

**THE FRAGMENTS OF PHERECRATES**

by

**Eduardo Urios-Aparisi**

Thesis presented for the Degree  
of the Doctor of Philosophy.

GLASGOW 1992

© Eduardo Urios-Aparisi, 1992

ProQuest Number: 11007933

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

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

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



ProQuest 11007933

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

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

Thesis  
9395  
copy 1

GOW  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

*A Adela*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is the result of what I would call collective effort. I call it collective, because I do not think I would have been able to complete it without the support of so many people who in Glasgow and in Barcelona have been helping and encouraging me.

I would like to thank especially my parents and family for their support, understanding and trust. They have inspired in me the confidence and determination to work and complete this thesis.

In Barcelona I would like to mention Prof. J. Pòrtulas and Dr. F. Mestre who greatly supported and encouraged me to come to Glasgow, as well as the other members of the Classics Department of the University of Barcelona.

In the University of Glasgow I thank the members of the Classics Department for creating an atmosphere of work, but one of fellowship and open communication. Among my many friends in Glasgow, I am especially grateful to Dr. K. Kapparis for his help and his friendship.

Above all, I want to thank my supervisor, Prof. D.M. MacDowell. He has been the person who has shaped, corrected and perfected the many faults and deficiencies in my research, naive and irregular at the beginning, with patience and understanding. The insight of his scholarly precision, experience and erudition is present throughout all this work and I should be blamed for any mistake therein.

## OUTLINE

This thesis comprises a linguistic, metrical and literary commentary on the fragments of Pherecrates, as collected in the latest edition of R. Kassel and C. Austin *Poetae Comici Graeci* vol. VII pp. 102-220 Berlin/New York 1989, and a general introduction.

The commentary of the 288 fragments is the main bulk of the work. Generally each play is treated according to the following scheme: first of all, I provide an 'introductory note' in which I discuss different questions regarding authorship, date, plot and contents; secondly, a commentary on each fragment. The individual fragments are handled in a similar fashion: I deal first with metre, contents and interpretations and then with the problems in specific lines and words. Perhaps the most remarkable passages in the commentary are from the play *Ἄγριοι, Κοριαννῶ* (above all fr. 73-76), *Κραπάταλοι, Μεταλλῆς* (fr. 113), *Πέρσαι, Χείρων* (fr. 155), and, from the "Incertarum fabularum fragmenta", fr. 193 and 197.

In the introduction I synthesize the information from the commentary, in order to give a general view of Pherecrates' work and style of comedy. First, I consider the testimonies about his life and works, above all those related to the dates and the question of the number of plays. Through the references to later scholars given by the sources of these fragments, I suggest the view of Hellenistic scholars about this playwright. The historical view of Pherecrates is completed by a description of the textual tradition for the sources of the fragments.

Secondly, I deal with the following subjects: metre (I include a list of the metrical schemes and the fragments where they are used); language (the words are grouped in three levels of language: colloquial, technical and poetical), style and humour (where special reference is made to the obscene humour). I also speak about the elements of dramatic structure and the passages which yield some parallels to Aristophanes' plays. Next, I outline the plots of the comedies and I attempt to establish different types of comedy either from external evidence or by means of speculation from the titles or the content of the fragments. Further, the topics and motives of the fragments are divided into food, music, moral decadence and *καμφοδούμενοι*.

Finally, I compare Pherecrates with Crates and Aristophanes in order to provide a possible background for the style which I aim to describe.

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. - LIFE AND WORKS	
A) LIFE.....	1
B) NUMBER OF PLAYS.....	5
2. - PHERECRATES IN THE LATER STUDIES OF COMEDY	
A) LYCOPHRON AND ERATOSTHENES.....	10
C) OTHER SCHOLARS. ARISTOPHANES OF BYZANTIUM.....	11
3. - THE SOURCES FOR THE TEXT	
A) SCHOLIA.....	16
B) POLLUX, HESYCHIUS AND MINOR SOURCES OF THE II CENTURY A. D.....	17
C) ATHENAEUS.....	18
D) PHOTIUS AND OTHER LEXICA.....	20
4. - FORMAL FEATURES OF PHERECRATES' FRAGMENTS	
A) METRE.....	22
B) LANGUAGE.....	25
<i>Colloquial language (25), Technical language (28), Poetic language (29), Comic         words and 'hapax legomena' (30),</i>	
C) STYLE AND HUMOUR.....	32
<i>High Style (32), Formal Style (33), Colloquial style (34), Humour (35),</i>	
5. - ANALYSIS OF THE DRAMATIC STRUCTURE.....	38
6. - CHORUS, CHARACTERS AND CHARACTERIZATION	
A) CHORUS.....	41
B) CHARACTERS.....	43

*Male characters (43), Female characters (45), Slaves (46), Mythological figures and personifications (46).*

C) CHARACTERIZATION..... 47

#### 7.- PLOTS. CLASSIFICATION OF COMEDIES

A) PLOTS..... 50

B) CLASSIFICATION OF COMEDIES..... 52

*Comedies of Manners (52), The Idler's Paradise (54), Fantastic and Mythological (55).*

#### 8.- COMIC THEMES

A) FOOD..... 57

B) MUSIC AND POETRY..... 60

C) MORAL DECADENCE..... 62

D) ΚΩΜΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ..... 64

9.- PHERECRATES AND OLD COMEDY..... 66

#### II. COMMENTARY

<sup>1</sup>Ἀγαθοί. Introductory note..... 72

Fr. 1 (74), 2 (77), 3 (80), 4 (81).

<sup>2</sup>Ἄγριοι. Introductory note..... 82

Fr. 5 (91), 6 (95), 7 (97), 8 (98), 9 (99), 10 (101), 11 (105), 12 (108), 13 (112), 14 (114), 15 (119), 16 (123), 17 (125), 18 (126), 19 (127), 20 (128),

<sup>3</sup>Ἀνθρωπηρακλής. Introductory note..... 129

Fr. 21 (129).

Ἀυτόμολοι. Introductory note..... 131

Fr. 22 (132), 23 (135), 24 (131), 25 (138), 26 (139), 27 (144), 28 (145), 29 (154), 30 (156), 31 (158), 32 (159), 33 (160), 34 (161), 35 (162), 36 (163),

Γράες. Introductory note..... 164

Fr. 37 (165), 38 (168), 39 (169), 40 (170), 41 (171), 42 (172),

<b>Δουλοδιδάσκαλος. Introductory note.....</b>	<b>173</b>
Fr. 43 (177), 44 (180), 45 (181), 46 (183), 47 (185), 48 (187), 49 (188), 50 (189), 51 (193), 52 (196), 53 (197), 54 (198), 55 (198),	
<b>Ἐπιλήσιμων ἢ Θάλαττα. Introductory note.....</b>	<b>199</b>
Fr. 56 (201), 57 (203), 58 (205), 59 (206), 60-61 (207), 62 (209), 63 (210),	
<b>Ἴπνός ἢ Παννοχίς. Introductory note.....</b>	<b>211</b>
Fr. 64 (214), 65 (215), 66 (216), 67 (216), 68 (217), 69 (220), 70 (221), 71 (230), 72 (231),	
<b>Κοριαννῶ. Introductory note.....</b>	<b>232</b>
Fr. 73 (235), 74 (239), 75 (242), 76 (46), 77-78 (249), 79 (250), 80 (252), 81 (253), 82-83 (254), 84 (256),	
<b>Κρασιάταιοι. Introductory note:</b>	
A) Date.....	260
B) Title Coins in Hades.....	261
C) A comedy set in Hades.....	267
D) Other possible fragments,..	268
Fr. 85 (270), 86 (276), 87 (279), 88 (281), 89 (283), 90 (284), 91 (285), 92 (286), 93 (287), 94 (288), 95-96 (289), 97 (290), 98 (292), 99 (293), 100 (296), 101 (298), 102 (301), 103-104 (306),	
<b>Δῆροι. Introductory note.....</b>	<b>307</b>
Fr. 105 (309), 106 (311), 107 (313), 108-109 (314), 110 (316), 111 (310), 112 (319),	
<b>Μεταλλίς. Introductory note:</b>	
A) Date.....	320
B) Authenticity.....	320

C) Title and content,.....322

D) A possible fragment,.....322

Fr. 113; a) Analysis of content (324); b) Analysis of style and vocabulary (326);  
c) Content; the tradition of the Idler's Paradise (327); d) Commentary (332), 114  
(356), 115-116 (362).

**Μέτοικοι**.....364

**Μυρμηκάνθρωποι**. Introductory note.....366

Fr. 117 (369), 118 (370), 119 (371), 120 (372), 121 (373), 122 (374), 123 (375),  
124-125 (376), 126 (377), 127 (382), 128 (383), 129-130 (384), 131 (385).

**Πέρσαι**. Introductory note:

A) Date and authorship,...386

B) Title and content,.....388

Fr. 132 (390), 133 (391), 134 (392), 135 (393), 136 (394), 137 (395), 138 (403),  
139-140 (408), 141 (409).

**Πετάλη**. Introductory note.....410

Fr. 142 (411), 143 (412), 144 (415), 145 (416), 146 (417), 147 (418), 148 (419)  
149 (420).

**Τυραννίς**. Introductory note.....421

Fr. 150-151 (423), 152 (424), 153-154 (429).

**Χείρων**. Introductory note.....430

Fr. 155 (433), 156 (458), 157 (463), 158 (466), 159 (471), 160 (472), 161-162  
(473).

**Ψευδηρακλής**. Introductory note.....479

Fr. 163 (480).

**Incertarum Fabularum Fragmenta: Fr. 164.....483**

**Dubia: Fr, 283.....590**

### **III ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY**

#### **I. Editions and commentaries of Primary sources:**

1. *Collections*.....596

#### 2. *Aristophanes:*

a) Complete editions.....598

b) Editions of single plays with commentary.....599

3. *Other comic poets*.....599

4. *Other authors*.....600

5. *Later writers and Lexica*.....601

#### **II. Secondary sources:**

1. *About Pherecrates*.....603

2. *General Literature*.....604

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1. - LIFE AND WORKS.

#### A) LIFE.

Pherecrates must have been one of the most important and influential playwrights in Athens of the V century. The little information that has reached us comes from the Anon. *De com.* (Proleg. de com. III) 9 p. 7 Kost. (test. 2a). This testimony is usually regarded as a very valuable and reliable source for Old Comedy (cf. Norwood *Gr. Com.* p. 3 and Nesselrath *MK* pp. 45ff.). In the case of Pherecrates it provides some succinct remarks about his plays and his life: Φερεκράτης Ἀθηναῖος. νικᾷ ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου· γενόμενος δὲ (ὁ) ὑποκριτῆς ἐζήλωσε Κράτητα, καὶ αὖ τοῦ μὲν λαιδορεῖν ἀπέστη, πράγματα δὲ εἰσηγούμενος καινὰ ἠὺδοκίμει γενόμενος εὐρετικὸς μύθων.

Pherecrates' victory is then to have been in the year 438-7 in the archonship of Theodorus. This date is not given without problems since the manuscripts reading is ἐπὶ θεάτρου and ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου is the conjecture of Dobree that seems to have gained

general acceptance. It is supported from the point of view that ἐπι plus genitive generally refers to the archon and also from the paleographical evidence: Hermippus according to his test. 3 won in the Dionysia of 435, while Pherecrates won in the Dionysia also before Hermippus according to test. 5 (cf. Storey *Phoenix* 44 (1990) p. 3 n. 11; about other conjectures see Bonanno *Cratete comico* p. 25 n. 1). In the year 438-7, when Callias also contended (cf. Call. test. 4 and Pickard-Cambridge *DFA* p. 121), Pherecrates took his first victory (this conclusion is based on the assumption that the source of this date was the Didaskaliai where the victories in Dionysian and Lenaian contests of poets and actors were recorded and thus the source cites the first mention of the poet; cf. Geißler (1925) p. 5, Storey art.cit. p. 4).

In connexion with Pherecrates' career, this text also points out the fact that he was an actor before following Crates and probably imitating him in his style of comedy and then goes on to sketch some other features of his plays which I will discuss later.

Two other dates can be given with certainty: 420, when *Agrioi* was performed, and 411, when Aristophanes mentions him in *Lys.* 157-9 (cf. fr. 193), although we do not know if he was still alive.

The date of his death is totally uncertain. I would tentatively suggest that he lived till about the end of the century, above all if we accept that in *Cheiron*, fr. 155.26, he mentions Philoxenus, a dithyrambic poet known in Athens by this

time (see ad fr.).

Our source mentions also Crates as forerunner of the comedy of Pherecrates. According to Storey art.cit. p. 3, it attempts to establish "a vertical relation between poets (usually carried by the verb ζῆλον)" (cf. Eup. test. 1, Ar. test. 1. 46-51 and test. 4 where it is used in relation to Aristophanes' emulation of Euripides). Crates seems to have already died by 425 (when he is mentioned by Ar. *Equ.* 537) and his first victory is in 451-450 (cf. M. Bonanno *Cratete comico* p. 27). He presents some similarities with Pherecrates: he was first of all an actor in the comedies of Cratinus (cf. *Crat.com.* test. 2a), and secondly he seems to have also avoided the iambic comedy (cf. infra p. 66).

In the span of time between 438-7 and approximately 400, Pherecrates produced about eighteen plays (about the number, see pp. 5ff.) and won one Dionysian and two Lenaeian contests (cf. test. 5 and 6). He was a contemporary of Phrynichus (first victory 436-2, 405 performance of *Mousai*) and Hermippus (435 victory, 420-19 performance of *Artopolides*). The first group of poets of Old Comedy we know of are Chionides, Magnes and Ecphantides whose activities would spread from 487, the beginning of the Dionysian contest (cf. Chion. test. 1) until the middle of the century (cf. the criticism of Ecphantides by Cratinus in fr. 281 and 361. 1, as older poet than him). A second earlier group would be formed by Cratinus (first victory 455-4 and 422 death), Crates (see supra p. 2), Callias (first victory 446; about his dates see further Storey *Hermes* 116 (1988) pp. 379-83) and

Teleclides (first victory 441). A younger group of playwrights could immediately be distinguished: Aristophanes (427 first play *Daitales*-388 *Wealth*), Eupolis (429 *Prospaltioi?* to 412-1 death?; cf. Storey *Phoenix* 44 (1990) p. 2-7) and Plato comicus (427-4 first victory).

The notice provided by test. 1 that Pherecrates was an actor and then became a playwright is somehow unusual for comedy. Actually only Crates is attested to have been an actor in Cratinus' play, according to Crat. test. 2 and 3 (E. Rohde *Kleine Schriften* II p. 412 n. 2 Tübingen 1901 wants to interpret as χοροδιδάσκαλος rather than actor, cf. M. Bonanno op.cit. p. 28 n. 2).

With regard to tragedy, this piece of information is not so unusual. At least this conclusion is drawn from Soph. T 4R.: πρῶτον μὲν καταλύσας τὴν ὑπόκρισιν τοῦ ποιητοῦ διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν μικροφωνίαν (πάλαι γὰρ καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς ὑπεκρίνετο αὐτός) (cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1 1403b 23, Pickard-Cambridge *DFA* p. 93 and 130-1, and Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) p. 140). In Comedy this fact may have been also common and Pickard-Cambridge *DFA* p. 93 speculates that Cratinus played in some of his plays from Athen. I 22a, though see K-A *PCG* IV p. 121; Aristophanes has been also suspected to have acted in some of his early plays as a way of learning how to compose them, mainly from the number of personal references found in them (cf. N.W. Slater *GRBSt* 30 (1989) pp. 67-82), but this is part of a very long and inconclusive discussion (cf. Mastromarco *QS* 10 (1979) pp. 153-96, S. Halliwell *CIQ* n.s. 30 (1980) pp. 153-96, D. MacDowell *CIQ* n.s. 32 (1982) pp. 21-6, Perusino *Dalla*

*Commedia Antica alla Commedia di Mezzo* pp. 37ff. Urbino 1986).

The notable element is that Crates is said to be actor in the comedies of Cratinus, that is to say, not in his own plays, as it seems to be the case in the other poets. In the case of Pherecrates we may also conclude that he was recorded to have been an actor before writing his own plays.

Perhaps we should bear in mind that sometimes these sources draw information from the evidence found in the plays (let us suppose that they concluded that Crates was an actor from a reference made by Cratinus mocking him of being a simple actor, not a real poet). But still there is no reference about Crates being mentioned in a play of Cratinus and the source seems trustworthy, mainly regarding Pherecrates.

It seems likely that acting was one way of learning how to write plays, as well as the contact with other playwrights (cf. Sophocles learning it from Aeschylus according to Soph. T 14R), especially at the beginning of the tragic contests and the early evolution of the tragic genre probably had a great influence in comedy. In general the status of the actors and the evolution of their activity during the V century is not well attested; it seems to have developed towards a greater professionalism and independence (cf. Ghiron-Bistagne op.cit. p. 46-7 and N.W. Slater in Winkler- Zeitlin *Nothing to do with Dionysos* pp. 385ff. Princeton 1989).

B) THE NUMBER OF PLAYS.

The number of comedies of Pherecrates is disputed. We have nineteen titles attributed to him, but already from Antiquity doubts about the authenticity of some of them arise. The main difficulties are caused by the following plays:

- *Agathoi* was confused with a homonymous play by Strattis.
- *Anthropherakles* can be according to K-A PCG VII p. 103 (cf. Schmid GGrL p. 100) the same play as *Pseudherakles*.
- *Automoloi* was represented again in a later διασκευή according to Poll. II 33 (fr. 35).
- *Metalles*, *Persai* and *Cheiron* are attributed by Eratosthenes to Nicomachus. Although, in the case of *Persai*, it seems that the author of the play was lost, and someone suggested to attribute it to Pher<sup>e</sup>crates, a doubtful attribution according to Eratosthenes (cf. Athen. XI 502a ad fr. 134).
- *Metoiikoi*, attributed to Pherecrates by Apoll. Dysc. pron., GrGr II 1. 1 p. 69.18 Sch. (cf. Pl.com. fr. 83), is also the title of a play by Crates and another, by Plato comicus. No fragments are extant.

The subject is complicated a little when Suda φ 212, test. 1, gives a figure of only seventeen plays, and Proleg. de com. VIII 3 p. 18 Kost., test. 3, eighteen. The frequent mistakes in the textual transmission of numbers and later writers' partial knowledge of the works of classical authors, either because some were lost (cf. the recent discovery of Pl. com. *Rabdouchoi*, test. 7), or because the theories of some Hellenistic scholars about authorship were taken into account (cf. Eratosthenes in our case), cast doubts on the validity of both numbers.

Perhaps the easiest solution is either to ascribe *Metoiroi* to Crates or Plato comicus, or to consider *Anthropherakles* and *Pseudherakles* the same play (in this case the first title is perhaps preferable since the second one would be easily confused with the homonymous comedy by Menander). It would be as easy to accept both suggestions and ascribe only seventeen plays to Pherecrates as in test. 1.

The concept of διασκευή, suggested by Poll. loc.cit. in connexion with *Automoloi*, is doubtful. This term seems to mean 'revision' of a play. Athen. III 110b says that Epicharmus' *Mousai* is a revision of "Ἡβης γαμός and this activity seems to have been commonly done by poets in the V and IV century, regarding their own plays. We have some instances in Aristophanes (*Clouds*, *Thesmophoriazusae*, *Wealth and Peace*; *Frogs* is said to have been restaged in the *Hypoth.*) and in Eupolis (*Autolykos*); it seems to have been more frequent in Middle and New comedy (e.g. Diphilus *Synoris*, cf. Athen. VI 247c and see further Pickard-Cambridge *DFA* pp. 100-1 and Hunter on Eub. p. 147).

Yet, the reference of Pollux to a διασκευή of Nicomachus seems to mean what we would call 'adaptation' of a play by a later author for an audience of his time. This activity was very often done to tragedies of the V century by later actors (cf. Pickard-Cambridge *DFA* pp. 99-100), and it has been used to explain the difficulties in the ascription of some plays of Pherecrates. Thus, Kock *CAF* I p. 145 suggests that *Agathoi* was reelaborated by Strattis for the audience of the IV century. Also Meineke *FCG* II p. 307 attributes to Nicomachus the reelaboration of some of the

plays, ascribed to Nicomachus by Eratosthenes (see above p.6), while Kaibel *Hermes* 24 (1889) p. 44 and Geissler (1925) p. 41 suggest that they were re-elaborated in a "Buch-drama des 4. Jahrh." (Geissler (1925) p. 42).

Otherwise, Körte *RE* XIX.2 1989. 13 concluded that this proposal is a piece of hypercriticism based on very weak linguistic difficulties and above all Strattis, who lived between the V and the IV century, seems to have been too early to make adaptations of old comedies (the date of the first re-staging is 339, cf. I col. 15, 13 Mette).

In consequence, the practice of the διασκευή of comedies must have been fairly common, mainly insofar as there was not a strict sense of originality and authorship and it may have been perfectly acceptable (it could be something similar to the 'contaminatio' in Roman comedy; see further about διασκευή Kassel *ZPE* 14 (1974) pp. 125-7). But, as we will see in the commentary on fr. 113 for instance, most of the objections to the authorship that lead to this conclusion seem to be based on critical analysis of later scholars made on assumptions about Pherecrates' style and language and to refer to the διασκευή to solve these problems seems to be unnecessary and thus I agree with Körte (see *supra*).

As I have already said in p.2, the only play that can be dated with certainty is *Agrioi* in 420. Other suggestions and conjectures have been made and they are discussed in the commentary in each individual case; but in general the scarcity of fragments and the fact that the fragments of his plays make

hardly any reference to public figures do not allow us to reach any firm conclusions about the dates.

The number eighteen or seventeen is reasonable in comparison with other poets (about the subject of the "productivity" of the poets of Old Comedy in comparison with Middle Comedy, cf. Mensching *MusHelv* 21 (1964) pp. 15-49). Perhaps we know of three exceptionally prolific poets whose lives seem to have lasted a long space of time and began to produce at a very young age: Cratinus (about 28 comedies), Aristophanes (about 40) and Plato comicus (about 28), while Eupolis produced about 17 in a rather small period of time (between 429 and 411 approximately according to Storey art.cit. pp. 4ff.). In general the rest of the poets fluctuates between two or three and twenty plays whose titles are known to us. Some of the reasons for such small number in contrast with the extraordinary production of Middle and New Comedy could be as follows:

- the complicated preparation of a chorus,
- the competitive contest to reach the right to perform,
- the preservation of plays which were not performed in the Middle and New Comedy, the so called ἀδιδάκτα (cf. Mensching art.cit. pp. 16-7),
- the fact that the plays that were not accepted for performance, probably were not entered in the official records and most of them were not copied again or lost at a very early stage; only some revisions of plays already performed have reached us (cf. supra p. 7).

## 2. - PHERECRATES IN THE LATER STUDIES ON COMEDY

In words of Jebb on *OC* p.5 Pherecrates was "one of the best poets of Old Comedy". This assumption may be true; but at least from the papyri discovered in our century from Hellenistic and Roman times, we could conclude that Pherecrates was not at least, taught in the schools and, thus, he never achieved the degree of appreciation of Aristophanes, Cratinus, Eupolis.

Nevertheless, he was probably appreciated to some extent by the Alexandrian scholars and I think it is possible to trace some instances about their treatment in the Alexandrian scholarship.

### A) LYCOPHRON AND ERATOSTHENES

Lycophron is likely to have edited his works in a general edition of the comic poets (cf. Pfeiffer *History of Classical Scholarship* I p. 119 and n. 6 Oxford 1968); or at least he dealt with the problems of vocabulary *ἐν τῷ θ' Περὶ κωμῳδίας* according to Athen. XI p. 485d quoting fr. 101 (cf. Ar. Byz. fr. 411 Sl.).

Eratosthenes approached some problems of the works of Pherecrates and is quoted in the following passages:

- Harp. p. 203, 8Dind., cf. *Μεταλλῆς* test. i: ὅπερ Νικόμαχόν φησι πεποιηκέναι Ἐρατοσθένους ἐν ζ' περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας (fr. 93Str.); cf. test. ii (Phot. p. 32, 11) and iii (Athen. XV p. 685 a) who clearly follow him in his opinion.

The problem of the attribution of *Metalles* to Nicomachus and the *διασκευή* has been already dealt with (cf. *supra* p. 7).

Eratosthenes' attribution to Nicomachus seems to be based on terminological grounds, as Pfeiffer *op.cit.* p. 161 suggests; but as Nesselrath *MK* p. 179 (see also n. 89) suspects, they "offenbar nicht der einzige Grund gewesen sind. Könnte es unter anderem auch der (zu einer "alten" Komödie nicht mehr passende) "Charakter" der Μεταλλεῖς gewesen sein, der Eratosthenes dazu veranlaßte, sie einem anderem Dichter zuzusprechen?" (cf. *infra* on Pherecrates' style). At any rate we could see that his approach was the origin of the somehow restrictive view that considers Pherecrates as ὁ ἀπτικώτατος (cf. Phryn. fr. 8Borr. and Athen. VI p. 268e, test. 10). It is also likely that the doubts about the authenticity of *Persai* and *Cheiron* were originated in Eratosthenes' studies.

- Fr. 172, quoted by Schol. min. ('Did. ') Hom. β 289 p. 46 Barnes and in Eust. *in Od.* p. 1445. 42 (who mentions Eratosth. fr. 55Str.), from a Homeric glossa of Eratosthenes. Fr. 145 is also related to a Homeric glossa of an Alexandrian, perhaps Apollodorus (cf. Taillardat-Roesch *Rev.Phil.* 92 (1966) p. 73, 74 and n. 1).

- Fr. 165 ([Didym.] Π. τῶν ἀπορουμένων παρὰ Πλατ. λέξ. p. 400 Mill. Another discussion about the meaning of an expression (cf. Eratosth. fr. 75Str.).

## B) OTHER SCHOLARS. ARISTOPHANES OF BYZANTIUM

It would be interesting to have some firm evidence about Pherecrates and Aristophanes of Byzantium, but unfortunately he

is not said to have quoted any fragment of Pherecrates. On the basis that Aristophanes of Byzantium is mentioned within the context of the discussion of some points and that he dealt with comedy in an extensive way, I will attempt to study some features of Pherecrates which he may have cited.

The supporting evidence is not decisive in linking these features of Pherecrates to the studies of Aristophanes of Byzantium; but at least it will sketch further other aspects of Pherecrates' work which were notable for later scholars.

- Phot. α466 quotes fr. 39 in the framework of a discussion of the unusual feminine 'Αθηναῖα which is also dealt with by Ar. Byz. fr. 351.

- Fr. 58 (Eust.<sup>1</sup> in *Il.* p. 707, 36) is also related to Ar. Byz. fr. 1851. (cf. Eust.<sup>2</sup> in *Od.* p. 1761, 23.29), about the term ἄρδα.

- Fr. 117 Athen. VII p. 287a can be connected with the discussion of Ar. Byz. fr. 40951. about βόαξ.

- Fr. 160 is quoted within the context of other comic texts about the length of the iota in πέρδιξ, subject dealt by Ar. Byz. fr. 34651.

- Fr. 240 (Phot. (z) ε 1719) is a discussion of the term ἐπιστάσις. Ar. Byz. fr. 3551. (Eust. in *Od.* p. 1827, 45) dealt also with this subject.

But beyond this lexicographical point of view, three aspects more were dealt by Aristophanes of Byzantium which could be easily related to Pherecrates:

- The beginning of the study of metre, especially in the

distinction of different  $\kappa\omicron\lambda\alpha$  and the classification of feet, (cf. Pfeiffer op.cit. p. 198 and Ar.Byz. fr. 346Sl. about the question of vowel lengthening).

This aspect can be related to Pherecrates' "invention" of the "Pherecrateum" (cf. test. 11). In fact this metre is very common as 'end of  $\kappa\omicron\lambda\alpha$ ' and Hephaestion of Alexandria quotes it from such point of view in *De signis* p. 68. 22 Consbr. (de Anacreonte) (cf. Ar. Byz. fr. 383bSl.). It seems also reasonable that this scholar of the II century A.D. (cf. Sandys *A History of Classical Scholarship* p.321 Cambridge 1903 and J.M. van Ophuijsen *Hephaestion on Metre* pp. 3ff. Leiden 1987), based his work on the research started by Aristophanes of Byzantium (cf. Pfeiffer op.cit. pp. 187-8 and van Ophuijsen op.cit. p. 27). Therefore, we may suppose that Aristophanes of Byzantium may have also dealt with Pherecrates' "original" treatment of this metre.

- The stress on the importance of Menander, as representative of a 'new' style of Comedy (cf. Pfeiffer op.cit. p. 190 and Nesselrath *MK* pp. 181ff. who uses this argument to suggest that this scholar distinguished the traditional three stages of Greek Comedy: old, middle and new).

- The critical approach to the Classical authors and, thus, the establishment of 'selective lists of authors' (cf. Pfeiffer op.cit. pp. 204ff.).

These last points are related to the critical approach of our scholar who began to study the authors within their context. In this case although Pfeiffer op.cit. pp. 204ff. warns us of the anachronistic sense of the word 'canon', it seems likely that

Aristophanes began to point out outstanding figures of every epoch and probably pre-determined the choice of later times.

In the lists of authors, Pherecrates is nearly always mentioned among the best seven Old Comedy poets. In brief:

- Anon. *de Com. (Proleg. de com. III)* 9 p. 7 Kost. (test. 2a) gives a list of eight poets: Epicharmus, Magnes, Cratinus, Crates, Pherecrates, Phrynichus, Eupolis, Aristophanes.

- In the *Canones comicorum* ed. Kroehnert (*Canonesne poetarum scriptorum artificium per antiquitatem fuerunt?* diss. Regim. Pruss. 1897) tab. M cap. 4 (p. 6) = C cap. 10 (p. 12), the list is as follows: Epicharmus, Cratinus, Eupolis, Aristophanes, Pherecrates, Crates.

- The later scholar Tzetzes (about him, cf. N.G. Wilson *Scholars of Byzantium* p. 190 London 1983) mentions him often in his lists; in *diff. poet. (Proleg. de com. XXI<sup>a</sup>)* 78 p. 87 Kost. (test. 2a): Sousarion (as the πρώτος εὐρετής), Cratinus, Eupolis, Pherecrates, Aristophanes, Hermippus, Plato. In *proleg. ad Lycophr.* II p. 3, 8 Sch. (*Proleg. de com. XXII<sup>b</sup>*, 39 p. 113 Kost.), he mentions only five main poets of Old Comedy: Aristophanes, Cratinus, Plato, Eupolis, Pherecrates. And in *proleg. ad Hes.* ed. Colonna, *Boll. Comit.* 2 (1953) p. 35, 62.67 (codd. MEC) (test. 9) Aristophanes, Eupolis, Pherecrates. It seems highly unlikely that a copy of Pherecrates' plays survived until this time (XII century A.D.) and therefore he must be based on an older source.

In conclusion, we can assume to some extent that Pherecrates was at least regarded as an important author for his language by

Eratosthenes and probably other scholars. It is more difficult to link him to Aristophanes of Byzantium, but it seems that Pherecrates was chosen among the seven best poets of Old Comedy and Aristophanes may have had something to do with it. In general although he never acquired the importance of Aristophanes or other poets, he was not regarded as a secondary figure (see also on p. 18 about Pherecrates in Athenaeus).

### 3. - THE SOURCES OF THE TEXT

The transmission of the 288 fragments of Pherecrates is mainly through quotations and references in the Scholia, Pollux, Athenaeus, Lexicons. The contents of the fragments are very varied, but generally they have an antiquarian and lexicographical character, being an important bulk of them related to the subject of food and the banquet transmitted by Athenaeus.

#### A) SCHOLIA.

The Scholia belong mainly to Aristophanes' commentaries, although some of them are from other authors like Lucian (fr. 18), Euripides (fr. 51), Sophocles (fr. 141, cf. Peppink *Mnem.* 1 series III (1934) p. 76-7), Plato (fr. 161), Homer (fr. 172). Most of them come probably from the commentaries of the Alexandrian scholars (cf. White *Sch. on Av.* pp. LXIX f., in our case see fr. 140 and supra on pp. 10ff.).

The main manuscripts of Aristophanes that preserve the Scholia are the Codex Venetus (V) and the Codex Ravennas (R), while many of our fragments also appear quoted in the Laurentianus XXXI 5 (Γ) which was written by three hands (cf. e.g. fr. 22 in which V and Γ can be easily compared). Not very often Estensis III D 8 (ε) and Codex Laurentianus Conv. Soppr. 140 (θ) preserve some citations. About the manuscripts of these Scholia, see the description and bibliography in D. Mervyn Jones

and N.G. Wilson *Scholia in Aristophanem I. 2 in Equites* pp. Vff. Groningen 1969.

The edition in progress of these texts has reached *Acharnians, Knights, Clouds, Wasps* and *Peace* and the commentaries of Tzetzes, W.J.W. Koster (ed.) *Scholia in Aristophanem* Groningen I-II. 2 1969-83, IV (Tzetzes' comment) 1960- 1964. I follow the reading of Kassel-Austin in the Scholia that have not been edited yet. For *Birds* White op.cit. is still of use and for the rest Dübner *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem* Paris 1855.

#### B) POLLUX, HESYCHIUS AND MINOR SOURCES OF THE II CENTURY A. D.

Pollux of Naucratis, an Atticist lexicographer of the times of Hadrian (cf. Bethe *RE* X 773 ff.) is an important source of fragments in his *Onomasticon* preserved to us in excerpt of 10 books (cf. Bethe op.cit. 776 83 ff.).

Its main edition is that of E. Bethe *Onomasticon* Leipzig 1900 who gives a complete stemma of manuscripts in p. XV (for a simplified version see Hunter on Eub. p. 33).

The *Lexicon* of Hesychius of Alexandria has been preserved in only one manuscript written in the early XV century, Marc. gr. 622 (H) (cf. K. Latte in *Hesychius Lexicon* pp. xxivff.). About the origin and importance of this Lexicon, cf. Latte in op.cit. pp. viiff. and N.G. Wilson op.cit. p. 43.

Two minor sources are the Harpocration *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*, edited by Dindorf, Oxford 1853 (cf. especially

pp. 111-x; but see now Harpocration *Lexeis of the Ten Orators* ed. J.J. Keane Amsterdam 1991); and the fragmentary text of Orus preserved above all through the Byzantine *Lexicon* of "Zonaras" (cf. K. Alpers *Das attizistische Lexicon des Oros* Berlin/New York 1981 for fragments 169, 183, 189, 196, 248).

### C) ATHENAEUS.

*The Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus provides us with a great number of fragments. This work which belongs to the III century A.D. (about dates see B. Baldwin *Acta Classica* 19 (1976) pp. 21-42, especially pp. 24ff.) is divided into fifteen books that in fact are an abbreviated version of the original thirty books (cf. Gow on Machon p. 25). Athenaeus' main interest is, as I have already said, related to banquets and food and he quotes passages from all the plays attributed to Pherecrates. He seems to be well informed about our playwright since he mentions doubts in the attribution of certain plays (cf. *Agathoi* in fr. 1, *Metalles* and *Persai* in *Metalles* test. 111 and *Cheiron* in fr. 162); he also gives us information about the content of *Doulodidaskalos* (cf. test. 1), about *Corianno* (cf. test. 11) and the date of performance of *Agrioi* (cf. test.1).

The main manuscript is called codex A Marcianus gr. 447 which, according to N.G. Wilson *JHS* 82 (1962) p. 147, was written by the scribe John the Calligrapher in the early X century A.D. It became part of the Library of the Cardinal Bessarion in the XV century. It contains most of what is

preserved, beginning at III 74a and ending at XV. 702c with some gaps in XI after 466d and some minor ones after 502b (cf. Gow's description in *op. cit.* p. 26).

The other important source is the Epitome which has survived completely and, thus, fills up the gaps in the text of A. It is contained in two manuscripts: E, Laurentianus 60.2 and C, Parisinus suppl. gr. 841 (about them see Hunter on Eub. p. 31).

Two further problems arise from these texts: on the one hand, the comparison between A and the Epitome (CE); on the other, the relationship between the Epitome (CE) and Eustathius.

The first problem is generally solved now by accepting that the Epitome was not done from A with some corrections of the scribe (as Maas *Gnomon* 4 (1928), 570-1, *BZ* 35 (1935) 299-307 and 36 (1936) 27-31 = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 505-20 had suggested); but from another source that in some cases contained better readings than the fuller version of A (cf. Pherecr. fr. 85 κατά σφακελίζε CE κατασφα- A, see Collard *RFIC* 97 (1969) p. 959, M. van der Valk *Eustathii Commentarii* I pp. lxxxiiff. Leiden 1971; for a stemma see Hunter on Eub. p. 32).

Secondly, Eustathius' commentary quotes often Athenaeus. It so happens that his text in many cases coincides with that of the Epitome. P. Maas *Kl. Schr.* pp. 505f. suggested that Eustathius himself had written it; but his solution is not now accepted since it is based on the superior quality of readings (cf. Collard *art. cit.* p. 165), while the differences were explained as arising from a further work on Eustathius' comments on Homer (cf. Maas *ibid.* p. 506); but this sort of philological work can hardly

have been undertaken by Eustathius and above all some differences are "hard to explain as the products of one mind" (cf. Hunter p. 32 and n. 2 with references).

It seems likely that he was able to read a fuller Epitome than the one we have. Cf. fr. 207 preserved by Eust. *In Od.* p. 1428. 60: though in this text he quotes Athen. XI p. 480e, our Epitome does not refer to Pherecrates but only gives Hermipp. fr. 55, mentioned by Eustathius also.

#### D) PHOTIUS AND OTHER LEXICA.

The main sources of fragments are the Lexica compiled in the Byzantine epoch; among them Photius has preserved the greatest number of texts. Pherecrates is frequently mentioned because he was seen as one of the best examples of the Attic dialect (cf. supra about ὁ ἀττικώτατος p. 11), since the study of the Attic dialect seems to be the main interest of these compilations.

The Lexicon of the patriarch Photius was written during the X century A.D. and his activity as lexicographer seems to have been connected also with the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (cf. N.G. Wilson *Scholars of Byzantium* p. 92 London 1983 and Theodoridis in *Photius Lexicon* pp. xxxvff. Berlin 1982; about his sources, cf. K. Alpers on Orus p. 70 and Theodoridis in op. cit. pp. lxxiiff.)

The codex tradition is discussed in detail by Tsantsanoglou *Τὸ Λεξικὸν τοῦ Φωτίου* p. 36ff. Thessalonica 1967, see also Theodoridis in op. cit. pp. xxxff. The following manuscripts are especially notable:

- Galeanus (g) Cambridge, Trinity College O.3.9 / 5985  
(edited by R. Porson London 1822).

- Zavordensis (z) 95 is the only manuscript that preserves the complete text of Photius. It is in process of being edited, but so far only the first volume  $\alpha$ - $\delta$  has appeared. Many of the new fragments and readings provided by this codex were already found in the following codex.

- Berolensis graec. oct. 22 (b). Its new readings were already edited by Demiańzuck in his *Supplementum comicum* Hildesheim 1967.

About the transmission of codices in the Suda, cf. A. Adler in Suidae *Lexicon* pars V p. 216 Leipzig 1928-1938.

#### 4.- FORMAL FEATURES IN PHERECRATES' FRAGMENTS

##### A) METRE.

The *iambic trimeter* is the metrical pattern most often found in the fragments, indeed. Pherecrates uses such metre according to the usual pattern of Greek Comedy (cf. the description in West *Gr. Metre* pp. 88ff. and, in more detail, White pp. 40-3, Descroix *Le Trimètre Iambique* Macon 1931, reprint New York-London 1987).

There are some examples of a number of resolutions in a line (cf. fr. 6.1, 56.3, 76.2). Also some three-word trimeters in fr. 22.2 and 113. 11 and they could suggest some imitation of tragic poetry according to M. Marcovich *Three-Word Trimeter in Greek Tragedy* p. 192 Königstein 1984.

Pherecrates has more examples of the *iambic tetrameter catalectic* in more plays than usually found in the other poets of Old Comedy, according to F. Perusino *Tetrametro iambico catalettico* p. 99 Roma 1968.

This metre is normally part of the agon (cf. fr. 98 and comment ad loc.), the chorus' entries and exits, and the exhortative portions before and after an agon (cf. Perusino op.cit. p. 16 for its general use). The following passages can be scanned in this metre: fr. 50. 1 (*Doulodidaskalos*, Kaibel's doubtful conjecture), 61 (*Epilesson*, conjecture), 69 (*Ipnos*, Meineke's conjecture), 98 (*Crapataloi*), 110 (*Leroi*, doubtful scansion).

He also uses the rare acatalectic form of this metre (cf.

fr. 111 and comment ad loc.).

The *iambic dimeter* in fr. 50. 2-5 is probably part of a pnygos; for this part of a comic play Pherecrates seems to have also used the *anapaestic dimeter* in fr. 126 (see further West *Gr. Metre* pp. 93-4, White pp. 98ff.).

The *trochaic tetrameter catalectic* is found in fragments which may belong to recitative speeches, may also convey the hasty pace of the parodos (cf. Pherecrates' imperative forms in fr. 89), or may be part of the dialogue of a chorus and a personage in a syzygy (cf. fr. 196 and see further White p. 99). In the fragments there are three examples of lines without diaeresis: fr. 10. 2, 99, 152. 5 and 155.6.

The *anapaestic tetrameter catalectic* appears frequently in the fragments and some of them clearly belong to the parabasis (cf. fr. 11?, 51, 100, 137, 199). See supra for the anapaestic dimeter.

The *dactylic hexameter κατά στίχον* is unusual in Comedy, but fr. 162 (*Cheiron*) is a long example of this metre with a clear parodic intention of elegiac poetry (Cratin. fr. 253 of a play called *Cheirones* uses also this metre as parody of the same kind of poetry).

We have some examples of what West *ibid.* pp. 95ff. calls 'Comic dicola'. Some of them are probably original creations of Pherecrates and it seems fairly probable that they belonged to the parabasis of the play. The following schemes can be found:

- *Eupolidean*, fr. 34, 52, 70, 127, 139, 204.

- Combinations of *glyconic*, *Aristophanean* and *Pherecratean*

*metre* in fr. 114 and 138 which seem to have been invented by Pherecrates (cf. comment ad loc.).

- *Archilocheus*, fr. 71.

- *Euripidean fourteen-syllable*, fr. 2. 3 and 195, ubi vid.

In respect of *Lyric combinations*, generally part of the chorus' songs, we have examples of:

- *Anaclastic glyconic*, fr. 14 , 102 and perhaps 101.

- The *Pherecrateion*, fr. 84, metre that was probably named after this passage.

- Fr. 2 shows a complex combination of *Dactylo-epitrite* that follows the scheme, D-e-D-e in l. 1-2 and ends in l. 3 in the 'Euripidean fourteen-syllable' previously mentioned. This metrical pattern and the context of the fragment suggest a choral origin. A similar pattern of Euripidean fourteen syllable, perhaps followed by a Dactylo-epitrite is found in Ar. *Vesp.* 272-3 (about it see Zimmermann *Untersuchungen* I pp. 97-9). The Dactylo-epitrite was related to the innovations introduced in the musical and poetical field by the new school of dithyrambists (cf. West *ibid.* p. 138). For parodies of such poetry, cf. Ar. *Ecc1.* 571-80 (see Zimmermann *ibid.* II p. 138).

In conclusion, we can observe how Pherecrates made use of a great variety of metrical patterns. Such a variety is related first of all to the obligations of a genre in which the choral parts are still important, secondly the originality and the innovations were also expected from the metrical point of view (cf. fr. 84); and, finally, also to the importance of the musical element in the comic performance.

## B) LANGUAGE.

The analysis of the levels of language is complicated by the lack of context and the unreliability of our sources. In many cases it is impossible to ascertain to which level a word belongs. It seems likely that Pherecrates mainly tried to emulate colloquial Greek; but through the use of spoken expressions and terms, he is also able to reproduce other levels of literary and non-literary languages. I will divide and classify the different levels of language in colloquial language, technical language, language of serious poetry, comic words per se and 'hapax legomena' following, where applicable, Dover's analysis of such levels in I pp. 230ff.

### *Colloquial language.*

Pherecrates generally used the Attic dialect, as one might expect. Our sources point out in particular some instances of terms that are properly Attic: 177 σκόνηζα (instead of κόνηζα), 180 τὸ κριβάνον (instead of κλιβάνον), 214 ἀκοήν (Attic for the epic ἀκουή), 215 ἀλιῶς. In such contexts the use of non-Attic words is a remarkable fact, especially if we take into account the fact that he was called ὁ Ἀττικώτατος (cf. test. 10 and see supra p. 11). In fact we know of only one case where he refers to a non-Attic speaker (fr. 74. 3-4 with reference to the Mariandynian slave). But even in this case it is for the sake of a joke and we cannot say to what extent foreign speech was reproduced, or if he followed the conventions of Tragedy in which the non-Attic characters could speak Attic perfectly (see an

analysis of the dialects and characters in Aristophanes and the comic fragments found in Dover I pp. 239-42).

The following words are not originally Attic: fr. 137. 9 δένδρη Ionic, 6 (λήνους) and 115 ἄρμῶ Doric and Hippocratic diction, 251 καραιβαρᾶν is suggested by Rehrenböck (1987) 48 to be Boeotian (but see comment ad loc.), 149 Μεγάλλειον and 9 πώμαλα Sicilian. Words of poetic dialects are: fr. 211 ἀγγάσκε (Schmid *GGrL* p. 106 n. 6 suggests to be Aeolic, but see Buck *The Greek Dialects* p. 81 Chicago 1928), 105 βρένθειον Sapphic, 41 ἄορτῆρα epic. Other terms classified by Schmid loc.cit. as dialect, but of doubtful origin are: fr. 80 ὀκλάξ and 253 ληκούμεθα which are suggested to be Ionic and 47 ἀπολιβάξεις Doric (see comment ad loc.).

The words, which I think could be part of the spoken Attic, are mainly found in other comic poets or later in Plato, Xenophon or the Hellenistic poets Theocritus and Herondas (cf. Dover loc.cit.). I propose to give a list as complete as possible, of the terms and expressions that could be derived from this linguistic level. I think it is also necessary to bear in mind, on one hand, that some cases are hypothetical, based solely upon the comparison with other writers or metrical and stylistic analysis and, on the other, that the mixture of different levels of language seems to be a feature of the comic poetry and in some occasions part of its comic effect (cf. Dover I pp. 237ff.). Each word will be discussed in its specific passage.

- Terms from colloquial and quotidian world: fr. 36 πασσυδί; 43.3 θράπτει; 45 ἀπονίζω; 46 θησέφ; 68 ῥῖαν; 73.1 τράγη, .2

κάντραγεῖν; 75.1 διεφθός; 95 ἐξ ἐωθινοῦ?; 96 and 206 γυνήν; 108 χρῆσται; 142.1 πόθεν; 213 Ἀδώνιος and Ἀδώνιον; 217 ἀμυστί; 218 ἀνασιῶ; 220 ἀνδράποδον? (for feminine slave, perhaps comic); 242 ἕτερος; 243 ἐττημένα?; 247 θυμέλη; 266 σκίτων; 267 σόφισμα?; 270 στρόφιγγες?; 281 χολλάδας.

- Diminutives (about the function of the diminutive especially in Menander's comedies see C. Prato *Ricerche sul trimetro di Menandro: metro e verso* pp. 26-7 Romae 1983 who refers to G. Pascucci 'Note stilistiche sull' uso del diminutivo greco' *Stud. it. filol. class.* 38 (1965) p. 189):

- ιον: 26.2, 32, 106, 113.1, 139.2, 143, 151, 261,

- ιδιον: 30, 62, 137.10,

- ισκος: 113.14, 272,

- ισκη: 75.4.

- Vulgar and slang words: 47 ἀπολιβάξεις (doubtful see comment ad loc.); 62 συνών; 63 θαλλοφόρους; 76.3 and 155.8 ὤ κατάρατε; 101 λαψάμενος; 136 ἀποκυβιστᾶς; 137.6 βαλανεύσει; 138.3 προσκινῶν; 144 λακπατεῖν; 159 λαικαστρας; 166 ὁ πανοῦργος; 173 ὕβριστόν (? , perhaps a comic insult) and κόβαλον; 176 ἐγκιλικίζουσ'; 188 ἀνεμολύνθη; 228 ἀρχαῖος; 232 βλιμάζειν; 253 ληκῆσθαι; 262 ῥυπαίνω; 263 σαπράν; 264 σιναμωρεύματα (? , comic formation).

- Exclamatory phrases: 29.1 νῆ τὴν Δήμητρ', 43 πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνος, 56.3 οἴμοι τάλας, 75.3 and 117.2 νῆ τῷ θεῷ, 102.4 νῆ τὸν φίλιον, 113.20 οἴμοι ὧς ἀπολεῖς plus participle, 135 and 142.1 οὔτος σύ.

- Word order and other constructions: 73.1 φέρε δὴ and

subjunctive, 73.2 ἰδοῦ plus a noun, οὐκ plus jussive future (cf. Smyth *Greek Grammar* §1919 and 1918 Cambridge Mass. 1984), 80 εἴτ' (not at the beginning of a sentence), 82 ἐνός γε του, 150 πάνυ at the end of a line.

- Forms commonly found in later Greek: 34 πεπληθῆναι, 56 ἀποκριθῶ, 66 πάλης, 83 κόιξ, 63 ἔσαττε, 198 τευτάζει, 196 πρωπέρυσι, 218 ἀναστῶ (? perhaps a colloquial usage of the word, see ad loc.), 225 ἀπολέγομαι, 246 ζῆθι.

#### *Technical language.*

Different technical terminologies originated from different social and cultural strata are also found in his fragments.

- Idiomatic expressions: fr. 6 ἔχ' ἀτρέμ', 22 οἱ κακῶς ἀπολούμενοι, 35 ἐν χρῶ κουριώντας, 37. 1 οὐδὲ θάτιον, 37.2 πανταχοῦ ἄγω, 70 τί μαθόντ', 75.5 κινεῖται ... χολή, 76.5 ἔρρ' ἐς κόρακας, 76. 3 and 87 τί ἠργάσω, 77. 1 and 98 ἀπαρτί μὲν οὖν, 113.21 ὡς ἔχετε, 113.26 τὰ καλὰ τῶν καλῶν (perhaps poetic), 117.2 τὸ παραπάν, 122 γυνή γράυς, 156.5 κατὰ χειρός, 156.6 νῦν δ' ἄρτι, 156.7 κατὰ μίτον, 157 τὴν αἵτιαν ἔχουσ', 159.2 καλόν γε (cf. Dover I p. 21 n.14), 162. 13 ἐπ' οἴνοις, 175 ποῖ κῆχος, 196 ἔτος τρίτον.

- Terminology of festivals and religion: 7 οἱ προτενθοί, 28.2 τὸ νομιζόμενον and .6 θυλήμασι, 63 θαλλοφόρους, 121 ἀρᾶται and ἐπιθεάζει, 167 διακόνιον and ἀμφιφῶντα, 213 Ἀδώνιος, 265 Σκίρα.

- Cooking terms: 8 ἀνακυκῆσαι, 26 ὀπτῶσα, see several examples in fr. 50 and 57, 80 ἔψουσ', 89 τακερούς, 109 ἀπὸ τηγάνου φαγεῖν (cf. fr. 128 and 133), numerous terms in fr. 113

(see comment ad loc.) fr. 137, fr. 195 and 197, 157 παροψίδες, 180 τὸ κρίβανον, 226 ἀπολοπίζειν.

- Military terminology: 12 δελφίς and δελφινόφορος κεραία, 18 ἀποσταυροῦνται, 22 ἐπαμφοτερίζουσ', 37.1 ἐπισιτιεῖ, 83 κωρύκους, 235 διακόκκω (?).

- Poetical and musical terms: 6 κιθαρωδός, 31 τὰς ἁρμονίας, 47 τριγώνους and λύρας, 84.3 συμπτύκτοις ἀναπαστοίς, many instances in fr. 155, 162. 10 ἔλεξ' ἔλεγεῖα, 205 ὑμέναιον ὕμνεῖ γαμικόν, 276 ὑφόλμιον.

- Agricultural terms: 24 συγκαρκινωθῆ, λήια, 72 ἀλοάσαντ', fr. 172, 197 and 201 are lists of different kinds of grains, 243 ἐττημένα (?), 114.1 ἀναδενδράδων.

- Official and formal language: 2. 1 στεφανώμασιν, fr. 39 (parody of official expressions), 52 ἀναψηφ(ισασθ'), 59 ἐνεχυριμαῖός, 64 ὑπόβολον, 61 ἐφ' οὔ (archon), 70.3 κατασκευασμένον / συνέδριον, 240 ἐπιστάτην, 233 βοεικός (ending fashionable within sophistic circles, cf. fr. 37.3 λαρυγγικόν).

- Medical terminology: fr. 58, 75.1 τὸ σ(ί)αλον, 85 σφακέλιζε, 139.2 περιμάττομεν, fr. 169, 208 θέρμην, 270 στρόφιγγες.

- Other activities: weaving: 51 κατάγωμεν, 53 ῥαβδίζειν, 277 ὕφός; shoes: 192 καττύομαι, 261 ῥάδια; 234 δακτυλιουργόν (cf. fr. 137 where different trades are mentioned in a long list).

#### *Poetic language.*

The poetic language in Pherecrates is mainly related to choral passages and fragments of high-style which have generally a descriptive character (cf. on fr. 114) or as in fr. 113 a parodic style of a messenger's speech in tragedy.

I have already pointed out some non-Attic words which may have a poetic function. In general the use of such words is sparse, and they give a contrasting tone to other non-poetic words whenever we have a long text. The rest of the instances which are few lines or just one or two words, do not allow us to reach any clear conclusion about the intention within the play.

Poetic terms: 20 *τερθρευόμενος* (tragic), 23 *αἰ πτέρυγες*, 25 *στραγγαλίδας*, 29.2 *ἀνίαρρον* (elegy perhaps), 69 *περίβολος* and *περίερκτος*, 83 *τεῦχος*, 88 *κνέφας*, 105 *βρενθεῖον* (Sapphic), 104 *δυσημερεῖν* and cf. 245 *εὐμερία*, fr. 113, 120 *τεθολωμένον*, 126.2 *καταμήσσονται*, 131 *ἀνελεύθερον?*, 152.3 *ἐμφέρη*, 162.1 *θάλειαν*, 162.2 *ῥέζει*, 162.3 *εὐκηλος*, 162.5 *ὑπεβλέπομεν*, 185 *καθίζανε*, 202 *κομῶν*, 203 *βριθομένης*, 211 *ἄγχασκε*, 212 *ἀδήφαγοι*, 216 *ἀλλοκότως*, 222 *ἀνούστατοι*, 244 *εὐδουλος*, 259 *πλοκάδας*, 273 *ταχεωσί*, 279 *φῖτυ*. An important number of poetic expressions can be found in fr. 137 and 138 (see commentary ad loc.).

*Comic words per se and "hapax legomena".*

In this section I attempt to collect the words that belong to the comic terminology either as a joke common to other comic poets or because the meaning of the term itself seem to suggest this function. I have included some words that perhaps should have been placed among the "hapax legomena" listed afterwards, because they seem to be clearly a comic formation; on the other hand, most of the "hapax legomena" may have had a parodic sense (in many cases of high-style) and, thus, a comic one, but I have preferred to distinguish them, since they form an important group and some of them probably represent the poetic contribution of

and some of them probably represent the poetic contribution of Pherecrates to the Greek language.

- Comic words: 70.4 μαγεῖραιναί, .5 ἰχθυοπώλαιναν (see also 186 ἀνδροκαπράναν), 37.3 λαρυγγικόν (hapaκ, see also fr. 233 βοεικός), 86 Κραπάταλοι and ψωθία, in *Κραπάταλοι* test.1 κίκαβος, 102 κακηγορίστερον, 101 ἐκκαρυβδίσαι, 111 κυντερώτερα, 126.3 λαγαρίζομενοι, 163.1 δοκησιδεξίων, 172 σεσαγμένους, 187 μειξοφρύς, 238 ἐμπύγονα, 252 κλεπτίδας, 254 μητρίδα, 256 ναικισήρεις, 257 οὐλοκέφαλος, 269 στρατηγίς, 274 τραπεμπάλιν.

- Hapaκ legomena: 9 ἀποπροσωπίζεσθε, 15 φιλαρχικοί, 21 ἀνταποδίδωμι, 69 περίερκτος and περίβολος, 81 ἀνύδρευσαι, 87 ἀμάχαιρος, 113.1 συμπεφυρμένα, .11 καταχυματίοις, 113.4 τονθολυγοῦντες, .13 ὀλόκνημοι, .17 χναυρότατα, 28 τριχάπτοις, 114.2 λωτοφόρψ, 132 τὸ πολλαγόρασον, 134 κώμφαλωτάς, 137.4 κοχυδοῦντες and ἐπιβλύξ, .8 πολυτύρων and λειριοπολφανεμώναις, 152.5 γαστροίιδας, .7 ἀνεκλογίστως, 168 ἄγρυπτα, 211 ἄσμηκτος and ἀπαπαλέκτος, 237 ἐγρηγορίσιον and παυσινύσταλον, 260 πρωτόβαθρον, 261 ῥόδια, 264 σιναμωρεύματα, 268 στομοδόκον.

Despite the limited number of fragments out of seventeen plays and the narrow range of linguistic and thematic interests of the sources, I think we can accept fairly confidently the richness and diversity of the language of Pherecrates. Perhaps, language is a source of comedy more than any other element, but Pherecrates uses it not only with the formation of new words or the use of unexpected expressions; but, as far as one can guess (cf. fr. 73-6), also with the intention to recreate some kind of

daily life and colloquial atmosphere suitable to the characters and situations that are being represented.

### C) STYLE AND HUMOUR.

Corresponding to the analysis of metre and language, the style of Pherecrates can be approached from different points of view, bearing in mind that in some cases several kinds of style can be mixed in one passage.

#### *High style*

It refers to the fragments that use the language, metre and syntax of serious poetry, that is to say, epic, lyric and tragedy. We cannot suggest their function in some particular cases, since the context is not given, but it seems logical that it was mainly parodic, and, on some occasions, it served to identify and even characterize some personages with specific stylistic features.

Some fragments belong probably to the parabasis of choral passages where the lyric element was used in connexion with the music. In some cases, the text finishes or is interspersed with non-poetic expressions (cf. fr. 2) and sometimes a banal subject, dealt with such style, can provide enough contrast to make a description comic (cf. fr. 152). The contrary case can also happen: a subject proper to serious poetry can be treated with rather colloquial language (cf. fr. 159).

There are some three-word trimeters which could have a paratragic intention (p. 22), and, as H.W. Miller *C1Ph* 37 (1942)

p. 195 points out regarding this metrical feature in Aristophanes, "a comic effect is produced as a result of the incongruity of the impressive form and the unimpressive thought of the passage. The size of the words, many of them Aristophanic coinages, is rarely appropriate to the thought expressed".

The following fragments can be listed: 2 (cf. στεφανώμασιν in v. 2, an unusual formation in -μα, and the metrical pattern of the fragment); 10 (cf. the gnomic style in l. 2, ὀρθραί in l. 3, and the possible παρὰ προσδοκᾶν at the end); 23 (cf. αἱ πτέρυγες and the predicative position of μετέωρον); 113 (possibly a parody of a long complicated and finally boring messenger's speech in tragedy); 114, 137 and 138 may belong to what is called 'comic fantasy' (cf. on fr. 114) where the lyric expressions are very frequent; 152 (see above); 155 (above all ll. 1-2 seem to have a paratragic tone, see further on p. 36 and comment ad fr.); 162 (imitation of the gnomic style of elegy in hexameters); 168 (accumulation of newly compound adjectives in α- negative, perhaps in order to parody the tragic style (cf. also fr. 87 in v. 2 ἀμάχαιρος and in v. 3 ἀνόδοντος and fr. 210; in Aristophanes some examples of this comic formation can be found in connexion with the tragic style, cf. *Ran.* 204 and 837-39); 202 poetic invocation. The Scholiast on Soph. *El.* 86 points out remarkably an example of a parody of a Sophoclean passage, but unfortunately the citation is lost.

#### *Formal style*

It includes those passages with expressions that imitate what I have mentioned in the section of 'technical language'. It

may be characterized by the use of stiff and standard phrases that generally can be identified with a special group or subject.

The following fragments can be pointed out: 39 (parody of an expression used in historical and official texts, cf. also fr. 200); 85 is perhaps the speech of a doctor or someone imitating it; 92, 146, 166 (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 269 and W. Horn *Gebet und Gebetsparodie in den Komödien des Aristophanes* p. 48 Nürnberg 1970), 181 and 205 can be related to the style of religious prayers and hymns.

Another element that is noticeable, is the amount of proverbs which are preserved in our sources, as being used by Pherecrates. We will see with regard to fr. 73 how a proverb or a sententious phrase can be made into a joke, or, at least, as an element to portray a character; similar cases are fr. 14.4ff., 43. 3-4, 156; but still there are many passages which are quoted without any context, and it is not possible to gather which was their function in Pherecrates' play and to what extent one has to interpret them literally or metaphorically. The following fragments can be listed, besides the one before quoted: 16, 73.5, 76.5, 85.2, 129, 154, 162, 171.

#### *Colloquial style.*

It has been already studied from a linguistic point of view; but perhaps we could see how Pherecrates used it in fr. 73 and 74. These two fragments could likely be part of the same scene of a dialogue between a mistress (doubtful, see comment ad loc.) and her servant. As it has been already pointed out, the text uses colloquial expressions (cf. v.1 φέρε δῆ with subjunctive, 1.2

κάντραγεῖν, 1.3 ἴδου plus a noun but without a verb, cf. Dover I p. 20) and finishes in 1.4 with a sententious note that may be suitable to a woman who is worried about her appearance. Fr. 74 is built with similar quotidian expressions: 1.2 the negative jussive future as imperative, the genitive partitive and the question at the end of the line (cf. Ar. Av. 1003). The fragment seems to build up the sentences not only in order to convey a normal dialogue in Athens, but also to finish with a joke, in this case, by stressing the ignorance and foreign character of the servant. A similar interpretation can be made of fr. 75 and 76, but I will refer to them later, when talking about the characters who, we could guess, spoke these lines. Otherwise, fr. 56 is an example of the use of reported speech in a climactic way.

#### *Humour.*

In these fragments we can find three kinds of humour: a parodic one that tries to imitate the high style of serious poetry; the simple joke which is prepared through the comic dialogue and is organized to end in a climax (as we have just seen in fr. 74), and, last but not least, the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* or 'surprising twist' at the end of a passage (cf. fr. 10.4, 26.2, 85.4, 117). Perhaps we should add other comic devices: exaggeration (fr. 175), use of a slang word in an unusual context (cf. fr. 170), anacoluthon (cf. fr. 145 and perhaps 176), etymological joke (fr. 150), enumeration as in fr. 50, 106, 138.2, 144, 156, 186, 190, 197. In some of these enumerations the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is its final comic point, but can also be the

absurdity of the long enumeration or some other element of comic business that we cannot know since the context is lost.

In relation to the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, Pherecrates' way of dealing with obscene jokes (a very popular element in Old Comedy), needs to be discussed here. The only mention of Pherecrates in Aristophanes, *Lys.* 157-9, can be understood as a reference to the way our author dealt with such jokes by using euphemistic terminology with double standards (cf. on fr. 193). I think that the wording of some fragments such as 10.4, 11.2, 26.2, 27, 50, 138, 190, 193 contains an ambiguity. A person who knows well the slang terminology or a gesture or even a change of tone of the voice of the actor could have interpreted such an ambiguous expression from an erotic point of view. Other passages have a clear obscene sense, cf. fr. 27, 93, 155 (a remarkable fragment for the use of technical musical terms with a clear erotic sense), 159, 227, 253. A reference to scatological humour can be found in fr. 93.

Although I think we can not fairly judge from these passages the role and importance of the obscene humour in his plays, at least it approximately coincides with the image of a poet who carefully chose the wording of a joke in order to play with the double sense of a sentence as Aristophanes *loc.cit.* could be understood.

From such a fragmentary work, it is difficult to convey an overall idea of the style of Pherecrates. The general impression is that of carefulness and elegance (cf. Meineke *Hist. crit.* *FCG*

I p. 67). On the one hand, Pherecrates tries to give a lively and perhaps realistic representation of the dialogues and the characters and, on the other, combines them, in such a way that they could be funny with a style of humour that ranges from moderate obscenity to a complex game of parodies. There is perhaps a tendency to the commonplace and the use of proverbs and sententious expressions that, although effective because of their realism, can burden the style with formalized phrases and work against its liveliness.

In general the variety of metre, language and style suggests that Pherecrates had a clear knowledge of Attic language and tried to make the most of it, probably in search of an original comic effect.

## 5. - ANALYSIS OF THE DRAMATIC STRUCTURE.

The remains of the plays of Pherecrates do not really allow us to assess how he organized the different parts of the comedy. We can not say to what extent he followed the organization of the plot in comparison to Aristophanes, although it is possible to observe the repetition of certain patterns and metrical schemes.

In theory the main parts of a comedy are: the prologue, the agon, the parabasis (divided into different elements also: kommation, proper parabasis or anapaests, pnigos or makron, ode, epirrhema, antode, antepirrhema), comic scenes, exodos. This distribution suffers many changes and one may suppose that Pherecrates did not necessarily follow it. The fullest analysis of these elements in the comic fragments is found in Whittaker (1935) pp. 181-191, and I will follow it for most of this introduction, although many of her assumptions based on very flimsy evidence will be mainly discussed in the commentary.

Some plays like *Άγριοι*, *Μυρμηκάνθρωποι* and *Κραπάταλοι* seem to have developed the subject of the trip, and as far as one can conclude from the fragments, the plot was organized in a way similar to that of *Frogs* or *Birds*. The following parts can be distinguished: Prologue (preparation for the trip or travelling, cf. fr. 85 in *Krapataloi* and fr. 118-9 in *Myrmekanthropoi*); arrival at the destination and meeting with the inhabitants in the parodos of the chorus (cf. fr. 5 in *Agrioi* and fr. 120-2 in *Myrmekanthropoi* and perhaps fr. 126 according to Whittaker p. 183); agon and parabasis (*Agrioi* fr. 10-4, *Krapataloi* fr. 90, 98-

100); perhaps episodic scenes after the parabasis; exodos (*Krapataloi* perhaps fr. 101-2). The similar theme of *Metalles* or *Persai* could lead to a similar pattern, but in these cases the uncertainties are even greater.

*Αὐτομόλοι* seems to have contained an agon (fr. 28 and note ad loc.) and possibly the comments of a βωμολόχος in the middle of the debate (fr. 29). It probably had a parabasis in Eupolidean metre (cf. fr. 34).

From its content and the references to slaves' activities in some fragments, *Δουλοδιδάσκαλος* seems to have staged some 'comic scenes' in which some persons are trained to become slaves (cf. fr. 44-5). We have the remains of a Pnigos (fr. 50) and a line from the parabasis (fr. 52).

*Ἴπνός ἢ Παννυχίς* has also another example of a parabolic passage in fr. 70.

*Κοριαννώ* has a group of fragments that could be interpreted as belonging to the same scene: 73-4, 75-6 and 77-8, either the prologue or episodic scenes at the end would be suitable for them. The trochaic tetrameter catalectic in fr. 83 and the address to the audience in fr. 84 seem to be part of the parabasis.

*Μεταλλῆς* is notable for the long speech on fr. 113 and the parabolic fr. 114 in comic dicola.

Similar to *Μεταλλῆς* in its subject, *Πέρσαι* has preserved part of the agon in fr. 137 and another group of comic dicola in fr. 138, which together with the Eupolidean lines in fr. 139, may belong to the parabasis.

*Χείρων* is remarkable for the long dialogue in fr. 155. G. Pianko *Eos* 53 (1963) p. 56-62 tries to reconstruct the play, but I think unsuccessfully from the number of fragments and evidence which is left to us (see introductory note on this play).

Fr. 163, the only one preserved from the play *Ψευδηρακλής*, according to Whittaker (1935) p. 181, may belong to the prologue of the play and is "a similar address to the audience in a colloquial vein very reminiscent of *Vespae* v.78ff, *Pax* v.45 ff".

I would like to draw attention to three dramatic devices in particular:

- Pherecrates' number of plays with plural titles that could be identified as referring to the chorus: ten out of the nineteen titles attributed to him (see pp. 6ff. about the number of plays). Among the other nine, we know that three had a chorus according to our sources: *Δουλοδιδάσκαλος*, *Ἴππος ἢ Παννυχίς* and *Κοριαννῶ*; as for the rest *Ἀνθρωφηρακλής*, *Ἐπιλησμών ἢ Θάλαττα*, *Πετάλη*, *Τυραννίς*, *Χείρων*, *Ψευδηρακλής*, there is no evidence about the chorus.

- in four plays: *Αγριοί*, *Αυτομολοί*, *Κραπαταλοί*, *Περσαί*, we can ascertain that there was an agon and it may have an important role as in Aristophanes, as Whittaker p. 184 suggests.

- Pherecrates uses also the device of addressing the audience directly. This metatheatrical device has a comic end as well as it is a way of encouraging the audience to participate in the play. Fr. 102 is a clear reference to the judges to judge fairly the comedy. Other instances can be fr. 84, fr. 101 and 163

(it is also possible that fr. 37 is a reference to a living person supposedly in the audience).

In conclusion, from the presence of the chorus and the use of determinate metres it can be speculated that his plays may have followed the traditional elements in the distribution of a comedy, although the poet had some freedom in the moment of composing, as Aristophanes' comedies and the later evolution of Comedy show.

## 6. - CHORUS, CHARACTERS AND CHARACTERIZATION

### A) CHORUS.

From the conclusions just drawn the chorus seems to have been important at least at the moment of giving a name to a play. In this sense he follows the tradition of Old Comedy, but still it is not clear which was its dramatic role in the development of the play.

Collecting all the information from the fragments, the following types of choruses can be distinguished:

- Chorus of men: *Agathoi*: it is not known to whom this title refers; if they speak fr. 2 in lyric metres, they could be 'old men' criticizing the decadence of morals of the youth. *Agrioi*: chorus of wild and primitive beings (cf. test. ii); if fr. 14 refers to them, they were seen as primitive 'vegetarians'. *Automoloi*: again their identification is uncertain, perhaps the gods themselves (cf. fr. 28). *Metalles*: chorus of miner-slaves. *Persai*: chorus of Persian men (see introductory note on another possible sense of this word).

- Chorus of women: *Graes*: old women who may suffer a rejuvenation (see introductory note p. 164). *Doulodidaskalos*: 'old women' or perhaps more exactly 'spinner women' who may speak fr. 51 in their dramatic character. In *Ipnos* or *Pannychis* the chorus may have been women, if fr. 70 is spoken by the chorus.

- Personifications: *Leroi*: the chorus may have been formed by women's accessories. *Krapataloi*: the chorus could be a

personification of the fictitious coins that existed in Hades, if it followed the custom that the title in plural meant the chorus of the play, but it is not sure (cf. fr. 98 probably from the agon; it contains terms from monetary language).

- Fantastic figures: *Myrmekanthropoi*: the 'ant-men' (see introductory note), are perhaps mythological beings (cf. fr. 126 where they may be speaking in their dramatic character, according to Whittaker p. 183).

As for the rest, only *Korianno* has a passage that could be part of the parabasis (cf. fr. 84), but we do not know who formed the chorus.

The fragments that can be ascribed with some certainty to the chorus generally deal with the following subjects: criticism of the relaxation of morals, above all of young people (fr. 2, 34 and perhaps 20 and 138, see *infra* p. 62); maybe complain about the treatment of the chorus in the past (fr. 199); draw the audience's attention to the anapaestic part of the parabasis (fr. 84 and maybe 204); petition for a fair judgement from the judges of the theatrical contest (fr. 102); criticism of the pointless activities of the audience, according to my interpretation of fr. 126; address to an actor (*κατακελεύσματος*) to make a good agonistic speech (fr. 12), descriptions of idyllic places in the parabasis (fr. 114).

Other uncertain passages that could belong to the chorus are fr. 52 (advice to the city?), fr. 70 (criticism of the immorality of tradesmen), and maybe fr. 38, fr. 138 and 139.

## B) CHARACTERS.

As in the case of the chorus, we can only guess some characters of some plays and thus I am going to deal mainly with the information in groups:

### *Male characters.*

We know that the two main characters of *Agrioi* were two misanthropic men, perhaps one of them is portrayed in fr. 5 as boastful and presumptuous, while in fr. 7 another or the same character uses a trick to get some food. In fr. 57 (*Epilemon* or *Thalatta*; see introductory note to this play about the possible senses of the title) a man is preparing his dinner-basket in order to go to eat to another person's house and maybe there is a reference to a fishmonger in fr. 62. *Korianno* seems to have depicted a scene in which an old man and his son are fighting for a lover (as fr. 77-9 could be interpreted, cf. fr. 166). In *Krapataloi* an old man (and probably his slave) went down to Hades, as far as fr. 87 is concerned. An old man, perhaps identified with Deucalion, was also present in *Myrmekanthropoi*, (cf. fr. 119-25).

The figure of the old man as hero of the play seem to be quite common. He was probably depicted as yearning for past times and sceptical about the present. This is possibly the reason to start the trip down to Hades in *Krapataloi* and the old man speaking fr. 87 is characterized comically by an artificial and pompous language. Such a character may have also been represented by mythological figures like Cheiron (see infra on p. 47).

*Female characters.*

Women seem to have played a remarkable role in the comedies of Pherecrates; at least four titles: *Ἐπιλήσμων ἢ Θάλαττα*, *Ἴπνός ἢ Παννυχίς*, *Κοριαννώ*, *Πεταλή*, can be interpreted as having a woman more exactly a hetaira, as main character. There is also a number of fragments in which the speakers are female: fr. 43 (*Doulodidaskalos*), fr. 73-4 maybe, and fr. 75-6 (*Korianno*), fr. 113 (*Metalles*), fr. 117 (*Myrmekanthropoi*), and fr. 155 (*Cheiron*, see later on personifications). We have to mention also the plays with a female chorus, cf. *Γράες*, *Δουλοδιδάσκαλος*, *Ἴπνός ἢ Παννυχίς*.

Pherecrates seems to have been one of the first poets to develop more seriously the character of the hetaira who will become very important in the later stages of Comedy. Above all fr. 73-6 provide some certain elements that can be related to an hetaira as their apparent sophistication and refinement, their activities in public places, like the Public Baths, their bibulousness (see *infra* in p. 48).

From what we can gather, women in general were portrayed with caricatured features similar to those found in Aristophanes: superstition (fr. 43, see Oeri *Der Typ der komischen Alten* p. 21), drinking and eating (fr. 73-4, 75-6, perhaps fr. 110; cf. fr. 152), talkativeness (fr. 113), lechery (fr. 155; cf. fr. 186). For other instances about this character in Comedy, see M. M. Henry *Menander's Courtesans and the Greek Comic Tradition* pp. 16ff. Frankfurt am Main /Bern/New York 1985.

It is not clear whether he portrayed young women with

hostility in contrast with old ones, as Henderson (1987) p. 108 suggests. It is true that he probably dealt with the subject of rejuvenation (cf. fr. 185).

#### *Slaves.*

The role of the slaves in Comedy is quite important and acquires a more prominent role as it evolves with the development of some stock-characters. At least in *Doulodidaskalos* this figure must have played a fairly important role. In this play the slaves learn their 'trade' by 'habit' (ἐθισθέντες, Athen. VI 262b). Other activities of daily life which are commonly mentioned in comedy are found in the fragments belonging to this play: fr. 44 carrying a lamp, fr. 45 serving (also found in fr. 135 and 183), fr. 50 cooking, fr. 47 and 53 cleaning, fr. 49 stealing. In *Korianno* fr. 73-4 a slave's misunderstanding of Greek is an opportunity to make fun of their foreign origin.

I do not think that there is any lengthy passage that can be attributed with certainty to a slave. I would suggest that fr. 113, a long speech of a woman, could be spoken by a slave who uses at a parodic level a very complicated poetic language. In this case she could take the role of the slave-messenger, a very common type in Tragedy and Comedy (cf. Nicostr. fr. 13, Mnesim. fr. 4, Στεφανῆς Ὁ Δοῦλος pp. 105ff.).

#### *Mythological figures and personifications.*

As far as one can guess from fr. 1, Heracles may have been depicted as a glutton, and in at least one or two other plays, he must have been an important figure (cf. Ἀνθρωπήρακλης and Ψευδήρακλης).

It is possible that Deucalion (cf. fr. 125) and Pyrrha (fr. 122) were characters in *Myrmekanthropoi* (see introductory note on this play). Both seem to have been portrayed as old persons.

The centaur Cheiron must have been the protagonist of the play with the same title and, like Heracles, was a common character in Greek comedy as a figure that represents the traditional wisdom. He possibly was portrayed as an old person with very lengthy speeches and an elaborate language (cf. fr. 156 and 162). In the same play we can tentatively identify Achilles and Odysseus with possibly a reference to their role in Homer (cf. also fr. 165).

The long dialogue of Music and Justice (fr. 155) shows the sophisticated level of Pherecrates' style. It is a play on words of the technical musical terminology, but used in a context of a typical conversation of women full of 'double entendres'. Mrs. Music is not really very dignified by all her lovers, and maybe she is depicted in the terms of a hetaira, although this is pure guessing. Such style of conversations will be paralleled clearly by later writers like Herod. VII, Theocr. 15.

Iocasta is possibly the speaker of fr. 96 in *Krapataloi* in which also Aeschylus speaks fr. 100, in the Underworld.

### C) CHARACTERIZATION.

Perhaps we can take as an example of characterization fr. 75 and 76 which can be easily linked. In the first one a female character, probably just arrived on stage, explains that she has

been to the 'public-baths' and thus has a very 'boiled' throat. The fact of coming from the baths is an indication that she is a hetaira, but also sets the subject of the following lines insofar as it is an excuse for the playwright to introduce the subject of drinking and finish the passage making reference to a traditional joke: the woman who drinks a very large quantity of wine from a very big container (cf. fr.152 for parallels). The language she uses is also characteristic: l.1 διεφθός is a cooking term that is applied here in metaphorical sense and also makes reference to the heat in the baths; τὴν φάρυγα in l.2 is colloquial for the throat and the words γλίσχρον and τὸ σάλον are unusual terms to describe thirst and suggest a rather experienced woman; the noun φάρμακον in l. 6 and the expression κινεῖται... χολή also follow this kind of colloquial pseudo-scientific language.

The second fragment could follow nearly immediately. The character complains to Glyce about the drink just served to her because of the proportions of the mixture of wine and water. The dialogue is mainly between Glyce and her daughter (cf. l.4 ὦ μάμμη, although it could also be said by a young servant), and it is remarkable for the vividness and quickness of the dialogue in contrast with the sententious phrase that the first speaker uses to end the conversation with an ironical remark (see commentary ad loc. for the distribution of the lines). If we accept that the two fragments and thus the characters are closely connected, perhaps we could guess that the first speaker is Korianno, maybe depicted as an old woman, with the traditional features of a drunkard and a 'lena' (cf. Oeri *Der Typ der komischen Alten* p.

15, and J. Henderson (1987) pp. 119ff.).

The depiction of characters is at least in this passage through linguistic and topic elements. We do not know to what extent the figures were subordinated to their status nearly as stock-characters or whether the vividness of the speech and the unusual circumstances gave them a particular personality. It seems that Aristophanes tended to play with role-reversal and the 'discontinuity' of his personages in order to achieve a comic effect (cf. M. Silk in C. Pelling (ed.) *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* p.159 Oxford 1990). Pherecrates may have tried to innovate through the invention of new situations and plots (see pp. 50ff.), while the characters may have tended to develop the jokes and commonplaces to which they are traditionally related (about the beginning of the stock-characters of Middle and New Comedy in Old Comedy, see Webster *Studies in Later Gr. Com.* p. 66 Manchester 1970<sup>2</sup>, Nesselrath *Lukians Parasitendialog* pp. 98-9).

## 7.- PLOTS. CLASSIFICATION OF COMEDIES

### A) PLOTS.

The plots and the novelties he introduced in this sphere seem impossible to deal with from such a small amount of fragments and external sources. The main piece of evidence about them is the testimony of the Anon. *De com.* (Proleg. de Com. III) 29 p.8 Kost. (test. 2a): πράγματα δὲ εἰσηγούμενος καινὰ ἠὺδοκίμει, γενόμενος εὐρετικὸς μύθων (about this testimony see p. 1).

This generalization is difficult to prove and, at least regarding the organization of the structure of a comedy, he uses the chorus quite often, fact that must have had some influence in the development of the plot (cf. pp. 40ff.).

The title of the plays can be also an element to judge the innovations, Pherecrates tried to introduce at this level because none of the titles has an exact parallel in Old Comedy and only some of them which were doubtful in their attribution in Antiquity are found in later playwrights only.

The plays of which we know or can guess some details of the contents are the following ones:

*Agrioi*: two Athenian men set off, because of their misanthropy, towards another land where they meet a tribe of 'wild beings' very primitive in their habits. The play seems to have developed the situations and conflicts that such an encounter creates.

*Doulodidaskalos*: activities of a slave-trainer who teaches

slaves by 'habit' (cf. test. 1).

*Korianno*: the life and activities of a hetaira, Korianno; in some moments of the action a fight between an old and a young man, perhaps his son, for the love of a woman takes place.

*Krapataloi*: the trip of an old man (and his slave?) to the Underworld where they find a new monetary system, in a life of ease and abundance. Down there they also meet Aeschylus and perhaps some mythological figures. The comparison with Aristophanes' *Frogs* is unavoidable; but there is no certitude about the means of the trip.

*Metalles*. The trip to the Underworld through the mines (of Laureion?) seems to be the subject of this play. A woman, perhaps a slave, explains the wonderful Land of Cockaigne she found there.

*Myrmekanthropoi*. Perhaps a mythological comedy in which Deucalion and Pyrrha's myth is adapted as a journey to avoid the flood and reach a land inhabited by the 'Ant-men'.

*Persai*. Another fantastic representation of a world of wealth and easy life, set perhaps in Persia.

*Tyrannis*. Woman obtaining the power and establishing a free-drinking society (fr. 152)?.

*Cheiron*. Mythological comedy with parody of epic (cf. fr. 159). The figure of Cheiron and his wisdom seems to have been related to the image of good taste in Music, fr. 155, the concept of sensitivity of old age, fr. 156, and traditional hospitality fr. 162.

Only the plots of these plays can be sketched in general terms.

#### B) CLASSIFICATION OF COMEDIES.

On the whole I would distribute the comedies in three subjects, marking the doubtful ones with a question-mark in parenthesis:

- Comedies of manners: *Agathoi* (?), *Doulodidaskalos*, *Leroi* (?), *Metoikoi* (?). Hetaira-comedies: *Epilemon* or *Thalatta*, *Ipnos* or *Pannychis*, *Korianno*, *Petale*. Political fantasies: *Graes* (?), *Tyrannis* (?).

- The Idler's Paradise: *Agrioi*, *Krapataloi*, *Metalles* and *Persai*.

- Fantastic and mythological plays: *Automoloi* (?), *Cheiron*, *Pseudherakles* and *Anthropheracles* (?), *Myrmekanthropoi*.

##### *Comedies of manners.*

As H.W. Prescott *CP* 12 (1917) p. 420 suggests, the scanty fragments do not allow us to solve the question whether these comedies dealt with subjects and situations closely connected with daily life in Athens, as it would suit the so called 'comedy of manners'. Perhaps we could qualify them more accurately "social satire", as he denominates them in p. 421. But despite this uncertainty, I think that there are some instances of domestic themes, although some plays may have mixed elements from real Athens and mythology (cf. *Agathoi* which I have classified as comedy of manners, but this classification is more than doubtful,

since it is possible that Heracles took part in it). In any case I find the term 'social satire' wide enough to embrace all kinds of comedy, while comedy of manners refers to the representation of activities and situations with which the spectators can easily identify themselves.

Pherecrates' criticism is mainly directed towards issues like drinking abuse by women, sex excesses, luxury, stealing by slaves, by tradesmen, musical and poetical novelties against the tradition. Public figures are named not as political characters, but in their social aspect, in a way that may remind more of the exemplification or proverbialization of a name rather than real abusive attack.

Two plays at least seem to have depicted what is called a political fantasy of women, trying to obtain the power or achieving it. In *Tyrannis* one of its results seems to be a new 'convivial' status for women (fr. 152). Something similar may have occurred in *Graes*, where a rejuvenation of the Old women may have led to a recovery of their 'sexual instinct', a little like Demos in *Ar. Equ.* 1390; but only fr. 39 suggests a reference to a political issue.

Within this group, I have included the comedies in which a hetaira seems to have played some role and Pherecrates is possibly one of the first poets to give her an important place. At least fr. 73-6, *Korianno*, about which I have already written (p.47), may have been set within the context of daily activities, and this example, also supported by the reproduction of spoken language, leads me to speculate that the description of

quotidian activities and customs played an important role.

*The Idler's Paradise.*

The topic of the Land of Cockaigne seems to have been dealt with at least in three plays: *Krapataloi*, *Metalles* and *Persai*. They portray this theme from different points of view.

*Krapataloi* and *Metalles* set the Idler's Paradise in Hades. The former represents it as a place where everything can be bought with a 'worthless coin', that is to say, life is very cheap and easy. The probability that an old man was the main character to go on the trip and that Aeschylus appears defending his own poetry (cf. fr. 100) suggests that the dramatic motivation may have been the search for the 'good old days', similar to Aristophanes *Frogs* and perhaps Cratinus *Malthakoi* (cf. Langerbeck (1963) p. 196).

*Metalles* develops the subject from the point of view of the  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$  βίος, that is to say, the life in which everything is done automatically. Fr. 137 of *Persai* develops the same topic, but with the difference that one must suppose that this play was set in Persia, the Paradisical country par excellence. Similar descriptions of this topic are found in Crat.com. fr. 16 and Telecl. fr. 1 (see further Baldry (1953) pp. 51ff. and W. Rehrenböck *Wien Human. Blätter* 129 (1987) pp. 17ff.). The closeness of Pherecrates' description in fr. 113 and 137 to that of the two poets just mentioned suggests that Pherecrates used this subject according to a traditional imagery and terminology.

In *Agrioi* the plot, the encounter between two Athenian men and a more primitive society, seems to be a reversal of what I

have qualified as the comedies of the idler's paradise (cf. H. Langerbeck (1963) pp. 200ff.). The comic end of this reversal was probably to satirize and play on the comic business and the absurdity of the traditional elements of this commonplace, but also the comparison of both ways of life. Perhaps it worked towards a positive view of Athenian society, although this conclusion is uncertain (see introductory note on this play).

*Fantastic and Mythological plays.*

Among the plays with a fantastic and mythological subject in their fragments and titles, *Myrmekanthropoi* is remarkable. Pherecrates seems to have combined possibly the myth of Deucalion and Pyrrha and the invented figures of a chorus of human ants. The figures of the two heroes may have been represented with realistic features of two old persons. This realism of the portrayal of heroic and mythical characters could also be a feature of *Cheiron*, a play that seems to deal with artistic matters at some length (cf. fr. 155 about the decadence of the musical art in relation also to its moral decadence). The main character must have been the old centaur whose wisdom in terms of good manners (cf. fr. 162) was regarded as proverbial; similar subjects seem to have been dealt with by Cratinus in *Cheirones* (cf. K-A PCG IV p. 245).

It is difficult with the present evidence to evaluate the statement of the Anonym. *de Com.* above quoted (p. 50); but it seems fairly sure that the plot is the part of the comedy in which Pherecrates introduced more innovations. The characters

tend to be depicted in situations of daily life. We do not know how the dramatic action was provoked, but at least in the case of *Agrioi* the personage's misanthropy seems to have been enough to start the dramatic development of the play. We can compare this method with the typical Aristophanic way in which a character is provoked to act in order to resolve a concrete problem (cf. introductory note on *Agrioi*).

## 8.- COMIC THEMES

Aware of the lack of material, we can assess with some certainty that a number of comic themes are especially the subject of the fragments of Pherecrates. It is also necessary to bear in mind that this does not imply that they were the main theme in a play, since it is difficult to know with certainty, but only that they were probably an important element. The motifs I will point out are food, music and poetry, moral decadence and κωμφοῦμενοι.

### A) FOOD.

Except for *Petale*, all the plays with more than one quotation have at least one fragment that mentions food and its related subjects like: cultivating, shopping, sacrificing, cooking, banquet. There are also references to three personages strictly related to it: the cook, the glutton and the parasite.

In fr. 70.4 5 the figure of a cook is mentioned, but we do not know whether any cook or a character who undertook a similar role appeared on stage. Notwithstanding, some fragments resemble recipes that could have been said by one of them (cf. fr. 8, 89, 177, 197); about this figure in Old Comedy see Dohm *Magiēros* p. 30.

The subject of cultivating is found in a peasant's prayers in fr. 24 belonging to *Automoloi*. Shopping is mentioned in fr. 13 (*Agrioi*), fr. 132 (*Persai*). Cooking is mentioned in fr. 26

(*Agrioi*), fr. 66 (*Ipnos*), fr. 80 (*Korianno*), fr. 133 (*Persai*), fr. 180 (cooking implements), fr. 195 and 226. Sacrifice is a topos of Old Comedy, represented by the complaint of the gods for the way men perform their sacrifices reserving the best part of the meat for themselves (*Automoloi* fr. 28, cf. fr. 33); fr. 50 (*Tyrannis*) is a joke on the etymology of βωμόλοχος which in fact calls the gods, parasites.

The preparation and celebration of a banquet is on many occasions related and described in Aristophanes (cf. *Ach.* 1000-47, *Av.* 529, etc.) and it seems to have been part of some comedies of Pherecrates as in fr. 32 (*Automoloi*), fr. 50 (*Doulodidaskalos*), fr. 57 and 60 (*Epilesmon*), fr. 113 (*Metalles*), fr. 133-5 (*Persai*), fr. 162 (*Cheiron*, bad manners in a banquet).

The types of food and meals Pherecrates mentions generally belong to what was considered a dainty in Athens as in fr. 50, 87, 109, 113 and 137 (where several dishes are enumerated), 157, 158, 195 (sauces). But there are also common items of food as fish (fr. 26, 32, 61, 62, 117, 125, 188), figs (fr. 85, 103) and lentil-soup (fr. 73.4). Wild fruits and raw meat are found, probably as signs of primitivism or of the desperation of a glutton (cf. fr. 13 and 14, *Agrioi*, fr. 172, 174).

Heracles could have represented the figure of the glutton (see pp. 46ff.); but, besides him, fr. 99 and 167 refer to activities such as stealing the cake offerings to the Gods, that could be attributed to one of them; fr. 170 refers to the consequences of eating too much, too quickly (cf. also the verb ἀποτηγανίζω and the expression ἀπὸ τηγάνου φαγεῖν, fr. 109,

elements traditionally associated with this figure).

It is widely accepted that the figure of the parasite existed already in Doric comedy, (cf. W. Geoffrey Arnott *GRBS* 9 (1989) pp. 161-2); but in Doric and in Old Comedy he was denominated κόλαξ, ψωμοκόλαξ (cf. Ar. fr. 172) and only in Middle comedy it acquire the denomination of παράσιτος and became a definitive stock-character in the comic theatre (cf. Arnott art. cit. pp. 162ff., Nesselrath *Lukians Parasitendialog* pp. 92ff.).

In Pherecrates we have some instances that can refer to the activities and features of such a personage. In fr. 7 in which he uses a formula of introduction similar to that of Middle Comedy's parasites as Arnott art. cit. pp. 165-6 points out; but in this case the speaker tries to cheat by saying that he is part of the foretasters of a festival. In fr. 37 (*Graes*) which mentions Smikythion, perhaps a living person in Athens, the use of the verb ἐπισιτέω, as in Crat. com. fr. 37 ἐπισίτιος, implies at least the functions of a parasite, besides its technical meaning (cf. Nesselrath op. cit. p. 98).

The presentation of food and its related subjects seems to have had a particular importance in some plays as *Agrioi*, *Doulodidaskalos*. In plays in which a trip to Hades (*Krapataloi* and *Metalles*) or to a land of Plenty (*Persai*), banquets and all kinds of food automatically cooking itself are symbols of the life of ease and abundance in contrast with the painstaking job living in Athens (cf. fr. 137 especially). In *Cheiron* the banquet is also mentioned in relation to the preservation of the traditional patterns of behaviour (fr. 162), a subject that will

become popular in later Comedy (cf. Hunter on Eub. p.22 and 186).

The role of this subject in our playwright seems to be concordant with the comic tradition of Crates (cf. later on Pherecrates and Old Comedy) that probably goes back to the Doric Comedy. It was surely a popular subject, since all the comic poets use it quite often; even in Aristophanes who seems to distance himself from this style of comedy (cf. *Equ.* 537ff.) it often appears either in a festive context (cf. *Pax* 922ff.) but also in the representation of poverty (cf. the Megarian-scene in *Ach.* 729ff.). Such popularity is also understandable within the context of a society whose agriculture connects all its social, political and religious activities (cf. Mikalson *Athenian Popular Religion* p. 21 Chapel Hill & London 1983).

#### B) MUSIC AND POETRY.

At a linguistic and metrical level Pherecrates develops and deals with a wide range of poetic tones and styles (see pp. 32ff.); but this variety is not present when we approach arts in Pherecrates as a motif in his comedies.

In fact we have only six fragments in which references to this subject are made:

Fr. 6 (*Agrioi*) is a discussion about the worst 'cithara-players', Meles and Chaeris, in Athens at that moment.

Fr. 15 (*Agrioi*) derides the poet Carcinus and his sons, although it is not clear from which point of view.

Fr. 31 (*Automoloi*) uses the common image of the 'ant-path'

to denominate the new music which was fashionable in Athens (cf. fr. 155).

In fr. 47 (*Doulodidaskalos*) someone orders to throw away trigones (instrument adopted from oriental music) and lyres (a traditional instrument).

Fr. 155 (*Cheiron*) is a long dialogue about the relationship between Mrs. Music and her lovers of the New Style of Dithyramb: Melanippides, Cinesias, Phrynis, Timotheus, Philoxenus.

The other two fragments are fr. 100 (*Krapataloi*) in which Aeschylus makes a defence of his innovations in the field of tragedy, and fr. 162 (*Cheiron*), which is a speech in hexameters in which Simonides is cited as elegiac poet, knowledgeable in symposiastic manners. Fr. 189 is suggested to be a quotation from a fable of Aesop (cf. comment ad loc.).

To these sketchy fragments we can add fr. 102, in which Pherecrates threatens the jurors of the comic contest making reference to his own style of poetry and also fr. 84 and fr. 199, probably a reference to the poverty of the costume of the chorus in the past.

On the whole, these fragments show a disagreement with the new tendencies in the music of his time that mainly influenced the Dithyrambic genre and then was adopted by Euripides and Agathon to tragedy. This position seems to be similar to that of Aristophanes for instance in the antagonism between Euripides and Aeschylus in *Frogs*. In Pherecrates it is not only for aesthetic reasons, but, at least in fr. 155, it could be related to the

moral decadence of education, bearing in mind the close relationship between both elements in Greek culture.

### C) MORAL DECADENCE.

In several fragments some characters are particularly identified with a series of activities which seem to be qualified as morally wrong and decadent. Some of these topics are also found in other comic writers and they seem to form part of the common thematical background that these authors share. Pherecrates probably used them to characterize some of his personages (cf. supra pp. 43ff.); but the content of the fragments sometimes refers to other instances of these activities and the persons who usually performed them.

Women appear in connexion with heavy drinking (fr. 73-6, 110, 179?, 147?, 152?); with luxury and excess (fr. 41-2, 186, probably 192 and 261, 263, 264). In contrast they can be portrayed performing activities that to some extent convey a positive portrayal (cf. infra p. 63).

Young men are also depicted with features associated with the image of decadence of traditional virtues, for instance in fr. 2 (going to the perfume-shop); effeminacy in fr. 15 and 138; antithesis old/young man in fr. 77-8 and cf. on Alcibides in fr. 164.

Traders are also mentioned with negative implications: fr. 62 may be refers to a fishmonger, in fr. 70 the subject of women against men is also dealt from the point of view of tradesmen;

fr. 71 could refer to a corn-seller and in fr. 110 a trader could be stealing. In fr. 2 they are related to inactivity and luxury. These elements are also common in Aristophanes' plays (cf. Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* pp. 114ff. and Dover *Pop. Mor.* p. 40).

The way Pherecrates conveys these figures on each passage, is very similar to that of Aristophanes, and one may suppose that they are depicted according to some standard features. It is interesting how in fr. 70 ('Ἴπνος ἢ Παννυχίς) men are depicted as corrupted in their morals by talking all the time in the perfume-seller's (cf. fr.2), while women are proud to have no names for a female-cook nor fishmonger and thus it is concluded that women never performed such jobs. The joke is against men corrupted in their morality, and also in their activities as traders; while it can be reverted and ironically one can easily find a reference to other activities in which women were vituperated, like bread-sellers (cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 1388ff., *Ran.* 549ff., etc.). In general women can be depicted from a negative point of view but also as the keepers and saviours of the good habits as in cooking fr.10, 26; spinning fr.51; in a festival fr. 181, fr.205, 213 (the Adonian festival); criticizing men fr. 39, 200 (see possibly the argument in *Graes and Tyrannis* and about this subject in Aristophanes, Henderson (1987) pp. 113ff.).

It also seems that the young men were represented according to the topos of the "jeunesse dorée" in Old Comedy, clearly inverted in *Ar. Vesp.* 1335ff. by the figures of Philocleon and Bdelycleon; but also in the stock-subject, commonly found in

later Comedy of the fight of the father and son for the love of the same woman.

D) ΚΩΜΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ.

Pherecrates mentions the following real persons by their names:

- Meles, son of Peisias, cithara-player fr. 6.2 (*Agrioi*);
- Chaeris, cithara-player fr.6.3;
- Lycurgus, a tradesman and politician, fr. 11;
- Carcinus and his sons, poets and dancers, fr. 15;
- Smicythion, possibly a parasite, fr. 37 (*Graes*);
- Pulytion, a rich tradesman, fr. 64 (*Ipnos*);
- Cleisthenes, an effeminate youngster, fr. 143 (*Petale*),  
cf. Ar. fr. 422;
- a group of Dithyrambic musicians in fr. 155 (*Cheiron*):  
Melanippides, Cinesias, Phrynis, Timotheus, Philoxenus;
- Alcibiades, the young politician, fr. 164.

Only two politicians are mentioned and even then they are criticized not because of their political activities but from other points of view: Lycurgus because of his commercial activities with the Egyptians, Alcibiades because of his effeminacy and success among women. The rest include an important number of musicians, connected with bad taste and decadence in Music, Cleisthenes who becomes the stock-character for the effeminate young man, Pulytion, the corrupted tradesman, and Smicythion, the parasite.

This scarcity is probably due to a different approach to Old Comedy from the one represented by Aristophanes. The few citations can be regarded as representatives of stereotypical figures who may have been mentioned just for the sake of a joke.

## 9. - PHERECRATES AND OLD COMEDY.

The preceding study of the fragments has yielded some interesting conclusions, although in some ways unsatisfactory, about his work and style. It is even more uncertain to try to trace the net of relationships and influences that related Pherecrates' work to that of other playwrights of Old Comedy, but I will try to expound the evidence we have about it.

Again I have to refer to test 2a (cf. p.1) in order to proceed with further speculation about Pherecrates and his relation to other playwrights of Old Comedy. Two elements can be highlighted in connexion with Crates:

- the fact that he was first of all an actor, that is to say, that both seem to come from a similar background in terms of theatrical experience (about it cf. supra p. 2).

- Pherecrates is clearly a follower of Crates (cf. ἐζήλωσε Κράτητα and see supra p. 3). The second sentence καὶ αὖ τοῦ λαιδορεῖν ἀπέστη, has been related to what Arist. *Poet.* 5 p. 1449b 5 says about Crates (cf. test.5): τὸ δὲ μύθους ποιεῖν (Ἐπίχαρμος καὶ Φόρμις) τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ Σικελίας ἦλθε, τῶν δὲ Ἀθηνησιν Κράτης πρῶτος ἤρξεν ἀφέμενος τῆς ἰαμβικῆς ἰδέας καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μύθους. The exact meaning of these words has been debated (about them, see p. 68).

A third text which is quoted in this context is Ar. *Equ.* 537-40 in connexion with Ar. fr. 347 and Ar. *Vesp.* 1177. Bonanno *Cratete comico* pp.36ff. interprets the first text quoted, as parodying two elements of the comedies of Crates: 1. 538 refers

to food as it was a very frequent element in Crates' comedies; and 539 refers to the 'sobriety' of Crates' plays with a play on words with κραμβοτάτου (dry) and κράμβην (a vegetable used to relieve drunkenness) and the reference to ἀστειοτάτας ἐπινοίας, an example of which is Crat.com. fr. 32 parodied in Ar. fr. 347. She sees in it a reference to the escapist comedy of Crates, perhaps overinterpreting the passage of Ar. *Vesp.* 1177ff. (as she says in p. 40: "Aristofane allude aspramente alla poesia di Cratete, volta al μύθους ποιεῖν (cf. IX), fuori dagli eventi concreti e quindi propriamente umani (τῶν ἀνθρωπικῶν), degni dell' attenzione quotidiana (κατ' οἴκ(α)ν). La censura nei confronti dei poeti 'd'evasione' è evidente").

