtos*

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.174; 1847. 580; Bothe 1855. 423; Meineke 1857 V.81; Kock 1884 II.145; Edmonds 1959 II.56–57; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.252; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 252

**Citation Context** As a prelude to a discussion of cups, Athenaeus starts to inquire whether the ancients used large cups for drinking but, before even finishing the question, becomes sidetracked into a brief account of cup-cabinets (11.460d–f). No quotation follows the reference to Anaxandrides, and it is more likely that it has fallen out of Athenaeus’ text than that none was provided. Ar. fr. 106 precedes, while Eub. fr. 62; 116; 95; and Cratin. Iun. fr. 9 follow.

**Interpretation** A κυλικεῖον is a sideboard or cabinet for storing cups, as the name implies, although almost certainly not limited to *kylixes* (the stem *kylik-* is used generically here for any sort of vessel, like ‘cup’ in English ‘cupboard’). The form seems to have been somewhat similar to a table (but note Ath. 5.202e and *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59014b.9, where tables and sideboards are distinguished), with an upright part on top for the storage and display of the cups; see Richter 1966. 81–4 (collection and discussion of the literary and artistic testimonia); Andrianou 2009. 82–3 (63–85 for storage furniture generally). The testimonia show that sideboards could be elaborately carved and decorated and could thus be a luxury item not out of keeping with the content of fr. 29. Amyx 1945. 513 suggests that the reason for the seemingly widespread use of these and similar items of furniture was the near total lack of suitable storage (e.g. shelving) in the classical Greek house, although small rubble foundations in houses at Olynthus have been identified as foundations for built-in storage units (*Olynthus* VIII, pp. 97–8)<sup>50</sup> and the use of pegs for hanging household items is seemingly ubiquitous in antiquity (already in Homer; e.g. *Il.* 5.209 with Kirk 1990 *ad loc.*).

---

<sup>50</sup> Milne, *CVA USA 11* (Metropolitan Museum 2), p. xiv, n. 1 rightly criticizes the use of κυλικεῖον to refer to these built-in storage units, since the sideboards designated as such seem to have been portable.



**Νηρεύς (*Nēreus*)**  
(‘Nereus’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.372; 1840 III.174; 1847. 580; Bothe 1855. 423; Kock 1884 II.145; Breitenbach 1908. 40–41; Edmonds 1959 II.56–7; Webster 1970. 6, 66; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.252; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 252 (cf. 150 n. 175); Bowie 2010. 156

**Title** The title appears elsewhere only in the play by Anaxilas, the sole fragment of which Meineke (1839 I.372) considered assigning to Anaxandrides; Meineke equally unconvincingly pondered emending the title of Anaxandrides’ *Nērēides* to *Nēreus*. For names of mythological characters used as titles, see on *Anchisēs*; Introduction.

The sea-god Nereus, son of Pontos and father of the Nereids (including Thetis), is referred to in Homer only obliquely as the Old Man of the Sea (*H. Il.* 1.358, 556); his name is given first at Hes. *Th.* 233 (cf. West 1966 *ad loc.*). He is known mainly for his encounter with Heracles, when the latter was seeking the Garden of the Hesperides. In one version (Pherecyd. *FGrHist* 3 F 16a; cf. Jacoby 1923 *ad loc.*), Heracles attempted to elicit directions to the Garden from Nereus by force; the latter resisted by changing into fire and water (cf. Stesich. fr. 16a Davies). In another version (Panyas. fr. 9 Bernabé), Heracles received the bowl of Helios from Nereus. In general, see Pipili in *LIMC* VI.1.824–37; Bloch in Roscher 1884–1937 III.240–50.

Discussion of the title and thus the content of the play has been unnecessarily confused by the existence of a cook, Nereus of Chios. Bowie 2010. 156 is the latest in a long line of scholars (including K–A on Euphro fr. 1.6) to suggest that the play involved a conflation of the sea-god and the cook, even though Breitenbach 1908. 40 pointed out a century ago that the chronology does not work (cf. Euphro fr. 1.12 for an explicit statement concerning the cook’s date).<sup>51</sup> Little is known about the cook Nereus save that Euphro includes him in a catalogue of cooks cast as the Seven Wise Men (fr. 1.6 Νηρεύς δ’ ὁ Χῖος γόγγρον ἤψε τοῖς θεοῖς); other possible references to him are illusory. Euphan. fr. 1.2 λοπάδα Νηρείων τέκνων (Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 115.1 aptly compares Plaut. *Pseud.* 834 *Neptuni pecudes*), adesp. com. fr. 1146.37 Νηρέως τε χῦμα πηγόν (cf. Willis 1991. 350), and Matro fr. 1.33 (*SH* 534) all refer to the sea-god;

<sup>51</sup> It is unlikely that Euphro is implying a generic post-classical date for Nereus and the other cooks in his catalogue rather than specifically placing him in his own day, since all other references to these men also belong to the third century.

Alex. fr. 115.1, the only evidence for Nereus as a fishmonger, is rightly taken by Breitenbach 1908 and Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* as what the latter describes as ‘a facetious designation of an aged fisherman’ (cf. Eust. *Il.* 1330.11–13).

**Content of the comedy** The sole fragment portrays Nereus as a cook (but not the cook Nereus of Chios) or possibly a fishmonger, whose specialty, unsurprisingly, is seafood. The depiction of the god as a cook using high-flown language to describe mundane objects may indicate the tenor of the play, and an obvious assumption is that it involved a parody of the sea-god, in which he was transformed from a protector of the sea and its inhabitants into a seafood chef. If Nereus’ struggle with Heracles formed part of the play, it may have been fashioned as an encounter between cook and glutton.

**Date** Unknown.

fr. 31 K.-A. (30 K.)

ὁ πρῶτος εὐρών πολυτελὲς τμητὸν μέγα  
 γλαύκου πρόσωπον τοῦ τ’ ἀμύμονος δέμας  
 θύννου τά τ’ ἄλλα βρώματ’ ἐξ ὑγρᾶς ἀλὸς  
 Νηρεὺς κατοικεῖ τόνδε πάντα τὸν τόπον

1 πολυτελὲς τμητὸν ACE: πολυτελοῦς τμητὸν Bothe: πολυτελὲς θνητοῖς Herwerden: πουλύποδας, τιλτὸν Kock 2 ἀμύμονος Hertelius: ἀκυμονος ACE 3 τά ... ἀλὸς om. CE βρωτὰ τάξ Kock 4 κατοικῶ Naber τόνδε πάντα A: πάντα τόνδε CE

The discoverer of the lavish great severed  
 head of the *glaukos* and the body of the blameless  
 tuna and the other foods from the watery sea,  
 Nereus, inhabits this whole place

[1–4] Ath. 7.295e

Ἀναξανδρίδης Νηρεῖ· —

Anaxandrides in *Nēreus*: —

[1–2] Eust. *Od.* 1842.64

ὁ εἰπὼν μέγα γλαύκου ἰχθύος πρόσωπον· —

The one who mentioned the great head of the *glaukos* fish: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —

**Discussion** Dobree 1833 II.315; Meineke 1839 I.372; 1840 III.174; 1847. 580; Bothe 1855. 423; Meineke 1857 V.clxxviii; Naber 1880. 54; Kock 1884 II.145–6; Zacher 1886. 713; Kock 1888 III.737; Blaydes 1890a. 82; Herwerden 1893. 157–8; Blaydes 1896. 122; Herwerden 1903. 97; Leo 1912. 239; Wilamowitz 1925. 145 n. 1; Edmonds 1959 II.56–7; Webster 1970. 66, 83 n. 1; Nesselrath 1990. 248 n. 16, 256, 301–2; Kassel–Austin 1991. 252; Willis 1991. 350; Wilkins 2000. 18, 390; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 252–3

**Text** Naber’s emendation of the paradosis κατοικεῖ in 4 to κατοικῶ is not without merit, since it fits the boasting character often associated with cooks (i. e. the god as a cook, not the actual cook of that name as Naber believed), and the corruption would be easy. Without additional context, however, the change is unwarranted. A possible further difficulty is that the hero of the play would then be the speaker of the prologue (assuming that is a correct assumption) and so would be describing himself and his background, a task normally left to others in tragic antecedents and later comedy, but common in Aristophanes (e. g. *Ach.*; *Nu.*).

**Interpretation** Leo 1912. 239 (cf. Nesselrath 1990. 248 n. 16) cites this as an example of a fragment from a prologue (an observation made already at Meineke 1839 I.372; contrast Wilamowitz 1925. 145 n. 1); its expository character makes this likely. In contrast to normal Aristophanic practice, and presumably that of fifth-century comedy generally, which avoids an expository monologue and delays naming the hero of the play (see Olson 1992), this fragment, together with other more or less contemporary examples (e. g. Henioch. fr. 5; Eub. fr. 68; Alex. fr. 255), suggests that by the middle of the fourth century the structure and exposition of comic plots at least occasionally resembled that familiar from New Comedy, and that comedy had already adopted elements of tragedy beyond mere parody (note the view of Wilamowitz 1925. 145 n. 1 that the language is tragic; cf. Cobet 1873. 359). For divinities speaking prologues, cf. on fr. 58; Ar. fr. 331 (*Th.* II); adesp. com. fr. 1062 (with introductory note of Olson 2007. C2).

The depiction of Nereus perhaps echoes that of Proteus in H. *Od.* 4.399–424, although the image of a sea-god surrounded by sea-creatures (here more implicit than explicit) is applicable to any sea-god.

**1 ὁ πρῶτος εὐρών** For the πρῶτος εὐρετής, see on fr. 10.2 εὔρε; cf. Wilkins 2000. 78 n. 111. For the metrical position, cf. Alex. fr. 152; 190; Eub. fr. 72; Men. fr. 18; cf. ὁ πρῶτος εἰπών at Alex. fr. 27; adesp. com. fr. 859. Comic cooks often claim originality for their work; cf. Alex. fr. 190; Euphr. fr. 1. The fragments cited by Dohm 1964. 130 n. 1, however, while mocking the conventional attribution of inventions, do not establish a wider connection between cooks and inventions.

**1–2 πολυτελὲς τιμητὸν μέγα / γλαύκου πρόσωπον** While accumulation of adjectives for comic effect is common in Aristophanes, it has little place in straightforward exposition, as is the case here, a fact that has led to emendation. Such extravagant language, however, is fitting in a catalogue of food, particularly when the efforts of a famous cook are being described; cf. Zacher 1886. 713. See on fr. 34.16 (cf. on fr. 42.37) for the possibility that this is an example of enallage, and note Headlam 1902. 434.

**πολυτελὲς** ‘Costly’ or ‘extravagant;’ cf. Waanders 1983. 180. Generally positive, the adjective is applied to a wide variety of objects, including food, e.g. Dionys. Com. fr. 2.37–8; Athenio fr. 1.37; adesp. com. fr. 457 K. (not accepted by K.-A.). For the word’s occasional use with a negative connotation, esp. Men. fr. 544.

**τιμητόν** Large fish are regularly sliced (see on fr. 42.53), either by the cook for preparation or simply purchased thus, although the procedure was of course usually applied to the body; here the word must mean ‘cut off (from the rest of the body)’. While forms of τέμνω as well as the noun τέμαχος are common, the adjective τιμητός is not; for its use for food, cf. Euthydem. *SH* 455.6 (of the *oxyrhynchos* fish); Antiph. fr. 131.9 (of cheese).

**γλαύκου πρόσωπον** Cf. Antiph. fr. 130.4 γλαύκου προτομή. Fish heads are commonly eaten and often treated as a delicacy (e.g. Antiph. fr. 45; Anaxil. fr. 20.1; Alex. fr. 159.4; Eub. fr. 109.4; Matro fr. 1.31, 53–5 [*SH* 534] with Olson–Sens 1999 *ad locc.*); this seems to have been especially true for the *glaukos* (cf. Sannyr. fr. 3; Sotad. Com. fr. 1.5; Amph. fr. 16; 35; Antiph. fr. 77; 130.4; Bato fr. 5.16–8; Arcestr. fr. 21 [*SH* 151]; Dohm 1964. 108). The precise identification of the *glaukos* is uncertain, and the word seems to have been used for at least two separate fish. Here the reference is almost certainly to a shark or dogfish; for general discussion, including attempts at a more exact identification, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 115.8; Olson–Sens 2000 on Arcestr. fr. 21.1 (*SH* 151); Thompson 1947. 48; Micha-Lampaki 1984. 80–1. The use of πρόσωπον rather than the more usual κράνιον (Antiph. fr. 77; cf. Amph. fr. 16), κεφαλή (Sotad. Com. fr. 1.5; Amph. fr. 35), or κεφάλαια (Bato fr. 5.18; Arcestr. fr. 21.1 [*SH* 151]) continues the reliance on extravagant language to describe Nereus’ dis-

coveries. The only other attestation of the word in reference to fish is at fr. 34.16, in a similar context; different is Eup. fr. 120 = Cratin. fr. 314.

**2-3 ἄμύμονος** ἄμύμων, rare outside epic (twice in comedy; never in tragedy) is an epithet of general commendation; see Parry 1973. Parry p. 87 categorizes the use of the word at Hermipp. fr. 77.5 to describe Chian wine as parody of its use in Homer; regarding the occurrence here, she states (87) that ‘obviously, ἄμύμων is more likely to refer to the size, strength, and beauty of the tuna’s body than to some indefinable aspect of its “blamelessness”’. Given the word’s virtual restriction to epic<sup>52</sup> and the generally high-flown character of the passage in general, however, it is most likely used here in a conscious attempt to evoke an epic feeling and elevate the character of Nereus (probably shown later in more humble circumstances). Perhaps worth noting, given the context, is Hes. *Th.* 263–4, where both Nereus and the works of his daughters are called ἄμύμων.

**δέμας** Normally used of men, but of fish at Archestr. fr. 32.5 (*SH* 162). Like ἄμύμων, this is a poetic word, common in epic, and thus continues the elevated tenor.

**θύννου** The tuna, a large fish, was regarded as a delicacy (esp. Anan. fr. 5.7–8; Archestr. fr. 20 [*SH* 150]) and was commonly eaten and purchased in slices (τέμαχος; cf. above on τμητόν); for a thorough discussion, including identification of varieties, parts eaten, and methods of catching, see Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 35.2 (*SH* 165); Thompson 1947. 79–90. The mock-heroic depiction of the tuna accords well with the general tone of the fragment.

**3 βρώματ(α)** See on fr. 2.2.

**ἐξ ὑγρᾶς ἁλός** This expression has the appearance of a stock noun-adjective phrase of the sort commonly found in Homer, although the sea is never actually qualified as ὑγρός in epic; cf. Pi. *O.* 7.69 ἐξ ἁλὸς ὑγρῆς; Friis Johansen–Whittle 1980 on A. *Supp.* 259. Although equally appropriate if taken at face-value, the phrase here humorously refers as well to the brine in which the fish are cooked; cf. Matro fr. 1.77 (*SH* 534) with Olson–Sens 1999 *ad loc.*

**4 Νηρεΐς** See Introduction to the play. Note the emphatic placement of the word, not only at the beginning of the line but also juxtaposed with ἁλός and providing the culmination to the short catalogue of sea creatures

<sup>52</sup> Parry is able to cite 15 examples of the word outside epic, although this figure includes e.g. Hermipp. fr. 77.5, which she considers epic parody, and occurrences such as those at Mosch. 2.93 and [Mosch.] 4.8 that clearly belong to the epic tradition even if they stand outside it; mentioned but not included in this figure is ἀμυμ[ - - ] at *PMG* adesp. fr. 924.17 (= B. fr. 66.17 dub.).

sandwiched between ὁ πρῶτος εὐρών and the name. The appearance of the name resolves the suspense or quasi-riddle in 1–3.

**κατοικεῖ** Edmonds' translation 'reign' is a bit strong. The word normally means 'inhabit' or 'dwell in' (contrast S. OC 1004 [but note Jebb 1887 *ad loc.*]; Pl. *Lg.* 683a), as at Antiph. fr. 210.2 and Men. *Pk.* 123, the only other occurrences in comedy.

**τόνδε πάντα τὸν τόπον** The main question is what τόπον refers to; the demonstrative implies that the place is at hand or perhaps simply in mind, having just been described. The obvious solution is to assume that it refers to the scene at hand, i.e. the setting. For this use of the demonstrative in Euripidean prologues (far less frequent in Aeschylus and Sophocles), cf. Hermann 1831 on E. *Hec.* 8; Barrett 1964 on E. *Hipp.* 12; Kassel 1976; for a vaguer use of the demonstrative, cf. Kannicht 1969 on E. *Hel.* 1. This in turn suggests that the play, or at least its opening, is set in a location suitable for the activity of a cook, e.g. a banquet, or before a house or some other place where there will be a feast, etc. Less likely, the word refers to the realm of culinary arts. While τόπος can on occasion mean something like 'topic' or 'subject' (e.g. Isoc. 5.109; 10.38)<sup>53</sup>, that seems a specialized and non-poetic use.

#### fr. 32 K.-A. (31 K.)

Antiatt. p. 87.5

γ ο γ γ υ σ μ ό ς · ἀντὶ τοῦ <τον>θορυσμοῦ. Ἀναξανδρίδης Νηρεΐ

supp. Bekker

G r u m b l i n g. Instead of muttering. Anaxandrides in *Nēreus*

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.174; 1847. 580; Bothe 1855. 423; Kock 1884 II.146; Edmonds 1959 II.56–7; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.252; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 253

**Interpretation** The two words are often treated as synonyms; cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 335 with Fischer 1974 *ad loc.* for further references. Phryn. *Ecl.* 335 makes the further claim that while the former word is Ionic, the latter is Attic (cf. Thom. Mag. p. 352.17). Unlike γογγυσμός and related forms, which do not appear

<sup>53</sup> LSJ s.v. II.1 cite also Aeschin. 3.216, but there Σ 3.473 rightly gloss the word as ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπιχείρημα (cf. LSJ s.v. III).

elsewhere before the second century AD, τονθορυσμός or related forms are attested already at A. fr. 298 (the sound made by a bull when its throat has just been cut). That the three occurrences of τονθορύζω in Aristophanes (*Ach.* 683; *V.* 614; *Ra.* 747) all mean ‘grumble’ or ‘mutter’, while elsewhere it is glossed ἡρέμα γογγύζειν (*Synagoge* τ 221, etc.), suggests that γογγύζω is the stronger verb. The corruption in the transmitted text is due to mistaken word division, which produced the unwanted article τόν, or haplography.

**Νηρηίδες (*Nērēides*)**  
(‘Nereids’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.372; 1840 III.174; 1847. 581; Bothe 1855. 423; Kock 1884 II.146; Lawler 1941. 154; Edmonds 1959 II.56–7; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.253; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 253

**Title** For the title, cf. Aeschylus *Nereids*; Alexis Φιλόκαλος ἡ Νύμφαι, although Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* prefers the view that the nymphs of the title had a shrine on stage but not necessarily a role, which seems unlikely here. Meineke’s suggestion (1839 I.372) that the title be emended to *Nereus* has little to commend it. For the Nereids in Greek art, see Barringer 1995; *LIMC* VI.1.785–6.

**Content of the comedy** The title suggests a mythological parody, although all that can be said with certainty is that the play involved a drinking party. Little help is gained from comparison with Aeschylus’ *Nereids*, which was the second play in a trilogy about Achilles and is the only other play with this name. The subject of Aeschylus’ play is uncertain (see Radt 1985 *ad loc.*), and in any case the two need not have anything to do with one another. Furthermore, any number of plots involving Nereids can be imagined.

**Date** Unknown.

fr. 33 K.-A. (32 K.)

δὸς δὴ τὸν χοῶ  
αὐτῷ σύ, Κῶμε, καὶ τὸ κυμβίον φέρων.  
(B.) Εὐριπίδης τις τήμερον γενήσεται

habet A

1 χοῶ Jacobs: χο’ A      2 σύ, Κῶμε Dobree: σύγκωμε A      φέρων post αὐτῷ transp.  
Bergk      3 τήμερον Dindorf: σήμερον A

Give the chous  
to him, Komos, and bring the schooner as well.  
(B.) He will be a Euripides today

Ath. 11.482c–d

μνημονεύει δ’ αὐτοῦ (i. e. Euripides) καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Νηρηίσιν· —

Anaxandrides also mentions him (i. e. Euripides) in *Nērēides*: —



**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x-υ- x-υ⟩| - - - υ-  
 - - υ- υ| - υ- υ-υ-  
 - - υ- -| - υ- υ-υ-

**Discussion** Jacobs 1809. 261; Meineke 1840 III.174–5; 1847. 581; Bothe 1855. 423–4; Meineke 1857 V.clxxviii; Kock 1884 II.146; Edmonds 1959 II.56–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.253; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 253

**Citation Context** The fragment is cited in a brief interlude in Athenaeus' discussion of *kymbia* (11.481d–2e; cf. on fr. 3), in which quotation of Ephipp. fr. 9 calls forth a brief discussion and collection of testimonia for a certain Euripides, to be distinguished from the homonymous tragic poet. In addition to Ephipp. fr. 9, Athenaeus refers to *On the poets mocked in Middle Comedy* by Antiochus of Alexandria<sup>54</sup> and quotes this fragment and Ephipp. fr. 16.

**Text** In 2, emendation of A's σύγκωμε to σύ, Κῶμε is metrically necessary, and in any case the three occurrences of σύγκωμος (A. fr. 355; Ar. *Ach.* 264; E. *Ba.* 1172) are all specifically tied to the worship of Dionysus and an actual revel, so that it is inappropriate here. Dobree's Κῶμε (*LGPNI* II s. v. Κῶμος [2]; 12x total in *LGPNI* II, although only two others are from the fourth century) is surely correct.

**Interpretation** There are clearly two speakers in this fragment, in addition to another individual discussed in the third person only. The speaker of 3 may be a fourth person, or this may be Komos' humorous response to the command (cf. on 2). Since the language of the command suggests that Komos is not simply handing the objects to the third person but bringing them to him, the third person is probably some distance away; there may be a number of separate couches arranged around the stage for a banqueting/symposium scene, or the man may even be offstage.

**1 χοῦ** A standard liquid measure equaling 3.2 litres (cf. Young 1939. 278–80 [2-*chous klepsydra*]; Broneer 1938. 222–4 [equivalent dry measure]), although the word often refers to the trefoil-mouthed pitcher (see *Agora* XII, pp. 60–3), presumably containing one *chous*, at least originally, in which wine was served. As here, the two meanings often seem to be conflated (e. g. Cratin. fr. 299; Alex. fr. 15.18–19); for the price of a *chous*, see Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Pritchett 1956. 199–203. For the accentuation (χοῦ as opposed to χόα), see

<sup>54</sup> Aside from the passing reference of Athenaeus, nothing is known about either the man (*RE* Antiochus 67) or his work.

K.-A. on Cratin. fr. 199.3; Pierson 1830–1831 on Moer. p. 374 (χ 26 Hansen); contrast Threatte 1996 II.267–8.

2 αὐτῷ The same man as the subject of 3.

σύ, Κῶμε Meineke believed Komos to be a slave; cf. *SGDI* 1909.4, a manumission inscription from Delphi from 278 BC. This need not be the case, but if it is, and if Komos is the speaker of 3 (see above), the snide tone fits the clever slave type. In Aristophanes, named slaves almost always remain mute (cf. Olson 1992. 309–12); whether the rule applied in comedy generally is unclear. Dobree suggested that the name is that of the Bacchic daemon (see Roscher 1884–1937 III.1281–2), a view of which Meineke was rightly skeptical.

κυμβίον See on fr. 3.2.

3 For the thought, cf. Ar. *Ec.* 1021 οἴμοι, Προκρούστης τήμερον γενήσεται; fr. 957 with K.-A. *ad loc.*; Eub. fr. 119.5 with K.-A. *ad loc.*

Εὐριπίδης τις Ath. 11.482c distinguishes the famous poet from this man (*PAA* 444547; *LGPV* II s. v. [17]); cf. Steinhausen 1910. 49. Nothing is known about him aside from the snippets provided here by Athenaeus, who ascribes to him a reputation as a drunk (φίλοινος); cf. Ephipp. fr. 9.2 οὐ κυμβίοισι πεπολέμηκ' Εὐριπίδης; 16.5 κυμβία τε παρέχοιμι ἑστιῶν Εὐριπίδη. That all three passages connect Euripides with κυμβία might suggest that he had a penchant for the shape, but might simply mean instead that it was popular at the time. For the force of τις, see Cooper 1998–2002 51.16.2B; Riddell 1867. 136 (§51β); cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1166 τις ... Ὀρέστης with Starkie 1909 *ad loc.*; Dover 1993 on Ar. *Ra.* 912; Men. fr. 505.

Ὀδυσσεύς (*Odysseus*)  
(‘Odysseus’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.372; 1840 III.175; 1847. 581; Bothe 1855. 424; Kock 1884 II.146; Edmonds 1959 II.58–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.253 (cf. 1986 V.231); Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 253–4

**Title** A popular figure in both comedy and tragedy, Odysseus was the title-character of comedies by Epicharmus (two plays), Dinolochus, Cratinus (in plural), Theopompus (possibly plural), Amphis, Eubulus, and Alexis (two plays), and of tragedies by Sophocles (two plays), Sophocles II (*TrGF* 62), Apollodorus (*TrGF* 64), Chaeremon (*TrGF* 71), and adesp. trag. *TGrFF* 7a and 7b. In addition, he played a major role in numerous other plays.

For a useful study of the character of Odysseus throughout European literature, although dwelling little on comedy, see Stanford 1963a; for Odysseus in comedy, Schmidt 1888; Phillips 1959. See in general *LIMC* VI.1.943–7.

**Content of the comedy** Odysseus’ adventures are too varied and numerous for speculation on the plot of the play to be profitable, although tentative suggestions can be made on the basis of the fragments. Fr. 34 may be part of a comic treatment of his death (see introduction to fr. 34). Fr. 35.1, on the other hand, may refer to the Athenians, in which case the play is probably not strictly a mythological parody but an amalgam of legend and reality similar to the fantasy world often found in fifth-century comedy; perhaps Odysseus came to Athens or met Athenians on his fantastic adventures (see Introduction).

**Date** The play took fourth at the City Dionysia between 374 and either 365 BC or 357 BC (although not in 368 or 364 BC, and almost certainly not in 373 BC); see on test. 5.7.

fr. 34 K.-A. (33 K.)

- τῶν ζωγράφων μὲν ἡ καλὴ χειρουργία  
ἐν τοῖς πίναξιν κρεμαμένη θαυμάζεται·  
αὕτη δὲ σεμνῶς ἐκ λοπάδος ἀρπάζεται  
ἀπὸ τοῦ ταγήνου τ’ εὐθέως ἀφανίζεται.
- 5 ἐπὶ τίνα † δ’ ἄλλην τέχνην †, ὃ χρηστὲ σύ,  
τὰ στόματα τῶν νεωτέρων κατακάετ’ ἢ  
ὠθισμός ἐστι δακτύλων τοιουτοσὶ  
ἢ πνιγμός, ἂν μὴ ταχὺ δύνηται καταπιεῖν;

- ἀλλ' οὐ μόνη γὰρ τὰς συνουσίας ποιῇ  
 10 εὖοψος ἀγορά; τίς δὲ συνδειπνεῖ βροτῶν  
 φρυκτοὺς καταλαβὼν ἢ κορακίνους ὠνίους  
 ἢ μαινίδ'; ὥραϊον δὲ μειρακύλλιον  
 ποίαις ἐπωδαῖς ἢ λόγοις ἀλίσκεται  
 τίσιν, φράσον γάρ, ἄν τις ἀφέλῃ τὴν τέχνην  
 15 <τὴν> τῶν ἀλιέων; ἦδε γὰρ δαμάζεται,  
 ἐφθοῖς προσώποις ἰχθύων χειρουμένη,  
 † ἄγουσ' ὑπ' αὐτὰ σώματ' ἀρίστου πύλας, †  
 ἀσύμβολον κλίνειν τ' ἀναγκάζει φύσιν

habent A (1–19); CE (1–8)

2 πίναξιν A: πίναξι CE κρεμαμένη ACE: κρεμαμένοις Bergk 3 αὕτη Schweighäuser: αὐτή ACE: αὖτις Papabasilios δὲ σεμνῶς ACE: δὲ σεμνῆς Bothe: δ' ἀσέμνως Hirschig: possis δ' ἀσελγῶς 5 ἐπὶ ACE: ἐπεὶ Tucker (ἐπεὶ τίν' ἄλλην διὰ τέχνην): κατὰ Richards: διὰ Herwerden δ' ἄλλην ACE: δ' ὥδ' ἄλλην Erfurdt: δῆτ' ἄλλην Bergk: μᾶλλον δὲ Kaibel τέχνην ACE: τῶν τεχνῶν Porson: φέρε τέχνην Meineke: διὰ τέχνην Tucker 6 νεωτέρων A: νέων CE κατακάεται ACE (corr. Dobree): ἐπικάεται Richards ἢ om. A 7 ἡθισμός A 8 δακτύλων ACE: γαστρίδων Kock: δαιταλέων Blaydes: δαιτυμόνων Herwerden τοιουτοσὶ Erfurdt: τοσουτοσὶ Kuses: τοιοῦτος CE: τοιούτων A 8 ἂν Dindorf: ἐὰν ACE 9 μόνη Casaubon: μονονη A 10 fort. δ' ἀσυνδειπνεῖ 11 καταλαβὼν ἢ A: λαβόντι καὶ Kock: fort. καταβαλὼν ἢ κορακίνους Casaubon: κωρακίνους A 12 μαινίδ' Casaubon: μηδὲν A 14 ἂν Dindorf: ἐὰν A 15 τὴν add. Jacobs 17 ἄγουσ' ὑπ' αὐτὰ A: ἄγουσὶ τ' αὖ τὰ Jacobs: οἴγουσ' ὑπ' αὐτὰ τὰ Erfurdt αὐτὰς Bothe σῶμα τὰρίστου Browne ἀρίστου A: ἐπ' Εὐρύτου Jacobs 18 κλονεῖν Sansone

- The beautiful handiwork of painters  
 is marvelled at when hanging where paintings are sold;  
 but this one is snatched haughtily from a pan  
 and at once disappears from the griddle.  
 5 And regarding what other art, my good man,  
 are the mouths of young men scorched, or  
 is there such a shoving of fingers  
 or choking, if it can not be gulped down quickly?  
 For does not a market well-stocked with fish alone  
 10 produce socializing? Who of mortals dines in company  
 after laying hold of small-fry or ravenfish that was for sale  
 or a sprat? With what sorts of charms or with what words  
 is a handsome young boy caught, tell me,  
 if someone takes away the art  
 15 of fishermen? For this (art) conquers (them),



1884 II.146–8; Herwerden 1886. 183–4; Zacher 1886. 713–14; Kock 1888 III.737; Paley 1889 52–5; Papabasileiou 1889. 205–6; Blaydes 1890a. 82; Herwerden 1893. 158; Blaydes 1896. 122–3; Pickard-Cambridge 1900. 54, 186; Herwerden 1903. 97–8; Richards 1907. 160 (= 1909. 79–80); Tucker 1908. 191; Edmonds 1959 II.58–9; Henderson 1991. 202; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.253–4; Davidson 1993. 63 with n. 76; Wilkins 2000. 298, 341; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 253–5; Rusten 2011. 464–5

**Citation Context** Near the end of a section on fish-sellers (6.224b–8c), Athenaeus adduces this fragment to demonstrate the pride fishermen take in their trade, and claims that a fisherman was a character in this play and spoke these lines. After quoting the fragment, Athenaeus turns his attention back to fish-sellers and cites two other long fragments, Alex. fr. 78 and Diph. fr. 31.

**Text** There is no need for Bergk's κρεμαμένοις in 2.

In 3, Papabasileios' emendation of the paradosis αὔτη to αὖξις (better αὖξις; cf. Chandler 1881 §644), a young tuna (Phryn. Com. fr. 59; Thompson 1947. 21) is possible. The use of the specific for the general is doubtful, however, and in lines 11–12 scorn is cast on small fish.

If the transmitted σεμνῶς is correct in 3, the word ought have the sense 'haughtily' or 'pompously', the normal meaning of the adverb in comedy (e.g. Ar. V. 585; Ephipp. fr. 19.4; Amphis fr. 13.3; cf. Dover 1993 on Ar. *Ra.* 178 and p. 21 of his edition).<sup>55</sup> Since this is not quite the desired sense, Hirschig proposed ἀσεμνῶς (with elision of δέ); Bothe translated this as 'irreverenter', although 'in an undignified manner' is better here. ἄσεμνος, however, is primarily a late word, although it does occur at Arist. *Mu.* 398b4, and is exclusively prosaic. Better is ἀσελγῶς with the sense 'wantonly' or 'without restraint'; cf. Ar. *Pl.* 560 (note Σ<sup>Tzet.</sup> *ad loc.* for the equivalence of ἀσελγῶς and μὴ σεμνῶς); Diod. Com. fr. 2.41; Renehan 1975. 44 (s. v. ἀσελγήης).

The spelling τάγηνον in 4 occurs also at Ar. *Eq.* 929; Eup. fr. 374; Pl. Com. fr. 189.12; Alex. fr. 115.12 (cf. Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*); 192.6, although τήγανον seems to be the predominant form (e.g. Eup. fr. 144; Teleclid. fr. 10; Eub. fr. 75.8; Diph. fr. 43.4); cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 11.8 (*SH* 140). The attempts of grammarians and lexicographers to deal with this dichotomy led

<sup>55</sup> It is also possible to translate σεμνῶς as 'reverently' or 'with awed respect,' despite the fact that the word seldom, if ever, has this sense in comedy. Although description of food in similar terms, even in combination with rapacious dining, is common for example in the fragments of Matro, such a sense is not appropriate here, where there is little emphasis on the food itself, but only on taking advantage of the eagerness of others to obtain the food.

to confusion: Phot. τ 3 τάγηνον· τοῦτο Ἰώνων τινὲς τήγανον λέγουσι; Moer. τ 3 τάγηνον Ἀττικοί· τήγανον Ἑλληνες (cf. Hansen 1998 and Pierson 1830–1831 [p. 330] *ad loc.*); Phryn. *PS* p. 112.11 τάγηνον οἱ Ἀττικοί· τήγανον οἱ Δωριεῖς; Ath. 6.228d.<sup>56</sup> Given the interchangeability of the forms, most likely both were correct; against the claim that τήγανον is non-Attic, cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1491.38, an inventory of 307/6 BC (cf. Threatte 1980 I.133).

Kock believed there was a deep-seated corruption in 5–6, arguing that ‘non recte se habet κατακάειν τὰ στόματα ἐπὶ τι’; but the perceived problem ought probably to be traced to a loose sentence-structure and a vivid image.

Although the sense of ἐπὶ τίνα δ’ ἄλλην τέχνην in 5 seems generally correct, the line lacks one syllable, or, more precisely, one-half of one foot (note τέχνη). The most reasonable approach is to insert the equivalent of a long syllable after either τίνα or ἄλλην. Of the numerous suggested supplements, perhaps the best is Tucker’s ἐπεὶ τίν’ ἄλλην διὰ τέχνην. For the force of ἐπεὶ, cf. Diggle 1981. 61.

In 7, the omission of ῆ in A is presumably the result of haplography (if A already read ῆθισμός at the beginning of the line) or a conflation with the following word.

The many suggested emendations of δακτύλων in 7 ignore the fact that the text is sound, since the Greeks normally ate with their fingers, and only serve to destroy the image; cf. Zacher 1886. 713–14; Matro fr. 1.14, 105–6 (*SH* 534) with Olson–Sens 1999 *ad locc.*

10–12 state that someone who acquires certain kinds of fish will not attract others to his company, a sentiment that seems to be in direct conflict with the rest of the fragment. The passage can be understood by assuming that the relatively worthless fish mentioned here describe an agora that is not truly εὖοψος, hence that does not attract company; for small, bad fish, see Wilkins 2000. 301. But such this distinction between desirable and undesirable fish is not made elsewhere in the fragment, where the products of the fisherman’s art are extolled with little attention to specifics. In addition, the next line, detailing the result of the absence of fish, ought to be in contrast to this line. Emendation ought therefore to be considered. One possibility, admittedly difficult, is to read δ’ ἄσυνδαιπνεῖ; but the putative verb is nowhere attested, and alpha-privative is comparatively rare in the formation of verbs. A better solution is to write καταλαβών for καταβαλόν, although the sense ‘reject’ or ‘cast aside’ is not easily paralleled; for examples of similar transpositions, cf. Millis 1997. 578 with n. 17.

<sup>56</sup> Ath. 6.229b adds an additional complication, reporting that χωρὶς δὲ τοῦ τ στοιχείου Ἰωνες ἤγανον λέγουσιν, ὡς Ἀνακρέων (*PMG* 436).

Taken literally, ἀρίστου πύλας in 17 means the gateway to a meal (note long α), but ἄγω, normally governing an animate object, suggests that the phrase is not to be so taken. Bothe's αὐτάς solves this difficulty but with no apparent improvement to the sense. According to the translations of Edmonds and Henderson 1991 §451<sup>57</sup>, the pun is between ἄριστον ('meal') and ἄριστος ('best'), although the difference in quantity of the *alphas* makes this difficult. The ambiguity could be preserved by rewriting the line e.g. ὑπ' αὐτὰ σώματ' ἄγουσι τᾶρίστου<sup>58</sup> πύλας, or by adopting Browne's σῶμα τᾶρίστου (which requires emending αὐτά to e.g. αὐτάς [Bothe] or αὐτό), although the sense of the line remains opaque. Jacobs' Εὐρύτου πύλας (the sense but not the words endorsed by Meineke) is likewise not without problems; cf. Page 1978 on Rufin. 21.6, although he is perhaps overly literal-minded there. Possibly σώματ(α) is an intrusive gloss on πύλας (or ἀρίστου πύλας) that has ousted part of the line. Less likely, πύλαι is used as a metaphor for the anus; cf. Henderson 1991 §451. Henderson §452 compares Ar. *Eq.* 54–5 (but cf. Sommerstein 1981 *ad loc.*); better is the comparison of εὐρυπρωκτότεροι with the (implied) gates of Troy at Eub. fr. 118.7–8.

**Interpretation** This praise of the fisherman's art owes much to the boastful tone and exaggeration common to cooks' descriptions of their art; cf. on Νηρέυς *passim*; Xenarch. fr. 8; contrast Alex. fr. 159 (from his Ὀδυσσεὺς ὑφαίνων). Although the possibilities for this fragment within the play are many, Odysseus' later reputation as a glutton (e.g. Luc. *Trag.* 261–2; Ath. 10.412b–d; 12.513a–d; perhaps pre-figured by H. *Il.* 19.155–72) may be relevant, and conceivably the fragment is part of a parody in which the hero is killed by eating too much fish (as at Luc. *Trag.* 261–2) rather than by the spine of a ray (an elaboration of H. *Od.* 11.34; e.g. A. fr. 275; Pearson 1917 on S. Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ).

For fishing, a vital part of the food supply in Athens as elsewhere, see Ravara Montebelli 2009; Ehrenberg 1962. 130–2, pl. XII b, c; Cloché 1931. 24–5, pls. XVII, XXXVI.

<sup>57</sup> Despite his translation, 'the threshold of a meal/the Best,' Henderson makes the further claim that 'here ἀρίστου plays on some proper name, perhaps Εὐρύτου (Jacobs, cited by Kock)'; this is a misunderstanding of what Jacobs says.

<sup>58</sup> I.e. τοῦ ἀρίστου. τᾶρίστου was suggested already by Edmonds, presumably meaning τοῦ ἀρίστου, although his same note refers also to his deletion of τ' (i.e. τε) in the following line. Against Edmonds' rewriting of the line, note the rarity of a fourth-foot anapaest of this form (six examples in Ar. [of which only two have a sense pause]; cf. White 1912 §120, iv).



1 **τῶν ζωγράφων** See introduction to Ζωγράφοι ἢ Γεωγράφοι. Note the emphatic position.

**χειουργία** A prosaic word (like other forms of the compound), used elsewhere in poetry at Ar. *Lys.* 673<sup>59</sup> (metaphorical). The abstract is used for the concrete; cf. Gildersleeve 1900–1911 §41.

2 **ἐν τοῖς πίναξιν** Edmonds translates ‘in the picture-gallery’<sup>60</sup>; a second possibility is to take ἐν τοῖς πίναξιν closely with χειουργία and translate ‘handiwork on boards.’ But examples such as Ar. *Nu.* 1065 οὐκ τῶν λύχνων; V. 789 ἐν τοῖς ἰχθύσιν (cf. MacDowell 1971 *ad loc.*); Eup. fr. 327 (further examples at *Agora* III, pp. 193–205); and Poll. 9.47 make it clear that the idiom is used exclusively for places where an item is sold. For the πίνακες themselves, see above on fr. 14; cf. Wilkins 2000. 341.

3 **αὕτη δέ** I.e. ἀλιευτική (or ἀλιέων) χειουργία (or τέχνη). Note the explicit contrast with τῶν ζωγράφων μέν. Although strict grammatical parallelism in μέν/δέ clauses is usual, it is not necessary; cf. X. *An.* 1.10.12 πεζοὶ μέν ... τῶν δὲ ἱππέων; Denniston 1954. 369 n. 1.

**ἐκ λοπάδος** A broad, shallow, lidded cooking dish with a broad flaring rim, which *Agora* XII, p. 227 aptly characterizes as ‘a flattened version of the lidded chytra’; see *Agora* XII, pp. 227–8, pl. 95; Sparkes 1962. 130–1; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 24.7 (*SH* 154); Dedousi 2006 on Men. *Sam.* 365. Here, as often, the same dish is used for cooking and serving. As often with the names of vessels, the λοπάς is named for a marine animal (here the limpet); e.g. ἐλέφας (*Damox.* fr. 1.1); ἐχῖνος (Ar. V. 1436); λεπαστή (*Antiph.* fr. 47.3). In regard to this phenomenon, *Agora* XII, p. 3 n.4 suggests that ‘the comic dramatists ... were perhaps satirizing a vogue, for few of the names seem to have had a long life’. But this is not true in the case of λοπάς, as with many other similarly named vessels, since the name is used for at least a century (e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 1034; Men. *Sam.* 365). An apparent variant of the name, λοπάδη, occurs at *Agora* XXI, B 14.

4 **ἀπὸ τοῦ ταγήνου** Apparently a heavy, flat-bottomed griddle with a low, vertical rim, although few examples survive; see *Agora* XII, p. 228, pl. 96; Sparkes 1962. 129; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 11.8 (*SH* 140). Normally

<sup>59</sup> In Dunbar’s concordance to Aristophanes, for Σ. 672 read Λ. 673.

<sup>60</sup> His note *ad loc.* makes it clear that he is thinking of a museum, not a gallery where paintings for sale are displayed. Edmonds’ citation of Polemon’s Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς Προπυλαίοις πινάκων to support his interpretation instead reinforces the fact that this area of the Propylaia had no separate name in antiquity and seems never have been referred to as anything other than simply the Propylaia; Pinakothek, the modern name for this area of the Propylaia, has no ancient basis.

used for frying, the larger varieties seem also to have been used as a container for charcoal over which a grill was placed (thus Sparkes). *Agora* XII, p. 228 n. 2 raises the problem that the τάγηνον seems too large for use in a normal household kitchen; this may be due, however, to the paucity of extant examples. A τάγηνον is distinguished from a λοπάς also at Pl. Com. fr. 189.12; Eub. fr. 108.

**ἀφανίζεται** Cf. Eub. fr. 80.7 ἄμα δὲ λαβοῦσ' ἠφάνισε πηλίκον τινά.

5 On τέχνη, see Löbl 1997–2008 I.118. For seduction as a τέχνη, cf. Lys. 1.16.

**ὦ χρηστὲ σύ** See on fr. 2.4. For expressions of this type, see Griffith 1968 (cf. Austin 1973 on *CGFRP* adesp. fr. 228.5 [= adesp. com. fr. 1053.5]), who notes that such addresses appear in comedy only in iambic trimeters and only at line end when masculine (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 433; *Ec.* 935); they are also used by social equals directed at one other.

6 **τῶν νεωτέρων** Discussing Aristopho fr. 12.10, Herwerden 1886. 183–4 adduces this passage; Antiph. fr. 193.10; Alex. fr. 183.1; and Xenarch. fr. 4.2, and describes οἱ νεώτεροι as ‘iuvenes elegantiores (i giovanetti), qui genio indulgentes convivia et lupinaria frequentarent, non tantum aetate iuniores sed imprimis spiritu, qui omnibus iis fruerentur quas iuvenili aetati congruerent;’ the ὥραϊον μειρακύλλιον in 12 who is lured by the results of the fishermen’s art reinforces Herwerden’s assertion. For οἱ νεώτεροι, see Sommerstein 2009. 193–4; Bryant 1907, esp. 74–6; cf. Plaut. *Capt.* with Brix–Niemeyer 1897 *ad loc.*

**κατακάετ(αι)** The prefix is intensive, as in καταπιεῖν (8).

7–8 **ὠθισμός ... πνιγμός** Cf. Plb. 4.58.9 ἐν τῷ περὶ τὰς πύλας ὠθισμῷ καὶ πνιγμῷ διεφθάρη.

7 **ὠθισμός** Otherwise exclusively prosaic vocabulary (although ὠθέω is widespread from Homer on) used in connection with hoplite battles (but metaphorical at Hdt. 8.78 ὠθισμός λόγων πολλός; 9.26.1); cf. Pritchett 1974–1991 IV.65–73; Hanson 1989. 28–9, 174–7; Hornblower 1991–2008 on Th. 4.96.2. Although attempts have been made to tie the word to a specific action in battle (see Hornblower for bibliography and a synopsis of the arguments), Pritchett’s simple definition ‘mass pushing at close quarters’ (65) works best and is certainly correct here. This evocation of warfare presents a vivid image of the struggle to obtain the fruits of the fisherman’s labors; cf. Eup. fr. 175 with Carey 2000. 423–4; Matro fr. 1.7, 28–32 (*SH* 534) with Olson–Sens 1999 *ad locc.*

8 **πνιγμός, ἂν μὴ ταχὺ δύνῃται καταπιεῖν** The subject of δύνῃται is ostensibly τέχνη, the fishermen’s art, but through metonymy the result of that art, i.e. fish. The phrase may refer to the struggle to get the fish and the consequences of a failure to do so (Pickard–Cambridge 1900 *ad loc.* glosses πνιγμός as ‘breathless anger’); on the other hand, it may refer to the sensation

produced by not gulping down the hot fish quickly enough (cf. 6; Eub. fr. 8.2–4 ὃς μόνος βροτῶν / δύναται καταπιεῖν ἐκ ζεόντων λοπαδίων / ἄθρους τεμαχίτας). Most likely, the line is meant to evoke both meanings at the same time; cf. Ar. *Ra.* 122 (Hp.) κρεμάσαντι στυτόν. (Δι.) παῦε, πνιγερὰν λέγεις with Σ<sup>RVEΘ</sup> and Kock 1898 *ad loc.* and the similar use of ἀγχόνῃ (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 125; E. *Heracl.* 246 with Wilkins 1993 *ad loc.*).

**9 ἀλλ(ὰ) ... γάρ** Kassel–Austin compare fr. 53.3 and 56.1 for the postponement of γάρ; it is better to take the two particles together (Denniston 1954. 101 notes that ἀλλὰ γάρ predominates in prose, just as ἀλλὰ ... γάρ does in poetry). Denniston 1954. 100–1 (cf. Wilamowitz 1895 on E. *HF* 138) glosses the phrase ‘but, as a matter of fact’ and notes that it marks a transition from a subsidiary to a decisive point.

**τὰς συνουσίας** Cf. Alex. fr. 160.1 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*

**10 εὖοψος ἀγορά** For the phrase, cf. Timocl. fr. 11.1 ἀγορὰν ἰδεῖν εὖοψον; Crit. fr. 3.7. As often, ὄψον refers primarily to fish; cf. on fr. 40.6; Gow 1965 on Macho 28; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 39. The agora mentioned is almost certainly not the well-known civic centre of Athens, but either a separate market or area devoted to the sale of fish or, more likely, a generic market-place. Like most goods and services for sale in Athens, fish seem to have had one or more areas specifically devoted to them (Thphr. *Char.* 6.9 [*Agora* III, p. 196, #647] distinguishes between τὰ ἰχθυοπώλια and τὰ ταριχοπώλια). For the fish markets in particular, see *Agora* III, pp. 195–6; for the various other markets, pp. 193–206 (add. *SEG* XXVI 72.18–23; cf. on 2 ἐν τοῖς πίναξι). Judeich 1931. 359 believed that a fishmarket was near the Stoa Poikile (cf. Alciph. 1.3.2), although this view is rejected, probably correctly, at *Agora* III, p. 195 (on #640). As one would expect, given that such markets probably did not consist of permanent structures, there is no concrete evidence for any exact locations, but markets probably were in central places (and almost certainly in Athens rather than Piraeus).

**τίς ... βροτῶν** An almost exclusively poetic formulation attested already in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 1.142; *Od.* 1.282); elsewhere in comedy only at Ar. fr. 718 (but e.g. S. *OT* 437; E. *Hel.* 656; *HF* 1 [cf. Bond 1981 *ad loc.*]).

**συνδαιπνεῖ** Elsewhere, the verb means simply ‘to dine together (with)’; e.g. Epich. fr. 32.1 συνδαιπνέων τῷ λῶντι; Pl. *Smp.* 174e εἰς καλὸν ἤκεις ὅπως συνδαιπνήσης; X. *Cyr.* 4.5.9; Lys. 1.22. Although in the other occurrences of the word the action is seen from the point of view of the guest, here it must be from that of the host, since (as the remaining lines make clear) the great benefit of the fisherman’s art is the ability to attract other people.

**11 φρυκτούς** Small-fry, generally identified with ἐπανθρακίδες; cf. Hsch. φ 932 φρυκτά· ξηρὰ ἰχθύδια εὐτελῆ; Alex. fr. 159.3 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Thompson 1947. 64 s. v. ἐπανθρακίδες; Strömberg 1943. 89.

**κορακίνους ὠνίους** For the κορακῖνος, see on fr. 28.1. ὠνίους echoes εὖοψος ἀγορά from 10.

**12 μαινίδ(α)** A small, cheap fish, similar or identical to the σμαρίς (Speusipp. ap. Ath. 6.313a; Hsch. σ 1229); see Thompson 1947. 153–5; Michalampaki 1984. 94–5.

**ῥαῖον δὲ μαιρακύλλιον** A young boy between childhood and adulthood, but here probably in his late teens (note ῥαῖον ‘in the bloom of youth, seasonable,’ i. e. for sexual conquest; cf. Ar. Av. 138; Schmidt 1876–1886 IV.29; Olson-Sens 2000 on Arcestr. fr. 39.9–10 [SH 169]); for the fluidity of this and related words, see Gomme–Sandbach 1973 on Men. Dysc. 27. Although generally comic vocabulary (Ar. Ra. 89; Epicr. fr. 5.3; Eub. fr. 75.3; Men. Epitr. 169; adesp. com. fr. 254), μαιρακύλλιον occurs also at D. 21.78; 23.163; see also Bryant 1907. For diminutives in -ύλλιον, see Leumann 1953. 214–16; Neil on Ar. Eq. 224.

**12–17** Cf. Lynceus of Samos ap. Ath. 7.295a–b καὶ γὰρ τὸν Θησέα, φησί, γεγονότα καλὸν ὑπολαμβάνω τοῦ Τληπολέμου τὸν ἰχθὺν αὐτῷ παρασχόντος παρῆσχηκέναι.

**13–15** The speaker returns to his opening theme, the supremacy of the art of fishing, but now makes clear that its greatest benefit in his eyes is the ability to attract potential lovers.

**13–14 ποίαις ἐπωδαῖς ἢ λόγοις ἀλίσκεται / τίσιν** For the pursuit of lovers, primarily boys, see Dover 1978. 81–96; for the treatment of such pursuits and their consummation in comedy, 135–53.

ἐπωδαί are charms, sometimes with the connotation of something slightly magical; cf. S. OC 1194 with Jebb 1887 *ad loc.*; Pl. Phd. 77e with Burnet 1911 *ad loc.* Here something like ‘blandishments’ is probably meant. The word is attested nowhere else in comedy (although cf. ἐπαοιδή at Ar. fr. 29), but is not uncommon in tragedy and prose.

By λόγοις τίσιν are meant whatever the pursuer might say to his potential lover, i. e. both entreaties and arguments for acceptance of him; cf. Pl. Smp. 182a–b. Older youths and men were sometimes prohibited from speaking to or otherwise coming into contact with youths in unsupervised circumstances, for fear of what might happen; e. g. Aeschin. 1.11–12; Pl. Smp. 183c; SEG XLIII 381B.13–15 (early second century BC); cf. Ar. Av. 137–42 with Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.* For the postponement of τίσιν, cf. Thomson 1939.

For ἀλίσκομαι used of a potential lover being ‘caught,’ cf. Aeschin. 1.195; Pl. *Smp.* 184a; Dover 1978. 87–8. For the pursuit and ‘capture’ of a lover generally, see Dover 1978. 81–96.

**14 φράσσον γάρ** Cf. Antiph. fr. 49.1 (same metrical position; seemingly also a rhetorical question); Cratin. fr. 40; Amphis fr. 36.1; Nicostr. fr. 4.1 (φράζε).

**15 δαμάζεται** Cf. on fr. 6.2 and on χειρουμένη (16).

**16** Perhaps a mock-tragic line; cf. A. *Ch.* 694 τόξοις πρόσωθεν εὐσκόποις χειρουμένη.

**ἐφθοῖς προσώποις ἰχθύων** Cf. on fr. 31.2. Bers 1974. 44 treats ἐφθοῖς προσώποις ἰχθύων as an example of enallage, but this understanding of the phrase is not necessary; fr. 31.1–2 τμητὸν μέγα / γλαύκου πρόσωπον is similar.

**χειρουμένη** Normally in the middle (contrast Ar. V. 443), the verb is commonly used of physical assaults and capturing both in the tragedians (normally of persons; e.g. A. *Ch.* 694; S. *OC* 903; *Ph.* 92; E. *El.* 1168; *IT* 359) and the historians (normally of states or armies; e.g. Hdt. 1.169.2; 4.103.3; Th. 1.122.2; 3.11.3; X. *HG* 2.4.26; Ages. 1.20), although it need not always have a violent connotation (e.g. Men. fr. 821). Here it does not refer to a physical attack, but continues the undercurrent of violence begun with ἀλίσκεται (13), δαμάζεται (15), and possibly ὠθισμός (7) and πνιγμός (8).

**17–18** These two lines involve some sort of word-play, conceivably obscene, but 17 is difficult to make sense of as it stands, even if the precise corruption cannot be pinpointed. Even if the wording remains uncertain, the sense may have been along the lines of ‘driving the (best, choicest?) morsels past the gates (of the mouth/body?), even a free-loading nature (which otherwise would have kept grabbing for more?) is driven to capitulate’; this would thus be a high-flown description that continues the overtones of martial violence in the previous couplet.

**18 ἀσύμβολον κλίνειν τ’ ἀναγκάζει φύσιν** For ἀσύμβολον, see on fr. 10.2. κλίνειν evokes a symposiastic context, but is perhaps used in the martial sense ‘make (a foe) give way’, as at e.g. H. *Il.* 5.37.

The various interpretations of the line are all problematic. ‘And makes it feast Dame Nature as a guest’ (thus Edmonds); in addition to the obscure referent of ‘it’, ἀσύμβολον is not a complimentary term and does not mean ‘guest’. Henderson 1991. 5 (cf. §451, where his translation of ἀσύμβολον has the same failing as Edmonds’) believes that φύσις refers to the genitals<sup>61</sup> (cf.

<sup>61</sup> His assertion of the same meaning at Alex. 242.8, where he echoes Edmonds *ad loc.*, is probably equally mistaken.

Telò 2005). It is unclear what this might mean, and Henderson offers little in the way of help.

## fr. 35 K.-A. (34 K.)

ὕμεις γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἀεὶ χλευάζετ', οἷδ' ἀκριβῶς.  
 ἂν μὲν γὰρ ἢ τις εὐπρεπής, Ἰερὸν Γάμιον καλεῖτε·  
 ἔαν δὲ μικρὸν παντελῶς ἀνθρώπιον, Σταλαγμόν.  
 λαμπρός τις ἐξελήλυθ' <— ≡> Ὀλολυσ οὗτός ἐστι·  
 5 λιπαρὸς περιπατεῖ Δημοκλῆς, Ζωμὸς κατωνόμασται·  
 χαίρει τις αὐχμῶν ἢ ῥυπῶν, Κονιορτὸς ἀναπέφηνεν·  
 ὀπισθεν ἀκολουθεῖ κόλαξ τῷ, Λέμβος ἐπικέκληται·  
 τὰ πόλλ' ἄδειπνος περιπατεῖ, Κεστρίνός ἐστι Νήστις.  
 εἰς τοὺς καλοὺς δ' ἂν τις βλέπη, καινὸς Θεατροποιός·  
 10 ὑφείλετ' ἄρνα ποιμένος παίζων, Ἀτρεὺς ἐκλήθη·  
 ἔαν δὲ κριόν, Φρίξος· ἂν δὲ κωδάριον, Ἰάσων.

habent ACE (1–11; Ath. 6.242d–f); Eust. *Od.* 1462.60 (1, 3, 5–8, 10–11); 1761.48 (7); ACE (8; Ath. 7.307e–f)

2 ἂν Eust.: ἔαν ACE 2–3 contraxit Eust. ἂν μὲν γὰρ ἢ τι σμικρόν 4 <— ≡>] εὐθὺς Schweighäuser: fort. αὐδὴν: ὑμῖν Meineke: ὄψιν Richards 7 τῷ CE: τῷ A, Eust. 9 καινὸς θεατροποιός ACE: καπνὸς θεατροποιός Schweighäuser: παῖδας, θεατροπίτης Kock 11 ἂν Porson: ἔαν ACE, Eust. κωδάριον ACE, Eust.: corr. K-A

For you always mock one another, I know well.  
 For if someone is attractive, you call him Sacred Marriage;  
 and if he is an exceedingly small fellow, Drop.  
 Someone has turned out comely [---], this one is Womanish;  
 5 Democles walks about (over-)oiled, he has the name Soup;  
 someone delights in being unanointed or dirty, he is clearly Dustcloud;  
 a flatterer follows behind someone, he is called Skiff;  
 whoever walks around generally dinnerless, is Starving Mullet.  
 If someone stares at handsome boys, a new Theatre-maker;  
 10 if he took a shepherd's lamb as a joke, he was dubbed Atreus;  
 if a ram, Phrixos; and if a fleece, Jason

Ath. 6.242d–f

τῶν δὲ τοιούτων ἐπιθέτων ἃ ἐπὶ χλεύῃ Ἀθηναῖοι παίζοντες ἔλεγον μνημονεύει Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Ὀδυσσεὶ οὕτως. —

Of such nicknames, which the Athenians used to say in jest, Anaxandrides in *Odysseus* makes mention as follows: —

[8] Ath. 7.307e–f

Ἀναξανδρίδης Ὀδυσσεῖ (Ὀδ. om. CE). —

Anaxandrides in *Odysseus*: —

**Metre** Iambic tetrameter catalectic.

— — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 5 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 10 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —

Recitative iambic tetrameter catalectic is commonly used in hortatory passages; see White 1912 §168 (§188 for examples from poets other than Aristophanes). Here the relatively high proportion of resolved feet suggests a closer affinity with the tetrameter White §173 characterizes as melodramatic, which is found in debates. In Aristophanes, White §179 notes, ‘the chief pause is generally coincident with the close of the first colon,’ i. e. after the second metron; the same is true here, in strong contrast to the apparent practice of Menander. On the other hand, the relatively high degree of resolution seems closer to Menander’s practice. For discussion of Menander’s use of the metre, see Handley 1965. 61–2 and on 880–958 (p. 284 under (ii)).

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 111–12; Grotius 1623. 640–1, 979; Toup 1775. 51; Tyrwhitt ap. Toup 1790 IV.499–500; Porson 1812. 81; Meineke 1840 III.177–9; Bothe 1944. 36–7; Meineke 1847. 582; Bothe 1855. 424–5; Meineke 1857 V.clxxviii, 81; Kock 1884 II.148–9; Blaydes 1890a. 82; Blümner 1891. 83–4, 114–15; Herwerden 1893. 158; Blaydes 1896. 123, 333; Herwerden 1896. 398–400; Pickard-Cambridge 1900. 54–5, 186; Herwerden 1903. 98; Richards 1907. 160 (= 1909. 80); Edmonds 1959 II.58–61; Perusino 1968. 125–8, 145; Webster 1970. 40; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.255; Wilkins 2000. 80 n. 114; Olson 2007. J13; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 255–6; Rusten 2011. 465



**Citation context** Although the fragment is quoted by Athenaeus in his section on parasites (6.234c–48c), the primary reason for the citation is the occurrence of a nickname in Alex. fr. 238, which immediately precedes. For that reason, there is no need to assume that all the figures mentioned are parasites, and Gulick's over-translation ('epithets of this kind, applied to parasites by Athenians in derisive jest...') is inappropriate. Further, while some lines (e.g. 7, 8) might easily be said of a parasite, others (e.g. 2, 9) are decidedly out of keeping with the usual depiction of them. For speculation on the speaker and addressee of these lines, see on 1.

**Text** Although the sense of 4 seems complete, the line is metrically deficient, lacking the final syllable of one metron and the first syllable of the next; the gap could fall after either τις or, more likely, ἐξελήλυθ'. The best suggestion is Schweighäuser's εὐθύς (with a comma after ἐξελήλυθ'), which could have resulted from a sort of haplography; in support, cf. Men. *Dysc.* 494 with Handley 1965 *ad loc.* An alternative is an accusative of specification modifying λαμπρός, e.g. εἶδος *vel sim.* or, better, αὐδήν. The voice is often described as λαμπρός (cf. LSJ s. v. I.2), although the word usually refers to its clarity and does not seem to be necessarily feminine in character (but cf. Arist. *HA* 544b32–545a22 for the differences between the voices of animals of either sex). αὐδή occurs in comedy only at Ar. *Av.* 241 (the call of the hoopoe) but does provide an understandable connection with Ὀλολυσ (see below). Also possible, if less likely, is an interjection such as οἶδ' εὖ γ', although such a parenthetical remark does not occur elsewhere in the body of this passage (but cf. 1).

In 9, Schweighäuser's καπνός fits well with Aristopho fr. 5.7, where someone receives this nickname for τοὺς καλοὺς πειρᾶν, but less well with Eup. fr. 135, where Theogenes is called καπνός because πολλὰ ὑπισχνόμενος οὐδὲν ἐτέλει, and in any case is difficult together with Θεατροποιός.

**Interpretation** This is one of the longest extended catalogues of Attic nicknames, but such humor is common (e.g. fr. 46; Ar. *Av.* 1291–8; Antiph. fr. 173; 193.10–11; Aristopho fr. 5; Alex. fr. 183.1–2; Timocl. fr. 6.13–16; cf. Men. *Dysc.* 493–7; Wilkins 2000. 80–1). For nicknames in general, see Bechtel 1898; Grasberger 1883, with addenda in 1888. 309–38.

Most similar humor consists of an isolated joke or, in the case of Ar. *Av.* 1291–8, a catalogue of variations on a single theme (nicknames derived from birds) with little syntactic variation. This passage, by contrast, offers a catalogue of thematic groups combined with syntactic variety. 2–4 comment on physical appearance, and the first and third examples, referring to attractiveness, unite the group. A pair of opposite extremes follows, namely the excessive or inadequate use of oil. The next three lines, 7–9, describe various



disreputable character-types, as do 10–11, although using examples based on mythology (cf. *ad loc.* for the connections between the stories). The first five examples can also be viewed as commenting on attractiveness or lack thereof, and the final six as referring to relationships among individuals, primarily in terms of getting something from someone. In contrast to these divisions, the passage opens and closes with groups of conditional statements, while the central part consists of direct statements, although tantamount to implied conditions. The passage concludes by speeding up, collapsing three examples into two lines.<sup>62</sup>

The last three nicknames seem to derive from single incidents and thus are isolated jests. The rest, however, refer either to physical appearance or to what seems to be a repeated pattern of behaviour, and are therefore presumably more or less permanent nicknames; the use of the perfect (see below on 5–7) supports this notion.

1 Athenaeus' introductory sentence implies that ὅμεις refers to the Athenians; if so, it is plausibly spoken by Odysseus himself. For possible ramifications of this scenario, see the Introductions to this play and to Anaxandrides.

**χλευάζετ(ε)** The verb (and related words) does not appear much before the fourth century (first attested at Ar. *Ra.* 376), but is common thereafter (elsewhere in the fourth century at Epicr. fr. 10.30; D. 7.7; 19.23; [D.] 47.34; [Pl.] *Err.* 397d; Arist. *Rh.* 1379a29; Men. *Epitr.* 432; cf. D. 18.85 with Wankel 1976 *ad loc.*).<sup>63</sup> Given its absence from serious poetry, it is probably colloquial.

**οἶδ' ἀκριβῶς** The phrase or variations of it is not uncommon in comedy (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 100; Av. 156; Men. *Epitr.* 447; *Pk.* 495; Philem. fr. 9.1; Nicom. Com. fr. 1.4), although this is the only extant example between Aristophanes and the late fourth century.

2 **εὐπρεπής** Often used of physical beauty, normally that of women or young men (and thus sex-objects); e.g. Ar. *Th.* 192 (Agathon), 233 (the Relative disguised as a woman); *Ec.* 427 (Praxagora disguised as a man), 701 (boys); Xenarch. fr. 4.3 (boys).

<sup>62</sup> This structural technique is analogous to that employed by Aristophanes when he begins a catalogue with full examples and then proceeds with the rest in an abbreviated form; cf. Spyropoulos 1974. 126–7.

<sup>63</sup> The one exception is χλεύη at *h.Cer.* 202 (cf. Richardson 1974 *ad loc.*), where the word is connected with the actions of Iambe; note the similar context of χλευάζω at Ar. *Ra.* 376 (cf. Richardson 1974 on *h.Cer.* 192–211 [esp. pp. 214–15]). This suggests that the word may have originated in a religious context. χλεύη does not occur again until Aeschro *AP* 7.345.4 (*HE* 4; early fourth century?) and thereafter only sporadically (e.g. A.R. 1726). See also Schmidt 1876–1886 III.460–2.

**Ἱερὸν Γάμον** Following Meineke (cf. Blümner 1891. 114–15), this phrase has often been taken as a reference to a festival celebrating or imitating the marriage of Zeus and Hera (cf. Phot. ι 57 Ἱερὸν γάμον· Ἀθηναῖοι ἐορτὴν Διὸς ἄγουσι καὶ Ἥρας, Ἱερὸν γάμον καλοῦντες; Hsch. ι 322; *EM* p. 468.56; Men. fr. 225; Klinz 1933. 97); Deubner 1932. 177–8 briefly discusses the evidence and places the festival on 24 Gamelion.<sup>64</sup> The Ἱερὸς γάμος may have been part of another festival, however, rather than comprising its own; one possibility is the marriage of Dionysus and the wife of the archon basileus, which took place on the second day of the Anthesteria (cf. [D.] 59.73, 74–8 with Kapparis 1999 *ad loc.*; Hamilton 1992. 53–6). Although Athenaeus seems to suggest a specifically Athenian context for the fragment, the term itself could seemingly refer to an event encompassed by a wide variety of festivals or celebrations held throughout Greece and beyond; cf. Klinz 1933; Klinz 1935; Nilsson 1967–1974 I.120–2; Cremer 1982. In any event, the point of the nickname is that the namer finds the person so described wildly attractive and sexually appealing.

**3 ἀνθρώπιον** The word generally indicates scorn or contempt (e.g. E. *Cyc.* 185 with Seaford 1984 *ad loc.*; D. 18.242 with Wankel 1976 *ad loc.*; X. *Mem.* 2.3.16; *Cyr.* 5.1.14; contrast Ar. *Pax* 263 with Olson 1998 *ad loc.*). Here it may have a touch of scorn, but for the most part it simply emphasizes further the man's tiny stature (already emphasized by παντελῶς).

**Σταλαγμόν** A σταλαγμός is a drop (e.g. A. *Th.* 61 [foam from a horse's mouth]; S. fr. 370.2 [myrrh]; E. *Ion* 351 [blood]), but the word can be used metaphorically for a tiny amount of anything (Ar. *Ach.* 1033 σταλαγμόν εἰρήνης [although peace is actually represented here by wine]; Diog. Sinop. *TGrF* 88 F 2.1 τύχης σταλαγμόν [cf. Snell 1986 *ad loc.* for further occurrences of this phrase]); cf. Schmidt 1876–1886 II.267. *Stalagmos* is the name of a slave in Plaut. *Capt.* and the title of a play by Naevius, presumably named for an eponymous character (cf. Schmidt 2002. 207). For this and similar names, see Bechtel 1898. 11–12; Fick–Bechtel 1894. 330.

**4–10** For the absence of εἰ *vel sim.*, cf. Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.233–4; van Leeuwen 1902a on Ar. *Av.* 78; Handley 1965 on Men. *Dysc.* 57ff. (p. 141 under (iii)) and 493–7.

**4 λαμπρός** Why someone who is λαμπρός should be called effeminate (cf. on Ὀλολυσ) is unclear. If a man has retained a youthful look into adulthood, he could rightly be so called (e.g. Agathon at Ar. *Th.* 191–2; cf. on fr. 9.6 for the word used of physical attractiveness). But λαμπρός is not so unequivocal a word that it seems capable of bearing such a meaning without further

<sup>64</sup> Mikalson 1975. 105 reports no evidence for events, civil or sacred, on 24 Gamelion.

qualification, so the word that has fallen out of the line may have specified how the person being described was λαμπρός.

**ἐξελήλυθ(ε)** The use of the perfect implies a permanent state, so the sense must be ‘turned out (to be)’; cf. S. *OT* 1011 with Kamerbeek 1967 *ad loc.*; Diph. fr. 68; Ar. *Eq.* 430.

**Ὀλολος** The word occurs elsewhere only at Theopomp. Com. fr. 62 and Men. fr. 109 (although that fragment, composed of two entries from Photius, seemingly refers to two different occurrences). Photius, the source for the fragments, glosses the word differently each time; ο 243 ὅλολυν· Μένανδρος τὸν γυναικῶδη καὶ κατάρθεον καὶ βάκηλον; ο 245 ὀλόλ' τοῦτος<sup>65</sup> τοὺς δεισιδαίμονας ἐκάλουν οἰωνιζόμενοι. Μένανδρος Δεισιδαίμονι. Despite the difference in the glosses, the word (< ὀλολύζω (see Frisk 1954–1972 s. v.) ‘cry aloud’, normally used of women, often when they cry out to the gods) must mean something like ‘womanish’ or ‘effeminate’ (cf. Schmidt 1876–1886 III.396); the two entries in Photius show that it could refer to any number of characteristics of women, depending on context.

5–7 For the parataxis, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 103.7–13, 16–20. For the use of the perfect in the apodosis in contrast to 2–4 above and 8–10 below, see Goodwin 1890 §49; Rijksbaron 1984 §10.1; cf. Timocl. fr. 6.13–16 with Kock 1884 II *ad loc.*

5 **λιπαρός ... Δημοκλῆς** λιπαρός describes someone’s appearance after being oiled; cf. esp. Ar. *Pl.* 615–16 λουσάμενος / λιπαρός χωρῶν ἐκ βαλανείου; Schmidt 1876–1886 IV.677–8. Here the context requires that the word refer to excessive use of oil. Note the contrast with the following line.

**περιπατεῖ** The verb here need mean no more than ‘walk about’ (cf. Men. *Sam.* 607 μέλας περιπατεῖ; Alex. fr. 164.3), although Hunter 1979. 183 cites it as an example of the word implying ‘a degeneracy of sorts, being used to describe the activities of drunkards, pimps, and the like’ (e.g. Alex. fr. 91.1; Dromo fr. 1.4). For its use in later comedy generally, see Hunter 1979. 182–4.

Democles (*PA* 3485; *PAA* 315565; *LGP*N II s. v. 7) is otherwise unknown; since *LGP*N II and *FRA* together list over 40 Athenians and foreigners by this name resident in Athens in the fourth century, an attempt to identify him with a specific known historical figure stands little chance of success. Schweighäuser identified the man mentioned here with the parasite Democles (*PAA* 315570; *LGP*N II s. v. 67) known only from Hegesand. *FHG* 4.419 fr. 28, who reports that he was a contemporary of Metaneira (for her dates, see

<sup>65</sup> Printed by Kock (fr. 112), for example, as ὀλόλους, following the mss.; hence separate entries in LSJ for ὀλολος and ὀλολοι. For the correct spelling ὀλόλυας, cf. Hdn. 2.938.13–17.

Kapparis 1999 on [D.] 59.19) and was nicknamed Λαγυνίων.<sup>66</sup> Despite the fact that the two men seem to be more or less contemporary and to have been well-known enough in Athens to have received nicknames, albeit different ones, there is little reason to identify them. Schweighäuser suggested a reference to the Democles mentioned at Timae. *FGrHist* 566 F 32 as a κόλαξ of Dionysius II; this is unlikely, given that there is no evidence that that man ever left Sicily or would have been known in Athens.

**Ζωμός** The generic name for broth made from boiling meat, and often described as black (μέλας) because of the high blood content. The word can refer to the peculiarly Spartan broth (e.g. Antiph. fr. 46.4; Plu. *Lyc.* 12; *Mor.* 236f; cf. Weber 1887. 9), but broth was a common part of Attic fare as well (e.g. fr. 42.13, 40; Metag. fr. 18; Nicostr. Com. fr. 16; Alex. fr. 168); for a general discussion, see Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.94 (*SH* 534).

The two possibilities for the point of comparison between Democles' excessive use of oil and ζωμός are that he douses himself to such an extent that he drips, or that his appearance has a sheen similar to that of the bloody, greasy soup.<sup>67</sup> The speaker of Aristopho fr. 5 seems also to be called Ζωμός, although the point there is obscure; cf. also Bechtel 1898. 76.

**6 ἀύχμῶν** 'Dry', i.e. unanointed with oil; cf. Denniston 1939 on E. *El.* 239. Note the use of the word at Ar. *Nu.* 442 (what Strepsiades will be like at the Phrontisterion; cf. 836), 920 (Just Argument as described by Unjust Argument); Thphr. *Char.* 26.5 (a poor commoner); cf. ἀύχηροκόμας at fr. 42.9. Thus this line, when compared with the previous one, offers the opposite extreme.

Both ἀύχμέω and ἀύχμάω are apparently acceptable forms of the verb. The dictum at Phryn. *PS* p. 10.4–6 that the participle derives from ἀύχμάω but

<sup>66</sup> Some doubt must be attached to this story, at least regarding the nickname, since the vessel known as a *lagynos* (the modern identification is almost certainly correct) does not seem to have been produced before the third century, while this anecdote must have arisen in the early part of the fourth century. Note, however, that the word λάγυνος does occur earlier (esp. Stesich. *PMG* 181 τριλάγυνον) than the appearance of the vessel and so must have had a wider use; for discussion and bibliography, see *Agora* XXIX, p. 226; Amyx 1958. 210–11. Still, the earliest occurrences suggest that the word was used originally for the name of measurement (= one Attic *chous*) and thus may be thought inappropriate for a nickname (although cf. English 'half-pint'). Alternatively, if the two men are to be identified, the nickname Λαγυνίων could derive from the extravagant amount of oil he used. Against the idea that it might be inappropriate for a nickname, cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 77–81.

<sup>67</sup> If the latter, it is perhaps likely that boiling the meat caused a fatty surface on the soup and that this glistening gave rise to the comparison; thus Blümner 1891. 83–4.

the other forms from ἀύχμέω is belied by Phryn. Com. fr. 81 ἀύχμῶς (cited at Poll. 2.33); which form of the verb is represented here is impossible to know.

**ῥυπῶν** Cf. Ar. Av. 1282 (Laconizers also emulating Socrates); Lys. 279 (Laconizer); Aristopho fr. 9.2 (followers of Pythagoras); Schmidt 1876–1886 II.207. For bathing (or lack thereof), cf. Dunbar 1995 on Ar. Av. 132. For all aspects of Greek bathing, Ginouvès 1962; Yegül 1992. 6–29; for a general introduction, Weber 1996. The meaning of the line hinges on the contrast between this man, who is (habitually?) dirty, and the normal Athenian, who bathed on a more or less regular basis.

**Κονιορτός ἀναπέφηνεν** Cf. Aristopho fr. 10.7–8 ἐλαίῳ μῆτε χρῆσθαι μῆθ' ὀρᾶν / κονιορτός. At D. 21.103, 139 a certain Euktemon of Lousia (PA 5800; PAA 438275; probably the same as PA 5785; PAA 438280; cf. Sundwall 1909–1910. 79) is referred to as ὁ κονιορτός; Webster 1970. 40 suggests that this man is meant here. Certainly, if Euktemon's nickname was as well-known as Demosthenes' off-hand use of it suggests, this line might be a reference to him, although note that D. 21 (347/6 BC) dates to a bare minimum of ten years after Anaxandrides' comedy. Since the only other information known about Euktemon is that he seems to have been ναοποιός at Delphi from 346–337 BC, it is impossible to tell how much he was in the public eye when the play was performed, and Webster's conjecture is thus no more than a guess.

**7 ὄπισθεν ἀκολουθεῖ** I.e. is in constant attendance, like e.g. the flatterer in Thphr. Char. 2, or perhaps is always running after; the reference is not to be taken literally as an indication of social hierarchy. Following behind is the proper place for a slave; cf. Thphr. Char. 18.8 with Diggle 2004 *ad loc.* for further examples.