The study of the fragments has shown that at least the statement about its lack of 'λοιδορεῖν' (understood as 'to insult' particularly living Athenians; cf. about this subject now Halliwell *JHS* cxi (1991) pp. 48-70) may be true since there are very few references to personalities and these are of a special kind (cf. pp. 64-5). I think that the feature of the 'very refined ideas' with which Aristophanes qualifies Crates' poetry can be paralleled by the way Aristophanes in *Lys.* 157-9 qualifies "Pherecrates' way" (cf. on fr. 193 and supra p. 36).

It seems interesting to follow Aristotle's division of Old Comedy into two kinds: one that followed the ἰαμβικὴ ἰδέα or iambic style of Cratinus and the other one that was interested in the development of the plot and, in some way, in the continuity of the action and lost interest in the representation and vilification of contemporary personages (this subject is

ultimately connected with Doric comedy of Epicharmus by Arist. *Poet.* 1449a 7). According to M. Heath's interpretation of Arist. *Poet.* 1449b 5 (in *CQ* 39 (1989) p.351), the stress in the plot-construction led Crates to the other feature of his poetry (M. Heath *G&R* XXXVII (1990) p. 144 suggests also that this tendency of Crates' style to give importance to plot-construction may have influenced the comedies of Cratinus and had thus an important role in the evolution of the genre). This interpretation of the evolution may be true, but we should also have in mind the prejudiced approach of Aristotle and his followers to the comedies of Cratinus and the iambic poetry in general. It may be possible as well, when we compare Crates and Cratinus. It shapes our understanding of Old Comedy into two compartments, which evolved into one tradition more successfully represented by Aristophanes and Eupolis and another one, by Pherecrates and perhaps Plato com. (cf. Norwood *Gr. Com.* pp. 165ff.).

But I think that, when we reach this point in the last quarter of the V century, the differentiation is not so clear. Comedy has become a complex and more sophisticated genre that borrows ideas and techniques from tragedy, genre at its peak at this moment. Aristophanes' attacks go beyond the pure abuse and his role as poet/ adviser to the city can be understood in the tradition of the iambic poetry, but also within the evolution of the genre itself towards a wider institutional recognition.

Accordingly Pherecrates' comedies can be understood not only as a conscious separation from the iambic tradition, for the sake of originality or of teaching, taking into account that the so

called political comedy was certainly more successful. His main concern seems to portray situations of social interest, more than political issues. It is not a totally different approach from that of Aristophanes who in many cases conveys similar ideas and concerns (cf. an extreme interpretation of Aristophanes from this point of view in E. Segal *HStC1Ph* 77 (1973) pp. 132-3). Besides this point, we have to bear in mind that the main intention of any comedy was to provoke laughter, a fact that dominates any serious point and obliges the comic poet to adapt his plays to the interest and taste of his audience.

In this context it may be worth taking into account what Pherecrates himself says about his own poetry. In fr. 106: τοῖς δὲ κριταῖς / τοῖς νυνὶ κρίνουσι λέγω / μὴ 'πιορκεῖν μηδ' ἀδίκως / κρίνειν, ἢ νῆ τὸν φίλιον / μῦθον εἰς ὑμᾶς ἕτερον / Φερεκράτης λέξει πολὺ τοῦ-/ του κακηγορίστερον, (accepting that Pherecrates is the correct text in 1.6, instead of Philokrates in the manuscripts, see comment ad loc.). He clearly says to the judges of the contest that his poetry could be even more κακηγορίστερον; κακηγορία is a term used mainly in legal terminology to refer to the abusive vocabulary and style which he carefully tries to avoid.

Aristophanes only once refers to Pherecrates, who does not seem to enter in the attacks between probably closer rivals as Cratinus (against Aristophanes in fr. 213), Eupolis (against Aristophanes in fr. 89) and Aristophanes (against Cratinus in *Ach.* 849, 1173 and Eupolis in *Nub.* 553).

The relationship between these two comic poets can be

established on other grounds: some subjects that Aristophanes develops in his plays are explained more fully, if we bear in mind that other playwrights had dealt with them. For instance, the dressing-up of Dionysos as Heracles in *Frogs* recalls the title of the play *Pseudheracles* of Pherecrates. It is possible that it was a traditional subject which Aristophanes adapts in Dionysos' trip to recover one of the tragic poets. The theme of the trip to Hades may have been similarly developed in Pherecrates' *Krapataloi* (cf. fr. 100). Also if we take that the subject of the old man/young man fighting for a woman, found probably in *Korianno*, was a common comic theme, the inversion of this subject in Ar. *Eccl.* 887ff., a young woman and an old one fighting for a young man, explains more deeply its comic intention (see pp. 57ff. about other topics that Pherecrates deals with in his fragments).

Other subjects that may have belonged to this "comic pool or repertoire of comic materials" (cf. M. Heath *G&R* XXXVII (1990) p. 152, see supra on pp. 57ff.) are as follows:

- The idler's Paradise is a subject that links him to Crates who developed it in *Θηρία* fr. 16, 17 from the point of view of the *αὐτοματὸς βλοῦς*. It is also dealt with by Telecl. fr. 1 (a poet probably contemporary with Pherecrates), Nicoph. fr. 21 and Met. fr. 6 (poets probably younger than him). See further on introductory note on fr. 113 and 137.

- The subject of *Cheiron* and its musical and poetical criticism is also found in Cratin. *Cheirones* as I have already mentioned.

- The political fantasies of women taking power, probably used in *Graes* and *Tyrannis*, were taken also by Aristophanes in *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazousai*.

In relation to the evolution of Old Comedy into Middle Comedy, we can say that Pherecrates belongs totally to the Old Comedy; but already in Antiquity his style and the subjects of his plays had the proximity to Middle Comedy which made the ancient scholars doubt the authorship of some of his plays, notably *Agathoi*, *Automoloi*, *Metalles*, *Persai* and *Cheiron* (see supra on pp. 5ff. and 11).

## COMMENTARY

### Ἄγαθοι

#### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Athenæus (cf. fr. 1 and 2) has doubts about the authorship of the play and attributes it to Strattis as another possibility. This fact has led some scholars to suggest a reworking of an early play (διασκευή), but such a proposal does not seem to be appropriate for an author of such an early period of the end of the V century (cf. above pp. 7f.). As Kaibel says apud K-A ad loc. the play may have reached the Alexandrian scholars without the author's name and the official lists had two plays with the same title by both playwrights. Strattis' list of plays in Sud. ζ1178 (cf. Strat. test. 1) includes the title Ἄγαθοι ἦτοι Ἀργυρίου ἀφανισμός which is treated by K-A as two different plays (cf. Meineke *Hist. crit.* p. 226 who proposes that only the second part of the title belongs actually to Strattis as a reworking of *Agathoi* of Pherecrates). It is, anyway, interesting that Pollux (cf. fr. 3 and 4; he, otherwise, in fr. 35 suggests that *Automoloi* was reworked again at a later time) ascribes this play to Pherecrates without any doubt.

The title suggests that the chorus was formed by men, and

perhaps they were old (cf. on fr.2); it reminds one of the style of titles like Cratinus *Μαλθακοί*. It is difficult to see to whom it could refer. Maybe <sup>it</sup> has something to do with the expression *καλοὶ κάγαθοί* which summarizes the ideal of aristocratic class and in general of the perfect nobleman. Fr. 2 is a reference to the topic of the luxury and moral decadence usually associated with young rich men. Its lyric metres suggest that it was part of a choral portion.

In fr. 1 one of the speakers is characterized as a 'glutton' and he may be Heracles himself.

## Fr. 1

The fragment is a dialogue between two men probably. One of them is clearly a boastful person (cf. on ἐγὼ 1.1) and a glutton. The amount of food that he eats (cf. on 1.3 ὀλιγόσιτος), and the fact that in Old Comedy the figure of the parasite per se did not exist, but was mainly identified with Heracles (cf. e.g. Ar. *Ran.* 62ff. and van Leeuwen ad loc.), has led Kock ad loc. to suggest that one of them is Heracles, although it is not clear from our source.

1. ἐγὼ κατεσθίω: the use of the personal pronoun at the beginning could be understood as a sign of boastfulness (the expression ἐὰν βιάζωμαι 1.2 can convey some false modesty, even if it is interpreted as passive "if I am forced" or middle "if I force myself", since it could imply that only under some circumstances I am able to do it). The speaker tries to play down what is evidently an incredible amount. Such an exaggeration and attitude is a normal feature in the representation of the parasite and the glutton in New and Roman Comedy (cf. Nesselrath *Lukians Parasitendialog* p. 30 n. 43).

2. πένθ' ἡμιμέδιμν': a hemimedimnon is a dry measure that was equivalent to 24 choinikes (a medimnos being 48 choinikes cf. Xen. *Anab.* I.5.6, Poll. 4. 168). This measure would be equal to about twenty three litres (cf. O.A.W. Dilke *Mathematics and measurements* p.26 London 1987, according to whom the capacity of a medimnos is between 46.08 and 51.84 litres).

The speaker suggests in this fragment that he is able to eat

120 choinikes a day, that is to say about 115 litres, of barley grain, the standard food in ancient Greece.

One choinix of barley has been suggested to be the normal amount of food for a slave from Athen. VI 272b and the normal diet of an Athenian person was one and a half or two. One choinix seems to be the amount in Homer (cf. *Od.* 19. 27) and the strict diet of Pythagoras recommends ἡ γὰρ χοῖνιξ ἡμερησία τροφή (cf. D.L. VIII.18). Two choinikes and one kotyle of wine was the amount given to the Spartan kings according to Hdt. VI 57.3, while the Spartans demand from the Athenians two choinikes of barley, two kotylai of wine and 'meat' in order to achieve an armistice in Thuc. IV 16.1. Half a choinix and no wine was seen as a very poor amount given to the Athenian prisoners at Syracuse according to Thuc. VII. 87.2.

3. ὤς ... ἄρ': an exclamation form with the verb in imperfect. It is common in Comedy (cf. Ar. fr. 415 and K-A ad loc.) and probably colloquial. It indicates "sudden realization of a fact" according to MacDowell ad *Vesp.* 314.

ὀλιγόσιτος: a comic word found only here and in Phryn.com. fr. 24: ὁ δ' ὀλιγόσιτος Ἡρακλῆς ἐκεῖ τί δρᾷ;. This text also suggests that the adjective and Pherecrates' fragment could be related to Heracles although Phrynichus may use the prototype name of the glutton for another person (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 928 for another use of Heracles to indicate 'boulimia'). About Heracles see Athen. IX-X 411a-b, and about studies on his figure, cf. Hofmann *Mythos und Komödie. Untersuchungen zu den Vögeln des Aristophanes* p. 30 n.3 Hildesheim/New York 1976 and R.Hosek in *Γέρας. Studies*

*Thomson* pp. 119ff. Prague 1963. A similar comic word applied to Heracles is γαστριμαργον in *Ar. Av.* 1583.

4. μακρᾶς: connected with ἡμέρας by d'Arnaud *Specimen animadversionum criticarum ad aliquos scriptores graecos Harlingae* 1728 p.52 (cf. K-A's app.crit.), in contrast with βραχε(ας ἡμέρας (cf. *Sosith.* 99 F2, 6-8Sn). Alternatively it may be connected with τριήρους, but the problem of this interpretation is that triremes seem to have had a standard size. Thus different proposals have been made to change it (cf. K-A ad loc.), Herwerden's emendation, νεῶς μακρᾶς τὰ σιτία, and the ironical change into μικρᾶς of Meineke are good suggestions.

Nonetheless the text can be kept if it is understood as a comic exaggeration (triremes even larger than usual), or taking into account that three kinds of triremes were distinct by the middle of the V century: a kind called the 'fast trireme', another type which would be 'troop-carrier' that would include the ten ἐπιβαταί and whose shape would have include some structural changes, and a horse-carrier (cf. *Thuc.* II 56.2). About this subject see further Morrison-Coates *The Athenian Trireme* p. 94 and especially pp. 151ff. Cambridge 1986.

The amount here given would not be enough, nonetheless, for a whole trireme with soldiers which would hold about 200 oarsmen, 10 epibatai, 4 archers, cf. Morrison-Coates op.cit. pp. 108ff. The tone seems to be hyperbolic; cf. Böckh *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener* I p. 357 Berlin 1886<sup>3</sup> who points out the incongruence and wonders: "wer wird vom Spaßmacher die Genauigkeit eines Proviantamtes fordern?".

## Fr. 2

This fragment seems to be a lyrical part of the chorus. The metre is complicated: ll. 1-2 dactylo-epitrite (D-e-D-e) and l. 3 what is called 'Euripidean fourteen-syllable' (cf. fr. 195). About the use of the dactylo-epitrite combinations in the parody of dithyrambic writers see p. 24. The verb in l. 3 in the second person plural can be an address to the audience or to a particular group of people.

The subject of the text seems to be a criticism of the morality of some people who are described as going to parties (cf. on l. 1 λουσάμενοι) and being idle in the market-place all day long. This criticism is a topic of Old Comedy, especially referring to young men who are worried by their appearance instead of going to the palestra and exercise (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 1373, 1375ff., *Adesp.* 42D, *Pherecr.* fr. 70. 3). About this group of young people see Carter (1986) pp. 122ff.

1. λουσάμενοι: the act of having a bath before dawn has a sarcastic air similar to that of fr. 73: drinking and being drunk 'before the market-place is full'. This activity could lead the audience to the following conclusions: the bath is taken at home, so it is a hot bath (cf. R. Ginouvés *Balaneutiké* p. 177) and therefore it can be interpreted as a first sign of moral decadence, since men are recommended to have cold baths in the gymnasium, after doing some exercise (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 837), and hot baths are customary only for men and women when going to a religious ceremony (cf. *Pax* 834) or to a party at night (not early in the morning and to go to the perfume-shop as here; cf.

Ar. Av. 131-2 and Sommerstein ad loc.). A similar expression is found in Ar. fr. 619.

2. ἐν τοῖς στεφανώμασιν: 'the place where the garlands were sold' (cf. LSJ s.v., Ar. *Ecc1.* 302). As Cratin. fr. 105 shows, there was a long list of different plants, tree branches and flowers that were used to make crowns. To wear a crown was very frequent, mainly for religious activities and festivals. As Ussher ad Ar. loc.cit. points out, this part of the Athenian agora and that of the perfume-seller, also mentioned in our fragment, were 'the centre of social life and gossip'. Their bad reputation and 'low moral character', as Hunter on Eub. p. 191 says, subsisted in Middle Comedy when Eubulus composed *Στεφανοπωλίδες* (cf. also Arist. *AP* 14.4, Aelian *NA* 1. 38.1, Dionysius Soph. *AP* 5.81).

ἐν τῷ μύρῳ: the perfume-shop is designated usually in the singular (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 1375, fr. 258.1, Eup. fr. 222.2, Polyz. fr. 12, except for Poll. X 19), as τὸν λιβανωτὸν that designates also the 'frankincense-dealer' (cf. Eup. fr. 327.4) and τοῦψον, the fishmonger (cf. Ar. fr. 258). In contrast, most of the other places are mentioned in the plural (cf. ἐν τοῖς ἰχθύσι, Ar. *Vesp.* 789; οὐκ τῶν λύχνων, *Nub.* 1065, Cratin. fr. 209; οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων Av. 13; see further *Lys.* 557, Eup. fr. 327). This fact either means that there was only one dealer in this product (while in the plural it meant that there was more than one, cf. MacDowell ad *Vesp.* 789) or that the singular is collective for all the shops of this kind, or perhaps indicates a whole market devoted to the same product. About the use of perfumes after a

bath among the Greeks, cf. Long *Barbarians in Gr. Com.* p.77.

3. λαλεῖτε: about this verb cf. on fr.70.3.

σισυμβρίων: 'Bergamot-mint, *Mentha aquatica*' (LSJ s.v.I) can be found among the list of flowers in Cratin. fr. 105.3. In Ar. Av. 160 Pax 869 and Schol. ad loc. it is connected to marriages; in Ov. *Fasti* IV. 869 it is devoted to Aphrodite. About this plant, cf. Steier *RE* XV 2020ff. and especially 2025. 66ff.

It is possible then to suggest that the choice is not casual, but that there is a secondary meaning, implying that they are speaking about 'the female sexual organ', as Henderson *MM* p. 136 says, referring to Theop. com. fr. 11.2, where it is the name of a prostitute.

κοσμοσανδάλων: the Doric form of the ὑάκινθος appears also in fr. 138.4 in a clear erotic context (see ad loc.). Its secondary meaning is not clear, but I would suggest that it refers to homoerotic intercourse, because on one hand, the Dorians were related to this kind of love (cf. Dover *GH* pp. 185ff.) and, on the other, it makes good sense in this fragment that the young people are 'chatting' about it, since they were usually depicted as effeminate (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 687ff.). About the effeminacy and homosexuality in Aristophanes, cf. Dover op. cit. pp. 135ff., Carter (1986) p. 120 n. 47.

Fr. 3.

διφφοι διωχεῖς: Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) pp. 259-60 suggests that, according to different lexicographers, the word διωχεῖς is used to mean διφφοι, which should be eliminated from the fragment since Pollux repeats it mechanically and seems to be assigning to Pherecrates only διωχεῖς (that has a predicative function in this text). This is possible, but not certain. Maybe διωχεῖς is a normal term not very well attested in our literary sources, or perhaps Pherecrates has modified the normal form (διφφοι) with another one which has a different tone.

Otherwise, διφφοι, if is kept in the fragment, was a word with different meanings at several levels of language. It could at least originally designate "chariot-board on which two could stand" (cf. *Il.* 5. 160), but already in Homer it meant a simple chair without arms or back (cf. *Il.* 3.424 and *Od.* 19. 97; see Athen. V 192e). In Ar. *Av.* 1552 it seems to mean also "night-stool" or λάσανα (cf. Pherecr. fr. 93). See further G.M.A. Richter *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* pp. 47f. London 1966.

It is not improbable that Pherecrates invented the adjective διωχεῖς (cf. Kaibel in K-A ad loc.), if he meant the first sense or perhaps any of the other ones in a pseudo-poetical way with a comic intention. This adjective seems to qualify, according to the lexicographers cited by K-A, a 'two person-chariot' from δι-όχεῖν. Both terms together may be just a play on the repetition of the δι- at the beginning, perhaps in order to obtain a solemn expression, but also to specify a special piece of furniture.

Fr. 4

ἰσχαδωνῶν: as ὀπωρῶνης refers to the 'fruiterer', especially the one who sells fruit he has stolen (Dem. 18. 262; cf. Pickard-Cambridge *DTC*<sup>2</sup> p.134 and 174 about this figure in comedy), ἰσχαδωνῶν may particularly refer to the person who sells dry figs (and maybe from a negative point of view, the figs that he has stolen). Other nouns ending in -ωνης are ἀνδραποδῶνης (Ar. fr.326), ὀψῶνης (Ar. fr. 517), σιτώνης (Dem. 18. 248, synonymous with σιτοφύλακες) and δεκατώνης (Dem. 23. 177, Anaxil. fr. 7). The two latter terms are official titles. In contrast with σῦκα, ἰσχάδες designates 'dry figs' which were a cheap fruit in Athens (cf. fr. 74.1).

## \*Αγριοί

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Athen. V 218d (test.1) dates the performance of this play to 420 and, according to Pl. *Prot.* 327c (test.11), it was performed in the Lenaeon contest. Other plays performed the same year were Eupolis *Αύτολυκός α'* (cf. Eup. test. 1.7 and K-A *PCG* V p.321, see further Storey *Phoenix* 44 (1990) pp. 28-9), possibly Plato com. *Νίκαι* (cf. fr.86 and Geissler (1925) pp. 43f.) and Ar. *Είρηνη β'* (cf. K-A *PCG* III 2 p. 170).

The most important source for knowledge of this play is Plato loc.cit. The text is as follows: ἀλλ' εἶεν ἄγριοί τινες οἷοίπερ οὐς πέρυσιν Φερεκράτης ὁ ποιητῆς ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ. ἢ σφόδρα ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀνθρώποις γενόμενος, ὥσπερ οἱ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χορῷ μισάνθρωποι, ἀγαπήσαις ἄν εἰ ἐντύχοις Εὐρύβατῳ καὶ Φρυγῶνδᾳ καὶ ἀνολοφύραι' ἄν ποθῶν τὴν τῶν ἐνθάδε ἀνθρώπων πονηρίαν. Plato wrote *Protagoras*, according to A. Lesky *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*<sup>22</sup> pp. 560ff. Bern 1962, after 399 and its dramatic date seems to have been 433 (see Guthrie *History of Greek Philosophy* p. 214 Cambridge 1975 and Turner *The Protagoras of Plato* pp. 32-4 London 1891). Morrison *CQ* 35, (1941) pp. 2-3 (cf. also Taylor *Plato the Man and the Work* p.236 London 1926) discusses several pieces of evidence for and against this last date and concludes that perhaps Protagoras had really seen it in a later visit in 421-420 or "he might have been conscious of the anachronism, but have thought it trivial enough not to disturb the reader".

The difficulty of this text is related more to the general

interpretation of this play. The speech of Protagoras makes reference to the radical difference between people brought up in a certain social organization and ἀνθρώπους οἷς μήτε παιδεία ἐστὶν μήτε δικαστήρια μήτε νόμοι μήτε ἀνάγκη μηδεμίᾳ διὰ παντός ἀναγκάζουσα ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, and, as example of this, he puts forward the ἄγριοι in the play of Pherecrates performed last year in the Lenaea. This example is used again, but in another sense; the speaker turns towards his audience and compares the situation taking place in the play with that of an Athenian among the worst Athenian crooks.

The οἱ ἐν ἐκεῖνῳ τῷ χόρῳ μισάνθρωποι would then be the characters who were to meet the ἄγριοι. In this case the interpretation of Madvig *Kleine Philologische Schriften* pp. 409-11 Leipzig 1875 is probably right; he understands ὥσπερ ἐν ἐκεῖνῳ τῷ χόρῳ <γενόμενοι> μισάνθρωποι, as a parallel expression to ἐν τοιούτοις ἀνθρώποις γενόμενος. The misanthropists were the persons who got in touch with the savages who possibly formed the chorus of the play, as in many comedies of Aristophanes the chorus gives the title to the comedy (Acharnians, Knights, Birds, etc.) and whose way of life is given as an example in the speech of Protagoras. Another possibility would be that the chorus is formed by misanthropic men (cf. Meineke ad loc.); but Madvig's interpretation seems more likely (see also Conti Bizzarro 'Ταλαρίσκος' (1987) p. 26).

There are also several proposals as to who formed the chorus of savages. In myth there are many examples of people depicted with primitive and also non-human features. Heinrichs (cf. Conti

Bizzarro *ibid.* p.26 n.5) identifies them with the Centaurs since fr.5 makes reference to the two Athenian cithara-players and the relation of the Centaurs to music (the same opinion is held by Kraus *Kl.P.* IV p. 729 and Turato *La crisi della città e l'ideologia del selvaggio nell' Atene del V secolo a.C.* p. 97 Roma 1979, although he also points out that these identifications are rather doubtful). In general the chorus seems to have been formed by 'wild' human beings. Conti Bizzarro suggests that in fr. 5 there is an allusion to androphagy, following Kraus *Kl.P.* IV 729). But in this fragment there is no reference to such activity.

In any case, the play seems probably to be set, at least in part, away from Greek territory, because it is difficult to imagine that the contrary movement took place: a group of savages coming into Greece.

Two features can be guessed about the main characters, in the plural if we understand that *μισάνθρωποι* in the text of Plato means them.

- they were probably two, as in plays of Aristophanes like *Birds* or *Frogs* (cf. also fr. 5 which contains a dialogue that could be attributed to the main characters).

- they were Athenians (at least one of them), as is clear from the references to known public figures of Athens in fr. 6, 11 and 14.

The reason for leaving Athens might be simply their misanthropy. Dover *Ar. Com.* p. 146 makes an interesting remark about this fact: "it seems that Aristophanes needs some dramatic

motivation, however perfunctory, for bringing his characters into contact with the world of the birds. Similarly in Pherekrates' *Savages* produced in 420, the plot seems (Plato *Protagoras* 327c) to have required two or more misanthropes to go off in search of primitive simplicity: misanthropy also appears as an attribute of well-known characters in Athenian folklore (e.g. Timon)". Cf. also W.S. Görler *Hermes* 91 (1963) p. 272, about misanthropy in general (cf. *Ar. Av.* 1549, *Lys.* 805, *Phryn.com.* fr. 19).

Their attitude towards the chorus will be discussed later, but it seems to be somewhat self-sufficient and contemptuous (see fr. 5).

According to these premises, the plot seems to have begun with a trip or the preparations for it, towards the place where 'agrioi' live. The meeting with them will have been in the *parodos* because it implies the chorus' entrance. Norwood *Gr. Comedy* p. 155 suggests that fr. 13 could be part of the prologue of the play, but there is no clear evidence for this; it could be part of a later scene where the habits of the savages were carefully explained.

The reception of the Athenians by the savages was not very friendly following the interpretation of fr. 5 (although, again, it is doubtful whether this fragment should be placed here; there could be also the possibility of a war of the same kind as *Ar. Av.* 1170ff.; see comment ad fr. for other interpretations) the chorus does not seem to be portrayed as an example of hospitality and friendship. According to the interpretation of Norwood *Gr.com.* p. 156, fr. 18 and 12 would be examples of this aggressive

reception by the chorus of the characters. It is uncertain whether fr. 12 is to be interpreted literally or metaphorically, but fr. 18 is clearly quoted as an example of the metaphorical usage of this expression in the same way as Ar. fr. 803.

The contrast of the two ways of living was made perhaps after the meeting and from several points of view according to the fragments:

- music, history and habits. In the first point I include fr. 6 where it is discussed which was the worst Athenian citharist, perhaps a comparison with the best musician of the savages. Secondly, fr. 10 seems to be a description of the legendary past of Athens; the contrast could be found in the fact that the most primitive life in the history of Athens was more advanced than that of the *agrioi*, as it is shown by fr. 13 or 14. Thirdly in fr. 15 the political ambition and corruption of some Athenian social class could be satirized, perhaps as a part of a longing for the past or perhaps as a proof of the complication of the political and social life of the city. On the other hand the habits of the savages seem to be mentioned in fr. 9.

- food. There are several fragments related to food or similar things: 7, 8, 13, 14, 17. Although it is possible for them to have a metaphorical meaning, I think that the importance of food in this comedy is quite clear and may be a good reason to favour the literal sense in some cases. It would not be surprising if there was a cooking scene in the play (similar to that of *Ach.* 1000-47, *Pax* 922-1126 or *Av.* 848-1057). I think that fr. 13 and 14, in which the scarcity of food of the savages is

mentioned, are evidence for the idea that food was one of the elements of comparison of both societies (see comment ad loc.).

Finally, I have already mentioned fragments of doubtful meaning: 12 and 18 could be part of an agon in which each party tried to show the advantages of their own way of life. The agon could be organized in two long speeches (part of one could be fr. 10). In it there could have been a dialogue as in fr. 9. The number of fragments does not allow, however, a clear reconstruction of the play.

*Agrioi* was a play that had a certain impact on its time, the beginning of the uncertain peace of Nicias, as is shown by the quotation of Plato. The importance of this play has been recently emphasized by T. Long in *CIW* 71 (1978) pp. 381-2, Turato op.cit. pp. 96ff. and Conti Bizzarro *Ταλαρίσκος* (1987) pp. 25-32.

Long and Turato seem to tackle the play from different points of view. On the whole Long p. 381 starts from the analysis of several fragments as examples of comic transformation of the idea of the Noble Savage and according to him: "the spare remains of the piece show very clearly, however, that it refuted at least three of the four major points which Ferguson sees as common to a positive conception of the primitive life of man" (cf. Ferguson pp. 16ff.) and in his book *The Barbarians in Gr.Com.* p. 158, he concludes by saying: "this play gave a theoretical twist to the subject matter by playing upon the sophistic inquiry into the question of the primitive state of man".

Turato places this play within the context of the legendary tradition about the primitive ways of living represented

frequently in Greek mythology by Cyclopes and Centaurs and the situation of crisis in which the concept of polis was. About this comedy he says on p.96, "le suggestioni utopiche e regressive - non sappiamo come tematizzate- dovevano consistere nell'eliminazione del discrimine tra mondo animale e mondo umano su cui fondava uno dei plessi ideologici della «civilizzazione» e del suo sbocco «cittadino»".

I think it is also interesting to quote Carrière *Carnaval* p. 93 in this connexion, as he similarly places the problem of the Utopia in Comedy within what is usually called 'le conflit de la Nature et la Loi': "la Comédie Ancienne avait déjà résolu à sa façon le conflit de la Nature et la Loi. Mais cette résolution ne se situe pas sur le plan rationel et philosophique. La Comédie se moque du grand débat sophistique. C'est dans la fiction et l'utopie qu'elle médiatise la nature et la culture, le mythe et l'histoire, l'instinct et la loi, la liberté anarchique et la cité".

These interpretations differ in the point of view, but agree on the general idea that some comic plays presented a problem that was considered fundamental in the Greek thought of the V and IV century: Nature and Civilization, and that it received several answers according to the points of view from which this theme was approached. In the context of our scanty fragments we have to take into account some further points.

The fragments seem to refer more to popular and comic tradition than to a sophistic enquiry (that probably used that tradition too). For instance, fr. 10 can be connected with a

popular theme in which slaves did not exist and women did all the work. This fragment and fr. 13 can have reference to the traditional description of the idler's paradise, a commonplace in comedy (cf. Baldry (1953) pp. 49-60) and all reference to food can be understood in the same way (see W. Fauth *WSt* 86 (1973) 39-62). It is interesting to remark that there are several fragmentary plays in which the concept of animality and the world of Cockaigne were in relation, for instance Crates' *Θηρία* and Cratinus' *Αἴγες* (about the relation between Crates and Pherecrates see supra p. 66; about Crates' play see Baldry loc. cit. and about Cratinus' one see Schmid *GGrL* IV p. 117).

From this point of view this comedy seems to have followed the tradition of the comedies of the idler's paradise, but reversing the terms of the topical idealizations of other plays, surely by adding realistic and even absurd touches to the features of the savages, for instance fr. 9 (see supra pp. 54-5 and Langerbeck (1963) pp. 200ff.).

Perhaps a similar process can be perceived in Aristophanes' *Birds*. The world of the *Birds* which was intended to represent an ideal world in fact becomes another image of Athens from which the hero had flown. As Carrière *Carnaval* p. 105 says: "le triomphe utopique du héros sur l'odieuse réalité devient triomphe de la réalité sur l'utopie". In Pherecrates it seems as if the Athenian persons meet a world with no rule and no social organization at all and the comparison of the two worlds is mainly unfavourable to the chorus (according to Pl. loc. cit.). It is possible that the play was written within the optimism of the V century. As

Dodds *The Ancient Concept of Progress*<sup>2</sup> p. 10 Oxford 1973 describes it, "since Protagoras also believed that 'virtue' can be taught, this may well have led him to take a rosy view of man's prospects; Plato makes him claim that the very worst citizen of modern Athens is already a better man than any savage. In the same spirit Democritus seems to have held that man's natural endowment was malleable and could be 'reshaped' by education. In the great days of the fifth century such optimism was natural".

Maybe, as it has been suggested already, the main intention was simply to satirize the idealized tradition of the Idler's paradise (cf. the parody of mythological subject in Cratinus' *'Οδυσσεύς*) and such satire gives another instance to a sophist of his optimistic representation of the civilization. Nonetheless, the humour also worked against such individuals as Carcinus' sons (fr.15), Chaeris and Meles (fr.6), who were probably representatives of the Athenian popular culture.

Fr. 5

It is disputed which is the final point of this fragment and three different explanations have been given. Bentley *ep. ad Hemst.* (38, I p. 288 Wordsw.) suggests that "cum laudasset ille nescio quis fortunas suas, tum ob alia, tum ob firmam, credo, valetudinem, etsi strenue nepotaretur; Hunc alter excipiens, Ita vero, αὐτὸ εἰρωνικῶς, tum fortunas suas laudabis, cum cognati tui te mox sepelient. Non, non, subjungit ille, Equidem eos omnes componam, et μακαριοῦσά με superstitem et sanum". That is to say, he proposes a scene in reference to the topic of a father-son relationship. Bothe relates the subject of the fragment to someone boasting about his intention of travelling "ad feros", and Kaibel *apud K-A ad loc.* suggests that someone has been laughing at the 'sanam Ferorum vitam victumque' and someone else retorts that they 'will bury him instead'.

Any of these interpretations is possible, but my first impression when reading the text was that the dialogue would also make sense in the context of the encounter with the chorus. One of them points at the 'ferocity' of the chorus and the other in a boastful manner answers back that he will 'bury them' but his mind turns unexpectedly in the manner of a joke *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, not to how he is going to defeat them, but where to find the *ληνοὺς* (or coffins, see *infra* about this word), in which he will bury them. I suspect that there is some kind of play on words in l. 2 *κατορύττωσιν*, maybe the first speaker uses it in metaphorical sense while the second one takes it in a literal meaning (see comment *ad loc.*). The subject of the chorus entering

the stage in a rage is found in *Ar. Ach.* 240 and *Vesp.* 230.

The proposal of Bentley to supplement ᾧ 'τάν in the fifth foot seems to be likely (although Conti Bizzarro *Ταλαρίσκος* p. 29 n. 23 warns us against accepting it too readily). This expression implies a somewhat 'condescending tone' (cf. Dodds ad *Bacc.* 805), but its origin and meaning are disputed (cf. further G.J. de Vries *Mn.* XIX (1966) pp. 225-230).

1. ἦ μὴν: this expression at the beginning of the sentence according to Denniston *GP* p.350 "introduces a strong and confident asseveration, being used both in direct and indirect speech. It is more frequently employed in oaths and pledges". Here as in most of the instances in Aristophanes (cf. Denniston *loc.cit.*) it is used with future indicative, but the tone does not seem to be threatening.

μακαριεῖς: K-A ad loc. propose that the verb μακαρίζειν can have an ambiguous sense and the repetition in l. 3 implies that it is stressed in some way. The first speaker says something like 'you will congratulate yourself' (cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 588), or 'you will be thinking yourself lucky', (cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 429), and then the other retorts 'they will make me happy' understanding the verb from another point of view. This verb and the adjective μάκαρ seem to be specially related to the state of the dead in the Islands of the Blessed (cf. *Ar. fr.* 504.9 and K-A ad loc.).

2. κατορύττωσιν: I think that the term has a certain degree of ambiguity. It seems that it can be understood literally to designate 'to bury', the commonest sense; but maybe the speaker

uses it on a more colloquial level as meaning 'to destroy utterly', as in fr. 155.19 (where it implies an obscene sense, about it see Henderson *MM* p.168).

4. **καίτοι**: it is, as Denniston *GP* p.557 says, "used by a speaker in pulling himself up abruptly".

**ληνοῦς**: this word is a hapax in literary texts with the meaning of 'coffin', although it is found in funerary inscriptions in Doric, as *C.I.G.* 1979. 1981 (Thessalonica), *I.G.* XIV 150,5 (Syracuse), XIV 871 (Cumae). The source of our fragment (Poll. 10. 150) and other lexicographical texts (see K-A ad loc.) seem to imply that this sense was commoner than it seems to us from the extant evidence.

The word generally means "anything shaped like a tub or trough" (LSJ s.v.) and as we can see from the evidence of the inscriptions and the use in Theocr. 7. 25 and 25. 28 (meaning 'wine vat'), the word seems to be frequently used in Doric dialect. This fact can be related to the use of **πάμαλα** in fr. 9; but I do not think that this is enough to suggest that one of the speakers is of Doric origin or speaks in this dialect, as is common with the doctors in Comedy (cf. Crat. fr. 46, Alex. fr. 146, Men. *Asp.* 374ff. and Sandbach ad loc., 439ff., Epicr. fr. 10), since we do not know to what extent it was a popular or technical term in Attic of the V century.

I agree with Conti Bizzarro *Ταλαρίσχος* p.32 that maybe there is a play on the ambivalence of this term meaning 'coffin' and 'wine vat'; but I think that his proposal of a reference to the

ληνός Ἀσσία explained by Pollux loc. cit. with an implication of androphagy is too far fetched.

## Fr. 6

The mention by name of the two cithara-players, who were probably alive in Athens, is an important feature of this fragment (see supra p. 64).

Long *Barbarians in Gr. Comedy* p. 18 suggests that Pherecrates follows Democritus (68b 144D-K) "who claimed that the music would be one of the last developments of primitive man because it is one of the least necessary arts" and for this reason "in the land of the savages (Pherecrates 6) there seems to have been a discussion not about who was the best but who was the worst musician". About the subject of music and its connexion with education in Pherecrates see p. 60.

2. At the end of the line the additions suggested by Dobree (<τὸν>...<δ'>) seem to be more likely than that of Porson (δὲ...τ(ς)). On one hand they are closer to the text of the manuscripts and on the other, they seem to be more logical for the expression ἔχ' ἀτρέμ' 1.3 (see ad loc.).

<ὁ> Πεισίου Μέλης: Meles was surely a famous cithara player in Athens at that time, also mentioned in Ar. Av. 766. This fragment has identified him with the figure of Cratin. fr. 185 εἰ δ' ὁ Πεισίου προδοῦναι τοῖς ἀτίμοις τὰς πύλας / βούλεται, πέρδιξ γενέσθω, τοῦ πατρὸς νεόττιον / ὡς παρ' ἡμῖν οὐδὲν αἰσχρὸν ἐστὶν ἐκπερδικίσαι. But already the Sch. ad Av. 766 expressed his ignorance about this fact (cf. Cratin fr. 251 and 282).

Perhaps his main fame is as the father of Cinesias, a famous cithara-player and musician who was later in the main stream of

renovation of the traditional Greek music (cf. *Pherecr.* fr. 155. 8). Meles and his music are criticized by Pl. *Grg.* 502a, as having a style which intends to please rather than to educate the audience.

3. ἔχ' ἀτρέμ': the speaker of this line interrupts the other with this expression of silence. Instances of this expression at the beginning of line, cf. K-A ad loc. and Kassel *ZPE* 32 (1978) 23.

Χαῖρις: the information about Chaeris, the cithara-player, is a little confusing mainly because there is another pipe-player named Chaeris in Ar. *Ach.* 16, 866, *Pax* 951, *Av.* 857 and Cratin. fr. 118.

The Schol. ad Ar. *Av.* 858 suggests that there are two men named Chaeris: one a cithara-player in our fragment and another one the flute-player, who would be Theban according to the Sch. ad Ar. *Ach.* 866a. This suggestion has been dismissed by Starkie ad loc. as having been wrongly inferred from the text of Ar. *Ach.* 16 and Sommerstein ad *Ach.* 16 probably rightly suggests that there was only one musician with this name who played both instruments equally badly.

## Fr. 7

This fragment is constructed in a series of quick expressions: a negative imperative; in 1.2 genitive with the verb εἶμι; the final sentence could be understood as lacking the object as it is common in a dialogue (cf. Eur. fr. 255.4N<sup>2</sup>, Ar. *Vesp.* 193, *Th.* 35); but this is not certain. About the form of introduction related to the figure of the parasite, cf. supra p. 59.

2. τῶν προτενθῶν: οἱ προτενθαί was originally the name of a special group of officials whose task was to taste the meals before the celebration of a feast, especially the Δορπία, the first day of the Apaturia; although their function was performed probably the day before the beginning of the celebration (cf. Dover ad *Nub.* 1198). This passage of Aristophanes and Philyll. fr. 7 contain reference to them.

As in the case of the sycophants who were immediately identified as villains, the figure of the 'foretaster' seems to represent in Comedy the condition of a parasite or a glutton. Ar. loc. cit. (cf. Taillardat *Images* §710) compares the orators to them and Philyll. fr. cit. makes the personification of Dorpia appear and she is identified by mentioning them, in a play with the expressive title of *Heracles*.

Fr. 8

The fragment refers to the custom of serving pears in water in a banquet, as it seems to have been so common (cf. Athen. XIV 650c) that Alex. fr. 34 uses it as an example with a proverbial sense. This fragment has the air of a recipe or the instructions of a cook. It would be also suitable to the context of a banquet in which the wild men are instructed to do things properly.

**ἀνακυψῆσαι:** 'to stir' in the same cooking sense as Ar. *Ach.* 671, *Vesp.* 1515, *Pl.* 302 and 309.

**τὰς ἀπλοῦς:** designates cultivated pears instead of ἡ ἄχρας that means 'wild pear' cf. fr.13. The latter type are also dipped in wine so as to make a kind of 'sweet wine', see further Olck *RE* III 497.

**ἀπαζετε:** cf. on fr. 99 ἀπαζέτω.

Fr. 9

This fragment is notable because of the unusual word ἀποπροσωπίσθε and the kind of medical activity described in it. Norwood *Gr. Comedy* pp. 156-7 interprets it as follows: "the aborigines rub themselves with the inside of bean-pods, as the Zulus use banana-skins for cleaning their teeth". But, since we have attested some instances of the use of beans for medical purpose, it is possible to understand that the first speaker asks if they know the cure of the bean-cataplasm and they answer back with a definitive 'not at all'. The problem of this interpretation lies in the meaning of the verb.

**ἀποπροσωπίσθε:** this verb is a hapax of Pherecrates. Sud. α2610 and Poll. II 48 give it the meaning 'to clean', 'to wipe off' the face. In this case two interpretations are possible. Either it is formed in parallel with the verb ἀπονίπτεσθαι, which designates mainly to clean hands and feet with water; maybe in this case it is a comic invention and Norwood's interpretation must be understood. Or, I would suggest, maybe the sense of the lexica is wrong and the implications of this verb here are related more to the meaning of 'making a mask' out of beans, since the word πρόσωπον could have this sense (cf. LSJ s.v. III), and thus it refers to making a 'bean-cataplasm' .

**κυάμοις:** 'beans' were used in Greek medicine in combination with other different substances for several purposes. Diosc. *Mat. Med.* II 127 (I p. 247 Wellm.) explains some of them that are used to cure illnesses in face and eyes: σὺν μέλιτι δὲ καὶ τηλίνῳ καὶ

παρωτίδας καὶ ὑπόπια διαφορεῖ σὺν ῥόδῳ τε καὶ λιβάνῳ καὶ τῷ τοῦ  
ῶσθ' λευκῷ, ὀφθαλμῶν προπτώσεις καὶ σταφυλώματα καὶ οἰδήματα  
στέλλει· φυραθὲν δὲ σὺν οἴνῳ συγχύσεις καὶ πληγὰς ὀφθαλμῶν  
καθίστησιν εἷς τε ἀνακόλλημα ῥεύματος χωρὶς τοῦ λέπους μασσηθεὶς,  
ἐπιτίθεται κατὰ τοῦ μετώπου· καὶ διδύμων φλεγμονὰς ἐψηθεὶς ἐν  
οἴνῳ θεραπεύει καὶ τοῖς ἐφηβαίοις δὲ τῶν παίδων καταπλασσάμενος  
ἀνήβους ἐπὶ πολὺ τηρεῖ.

**πώμαλα:** perhaps a colloquial expression for οὐδαμῶς. It is  
also found in Ar. *Pl.* 66 and fr. 361. Sch. ad Dem. 19. 51  
suggests that the expression is Syracusian, although Harpocr.  
p. 268. 7 Dind. says that it was very common. About its origin see  
K-G II p. 164.

The interpretation of this fragment is clearly a reference to the times when household and milling activities were performed by someone other than slaves, as was common in the Ancient world. Two interpretations have been proposed: in words of Th. Williams *Hermes* 91 (1963) p.328 n.2, Zielinski (*Die Märchekomödie in Athen* St. Petersburg p. 25) suggests that αὐτὰς in l.2 can refer to the "Märchen which do the work for those whom they favour"; in ancient Greece the nymphs, in comparison with other figures of western mythology. But this interpretation lacks clear evidence that the Nymphs played such role in Antiquity. In comedy this representation of an ideal world would be envisaged by the things acting by themselves without any external help, as we see in fr. 113.

I think that the other possibility is better: to connect it with an Athenian tradition collected by Hdt. VI 137 who, quoting Hecataeus *FrGrH* 1 F127 refers to a time when there were no slaves and everything that the slaves did was supposed to be done by women and children.

P. Vidal-Naquet *The Black Hunter* (Engl. transl.) Baltimore/London 1986 p. 172 points out that χῶμῃ in l. 4 seems to refer to an earlier, 'pre-urban' time in which women had to do all the work at home, even the most humble sort: milling, which already in *Od.* 20. 105 was performed by slaves as a kind of punishment (cf. also Eur. *Cycl.* 240, *Lys.* 1.18, *Men. Asp.* 245, *Theocr.* 24. 51 and Gow ad loc.; see also Th. Williams loc.cit.)

The metre is trochaic tetrameter catalectic, also found in fr. 83, 89, 99, 152. About it see supra p. 23.

1. This first line is notable for the number of negative forms which nearly amount to a polyptoton: οὐ ... οὐτε... οὐτε... οὐδενί.

οὐτε Μάνης οὐτε Σηκίς: Manes is a proper name in several barbarian countries, like Lydia (Hdt. I 94, IV 45); Cappadocia (Strab. XII 553) and Phrygia. In Athens it was thus commonly used as a name for slaves coming from any of these regions and became a typical slave-name (cf. Ar. Av. 1311, Lys. 1211, AP VII 179, 538), as is its feminine form Mania (cf. Mach. 191 and Gow ad loc.). Here it is used in an archetypical sense as a denomination for the male household-slave par excellence (cf. 1.2 δοῦλος, Sch. ad Ar. Av. 523 and see also Ran. 965).

Sekis is a little more complicated, since in this passage it seems to be the name for a household slave woman in contrast with Manes; but in Ar. Vesp. 768, and Poll. III 76 (cf. Hesych. ζ480) it does not necessarily have the meaning of a proper noun. But the Schol. ad Ar. Vesp. 768b suggests that it was a name and there are other examples of names given to slaves according to the function they are supposed to perform (cf. O. Masson in *Actes du Colloque 1971 sur l'esclavage* p. 17 Paris 1973).

2. μοχθεῖν: similarly Ar. Pl. 517 uses this verb to express the toils of the slaves.

ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ: the expressions ἐν οἰκίᾳ (Ar. Ach. 973) and κατ'οἰκίαν are commoner, but an example of this synizesis is found in Vesp. 827 (see MacDowell ad loc.).

3. K-A ad loc. suggests that the noise of the ἀλετρις to which this line refers, can be paralleled by Ar. *Ecc1.* 739-41: σὺ δὲ δεῦρ', ἡ κιθαρωδός, ἔξειθι, / πολλάκις ἀναστήσασα μ' εἰς ἐκκλησίαν / ἄωρι νύκτωρ διὰ τὸν ὄρθριον νόμον, if we understand the interpretation of the Sch. ad loc. that ἡ κιθαρωδός is a reference to the miller. This interpretation has been rejected by Ussher in his comment ad loc.; but I think it really suits the text of Aristophanes and in some way explains our text better. The noise of the milling was accompanied by the singing of the slave-women. We have reference to the ἐπιμύλιος ῥοδή and ἱμαῖος in Athen. XIV 618d and Poll. IV 53 as nouns for mill-song and in Plut. *Mor.* 157d-e (cf. *PMG* 869) one of them is preserved: ἄλει μύλα ἄλει / καὶ γὰρ Πιττακὸς ἄλει / μεγάλας Μυτιλήνας βασιλεύων. The sense of ἄλει, as Campbell in *Gr. Lyric Poetry*<sup>2</sup> p. 449 Bristol 1982 points out, may be political or sexual.

The ending of our fragment is suspect on textual grounds, but I would suggest that it may have a secondary sexual sense if we take the verb θιγγανουσῶν with a sexual meaning (cf. LSJ s. v. 2), and maybe also μύλη, as in the mill-song just quoted. The reference would come as a παρὰ προσδοκίαν.

**θιγγανουσῶν:** the verb has been suspect for two reasons: on one hand as Kock ad loc. says, 'mulieres molas non tangebant, sed circumagebant' and, on the other, it is used mainly with genitive.

Kock's proposal, περιαγουσῶν, is probably wrong since the method of milling in classical Athens does not seem to be by rotary mill as the verb περιάγω implies in Hellenistic Greek.

This conclusion is suggested by Moritz *Grain-Mills and flour* p. 3 who points out that στρέφειν, περιάγειν, περιελαύνειν are attested in later sources. The evidence of Poll. VII 180 can, notwithstanding, be connected with its use in classical times; but the main problem remains in the lack of any reference to this kind of mills in other sources. In our texts this activity is represented with μλωθρέω Men. *Pk.* 87, and other verbs meaning 'to grind', as for instance ἀλέω (cf. 1.3), ἀλετρεύω, ἀλήθω (cf. fr. 79), τρίβειν (Ar. *Pax* 16, 81), λαίνειν (Hdt. I 200), ἐρείχειν (Ar. fr. 22), κατερείχειν (Ar. *Vesp.* 649). It is then possible for a slave 'to touch' the mill-stone, above all if we accept that there is no reference to a rotary one and thus it could refer to what is called χειρομύλη (cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 6.2.32), a hand-mill.

Other suggestions that try to solve the problem of the object and are closer to the reading of the manuscripts are: θρυγανωσῶν Headlam *CIR* 10 (1896) p. 438 and θηγανουσῶν Radermacher *JbClPh* 151 (1895) p.254. On the other side, van Herwerden *Mh* 6 (1878) p.57 suggested to change the accusative into τῆς μύλης. Perhaps the sense of the two first verbs (θηγανωσῶν means 'sharpen' and is only found in a conjecture in Aesch. *Ag.* 1535 and the first one means 'to tap' a door and is found in Ar. *Eccl.* 34) do not give a better sense than θιγγάνω. We have one example of the verb θιγγάνω in Attic with what seems to be an accusative: Soph. *Ant.* 546: μή μοι θάνης σὺ κοινὰ, μήδ' ἄ μή 'θίγες. This construction has been explained as an adverbial use or a sort of attraction (cf. Jebb ad loc.) but it can be an

example of the indiscriminate use of accusative as object to this verb (cf. K-G I p. 348A 7). Other examples of προσβιγγάνω plus accusative can be found in Alcman fr. 58. *PMGF* and in Theocr. 1. 59 (in tmesis) that has led also to uncertain or unnatural explanations (cf. Dover in *Theocritus Select poems* London 1971 and also Gow ad loc.).

τὰς μύλας: seems to refer here to the "nether millstone" in contrast with the ὄνος, the upper part (cf. Moritz *Grain-mills and flour* pp. 37-8).

Fr. 11

Unfortunately the fragment is corrupted, although its subject is clearly Lycurgus, who was accused frequently of having links with the Egyptians who were seen as thrifty and wicked in general.

Besides the metrical lacuna at the end of l. 1, there are problems in connexion with the verbs, since in l. 1 αὐτὸν is clearly in the third person singular and ξυνέχῃ in l. 2 is in the second person. Bergk *Comment. crit.* I (1884) p. 27 apud K-A's app. crit., suggests a change of speaker in the second line. Several proposals of change have been made, although as Kock ad loc. says "incredibilia de his versibus protulerunt":

- Bergk loc. cit. according to White on *Sch. on Av.* ad v. 1294, "suggested that an Egyptian word (cf. Cephisodemus' statement given below about the word καλάσιρις) signifying ἐς οἴκουσ originally ended the first verse, and that the second speaker objected and insisted that the second speaker should drop Egyptian and talk Greek!"

- Portus guessed εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον φέροντα / οἴκείας λέξεις. The main problem of this suggestion is that the word λέξεις has no instances earlier than Plato (cf. LSJ s. v. and Fournier *Les verbs "dire" en Grec Ancienne* p. 227 Paris 1946). Similarly Edmonds *FAC* I p. 212 suggested ἄγοντα / οἰκά<δε> λέξεις.

- Different participles have been suggested at the end of the l. 1: ἄγοντα Dindorf, ἰόντα Cobet, and an infinitive ἀποικεῖν Bothe, accepted by Kock. All of them explain the mistake as haplography, trying to restore the missing word from either

Αἴγυπτον or οἴκους.

- For the second line, there are also the most varied solutions: Bothe εἰκὸς λέξεις. Kock: εἰκὸς γ' ἔξεις ἴν' Ἄρη ξυνάγη. Herwerden in *Obs.* p.8 οἴμοι τί λέγεις ἵνα δὴ ξυνέχη (or συζῆ) and in *Coll.* p.13 <B> οἰκτρόν γε λέγεις, εἰ δεῖ συζῆν. Kaibel apud K-A: οὔκουν ἔξεις ἵνα μὴ συνίη.

The metre is anapaestic tetrameter catalectic (see p. 23).

1. **κινδυνεύειν εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον**: the expression could be understood in absolute sense as LSJ s.v. κινδυνεύειν suggest: "venture thither".

Egypt and the Egyptians were well known in Greece from antiquity and Herodotus deals with them carefully in his bk. II. According to Lloyd on Hdt. 2 pp. 14ff. Greeks had been travelling to Egypt for several reasons, as mercenaries, merchants, naval experts, allies, students (see further Austin *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age* (1970), and Boardman *The Greeks overseas*<sup>2</sup> p. 111 London 1980).

2. **συνέχη**: it may mean 'to be on friendly terms' or it may ambiguously refer to the feature of effeminacy which was characteristic of Lycurgus according to other poets. The sense is found in some passages referring to the sexual intercourse between animals (cf. Arist. *HA* 540a 24, *GA* 731a 18), and in Thphr. *Char.* 28.3 in the language of a κακολόγος (in this text the verb is used of women but it is probably drawn from the previous comparison to dogs). Cf. LSJ s.v. 2c and d.

**Λυκούργου**: Lycurgus seems to have been a real person, son of

Lycomedes, from the noble family of the Eteobutadae in the deme of Butadae; his death is said to have been in 404 or 403 at the hands of the Thirty (cf. Davies *APF* p. 350). His grandson was the famous orator of the same name. He is also mentioned in *Ar. Av.* 1296 and *Cratin.* fr. 32. He is always derided for some Egyptian element or other: *Cratin.* fr.cit. makes him wear a *καλασίριν*, a typical Egyptian cloth, and thus depicts him as an effeminate. *Ar.* loc.cit. compares him to an Ibis, the Egyptian sacred bird.

From Koehler *Hermes* 5 (1871) p.352 onwards it has been accepted that the main criticism made of Lycurgus was his relation to the introduction of the cult of Isis in Athens (see further K-A ad *Cratin.* loc.cit.).

**πατριώταις:** this word refers to "fellowcountryman: prop. of barbarians who had only a common *πατρις*" according to LSJ s.v. It implies here that Lycurgus is an Egyptian and can be related to the kind of abuse to call someone foreigner (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 1533 *πατρι(ο)ις*, *Alex.* fr. 327 and *Archipp.* fr. 61).

Fr. 12

The text seems to be a metaphorical expression taken from an image of sea warfare (about Aristophanes' use of these images cf. Taillardat *Images* §583). The metre is anapaestic, and it is possible that it belonged to the beginning of the agon when the chorus exhorts one of the characters to speak (cf. *Ar. Equ.* 762 where a metaphor is used).

Norwood *Gr. Com.* p. 156 suggests another explanation. According to him it is not metaphorical, but it describes a 'comic siege', and "the language suggests a passage of Thucydides (VII 41) the scholium on which borrows the words of Pherecrates. In Thucydides the reference is to sinking ships by dropping leaden weights from a height. And in Pherecrates *καταδύων* suggests as much. But it is hard to imagine a naval scene in the play (like the massed attack by canoes in *Robinson Crusoe*), therefore we should regard *καταδύων* as intransitive, and the whole idea transferred from sea- to land-fighting". The explanation seems to be too far-fetched.

If we do not understand it in a metaphorical sense, the text may be simply a description of this weapon to the Savages who might not know its function, or in the preparation for a war against someone's invasion (cf. *Ar. Av.* 1122ff.).

1. *ὁ δὲ δῆ*: Kock suggested modifying the text slightly to *ὄδε δῆ*, comparing it with *Pl.com.* fr. 175.1 and *Alc.* fr. 22.1. The speaker perhaps points to a *δελφίς*, if we take it literally or metaphorically to someone or something which has just been

mentioned. This proposal would fit Denniston's analysis; he points out that when δῆ follows a pronoun like ὅδε "the emphasis is often ironical, contemptuous or indignant in tone" (p. 207 and 208 for instances). In any case the sentence seems to be ironical and grandiloquent from the detail of the description of this weapon's effectiveness in l. 2.

**δελφίς:** it was a military engine used for sea battles whose main purpose was to sink the enemy's ship. It is mentioned in *Ar. Equ.* 762 and in the form of αἱ κεραῖαι ... δελφίνοφόροι in *Thuc.* VII 41, another source is *Diod.* XIII 78.4.

As *Thuc.* loc.cit. points out, they were placed in the κεραία, that is to say, either special 'antennae' (set up over the ram of the ship cf. *Poll.* I 85) or τῆς κεραίας τοῦ ἵστοῦ (according to *Sud.* δ208). The main function was to hole the other ship either before or after it had been rammed or in case this action had failed. This activity is parallel to that of the λιθοφόροι whose main intention was to kill the members of the other ship; cf. *Diodorus* 13. 78.7 and *Athen.* 5.208d: τριῶν δὲ ἰστῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἐξ ἑκάστου κεραῖαι λιθοφόροι ἐξήρτηντο β', ἐξ ὧν ἄρπαγές τε καὶ πλίνθοι μολίβου πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιτιθεμένους ἤφειντο (*Carson Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* p. 239 n.67 Princeton 1971).

**κεραία:** an emendation of *Blaydes Adv.* I p.16 which improves the suggestion of *Salmasius* (cf. *K-A's app.crit.*) κερουχος (non-Attic, cf. *Carson op.cit.* p.263).

2. This line seems to be echoed in the *Sch.* ad *Thuc.* VII 41: (δέλφινες) οἱ ἐμπύκτοντες αὐταῖς διέκοπτον τοῦδαφος αὐτῶν καὶ

κατέδουον. It was probably the standard way of referring to these activities, as in Dem. 32.5. The correction of Blaydes seems to be unnecessary: the καί joins the two participles and they describe the way the lead dolphin works: it falls on the shipboard and sinks the ship.

### Fr. 13

This fragment is a list of 'wild fruits'. Their element in common is that, although they were consumed in antiquity by human beings, their main use was for animals and probably they were seen as a primitive kind of food. The fragment is not easy to relate to any particular situation, except for the verb περιόντας. The sense of this verb in Ar. *Lys.* 558, Phryn.com. fr. 3.4, Pl.com. fr. 211, Eup. fr.327 and possibly Antiph. fr.275 (see also Dem. 21.104) is 'to walk around' the different parts of the Agora, as we could say 'to go window shopping'.

The difference in this fragment is that the text does not refer to the τάρπιχος in Pl.com. loc.cit. or the other commodities that are mentioned in Ar. and Eup. loc.cit. Here the stalls in the market-place (cf. K-A ad Eup. loc.cit.) are wild fruits which are not consumed except on special occasions or by animals (especially pigs as we will see on the comment on each word). Two interpretations are possible: either it is a reference to the variety and the degree of specialization of the Athenian Agora, as Ehrenberg *The people of Ar.* p. 133 n.6 suggests; or it is a joke, envisaging that the savages have an Agora with stalls selling acorns and wild pears, comparable to the Athenian Agora.

The metre is anapaestic as in fr. 12. The polysyndeton seems to emphasize the amount of the different types of food; it maybe suggests that it was part of a longer list.

τάς βαλάνους καὶ τὰς ἀκύλους: two kinds of acorn: the first one is the acorn provided by the oak (ἡ δρύς) and the second one

by the holm-oak or ilex (ἡ πρῖνος) (cf. Theophr. *HP* III 16.3, Phot. α879, Eust. *ad Od.* 1657. 14, *EM* p.544.51, [Did.] *Sch. in Hom.* x 242, Hesych. α2689). The word βάλανος seems to have had the general sense of 'nut' and it is attested as referring to other kinds (see LSJ s.v., Olck *RE* V 2070 and West *ad Hes. Op.* 233). They are mentioned together in *Od.* 10. 242 as the food Circe gives the companions of Odysseus transformed into pigs, and βάλανος on its own as pig-fodder in 13. 409.

As West *loc. cit.* points out, some kinds of βάλανοι could be used as food for human nutrition, and they were consumed in early times. Three expressions in ancient Greek suggest that they were identified with primitive ways of life: the Arcadians in Paus. VIII 42.6 are called βαλανηφάγοι; the proverb ἄλις δρυός, explained in Zenob. *Epit.* II 40; and the βαλανίτης βίος in contrast with the ἀηλεμένος βίος, described by Amph. fr. 9, cf. further Sud. α1183, Eust. *ad Od.* p. 1859. 48, Zenob. I 21.

τὰς ἀχράδας: simply "wild pears", differentiated from the cultivated one, which is ἡ ἄπιος (Theophr. *HP* I 4.1). As we can see in fr. 8, they are served in a drink at banquets (perhaps where Chremylus ate it in *Ecc1.* 355; for its constipating effect see Ussher *ad loc.*), and are a poor man's food in Alex. fr. 167.13, Arist. *HA* VIII 6.3 mentions them as a food for pigs also.

περιόντας: see *supra* p. 112.

Fr. 14

The metre of this passage is according to West *Gr. Metre* p. 116, anaclastic glyconic: *gl" / gl" / gl" ///*, twice with a third line catalectic. The denomination of this metre has been disputed since Wilamowitz denominated it "choriambic dimeter", distinguishing it for the first time in *Gr. Versk.* pp. 210-44 (about this denomination see *supra* p. 301). The scheme is very similar to that of the "Eupolidean" and it has been suggested that this is an example of the *pnigos* of a *parabasis* in this metre (cf. Sifakis *Parabasis* p. 34). Other passages in this metre are fr. 102 and maybe 101.

This fragment seems to refer to a way of life that survives on wild fruits. This satire could be related to the savages and their life-style. In later comedy the same kind of criticism is made against the 'vegetarian' philosophers, as in Alex. fr. 27, 223.4ff.

The style is typical of the *παρὰ προσδοκᾶν*-jokes: it begins with a general sentence on the eating habits and in the second stanza the description is compared with the proverb which leads to the final reference to the 'toes' in l. 6. A similar way of joking can be found in fr. 73 (see *supra* p. 35).

1. *ἐνθρόσχοισι*: "chervil, *Anthriscus*". It is only attested as *ἐνθ-* in Theophr. HP VII 7.1 and doubtfully in fr. 114. 3 (*χάνθ-*). The other instances of this plant begin with *ἀνθρ-*, as in Sapph. 96. 13V, Cratin. fr. 98. 6 (in a passage that is corrupt), Hesych. α5158 and Poll. VI 106.

There is no explanation about the origins and relationship between these forms. Carnoy *Dictionnaire étymologique des Noms Grecs des plantes* s.v. *anthriscos* Louvain 1959. suggests: "ce sont les divers noms du 'cerfeuil' grec (*Scandix australis*) tous dérivés de l'ind.-eur. 'andher-' «pointe», en raison de la forme pointue des fruits de cette ombellifère, lesquels peuvent atteindre quatre centimètres". Rehrenböck (1985) p.237 explains how this word was confused till Dindorf's second edition of Athenaeus with the form ἔνθρουσχοις, based on a gloss of Hesych. 8803 θρούσχα ἄγρια λάχανα (cf. α5158) and he tries to give another etymology of ἄνθρουσχιον, not very convincing.

I would like to draw attention to two points: on the one hand, the plant ἔνθρουσχον ἡδυόσμον is included among the poisonous plants, but it is added at the end for its similarity with the καυκαλίς, so it is not totally sure that it was inside this group of poisonous plants. On the other hand, in the form ἄνθρουσχον (see supra for other references), it usually appears in the context of heavenly places and always in relationship with other flowers.

In this fragment it could be interpreted from different points of view: firstly, the plant was in fact edible (at least in some special preparation), and it is added to the inedible plants by Theophrastus only for the sake of the similarity of shape. Secondly the plant is not edible, but the people who are living on it in the play, do not have anything else to live on but its smell. Finally, the description of the way of life here proposed is a parody on the topical description of an idyllic

place or of the underworld, making reference to the texts above cited and other similar ones. The parody would take literally that this plant is the only one that grows in such a place and the people there have only to eat the wonderfully scented plant.

**βρακάνοις:** 'wild herbs' or 'weeds', according to LSJ and Carnoy op.cit. s.v. It is only attested in Luc. *Lex.* 2: ἐγὼ περιελθὼν τὰ ἀρώματα σκόροδά τε εὔρον ἐν αὐτοῖς πεφυκότα καὶ γηπαττάλους τινὰς ἀνορύξας καὶ τῶν σκανδικῶν καὶ βρακάνων λαχανευσάμενος, and in Hesych. β1041 βράκανα· τὰ ἄγρια λάχανα.

**στραβήλοις:** only found in this passage with the meaning of "wild olives"; cf. Poll. VI 45: τὰς δὲ κοτινάδας ἐλάας στραβήλους [τραμβήλους codd.] ὠνόμασε Φερεκράτης.

The commonest sense of this word is "snail or shell fish" (cf. Soph. fr. 324 and Arist. fr. 304). It seems fairly clear that the similarity of both things: the fish and the fruit must have been the reason for it to be named with the same noun as it frequently happens (e.g. ἡ βάλανος: acorn and also 'barnacle', cf. LSJ and Olk *RE* V 2070, and ὁ στρόβιλος, see Carnoy op.cit. s.v. "strabilos").

It may be a coincidence, but the octopus mentioned later was related to olives in the following ways: in legend he was said to be amphibious and appear climbing on the trees (cf. Arist. *HA* 622a31 and Thompson *Fishes* p. 207) and he was fished 'by means of a leaden weight, garnished with hooks and hidden among olive twigs' according to Thompson *Fishes* loc.cit.

4. **τοὺς πουλύποδας:** octopus was an animal included in many legendary stories (see Thompson *Fishes* p. 206 and O. Keller *Die*

*antike Tierwelt* II p. 508 Leipzig 109-13).

In this passage it is related to the proverbial story that this animal gnaws its own tentacles during his winter hibernation because of hunger. This story is, nonetheless, proved to be true nowadays; but not for the reason it was explained in Antiquity (cf. West ad Hes. *Op.* 524). It is fairly common in Comedy (cf. *Diph.* fr. 33, *Alc.com.* fr.30) and in proverbs, as πολύποδος δίκην αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν καταφαγῶν (cf. Leutsch-Scheidewin *CPG* II p. 204 and n. 27). In Hes. *loc.cit.* it is used in comparison with a "starved old man squeezing his swollen feet", in words of West ad *loc.* and this subject is also found in Hes. *Scut.* 265f. and *Hermipp.* fr. 23.

The octopus seems to represent in this passage a symbol of stupidity (cf. Leutsch *loc.cit.*); but it is possible that it changed according to the context. It may represent 'ability and craftiness', as in *Soph.* fr. 307R. (see Thompson *ibid.* p. 206).

5. There is a lacuna in the text following Dobree's metrical restoration (see comment ad *Ar. Nub.* 518). The main question is to decide to whom these lines refer: it could follow with the image of the octopus or ironically refer to the hungry persons, mentioned at the beginning. The latter suggestion seems better; the following restorations are possible:

- νύκτωρ <ἀνστάντας>, Bergk's suggestion possibly refers to the persons who cannot sleep at night and get up. It is criticized by Kock ad fr. who says: "at surgere non opus est eum qui sibi digitos circumrodit".

- Kock proposes <ῥύζωντας (ῥύζοντας)> in parallel with *Hermipp.*

fr. 23 ῥύζων ἅπαντας ἀπέδομαι τοὺς δάκτυλους, which means 'growling'.

- Herwerden *Mh* 6 (1878) p. 57 suggests τοὺς πόδας, perhaps a possible word to be left out by the scribe; but it seems a little repetitive taking into account the repetition of this noun in the ending of the former word and τοὺς δακτύλους that means something similar in l. 6.

- Tucker *CIR* 34 (1920) p. 154 proposes a change in the order of the words: δακτύλους νύκτωρ περιτρώ- /γειν αὐτοὺς τοὺς αὐτῶν. It implies a change of metrical analysis since it would finish in the form: - - <->, instead of - υ - found in l. 3.

Fr. 15

This fragment seems to be mixed with the quotation of the Scholiast and corrupted. There have been two reconstructions and, in my opinion, the most faithful is that of Meineke *FCG* I p. 515 who begins from τρεῖς onwards. The reconstruction of Kaibel is interesting since it is in iambic trimeter. Perhaps the words καὶ Καρκίνος μὲν τις ἦν Θωρυκίου υἱός should be considered an addition of the scholiast and the text of Pherecrates should start with ἦσαν δὲ (the expression Θωρυκίου υἱός is a mistake or misunderstanding of the demotic Θωρ(χιος))

Carcinus and his sons are frequently the subject of comic parody in Athens. Their stand as public figures, playwrights and dancers was probably the reason for them to become a topic of the satire of Pherecrates and his contemporaries, as an example of bad poetry, corrupt youth and complicated dancing that will remain in the later tradition (cf. R. Vattuone *Ricerca su Timeo: la "pueritia" di Agatocle* Florence 1983 pp. 15ff.).

The details about their life and works are scarce and sometimes too confusing.

We know that Carcinus, son of Xenotimus, was the first famous member of this rich family originally of the deme Thoricus (cf. Davies *APF* p.283). He was a member of the liturgical class and took part as a general in the attacks on the Peloponnesian coast in 431 (cf. Thuc. II 23.2, *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 296. 30-40), the epithet θαλαττικός in Ar. *Vesp.* 1519 and Pl.com. fr. 143 is probably an ironical reference to his naval activities and his name (cf. also Com. Adesp. fr. 52K). He is said to have written plays, probably

tragedies (cf. *Pax* 791-5, *Nub.* 1259-61, although it is disputed whether he or his son, Xenocles, is meant in this passage of Aristophanes; cf. MacDowell on *Vesp.* 1501). He is also mentioned as a dancer and as having made his sons take part as dancers in his own plays. From the artistic point of view they were famous for their dancing abilities and complicated pirouettes (see Ar. loc.cit., *Pax* 781-90 and 864).

Xenotimus was probably his oldest son (cf. Davies loc.cit.) and belonged to the cavalry group as probably other members of this family might have (cf. on κομηῆται).

Xenocles is called ὁ μέστος in Ar. *Vesp.* 1502 and was notable for his bad tragedies (cf. *Nub.* 1264, *Vesp.* 1511, *Th.* 169 and 440, *Ran.* 86, Pl.com. fr. 143). He also had a son named Carcinus II who was a playwright as well, cf. *TGrF* 70Sn.).

The number is, nonetheless, confusing: three sons are mentioned in *Vesp.* 1498ff.; but the Sch. ad loc.cit. says that there were four of them with the evidence provided by our fragment. At least the third son was probably called Xenarchus (cf. Sch. *Pax* 781) or Xenocleitus (cf. Sch. *Ran.* 80). The fourth son is identified by Sch. on *Ran.* 86 and also MacDowell ad *Vesp.* 1501 with Datis mentioned in *Pax* 289; but van Leeuwen *Mn* XVI (1888) pp. 435-8 thought it was nickname of Xenocles (the second son; Platnauer ad *Pax.* 289 agrees with him).

The question seems insoluble and maybe we have to be sceptical with the whole problem with Davies ibid. p. 285. MacDowell suggests that perhaps the fourth son only became famous after 422 (date of performance of Aristophanes' *Clouds* and maybe

this is the point of our passage written in 420: there was another son less well known and his mention at the end would be surprising; but it is necessary to bear in mind that the text of Pherecrates is suspect as a piece of evidence. Maybe there is a kind of joke that we cannot understand for lack of context and perhaps the Scholiast cannot explain it either.

The fragment seems to satirize them from the point of view of their social origin: they are κομηῆται that implies a reference to the young members of the cavalry, generally pro-Doric in their opinions and attitudes; of their appearance: μικροί; and maybe of their political ambition, if we keep the reading of the manuscripts as φιλαρχικοί, but see comment ad loc.

**μικροὶ καὶ κομηῆται:** one of the main features of the sons of Carcinus was that they were μικροί (cf. Taillardat *Images* §247 where he makes reference to the passages of Aristophanes in which they are mocked because of their small size and the different metaphors he uses for this purpose).

Κομηῆται or having long hair is said mainly of special groups of people. As Dover on *Nub.* 14 says: "a) unworldly men, careless of their appearance (cf. 836 and perhaps 332) and b) fastidious well-to-do young men. It was therefore characteristic of those who served as cavalry, for only the rich could afford to maintain horses". It is also an element to criticize the habits of these noblemen, who were said to be paederasts (cf. *Nub.* 1101 and Dover ad loc. and Henderson *MM* p. 126).

At least one of them can be put in relationship with the

cavalry-group. Their noble origin, the contacts with the theatre, dance and their physical appearance made them an easy target for theatrical mockery.

**φίλαρχοι / φιλαρχικώτεροι:** while the former adjective is common to designate an ambitious person in Plato (cf. *Phd.* 82c, *R.* 549a); the latter is the comparative form of *φιλαρχικός*, probably a comic invention of Pherecrates. It is a normal way of forming in the fashion of the sophistic rhetorics which tended to use and invent adjectives ending with *-ικός*. In this case it sounds redundant since there exists *φίλαρχοι* with that meaning, as *βαδιστικός* instead of *βαδιστής* in *Ar. Ran.* 128 (see further Pepler (1910) pp. 439-40). Pherecrates here means to make an allusion to their political ambition represented by Xenocles as orator (see *Ar. Thesm.* 440-2 and *Pl.com.* loc.cit.).

Meineke's suggestion (accepted by Kaibel apud K-A) to change it into *φίλορχοι* and *φιλορχικώτεροι*, may be right for the following reasons: firstly the main point of the satire of Aristophanes against them is that they were dancers and dramatists (cf. *Vesp.* 1534 where they are called *τοῖς τριορχοῖς* in a pun with a reference to their dancing and their lechery; cf. Henderson *MM* p.125); secondly in fr.6 belonging to this play there is also a satire against some musicians; finally Pherecrates had abandoned 'abusive attacks' and, as we have seen in p. 64, his references to real Athenian persons are general statements that are connected to the conventional joke and they are usually satirized because of their quality as dancers.

Fr. 16

The proverbial expression ἄνθρωπειος ὄνος seems to be used as a kind of metaphor for those people who are big in size, but lack any intelligence. Apost. II 90 compares it with οἱ ἵπποι ἐν Ἀχαρναῖς in an expression that seems to imply that this proverb was also used by Pherecrates, although other sources (cf. Diogen. I 265, Prov. Bodl.57) only attribute the first one to him.

Donkeys were related in popular wisdom to the idea of stupidity (cf. Henderson *MM* p.80-1) and clumsiness (cf. Taillardat *Images* §791ff.). This identification of animals with some features is used frequently in the literature of the fables. It can be related to other proverbial expressions that identify animals and cities, for instance, ἵπποι ἐν Ἀχαρναῖς above mentioned, Βοιωτῖα ὄς (cf. Pind. *O.* 6. 90). In these two cases the implication or the insulting intention of the phrase is not only implied by the animal, but also by the place of origin which gives even more strength to the expression.

The city of Antron was placed on the east coast of the Thessalian region of Phthiotia, as H. Kramolichin in '*Griechenland*' s.v. describes it: "auf der Othrysgebirge in Thessalien nach 50 vorspringenden Halbinsel kap Stavros, antik Posidion, liegen beim Dorf Phano ca 3Km östlich von Glypha auf einem Felsen 25m über dem Meer die Ruinen der antiken Stadt A. Sie wird bereits im Schiffskatalog der Ilias als zum Gebiet des Protesilaos gehörig genannt" (cf. also Hirschfeld *RE* I 2642). It was well known in Antiquity for its temple of Demeter (cf. *Il.* 2. 697) and *hCer.* 491 that calls it ἄνθρωπῶν τε πετρήεντα.

In Antiquity the origin of this sentence was disputed. The Paroemiographers above quoted relate it to the existence of 'big donkeys' in this place. Eustath. *Sch. ad Hom, Il.* II 697 (see Erbse ad loc.), and Strab. IX 5.14 p. 435 give the explanation that it was a natural submarine reef in the strait towards Euböia, (according to Hirschfeld loc.cit. this is the most likely explanation) and Steph. Byz. s. v. Ἀντρών p. 101. 16ff. refers it to a big milling stone (about ὄνος as name for the nether milling stone, cf. Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour* pp. 37-8).

Fr. 17

As Kaibel suggests apud K-A ad loc. "utrem dicit tragice locutus vel dithyrambice". The reason for this suggestion seems to be in the application of the newly formed adjective γλευκαγωγός to something as common as a wine-skin.

γλευκαγωγός: it means 'new-wine carrier'. The first part of this word, τὸ γλεῦκος, is in fact only found here in Classical Greek, while it becomes commoner in later Literature (cf. LSJ). This does not necessarily mean that it was an unusual noun, but it may have had some special tone, perhaps only used in technical terminology, as ἡ γλυξίς in Phryn. com. fr. 68 and Polyzel. fr. 13 means 'tasteless wine'. Other designations can be νεός οἶνος (cf. Ar. Pax 916) and ὁ γλυκός (Alex. fr. 60.1 and 178.14).

The second part, -αγωγός, is a common suffix in word-composition. In fact it is used in formal nouns as ὀλκάδας οἶναγωγούς in fr. 153.4 (cf. Cratin. fr. 396). But here it seems to be a rather pompous invention to qualify βύρσα and similar compounds applied to vulgar things are found in Ar. Lys. 1174 and Crat.com. fr. 15 where see K-A.

βύρσα: it is not frequently found with the meaning of 'wine skin' till later texts (Luc. Lex. 6 and Aristid. Or. 26 (14). 18). In this sense ἄσχος is the most frequent noun. More commonly it means 'skin of animal', 'leather' and was applied in pejorative sense to human skin and even related to designate a person in Ar. Equ. 369 (cf. Taillardat *Images* §66).

The word γλευκαγωγός meaning 'new-wine' could also imply that

the skin is also new, since it seems to have been customary to use new wine skins with the new wine (cf. *Ev. Mat.* 9.17 et al.).

#### Fr. 18

The Scholiast on Luc. *Anach.* 32 p. 170. 24R implies that this expression is used by Pherecrates in metaphorical sense as in Ar. fr. 803 (according to the same source) and Eup. fr. 440. It may mean that they defend themselves by all means, as is suggested by the fact that γέρρα, which from the sense of ἀποσταυροῦνται may mean 'wicker-work' constructions, seem to be a rather weak way of defence.

**γέρροις:** γέρρα is a general term whose exact application and origin is obscure for us (cf. D.A. Amyx *Hesperia* 27 (1958) p. 265). It seems to have designated 'a sort of covering, either from leather or wicker-work' according to K. Kapparis *Demosthenes 59, Against Neaira* diss. Glasgow 1991 p.336; although the gloss of Sud. γ205 seems to favour the wicker-work as a primordial element. In the context of ἀποσταυροῦνται, the immediate reference could be an "oblong shield covered with ox-hide" of Persian or Scythian origin (cf. Hdt. 7. 61, Sch. Luc. 170.11); but its sense expanded to designate any kind of cover, as the coverings of the booths at the Athenian agora (cf. Harp. s.v.), or even the booths themselves (cf. Hesych. γ441· τὰ ἀπὸ καλάμων ἢ παπύρων ἔργαστήρια). Thus as Kapparis *ibid.* pp. 336ff. suggests, it seems to have designated all kind of public fence or protection to form a provisional building or construction.

**ἀποσταυροῦνται:** "to fence off with a palisade" (LSJ s.v.).

It is only found here in passive and the other instances quoted in LSJ are from historians (cf. Thuc. IV 69, VI 101; Xen. *HG* VII 4.32; Plb. IV 56.8 and Plut. *Arat.* 40). It may have been a military term.

#### Fr. 19

**ἀμφιμαλλον:** the several instances quoted by Demiańzuck p.66 show that this adjective was mainly used to designate clothes or carpets with double woollen wool, as LSJ translates it "woolly on both sides". Ael. *Varia Historia* is a late, but interesting instance about the use of this word since he uses it when talking about satyrs and Silenoi: ἐσθῆς δ' ἦν τοῖς Σιληνοῖς ἀμφιμάλλοι χιτῶνες. αἰνίττεται δὲ ἡ στολή τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Διονύσου φυτεῖαν καὶ τὰ τῶν οἴναριδων δάση. Such kind of rough clothing would fit the primitive appearance of the savages in this play.

It is synonymus with other terms like ἀμφιδασύς (cf. *Il.* 15. 309), ἀμφίμιτος and ἀμφίταπος (cf. *Bluemner Tech.* I p. 171).

Fr. 20

**τερθρευόμενος:** the disposition of the text seems to favour to attribute the participle only to Pherecrates. Gaisford on *EM* 753.7 attributes *τερθρευόμενος κενὸν ἑώραται* to Pherecrates and *τερθρεία μέντοι πνοή* to Soph. fr. 333R (that designates some ropes employed for reefing the sails and that were fastened to the ἡλακάτη; cf. Ar. *Equ.* 440).

The participle coming from *τερθρευομαι* is used frequently in later times to mean 'the use of extreme subtlety in the argumentation' and probably is a denominative form of the noun *τερθρεία*. It is generally connected with *τερθρός* 'the rope from the end of a sail-yard (*τέρθρον*) used for reefing' according to Richardson *CIQ* 39 (1945) pp. 59ff.; but its etymology and the origin of the expression are doubtful (cf. Frisk s.v. *τερθρεύομαι*).

The instances of this verb are mainly from Hellenistic times, although we have an example of the form *ὁ τερθρεύς* in Hermipp. fr. 43 as an epithet of Diagoras, maybe a philosopher (cf. K-A ad loc.).

### Ἀνθρωπηρακλῆς

Work added by Demiańczuk to the corpus of Pherecrates. The problem of the number of plays and the relationship between this play and *Ψευδηρακλῆς* has been dealt with in pp. 5f.

This title can be related to the ambiguous status of the figure of Heracles and the two sides of his mythical image, sometimes mainly human or mortal hero, sometimes mainly divine (see Farnell *Gr. Hero Cults and Ideas of immortality* pp. 95ff. Oxford 1921 and Wilamowitz *Der Glaube der Hellenen* II p. 20 Berlin 1931-2). For the figure of Heracles in general in Comedy see fr. 1. 3. *Ἀνθρωπορέστης* by Strattis is a similar title.

Kassel in K-A ad loc. suggests that fr. 166 belongs to this play, see comment on this fragment.

### Fr. 21

This line is a prayer to Zeus and Demiańczuk (following Reitzenstein *Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios* p. XVIII Leipzig/Berlin 1907) attributed this line to Heracles. Although there is no clear evidence, it is an interesting suggestion.

**καλῶς γ'**: it is a colloquial expression that in some cases has a tone of indignant irony (cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 551, Dem. 9. 66 and Denniston *GP* p. 128 for other instances).

**ἀνταποδίδωμι μοι τὴν χάριν**: this verb ἀνταποδίδωμι is only found in this passage of Pherecrates, although it seems to be a variation of the traditional formula: ἀποδίδωμι τὴν χάριν (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1347, *Pax* 761, *Ecc1.* 1048) and means 'give back, return

a favour'. In some contexts this favour could be of sexual kind (cf. Henderson *MM* p. 160) and so it could be meant here if spoken by one of Zeus' lovers.

## Αὐτομόλοι

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The mention of Argos in fr.22 has been connected with the position of neutrality of this city during the Peloponnesian war and thus some suggestions have been made about its date. According to Meineke *CGF* I p. 81 it was written 'non ante Ol. 90.4' and according to Geissler (1925) p. 31 between 428 and 421. But in my opinion I think that the play could have been written any time during the Peloponnesian war, because, on the one hand, the situation of the Argives is never totally clear (cf. on fr. 22); on the other, even if they took this position once, they could be depicted as "people who are always obstructing without doing anything" (as in fr.22), it may have easily become a topic about their character. In fact the position of Argos during the Persian war as described by Hdt. 7.148ff. is also dubious and could be described by the words in fr. 22.

Poll. II 33 on fr. 35 suggests that Strattis wrote a διασκευή of this play for the IV century audience; about it cf. supra p. 7.

The title must refer as usual to the chorus of the play; but there is no evidence about who was meant. Its meaning 'Deserters' can be connected to the war which probably was taking place when this play was performed. The verb αὐτομολέω can also be related to slaves deserting their master (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 21-6). Another instance of the use of this word in the title of a comedy is Epicharmus's Ὀδυσσεὺς αὐτόμολος.

It is possible that the 'deserters' are actually the gods

themselves, as Norwood *Gr. Com.* p. 161 suggests. This interpretation can be supported by fr. 28 which criticizes the lack of proper meat in the sacrifices for the gods, and maybe fr.24, the prayer for snow and fr.33 the reference to the sacrifice of pigs. Gods and humans are portrayed in conflict also in *Ar. Av.* 1170ff.

No definitive conclusion can be reached. Above all fr. 28 is transmitted in a very bad state and we can not know to what extent it has anything to do with the general content of the play, since the metre suggests that it may have belonged to the parabasis of this play.

Other subjects in the fragments are: food in 26 and 32; satire of bad players and music in fr. 29 and 31; bad habits in fr. 27 and 34.

Fr. 22

This fragment is not more than a passing topical remark that makes reference to the Argives' neutral position in a war, and their taking advantage of this position. It was a common joke of Comedy according to Schol. ad *Pax* 476a: αἰνίττεται δὲ εἰς τοὺς Ἀργεῖους ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πολέμῳ ἐπαμφοτερίζοντας διὸ καὶ πολλὰ ἐκωμῶδουντο. The text of Ar. *Pax* 475-7 is as follows: οὐδ' οἶδε γ' εἶλκον οὐδὲν Ἀργεῖοι πάλαι / ἄλλ' ἢ κατεγέλων τῶν ταλαιπωρουμένων / καὶ ταῦτα διχόθεν μισθοφοροῦντες ἄλφιστα. The other text worth mentioning in connection with the Argive position is Thuc. V 28: οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἄριστα ἔσχον τοῖς πᾶσιν, οὐ ξυναράμενοι τοῦ Ἀττικοῦ πολέμου ἀμφοτέροις δὲ μᾶλλον ἔνσπονδοι ὄντες, ἐκκαρπώσαμενοι.

In the Peloponnesian war this neutrality lead Argos to prosperity since it could take advantage of the fear of Spartans that an Argive-Athenian coalition could be formed and that they would attack some members of the Spartan alliance (cf. D. Kagan *The Archidamian war* p. 73 Ithaca/London 1969). This position changed slightly in the times after the Peace of Nicias in favour of Athens, but still it was not definitive mainly because of the fights between oligarchs and democrats (see Kagan *CP* 57 (1962) pp. 209-18). As I have already pointed out in p.131 their position was similar during the Persian war.

1. οὗτοι: it has as emphatic and contemptuous a meaning as οἶδε in Ar. loc.cit. (see also ἐκείνοις in fr. 74.3)

οἱ κακῶς ἀπολούμενοι: frequent expression for "vigorous

abuse" (see Ussher ad *Ecc1.* 1076 and LSJ ἀπόλλυμι B.1).

2. ἐπαμφοτερίζουσ': found only here and Thuc. VIII 85 with this sense, and, according to LSJ s. v., it means 'to be double, play a double game' (cf. Schol. ad *Pax* loc. cit., Phryn. *Praep. soph.* 72. 10 and Thuc. II 9.2: Πελοποννήσιοι μὲν οἱ ἐντὸς Ἴσθμοῦ πάντες πλὴν Ἀργείων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν (τούτοις δὲ ἐς ἀμφοτέρους φιλα ἦν...)).

ἐμποδῶν καθήμενοι: it implies 'obstructing the way' (cf. Ar. *Pax* 473 and Platnauer ad loc. "«s'asseoir dans les jambes des gens» (Mazon) = to thwart efforts"). The absolute construction is unusual; the expression is more frequently used with an infinitive as object.

### Fr. 23

As Taillardat *Rev. Phil.* 33 (1959) p.70 suggests, the poet plays with the sense of some of the words of this fragment which could be understood in a literal and a metaphorical sense (see notes below on μετέωρον, αἱ πτερύγες and ἐμπέσωσιν).

This passage refers to the traditional image of the 'winged ship' that flies towards its destination, generally as a metaphor (cf. *Od.* 11. 125, *Hes. Op.* 628 where see West, fr. 76.7Rz, *Aesch. Pers.* 559, *Ag.* 52, *Eur. IT* 289) or an erotical image (cf. *Eur. Hel.* 147 and 666 and R. Kannicht ad loc. Heidelberg 1969 vol. II).

According to Taillardat loc.cit. the point of this fragment is the substitution of ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν for τοῖς πολεμοῖς in a paradoxical sense. The expression ἐμπέσωσιν ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν would sound 'sinon absurde, du moins étrange' (cf. infra on ἐμπέσωσιν). Another possible interpretation is to take ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν with αἴρουσ' and the ἕως-clausula would be parenthetical.

1. μετέωρον: it is ambiguously placed at the beginning of the line, since it could mean on the one hand: 'in mid air', without touching the ground because someone is raising the ship up (cf. *Ar. Equ.* 1362 and *Pax* 80) or referring to the winds (cf. *Nub.* 264, *Cratin.* fr. 222). And, on the other hand, it is used in nautical terminology as meaning 'on the high sea' (cf. *Thuc.* I 48, IV 26, etc.).

αἱ πτερύγες: this noun generally found in plural is approximately synonymous with τὸ πτέρον, in the sense of 'wings'

and anything 'wing-shaped'. Here again it could designate in metaphorical sense: 'blade of the steering oar' or 'rudder' (cf. Hesych. s.v. πτερύγες and Poll. I 20 πτερύγιον) or with a reference to the sails (cf. πτερόν in Eur. *Hel.* 147).

2. ἐμπέσσωσιν ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν: as I have pointed out already, Taillardat interprets it as a 'paraprosdokian' expression with an unusual substitution at the end.

The verb seems to envisage the action of falling into or upon something or someone with a negative or aggressive intention (cf. the gloss cited in K-A ad loc. which compare it with ἐμπλήσσω, meaning 'to attack') and the fact of 'attacking' the sky seems to be an unexpected expression.

Fr. 24

The passage could be addressed to Zeus as a prayer for snow (cf. Wilamowitz on *Lys.* p.20). This subject can be related to Zeus as the god of the weather. The audience could also relate it to the mythological story of the 'Snow of Gold' over Danae (cf. *Pi. I.* 7 (6).5 and in *AP V* 63 (Aescl.) it is developed into the form of an invocation to Zeus to snow; see also *Pind. O.* VII 49f and *Soph. Ant.* 944-50 about this subject).

1. **νεῖψον**: it seems to be the most suitable reading with the sense 'to snow'. Valesius, according to Dindorf ad *Harp.* p. 168.11, proposes **νίψον** from the verb **νίπτω** or **νίζω** meaning 'to wash', 'to sprinkle with water'.

**τὰ λῆια**: about this word 'roots' in Attic inscriptions see Threatte I p. 371 .

2. **συγκαρξινώθῃ**: from the verb **συγκαρξινώω**, a compound only found here; it means 'to entwine or interlace its roots'. In the simple verbal form *Theophr. HP* I 6.3, *CP* III 21.5 uses it with the meaning 'to spread crab-wise' (LSJ s.v.). According to *Poll.* VII 150, this verb seems to be considered as the technical form for **τὸ ῥιζοῦσθαι τὸν σῖτον**. See *Theophr. CP* 3. 21. 4ff. for the beneficial effects of snow on the seeds.

Fr. 25

This fragment seems to refer to an expression that, according to LSJ s.v. σφίγγω I.2, means: "you tied knots fast, i.e. raised all sorts of difficulties". Dobree *Adv.* I p. 609 interprets it as a metaphorical reference to the relation between Sparta and Athens and the peace attempts during the Peloponnesian war. Kaibel, *apud K-A*, sees it as a reference to the Argives in fr. 22. Both suggestions are possible.

The repetition of harsh consonantal sounds in στραγγ- and -σφίγγ- may be deliberate.

στραγγαλίδας: meaning 'knot', is only found here and in *Stratt.* fr.51: οὐ σχοινί', οὐδὲ στραγγαλίδες εἶσι.

Fr. 26

The fragment in trochaic trimeter can be understood either as a description of the activities of 'a woman' in collective terms, who stays at home preparing meals for themselves or for their family; or in a particular case, as the preparation of a meal for the guests of a very poor banquet (cf. Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 260). Kaibel apud K-A understands it from the first point of view and explains it within the context of war which may have been the subject of this play: "homines per belli tempora domo absentes".

I think that Conti Bizzarro's doubts about the text are due to his interpretation. He suggests that λέκιθον ... ἢ φακῆν are not real alternative dishes and proposes, *ibid.* p. 261, λέκιθον ἔψουσά <τε> φακῶν, following a suggestion of Schweighäuser. But the text does not need any modification if we understand it in the first sense: 'the woman of each one of us' is preparing gruel or lentil-soup indicating in this case different kinds of dishes, probably cooked by different women.

This description falls within the general ideology and probably practice of the normal Athenian family of the V century in which the activities and general understanding of the woman's (more exactly the Athenian woman's) role was restricted to the house activities and even more strictly to the precinct of the house. The generalization about their role is clearly conceptualized by Dem. 59. 122. The activity of cooking was frequently associated with women in Greek Comedy, as Dohm *Mageiros* p. 67 explains. About the role of women in the

fragments of Pherecrates see p. 62.

1. ἡμῶν ἐκάστω: the speaker of these lines can be, according to this expression, the chorus or one character speaking about two or more persons. It is not clear if we must understand this expression together with the noun (the wife of each of us) or with the verb as referring to the persons for whom the meal is prepared ('for each guest').

λέκιθον: noun that designates a kind of 'gruel of pulse or cereals' (LSJ s. v.). In the text that has come down to us it is difficult to distinguish it from the feminine form ἡ λέκιθος that means 'yolk of an egg' (above all Gal. VI 782 distinguishes both dishes, cf. further Chantraine *Dict. étym.* and H. Frisk s. v.)

The first meaning seems to be clearly the one of this fragment since we have the word ἔψουσ' 'boiling'. The following instances can be found: Ar. *Lys.* 562, *Ecc1.* 1177 and Pl. 427 (in the compound of λεκιθόπολιν), Canth. fr. 13 and Alex. fr. 260. The texts suggest that it was a normal kind of meal (see also on φακῆν).

φακῆν: another kind of soup, made from lentils. As MacDowell ad *Vesp.* 811 says, "this was regarded as a homely treat, enjoyed by ordinary people though despised by rich ones (*Wealth* 192, 1004, fr. 23)".

2. ὀπιᾶσ': this word can refer to several methods of cooking, as LSJ s. v. suggest: "hence it appears that ὀπιᾶν was used of all kinds of 'cooking by means of dry heat', opp. ἔψω (boil in water) which never appears in Hom. whose heroes ate only roast meat".

Though perhaps it is not meant here, a secondary sense can be found in *Lys.* 839, cf. Henderson *MM* p.175 and Taillardat *Images* §302.

**ὄρφανόν:** the meaning of this adjective in these lines is puzzling and several answers have been given:

- Meineke *FCG* II p.263: "ὄρφανόν τὰρ(χίου) dicit salsamentum nullis condimentis apparatus" though Kock ad loc. objects to it "id dici poterat τὰρ(χίου) ὄρφανόν ἀρτυμάτων (cf. *Pl. Alcib.* 2. 147a), sine genetivo dici non poterat".

- Some scholars have suggested some textual changes: Bergk apud *FCG* V. LII, ὄρφον ἢ τ' and Kock ad loc. ἔριφον ἢ τ'. But none of them seem to fit the meaning of this fragment that refer to very simple kind of food: Bergk's suggestion is a very expensive kind of fish and Kock's proposal 'kid' is generally related in Comedy to banquets and special meals.

- R. Renehan *St. Gr. Texts* pp. 78-9 suggests, 'it is further ὄρφανόν, an "orphan"; that is to say, it is not accompanied by its "parents" (full-grown fish). It is quite alone. Each man is to expect as his portion a small fish -and one only". Probably he intends to add a further detail to the poverty described in the former line.

- G. Rehrenböck p. 240 suggests that "die Lösung des Rätsels bietet ehre das Verbum ἀναμένει: die Frau wartet geduldig auf ihren Mann, während sie die Speisen zubereitet: solange er aber nicht im Hause weil, ist das τὰρ(χίου) ein ὄρφανόν ('verlassen, unbeachtet'). Derselbe Gebrauch von ὄρφανός (cf. *LSJ*) findet sich bei Herond. 3. 15: ἡ δέλτος ὄρφανῆ κεῖται (cf.

Cunningham p. 107 ad locum: "neglected") und Epigr. ap. Paus. I 13. 3: ὀρφανὰ κεῖται ... σκύλα- Auch ein οἶκος kann ὀρφανός sein, wenn der Mann fehlt und nur die 'mannesmutige' Frau darin waltet: Soph. fr. 857 N<sup>2</sup> = 943Radt: κατ' ὀρφανὸν γὰρ οἶκον ἀνδρόφρων γυνή".

I think that any of the interpretations of Meineke, Renehan or Rehrenböck can be correct. Meineke's has the advantage that we do not know how the text continued, but it is possible that another word in genitive depended on ὀρφανόν. According to Renehan's, τὰριχίον is a very common dish and the fact of having only a small piece for a meal is a touch of irony about extreme poverty. And finally, according to Rehrenböck's, the irony could be not only in the fact that the small fish is abandoned by his father, but also in the reference to the woman's loneliness, waiting for her husband.

In the context of the last sentence, I think that this line could be understood in the same sense as other fragments with a 'para prosdokian' at the end, (cf. fr.2 and 13, see p. 36 about this kind of joke in Pherecrates). The topical description of the woman cooking at home ends with a reference to her own loneliness in the image of an 'orphan dried fish'. In this case maybe we could speculate that there is a reference to her state of sexual eagerness, if the dried fish could be understood in a secondary sense, as ὀπτᾶω is (cf. *Lys.* 839).

τὰριχίον: diminutive of the noun τὰριχος, that means "dried or smoked fish" (LSJ). Fish was a very common food of daily life in Athens (cf. Besnier *D-S* IV 1022) and especially this kind was

very cheap. In the metaphorical sense Aristophanes uses it to designate "stockfish" (cf. Taillardat *Images* 8434).

According to Besnier op.cit. p. 1025 "on servait les τάρχη comme entrées, et on les mangeait, en général crus, après les avoir fait tremper dans l'eau douce, pour les desaler, ou dans de l'eau de mer, pour leur donner au contraire plus de goût, on les assaisonnait, selon les cas, de moularde, de vinaigre, de muria". There were several kinds of τάρχη and some of them were also baked as in our passage (cf. Besnier op.cit. p.1023).

Fr. 27

This fragment attributed to Pherecrates by the codex Berol. of Photius (cf. α1638 and fr.4 Demiańczuk) refers to a verb with clear erotic innuendo: ἀνὴρ ἀναρριπίζεται, also attested in Zon. *Lex.* 206 and Hesych. α 4946. It means the activity of "bursting into flames" (cf. Henderson *MM* p. 178). In Aristophanes it is only found in the simple form ῥιπίζω in *Eccl.* 842, *Ran.* 360, which Henderson loc.cit. considers to have erotic connotations; but his assumption seems to be derived from our text. In these two passages of Aristophanes the secondary sense can not be stated so clearly as Henderson intends. The former one could have some obscene sense, but only insofar as the activity of cooking provides many metaphors and the sense can be conveyed by the connexion with the former sentence with immediate erotic references (cf. αἱ μυροπώλιδες); but the term can refer simply to a method of cooking with the help of a fan that the Sch. ad loc. identifies with ὀπιᾶν (about it cf. on fr. 26.2). In the latter text it is within the political context and it may be too far-fetched to try to find secondary allusions, although again it could not be totally ruled out.

The similarity of the beginnings of the two words may be worth noticing.

Fr. 28

This fragment is full of textual problems that are difficult to solve in detail, although the main subject, the complaint about the scarcity of food for the Gods in sacrifices, is clear.

This subject became a topic throughout Greek Comedy and Burkert *Homo necans* p.7 says: "the rite was objectionable, and was already felt to be so early on, because it so clearly benefits man. Is the god 'to whom' the sacrifice is made any more than a transparent excuse for festive feasting? All he gets are the bones, the fat and the gall bladders. Hesiod says that the crafty Prometheus, the friend of mankind, caused this to be so in order to deceive the gods, and the burning of bones became a standard joke in Greek Comedy".