**κόλαξ** At least in this period, the distinction between κόλαξ and παράσιτος seems to be a fluid one, with the terms at times clearly distinguishable, and at other times differing little; cf. Brown 1992. 98–103; Nesselrath 1985. 88–121; 1990. 309–17; Ribbeck 1883; contrast Arnott 1996's introduction to Alex. Παράσιτος. For an extended description of the activities of the κόλαξ, cf. Eup. fr. 172 (from Κόλακες); Thphr. Char. with Diggle *ad loc.* Since this line seems to form a pair with 8 (cf. the pairing of 5–6), the individual referred to is probably a parasite who has the ability to insinuate his way into dinner.

**Λέμβος** For the word, see on fr. 12. For the name, cf. Bechtel 1898. 68; the name of the historian Heraclides Lembus (cf. Lucas 1940); a hetaira named Λέμβιον at Rufin. 17.1;<sup>68</sup> and the character Scapha in Plaut. *Most.*

<sup>68</sup> Page *ad loc.* reports difficulty finding this epigram in Jacobs' first edition, where it is listed instead as Nicarchus iii; this error has mutated into Nearch. iii at Pape-Benseler 1884 s. v. Λέμβιον.

8 The juxtaposition of a constantly hungry man with the κόλαξ in 7 might suggest that a parasite or flatterer is meant here as well; note also the apparent application of the phrase κεστρεὺς νῆστις to a parasite at Amips. fr. 1 (see below). The implication could be that he is unsuccessful in attempts to freeload, but more likely it refers to the stereotype that such people were never satisfied.

**τὰ πόλλ(α)** Cf. Eup. fr. 172.4; Men. *Dysc.* 334 with Gomme–Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.*; Alex. fr. 189 ἐπὶ τὰ πολλά with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* At Dionys. Com. fr. 2.26 the phrase is probably not adverbial.

**ᾄδειπνος** The adjective is more common than LSJ's citation of only Hp. *Aph.* 5.41 and X. *An.* 4.5.21 suggests (e.g. Eup. fr. 347; Antiph. fr. 197.3; Alex. fr. 243.4; Men. *Asp.* 232). The word is not elsewhere used of parasites (if that is the case here).

**Κεστρινός ... Νήστις** The phrase or a variation on it became a commonplace for indicating someone who was starving; Ath. 7.307c–8b lists over a dozen occurrences (e.g. Ar. fr. 159; Pl. Com. fr. 28; Archipp. fr. 12; Antiph. fr. 136; Eub. 68; adesp. com. fr. 112). For further references, bibliography, and discussion, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 258 (cf. also Ribbeck 1883. 71). Arnott is perhaps overly optimistic in attributing the application in many of these fragments to parasites (Hunter 1983 on Eub. fr. 68 is rightly more cautious), although Amips. fr. 1 does seem to refer to a parasite, like this fragment.

κεστρινός occurs only here and in Hyp. fr. 188; elsewhere the normal word κεστρεὺς is used.<sup>69</sup> Harp. p. 175.12–13 Dindorf (κ 45 Keaney) (the source for Hyp. fr. 188) offers the not very useful comment that ἐπισκεπτέον δὲ εἰ διαφέρει τι κεστρέως; for the two forms, see Frisk 1954–1972 and Chantraine 1968–1980 s.v. κεντέω; Strömberg 1943. 35; Perpillou 1973 §326. For the fish itself, see Thompson 1947. 108–9 (cf. 110–12 [s.v. κεφαλος]; 176 [s.v. νῆστις]); Olson–Sens 2000 on Arcestr. fr. 43.1 (*SH* 174); Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.59 (*SH* 534); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 258.

9 εἰς τοὺς καλοὺς δ' ἄν τις βλέπη Cf. on fr. 34.12, 13–14.

**καινός Θεατροποιός** Although the line is not manifestly corrupt, the sense is obscure, and θεατροποιός does not appear elsewhere; Meineke *ad loc.* sums up the situation well: 'de sequenti θεατροποιός nihil dum coniecturae vel interpretationis allatum est.' The humor in the nickname may lie in a pun based on the idea of seeing in βλέπη and the derivation of Θεατροποιός from

<sup>69</sup> The plural is used with the meaning τὰ τομῖα καὶ τεμάχη τῶν ἰχθύων at *AB* 1.271.20 (whence *EM* p. 506.45; cf. Phot. κ 627) and is apparently the name of a Thesprotian tribe at Rhian. fr. 34 (cf. also Κεστρίνη, an area of Elis). The diminutive κεστρινίσκος occurs at Clearch. fr. 101.

θεάομαι, although the exact point is unclear; or this may be topical humor now lost to us. One obvious possibility would seem to be a reference to one of the men responsible for the reconstruction of the Theatre of Dionysus who also had a reputation as a pederast, but the work on the Theatre is probably too late (*ca.* 350 BC; see Papastamati-von Moock 2014) for Anaxandrides' play (see Introduction above). Although the work is traditionally attributed to Lycurgus, it is now clear that his achievement was in fact the completion of a project begun earlier by others; see Papastamati-von Moock 2014; Csapo–Wilson 2014, esp. 395–7; Pickard-Cambridge 1946. 136–7. Lycurgus himself is clearly too late to be mocked by Anaxandrides, but the same also seems true of his predecessors, notably Eubulus. The word could refer to some official connected with the administration of the Theatre or performances in it, e.g. the office of ἀρχιτέκτων (cf. Csapo 2007; Pickard-Cambridge 1968. 46–7, 266), but these may well also be too late.

For the force of καινός, see Headlam–Knox 1922 on Herod. 4.57; Nock 1948. 35–6 with n. 73 (= 1972. 149).

**10–11** Conceivably, the passage could continue in the same vein beyond these lines, but the point has been made at length and the tripartite structure of these verses has the feel of a culmination; see Introduction to this fragment.

All three stories mentioned in these lines were handled to a greater or lesser degree by Euripides and occur in fourth-century tragedy as well (e.g. *Atreus*: Diogenes Sinopensis; *Thyestes*: Apollodorus; Chaeremon; Diogenes Sinopensis; *Phrixus*: Timocles; *Jason*: Antiphon; *Medea*: Dicaeogenes; Carcinus II; Diogenes Sinopensis).

**10 ὑφείλετ' ἄρνα ποιμένος παίζων** Since all the other people described in this fragment represent plausible, whether or not historically accurate, situations, there is no reason to think that that is not the case here as well, despite the lack of parallels. For theft and its consequences in Athens, see Cohen 1983; for the social significance of stealing sheep in modern Crete (perhaps of some relevance to classical Greece as well), see Herzfeld 1985. But note that 10–11 conclude by extending further and further into mythology and thus may be meant to give an absurd or fantastic ending to this passage.

**Ἄτρεὺς ἐκλήθη** For the story of Atreus, Thyestes and the golden lamb, see Robert 1920. 294–7; *LIMC* III.1.17–18; as noted by Meineke, however, one would expect Thyestes here instead of Atreus. Rather than evidence for an otherwise unknown variant of the story, the mention of Atreus is best taken as simply the name that most readily springs to mind in connection with the story; cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 869; Fraenkel 1922. 82; Tierney 1944/1945. 28.

The switch to the aorist seems odd, but see on 5–7.



**11 ἔαν δὲ κριόν, Φριξος** For the story of Phrixos and his sister Helle and their escape on the back of a golden ram, see *LIMC* VII.1.398–404. The reference to the golden lamb of Atreus in the previous line naturally suggests the golden ram of Phrixos, which in turn leads logically to the golden fleece.

**ἄν δὲ κφδάριον, Ἰάσων** For Jason and his journey to Colchis to obtain the golden fleece, see *LIMC* V.1.629–38. The fleece taken by Jason was in fact that of the ram ridden by Phrixos, so this reference is a logical progression from the first half of the line.



Ὅπλομάχος (*Hoplomachos*)  
(‘Hoplomachos’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.372; 1840 III.179; 1847. 582; Bothe 1855. 425; Kock 1884 II.149; Edmonds 1959 II.60–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.256; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 257

**Title** Cf. Alexis *Stratiōtēs*. Meineke (1839 I.372) states that ‘titulus incertum est utrum de campidoctore vel armorum magistro an de ephebo qui artem arma tractandi disceret, intelligendus sit.’ Although precise identification of the play’s eponym is debatable, Meineke’s alternatives are incorrect, since the word ought not to refer to an ephebe who learns how to handle arms but to the man who teaches the ephebe. Pl. *La.* 183b; *Euthd.* 271d–2a; X. *Lac.* 11.8; Thphr. *Char.* 5.10 all refer to *hoplomachoi* as travelling instructors (see Diggle 2004 on Thphr. *Char.* 5.10 [with bibliography]); since there are no references from this period that suggest otherwise,<sup>70</sup> such a person is almost certainly meant here. By the third century, the term seems to have become institutionalized, at least in Athens, as the designation for an instructor of ephebes; cf. Teles p. 50 ἔφηβος γέγονεν· ἔμπαλιν τὸν κοσμητὴν φοβεῖται, τὸν παιδοτρίβην, τὸν ὀπλομάχον, τὸν γυμνασίουαρχον. ὑπὸ πάντων τούτων μαστιγοῦται, παρατηρεῖται, τραχηλίζεται; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 697E.11 (128/7 BC; from Delphi but referring to Athenian ephebes); *SEG* XXVI 176.60 (AD 170/1–175/6; from Athens); Pélékidis 1962. 108.<sup>71</sup>

**Interpretation** A reasonable hypothesis is that the *hoplomachos* of the play is a version of the well-known character-type of the braggart soldier (note the mocking treatment in Pl. *La.*; cf. the account in X. *Lac.*); for the type, see Hofmann–Wartenberg 1973; Neumann 1958. 137–42; Arnott 1996 introduction to Alex. *Stratiōtēs*.

**Date** Unknown.

<sup>70</sup> Ephor. *FGrHist* 70 F 54 reports that fighting with heavy arms originated in Mantinea and that a certain Demeas was the first instructor. Demeas was presumably a Mantinean and not a travelling instructor, but his position has little if any bearing on the situation in Athens.

<sup>71</sup> At *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59298 (250 BC), a certain Paramonos, the recipient of the letter, is designated as *hoplomachos*. He obviously has no connection with Athenian ephebes, but in a second letter, *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59488, Paramonos requests the purchase of twelve strigils, which perhaps implies the existence of a permanent or semi-permanent establishment in Philadelphia.



is embedded in a quotation attributed to the grammarian Trypho (fr. 110), i. e. Athenaeus is quoting Trypho, who is quoting Anaxandrides. The fragment thus provides an important and instructive glimpse into Athenaeus' methodology and sources. It seems unlikely that Athenaeus knew any more about the play or the even the larger context of the fragment than can be gleaned from the single line quoted by Trypho. In addition, even when taking a quotation from a secondary source, such as Trypho here, his normal procedure is to remove all traces of this fact, as at 4.182d, creating the impression that he knows the material at first hand.

**Text** The text seems sound but has often been suspected; Meineke 1856 on Theoc. 20.29 characterizes this fragment as 'obscuris seu potius corruptis verbis Anaxandridis.' Garrod 1922. 68 unconvincingly suggests that the line could be trochaic tetrameter (with a missing foot at the beginning) if the first *alpha* in μάγαδις is long; to support the long *alpha*, he is compelled to emend all other occurrences.

**Interpretation** The line seems to prescribe how a conversation between two characters will take place, presumably due to some external circumstance. The context may well be similar to that at Men. *Sam.* 255–61, where certain parts of the conversation are meant to be heard and others not (note παρεξήλλαξε 'with a change of voice' at 257; cf. Gomme–Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.*).

**μάγαδις λαλήσω** A form of brachylogy, i. e. identification instead of comparison; cf. fr. 38.2 and, for numerous examples and bibliography, see Headlam–Knox 1922 on Herod. 6.14; Handley 1965 on Men. *Dysc.* 444f.; K.-A. on Cratin. fr. 56; Diggle 1997. 102–3.

**μάγαδις** Usually taken to be the name of a harp or similar instrument on the basis of the corrupt Anacr. *PMG* 374; cf. Maas and Snyder 1989. 149–50. The other passage in which it seems to be an instrument is S. fr. 238 πηκται δὲ λύραι καὶ μαγαδίδες / τά τ' ἐν Ἑλληνισι ξόαν' ἡδυμελῇ, which is probably corrupt as well and in which the word has been taken as an intrusive gloss. West 1992. 72–3 discusses the problems with identifying μάγαδις as the name of an instrument and suggests that it means instead 'octave concord' and that the verb μαγαδίζω means 'produce an (octave) concord'; cf. Barker 1988. Both West and Barker discuss the phenomenon of later grammarians and lexicographers who had no apparent personal knowledge of what a μάγαδις was and thus — as Trypho and Athenaeus appear to have done here — came to erroneous conclusions regarding it.

**λαλήσω** λαλέω by this time normally means little more than 'talk'; cf. Dover 1993. 22. Theoc. 20.29 κῆν αὐλῶ λαλέω, κῆν δώνακι, κῆν πλαγιαύλῳ (the variant δονέω is often printed for λαλέω, especially in older editions, but cf. Gow 1952 *ad loc.*) suggests that the verb can be used for playing an

instrument (if that is what a μάγαδις is), hence Weston's μάγαδι; Meineke 1856 on Theoc. 20.29 (quoted above in part) denies any connection between the two passages.

**μικρὸν ... καὶ μέγα** The contrast in Trypho and Athenaeus between ὀξύς and βαρύς sounds suggests that the same contrast is intended here. μέγας does often refer to sounds (cf. LSJ s. v. II.3; with their inclusion of Hdt. 3.62 contrast Powell 1938 s. v. VII.2), specifically with the meaning 'loud.' Similarly, μικρός is often used of sound with the meaning 'soft' (not documented by LSJ, excepting the doubtful inclusion, s. v. μέγας II.3, of Hdt. 3.62); cf. Pl. *Lys.* 211a; Philem. fr. 4.1; Men. *Sic.* 201 (note *app. crit.*; cf. Kassel 1965 on 202); Austin 1968; in the case of both words, when used with the sense 'loud' and 'soft', respectively, the adverb is far more common than the adjective. The contrast here is thus most likely between soft and loud sounds, rather than between sounds that are high and low in pitch. Presumably the production of two sounds that are different but complementary brought to mind the image of the μάγαδις.

**ἄμα σοι** The voices of the two (speaker and addressee) together will produce a sound reminiscent of that characteristic of the μάγαδις (i.e. one speaks softly and the other loudly, or perhaps the two together speak softly at one point and loudly at another).

#### fr. 37 K.-A. (36 K.)

Antiatt. p. 106.18

λεπτοτέρως · Ἀναξανδρίδης Ὀπλομάχῳ

More delicately. Anaxandrides in *Hoplomachos*

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.180; 1847. 583; Bothe 1855. 425; Kock 1884 II.149; Blaydes 1896. 123; Herwerden 1903. 98; Denniston 1927. 119; Edmonds 1959 II.60–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.256; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 257

**λεπτοτέρως** Edmonds, presumably thinking of fr. 36, takes this word as referring to the voice (cf. LSJ s. v. II.2, where characterized, probably wrongly, as a rare usage); cf. Diggle 1970 on E. *Phaeth.* 76; 1996. 193. Denniston 1927. 119 understands it as a disparaging reference to philosophers and cites a range of examples to that effect (cf. Dover 1968 on Ar. *Nu.* 153; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 223.8). Given the word's wide range of applications (it can refer to virtually anything which is in some sense slender, light, refined, *vel sim.*; cf. LSJ s. v.) and the absence of any context here, any suggestion is mere speculation.

For this form of the comparative adverb, see Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 I.577.

**Πάνδαρος** (*Pandaros*)  
(‘Pandaros’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.372–3; 1840 III.180; 1847. 583; Bothe 1855. 425; Kock 1884 II.149; Edmonds 1959 II.60–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.257; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 257

**Title** There is no other known play with this title. The *Pandaros* by Nicostratus mentioned by Meineke 1839 I.348 and Kock 1888 III.739 is a textual error (Kuster’s Πάνδροσος for the mss. Πάνδαρος is obviously correct), as Meineke acknowledged but Kock did not. Presumably the Pandarus in question is the famous archer; cf. H. *Il.* 2.826–7 Λυκάονος ἀγλαῶς υἱός / Πάνδαρος, ᾧ καὶ τόξον Ἀπόλλων αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν (interpreted by Σ<sup>A</sup> as τὴν τοξικὴν ἐμπειρίαν [Σ<sup>B</sup> τὴν τοξείαν μετωνυμικῶς]). He is described as coming from Λυκίη (not modern Lycia; cf. Kirk *ad loc.*), but his men are called Trojans; he wounded Menelaos and was himself killed by Diomedes. For general accounts of Pandarus, see Roscher 1884–1937 III.1504–5; Robert 1920. 1161–4; Canciani in *LIMC* VII.1.160–1.

That the title refers to a non-heroic proper name is unlikely. *LGPN* record only five examples of the name, four of them Hellenistic or Imperial and all from Central Greece or Italy. The only pre-Hellenistic example is a fourth-century Thessalian who made a dedication at the Sanctuary of Asclepius in Epidaurus in return for a cure.

**Content of the comedy** The possibilities for the treatment of Pandarus in comedy, especially as a title character, seem limited. He is known as a stereotypical oath-breaker (D. Chr. 74.15; Σ D. 24.121 (238); cf. Σ<sup>T</sup> H. *Il.* 4.89 Πάνδαρος ἢ πάντων ἄρά), but this seems to be a product of the later scholarly tradition. Σ<sup>T</sup> H. *Il.* 4.89 further reports that αἰσχροκερδὴς οὗτος ὁ καὶ τοὺς ἵππους οἴκοι καταλιπὼν φειδοῖ τροφῆς; in this comment, a reference to *Il.* 5.192–205 with an additional negative characterisation, Robert 1920. 1163 saw comic potential.

**Date** Unknown.

## fr. 38 K.-A. (37 K.)

οὐκ ἐπικεκυφὼς ὀρθός, ὦ βέλτιστ', ἔση·  
αὕτη δὲ καριδοῖ τὸ σῶμα καμπύλη,  
ἄγκυρά τ' ἐστὶν ἄντικρυς τοῦ σώματος

habent A, CE (2–3)<sup>72</sup>, Eust. (2–3 ἐστίν)

1 ἐπικεκυφὼς Casaubon: ἐπικεκυφὼς A: ἀνακεκυφὼς Meineke ἔση A: ἔσει Dindorf

2 καμπύλη Musurus: καμπύλη τ' ACE Eust.: καμπύλον Meineke: ἡ καμπύλη

Blaydes 3 τ' A: τε CE: om. Eust. τοῦ σώματος ACE: τοῦ σχήματος Hirschig:

τὸ σχῆμά σου Kock

You will be straight, not bent over, my good sir;  
but like a crook she curls her body in a shrimp-like manner,  
and straightaway is an anchor for the body

Ath. 3.105f–6a

ὁ δ' αὐτὸς κἀν Πανδάρῳ φησίν. —

The same poet also says in *Pandaros*: —

Eust. *Il.* p. 1220.48

ἐκ τῆς καρίδος δὲ χρηστόν ἐστι τὸ καριδῶ, ἥγουν ὡς εἰπεῖν σφαιρῶ, οἶον. —

From 'shrimp' there exists the verb 'wriggle like a shrimp', that is to say 'curl'; for example: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

—υ—υ— —|—υ— —υ—  
—υ— —υ—|— υ—υ—  
—υ— υ—|—υ— —υ—

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.180; 1847. 583; Hirschig 1849. 5; Bothe 1855. 425–6; Meineke 1857 V.clxxviii; Kock 1884 II.149; Blaydes 1890a. 82; Blümner 1891. 170; Blaydes 1896. 123; 1898. 186; Herwerden 1903. 98; Blaydes 1905. 325; Edmonds 1959 II.60–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.257; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 257

**Citation context** Athenaeus quotes this fragment, together with fr. 23 (see *ad loc.*), 28 and fragments of other authors, as part of his demonstration that καρίς can have a long *iota*; this fragment, however, shows no such thing.

<sup>72</sup> In CE, this fragment is placed in 3.106c, immediately preceding the fragment from Diphilus Siphnius.

Either *καρίς* belongs in the passage but has dropped out, therefore, which seems unlikely; or the discussion of *καριδες* brought this passage to mind, and Athenaeus thought it worth quoting although not strictly relevant; or, he believed (whether rightly or wrongly) that, like *καρίς* in these passages, *καριδόω* has a long *iota*. The third alternative seems the most reasonable, although the difficulty remains that the quantity of the *iota* is indeterminate on the basis of the meter, something Athenaeus apparently ignored.

**Interpretation** Although a sexually explicit reading of the fragment is possible, a more literal interpretation is preferable (and leaves open the possibility of sexual connotations being present and/or imputed to the lines by a character). The basic content appears to be that one character (an old man or someone otherwise incapacitated?) will no longer be bent over but will be able to stand (or walk) upright, once he can lean on a woman who will bend over so that she acts as a support for him. The woman could be his daughter or, perhaps more likely, a slave or hetaira, especially if sexual connotations are intended. Alternatively, the situation described might be metaphorical, e.g. with the woman being a divine figure such as Health or Plenty, who will prop up the man in whatever dire straits he faces. It is unclear whether the situation, whatever its nature, is imagined as taking place imminently or at some unspecified point in the future, and also whether it will occur on stage or off. At least two characters are on stage: the speaker and the addressee. The woman, most likely a mute character, may be on stage as well unless the discussion concerns a hypothetical future situation. The issue of potential sexual content remains difficult. Much of the vocabulary could be interpreted that way, but the absence of context renders certainty impossible; for a cautionary tale of the dangers of relying solely on vocabulary, see Henderson 1991. 246.

1 For the contrast, cf. Arist. *HA* 3.522b18 ὀρθὸς ἔστηκεν, μικρὸν ἐπικύπτων.

**ἐπικεκυφώς** At Ar. *Lys.* 1003, the verb simply means ‘bend over’; at Ar. *Th.* 239 and adesp. com. fr. 368 (cf. Antiph. fr. 27.18 [ἐπιπεφυκώς A; ἐπικεκυφώς Meineke]; Ar. *Ra.* 425 ἐγκεκυφώς; Henderson 1991 §361) it means ‘bend over so as to expose the anus’. Here the word could possibly refer to the phallus and mean ‘limp’ as opposed to ὀρθός (‘erect’; cf. Henderson 1991 §10). For the colloquial nature of the compound verb, see Austin–Olson 2004 on Ar. *Th.* 239.

**ὦ βέλτιστ(ε)** Dickey 1996. 119–20 briefly discusses βέλτιστε in Aristophanes and Menander and notes (p. 139) that it is often ironic or sarcastic. Here, as at Alex. fr. 201.4; Philem. fr. 103.2; Posidipp. fr. 29.2, the phrase (+ ἔση) fills the same metrical position as the type characterized as (ὦ) πονηρὲ σύ by Griffith 1968 (cf. above on fr. 34.5).

**ἔση** The general scholarly consensus is that the 2nd sing. fut. mid. ends in -ῆ in the fifth century, but over the course of the fourth century changes to an ending in -ει, which becomes the dominant form by the end of the century; cf. Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 I.184; II.61–2, 222; Mayser 1938 I.2.90; Arnott 2001b; fr. 46.1 with n. The manuscript evidence for all authors offers both forms and is thus of little help (cf. the catalogue for Lucian at Schmid 1887–1897 I.230); Threatte 1996 II.451–2 notes the lack of evidence before the Roman period. Either form is possible here, although it is worth noting that Anaxandrides uses a newer verb form elsewhere (fr. 2.3 ἦδεν; metrically guaranteed). Perhaps A’s ἔση indicates the survival of the original text, although it might also be the product of later hypercorrection.

**2 αὔτη** Kock’s comment ‘αὔτη certe est βακτηρία’ is overly literal; aside from the question of whether a staff (καμπύλη [sc. βακτηρία]) can ‘curl’ its ‘body’ in poetry that is not high-style (or mock high-style), which this passage does not seem to be, he misunderstands the idiom at work (cf. on καμπύλη).

**καριδοῖ τὸ σῶμα** καριδόω is attested only here in Classical literature and must mean, as Eustathius explains, ‘move like a shrimp’, i.e. curl one’s body; it is doubtless intransitive with τὸ σῶμα as an accusative of respect. Van der Valk states that to Eustathius himself ‘debetur interpretatio καριδῶ = σφαιρῶ “conглоbo”, quae interpretatio (haud recta) fluxit e falsa explicatione loci Anaxandridis difficilis.’ He may be correct in attributing this interpretation of the verb to Eustathius, but there is no reason to think that Eustathius is far wrong, especially since he seems to have known the verb from another context as well: cf. *Opus*. p. 105.42–4 ὑποκυρτοῦντες ἢ, καθά τις ἔφη, καριδοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς προσκυνητικῶς, αἰτούμενοι τὸ συμπαθές, προκαλούμενοι συγχώρησιν.

**καμπύλη** The adjective is possible, but the noun (cf. Ar. fr. 142; Plu. *Mor.* 790b) is idiomatic; cf. on fr. 36. Meineke 1840 II.180 conjectured καμπύλον and paraphrased ‘αὔτη δὲ καριδοῖ τὸ σῶμα ὥστε γίγνεσθαι καμπύλον’; his interpretation is correct, his conjecture unwanted.

**3 ἄγκυρα** For the metaphorical use of ‘anchor’, cf. S. fr. 685 with Pearson 1917 *ad loc.* If the fragment is sexually explicit, perhaps cf. Hsch. α 577<sup>73</sup> (= AB p. 209.27) ἄγκυρα· τὸ αἰδοῖον, παρὰ Ἐπιχάρμῳ (fr. 189); Sophr. fr. 52; Henderson 1991. 25. For anchors, see on fr. 12.1.

<sup>73</sup> Latte’s reference *ad loc.* to EM is mistaken.



## fr. 39 K.-A. (38 K.)

*Suda* α 3824

Ἄρεως νεοττός, καὶ Ἄρεως παιδίον, ἐπὶ τῶν θρασυτάτων. κέχρηται τῷ μὲν πρώτῳ Πλάτων Πεισάνδρῳ (fr. 112), τῷ δευτέρῳ Ἀναξανδρίδης † Πεισάνδρῳ

Ἀναξανδρίδης Hemsterhuis: Ἀλεξανδρίδης codd. Πεισάνδρῳ codd.: Πανδάρῳ Meineke

Nestling of Ares, and child of Ares, regarding the very bravest. Plato in *Peisander* used the first, and Anaxandrides in † *Peisander* † the second

**Metre** Uncertain (υυ—υ× or υ—υ× with synizesis in Ἄρεως).

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.181; 1847. 583; Bothe 1840. 426; Meineke 1857 V.81; Kock 1884 II.150; Blaydes 1896. 123; Herwerden 1903. 98; Edmonds 1959 II.60–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.257; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 258

**Text** Anaxandrides is not otherwise known to have written a *Peisander* (a fact not in itself necessarily significant), but the repetition of the title combined with this fact suggests that Πεισάνδρῳ was mistakenly written twice and has ousted the true title. Meineke conjectured Πανδάρῳ, presumably because of the vague paleographic similarity, but his suggestion is not significantly more probable than any other. The fragment is retained here in its traditional place, but would probably be better placed among the *incerta*.

**Ἄρεως παιδίον** This proverbial designation is first attested at Ar. *Av.* 835, where it has the form Ἄρεος νεοττός; Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.* suggests a connection with the Homeric tag ὄζος Ἄρηος (e.g. *Il.* 2.540). Exhaustively discussed at Spyridonidou-Skarsouli 1995 §55 (pp. 396–400), to which add Plu. *Mar.* 46.8 ἐν ἀρχῇ Ἄρεως ὠνομάζετο, ταχὺ δὲ τοῖς ἔργοις ἐλεγχομένοις, αὐθις Ἀφροδίτης υἱὸς ἐκαλεῖτο (adduced by K.-A. *ad loc.*).

**Πόλεις (*Poleis*)**  
(‘Cities’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.181–2; 1847. 583; Bothe 1855. 426; Kock 1884 II.150; Edmonds 1959 II.60–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.257 (cf. 1986 V.424); Nesselrath 1998. 173; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 258

**Title** Aside from Eupolis’ play of the same name, a Πόλεις is variously attributed in antiquity to Philyllus, Eunucus, or Aristophanes, and Heniochus may have written one as well (cf. K.-A. on fr. 5). Plural titles are normally taken to refer to the composition of the chorus, and indeed that appears to have been the case in Eupolis’ play (cf. Storey 2003. 217–18 with bibliography for an ‘individualized’ chorus); Meineke 1840 III.181 thus reasonably suggested that Anaxandrides used personified states as characters.<sup>74</sup> Which states were represented is a more difficult question and one that, in the absence of a clear historical context is essentially unanswerable, with the apparent exception of Egypt (fr. 40). Kock 1884 *ad loc.* is uneasy with Meineke’s suggestion but has no cogent argument against it: ‘de argumento (i. e. of Meineke) non habeo quod opponam: sed quod in antiqua comoedia Eupolidi licebit, in nova aliter instituendum erat Anaxandridi,’ presumably based on the false assumptions that a play with personified states must have closely paralleled Eupolis’ *Poleis* and that such engagement with politics is out of place in fourth-century comedy.

**Content of the comedy** One obvious conclusion from the title, especially when taken with the content of fr. 40 (cf. the introduction to fr. 40), is that the play was largely concerned with contemporary Athenian politics and especially foreign policy; for Anaxandrides and politics, see Introduction; Webster 1970. 40. The play could have dealt with Athens’ relations with a number of foreign states and its attempts to position itself within the Greek world at large; in contrast to Eupolis’ depiction of Athens’ subject-allies, the cities will presumably have been independent. Alternatively, the focus might have been less political and more cultural, possibly culminating in a display of Athens’ superiority. The cities of the title could be portrayed by representatives who have travelled to Athens, or conceivably represent immigrant groups living in Athens; or the play may have revolved around an Athenian (or group of Athenians) travelling through various cities, perhaps out of disgust with Athens only to realize its superiority in the end.

---

<sup>74</sup> Gulick’s translation (1928–1957) of the title as *Island-towns*, apparently with Eupolis’ play in mind, is irresponsible.

**Date** There is no solid evidence for the date of the play. Rehdantz' suggestion for the historical context of fr. 40 (see *ad loc.*) would place it at the end of the 360s BC or shortly thereafter; Nesselrath 1998. 173 suggests a date perhaps a decade or so earlier in the context of the Second Athenian League.

## fr. 40 K.-A. (39 K.)

οὐκ ἂν δυνάμην συμμαχεῖν ὑμῖν ἐγώ·  
οὔθ' οἱ τρόποι γὰρ ὁμονοοῦσ' οὔθ' οἱ νόμοι  
ἡμῶν, ἀπ' ἀλλήλων δὲ διέχουσιν πολὺ.  
βοῦν προσκυνεῖς, ἐγὼ δὲ θύω τοῖς θεοῖς·  
5 τὴν ἔγχελυν μέγιστον ἤγεῖ δαίμονα,  
ἡμεῖς δὲ τῶν ὄψων μέγιστον παρὰ πολὺ·  
οὐκ ἐσθίεις ὕει', ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἥδομαι  
μάλιστα τούτοις· κύνα σέβεις, τύπτω δ' ἐγώ,  
τοῦψον κατεσθίουσαν ἥνικ' ἂν λάβω.  
10 τοὺς ἱερέας ἐνθάδε μὲν ὀλοκλήρους νόμος  
εἶναι, παρ' ὑμῖν δ', ὥς ἔοικ', ἀπηργμένους.  
τὸν αἰέλουρον κακὸν ἔχοντ' ἐὰν ἴδῃς  
κλάεις, ἐγὼ δ' ἥδιστ' ἀποκτείνας δέρω.  
δύναται παρ' ὑμῖν μυγαλῇ, παρ' ἐμοὶ δέ γ' οὔ.

habent ACE, Eust. (10–11)

1 συμμαχεῖν A: ξυμμαχεῖν CE      3 ἡμῶν A: ὑμῶν CE      διέχουσιν Musurus:  
διέχουσι ACE      5 ἤγεῖ A: ἡγήῃ CE      δαίμονα ACE: δαιμόνων Blaydes      6 παρὰ  
A: πε(ρι) CE      11 ὑμῖν ACE: ἡμῖν Eust.      12 αἰέλουρον A: αἴλουρον CE  
13 κλάεις Dindorf: κλαίεις ACE      14 δύναται ACE: δυνατή Kock      δέ γ' A: δ'  
CE

I could not have allied with you;  
for neither our ways agree nor our laws,  
but they differ greatly from one another.  
You grovel before a cow, but I sacrifice it to the gods;  
5 you consider the eel the greatest divinity,  
but we by far the greatest of *opsa*.  
You do not eat pork, but I enjoy  
it especially; you worship a dog, but I beat it,  
whenever I catch it gulping down my *opson*.  
10 It is law that priests here be whole,

but among you, as it seems, that they have been dedicated as first-fruits.

If you see a cat doing poorly,

you weep, while I gladly kill and skin it.

Among you the mouse is powerful, but to me it is not.

Ath. 7.299e–300a

Ἀναξανδρίδης δ' ἐν Πόλεσι πρὸς τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἀποτεινόμενος τὸν λόγον φησὶν· —

Anaxandrides in *Poleis*, offering this account against the Egyptians, says: —

Eust. *Il.* 1183.12

ἐκ τοῦ ἀπάρχεσθαι σκῶμιά τι εὐνουχικὸν προῦκυψε παρὰ τινι λογίῳ Αἰγυπτίῳ ἀνδρί, εἰπόντι ὡς τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἱερεῖς, εὐνούχους δηλαδὴ ὄντας, σκώπτει τις εἰπὼν ἀπῆρχθαι διὰ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν ὡς οἶά τινα προδεδόσθαι ἀπαρχὴν τὴν τμησιν τῶν αἰδοίων, ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ τοὺς ἱερέας ἐνθάδε μέν, ἤγουν ἐν Ἑλλησιν, ὀλοκλήρους ... ἀπηργμένους (10–11)

From the offering of first-fruits a joke concerning eunuchs arose from a learned Egyptian, who said that one mocks Egyptian priests, that is to say as being eunuchs, by saying that they offered as first-fruits the amputated part of their genitals, as is clear from the passage, 'It is the law that priests here,' that is, among the Greeks, 'be whole'

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

```

--υ--  -|-υ-  --υ--
--υ--  υ|υυ-  --υ-
--υ--  --υ|υ  --υ-
--υ--  υ-υ|-  --υ-
5  --υ--  υ-υ|-  --υ-
--υ--  -|-υ-  --υυ-
--υ--  υ-|-υ-  υ-υ-
υ-υ-  -|υυ-  --υ-
--υ--  υ-υ|-  υ-υ-
10 υ-υυ-  --υυ|-  --υ-
--υ--  -|-υ-  υ-υ-
υ-υ-  -|υυ-  υ-υ-
υ-υ-  -|-υ-  --υ-
υυυ-  -|-υ-  υ-υ-υ-
```

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 110; Grotius 1626. 640–3, 979; Meineke 1840 III.181–2; Rehdantz 1845. 162 n. 107; Meineke 1847. 583–4; Bothe 1855. 426; Meineke 1857 V.clxxviii; Kock 1884 II.150; 1888 III.737; Paley 1889. 54–7; Blaydes 1890a. 82; Blaydes 1896. 123; Pickard-Cambridge 1900. 55, 186; Herwerden 1903. 98; Edmonds 1959 II.60–3; Webster 1970. 40; Carriere 1979. 278–9; Long 1986. 14, 38; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.258–9; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 258–9; Arnott 2010. 301; Rusten 2011. 465–6

**Citation context** In the course of discussing eels (7.297c–300d), Athenaeus cites Antiph. fr. 145, which refers to the veneration of eels by the Egyptians; this leads him to quote two additional fragments that mock Egyptians: this fragment (which incidentally mentions eels) and Timocl. fr. 1 (which does not). Eustathius, whose knowledge of the fragment presumably derives from Athenaeus, quotes 10–11 only as evidence for the claim that Egyptian priests were castrated and dedicated the amputated part as a first-fruit offering.

**Interpretation** Meineke 1840 III.181–2 plausibly summarized this fragment and the context that immediately preceeded it as ‘Aegyptiorum legatos ... foedus et auxilia Atheniensium petentes. ad horum preces Atheniensium civitas respondisse videtur ea quae ex Athenaeo attulimus’ (i. e. fr. 40), but he declined to connect it with a specific historical event. Rehdantz 1845. 162 n. 107, by contrast, specifically connected it with an embassy sent to Athens by the Egyptian king Tachos, apparently to gain help against the Persians, an event that may be commemorated at *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 119 (360/59 BC; revised to 367/6–364/3 in addenda).<sup>75</sup> Athens declined to form such an alliance, but the general Chabrias did go to Egypt in 361 BC, although of his own volition and without official Athenian sponsorship; cf. D.S. 15.92.3; Plu. *Ages.* 37.5; Nep. *Chabr.* 2.3. Even if Rehdantz’ suggestion is accepted, the episode with the Egyptians must have formed a small part of the play, partly because it seems to have been an isolated incident but largely because the title suggests a broader context.

As Meineke noted, the speech presupposes a scene in which an alliance with the Egyptians is mooted; the rejection of such an alliance implies that the Egyptians were the impetus behind the attempt. Whether the speaker is a representative of the Athenian state or a private individual acting on his own behalf is unknowable and depends on the interpretation given to the play as a whole (see the Introduction to *Poleis* above).

For the view that various Egyptian practices are an inversion of ‘proper’ behaviour, cf. Hdt. 2.35.2; S. *OC* 337–41 with Jebb 1887 *ad loc.*; D.S. 1.27;

<sup>75</sup> Dušanić 1980/1981. 14–15 denies on onomastic grounds that the men listed are Egyptians and proposes that they are Anatolians instead.

Nymphod. fr. 21 (II.380 Müller); Brown 1996. 20 n. 55. For Egyptian religion as *dementia*, cf. Cic. *ND* 1.43. For Egyptians and Isis in Athens, see Simms 1989; Parker 1996. 272 n. 71.

1 Cf. Ar. *Pl.* 178, where an alliance with the Egyptians is given as one example of something unexpected and not entirely natural that has come about through the influence of Wealth.

**οὐκ ἄν δυνάιμην** A trimeter opening common in comedy of the fourth century and later (e.g. Eub. fr. 88.1; Men. *Epitr.* 499; Philem. fr. 121.1 [οὐκ ἄν δύναιο]) and in Euripides (e.g. *Hec.* 749; *Alc.* 63 [οὐκ ἄν δύναιο]); cf. Stephanopoulos 1988. 225 (on Tadesp. trag. *TGrFF* 331).

**συμμαχεῖν** During the fourth quarter of the fifth century, σύν replaces ξύν as the normal Attic form; see Threatte 1980 I.553–4.

**ὁμῖν ἐγώ** Despite the constant switching between singular and plural for both speaker and addressee throughout the fragment, probably only two characters are involved, each representing his state or group.

2–3 Cf. Hdt. 2.35.2 Αἰγύπτιοι ... τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ἔμπαλιν τοῖσι ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποισι ἐστήσαντο ἥθεά τε καὶ νόμους κτλ. (cf. Cartledge 1993. 58–9); S. *OC* 337–41.

**οὐθ' οἱ τρόποι ... οὐθ' οἱ νόμοι** The two terms are essentially synonymous here, although it may be possible to distinguish between τρόποι (the way people are and act) and νόμοι (the behaviors they think of as sanctified by custom and precedent).

3 **ἡμῶν** I.e. both the Egyptians and the Athenians; elsewhere in this fragment, the first person refers solely to the Athenians.

4 **βοῦν** A reference to Isis; cf. Hdt. 2.41.1 τοὺς μὲν νυν καθαροὺς βοῦς τοὺς ἄρσενας καὶ τοὺς μόσχους οἱ πάντες Αἰγύπτιοι θύουσι, τὰς δὲ θηλέας οὐ σφι ἔξεστι θύειν, ἀλλ' ἱραὶ ἐστί Ἴσιος. For cattle and aspects of their worship in Egypt, see Hdt. 2.41 with Rawlinson 1880 *ad loc.*; D.S. 1.85, 88.4.

**προσκυνεῖς** A gesture of subservience, raising the hand to the lips, reputedly common in Egypt and the East, but among Greeks viewed as slavish and so used only for the gods; cf. Hdt. 2.80 (of the Egyptians) ἀντὶ τοῦ προσαγορεύειν ἀλλήλους ἐν τῇσι ὁδοῖσι προσκυνέουσι κατιέντες μέχρι τοῦ γούνατος τὴν χεῖρα; X. *An.* 3.2.13 (of the Greeks) μέγιστον δὲ μαρτύριον ἡ ἐλευθερία τῶν πόλεων ἐν αἷς ὑμεῖς ἐγένεσθε καὶ ἐτράφητε· οὐδένα γὰρ ἀνθρώπον δεσπότην ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεοὺς προσκυνεῖτε. For the word and its connotations, see Neil 1901 on Ar. *Eq.* 156; Burkert 1996. 85–9 with n. 53 (p. 211; with bibliography).

5 **τὴν ἔγχελυν μέγιστον ἡγεῖ δαίμονα** Cf. Hdt. 2.72 νομίζουσι (i.e. the Egyptians) δὲ καὶ τῶν ἰχθύων καλούμενον λεπιδωτὸν ἱρὸν εἶναι καὶ τὴν ἔγχελυν; Antiph. fr. 145.1–2 τὰ τ' ἄλλα δεινούς φασι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους /

εἶναι τὸ νομίσαι τ' ἰσόθεον τὴν ἔγγελλυν; aside from this fragment and the two references given above (and indeed Anaxandrides and Antiphanes may be dependent on Herodotus rather than providing additional evidence), the eel is not known to be sacred in Egypt. Possibly the account derives from the Greeks conflating the eel with a fish with which they were generally unfamiliar.

For eels in general, see Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 10.1 (*SH* 139); van Leeuwen 1902 on Ar. V. 510; Thompson 1947. 58–61; Wilkins 2000. 37–8.

**6 τῶν ὄψων** ὄψων is what is eaten in addition to the bread or porridge of the main course and is most commonly fish of some sort; cf. on fr. 34.10; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 47.6; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 11.7 (*SH* 140); *Agora* III.194 (#637). Praising eel as by far the greatest ὄψων is in keeping with its generally high reputation as a delicacy.

**παρὰ πολὺ** Mainly a prose idiom (e.g. Th. 1.29.5; 2.89.5; Pl. *Ap.* 36a; Isoc. 8.63); elsewhere in comedy only at Ar. *Pl.* 445; cf. Macho 444.

**7 οὐκ ἐσθίεις ὕει(α)** Sc. κρέα. Cf. Hdt. 2.47.1 ὃν δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι μιὰρὸν ἡγνῆται θηρίον εἶναι· καὶ τοῦτο μὲν, ἦν τις ψαύσῃ αὐτῶν παριῶν ὕος, αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἱματίοισι ἀπ' ὧν ἔβαψε ἑωυτὸν βὰς ἐς τὸν ποταμόν κτλ. While Anaxandrides' statement is generally true and is expected of a Semitic people, the Egyptians do seem to have eaten pork on the occasion of a special sacrifice; cf. Hdt. 2.47.2–3; Plu. *Mor.* 352f, 353f–4a (*de Iside*) with Griffiths 1970 *ad loc.*

**7–8 ἐγὼ δὲ γ' ἡδομαι / μάλιστα τούτοις** Cf. A. fr. 309 ἐγὼ δὲ χοῖρον καὶ μάλ' εὐθηλούμενον / τόνδ' ἐν νοτοῦντι κριβάνῳ θήσω. τί γὰρ / ὄψων γένοιτ' ἂν ἀνδρὶ τοῦδε βέλτιον. The line is possibly a reference to female genitalia (i.e. χοῖρον; cf. Henderson 1991 §§110–11).

**8 κύνα σέβεις** Presumably a reference to Anubis; cf. Plu. *Mor.* 368e (*de Iside*) διὸ πάντα τίκτων (sc. Anubis) ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κύων ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν τοῦ κυνὸς ἐπὶ κλησιν ἔσχευ (cf. Griffiths 1970 *ad loc.*); D.S. 1.87.2–3; Str. 17.1.40; Lilja 1976. 83. It is possible, however, that general worship without implicit connection with a specific deity is meant; cf. Timocl. fr. 1; Helm 1906. 145. Less likely, given the preceding references to animals regarded as divinities, Anaxandrides is simply referring to the Egyptians' general attitude toward dogs (somewhat similar to that toward cats; cf. 12–13); cf. Hdt. 2.66.4, 67.1; D.S. 1.83.1–6, 84.2.

**τύπτω δ' ἐγώ, / τοῦτον κατεσθίουσαν ἡνίκ' ἂν λάβω** Dogs had (as they still do today) a reputation for stealing food from the inattentive; e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 1159–61; V. 837–8; *Pax* 24–5 with Olson 1998 *ad loc.* For striking a dog, cf. Ar. *Eq.* 289 κυνοκοπήσω σου τὸν νῶτον with van Leeuwen 1900 *ad loc.* For the general position and treatment of dogs in a Greek household, see Mainoldi 1984. 152–4. At least by the end of the fifth century, dogs were commonly

although not invariably referred to as feminine (cf. Williams 1999): e.g. Ar. *Lys.* 298; Pherec. fr. 193; Lilja 1976. 50.

**10 τοὺς ἱερέας ἐνθάδε μὲν ὀλοκλήρους** Cf. *Synagoge* B α 2518 (≈ Phot. α 3311) καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐδοκιμάζοντο Ἀθήνησιν, εἰ ἀφελεῖς καὶ ὀλόκληροι; Tsantsanoglou 1984. 37–8.

For ὀλόκληρος meaning ‘uncastrated’, LSJ cite this fragment; Pl. Com. fr. 188.9; Men. fr. 174; Luc. *Asin.* 33. In fact, the word does not mean that at Pl. Com. fr. 188.9; at Men. fr. 174 it must have the same sense as here (the fragment, itself too scanty to admit interpretation, is quoted at Phot. ο 236, i.e. in an identical context); and only at Luc. *Asin.* 33 does it mean ‘uncastrated’, although even there that sense may be more dependent on context than any normal meaning of the word. Here, and thus at Men. fr. 174, it has its normal religious meaning of ‘whole’ or ‘unblemished’; cf. den Boer 1947 and the passages cited below (on νόμος).<sup>76</sup> The contrast with ἀπηργμένους (11) is thus not evidence that the word here, or indeed regularly, can mean ‘uncastrated’, but that Anaxandrides is playing with the root-meaning (the joke being perhaps re-enforced by the somewhat unexpected appearance of ἀπηργμένους in the emphatic final position of 11 [see below]).

**νόμος** Cf. Tsantsanoglou 1984. 38 ‘the wording in Bek. An. [i.e. *Synagoge* B α 2518; quoted in part above] suggests that an official text is being literally reproduced and interpreted’; Sokolowski 1955 #5.10; 1969 ##162.14 (restored); 166.9.

**11 παρ’ ὑμῖν δ’, ὡς ἔοικ’, ἀπηργμένους** Eustathius clearly understands this line as referring to the castration of the priests; Herodotus does not mention the practice among the Egyptians, as one might expect if he was aware of it, but only their apparently ordinary practice of circumcision (2.36.3 τὰ αἰδοῖα ὄλλοι μὲν ἔῳσι ὡς ἐγένοντο, ... Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ περιτάμνονται, 37.2, 104.2–4). The Greeks did mock circumcision, not practicing it themselves (e.g. Ar. *Av.* 507; Pl. 267; Dover 1968 on *Nu.* 538–9; 1978. 129; Henderson 1991. 111 n. 17); in all cases, however, the word used for a circumcised man is ψωλός or ἀπεψωλημένος. Here what is meant is probably castration, since that would seem the more outlandish and the point is to emphasize the utter foreignness of the Egyptians, although distortion through exaggeration presumably plays a large part in this depiction. Whether or not the Egyptian priests in fact practiced castration, they are presumably being assimilated to practitioners of known Eastern religions; this is furthered by the use of the verb (‘have

<sup>76</sup> Very similar is the use of the word regarding sacrificial victims as at, for example, SEG XXV 687.1; the use of the word at Pl. Com. fr. 188.9 presumably is drawing on this usage.



dedicated [a part of] themselves as first-fruits<sup>77</sup>), which calls to mind the self-castration of the worshippers of Cybele.

The unexpected occurrence of ἀπηργμένους forms a contrast to the previous line's ὁλοκλήρους (which is now seen to mean not 'unblemished' but 'unmutilated'). The parenthetical ὡς ἔοικ(ε) serves to create a slight pause before the punch-line; cf. Ar. *Pl.* 1017; Eub. fr. 9.3.

12–13 τὸν αἰέλουρον κακὸν ἔχοντ' ἐὰν ἴδῃς / κλάεις Possibly underlying this statement, or rather the belief on which it comments, is an allusion to the goddess Bastet (cf. Plu. *Mor.* 376d [*de Iside*] with Griffith 1970 *ad loc.*). More likely it simply reflects the general reverence of the Egyptians toward cats; cf. Hdt. 2.66–7; D.S. 1.83–84.4, 87.4.<sup>78</sup> For cats generally, see Engels 1999; Hopkinson 1984 on Call. *Cer.* 110; Lloyd-Jones 1975. 76–7; Benton 1969.

The form αἰέλουρον (as opposed to the variant reading αἴλουρον) is metrically necessary here, but compare Phot. α 564 αἰέλουρος· τετρασυλλάβως; Moer. α 78 αἰέλουρος Ἀττικοί· αἴλουρος Ἑλληνας.

13 ἐγὼ δ' ἤδιστ' ἀποκτείνας δέρω There is no real parallel for this behavior, but compare the inclusion of cats in a catalogue of food at Ar. *Ach.* 879. Alternatively, the interest may be in the cat's skin rather than in its potential as a foodstuff.

14 δύναται παρ' ὑμῖν μυγαλῇ Cf. Hdt. 2.67.1; Plu. *Mor.* 670b; Str. 17.1.40; Nic. *Th.* 815–16 with Gow–Scholfield 1953 *ad loc.* (cf. D.S. 1.87.6).

<sup>77</sup> This sense of the verb is probably related to that referring to the cutting of a lock of hair for use in a ritual; e.g. H. *Il.* 19.254 (in his discussion of which Eustathius quotes this fragment of Anaxandrides); E. *El.* 91.

<sup>78</sup> Timocl. fr. 1 seems to offer an intermediate point between cat as specific goddess and general reverence for cats.

**Πρωτεσίλαος (*Prōtesilaos*)**  
(‘Protesilaos’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.182; 1847. 584; Bothe 1855. 426; Kock 1884 II.150–1; Edmonds 1959 II.62–3; Webster 1970. 18 n. 1; Nesselrath 1990. 195, 212–15; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.259; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 260

**Title** Kock suggested emending to Πρωτεσίλεως, the Attic form of the Epic/Ionic Πρωτεσίλαος, but either form is acceptable in poetry (cf. Kannicht 1969 on E. *Hel.* 131, 564). Moreover, by the last quarter of the fourth century, Athenian names in -λαος began to supplant those in -λεως; cf. Thraette 1996 II.44–9.

There are no other comedies with this title, but it does occur as the title of a tragedy by Euripides and a satyr play by the otherwise unknown Harmodius (*TrGF* 156; first century BC?); Sophocles’ Ποιμένες (possibly satyric) also concerns Protesilaos and seems to focus on his death.

Protesilaos figures in Greek literature primarily as the first of the invading Greeks to disembark at Troy and thus, in accordance with an oracle, the first to die (e.g. H. *Il.* 698–702; *Cypr.* arg. 53–4; fr. 26; Apollod. *Epit.* 3.29–30 with Frazer 1921 *ad loc.*); for a general account of his story, cf. Canciani in *LIMC* VII.1.554–60; Türk in Roscher 1884–1937 III.3155–71. Euripides’ tragedy seems to have dwelt on the brief time Protesilaos had with his newly-wed wife before he sailed to Troy and died; cf. E. *Prot.* test. ii with Kannicht 2004 *ad loc.* and p. 635. That play could have ended by foretelling’ Protesilaos burial at Elaious in the Thracian Chersonesus opposite Troy and his eventual heroization there by the local population (cf. Σ<sup>Tzet.</sup> Lyc. 533); if so, that could provide a connection with fr. 42 of Anaxandrides’ play (if it in fact was a parody of Euripides; see below).

**Content of the comedy** Kock speculated that Anaxandrides ‘fortasse traegodiae Euripidae argumentum in ridiculum deflexerat’; fr. 42 describes a wedding feast that might be interpreted as that of Protesilaos. But Anaxandrides’ play seems to revolve around contemporary Athenian society and to be populated by well-known contemporary figures. Unlike divinities such as Dionysus in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* or Hermes in *Peace*, who despite their connection with the heroic past were conceived of as living presences and thus could appear in the contemporary world,<sup>79</sup> Protesilaos is confined to the realm of the Trojan

<sup>79</sup> Similar are characters such as Herakles, who achieved divine status, or even Tereus who, while not divine, was transformed into a creature regularly encountered. But interaction even with these figures tends not to occur in contemporary Athens,

War. Since the play is ostensibly about him, but also features contemporary politicians and leaders, there seem to be two possible conclusions. Either the references to contemporary figures and events are incidental to the plot and are only introduced in passing for the sake of mockery, or the play deals with contemporary events that are somehow represented somehow in terms of the story of Protesilaos. The fragments suggest a more than incidental connection with contemporary politics, and thus the latter possibility seems more likely. If so, at least some fourth-century plays with mythological titles may have been closer in plot and intent to Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros*, which used the wooing of Helen to mock Pericles for having brought war to the Athenians, than to the mythological farce of Plautus' *Amphitryo*.<sup>80</sup>

**Date** Breitenbach 1908. 126 dated the play to *ca.* 381/0 BC on the assumption that it closely followed the wedding of Iphicrates (for the date of the wedding, cf. on fr. 42.3–4); on similar grounds, Nesselrath 1990. 195 places it between 386 and 380 BC. In either case, this would be Anaxandrides' earliest known play (he first took the prize in 376 BC; cf. test. 3). But Iphicrates' wedding seems to have attracted enough renown that reference to it would still have been meaningful some years later (and fr. 42 does not obviously treat it as a recent event) and, more important, the public career of Melanopus (cf. on fr. 41.2) is not attested prior to 372 BC. The play is thus better dated not earlier than the mid to late 370s BC.

## fr. 41 K.-A. (40 K.)

μύρῳ δὲ παρὰ Πέρωνος, οὐπὲρ ἀπέδοτο  
ἐχθρὸς Μελανώπῳ, πολυτελοῦς Αἰγυπτίου,  
ὃ νῦν ἀλείφει τοὺς πόδας Καλλιστράτου

habent A(1), A(2)

1 μύρῳ δὲ A(1): μύρον τε A(2)      2 ἐχθρὸς A(1): χθρὸς A(2)      αἰγυπτίου A(2): ἐν αἰπτίῳ A(1)      3 νῦν ἀλείφει A(2): συναλείφει A(1)

---

although there are exceptions (e.g. Dionysus at the beginning of *Frogs* and especially Plutus in Aristophanes' play of that name).

<sup>80</sup> This is not to suggest that such plays were allegories appreciated only by the discerning few, as Cobet 1840. 124 seems to imply. Rather, the meaning would presumably be obvious to most, if not all, as seems to have been the case with Cratinus' play or Aristophanes' *Knights*.

with perfumed oil from Peron, some of that which he sold  
yesterday to Melanopus, a very rich Egyptian perfume,  
with which he now anoints the feet of Callistratus

Ath. 12.553d–e (1)

Ἀναξανδρίδης δὲ ἐν Πρωτεσιλάῳ. ---

Anaxandrides in *Prōtesilaos*: ---

Ath. 15.689f–90a (2)

Ἀναξανδρίδης Πρωτεσιλάῳ. ---

Anaxandrides in *Prōtesilaos*: ---

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

υ-υ-υ υ-υ| υ-υ-υ-  
 - - - - - | - - - - -  
 - - - - - | - - - - -

**Discussion** Bergk 1837. 45; Meineke 1840 III.190; 1847. 587; Bothe 1855. 429; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix; Kock 1884 II.151; Blaydes 1890a. 83; Blaydes 1896. 123; Edmonds 1959 II.62–3; Webster 1970. 30; Long 1986. 80–1; Nesselrath 1990. 213–14; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.259; Scholtz 1996; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 260; Rusten 2011. 466

**Citation context** Athenaeus quotes the fragment twice, both times in close proximity to Antiph. fr. 105 and Cephisod. fr. 3, suggesting that he got the three fragments from the same source. At 12.553d–e, the fragment is quoted with a number of other fragments as evidence that in Athens people addicted to luxury had their feet rubbed with perfume (12.553a–e); it follows Cephisod. fr. 3; Eub. fr. 107; 89; Antiph. fr. 31; 152; 101; 105. The fragment also occurs at 15.689f–90a, in the midst of a long discussion of perfume (15.686c–92f). The specific context is as support for the claim that the Athenians used particular perfumes for different parts of the body; this fragment follows Antiph. fr. 105 and Cephisod. fr. 3. Mention of the perfumer Peron prompts the quotation of three other fragments that also mention him: Theopomp. Com. fr. 1; 17; Antiph. fr. 37.

**Interpretation** The fragment clearly satirizes a particular political relationship in the earlier part of the fourth century and appears to allude to the same event or habit<sup>81</sup> referred to at Plu. *Dem.* 13.3 καὶ Μελάνωπος ἀντιπο-

<sup>81</sup> Plutarch says that Melanopus received money from Callistratus πολλάκις and adds that he customarily (εἰώθει) offered an excuse for such behavior to the *dēmos*.

λιτευόμενος Καλλιστράτῳ καὶ πολλάκις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ χρήμασι μετατιθέμενος εἰώθει λέγειν πρὸς τὸν δῆμος· Ὁ μὲν ἀνὴρ ἐχθρός, τὸ δὲ τῆς πόλεως νικάτω συμφέρον. Scholtz 1996 discusses this fragment at length, and although he suggests that the interpretation may be debatable, there is no real doubt that Melanopus is described as anointing Callistratus' feet (i. e. taking bribes from him; see on 3). Whether this fragment satirized an on-going political relationship or alludes to a particular event is uncertain. If the latter, one possibility is that it involved dealings between Athens and Egypt. This is supported by the allusion at D. 24.127 to the apparently infamous incident when Melanopus παρεπρεσβεύσατ' εἰς Αἴγυπτον, adds point to the mention of Egyptian perfume in 2, and fits well with Callistratus' concern with foreign policy and advocacy of a shifting series of alliances for Athens. For Athens' relationship with Egypt, cf. above on *Poleis*.

The fragment consists of several clauses dependent on a noun in the dative. Whether the satire of the political relationship was merely a passing jibe depends on the subject (i. e. Melanopus or someone mentioned in the main clause of the sentence) of ἀλείφει in 3. Equally uncertain is the use to which the perfumed oil (1) was put in the main clause (omitted in the fragment quoted by Athenaeus). The possibility must remain open that the overall context is unrelated to political satire, but that mention of perfumed oil created the opportunity for a quick joke at the expense of contemporary politicians.

**1 μύρω** A mixture of perfume (which provided the scent) and oil (which provided the medium); cf. Thphr. *Od.* 15–20; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.105–6 (*SH* 534); Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 60.3 (*SH* 192). Perfumed oil is not to be confused with an unguent; cf. X. *An.* 4.4.13 where, in the absence of oil, the men use a χρίμα instead, in this case pig-fat or the like.

**παρὰ Πέρωνος** Peron (*PAA* 772900) was apparently a seller of perfume in the earlier part of the fourth century and was well-known enough to be mentioned at least four times in comedy (also Antiph. fr. 37; Theopomp. Com. fr. 1; 17 [both omitted at *LGN* II s. v.; all four are given together at Ath. 15.689e–90a]<sup>82</sup>). Scholtz 1996. 73 n. 20, following Long 1986. 79–80, suggests that Peron was non-Athenian; *LGN* II s. v. includes him as possibly Athenian.

---

Plutarch's language strongly suggests that Melanopus was bribed repeatedly, but whatever the truth of the matter, his contention is almost certainly derived from contemporary political slander, e. g. from attacks by comic poets, as here; the phrase ὁ μὲν ἀνὴρ ἐχθρός, τὸ δὲ τῆς πόλεως νικάτω συμφέρον may originate in a similar source.

<sup>82</sup> Athenaeus may have found the four fragments (all we know of Peron) together in the same source, e. g. a work on *komōidoumenoi*.

The two fragments of Theopompus attest to nothing except that he was mentioned; this fragment and that of Antiphanes add little more. The only reason to consider Peron a non-citizen is the unprovable assertion that perfumers are most likely foreign. There is no reason to assume that he is meant to be included in the intricacies of the relation between Melanopus and Callistratus, particularly if he is not a citizen, other than the fact that his name occurs with theirs here. He is probably mentioned simply as a well-known perfume-seller to add a degree of realism and to make the jibe at Melanopus more concrete; less likely, he may have some connection with the context to which the lost main clause of this fragment belongs.

**οὔπερ** Partitive genitive.

**ἀπέδοτο** The subject is Peron.

**2 Μελάνωπῳ** Μελάνωπος Λάχητος Αἰζωνεύς; *PA* 9788; *PAA* 638765; Develin 1989 #1933; *LGPNI* s. v. 7; grandson of the eponym of Plato's *Laches*. The known dates of his public career range between 372/1 BC (envoy to Sparta; *X. HG.* 6.3.2) and possibly as late as 355/4 BC (*strategos*; *D.* 24.12–13; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 150.5 [restored]<sup>83</sup>). Aside from *Plu. Dem.* 13.3 (quoted in the Introduction to this play), the known dealings between Melanopus and Callistratus are confined to both men taking part in an embassy to Sparta in 372/1 BC (*X. HG.* 6.3.2–3) and the prosecution of Melanopus by Callistratus for defrauding the *naopoioi* of three consecrated half-obols (*Arist. Rh.* 1.1374b25–7).

**πολυτελοῦς Αἰγυπτίου** For Egyptian myrrh, cf. *Thphr. Od.* 30, 31 ἀχρωμάτιστα δὲ τῶν μὲν πολυτελῶν Αἰγύπτιον (sc. μύρον); *Achae. TrGF* 20 F 5; *Pl. Com.* fr. 71.6–7; *Antiph.* fr. 105.2–3; *Ephipp.* fr. 8.1; *Dexicr.* fr. 1; *Did.* pp. 305–6 Schmidt; *Dsc.* 1.59.1. For πολυτελοῦς, cf. on fr. 31.1.

**3 ὧ** The perfumed oil bought by Melanopus.

**ἀλείφει τοὺς πόδας** The subject of the verb is almost certainly Melanopus. Scholtz 1996. 70–2 discusses other possibilities in some detail, but there is no other natural way to interpret the passage. His claim (71) that there is no consensus on how to understand the passage overstates the matter; in fact, only Kock expresses real doubt, and virtually every discussion of these lines treats Melanopus as the subject of ἀλείφει.

Scholtz 1989. 73–7 establishes two facts crucial to understanding the connotations of this act. First, the anointer is invariably of lower social status (or for some reason places him or herself in that role) than the person being anointed, so Melanopus is satirized as the lackey of Callistratus. Second, the act of anointing the feet frequently has sexual overtones (e.g. *Cephisod.* fr.

<sup>83</sup> D. Lewis (ap. Develin 1989. 282 [*stratēgoi* for 355/4 BC]) expresses doubt that the inscription should be dated this late.

3; Antiph. fr. 105.2–3), especially when, as often, performed by a female on a male. The political relationship between the two men is thus portrayed in terms of a sexual relationship in which Melanopus is the passive, Callistratus the dominant partner.

**Καλλιστράτου** Καλλίστρατος Καλλικράτους Ἀφιδναῖος; *PA* 8157 [with suppl.] = 8129 = 8130; *PAA* 561575; Davies 1971. 277–82; Develin 1989 #1564; *LGPN* II s. v. 50. Callistratus was active politically as early as 392/1 BC (Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 149a) and was one of the leading politicians in Athens until the 360s BC, holding numerous offices, but in 361/0 BC, following the Battle of Mantinea, went into exile in Methone and was condemned to death ([D.] 50.48); ca. 355 BC he returned to Athens and was killed seeking refuge at the Altar of the Twelve Gods (Lyc. *Leocr.* 93). Cf. Sealey 1956; Wankel 1976 on D. 18.219 offers further discussion of Callistratus' career with references and bibliography. For his dealings with Melanopus, see above on Μελανώπω (2). He is mocked elsewhere in comedy at Antiph. fr. 293; Eub. fr. 10; 106.

## fr. 42 K.-A. (41 K.)

- κἄν ταῦτα ποιῆς ὥσπερ φράζω,  
 λαμπροῖς δειπνοῖς δεξιόμεθ' ὑμᾶς,  
 οὐδὲν ὁμοίοις τοῖς Ἴφικράτους  
 τοῖς ἐν Θράκη· καίτοι φασὶν  
 5       βουβαυκαλόσαυλα γενέσθαι.  
 κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν μὲν ὑπεστρώσθαι  
 στρώμαθ' ἄλουργῇ μέχρι τῆς ἄρκτου·  
 δειπνεῖν δ' ἄνδρας βουτυροφάγους,  
 αὐχμηροκόμας μυριοπληθεῖς·  
 10       τοὺς δὲ λέβητας χαλκοῦς εἶναι,  
 μείζους λάκκων δωδεκακλίνων·  
 αὐτὸν δὲ Κότυν περιεζῶσθαι  
 ζωμόν τε φέρειν ἐν χοῖ χρυσῇ,  
 καὶ γευόμενον τῶν κρατήρων  
 15       πρότερον μεθύειν τῶν πινόντων.  
 αὐλεῖν δ' αὐτοῖς Ἀντιγενείδαν,  
 Ἀργᾶν δ' ἄδειν καὶ κιθαρίζειν  
 Κηφισόδοτον τὸν Ἀχαρνῆθεν,  
 μέλπειν δ' ᾠδαῖς

- 20    τοτὲ μὲν Σπάρτην τὴν εὐρύχορον,  
       τοτὲ δ' αὖ Θήβας τὰς ἐπταπύλους,  
       τάς <θ'> ἁρμονίας μεταβάλλειν.  
       φερνάς τε λαβεῖν δύο μὲν ξανθῶν  
       ἵππων ἀγέλας αἰγῶν τ' ἀγέλην  
 25    χρυσοῦν τε σάκος φιάλην <☞ —>  
       <☞ — ☞ —> τε λεπαστήν  
       χιόνος τε πρόχουν κέρχων τε σιρὸν  
       βολβῶν τε χύτραν δωδεκάπηχυν  
       καὶ πουλυπόδων ἐκατόμβην.  
 30    ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως φασὶ ποιῆσαι  
       Κότυν ἐν Θράκῃ, γάμιον Ἴφικράτει.  
       τούτων δ' ἔσται πολὺ σεμνότερον  
       καὶ λαμπρότερον παρὰ δεσποσύνοις  
       τοῖς ἡμετέροις. τί γὰρ ἐλλείπει  
 35    δόμος ἡμέτερος, ποίων ἀγαθῶν;  
       οὐχὶ σμύρνης Συρίας ὅσμαι  
       λιβάνου τε πνοαί; τερενόχρωτες  
       μαζῶν ὄψεις, ἄρτων, ἀμύλων,  
       πουλυποδείων, χολίκων, δημοῦ,  
 40    φυσκῶν, ζωμοῦ, τεύτλων, θρίων,  
       λεκίθου, σκορόδων, ἀφύης, σκόμβρων,  
       ἐνθρυμματίδων, πτισάνης, ἀθάρης,  
       κυάμων, λαθύρων, ὥχρων, δολίχων,  
       μέλιτος, τυροῦ, χορίων, πυῶν,  
 45    καρύων, χόνδρου,  
       κάραβοι ὀπτοί, τευθίδες ὀπταί,  
       κεστρεὺς ἐφθός, σηπίαί ἐφθαί,  
       μύραιν' ἐφθή, κωβιοὶ ἐφθοί,  
       θυρνίδες ὀπταί, φυκίδες ἐφθαί,  
 50    βάτραχοι, πέρκαι,  
       συνόδοντες, ὄνοι, βατίδες, ψῆτται,  
       γαλεός, κόκκυξ, θρίσσαι, νάρκαι,  
       ρίνης τεμάχη, σχαδόνες, βότρυνες,  
       σῦκα, πλακοῦντες, μῆλα, κράνειαι,  
 55    ῥόαι, ἔρπυλλος, μήκων, ἀχράδες,  
       κνηῆκος, ἑλᾶαι, στέμφυλ', ἄμητες,  
       πράσα, γήτειον, κρόμμυα, φυστή,  
       βολβοί, καυλοί, σίλφιον, ὄξος,  
       μάραθ', ὠά, φακῇ, τέττιγες, ὀπός,



- 60 κάρδαμα, σήσαμα, κήρυκες, ἄλεις,  
 πίναι, λεπάδες, μύες, ὄστρεια,  
 κτένες, ὄρκυνες· καὶ πρὸς τούτοις  
 ὀρνιθαρίων ἄφατον πλῆθος,  
 νητῶν, φαττῶν· χῆνες, στρουθοί,  
 65 κίχλαι, κόρυδοι, κίτται, κύκνοι,  
 πελεκάν, κίγκλοι, γέρανος. (B.) τουδὶ  
 τοῦ χάσκοντος διατειναμένη  
 διὰ τοῦ πρωκτοῦ καὶ τῶν πλευρῶν  
 διακόψειεν τὸ μέτωπον.  
 70 (A.) οἶνοι δέ <υ> σοι λευκός, <Ϟ —>,  
 γλυκύς, αὐθιγενής, ἡδύς, καπνίας

habent ACE, Eust. (13, 26–7)

1–2 om. CE 1 ποιῆθ' Kock: ποιῆσθ' Bergk 2 δεξόμεθ' Wakefield: δέξεθ'  
 A: δέξεται Erfurdt: δέξονθ' Jacobs 3 ὁμοίους Jacobs: ὁμοίως AC: compend. E  
 4 καίτοι Musurus: καὶ τοῖς A: ἐν οἷς CE 5 om. CE βουβαυκαλόσσαυλα  
 Haupt: βυβακαλους ἀυτὰ A: βουβαύκαλα ταῦτα Meineke 7 στρώμαθ' ἄλουργῇ  
 Wakefield: στρώματα ἄλουργά CE: στρώματα μὲν ἄλουργά A μέχρι τῆς fort.  
 corrupt. Kaibel ἄρκτου ACE: ἄκρας Meineke: ἀκάτου Kock 8 βουτυροφάγους  
 Casaubono duce Elmsley: βούτυρον φασὶν ACE: βουτυροφάγας Dobree: βουτυροφα-  
 γᾶς Blaydes 10 τοὺς ACE: τοῖς Desrousseaux χαλκοὺς om. CE: χρυσοὺς van  
 Herwerden 13 χρυσῶ: Harvey 16 Ἀντιγενείδαν Schweighäuser: Ἀντιγενί-  
 δαν A: Ἀντιγενίδην CE 20 τότε A: ποτὲ CE εὐρύχωρον Musurus: εὐρύχωρον  
 ACE 21 τότε A: ποτὲ CE Θήβας A: πύλας CE Θήβαις ταῖς ἐπταπύλαις  
 Richards 22 om. CE τὰς θ' Meineke: τὰς A: τὰς δ' Wilamowitz 23 τε  
 ACE: δὲ Blaydes 24 ἀγέλας CE: ἀγέλην A 25 φιάλην CE, Eust.: φίλην  
 A <θ' ὑάλου> Diggle 27 χιόνος ACE, Eust.: Χίου Kock κέρχων  
 A: κέγχρων CE 27–28 σιρὸν ... χύτρην Dobree: χύτρην ... σιρὸν ACE  
 28 δωδεκάπηχυν A: δωδεκάπηχ (χ super η) E: δωδεκαπήχεων C 29 πολυπόδων  
 Valckenaer: πολυπόδων ACE 30–31 om. CE 33 καὶ λαμπρότερον om. CE  
 34 ἐλλείπει Bothe: ἐκλείπει ACE 36 οὐχὶ σμύρνης Casaubon: οὐ σμύρνης ἐκ  
 Kaibel: οὐ σμύρνης καὶ A: οὐ σμύρνης CE: οὐ σμύρνης ἐκ Kaibel: ἄρ' οὐ σμύρνης  
 Meineke ὁσμαι C: ὁδμαι AE 37 πνοαί Schweighäuser: duce Dindorf:  
 ποῖαι ACE 39 πολυποδείων Schweighäuser: πολυποδείων A: πολυποδίων CE  
 χολίκων A: κολλίκων CE 40–42 θρίων, κεκίθου et σκόμβρων, ἐνθρυμματίδων  
 om. CE 43 ὥχρων CE: ὠχρῶν A δολίχων om. CE 44 om. CE πυῶν  
 Schweighäuser: πυρῶν A: γύρων Meineke 48 om. CE 49 θυννίδες ὀπταί·  
 φυκίδες ἐφθαί· A: θυννίδες ἐφθαί tantum CE: aut θυννίδες ἐφθαί, φυκίδες ἐφθαί  
 aut θυννίδες ὀπταί, φυκίδες ὀπταί Meineke 50–52 om. CE 52 θρίσσαι A:  
 θρίτται aut θρᾶτται Kock 53 ρίνης τεμάχη Schweighäuser: ρείνης τεμάχη A: om.  
 CE 54 σῦκα· πλακοῦντες A: σύκα CE: συκοπλακοῦντες Bothe 57 γήτειον  
 Dindorf: γήτεια ACE κρόμ(υα) ACE 57–59 φυστή, βολβοί et σίλφιον, ὄζος,  
 μάρμαθ', ὠά om. CE 59 φακῇ ACE: φακοί Blaydes τέττιγες, ὀπός (vel

τέττιξ ὀπτός) Dobree: τέττιγες, ὀποί Meineke: τέττιγες ὀπτοί ACE 60 κήρυκες·  
 ἄλεις· ACE: κήρυκες ἄλός Bothe 61 om. CE πίνναι A<sup>84</sup> ὄστρεια  
 Schweighäuser: ὄστρεα A 62 κτένες, ὄρκυνες om. CE 63 ἄφατον Schweig-  
 häuser: ἀφάτων ACE 64–65 στρουθοί, κίχλαι, κόρυδοι om. CE 66 pers.  
 dist. Kock τουδὶ Meineke: τῷδὶ Olson: τουτὶ A: τουτουὶ CE 66–67 τουτὶ σοῦ  
 χάσκοντος Kock 69 διακόψειεν A: διακόψειε CE 70 pers. dist. Kaibel δέ  
 σοι ACE: δέ γε σοι Dobree: δ' ἔτι σοι Erfurdt: δ' ἔσται Jacobs: δ' εἰσὶν Kaibel: δ' οἶκοι  
 Kock 70–71 δέ <υ>: δέ γε Dobree: δ' ἔτι Erfurdt λευκός· γλυκύς· A: γλυκὺς·  
 λευκός CE: λευκός pro var. lect. habet Dobree <Ϟ —>: κερρός Meineke: ἐρυθρός  
 Erfurdt

- And if you do these things just as I indicate,  
 we will receive you with a brilliant feast,  
 not at all like that of Iphicrates  
 in Thrace; and yet they say
- 5 it was a great, swaggering affair.  
 Throughout the agora were strewn  
 purple carpets up to the stars;  
 butter-eating men were feasting,  
 dirty-haired hordes.
- 10 The kettles were bronze,  
 larger than pits which hold twelve couches.  
 And Cotys himself wore an apron  
 and served soup in a golden *chous*,  
 and having a go at the *kraters*
- 15 became drunk before the drinkers.  
 Antigeneidas played the aulos for them,  
 and Argas sang, and Cephisodotus  
 from Acharnae played the cithara,  
 and with songs celebrated
- 20 now the broad dancing-places of Sparta,  
 now seven-gated Thebes,  
 and varied the harmonies.  
 And he took as a dowry two herds  
 of bay horses and a herd of goats
- 25 and a golden strainer and a *phiale* <- - ->  
 <- - -> and a *lepaste*  
 and a pitcher of snow and a bin of millet,

<sup>84</sup> πίνναι seems never to have been printed here previously, although arguments for this orthography have long been made; cf. note *ad loc.*

- and a twelve-cubit pot of bulbs  
and a hecatomb of octopuses.
- 30 This is how they say Cotys did these things  
in Thrace, as a marriage-celebration for Iphicrates.  
But much more grand than these  
and more brilliant will be that in the house  
of our masters. For what does
- 35 our house lack of such things as are good?  
Are there not the scents of Syrian myrrh  
and the wafts of frankincense? There are sights  
of tender-skinned *maza*, baked loaves, cakes,  
of octopuses, sausages, beef-fat,
- 40 of sausages, broth, beets, fig-leaves,  
of porridge, garlic, small-fry, mackerel,  
of cakes, barley-gruel, wheat-gruel,  
of fava beans, vetch, pale vetch, long beans,  
of honey, cheese, pudding, wheat,
- 45 of nuts, groats,  
broiled crawfish, broiled squid,  
stewed mullet, stewed cuttle-fish,  
stewed moray eel, stewed gobies,  
broiled tuna, stewed wrasse,
- 50 angler-fish, perch,  
dentex, hake, skates, turbot,  
thresher shark, gurnard, sprats, electric rays,  
monkfish-steaks, honey-combs, grapes,  
figs, flat-cakes, apples, cherries,
- 55 pomegranates, thyme, poppy seeds, pears,  
saffron, olives, olive-cakes, milk-cakes,  
leeks, shallots, onions, barley-cake,  
bulbs, silphium-stalks, silphium, vinegar,  
fennel, eggs, lentil-soup, cicadas, fig-juice,
- 60 cress, sesame, whelks, salt,  
pinnae, limpets, mussels, oysters,  
scallops, tuna. And in addition to these,  
an extraordinary crowd of little birds,  
of ducks, of pigeons; geese, sparrows,
- 65 thrushes, larks, jays, swans,  
pelican, wagtails, crane... (B.) May that crane,  
stretching through the asshole and ribs

of this gaping one here,  
split his brow.