For example we find several variations of this joke in Ar. Av. 190ff. (one of the advantages of building a city in mid air is to get the savoury steam that comes from the burning of the sacrifices, or in l. 1515ff. Prometheus mentions it as the first complaint of the Gods about the construction of the city), in Pl. 1180 a priest grumbles about the lack of sacrifices after the healing of Plutus; see also Eub. fr. 94 and 127 (see Hunter on Eub. p. 189 and 226 respectively), fr. adesp. 1205K, Men. *Sam.* 399-402, fr. 264 K8-T and *Dysc.* 451ff. (where see Handley).

The passage in anapaestic tetrameters may have belonged to the agon of the play (cf. Whittaker p. 187 and Gelzer *Ag.* p.185). It seems likely from the introductory words of Clement that the speaker is a god (or gods, as is suggested by the pronouns: ἡμῖν in l. 5 in contrast with ὑμῶν in l.2 and the second person plural

of the passage). In other texts we have the same complaint put in the mouth of a normal person in the form of a social criticism as Knemon in Men. *Dysc.* loc.cit. and a priest in Ar. *Pl.* loc. cit.

The speaker seems to begin by explaining all the details about a sacrifice and suddenly draws attention towards special moments of this ritual: the ways of handling thigh-bones, groins and the hind part of the back which are the most interesting parts of the sacrifice for them. Finally he compares himself to dogs (who also receive the left-overs only). At the end he shows the last act of the humans: to cover this shameful offering with other food and things (of less value because they are not real meat, the text seems to indicate).

The description of the different parts of a sacrifice can be understood from a metaphorical point of view also with a marked sexual implication (see Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) pp. 262-3 and *infra* on 1.3. At a linguistic level the passage also has terms belonging to proper sacrificial language (cf. ἀποκρίετε 1.1, τὸ νομιζόμενον 1.2 and θυλήμασι 1.6).

1. Hermann<sup>1</sup> apud Runkel (while Hermann<sup>2</sup> means his edition of Aesch. II p.101, 1852 according to K-A's app.crit.) proposed to supplement the gap at the end of the line with τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, a suggestion perhaps supported by the mention of τῶν ἱερῶν at the end of the words of Clem. Alex. *Strom.* VII 30.3 and by Schol. on Ar. *Pl.* 1185. Certainly the first offering was awarded to the priest and on some occasions it was seen as a part of the offerings to the gods (cf. Ziehen *RE* XVIII 1. 619-20, Ph.

Legrand *D-S* s. v. *Sacerdos* pp. 941ff. and Stengel *Hermes* 31 (1896) pp. 642-3).

**ἀποκρίνεται:** it designates the tearing apart of the victim and suggests also the distribution of each part to the different attendants of a sacrifice (K-A refer to Pl. *Plt.* 302c for the sense of 'tearing apart', but *Tim.* 73c is interesting as well, because within the context of the explanation of the human body, this term is used in relation to the parts especially assigned to the Gods).

2. **τὸ νομιζόμενον:** it refers to the part of the sacrifice devoted to a special group: it could be gods or priests, but it could have a more general meaning in our text (cf. LSJ s. v. νομίζω). In the first case it had some proper names like θεομοίρα for Gods and ἱερῶσύνα or γέρη for priests (see K-A for other references about this distribution of food and Ziehen loc. cit.). They all mean portions of the sacrificed animal.

**ὑμῶν αἰσχύνῃ· τὸ κατ' εἰπεῖν:** the reading of the codices is clearly corrupt and the following proposals have been suggested:

- <πρώτοις> ὑμῶν <εἴτ'> (αἰσχύνῃ τὸ κατεῖπεν), Hermann'

- <χᾶπειθ'> ὑμῶν (αἰσχύνῃ <τοῖ> τὸ κ.), Hermann<sup>2</sup> (cf. Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 262).

- <χᾶπειθ'> ὑμῶν <εἴτ'> (αἰσχύνῃ τὸ κ.), Staehlin *Clemens Alexandrinus Stromata VII* 30.3 Leipzig 1905-36.

- <χᾶπειθ'> ὑμῶν (αἰσχύνῃ τοῦτο καὶ εἰπεῖν), Kaibel apud K-A ad loc.

The text, as it is transmitted, seems to mean 'with shame on yourselves' and then the other sentence would introduce the

description of the ritual that takes place in the following lines.

Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.262 points out that it is a 'marca escrologica' following the second suggestion of Hermann. The speaker is ashamed to explain it and this warning may support the suggestion of the obscene implications of the words. At the end of this passage, the 'humans' are also ashamed (cf. 1.6 αἰσχυνόμενοι); about other acts that can produce shame, cf. Hdt. I 10 and Ar. *Eccl.* 484.

3. In this line Pherecrates describes the different parts involved in a sacrifice to the gods. The change of tone has been interpreted in two ways: beginning with οὐ (the manuscripts' text), as an interrogative/exclamative sentence in which the speaker accuses the listener of their way of making sacrifices in a rhetorical way, or changing οὐ into εὖ (as Stählin does accepting the conjecture of Jackson, see K-A's app.crit.), like a direct affirmation.

Some of the words used in this text could be ambiguous. Above all μηρῶ and βουβώνων in 1.2, ὀσφύν and σφόνδυλον in 1.3 at a literal level describe the different parts of a victim and the usual way of dividing it for a sacrifice. But at a secondary sense they are chosen in a way that the whole text seems to be implying some kind of sexual reference. The text, nonetheless, ends with a simple return to the sacrificial activities of human beings, perhaps in a purposefully anticlimactic way. The same ambiguous references can be found in Ar. *Pax* 1039 and Eub. fr. 127.

The end of the line seems to have a lacuna, above all if we do not keep the word κομιδῆ (see ad loc.). Perhaps the best solution is that of Hermann: κρέα πάντα that would give an object to περιλέψαντες, understanding τῷ μηρῷ as a genitive depending on it.

τῷ μηρῷ: accepted by all the editors, is a conjecture of Sylburg instead of τῷ μηρῷ in the manuscripts.

This part is commonly found in the descriptions of sacrifices since Homer, but generally designated with the noun, τὰ μηρία, which only meant the thigh-bones of the animals. The word also can designate the human limbs (see Eub. fr. 127), and in this sense it could contrive immediate homoerotic implications to the audience.

περιλέψαντες: from the verb περιλέπω is conjecture of Scaliger that means "strip off all round" (LSJ). The reading of the manuscripts is περιλάψαντες from the verb περιλάπτω. The reason for this change is mainly that this latter term is only found here according to LSJ s.v. and its meaning seems to be unsuitable, since it would mean "to suck or lick all around".

In my opinion both verbs could be possible. On one hand, the verb from λάπτω could have the following implications: it is related in *Il.* 16. 161 to the licking of the wolves and in Aristophanes a metaphor for greediness (cf. Taillardat *Images* §155). The similarity of both words could be in favour of this ambiguity: the metaphorical word (περιλάπτω) has substituted the technical one (περιλέπω) in order to achieve a comic purpose. On the other, περιλέπω besides being the term expected to mean 'to

strip off all around', it could imply to become in a state of sexual excitation, as Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.262 notes (cf. Eup. fr. 465, Alex. fr. 50, Mnesim. fr. 4.18 and see Henderson *MM* pp. 167-8).

{κομιδῆς}: Meineke and other scholars after him, delete this word from the text for the repetition in l.4 where it could make better sense and also for metrical reasons: with κομιδῆς βουβώνων finishes the last metron with - - - instead of the normal way of an anapaest: υ υ - -. But some examples of ending the seventh biceps with all spondei are found, as Cratin. fr. 143.2, Crat. com. fr. 19.1 and 4, Philyll. fr. 12.1 (see Steph. Byz. ad Ar. fr. 548).

Perhaps taking into account the state of the text and that l.2 presents a gap I think to reject this adverb is not certain, because it makes good sense with the participle and also it stresses the greediness of the humans to collect all the possible meat, while at the same time works towards the rhetorical sententiousness of this fragment and in general of speeches belonging to the parabasis or the agon (cf. Ar. Av. 703, 704 and 705 with a polyptoton or in 717-8 wher πρὸς is repeated several times, in Pax 764 we find a climactic mention of adjectives beginning with π).

βουβώνων: designates 'groins', it is found only in plural here and in Luc. *Tim.* 56. Henderson *MM* p. 125 suggests that it implies 'testicles' following the analysis of the verb βουβωνιᾶν. It is possible and it would suit the context of a secondary implication I have proposed; but unfortunately there is little

evidence about it and the text of Luc. *Tim.* 56, simply says that the water reached them to the groins. Maybe further implications could be inferred easily, but one can not say for certain.

4. **τὴν ὄσφυν:** it is a common element in the description of sacrifices in the extant literature (cf. Hdt. 2.40.2, *Aesch. PV* 496, Ar. *Pax* 1053, *Vesp.* 225. 740, *Lys.* 964, fr. adesp. 1205K, Arist. *HA* 493a 21-4 and *Men. Dysc.* 451). *E. M.* p. 636.23 describes it as follows: ὄσφυν λέγεται τὸ τρίτον μέρος τῆς ῥάχεως· ἡ γὰρ ῥάχις τρεῖς ἐπωνυμίας ἔχει· καὶ ἡ μὲν πρώτη καλεῖται αὐχὴν, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα ἰξύη, ἡ δὲ τρίτη ὄσφυν and it was characterized with powerful qualities as a place where the marrow was found (cf. Pl. *Tim.* 73c-74b). The ὄσφυν ἄκρα "doubtless includes the tail; this may once have been regarded as peculiarly endowed with life and therefore valuable (H. Wagenvoort 'Zur magischen Bedeutung des Schwanzes' *Serta Phil. Aenospontana* pp. 237ff., Schol. *Aesch. PV* 196, εὐκίνητος γὰρ οὔσα καὶ σπέρματα ἔχουσα θύεται τοῖς θεοῖς) but to fourth century eyes it looked "a scurvy offering", according to Gomme-Sandbach on *Men.* p. 206. In consequence both terms ὁ ὄσφυν and ἡ κέρκος, can be understood, in their secondary sense, as phallus (cf. *Ach.* 785 and *Eub.* fr. 127).

**λοιπὸν:** cf. *Men. Sam.* 404 λοιπὸν γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦτο μοι, passage that develops the same subject as our fragment.

**σφόνδυλον:** K-A seem to prefer the correction of Meineke (cf. *CGF* V 1 p.26) who, following the literary (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1488) and epigraphic testimony, suggests that σφόνδυλον was used in Attic instead of the Ionic form attested in the manuscripts of this text: σπόνδυλον. This correction seems to be supported by

the fact that Pherecrates was qualified as ὁ ἄτιχώτατος in test. 10. Yet some instances of literary use of dialectical terms are notable in Pherecrates (cf. p. 26) and maybe we can not rule out its use in here.

The original meaning is "vertebra", but it seems to have been used here as a collective noun for 'back bone' (cf. Ar. loc.cit.). This sense is found in plural in Eur. *Ph.* 1413 or with the restricted meaning of 'neck' in Eur. *El.* 841. I think that the irony can be also in the implication that only 'a vertebra' of the victim is left in sacrifices for the gods.

5-6. This line is especially difficult because its problems are not only in the construction with the two ὥσπερ, but also with the word ῥινήσαντες.

On the one hand, it seems that most of the editors of comic fragments think that it comes from ῥινάω, the denominative verbal form of ῥινή, that means "file, rasp" (LSJ). But LSJ and the etymological dictionaries (Frisk and Chantraine s. v. ῥίς) tend to think that the meaning is "to lead by the nose", and according to them there would be another instance of this expression in Men. fr. 698Kδ; in this case the meaning would be, according to the source of the fragment of Menander: "to be cheated by the smell".

On the other hand, the metre is not complete and several modifications have been suggested: Hermann<sup>2</sup> proposes to insert <ῥινή> after the first ὥσπερ and to seclude [καί] after the second one. Kock eliminates the first ὥσπερ (already suspect for Meineke) and substitutes it by τοῖς ὀδοῦσιν. Both of them understand the participle according to the first sense. If we

understand the participle according to the first sense. If we follow the second interpretation, the expression could be understood as parenthetical with a sort of irony in it: "as you have misled us by the nose" (cf. Eust. *in Il.* 998.30 δοκεῖ λέγεσθαι ἐπὶ ἀπάτης τὸ ῥινᾶν ὡς ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν δι' ὀσφρήσεως ἀπατωμένων ἢ καὶ ἀπατώντων) and the repetition of ὥσπερ would be explained by Kaibel apud K-A: "duplex comparatio perapta videtur dei indignabundi orationi".

The punctuation of these two lines is debatable. Meineke and Kock end 1.5 in an interrogation, and Meineke also 1.6 (while Edmonds *FAC I* p. 217 only in 1.6). The reason for it is that they keep the reading οὐ in 1.3. K-A, otherwise, keep an assertive tone, which I would support at least for 1.6.

**νέμεθ'**: the meaning of this verb is not totally clear. It could mean: "to allot, to distribute" (cf. LSJ s.v. A I), "you distribute the vertebra left-over for us as for the dogs". Or "consider, think" (LSJ s.v. A III 3), "you think that this vertebra is left for us as for the dogs also".

**τοῖς κυσίν**: for a similar comparison, cf. Com. Adesp. fr. 1205. 4K.

**θυλήμασι**: perhaps the best of a series of emendations (see Kock's app.crit.). It embraces all kind of things especially cakes, grains, wine and oil, that are offered in a sacrifice. Pherecr. fr.247 denominates them θυμέλη where see ad loc. See also Ar. *Pax* 1040, Pl.com. fr. 188.18 and Telecl. fr.35.

Fr. 29

The subject of this fragment is music as in fr. 31. In the present text someone's singing is compared to a crown of nettles. This comparison would have more strength, if there had been a musical performance before these words and thus it could be placed within the scene of a symposium. However, τὸ κακῶς ᾄδοντος ἀκούειν in l. 1 seems to be a general remark about singing (cf. Ar. fr. 225.2). About music in Pherecrates, cf. pp. 60ff.

The anapaestic tetrameter is associated with the agon and Whittaker p. 187 and Gelzer *Ag.* p. 185 (cf. Kassel *Festschr. Risch* (1968) pp. 559ff.) suggest that this is a comment appropriate to a buffoon in the middle of a literary contest.

1. νῆ τῆν Δήμητρ': this exclamation is restricted to men in comedy as Henderson ad *Lys.* 271 suggests, quoting J. Werres *Die Beteuerungsformeln in der attischen Komödie* pp. 45-6 Diss. Bonn 1936.

ἀν(ια)ρον: in Comedy only found here and in Ar. *Pl.* 561. It is frequent in poetry (cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1314) and prose (cf. *Lys.* 25. 27), mainly with regard to the idea that Theogn. 872 sententiously states (using the nominal form ἀν(ι)η): τοῖς δ' ἐχθροῖς ἀν(ι)η καὶ μέγα πῆμ' ἔσομαι.

<γ'>: this particle, suggested by Kuster and accepted by K-A as well as Meineke, would give an emphatic sense to the verb ἀν(ια)ρὸν (cf. K-A's app. crit. and Denniston *GP* pp. 120ff.). Dindorf's proposal, ἄρ', is not so easy to insert, but it would give a satisfactory sense with an optative of wish following it

(cf. Denniston *ibid.* p. 36).

2. ἀκαλήφαις: name of a plant 'nettle' or a sea-fish "sea-anemone". Both meanings in Ar. *Vesp.* 884 are related to the metaphorical sense of "sting, prickliness" (cf. MacDowell *ad loc.* and Taillardat *Images* §364). It is quite common in comedy, e.g. *Equ.* 422, *Lys.* 549, *Eup.* fr. 68.

The first sense is more likely because of the word ἐστεφανῶσθαι, being crowned with a branch of a plant (for the several kinds of plants and flowers used see Ganszyniec *RE* XI 2. 1592-3), was a normal custom in the Greek world and it was related to different moments of daily life: wedding, death, agon, cult, symposium, oracles (cf. Ganszyniec *op.cit.* 1594ff.). Pherecrates uses it in a metaphorical sense to indicate that the pain (ἀν(α)πον) caused by hearing someone playing bad music is harder than the pain caused by a crown of nettles.

Fr. 30

The double genitive of the sentence together with the *ἐκ* plus genitive has caused confusion. It seems that syntactically the verb ὄζειν governs the genitive μελικήρας and *ἐκ* plus genitive expresses origin, while in the comparison αἰγιδίων would be a genitive of origin without *ἐκ* (cf. Hdt. III 23: ὄζειν ἀπ' αὐτῆς [κρήνης] ὡσεὶ ἴων and see Poultney *The Genitive Case in Aristophanes* p.94 Baltimore 1936). The translation of this interpretation would be: "to smell honey-cake of his mouth is as to smell the smell of kids".

The sense of the sentence is disputed and two suggestions had been made.

Meineke and Kock ad loc. accepted Dobree's explanation ad Ar. *Pl.* 1021, p.128: "dicit alicui non minus suavam animam esse quam capellis, illas autem bene olentibus herbis vesci notum est". But it is not a satisfactory explanation, especially because a male-goat is notable for its unbearable stinking smell.

Daléchamp (apud Schweighaeuser *Anim. in Athen.* VII p. 572 Argentoratum 1805) and Toup ad Schol. Theocr. 5.59 (*Curae Posteriores* (1772) p. 35) suggested that this passage refers to this stinking smell (cf. Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 264 and K-A ad loc.). It is supported by Ar. *Pl.* 294-5 and also the verb τραγίζειν (cf. Galen. XIV 57), τραγίου ὄζειν meaning πνεῖν (in *AP* IX 368, XI 140) and the compound τραγομάσχαλος in Ar. *Pax* 811 cf. *Ach.* 852 (cf. Richter *RE X A* (1972) 430. 65).

This sentence would be suitable to the context where someone is checking someone else's mouth in order to know the food eaten

(cf. Eup. fr.7) and exclaims that the smell of honey-cake is as strong as the smell of kids.

**τῶν αἰγιδίων:** diminutive of the noun for 'kid' ὁ αἴξ. In literary texts it is only found here and in Antiph. fr. 21.4 and in inscriptions, cf. LSJ s.v. It seems that the ending -ίων was a popular way of strengthening the diminutive (see Schwyzer *GrGr* I p. 471).

**ῥζειν:** cf. supra about its construction with genitive.

**μελικήρας:** hapax of Pherecrates. The sense suggested by Athen. XIV 648c is synonymous with μελικηρίς, a kind of honey cake.

Fr. 31

The most likely explanation of this fragment is that it refers to the new musical movement that was introduced in Athens with new rhythms and instruments. It is a common place in Aristophanes (cf. Taillardat *Images* §784ff.) and it seems that the same happens in Pherecrates (cf. fr. 155.16 and 23), and it may have been a joke in common with other comic poets. It attempts to describe the innovations in the traditional mode-system that had great influence in the musical side of the poetic composition and also in the words. These changes were firstly felt in the dithyrambic genre. Here the image recalls the ups and downs in a mountain-path and at a metaphorical level in the change in the scales of the music.

**ἀτραπιζοντες:** verb invented by Pherecrates with clear comic intentions from the noun ὁ ἀτραπός, that means 'path, especially mountain path'. The image recalls the expression μύρμηκος ἀτραποῦς in Ar. *Thesm.* 100 or in Pherecr. fr. 155. 16 ἐκτραπέλους μυρμηκιάς. They compare the music of the dithyrambic poets with the ant-paths. One of them, Philoxenus was called ὁ Μύρμηξ (cf. Sud. φ393).

**διὰ πασῶν:** in musical terminology it designates the different scales of Greek music. It is called καλλίστην συμφωνίαν by Pl. *R.* 432a. 3 (cf. Mach. fr. 2.11, Arist. *Probl.* 920a 27 and Hipp. *Vict.* I 8).

Fr. 32

Another example of anapaestic tetrameter catalectic, as in fr. 28-33. It is also related to food as fr. 26 and, to some extent, fr. 28 and 33 that deal with sacrifice.

**τούγγαριον**: diminutive of ὄψον. As in the case of αἰγιδίων in fr. 30, it is a form probably colloquial mainly found in Comedy (cf. Athen. IX 395 where he quotes most of the fragments we have with this word).

Following Athen. loc.cit. the noun could have two meanings: on one hand, "fish" the chief delicacy in Athens, and, on the other, "tasty side-dishes". The first meaning seems to be that of this fragment. However, Edmonds *FAC* I p. 219 translates it as 'this little toss-up'.

**τούτῃ**: the demonstrative pronoun with the deictic particle -ί can point at something that is on stage or something that has just happened or been mentioned (cf. fr. 155. 20).

**παρέθηκε**: frequently used of meals; cf. fr. 125, LSJ s.v. παρατίθημι 1b "set before, serve up".

Fr. 33

The tone of this fragment is not clear. Some speculative suggestions have been made: making it a question, according to Daléchamp (apud K-A); adding <μὰ Δί'> at the beginning according to Headlam *CIR* 13 (1899) p.5 or <οἷς> according to Edmonds *FAC* I p.218 n.2 for haplography. Maybe Stratt. fr. 1.19 "οὐδ' ἄρα θύεις ῥηξιχθον'; "οὐκ", ἔφη, "ἔγώ" supports the first proposal, for it could be a usual form of negative question. The metre is anapaestic tetrameter.

**γαλαθηνόν:** adjective that designates a young tender animal in opposition to a full grown-up one τέλειος. In Pherecrates fr. 49 we have another example of this word to designate χοιρία (see also Crat.com. fr. 1).

**ἕν θύειν:** the sacrifice of a pig (generally a small one, cf. Ar. *Pax* 374 and Sch. ad loc.) was a ritual commonly related to the earthly goddesses Demeter and Kore (cf. W. Burkert *Homo necans* pp. 256ff.) in the Eleusinian mysteries and related to their initiation rites (cf. Ar. *Ran.* 337-8); but it may be offered to other gods (in Cos to Dionysos, cf. Hicks *JHS* 9 (1888) p.335).

The sacrifice of a pig has erotic overtones in *Ach.* 792 and it may be true that it was totally forbidden to devote it to Aphrodite (cf. Orth *RE* II A.1 811ff.); but in Antiph. fr. 124 it is sacrificed for her in Cyprus and in Argos according to Athen. I 95f and Eust. *in Il.* p. 853.34 (see further Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 200a).

Fr. 34

The line seems to belong to the parabasis of the play, since the Eupolidean metre is usually found in this context. Its content may be similar to that of fr. 2 and as Kock ad loc. says "poeta mollitiem et luxuriam civium videtur castigasse" (see Eup. fr. 385. 3 in connexion with Alcibiades).

About the problems of this gloss (Phot. α238=Sud. α301) and the relation of this fragment to fr. 178 (mentioned in the same source), see Rehrenböck pp.241-4 and Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) pp.264-6.

**ἀγορὰν πεπληθέναι:** the earliest instance of the perfect form of this verb. "When the market place is full" is the normal way of referring to the middle of the morning (cf. LSJ s.v. ἀγορά IV). For criticism of drinking before this time of day, cf. Baton fr. 5. 3-4 (in connexion with the activities of young people at dawn): καὶ πότους ἐωθινοῦς / πίνει διὰ σέ νῦν.

Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.266 tries to explain it as a reference to the Assembly-time at dawn; but the Athenian Assembly met in the Pnyx, not in the Agora as in Homer. In Ar. *Ach.* 19-21 the young people stay in the Agora talking instead of going to the Assembly.

Fr. 35

This phrase with the verb κουριάω is found for the first time in Greek Literature in Pherecrates and in later Hellenistic Literature (cf. e.g. Plut. *Alc.* 23, Luc. *Lex.* 10). About similar expressions see on ἐν χρῶ. About long hair in Attic comedy, see on κομῆται in fr. 15.

**κουριῶντας:** from the denominative verb κουριάω, it means according to Poll. II 33 δέομαι κουρᾶς, 'to need a short hair cut'. This formation is common in Greek comedy (cf. Peppler (1921) pp. 154-6). Verbs with the ending -ιάω can denote sickness (cf. Eup. fr. 467 μαστιγιᾶν or Lys. 715 βινητιᾶω; see also K-B II p. 264).

**ἐν χρῶ:** 'head-shaven', was a fairly common phrase in ancient Greek. It can be found in other similar and probably parallel expressions: ἐν χρῶ κείρειν (Hdt. 4. 175) or ἐν χρῶ κεκαρμένοι (Xen. HG I 7.8).

Fr. 36

πανσουδί: or, according to Meineke πανσουδί, is used here by Pherecrates with the meaning παντελῶς (cf. Sud. π768) since, in words of Goodhart *The Eighth book of Thucydides' History* p.2 London 1893: "it would appear that the real sense of the latter part of the compound (συ-, σεύομαι, σύδην) was lost, and the word became a synonym for παντελῶς".

It was the Attic form of the epic adverb πανσουδίη (cf. *Il.* 2.12 and in lyric, Eur. *Troad.* 797; see further K-B II p.303β), but the lexicographers already doubted about its sense: πανστρατίη or πανορμεί (cf. Eust. *in Il.* 166. 14-19).

The form used by Pherecrates is also doubtful. R. Tosi *Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci* p. 152 Bologna 1988 discusses the reading of the manuscripts of different lexicographers. He is favourable to the assimilated form, insofar as Poll. VI 169 quotes it in assimilation in amongst a list of adverbs beginning with παν- without assimilation.

Especially if the word was common in spoken Attic as a synonym for παντελῶς, one would expect that the assimilation to be the form used by Pherecrates.

## Γρᾶες

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

It can be assumed from the title that the chorus of this play was formed by old women, γρᾶες, noun which usually has negative connotations (cf. fr. 122). Yet the general content of this play is impossible to substantiate from the scanty evidence of the fragments.

One possible subject may have been a women's revolt like that of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, (cf. fr. 39 and Ehrenberg *The people of Ar.* p. 157). It seems to have mentioned some old-fashioned garments in order to depict women surrounded by some kind of excessive luxury (cf. fr. 41-2), and perhaps there is reference to some love affair (cf. fr.38). If we accept that fr. 185 belongs to here, the revolt may have been preceded or concluded by a sudden rejuvenation of the chorus, which seems to be a topic in plays with 'old men' as main characters; cf. Ar. *Γῆρας* (PCG III 2 p.89), *Equ.* 1316ff., and the comic reversal of the 'young' Philocleon in *Vesp.* 1333ff.

Plautus' *Anus* may have followed this traditional image of the old lecherous women; see further about this tradition, Grassman *Die erotische Epode des Horaz* p.14 Hildesheim Munich 1960.

Fr. 37

The fragment is a dialogue between two persons about a third one: Smicythion. The main point of it seems to be a joke about him being a 'glutton' and also a 'mercenary' (see on 1.3; the figure of a soldier and a glutton is identified in Eup. fr. 35 with Peisandros; cf. Storey *Phoenix* 44 (1990) p. 16). It is possible to identify Smicythion with a person living in Athens according to Ar. *Vesp.* 401; but as we will see on Σμικυθίων 1.1 it is not sure and he may have been a character in the play, or a real person who is abused in the terms I have just mentioned.

1. σὺ δ' οὐδὲ θᾶλλον: colloquial phrase, frequent in Comedy (poetical language would have delayed the σὺ δ' probably after the vocative according to Dover I pp. 59-60). On the one hand, σὺ δ' must imply an address to someone on stage or among the audience (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 262, *Vesp.* 157). On the other, οὐδὲ θᾶλλον is a common expression in which οὐδὲ is an "emphatic negative 'not at all'" according to Denniston *GP* p. 197, and in this sense mainly with adverbs, cf. LSJ s.v. 3. In this case it means 'make haste and ...' (LSJ s.v. ταχύς).

Other instances of this expression are Ar. *Pax* 1126, *Av.* 1324, Eup. fr. 273, Cratin. fr. 129 and K-A ad loc. About being a parasite and providing himself with food very quickly, see Alex. fr. 205.2.

Σμικυθίων: Usual Attic name. The first words seem to imply that this vocative is addressed to a person on stage and thus a character; although the text may have been a joke played on a

well known personage of Athenian life perhaps even sitting among the audience, since in Ar. *Vesp.* 401 this name denotes a sycophant (see also Ar. *Pax* 46 and Neil on *Equ* 969).

**ἐπισιτιεῖ**: this verb originally means 'to supply food for an army'; but Athen. VI 246f mentions it as used in the same sense as παρασίτος or παρασιτέω in later Literature (cf. Nesselrath *Lukians Parasitendialog* pp. 98-9). The word ἐπισίτιος is also found in Crat.com. fr. 37, Ar. fr. 452, Eub. fr. 20 and Timocl. fr. 31: εὐρήσεις τε τῶν ἐπισιτιῶν / τούτων τιν', οἳ δειπνοῦσιν ἐσφωδωμένοι / τ'ἀλλότρι' (see also Bonanno *Cratete comico* pp. 142-4).

In our text it is not so clear that this step has been made, mainly because the last words, τιν' ἐπὶ μισθῷ ξένον, could refer to the military activities of such a Smicythion (see *infra ad loc*). It could be anyway possible to speculate that this character of the military food-supplier had become a stock character to designate the parasite and thus the figure is perhaps close to that of the boastful soldier, represented by Lamachus in Aristophanes (cf. also Pherecr. fr. 1); the process of assimilation of the figure with this role can be parallel to that of the προτενθαί in fr. 7.2.

2. The dialogue is now about the figure of Smicythion, but none of them seems to refer to him in a direct way (as with the deictic -ί). It is possible that he had gone off-stage, if he was there anyway.

**πανταχοῦ**: instead of πανταχοῖ with a verb of movement is not unusual and it can be explained as being a pregnant construction.

Cf. K-G I p.545 and Ar. *Lys.* 1230, Eur. *IT* 68.

3. The last line seems to contain a joke that is difficult to understand without a context that gives the exact sense of each word.

First of all, the correction of τῆν to τιν' (cf. Porson *Adversaria* p.83) seems necessary for metrical reasons.

Secondly, τιν' ἐπὶ μισθῷ ξένον, can have the meaning of mercenary (cf. Edmonds *FAC* I p. 221), but not necessarily; it could be also understood as a foreigner who works in Athens like a teacher of rhetoric or sophists. It is interesting in this case to compare it to Av. 1694ff. where there is a song that refers to Gorgias and Philippus as barbarians, and perhaps gluttons of words (cf. Ἑγγλωτογαστόρων l.1702). In our fragment λαρυγγικόν could have a similar meaning, bearing in mind that Gorgias is, for instance, one of the foreign teachers of rhetoric who taught receiving money and against them the adjectives formed with the ending -κός can be a parody of their way of speaking.

Finally λαρυγγικόν, hapax of Pherecrates. It is formed from two elements: λάρυγξ 'larynx or upper part of the wind pipe' that here seems to stand for φάρυξ, a commoner expression to designate a glutton (cf. Eub. fr. 137.2, it seems to have been a normal confusion see LSJ s.v.). And the ending -κός is a usual way of composing new words with comic intention to satirize the language of sophists, as has been pointed out already. It is even more striking attached to a part of the body as here (cf. Pepler (1910) pp. 441ff. with reference to other compounds in -κός about

domestic matters).

In general it seems that τοῦτον in 1.2 refers to Smicythion. Two more adjectives are related to this pronoun in the following verse. On one hand they can be understood together and then Smicythion would be a foreigner who is called glutton and greedy for pay. On the other he could be an Athenian, a character of a personage in real life, who is qualified by λαρυγγικόν and τιν' ἐπὶ μισθῷ ξένον as predicatives and he is insulted by calling him a glutton and foreigner (a normal abuse in comedy, cf. fr. 11 and Long *Barbarians in Gr. Com.* p. 112).

#### Fr. 38

The use of carrier pigeons in Classical Athens was possibly not very usual. In fact this fragment is the only one that can be dated so early, and most of the other testimonies are later accounts (cf. Anacreont. fr. 149 and Ael. *VH IX 2*). About this kind of pigeon see further Steier *RE IV A.2 2493ff.*, Thompson *Birds* p.242, J. Pollard *Birds in Gr. Life and Myth* p.91 London 1977.

τὸν περιστερὸν: in masculine is a typical Attic form instead of the commoner one in feminine.

Fr. 39

This fragment is clearly a parody of the rhetorical and official formula: Ἀθηναῖοί τε καὶ συμμαχοί. The inscriptions and Thucydides provide with similar expressions (see e.g. Thuc. IV 119. 1 and Ar. *Nub.* 609).

Ἀθηναίαις: about its metrical scansion, see K-A ad Eup. fr. 37 (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 282 and Sandbach on Men. *Epit.* 348).

Its use here is clearly meant to be a parodic change of a masculine formula into a feminine one. Similarly Canth. fr. 5 modifies the expression καλὸς κάγαθός into γυναῖκα Ἀθηναίαν καλήν τε κάγαθήν (cf. Eup. fr. 109).

But from Antiquity the use of this expression by Pherecrates led to a series of considerations and doubts because this word is not found in Classical Attic, although later it became fairly common as a name (cf. Dittenberg *Hermes* 42 (1910) p. 10). Phryn. fr. 8 Borr. condemns this noun as ἀναττικόν (cf. Phot. α466) and is surprised that Pherecrates used it, ἀττικώτατος ὦν. The proper denomination for a woman from Athens at this time would be Ἀττική and the main reason would be that Ἀθηναία is the name of the goddess (cf. Eust. *in Od.* p. 1456.50, see also N. Loraux *Les Enfants d'Athens* pp. 119ff. (especially p. 125) Paris 1981).

There are, notwithstanding, instances of this word in later Comedy: Canth. fr. cit., Philem. fr. 69, Diph. fr. 10 and one example from a doubtful text in Pi. fr. 124e Sn.-Maehl. and a passage of Ion Ch. *FrGrH* 392 F11 (see Dittenberg art. cit. pp. 11ff. about them). Perhaps it is notable that they refer to

plays with probably a mythical content. This fact together with what Sud. α729 says: πλὴν πολλή γε ἡ χρῆσις τῆς φωνῆς ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικῶν παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις has led to the conclusion that the play may have dealt with a mythical subject. But both pieces of evidence are too general to lead to any conclusion about the the content of the play.

#### Fr. 40

The main difficulties, this fragment presents, are in the textual problems. They are explained in K-A's app.crit.; but in brief, they are as follows: ἐκαθίζομεν ἐν Ἄγρας or ἐβαδίζομεν ἐξ or ἐν/ ἐς Ἄγρας. It seems that the reading of the manuscripts is according to K-A ad loc., ἐβαδίζομεν ἔξαγρας, and thus the suggestion ἐξ Ἄγρας is probably right here, although the other proposals may have been commoner as formula (cf. infra on Ἄγρας).

Accordingly, the line could be part of a description of a trip from Agra, a place near Athens famous for the celebration of the Lesser Festival to Demeter (for an interpretation following the other suggestions, see Meineke ad loc. and Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 267).

εὐθύς γὰρ ὥς: cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1304: εὐθύς γὰρ ὥς ἐνέπλητο πολλῶν κάγαθῶν and according to Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.268 "introduce un evento imprevisto, sicuramente avventuroso".

ἐξ Ἄγρας: it is frequently found in the formula ἐν Ἄγρας as a genitive of place (cf. Chantraine *Rev. Phil.* 92 (1966) pp.

37-9).

\*Αγραι or \*Αγρα was a small village that lay towards the southwest part of the city near the river Ilissus. It was famous for the sanctuary of Demeter Μετρός, where the Lesser Mysteries took place. They were performed in the month of Anthesterion (February/March) and were a prerequisite to be initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries (cf. Brumfield *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and their relation ot the Agricultural Year* pp. 139ff. New York 1981). In the sanctuary devoted to Artemis also the festivities to Artemis Agrotera were celebrated (cf. Deubner *Attische Feste* p. 209 Hildesheim 1962). About this village see further C. Wachsmuth *RE* I 888, W. Judeich *Topographie von Athen* p. 176 A. b Munich 1931 and E. Freund in S. Lauffer (ed.) *Griechenland. Lexicon* s. v. Munich 1989.

#### Fr. 41

This word, as the one in the following fragment, seems to be related to a very special sort of clothing. It could be a kind of anachronism or a way of designating a very special kind of belt, perhaps a war-like belt, and it would fit the idea that the play refers to the past or that the 'Old Women' are depicted as wearing very anachronistic clothes.

ἀορτήρα: about the etymology of this word and several meanings, cf. Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s. v. ἀείρω 2. Perhaps remarkable is the utilization of a word found in *Il.* 11. 31 and

*Od.* 11.609 and it seems to have the same meaning as in the epic poems: "sword-belt" (cf. also *Poll.* X 160 and *LSJ* s.v. ζωστήρ).

Fr. 42

ἀρτήρ: according to *Phot.* α2891 it is a kind of shoe and *LSJ* s.v. gives more details: "a felt-shoe" although this distinction is not clearly attested. It is only found here with this sense and with another meaning in *LXX Ne* 4.17 (II) 'that by which anything is carried'. *Frisk* s.v. explains it as follows: "kann als 'Anbinder, Angebundenes' zu 2.ἀείρω 'anbinden' gehören; allenfalls auch zu ἀρτάω mit Haplologie für \*ἀρτη-τήρ. Dazu ngr. (pont.) ὀρτάρια 'Saken'; *Amant.* 'Αρχ. 'Εφ. 28.85ff." The compounds in -τήρ became frequent in Greek poetry as poetic formations instead of -τής (cf. *Buck-Petersen A Reverse Index* p. 302). About different kinds of shoes and 'bibliography about them see *H. Blanck Einführung in das Privatleben der Griechen und Römer* pp.55ff. Darmstadt 1976.

## Δουλοδιδάσκαλος

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This play has been dated on the basis of fr. 52 which may belong to the parabasis and has been interpreted as a reference to a historical fact in parallel with other comic fragments.

On one hand, Geissler p. 22 follows Meineke's proposal and identifies the χρυσία in fr. 52 with Cratin. fr. 76 belonging to the play *Θράτται* where there is a reference to the 'Egyptian gold'. Therefore Geissler's date for our play is around 435-30.

On the other, Edmonds *FAC I* p. 222 n. a agrees with Brandes *Observationes criticae de comoediarum aliquot Atticarum temporibus* p. 21 diss. Marburg 1904, and understands it as Leuco fr. 1 of the play *Φράτερες* performed in 421 (cf. Geissler p. 40). The golden pots which were called Παῖπες could be meant here and also in Cratin. fr. 76 (where see K-A; against this date, cf. Geissler p. 23).

None of these dates are sure, in my opinion, because the meaning of χρυσία in fr. 52 is too general to provide a certain identification without any other evidence. The references to gold in Greek literature are numerous, and, if we do not take it as an imagined situation, it can point towards different affairs in the history of V century Athens.

The main piece of evidence about the content of this play is Athen. VI 262b (test.1): ἀεὶ ποτε ἐγὼ τεθαύμακα τὸ τῶν δούλων γένος ὡς ἐστὶν ἐγκρατέες τσοσάταις ἐγκαλινδουμένον λιχνεύαις. ταύτας γὰρ ὑπερορῶσιν οὐ μόνον διὰ φόβον ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ διδασκαλίαν, οὐ τὴν ἐν Δουλοδιδασκάλῳ Φερεκράτους ἀλλὰ

έθισθέντες.

Pherecrates seems to have developed a fairly original idea: to stage the events taking place in a school for slaves. Maybe the main theme of the play was education and perhaps it had similarities with Aristophanes' *Clouds* in this regard. Some topics such as the difference between old and modern education might have developed, but no sure conclusion can be drawn, except that the slaves were taught how to perform accurately all their duties by repetition, as is shown by the quotation of Athenaeus and perhaps by fr. 44 and 45. It is possible then that part of the comic elements of this play was the way these duties were performed. That is not necessarily total invention, since Arist. *Pol.* 1255b 22 attests the existence of a δουλική ἐπιστήμη especially taught in Syracuse.

The main character, or at least one of the most important, was the δουλοδιδάσκαλος, who gives his name to the whole play (cf. Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*).

In the V century, διδάσκαλος was used generally to designate a teacher, and perhaps mainly 'a teacher of letters' and, according to Marrou *A History of Education in Antiquity* pp. 42-3 Engl. transl. London 1956, he was the third branch added approximately in the VI century (cf. Marrou op.cit. p. 43) to a child's education before the παιδοτρύβης and the κιθαριστής.

The compound δουλοδιδάσκαλος is only found here in Classical literature and in later times only in Procop. *Arc.* 15 referring to Theodora, according to LSJ. Although there seem to have existed slaves who attended or received lessons mainly from the IV

century onwards, the comic point here is the existence of a person exclusively devoted to the task of training slaves to serve. Other compounds are γεροντιοδιδάσκαλος, a comic word probably coined in Pl. *Euthyd.* 272c 5 and Ἄσωτοδιδάσκαλος, the title of a play doubtfully attributed to Alexis.

About the status of this character, maybe we could speculate that she may be a woman, first of all because women had probably an important role in the education of slaves (cf. Henderson (1987) p.114 n.66); secondly because the chorus was formed of women (see *infra*); thirdly because women were in charge of the quotidian housekeeping.

As it has been hinted above, the chorus of the play was formed by women, more exactly 'spinner-women'. On the basis of fr. 51, they are the Athenians who made the peplos for Athena in the festival of the Panathenaea (see comment ad loc.). Spinning was performed, nonetheless, by slaves, but also it is the symbol of the activities of an Athenian housewife. Another feminine character was on stage according to fr. 43.3.

According to the tasks described, it seems that the slaves of this comedy were private, though there is reference to public slaves in fr. 53. Thus I do not know to what extent it is possible to conclude with Carrière *Carnaval* p.68, "«outil animé de l'économie», l'esclave est, chez Phérécrate, chargé de tâches domestiques, et, chez Aristophane, chargé de la culture du sol" (about other slave figures in Pherecrates, see p. 46).

It is a pity that we can not give more details and find more exactly the date of performance. This play may have had an

important function within the context of the evolution of comedy in increasing the importance of the character of the slave. About the role of the slave in comedy, cf. Στεφανῆς Ὁ δοῦλος, especially p.183 about this play, Zuretti *Riv.Fil.* 31 (1903) pp. 46ff., Spranger *Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz* p. 16 Stuttgart 1984 and E. Lévy in *Actes du Colloque 1972 sur l'esclavage* pp. 36ff. Paris 1974.

Fr. 43

This fragment is a dialogue between two persons. The division of lines between the speakers is doubtful, and Meineke gives the first line to one speaker and the other three to the second one. Kock, Edmonds and K-A follow a more likely division: the first line to one speaker; the second to another and the third and fourth to the first speaker. In 1.3 there is a change of tone which seems to suggest a change of speaker.

Following the latter division, the first speaker (probably a man, cf. the masculine κῆθαρος and ὄν in 1.1) explains a dream to a woman (identified by Wilamowitz *Hermes* 7 (1873) p.147 with a γραῦς ὄνειροπόλος). Such activity was likely common in Athens: it is mentioned in *Ar. Vesp.* 52, as costing two obols to a slave, and it is a feature of the one who suffers δεισιδαιμονία in *Theophr. Char.* 16. 11.

The point of the dialogue seems to be the play on the word κῆθαρος, repeated four times in the text. Its meaning can be as follows: A explains a dream; B either sees it as a good omen or simply says 'the kitharos is a good fish'; but A is afraid (and perhaps considers it as a nightmare, cf. θράττει) of what they say and seems to quote a saying or popular thought about this fish (see on κῆθαρος 1. 1 and fr. 14. 5-6 for other passages ending in a proverb).

In general about dreams Handley ad *Dysc.* 412ff. and further Dodds *The Greeks and the Irrational* pp.102ff Berkeley 1951.

1. **κίθαρος**: it was according to Thompson *Fishes* s.v. "a common fish, apparently, but unidentified. Coupled, now and then, with ῥόμβος (Plin. XXXII 11, Xenocr. XI 27, Galen. VI 724) and hence supposed to be another flat-fish or pleuronectid", Gulick ad Athen. VII 305f translates it as "turbot" and Edmonds *FAC* I p. 223 as "plaice". Besides other features of its physiognomy and customs (cf. Arist. *HA* 508 and Athen. loc.cit.), he is notable for his dedication to Apollo because of its similarity with the cithara, according to Athen. VII 306a. This fact explains the exclamation of l. 2 πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνος.

**ἀγοράζειν**: the verb could mean "to frequent the agora" without necessarily implying to go shopping. It is so used of the young people who 'waste' their time in the perfume-shop in Ar. *Equ.* 1373 and of men "occupying" the agora in an ironical sense in *Lys.* 556. About this verb in the first meaning see also *Lys.* 633 and Sch. ad loc., Isocr. *Areop.* 98 and Cratin fr. 257.2).

2. **πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνος**: it is an utterance that means mainly 'in the name of' and generally accompanies a question or a request (cf. LSJ s.v.A I 4 and *Nub.* 314). In this case the utterance acquires another level since the implication is that this fish is devoted to Apollo.

**πάνυ**: placed after the intensified word, see Dover I pp. 53ff.

3. **θράττει**: cf. Cratin. fr. 363 and K-A ad loc. About its relation to ταρασσῶ, see Pearson ad Soph. fr. 1055. The verb implies the feeling of a nightmare.

**ᾧ γαθή**: as Neil says on *Equ.* 160: "the democratic spirit of

Athens levelled distinctions of class and address, and ὤγαθέ was not specially respectful: Socrates uses it to a eunuch porter, Plato *Protag.* 314d". It seems to have had a sort of familiar sense and can be used "in encouragement (e.g. *Equ.* 71, *V.* 286) in expostulation (cfr. 726, *Equ.* 160)" according to Dover ad *Nub.* 675.

4. This line is an incomplete iambic trimeter. Several suggestions have been made: Meineke to add καὶ before κακόν; and Kock prints ἐνίσοι' at the beginning.

This expression is proverbial (cf. *Ar.* fr. 591. 60ff., ὄρθς ἄρ' ὡς ἐνῆν τι κἄν κιθάρω κακόν. πρὸς τὴν παροιμίαν προ-/φέρεται, ὡς Καλλίστρατος (fr. nov.), ἔστιν κι-/θάρου καὶ κακόν). It is parallel to other proverbs like ἔνεστι κἄν μύρμηκι κἄν σέρφω χολή (cf. *Sud.* σ 256 and *Sch.* on *Ar. Vesp.* 352 and *Av.* 82; see also *Zen.* III 70, *Diogen.* I 12). About other fishes which had some kind of religious or social taboo, cf. *Cratin.* fr. 236.

κἄν: καὶ ἐάν, familiar word for 'only a little'; cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 92 and MacDowell ad loc.

Fr. 44

This fragment might have been part of a scene in which the 'doulodidaskalos' teaches a slave how to behave, perform the duties and accomplish the orders of their masters.

Among the several duties of a slave, to carry the light for the master at night after the symposium was very important (cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 219), or for early morning business (cf. *Eccl.* 1ff. and Ehrenberg *The people of Ar.* p. 177). The joke in this fragment was the detail of the description and the clumsiness of the slave when performing simple duties.

1. ἄνυσόν ποτ': cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 1168 in a similar construction: ἄνυσόν ποθ' ὑποδησάμενος.

2. λυχνοῦχον: as the noun λύχνον, is used very frequently in Old Comedy to designate 'a portable lamp' in any of the activities above mentioned (cf. λύχνος in *Ar. Equ.* 1315 and *Nub.* 18 and λυχνοῦχος in *Pl.com.* fr. 91). Only this fragment makes a difference between the two words, considering λύχνος mainly as the lamplight and λυχνοῦχος as the lamp-stand.

ἔκφερ': as meaning 'to bring something on stage', cf. fr. 73. 1.

Fr. 45

As in the former fragment, this one is formed by a series of orders, which suggests that the scene is similar. We could speculate that this text refers to the preparations of a banquet and the activities of a slave before serving drinks, while the other explained the preparation for the walk with the master after the end of the symposium, but this is not certain. According to Headlam ad Herond. I 79, who quotes Alex. fr. 124, Xen. Cyr. I 3.9 and AP VII 339, this description of the cleaning of a cup was frequent in Comedy.

1. ἀπονοίξει: the imperative suggested by Bergk *Rel.* p.299 is the most logical solution in the context of the future participle at the end of the line and the imperative ἔγγχει in l.2. This construction emphasizes the preparation of the container more than the activity of serving wine which will be explained in l.2. 'Απονοίξειν, the reading of A, the best manuscript of Athenaeus (cf. p. 18) has been defended by Kock, as an 'infinitivus pro imperativo' (cf. also Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 268). Dobree (apud K-A ad loc.) modified it into ἀπονοίζων ...δὸς ἐμπιεῖν; but it does not follow the order of events: first 'rinsing the cup' in order to give to drink and then fill the cup with wine.

The verb ἀπονοίζω is from the verb νοίζω that according to LSJ 'Attic Prose writers use the word only in compounds'. It is used frequently to wash the hands and feet and rarely of things (cf. LSJ s.v.).

δῶσαν πιεῖν: about this expression, cf. Hermipp. fr. 44.2,

Cratin. fr. 132, Ar. *Pax* 49 (in this case with a particular sense, cf. Platnauer ad loc.)..

τὸν ἡθμόν: about the aspiration cf. *SIG* 2 (Sigeum, VI b.C.), Herodian. I 543, Epig. fr. 5.4 and Meisterhans *Grammatik*<sup>3</sup> p.87 n.783.

Here this word means "wine-colander" for the impurities of the wine as in Epig. loc.cit.; but perhaps because of its shape this noun could designate very different things (cf. LSJ). A very similar object was the κοσκίνον or sieve.

Fr. 46

It is not strange that the reference to this temple is made in the context of a play about slaves since it was considered a place of asylum for slaves and criminals (see Ar. *Equ.* 1312, fr. 475, fr. 577, Jacoby *FGrH* ad Philoch. 328 F177, Pausan. I 17.2). The main difficulty is in the text of the first word.

**Κάλλαισχρον:** this noun seems to be the best solution for the text that makes little sense otherwise: μάλλ' αἴσχρον (or μάλλον αἴσχρον), A, and μάλ' αἴσχρον B.

Callaeschrus seems to have been a fairly common name in Athens. Its meaning was: "ein schöner Leidig oder schöner Aἴσχος, wie einer wohl ursprünglich hieß, der sich so umnannte" according to Pape *Wörterbuch Gr. Eigennamen* s. v. It was especially connected with the family of Critias, mainly as one of the leaders of the Four Hundred according to Lys. XII 66 (about it cf. Davies *APF* pp. 326ff.); but as Davies *ibid.* p. 328 points out the name is common enough to conclude that any person with this name was related to this family. It was very common in the IV century (cf. Dem. 18. 187 and 21. 157) and it may be the title of a comedy of Theopompus (cf. fr. 22ff.).

**Θησέφ:** about this form in inscriptions cf. Thraette I p. 302, 312 and 315.

According to Wycherley *The Stones of Athens* p. 64 New Jersey 1978: "it was a spacious precinct -Peisistratos held an armed muster there- with a sekos or inner sanctum. We have no good evidence for a temple; but there were walls on which were

displayed paintings by Mikon and possibly Polygnotos. From Pausanias' account one infers that the site of the shrine was east or southeast of the agora, still beyond the reach of the excavations".

This text seems to belong to the subject of music that seems to have had some importance in Pherecrates' works (cf. supra p. 60). In this case the reference to the trigone is related to the adaptation of oriental instruments and, implicitly, some of their musical style.

The correlative construction with a negative and two *καί* can be translated as 'not only ... but also' (cf. Denniston *GP* p. 323). The question mark at the end, added by Kock, seems suitable for the expression: negative plus future meaning an imperative.

The combination of the two kinds of instruments: a new one recently adopted from the oriental music and a traditional lyre, suggests to me that the speaker is entreating someone not to 'destroy' the traditional and also the modern music.

**ἀπολιβάξεις:** 'to throw away, to destroy' is an expressive 'métaphore populaire', as Taillardat *Images* §220 designates it, that may be originated from the dripping of a fountain or a stream lost in the ground (cf. Anecd. Bekk. ἄλλοι δὲ τὸ πόρρω ἀπελθεῖν, παρὰ τὴν Λιβύη· πόρρω γὰρ ἡ Λιβύη. Οἱ δὲ ἀπορρῖψαι καὶ ἀποφθεῖν). It is also found in Ar. *Av.* 1467 in intransitive form: οὐκ ἀπολιβάξεις ὧ κάκιστ' ἀπολούμενος and in transitive in *Eur. fr.* 223 (see *Av.* 1020, *Nub.* 1253, 1296).

**τριγώνου:** used here in masculine form as in Soph. *fr.* 412R., although the neuter form seems to be commoner (cf. LSJ s.v.). At the time of Pherecrates it may have been a generic name for oriental instruments (cf. Martha Maas and Jane McI. Snyder

*Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece* p. 148 New Haven 1989).

This instrument of oriental origin was commonly disregarded by comic poets (cf. Eup. fr. 88.2, 148.4 and Ar. fr. 255) and Pl. R. 339c forbids it in his Republic of Demiurgs. See in very detail Susemihl and Hicks *Politics of Aristotle* I p. 635 New York 1976.

**λύρας:** the four stringed lyre or lute was differentiated from the cithara, as Anaxil. fr.15 and Pl. R. 339d show; although *κιθαρίζειν* could mean to play either of both instruments and *κιθαριστής* could designate a lyre or a cithara player (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 989ff. and Dover on *Nub.* 1357). The difference of these instruments was on their shape and features (cf. Winnington-Ingram *CIQ* n.s.6 (1956) pp. 169ff.); but they are confused in many texts (see further M. Maas and J. McI. Snyder op.cit. pp. 79ff.). Pl. loc.cit. mentions it among the instruments acceptable in his ideal city.

Fr. 48

The metre of this fragment as it has been transmitted could be iambic; but the main problem is the anapaest in the second foot of the word ἀστραγάλων and Meineke suggested to be an Eupolidean without the beginning. Other scholars (see K-A ad loc.) prefer an iambic trimeter adding a monosyllable before κονδύλοισι.

Both activities: playing knuckle-bones and fist-fighting are normal ways of entertaining and sport in Athenian daily life.

ἀντ': see K-A ad loc. about the elliptical use of the preposition meaning here 'ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀστραγάλου παίζεσθαι' (cf. Soph. *Phil.* 369).

ἀστραγάλων: they were 'knucklebones' used as dice for a lot of games. They could be very cheap (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 295) or especially priced according to the animal they came from (cf. Herond. III 19). About them and the different kinds of games, cf. Starkie ad Ar. loc.cit., Lamer *RE* XII 2 1933ff. and Lafaye *D-S* V 28-31, s.v. Talus.

κονδύλοισι: this word was mainly used to designate the knuckle of fingers and there are several expressions where it means 'to slap' or 'to punch with the knuckles', 'to thrash' (see LSJ s.v. I). Here the pun seems to be in the fact that both words mean knuckle-bones, but the former is of an animal and the latter of a person and therefore, it implies that 'you play knuckles (implying 'you are boxing') instead of knuckle-bones' (as meaning 'instead of playing dice').

Fr. 49

The context of these lines is impossible to guess with certainty, but, since slaves were an important element in this comedy, they could refer to the topic of a slave stealing food (cf. *Ar. Pax* 14, *Plut.* 320, 1139ff.). The words can be interpreted as an excuse for the robbery, as Kaibel suggests apud K-A ad loc.

γαλαθῆν': cf. on fr. 33. As Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 77 says quoting Pl.com. fr. 27.2: "Pigs, too, were common [in Comedy]. It was known to be most lucrative to kill a pig: 'its meat is delicious, and nothing in a pig is lost except the bristles, the mud and the squeal'"

Fr. 50

This fragment seems to be part of a 'pnigos' or 'stifler' in iambic rhythm also called a iambic run. This metre usually comes at the end of a speech in an agon or an excited dialogue. A parallel passage can be mentioned in Ar. *Eccl.* 1168ff. where the pnigos contains a description of a banquet like in our text; but in the case of Aristophanes all together is one word (see Ussher ad loc.)

This list of meals begins after ὑπάρχει in l. 2. All of them seem to be part of a topical description of a banquet (for example Pherecrates mentions some of them in the long fr. 113, an instance of bountiful αὐτοματὸς βίος: ἐγγέλεια l. 12, φύσκαι l. 8, πλευρὰ δελφάκεια l. 16; see a complete list in Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 270 n. 23).

The enumeration is possibly given in a certain order: first of all, two fish meals, afterwards six meat courses, one dessert and finally another meat course, although the reading is suspect for it breaks the order (see ad loc.).

The reading of the manuscripts of the first line is doubtful, mainly for metrical reasons. The original text seems to be trochaic rhythm, but this metre is not expected to precede a iambic pnigos (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 1443-51). Many suggestions have been made, but as K-A ad loc., I do not find anyone compulsive enough to be preferred to the other ones.

2. καὶ δῆθ': according to Denniston *GP* p. 278, in this text "καὶ is not, as elsewhere, connective, and καὶ δῆτα is used like καὶ

δή" which "signifies, vividly and dramatically, that something is actually taking place at the moment" (cf. Denniston *GP* p. 250 and 251).

**τέμαχος:** generally denominates a slice of fish, (mainly salted fish, cf. Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s.v. τέμνω), unlike τόμος in 1.4 only applied to meat pieces. It is found in connexion with ἐγγέλειον or ἐγγελύς in Ar. *Ach.* 881: ὦ τερπνότατον σὺ τέμαχος ἀνθρώποις φέρων, / δός μοι προσειπεῖν, εἰ φέρεις, τὰς ἐγγέλεις, and also in Pherecr. fr. 113. 10.

3. **ἐγγελεῖον:** here and possibly in other passages (see e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 881) an adjectival form of ἐγγελύς. About its being a delicacy, see Ar. loc.cit. and commentaries on it, Oder *RE* I 1 and Thompson *Fishes* s.v. ἐγγελύς.

**τευθίς:** Neil in his commentary to Ar. *Equ.* 929 says: "the τευθίς, smaller and more delicate than the τεύθος and σηπία, was broiled as a rule Antiphanes 217. 21, Melagenes 6.6, Anaxandr. 41, 46 (τευθίδες ὀπτά, σηπία(ι) ἐφθαί), Athen. III 108a-c (...) It does not seem to have been thought a dainty dish except when served very hot in the frying pan as here" (see also Thompson *ibid.* s.v.).

**πούς:** it seems to mean here "feet" only, but it could also refer to "foot with leg" (LSJ s.v. πούς 1). It might be referred to pig trotters, rather than any other animal (cf. Ecph. fr. 1).

5. **ὄρνιθια:** cf. Ar. *Av.* 1590. I think it must designate "bird-flesh" (cf. Rogers' translation of Ar. loc.cit.). The word in plural and its complement, πλήθει πολλά, indicate quantity; but also it may refer to the variety of different kinds of birds

served in a banquet.

6. **μερίς κρεῶν**: the repetition of the word κρέας (in genitive, cf. 1.4) has been suspect and Kock suggest the following emendation: "cum caseo et melle poeta sine dubio non carnes, sed τράγημα coniuxerat scribendum videtur μετ' ἰτρῶν". Another possibility is to understand that it is a reference to the ματτιῆ according to Kaibel apud K-A since they were served at the end of a banquet (cf. Athen. XIV 664b). Conti-Bizzarro (1988-9) suggests χωρίς as a contrasting point to the other elements of the banquet.

I agree that the text in its literal sense is doubtful, above all bearing in mind that μερίς seems to be more frequent in oratory, sophistic and late literature (perhaps the first instances are Antipho 5.51 and our text; cf. LSJ s.v.). In the context of food μερίς could imply a 'piece of meat' on its own (cf. Theophr. *Char.* 17.2).

It seems that the delicacy meat at the end of a banquet is the most likely explanation, as suggested by Kaibel; this dish appears much more often in Middle and New Comedy, but this does not mean that it is not to be found already in Pherecrates. The text does not need an emendation. It follows an order: first of all, fish: salted eels and squid as starter; second meat of all kinds in abundance: lamb, pig-courses, liver, ribs, chicken or bird-flesh, finally cheese with honey and the ματτιῆ as dessert.

The expression could be ambiguous and I would suggest that there is a secondary sense implicit. The word κρεῶν can be found in Aristophanes as referring to the human body in a very physical

sense and perhaps with an obscene secondary idea (see above all Taillardat *Images* §65 and Henderson *MM* p. 129 and 144).

The last expression comes as a surprise for the audience. The fragment begins with mention of specific types of food, but *μερίς κρεῶν* seems to be a more abstract formula. It is a "piece of meat" that by association could mean flesh, human flesh. With this 'double entendre', the speaker can make reference to an essential "course" of a Greek banquet: the *ἀύλητριδες*. Fr. 113. 28 makes explicit reference to their appearance in order to serve wine at the end of a banquet, but also with some erotic innuendo (cf. maybe Ar. *Lys.* 1060ff. according to Henderson *MM* p. 144). The ambiguity of the expression can benefit from the secondary sense of the word *κρέας*, as described above. Maybe the choice of the unusual noun *μερίς* is not casual. On one hand, it has the resonance of a feminine form and, on the other, it could be related to *μέρος*, that in colloquial sense it could refer to the male organ (see J.N. Adams *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* p. 45 London 1982), but in feminine.

Fr. 26, 27, 28. 3-4, 185 could make similar sexual inferences.

Fr. 51

The present fragment may be part of a speech in anapaests and spoken by the chorus, as Kock suggests.

The Sch. (M) to Eur. *Hec.* 421 makes reference to this passage, and suggests that the chorus of this play must have consisted of γυναῖκες τέλειαι who were appointed to weave the peplum of Athena, nine months before the celebration of the Panathenaia; they were called ἐργαστιναί.

This line must, then, refer to this activity since the peplum was made of wool (τῶν ἐρίων) and it was very colourful (ἀνθῶν τῶν παντοδαπῶν). As Parke (1977) pp. 33f. suggests (see also Deubner (1969) pp. 22ff.): "the main preoccupation was not the weaving of the material so much as its decoration. This was woven into the dress in the manner of tapestry", and he adds afterwards, "the design of the peplos was executed in bright colours -yellow and blue are mentioned- and the general effect was evidently most striking".

This piece of cloth was a topos of Old Comedy and Ar. *Av.* 827 makes use of it also. As Parke (1977) p. 34 says, it was "a conventional motive in New Comedy to describe a maiden leading a sheltered life in the country as only coming to town to see the peplos". In tragedy it appears in Euripides *loc. cit.*

The difficulty in the interpretation arise from the presence of τῶν ἐρίων and ἄνθων and the construction of the verb κατάγωμεν with a genitive only found here. The meaning of κατάγωμεν seems to be 'to spin'. Yet, the word ἄνθων meaning 'dyes' in strict sense, does not fit its meaning.

Kock suggests in his commentary ad loc. that τῶν ἐρίων is a gloss from ἀνθῶν τῶν παντοδαπῶν and Edmonds *FAC* I p. 224 n. 4 agrees with him. This suggestion is supported by the fact that the dyed wool was called ἄνθος, name mainly of the dye (cf. *Bluemner Tech.* p.222 and Gow ad *Theocr.* 15. 116). In this case the two words could indicate different kinds of wool. On the one hand, ἀνθῶν τῶν παντοδαπῶν could mean "dyed wool" and, on the other, τῶν ἐρίων would be a general partitive noun at the beginning to indicate all kinds of wool included undyed wool.

The genitive should be considered then partitive as in *Ar.* fr. 735 (as *Meineke CGF* II 1 p. 271 proposes) perhaps to indicate a part of one kind of wool and a part of the other which could be woven together (about the use of the partitive genitive as object of verbs, see *Poultney The Genitive Case in Ar.* pp. 77ff. Baltimore 1936).

**κατάγωμεν:** about this activity see *Epig.* fr. 7 and *Pl. Soph.* 226. According to *Bluemner Tech.* I pp. 112ff. "die drei Hauptmanipulationen dabei sind also *Ausziehen de Fadens*, was bei den Griechen στήμονα resp. κόρκην κατάγειν heisst daher κατάγμα das zum Spinnen herausgezogene, bei den Röm. *filum deducere*; ferner das *Drehen des Spindel* resp. des Wirtels, ἄτρακτιον ἐλ(σσειν, ἐπιστρέφειν, *fusum (turbinem) pollice (digitis) versare* oder *torquere*; und drittens das *Drellen de Fadens*, στρέφειν (περιστρέφειν) τὸ νήμα, τὴν κόρκην, etc. *fila (stamina) pollice (manu, digitis) versare* oder *torquere*".

In *Plato Men.* 80e it is used in metaphorical sense λόγον

κατάγειν, though some scholars have doubts about the text. It is possible that here a metaphorical sense is implied, above all in the context of the parabasis when the chorus speaks according to its dramatic character (cf. supra p. 41).

The verb implies that several women are going to begin the weaving of wool of different colours, τῶν παντοδαπῶν, maybe inferring that each one will do one colour.

Fr. 52

Fragment in Eupolidean metre (cf. fr. 34) that could be part of the parabasis of the play for its metre and perhaps its subject, if it was an advice to vote again to return the 'gold'. The imperative (ἀναψηφίζασθε) is suitable to a chorus-leader's speech of advice to the city. But it is not a definitive argument, because, except for the metre, the subject can be found outside parabolic speeches (e.g. *Ach.* 100ff. and the references to the *gold* promised by the Persians in support of the Athenians or the speech of Dicaeopolis in the same play ll. 496ff.).

**ἀναψηφίζασθε**: this compound verb in middle voice was used of the voters, while in active of the chairman, who puts to vote a proposal (cf. *Thuc.* 6. 14).

**τὰ χρυσία**: Meineke puts this form in connexion with the gold vases that were sent from Egypt to Athens as a present (cf. *Cratin.* fr. 76); but this passage of the Athenian history is very vague (see K-A ad *Cratin.* fr. cit.). It may just mean 'gold coins' and could refer to the minting of gold coins that took place in Athens in 407 and is mentioned in *Ar. Ran.* 720.

Fr. 53

The metre is doubtful, and two possibilities are still opened: an iambic metre (cf. Herwerden *BphW* 27 (1907) p. 207, see also Demiańczuk comment ad loc.) or what K-A call 'Eupolideus formae rarioris', quoting fr. 70.1 and Cratin. fr.105.8. Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 292 suggests the modifications: ῥάινειν <κά>νακορεῖν <τάς> ἀγοράς which would be an anapaestic dimeter.

As in fr. 45, it contains a detailed description of a task which could be possibly performed by a slave (cf. Phryn.com. fr. 39: σὺ δ' εἰσιῶσα δουλικῶς ἐνσκεύασαι / καὶ τᾶνδον ἀνακάλλυνον). In our case it would refer to the collection and cleaning of public places. The status of the persons who perform this task is not known with certainty. They were called ἄνδρες κοπρολόγοι. Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 174 suggests that "they were perhaps private day-labourers, though they seem to have been those who had «to besprinkle and to sweep again the market-place»" (cf. O. Jacob *Les esclaves publiques à Athenes* pp.13ff.).

ῥάινειν, ἀνακορεῖν: the verb ῥάινειν and the simple form κορεῖν could have epic and poetic resonances since they can be found together in *Od.* 20. 149-50: ἀγρεῖθ', αἶ μὲν δῶμα κορήσατε ποῖπνύσασαι / ῥάσσατέ τ' ἐν τε θρόνοις εὐποιήτοισι ταπήτας (cf. ῥᾶνον in TrGF adesp. 90.1).

The compound ἀνακορεῖν is only found in Pherecrates; but it seems to mean simply 'to sweep again' after having swept once already. It is possible that the text contained the verb 'to sweep' κορεῖν or καλλύνειν beforehand (about it cf. LSJ s.v.

καλλύω). A similar verb and formation would be ἀνακαλλύω found in Phryn.com. fr.cit.

#### Fr. 54

ἐγκέντριδας: synonym of κέντρον. It is applied to different things; but always denominates a sharp point. This special use makes it suspect of being a poetical or comic word (see, for example, MacDowell ad *Vesp.* 427).

Here it designates the 'spurs' for horses. This meaning may have been fairly common in Classical Greek (cf. Eust. in *Il.* p. 811. 40); but this is the only instance we have. In Pl. com. fr. 40 it means "goad" for yokes and Xen. *Cyr.* 6.1 uses it to designate "spurs" of a special collar for hunting dogs.

#### Fr. 55

ῥαβδίσειν: it is difficult to reach a conclusion about the meaning this word could have had in Pherecrates. Ar. *Lys.* 576 applies it to terminology used of wool appropriate to a woman's speech. Perhaps Pherecrates used it in the literal sense 'to cudgel' or to beat wool in order to clean or soften it (cf. Bluemner *Tech.* I 102 quoting Ar. loc.cit.). It would be related to the mention of wool in fr. 51 and that the chorus was formed by women.

## Ἐπιλήσμων ἢ Θάλαττα

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

It is impossible to explain which was the general content of this play. It has been suggested that Thalatta may be the name of a hetaira, above all on the basis of the passage of Athen. XIII 567c who mentions this name as title of another play by Diocles: καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πολλὰ, ὠναιδῆς, δράματα ἀπὸ ἐταιρῶν ἔσχε τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς, Θάλαττα Διοκλέους, Φερεκράτους Κοριαννῶ (cf. Kaibel apud K-A ad loc.).

The compound title may be simply an alternative name, either popular or given by later scholars, in order to distinguish two comedies with the same title, here for instance from that of Diocles (perhaps having been lost or arriving with no definitive title; in this case the double title is found in later authors; see Introductory Note on *Agathoi*), or as an aid to remember the content of the play (cf. further Hunter on Eub. pp. 146-8). The meaning of this double title can be interpreted in two ways:

- If Ἐπιλήσμων refers to a male figure: 'the forgetful man' he could be another important character in the play together with Thalatta, the hetaira. In this case, the play could have developed the topic of the old man and the hetaira, more frequently found in Middle and New Comedy, but already hinted at in Ar. *Vesp.* 1326-71; the only piece of evidence for it could be the mention of θαλλοφόρους in reference to old men in fr. 63. It is clear from fr. 57 that there was a male character who went to someone's to have a banquet.

- If, otherwise, it is feminine, it could mean the nickname or main feature of the woman: *The forgetful woman or Thalatta*.

In any case, the fragments suggest that it was possibly a 'comedy of manners' (cf. supra p. 52) with many elements of daily Athenian life like 'being ill' (fr.58), 'going for a dinner with their own meal' (fr.57), perhaps a reference to this dinner or more probably to another banquet (fr.60), perhaps the mention of θαλλοφόροι at the Panathenaic procession (fr. 63); losing the tunic for debts (fr. 59). Also fr. 56 could be placed in a similar context, but it is doubtful.

Fr. 56

A character narrates the dialogue with a man (οἴμοι τάλας, 1.3). Kock suggests that 'mulier de marito queritur', but it is uncertain and Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p.352 relates it to the criticism of the way of speaking of some politicians, a common topic in Aristophanes, above all about Cleon (cf. MacDowell's comment on *Vesp.* 1034 and K-A ad *Ar.* fr. 644). The vividness of the narration increases with the use of the direct speech in 1. 2 and 3.

1. The reading of the manuscripts is incomplete and does not give proper sense. Different suggestions have been made in order to alter φέρεται. Perhaps the easiest way to complete the verb is to add καὶ before πνίγεται, since it can be missed by haplography from its similarity with the ending of φέρεται (see Kock *RhM* 30 (1874) p.403).

Two emendations to the text are perhaps worthy of mention: τεύρεται suggested by Kock loc.cit. and φλέγεται by Herwerden *Mn.* 10 (1882) p. 71. The first one is found in comic parody of this tragic expression of pain and distress (cf. *Ar. Lys.* 960 and Henderson ad loc.). The latter one is found in metaphorical sense of the 'spirit' burning in *Ar. Thesm.* 680, *Nub.* 992.

πνίγεται: normal verb to express exaggerated anger and agitation in comedy. It is more often found in the compound form ἀποπνίγω. About its meaning in Aristophanes, see Taillardat *Images* § 381.

2. ἀποκριθῶ: the main objection to this verb is in the fact

that ἀποκρίνομαι in the aorist passive forms with middle meaning is only found among classical authors in Pl. *Alc.* 2. 149a and Xen. *An.* II 1.22; but in later authors (cf. Theocr. VIII 74 and Machon 146) and in New Testament Greek it became very common.

Perhaps Mervyn Jones *CIR* 72 (1958) p.238 made the best attested alteration, as the selective apparatus criticus of K-A point out (Kock suggested ἀποδixθ and Edmonds *FAC* I p.226 n.5 ἀπομύω).

Nonetheless, the change seems unnecessary since, according to Phryn. *Ecl.* 78, it was already quite common and for instance the verb ὑποκρίνομαι already is found in passive with a middle sense in a writer as early as Ctesiph. fr. 29. 41. It may have been a form belonging to spoken Attic (cf. Lautenmsach *Gl* 3 (1911) p.235 for further references).

3. χάράδρα: a 'mountain stream', generally characterized by its strength and speed.

Fr. 57

The subject of this fragment refers to a very common topic in Comedy: the kind of banquet or communal dinner in which every guest brings his own meal (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1138, *Vesp.* 1251 and Pherecr. fr. 127 maybe in metaphorical sense).

1. **συσκευασάμενος:** cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1096 δεῖπνον τις ἐνσκευαζέτω, and Phryn.com. fr. 39 (cf. Diph. fr. 89).

**τὸ σπυρίδιον:** diminutive form of ἡ σπυρίς, is a small basket made of wicker-work. It is also found in Ar. *Ach.* 453 where it is part of the parody of Telephus (cf. D.L. VI 5.87) and it may have been a very small one, that perhaps indicates the size of the meal that it is going to contain. Both σπυρίς and σπυρίδιον seem to be a common way of carrying food according to Athen. 8. 365a (cf. Ar. fr. 557 and K-A ad loc.). LSJ s.v.2 say that it is the translation of the latin "sportula". Food can also be carried in a κίστη in Ar. *Ach.* 1069 (see Rennie ad loc.).

2. **ἔπρὸς ὠφελήν:** several solutions have been suggested to correct this passage.

On one hand it has been suggested to be a name, since the expression ὡς πρὸς is sometimes used "to have the intention of going to someone's house", according to LSJ s.v. ὡς C II a, and the text of Athen. VIII 365a goes on by saying: ὅταν τις αὐτὸς αὐτῷ σκευάσας δεῖπνον καὶ συνθεῖς εἰς σπυρίδα παρά τινα δεῖπνήσων ἴη. But there is no evidence about a name like ὠφελήν and Meineke suggests altering it into an attested name like ὠφέλαν. The suggestion of Schweighaeuser is τὸν ὠφέλαν following a very

similar passage of Apoll. Car. fr. 29.2 (suggestion taken by Blaydes *Adv. I* p. 17 who proposes ὡς (πρὸς) ᾽Οφέλαν); Kaibel apud K-A favours ᾽Οφελίων(α) or perhaps ᾽Οφελίμην, as the name of a hetaira.

On the other hand, Kaibel in his edition of *Athen.* proposes: ὡς προσωφελεῖν; but this proposal does not fit the context of the quotation and the preceding line.

I would be in favour of the first proposal. A name (of a hetaera) could be suitable to the context and maybe it was invented by Pherecrates, as Kaibel apud K-A suggests.

Fr. 58

In the comedies of Aristophanes there is no scene that shows on stage a person ill with high temperature as it seems to be represented here. Perhaps the most nearly parallel scene would be that of the wounded Lamachus in *Ar. Ach.* 1191f. (in general some illnesses are mentioned, for instance in *Thesm.* 483ff.; there are also doctors but they are generally mentioned for the sake of a joke, cf. Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p.247 and 280ff.).

Perhaps we can envisage that the scene represented here was of a person lying on a bed (maybe using the ἐκκυκλήμα), as it happens at the beginning of Aristophanes' *Clouds* in which the two characters lie in bed. This idea would fit the representation of a play with a domestic character.

The text has been restored with the help of the two quotations of Eustath. *in Il.* 707.36 and *in Od.* 1761.29 where the word ἄρδαν is found instead of ἄρδαλα in the first citation.

**ἄρδα:** 'dirt' is first found here in Classical Literature. The verb ἄρδαλόω is attested in *Philem.* fr. 62 (cf. also the adjective ἄρδαλος). According to *Ar.Byz.* fr. 1851. apud Eust. *in Od.* p.1761. 29 it is of foreign origin (συνάπτει δὲ τούτοις ξενικὸν καὶ τὸ (ἄρδα καὶ add. Slater) ἄρδαλῶσαι).

**σπόγγισον:** 'to sponge off'. About the Ionic σπόγγισον instead of the usual Attic aspiration σφόνγγισον (cf. fr. 28.4 σφόνδυλον), see *Ar.* fr. 59. In Aristophanes the 'sponge' is related in some occasions to scenes of fear and its physical influence on the characters (cf. *Thesm.* 245, *Ran.* 482, 487).

This fragment refers to the probably common but disagreeable proceeding of 'taking the securities' of a debtor (cf. *Ar. Nub.* 35, 241, *Ecc1.* 567 where Praxagora takes it as one of her first measures in the new society, *Pl.* 451). Pawning the chiton was sign of deep poverty (cf. *Ar. Nub.* 179 and Dover ad loc. and *Pherecr.* fr. 123).

**ἐνεχυριμαῖος:** the adjective 'pledged', 'in the state of being pledged' is only found here in Classical literature, and *Phryn. ecl.* 342 condemns it since it is used by οὐδεις τῶν δοκίμων, while ἐνέχυρον is commoner. In spite of this very sweeping sentence, there is evidence about a variation of the saying βοῦς ἀλλότριος τὰ πολλὰ ἔξω βλέπει (*Zen.* II 81) into βοῦς ἐνεχυριμαῖος (cf. L. Cohn *Zu den Paroemiographen* p. 75 Breslau 1887) and in the V century the contamination of -ιμος and -ιμαῖος seems to have been fairly normal (cf. Buck-Petersen *A reverse index* p. 45; other compounds with this suffix can be found in *Hdt.* 2.36 εὐχωλιμαῖος, *Ar. Pax* 678 ἀποβολιμαῖος playing with the term ὑποβολιμαῖος; see *Ψευδοβολιμαῖος* by Cratinus iun.).

**χιτών:** at early times it usually designated a man's tunic (in contrast with the woman's πέπλος); but later it could mean also the woman's small tunic (above all the diminutive χιτώνιον indicates the Ionic chiton, the 'regular indoor dress of Greek women' according to Gow on *Theocr.* 15.21). In IV century Greek χιτωνίσκος was the regular name without any diminutive sense (cf. *Dem.* 19. 217 and MacDowell ad loc.).

#### Fr. 60

The manuscripts VΓ of Sch. Ar. *Vesp.* 968d give a corrupted quotation of this fragment and perhaps the best suggestion is the addition of Meineke ed. min. inspired by the text of Aristophanes: καὶ τραχήλι' ἔσθ(ει).

The kind of food that has been served (about παρέθηκε cf. fr. 32) 'heads and odds-and-ends' as Edmonds *FAC* I p.227 translates it, does not seem to be a delicacy.

κράνι': 'heads' in general is called εὐσάρκα by Amphis fr. 16 (cf. also Hipp. *Epid.* 7.62) and according to the Sch. cit. it can designate 'fish-heads' also.

⟨τραχήλια⟩: it designates the parts of the animal from the τράχηλος or neck. It is dog's food in Ar. *Vesp.* 968.

#### Fr. 61

Fragment of difficult interpretation because of the textual problems. The metre seems to be iambic tetrameter catalectic and there may be a syllable missing at the beginning.

τῶλεν: the solutions given to this corrupted word are not satisfactory since the quotation is not long enough to give an approximate sense. The following proposals have been made:

- Lobeck *Paralipomena grammaticae* p. 192 n.6 Leipzig 1837: ὁ δεῖν' ὀβελίαν δεῖ (against this interpretation see Kock ad loc. "at ea adhortationis alacritas huius modi sententiae non convenit").

- Meineke ed. min.: ὄφειλεν or ὄφειλε σ'.
- Kock: εἴωθεν or ἔοικεν
- Palmer *Hermath.* 4 (1883) p. 335: ὄλον μὲν.
- Headlam *CIR* 13 (1899) p. 5 ἔδει μὲν.
- Desrousseaux *Observations critiques sur les livres III et IV d'Athénée* p. 50 Paris 1942: <sup>v</sup> ὄδε μ' (cf. Taillardat *Images* §141).

- the most radical change is that of Kaibel apud K-A: αἰνεῖν μὲν ὀβελίαν, σποδίτου δὲ προτιμᾶν.

**ὀβελίαν:** according to Athen. III 111b, it means here bread ἐν ὀβελίσκοις ὀπιᾶτο. But this explanation of the origin of the noun was already disputed and, according to the same source, it could also refer to bread that costs one obol and maybe the form ὀβολίαν recalls this origin (cf. Ar. fr. 456).

Ar. fr. 105 refers to the special kind of bread that was carried by the ὀβελιαφόροι in the City Dionysia and seems to have been identified in a vase-painting as a long loaf of bread carried by two men in a stick, perhaps still the spit where it was cooked (see Pickard-Cambridge *DFA* fig. 84 p. 213 and p. 61, and in favour of this opinion also Poll. VI 75, Hesych. οἱ8, Phot. p. 313.20). Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 223 n. 1 suggests that the explanation of the method of cooking with the spit is not possible technically and that it seems more likely that the noun refers to its shape simply. The explanation of the obol of price is not convincing for bread to be so expensive (see Blumner *Tech.* I p. 75 n. 1).

**σποδεῖν:** originally "to pound, smite, crush" (LSJ s.v.) is

very common in comedy, and, according to Taillardat *Images* §633, "propement broyer, se dit souvent des mauvais coups" in metaphorical sense.

In Ar. *Pax* 1306 and possibly this fragment it means 'eat, devour'. But as Fritzsche *Quaestiones Aristophaneae* I p. 73 Leipzig 1835 says, it could ambiguously mean "paedicare" (see Ar. *Ecc1.* 113, further Taillardat *Images* §193 and Henderson *MM* p. 172).

**προτιμᾶν**: in a negative phrase it does not mean 'to prefer'; but rather φροντίζειν (cf. Lobeck loc.cit.), or "curare" (cf. *Ach.* 27, *Pl.* 655 and van Leeuwen ad *Ran.* 638: "id autem quod curare se negat aliquis ubi additur, in genitivo ponitur"; see also K-G I 393b).

#### Fr. 62

The text must be spoken by a male character or said about a man (cf. συνῶν). It contains several expressions that can be understood in an ambiguous sense: συνῶν can mean 'live together with', but also "to have intercourse, sexual relationship with" (cf. LSJ s.v. σύνειμι II and further Henderson *MM* p.159 and 214).

These words could be addressed to a fishmonger in a derogatory manner with reference to two very common sorts of fish. In metaphorical sense, these kinds of fish may refer to persons of low social or personal status.

1. **χορακινίδιοις**: diminutive of χορακῖνος (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 560), a very common fish to which several types have been related. "The

ancients gave etymological explanations to its name: for its black colour from κόραξ 'raven', and Athen. VII 309a: referring only to the Νειλῶται κορακῖνοι, but perhaps to all of this species, διὰ τὸ τὰς κόραξ κινεῖν" according to Thompson *Fishes* p. 122-3.

See further Arcestr. *SH* 150.3 and Ar. fr. 550.

2. **μαινιδίους**: diminutive of μάγνη, is "a little worthless fish: a sprat or its Mediterranean analogue *Maena vulgaris*", cf. Thompson *Fishes* s.v. It is found in Ar. fr. 258, *Ran.* 985, Eub. fr. 148.6, Antiph. fr. 69. It was seen as gregarious and very prolific (cf. Thompson loc.cit.).

#### Fr. 63

The honour of carrying olive-shoots in the Panathenaia festival was given to old men, but it could also qualify a person 'no longer fit to do anything else', MacDowell on *Vesp.* 544 (see also Cratin. fr. 33).

### Ἴπνός ἢ Παννυχίς

One of the topics of this play may have been the 'war of sexes' depicted in fr. 64 (as in Ar. *Lys.*, *Eccl.* and to a certain extent *Thesm.*); but otherwise the fragments shed very little light about its content. The double title (about them in general, see introductory note on *Epilemon*, p.199) could lead to further speculation.

On one hand, Ἴπνός refers, as Harp. s.v. explains, to the kitchen as a part of the house. It is generally identified with the part where the oven is placed and the cooking utensils (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 139, 837). In this context it may be interesting to point out that some or even most of the cooking activities that included frying or roasting were done outside (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1005 and 1096ff.) while baking is done inside the house (cf. fr. 26. 2). As it is expected then, some kind of cooking must have taken place (cf. fr. 66) and there are references to food and commercial activities which are related subjects (cf. fr. 67 and 71 and fr. 70. 4, perhaps by chance, mentions the non-existence of the feminine of μάγειρος, μαγείραιναν).

On the other hand, Παννυχίς is a common title that was used by other writers like Eubulus, Alexis and Hipparchus. It could be interpreted in two ways.

Firstly, it may be related to the night festival that usually included songs and dances and was held after the δεῖπνον (cf. Pl. *Rep.* 328a: καὶ πρὸς γε παννυχίδα ποιήσουσιν, ἦν ἄξιον θεάσασθαι. ἐξαναστησόμεθα γὰρ μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον καὶ τὴν παννυχίδα θεασόμεθα τε πολλοῖς τῶν νέων αὐτόθι καὶ διαλεξόμεθα, also Soph.

*Ant.* 1146-52). This kind of festivals could be a celebration sometimes of religious character (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 371). It could in more general sense indicate any activity that lasted all night long and παννυχίω indicates in *Ar. Nub.* 1069, fr. 715 and *Men. Dysc.* 858 (see Sandbach ad loc.) 'to make love' (see Henderson *MM* p. 157-8). But Παννυχίς was particularly a women's festival (cf. Hunter on *Eub.* p. 175) and it may suggest that the play took place during the celebration of a festival. This context seems to have been common in Old Comedy (cf. *Ar. Thesm.*) and maybe in some cases, this setting was the only one where subjects like women taking power could have been possible to imagine for the ancient scholars (cf. the other title of *Lysistrata*, *Adoniazousae* according to Schol. ad 389, see *Ar. test.* 2a 19; the Hypoth. II to *Eccl.* places this play in the festival of the Scira).

Another possibility, suggested by K-A, is that Παννυχίς is a proper name of a hetaira. In this case it would be the first example of this name, found in this sense in *Luc. Dial. mer.* 9 (cf. K-A *PCG* V p. 238).

The play has been dated before 415 because fr. 64 mentions the house of Pulytion which was famous for its luxury till later times (cf. [Pl.] *Eryx.* 400b and *Pausan.* 1.2.5). This date has been suggested because in this year a mock-celebration of the mysteries took place in this house (cf. *And.* 1.17). The fact that Pausanias says that at his time it was a temple of Dionysus could be important, since it could imply that it was confiscated and made into an official temple perhaps as a punishment of this rich man for his activities in Alcibiades' house (cf. *Plut. Alk.* 22.4).

It seems then possible that 415 could be the terminus ante quem this play was performed, as Körte *RE* XI (1939) 1987 suggests. In any case the house was known to have belonged to Pulytion much longer after the V century and there are some elements of the history of this house that we do not know.

This interpretation also takes the fragment literally and maybe it is the only way to take it; but it could be also understood in the way of a joke in the context of an exclamation about something totally impossible and incredible to see or an expression of bewilderment about the possession of a vain character being mortgaged (see *infra* on fr. 64.2).

Fr. 64

The private houses in the Classical Athens were very few times outstanding and tended to blend with the other houses (cf. Isocr. VII 52 and Dem. 3.25); for this reason the house of Pulytion at colonnades of the Ceramicus was especially outstanding and remembered for its magnificence till later times (cf. [Pl.] *Eryx*. 400b and Paus. 1. 2. 5).

It is not clear if the house was represented on stage by one of the doors which formed part of the staging of the play (if we take ὄραξ in literal sense: 'don't you see'. The text, otherwise, could be understood as follows: (the speaker pointing at his own or another character's house), "don't you see the house of a 'Pulytion' on mortgage" (since the character considers himself as a rich man and influential; cf. a similar interpretation of fr. 125). Or interpreting the verb ὄραξ in the sense of 'to discern, perceive' (LSJ s. v. I 2 or III).

2. τὴν Πουλυτίωνος: the name Πουλυτίων is not commonly found in Classical Athens. Pape *Wörterbuch Gr. Eigennamen* s. v. only registers a rich man who became especially famous because of the mockery of the Eleusinian mysteries (cf. And. 1.12, Isocr. 16.6). It seems that Pulytion himself took part in a similar celebration which occurred at the house of Alcibiades (see Plut. *Alk.* 22.4 and MacDowell on Andocides *On the Mysteries* p.179 and 183 Oxford 1962). The mortgaging of the house is not necessarily due to his activities in the mysteries (when the house would be confiscated), although one cannot rule out totally that the house

was mortgaged after being confiscated on his death or exile and still was called with his name. Anyway, he was probably seen, as Sommerstein *CIQ* 80 (1986) pp. 106 says, "as an extravagant wastrel who had got deeply into debt".

ὑπόβολον: this word seems to mean 'mortgaged ἐπι ὀβολιμαίω τόκῳ' (cf. Phot. p. 626.9). It seems to refer to the tablets that were affixed in order to point out this fact (cf. Dem. 41.6).

Nonetheless, there is no further literary evidence about the use of this word in antiquity and we have to rely on the later lexicographers about the use of this word.

#### Fr. 65

This line is an example of use of military or pseudo-military language. The two verbs are very similar in their sense. The first one, ἐπανεχώρησα, means 'to retreat, return' and "is oftenest in military or quasi-military contexts Th. VI 49.4, *Lys.* 461" as Ussher on *Ecc1.* 29 says. The second one, ἀπέδραν (cf. Ar. fr.519, Phryn. com. fr. 46.3) indicates "to run away on the sly" (cf. Conti Bizzarro (1989) p.272 who suggests that these words could be said by a deserter or a slave, see Pl. *Prot.* 310c, Men. *Sam.* 358, fr. 195K8-T).

#### Fr. 66

This fragment suggests a possible scene in the 'kitchen' as the title implies (cf. Kaibel apud K-A). It refers to ways of making a fire ready by blowing the fine ashes. In Dionys. fr. 2. 16 a cook speaking gives this function to the ὀψοποιός or assistant.

The passage could be understood also within the context of the procedures to make a sacrifice, as for instance Eup. fr. 99. 41-3, Ar. fr. 345, Arched. fr. 2. 4-5 (sprinkling on some oil); cf. Blake in *Menander's "Dyscolus"* pp. 172f. New York 1966.

πάλης: its meaning seems to be related to a very fine dust, either that of the finest meal, Hippocr. *Mul.* I 64 or that of a fire as here. This latter sense is only found in Pherecrates in literary text; as for the first meaning Aristophanes uses other compound forms as παιπάλη *Nub.* 260 and 262, παιπάλημα *Av.* 431, παλημάτιον *Ar.* fr. 700.

#### Fr. 67

Porson in Th. Kidd *Tracts and miscellaneous criticism of the late Richard Porson Esq.* p.184 London 1815 suggests a modification of the manuscripts' reading, that is probably right. The text has to be interpreted then as a reference to the archon (cf. ἐφ' οὗ) a year earlier, under whom the price of the wheat was cheap. The pronoun ὅδε generally implies the person who is going to be spoken of (cf. fr. 12. 1 on ὁ δέ).

Bearing in mind that the play has been dated before 415,

Edmonds *FAC* I p.229 n.c tried a highly speculative proposal to identify this figure with Nicias.

An important historical fact that might have influenced the price of corn at this time is the occupation of Decelea in 413 in Thuc. VII 28.1. Hopper *Trade and Industry in Classical Greece* p.79 London 1979 concludes that this fact produced an increase of price; but Westlake *CIR* LXII (1948) pp. 2ff. sees no reason to reach this conclusion in the passage of Thucydides (cf. also Gomme ad loc.).

Maybe we have here a topical reference to an important element of Athenian daily life. Actually it is not strange that the price of wheat is one of the first things Dicaeopolis asks the starving Megarian in *Ach.* 758: Δι.: τί δ' ἄλλο Μεγαροῦ; πῶς ὁ σῖτος ὄνιος; / Με: παρ' ἀμὲ πολυτίματος ἕπερ τοῖ θεοί, (about the relationship between πυρός in our text and σῖτος in Aristophanes see Moritz *CIQ* n.s. 5 (1955) pp. 135ff.). It was probably a way of measuring the economic situation of a place.

#### Fr. 68

Some textual difficulties cause difficulties to understand the text with precision.

In particular it refers to the unusually attested 'bathing-skin' (cf. on ῥαν) and according to Poll. X 181, the source of our fragment, it was part of a longer enumeration of τὰ ἐργαλεῖα τῆς παιδοτριβικῆς, that is to say, the instruments used in education. The boys' education is the subject of *Ar. Nub.* 961ff. especially.; but it could also relate to the education of girls,

since it seems to have been quite normal (cf. F.A.G. Beck *Album of Gr. Education* Sidney 1975) and this kind of clothing was mainly worn by women and by men when they were in presence of women.

ῥαν: word that covers a wide range of meanings more or less related. It is mainly found as a sort of cloth for special occasions. It was made of sheep-skin and used as a military garment in Hermipp. fr. 56, for religious celebrations Hermipp. fr. 76 and in our case as in Theop.com. fr.cit. it is 'a sort of drawers or apron used by bathers' (LSJ s. v.).

Poll. loc.cit. explains that it was used by αἱ λουόμεναι γυναῖκες ἢ οἱ λούοντες αὐτάς and in a former passage, VII 66 quoting Theop.com. fr.cit., says that it is τὸ δὲ περὶ τοῖς αἰδοίοις, οὐ μόνον γυναικῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνδρῶν, ὅποτε σὺν ταῖς γυναιξὶ λούοιεντο, ῥαν λουτρίδα ἔοικε θεόπομπος ὁ κωμικὸς. It is clear that it was mainly a female garment to preserve Athenian women's and girl's dignity when having a bath in a public place in a male company who should wear it in this case as well.

We may have its depiction in some vase paintings with Atalanta wearing something similar (cf. Beck op.cit. pl.84, 409: Cup. Paris, Louvre CA 2259; Seltman *Women in Antiquity* London 1959<sup>2</sup> pp. 121-2, see J. Boardman in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* II. 1 p. 945 Zürich/Munich 1984); a later Roman mosaic in the Piazza Armerina in Sicily depicts women in a gymnasium wearing a similar kind of clothing (cf. W. Dorigo *Late Roman Painting* p.165 Engl.transl. London 1970). Ginouvès

*Balaneutiké* pp. 223-4 relates it to other bath implements like the ἐκλουτρίς, maybe a στολά (cf. *ibid.* n.4) and κυστίς for the hair.

**λούμενφ:** it seems that this is the reading closer to the textual tradition, accepting the easy change of προζώννυται into προζώννυτε as suggested by Bentley *Epist. ad Hemst.* (I p. 291 Wordsw.) (see K-A for other changes).

Yet it is not clear whether it refers to a boy or a woman; it is possibly said, as Edmonds *FAC* I p. 229 n.d proposes, 'of a mother whose little girl (παιδάριον) is getting too old to bathe naked'.

**προζώννυτε:** this compound is only found in Pherecrates. It seems to be a descriptive verb to mean 'girding the ᾤον in front', perhaps as a kind of wide belt fastened to the waist and the breasts (cf. Theop. com. fr. 38 τηνδι περιζωσάμενος ἥβης λουτρίδα / κατάδεσμον ἥβης περιπέτασον).

Fr. 69

A fragment whose metre is according to Meineke *FCG* II p.280 "iambicus tetrameter in fine truncatus quamquam etiam rationem sequi liquet". It is impossible to determine which is the exact meaning of the words. In fact the text reminds of fr.18: a kind of defence made of wicker-work and the it could suggest the style of a military or pseudo-military terminology, as in fr.65. The emphatic sense of both adjectives also suggests a poetic reference (cf. on περίερκτος), Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) pp. 274-5 suggests that they are technical terms and "si tratterà, quindi, della σκηνή drammatica e del περίβολος, in cui si svolgevano gli agoni lenei" referring to the κάπναι in Ar. *Vesp.* 394.

**σκηνή:** it seems to mean any kind of small and provisional house and was used in several contexts: tent (cf. Th. 2.34, Ar. *Pax* 879 and Platnauer ad loc.), a booth in the market-place (*Thesm.* 658), and also to the scene in the theatre (see *Pax.* 730, *Vesp.* 394; see further Dover on *Nub.* p. lxxi).

**περίερκτος:** a hapax formed after περιέργω (περιείργω in Attic) whose meaning is 'enclosed' (LSJ).

The relation of the two adjectives, one next to the other although applied to different words, seems to be periphrastic and emphatic. It could be translated as 'the hut encircled by encircling reed-fence'.

**περιβόλοις:** only found here and in Eur. *IA* 1477 in a choral portion with the meaning of 'encircling, compassing'.

**κάπναισι:** in plural it designates here and in Ar. *Vesp.* 394

a group of reeds forming a fence. In Ar.loc.cit. they are surrounding the shrine of Lycus to whom Philocleon prays: *κού μή ποτέ σου παρά τὰς κάννας οὐρήσω μήδ' ἀποπάρδω.*

#### Fr. 70

The Eupolidean metre is usually related to choral parts of a comedy and especially to the parabasis in the section called the 'anapaests' (about it see supra p. 23 and Sifakis *Parabasis* p. 34).

As in fr. 155. 25ff., the quotation of Athenaeus is divided into two parts, but probably they belong to the same parabolic speech in which some lines have been left out by our source (as it is interpreted by Kock comparing it with *Thesm.* 785ff.). Another possibility is that it is part of a scene with the chorus and the second quotation belongs to a speaker different from that of the first lines. In that case it does not belong to a parabasis' anapaestic speech (cf. Edmonds *FAC* I p. 231 n. a).

The theme developed through these lines -and perhaps the whole speech if we accept the first opinion- was a kind of defence of women in opposition to men, but from an original and ironical point of view. In ll. 1-3 a man is identified as having the activities of a perfume-seller and his circle of decadent activities (cf. fr. 2). Lines 4-5 defend that women never are 'coquette' (*μαγε(ραινα)*) or 'fish-mongeress' (*ἰχθυοπώλαινα*). We cannot say how these women were depicted to contrast with men, but they might have been shown as staying at home, devoting themselves to domestic activities as in Pherecr. fr. 10 and 26 and therefore, fulfilling their traditional role in Athenian

society.

The joke is, nonetheless, the fact that on one hand these names did not exist in their feminine form, but the masculine one was used to designate both sexes, and on the other hand, women were satirized traditionally in comedy performing other activities like the bread-seller (cf. supra p.63). This text follows a common place in Old and Middle comedy: the criticism of social habits through the criticism of the sellers in the shops of the market-place (this subject is already found in Epich. fr. 17 Kaib.). It seems unlikely that the following words of Athenaeus: ἐκάστῳ γὰρ γένει ἀρμόζοντα δεῖν εἶναι καὶ τὰ τῆς τέχνης are a paraphrase of the text of Pherecrates, as Meineke *FCG* II p. 277 says.

The whole passage of Athen. XIII 612a suggests an interesting parallel between the Socratic philosophy and the perfume technique, as both tend to the 'pursuit of happiness'. Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.277 finds parallelism between the description of the effeminate perfume seller 'sitting ὑψηλῶς' under the sunshade in our text and the description of Socrates in Pl. *Phaed.* 89d (cf. also *Thaet.* 175d); but maybe both follow a traditional representation of the intellectual as sitting in a high place thinking and talking nonsense (cf. Aristophanes' representation of Euripides in *Ach.* 407f. and in *Nub.* 331ff. the words of Socrates which depict the thought of the intellectuals as μετεωροφρένας, l.333). The intention of Athenaeus, when quoting this text, is mainly to give another example of the

tradition that goes back to Solon and considers the selling of perfume as a disreputable activity.

1-3. The topic of these lines is the moral decadence of some individuals in connexion with the group of people usually assembled in the perfume-seller's stall in the agora (cf. fr. 2). The order of the words, putting the main word *μυροπωλεῖν* at the beginning and then the question is typical hyperbaton of the colloquial language that can be compared to fr. 6.1, 74.1, 108.

1. *μυροπωλεῖν*: the person in charge of selling the perfume (who was the same as the perfume-maker, cf. Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p.125) had his shop perhaps with other shops of the same kind in a special part of the agora called τὸ μύρον (cf. fr. 2.2, *Ar. Equ.* 1375, Polyzel. fr. 13, *Eup.* fr. 222) and surrounding it there was usually a group of rich men who were always chatting away (cf. *infra* on ἐλλαλεῖν). This activity could also take place in the garland-shop (cf. fr.2, *Ar. Eccl.* 302), in the barber's and in the shoe-maker's (cf. *Lys.* 24. 20).

The word in itself is seldom found in literary texts (only another time in *Ar.* fr. 856). The perfumer seems to have been called commonly ὁ μυροπώλης and the shop τὸ μυροπώλιον. *Ar. Eccl.* 841 uses the feminine form αἱ μυροπώλιδες to designate women who provide the banqueters with perfume and of similar status to the αὐλητρίδες (cf. *Ussher's* comment on *Ar.* loc.cit.).