70 (A.) And wines for you, white, <– – –>  
sweet, local, sweet, smoky

Ath. 4.131a–f

Ἀναξανδρίδης δ' ἐν Πρωτεσιλάῳ διασύρων τὸ τῶν Ἰφικράτους γάμων συμπόσιον, ὅτε ἦγετο τὴν Κότυος τοῦ Θρακῶν βασιλέως θυγατέρα, φησί· —

Anaxandrides in *Prōtesilaos*, when mocking the symposium at the wedding of Iphicrates, when he married the daughter of Cotys, the king of the Thracians, says: —

Eust. *Od.* 1835.20

χοῦς ... οὐ μόνον ἀρσενικῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ θηλυκῶς, οἶον· (line 13). αὕτη δὲ καὶ πρόχους κατὰ σύνθεσιν λέγεται, οἶον· (26 φιάλην–27 πρόχουν)

*Chous* ... is not only masculine, but also feminine, for example (line 13). But it is also, using a compound, called *prochous*, for example: (26 *phiale*–27 *prochous*)

**Metre** Anapaestic dimeter.

```

---υ--- | ----
---- | ---υ---
-υ--- | ---υ---
---- | ----
5  ---υ--- υ---
   υ---υ--- | υ---
   -υ--- | υ---
   ---- | ---υ---
   -υ--- | -υ---
10  -υ--- | ----
   ---- | -υ---
   -υ--- | υ---
   -υ--- | ----
   -υ--- | ----
15  υ---υ--- | ----
   ---- | -υ---
   ---- | -υ---
   -υ--- | υ---
   ----
20  υ--- | ---υ---
   υ--- | ---υ---

```

---υυ- | υυ--  
 ---υυ- | υυ---  
 ---υυ- | ---υυ-  
 25 ---υυ- | υυ-⟨ω-⟩  
 ⟨ω-ω-⟩ υυ--  
 υυ-υυ- | ---υυ-  
 ---υυ- | -υυ--  
 ---υυ- υυ--  
 30 ---υυ- | -υυ--  
 υυ--- | υυ-υυ-  
 --- | υυ-υυ-  
 ---υυ- | υυ-υυ-  
 ---υυ- | υυ--  
 35 υυ-υυ- | ---υυ-  
 --- | υυ--  
 υυ-υυ- | υυ---  
 --- | ---υυ-  
 ---υυ- | υυ--  
 40 --- | ---  
 υυ-υυ- | υυ---  
 ---υυ- | υυ-υυ-  
 υυ-υυ- | ---υυ-  
 υυ--- | υυ--  
 45 υυ---  
 υυ--- | -υυ--  
 --- | -υυ--  
 --- | -υυ--  
 -υυ- | -υυ--  
 50 -υυ-  
 υυ-υυ- | υυ---  
 υυ--- | ---  
 ---υυ- | υυ-υυ-  
 -υυ- | -υυ--  
 55 υυ--- | ---υυ-  
 -υυ- | -υυ--  
 υυ--- | -υυ--  
 --- | -υυ--



Macedonian ones). Athenaeus quotes only Antiph. fr. 170, which unfavourably compares contemporary Greeks with their (?) ancestors and the Great King. This fragment provides the impetus for quoting Ar. *Ach.* 85–9 (as an example of the magnificence of the barbarians) and, presumably, this fragment. This is followed by Lync. fr. 1, Hegesander of Delphi fr. 10 (*FHG* 4.415), Diph. fr. 17 and Men fr. 351, all of which compare Athenian diners to other Greeks, but also serve as a transition to the discussion of pre-dinner snacks that follows.

**Text** In 1, Kock's ποιῆθ' or less likely Bergk's ποιῆσθ' are possible, given ὕμᾱς in 2. But A's ποιῆς is perfectly acceptable and ought to be retained; cf. Arnott 2001a.

The boldness of the image in 7 and the lack of parallels have bothered many scholars, and so Meineke emended to ἄκρας ('inde a foro usque ad arcem, in qua habitabat Cotys'), Kock to ἀκάτου ('usque ad scapham Iphicratis'), while Kaibel suggested that the corruption might reside instead in μέχρι τῆς. Both emendations have some plausibility, Meineke's more so, but neither convinces; as for Kaibel's proposal, it is difficult to imagine what emendation of μέχρι τῆς could answer the supposed problems of the phrase.

Dindorf was the first to recognize that 26 contains a lacuna. The best solution is to assume that 25 is not in fact a monometer (as is usually assumed), that φιάλην belongs to 25 rather than 26 (as is usually assumed), and that the lacuna occupies the end of 25 and the beginning of 26. The lacuna thus consists of one anapaest at the end of 25 (plausibly filled by Diggle's <θ' ὕαλου>) and two anapaests at the beginning of 26 (presumably to be filled by an adjective modifying λεπαστήν, e.g. a compound of χρυσός *vel sim.*). Aside from occasional attempts at emendation (e.g. Bothe) or wholesale rewriting of the passage (e.g. Edmonds), this lacuna has been placed at the beginning of 26 (treating 25 as a monometer and assuming that φιάλην belongs to line 26). With such a placement, however, neither of the two possible ways of interpreting the syntax is satisfactory. One option is to place a comma after τε and treat λεπαστήν as joined asyndetically; but the asyndeton would be out of place in this polysyndetic passage (contrast 37–66), and no editor has so punctuated. The other possibility is to assume that λεπαστήν is in apposition, presumably explanatory, to φιάλην, although the glossing also seems out of place.<sup>86</sup> Kassel–Austin mark a lacuna of one anapaest at the beginning

<sup>86</sup> Kassel–Austin on Cratin. fr. 252 offer a number of apparent parallels for this construction; but in the case of Cratin. fr. 252, Phryn. Com. fr. 42, and Pherecr. fr. 113.19, the word in apposition defines the given vessel in a necessary way, i.e. its unusual size or use, while Theopomp. Com. fr. 31.4 is irrelevant. In contrast, the text here, if sound, defines one drinking vessel in terms of another; although this

of the line and thus treat it as a paroemiac. Although this offers a line that observes diaeresis (unnecessary in the case of a paroemiac; cf. 5), a paroemiac is not wanted here, since the other examples in this fragment (5, 22, 29, 69) all coincide with structural divisions and a clausular ending. It is also possible that φιάλην is an intrusive gloss on λεπαστήν (see below for the disputed nature of the λεπαστή) that has ousted the true reading, as at e.g. Ar. *Pax* 916 as quoted at Ath. 11.485a, where κύλικά, originating as a gloss, has entered the text and ousted νέου.

Dobree's conjecture σιρόν in place of ACE's χύτραν in 27, and the reverse in the next line, is almost certainly correct, since a σιρός is more appropriate for storing grain, just as a χύτρα is for bulbs (cf. Ar. *Ec.* 1092 βολβῶν χύτραν); cf. Toup 1778. 371–2.

Bothe's emendation to ἐλλείπει (ἐκλείπει ACE) in 34 has the double advantage of giving better sense and being able to govern both accusative (τί) and genitive (ποιῶν ἀγαθῶν).

In 36, CE are missing a syllable, and A's καί seems a clumsy stopgap. The best solution is probably Casaubon's οὐχὶ σμύρνης (taking Συρίας as an adjective); Kaibel's οὐ σμύρνης ἐκ (printed by Kassel–Austin) is possible, but virtually violates metron diaeresis. For ὀσμάι (as opposed to ὀδμάι, the reading of AE), cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 62; Threatte 1980 I.567–8; Barrett 1964 on E. *Hipp.* 1391 (addenda p. 437); the same error occurs at Antiph. fr. 159.10; Alex. fr. 195.3 (cf. Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*).

In 49, Meineke 1840 III.189 suggested making both fish in the line either stewed (ἐφθαί; so CE) or broiled (ὀπταί). But the variation (found in A) provides a suitable conclusion to the similar variation in this short section as a whole (46–9; see *ad loc.*).

ACE's ὀπτοί in 59 is metrically impossible; although Meineke's ὀποί is a paleographically trivial correction, the word seems not to occur normally in the plural, and Dobree's ὀπός is thus preferable. Dobree's alternative suggestion, τέττιξ ὀπτός, is possible only if τέττιξ refers to the fish of that name; on the implausibility of that interpretation, cf. *ad loc.*

The end of 60 has often been doubted, but needlessly so; the transmitted text ties together the list of condiments and the list of shellfish and facilitates the transition between them. Meineke 1840 III.189 was dissatisfied with the text ('mirum est sal hoc loco commemorari'), but was disinclined to emend, noting 'at similiter vs. 58 [59 K–A] pisces τέττιγες commemorantur inter

---

procedure is common among the lexicographers and authors such as Athenaeus, it is inappropriate for an author referring to what is apparently a relatively common contemporary drinking vessel.



condimenta';<sup>87</sup> Kock 1884 III.155 was convinced that the text was unsound ('ἄλεις vix sanum') but neither emended nor marked as corrupt his printed text; his abysmal suggestion ἄμης ('milk-cakes'; cf. on 56 above) is far more out of place than ἄλεις. Bothe 1855. 428–9 did emend, but his κήρυκες ἄλός ('*praecones maris, pisces*'), although a possible locution, is inappropriate in context (ἄλς, 'sea', occurs in comedy only at fr. 31.3, where it fits well with the mock-epic tone; cf. *ad loc.*).

70 as transmitted is metrically deficient on two counts. The first half of the line lacks one short syllable. The best suggestion is Dobree's δέ <γε>, which is paleographically simple to account for and idiomatic (cf. Denniston 1954. 154: 'In Aristophanic and Platonic dialogue δέ γε often picks up the thread after a remark interpellated by another speaker. It thus connects ... the speaker's words with his own previous words, not with those of another person.'). Erfurdt's δ' ἔτι, on the other hand, is far more rare in comedy (Ar. *Ra.* 1329; Men. *Mis.* 194) and less appropriate after an interruption, while Jacobs' δ' ἔσται and Kaibel's δ' εἰσίν are both flat and more difficult to account for paleographically. The second half of the line lacks one anapaest, presumably an adjective describing a type of wine. An obvious suggestion is another wine designated by colour, in which case Meineke's κίρρος is perhaps best, given the association of white and yellow wines in Athenaeus. Less likely is Erfurdt's ἐρυθρός, which often describes wine in Homer (e.g. *Od.* 5.163) but less so elsewhere.

**Interpretation** Long anapaestic catalogues of food are common in Middle Comedy (e.g. Mnesim. fr. 4 [the only fragment which vies with this one in length]; Antiph. fr. 130; 131; Eub. fr. 63; Ephipp. fr. 12; 13; Alex. fr. 167; cf. Headlam-Knox 1922 on Herod. 7.57–61) and are perhaps the most easily recognizable feature of fourth-century comedy (cf. Nesselrath 1990. 267–80; Meineke 1839 I.302–3; Dohm 1964. 87 n. 1); the lack of context for such passages, however, leaves considerable doubt as to their position and use in plays. Scholars normally associate them with the conclusion of a comedy (Arnott 1996. 20 describes them as 'doubtless continuing a tradition of celebratory finales that goes back at least to Aristophanes [e.g. *Pax* 974–1015]'; cf. the song in dactylic tetrameters at Ar. *Ec.* 1169–76), and Webster 1970. 18 thus suggested that this passage is from the exodos (cf. the wedding at the end of Aristophanes' *Peace* or *Birds*). But Alex. fr. 167 may belong instead to the prologue (cf. Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* and pp. 20, 479–80), while Hunter 1983 on

<sup>87</sup> Meineke's final decision is sound, his reasoning is not; τέττιγες here are not fish, but rather cicadas, and thus fit well in this mixture of condiments and finger-food.

Eub. fr. 63 compares the effect of such passages to the *pnigos* of Old Comedy. Interest in overly lavish and extravagant feasts is not confined to comedy, but also appears e.g. in the gastronomic mock-epics of Arcestratus and Matro and Philoxenus' *Banquet*, and is indicative of a wider cultural fascination due in part to the importation of Sicilian cuisine to the east and the proliferation of cookbooks; cf. Olson–Sens 1999. 24–33; 2000. xxviii–xliii, xlvi–lv.

The first part of the fragment (3–29), the description of the wedding feast in Thrace, resembles most closely the symposium that followed a meal because of the emphasis on drinking and musical entertainment. In contrast, the second part (37–71) is roughly analogous to the meal itself, although the intent is clearly to present a vast array of foodstuffs rather than to follow precisely the normal sequence of dining (see Olson–Sens 1999. 26, with a brief outline of such feasts). The speaker presents the food in logical groups (breads and sidedishes [37–45], cooked fish [46–53], a mixture mostly of fruits and vegetables [53–60], shellfish [60–2], birds [64–6]) in a more or less intelligible order, but prefers to overwhelm the listener with quantity rather than offering a clearly defined flow of courses.

1 κἄν ταῦτα ποιῆς ὥσπερ φράζω Cf. Ar. Av. 977 κἄν μὲν, θέσπιε κοῦρε, ποιῆς ταῦθ' ὥς ἐπιτέλλω.

2 λαμπροῖς δείπνοις Cf. 33; Antiph. fr. 226.6–7 τοῖς λαμπροῖσι γὰρ / δείπνοις; X. *Smp.* 1.4. Although often simply an adjective of general commendation, λαμπρός properly refers to a radiant outward appearance, commonly the result of physical beauty or the bloom of youth (cf. on fr. 9.6), and here probably indicates the magnificence of the feast (cf. 33); for the connotation of the word in the context of marriage, cf. Parca 1992. 184–5.

δεξιόμεθ' ὁμᾶς The speaker, apparently a slave (cf. 33–4), amalgamates himself with his master, the host. δέχομαι with an accusative object and a dative is not uncommon; e.g. Ar. Av. 1729; S. OC 4, where Jebb 1887 *ad loc.* gives further examples; LSJ s. v. II.1.

3–4 οὐδὲν ὁμοίους τοῖς Ἰφικράτους / τοῖς ἐν Θράκῃ As becomes clear at 31 (cf. 12), the feast referred to is that held to celebrate the wedding of Iphicrates and the daughter of the Thracian king Cotys. Prior to his marriage into the Thracian royal family, Iphicrates may have had contacts or experience in the region; cf. Parke 1933. 52.

Ἰφικράτης Τιμοθέου Ῥαμνούςιος (PA 7737; PAA 542925; Davies 1971. 248–52; Develin 1989 #1449; LGPN II, s. v. 4), the famous Athenian general, seems to have been born ca. 413 BC and was *strategos* seventeen times between 393/2 and 356/5 BC, including a run of seven consecutive years beginning in 393/2 BC, before his death shortly before or in 352 BC. In accord with the ancient tradition (e.g. Nep. *Iph.* 3.4; Ath. 4.131a), he is usually held to have

married Cotys' daughter (named Thressa in Nepos); but Davies 1971. 249–50 argues cogently on the basis of relationships mentioned at D. 23.129 and the reconstruction of the Thracian royal family (see Höck 1891. 89–116) that the woman was instead Cotys' sister. The date of the wedding is disputed as well. It is normally placed *ca.* 381 BC on the assumption that Cotys must have been granted Athenian citizenship before the wedding but would not have been given it prior to his taking the throne in 384 or 383 BC.<sup>88</sup> Regardless of whether this assumption is as important in the case of a sister as it may be for a daughter, Iphicrates' son Menestheus (*PA* 9988; *PAA* 645115; *LGPNI* II, s. v. 22) was *strategos* in 356/5 BC (in which year Iphicrates himself was general for the last time); this strongly suggests that he was 30 by then, which places his birth, and thus the marriage of his parents, in 386 BC at the latest. Davies adds further evidence that the citizenship of Menestheus was not uncontested, and the earlier date ought thus to be favored.

4–29 The description of the wedding of Iphicrates provides an example of an outrageously extravagant feast as a point of comparison for the one described afterward. The emphasis is on the enormous size of the event (cf. *Ar. Ach.* 73–89) and its implements, but also on the Thracians' ignorance (or disregard) of proper etiquette (e.g. the barbarians were dirty [9], the host himself served the guests [12–13] and became drunk early on [14–15]). But the point is not to disparage this feast but to create an exemplar of fantastic excess beyond which the feast described in the latter part of the fragment will go.

This extended passage in indirect discourse is nearly unparalleled in poetry; the only comparable passage is *A.R.* 3.579–604 (where the acc. + inf. construction is reintroduced by a second verb of speaking at 594). The effect is presumably prosaic, although the parallel in Apollonius suggests that this need not be the case.

5 **βουβαυκαλόσσαυλα** A comic compound apparently derived from (1) *βοῦς* (cf. Chantraine 1968–1980 s. v. *βου-* 3 for the word adding the sense 'large' or 'great' in compounds); (2) *βάυκαλον* (*EM* p. 192.20 *βάυκαλον· μαλακίζόμενον, τρυφερὸν καὶ ὠραϊστήν*; cf. *Hsch.* β 364 (= *AB* p. 225.26); *Phot.* β 104); and (3) *σαύλος* (*Phot.* σ 97 *σαῦλον· τρυφερὸν*; *Hsch.* σ 267; *Anacr. PMG* 498; *E. Cyc.* 40; *Ar. V.* 1173). It thus means something like 'great-luxurious-lascivious'.

6 **κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν** The phrase re-enforces the scale of the banquet; only an expanse as large as an agora is capable of accommodating such a crowd. The phrase may also suggest a large, public feast, as at a major festival, and thus further emphasizes the size of the affair; for the scale and the enter-

<sup>88</sup> For the evidence, with brief discussion, of his Athenian citizenship, see Osborne 1981–1983 III.49–50 (T 36).

tainment, cf. the wedding celebration arranged by Philip II for his daughter in 336 BC (D.S. 16.91.4–92.5).

**6–8 μὲν ... δέ** The particles strengthen the contrast between the richness of the surroundings and the barbaric nature of the feasters.

**6–7 ὑπεστρώσθαι / στρώμαθ' ἄλουργῇ** Although στρώματα can be anything strewn (e.g. bedding, coverings for couches), here they are presumably carpets or the like. Plu. *Mor.* 527b mentions στρωμνὰς ἄλουργεῖς καὶ τραπέζας πολυτελεῖς as a sign of ostentatiousness; similarly at *Lyc.* 13.6 he includes στρωμνὰς ἄλουργεῖς with silver-footed couches, golden kylixes, and associated items as objects banished from Sparta by Lycurgus. For further discussion of the connotations of purple, see Blum 1998 (25–8 for discussion of the adjective ἄλουργῆς in particular); Reinhold 1970. 22–8. In the mid-fourth century, both ἄλουργῆς and ἄλουργός are acceptable forms of the adjective; see Threatte 1996. II.295–6; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1514.12–13, 14 (nom. sing. ἄλουργός), 21–2 (dat. sing. ἄλουργεῖ).

**μέχρι τῆς ἄρκτου** The constellation Ursa Major; for thorough discussion, see Kidd 1997 on Arat. 27. Or 'to the north?'; cf. White 1987. 68–70.

**8 ἄνδρας βουτυροφάγους** Although butter was known to the Greeks and used by them for medicinal purposes (Hp. *Mul.* 1.63 [VIII.130 Littré], 64 [VIII.132 Littré]; both instances use the word πικέριον rather than βούτυρον), it is mainly associated with barbarians (Hdt. 4.2; Hp. *Morb.* 4.51 [VII.584 Littré]; Arist. fr. 636; Plin. *NH* 28.133 *butyrum, barbararum gentium lautissimus cibus*; for the similar characterization of barbarian tribes as 'milk-drinkers', cf. Hdt. 1.216.4; 4.186.1; Seaford 1984 on E. *Cyc.* 136]). Statements occasionally found, such as Casaubon's comment *ad loc.*, 'Thracēs poeta facit butyrophagos, cum in Graecia vix butyri adhuc esset usus cognitus', are basically correct in suggesting that the Greeks did not use butter as a condiment, but potentially misleading in implying that they lacked real knowledge of it (note that Hp. *Morb.* 4.51 [VII.584 Littré], for example, describes in detail the process of its manufacture). The epithet, like 'milk-drinking' (e.g. Hdt. 1.216) characterizes the Thracians as barbarians and more primitive than the Greeks; cf. Long 1986. 8–9; Cropp 1988 on E. *El.* 169.

**9 ἀύχηροκόμας** Cf. on fr. 35.6 ἀύχμων. Kassel–Austin cite Anacr. *PMG* 422 Ὀρηκίην σίοντα χαίτην, although it is impossible to determine whether that fragment refers to the phenomenon noted here. Dirtiness characterizes the Thracians as non-Greek; cf. fr. 35.6; 59.1.

**μυριοπληθεῖς** The word occurs also at E. *IA* 571 in a corrupt passage in a choral ode, the authenticity of which has been doubted ('fortasse non Euripidei', Diggle), where it may have been used adverbially; it appears again at Hdt. 9.3 to describe the vastness of an army. For the force of μυριο-, cf.

Olson 1998 on Ar. *Pax* 521. The sheer numbers reflect the non-Greekness of the setting; for the enormity of barbarian populations, cf. Hdt. 4.81.1; 5.3.1; Th. 2.97.6.

**10 λέβητας χαλκοῦς** The *lebēs* is a large, deep bowl, made either of metal or clay and often set on a three-legged stand; see Amyx 1958. 199–200; Kanowski 1984. 86–8; Richter–Milne 1935. 9–11. The vessel served a variety of purposes, functioning as an urn (A. Ag. 444; Ch. 686; S. El. 1401); a basin for washing the feet or other body parts (e.g. Hsch. λ 484 λέβης· χάλκειος ποδανιπτήρ; cf. Fraenkel 1950 on A. Ag. 1129; Ginouvès 1962. 61–75); a mixing vessel (e.g. Semos of Delos *FGrHist* 396 F 16); or a pot for boiling water, whether for cooking, bathing, or some other purpose (e.g. Antiph. fr. 26.3–4). Especially in this last use, its tripod stand is functional, providing a means of suspending the vessel over a fire. The context suggests that here the vessels are used as a cooking pot, most likely for the soup mentioned in 13. In any case, the larger context of a wedding-feast would call to mind the λέβης γαμικός, a vessel apparently used in some sort of bridal purification; cf. *Agora* XII.54; Boardman 1958–1959. 161–2. Amyx, following Richter–Milne, maintains that a difference in use follows that in material, with the bronze *lebēs* used mainly to heat liquids over fire and the clay version used to mix wine; in any event, bronze *lebētes* seem to have been common, so serious consideration should be given to van Herwerden’s χρυσοῦς, which better fits the context of extravagant display.

**11 μείζους λάκκων δωδεκακλίνων** The size of a room is often indicated in terms of the number of couches it can contain; cf. on fr. 71.1; Phryn. Com. fr. 69; Amphis fr. 45; Eub. fr. 119 with Hunter 1983 *ad loc.* δωδεκάκλινος thus means literally ‘a house or room that contains twelve couches’; but ‘twelve’ is frequently used to mean a vaguely large number (cf. 28 δωδεκάπηχυν; Dover 1993 on Ar. *Ra.* 1327). Pits for storage of various items, both liquid and dry, are common in domestic architecture; e.g. *Agora* XIV. 197; *Olynthus* XII.204–5, 305–7; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 184.3; D.S. 31.9.2 for a pit described as a nine-couch room in size. λάκκοι in particular seem to have been normally used for liquids; e.g. X. *An.* 4.2.22; Ar. *Ec.* 154; Alex. fr. 179.9 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Anaxil. fr. 1; Phot. λ 46 (cf. 43; 45).

**12 αὐτὸν δὲ Κότυν** King of Thrace ca. 384–359 BC and granted Athenian citizenship sometime early in his reign or possibly slightly before he acceded to power; his daughter or sister married the Athenian Iphicrates. See Osborne 1981–1983 III.49–50; above on 3. For recent discussions of Cotys (*PAA* 583219) and his reign, particularly the archaeological evidence, see Archibald 1998, esp. 218–26, 231 (see 260 and pl. 17 for silver bowls inscribed with Cotys’ name, which were perhaps gifts from him); Peter 1997. 112–25. That Cotys himself

is serving the soup, a task normally delegated to a slave, continues the inversion or contrast with normal Athenian practice and introduces what might normally be mockery of Cotys for his barbarousness (i.e. not knowing — or ignoring — normal dining etiquette and being ready to assume a slavish role) and for his gluttony (by placing himself in a position to have first access to the food; cf. 14–15) but here is perhaps grounds for envy (Cotys' quick and unlimited access to food and drink).

**περιεζῶσθαι** Most scholars have claimed that this verb, when used in a culinary context, is equivalent to ἔχων περίζωμα (cf. Heges. fr. 1.7) or περιζώστρον (cf. Anaxandr. fr. 70); see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 179.11 for bibliography. But Arnott 1996 (followed by Dunbar 1995 on Ar. Av. 1148) argues forcefully that the word means 'with the tunic supported by a waist-belt', and suggests that this refers to a style of dress in which 'the χιτῶν was worn like a modern bath-towel, doubled and hanging down over the belt, with the arms and upper body left free'.<sup>89</sup> Although Arnott's arguments are generally persuasive, his dismissal of several possible representations of aprons is not conclusive, and the post-classical meaning of περίζωμα, 'loin-cloth', perhaps more likely implies an evolution from a sense akin to 'apron' than to a style of dress. In any case, this sort of dress is more appropriate for a menial than a king and thus continues the characterization of Cotys (cf. previous note).

**13 ζωμόν** See on fr. 35.5.

**ἐν χοῖ χρυσῇ** See on fr. 33.1. Eust. *Od.* 1835.20 reports that χοῦς is καὶ οὐ μόνον ἄρσενικῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ θηλυκῶς and quotes this line in support;<sup>90</sup> in fact, the occurrence here seems to be the only example of the feminine (contrast fr. 33.1).<sup>91</sup> That the *chous*, normally a clay vessel, is made of gold indicates the incredible extravagance of the feast, and the use to which Cotys puts it perhaps suggests both the enormous quantity of soup being served and his ignorance of the vessel's proper function.

<sup>89</sup> This interpretation had been suggested earlier by Dedousi 1965 on Men. *Sam.* 283 (= 68 in her first edition; see now Dedousi 2006), although with little supporting evidence (primarily Poll. 4.119).

<sup>90</sup> Eustathius makes virtually the same point elsewhere and cites Strabo in support (cf. Eust. *Il.* 305.43 with van der Valk 1971–1987 *ad loc.* for further examples from both Eustathius and Strabo), although in these instances he is discussing χοῦς (B) ('heap of earth'). Note that his statement at *Od.* 1390.60, ὁ χοῦς μέντοι τὸ μέτρον, ἀεὶ ἄρσενικῶς. ὁ δὲ γε τῆς γῆς, καὶ θηλυκῶς, flatly contradicts his assertion here and his citation from this fragment.

<sup>91</sup> This assertion excludes the feminine examples of χοῦς (B) (see previous footnote) and Nic. *Th.* 103, which LSJ mistakenly cite (corrected in the supplement; cf. Gow 1951. 110).

14 γεύομενον τῶν κρατήρων γεύομαι is normally found with a genitive of the thing tasted (e.g. Ar. fr. 478; Axionic. fr. 4.18; Phoenicid. fr. 2.3). The construction here is probably similar, with the verb having the sense ‘experience’ or ‘have a go at’ (the translation of Ar. *Ra.* 462 by Sommerstein 1996); less likely, τῶν κρατήρων may be a genitive of source.

16 αὐλεῖν For the *aulos*, see on fr. 19.2.

Ἀντιγενεΐδαν Ἀντιγενεΐδας Σατύρου (or Διονυσίου) Θηβαῖος (Stephanis 1988 #196; Koumanoudes 1979 #138; Berve 1926 II.8 [p. 415]), one of the foremost musicians of the first half of the fourth century, popularized a new style of *aulos*-playing known as πλάσις or μετὰ πλάσματος (Thphr. *HP* 4.11.4–5); in general, see Dinse 1856. For the orthography of his name (–εΐδας vs. –ίδας), cf. Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 II.283; Lobeck 1837. 4–6.

17 Ἀργῶν δ’ ᾄδειν For Argas, see on fr. 16.4. On the basis of this passage (in contrast to fr. 16.4, where he seems to be a *kitharistēs*), Stephanis 1988 #292 suggested that he was an aulode; for ᾄδειν meaning ‘sing with musical accompaniment’, cf. Ar. *Ra.* 1304–7; Amips. fr. 21.1–2; Cratin. fr. 254.

18 Κηφισόδοτον τὸν Ἀχαρνῆθεν The *kitharistēs* Cephisodotus (Stephanis 1988 #1393; *PA* 8326; *PAA* 567705; *LGPN* II s. v. #20) is otherwise unknown; see on 19–22 for possible identification with another Cephisodotus.

19–22 Scholars have disagreed about whether the subject of these lines is all three musicians (thus Meineke and Edmonds) or only Cephisodotus (thus Bothe). Bergk 1883 II.544, advocating the latter, suggested that ‘dieser Kephisodotos ist wohl ein Politiker, der damals bald zu Sparta, bald zu Theben hinneigte, den der witzige Komiker als Kitharöden einführt’. Bergk’s interpretation lends point to the references to Sparta and Thebes, explains the presence of an otherwise unknown musician in the company of two of the most famous, as well as the poet’s furnishing him with a demotic, and adds a political tone that coincides with what can be suggested about the general content of the play (on the final point, see the Introduction to the play and the general Introduction). The main objection to Bergk’s suggestion is the lack of a known, politically important Cephisodotus of Acharnae. Bergk proposed an identification with the general Cephisodotus (*PA* 8313; *PAA* 567530), although Kassel–Austin are rightly critical of this; a second possibility is a relative (grandfather?) of Cephisodotus son of Euarchides of Acharnae (*PA* 8327; *PAA* 567730), who seems to have been politically active in the latter part of the fourth century and the early years of the third.<sup>92</sup>

<sup>92</sup> Kirchner (on *PA* 8326) hints at kinship between the two men.



An additional possibility is that Cotys resumes as the subject and that the references to Sparta and Thebes allude to his political maneuvering; but this interpretation is difficult, since the names of musicians intrude between the verb and the last mention of Cotys.

**19 μέλπειν δ' ὥδαῖς** Cf. E. *Cyc.* 69–70 with Seaford 1984 *ad loc.*; Ar. *Th.* 988–9. μέλπω is normally confined to high poetry; the only other occurrences in comedy are the four times it is used in a religious context during the same choral ode in Ar. *Th.* (961, 970, 974, 989).

**20–21 τοτὲ μὲν ... τοτὲ δ' αὖ** Cf. Ar. *Av.* 1398–9; without αὖ, e.g. S. *OC* 1745; Ar. *Eq.* 540.

**Σπάρτην τὴν εὐρύχορον ... Θήβας τὰς ἑπταπύλους** The references to Sparta and Thebes combine the names of the cities with traditional epithets from epic and other elevated poetry. If these lines are not interpreted as a political jibe against Cephisodotus, they serve to characterize more fully the entertainment at the wedding feast and perhaps provide a humorous contrast between the ethos associated with such poetry and Cotys' evident ignorance of the behavior or social conventions appropriate to such an occasion. The first half of the fourth century, however, did witness the Spartan attempt at hegemony, followed by that of Thebes, and the rebuilding of an Athenian League, and these names likely evoke contemporary political relationships. For the history of the period, see Cartledge 1987, esp. 274–313 for the relation between the three states; Hamilton 1991; Buckler 1980.

Sparta is described as εὐρύχορος only in a Delphic oracle at Hdt. 7.220.4 (Parke–Wormell 1956 II.44 #100), but the adjective is applied to Lacedaimon twice in Homer (*Od.* 13.414; 15.1). ἑπτάπυλοι, on the other hand, is the standard epithet of Thebes both in Homer (*Il.* 4.406; *Od.* 11.263) and elsewhere (e.g. P. *P.* 3.90–1; N. 9.18 with Braswell 1998 *ad loc.*; B. 19.47;<sup>93</sup> cf. A. *Th.* 165).

**22 τὰς <θ> ἁρμονίας μεταβάλλειν** ἁρμονία is the term for a musical mode; for discussion generally and concerning the individual modes, see West 1992. 177–89; Anderson 1994 *passim*. For changes of mode, cf. Phryn. *PS* p. 25.2–9; Antiph. fr. 207.4 with Kassel–Austin *ad loc.* Although the meaning of the word in its technical musical sense is foremost in this context, the notion of joining inherent in the word could easily refer as well to alliances or pacts between states, especially if the idea has already been suggested; alternatively, the point may be that different modes are used for singing about Sparta and about Thebes.

**23 φερνάς τε λαβεῖν** After describing various aspects of the wedding feast, the poet turns to a description of the dowry, although it is quickly

<sup>93</sup> LSJ's citation of 18.47 uses the old numbering.



assimilated to the feast itself; the accusatives in 23–9 are all in apposition to φερνάς. Despite attempts to distinguish different senses for the two words for a dowry, προίξ and φερνή (e.g. Page 1938 on E. *Med.* 956 claims that the former means ‘money-settlement’ and the latter ‘personal goods and outfit’), the real difference between the two seems to be that the latter is mainly poetic and the former is not (cf. Schaps 1979. 100); for the dowry in general, see Schaps 1979. 74–88, 99–107. Although the subject is not expressed, and Iphicrates has not been mentioned since 3, the placement of this phrase, particularly with φερνάς in the emphatic first position, immediately calls to mind the bridegroom. λαμβάνω seems to be the standard verb for the bridegroom receiving the φερνή (e.g. E. *Ion* 298; Aeschin. 2.31; cf. Plb. 28.20.9).

23–4 δύο μὲν ξανθῶν / ἵππων ἀγέλας Horses are stereotypically ξανθός already in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 9.407; 16.149 [a proper name] with Janko 1992 *ad loc.*) and commonly thereafter (e.g. S. fr. 475; E. *Phaeth.* 74 with Diggle 1970 *ad loc.*; Denniston 1939 on E. *El.* 476–7; cf. the proper name Xanthippos) and are associated with the Thracians already in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 13.4). In the latter part of the fifth century, a horse of good quality cost 12 *minae* (Ar. *Nu.* 21, 1224; cf. [Lys.] 8.10), while one of poor quality could be had for 3 *minae* (Is. 5.43). Thus, two herds of horses, even of middling quality, is a very extravagant gift. For further discussion, see Wyse 1904 on Is. 5.43.

24 αἰγῶν τ’ ἀγέλην After the horses, the goats are a shift from the elevated to the banal; Diggle notes that ‘the feeble repetition of ἀγέλη perhaps supports the point, together with the bareness of both αἰγῶν and ἀγέλην unqualified.’ In the fourth century, goats, at least in sacrificial contexts, cost between 10 and 12 *drachmae* per head; see Pritchett 1956. 258–9.

25 χρυσοῦν τε σάκος σάκος is hair-cloth and, by extension, anything made from this cloth, usually a sack or similar container. At Hippon. fr. 57 and Poll. 6.19 (where coupled with ὑλιστήρ and τρύγοιπος), however, the word has the sense ‘strainer’; cf. Hdt. 4.23.3 σακκέουσι ἱματίοισι; Olson 2015 on Eup. fr. 476. Here the word must refer to the implement regardless of the material it is made from;<sup>94</sup> the adjective perhaps alludes to the reputation of Thrace as a major gold-producing region, but in any case fits the extravagant ostentation of the scene. Since the σάκος was normally made of goat-skin, it forms a skillful transition from the livestock of the previous lines to the drinking vessels of those that follow.

There is probably word-play with σάκος, the neuter noun meaning ‘shield’; thus Bothe’s translation, ‘aureum scutum’. Since the word is largely confined

<sup>94</sup> Gulick’s translation, ‘a golden sack’, has little merit.

to epic and other elevated poetry, its incongruous appearance between lists of livestock and drinking vessels continues the mixture of elevated and banal.

Various grammarians contend that σάκος (as opposed to σάκκος) is the Attic form; e.g. Phryn. 229 σάκκος Δωριεῖς διὰ τῶν δύο κκ, Ἀττικοὶ δὲ δι' ἐνός; Moer. σ 32 with Hansen 1998 *ad loc.* for additional examples. In fact, both forms are found in Attic inscriptions (see Threatte 1980 I.517), and the distinction may have arisen from the occurrence of σάκκος at Ar. *Ach.* 745, where it is used by the Megarian, as opposed to σάκος at *Ach.* 822 and elsewhere.

**26 φιάλην** A broad, shallow bowl with no handles and a central boss in the interior; *Agora* XII.105–6; Kanowski 1984. 116–17;<sup>95</sup> Richter–Milne 1935. 29–30. Phialai were normally produced in metal (e.g. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1445.31 [silver; 376/5 BC]; 1457.4 [tin; after 316/5 BC]) or glass (e.g. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1106.153 [Cos; ca. 300 BC]) rather than clay (see *Agora* XII for clay examples); the value comes from the material alone.

**λεπαστήν** A drinking-cup probably named for the limpet (λεπάς), and therefore presumably with a shape similar to its shallow, conical shell. No surviving cup has been identified as a λεπαστή, and its identification was disputed already in antiquity; cf. Olson 1998 on Ar. *Pax* 916. The vessel may be identical with the λεπαστίδες mentioned in a short list, perhaps an inventory note or price list, on a late archaic stamnos (Berlin 2188; *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 297–8; Beazley 1927. 349). Drinking-cups or other vessels named after animals are fairly common (e.g. ἐλέφας [Damox. fr. 1]; ἐχῖνος [Ar. V. 1436; Eup. fr. 453]; cf. Sandulescu 1964, esp. 205–6). Since few of these names seem to have lasted long and most are found only in comedy, Sparkes and Talcott (*Agora* XII.3 n. 4) suggest that the comic poets were ridiculing a current fad; this is not the case for the λεπαστή, since it appears already at least two generations before Anaxandrides, and is probably not true for most other similar names either.

**27 χιόνος τε πρόχουν** The Greeks both drank (melted) snow (e.g. Alex. fr. 145.10 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Dexicr. fr. 1) and used it to cool wine (e.g. Stratt. fr. 60; Macho 270 with Gow 1965 *ad loc.*; *Agora* XXIX. 181 n. 19); there is accordingly no need for Kock's Χίου. The fact that snow is included in a list of lavish gifts suggests that the wedding took place during a time of year when snow might be difficult to obtain; in any event, it is presumably regarded as a local Thracian product, since in Attica and southern Greece generally any accumulation of snow is rare aside from in the mountains.

The πρόχους was apparently a small jug or pitcher, similar to the oinochoe; for the oinochoe and related forms, see Green 1972. The various occurrences

<sup>95</sup> In the references on p. 117, for *Agora*, p. 12 read p. 20.

(e. g. E. *Ion* 435; Xenarch. fr. 7.14) of πρόχους add little additional information, although the προχοΐδιον is twice connected with the *kadiskos* (Cratin. fr. 206; Stratt. fr. 23).

κέρχων τε σιρόν κέρχνος (equivalent to κέγχρος) is common millet; cf. Hsch. κ 1163 καὶ ὄσπριον κέχνος; Thphr. *HP* 1.11.2; Pritchett 1956. 191–2; Jasny 1944. 12–13; Jardé 1925. 2–3; for the word, Shipp 1979. 282–3. For the importance of the grain supply from the north, including Thrace, cf. Hdt. 4.17.1; Isager and Hansen 1975. 20–1; Moreno 2007, esp. 144–208. The point here, as in the following two lines, is the sheer quantity rather than the inherent value of the item.

σιροί are storage pits, normally for grain; cf. on 11; Husson 1983 252–3; S. fr. 276 σιροὶ κριθῶν with Pearson 1917 *ad loc.*; D. 8.45 τῶν μελινῶν καὶ τῶν ὀλυρῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς Θρηκίοις σιροῖς with Σ *ad loc.*; Var. R. 1.57.2 *quidam granaria habent sub terris speluncas, quas vocant sirus, ut in Cappadocia et Thracia*; Col. 1.6.15; Plin. *NH* 18.306.

28 βολβῶν τε χύτραν δωδεκάπηχυν βολβός is the generic term for edible bulbs, numerous types of which were known and distinguished in antiquity; when used of a food, usually the bulb of the purse-tassel hyacinth is meant. Although the point here and in the following line, as in the previous one, is partly the quantity of the gift, the more important point, especially since the recipient is a bride-groom, is that both bulbs and octopus (for the collocation of the two, cf. Alex. fr. 175.3 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Toup 1778. 371–2) were believed to be aphrodisiacs. For bulbs in general and their perceived value as an aphrodisiac, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 167.13; Hunter 1983 on Eub. fr. 6.5 (7 Kock); Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 91 (*SH* 137).

For χύτρα, see on fr. 6.3. δωδεκάπηχυς, a linear measurement, presumably refers to the breadth of the pot; cf. on 11 for twelve with the sense ‘very large’. Compounds in -πηχυς are common; for ‘twelve cubits’, cf. Hdt. 2.153 (statues); Opp. *H.* 2.143 (width of an ox-fish).

29 πουλυπόδων ἑκατόμβην Like the bulbs in 28, the octopus was considered an aphrodisiac and is thus an appropriate gift here; in general, see Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 54.1 (*SH* 184); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 175.3; Thompson 1947. 204–8. For ἑκατόμβη used of food, cf. Ephipp. fr. 8.4 ὦν ἑκατόμβη.

30–1 The long passage in indirect statement (4–29) concludes with the repetition of φασί from 4. After this brief summation, the speaker proceeds to his main topic, the description of the feast given by his masters (32–71).

ταῦτα μὲν ... γάμον Possibly ταῦτα is adverbial and γάμον is the direct object of ποιῆσαι (thus Gulick 1928–1957; for γάμον ποιέω, cf. D. 30.21); but ταῦτα is better understood as the direct object, and γάμον in apposition to the

sentence. μέν indicates a reference to the description just made of the wedding of Iphicrates and supposes a contrast with what will follow, but see on 32 δ(έ).

32–5 Now that the description of the wedding of Iphicrates is complete, these lines both establish a contrast with it and introduce the catalogue that follows (36–66).

32 **τούτων δ(έ)** This phrase does not respond to ταῦτα μέν (30), since both ταῦτα and τούτων refer to the same things; rather, δέ is resumptive (Denniston 1954. 182–3).

**πολὺ σεμνότερον** Presumably a reference to the wedding feast as a whole, but for σεμνός used of food, cf. Aristopho fr. 7.4; Eub. fr. 14.4, 7. For the normal comic sense of the word, see on fr. 34.3.

33 **λαμπρότερον** See on 2.

**παρὰ δεσποσύνους** For δεσπόσυνος in the sense δεσπότης, cf. Tyr. fr. 6.2; AP 12.169.4 (HE 1506).

36–66 This catalogue of the food that will be present at the upcoming feast can be divided into distinct parts; for examples of similar comic catalogues, cf. Headlam–Knox 1922 on Herod. 7.57–61. The scene of luxury is set with the mention of perfumes and incense; encompassing one and a half lines, this is the only complete sentence in the passage. The main part of the catalogue opens with a series of dependent genitives (38–45); cf. Ephipp. fr. 12.1–2; Antiph. fr. 140; Mnesim. fr. 4. 31–2, 46–9. 46–62 continue the catalogue in the nominative; cf. the similar transition at Ephipp. fr. 12.2–3; Mnesim. fr. 4.32–3. The final section forms a short coda, with another series of dependent genitives (63–4) followed by a longer series of nominatives (64–6). The change in construction is primarily for variation, although the change between 45 and 46 corresponds to a change in type of food (but that in 64 does not).

36–7 **οὐ σμύρνης ἐκ Συρίας ὀσμαι / λιβάνου τε πνοαί** Both myrrh and frankincense are routinely said to originate from Syria (e.g. A. Ag. 1312; E. Ba. 144; Antiph. fr. 200.9; Arcestr. fr. 60.5 [SH 192] with Olson–Sens 2000 *ad loc.*; Theoc. 15.114), although it was only the end-point of long trade routes from the East; for a general account, see Miller 1969. Normally perfumes are brought out and burned at the close of dining and the start of a symposium (e.g. Alex. fr. 252.3; Nicostr. Com. fr. 27; Mnesim. fr. 4.57–63); here their use is perhaps meant to set the tone of luxury and wealth, but it may also indicate ignorance of proper etiquette.

37–8 **τερενόχρωτες / μαζῶν ὄψεις** The phrase is clearly an example of enallage, unlike the other two possible examples from Anaxandrides (fr. 31.1–2; 34.16); cf. Headlam 1902. 434 ‘when epithets transferred are found in comedy, they are always in burlesque of lyric style, or of tragic, which derived its ornate character from lyric’. Bers 1974. 44 notes that ὄψις is found with a

transferred epithet also at S. *OT* 1375 and App. *BC* 4.89; for the phrase here, cf. E. *Med.* 905 ὄψιν τέρειναν. τερενόχρως is attested only here, Orph. *L.* 33, and Opp. *H.* 2.56 (of the νάρκη); cf. τέρενα χρώα at H. *Il.* 4.237; 13.553; 14.406; Hes. *Th.* 5; *Op.* 522.<sup>96</sup>

τερενόχρωτες perhaps suggests the tender body of the bride; cf. Archil. fr. 196a.6 καλή τέρεινα παρθένος; Hippon. fr. 119; Degani 1977. 17–19.

μᾶζα is an uncooked, kneaded cake made from ground roasted barley mixed with water, milk, or oil; cf. Olson 1998 on Ar. *Pax* 1; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 145.7; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.92 (*SH* 534).

ἄρτων Baked bread made from ground wheat; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Arcestr. fr. 5.15–16 (*SH* 135); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 125.4 (discussion of varieties).

ἀμύλων A fine cake made from unmilled flour combined with milk or honey; cf. Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.5 (*SH* 534); Gow 1952 on Theoc. 9.21; Pellegrino 1998 on Metag. fr. 6.11.

39 **πουλυποδείων** The diminutive of πούλυπους; see on 29.

χολίκων Sausages made from intestines (Ar. *Eq.* 1179 with Σ<sup>VEΓΘΜ</sup> *ad loc.*; cf. Dioxiipp. fr. 1.2), normally of a cow (Pherecr. fr. 113.15; Ar. fr. 83; Eub. fr. 63.4); cf. Ar. *Pax* 717 with Σ<sup>RVT</sup> and Olson 1998 *ad loc.*; *Ra.* 576 with van Leeuwen 1896 *ad loc.* CE's κολλίκων (cf. CE's superscript κόλικες at Eub. fr. 63.4; B's κόλικας at Ar. *Pax* 717; RVAK's κόλικας at *Ra.* 576) seems to result from a mistaken equation of the two words in ancient scholarship (cf. Σ<sup>RVMEΘBarbV57</sup> [cf. Σ<sup>Tzet</sup>] Ar. *Ra.* 576, where note that Chantry's restoration implies confusion over the correct reading rather than the meaning), or perhaps simply from confusion over the proper orthography.

δημοῦ δημός, 'fat' (cf. *Epim. Hom.* δ 24 δημός δὲ τὸ λίπος; Hsch. δ 863), usually of cattle (but cf. H. *Il.* 22.501 [of sheep]), is common in epic (e.g. H. *Il.* 8.240; *Od.* 9.464; Hes. *Th.* 538), normally as part of sacrificial ritual, but becomes rare thereafter. It is mentioned as a food only as part of the dish δημοῦ βοείου θρίον (Ar. *Eq.* 954; cf. *V.* 40; conjectured by Elmsley 1809 at *Ach.* 1102), a mixture of meat, eggs, cheese, honey, and various other ingredients, all wrapped in fig-leaves (cf. Poll. 6.57; *Suda* θ 489, 502; Hsch. θ 759; Σ<sup>VEΓΘΜ</sup> Ar. *Eq.* 954; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 178.6–11 [a.ii]); presumably that is what is meant here.

40 **φυσκῶν** Sausages made of wheat flour and meat (Σ<sup>VEΓΘΜ</sup> Ar. *Eq.* 364; *Suda* φ 845) or barley flour, fat, and blood (*EM* p. 802.56–7); often included in

<sup>96</sup> A possible example of τέρην used of food is Alex. fr. 194.2, if one accepts Porson's conjecture; cf. Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* for arguments not to do so.

catalogues of food, particularly together with other types of sausages (e.g. Pherecr. fr. 113.8; Ar. fr. 702; Mnesim. fr. 4.15; Eub. fr. 63.6).

**ζωμοῦ** See on fr. 35.5. ζωμός occurs in the middle of a list of sausages also at Ar. fr. 702.

**τεύτων** Beets, presumably the leaves. In comedy they normally occur as a wrapping for eel (e.g. Ar. *Pax* with Olson 1998 *ad loc.*; Eub. fr. 34.1 (35 K) with Hunter 1983 *ad loc.*), occasionally for another fish (Antiph. fr. 179; Eub. fr. 92), once apparently simply as the vegetable (Ar. fr. 128 [where the diminutive is used]), and once in reference to the use of beet as a purgative (Ar. *Ra.* 942 with Kock 1898 *ad loc.* [specifically the white beet]); all other occurrences mock non-Attic forms of the word (e.g. Alex. fr. 146.5 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*). Here, the preceeding list of sausages (i.e. foods made by stuffing a casing with ingredients) suggests their normal role as a wrapping for eel or other fish; the same is probably true for θρίων below.

**θρίων** See on 39 δημοῦ and 40 τεύτων.

**41 λεκίθου** A thick soup or porridge of barley or pulse; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 260.2; Pellegrino 1998 on Metag. fr. 18.2.

**σκόροδον** Garlic cloves were eaten raw, as presumably here, often as an appetizer; cf. Olson 2002 on Ar. *Ach.* 521; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 179.6 (where mislabeled as line 5).

**ἄφύης** The fry of numerous sorts of fish (Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 84.1 notes that it 'is not a species name but rather the commercial/popular one'), which are often fried and frequently appear in banquet catalogues; cf. Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.22 (*SH* 534); Pellegrino 1998 on Metag. fr. 6.8. Hsch. α 8804 asserts that the singular is not used in Attic (a claim echoed by Arnott 1996), although numerous examples to the contrary exist; cf. Ar. fr. 520.1; Call. Com. fr. 10; Nicostr. Com. fr. 11; Archestr. fr. 11.1 (*SH* 140) with Olson–Sens 2000 *ad loc.*

**σκόμβρων** Mackerel was a very common fish, most often caught in the Hellespont or Black Sea, and was frequently pickled; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 77.3; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 39.6 (*SH* 169).

**42 ἐνθρυμματίδων** θρυμματίς is a kind of cake (Poll. 6.77; Theognost. *Can.* 2.20.24), which Phot. θ 238 describes as a σκεύασμα διὰ στέατος καὶ σεμιδάλεως καὶ συκκαλίδων (cf. Antiph. fr. 181.4–5, where it is called τεταραγμένη [cf. Totaro 1998 on Amips. fr. 17]), while at Lync. fr. 1.8 it is called γλυκεῖαν; cf. Philox. *PMG* 836b.17; Nicostr. Com. fr. 1.3. ἐνθρυμματίς, apparently the same food, is mentioned only here and at Hsch. θ 794 θρυμματίς· ἢ ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐνθρυμματίς.

**πιτσάνης** Gruel made from ground barley and flavored with salt; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 146.2–3; Gomme–Sandbach 1973 on Men. *Epitr.* 141.

It is found in catalogues of food (Nicopho fr. 6.3; Ar. fr. 428), but was also recommended for the sick (e.g. Hp. *Acut.* 4 [II.244–6 Littré]; cf. Ar. fr. 165 with Kassel–Austin *ad loc.*).

**ἄθάρης** Gruel made from wheat; cf. Phot. α 471 ἡ ἐκ πυρῶν ἐψημένων καὶ διακεχυμένων ὥσπερ ἔτνος τροφή; Hsch. α 1533 ὀλόπυρος<sup>97</sup> πτισάνη πυροῦ, 1535, 1581; *Suda* α 708. It is occasionally included in catalogues of food (Pherecr. fr. 113.3; Nicopho fr. 6.1). ἄθάρη, as opposed to ἀθήρη, seems to be the correct Attic form; cf. Phot. α 471 with Theodoridis 1982 *ad loc.*; Holzinger 1940 on Ar. *Pl.* 673. Hsch. α 1581 claims that the food is Egyptian; cf. Gal. *Glauc.* 2.12 (XI.142 Kühn); Plin. *NH* 22.121.

43 Cf. Alex. fr. 167.11–12 κύαμος ... / ... ὥχρος, λάθυρος; Poll. 1.247 κύαμοι, ὥχροι, δόλιχοι, λάθυροι.

**κυάμων** The broad or fava bean, which was eaten raw, boiled, or roasted; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 167.11; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 60.15 (*SH* 192).

**λαθύρων** A vetch frequently coupled with ὥχρος (e.g. Thphr. *HP* 8.3.1–2; Gal. *Alim.* 1.16 [CMG V.4.2]; below) and defined in the lexicographers as ἄρακος or ὄσπριον (Phot. λ 25; Hsch. α 6953; λ 109); cf. Gal. *Alim.* 1.26 (CMG V.4.2); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 167.12.

**ὥχρων** An unidentified type of vetch; cf. Gal. *Alim.* 1.25 (CMG V.4.2); Hsch. ω 515, where the extraneous gloss καὶ ὄσπριον λαθύρῳ ἐοικός presumably belongs to a lost lemma ὥχρος; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 167.12; above on λαθύρων.

**δόλιχων** An unidentified type of pulse; cf. Gal. *Alim.* 1.28 (CMG V.4.2); Hsch. δ 2143 δόλιχοι· ὄσπριον εἶδος; *Suda* δ 1339. Possibly related to the plant is Δόλιχος at *hCer.* 155. For the collocation of δόλιχοι and ὥχροι, cf. Gal. (cited above); Hp. *Vict.* 2.45 (CMG I.2.4).

44 **μέλιτος** Honey was used as a sauce for many foods, including cheese and meat; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 60.17 (*SH* 192).

**τυροῦ** Cheese is often included in catalogues both as a food and a seasoning; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 14.5 (*SH* 144) and Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.92 (*SH* 534).

**χορίων** Normally found in the plural (contrast Alex. fr. 178.13), χόρια is a pudding made of honey and milk cooked in an internal membrane (χόριον) taken from a sheep or goat; cf. Hunter 1983 on Eub. fr. 74.4; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 178.13; Gow 1952 on Theoc. 9.19.

<sup>97</sup> So Schmidt; Latte's ὀλότυρος is presumably a typographical error, since the word is otherwise unattested, it makes little sense here, and Latte makes no mention of Schmidt's reading.



**πυῶν** Schweighäuser's πυῶν is surely correct, even though πυός seldom if ever occurs in the plural, since 'beestings' is exactly what is wanted here, while A's πυρῶν ('wheat') is out of place. Collocation of χόρια and πυός is fairly frequent (Ar. fr. 333.5; 581.4; Eub. fr. 109.4 [cf. 74.4–5]); for πυός, cf. Olson 1998 on Ar. Pax 1150.

**45 κάρυον** The generic term for nuts; cf. Pellegrino 1998 on Metag. fr. 18; below on χόνδρου.

**χόνδρου** Pudding made from wheat groats or barley groats, and like πτισάνη (42) occasionally served to the sick; cf. Hunter 1983 on Eub. fr. 89.4 (90 K); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 196; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.102 (*SH* 534). Like κάρυα (above), χόνδρος is often found as a dessert, so the two form a suitable end to this section of the catalogue.

**46–62** The construction switches to the nominative for a long section of the list (46–62) comprised of various fish (46–53), followed by an amalgam, predominantly fruits, vegetables, grains, and seasonings (53–62).

**46–9** Note the back and forth in each line between broiled and stewed fish and the accompanying variation in number and/or gender.

**46 κάραβοι ὀπτοί** The crawfish, to be distinguished from the lobster (ὀστακός), is common in banquet catalogues (e.g. Mnesim. fr. 4.44; Ephipp. fr. 15.5), where it is occasionally mentioned as being broiled (e.g. Alex. fr. 57.4; cf. Metag. fr. 6.6); cf. Pellegrino 1998 on Metag. fr. 6.6; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 57; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.66 (*SH* 534); Thompson 1947. 102–3. For broiling, see on fr. 23.

The correction is not uncommon (e.g. 47, 48, 55); cf. White 1912 §790 (where restriction of the phenomenon to anapaestic tetrameters and dactylic hexameters is not quite accurate); Introduction.

**τευθίδες ὀπταί** Like crawfish, squid frequently appear in banquet catalogues (e.g. Mnesim. fr. 4.41; Antiph. fr. 130.3) and are often broiled (e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 929–30; Eub. fr. 14.8); cf. Pellegrino 1998 on Metag. fr. 6.6; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 84.1; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.50 (*SH* 534); Thompson 1947. 260–1.

**47 κεστρεὺς ἐφθός** κεστρεὺς, the generic term for the grey mullet, is common in food catalogues (e.g. Philyll. fr. 12.3; Mnesim. fr. 4.45); cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 16.8–11; Olson–Sens 2000 on Arcestr. fr. 43.1 (*SH* 174); Thompson 1947. 108–10 (cf. pp. 110–12 s.v. κέφαλος, 176 s.v. νῆστις). For the name of the fish used as a nickname for a starving person, see on fr. 35.8. For ἐφθός as opposed to ὀπτος, see on fr. 23.

**σηπίαι ἐφθαί** Cuttlefish are common in food catalogues (e.g. Mnesim. fr. 4.43; Eub. fr. 109.2) and are stewed at Alex. fr. 192.1–3; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 159.3; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.34 (*SH* 534); Dohm 1964. 110–11; Thompson 1947. 231–3.



**48 μύραιν' ἐφθή** The moray eel appears in catalogues of food also at Pl. Com. fr. 166 and Mnesim. fr. 4.39 (in both of which it is spelled *σμήραινα*); cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 17.2 (*SH* 147); Thompson 1947. 162–5 (cf. 165–6 s. v. *μῦρος*).

**κωβιοὶ ἐφθοί** See on fr. 28.3.

**49 θυννίδες ὅπται** One of several difficult to distinguish species of tunny, as at e. g. Cratin. fr. 171.49; Antiph. fr. 78.2; Mnesim. fr. 4.35; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 38.1–2 (*SH* 168). For the tunny, see on fr. 31.3.

**φυκίδες ἐφθαί** The female wrasse, as opposed to the male (*φύκης*), is found occasionally in catalogues of food (Antiph. fr. 130.8; Ephipp. fr. 12.3; Mnesim. fr. 4.38); cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 115.12–13; Thompson 1947. 276–8.

**50 βάτραχοι** The angler-fish, also known as the *άλιεύς*, appears in catalogues at Mnesim. fr. 4.37 and Antiph. fr. 130.5 (*βατράχου γαστήρ*); cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 48 (*SH* 178); Thompson 1947. 28–9.

**πέρκαι** See on fr. 28.2.

**51 συνόδοντες** The dentex, known variously as the *συνόδων* (Antiph. fr. 130.3), *συνόδου* (Artem. 2.14), and *σινόδων* (Antiph. fr. 45.2), is included in catalogues of food at Pl. Com. fr. 189.14, Antiph. fr. 130.5, and Philox. *PMG* 836b.14; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 18.1 (*SH* 148); Thompson 1947. 255–6. Note that Thompson's claim (256), presumably based on Antiph. fr. 45, that 'the head is not worth eating', is almost certainly mistaken, since fish-heads often appear in lists of delicacies (e. g. Ar. fr. 380; Eriph. fr. 3; Antiph. fr. 77; Eub. fr. 109; Archestr. fr. 19.1 [*SH* 149]) and could be purchased separately (Archestr. fr. 21.1 [*SH* 151]).

**ὄνοι** A member of the cod family, perhaps the hake, which is found in a catalogue of fish at Henioch. fr. 3.3; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 15.1 (*SH* 145); Thompson 1947. 182–3.

**βατίδες** The ray could be either stewed (Metag. fr. 6.4) or broiled (Hermipp. fr. 46.2), and is frequently included in catalogues of food (e. g. Ar. fr. 333; Call. Com. fr. 6.1; Antiph. fr. 130.6; Alex. fr. 84.1); cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 50.1 (*SH* 180); Pellegrino 1998 on Metag. fr. 6.4; Thompson 1947. 26–8.

**ψήτται** See on fr. 28.3.

**52 γαλεός** The thresher shark or dogfish, occasionally found in food catalogues (e. g. Pl. Com. fr. 146; Ephipp. fr. 12.1; Mnesim. fr. 4.32), could be broiled (Ar. fr. 333.3), stewed in sauce (Antiph. fr. 221.3–4; cf. Timocl. fr. 3), or have one part broiled and a separate part stewed (Sotad. Com. fr. 1.2–4); cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 22.1 (*SH* 152); Thompson 1947. 39–42.

**κόκκυξ** The gurnard received the name *κόκκυξ* from the sound it makes when pulled from the sea; cf. Arist. *HA* 535b19–20 *ὁ δὲ παραπλήσιον τῷ*

κόκκυγι [i. e. the bird] ψόφον, ὅθεν καὶ τοῦνομα ἔχει; Ael. NA 10.11. The various gurnards were occasionally associated with the red mullet (τρίγλη), apparently on the basis of their similar coloring; cf. Numen. SH 585 ἐρυθρὸν κόκκυγ(α); Speus. ap. Ath. 7.324f. At Epich. fr. 122.7–8 it is filleted, seasoned, and broiled, while Dorion ap. Ath. 7.309f repeats these instructions with the additional specification that the seasoning consist of herbs, cheese, silphium, salt, and olive oil. κόκκυξ appears in catalogues of fish elsewhere at Mnesim. fr. 4.39 and Ephipp. fr. 12.4 (in both cases following τρίγλη); in general, see Thompson 1947. 120–1.

**θρίσσαι** One generic term, along with θρᾶττα, τριχίας, and τριχίς, for various small, inexpensive clupeoid fish, including sprats, sardines, and anchovies; despite their cheapness, these fish are not normally spoken of in derogatory terms, so statements such as that of Arnott 1996 (on Alex. fr. 18.2) that they are ‘fish of mean reputation in the kitchen’ should be modified. θρίσσαι appears elsewhere in a catalogue of fish possibly at Ephipp. fr. 12.5 (where note *ap. crit.*), although taken together the various terms are common; in general, see Olson on Ar. Ach. 551; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 18.2; Thompson 1947. 77–8.

**νάρκαι** The electric ray, which could be stewed (Pl. Com. fr. 164), baked (Antiph. fr. 130.2), or stuffed and broiled whole (Alex. fr. 38), is frequently included in catalogues of food (e. g. Antiph. fr. 127.3; Mnesim. fr. 4.37; Timocl. fr. 11.7); cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 38; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archemstr. fr. 49.1 (SH 179); Thompson 1947. 169–71.

53 **ρίνης τεμάχη** ρίνη, a type of shark, is probably the monkfish or angelfish or a related species, which is eaten in slices also at Mnesim. fr. 4.31–2 and Ephipp. fr. 12.1–2; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archemstr. fr. 47.2 (SH 177) and Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.56 (SH 534); Thompson 1947. 221–2.

**σχαδόνης** Honey-comb appears occasionally in catalogues of food (e. g. Ar. fr. 333.3; 581.3; Antiph. 273.1; Eub. fr. 74.4), often with similarly rustic sorts of food.

**βότρυες** For grapes in catalogues of food, e. g. Ar. fr. 581.1; Antiph. fr. 66; Eub. fr. 74.2.

54 **σῦκα** Fresh figs, as opposed to dried ones (ισχάδες); for their occurrence in lists of food, cf. Demetr. Com. Vet. fr. 5; Antiph. fr. 177.3; Eub. fr. 74.2.

**πλακοῦντες** Fried (e. g. Ar. Ra. 507) or baked (e. g. Ar. Ec. 223b) flat-cakes occasionally appear in catalogues of food (e. g. Alex. fr. 252.4; Philippiid. fr. 20.1; Diph. fr. 80.1); cf. Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.117 (SH 534).

**μῆλα** Probably ‘apples’, although the word is also used as a generic term for various fruits; cf. Ar. Nu. 978 with Dover 1968 *ad loc.*; V. 1056 with Rogers 1915 *ad loc.* Apples appear in food catalogues at, e. g., Ar. Pax 1001 with Olson

1998 *ad loc.*; Eub. fr. 74.3; Ephipp. fr. 13.5; in general, cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 60.15 (SH 192).

**κράνεια** The cornel cherry, mentioned only here in comedy, is known already in Homer (*Od.* 10.242), where it is considered typical food for pigs; more common is a reference to the wood of the tree, particularly when used for spears or other weapons, as at e.g. H. *Il.* 16.676; E. fr. 785.2; *AP* 6.122.1 (*HE* 644). Thphr. *HP* 3.2.1 reports ('they say') that, contrary to most fruits, the wild cornel cherry is riper and sweeter than the cultivated variety.

55 The items in this line are occasionally referred to as food; but the last two and perhaps the last three are equally well known as purgatives and may be included here for the sake of humor. For μήκων as a purgative, cf. Thphr. *HP* 9.12.3–5; for ἄχρας, cf. Hp. *Salubr.* 2.55 (*CMG* I.2.4) ἄχράδες δὲ χειμέριοι πέπειροι διαχωρέουσι καὶ τὴν κοιλίην καθαίρουσιν. ἔρπυλλος is asserted to be a diuretic at Gal. XI.877 Kühn (οὖρα κινεῖν); cf. Dsc. 3.38.2. Only ρόαι are not known to be purgatives, although note the existence of a type of poppy called ροιάς, which Thphr. *HP* 9.12.4 says καθαίρει δὲ κάτω; such an association is difficult, however, given the position of ρόαι at the head of the group. Nevertheless, the pomegranate may have been regarded as an abortifacient; cf. Nixon 1995. 85–8.

**ρόαι** For pomegranates in food catalogues, e.g. Ar. *Pax* 1001; Antiph. fr. 66; Ephipp. fr. 24.1. ροιά, the epic-ionic form, gradually replaces ρόα, the earlier Attic form, in the latter part of the fourth century (cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 73; Threatte 1980 I.333–4), although it was on occasion used earlier for metrical reasons (e.g. Ar. *Pax* 1001); the distinction in meaning sometimes asserted (Amm. 430 ροιά μὲν μετὰ τοῦ ἰ τὸ δένδρον, ρόα δὲ ὁ καρπός; cf. Poll. 6.80) cannot be maintained.

**ἔρπυλλος** Known for its pleasant scent (e.g. Thphr. *HP* 6.6.2), thyme is most often used for garlands (e.g. Cratin. fr. 105.4; Eub. fr. 104.7) or perfume (e.g. Antiph. fr. 105.7); cf. Ar. *Pax* 168 with Olson 1998 *ad loc.*; Gow 1952 on Theoc. *Ep.* 1.2.

**μήκων** Poppy seeds are occasionally mentioned as food, e.g. Ar. *Av.* 160 (reminiscent of a wedding) with Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.*; Th. 4.26.8 (collective singular, as here) with Gomme 1956 *ad loc.*

**ἄχράδες** Wild pears, as opposed to the cultivated pear (ἄπιος; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 34.2), are found in a catalogue of food also at Alex. fr. 167.13; cf. Ussher 1973 on Ar. *Ec.* 355; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 167.13.

56 **κνήκος** Saffron appears in a food catalogue only here, although Dsc. 4.188.1 reports that τούτου τῷ ἄνθει χρῶνται εἰς τὰ προσοχήματα; at 4.188.2 he further remarks that τὸ δὲ σπέρμα κοπτόμενον καὶ χυλιζόμενον σὺν

ὕδρομέλιτι ἢ ζωμῶ ὄρνιθος κοιλίαν καθαίρει. Thphr. *HP* 6.4.5 distinguishes three types of the plant, two wild and one cultivated.

**ἐλᾶαι** Olives occur regularly in catalogues of food (e.g. Ar. fr. 581.3; Antiph. fr. 140.2; Mnesim. fr. 4.29); cf. Arnott 1996 of Alex. fr. 263.3; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 8 (*SH* 138).

**στέμφυλ(α)** Pressed cakes made from olives; cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 385 στέμφυλα οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ τὰ τῶν βοτρύων ἐκπιέσματα ἀμαθῶς, οἱ δ' Ἀττικοὶ στέμφυλα ἐλαῶν with Fischer 1974 *ad loc.* for further references, to which add e.g. Hsch. σ 1737; *EM* p. 216.21); Σ<sup>ΕΘΝΑ</sup> Ar. *Nu.* 45; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 201.1.

**ἄμητες** For milk-cakes (cf. Σ<sup>RVΘNBarbRs</sup> Ar. *Pl.* 999 εἶδος πλακοῦντες γαλακτώδους; Phot. α 1195 with Theodoridis 1982 *ad loc.* for further references) in catalogues of food, e.g. Amph. fr. 9.3; Ephipp. fr. 8.3; Alex. fr. 168.5; cf. Telecl. fr. 1.12.

**57 πράσα** For leeks in catalogues of food, cf. Chionid. fr. 7; Alex. fr. 132.8; in general, see Gal. *Alim.* 2.43, 69; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 132.8.

**γήτηιον** This vegetable has not been precisely identified, although it is clearly related to the onion; Thphr. *HP* 7.4.10 describes it as ἀκέφαλόν τι (i.e. having no bulb) καὶ ὥσπερ ἀρχένα μακρὸν ἔχον, ὅθεν καὶ ἡ βλάστησις ἄκρα. For a general discussion, including rejection of several possible identifications, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 132.7; cf. Neil 1901 on Ar. *Eq.* 677.

**κρόμυα** Onions often occur in comedy as typical soldiers' rations (e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 600; *Pax* 1129), but appear in catalogues of food, presumably from banquets or the like, at Antiph. fr. 63.1; 71.2; Philem. fr. 113.3.

**φυστή** A kind of cake similar to μᾶζα (cf. Ar. *V.* 610 φυστήν μᾶζαν; Moer. φ 10 τὸ φύραμα τῶν ἀλφίτων, ὅταν μὴ γένηται μᾶζα) and made from groats with the addition of wine or honey (cf. Σ<sup>VT</sup> Ar. *V.* 610 ἐξ ἀλφίτου καὶ οἴνου; *EM* p. 803.1 τὰ ἀναπεφυρμένα μέλιτι ἄλφιτα); cf. Gow–Page 1965 on *AP* 7.736.6 (*HE* 2172). The word occurs elsewhere in comedy at Chionid. fr. 7.

**58 βολβοί** See on 28.

**καυλοί, σίλφιον** καυλός means 'stalk' or 'stem', but here and in similar contexts refers to silphium stalk; σίλφιον, the name for the plant as a whole, seems normally to be used in this and similar contexts for a specific part of it, either the root (so Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 9.1 [*SH* 137]) or the seed (so Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 132.5). Although the plant has not been specifically identified, both silphium and its parts are common in catalogues (e.g. Antiph. fr. 70.1; 140.1; Mnesim. fr. 4.30); for the collocation here, cf. Alex. fr. 132.5 καυλόν, σίλφιον; Eub. fr. 6.3 οὐ καυλοῖσιν οὐδὲ σιλφίῳ (cf. fr. 18.3–4).<sup>98</sup> In

<sup>98</sup> Unease with this collocation is presumably the cause behind LSJ's ill-considered definition of καυλός (s.v. II) in these three fragments; this portion of LSJ's entry

general, see Neil 1901 on Ar. *Eq.* 894; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 132.5; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 9.1 (*SH* 137); 46.14 (*SH* 176).

**ὄξος** Vinegar is common in food catalogues (e.g. Antiph. fr. 140.7; Alex. fr. 179.4; Anaxipp. fr. 1.7); in general, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 286.3; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 23.6 (*SH* 153).

**59 μάρραθ(α)** Fennel appears in catalogues at Alex. fr. 132.5; Epich. fr. 158.2, 6;<sup>99</sup> in general, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 132.5; Gal. *Alim.* 2.56 (*CMG* V.4.2). The word occurs elsewhere in comedy only at Hermipp. fr. 75.2, in a pun on Marathon.

**ᾠά** Eggs are common in catalogues of food (e.g. Philyll. fr. 24; Antiph. fr. 140.4 [where also in a list predominantly of condiments]; Anaxil. fr. 18.5; Alex. fr. 179.8), although the method of cooking (cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 178.10) and the type of egg are seldom specified; LSJ s.v. overstate the evidence in claiming that the word is used ‘mostly of hen’s eggs’ (cf. Heraclides of Syracuse ap. Ath. 2.58b).

**φακῆ** A soup or porridge made from boiling (Antiph. fr. 171; Men. *Carch.* fr. 1.2; *Suda* φ 23; *EM* p. 786.40) lentils (φακός). Commonly considered humble food, φακῆ seldom occurs in catalogues of food; cf. Starkie 1897 and van Leeuwen 1909 on Ar. V. 811; Kassel–Austin on Ar. fr. 23.

**τέττιγες** Cicadas are occasionally referred to as food; cf. Ar. fr. 53 with Kassel–Austin *ad loc.*; 581.4; Alex. fr. 167.13 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Apost. 16.35a τέττιγας ἐσθίεις· ἐπὶ τῶν διὰ λιχνείαν καὶ τὰ οὐδενὸς ἄξια ἐσθιόντων with Leutsch 1851 *ad loc.*; Beavis 1988. 102. Arnott 1996 suggests that here the fish τέττιξ (cf. Thompson 1947. 259–60) is meant; but this fish is known only from Ael. *NA* 13.26; a fish would be out of place in the immediate context of a list of plants (cf. the similar context at Alex. fr. 167); and the parallels provide no reason to think the fish instead of the cicada is meant.

**ὀπός** ὀπός frequently refers to juice extracted from the wild-fig (e.g. Σ<sup>M</sup> Ar. *Pl.* 719 κυρίως γάλα συκῆς; Arist. *HA* 522b2; Thphr. *CP* 1.16.7) but can also be used for the juice of silphium<sup>100</sup> (Antiph. fr. 88.4; cf. Nic. *Th.* 907; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 9.1 [*SH* 137]) or other plants (Eub. fr. 18.1). Here the lack of specification and the fact that silphium has already been mentioned suggest that fig-juice is meant; regardless, the word clearly refers to a condiment or

---

should be deleted, and these examples should be recognized as a subset (with the meaning ‘silphium stalk’) of those given s.v. I.1.

<sup>99</sup> The reference at LSJ s.v. to Epich. fr. 156; 159 is apparently a typo; at any rate, Kaibel’s numbers (which LSJ claim to cite) are fr. 159 and 161.

<sup>100</sup> This usage is the basis of ancient scholarly claims (e.g. Σ<sup>A</sup> Ar. *Ec.* 404) that ὀπός originates in Cyrene.

dressing. ὀπός is routinely characterized as highly acidic or pungent (e.g. Ar. *Ec.* with Ussher 1973 *ad loc.* [cf. Σ *ad loc.* πάνυ γὰρ δριμύτατος ὁ ὀπός]; *Pl.* 719 [cf. Σ<sup>recc.</sup> *ad loc.*]; Diph. fr. 18.2 [equated with sharp vinegar]; cf. Ar. *Pax* 1184 βλέπων ὀπόν), whence its use to curdle milk for cheese (e.g. Emp. *FVS* 31 B 33; Arist. *HA* 522b2–5; cf. Thphr. *CP* 1.16.7).

**60 κάρδαμα** As with ὀπός, κάρδαμον (cress) is noted for its acerbity (e.g. Thphr. *HP* 1.12.1 [classified as δριμύς]; Dsc. 2.155; cf. Ar. *V.* 455 βλεπόντων κάρδαμα); this may be the origin of the apparently proverbial διαφέρει σῦκα καρδάμων at Henioch. fr. 4.2. It is included in lists of condiments at Antiph. fr. 140.4 and Eub. fr. 18.2 (cf. fr. 35.4) and described as ὄψον at X. *Cyr.* 1.2.8 (on ἄρτος) and Luc. *Tim.* 56 (on μᾶζα), in both of which it is indicative of simple fare. For the plant's cultivation, cf. Thphr. *HP* 7.1.2–3, 6; for its medicinal uses, cf. Dsc. 2.155; Plin. *NH* 20.127–30. At Thphr. *HP* 7.1.8 it is characterized as φίλυδρα (cf. Hp. *Vict.* 2.54 [VI.558.6–8 Littré]; Ar. *Nu.* 232–4 with van Leeuwen 1898 *ad loc.*), whence the joke at Ar. *Th.* 616 about difficulty in urinating after eating cress. At least some varieties of cress are associated with the East; cf. Theopomp. Com. fr. 18 Μήδων γαῖαν, ἔνθα καρδάμων / πλείστων ποιεῖται καὶ πράσων ἀβυρτάκη; Eub. fr. 18.2 κάρδαμον Μιλήσιον; Dsc. 2.155 κάρδαμον δοκεῖ κάλλιστον εἶναι τὸ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι.

**σήσαμα** Sesame seeds appear in catalogues in combination with condiments or small finger-foods (e.g. Antiph. fr. 140.2; Alex. fr. 132.3; Philem. fr. 113.3; Philippid. fr. 20.1); for sesame in general, cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 132.3. Sesame perhaps occurs most frequently as a primary ingredient in σησαμῇ or σησαμῖς, a sesame-cake served at weddings (cf. Olson 1998 on Ar. *Pax* 869;<sup>101</sup> Gomme–Sandbach 1973 on Men. *Sam.* 74), and so is perhaps particularly appropriate here.

**κήρυκες** κῆρυξ,<sup>102</sup> the general term for large, whelk-shaped gastropods, is included in catalogues of food also at Anaxil. fr. 18.4; Alex. fr. 175.2; 281.2; in general, cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 7.6–7 (*SH* 187); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 175.2; Thompson 1947. 113–14. Its reputation as an aphrodisiac (Alex. fr. 175.2; 281.2; contrast Gal. 14.487) may influence its inclusion here.

**ἄλες** Salt is common as a preservative but also as a condiment (e.g. Antiph. fr. 71.2; Alex. 138.6; Sotad. Com. fr. 1.7); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 138.6

<sup>101</sup> In the text and note, for σησαμῇ read σησαμῖ (contraction of σησαμέα).

<sup>102</sup> For κῆρυξ, the traditional accentuation, as opposed to the expected κήρυξ, cf. Chandler 1881 §622; Lobeck 1837. 411–12. In fact, the traditional accentuation as articulated by the ancient grammarians is probably dependent on an ancient misunderstanding of the Homeric text; cf. Leaf 1900–1902 on H. *Il.* 17.324; Matthews 1996 on Antim. fr. 22.1 (21.1 Wyss).



rightly notes that the plural becomes the norm in later comedy. Salt was obtained in chunks (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 521; Hsch. χ 629; *Suda* χ 391; cf. Hdt. 4.181), which were then ground into λεπτοὶ ἄλεις (e.g. Ar. fr. 158.2 with *ap. crit.*; Alex. fr. 192.5; adesp. com. fr. 1146.24; Archestr. fr. 37.8 (*SH* 167) with Olson–Sens 2000 *ad loc.*); for a general account of salt in antiquity, including various production methods, see Forbes 1993. 164–81. At Ar. *Ach.* 521, salt is characterized as a Megarian product (cf. *Ach.* 760; Plin. *NH* 31.87), but at least in the Roman period it was collected in Attica and Euboea as well (Plin. *NH* 31.87).

**61 πίναι** The fan mussel, a large bivalve shellfish, found elsewhere in catalogues of food at Philyll. fr. 12.1–2 ὄστρειον, / ... λεπάδας ... μῦς, πίννας, κτένας; Posidipp. fr. 15.3 πίννας ... μύας; Alex. fr. 84.1 with *ap. crit.*; 281.1; cf. Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.25 (*SH* 534); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 281.1; Thompson 1947. 200–2. πίνη rather than -vv- seems to be the correct spelling,<sup>103</sup> cf. LSJ s. v.; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.25 (*SH* 534); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 84.1; Mayser 1906 I.241; Kontos–Charitonides 1903. 227.<sup>104</sup>

**λεπάδες** The limpet, a shellfish normally found clinging to a rock (e.g. Hermipp. fr. 31 λεπάδας δὲ πετρῶν ἀποκόπτοντες; Hsch. λ 657 λεπάδες· τὰ πρὸς ταῖς πέτραις κεκολλημένα κογχύλια ὀστρέων ἐλάττω; λ 662; Σ<sup>V</sup> Ar. V. 105; Σ<sup>RVMEON</sup> Ar. *Pl.* 1096), whence the jokes at Ar. V. 105 and *Pl.* 1096, is found in catalogues of shellfish also at Archipp. fr. 24; Philyll. fr. 12.2; Philippid. fr. 4; Plaut. *Rud.* 297–8 *lopadas, ostreas, ... / ... musculos*; in general, cf. Thompson 1947. 147–8.

**μύες** Mussels are an apparently inexpensive shellfish (cf. Alex. fr. 15.5; Mart. 3.60.3–4), occasionally found in catalogues of similar foods (A. fr. 34 μύες κῶστρεια; Philyll. fr. 12.2; Antiph. fr. 191.1 [described as Ποντικοί]; Posidipp. fr. 15.3); cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 7.1 (*SH* 187); Thompson 1947. 166–7. The normal Attic form is the contracted μῦς, although the uncontracted form is acceptable in poetry when metrically necessary; cf. Posidipp. fr. 15.3; Gomme–Sandbach 1973 on Men. *Sam.* 98; Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 I.439.

**ὄστρεια** The term for mollusks in general (cf. Diph. fr. 43.1–2 ὀστρέων γένη / παντοδαπά; Hsch. μ 1788 μύες· ὀστρέου τι εἶδος; Thompson 1947. 190) as well as for oysters in particular, as here (cf. Cratin. fr. 8; Philyll. fr. 12.1; Philippid. fr. 4; Matro fr. 1.16 [*SH* 534]); cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 7.1 (*SH* 187); Thompson 1947. 190–2; Andrews 1947–1948. ὄστρεια (metrically

<sup>103</sup> Kassel–Austin follow the manuscript readings and thus print the form with a single ν only at Posidipp. fr. 15.3, where πίννας survives in A (cf. Matro fr. 1.25).

<sup>104</sup> Stephanus s. v. πίνος (6.1097c) quotes Σ<sup>Triel</sup> S. *Ai.* 381 πίνα ὁ ῥύπος, δι' ἐνὸς ν· πίννα, τὸ ὄστρεον, διὰ δύο ν; but this is almost certainly a late attempt to impose order on inconsistent orthography.

guaranteed) rather than ὄστρεα is the classical orthography (cf. Ath. 3.92e ὄστρεα δὲ μόνως οὕτως ἔλεγον οἱ ἀρχαῖοι; *SEG* XXIV 277.B.60 [Epidaurus, ca. 350–330 BC; used of dye from the shellfish]; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 115.1), although already by the third century ὄστρεα is common, at least in papyri (cf. Mayser–Schmoll 1970 I.56).

**62 κτένες** The general term for various species of scallops, κτένες are included in catalogues of shellfish at Philyll. fr. 12.2; Archipp. fr. 24; Alex. fr. 175.2; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Arcestr. fr. 7.2 (*SH* 187); Thompson 1947. 133–4; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 175.2 for the possibility that they were considered aphrodisiacs. Although scallops are found throughout the Mediterranean, those near Mytilene seem to have been particularly well-known (Philyll. fr. 12.2; Arcestr. fr. 7.2 [*SH* 187]; cf. Arist. *HA* 603a21–3).

**ὄρκυνες** This fish is equated with the tuna (cf. on 31.3) at Arcestr. fr. 35.2–3 (*SH* 165) θύννον, ... ὃν καλέουσιν (sc. the Samians) / ὄρκυν, while Aristotle distinguishes the two at *HA* 543b2–6 αἱ πηλαμύδες καὶ οἱ θύννοι τίκτοθσιν ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ ... οἱ δ' ὄρκυνες καὶ σκορπίδες καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ γένη ἐν τῷ πελάγει. The matter is further complicated by the equation of ὄρκυς and the slightly more common (although not mentioned in comedy) ὄρκυνος; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Arcestr. fr. 35.3 (*SH* 165); Thompson 1947. 185–6. The more substantial problem is that the tuna or a similar fish is out of place in a catalogue of shellfish; unless this disparity is accepted, however, either Anaxandrides is referring to some otherwise unattested shellfish also called ὄρκυς or the word is corrupt, neither of which seems likely.

**καὶ πρὸς τούτοις** The catalogue now shifts from shellfish to birds; for the phrase, cf. Eub. fr. 63.1; Anaxil. fr. 18.5.

**63 ὀρνιθαρίων ἄφατον πλῆθος** For the form of the diminutive, cf. on fr. 28.4 καριδίων. ἄφατον here means ‘unbelievable’ or ‘unspeakable’ as at B. 18.18 ἄφατα δ' ἔργα; Hdt. 7.190 ἄφατα χρήματα; cf. Epicr. fr. 10.12 ἤκουσα λόγων ἀφάτων, ἀτόπων; Ar. *Av.* 427; *Lys.* 198, 1080, 1148.<sup>105</sup> Attempts to restrict use of the word mainly ‘to lyric in passages of some considerable solemnity (serious or mock)’ (thus Bulloch 1985 on Call. *H.* 5.77; cf. Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 427) somewhat overstate the evidence, but do fit with the parodic high-style of this passage. The use of the word may also be meant to contrast with the chattering normally associated with flocks of birds (e.g. Alex. fr. 96).

**64 νητιῶν** The term for ducks in general; cf. Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.95 (*SH* 534); Thompson 1936. 205–6. Ducks are relatively common in catalogues of food, e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 875; *Pax* 1004 χῆνες, νήττας, φάττας (charac-

<sup>105</sup> Against the notion that the phrase ἄφατον ὥς is peculiarly Laconian, cf. Colvin 1999. 234.



terized as Boeotian in both passages); Antiph. fr. 295.2 φάτται, νῆτται, χῆνες; cf. Ar. *Pl.* 1011 νηττάριον ἄν καὶ φάττιον with Holzinger 1940 *ad loc.*

**φαττῶν** The ring dove or wood pigeon, a large pigeon; cf. Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 303; Thompson 1936. 300–2. For the φάττα in catalogues of food, cf. on νηττῶν; Ephipp. fr. 3.8 (= Eub. fr. 148.5); 15.8.

**χῆνες** Domesticated geese are known already in Homer (e.g. *Od.* 15.174), although they obviously continued to exist in the wild as well; cf. Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 707; Thompson 1936. 325–30. The domesticated birds were grain-fed (Epig. fr. 2.1–2 χήνα ... / σιτευτόν; Arcestr. fr. 58.1 (*SH* 189) σιτευτόν ... χηνὸς ... νεοττόν with Olson–Sens 2000 *ad loc.*; cf. Matro fr. 5.2 (*SH* 538) σιτευτὰς ὄρνιθας with Olson–Sens 1999 *ad loc.*) and the liver, as still today, seems to have been a delicacy (Ath. 9.384c citing Eub. fr. 99; Plu. *Mor.* 965a). For their presence in catalogues of food, cf. on νηττῶν; Mnesim. fr. 4.47.

**στρουθοί** Cf. on fr. 7.

65 The alliteration in this line is far more pronounced than elsewhere in the fragment. Perhaps it was meant as a verbal display as the list of food draws to a close, but it need have no greater significance than delight on the part of the poet in the effect (cf. Olson–Sens 2000. lx).

**κίχλαι** The general term for various species of thrushes; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 168.5; Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 591; Thompson 1936. 148–50. Thrushes appear frequently in catalogues of food (e.g. Ar. fr. 402.7; Ephipp. fr. 3.8 [= Eub. fr. 148.5]; Nicostr. Com. fr. 4.4; Matro fr. 1.78 (*SH* 534) with Olson–Sens 1999 *ad loc.*) and can be either roasted (Ar. *Ach.* 1007; Telecl. fr. 1.12; Pherecr. fr. 113.23; Men. fr. 409.13) or stewed (Ar. *Pax* 1197; Pherecr. fr. 137.10; cf. fr. 113.23). For the prosody, cf. 37 τερυνόχρωτες; Ar. *Av.* 591 κίχλῶν; Dunbar 1995 on *Av.* 579.

**κόρυδοι** The crested lark (cf. Arnott 1996 introduction to Alex. fr. 48; Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 302; Thompson 1936. 164–8) does not appear elsewhere in catalogues of food or the like, nor does it seem to be known elsewhere as a food. Its occurrence here is unproblematic, since songbirds or other small birds alien to the modern palate (e.g. κίτται below) occasionally appear in food-catalogues, but note that the remaining birds in this catalogue occur seldom or never as food elsewhere.

**κίτται** The jay (cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 96.2–4; Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 302; Thompson 1936. 146–8); the claim that the word refers to jays or magpies (e.g. Thompson) is predicated on post-classical usage (cf. Arnott). The jay appears only rarely in catalogues of food (Eup. fr. 13.4; Antiph. fr. 295.3; Mnesim. fr. 4.49).

**κύκνοι** The general term for swans (for the lack of differentiation among species, cf. Arnott 1977. 149–53), although only one, the Mute Swan, is likely

to have been more than a rarity in central Greece and Attica; cf. Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 769, 771–2; Thompson 1936. 178–86. Despite Athenaeus' claim at 9.393c–d (οὐκ ἀπελείποντο δὲ ἡμῶν τοῦ συμποσίου πολλάκις οὐδὲ κύκνοι), swans are very rarely mentioned as food (elsewhere only at Plu. *Mor.* 997a, where Wyttenbach emended κύκνων [mss.] to χηνῶν); this is probably due more to unfamiliarity with swans (cf. Arnott [cited above]), which were found mainly in northern Greece and farther north, than any scruple, religious or otherwise. For the prosody, cf. above on κίχλαι.

**66 πελεκάν** Probably the term for various species of pelican and apparently equivalent to πελεκᾶς and πελεκῖνος; cf. Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 882, 883; Thompson 1936. 231–3 s. v. πελεκάν, 233 s. v. πελεκᾶς, where probably wrongly identified as a woodpecker (cf. Dunbar 1995), 234 s. v. πελεκῖνος. The word occurs elsewhere prior to the Roman period at e.g. Arist. *HA* 597b29–30, 614b27. Pelicans are now mainly confined to northern Greece and farther north but in antiquity may have been more common farther south. They seemingly are referred to nowhere else as food.

**κίγκλοι** The general term for species of wagtails; cf. Thompson 1936. 140–1. The birds are most frequently noted for their characteristic movement (e.g. Ar. fr. 29; 147; Autocr. fr. 1.10) or for the proverb πτωχότερος κίγκλου (e.g. Men. fr. 168 with K.-A. *ad loc.*), which arises from the supposition that they have no nests of their own but use those belonging to other birds. Wagtails are mentioned as food nowhere else.

**γέρανος** Cranes are well attested throughout Greek literature from early epic (e.g. H. *Il.* 3.3–5; Hes. *Op.* 448–9) on, although they are known mainly from their migration south through Greece in the fall and their return north in the spring; cf. Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 710; Thompson 1936. 68–75. They are not referred to as food elsewhere before the Roman period (e.g. Plu. *Mor.* 997a; Hor. *Serm.* 2.8.87; Plin. *NH* 10.60), but cf. the play on γ' ἔρανος and γέρανος at Epich. fr. 76 (cf. Crusius 1910. 59–60 [= Latte 1961 V.59–60]; Orth 2009. 253 [on Stratt. fr. 63]). Cranes are normally referred to as feminine (e.g. Hes. *Op.* 448–9; Ar. *Av.* 1137; Arist. *HA* 614b18; Call. fr. 1.14); cf. 67.

**66–9** A second speaker interrupts the description of the feast. Since this interruption is insulting and has little relation to the description, and the first speaker resumes his account in 70 with no acknowledgement of the interruption, the lines seem to be a so-called 'bomolochic' aside,<sup>106</sup> aptly characterized by Bain 1977. 102 as 'exclamations designed to break up long speeches' (cf. Alex. fr. 153.14 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Pl. *Com.* fr. 189.22 with Pirrotta

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Bain 1977. 87–94, 102–3; Schaffner 1911, esp. 19–21.

2009 *ad loc.*). Typically, the insult is directed at the interrupted speaker, who however fails to react to it; that is likely the case here as well (note the deictic τουδί), although the interpretation of χάσκοντος is somewhat problematic (cf. below).<sup>107</sup> This injection has the additional structural purpose of facilitating the transition from the catalogue of food that preceded to the catalogue of wine that follows.

**66–7 τουδί / τοῦ χάσκοντος** χάσκω is normally ‘gape at with the mouth open’ (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 10; *Eq.* 651), which does not adequately describe the extended monologue of the first speaker. It is claimed (e.g. LSJ s. v. II) that the verb can occasionally mean ‘utter’ (S. *Ai.* 1227 [cf. Σ<sup>Fr</sup> λέξει, εἰπεῖν]; Ar. *V.* 342 [cf. Σ<sup>LhAld</sup> εἰπεῖν]; possibly Call. *H.* 2.24 [but cf. Williams 1978 *ad loc.*]), but MacDowell’s interpretation (1971 on Ar. *V.* 342) of these passages (‘χανεῖν implies contempt for what was spoken... “bluster”’) is better. Alternatively, the word here may mean ‘fool’ or ‘simpleton’ by extension (cf. Ar. *Eq.* 261; *Ra.* 990) or may be taken with τοῦ πρωκτοῦ (in which case Olson’s τωδὶ in 66 is attractive).

**67 διατειναμένη** A generally prosaic word, extremely rare in poetry and found only here in comedy (elsewhere in poetry at e.g. Theoc. 22.67; *AP* 5.55.1 [*HE* 1483]). The participle modifies γέρανός, the bird last mentioned.

**68 διὰ τοῦ πρωκτοῦ καὶ τῶν πλευρῶν** The crane is presumably imagined as swallowed whole and then bursting out through one end or the other of the person and pecking him in the head. Vulgarities such as πρωκτός, although not unparalleled in this period (e.g. Eub. fr. 106.6), are rare, a fact presumably indicative more of the selective nature of the fragments’ transmission than of a general absence of such terms in Middle Comedy.<sup>108</sup>

**69 διακόψειν** A primarily prosaic word, used of cleaving something in two; for its use to refer to a wound, cf. Hp. *Aph.* 6.18 (IV.566–8 Littré); Men. *Georg.* 48; *Sam.* 679. For the form, see Lautensach 1916. 171–5 (174–5 for movable-*nu*).

**τὸ μέτωπον** Properly the brow; cf. on fr. 59.4.

<sup>107</sup> Note also that in the mind of Speaker B (and presumably the audience as well) the fact has become blurred that Speaker A is comparing a feast that will take place in the future with one from the past, but is not describing foods actually at hand.

<sup>108</sup> For the sake of comparison, note for example that in Aristophanes πρωκτός (or compounds of the word) occurs 48x in the extant plays, but only 2x in the fragments; πέος 20x in the plays but never in the fragments; βινεῖν 20x in the plays but only 1x in the fragments; χέζειν or χεζητιᾶν 13x times in the plays but never in the fragments. In terms of percentages of total word counts, vulgarities occur slightly less than half as often in the Aristophanic fragments as in the extant plays.

**70–1** The first speaker does not acknowledge the interruption and resumes his catalogue, switching from foodstuffs to wines. Although there is no clear statement to this effect, and the only transition is the interruption of Speaker B, the introduction of wine into the catalogue signals that Speaker A has ceased to describe the feast itself and has moved on to the symposium that will follow.

**70 οἶνοι** Wines are commonly designated by place of origin, colour, or taste, although these are not mutually exclusive categories; the terms used here all refer to generic types and could be used of wines from numerous localities. For an extensive discussion of varieties of wine and their individual characteristics, cf. Ath. 1.25f–33f.

**λευκός** In Homer, the color of wine is normally ἐρυθρός (e.g. *Od.* 9.208) or μέλας (e.g. *Od.* 5.265), both perhaps indicating the same sort, whereas later distinctions are made between λευκός, κιρρός, and μέλας (which would presumably include red);<sup>109</sup> cf. Ath. 1.32c τῶν οἴνων ὁ μὲν λευκός, ὁ δὲ κιρρός, ὁ δὲ μέλας, καὶ ὁ μὲν λευκός λεπτότατος τῇ φύσει, οὐρητικός, θερμὸς πεπτικός τε ὢν τὴν κεφαλὴν ποιεῖ διάπυρον· ἀνωφερὴς γὰρ ὁ οἶνος (cf. 1.26c, 32d).

**71 γλυκός** Wines of different origins and colors all have varieties that can be characterized as ‘sweet’; e.g. Ath. 1.32c, f. The use of γλυκός alone, however, is equivalent to γλεῦκος, ‘new wine’ or wine that has not yet fermented; cf. Kerényi 1960. 5–11; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 60.1; Wilkins 2000. 219 n. 72; Chadwick 1996. 78.

**αὐθιγενής** The word, ‘native’ or ‘local’, is apparently not used of wine elsewhere, but see Ascani 2001. 453–4 with n. 32 and her equation of the word with αὐτίτης (e.g. Polyzel. fr. 1). It seems to be primarily poetic (e.g. B. 2.11 Μοῦσ’ αὐθιγενής; E. fr. 472.5–8 αὐθιγενής ... κυπάρισσος) and is thus perhaps parodic high-style, although it occasionally occurs in prose (prior to the Roman period only in Herodotus, e.g. 2.149.4 ὕδωρ ... αὐθιγενές). There is no compelling reason to assume that the wedding being described took place, like that of Iphicrates, in Thrace; but for praise of Thracian wines, cf. Ath. 1.31a–b. It is possible that rather than γλυκός and αὐθιγενής referring to separate wines, they are meant to be taken together as ‘local unfermented wine’.

**ἡδύς** When applied to wine, an adjective of general commendation from Homer onward (e.g. *Od.* 9.204–5 [Thracian wine]; 3.51; Ar. fr. 613; Eub. fr. 136.2; Amph. fr. 9.3; Alex. fr. 46.9).

<sup>109</sup> The occurrence of οἶνος ἐρυθρός at Archil. fr. 4.8 may simply be dependent on Homeric language.

**καπνίας** ‘Smoky’ wine is presumably that which has been aged by exposure to smoke; cf. Colum. 1.6.20 *apothecae recte superponentur his locis, unde plerumque fumus exoritur, quoniam vina celerius vetustescunt, quae fumo quodam genere praecoquem maturitatem trahunt*. For the wine itself, cf. Pherecr. fr. 137.6; Cratin. fr. 462;<sup>110</sup> Pl. Com. fr. 274; Hor. C. 3.8.11; *App. Prov.* 3.43 with Leutsch–Schneidewin 1839 *ad loc.*; Ascani 2001. 454 n. 32; Pickard-Cambridge 1927. 290–1 n. 6.<sup>111</sup>

<sup>110</sup> This fragment records that the poet Ecphantides was called Καπνίας, seemingly referring to the wine, although Hsch. κ 716 interprets the name as derived διὰ τὸ μηδὲν λαμπρὸν γράφειν.

<sup>111</sup> Pickard-Cambridge 1962. 192 n. 5 offers an abbreviated version of his comments.

**Σαμία** (*Samia*)  
(‘Samian Woman’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.191; 1847. 587; Bothe 1855. 429; Kock 1884 II.155; Edmonds 1959 II.70–1; Webster 1970. 77; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.264; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 265

**Title** Titles formed from an ethnic are common; see on Ἀμπρακιῶτις and Θετταλοί. The only other example of this particular title is Menander’s homonymous play, although Crates wrote a Σάμιοι.

**Content of the comedy** Little can be said about the plot; Webster 1970. 77 not unreasonably implied that it perhaps resembled that of similarly titled plays, which hinge on a recognition that in turn leads to marriage. If so, the title character may be a hetaira, as in Menander’s *Samia*. Although the date of the comedy is unknown, Athens’ involvement on Samos in the middle of the fourth century and the establishment of a cleruchy there in 365 BC make a politically motivated plot perhaps equally possible; cf. Cargill 1995. 17–21; Shipley 1987. 138–43, 155–64.

**Date** Unknown.

fr. 43 K.-A. (42 K.)

τὸ γὰρ κολακεύειν νῦν ἀρέσκειν ὄνομι’ ἔχει

habent ACE

καὶ ἐν Σαμία om. CE

1 γὰρ ACE: δὲ Bothe ἀρέσκειν Canter: ἀρέσκειαν ACE: ἀρέσκει’ Blaydes

For ‘flattering’ now has the name ‘be pleasing’

Ath. 6.255a–b

ταύτην δὲ τὴν κολακείαν τινὲς ἐκτρεπόμενοι τοῦνομα ἀρέσκειαν προσαγορεύουσιν, ὥς καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Σαμία. —

Some, changing its name, call this flattery ‘being pleasing’, as also Anaxandrides in *Samia*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — — | — — — — —

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 111; Canter 1564. 183; Grotius 1626. 642–3; Meineke 1840 III.191; 1847. 587; Bothe 1855. 429; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix; Kock 1884 II.155; Blaydes 1896. 124; Herwerden 1903. 99; Edmonds 1959 II.70–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.264; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 265

**Citation context** Athenaeus quotes this fragment in the midst of a long discussion of flattery (6.248c–62a). He appears to connect it anachronistically with the attempts by the Athenians on Lemnos to show fawning gratitude to Seleucus I and Antiochus I. Even if Athenaeus does not mean to imply that the fragment refers to the behaviour of third-century Greeks, there is no compelling reason to think that he had concrete knowledge of a political context for the fragment. That said, see introduction to the play for the possibility that it may have been political; for Athenian involvement on Lemnos in the fourth century, see Cargill 1995. 12–15, 94–99; Stroud 1998.

**Text** Bothe, rightly noting that δέ is occasionally corrupted to γάρ (cf. Pearson 1917 on S. fr. 873.1; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 91.1), emended the text on metrical grounds (cf. his similar emendation in fr. 46.3); but an anapaest in place of an iamb is so common as to need little defense (cf. White 1912 §§113–22).

**Interpretation** κολακεία and ἀρέσκεια are essentially similar behaviours, distinguished by the underlying motive; cf. Arist. *EN* 1108a27–9 ὁ μὲν ὡς δεῖ ἡδὺς ὦν φίλος καὶ ἡ μεσότης φιλία, ὁ δ' ὑπερβάλλον, εἰ μὲν οὐδενὸς ἔνεκα, ἄρεσκος, εἰ δ' ὠφελείας τῆς αὐτοῦ, κόλαξ; 1127a7–10 ὁ μὲν τοῦ ἡδὺς εἶναι στοχαζόμενος μὴ δι' ἄλλο τι ἄρεσκος, ὁ δ' ὅπως ὠφελεία τις αὐτῷ γίγνηται εἰς χρήματα καὶ ὅσα διὰ χρημάτων, κόλαξ; Diggle 2004. 181–2, 222–3; Ussher 1960 on Thphr. *Char.* 2.1. For the κόλαξ, see on fr. 35.7. The thought expressed here is common in political writing; cf. Th. 3.82.3 καὶ τὴν εἰωθυῖαν ἀξιώσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν τῇ δικαίῳσει with Hornblower 1991–2008 *ad loc.*; Pl. *R.* 560d–e; Isoc. 7.20; Sall. *Cat.* 52.11.

**Σατυρίας (*Satyrias*)**  
(‘*Satyrias*’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.191; 1847. 587; Bothe 1855. 429; Kock 1884 II.155; Edmonds 1959 II.70–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.265; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 265

**Title** The name *Satyrias* is not otherwise attested, although Meineke 1839 I.373 is surely correct in his opinion that ‘*Satyrias nomen proprium fuisse videtur a Σάτυρος formatum, ut Ἀριστίας ab ἄριστος, Διδυμίας a δίδυμος, Σκληρίας a σκληρός et similia*’; cf. Chantraine 1933. 92–6; Breitenbach 1908. 78–9. Breitenbach compares Plautus’ *Saturio*, although this is rather the transliterated Latin form of Σατυρίων, a fairly common name of the late Hellenistic period (*LGPN* II list 19 occurrences in Attica, of which the four third-century instances are the earliest), and thus is almost certainly unrelated, aside from sharing a common stem.

**Content of the comedy** Only a single, uninformative word survives from the play, but the title is more likely meant as a descriptive name than as a reference to an otherwise unknown historical figure.

**Date** Unknown.

fr. 44 K.-A. (43 K.)

habet A

ὦ τ ἄ ρ ι α δ' ὠνόμασε καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Σατυρίᾳ

Ath. 3.95c

Anaxandrides in *Satyrias* also mentioned p i g s ’ e a r s

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.191; 1847. 587; Bothe 1855. 429; Kock 1884 II.155; Edmonds 1959 II.70–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.265; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 265

**Citation context** The serving of tripe and the like at Athenaeus 3.94c evokes an extended discussion of such food (lasting until 3.101e, but with a long digression at 3.96f–100b). After more general remarks (3.94c–5a), the discussion turns to parts of pigs specifically (3.95a–6e). This fragment occurs near the beginning of that section, in the midst of quotations largely concerned with



pigs' snouts; Alex. fr. 115; Theophil. fr. 8.1–3; Anaxil. fr. 19; 13; 11 precede, and Axionic. fr. 8; Ar. fr. 478; Pherecr. fr. 107; Plb. 6.59; Stesich. fr. 44 (*PMG* 221); Archipp. fr. 1; Arar. fr. 1 follow.

**Interpretation** ὠτάριον, a diminutive of οὖς, occurs also at Alex. fr. 115.16; Anaxil. fr. 9, and has been plausibly restored at Anaxil. fr. 19.4; for the form, cf. Tsantsanoglou 1984 on Anaxil. fr. 9 (68 Tsants.). Tsantsanoglou makes the further cogent argument that pigs' ears specifically are meant by this word, since this is explicitly stated at Alex. fr. 115.16 and implied at Anaxil. fr. 19.4 (if the restoration is accepted) and by the general context of Ath. 3.95. For parts of pigs (including ears) generally, see Wilkins 2000. 20 n. 62.

**Σώσιππος** (*Sōsippōs*)  
(‘Sosippus’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.191; 1847. 587; Bothe 1855. 429; Kock 1884 II.155; Edmonds 1959 II.70–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.265; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 265

**Title** This is the only known play with this title. The title is clearly a personal name, but to whom it refers, and whether that person is real or fictional, is unknown. Meineke 1839 I.373 tentatively suggested a connection with the obscure comic poet Sosippus (*LGPNI* s. v. #28); but he is very poorly attested and, since he seems to have been a contemporary of Diphilus, is probably too late to have been mentioned by Anaxandrides.<sup>112</sup> Breitenbach 1908. 43–4, rightly dismissing Meineke’s suggestion, instead thought of the Sosippus who was an Olympic victor in 388/7 BC (*PA* 13271; *PAA* 863320; *LGPNI* s. v. #26; Moretti 1957 #382). Breitenbach himself notes that it is unclear if this man was an Athenian, although his nationality is not necessarily relevant; a more compelling objection is that he achieved fame a decade before Anaxandrides began to write plays, and there is no reason to think that he remained relevant in the popular imagination. *LGPNI* s. v. #2 are rightly more cautious and label the eponymous hero of the play fictitious. This may be correct, but Sosippus is not the sort of speaking-name expected in such a circumstance, and the reference may be to a prominent contemporary (*LGPNI* record 13 occurrences of the name, excluding the Olympic victor, the poet, and the eponym of this play, in Athens in the fourth century).<sup>113</sup>

**Content of the comedy** Little can be said about the content. The lone word that survives could suggest epic parody, but even if this is true, such parody need not have involved more than a line or two. Similarly, the possible referents of the title are too varied and speculative to allow for any substantive larger comment.

**Date** Unknown.

<sup>112</sup> Sosippus is known only from Ath. 4.133f, where doubt is expressed as to whether Diph. fr. 18 belongs to the Ἀπολείπουσα of Diphilus or of Sosippus (but note the absence of such doubt at Diph. fr. 17, quoted at Ath. 4.132c–e); Meineke 1839 I.452–3 thus hesitantly suggested emending Sosippus to Poseidippus, although Poseidippus is not otherwise known to have written an Ἀπολείπουσα.

<sup>113</sup> Even if the title refers to a contemporary, the reference may be oblique and so does not necessarily imply the existence of a Sosippus who is mocked in this play; cf. the possibility that Lysistrata in Ar. *Lys.* refers to or was modeled on the priestess Lysimache (cf. Henderson 1987. xxxviii–xl).

## fr. 45 K.-A. (44 K.)

Σ<sup>AT</sup> H. Il. 23.1 b<sup>1</sup>

π τ ό λ ι ν · Κυπρίων τῶν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ἢ λέξις· κεῖται δὲ καὶ παρὰ κωμικῶ Ἀναξανδρίδῃ  
ἐν Σωσίππῳ

πτόλιν T: κατὰ πτόλιν A      κυπρίων T: πτόλιν. κυπρίων A: πόλιν. κυπρίων Villoison  
παρὰ AT: παρὰ τῷ Meineke      Ἀναξανδρίδῃ Meineke: Ἀλεξανδρίδῃ T: om. A

C i t y. (This form of) the word is used by the Cypriots in Salamis. It occurs also in the comic poet Anaxandrides in *Sōsippōs*

Σ<sup>T</sup> H. Il. 23.2 b<sup>2</sup>

ὅτι τὸ π τ ό λ ι ν καὶ παρὰ κωμικοῖς

(This form of the word) ‘c i t y’ (occurs) also in comic poets

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.191; 1847. 587; Bothe 1855. 429–30; Meineke 1857 V.81; Kock 1884 II.155; Edmonds 1959 II.70–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.265; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 265

**Citation context** The scholia to the *Iliad* cite Anaxandrides’ use of the word as part of the discussion of the word in H. Il. 23.1 ὥς οἱ μὲν στενάχοντο κατὰ πτόλιν· αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοί. Since the word is common in elevated poetry both generally (see below) and in the phrase κατὰ πτόλιν (e.g. A.R. 1.247 [same metrical position]; A. *Th.* 6; E. *Andr.* 699), but almost non-existent in comedy, Anaxandrides is a far from obvious parallel to cite. The obscurity of the reference might thus suggest that its ultimate source was a work of Hellenistic scholarship on epic diction or epic parody in the comic poets. If Anaxandrides did parody H. Il. 23.1–2, a political point is easy to imagine (e.g. ‘there was much groaning throughout the city when they came to the islands [i.e. νήσους for the Homeric νῆας] and the Hellespont’), but the possibilities are legion and such speculation is largely fruitless.

**Interpretation** A common form of the word in Homer (e.g. Il. 2.130; Od. 2.383), tragedy (e.g. A. *Ag.* 595; E. *Ph.* 250; *Ba.* 216; not in S.) and other high-style poetry; see Friis Johansen–Whittle 1980 on A. *Su.* 699 for further examples of this and related forms in tragedy, together with brief discussion and bibliography. Despite the claim at Σ<sup>T</sup> H. Il. 23.2 that the word is used παρὰ κωμικοῖς, this is the only extant example in comedy.<sup>114</sup> Since the form πτόλ– is

<sup>114</sup> The only comparable form in comedy is ἀμφιπτολεμοπηδησίστρατος (although from πόλεμος rather than πόλις) at Eup. fr. 424.

used only *metri gratia* after a short syllable, commonly a preposition, that is likely to have been the case here as well whether there was epic parody or the word was merely meant to add an element of solemnity.

**Τηρέυς (Tēreus)**  
(‘Tereus’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.191; 1847. 587; Bothe 1855. 430; Kock 1884 II.156; Edmonds 1959 II.70–1; Webster 1970. 40; Nesselrath 1990. 195, 216–18; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.265 (cf. 1983 IV.59); Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 266

**Title** Tereus was the eponym of comedies by Cantharus and Philetaerus, as well as a major character in Aristophanes’ *Aves*; tragedies were written about him by Sophocles, Philocles I, possibly Carcinus (cf. *TrGF* 70 F 4 with *app. crit.*), Livius Andronicus, and Accius. The standard version of the myth, known from numerous sources, is that Tereus raped Philomela, sister of his wife Procne, and then cut out her tongue to prevent her from disclosing his crime; but Philomela depicted the events in a tapestry, which was made known to Procne. In revenge, the sisters slaughtered Itys, son of Tereus and Procne, and served him to his father; when Tereus discovered what had happened and pursued them, all three were transformed into birds: Tereus into a hoopoe, Procne into a nightingale, and Philomela into a swallow. For a succinct account of the story, see Apollod. 3.14.8; for fuller accounts, including variants, see Touloupa in *LIMC* VII.1.527–9; Höfer in Roscher 1884–1937 V.371–6; Pearson 1917, introduction to S. *Tereus* (fr. 581–95); Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 15. For Tereus in Athenian drama, see Dobrov 1993.

**Content of the comedy** The transformation of Tereus in itself clearly offers scope for comic treatment, notably in Aristophanes’ portrayal of Tereus in *Aves*; Nesselrath 1990. 216–18 argues that this play offered a rationalization of the myth. His interpretation hinges on the acceptance of ὄρνις as a nickname (cf. on fr. 46.1) with relevance to the plot as a whole rather than simply as a passing joke, and he concludes (217) that Tereus here is not the Thracian king of myth but rather ‘ein harmloser athenischer Ehemann, der vielleicht ein zu großes Interesse an der Schwester seiner Frau bekundet hatte, für diese Verirrung dann aber bei beiden Damen in Ungnade fiel hatten, sich schließlich in fr. 45 [46 K.-A.] auch noch anhören mußte, daß er als Mann, der Frauen gegenüber den kürzeren zog, künftig ὄρνις heißen werde.’ Nesselrath’s suggestion is a relatively detailed example (apparently developed independently) of the general interpretative framework for mythological plays proposed in passing at Winkler 1982.

**Date** The play has been dated to *ca.* 350 BC or shortly thereafter (cf. Nesselrath 1990. 195; Webster 1970. 40) on the basis of suggested identifications of the Polyeuctus in fr. 46.3 (see *ad loc.*), although the evidence is far from compel-

ling. It apparently failed to place well in competition, with the result that Ath. 9.373f–4b (citing fr. 48) marvels that it was preserved; cf. on fr. 48; test. 2.

## fr. 46 K.-A. (45 K.)

Ὅρνις κεκλήση. (B.) διὰ τί, πρὸς τῆς Ἑστίας;  
 πότερον καταφαγὼν τὴν πατρῶαν οὐσίαν,  
 ὥσπερ Πολύευκτος ὁ καλός; (A.) οὐ δῆτ', ἀλλ' ὅτι  
 ἄρρηγν ὑπὸ θηλειῶν κατεκόπη

habent ACE

You will be called Bird. (B.) Why, by Hestia?  
 For consuming my inheritance,  
 like the handsome Polyeuctus? (A.) Not at all, but because,  
 although a man, you were made into mincemeat by women

Ath. 4.166d

Πολύευκτον δ' Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Τηρεῖ κωμῶδων ὄρνις κεκλήση, φησί, διὰ τί —

Πολυεύκτου δ' Ἀναξανδρίδης λέγων CE

Mocking Polyeuctus, Anaxandrides in *Tereus* says: Why —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —  
 — — — — — | — — — — —

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 109; Ruhnken 1768. lxxxi (= 1828b. 344); Meineke 1840 III.191–2; 1847. 587–8; Bothe 1855. 430; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix; Kock 1884 II.45; Blaydes 1896. 124; Herwerden 1903. 99; Edmonds 1959 II.70–1; Webster 1970. 40, 57; Nesselrath 1990. 216–18; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.266; Wilkins 2000. 293; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 266–7

**Citation context** Athenaeus quotes this fragment in the course of a list of examples of spendthrifts (4.165d–9a): Alex. fr. 110 (Diodorus); 248 (Epicharides); Diph. fr. 37 (Ctesippus son of Chabrias); Timocl. fr. 5 (the same); Men. fr. 264 (the same); 247 (a generic spendthrift); Axionic. fr. 1 (Pythodelus) precede;

Theopomp. Hist. *FGrHist* 115 F 110 (Eubulus the politician); 233 (people of Tarentum); 224 (Philip II) and various other fragments of historians on a variety of persons follow. Despite the hesitation sometimes expressed (e.g. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 110.1 for Diodorus), all the men mentioned in Athenaeus' catalogue of spendthrifts appear to be historical persons of the fourth century.

**Interpretation** In accord with his general interpretation of the play (see Introduction there), Nesselrath takes Speaker B to be Tereus, despite the fact that Itys was traditionally the one slaughtered by the women. Such disregard for the traditional account is possible (cf. on fr. 35.10), but seems more probable in a passing joke than as a structural feature; for possible support for Tereus as Speaker B, see on 1. Speaker B could be interpreted as Itys if the fragment contains a conflation of the traditional story of his death and the version known from later sources (Serv. *Ecl.* 6.78 ~ *Myth. Vat.* 1.4) according to which he, like Tereus, Procne, and Philomela, was transformed into a bird. The allusion to a squandered patrimony may point to a conflict between generations and so perhaps suggests that the dysfunctional family dynamic was even more complicated than Nesselrath and the traditional myth itself allowed for; for the possibility that the reference to squandered patrimony is a passing joke, see on 1.

Structurally, the fragment is similar to fr. 1 (cf. *ad loc.*). Speaker A makes a statement (here 1); Speaker B misunderstands the content and reaches a conclusion radically different from the one intended (2–3); the first speaker then offers a correction, clarifying what was meant (3–4).

**1 Ὀρνις** For nicknames in general, see on fr. 35; for specific birds as nicknames, cf. Ar. Av. 1290–99 with Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.* The generic word ὄρνις seems not to have normally functioned as a nickname, although it was occasionally used to characterize people as flighty (cf. Ar. Av. 169–70 with van Leeuwen 1902a *ad loc.*). This seems to have led to Meineke's claim (1840 III.192) that 'ceterum in Anaxandridis verbis ita demum acumen inest, si Polyeuctum ludibrii causa Ὀρνις appellatum fuisse statuas, quod nomen Athenienses volaticis et inconstantis animi hominibus indidisse constat,' but this behaviour is not really what Polyeuctus is criticized for here. If Tereus is addressed, there may be a play on words similar to that at Timocl. fr. 19.3–4 (B.) διὰ τί Τηρέα λέγεις; / (A.) διότι τηρ[ε]ῖν δεῖ παρόντος τοῦδε τὰ σκεύη σφόδρα, although for the joke to work here, there must have been some sort of set-up to facilitate the connection with τηρεῖν.

**κεκλήση** For this termination for the 2nd singular future passive (as well as present passive), as opposed to -ει, cf. fr. 38.1 with n.; Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 II.60; Mayser 1938 I.2.90; Threatte 1996 II.451–2.

**πρὸς τῆς Ἑστίας** Oaths by Hestia, apparently normally spoken by men (contrast *adesp. com. fr. 1000.39*), seem to be confined to comedy: *Ar. Pl. 395*; *Antiph. fr. 183.2* νῆ τὴν Ἑστίαν; *Eub. fr. 60* νῆ τὴν Ἑστίαν; *Strato Com. fr. 1.28*; *adesp. com. fr. 1000.39*; *1093.231*. They are thus presumably colloquial, as Cobet 1880. 60 recognized.<sup>115</sup> The comment of Cunningham 1971 on *Herod. 7.120* that ἐστίη (i.e. ἐστία) is ‘frequent in oaths from Homer on’, is true enough, but does not include the necessary qualification that the form in Homer (e.g. *Od. 14.158–9*) is invariably ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα θεῶν ξενίη τε τράπεζα / ἰστίη τ’ Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος, ἦν ἀφικάνω and in other authors refers to a particular hearth (e.g. *Herod. 7.120* μὰ τὴν Κέρδωνος ἐστίην; *S. El. 881* μὰ τὴν πατρῶν ἐστίαν) rather than to the personified goddess. For the goddess Hestia generally, see Sarian in *LIMC V.1.407–12*; Preuner in *Roscher 1884–1937 I.2605–53* (2623 for Hestia in oaths). Of dubious relevance is *Opp. Cyn 3.118*, where the cock is called ὄρνις ... συνέστιος.

**2 καταφαγὼν τὴν πατρῶν οὐσίαν** The image of eating or consuming one’s own wealth or that of another is as old as Homer (e.g. *Od. 1.375* ὑμὰ κτήματ’ ἔδοντες, where meant literally) and is common in comedy (e.g. *Antiph. fr. 236.1*; *Alex. fr. 128.1–2*; *Anaxipp. fr. 1.32*); for numerous further examples of this and other metaphors for squandering wealth, cf. Arnott 1996 on *Alex. fr. 110.2*; Biles–Olson 2015 on *Ar. V. 1114–16*. The connection between being called ‘Bird’ and squandering one’s wealth remains obscure, unless it hinged on wordplay involving Τηρεύς/τηρέω. Csapo 1993. 122 wondered if there might be some connection with birds abusing fathers; cf. *Ar. Eq. 496–7*; *Av. 1347–8*; *Σ A. Eu. 861*.

**3 Πολύευκτος ὁ καλός** Ruhnken 1768. lxxxi (= 1828b. 344) suggested that this Polyeuctus is the same man as the well-known orator and politician of the third quarter of the fourth century, Πολύευκτος Σωστράτου Σφήττιος (*PA 11925 + 11934 + 11950*; *PAA 778285*; *LGPN II s. v. #49*); this thesis has often been accepted, e.g. by Meineke 1840 III.192 and Nesselrath 1990. 195, although it was rejected early on by Böhnecke 1843. 643 n. 4. With this identification, the description of the man as καλός may be a mocking reference to his un-gainly appearance (cf. *Plu. Phoc. 9.9*, where he is described as ὑπέρπαχυς), but more likely it indicates simply that he is both young and well-born. The main obstacle to the identification (aside from the lack of any obvious connection between the man and the content of the fragment) is that the period of his major political importance is probably after Anaxandrides’ career had come to an end. Conceivably, he might have been already well-known enough in his

<sup>115</sup> At *Roscher 1884–1937 I.2623* the reference to Cobet is wrongly given as p. 1.



youth to be mocked in comedy, but the only real basis for this identification is that he is the most well-known bearer of the name.

Webster 1970. 40 asserted that the reference was to a somewhat lesser known man, Πολύευκτος Τιμοκράτους Κριωεύς (*PA* 11946; *PAA* 778225; *LGNP* II s. v. #34), although he provided no support for the suggestion. Webster presumably based his deduction on the fact that the family of this Polyeuctus was wealthy (cf. Davies 1971. 513–14 s. v. Τιμοκράτης II [*PA* 13772; *PAA* 888265]), although he was (slanderosly) described as a μισθοφόρος of Meidias at D. 21.139. Again, there is little concrete evidence to support the conclusion, and this Polyeuctus likewise seems slightly too young to be mocked in Anaxandrides.

Since approximately twenty-five other known bearers of this name are possible contemporaries of Anaxandrides, and no obvious connection exists between any of these men and the description in this fragment, the safest course is to treat the man mentioned here as a distinct historical figure (thus *PAA* 778017; *LGNP* II s. v. #5).<sup>116</sup> A similar controversy has centred round the eponym of Heniochus' Πολύευκτος; this man has been identified with the Polyeuctus here,<sup>117</sup> has been viewed as distinct from him, and has been judged fictitious (cf. Breitenbach 1908. 38–40; Wilamowitz 1925. 145 n. 1; *LGNP* II s. v. #6). Even assuming that the eponym of Heniochus' play is a historical figure, the dates for Heniochus are too poorly known to make even an educated guess at a possible identification, so the title of his play offers no help.

Physical descriptions such as ὁ καλός are frequently used to distinguish homonyms or to identify an individual precisely, although in comedy there is often an added point to the choice of adjective. For καλός used this way, Kassel–Austin note Pl. *Prt.* 362; *Phdr.* 278e; X. *HG* 2.3.56; Antiph. fr. 27.10; for other adjectives, cf. Ar. *Av.* 988; *Th.* 31–3; *Ra.* 709.

4 ἄρρην ὑπὸ θηλειῶν κατεκόπη The reference is primarily to the relationship between Tereus and Procne and Philomela, but the imagery suggests a defeated fighting-cock; cf. Ar. *Av.* 286; Heraclid. Com. fr. 1; Borthwick 1966. 4–5; 1967. 249; Haslam (i. e. Lobel) [ed. pr.] on *POxy.* XLIV 3151 fr. 1 col. 2.5. The imagery may also echo the apparently popular belief that among chickens the female can be the dominant sex, resulting in a reversal of normal roles; cf. Arist. *HA* 631b8–18; Ael. *NA* 4.29; 5.5; English 'hen-pecked'.

<sup>116</sup> Coincidentally, and of very doubtful relevance, Polyeuctus also appears as a *kalos*-name in the mid-fifth century; cf. *ARV*<sup>2</sup> p. 1607; *PA* 11921; *PAA* 778000; *LGNP* II s. v. #1.

<sup>117</sup> Bergk 1887. IV.169 n. 193 identified these two men with one another but not with the orator.

κατακόπτω means ‘cut up in small pieces’ (e.g. for cooking, as at Ar. Av. 1688 [of birds]), but can also be used in a military sense, like the English ‘butcher’ (e.g. Th. 7.29.5; D. 13.22); cf. περικόμματα at Ar. Eq. 372 with Blaydes 1892 *ad loc.* Here the word may have the connotation ‘defeat overwhelmingly’, but perhaps it also has the sense ‘bore (with words)’, as at Alex. fr. 177.12 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Anaxipp. fr. 1.23; Men. Sam. 285 with Gomme–Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.*; Hegesipp. Com. fr. 1.3. In any event, it is clear that a man has in some way been worsted by two women.

## fr. 47 K.-A. (46 K.)

ἀλλ', οἷα νύμφη βασιλῆς ὠνομασμένη,  
μύροις Μεγαλλείοισι σῶμ' ἀλείφεται

habet A

1 ὠνομασμένη A: ὠραῖσμένη Headlam: ἐξωρασμένη Herwerden: ἀσμένη χεροῖν Toeppel: ἔνδον ἀσμένη Kock 2 Μεγαλλείοισι Cobet: Μεγαλλίοισι A: Μεγαλλείοις τὸ Herwerden

But, like one called a royal bride,  
she anoints her body with Megallian perfumes

Ath. 15.691a

Ἀναξανδρίδης Τηρεῖ· —

Anaxandrides in *Tēreus*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — — | — — — — —  
— — — — — | — — — — —

**Discussion** Toup 1770 II.402; Meineke 1840 III.192–3; Cobet 1847. 127 (cf. 1858. 77); Emperius 1847. 311; Meineke 1847. 588; Bothe 1855. 430; Herwerden 1855. 55–6; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix, 81; Töppel 1867. 7–8; Herwerden 1872. 85–6; Naber 1880. 54–5; Kock 1884 II.156; Herwerden 1886. 179; Kock 1888 III.737; Blaydes 1890a. 83; Blaydes 1896. 124; Blaydes 1898. 186; Headlam 1899. 6; Herwerden 1903. 99; Edmonds 1959 II.70–1; Long 1986. 81; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.266; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 267

**Citation context** Toward the end of a long discussion of perfumes (15.686c–92f; including Anaxandr. fr. 41 at 15.689f–90a), Athenaeus breaks into summary

lists of different types. This fragment is the last in the short section on Megallian perfume: Ar. fr. 549; Pherecr. fr. 149; Stratt. fr. 34; Amphis fr. 27 precede.

**Text** The sense of the fragment is generally clear, but 1 poses several serious difficulties, primarily ὠνομασμένη, which is generally thought to be either corrupt or used in an unparalleled sense. The text is probably sound, with ὠνομασμένη used as a copulative (i. e. 'like one named as a royal bride...'); cf. Antiph. fr. 104.2; ΣbT H. *Il.* 23.90.

Meineke 1840 III.193 suggested that, barring corruption, ὠνομασμένη must be used with the sense of κατ'ὠνομασμένη ('betrothed'; cf. Plb. 5.43.1; Hsch. τ 85a); but no parallel for ὠνομασμένη with this sense exists.<sup>118</sup> A number of scholars have assumed corruption and suggested various emendations, most involving some word followed by ἄσμενη, although none of these is convincing. The difficulty may be somewhat obviated by Toup's suggestion (1770. 402) that βασιλῖς is a proper name, specifically that of an hetaira. But there is no particular reason to think that the name belongs to an hetaira,<sup>119</sup> and in any case the name itself is both extremely rare and fairly late.<sup>120</sup>

**Interpretation** The fragment concerns a woman anointing herself with perfume and thus being compared to a bride; whether she is an ordinary bride being compared to a particularly wealthy bride, or a non-bride being compared to a bride, is unclear. One obvious suggestion for the identify of the subject is either Procne or Philomela, the two main women in the story of Tereus.

1–2 Anointing oneself is presumably part of a normal bride's preparation for the wedding, after she has taken her bath; cf. Oakley–Sinos 1993. 15–16.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>118</sup> The citation by Gulick 1928–1957 of H. *Il.* 9.515 and 23.90 offers no support for this interpretation, despite his claim to the contrary.

<sup>119</sup> For support for his assertion, Toup relied on Hsch. α 7247 Φορμισίους δὲ τὰ γυναικεῖα αἰδοῖα [Ar. *Ec.* 97] καὶ Βασιλείδας καὶ Λαχάρας. Since the Hesychius passage does not in fact support Toup's proposal, Meineke was correct in rejecting it, although his argument that there is no such name as Βασιλείδης or Βασιλίδης carries little weight and in any case is no longer true (there are 25 from Athens alone, although most are late Hellenistic or later, with the earliest certain example being from the mid-third century [*PA* 2840; *PAA* 263330; *LGPN* II s. v. #17]).

<sup>120</sup> There is one example from the second century and one from the first, both of them from Rhodes, and three examples from the Roman Imperial period, all from Magna Graecia. But there is one fourth-century Athenian example of the similarly formed name Βασίλιννα (*PA* 2842; *PAA* 263600).

<sup>121</sup> Note that X. *Smp.* 2.3 states that women, particularly brides, wear myrrh and so need no other perfume, not, as Oakley–Sinos 16 paraphrase, 'that women wear enough myrrh on this occasion that men's perfumes go unappreciated.'

**2 μύροις Μεγαλλείοισι** For perfume generally, cf. on fr. 41.1. Megalleian perfume received its name from Megallus, its reputed *πρῶτος εὐρετής* (cf. Ar. fr. 549 with Kassel–Austin *ad loc.*), and was apparently expensive and of high quality (cf. Amphis fr. 27; Eub. fr. 89.5–6 [fr. 90 K] with Hunter 1983 *ad loc.*); for details concerning its manufacture, cf. Thphr. *Od.* 29; Dsc. 1.58.3; Plin. *NH* 13.13. The names of both the perfume and its supposed inventor are often transmitted in a corrupt form (note especially Hsch. μ 1011, where the corruption goes back at least to Hesychius’ source); cf. Renehan 1969. 13.

## fr. 48 K.-A. (47 K.)

ὀχευομένους δὲ <— ∪ — x> τοὺς κάπρους  
καὶ τὰς ἀλεκτρύονας θεωροῦσ’ ἄσμενοι

habent ACE

Τηρεῖ om. CE

1 ὀχευομένας δὲ τὰς Bothe: ὀχευομένας δὲ τὰς κύνας Herwerden 2 θεωροῦσ’  
CE: θεωροῦσιν A

They delight in watching the boars  
and hens being mounted

Ath. 9.373e–f

τὸν δ’ ἀλεκτρύονα ... οἱ ἀρχαῖοι καὶ θηλικῶς εἰρήκασιν ... Ἀναξανδρίδης Τηρεῖ· —

The ancients used the word ‘cock’ also for the feminine ... Anaxandrides in *Tēreus*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— ∪ — — ∪ | < — ∪ — x > — ∪ —  
— — ∪ — — — ∪ — — — ∪ — — — ∪ —

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.192; 1847. 588; Bothe 1855. 430; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix; Kock 1884 II.156; Herwerden 1886. 178; Blaydes 1890a. 83; Blaydes 1896. 124; Herwerden 1903. 99; Edmonds 1959 II.72–3; Nesselrath 1990. 218; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.266–7; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 267

**Citation context** Within a more general discussion of birds (9.373a–4d), Athenaeus includes a section on the use of the word ἀλεκτρύων ‘cock’ as a feminine; Cratin. fr. 115 and Stratt. fr. 61 precede, and Theopomp. Com. fr. 10 and Ar. fr. 193 and 194.1–2 follow. The list of citations is interrupted after this fragment by the narrator’s comment that he is surprised this play survived and his quotation of Chamaeleon fr. 43 (= Anaxandr. test. 2).

**Text** The lacuna in 1 is normally assumed to fall at the beginning of the line. But placing it after δέ or, less good, at the end of the line preserves Anaxandrides' normal penthemimeral caesura.

The text has often been doubted; the fragment is not obviously corrupt, but it is difficult to make sense of, probably due in large part to the lack of context. If emendation is warranted, the best solution is Bothe's ὀχευομένας δὲ τὰς κάπρους (1855. 430; followed by Edmonds 1959); ἡ κάπρος is unparalleled, but the formation is not difficult. Needless drastic is Herwerden 1893. 178, who conjectured ὀχευομένας δὲ τὰς κύνας, 'cum tamen manifesto sermo fiat de bestia femina, nec fere praeter canes et gallos animalia coeuntia saepe spectentur.' Similarly unnecessary, and unhelpful, are judgements of hopeless corruption, e.g. Kaibel's simple 'verba corrupta' (quoted by Kassel–Austin *ad loc.*) or Kock's despairing 'quid faciam nescio' (1884 II.156).

**Interpretation** The fragment obviously refers to some group taking pleasure in watching animals having sex. Difficulty in imagining a context was probably the driving force behind most attempts at emendation (see above), although changing the text to refer to female animals in both has satisfied many. Nesselrath believed the fragment could support his general interpretation of the play as that of a man dominated by women (cf. Introduction to this play); since it does not really accomplish this, he asserts that, 'man vermisst bei τὰς ἀλεκτρυόνας eine partizipiale Ergänzung wie bei ὀχευομένους δὲ τοὺς κάπρους; vielleicht ist hinter ἀλεκτρυόνας eine Lücke anzusetzen, in der vielleicht ebenfalls stand, wer diejenigen sind, die dergleichen ἄσμενοι θεωροῦσιν.'

**1 ὀχευομένους** The normal, generally prosaic (in poetry only at Theoc. 5.147), term for sex between animals;<sup>122</sup> as expected, the active is regularly used for the male, the passive for the female (e.g. Pl. *R.* 454d τὸ μὲν θῆλυ τίκτειν, τὸ δὲ ἄρρην ὀχεύειν; Arist. *HA* 540a21–3 ὀχεύεται δ' ἡ μὲν θήλεια ..., ὁ δ' ἄρρην ... ὀχεύει).

**τοὺς κάπρους** The wild boar is known as the victim in an oath-sacrifice (H. *Il.* 19.250–5; Ar. *Lys.* 202<sup>123</sup>) and is common in Homeric similes reflecting

<sup>122</sup> The word is used for people at *Suda* χ 73 χαμαιτυπεῖον· πορνεῖον. καὶ χαμαιτύπη, ἡ πόρνη. ἀπὸ τοῦ χαμαὶ κειμένην ὀχεύεσθαι and the reputed inscription on the tomb of Sardanapalos ἔσθιε, πῖνε, ὄχευε (Hellanic. *FGrHist* 4 F 63; Callisthenes *FGrHist* 124 F 34; Apollod. *FGrHist* 244 F 303), although note that Aristobul. fr. 6 gives the text as ἔσθιε, πῖνε, παῖζε. Cf. also Alc. Com. fr. 18.

<sup>123</sup> Σ<sup>RBar</sup> *ad loc.* report that it is used ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰδοίου; this gloss is expanded at *Suda* κ 348 κάπρος· τὸ αἰδοῖον τοῦ ἀνδρός. This interpretation is almost certainly incorrect.

aggressive self-defence (e.g. H. *Il.* 11.414–18; 13.471–5 with Janko 1992 *ad loc.*); in comedy, the boar appears primarily in lists of food (e.g. Ar. fr. 333.5; Stratt. fr. 12.2; Eub. fr. 63.3; Mnesim. fr. 4.48).

**2 τὰς ἀλεκτρυόνας** Although specifically feminine forms exist (ἀλεκτορίς [e.g. Arist. *HA* 558b17]; ἀλεκτρυονίς [ $\Sigma^R$  Ar. *Nu.* 226]), the normal Attic for both the male and female chicken is ἀλεκτρυών (hence the comic formation ἀλεκτρύαινα at Ar. *Nu.* 666); cf. Ath. 9.373e–4c (see Citation Context); Phryn. *Ecl.* 200 (207 R) with Rutherford 1881 *ad loc.*; Hsch.  $\alpha$  2859; van Leeuwen 1898 on Ar. *Nu.* 666. For chickens in general, cf. Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 483; Thompson 1936. 33–44.

**θεωροῦσ(ι)** Not simply ‘look at’ but ‘watch as a spectator’; cf. Bill 1901; Koller 1958.

"Υβρις (*Hybris*)  
(‘Hybris’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.193; 1847. 588; Bothe 1855. 430; Kock 1884 II.157; Edmonds 1959 II.72–3; Webster 1970. 83; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.267; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 267

**Title** Sophocles wrote a satyr play of the same name, for the title of which Pearson 1917 *ad loc.* compares two other plays of Sophocles, Ἐρις and Μῶμος, the latter also a satyr play. For plays named after an emotion, behaviour or the like, e. g. Anaxandrides Ἀντέρως (but see *ad loc.*) Anaxilas Εὐανδρία; Eubulus Ὀλβία; Menander Ὀργή. For hybris in general, Fisher 1992, who defines it (493) as ‘the deliberate infliction of shame and dishonour’; MacDowell 1990a. 17–23 and on D. 21.47 (the supposed law against hybris). The title of this play probably refers to the abstract, but the quasi-divine personification is also possible. For Hybris as a quasi-divinity, cf. Paus. 1.28.5 (discussing the Areopagus) τοὺς δὲ ἀργοὺς λίθους, ἐφ’ ὧν ἐστᾶσιν ὅσοι δίκας ὑπέχουσι καὶ οἱ διώκοντες, τὸν μὲν Ὑβρεως τὸν δὲ Ἀναιδείας ὀνομάζουσι (cf. X. *Smp.* 8.35; Ister *FGrHist* 334 F 11 with Jacoby 1950–1955 *ad loc.*); Panyas. fr. 17.8; 18; Eub. fr. 93.6–7; Ath. 2.36d; Loeb in *LIMC* V.1.551–3.

Two other possible referents of the title are of dubious relevance. On a red-figure vase depicting the apotheosis of Heracles (Munich 2360; *ARV*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 1186 #30, 1685), a satyr is labelled Ὑβρις; Loeb in *LIMC* V.1.552 suggests that ‘daneben gibt es Hybris auch in “harmloser” Form, als Mutwilligkeit besonders von jungen Tieren und Menschen, die keine Götterstrafe nach sich zieht. So kann auch ein Satyr den Namen H. tragen.’ At Apollod. 1.4.1 and Σ<sup>Tzet.</sup> Lyc. 772, Pan is reported to be the son of Zeus and Hybris, but this apparent assertion is probably illusory and an example of textual corruption due to folk etymology; cf. Σ<sup>BDEF</sup> Pi. *P.* arg., where Pan is the son of Zeus and Thybris (DEF: Thymbris B; note Aegius’ emendation of Hybris to Thymbris at Apollod. 1.4.1).

**Content of the comedy** The play could have been a social comedy that hinged on an act perceived, rightly or wrongly, as hybris. Equally possible, it was a more pointed political play. The single fragment is uninformative.

**Date** Unknown.

## fr. 49 K.-A. (48 K.)

οὐκουν λαβὼν τὸν φανὸν ἄψεις μοι λύχνον;

habet A

οὐκοῦν Porson

Won't you take the torch and light a lamp for me?

Ath. 15.700a

Ἀναξανδρίδης δὲ ἐν ὕβρει· —

ενυβρι A: corr. Casaubon

Anaxandrides in *Hybris*: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — —

**Discussion** Jacobs 1809. 370; Porson ap. Morell 1824. 889 n. 2; Meineke 1840 III.193; 1847. 588; Bothe 1855. 430; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix; Kock 1884 II.157; Edmonds 1959 II.72–3; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.267; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 267

**Citation context** As the dinner party depicted in Athenaeus draws to a close, talk turns to various sources of artificial light (15.699d–701b). At 15.699f, Athenaeus alleges that what are called φανοί in his day were once called λυχνοῦχοι, and cites a number of comic fragments as evidence. He then (15.700a–c) cites several counter examples, including this fragment, for the use of φανός in the past; Alex. fr. 91 precedes, while Men. fr. 60; Nicostr. Com. fr. 22; Philippid. fr. 16 follow.

**Interpretation** The line may be spoken to a slave; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 18; Herod. 8.6. The setting is possibly indoors and almost certainly at night; cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 91.3.

**οὐκουν** Common in questions with a 2nd person future (Denniston 1954. 431–3) as a colloquial equivalent of the imperative; against Porson's οὐκοῦν (ap. Morell 1824. 889 n. 2), cf. Denniston 1954. 433–4; Barrett 1964 on E. *Hipp.* 331–2.

**τὸν φανόν** For a torch used for lighting something else, cf. Ar. fr. 391 ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἀμπελίνων τὰς λαμπάδας κατεσκεύαζον εἰς ἔξαψιν (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 308 for a torch made from vine-branches). For a φανός distinguished from a lamp, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 91.3.



**λύχνον** The normal means of indoor lighting, lamps consisted of a central oil reservoir from which one or more nozzles containing a wick protruded; they could either be hand-held or suspended from a lampstand (λυχνεῖον; cf. Pritchett 1956. 240–1).

**Φαρμακόμαντις** (*Pharmakomantis*)  
(‘Soothsaying Druggist’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.193; 1847. 588; Bothe 1855. 430; Kock 1884 II.157; Blaydes 1896. 125; Edmonds 1959 II.72–3; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.267; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 268; Holford-Strevens 2009. 626 n. 16

**Title** The word φαρμακόμαντις occurs only as the title of this play, but presumably implies a person concerned with both medicine and soothsaying (Kock 1884 II.157: ‘homo medici simul et arioli partes agens’). The first element of the word likely refers to the so-called ῥιζοτόμοι, who combined medicine and magic; see below. A μάντις is a seer who practices divination through the interpretation of signs and is distinguished from one who gives oracles (cf. Th. 8.1.1; Paus. 1.34.1; Argyle 1970); cf. Ziehen 1930; Casevitz 1992 (with further bibliography).

Both prior to the rise of ‘scientific’ medicine and contemporaneous with it, the collection and distribution of medicinal plants (not just the roots; cf. Thphr. *HP* 9.8.1) was carried out by ῥιζοτόμοι, whose reputation varied (negative: e. g. *h.Cer.* 229; S. Πιζοτόμοι [fr. 534–6 Radt; cf. Pearson 1917 *ad loc.*], apparently about Medea; positive: e. g. Diocles of Carystus, ‘qui secundus [to Hippocrates] aetate famaue extitit’ [fr. 5 = Plin. *NH* 26.10]); cf. A. Ag. 17 with Fraenkel 1950 *ad loc.*; Lloyd-Jones 1978. 48–50 (= 1990. 321–3); Scarborough 1991. Theophrastus provides a brief discussion of them (*HP* 9.8), as well as of the uses, both medicinal and toxic, of various plants (*HP* 9.9–20). The knowledge gathered by the profession was the basis for later work; thus Crateuas (second/first century BC) was the major source for Dioscorides’ *Materia Medica* (cf. Delatte 1938, esp. 14–23).

**Content of the comedy** Fr. 50 could plausibly be taken as the title character speaking about himself (thus already Meineke 1840 III.193), suggesting that he was portrayed as a fast-talker if not also a quack. Perhaps the play involved him besting a doctor and/or soothsayer by taking on the role of both; see Holford-Strevens 2009. 625–6 for doctors in comedy, conflict between doctors and soothsayers, and the suggestion that the title character here might have combined both roles. Fr. 51 apparently refers to culinary, not medicinal, uses for various herbs; a conflation or confrontation could have occurred between the φαρμακόμαντις and a cook; for a possible ‘medical cook’, cf. Arnott 1996 Introduction to Alexis *Asklēpiokleidēs*. Less likely is the view of Lobeck 1829. 628–9, who compared titles such as Phrynichus *Mystai*, Antiphanes *Mētragyrētēs* and *Mystis*, Alexis *Theophorētōs*, and Nicostratus *Hierophantēs* and suggested that the play was a parody or satire of mystery religions.

**Date** The title could be restored at test. 5.12 (see *ad loc.*); if so, the play took fifth place at the City Dionysia between 364 and 356 BC.

fr. 50 K.-A. (49 K.)

ὅτι εἰμὶ ἀλαζών, τοῦτ' ἐπιτιμᾷς; ἀλλὰ τί;  
νικᾷ γὰρ αὕτη τὰς τέχνας πάσας πολὺ  
μετὰ τὴν κολακείαν. ἦδε μὲν γὰρ διαφέρει

habent ACE

φησιν Ἀναξανδρίδης ὁ κωμικός (post Anaxandridae verba) CE

1 ὅτι εἰμι om. CE      1-2 ἀλλὰ τί· νικᾷ γὰρ Casaubon: ἀλλὰ τί· καὶ γὰρ A: ὑπερτείνει  
CE

Because I am a braggart, you censure this? But why?  
For that art outdoes all others by far  
after flattery. For this one is superior

Ath. 6.261f

τῇ δ' ἀλαζονείᾳ μετὰ τὴν κολακείαν χώραν δίδωσιν Ἀναξανδρίδης ὁ κωμωδιοποιὸς ἐν Φαρμακομάντει λέγων οὕτως: —

After bragging, Anaxandrides the comic poet gives pride of place to flattery, speaking in *Pharmakomantis* as follows: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter

uu-u- -|-uu -u-  
 --u- -|-u- u-u-  
 uu-uu- -|-u- -uu-

**Discussion** Grotius 1626. 642–3; Meineke 1840 III.193; 1847. 588; Bothe 1855. 430–1; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix; Kock 1884 II.157; Edmonds 1959 II.72–3; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.267; Wilkins 2000. 86 n. 144; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 268

**Citation context** Athenaeus quotes this fragment at the end of a long discussion of flattery (6.248c–62a, which includes fr. 43); Ar. fr. 172; Sannyr. fr. 11; Philem. fr. 7; Philippid. fr. 8 (all as attestations of the word ψωμοκόλαξ) and Diph. fr. 48 (for ψωμοκόλαφος) follow.

**Interpretation** Meineke 1840 III.193 reasonably suggested that the φαρμακόμαντις himself speaks these lines as a sort of *apologia pro vita sua*: ‘ἄλ᾽αἰσχροῖαν huic hominum generi propriam ... excusare studet.’ Kock 1884 II.157 accepted

Meineke's attribution of the lines to the *φαρμακόμαντις*, but interpreted the speaker's intention as 'ἀλαζονείαν ab arte sua abesse posse negans.' Kock is probably closer to the mark, since the speaker makes no apologies and seems almost to revel in his behaviour.

1 ὅτι ..., τοῦτ' ἐπιτιμᾷς Cf. D. 20.148; Alex. fr. 91.1–2.

ὅτι εἴμ(ι) Hiatus after ὅτι (or ὅ τι) is common in comedy (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 1248; Men. *Dysc.* 452); cf. Descroix 1931. 28.

ἀλαζών An ἀλαζών is one who claims to have abilities he does not in fact possess; cf. Arist. *EN* 1108a21–2; 1127a20–2 δοκεῖ δὴ ὁ μὲν ἀλαζών προσποιητικὸς τῶν ἐνδόξων εἶναι καὶ μὴ ὑπαρχόντων καὶ μειζόνων ἢ ὑπάρχει. This behaviour is not necessarily reprehensible (cf. *EN* 1127b9–13), unless it is engaged in for the sake of profit (*EN* 1127b21–2, where Aristotle censures men οἷον μάντιν σοφὸν ἢ ἱατρὸν as examples). According to *Tract. Coisl.* 38–9 (XII Janko), the ἀλαζών is one of the three main character types of comedy: ἡθὴ κωμωδίας τὰ τε βωμολόχια καὶ τὰ εἰρωνικά καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀλαζόνων (cf. Janko 1984. 214–18). In general, cf. *Thphr. Char.* 23 with the introductions of Diggle 2004 and Ussher 1960; Ribbeck 1882; MacDowell 1990b.

2 νικᾷ γὰρ αὕτη τὰς τέχνας πάσας πολὺ For τέχνη, cf. Löbl 1997–2008 I.118–19, who glosses this occurrence of the word as 'Verhaltensweise, Methode'; for *alazoneia* as an art, cf. Ribbeck 1883. 65–7. For one τέχνη conquering another, cf. fr. 34. The implicit comparison is presumably between ἀλαζονεία and rhetorical skill (*vel sim.*); the point is that the former is a more effective way to achieve one's goal (receiving a meal?). The lack of resolution suggests that the line may be a tragic quotation or parody; cf. the verbal reminiscence of S. *Ai.* 1357 νικᾷ γὰρ ἀρετὴ με τῆς ἔχθρας πολὺ.

3 τὴν κολακείαν Cf. on fr. 35.7 κόλαξ. The essential difference between an ἀλαζών and a κόλαξ is that the former claims greater abilities for himself, whereas the latter claims them for another.

ἦδε μὲν γὰρ διαφέρει διαφέρω is rarely used absolutely, which may imply that this sentence continued into the next line, but cf. fr. 18.5; Th. 3.83.1. For the thought, cf. Zagagi 1980. 28 n. 50.

## fr. 51 K.-A. (50 K.)

ἀσφάραγον σχῖνόν τε τεμὼν καὶ ὀρίγανον, ὅς δῃ  
σεμνύνει τὸ τάριχος ὁμοῦ μιχθεὶς κοριάννῳ

habent CE (ἀσφάραγον ... κοριάννῳ); Eust. (ὀρίγανον ... κοριάννῳ)

1 τεμὼν Casaubon: τέμνων CE 2 τάριχος Eust.: τάριχον CE μιχθεὶς Eust.:  
μιχθὲν C: μιχ<sup>θ</sup> E: μειχθεὶς Nauck

Cutting up asparagus and squill and marjoram, which indeed,  
when mixed together with coriander, lend an air to salt-fish

Ath. 2.68b

ὅτι εἴρηται ἀρσενικῶς ὁ θύμος καὶ ὁ ὀρίγανος. Ἀναξανδρίδης. —

Thyme and marjoram are masculine. Anaxandrides: —

Eust. II. 1148.26

τὸ ὀρίγανον καὶ ὁ ὀρίγανος, οἶον. —

Marjoram is neuter and masculine, as for example: —

*Et. gen.* AB

λέγεται καὶ ὁ ὀρίγανος καὶ ἡ ὀριγάνη καὶ τὸ ὀρίγανον ... ἀρσενικῶς δὲ παρὰ Ἀναξαν-  
δρίδην ἐν Φαρμακομάντει. —

Marjoram is both masculine and feminine and neuter ... but is masculine in Anaxan-  
drides in *Pharmakomantis*: —

**Metre** Dactylic hexameter.

—υυ — — —υ|υ —υυ —υυ —  
— — —υυ —υ|υ — — —υυ —

Dactylic hexameters in comedy are used mainly for riddles, oracles, and mock-epic; this passage seems to be part of a mock-heroic description of a cook's activities. For hexameters in comedy, cf. White 1912 §§356–66; hexameters in comic fragments belong overwhelmingly to fifth-century comedy.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.193–4; 1847. 588–9; Bothe 1855. 431; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix, 81; Kock 1884 II.157; Blaydes 1890a. 83; 1896. 125; Herwerden 1903. 99–100; Edmonds 1959 II.72–3; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.268; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 268

**Citation context** The epitome of Athenaeus preserves this fragment in what must have been part of a discussion of various seasonings and the like. This fragment and Ion eleg. fr. 28, which follows, are adduced as evidence for the masculine form ὁ ὀρίγανος; they are followed by Pl. Com. fr. 169 for the feminine and Epich. fr. 15 and Amips. fr. 36 for the neuter. Eustathius' citation of this fragment for the same reason is presumably derived from Athenaeus. The citation in the *Et. gen.* probably reflects an independent use of the same source as the one Athenaeus used.

**Interpretation** The passage could be spoken by a cook but just as easily by the title character; see Introduction to the play for a possible relation between the two. The lines are doubtless part of a recipe, perhaps taken from a cook-book attributed to either the title-character or some famous cook (cf. esp. Pl. Com. fr. 189 [cf. Olson–Sens 2000. xl–xliii for a translation and discussion]). Although these lines, and presumably the rest of the recipe, are meant to be mock-epic, they owe little to Homer (cf. τέμει\* at H. *Il.* 13.707; ὁμοῦ\* at H. *Il.* 11.127; *Od.* 4.723; 12.178, 424), a fact presumably due to the predominance of non-epic vocabulary here. For the tradition of epic parody, especially in gastronomic contexts, see Olson–Sens 2000. xxviii–xliii.

1 For the collocation of asparagus and squill, cf. Amips. fr. 24 οὐ σχῖνος οὐδ' ἄσφάραγος.

**ἄσφάραγον** Asparagus appears occasionally in lists of food (e.g. Amips. fr. 24; Aristopho fr. 15; Philem. fr. 100.6); in general, see Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.16 (*SH* 534). For this spelling, as opposed to ἀσπάραγος, which first appeared in the early fourth century but did not replace the aspirated form, cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 81 (81 R) with Rutherford 1881 *ad loc.*; *PS* 41.1; Eust. *Il.* 899.19–22.

**σχῖνον** The σχῖνος or σκίλλα (e.g. Diph. fr. 125.3; Theoc. 7.107; Σ<sup>VMEΘ</sup> Ar. *Pl.* 720a; Hsch. σ 3027) is the sea-squill, an onion-like bulb (e.g. Thphr. *HP* 7.9.4; 7.13.4); cf. Totaro 1998 and Orth 2013 on Amips. fr. 24. For the doubts about the identification expressed by Parker 1983. 231 n. 142, see Orth 2013 on Amips. fr. 24. The squill appears occasionally in comedy (Ar. *Pl.* 720; fr. 266; Cratin. fr. 250.2; Diph. fr. 125.3; cf. Cratin. fr. 73 σχινοκέφαλος), although rarely as food, as here (Amips. fr. 24). Squill also was widely reputed to have purifying and apotropaic qualities, and so is perhaps an appropriate item for a φαρμακόμαντις to be collecting; cf. Kassel–Austin on Cratin. fr. 250.2; Gow 1952 on Theocr. 5.121; 7.107; Scarborough 1991, esp. 146–7.

**ὀρίγανον** Marjoram (possibly also called ὕσσωπος; cf. Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 23.5 [*SH* 153]) is very common as a condiment (for its use with fish, cf. Antiph. fr. 221.4); in general, see Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 36.6 (*SH* 166); Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 132.7 (including discussion of the varying gender of the word).

2 Cf. Tzet. *Epist.* 77 λόγων δυνάμει σεμνύνειν τὸ τάριχος.

**σεμνύνει** Colloquial vocabulary, rare outside prose or comedy (e.g. E. *IA* 901; fr. 924.3); the adjective σεμνός (cf. on fr. 58.3), on the other hand, occurs in all genres (although not in the Homeric epics).

**τὸ τάριχος** Widely available in Athens' markets, salt-fish, normally tuna or mackerel, is often portrayed as a cheap food (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 967 with van Leeuwen 1901 *ad loc.*; *Eq.* 1247 with Neil 1901 *ad loc.*; V. 491 with Starkie 1897 *ad loc.*), but not always (Olson 1998 on Ar. *Pax* 563; Olson–Sens 1999 on Matro fr. 1.17 (*SH* 534); Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 39.1–2 [*SH* 169]); see Olson 2002 on Ar. *Ach.* 967 on the tendency of modern commentators to overplay its cheapness. Here the context could imply that the skill of the cook (or his careful choice of condiments) enables the salt-fish to be tastier or more desirable than normal, but nothing in the passage suggests that it was considered low quality *per se*.