τί μαθόντ': it is not necessary to change it into τί παθόντ', as *Dobree Adv.* II p.347 since it is the reading of A, the best manuscript of *Athenaeus*, and is well attested in *Ar.*

*Ach.* 826, *Nub.* 402 and 506, *Lys.* 599, *Pl.* 908 and *Eup.* fr. 193.4. It is also common in Atticist Greek and its meaning is, according to LSJ s.v. *μολθάνω*, «*under what persuasion, with what idea? hence ironically, for why on earth?*» (see Rennie on *Ach.* 826 and Starkie on *Vesp.* 251).

*καθήμενον* / *ὑψηλῶς*: the participle seems to add another feature to depict this perfume-seller: he sits in a high position, perhaps in order to control his products and the clients who come to buy them. Another possible explanation is that it could imply a secondary sense: *καθήμενον* could also mean 'to sit doing nothing, be idle' and in similar context see *Ar. Equ.* 1375. And *ὑψηλῶς* could be understood as 'boastfully, proudly'. Perhaps both are ambiguously employed to indicate a figure of a very 'high' appearance, sitting in a high position, doing nothing. This is the normal position with which the intellectuals (Socrates but also the dithyrambic poets) are depicted (cf. *supra* and see also Dover on *Nub.* pp. lxxvii f. and *Ar. Nub.* 331 and R. K. Fisher *Aristophanes' "Clouds"* p. 107 Amsterdam 1984).

*σκιαδεῖψ*: a 'sunshade' in general, but particularly the one used by women (cf. *Poll.* VII 174) and also in religious processions (cf. *Ar. Av.* 1508 in the parody of the Panathenaia, see further Deubner (1962) p. 31 n.4; in *Eup.* fr. 481 Dionysos carries one and may be a reference to the one in the processions and also to an effeminate depiction of the god). It was a sign of effeminacy for a man to carry it, because it was used to protect the whiteness of the skin (about white skin and effeminacy, cf.

Alex. fr. 322) and in the agora it covered the reed-booths that formed different shops (cf. fr. 18 γέρροις).

κατεσκευασμένον / συνέδριον: this expression is very similar to that of Pl. *Prot.* 317d: βούλεσθε οὖν, ὁ Καλλίας ἔφη, συνέδριον κατεσκευάσωμεν, ἵνα καθιζόμενοι διαλέγεσθε, but in Plato the voice is active, while it is not in our fragment (Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.277 suggests that Plato's text is a linguistic echo of our; but it seems unlikely). Perhaps the best way of understanding this construction is as Kock does, interpreting it as a middle participle which would agree with ἄνδρ', and would be parallel to καθήμενον in l.1. Thus it may indicate a personal interest of this perfume-seller in this meeting.

The noun συνέδριον, according to Turner on Pl. *loc.cit.* Oxford 1891, was used "mostly of the 'meeting' and not of the meeting place"; this is true for the two texts just cited; but in other instances, like Polyb. II 39.1, it could mean the 'meeting house' (cf. Sandbach on Men. *Dysc.* 177).

3. The text of the manuscripts is as follows: συνέδριον οὗ τοῖς μειραχίοις ἐλάλει. The word οὗ after συνέδριον does not fit the metre and the only way to understand it is as a pregnant construction (cf. LSJ s.v. ὅς Ab I 2). Also ἐλάλει is unmetrical and not suitable to the sense without οὗ. Perhaps the simplest solution is the text generally adopted: συνέδριον τοῖς μειραχίοις ἐλλαλεῖν (see *infra* on ἐλλαλεῖν).

τοῖς μειραχίοις: this word could be related to συνέδριον, to ἐλλαλεῖν or to both at the same time.

It is the diminutive of ἡ μεῖραξ which already had a

derogatory sense in Cratin. fr. 60 (about changes of genre and sense, see K-A's comment ad Cratin. loc.cit.). It is usually found in connexion with these effeminate young men. They were symbols of the looseness and softness that characterized some Athenian young people and in Aristophanes they are related to the sophistic education (cf. Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 125 and Carter (1986) pp. 119ff.

**ἐλλαλεῖν**: a suggestion made by Dobree and it is probably the best to solve the problems of the text. It is never found in ancient Greek. K-A draw attention to the comic formation of ἐναριστᾶν in Eup. fr. 269.1 'to have breakfast in'; Pherecrates could have formed it in parallel. Other suggestions are: Meineke μειρακίοις συλλαλεῖν (found in later Greek literature and inscriptions); ἐκλαλεῖν (cf. Eur. fr. 219N<sup>2</sup>), as Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 276 suggests, but its sense seems to be 'to speak out', 'to proclaim' and it does not fit well the rest of the lines; and διαλαλεῖν according to Cobet apud K-A's app.crit. (cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 175) which has the disadvantage of the repetition of δι' immediately afterwards, although this fact may have provoked the mistake.

In any case, the verb λαλεῖν is common in connection with the topic of the rich youth sitting in the agora and avoiding the main problems of the city (as Ar. *Ach.* 22 depicts them standing about and avoiding the purple rope that surrounds the Assembly: οἱ δ' ἐν ἀγορᾷ λαλοῦσιν κᾶνω καὶ κάτω / τὸ σχοινίον φεύγουσι τὸ μεμιλωμένον), by 'babbling' or 'gossiping' about banal subjects, (cf. Pherecr. fr.2). Perhaps the best example of the idle talking

is *Equ.* 1376ff. and *Eup. fr.* 166 has also a good description of one of these young men, Phaiax: λαλεῖν ἄριστος, ἀδυνατώτατος λέγειν. A similar line is that of *Nub.* 1053: ἅ τῶν νεανίσκων ἀεὶ δι' ἡμέρας λαλούντων / πλήρες τὸ βαλανεῖον ποιεῖ κένας δὲ τὰς παλαίστρας.

**δι' ἡμέρας:** about this expression, see *Ar. Nub. loc. cit. Ran.* 260, *Telecl. fr.* 30, *Eub. fr.* 33.2. Another way of saying it would be τὴν ἡμέραν ὅλην see Sandbach on *Men. Dysc.* 755.

4. **αὐτίκ':** the speaker seems to give some of examples of jobs never found in feminine form and compare them to men's jobs already mentioned (cf. *LSJ s.v. αὐτίκα II*).

**μαγεῖραιναν:** like the following noun ἰχθυοπωλαίναν, is a comic invention, that follows the pattern of ending in -αίνα to form feminines as in Aristophanes ἀλεκτρυάίνα in *Nub.* 666, 667, 851, 852; κηρύκαινα in *Ecccl.* 713 and Σκύθαινα in *Lys.* 184. The use of this ending is, according to A. da Costa Ramalho *Emerita* 18 (1950) p. 39 also found in θέαινα in *Il.* 8.5 and other Homeric passages and *Antiph. fr.* 81.3; in feminine words of the theme in -ν- or -ντ- like θέραπων (θεραπαίνα), γέιτων, τέκτων, etc., and in feminine of animals and names of persons. Pherecrates seems to have used a common way of coining feminine names as we see from the texts of Aristophanes. It is difficult to know if the ending has a pejorative nuance as Chantraine *La formation des noms en Grec Ancien* p. 108 apud da Costa Ramalho p.40 says and if Aristophanes is playing with the Homeric expression θεαῖνα and nouns of animals ending with it (cf. also E. Fraenkel *Kl. Beitrage zur klassischen Philologie* Roma 1964, I pp. 149-50, A. da Costa

Ramalho art.cit. p. 40 is against this interpretation).

The role of a μάγειρος was mainly to cook a meal for a banquet and this cooking was usually related to the performance of a sacrifice. It was a masculine task (cf. Berthiaume *Les rôles du Magesiros* p.31 Leiden 1982). A. da Costa Ramalho art.cit. pp. 41f. explains it as follows: "la palabra 'cocinheiro' ou μάγειρος aparece frequentemente na comédia, principalmente na comédia depois de Aristófanés, mais preocupada com ben comer, que com ben pensar ou proceder". It is possible then to speculate that this figure was already portrayed with the features of the parasite and the boastful individual who would become a stock-character in later comedy. In this way one can understand that women could be proud that women-cooks never existed; despite this fact women really cooked, but at least according to fr. 22, it was done at home.

5. οὔτε μὴν οὐδ': the correction of Dindorf οὔτε instead of οὔ seems to be the correct reading because of the reading οὔτε in the conjecture of l.4 (cf. K-A ad loc.). The other suggestion are discussed by K-A. About Kock's proposal, see Denniston *GP* p. 345.

The colloquial anacoluthon, common in literary Greek, joins the two οὔτε; the οὐδ' in this case would be adverbial (similarly cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 480 and see further Denniston *GP* pp. 339-40 III).

ἰχθυοπώλαιναν: according to A. da Costa Ramalho loc.cit. it is not only a hapax, but also the only word ending in -πώλαινα in Greek. Again this job is rejected to have ever been performed by women but the reason for it is not so clear. We do not know whether women sold fish in the agora, but as he says: "a verdade

é que a reputação de destreza da língua que hoje caracteriza, entre nós, estas negociantes, pertencia antão conspicuamente às ἀρτοπώλιδες ".

Probably, therefore there is an irony related to the fact that if they were not fishmongers, they were ἀρτοπώλιδες about whom there is even a play by Hermipp. (cf. *PCG V* p.565). About the topic of the fish-market, cf. *Ar. Equ.* 816, *Vesp.* 789, fr. 402, *Amphis* fr. 30, *Alex.* fr. 16.

Fr. 71

About its metre Meineke *CGF* II p. 278 suggests that it is an Archilocheus similar to Ar. *Vesp.* 1518, 1521f., Aesch. *Sept.* 764, Eur. *Rh.* 906, Cratin. fr. 32, 62 and 360. It is scarcely found and thus very difficult to reach any conclusion about when it was used in particular, if it had any particular function or meaning (see MacDowell on *Vesp.* loc.cit.).

For the technical meaning of the text, see Bluemner *Tech.* I pp.4ff. The text has been interpreted by Meineke as "iumentis frumentum terere tritumque statim vendere"; but Kaibel apud K-A disagrees on the grounds that "neque enim boves cum frumentum terunt ὑποζύγια sunt nec βοσσί quis ἄλοῶν sed βόας ἄλοῶν dicitur". His interpretation seems more likely "frumentum vix tritum tradere iumentis", bearing in mind that ἐκποιῆσαι meaning 'to sell' is only found in later legal texts (cf. Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.277). Accordingly it is possible that this sentence is applied in the form of a proverb: 'to give the recently threshed corn to the animals', as meaning 'to waste efforts'.

**ὑποζυγίαις:** noun to designate 'beasts for the yoke, beasts of draught or burden' (LSJ). Xen. *Oec.* 18.4 defines them : ὑποζύγια καλούμενα πάντα ὁμοίως, βούς, ἡμιόνους, ἵππους.

**ἀλοάσαντι:** verb that means originally 'thresh', that is to say. to separate grain and chaff from the straw. For this purpose, draught animals were used besides other means (cf. Xen. op.cit. 18.3, Theocr. VII 34 and 156 and Gow ad loc.); for details of this agricultural activity see Bluemner *Tech.* I pp.

33ff. and for other metaphorical uses of this verb and activity in general, Müller *Handwerk und Sprache* pp. 250ff. Another name for this old practice, already mentioned in *Il.* 20. 495, is τριβειν with several compound forms.

This verb widens its sense and comes to mean metaphorically 'cudgel', 'thrash' (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 149, fr. 932 and further Müller *ibid.* p. 253 and Taillardat *Images* §138).

**ἐκποιῆσαι:** here it is a case of correption of the diphthong -οι-. See *supra* about the sense of this word in this passage.

#### Fr. 72

The two words are connected with banquets and mainly with activities that take place at the end of them.

**κυμβέλων:** diminutive for κύμβη, vessel that designates either a drinking-cup or a boat. The shape is described by Harpocrat. s.v. and according to *Athen.* XI 481d they had no handles or base: γένος ποτηρίων βαθέων τὰ κυμβ(α καὶ ὀρθῶν, πυθμένα μὴ ἔχόντων μηδὲ ὄτα (see further *Athen.* XI 481d-482e). They were pricey (see MacDowell on *Dem.* 21.133) and frequently appear in Comedy (cf. *Alex.* fr. 146, *Ephipp.* fr. 16, *Anaxandr.* fr. 33).

**κατάκτου κοιτάβου:** it was " a game in which players tried to dislodge a thin plate set on the top of a long telescopic rod" according to Hunter on *Eub.* p. 108. It is frequently found in comedy e.g. *Ar. Pax* 1242, *Nub.* 1069, *Eub.* fr. 15.

## Κοριαννώ

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The title of this play is a woman's name. Her status can be stated with certainty. She was a hetaera according to Athen. XIII 567c (cf. test.ii) who quotes this play among other later plays, entitled with the names of hetaerae, probably the main characters of these plays. As it is common in Aristophanes (like, for instance, *Lysistrata*, *Praxagoras*, *Dicaeopolis*), the name may have a secondary sense. It comes from the herb called κοριαννόν or κοριανδρόν (cf. *Ar. Equ.* 676, 683, *Alc.com.* fr. 17, *Anaxandr.* fr. 51), and, as Henry *Menander's Courtesans and the Gr. Comic Tradition* p. 16 n.3 Frankfurt am Main/Bern/New York 1985 suggests, it could have something to do with the quantity of watering this plant needs. Theophr. *HP* 7.1.3 explains: κοριαννον δὲ δυσφύεσ' οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐθέλει βλαστάνειν τὸ νεόν ἐὰν μὴ βρεχθῆ, a fact that would fit the image of a harlot or a prostitute who is depicted in some fragments as a heavy drinker (cf. fr. 67-70). Some of the manuscripts of Suidas and Pollux transmit the title in plural, but that is likely to be a mistake (cf. Meineke *CGF* I pp. 83ff.).

The characters and their characterization have been discussed supra in pp. 48f. Yet, I would like to summarize their features as they are represented in the fragments.

Two women speak in fr. 75: one seems to have just arrived from the baths and she may be depicted as φαρμακίς (cf. fr. 80 where her actions may have been described). The main subject of discussion is drinking and it is easily connected with fr. 76

where she could be identified with the first speaker. Maybe she is Corianno herself, depicted as a *lena*. In fr. 76 we know of another character: Glyce and of her daughter or servant. The name of Glyce is also related to wine (cf. comment ad loc.) and she could be a prostitute as well; but it is not clear from the context.

Fr. 73 and 74 could also belong to the same scene. But in this case it is not clear who the characters were. It is possible that two women are speaking; one asks for drink and food to a servant who misunderstands it and this misunderstanding leads to a joke (perhaps playing on the servant's ignorance). Kaibel apud K-A suggests that it is a man, a kind of braggart who just arrived from the east and perhaps is the lover of Corianno (see comment ad loc.).

If we take the first interpretation, the four fragments could be connected into one scene: two women speaking and in the middle or the end of their conversation, another one arrives from the baths.

Another scene that could have taken place is a fight between an old father and his son for a *hetaera*. Fr. 77, 78 and 79 (cf. also 166) could be the remains of their discussion developed perhaps with a lot of pantomime and play on words (cf. fr. 78). This scene must have been very popular in Greek Comedy of its time, and we have an example of the comic inversion of roles that Aristophanes stages in *Eccl.* 877ff.

The other fragments are too short to reach a definitive conclusion. Fr. 83 seems to be part of a narrative description and

fr. 84 part of the parabasis (the χομμάτιον or the parabasis itself) where the chorus makes an interesting remark about the originality of a new metrical invention.

Pherecrates uses some topics that are traditionally related to women:

- drinking a lot and in secret (at home): cf. *Eccl.* 14-5, 43, *Lys.* 114, *Thesm.* 347.

- eating a lot, cf. *Thesm.* 418, 813, Semonid. fr. 7 46-7 D<sup>2</sup>.

- the other is doubtful, but also possible: pretended wealth and sophistication (cf. comment on φακοί 73.3).

Otherwise he seems to follow the trend which is sketched in other plays: the depiction of characters and scenes in the context of daily life events, trying to make fun on the idiosyncrasy of the characters and their social behaviour. It is interesting to compare the comic motivation when developing a traditional joke; for instance, a woman in fr. 75 is thirsty because she has just arrived from the baths; while in *Ar. Eccl.* 144-6, the woman is thirsty because she is wearing a beard with which women are trying to obtain men's power; the same joke acquires another dimension in the sophisticated style of Aristophanes.

Fr. 73

The text of this fragment is part of a dialogue. On the one hand, everybody seems to agree that the point of the passage is to play on the character's affectation trying to be sophisticated and wealthy, while in reality φακοί may be the only kind of food to be found at home. On the other hand, in respect of the characters who take part in this conversation several proposals have been made:

- Bergk *Rel.* p. 299 suggests that they are two women, in a kind of hen-party of two rivals in love with the same person (cf. Handley on fr. 75-6 in P.E. Easterling-B.M.W. Knox *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* I p. 392 Cambridge 1985).

- Kaibel, and Koerte *RE* XIX (1983) 1988.31 agrees with him, suggests that it is a boastful man, lover of Corianno, just arrived from Asia (cf. fr. 74.3 talking about the Mariandynians) and speaking to his servant.

- Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.277 suggests that the speaker is a hetaera who is putting up some kind of appearance in the presence of her lover.

The three interpretations seem possible. I tend to agree with the first one, above all because women are generally depicted in Aristophanes as drinking at home, except on the occasion of a festival being among other women (cf. *Lys.* 1-2 and 114 and Henderson ad loc.) in contrast with man drinking-scenes in Comedy who usually drink in the context of a banquet (cf. *Equ.* 98, *Vesp.* 1210-7). The dialogue seems to be placed in the context of an interior (cf. Kock: 'in aulae vel in aulae peristylo').

The vocabulary of this text is very colloquial: φέρε δὴ 1.1, (see Denniston *GP* p. 216-7), κἀντραγεῖν 1.2, ἴδου 1.3, μὴ μοι φακούς 1.4 without verb, τράγη 1.5.

1. **κατακλινῶ**: about this expression and similar ones with the future indicative and the same sense (cf. *Ar. Equ.* 98 and *Vesp.* 121, 1216, where it designates 'to lie down on a couch' to eat and drink as it probably happens here).

**τραπέζαν <ἔκ>φερε**: the manuscripts' reading, φέρε, is clearly wrong. Two solutions are possible: ἔκφερε, made by Kock and εἴσφερε suggested by Dobree *Adv.* II p.306.

The second suggestion εἴσφερε is found in the form τραπέζας εἴσφερε in *Vesp.* 1216, *Ran.* 518, meaning 'to serve the dinner' (cf. *Alex. fr.* 89.1). The other indicates to bring things onto stage (cf. *Nub.* 19 and *Dover ad loc.*, *Pherecr. fr.* 44, *Pl.com. fr.* 71.2, *Ar. fr.* 545 and *K-A ad loc.*). This suggestion seems to be more likely in the context of the fragment that takes place on stage, since the prefix ἐκ- was used for the action of bringing something on stage (cf. *Ar. fr.* 362) while the other suggestion, at least in the two passages above cited, refers to something that does not happen in the sight of the audience.

2. **κἀντραγεῖν**: the construction with this infinitive after the noun κύλικα (the drinking-cup par excellence), is awkward and Toup suggested an emendation καὶ τράγημ'. This suggestion seems unnecessary in the context of the fragment, since it has been attested the similar constructions in *Ar. Ecc1.* 306ff., *Phryn.com. fr.* 26, *Xen. Cyr.* VIII 3.41, *Luc. Conv.* 38 (cf. *K-A ad*

loc. and Renehan *Stud. in Gr. Texts* (1976) p.79).

It means 'to nibble' and implies to eat dessert or any kind of aperitif to go with drinking as it is in our case, for example dried fruits, sweets. About it see *Equ.* 51 and Neil ad loc., also *Vesp.* 612 and Taillardat *Images* §132.

3. Between 1.2 and 3 there was probably a pause where the first personage goes to recline and the second fetches something. This line is an example of the colloquial enumeration without verb (see also *Ar. Ach.* 470).

φακοῖ: 'lentils'. In Old Comedy this vegetable can be understood in two ways: either 'lentils au naturel', as Neil ad *Equ.* 51 suggest, which would be expected by the word κἀντραγεῖν; or as LSJ s. v. 1b explains it: as a synonym with φακή, that is, the lentil-soup so common in Old Comedy (cf. also *Amph.* fr. 40, *Gal.* VI 770 and *Vict. Att.* 7).

I would be inclined to accept the second meaning for the reason that it would fit the content of the last lines: the lentil-soup had proverbially very bad smell (cf. infra on ὄζει κακόν) and it was considered as a poorman's food (cf. *Ar. Pl.* 1004, *Sud.* φ 23, *Macarius VIII* 7).

The text plays with an ambiguity. The first speaker asks for 'dry-fruits' and the second one brings the lentil-soup, probably because of a misunderstanding (see on fr. 74 for the τραγήματα and with a similar joke on the misunderstanding of the slave).

4. μή μοι φακοῦς: about this elliptical expression usually said with accusative, see similarly *Ar. Vesp.* 1179 and *Ephipp.* fr.21.3 and further K-G I pp. 329-30.

5. **τράγη**: this fragment and Theophr. *HP* II 7.6 are the only instances where the aorist form does not occur in a compound form. The best explanation is that it is due to the economy of language that avoids using a prefix recently mentioned in 1.2 (cf. Taillardat *Images* §132, C. Watkins *HSCP* 71 (1966) 115-9, R. Renehan *Gr. Textual Criticism* (1969) 77-85 and *St. Gr. Texts* pp. 11-27).

**τοῦ στόματος ὄζει κακόν**: about this construction with genitive without preposition, see fr. 30, Ar. *Ach.* 852. It seems that there is a reference to the proverb **τοῦπι τῆ φαιῆ μύρον** which seems to have been coined after Stratt. fr. 47.2 (cf. K-A ad loc.); but maybe it was commoner in the reference to the bad smell of this soup (see Plut. *Aet. Rom.* 279f. apud Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 278 about the 'Solonian' prescription for the bride's breath smell).

Fr. 74

As it has been suggested, this fragment and the former one could be part of the same scene. If in fr. 73 the first speaker asks for drink and food to go with it, in this passage one person begins by asking someone to bring ἰσχάδας, that is to say, 'dried figs' which are normally considered a kind of τραγήματα in contrast with the φακοί, that are never to be so (cf. Pl. *Rep.* II 372c and Luc. *Merc. Cond.* 24).

The point of the joke seems to be the misunderstanding of the servant who brings the χύτρας instead of ἰσχάδας and the explanation that the speaker gives: the servant is from Mariandynia and thus it is pointing out the barbarian condition of the slave. The two last lines could be speculated to have two other connotations: the explanation is a comic invention to make fun of the servant's ignorance in confusing such common things. Another possibility is to understand a secondary obscene sense: ἰσχάς could refer to the female sexual organ at least in later Greek according to Henderson *MM* p. 134 and χύτρας was easily compared with rear (cf. J.N. Adams *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* London 1982 p.86). The speaker may be making a double entendre implying that this mistake is normal in Mariandynia since they all are homosexual and confuse one part with the other (for the use of obscenity in Pherecrates, see p. 37).

The two last lines, according to Meineke, may be given to a third speaker, but there is no indication of a change of speaker and they come immediately after without any particle; it makes it impossible to know which is the tone with which these words were

said. As K-A ad loc. say, the lines could be addressed to another person by the first speaker. A possibility is to add <γ'> before ἐκείνοις in 1.3 which could have an ironical conclusive tone stressing the word Μαριανδυνοῖς.

The language of the whole passage is very colloquial, as in the former fragment, as in 1.2 the future indicative with a question, the genitive partitive, the 'tag-question' at the end.

1. ἰσχάδας ... τῶν πεφωγμένων: in an emphatic manner the speaker stresses the kind of figs by using the partitive genitive at the end.

These dry-roasted figs are not commonly found anywhere else. Maybe it was not a different type of dried figs; but the speaker is trying to make clear which kind of figs in order to make it easy for the ignorant servant to distinguish from the σῦκα. Nonetheless, it seems to have been a normal Greek custom to roast the τραγήματα (cf. Epich. fr. 151 Kaib. and Ar. *Ecc1.* 844). The verb φάγω is not common in Attic Literature that prefers φρύγω.

In general 'figs' were common and cheap in Attica that was famous all over the world for them (cf. Athen. XIV 652f. and further Olk *RE* VI 2. 2107ff.).

προέλε: from the verb προαιρέω, it means to 'produce from one's stores' (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 419). In later comedy it would be related to the bad slave who eats things when going for food there (cf. Theophr. *Char.* 4.6).

2. There is a gap in the quotation of Athenaeus, who is mainly interested in the special kind of figs, where the speaker gave

some orders and perhaps holds a conversation with another character, although it is not necessary to be very long. As we can see from fr. 73, the orders are accomplished immediately.

ἐν τοῖς Μαρριανδουνοῖς: the Mariadynians were a people of the North-West of Asia minor who were under the power or influence of the Greek colony Heraclea Pontice. Their status is not very clear, but it seems that it was close to that of the helots in Sparta and lived, above all, working on the fields surrounding the city. They became very Hellenized, but kept being barbarians and as our fragment shows (cf. βαρβαροῖς), they had their own language. During the IV century they provoked several revolts. In Athens they were very common as slaves (cf. also Eup. fr.302 and K-A ad loc. for other instances). Vidal-Naquet *The black Hunter* pp. 180-2 Engl.transl. Baltimore/London 1986 discusses their social status and the political and social problems that <sup>they</sup> seem to have provoked and quotes as a good compilation about them: D. Asheri "Herakleia Pontike: Über die Frühgeschichte von Herakleia Pontike" *Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris n<sup>o</sup> 5: Forschungen auf der Nordküste Kleinasiens I* Vienna 1972.

5. χύτρας: very popular earthen pot which had a great range of uses: from very common daily life to religious functions in sacrifices (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 284) and offerings. It is also found in proverbs like χύτραν ποικίλλειν: to do a useless thing (cf. Sch. ad Ar. *Vesp.* 280b) and in a children's game: the χυτρίνδα, where the one who had the χύτρα was the 'seeker' (see further Ussher on *Ecc1.* 734, and Saglio *D-S* 1.2, 1140ff.).

Fr. 75

It is another dialogue probably between two women. The first one explains what she has been doing and she may have just come on stage. The point of the fragment seems to be to play on the joke of the women's bibulousness and, above all, related to drinking from big containers (cf. 1.7).

As I have already said (cf. p. 48), the first speaker uses a very specialized and pseudo-scientific language that may suggest that she is a φαρμακίς, she may be Corianno herself; but we can not assess it with certainty. This figure of the witch is found in several instances in Greek Literature, as in Ar. *Nub.* 749, possibly in Men. *Θέτιαλη* (cf. fr. 192Kb-T) and Theocr. 2.

1. **βαλανείου**: common word to indicate bath and especially used of the public baths in Athens.

In Athens there were some houses that had their private baths, but it seems that they were unusual and only the richest households could afford one (cf. Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p.205). I think that the second sense is better here, since it is not a casuality, but it needs to convey some meaningful information.

In comparison with Aristophanes, where the word is usually related to men staying there, instead of being in the assembly dicussing the problems of the city (cf. *Nub.* 105, 837, *Equ.* 1401, etc.), here it is a woman who has just come from there. Normal Athenian women may have attended the public baths and Ginouvés *Balaneutiké* pp. 220ff. suggests that some public baths for women

may have existed or at least some hours a day the baths were reserved for women. It was, nonetheless, clearly stated that it was shameful for a woman to be in the public baths (cf. H. Diels *Vorsokratiker* II p. 407. 1. 22-24) and we may suppose that any woman who could afford it, had a bath at home. It is attested by Athen. XIII 590f that prostitutes and hetaerae went to the public baths to show their bodies and probably for business (cf. Ginouvés *ibid.* p.222).

If this is the case, the character in this passage was a prostitute or someone connected with them, perhaps a 'lena'.

**δλεφθος:** it is mainly a cooking term (cf. Pherecr. fr. 113.14, Telecl. fr.51) and in medical terminology it can be also identified with one of the first moments of the process of some fevers (cf. Hipp. *Epid.* IV 16 (vol. V p. 154. 11L.), *Acut.* 49 (I p. 134.6 Kuehl) which is translated as 'languor' (about it cf. Vintró *Hipócrates y la nosología Hipocrática* p.128 Barcelona 1972).

In this fragment it refers simply to the 'boiling' heat which could be felt in the βαλανείφ and it was seen as a feature of moral degradation (cf. Dover on *Nub.* 837). It is also a good excuse for introducing the subject of drinking.

3. **γλίσχρον ... τὸ σίαλον:** these terms (and also ξηράν... τήν φάρυγα in 1.2) are an unusually minute way of describing thirst. They seem to be common in Classical Greek, although with this meaning they are mainly found in medical or technical literature (e.g. γλίσχρον Hipp. *VC* 14 or *Pl. Ti.* 82d, 84a, Arist. *Mete.* 333b 34, etc.). Aristophanes uses it to qualify a glutton (cf.

Taillardat *Images* §157). About σιάλον cf. Hipp. *Aph.* 7.16, Xen. *Mem.* I 2.54.

4. This verse seems to be corrupted because the reading of the manuscripts εἰ λάβω κυρίσοι gives no clear sense. Among the restorations suggested up till now, I think, that of Kock is probably closest to the manuscripts' reading and gives the most interesting sense introducing the subject of the cup: τί λάβω κεράσαι σοι; τὴν κοτυλίσκη;. There is a series of suggestions that are similar and could be also possible (see K-A's app. crit.).

**τὴν κοτυλίσκη:** it is the diminutive form of the word κότυλος or κοτύλη which designates already a small cup. E. Pottier describes it in *D-S* I 2. 1549 as follows: 'vase à boire et à puiser ou à verser. Dans ce sens, on trouve indifféremment en grec κότυλος et κοτύλη. Les deux formes sont employées dans les poésies homériques qui le représentent comme une vase à boire de capacité médiocre et en usage chez les pauvres gens'. It had the same religious (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 459 κοτυλίσκιον) and convivial uses as a κοτύλη, and sometimes it is mentioned as a kind of κύαθος, (cf. Pollux VI 19 and Sch. on Ar. *Ach.* 1067), a small cup used to pour wine and water into the crater.

About other uses and instances, cf. Athen. XI 478b-479c and about the form of the -ίσκη ending, see Schwyzer *GrG* I pp. 541-2 and Arnot *Glotta* 59 (1991) pp. 187ff.

5. **κινεῖται ... χολή:** it is used to designate 'to be sick' or 'angry and bad tempered'. This expression coming from the traditional medicine that explains psychological states by

physical movements of the different parts of the body, probably belongs to the colloquial Attic (cf. Taillardat *Images* §353) and is found frequently as in Eur. *Med.* 98-9, Ar. *Vesp.* 403, *Ran.* 4, *Lys.* 68, Men. *Epitr.* 768 and Bato fr. 7.3. In the context of wine and women Aristophanes uses a similar expression also in *Lys.* 464ff.: Δν. ἡ γυναιξίν οὐκ οἶει / χολήν ἐνεῖναι; Πρ. νῆ τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ μάλα / πολλήν γ', ἕανπερ πλησίον κάπηλος ἦ.

It is perhaps interesting to point out that there is a kind of illness called χολή δριμεῖα whose symptoms are high temperature and thirst that cannot be quenched by drinking, but increased (cf. Aesch. *Choe.* 185-6 and Hipp. *Acut.* 62). Perhaps the expression was traditionally related in this sense: women always develop this illness when wine is concerned.

6. **φάρμακον**: 'drug, medicine', it is suitable to the context of the woman who speaks with such pseudo-scientific terms and who we may suspect to be γυνή φαρμακίς as in Ar. *Nub.* 749. About the topic of illness caused by a drug, see Eur. *Bacc.* 326-7 and Dodds ad loc.

The speaker is looking for an excuse to change the cup and thus to get a bigger one.

**τὴν μεζζονα**: the actor would produce a big vessel for wine in this moment. The wine-cup par excellence is the κόλιξ and it is probable that it was understood here, although probably one of exceptional size. A similar situation with wine cups and women is found in Ar. *Lys.* 195ff., Pherecr. fr. 152, Eub. fr. 42.

## Fr. 76

It can be clearly connected with the foregoing fragment in its sense and Kock made the following suggestion to complete the first line: <καὶ δὴ κέχραται. πρόσφερ'. ::>. Anyway, the drinking subject is now developed towards a common place usually related to it in Comedy: the proportions of wine and water. In other passages women are depicted as liking to drink unmixed wine (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 197, *Eccl.* 227, 1123, Cratin. fr. 299, Diph. fr. 57). In our case the joke is in the immoderate quantity of the mixture of the two elements.

We can distinguish three characters speaking: one is Glyce, who is mentioned in 1.1. Another one speaks in 11.2 and 5 and is impossible to ascertain who she is and a third one who has some words in 1.4 could be the child or the servant of Glyce (see on ὄ μάρμη in 1. 4). If we follow the organization of the text before proposed after fr.75, the first speaker of this fragment would coincide with the first speaker of the former fragment and Glyce would be speaker B in fr. 75.

In this context Glyce would be the owner of the house but her status is certainly unknown, A. could be Corianno herself for the length of this passage and the number of lines.

As in other fragments it finishes with a sententious line that sounds like a joke (cf. p. 34).

1. ἄποτος: in medical terminology, cf. Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p. 281 n.57 and see Phryn.com. fr. 57 as a paratragical expression.

ὁ Γλύκη: it was a common name in Athens (cf. Kirchner *PA* 3039.41, 3038 a, b). It could be translated as 'sweetie' as Stanford does on his note on *Ran.* 1344. I find that it is easily related to wine as ὁ γλυκός was the name for 'sweet wine' (see on fr. 17). It is mentioned in three passages in *Ar. Eccl.* 43, *Ran.* 1343 and 1362; but it is not clear to which social status they belong, if they are different persons. Stanford on *Ran.* 1343 suggests that Glyce is a slave who has stolen a cock, but afterwards in 1362 it is said εἰς Γλύκης which could refer to the house of Glyce's owner, but I find it unlikely if she was a slave. Perhaps she was a free-woman in the neighbourhood or a special kind of slave, maybe a hetaera.

2. ὕδαρῆ: cf. *Alex.* fr. 228.4, *Antiph.* fr. 25.4, *Epphip.* 11.2.

παντάπασι μὲν οὖν: Kock suggests πανταχῶς instead of παντάπασι because of metrical reasons: "damnandum propter vitiosam anapaesti in quinto pede incisionem"; but this change is not necessary because there are other instances of it, although it is rare (cf. fr. 74.2, 77.1 and Handley *The Dyskolos of Menander* p.68 London 1965).

About this combination of particles following an adverb, cf. Denniston *GP* p. 477 (c) and see on fr. 77.1.

3. τί ἠργάσω: K-A's suggestion of ἠργ- instead of εἰργ- is supported by the fact that this is the common augment in Classical Greek, while later Greek would favour the latter one (cf. Meisterhans *Grammatik*<sup>2</sup> p.171, *Av.* 323, *Vesp.* 787 and 1350, *Thesm.* 743 and *Eccl.* 134). The construction is usually with double accusative, but can be also found with dative (cf. *Soph.*

OT 1373 and Ar. *Vesp.* 1350). Here it is left unspecified and could be understood: what have you done to me or what have you done to it?. It is a common colloquial expression also found in fr. 82 in the form τί μ'εἴργασαι; (cf. *Thesm.* 945).

4. The correct measures of mixing wine and water were not clear and perhaps, at the end, depended on the kind of wine and the συμποσίαρχος. As Jardé *D-S V* 921 says: "on obtient des mélanges dans lesquels le vin intervient pour  $1/5$ ,  $1/4$ ,  $2/7$ ,  $1/3$ ,  $2/5$ ,  $1/2$  (ἴσον ἴσφ),  $4/7$ ,  $3/5$ ,  $2/3$ ".  $1/4$  is considered best by Hes. *Op.* 596, Ar. *Equ.* 1188, Polb. VI 18; ἴσον ἴσφ is also very frequently mentioned in Old Comedy as a sensible proportion. In this fragment  $2/4$  might imply two things: it is a lot of liquid which recalls the big cup that was mentioned at the end of the last fragment; and also it is a strong mixture that was considered by a woman fond of drinking, water (see also Cratin. fr. 195 and K-A ad loc.).

ὦ μάμμη: from a servant to a master, cf. Theocr. 15. 60 (μάτερ), and further Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.283. About the difference between μαμμία and μάμμη or μαμμᾶ, see *Nub.* 1383 and Dover ad loc.

5. ἔρρ' ἐς κόρακας: a well known expression that implies disdain, e.g. Ar. *Pl.* 604, *Pax* 500, *Amips.* fr.23.

βατράχοισιν οἰνοχοεῖν σ' ἔδει: about this proverbial phrase, cf. Aristophont. fr.10.3. and Zenob. *vulg.* II 78. About the use of ἔδει/δεῖ or χρῆν/ἐχρῆν, cf. Barrett ad Eur. *Hi.* 1072-3.

#### Fr. 77

This fragment can be understood in the context of a scene where father and son argue about a woman (see K-A ad loc.)

1. ἀπαρτί μὲν οὖν: the combination of adverb and two particles indicate a very strong negation of the preceding sentence. About ἀπαρτί see fr. 98.2, Ar. *Pl.* 388, Plat.com. fr.59.

In this case the two particles are used as a very emphatic adversative formula (cf. Denniston *GP* p. 475 (3)), while in fr. 76 the speaker corrects what the other speaker has just said. About the repetition of μὲν see Eup. fr. 429.

2. ὄρα: cf. Ar. *Ecc1.* 922-3 τὴν δ' ἐμήν / ὄραν οὐκ ἀπολείς οὐδ' ἀπολήψει.

#### Fr. 78

It seems likely that it belongs to the same scene as the former fragment. It contains the hapax ὕσχυαμαξ, whose meaning is 'to be mad from taking henbane: to be raving mad' (see LSJ s.v. and Phot. p. 619.10, Sud. v123; for further references about the effect of this plant, see Stadler *RE IX* 1 192-5).

This word may have belonged to familiar Attic. In a context of a fight between father and son, the similarity between ὕσχυαμάω and υἱός must be taken into account. A possible reconstruction with fr.166 which Meineke suggested to belong to this play could be as follows: ὦ Ζεῦ πολυτίμητ' ἄρ' ἀκούεις ἃ με λέγει / ὁ πανοῦργος υἱός; :: ὕσχυαμαξ ἀνὴρ γέρων.

#### Fr. 79

The coincidence with the ending of fr.87 is puzzling and difficult to solve. There are two main positions: Kock, Edmonds and K-A think that they are two different fragments of two different plays. Runkel, Meineke (cf. *CGF* II p.292) and Rehrenböck pp. 74ff. consider that the title given by Pollux X 89 is wrong and it should be emended into *Corianno* to which fr.87 would belong.

I agree with the first proposal and I think that the repetition of the noun ἀνόδοντος and the similarity of the construction do not necessarily lead to the conclusion that both texts are the same one. The repetition of lines was common and expressions that probably were successful in the case of a joke, (cf. Hunter on Eub. p. 175 quoting Ar. *Vesp.* 1031-6 and *Pax* 754-9). The addition of ἀλήθει is 'hard to explain', as Edmonds *FAC* I p. 238 n.a suggests. And finally the figure of the toothless old man was a stock-character in Comedy that appears frequently in our fragments, and see for instance Ar. *Ach.* 715, *Pl.* 266, Phryn.com. fr. 85, Eub. fr.144. Com. Adesp. 1090K has the comic coinage νωδόγερον (cf. Com. Adesp. 860K, Theocr. 9. 21, Pollux II 16).

**ἀνόδοντος:** the form is only found in the two passages of Pherecrates beforehand discussed and it may have been a comic coinage, (cf. fr. 168. 2 about words beginning with α- negative), but one cannot explain it with certainty. It substitutes the commoner form νωδός.

ἀλήθει: it is more frequent as a late form of the verb ἀλέω; but it is already attested in the Classical language (cf. Slater *Phoenix* 30 (1976) p. 241 about the confusion in the Hellenistic scholars).

It may have a literal sense 'to grind', but one would suspect that the word would refer to a secondary sense, maybe to eat with the irony in the fact that he has no teeth already or perhaps in a obscene sense, as the activity of 'grinding' seems to have been related to (cf. fr. 10; see also in Carm. Pop. 869PMG ἄλει, μύλα, ἄλει / καὶ Πιπταχὸς ἄλει / μεγάλας Μυτιλήνας βασιλεύων and Campbell *Gr. Lyric Poetry* pp. 448-9 ad loc., also μύλλω in Theocr. 4.58 and in Latin 'molo', further Adams *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* pp. 152-3 London 1982).

Fr. 80

The fragment recalls the description of a cooking scene in which a woman is preparing some kind of vegetables.

**ἀδράφαξυν:** the exact spelling of this word is not clear and it is possible that it was not normalized, since several forms are attested to designate this kind of wild vegetable. Ar. *Equ.* 630 reads ψευδάτραφαξυς and Phot. α387 and other lexicographers (see K-A ad loc.) also call it ἀνδράφαξυς; but it may be a mistake due to a normal confusion in the textual transmission as in Ar. *Ran.* 1099 the mss. M and R read ἀνδρός instead of ἀδρός (cf. G.P. Shipp *Modern Gr. Evidence for Ancient Gr. Vocabulary* s.v. ἀδρός Sidney 1979) or by confusion with ἀνδράχλη 'portulaca'.

This wild vegetable (cf. Hesych. α1195) is called in Latin 'artiplex' and 'orach' in English. It grows very quickly and is difficult to weed out because it resembles other vegetables (cf. Plin. *NH* XX 213 and Theophr. *HP* VII 1,2 who also says that it springs in Gamelion, the month when the Lenaia were held).

Aristophanes uses it as a metaphor with political sense (cf. Ar. loc.cit. and Neil ad loc., Taillardat *Images* §392). Neil points out in his comment: "it is curious that the ἀτράφαξυς, which is constantly mentioned along with coriander, occurs in a fragment of Pherecrates *Κοριαννῶ*" (κοριαννα is also 'coriander'). The kind of meal here could be a poor person's food (about poor people and philosopher cooking and living on vegetables, cf. on fr. 14) or a special potion.

**εἴτ'**: in the middle of a sentence and after a participle,

one would expect a finite verb (cf. LSJ s.v. I 2 'expressing surprise or incongruity'); but maybe it is just part of a longer enumeration of a woman's activities or something similar.

**ὄκλαξ καθημένη:** Sud. o111 and other instances (as cited by K-A ad loc.) explain its meaning as "going down on the knees, kneeling down". It is only found here and in Hipp. *Haem.* 4 (VI 440. 6L).

#### Fr. 81

The text seems to distinguish two different actions: 'pour <it> down upon her and draw the bucket up with water'.

**κατάχεον:** 'pour down upon'; it is used with an object in genitive and another in accusative that must be understood or maybe we have to take the accusative at the end of the line as 'the water of the bucket' (about the construction of this verb, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 246, 1040, *Equ.* 1091, *Nub.* 74).

**κάνυδρευσαι:** hapax of Pherecrates. The sources of our fragment (Phot. α 2152) explain that it means 'to draw water up the well' and it is clearly formed with the prefix **άν(ά)**; the noun τὸν κάδον contributes also to this meaning as it is normally used of the bucket of a well (cf. Ar. *Ecc1.* 1002 and Ussher ad loc.).

It is, otherwise, very similar to other compounds with the negative suffix in **άν-**, as **άνύδρευτος** or **άνυδρ(α)**.

### Fr. 82

This line is formed by a series of common expressions. Firstly, the adverb πάντως that in this position could have a strong affirmative sense (cf. LSJ s.v. II.3). Then, a partitive genitive dependant on εἶσι, quite usual in Aristophanes (cf. fr. 278.2 and Poultney *The Syntax of the Genitive Case in Aristophanes* p.77 London/Baltimore 1936). Finally, the numeral adjective εἴς followed by γε and the indefinitive adjective του (from τις), that in our case is masculine as our sources indicate: Sud. τ809 and Phot. p. 596.13. Other similar instances are Thuc. VI 34, VI 77, Ar. *Ecc1.* 523, fr. 191.

A parallel to this sentence is Ar. *Pl.* 345 εἴ γάρ τῶν φίλων that Rogers ad loc. connects with the well-known proverb κοινὰ τῶν φίλων (Zenob. IV 79). It might have had this sense of a biased friendship or perhaps that they have allies in their group.

### Fr. 83

The terms employed in this fragment (ἔσονται, τεύχος, κόλι, and κωρύκους) are usually related to food in other texts; but in our case it is very difficult to state if they had any connexion with such theme, although I would be inclined to say so (cf. on κωρύκους). It could be part of a description of something not happening on stage, (cf. the imperfect form of ἔσονται).

The last three words have in common, on one hand, the repetition of 'κ' sounds; on the other, that they are different kinds of containers that range from the most general to the most

concrete which suggests that the intention of the speaker is to embrace all kind of vessels.

**ἔσαυτε**: in comedy used generally to indicate to fill, stuff with food (cf. fr. 172, Eub. fr. 42.3, Alex. 138.6, Theop. com. fr.46). It can be constructed with genitive or dative.

**τεῦχος**: word not common in comedy nor in prose (cf. LSJ s.v.); but very usual in epic and tragic poetry. Its general meaning is 'tool, implement', but more frequently in plural it could mean 'arms, armour', or perhaps better here 'vessel' without specifying its kind.

**κόιξ**: another kind of vessel, but this seems to be a "palm-leaf basket", found in other instances: Antiph. fr. 64 (where see K-A), Epich. fr. 113 Kaib. The latter text is a similar enumeration: ἦ θύλακον βόειον ἢ κόιν φέρει / ἢ κωρυκίδα.

**κωρύκος**: 'a leather sack or wallet for provisions' (LSJ). This sack (cf. also the κόιξ as vessel for grain in Antiph. loc.cit. and the θύλακος, made of leather as the κωρύκος) is described as bread-carrier and it is also connected with the other two containers just described (cf. Epich. fr.cit. and Ar. Lys. 1210 and see Henderson and Sommerstein ad loc.).

Fr. 84

This passage belongs to a part of the parabasis of *Korianno*, although it is difficult to know to which part exactly, on the one hand, because in Aristophanes the terms ἄνδρες, προσέχετε τὸν νοῦν and ἀναπαστοῖς can be found either in the κομμάτιον or the parabasis itself and, on the other, because the Sch. ad Heph. p. 161c is not very definitive and, as Koster *Phil.* 80 (1924-5) p.362 says: "neminem fugit hanc meram coniecturam Scholiastae esse, cum ipse ἔοικεν explicationi praemittat".

The three lines are composed in 'pherecrateans'. This is the name given to a traditional metre: oo-vv-- based on a choriambic colon (-vv-) which was normally used as catalectic clausula to glyconics. But Pherecrates, first of all, calls it συμπύκτοις ἀναπαστοῖς (cf. note on these words; about Hephaestion's interpretation of this metre, cf. Dale *The lyric metres of Gr. Drama*<sup>2</sup> p. 61 n.2 Cambridge 1968) and claims it to be ἐξευρήματι καινῷ.

In which way was it original, then? In Dale's opinion (op.cit. pp.61-2) "obviously it was no 'new invention' of Pherecrates to contract an anapaest, and the most probable explanation seems to be that instead of ordinary anapaestic cola with irregular incidence of spondees he uses hexamakra with resolutions and contractions so regularized that each line 'folds up' into a pherecratean. It is noteworthy that in *Ion*. 490ff. Euripides takes up another choriambic colon nearly related to the pherecratean (in effect a headless form of it), the 'reizianum' -- vv--, and plays on its compatibility with anapaests".

Dale who follows more or less Koster loc.cit. in his explanation of this passage, considers that the words συμπύκτωις means 'contracted' and what happens is that Pherecrates contracts an anapaestic trimeter in such a way that it becomes ambiguously a 'new' metre, a Pherecratean. Probably he was the first in using this metrical scheme in a standardized way in double colon with a diaeresis after each Pherecratean length (see Dale p.61 n.3), and perhaps it would make sense that the rest of the parabasis parodied poetical forms used in tragedy, just as in fr. 155 the new musical forms are criticized.

There are two likely possibilities: that these three lines were the beginning of the anapaestic parabasis or kommation, insofar as in Aristophanes sometimes kommation and parabasis have the same metre with slight variations (cf. *Ach.* 626ff., *Equ.* 498ff., *Pax* 729ff.); or that the metre continued in the same way because 'it is difficult to see how Heph. could have reckoned in double cola if he had these three pherecrateans and no more before him' according to Dale op.cit. p.61 n.2. A similar group of lines in Pherecratean is Eup. fr. 175 which Whittaker p. 189 suggests to be part of the kommation of the parabasis.

1. ἄνδρες: this vocative seems to refer to the audience, as in *Ach.* 496, *Lys.* 630, see further K-A ad fr. (about this problem: to whom does ἄνδρες refer, the audience or the chorus, in Middle Comedy, cf. Bain *Actors and Audience* pp. 190ff. Oxford 1977).

προσέχετε τὸν νοῦν: this is a common formula to address an audience in order to draw their attention (cf. *Ar. Nub.* 575 and

Dover ad loc. and further references in K-A's note on this passage). A parallel passage is *Equ.* 503: ὑμεῖς δ' ἡμῖν προσέχετε τὸν νοῦν / τοῖς ἀναπαστοῖς. Maybe we should pay attention to Hermann's suggestion in *Elem. doct. metr.* (1816) p.603: πρόσχετε (based on the reading πρόσχετε in *Heph.* I, Schol.<sup>2</sup>), since the aorist form would be a variation of the traditional phrase, but it would be suitable to the rigidity of the metre.

2. **ἐξευρήματι καινῷ**: the expression is also found with similar words in some passages of Aristophanes (cf. *Eccl.* 577, *Nub.* 547, *Vesp.* 1052). In the last case the similarity has another double sense since Aristophanes is attacking poets who do what Pherecrates is just doing here: to find or invent something new in order to surprise the public only.

3. **συμπύκτοις ἀναπαστοῖς**: the main difficulty in this passage is the interpretation of the word συμπύκτοις. It may have the following meanings:

- in literal sense it means: 'folded together' (LSJ). It is found in *Diph. fr.* 90.2 and it is doubtful reading of some late mss. in *Ar. Ran.* 800, accepted by Stanford (ξύμπυκτα), but not by Coulon who prints ξύμπηκτα.

- from a metrical point of view, as Dale op.cit. p.62 says, this word "in ancient metrical theory is used of a contracted 'foot', such as a spondee in dactyls or anapaests". This interpretation seems to be right for this text and also coincides with the term ἀναπαστοῖς which seems traditionally applied in a technical sense.

If it is a simple technical term, we may suppose that there

is some kind of parody of the language of sophists and rhetoricians. The simple form πτυκτός is already found in *Il.* VI 169 where there is a reference to folding tablets to write: γράψας ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῷ θυμοφθόρα πολλά.

## Κρατάλοι

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

#### A) *Date.*

Regarding the date there has been a lot of uncertain speculation. Perhaps the only certain date is that it was performed after 456-5, year of Aeschylus' death, since fr. 100 is said by him probably in Hades.

Meineke *FCG* II 290, G. Kaibel *Hermes* 24 (1889) p. 45 and Schmid *GGrL* IV 1 p. 104 n.11 have suggested that Pherecrates' play (that seems to deal about a trip to the Underworld) is a precedent to Aristophanes' *Frogs* performed in 405 (according to these scholars too late a date for Pherecrates to be alive; but see on *Cheiron* and supra on p. 2).

Another element that has been taken into consideration is the date of Aristophanes' *Peace*: 421. According to Geißler (1925) p.39, Aristophanes inspired himself in Pherecrates. In *Pax* 749 Aristophanes describes his own comic art in terms similar to what in fr. 100, Pherecrates makes Aeschylus say about his achievements in tragedy.

Finally Rehrenböck p. 54 tries to support Geißler's date by taking Oellacher's argument in *WSt* 38 (1916) p. 147 and which is used to date also *Metalles* and *Persai* (see introductory notes to these plays). I do not think it is necessary to discuss this argumentation here; Rehrenböck takes for granted that every time Athenaeus quotes a list of titles it is done in chronological order, after he claimed in VI 268e that he was going to do it in

this order. On some occasions it does not seem impossible; but the generalization, on which Rehrenböck bases his date (between 425 and 420), is more than doubtful.

These suggestions are not convincingly supported, especially since we do not have any ground to know whether Aristophanes inspired himself in Pherecrates or viceversa. And maybe that is not the way to understand it at all, and both comic poets follow another independent source or a popular story which places Aeschylus in Hades in the tradition of the heroes of the *Odyssey*.

B) *Title. Coins in Hades.*

The word κραπάταλος is not found in any other literary source except for here. It may have been a colloquial term and since the title is in plural it may refer to the chorus of the play (cf. Rehrenböck p. 57).

We have to rely on Lexicographers to trace back to the original sense of this word and the one in Pherecrates. The main source is Hesych. κ3971 (cf. test. iii): κραπαταλλός· παρά πολλοῖς ὁ μωρός, ἢ νόμισμα (about the double or single lambda, see fr. 86 where the metre requires it single, cf. further Rehrenböck (1987) p.64). The first part of the gloss distinguishes a common meaning 'a mad person' and, according to this sense, Hesych. κ3969 explains an adjective, probably derived from it: κραπαταλλίας· άνεμώδης, καὶ άσθενής. καὶ άνίσχυρα λέγων. ἄμεινον δέ ληρώδης.

The second sense is a kind of coin; and it is relevant to our play, because this is its meaning here according to Pollux IX

83 (cf. test. 1): ὄνομα δὲ νομίσματος καὶ κραπαταλοὶ εἴτε παίζων εἴτε σπουδάζων Φερεκράτης ἐν τῷ ὁμωνύμῳ δράματι· λέγει δὲ τὸν μὲν κραπαταλὸν εἶναι ἐν ᾧδου δραχμῆν, ἔχειν δ' αὐτὸν δύο ψωθίας. τὴν δὲ ψωθίαν εἶναι τριώβολον καὶ δύνασθαι ὀκτὼ κικκᾶβους. This sense is also transmitted by Arcad. p. 54. 7 = p. 60. 21 Schm. (cf. test. 11).

In consequence, we might suppose that this noun was borrowed from spoken Attic and it may have been found in other texts (cf. test.iii παρὰ πολλοῖς); but only preserved in Pherecrates who designates with it ἐν ᾧδου δραχμῆν. I think in consequence that our poet says that this word that normally meant "the mad man", is a 'drachma in Hades' (cf. Rehrenböck (1987) pp. 63ff. and M. Caccamo Caltabiano- P. Radici Colace *ASNP* 17 (1987) p. 974). I agree with them that it is an invention of Pherecrates and not any out-of-use coin (cf. Rehrenböck (1987) p. 63 and n. 75).

Another gloss of Hesych. κ3970 κραπαταλλοὶ· ἰχθύες τινές has been brought forward as a possible origin of this expression (cf. LSJ s. v. κραπάταλος, Thompson *Fishes* p. 132, Rehrenböck (1987) pp. 63ff. and M. Caccamo Caltabiano-P. Radici Colace art.cit. p. 973). This suggestion would assume that the ultimate meaning of the noun generically designates a group of fish (Rehrenböck loc.cit. specifies that it was the small fish caught in the net and that was thrown back to the sea because it was inedible; this is a plausible interpretation; but I think it goes a little beyond the evidence, taking into account also that small fish was part of a delicacy called ἀφύαι or "small-fry"; cf. fr. 109), and perhaps it came to be applied metaphorically to weak and

brainless persons, ὁ μωρός, as a kind of insult (as for example ὄνος and similar expressions; cf. Taillardat *Images* §350ff.). This connexion with food is meaningful in relation to the sense of ψωθ(α (cf. infra "bread crumbs"), as M. Caccamo Caltabiano- P. Radici Colace art. cit. p. 974 propose, who also draw attention to the "forte valenza ctonia della simbologia ittica".

ἡ ψωθ(α is mentioned by Pollux loc.cit. as the second coin in the coinage of the Underworld that Pherecrates invents. Its original sense seems to have been "bread crumbs" (cf. fr.86), as M. Caccamo Caltabiano- P. Radici Colace art. cit. p. 94 say: "viene distinta la parte superiore del pane (detta ἀττάραγος) dalla parte inferiore (αἰ δ' ἐκ τοῦ κάτω) ψωθ(αι (cf. Poll. 7. 23. 6-8 = ἀποθραύσματα Hesych. ψ307)". They also relate "l'aspetto bruno e la natura secca" (p. 975) of these ψωθ(αι to the Underworld.

According to Pollux it is equal to a τριώβολον; but this subject raises another problem that I will discuss after dealing with the last coin in Pollux's account: ὁ κίκαβος.

κίκαβος, the smallest unit, is a noun invented by Pherecrates. He may have formed this word, as it is commonly agreed (cf Frisk s.v., Rehrenböck (1987) pp. 65ff., M. Caccamo Catalbiano- P. Radici Colace art. cit. p. 975), in parallelism with the coin κόλλυβος (a small coin, cf. Ar. Pac. 1200, Eup. fr. 274, Call. fr. 191. 2 Pf.), and probably related to κίκαβαῦ, "the cry of the owl" (cf. Ar. Av. 261, Lys. 761, see Schmid *GGrL*

p. 104 n. 2 and Rehrenböck (1987) p. 67 who compares it to γρϜ, "the grunt of the pig" and also according to Schol. Ar. Pl. 17, Sud. γ461 is the name of a coin). It has been related to the Latin "ciccus", 'the seeds of the pomegranate eaten by Persephone; but that seems less likely (about it, cf. Rehrenböck (1987) p. 66).

The relation with κικκαβαϜ could be a good comic resource inasmuch as it could be easily related to the γλαϜκες Λαυρειωτικάι, as Ar. Av. 1106 calls the Athenian coins, mainly distinguished by the symbol of the owl. M. Caccamo Catalbiano- P. Radici Colace art. cit. p. 979 say this noun "ribadische nel richiamo al grido della civetta, κικκαβαϜ, evanescente e fantasmico ricordo della simbologia monetale terrena, l'inconsistenza tradizionale della moneta dell' Ade: una moneta che non si vede, non si tocca, ma di cui si sente semplicemente l'eco".

The text of Pollux presents other difficulties in relation to the equivalence of the different coins with the real Athenian coins. The manuscripts give the following parities:

1 κραπάταλος = 1 δραχμή (6 ὀβολοί) = 8 ψωθίαι\*

1 ψωθία = 1 τριῶβολον (3 ὀβολοί) = 8 κικκάβοι

1 κικκαβος = 1 χαλκός (1/8 ὀβολοί)?

[\*But 8 τριῶβολα = 24 ὀβολοί = 4 δραχμαί = 1 τετραδραχμή, the normal Athenian parity]

The scheme shows a perfectly logical table of correspondence in an eightfold system, as far as the coins in Hades are

concerned; but the difficulties arise when we take into account the value in relation with the coins in the Athens. Two interpretations of this problem have been suggested:

- To suggest some textual modifications. The obvious one and the one that has been more widely accepted is that of Meineke *Quaestionum scenicarum specimen secundum* Berlin 1826 p. 37: ὀκτὼ ψωθίαις into δύο ψωθίαις, which makes possible the parity: ψωθίαις = τριώβολον. It is also an easy mistake of the copyist because of the presence of ὀκτὼ κικκᾶβους later on in the same text. The second parity 1 ψωθίαις = 8 κικκᾶβοι is not equal to 1 τριώβολον, that is to say 3 ὀβολοί, but to an obol; if we accept the parity 1 κικκᾶβος = 1 χαλκός. This problem is not so easy to solve: Kaibel suggested ιη', that is to say, 18, considering a parity 1 ὀβολός = 6 χαλκοί; but this is not the value of the χαλκός in Classical Athens (cf. Poll. IX 65 who quotes Philem. fr. 76, 66 and 67). Another suggestion has been made by Kraus (apud Rehrenböck (1987) loc.cit.) <τρῖς> ὀκτὼ which would be more suitable for the correspondence of 24 κικκᾶβοι = 1 ψωθίαις = 1 τριώβολον (for this kind of expression cf. fr. 129).

- To keep the text without any change. Schmid *GGrL* p. 104 suggested this first and recently this position has been taken and developed by M. Caccamo Caltabiano - P. Radici Colace art. cit. p. 977. Their argumentation is based on several points:

Firstly, Pollux's expression εἴτε παίζων εἴτε σπουδάζων p. 972 «riflette bene quella categoria dello σπουδαιογέλοιοιον che è una caratteristica dell' atteggiamento parodico, in cui le strutture 'serie' di un modello, in questo caso il sistema

economico della polis, vengono con *ditorsio* 'riempite' di contenuti 'non seri'». But in my opinion, Pollux maybe shows here his ignorance about the real content of the play and he could be quoting other sources.

Secondly, Pollux IX 79. 82 explains the monetary system within the context of coins δοκούντων μὲν βαρβαρικῶν ὄντων δὲ Ἑλληνικῶν and refers immediately before our text to σίγλος and δανάκη, two coins of Persian origin which could be devoted to the payment of Charon (cf. M. Caccamo Caltabiano-P. Radici Colace p. 973 and n. 9).

Finally, their interpretation of the passage is that δραχμή is here meant "non nel valore specifico di unità di computo, ma in quello più generico -per altro mai attestato- di valutazione". And they conclude that p. 978 " l'individuazione di un sistema che non rispetta la logica delle proporzioni, anche perché in questa illogicità è racchiuso l'urto comico, ma vuole, piuttosto che 'riprodurre', semplicemente 'alludere' alla realtà monetali più in uso. Che tale punto di vista sia corretto è spiegato non solo dall'ampia diffusione del triobolo come taglio monetale, ma soprattutto dalla sua vasta ed importante funzione sociale".

According to them, the Pherecratic monetary system would not be a a straightforward imitation of the real one; but a parody and in some way a simplification. Partly for this simplification, I am inclined to accept their interpretation: a complicated system of parities of different coins would have been difficult to develop in a comedy. Pherecrates could have observed the way the Attic monetary system worked and invented a similar one that,

according to him, was to be found in Hades. In this sense of parody of the Athenian way of life fr. 90, can be understood and perhaps the literary criticism of fr. 100. It can be related as well to the kind of parody that, in my opinion, can be found in a play like *Ἄγριοι*: the social and poetic criticism of Athenian society by contrasting it with other societies, in this case, with what we would call "an ideal world".

C) *A comedy set in Hades.*

At least part of this play was set in Hades. This theme was a commonplace in the tradition of Attic Old Comedy and can be related to the traditional subject of the 'Katabasis' which is already found in the *Odyssey* 11.

It seems that Pherecrates deals with it from two points of view as I have already suggested:

On the one hand, Hades seems to be portrayed as a world of easy and cheap life, through the use of a currency that is worthless in the Upper world. This subject is related in other comedies to the description of the abundance, wealth and comfort that is found there (cf. 'introductory note' on *Πέρσαι*).

On the other hand, the poetic criticism, at least in fr. 100, could also be related to other comedies where this theme is set in Hades. The clearest example is Aristophanes' *Frogs* and it seems that he could have used it also in the fragmentary play *Γηρυτιάδης* (cf. fr. 156).

From fr. 87 I would guess that an old man and perhaps his slave (cf. fr. 94) were characters in this play, and also

Aeschylus (cf. fr. 100 which may be part of an agon). Fr. 85 is a discussion about the effects of green figs that perhaps were a way of going to Hades and fr. 87 may have been part of the same introductory scene of preparation to go there.

As it generally happens in Old Comedy, the plural title may refer to the chorus of this play. Within the context of a search for originality of Old Comedy, a chorus formed by invented coins can not be ruled out. It is, nonetheless, difficult to imagine how such a personification was made and the only one we can compare it with is the play *Ἀῆροι*. The chorus has two speeches, one to the audience (fr. 101) and another to the judges (fr. 102), asking for a fair judgement and, of course, the victory in the competition.

D) *Other possible fragments.*

Meineke loc.cit. suggests that Hesych. κ3969 κραπατάλας (cf. test. 111) is a fragment of Pherecrates and Kock includes it as fr. 99 in his edition. As Rehrenböck p. 120 suggests it could be a comic word and several examples of this ending can be found in Pherecrates, e.g. ὄβελίτας fr. 61, ἀνθοσμίτας fr. 113. 30, καπνίτας fr. 137. 6.

Rehrenböck (1987) p. 65 (cf. K-A ad test.1) proposes that the lemma of Phot. p. 165. 21 is κίμβιας καὶ κικκίβους, explained as τοὺς γλισχροὺς, and that it could belong to our play. This seems to be a reasonable suggestion, although κίμβιξ is only attested in Xenoph. 21 as an insult of the φιλαργυρία of Simonides (cf. Sch. Ar. Pac. 697) before Pherecrates' time and it

appears to be very frequent in later writers, above all, Arist.  
*EN* 1121 b 22, *MM* 1192 a 9, *EE* 1232 a 14.

K-A *PCG* VII p. 152 mention the conjecture of Hemsterhuys  
*Luc.* I (1743) p. 422 that καρκαδόνα could belong to this play.  
The gloss is as follows: Phot. p. 132. 24 = Sud. κ392 καρκαδόνα·  
τοῦτο λέγεται Χάρωντος δάνειον, συναγόμενον ἐκ τοῦ ὀβολοῦ τοῦ  
συγκηδευομένου τοῖς τελευτῶσιν, οὐχ ὡς ἔνιοι πλανώμενοι βοτάνης  
ὄνομά φασιν εἶναι. It is possible and perhaps this could be the  
name of the obol in Hades; but it also could be within the  
tradition of other coins that were given to Charon as it has been  
shown earlier: σίγλος and above all δανάκη (cf. Call. fr. 278Pf.,  
Hesych. δ219, Phot. δ45 and 51, Sud. δ59).

Fr. 199 has been also related to this play (cf. comment ad  
loc.).

As Kock *CAF* I p. 167 says: "haec cum Aristoph. *Ran.* 117-134 comparanti et apud inferos scaenam esse consideranti non dubium videtur quin admoneatur nescio quis, quomodo in orcum pervenire". The text seems to be "la réponse à une consultation", as Desrosseaux *Observations critiques sur les livres III et IV d'Athénée* Paris 1942 p.17 suggests. It is not clear if this was the actual method followed to reach Hades (cf. Desrosseaux loc. cit. and Rehrenböck (1987) pp. 66-7); but, in any case, one has to bear in mind that fever was considered a dangerous element in an illness (cf. infra comment on πύρεττε); and also it seems a good comic device: such a small thing as green figs, can be deadly.

The fragment is carefully constructed in a climactic enumeration of imperatives: 1.1 πύρεττε... (1.2-3 τρῶγε, κάθειυδε) and 1.4 σφακέλιζε καὶ πέπρησο καὶ βόα. The terminology is specifically medical (cf. Pherecr. fr. 58, 169, Ar. fr. 2 and 346.1) and one would suspect that a doctor gives the instructions (cf. comment on Pherecr. fr. 169).

1. ὦ δαιμόνιε: It is a very common expression in Aristophanes (cf. K-A ad loc.); according to Stanford on Ar. *Ran.* 44 "sometimes<sup>e</sup> implies a touch of pained surprise or sudden wonder" (about it cf. Rehrenböck p.67 and further E. Brunius-Nilsson *Daimonie* diss. Uppsala 1955 p. 97).

πύρεττε: "be feverish"; such imperative is unusual and seems to be clearly comic (cf. supra). Fever, in general, was

identified easily as one of the first symptoms in an illness and was described in detail in Greek medicine (for a list of the different kinds of fever cf. E. Vintró *Hipócrates y la Nosología Hipocrática* pp. 164ff. Barcelona 1972). Pherecr. fr. 169 refers to fever as θερμή, a general term for it; Aristophanes mentions two kinds, mainly πυρετός properly "fever" and ἥπιαλος "ague" ("callida or frigida febris", according to van Leeuwen ad Ar. *Vesp.* 284). Other instances are Ar. *Ach.* 1165, *Vesp.* 813 and 1038, fr. 346.

τῶν φιβάλεων: according to Athen. III p. 75 b this kind of figs was very commonly found in Attic comedy (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 802, Hermipp. fr. 53, Telecl. fr. 6 where it seems to have a metaphorical sense). About the word and its different forms, cf. Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s. v. φιβάλεως.

The genitive is unusual with the verb τρώγω; but it can be explained as partitive (cf. other examples of constructions with partitive genitive in fr. 74.1, 51). The position separated from σύκων and at the beginning of the sentence seems to be assertive, stressing the kind of figs. In fr. 74. 1 the general word (ἰσχάδας) is in accusative at the beginning and the more particular one (τῶν πεφωγμένων) is at the end also with the same stressing intention.

According to Sch. ad *Ach.* 802b (cf. Sud. τ1085) φίβαλις seems to be probably an early kind of fig especially devoted to be dried, although with the method of caprification (cf. Theophr. *HP* II 8. 1ff.) it was possible to eat them all through the year; another noun for "early figs" is πρόδρομοι; ὄλονθοι and ἐρινά can

designate them also; but properly they mean "wild figs".

The Sch. cit. explains also that they were from a place in Megaris or in Attica. The lack of evidence about a place with such a name makes this explanation doubtful and Olk *R-E* VI 2. 2108 suggests: "da Aristophanes (*Ach.* 802) φιβάλεως ἴσχας sagt, so erklärt der Scholiast die Früchte des Baumes φίβαλις für besonderes geeignet zum Trocknen, wobei freilich mit Unrecht annimmt, daß die φίβαλις nach einem Ort in Megaris oder Attika benannt sei". In my opinion this explanation seems plausible from the point of view that the adjective could designate also "myrtle-berries" (cf. *Apolloph.* fr. 5.4 and *EM* 793.26) and, above all, Megarian figs from Φαλυκός were famous for being earlier than the Attic ones (cf. *Theophr.* op.cit. VIII 2. 11: τὰ γὰρ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι προτερεῖ πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ καὶ ὅλως τὰ ἐπιθαλάττια καὶ εἰς ταῦτα καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους καρπούς, ὡς τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἀκτὴν καλουμένην τῆς Πελοποννήσου καὶ τὰ ἐν Φαλύκῳ τῆς Μεγαρίδος). On the other hand, the scholiast could have drawn this opinion from the text of Aristophanes, a dialogue between a Megarian and Dicaeopolis.

Olk loc. cit. gives the following etymology, "statt att. φήληξ sagten die Lakonier οἴδαξ (*Poll.* VI 81), wohl die "schwellende" Prellwitz (a. a. O.) führt φήληξ auf indog. √bhale= "strotzen" zurück und erklärt φίβαλις als reduplizierte Form davon".

σύκων... τῆς μεσημβρίας: σύκων designates a fig in general, while ἴσχας, a dried one. Σύκα are very frequently mentioned in Greek Comedy (about them cf. *Pherecr.* fr. 103, *Eub.* fr. 74 and

Hunter ad loc. p. 165, Ar. *Vesp.* 303 and MacDowell ad loc.).

Eating figs during the midday meal is a theme commonly found in other fragments of Greek Comedy (cf. Ar. fr. 479 κάμνοντα δ' αὐτόν τοῦ θέρους ἰδῶν ποτε / ἔτρωγ', ἵνα κάμνοι, σῦκα τῆς μεσημβρίας, Nicoph. fr. 20: ἐὰν δὲ γ' ἡμῶν σῦκά τις μεσημβρίας / τραγῶν καθεύδη χλωρά, πυρετὸς εὐθεῶς / ἦκει τρέχων, οὐκ ἄξιος τριωβόλου / κᾶθ' οὗτος ἐπιπεσὼν ἐμείν ποιεῖ χολήν, Eub. fr. 105: νῆ τὸν Δί' ἠσθένουν γὰρ, ὃ βέλτιστε σύ, / φαγοῦσα πρόην σῦκα τῆς μεσημβρίας). It is difficult to say whether it is superstition or it is "based on supposedly dietetic reasons, which, however, it would be difficult to discover; they are, in fact, simply humorous, forbidding just the suitable sort of food", according to Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 262 n.7. I do not know if the effects of eating such figs were deadly, but Hipp. *Vict.* II 564 4 does not recommend them and even suggests that they can provoke fever, as happens in our fragment: σῦκον χλωρὸν ὑγραίνει καὶ διαχωρεῖ καὶ θερμαίνει. ὑγραίνει μὲν διὰ τὸ ἔγχυλον εἶναι, θερμαίνει δὲ διὰ τὸν γλυκὺν ὀπὸν καὶ διαχωρεῖ. τὰ πρῶτα τῶν σῦκων κάκιστα, ὅτι ὀπωδέσκατα, βέλτιστα δὲ τὰ ὕστατα. I would also suspect that if it was a joke in the sense Ehrenberg suggests, it would not be funny after being said by two probably contemporary poets as Aristophanes and Pherecrates. I would suggest that they might have been seen as dangerous together with a big meal. In this connexion Eur. fr. 907N<sup>2</sup>: κρέασι βοείοις χλωρὰ σῦκ' ἐπίσθιεν / ἄμουσ' ὑλάκτιον, might have been seen as the summit of Heracles' gluttony. Eating χλωρὰ σῦκα is found also in Call. fr. 191. 92f. Pf. in relation to Hipponax (cf. Hippon. 26, 5W and K. Lembach

(1970) p. 142 n. 39).

**κάμπιμπλάμενος:** in Aristophanes the aorist participle is more frequently found (έμπλήμενος, cf. *Equ.* 935, *Vesp.* 424, 1127, *Ecc1.* 56). Nauck's proposal to change it into κάμπλήμενος (cf. K-A's app. crit.) seems to be possible also because as Kock ad loc. says: "recte. nam postquam se inpleverit ficibus dormire iubetur".

Although it is a strange expression there are some cases of present participle instead of aorist, as in Cratin. fr. 149: ἦσθε πανημέριοι χορταζόμενοι γάλα λευκόν / πυθὼν δαινύμενοι κάμπιμπλάμενοι πυριάτη. The sense of 'being full' is found in passive present πίμπλαμαι (see further LSJ s. v.).

**σφακελίζε:** this verb is formed from the noun σφακελός and designates "to have a strong headache with spasms and convulsions" (cf. also Cratin. fr. 384). In medical terminology it could also have the sense of "suffer from gangrene" and it seems that it designated an advanced stage of the gangrenous process. As A. Bozzi *Note di lessicografia ippocratica* p. 65 Rome 1982 points out, "è quindi ipotizzabile che il concetto di "dolore lancinante" sia da considerarsi uno sviluppo semantico secondario derivato dalla conoscenza di un fenomeno patologico ben definito nelle opere di medicina e caratterizzato da forte dolori".

**πέπρησο καὶ βόα:** πέπρησο, imperative perfect of the verb πίμπρημι, here it means "to burn with fever" (cf. LSJ s. v., Rehrenböck p. 68, and for other instances of this meaning, see K-A ad loc.). The literal sense "to burn up" seems to be very common in the literary texts (cf. LSJ s. v.); while the compound form

in the literary texts (cf. LSJ s.v.); while the compound form ἐμπύρημι often has a metaphorical sense (cf. Taillardat *Images* §349 and 350).

The relation between "being burned" and shouting can be found also in Ar. *Ran.* 859 (in this case burning with anger): σὺ δ' εὐθὺς ὥσπερ πρῖνος ἐμπρησθεὶς βοῆς (cf. also *Vesp.* 35).

The ending is clearly anticlimactic in the last word; for it does not refer to the symptoms of the illness, but to the reaction of the ill person (a similar enumeration with an anticlimax in the word βοή at the end is Pl.com. fr. 27.4).

The text is corrupted. It seems that τριώβολου is an interlinear gloss; as Rehrenböck (1987) p. 58 says: "indem jemand zu ψωθ(α(ν)) erklärend einen Akkusativ τριώβολον schrieb; daraus entstand später eine genitivus pretii, welcher fälschlich auf κραπατάλον bezogen wurde, wo man eigentlich einen äquivalenten Genitiv δραχμῆς erwarten sollte. Letzteres wurde wahrscheinlich durch das Metrum veranlaßt". This explanation seems quite likely and from this point of view the verb λήψει would mean "to receive" as Gulick translates it in Athen. XIV 646c, vol. VI p. 646 or as Rehrenböck loc. cit. suggests perhaps excessively: "Du wirst im Hades (statt unsere Drachmen und Obolen) den Krapatalos und die Psothia und den Kikkabos (kollektive Singulare) erhalten... und damit alles, was dir beliebt, einkaufen können!".

Other scholars suggest textual changes as Kock ad loc. says: "λήψει δ' ἐν Ἄιδου κραπατάλου καὶ ψωθίας, i. e. 'vilissimo pretio apud inferos emes' quod apud nos multo pluris constat, but perhaps it is unnecessary.

Another possibility I would suggest is to keep the word τριώβολου understanding the text of Poll. IX 83 (see K-A test. 1) and consequently our fragment in a different way. In Pollux a krapatalon is equivalent to a drachma and a psothia to a triobol; but perhaps he means that they are both units of money and not equal in the value. In such a case, our fragment could be understood as follows: "you will buy one 'crapatalon' and one 'psothia' in exchange for one triobol". We have to bear in mind also that Athen. XIV 646c, our source, quotes the word ψωθ(α or

'bread crumbs' as having a literal sense, the expression could sound ridiculous to an Athenian person: the price for such things is too high; but it will become clear, when the real value of this currency in Hades is explained.

As Rehrenböck (1987) pp. 60ff. points out, this line refers to the effortless and extremely cheap life in the Underworld, a topic found all through Greek Literature, as for instance the proverb in Phot. ε1834 ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀβολοῦ χ(μ)αιραι (about it cf. Theodoridis *ZPE* 67 (1987) pp. 5ff.), Eup. fr. 198, Call. fr. 191, 1Pf. and *Epigr.* 13, 6Pf. (see Gow-Page ad *Hell. epigr.* 1192).

In fact a triobol or half-drachma in Athens was not an important quantity; in Old comedy it was identified with the poor pay of a dicast (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 51, *Nub.* 863, etc.; about it see further Hunter on Eub. p.180).

Coins were used in Hades to pay Charon in order to pass to the other side of Lethe (cf. two obols in Ar. *Ran.* 270; about two obols in daily life in Athen, see *Vesp.* 52 and MacDowell ad loc.).

**κραπάταλον:** cf. introductory note.

**ψωθία:** according to Athen. XIV 646c ψωθία τὰ ψαθύρια (cf. Rehrenböck (1987) p. 58 and K-A ad test. 1 for other references to Lexicons and Grammarians ), that is to say, "small crumb, bread crumb, morsel". This is the only instance in a literary text; but one might suspect that it was fairly common in spoken Attic. Other synonymous words can be ψωμός and θρύμματα (cf. Ar. fr. 173).

Athen. loc. cit. seems to point out that here the word has a literal sense, but Poll. IX 83 also explains: ἔχειν δ' αὐτὸν δύο

ψωθίας, τὴν δὲ ψωθίαν εἶναι τριώβολον καὶ δύνασθαι ὀκτὼ  
κιχκάβους. According to Pollux ψωθία is, like the κραπάταλος, a  
coin in Hades; but the text of Pollux reads the feminine ἡ ψωθία  
instead of the neuter in Athenaeus and the other references. To  
change it into ψωθίαν has been thus suggested (cf. Rehrenböck  
(1987) pp. 57-8 and K-A's app.crit. ad loc. for the different  
suggestions of the scholars). Rehrenböck loc. cit. suggests:  
"aufgrund eines Vergleiches mit obiger Pollux-Stelle entscheide  
ich mich für die feminine Form ψωθίαν gegenüber den neutralen -  
(-ov/(-α. Der Singular ergibt sich durch κραπάταλον und das  
gleichfalls singularische τριώβολον (-ου)".

In conclusion the text seems to be playing on the similarity  
of both words, ἡ ψωθία, the coin that according to Pherecrates  
was used in Hades and τὰ ψωθία, bread-crumbs. In view of this  
ambiguity it may not be necessary to emmend the neuter into  
feminine, because it seems possible that at some stage  
Pherecrates may have played with the two words (see supra on p.  
276).

Fr. 87

There seems to be no reason to doubt that this fragment belongs to this play (cf. K-A ad loc. and comment on fr. 79). Graf *Phil.* 50 (1891) p. 606 suggests "nun findet sich in des Pherekrates *Krapataloi* Frg.82 [87] folgendes Gespräch zwischen einem Alten, der im Begriffe ist, in die Unterwelt hinabzusteigen, um von der außerordentlichen Billigkeit der Lebensmittel daselbst Vortheil zu ziehen, und seinem Sklaven". Dieterich *Nekyia* p. 25 n. 1 1893 relates the *βόεια...χρέα* in l. 2 to the sun's cattle which live in the Underworld, (cf. *χίμαιραι*, goats, in Phot. ε1834; see on Pherecr. fr. 86 p.277, and other animals in Ar. *Ran* 338). As Dieterich loc. cit says, "dadurch erklärt sich Pherekrat. *Κραπάταλ.* fr.82K: einer wird gefragt, ob er ein Messer eingesteckt habe, damit er die *βόεια χρέα* in Hades als zahnloser Greis bewältigen könne".

1. *τι μ'εἴργασαι*;: about this expression, cf. on Pherecr. 76. 3 *τι ἡργάσω*;

2. *ἀμάχαιρος*: hapax of Pherecrates who has several examples of adjectives with an α- negative prefix, probably comic coinages (cf. *ἀνόδοντος* in l. 3, fr. 168. 2, 209, 210, 212).

*ἐνέθηκας*: in literal sense as in Pherecr. fr. 44. 2; cf. fr.156. 6 for a metaphorical use of this verb.

*νοστήσω*: the simple sense 'to go' or 'to come' seems to be appropriate here, although as K-A ad loc. point out, this verb is "apud comicos raro" (cf. also Ar. *Ach.* 29). The whole expression is unusual and might be a parody of the grandiloquent style of

epic poetry for example (cf. Kaibel apud K-A ad l. 2).

ἐπι βόεια...χρέα: it could refer to the herds of the sun. It is, otherwise, a common expression for 'beef' (cf. Hdt. 2.37, Pl. *Rep.* 338c, Ar. *Ran.* 924, Eur. *Cyc.* 218). The unusual sentence and its reference to food could make an allusion to the traditional theme of abundance in Hades (cf. Pherecr. fr. 113). Beef, on the other hand, was a luxury, mainly eaten in Classical Athens at festivals especially the Panathenaia (about it cf. Hunter on Eub. p. 92).

3. Cf. on fr. 79. Some suggestions have been made for the end of the line, about them cf. K-A ad loc.

Fr. 88

This fragment seems to make reference to the scene of the return of the master with his servant after a banquet at night, as in Ar. *Vesp.* 1292ff., *Nub.* 607ff. In Ar. fr. 480 a slave says: ὄρα βαδίζειν μούστιν ἐπὶ τὸν δεσποτὴν / ἤδη γὰρ αὐτοῦς οἴομαι δεδειπνάναι (cf. Ar. *Pl.* 823). This fragment implies probably that the banquet has just begun, as it seems the commonest time to start one was at dusk (cf. Hunter on Eub. p. 218).

1. ἐβάδιζον δ' ἀπὸ / δείπνου: separation into different lines of preposition and noun is also found in Ar. *Thesm.* 386, Axionic. fr. 6. 1.

Other instances of the expression ἀπὸ δείπνου βαδίζειν are Ar. *Vesp.* 1401, *Pax* 839.

κνέφας: here it takes the commonest sense, "evening dusk"; but it could also designate 'morning twilight' as in Ar. *Ecc1.* 290: πρὸ πάνυ τοῦ κνέφους, in parallelism with the same use of the unusual adjective κνεφαῖος in Ar. *Vesp.* 124, *Lys.* 327, *Ran.* 1350, adjective that Rau *Paratragodia* p.134 München 1967 suggests, is poetic; κνέφας is even less common.

ἄωρα: and its adverb ἄωρῖ in general mean 'out of time, out of season', designating an unspecific time (cf. e.g. Herond. 3.29 and Headlam ad loc.). As van Leeuwen says ad Ar. *Ach.* 23-4: οὐδ' οἱ πρυτάνεις ἤκουσιν, ἀλλ' ἄωρῖαν / ἤκοντες, "sero. Oppositum est τῆν ὥραν sive ἐν ὄρα 'suo tempore'".

The sense of our passage seems to be parallel to that just quoted 'late' simply, or, as LSJ s.v. more specifically suggest:

"midnight, dead of night", quoting Alciphr. 3. 47: ἦν ἄωρία τῆς νυκτὸς μεσοῦσης, (cf. also the compound form in Aesch. Ch. 34 ἄωρόνυκτον ἀμβόα-/μα). This word is difficult to define exactly, because according to the context and to other time-elements it can also mean 'early' (cf. Ar. Ecc1. 741 ἄωρι νύκτωρ, fr. 703 and also Lucian *Bis Acc.* 1: ἡ Σελήνη δὲ ἄγρυπνος καὶ αὐτὴ περιέρχεται φαίνουσα τοῖς κωμάζουσι, καὶ τοῖς ἄωρι ἀπὸ τῶν δείπνων ἐπανιοῦσιν).

Fr. 89

This fragment may be part of a recipe; about food in Hades, cf. on fr. 87 and 113.

**τακερούς:** cf. Pherecr. fr. 113. 13: σχελίδες δ' ὀλοκνήμοι πλησίον τακερώταται and Ar. fr. 372: Ἀῆμνος κυάμους τρέφουσα τακερούς καὶ καλοῦς (see also fr. 4. 2, Antiph. fr. 1. 4, Dionys. com. fr. 3. 7).

The ἐρεβίνθοι or chick peas were made soft before being consumed (cf. Gal. vol. VI p. 533 Kuhn: εἰσθισμένοι δὲ εἴσιν ἐν πολλοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐψηθέντας ἐν ὕδατι τοὺς ἐρεβίνθους ἐσθίειν, ἔνιοι μὲν αὐτοὺς μόνους ψιλοῦς, ἔνιοι δὲ ἄλσι μετρίως ἠδύοντες. οἱ παρ' ἡμῖν παραπλήσιον ἀλεύρω τι ποιοῦντες ἐκ τῶν ξηρῶν τυρῶν ἐκεῖνῳ περιπάττουσιν αὐτούς), or before being sown so as to make them big (cf. Theophr. *HP* II. IV. 2: τοὺς ἐρεβίνθους δέ, ὥστε μεγάλους, αὐτοῖς κελύφεσι βρέξαντα σπεῖρειν).

**ποιῆσαι:** cf. Dionys. com. loc. cit.: τακερὰ ποιήσας ταῦτα καὶ ζέσας σφόδρα (referring to meat 'κρέα'). The reading of A is the infinitive ποιῆσαι while the Epitome (Athen.<sup>2</sup>) has ποιήσεις. In some cases the epitome's reading is better; but here A seems to have a better reading (about it cf. supra p. 18 and Rehrenböck pp. 80-1).

**ἐρεβίνθους:** cf. Pherecr. fr. 170. In the context of a comedy maybe we should not disregard the erotic sense of this word, 'erect member' (cf. Henderson *MM* p. 119).

**ἀπόδοι:** cf. Ar. *Equ.* 119. About the different readings of

the manuscripts see K-A's apparatus criticus and Rehrenböck p. 81.

#### Fr. 90

The Etruscans were famous as makers of very elaborate objects and works of art that were exported to Athens (cf. Critias fr. 1PLG). We have references to a kind of σάλπιγξ (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 567-8), of κώδων (cf. Soph. *Aj.* 17), of σανδάλια (cf. Cratin. fr. 139, probably the ones worn by the statue of Athena Polias, see Bryant *HStClPh X* (1899) pp. 57ff.), and of χρυσότυπος φιάλη (cf. Athen. I 28 b-c).

In this case τὰ λυχνεῖα must have been a kind of very ornamented (cf. Athen. XV 700c) bronze candelabra; about them cf. E. Richardson *The Etruscans: Their Art and Civilization* pp. 109ff. Chicago 1964, M. Moretti-G. Maetzke *The art of the Etruscans* Engl. transl. London 1970 p. 237 and 238-9, and S. Pezzella *Gli Etrusci. Testimonianze di Civiltà* pp. 63ff. Florence 1987. In a play set in Hades, at least partly, this fragment could have been a comic reference to the fashion in Athens as followed also in the Underworld.

**λυχνεῖων:** discussion about the different forms of this word is found in Rehrenböck p. 83, and also K-A ad Ar. fr. 573. 3; see further Thraette I p. 316 (nr. 29).

**ἔργασια:** it is a word of very wide sense within the context of the production of an object. According to [Dem.] 59. 67 it can be defined as ὅποσαι ἂν ἐπ' ἐργαστηρίου καθῶνται ἢ πωλῶνται

ἀποπερασμένως (cf. H. Wankel ad Dem. 18. 129).

Fr. 91

This line could be said by someone who is complaining because nobody opened the door, as it was customary that a slave would open it when someone knocked or rather kicked it (cf. Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 176).

A "door-scene" is often found in the extant plays of Aristophanes and it may have been a commonplace in Old Comedy for its potential humour, (cf. e.g. the two scenes in *Ar. Ran.* 37ff. with Heracles and 460ff. with Aecus).

Rehrenböck p. 84 wonders, "wurde etwa ein Ankömmling in der Unterwelt so unwirtlich behandelt?". The topic of πύλαι "Αιδου is very common throughout Greek Literature (about it cf. Fraenkel ad Aesch. *Ag.* 1291). Eur. *Hipp.* 56 refers to them as being opened for a person who is going to die, perhaps by chance with the same verb as here: οὐ γὰρ οἶδ' ἀνεφγμέννας πύλας / "Αιδου, φάος δὲ λοίσθιον βλέπων τόδε (similarly cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 604). In *Ar. Ran.* 163, 463 and 460 ἡ θύρα refers to the door of the house of Aecus in Hades and this may be different from αἱ πύλαι of Hades.

ἀνέφγε: cf. K-A ad loc., Rehrenböck pp. 84-5.

ὁ δέσποτ': it is the normal way for a slave to address his master, e.g. *Vesp.* 142, 420 and also to address a god (cf. Rehrenböck p. 87), as part of invocations in prayers. In the last case it is said together with the name of the god or ἄναξ or on its own when any of them has just been mentioned (cf. *Ar. Pax* 385, 389a, and 399; see also *Ar. Vesp.* 875, *Pax* 90 and Platnauer ad loc. and Telecl. fr. 35).

Ἄγυιεύς: according to MacDowell ad *Ar. Vesp.* 875 "'god of streets'. Apollon Agyieus, like Hermes and Hekate (cf. 804), was frequently represented in front of houses in the streets of Athens by a pointed stone pillar" or also altars (cf. MacDowell loc. cit. for a discussion on what they were exactly and Handley ad *Men. Dysc.* 659 for pictorial representations). It is frequently mentioned in tragedy and comedy, e.g. *Aesch. Ag.* 1081, *Soph. El.* 637, 645, *OR* 911, fr. 370, *Eur. Phoen.* 631, *Ar. Vesp.* 875, *Thesm.* 488, *Eupol.* fr. 420, *Men.* loc. cit., *Plaut. Bacch.* 172.

*Poll.* IV 123: ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ ἀγυιεύς ἔκειτο βωμὸς ὁ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν, seems to suggest that it was a fixed element at the stage; it might be possible because a house is very frequently needed in the extant tragedies and comedies (cf. *Pherecr.* fr. 91 about door-scenes, and P. D. Arnott *Greek Scenic Conventions in the fifth century B.C.* Oxford 1962 p. 45).

### Fr. 93

About this kind of humour frequently found in Old Comedy, cf. Henderson *MM* pp.195ff.

The interpretation of this action seems difficult to visualize without any context. In Ar. *Ran.* 1074, Sosip. fr. 1.12 and *Damox.* fr. 2.39 the verb προσπέρδομαι plus dative has some contemptuous and abusive sense (cf. καταπέρδομαι with genitive in *Vesp.* 394, 618, *Pax* 547, *Pl.* 618). It seems that the speaker is complaining about a similar abuse he has suffered with the addition of the λάσανα on his head.

**λάσανα:** I would suggest that it originally means a stand or trivet, either for a cooking pot, e.g. Ar. *Pax* 892-3, *Diocl.com.* fr. 9 (cf. Hesych. λ352: χυτροπόδες, about χύτραι without feet and some pictures of them on stands cf. B.A. Sparkes *JHS* 82 (1962) p.30) or for a 'chamber pot' or ἀμίς (although it designated by extension of meaning or perhaps euphemistically the pot itself, cf. *Eup.* fr. 240, Ar. fr. 477, *Plat.com.* fr. 124). Henderson *MM* p. 191 proposes that "δίφρος and διφρίσκος were euphemisms for λάσανα, suggesting perhaps that that word, like ἀμίς, had an impolite tone". The problem is that neither δίφρος nor διφρίσκος appear in Classical Greek with this meaning and it seems to have been drawn from later Greek: *Aristides Or.* 49.19 and from *Poll.* X 45; but maybe as Sommerstein ad Ar. *Av.* 1552 argues, "its appearance in *Pollux* 10.45 is evidence that it was used in this sense in classical Attic".

According to *Poll.* X 44-45, τῷ μὲν ἀνδρὶ καὶ λάσανα ἀναγκαῖα

καὶ ἀμίς, while the one used by women was called σκάφιον, because it had a different shape (cf. Eup. fr. 53, Ar. *Thesm.* 633 and van Leeuwen ad loc., see also Henderson *MM* p.90). Other related words are σκωραμίς, Ar. *Thesm.* 371, ἀπόπατον Ach. 81 and ἄφοδος Eccl. 1059 and Antiph. fr. 42.5.

πέρδεται: also βδεῖν, βδύλλειν /βδύλλεσθαι, cf. Henderson *MM* p. 195.

#### Fr. 94

νοτοπλήγα: only found here and in Ar. fr. 862 (the attribution to Aristophanes has been put in doubt by Kaibel apud K-A ad loc.). A similar compound in -πλήξ is Hippon. 102. 6W αὐχενοπλήγα. The number of compounds of this noun derived from πλήσσω is very high in poetry and drama (above all in Hellenistic poetry); but they generally use the thing or person who hits, rather than the thing which is hit, as in our fragment (cf. κεραυνοπλήξ, Alcae.com. fr. 3, κυματοπλήξ Soph. O.C. 1241, οἰστροπλήξ Aesch. Pr. 681, Soph. El. 5, Eur. Bacc. 1229, etc.).

Slaves were often threatened with being beaten on the back and the ribs, e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 1295, *Pax* 747.

διακονεῖν: in absolute construction, cf. Ar. Av. 1323 (see LSJ s. v.).

Fr. 95

περιέρρων: "wander about" (LSJ); other instances are Ar. *Equ.* 533, Com. adesp. fr. 1112K. The verb ἔρρω in simple form and also ἀπέρρω has generally a bad connotation in spoken Attic, above all in expressions such as ἔρρ' ἐς κόρακας (cf. Ar. *Pl.* 604, *Pherecr.* fr.76.5) or the imperative ἀπέρρε (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 783, *Ecccl.* 169 and Ussher ad loc. "strong contemptuous dismissal", *Pax* 1294, *Cratin.* fr. 129 and *Plat.com.* fr.182). In Ar. *Equ.* 533 περιέρρων indicates the wandering about of a drunk old man.

ἐξ ἐωθινοῦ: in Comedy also in Ar. *Thesm.* 2, *Alex.* fr. 259.4 and *Men. Sam.* 511 (cf. *Rehrenböck* p. 91). The expression is more frequent in prose (cf. *Pl. Phaedr.* 228b, *Symp.* 220c, *Xen. HG* I.1.5).

Fr. 96

Kock suggested that this line should be said by Iocasta, according to the myth and her relation to Oedipus, and that, consequently, she was placed in Hades, as fr. 100 is said by Aeschylus. If this was the case, it might have been related to *Od.* 11.84ff. where Odysseus meets his mother and refers to other mythological women in Hades, in what has been called 'the catalogue of women'. Notwithstanding, as Kaibel apud K-A ad loc. says, "sententia fort. 'haec incommodum est simul mariti ac filii curam agere'".

ἄτοκόν: since the later part of the V century onwards and in colloquial Attic (probably as here γυνήν), it came to have

pejorative connotations similar to κακός or ἀνόητος (cf. Men. *Dysc.* 288 and 701, *Asp.* 160, see in more detail W.G. Arnott *Phoenix* 18 (1964) pp. 119-22). The superlative ἀτοπώτατη is found in Pherecr. fr. 229.

γυνήν: see fr. 206.

#### Fr. 97

The fragment is corrupted and no solution seems to solve in a satisfactory way TANAMHΔYN: R, M or TANAMEΔYN: V (about codices cf. Hertz ad *GrL* II pp. XXff.). Perhaps among the many solutions (a list of them is found in Rehrenböck p. 97) only two selected by K-A seem to be worth taking into consideration: ὥστ' οὐ κακὸν ὄζει θαίματιά γ' suggested by Dobree ad Ar. *Pl.* 1021 and ὥς τοι κακὸν ὄζει τὰμά. :: μὰ Δί' proposed by Toepfel (Cobet *Mn* II 5 (1877) p. 174 following Toepfel suggests: ὥστ' οὐ κακὸν ὄζει τὰμά'; :: μὰ Δί').

Both suggestions seem to be possible; but none is totally satisfactory from a palaeographical point of view. Regarding the content of this fragment, Priscianus begins the passage by giving some examples that seem to deal with pleonasm (cf. fr. 156. 6-7), and then goes on to mention examples of ellipsis in which most of the instances are internal accusative with ὄζω and oleo (cf. Teren. *Adelph.* 117 and Iuv. V 85ff.), and this line among them.

In the first proposal, it is not clear if Dobree's θαίματια refers to τὰ ἱμάτια, commonly contracted in such a way, or τὰ αἱμάτια 'black pudding', as Rehrenböck loc.cit. understands it, but, as he says, is not found in literary texts.

Otherwise, τὰμὰ is a plausible proposal which would fit the context of an elliptical expression and is found in Aristophanes with different senses (cf. above all *Eccl.* 393). Priscianus' use of parallelism between Greek and Latin texts (cf. after citing fr. 156. 6-7, he says "nostrī quoque 'nunc nuper'") support this proposal, as immediately he mentions Terent. *Adelph.* 117: "olet unguenta: de meo", an example of substantivation of the possessive adjective 'meus', meaning here 'de mea pecunia' as in Plaut. *Bacch.* 512 (cf. also 98, *Men.* 149, etc.).

The theme of bad smell (above all from the mouth), is often found in Greek comedy (cf. fr. 73. 5, about ὄζει cf. fr. 30); but I do not think one can reach any conclusion that bad breath smell was dealt with in this fragment, as Rehrenböck p. 98 suggests.

A possible solution could be: ὄς τοι κακὸν ὄζει.: πᾶνυ μὲν οὖν ἀλλὰ γλυκύ. It would be a dialogue in which one character accepts the other's opinion about this smell; and at the same time regards it as sweet from another point of view. In this case I would take the reading of manuscript V: TANAMEΔYN. The changes that it implies are not very difficult: Π for T, Y for A, O for Δ (cf. Priscian. XVIII, 243 -GrL III p. 329.8- ἦ οἴονται reads NAAIONTAI in M, cf. Hertz's app. crit.). The main problem of this proposal is that the expression πᾶνυ μὲν οὖν ἀλλὰ is a later particle, first found in Ar. *Pl.* 97, 1195 (cf. perhaps *Ran.* 602 see further Denniston *GP* p. 476) and that before ἀλλὰ a negative seems to be needed rather than an affirmative phrase. The text would be an example of ellipsis of the verb in the second part of the dialogue.

Fr. 98

The metre, iambic tetrameter catalectic, can be found in different parts of a comedy, e.g. *Ar. Thesm.* 533-72; but as Gelzer *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes* p. 185 München 1960 suggests, this fragment could be part of an agon in which the epirrhema is in iambic metre as here, while the antepirrhema in anapaestic tetrameters as fr. 100 (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 905ff. and 1004ff.). The contrary distribution: epirrhema in anapaestic tetrameters and antepirrhema in iambic ones is also found (cf. *Nub.* 961 and 1036 respectively). The metre in both cases seem to be used to characterize a personage. About the iambic tetrameter, see also White (1912) p. 62 and 68.

The meaning of this fragment seems to be clear: it is a dialogue in which two persons talk about the 'debt' that one of them has with a third one. The tone of the second line is boastful and reminds me of the style of fr. 5.

It has a rather elaborate expression and the two main verbs: ἀποτινεῖν and προσλαβεῖν (cf. comment on them) could have been related to a monetary context; but it is difficult to say whether it had a metaphorical or a literal one. Some suggestions have been made: for example, a dispute between Charon and a dead person about the fare of the trip to the other side of the lake (cf. Rehrenböck p. 101) or a 'Totengericht' (cf. Schmid *GGrL* I. 4 p. 104 n. 14), or problems with betting (cf. Rehrenböck loc. cit.); but I would not reject a 'Kaufhandlung' for an unsatisfactory purchase, as Rehrenböck loc. cit. does; above all, if we take into account that coins had an important role in this play.

τι δαί: δαί, particle always found with an interrogative, gives emphasis and vividness to the expression; but it can simply have a connective sense (about it cf. Denniston *GP* p. 263).