**κοριάννη** Coriander occurs occasionally as a garnish (used with fish at Ar. *Eq.* 676, 682); cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 132.6; Pritchett 1956. 185.

**Φιαληφόρος (*Phialēphoros*)**  
(‘Phiale-bearer’)

**Discussion** Meineke 1839 I.373; 1840 III.194; 1847. 589; Bothe 1855. 431; Kock 1884 II.157; Edmonds 1959 II.72–3; Webster 1970. 77; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.268; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 268

**Title** The basic meaning of the title seems clear, but little else can be said with certainty. Plb. 12.5.9 mentions a priestess with this title in Locris, and Kock, noting that Anaxandrides had also written a play entitled *Locrides* (fr. 27), therefore rashly suggested a connection between the two; there is no evidence that the cult in Locris was more than purely local, and little reason to believe that such a cult, from a distant part of Greece, would have been sufficiently well-known in Athens to have inspired a play. Perhaps more relevant is *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1328, a decree from 183/2 BC of an association of *orgeones* concerning the worship of the Magna Mater in Peiraeus, which instructs φιαληφόροι and αἱ περὶ τὴν θεὸν οὔσαι to περιτιθέναι ... ἐν τῷ ἀγερμ[ῶ]ι κόσμον ἀρ[γυροῦ]ν (lines 10–11).

**Content of the comedy** The action might have taken place at a festival, but more likely concerned a seduction, as Webster 1970. 77 thought, perhaps with a rape having occurred at a festival earlier; cf. Introduction to *Kanēphoros*.

**Date** Unknown.

fr. 52 K.-A. (51 K.)

〈×〉 τὸν μόναυλον ποῖ τέτροφας; οὔτος Σύρε.  
(Σύρος) ποῖον μόναυλον; (Α.) τὸν κάλαμον

habent ACE

1 τὸν ACE: καὶ τὸν Schweighäuser: τὸν ἐμὸν Meineke: τὸν σὸν Porson      2 κάλαμον  
ACE: καλάμινον Dindorf dubitanter

what have you done with the monaulos? You! Syrus!  
(Syrus) What do you mean, ‘monaulos’? (A.) The reed

Ath. 4.176a

καὶ ἐν Φιαληφόρῳ. —

καὶ ἐν Φιαληφόρῳ A: Ἀναξανδρίδης CE

And in *Phialēphoros*: —



**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x⟩-υ- -| -υ- -υ-  
 -υ- -| -υ- ⟨x-υ-⟩

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.194; 1847. 589; Bothe 1855. 431; Kock 1884 II.158; Teuffel 1887. 137 (on Ar. *Nu.* 858); Blaydes 1896. 125; Herwerden 1903. 100; Edmonds 1959 II.72–3; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.268; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 268–9

**Citation context** Within a larger discussion of musical instruments generally (4.174b–85a), Athenaeus cites this fragment together with a handful of others as evidence for the monaulos (4.175f–6a). S. fr. 241, Arar. fr. 13 and Anaxandr. fr. 19 precede; Sopat. fr. 2 follows.

**Text** Of the various supplements proposed for the missing syllable at the beginning of 1, Porson's τὸν σόν (i. e. Syrus') is perhaps least likely, since in 2 Syrus shows no understanding of what is meant (although conceivably this ignorance could be feigned).

**Interpretation** The fragment preserves a snippet of dialogue, perhaps between a (young?) master and an ignorant or recalcitrant slave. Equipment might be being hastily gathered for a feast of a wedding (cf. fr. 19) or, since musicians are seldom more than auxiliary characters, perhaps a young man is preparing to take part in a festival in order to gain access to the *phialēphoros* of the title.

1 τὸν μόναυλον Cf. on fr. 19.2.

ποῖ τέτροφας Cf. Ar. *Nu.* 858 τὰς δ' ἐμβάδες ποῖ τέτροφας; V. 665; *Ec.* 682.

οὔτος 'Hey! You!'; a common colloquial use in impatient addresses (cf. Dover 1968 on Ar. *Nu.* 723; *Ra.* 198).

Σύρε Although Σύρος is not impossible as the name of an Athenian (*LGPV* II s. v. lists three instances, two of them are from the fourth century), the overwhelming majority of examples of the name seem to be slaves, as probably here. Slave-names derived from a real or presumed place of origin are extremely common and exhibit a wide variety of toponyms; cf. Fragiadakis 1988. 14–21 for a brief discussion and numerous examples. Σύρος itself is very common (Fragiadakis provides 36 examples from Athens; cf. *Antiph.* fr. 166; Breitenbach 1908. 107 n. 286) and thus may be used here as a stereotypical slave-name. Fragiadakis 1988. 17 #87 and 372 #743 speculates that Syros may be a fluteplayer; this suggestion depends entirely on accepting Porson's restoration in 1.

2 ποῖον ‘What do you mean?’, as opposed to τὸν ποῖον (‘which?’); cf. Dover 1968 on Ar. *Nu.* 247; 1993 on *Ra.* 529; Diggle 1981. 50–1.

τὸν κάλαμον West 1992. 92–3 states that, in this instance at least, κάλαμος refers to the material from which the monaulos is constructed; Anderson 1994. 136–8, discussing the word more generally, argues on the basis of Archytas *FVS* 47 F 1 that it refers to a type of syrinx or one component of a syrinx. Anderson may be correct concerning the general use of the word or at least its use by Archytas, but here κάλαμος and μόναυλος seem to be used as synonyms.

## Incertarum fabularum fragmenta

fr. 53 K.-A. (52 K.)

ὅστις γαμεῖν βουλεύετ', οὐ βουλεύεται  
 ὀρθῶς, διότι βουλευσάμενος χοῦτ' αὖ γαμεῖ.  
 πολλῶν κακῶν γάρ ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τῷ βίῳ.  
 ἢ γὰρ πένης ὢν τὴν γυναῖκα χρήματα  
 5 λαβὼν ἔχει δέσποιναν, οὐ γυναῖκα ἔτι,  
 ἥς ἐστι δοῦλος καὶ πένης. ἢν δ' αὖ λάβῃ  
 μηδὲν φερομένην, δοῦλος αὐτὸς γίγνεται.  
 δεῖ γὰρ τὸ λοιπὸν ἀνθ' ἐνὸς τρέφειν δύο.  
 ἀλλ' ἔλαβεν αἰσχράν· οὐ βιωτὸν ἐστ' ἔτι,  
 10 οὐδ' εἴσοδος τὸ παράπαν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν.  
 ἀλλ' ἔλαβεν ὡραίαν τις· οὐδὲν γίγνεται  
 μᾶλλον τι τοῦ γήματος ἢ τῶν γειτόνων.  
 ὥστ' οὐδαμῶς κακοῦ γ' ἀμαρτεῖν γίγνεται

habent SMA

1 βουλεύετ(αι) ex βούλεται corr. SM<sup>2</sup>A      2 βουλευσάμενος Diggle: βουλεύεται SMA  
 3 γάρ ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τῷ SMA: ἀρχηγὸν οὔσαν τῷ (sublata post v. 2 interpunctione)  
 Nauck: γάρ ἐστιν ἀρχηγὸς Schmidt      4-7 ἢν γὰρ ... / ..., / ἴσ' ἐστι .... ἢν δ' αὖ λάβῃ  
 / ..., δοῦλος διττῶς γίγνεται Papabasilieou 6 καὶ πένης SMA: καὶ πελάτης Emperius:  
 παντελῶς vel διατελής Schmidt: κοῦκ ἀνὴρ Kock (οὐκ ἀνὴρ Blaydes): κᾶν πένης ὢν αὖ  
 λάβῃ Schenkl: ἢν πένης δ' ὢν αὖ λάβῃ Olson      7 αὐτὸς MA (def. Hense): αὐτὸς S:  
 αὐθις Gesner: αὐτῶς Scaliger: αὐτῷ Paley: αὐτοῦ Schenkl: εὐθὺς Blaydes      γίγνεται  
 SMA: corr. Morelius (item 11, 13)      9 ἀλλ' SMA: εἰ δ' Blaydes      9-10 post v. 12  
 dub. transp. Hense

Whoever plans to marry, does not plan  
 well, because after planning he marries even so.  
 For this is the beginning of many evils in his life;  
 for if he is poor, after taking money he has  
 5 his wife as a master, no longer a wife:  
 he is her slave and poor. But if one takes  
 a woman who brings nothing, he too becomes a slave;  
 for it is necessary in the future to support two instead of one.  
 Suppose he takes an ugly one; life is no longer liveable,  
 10 nor is there any entrance at all into the house.  
 Suppose someone takes a beautiful one; she belongs  
 to the one who married her no more than to the neighbors.  
 So there is no way to avoid trouble

Stob. 4.22b.28

(ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαθὸν τὸ γαμεῖν) Ἀναξανδρίδου· ---

(That marriage is not good) Anaxandrides: ---

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

---υ--- ---υ|--- ---υ---  
 ---υυυ ---υ--- ---υ---  
 ---υ--- υ|---υ--- ---υ---  
 ---υ--- -|---υ--- υ---υ---  
 5 υ---υ--- ---υ|--- υ---υ--- 5  
 ---υ--- υ|---υ--- ---υ---  
 ---υυυ -|---υ--- ---υ---  
 ---υ--- υ|---υ--- υ---υ---  
 -υυυ--- -|---υ--- υ---υ---  
 10 ---υ--- υυυυ|--- ---υ---  
 -υυυ--- ---υ|--- ---υ---  
 ---υ--- ---υ|--- ---υ---  
 ---υ--- υ-|υ--- ---υ---

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 109–10; Stephanus 1569. 19–21; Grotius 1623 II.276–7, 541; Walpole 1805. 14–15, 92; Meineke 1840 III.195; Emperius 1847. 311; Meineke 1847. 589; Bothe 1855. 431–2; Herwerden 1855. 56–7; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix; Kock 1884 II.158; Nauck 1884. lxxvii; Herwerden 1886. 178; Schmidt 1886–1887 III.49–50; Kock 1888 III.737; Nauck 1888. 233–5; Plaey 1889. 56–9; Papabasileiou 1889. 206; Blaydes 1890a. 84; Schenkl 1891. 327; Nauck 1894. 93; Blaydes 1896. 125; Pickard-Cambridge 1900. 58; Herwerden 1903. 100; Richards 1907. 161 (= 1909. 80); Breitenbach 1908. 167; Hense 1920/1921. 97–8; Edmonds 1959 II.74–5; Webster 1960. 214 n. 3; Marzullo 1962. 552–3; Carriere 1979. 302–3; Kassel–Austin 1991. II.269; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 269; Rusten 2011. 468

**Citation context** Within Stobaeus 4.22 (On marriage), the fragment is the first citation in the second section (4.22b; That marriage is not good); Alex. fr. 264 follows.

**Text** If in 2 there are two finite verbs (as transmitted in Stobaeus), καί must be the copula and οὕτω inferential. This is perhaps possible, but χοῦτω seems better with the two words taken together in the sense ‘still, even so’; Diggle’s βουλευσάμενος allows this sense and is an easy change (with the corruption

to βουλεύεται resulting from the use of that form twice in the previous line and the participle occurring in the midst of a string of finite verbs).

The transmitted text of 3 is unexceptional and ought to be retained despite attempts at emendation. Nauck 1884. lxxvii (cf. 1888. 233–5; 1894. 93) introduced ἀρχηγὸν οὖσαν into this line in place of γάρ ἐστιν ἀρχή on the basis of passages such as E. *Hel.* 425–6 γυναῖκα τὴν κακῶν πάντων ἐμοὶ / ἄρξασαν (perhaps more to the point is E. *Hipp.* 881 κακῶν ἀρχηγὸν ἐκφαίνεις λόγον or Men. fr. 296.9–10 τὴν νύκτα τὴν / πολλῶν κακῶν ἀρχηγόν). The change makes the woman explicitly responsible for her husband's future problems, which is the main point of the argument in the following lines, but the point here is that marriage itself is the beginning of trouble. Schmidt's adaptation (1887. 49–50) of Nauck's conjecture simply uses a different word to express the same thought as the transmitted text.

The word order in 4–5 is unusual but not corrupt; Bothe struggled with τὴν γυναῖκα χρήματα / λαβὼν ('quae vereor ut quispiam intellexerit') and emended to τῆς γυναικός.

6, particularly καὶ πένης, has routinely been considered corrupt,<sup>124</sup> on the ground that a man who marries into money would no longer be poor. But the transmitted text unproblematically makes the desired point that a man who marries a rich woman becomes her slave and is still poor (because she keeps her money to herself; see *ad loc.*), i. e. there is no point in marrying a rich woman. Some scholars attempted to remove the presumed difficulty by emending away καὶ πένης; others rewrote the end of the line to varying degrees to make πένης the subject of the next sentence (the easiest such solution was that of Grotius 1623 II.277, who simply punctuated after δοῦλος rather than πένης, and removed δ' from later in the line). But the parallel structure thus created (the poor man who marries a rich wife becomes a slave; the poor man who marries a poor wife also becomes a slave) is not the one that is wanted, because it stresses the financial wherewithal of the man rather than the assertion that all women have an equally deleterious effect.

αὐτὸς in 7 has often been considered corrupt, but is probably acceptable. Hense 1920/1921. 97 defended the transmitted text, but his interpretation ('Er wird aus eigenen Antrieb [αὐτὸς] zum Sklaven') is dubious. Gesner's αὐθις might be an improvement; Scaliger's αὐτως is unlikely, since the word is extremely rare in comedy (only Eup. fr. 260.26).

Hense 1920/1921. 98 suggested transposing 9–10 and 11–12 on the basis of a two-fold argument. He first noted that since τις must be supplied in 9,

<sup>124</sup> Bothe prints the vulgate, without obelizing or commenting, and so seemingly endorses it, but his translation reflects the text of Grotius 1623 II.277.

it is easier to have 11, which contains τις, precede it. Second, in 4–8, which discuss the relative merits of a wealthy and a poor wife, the seemingly more desirable rich wife is first presented, and when she is shown to be undesirable in reality, the seemingly undesirable poor wife is introduced; transposing 9–10 and 11–12 creates a similar structure. Hense found some support for his transposition in the proverb ἄν μὲν καλήν (sc. γήμησ), ἔξεις κοινήν, ἄν δὲ αἰσχροάν, ἔξεις ποινήν (see *ad loc.*), but the word order of the proverb is not fixed and in any case bears no relation to the text other than drawing on a similar stock of popular wisdom. If the transposition were to be accepted, the manuscript error would be an obvious case of homoioarche (ἀλλ' ἔλαβεν) causing the omission of 9–10, which were then written in the margin and afterwards inserted in the wrong place, when the manuscript was copied again.

**Interpretation** Assertions that women are a bane to men are common, especially in archaic poetry (e.g. Hes. *Th.* 590–610 [esp. 592 πῆμα μέγα θνητοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσι ναιετάουσιν]; *Op.* 375, Semon. fr. 7); the condemnation of women is often not absolute but directed only at certain ones (cf. Hes. *Op.* 702–3 οὐ μὲν γάρ τι γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ ληΐζετ' ἄμεινον / τῆς ἀγαθῆς, τῆς δ' αὖτε κακῆς οὐρίγιον ἄλλο). For similar assertions in comedy, e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 41–55; Alex. fr. 150 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Webster 1960. 214–17.

The fragment is structurally similar to frs. 34, 35, and 40: an opening gnomic statement is followed by numerous examples in support of the assertion.

Breitenbach 1908. 167 dubiously suggested that this fragment belongs to the play Αἰσχροά, apparently based on little more than ἀλλ' ἔλαβεν αἰσχροάν in 9.

1–2 For a similar example of poor planning leading to unwanted circumstances, cf. Men. fr. 299; for the decision to marry characterized as a lack of sense, cf. Men. fr. 64. Note the chiasmic structure of the opening sentence and the enjambment of ὀρθῶς, which may well occur παρὰ προσδοκίαν.

3 Cf. the story of Pandora, esp. Hes. *Th.* 570, 585; *Op.* 57, 89.

τῷ βίῳ Since one typical complaint against women is the drain they place on a man's resources, esp. food (e.g. Semon. fr. 7.24, 46–7; Ar. *Nu.* 52; cf. 8), the word may contain some notion of 'livelihood' (e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 1101; *Pax* 1212).

4 ἢ γὰρ πένης ὦν Cf. the similar line-beginning at e.g. Men. frs. 299.1 ὅστις πένης ὦν; 802.1 ὅταν πένης ὦν (the latter in the context of marrying a rich woman); cf. on fr. 18.6. For the poor, see Rosivach 1991.

4–5 Cf. E. *Med.* 232–4 ἄς (sc. γυναῖκας) πρῶτα μὲν δεῖ χρημάτων ὑπερβολῇ / πόσιν πρίασθαι, δεσπότην τε σώματος / λαβεῖν.

ἔχει δέσποιναν, οὐ γυναῖκ' ἔτι The sentiment is commonplace; e.g. E. *Phaeth.* 158–9 (fr. 775) with Diggle 1970 *ad loc.*; fr. 502; Antiph. fr. 48;<sup>125</sup> 270; Alex. fr. 150 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Men. fr. 802; Diod. Com. fr. 3; Arist. *EN* 8.1161a1–3; Gomme–Sandbach on Men. *Epir.* 134ff.; Stärk 1989. 51 and n. 197.

6 καὶ πένης In reality, a man would have control of whatever wealth his wife brought with her to the marriage; see Schaps 1979. 48–58 (cf. 76); Diggle 1970 on E. *Phaeth.* 158–9 (fr. 775). But in the comic world, this need not hold true: e.g. the situation of Strepsiades in Aristophanes *Clouds*: he has a rich wife, but remains poor himself and suffers under the burden of being subject to her whims and attempting to maintain her (and their son's) extravagant lifestyle on his own apparently meagre income.

7 The repetition of δοῦλος adds symmetry to the argument and emphasis to the conclusion: the problems associated with marrying a rich woman cannot be avoided by instead marrying a poor woman, since the latter leads to an identical result.

γίγνεται For γιν- vs. γιν-, see on fr. 25.

9–12 For the thought, cf. the proverb ἄν μὲν καλὴν (sc. γήμηγ), ἔξεις κοινήν, ἄν δὲ αἰσχράν, ἔξεις ποιήν (preserved at D.L. 6.3; Gell. 5.11.3; Stob. 4.22.17; preserved in reverse order at e.g. D.L. 4.48; *P.Stras.* 92; cf. Freudenthal 1880. 413 #14; Sternbach 1887. 179 n. 2).

9 ἀλλ' ἔλαβεν αἰσχράν Cf. on the introduction to *Aischra*; Philippid. fr. 29.1. Note the echo in 11 (ἀλλ' ἔλαβεν ὥραίαν).

οὐ βιωτόν ἐστ' ἔτι Cf. Antiph. fr. 188.10; Men. *Dysc.* 160 with Handley 1965 *ad loc.*; Philem. fr. 96.7 with Kassel–Austin *ad loc.*

10 οὐδ' εἴσοδος τὸ παράπαν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Grotius not unreasonably translated 'taedet pigetque in propriam ingredi domum', although the Greek ('there is no entrance whatsoever') seems stronger. Presumably the point is that the man would be ashamed to have his wife seen by others because of her ugliness and therefore entertains no guests, so that the line forms a contrast with 11–12, where having a beautiful wife causes him to be cuckolded.

τὸ παράπαν is colloquial, found only in prose (e.g. Th. 6.80.1; Pl. *Grg.* 450d; D. 22.32) and comedy or the like (e.g. Ar. *V.* 478; Pl. 17; Pherecr. fr. 117.2).

<sup>125</sup> This fragment (from Antiatt. p. 86.14) clearly refers to a reversal of roles in a marriage, but the text is slightly problematic. The first part is probably better read γαμῶ ἢ γυνὴ λέγει, οὐ <μόνον> γαμοῦμαι; more seriously, probably only the first part of the Antiatticist's entry belongs to Antiphanes, since in the Antiatticist an attribution rarely if ever precedes a citation except in a few cases where there is reason to suspect corruption.

παράπαν always has the article in comedy and occurs without it elsewhere only exceptionally (e.g. Th. 6.18.7; Plb. 5.60.7; Simyl. Iamb. SH 727.2).

12 **μᾶλλον τι τοῦ γήματος ἢ τῶν γειτόνων** Cf. Hes. *Op.* 701 with West 1978 *ad loc.*; Archil. fr. 196a.33–4. Adultery is an issue of importance *inter alia* because of its potential for interference in the determination of legitimate heirs and inheritance; whatever the reality, it is regularly portrayed as a very real concern, against which the head of a household must be constantly on guard. In general, cf. Dover 1974. 209–10; Fantham *et al.* 1994. 113–15; for legal action regarding adultery, cf. Carey 1995.

13 **ὥστ' οὐδαμῶς κακοῦ γ' ἁμαρτεῖν γίγνεται** Kassel–Austin compare And. 1.20 δυοῖν μεγίστοις κακοῖς οὐκ ἦν αὐτῷ ἁμαρτεῖν; cf. also S. *El.* 1320; Th. 1.33.3.

fr. 54 K.-A. (53 K.)

οὔτοι τὸ γῆράς ἐστιν, ὥς οἶει, πάτερ,  
τῶν φορτίων μέγιστον, ἀλλ' ὅς ἄν φέρῃ  
ἀγνωμόνως αὐθ', οὗτός ἐστιν αἴτιος.  
† οὐδ' εὐκόλως ἐνίοτε κοιμίζειν ποεῖ †  
5 μεταλαμβάνων ἐπιδέξι' αὐτοῦ τὸν τρόπον,  
λύπην ἀφαιρῶν ἡδονὴν τε προστιθείς,  
† λύπην δὲ ποιῶν εἴ τις δυσκόλως ἔχει †

habent SMA

2 φορτίων] φροντίδων A 3 αὐθ' vulg.: αὐτ' SMA οὔτος SMA: αὐτός Herwerden αἴτιός ἐστιν A: ἐστὶν ἄθλιος Diels 4 οὐδ'] σὺ δ' Grotius: ὅδ' Gesner (ὁ δ' Meineke) ἐνίοτε κοιμίζειν (κομίζειν A) SM: ἔνεγκε καὶ μεῖον Jacobs: ἐνίοτε, μὴ μείζον Kock: οἶόν τε κουφίζειν Hense ποιεῖ S: ποιεῖ Grotius 5 ἐπὶ δέξι' M 6 λύπην τ' cod. Voss. 7 λύπην δὲ ποιῶν SMA: κοῦφόν τε ποιῶν Dobree: λείον δὲ ποιῶν Schenkl: λήθην δὲ ποιῶν Headlam: λήθη τι παύων Kock εἴ τις ... ἔχει SM: εἴ τι ... ἔχει (ἔχοι Headlam) Gaisford: εἴ σὺ ... ἔχων vel ἐσθ' ὁ ... ἔχων Hense λύπην δ' ἐποίησ' ὅστις εἶχε δυσκόλως Bruck

Not at all is old age, as you think, father,  
the greatest of burdens, but whoever bears  
it senselessly, he is responsible.  
† Nor at times does he cause to sleep contentedly †  
5 changing his ways from left to right,  
setting aside pain and adding pleasure,  
† but making pain if one is discontented †



(ὅτι τὸ γῆρας ἀνεπαχθὲς καὶ πολλῆς αἰδοῦς ἄξιον ἢ σύνεσις ἀπεργάζεται) Ἀναξανδρίδου. —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

5

---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---
uu---	uu---	uu---	uu---
u---	u---	u---	u---
u---	u---	u---	u---

**Citation context** Within Stobaeus 4.50 (On old age), the fragment is the second citation in the third and final part (4.50c; That understanding makes old age not burdensome and worthy of much respect); adesp. frag. *TGrFF* 552 = [Men.] *Mon.* 260 (wrongly attributed to Anaxandrides by a number of early modern editors) precedes, and S. fr. 210c follows.

**Text** 4 is metrically unproblematic but is difficult to make sense of. If 4–6 are meant as a positive example of bearing old age well, in contrast to 7 and what originally followed that line, the introductory negative makes little sense. Alternatively, and perhaps more likely, 4–7 (and what immediately followed) might be an expansion of 2–3 that describe how one who bears old age without the requisite understanding suffers no matter what he does. In either case, the end of the line seems deficient in terms of both grammar and sense. ποιεῖ with a causative verb is difficult to parallel, and the sense ought to be ‘causes himself to sleep’, not ‘makes someone (or something) cause someone (or something) to sleep’. Some problems could perhaps be solved by introducing the middle κοιμᾶσθαι, but the corruption would not be easy to explain and difficulties

would remain. For the corruption of κομίζεῖν to κομίζειν in A, cf. Ar. Av. 1734; E. Tr. 594.

7 is metrically deficient (as transmitted, the second metron is composed of four longs); the simplest solution is Gaisford's τι in place of τις. But it remains unclear how extensive the corruption is, since the sentence is incomplete and the precise point being made is not clear, not least because of the difficulties in 4, with which this line is a contrast (εὐκόλως vs. δυσκόλως).

**Interpretation** For a son admonishing a father, Kassel–Austin *ad loc.* adduce Men. Dysc. 797–812 (cf. Handley 1965 *ad loc.* [p. 271]); fr. 191; Apollod. Com. fr. 17; add Men. Sam. 137–42b. Webster 1960. 166 (cf. 1970. 75) viewed this passage as a characterization of ‘the stern father of the prodigal son’, adding that this is the only recognizable example of such a character between Aristophanes and Menander. The passage reads as a consolation of someone burdened by old age (and is seemingly thus presented by Stobaeus), but it may have had a sharper point in its original context.

1–2 οὗτοι τὸ γῆρας ἐστὶν ... / τῶν φορτίων μέγιστον Both defences of and attacks on old age, whether explicit or implied by the treatment of certain characters, are common in ancient literature, both Greek and Roman; the treatment of old age in comedy most often consists of ridicule of the old on the basis of stereotypical characteristics such as steadfast adherence to old-fashioned ways, lecherousness, etc. For examples of both positive and negative portrayals, see Allen 1993 on Mimm. fr. 1; Powell 1988. 24–30; cf. Falkner–de Luce 1989, esp. 230–51 (= Eyben 1989); Oeri 1948. For old age described as a burden, cf. E. HF 637–54; Plaut. Men. 756–7 *consitus sum / senectute: onustum gero corpus*; Cic. Sen. 2; Sen. Ep. 30.1; for the metaphorical use of φορτίον, cf. Antiph. fr. 270; [Men.] Mon. 459, 660. φορτίον is diminutive in form but not meaning (*pace* Dunbar 1995 on Ar. Av. 1375); cf. Petersen 1910. 11. For the sense of the word, see Blümner 1891. 157.

πάτερ Cf. on fr. 1.4.

2–3 ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν φέρῃ / ἄγνωμόνως αὐθ', οὗτός ἐστιν αἴτιος For the thought, cf. Pl. R. 329d ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτων [i.e. the burdens of old age] πέρι καὶ τῶν πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους μία τις αἰτία ἐστίν, οὐ τὸ γῆρας, ὃ Σώκρατες, ἀλλ' ὁ τρόπος τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ἂν μὲν γὰρ κόσμοι καὶ εὐκολοὶ ᾧσιν, καὶ τὸ γῆρας μετρίως ἐστὶν ἐπίπονον· εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ γῆρας, ὃ Σώκρατες, καὶ νεότης χαλεπὴ τῷ τοιούτῳ συμβαίνει.

ἄγνωμόνως The adverb occurs only here in comedy, although the adjective appears several times in Menander (e.g. Ep. 918; fr. 641.1). The adjective does not seem to belong to any particular linguistic stratum, occurring in both elevated poetry (e.g. Pi. O. 8.60) and prose (e.g. Pl. Phdr. 275b), but the adverb occurs elsewhere only in prose (e.g. X. HG 6.3.11; Isoc. 15.227; D. 2.26).

**οὗτός ἐστιν** For the metrical position, cf. Philem. fr. 104.5; Men. *Carch.* 10; *Sam.* 608; adesp. com. fr. 1147.167 with Nünlist 1993. 249 (who also discusses whether it indicates a character on stage).

**αἴτιος** I.e. is responsible for old age being a burden to himself; for the sense of the word, cf. Schmidt 1876–1887 I.150–2.

**4 κοιμίζειν** The verb is extremely rare in comedy, occurring elsewhere only at Nicopho fr. 15 κοιμίσαι τὸν λύχνον; cf. Phryn. Com. fr. 25 τὸν λύχνον κατακοίμηση; Call. fr. 195.23–6 with Clayman 1980. 31–2. For its metaphorical use, cf. X. *Smp.* 2.24 ὁ οἶνος ... τὰς μὲν λύπας ὥσπερ ὁ μανδραγόρας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κοιμίζει.

**5 ἐπιδέξι(α)** See on fr. 1.4. LSJ translate the word here and at Nicom. Com. 1.27 as ‘dexterously, cleverly’ and compare Pl. *Tht.* 175e, where they translate ‘elegantly’. The sense of the word at Nicom. Com. fr. 1.27 is uncertain and the passage may be corrupt; at Pl. *Tht.* 175e, the word may contain the notion of elegance, but that is not the primary sense. Here too LSJ’s gloss does not offer the desired sense, since something like ‘in the opposite direction’ is wanted.

## fr. 55 K.-A. (54 K.)

ἡδονὴν ἔχει,  
 ὅταν τις εὖρη καινὸν ἐνθύμημά τι,  
 δηλοῦν ἅπασιν· οἱ δ’ ἐαυτοῖσιν σοφοὶ  
 πρῶτον μὲν οὐκ ἔχουσι τῆς τέχνης κτιτήν,  
 5 εἶτα φθονοῦνται. χρή γὰρ εἰς ὄχλον φέρειν  
 ἅπανθ’ ὅς’ ἂν τις καινότητ’ ἔχειν δοκῇ

habent ACE

3 δὲ αὐτοῖσι A: δ’ αὐτοῖσι C: corr. Porson      6 ὅταν Bamberger

There is pleasure,  
 whenever one finds some new invention,  
 in showing it to all; but those who keep their cleverness to themselves  
 first do not have a judge of their art,  
 5 next they are resented. For one ought to show  
 the crowd everything one thinks is novel

Ath. 5.222b

κατὰ γὰρ τὸν κωμωδιοποιὸν Ἀναξανδρίδην. —

Ἀναξανδρείδην A      ὁ κωμ(ικὸς) Ἀναξανδρίδ(ης) post poetae verba CE

According to the comic poet Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

<x—υ— x—υ>— υ—υ—  
 υ—υ— —|—υ— υ—υ—  
 ——υ— υ|—υ— ——υ—  
 ——υ— υ—υ|— υ—υ—  
 5 ——υ— —|—υ— ——υ—  
 υ—υ— —|—υ— υ—υ—

**Discussion** Grotius 1626. 644–5, 979; Porson 1812. 76; Meineke 1884 III.196; 1847. 590; Bothe 1855. 432; Bamberger 1856. 71; Kock 1884 II.159; Herwerden 1893. 158 (cf. 175); Blaydes 1896. 125, 333; Pickard-Cambridge 1900. 58; Herwerden 1903. 100; Edmonds 1959 II.74–5; Webster 1970. 51; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.270–1; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 270

**Citation context** Athenaeus quotes the fragment as a closing tag at the very end of Book 5 (222b), as the dinner party breaks up and the guests depart; he presumably intends it to be taken as epitomizing his thinking in composing the work (cf. the similar use of the fragment at Cobet 1858. 1).

**Interpretation** Kassel–Austin, following Webster 1970. 51, reasonably suggest that these lines are spoken by a cook;<sup>126</sup> for cooks as inventors, cf. on fr. 31.1. Webster (offering a translation of 3–6) also rightly observes the resemblance between this fragment and E. *Med.* 294–305, although he overstates the relationship in claiming that this passage is based on Euripides;<sup>127</sup> for Anaxandrides' use of Euripides, see the Introduction to *Helenē*. If a model is to be sought, note the prevalence of the theme of invention in satyric drama; cf. Seaford 1984. 36–7. The point of this fragment is an inversion of that in Euripides, i.e. here one encounters resentment for keeping one's ideas to oneself, whereas in *Medea* the resentment arises from flaunting one's superior

<sup>126</sup> Less likely is Webster's alternative suggestion that an 'intriguing slave' is speaking.

<sup>127</sup> The passage from *Medea* is parodied at Ar. *Th.* 1130–2 (cf. Austin–Olson 2004 *ad loc.* for other Aristophanic parodies of *Medea*); S. fr. 763 is also similar, which led Sande Bakhuyzen 1877. 135 to attribute (probably wrongly) the fragment to a comic poet such as Sophilus.

wisdom; somewhat similar is Amphis fr. 14, where the speaker is waiting for the right audience before introducing a novel musical instrument. For praise of novelty, cf. Ar. *Nu.* 547–8 with Starkie 1911 *ad loc.*

2 **εὖρη καινὸν ἐνθύμημα** For the sense of the noun, e.g. X. *An.* 3.5.12; *HG* 4.5.4; Men. *Epitr.* 512 (the only other occurrence in comedy; Gomme–Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.* compare the use of the verb at Th. 8.68.1); Schmidt 1876–1886 III.645. Cf. Amphis fr. 14.2 καινὸν ἐξεύρημα; Pherecr. fr. 84; Headlam–Knox 1922 on Herod. 6.89; Naber 1880b. 264–5.

3 **οἱ δ' ἐαυτοῖσιν σοφοί** Cf. Pl. *Grg.* 522d τῆς βοηθείας ἐαυτῶ; Gilder-sleeve 1900–1911 §489.

4 **τῆς τέχνης κτιτήν** Cf. Cratin. fr. 360.2 τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας κριτής.

5 **χρὴ γὰρ εἰς ὄχλον φέρειν** Cf. Amphis fr. 14.5–6 διὰ τί δ' οὐκ ἄγεις / εἰς τὸν ὄχλον αὐτό;

6 **καινότη(α)** A prosaic word attested only here in poetry, it is most often used of innovation in rhetoric or speech, e.g. Th. 3.38.5; Isoc. 2.41; 10.2 ἐπὶ τῇ καινότητι τῶν εὐρημένων (still referring to language); for a comparison between cooking and rhetoric, cf. Pl. *Grg.* 464d–5d (esp. 465d ὃ μὲν οὖν ἐγώ φημι τὴν ῥητορικὴν εἶναι, ἀκήκοας· ἀντίστροφον ὁψοποιίας ἐν ψυχῇ, ὥς ἐκεῖνο ἐν σώματι). Cf. Löbl 1997–2008 I.119.

#### fr. 56 K.-A. (55 K.)

ὅστις λόγους παρακαταθήκην γὰρ λαβὼν  
ἐξεῖπεν, ἄδικός ἐστιν ἢ ἀκρατής ἄγαν·  
ὁ μὲν διὰ κέρδος, ἄδικος· ὁ δὲ τούτου δίχα,  
ἀκρατής· ἴσως δέ γ' εἰσὶν ἀμφοτέροι κακόν

habent SMA, corp. Par.

1 παρακαταθήκην γὰρ Porson: γὰρ παρακαταθήκην SMA: γὰρ om. corp. Par  
2 ἐξεῖπεν om. S 4 ἴσως MA, corp. Par: ἴσου S: ἴσον Gesner κακόν Reisig  
(ἴσον ... κακόν): κακοῦ SMA: κακοί Gesner

For whoever takes words given in trust  
and announces them is unjust or excessively lacking in self-control.  
The one who does this for gain is unjust; the one not for this,  
weak. And indeed they are both equally bad

Stob. 3.41.2

(περὶ ἀπορρήτων) Ἀναξανδρίδου. —

Ἀλεξανδρίδος corp. Par.

(About things not to be spoken) Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — | — — — — — — —  
 — — — — — — — — — — — — —  
 — — — — — — — — — — — — —  
 — — — — — — — — — — — — —

For the lack of caesura in 1, see Introduction; cf. fr. 34.6; 48.1; 53.2.

For the synizesis ἡ ἀκρατῆς in 2, cf. Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 I.228–9; Platnauer 1960. 142; West 1982. 13; Σ<sup>Tric.</sup> A. *Eu.* 85.

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 110; Stephanus 1569. 21–2; Grotius 1623 II.158–61; Brunck 1794. 184, 204; Porson 1815. 247; Reisig 1816. 35–6; Meineke 1840 III.197; 1847. 590; Bothe 1855. 432; Kock 1884 II.159; Blaydes 1890a. 84; Blaydes 1896. 125; Edmonds 1959 II.76–7; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.271; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 270

**Citation context** The fragment is quoted at Stobaeus 3.41.2, near the beginning of the chapter ‘About things not to be spoken’. E. fr. 411 precedes, and S. fr. 935 follows; in this short chapter composed largely of tragic fragments, this is the only fragment from comedy.

**Text** ἴσως is unproblematic (see *ad loc.*), and there is thus no need for Gesner’s ἴσον. Similarly, ἴσον is possible with Reisig’s κακόν but again is not necessary. At the end of the line, the transmitted κακοῦ makes little sense unless the next line continued with a noun on which it is dependent. Gesner’s κακοί and Reisig’s κακόν are both possible, but the latter seems both more idiomatic and perhaps more liable to corruption.

**Interpretation** The fragment clearly concerns a secret, but could belong to a debate (either as a dialogue or as a monologue with the speaker musing to himself) condemning someone who has revealed a secret, assessing the trustworthiness of someone to whom a secret has (or will be) revealed, or considering whether to share a secret. Whatever the context, discussion of a secret might fit best in a social comedy revolving around some romantic intrigue.

**1 παρακαταθήκην** A legal term, normally used of property or valuables given as a pledge or deposited in trust; e. g. Th. 2.72.3 (land held in trust);

Pl. *R.* 442e (money held in trust); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1407.42 (temple property); Ammon. *de Imp.* app. crit. on 1 (the reading of C\*) παραθήκη καὶ παρακαταθήκη ἢ εἰς φυλ[ακ]ήν τινος π[ράγ]ματος δόσις. For the use here, cf. Isoc. 1.22 μᾶλλον τήρει τὰς τῶν λόγων ἢ τὰς τῶν χρημάτων. Anaxandrides uses the normal Attic form παρακαταθήκη, as opposed to παραθήκη;<sup>128</sup> for the distinction, cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 286 (cf. Rutherford 1881 *ad loc.* [287]); Moer. π 41; contrast Cyr. παρ 136 A (reported by Hansen 1998 on Moer. π 41); Thom. Mag. p. 313.10–17.

**γάρ** For the position, cf. Antiph. fr. 27.22; 162.4; Dover 1987. 63.

**2 ἄδικός ἐστιν ἢ ἀκρατής** Cf. Arist. *EN* 7.1151a10–11 καὶ οἱ ἀκρατεῖς ἄδικοι μὲν οὐκ εἰσίν, ἀδικοῦσι δέ; for the distinction between ἀκράτεια and ἀδικία, cf. [Arist.] *VV* 1250a22–6.

**3 τούτου δίχα** Here and at Ar. fr. 489.1, the only other attestation of the preposition in comedy (δίχα is adverbial at Ar. *Pax* 1262; Hermipp. fr. 63.11; Men. *Pk.* 788), δίχα follows the word it governs, as is normal in tragedy (e.g. A. *Ag.* 861; S. *Ph.* 31; E. *Ion* 775).

**4 ἴσως ... κακόν** ‘Both are equally a bad thing.’ ἴσως in the sense ‘equally’ is reasonably common (e.g. Pl. *Lg.* 805a [cf. Ast 1835–1838 s.v. ἴσως for further examples]; D. 3.26; Plb. 3.76.13).<sup>129</sup> For the use of a neuter singular adjective as predicate for a singular or plural masculine or feminine subject, see Gildersleeve 1900–1911 §126 with examples from both poetry (e.g. E. *El* 1035; Ar. *Pl.* 203) and prose (e.g. Th. 1.10.1; Pl. *Grg* 506e); Holzinger 1940 on Ar. *Pl.* 203; Barrett 1964 on E. *Hipp* 443.

**δέ γ(ε)** Continuative; cf. Denniston 1954. 155–6. The particles may be juxtaposed, as here, or separated, depending on metrical necessity; cf. Denniston 1954. 152; Ar. *Eq.* 363–5.

<sup>128</sup> Instead of the dialectical distinction assumed by e.g. Moer. π 41, *EM* p. 349.4–6 claims that the use of two prefixes provides emphasis.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. the use of ἴσως at D. 5.10 (reading οὔτε after ἴσως); further examples are gathered by Fuhr 1902. 1125.

## fr. 57 K.-A. (56 K.)

χαλεπή, λέγω σοι, καὶ προσάντης, ὦ τέκνον,  
 ὁδὸς ἐστίν, ὥς τὸν πατέρ' ἀπελθεῖν οἴκαδε  
 παρ' ἀνδρός, ἥτις ἐστὶ κοσμία γυνή.  
 ὁ γὰρ διάυλος ἐστὶν αἰσχύνην ἔχων

habent SMA

3 παρ' ἀνδρός MA: παρανδρος S: παρὰ τάνδρός Herwerden

Difficult, I tell you, and arduous, my child,  
 is the road home to a father  
 from a husband, for anyone who is a well-ordered wife.  
 For the return is shameful.

Stob. 4.23.1

(γαμικὰ παραγγέλματα) Ἀναξανδρίδου. —

(Marital precepts) Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

υ υ υ — — | — υ — — — υ —  
 υ υ υ — — υ — | υ — — — υ —  
 υ υ υ — υ | — υ — υ υ —  
 υ υ υ — υ | — υ — — — υ —

3 is a perfect trimeter; cf. fr. 16.1.

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 112; Grotius 1623 II.315bis–16; Meineke 1840 III.197; 1847. 591; Bothe 1855. 432; Herwerden 1855. 57; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix; Cobet 1858. 614; Kock 1884 II.159–60; Paley 1889. 58–9; Blaydes 1896. 125; Herwerden 1903. 100; Edmonds 1959 II.76–7; Webster 1970. 72; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.271; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 270–1; Rusten 2011. 468

**Citation context** The fragment is quoted at Stobaeus 4.23.1 as the initial item in the chapter on ‘Marital precepts’, the first half of which is dominated by Euripides and, to a lesser extent, comedy of the late fourth century; E. fr. 463 follows.

**Text** Herwerden 1855. 57 introduced the definite article into the text in 3, reading παρὰ τάνδρός; Cobet 1858. 614 defended this on the grounds that ὁ ἀνὴρ is the expression for ‘husband’, whereas ἀνὴρ means simply ‘man’. But the article is not required (cf. adesp. com. fr. 1000.23; Gildersleeve 1900–1911



§§568–9; Sansone 1993. 202–4), and there is thus no compelling reason to introduce it here unless one feels a need for strict grammatical parallelism between ὡς τὸν πατέρ(α) and παρ' ἀνδρός.

**Interpretation** Without context, it is uncertain whether this fragment was spoken as advice, perhaps as the result of pre-marriage trepidation, or it formed a comment on something that had already taken place or was being considered. The advice or censure is most naturally taken as directed at the addressee, but perhaps two people are discussing a third instead. The obvious interpretation is that a father is addressing a daughter (thus e. g. Webster 1970. 72, comparing Plaut. *Men.* 763–4), both because the content is put in terms of a father-daughter relationship and because such scenes are common. In contrast, Edmonds thought the speaker was a woman; if so, perhaps a nurse is the most likely candidate. In any case, the speaker is the older of the two, since τέκνον is used to address a younger person, although not necessarily one's child.

In general, cf. E. *Med.* 230–251 (Medea's speech on the misfortunes of women), esp. 236–7 οὐ γὰρ εὐκλεεῖς ἀπαλλαγαί / γυναῖξιν οὐδ' οἶόν τ' ἀνήνασθαι πόσιν (cf. Σ<sup>AB</sup> ἀκλεεὺς γὰρ γυναικὶ ἀπολιπεῖν τὸν οἰκεῖον ἄνδρα); Murgia 1971. 209: 'In the conventional language of antiquity, for a woman to return to the house of her father connotes not triumph, but divorce or widowhood.'

1–2 For the image, cf. Hes. *Op.* 290–1; Pi. *I.* 2.33; Pl. *R.* 328e; X. *Mem.* 2.1.29.

**προσάντης** Only here in comedy, elsewhere in poetry at Pi. *I.* 2.33; E. *Med.* 305, 381; *Or.* 790; *IT* 1012; fr. 953a.14, otherwise prosaic.

ὦ τέκνον Cf. Dickey 1996. 65–9 (for ὦ see on fr. 1.4); use of τέκνον does not necessarily imply that the speaker and addressee are related (cf. on fr. 1.4 πάτερ).

2 ἀπελθεῖν The normal term for a wife abandoning her husband is ἀπολείπω or ἀπόλειψις; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 1068 with Dover 1968 *ad loc.* (cf. Thom. Mag. p. 29.13–14); Is. 3.8 with Wyse 1904 *ad loc.*; Plu. *Alc.* 8.5 with Baehr 1822 *ad loc.*; Hsch. α 6437; Phot. α 2541; AB p. 201.22. ἀπέρχομαι is rarely used with this sense (cf. Men. *Dysc.* 22),<sup>130</sup> although the meaning here is clear; note the variety of terms for a husband sending away his wife (e.g. ἀποπέμπω, ἐκπέμπω, ἐκβάλλω). For a woman to enact a divorce, she was required to present the case in writing to the archon (presumably the eponymous archon), so simple abandonment did not lead to the dissolution of a marriage; no such

<sup>130</sup> Neither LSJ nor DGE recognize this as a distinct sense of the word; Stephanus cites Orig. *Comm. in Matt.* 14.642f (p. 332.2 K); 644b (p. 334.33 K).

procedure seems to have been required of the husband. For discussion of the evidence, procedures, and related issues (most notably possession of the dowry), see Cohn-Haft 1995; Kapparis 1999 on [D.] 59.51; Harrison 1968 I.38–44; Stärk 1989. 51 n. 198.

**ἀπελθεῖν οἴκαδε** A common trimeter ending; e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 84 ἀπῆλθεν οἴκαδε; *Lys.* 726 ἀπελθεῖν οἴκαδε; *Ra.* 1167 κατελθεῖν οἴκαδε; Alex. fr. 222.17 ἀπῆλθεν οἴκαδε; Men. *Dysc.* 133 ἀπελθὼν οἴκαδε.

**3 ἥτις ἐστὶ κοσμία γυνή** The antecedent of ἥτις, here γυνή, has been attracted into the relative clause rather than remaining outside it as a dative, its proper case (cf. Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904. II.417–18; Alex. fr. 187.3–4 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*); although the construction is common, the word order is more contorted than usual.

For a woman described as κοσμία, cf. Men. *Georg.* 42; Arist. *Pol.* 3.1277b23; Austin–Olson 2004 on Ar. *Th.* 571–3; contrast Sem. fr. 7.4. For a description of behaviour that makes a person κόσμιος, cf. Philemo fr. 4. Here the main sense is ‘well-behaved’ in terms of fulfilling all her requisite duties to her husband and household. Order is a primary requisite for a successful household (e.g. Pl. *Grg.* 504a), and responsibility for it seems to have been assigned to the wife (e.g. X. *Oec.* 8.3, 10, 17–23).

**4 δίαυλος** A race of two στάδια, i.e. a sprint the length of the stadium and back; the word is often used metaphorically for a journey that involves a trip out and back, e.g. A. *Ag.* 344; E. *HF* 1102; Alex. fr. 237 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.* LSJ s.v. (followed by Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 237) state that the use here is ‘of a wife’s return to her husband’. Logic would seem to dictate that the word is used to describe the woman’s movement from her father’s home to her husband’s (at the time of marriage) and then back again, rather than the reverse; in any case, it is not apparent how a return to her husband could be described as bringing shame, whereas an abandonment of him certainly would (cf. E. *Med.* 236–7 οὐ γὰρ εὐκλεεῖς ἀπαλλαγὰι / γυναιξίν).

**ἐστὶν ... ἔχων** For the periphrasis, cf. A. *Ch.* 136 with Garvie *ad loc.*; Ar. *Pax* 334; Antiph. fr. 54.3; D. 20.152; Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.38–9; Thesleff 1954 §275; Björck 1940. 17–40.

## fr. 58 K.-A. (57 K.)

τὸ νέκταρ ἐσθίω πάνυ  
 μάττων διαπίνω τ' ἀμβροσίαν καὶ τῷ Διὶ  
 διακονῶ καὶ σεμνός εἰμι' ἐκάστοτε  
 Ἥρᾳ λαλῶν καὶ Κύπριδι παρακαθήμενος

habent CE [1-4]; Eust. [1-3 διακονῶ]

1-2 τὸ νέκταρ πάνυ μάττων ἐσθίω CE, Eust.: corr. Casaubon: πάνυ μάττων ἐσθίω /  
 νέκταρ Meineke

I eat up nectar  
 kneading it very much and I drink down ambrosia  
 and I serve Zeus and I am reverent on each occasion  
 talking to Hera and sitting beside Cypris

Ath. 2.39a

οἶδα δ' ὅτι Ἀναξανδρίδης τὸ νέκταρ οὐ ποτόν, ἀλλὰ τροφήν εἶναι λέγει θεῶν. —

I know that Anaxandrides says that nectar is not the drink but the food of the gods: —

Eust. *Od.* 1632.61-1633.1

παρὰ δέ τισι τῶν παλαιῶν τὸ νέκταρ ξηρὰ ἦν θεία τροφή. προφέρεται γοῦν Ἀναξαν-  
 δρίδης μὲν γράφων οὕτω. —

Among some of the ancients, nectar was dry divine food. Anaxandrides at any rate  
 alleges this, writing as follows: —

Phot. v 96 = *Suda* v 143

νέκταρ, θεῶν πόμα, καὶ οἶνος οὕτως, ὥς Ἀναξανδρίδης (fr. 80a). καὶ βρώμα τῶν  
 θεῶν· ὁ αὐτός

Nectar, a drink of the gods, and thus wine, as Anaxandrides (says) (fr. 80a). And food  
 of the gods, (as) the same author (says)

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x—υ—⟩ υ—υ|— υ—υ—  
 —υ—υ— —|—υ—υ— —υ—υ—  
 υ—υ— —|—υ— υ—υ—  
 —υ—υ— —|—υ—υ— υ—υ—

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.198; 1847. 591; Bothe 1855. 433; Kock 1884 II.160;  
 Blaydes 1896. 125; Herwerden 1903. 100; Edmonds 1959 II.76-7; Kassel-Austin  
 1991 II.272; Wilkins 2000. 227 n. 103; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 271

**Citation context** At Athenaeus 2.38f–9a, mention of people near Mt. Olympus in Lydia making a drink called nectar prompts a brief collection of examples to show that the word sometimes referred to the food of the gods, not their drink. This fragment comes first, followed by Alcman *PMG* 42 and Sappho fr. 141.1–3 (the Sappho fragment in fact mentions only drinking ambrosia, but that is presumably meant to imply eating nectar). The Homeric usage, in which nectar is drink and ambrosia food, is then noted. The quotation from Eustathius (lacking 4), making the same point about the use of nectar for food, is presumably drawn from Athenaeus. The lexicographic note preserved in Photius and the *Suda* is slightly more complicated. It cites Anaxandrides as an authority for two different, and mutually exclusive, uses of the word: one with the sense ‘drink of the gods’ and by transference ‘wine (for humans)’, the other with the sense ‘food of the gods’. Only the latter is appropriate here, and the former must thus in fact be a different, unrecorded fragment of Anaxandrides (fr. 80a).

**Text** As transmitted, 1–2 necessitate a line division τὸ νέκταρ πάνυ μάττων / ἐσθίω κτλ., which makes both unmetrical. Casaubon’s transposition of ἐσθίω neatly solves this problem, as does Meineke’s of νέκταρ, which rests in part on his opinion that the article at the beginning of 1 is ‘inutilis’. This assertion is a trifle bold, given the lack of context (e.g. the article may be adding specificity to a generalizing statement which preceded; cf. Hermipp. fr. 77.10), and a lack of parallelism in the use of the article (τὸ νέκταρ ... ἀμβροσίαν) is in any case not necessarily objectionable; cf. 2–4 τῷ Δί ... Ἡρᾷ ... Κύπριδι; fr. 57.2–3 ὥς τὸν πατέρ(α) ... παρ’ ἀνδρός; Gildersleeve 1900–1911 §§603, 605.

**Interpretation** If the fragment is taken at face-value, the speaker is Ganymedes, the Trojan prince who was taken by Zeus and became the wine-server to the gods (cf. Sichtermann in *LIMC* IV.1.154–69; Drexler in Roscher 1884–1937 I.1595–1603). Since the speaker seems to be introducing himself by way of describing his activities, he has presumably just come on stage; the most plausible context for such an exposition is the prologue.<sup>131</sup> In contrast to Anaxandrides’ *Nereus*, where Nereus is both the eponym of the play and

<sup>131</sup> Given the explicit description of the activities that serve to identify Ganymedes, it seems likely that his name was also given in close proximity to this fragment. The identification by name of divine prologue-speakers can be made at the outset or delayed until the end of the prologue; cf. Gomme-Sandbach 1973 on Men. *Asp.* 147–8.

the plausible speaker of the prologue (cf. on fr. 31),<sup>132</sup> Ganymedes need not have any larger role within the play.<sup>133</sup> Menander and Plautus offer numerous examples of a divinity delivering the prologue, although in such cases an abstract is common (e.g. Men. *Asp.* [Τύχη]; Pk. [Ἄγνοια]; Plaut. *Cas.* [Fides]; *Cist.* [Auxilium]) but not invariable (e.g. Men. *Dysc.* [Pan]; cf. E. *Alc.* [Apollo and Thanatos]; *Hipp.* [Aphrodite]); when the divinity is not a personified abstract, he/she has some close connection with the setting or action of the play. Ganymedes may well be used here to set a scene of interplay among the gods, which could be a plausible opening for one of the γοναί-plays; at least as likely is that this fragment belongs to the prologue from *Anchisēs* and Ganymedes uses his own abduction by Zeus as a parallel for an affair between Aphrodite and Anchises (assuming that this was the plot of that play).

1–2 For eating nectar and drinking ambrosia, see Wright 1917. 5: ‘Anaxandrides is using the method of comic inversion.’

1 τὸ νέκταρ Although most often a liquid (e.g. H. *Il.* 1.598; *Od.* 5.93; E. *Ba.* 143; Hermipp. fr. 77.10–11; Alex. fr. 124.1–3), nectar appears also on occasion as a solid (Hes. *Th.* 640 with West 1966 *ad loc.* [although this passage could also be explained as an example of zeugma]; Alcm. fr. 42 [cited by Ath. together with this fragment]; Arcestr. fr. 16.4 [*SH* 146] with Olson–Sens 2000 *ad loc.*); cf. Roscher 1883, esp. 24–6. The etymology of νέκταρ is disputed; for discussion and bibliography, see Beekes 2010 *s. v.*

πάνυ Taken with μάττων, the word is purely intensive; cf. Thesleff 1954 §§66, 70.

2 μάττων ‘Kneading’, i.e. preparing the νέκταρ as if to make μᾶζα (cognate with μάττω); for μᾶζα and its preparation, see Olson 1998 on Ar. *Pax* 1.

διαπίνω Cf. Gow–Page 1965 on *HE* 1837; Degani 1984. 304 n. 119.

ἀμβροσίαν Normally a solid food (e.g. H. *Il.* 5.777; *Od.* 5.93; Pl. *Phdr.* 27e; Ar. *Pax* 724) or, especially in epic, an ointment (e.g. H. *Il.* 14.170–1 with Janko 1992 *ad loc.*; A.R. 4.871), ambrosia can also be a liquid (Sapph. *PLG* 141.1–4; Ar. *Eq.* 1094–5; Arcestr. fr. 59.11 [*SH* 190]; Paus. Gr. α 83 γένος τι συνθέσεως

<sup>132</sup> Cf. also Plautus *Amphitruo*, where Mercury delivers the prologue and has a role as a character.

<sup>133</sup> Edmonds’ suggestion that the ascription of this fragment to Anaxandrides is mistaken and that it may belong instead to Antiphanes’ *Ganymedes* is not worthy of serious consideration. Aside from the fact that if the ascription were corrupt, Alcaeus and Eubulus, who also wrote plays entitled *Ganymedes*, would have to be considered as well, the name Anaxandrides is frequently corrupted into other names, while the reverse rarely if ever occurs.

ἐξ ὕδατος ἀγκραιφνοῦς καὶ μέλιτος καὶ ἐλαίου <καὶ> παγκαρπίας); Wright 1917. 5–6.<sup>134</sup>

**3 διακονῶ** In comedy, the word normally refers to serving at meals or feasts (e.g. Men. fr. 208.1–2; Euphro fr. 9.1; Hegesipp. fr. 1.11; Posidipp. fr. 2; 28.19), although it can also be used specifically for serving wine at a symposium (Philem. fr. 64; Diph. fr. 42.25, 33). The phrase τῷ Διὶ / διακονῶ may have a sexual connotation in this context (for Ganymedes' two duties, e.g. E. Cyc. 582–8 with Seaford 1984 *ad loc.*; Luc. *DDeor.* 8; 10), although it apparently does so nowhere else.

**σεμνός** 'Devoted to the gods', as at E. *Hipp.* 1364 ὅδ' ὁ σεμνὸς ἐγὼ καὶ θεοσέπτωρ; Ion 56 καταζῆ (sc. Ion) δεῦρ' ἀεὶ σεμνὸν βίον. Used of mortals, σεμνός normally means 'overly proud' or 'haughty' (cf. on fr. 34.3), although it seems unlikely that Ganymedes would describe himself as such; perhaps it reflects his immortal status, although whether his position is sufficient to warrant the epithet is debatable.<sup>135</sup>

**ἐκάστοτε** Presumably colloquial vocabulary; see Austin–Olson 2004 on Ar. *Th.* 218–20.

**4** There may be some point to the specific goddesses mentioned here, insofar as Ganymedes, Zeus' male lover, is depicted as associating with the goddess of marriage and the goddess of desire/sexual love.

**Ἥρα λαλῶν** Contrast the antipathy of Hera toward Ganymedes at Luc. *DDeor.* 8. Hera rarely appears in comedy, presumably because of the general lack of comic potential in the stories associated with her.<sup>136</sup> Her occurrences in comedy can be grouped into two basic categories: as goddess of marriage (Ar. Av. 1731, 1741; *Th.* 973; at Av. 1633 she is simply the wife of Zeus) and as a way of characterizing Aspasia (Cratin. fr. 259; cf. Eup. fr. 294; 438). In addition, Samian Hera appears at Antiph. fr. 173, in the context of the different

<sup>134</sup> The other examples of ἀμβροσία as a liquid occasionally cited tend to be problematic. At H. *Il.* 19.3–98, 347–8, 353–4, it may be a liquid of a sort but is clearly part of an embalming process and so ought to be distinguished from a potable drink; similar is Hes. fr. 23a.22–3. At E. *Hipp.* 748 the word used is the adjective, which means 'divine' (as normally) rather than 'of ambrosia' and thus implies nothing about whether ambrosia is liquid or solid (cf. Barrett 1964 *ad loc.*).

<sup>135</sup> Epithets of Ganymedes elsewhere tend to focus solely on his physical attractiveness; e.g. *hVen.* 202 ξανθός; Call. *Ep.* 52.3 εὐχαίτης; Theoc. 12.35 χαραπός.

<sup>136</sup> Note also her limited role in Athenian religion (cf. Deubner 1932. 177–8; on fr. 35.2), as well as the near absence of temples or sanctuaries dedicated to her in Athens or Attica (one existed on the road to Phaleron [Paus. 1.1.5; 10.35.2]; the single known example in the city was not built until the time of Hadrian [Paus. 1.18.9]).

birds associated with various deities, as having peacocks;<sup>137</sup> at anon. Dor. fr. 1.13 Hera's jealousy toward Heracles is mentioned. For λαλῶν, cf. on fr. 36.

**Κύπριδι** Κύπρις is the most common name for Aphrodite aside from her actual name and is attested 17 times in comedy, although only here in Anaxandrides; cf. Bruchmann 1893. 61.

## fr. 59 K.-A. (58 K.)

ἐὰν λούσησθέ νυν  
 ῥάφανόν τε πολλήν ἐντράγητε, παύσεται  
 τὸ βάρος, διασκεδᾶτε τὸ προσὸν νῦν νέφος  
 ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου

habent CE

1 νυν Bothe: νῦν CE  
 τε Bernhardt

2 ἐντρώγητε CE: corr. Musurus

διασκεδᾶτε CE: -δῶ

Now if you wash  
 and nibble a lot of cabbage, your headache  
 will cease, you will scatter the cloud now  
 upon your brow

Ath. 1.34d-e

Ἀναξανδρίδης: —

Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x—υ— x—⟩υ— ——υ—  
 υ—υ— —|—υ— υ—υ—  
 υ—υ— υ—υ|υ ——υ—  
 υ—υ— —|⟨—υ— x—υ—⟩

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 109; Meineke 1840 III.197–8; 1847. 591; Bothe 1855. 432–3; Herwerden 1855. 57; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix, 81; Kock 1884 II.160;

<sup>137</sup> Hera may also appear in a catalogue of gods at Ar. Av. 575 if one read reads Ἥραν (so M; all other mss. read Ἥριν), although this is probably mistaken (cf. Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.*).

Blaydes 1890a. 84; 1896. 126; Herwerden 1903. 100; Edmonds 1959 II.76–7; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.272; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 271–2

**Citation context** The fragment is quoted by Athenaeus at the end of Book 1 as part of a brief discussion of cabbage as a cure (or prophylactic) for hangovers. Timae. *FGrHist* 566 F 47; Alex. fr. 287; Eub. fr. 124; Apollod. Car. fr. 32 (discussing the word for cabbage) precede; Nicoch. fr. 18; Amphis fr. 37; Thphr. *HP* 4.16.6 follow.

**Text** The transmitted ἐντρώγητε in 2 does not scan, and Musurus' correction is thus necessary on metrical grounds; in addition, the compound form of the verb is not attested in the present (cf. Starkie 1897 on Ar. V. 612; Renehan 1976. 80). C and E both read παύσεται; Desrousseaux's claim that E reads παύσετε is erroneous.

Bernhardy 1829. 468 proposed emending to διασκεδῶ τε in 3 in order to remove the asyndeton; for this use of τε, cf. Denniston 1954. 497–500. But the asyndeton is unproblematic (see *ad loc.*), and the emendation creates problems, since διασκεδάννυμι cannot be intransitive. Bernhardy supplied ἡ ῥάφανος as the subject, but this is awkward because παύσεται, with τὸ βάρος as the subject, intrudes between ῥάφανον and διασκεδῶ; slightly better is Edmonds' tentative 'the suggested treatment of which it [i.e. the cabbage] is a part',<sup>138</sup> while Kock's suggestion, τὸ βάρος πανόμενον, is rightly dismissed by Kassel–Austin. Van Herwerden 1855. 57 retained διασκεδᾶτε but removed the asyndeton by reading διασκεδᾷτε τε τὸ προσὸν νέφος; the change is paleographically easy, but νῦν is not, as he describes it, 'supervacaneum', and its removal weakens the clause. The same changes were made by Blaydes 1896. 125, which van Herwerden 1903. 100 cited with approval, apparently having forgotten that he had previously done the same.

In 4, Meineke 1840 and 1847 (and Iacobi's index in Meineke 1857, but not Meineke's edition of Athenaeus), Bothe 1855, Kock 1884, and Edmonds 1959 all print προσώπου, with no critical note, against μετώπου, the reading of C and E, which is adopted by Kassel–Austin and editions of Athenaeus; presumably, Meineke made an unconscious slip and was followed uncritically by the others.<sup>139</sup> For the distinction between the two words and their confusion, cf. Seaford 1984 on E. *Cyc.* 227.

<sup>138</sup> Less happy is his alternative, that 'Zeus [is] understood as in συνεσκότασε and the like.'

<sup>139</sup> The error is easily accounted for by the relative rarity of μέτωπον in comedy (Ar. *Eq.* 550, 631; *V.* 655; *Pax* 774; *Pl.* 942; *Pherecr.* fr. 169.2; *Anaxandr.* fr. 42.69; *Amph.* fr. 33.3; *Alex.* fr. 275.4; *Diph.* fr. 67.8; *adesp. com.* fr. 1113.13) as opposed to the ubiquity



**Interpretation** The fragment seems to be part of a dialogue between two characters (or more, if the verbs are true plurals), one of whom is suffering the after-effects of heavy drinking. Presumably the occasion for the drinking was a symposium or banquet that took place earlier in the day, so this fragment is set late in the day, or, more likely, the social event happened the previous day, placing this fragment early the next morning. Unless this bit of dialogue belongs to an opening scene, the previous scene presumably ended with the addressee(s) and possibly others, but probably not the speaker, going off to a symposium, so that the fragment belongs early in the next scene. The content fits with the scene(s) of heavy drinking described in frs. 1–3 of *Agroikoi*, so this fragment may belong to that play, but scenes of drinking and its aftermath could have easily occurred in a number of contexts in a number of different plays.

1–2 For the force of the aorist subjunctives, cf. Goodwin 1890 §90.

1 **λούσησθε** It is unclear whether merely washing the face, hands, etc. from a basin or using a bathtub is implied. Either option would have been available in a moderately well-to-do house or a public bath (cf. Travlos 1971. 180–1; Olson 1998 on Ar. *Pax* 1103), although the season, and thus possible water shortages, would dictate how frequently baths were taken; cf. Ginouvès 1962. 29–60, 77–99; Dunbar 1995 on Ar. *Av.* 132. Numerous public fountains were also available throughout the city, although their main function was to provide drinking water and it is doubtful that using them for bathing to any extent more than splashing the face would have been tolerated.

**νυν** Inferential (LSJ s. v. II; Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 II.118) rather than temporal, so that Bothe's *νυν*, as opposed to CE's *νῦν*, is to be preferred.

2 **ράφανον** *ράφανος*, 'cabbage', is the Attic term for what was elsewhere called *κράμβη* (but note Eup. fr. 84.2 *ναὶ τὰς κράμβας*; Telecl. fr. 29; Antiph. fr. 6 *κραμβίδιον*); cf. Apollod. Car. fr. 32 *† εἰ δ' ὅτι † καλοῦμεν ῥάφανον, ὑμεῖς δ' οἱ ξένοι / κράμβην*; Phryn. *Ecl.* 111 *ῥάφανον ἐπὶ τῆς ῥαφανίδος μὴ θῆς· σημαίνει γὰρ τὴν κράμβην*. The word is regularly distinguished from the similar Attic word *ῥαφανίς*, 'radish', by lexicographers and grammarians (e.g. Ammon. 424, 425; Poll. 1.247; 6.54; Phot. ρ 49; Hsch. ρ 143 [= Trypho fr. 120; cf. von Velsen 1853 *ad loc.*], 144; *Suda* ρ 55; Σ<sup>RVMEΘ</sup> Ar. *Pl.* 544; Thom. Mag. p. 322.16–17), although with some confusion, since the non-Attic word for *ῥαφανίς* is *ῥάφανος* (but note Call. Com. fr. 26; [Arist.] *Prob.* 924a34). For the belief that eating cabbage (normally boiled; e.g. Alc. Com. fr. 24; Antiph. fr. 181.6; Eub. fr. 148.3) was a cure for hangovers and particularly the associated

---

of *πρόσωπον* (17 times in Ar.; over 20 times in the rest of comedy); cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 275.4 for the same error in antiquity.

headache, cf. the fragments quoted at Ath. 1.34c–e (see Citation Context), which preserves the bulk of the evidence; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 15.7.

**ἐντράγητε** For the sense of the word ('nibble' rather than 'eat'), see Chadwick 1996. 288–90; Olson 2002 on Ar. *Ach.* 801. The word might be used here to express the only sort of eating the addressee is capable of when hungover, but the verb is also regularly used for the sort of snacking that accompanies drinking.

**3 τὸ βάρος** The normal word for a hangover and the headache associated with it is κραιπάλη, but the meaning here seems clear (Gulick's 'sadness' and Edmond's 'dumps' are both wide of the mark); cf. Ath. 2.45e καὶ ὁ γλυκάζων δ' οἶνος οὐ βαρύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν, ὡς Ἱπποκράτης ἐν τῷ περὶ διαίτης (*Acut.* 50 [Π.332 Littré] ὁ μὲν γλυκὺς [sc. οἶνος] ἥσσόν ἐστι καρηβαρικὸς τοῦ οἰνώδεος); Arist. *HA* 8.603b8 κεφαλῆς πόνος καὶ βάρος; Plu. *Mor.* 596a. The word can be used of virtually any physical feeling of heaviness or torpor; cf. *DGE* s. v. I.3; Chadwick 1996. 67

**διασκεδᾷτε** The verb occurs elsewhere in comedy at Ar. *V.* 229; *Av.* 1035 (both of scattering physical objects, respectively wasps and urns). For the asyndeton, cf. Dover 1987. 234–5 (with his observation that in Aristophanic comedy 'asyndeton ... is used ... to give us a vivid series of physical details'); Handley 1965 on Men. *Dysc.* 19f and 1990. 136.

**3–4 τὸ προσὸν νῦν νέφος / ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου** For the image, cf. A. *Th.* 228–9 ὕπερθ' ὀμμάτων / κριμναμενᾶν νεφελᾶν; S. *Ant.* 528 νεφέλη δ' ὀφρύων ὕπερ; E. *Hipp.* 172 ὀφρύων νέφος (cf. Σ<sup>MAB</sup> *ad loc.*); Ar. fr. 410 ὡς ἐς τὴν γῆν κύψασα κάτω καὶ ξυννεοφυῖα βαδίζει; E. *El.* 1078 συννέφουσιν ὄμματα; *Ph.* 1308; Arist. *Phgn.* 809b21–2, 811b34–5; Hsch. ξ 163; σ 2653; Hense 1905. 11 n. 1, 31–3; Rutherford 1881. 480 for Anaxandrides' use of a tragic metaphor. For the word-order, cf. E. *Supp.* 1036; *Ba.* 1226; Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.623; Schöne 1925. 158–60; Vahlen 1911 I.216 for examples from prose.

## fr. 60 K.-A. (59 K.)

ὦ πονηρὰ καρδιά,  
ἐπιχαιρέκακον ὥς εἶ μόνον τοῦ σώματος·  
ὀρχῇ γὰρ εὐθύς, ἂν μ' ἴδῃς δεδαικτότα

habet A

2 ὥς A: πῶς Dobree      3 ὀρχῇ Canter (ὀρχεῖ Dindorf): ἀρχῇ A      μ' add. Toup

O wicked heart,  
how you are the only part of my body that delights in my misfortune!  
For straightaway you dance, if you see me frightened

Ath. 15.688a–b

Ἀναξανδρίδης δὲ τὸν ἀγωνιῶντα παράγει λέγοντα· —

Anaxandrides brings on stage the anxious man, who says: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x— — x⟩|— — — —  
— — — — —|— — — —  
— — — — —|— — — —

**Bibliography:** Canter 1564. 157; Grotius 1626. 644–5, 979; Valckenaer 1739. 82–4; Toup 1778. 304 (= 1st ed. [also 1778] 179); Dobree 1833 II.353; Meineke 1840 III.198–9; Ladewig 1842. 28–31; Meineke 1847. 591; Bothe 1855. 433; Naber 1880. 55; Kock II 1884 II.160–1; Schmidt 1886–1887 I.28; Blaydes 1890a. 84; Blümner 1891. 111; Blaydes 1896. 126; Edmonds 1959 II.76–7; Webster 1970. 146; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.273; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 272; Rusten 2011. 469

**Citation context** In a short section near the end of Book 15, Athenaeus adduces a number of passages as evidence that the soul is to be located in the heart (15.687e–b); H. *Od.* 20.17, 13; *Il.* 7.216; 10. 93–5; S. fr. 766 precede, and Pl. *Ti.* 70c follows. Athenaeus introduces the fragment with the comment that Anaxandrides τὸν ἀγωνιῶντα παράγει ('brings on stage a man in distress'), which might suggest a recognizable character-type. No such type is obviously identifiable with those known from e.g. Theophrastus *Characters* or the list of masks at Pollux 4.143–54, but there are several possibilities among the masks identified by Webster. Webster 1978. 18 notes that on Mask L (Old Man), 'the brows often give a worried expression'<sup>140</sup> and he tentatively suggests an

<sup>140</sup> For the brows indicating a worried expression, cf. on fr. 59.3–4 (esp. Hense 1905).

identification with Pollux' First Hermonian (4.144 ἀνατέταται τὰς ὀφρῦς, τὸ βλέμμα δριμύς); cf. 1995. 13 (Mask 5). Another possibility is 1978. 19 Mask O (Young Man), which Webster describes as 'the worried lover' and from which he derives the Second Wavy-haired Young Man of Pollux's list (4.147; cf. 1995. 22 [Mask 16]).

**Text** For ὀρχῆ as opposed to ὀρχεῖ in 3, cf. on fr. 38.1. Toup's insertion of μ' is paleographically trivial and metrically unnecessary, yet is required in order to clarify that the speaker is the one frightened (as is proven by the examples cited *ad loc.*, especially those from Plautus); its absence led to erroneous interpretations by Valckenaer 1739. 83 and Blaydes 1896. 126 (inserting τιν').

**Interpretation** The sentiment of this fragment could be appropriate to a young lover, perhaps reflecting trepidation before meeting the object of his affections, or his agitated state after meeting her. But the content is also suitable for numerous other characters and situations (including actual fear, e.g. in anticipation of a beating). The speaker's address to his heart implies that the fragment is part of a monologue; a short aside is also possible.

**1 ὦ πονηρὰ καρδία** Addresses to one's heart or soul are relatively common in epic and archaic poetry (e.g. H. *Il.* 22.98; *Od.* 20.18 τέτλαθι δῆ, κραδίη; Archil. fr. 128.1; Ibyc. *PMG* 317b; Thgn. 1029) but rare in tragedy earlier than Euripides (A. *Th.* 1034; S. *Tr.* 1260 [cf. *Ph.* 712; fr. 757 (an address to the speaker's γλῶσσαι)]). In Euripides, such addresses become common again (e.g. *Alc.* 837; *Med.* 1240; *IT* 344; *Or.* 466), whence, at least in part, the occurrences in Aristophanes (e.g. *Ach.* 450, 480; *Eq.* 1194; cf. Cratin. fr. 171.63). For addresses to one's heart or soul in general, cf. Pelliccia 1995, esp. 74–5 with n. 123,<sup>141</sup> 121–2; de Romilly 1984; Leo 1908, esp. 36, 98–102. Although the address here is clearly drawing on this tradition, it may also belong to an image well-known from Middle or New Comedy; cf. on 3 ὀρχῆ. For a survey of uses or senses of καρδία, particularly in Aristophanes, see Handley 1956. 208–9, 216–17, 222–3; for καρδία in connection with fear, cf. Sullivan 2000. 76–7. The speaker's heart is described as πονηρά because it does not behave as it should and thus creates an unpleasant feeling; cf. Dover 1974. 52–3.

**2 ἐπιχαιρέκακον** Cf. Arist. *EN* 2.1108b3–6 ὁ μὲν γὰρ νεμεσητικός λυπεῖται ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναξίως εὖ πράττουσιν, ὁ δὲ φθονερός ὑπερβάλλων τοῦτον ἐπὶ πᾶσι λυπεῖται, ὁ δὲ ἐπιχαιρέκακος τοσοῦτον ἐλλείπει τοῦ λυπεῖσθαι ὥστε καὶ χαίρειν (contrast *Rhet.* 2.1386b34–1387a1 ὁ γὰρ αὐτός ἐστιν ἐπιχαιρέκακος καὶ φθονερός); cf. *EN* 1107a9–12. The occurrence here is apparently the

<sup>141</sup> In n. 123, correct Anaxandr. fr. 5.9 to 59 (= 60 K-A).

earliest extant use of the word (but cf. Kaibel 1899b. 18); it appears elsewhere in the fourth century at Alex. fr. 52 and as the title of a comedy by Timocles. In general, cf. Stevens 1948; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 52; Valckenaer 1739. 83.

3 ὀρχῇ This striking image appears first at A. *Ch.* 167 ὀρχεῖται δὲ καρδία φόβῳ, although it does have some earlier precedents (e. g. H. *Il.* 7.216; 10.93–5; Sapph. fr. 31. 5–6). Variations on the image become more common throughout the classical period and later, although it is not found elsewhere in comedy of the mid to late fourth century; cf. A. *Ch.* 167 with Garvie 1986; S. fr. 766 with Pearson 1917 *ad loc.*; Ar. *Nu.* 1391–1 with Blaydes 1890b *ad loc.*; Pl. *Ion* 536b; Dickey 1996. 187; Webster 1957. 152; Blümner 1891. 111–12. The concentration of the same image in Plautus (cf. *Aul.* 626–7 *continuo meum cor coepit artem facere ludicram / atque in pectus emicare* [cf. Stockert 1983 *ad loc.*]; *Cist.* 551 *iam horret corpus, cor salit*; *Capt.* 636–7; *Cas.* 414–15; *Mil.* 1088) might suggest a precedent in fourth-century comedy (cf. Marx 1928 on Plaut. *Rud.* 1290), implying that the image was more common in the comedy of that period than the other evidence suggests, although the numerous papyrus finds of the last century or so have yet to reveal an example.

fr. 61 K.-A. (60 K.)

μηδέποτε δοῦλον ἡδονῆς σαυτὸν ποίει·  
λάγνης γυναικὸς ἔστιν, οὐκ ἀνδρὸς τόδε

habent LMA

1 = [Men.] *Mon.* 512      ποιεῖ L      2 λάγνης LMA: λάγνου Blaydes: μάχλης  
Herwerden

Never make yourself a slave of pleasure;  
this is the trait of a lecherous woman, not a man

Stob. 3.6.6

(περὶ ἀκολασίας) Ἀναξανδρίδου. —

Ἀλεξανδρίδου L

(On licentiousness) Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— ∪ ∪ — ∪ | — ∪ — — ∪ —  
— ∪ — ∪ | — ∪ — — ∪ —

**Discussion** Grotius 1623 II.42–3; Meineke 1840 III.199; 1847. 591; Bothe 1855. 433; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix; Kock 1884 II.161; Blaydes 1890a. 84; Blümner 1891. 73; Blaydes 1896. 126; Herwerden 1903. 100; Edmonds 1959 II.76–9; Dover 1974. 101–2; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.273; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 272

**Citation context** The fragment occurs near the beginning of Stobaeus' chapter 'On licentiousness' (3.6) in the midst of a small cluster of comic fragments; Euphro fr. 11 precedes and Alex. fr. 297 follows.

**Text** Bothe 1855. 433 suggested that reading αὐτόν for σαντόν in 1 would be 'non deterius'. αὐτόν is grammatically possible (cf. Philem. fr. 116.3; Men. fr. 219.2; Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.572; Threatte 1996 II.327) and the change is paleographically trivial ('adhaeserit σ vicinum'), but the idiom is relatively uncommon in comedy (predominantly from the late fourth and third centuries; cf. Iacobi's index to Meineke s. v. αὐτοῦ), and the change would be emendation for its own sake.

πόει for the manuscripts' ποιει (however accented) is possible but not preferable; cf. Arnott 2001a; Threatte 1980 I.328–9 ('The spellings without iota increase in frequency until the second half of the fourth century, when they are most common', but 'at no period do they become as frequent as the traditional spelling with iota'); Crönert 1903. 116–21 ('ubique ergo diphthongus invita metri ratione scribitur' [p. 117]). The spelling πο- (as opposed to ποι-) is often used as a convention to represent correction (and thus a distinctive pronunciation?) of the syllable, but evidence for its similar use in antiquity is lacking; what is more, there is no rationale for the application of the convention only to ποιέω and cognates, but not to the phenomenon as a whole regardless of the word in which it occurs (e. g. Anaxandr. fr. 1.3 τοιοῦτον not τοοῦτον).

Blaydes' emendation to λάγνου (1896. 126) in 2 is based on the mistaken belief that λάγνης (nom.) is the only Attic form of the word (see *ad loc.*) and ought thus to be rejected. Van Herwerden's μάχλης (1903. 100) is based on a related misunderstanding.

**Interpretation** The moralizing tone suggests an older speaker or one represented as adhering to an old-fashioned morality, reproving another for his actions or intended course of action. The view of women is a standard one; for further examples (including a translation of this fragment) and discussion, see Dover 1974. 101–2.

**1 δοῦλον ἡδονῆς** For the image of being a slave to one's passions *vel sim.*, see Blümner 1891. 73. For the specific phrase, cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 238e τῷ δὴ ὑπὸ ἐπιθυμίας ἀρχομένῳ δουλεύοντί τε ἡδονῇ ἀνάγκη που τὸν ἐρώμενον ὡς ἥδιστον ἑαυτῷ παρασκευάζειν. Although the line might allude to contemporary philosophical ideas, any apparent reminiscence of such doctrine more likely indicates philosophy's adoption of commonplaces. Cf. on fr. 20 for mocking Plato; Brock 1990. 41 and Webster 1970. 50–1 for knowledge of philosophers and their doctrines by poets of Middle Comedy (cf. Arnott 1996 introduction to Alexis' *Phaedrus*; on fr. 247.10–13).

**2 λάγνης** The word was much disputed in antiquity on two counts. The first is whether the correct form is λάγνης or λάγνος. The latter is clearly possible, given Ar. fr. 534; cf. K.-A. *ad loc.* and note esp. Bossi 1980–1982; 1983. This possibility was routinely denied in antiquity, hence Blaydes' emendation to λάγνου; cf. Phot. λ 20 λάγνης, οὐ λάγνος ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀττικῶν λέγεται (= Orus fr. B 88; cf. Alpers 1981 *ad loc.*) and Phryn. *Ecl.* 155 λάγνης διὰ τοῦ η, ἀλλὰ μὴ λάγνος φαθί (see Theodoridis 2012 on Phot. and Fischer 1974 on Phryn. for additional iterations of the claim).

The related question of whether the word could be used of a woman was also disputed. The claim of [Hdn.] *Philet.* 228 λάγνος ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν· οὕτως Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 534)· παρά τισι λάγνης· μάχλος δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικῶν· καὶ μαχλάς, ὡς Μένανδρος (fr. 495) has often been repeated (e.g. LSJ s. v. λάγνος; cf. Arc. p. 62.2 οὐκ ἔχει γὰρ ἴδιον θηλυκόν), hence van Herwerden's μάχλης.

The claims concerning λάγνος vs. λάγνης (and thus whether there is a feminine form) may be generally true, and could thus have led to exaggerated claims that a female form of the adjective did not exist at all; cf. Probert 2006. 265. Here the unexpected use of the feminine perhaps lends greater force to the statement, as well as offering a characterization of the person in question (if the lines concern an actual character and were not simply said as an abstract observation).

#### fr. 62 K.-A. (61 K.)

Ἔρως σοφιστοῦ γίγνεται διδάσκαλος  
σκαιοῦ πολὺ κρεῖττων πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρώπων βίον

habent SMA

1 γίνεται SMA: corr. Morelius      2 σκαιοῦ SMA: Κείου Meineke      κρεῖττον A  
πρὸς τὸν M: πρὸς τῶν SA: τῶν πρὸς Meineke

For human life, Love is a teacher  
much better than a clumsy sophist

Stob. 4.20.10

(περὶ Ἀφροδίτης) Ἀναξανδρίδου· ---

(Concerning Aphrodite) Anaxandrides: ---

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

υ-υ-υ- -| -υ-υ- υ-υ-υ-  
 ---υ-υ-υ- -| -υ-υ- ---υ-υ-

**Discussion** Morelius 1553. 109; Grotius 1623 II.242–3; 1840 III.199; 1847. 592; Bothe 1855. 433; Meineke 1857 V.clxxix–clxxx; Herwerden 1878. 67; Kock 1884 II.161; Blaydes 1896. 126; Edmonds 1959 II.78–9; Webster 1970. 50; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.273; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 272

**Citation context** The fragment is cited near the beginning of the Stobaeus' chapter 'On Aphrodite' (4.20), in a section dominated by Euripides; Aristarch. Trag. *TrGF* 14 F 2 precedes, and E. fr. 269 follows.

**Interpretation** The lines are probably best taken as the expression of a commonplace; for the thought, see on 1. They could easily have been spoken by some love-struck person, but might also be part of a moralizing speech ('some lessons cannot be taught'). The context suggested by Herwerden 1878. 67, defending the transmitted reading σκαίου against Meineke's proposed Κείου, seems overly literal: 'haec dici potuisse ab amatore aliquo adulescenti, qui *inepti*, ut ipsi videatur, magistri voce correptus, iram non cohibens ista reponat'.

1 Ἔρως For Eros as a teacher, cf. E. fr. 430; 661; Alex. fr. 290 (where ἔρωτος ought to be capitalized) with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; Nicias *SH* 566.<sup>142</sup> For Eros in comedy, see Zagagi 1980. 92–6; in general, Hermay *et al.* in *LIMC* III.1.850–942. Cf. Alciph. 4.7.4, 7 (= adesp. com. fr. 121–2 K.), where hetairai claim to be better teachers than sophists.

σοφιστοῦ In the context of teaching, the sense (often with a negative connotation) of σοφιστής as one who teaches for a fee is clearly uppermost; the point is thus that Eros offers a greater education than one who claims to have expertise (whether or not this claim is acknowledged by others). For the word and the sophists in comedy, see on fr. 16.6; Dover 1968 on Ar. *Nu.* 331; Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 20.1–2; 27.1–2; cf. Barrett 1964 on E. *Hipp.* 921.

1–2 διδάσκαλος / ... πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρώπων βίον E.g. [A.] *PV* 109–11 πρὸς / πηγὴν κλοπαίαν, ἢ διδάσκαλος τέχνης / πάσης βροτοῖς πέφηνε;

<sup>142</sup> Cf. also E. *Med.* 843–5 τῇ Σοφίᾳ παρέδρους ... Ἐρωτας / παντοίας ἀρετῶς ξυνεργούς with Page 1938 *ad loc.*; Nonn. *D.* 7.110 σοφὸς αὐτοδίδακτος Ἐρως.



Men. fr. 301 ἄρ' ἐστὶν ἀρετῆς καὶ βίου διδάσκαλος / ἐλευθέρου τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀγρός.

The main point seems to be a refutation (or at least disparagement) of the sophists' stereotypical claim that their teaching makes men better (e.g. Pl. *Prt.* 318a–19a; cf. Guthrie 1969. 250–60).

2 σκαιοῦ Here 'intellectually clumsy', as often; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 629 with Dover 1968 *ad loc.*; V. 1183 with Starkie 1897 *ad loc.*; Men. *Epitr.* 918 with Gomme–Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.*; Bond 1981 on E. *HF* 283;<sup>143</sup> Taillardat 1965 §11; Blümner 1891. 6. This use doubtless derives from the application to thought processes of the difference in agility between the right and left hands, although it occurs first only in the fifth century (e.g. Hdt. 1.129.3; S. fr. 771); for explicit contrast between δεξιός and σκαίος as applied to the intellect, cf. Ar. V. 1265–6. Probably related is the older notion of 'right' and 'left' as 'lucky' and 'unlucky' respectively, particularly in connection with divination; cf. H. *Il.* 12.239–40 with Leaf 1900–1902 *ad loc.*; Pease 1920–1923 on Cic. *Div.* 1.12. Since σκαίος in the sense found here is frequently and naturally contrasted with σοφός (e.g. S. fr. 771 with Pearson 1917 *ad loc.*; E. *Med.* 294–9; *Herac.* 458–9 with Wilkins 1993 *ad loc.*; Dover 1974. 120<sup>144</sup>), the phrase σοφιστῆς σκαίος constitutes something of an oxymoron.

fr. 63 K.-A. (62 K.)

ὑπὲρ σεαυτοῦ πράξον ὅ τι ἂν σοι δοκῇ,  
ἐγὼ δ' ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ

1 πράξον ὅ τι ἂν σοι Sansone: πράττε ὅτι ἂν σοι cod.: πράτθ' ὅτιοῦν ἂν σοι Meineke (ὅτιοῦν, ἂν Kock): πράτθ' ὅ τι ἂν σεαυτῷ Kaibel

On behalf of yourself do whatever seems best to you,  
and I on behalf of me

Antiatt. p. 92.16–21

ἐμὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμαυτόν, σὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ σεαυτόν. Φιλήμων Γαμοῦντι. [fr. 18]. Ἀναξανδρίδης. —  
'Me' instead of 'myself', 'you' instead of 'yourself'. Philemo in *Bridegroom*: [fr. 18].  
Anaxandrides: —

<sup>143</sup> For a correction of Bond's interpretation of Men. *Sam.* 428, cf. Bain 1983 *ad loc.*; in Bain's note, for *HF* 683 read 283.

<sup>144</sup> In Dover's discussion, for *Herac.* 958f. read 258f.

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

υ-υ-υ -| -υ-υ-υ -υ-υ-  
 υ-υ-υ-υ -| <-υ-υ- x-υ-υ->

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.199; 1847. 592; Bothe 1855. 433; Meineke 1857 V.clxxx; Kock 1884 II.161; Blaydes 1890a. 84; 1896. 126; Edmonds 1959 II.78–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.274; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 272

**Citation context** The Antiatticist cites the fragment together with Philem. fr. 18 as examples of the first and second person pronouns used in place of the corresponding reflexives.

**Text** The hiatus in the transmitted text *πρᾶττε ὅτι* is intolerable, yet elision creates a metrically deficient line. Sansone's *πρᾶξον* neatly removes the problem while not introducing others. Meineke's *πρᾶτθ' ὅτιοῦν* is simple, but *ὅτιοῦν* is always used with a negative elsewhere in comedy (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 344 *κούχῃ γυναιξὶν μὰ Δί' οὐδ' ὅτιοῦν*; Crates Com. fr. 19.3 *οὐκ ἄρ' ἔτ' οὐδὲν κρέας, ὥς ὑμεῖς λέγετ', οὐδ' ὅτιοῦν*; Xenarch. fr. 14.2).<sup>145</sup> Kaibel's *πρᾶτθ' ὅ τι ἄν σαυτῷ* implies a conscious change to the text introduced on the basis of the Antiatticist's lemma and removes from the lemma any example of the second person pronoun used for the reflexive. The first point runs counter to the inattention to detail characteristic of the Antiatticist in its current form; the second is not fatal, since the text of the Antiatticist is often hopelessly abbreviated and internally contradictory, but there is no compelling reason to thus further reduce the intelligibility of the lemma.

**Interpretation** The lines seem to be part of a dialogue in which two characters discuss what course of action to take and agree to act independently (or at least one of them proposes to do so).

Despite the Antiatticist's demonstration of the use of the personal pronoun for the reflexive in the first and second persons (implying that this had been condemned by Atticists), the usage is not uncommon (e.g. S. *OT* 379; E. *Andr.* 256; *Hipp.* 1409), except in comedy; cf. Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.559; Moorhouse 1982. 137.<sup>146</sup> Apparently for this reason and because the Antiatticist's lemma contains *ἐμέ* and *σέ* instead of *ἐμοῦ* and *σου* or *σοι*, Bothe

<sup>145</sup> In prose of the Classical and Hellenistic periods, the usage is not so restrained, and *ὅτιοῦν* appears with and without a negative in roughly equal numbers. The word is not attested in tragedy.

<sup>146</sup> Moorhouse's note on this usage, that 'in principal clauses there is regularly a contrast, with reference to another person than the self', is a more exact way of explaining the phenomenon than Edmonds' comment that '*ἐμοῦ* is due to contrast with *σοι*', although the latter is still correct.

believed the entry illustrated a usage uncommon in Attic, namely ὑπέρ governing the accusative yet retaining the meaning ‘on behalf of’.<sup>147</sup> Although Bothe’s line of reasoning has some merit, his emendations<sup>148</sup> are unappealing and he is looking for rigorous consistency where there likely was none. The Atticist debates, at least as they survive for us, often appear to concern usages that modern scholars find unexceptional. The further difficulty here is that the text of the Antiatticist is in general so badly abbreviated that citations cannot always be taken to illustrate the point apparently being made; there is often little means of knowing whether a quotation in any given lemma was originally meant as support for the main point or a tangential point, was there as a counter example, or was quoted only as an example for condemnation.

## fr. 64 K.-A. (63 K.)

τὸ συνεχὲς ἔργου παντὸς εὕρισκει τέλος

habent SMA

ἔργου SM: ἔργον A

Perseverance finds an end of every task

Stob. 3.29.12

(περὶ φιλοπονίας) Ἀναξανδρίδου. —

(On the love of labour) Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — — | — — — — —

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.199; 1847. 592; Bothe 1855. 433–4; Meineke 1857 V.clxxx, 81; Kock 1884 II.161; Edmonds 1959 II.78–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.274; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 272

**Citation context** The fragment is quoted by Stobaeus near the beginning of his chapter ‘On the love of labour’ (3.29) in a section dominated by Euripides; Critias eleg. fr. 9 precedes and E. fr. 233 follows.

<sup>147</sup> This usage occurs outside Attica (cf. LSJ s. v. B.V), although apparently not before the third century.

<sup>148</sup> ὑπὲρ σέ γ’ αὐτὸς πρᾶτθ’ ὅτι οὖν ἄν σοι δοκῇ / ἐγὼ δ’ ὑπὲρ ἔμ’ οὖν.

**Text** The genitive ἔργου rather than the nominative (the reading of A) is to be preferred, insofar as ἔργον is superfluous with τὸ συνεχές, while παντός requires some specificity; the word is to be taken with τέλος (thus Kock, ‘*constantiam* dicit ad cuiusvis operis finem pervenire’; Edmonds; contrast LSJ s. v. συνεχής II.1).

**Interpretation** Naeke 1817 on Choeril. fr. 11 (his fr. 9) πέτρην κοιλαίνει ῥανὶς ὕδατος ἐνδελεχείη notes the similarity of thought with this fragment (mistakenly attributing it to E. *Archelaos*) and adduces other examples (e. g. Bion fr. 4; Diogenian. 7.77a [cf. Leutsch–Schneidewin 1839 *ad loc.*]); cf. Bernabé 1996 on Choeril. fr. 11 for numerous examples from Latin literature.

**τὸ συνεχές** Equivalent to συνέχεια (cf. Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.266–8, esp. 268 Anm. 3 ‘Das Neutrum des Adjektivs in der Singularform drückt einen abstrakten Begriff aus’; Gildersleeve 1900–1911 §§36, 573), τὸ συνεχές must have the sense ‘perseverance’ or ‘persistence’, like συνέχεια at D. 18.218 (cf. Wankel 1976 *ad loc.*, ‘Das Substantiv ist in dieser Bedeutung ... in der klass. Literatur nur hier belegt’).

#### fr. 65 K.-A. (64 K.)

καλὸν γ’ ἀποθανεῖν πρὶν θανάτου δρᾶν ἄξιον

ἄξιον ω: ἄξια Blaydes

It is good to die before doing something worthy of death

Arist. *Rh.* 3.1412b16–20

τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ τὸ Ἀναξανδρίδου τὸ ἐπαινούμενον, [fr. 65]. ταὐτὸ γάρ ἐστι τῷ εἰπεῖν ἄξιόν γ’ ἀποθανεῖν μὴ ὄντα ἄξιον ἀποθανεῖν, ἢ ἄξιόν γ’ ἀποθανεῖν μὴ θανάτου ἄξιον ὄντα, ἢ μὴ ποιοῦντα θανάτου ἄξια

Another example is the celebrated [witticism] of Anaxandrides: [fr. 65]. For this is the same as saying that it is a worthy thing to die when not worthy of dying, or that it is worthy that one die not being worthy of death, or not doing things worthy of death

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — — | — — — — —

**Discussion** Grotius 1626. 644–5; Meineke 1840 III.200–1; 1847. 593; Bothe 1855. 434; Kock 1884 II.161; Blaydes 1896. 126; Edmonds 1959 II.78–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.274; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 273

**Citation context** Aristotle cites and explains the fragment in the course of discussing witticisms that turn on the antithesis between different senses of a single word, as at e.g. Isoc. 4.119 ἅμα γὰρ ἡμεῖς τε τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπεστερούμεθα καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀρχὴ τῶν κακῶν ἐγίγνετο; 5.61; 8.101. In the fragment, the thought is more compressed and the contrast implicit, hence Aristotle's use of paraphrase to bring out the antithesis. After a brief theoretical discussion, he reiterates his point with examples clearly invented on the basis of this fragment: δεῖ δ' αἰεὶ προσεῖναι ἢ τὸ πρὸς ὃν λέγεται ἢ τὸ ὀρθῶς λέγεσθαι, εἰ τὸ λεγόμενον ἀληθὲς καὶ μὴ ἐπιτόλαιον· ἔστι γὰρ ταῦτα χωρὶς ἔχειν, οἷον Ἀποθηήσκειν δεῖ μὴθὲν ἀμαρτάνοντα· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀστεῖον. τὴν ἀξίαν δεῖ γαμεῖν τὸν ἄξιον.<sup>149</sup> ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀστεῖον. ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἅμα ἄμφω ἔχη· Ἄξιόν γ' ἀποθανεῖν μὴ ἄξιον ὄντα τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν (1412b24–9). Aristotle to some extent blurs the distinction between his earlier example from Isocrates, which hinges on different meanings of the same word, and this fragment, which is an oxymoron; somewhat closer to the wordplay here is his additional example, adesp. com. fr. 97 οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο μᾶλλον ἢ ξένος ξένος. The thought is a variation on the commonplace that no man can be judged truly happy before he has died, as at e.g. Hdt. 1.30–2; A. Ag. 928–9 with Fraenkel *ad loc.*; S. Tr. 1–3 (where the thought is called λόγος ... ἀρχαῖος); E. Andr. 100–102 with Stevens 1971 *ad loc.* For a close approximation of the wording (but not the sense), cf. [Men.] Mon. 277 ζῆν βουλόμενος μὴ πρᾶττε θανάτου γ' ἄξια.

<sup>149</sup> Spengel 1828. 20 n. inserted δέ before δεῖ in order to make the line a trimeter and suggested that it was a fragment of an unknown poet, although he did note the similar quotation of Anaxandrides cited shortly before; he subsequently rejected this idea in his edition of Aristotle's *Rhetorica* (1867), noting 'omninoque mirum est aliud hic intrudi exemplum ab auctore in poetae versu interpretando occupato'. Nevertheless, his original suggestion had been accepted by Meineke in his note on Anaxandr. fr. 65, although he preferred to read ἔδει rather than δέ δεῖ and tentatively attributed the fragment to Anaxandrides, although printing it among the adespota. Meineke's rationale for the attribution was the preceding quotation of Anaxandrides and the statement 'huius [i.e. Anaxandrides] enim fabulis ut plurimum delectatus esse videtur Aristoteles'; for Aristotle's citations of Anaxandrides, see Introduction. Kock followed Meineke, but printed the fragment as both Anaxandr. fr. 79 (dub.), where he read γὰρ δεῖ, and adesp. com. fr. 206, where he printed the text as it appears in Aristotle (unmetrical). Kassel-Austin rightly reject the possibility that this is a poetic fragment, let alone a fragment of Anaxandrides; it is simply a snippet invented by Aristotle for the purposes of illustration.

## fr. 66 K.-A. (67 K.)

ἡ πόλις ἐβούλεθ', ἥ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει

The city, that has no concern for laws, wished it

Arist. *EN* 7.1152a20–3

ἔοικεν δὴ ὁ ἀκρατὴς πόλει ἣ ψηφίζεται μὲν ἅπαντα τὰ δέοντα καὶ νόμους ἔχει σπουδαίους, χρήται δ' οὐδέν, ὥσπερ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἔσκωπεν. —

The unrestrained man is similar to the city that passes all the necessary decrees and has good laws, but uses none of them, as Anaxandrides joked: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— ∪ ∪ — ∪ | — ∪ — — ∪ —

**Discussion** Grotius 1626. 644–5, 979; Gataker 1659. 77; Koraes 1822 on Arist. *EN* 7.1152a; Meineke 1839 I.368; 1840 III.200; 1847. 592; Bothe 1855. 434; Meineke 1857 V.clxxx, 81; Kock 1884 II.162; Bergk 1887 IV.160 n. 141; Nauck 1894. 93; Edmonds 1959 II.78–9; Webster 1960. 156; Webster 1970. 32, 82–3; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.275; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 273

**Citation context** In the course of discussing restraint and its lack, Aristotle deals with the behaviour and moral character of an unrestrained man and compares him to a state like the one described by Anaxandrides.

**Interpretation** A parody of E. fr. 265a ἡ φύσις ἐβούλεθ', κτλ., the first line of which is quoted by a variety of sources. Only with the discovery of Menander *Epitrepontes*, where the Euripides fragment is quoted at 1123–4, did the play (*Augē*), the second line, and thus the context become clear. In Euripides, the line apparently referred to the rape of Auge by Heracles and seems, if not to have condoned the action, at least to have excused it;<sup>150</sup> the quotation by Menander retains basically the same context. The potentially inflammatory content of Euripides' line, especially if taken out of context, together with the large number of later writers who quoted it, suggests that it quickly became infamous, much like E. *Hipp.* 612 (cf. Barrett 1964 *ad loc.*; citation apparatus in Stockert 1994). Euripides is often quoted or parodied in Middle Comedy; e.g. Antiph. fr. 238.3; Eub. fr. 6.2 (7 K) with Hunter 1983 *ad loc.*; Alex. fr. 3 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*; cf. Webster 1960. 156; 1970. 82–3. For Anaxandrides' use of Euripides, see on *Helenē* and Introduction.

<sup>150</sup> Cf. Ar. *Nu.* 1075–9 with Dover 1968 *ad loc.*; Heinimann 1945. 132–3.

Here the city (i. e. the demos?) is implicitly compared to a promiscuous woman, presumably as it gives in to the demands of demagogues or the like. The line suggests political satire, but whether this was a passing jibe or a larger element of the play to which the fragment belonged is unclear; it is nevertheless an important piece of evidence for political criticism in fourth-century comedy. For politics in the plays of Anaxandrides and his mocking of contemporary political figures, see on *Poleis*, *Prōtesilaos* and Introduction.<sup>151</sup>

Koraes 1822 on Arist. *EN* 7.1152a suggested that this fragment belonged to *Poleis*, apparently relying only on the content and merely noting τὸ δὲ ἔπος [i. e. the fragment] ἴσως ἐκ τοῦ δράματος τοῦ ἐπιγραφομένου, Πόλεις. Support for the suggestion might be found in the scholia to Ov. *Ib.* 523 (= Anaxandr. test. 2a; see *ad loc.*), which reports that Anaxandrides *quom Athenienses bonas leges habere diceret, sed malis uti eos praedicaret, enumeraretque ceteras nationes quae aut sine lege essent aut non in condendis legibus tantum salis habuissent, usui venirent tamen melius, coniectus in carcerem est*, etc. The claim that Anaxandrides said that the Athenians have good laws but use bad ones might be drawn from this fragment (but see on dub. fr. 83), confounded to some extent with its Aristotelian context, but the claim that Anaxandrides also enumerated and criticized other states cannot be inferred from this passage, Aristotle, or Ovid. The only known play of Anaxandrides that seems to offer a context for such a list is *Poleis* (see *ad loc.*). But the question remains whether the scholia can be taken seriously (i. e. whether its ultimate source had access to more information about the content of Anaxandrides' plays), whether it represents a deduction from piecing together the same bits of evidence we have, or whether it is jumble of misunderstanding and misinformation (even if honestly meant).

ἡ πόλις Presumably Athens is meant, which seems to be how Aristotle understood the word, although there is no explicit statement to that effect; for ἡ πόλις used of a city other than Athens, e. g. Alex. fr. 255.1; Diph. fr. 31.22 (both referring to Corinth).

ἐβούλετ(ο) Whether the object was a general situation or a specific action, or even whether it was expressed or unexpressed, is unknowable without context. But whatever it was, it almost certainly was not νόμος or νόμους

<sup>151</sup> Early commentators, e. g. Gataker 1659. 77, whence Barnes 1694 on E. *Ph.* 392 (= 396 Barnes), connected the fragment with test. 2a and claimed that the criticism of Athens here led to Anaxandrides being put to death; see on test. 2a. Koraes 1822 understood it as symptomatic of Anaxandrides' anger with the Athenians as the result of a failure to take the prize in a dramatic competition and connected it with test. 2 (see *ad loc.*).

ἀγαθούς, as was understood e. g. by the anonymous commentator on Aristotle (cf. on dub. fr. 83) and many early editors of Aristotle, leading to emendations such as Lambinus' ἐβούλευ(ε); cf. Zell 1820 on Arist. *EN* 7.10 (1152a22–3).

fr. 67 K.-A. (68 K.)

ὑπερήμεροί μοι τῶν γάμων αἱ παρθένοι

In my view, the young women are delinquent regarding marriage

Arist. *Rh.* 3.1411a18–20

καὶ τὸ Ἀναξανδρίδου ἱαμβεῖον ὑπὲρ τῶν θυγατέρων πρὸς τὸν γάμον ἐγχρονίζουσιν,

---

Ἀναξανδρίδου A: ἀλεξανδρου F: ἀλεξανδρίμου D

And Anaxandrides' iambic verse about the daughters delaying in regard to marriage,

---

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

υ υ υ υ — — | — υ — — υ —

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.200; 1847. 593; Bothe 1855. 434; Kock 1884 II.162; Cooper 1920. 50 with n. 2; Edmonds 1959 II.78–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.275; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 273

**Citation context** Aristotle cites this line as one example of a metaphor; all his other examples in this section of the *Rhetoric* are drawn from oratory. By ἱαμβεῖον, Aristotle simply means 'an iambic trimeter', i. e. a line of dialogue from drama; cf. *Rh.* 3.1404a31, 1406b3; Dover 1987. 99–100; Vahlen 1914. 151 (271).

**Interpretation** Aristotle's introduction to the fragment suggests that he was recalling the original context (which he presumably assumed his readers would also recall) and that the speaker was referring to his own daughters or perhaps those of another character in the play. Cooper's suggestion (1920. 50 n. 2) that the play had a mythological plot and the daughters were those of Danaus is sheer speculation. Cope–Sandys 1877 on Arist. *Rh.* 3.1411a18–19 suggest that Aristotle is speaking more generally by using τῶν θυγατέρων in a manner similar to that at e. g. *Ev. Luc.* 23:28 θυγατέρες Ἱερουσαλήμ. The analogous use of υἱός (e. g. *H. Il.* 1.162 υἱὲς Ἀχαιῶν) is mainly poetic, while that



τῶν γάμων The plural normally has the sense 'wedding celebrations', not 'marriages'; cf. Bers 1984. 28–34.

**Citation context** The first 94 chapters of Pollux Book 5 concern a wide variety of vocabulary relating to animals; 5.16 concerns the names for animal pelts. Pollux provides a list of examples with the same formation as the words in the fragment, including four of the five found there (not *κυνῆ*), and then cites the fragment as evidence. A few examples of words for pelts that are formed differently (*νεβρίς*, *αἰγίς*, *κώδιον*) follow.

**Interpretation** The list contains a group of lavish items, possibly for use as carpets or the like (cf. Nonn. *D.* 16.95–99) or as trophies, but more likely as clothing marking (mock?) heroic status. The use of skins as clothing is often indicative of rustic status (cf. West 1978 on Hes. *Op.* 543–6; Gow 1952 on Theocr. 3.25; Blaydes 1890b on Ar. *Nu.* 72; Stone 1984. 181); Braswell 1988 on Pi. *P.* 4.81 offers a corrective to this view, rightly noting that such garments are just as often associated with heroes. The enumeration degenerates from fearsome and dangerous (and thus difficult to kill) animals at the beginning, to timid and slavish animals at the end; what starts as praise, presumably of the hunter's prowess or the owner's means of acquiring such exotic pelts, thus ends with a tone of mockery. For similar lists of animals, cf. Spyropoulos 1974. 68–9.

The form of these words is simply the feminine of a three-termination adjective in -οῦς, -ῆ, -οῦν; examples of the other two genders for the words are not necessarily attested. Terms for the hides of various animals may have retained the feeling of adjectives (with δορά *vel sim.* understood); alternatively, they may have been thought of as substantives (e.g. κυνῆ in its normal sense 'cap' or 'helmet').

**ἄρκτιῆ** The word is attested only here in Greek literature; cf. Hsch. α 7282 ἄρκτιῆ· ἡ τῆς ἄρκτου δορά, presumably a gloss on this passage (like the lexicographic entries on λεοντῆ and παρδαλῆ; cf. below). Bears are first mentioned at H. *Od.* 11.611 (where depicted together with boars and lions on Herakles' baldrick), but are unlikely to have existed in the historical period south of the northern mountains of modern Greece, i.e. in Epirus, Macedonia, and Thrace; like lions and leopards, they were thus outside the experience of most people and to some degree fantastic.<sup>152</sup> Cf. *hAphr.* 71; X. *Cyn.* 11.1 λέοντες δὲ καὶ παρδάλεις, λύγκες, πάνθηρες, ἄρκτοι καὶ τᾶλλα ὅσα ἐστὶ τοιαῦτα θηρία ἀλίσκεται ἐν ξέναις χώραις περὶ τὸ Πάγγαιον ὄρος καὶ τὸν Κίττον τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς Μακεδονίας, τὰ δ' ἐν τῷ Ὀλύμπῳ τῷ Μυσίῳ καὶ ἐν Πίνδῳ, κτλ. (bears are also associated with lions and leopards at e.g. *Cyr.* 1.4.7); Keller 1909 I.175–81; Wellmann 1896.

<sup>152</sup> Paus. 1.32.1, which describes Parnes as παρεχομένη θήραν συῶν ἀγρίων καὶ ἄρκτων, is presumably not based on personal experience, since it is unlikely that Pausanias visited the mountains himself, and may simply be an attempt to characterize the mountains as wild or remote places; thus, there seems little reason to grant credence to the claim. Although few Athenians would have encountered bears even occasionally, the animals did form an integral part of the worship of Artemis Brauronia; cf. Henderson 1987 on Ar. *Lys.* 645; K-A on fr. 386.

The orthography of ἄρκτος (as opposed to ἄρκος) was disputed in antiquity; cf. Phot. α 2824 (cf. 2265, 2826) ἄρκτος· τὸ θηρίον σὺν τῷ τ with Theodoridis 1982 *ad loc.*; Crönert 1903. 87 n. 1.

**λεοντῆ** Cf. Phot. λ 187 λεοντῆ· ἡ δορὰ τοῦ λέοντος with Theodoridis 2012 *ad loc.*, to which add Hsch. λ 646 λεόντειος δορὰ· τὸ δέρμα αὐτοῦ (so Latte) with Schmidt's (λ 649) emendation to λεοντῆ· λέοντος δορὰ. References to lionskins are not uncommon, primarily because of the association with Herakles (e.g. Hdt. 4.8.3; Ar. *Ra.* 46, 430; cf. Pl. *Cra.* 411a); for an association of lionskins with leopardskins, cf. Hdt. 7.69.1 Αἰθίοπες δὲ παρδαλέας τε καὶ λεοντέας ἐνναμένοι. Lions usually represent heroic qualities (cf. Lonsdale 1990, esp. 39–70; Schnapp-Gourbeillon 1981. 38–63) and are common throughout Greek literature, but by the historical period were extinct in Greece, although known in Thrace (cf. How–Wells 1912 on Hdt. 7.125–6), Asia Minor and Africa; cf. Usener 1994; Sallares 1991. 401, 502 n. 18; Keller 1909. 1.24–61; Janko 1992 on H. *Il.* 15.586–8 (where for *JHS* 109 read *JHS* 99).

**παρδαλῆ** Cf. [Hdn.] *Philet.* 46 παρδαλῆ τὸ τῆς παρδάλεως δέρμα, ὡς λεοντῆ καὶ ἰξαλῆ, τὸ τῆς αἰγός, καὶ μοσχῆ· ἄρνέα δὲ καὶ λυκέα; Hsch. π 741 παρδαλέην· παρδάλεως δορὰν; *EM* p. 652.35–8 καὶ τὸ θηλυκόν, παρδαλέη παρδαλῆ, ἐπὶ τῆς δορᾶς, ὥσπερ λεοντέη λεοντῆ· καὶ τὴν παρδαλέαν τὴν παρδαλῆν, ὡς τὴν λεοντῆν; Σ<sup>bT1</sup> H. *Il.* 10.29 (cf. Σ<sup>A</sup>) παρδαλέη· τὸ μὲν ζῶον πόρδαλις,<sup>153</sup> ἡ δὲ δορὰ παρδαλῆ; Σ<sup>REF</sup> Ar. *Av.* 1250 (cf. Σ<sup>r2</sup>) παρδαλᾶς· παρδάλεων δορὰς. In high poetry, wearing a leopard skin is the mark of a hero (H. *Il.* 3.17 [Paris; but cf. Krieter-Spiro 2009 *ad loc.*]; 10.29 [Menelaos]; Pi. *P.* 4.81 [Jason]; cf. S. fr. 11), while at Ar. *Av.* 1250 it is apparently connected with the giants (cf. Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.*). Eust. p. 374.44–6 (on H. *Il.* 3.17) notes the existence of a proverb about wearing a leopard-skin (ἰστέον δὲ καί, ὅτι παροιμιωδῶς παρὰ τοῖς ὕστερον παρδαλέην ἐνεῖσθαι λέγεται ὁ ποικίλος τὸν τρόπον καὶ οἶον πολύστικτος τὸ ἥθος κατὰ τὴν πάρδαλιν), although it is unclear what literary sources, if any, he is drawing on, and he may simply be deriving the idea from the character of Paris (here wearing a leopardskin). The leopard, like the panther, apparently never existed in Greece but was confined to Asia and Africa, so that most knowledge of such animals will have been derived from the importation of the skins as a luxury good; cf. Dover 1968 on Ar. *Nu.* 347; Keller 1909 I.62–4; Wotke–Jereb 1949.

<sup>153</sup> For the orthography, cf. Ael. Dion. π 18 πάρδαλιν· Ἀττικοί, πόρδαλιν· Ἰωνες; *EM* p. 652.28 πάρδαλις· πότε πόρδαλις, καὶ πότε πάρδαλις; Erbse 1969–1988 on Σ H. *Il.* 10.29. Hsch. π 3009 πόρδαλις· ὁ ἄρσην, ἡ δὲ θήλεια πάρδαλις. ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ προαλέσθαι· ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ παράλεσθαι is a mistaken attempt to make sense of the discrepancy, which is probably dialectal; cf. Buck 1955. 20.

**μοσχῆ** The word occurs only here, although the adjective μόσχειος appears occasionally with the sense ‘leather’; e.g. X. *Cyn.* 2.9 κυνοῦχος μόσχειος (a calf-skin bag); *Eq.* 12.7 (used to protect the place under one’s arm near the breastplate; cf. Plb. 6.23.3 [covering for a Roman shield]). The point here, as with κυνῆ, is presumably that the calf is a common as well as a timid and easily killed animal.

**κυνῆ** The word is common throughout Greek literature (first at H. *Il.* 3.16; in comedy at e.g. Ar. *Nu.* with Blaydes 1890b *ad loc.*; V. 445; *Av.* 1203 with Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.*; fr. 559) with the meaning ‘hat’ or ‘helmet’, and would be interpreted thus here, did the preceding words not clearly refer to pelts. The word continues the mocking tone begun by μοσχῆ and adds a final absurd element. For dogs, see on fr. 40.8.

fr. 69 K.-A. (66 K.)

οὐχὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς ἡ χάρις τίκτει χάριν

habet L

Among most a favor does not produce a favor

Stob. 2.46.5

(περὶ ἀχαριστίας) Ἀναξανδρίδου. —

Ἀναξανδρίδου Gaisford (?)<sup>154</sup>; Σοφοκλέους L (vid. infra)

(On ungraciousness) Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

—υ—υ— —|—υ— —υ—υ—

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.200; 1847. 592; Bothe 1855. 434; Meineke 1857 V.clxxx, 81; Herwerden 1868. 27–8; Kock 1884 II.162; 1888 III.737; Nauck 1894. 93; Edmonds 1959 II.78–9; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.276; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 273

<sup>154</sup> Gaisford was the first to print the readings of this ms. (without critical notes), but he may have been anticipated in making this correction, since the ms. and at least some of its readings were known and were the subject of discussion prior to Gaisford’s edition (cf. Wachsmuth 1882. 1–2). The lack of a note in Gaisford’s edition apparently led Meineke to the erroneous conclusion that Ἀναξανδρίδου is in fact the ms. reading.

**Citation context** The fragment is quoted near the beginning of Stobaeus' chapter 'On ungraciousness' (2.46) in the midst of a group of quotations from Sophocles: *OT* 611–12 (deleted by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990a [cf. 1990b *ad loc.*]); *Ai.* 522–4, 1267 precede, and fr. 920 follows. The ascription of the fragment to Anaxandrides is problematic. The lemmata for Stob. 2.46.4–8 all seem to be displaced in the manuscripts; the universally adopted solution is to move the lemma of 2.46.8 (τοῦ αὐτοῦ) to 2.46.4, which results in the displacement of the lemmata for 2.46.4–7 (cf. Wachsmuth *ad loc.*). This transposition restores 2.46.4 (S. *Ai.* 1267) to Sophocles and 2.46.7 (Theocr. 5.38) to Theocritus; there is some indirect evidence that 2.46.8 (Men. fr. 700) belongs to Menander,<sup>155</sup> but there is no external control on the authorship of the two other citations (this fragment and S. fr. 920). The assignment of these quotations thus depends on the plausible assumption that the section of Stobaeus is sound aside from a slight dislocation of lemmata.

The question of the authorship of the fragment is further complicated by the fact that the line is repeated at Stob. 2.46.21 (with οὐ in place of οὐχι), where the lemma reads Ἀπολλώνιος Νουμηνίω. Van Herwerden 1868. 27–8 emended to Εὐπολις Νουμηνίαις, since Eupolis alone is known to have written a comedy with this title and no comic poet Apollonius is otherwise known;<sup>156</sup> he does not note that the preceding lemma, Ἀπολλώνιος Ἡρωδιανῶ (apparently not included among the fragments of Apollonius Tyanensis [cf. below] or any other Apollonius), may have contributed to the assumed corruption. The obvious objection to van Herwerden's arguments is that this Apollonius need not be a comic poet, and a prose quotation with the attribution Ἀπολλώνιος Νουμηνίω is in fact cited at Stob. 4.56.35 (Ap. Ty. fr. 93); less likely is reversing the word order to Νουμήνιος † Ἀπολλωνίω †,<sup>157</sup> converting this into a

<sup>155</sup> Men. fr. 700 also occurs in a gnomology (*POxy* XLII 3005.2–3; cf. Men. fr. 907) that appears to be composed entirely of quotations from Menander; such a gnomology is poorly paralleled (cf. Parsons [ed. pr.] *ad loc.*, but note the Appendix euripidea from the florilegium of Orion [cf. Haffner 2001. 20–2]). The decision of Kassel-Austin to print *POxy* XLII 3005 with the otherwise identifiable quotations removed as Men. fr. 907 is unfortunate; it obscures the nature of the document and treats as a single fragment what should be a score.

<sup>156</sup> *POxy* XXXIII 2659, a papyrus discovered subsequent to van Herwerden, attributes a play entitled [ - - - ] ἐπικλητος to a certain [Ἀπο]λλώνιος; nothing more is known about the man, and the possibility remains that the attribution is the result of corruption (cf. Apollod. fr. 16).

<sup>157</sup> The only known works of Numenius are Ἀλιευτικόν (SH 568–88), Θηριακόν (SH 589–94), a work περὶ δειπνῶν (SH 596), and possibly a work that discussed remedies for gout (SH 595).

reference to the poet Numenius. The second main thrust of van Herwerden's argument is that the apparent allusion to S. *Ai.* 522 (see below) is more appropriate for Eupolis than Anaxandrides; in addition to emending Ἀπολλώνιος to Εὐπολῖς at Stob. 2.46.21, he thus denies that Stob. 2.46.5 should be attributed to Anaxandrides. Van Herwerden's reasoning has some merit, but it is not impossible either that Anaxandrides alluded to a line of Sophocles or that he repeated a line of Eupolis. It is true that Anaxandrides does not quote or allude elsewhere to specific lines of fifth-century comedy or tragedy other than Euripides, but this is not unusual among the comic fragments and should not be taken as determinative. The difficulties concerning the attribution of the fragment are most likely simply due to the fact that it is a memorable expression of a commonplace thought that figured in a variety of anthologies at ever greater remove from the original source and was thus increasingly liable to corruption.

**Interpretation** A cynical comment on human nature, which nonetheless leaves open the possibility of an exception in the present case.

**παρὰ πολλοῖς** Supply ἀνθρώποις *vel sim.* Except when purely spatial, παρὰ with the dative refers only to persons, so Edmonds' 'in favors' will not do. Although παρὰ with the dative is common in all genres, παρὰ πολλοῖς is rare and predominantly prosaic (e.g. Isoc. 15.87; Pl. *Lg.* 10.888e; Arist. *Pol.* 3.1278a29).

**ἡ χάρις τίκτει χάριν** The phrase has often been understood as an allusion to or reminiscence of S. *Ai.* 522 χάρις χάριν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ τίκτους' ἀεί. While the resemblance is fairly close, the sentiment is commonplace and such formulations are not unusual; e.g. Zen. 3.28 δίκη δίκην ἔτικτε καὶ βλάβην βλάβῃ (cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin 1839 *ad loc.* for further instances, but correct Apostol. 7.9 to 6.9); Apostol. 7.94a ἔρις ἔριν τίκτουςα προσμνᾶται λόγον (*Suda* ε 3008; Mant. 1.60; cf. Mant. 1.59 ἔρις ἔριν ἀντιφυτεύει); S. *OC* 779 ὅτ' ἡ χάρις χάριν φέροι; E. *Hel.* 1234 χάρις γὰρ ἀντὶ χάριτος ἐλθέτω.<sup>158</sup> The phraseology may thus owe as much if not more to proverbial language as to Sophocles, and indeed *Ai.* 522 itself is labeled a γνώμη by Σ<sup>HH</sup> *ad loc.* Admittedly, many items in the paroemiographers may have become proverbial because they were well-

<sup>158</sup> Lobeck 1809 on S. *Ai.* 522, followed by Bothe 1826 (who credits Lobeck) and Kamerbeek 1953 (who does not), adduced Sen. *Ben.* 2.12 *gratia gratiam parit*; unfortunately, such a phrase seems not to occur at Sen. *Ben.* 2.12 or elsewhere in Seneca or indeed anywhere in Latin literature so far as I have been able to ascertain. The earliest occurrence of the phrase of which I am aware is Lehmann 1630. 117 (Danck #5), where no source is given, but there may be others.

known poetic texts, but in this instance the phraseology is so widespread that it is difficult to believe that Anaxandrides is alluding to any specific text. For χάρις, see MacLachlan 1993.

## fr. 70 K.-A. (69 K.)

ὥς δεῖ παχεῖαν τὴν περιζώστραν ἔχειν

habent FS, A

εἶρηκεν ... τὴν περιζώστραν om. F      δεῖ S: δὲ A: δὴ Reisig      ἔχειν FS: ἔχει A

that it is necessary to have the apron which is thick

Poll. 2.166

Ἀναξανδρίδης δὲ καὶ περιζώστραν εἶρηκεν. —. δῆλον ὅτι τὴν ζώνην, ἣν Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσι φασκίαν

Anaxandrides used also the word ‘apron’: —. It is clear that [this means] the belt, which the Romans call *fascia*

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — — | — — — — —

**Discussion** Toup 1790 IV.364–5; Reisig 1816. 291; Meineke 1840 III.202; 1847. 594; Bothe 1855. 435; Kock 1884 II.162; Blaydes 1890a. 84; 1896. 126; Herwerden 1903. 101; Pickard-Cambridge 1953. 234 n. 2; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.276; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 273

**Citation context** The bulk (2.22–236) of Pollux Book 2 is concerned with body parts; the section on ribs contains a short digression on the words for belts and similar objects that fasten around the body under the ribs. The fragment is cited as evidence for the word *perizōstra*, apparently a sort of apron. Cf. Poll. 7.65 τὸ δὲ τῶν μαστῶν τῶν γυναικείων ζῶμα ταινίαν ὠνόμαζον ἢ ταινίδιον, τὸ δὲ περὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ περιζῶμα ἢ περιζώστραν (‘The belt for women’s breasts they called a “band” or a “little band”, the one around the belly a “girdle” or an “apron”’), which may be another echo of this fragment.

**Text** δεῖ and δὴ are equally plausible, but in the absence of any context, there is no compelling reason to emend. If Reisig’s δὴ (1816. 291) is printed in place of δεῖ (for the collocation ὥς δὴ, e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 693; *Pl.* 891; Antiph. fr. 5.1), it is perhaps best to also accept A’s ἔχει (thus Meineke, Kock, Edmonds) and understand the sentence as an exclamation; less likely with the adoption

of δῆ is to retain ἔχειν (with FS) and understand this as a consecutive clause (cf. Goodwin 1890 §§608–9).

**Interpretation** The line may belong to a cook cataloguing his equipment or specifying his needs, although this depends on interpreting the word *perizōstra* as ‘apron’, which is not unproblematic. It might also belong to a scene in which characters describe what will be necessary for a disguise (as a woman or a cook?).

ὥς δεῖ ... ἔχειν The line could be construed in several different ways (see on Text). As printed, it is perfectly intelligible as either an independent or a dependent sentence.

**παχεῖαν** παχύς with a positive sense is used frequently to describe food (e.g. Ephipp. fr. 3.7; Nicostr. Com. fr. 13.2; Archestr. fr. 18.1 [SH 148] with Olson–Sens 2000 *ad loc.*) and occasionally people (e.g. Ar. Pax 639; cf. Taillardat 1965 §543).<sup>159</sup> Far less common is the application of the word to clothing (Theopomp. Com. fr. 11 χλαῖναν <δέ> σοι / λαβὼν παχεῖαν ἐπιβαλὼν Λακωνικήν; Pl. Cra. 389b λεπτῷ ἱματίῳ ἢ παχεῖ; Thphr. Char. 19.6), although in this case too it presumably refers to desirable qualities. The predicative position of the word makes it emphatic, so the point is not so much that it is necessary to have an apron, but that one ought to have one that is thick.

**τὴν περιζώστραν** The word appears only here and in the discussion of Pollux, who is vague and apparently confused about precisely what the garment is. At 7.65 he distinguishes the περιζώστρα from the ταινία, which is wrapped around women’s breasts, and equates it with the περιζώμα, which is wrapped around the belly; he does not specify that the περιζώστρα is a woman’s garment, but that seems to be the implication. At 2.166, he equates it with the Latin *fascia*, which can refer to two distinct items. The first, a band wrapped around a woman’s breasts (cf. TLL s.v. I.A.b), is ruled out by Pollux’ statement at 7.65, whereas the second, a band wrapped around the lower legs of men (cf. TLL s.v. I.A.c), does not correspond to the implication that it was worn by women and, more important, the claim that it was wrapped around the belly. Perhaps the best way to reconcile the conflicting evidence is to assume that the word refers to something wrapped around the waist but coming down over the legs, i.e. an apron; for the problems associated with this interpretation, see on fr. 42.12.<sup>160</sup>

<sup>159</sup> For its use with a pejorative sense, cf. Ar. Nu. 842; Taillardat 1965 §469.

<sup>160</sup> Pickard-Cambridge 1953. 222 n. 6 understands the fragment as a reference to padding worn by the comic actor; cf. Beare 1954. 68–9. Such metatheatrical self-referentiality is very uncommon in the remains of comedy from this period, but cf. Alex. fr. 103.12–15 with Arnott 1996 *ad loc.*



## fr. 71 K.-A. (CGFP 2; Alexand. Com. fr. 5 K.)

ταμειῖον ἀρετῆς ἐστὶ γενναία γυνή

habent SMA (Stob.), pap.; cf. [Men.] *Mon.* 744; Clem. Al. *Paed.* 3.11.67

ταμειον pap.: ταμειον SMA      γενναία SMA: ἀνδρεία Clem. Al.: σώφρων [Men.]  
(em. Meineke: σωφροσύνη μόνη mss.)

A noble wife is a storehouse of virtue

BKTV(2).9773 (= Pack<sup>2</sup> 1573)

Ἀναξαν[δρίδου] —

Anaxan[drides:] —

Stob. 4.22.4

(ὅτι κάλλιστον ὁ γάμος) Ἀναξανδρίδου —

Ἀλεξάνδρου MA (om. S; corr. Dobree)

(That marriage is best) Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

υ υ — υ υ — — | — υ — υ — υ —

**Discussion** Grotius 1623 II.276–7; Meineke 1839 I.370; 1841 IV.554 (Alexand. Com. inc. fr. 1); 1847. 1164; Bothe 1855. 705–6 (Alexand. Com. inc. fr. 1); Meineke 1857 V.clxxx; Kock 1888 III.373 (Alexand. Com. fr. 5); Edmonds 1959 II.80–1 (cf. 1961 III.312 [Alexand. Com. fr. 10 dub.]); Austin 1973. 2; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.276; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 273

**Citation context** Prior to the publication of BKTV(2). 9773<sup>161</sup> in 1907, scholars generally followed Stobaeus and assigned this fragment to Alexander, although there was occasional dissent (Dobree 1833 II.280 suggested Anaxandrides; Naeke 1842–1845 I.11, Alexander Aetolus (*TrGF* 101);<sup>162</sup> Gaisford, Euripides' *Alexander*). Several variations of the line occur: [Men.] *Mon.* 744 ταμειῖον ἀρετῆς ἐστὶν ἡ σώφρων γυνή (thus Meineke; cf. app. crit. above); Stob. 3.5.5

<sup>161</sup> The papyrus is a fragment of an anthology composed, at least in the extant portion, of a selection of passages that defend women and a selection that attack them. For discussion of the papyrus and fragments of other similar, thematically arranged anthologies, together with the suggestion that such fragments may originally have belonged to anthologies akin to Stobaeus in terms of scope, see Barns 1951.

<sup>162</sup> Note Naeke's characterization of the line as 'Euripide vel Euripidea aetate dignus'.

Μενάνδρου· ταμειῖον ἐστὶν ἀρετῆς ἢ σωφρονσύνης; Clem. Al. *Paed.* 3.11.67 ταμειῖον ἀρετῆς ἐστὶν ἀνδρεία γυνή (without attribution). These three occurrences (accepting Meineke's emendation of [Men.] *Mon.* 744 and similar emendation of Stob. 3.5.5) and the Anaxandrides quotation are all clearly versions of the same gnomic statement. The variation between the approximate synonyms γενναία, σώφρων, and ἀνδρεία<sup>163</sup> can be accounted for in one of three ways: Anaxandrides used (with or without varying it) a conventional saying itself already subject to variation; Anaxandrides coined the phrase, and it subsequently took on a life of its own as a conventional saying with the possibility for variation that entails; or the variation is the result of corruption, presumably abetted by the fact that the line has a complicated textual tradition involving passage through a variety of anthologies.

**Text** In the absence of more complete knowledge of the context and origin of the line, it is best to retain Stobaeus' γενναία, since this is the adjective used in the version specifically attributed to Anaxandrides. Although the word has a good Euripidean parallel (*Tr.* 1013), it seems flat. A more striking choice is Clement's ἀνδρεία; the collocation ἀνδρεία γυνή is both unusual (but cf. Arist. *Pol.* 3.1277b22 [cf. *Po.* 1454a23–4]; Ar. *Lys.* 1108 ὁ πασῶν ἀνδρειοτάτη [said of Lysistrata]), hence susceptible to corruption, and the sort of word-play in which Anaxandrides sometimes indulges. But immediately after quoting this line, Clement quotes extensively from *Proverbs* and may thus have been influenced by *Prov.* 12:5 γυνὴ ἀνδρεία στέφανος τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς.

ταμειῖον (pap.), as opposed to ταμειῖον (Stob.), is the classical form; cf. Men. *Sam.* 229 (metrically guaranteed); Threatte 1980. I.416–18; Crönert 1903. 34–5.

**Interpretation** Standing in isolation, and as presented in the anthologies, the line is a stock piece of moralizing, although it might have been much more pointed in its original context (e.g. said sarcastically in reference to a specific character or women in general).

**ταμειῖον** The word can refer to an actual receptacle or storehouse (e.g. Pl. *R.* 416d; Men. *Sam.* 229) or to something used as such on an *ad hoc* basis (Th. 7.24.2), or may have an abstract sense (Th. 1.96.2 ταμειῖον τε Δῆλος ἦν αὐτοῖς); for its metaphorical use (not in LSJ), as here, cf. Democr. *SVF* 68 F 149; Anaxandr. fr. 81 (= Diph. fr. 134); Phoenicid. fr. 3.4; Phryn. *PS* p. 130.5–6.

**γενναία γυνή** Cf. E. *Tr.* 1013 (same metrical position). The adjective is a term of general commendation (cf. Dover 1974. 95 'an extremely general term') common throughout Greek literature, both poetry and prose.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Hsch. α 4736 ἀνδρείων· γενναίων; γ 354 γενναῖος· ἀνδρεῖος (cf. Latte 1953 *ad loc.*).

## fr. 72 K.-A. (70 K.)

τρίκλινον δ' εὐθέως συνήγετο  
καὶ συναυλίας γερόντων

habent CE

1 <εἰς> τρίκλινον Blaydes

a three-man dinner party was quickly gathered  
and symphonies of old men

Ath. 2.48a

Ἀναξανδρίδης: —

Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Trochaic tetrameter catalectic.

<—υ—x —υ>—υ— | —υ—υ —υ—  
—υ—υ —υ— | <—υ—x —υ—x>

**Discussion** Jacobs 1809. 41; Meineke 1840 III.201; 1847. 593; Bothe 1855. 434; Kock 1884 II.162; Blaydes 1896. 126; Herwerden 1903. 101; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.276; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 274

**Citation context** The fragment is quoted in the epitome of Athenaeus as part of a short collection of examples that denote the size of rooms in terms of how many couches they can accommodate (2.47f–8a); Antiph. fr. 292; Phryn. Com. fr. 69; Eub. fr. 119.1–3; Amphis fr. 45 precede. Adesp. trag. *TGrF* F 90 follows immediately, with no indication that the subject has changed or attribution of authorship; in the complete version of Athenaeus, one of the interlocutors must have said something that gave rise to the quotation of adesp. trag. *TGrF* F 90, which in turn led to a discussion of bed-coverings.

**Text** Blaydes 1896. 126, citing Antiph. fr. 292, suggested <εἰς> τρίκλινον and thus retained the normal meaning of the word (see below). But his supplement introduces numerous problems of its own (e.g. συναυλίας must be emended to create a singular subject [the position of δέ excludes the possibility that it occurred in the lost portion of 1] if the verb is passive, or to create an object if the verb is middle) and ought to be rejected.

**Interpretation** A symposium is being described; the events referred to presumably occurred offstage and are only now being related (note the past tense of συνήγετο; cf. Ar. V. 1299–1325). The involvement of old men and their

possible ignorance of symposium-etiquette (cf. on συναυλία) might suggest a group such as that apparently found in *Agroikoi* or *Gerontomania*, although the fragment is too brief to be conclusive in this regard and such characteristics are found in other groups as well.

**τρίκλινον** The word is probably best taken ‘dinner-party’<sup>164</sup> by metonymy, as at Arched. fr. 2.12; Men. fr. 186.1 (cf. Gomme–Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.* [their fr. 208–9.4]), in contrast to the normal meaning ‘three-couch room’. For the use of τρίκλινον and related compounds to designate rooms of differing sizes, cf. fr. 42.11 with n.; McCartney 1934; *Olynthus* XII.349–51 n. 111;<sup>165</sup> *Olynthus* VIII.173–4. For the κλίνη, cf. Pritchett 1956. 226–33; Richter 1926. 54–71; Olson–Sens 2000 on Archestr. fr. 4.1 (*SH* 191).

**συνήγετο** Cf. on fr. 2.1.

**2 συναυλία** The word presumably refers to a musical performance involving more than one instrument, but the precise meaning is unclear and was disputed already in antiquity; cf. Semus *FHG* 4.494 fr. 10 ἀγνοουμένης δὲ παρὰ πολλοῖς τῆς συναυλίας; K.-A. on Antiph. fr. 49.1. It was reportedly used of three different sorts of musical events: (1) ὅταν δύο ἀύληται τὸ αὐτὸ ἀύλωσιν (Σ<sup>VEΓΘ</sup> Ar. Eq. 9; cf. Hsch. ξ 125; Phot. ξ 50); (2) ὅταν κιθάρα καὶ ἀύλὸς συμφωνῇ (Σ<sup>VEΓΘ</sup> Ar. Eq. 9); (3) ἢν τις ἀγὼν συμφωνίας ἀμοιβαῖος ἀύλου καὶ ῥυθμοῦ, χωρὶς λόγου τοῦ προσμελωδοῦντος (Semus *FHG* IV.494 fr. 10). On occasion, the word was also used metaphorically; cf. A. *Th.* 839 (see Σ *ad loc.*);<sup>166</sup> Hemsterhuis 1743 on Luc. *DMar.* 3.2,<sup>167</sup> who offers the definition ‘quum duo pluresve in eandem rem consentiunt, ac mutuis animorum studiis conspirant’. The matter is further complicated by the existence of a homograph (LSJ s. v. συναυλία B) derived from αὐλή (for the related derivatives, cf. Chantraine 1968–1980 s. v. αὐλή), which seemingly occurs prior to the Roman period only at Arist. *Pol.* 7.1335a38, where it is synonymous with σύζευξις. The main difficulty here is which word is used; a related problem is in which sense the word is used, if συναυλία A is intended.

<sup>164</sup> Edmonds translates ‘couches three’, apparently thinking of Amphis fr. 45 (cf. LSJ s. v. τρίκλινος II.3 ‘set of three couches’). But this meaning is unnecessary in either fragment and impossible at *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1097.29–30 (= *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2499), the third citation adduced by LSJ.

<sup>165</sup> Pritchett 1956. 227 is rightly sceptical of Robinson’s claim (*Olynthus* XII.350) that ‘the τρικλίνιον ... was probably most common’.

<sup>166</sup> While the use here is striking, it follows from ἔτευξα τύμβῳ μέλος at 835; cf. Hutchinson 1985 *ad loc.*

<sup>167</sup> Hemsterhuis’ learned note (rightly lauded by Pearson 1917 on S. fr. 60) is unfortunately predicated on an incorrect reading (συναναμίγωσσο: ξυναλία [ξυναυλία L] μίγνυσο β).

Stephanus (reading the vulgate συναλῖαι γέροντι [a misreading of the manuscripts]) and Casaubon (reading συναλῖαι γερόντων [unaware of the true manuscript reading, he corrected the mistaken vulgate by conjecture]), followed by Hemsterhuis 1743 on Luc. *DMar.* 3.2, believed this was an occurrence of συναλῖα B, although unlike at Arist. *Pol.* 7.1335a38, where the word is used quasi-metaphorically of marriage, here it must either be used metaphorically of groups or must retain a literal sense and refer to the old men sharing the room. Since this word is exceedingly rare and, more important, must in this case be used in an otherwise unattested sense, συναλῖα A ought to be preferred. But the precise sense of the word here, and whether or not it is intended metaphorically, cannot be determined.

## fr. 73 K.-A. (71 K.)

χοῦς κεκραμένος

ψυθίου

habent CE

1 κεκραμένου Bothe      2 ψιθίου C

a mixed chous

of psythian (wine)

Ath. 1.28f

καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης. —

Also Anaxandrides: —

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

⟨x—υ— x—υ— υ—υ—  
υ—υ—⟨υ— x—υ— x—υ—⟩

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.201; 1847. 593; Bothe 1855. 434; Kock 1884 II.163; Blaydes 1896. 126, 333; Herwerden 1903. 101; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.277; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 274

**Citation context** In the course of a discussion (1.28d–33f) of different varieties of wine, predominantly regional wines, the epitome of Athenaeus quotes the fragment as one of two authorities for psythian wine; Eub. fr. 136 precedes.

**Text** Bothe 1855. 434 suggested with some plausibility reading κεκραμένου, since it is the wine that is mixed, not the chous; cf. esp. Men. *Her.* fr. 4 Sandbach

(fr. 3. Körte) χοῦς κεκραμένου / οἴνου. While enallage is possible, it seems out of place in what appears to be straightforward dialogue; cf. on fr. 41.37–8 (where the enallage is also unexpected).

Manuscripts of all authors using the word routinely vary between ψίθιος and ψύθιος (or between *psithius* and *psythius* in Latin), while editors invariably print ψίθιος (or *psithius*), although with no clear reason for doing so. The etymology is unknown (Beekes 2010 s.v. thinks the word is probably pre-Greek; Chantraine 1968–1980 s.v. ‘Inconnue. Ressemble a priori au dérivé d’un toponyme’), and variation between υ and ι is possible in either direction (cf. Threatte 1980 I.260–6 for discussion and parallel examples [e.g. βύβλιος/βίβλιος, for which cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 140.1]). The only solid evidence for the classical orthography is SEG IX 11.10 σταφυλὰ ψυθία, a fourth-century document from Cyrene; while one inscription from Cyrene may shed little light on Athenian orthographical habits generally, in this instance it provides the entirety of the evidence and ought to be followed.<sup>168</sup>

**Interpretation** The fragment plausibly belongs to a symposium or banquet scene but could just as easily belong to a description, comparison or much else.

1 χοῦς See on fr. 33.1.

κεκραμένος For mixing wine with various ratios of water, the normal way of consuming it, see on fr. 3.2.

2 ψυθίου ψυθία is a sort of grape (Poll. 6.82 σταφυλαί, καὶ τούτων ὀνόματα ... ψιθία; Σ Nic. *Al.* 181 ψιθία δ’ εἶδος ἀμπέλου, ἥτις καὶ πρᾶμνία λέγεται [cf. Σ 163]; Hsch. ψ 186 ψιθία· εἶδος ἀμπέλου; Columella 3.2.24; cf. Hsch. π 2806 πολλόγειος· ἡ ψιθία σταφυλή; Plin. *NH* 12.130), whence ψύθιος οἶνος (Eub. fr. 136; cf. Hsch. μ 658 μελαμψίθιος· οἶνός τις οὕτω καλεῖται; Dsc. 5.6.4). Both this wine and the related μελαμψύθιος are apparently raisin-wines;<sup>169</sup> cf. Plin. *NH* 14.80 *psithium et melampsithium passi genera sunt suo sapore, non vini*; Verg. *Georg.* 2.93; 4.269; Stat. *Silv.* 4.9.38. For what little is known about the plant itself and its cultivation, cf. *Gp.* 5.2.4 μόνη μέντοι ἡ ψιθία καὶ ἡ Κερκυραία, καὶ ἡ καλουμένη χλωρίς, λευκαὶ οὔσαι, χαίρουσι ταῖς λεπτογείοις, διὰ τὸ εἶναι λιπαρώτεραι; Hug 1959; Dalby 2000. 402.

<sup>168</sup> Latte 1966 seems to have been the only scholar willing to adopt this orthography, noting on Hsch. μ 658 ‘ubique ψυθ- scribendum’.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. the mention of ψιθία ἀσταφίς at *EM* p. 149.27. Dsc. 5.5 reports the existence of χυλὸς ὄμφακος ψιθίας σταφυλῆς μήπω περκαζούσης.

## fr. 74 K.-A. (72 K.)

Antiatt. p. 111.27

πληγὴν ἔχων· ἀντὶ τοῦ τετρωμένος. Ἀναξανδρίδης

‘Having a blow (i.e. ‘having been struck’); instead of ‘wounded’. Anaxandrides

**Metre** Iambic trimeter? (— — —)**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.201; 1847. 593; Bothe 1855. 434; Kock 1884 II.163; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.277; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 274**Interpretation** Although πληγὴν ἔχων is glossed ‘wounded’, presumably the sense is ‘having received a beating’. The construction, which expresses a verbal notion periphrastically, is poorly documented in the standard grammars;<sup>170</sup> its meaning can be either active (e.g. E. *HF* 709 with Bond 1981 *ad loc.* [cf. Willink 1986 on E. *Or.* 661]; *Ph.* 773 with Mastronarde 1994 *ad loc.*) or passive (e.g. S. *Ai.* 180 μομφὰν ἔχων; Ar. *V.* 506 with Blaydes 1893 *ad loc.*; Gildersleeve 1900–1911 §178), as here; cf. LSJ s.v. ἔχω A.I.8. The use of the phrase is a reflection of the extreme irregularity of the verbs πλήττω and τύπτω;<sup>171</sup> cf. Rutherford 1881. 257–65. The particular phrase is found nowhere else,<sup>172</sup> but may owe its genesis to the common locution πληγὴν λαμβάνω (e.g. Ar. *Ra.* 673; Cratin. fr. 92; Phyllyl. fr. 9; Men. *Dysc.* 205).

## fr. 75 K.-A. (73 K.)

*Synagoge* B α 740 = Phot. α 780ἀκολαστάσματα δὲ λέγουσι μὲν κατακόρως οἱ Ἐπικούρειοι, πλὴν καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης κέχρηται τῇ λέξει καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης [*Lys.* 398]ἀκολαστάσματα Meineke: ἀκολαστήματα *Synagoge*: ἀκολαστήματα Phot. Ἀλεξανδρίδης codd.The Epicureans make excessive use of the term ‘acts of licentiousness’, although both Anaxandrides and Aristophanes [*Lys.* 398] have used the word<sup>170</sup> E.g. Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904 I.222–3 note this construction only in terms of its ability to take a second accusative.<sup>171</sup> The Antiatticist’s entry might be a response to an Atticist attempt to deny that πληγὴν ἔχων is correct, on the basis that πέπλαγμαι exists (although the perfect passive of τύπτω does not).<sup>172</sup> The closest parallel, Ar. *Nu.* 1425 ὅσας δὲ πληγὰς εἶχομεν, is somewhat different and refers to blows received in the past rather than to a present state of having been struck.

**Metre** Uncertain (word is ◡◡—◡◡).

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.201–2; 1847. 593; Bothe 1855. 434; Meineke 1857 V.clxxx, 82; Kock 1884 II.163; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.277; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 274

**Citation context** A lexicographic notice assigned by Cunningham to Σ''.

**Text** Whether the word is ἀκολαστάσματα<sup>173</sup> (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 398: ἀκόλαστ' ἄσματα codd.) or ἀκολαστήματα (cf. Muson. fr. 4; Plu. *Crass.* 32.5; M. Ant. 11.20.5) has been disputed.<sup>174</sup> Analogy with τέχνασμα (e.g. Ar. *Th.* 198;<sup>175</sup> E. *Or.* 1053 [cf. Willink 1986 *ad loc.*]) and τέχνημα (e.g. S. *Ph.* 36; E. *IT* 1355) suggests that either form is possible. Clearly the reading at Ar. *Lys.* 398 is due simply to the failure to properly divide ἀκολαστάσματα,<sup>176</sup> which ought probably to be retained in Aristophanes and adopted here. The readings of the lexicographers are best explained as independent errors, in which the *Synagoge* mistakenly omitted a letter and created a nonexistent form, whereas Photius substituted a more common form for a less common one.

**Interpretation** Anaxandrides is cited along with Aristophanes merely as proof that the word is not confined to the Epicureans; in fact, it is extant only here and at Ar. *Lys.* 398 prior to the first century AD, and even thereafter is rare (prior to the third century AD only in the passages cited under Text). But cognate forms are common enough in comedy (e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 1348; Pl. Com. fr. 98.3; Alex. fr. 37.6) and elsewhere (e.g. E. *Or.* 973; Th. 3.37.3; Pl. *Grg.* 477e), and the meaning is clear (cf. Dover 1993. 59; Mastronarde 1994 on E. *Ph.* 971; van Leeuwen 1902a on Ar. *Av.* 1227); note Mastronarde's suggestion that the adjective ἀκόλαστος 'perhaps has a somewhat colloquial air' due to its occurrence predominantly in comedy and prose.

<sup>173</sup> DGE does not recognize this as a legitimate form of the word; LSJ, on the other hand, retain it for Anaxandrides and Aristophanes (their additional citation of Alciph. 1.38 [deleted in the Supplement] is a conjecture by Bergk).

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 37.6 and 345 Kock (interpreted by K-A as a citation of fr. 37.6) for difficulties concerning the transmission of ἀκολασία versus ἀκολαστία.

<sup>175</sup> Fritzsche emended to the more common τεχνήμασι, a poor choice on methodological grounds, as is van Leeuwen's support of the emendation in order to achieve homoioteleuton with the following line.

<sup>176</sup> Henderson prints ἀκολαστήματα on the basis of Photius.



## fr. 76 K.-A. (74 K.)

Hsch. α 4003

ἀμφίδυσις· ἐπίθετον φιάλης, παρὰ Ἀναξανδρίδῃ

Sunken on both sides. Epithet of a phiale, in Anaxandrides

**Metre** Uncertain (word is —υυυ).**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.202; 1847. 594; Bothe 1855. 435; Kock 1884 II.163; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.277; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 274**Interpretation** This seemingly straightforward lexicographic entry presents two interrelated difficulties of text and meaning; in all likelihood, the meaning was disputed already in antiquity (note that Hesychius reports only that the word describes a phiale), much like the similar ἀμφίθετος (cf. Ath. 11.500f–1d). Meineke notes that the text had been emended<sup>177</sup> to ἀμφίθετος on the basis of Hsch. α 4021 ἀμφίθετος φιάλη· ἐκατέρωθεν τίθεσθαι δυναμένη ἢ ἀμφοτέρωθεν τετορευμένη κτλ.; he argues against accepting this emendation by claiming that ἀμφίδυσις refers to a cup ‘quae ab utraque parte δύσιν seu στόμα habet’, i.e. ‘significatur ἀμφικύπελλον’. Meineke is probably correct in dismissing the emendation, although his suggested interpretation of the word differs little if at all from the meaning of ἀμφικύπελλος. Rather than being a ‘double-cup’, as LSJ and others have understood it, the word may refer to the indentation on the bottom of the phiale (i.e. the underside of the central boss that projects into the cup), which can be quite deep; note that the interpretations of ἀμφίθετος listed at Ath. 11.500f–1d nowhere claim that the word refers to a double-cup but only to one that can be set either right-side-up or upside-down. For the phiale, see on fr. 42.26.

## fr. 77 K.-A. (1 Dem.)

Phot. α 1761

ἀνδρικός καὶ ἀνδρικότατος Πλάτων [e.g. *Phdr.* 273b; *R.* 567b] καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης [e.g. *Eq.* 81], ἀνδρικότερος δὲ Ἀναξανδρίδης‘Manly’ and ‘manliest’ Plato [e.g. *Phdr.* 273b; *R.* 567b] and Aristophanes [e.g. *Eq.* 81], ‘manlier’ Anaxandrides

<sup>177</sup> Meineke does not record the author(s) of this emendation, but merely notes ‘corrigunt ἀμφίθετος’.

**Metre** Iambic trimeter? (word is —υ—υ×)

**Discussion** Demiańczuk 1912. 7; Edmonds 1959 II.80; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.277; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 274

**Interpretation** The positive form of the adjective (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 695; Eub. fr. 11.1) and the adverb (e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 379; Men. *Asp.* 382) are relatively common in comedy, the comparative (Ar. *Eq.* 81, 82, 453 [all adverbial]; V. 1077, 1199) and superlative (Ar. V. 1090; Pax 515 [adverbial]) less so; in prose, the word is common only in Plato (cf. Ammann 1953. 23). The absence of it in high poetry suggests that, like most adjectives in -ικος, it is colloquial; cf. Neil 1901 on Ar. *Eq.* 80–1. Since the word is not rare and its meaning is clear, the purpose of the entry in Photius may have been to delineate the genres in which it appears; cf. Poll. 2.20 for a similar entry.

fr. 78 K.-A. (75 K.)

Phot. τ 88

τ ἄ χ α · ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔπειτα. οὕτως Ἀναξανδρίδης

‘Quickly’, instead of ‘thereupon’; thus Anaxandrides

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.202; 1847. 594; Bothe 1855. 435; Kock 1884 II.163; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.278; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 274

**Interpretation** The equation of τάχα with ἔπειτα perhaps refers to the use of the adverb with the future indicative (usually a verb of perception) in threats; cf. Stockert 1992 on E. *IA* 311 (cf. on 970); Fraenkel 1950 on A. *Ag.* 1649; Garvie 1986 on A. *Ch.* 305.

fr. 79 K.-A. (76 K.)

Poll. 6.43

τὸ δὲ χορτάζειν Ἀριστοφάνης [*Pax* 139, 176; fr. 162] εἶρηκε, καὶ τὸ χορτάζεσθαι Ἀραρώς [fr. 21], Ἀναξανδρίδης δὲ καὶ χ ο ρ τ α σ μ ό ν

Aristophanes [*Pax* 139, 176; fr. 162] has said ‘to fatten’, and Araros [fr. 21] ‘to be fattened’, and Anaxandrides ‘a fattening up’

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.202; 1847. 594; Bothe 1855. 435; Kock 1884 II.163; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.278; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 275

**Citation context** In the course of a long section of words for ‘food’ and ‘eating’ in general (6.27–45; ‘drinking’ precedes and specific foods follow), Pollux cites Anaxandrides in a short notice on χορτάζω and its cognates.

**Interpretation** χόρτος (‘fodder’) and cognates are used properly of animal food; e.g. Hes. *Op.* 542; Pl. *R.* 372d; cf. Ar. *Pax* 139, 176. In comedy, the word is frequently used of food for men, presumably not without comic effect; cf. Ath. 3.99e–100b; Taillardat 1965 §133 (cf. §779); Handley 1965 on Men. *Dysc.* 424; Bergk 1838. 157. χορτασμός is attested only here; for the formation, cf. Kühner–Blass 1890–1892 II.272–3.

#### fr. 80 K.-A. (77 K.)

Ath. 2.57e

διὰ τεσσάρων δ' αὐτὰ προενήνεκται Ἀναξανδρίδης ᾠήματα εἰπών

Anaxandrides, saying ‘e g g l e t s’, has extended the word [eggs] through four (syllables)

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.201; 1847. 593; Bothe 1855. 434; Kock 1884 II.163; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.278; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 275

**Citation context** The epitome of Athenaeus cites the fragment in the course of a collection of quotations concerning eggs (2.57d–8b); the passing reference to Anaxandrides falls between Semon. iamb. fr. 11 and Ephipp. fr. 24.2–3.

**Interpretation** For eggs, see on fr. 42.59; for diminutives in –άριον, see on fr. 28.4 καριδίων. Kramer 1983. 118 interprets the word at Ephipp. fr. 24 as ‘cups’, against Ath. 2.57e, by adducing *BGU* 781.5.6; Hsch κ 4335. If he is correct, the same is probably true here as well, although this would imply that Athenaeus has seriously misunderstood or grossly misrepresented his source, unless the fault lies with the epitomizer. Bothe’s interpretation (1855. 434) of Athenaeus’ statement, ‘morem quattuor ova simul apponendi in conviviis dicere videtur’, is an unfortunate lapse.

## fr. 80a

Phot. v 96 = *Suda* v 143

νέκταρ, θεῶν πόμα, καὶ οἶνος οὕτως, ὡς Ἀναξανδρίδης. καὶ βρώμα τῶν θεῶν· ὁ αὐτός (fr. 58.1)

N e c t a r, a drink of the gods, and thus wine, as Anaxandrides (says). And food of the gods, (as) the same author (says) (fr. 58.1)

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** See on fr. 58 (although none recognize this as a separate fragment)

**Citation context** The lexicographic entry cites Anaxandrides twice for two mutually exclusive meanings of the ‘nectar’. Only the second is appropriate for fr. 58.1, so the first must be a separate fragment; see on fr. 58.