σαυτὸν ... ἀξιοῖς: cf. Ar. *Equ.* 182, οὐκ ἀξιῶ 'γὼ 'μαυτὸν ἰσχύειν μέγα. The construction with the pronoun in accusative as subject of the infinitive seems to be normal when there is an emphatic or contrasting intention (see further MacDowell on Dem. 21. 74).

προλαβεῖν: it is not so clearly related to monetary or economic matters as ἀποτίνειν (that means 'to pay', cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1255, 1263) It can have the general sense of 'to receive', but secondarily it could mean 'to gain' (cf. LSJ).

#### Fr. 99

The main difficulty of this fragment is in regard to the expression ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς (cf. Rehrenböck p. 79 wonders whether it is "in Athen oder in Hades?"). This problem is also related to the meaning we can give to the verb ἀρπάζεω.

In general I think that the fragment gives sense in relation to a topic in Greek Literature in general: the stealing of cakes placed as offerings in the crossroads devoted to Hecate. Perhaps the best parallel is Ar. *Pl.* 597 (see later on ἀρπάζεω). About eating the offerings of another god, cf. Pherecr. fr. 167. About Hecate as goddess of crossroads, cf. Soph. fr. 535R (see also fr. 734R), Theophr. *Char.* XVI 14 and 15, Athen. VII 325a where she is called τριοδίτης (cf. εἰνοδίαι in Soph. fr. 535.2R). About the

cakes given to her as δειπνον, cf. μαγίδας, in fact μάζας, in Soph. fr. 734R and Sophr. fr. 159 Kaib. (cf. infra on ἐγκρίδες).

**ἀρπάζετω:** it is mentioned in Pherecr. fr. 8 possibly in the context of a recipe or something similar. In my opinion here it could be related to Ar. Pl. 594-7: παρὰ τῆς Ἑκάτης ἔξεστιν τοῦτο πυθέσθαι, / εἴτε τὸ πλουτεῖν εἴτε τὸ πεινῆν βελτίον. Φησὶ γὰρ αὕτη / τοὺς μὲν ἔχοντας καὶ πλουτοῦντας δειπνον κατὰ μῆν' ἀποπέμπειν. / τοὺς δὲ πένητας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀρπάζειν πρὶν καταθεῖναι. See also Theophr. Char. XXVI 5, Dem. 54.39, Plut. Qu. Conv. 7.6, Luc. Dial. Mort. I 1, ibid. XXII 3, Petron. Satyr. 134.

**ἐγκρίδες:** cf. Hesych ε 261 πέμμα ἐλαίῳ ἐψόμενον καὶ μελιτούμενον. ἔνιον δὲ ταγηνίας.

This kind of honey-cake must have been quite common, insofar as it is already mentioned by Stesich. 179 PMG in a context of honey products: σασαμίδας χόνδρον τε καὶ ἐγκρίδας / ἄλλα τε πέμματα καὶ μελιχλωρόν; Epich. fr. 52 Kaib. in relation to other kinds of bread: κριβανίτην, ὄμωπον, σταιτίτην, ἐγκρίδα, ἀλειφατίτην, ἡμιάρτιον, (some of them mentioned by Sophr. fr. cit. as offerings to Hecate). We also have the reference to the ἐγκριδοπόλην in Ar. fr. 269, Nicoph. fr. 10. 5 and Antiph. fr. 273.1 (in plural).

Except for the honey, it is not known from which ingredients they were made. In this case the etymology does not help either because it is not clear. There are two main proposals: Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s. v. favours the formation from κρῖ κριθή, 'barley';

while Frisk suggests it comes from ἐγκεράννυμι / ἐγκράσαι 'hineinmischen'. The later interpretation has the advantage that many nouns of this sort refer to the way or the place something is cooked, rather than its ingredients (cf. μαγίς or μάζα from μάτω, ταγηνίας from the 'frying-pan' τάγηνον or ἐσχάρτης from ἐσχάρα or 'open-brazier'). Chantraine loc. cit. is, otherwise, sceptical about this etymology and considers that it is satisfactory for the sense, but not for the form. It is very likely that it had something to do with ταγηνίαι or 'pancakes' (LSJ s. v.), mentioned by Hesych. loc. cit., which are described by Magnes fr. 2 in similar terms: ταγηνίας ἤδη τεθέασαι χλιαροῦς / σίζοντας ὅταν αὐτοῖσιν ἐπιχέης μέλι.

#### Fr. 100

The Scholiast ad Ar. *Pax*. 749 (see K-A for sources), clearly says that this verse is said by Aeschylus. This passage of Aristophanes and also *Ran.* 1004 show a striking similarity with our line. Ar. *Pax* 748ff.: τοιαῦτ' ἀφελὼν κακὰ καὶ φόρτον καὶ βωμολοχεύματ' ἀγεννή / ἐποίησε τέχνην μεγάλην ἡμῖν κάπύργωσ' οἰκοδομήσας / ἔπεσιν μεγάλοις καὶ διανοίαις καὶ σκώμμασιν οὐκ ἀγοραίοις, and *Ran.* 1004: ἀλλ' ὃ πρῶτος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πυργώσας ῥήματα σεμνὰ / καὶ κοσμήσας τραγικὸν λήρον, θαρρῶν τὸν κρουνὸν ἀφίει.

In the context of a play set in Hades, this line could have been said in an agon, as it has been already suggested (cf. on fr. 98), in which Aeschylus himself defends his own poetry (cf. Ar. *Ran.* 1010).

The similarity between the three passages has led to speculations about the date of the play (cf. introductory note p. 260) and the original authorship of this image.

In general, scholars have suggested that Aristophanes must have imitated Pherecrates (cf. Kaibel *Hermes* 24 (1889) p. 45, Schmid *GGrL* p. 104, see further Rehrenböck p. 104); but this suggestion about the length of Pherecrates' life is uncertain.

It is also uncertain to speculate about who was the first in delivering the image of this fragment: Pherecrates or Aristophanes in *Pax* 749. Dalfen *Polis und Poesis* p. 85 Munich 1974 argues in favour that Aristophanes imitates Pherecrates, for the former poet tries to compare himself to Aeschylus, using the expression that Pherecrates puts in Aeschylus' mouth. But, in my

opinion, both poets refer to a common topic about the poetry of Aeschylus, as Taillardat *Images* p.27 says: "il suffit de réunir en un même chapitre toutes les images qui font du poète un architecte et du poème un édifice pour constater qu'elles sont très courantes et qu'en conséquence il n'est pas sûr que l'un des deux poètes imite l'autre; il est même beaucoup plus vraisemblable que la rencontre d'expression n'est due qu'au hasard, cette image étant un cliché".

This image suggests, on the one hand, the conception of poetry as 'techne' (rather than pure inspiration from the Muses) as Dalfen loc.cit. suggests, and on the other seems to be related not only to the grandiose style of Aeschylus, but also to his innovations in the performance and the staging of a play, so we could partly read the verb ἐξοικοδομήσας in literal sense 'to construct a building' (references to the staging innovations of Aeschylus can be found in *TrGF* III test. N). Cf. also Ar. fr. 696 (see Meineke *FCG* I p.8). About the theme of the poet as an architect. (cf. Cratin. fr. 70 τέκτονες εὐπαλάμων ὕμνων and further Taillardat *Images* §749 and 750).

ἐξοικοδομήσας: for the metaphor cf. Ar. *Pax* 749 οἰκοδομήσας.

Fr. 101

From a metrical point of view this fragment seems to be a *locus desperatus* and no satisfactory solution has been given. This problem might be due to the fact that some words of the quotation have been lost. From the point of view of the meaning, yet, it is clearly an address to the audience and a reference to the custom of eating and drinking during the all-day performance. In general, the best account of this custom is Athen. XI 464c-f who quotes Philochorus 328 F 171J. In Ar. Av. 786-9 there is a reference to going home to eat before the ending of the tragedies, and he mentions more frequently the throwing of dry fruits and other sweets to the audience in order to win their applause (see *Vesp.* 58, *Pax* 962, *Pl.* 797-9 and further Pickard-Cambridge *DFA* p. 272).

Pherecrates here refers only to drinking and it seems that there was a drink customarily drunk in the theatre, called τρῖμμα (cf. Hesych. s. v. and Bonanno *Cratete comico* p. 135 n. 1).

K-A render|a good selection of different proposals. Three main solutions have been given:

- Bergk restores them in 'choriambic dimeters' as fr. 102 and 14 and suggests that it belongs to the pnigos of the parabasis. Wilamowitz ad *Lys.* 1058-71 also follows this scansion (as in *Lys. loc. cit.* and in *Eccl.* 144-8); but regards it as an address to the audience at the end of the play. Edmonds *FAC I* p. 242 suggests the same metre but with different textual changes: τῶν θεατῶν δ' ὅστις <έ>δ(- / ψη, λεπαστήν λαψάμενος / μεστήν ἐχαριβδίσαι, but the sense is less satisfactory, because the

past tense is not appropriate.

- Kock makes it into Eupolidean metres; but as Sifakis *Parabasis* p. 117 n. 45 says: "Kock's reconstruction involves major changes and in fact does away with the image of the monster lapping with its tongue. Rather than lose the forceful metaphor I would lose the fragment from the parabasis".

- The same argument can be applied to Kaibel's proposal in trochaic metre.

The text seems to be a construction of relative clause with a conditional sense which is found with a subjunctive mood with ἄν or κε (cf. Goodwin §532) or rarely without it (Goodwin §539-40); although it could also be built with an indicative (cf. Goodwin §534 and 563). The main clause has a middle imperative aorist.

The comicality of this fragment is of a verbal kind. The corruption does not allow us to conclude in which metre it was written, but the last word seems to be climactic in the quick sequence of the two lines: from 'licking' the cup (ἡ λεπαστή was already a very big cup) to 'gulping it down full of wine like Charybdis'. In my opinion the style is more similar to the quick and concise one of a pnygos, as Bergk suggests. The reference to the audience's bibulousness can be connected with the abusive address, often found in Old Comedy, as in *Ar. Nub.* 494ff. (cf. Dover on *Nub.* 208).

τῶν θεατῶν ὅστις: in Aristophanes two similar instances with verb in indicative are found: similar construction as *Ar. Equ.*

228: καὶ τῶν θεατῶν ὅστις ἐστὶ δεξιὸς and *Nub.* 1096: καὶ τῶν θεατῶν ὀπότεροι πλείους σκόπει.

**λεπαστήν:** a "limpet-shaped drinking cup" (LSJ). Athen. XI 485a describes it as follows: τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ποτήριον ὠνομάσθη ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς τὰς μέθας καὶ τὰς ἀσωτίας πολλὰ ἀναλισκόντων, οὗς λαφύκτας καλοῦμεν. κύλικες δ' ἦσαν μεγάλαι (cf. also Nicander *Thyatharsenus* 343 F15 J.). It is frequently found in the comic fragments: *Ar.* fr. 174, *Cratin.* fr. 468, *Theop. com.* fr. 31, 41, 42, *Hermipp.* fr. 45, *Antiph.* fr. 47.3, *Apolloph.* fr.7, *Philyll.* fr. 5.

**λαψάμενος:** the verb λάπτω was in this time already a colloquial expression to designate "to drink greedily" (cf. LSJ s.v.; *Ar. Pax* 885, *Ach.* 1229, *Nub.* 811, fr. 615, *Xenarch.* fr. 9; see also Athen. X 443e and 485a). But it also keeps the image from which it originally comes, that of a wolf (cf. *Il.* 16. 161) or a dog (cf. Sch. ad *Ar. Nub.* 811) "lapping the vessel with the tongue" (see also Taillardat *Images* §155 who relates it to κάπτειν and χορτάζεσθαι as other metaphors taken from terms usually applied to animals).

**ἐκχαρυβδίσαι:** a hapax, probably invented by Pherecrates. Two readings of this word are possible: ἐκχαρυβδίσαι or ἐγχαρυβδίσαι (cf. Dobree ad *Ar. Pl.* 1012 apud Rehrenböck p. 109 and K-A ad loc., see also Richards *CLR* 13 (1899) p. 426). Perhaps Hesych. ε3819 ἐξεχαρυβδαίνθη and the parallel form ἐκπίνειν would be favourable to the form ἐκχ-.

Charybdis, the mythical whirlpool of *Od.* 12. 104 that swallowed great quantities of water, became a symbol for

greediness and bibulousness. Some comic compounds are found, besides this one: Hippon. 128W (126 Deg.) ποντοχάρυβδιν (related to women drinking, cf. Degani *Studi su Ipponatte* p. 194 Bari 1984); μεθυσοχάρυβδις Com. adesp. fr. 1077K and γαστροχάρυβδις in Cratin. fr. 428. The image is also recalled in Ar. *Equ.* 428 (see also Anaxil. fr. 22. 18, Alciph. I. 66, Cic. *de Orat.* III. 163; cf. Taillardat *Images* §724).

#### Fr. 102

The metrical combination of this fragment is what has been called a "choriambic dimeter" following Wilamowitz (*Gr. Versk.* pp. 210ff.) and thus "wilamowitzianus" (about the origin of this denomination, cf. Poultney *AJP* 100 (1979) p.142 n.4). But, nowadays, this name and Wilamowitz's analysis seem inappropriate (cf. K. Itsumi *CIQ* n.s.32 (1982) p. 59 and n. 6) and Maas' interpretation seems to be more widely accepted (oo-x-uv- P. Maas *Greek Metre* §54 Engl. trans. Oxford 1962; discussion about this scheme and other proposals is found in K. Itsumi art.cit. p. 60) and the denomination of "anaclastic glyconic" has been suggested (cf. P. Maas loc.cit., West *Gr. Metre* p. 193).

The similarity of this metrical scheme with the first colon of an Eupolidean (cf. on fr. 34) has led Sifakis *Parabasis* p. 34 to suggest that "this fragment shows what form a Pnigos, following a Parabasis in Eupolidean, would have". But the metre is found in Ar. *Vesp.* 1457-61 and 1469-73 in choral songs in the context of choriambic systems (see MacDowell ad loc.). This use κατὰ στίχον does not seem to be very common except for Euripides

and some parts of Aristophanes; according to Itsumi art.cit. p.71 this unfrequent use is due to the fact that it "was not considered at the first stage as an independent verse but as an occasional variant on glyc.". Progressively it is more frequent in the lyric parts of plays, above all in relation to the new usage of aeolic rhythms by Euripides.

This passage presents quite a rigid metrical frame with only two resolutions in l. 2 and 6, in comparison with the frequent resolutions in Euripides himself (cf. Itsumi art.cit. p.72). It is perhaps due to the solemnity and apparent seriousness with which Pherecrates wants to present his appeal to the judges.

From the point of view of its content, this kind of appeal to the judges to be fair and thus to give the prize to this play, is used by Aristophanes in the Parabasis of *Av.* 1102ff. and *Nub.* 1115ff.; or in the final scene in *Eccl.* 1154ff. and also 1141ff.

I would suggest that the metrical rigidity I pointed out before, is related to the metrical interests of Pherecrates, as in fr. 84 where, through a very rigid scheme, he pretends to have invented a new metre. It would suit better, in my opinion, the wish to provide the Athenian audience with innovations and novelties and it would fit the character of a Parabasis, especially the Pnigos, to which most of the new metrical forms of this genre are related (cf. Sifakis *Parabasis* pp. 67-8 and later on *Φερεκράτης* l. 6). It seems also interesting to notice that the only place where the 'eulogy of the poet' is not made in the Parabasis is in *Eccl.* that does not have a proper Parabasis.

In line 4 after ἦ (as in Ar. *Pax* 1315), the chorus probably

threatens the judges. This kind of threat, generally with a comic point (here perhaps the unusual *κακηγορ(στερον* at the end), is also found in *Ar. Nub.* 1115 and *Av.* 1101, uttered by the chorus in its dramatic character (R.K. Fisher *Aristophanes 'Clouds': purpose and technique* p.208 Amsterdam 1984 suggests that it is perhaps an innovation of Aristophanes).

1. *κριταῖς*: the judges of the theatrical contests are mentioned implicitly by *Ar.* in *Ach.* 1224 and clearly in *Nub.* 1115, *Av.* 445, 1101 and *Ecc1.* 1142, 1154. They were ten and carefully chosen by lot among members previously selected from each tribe. About the way they were appointed and acted, see Pickard-Cambridge *DFA* pp. 95ff.

3. *μη'πιορκεῖν*: *ἐπιορκεῖν*, "to break the oath" according to Norwood *Gr.Com.* p. 160 (perhaps better meaning than "to swear falsely" as Rehrenböck p. 116 suggests). Very similar expression is found in *Ar. Ecc1.* 1160 *μη'πιορκεῖν, ἀλλὰ κρίνειν τοὺς χοροὺς ὀρθῶς ἀεὶ*. About this oath, cf. *Pl. Legg.* 659a and *Dem* 21.17 who talks about the activities of Meidias against him when he was choregus (see MacDowell ad loc.)

4. *νη' τὸν φίλιον*: that is to say, *νη' τὸν φίλιον Δία*. It was a very common invocation and could be simply translated as "I declare"; but still Zeus was seen as god of the relationship of love and friendship and in particular occasions when these themes were discussed, to utter this expression was meaningful (see *Phryn. praep. soph.* p. 123.11 apud K-A's comment ad loc., *Men. fr.* 49Kδ-T *μαρτύροι τὸν φίλιον, ὧ Κράτων, Δία, Ar. Ach.* 730 *ναὶ*

τὸν φίλιον and Pl. *Euthphr.* 6b, *Phdr.* 234e, *Gorg.* 500b and 519e with the expression πρὸς φίλου). Zeus Philius was connected with banquets (cf. Diod. fr. 2.5 who makes him the inventor of the 'parasitic art', see Burkert *Gr. Religion* p.107). About him and his cults, see further Cook *Zeus* vol. II 2 p. 1160ff.

5. μῦθον... λέξει: see Ar. *Lys.* 781 μῦθον βούλομαι λέξαι τιν' ὅμῃν and 806 κἀγὼ βούλομαι μῦθόν τιν' ὅμῃν ἀντιλέξαι.

The word μῦθον appears in Aristophanes with two meanings:

a) explanation, speech (cf. *Vesp.* 725-6: πρὶν ἂν ἀμφοῖν μῦθον ἀκούσης, / οὐκ ἂν δικάσαις),

b) story, fiction, fable, (especially related to those of Aesop), see e.g. *Vesp.* 566, 1179 (in plural, mythical story), *Pax* 131, *Pl.* 177.

6. Φερεκράτης: the reading of the manuscripts is Φιλοκράτης; but Grotius' change seems generally accepted (cf. K-A's app. crit.). It is a pity that in such crucial point the text is so doubtful.

In fact this instance would be the only one in which a poet gives his own name. In parabolic passages Aristophanes uses the first person (cf. *Nub.* 517ff.) or speaks about ὁ ποιητής (cf. *Ach.* 633, *Equ.* 509, 548), ὁ διδάσκαλος (*Pax* 738, fr. 348) or ὁ κωμωδιδάσκαλος (cf. *Equ.* 307), τῷ φαλακρῷ in *Pax* 771.

It seems strange that no source has pointed out this passage as an original element of Pherecrates and perhaps it was not as unusual as it appears in the surviving comic literature, or the textual confusion was already found at a very early stage and it was interpreted as a passage uttered by a character or someone

with the name of Philocrates (see *infra*). It agrees, otherwise, with the originality and individuality with which the comic poets seem to have tried to characterize their works, mainly in the *Parabasis* and especially the *Pnigos*, as I have already pointed out.

The name Philocrates is very common in Attic (cf. Hunter on Eub. p.217) and in the IV century there was a famous politician of this name (cf. Dem. 19. 150). There is a reference to a 'bird-seller' called Philocrates in Ar. Av. 14: ὁ πινακοπῶλης Φιλοκράτης μελαγγολῶν, and in 1077 designated as ὁ Στρούθιος. About them, see further Kirchner PA 14568ff. and RE XIX 2 (1938) 2495-2500.

Maybe the reading transmitted by the manuscripts could be kept, if we understand this passage as an eulogy of the poet, made by the chorus-leader on his behalf. The name Philocrates could be that of the chorus-leader in his dramatic character.

7. κακηγορίστερον: "more abusive", comparative form of the adjective κακηγόρος. This adjective is not often found in Classical literature (in poetry in Pind. O. 1. 53 and Ecph. fr. 6 in superlative and in prose only in Pl. Phdr. 254e) while the noun ἡ κακηγορία and the verb κακηγορέω are very common (see LSJ s. v.). About it and its meaning in the comic style of Pherecrates see *supra* p. 69.

This comparative is probably a comic formation similar to other comparative and superlative comic terms (see further on Pherecr. fr. 111).

Fr. 103

τῶν διφύρων: about σῦκον in general, cf. ad fr. 85. 2, 139.1. This kind of fig is also mentioned by Ar. *Eccl.* 707 and Antiph. fr. 196, and refers to the fig-tree that gives fruit twice a year. It was considered by Theop. *FGH* I. 324, a sign of the wealth and good luck of Philip.

About them in detail, see Athen. III 77d-e.

Fr. 104

About δυσήμερεῖν, cf. fr. 245.

## Λῆροι

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

*Λῆροι* seems to designate here according to Hesych. λ895 ληροί: τὰ περὶ τοῖς γυναικεῖοις χιτῶσι κεχρυσωμένα (cf. also Phot. p.222. 8). This is the first instance of this word with this meaning; but it is frequent in later literature (cf. *AP* 6. 92.2 and Gow-Page *Hell. epigr.* p.290, Luc. *Lex.* 9 and Sch. ad loc.). The testimony of Poll. VI 101 seems to point out that it was not unusual in Classical Greek.

The later texts (cf. *AP* loc.cit. and Hesych. loc.cit.) have an oxytone accent. This problem led H.W. Chandler *A practical Introduction to Gr. Accentuation* pp. 88-9 Oxford 1881<sup>2</sup> to suggest that it is an exception of the general rule that is, as stated by J. Vendryes *Traité d'Accentuation Grecque* p. 173: "les trois substantifs à sens abstract λῆρος, ὄνειρος et ὄχρος font remonter l'accent tandis que les trois noms de parenté masculins γαμβρός, ἔκυρος et πενθερός sont oxytons". Chandler op.cit. p. 280 suggests that λῆρος means 'nonsense' while ληρός 'an ornament'.

The distinction between the two accentuations and the two meanings as suggested by Chandler is maybe unnecessary here and maybe λῆρος is right, meaning "gold ornaments" as a particular usage of λῆρος meaning "trash, trumpery" (cf. Boeotian λεῖρος, *IG* 7.2421 and Frisk s.v. and Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s.v.2). The latter word is quite frequent in Attic Comedy, e.g. *Ar. Nub.* 359, *Ran.* 809, 1005, etc.

The connexion between the two meanings may have had some pejorative overtones for this kind of gold ornaments which may

have been regarded as unnecessary ostentation.

According to Bergk *Rel.* p. 131 apud K-A, the title could be a reference to the chorus of the play which would be a "chorum mulierum nimis ornamentis instructum" in words of K-A. If this is right, women could be dressed or represent different kinds of ornaments (and maybe it would have been a personification similar to that of *Krapataloi*). These ornaments may have been alluded in fr. 106. The content could be similar to the play *'Αγαθοί* and it could also have similarities with Cratinus' *Μαλθακοί* (cf. K-A ad loc. and above all Pherecr. fr. 106 and Cratin. fr. 105 where there are similar enumerations of luxurious elements). Possibly a banquet scene was described according to fr. 105, 107 and maybe 109 and 112.

Fr. 105

The state of the two lines and the lack of any external evidence does not allow us to give a satisfactory explanation of the content of this fragment. It seems reference to the customs related to the banquet in which the perfume had an important role, but it is not so clear and we could speculate that it is a sentence that fits a passage within the context of a perfume-shop, mentioned in fr. 2 and 70 as a topical place as a symbol of the moral decadence (see infra on βρένθειον and τοῖς εἰσοῦσιν).

Perfume was a very common element in Greek daily life. It was customary to perfume the house, the dead people (cf. *Il.* 23. 186), after a bathe (*Od.* 4.252, Magn. fr. 3), in sacrifices, in weddings, love-making (cf. *Ar. Lys.* 940), etc. (cf. Chapot op.cit. 591-8); but above all in Comedy it is found related to banquets: cf. *Ar. Ach.* 1091, *Nicostr.com.* fr. 27, *Alex.* fr.252.3, *Matron Conv.* v.120. As Long *Barbarians in Gr. Com.* p.78 says: "the perfume was not a feature of the dinner itself, unless it appeared as an added aroma mixed in the wine (*Philippides* 39). It made appearance after everyone had eaten (*Plato* 69, *Philyllus* 3) and the flute girls and other entertainments had replaced the pleasures of the dining table".

The metre is iambic trimeter, although Dindorf makes a proposal to solve the textual problems by making it tetrameter: ἔστην δὲ κάκελευον ἐνχέασθαι / νῶν βρένθειον μύρον, ἵνα τοῖς ἰοῦσιν ἐγγέη τις, but maybe the changes are unnecessary.

1. The ending of this line is corrupted and several changes have been suggested (see apud K-A); but none is convincing enough.

**ἐγγέασθαι:** it is doubtful in this line (mainly insofar as it is repeated in 1.2 ἐγγέη). It means "to pour into" a container and it is generally related to pouring wine (cf. Pherecr. fr. 75.7 and 76, Ar. *Vesp.* 617 in middle voice 'to pour wine for oneself'). The contrary would be ἐκχέω (cf. *Lys.* 940).

If this is the right text, it should be understood as follows: "and he ordered us to pour Brentheian perfume for both of us in a jar" (for different perfume-containers, see Poll. VI 105 and fr. 112). The verb could be understood as middle voice in absolute sense, as in Ar. *Vesp.* 616.

2. The change into the second person singular: ἐγγέη from νῶν in 1.1 is not easy to explain and thus some changes have been suggested. Meineke's proposal: ἐγγέω is probably the closer to the text; other suggestions are; ἐγγυῶ, Bothe or μεταδιδῶ, Kock.

**βρένθειον:** perfume of Lydian origin, but unknown composition (cf. V. Chapot *D-S* V 595). The Sch. on Clem. Alex. *Paed.* II 64 suggests uncertainly: βρένθειον ἀπό τινος ἄνθου ἡδέος and probably it had some relationship with βρενθινά 'roots used by women to make face-paint' (LSJ). It must have been an usual and expensive perfume (cf. a similar kind of perfume Βασιλεος in Crat.com. fr. 2).

**τοῖς εἰσοῦσιν:** its meaning is simply 'those who go into' a place (in a banquet, cf. Xen. *An.* VII 3.21). It may be interesting to notice, nonetheless, that it is a formula that designates

special occasions: 'to come on stage' of a chorus or an actor (cf. Pl. *Rep.* 580b), 'to come into the assembly' or 'to come before the court' (cf. LSJ s. v.).

#### Fr. 106

This fragment seems to be part of a long enumeration of feminine garments, probably similar to that of Ar. fr. 332 and possibly the comic effect was not only in the quantity of different elements mentioned, but also in their disposition throughout the lines. It may be a common device in Comedy as some other instances are preserved where there is a part of a long enumeration: e.g. Nicostr. fr. 32, Antiph. fr. 140, Nicoph. fr. 6, Plaut. *Rudens* 297-8 (generally food and things to eat), Ephipp. fr. 12 (second courses), Lysip. fr. 2 (a list of shoes), Anaxandr. fr. 41 (items of luxury of the Thracian Iphicrates), Nicoph. fr. 10 (vendors of wares of different sorts) and Plaut. *Trinummus* 252-4 (members of the household).

**μίτραν:** it is an old piece of clothing that, through the times, happened to mean different things: in Homeric poetry it designates a part of the armour of a warrior, but in later times it came to mean a head-band, and as Rogers on *Thesm.* 257 describes it: "as a part of the headgear it was probably a ribbon tying the κεκρύφαλος, and curbing the too luxuriant tresses".

In the Classical times also it designated a head-dress which was common among the Oriental peoples (cf. Hdt. I 195, VII 62, 90; Eur. *Hec.* 924, *Bacc.* 833) and originally found in Lydia (cf.

Sapph. 98L-P, Alc. I 67-8PMG). As Long *Barbarians in Gr. Com.* p.88 describes it: "this combination of veil and headdress, in many different forms, became a distinctively feminine item of apparel" and, if a man wore it, it was a sign of effeminacy (cf. *Thesm.* 163). In Hellenistic times it also became a synonym of ζωνή (cf. Theocr. 27. 55); see further Gross *Kl. P.* 3. 1365.

**άλουργή:** it means 'genuine purple dye' (LSJ). Pl. *Tim.* 68c describes it as follows: ἐρυθρόν δὲ μέλανι λευκῷ τε κραθέν ἄλουργόν. Arist. *De sensu* 440a 1 identifies it with one of the colours of the rainbow and considers it one of τὰ ἥδιστα τῶν χρωμάτων (see further André *Etudes sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine* p. 13 Paris 1949).

In Homer with the name πορφύρεος (cf. *Il.* 8. 221) it was a sign of nobility and still in Classical epoch it keeps being an element of wealth and high moral standard, its production being very expensive and difficult (cf. Besnier *D-S* IV 1. 769ff., Bluemner *Tech.* I pp.224ff. and Forbes *St. in Ancient Tech.*<sup>2</sup> III pp. 210-6 Leiden 1964-72).

**στρόφιον:** the diminutive form of στρόφος (cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 457, *Sept.* 872 and *Th.* 872 that means "women's girdle"); but there are more instances of στρόφιον especially in Comedy (Ar. *Lys.* 931, *Thesm.* 139,, 251, 255, 638, fr. 664, 332.4) and it designates the 'band worn by women round the breast' (LSJ) next to the skin (cf. M. Bieber *Gr. Kleidung* Taf.VIII 4 Berlin/Leipzig 1928 and *RE* IVa 378ff.), synonymous with ζωνή. It can also mean a head-band worn by priests (cf. LSJ s. v. II), as can στρόφος.

**ὄχθοιβον:** the uncommonest element of this list. The best

definition of this kind of purple stripe also worn around the breast, but in front of the chiton is that of Phot. p.366.5 ὀχθοίβους· τὰ λάματα. Ἔστι δὲ περὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ χιτῶνος ἀλουργῆς πρόσραμμα (cf. also Hesych. ο2033, Et.gen. s.v., Et.magn. p. 645. 2, Sud. ο1049). The presence of the purple colour in this piece of clothing can be also a sign of being a luxury.

**κτένα:** the word that ends our passage is not a feminine garment; but it means 'comb'. In the context of the female toilet it must have this meaning; but maybe it is an example of a comic bathos in which the last element of the list has another implication besides the usual sense (cf. LSJ s.v. κτεῖς ὁ 'pubes', Hipp. Aph. 7.39, Art. 51).

#### Fr. 107

This fragment suggests that a ῥύγχος or something similar to it was on stage or it was just mentioned since τοῦτί, the deictic adjective, could have both senses (cf. fr. 32, 155.20). The line can be interpreted in three ways:

- Kock suggested a similar situation to that of Ar. Ach. 768, where the two girls are taken to be 'pigs' and several obscene remarks are made, playing on the literal and erotic meanings to which a pig was related.

- van Leeuwen ad Ach. 744 proposes a parody of the Thyestes' banquet, as Ar. fr. 478 just cited by Athen. III 95d, the source of our fragment.

- it could be an ironical remark about a human nose, as in Cratin. fr. 468 and Archipp. fr. 1 (see Ar. fr. 478 and Arar. fr.

1). In our case someone would defend his own or someone else's nose from this ridiculous comparison.

#### Fr. 108

The word ὄνομα with the article is in a predominant place and seems to be the important word of this sentence. I suspect that this question introduced a joke or a pun on the name that was said afterwards and a similar case would be Ar. *Thesm.* 1200, Av. 1203. The position of κάτειπε is also usual in comedy, as K-A ad loc. point out.

The other words are used in their normal meanings, apparently. For κάτειπε, as meaning 'say' simply, cf. Ar. *Nub.* 155, *Pax* 20 and 657 and *Pl.* 86. The verb χρῆσται is a future form 'conglutinatum ex χρῆ ἔσται' as Kock says (cf. Eup. fr. 11, Ar. fr. 377, Cratin fr. 135, Schwyzer *GrGr* I p. 402).

#### Fr. 109

The metre of this fragment is doubtful. Apparently it is an iambic rhythm, but it is one syllable short to be a trimeter. Two solutions have been given:

- to consider that these are 'tetrametrorum reliquae' as Meineke does (and K-A, following him).

- to think that there is a corruption in the text. Dindorf suggested to add ἄν before φαγεῖν (cf. also a more elaborate emendation by Tucker *CIQ* 2 (1908) p. 191).

The simplest solution is that of Meineke. But perhaps Dindorf's solution is also possible since the particle ἄν plus an

iterative imperfect is common to denote a customary action (cf. Goodwin p. 56), although ἔφασxon had already lost its iterative sense (cf. LSJ s. v.).

About the meaning of this expression, cf. on ἀπό τηγάνου.

1. ἀπό τηγάνου: τηγάνος or τάγηνος 'frying pan' is a word often found in comedy indifferently in either of these forms. They are said to be Doric and Attic respectively by Phryn. *Praep. soph.* p. 112. 11: τάγηνον οἱ Ἀττικοί, τήγανον οἱ Δωριεῖς (or Ionic according to Phot. s. v. τάγηνον, see also Moer. p. 210. 12). In Pherecrates it is also found in fr. 133 and fr. 128 in the verb ἀποτηγανίζω. The choice of the form may be due to metrical reasons, e. g. Eup. fr. 374 τάγηνον and Eup. fr. 155 τηγάνου.

In our fragment the meaning of this expression ἀπό τηγάνου / φαγεῖν is not clear. It could simply mean 'to eat out the frying pan' (cf. Edmonds *FAC I* p. 245) or to eat something 'au téganon', as Gulick translates it in Athen. VI 228e.

I am inclined to think that the fragment refers to the custom that became a topic in relation to the ways of eating of the parasites and gluttons. It is found in other comic fragments, e. g. Anaxandr. fr. 34. 4: ἀπό τοῦ ταγήνου τ' εὐθέως ἀφανίζεται (talking about the speed in which some young men eat the fish), also Eup. fr. 374, Eub. fr. 75 and 108. 3.

About this cooking implement, cf. Sparkes *JHS* 82 (1962) p. 129 and pl. V(5). Other instances are Ar. *Equ.* 929, Eup. fr. 374, Pl. com. fr. 189. 12, Eub. fr. 108. Athen. VI 228c and Poll. X 98 are the major sources of testimonies.

2. **ἀφύας**: 'small-fry, like our Whitebait including the young of various fishes' (cf. Thompson *Fishes* s. v.). There are several methods of cooking them (cf. Thompson *loc. cit.*); but especially they are fried in a lot of oil (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 648, Hesych. α8814, Sud. α4460 and Phot. α3407).

#### Fr. 110

The object of the participle λαβοῦσα and the function of τῆς χοίνικος are the main textual problems of this line. Three solutions have been given:

- Dobree *Adv.* I p. 578 suggests: λαβοῦσα μέντοι χοίνικα, / τὸν πύνδακ' εἰσέκρουσε, as the remains of two iambic trimeters.

- Meineke *FCG* II p. 298 suggests λαθοῦσα instead of λαβοῦσα and it would be a construction in genitive, which gives the verb a causal sense (see *LSJ* s. v. λανθάνω B): 'making forget the choinix' (but according to *LSJ* this construction with a simple form of the verb is only found in epic poetry).

- Kock proposes that "fortasse antecedebat accusativus unde genitivus pendeat".

I think that the text could be understood without modifications, if χοῖνιξ could be a unit of measure and the vessel that contained such amount. The object of λαβοῦσα would be understood from the genitive which follows. Unfortunately there is no instance of the vessel with this meaning. Some examples of this noun have a proverbial sense, e. g. *Od.* 19. 28 οὐ γὰρ ἀεργὸν ἀνέξομαι ὅς κεν ἐμῆς γε / χοίνικος ἄπτηται, or in *Athen.* X 452e μὴ καθῆσθαι ἐπὶ χοίνικα a colloquial expression meaning 'my daily

bread' . In Aristophanes it refers always to the measure of capacity.

This fragment refers to a woman who is cheating with grain (about possible contexts, see *infra*).

**χοίνικος**: a measure of corn mainly, but also of figs (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 718, fr. 481). It was equivalent to a little more than one litre (cf. Chantraine *Kl.P.* I 1152, Hultsch *RE* III 2356-7 and Hultsch *Griechische und Römern Metrologie* pp.82ff. Berlin 1862). It was used in very colloquial expressions. This amount seems to have been the ration of a slave a day or a soldier (cf. Athen. VI 272b, Ar. *Eccl.* 424 and see further on fr. 1.2).

**τὸν πύνδακ' εἰσέχρυσεν**: parallel texts are Ar. fr. 281 and Theophr. *Char.* XXX 11; both are related to the shop-keeper that cheats the customers.

This line could have been said in two contexts, bearing in mind that it refers to a woman: On one hand she could be a shop-keeper, following the instances just mentioned. In fact she could have been an ἀρτοποιίς, a personage usually depicted with such a feature (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 238, *Ran.* 858), and she could be cheating with the grain she is selling (about the selling of bread and grain, cf. Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour* p. 34-5); or she may be selling or drinking wine, as in Ar. *Thesm.* 347-8.

On the other hand this sentence could be the complaint of a slave about the meanness of the mistress.

Fr. 111

It is difficult to obtain a definitive sense out of this line. The metre seems to be an unusual iambic tetrameter acatalectic (cf. K-A for references); but three metrical patterns have been suggested:

- part of a pnhgos or iambic run in dimeters is suggested by Meineke (cf. *Ar. Nub.* 1443-51 and further *West Gr. Metre* pp. 93-4),

- divided in trimeters: ἔπειτα <καὶ> ἕτερα / τούτων by Porson apud K-A.

- organized in trochaic metres, if we read εἴθ' ἕτερα, according to Dobree *Adv.* I p. 597.

The diphthong *oi* in ποιοῦντα is in correption, as it is usual in Attic (cf. *West* *ibid.* p. 11).

I think that there are two ways of understanding this line:

- ἕτερα could be the subject of ποιοῦντα and would have τούτων as a dependent genitive, having the sense of 'other things among these' or 'things different to these' and, then, ποιοῦντα meaning 'to cause, to bring about' (LSJ s.v. A II) would have πολλὰ κυντερότερα as complement.

- Another possibility is to understand ποιοῦντα having a subject not in our text, either masculine or neuter plural and with a double accusative object: ἕτερα and the form κυντερότερα as predicative (cf. LSJ s.v. ποιέω III).

**κυντερότερα:** comparative form of the already comparative κύντερος: "more dog-like", "more shameless" (LSJ) already found

in *Il.* 8.483. The formation of a superlative from an adjective already superlative seems to be common in comic texts (cf. *Ar. Equ.* 1165 and *Eub.* fr. 83); but as Neil ad *Equ.* loc.cit. says, is "not confined to comedy" (cf. *Aesch.* fr. 432R. and see further K-B I p.573 and Schwyzer *GrG* I p. 535.8).

#### Fr. 112

This fragment is related with the commonplace of the perfume (cf. further p.307). *Athen.* X 424a states that Pherecrates used *κύαθος* and *Poll.* VI 105, its diminutive form: *κύαθιον*. It is difficult to decide which one.

The main function of a *κύαθος* was to serve the wine and in order to keep it cool it was made of metal. This use as a ladling-cup for perfume is uncommon in our literary sources, though it is ambiguously mentioned in *Ar. Ach.* 1053, when the wine-treaty becomes a perfume-treaty, as if it accommodates to the context of a wedding in which perfume was very much in demand (cf. Rogers ad loc.). It is easier to understand this transformation if we bear in mind the fact that the same word could be used in both contexts.

In our case the fact of being made of silver suggests also the luxury that has been depicted in other passages (cf. fr. 135 for other luxurious implements made of silver).

## Μεταλλῆς

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

#### A) *Date*

The date of the play is uncertain. The only evidence we can take into account is that Athen VI. 268e says that he is citing the plays in chronological order: Cratin. fr. 176: *Ploutoi*, Crat.com. fr.16-17: *Thera*, Telecl. fr. 1: *Amphiktyones*, Pherecr. fr.113: *Metalles*, Ar. *Tagenistai* test. iii, Nicoph. fr.21: *Seirenes*, Metag. fr.6: *Thouripersai*.

From our scarce knowledge of the poets, I think that this order is possible, although we might doubt whether it is based on real evidence or just a fairly general idea and used here as a rhetorical device by the speaker; if this is the case, we may doubt whether Teleclides is correctly placed before Pherecrates, because both authors seem to be quite contemporary in their productions. In any case, any attempt to set some limits is also based on very doubtful dates: Cratinus' *Ploutoi* seems to be produced in 429 (cf. K-A ad fr. 171. 22), but still it is a disputed date (cf. Austin *CGFP* p. 39), and Aristophanes' *Tagenistai* is dated by Geißler (1925) pp. 48-9 after 421 and before 415 on metrical grounds not totally convincing.

#### B) *Authenticity*

The Alexandrian scholar Eratosthenes suggested, according to Harp. p. 203. 8 Dind. and Phot. p. 31. 11 (cf. *Metalles* test. i and iii and fr. 116), that this play was not written by

Pherecrates, but by Nicomachus. Similarly *Cheiron* was attributed to ὁ Νικόμαχος ὁ ῥυθμικός by Athen. VIII 364a quoting fr. 162 and his source may have been Eratosthenes as well.

Eratosthenes seems to have thought of the Nicomachus who was a comic playwright of the New Comedy, although this identification is not totally sure, because there are two tragedians with the same name: Nicom. Athen. 36Sn and Nicom. Alex. 127Sn. One of his objections seems to be the use of a term mainly Ionic or Doric (cf. fr. 116); about Eratosthenes' ideas about Comedy, see *supra* p. 10.

In more detail we have the difficulties of attribution posed by Meineke in *FCG* II pp. 307ff. In general he says "hoc certe negari non potest in paucis huius fabulae fragmentis, praesertim in longiore illo quod primo loco exhibui, plurima reperiri, quae dictioni, qua veteres comici usi sunt, vehementer repugnant"; his main questions are of linguistic and metrical character and have been discussed in detail by Rehrenböck pp. 144-5. In any case, Meineke suggests (cf. *op.cit.* p. 309) that we have part of the work of an adaptor, Nicomachus, who modified the play of Pherecrates for a later audience. This suggestion has been supported also by Kaibel *Hermes* 24 (1889) p. 44 and Geißler (1925) p. 41.

As Körte *RE* XIX 1989. 13 already concluded, this proposal is a piece of hypercriticism based on very weak metrical and linguistic difficulties and besides there is no evidence of later adaptations of plays belonging to Old Comedy (further cf. *supra* pp. 7f.).

C) *Title and content*

The title designates with certainty the chorus of miners of the play. In Athens the mines 'par excellence' were those of Laureion where silver for coinage was extracted (about the system of exploitation of the mines, cf. Osborne *Demos* Cambridge 1985 pp. 111ff. and Sommerstein ad Ar. Av. 593).

Fr. 113 is a remarkable passage of a woman who in a very long and detailed speech explains what she saw on her trip down to Hades with someone else (cf. v. 21). She tells us that she has found a Land of Plenty where the dead are continuously banqueting (note that the tenses of the passage are generally imperfect or pluperfect). As we will see from the commentary on this fragment, it is clearly related to the comic tradition of the trips to Hades and mainly to the depiction of the commonplace of the Idler's Paradise where everything is done automatically.

Another tradition that is also referred to in fr.cit. and above all in fr. 114, is that of the lyric poetry and the description of the idyllic landscape. It is comparable to the use of the same tradition in the description of the Island of the Blessed in Ar. *Ran.* 326ff. Pherecrates' *Persai* fr. 137 and 138 develops both topics from a different point of view.

D) *A possible fragment*

Meineke *FCG* II 1 p. 309 suggests that Hesych. τ205 could belong also to this play (cf. K-A *PCG* VII p. 161).

τάππος: the noun τάππος or τάππος in Attic designates in general anything that had a broad flat surface and in this case

one would think that Hesych. τ205 mentions a special kind of stone placed under the oven or as a base for the oven. It is possible that he took this meaning from our play, and did not give the name of the author, mainly because Pherecrates seems to be prone to use very uncommon words sometimes belonging to a special terminology.

## 1. Analysis of content.

This is the longest fragment we have of Pherecr. It is the speech of a woman (cf. v. 20) who describes the wonderful world she has found on her trip down to the Underworld. The content of the fragment is mainly the detailed description of a banquet and from this point of view it can be divided in the following parts:

- v. 1-2 are a kind of introduction where the speaker insists on the quantity of things and the wealth that exists down there.

- v. 3-9 are organized around a μὲν (v. 3-7), and a δὲ (v. 8-9) clausula, and describe the items, found in the rivers that flow in Hades and beside them. Soups and cakes on one hand and on the other different kinds of sausages.

- v. 10-19 have a similar pattern to the last part: παρῆν ... μὲν in v. 10 and παρῆν δὲ in v. 18, and describe first of all different types of fish and meat and secondly two kinds of milk delicacies.

- v. 20-22 in which the listener interrupts impatiently.

- v. 23-31 follow the same style of narration: v. 24-5 about κίχλαι 'thrushes' and 26-7 about μήλα 'apples'. The mention in v. 25 of ὑπὸ μυρρίναισι κάνεμώναις together with apples recalls the traditional description of idealized landscapes and gardens of lyric poetry with these plants that are usually related to Aphrodite, as myrtle and apples in Ibyc. 315PMG, Archil. 30. 1W, Stesich. 187. 3PMG, culminating with the mention of the roses in

v. 29 as an euphemism, but that, as flower, is mentioned as well in such lyric tradition (cf. Ibyc. and Stesich. loc. cit.). In general see further E. Cavallini *Presenza di Saffo e Alceo nella Poesia Greca fino ad Aristofane* p. 57, n. 64 and 65 Ferrara 1986. Some of these elements are mentioned in fr. 58. 1-2.

- v. 28-31 where half naked young women serve wine without mixture.

- v. 32-33 are a kind of conclusion to the narration, indicating that the banquet could begin again if one was able to eat and drink all this.

As we can see the text is tightly woven, though an incongruence in the number and gender of the participle σίζοντι[α] and the verb ἐπέχοντο with the previous line has led Kock ad loc. to change the order by adding v. 9, 10 and 11 between v. 5 and 6, but this change breaks the careful construction that we have explained earlier on and does not take into account the surprise function of καὶ ναστῶν τρύφη in v. 5, similar to that of καὶ πρὸς τόμοι in l. 19. The neuter forms can be explained as an attraction (cf. comment ad loc.).

## 2. Analysis of style and vocabulary.

I think that the style is clearly pseudo-poetic and tries to give grandiose echoes to the description of simple food. In order to obtain this style he uses some devices:

a) Abundance of participles: συμπεφρμένα and εἰργασμένα in v. 1 and 2, in v. 4 τονθολυγοῦντες, a new word invented perhaps by Pherecrates, that as in v. 7 and 8 ζέοντες and σίζοντα, has an

onomatopoeic intention; in v. 11 and 12 ἐξωπημένα and συγκεκαλυμμένα are long compound participles as later in l. 18; in v. 15 ἀτρίζοντα; in v. 16 ἐπεξανθισμένα; in v. 17 καθημένα; in v. 18 the unusual form κατανεनिμένος; in v. 23 ἦρτυμένοι; ἀντιβολοῦσαι and κεχυμένοι in v. 24 and 25; πεφυκότα in v. 27; ἦβυλλιῶσαι and κεκαρμένοι in v. 29 and τοῖσι βουλομένοις in v. 31.

b) Some rhetorical devices:

- Onomatopoeia in some participles above quoted.
- Pleonasm in v. 1 and 2 of πάντα, πᾶσι, πάντα, together with asyndeton to stress the idea of abundance.
- Polysyndeton in the repetition of καί in v. 14, 15 and 16.
- Addition of new elements in an enumeration at the end of a sentence leaving it hanging in appearance (cf. v. 5 and 19 above quoted).

c) Different levels of vocabulary:

- Standard expressions in Comedy as ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς and πάντα τρόπον in v. 2; the combination of two nouns as ἐν καταχύτλοις λεκάναισι, in v. 19 is a common poetic device; οἴμ' ὡς ἀπολεῖς in v. 20, very usual interjection; l. 21 ὡς ἔχει very common parenthetical sentence; v. 22 frequent word order in Comedy, see ad loc.; v. 26 τὰ καλὰ τῶν καλῶν, formal idiom for a superlative; τοῖσι βουλομένοις in v. 31.

- Usual vocabulary of comedy (see infra).

- Uncommon expressions sometimes borrowed from poetic texts: l. 4 στενωπῶν, v. 5 τρύφη, v. 16 ἐπεξανθισμένα, v. 21 κολυμβᾶν.

- Words only found here, some of them are probably invented

by Pherecrates, but it is not clear in all the cases, as in v. 11 καταχυματίοις, v. 4 τονθολυγοῦντες, v. 13 ὀλόκνημοι, v. 17 χναυρότατα, v. 28 τριχάπτοις.

### 3. Content: the tradition of the Idler's Paradise.

This fragment shows striking similarities with other texts not only because of their content, but also regarding the expressions used. Fr. 137 of *Πέρσαι* and Telecl. fr. 1 that belongs to the play *Ἀμφικτύονες* are the most similar passages; but Athen. VI 267e-270a quotes also: Cratin. fr. 176, from *Πλοῦτοι*; Crat.com. fr. 16 and 17, from *Θηρία*; Metagen. fr.6, from *Θυριοπέρσαι*; Nicoph. fr. 21, from *Σειρῆνες*; he also mentions Ar. *Ταγηνίσται* (test. iii).

Baldry (1953) pp. 49ff. compares the different texts and reaches the conclusion pp. 59-60 that "each playwright took one version or other of the traditional picture -its setting in the past or the future or elsewhere- in order to make fun of it by comic exaggeration". I agree with him that these fragments refer to a traditional image of the Utopianland where everything is done by itself, the *αὐτοματὸς βίος* is, as he points out p. 50, their common element, and according to him p. 59 it was already in this moment "regarded as comic".

I would add that it is the popular vision of what in the 'high' literary tradition was considered the Islands of the Blessed, a place for heroes and noblemen. This movement towards a more popular image of Immortality and Happiness in the world of Death can be also traceable in the pictorial representations of

the late V century B.C. made by the Meidias Painter of the Garden of the Blessed as a "garden of love and corporeal luxury" as L. Burn puts it in *The Meidias Painter* Oxford 1987 p. 19.

The additions and innovations of this passage towards this topic are very few and actually according to Baldry (1953) p. 56 they are reduced to vv. 26-7. But in view of the uncertainties of dates it is difficult to reach a clear conclusion about the dependence and originality of our passage in comparison with the other fragments before cited.

I think that we could summarize the similarities of Pherecrates' text with other passages before reaching further conclusions.

From the point of view of the described wonders:

- v. 3-4: rivers of food: fr. 137.5, Telecl. fr. 1. 8 (ζωμοῦ δ' ἔρρει... ποταμῶς, as here), Metag. fr. 6. 1, 3 and 5; flooding everything fr. 137. 3, Nicoph. fr. 21. 3,
- v. 6: αὐτομάτην, Crat. 17. 7,
- v. 5, 6, 8, 23: insistence in the fact that everything is broken into small pieces, ready to be eaten: Telecl. 1. 10,
- v. 7, 24: the food moves itself into the mouth of the persons, (maybe ironically here τοῖς νέχροις): Telecl. fr.1. 12, Metag. fr.6. 10-11,
- v. 14, 17: it places itself on the serving plates or on the tables: Telecl. fr. 1. 7 and 11 and 34. 2,
- v. 23: it cooks itself: Crat. fr.16. 8-9, Telecl. fr.1. 6-7, Metag. fr. 6. 2. 9,
- v. 24: it asks to be eaten: Telecl. fr. 1. 5. 12, Metag. fr.6.

10, Nicoph. fr. 21.4.

We can list the following dishes that occur in other comic texts:

- v. 3 ἄθάρη: Crat.com. fr. 11, Nicoph. fr.6, Ar. Pl. 673, and ζωμός: Telecl. fr. 1. 8,
- v. 5 ναστοί: fr. 137. 7, Metag. fr. 6. 3,
- v. 7 φύσκαί: fr. 50.4, Cratin. fr.205 and ἄλλάντες: Metag. fr. 6. 7,
- v. 10 τεμάχη: (fish slices in general) Telecl. 1. 7, Crat.com. fr. 6. 9,
- v. 11 καταχυσματίοι: Telecl. fr.1. 9, cf. fr. 157,
- v. 12 ἐγγέλεια: Metag. fr. 6. 9 and Eub. fr. 34,
- v. 13 σχελίδες: Ar. fr. 264,
- v. 14 ἀκροκόλια: Telecl. fr. 51,
- v. 15 χόλικες βοός: Eub. fr. 63. 4,
- v. 16 πλευρά δελφάκεια: fr. 50.5, Telecl. fr. 1. 14,
- v. 17 ἄμυλος: Telecl. fr. 34. 2, Ar. Pax 1195,
- v. 18 χόνδρος: Ar. fr. 208, Eub. fr. 89. 4-5,
- v. 19 πυός: Cratin. fr. 149. 2, Ar. Vesp. 709,
- v. 23 κίχλαι: fr. 137. 9, Telecl. fr. 1. 12, Pl. com. fr. 188. 8-9, (cf. also Pherecr. fr. 50. 5-6 ὄρ- / νίθεια πλήθει πολλά),
- v. 26 τὰ μήλα: fr. 158.1,
- v. 30 wine unmixed with water: fr. 137. 6, Telecl. fr. 1. 4, Ar. fr. 504. 8.

On the other hand, there is no reference to other common dishes as, for instance, μᾶζαι (cf. Cratin. fr.176. 2, Telecl. fr. 1. 4, Metag. fr. 6. 2), τευθίς (cf. fr. 50. 3, Metag. fr.6.

6), ἄρνειον κρέας (cf. fr. 50. 2-3, Eub. fr. 75. 5), ἀφύαι (cf. Metag. fr. 6. 8 Ar. Ach. 640), λαγῶνον κρέας (cf. Telecl. fr. 34, Pl.com. fr. 188. 10, Ar. Ach. 1006, Pax 1196). And finally he does not mention a feature that seems to belong mainly to Cratin. fr. 176. 2 and Telecl. fr. 1. 14: people using these delicacies for money or to play with them.

The cooking methods mentioned are also common and this suggests that each food had a particular way to be cooked or one that was regarded as a particularly delicate one. In summary:

- v. 10 τεμάχη...ἐξωπτημένα, cf. Telecl. fr. 1. 6 ἰχθύες... ἐξοπτῶντες,
- v. 12 τεύτλοισί τ' ἐγγέλεια συγκεκαλυμμένα, cf. Eub. fr. 34, 36, 64, Ar. Pax 1013, Ach. 894,
- v. 14 διέφθ' ἀπροκάλια, cf. Telecl. fr. 51 (similarly Pherecr. fr. 50.5 πούς ἐφθός),
- v. 17 ἄμυλοι with meat, cf. Telecl. fr. 34. 2 and K-A ad loc.,
- v. 18 χόνδρος γάλακτι κατανεμιμένος, cf. Eub. 89. fr. 4-5,
- v. 23 ὄπται κιχλαί γάρ εἰς ἀνάβραστ', cf. fr. 137. 10.

As we can see, this text is very closely related with elements found in other comic passages and his own work like fr. 50, a short enumeration of similar dishes in the style of a pnigos, or fr. 137 more similar to our text, as it is another description of the αὐτόματος βίος in Persia with some modifications. I do not think that one has to judge it from the point of view of the originality, because he may not be referring to Cratinus or Crates or Teleclides; but to a common source of popular inspiration, a standard description of the Idler's

Paradise. In this context, perhaps the capacity of being faithful to this tradition and at the same time of producing some innovations was expected instead of total originality.

We should take into account mainly his dependence in the wording and expression of ideas. In this passage Pherecrates tends to use common phrases that seem to have been formalized, sometimes only to fit the metre (see *supra* on style and vocabulary); this may be a purposeful way of depicting the character as a flamboyant speaker; but it may also show the limitations of his ingenuity.

In conclusion I think one can not find the real dimension of this long fragment. Pherecrates has organized a traditional description of the Underworld around the celebration of an unending banquet. He may have set it in Tartaros, perhaps reversing the traditional view of this place of punishment and suffering. It is a mystery for me why a woman is the person who explained it: was she the main character of the play or perhaps a minor character, a slave perhaps, explaining what happened to herself and another character (cf. v. 21)? Possibly it never happened at all and she is just inventing it and boasting about it; in such case v. 20-1 would have a rather scornful tone.

d) *Commentary*

1. **ἐκεῖν' ἦν πάντα:** ἐκεῖνα πάντα is very commonly found to designate a group of things; and it might be translated as 'that whole place' (cf. Neil ad Ar. *Equ.* 99; see also *Av.* 1158, Aesch. *Pers.* 395). In the form πάντα ταῦτα (cf. *Crat.com.* fr. 195. 5 and *Pl.com.* fr. 23. 2) it can refer to a group of things that are near in time or space, and also πάντα ταυτί (cf. *Equ.* 99, *Pax* 319), that can designate the stage itself.

**συμπεφυρμένα:** according to LSJ s.v. in Comedy this compound verb is only found here, but in simple form it is attested in Ar. *Ran.* 945. As the compound form, the simple one already implies 'to mix together without any order' (cf. LSJ s.v. φύρω II "jumble together, confuse"). The verb φυράω has a similar meaning, but it is used as a cooking term.

2. **ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς:** this is the ordinary phrase that, according to Rennie on Ar. *Ach.* 982, suggests "the state of perfect bliss". Ar. loc.cit. changes it into ἐν πᾶσιν βολίτοις and ἐν πᾶσιν λαγφοῖς in *Vesp.* 709. In this case it is used with the preposition ἐν with the sense of 'state or condition' (cf. LSJ s.v. III, e.g. *Pax* 439 ἐν εἰρήνῃ), but it can be used in other expressions, as in *Av.* 1706 ὧ πάντ' ἀγαθὰ πράττοντες, *Ach.* 982-3 ὅστις ἐπὶ πάντ' ἀγάθ' ἔχοντας ἐπικωμάσας / ἠργάσατο πάντα κακά, *Ran.* 302, *Pl.* 593, 1121, *Theop.com.* fr. 39, *Amph.* fr. 28.

**πάντα τρόπον:** for the adverbial use of these words, cf. Ar. *Nub.* 701, *Ran.* 618 and *Pl. Phd.* 94d.

**εἰργασμένα:** about unnecessary emendations of this word, see Rehrenböck pp. 146-7.

3. **ποταμοί:** it refers to the traditional image of the Underworld which was surrounded by rivers, seas or lakes, forming a complex and rather confusing geography. This is probably due to the lack of a clear and unified tradition about it. Different names are given to them: Styx, Acheron, Cocytos, Lethe, Pyriphlegethon.

Within the context of the comic tradition these rivers are not full of water, but of other things, as in our case: **ἀθάρης** καὶ μέλανος ζωμοῦ (see also fr. 137. 4-5), Telecl. fr. 1.8 ζωμοῦ δ' ἔρρει παρὰ τὰς κλίνας ποταμὸς κρέα θερμὰ κυλίνδων and Metag. fr. 6.1 and 9 (not placed in Hades but in Persia): ὁ μὲν ποταμὸς ὁ Κράθις ἡμῖν παραφέρει / μάζας μεγίστας.

**ἀθάρης:** "wheatmeal gruel" called "frumenty" in English. About the different spellings, see K-A ad loc. It is very often mentioned in Comedy (cf. Poll. VI 57), Crat.com. fr. 11, Ar. Pl. 673, Nicoph. fr. 6. 1, Anaxandr. fr. 42. 42 and also Sophr. fr. 77 Kaib.

Phot. α471 describes it as follows: ἀθάρη καὶ ἀθήρα καὶ ἀθέρα καὶ ἀθάρρα τὸ αὐτὸ φασιν. ἔστι δὲ ἡ ἀθάρη ἡ ἐκ πυρῶν ἐψημένων καὶ διακεχυμένων ὥσπερ ἔτνος τροφή. According to Hesych. α1581, Plin. Nat. Hist. XXII 121 and Schol. Oribas. 45. 4. 1 it would be of Egyptian origin.

**μέλανος ζωμοῦ:** this kind of "black broth" came originally from Sparta (cf. Matro Conv. 94) and it was well known in Athens, see Athen. IX 24. It is another common delicacy in the descriptions of the Idler's Paradise of Attic Comedy (see also fr. 137. 4, Telecl. fr. 1. 8, Nicoph. fr. 21. 3, with pieces of meat floating

in it). It was similar to the Lydian sauce *καρύκη* (cf. fr. 195). See further Orth *RE* XI (1921) 950. 31, 954. 30.

4. *διὰ τῶν στενωπῶν*: as K-A ad loc. and Rehrenböck p. 147 point out, this is a variation on the comic description of this flood of food, as *διὰ τῶν τριόδων* in fr. 137. 3 and *διὰ τῶν ὄδων* in Nicoph. fr. 21. 3.

As in the case of *διὰ τῶν τριόδων* (see ad loc.), οἱ *στενωποί* could refer to a feature of the traditional element in Hades, the narrow places and valleys especially of Tartaros where this description may be situated (cf. on *Τάρταρον*, l. 21). Soph. fr. 832R refers to *στενωπός* "Αἴδου, probably as the "narrow entrance to Hades" as Pearson ad loc. says

*τονθολυγόντες*: an onomatopoeic neologism of Pherecrates, formed in analogy with verbs like *πομφολύζω* "to bubble or boil up" and *τονθορύζω* "mumble". About this and other similar expressions, cf. Tichy pp. 214-6 and Perpillou *REG* 95 (1982) pp. 260-4.

This verb is intended to describe the sound of the hot soup streaming through the narrow straits, as Perpillou art.cit. p. 260 suggests it can be placed among verbs formed with the group of sounds (o-) o-u, as *βομβυλιάζω* (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 107 the noun that describes the 'buzzing' of a bee) or *πομφολύζω* mentioned beforehand. It attempts to give an animated tone to the description as *ζέοντες* and *σίζοντ'* in l. 8 and 9 respectively (cf. supra on participial expressions in this text).

*ἀόταῖσι μυστίλαισι*: about the 'associative dative with αὐτός', cf. K-G I p. 433, and about its use in Comedy, with and

without article, cf. van Leeuwen on *Vesp.* 119, Appendix p. 161.

Μυστιλαί were pieces of bread used to sop up broth instead of spoons (cf. K-A ad Ar. fr. 847 and Neil ad *Equ.* 827). As Neil points out, a spoon was properly called τὸ μύστρον (cf. Nicoph. fr. 10 μυστριοπάλαις) or τὸ λίστριον (cf. Ar. fr. cit.). Our fragment propounds that the broth moved with the bread ready to be eaten, so that the dead person did not have to make any effort (see also τρύφη).

**νάστων:** the sources are confusing about what is exactly a νάστος. Athen. III 111c gives two senses: a kind of bread loaves or flat round cake. The reason for this confusion could be that the word was taken in literal sense, that is to say, as an adjective derived from νάσσω: "to knead well" or "to stuff quite full" (LSJ s.v.), and therefore it could be said of different kinds of food.

The first sense seems to be the most widely accepted to suit this passage, as Poll. VI 78 describes it: ναστοὶ δ'οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ σακτοὶ καλοῦνται, κῆνος· σὺν ἄσταφισι καὶ ἄμυγδάλαις, ἅπερ τριφθέντα καὶ μιχθέντα ὀπιᾶται. As we can see from this text (see also Athen. XIV 646e), it could be stuffed with crushed almonds and raisins, or with cheese (cf. fr. 137.7 in the diminutive form), and it could be also covered or mixed with honey (cf. Ar. *An.* 567, λάρψ ναστοῦς θύειν μελιτοῦντας, Nicostr. fr. 13. 4 who describes the pleasures given by a very big ναστός and Diph. fr. 45. 3).

It is often mentioned as a delicacy (Ar. loc.cit. ironically suggests making it an offering to the new gods, the birds), and

appears in the descriptions of the Idler's Paradise in Metag. fr. 6. 3, ὁ δ' ἕτερος [ποταμός] ὠθεῖ κῦμα ναστῶν καὶ κρέων.

**τρύφη:** as Rehrenböck p. 150 points out: " das Schlaraffenland bietet nicht nur die zum Schlucken notwendigen Löffel, sondern sogar mundgerechte Portionen, damit man sich die Mühe des Zerkleinerns ersparen kann" (cf. v. 8 τόμοι, v. 10 τεμάχη, v. 19 τόμοι).

The nominative at the end of the line, as in l. 19 καὶ πνοῦ τόμοι, adds a new element in the enumeration of the food found in the river and ἔρρεον should be understood (cf. Metag. fr. cit. for a parallel passage, and Rehrenböck p. 150).

The word τρύφος is first recorded in *Od.* 4. 508 and appears often in later Hellenistic poetry (cf. *AP* VI 105. 3 τρύφη ἄρτου, but also in other contexts *AP* VI 299 and IX 421) and history (cf. *Hdt.* IV 181). A synonymous noun is θρύμμα, more commonly found in medical texts (according to *LSJ* s.v.); cf. *Ar.* fr. 173 ἄρτων περιλοιπα θρύμματα.

6. **καύτοματήν:** from *Hes. Op.* 118 (about the sense of this word in his poetry, cf. W.J. Verdenius *A Commentary on Hesiod 'Works and Days' vv. 1-382*, on v. 103, p. 73, Leiden 1985), this adjective is closely connected with a life of ease and happiness in what we call generically the Idler's Paradise (cf. *Crat.com.* f. 17. 7, *Cratin.* fr. 172, 363, *Telecl.* fr. 1. 3, *Pherecr.* fr. 137. 3, *Metag.* fr. 6. 2 and 9, further *Pl. Pit.* 271e and Baldry (1953) p. 50).

**ἔνθεσιν:** in a context similar to this one, cf. *Telecl.* fr. 1. 10 ἀφθονία τῆν ἔνθεσιν ἦν ἄρδονθ' ἀπαλήν καταπίνειν. See also

Hermipp. fr. 41 and Neil ad *Equ.* 51.

7. **λιπαράν:** cf. fr. 137. 3 λιπαροῖς ἐπιπάστοις, see Ar. *Ach.* 640 and Rennie ad loc. about the sense of this adjective: 'shiny' and 'oily' as in our text.

**κατὰ τοῦ λάρυγγος:** about the confusion between ἡ λάρυγξ 'wind pipe' and ἡ φάρυγξ 'gullet', see on fr. 37. 3.

8. **φουκαῖ:** "sausage, black pudding" (LSJ s.v.); see also fr. 50. 4, Cratin. fr. 175. 3, Ar. fr. 702, Eub. fr. 14. 7, Mnesim. fr. 4. 14-5. There are different names for pork saussages in Greek: ὁ ἀλλᾶς, ἡ χορδή (cf. fr. 130. 9); but it is not clear in what they were different.

**ζέοντες:** perhaps in the sense of "boiling hot", although this verb is not found in relation to cooking except for liquids, instances of solids are Hes. *Th.* 695, 847 χθόνα and Call. *Dian.* 60 χαλκός. I do not think we can ascertain if its use was normal in spoken Greek; but Pherecrates may have chosen it because of its rarity and also as a variation for σίζοντ' in the following line.

**τόμοι:** cf. fr. 50. 4 φύσκης τόμος and comment ad loc.

9. **σίζοντ' ἐκέχουτ':** cf. Com. Adesp. fr. 140K σίζοντιας. About this verb and its onomatopoeic origin cf. Tichy pp. 123ff. and see p. 124 n. 127 about this construction in neuter form: "die Kongruenz mehrerer pluralischer Sachbezeichnungen von verschiedenen Genus mit dem Prädikatsnomen bzw. prädikativen Adjektiv im Neutrum Plural und dem Verb im Singular ist für das Attische Regulär" (see further K-G I pp. 77ff.).

**ὄστράκων:** the exact meaning here is doubtful and three

suggestions have been made: Gulick ad Athen. VI 268d 'mussels'; and Edmonds *FAC* I p.247 n.d as "prob. discarded oyster-shells thrown into the gutter"; Tichy p.124 translates it as "Tonscherben", that is to say, 'pieces of pottery' (cf. LSJ s.v. 2).

Because Pherecrates refers here to rivers, the first suggestion is possible only, if ἀντί is understood with the meaning of "like, in comparison with" (cf. LSJ s.v. III 5); but according to them, it is first found in Pl. *Rep.* 331b. The second one by Edmonds seems to go too far beyond the text; and perhaps it is much simpler to understand an ironic reference to the pieces of pottery and pebbles found in the banks of real rivers, as finally Tichy suggests.

10. **καὶ μὴν παρῆν:** cf. Alex. fr. 139 καὶ μὴν παρῆν ἀνθράκιον ἡμῖν ἐν μέσῳ / σεῖσων τε κυάμων μεστός. This combination of words is a formalized expression in such narrations. The group καὶ μὴν "often introduces a new argument, a new item in a series, or a new point of any kind" according to Denniston *GP* p. 135; but also in Drama it was a common way of introducing a new character on stage (cf. op. cit. p. 356). Other instances of the use of the verb πάρειμι with food are l. 18, Telecl. fr. 1. 9, Eub. fr. 63. 1, 36. 3.

**τεμάχη:** it generally refers to 'fish slices', especially of eel (see on fr. 50. 2 and Metag. fr. 69 in a similar context: τεμάχη δ' ἄνωθεν αὐτόματα πεπνιγμένα).

**ἐξωπτημένα:** about this cooking method, cf. fr. 26. 2. In relation to cooking fish the verb is found in Telecl. fr. 1. 7

and Eub. fr. 14. 8. The commoner form is the simple verbal adjective ὀπίός (cf. v. 24).

11. **καταχυσματίοισι:** according to Poll. VI 68 εἴη δ' ἄν τῶν ἠδυσμάτων, that is to say, condiments and sauces to go with different dishes, generally made of oil, vinegar, garlic, etc. pounded together (about ἠδύσμα, cf. ad fr. 157. 2). Ar. Av. 533ff. explains in a comic enumeration: ἀλλ' ἐπικνῶσιν τυρόν, ἔλαιον, / σίλφιον, ὄξος, καὶ τρίψαντες / κατάχυσμ' ἕτερον γλυκὺ καὶ λιπαρόν, see also v. 1637, Philon. fr. 9, Pl. com. fr. 189. 9. This type of side dish can be identified as αἰ παροψίδες in fr. 157.

The word here is a diminutive, and the only instance in Classical Greek. It could have been invented to stress more the character of 'dainty dish'. In parallel Telecl. fr. 1. 9 uses ὑποτριμμάτιον, the diminutive of ὑποτρίμμα, another noun for 'condiment'.

**εὐτρεπή:** qualifying δεῖπνον, cf. Antiph. fr. 80. 12, Anaxipp. fr. 1. 13 and ἄριστον Men. Pk. 117.

12. **τεῦτλοισί:** 'beet' is often found in Comedy, above all in this recipe together with eels (cf. Eub. fr. 34 and Hunter on Eub. p. 126). Other jokes in later playwrights refer to the use of the Doric form σεῦτλον instead of the Attic one, τεῦτλον (cf. Euphr. fr. 3. 2, Diph. fr. 47, Alex. fr. 146.5ff.).

**ἐγγελεῖα:** adjective of ἐγγελεύς 'eel'. This plural form could be generic to designate this very popular delicacy, although τέμαχος seems to be understood in these cases (cf. fr. 50. 2-3).

13. **σχελίδες:** it designates specifically 'ribs of beef' (Ar. *Equ.* 362, fr. 264); but in our case the adjective **ὀλόκνημοι** can imply either an exaggeration implying 'beef-ribs with a lot of meat' or **σχελίδες** mean here 'meat' in general, as in Aesch. fr. 443 (cf. Sch. ad Ar. *Equ.* 362 and Hesych. σ2974).

**ὀλόκνημοι:** a hapax of Pherecrates, probably invented in accordance with the pseudo-poetic tone of the passage (cf. similar adjectives applied to food are **ὀλομελής** in Diph. fr. 33.2, **ὀλόκληροι** in Pl.com. fr. 188. 8 and **ὀλόλευκον** in Antiph. fr. 184.2, see also Hermipp. fr. 10, Philetaer. fr. 20). According to LSJ s.v., it means 'a ham containing the whole leg', from the simple form **κνήμη:** "leg". It may convey some echoes of the Homeric compounds: **χαλκονημίδες** in *Il.* 7. 41 (cf. the **βοεΐαι κνημίδες** worn by Laertes in *Od.* 24.229)

**τακερόταται:** about **τακερός** cf. fr. 89 and Ar. fr. 4 (see *infra* on **ἀκροώλια**).

14. **ἐπὶ πινακίσκοις:** compare with v. 17 ἐπ' ἀμύλοις. It is a 'small platter or trencher' (LSJ s.v. **πίναξ** 2), often mentioned in Comedy (cf. Ar. *Pl.* 813, fr. 547, Pl.com. fr. 127, Lync. fr.1. 5). Its diminutive form **πινακίσκιον** is also found in Antiph. fr. 55. 8. For the diminutive suffix **-ίσκος**, cf. *supra* on fr. 74. 4.

**διέφθ':** cf. on fr. 75.

**ἀκροώλια:** it is a collective noun that designates all the extremities of the body of an animal above all and generally in culinary contexts of a pig (cf. Antiph. fr. 124. 1); in this case it can mean **ὁ ποῦς** (cf. fr. 50. 5), **τὸ ῥύγχος** (cf. fr. 107), **τὰ**

ῶτα καὶ μῆν, τὸ δεῖν', ἀκροκώλιά γε σοι τέτταρα / ἤψησα τακερά,  
Ar. fr. 4. About this term see also Eub. fr. 6, Alex. fr. 123. 2,  
Matr. SH 534. 94, Philox. Leuc. fr. 836b PMG (see Athen. III 94e-  
95e).

15. ἀτμίζοντα: the verb describes the action of emitting ἀτμίδα,  
'the vapour of the hot meat'. It is described in detail in  
Nicostr. fr. 13. 4-5, see also Soph. fr. 370, Phryn. *Praep.*  
*soph.* p. 8. 10.

χόλικες βοός: as in the case of σχελίδες, they seem to mean  
'guts or bowels of an ox' without βοός (cf. LSJ s.v.), although  
perhaps rhetorically they are mentioned together also in Eub. fr.  
63. 4: χόλικές τε βοός. They are also referred to in Ar *Equ.*  
1179, *Pax* 717, where they are also boiled, *Ran.* 576 and fr. 83. A  
more general word for 'bowels' is χολλάδες (see fr. 280).

16. πλευρὰ δελφάκει': 'ribs of pork', cf. fr. 50. 5 in singular  
and Ar. fr. 520. 5ff. εἶ δὲ μῆ, πλευρὸν ἢ γλωτταν ἢ / σπληνά γ' ἢ  
νήστιν ἢ δέλφακος ὀπωρινῆς / ἡτριάσαν φέρετε δευρο μετὰ κολλάβων  
/ χλιαρῶν.

The products of a δέλφαξ, a grown swine or pig, are  
especially appreciated (see Ar. fr. 333. 6, fr. 236, Alex. fr.  
129. 2; about its sacrifices see Eup. fr. 30, Theop.com. fr. 49,  
and in general Athen. IX 375a).

ἐπεξανθισμένα: 'to brown over by roasting' in compound form  
is only found here, while it is commoner in the simple form  
ξανθίζω, see Ar. *Ach.* 1047 (van Leeuwen ad loc. could be right in  
saying: "solemne est hoc verbum" and comparing it with "floridae  
dictioni indulgens aliqui" who speaks in Antiph. fr. 216).

17. **χναυρότατα**: adjective only found here, but possibly not an original neologism of Pherecrates, as Schmid *GGrL* I 4 p. 107 n. 1 proposes.

It was probably common in spoken Attic form from the verb χναύω 'to nibble' (found only in comic passages, cf. Epich. 164 Kaib., Eur. *Cycl.* 358, Eub. fr. 148, Ephipp. fr. 8. 4) which was popular enough to lead to other verbal formations in Comedy, e.g. χναύμα Mnesim. fr. 4. 12, the diminutive χναυμάτιον Ar. fr. 236 and the adjective χναυμαστικός Ephipp. fr. 8. 4.

**παρέκειτ' ἐπ' ἀμύλοις καθημένα**: Teleclides uses παρέκειτ' in a similar context in fr. 1. 7 and describes a dish as λαγφοῖς ἐπ' ἀμύλω καθημένοις in fr. 34. 2.

The noun ἄμυλος describes a kind of cake or bread made of very fine meal that is often found in Comedy as a delicacy, sometimes together with meat as in our case and Telecl. fr. cit. or on its own as Metag. fr. 6. 11: ἄμυλοι δὲ περινάουσιν ἡμῖν ἐν κύκλω. See also Stratt. fr. 11, Ar. *Ach* 1092, *Equ.* 1190, *Pax* 1195-6, fr. 405, Pl.com. fr. 188. 8 ἄμυλος ἔγκυμων, Philox. 836. 16ff. *PMG* τυρακίνας δὲ γάλακτι / καὶ μέλι συγκατάφυρτος ἧς ἄμυλος πλαθανίτας, and further Gow ad Theocr. 9. 21.

18. **χόνδρος**: 'groats of wheat or spelt' that together with milk form what could be called in English 'porridge', the Latin term is 'alica'. It was made from the ζειά according to Diosc. II. 48 and *Geop.* III. 7, (about it cf. on fr. 201). As Hunter on Eub. p. 182 points out, they are "part of the 'good life'" at Ar. *Vesp.* 737, fr. 428, Hermipp. fr. 63. 3 who especially mentions the Thessalian type, Antiph. fr. 36. 2-3, Alex. fr. 196, and Men. fr.

451. 10K8-T.

Other references and instances about it are to be found in K-A ad Ar. fr. 208 (see mainly Bluemner *Tech.* pp. 55ff., Olck *RE* I. 2 1478ff. and III. 2 2372. 22-59).

**γάλακτι κατανευιμμένος:** about the scansion γαλάκτι in this line, cf. Antiph. fr. 52. 4: γαλάκτοθρέμμονα.

The form κατανευιμμένος is unusual and it has been disputed if it is the perfect participle of κατανείφω or of κατανίζω. K-A ad loc. give both possibilities, perhaps inclining their preference towards the first one, suggested by Meineke *Analecta critica ad Athenaei Deipnosophistas* Leipzig 1867 p. 118 (according to them also Döhring *De Luciano Atticistarum irrisione* p. 113 diss. Rsot., Berlin 1916 and Kaibel). The second one is favoured by LSJ s. v. κατανίζω and Rehrenböck p. 160.

Some passages refer to food falling as snow, Nicoph. fr. 21. 1 νειφέτω μὲν ἀλφίτοις, / ψακαζέτω δ' ἄρτοισι, ὑέτω δ' ἔτνει, also Ar. *Nub.* 965 and fr. 581. 5.

It is difficult to reach a definitive conclusion, but I would suggest that the words καταχύτλοις and λεκαναῖσι mentioned in the following line refer to big containers, and above all καταχύτλοις can mean 'bath' and therefore its ambiguity cannot be kept beyond l. 18, between a rather poetical and a more colloquial expression. The sense becomes clear with these big bowls used for washing, in an anticlimactic way.

19. **ἐν καταχύτλοις λεκαναῖσι:** the juxtaposition of two nouns is a poetic construction that in fact increases the identification of the two elements of comparison, one having a predicative

function. Here it means 'in λεκαναῖσι like καταχύτλοις'. In Comedy most of the instances are related to sizable vessels and pots as in *Crat.com.* fr. 13, *Phryn. com.* fr. 42, *Anaxandr.* fr. 42. 26 and similarly *Ar. Thesm.* 18, *Eccl.* 724 (see further Bonanno *Cratete comico* p. 80 and K-A ad *Cratin.* fr. 252).

The word **καταχύτλος** describes a "watering pot, portable shower-bath" (LSJ s.v.). See also *Eup.* fr. 205: ἀλλ' ὧ φίλε Ζεῦ καταχύτλον τὴν ῥῖν' ἔχεις, *Hesych.* κ1526. *Ginouvès Balaneutiké* pp. 213-4 relates it to the ἀρύταινα "récipient plus ou moins grand, dont on voit qu' il servait à 'puiser' l' eau propre qu' on jetait sur le baigneur comme aussi bien à vider les cuves pleines d' eau sale. Le καταχύτλον devait avoir à peu près les mêmes fonctions, si l' on se fie à l' etymologie du mot".

A **λεκανή** is an 'all-purpose basin' found in different sizes and in Comedy especially mentioned as a 'receptacle for vomit' (cf. *Ar. Nub.* 907, perhaps *Vesp.* 600 also refers to the same kind of λεκανή insofar as it is where the sponge was generally placed, *Cratin.* fr. 217, *Theop.com.* fr. 41. 1, *Polyzel.* fr. 4). It is also mentioned as a 'hod' in *Ar. Av.* 840 and 1143. The different sizes can be distinguished through diminutive forms in *Ar. Ach.* 1110: τὸ λεκάνιον, fr. 843: ἡ λεκανίς and λεκανίσκη in *Telecl.* fr. 1. 11. Representations can be found in B.A. Sparkes- L. Talcot *Pots and Pans of Classical Athens* plates 20-22 and 43 Princeton 1951.

**προῦ τόμοι:** it designates the 'beestings', the first milk after the birth (Latin 'colostra' *Mart.* XIII 38). This delicacy could be equivalent to our 'cream' (cf. *MacDowell* ad *Vesp.* 710,

Cratin. fr. 149 and K-A ad loc.: ἦσθε πανημέριοι χορταζόμενοι γάλα λευκόν, / πύον δαινύμενοι κάμπιμπλάμενοι πυριάτη and fr. 507, Ar. Pax 1150, fr. 333. 5, 405, Eub. fr. 109. 4). In *Vesp.* 710, as in Cratin. just cited, it is related to another dairy product: πυριάτη 'beestings heated and curled' (cf. MacDowell ad loc.). Another milk product generally mentioned together with them is the χόρια or 'milk puddings' which are a kind of cake (cf. Eub. fr. 74. 4, 109. 4 and Gow ad Theocr. 9. 19).

The fact that they are 'pieces of beestings' may be a comic exaggeration in order to stress the thickness of the cream.

20. οἴμ' ὤς: this expression can indicate anger (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1117 and Rennie ad loc.), 1081 (and van Leeuwen ad loc. 'indignantis') or surprise and incredulity, as here and Cratin. fr. 195, Ar. *Thesm.* 1185, *Nub.* 773 (cf. Rehrenböck p. 161).

ὤς ἀπολεῖς... διατρῖβου' ἔτι: about this phrase cf. K-A ad loc. The verb διατρῖβω implies 'to waste the time', so in the context of this description seems to be impatient. About ἀπολεῖς with participle, cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 849 and Agath. 19 F13 Sn. ἀπολεῖς μ' ἐρωτῶν καὶ σὺ χῶ νεὸς τρόπος.

21. κολυμβᾶν: this verb originally means 'to plunge headlong' (LSJ s. v.). In the context of a katabasis, it also recalls the imagery of jumping into the sea to enter Hades (about this subject cf. Ginouvés *Balaneutiké* pp. 417ff.). Anacr. 376 *PMG* expresses it in similar terms: ἀρθεις δηῦτ' ἀπὸ Λευκάδος / πέτρης ἐς πολιὸν κύμα κολυμβέω μεθύων ἔρωτι. Jumping from the Leucadian rock is the way to go down to Hades for Aphrodite or, in the legendary lives, some poets like Sappho (cf. Men. fr. 258 K8-T)

and ironically in Eur. *Cycl.* 166; see further about the jump from the Leucadian rock, Nagy *HStC1Ph* 77 (1973) pp. 137ff. and Lefkowitz *GrRBS* 14 (1973) p. 113.

ὡς ἔχετε': instances of this formalized expression 'as you are' or 'immediately' are found in Headlam ad Herond. 7. 8.

It is difficult to see how such a common sentence could convey a special tone or meaning; but Neil ad *Equ.* 488 suggests that in first person, as in Eur. *Hec.* 614, "the tone is rather apologetic" and perhaps in general it was a polite formality, see also Ar. *Lys.* 367, *Pl.* 1089 (where see Holzinger), Antiph. fr. 197.

The second person plural is explained by Rehrenböck p. 161 as follows: "wenn Sprecherin A als Rednerinn einer Gruppe von heraufgekommenen Personen (der 'Metalles'?) auftritt".

Τάρταρον: the geography of the Underworld in Antiquity is rather confusing; the different descriptions and traditions are collected, mixed and changed according to different religious beliefs throughout Greek Literature.

Tartaros is concretely a part of this Underworld that, according to O. Wasser in Röscher *Lexicon* V. 121, 'an die untersten Grenzen der Erde und des Meeres wird der T. versetzt, wo, nicht mehr erfreut von den Sommerstrahlen und der wehenden Luft (vgl. Finster a. O. 73. 279), Iapetos und Kronos sitzen, *Il.* 8. 478ff., die Titanen, die deshalb ὑποταρτάροι heißen, bei Homer im Eid der Hera *Il.* 14. 279 und bei Hesiod *Th.* 851'.

This is the image portrayed by the epic poetry; but even then, and above all the most complete description we have: Hes.

*Th.* 721ff. is full of contradictions and probably of later additions, (about this passage see Stokes *Phronesis* 7 (1962) p. 1-37). The most outstanding features of his description are the existence of rivers and lakes (cf. *Th.* 738ff.) which stream through narrow doors, the deep χάσμα (cf. *Th.* 740, *Eur. Ph.* 1604) where one arrives after going through the bronze doors guarded by Poseidon (*Th.* 732).

In the following tradition it is understood as meaning Hades in general (cf. *Theogn.* 1034, *Anacr.* 395. 8*PMG*, *Pind. P.* 1. 15, *Soph. OC* 1389, *Eur. Hyp.* 1290, *Phoen.* 1604); but still is seen as the place of punishment of those whom the gods hate (cf. *Hes. Th.* 739), as the Erinyes in *Aesch. Eum.* 72 and in general *Eur. HF* 870. *Or.* 265.

This distinction between Tartaros and the Islands of the Blest is especially important in the Platonic vision and his introduction of the 'purgatorial' punishment (about it cf. Dodds ad *Pl. Grg.* 525b 1- 526d 2 and 526e 1-6). According to *Arist. Anal. Post.* 94b 33 it was specially feared by the Pythagoreans.

In our text it could be simply as 'pars pro toto' for Hades; but I would think that it may have its traditional meaning of place of punishment. In this case we could understand that the woman is describing her trip down to Tartaros, and, instead of the dreadful things one could have expected, she found a life of ease and abundance.

22. The construction is common for passages where the speaker wants to add new elements to the narration (see *Ar. Ach.* 1011, *Nub.* 154 and van Leeuwen and Dover ad loc., *Lys.* 399 and

Henderson ad loc. who cites Burckhardt *Spuren der Athenischen Volksrede in der alten attischen Komödie* p. 187 Basel 1924, 769, Th. 773).

τάπ(λοιπ)': see Soph. *Ph.* 24 τάπ(λοιπα τῶν λόγων, Ar. *Equ.* 688, Eur. *Tro.* 923.

23. ὄπται κίχλαι: cf. fr. 137. 9 κίχλαις τ' ἀναβράστοις and Telecl. fr. 1. 12 ὄπται δὲ κίχλαι.

The word κίχλη designates here a kind of bird, and in other passages it can mean a type of fish (cf. LSJ s.v. "a species of the 'wrasse'" and Eub. fr. 28 for a confusion between both animals). They are often quoted in Comedy as a delicacy and here we have an extended image of them flying over the mouths of the diners (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 961, 1011, 1116, *Av.* 591, *Pax* 531, *Nub.* 339, *Pl.com.* fr. 2. 8). About their life and habits and in general as food, cf. Thompson *Birds* s.v. pp. 148ff.

εἰς ἀνάβραστ' ἤρτυμέναι: the expression εἰς ἀνάβραστ[α] is unusual and Rehrenböck p. 163 suggests that κρέα should be understood here as in Ar. *Ran.* 553: καὶ κρέα γε πρὸς τούτοισιν ἀνάβραστ' εἴχοσι, (cf. *Ran.* 510 also ἐπεὶ τοὶ καὶ κρέα / ἀνέβραπτεν ὀρνίθια and Aristom. fr. 8). The whole phrase could have a culinary character taking εἰς with the sense of manner as in Ar. *Ach.* 686 εἰς τάχος, *Av.* 805 εἰς εὐτελείαν and maybe in Men. *Dysc.* 396 ἐκί>ς βίαν (cf. LSJ s.v. IV. 3 and *Supplement* s.v. Oxford 1968). The participle ἤρτυμέναι, from the verb ἄρτυω, can mean 'cooked', 'properly dressed' (cf. Cratin. fr. 336, Eup. fr. 365, Soph. fr. 1122R.).

Regarding the sense ἀνάβραστος is the verbal adjective of

ἀναβράττειν that means "to boil, seethe" (LSJ). It seems to be a common way of cooking meat in general, above all birds at least in relation to the passages of comedy before quoted (see also *Pax* 1197 *Ach.* 1005). Ἀναβράττειν is also mentioned in the process of the preparation of grain (cf. fr. 197. 1).

It seems that Pherecrates here has altered the normal method of cooking, by poetic licence. One would expect, first of all, the thrushes to be seethed and then 'roasted' as ὀπαί would mean here, this order is kept in the comic enumeration in *Ach.* 1005 ἀναβράττετ' ἔξοπιᾶτε.

24. About this image of a meal flying to the mouth of the gourmand, cf. *Telecl.* fr. 1. 5 and 12, *Metag.* fr. 6. 10, *Nicoph.* fr. 21. 4. About other objects that acquire self-movement in the ideal world see *Crat. com.* fr. 16. 4, 17, *Eup.* fr. 299.

**ἀντιβολουσαι:** "to meet as a suppliant, to entreat" is a comic exaggeration of the type also found in *Telecl.* fr. 1. 5 ἵκετεύουσαι καταπίνειν of μᾶζαι and also *Nicoph.* fr. 21. 4 πλακοῦς ἑαυτὸν ἐσθ(εῖν) κελεύετω.

25. ὑπὸ μυρρίναισι κἀνεμώναις: flowers were an important feature in a banquet, above all because of their use in wreaths, as μυρρίναι or Myrtle-branches are found in *Ar. Nub.* 1364, *Thesm.* 448, fr. 444, related to this activity (*Vesp.* 861 in the context of the sacrifice before the mock-trial); and ἀνεμόναι or poppy anemone, very similar to roses, but not so much appreciated, is used in wreaths for banquets in *Cratin.* fr. 105. 3 (see further Lembach (1970) p. 168). Pherecrates seems to depict them growing freely all over the place.

**κεχυμένοι:** some suggestions (see K-A's app. crit.) have been made to correct the ending of this participle in order to understand in words of Kock ad loc. "nam convivantes sub myrtis recubant, non aves"; but this change is unnecessary. As in v. 9, the φύσκαί ἐκέχυντο 'were flowing', here the thrushes do it in such abundance that they 'were piled' under the flowers. It recalls *Od.* 22. 387 where fishes οἱ δέ τε πάντες / κύμαθ' ἄλδος ποθέοντες ἐπὶ ψαμάθοισι κέχυνται (see further Tichy p. 124 n. 127).

26. **τὰ δὲ μῆλα:** 'apples' are especially related in mythology to the golden apples of the Garden of the Hesperides that were gained by Heracles in one of his feats, a subject that appears often in the vase paintings of the latter part of the V century, according to L. Burn *The Meidias Painter* Oxford 1987 p. 19 and n. 10 where she cites M. K. Brazda *Zur Bedeutung des Apfels in der antiken Kultur* Bonn 1977 about its meaning in Antiquity (see also fr. 158).

**τὰ κακά τῶν καλῶν ἰδεῖν:** the polyptoton τὰ κακά τῶν καλῶν and the infinitive of aspectual sense ἰδεῖν (see K-A ad loc.) are two standard poetic expressions .

The first one is found in another comic passage, *Diocl.* fr. 2 πλυνεῖ τε τὰ κακά τῶν καλῶν ὑμᾶς. This figure of speech is studied in detail by Gygli-Wiss *Das nominale Polyptoton in älteren Griechisch* Göttingen 1966, above all p. 30 about this passage and 35 about its use as a tragic expression. In summary Haupt *Opuscula* II pp. 156-7 Leipzig 1886 describes its meaning as follows: "nam κακά καλῶν etsi dicuntur quae sunt κάκιστα, tamen

non tam haec significantur quam ea quae mala sunt inter ipsa mala  
atque ita eminent ut praecipue et proprie mali dicenda sunt".

27. ἐξ οὐδενός πεφυκότα: this 'original' (cf. Baldry (1953) p.  
56) addition of Pherecrates to the description of the Land of  
Plenty was really meant to be the highest instance of this magic  
self-movement as we saw earlier in v. 24. The distribution of the  
words seems to try to provoke amazement: τὰ δὲ μῆλ' ἐκρέματο  
seems to be purposely separated from the place where they grow,  
they hung from nothing, they appear magically.

Pherecrates may have added a festive tone to what Eur. fr.  
532. 2 N<sup>2</sup> in pessimistic and sententious lines says: τοὺς ζῶντας  
εὖ δρᾶν· καθανὼν δὲ πᾶς ἀνὴρ / γῆ καὶ σκιά· τὸ μηδὲν εἰς οὐδὲν  
ῥέπει (cf. also Eur. *Ion* 594, Soph. *Ai.* 1231).

28. κόραι: wine-bearer women, together with the flute-players,  
dancers, hetærae in general were usually present at the end of a  
good banquet.

ἀμπεχόναις τριχάτοις: it is not clear to what kind of  
clothing these two words refer. The first one is a general noun  
for any kind of garment as Gow on Theocr. 15. 21 points out:  
"ἀμπέχονον (from ἀμπέχειν) is suitable for any sort of wrap, and  
ἀμπεχόνη is not uncommon for clothing in general". He,  
notwithstanding, identifies ἀμπέχονον with the θερσίτριον, "a  
light summer garment". This interpretation suits what in vague  
terms the lexicographers explain about them: Sud. α1653, (cf.  
also Phot. α1243, Hesych. α3793, Et.Gen. AB s.v. ἀμφ(ι),  
ἀμπεχόνη: ἀμφιον, ἱμάτιον καὶ ἀμπεχόνιον, λεπτόν ἱμάτιον,  
παλλίον.

If the word ἀμπεχόνη seems quite usual, the form τριχάπτος is not so common. LSJ give two definitions very similar to each other; on one hand it is found only in Pherecrates as an adjective meaning 'plaited or woven of hair', a definition taken probably from Poll. II 24 καὶ τριχάπτον δὲ πλέγμα τι ἐκ τριχῶν, clearly an etymological explanation; on the other hand, there are some later instances of τὸ τριχάπτον, as a noun, meaning "fine veil of hair".

The lexicographers coincide in general terms in giving another explanation: Sud. τ1035, (see also Hesych. τ1462, Phot. p.602.2, Lex. Bachm. p.390.18): τριχάπτον· τὸ βαμβύκινον ὕφασμα, ἱμάτιον πολυτίμητον, that is to say, a very expensive garment made of cotton. This material was already known and regarded as an Oriental luxury; in Classical Greek it is called ἐρία ἀπὸ ξύλου and is mentioned in Hdt. III 147, 106 and VII 65 (see further Plin. *NH* XIX. 14).

I would think that it would suit the context of a very refined banquet in Oriental style that these 'girls' would wear expensive cotton clothes, but no clear evidence can prove what was really meant here and perhaps it is purposely described in an ambiguous way.

**ἀρτίως:** about the use of this adverb with participle see fr. 122, Cratin. fr. 195 νόυν δ' ἦν ἴδῃ Μενδαῖον ἡβῶντ' ἀρτίως / οἴνισκον.

29. A similar description of the heterae in the Underworld as in Ar. *Ran.* 516 ἡβυλλιδῶσαι κάρτι παρατετιλμένοι.

**ἡβυλλιδῶσαι:** 'being in the bloom of youth' is a comic

diminutive from ἠβάω, (see Cratin. fr.cit. in an ironical sense). As Peppler *AJPh* 42 (1921) p. 153 says: "like ἠβάω from ἠβη so ἠβυλλιάω is made from an assumed form ἠβύλλιον with the same verbal ending -άω. The diminutive here is hypocoristic, and is used to arouse passion".

**τὰ ῥόδα:** about ῥ- not producing position length, cf. K-A ad loc. and Rehrenböck p. 168. In the sense of feminine sexual organs, this is the only clear literary reference; but it seems that it was common (cf. Hesych. ῥ403 ῥόδον· Μιτυληναῖοι τὸ τῆς γυναικός and about other possible instances see Henderson *MM* p. 135). It is also mentioned in 138.2.

**κεκαρμέναι:** 'to cut one's hair', here 'to depilate'. It seems to have been an extended custom among Greek women. See further Henderson *MM* p. 146, and ad *Lys.* 87-9; M. Kilmer *JHS* 102 (1982) pp. 104ff. about different styles and pictorial examples and D. Bain *LCM* 7 (1982) pp. 7-10 (and addendum p. 111) with discussion of the different literary instances and their interpretation.

30. The abundance of wine is also a commonplace in the description of the Underworld (cf. fr. 137. 6 where Zeus rains wine, Telecl. fr. 1. 14 and Ar. fr. 504. 8); Pl. *Rep.* 353c makes a detailed description of the drinking parties in Hades; in contrast see Aristoph. fr. 12. 7-8 who describes the water-drinking vegetarian parties of the Pythagoreans.

**ἀνθοσμίου:** cf. also Ar. *Pl.* 807 and *Ran.* 1150 οἶνον οὐκ ἀνθοσμίαν (about this expression see Taillardat *Images* §484). This wine 'redolent of flowers' (LSJ s.v.) could be identified

with the wine called σαπρίας from Chios and that Hermipp. fr. 77. 4ff. idealistically describes as follows: τοῦτον ἐγὼ κρίνω πολὺ πάντων εἶναι ἄριστον / τῶν ἄλλων οἴνων μετ' ἀμόμονα Χῖον ἄλυπον. / ἔστι δὲ τις οἶνος, τὸν δὴ σαπρίαν καλέουσιν, / οὗ καὶ ἀπὸ στόματος στάμνων ὑπανοιγομενάων / ὄζει ἴων, ὄζει δὲ ῥόδων, ὄζει δ' ὑακίνθου.

The ending in -ίας is found in other names of wine as σαπρίαν in Hermipp. fr.cit. and καπνίας in fr. 137. 6. It could be also called ἄνθινος οἶνος (cf. LSJ s.v. ἄνθινος).

31. ἦντλουν: generally to draw water from a fountain, well or large container (cf. fr. 81 and the saying ἐκ πίθω ἀντλεῖς δῆλον in Theocr. 10. 13 as a sign of plenty).

χώνης: the mention of μέλανος in v. 30 and the use of a funnel to pour wine indicates that it is drunk pure, without mixing it with water as it was customary among the Greeks (cf. fr. 75. 4 on the κοτύλη). Instances of small funnels can be seen in B. A. Sparkes- L. Talcott op.cit. pl. 48.

A famous wine drinker, Alcetas the Macedon, was called Χώνη because as Athen. X 436e (quoting Diotimus Athen. fr. 79 Preller) says: ἐντιθέμενος γὰρ τῷ στόματι χώνην ἀπαύστως ἔπινεν ἐπιχεομένου οἴνου.

τοῖσι βουλομένοις πινεῖν: cf. Telecl. fr. 1. 9; about this common participial expression see LSJ s.v. II. 3.

32-3. Kassel *Maia* 25 (1973) p. 102 relates it to the passage of Eur. *Cycl.* 147 ναί· δὶς τόσον πᾶμ' ὅσον ἂν ἐξ ἄσχοῦ ῥυῆ.

τῶνδ': it is the object of φάγοι and πίοι according to Kock ad Telecl. fr. 1. 9. It usually refers to the following elements

in an enumeration and for this reason it has been suggested that it should be changed to τούτων (cf. K-A's app.crit.). According to Rehrenböck p. 160 this expression can be used when "der Autor etwas gleichsam Gegenwärtiges vor Augen stellen will" (cf. K-G I pp. 646-7, Schwyzer GrG II p. 209).

ἐξ ἀρχῆς πάλιν: cf. K-A for instances about these words, usually together at the end of a metric verse.

I find that this passage holds some relation to what M. Silk YCS 26 (1980) p. 137, analysing Aristophanes' lyric passages, defines as "comic fantasy" with the following words: "with the fantastic lyric, we stop *seeing* any reality and, probably, we can do no more than gaze in astonishment at the fantasy itself; we are offered not a new vision of life, but almost a new kind of life, hardly relatable to our own" (his italics).

This vision of an ideal new world is clearly presented in the context of the lyric tradition, and perhaps more accurately what M. Silk art.cit. p. 125 calls "low lyric that descends from folk song and Archilochus- or, presumably from folk song to Archilochus- and is drawn on variously by Hipponax and, underneath the aristocratic accent, by Anacreon". This distinction is useful, but I think we shall see how in our text the spectrum of influences has to be opened to other poets like Sappho.

From the metrical point of view it is a rare polyschematistic combination of different cola of similar rhythms, neatly divided by a pause. This kind of combinations is a typical feature of parabolic passages and among them the Eupolidean is perhaps the commonest (but see also the Cratinean, cf. West *Gr. Metre* pp. 95ff.). The analysis is as follows: *gl*" (*wil*) | *ar* / *gl*" (*wil*) | *pher* / *gl* | *ar*. About it see further West *ibid.* p. 96 and L.P.E. Parker *PCPhS* 214 (1988) p. 119 who suggests in n.20 that the "prototype of this kind of combinations may be Anacreon, *P. M. G.* 388".

Its language makes clear references to poetic expressions (cf. on each word).

Regarding the content it mentions plants and flowers that are usually related to the descriptions of a "locus amoenus", the meadow where a god or a lover appears, cf. Hes *Th.* 279, Sapph. 2. 10 (see further about this subject Cavallini *Presenza di Saffo e Alceo nella poesia greca fino ad Aristofane* Ferrara 1986 pp. 178ff.) or in the description of the island of the Blessed in Pind. fr. 129.3 and Ar. *Ran.* 326ff. Similar lyric tones are found in fr. 138 with erotic references, Ar. *Equ.* 402-3 and Stratt. fr. 71, (perhaps parody of Euripidean lyrics, cf. K-A ad loc.).

The description alludes to different landscapes: v. 1, a shadowy place with tree-climbing vine trees, covered with soft thorny plants; v. 2, a meadow with lotus-flowers, the luxuriant galingale, and v. 3 a kind of garden with chervil, violets and clover. Perhaps except for the tree-climbing vine tree and the clover at the end, all the flowers are distinguished in Antiquity by their aromatic qualities.

1. **ἀναδενδράδων**: it is a kind of vine tree that is not often mentioned in our sources, although there are some instances as Alex. fr. 11, Dem. 53. 15 (cf. other instances quoted by K-A ad loc. and Phot. α1454).

The ἀναδενδράς [ἄμπελος] designates a 'tree-climbing vine' (cf. Thphr. *CP* I 10. 4) and in later Greek it was called ἀναδενδρίτης ἄμπελος, being named in Latin 'vitis arbustiva' that is more extensively documented (cf. K.D. White *Roman Farming*

London 1970 p. 236). The commonest method of cultivation in Greece seems to have been by tying the vine to a stake or ἡ χάραξ (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1201, 1291, *Ach.* 986, 1178, *Pax* 1263 and further R.J. Forbes *Studies in Anc. Technology* I pp. 106ff. Leiden 1955).

This kind of vines can be identified with some vase paintings depicting Dionysian subjects, in which they grow quite high forming a kind of tree and producing big bunches of grapes, see some of them reproduced in C. Bérard et al. *A City of Images* Engl. transl. Princeton 1989, pl. 182-4.

**ἀπαλάς ἀσπαλάθους:** ἀσπάλαθος is a kind of thorny plant that is difficult to identify. Gow ad Theocr. 4. 56 suggests that it is "a plant of some size, possibly *Genista acantholada*" (cf. also LSJ s.v. 2 and 3). According to the Sch. ad Theocr. loc.cit. it was poisonous and Theophr. *HP* IX 7. 3 mentions it among a list of plants used to make perfumes and of Oriental origin (see Lembach (1970) p. 72). There are some difficulties in relation to the gender of this word, here feminine while in Ar. fr. 783 masculine (see K-A ad loc.).

Pherecrates may be using it in general terms; but perhaps he mentions them specifically because of its connexion with the world of the Dead, suitable to what seems likely to be the general theme of this play. In a gnomic elegy Theogn. 1193f. relates this plant to the dead corpses: ἀσπάλαθοι δὲ τάπησιν ὁμοῖον στρωμα θανόντι / τῷ ξυνόν, σκληρόν γίνεται ἢ μαλακόν, and Pl. *Rep.* 615e-616a mentions it as an instrument to whip the tyrants in Tartaros: τὸν δὲ Ἄρδιαῖον καὶ ἄλλους συμποδίσαντες χεῖράς τε καὶ πόδας καὶ κεφαλὴν, καταβαλόντες καὶ ἐκδείραντες,

εἴλικον παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐκτὸς ἐπ' ἀσπαλάθων κάπτοντες καὶ τοῖς ἀειπαριοῦσι σημαίνοντες, ὧν ἔνεκά τε καὶ ὅτι εἰς τὸν Τάρταρον ἐμπεσοῦμενοι ἄγοιντο.

About this plant, see further Wagler *RE* 2 (1896) 1710 and K. Lembach *loc. cit.*

The similarity of the two words seems to convey a poetic surprising effect, because ἀσπάλαθοι are not ἀπαλαί, soft, tender (cf. also μαλακῶν in v. 3), and as K-A suggest: "plantam spinosam a Pherecrate ideo 'mollem' dici quia in Orco naturam suam mutaverit existimat W. Hoffmann [*Ad antiquae Atticae comoediae historiam symbolae* diss. Berlin 1910] p. 26". The effect could be even more surprising if the audience related it to a traditional element of punishment in Hades.

**πατοῦντες:** it could simply mean 'to tread on' (cf. Sapph. 54LP= inc. aut. 16V: πο<ι>ας τέρεν ἄνθος μάλακον μάτεισαι; see further LSJ s.v.3) or it could bear a frequentative sense 'to dwell in, inhabit' (cf. LSJ s.v. 2, and also Gow ad Theocr. 18. 20).

2. **λειμῶνι:** a 'meadow' is part of the idealized landscape in Greek literature as in Hes. *Th.* 279, 1249, Sapph. 2. 90V, (where Aphrodite is to be met), Pind. fr. 129. 35n. Aristophanes also takes this tradition and relates it to the Underworld where the Blessed dwell, in *Ran.* 326 etc. (cf. Pl. *Sph.* 222a and *Phdr.* 248c: ὁ δέ γε ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ποταμοὺς ἑτέρους αὖ τινὰς πλοῦτου καὶ νεότητος οἶον λειμῶνας ἀφθόνους, τὰν τούτοις θρέμματα χειρωσόμενος).

**λατοφόρη:** this adjective is a hapax, possibly invented by

Pherecrates in analogy with other compounds in -φορος, as ἀνθοφόρον ἄλλος in Ar. *Ran.* 445. Meadows with lotus-flowers can be found in the description of cities as Sparta in *Od.* 4. 603, Thebes, Eur. *Phoen.* 1571, and *Il.* 12. 283 has πεδία λωτεῦντα to describe the flowers grown in the heights of the Cythera while Zeus sleeps.

The λωτός embraces different types of flowers that sometimes have nothing in common (see A. Hort's index s.v. λωτός in Theophr. *HP* vol. II p. 462 and further Steier *RE* 13. 2 (1927) 1515ff.); according to Hesych. λ1527 it was also a general name for ἄνθος. In idealistic descriptions, it is usually identified with the μελιλωτός or τρίφυλλον, a very aromatic yellow flower (cf. Theocr. 18. 43 and Gow ad loc.).

κύπειρόν: '*Cyperus longus*, galingale' (LSJ). It is mentioned in Homer as fodder for horses (cf. *Il.* 21. 351, *Od.* 4. 603) and in *hMer.* 107: λωτὸν ἐρεπτομένας ἤδ' ἐρσήεντα κύπειρον, as food for cows together with the lotus in an ἀριπρεπέος λειμῶνος (v. 106), similar to our passage (cf. also Theocr. 13. 34-5).

According to Gow ad Theocr. 1. 106, it "grows to a height of two or three feet in dry soil (which the oaks might be thought to suggest) and considerably more in swampy places". It is also listed among the 'aromata' in Theophr. *HP* 9. 7. 3 and Hdt. IV 71 mentions that it is used by the Scythians to embalm their king (see Diosc. I 4 for its medical faculties).

As the adjective δροσώδη suggests here it refers to the one grown in swampy areas, as in Ar. *Ran.* 243 it grows in the places where the frogs jump about: ἡλίοις ἐν ἀμέραισιν / ἡλάμεσθα διὰ

κυπέρου / καὶ φλέω.

**δροσώδη:** in the description of an idyllic place cf. Eur. *Bacc.* 705. It is found in Comedy in Antiph. fr. 55. 13 and Alex. fr. 129. 12 among other words that are qualified as medical terms: ἔγχυλα δ' ἀτρεμῆ καὶ δροσώδη τὴν σχέσιν / :: Ἄπολλον, ὡς ἰατρικῶς. It is possible that it was taken from the technical terminology of medicine that used abundantly the termination -ώδης to form new adjectives (cf. Dieter op de Hipt *Adjektive auf -ώδης im 'Corpus Hippocraticum'* Hamburg 1972 p. 251 about the frequency in other prose writers Other adjectives like δροσερός (cf. Eur. *Bacc.* 805, *Hi.* 226, *Cyc.* 50, Ar. *Nub.* 338) and δροσέεις (cf. Sapph. 95. 12V, Soph. *Tr.* 833) are commoner in lyric texts.

3. **κάνθροσκου:** 'chervil' (cf. fr. 14. 1: ἐνθρύσκοισι καὶ βρακάνοις). It is recorded with the spelling ἐνθ- or ἀνθ- (cf. Sapph. 96. 12-3V: ἄ δ' <ἐ>έρσα κάλα κέχυται, τεθά- / λαισι δὲ βρόδα κάπαλ' ἄν- / θρυσκα καὶ μελίλωτος, and perhaps in Cratin. fr. 105. 6, according to K-A on our fr.).

About it cf. Hesych. α5158: ἀνθεμώδης ἀνθροσκιον· λάχανον ἔχον ἄνθος, ὡς ἄνηθος, ε3064 ἔνθρυσκον· λάχανον ἱκαρίφ ὅμοιον, φέρει δὲ καὶ ἄνθος ὥστε εἶναι καὶ βρωτὸν καὶ στεφανώδιον, Thphr. *HP VII.* 7. 1: πάλιν καυκαλῖς ἔνθρυσκον ἡδύοσμον, see also *EM* 108. 48.

**μαλακῶν:** cf. v. 1 ἀπαλάς, Sapph. 54LP (inc. aut. 16.3V.): μαλακὸς πόας ἄνθος and *Il.* 14. 347ff.

**ἴων:** 'violets' are flowers often related to the garlands and the banquet, because they bloom very early in the season (cf. Ar.

fr. 581. 1 and *Pax* 577, Theophr. *HP* 6. 8. 1). In comedy they were also connected with the past 'pride' of Athens (cf. *Ar. Ach.* 637, *Equ.* 1323).

They are found in a description of a meadow in *Od.* 5. 72 ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμῶνες μαλακοὶ ἴου ἠδὲ σελίνου / θήλειον, and also in *Sapph.* 94. 12V, *Alc.* 384V, *Ibyc.* 315P, *Stesich.* 10LP, *Pind. O.* 6. 55ff.

λεῖμακα: could have two meanings in this context: a more specific sense of 'garden', according to *Sud.* λ363, *Hesych.* λ523, *Ps. Herodian.* 78 and *Ba.* 289, or as a poetic variation for λείμων (cf. *Eur. Ph.* 1571, *Bacc.* 867; see *Rehrenböck* p. 176).

τριφύλλου: 'clover'; a description is found in *Diosc.* 3. 113.

#### Fr. 115

ἄρμῳ: 'now, this very moment' is an unusual form in Attic. It occurs more often in Ionic in the Hippocratic texts and in Doric in the form ἄρμοῦ, an adverbial ending as ἔνδοι or ἔξοι (cf. *Gow ad Theocr.* 15. 1). It is found in *Pind.* fr. 10Sn, *Call.* fr. 274Pf, *Theocr.* 4. 51. In Attic it is found only here, in *Aesch. Prom.* 615 and it has been conjectured in *Ar. Ach.* 393, where see *Sommerstein ad loc.*

#### Fr. 116

εὐθὺ Λυκεῖου: about Pherecrates' text see *Kaibel apud K-A ad loc.* About its grammatical use and the problems of the Alexandrian scholars see *Slater Phoen.* 30 (1976) 234-41, his note on *Ar. Byz.* fr. 369 and *Alpers ad Or.* fr. B71. Briefly, εὐθὺ plus

genitive of direction is common, as εὐθύς is used with genitive of time, while the contrary is not found (cf. Slater art.cit. p. 236). Instances in Comedy are: Ar. *Equ.* 254, *Pax* 68, *Av.* 1421, fr. 166, Epicr. fr. 9.2, Eup. fr. 54, 99. 84, 196, 327.3.

**Λυκεῖου:** in Comedy it is only mentioned in Ar. *Pax* 355-6: πλανώμενοι / εἰς Λυκεῖον κάκ Λυκεῖου ξὺν δορὶ ξὺν ἀσπίδι. It refers to a 'parade-ground' outside the city walls near the temple of Apollo Lyceius and a gymnasium. Socrates spent most of his time there (Pl. *Euthphr.* 2a, *Symp.* 223d, etc.). It seems that there was also a theatre (cf. Xen. *Hell.* I 1.3, II 4. 27 and futher E. Meyer *Kl.P.* 3 808. 49).

## Μέτοικοι

The authorship of this play is suspect, mainly for two reasons:

- there are three plays with the same title in Old Comedy: one by Crates com., this by Pherecrates and a third one by Plato com. However this is not a great problem, because as in Tragedy there were topics that were popular and used therefore by different playwrights, and for instance in Middle Comedy Antiphanes and Philemo also wrote plays titled *Μέτοικος*.

- the three plays have a scanty number of fragments: only one of Crates and four of Plato comicus. Especially Pherecrates' authorship is inferred from the source of Pl.com. fr. 83 Apoll. de Pron. GrGr II 1.1 p. 113. 17, while in the same work p. 69. 18 the authorship is attributed to Plato.

On the one hand, it would be easy to mistake Pherecrates instead of Crates as K-A PCG IV p. 85 suggest. On the other, the contrary solution is also possible: that Crates' play should be attributed to Pherecrates (cf. Bonanno *Cratete Comico* p. 163 n.2 and also Rehrenböck p.245), insofar as this title does not appear in the lists of Crates' plays (cf. test. 1).

Finally it is also fairly possible that Pherecrates did not write any play with this title and that there is a mistake in the attribution of the source of Pl.com. fr. cit. (cf. Kaibel apud K-A PCG VII p.466 and Bonanno loc.cit.). In this case we may have just one play with this title and it would suit the context of a later V century poet who would be forerunner of a common topic in later Comedy. In this connexion this solution would fit the

number of plays that were attributed to Pherecrates by the test.  
1 (see supra p. 6). About these plays and the figure of the  
metic, see C. Whitehead *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic* p. 39  
Cambridge 1977.

## Μυρμηκάνθρωποι

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

From the title it is clear that the chorus of the play was formed by μυρμηκάνθρωποι or ant-men. This word seems to have been invented by Pherecrates following two traditions: on one hand that of the animal choruses like Frogs, Wasps or Birds of Aristophanes and, on the other, that of mythical beings, half human, half animals, like Centaurs, Satyrs, Sirens, etc. This duplicity is found in fact in some choruses of Aristophanes, for instance, in Wasps, the chorus is first of all formed by old jurors who, in a moment, are rejuvenated by becoming 'wasps' (cf. l. 405).

In Antiquity the relationship between men and ants was a commonplace and can be found in many myths and fables:

- In the island of Aegina the Myrmidones were said to be originally ants transformed into men by Zeus at the request of the King Aeacus (cf. Davies-Kathirithamby *Gr. Insects* p. 42).

- In Thessaly Zeus was said to have transformed himself into an ant to lie with Eurymedusa, daughter of Cleitor (cf. Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2. 39.6 and further Cook *Zeus* I pp. 532-3 n. 12).

- Hdt. III 102 talks about mythical beings named Μύρμηκες who lived in Persia: οὗτοι ὄν οἱ μύρμηκες ποιεύμενοι οἴκησιν ὑπὸ γῆν, ἀναφορέουσι τὴν ψάμμον, κατάπερ οἱ ἐν τοῖσι Ἑλλήσι μύρμηκες καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ εἶδος ὁμοιότατοι οὗτοι· ἡ δὲ ψάμμος ἢ ἀναφερομένη ἐστὶ χρυσῆτις.

- In the Aesopic fables, they are often related to other

animals: τέτιξ 401 Halm, κάνθαρος 295H., περιστέρα 296H., but also related to man (cf. 294H. Μύρμηξ ὁ νῦν τὸ παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπος ἦν). They are usually seen as models of organization and work (see also West on Hes. *Erg.* 778).

- In Comedy there are several titles: *Μύρμηκες* by Plato comicus and Cantharus and *Μύρμηξ* by Posidippus; but we do not know anything about them. It is also the nickname of the musician Philoxenus (see on fr. 155. 26) and describes the complicated musical innovations which were introduced by the new school of Dithyrambists.

In general they were regarded as social animals, with a similar organization to that of the human beings (cf. Davies-Kathirithamby *Gr. Insects* pp. 38ff.).

Kaibel apud K-A ad loc. and Kock suggest that the topic of the Myrmidones in Aegina was the subject of the play (as narrated by Hes. fr. 205, Ovid. *Met.* VII 615ff.). It has been connected to the mention of Deucalion in fr. 125 and possible references to the mythical flood in fr. 118 and 119. This interpretation has been accepted by most of the scholars (cf. Schmid *GGrL* I 4 pp. 104-5, Edmonds *FAC* I pp. 250ff., Dover *JHS* 86 (1966) p. 41). This legend was familiar to the Athenian audience, since it was remembered during the festival of the Anthesteria; cf. Deubner (1932) p. 113, Parke (1977) pp. 117-8.

The connexion of both myths may have been ingenious and it suits the implications of test. 2 about Pherecrates' innovations in the plot (cf. supra pp. 50ff.); but it is, nonetheless, uncertain. It is true that a storm may have been narrated or

staged (cf. fr. 118) and that some kind of joke between the name for the distaff and the mast of a ship was made (cf. fr. 119); but it all could be said about someone who happen to suffer the same circumstances as the hero and not necessarily the myth was staged.

There is an instance of a pnigos in anapaestic dimeters that is unfortunately corrupted, but that may have been a reference to the chorus of ants. Traces of commonplaces also remain, in connexion to other fragments, as in fr. 117 and 125 about fish and about food in general in fr. 128, slaves fr. 130, 131.

Fr. 117

Part of a dialogue in which one of them is a woman, see the expression  $\nu\eta\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omega}$  1.2.

The conversation here seems to develop towards the final pun that plays on the similarity of  $\beta\acute{\omicron}\alpha\zeta$  and  $\beta\omicron\eta$  (see *infra*; about similar endings on a pun or a proverb cf. fr. 43, 73, 76 and *supra* p.35).

It is not strange that this conversation dealt with fish, since it was a popular food in Attica and Old Comedy seems to refer to it and the job of the fishmonger, sometimes in pejorative terms (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 789, fr. 402. 7, *Pherecr.* fr. 70. 5).

About the subject of fish speaking cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 578, Eub. fr. 29 (the proverbial sentence  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega\nu\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa(\chi\lambda\eta\varsigma)$ , Luc. *Gall.* 1.

3. The pun is reserved to the end according to this kind of construction that puts the important word in the last place. The sentence seems to be completed on itself, since we can understand that, on one hand, after  $\beta\acute{\omicron}\alpha\zeta$ ,  $\phi\omega\nu\eta\nu\ \xi\chi\omega\nu$  or  $\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ , as it is suggested by Kock, are implied or missing; on the other, that it is an etymological pun, because the speaker may imply that the noun  $\beta\acute{\omicron}\alpha\zeta$  comes from the fact that they have  $\beta\omicron\eta\nu$  (cf. Archipp. fr.16 from a play called *'Ιχθύες: ἐκήρυξεν βόαξ*; about other plays on fish names, see Ar. fr. 612)

$\beta\acute{\omicron}\alpha\zeta$ : it was a popular kind of fish, identified with the 'Bogue, *Box*, *boops*' and often mentioned in comedy (cf. Ar. fr.

491, Pl.com. fr. 44, Archipp. fr.cit., Nicom. fr. 1.23, Polioch. fr. 1.2). It was sacred to Hermes (cf. further Thompson *Fishes* p. 36).

#### Fr. 118

Kock suggests that "significatur tempestas ingruens, quam sine dubio diluvies sequebatur. cf. fr.119". And following this interpretation Whittaker p. 182 suggests that this fragment may have belonged to the prologue.

οἴμοι κατοδαίμων: cf. Ar. fr. 290.1 and *Equ.* 234.

αἶγλις αἶγλις: about the form of the repetition cf. Ar. *Ran.* 847.

This word seems to be here synonymous with καταγλις 'strong wind' (cf. Phot. α525, Sud. α121, Hesych. α1723, *Et.magn.* p. 28.20). In simple form it is unusual in Greek literature; in fact LSJ only refers to Aesch. *Ch.* 593 and two later orators: Aristid. I 487J and Lib. *Or.* 18. 268. It seems likely that Pherecrates uses here the form which could be considered poetical.

Originally it designated the "goatskin" of Zeus or Aegis which in Greek poetry is associated with his image as "god of weather" who moved it standing on top of Ida when he wanted to provoke in his anger a storm (cf. *Il.* 17. 591-5) It also belongs to Athene (cf. *Il.* 5. 738) and Apollo (*Il.* 15. 229, etc.); see further R.L. Fowler *Phoenix* 42 (1988) pp. 95-113.

This fragment seems to be composed of one line, and the words ἀφ' οὗ τὸ λίνον ἦν, belong to the text of Poll. VII 73 (cf. the explanation of Rehrenböck p. 246).

Kock's interpretation of this passage follows the legend of Deucalion. According to him it is part of the beginning of the rain and explains how they had to use a distaff or spindle as a mast (cf. τὸν γέρονθ' and the long explanation of Zieliński *Iresione* I 40 apud Rehrenböck p. 247).

It is possible to speculate that this line refers to a kind of stage business, if we understand τὸν γέροντα not only as distaff, but in its literal meaning, the old man (cf. *infra* for other words in the sense of distaff). That is to say, the use of this word can be purposeful to create an ambiguity: one speaker can be meaning the 'distaff' and the other 'the old man' to be placed instead of the distaff as a mast (cf. the proverb γέρον στύππινος in fr. adesp. 855K and Apost. XVII 59, Diogen. VIII 14 which means 'feeble old person' from στυππεῖον 'the coarse fibre of flax or tremp').

τὸν γέρονθ': here 'distaff, spindle'. It must have been the familiar or slang word for it, probably a descriptive noun for the instrument that is said to have had a figure of an old man and the hands ὡς Ἑρμοῦ τετραγώνου, ἐξ ὧν ἐκρέματο, φησί, τὰ νηθόμενα στυππεῖα according to Eust. *in Od.* 1923.63).

It is used instead of ἡ ἡλακάτη or ὁ ἄτρακτος, which ambiguously can designate the staff or the mast (cf. Pl. *Rep.* 616c

where the philosopher relates both words very quickly for this reason: after having described the world as a ship, he passes to the metaphor of a spinning wheel by an ambiguous word: ἡ ἡλακάτη which can mean both, see Adam's note on *Pl. Rep.* 616c 17). About this terminology see further Blümner *Tech.* I pp. 109-20 and p. 182 n.6 about our fragment.

#### Fr. 120

This fragment is formed by a group of participles indicating 'joy' (about the enumeration and its function in Aristophanes, cf. Skyrpoulos *L'accumulation verbale chez Aristofane* p.75 Thessaloniki 1974). The three are in masculine gender and it would be likely that they were said by or about a man.

**τεθολωμένον:** the two first verbs are normal, but this one is not common in our texts and neither in the same metaphorical sense as here. Its literal meaning is «'make turbid', prop. of water» (cf. LSJ s.v. θολώ). In metaphorical sense it seems to express a moment of particular emotion which precedes bursting into tears, generally of sorrow, as it is shown in Eur. *Alc.* 1067: θωλοῦ δὲ καρδίαν, ἐκ δ' ὄμματων / πηγαὶ κατερρώγασιν· ὦ τλήμων ἔγω.

I suspect that the enumeration in its context was intended to be comical, perhaps it was part of a larger one in which the speaker expressed excessive happiness adding as many adjectives and participles as possible and more and more absurd ones, or perhaps it was an inversion of a tragic intention to give a

melodramatic tone with the use of this word.

If the subject of this play was related to the flood and the myth of Deucalion, this word would be suitable as a 'para prosdokian' that could be interpreted as a reference to the person as 'being muddy with happiness'.

See also comment on fr. 284.

#### Fr. 121

This fragment shows the continued enumeration of two verbs, nearly synonymous; but while the first one is fairly general and common, the second one is unusual and gives a more specific and in some way unexpected sense to the expression.

Following the interpretation related to Deucalion's legend, Kock suggests "intellegendus est Aeacus, qui civibus amissis 'Iovem patrem' precatur ut alios sibi det quoquo modo creatos" and Edmonds *FAC* I p. 251 n. c "if the curses are Deucalion's, the father is Prometheus".

**ἀρᾶται:** in tragedy according to Corlu *Mots relatif à la idée de prière d'Homère aux tragiques* p. 288 Paris 1966, "ἀράομαι et ἀρά sont alors exceptionnels pour des demandes de faveurs aux dieux, que ce soit pour autrui ou pour l'orant lui-même; ils se spécialisent presque exclusivement dans la malédiction". The construction of our fragment could be similar to the absolute form in Eur. *Alc.* 714: ἀρᾶ γονευσιν, οὐδὲν ἔχδικον παθῶν (cf. Corlu op. cit. pp. 271ff. and LSJ s. v. I 3).

**ἐπιθεάζει:** this verb is frequently found in tragedy (cf.

Aesch. *Cho.* 856 and Eur. *Med.* 1409) and in Pl. *Phdr.* 241b. It means 'to invoke the gods against' and is difficult to distinguish from ἐπιθειάζω, a common verb in Thucydides, e.g. II 75; VIII 53. It is a compound form from θεός (see Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s. v.) and probably by comparison with ἐπονομάζω (about the suffix -άζω cf. Schwyzer *GrG* I pp. 734-5).

Perhaps the irony of the verb would be that someone is 'cursing and invoking the gods against his father' who may be a god himself or other variations of this joke if the words were said by a god or a hero (in this sense it could be a modification of the relation between son and father; cf. Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 208, although there is no clear evidence for this).

#### Fr. 122

Ar. *Ran.* 433: ξένω γάρ ἐσμεν ἀπίως ἀφιγμένω could be a parallel sentence to this fragment. The word ἀφιγμένη generally indicates 'to arrive', but not necessarily to the place where the speaker is (cf. Ar. *Pax* 130). Again referring to the myth of Deucalion, Kock suggests that these words would suit Pyrrha.

γυνή γραύς: is also common, cf. Eur. *Tr.* 490, Ar. *Thesm.* 345, Dem. 19. 283. It is probably meant to distinguish the feminine from a possible masculine form ὁ γραύς (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 1214) or as an element of respect, as γραύς could have had a certain pejorative sense (cf. Henderson (1987) p. 110; perhaps in relation to the other meaning of γραύς or 'scum' of boiled milk,

cf. LSJ s.v. Taillardat *Images* §167, see Ar. *Pl.* 1204ff.), as also γερών has (cf. Taillardat *ibid.* §462).

#### Fr. 123

The new text provided by the new edition of Photius seems corrupted and Tsantsanoglou's proposals is to change into εἴμαθ' ὦν. Conti Bizzarro (1986-7) p. 92 prefers the form with crasis θοίματιον.

**πάντως:** it may have two senses: 'especially, in all ways' stressing the affirmative sense of this line (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 956) and as an affirmative answer to the question (cf. Ar. *Pl.* 273).

**ἀμφέξομαι:** cf. Philetaer. 18. It is a case of assimilation of the verb ἔχω that was probably common in spoken Attic, cf. K-B I p.277, Thraette p. 456.

**ἱμάτιον:** 'cloak' usually worn over the chiton outside the house (cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 333, Ar. *Nub.* 179, *Vesp.* 408, *Lys.* 1093).

This fragment may be said by someone who is going out or is to do serious business (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1093 and Henderson ad loc.). It could be an elegant piece of clothing (cf. Epich. fr. 277 Kaib.). Taking it off could be a sign of fight (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 408 and MacDowell ad loc.), while not having one or to say that someone has stolen it from the gymnasium was sign of extreme poverty (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 179 and Dover ad loc.).

#### Fr. 124

**ἐνριγισχάνειν:** hapax of Pherecrates. It is a frequentative compound in ἐν- (cf. fr. 70 for other verbs with this prefix), of the verb ἐνριγώω "to shiver in" (cf. Ar. *PL.* 846). Both passages refer to the same topic: to feel cold, as a sign of poverty.

**τριβών:** small and unpretentious cloak related to a humble status (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 184, 343, *Pl. Symp.* 219b, *Dem.* 54.34).

#### Fr. 125

The metre is anapaestic tetrameter catalectic. The words would suit Pyrrha (cf. Edmonds *FAC* I p.233 and Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 131) addressing Deucalion, but still it can be referred to someone called Deucalion as a joke, maybe criticising the excess of fish in the Athenian diet; many other interpretations are possible.

**μηδέποτ' ... μηδ':** cf. Ar. *Ran.* 1522ff. for this hyperbolic expression, as van Leeuwen ad loc. says.

**παραθῆς:** about serving food in a banquet cf. fr. 60.

**Δευκαλιών:** the figure of Deucalion, the son of Prometheus and Clymene, was usually associated with the 'deluge' (cf. *Pl. Tim.* 22a) and the subsequent creation of human beings from stones. He was placed in the very early moments of the beginning of the world and he was perhaps related to the first generation of humans (cf. Gow on *Theocr.* 15. 141). In Athens he was especially remembered in the festivity of the Anthesteria (cf. Deubner (1969) p. 113).

Fr. 126

The metre of this fragment, unfortunately corrupt, seems to be anapaestic dimeters that can be found on their own, as in Cratin. fr. 151 (cf. West *BICS* 24 (1977) pp. 89-94); but more often it comes after the speech in the parabasis or after the agon, generally when they had been in anapaestic tetrameters (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 659-64, *Equ.* 547-50, *Vesp.* 1051-9, etc.) for the first kind and after an agon (cf. *Vesp.* 620-30, 719-24, *Ran.* 1077-98).

It is difficult to say which is the subject of these lines from the state in which they are, but Kock and subsequently Whittaker pp. 183ff. suggest that they are a reference to the entrance of the chorus. In words of Whittaker p.185: "this exemplifies an Aristophanic trick of stage-craft. When the chorus represents indefinite multitudes, but cannot exceed its conventional number of twenty-four, the actors speak as if multitudes were present and so hypnotize the audience into accepting the chorus as an adequate substitute. Another point of interest is that this *pnigos* seems to come from the middle of a *Parodos*, for according to its expression the *μυρμηκάνθρωποι* are still in the first stages of creation, so that the chorus cannot all have entered yet".

On the one hand, I do not see any piece of evidence that ant-men were created on stage in our passage, if they appear it may seem more possible to be addressed directly by the character. On the other, the words seems to recall the ant-nest (cf. τὸν χοῦν l.2), rather <sup>than</sup> a normal house, and maybe it would seem excessive to try to compare the whole stage and the theatre with an ant-

nest.

I would be in favour of a metaphorical interpretation, as that of Zielinski *Ires.* p. 69 apud K-A in comparison with *Ar. Av.* 1114ff. As in other *pnigos* it would be an address to the audience or the judges.

I would suggest emending the text in the following way: ἄρα προθυμεῖσθ' ὑμεῖς κάκ τῆς / ὀροφῆς τὸν χοῦν κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς / καταμήσεσθαι λαγαρίζομενοι; The first line is a variation on Edmond's proposal, see *infra*, but it is possible as a haplography. The only major change would be the form καταμήσεσθαι instead of καταμήσονται which could be the ending corrupted from ECΘAI into ONTAI. Otherwise the disposition of the verses does not need any addition as ὑμῶν or ἡμῶν in the second line.

Accordingly, my interpretation would be as follows: I tend to think that the speaker is the chorus or the chorus-leader speaking in their dramatic character as ants, but one cannot rule out that the speaker is a character of the play who takes the image of the ants for his argument. In any case it is an address that could be similar to *Ar. Av.* 723ff. The speaker, having been speaking or criticizing other poets or the social or political situation of the city (common subjects of this kind of speeches), develops or perhaps follows the image of the ants digging and building their house, while from the roof the soil with which they are building it, heaps all over their heads. The image would recall an idea of working in vain or work that implies more effort than necessary. It could be sustained by the common image in the Ancient world of the ants as very humanized beings in

their customs and also that they are not simply ants, but ant-men.

The final position of the word λαγαριζόμενοι could be a comic device to delay and surprise the audience; but it is difficult to say of what kind, see *infra ad loc.*

1. ἄρα: Meineke's suggestion instead of ἄρα in the manuscripts. In first position as Denniston *GP* p. 48 says, ἄρα is only found in interrogative sense, while ἄρα generally takes second or other place in the sentence (cf. *ibidem* p. 41). If said by the chorus, this fragment could be a rhetorical question to the audience or the actors on stage, although in the last case it would not belong to the parabasis.

ποθ' ὕμεῖς: it is difficult to understand due to the verb καταμήσονται in the third line. Several suggestions have been made:

- Meineke ποθ' ὕμῖν (accepted by Kaibel), ποθ' ὕμᾶς and προθύμως (accepted by Kock).

- Edmonds *PCPhS* 103 (1932) p. 10 makes an interesting addition at the end of the line: ἄρα ποθ' ὕμεῖς <ένθυμεῖσθ' ὦς>, in comparison with Cratin. *iun.* fr. 1.

See *supra* for my emendation of this line.

2. The ways of solving the line are two: either suggesting a lacuna at the beginning as Kaibel who suggests οὔτοι, the ants, (apud K-A *ad loc.*). Or putting the lacuna at the end as Meineke who suggests ὕμῶν or Kock ἡμῶν. In both cases it would qualify κεφαλῆς.

καὶ τῆς ὀροφῆς: according to this text, the most likely would be that this genitive depends on τὸν χοῦν. But even so, the position is awkward and for instance Kock suggests ἀπὸ instead of καὶ. Perhaps it depended on a preposition in the preceding line. A simpler change would be κάκ.

It is difficult to know what is exactly meant by ὀροφῆς here: ceiling or roof. According to LSJ, ὀροφή and ὄροφος are used indistinctively, but as Dover on *Nub.* 173 says: "the articles ὀροφή and ὄροφος in LSJ need reorganization; in particular, ὄροφος in *Lys.* 229f. is 'ceiling' looked at from inside, not 'roof' looked at from outside".

τὸν χοῦν: 'soil excavated or heaped up' (LSJ s. v. B). Hesych. s. v. χοῦς: καὶ τὸ ἐπιβαλλόμενον τῷ ὀρόφῳ χῶμα is suitable here due to the mention of ὀροφῆς before, and if we are to imagine a house with a roof made of turves. The more general sense would fit a description of an ant-nest which in winter time has the appearance of a heap of soil. There are several mentions of the place where ants lived; but except *Ael. Nat.* 6.43 none explains this particular construction, though it may have been normal: τὴν δὲ γῆν ἣν ἐξορύττουσιν, ἀλλὰ ταύτην ὑπὲρ τοῦ στομίου περιβάλλοντες οἴονεῖ τὰ τεῖχη τινὰ καὶ προβλήματα ἐργάζονται.

3. κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς: it expresses the movement of something 'down over the head'. It is used to refer to ritual acts which involve covering one's head, for instance *Il.* 18. 24 (with dust), *Od.* 8.85, *Ar. Equ.* 1094.

καταμήσονται: unusual poetic form that indicates 'scrape up, heap up' only found once in *Il.* 24. 165 and possibly also in

Soph. *Ant.* 601. The commoner form is ἐπαμάομαι (cf. Heubeck et al. ad *Od.* 5. 482).

This is an emendation of Meineke *FCG* I p.86 n.38, but the reading of the manuscript κατακοιμήσονται does not fit the metre nor the sense.

3. λαγαριζόμενοι: semantic hapax of Pherecrates, it is also found in Ar. *Vesp.* 674, but it seems that has another sense. The difference of meanings could suggest also a different form. (cf. MacDowell ad Ar. loc.cit.). In fact the manuscripts of the Sch. ad Ar. *Vesp.* 674c read λαγουριζόμενοι in Pherecrates' quotation (while λαγαρύζ- Γ and λαγρίζ- V in relation to Aristophanes' text); but the origin of the difference is difficult to explain and it seems likely that Pherecrates may have followed the same form as Aristophanes, above all bearing in mind that both are related by the Scholiast. A variation that would make hardly any difference is λαγαρύζ- and λαγρίζ- (about these compound verbs see Schwyzer *GrG* I p. 736 n.12).

In Aristophanes the Scholiast seems to be confused about the meaning (cf. Taillardat *Images* §130); but it seems that the proper explanation is that of Taillardat loc.cit.: 'to get thin' from the adjective λαγρός (cf. also MacDowell ad *Vesp.* 674).

The Sch. ad *Vesp.* 674c explains it as follows, Φερεκράτης ἀντὶ τοῦ σκαλεύειν, that is to say 'to jog or nudge with the elbow'. Hesych. λ37 gives a very similar meaning and tries to explain the origin of this word: the movement of hitting the flanks (λάγονες) with the elbows or the arms stretching them often: λαγαριζόμενοι· σκαλεύειν· δηλοῖ δὲ πρὸς τὰς λάγονας τὸν

ἀγκῶνα προσάγειν, πυκνὰ διατείνοντα τὴν χεῖρα. It could also come from λαγάρος, but in its relation to λάγων; it would be then a method of digging used by dogs and other animals with the front of the paws.

It has the descriptive tone of comic invention which plays with the wide range of meanings of λαγάρος.

#### Fr. 127

Fragment corrupted, although the correction in Eupolideans made by Meineke is very feasible and above all taking into account that Poll. X 91 quotes before the lines of Eup. fr. 86 in this metre.

If it is an Eupolidean, Meineke suggests that it refers to a metaphor in which the poet speaks about his own poetry in comparison with a banquet (maybe when the person brings his own food, cf. fr. 57), a common topic in Comedy (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 538, fr. 347, Cratin. fr. 182, Metag. fr. 15, Com. Adesp. fr. 1330K, see mainly Taillardat *Images* §751-5 and K-A on Ar. fr. cit.).

Another possibility is that of Kaibel who interprets it in literal sense with the reference to the flood "cibaria nostra cistis adservata ab aquae impetu segura sunt" apud K-A ad loc.

Finally it could be understood in literal sense as a reference to the custom of throwing figs and other dried fruits to the audience in order to win its support (cf. on ἀριστήσειν).

τάς κύτας: Two emendations have been suggested to this word: κοίταις by Meineke and κίσταις by Kock *RhM* 30 (1875) p. 415 (vid.

van Leeuwen ad Ar. *Equ.* 1211).

The first one is a basket for food found also in e.g. *Crat. com. fr.* 13 and 14, *Eupol. fr.* 86, *Men. Dysc.* 448 (and Handley ad loc.), *Luc. Ep. Sat.* 21, see *Hesych.* κ3274.

The second one, κίσταις, is mentioned in Ar. *Ach.* 1085-6, *Equ.* 1211 for carrying food and other things when leaving home (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 529). Both words seem to be possible, although the corruption of κοίτας into κύτας seems to be more likely.

ἀποβανθ': Meineke's suggestion is ἀπόκειθ' that improves the text and implies that there are still things left in the basket. Otherwise, Kaibel's proposal is ἐν ἐμαῖς ἀποκέκληθ' according to his interpretation as a reference to the deluge.

ἀριστήσειν: 'to have lunch'. In the context of a metaphor about poetry it is used by Ar. *Equ.* 538; but probably both have different senses, Aristophanes criticizes the 'light lunch' that Crates serves to the audience (cf. Taillardat *Images* §753, Bonanno *Cratete comico* pp. 36ff.).

Perhaps if it is understood in literal sense, it could refer to the custom of throwing dried fruits to the audience in order to make it laugh, as Ar. *Pl.* 795ff. *Vesp.* 58ff. criticizes it as an easy and common device among other poets.

#### Fr. 128

ἀποτηγανίζεις: verb also found in *Sot.com. fr.* 1.1, *Phryn. com. fr.* 60, *Mach.* 421. As Gow ad *Mach.* 1.cit. says, the meaning could have been to 'fry away' or simply 'to fry', understanding the prefix ἀπο- only as a way of strengthening the verbal form

(cf. Bekker *Anecd.* 11. 10: ἀποτηγανίσαι· ἀντί τοῦ τηγανίσαι ὡς ἀποδραμεῖν ἀντί τὸ δραμεῖν).

It could also have derivated from the activity of 'eating out of the frying pan directly', as described in fr. 109 which would refer to the actions of a parasite.

#### Fr. 129

This fragment is a reference to a common Attic proverb that was related to the popular game of dice. With some variation it is often found in Tragedy and Comedy e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 32f., Soph. fr. 895R., Ar. *Ran.* 1400, Eup. fr. 372 (see also Pl. *Legg.* 968c, Sud. τ1006 and Poll. s.v. τρις).

It could be understood as the English expression 'it is neck or nothing', being τρις ἕξ, the maximum throw and τρεῖς κύβοι the minimum. Fraenkel in his note on Aesch. loc.cit. describes a pictorial representation of this game (cf. also Murray *A History of Board Games other than Chess* Oxford 1925 p.25).

#### Fr. 130

**Μανία:** it is usually a name applied to female slaves from Phrygia and other Eastern countries (see Μάνης in fr. 10.1). As the adjective here indicates and it seems to be commonly understood on its own also, this slave was generally devoted to household activities. For further references see K-A ad loc.

**θρεπτήν:** verbal adjective of τρέφω, is found here, in Lys. fr. 215S and in several inscriptions (cf. LSJ s.v.) with the specific sense of a 'slave bred at home'.

Fr. 131

After the conjecture of Cobet *Novae lectiones* Leiden 1858 p. 428 on Soph. fr. 940 to write ἀκόλαστον στόμα (instead of σῶμα), it has been suggested that here στόμα should be also written; above all because of the gloss Phot. α1835: ἀνελεύθερος· ὁ μικρολόγος (cf. also Sud. α2247, Hesych. α4865 and Ar. fr. 706 which refers to a dialect as ἀνελεύθερος, with the meaning of 'rude, vile', cf. Taillardat *Images* pp. 12-4).

But in Classical times, the word σῶμα on its own did not mean slave as in later epoch. This is a variation on the normal expression: δοῦλον σῶμα, as Poll. III 78 says, σώματα δ' ἀπλᾶς οὐκ ἄν εἴποις, ἀλλὰ δοῦλα σώματα (cf. Soph. fr. 940R and Xen. *HG* II 1. 19 according to Renehan *St. Gr. Texts* pp. 81f.).

## Πέρσαι

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

#### A) *Date and Authorship.*

The discussion about the date has been based on several presumptions and doubtful evidence:

Firstly the uncertain statement of Athen. VI 209b, discussed already on *Μεταλλῆς*. According to him several plays are mentioned in chronological order: this one would come after *Μεταλλῆς* and before Aristophanes' *Tagenistai*.

Secondly, according to Geissler (1925) p. 41 "Πέρσαι 2 [fr. 138] ist ein notorische Eupolisnachahmung, wie ein Vergleich mit Fragment 17 [fr. 176] der *Κόλακες* lehrt; der Nachahmer hat die Beschreibung des Stutzers, die er bei Eupolis vorfand, zugleich verbreitert und vergrößert". His conclusion is that both belong to the same year: 421. But his argument of imitation or originality is not conclusive as to which one is the imitation or the original and cannot be taken as a reliable piece of evidence. About it and several opinions on the subject, see Rehrenböck (1988) pp. 48-9 and n. 9.

Thirdly, the parody of Soph. *El.* mentioned in tr. 141 has added further complications to this problem and also in connexion with the authorship that will be discussed later. The date of Sophocles' *Electra* has been the subject of a long and detailed scholarly discussion and mainly by A. Vögler *Vergleichende Studien zur sophokleischen und euripideischen Elektra* Heidelberg 1967 and P. Kimple *Die "Elektra" des Sophokles und Euripides'*

"*Iphigenia bei den Tauren*" Göttingen 1970, although their conclusions are not always accepted (cf. Kamerbeek in *The plays of Sophocles* V p. 6 against them and, on the contrary, Lloyd-Jones' review of Vögler's book in *ClR* 19 (1969) pp. 36-8.

In general the discussion has been centred upon the determination of the priority of Sophocles' or Euripides' *Electra*. The Sophoclean one is said to have been performed after 425 or 420 (cf. Jebb on Soph. *El.* pp. lvi-ii) to 410 approximately; meanwhile, Euripides is generally accepted to be performed in 413; but it has been largely disputed (cf. e.g. Donzelli *Studio sull' Elettra di Euripide* pp. 27ff. Catania 1978), and recently W. Burkert *MusHelv* 47 (1990) pp. 65-9 suggests 420 as the year of performance, by comparing it with historical events (cf. Newiger *Hermes* 89 (1961) pp. 422-30 who suggests a similar date from another point of view, against it see Lloyd-Jones recens. cit. p. 37 n. 1).

In any case, none of these arguments can be seriously considered to date *Persai*, because the parody could have been done some years later.

This discussion is connected with the problem of the authorship. The origin of this problem is Athen. XI 502a on fr. 134 (see also on fr. 138 and 139 and the Sch. ad Ar. Ran. 362, on fr. 140) who says: καὶ Φερεκράτης δὲ ἦ ὁ πεποιηθεὶς τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένους Πέρσας. It seems likely that this opinion comes from the studies of an Alexandrian scholar and Strecker *De Lycophrone Euphronio Eratosthene comicorum interpretibus* diss. Gryphisw. 1884 fr. 15 (apud K-A) relates it to Eratosthenes who

is said to be doubtful about the ascription of *Metalles* in fr. 116. Geißler loc.cit. suggests that the play may have suffered a διασκευή, at a later time, on the grounds that the date of performance of Sophocles' *Electra*, 413, is too late for Pherecrates to have written any play. This argument seems to be very weak and has no clear evidence to support nor the διασκευή of plays by other writers already after 413 nor the fact that Pherecrates could not have lived till this year (cf. supra pp. 2f. and p.7)

#### B) *Title and content*

The title of the play suggests that the chorus was formed by 'Persians'. As K-A CGF VII p. 167 mention, Aeschylus and Phrynichus (*Phoenissai* TrGF p. 74) wrote tragedies with the same subject and Anaxion of Mytilene (TrGF p. 202) a satyric drama. In Comedy we know of Epicharmus *Πέρσαι* (fr. 101 and 102Kaib.), Chionides one called *Πέρσαι ἢ Ἀσσύριοι*, Metagenes *Θουριοπέρσαι* and Theopompus com. *Μήδος*. Perhaps the dithyramb of Timotheus with the same title should be added (probably performed in Athens in 408-7; cf. T.H. Janssen in *Timotheus Persae* p. 22 Amsterdam 1984). In some way fr. 137. 8 and 138 can have some examples of parody of dithyrambic word-formation and style, on which see Hunter on Eub. pp. 166-7.

It is possible that, as Schmid *GGrL* I.4 p. 105 proposes, they were seen or portayed as gluttons and even the word *Πέρσαι* did not have anything to do with the country; but refer to the stock-character of the glutton as a title like *Θουριοπέρσαι* by

Metagenes seems to suggest (cf. Baldry (1953) p. 57 and Rehrenböck p. 189).

In Ar. *Ach.* 65ff. the Persians are represented as leading a very wealthy and luxurious life. That seems to be the general image the Greeks had of them. It is already hinted<sup>at</sup> in Aesch. *Pers.* 3 (cf. Broadhead ad loc. and E. Hall *Inventing the Barbarian* pp. 177ff. Oxford 1989; about Persians in Old Comedy, cf. M. Daumas *REA* 87 (1985) pp. 289-305 and R. Schmitt in *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin Oblata (=AcIr 23)* Leiden-Teheran-Liège 1984 pp. 459-72)

From fr. 134, 135 and 138 we may conclude that a banquet took place or was described. Fr. 137 could be part of an agon for metrical reasons. It is a description of a world without any trade and work where everything is done automatically. This commonplace could be an illustration of the idealized way of life of the Persians (maybe in contrast with that of the Athenians); but it is not sure.

Fr. 132

This fragment could refer to a child (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 290ff.), or, more likely, to a slave who buys more things than necessary (cf. Diph. fr. 55), insofar as the word τὸ παιδίον can have both senses (cf. LSJ s.v. 1 and 2).

The theme of 'going shopping' or 'sending someone for shopping' is a commonplace in Greek Comedy, very frequent in Middle and New Comedy in which it is often an opportunity for deception and was very badly regarded (cf. Ar. fr. 310, 517, Lys. I. 8 and Carey ad loc. Cambridge 1989, Theophr. *Char.* II 26 and Ussher ad loc.). The slave in charge of this function was called ὀψώνης (cf. Ar. fr. 517) or ἀγοραστής (cf. Xen. *Mem* I 5. 2 and Men. fr. 433K8-T in general).

τὸ πολλαγόρασον: it is a hapax, probably a neologism invented by Pherecrates for this passage (cf. K-A ad loc.). The ending -σον is a common way to form adjectives from verbs, similarly πολύχεσος Com. Adesp. fr. 19K (cf. Rehrenböck p. 191).

τηλιῶν: it designates the stalls of corn and bread in a market place by extension of its original sense: "board or table with a raised rim or edge, to prevent meal and/pastry placed on it from falling off" (LSJ). It is also mentioned in Ar. *Pl.* 1037, Eup. fr. 209, Philox. fr. 185 Theod.

It seems that τηλία meant also κόσκινον, 'sieve', according to Hesych. s.v. τηλία (about it see further Bluemner *Tech.* I p. 50 n. 6 and 7).

Fr. 133

This fragment is quoted in the context of other references to τηγανός (cf. fr. 109 and 128). It can be interpreted in two ways. On one hand it is the description of how someone having sat on the frying-pan sets fire to it (cf. Edmonds *FAC* I p.254 n.a who compares it with Ar. *Pax* 230ff.; but instead of the mortar, a frying-pan). On the other, it could have an accusative as object, which would be places 'on top of the frying-pan' (cf. LSJ s.v. καθίζω 1.2 who suggest that this verb with things is unusual with sense of 'set, place').

It could be a cook's speech or someone in this function; note similarly Ar. *Av.* 15/9 putting the fire on in a cooking scene.

ἐπὶ τηγανοῖς: 'frying-pan', cf. fr. 109 and 128. It seems that the most logical sense is 'on top of' and the verb καθίσανθ' could mean either 'to sit' or 'to set' something. The preposition can be found in the context of food frequently with the meaning 'in addition to' but mainly of a relish (LSJ s.v. B I 1.e), according to this sense it could mean 'having placed it beside the frying-pans to make fire underneath the reed'

ὑφάπτειν: "to make fire underneath", see also Ar. *Thesm.* 730 ὑφαπτε καὶ κάτωθε (about making fire when cooking cf. Ar. *Av.* 158 and see on Pherecr. fr. 66).

τοῦ φλέω: it can be a genitive partitive; although it could depend on the prefix ὑπὸ in the verb. It designates a 'wool-tufted reed' (LSJ s.v.) that has grown in the banks of rivers and

lakes (cf. Ar. *Ran.* 244, Theophr. *HP* IV 10. 6) and was used in other functions besides this one to kindle a fire (cf. Ar. fr. 24). Further Blümner *Tech.* I p. 300.

#### Fr. 134

This and the following fragment could be part of the description of a banquet with the wealth and luxury of the Persians. The connexion of χρυσίδες (cf. fr. 135) with them is clearly found in Ar. *Ach.* 73-5: ξενιζόμενοι δὲ πρὸς βίαν ἐπίνομεν / ἐξ ὑαλίνων ἐκπωμάτων καὶ χρυσίδων / ἄκρατον οἶνον ἠδύν.

**κόμφαλωτάς χρυσίδας:** the noun φιαλάς is not implied, because χρυσίς and ἀργυρίς (cf. fr. 135) can mean on their own a cup made of gold or silver (cf. Ar. *Pax* 425, *Ach.* 74). Athen. XI 502a suggests that it is particularly an Attic word.

Nonetheless its shape may have been similar to a phiale. It was a shallow bowl generally without handles, though they could have handles as well, decorated in many fashions and styles. In this case κόμφαλωτός (about adjectives in -ωτός cf. Buck-Petersen *A reverse Index* p. 470), designates the commonest form of all: with a central boss that protruded up into the centre of the bowl and was useful to hold it, similar ways of designating it are μεσόμφαλον in Theop. com. fr. 4 and ironically βαλανειομόφαλος in Cratin. fr. 54. The main purpose of this vessel was to pour a libation. About it and the way it was used, see further J. Veach Noble *The Techniques of Painted Attic Pottery* pp. 22-3 London 1966.

Fr. 135

About its content see on fr. 134.

**οὗτος σὺ:** a common expression from colloquial Attic to address someone. About its use in Ar. see van Leeuwen ad *Vesp.* Appendix pp. 160-1 and further Stevens *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides* pp. 37ff. Wiesbaden 1976.

**ἀργυρίδα:** see on χρυσίδα fr. 134, and Anaxil. fr. 39: καὶ πίνειν ἐξ ἀργυρίδων χρυσῶν.

This fragment transmitted by Phot. (z) α2533 records the metaphorical use of the verb ἀποκυβιστάω in Pherecrates. Its literal sense is 'to plunge headlong away from the giving' or as Rehrenböck p. 233 says: "Hals über Kopft verschmächst du die Gabe" and Conti Bizzarro (1986-87) p. 88: "qualcuna fa una capriola dinanzi a un dono, gli volta le spalle, in altre parole lo rifiuta".

The sense is clear; but the origin of this metaphor or the comic scope of the expression are not so clear, if it had any. It is only found here in transitive sense (cf. Conti Bizzarro *ibid.* p. 89 n. 15), and one may wonder if it was an invention of Pherecrates or a colloquial use.

Conti Bizzarro (1986-7) p. 88 suggests modifying Photius' gloss: ἢ ἀπαρνεῖσθαι into ἀπαρνεύειν that is properly a synonym of ἀποκυβιστάω. As he says *loc.cit.*: "nell'*interpretamentum* foziano gioca una funzionale interferenza tra el significante ἀπαρνεύειν, garantito da una salda costellazione lessicografica, e il metaforico significato espresso del quasi omoïono ἀπαρνεῖσθαι" (his italics) and he goes on to explain the interference of the two semantic levels with the reference to *Od.* 4. 651 χαλεπὸν κεν ἀνήνασθαι δόσιν εἴη and 18. 287: οὐ γὰρ καλὸν ἀνήνασθαι δόσιν, where the presence of ἀναίνομαι, synonym of ἀπαρνεόμαι, would have caused such confusion.

This is a possible suggestion corroborated partly by the common way in which Photius makes use of ἢ to refer to synonymous words rather than to add another meaning (cf. Phot. α3109 on fr.

31 and α2766 on fr. 121). But if we eliminate it, what was Photius' understanding of the text? I do not see how the verb ἀπαρνεύω, not found in Ancient Greek, could have been understood in a metaphorical sense that Conti Bizzarro seems to ascertain (see p. 88 before cited).

I think that he properly points out the relationship of our fragment with the Homeric sentences before mentioned (p. 89). In a passage in elevated context it would have made sense to substitute a more colloquial verb for the epic ἀναίνομαι.

#### Fr. 137

The fragment in anapaestic tetrameters can be divided into two parts:

- vv. 1-2 are a long list of different craftsmen, mainly of two kinds: agriculture and metal workers. A similar enumeration is found in Ar. *Pl.* 513ff.: τὶς χαλκεύειν ἢ ναυπηγεῖν ἢ ῥάπτειν ἢ τροχοποιεῖν / ἢ σκυτοτομεῖν ἢ πλινθουργεῖν ἢ πλύνειν ἢ σκυλοδεψεῖν, / ἢ γῆς ἀρότροις ῥήξας δάπεδον καρπὸν Διοῦς θερίσασθαι. In the case of Pherecrates one could suppose that what the speaker is talking about, is that there will be no need of them when everything is growing spontaneously, while in Ar. *Πενία* is speaking about what will happen without them when everybody will be rich.

- vv. 3-10 are a description of an ideal life. The description has some similarities with the automatic cooking which is described in fr. 113. But it seems to be placed in the real world with the urban landscape in v. 6-8 after the reference

to the rivers and streams (vv. 3-5) and finally going back to an idyllic description of trees in the mountains (vv. 9-10).

This fragment may be, as has been suggested by Gelzer *Ag.* p. 185 (cf. τ(ς) δ' ἔσθ' ἡμῖν σῶν...), part of an agon 'of exposition' (cf. Whittaker p. 187). The pronoun ἡμῖν could refer to a group (cf. Rehrenböck p. 187), perhaps the chorus. It has been suggested that it was spoken by Wealth as a reply to Poverty in a debate, (cf. Ritter quoted by Baldry (1953) p. 57); it is a possible suggestion, although it seems strange that he would mention himself as a river in l. 5.

The language is elevated with words possibly invented by Pherecrates for this text, in summary:

- hapax and neologisms: κοχυδοῦντες and ἐπιβλύξ v. 4; πολυτύρων v. 7; λειριοπορφανεμώναις v. 8.

- unusual and perhaps poetical expressions: ῥεύσσονται, σφῶν ἀρύτεσθαι v. 5; ὄχετοῖ βοτρυῶν v. 8; δένδρη v. 9.

- figures of speech: onomatopoeia κοχυδοῦντες; variatio (cf. Rehrenböck p. 204) μετὰ...σὺν v. 7 and 8; figura etymologica ὄχετοῖ ... ὄχετεύσσονται v. 7 and 8.

1. ἀροτῶν: "ploughers", about this activity, cf. Hes. *Op.* 384 and West ad loc. (who suggests that it was accompanied by sowing). Ar. *Ran.* 1034 mentions it among the teachings of Hesiod.

ζυγοποιῶν: "maker of yokes" (cf. Ar. fr. 464 infinitive ζυγοποιεῖν). About this craft, cf. Bluemner *Tech.* II pp. 324ff.

χρεῖα: in a proverbial expression χρεῖα means 'necessity' and is linked to the learning of these activities (cf. Eur. *tr.* /15N<sup>2</sup>

χρεία διδάσχει, κἄν βραδύς τις ἦ, σοφόν, *EI.* 376, *Ar. Pl.* 534, *Men. fr.* 229Kδ-T).

2. **δρεπανουργῶν:** in the context of this quotation where peasant activities are described, the meaning "scythe-maker" or "sickle-maker", with reference to the activity of pruning a tree, seems to be more appropriate than 'swordmaker' suggested by the passage of *Ar. Pax* 548 (cf. Baldry (1953) p.56 n.3). About the technique of metal craft<sup>S</sup>men, cf. Bluemner *Tech.* IV pp. 360ff., above all p. 363.

**χαλκοτύπων:** (cf. *Crat. iun. fr.* 8.1), it designates a "coppersmith". *Xen. HG III* 4. 17 distinguishes it from a χαλκεύς that acquires the more general sense of "blacksmith"; see further Bluemner *Tech.* IV p.323 and n.3.

**σπέρματος:** the enumeration now refers to agricultural techniques rather than the person who does them. This noun is synonymous with σπορός and means "sowing". About it, cf. *Hes. Op.* 781 and West ad loc.

**χαρακισμοῦ:** in general it can designate "palisading, fencing" (LSJ s.v.); although more specifically it can be understood as 'the activity of placing the χάραξ or vine-prop' often mentioned in comedy (cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 1291, *Pax* 1263; see also on *fr.* 114. 1 on ἀναδενδράδων).

3. **αὐτόματοι:** cf. *fr.* 113. 6.

**διὰ τῶν τριόδων:** cf. rivers flooding διὰ τῶν στενωπῶν in *fr.* 113. 4.

**ποταμοὶ ...ζῶμοϋ μέλανος:** cf. *fr.* 113. 3.

**ἐπιπάστοις:** they were small relishes of salty (sometimes

sweet), flavour usually eaten with wine (cf. Neil ad Ar. *Equ.* 103 and Schol. 103a, Sud. ε2507). The word can have the literal sense as adjective "sprinkled" (cf. Theocr. 11. 2).

4. Ἀχιλλεῖοις μάζαις: they were a special kind of μάζαι, made with barley imported from the North coast of <sup>the</sup> Euxine where the cult of Achilles seems to be quite prominent (cf. Pearson ad Soph. fr. 551). They were given as meal for the diners in the Prytaneum (cf. Sch. ad Ar. *Equ.* 819) and according to Pearson loc.cit. "it may be suggested by way of explanation that the Achillean cake was honoured as a survival of the primitive diet rather than prized as a luxury".

κοχυδοῦντες: it is a hapax here, but similar forms are found, as Theocr. 2. 107 κοχύδεσκεν and Stratt. fr. 64. 1 οἶνος κοχύζει, so it may have been commoner than it is recorded in our texts (cf. Hesych. κ3885).

It is an onomatopoeic verb to designate the movement of a river "streaming forth copiously", as in fr. 113. 3 the verb τονθολυγοῦντες imitates the sound of the river of soup. It is related to the adverb χύδην (cf. fr. 179). About it, see further Tichy pp. 624ff.

ἐπιβλῦξ: hapax of Pherecrates, may be invented by him here. This adverb is formed in parallelism with the epic adverb ἐπιμίξ, (cf. Tichy p. 141), from the verb ἐπιβλύω or ἐπιβλύζω, common in later Poetry, cf. A.R. IV. 1238, AP 9. 349 (Leon.); see also K-A ad loc. about a doubtful passage in Hesych.ε9644.

5. τῶν πηγῶν τῶν τοῦ Πλούτου: Plutus here seems to be understood as the name for a river, the word πηγὰί could mean

stream or source (cf. LSJ s.v.). This representation of Plutus is not found anywhere else, although it suits the context of the rivers generally related to the image of abundance in excess (about the personification of Plutus in Aristophanes cf. Newiger *Metapher und Allegorie* pp. 165ff. Munich 1957).

**ῥευσόνται:** as Rehrenböck p. 201 points out ῥύησονται would be the common form in Attic prose (cf. LSJ s.v. and K-A ad Crat.com. fr. 17. 4 quoting [Hdn.] *Philet.* 300); but some instances of this form are found in Crat. loc.cit., Ar. *Equ.* 526 ῥεύσας and Eur. fr. 384N<sup>2</sup>.

**σφῶν ἀρύτεσθαι:** about this construction with infinitive and genitive cf. K-A ad loc. The verb ἀρύτεσθαι is infrequent, cf. fr. 147.1.

6. **ὁ Ζεὺς δ' ὕων:** in this case Zeus rains wine as similarly in Cratin. fr. 131 ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς ὄσταφ(σιν) ὕσει τάχα, Nicoph. fr. 21. 2 ὕέτω δ' ἔτνει and Soph. fr. 524R.

**οἶνον κωνίαν:** about wine in this context cf. on fr. 113. 30 (see further A. Dieterich *Nekyia* Stuttgart 1969<sup>3</sup> pp. 72ff.).

"Smoked wine" is found also in Anaxandr. fr. 42. 71, Pl.com. fr. 274 and as a joke Ecphantides, a Megarian comic poet, was called Κωνίαν (cf. *Vesp.* 149, Cratin. fr. 462). This joke seems to have become proverbial for other poets (cf. App. Prov. III. 43 and Leutsch ad loc., *CPG* I p. 425; see also Pickard-Cambridge *DTC* p. 192 and n. 5). This expression could be related to a colloquial meaning of the noun κωνός as 'garrulous person' (cf. Taillardat *Images* § 519).

No evidence in Ancient Greece is found about this kind of

wine. Three explanations have been given:

- Hesych. κ716 and Phot. 130.24 refer to it as κεκαπνισμένος wine, that is to say 'smoked wine' without further explanation.

- LSJ s.v. II. 1 suggest that it is wine produced from καπνεῖος ἄμπελος, a sort of vine tree that produced 'smoke-coloured grapes' (cf. Theophr. *HP* II 3.2 and S. Amigues ad loc. [I p. 124 Paris 1988]).

- Finally it could designate an old wine in general, cf. Sch. ad Ar. *Vesp.* 151b.

A possible explanation of the method is given by Columella *R.R.* I 6. 20: "apothecae recte superponentur his locis, unde plerumque fumus exoritur, quoniam uina celerius uetustescunt, quae fumo quodam genere praecoquem maturitatem trahunt". It is possible that this method was already known in Greece, but there is no reference to it nor to what made them so special so as to be placed among the dainties of a Land of Cockaigne, but one may suppose that it was an old wine with a very strong flavour.

κατὰ τοῦ κεραμοῦ: the expression refers 'pars pro toto' (cf. Rehrenböck loc.cit.) to 'the roof' of the house. Roofs were usually covered with tiles (cf. Ar. fr. 363 and K-A ad loc. and M. Roland *L'urbanisme dans la Grèce antique* p. 236 Paris 1974<sup>2</sup>) or at least used as a place for them to dry (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 1126). The word κέραμος can be used as a collective noun for 'tiles' (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1295 and MacDowell ad loc., about another interpretation of this passage, see Taillardat *Images* §862).

βαλανεύσει: the act of having a bath and the figure of a bathman, ὁ βαλανεύς, were regarded in Athens in very negative

terms. He was a proverbial figure for a 'busybody' and was depicted as greedy (cf. Theophr. *Char.* IX 8 and Ussher ad loc. and Athen. VIII 351f, Liban. 4. 140R). To call someone a bathman was an insult (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 1403, *Ran.* 710).

The verb has the general sense of 'heating a bath' and so it is used as a simile in Ar. *Lys.* 337 (where see Henderson ad loc.) and in Ar. *Pax* 1103 it is a proverbial sentence: βαλανεύω ἑμαυτόν 'to serve myself' (cf. Zenob. 3. 58).

K-A seem to favour that the second sense is understood here and it implies that Zeus is 'serving himself' from this wine since he seems to be the subject of the verb. Another interpretation is LSJ s.v. βαλανεύω: 'to drench like a bathman'. The second sense seems to be better in my opinion: 'Zeus will drench <you> raining smoked wine over the tiled roof', so that in the image the urine is equated to a bath, while Zeus is equated to a bathman.

7. ὀχετοί: figura etymologica with ὀχετεύσονται (cf. Rehrenböck p. 204 and K-A ad loc. for other instances of this figure of speech).

This noun is found in Telecl. fr. 1. 9 describing 'streams of delicate sauce', ὑποτριμματίων δ' ὀχετοὶ τούτων τοῖς βουλόμενοισι παρήσαν, in the Idler's Paradise. In this fragment the image is rather more mixed, "from the roof streams of grape bunches with small cakes stuffed with cheese are carried together with hot soup", to express the idea of disordered abundance. In Eur. *Cycl.* 496, cf. βοτρυῶν φίλαισι πηγαῖς.

8. ναστίσκων πολυτέρων: about ναστισκός, diminutive of νάστος,

cf. fr. 113. 5. The word πολυτύρων is a hapax of Pherecrates; but it is a quite common way of forming adjectives.

θερμῷ σὺν ἔτνει: about hot thick vegetable soup see Ar. fr. 514, *Equ.* 1171 πρίσινον, *Ach.* 246, *Av.* 78. In contrast ζωμοῦ is a meat-soup.

λειριοπολφανεμώναις: it is a comic word formed by different kinds of food, similar to Aristophanes' long compounds as in *Eccl.* 1169-76, *Av.* 491, *Lys.* 457-8 (cf. *Vesp.* 505). The different elements are as follows:

a) λειριο- from the noun τὸ λείριον simply means 'Madonna lily, *Lilium candidum*' (LSJ).

b) πολφ- from ὁ πολφός is a "sort of farinaceous food eaten with porridge" (LSJ), cf. Ar. fr. 701, *Metag.* 18.

c) -ανεμώναις, its commonest meaning is the flower 'anemone' (cf. fr. 113. 25); but it is likely that the proper meaning here is the one given by Hesych. α 4882 ἀνεμώνη· μάζης εἶδος (cf. *Poll.* VI 76 in a list of different names for μάζαι).

From this interpretation of the different elements it is an 'omelette made of groats and lilies'; but lilies do not seem proper and Meineke, on one hand, conjectured that they are a kind of 'maza' (cf. ἄνθεμα or ἀνεμώνη in the list of *Poll.* loc.cit.). Kaibel, on the other hand, suggests according to K-A ad loc. "sive candidum colorem sive dulcem odorem significari mavult" which would suit the sense of the adjective λειριοεῖς (cf. *Sud.* λ394).

Perhaps the comic intention of this kind of long compound nouns is parody of the dithyrambic style as in Timotheus' *Persai*

123-4 μελαμπέταλο / χίτωνα (cf. Ar. Ach. 229, 232).

9. δένδρη: ionic form, perhaps used in poetic contexts (cf. Av. 1066 δένδρεσί τ' ἔφημένα καρπὸν ἀποβόσκειται and Eur. fr. 484. 5N<sup>2</sup>).

χορδαῖς ὀπταῖς ἐριφεῖσις: about kid sausages as delicacy cf. Eub. fr. 63. 2, Antiph. fr. 221. 7; about different dishes of kid, cf. Ar. fr. 449, Xenoph. 6. 1D.

10. φυλλοροήσει: comically here trees shed sausages, similarly Ar. Av. 1480 uses it in comic sense. Other synonymous verbs are φυλλοχόεω (cf. Hes. fr. 240 φυλλοχόος) and φυλλοβολέω, Ar. Nub. 1007; see further Rehrenböck pp. 204-5.

τευθιδίσις: diminutive of τευθίς 'squid, calamary' (cf. Metag. fr. 6.6); in general see Thompson *Fishes* pp. 260-1, Dohm *Mageiros* p. 111-2 on Sotad. fr. 1. 14ff.

χιχλαιοι τ' ἀναβράστοις: cf. fr. 113. 23.

Metrically speaking this fragment is a series of glyconic and Aristophanic or Pherecratean feet; the combination reminds one of the lyric metres used mainly in parabolic passages like the Eupolidean and other original combinations (cf. on fr. 114). The metrical scheme, according to description and terminology of West *Gr. Metre* p. 96, is as follows: "gl | ph / "gl | ar / gl | ph / gl | ph / gl | ph.

As in fr. 114 the language used is fairly uncommon and perhaps a comic parody of poetic expressions. It is clearly constructed in v. 1-4 with eight pairs of vocative participles that invoke someone unknown for us, to conclude it with two imperatives in v. 5. Similar kind of invocation is found in fr. 202, Ar. *Pl.* 253, Eup. 204, 176 with relative clauses. This fragment shows unusual examples of internal accusatives (cf. Ar. *Ran.* 602 and see van Leeuwen ad *Ran.* 562 for other instances).

The context of this text is clearly a banquet, especially in relation to the libation at the end. Lines 1-2 refer mainly to flowers and the exhalation of their smell when talking, breathing, chatting, smiling. In lines 3-4 the tone changes and becomes more explicit. If we accept that the two first lines do not convey any secondary sense, but simply describe very poetically this man; then we have a contrasting view of a person: on the one hand, he is delicate and on the other he is lascivious. Both elements would help to create a caricatured representation of this person..

Two identifications have been made. It could allude to a

banqueter, as Meineke *FCG* II p. 319 suggests, "mihi illa de homine Calliae Eupolidei (Adulat. XVII) [Eup. 176] haud dissimili et in Persicam mollitiem effuso intellegenda videbantur", (cf. Kock ad loc.). Bothe apud K-A ad loc., proposes "servum a cyathis venustum et cinaedum". Both are possible suggestions.

1. **μαλάχας**: "Malva silvestris", as Steier *RE* XIV 923 describes it, "die Roß-Malve wurde als Gemüse gegessen (Theophr. h. pl. VII 7. 2, Diosc. II. 118, Luc. pseudom. 25, hier auch μάλβαξ = μαλάχη), das etwa so wie unser Spinat zubereitet wurde, aber als ziemlich minderwertige, billige Kost der Ärmeren galt" (cf. Ar. *Pl.* 543-4: σιτεῖσθαι δ' ἀντὶ μὲν ἄρτων / μαλάχης πτόρθους, ἀντὶ δὲ μάζης φυλλεῖ' ἰσχνῶν ῥαφανίδων...). It was used also as a medical plant (see West on Hes. *Op.* 41).

In Doric comedy (Epich. fr. 153 Kaib.) and in Antiph. fr. 156 it is spelt *μολόχη* (see Alpers ad Orus fr. B95).

**ἔξερῶν**: the sense of this verb is doubtful. On the one hand, it could mean 'to utter' as *ἔξερυγγάνειν*, according to LSJ s.v. II (cf. Eup. fr. 204 ψάγδαν ἐρυγγάνοντα), and thus *μαλάχας* would be an internal accusative as it seems the case with the other participles; but, on the other hand, the noun *μαλάχας* implies, as we have seen, a poor man's food so it could simply mean "to vomit" (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 341, *Vesp.* 993), implying a rejection of such humble food in contrast with the perfume and flowers.

**ἀναπνέων**: verb only found here in Comedy. It means 'to exhale' the perfume of the hyacinth (LSJ s.v. III). Ar. *Nub.* 627

uses the noun ἀναπνοή that seems to be a learned word according to Dover ad loc.

**ὑάκινθον:** 'hyacinth', a kind of flower that belongs to the lyric tradition. It appears for the first time in literature in *Il.* 14. 348 in the description of the garden of flowers that grow on the Mount Ida when Zeus falls asleep (cf. also Sapph. 105b. 1V). Hermipp. fr. 77. 8 refers it to the smell of the "flowery" Thasian wine. About the difficulties of identifying it cf. Gow on Theocr. 10. 28.

2. **μελιλότινον λαλῶν:** adverbial form "to talk sweet as melilot" (LSJ s.v.). The μελιλωτον appears frequently in poetic texts associated with idyllic and perfumed places (cf. Sapph. 96. 14V and in fr. 114. 2 on λωτοφόρῳ). Cratin. fr. 105. 7 mentions it among the flowers used for wreaths in banquets (cf. Antiph. 119). About the problems of identification of this flower in Antiquity and its use, cf. Arnott *BICS* 32 (1985) p. 79-82.

The expression implies softness and banality, perhaps suggesting that someone is always speaking about banquets or perfumes (cf. similarly Eup. loc.cit. ψάγδαν ἐρυγγάνοντα, Pherecr. fr. 2. 3).

**ῥόδα:** 'rose' could simply refer here to the flower and be a complimentary element about this character; but it could also have an ambiguous sense, meaning 'pudenda mulebria', as in fr. 113. 29, it fits perfectly the use of different flowers throughout the passage.

**προσσηρῶς:** it is an unusual compound of the verb σείρω "to grin or snarl at" (LSJ s.v.). In our context it could imply "to

smile" roses in a positive point of view; or it may convey a gesture of disdain towards the 'roses'; this verb is included among the features of a 'flatterer' by Poll. VI 123: εἴποις δ' ἄν καὶ κύων προσαίνων προσσεσηρῶς, ἐπισίτιος, λυμεῶν τῆς νεότητος, ἀσύμβολος, παρεχόμενος συμβολᾶς τὸν γέλωτα, πᾶν ἄν εἰπὼν καὶ πᾶν ἄν παθῶν. This ambiguously deprecatory gesture is clear in the simple form (cf. Ar. *Pax* 620).

3. **φιλῶν μὲν ἀμάρακον:** about its sense, cf. K-A ad loc. citing Schweighaeuser 'cuius oscula amaracum olent'. 'Marjoram' designates a flower and its perfume (about it and its family, cf. C. Andrews *CIPh* 56 (1961) pp. 75ff. above all pp. 77-8). Antiph. fr. 105.6 suggests that someone puts it on his eyebrows and hair: ἀμαρῶν δὲ τὰς ὀφρύς καὶ τὴν κόμην. The gender of this flower is doubtful and can be found either in neuter or in masculine (cf. 71 Chaer. F14. 16Sn ἔρση δὲ θαλερός ἐκτραφεὶς ἀμάρακος / λειμῶσι μαλακοῦς ἐξέτεινεν αὐχένας).

**προσκινῶν δὲ σέλινά:** προσκινῶν is only found here in active voice, while in the other instances in passive it refers to women (cf. Ar. *Pax* 903, *Ecc1.* 256, Xenarch. fr. 4. 24). According to Sch. ad *Lys.* 227: τοῦ μὲν ἀνδρός ἐστὶ τὸ κινεῖν, τῆς δὲ γυναικὸς τὸ προσκινεῖσθαι. The erotic implications that may be suggested by ῥόδα in v. 2 are expressed clearly here.

This sense is confirmed by the obscene sense of σέλινά that, besides celery, can mean according to Hesych. σ384, τὸ γυναικεῖον (cf. Cratin. fr. 116. 3, Henderson *MM* pp. 151-2).

4. **γελῶν δ' ἵπποσέλινά:** as Meineke *FCG* II 1 p. 319 suggests "idem, opinor, est ac si dixisset γελῶν ἵπποπορνικῶς". The erotic

content of the phrase is not so clear, although it seems to combine different levels of language. On one hand, ἵπποσέλινά is a plant of the family of the celery, identified with the "alexanders, *Smyrniolum olusatrum*" (cf. *Theophr. HP I 9.4*). Its particularities are explained by *Theophr. HP II 2. 4* and about its medicinal functions, cf. *Diosc. III 67*. On the other, it conveys words with different obscene sense: ἵππος can mean, according to *Hesych. 1845*, τὸ μόριον καὶ τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς and also was an insult for a 'lecherous woman' (cf. *LSJ s.v. IV*) while about σέλινά see on l. 3 (further see *Henderson MM p. 127 and 133*).

**κοσμοσάνδαλα βάλνων:** κοσμοσάνδαλα is Doric for ὑάκινθος (see on v. 1) and was used in banquets as a wreath (cf. *Cratin. fr. 105, Paus. 2. 35. 5*). In such a context βάλνων is likely to be understood with the obscene sense "to mount" (cf. *Hesych. 882 and Henderson MM p. 155*) while the plant could refer to the plant worn as wreath by the subject. A parallel passage is *Eup. fr. 176. 1-2*: ὃς χαρίτων μὲν ὄζει / καλλαβίδας δὲ βάλνει where ὀρχεῖται is substituted by βάλνει that implies the erotic acts represented in the dance.

5. **ἔγχει:** commonly used to refer to pouring wine (cf. *fr. 45. 2, 75. 7, 76 2 and 3*) and to pour perfume in *fr. 105*.

**κάπιβόα τρίτον παιδν':** κάπιβόα seems to be common to 'intone' a song or hymn, cf. *Ar. Av. 896, Aesch. Pers. 1054*.

"To intone the third paian" refers to the custom of making a last libation of pure wine in honour of Zeus Soter before beginning the drinking (cf. *Pearson ad Soph. fr. 425 and further*

references and bibliography, cf. H. Friis Johansen- E.W. Whittle on Aesch. *Suppl.* 26, [Aeschylus *The Suppliants* II p. 27 1980]). Fraenkel ad Aesch. *Ag.* 245 τριτόσπονδον εὔποτμον παιᾶνα φίλος ἔτιμα describes the ritual as follows: "the master of the house offers the libation and utters the prayer over it, ending with ἰή παιῶν (cf., e.g., Ar. *Peace* 453, *Thesm.* 310), and to this 'Amen' either the whole company of those present or one individual replies with the singing of a hymn" (see further Pl. *Symp.* 176a).

#### Fr. 139

This fragment in Eupolidean metre (cf. on fr. 34), refers to the belief in the medical use of the figs according to Athen. III 78d.

1. σῦκόν ... νέον: about figs, cf. on fr. 85. 2. They are especially attractive to children, cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 296ff.

διὰ χρόνου: about this adverbial expression "after a time", cf. van Leeuwen ad Ar. *Vesp.* 1252.

2. περιμάττομεν: "wipe all around"; this term seems proper of medical terminology, (cf. LSJ s.v. with other references); in contrast, cf. Men. *Phasma* 54.

#### Fr. 140

The Sch. ad Ar. *Ran.* 362 gives an example of the word τᾰπόρητ' used in the Aristophanes passage on which he is commenting. Its sense in Pherecrates is, as in Ar. *Eccl.* 442: "ineffable, secret" about sacred things (see Sch. ad loc.); while

in Ar. *Equ.* 282, fr. 633 and *Ran.* 362 it refers to "forbidden exports" and in *Equ.* 648 about secrets in the Assembly.

The text is confusing and places doubts on the authorship of this play, about it see p. 386.

#### Fr. 141

This fragment has been taken as evidence for the date of Sophocles' *Electra*, whose Sch. on 86 mentions it and also as evidence for the date and different proposals on the authorship of our play (cf. supra p. 387).

I agree with Kaibel *Sophokles' Elektra* p. 83 n. 35 Leipzig 1896 (1911<sup>2</sup>) that "warum und wie Pherekrates die Stelle parodiert hat, wissen wir leider nicht".

The text of Soph. is as follows: ὦ φάος ἀγνὸν / καὶ γῆς ἰσόμοιρ' ἀήρ; but it does not contain any philosophical reference, as Kamerbeek ad loc. correctly explains, but a simple poetical invocation to the first moments of the dawn (for a philosophical interpretation, see Bignone *BCPEN* 1 (1942) pp. 176ff.).

## Πετᾶλη

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

*Πετᾶλη* seems to have been a name for a woman. This word is found in *AP IX 226* as a poetical synonym for πέταλον, that is to say, 'petal'. But there are other instances about this name: *Hdn. π. μον. λέξ. 39.3* and *Hesych. s. v. Πέταλα*, and in *Alciphr. IV 8* and *9* she is a hetaira. It is thus possible that she was the main character in the same way as the play *Corianna*, but no certain conclusion can be drawn from the fragments.

They preserve references to several topics already found in *Pherecrates*: wine and perfume, fr. 147 and 149 respectively; love fr. 143 (see for instance a possible love-scene in *Corianno* fr. 77f.) and perhaps food (cf. fr. 148).

*Geissler* (1925) p. 34 is probably right in pointing out that the play may have been written after 425, insofar as the figure of Cleisthenes in fr. 143.1 appears as depicted as effeminate for the first time in *Ar. Ach.* performed in that year. But he is mentioned all through his comedies in *Nub. 355*, *Av. 831*, *Lys. 621*, *1092*, *Thesm. 235*, *571ff.*, *Ran. 48*, *57*.

The text is part of a dialogue. In words of Kaibel apud K-A: 'interrogatus unde veniat respondet ille ita ut altius repetita narratione prius quo iturus fuerit exponat'. The tone of the question is rather familiar and colloquial, while the second speaker seems to avoid to answer it straightforwardly, indicating where he is going and in particular that he is going to a wealthy part of Athens.

1. οὗτος: it is difficult to indicate which implications this appellative pronoun in relation to the second person has. According to LSJ s.v. C.I 5 'mostly implies anger, impatience or scorn. As Humbert *Syntaxe Gr.* p.31 says: "le pronom est employé pour interpeller quelqu'un, principalement pour l'arrêter dans sa marche ou dans sa façon de faire. Tandis que lat. iste, quand il ne désigne pas expressément une seconde personne, possède une signification péjorative bien établie, οὗτος n'implique par lui-même aucun jugement défavorable: il constate seulement que l'objet désigné est bien connu de la personne à laquelle on s'adresse - que ce soit en bonne ou en mauvaise part. La valeur, laudative ou dépréciative, se dégage des circonstances, ou du ton général de la phrase; souvent pour éviter toute équivoque, le pronom est précisé par un adjectif qualificatif" (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1145, 1364, *Av.* 223, *Nub.* 723, *Thesm.* 610, *Ecc1.* 372, 520, 753).

εἰς Κολωνὸν ἰέμεν: the speaker eludes the question by answering where he was intending to go. In very similar terms the proverbial sentence: ὄψ' ἦλθεσ, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν Κολωνὸν ἴεσο (cf.

Argum. 11 Soph. *OC* (p. 2. 11 de M.) and see Jebb ad loc. [Cambridge 1928] and Fuks *Eranos* 49 (1951) p.173) implies the same sense as Pherecrates tries to refer: the fact that going to such place was socially acceptable. Therefore to stress it could seem justifiable or simply ridiculous.

2. The text makes reference to two places: Κολωνός ἀγοραῖος or μίσθιος or ἐργατικός and the deme of Κολωνός (about the difference between them through inscriptions, see D.M. Lewis *ABSA* 5 (1955) pp. 12-7). The former one is a market of daily labourers placed on the hill west of the Agora. The place was called according to the Argum.cit., the μισθωτήριον (about it cf. A. Fuks art.cit. pp. 1/1-3).

The deme Colonus was in "the N.W.N. from the Dipylon gate at Athens" according to Jebb's introduction on Soph. *OC* p.XXX. It is also named Ἴπιος from an altar devoted to Poseidon and it was a place in which probably the rich members of the ἱππῆς lived and met (cf. Thuc. VIII 67.2). According to E. Kirsten *WSt* 86 (1973) pp. 13-5, "den Namen des Hügels mit den Hippeis, der ursprünglich (vor der Absonderung der Pentakosiomedimnoi) einzigen bevorrechtigten Schicht der attischen Gesellschaft verbunden, die Aristophanes in seinem "Hippeis" gefeiert hatte".

#### Fr. 143

The fragment is an invocation to a pigeon to take the speaker to Cythera or Cyprus, traditional places of worship of Aphrodite. It has been interpreted as a metaphor. Two suggestions have been made in relation to the speaker:

- Meineke *CGF* II p.322 proposes 'loqui videtur Cinesias aliquis aut Leotrophides, levissimi homo ponderis'. He seems to understand that the speaker wants to fly himself and then the examples mentioned are satirized by Aristophanes because of their lightness in connexion to their poetry. Perhaps this interpretation is too far fetched and mainly if we take into account that Cleisthenes was satirized because of his effeminacy mainly.

- Kock ad loc. suggests: 'Venus aut puellula loqui videtur quae, ut Trygaeus cantharo, columba vehi volebat' and Kaibel apud K-A suggests that she may be Petale. This interpretation is more feasible and we may imagine that the play had a similar starting plot to that <sup>of</sup> Ar. *Pax*.

Another interpretation would be to understand that the speaker is sending a letter to a beloved person with a pigeon (cf. fr.38). The speaker is asking the pigeon to accomplish his or her wishes by using in metaphorical sense the flight to any of the islands devoted to Aphrodite. It could be a parody of lyric expressions of love (cf. Eur. *Hel.* 147, 666-8, *Cycl.* 71, Ar. *Eccl.* 899).

This invocation acquires a paradoxical sense with the comparison of the dove to the famous Cleisthenes. It seems a reversal of terms. The figure of the bird was possibly associated with effeminacy (see infra on ὁμοῖον Κλεισθένει).

1. **περιστέριον**: diminutive form of περιστέρα or περιστερός (cf. fr. 38), it designates a dove or a pigeon, and especially as a

domestic bird; about it cf. Thompson *Birds* pp. 244-6 and J. Pollard *Birds in Gr. Life and Myth* p.56 London 1977. Here it appears related to Aphrodite (cf. comment on Κύθηρα και Κύπρον) to whom the white pigeons were usually related (cf. Thompson loc.cit. and clearly Alex. fr. 217 λευκός 'Αφροδίτης εἶμι γάρ περιστερός (cf. A.R. III 548, Plut. *Mor.* i 463). Similarly another bird devoted to the goddess of love is the στρούθος, cf. Sapph. fr. 1. 10V.

**ὄμοιον Κλεισθένει:** here the manuscripts' reading Καλλισθένει is unmetrical and perhaps the best solution is that of Porson and Elmsley Κλεισθένει (cf. Conti Bizzarro (1988-9) p.288).

As Dover on *Nub.* 355 says, he is 'the stock effeminate of Old Comedy' and other figures as Cleonymus, Straton are mentioned also in this respect in nearly all the plays of Aristophanes (see *supra*).

The comparison of the 'little dove' with Cleisthenes can be comparable with that of Cleonymus in Ar. *Ach.* 88. In our case the small white dove is related to the whiteness of the skin and softness of the manners with which Cleisthenes and other characters are depicted. About the features of the politician Teleas, as ὄρνις see Ar. *Nub.* 166ff. (and the Sch. ad loc. who states that he is also satirized as "passive homosexual").

**Κύθηρα και Κύπρον:** both places are commonly related to Aphrodite. Cythera is an island to the SW of Malea which had a cult of Aphrodite Urania. Its fame seems to have been already widespread in the time of Hesiod, although there are doubts about its relationship with the adjective Κυθερεΐα (cf. West on Hes.

Th. 199). In Cyprus there was a cult of Aphrodite Scotia, goddess of marriage and initiation; she was usually related to this island in myths and legends (cf. the epithets Κύπρις, *Il.* 5. 330 and Κυπρογενής, Κυπρογενεία, Hes. loc. cit.).

#### Fr. 144

This fragment is an enumeration of five infinitives in asyndeton (similarly to Cratin. fr. 341 and Pherecr. fr. 197). They could depend on another verb as Kock suggests or be equivalent to imperatives, common in Attic Greek.

Its comic effect seems to be in the accumulation of verbs meaning hitting or treating badly someone in crescendo; probably also in the context where these forms could be hyperboles to describe a person's expected behaviour, and also in the surprise of a not usual form as λακπατεῖν among the common verbs. Similar enumerations are also Ar. *Equ.* 495, 692, *Pax* 320.

λακπατεῖν: it is unusual in Classical literature as a verb (perhaps the nearest form in λακπάτητον in Soph. *Ant.* 1359); but not in the separated form λάξ πατεῖν. It literally means 'to trample on' and it became a kind of cliché of brutality and also of irreverence to mean 'to trample on sacred things'. About its meaning in Aristophanes, cf. Taillardat *Images* 5362 and 771.

#### Fr. 145

Probably the text of Pherecrates is a joke about synonyms similar to Ar. *Ran.* 1159, χρῆσον σὺ μάκτραν, εἰ δὲ βόλει

κάρποδον, as Meineke *CGF* II p. 323 suggests (cf. also Stanford on *Ar.* loc. cit.). Edmonds proposes (*FAC* I p. 258 n. b): "perh. ridiculing the ὀρθοέπεια or 'correct speech' taught by some sophists, e.g. Prodicus, caricatured by Plato *Prot.* 337".

I think that there are two possible explanations: the word πρόσφερε is very vague and could provoke a confusion which could be developed in the following lines or the speaker uses πρόσαιρε alongside πρόσφερε within a religious context where the last verb is more appropriate (see ad loc., although αἶρω is used in the context of a sacrifice in *Ar. Av.* 850; but this does not exclude the idea that it is a more colloquial expression).

πρόσαιρε: the simple form αἶρε and its compounds are frequently found in Aristophanes with the same meaning as Pherecrates and they seem to be colloquial expressions that meant as Platnauer says on *Ar. Pax* 1, "not 'bring', but 'hand me'. For this uses Σ<sup>h</sup> quotes *Il.* VI 264 μή μοι οἶνον αἶρε" (cf. also *Ar.* op. cit. 122/, *Th.* 225, *Soph. Ai.* 545); the meaning 'to bring' is supported by LSJ s. v. αἶρω I 2.

τὸ κανοῦν: it designates a basket of reed or cane, used to carry food, especially bread, or, in sacrifices, it can hold the different elements to perform it (cf. *Pax* 918, *Av.* 43, *Pl. com.* fr. 91. 1-2).

Humborg *RE* Suppl. IV 867ff. describes it as follows: "x. ist ein flacher, breiter, offener und wenig tiefer Korb, Daremberg-Saglio s. canistrum S. 890 Fig. 1123; er begegnet häufig auf den Bildwerken und den mannigfaltigen, oft zeitlichen Formen einer

runden oder auch ovalen Platte, Schale oder Schlüssel".

προσφέρει: it is a word with wider meaning than προσάγω. It means originally 'bring to, apply to' in a religious context it can also mean 'to present, to offer'.

#### Fr. 146

The text as it stands can be interpreted in the following way: "why do you importune so in vain a god?". But there are difficulties in understanding the sense of αὐτό that was suggested by Wilamowitz (see K-A ad loc.) instead of the manuscripts' reading: αὐτῷ. It could be an accusative, but then the verb λιπαρέω is never found with the construction of double accusative; another possibility would be to understand it as an adverb; but this is even more unusual in literary texts; cf. LSJ s. v. αὐτός IV 2. Another possibility is Nauck p. 69: δῆτα.

I would suggest two possible changes. On the one hand αὐτε instead of αὐτό, unusual in comedy, it is nonetheless found in a context of epic parody as in Ar. *Vesp.* 1015, *Lys.* 66, Cratin. fr. 182, Metag. fr. 4.2, cf. Hermipp. fr. 63.6 and *Pax* 1270. In tragedy it is found in Aeschylus from epic poetry (cf. Wilamowitz on *Lys.* 66) and in Soph. *Trach.* 1009. On the other hand, one could read τῆνδ' at the beginning of the verse, only adding -v- to τῆ, the reading of the manuscripts. It would depend on θεόν at the end of the line and perhaps the only difficulty would be the distance of this demonstrative adjective from its name and that the noun is usually accompanied by the article, but it could be elided in poetry (cf. Goodwin *A Gr. Grammar* §945 London 1894<sup>2</sup>).

It could have some epic resonance with the Homeric formula: τὸν δ' αὔτε προσέειπε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἄθηνη in *Il.* 1.206; this expression is also parodied in Cratin. fr. 182 and Ar. *Lys.* 66. In this case the text could be interpreted as follows: "again do you importune so in vain the goddess?".

**λιπαρεῖς:** 'to insist, to importune'. Etymologically it is related to λιπιω (cf. Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s.v.) and its relation to λιπαρός is discussed (cf. Frisk *Eranos* 40 (1942) p.85). With similar meaning as here, cf. Hdt. II 41, Soph. *OT* 1435, Ar. *Ach.* 425.

#### Fr. 147

The fragment refers to the custom of drinking unmixed wine, usually regarded as primitive. It was a topic usually related to women's bibulousness, e.g. Antiph. fr. 58, proper of barbarians (cf. Pl. *Legg.* 637e).

**πιθῶνος:** in literary texts it is found here and in Eup. fr. 122. It is used of a cellar, generally for πίθοι or large wine-jars. This could be a specialized term to designate what in Homer is called ὁ θάλαμος, treasury or store-room which is described in detail in *Od* 2. 337ff. with special reference to the pure wine in πίθοις.

**ἦρυσαν:** it is a conjecture of Meineke instead of εἶρυσαν (cf. K-A for the reading -υσεν).

This conjecture would have in favour that the verb ἀρύτω

commonly indicates: 'to draw water or wine' (cf. in middle voice in Ar. *Av.* 272, Pherecr. fr. 137.5); ἐρύω has a similar sense but implies the use of force or violence, and it is used in epic contexts; perhaps the manuscripts' reading could be suitable to a parody of the grandiose tone of an epic passage, for instance *Od.* 2.389 where Athena alone εἶρυσε ships to the coast.

ἄκρατον: it was used on its own to indicate 'pure wine', not mixed with water, as was common among the Greeks. It is often found in Aristophanes, e.g. *Ach.* 1229, *Equ.* 87, 105, *Vesp.* 525, *Eccl.* 1123 (cf. also *Men.* fr. 779 K8-T).

#### Fr. 148

Melanthius, a tragic poet (who has to be distinguished from an elegiac poet of the time of Cimon and a later poet of the same time; cf. A. Dihle *RhM* 119 (1976) pp. 146-8), was usually criticized in Old Comedy for different reasons:

- as here, love of expensive fish and delicacies, that is to say a glutton (Ar. *Pax* 804, 1009ff., *Eup.* fr. 43, *Archipp.* fr.28, *Leucon* fr.3).

- effeminacy, *Eup.* fr. 178, *Callias* fr. 14.

- skin-disease (leprosy); cf. Ar. *Av.* 150-1 (although I wonder if it is not a reference to his plays or something similar).

- ὡς λαλός, *Pl.com.* fr. 140.

He wrote a play called *Medea* which is mentioned in Ar. *Pax* 1011ff. and has been doubtfully attributed to Morsimos (cf. Platnauer ad Ar. loc.cit., *TrGF* 23 T 4aSn; but perhaps rightly

Dihle art.cit. is in favour of attributing it to Melanthius; see also Sommerstein's note on Ar. Pax 804)

Fr. 149

Μεγάλλειον μύρον: it is an expensive perfume, said to ἔσθῃve been discovered by Megallos of Sicily, others say of Athens (cf. Athen. XV 690f, Pollux VI 104 and Hunter on Eub. p. 182). It is also mentioned in Comedy in Ar. fr. 549, Stratt. fr.34, Anaxandr. fr.47, Amph. fr.27 (further about its preparation cf. also Theophr. *Odor* 29 ff. 42. 55). For the problems of spelling of this noun, see Renehan *Gr. Textual Criticism* Harvard 1969 p. 13.

## Τυράννις

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

It is not clear what was the general content of this play, from only five fragments. Kock suggests that fr. 152 seems to put forward a situation similar to that of Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*. He would understand the word Τυράννις as a revolution in which women take power to organize the state the way they think it is the best. But this is far from sure and W. Hoffmann p. 34 apud K-A suggests that the title seems to refer to the subject of "praesenti earum dominatione"

A title similar to this one is *Peace* in Aristophanes and it is possible that a personification could have appeared as in Aristophanes play or in *Birds*, Βασίλεια with which it is possible to find some relation, or in Pherecrates' *Cheiron Mousike* (cf. fr. 155). Tyrannis was a word with a bad sense in this time, it could mean 'conspiracy' or 'tyranny' (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 417 and MacDowell ad loc.). But also it designated the power of Zeus (cf. LSJ s. v. I and II 2) and perhaps in this sense could have been a trip to Olympus to get the 'power' and 'order' as Aristophanes' *Peace*; fr. 150 in which a god seems to speak would fit better in this context; fr. 152 could be a narration of what happened on earth after Tyrannis was brought down or even what a character has seen in the other world.

Fr. 200, 207 and 269 have been ascribed to this play, see comment on them.

Geissler (1925) p. 26 suggests that 430 is 'terminus post quem für die Τυράννις des Pherekrates'; but this statement is

based on the doubtful ascription of fr. 207 to our play and its  
comparison with Hermippus' *Stratiotai* fr. 55.

#### Fr. 150

Kock's interpretation which follows Dobree *Adv. I* p. 586 is that the speaker may be a god who explains the origin of a *καπνοδόχην μεγάλην* built to take the smoke coming from sacrifices, which is the part of the sacrifice devoted to them (the so called *κνίση*, cf. *Ar. Av.* 1515ff. and *Il.* 1.317). Kaibel apud K-A gives another suggestion that the speaker is a parasite.

2. **βωμολόχοι:** the speaker seems to make an etymological pun here. In fact he explains *βωμολόχοι* as *πρὸς τοῖσι βῶμοις πανταχοῦ / ἀεὶ λοχῶντες*. This explanation seems to have been popular (cf. *Hesych.* β1389); but the word had already lost its original meaning and it designated a parasite (cf. *Ar. fr.* 171 and *Wüst RE* 18 4 (1949) 1384.65); a buffoon (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 358 and Stanford's note on it) or as an abusive adjective 'coarse, ribald' (cf. *Ar. Equ.* 1358, *Ran.* 1085, 1521, etc.).

3. **καπνοδόχην:** it means a hole in the roof of the house where usually the smoke comes out; the light of the sun was also seen through it (cf. *Hdt.* IV 103, VIII 137, *Eup. fr.* 144). It is also designated as *καπνή* (cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 143, *Eup. fr.* 97, *Alex. fr.* 173.13).

#### Fr. 151

This fragment makes reference to a common expression in Classical Greek to designate things that have not been used for a long time. See further *Themist. Or.* XVIII 221b and Pearson ad *Soph. fr.* 286.

σικυαῖσι: 'meal tub' in general (LSJ). The Sch. ad Ar. *Pl.* 806 considers it more concretely ἀρτοθήκη or 'bread basket' (see also Ar. *Equ.* 1296). The reading of the manuscript V is σικυαῖσι or 'cupping instruments' (correcting the form συκυαῖσι of most manuscripts), although it is also found in comic fragments: Crat. com. fr. 46, Eub. fr. 145, Antiph. fr. 206.4, as part of gear of a doctor, it does not make any sense within the following words.

#### Fr. 152

The topic of women's bibulousness in connexion with the size of the cups is already found in Pherecr. fr. 75. More particularly about making big vessels, see Ar. *Lys.* 200, Eub. fr. 42, Epig. fr. 4, Ar. fr. 364.