**Interpretation** For nectar as a metaphor for wine, see Arnott 1996 on Alex. fr. 124.2–3; in general, see on fr. 58.1.



dicat, quod filiae conlocandae occasionem invenerit: semper enim puellam parentibus quasi quoddam horreum curarum esse.’ The main problem here is the interpretation of ταμειῖου, which can be used metaphorically (see on fr. 71; Blümner 1891. 62), but not with the abstract sense ‘care’, as Kock himself implicitly acknowledged. Kock was thus compelled to supply a second line to make grammatical and interpretative sense of the fragment.

fr. 82 K.-A. (80 K.) = Anaxandr. Hist. *FGrHist* 404 F 6

Ath. 11.502b

Σῆμος (*FGrHist* 396 F 18) δ’ ἐν Δήλῳ ἀνακεῖσθαί φησι χαλκοῦν φοῖνικα, Ναξίων ἀνάθημα, καὶ καρυωτάς φιάλας χρυσᾶς. Ἀναξανδρίδης δὲ φιάλας Ἄρεος καλεῖ τὰ ποτήρια ταῦτα

Semus (*FGrHist* 396 F 18) says that on Delos there is a golden palm dedicated by the Naxians and golden *phialai* decorated with dates. Anaxandrides calls these cups ‘*phialai* of Ares’

**Metre** Uncertain.

**Discussion** Meineke 1840 III.201; 1847. 593; Bothe 1855 434; Kock 1884 II.164; Blaydes 1890a. 84; Blaydes 1896. 126; Tucker 1908. 203; Edmonds 1959 II.80–1; Nesselrath 1990. 277–8; Kassel–Austin 1991 II.278; Sanchis Llopis *et al.* 2007. 275

**Citation context** The fragment is quoted by the epitome of Athenaeus as the final citation in the course of a discussion about *phialai* (11.501a–2b).<sup>178</sup> Semus *FGrHist* 396 F 18 immediately precedes,<sup>179</sup> but the section as a whole contains a mix of quotations from Homer, historians, grammarians and comic poets.

**Interpretation** The fragment is more likely to belong to the comic poet than to the historian, so its position among the dubia is not entirely warranted. Nesselrath 1990. 278 n. 101 rightly noted that the form Ἄρεος (as opposed to Ἄρεως) is poetic. The phrase also occurs at Antiph. fr. 110, where it is said to be a quotation from Timotheus (*PMG* 797) and thus clearly poetic (and ostensibly appropriate for high poetry). The fragment here may well be

<sup>178</sup> Most of this section survives in the full version of Athenaeus, but the loss of a folio from A’s exemplar means that the end of this discussion (including the quotation from Anaxandrides) survives only in the epitome.

<sup>179</sup> At Anaxandridas *FGrHist* 404 F 6, the fragment of Semus is mistakenly given as 16.

instance of Anaxandrides mockingly referring to the same line of Timotheus; for Anaxandrides and Timotheus, see on fr. 6. For comparisons between cups and shields (as seems to be the case here), cf. Aristopho fr. 13.2; Theopomp. Com. fr. 4.

fr. 83

νόμους μὲν ἀγαθοὺς εἶχεν, οὐκ ἐχρήτο δέ  
had good laws but did not use them

*Comm. in Arist. Graeca* 20.444.1–4

ὥσπερ εἰ Ἄναξανδρίδης ὁ ποιητὴς ἀποσκώπτων πόλιν τινά, ἢ νόμους μὲν ἀγαθοὺς εἶχεν, οὐκ ἐχρήτο δὲ αὐτοῖς, εἶπεν· ἢ πόλις, ἢ οὐδὲν μέλει τῶν νόμων τῶν ἀγαθῶν (≈ fr. 66), ἠβούλετο νόμους ἔχειν ἀγαθοὺς καὶ ψηφίσματα ἀγαθὰ ψηφίζεσθαι

Just as the poet Anaxandrides said, mocking a certain city that ‘had good laws but did not wish to use them’, ‘The city, to which none of the good laws matter (≈ fr. 66), wished to have good laws and to pass good decrees’

**Metre** Iambic trimeter.

— — — — — | — — — — —

**Discussion** Browne 2001

**Interpretation** Browne 2001 noted that this anonymous commentator on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, while offering a garbled version of fr. 66, the text on which he is ostensibly commenting, also includes an iambic trimeter. The same line seems to occur at Σ<sup>S3</sup> Ov. *Ib.* 523 (= Anaxandr. test. 2a) *bonas leges habere (dicere), sed male* (Browne : *malis* cod.) *uti*, which Browne translates into Greek as νόμους μὲν ἀγαθοὺς εἶχεν, οὐκ ἐχρήτο δ’ εὖ; he further postulates that the discrepancy between the two versions is the result of an ancient variant. Finally, the line also appears at Arist. *Rh.* 1152a21, where it is paraphrased as νόμους ἔχει σπουδαίους, χρήται δὲ οὐδέν. Thus, in accord with Browne’s interpretation, Aristotle knew the line, but chose to paraphrase rather than quote it, whereas the anonymous commentator and the scholiast to Ovid, presumably independently, had access to the original. If this is a genuine fragment, the fact that it is quoted together with fr. 66 and has similar content suggests that it appeared in close proximity to that fragment (possibly in *Poleis*; cf. on fr. 66). Browne’s hypothesis is clever but difficult to accept, par-

ticularly in seemingly requiring that an anonymous commentator on Aristotle and the scholia to Ovid had access to a text of Anaxandrides. Similarly difficult is the fact that the hypothesis requires that one of the three attestations be a paraphrase while that the other two represent two ancient variants of the line (one of them also requiring emendation, admittedly easy, in order to work).



## Bibliography

- Abresch 1755: Friedrich Ludwig Abresch, *Dilucidationes Thucydideae, quibus et passim cum Novi Testamenti, tum aliorum scriptorum loca illustrantur aur emendantur* (Utrecht)
- Adams 1982: James Noel Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London)
- Aleshire 1989: Sara B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, their Dedications, and the Inventories* (Amsterdam)
- Allen 1993: Archibald Allen (ed.), *The Fragments of Mimnermus: Text and Commentary* (Palingenesia 44: Stuttgart)
- Alpers 1981: Klaus Alpers (ed.), *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros: Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe der Fragmente* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 4: Berlin and New York)
- Ammann 1953: A. N. Ammann, *-ΙΚΟΣ bei Platon: Ableitung und Bedeutung mit Materialsammlung* (Freiburg)
- Amyx 1945: Darrell A. Amyx, 'A New Pelike by the Geras Painter', *AJA* 49: 508–18
- Amyx 1958: Darrell A. Amyx, 'The Attic Stelai Part III', *Hesperia* 27: 163–307
- Anderson 1985: John K. Anderson, *Hunting in the Ancient World* (Berkeley)
- Anderson 1994: Warren D. Anderson, *Music and Musicians in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca)
- Anderson 1986: William S. Anderson, 'Corinth and Comedy', in Mario A. del Chiaro and William R. Biers (eds.), *Corinthia: Studies in Honor of Darrell A. Amyx* (Columbia), pp. 44–9
- Andrews 1947–1948: Alfred C. Andrews, 'Oysters as a Food in Greece and Rome', *CJ* 43: 299–303
- Andrianou 2009: Dimitra Andrianou, *The Furniture and Furnishings of Ancient Greek Houses and Tombs* (Cambridge)
- Archibald 1998: Zofia H. Archibald, *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace: Orpheus Unmasked* (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology: Oxford)
- Ardaillon 1897: E. Ardaillon, *Les mines du Laurion dans l'antiquité* (Paris)
- Argyle 1970: A. W. Argyle, 'Χρησμολόγοι and Μάντις', *CR* ns 20: 139
- Arnott 1974: W. Geoffrey Arnott, review of Garton 1972, *JRS* 64: 270
- Arnott 1977: W. Geoffrey Arnott, 'Swan Songs', *G&R* 24: 149–53
- Arnott 1985: W. Geoffrey Arnott, 'Μελίλωτος, *Melilotos*', *BICS* 32: 79–82
- Arnott 1996: W. Geoffrey Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 31: Cambridge)
- Arnott 2001a: W. Geoffrey Arnott, 'Some Orthographical Problems in the Papyri of Later Greek Comedy I: ΠΟ(Ι)ΕΙΝ (Along with Compounds and Congeners)', *ZPE* 134: 43–51
- Arnott 2001b: W. Geoffrey Arnott, 'Some Orthographical Problems in the Papyri of Later Greek Comedy II: –ΕΙ or –Η(Ι) as the Ending of the Second Person Singular Middle and Passive in the Present and Other Tenses of Verbs in –Ω', *ZPE* 135: 36–40
- Arnott 2010: W. Geoffrey Arnott, 'Middle Comedy', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy* (Leiden and Boston), pp. 279–331

- Ascani 2001: Alessia Ascani, 'On an Aristotelian Quotation (fr. 10–11 Gigon) in the Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας by Demetrius', *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 54: 442–56
- Ast 1835–1838: Friedrich Ast, *Lexicon platonicum, sive vocum platoniarum index* (3 vols.: Leipzig)
- Auhagen 2009: Ulrike Auhagen 2009, *Die Hetäre in der griechischen und römischen Komödie* (Zetemata 135: Munich)
- Austin 1968: Colin Austin, 'Menander, Sikyonius 201 and 270', *CR* ns 18: 21
- Austin 1973: Colin Austin (ed.), *Comicorum graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta* (Berlin and New York)
- Austin–Olson 2004: Colin Austin and S. Douglas Olson (eds.), *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriasusae* (Oxford)
- Austin 1994: Norman Austin, *Helen of Troy and her Shameless Phantom* (Ithaca)
- Baehr 1822: Johann Christian F. Baehr (ed.), *Plutarchi Alcibiades* (Heidelberg)
- Bain 1977: David Bain, *Actors and Audience: A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama* (Oxford)
- Bain 1983: David M. Bain (ed.), *Menander: Samia* (Warminster)
- Bakola 2010: Emmanuela Bakola, *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy* (Oxford)
- Bamberger 1856: Ferdinand Bamberger, *Opuscula philologica maximam partem aeschylea* (Leipzig)
- Barker 1988: Andrew Barker, 'Che cos'era la magadis', in B. Gentili and R. Pretagostini (eds.), *La musica in Grecia* (Rome), pp. 96–107
- Barnes 1694: Joshua Barnes (ed.), *Euripidis quae extant omnia: tragoediae nempe XX, praeter ultimam, omnes completae, item fragmenta aliarum plusquam LX tragoediarum, et epistolae V* (2 vols.: Cambridge)
- Barns 1951: John Barns, 'A New Gnomologium: with Some Remarks on Gnostic Anthologies, II', *CQ* ns 1: 1–19
- Barrett 1964: W. S. Barrett (ed.), *Euripides: Hippolytus* (Oxford)
- Barringer 1995: Judith M. Barringer, *Divine Escorts: Nereids in Archaic and Classical Greek Art* (Ann Arbor)
- Barringer 2001: Judith M. Barringer, *The Hunt in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore)
- Bathrellou 2014: Eftychia Bathrellou, 'New Texts: Greek Comic Papyri 1973–2010', in Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy* (New York), pp. 803–70
- Beare 1954: W. Beare, 'The Costume of the Actors in Aristophanic Comedy', *CQ* ns 4: 64–75
- Beavis 1988: Ian C. Beavis, *Insects and Other Invertebrates in Classical Antiquity* (Exeter)
- Beazley 1927: J. D. Beazley, 'Some Inscriptions on Vases', *AJA* 31: 345–53
- Bechtel 1898: Friedrich Bechtel, *Die einstämmigen männlichen Personennamen des Griechischen die aus Spitznamen hervorgegangen sind* (AbhBerlin, N.F. 2.5: Berlin)
- Bechtel 1902: Friedrich Bechtel, *Die attischen Frauennamen nach ihrem Systeme dargestellt* (Göttingen)
- Bechtel 1917: Friedrich Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle)
- Beekes 2010: Robert Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 10: Leiden and Boston)

- Benton 1969: Sylvia Benton, 'Pet Weasels: Theocritus xv.28', *CR* ns 19: 260–3
- Berger 1887–1893: Ernst Hugo Berger, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen* (4 parts: Leipzig)
- Bergk 1837: Theodor Bergk, 'Coniecturae in Comicos Graecos', *ZAlt* 4: 42–50
- Bergk 1838: Theodor Bergk, *Commentationum de reliquiis comoediae Atticae antiquae libri duo* (Leipzig)
- Bergk 1872–1887: Theodor Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (4 vols. [1872, 1883, 1883, 1887]: Berlin)
- Bernabé 1996: Alberto Bernabé Pajares (ed.), *Poetae epici graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta* Vol. I (Stuttgart and Leipzig)
- Bernhardy 1829: Gottfried Bernhardy, *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache* (Berlin)
- Beroutsos 2005: Demetrios C. Beroutsos, *A Commentary on the Aspis of Menander. Part One: Lines 1–298* (Hypomnemata 157: Göttingen)
- Berry 1940: Edmond Grindlay Berry, *The History and Development of the Concept of ΘΕΙΑ ΜΟΙΡΑ and ΘΕΙΑ ΤΥΧΗ Down to and Including Plato* (Chicago)
- Bers 1974: Victor Bers, *Enallage and Greek Style* (Mnemosyne Supplement 29: Leiden)
- Bers 1984: Victor Bers, *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age* (New Haven)
- Berthiaume 1982: Guy Berthiaume, *Les rôles du μάγειρος: étude sur la boucherie, la cuisine et le sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne* (Mnemosyne Supplement 70: Leiden)
- Berve 1926: Helmut Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (2 vols.: Munich)
- Biles–Olson 2015: Zachary Biles and S. Douglas Olson (eds.), *Aristophanes: Wasps* (Oxford)
- Bill 1901: Clarence P. Bill, 'Notes on the Greek Θεωρός and Θεωρία', *TAPA* 32: 196–204
- Björck 1940: Gudmund Björck, *HN ΔΙΑΔΕΚΩΝ: die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen* (Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala 32:2: Uppsala and Leipzig)
- Blaydes 1890a: Frederick Henry Marvell Blaydes, *Adversaria in comicorum graecorum fragmenta pars prior: secundum editionem Meinekianam* (Halle)
- Blaydes 1890b: Frederick Henry Marvell Blaydes (ed.), *Aristophanis Nubes* (Aristophanis comoediae 9: Halle)
- Blaydes 1892: Frederick Henry Marvell Blaydes (ed.), *Aristophanis Equites* (Aristophanis comoediae 10: Halle)
- Blaydes 1893: Frederick Henry Marvell Blaydes (ed.), *Aristophanis Vespae* (Aristophanis comoediae 11: Halle)
- Blaydes 1896: Frederick Henry Marvell Blaydes, *Adversaria in comicorum graecorum fragmenta pars II: secundum editionem Kockianam* (Halle)
- Blaydes 1898: Frederick Henry Marvell Blaydes, *Adversaria in varios poetas graecos ac latinos* (Halle)
- Blaydes 1905: Frederick Henry Marvell Blaydes, *Analecta comica graeca* (Halle)
- Blech 1982: Michael Blech, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*. (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 38: Berlin and New York)
- Bloesch 1953: Hansjörg Bloesch, *Agalma: Kleinod, Weihgeschenk, Götterbild. Ein Beitrag zur frühgriechischen Kultur- und Religionsgeschichte* (Bern)

- Blum 1998: Hartmut Blum, *Purpur als Statussymbol in der griechischen Welt* (Antiquitas Reihe 1, Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte 47: Bonn)
- Blümner 1875–1887: Hugo Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern* (4 vols.; vol. 1, 2nd ed. 1912: Leipzig)
- Blümner 1891: Hugo Blümner, *Studien zur Geschichte der Metapher im Griechischen I: Über Gleichniss und Metapher in der attischen Komödie* (Leipzig)
- Boardman 1958–1959: John Boardman, 'Old Smyrna: The Attic Pottery', *ABSA* 53–54: 152–81
- den Boer 1947: W. den Boer, 'ΟΛΟΚΛΗΡΟΣ', *Mnemosyne* SER. 3 13: 143–4
- Bogaert 1976: Raymond Bogaert, *Epigraphica III: Texts on Bankers, Banking and Credit in the Greek World* (Textus minores 47: Leiden)
- Böhnecke 1843: Karl Georg Böhnecke, *Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der attischen Redner und der Geschichte ihrer Zeit* (Berlin)
- Bond 1981: Godfrey W. Bond (ed.), *Euripides: Heracles* (Oxford)
- Borthwick 1966: E. Kerr Borthwick, 'Death of a Fighting Cock', *CR* NS 16: 4–5
- Borthwick 1967: E. Kerr Borthwick, 'Two Notes on the Birds of Aristophanes', *CR* NS 17: 248–250
- Borthwick 1976: E. Kerr Borthwick, 'The "Flower of the Argives" and a Neglected Meaning of ἄνθος', *JHS* 96: 1–7
- Bossi 1980–1982: Francesco Bossi, 'Aristoph. fragm. novum', *MCr* 15–17: 75
- Bossi 1983: Francesco Bossi, 'Or. B. 88 Alpers', *GFF* 6: 17–18
- Bothe 1826: Friedrich Heinrich Bothe (ed.), *Sophoclis tragoediae* (2 vols.: Leipzig)
- Bothe 1844: Friedrich Heinrich Bothe, *Die griechische Komiker: eine Beurtheilung der neuesten Aufgabe ihrer Fragmente* (Leipzig)
- Bothe 1855: Friedrich Heinrich Bothe, *Poetarum comicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Paris)
- Bowie 2000: Angus Bowie, 'Myth and ritual in the rivals of Aristophanes', in David Harvey and John Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London), pp. 317–39
- Bowie 2010: Angus Bowie, 'Myth and Ritual in Comedy', in Gregory W. Dobrov (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy* (Leiden and Boston), pp. 143–76
- Braswell 1988: Bruce Karl Braswell, *A commentary on the fourth Pythian ode of Pindar* (Texte und Kommentare 14: Berlin)
- Braswell 1998: Bruce Karl Braswell, *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Texte und Kommentare 19: Berlin)
- Braunlich 1936: Alice Braunlich, '"To the Right" in Homer and Attic Greek', *AJP* 57: 245–60
- Breitenbach 1908: Hermann Breitenbach, *De genere quodam titulorum comoediae Atticae* (Basel)
- Brix–Niemeyer 1897: Julius Brix (ed.), *Plautus: Captivi*<sup>5</sup> (rev. Max Niemeyer; Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus 2: Leipzig)
- Brock 1990: Roger Brock, 'Plato and Comedy', in Elizabeth M. Craik (ed.), *Owls to Athens': Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford), pp. 39–49

- Broneer 1938: Oscar Broneer, 'Excavations of the North Slope of the Acropolis, 1937', *Hesperia* 7: 161–263
- Brown 1996: Christopher G. Brown, 'In the Cyclops' Cave: Revenge and Justice in *Odyssey* 9', *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 49: 1–29
- Brown 1992: Peter G. McC. Brown, 'Menander, Fragments 745 and 746 K–T, Menander's *Kolax*, and Parasites and Flatterers in Greek Comedy', *ZPE* 92: 91–107
- Browne 2001: Gerald M. Browne, 'Novus Anaxandridis Versus', *ICS* 26: 129
- Bruchmann 1893: Karl Friedrich Heinrich Bruchmann, *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas Graecos leguntur* (Roscher, *Lexikon* supplement 1: Leipzig)
- Brunck 1794: Richard Franz P. Brunck (ed.), *ἩΘΙΚΗ ΠΟΙΗΣΙΣ sive gnomici poetae graeci* (Strasbourg)
- Bryant 1907: Arthus Alexis Bryant. 'Boyhood and Youth in the Days of Aristophanes', *HSCP* 18: 73–122
- Buck 1955: Carl Darling Buck, *The Greeks Dialects: Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary* (Chicago)
- Buckler 1980: John Buckler, *The Theban Hegemony, 371–362 B.C.* (Cambridge MA)
- Bulloch 1985: A. W. Bulloch (ed.), *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 26: Cambridge)
- Bunbury 1883: Edward Herbert Bunbury, *A History of Ancient Geography among the Greeks and Romans from the Earliest Ages till the Fall of the Roman Empire* (London)
- Burkert 1975: Walter Burkert, 'Aristoteles im Theater: zur Datierung des 3. Buchs der "Rhetorik" und der "Poetik"', *MH* 32: 67–72
- Burkert 1996: Walter Burkert, *Creation of the Sacred: Tracks of Biology in Early Religions* (Cambridge MA)
- Burnet 1911: John Burnet (ed.), *Plato: Phaedo* (Oxford)
- Bux 1934: E. Bux, 'Terpsikles (1)', *RE* ser. 2 10: 790
- Caley 1945: Earle R. Caley, 'Ancient Greek Pigments from the Agora', *Hesperia* 14: 152–6
- Caley–Richards 1956: Earle R. Caley and John F. C. Richards (eds.), *Theophrastus: On Stones* (Columbus Ohio)
- Canter 1564: Willem Canter, *Novarum lectionum libri quatuor, in quibus praeter uariorum autorum, quam Graecorum tam Latinorum, explicationes et emendations, Athenaei, Gellii, & aliorum fragmenta quaedam nunc primum in lucem proferuntur* (Basel)
- Canter 1566: Willem Canter, *Novarum lectionum libri septem, in quibus praeter uariorum autorum, quam Graecorum tam Latinorum, explicationes et emendations, Athenaei, Gellii, & aliorum fragmenta quaedam nunc primum in lucem proferuntur* (ed. altera, tribus libris aucta: Basel)
- Capps 1910: Edward Capps (ed.), *Four Plays of Menander: The Hero, Epitrepontes, Periceirromene and Samia* (Boston)
- Carey 1989: Christopher Carey (ed.), *Lysias: Selected Speeches* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics: Cambridge)
- Carey 1995: Christopher Carey, 'Rape and Adultery in Athenian Law', *CQ* NS 45: 407–17

- Carey 2000: Christopher Carey, 'Old Comedy and the sophists', in David Harvey and John Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London), pp. 419–36
- Cargill 1995: Jack Cargill, *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century B.C.* (Mnemosyne Supplement 145: Leiden, New York and Cologne)
- Carriere 1979: Jean Claude Carriere, *Le carnaval et la politique: une introduction à la comédie grecque suivie d'un choix de fragments* (Besançon)
- Cartledge 1987: Paul Cartledge, *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta* (London)
- Cartledge 1993: Paul Cartledge, *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford)
- Casevitz 1992: Michel Casevitz, 'Mantis: le vrai sens', *REG* 105: 1–18
- Casson 1971: Lionel Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton)
- Cazeaux 1979: Jacques Cazeaux, 'La Thessalie des magiciennes', in Bruno Helly (ed.), *La Thessalie, actes de la table-rond, 21–24 Lyon Juillet 1975* (Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée: série archéologique 6:5: Lyon), pp. 265–75
- Chadwick 1996: John Chadwick, *Lexicographica Graeca: Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek* (Oxford)
- Chandler 1881: Henry William Chandler, *A Practical Guide to Greek Accentuation*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford)
- Chantraine 1933: Pierre Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris)
- Chantraine 1968–1980: Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris)
- Clayman 1980: Dee L. Clayman, *Callimachus' Iambi* (Mnemosyne Supplement 59: Leiden)
- Cloch   1931: Paul Cloch  , *Les classes, les m  tiers, le trafic* (Vie publique et priv  e des anciens Grecs 5: Paris)
- Cobet 1840: Carel Gabriel Cobet, *Observationes criticae in Platonis comici reliquias* (Amsterdam)
- Cobet 1847: Carel Gabriel Cobet, *Oratio de art interpretandi grammatices et critics fundamentis innixa primario philology officio* (Leiden)
- Cobet 1858: Carel Gabriel Cobet, *Novae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores graecos* (Leiden)
- Cobet 1873: Carel Gabriel Cobet, *Variae lectiones* (Leiden)
- Cobet 1880: Carel Gabriel Cobet, 'Fragmenta inedita poetarum graecorum', *Mnemosyne* NS 8: 56–67
- Cohen 1983: David Cohen, *Theft in Athenian Law* (M  nchener Beitr  ge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 74: Munich)
- Cohen 1997: Edward E. Cohen, 'The Astoi of Attika: Nationality and Citizenship at Athens', in G. Th  r and J. V  lissaropoulos-Karakostas (eds.), *Symposion 1995: Vortr  ge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Cologne), pp. 57–95
- Cohn-Haft 1995: Louis Cohn-Haft, 'Divorce in Classical Athens', *JHS* 115: 1–14
- Collard et al. 1995: Christopher Collard, Martin Cropp and Kevin H. Lee (eds.), *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays I* (Warminster)
- Colvin 1999: Stephen Colvin, *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford Classical Monographs: Oxford)



- Connelly 1996: Joan B. Connelly, 'Parthenon and *Parthenoi*: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze', *AJA* 100: 53–80
- Conophagos 1980: Constantin E. Conophagos, *Le Laurium antique et la technique grecque de la production de l'argent* (Athens)
- Contiades–Tsitsoni 1990: Eleni Contiades–Tsitsoni, *Hymenaios und Epithalamion: Das Hochzeitleid in der frühgriechischen Lyrik* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 16: Stuttgart)
- Cooper 1998–2002: Guy L. Cooper III, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax* (4 vols.: Ann Arbor)
- Cooper–Morris 1990: Frederick Cooper and Sarah Morris, 'Dining in Round Buildings', in Oswyn Murray (ed.), *Symptica: A Symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford), pp. 66–85
- Cooper 1920: Lane Cooper, 'A Pun in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle', *AJP* 41: 48–56
- Cope–Sandys 1877: Edward Meredith Cope and John Edwin Sandys (eds.), *The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary* (3 vols.: Cambridge)
- Cousin 1904: Georges Cousin, *De urbibus quarum nominibus vocabulum ΠΟΛΙΣ finem faciebat* (Nancy)
- Cremer 1982: Marielouise Cremer, 'Hieros Gamos im Orient und in Griechenland', *ZPE* 48: 283–90
- Crönert 1903: Wilhelm Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis, cum titulorum Aegypti papyrorum codicum denique testimoniiis comparata* (Leipzig)
- Cropp 1988: Martin Cropp (ed.), *Euripides: Electra* (Warminster)
- Crusius 1888: Otto Crusius, 'Coniectanea', *Philologus* 46: 606–31
- Crusius 1892: Otto Crusius, *Untersuchungen zu den Mimiamben des Herondas* (Leipzig)
- Crusius 1896: Otto Crusius, 'Argas', *RE* 3 (1896) 687–8
- Crusius 1910: Otto Crusius, *Paroemiographica: textgeschichtliches zur alten Dichtung und Religion* (SBMünchen: Munich)
- Csapo 1993: Eric Csapo, 'Deep Ambivalence: Notes on a Greek Cockfight (Parts II–IV)', *Phoenix* 47: 115–24
- Csapo 2007: Eric Csapo, 'The Men who Built the Theatres: Theatropolai, Theatronai, and Arkhitektones', in Peter Wilson (ed.), *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies* (Oxford), pp. 87–115
- Csapo–Wilson 2014: Eric Csapo and Peter Wilson, 'The Finance and Organisation of the Athenian Theatre in the Time of Eubulus and Lycurgus', in Eric Csapo, Hans Rupprecht Goette, J. Richard Green and Peter Wilson (eds.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Berlin), pp. 393–424
- Cunningham 1971: Ian C. Cunningham (ed.), *Herodas: Mimiambi* (Oxford)
- Dalby 2000: Andrew Dalby, 'Topikos Oinos: the named wines of Old Comedy', in David Harvey and John Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London), pp. 397–405
- Dale 1954: A. M. Dale (ed.), *Euripides: Alcestis* (Oxford)
- Damon 1997: Cynthia Damon, *The Mask of the Parasite: a Pathology of Roman Patronage* (Ann Arbor)
- Darbshire 1890: Herbert Dukinfield Darbshire, 'Contributions to Greek Lexicography I. ἐπιδήξιος, ἐπιδήξια: ἐνδέξιος, ἐνδέξια', *TCPHS* 3: 154–75
- Darbshire 1895: Herbert Dukinfield Darbshire, *Reliquiae Philologicae* (Cambridge)

- Davidson–Thompson 1943: Gladys Davidson and Dorothy Thompson, *Small Objects from the Pnyx I* (*Hesperia* Supplement 7: Baltimore)
- Davidson 1993: James N. Davidson, 'Fish, Sex and Revolution in Athens', *CQ* ns 43: 53–66
- Davidson 1997: James N. Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (London)
- Davies 1971: John K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford)
- Dawes 1817: Richard Dawes *Miscellanea critica* (ed. by T. Kidd: Cambridge)
- Dedousi 1965: Christina B. Dedousi (ed.), *Μενάνδρου Σαμία* (Κέντρον Ανθρωπιστικών Κλασσικών Σπουδών, series 2, 9: Athens)
- Dedousi 2006: Christina B. Dedousi (ed.), *Μενάνδρου Σαμία* (Ακαδημία Αθηνών, Βιβλιοθήκη Α. Μανούση 8: Athens)
- Degani 1977: Enzo Degani, 'Sul nuovo Archiloco', in Enzo Degani (ed.), *Poeti greci giambici ed elegiaci* (Lettture critiche di letteratura greca e Latina 6: Milan), pp. 15–43
- Degani 1984: Enzo Degani, *Studi su Ipponatte* (Bari)
- Delatte 1938: Armand Delatte, *Herbarius: recherches sur le cérémonial usité chez les anciens pour la cueillette des simples et des plantes magiques*<sup>2</sup> (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 81: Paris)
- Demiańczuk 1912: Jan Demiańczuk, *Supplementum Comicum: comoediae Graecae fragmenta post editiones Kockianam et Kaibelianam reperta* (Cracow)
- Denniston 1927: J. D. Denniston, 'Technical Terms in Aristophanes', *CQ* 21: 113–21
- Denniston 1939: J. D. Denniston (ed.), *Euripides: Electra* (Oxford)
- Denniston 1954: J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> (revised by K. J. Dover: Oxford)
- Descroix 1931: Joseph Marie Descroix, *Le trimètre iambique des iambographes à la comédie nouvelle* (Macon)
- Deubner 1932: Ludwig Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin)
- Develin 1989: Robert Develin, *Athenian Officials 684–321 B.C.* (Cambridge)
- Dickey 1996: Eleanor Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford)
- Diggle 1970: James Diggle (ed.), *Euripides: Phaethon* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 12: Cambridge)
- Diggle 1981: James Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford)
- Diggle 1994: James Diggle, *Euripidea: Collected Essays* (Oxford)
- Diggle 1996: James Diggle, 'Epilogomena Phaethontea', *AntCl* 65: 189–99.
- Diggle 1997: James Diggle, 'Notes on Fragments of Euripides', *CQ* ns 47: 98–108
- Diggle 2004: James Diggle (ed.), *Theophrastus: Characters* (Cambridge Classical Commentaries 43: Cambridge)
- Di Marzio 1998: Marialuigia Di Marzio, 'Il "Protesilao" di Anassandride (Fr. 42 K–A)', *QUCC* ns 58: 75–89
- Dinse 1856: Maximilian Dinse, *De Antigenida Thebano musico* (Berlin)
- Dittmer 1923: William Anthony Dittmer, *The Fragments of Athenian Comic Didascaliae Found in Rome* (Leiden)
- Dobree 1820: Peter Paul Dobree (ed.), *Richardi Porsoni Notae in Aristophanem* (Cambridge)
- Dobree 1831–1833: Peter Paul Dobree, *Adversaria* (2 vols., ed. J. Scholefield: Cambridge)
- Dobrov 1993: Gregory Dobrov, 'The Tragic and the Comic Tereus', *AJP* 114: 189–234



- Dodds 1959: E. R. Dodds (ed.), *Plato: Gorgias* (Oxford)
- Dodds 1960: E. R. Dodds (ed.), *Euripides: Bacchae*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford)
- Dohm 1964: Hans Dohm, *Mageiros: die Rolle des Kochs in der griechisch-römischen Komödie* (Zetemata 32: Munich)
- Donohue 1988: Alice Donohue, *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture* (Atlanta)
- Dover 1968: K. J. Dover (ed.), *Aristophanes: Clouds* (Oxford)
- Dover 1974: K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford)
- Dover 1978: K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (London)
- Dover 1980: K. J. Dover (ed.), *Plato: Symposium* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics: Cambridge)
- Dover 1987: K. J. Dover, *Greek and the Greeks* (Oxford)
- Dover 1993: K. J. Dover (ed.), *Aristophanes: Frogs* (Oxford)
- Dover 1997: K. J. Dover, *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford)
- Doxiadis 1995: Euphrosyne Doxiades, *The Mysterious Fayum Portraits: Faces from Ancient Egypt* (London)
- Dunbar 1995: Nan Dunbar (ed.), *Aristophanes: Birds* (Oxford)
- Dupréel 1922: Eugène Dupréel, *La légende socratique et les sources de Platon* (Brussels)
- Dušanić 1980/1981: S. Dušanić, 'Athens, Crete and the Aegean after 366/5 BC', *Talanta* 12–13: 7–29
- Dyck 1995: Andrew R. Dyck (ed.), *Epimerismi Homeric: pars altera Epimerismos continens qui ordine alphabetico traditi sunt* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 5/2: Berlin and New York)
- Dziatzko–Hauler 1913: Karl Dziatzko (ed.), *Terenz: Phormoi*<sup>4</sup> (rev. Edmund Hauler; Ausgewählte Komödien des P. Terentius Afer 1: Leipzig)
- Eden 1984: P. T. Eden (ed.), *Seneca: Apocolocyntosis* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics: Cambridge)
- Edmonds 1933: John Maxwell Edmonds, 'Some Notes on the Older Fragments of the Middle Comedy', *PCPhS* 154: 4–8
- Edmonds 1957–1961: John Maxwell Edmonds (ed.), *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* (4 vols. [1957, 1959, 1961, 1961]: Leiden)
- Ehrenberg 1962: Victor Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*<sup>3</sup> (New York)
- Eibel 1893: Jacob Eibel, *De vocativi usu apud decem oratores atticos* (Würzburg)
- Eichholz 1965: D. E. Eichholz (ed.), *Theophrastus: De lapidibus* (Oxford)
- Ellis 1886: Robinson Ellis, 'Corrections of the Text of Parthenius Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων', *AJP* 7: 224–7
- Elmsley 1803: Peter Elmsley, 'Schweighaeuser's edition of Athenaei Naucraticae Deipnosophistarum libri quindecim', *Edin. Rev.* 3: 181–94
- Elmsley 1809: Peter Elmsley (ed.), *Aristophanis comoedia Acharnenses* (Oxford)
- Engels 1999: Donald W. Engels, *Classical Cats: The Rise and Fall of the Sacred Cat* (London)
- Erbse 1969–1988: Hartmut Erbse (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)* (7 vols.: Berlin)
- Erbse 1997: Hartmut Erbse, 'Sapphos Sperlinge', *Hermes* 125: 232–4

- Eyben 1989: Emiel Eyben, 'Old Age in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Early Christianity: An Annotated Bibliography,' in Thomas M. Falkner and Judith de Luce (eds.), *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (SUNY Series in Classical Studies: Albany), pp. 230–51
- Falkner–de Luce 1989: Thomas M. Falkner and Judith de Luce (eds.), *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (SUNY Series in Classical Studies: Albany)
- Fantham *et al.* 1994: Elaine Fantham, Helene P. Foley, Natalie B. Kampen, Sarah B. Pomeroy and H. A. Shapiro, *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text* (New York)
- Fick–Bechtel 1894: August Fick and Friedrich Bechtel, *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt and systematisch geordnet*<sup>2</sup> (Göttingen)
- Figueira 1998: Thomas J. Figueira, *The Power of Money: Coinage and Politics in the Athenian Empire* (Philadelphia)
- Fine 1951: John V. A. Fine, *Horoi: studies in mortgage, real security and land tenure in ancient Athens* (Hesperia Supplement 9: Princeton)
- Finley 1985: Moses Finley, *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500–200 B.C.* (reprinted [1st ed. 1951] with new introduction by P. Millet: New Brunswick)
- Fischer 1974: Eitel Fischer (ed.), *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 1: Berlin and New York)
- Fisher 1992: Nick Fisher, *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece* (Warminster)
- Fisher 2000: Nick Fisher, 'Symposiasts, Fish-eaters and Flatterers: Social Mobility and Moral Concerns in Old Comedy', in David Harvey and John Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London), pp. 355–96
- Fontaine 2010: Michael Fontaine, *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy* (New York and Oxford)
- Forbes 1993: R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*<sup>3</sup> (= 2nd edition [Leiden 1964–1965]; 3 vols.: Leiden)
- Fossey 1990: John M. Fossey, *The Ancient Topography of Opountian Lokris* (Amsterdam)
- Fraenkel 1912: Eduard Fraenkel, *De media et nova comoedia quaestiones selectae* (Göttingen)
- Fraenkel 1922: Eduard Fraenkel, *Plautinisches in Plautus* (Philologische Untersuchungen 28: Berlin)
- Fraenkel 1950: Eduard Fraenkel (ed.), *Aeschylus: Agamemnon* (3 vols.: Oxford)
- Fraenkel 1968: Eduard Fraenkel, 'Zur römischen Komödie', *MH* 25: 231–42
- Fraenkel 2007: Eduard Fraenkel, *Plautine Elements in Plautus* (= Fraenkel 1922, trans. by T. Drevikovsky and F. Muecke: Oxford)
- Fragiadakis 1988: Charilaos Fragiadakis, *Die attischen Sklavennamen von der spätarchaischen Epoche bis in die römische Kaiserzeit: eine historische und soziologische Untersuchung* (Athens)
- Frazer 1913: James George Frazer (ed.), *Pausanias' Description of Greece*<sup>2</sup> (6 vols.: London)
- Frazer 1921: James George Frazer (trans.), *Apollodorus: The Library* (Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols.: London)

- Freudenthal 1880: J. Freudenthal, 'Zu Phavorinus und der mittelalterlichen Florilegienlitteratur, *RhM* 35: 408–30
- Friis Johansen–Whittle 1980: H. Friis Johansen and Edward W. Whittle (eds.), *Aeschylus: The Suppliants* (3 vols.: Copenhagen)
- Frisk 1954–1972: Hjalmar Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3 vols.: Heidelberg)
- Fuhr 1902: Karl Fuhr, review of A. Westermann (ed.), *Ausgewählte Reden des Demosthenes* I (Berlin, 1902), *PW* 22: 1121–8
- Furley 2009: William D. Furley (ed.), *Menander Epitrepontes* (BICS Supplement 106: London)
- Galinsky 1972: Karl Galinsky, *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century* (Oxford)
- Gantz 1993: Timothy Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: a Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore)
- Gargiulo 1999: T. Gargiulo, 'Anaxandr. fr. 7 K-A', *Eikasmos* 10: 83–4
- Garland 1985: Robert Garland, *The Greek Way of Death* (London)
- Garrod 1922: H. W. Garrod, 'Magadis', *CR* 36: 67–8
- Garton 1972: Charles Garton, *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre* (Toronto)
- Garvie 1986: A. F. Garvie (ed.), *Aeschylus: Choephoroi* (Oxford)
- Gataker 1659: Thomas Gataker, *Adversaria miscellanea, in quibus [sic] Sacrae Scripturae primò, deinde aliorum scriptorum locis aliquam [sic] multis lux redditur* (London)
- Gerber 1982: Douglas E. Gerber (ed.), *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary* (Phoenix Supplementary Volume 15: Toronto)
- Geyer 1924a: F. Geyer, 'Lais (1)', *RE* 23: 513–15
- Geyer 1924b: F. Geyer, 'Lais (2)', *RE* 23: 515–16
- Gildersleeve 1900–1911: Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes* (New York)
- Gildersleeve 1930: Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, *Selections from the Brief Mention* (ed. by C. W. E. Miller: Baltimore)
- Ginouvès 1962: René Ginouvès, *Balaneutikè. Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque* (Paris)
- Goette 1995: Hans Rupprecht Goette, 'Studien zur historischen Landeskunde Attikas, 1–3', *MDAI(A)* 110: 171–205
- Goldhill 2005: Simon Goldhill, 'Music, Gender, and Hellenistic Society', in Victoria Pedrick and Steven M. Oberhelman (eds.), *The Soul of Tragedy: Essays on Athenian Drama* (Chicago), pp. 271–90
- Gomme 1956: A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides III: Books IV–V 24* (Oxford)
- Gomme–Sandbach 1973: A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford)
- Goodwin 1890: William Watson Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (Boston)
- Gow 1951: A. S. F. Gow, 'Nicandrea: with Reference to Liddell and Scott, ed. 9', *CQ* ns 1: 95–118
- Gow 1952: A. S. F. Gow (ed.), *Theocritus* (2 vols.: Cambridge)

- Gow 1965: A. S. F. Gow (ed.), *Macho* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 1: Cambridge)
- Gow–Page 1965: A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams Volume II Commentary and Indexes* (Cambridge)
- Gow–Scholfield 1953: A. S. F. Gow and A. F. Scholfield (eds.), *Nicander: The Poems and Poetical Fragments* (Cambridge)
- Grasberger 1883: Lorenz Grasberger, *Die griechischen Spitznamen*<sup>2</sup> (Würzburg)
- Grasberger 1888: Lorenz Grasberger, *Studien zu den griechischen Ortsnamen* (Würzburg)
- Green 1972: J. Richard Green, ‘Oinochoe’, *BICS* 19: 1–16
- Green–Handley 2000: J. Richard Green and Eric Handley, ‘The Rover’s Return: A Literary Quotation on a Pot from Corinth’, *Hesperia* 70: 367–71
- Griffith 1968: J. G. Griffith, ‘A Vocative Expression in Greek Comedy’, *CR* ns 18: 8–11
- Griffith 1983: Mark Griffith (ed.), *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics: Cambridge)
- Griffiths 1970: J. Gwyn Griffiths (ed.), *Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride* (Swansea)
- Grotius 1623: Hugo Grotius (ed.), *Dicta poetarum quae apud Io. Stobaeum extant* (2 paginations: Paris)
- Grotius 1626: Hugo Grotius (ed.), *Excerpta ex tragoediis et comoediis graecis tum quae extant, tum quae perierunt* (Paris)
- Gulick 1928–1957: Charles Burton Gulick (ed.), *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists* (7 vols., Loeb Classical Library 204, 208, 224, 235, 274, 327, 345: Cambridge MA)
- Guthrie 1969: W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy III: The Fifth-century Enlightenment* (Cambridge)
- Gutschmid 1855: Alfred von Gutschmid, ‘De rerum aegyptiacarum scriptoribus graecis ante Alexandrum magnum’, *Philologus* 10: 522–42
- Gutschmid 1889: Alfred von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften. Erster Band: Schriften zur Ägyptologie und zur Geschichte der griechischen Chronographie* (Leipzig)
- Haffner 2001: Medard Haffner (ed.), *Das Florilegium des Orion* (Palingenesia 75: Stuttgart)
- Hall 2000: Edith Hall, ‘Female figures and metapoetry in Old Comedy’, in David Harvey and John Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London), pp. 407–18
- Hamilton 1991: Charles D. Hamilton, *Agasilaus and the Failure of Spartan Hegemony* (Ithaca)
- Hamilton 1992: Richard Hamilton, *Choes and Anthesteria: Athenian Iconography and Ritual* (Ann Arbor)
- Hammond 1967: N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus: the Geography, the Ancient Remains, the History and Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas* (Oxford)
- Handley 1956: Eric W. Handley, ‘Words for “soul”, “heart” and “mind” in Aristophanes’, *RhM* 99: 205–25
- Handley 1965: Eric W. Handley (ed.), *The Dyskolos of Menander* (London)
- Handley 1990: Eric W. Handley, ‘The Bodmer Menander and the Comic Fragments’, in Eric Handley and André Hurst (eds.), *Relire Ménandre* (Recherches et rencontres 2: Geneva), pp. 123–48

- Handley 2002: Eric W. Handley, 'Acting, action and words in New Comedy', in Pat Easterling and Edith Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession* (Cambridge), pp. 165–88
- Hansen 1998: Dirk U. Hansen (ed.), *Das attizistische Lexikon des Moeris: quellenkritische Untersuchung und Edition* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 9: Berlin and New York)
- Hansen–Nielsen 2004: Mogens Herman Hansen and Thomas Heine Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis* (Oxford)
- Hanson 1989: Victor Davis Hanson, *The Western Way of War: Infantry Battle in Classical Greece* (London)
- Harris 1995: Diane Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion* (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology: Oxford)
- Harrison 1968–1971: A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Classical Athens* (2 vols.: Oxford)
- Harvey 1980: F. D. Harvey, 'A Wild Chous Chase', *AJA* 84: 92–93
- Harvey–Wilkins 2000: David Harvey and John Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London)
- Haupt 1848: Moritz Haupt, 'Über einige Stellen aus den Choliamben des Phönix von Kolophon', *BerVerhLeipzig* 1: 411–16
- Haupt 1872: Moritz Haupt, 'Coniectanea', *Hermes* 6: 385–91
- Haupt 1875–1876: Moritz Haupt, *Opuscula* (3 vols.: Leipzig)
- Hauschild 1933: Hans Hauschild, *Die Gestalt der Hetäre in der griechischen Komödie* (Leipzig)
- Häussler 1968: Reinhard Häussler (ed.), *Nachträge zu Otto*, Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer (Darmstadt)
- Haussoullier 1884: Bernard C. L. M. Haussoullier, *La vie municipale en Attique: essai sur l'organisation des dèmes au quatrième siècle* (Paris)
- Headlam 1899: Walter Headlam, 'Critical Notes', *CR* 13: 3–8
- Headlam 1902: Walter Headlam, 'Metaphor, with a Note on Transference of Epithets', *CR* 16: 434–42
- Headlam–Knox 1922: Walter Headlam (ed.), *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments* (ed. A. D. Knox: Cambridge)
- Heinimann 1945: Felix Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis: Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 1: Basel)
- Helly 1995: Bruno Helly (ed.), *L'état thessalien: Aleuas le Roux, les tetrads et les Tagoi* (Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, série épigraphique et historique 25:2: Lyon)
- Helm 1906: Rudolf W. O. Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig)
- Hemsterhuis 1743: Tiberius Hemsterhuis (ed.), *Luciani Samosatensis opera* (3 vols.: Amsterdam)
- Hemsterhuis 1811: Tiberius Hemsterhuis (ed.), *Aristophanis comoedia Plutus* (editio nova: Leipzig)
- Henderson 1987: Jeffrey Henderson (ed.), *Aristophanes: Lysistrata* (Oxford)
- Henderson 1991: Jeffrey Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*<sup>2</sup> (New York and Oxford)

- Henry 1985: Madeleine Henry, *Menander's Courtesans and the Greek Comic Tradition* (Frankfurt am Main)
- Hense 1905: Otto Hense, *Die Modificirung der Maske in der griechischen Tragödie*<sup>2</sup> (Freiburg)
- Hense 1920/1921: Otto Hense, 'Zu den Bruchstücken der griechischen Komiker. II', *WS* 42: 97–102
- Hermann 1831: Gottfried Hermann (ed.), *Euripidis Hecuba* (Euripidis tragoediae vol. I.1: Leipzig)
- Hermann–Blümner 1882: Karl Friedrich Hermann and Hugo Blümner, *Lehrbuch der griechischen Privataltertümer*<sup>3</sup>, Freiburg/Tübingen.
- Herwerden 1855: Henricus van Herwerden, *Observationes criticae in fragmenta comicorum graecorum* (Leiden)
- Herwerden 1868: Henricus van Herwerden, *Analecta critica ad Thucydidem, Lysiam, Sophoclem, Aristophanem et comicorum graecorum fragmenta* (Utrecht)
- Herwerden 1872: Henricus van Herwerden, *Studia critica in poetas scenicos Graecorum* (Amsterdam)
- Herwerden 1876: Henricus van Herwerden, 'Notulae ad Athenaeum', *Mnemosyne* NS 4: 294–323
- Herwerden 1878: Henricus van Herwerden, 'Curae criticae in poetis scenicis graecorum', *Mnemosyne* SER. 2 6: 55–84
- Herwerden 1886: Henricus van Herwerden, 'De fragmentis comicorum graecorum commentatio altera', *Mnemosyne* NS 14: 158–96
- Herwerden 1893: Henricus van Herwerden, 'Ad fragmenta comicorum', *Mnemosyne* NS 21: 149–79
- Herwerden 1896: Henricus van Herwerden, 'Ad fragmenta comicorum graecorum', *Mnemosyne* NS 24: 397–404
- Herwerden 1903: Henricus van Herwerden, *Collectanea critica, epicritica, exegetica sive addenda ad Theodori Kockii opus Comicorum atticorum fragmenta* (Leiden)
- Herzfeld 1985: Michael Herzfeld, *The Poetics of Manhood: Contest and Identity in a Cretan Mountain Village* (Princeton)
- Herzog–Hauser 1948: G. Herzog–Hauser, 'Tyche', *RE* ser. 2 14: 1643–1689
- Hirschfeld 1894: G. Hirschfeld, 'Ambrakia' *RE* 2: 1805–7
- Hirschig 1849: Willem Adrien Hirschig, *Annotationes criticae in comicos (med. com. fragm.), Aeschylum, Isocratem, Demosthenem, Aischinem, Theophrastum, Lucianum* (Utrecht)
- Hirzel 1883: Rudolf Hirzel, 'Ein unbeachtetes Komödienfragment', *Hermes* 18: 1–16
- Hirzel 1902: Rudolf Hirzel, *Der Eid: ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte* (Leipzig)
- Hirzel 1909: Rudolf Hirzel, *Die Strafe der Steinigung* (*AbhLeipzig* 27:7: Leipzig)
- Höck 1891: Adelbert Höck, 'Das Odrysenreich in Thrakien im fünften und vierten Jahrhundert v. Chr.', *Hermes* 26: 76–117
- Hofmann–Wartenberg 1973: Walter Hofmann and Günther Wartenberg, *Der Bramarbas in der antiken Komödie* (*AbhDDR*: Berlin)
- Holford-Strevens 2009: Leofranc Holford-Strevens, 'Selinus or Athens?', *CQ* NS 59: 624–6

- Holzinger 1940: Karl Holzinger, *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zu Aristophanes' Plutos* (SBWien 218.3: Vienna and Leipzig)
- Homeyer 1977: Helene Homeyer, *Die spartanische Helena und der trojanische Krieg: Wandlungen und Wanderungen eines Sagenkreises vom Altertum* (Palingenesia 12: Wiesbaden)
- Hopkinson 1984: Neil Hopkinson (ed.), *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 27: Cambridge)
- Hopper 1953: R. J. Hopper, 'The Attic Silver Mines in the Fourth Century B.C.', *ABSA* 48: 200–54
- Hopper 1968: R. J. Hopper, 'The Laurion Mines: A Reconsideration', *ABSA* 63: 293–326
- Hornblower 1991–2008: Simon Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* (3 vols.: Oxford)
- Houtsma 1870: Everhardus Otto Houtsma, *Lexicon rhetoricum cantabrigiense* ([reprinted in 1965. 61–13] Leiden)
- How–Wells 1912: W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (2 vols.: Oxford)
- Hubbard 1989: Thomas K. Hubbard, 'Old Men in the Youthful Plays of Aristophanes', in Thomas M. Falkner and Judith de Luce (eds.), *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (SUNY Series in Classical Studies: Albany), pp. 90–113
- Hübner 1828–1831: Heinrich Gustav Hübner (ed.), *Diogenis Laertii De vitis, dogmatis et apophtegmatibus clarorum philosophorum libri decem* (2 vols.: Leipzig)
- Hug 1959: A. Hug, 'Ψῖτος οἶνος', *RE* 46: 1414
- Hull 1964: Denison Bingham Hull, *Hounds and Hunting in Ancient Greece* (Chicago)
- Humborg 1924: F. Humborg, 'Καροῦν', *RE Suppl.* 4: 867–75
- Hunter 1979: Richard L. Hunter, 'The Comic Chorus in the Fourth Century', *ZPE* 26: 23–38
- Hunter 1983: Richard L. Hunter (ed.), *Eubulus: the Fragments* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 24: Cambridge)
- Husson 1983: Geneviève Husson, *OIKIA. Le vocabulaire de la maison privée en Égypte d'après les papyrus grecs* (Paris)
- Hutchinson 1985: G. O. Hutchinson (ed.), *Aeschylus: Seven against Thebes* (Oxford)
- Isager–Hansen 1975: Signe Isager and Mogens Herman Hansen, *Aspects of Athenian Society in the Fourth Century B.C.: a historical introduction to and commentary on the paragraph-speeches and the speech Against Dionysodorus in the Corpus Demosthenicum (XXXII–XXXVIII and LVI)* (Odense)
- Jacobi 1930: Friedrich Jacobi, *ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΘΕΟΙ* (Halle)
- Jacobs 1809: Friedrich C. W. Jacobs, *Additamenta animadversionum in Athenaei Deipnosophistas* (Jena)
- Jacoby 1923: Felix Jacoby (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker I* (Berlin)
- Jacoby 1929–1930: Felix Jacoby (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker IIB* (Berlin)
- Jacoby 1950–1955: Felix Jacoby (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker IIIB* (3 vols.: Leiden)
- Jäkel 1964: Siegfried Jäkel (ed.), *Menandri Sententiae. Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis* (Leipzig)



- Jan 1848–1852: Ludwig von Jan (ed.), *Macrobian Ambrosii Theodosii opera quae supersunt* (Quedlinburg)
- Janko 1984: Richard Janko, *Aristotle on Comedy: towards a reconstruction of Poetics II* (London)
- Janko 1992: Richard Janko (ed.), *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: Books 13–16* (Cambridge)
- Jardé 1925: Auguste Jardé, *Les céréales dans l'antiquité grecque* (Paris)
- Jasny 1944: Naum Jasny, *The Wheats of Classical Antiquity* (Baltimore)
- Jebb 1887: Richard Claverhouse Jebb (ed.), *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments. Part II: The Oedipus Coloneus* (Cambridge)
- Jones 1910: Horace Leonard Jones, *The Poetic Plural in Tragedy in the Light of Homeric Usage* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 19: Ithaca)
- Judeich 1931: Walther Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*<sup>2</sup> (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 3.2.2: Munich)
- Kaibel 1887: Georg Kaibel, 'Sententiarum liber quartus', *Hermes* 22: 497–514
- Kaibel 1894: Georg Kaibel, 'Anaxandrides I', *RE* 2: 2078–9
- Kaibel 1899a: Georg Kaibel (ed.), *Comicorum graecorum fragmenta* (Poetarum graecorum fragmenta 6.1: Berlin)
- Kaibel 1899b: Georg Kaibel, *De Phrynicho sophista* (Göttingen)
- Kakavogiannes 2005: Evangelos Ch. Kakavogiannes, *Μέταλλα εργάσιμα και συγκεχωρημένα. Η οργάνωση της εκμετάλλευσης του ορυκτού πλούτου της Λαυρεωτικής από την Αθηναϊκή Δημοκρατία* (Δημοσιεύματα του Αρχαιολογικού Δελτίου 90: Athens)
- Kamerbeek 1953: J. C. Kamerbeek (ed.), *Sophocles: The Ajax* (The Plays of Sophocles 1: Leiden)
- Kamerbeek 1967: J. C. Kamerbeek (ed.), *Sophocles: The Oedipus Tyrannus* (The Plays of Sophocles 4: Leiden)
- Kannicht 1969: Richard Kannicht (ed.), Euripides *Helena* (2 vols.: Heidelberg)
- Kanowski 1984: M. G. Kanowski, *Containers of Classical Greece* (St. Lucia)
- Kapparis 1999: Konstantinos A. Kapparis (ed.), *Against Neaira [D.] 59* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 53: Berlin)
- Kassel 1965: Rudolf Kassel (ed.), *Menandri Sicyonius* (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 185: Berlin)
- Kassel 1976: Rudolf Kassel, 'Euripides Bakchen 23', *ZPE* 21: 35–6
- Kassel 1979: Rudolf Kassel, 'Ein neues Philemonfragment', *ZPE* 36: 15–21
- Kassel 1983: Rudolf Kassel, 'Dialoge mit Statuen', *ZPE* 51: 1–12
- Kassel–Austin 1983–2001: Rudolf Kassel and Colin Austin (eds.), *Poetae comici Graeci* (8 vols. [2001, 1991, 1984, 1983, 1986, 1998, 1989, 1995]: Berlin and New York)
- Katsouris 1976: Andreas G. Katsouris, *Η παρεξήγηση στην τραγωδία και στην κωμωδία* (Ioannina)
- Keller 1909–1913: Otto Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt* (2 vols.: Leipzig)
- Kennedy 1991: George A. Kennedy (trans.), *Aristotle on Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (Oxford)
- Kerényi 1960: Karl Kerényi, 'Parva realia', *SO* 36: 5–16
- Kerferd 1950: G. Kerferd, 'The First Greek Sophists', *CR* 64: 8–10



- Keuls 1978: Eva Keuls, *Plato and Greek Painting* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 5: Leiden)
- Kidd 1997: Douglas Kidd (ed.), *Aratus: Phaenomena* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 34: Cambridge)
- Killeen 1973: J. F. Killeen, 'Plautus Pseud. 296ff.', *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 26: 59–60
- Kirk 1990: G. S. Kirk (ed.), *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume II: Books 5–8* (Cambridge)
- Kleingünther 1933: Adolf Kleingünther, *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung* (Philologus Supplement 26.1: Leipzig)
- Kleinknecht 1937: Hermann Kleinknecht *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 28: Stuttgart)
- Klinz 1933: Albert Klinz, *ΙΕΡΟΣ ΓΑΜΟΣ: quaestiones selectae ad sacras nuptias Graecorum religionis et poeseos pertinentes* (Halle)
- Klinz 1935: Albert Klinz, 'Ἰερὸς γάμος', *RE* Suppl. 6: 107–13
- Kock 1875: Theodor Kock, 'Comicorum graecorum emendationes', *RhM* 30: 398–418
- Kock 1880–1888: Theodor Kock (ed.), *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta* (3 vols. [1880, 1884, 1888]: Leipzig)
- Kock 1894a: Theodor Kock (ed.), *Die Wolken*<sup>4</sup> (Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes 1: Berlin)
- Kock 1894b: Theodor Kock (ed.), *Die Vögel*<sup>5</sup> (Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes 4: Berlin)
- Kock 1898: Theodor Kock (ed.), *Die Frösche*<sup>4</sup> (Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes 3: Berlin)
- Koller 1958: Hermann Koller, 'Theoros und Theoria', *Glotta* 36: 273–86
- Komornicka 1996: A. M. Komornicka, 'Les toastes portés au cours de banquets athéniens. À partir de fragments de la comédie grecque', in C. Klodt (ed.), *Satura Lanx: Festschrift für Werner A. Krenkel* (*Spudasmata* 62: Zurich, New York and Hildesheim), pp. 169–78
- Konstantakos 2004: Ioannis M. Konstantakos, 'Antiphanes' Agroikos-plays: An Examination of the Ancient Evidence and Fragments', *RCCM* 46: 9–40
- Konstantakos 2005: Ioannis M. Konstantakos, 'Aspects of the Figure of the ἄγροικος in Ancient Comedy', *RhM* 148: 1–26
- Kontos–Charitonides 1903: K. S. Kontos and Ch. Ch. Charitonides, 'Ποικίλα φιλολογικά', *Ἀθηνᾶ* 15: 213–454
- Koraes 1822: Adamantios Koraes (ed.), *Ἀριστοτέλους Ἠθικὰ Νικομάχεια* (Ελληνική Βιβλιοθήκη 14: Paris)
- Kordellas 1894: A. Kordellas, 'Λαυρεωτικοὶ ἀρχαϊότητες', *MDAI(A)* 19: 238–44
- Körte 1959: Alfred Körte (ed.), *Menander: Reliquiae* II (rev. Andreas Thierfelder: Leipzig)
- Kotsidu 1991: Haritini Kotsidu, *Die musischen Agone der Panathäen in archaischer und klassischer Zeit: eine historisch-archäologische Untersuchung* (Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt 8: Munich)
- Koumanoudes 1979: Stephanos N. Koumanoudes, *Θηβαϊκή προσωπογραφία* (Athens)
- Kraay 1976: Colin M. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London)
- Kramer 1983: Johannes Kramer, 'Etyma romanischer Wörter in griechischen Papyrusurkunden', *ZPE* 51: 117–22

- Krieter-Spiro 1997: Martha Krieter-Spiro, *Sklaven, Köche und Hetären: das Dienstpersonal bei Menander: Stellung, Rolle, Komik und Sprache* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 93: Stuttgart)
- Krieter-Spiro 2009: Martha Krieter-Spiro (ed.), *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar/BK) III: dritter Gesang (Γ)* (Berlin and New York)
- Kugelmeier 1996: Christoph Kugelmeier, *Reflexe früher und zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der Alten attischen Komödie* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 80: Stuttgart and Leipzig)
- Kühner–Blass 1890–1892: Raphael Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Erster Teil: Elementar- und Formenlehre* (3rd ed. rev. by F. Blass: Hannover)
- Kühner–Gerth 1898–1904: Raphael Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre* (3rd ed., rev. by B. Gerth.: Hannover and Leipzig)
- Kurtz–Boardman 1971: Donna Kurtz and John Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs* (London)
- Küttler 1909: Otto Küttler, *Precationes quomodo oratores veteres usurpaverint in orationibus* (Jena)
- Labiano Ilundain 2000: Juan Miguel Labiano Ilundain, *Estudio de las interjecciones en las comedias de Aristófanes* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 48: Amsterdam)
- Ladewig 1842: Theodor Ladewig, *Über den Kanon des Volcatius Sedigitus* (Neustrelitz)
- Lambert 2004: Stephen D. Lambert, 'Restoring Athenian Names', in Angelos P. Matthaiou and Georgia E. Malouchou (eds.), *Ἀττικαὶ ἐπιγραφαὶ. Πρακτικὰ συμποσίου εἰς μνήμην Adolf Wilhelm* (Athens), pp. 327–41
- Lambert 2012: Stephen D. Lambert, *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1–322/1 BC* (Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy: Leiden and Boston)
- La Penna 1959: Antonio La Penna (ed.), *Scholia in P. Ovidi Nasonis Ibin* (Firenze)
- Latte 1915: Kurt Latte, 'Zur Zeitbestimmung des Antiatticista', *Hermes* 50: 373–94
- Latte 1953–1966: Kurt Latte (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon* (2 vols.: Copenhagen)
- Latte 1961: Kurt Latte (ed.), *Corpus paroemiographorum graecorum: Supplementum* (Hildesheim, Zurich and New York)
- Latte 1965: Kurt Latte and Hartmut Erbse (ed.), *Lexica graeca minora* (Hildesheim)
- Latte 1968: Kurt Latte, *Kleine Schriften zu Religion, Recht, Literatur und Sprache der Griechen und Römer* (Munich)
- Lautensach 1916: Otto Lautensach, 'Grammatische Studien zu den attischen Tragikern und Komikern. Optativ (Fortsetzung zu Glotta VII 92ff.). Nachtrag zu Glotta VII S. 102', *Glotta* 8: 168–96
- Lautensach 1917: Otto Lautensach, 'Grammatische Studien zu den attischen Tragikern und Komikern (Fortsetzung zu Glotta VII 92ff.). Nachtrag zu Glotta VIII S. 196', *Glotta* 9: 69–94
- Lawler 1941: Lillian B. Lawler, 'ΙΧΘΥΕΣ ΧΟΡΕΥΤΑΙ', *CP* 36: 142–55
- Leaf 1900–1902: Walter Leaf (ed.), *The Iliad* (2 vols.: London)
- Leeuwen 1896: J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Ranae* (Leiden)
- Leeuwen 1898: J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Nubes* (Leiden)
- Leeuwen 1900: J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Equites* (Leiden)
- Leeuwen 1901: J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Acharnenses* (Leiden)
- Leeuwen 1902a: J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Aves* (Leiden)

- Leeuwen 1902b: J. van Leeuwen, 'Ad Aristophanis Plutum (cont.)', *Mnemosyne* ns 30: 348–60
- Leeuwen 1909: J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Vespae*<sup>2</sup> (Leiden)
- Lefèvre 1982: Eckard Lefèvre, *Maccus vortit barbare: Vom tragischen Amphitryon zum tragikomischen Amphrityo* (AbhMainz: Mainz).
- Lefkowitz 1981: Mary Lefkowitz, *Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore)
- Legrand 1910: Ph.-E. Legrand, *Daos: tableau de la comedie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle* (Κωμωδία Νέα) (Lyon and Paris)
- Lehmann 1630: Christopher Lehmann (ed.), *Florilegium politicum: politischer Blumen-garten* (s.l.)
- Lehrs 1882: Karl Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis homericis*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig)
- Leo 1908: Friedrich Leo, *Der Monolog im Drama: ein Beitrag zur griechisch-römischen Poetik* (Berlin)
- Leo 1912: Friedrich Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin)
- Leumann 1953: M. Leumann, 'Deminutiva auf -ύλλιον und Personnamen mit Kennvokal u im Griechischen', *Glotta* 32: 214–25
- Leutsch 1851: Ernst Ludwig von Leutsch (ed.), *Corpus paroemiographorum graecorum* II (Göttingen)
- Leutsch-Schneidewin 1839: Ernst Ludwig von Leutsch and Friedrich Wilhelm Schneidewin (eds.), *Corpus paroemiographorum graecorum* I (Göttingen)
- Lilja 1976: Saara Lilja, *Dogs in Ancient Greek Poetry* (Commentationes humanarum litterarum 56: Helsinki)
- Lindsay 1900: W. M. Lindsay (ed.), *The Captivi of Plautus* (London)
- Lloyd 1975–1988: Alan B. Lloyd (ed.), *Herodotus, Book II* (3 vols., Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain 43: Leiden)
- Lloyd-Jones 1975: Hugh Lloyd-Jones (ed.), *Females of the Species: Semonides on Women* (London)
- Lloyd-Jones 1978: Hugh Lloyd-Jones, 'Ten Notes on Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*', in R. D. Dawe, J. Diggle and P. E. Easterling (eds.), *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry by Former Pupils Presented to Sir Denys Page on his Seventieth Birthday* (Cambridge), pp. 45–61
- Lloyd-Jones 1990: Hugh Lloyd-Jones, *The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones: Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy* (Oxford)
- Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990a: Hugh Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson (eds.), *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Scriptorum classicorum bibliotheca oxoniensis: Oxford)
- Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990b: Hugh Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea: Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Oxford)
- Lobeck 1809: Christian August Lobeck (ed.), *Sophoclis Ajax* (Leipzig)
- Lobeck 1820: Christian August Lobeck (ed.), *Phrynichi Eclogae nominum et verborum atticorum* (Leipzig)
- Lobeck 1829: Christian August Lobeck, *Aglaophamus, sive, de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis libri tres* (Königsberg)
- Lobeck 1837: Christian August Lobeck, *Paralipomena grammaticae Graecae* (Leipzig)

- Lobeck 1843: Christian August Lobeck, *Pathologiae sermonis graecae prolegomena* (Leipzig)
- Lobeck 1853–1862: Christian August Lobeck, *Pathologiae graeci sermonis elementa* (2 vols.: Königsberg)
- Löbl 1997–2008: Rudolf Löbl, *TEXNH – TECHNE: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung dieses Wortes in der Zeit von Homer bis Aristoteles* (3 vols.: Würzburg)
- Loewe 1925: R. Loewe, 'Die Vokativpartikel in der griechischen Prosa', *ZVS* 53: 115–49
- Long 1986: Timothy Long, *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* (Carbondale)
- Lonsdale 1990: Steven H. Lonsdale, *Creatures of Speech: Lion, Herding, and Hunting Similes in the Iliad* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 5: Stuttgart)
- Loomis 1998: William T. Loomis, *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens* (Ann Arbor)
- López Eire 1996: Antonio López Eire, *La lengua colloquial de la Comedia aristophánica* (Murcia)
- Lucas 1940: H. Lucas, 'Zu Herakleides Lembos', *Hermes* 75: 234–7
- Maas 1914: Paul Maas, 'Hymenaios', *RE* 17: 130–4
- Maas–Snyder 1989: Martha Maas and Jane McIntosh Snyder, *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece* (New Haven)
- MacDowell 1971: Douglas M. MacDowell (ed.), *Aristophanes: Wasps* (Oxford)
- MacDowell 1990a: Douglas M. MacDowell (ed.), *Demosthenes: Against Meidias (Oration 21)* (Oxford)
- MacDowell 1990b: Douglas M. MacDowell, 'The Meaning of ἀλαζών', in Elizabeth M. Craik (ed.), *'Owls to Athens': Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford), pp. 287–92
- MacLachlan 1993: Bonnie MacLachlan, *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry* (Princeton)
- MacLeod 1978: M. D. MacLeod, 'Some Notes on Three Dialogues of Lucian', *Hermes* 106: 505–8
- Madvig 1884: Johan Nicolai Madvig, *Adversaria critica ad scriptores graecos et latinos III: Novas emendations graecas et Latinas continens* (Copenhagen)
- Mahlow 1926: Georg H. Mahlow, *Neue Wege durch die griechische Sprache und Dichtung* (Berlin)
- Mainoldi 1984: Carla Mainoldi, *L'image du loup et du chien dans la Grèce ancienne d'Homère à Platon* (Paris)
- Martin 1931: Josef Martin, *Symposion: die Geschichte einer literarischen Form* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums: Paderborn)
- Marx 1928: Friedrich Marx (ed.), *Plautus Rudens: Text und Kommentar (AbhLeipzig 38.5: Leipzig)*
- Marzullo 1962: Benedetto Marzullo, review of Edmonds II (1959), *Gnomon* 34: 543–54
- Masson 1986: Olivier Masson, 'Remarques sur l'onomastique d'Ephèse (à propos de l'index *Ephesos* VIII.2)', *ZPE* 64: 173–83
- Masson 1990–2000: Olivier Masson, *Onomastica graeca selecta* (3 vols.: Paris [vols. 1–2], Geneva [vol. 3])
- Mastronarde 1994: Donald J. Mastronarde (ed.), *Euripides: Phoenissae* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 29: Cambridge)

- Mathiesen 1999: Thomas J. Mathiesen, *Apollo's Lyre: Greek Music and Music Theory in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Lincoln NE)
- Matthews 1996: Victor J. Matthews (ed.), *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary* (Mnemosyne Supplement 159: Leiden and New York)
- Mayser 1906–1970. Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* I (Leipzig 1906); II (Berlin 1926–1934); I.1, 2nd edition, rev. H. Schmoll (Berlin 1970); I.2–3, 2nd edition (Berlin 1938)
- McCartney 1934: Eugene S. McCartney, 'The Couch as a Unit of Measurement', *CP* 29: 30–5
- Meineke 1823: August Meineke, *De Euphorionis Chalcidensis vita et scriptis* (Danzig)
- Meineke 1839–1857: August Meineke (ed.), *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum* (5 vols. in 7 [1839, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1857]: Berlin)
- Meineke 1847: August Meineke (ed.), *Fragmenta comicorum graecorum* (editio minor; 2 vols.: Berlin)
- Meineke 1856: August Meineke (ed.), *Theocritus Bion Moschus*<sup>3</sup> (Berlin)
- Meineke 1865: August Meineke, *Vindiciarum Aristophanearum liber* (Leipzig)
- Meineke 1867: August Meineke, *Analecta critica ad Athenaei Deipnosophistas* (Leipzig)
- Meinhardt 1892: Paul Meinhardt, *De forma et usu juramentorum, quae inveniuntur in comicorum graecorum et Platonis, Xenophontis, Luciani sermone* (Jena)
- Mejer 1978: Jørgen Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background* (Hermes Einzelschriften 40: Wiesbaden)
- Mette 1977: Hans Joachim Mette (ed.), *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Griechenland* (Berlin and New York)
- Micha-Lampaki 1984: Aspasia Micha-Lampaki, *Ἡ διατροφή τῶν ἀρχαίων Ἑλλήνων κατὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους κωμωδιογράφους* (Athens)
- Mikalson 1975: Jon D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton)
- Mikalson 1983: Jon D. Mikalson, *Athenian Popular Religion* (Chapel Hill)
- Milanezi 2000: Silvia Milanezi, 'Laughter as Dessert: On Athenaeus' Book Fourteen, 613–616', in David Braund and John Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire* (Exeter), pp. 400–12
- Miller 1969: J. Innes Miller, *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire, 29 B.C. to A.D. 641* (Oxford)
- Millis 1997: B. W. Millis, 'Antiphanes fr. 46 K-A and the Problem of Spartan Moustaches', *CQ* NS 47: 574–8
- Millis–Olson 2012: B. W. Millis and S. Douglas Olson (eds.), *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens: IG II<sup>2</sup> 2318–2325 and Related Texts* (Brill Studies in Greek and Latin Epigraphy: Leiden and Boston)
- Mills 1997: Sophie Mills, *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford Classical and Philosophical Monographs: Oxford)
- Minnen 1997: Peter van Minnen, 'The Performance and Readership of the *Persai* of Timotheus', *APF* 43: 246–60
- Mittelhaus 1919: K. Mittelhaus, 'Kanephoroi', *RE* 20: 1862–6
- Moorhouse 1982: A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Mnemosyne Supplement 75: Leiden)

- Morelius 1553: Gulielmus Morelius (ed.), *Ex veterum comicorum fabulis, quae integrae non extant, sententiae* (Paris)
- Morell 1824: Thomas Morell, *Lexicon graeco-prosodiacum* (ed. altera: London)
- Moreno 2007: Alfonso Moreno, *Feeding the Democracy: The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC* (Oxford Classical Monographs: Oxford)
- Moretti 1957: Luigi Moretti, *Olympionikai: i vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici* (Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei 354; Memorie 8.8.2: Rome)
- Morrison 1996: J. S. Morrison, *Greek and Roman Oared Warships* (Oxford)
- Morrison-Coates 1986: J. S. Morrison and J. F. Coates, *The Athenian Trireme* (Cambridge)
- Morrison-Williams 1968: J. S. Morrison and R. T. Williams, *Greek Oared Ships, 900–322 B.C.* (Cambridge)
- Müller 1986: Carl Werner Müller, 'Io und Argos auf einem frühkaiserzeitlichen Wandmosaik', *RhM* 129: 142–56
- Murgia 1971: Charles E. Murgia, 'More on the Helen Episode', *CSCA* 4: 203–17
- Murray 1990: Oswyn Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford)
- Naber 1880: Samuel Adriaan Naber, 'Ad fragmenta comicorum graecorum', *Mnemosyne* ns 8: 21–55
- Naber 1882: Samuel Adriaan Naber, 'Euripidea', *Mnemosyne* ns 10: 258–89
- Naeke 1817: August Ferdinand Naeke (ed.), *Choerili Sami quae supersunt* (Leipzig)
- Naeke 1842–1945: August Ferdinand Naeke, *Opuscula Philologica* (2 vols.: Bonn)
- Nauck 1848: August Nauck (ed.), *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta* (Halle)
- Nauck 1862: August Nauck, *Euripideische Studien* (Mémoires de l'académie impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg, VII<sup>e</sup> série, tome VI, no. V: St. Petersburg)
- Nauck 1866: August Nauck, 'Kritische Bemerkungen IV', *Mélanges gréco-romains* 2: 639–746
- Nauck 1884: August Nauck (ed.), *Iamblichi de vita pythagorica liber* (St. Petersburg)
- Nauck 1888: August Nauck, 'Kritische Bemerkungen IX', *Mélanges gréco-romains* 5: 93–252
- Nauck 1894: August Nauck, 'Bemerkungen zu Kock Comicorum Atticorum fragm.', *Mélanges gréco-romains* 6: 53–180
- Navarre 1924: Octave Navarre (ed.), *Les caractères de Théophraste* (Paris)
- Neil 1901: Robert Alexander Neil (ed.), *The Knights of Aristophanes* (Cambridge)
- Nesselrath 1985: Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, *Lukians Parasitendialog: Untersuchungen und Kommentar* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 22: Berlin and New York)
- Nesselrath 1990: Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, *Die attische Mittlere Komödie: Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 36: Berlin and New York)
- Nesselrath 1993: Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, 'Parody and Later Greek Comedy', *HSCP* 95: 181–95
- Nesselrath 1995: Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, 'Myth, Parody, and Comic Plots: The Birth of Gods and Middle Comedy', in Gregory W. Dobrov (ed.), *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy* (Atlanta), pp. 1–27



- Nesselrath 1998: Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, 'The Polis of Athens in Middle Comedy', in Gregory W. Dobrov (ed.), *The City as Comedy: Society and Representation in Athenian Drama* (Chapel Hill), pp. 271–88
- Neumann 1958: Manfred Neumann, *Die poetische Gerechtigkeit in der neuen Komödie: Untersuchungen zur Technik des antiken Lustspiels* (Speyer)
- Newman 1887–1902: William Lambert Newman (ed.), *The Politics of Aristotle* (4 vols.: Oxford)
- Nickau 1966: Klaus Nickau (ed.), *Ammonii qui dicitur liber De adfinium vocabulorum differentia* (Leipzig)
- Nilsson 1967–1974: Martin P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*<sup>3</sup> (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 5.2.1–2: Munich)
- Nixon 1995: Lucia Nixon, 'The Cults of Demeter and Kore', in R. Hawley and B. Levick (eds.), *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments* (London), pp. 75–96
- Nock 1928: Arthur Darby Nock, 'Notes on Ruler-Cult, I–IV', *JHS* 48: 21–43
- Nock 1972: Arthur Darby Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (ed. Z. Stewart, 2 vols.: Oxford)
- Nünlist 1993: René Nünlist, 'P. Mich. inv. 6950 (unpubliziert), P. Köln 203 und 243: Szenen aus Menanders *Dis Exapaton*?', *ZPE* 99: 245–78
- Oakley–Sinos 1993: John H. Oakley and Rebecca H. Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison)
- Oeri 1948: Hans Georg Oeri, *Der Typ der komischen Alten in der griechischen Komödie, seine Nachwirkungen und seine Herkunft* (Basel)
- Ohlert 1912: Konrad Ohlert, *Rätsel und Rätselspiele der alten Griechen*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin)
- Oldfather 1926: William Abbott Oldfather, 'Lokris', *RE* 25: 1135–1288
- Olshausen 1991: Eckart Olshausen, *Einführung in die historische Geographie der alten Welt* (Darmstadt)
- Olson 1992: S. Douglas Olson, 'Names and Naming in Aristophanic Comedy', *CQ* ns 42: 304–19
- Olson 1998: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Aristophanes: Peace* (Oxford)
- Olson 2002: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Aristophanes: Acharnians* (Oxford)
- Olson 2007: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy* (Oxford and New York)
- Olson 2012: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and Related Texts* (Texte und Kommentare 39: Berlin and Boston)
- Olson 2015: S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Eupolis fr. 326–497: fragmenta incertarum fabularum* (Fragmenta Comica 8.3: Berlin)
- Olson–Sens 1999: S. Douglas Olson and Alexander Sens (eds.), *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE* (American Classical Studies 44: Atlanta)
- Olson–Sens 2000: S. Douglas Olson and Alexander Sens (eds.), *Archestratus of Gela: Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE* (Oxford)
- Orth 2009: Christian Orth, *Strattis. Die Fragmente. Ein Kommentar* (Studia Comica 2: Berlin)
- Orth 2013: Christian Orth (ed.), *Alkaios – Apollophanes* (Fragmenta Comica 9.1: Berlin)