The general tone of the narration recalls the dialogue between Chremes and Blepyros in *Eccl.* 372ff. that explains the novelties decided in the Assembly and it could well have been spoken by a man, (cf. σφ(σι δὲ γ' αὐταῖσι 1.4). Starting from this similarity Kock suggests a similar feminine take-over to that of Aristophanes; in our case one of the special measures taken by women (if this interpretation is right) would be to make big drinking vessels for women and flat ones without depth for men. A similar joke is made in *Eccl.* 446-8 when we are told that one of the decisions taken by the Assembly is the free exchange of drinking cups: ἔπειτα συμβάλλειν πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἔφη / ἱμάτια χρυσί' ἀργύριον ἐκπώματα.

The whole passage has a comical touch of excessive rhetoric, as in the detailed description of such a simple object; 11.4-5,

in the terminology: ἐμφερῆ 1.3, ἀνεκλογ(στῶς 1.7; in the enumeration in 1.5 and the litotes of the beginning of 1.6. The verb ἐκποθῆ 1. 7, ἐκπιεῖν in 1. 8 and πιεῖν in 1.9 resemble a kind of polyptoton (cf. Ar. Av. 703-5).

1. **κεραμεύειν**: see supra about making big vessels.

3. **κόγχην**: it designates originally, as Thompson *Fishes* s.v. says, "a shell apart from the animal within" and here a "shell-full". This meaning can be also found in its masculine form κόγχος (cf. Ariston. fr. 1, Phryn. com. fr. 51).

**ἐμφερῆ**: found first in Sapph. fr.85, it is according to Starkie on *Vesp.* 1102 a poetical adjective instead of προσφερῆς. Other instances are Ar. *Nub.* 502, fr. 68.

**γευστήρ(οις)**: a small flat-cup for wine-tasting, see Ar. fr. 310. 2.

4-5. These lines are a description of the drinking cups women have made for themselves, in opposition to that of men described in the two first lines. The text is a little corrupted.

In the first one of them, the emendation of Bergk σφ(σι δέ <γε> improves the reading of ms. A.

The second line is formed by an enumeration of adjectives. They could refer to κύλικας or ὀλκᾶδας in the preceding line. Edmonds *FAC* I p. 261 n. b seems to interpret them with ὀλκᾶδας, according to the senses he gives to each adjective; but I think that they qualify κύλικας, perhaps except οἰναγωγούς that could go with either of them. It would be an enumeration as in Eub. fr. 56, Aristophon. fr. 13.3, Alex. fr. 124, 210, Antiph. fr. 172.4.

κύλικας: it was the specific vessel for drinking after mixing wine and water in the κρατήρ (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 195).

όλκάδας: merchant-ship without oars and for this reason it had to be towed out of the harbour. About them, cf. Morrison and Williams *Gr. Oared Ships* pp. 244-5 Cambridge 1968. A similar comparison with this ship can be found in Eur. *Cycl.* 505-6, σκάφος όλκάς ὄς γεμισθεις / ποτι σέλμα γαστρὸς ἄκρας.

οίναγωγός: as I have said it could qualify both terms. About similar terms and usage, cf. Pherecr. fr.17. The comic element of this adjective exists mainly, if it refers to the κύλιξ.

λεπτιάς: the adjective is unexpected, since the word should have a reference to the capacity of the cups. Edmonds *FAC I* p.261 n.e tries to keep the reading and interprets it as referring to 'thin-sided, giving plenty of room inside'. Some modifications have been proposed: Kock λευράς or στρεβλάς; Peppink *Obs.* p.66 λεπαστίδας coll Hesych. λ664 and Kaibel in ed. Ath. έκτεταμένας try to solve the difficulty of the adjective μέσας.

Perhaps the text could be kept if we understand that it is a reference to the thin and beautiful construction of these big cups, perhaps indicating the fineness of their decoration (cf. LSJ s.v. λεπτός I 3). Maybe it is not necessary for the description to refer only to their size; but to their beauty also (see infra on μέσας).

μέσας: the reading of A, while CE have μεστάς which is unmetrical. As we have seen the sense of μέσας is not very clear and some suggestions have been made; but as Meineke explains,

"media parte in immanem ventrem patentem".

Among so many doubts, since the adjective γαστροειδᾶς is also suspect, it is better to keep the text as it is transmitted.

A possible interpretation of this line is as a parallel construction: περιφερεῖς λεπτὰς, μέσας γαστροειδᾶς. In this case περιφερεῖς would be interpreted 'circular top part', as opposed to μέσας the middle and bottom part of the cup. The main problem of this interpretation is that the sentence does not seem to express this contrast with a δὲ as it would be expected. Bothe 1844 p. 14 apud K-A's app. crit. seems to have understood the text in this sense when he suggest the emendation: δὲ γαστροειδᾶς (see *infra*).

**γαστροειδᾶς:** it only occurs here and maybe it is a comic invention of Pherecrates; but the manuscripts doubt about its form. In its sense it is clearly related to γάστρη 'belly' and has something to do with a paunch-like shape. In parallel ἡ γάστρα designates 'the lower part of a vessel bulging out like a paunch' (LSJ); ἡ γάστρις is also an adjective or a name similar to the preceding; ὁ γάστρων is a 'pot-belly' found in Ar. *Ran.* 200 and the adjective γαστρῶδης is also found in Ar. *Pl.* 560.

I would be in favour of the reading of Eust. in *Od.* p. 1648.27: οὕτω δὲ καὶ γαστροειδῆς τις καλεῖται ὑπὸ Ἀττικῶν which seems to make a good sense. The ending -ις is a common way of formation for names for pots like χρυσίς, fr. 134, Ar. *Pax* 425, λεκίς Epich. fr. 126 Kaib., χυτρίς Hdt. V 88. The feminine diminutive form could have delicate implications, by joining γαστήρ, which in fact has colloquial connotations (it implies a

glutton; cf. γαστήρ in Ar. Av. 1604 and Hes. Th. 26) and a delicate feminine poetical ending -τιδας (similar poetical forms are οἷς Theocr. 1. 9 and γραυῖς Call. fr. 513Pf.); about the termination in -τις -τιδος see Buck and Petersen *A reverse index* pp. 416-7.

Several emendations have been made (cf. K-A's app.crit.), but none seems to be more likely than the others and perhaps the reading of Eustathius is correct.

7. αὔθ': it is normally explained according to Meineke *CGF* II p. 325: "πόρρωθεν ex longinquo rem (αὐτό) ita instituentes ut plurimum vini bibere possint". Perhaps αὐτά would be meant and refer to the ποτήρια in l. 1.

ἀνεκλογ(ισ)τος: only found here and as adjective in *BUG* 183. 24 (I century A.D.). It is the compound form of the common adjective ἀλογ(ισ)τος 'incalculable' (cf. Soph. *OC* 1675, Eur. *Or.* 1569). Together with πλεῖστος it is a sort of redundancy to stress the incredible amount of wine consumed by women.

9-10. Both lines seem to be the climax of this speech. L. 8 makes reference to the theme of the oath, while the following one gives a twist to the expression: the only cup women are going to drink from is bigger than a thousand pots in a clear comic exaggeration.

This subject of the oath and the big drinking cup is similarly developed in Ar. *Lys.* 194ff.; but in the context of another kind of topic: the drinking of pure wine (cf. fr. 147).

Fr. 153

The text, as K-A point out, uses terminology that Aristophanes applies to the ways of speaking of a demagogue in *Equ.* 626 about Cleon (see also *Pherecr.* fr. 56 for other metaphors about the voice).

**ἀνέρωγε:** it gives the image of a volcano bursting forth suddenly (εὐθὺς). In the simple form, ῥηγνύναι φωνήν, it is also found (cf. *Hdt.* I 85). In *Ar. Nub.* 357, 960 it can be also related to the sound of a thunder (about it Taillardat *Images* §698).

**τὸ φῶνημ':** it is mainly found in Classical Greek in Sophocles' tragedies as meaning 'voice, utterance' (cf. *Aj.* 16, *Ph.* 1295, *Ichn.* 39) or 'speech' (*Ph.* 239, *OT* 324).

Fr. 154

It is a proverb according to Hesych. γ1004 (see also *Sud.* γ493, *Zen.* II 98 and *Diogen.* III 75). It can mean here 'to order something to someone who needs in fact no order to accomplish it'. According to *Sud. gl.cit.*, it could have the sense 'tell an unarmed man to stand on the defensive, i.e. to give orders that cannot be obeyed' (LSJ). Finally it could also suggest 'ridicule ei qui nihil habet quod custodiat' (cf. Kaibel apud K-A). From the sentence these senses can be possible. *Philem.* fr. 11 uses it as follows: γυμνῷ φυλακὴν ἐπίταττε <-> καὶ διὰ τριῶν / ποτηρίων με ματτύης εὐφραίνεται.

## Χεῖρων

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

From Antiquity doubts have risen about the authorship of this play. Athen. IX 368b already says τὸν εἰς Φερεκράτην ἀναφερόμενον (also in XIV 653e) and in VIII 363f attributes it to Νικόμαχος ὁ ῥυθμικός. The main difficulty comes from the long fr. 155 which mentions Timotheus and perhaps Philoxenus, a poet who, according to Marmor Parium A. 1.2, lived from 435 to 380. This must be the main reason to doubt about the authenticity of the authorship of Pherecrates, since he is not normally believed to have lived till such late date (cf. Geißler (1925) p. 42 and Wilamowitz *Timotheos 'Die Perser'* p. 75).

I think that the authorship of the whole passage, including ll. 26-8, can be ascribed to Pherecrates (pace Düring *Eranos* 43 (1945) p. 177 who seems to favour the view that Philoxenus was not mentioned in the play) because, on one hand, the last lines seem to follow the style and tone of the rest of the fragment (see comment ad fr. 155. 26); and, on the other, we can argue with Körte *RE* XIX.2 (1938) 1989 that "das letzte Datum, das wir für P[herekrates] besitzen, ist (s. o.) 415, aber warum soll der Dichter nicht noch oder meinetwegen 15 Jahren länger gelebt und gewirkt haben? Aristophanes hat noch 40 Jahre nach seinem ersten Dionyseinsieg sein letztes Stück geschrieben, es wäre also keineswegs auffallend, wenn P. 30 Jahre nach dem Dionysiensieg den *Chiron* verfaßt hätte".

From this point of view, this play must have been one of the last pieces composed by Pherecrates, perhaps even posthumously

performed, probably after 415, a time when Philoxenus may have been already well known in Athens. As in other plays of the end of the V century its style was probably close to that of a Middle and New Comedy and such closeness must have been one of the reasons for the Alexandrian scholars to doubt about the authenticity of the ascription.

The figure of Cheiron, the old centaur, was traditionally related to the education of Achilles and represented the traditional wisdom preserved mainly in the *Χειρῶνος ὑποθηκαί* of Hesiod (cf. Merkelbach-West *Fragmenta Hesiodica* pp. 143ff. Oxford 1977).

This element of traditional culture seems to have been parodied in the play, as far as fr. 162 can be interpreted, similarly the role of Music in fr. 155 is parallel to the importance of this genre in Achilles' education, as he is portrayed as playing the lyre in the moment that he is not fighting (cf. *Il.* 9. 186). Cratinus' *Χειρῶνες* developed a similar theme, since music seems to have played also an important role (cf. fr. 247, 248, 254, cf. K-A *PCG* IV p. 245).

Perhaps the most complete attempt at a reconstruction of the plot is that of Pianko in *Eos* 53 (1963) pp. 56-62. She suggests mainly three scenes:

- First of all, agreeing with Schmid *GGrL* I 4 p. 106, the dialogue between Mousike and Dikaiosyne in fr. 155 might be in the beginning of the play, (perhaps after the dialogue between Cheiron and Dikaiosyne).

- Secondly, p. 60 she proposes that an agon is organized

between Timotheus, representative of dithyrambic music, and "Terprando o Arione o Alcmane o ancora qualche altro autore di ditirambi" for which the items mentioned in fr. 159 and 161 would be the prizes.

- Finally a banquet (p. 61) would be the end of the play, according to fr. 157-8 and 162.

The second suggestion may be the weakest of the three. Nothing in the fragments implies that Timotheus appeared and, above all, it is unclear that he was the last poet mentioned, because Philoxenus could have been also in the list of the assailants of Music, as I have already said.

The scene of a banquet is likely; it is not only a common element in Comedy, but also would be suitable to a context where music is discussed (probably it was part of *Gerytades* of Aristophanes cf. fr. 161ff.).

It is also doubtful that the whole play was about music. As I have said, the figure of Cheiron was especially related to music, but the play may also have dealt with other themes of moral and social problems, like for instance, the education of young people, a topic which may be suggested in fr. 156.

About the character of the two speakers in fr. 155 see comment ad fr. and supra p. 47.

The long fragment quoted by [Plutarch] *De mus.* 30 p. 1141c has been often studied as it is one of the main sources for our knowledge of the 'new music' which seems to have developed throughout the V century, as a way of renovation of the traditional conception of Greek music .

It seems that the first innovations took place in the dithyrambic field; as a more panhellenic genre, it was more liable to foreign influences, and this is one of the elements that Pherecrates points out here (cf. 1.8 on Ἀττικὸς). Also it influenced tragic poets such as Agathon and Euripides (about it cf.

P. Rau *Paratragoedia* München 1967 pp. 102ff.).

Aristophanes frequently satirizes the dithyrambic poets and even parodies their new style (cf. *Ar. Av.* 209ff. and Sommerstein ad loc.), although he seems to pay attention mainly to the changes in tragedy and makes these changes the topic of some of his plays like *Thesmophoriazusa* or *Frogs*.

The two characters of this fragment seem to be personifications. Mousike at least must be a personification of the μουσική τέχνη that in Athens embraced not only what we understand as music, but also poetry and dance. Δικαιοσύνη does not only need to be a personification of Justice or Right Judgement, but also a goddess herself (cf. LSJ s.v. III) and, in my opinion, could follow the traditional image of Δίκη described in Hes. *Op.* 259 and Aesch. fr. 281aR: she was probably identified with the goddess sitting near the throne of Zeus who sent her to

the mortal beings and she inscribes their wrongs in his register (cf. also E. Fraenkel *Eranos* 52 (1954) p. 73f. = *Kl. Beiträge* I pp. 260f. Roma 1964). Perhaps it is remarkable that the playwright seems to try to make the complicated language of these two characters (a personification and a goddess) a colloquial conversation between two women about sexual affairs and at the same time to employ technical terms for music, used by sophists and musicians and applied also to Rhetoric, as D. Restani *Riv. It. di Mus.* 18 (1983) pp. 132-92 has shown.

In general the whole fragment is a priamel, an <sup>a</sup>elaborate rhetorical construction in which the elements of the speech are organized towards the highlighting of a 'subject of ultimate interest' (cf. W.H. Race *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* p. 15 Leiden 1982, see pp. 7ff. about a discussion on the general features and p. 86 about this fragment). The text is organized according to the following pattern: 1-2 introduction, typical beginning of a tragic speech, 3-5 sufferings from Melanippides and 6-7 her reaction after these sufferings; 8-12 from Cinesias, his pupil and 13 her reaction against them; 14-16 from Phrynias and 17-8 her reaction; 18-25 about Timotheus, disciple or follower of Phrynias.

We can see how, on one hand, she does not follow a perfect chronological pattern, because as Düring art.cit. p. 180 says: "to the Greeks the relation master-disciple was by far the most natural sequence". On the other, the text is organized in a contrasted explanation of her misfortunes, but in order to give variation <sup>i</sup> and vividness to this long speech, it is formulated in

parallel sequences which increase their intensity by using stronger expressions and describing the kind of sufferings (cf. ἀπολώλεχ' and διέφθορεν in l.10 and 15 respectively are nearly synonymous, but κατορώρυχε and διακέκναικ' (ε) in l.19 and 20 and in the same line αἴχιστα suppose an increase beyond the two verbs formerly cited).

The parallelism is also stressed by the structure of suffering / recovery which is found in vv.6-7, 13 and 17-18 and by the repetition of single words or expressions throughout the speech, perhaps with the intention of a pun: in l.5 she says: χαλαρωτέραν τ' ἐποίησε χορδαῖς δώδεκα, in l. 16 the terms exchange their place: ἐν πέντε χορδαῖς δώδεχ' ἄρμονίας ἔχων; to come back in l. 25 to the first point: ἀπέδυσσε κἀνέλυσε χορδαῖς δώδεκα. Whatever these words really mean, they can be understood as a way of making fun at the way these musicians tried all kind of combinations to create novelties.

The main question is still to designate which is the last and worst subject in the roll of her lovers. In our text this subject seems to be Timotheus, and perhaps Race op.cit. p.19 overstates his interpretation of this text when he suggests that l. 19 could be a parody of a passage of Timotheus *Persai* ll. 221-9 where he places himself at the end of a list of innovators in music (see comment on l.19), firstly because the elements of comparison are very flimsy and secondly because, although Music seems to be nearly dead due to her relation to him, it is not clear that he was the last poet to be quoted..

In this connection the question of lines 26ff. arises:

taking for granted that the passage belongs to Pherecrates, to whom does it refer, to Timotheus' art or that of Philoxenus? Following Bergk (cf. Meineke *FCG* II pp. 332ff.) they have been placed after l. 23 (or with a change into dative after l. 25 by Brunck; but this is less likely because the sentence of l.25 is parallel to that of l.16 which ends a passage on the author). According to Pickard-Cambridge *DTC* p. 46, "Westphal conjectures that they were accidentally omitted by the scribe, and afterwards inserted in the wrong place. and a marginal note added by someone, 'Music says this'" (Düring art.cit. p. 178, Borthwick *Hermes* 96 (1968) pp. 62-3, Edmonds *FAC* I p.164 follow his opinion). On the other hand, it is possible to think that these lines were said about Philoxenus as Kock *CAF* p. 190 and K-A, following Kaibel's commentary, suggest (see also D. Restani art.cit. p. 186 n.179). It is uncertain, above all because we know very little about the musical style of Philoxenus. From the point of view of the priamel it would be normal that the ending of this speech is Timotheus; but as we have seen, the text follows a series of contrasts which may have been overpassed by a fifth person, that is to say, Philoxenus and if in l. 19 Mrs. Music was 'buried' by Timotheus, Philoxenus may have made her look like 'cabbage' (see comment on ll.26ff.). This fifth element would be understandable within the game of contrasts towards the final misery of Mrs. Music.

The ancient concept of <sup>music</sup> included singing poetry, dancing, playing instruments, and even performing a play in the theatre. Music had an important role in education (cf. one of the first

complaints of ὁ Κρεῖττων λόγος in Ar. *Nub.* 964ff.) and in the religious life. According to W.D. Anderson *Ethos and Education in Greek Music* Cambridge Mass. 1966 p. 32: "the Greeks, whose doctrines on ethos possess a maturity and philosophical interest beyond those of all other people, kept the supposed ethical properties of music largely distinct from the therapeutic". The influence of music in human nature seems to be part of its essence. The sources for our knowledge of Classical Greek music are late, fragmentary and confusing (about them see J. Chailly *La musique grecque* pp. 19ff. Paris 1979), and also we have to take into account that the theory was based on stringed instruments, that is to say, the κίθαρα which was taught at schools.

The attacks of Pherecrates are directed against the musicians who introduced distorting elements in the rather rigid traditional system which was based on the tetrachords, similar to what nowadays is understood as the octave (cf. W.D. Anderson *op.cit.* pp. 16-7 and J. Chailly *op.cit.* pp. 25ff.). These tetrachords could be identified with the strings of the phorminx (cf. G. Abraham *The Concise Oxford History of Music* p.29 Oxford 1979), but they remained the basis of Greek music even when new strings were added to the instrument. The new musicians seem to have innovated in this field (cf. Timotheus' addition of strings, Phot. *Bibl.* 320a), but mainly in the modification of the traditional 'modes', a modern term difficult to define. According to Chailly *op.cit.* p.107 it is "l'ensemble des caractéristiques que permettent de reconnaître un type d'organisation musicale. La répartition des intervalles en est un élément très important,

mais ce n'est pas le seul. Il faut donc 'distinguer le mode et l'échelle', car celle-ci n'est que le catalogage des sons disponibles, tandis que le mode en est l'organisation structurée" and later on he says p. 108: "un 'mode' est aisément reconnaissable et acquiert une personnalité qui permet de lui attribuer un rôle social ou religieux, voir magique: d'où cette notion d'éthos (ἦθος) qui tient une su grande place dans l'«éthique» platonicienne et que connaissent à peu près toutes les musiques orientales (râgas Hindous, etc.): un mode caractérise un sentiment, une heure de la journée, une catégorie sociale, etc."

It is then understandable why the comic poets, and above all Pherecrates, and afterwards Plato condemned such a kind of music which in search of originality, of greater expressivity and resemblance to natural sounds, modified these rules, used new foreign instruments (like the trigonon, cf. Pherecr. fr. 47) and tended to give more importance to the musical element than to the words (cf. Borthwick art.cit. p. 71 and Restani art.cit. p. 154). Fr. 6, 47 and 31 are other texts which seem to deal with this subject.

The names are not in chronological order, and some elements attributed to them (for instance the number of χορδαί in ll. 5, 16 and 25, or κάμπας ποιῶν in l. 9, κάμπτων in l. 15 and κάμπων in l. 28), are general features, nearly commonplaces, applied to several musicians. In the same way in l.23 there is a reference to the 'ant-runs' with which Aristophanes qualifies Agathon's performance (cf. *Thesm.* 100). I think it is clear how the individual features can be transformed and simplified for the

sake of a joke and in fact this representation becomes a caricature. As it is, there is some kind of general truth and some elements that the audience could identify with the individuals (more details are given about those who probably were alive when this play was performed: Cinesias ll. 8ff. and Timotheus ll. 21f.) besides their names; but, otherwise, it uses in ambiguous sense, a group of technical terms probably applied to this new music and also a conservative point of view of a contemporary to this movement. On the other side there would be Agathon and Euripides and perhaps Eupolis (cf. Restani art.cit. p. 168 n.102).

1-3. These lines are very complex in the structural level and recall some beginnings of speeches in tragedy (cf. K-A's note on l. 1). As Meineke *CGF* I p. 79 suggests, fr. 168 may be well placed at the beginning.

Restani art.cit. p. 143 analyses it as follows: "litote iniziale οὐκ ἄκουσα v.1, anafora tra l'inizio dei due successivi vv.2-3, ἐμοί τε λέξαι... / ἐμοί γάρ ἦρξε, complicata da un poliptoto a partire della metà del verso iniziale, σοί τε γάρ κλύειν / ἐμοί τε λέξαι ed arricchita da un parallelismo strutturale: pronomi-coniugazione-verbo all'infinito".

This complication aims at characterizing a personage who is perhaps thought to be very important and who at least is referring continuously to herself: ἐμοί / ἔμοιγε: ll. 2, 3, 5, 13, 17, 22; με l.4, perhaps 6, 15, 19, 28.

The litotes οὐκ ἄκουσα l.1 reminds of the Homeric phrase

ἐκὼν ἀέκοντι γε θυμῷ (mentioned in 1.2), *Il.* 4.43, 7.379.

2. **Θυμὸς:** Kock suggests changing θυμὸς, the manuscripts' reading, into μῦθον (Weil-Reinach into μῦθος), but it is clearly unnecessary since the word μῦθος seems to mean in *Ar. Vesp.* 1179, *Lys.* 782, 805 and possibly *Pherecr. fr.* 102. 5, 'legend', 'story for children', and Mrs. Music is going to explain her own 'real' experiences. As K-A also point out, the sentence has very close similarities with *Soph. El.* 286: ὅσον μοι θυμὸς ἡδονὴν φέρει.

3. **Μελανιππίδης:** Melanippides of Melos "was active from about 480 onwards, and died at the court of Perdiccas in Macedonia sometime between 454 and 413" according to Pickard-Cambridge *DTC* p. 40.

The main references about him can be found in *Arist. Rhet.* III 9. 1409b 27, *Xen. Mem.* I.4.3, *Ps.-Plutarch De mus.* 30 p.1414c (the source of our fragment) and *Sud.* μ454-5 (D. Restani art.cit. p.142 n.10 gives a complete list of references and bibliography).

The features of his style and music are doubtful. He is related to the "new importance accorded to the aulos and an increase in the number of 'chordai'; in rapid succession he is categorized as 'melopoios', i.e. a lyric poet, and again, as dithyrambic poet" (cf. Anderson *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* XII p.98 London 1980, interpreting *Ps.-Plutarch loc.cit.*, although *Pickard-Cambridge loc.cit.* considers that these words "are perhaps an interpolation as they stand; but they may have some basis of fact").

In any case, he was seen as the first and one of the greatest figures among the dithyrambic poets (cf. *Xen. loc.cit.*)

and his contribution seems to have been the development of the ἀναβολαὶ (which some consider are meant here with ἀνήκε με, l. 4, and χαλαρωτέραν l. 5, cf. Restani art.cit. p. 147 and Pickard-Cambridge loc.cit.) This term is especially important, because it seems to be one of the main innovations of these poets (Düring art.cit. p.183 relates it to l.9 referred to Cinesias and Borthwick art.cit. p.66 to the movements of dance in ll. 11-12); but it is a little difficult to define (cf. Restani art.cit. pp. 147ff. about the different meanings of this word and its evolution) .

It seems that originally ἀναβολαὶ meant an instrumental prelude, part of the προοίμιον in a performance. But perhaps it was introduced progressively throughout the composition and it might allude to the dithyramb as a whole (cf. Düring art.cit. p.183); Pickard-Cambridge loc.cit., following Arist. loc.cit., considers that they were "lyric solos -at least they were probably solos- in which no antistrophic arrangement was observed". This element had influence on the music as a whole, but it seems better to keep the sense of 'prelude' (according to Chailly op.cit. p.203 and against Düring loc.cit.) and to consider the introduction of these novelties throughout a dithyramb with the name of μεταβολή (cf. comment on l.9).

4. ἀνήκε με: together with χορδή, it is perhaps the oldest technical term found here. In musical terminology it simply means 'to unstring' a bow or stringed instrument, already found in Hdt. III 22. Besides, it can be found often in Pl. *Rep.* 388e, *Ly.* 209b, Xen. *Mem.* III 10.7, etc. In relation to musical 'modes',

Arist. *Pol.* 1342b 22 ἀρμονίαι ἀνειμέναι are in opposition to σύντονοι. Aristoxenus *El. harm.* I 18 opposes it to ἐπιτείνει (cf. LSJ s.v. ἀνήμι II.7 opp. to ἐντείνω also; see Restani art.cit. p.144).

Düring p.180 and Restani loc.cit. point out that musically it is connected with χαλαρός (see on χαλαρώτερον infra). It implies an idea of effeminacy or weakness and can be also taken literally: 'he loosened her clothes' (cf. LSJ s.v. II.5).

5. χαλαρωτέραν: Plato in *Rep.* 398e explains that some "ἀρμονίαι"<sup>are</sup> "χαλαραί", that is to say, not related to the idea of manliness and discipline that built up 'character'. In musical terminology this seems to be meant here also. The text of Plato is as follows: τίνες οὖν θρηνώδες ἀρμονίαι; λέγε μοι· σὺ γὰρ μουσικός. Μιξολυδιστί, ἔφη, καὶ συντονολυδιστί καὶ τοιαῦταί τινες. Οὐκοῦν αὗται, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἀφαιρετέαι; ἄχρηστοι γὰρ καὶ γυναιξίν ἄς δεῖ ἐπιεικεῖς εἶναι, μὴ ὅτι ἀνδράσι. Πάνυ γε. Ἄλλα μὴν μέθη γε φύλαξιν ἀπρεπέστατον καὶ μαλακία καὶ ἀργία. Πῶς γὰρ οὐ; Τίνες οὖν μαλακαί τε καὶ συμποτικάι τῶν ἀρμονιῶν; Ἰαστί, ἦ δ' ὅς, καὶ λυδιστί αὖ τινες χαλαραὶ καλοῦνται.

The sexual meaning seems to be related to the loss of virginity (cf. Henderson *MM* p.177, J.N. Adams *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* London 1982 p.173 about the verb χαλάω). This verb is also used as a synonym of ἀνήμι in *h.Ap.* 6, *h.Hom.* 27.12 (cf. LSJ s.v. I).

χορδαῖς δώδεκα: χορδή in musical sense could either mean 'string' or 'note'. The latter sense allows us to keep the text of the manuscripts δώδεκα and thus it seems preferable,

following Düring's proposal art.cit. pp. 180-1. The former could be related to νεῦρον and its ambiguous sense, but it is against the evidence of the number of strings which is said to have been increased by Timotheus (cf. on l. 25).

In metaphorical level we can also establish two meanings:

- an unexpected word, instead of δωδεκαμήχανον or the twelve 'positions' of a prostitute which Ar. *Ran.* 1327 applies to a song of Euripides (see Taillardat *Images* §785 n.4 and Borthwick art.cit. p.69; cf. also Pl.com. fr. 143).

- a play on words similar to Pl.com. fr. 189.20, where νεῦρον can also mean 'membrum virile'.

6. ἀποχρῶν ἀνήρ: it is difficult to say in which 'positive' sense ἀποχρῶν (also in l.7) is used here. Its original meaning is 'to suffice, to be enough'. Perhaps it is meant that he was 'man enough' implying that he did not effeminate music totally, but kept it still within the limits of morality. Maybe less likely, it could have in the active form the sense of this verb in the passive, whose meaning is then: 'to misuse, to abuse', 'he was a man indeed, in misusing me'. Finally it can be parallel to Pl. *Alc.* II 145c: σύμβολον ἀποχρῶντα τῇ πόλει, whose best rendering is 'convenient', 'Melanippides was still a man convenient for me'. In this case it might have a moral connotation and it can also show her contempt towards the poet: she is using him in fact.

7. As Restani art.cit. p.157 has noted, this part ends with a reference to the common place 'complaint on the times' which would be expressed by πρὸς τὰ νῦν κακά.

Some words are missing from the text, but it is difficult to restore and none of the different suggestions is totally convincing (see K-A's apparatus criticus).

The structure of the sentence οὗτος μὲν in 1.6 and Κινησίας δέ in 1.8 helps to introduce the following musician who is partly identified with πρὸς τὰ νῦν κακὰ in 1.7.

8-12. Κινησίας: Cinesias was Athenian, whose father, Meles, also a musician, is criticized by Pherecr. fr. 6 (about them cf. Kirchner *PA* 8438). He is often satirized in comedy. Aristophanes makes him appear on stage on *Ar. Av.* 1372-1409 and also in *Gerytades* according to fr. 156. 8-10 and another play devoted to him, perhaps as a main character is that of *Strattis Cinesias* (cf. K-A *PCG* VII p. 631ff.; fr. 14ff.). He is mentioned in *Ar. Ecc1.* 327-30, *Ran.* 1437 (and possibly alluded<sup>to</sup> in 1.366); *Pl.com.* fr. 200. He is identified with the character in *Ar. Lys.* 838 by the Sch. ad loc., but this is doubtful since Cinesias is a common name in Athens (cf. Henderson on *Lys.* p. xli). There is an extensive bibliography about him, cf. Restani art.cit. p.157 n. 63.

He was mainly criticized because<sup>of</sup> the 'lightness' of his songs which gave no importance to the words, and because<sup>of</sup> his pretension to amuse and not to instruct people (cf. *Pl. Gorg.* 501e). He was accused of impiety against the traditional gods by *Lysias* fr. 53 Thalheim. He also took part in the political and military life of Athens as citizen (cf. *Lys.* 21. 20 who accuses him of cowardice). *IG II<sup>2</sup>* indicates that he proposed a decree in honour of Dionysius, tyrant of Syracuse. His physical appearance

was also satirized by the comic poets; he is said to be thin and tall (cf. Athen. XII 551d, Ar. *Ran.* 1437, fr. 156.11, Pl.com. loc.cit.), to have several diseases: in the lungs (Pl.com. loc.cit.), diarrhoea (Ar. *Eccl.* 330, *Ran.* 336 and Sch. ad loc., fr. 156.13), possibly jokes on his poetry and effeminacy (cf. Pl.com. fr. 200.4, <sup>which</sup> according to Henderson *MM* p.212 'seems to indicate pathic lechery'). See further Maas in *RE* XI.1 479ff.

ὁ κατάρατος Ἄττικὸς: κατάρατος is a common insult in comedy (cf. Pherecr. fr. 76.3), but also Ἄττικὸς could have had a derogatory sense according to Düring art.cit. p.183, who quotes Pl. *Legg.* I 626d.

Following Düring's idea, I would add that Ἄττικὸς was an autochthonic name used of persons born in Attica, but not Athenian citizens. It could be related to what Cinesias says of himself in Ar. *Av.* 1403: ταυτί πεπόηκας τὸν δουλοδιδάσκαλον / ὅς ταῖσι φυλαῖς περιμάχητός εἰμ' ἀεὶ, that in fact is a depreciatory statement about his fame (cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3028), as dithyrambic poet among the tribes of Attica. K-A ad loc. report two other possible inferences: "Atticum dici Cinesiam ut Melanippides Phrynidi Timotheo genere peregrinis opponatur censet Meineke; aliter Kaibel, 'quoniam fabula apud Chironem agi fingitur'", that is to say, the play or only this dialogue was set in Thessaly. If we accept that Dikaiosyne is a goddess, the dialogue could have taken place in Olympus.

9-11. The musical sense of these lines seems to be related to the introduction of ἀναβολαί through the technique of the καμπή or 'sudden turn' (see infra on καμπάς). Its introduction, as it is

stressed in our text, had a twofold influence on the musical level (cf. ἔξαρμονίους l. 9) and on the performance (cf. on l. 11 ἐν ταῖς ἀσπ(σιν)). The erotic meaning of this text is not so clear as in other parts. Henderson *MM* p.175 suggests that καμπή in Ar. *Pax* 904 is "used of a mode of sexual congress" from a hippical metaphor and thus it could be transposed into musical reference and still have an erotic sense of "bend and twist (in love making)" (cf. Henderson loc.cit.).

The reference seems to be a little flimsy and maybe it will be to go beyond the evidence to suggest that there may be another reference in τῆς ποιησέως l.9 (meaning the act of making love, cf. Henderson *MM* p.158 for ποιεῖν instead of βινεῖν). In any case the tone of the voice and the gestures must have helped in the understanding of any other meaning, even if the text does not provide with clear understated sense.

ἔξαρμονίους: only found here and in l. 26. It seems to be created in opposition to ἑναρμόνιος, which in Ancient theory of music was one of the γένη, (opposed to διατόνον and χρωματικόν) that can be defined in words of Chailley op.cit. p.205 "classification des systèmes musicaux en fonction des intervalles que composent les tétracordes". About this hapax and other parallel words like ἔξωρος, ἔξυπνος, etc., cf. Düring art.cit. p.185.

In relation to the καμπαί it makes a reference to another innovation in the musical field: the μεταβολή, defined by Chailley op.cit. p.211 as "passage d'une catégorie musicale (genre, système, etc.) dans une autre, analogue à la 'modulation'

de la musique classique".

**καμπάς:** 'turn, sudden change' (LSJ s.v. III 1). This word seems to be an example of the novelties introduced in the musical terminology by this new school (cf. Timoth. fr. 802PMG about his master Phrynis τὸν ἰωνοκάμπταν), and perhaps for this reason it is frequently used by the comic poets in relation to all of them in nominal or verbal form (cf. κάμπτων l. 15).

It seems to have come from a metaphor about 'horse-races', as καμπή also means the 'turning point in a race-course'. Perhaps the most thorough explanation is that of Restani art.cit. pp. 158ff.

Καμπή, κάμπτων, κατακάμπτω are found in Ar. *Nub.* 178, 331-334 (about it cf. Borthwick art.cit. p.72), 969ff., *Thesm.* 55, 68, 93 and seem to imply a 'swirling' musical movement, but as it occurs often in comedy, "tale linguaggio allusivo, che dimostra quanto il pubblico fosse in grado di comprendere l'oggetto dei lazzi e delle 'pointes' beffarde, risulta oggi un ostacolo difficilmente superabile, per definire esattamente la pratica musicale delle καμπά", Restani art.cit. p. 161.

She finds two ways of interpreting it (p. 158):

a) "la prima fa riferimento ai vocalizzi canori ed ai simili virtuosimi strumentali", interpretation of Taillardat §784 (also Lasserre in his edition of Ps-Plutarch *De Musica* p. 145, cf. Restani art.cit. p. 158 n. 66).

b) "la seconda -a cui anche noi ci accostiamo- spiega il termine come una variante minore e più rapida di 'metabolé'" which is understood according to Chailly's definition above

quoted.

She suggests, p. 161, that it is "un esercizio musicale non conforme alle regole dell'antica 'techne', realizzabile soltanto con strumenti più complessi di quelli in uso fino allora", In her opinion, thus, these words refer to the instrumental element of music which was "la caratteristica più vistosa della 'nuova' scuola" (Restani loc.cit.). The new instruments gave more freedom of expression to the musician who, at the same time, had become professional and, thus, dominated the technical difficulties of an instrument (Restani p.162). She seems to consider that the term *καμπή* denominates later "alle inflessione vocali e canore dell'imperatore Nerone, paradigma per gli antichi, di effeminatezza e futilità" which influenced the interpretation of this word used in Classical Greek.

For the understanding of our fragment I would like to draw attention to a point she leaves a little marginal: the influence on the dance (cf. p.161 n.76); because it could be also one of the most outstanding issues of the new music for an Athenian audience. It seems that Pherecrates understood it this way, insofar as one of the first criticisms is directed towards this feature. Following Borthwick's interpretation of ll. 10-12, I think that here Pherecrates seems to criticize the influence in the chorus' dances and above all one of the most important for its military character on a child's education: the Pyrrhic dance (about it see also Borthwick *Hermes* 98 (1970) pp. 318ff.). Line 9 could refer to the level of composition, but *τῆς ποιήσεως* in l.10 can be understood above all as 'performance' and in the ll. 11-20

the stress is put on the chorus's confusion in the στροφαῖς (1.9), the change of direction in the strophic/antistrophic organization of the poem (cf. Borthwick *Hermes* 96 (1968) p.66). The main point is the interpretation of ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσιν 1.11 Borthwick art.cit.p.65 suggests the Pyrrhic dance's reference; Zieliński *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie* p. 267 n. 2 Leipzig 1885, followed by Düring art.cit. pp. 185-6 understands it as a mirror where right and left are confused.

14. Φρύνις: from Mytilene, son of Kamon, was mainly a citharoede, master of Timotheus or at least predecessor of his music (cf. Arist. *Met.* a I p.993b 15). Ar. *Nub.* 971 (as well as Timoth. fr.802 *PMG*) relates him to the use of the χαμπή (Pherecr. fr. 155.15). The Sch. ad *Nub.* 971a tells us that he won the prize at the Panathenaia in the archonship of Callias whom Dover ad loc. identifies with the archon of the year 456-5, although some prefer to change it into the date 446 (cf. Webster's note in Pickard-Cambridge *DTC* p. 43 n. 4). Other references to him are Sud. φ 761, Procl. *Chrest.* 320a 33 (cf. W. Riemschneider *RE* XX 923, Pickard-Cambridge *DTC* p. 43).

στρόβιλον ἐμβαλῶν: about this expression see Borthwick art.cit. pp. 67-8. Again it is an obscene-musical term. Originally it refers to 'the whirling top/ shaft' and then it became to designate a 'pirouette' and to refer to "an innovation in the dithyrambic ἀγωγή, melodic, rhythmic and orchestric, and to an irregular rotary motion, which disturbed the prevailing pattern of the κύκλιος χορός with a violent whirling" (cf. Ar. *Pax* 865, Athen. XIV 630a, Henderson *MM* p.124 and Taillardat

*Images* §792). Its erotic sense is identified with the phallus in Henderson *MM* p. 170 who infers it also from the sexual connotations of the verb ἐμβάλων.

I think it is interesting to note that Pherecrates is again referring to the performing part of a dithyramb and especially to the dance which Borthwick art.cit. p.68 identifies with the τυρβασ(α (cf. Hesych. s.v. and also s.v. τύρβη).

15. στρέφων: musically related to στροφή, cf. 1.9. This word and στρόβιλον could be also taken from spinning-women's terminology: στρόβιλον can mean 'spinnin<sup>n</sup>g-top' (LSJ s.v.2) and στρέφω 'to spin' (LSJ s.v. IV). It would be appropriate to a woman's language: in an ambiguous sense it can also be found in Ar. *Lys.* 839 and Henderson's note relates it to Amphis fr.20 and Anacreon 417. 4 *PMG*, although in this text it is a metaphor that belongs to the equine world (see also ἐμβάλοιμι v.3).

16. There have been many attempts to change this line, above all the word πέντε which is not easy to explain (see Restani op.cit. p. 165 and n. 89-90). Ἄρμον(ας δώδεκα could be a play on words with the 'twelve positions' above mentioned on l. 5 (cf. Borthwick art.cit. p. 69). According also to Borthwick p.69 n.1, πέντε could be a "round number" to indicate 'few' and he suggests that this line "doubtless refers (even if imprecisely), to the elaborate fingerings of this master of modulations". J. Chailley *Acta Musicologica* XXVIII (1956) p.150, quoted by Restani art.cit. p. 165 n. 90, considers it "une exagération comique" and translates it "il a mis douze échelles de 7 notes (ἄρμον(ας) dans des intervalles d'une quinte".

19. ὁ δὲ Τιμόθεος: he lived between 450 and 360 approximately; as I have already mentioned, he was considered a disciple of Phrynis (cf. also Phot. *Bibl.* 320a), but Timotheus attacked him (fr. 802 *PMG*) and considered himself as perhaps the greatest innovator of contemporary music (fr. 796 *PMG*). Maybe for these reasons, Pherecrates qualifies him as one of the most important corruptors of the traditional Music. In some stories he is related to Euripides who is said to have written the prologue for *Persai*, a nome (in the form of a dithyramb) which has survived in a long fragment in a papyrus (cf. Satyrus *Vit. Eur.* fr.39; for the nome see fr. 788 ff. *PMG*).

Race op.cit. p.86 suggests that this passage is a parody of *Persai* fr. 791.29 which after mentioning Orpheus and Terpander goes on to say: νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις / ῥυθμοῖς τ' ἔνδεκακρουμάτοις / κίθαριν ἔξανατέλλει, / θησαυρὸν πολύυμνον οἴ- / ξας Μουσᾶν θαλαμειτόν· / Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νιν ἄ / θρέψασ' ἄ δυωδεκατειχέος / λαοῦ πρωτέος ἐξ Ἀχαιῶν. But his assertion, though interesting, seems to be very weak (see supra).

References and bibliography about Timotheus can be found in Restani art.cit. p.177 n.143.

κατορύχε / καὶ διακέκναικ': both expressions of the extreme ill-treatment caused to Music by him. The first one "to bury", as Borthwick says art.cit. p. 69, "besides being used κακεμφάτως (as in *Pax* 898; *Av.* 442; cf. *Nub.* 714), effects a transition to the joke about his ἐκτράπελοι μυρμηκίαι" (about its sexual implications -maybe referring to homosexual congress-, cf. *Ar. Av.* 442 and Henderson *MM* p. 168). The second one 'to wear out

totally' is frequently in Euripides expressing lyrically extreme suffering (cf. *Med.* 164, *Alc.* 109, *IA* 27, *Heracl.* 296). Borthwick loc.cit. relates it to ἀνακνᾶν, Ar.fr.37; διακνα(ειν is also found in Ar. fr. 926, *Stratt.* fr. 1 where it means as in Ar. *Ran.* 1228 'to kill a character of a part of a play by acting badly' (cf. LSJ s.v. and Ussher's note on Ar. *Eccl.* 975).

20. ποῖος: Headlam on *Herond.* 6. 48: 'it asks for further description'. In a poet who claims to be very important (cf. *Timotheus* fr. 791. 29) this is nearly an insult.

οὔτιος: οὔτιος is also found with ποῖος in Ar. *Ach.* 963 and in *Thesm.* 29ff.; but on its own it is a normal way to address someone (cf. fr. 142.1). The deictic suffix generally indicates that something or someone is pointed out. It could imply that he is on stage (as Pianko *Eos* LIII (1963) p.62 suggests) or amongst the audience; but it could also mean that he has just been mentioned.

21. πυρραῖας: 'red-haired, prop. of red-haired slaves from Thrace' (LSJ s.v.). It is another word that shows her contempt towards the poet (see Ar. *Ran.* 730).

23. ἄγων ἐκτραπέλους μυρμηκιάς: the expression is parallel to ἄγειν ὄδον and as Renehan *St. Gr. Texts* p. 89 says, "the root in ἐκτραπέλους determined the choice of the verb".

It makes reference to a common sentence frequently applied to this kind of music: the comparison to an ant-path. Such image had already been used by Pherecrates in fr.31 and also found in Ar. *Nub.* 1003 and *Thesm.* 100, for further references see K-A ad loc., Borthwick p. 69 and Restani p. 178. Other compounds as

εὐτράπελος (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 469) are similarly used to qualify speech meaning 'dexterous' and ἔκτραπέλους seems to be another rhetorical and musical term that is particularly connected to the use of the μεταβολή or 'wriggling chromatic tunes' (cf. Borthwick loc.cit.), especially frequent in Timotheus (cf. Restani p. 166).

24. This line seems to refer to 'solo' compositions, in opposition to the choral ones and in this way it stresses the importance of the performance of the poem, in contrast with the rest of the speech where a chorus performance should be understood instead.

25. ἀπέδουσε κἀνέλυσε: the presence of two compounds of the same verb: ἀπέλυσε κἀνέλυσε in the manuscripts has been considered suspect. These are three main suggestions:

- K-A accept the proposal of Wyttenbach to change the first verb into ἀπέδουσε, while they keep the second κἀνέλυσε and agree then with Meineke, Kock, Düring and Edmonds.

- Borthwick art. cit. p. 73 has the contrary opinion: "Wyttenbach's much-accepted ἀπέδουσε for the former verb should be rejected- it has no musical meaning, whereas ἀνέλυσε is not only appropriate to the theme of the personal outrage, but also alludes to the Timothean lyric style and its technical vocabulary - ἀπολελύμενα δὲ ἃ εἶκῃ γέγραπται καὶ ἄνευ μέτρου ὀρισμένου· οἷόν εἰσι οἱ νόμοι κιθαρωδικοὶ Τιμοθέου (Heph. Poem. 5)". His opinion is that the second verb is suspect and he suggests ἀνέτρησε instead.

- Restani art.cit. p. 185 keeps the text and translates κἀνέλυσε as 'mi desarticolò' p. 191 and n. 200.

In my opinion to keep the manuscripts' reading could give a good sense; ἀπέλυσε has clear musical resonances, as Borthwick points out, and at the same time the verb λύω and its compounds are synonymous with χαλάω (cf. on χαλαρώτεραν l. 5; cf. Borthwick art.cit. p. 73 n.2). In the case of the second verb, ἀνέλυσε, perhaps we could keep it, if we understand it as a dramatic intensification which is also stressed by the preverb ἀνα- (cf. LSJ s.v. F 3) and, in its sexual sense, it keeps an analogy with ἀνήκε in l.4, connected also with χαλαρώτεραν, as I have already pointed out. Although it does not have a clear musical reference, still Pi. N. X 90 uses it in connexion with φωνάν. About variation of prefix in one repeated verb, cf. Ar. fr. 708. *Lys.* 1279, *Thesm.* 284.

χορδαῖς δώδεκα: as in the other cases, it has been object of many changes, probably unnecessary. Timotheus was famous for his changes in the number of strings (cf. Nicom. *Harm.* 2.35 Mab., as he himself says in fr. 721. 229 *PMG*).

26-8. As I have pointed out in the introductory note on this fragment, there are different ways of placing and understanding these three lines: placing them after l.23 as a reference to Timotheus and in this case they will deal probably with his choral songs, while the following lines 24ff. (according to the edition of K-A) will deal with the 'solo-songs' or 'nomes' he composed, and at least *Persai* would an example (fr. 491 *PMG*).

I am inclined to think that Philoxenus was mentioned here for two reasons:

a) Timotheus was especially famous because τοὺς γοῶν πρώτους

νόμους ἐν ἔπεσι διαμιγνύων διθυραμβικὴν λέξιν ἦδεν, ὅπως μὴ εὐθὺς φανῆ παρανομῶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν μουσικὴν, Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* IV 1132e; that is to say, he wrote nomos in the style of dithyrambs, mainly choral songs, and the *Persai* is clearly one of them.

b) Philoxenus is accused by Ar. fr. 953 that εἰς τοὺς κυκλίους χορούς \* \* \* μέλη εἰσηνέγκατο. A feature contrary to what we have just described in Timotheus; Philoxenus introduced songs, solo-songs in chorus and the poem *Κύκλωψ ἢ Γαλάτεια* (cf. Philox. Cyth. fr. 815ff. *PMG*) seems to have staged the Cyclops in costume and playing the kithara, and was parodied by Ar. *Pl.* 290ff., according to the Sch. ad loc. (about it cf. Pickard-Cambridge *DTC* pp. 45-6, above all Webster's notes). As we have already seen, what seems to be mostly criticized throughout this fragment is modifications in music which affected directly the dance and the chorus. Probably Pherecrates may be stressing in fact the important educational and moral role of the chorus in Athenian society (as *Pl. Legg.* 653a ff.). This confusion made by Philoxenus would be even worse for our, nearly dead, Mrs. Music. Perhaps what is left out in connexion with the v. 26 was something like χορούς, mentioned in the text of our source, or related to it (maybe κάμπα, often mentioned with an ambiguous sense, cf. l. 9).

Philoxenus lived arround 436-379. He was born in Cythera. The main problem about him and his work is that he was confused with Philoxenus of Leucas (see D.F. Sutton *Dithyrambographi Graeci* p.70 Hildesheim 1989). The main sources about him are *Suda* φ393 and *Athen.* I 6e-7a. He is cited by Aristot. *Poet.* 48a

15 and parodied in Ar. loc.cit. (see Sch. ad loc. and Sch. ad Theocr. 6 where see also Gow's comment). Cf. Pickard-Cambridge *DTC* pp. 45ff., R. Keydell *Kl.P.* VI 786.

Accordingly, I will understand something related to the chorus' new influences in the form of νιγλαροί as it is said in l. 27 and some other elements which are missing from our quotation.

The sense of the comparison is doubtful. It is related to the reading of the word κάμπτων in the manuscripts or κάμπδν, as Elmsley ad Ar. *Ach.* 554 suggested (cf. K-A's app.crit.). Borthwick art.cit. p.71 supports the change which "must be right in order to pun on the musical term [κάμπη] and on κάμπη caterpillar" and connects it to the image of the "winding galleries of the μυρμιχ(α)". On the other hand, Restani art.cit. p. 190 keeps the reading of the manuscripts "sia perché *lectio codicum*, sia per l'analogia stilistica con il v. 15, ricordando che nell' intero frammento 145K sono frequenti le ricorrenze stilistiche e, perfino, lessicali" and suggests the comparison to be a "metafora gastronomica".

In the context of the verb κατεμέστωσε (a hapax, probably an expressive form with the air of an exaggeration), I would think that the genitive is necessary. It has been related to Aristoph. fr.10.4 which shows that 'caterpillars' were commonly related to vegetables and it was commonly believed that these insects were born from them, especially the 'cabbage' (cf. Davies-Kathirithamby *Gr. Insects* p. 102).

Yet it is certainly inconclusive and maybe if we understand

that the word *καμπός* is missing from the beginning of the citation, the verb *καμπών* could be kept with an internal accusative qualified by the series of adjectives in these lines and then a form in genitive is missing from our text.

26. *ἐξαρμονίους*: see on l. 9.

*ὑπερβολαίους*: in musical terminology it can be related to the later name given to the "highest note in the two-octave scale" (cf. LSJ s.v. *ὑπερβολαῖος* and see also Chailly op.cit. p.217).

27. *νιγλαροῦς*: references about it, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 554 and Sch. ad loc., Eup. fr. 121, Phryn.com. fr. 74.1 (conjecture). Restani art.cit. pp. 186ff. relates it to *τερπειζῶ*, word considered synonymous by the lexicographers (cf. Poll. IV 83, Hesych. v560) and analyzes the different possible meanings and consequences at a musical level. She concludes that "l'esecuzione di *νίγλαροι* veniva pertanto a proporre i due moduli più 'rivoluzionari' de questa nuova suola: la ricerca di maggiore libertà espressiva, contro le forme stereotipate de certa musica 'arcaica', ed un impiego della 'mimesis', intesa come riproduzione de suoni o di versi di animali o di rumori vari. Ne risultava sminuita l'importanza del testo nei confronti della musica e si ricercava una maggiore professionalità esecutiva e virtuosistica, con relativo sviluppo della specializzazione. D'altra parte, però il testo del 'libretto si svoutava di significato ed, a volte, cadeva nel ridicolo e nel grottesco" (pp. 188-9).

*ῥαφάνους*: 'cabbage' is Attic for *κραμβή* (LSJ s.v. *ῥαφανός*), as I mentioned, it appears often as a place where the caterpillars

mentioned as a cure for the hang-over (cf. Eub. fr. 124, Nicoch. fr. 18, Alex. fr. 287).

#### Fr. 156

This fragment deals with a commonplace in Greek Literature: the relationship between age and experience. There are many passages that develop it in a similar way to our case and, above all, make reference to the sentence of l. 4 (see comment ad loc.). It is clear that youth was seen as a stage of inexperience and ignorance and to be wise, to be sensible ( $\phi\rho\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  related, in this case, to  $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ ) was a symbol of old age, maturity.

About this theme see Dover *Pop. Mor.* pp. 102ff. , also B.E. Richardson *Old age among the ancient Greeks* pp. 16ff. New York 1969, Kirk *Eranos-Jb* 40 (1971) p. 123 and 142, M. Reinhold *PAPhS* 114 (1970) p. 34.

Perhaps this process of sensibility which is described in our passage could be compared with a passage of 'madness' in Ar. *Nub.* 814ff. In this case, the old man is showing signs of madness and this is expressed in physical terms (cf. l. 831-2 and Dover's note to 832), but also with similar words to express his mental state. For instance  $\acute{\omicron}\kappa\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \phi\rho\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  in l. 817 (the son Pheidippides to his father Strepsiades); l. 821 (Strepsiades accuses his son of  $\phi\rho\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\iota\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ ), and Pheidippides utters in l. 844  $\tau\acute{\iota}\ \delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\phi\rho\nu\omicron\nu\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\delta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ; (see l. 4 in Pherecrates' text). Also  $\tau\eta\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\acute{\omicron}$  in l. 819 is used in contrary way to our text, father to the young boy and  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\upsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , l. 820, is used by the 'youthful' father (cf. l. 5). Similarly l. 5 could refer to the

way of thinking of a young person in contrast with the φρονεῖν which must be the proper way of thinking of a 'mature' old man. In a parallel scene, ll. 1451ff., Strepsiades seems to recover from his madness, (see further R.K. Fisher *Aristophanes' "Clouds". Purpose and Technique* P. 187-8 Amsterdam 1984).

It is difficult to know the exact nature of this text, but I would suggest two possibilities: it is part of a speech between two characters (ἐπήραξ l.1 in second person singular), where in a moment the speaker addresses the chorus or the audience (cf. ὦνδρες l.3), or it can be a monologue in which the character refers first to an absent personage (as in *Men. Dys.* 639) or to an object (as in *Ar. Eccl.* 1ff.), a god, his 'heart' or something similar and then turns to the chorus or the audience (probably it is indifferent, cf. D. Bain *Actors and Audience* p. 192 Oxford 1974), explaining his ideas or what has just occurred to him or even presenting himself, maybe as in *Phryn.com.* fr. 19 or *Ar. Ach.* 1ff. as part of the prologue.

1. ἐπήραξ: similar passages of the verb ἐπαίρω referring to an old man are found in *Ar. Nub.* 42, 809 and 1457. About this verb's tense, aorist or imperfect cf. Dover ad *Nub.* 42.

2. A similar expression is found in Aristophanes with the compound εἰσχυλίνδειν in *Eccl.* 651 and 767, as Taillardat *Images* 8558 says: "il est clair que, dans ce cas, εἰσχυλίνδειν, n'est qu'un synonyme expressif de ἐμβάλλειν (p.ex. ἐμβάλλειν τινὰ εἰς συμφορᾶς, Antiphon 3,4,10; εἰς ἀτυχίας, Esch. 3,79; εἰς κακὸν, *Ar. Nuées*, 1460)" and other passages he quotes are Apollod.

Caryst. 5. 7 and Xen. *Mem.* I 2.22.

The original meaning of the verb κυλίνδω is "to roll" and, in the same way as our passage, it can be found in other contexts with a metaphorical sense: μετακυλίνδειν in *Ran.* 53 (cf. Taillardat *ibid.* §39 referring to the 'voyage de la vie'), and related to χωρεῖ τὸ πρᾶγμα in a political sense (cf. Taillardat *Images* §671 on *Ecc1.* 208).

3. ὄνδρες: about the different possibilities to address audience and chorus, see *supra*.

ἦν: the first person ἦν for the imperfect of εἶμι, instead of ἦ (by assimilation with the third person probably; cf. 1.5) was a common interchangeable expression that in our texts become more frequent towards the end of the V century (cf. Barrett on *Eur. H1.* 700).

4. ἐδόκουν μὲν ἐφρόνουν δ' οὐδέν: the sententious phrase can be interpreted in two ways: first of all, Kock *ad loc.* suggests a more likely interpretation (see K-A's comment) : "ἐδόκουν *mihi videbar* φρονεῖν δηλονότι.", that is to say, "I seemed [to myself] to be wise, but I was not". Secondly, another interpretation is that the verb δοκεῖν could be understood in absolute sense "to have an opinion" and φρονεῖν as M. Pope *JHS* 94 (1974) p.108 says: "there is no doubt that in the later fifth century the word φρονεῖν could be used by itself to imply being wise".

The concept of being wise is described by *Soph. Aj.* 554-5 in terms slightly different from our understanding: ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν ἡδιστος βίος / ἕως τὸ χαίρειν καὶ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι μάθης. This sententious phrase implies that in *Sophocles* "φρονεῖν

clearly embraces the ability to experience joy and sorrow as well" according to M. Pope loc. cit. The same ideas are expressed in Aesch. *Prom.* 443-4 and 447-450 and Pl. *Legg.* 888c.

The character here only says commonplaces in the context of very general and formal expressions like ἐγκυλίσαι l. 2, κατὰ χειρὸς, l. 5 and κατὰ μέτρον l. 7.

5. κατὰ χειρὸς: this expression is equivalent to the English sentence: "ready to hand" and seems to recall the image of a banquet where ὕδωρ κατὰ χειρὸς was usually poured before the beginning (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1216, Av. 403, fr. 516, Eup. fr. 320) and at the end (which was called more exactly ἀπονίζεσθαι according to Orus fr. B37). A similar use of this expression is found in Telecl. fr. 1.2.

This implicit reference to a banquet is suitable to these lines where he explains his youth.

ἐνθυμουμένω: in contrast with φρονεῖν. It seems to imply 'intuition' although it means already a step towards the final 'maturity' explained in the following lines.

6. νῦν δ' ἄρτι: this expression seems to have been common to designate the 'sudden realization of a truth' as Henderson ad Ar. *Lys.* 1008 says. The verb μανθάνω is said by Prisc. *Ins. gramm.* XVIII 242 (quoted by K-A ad loc.) as being understood in an elliptic way; but the sentence seems to stand by itself as an exclamation.

ἐντιθησι νοῦν: this is the only instance of ἐντιθημι with νοῦν (cf. LSJ s.v. ἐντιθημι 2b), but other examples with similar sense can be found in Pl. *Leg.* 800c (ἀθυμ(αν) and Thgn. 429ff.

which is worth quoting for the resemblance of its content: φύσαι  
καὶ θρέψαι ῥᾶνον βροτὸν, ἢ φρένας ἐσθλὰς / ἔθ<sup>ν</sup>έμεν· οὐδεὶς πω τοῦτό  
γ' ἐπεφράσατο, / ᾗ τις σώφρον' ἔθηκε τὸν ἄφρονα κάκ κακοῦ ἐσθλόν.

Here we have an expressive phrase, very similar to a  
commoner idiom ἔχειν νοῦν (cf. LSJ s.v. νόος 2a). The fact of  
"having νοῦν" or intelligence, as it could be translated, was  
regarded as special and, for example, was seen as rare among  
young people and women, cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1124 and Henderson's note ad  
loc.

7. This line has a gnomic appearance, although it has not been  
transmitted in the corpus of paroemiographers (cf. K-A's comment  
ad loc. for other instances). The main problem is that we do not  
know with certitude if it belongs to this fragment or not, since  
it was added by Jacobi (cf. K-A's app.crit. ad loc.).

The addition, however, makes sense within the context of the  
fragment in which the character expresses himself with a number  
of gnomic phrases and can be also parallel to other fragments  
with similar metaphors, like Pherecr. fr. 43. 3 and 76.5, it does  
not necessarily follow that he had to use this metaphor taken  
from the world of the spinners, a feminine one, par excellence.

As D. Müller *Handwerk und Sprache* p.214 says, «'ich Überlege  
die Dinge entsprechend dem Aufzug, Faden für Faden' ist wohl vom  
Anbringen der Kettenfäden am oberen Querbalken des Webstuhls  
genommen, wobei Faden nach Faden mit großer Genauigkeit in  
gleichen Abständen befestigt werden mußte, ein für bedächtige  
Gewissenhaftigkeit sehr geeignetes Bild».

The content of the whole fragment is uncertain . Metrically the line is iambic, but there is one foot missing and the last line is corrupted, so it is difficult to know the exact sense of the comparison of the παροψίδες. The text can be part of a dialogue and the speaker seems to answer positively (νή τὸν Δί' is always affirmative cf. LSJ s.v. νή, in comparison with μά which can be either way).

In the first line there is a word missing and the solutions have been quite varied but since the sense of the two lines is complete none of the emendations are definitive. After Δί' Kaibel suggests <οὔτοι γ'> and interprets it as a comparison with 'parasites' and Gulick seems to agree when saying on p. 167 n. 1 that "it seems to compare parasites with sauces, whose quality is determined solely by their piquancy"; Peppink *Obs.* p.55 apud K-A suggests <ὀρθός> and Edmonds *FAC I* p.266 <ᾧνερ>. After ᾧπερ Meineke *Anal. Ath.* p. 162 suggests ᾧπερὲι γάρ.

1. αἱ παροψίδες: here according to our source (Athen. IX 368b) it seems to designate 'sauces or seasonings' which were usually served in a vessel that probably for antonomasia is also called in other texts παροψίς. It can also designate 'dainty dish' or 'sweet' (cf. also παροψήμα LSJ s.v.), but here the word ἡδυσμάτων seems to point at the first sense given by Athen. loc.cit. 'the sauces have their reputation (name) according to the seasoning (they are formed)', while another possibility is 'the side-dishes have their reputation according to the seasonings'. Pottier *D-S*

4.1 p. 337 describes it as follows: "vase ou plate creux dans lequel on mettait les légumes, ragoûts, et autres aliments que l'on préparait pour le repas; le même mot pouvait, d'ailleurs, désigner aussi la nourriture contenue dans ce récipient. La forme en devait donc être analogue à celle de *catinum*, *discus* et *lanx*. Il est assimilé par les lexicographes au *tryblion*, plat à ragoût; mais il serait de dimensions plus grandes. Letronne en concluit qu'un très grand τρύβλιον se confondait avec la παροψίς. D'autre part, il servait aux assaisonnements (ἡδύσματα), ce qui le rapprocherait de la catégorie des saucières [ACETABULUM]".

In comic fragments they are usually found as elements of comparison (cf. Ar. fr. 191, Pl.com. fr. 190) or in metaphorical sense (cf. Magn. fr. 1 and Sot.com. fr. 3) In both cases they are related to something that is secondary but still good. Perhaps it is best exemplified by Pl.com. loc.cit.: τὰ δ' ἀλλότρι' ἐσθ' ὅμοια ταῖς παροψίσι / βραχὺ γὰρ <τι> τέρψαντ' ἐξανήλωται ταχύ. They are also related to women and their cooking and eating customs (cf. Ar. fr.cit., Pl.com. fr.43 and παροψωνοῦσιν in Ar. *Ecc1.* 226).

2. τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχουσ': according to Casaubon *Animadv.* p.639.32, as quoted by K-A, "αἰτίαν ἔχειν Graecis significat nonnumquam idem ac 'dici', 'nominari' et κατηγορεῖσθαι". Yet, although the former seems to be the most likely sense here, in Aristophanes and in Classical Attic in general, the latter meaning κατηγορεῖσθαι "to be accused of" is more commonly found in connexion with legal terminology (cf. *Vesp.* 506 and similarly *Pax* 640 and *Ran.* 691). The first one is mainly found with the sense

of "to be reputed of" in Aesch. *Th.* 4 in poetical sense and in Plato (e.g. *Grg.* 503b, *Rep.* 435e) and later writers (cf. LSJ s.v. I 3).

τῶν ἡδυσμάτων: 'relish, seasoning, sauce' (LSJ s.v.). According to Pottier *D-S* I 1438 "les quatre éléments ordinaires d'un assaisonnement sont le vinaigre, l'huile, le sel et le poivre'. A list of them can be found in Alex. fr. 132 (cf. Athen. IV 170a).

3. This line is corrupted. There are many suggestions but in fact two main ways of understanding it:

- following the comparison of the παροψίδες, as a reference to the fact that the παροψίδες are known ἀπὸ τῶν ἡδυσμάτων. The main change is καλεῖταις into καλέσας which may be interpreted as the one who calls (the παροψίδες in that way; cf. Meineke's proposal ἄς apud K-A) or the one who invites to a party, the host.

In this sense, Kaibel suggests αὐτοῦς δ'ὁ καλέσας ἀξιοῖ, and, except for the fact that <sup>this</sup> involves many changes, it is an interesting suggestion. His text would be as follows: νῆ τὸν Δί' οὔτοι γ' ὥσπερ αἱ παροψίδες / τὴν αἵταν ἔχουσ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἡδυσμάτων, / αὐτοῦς δ' ὁ καλέσας ἀξιοῖ τοῦ μηδενός. Following the change into οὔτοι in l. 1 Fritzsche 1844/41 p. 14 suggests οὔς ὁ καλέσας ἐπαξιοῖ.

In Kaibel's text οὔτοι (later αὐτοῦς) were the parasites who are compared with the παροψίδες (possibly as lovers are compared with them in Ar. fr. 191) and ὁ καλέσας as the host who has invited them, cf. also Gulick in his edition of Athen. vol. IV p.

167.

- another interpretation is that of Kock. He follows the conjecture of Herw. *Obs. crit.* 17: οὕτω τὸ κάλλος ἀξιῶ. As he says 'pulcritudo per se sola nullius pretii est, nisi accedant boni mores, sicuti παροψίδες de natura condimentorum additorum bonae prauaeue habentur' and he invents another line (cf. K-A's app. crit.). In the same sense it is understood by Edmonds *FAC I* p. 266 who suggests ὁ καλὸν ἐκάλλεσας ἀξιῶ.

#### Fr. 158

The common element of this enumeration is that they are all food, but still it is difficult to determine in which context they were said together. Line 1 is clearly a group of fruits. As in other cases the enumeration is emphasized by the use of polysyndeton with καί.

It could be part of a description either of a banquet or of a shopping list or scene. Above all μήλα, μιμάκιυλα, μύρτα and σέλινα are usually related to extraordinary food sometimes in the Underworld or in a fantastic land (cf. Cratin. fr. 363, 116, Eup. fr. 13) and they have in comedy a secondary erotic meaning. From this point of view, although there is no reference to an erotical meaning of ἀμυγδάλας, μύελον or ἐξ οἴνου βότρυς, at least the other words certainly could be taken metaphorically as a reference to different parts of a woman's body from breasts to pubis in an ambiguous context.

1. **ἀμυγδάλας:** or almonds are not often found in the texts of comedy, but mainly related to the difficulty of being broken and similar jokes (cf. Ar. fr. 605, especially those coming from Naxos Phryn.com. fr. 70, Eup. fr. 271.1). According to Athen. II 52c they seem to have been eaten mainly while drinking wine and probably they were considered a kind of τραγήματα or sweets that accompanied the drinking (cf. Pherecr. fr. 73, Diph. fr. 80 enumerates them as one of these τραγήματα: τράγημα, μυρτίδες, πλακοῦς, ἀμύγδαλα). For the different medical usages see Athen. loc.cit.

**μήλα καὶ μιμα(κυ)λα:** two different kinds of fruit: apple and, according to LSJ s.v. 'fruit of the κόμαρος' or strawberry-tree, arbutus, that is to say, arbutus-berry, cf. Athen. II 50f.

Μήλα is frequently attested in Aristophanes, e.g. *Vesp.* 1057, 1268, *Nub.* 978, 997, *Pax* 1001, *Lys.* 856, *Eccl.* 903, fr. 625; μιμα(κυ)λα is found in *Crat.com.* fr. 40, *Amphis* fr. 38, *Theop.com.* fr. 68.

It is important that they are together, because they are usually related in Comedy to an erotical sense the 'apples' referring to a girl's breasts, while the berries, to the nipples. Perhaps the most explicit text parallel to this is *Crat.com.* fr. 43, πάνυ γάρ ἐστὶν ὀρικώτατα / τὰ τιθεῖ' ὥσπερ μήλον ἢ μιμα(κυ)λον; cf. also Ar. *Ach.* 1199 (to where fr.924K is ascribed by K-A).

2. **μύρτα:** or myrtle-berry, another common fruit of comic texts, is found in Ar. *Av.* 160, 1100, *Theop. com.* fr. cit., *Antiph.* fr. 177.4, *Phoenicid.* fr. 2.1, *Eub.* fr. 74. In other texts as in Ar.

*Lys*, 632 and 1004 and *Pl.com. fr.* 188.14 it has clear erotic connotations and seems to refer to the 'pudenda mul<sup>i</sup>ebria' (about it cf. Taillardat *Images* S112 and Henderson *MM* pp. 134-5).

About the plant μύρτος see Lembach (1970) pp. 125ff.

σέλινον: 'wild celery', 'Apium graveolens', also called smallage or ache (cf. A.C. Andrews *CIPh* 44 (1949) pp. 91ff.). It is found scattered throughout Greek Literature, mainly related to two elements:

- to fabulous descriptions of meadows, e.g. *Il.* 2. 776 and together with violets in *Od.* 5. 72.

- to crowns and garlands for banquets, as *Theocr.* 3. 23 and for the victors in the Nemean and Isthmian games.

These two elements can be probably in relation to the cult of the Underworld gods and dead ancestors, as *Sud.* σ212 shows, σελίνου στέφανος· πένθιμος; τὸ γὰρ σέλινον πένθεσι προσήκει. ὡς ἔφη καὶ Δοῦρις ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἀγώνων (cf. *FGrH* 76. 33J and the proverb in *Sud.* σ 211) and, according to Andrews art.cit. p. 95, they could have been used in funeral feasts as food (although he does not quote any instance about this fact). In any case, he shows that it is hardly ever part of a meal, except for salads, (cf. perhaps *Eub. fr.* 35); but mainly with medical facilities (cf. Andrews p. 99). They were abundant in gardens probably as ornamentation (cf. *Mosch.* 3. 100).

I think that except *Ar. Vesp.* 480 where it is in a proverbial sentence (cf. MacDowell's note ad loc. and perhaps also *Eub. fr.cit.*), the other pieces of evidence in comedy about this vegetable, e.g. *Ar. Nub.* 982, *Cratin. fr.* 116, *Pherecr. fr.* 138,

Pl.com. fr. 188.10 in the form ἐπισέλινα and also the instances of Theocr. 13. 42, 20. 23 (cf. G. Giangrande *JHS* 88 (1968) p. 172 n.3). They can be understood as meaning metaphorically 'pudenda muliebria' (cf. Phot. s.v. and Schol. ad Theocr. 11. 10; see further Henderson *MM* p. 136, 144, 151).

κάξ οἴνου βότρυς: this expression has been interpreted as referring to the custom of preserving grapes in wine according to Athen, XIV 653c who also quotes Eub. fr. 48: ἀλλὰ παραλαβὼν ἀκράτῃ κροῦε καὶ δίδου πυκνάς / καὶ βότρυς τρώγειν ἀνάγκαζ' αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴνου συχνοῦς (cf. Pherecr. fr. 137.7). For a similar construction, cf. Hipp. *Epid.* II 6.30 (V p. 138L): ἦν δὲ ἄλλως κεφαλὴν ἀλγέῃ, ἄρτον ὡς θερμότατον ἐξ οἴνου ἀκρήτου ἐσθλῆιν.

Βοτρῦς and σταφυλή seem to be synonymous to designate 'ripe full-grown grapes' (cf. Theocr. 1. 46 in comparison with the ὄμφαξ 'unripe grape'). Although *Il.* 18. 561: ἐν δ' ἐτίθει σταφυλῆσι μέγα βριθούσαν ἀλωὴν / καλὴν χρυσεῖην· μέλανες δ' ἀνά βοτρῦες ἦσαν, would suggest a specialization of the word as 'black grape', but it seems that it is here used for the sake of a variatio, as Hes. *Sc.* 293-4; οἷ δ' αὖτ' ἐς ταλάρους ἐφόρευεν ὑπὸ τρυγητήρων / λευκοῦς καὶ μέλανας βοτρῦας μεγάλων ἀπὸ ὄρχων. It has no clear erotic secondary sense, although it can be compared with Ar. *Pl.* 1084-5: ὄμως δ' ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸν οἶνον ἤξιους / πίνειν, συνεκποῖ' ἐστὶ σοὶ καὶ τὴν τρύγα where τὴν τρύγα, and βοτρῦς in our text could refer to the last part of the wine and imply a similar erotic reference.

3. μυελόν: the last item of this enumeration is doubtful; μυελόν is marrow, that is to say, a kind of meat. This item seems

strange after having enumerated a group of fruits. Bergk suggested κᾶμυλον, 'a cake of fine meal' (cf. LJS s. v. ἄμυλον) often found in comedy (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1092, *Pax* 1195, Eub. fr. 35.2). Meineke keeps the text according to a passage of Plut. *de Glor. Ath.* 6 p. 349a, οἱ δὲ χορηγοὶ τοῖς χορευταῖς ἐγγέλεια καὶ σκελίδας καὶ μυελὸν παρατιθέντες, εὐώχουν ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον φωνασκουμένους καὶ τρυφῶντας in the context of the food provided by the choregus at the end of a performance. This kind of meat was considered a dainty-meal already in *Il.* 22. 501 (cf. also Alex. fr. 191.10; it could be related to the δελφάκιον mentioned in Ar. *Lys.* 1062). Otherwise, the disorder could be purposeful, as in *Ach.* 1091ff. according to Rennie ad loc.

Another example of vegetables leading to a meat is fr. 50.7. It could draw attention to the abundance of courses and its unending repetition in a banquet; it could also refer to a strange way of having a banquet, as Athen. IV 145f refers to some customs of the Persians of eating all kind of meals together. It would not be surprising if the context is that of going shopping as in Ar. fr. 581.

Other instances of enumerations with the same content are: Cratin. fr. 116, 363, Eub. fr. 74, Eup. fr. 13, Alex. fr. 132, Antiph. fr. 177, Ar. fr. 581, Phoenicid. fr. 2 .

#### Fr. 159

These two lines seem to be, as Meineke *CGF* II p. 339 suggests, a parody of the words of Odysseus to Achilles in *Il.* 9. 270: δώσει δ' ἐπτά γυναῖκας ἀμύμονα ἔργα ἰδυίας / λεσβίδας. H.D.

Jocelyn *PCPhS* 206 (1980) p. 15 probably rightly expresses doubts about these lines to be put in the mouth of both refined heroes, he suggests that the word *λαϊκαστραί*, l. 2, is usually spoken by slaves and coarse characters. Both possibilities are still open although I think that the reference to the Homeric passage seems to be quite clear.

1. *Λεσβίδας*: in Homer there is reference to the beauty and special features of women from Lesbos (cf. *Il.* 9. 272) and up to the Hellenistic times they were seen as having a particular independence and autonomy (cf. *Luc. Dial. Mer.* 5); but in Classical Athens the verb *λεσβιάζω* was connected with the sexual practice of the 'fellatio', cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 1345ff., *Stratt. fr.* 41, *Theop. com. fr.* 36, *Hesych.* λ692, *Sud.* λ306. This fame in fact explains the answer that this line is given.

It is, nonetheless, doubtful that it was the only sexual activity with which they were depicted and Dover *GH* p. 182 n. 36 London 1978 argues: "to say as Giangrande [*QUCC* XVI (1973)] does (131f.), 'Lesbian' necessarily implied fellation to the exclusion of other sexual modes goes a little beyond the evidence; some references to 'Lesbian' behaviours in comedy were right in some these cases, but the comic passages themselves do not justify so narrow an interpretation (cf. in particular *Ar. Eccl.* 920, with Ussher's note ad loc.)". This Aristophanic passage also give Jocelyn place to suggest that 'Lesbian' could have the same meaning as nowadays. Our text qualifies them simply as 'prostitut<sup>t</sup><sub>es</sub>' (cf. on *λαϊκαστραί* l. 2).

2. **καλόν γε:** the tone of the answer is sarcastic as in Eur. *Cycl.* 555 (see Denniston *GP* p. 198 cf. Dover *op.cit.* p. 182 n.35).

**λαικαστρίαι:** about this term and the verb λαικάζειν see the extensive, but not very conclusive article of Jocelyn pp. 12-66. The word seems to designate in general 'prostitute' although it may have had a coarser sense than πορνή as Jocelyn tries to prove. It is found in Ar. *Ach.* 529 and 537 as a reference to the prostitutes of a brothel (see also Men. *Pk.* 235).

#### Fr. 160

The fragment seems to be a description of how someone gets on stage. At least ξξεισιν and δευρο have this sense as in Ar. *Nub.* 632-3: αὐτὸν καλῶ θύραζε δευρο πρὸς τὸ φῶς. / ποῦ Στρεψιάδης; ξξει τὸν ἀσκάστην λάβων;.

**πέρδικος τρόπον:** in comedy it usually refers to the feigned lameness of the partridge that, according to Arist. fr. 346Rose: ὅταν δὲ γνῶ ὅτι θηρεύεται, προελθὼν τῆς νεοτιᾶς κυλινδεῖται παρὰ τὰ σκέλη τοῦ θηρεύοντος, ἐλπίδα ἐμποιδῶν τοῦ συλληφθῆσεσθαι, ἐξαπατᾷ τε ἕως ἂν ἀποπτῶσιν οἱ νεοτιοί· εἶτα καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξίπταται. ἐστὶ δὲ τὸ ζῆλον κακότηες καὶ πανούργον, ἔτι δὲ ἀφροδισιαστικόν. This lameness is then related to the fact of having something to hide and the supposed wickedness of this animal which is in fact trying to protect its young (cf. Taillardat *Images* §222 and 407). It became a proverb: πέρδικός σκέλος (cf. Plut. II 24 and App. IV 56). Other instances are: Archyl. 224W, Ar. fr. 57, 512, Nicoph.

fr. 9, Phryn.com. fr. 55 (cf. Ar. Av. 1292, ἐκπερδικίσαι in Av. 767ff. and διαπερδικίζειν in Com. Adesp. fr. 87K; about it see also Taillardat loc.cit. and Thompson *Birds* s.v. πέρδιξ).

#### Fr. 161

The text is corrupted, although a general sense seems to be clear. Perhaps the simplest way of emending is that of Kassel: A τοῖς δέκα ταλάντοις ἄλλα προσθήσειν ἔφη / B πὸς ἄττα; A πεντήκοντα. Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 172-3: (Δι.) ἄνθρωπε, βοῦλει σκευάρι' εἰς Ἄιδου φέρειν / (Νε.) πὸς ἄττα; (Δι.) ταυτί. (Νε.) δύο δραχμάς μισθὸν τελεῖς;.

2. **πεντήκοντα:** the number seems to be 'a ridiculously large round number' (cf. MacDowell on Ar. *Vesp.* 669) which is related to money (the bribes of the allied cities to Athenian politicians in Ar. loc.cit. or also money taken from the public funds *Thesm.* 811), to grain in *Vesp.* 716, to the age of a person in *Vesp.* 490 or in mythology: the fifty nereids (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 883), the fifty sons of Aegyptus and the daughters of Danaus (cf. Ar. *Ran.* 1207). It might be remembered that 'five' is also a round number to indicate 'few' in Pherecr. fr. 155.16.

#### Fr. 162

These two passages are part of a speech in dactylic hexameters. This metre and the vocabulary show that it is a parody of gnomic poetry as that of Hesiod and Theognis and this parodical element could have been intended to characterize the

speaker of these lines, probably an old person, perhaps Cheiron himself, which criticizes the habits which were then common in banquets and hosts in comparison with the traditional hospitality. As we have seen, this theme about idealized past is also found in fr. 155 in relation to music, and the dithyramb especially. About this metre, cf. Wilamowitz *Gr. Versk.* p. 349, West *Gr. Metre* p. 98, White (1912) pp. 149ff.

The text is full of traditional ideas and expressions. There are frequent rhetorical devices and repetitions that probably are meant to caricature this style of poetry, see mainly <sup>n</sup> on l. 3. A change of tone can be noted on ll. 4ff. (see <sup>m</sup> comment ad loc.) which may suggest a change of speaker. This passage could be ironically said by a parasite who thinks that the fact of being rejected from banquets is due to the moral decadence.

1. μηδὲ σὺ γ': it seems to foreshadow the later quotation of Theognis (cf. 1.7) and it is a usual way of introducing admonitory sentences.

ἄνδρα φίλον κάλεσας: as K-A ad loc. points out, it is parallel to Hes. *Op.* 342 τὸν φιλέοντ' ἐπὶ δαίτα καλεῖν and it implies the traditional Greek conception of loving friends and hating enemies (cf. West ad Hes. loc. cit.).

ἐπὶ δαίτα θάλειαν: δαίς designates a special sacrificial banquet. According to Hoekstra ad *Od.* 15. 77, it is the commonest word for a meal in Homer and it is possibly due to the idealized features of the Homeric world where all meals implied a sacrifice and, therefore, the presence of the gods (cf. West on Hes. *Op.*

736).

The adjective θάλειαν or 'rich, plentiful' (LSJ s.v.) is mainly found in poetry and in comedy in case of parody as in Hermipp. fr. 77.11 τοῦτου χρή παρέχειν πίνειν ἐν δαιτὶ θαλείῃ / τοῖσι ἔμοῖσιν φίλοις, τοῖς δ' ἐχθροῖς ἐκ Πεπαρήθου. In this fragment and 63, Hermippus describes the abundance of a banquet in a similar parody of epic language and metre.

In the same sense, ῥέζει and εὕκηλος in 1.2 and 3 ('to do' and 'free from care' respectively) are 'mock heroic', as LSJ s.v. ῥέζω qualifies it; a similar passage is *Il.* 1.554, ἀλλὰ μάλ' εὕκηλος.

3. It is a piece of advice to the person (perhaps a young man). It is expressed in conventional terms (τέρπομαι φρένα is frequently found in Homer as K-A ad loc. point out). The polyptoton in the repetition τέρπου φρένα τέρπε τ' ἐκεῖνον is an emphatic form of finishing a sentence which gives certain solemnity to what is said. In a similar way the following passage begins with τινά τις together and perhaps it is worth noticing the quantity of verbs beginning with ὑπο- throughout the text: ὑποβλέπομεν 1.5, ὑποδεῖται 1.7, ὑποπίνεις 1.8, ὑπολύσεις 1.9. It is difficult to know whether there is a comic hint or may have some satirical point.

4-13. Afterwards, Athen. VIII 364b quotes the following passage which could be spoken immediately after the other (similarly to fr. 155). It compares the situation of an ideal past with the present. The stress is placed on the degradation of hospitality towards friends and relatives which could be considered a

fundamental norm in Greek hospitality (cf. on φίλον l.1). But in these verses the tone is more lively and the speaker describes a scene of banquet. The words are not, thus, as poetic as before, but still they are related to the banquet. The change of tone is not radical (for instance in l. 4 ἐπὶ δεῖπνον, a commoner expression is used instead of ἐπὶ δαῖτα in l.1). It may be also possible that these lines were spoken by another character who keeps the metre, but becomes more prosaic and direct in his statements.

4. **θύων:** (also ὁ θύων in l.9), see on ἐπὶ δαῖτα l.1: a banquet involved a sacrifice and it usually had religious connotations (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1062ff., *Thesm.* 157, fr. 714, Xen. *Mem.* II 3.11).

5. **ὑποβλέπομεν:** Wilamowitz on Ar. *Lys.* 519: "ὑποβλέπειν ist das homerische ὑπόδρα ἰδεῖν". Rogers on Ar. loc.cit. relates it to ταυρηδὸν βλέπειν found in *Ran.* 804 (cf. Pl. *Phd.* 117b). Another instance is Ar. *Thesm.* 396. The expression seems to indicate a way of looking with the eyes nearly closed to stare at someone more fixedly. This could mean to be angry or suspicious (as it is more usual), but also sleepy as in Hipp. *Coac.* 64 (cf. LSJ s.v. ὑποβλέπω 2).

6. According to K-A ad loc., this line would echo Theogn. 468: μηδὲ θύραζε κέλευ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντ' ἰέναι. Perhaps the only explanation of the connexion of both texts is that Pherecrates' line suggests just the contrary that Theognis orders, because the linguistic echoes are very weak. The scene explained in our fragment contradicts totally the rules established in the elegiac corpus.

7. ὑποδεῖται: the act of taking the shoes off when arriving at a house was common. The guest is now getting ready to go, after feeling the rejection (cf. Ar. Av. 492 for a similar absolute expression). The contrary is ὑπολύεις in l. 9, where probably the master, and by implication his slave, is meant to put the guest's shoes off (cf. Pl. Symp. 213b), while in our case the guest puts his shoes on himself, as the middle voice indicates.

8-9. Both lines refer to the drinking part of a symposium which took place at the end after a meal; τῶν ξυμπινόντων (more usually referred to as οἱ συμπόται) and ὑποπίνεις indicate it; ὁ θύων could be understood also as the one who makes a libation or drink-offering (cf. LSJ s. v. θύω 1).

10. κατακαλύοντι: line 11 shows this participle must mean 'hinder from going away'. In other passages, Ar. Ach. 1088 and Diph. fr. 62. 4, the verb is used in the sense of 'to hinder from δειπνεῖν'.

ἔλεξ' ἐλεγεία: ἐλεγεία refers, according to West *St. in Gr. Elegy and Iambus* Berlin/New York 1974 p. 3, to 'stretches of elegiac verse', while ἐλεγείον means an 'elegiac couplet'. As West op.cit. p. 13 n. 21 points out, here the host 'is not doing his party piece; he is just quoting the lines for the sake of their content'.

11-12. The lines transmitted in Theognis' text are as follows:  
μηδένα τῶνδ' ἀέκοντα μένειν κατέρυκε παρ' ἡμῖν, / μηδέ θύραζε  
κέλευ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντ' ἰέναι, / μηδ' εὔδοντ' ἐπέγειρε, Σιμωνίδη,  
ὄντιν' ἄν ἡμῶν / θωρηχθέντ' οἴνῳ μαλθακὸς ὕπνος ἔλη, / μηδέ τὸν  
ἀγρυπνέοντα κέλευ' ἀέκοντα καθεύδειν. / "πᾶν γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον χρῆμ'

ἀνιηρόν ἔφου".

As we can see, it has been changed to fit the metre and the context. About who is Simonides see Groningen *Theognis. Le premier livre* p. 198 Amsterdam 1966.

ἐπ' οἴνοις: parallel expression is Pl. *Symp.* p. 214b λέγομεν ἐπὶ τῆ κύλικι. Although it is rare it could be understood as a variation of ἐν οἴνῳ (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1227, see also LSJ s.v. ἐπί B. II.1).

## Ψευδηρακλῆς

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The title of this play coincides with one of Menander, also fragmentary (cf. fr. 451ff. K $\delta$ -T).

K-A on their note on test. 3 suggest that in fact this one and 'Ανθρωφηρακλῆς are the same play. I think it is a good suggestion and it also reduces the large number of titles attributed to Pherecrates (cf. supra pp. 5ff.).

Nonetheless, it is interesting to point out that the mythical theme suggested by the title could have been easily developed in a play of Old comedy and maybe we could speculate that the confusion is due not only to a confusion of titles with Menander; but to the lack of title tag in a play of Pherecrates or as an alternative title to the other play, 'Ανθρωφηρακλῆς. In this case we may suppose that Pherecrates dealt with this figure of the Sham-Heracles and perhaps it is interesting to notice that Menander must have dwelt on a traditional figure (about it cf. G.K. Galinski *The Herakles theme* pp. 81ff. Oxford 1972). The only example we have is Dionysos in Aristophanes' *Frogs* who dresses up like Heracles in order to perform one of their feats.

Fr. 163

In comparison with Ar. *Pax* 43 and *Vesp.* 78-87 where similar expressions are used, Whittaker p.181 suggests that this fragment can be part of an address to the audience probably in the prologue. Nevertheless, the first line is more specific: 'those clever in their own conceit' and this could be addressed to young people in particular.

The terms δοκησιδεξίων and πολυπραγμόναι are not very common and perhaps from these words a parody or a joke was intended; but it is difficult to say exactly, above all because we do not know to whom the first line refers. I agree with Meineke's opinion that the lost part to which the first line refers has to be placed before our quotation and not after l.1 as Kock and, following him, Kaibel suggest.

δοκησιδεξίων: is a comic word, found here and in Call.com. fr. 34. Ar. *Pax* 43 uses a similar adjective: δοκησίσοφος with a particular reference to young persons: ούκοῦν ἄν ἤδη τῶν θεατῶν τις λέγοι / νεανίας δοκησίσοφος· τὸ δὲ πρᾶγμα τί; and Pherecrates may have used this comic noun in connexion with this group of people.

Both parts of the compound were commonly used in sophistic and oratorical context. Δόκησις was opposed to γνώμη or knowledge, in the sense of opinion (cf. P. Huart *Γνώμη chez Thucydide et ses Contemporaines* p.100 and 116 Paris 1973) and the adjective could qualify then someone who is 'clever according to his opinions, not real experiences' (about other oppositions see Soph. *Tr.* 426

and Kamerbeek ad loc. [Leiden 1959]).

About the meaning of δέξιος, cf. Carter (1986) p. 121 n. 45: "in its original meaning it is full of good omen: right-handed, boding well, hence neat, clever, witty, useful. Out of forty-one uses in Aristophanes, a majority have this favourable sense. But a second, minority, meaning emerges during the 420s: cunning thought, skill in the law-courts, hence moral disreputability. It is often linked with 'komposos'".

2. μὴ πολυπραγμόναι: this verb could have a plain meaning, perhaps translatable as 'take no trouble about it' as LSJ s. v. 1 does. Ehrenberg *Polis und Imperium* p. 467 Zurich 1965 (reprint from *JHS* 67 (1949) pp. 46-67) shows that already in Herodotus this verb and its equivalent πολλά πράσσειν had a derogatory implication.

It does not always need to be understood in political sense, but in Thucydides at least (cf. Ehrenberg op.cit. p. 468) it can be interpreted from a political point of view, either as reference to political parties (cf. Ehrenberg loc.cit.) or in Aristophanes 'his views on πολυπραγμοσύνη centre on the issues of domestic policy, and in particular on the evils of litigation' (cf. Ehrenberg op.cit. p. 481). About this term in other passages, cf. van Leeuwen ad Ar. *Ran.* 228, Dover *Pop. Mor.* pp. 188-90, Dodds on Eur. *Bacc.* 389-92 and Bond on Eur. *HF* 266 [Oxford 1981].

If applied to the audience in the theatre, the term could be simply understood in literal sense: to be busy in many things, that is to say, do not be distracted or 'take no trouble about it' (implying that the solution is going to be found soon). This

order does not need to convey further sense; in the context of the prologue of the play it would suit the address to the audience in which the character promises to solve the present problem.

3. ἄλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ σοι: in Aristophanes it is usually a formula that implies agreement, according to Barrett ad Eur. *Hi.* 507 who has found four passages (one of them is this fragment) "where the apodosis may not be acquiescent but may suggest a course of action subject to the other's approval, with εἰ δοκεῖ = 'if you don't mind', 'if you please', but in each of the four either the text is fragmentary or the context is lacking, and acquiescence cannot be excluded". Besides the passages quoted by K-A: Ar. *Av.* 665, *Ach.* 338, *Thesm.* 218, I would add *Nub.* 11, and *Lys.* 1176 where see Dover and Henderson's notes respectively.

κἄπροϋ: as in Ar. *Lys.* 502 a story was explained afterwards, since it is "the proper word (not ἀκούω) for listening to a lecture or a speech (cf. ἀπροαίτης)" according to Stanford on Ar. *Ran.* 775 (cf. also Eup. fr. 102.7).

## Incertarum Fabularum Fragmenta

### Fr. 164

Pherecrates makes here a reference to a common place on the stories about Alcibiades, 'enfant terrible' of the social and political life of Athens in the V and IV century.

It is clearly a play on words with *άνηρ* understood as man in physical sense or husband. Jebb on Soph. *Trach.* 551 interprets the passage as follows: οὐκ ᾔδν άνηρ γάρ [i. e. ἔτι νέος ᾔδν]... It could also refer to passive homosexual behaviour. Eup. fr. 171 seems to make a similar joke: A: Ἄλκιβιάδης ἐκ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐξίτω. B: τί ληρεῖς; / οὐκ οἴκαδ' ἐλθῶν τήν σεαυτοῦ γυμνάσεις δάμαρτα; Several later authors make reference to these customs: Liban. fr. 50β1 (XI p. 643, 9F): γυναικεῖας ἐσθῆτας εὐχόμενος ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις άνηρ ᾔδν λανθάνειν and in different way Diogen. Laert. IV 49 ἔλεγεν [Socrates] ὡς νέος μὲν ᾔδν τοὺς άνδρας ἀπαγάγοι τῶν γυναικῶν, νεανίσκος δὲ γενόμενος τὰς γυναῖκας τῶν άνδρῶν. He is mentioned in Ar. *Ach.* 716 as εὐρύπρωκτος καὶ λάλος, an example of the behaviour of the rich youth (cf. Sch. ad loc.: Ἄλκιβιάδην τὸν Κλεινίου ὡς καταπύγωνα κωμφοδοῦσιν) and fr. 205, 244 (cf. Cassio in *Aristophane Banchettanti* Pisa 1977 p. 31). Other references are possibly fr. 556, *Vesp.* 44 and 46 (cf. also Archipp. fr. 48 and *Ran.* 1422).

Most of these anecdotes are preserved by Athen XII 534b ff. and Plutarch in his life of *Alcibiades*. About them, cf. R.J. Littman *TAPhA* 101 (1970) pp. 263-276 (p. 267 about our fr.) and W.M. Ellis *Alcibiades* pp. 17ff. London 1989.

The first line of this fr. is corrupted and, although the general sense seems to be clear, its tone and specific sense remain obscure. The suggestions are collected in detail in Rehrenböck p. 248. Perhaps the two proposals that modify least the text transmitted in the mss. are Edmonds *FAC* I p. 270: ὁ δ' <ἄρ'> Ἀχιλλεὺς εὖ ἐπὶ κορρῆς αὐτόθεν and Rehrenböck loc. cit. : ὁ δ' οὖν Ἀχιλλεὺς εὐθὺς ἐπὶ κορρῆς μανεῖς.

I would be inclined for the first part of the line to Edmonds' suggestion.

For the second part, perhaps the two adverbs εὖ πως, which give a strange sense, could be a confusion with οὕτως that gives a better meaning as preceding ὥστε in the following line. The last word could be solved with αὐτόθεν suggested by Edmonds or perhaps τουτονί making reference to a name just mentioned; I think that the verb πατάσσω as transitive is well attested with the same meaning 'to hit, strike' (LSJ s. v. II) and perhaps with the intention of giving a prosaic rendering of an epic sentence (cf. ἐπὶ κόρρης)

These lines seem to be part of a scene where Achilles acted in not a very heroic manner. It might be also possible that it portrayed two young heroes fighting as a prelude of the Trojan war; perhaps it belonged to *Χείρων* as Miller suggests (apud K-A ad loc.)

ἐπὶ κορρῆς: The word κόρρη or κόρη seems to have changed slightly in meaning in different genres and epochs. In epic

poetry it was synonymous with κρόταφος the temple or the side of the forehead, but in Attic it came to mean γνάθος or jaw as in this passage (cf. ἐκ τῶν γνάθων l. 2). It was then synonymous with ῥαπίζειν τὴν γνάθον and considered an act of ὕβρις either 'to hit with the flat of the hand (simply ἐπὶ κορρῆς) or with the fist (πύξ or κονδύλοις); see Dem. 21.72 and MacDowell's note to it, Gow on Theocr. 14.34. Ar. has similar expressions in *Ran.* 545: οὔ- / τοῦ δ' ἄτ' ὄν αὐτὸς πανοῦργος / εἶδε, κατ' ἐκ τῆς γνάθου / πύξ πατάξας μούξεκοψε / τοὺς χόρους τοὺς προσθίους and in 149-50 he places anyone who πατρὸς γνάθου / ἐπάταξεν suffering in Hades. Pl. *Grg.* 486c considers this expression as ἀγροικότερος 'rather very cruel', according to Dodds ad loc. and on 462 e6.

ὥστε: In l. 2 seems to be a consecutive conjunction to the action just explained, although Edmond understands it as a simple comparative sentence, ὥστε πῦρ, at least in his translation 'a blow that hit his face up like a fire, but I think that the first sense is better. The sentence appears to be an epic exaggeration.

#### Fr. 166

This fr. was ascribed to Corianno by Meineke (cf. comment on fr. 78); but the new text of Photius gives the reading ἄ σε instead of ἄ με, in fact, a conjecture of Meineke. This reading that seems to be the correct one, makes Meineke's suggestion less clear, although it does not necessarily prove that it is wrong.

Kassel, instead, attributes it to Ἀνθρωποφρακλῆς, probably on the grounds that fr. 21 could be said by Heracles and fr. 166 be said by another speaker referring to what the hero has just

spoken. It may be correct, but could be Dionysus, or not necessarily any of Zeus' sons as it is not evident from the text, but someone who has said something like Pheidippides in Ar. *Nub.* 1471 for example.

ὦ Ζεῦ πολυτίμητ': πολυτίμητε is often applied to a God, but sometimes to a human with an ironical sense (cf. Ar. *Ran.* 851) or a thing (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 759), in this case with a play on the word πολύτιμος (cf. Neil ad *Equ.* 1390.) It can be an invocation in a prayer or simply an exclamation (cf. *Vesp.* 1001 and MacDowell ad loc.). K-A refer to Ar. fr. 336.1 'in oratione indignantis' (see also K-A ad loc. for other references for the use of this expression).

πανούργος: This adjective seems to have a pejorative sense 'wicked, deceitful' but it might have the less pejorative meaning of 'artful, crafty, cunning' and thus 'clever' (cf. Henderson ad Ar. *Lys.* 12).

#### Fr. 167

The context of the fragment could be easily that of a glutton eating cakes offered to Apollo (to whom the διακόνιον was devoted), and to Artemis (to whom the ἀμφίφων was dedicated); cf. Rehrenböck p. 250.

διακόνιον: cf. Hesych. δ1069, Sud. δ589, Phot. δ334. A kind of cake in different shapes λύραν τε καὶ κοτύλην καὶ κλήμα καὶ ἄττα κυκλοτερῆ πέμματα (cf. Phot. loc. cit.) which could be part

of the eiresione (cf. Phot. loc. cit.) the traditional offering to Apollo during the festival of the Pyanopsia (cf. Deubner (1969) pp. 198ff. and p. 199 above all: "die Eiresione ist ein alter Segenszauber, den Apollon erst nachträglich an sich gezogen hat. Sie bestand aus einere Öl- oder Lorbeerzweige, der mit roten und weißen Wollbinden umwunden war, und von dem allerhand Baumfrüchte, speziell Feige, Brote uad Kuchen von verschiedener Form sowie Schälchen mit Honig, Öl und Wein herabhingen"; cf. also E. Pottier in *D-S I 2* 1549 b).

As Rehrenböck p. 251 says: "der Name dürfte sich daher erklären, daß es, ebenso wie der Amphiphon, nur für Kultdiener (διάκονοι; cf. LSJ s.v. I 2) zum Schmauze bestimmt war"; but as Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s.v. διακόσιον says "un rapport avec διάκονος n'est absolument impossible, mais lequel? On peut penser plutôt à un composé de κοινία, s'agissant d'un gâteau saupoudré" (this suggestion is doubtful, since the main difficulty remains in the long α of διακόσιον).

ἀμφιφῶντ': as LSJ says : 'cake offered to Munychian Artemis by double light, i.e. either surrounded by lighted tapers, or offered when sun and moon were both visible'. About it, cf. Deubner (1969) pp. 204ff. It is mentioned also in Philem. fr. 67 and Diphil. fr. 27.

ἐπήσθεν: LSJ s.v. ἐπεσθίω II, 'eat up dub. in Pherecr. 157'. Another passage in which this verb seems to have the same meaning is Ar. *Pl.* 1005: πρὸ τοῦ δ' ὑπὸ τῆς πενίας ἄπαντ' ἐπήσθειεν; but the lack of context here does not allow us to reject totally

other sense as 'eat after or with' (cf. LSJ s.v. I) found in Telecl. fr. 27 and Com. Adesp. fr. 722K.