- Osborne 1981–1983: Michael J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren 98, 101, 109, 4 vols. in 3: Brussels)
- Otto 1890: August Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig)
- Page 1938: Denys L. Page (ed.), *Euripides: Medea* (Oxford)
- Page 1955: Denys L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (Oxford)
- Page 1978: Denys Page (ed.), *The Epigrams of Rufinus* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 21: Cambridge)
- Paley 1889: F. A. Paley (ed.), *Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets with Renderings in English Verse* (London)
- Panofka 1847: Theodor Panofka, 'Archäologisches aus Italien', *AZ* 5: 17\*–28\*
- Pantelia 1987: Maria Pantelia, *Beauty Unblamed: A Study on Ancient Portrayals of Helen of Troy* (Diss. Ohio State)
- Papabasileiou 1889: G. Papabasileiou, 'Κριτικαὶ παρατηρήσεις Α' εἰς τὰ ἀποσπάσματα τῶν Ἀττικῶν κωμικῶν (Th. Kock 1880)', *Ἀθηνά* 1: 191–221
- Papastamati-von Moock 2014: Christina Papastamati-von Moock, 'The Theatre of Dionysus Eleuthérios in Athens: New Data and Observations on its "Lycurgan" Phase', in Eric Csapo, Hans Rupprecht Goette, J. Richard Green and Peter Wilson (eds.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Berlin), pp. 15–76
- Papazarkadas 2011: Nikolaos Papazarkadas, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens* (Oxford Classical Monographs: Oxford)
- Pape–Benseler 1884: Wilhelm Pape (ed.), *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*<sup>3</sup> (rev. Gustav Eduard Benseler, 2 vols.: Braunschweig)
- Parca 1992: Maryline Parca, 'Of Nature and Eros: Deianeira in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*', *ICS* 17: 175–92
- Parke 1933: Herbert William Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus* (Oxford)
- Parke–Wormell 1956: Herbert William Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* (2 vols.: Oxford)
- Parker 1997: L. P. E. Parker, *The Songs of Aristophanes* (Oxford)
- Parker 1983: Robert Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford)
- Parker 1996: Robert Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford)
- Parry 1973: Anne Amory Parry, *Blameless Aegisthus: a Study of ἀμύμων and Other Homeric Epithets* (Mnemosyne Supplement 26: Leiden)
- Pearl 1978: Orsamus M. Pearl, 'Rules for Musical Contests', *ICS* 3: 132–9
- Pearson 1917: A. C. Pearson (ed.), *The Fragments of Sophocles* (3 vols.: Cambridge)
- Pease 1904: Arthur Stanley Pease, 'Notes on Some Uses of Bells among the Greeks and Romans', *HSCP* 15: 29–59
- Pease 1907: Arthur Stanley Pease 'Notes on Stoning among the Greeks and Romans', *TAPA* 38: 5–18
- Pease 1920–1923: Arthur Stanley Pease (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis De divinatione* (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 6:2–3, 8:1–2: Urbana)



- Peek 1955: Werner Peek (ed.), *Griechische Vers-Inschriften I: Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin)
- Pélékidis 1962: Chrysis Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (Paris)
- Pellegrino 1998: Matteo Pellegrino (ed.), 'Metagene', in A. M. Belardinelli, O. Imperio, G. Mastromarco, M. Pellegrino and P. Totaro (eds.), *Tessere. Frammenti della commedia greca: studi e commenti* (Bari), pp. 291–339
- Pelliccia 1995: Hayden Pelliccia, *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar* (Hypomnemata 107: Göttingen)
- Peppler 1910: Charles W. Peppler, 'The Termination –κός, as Used by Aristophanes for Comic Effect', *AJP* 31: 428–44
- Perpillou 1973: Jean-Louis Perpillou, *Les substantifs grecs en –εύς* (Études et commentaries 80: Paris)
- Perrone Mercanti 1979: Micaela Perrone Mercanti, *Ancorae Antiquae: per una cronologia preliminare delle ancore del Mediterraneo* (Rome)
- Perusino 1968: Franca Perusino, *Il tetrametro giambico catalettico nella commedia greca* (Rome)
- Peter 1997: Ulrike Peter, *Die Münzen der thrakischen Dynasten (5.–3. Jh. v. Chr.): Hintergründe ihrer Prägung* (Griechisches Münzwerk: Berlin)
- Petersen 1910: Walter Petersen, *Greek Diminutives in –ION* (Weimar)
- Petsas 1966: Photios M. Petsas, 'Ο τάφος τῶν Λευκαδίων (Athens)
- Pfister 1937: F. Pfister, 'Περὶδευπνον', *RE* 37: 720–4
- Pharaklas 2004: Nikolas Pharaklas, *Για την εσπερία Λοκρίδα* (PIΘYMNA 19: Rethymno)
- Phillips 1959: E. D. Phillips, 'The Comic Odysseus', *G&R* ser 2 6: 58–67
- Photos–Jones and Ellis Jones 1994: E. Photos–Jones and J. Ellis Jones, 'The Building and Industrial Remains at Agrileza, Laurion (Fourth Century BC) and their Contribution to the Workings at the Site', *ABSA* 89: 307–58
- Pickard-Cambridge 1900: Arthur Wallace Pickard-Cambridge (ed.), *Select Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets* (Oxford)
- Pickard-Cambridge 1927: Arthur Wallace Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford)
- Pickard-Cambridge 1946: Arthur Wallace Pickard-Cambridge, *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (Oxford)
- Pickard-Cambridge 1953: Arthur Wallace Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (Oxford)
- Pickard-Cambridge 1962: Arthur Wallace Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*<sup>2</sup> (revised by T. B. L. Webster: Oxford)
- Pickard-Cambridge 1968: Arthur Wallace Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*<sup>2</sup> (rev. J. Gould and D. M. Lewis: Oxford)
- Pierson 1830–1831: Johannes Pierson (ed.), *Moeridis atticistae Lexicon atticum* (Leipzig)
- Pirrotta 2009: Serena Pirrotta, *Plato comicus. Die fragmentarischen Komödien: Ein Kommentar* (Studia Comica 1: Berlin)
- Platnauer 1960: Maurice Platnauer, 'Prodelision in Greek Drama', *CQ* NS 10: 140–4
- Porson 1812: Richard Porson, *Adversaria: notae et emendationes in poetis graecos* (ed. by J. H. Monk and C. J. Blomfield: Cambridge)

- Porson 1815: Richard Porson, *Tracts and Miscellaneous Criticisms* (ed. by T. Kidd: London)
- Powell 1938: J. Enoch Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge)
- Powell 1988: J. G. F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero: Cato Maior de senectute* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 28: Cambridge)
- Power 2010: Timothy Power, *The Culture of Kitharōidia* (Hellenic Studies 15: Cambridge MA)
- Pritchett 1956: William Kendrick Pritchett, 'The Attic Stelai Part II', *Hesperia* 25: 178–317
- Pritchett 1974–1991: William Kendrick Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* (5 vols.: Berkeley, etc.)
- Pritchett 1996: William Kendrick Pritchett, *Greek Archives, Cults, and Topography* (Ἀρχαία Ἑλλάς 2: Amsterdam)
- Pritchett 1998: William Kendrick Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes* (Ἀρχαία Ἑλλάς 6: Amsterdam)
- Probert 2006: Philomen Probert, *Ancient Greek Accentuation: Synchronic Patterns, Frequency Effects, and Prehistory* (Oxford Classical Monographs: Oxford)
- Race 1982: William H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Mnemosyne Supplement 74: Leiden)
- Radt 1985: Stefan Radt (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* Vol. 3 *Aeschylus* (Göttingen)
- Radt 1999: Stefan Radt (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* Vol. 4 *Sophocles*<sup>2</sup> (Göttingen)
- Rau 1967: Peter Rau, *Paratragodia: Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes* (Zetemata 45: Munich)
- Ravara Montebelli 2009: Christina Ravara Montebelli, *Halieutica : pescatori nel mondo antico* (Rerum maritimarum 4: Pesaro)
- Rawlinson 1880: George Rawlinson (ed.), *History of Herodotus: A New English Version* (4 vols.: New York)
- Rehdantz 1845: Carl Otto A. Rehdantz, *Vitae Iphicratis, Charbriae, Timothei Atheniensium* (Berlin)
- Reinach 1921: Adolphe Joseph Reinach, *Recueil Milliet: textes grecs et latins relatifs à l'histoire de la peinture ancienne* (Paris)
- Reinhold 1970: Meyer Reinhold, *History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity* (Collection Latomus 116: Brussels)
- Reisch 1885: Emil Reisch, *De musicis Graecorum certaminibus* (Vienna)
- Reisig 1816: Karl Christian Reisig, *Coniectaneorum in Aristophanem libri duo* (only vol. I published: Leipzig)
- Reitzenstein 1893: Richard Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion* (Giessen)
- Renahan 1969: Robert Renahan, *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader* (Cambridge MA)
- Renahan 1971: Robert Renahan, 'The Michigan Alcidas-papyrus: A Problem in Methodology', *HSCP* 75: 85–105
- Renahan 1975: Robert Renahan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes: A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones* (Hypomnemata 45: Göttingen)
- Renahan 1976: Robert Renahan, *Studies in Greek Texts* (Hypomnemata 43: Göttingen)

- Rhodes 1981: P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaeon Politeia* (Oxford)
- Rhodes–Osborne 2003: P. J. Rhodes and Robin Osborne (eds.), *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404–323 BC* (Oxford)
- Ribbeck 1882: Otto Ribbeck, *Alazon: ein Beitrag zur antiken Ethnologie und zur Kenntnis der griechisch-römischen Komödie* (Leipzig)
- Ribbeck 1883: Otto Ribbeck, *Kolax: eine ethologische Studie* (AbhLeipzig 9: Leipzig)
- Ribbeck 1885: Otto Ribbeck, *Agroikos: eine ethologische Studie* (AbhLeipzig 10: Leipzig)
- Ribbeck 1897: Otto Ribbeck (ed.), *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta II: comicorum fragmenta*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig)
- Richards 1907: Herbert Richards, 'Further Notes on the Greek Comic Fragments', *CQ* 1: 160–81
- Richards 1909: Herbert Richards, *Aristophanes and Others* (London)
- Richardson 1974: N. J. Richardson (ed.), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford)
- Richter 1926: Gisela M. A. Richter, *Ancient Furniture: A History of Greek, Etruscan and Roman Furniture* (Oxford)
- Richter 1966: Gisela M. A. Richter, *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (London)
- Richter–Milne 1935: Gisela M. A. Richter and Marjorie J. Milne, *Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases* (New York)
- Riddell 1867: James Riddell (ed.), *The Apology of Plato, with a Revised Text and English Notes, and a Digest of Platonic Idioms* (Oxford)
- Riginos 1976: Alice Swift Riginos, *Platonica: the Anecdotes concerning the Life and Writings of Plato* (Leiden)
- Rijksbaron 1984: Albert Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek* (Amsterdam)
- Robert 1920: Carl Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* (Berlin)
- Roccos 1995: Linda J. Roccos, 'The Kanephoros and her Festival Mantle in Greek Art', *AJA* 99: 641–66
- Rogers 1915: Benjamin Bickley Rogers (ed.), *The Wasps of Aristophanes, Acted at Athens at the Lenaean Festival, B.C. 422*<sup>2</sup> (London)
- Romilly 1984: Jacqueline de Romilly, 'Patience, mon coeur': *L'essor de la psychologie dans la littérature grecque classique* (Collection d'études anciennes: Paris)
- Roscher 1883: Wilhelm Heinrich Roscher, *Nektar und Ambrosia: mit einem Anhang über die Grundbedeutung der Aphrodite und Athene* (Leipzig)
- Roscher 1884–1937: Wilhelm Heinrich Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (6 vols. in 9: Leipzig)
- Rosen 2000: Ralph M. Rosen, 'Cratinus' *Pytine* and the construction of the comic self', in David Harvey and John Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London), pp. 23–39
- Rosivach 1987: Vincent J. Rosivach, 'Execution by Stoning in Athens', *ClAnt* 6: 232–48
- Rosivach 1991: Vincent J. Rosivach, 'Some Athenian Presuppositions about "The Poor"', *G&R* 38: 189–98
- Rostagni 1920: A. Rostagni, 'Sui "Caratteri" di Teofrasto', *RFIC* 48: 417–43

- Rothwell 1995: Kenneth S. Rothwell, Jr., 'The Continuity of the Chorus in Fourth-Century Attic Comedy', in Gregory W. Dobrov (ed.), *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy* (Atlanta), pp. 99–118
- Rouse 1902: W. H. D. Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings: an essay in the history of Greek religion* (Cambridge)
- Rouveret 1990: Agnès Rouveret, *Histoire et imaginaire de la peinture ancienne: Ve siècle av. J.-C.–Ier siècle ap. J.-C.* (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 274: Rome)
- Ruhnken 1768: David Ruhnken (ed.), *P. Rutilii Lupi De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis libri duo* (Leiden)
- Ruhnken 1828a: David Ruhnken (ed.), *Timaei sophistae lexicon vocum platoniarum* (ed. G. Koch: Leipzig)
- Ruhnken 1828b: David Ruhnken, *Orationes, dissertationes et epistolae* (ed. F.T. Friedemann: Braunschweig)
- Rusten 2011: Jeffrey S. Rusten (ed.), *The Birth of Comedy: Texts, Documents, and Art from Athenian Comic Competitions, 486–280* (Baltimore)
- Rutherford 1881: W. Gunion Rutherford (ed.), *The New Phrynichus, being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus* (London)
- Rzach 1902: Aloisius Rzach (ed.), *Hesiodi carmina: accedit Homeri et Hesiodi certamen* (editio maior: Leipzig)
- Sachs 2012: Gerd Sachs, *Die Jagd im antiken Griechenland* (Hamburg)
- Sallares 1991: Robert Sallares, *The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World* (London)
- Salmon 1984: B. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth: A History of the City to 338 BC* (Oxford)
- Sanchis Llopis et al. 2007: J. Sanchis Llopis, R. Montañés Gómez and J. Pérez Asensio (eds.), *Fragmentos de la comedia media* (Madrid)
- Sande Bakhuyzen 1877: Willem Hendrik van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *De parodia in comoediis Aristophanis: locos ubi Aristophanes verbis epicorum, lyricorum, tragicorum utitur* (Utrecht)
- Sandulescu 1964: C. Sandulescu, 'Über Formen und Namen der griechischen Gefässe', *Das Altertum* 10: 201–15
- Sansone 1993: David Sansone, 'Towards a New Doctrine of the Article in Greek: Some Observations on the Definite Article in Plato', *CP* 88: 191–205
- Scarborough 1991: John Scarborough, 'The Pharmacology of Sacred Plants, Herbs, and Roots', in C. Faraone and D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion* (Oxford), pp. 138–74
- Schadewaldt 1966: W. Schadewaldt, 'Experimentelle Philologie', *WS* 79: 66–79
- Schaffner 1911: Otto Schaffner, *De aversum loquendi ratione in comoedia Graeca* (Giessen)
- Schaps 1979: David M. Schaps, *Economic Rights of Women in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh)
- Schauenburg 1979: K. Schauenburg, 'Herakles mousikos', *JDAI* 94: 49–76
- Scheibler 1994: Ingeborg Scheibler, *Griechische Malerei der Antike* (Munich)
- Schelp 1975: Jochen Schelp, *Das Kanoun: Der griechische Opferkorb* (Beiträge zur Archäologie 8: Würzburg)
- Schenkl 1891: K. Schenkl, 'Adnotatiunculae ad comicorum atticorum fragmenta', in *Commentationes Woefflinianae* (Leipzig), pp. 323–8

- Schiassi 1951: G. Schiassi, 'De temporum quaestionibus ad Atticas IV saeculi meretrices et eiusdem comicas fabulas pertinentibus', *RFIC* 79: 217–45
- Schlesinger 1939: Kathleen Schlesinger, *The Greek Aulos: A Study of its Mechanism and of its Relation to the Modal System of Ancient Greek Music* (London)
- Schmid 1887–1897: Wilhelm Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus* (5 vols.: Stuttgart)
- Schmidt 1886–1887: Friedrich Wilhelm Schmidt, *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen dramatikern, nebst einem Anhang zur Kritik der Anthologie* (3 vols.: Berlin)
- Schmidt 1876–1886: Johann Hermann Heinrich Schmidt, *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache* (4 vols.: Leipzig)
- Schmidt 1888: J. O. Schmidt, 'Ulixes comicus', *JCP* Supplement 16: 373–403
- Schmidt 1902: K. Schmidt, 'Die griechischen Personennamen bei Plautus', *Hermes* 37: 173–211
- Schmidt 1886: Richard Schmidt, *De Hymenaeo et Thalasio dis veterum nuptialibus* (Kiel)
- Schmitt-Pantel 1990: Pauline Schmitt-Pantel, 'Sacrificial Meal and Symposion: Two Models of Civic Institutions in the Archaic City?', in Oswyn Murray (ed.), *Symptica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford), pp. 14–33
- Schmitz 1978: H. Schmitz, 'Heiliger Wein: religionsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu einigen Trinksitten', *ZPE* 28: 288–94
- Schnapp 1997: Alain Schnapp, *Le chasseur et la cité: chasse et érotique en Grèce ancienne* (Paris)
- Schnapp-Gourbeillon 1981: Annie Schnapp-Gourbeillon, *Lions, héros, masques: les représentations de l'animal chez Homère* (Paris)
- Scholtz 1996: Andrew Scholtz, 'Perfume from Peron's: The Politics of Pedicure in Anaxandrides Fragment 41 Kassel–Austin', *ICS* 21: 69–86
- Schöne 1925: H. Schöne, 'Eine umstrittene Wortstellung des Griechischen', *Hermes* 60: 144–73
- Schultz 1909–1912: Wolfgang Schultz, *Rätsel aus dem hellenistischen Kulturkreise* (2 vols.: Leipzig)
- Schultz 1914: Wolfgang Schultz, 'Rätsel', *RE* ser. 2 1: 62–125
- Schulze 1892: Wilhelm Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae* (Gütersloh)
- Schwering 1916/1917: W. Schwering, 'Zur Entstehung des Wortes *tragicomoedia*', *IF* 37: 139–41
- Seaford 1984: Richard Seaford (ed.), *Euripides: Cyclops* (Oxford)
- Sealey 1956: Raphael Sealey, 'Callistratus of Aphidna and his Contemporaries', *Historia* 5: 178–203
- Sekunda 2010: Nick Sekunda (ed.), *Ergasteria: works presented to John Ellis Jones on his 80th birthday* (Gdansk)
- Seyer 2007: Martin Seyer, *Der Herrscher als Jäger: Untersuchungen zur königlichen Jagd im persischen und makedonischen Reich vom 6.–4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. sowie unter den Diadochen Alexanders des Grossen* (Vienna)
- Shapiro 1992: H. A. Shapiro, 'Mousikoi Agones: Music and Poetry at the Panathenaia', in Jennifer Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens* (Hanover NH and Princeton), pp. 53–75
- Shilleto 1874: Richard Shilleto (ed.), *Demosthenis De falsa legatione*<sup>4</sup> (Cambridge)

- Shipley 1987: Graham Shipley, *A History of Samos, 800–188 BC* (Oxford)
- Shipp 1979: George Pelham Shipp, *Modern Greek Evidence for the Ancient Greek Vocabulary* (Sydney)
- Sicking 1883: L. J. Sicking, *Annotationes in Antiatticistam* (Amsterdam)
- Sidwell 2000: Keith Sidwell, 'Athenaeus, Lucian and Fifth-century Comedy', in David Braund and John Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire* (Exeter), pp. 136–52
- Simms 1989: Ronda R. Simms, 'Isis in Classical Athens', *CJ* 89: 216–21
- Smyth 1900: Herbert Weir Smyth (ed.), *Greek Melic Poets* (London)
- Smyth 1956: Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. by G. M. Messing: Cambridge MA)
- Snell 1986: Bruno Snell (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* Vol. I *Didascaliae tragicae, catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum*<sup>2</sup> (rev. Richard Kannicht: Göttingen)
- Snyder 1979: J. Snyder, 'Aulos and Kithara on the Greek Stage', in Timothy E. Gregory and Anthony J. Podlecki (eds.), *Panathenaia: Studies in Athenian Life and Thought in the Classical Age* (Lawrence KA), pp. 75–95
- Sokolowski 1955: Franciszek Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (Travaux et mémoires 9: Paris)
- Sokolowski 1969: Franciszek Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Travaux et mémoires 18: Paris)
- Solin 1996: Heikki Solin, *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen: ein Namenbuch* (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei Beiheft 2: Stuttgart)
- Solin 2003: Heikki Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom: ein Namenbuch*<sup>2</sup> (CIL Auctarium, ser. nov., vol. 2, 3 vols.: Berlin and New York)
- Sommerstein 1981: Alan H. Sommerstein (ed.), *Aristophanes: Knights* (The Comedies of Aristophanes 2: Warminster)
- Sommerstein 1996: Alan H. Sommerstein (ed.), *Aristophanes: Frogs* (The Comedies of Aristophanes 9: Warminster)
- Sommerstein 2009: Alan H. Sommerstein, *Talking about Laughter and Other Studies in Greek Comedy* (Oxford)
- Sommerstein–Bayless 2012: Alan H. Sommerstein and Andrew J. Bayless, *Oath and State in Ancient Greece* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 306: Berlin and New York)
- Sommerstein–Fletcher 2007: Alan H. Sommerstein and Judith Fletcher (eds.), *Horkos: The Oath in Greek Society* (Exeter)
- Sommerstein–Torrance 2014: Alan H. Sommerstein and Isabelle C. Torrance (eds.), *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 307: Berlin and New York)
- Sparkes 1962: Brian A. Sparkes, 'The Greek Kitchen', *JHS* 82: 121–37
- Sparkes 1975: Brian A. Sparkes, 'Illustrating Aristophanes', *JHS* 95: 122–35
- Spengel 1828: Leonhard Spengel, *ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΤΕΧΝΩΝ sive artium scriptores ab initiis usque ad editos Aristotelis de rhetorica libros* (Stuttgart)
- Spengel 1867: Leonhard Spengel (ed.), *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica* (2 vols.: Leipzig)



- Spyridonidou-Skarsouli 1995: Maria Spyridonidou-Skarsouli (ed.), *Der erste Teil der fünften Athos-Sammlung griechischer Sprichwörter* (Texte und Kommentare 18: Berlin and New York)
- Spyropoulos 1974: Elie S. Spyropoulos, *L'accumulation verbale chez Aristophane* (Thessaloniki)
- Stallbaum 1861: Gottfried Stallbaum (ed.), *Platonis Gorgias*<sup>3</sup> (Platonis opera omnia 2.1: Gotha)
- Stanford 1936: William Bedell Stanford, *Greek Metaphor: Studies in Theory and Practice* (Oxford)
- Stanford 1963a: William Bedell Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford)
- Stanford 1963b: William Bedell Stanford (ed.), *Aristophanes: The Frogs*<sup>2</sup> (London)
- Stanton 1996: G. R. Stanton, 'Some Inscriptions in Attic Demes', *ABSA* 91: 341–64
- Stärk 1989: Ekkehard Stärk, *Die Menaechmi des Plautus und kein griechisches Original* (ScriptOralia 11: Tübingen)
- Starkie 1897: William Joseph Myles Starkie (ed.), *The Wasps of Aristophanes* (London)
- Starkie 1909: William Joseph Myles Starkie (ed.), *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London)
- Starkie 1911: William Joseph Myles Starkie (ed.), *The Clouds of Aristophanes* (London)
- Steinhausen 1910: Joseph Steinhausen, *ΚΩΜΩΔΙΟYΜΕΝΟΙ: De grammaticorum veterum studiis ad homines in comoedia Attica irrisos pertinentibus* (Bonn)
- Stephanis 1988: I. E. Stephanis, *Διονυσιακοὶ τεχνῖται* (Herakleion)
- Stephanopoulos 1987: Th. K. Stephanopoulos, 'Marginalia comica III', *ZPE* 68: 1–7
- Stephanopoulos 1988: Th. K. Stephanopoulos, 'Tragica I', *ZPE* 73: 207–47
- Stephanus 1569: Henricus Stephanus (ed.), *Comicorum graecorum sententiae, id est γνῶμαι, latinis versibus redditae et adnotationibus illustratae* (Paris)
- Stephanus 1831–1865: Henricus Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, post editionem Anglicam, novis additamentis auctum, ordineque alphabetico digestum* (edd. K. B. Hase, W. Dindorf, L. Dindorf: Paris)
- Sternbach 1887: Leo Sternbach, 'De gnomologio Vaticano inedito', *WS* 9: 175–206
- Stevens 1948: Edward B. Stevens, 'Envy and Pity in Greek Philosophy', *AJP* 69 171–89
- Stevens 1971: P. T. Stevens (ed.), *Euripides: Andromache* (Oxford)
- Stevens 1976: P. T. Stevens, *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides* (Hermes Einzelschriften 38: Wiesbaden)
- Stewart 1990: Andrew Stewart, *Greek Sculpture: an Exploration* (New Haven)
- Stewart 1958: Zeph Stewart, 'The *Amphitruo* of Plautus and Euripides' *Bacchae*', *TAPA* 89: 348–73
- Stockert 1983: Walter Stockert (ed.), *T. Maccius Plautus: Aulularia* (Griechische und lateinische Schriftsteller: Stuttgart)
- Stockert 1992: Walter Stockert (ed.), *Euripides: Iphigenie in Aulis* (2 vols.: Vienna)
- Stockert 1994: Walter Stockert (ed.), *Euripides: Hippolytus* (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana: Stuttgart)
- Stone 1984: Laura M. Stone, *Costume in Aristophanic Poetry* (Salem NH)
- Storey 2003: Ian C. Storey (ed.), *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford)

- Strohm 1944: Hans Strohm, *Tyche: zur Schicksalsauffassung bei Pindar und den früh-griechischen Dichtern* (Stuttgart)
- Strömberg 1943: Reinhold Strömberg, *Studien zur Etymologie und Bildung der griechischen Fischnamen* (Göteborg)
- Stroud 1998: Ronald S. Stroud (ed.), *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B.C.* (Hesperia Supplement 29: Princeton)
- Stroud 2006: Ronald S. Stroud, *The Athenian Empire on Stone* (David M. Lewis Memorial Lecture, Oxford 2006: Athens)
- Sullivan 2000: Shirley Darcus Sullivan, *Euripides' Use of Psychological Terminology* (Montreal)
- Sundwall 1909–1910: Johannes Sundwall, *Nachträge zur Prosopographia Attica* (Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar 52: Helsinki)
- Sutton 1974: Dana Ferrin Sutton, 'A Handlist of Satyr Plays', *HSCP* 78: 107–43
- Sutton 1989: Dana Ferrin Sutton (ed.), *Dithyrambographi graeci* (Hildesheim etc.)
- Swindler 1929: Mary Hamilton Swindler, *Ancient Painting: From the Earliest Times to the Period of Christian Art* (New Haven)
- Taillardat 1965: Jean Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane: etudes de langue et de style*<sup>2</sup> (Paris)
- Taplin 1993: Oliver Taplin, *Comic Angels and other approaches to Greek drama through vase-paintings* (Oxford)
- Telò 2005: Mario Telò, 'Anaxippus fr. 1.46–7 K.-A.: Awakening Nature', *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 58: 262–6
- Testart–Brunaux 2004: A. Testart and J.–L. Brunaux, 'Eslavage et prix de la fiancée: La société thrace au risque de l'ethnographie comparée', *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 59: 615–40
- Teuffel 1887: W. S. Teuffel (ed.), *Die Wolken des Aristophanes*<sup>2</sup> (rev. by O. Kaehler: Leipzig)
- Theodoridis 1982–2012: Christos Theodoridis (ed.), *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon* (3 vols.: Berlin and New York)
- Thesleff 1954: Holger Thesleff, *Studies on intensification in early and classical Greek* (Commentationes humanarum litterarum 21.1: Helsinki)
- Thomas 1979: Richard F. Thomas, 'New Comedy, Callimachus, and Roman Poetry', *HSCP* 83: 179–206
- Thompson 1936: D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds*<sup>2</sup> (St. Andrews University Publications 39: London)
- Thompson 1947: D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Fishes* (St. Andrews University Publications 45: London)
- Thomson 1939: G. Thomson, 'The Postponement of Interrogatives in Attic Drama', *CQ* 33: 147–52
- Threatte 1980–1996: Leslie Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* (2 vols. [1980, 1996]: Berlin and New York)
- Threatte 1984: Leslie Threatte, 'Grammatical Errors and Epigraphical Hands', in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday* (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Monographs 10: Durham NC), pp. 259–75
- Tierney 1944/1945: J. J. Tierney, 'Some Attic Elements in Plautus', *PRIA* 50: 21–61



- Töppel 1867: Joachim Töppel, *De fragmentis comicorum graecorum quaestiones criticae: specimen tertium* (Neubrandenburg)
- Torr 1894: Cecil Torr, *Ancient Ships* (Cambridge)
- Totaro 1998: Piero Totaro (ed.), 'Amipsia', in A. M. Belardinelli, O. Imperio, G. Mastro-marco, M. Pellegrino and P. Totaro (eds.), *Tessere. Frammenti della commedia greca: studi e commenti* (Bari), pp. 133–94
- Toup 1760: Jonathan Toup, *Emendationes in Suidam, in quibus plurima loca veterum Graecorum, Sophoclis et Aristophanis in primis, cum explicantur tum emaculantur* [pars prima] (London)
- Toup 1770: Jonathan Toup (ed.), *Theocriti Syracusii quae supersunt* (2 vols., ed. Thomas Warton: Oxford)
- Toup 1775: Jonathan Toup, *Curae novissimae sive appendicula notarum et emendationum in Suidam, in quibus plurima loca veterum Graecorum, Sophoclis et Aristophanis in primis, cum explicantur tum emaculantur* (London)
- Toup 1778: Jonathan Toup (ed.), *Dionysii Longini quae supersunt*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford)
- Toup 1790: Jonathan Toup, *Emendationes in Suidam et Hesychium, et alios lexicographos graecos* (4 vols.: Oxford)
- Travlos 1971: John Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (London)
- Trinquier–Vendries 2009: Jean Trinquier and Christoph Vendries (eds.), *Chasses antiques: pratiques et représentations dans le monde gréco-romain (IIIe s. av.–IVe s. apr. J.–C.)* (Rennes)
- Tsantsanoglou 1984: Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou (ed.), *New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius* (Πραγματεῖαι τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν 49: Athens)
- Tucker 1908: T. G. Tucker, 'Emendations in Athenaeus', *CQ* 2: 184–209
- Tzifopoulos 1995: Y. Tzifopoulos, 'Proverbs in Menander's *Dyskolos*: The Rhetoric of Popular Wisdom', *Mnemosyne* 48: 169–77
- Uckermann 1888: W. Uckermann, 'τίς und ὅστις in pronominalen Wiederholungsfragen bei Aristophanes', *Philologus* 46: 57–69
- Usener 1912–1914: Hermann Usener, *Kleine Schriften* (4 vols.: Leipzig)
- Usener 1994: Knut Usener, 'Zur Existenz des Löwen im Griechenland der Antike', *SO* 69: 5–33
- Usher 1999: Stephen Usher, *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality* (Oxford)
- Ussher 1960: R. G. Ussher (ed.), *The Characters of Theophrastus* (London)
- Ussher 1973: R. G. Ussher (ed.), *Aristophanes: Ecclesiazusae* (Oxford)
- Ussher 1977: R. G. Ussher, 'Old Comedy and "Character": Some Comments', *G&R ser.* 2 24: 71–9
- Vahlen 1885: Johannes Vahlen (ed.), *Aristotelis De arte poetica liber*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig)
- Vahlen 1911: Johannes Vahlen, *Gesammelte philologische Schriften* (2 vols.: Leipzig)
- Vahlen 1914: Johannes Vahlen, *Beiträge zu Aristoteles' Poetik* (rev. by H. Schöne: Leipzig)
- Valckenaer 1739: Lodewijk Caspar Valckenaer, *Animadversionum ad Ammonium grammaticum libri tres* (Leiden)
- Valckenaer 1767: Lodewijk Caspar Valckenaer, *Diatrise in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias* (Leiden)
- van der Valk 1971–1987: Marchinus van der Valk (ed.), *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes* (4 vols.: Leiden)

- Veitch 1887: William Veitch, *Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective: their forms, meaning and quantity*<sup>4</sup> (Oxford)
- Velsen 1853: Arthur von Velsen (ed.), *Tryphonis grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta* (Berlin)
- Vendries 1999: Christophe Vendries, *Instruments à cordes et musiciens dans l'empire romain: étude historique et archéologique (IIe siècle av. J.-C./Ve siècle ap. J.-C.)* (Paris)
- Verdenius 1954: W. J. Verdenius, 'καί, "and generally"', *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 7: 38
- Vetter 1933: W. Vetter, 'Monaulos', *RE* 31: 74–5
- Vogt-Spira 1992: Gregor Vogt-Spira, *Dramaturgie des Zufalls: Tyche und Handeln in der Komödie Menanders* (Zetemata 88: Munich)
- Waanders 1983: F. M. J. Waanders, *The History of ΤΕΛΟΣ and ΤΕΛΕΩ in Ancient Greek* (Amsterdam)
- Wachsmuth 1882: Curt Wachsmuth, *Studien zu den griechischen Florilegien* (Berlin)
- Wackernagel 1916: Jakob Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen)
- Wackernagel 1955: Jakob Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften I* (Göttingen)
- Wakefield 1790: Gilbert Wakefield, *Silva critica: sive in auctores sacros profanosque commentarius philologus*. Pars secunda (Cambridge)
- Walbank 1957–1979: F. W. Walbank (ed.), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (3 vols.: Oxford)
- Walker 1997: Susan Walker, *Ancient Faces: Mummy Portraits from Roman Egypt* (London)
- Walpole 1805: Robert Walpole (ed.), *Comicorum graecorum fragmenta quaedam* (Cambridge)
- Wankel 1976: Hermann Wankel (ed.), *Demosthenes, Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz* (Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern, 2 vols.: Heidelberg)
- Ward 1970: A. G. Ward, *The Quest for Theseus* (London)
- Weber 1887: Ludwig Weber, *Quaestionum Laconicarum capita duo* (Göttingen)
- Weber 1996: Marga Weber, *Antike Badekultur* (Munich)
- Webster 1957: T. B. L. Webster, 'Some Psychological Terms in Greek Tragedy', *JHS* 77: 149–54
- Webster 1960: T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander*<sup>2</sup> (Manchester)
- Webster 1970: T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*<sup>2</sup> (Manchester)
- Webster 1978: T. B. L. Webster, *Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy*<sup>3</sup> (BICS Supplement 39: London)
- Webster 1995: T. B. L. Webster, *Monuments Illustrating New Comedy*<sup>3</sup> (rev. J. R. Green and A. Seeberg, BICS Supplement 50: London)
- Wehrli 1948: Fritz Wehrli (ed.), *Die Schule des Aristoteles* Vol. 3 *Klearchos* (Basel)
- Wellman 1896: M. Wellmann, 'Bär', *RE* 4: 2759–62
- Wendel 1935: Carl Wendel (ed.), *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera* (Berlin)
- Wendel 1929: Thilde Wendel, *Die Gesprächsanrede im griechischen Epos und Drama der Blütezeit* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 6: Stuttgart)
- West 1966: M. L. West (ed.), *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford)
- West 1977: M. L. West, 'Tragica I', *BICS* 24: 89–103

- West 1978: M. L. West (ed.), *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford)
- West 1982: M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford)
- West 1987: M. L. West, 'Problems in Euripides' *Orestes*', *CQ* ns 37: 281–93
- West 1992: M. L. West, *Greek Music* (Oxford)
- Westlake 1935: H. D. Westlake, *Thessaly in the Fourth Century* (London)
- Weston 1784: Stephen Weston, *Hermesianax, sive conjecturae in Athenaeum atque aliquot poetarum Graecorum loca* (London)
- White 1987: Heather White, *Studies in the Poetry of Nicander* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 12: Amsterdam)
- White 1912: John Williams White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy* (London)
- Whitehead 1986: David Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica 508/7 B.C.–ca. 250 B.C.* (Princeton)
- Wifstrand 1934: Albert Wifstrand, 'Eine Versregel für die Anapäste der griechischen Tragödie', *Hermes* 69: 210–14
- Wilamowitz 1889: Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), *Euripides: Herakles* (2 vols.: Berlin)
- Wilamowitz 1895: Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), *Euripides: Herakles*<sup>2</sup> (2 vols.: Berlin)
- Wilamowitz 1903: Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), *Timotheos: die Perser* (Leipzig)
- Wilamowitz 1921: Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin)
- Wilamowitz 1925: Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), *Menander: das Schiedsgericht (Epitrepontes)* (Berlin)
- Wilamowitz 1931–1932: Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (2 vols.: Berlin)
- Wilkins 1993: John Wilkins (ed.), *Euripides: Heraclidae* (Oxford)
- Wilkins 2000: John Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy* (Oxford)
- Williams 1986: Charles K. Williams, II, 'Corinth and the Cult of Aphrodite', in Mario A. del Chiaro and William R. Biers (eds.), *Corinthiaca: Studies in Honor of Darrell A. Amyx* (Columbia), pp. 12–24
- Williams 1978: Frederick J. Williams (ed.), *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo, a Commentary* (Oxford)
- Williams 1999: F. Williams, 'Daphne's Hounds: Gender and Feminism in Parthenius 15', *Eikasmos* 10: 137–42
- Willink 1986: Charles W. Willink (ed.), *Euripides: Orestes* (Oxford)
- Willis 1970: James Willis (ed.), *Macrobius*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig)
- Willis 1991: William H. Willis, 'Comoedia Dukiana', *GRBS* 32: 331–53
- Wills 1996: Jeffrey Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford)
- Wilson 1999: Peter Wilson, 'The *aulos* in Athens', in Simon Goldhill and Robin Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge), pp. 58–95
- Wilson 2002: Peter Wilson, 'The musicians among the actors', in Pat Easterling and Edith Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession* (Cambridge), pp. 39–68
- Winkler 1982: J. J. Winkler, 'Akko', *CP* 77: 137–8

- Winter 1925: J. G. Winter, 'A New Fragment on the Life of Homer', *TAPA* 56: 120–9
- Wirth 1880: G. Wirth, 'De motione adiectivorum, quae in ΙΟΣ, ΑΙΟΣ, ΕΙΟΣ, ΙΜΟΣ terminantur', *Leip. Stud.* 3: 1–56
- Wissowa 1913: Georg Wissowa, 'Athenaeus und Macrobius', *NAWG*: 325–37
- Woodford 1966: Susan Woodford, *Exemplum virtutis: A Study of Herakles in Athens in the Second Half of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Diss. Columbia)
- Wotke–Jereb 1949: F. Wotke and H. Jereb, 'Panther', *RE* 36.2: 747–76
- Wright 1911: Frederick Warren Wright, *Studies in Menander* (Baltimore)
- Wright 1917: F. A. Wright, 'The Food of the Gods', *CR* 31: 4–6
- Wycherley 1953: R. E. Wycherley, 'The Painted Stoa: *Sapiens bractis inlita Medis porticus*, Persius 3.53–54', *Phoenix* 7: 20–35
- Wyse 1904: William Wyse (ed.), *The Speeches of Isaeus* (Cambridge)
- Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980: G. Xanthakis-Karamanos, *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy* (Athens)
- Yegül 1992: Fikret K. Yegül, *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge MA)
- Young 1939: S. Young, 'An Athenian Clepsydra', *Hesperia* 8: 274–84
- Zacher 1886: Konrad Zacher, review of Kock II (1884), *PhW* 6: 709–16
- Zagagi 1980: N. Zagagi, *Tradition and Originality in Plautus: Studies of the Amatory Motifs in Plautine Comedy* (Hypomnemata 62: Göttingen)
- Zell 1820: Karl Zell (ed.), *Aristotelis Ethicorum Nicomacheorum libri decem* (2 vols.: Heidelberg)
- Ziegler 1949: Konrat Ziegler, 'Pantheon', *RE* 36.2: 697–747
- Ziehen 1930: Ludwig Ziehen, 'Μάντις' *RE* 28: 1345–55
- Zographou-Lyra 1987: Gerasimoula Zographou-Lyra, *Ο μύθος του Παλαμήδη* (Ioannina)
- Zuntz 1971: Günther Zuntz, *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia* (Oxford)

## Indices

### 1. Index fontium

- Antiat. p. 85.19: fr. 11; p. 87.23: fr. 26;  
 p. 87.5: fr. 32; p. 92.16–21: fr. 63; p.  
 96.33: fr. 12a (= Alexander Com. fr. 2);  
 p. 96.4: fr. 21; p. 104.17: fr. 8; p. 104.32:  
 fr. 15; p. 106.10: fr. 17; p. 106.18: fr.  
 37; p. 106.25: fr. 27; p. 111.27: fr. 74; p.  
 113.1: fr. 14
- Arist. *EN* 7.1152a20–3: fr. 66
- Arist. *Rh.* 3.1411a18–20: fr. 67;  
 3.1412b16–20: fr. 65; 3.1413b21: fr. 10;  
 3.1413b25: test. 8; 3.1413b25: fr. 13
- Ath. 1.28f: fr. 73; 1.34d–e: fr. 59; 2.39a:  
 fr. 58; 2.48a: fr. 72; 2.57e: fr. 80; 2.68b:  
 fr. 51; 3.105f: fr. 28; 3.105f–6a: fr. 38;  
 3.106a: fr. 23; 3.95c: fr. 44; 4.131a–f:  
 fr. 42; 4.166d: fr. 46; 4.176a: fr. 19;  
 4.176a: fr. 52; 4.182d: fr. 36; 5.222b:  
 fr. 55; 6.227b–d: fr. 34; 6.242d–f: fr.  
 35; 6.247e–f: fr. 25; 6.255a–b: fr. 43;  
 6.261f: fr. 50; 6.263b: fr. 4; 7.295e: fr.  
 31; 7.299e–300a: fr. 40; 7.307e–f: fr.  
 35; 7.329e: fr. 28; 9.373f–4b: test.  
 2; 9.373e–f: fr. 48; 10.455f: fr. 6;  
 11.460e: fr. 30; 11.463f: fr. 1; 11.481f:  
 fr. 3; 11.482c–d: fr. 33; 11.502b: fr.  
 82; 12.553d–e: fr. 41; 13.570d–e:  
 fr. 9; 14.614c: fr. 10; 14.634d–e: fr.  
 36; 14.638c–d: fr. 16; 14.642b: fr. 2;  
 14.654b: fr. 7; 14.654f: fr. 29; 15.688a–  
 b: fr. 60; 15.689f–90a: fr. 41; 15.691a:  
 fr. 47; 15.694e: fr. 18; 15.700a: fr. 49
- BKT* V(2).9773: fr. 71
- Chamael. fr. 43: test. 2
- Choerob. in Theodos. *Can.* 4.344.1: fr. 15
- Comm. in Arist. Graeca* 20.444.1–4: fr. 83
- D.L. 3.26: fr. 20
- Et. gen.* AB: fr. 51
- Eust. *Il.* 1148.26: fr. 51; 1183.12: fr. 40;  
 1220.48: fr. 38; 1220.54: fr. 23
- Eust. *Od.* 1462.60: fr. 35; 1632.61–1633.1:  
 fr. 58; 1761.48: fr. 35; 1835.20: fr. 42;  
 1842.64: fr. 31
- Hsch.  $\alpha$  4003: fr. 76
- IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2318.241: test. 4; 2323a.39–40: test.  
 7; 2325.142: test. 6
- IGUR* 218.1–14 (*IG* IX 1098): test. 5
- Macr. *Sat.* 5.21.8: fr. 3
- Marm. Par. *FGrHist* 239 A 70: test. 3
- Phot.  $\alpha$  36: fr. 12;  $\alpha$  780: fr. 75;  $\alpha$  1761: fr.  
 77;  $\nu$  96: fr. 58; 80a;  $\tau$  88: fr. 78
- Poll. 2.166: fr. 70; 5.16: fr. 68; 6.161: fr.  
 5; 6.43: fr. 79; 9.59: fr. 5; 10.172: fr. 24;  
 10.59: fr. 14
- Stob. 2.1.3: fr. 22; 2.46.5: fr. 69; 3.6.6:  
 fr. 61; 3.29.12: fr. 64; 3.41.2: fr. 56;  
 4.20.10: fr. 62; 4.22.4: fr. 71; 4.22b.28:  
 fr. 53; 4.22b.34: fr. 81; 4.23.1: fr. 57;  
 4.24c.41: fr. 81; 4.50c.88: fr. 54
- Suda*  $\alpha$  32: fr. 12;  $\alpha$  1982: test. 1;  $\alpha$  3824:  
 fr. 39;  $\nu$  143: fr. 58; 80a
- Synagoge* B  $\alpha$  740: fr. 75
- $\Sigma^{\text{AT}}$  H. *Il.* 23.1 b<sup>1</sup>: fr. 45
- $\Sigma^{\text{T}}$  H. *Il.* 23.2 b<sup>2</sup>: fr. 45
- $\Sigma^{\text{S}}$  Ov. *Ib.* 523: test. 2b
- Trypho. fr. 110: fr. 36

## 2. Index verborum

- ἀβελτέρειος: 83  
 ἀβέλτερος: 116  
 ἀγαθέ: 52  
 ἄγαλμα: 143  
 ἄγκυρα: 184  
 ἀγνώμων: 274  
 ἀγορᾶ χράομαι: 55  
 ἀγροῖκος/ἄγροικος: 34  
 ἄγω: 160  
 ἀγωνίζομαι: 98  
 ἄδειπνος: 174  
 ἀδικία: 279  
 –αδιον, diminutives in: 135–6  
 ἀθήρη/ἀθήρη: 223  
 αἰέλουρος/αἴλουρος: 193  
 αἰσχροῦ/αἴσχυρα: 58  
 αἰσχροῦ: 106  
 ἀκολάστασμα/ἀκολάστημα: 320  
 ἀκόλαστος: 320  
 ἀκολουθέω: 173  
 ἀκράτεια: 279  
 ἀκράτου: 47  
 ἀλαζονεία: 260  
 ἀλαζών: 260  
 ἀλεκτρύων, gender of: 254  
 ἀλίσκομαι: 165  
 ἀλλά ... γάρ: 163  
 ἀλουργής: 212  
 ἀλουργής/ἀλουργός: 212  
 ἄλς: 209  
 ἀμβροσία: 285–6  
 ἀμύμων: 149  
 ἀμφίδυσσις: 321  
 ἀνάλωμα: 131–2  
 ἀναχαιτίζω: 48  
 ἀνδρικός: 322  
 ἀνήλωμα: 132  
 ἀνήρ, with definite article: 280–1  
 ἀνθέω: 72  
 ἀνθρώπιον: 170  
 ἀντέρως: 63  
 ἀπάρχομαι: 192–3  
 ἀπελθεῖν οἴκαδε: 282  
 ἀπέρχομαι: 281  
 ἀποφαίνω: 120  
 ἀρέσκεια: 239  
 –αριον, diminutives in: 138  
 ἀρκτή: 306  
 ἄρκτος/ἄρκος: 307  
 ἄρμονία: 216  
 –ᾱς, as derogatory termination: 98  
 ἀσελγής: 158  
 ἄσεμνος: 158  
 ἀσύμβολος: 76, 165  
 ἀσφάραγος/ἀσπάραγος: 262  
 αὐδή: 168  
 αὐθιγενής: 236  
 αὐτοσχεδιάζω: 96  
 αὐτως: 269  
 αὐχμάω/αὐχμέω: 172–3  
 αὐχμηροκόμης: 212  
 ἄφατος: 232  
 ἀφύη, number of: 222  
 βάρος: 290  
 βέλτιστε: 183  
 βίος: 270  
 βολβός: 219  
 βου–, in compounds: 211  
 βουβαυκαλόσαυλα: 211  
 βουτυροφάγος: 212  
 βρέτας: 78–9  
 βρώμα: 43, 149  
 βύσμα: 122–3  
 βύστρα: 122–3  
 γάμος, in pl.: 305  
 γάρ, postponement of: 106, 163, 279  
 γε: 71  
 γελασίμη: 129  
 γελασίνη: 129  
 γέλοιος/γελοῖος: 74  
 γενναῖος: 314  
 γεροντομανία: 66  
 γεύομαι: 215  
 γεωγράφος: 88–9  
 γῆ: 61  
 γιγν-/γιν-: 126

- γλεῦκος: 236  
 γλυκύς, of wine: 236  
 γογγύζω: 151  
 γογγυσμός: 150–1  
 ὄ' ἔτι: 209  
 δαμάζω: 61, 165  
 δέ γε: 209, 279  
 δέ, continuative: 95  
 δέ, corrupted to γάρ: 239  
 δέ, explanatory: 53  
 δέ, postponement of: 70  
 δέ, resumptive: 220  
 δείκην: 78–9  
 δέμας, of fish: 149  
 δεσπόσυνος: 220  
 δέχομαι, with acc. and dat.: 210  
 δημός: 221  
 δήπου: 39  
 δῆτα: 39  
 διακονέω: 286  
 διακόπτω: 235  
 διανεκίης: 61  
 διανεκίης/διηνεκίης: 60  
 διαπίνω: 285  
 διαρταμέω: 60–1  
 διασκεδάννυμι: 288, 290  
 διατείνω: 235  
 διάυλος: 282  
 διαφέρω: 260  
 δοῦλος: 52, 53  
 δρμύς: 96–7  
 δυσμαθής: 65  
 δωδεκα-, in compounds: 213  
 δωδεκάκλινος: 213  
 –ει, as ending for 2nd sing. fut. mid./  
 pass.: 184, 247  
 εἶμι ... ἔχων: 282  
 εἰς αὐρίον: 53–4  
 εἰς τρίτην: 55  
 εἰσάγω: 64  
 ἐκάστοτε: 286  
 ἐκατόμβη, of food: 219  
 ἐκείνος, of indeterminate referent: 104  
 ἐλαφρός: 112  
 ἐλεύθεροι: 53  
 ἔνδον: 44  
 ἐνθύμημα: 277  
 ἐντρώγω: 288, 290  
 ἐξ ὑγρᾶς ἀλός: 149  
 ἐξάλλαγμα: 112  
 ἐξάλλασσω: 112  
 ἐπάγω: 41–2  
 ἐπαίρω: 41  
 ἐπεῖ: 159  
 ἐπὶ: 40  
 ἐπιδέξια: 37, 39, 275  
 ἐπικύπτω: 183  
 ἐπιχαιρέκακος: 292–3  
 ἐπτάπυλος: 216  
 ἐπωδή: 164  
 ἐρυθρός: 209  
 ἐρυθρότερος/-ώτερος: 119  
 εὐορκησία: 85  
 εὖοψος ἀγορά: 163  
 εὐπρεπής: 169  
 εὐρίσκω: 76, 104  
 εὐρυθμός: 96  
 εὐρύχορος: 216  
 ἔχω, with acc. as verbal periphrasis: 319  
 ζωγράφος: 88–9, 161  
 –η, as ending for 2nd sing. fut. mid./  
 pass.: 184, 247  
 ἦδεν/ἦδη, as 1st sing. pluperf. of οἶδα:  
 44  
 ἡδύς, of wine: 236  
 ἡμετέριος: 69  
 ἡμιχρύσους: 57  
 –ήριον: 96  
 θεά: 44  
 θεατροποιός: 174–5  
 θεῖα: 116  
 θέττα: 137  
 θεωρέω: 254  
 θραττίδιον: 137  
 θυγάτηρ: 304  
 ἴσως: 46  
 ἴσως: 279  
 κάθου, form of pass. imp.: 91  
 καί, generalizing: 72  
 καινός: 175

- καινότης: 277  
 καίτοι ... γε: 75  
 κακομαθής: 65  
 κάλαμος: 266  
 καλός: 105  
 καλός: 248–9  
 καπνίας: 237  
 καπνός: 168  
 κάπρος, as term for human genitalia:  
     253 n. 123  
 καριδύω: 184  
 καριδύω, length of *iota*: 183  
 καρίς: 119  
 καρίς, length of *iota*: 136, 182–3  
 καρύω: 47–8  
 κατα-, as intensifying prefix: 162  
 κατακόπτω: 250  
 κατοικέω: 149  
 καυλός: 228–9  
 κεστρῖνος νῆστις: 174  
 κῆρυξ, accentuation of: 230 n. 102  
 κιννάβαρις, gender of: 92  
 κλίνω: 165  
 κοῖλον: 47  
 κοιμίζειν: 275  
 κόκκυξ: 225–6  
 κολακεία: 239, 260  
 κόλαξ: 173  
 κονιορτός: 173  
 κορακινίδιον: 137  
 κόσμιος: 282  
 κρίνεια: 227  
 κυλικεῖον: 144  
 κυμβίον: 47, 154  
 κυνή: 308  
 -κτιτος, compounds in: 61  
 κωβίδιον, length of first *iota*: 136  
 κωδωνίζω: 98  
 κῶθος: 136  
 κωμωδοτραγωδία: 127  
 λάγνης/λάγνος: 295  
 λάγνος: 172 n. 66  
 λαλέω: 179  
 λαμβάνω, of bridegroom receiving  
     dowry: 217  
 λαμπρός: 72, 210  
 λαμπρός: 168, 170–1  
 λέγετε, as mark of impatience: 38  
 λεοντή: 307  
 λεπαστή: 218  
 λεπτός: 180  
 λῆμα: 132  
 λῆμμα: 131–2  
 λιθάζειν: 101  
 λιπαρός: 171  
 λοπάς: 161  
 μαγαδίζω: 179  
 μάγαδις: 179  
 μαίνομαι: 105  
 μανικός: 142  
 μάττω: 285  
 μέγας, of sound: 180  
 μεираκύλλιον: 164  
 μελετητήριον: 96  
 μέλπω: 216  
 μέν, without answering particle: 95  
 μέν ... δέ ... εἴτ(α): 53  
 μέν ... δέ, lack of parallelism in clauses:  
     161  
 μέν οὖν: 48  
 μεστός: 97  
 μέτωπον: 235, 288  
 μήλον: 226–7  
 μικρός, of sound: 180  
 μόναυλος: 107–8  
 μοσχῆ: 308  
 μυριο-, in compounds: 212–13  
 μυριοπληθής: 212  
 μῦς: 231  
 νέκταρ: 284–5  
 νεώτερος: 162  
 νῆ τὸν Δί(α): 71–2  
 νόμος: 190  
 νυν, inferential: 289  
 ξανθός, of horses: 217  
 ὄδε: 150  
 οἶδ' ἀκριβῶς: 169  
 οἰκόσιτος: 126  
 ὀλόκληρος: 192  
 ὄλολος: 171



- ὀνομάζω: 251  
 ὀπλομάχος: 177  
 ὀπός: 208  
 ὀπός: 229–30  
 ὀρᾶς, parenthetic: 105  
 ὀρίγανον, gender of: 262  
 ὀρνιθάριον: 232  
 ὄρνις, as characterization of humans: 247  
 ὀσμή/ὀδμή: 208  
 ὄστρειον/ὄστρεον: 231–2  
 ὅτι, followed by hiatus: 260  
 ὅτιοῦν: 298  
 οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην, as trimeter opening: 190  
 οὕκουν, in questions equivalent to imperatives: 256  
 οὗτος, as address: 265  
 ὀχεύω: 253  
 ὀψον: 163  
 παίγνιον: 71  
 παίζω, with πρόσ: 112  
 πάντη: 51  
 πάνυ: 285  
 παπαῖ: 97  
 παρά, with dat.: 310  
 παρὰ πολλοῖς: 310  
 παρὰ πολύ: 191  
 παραζάω: 45  
 παρακαταθήκη: 278–9  
 παράσιτος: 173  
 παρδαλή: 307  
 πάρδαλις/πόρδαλις: 307 n. 153  
 παρεσκευάζω: 38  
 πάτερ: 39  
 παχύς: 312  
 πελεκάν: 234  
 περιζώμα: 214  
 περιζώννυμι: 214  
 περιζώστρα: 312  
 περιπατέω: 171  
 περκίδιον: 137  
 πίναξ: 161  
 πίνη/πίννη: 231  
 πνιγμός: 162–3  
 ποιέω, with causative verb: 273  
 ποιέω/ποέω: 294  
 πόλις: 303  
 πολυτελής: 148, 198  
 πονέω: 75  
 ποτήριον: 46  
 προῖξ: 217  
 πρόσ: 116  
 προσάντης: 281  
 προσκυνέω: 190  
 πρόσωπον: 288  
 πρόσωπον, of fish: 148–9  
 πρωκτός: 235  
 πρῶτος εὐρών: 148  
 πτόλιν: 243–4  
 πύλαι: 160  
 πυξίον: 90  
 πυός, number of: 224  
 ραφανίς: 289  
 ράφανος: 289  
 ρόα/ροιά: 227  
 ρυπάω: 173  
 σάκος: 217–18  
 σάκος/σάκκος: 218  
 σεμνός: 158, 263  
 σεμνός: 286  
 σεμνός, of food: 220  
 σεμνύνω: 263  
 σίλφιον: 228–9  
 σκαιός: 297  
 σοφιστής: 98–9  
 σοφιστής: 296  
 σταλαγμός: 170  
 στρώμα: 212  
 σύγκωμος: 153  
 συμπαίζω: 137  
 σύν/ξύν: 190  
 συναυλία: 316–17  
 συνδειπνέω: 163  
 σχεδιάζω: 96  
 σῶμα: 53  
 τὰ πολλά: 174  
 τάγηνον: 158–9  
 ταμειῖον: 326  
 ταμειῖον/ταμεῖον: 314

- τάχα: 322  
 ταῶς: 142–3  
 τέκνον: 281  
 τεμενικός: 84  
 τερενόχρως: 221  
 τέρην, of food: 221 n. 96  
 τέττιξ: 229  
 τέχνη: 162, 260  
 τήγανον: 158–9  
 τις: 154  
 τίς ... βροτῶν: 163  
 τίς: 38  
 τις, postponement of: 164  
 τμητός: 148  
 τὸ παράπαν: 271–2  
 τὸ συνεχές: 300  
 τονθορύζω: 151  
 τονθορυσμός: 150–1  
 τόπος: 150  
 τοσουτοσί: 143  
 τρίκλινος: 316  
 τρόπος: 190  
 τρώγω: 111  
 ὑγιαίνω: 104  
 ὑγρός: 149  
 ὑπέρ, with acc.: 299  
 ὑπερήμερος: 305  
 ὑποφαίνω: 72  
 ὑποφαίνω, with part.: 70  
 φαίνομαι, with inf./part.: 95–6  
 φανός: 256  
 φαρμακόμαντις: 258  
 φερνή: 217  
 φίλε: 99  
 φορτίον: 274  
 φράσον γάρ: 165  
 φύσις: 165–6  
 χάσκω: 235  
 χειρουργία: 161  
 χειρώω: 165  
 χλευάζω: 169  
 χόλιξ/κόλιξ/κόλλιξ: 221  
 χόριον, number of: 223  
 χορτασμός: 323  
 χόρτος: 323  
 χοῦς: 153–4, 214  
 χοῦς, accentuation of: 153–4  
 χρηστός: 42–3  
 ψύθιος/ψίθιος: 318  
 ὦ, with voc.: 39–40, 43, 52, 99  
 ὦ χρηστὲ σύ, metrical position of: 162, 183  
 ὠάριον: 323  
 ὠθισμός: 162  
 ὠόν: 229  
 ὠραῖος: 164  
 ὥς δὴ: 311  
 ὥσπερ, corrupted to ὥσπερ: 110  
 ὠτάριον: 241

### 3. Index locorum

- Aeschin.  
   3,216: 150 n. 53  
 Alexand.Com.:  
   fr. 2: 85  
 Antiatt.  
   p. 79.18: 101 n. 43  
   p. 79.24: 101 n. 43  
   p. 84.7: 101 n. 43  
   p. 86.14: 101 n. 43, 271 n. 125  
   p. 87.18: 101 n. 43  
   p. 89.4: 101 n. 43  
   p. 96.1: 113  
   p. 112.29: 127 n. 49  
 Antiph.  
   fr. 48: 101 n. 43, 271  
   fr. 172.5: 42  
   fr. 188.15: 48  
 Ar.  
   *Pax* 869: 230 n. 101  
   *Lys.* 398: 320  
   fr. 606: 136

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Arist.<br/> <i>Rh.</i> 3.1413b26: 66 n. 34<br/> Dinol.<br/> fr. 3: 127 n. 49<br/> Dionys.Com.<br/> fr. 2.26: 174<br/> E.<br/> <i>Cyc.</i> 104: 96–7<br/> Euphro<br/> fr. 1: 145<br/> Hsch.<br/> α 1533: 223 n. 97</p> | <p>Men.<br/> fr. 109: 171<br/> fr. 174: 192<br/> fr. 438: 46<br/> fr. 907: 309 n. 155<br/> Philem.<br/> dub. fr. 198: 43 n. 32<br/> Pl.Com.<br/> fr. 188.9: 192<br/> Tim.<br/> fr. 22: 60–1</p> |
|--|---|

#### 4. Index rerum et personarum

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>abortifacients: 227<br/> Academy: 110<br/> accentuation, variance in: 34, 58, 74<br/> Achilleus: 65<br/> actors: 66–7<br/> adultery: 271<br/> Aeneas: 49–50, 57<br/> alliteration: 112, 233<br/> Ambracia: 62<br/> ambrosia: 284, 285–6<br/> Anaxandrides, corruption of name: 85, 90<br/> Anchises: 49, 51, 57, 285<br/> Anchises of Athens: 49<br/> Anchises of Sikyon: 49<br/> anchors: 83, 184<br/> angler-fish: 225<br/> Anteia: 69, 71<br/> Anthesteria: 170<br/> Anti-Eros: 63<br/> Antiatticist<br/> citations in: 85, 101, 112 n. 47, 129, 131, 271 n. 125<br/> text of: 88, 90, 91, 101, 298–9<br/> Antigenidas (musician): 215<br/> Anubis: 191<br/> aphrodisiacs: 219, 230, 232<br/> Aphrodite: 49, 287<br/> Apollo: 40</p> | <p>apples: 226–7<br/> apron: 214, 312<br/> <i>architektōn</i>: 175<br/> Ares: 185, 326<br/> Argas (musician): 97–8, 215<br/> Asclepius: 124–5<br/> asparagus: 262<br/> Atreus: 175<br/> aulos: 107–8<br/> Basilis: 251<br/> Bastet: 193<br/> bathing: 173, 289<br/> battle: 162<br/> beans: 223<br/> bears: 306–7<br/> beating: 119<br/> beauty: 105<br/> beestings: 224<br/> beets: 222<br/> bells: 98<br/> blushing: 119<br/> bomolochic aside: 234–5<br/> braggarts: 258<br/> bread: 221<br/> bulbs: 219<br/> butchery: 60–61, 250<br/> butter: 212<br/> cabbage: 289–90<br/> cake: 221, 222, 226, 228, 230</p> |
|--|--|

- Callistratus son of Callicrates  
   of Aphidna: 197, 198–9  
 calves: 308  
 carpets: 212, 306  
 Casius of Elis: 71  
 castration: 192–3  
 catalogue of food: 209–10, 220  
 cats: 193  
 cattle: 190  
 Cephisodotus (general): 215  
 Cephisodotus (musician): 215  
 Cephisodotus son of Euarchides  
   of Acharnae: 215  
 Cercius: 117  
*charis*: 311  
 Charisius of Elis: 71  
 charms: 164  
 cheese: 223  
 cherries: 227  
 chickens: 249, 254  
*chiton*: 214  
 chorus: 35, 37  
*chous*: 153–4, 214  
 Chrēstos: 43  
*chytra*: 61  
 cicadas: 229  
 cinnabar: 91–2  
 circumcision: 192  
 cithara: 121–2  
 citizenship, Athenian: 54–5  
 clothing: 306, 312  
 cod: 225  
 cooking methods: 120  
 cooks: 145–7, 258, 262, 276, 312  
 coriander: 263  
 Corinth: 70  
 Cotys (King of Thrace): 210–11,  
   213–14  
 couches: 213  
 cranes: 234  
 crawfish: 224  
 cress: 230  
 cult image: 78–9, 143  
 cupboard: 144  
 cups  
   derivation of names: 47, 218  
   material of: 46  
 cuttlefish: 224  
 Cynics: 125  
 Cyrene: 79  
 debts: 305  
 dedications: 63, 84, 142  
 Democles: 171–2  
 Democles (parasite): 171–2  
 dentex: 225  
 deposit: 278–9  
*deuterai trapezai*: 41  
 dialogue: 68–9, 83, 95, 97, 153, 179, 183,  
   247, 265, 278, 281, 289, 294, 298  
 Dionysus: 80–1, 133, 136–7, 170  
 Dioscuri: 117  
 dirtiness: 173, 212  
 divination: 258  
 division of speakers: 68–9  
 divorce: 281–2  
 dogfish: 148, 225  
 dogs: 191–2, 308  
 dowry: 216–17  
 drinking practices: 37–8  
 drunkenness: 46, 48  
 ducks: 232–3  
 education: 65, 93, 95, 107 n. 46, 177,  
   296–7  
 eels: 189, 190–1, 225  
 effeminacy: 170–1  
 eggs: 229, 323  
 Egypt: 189–90, 197  
 ephebes: 177  
 epic parody: 149, 242–4, 261–2  
 Erechtheus: 86  
 Eros: 63, 296  
 Eubulus (politician): 175  
 Euktemon of Lousia: 173  
 Eupolis: 310  
 Euripides (drunkard): 153–4  
 Euripides (tragic poet): 82, 86, 109, 194,  
   276–7, 302  
 exodus: 209  
 extravagance: 142

- family: 124, 126, 183, 246–7, 274, 281, 325–6  
 fat: 221  
 fate: 49, 51, 52–3, 56  
 feasts: 136–7, 206–7, 210, 286  
 feet, anointing of: 198–9  
 fennel: 229  
 festivals: 115, 264–5  
 figs: 226  
 fillets: 148  
 finale: 209  
 finance: 131–2  
 fingers, eating with: 159  
 fish heads: 148–9, 165, 225  
 fishing and fishermen: 158, 160  
 fishmarket: 163  
*flatfish*: 138  
 flattery: 239, 258  
 fodder: 323  
 Ganymedes: 50, 284–5  
 garlands: 43  
 garlic: 222  
 geese: 233  
 Gelasinos: 129  
 geography: 88–9  
*gēteion*: 228  
 gifts (for a lover): 64  
*glaukos*: 148  
 gluttony: 100  
 gnomes: 106, 270  
 goats: 217  
 goby: 138  
 grammar  
   abstract for concrete: 161  
   accumulation of adjectives: 148  
   asyndeton: 74  
   attraction of gender: 71  
   comic compounds: 211  
   comic forms: 129  
   demonstratives: 150  
   diminutives: 90, 137, 170  
   enallage: 148, 165, 220–1, 318  
   hyperbaton: 38  
   indirect discourse: 211  
   parataxis: 171  
   perfect, meaning of: 171  
   perfect, use in apodosis: 171  
   periphrastic construction: 319  
   poetic plural: 61  
   repetition of interrogative: 38  
   variant forms: 122–3, 137, 158–9, 172–3, 174, 218, 227, 231, 262, 279, 295, 307, 314, 320  
   variation in gender: 92, 214, 252, 254, 262  
   voc. sing. with pl. verb: 39  
 grapes: 226  
 groats: 224, 228  
 gruel: 222–3  
 gurnard: 225–6  
 hangovers: 289–90  
 health: 104  
 heart, address to: 292  
 Hecale: 109  
 Helen: 82, 83  
 helmsman: 56  
 Hera: 170, 286–7  
 Herakles: 84, 93, 109, 145–6  
 herring: 137  
 Hestia: 248  
*hetairai*: 67, 68, 70, 121, 183, 238, 251  
   formation of names: 72, 118, 140  
 honey: 223  
 honey-comb: 226  
 horses: 217  
 hunger: 106  
 hunters and hunting: 124, 306  
 hybris: 255  
*hymenaion*: 107–8  
 identity, mistaken/confused: 78, 115, 122, 141  
 inventors and inventions: 76, 104, 148, 276  
 Io: 114  
 Iphicrates son of Timotheus of Rhamnous: 195, 210–11  
 Isis: 190  
 Itys: 245, 247  
 Jason: 176  
 jays: 233

- jokes: 74, 76  
*kalamos*: 266  
*kanēphoros*: 115  
*kanoun*: 115  
 Kerkion: 118  
 Kerkios: 117–18  
*kestrinos*: 174  
 Komos: 153–4  
*kymbion*: 47  
 Lagiske: 70, 72  
 Lagynion: 172  
*lagynos*: 172 n. 66  
 Lais: 69, 71  
 lamps: 257  
 larks: 233  
 laughter: 74, 129  
 Laurium: 54  
*lebēs*: 213  
 leeks: 228  
 left: 297  
*lekithos*: 222  
*lembos*: 83–4  
 Lembos: 173  
 Lemnos: 239  
 lentils: 229  
 leopards: 307  
*lepastē*: 218  
 life, enjoyment of: 44–5  
 limpets: 231  
 lions: 307  
 Locrian maidens: 130–1  
 Locris: 130  
*lopas*: 161  
 loving cup: 38–9  
 Lycurgus (orator): 133, 175  
 Lycurgus (Thracian king): 133, 136  
 mackerel: 222, 263  
 madness: 105  
*magadis*: 178–9  
*mainis*: 164  
 marjoram: 262  
 marriage, sacred: 170  
*maza*: 221, 285  
 medicine: 258  
 Megallus: 252  
 Melanopus son of Laches of Aixone:  
     195, 198  
 melilot: 140  
 Melilotō: 140  
 Melilotos: 140  
 Menelaos: 83  
 Menestheus son of Iphicrates of  
     Rhamnous: 211  
 meta-theatre: 127–8  
 Metaneira: 171–2  
 metaphor: 48, 60, 61, 123, 131–2, 143,  
     161, 162, 170, 183, 184, 282, 290,  
     295, 304–5, 316, 324, 326  
 metonymy: 129, 162  
 mice: 52, 193  
 milk: 212  
 millet: 219  
 misers: 102, 105, 107  
 mollusks: 231–2  
 monaulos: 107–8, 266  
 monkfish: 226  
 monologue: 278, 292  
     expository: 43, 147  
 mullet: 224  
 music and musicians: 95, 96, 98–9,  
     107, 121–2, 215, 216, 265, 316  
 mussels: 231  
 mythological parody: 80, 93, 102, 114,  
     117, 128, 130–1, 133, 146, 152, 155,  
     194–5, 245, 304  
 Neaira: 71  
 nectar: 284, 285, 324  
 Nereids: 145, 149, 152  
 Nereus: 145–6, 147, 152  
 Nereus of Chios: 145–6  
 nicknames: 168–9, 247  
 Nikarete: 71  
 nuts: 224  
 oaths: 40, 76, 84, 85, 248  
     breaking of: 181  
 obeisance: 190  
 obliviousness: 79  
 obscenity: 235  
 octopus: 219  
 Odysseus: 155, 160, 169

- oiling: 171–2  
 Okimon: 72  
 old age: 66–7, 74, 273–4, 315–16  
 olives: 110–11, 228  
     sacred: 110  
 onions: 228  
*opos*: 229–30  
*opson*: 163, 191  
*orkys*: 232  
 oysters: 231–2  
 painting: 89, 90–1, 161  
 Palamedes: 77  
 Pan: 255  
 Pandaros: 181  
 Pandarus: 181  
*pantes theoi*: 44  
 parabasis: 74–5  
 parasites: 75–6, 125, 168, 173, 174  
 Paris: 307  
 peacocks: 142–3  
 pears: 227  
 pegs: 144  
 pelicans: 234  
 perch: 137  
 performance: 74–5, 87, 291–2, 312 n.  
     160  
 perfume: 196, 197, 220, 250–2  
*perideipnon*: 40  
 Peron: 197–8  
 Persephone: 325  
*phialē*: 218, 321, 326–7  
 Phila: 70  
 Philemon (actor): 66–7, 74, 87  
 Phrixus: 176  
 pigeon: 64  
 pigeons: 233  
 pigs: 191, 240–1, 253–4  
 pigs' ears: 241  
 pits, storage: 213, 219  
 Plato: 110–11  
 plugs: 122–3  
*pnigos*: 209–10  
 poetry, composition of: 104  
 politics: 186, 189, 194–5, 196–7, 215,  
     238, 239, 303  
 Polyeuctus son of Sostratus of Sphettos:  
     248–9  
 Polyeuctus son of Timocrates of Krioia:  
     249  
 pomegranates: 227  
 poppy seeds: 227  
 poverty: 106, 271  
*prochous*: 218–19  
 prologue: 147, 209, 284–5  
 Protesilaos: 194–5  
 Proteus: 147  
 proverbs: 52, 119, 234, 270, 271, 307,  
     310–11, 313–14  
*psitta*: 138  
 psythian wine: 318  
 pudding: 223, 224  
 pulses: 223  
 purgatives: 222, 227  
 purple: 212  
 raven-fish: 137  
 rays: 225, 226  
 Rhadamanthys: 76–7  
*rhizotomoi*: 258  
 riddles: 59–60  
 rustics: 34–5, 46, 49, 124, 306  
 saffron: 227–8  
 salt: 230–1  
 salt-fish: 263  
 Samos: 238  
 Satyrias: 240  
 Satyrio: 240  
 sausages: 221–2  
 scallops: 232  
 sesame: 230  
 sex: 66, 69, 115, 164–5, 183–4, 198–9, 253  
 ships and boats: 56  
 shrimp: 119  
 sideboards: 144  
 silphium: 228–9  
 silver-mining: 54  
 Simonides: 103  
*skindarion*: 138  
*skolia*: 103  
 slaves and slavery: 51, 52, 55, 58, 126,  
     154, 173, 183, 256, 265, 295

- slaves, city of: 52  
 small-fry: 164, 222  
 snow: 218  
 soldiers: 177  
 sophists: 98–9, 296–7  
 Sophocles: 310  
 Sosippos: 242  
 Sosippus (comic poet): 242  
 Sosippus (Olympic victor): 242  
 sound, volume of: 180  
 sparrow: 64  
 Sparta: 216  
 spendthrifts: 246–7, 248  
 squid: 224  
 squill: 262  
 Stalagmos: 170  
 stater: 50, 56–7  
 statues: 143  
 stoning: 101  
 strainers: 217  
 Sunium: 54–5  
 swans: 233–4  
 symposia: 35, 43, 60, 121, 152, 210, 220, 286, 289, 315–16  
 Syros: 265  
 tablet, writing: 90  
*tagēnon*: 161–2  
*temenos*: 84  
 Tereus: 245  
 Theatre of Dionysus: 175  
 Thebes: 216  
 theft: 175  
 Theolyte: 72  
 Theseus: 109, 325  
 Thessaly: 100  
 Thrace: 210–11, 212  
*thratta*: 137  
*thrissa*: 137, 226  
 thrushes: 233  
 Thyestes: 175  
 thyme: 227  
 Timotheus of Miletus: 58–9, 61, 326–7  
 titles  
     abstracts: 63, 66, 127, 255  
     descriptive terms: 58, 115, 117–18, 121, 124, 139, 177, 240, 258, 264  
     double: 88  
     ethnics: 62, 100, 130, 139, 238  
     mythological names: 49, 65, 80, 82, 86, 93, 109, 114, 117–18, 133, 145, 152, 155, 181, 194, 245  
     non-mythological names: 49, 58, 117–18, 139, 140, 181, 240, 242  
     objects: 102, 140  
     references to chorus: 35, 87, 88, 100, 124, 186  
     variation in number: 34, 88–9  
 toasts: 38–9, 47  
 torches: 256  
 tragic parody: 80, 83–5, 86, 93, 109, 114, 127–8, 147, 258  
 tripe: 240–1  
 Trypho: use by Athenaeus: 178–9  
 tuna: 149, 225, 232, 263  
 twelve: 213  
 Tyche: 53  
 ugliness: 58, 106, 271  
 Ursa Major: 212  
 vetch: 223  
 vinegar: 229  
 wagtails: 234  
 wealth: 53, 105  
 weddings and marriage: 58, 102, 107–8, 126, 206, 209–10, 211–12, 251, 265, 271, 281, 305, 325  
 whelks: 230  
 wild animals: 106  
 wine: 47, 236–7  
 women:  
     condemnation of: 270, 294  
     praiseworthy behaviour: 282, 314  
 work: 75  
 wrasse: 225  
 youth: 162, 164  
 Zeus: 170  
 Zomos: 172  
*zōmos*: 172