#### Fr. 168

This fragment has been plausibly attributed to *Cheiron*, as part of the dialogue between Music and Justice rendered in fr. 155, by Meineke, suggestion accepted by Edmonds *FAC I* p. 263 and Pianko *Eos* 53 (1963) p. 58.

**ἄγρυκτα κᾶλεκτα**: both words are unusual and probably are part of the comic element of the passage.

**ἄγρυκτα** is a hapax of Pherecr. according to LSJ, although on Ar. *Lys.* 656 the form γρυκτὸν is also found. The word invented for this passage is an easy compound with the privative α-. It comes from the verb γρύζω 'to say γρῦ, grumble, mutter' probably an onomatopoeic verb and perhaps imitating the sounds uttered by a baby (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 963) or an animal (cf. the grunt of a pig in Alciphr. 3.73, probably by similarity with γρυλίζω in later writers); but as Cunningham ad Herond. 3. 37 says: "quite early, it progressed to mean simply 'speak', as is shown by the derivatives ἄγρυκτὸς (Pherecr. 157.2) and ἄγρυξ(α (Pi. fr. 229)".

The difference with ἄλεκτα probably is that ἄγρυκτα refers to simply opening your mouth and making a noise of non-articulate speech, when ἄλεκτα implies articulate speech: to say it in words. The adjective ἄρρητος is commoner in the same sense. About ἄλεκτα, cf. λεκτὸν in Ar. *Av.* 423.

#### Fr. 169

As I have commented on fr. 58, ill people are not frequently found in the comedies of Aristophanes which have survived to us (cf. Ar. fr. 346.2, ὁ δ' ἔχων θέρμαν καὶ πῦρ ἦκεν). Perhaps a parody of doctors and illness was intended here and in the fragment of Aristophanes just quoted, a topic which would become a commonplace in later comedy, as in Men. *Aspis* 433ff.

θέρμην: 'feverish heat', also found in the Doric form θέρμαν (cf. Ar. fr. cit.). About different kinds of fever, see on fr. 85. 1.

#### Fr. 170

ἐρεβίνθους: "chick-peas" are usually found in comedy as dessert, e.g. Ar. *Pax* 1136, *Crobyl.* fr.9, *Sophil.* fr. 8. In some cases with an erotic sense in Ar. *Ach.* 801, *Ran.* 545 (cf. Henderson *MM* p. 119).

In this fragment they could be eaten as τραγήματα (dessert or food to go with drinking), as roasted dry-fruits seem to be commonly used for it (cf. *Pherecr.* fr. 74). The custom of eating them all the time, especially κυάμους, was seen as a sign of low social standard (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 537 and Henderson's note to it).

#### Fr. 171

Without any context this line has the appearance of a proverb, perhaps because Boeotia and the Boeotians were usually the object of many proverbial expressions and often satirized in

Comedy. They were famous because of:

-their gluttony (e.g. Eub. fr. 11, Demon fr. 1, Diphil. fr.22, cf. further Athen. X 417b; bearing in mind that Heracles was a Boeotian from Thebes),

-their eels from the lake Kopais (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 510. Eub. fr.36),

-their bellicosity (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 35 and Henderson's note),

-their stupidity (cf. Βοιωτίος νοῦς , a proverb in Macar. II, 79 and Ap. V. 11 in op. cit. p. and also Βοιωτία αἰνίγματα ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσυνέτων· Βοιωτὴ γὰρ ἡ Σφίγξ in *GCM* II 46, cf. Caver *RE* III 1. 638).

Thebes is frequently the setting for many tragedies and perhaps this is what Heraclid. *De urb. Graec.* I 25 τὰ δ' ἐκ πάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀκληρήματα εἰς τῆς Βοιωτίας πόλεις κατερρύη, meant in the previous words to our fragment. But we do not have any reference that Boeotia was, at the time of Pherecrates, a bad place to live for the Boeotian in Ar. *Ach.* 860ff. seems to be prosperous. In this case it may mean "the Boeotian woman" as in Ar. *Lys.* 86-7 and Laon fr.2: Βοιωτὸν ἄνδρα στέργε, τὴν Βοιωτίαν/ μὴ φεῦγ'. ὁ μὲν γὰρ χρηστὸς ἢ δ' ἐφίμερος; which seems that there is a slight joke on referring surprisingly to Βοιωτίαν not as the land, but as the Boeotian woman. If this is the interpretation of our fragment Heraclid. loc.cit. may have misinterpreted the line.

ἤνπερ φρονεῖς εἶ: about this expression, cf. Wankel on Dem. 18. 40: "das ist eine eindringliche Suggestiveformel, die eine Aufforderung enthält, vernünftig zu sein". The word φρονέω, as I have already commented on fr.156, came to mean 'to be sensible'.

It is very frequent in Ar., e.g. *Nub.* 562, 817, *Ran.* 703, 1485, *Thesm.* 533, etc.

Fr. 172

The fragment might refer to men who fill their stomachs with whatever they found in a kind of comic exaggeration, but they are more likely animals, and probably ὄνουç (cf. comment on κᾶχυρων), eating 'chaff and straws'. Another possibility is to understand τήν γαστέρα as a paunch that someone fills with them, but this interpretation does not suit the verb in the middle voice. Or it could be a description of the making of a 'padding' (about evidence on this theatrical element cf. *Stone Costume in Aristophanic Comedy* New York 1981 p. 127); but, as van Leuween ad Ar. *Ach.* 508 n. 13 comments on this passage, 'ventrem habere quis dicatur non liquet'.

ἦλων: probably here it means 'a heap of husks or chaff' as in *Od.* 5. 368, but it can also mean 'provisions for a journey' as in *Od.* 2. 410, 4. 363, 5. 266. In the first case it is synonymous with ἄχυρα; and it might be related etymologically to 'avena' according to Stanford ad *Od.* 5. 368 [1959<sup>2</sup>]; but see Frisk s.v. 2.

κᾶχυρων: Taillardat *Images* §683 distinguishes three senses:  
- 'paille' straw (cf. Hdt. IV 72, Xen. *Oec.* 18.2, Xenarch. fr. 4. 12,  
- «'balle' du grain» 'husk, chaff' (cf. Xen. *Oec.* 18. 6-7),  
- "le 'son' de l'orgue" or 'bran' (cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 730). In this

sense it was an ingredient for some special pastries as Antiph. fr. 225.1 : μάζα κεχαρακωμένη/ ἀχύροις and Polioch. fr. 2.2: μελαγρή μάζαν ἡχυρωμένη that as Taillardat loc.cit. says "il s'agit, chez ces deux comiques, de galettes faites avec de la farine d'orgue mêlée de son -non de balle évidemment- et qui figurent au menu des repas ridicules".

There was also the saying ὄνος εἰς ἄχυρα as MacDowell ad Ar. *Vesp.* 1310 says: "proverbial for having a thoroughly good time like English 'in clover'" (cf. Ar. fr. 78: ἔχεις ἄχυρα καὶ χνοῦν, Philem. fr. 158: ὄνος βαδίζεις εἰς ἄχυρα τραγημάτων). Our fragment could make use of this saying in the same way as these two just quoted referring to someone who is fully enjoying himself.

**σεσαγμένους:** from the verb σάπτω 'to fill quite full, pack, stuff' (cf. Pherecr. fr. 78; Eub. fr. 412.3). In comedy it seems to be a culinary term applied to gluttons (cf. also Antiph. fr.221, Pl. com. fr. 104).

#### Fr. 173

**ὕβριστὸν:** a comic adjective, probably insulting, also found in Pl. com. fr. 105. Schwyzer *GrG* I p. 542 n. 3 (cf. also K-B I p. 548) explains it as "Kom. als Neutr. zu ὕβριστής (die Maskulin auf \*-της kommen überhaupt nicht neutral vor, selten feminin)".

In Antiquity (cf. LSJ s.v.) it was related to superlatives like βέλτιστος, κάλλιστος, κράτιστος. In Ar. *Vesp.* 1303 the superlative ὕβριστότατος is found.

**κόβαλον:** cf. Ar. *Equ.* 417. Neil ad *Equ.* 270 says: "κόβαλος

an apish imp (possibly akin to κοφάλεμος see on 221), was familiarly used of grotesque trickery. κοβαλεία: ἡ προσποιητὴ μετ' ἀπάτης παιδιὰ. Harpocr. (cf. also Arist. *H. A.* IX 12. 597 b 23)".

The origin of this word seems to be Doric (cf.  $\bar{\alpha}$ ); according to Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s. v. "l'emploi de κόβαλος en attique avec une coloration péjorative, répose sur l'existence probable d'un terme dialectal signifiant quelque chose comme 'portefaix' (cf. en français l'emploi péjorative de 'jaquin' etc.) voir Björck *Alpha impurum* 46sq., 258sq., après Wilamowitz GGA 1898, 689".

Aristophanes plays with it making comic compounds as κοβαλικεύμασιν in *Equ.* 332 and ἐκκοβαλικεύεται in *Equ.* 270.

ἡργάσω: about this verb, cf. fr. 76. 3 and 87. 1.

#### Fr. 174

ἀχέρδου: wild-pear synonymous with ἀχράς (cf. Pherecr. fr. 13) and different from ἄπιος, the cultivated one. Phot. α3435 tries to distinguish both terms but the distinction seems to be 'ill founded' (cf. Gow ad Theocr. 24. 89, see also Lembach (1970) pp. 125ff.).

It seems to have been very common and to have given its name to the Attic deme Ἀχερδοῦς (as ἀχράς to Ἀχραδίνη, a quarter of Syracuse). It was prickly (cf. Sch. Hom. *Od.* 14. 10) and probably very sour to taste (cf. Com. Adesp. fr. 1277K, Alc. Mess. in *AP* VII 536). About its medical qualities see Diosc. *AP.* I 30: ἀχράς δύναμιν ἔχει στυπτικωτέραν τῆς ἀπίου.

**ἀκραχολωτάτης:** In comedy it is found also in Ar. fr. 608 applied to a dog: κύων ἀκράχολος / Ἐκάτης ἄγαλμα φωσφόρου γενήσομαι and Epinic. fr. 1.7 to a bee ἐσμὸν μελίσσης τῆς ἀκραχόλου γλυκύν.

As Neil ad *Equ.* 41 says, "ἀκράχολος was a word of the Ionic medical schools in the form ἀκρήχολος, *choleric*. In the extant Attic verse it is confined to comic lines of tragic rhythm".

As in the other two passages quoted, its comic sense might have been in the fact that it is unexpectedly applied to a plant, perhaps in parody of tragic or epic poetry. It is possible that there is a further play on words between ἀχέρδου and Ἀχερδοῦς, the Attic deme, as Meineke suggested in comparison with Com. Adesp. fr. 1277K (cf. K-A's comment ad fr. 174).

#### Fr. 175

**ποῖ κήχος:** in this case equivalent to ποῖ δῆ. A similar verse is Ar. fr. 671 ποῖ γῆς; ποῖ κήχος εὐθύς Σικελίας (cf. LSJ s.v. κήχος). About this expression, see Herodian. II 295Lentz (fr. 410 from *EM* 682. 52): καὶ αἰεὶ μὲν παρεζευγμένον εὐρήσεις τὸ ποῖ τὸ κήχος. Ἐρατοσθένης (fr. 68Str.) δὲ λαμβάνει ἐκ ταύτης τῆς συντάξεως· ποῦ ἐγγύς καὶ εἰς τίνα τρόπον· ποῦ ἄγχος, ποῦ κήχος; τὸ πῆ κῆ, πῆ ἐγγύς, πῆ ἄγχος, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἔναγχος, κήχος. Ἐλλειψις ἄρα τοῦ γ· κήχος· ἄγχος ἔχει αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ ἔναγχος.

**ἡμερῶν τεττάρων:** K-A suggest a similar irony to Ar. *Ran.* 55 or Plaut. *Curc.* 110. A παρὰ προσδοκίαν expression in contrast with the first assertion ἐγγύς.

A trip of four days could be seen as a long journey, if we

take into account that a soldier was supposed to bring food for three days when he was called up for a campaign (cf. the expression σιτί' ἡμερῶν τριῶν Ar. Pax 151, Vesp. 243, Eub. fr. 19).

#### Fr. 176

ἐγκιλικίζουσ': 'to play the Cilician', 'to cheat' (cf. also Ar. fr. 107): εἴ γ' ἐγκιλικίσαιμ' ἐξολοίμην, φαθὶ λέγων (cf. Κιλικισμὸν in Theop. FGrH 115 F 314, Κιλίκιος ὄλεθρος Zen. Ath. II 62). As Diogenian II 51 in CPG II p. 26 explains it: ἐγκιλικίζεται: κακοθεύεται, κακοποιεῖ· διαβεβόηνται γὰρ ἐπὶ πονηρίᾳ οἱ Κίλικες· ἐντεῦθεν λέγεται καὶ ἐγκεκλιτισμένος αἰσχρῶς.

Another name with whom this people are connected is Κιλίκιος τράγος (cf. Com. Adesp. fr. 806K, Sud. κ107: Κιλίκιος τράγος: ὁ δασύς· τοιοῦτοι γὰρ ἐν Κιλικίᾳ γίνονται τράγοι. ὅθεν καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν τριχῶν συντιθέμενα Κιλίκια λέγονται).

It belongs to the kind of verbs probably of popular origin, which were formed according to general features. As Eust. in Il. p. 741.14 says: εἰσὶ βλασφημίαι καὶ ἀπὸ πόλεων καὶ δῆμων πολλαί, ῥηματικῶς πεποιημέναι; ἔθνῶν μὲν οἷον Κιλικίζειν καὶ Αἴγυπτιάζειν τὸ πονηρεῦσθαι καὶ κρητίζειν τὸ ψεύδεσθαι· ἐκ πόλεων δὲ οἷον λεσβιάζειν, τὸ αἰσχροποιεῖν [explanation of λεσβιάζειν, cf. ad Pherecr. 159]· ἐκ δῆμων δὲ βλασφημίαι τὸ αἰξωνεῦσθαι· Αἰξωνεῖς γὰρ δημόται Ἀττικοὶ σκωπτόμενοι ὡς κακολόγοι, καθὰ Σφήττιοι ἐπὶ ἀγριότητι. To these expressions one can add, e.g. App. Prov. IV, 73: ὡς Κρητίζειν καὶ Λεσβιάζειν ἀπὸ νήσου Σίφνου καλουμένης. Ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἄπτεσθαι τῆς πυγῆς δακτύλῳ and Αἰολίζειν: ἀπατᾶν (cf.

Sch. ad Theocr. 1. 56 and Leutsch ad *CPG* I p. 452 n.). See also Lydians and Carians in the proverb: Λυδοὶ πονηροὶ, δεῦτεροὶ δ' Αἰγύπτιοι, / τρίτοι δ' ἅπαντων Κἄρες ἐξωλέστατοι. Diog. 6, 24, Apost. X 100; cf. W. Bühler *Zenobii Aethoi proverbialia* vol. IV p. 276 Göttingen 1982.

Cilicia is a region in the South-East coast of the Anatolian peninsula, between Pamphylia and Syria as west and east borders and Lycaonia in the North. It was divided into two different zones: 'Cilicia Pedias', a 'fertile plain surrounded by a horseshoe of mountains and watered by three great rivers' and 'Cilicia Thracia' or 'Thraceotis' very mountainous and with only one river (cf. A.H. Jones *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* p. 192 Oxford 1937). It had several Greek colonies as Tarsus, Mopsuestia and Mallus with different mythical heroes as founders (cf. A.H. M. Jones op. cit. p. 193, J. Boardman *The Greeks Overseas* p. 36 London 1980<sup>2</sup>). About it see also K. Ziegler *Kl. P.* III 208-9, Ruge *RE* XI 385ff. In later times there were Cilician pirates and the tribes from the mountainous zones were especially warlike (cf. Levick *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* Oxford 1967 p. 20).

#### Fr. 177

**σκόνηζα:** Attic word for κόνυζα and κνύζα (poetical form, cf. Theocr. 3. 68; 4. 25). It designates different kinds of 'Inulae' 'fleabane'. About them cf. K. Lembach (1970) p. 30

It was remarkable for its strong smell (cf. Theophr. *HP* VI 2. 6), used in cooking and as a flavouring for wine (cf.

κονιζ(της, LSJ s.v.), and often mentioned as a medicine in the Hippocratic corpus (cf. Hipp. *Nat. Mul.* 7. 316. 7; *Mul.* 8. 182. 10, etc.). In the Thesmophoria it was used, probably because of its anti-aphrodisiac powers (cf. Deubner (1969) p. 56. n.7. Lembach (1970) p. 31).

θύμον: 'Cretan thyme', '*Thymbra capitata*'. Another aromatic herb found in different contexts. Generally it is associated with different species (cf. Eup. fr. 13. 5, Antiph. fr. 177. 4), related to honey and bees (Zonas in *AP* 9. 226. 2); part of a drink called κυκεών drunk by rustic people as medicine (cf. Ar. *Pax* 712, 1169, *Pl. Rep.* 408b. Hipp. *Acut.* 6. 538; see P. Steinmetz in Theophr. *Char.* p. 65 München 1960.

The expression ταῦτόν θύμον φαγόντες Ar. *Pl.* 253 (cf. also 282) seems to have meant "to lead a frugal and simple life" and in this sense the ἄλας θυμίτας part of Lamachus' diet in *Ach.* 1099 can be understood (cf. *Ach.* 779). In other passages it is related to the vegetarian food of the Pythagoreans (cf. Aristoph. fr. 15, Alex. fr. 132. 6-8, Antiph. fr. 168 and 225. 7).

Both herbs together may imply a depiction of a cooking scene (in which the mention or enumeration of different spices or kinds of food is a very common element) or perhaps it is an expression to indicate someone's sobriety on eating.

Fr. 178

About this fr. see Tsantsanoglou *Hellenica* 20 (1967) 155-7. and Renhrenböck pp. 241ff. The reading of the manuscripts is ἤ καὶ, perhaps specifying two different hours of the day: at dawn or in the morning, but I think that Croenert's conjecture (apud K-A's app. crit.) is very plausible and mainly because both ideas are nearly synonymous, as referring to the early hours of the morning; see further on πρὶν ἀγορᾶν πεπληθῆναι in fr. 34.

Fr. 179

κοτυλίζειν: from the word κοτύλη, a ladling-cup used to pour wine in the crater and mix it with water (cf. Pherecr. fr. 75). Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 114 says that "it is significant that the word which expressed the pouring of wine into cups gradually acquired the meaning of general retailing"; but it seems that κοτυλίζω could mean simply 'to sell measuring with the κοτύλη' which is a cup and a small unit of dry or liquid measure, equivalent to 6 kyathoi or litres each (0.24 or 0.27 litters each), that is to say 0.24 or 0.27 litres (cf. O.A.W. Dilke *Mathematics and Measurement* London 1987 p. 26).

According to Ehrenberg loc. cit. 'apparently more women than men were engaged in this occupation' of κάπηλος or καπηλίσ (see also πανδοκεύτρια or hostess, p.cit. n. 4) and they were famous because of their ability to cheat and abuse, so as to become a commonplace in comedy (cf. Pherecr. fr. 70). Perhaps Ehrenberg's suggestion is correct, but I would doubt about it from the point of view that women's bibulousness was a topic and within this

context a καπηλις could be the symbol of this comic exaggeration.

For a metaphorical sense of κοτυλιζειν, cf. Ar. fr. 699.

καταπάττειν χύδην: καταπάττειν means 'to besprinkle' and χύδην 'in floods, in heaps'. The first term is usually related in comedy to 'fine flour' (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 262, 177 in a cooking context and Dover's note ad loc.) or gold (cf. *Nub.* 917, the simple form πάτιων) and other elements in a poetical way (cf. *Equ.* 500, 99, *Eub.* fr. 132). The other word χύδην could have the meaning to buy 'wholesale' (cf. LSJ). Thus I would suggest that perhaps a joke is intended: 'do not sell it by the cotyle but besprinkle it... in floods', perhaps in a surprising way the word to underline the bibulousness of the character.

#### Fr. 180

τουτι τι ἐστιν: cf. Kock ad loc. 'formula est mirantis' quoting Valckenaer *Diatrise in Euripidis Perditorum Dramatum Reliquias* Lugd. Batav. 1767 p. 285. About parallels to this expression in Aristophanes, cf. K-A ad loc.

ἀνεκᾶς: the accentuation has been object of a dispute (ἄνεκας or ἀνεκᾶς) from Antiquity (cf. testimonies ad *Crat.com.* fr. 12). The similarity with other adverbs like ἀνδρεκᾶς or ἐκᾶς seems to be likely explanation of this point (cf. *Apoll. Dys.* adv. *Gr.Gr.* II 1.1, p. 160. 25Schn. and Bonanno *Cratete Comico* p. 77 n.2).

τὸ κριβανον: Attic form for κλιβανος (lat. clibanus), generally in masculine, and only found here in neuter.

As Blümner *Techn.* I pp. 66f. describes it: "man buck nämlich

das Brot häufig im sogenannten κλίβανος, attisch κρίβανος, einem Gefäss mit Deckel, unten weiter als oben und ringsum mit kleinen Löchern versehen. Man umgab dies Gefäss, nachdem man es über den Teig gedeckt hatte, mit heisser Asche oder zündete Feuer darunter an dessen Hitze durch die Löcher gleichförmiger und ebenmässiger eindrang, als es in einem gewöhnlichen Backofen der Fall gewesen wäre. In der Regel waren diese Gefässe von Thon oder Eisen, nur der Prahlhans Trimalchio bäckt sein Brot in einer silbernen Clibanus. Feiner buck man Brot auf dem Herde, in der Asche, am Bratspiess u. s. w., wie wir das bei Besprechung der verschiedenen Brotsorten gleich sehen werden".

There was a kind of bread called κριβανίτης as well (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 87, 1125).

Edmonds *FAC* I p. 273 n. e interprets this fragment as follows, "lit. how 'up' the bread-pan is, i. e the lid tilted by the bread raising".

#### Fr. 181

The Adonian Festivals took place in Athens in the middle of the summer, probably the end of July. This date has been subject of some dispute, above all due to the passage of Ar. *Lys.* 388ff. but some scholars like A. D. Nock *Gnomon* 10 (1934) 291, Atallah *Adonis dans la littérature et l'art grecs* pp. 227-58 Paris 1966 and Gomme-Sandbach ad Men. *Sam.* 39 suggest that these must have been another festival in spring; but their arguments have been rejected from different points of view (cf. J. Servais 'La date des Adonies d' Athenes et l' expedition de Sicilie' in *Adonis* pp.

83ff. Roma 1984 and Weil in *BCH XC* (1966) pp. 682-3, 690 and 693 ff.). It has been related to the appearance of the star Sirius at this time of the year.

The festivities consisted in night celebrations (cf. ἐπαννυχίζον Men. *Sam.* 45) of women of the neighbourhood who planted green salad in pots as little gardens called 'Αδώντιοι καρποί or 'Αδώντιδος κήποι (cf. Sud. α514 and 517 respectively) and went up to the roof of the houses with ladders. In an atmosphere infused with sweet aromas of incense (cf. Grotanelli 'Da Myrrha alla Mirra: Adonis e in profumo dei Re Siriani' in *Adonis* pp. 35f.) they danced making a lot of noise (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 388 and 392 and Men. *Sam.* 44 and 46) to reach a frantic state (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 287 and 398, Men. *Sam.* 41). Some fruits were offered to Adonis, but as N. Weil art. cit. p. 682 says: "il faut sans doute retenir qu' aucun fruit n'était spécialement consacré à Adonis; qu'on lui offrait simplement des fruits de choix, de la meiller verme, comme les ὄρατους σιχθους de Praxilla ou les raisins noirs qui murissaient les premiers".

As Burkert *Gr. Religion* p. 177 says : "the climax is loud lamentation for the dead god. The dead Adonis was then laid out on his bier in the form of a statuette and borne to his grave: the effigy and the little garden were thrown into the sea" (cf. our fr. τὸν Ἄδωνιν κλάομεν or the word ἄδωνιασμός, a mourning song for Adonis, cf. Ar. *Lys.* 389 and Sch. ad loc.). About the rituals in this festivities, cf. also Detienne *The Gardens of Adonis* Engl. transl. London 1977 pp. 72ff.

Although the god and his myth were already known to Sappho

(cf. fr. 117 B a-b and 140 B V.), they were seen as recently introduced in Athens and generally from a negative point of view (about its origin and adaptation to the Greek Religion, cf. Burkert *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* Berkeley 1979 pp. 107ff.). Aristophanes refers to it in *Pax* 420 and it is frequently found in comedy (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 387-96, fr. 759, Cratin. fr. 17.3; in Middle and New Comedy: Eub. fr. 13; Diph. fr. 42, 40; Men *Sam.* 35-50). Plato com. wrote a play called 'Αδώνις (cf. K-A ad loc. for other plays with the same title) and Philippides 'Αδωνιάζουσαι (related to the letter of Alciph. IV14 inspired in Greek new comedy in general (cf. Weil *BCH* 94 (1970) p. 592 ) All these passages seem to portray it as a shameful activity, related to prostitutes mainly (cf. Diph. loc. cit.) to a dangerous licentiousness (cf. Men. loc. cit.), or to bad omens (cf. Ar. *Lys.* loc. cit.). Theocr. 15 is a later and probably stylized representation of this festivity already with an official character. A detailed analysis of the passages of comedy where it is mentioned is found in Long *Barbarians in Gr. Com.* pp. 22ff.

In any case, as Gow says ad Theocr. vol. II p. 266, "the 'Αδωνιάζουσαι of Philippides was probably as remote in theme as the *Lysistrata*, which according to Sch. Ar. *Lys.* 390 was sometimes (very inappropriately) called by this name". The festival was probably quite popular, mainly because of its unofficial character (cf. Burkert *Gr. Religion* p.177). In Comedy women's festivals were very frequent. Ar. *Thesm.* is the only complete example we have, and in general they seem to be chosen

as an excuse for the presentation of other elements or as a situation where some essential elements of the action took place. This feature became a commonplace in comedies related to hetaerae (cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 329ff. and Leo *Plautinische Forschungen* pp. 173-4 Berlin 1912<sup>2</sup> says commenting on it as inspired from Menander's lost play *Καρχηδόνιος*: "wie in dem hinzugenommenen Stück wurden Ἄφροδίσια gefeiert; sich darüber zu wundern sehe ich gar keine Veranlassung. In Menanders *Kolax* wurde auch ἡ τῆς πανδήμου Ἄφροδίτης ἑορτὴ gefeiert; er hat auch Ἄφροδίσια gedichtet, Ἄδωνιάζουσαι, Διονυσιάζουσαι, Παννυχίς sind Titel der neuen Komödie, die Hetärenfeste werden in der abgeleiteten Litteratur sehr häufig erwähnt, ein Hetärenpaar oder Hetäre mit Dienerin, mit der Schmuck beschäftigt oder von der Toiletten kommend, wird in diesen Stücken in der Regel aufgetreten sein").

It is not strange then to find this fragment in a poet whose number of hetaera comedies, as far as we can guess, was exceptional for this period (cf. *supra* p. 45).

#### Fr. 182

ὕπελυσε: the sense of this fragment is unclear, mainly because this verb ὑπολύω is used to mean: 'to undo' sandals or shoes in Attic Greek; but this meaning seems impossible, unless it is understood that δήμαρχός τις has undone the sandals of someone else; expression which can be simply said with the name of the person as in Pl. *Symp.* 213b, *Pherecr.* fr. 162,9.

Another possibility is to emend it; but as K-A *ad loc.* say: "nec iuvant coniecturae adhuc prolatae (ὕπεδυσε Bothe, ἀπέδυσε

Blaydes *Adv.* II p. 25, παρέλυσσε Herw. 'olim', Coll. p. 18)". The lack of any object makes them equally possible. Perhaps ἀπέδυσσε by Blaydes would be parallel to ἀποδύντες in Ar. *Ach.* 627 and it might be easily understood in the context where a demarch takes his cloak off and joins a chorus' performance.

Whitehead *The Demes of Attica* Princeton 1986 p. 332 gives two possible explanations "perhaps we should indeed visualize an amiable demarch letting down his official hair, so to speak, and joining in the fun of a dance (choros). On the other hand, the only surviving appearance of 'some demarch' in comedy (Arist. *Clouds* line 37: δάκνει μὲ δήμαρχός τις ἐκ τῶν στρωμάτων) represents him, albeit good-humoredly, as a figure more likely to diminish than to increase the pleasure of his feckless fellow demesmen; so it may be that what Pherecrates' demarch has 'undone' here is the dance itself". In this case the verb should be understood as metaphorical, and this would be the only instance for this meaning, related to one religious function of the demarch as organizer of some religious festivals (cf. op. cit. pp. 135-6, above all n. 83)

δήμαρχός τις: main official of a deme appointed probably by sortition although it is not exactly clear, because it depended probably on the deme. Yet in the V century this method seems to be generally used (cf. Whitehead op. cit. p. 115).

He had religious functions, as well as legal ones in his own deme (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 37 and see Whitehead op. cit. pp. 121ff. for the different functions of the demarch). As Whitehead op. cit. p. 122 says "he was also the crucial pivot between the spheres of

local government and central government, deme and polis". Despite this fact we only have two instances in comedy: this one of Pherecrates and the other one of Aristophanes in *Clouds*, already quoted.

#### Fr. 183

**παρασκευάζει:** this imperative is said to someone different from the second one (cf. σὺ δὲ, about this expression, see fr. 37.1), perhaps to a slave.

The words δεῖπνον παρασκευάζεσθαι seems to have been the way to mean 'to prepare a banquet' as in Hdt. IX 82. Other compounds of the verb seem to have specific senses for example δεῖπνόν τις ἐνεσκευάζετο in Ar. *Ach.* 1096 "used of 'arranging in' the χιστή" as Rennie says ad loc. (cf. Diph. fr.89 and συσκευάζειν in Ar. *Vesp.* 1251, Pherecr. fr. 57).

**καθίζανε:** it is a Homeric and poetic form of the verb καθίζω, 'to sit down' (cf. *Il.* 10.92; 23. 258; *Od.* 5.3; Sapph. 31. 3, 43.7; Alc. 75.8V; Aesch. *Eum.* 29).

It has an idea of reinforcement as Chantraine *Grammaire homérique* I p. 315 Paris 1958 says: "le suffixe -άνω s'est évidemment développé dans la langue épique comme il ressort de certaines formations qui lui sont propres. Il s'est même ajouté à des thèmes de présents caractérisés et parfois déjà affectés d'un suffixe" and later on "les dérivés en -άνω soulignent l'aboutissement de l'action. Il expriment surtout l'idée d'«obtenir» (λαγγάνω, τυγγάνω), d'«apprendre» (πυνθάνομαι)". According to Hainsworth ad *Od.* 5.3 (in A. Heubeck et al. *A*

*Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* I Oxford 1988) in Homer it had also the metrical ending: "finish a dactylic form before the bucolic diaeresis".

Here the word seems to have a stressing sense, perhaps parodical of poetic or archaic language, although this suffix may have been quite usual for the formation of verbs (cf. Schmid *GGrL* I 4 pp. 699ff.).

#### Fr. 184

**Ἐταίρας:** according to our sources, Hesych. ε6481, Athen. XIII 571c (cf. Philetaer. fr. 5) and 571c (cf. Apollod. *FGrH* 244 F 112) there existed a sanctuary devoted to Ἀφροδίτῃ Ἐταίρα at Athens and Ephesus (cf. also Athen. XII 573a). She was considered 'patroness of harlots' (cf. Gulick ad Athen. XIII 559a, vol. VI p. 23 n.a and *HSClPh* 5 (1984) p. 90). With the same function she was called Ἀφροδίτῃ Πορνῇ in Abydos (cf. Athen. XIII 572e) and probably Ἀφροδίτῃ ἐν καλάμοις or ἐν ἔλει was similar to that of Athens (cf. Athen. loc. cit.)

**Ἀφροδίτου:** the god Ἀφροδίτου seems to have been a minor divinity, represented in general by the figure of the 'androgynos': half woman and half man, normally dressed as woman. He was later better known as Hermaphrodite, and as P. Hermann in Roscher *Lexicon* I 2 2315 says: "es ist ohne weiteres klar, daß

dieser kyprische Aphroditos mit dem späteren Hermaphroditos identisch ist. Die komponierte Namensform bedeutet nichts anders als Herme des Aphroditos oder Aphroditos in Hermenform und ist nach Analogie verwandter Bildungen, wie Hermathena, Hermerakles, Hermerotes, entstanden".

This cult seems to come originally from Cyprus and Minor Asia, associated with the goddess Aphrodite, although it was never regarded as a foreign god; but, on the contrary, the eiresione was offered to him, a mainly Greek religious element, (cf. Delcourt *Hermaphrodite* pp. 49-50 Engl. trans. London 1961.

Ar. fr. 325 mentions him also and from the number of artistic representations, it seems that there was a revival of this cult at the end of the V century (cf. Jensen *RE VIII 1* (1913) 714ff.) According to Alciphro. III. 37 there was a shrine in Alopeke, a deme 2 km. south-west of Athens, where Socrates was born (cf. Pl. Gorg. 495 d), identified now with the modern Ampelokipi (cf. E. Freund in S. Lauffer (ed.) *Griechenland Lexicon der historischer Stätten* s.v. München 1989; E. Meyer *Kl. P.* I 1532).

This sentence, on the one hand, could have a moral sense; perhaps it is understood something like 'never go to the temple of Aphrodite Hetaera nor to that of Aphroditus', implying a reference to female prostitution and homosexual relationship, and perhaps bearing in mind what Philetas fr. 5 says: ὡς τακερὸν, ᾧ Ζεῦ, καὶ μαλακὸν τὸ βλέμμα' ἔχει. / οὐκ ἐτός ἐταίρας ἱερὸν ἐστὶ πανταχοῦ, / ἀλλ' οὐχὶ γαμετῆς οὐδαμοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος (cf. also Ar. *Vesp.* 10).

On the other hand, as I have already mentioned, there was a temple of Aphroditus in Alopeke, and also one of Aphrodite according to a later inscription *I.G. III 697* (cf. Preller *Griechische Mythologie* I p. 349 Berlin 1894); it is disputed if they were the same sanctuary (cf. Jensen op. cit. 717) and there may have existed more than one of each of them in Athens but this fr. might be a reference to this deme; a possible explanation would be 'when you go to Alopeke, do not go to...'

Fr. 185

Fragment attributed to *Γράες* by Meineke *FCG* II p. 268. It is a possible suggestion; but not sure, because some other plays could have a scene in which old women are young again. The sentence is rather repetitive with the adverbs *πάλιν αὖθις* (cf. *Ar. Pl.* 859) and with the prefix *ἀνα-* which give stress to the idea of repetition and improvement of a past situation.

The theme of the rejuvenation is a commonplace in Comedy which is found several times in Aristophanes from different points of view (cf. *Equ.* 1321, *Vesp.* 1256ff., *Ran.* 345, *Lys.* 670 and it seems it was mentioned in fr. 33 and 129. About this theme, cf. Conford *The Origin of Attic Comedy* pp. 87ff. London 1914 and also H.G. Oeri *Der Typ der komischen Alten* pp. 19-20. *Eccl.* 887ff. suggests the idea of "rejuvenating of old women" from a different point of view.

*ἀναθυσσιν*: seems to give the correct meaning as suggested by Meineke according to the proverb *Diogen.* IV, 10 (cf. Leutsch ad

loc., *CPG* I p. 234) γραῦς ἀναθυῶ: ἀντί τοῦ καπρῶ. 'Ἐπί τῶν παρ' ἡλικίαν γυναικιζομένων. Ὡς καί τὸ Γραῦς ἀναβακχεύει (cf. Phot. α1485 ἀναθυῶν· ἀνασκιρτῶν. καί αὖθις ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνανεάζειν and other instances quoted by K-A ad loc.).

Besides these texts, it is only found as meaning 'to be on heat again' in Arist. *HA* 546a 28, 573b 8 talking about swine's sexual rythms; perhaps applied to human beings it seems to be rather coarse (in comparison with ἀνανεάζειν in Ar. *Ran.* 592 for example), and it coincides with the insult κάπραινα or ἀνδροκάπραινα (cf. comment on fr. 186 and Taillardat *Images* §303).

Another possibility is to keep Suid. α1882 ἀνθύουσιν 'to take sacrificing again' which would have several implications (cf. Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.* p. 257 n. 7):

-it is related to the fact that 'women were especially devoted and played a great part in religious life' (Ehrenberg *ibid.* p. 257),

-the word θύω and the sacrificial world seems to have been the basis for obscene jokes (cf. Henderson *MM* p. 177),

-the poet could be playing on the similarity of both verbs and making an ironical reference to the saying above quoted.

αἱ γεραῖτεραι: this word can mean simply 'older than', 'someone who has been born earlier', as in Ar. *Equ.* 1004, Hdt. 6.52, Theocr. 15. 139, but it can also have a notion of dignity, as a synonymous with πρεσβύτερος (cf. LSJ s.v. γεραῖός). According to Jebb on Soph. *OC* 1294 it always implies the contrast between youth and a more advanced period of life (cf. Thuc. VI

18). See also Richards *Aristophanes and Others* p. 133 London 1909.

Bearing in mind the second connotation of this word, perhaps there is an intended contrast between this word and the verb ἀναθυᾶσιν which would be regarded as rather popular and coarse. The different registers of language stress the idea of the old women taking to sex again.

#### Fr. 186

This line summarizes commonplaces usually applied to women in comedy : lechery, drunkenness, and use of potions (witchcraft).

Several fragments mention them with some variation:

- Hermipp. fr. 9: ᾧ σαπρά καὶ πασιπόρνη καὶ κάπραινα,

- Theop. com. fr. 94: μεθύστρια and fr. 80: πρεσβυτικὸς φίλοινος, μεθύση οἰνομάχλη, κοχώνη,

- Phryn. com. fr. 34: ᾧ κάπραινα καὶ περιπολάς καὶ δρομάς.

These words could be applied, for instance, to a woman who speaks in Pherecr. fr. 70; this maybe was the reason for Demiańczuk's suggestion (fr. 21D) that it could belong to *Korianno*. Perhaps the term φαρμακίς is the most specific of all of them which might have been very derogatory like ἀνδροκάπραινα. They might have been said of a prostitute, or an Athenian woman in very abusive terms.

**ἀνδροκάπραινα**: Pherecrates' innovation of the common insult κάπραινα. Originally it designates the wild sow, feminine of κάπρος; but in comic fragments (cf. Hermipp. and Phryn.com. fr.

cit.) it only designates a 'lascivious woman'. In an erotic sense also the word *λαίνα* is also applied to women as in Ar. *Lys.* 231-2 (cf. Henderson ad loc.) The ending *-αίνα* was then a common way of forming feminine nouns (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 666 and Pherecr. fr. 70. 4-5) although it does not seem to convey itself any pejorative sense (cf. Dover *GH* p. 113 n. 7).

Aristophanes invents the word *ἀνδραραστής* with similar connotations in *Thesm.* 392.

*μεθύση*: cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1402, *Nub.* 555, cf. H.G. Oeri *Der Typ der komischen Alten* pp. 13ff.

*φαρμακίς*: it designates a witch or potion-maker. In Old Comedy we have only two references to this figure: this fr. and Ar. *Nub.* 749, although she may have been fairly common. The fullest description is that of *Φαρμακεύτρια* Theocr. 2 (cf. also Pl. *Grg.* 513 a, Lucian *Dial. Meretr.* 4.1ff.).

In our case, it seems to be an adjective (perhaps *γυνή* or *γραιός* understood) as in Ar. loc. cit. *γυναῖκα φαρμακίδα*. A similar word is *βάσκανος* which means, more specifically, sorcerer generally in masculine as noun (cf. Men. *Pk.* 279); but also as adjective in Ar. *Equ.* 103 (applied to sycophant especially see Neil ad loc.), and Pl. 571 (in feminine).

#### Fr. 187

The sense of the fr. is obscure mainly due to the word *μεξοφρυς*, an emendation suggested by Nauck, but not always accepted. Demiańczuk (ad fr. 21D) suggests that 'loqui videtur mulier de altera muliere pulchra ipsi simili'. It also could be

that it is a man speaking about a woman, insofar as μέλας in reference to skin or in general was a sign of masculinity (cf. Taillardat *Images* §314).

μείζοφρος: the emendation is made according to Cratin. fr. 470. It seems to mean "having eyebrows that meet" (cf. LSJ s.v. μείζοφρος) and perhaps it indicates that the eyebrows meet at the nose or it is a sign of gravity and anger, being a comic exaggeration for a person who is always frowning.

The form μείζοφρυξ 'half-Phrygian' is accepted by Edmonds *FAC* I p. 276 and explained at length by Rehrenböck p. 302, where he suggests that "inhaltlich gibt die Farbbezeichnung μέλαινα m. E. besseren Sinn, wenn die Herkunft der Dame angegeben wird, als wenn von zusammengewachsenen Augenbrauen die Rede ist. Auf eine Diskussion über die mögliche Haarfarbe der Phryger können wir bei einem Mischling doch wohl verzichten". He proposes that it is parallel with expressions as μείζοφρύγιος, μείζολύδιος, etc., and κολοφρυξ, ὀλόφρυξ, while μείζοφρος 'bleibt somit ein Hapax für Kratinos' p. 303.

In this case, the emendation is not necessary and the adjective μέλαινα' should be attached to another part of the body (maybe the skin or the hair) or in general to the dark complexion as in Dem. 21.71 and MacDowell ad loc.: ἰσχυρός τις ἦν, μέλας, εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι γιγνώσκουσιν τινες ὑμῶν ὃν λέγω.

Phrygian people were not denoted by their hair-colour (as Thracians, cf. Xanthias, the Thracian slave of Frogs), but their language (cf. μείζοφρύγιος Xanth. fr. 8), their religion and music

language (cf. *μῆξοφρύγιος* Xanth. fr. 8), their religion and music (cf. the cult of Cybele adopted by Athens, Boardman *The Greeks Overseas* p.93 London 1973<sup>2</sup>, H. Thiemer *Der Einfluß der Phryger auf die altgriechische Music* Bonn 1979). As slaves *Φρύξ* (Ar. *Vesp.* 433), Midas, Manes (*Lys.* 1211, *Pherecr.* fr. 10), Mania (*Ran.* 1345) are typical names of Phrygian slaves. They were famous for being rude, clumsy, badly behaved (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1309 a conjecture, *Av.* 1329, Taillardat *Images* §433), and cowardly (cf. Apollod.com. fr. 6); they were treated with contempt generally (cf. Gomme-Sandbach on Men. *Asp.* 206).

Nauck's emendation is supported by K-A who say: 'multo melius cum μέλαινα componitur μῆξοφρυς et eiusmodi proprietates requiri videtur ut κατ' ἐμέ intellegi possit'. Certainly eyebrows were an important facial element. They were the seat of smiles and joy, gravity and grief, disdain and pride (cf. LSJ s.v. ὄφρυς, Taillardat *Images* §503 and 326 van Leeuwen ad Ar. *Vesp.* 655); Cratin fr. 228 seems to point them out as the main feature of someone (instead of σύνοφρυς) perhaps Cleon (cf. O. Welsh *CIQ* 73 (1979) p. 215) or another politician as Pericles (cf. Gomme-Sandbach ad Men. *Sic.* 160). Both poets might use a common joke, a variation of σύνοφρυς, perhaps with a secondary sense that escapes us (cf. Taillardat *ibid.* §14 about the use of a similar expression by Ar. *Ran.* 1004 and *Pherecr.* fr. 100).

It is still uncertain what it exactly means here. In a similar way as I have suggested at the beginning, Gow on Theocr. 8. 72 explains that σύνοφρυς is used of brows contracted in a scowl (Dio Chrys. 33,54; cf. Eur. *Alc.* 777, Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.*

58), but Daphnis no doubt means eyebrows nearly joined over the nose- an admired trait". But what does it mean to have the brows mixed, confused? The image seems so uncertain that if it is not a caricature, the only way would be to keep the text of the manuscript and understand it as a reference to a slave or a kind of an insult calling someone half-barbarian.

#### Fr. 188

This fragment seems to make reference to someone eating, gulping food, in some way, similar to Pherecr. fr. 170. The element of ἀπληστ(α (cf. Pherecr. fr. 167) or gluttony was a commonplace in Attic comedy, above all, in relation to the figure of Heracles (cf. *Pax* 741, *Vesp.* 60 with a construction in accusative similar to here). A parallel expression is found in *Eup.* fr. 99, 82.

**ἀνεμολύνθη:** "to stain, sully", μολύνω with the strengthening prefix ἀνα-. It could indicate also repetition. In *Plu.* 2, 580 it seems to mean totally, 'from top to bottom'.

In *Theocr.* 5. 87. *Hippon.* 123D (cf. Henderson p. 75 and Dover ad *Theocr.* loc.cit. [London 1971]) the verb μολύνω has clearly an obscene sense. In *Ar. Equ.* 1286 the expression μολύνω τὴν ὑπὴνην is said in a context with sexual references.

**τὴν ὑπὴνην:** it designated originally the 'moustache' in distinction from the beard (πώγων, cf. *Eub.* fr. 98), although it was used also of the beard in general (cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 746, *Lys.* 1072, *Pl. com.* fr.130). As γένειον, it seems that its meaning

Theocr. 20. 22 (cf. Gow ad loc.; LSJ s. v. quotes also Arist. *HA* 518 b 18) to mean 'the upper-lip' (cf. Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s. v.: "se dit de la lèvre supérieure qui se couvre de poils").

τῆ γάρῳ: it seems to be a popular kind of food made of brine, pickled fish of different kinds and with different ingredients, which give place to several denominations: οἰνόγαρον, ὀξύγαρον, ἐλαιόγαρον or γαρέλαιον, ὑδρόγαρον. It was eaten as aperitif with vegetables or as medicine and was sold in a special shop in the agora, γαροπώλης (cf. Zahn *RE* VII 1 841ff.).

In Comedy it is mentioned also in Cratin. fr. 312, Pl. com. fr. 215.

#### Fr. 189

According to Crusius *Phil.* 47 (1889) 43 'ad fabellam (cf. *Phaedr.* I 9), quam altera persona narrabat pertinere conicio. Ita Trygaeus Aristophanis (Pacis v. 1066) oraculo audito.'

Another possibility is to understand ὁ λαγῶς as θαλάττιος a 'sea-hare' which was "a kind of sea-slug, with large ear-like tentacles, and the power of emitting a copious and beautiful purple dye: of which, however, there is no clear account in the ancient descriptions. The sea-hare was celebrated in antiquity as extremely poisonous, and of magical properties", as Thompson *Fishes* s. v. says. It is also found in Hippon. 169D, Epich. fr. 60.2 Kaib., Amips. fr. 17 (in a proverbial expression), Cratin. fr. 466, Eup. fr. 174, Soph. fr. 111R (see Jebb ad loc. about the form λαγός), Nicand. *Alex.* 465. A dead sea-hare could cause

death to someone and a dose of the liquid it emitted<sup>t</sup> was poisonous  
cf. <sup>h</sup>Tompson loc. cit.

**βασκάλνει:** here synonymous with τὸ λυπεῖν according to our source Zoran. p. 397, that is to say 'malign, disparage' (cf. LSJ s. v. 1, Gomme-Sandbach on Men. Asp. 153, and also Dem. 18.189, Antiphan. fr. 80. 8, Theocr. 6. 39). Originally 'to cast the evil eye on one' term probably from popular magic; cf. βασκάνιον in Ar. fr. 607 and βάσκανος in Men. Pk. 529.

#### Fr. 190

The metre is iambic tetrameter catalectic according to K-A's text. Elmsley *Edin. Rev.* 19 (1811) 88 suggests another scansion in iambic dimeters in comparison with fr. 50, *Doulodidaskalos*, to where he attributed these lines. The first line in Elmsley's proposal is presumably in catalectic dimeter and I do not see much the point when it is followed by a non-catalectic one.

The word *καρύα* in 1.2 does not fit the metre and seems thus corrupt. Elmsley suggests *καρύχη*, the Lydian sauce in fr. 195. It has been accepted in the text by Meineke (*CGF* II p. 341) and Edmonds *FAC* I p. 274.

The enumeration seems to be illogical, but it keeps quite well the order adjective plus noun or vice versa and it might be the case that the lost context might have give a meaning to these elements. I think that it could be understood as follows: "and there is radish unwashed and hot baths and dried fish baked and inuts..." Part of the pun may be in the contrast between the 'unwashed rad<sub>ish</sub>' and the 'hot baths' (see on θερμά λουτρά).

ράφανις τ' ἄπλυτος: 'unwashed radish', also called θασία according to Athen. II 56e-f, is found in Eup. fr. 338, Antiph. fr. 273, as part of long enumerations.

According to Amph. fr. 26 they were very cheap. In general ῥαφανίς was a generic name for species other than 'radish' (cf. Theophr. *HP* VII 4.2) and especially in comedy they were mentioned in reference to a punishment of adulterers (cf. Ar. *Nub* 1083 and Dover ad loc.). In Ar. *Nub.* 981 and *Pl.* 544 the head and the leaves respectively are mentioned in different contexts. About the first the Sch. ad loc. says: ὡς θερμὸν καὶ διεγεῖρον πρὸς τὰ ἀπροδίσια παρητοῦντο ταῦτα. The second seems to be a reference to simple food for poor people or soldiers.

θερμὰ λουτρά: these two words seem to be, at first sight, illogical in the context of the whole quotation, referring mainly to food.

Kock's suggestion is to change it into θέρμ' ἄλευρα, "puls ἐξ ἀλεύρων" which is never found and does not make better sense than the transmitted text; ἄλευρον is found in Ar. fr. 52, Sot. com. fr. 1.24, Phryn. com. fr.35, generally meaning only 'wheat meal', not a cooked food.

As Kaibel says (apud K-A), 'similia dissimilia iuxta enumerantur, consulto vero cum thermes coniuctae rapae illotae'. A similar case is, more or less, Call.com. fr. 26 where πῦρ has only distant relationship with the other elements of the enumeration, at least at first sight: ἔτινος, πῦρ, γογγυλίδες, ῥάφανος, δρυπεπεῖς, ἐλατῆρες.

The θερμὰ λουτρά is quite common in the context of the

comparison between old education and modern decadence (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 1044ff., see K-A ad Crat.com. fr. 17.2 for other instances). It was considered an element of moral weakness, and usually related to young men being in the baths only. The verb (cf. θερμολουτεῖν Hermipp. fr.68.2, Alex. fr.75) is opposed in this sense to ψυχολουτεῖν (cf. Ar. fr. 147). Other name with which they are denominated is βλανεῖα or 'public baths' (cf. Pherecr. fr. 75.1).

**τάριχη πνικτᾶ:** dried or smoked fish, very common in Greek Comedy and current in daily life, in Athens as cheap food (cf. Pherecr. fr. 26. 2).

In metaphorical sense it designated 'a stupid fellow' (cf. Taillardat *Images* §434, and LSJ s.v. τάριχος II.)

This way of cooking: 'baking in a closed pot (λοπάς) is frequently mentioned in comedy (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 511, Antiph. fr. 1, Cratin. fr. 29, Metag. fr. 6.9, Stratt. fr. 30, Alex. fr. 129.2).

**τάριχα:** general name for 'nut' and especially designates 'walnut' (cf. LSJ s.v., Lembach (1970) pp. 143-4 and n. 43 for other references).

In comedy they are found in relation to dried fruits thrown at the audience by the actors or the chorus (Ar. *Vesp.* 58, Pl. 797-801) and in an erotic sense designating feminine breasts (cf. Ar. fr. 664 and Crat.com. fr. 43)

#### Fr. 191

τὸ πνίγος: in Comedy generally it refers to a 'stifling heat' (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 1091 οὐδ' αὖ θερμὴ πνίγους ἡμᾶς / ἄστις θάλπει; although also to the heat, in general, after having a moment of very warm weather (cf. Ar. *Av.* πάσαις ὄραις, χειμῶνι, θέρει, / μετρίφ πνίγει, and Pl. *Phaedr.* 279b: ἴωμεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸ πνίγος ἡπιώτερον γέγονεν.

In metaphorical sense the verb πνίγειν is synonymous with ὀργιζεσθαι 'to be angry' (cf. Taillardat *Images* 9381).

ἀσελγές: it means "oppressive"; but here it is applied to weather elements, as in Eup. fr. 345 and Plat.com. fr. 232. It is normally used of persons qualified as 'licentious, brutal' (cf. Ar. *Pl.* 560, Dem. 21. 128 with a moral connotation of excess, see MacDowell ad loc. and Dem. 36.45).

#### Fr. 192

καττύομαι: manuscript C reads καττύομεν; the verb in middle voice is only found here, but some lexicons (cf. Phot. p. 150.18 and Anecd. Bekk. p. 270 quoted by K-A) would support this form as synonymous with ὑποδεῖσθαι, that is to say 'to put shoes on' (in general, cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1160 and maybe Crat. com. fr. 32.4)

Originally the expression means 'to put a piece of leather (καττύς, Ar. fr. 297 or καττύμα Ar. *Ach.* 301 and Sch. ad loc., and *Equ.* 315, 869) as the sole of a sandal' (see also πέλμα); it was not always made of leather, but of cork (cf. Dsc. *Eup.* 2. 30) or wood; a synonym of this verb is πτερνίζειν and as compound

form ἐπικαττύειν (cf. Com. Adesp. fr. 46K). About shoe-making in general, cf. Bluemner *Techn.* I pp. 270ff., above all, 275.

In Aristophanes it can be found with a metaphorical sense in *Equ.* 314 ('to stitch up a plot', cf. also Pl. *Euthd.* 294b) and in *Pl.* 663 (cf. Müller *Handwerk und Sprache* pp. 240-1)

καρκίνους: 'crab-shoes'; according to Hesych. κ832 they are κοῖλα ὑποδήματα, which are defined by Poll. VII 84 as follows: λέγοιτο δ' ἂν καὶ ὑποδήματα κοῖλα, βαθέα εἰς μέσην τὴν κνήμην ἀνήκοντα· τὰ δὲ μὴ κοῖλα αὐτὸ μόνον ἀποχρῶν ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν ὑποδήματα. περὶ ἧ δὲ τείνεται καὶ περιρράπτεται τὰ κοῖλα ὑποδήματα καλάποδες οὐ κατὰ τὴν νῦν χρεῖαν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν κέκληνται.

It could be translated, then, as 'calf-boots' (cf. Cunningham ad Herond. 7.60) and they might be masculine shoes (cf. Poll. VII 89-90, source of our fragment) in comparison with καρκίνια in Herond. 7. 60 and 128, which would be together a diminutive form for a kind of shoes for women.

Headlam ad Herond. loc. cit. suggests that the name is given from their colour (as καρκινίαις designates a red stone cf. Plin. *NH* XXXVII 72). It might well have an ironical reference to the way of walking produced by wearing these shoes; as that of a crab: slow and erratic, often suggested in Antiquity (cf. Ar. *Pax* 1083, *Crat.* com. fr. 32.3 in parody of epic language, and Appen. prov. III 45 καρκίνου πορεία ἢ ἀργὴ καὶ δυσδιόρθωτος and Diogen. V 96, Sud. κ395).

Perhaps if the verb was the active form καττύομεν, the expression could have several senses and be a joke. It could

mean: 'to put a new sole on' meaning we are trying to walk quickly', or 'we are putting new soles on 'crabs'.

#### Fr. 193

Not only the sense of this fr. has been disputed, but also whether Pherecrates ever said these words. This attribution has recently been denied by N. Schiel *Euphr.* 7 (1975-6) pp. 127-8 who suggested that Aristophanes here is criticising Pherecrates "for grinding out the same old themes and jokes, and for inflicting more suffering on an audience he has already punished". He understands τὸ τοῦ Φερεκράτους in *Ar. Lys.* as 'like Pherecrates does' and adduces the Sch.: ἐν τοῖς σφζομένοις Φερεκράτους τοῦ κωμικοῦ τοῦτο οὐχ εὑρίσκειται (cf. Schmid *GGrL* I 4 100 n. 8)

I think that Shiel's suggestion is not correct and Rehrenböck pp. 259 ff. discusses it at length. The main points of his argument are: the joke of the passage of *Lysistrata* is based on a misuse of the words which can be ambiguous; if Pherecrates had not said them, the whole joke would be lost; the expression τὸ τοῦ Φερεκράτους would designate a characteristic feature of the poet (cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 1525 τὸ Φρυν(χειον); *Pherecr. test.* 2 (Anon. *De Com.* 9 p.7 Kock) gives innovation as a feature of his plays (cf. Körte *RE* XIX 1990. 38 and 41).

A similar passage would be *Ar. fr.* 347: ἦ μέγατι βρῶμ' τέστι  
ἦτ τρυγφοδοιομουσική, / ἦνίκα Κράτης τὸ τε τάριχος ἐλεφάντινον /  
λαμπρὸν ἐνόμιζεν ἀπόνως παρακεκλημένον / ἄλλα τε τοιαῦθ' ἐτέρα  
μυρ' ἐχιγλίζετο (vid. ad *Crat. com. fr.* 32).

Although it is likely, then, that Pherecrates used this

expression probably recently before the performance of *Lysistrata*, it is doubtful what Aristophanes is making fun of and what Pherecrates actually said. There are two possible explanations:

- this phrase is a proverb, either before or after our playwright; who had used it in an obscene sense, and it was modified by Aristophanes for his own purpose.

- Aristophanes is giving an obscene sense to a proverbial sentence used by Pherecrates to refer to ἐπὶ τῶν μάτην πονούντων ἢ τῶν προπεπονθότων τι, as Diogen. V 85 says (cf. Apost. X 29, Sch. ad Ar. *Lys.* 158 Φερεκράτης ἐν δράματι εἶπε τοῦτο, ἔνθεν τάσσεται ἡ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλο πασχόντων <αὔθις> ἐφ' οἷς πεπόνθασιν.

The first suggestion is accepted by Willems *Aristophane. Traduction avec notes et commentaires critiques* II pp. 426f. Paris/Brussels 1919, explaining it as follows: "κύων δεδαρμένος équivaut à αἰδοῖον ἀνατεταμένον (voir plus loin le vers 953), et κύνα δέρειν δεδαρμένον c'est, pour emprunter à Hérodote, une expression qu'on pourrait également détourner de son acceptation première, δεψεῖν χεῖρὶ τὸ δέρμα (IV, 64), ou simplement δέφεσθαι. Si *Lysistrata* emploie ici le féminin τὴν κύνα, c'est qu'elle s'adresse à des femmes. Il y a là une malice du poète, car évidemment Phérécrates avait écrit τὸν κύνα".

The latter is supported by Wilamowitz in his note ad *Lys.* loc. cit.; van Leeuwen: 'ridicule detorquetur sensus locutionis proverbialis, qua ἐπὶ μάτην πονούντων dicebatur, ut νέκρον ἀποσφάττειν'; Henderson *MM* p. 133, and K-A who add: 'locutionem

proverbialem a rivali adhibitam Aristophanes facete ut solet detorsit, vid. ad Ar. Fr. 33, 47, 964'.

I would be inclined to think that Aristophanes is parodying him, at the same time as quoting him; that is to say whatever Pherecrates meant, the sentence is well attested to have an obscene sense in every <sup>one</sup> of its words at the level of slang terminology: δερεῖν and compounds as ἐκδερεῖν or ἀποδερεῖν meant "to masturbate" (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 592, Taillardat *Images* §103, Henderson *MM* p. 133) and κύων can refer to masculine or feminine genitals (cf. Eust. *in Od.* p. 1821.53, Hesch. κ4763). Maybe Pherecrates used it in an appropriate context as an ambiguous phrase (perhaps as suggested by Willems in <sup>the</sup> masculine), with the intention of making a subtle erotic reference, which Aristophanes parodies here in the context of a clearly obscene passage, making reference to the ὄλισβος (about it cf. Ar. fr. 992 and K-A ad loc. for other references).

Kaibel apud K-A suggests that Aristophanes can have confused Pherecrates with Cratinus who makes clear reference to the ὄλισβος in fr. 354; but this seems highly doubtful.

#### Fr. 194

κάδουζ: in fact it is a general term for a vessel 'that takes its specific meaning from the context' (according to Sparkes *JHS* 95 (1975) p.128) although its primary function might have been to carry liquids.

Here it designates the well-bucket as in Ar. *Eccl.* 100, Men. *Dysc.* 190, Herond. 5. 11 (Headlam ad loc. suggests ἀντλιαντητήρ

as a more elegant term found in Men. fr. 30 K8-T). It could be made of pottery or of bronze and was round with two handles (cf. D. A. Amyx *Hesperia* 27 (1958) plate 47).

Other functions were to store and transport wine (cf. Amyx art. cit. p. 186) and it designated the voting urn of the Assembly and tribunals in Athens, in diminutive form καδίσκος (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 321, 853) or as κάδος in Ar. *Av.* 1032. It appears without a definitive function in Archil. 4. 7 W<sup>2</sup>, Ar. *Ach.* 549, *Pax* 1202, fr. 280, fr. 598; in diminutive with metaphorical sense, Philipp. fr. 28.

ἀνασπᾶν: synonym of ἀντλέω (cf. Thuc. IV 97 ὕδωρ τε ὃ ἦν ἄψαυστον σφίσι πλὴν πρὸς τὰ ἱερὰ χέρνιβι χρῆσθαι, ἀνασπᾶσαντας ὑδρεύσθαι, in absolute construction. This image of drawing water out of the well possibly explains the expression ἀνασπᾶν λόγους (cf. Soph. *Aj.* 302, Ar. *Ran.* 903, Pl. *Tht.* 180a, cf. further Taillardat *Images* §766).

#### Fr. 195

The metre can be understood as an 'Euripidean fourteen syllable. This consists of two iambic metra followed by an ithyphallic' according to MacDowell ad *Vesp.* 248 and Aristophanes seems to use it mainly related to choral parts (cf. *Nub.* 1114, *Ran.* 395-6, 441-5) perhaps because of the mixture of iambic and trochaic rhythms, before the beginning of a song or between two different strophes (cf. Pherecr. fr. 2.3 and K-A ad loc.). The ithyphallic is also common as a clausula after an iambic metron in a pnygos (cf. *Ach.* 1160-1, 1172-3, *Av.* 635-6). If this is the

case here, the fragment should be written as follows: ἄβυρτάκην  
τρίψαντα καὶ / Λυδίαν καρύκην.

**ἄβυρτάκην:** as described by Phot. α66 (cf. also Anecd. Bekk. 323. 26-30): ὑπότριμμα βαρβαρικόν ἐκ δριμέων σκευαζόμενον, φημὶ ἐκ καρδάμων καὶ σκορόδων καὶ σινάπεως καὶ σταφίδων, ᾗ πρὸς κοιλιολυσίαν ἐχρῶντο. It belongs to this kind of products and food related to the Persian fashion and wealth (cf. Theop.com. fr. 18: Ἴζη δὲ Μήδων γαίαν, ἔνθα καρδάμων / πλείστων ποιεῖται καὶ πράσων ἄβυρτάκη), as it was the καρυκή or the κάνδαυλος (cf. Athen. XII 516d).

It seems to have been very sour sauce, but very much liked (cf. Alex. fr. 145.12-3); it is also mentioned in Antiph. fr. 140.3 as having 'young green vegetables' and in Men. fr. 247Kö-T.

This fragment seems to suggest that it is Lydian as the other kind of food; but it is not sure (cf. Theop.com. loc.cit.). R. Schmitt *Orientalia. Jacques Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (1984) pp. 69ff. tries to find an equivalent product in Persian-Iranian language. About this sauce and barbarian food in Comedy, see Long *Barbarians in Gr. Com.* pp. 69ff., especially p. 72.

**τρίψαντα:** τρίβω 'to pound' is the technical term to designate the preparation of τρίμμα or ὑποτρίμμα, general terms for sauce, drink or medicine compound of several products, generally spicy and sour (cf. Ar. *Ecc1.* 292 and Ussher ad loc., 404, *Pax* 8, 16, etc.)

**Λυδίαν καρυκήν:** or καρύκην, form preferred by Hdn. Gr. 1. 317 (cf. Tim. Phlias. *SH* 777). It was a very popular rich sauce

made of blood and spices, according to Zen. V 3, often found in different dishes as νόστος (cf. Athen. 14. 646e) a kind of cake. In general Alex. fr. 168. 4-5: τοῖς δὲ κεκαρυκευμένοις / ὄψοισι (about this verb in metaphorical sense, see Ar. *Equ.* 342, Plut. II 55a). According to Orth *RE* XI 954 it was made like the μέλας ζῶμος in Sparta.

It was mentioned 'in contrast with simple food' according to Neil ad *Equ.* 342 who also quotes Men. fr. 462.7, 518.7ΚΒ-T, Plut. *quaest. conv.* IV 1. 664a.

#### Fr. 196

Perhaps ταῦτ' or τοῦτ' suggested by Kassel after σὺ makes a better construction of the verb ἀκούω with accusative of the thing heard and genitive of the person from whom it is heard (cf. LSJ s.v. and K-G I pp. 360ff.). Although the particle δῆτ' suggested by Meineke and accepted by Kock in his text is not impossible according to Denniston *GP* p. 269 "it denotes that the question springs out of something which another person (or more rarely the speaker himself) has just said".

Kock proposes another division of these words and gives ἔτος τρίτον; to the first speaker, because the same speaker could not say "ante duo annos anno tertio"; although it could be an expression to specify the word πρῶπέρυσι, as Poll. I 57 says: προπέρυσι, τρίτον ἔτος τουτί και τέταρτον, και ὁμοίως κατ' ἀριθμὸν τὸν παρελθόντα χρόνον λογίζου.

**πρωπέρυσι:** two years ago, perhaps found first here in Greek literature, because the other instances are probably later, e.g. Pl. *Euthd.* 272b: πέρυσιν ἢ προπέρυσιν οὐδέπω ἦσθην σοφῶ (Hawtrey ad loc. [*Commentary on Plato's Euthydemus* Philadelphia 1981] suspects a parody of the Aristophanic style in the speech of Socrates), and Dem. 20.33 (πρωπέρυσιν), 33.25 (προπέρυσιν).

The form *πρωπέρυσιν* is reported to be Attic for *προπέρυσιν* (cf. Phryn. *Praep. soph.* p.105.9 quoted by K-A). It could be explained as an example of reduplication or lengthening of a short vowel in compound forms as *σοφώτερος* or *έτερώθι* (cf. Schwyzer *GrG* I p.293 and 354).

**ἔτος τρίτον:** the whole expression is *ἔτος τρίτον τουτί* (as in Dem. 21.13 and Poll. loc.cit.) which MacDowell ad Dem. loc.cit. explains: "the idiom may have originated as a parenthetic sentence, 'This is the third year', rather than as an accusative of time".

#### Fr. 197

This fragment is a comic enumeration of cooking methods. It might be a parody of the style of a recipe and its terminology and it may have been said by a cook or a *doulodidaskalos*, as Meineke suggests that it belongs to the play of that name (proposal accepted by Edmonds *FAC* I p.224). Certainly the instructions for cooking and its detailed mention would suit quite well a context where a slave is taught how to cook and serve a meal; fr. 44 and 45 are similarly a detailed description of how to use a lamp (cf. also fr. 53). The same metre is found

in fr. 51.

A general problem is to guess what is described by this group of verbs. Another similar enumeration in Ar. fr. 282: πίτιω, βράτιω, δεύω, μάτιω, πέτιω, καταλᾶ does not seem to keep any order and Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour* p. 160 suggests that it is an enumeration of 'the miller's and baker's activities', probably, I would add, with a comic intention in the alliteration of the sound 't' and the verbs with two 'τ' in the middle (cf. other enumerations of activities in Mnesim. fr. 4.52ff. and Cratin. fr. 150.2 for methods of cooking meat).

This fragment can be divided into two parts: till ἀλέσαι in 1.2 where the preparation of the grain to make flour is explained and from ἀλέσαι on, until the serving is finally mentioned. There is a gap in the metre of the second line and it partly depends on it to know what kind of food is referred to here.

If we accept Bergk's suggestion <πέψαι> (cf. K-A's apparatus criticus), that is to say 'to bake', it must refer to the preparation of barley-bread, occasionally done in Antiquity and mainly as food for poor people or slaves (cf. Hippon. 366D, Poll. VI 73, Athen. III 115c; see infra on φρυγεῖν about this grain being unsuitable to make bread).

The other possibility is the μᾶζα or barley-cake made with water, oil (Hesych. μ41), milk (cf. Sud. μ35 and Hes. *Op.* 590) or other ingredients (Poll. VI 76). It was very popular as staple food of the Athenians (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 1104, 1165, *Eccl.* 665) and other Greek people (cf. Plut. 16. 230e and Athen. IV 148f about an Arcadian dinner where there were special μᾶζονόμοι) and as

part of country feasts (cf. West as Hes. loc.cit.). In this case πέψαι does not seem appropriate, because the μᾶζα is characterized only by being kneaded (cf. μάττειν) and not baked, as Pl. *Rep.* II 372b show clearly the distinction between the two activities: τὰ μὲν πέψαντες, τὰ δὲ μᾶξαντες μᾶζας γενναίας καὶ ἄρτους ἐπὶ κάλαμόν τινα παραβαλλόμενος ἢ φύλλα καθαρὰ. I would suggest, instead, <δεῦσαι> before μᾶξαι that has similar letters to ἀλέσαι and thus could have been easily omitted, and it must have been an essential part of the preparation of any kind of dough: the mixing of the 'dry mass with water, so as to make it fit to knead' (cf. LSJ s.v. δεύω 2) and also it would include all the other ingredients; it is also mentioned by Aristophanes in the fragment above cited. As West on Hes. loc.cit. says: "μᾶζαι were kneaded shortly before they were consumed (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 673, *Vesp.* 614)" and probably its immediate consumption would be recommended because it was easier to digest (cf. Hipp. *Vict.* VI 536, Athen. III 115d).

My suggestion for the second line would be: ἀνεῖν, ἀλέσαι, <δεῦσαι>, μᾶξαι, τὸ τελευταῖον παραθεῖναι.

The anapaestic tetrameter seems to have been especially suitable for these long enumerations, e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 659, 676-7, Pl. 513-4, fr. 428, 430, possibly 282.

1. ἐπιχεῖσθαι: Edmonds *FAC* I p. 224 n.7 suggests it is suspect and changes it into ἐπιχῶσαι unnecessarily. It can mean "to heap barley up", as in Homeric language it can refer to the act of pouring earth over the grave to make a mound or tumulus (cf. in

middle voice A.R. III 205). Here it must already make reference to the moment after the threshing of the grains which took place outside, in the "threshing-floor, the ἀλωή, ἄλω, εἰλοπέδον or δῖνος" (about it cf. A.D. Ure *CIQ* n.s. 5 (1955) pp. 228ff. and Gow ad Theocr. 7. 34; about different methods of threshing, see Blümner *Techn.* I pp. 2ff.). A heap of winnowed grain was called σωρός.

τὰς κριθάς: "barley", is a kind of corn regarded as cheap in comparison with wheat which kept being preferable for human alimentation throughout Antiquity (cf. Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour* p. 150 and especially *CIQ* n.s. 5 (1955) pp. 137-8). It was devoted mainly to feed animals and became common for human consumption in certain preparations: μᾶζα (cf. supra), πτισάνη (Lat. tisana), connected with πτίττειν (cf. infra) that was a kind of porridge (cf. Ar. fr. 165), or as a drink χυλός (cf. Cratin. fr. 329).

Here it may refer to κριθάς ὄλας also called οὐλάς or ὀλάς when used in sacrifices (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 1167, *Pax* 948, etc.).

The process of cleaning it described in this line is quite long due to the fact that barley is husked and has to undergo special operations before it is edible (cf. Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour* p. XXI).

πτίττειν: it describes the process of winnowing the grain, that is to say, to hull it or husk it, ἀφαιρεῖν τὸ κέλυφος (cf. van Leeuwen ad *Ach.* 507, Theophr. *HP* IV 4.10: νῦν δ' οὐδ' ἄν εἴς τρῖψεϊεν, ἀλλὰ περιπτίσαντες καὶ ἀφέλοντες τὸ κέλυφος). I think it is worthwhile to distinguish between this action that seems to

mean the husking barley with a mortar and the winnowing by wind or with a basket which was denominated with λικμάω (or with a winnowing-basket, λίκνον, πτύον, πτέον or θρίναξ; about these methods, see Blümner *Techn.* I pp. 8ff., J.E. Harrison *JHS* 23 (1903) pp. 299ff. and 303ff., *JHS* 24 (1924) pp. 241ff., Gow ad *Theocr.* 7. 156; in Rome, cf. K.D. White *Roman farming* pp.184ff. London 1970.

It must be related to the fact that barley is husked, therefore after removing the chaff of it (in this case called λικμάω), the barley was brought inside and husked at least twice. The name give to this action is πύπτειν, the same one as that of 'hitting or grinding' (according to Sud. π3030 it can mean τύπτω and Phot. s.v. πύσαι· κόψαι) because it was done by the θυεία (also called ἴγδις, Lat. mortarium) or the ὄλμος (lat. pila, about the difference between these two objects, cf. Bluemner *Techn.* I p.14 n.6, Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour* pp.22ff. and Sparkes *JHS* 82 (1962) p.125). It is possible that, as Moritz *ibid.* p.218 n.D suggests, the whole process of preparing the barley-flour for the 'maza' was done in mortars, at least till the IV century.

It became a technical word to qualify grains cleaned from chaff and husks (cf. Arist. *HA* 595b, Hipp. *VM* 14L1., *Geop.* 3.7, 16.3.1).

φρυγεῖν: "to parch or roast" was another process barley had to undergo for the total elimination of the husks, as Moritz *Grain-Mill and Flour* p.XXI says: "the special hulling operation which such grain must undergo was in Antiquity inevitably

combined with a roasting of the grain in its husks: this roasting must have largely destroyed the gluten content of the grain, and have made it unsuitable for leavened bread, even if before hulling it contained a sufficient amount of suitable gluten-forming proteins. Barley with its low protein content, is unsuitable for bread irrespective of this" (about it in Rome, cf. also J. André *L'alimentation et la cuisine à Rome* p.55 Paris 1981<sup>2</sup>). If the order of our passage is correct, this activity was perhaps done also after husking the grain.

It was also called *κοδομεύειν* (cf. Hesych.  $\chi$ 3202-6 and Blümner *Techn.* I pp. 11ff.) and the implement in which it was done *φρύγειτρον* or *κοδομεῖον* (cf. Poll. VI 64 who quotes Theop.com. fr.54 and Polyz. fr.6; a description can be found in Sparkes art.cit. p.128).

The result of this 'parching' was the *κάχρυς* or *κριθαὶ κεφρυγμέναι* (cf. Thuc. VI 22, Cratin. fr. 300.2).

**ἀναβραττεῖν**: the meaning of this word in the context of milling is perhaps given by Arist. *Mete.* 368b 29: ἐπὶ μῆκος γὰρ πολλαπλασία τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ βάθους ἢ διάκρισις. ὅπου δ' ἂν γένηται τοιοῦτος σεισμός, ἐπιπολάζει πλῆθος λίθων, ὥσπερ τῶν ἐν τοῖς λίκνοις ἀναβραττομένων. The comparison is clearly made with the small stones which probably were mixed in the winnowing-basket (λίκνον) and were separated from the grain with this method (a description of it is found in Harrison *JHS* 23 (1903) pp. 299ff.). This seems to be the technique which is referred to by Pl. *Sph.* 226b simply by *βράττειν* that means according to Tim. *Lex. Plat.* s. v. βράττειν· ἀνακινεῖν, ὥσπερ οἱ τὸν σίτον καθαίροντες.

It seems then that this word means originally 'to shake, to agitate throwing up' and it was applied to different moments which included this action: winnowing with a basket, and more likely in our text: 'to sift' by agitating the grain (cf. Call. fr. 334Pf.: εἰκαίην τῆς οὐδέν ἀπέβρασε φαθλον ἀλετρῖς, Hesych. α6264 τὸ διαπτῆσαι πυροῦς ἢ ἄλευρα ὀθόνη and see Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour* p.160).

The other sense given by LSJ s. v. 'boil well, to seethe' does not suit here (although Edmonds *FAC* I p.225 translates it with this meaning) and it seems to be a metaphorical sense used generally of cooking meat (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1005, *Ran.* 510 in which case it might be better to translate it as 'to stew' as Stanford ad *Ran.* loc.cit. does) or fish (*Pax* 1197).

2. ἀνεῖν: this word was considered synonymous with πρίσσειν (cf. Hdn. Gr. 24. 18, Athen. X 455b, Eust. *in Il.* p. 801. 5), although it seems to refer to another moment of the cleaning and peeling of a grain. Blümner *Techn.* I p. 14 n.2 explains their difference as follows: "beim πρίσσειν wird allerdings die kleineartige Spreu von der eigentlichen Frucht gesondert, dass aber das ἀνεῖν das Loslösen der Hülsen durch Hitze oder Feuer an der trockenen Frucht bewirkt habe, den widerspricht die Mehrzahl der andern Erklärer, wonach gerade beim ἀνεῖν die Frucht mit Wasser abgemacht wird; so Ael.Dionys. bei Eust.: ἀνεῖν, τὸ ἀναδεύειν καὶ ἀνακινεῖν κριθᾶς ὕδατι φύροντα, und die andere Erklärung bei demselben: οἱ δὲ τὸ ἀναποιεῖν ταῖς χερσὶ τὸ σίτον ὕδατι ῥάναντας".

The procedure of cleaning would be completed with a second

pounding, sifting and watering which <sup>would</sup> be logically done in several moments of this activity, as Plin. XVIII 72-3 explains in the process of preparing the polenta, the μάζα in Latin: "Graeci perfussum aqua hordeum siccunt nocte una ac postero die frigunt, dein molis frangunt. Sunt qui vehementius tostum rursus exigua aqua adspergant et siccent, priusquam molant. Alii vero virentibus spicis deccisum hordeum recens purgant madidumque in pila tundunt et pergatum molunt".

ἀλέσαι: 'to mill', in this case, it was done with mortars as I have already pointed out (cf. supra ad π(τ)τειν). About methods and instruments see Blümner *Tech.* I pp. 23ff. and Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour* pp. 1ff.

The result of milling barley was called ἄλφιτα or barley-flour, 'placenta' in Latin, in distinction with ἄλευρα or wheat-flour. This distinction seems to have become clearer throughout the V century, as compounds like ἀλφιταμοιβοῖ (Ar. Av. 491), ἀλφιτόπωλις (Ecc1. 686), ἀλφιτοπωλαῖς (Nicoph. fr. 10) seem to designate barley-flour dealers only and Pl. *Rep.* 2. 372b differentiates them definitively (cf. Moritz *CIQ* 43 (1949) pp. 113ff.). But it seems that the difference was not in the kind of grain, but in the methods of preparation and the quality of the milling, ἄλφιτα being coarser flour than ἄλευρα, although the flour from barley was always less refined than that of wheat because of their husked grains.

<πέψαι>: about it and the rest of the sentence, cf. p. 528.

μάξαι: 'to knead' is clearly and well attested as the origin of the μάζα (cf. Athen. XIV 663b: ἡμεῖς δέ φαμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ μάττειν,

ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἡ μᾶζα αὐτὴ ὠνομάσθη). There are several implements used for kneading: κάρδοπος or μάκτρα seems to have been the most usual; it was a tray, round or oblong made of stone, wood or terracotta (cf. Sparkes art.cit. p. 126); the σκάφη (cf. Sparkes *JHS* 82 (1962) p. 127) and large bowls called λεκάναι (cf. Sparkes art.cit. pp. 128-9).

About the preparation of the dough, cf. Blümner *Techn.* I p. 60. It was a very widespread meal in Greece that received different names (cf. Fournier *D-S* IV 1143).

#### Fr. 198

Possibly part of a speech about the serving of a banquet.

**τευτάζει:** here synonymous with σπουδάζει (cf. Kaibel and other sources cited by K-A), meaning 'to order, to hasten someone to do something'. It is not frequently found in comedy, only in Phryn.com. fr. 37, Telecl. fr. 38 with the meaning of 'to be busy', while it is common in Plato, e.g. *Rep.* 51e, *Phlb.* 56e, *Tim.* 90b, with the sense 'to be engaged in something' (LSJ).

The verb seems to be only an Attic idiom which became old fashioned as Luc. *Lex.* 21 says: οὐδέπω τὸ ἔκταρ ἐμήμεκας οὐδέ τὸ τευτάζεσθαι οὐδέ τὸ σκύλλεσθαι (cf. Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s. v.).

#### Fr. 199

The context of this fragment is obscure; above all it is not clear to whom αὐτοῖς refers. I think that there are three possible explanations:

- a reference to the comic chorus of the past, pointing out the poverty of their way of dressing. This interpretation is favoured by comparison with Ar. fr. 264: ὁ χορὸς δ' ὄρχεϊτ' ἄν ἐναψάμενος δάπιδας καὶ στρωματόδεσμα / διαμασχαλίσας αὐτὸν σκελίσιν καὶ φύσκαϊς καὶ ῥαφανῖσιν.

Meineke *FCG* II p.290 suggests that it could be part of the play *Κραπάταλοι*, above all in comparison with fr. 100 where Aeschylus speaks. It would be related to the novelties of the tragic poet introduced in the costume of the chorus (cf. also Ar. fr. 696). But although it is an interesting suggestion, it seems that Ar. fr. 264 above cited (and perhaps our fragment as well) refers to the comic chorus and Aeschylus does not seem to have anything to do with comedy (cf. Rehrenböck p.108).

- it refers to the poverty of the chorus of other authors and is mainly an attack on the choregus' meanness in giving money for their costume. In this sense δάπιδες, generally related to expensive rugs (cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 840, *Vesp.* 676, *Pl.* 528, 542, *Hermipp.* fr. 63.26) are now filthy and they also have slave's bedclothes. This theme is a topic of Old Comedy (cf. above all Eup. fr. 329: ἤδη χορηγὸν πάποτε / ῥυπαρώτερον τοῦδ' εἶδες, and also *Ach.* 1155, *Pax* 135-7, *Eccl.* 1181, *Theophr. Char.* XXII 2).

- finally, αὐτοῖς could refer to some characters of the play or someone just mentioned.

#### Fr. 200

Probably it is an anapaestic tetrameter catalectic, best supplemented at the end with ἀρίστας, as Kock suggests. About

this metre and its use in the chorus' speech or the agon, see White (1912) §305.

σωτήρας: not common as feminine form, but generally as an adjective related to the goddess Τύχη (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 664, Soph. *OR* 80, Pind. *O.* 12. 2) and probably in a poetic sense applied to χθόνα in Eur. *Med.* 360 and τιμή in Eur. *El.* 993. About the formation of these nouns in -τηρ, cf. Williger *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Komposita der griechischen der 5. Jahrhunderts* pp. 47ff. Göttingen 1928.

Its sense is 'saviour' and, as Kock suggested, it may belong to the play *Tyrannis* (which could have developed a subject similar to Ar. *Eccl.* 202ff., women as saviours of the city).

In some way it seems a parody of a formal expression as fr. 39 of Pherecrates' *Graes*, to which it could also belong.

#### Fr. 201

Enumeration of different kinds of grains and vegetables. It is similar to Ar. fr. 428: ἄκαρους, πυρούς, πτισάνην, χόνδρον, ζειάς, αἴρας, σεμίδαλιν belonging to the play *Ὀλκάδες* and that Bergk apud K-A explains as "de frumenti copia quam onerariae naves advexerunt".

In our case, it is impossible to say to which context it could belong, in general these kinds of grains have in common to be fodder for animals, and, except κνάμους, not recommended for human alimentation, but in some medical preparations. They could be included among the group of τὰ ποιώδη, or herbaceous plants in

distinction with σῖτος καὶ τὰ σιτώδη, which are used to make bread and are more suitable for human alimentation in general (cf. Moritz *CQ* n. s. 5 p. 138 quoting Theophr. *HP* VII 1.1).

**κυάμους:** "beans, *Vicia faba*" (LSJ) appear to be a popular kind of food which, used for chewing when working (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 537 and Henderson ad loc.) or as a dessert (cf. Arcestr. fr. 62 Ribbeck apud Athen. III 101d) was a sign of poverty; they were not eaten by the Pythagoreans (cf. Athen. II 65f and Timocl. fr. 16, cf. Athen. IX 407f) and Arist. *HA* VIII 64 mentions them as food for cows.

**ἀφάκη:** 'tare, *Vicia angustifolia*' (LSJ). Arist. *HA* 596a 25 considers it a kind of food for animals: πιαίνει δὲ τὰ πρόβατα θαλλός, κότινος, ἀφάκη, ἄχυρα ὅποια ἂν ᾗ. ἅπαντα δὲ μᾶλλον πιαίνει ἄλμη προσρανθέντα and Diosc. *De mat. med.* II 177 mentions its medical uses: ἀφάκη θαμνίον ἐστὶ φυόμενον ἐν ἀρούραις, φάκου ὑψηλότερον, λεπτόφυλλον· τὰ δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ φυόμενα μείζονα θυλάκια τοῦ φακοῦ. Δύναμιν δὲ ἔχει τὰ σπερμάτια στυπτικὴν, ὅθεν ἴστησι καὶ ῥέυμα κοιλίας καὶ στομάχου, φρυττόμενα καὶ ἐρεϊκόμενα καὶ ἐψόμενα, ὥσπερ φακός. About it cf. also Ar. fr. 787 and Theophr. *HP* VIII 8.3.

**ζειάς:** "one-seeded wheat, *Triticum monococcum*, used as fodder for horses" (LSJ). It is frequently mentioned in Greek literature since Homer (e.g. *Il.* 5. 196, 8.564, *Od.* 4.41, 604, Hdt. II 36, Eup. fr. 186).

The distinction between ζειά and ὄλυρα is matter of discussion; perhaps as Lloyd on Hdt. loc.cit. says: "in technical

language ὄλυρα is probably 'soft|emmer', ζειά 'hard|emmer' (Jasny op. cit. [*The Wheats of Classical Antiquity*] p. 129), but such subtle distinctions would not have worried many and we can assume that to most people, as to H., the two terms were interchangeable".

**αἴρας:** as S. Amigues comments on Theophr. *HP* IV 4.10 (p. 226 n.17 Paris 1989), "le plurel αἴραι englobe l'ivraie des céréales (*Lolium temulentum* L.) et celle des champs de lin (*L. remotum* Schrank) (cf. *HP* VIII 7,1; *CP* II 16.2)". The darnel was later called ζιζάνιον (cf. Matt. *Ev.* XIII 25, *Geop.* II 43, X 87) and it was used as food for poultry (cf. Herod. 6. 100 and Headlam ad loc., *Geop.* XIV 7.3).

**ἀκεάνους:** a kind of vegetable similar to beans, cf. Hesych. α2312, Phot. α828, Sud. α724, *EM* 46.16: εἶδος ὀσπρίου ὅμοιον φακῆ παρὰ τὸ σκληρὸν καὶ ἄθλαστον κατὰ στέρησιν τοῦ κεάσαι, ὃ ἐστὶ θραῦσαι (cf. also Ael.Dion. fr. 28).

#### Fr. 202

It could be parody of poetical expressions to refer to someone's fair hair, such as the ones cited by K-A. The point of this sentence might have been to stress the ridiculous appearance of the actor. Similar parodic vocatives can be found in fr. 138.

**ξανθοτάτοις:** the superlative seems to be an exaggeration. Fair hair is common referring to hair of gods, goddesses and heroes (cf. LSJ s.v. ξανθός) and is found in compounds like ξανθοκόμης (cf. Hes. fr. 135.5, Pind. *N.* 9.17, Theocr. 17. 103).

Dover *GH* pp. 78-9 finds connexions between fair hair and homosexuality in vase paintings; it can also be connected with a slave, since Xanthias is a common name for a slave of barbarian origin (cf. *Ar. Ran.*).

**βοτρυχοῖσι:** the commonest form is βοστρύχος, although the anapaestic metre recommends βοτρυχοῖσι, which is found in one more metrical conjecture: *Eur. Phoen.* 1485 (βοτρυχώδεος). Starkie ad *Ar. Nub.* 536 suggests that it is a poetical word never found in trimeters.

Curls were a properly feminine element which is found in relation to man as a sign of effeminacy; other words with similar senses are κίκιννος 'ringlet' (cf. *Cratin.* fr. 399, *Ar. Vesp.* 1069, fr. 229, *Theocr.* 11. 10, 14.4) and πλόκαμος.

**κομῶν:** in proper sense it means 'to wear long hair', but it was used to mean 'to give oneself airs', 'to think oneself a cut above other people' (cf. *Dover GH* p. 79, *Taillardat Images* §327).

About the implications of wearing long hair, see fr. 15 on κομῆται.

#### Fr. 203

**βριθομένης:** very similar expression is found in *Od.* 15. 334 τράπεζαι σίτου καὶ κρειῶν ἥδ' οἴνου βεβρίθασι (cf. also *Il.* 8. 307) which could mean that it is a formal expression or that there is a reference or an echo of epic poetry.

This last suggestion may be true if we understand the metre as a dactylic hexameter: <-υυ> / -υυ / -υυ / -υυ / -υυ / --, or as Bergk suggests βριθομένης <πάντων> ἀγαθῶν ἐπίμεστα τραπέζης

to a banquet and symposiastic poetry in hexameters). K-A suggest that it is an anapaestic tetrameter catalectic.

**ἐπιμέστα:** here an adverb (cf. K-A ad loc.). It is only found here and in Call. *Cer.* 133; but as N. Hopkinson ad loc. (Cambridge 1984) points out: "compounds in δια-, ἐμ- and περί have similar meaning" (cf. the verb καταμεστόω in Pherecr. fr. 155. 28).

#### Fr. 204

Eupolidean metre used only in parabasis speech (cf. K-A ad loc., especially see Ar. *Nub.* 518-62).

**ἀφουπνίζεσθαι:** this verb is used by Eup. fr. 205 in the context of an address to the audience: ἀφουπνίζεσθαι < > χρῆ πάντα θεατήν, / ἀπό μὲν βλεφάρων ἀύθημερινὸν ποιητῶν λήθρον ἀφέντα.

Pherecrates may have referred to the sleep caused by the other poets' plays, rather than his own play. It is also a way of attracting the attention of the audience to the speech of the chorus (cf. Ar. *Equ.* 503, *Vesp.* 1015, *Av.* 688, *Thesm.* 785).

#### Fr. 205

The text transmitted by Phot. α3397 is metrically corrupted but it gives some sense. Ὡ Χάριτες is understood as an expression like νῆ τὰς Χάριτας in Ar. *Nub.* 773 and someone is stating that a wedding-hymn is sung or asking who is singing. several solutions have been suggested, although all of them are very uncertain:

very uncertain:

Reinach *REG* 5 (1892) p. 324 n.2 suggests "vers lyriques (trochaïco-crétiques)" and gives the following text: ᾠ Χάριτες  
1, ἀφροδίσιον τιν' ὑμέλ ναιον ὑμι νεῖ[τε] γεγαίμηχότι.

Kock *RhM* 48 (1893) p. 582 in cretic meter: ᾠ Χάριτες,  
<ἔλθετ'> ἀφροδίσιον / <νῦν> τιν' ὑμέναιον ὑμνεῖτε γαμικόν τε <υ>.

ᾠ Χάριτες: the Graces are ancient divinities who have developed a very long literary tradition because of their relation to music and art. In some places they had an important religious role, as for instance Orchomenos (cf. Pind. *O.* 14) where they seem to be related to Minyan goddesses (cf. Paus. IX 38.1 and Dodds ad *Bacc.* 414). Their number varies from place to place (cf. Alc. fr. 62 *PMG*) Phaenna and Keta in Sparta; Auxo and Hegemone in Athens (cf. Paus. IX 351-5); but the most widespread tradition is three: Aglaia, Euphrosyne and Thalia (cf. Hes. *Th.* 907, Pind. *op.cit.*).

They are related to many gods in the mythical tradition: with Aphrodite (cf. *Il.* 5. 338, *Od.* 8. 364, Hes. *Th.* 64, 907), with the Muses (cf. Bond ad Eur. *HF* 673), with the Hours (cf. *h. Ap.* 194, Hes. *Op.* 75), Artemis (*h. Hom.* 27. 15), Pan (Pind. fr. 71Sn.), Apollo (Pind. *O.* 14. 10). Their functions are many times confused with those of the Muses as inspirators of a song or a dance, but as C.A. Privitera in Pindaro *Le Istmiche* p. 193 Venice 1982 says: "le Muse suggeriscono la materia del canto, le Grazie lo rendono bello (*Nem.* 9. 53sqq.). La stessa concezione si intravede in Bacchilide (1. 151sqq.; 5. 9sqq.; 9. 1sqq.; 19. 5sqq.)

ed è pressupposta dai poeti successivi". Their relation to beauty is also implied in Ar. *Pax* 41.

They are also connected with dance in Ar. *Lys.* 1279 and Sommerstein ad loc., *Ran.* 335, fr.348; to peace and festivity (cf. *Pax* 456, *Ach.* 989, *Av.* 1320); to songs (*Thesm.* 122, *Eccl.* 974 and in an erotic song in *Av.* 1100, 1320 together with Πόθος).

According to Quint. Sm. IV 140, they dance in the wedding of Peleus and seem to be specially invoked in this kind of festivity. About them see further Furthwängler in Röscher *Lexicon* I 873ff., Schwarzenberg *Die Grazien* Munich 1966 and W.F. Otto *Die Musen* Düsseldorf 1955; in Pindar they are very important, cf. S. Anastase *Apollon dans Pindare* pp. 213ff. Athens 1975, Müller *Pindar and dance* pp. 21-2 and 83ff. Princeton 1982.

**ἀφροδίσιον:** adjective found in comedy only in Pl.com. fr. 55: ἀφροδίσιος λόγος (cf. Sem. fr. 7.91W and ἀφροδίσιον ὄρκον in Pl. *Smp.* 183b) and in Crat.com. fr.23: ἀφροδίσιος ἀθύρμασιν probably in a lyric context.

**ὕμναιον:** word formed from ὕμνην (in parallel to παιάν or διθυράμβος; cf. R. Muth *WSt* 67 (1957) p.9) insofar as it can designate a god, the song devoted to him. It can be pronounced as invocation when singing it (cf. Ar. *Pax* 1332ff.: 'Υμῆν, 'Υμέναι' ὦ) and or as adjective designating the marriage (cf. *Av.* 1728: ἀλλ' ὕμεναίσις / καὶ νυμφίδιοισι δέχεσθ' ὠδαῖς / αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν βασίλειαν).

Its exact meaning in relation to 'Epithalamion' and the wedding ceremony is not clear. The difference seems to be that ὕμέναιος is the hymn sung during the procession which led to the

groom's chamber (cf. Garland *The Gr. way of Life* p.221 London 1990), as Muth art.cit. p.23 points out in *Il.* 18. 409ff. and the ὕμην-song was accompanied by dances and music of flutes and phorminges. This word and its verb ὕμεναιῶ had a wider sense than ἐπιθαλάμιος (also called ἀρμάτειον μέλος, cf. Jebb ad *Soph. Ant.* 813); but they were generally confused (cf. Muth p.30), while in Hellenistic times the word ἐπιθαλάμιος was the generic name for a wedding song (cf. Muth p. 36).

The repetition ὕμναιον ὕμνεῖτε may be an etymological figure, as P. Maas *Kl.Schrif.* p. 227 suggests. The etymology of ὕμναιον is still doubtful (cf. W. Schmid *RhM* 61 (1906) p. 480, H. Ehrlich *RhM* 62 (1907) p. 321, Lamer *PhW* (1932) p.381, Diehl *RhM* 89 (1940), Muth art.cit. pp.13ff.).

**γαμικόν:** in comedy only found in *Ar. Av.* 1693: ἀλλὰ γαμικὴν / χλανίδα δότω / τις δεῦρό μοι. A more poetical form would be γαμήλιος. Perhaps the use of γαμικός could have a comic intention to break the poetic level or even to imitate the terminology of sophists for example; about the use of the -ικός ending in Comedy, cf. Peppler (1910) pp. 428ff.

The adjective seems to be redundant if applied to ὕμναιον which is already a wedding song, and perhaps it was connected with another noun (maybe for instance τὸν χορόν).

#### Fr. 206

**τάς γυνάς:** the examples of the noun γυνή following the α-declension instead of the regular one with the root γυναικ- are only found in Comedy (cf. *Alc.* fr. 32 ᾧ γυνή, *Men.* fr. 937K8-T

(fr. dub.) ὦ Ζεῦ πολυτίμηθ', ὡς καλαὶ νῶν αἰ γυναῖ, Philipp. fr. 2: γυναῖ as Nominative plural and Com. Adesp. fr. 1336K τὴν γυνήν.

The likely explanation is that it is a colloquialism to regularize the noun (in later times it was used in compound forms of γυνή, cf. Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s. v. d).

#### Fr. 207

The quotation is lost as Eustathius does not fulfil his promise to give the full citation; but as Kaibel says (cf. K-A ad loc.) "qui quod dicit ὅτε κατενεχθῆ ἔκ τοῦ πασσάλου, et ipse lepide sibi iocari videtur. de cylice non sane unco suspensa sed potantium in usum demissa iocatur Pherecrates".

As Rehrenböck p. 262 points out, we have at least πάσσαλος and Χία κύλιξ as part of the lost fragment.

πάσσαλος: or 'peg' it was found already in Homeric poetry to designate the place where arms, clothes, musical instruments were hung as e.g. ἔκ πασσαλόφι κρέμασεν φόρμιγγα *Od.* 8. 67. This sentence seems to be parodied later by Hermipp. fr. 55: Χία δὲ κύλιξ ὑψοῦ κρέματαί / περὶ πασσαλόφιν. This action of hanging a chalice from a peg seems to be represented in several vase paintings (cf. K-A ad Hermipp. fr. cit.) that may have been easily parodied with epic overtones by both poets.

About the erotic sense of this word see Henderson *MM* p. 123.

Χία κύλιξ: the Chian 'chalice' was perhaps the most famous item of the Chian pottery. As A. A. Lemos says in J. Boardman/C. E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson (ed.) *Chios* p. 233 Oxford 1986, 'commenting on

Athen. loc.cit.: "ironically we shall never know whether he meant to refer specifically to the most popular of Chian-vase shapes or simply to any old drinking-cup hanging on a peg. Be that as it may it is certainly true that the Χιακή κύλιξ, or what is called 'chalice' by the English, represents at least two-thirds of Chian production in the Archaic period. This shape is one of the features of this School, the other three being the fabric with the distinctive white slip, the inner decoration, mostly floral, of open vases of the sixth century and the fineness of line in the elaborate wares" which J. Boardman in op.cit. p. 251 qualifies as "exceptionally thin walls" (see supra on fr. 152. 5 in a detailed description of a similar vase).

I share Lemos' incredulity about what Χία κύλιξ meant in Hermippus or in Pherecrates; but I think that both must have a reason to choose this kind of pottery since other kinds of pottery were also famous and could have been used instead (cf. e.g. Laconian: Ar. fr. 225, from Teos: Alc. 322V, from Athens: Pind. fr. 124a. 4Sn., or from Argos in Sem. 27W). The Homeric reference seems to be the most likely explanation for both playwrights, above all in Hermippus' *Στρατιῶται* where the epic echoes could have been very numerous. Pherecrates may have been played with their shape and in relation to women's bibulousness as in fr. 75-6.

The wine from Chios was also well known and appreciated, e.g. Ar. fr. 225.3 and Hermipp. fr. 77.5. (cf. further J.P. Barron in Boardman/Vaphopolou-Richardson op.cit. p.95).

#### Fr. 208

This metaphorical expression to refer to being overcome, boiling over with anger comes from a popular explanation of this psychological state linking it to a physical reaction (cf. Taillardat *Images* §352 and R. Renehan *Phil.* 107 (1963) pp. 61ff. on the physiological explanation of anger made by Aristotle). The sentence seems to be very common and it has been found in Aristophanes with different variations (cf. Taillardat loc.cit.), perhaps the most common ones are: θυμός ζεῖ (cf. Soph. *OC* 434, ὀπην(κ' ἔξει θυμός and Eur. *Hec.* 1055) or Ar. *Thesm.* 468: οὐ θαυμάσιόν ἐστ' οὐδ' ἐπιζειν τὴν χολήν, (cf. A. R. IV 391). Parallel to our fragment are Theocr. 20.15 and *A. P.* 7. 208 and as Gow ad loc. says: "the use of αἷμα in any sense akin to θυμός is very rare (Aesch. 3. 160 εἶδὼς ὅτι αἵματος ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρετὴ ὦν(α, αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔχων αἷμα), and the reference may be only to the purely physical effect here further described in the next phrase".

#### Fr. 209

**ἄποδα:** Phot. α2473 does not give the meaning of this adjective in Pherecrates, so one may suspect that it could refer to any of the possible senses of ἄπους:

- without foot or feet,

- without the use of one's feet, lame; or it can qualify animals with weak feet (cf. Arist. *HA* 487b 24: κακόποδες οἱ διὰ τοῦτο καλοῦνται ἄποδες and 487b 26),

- Arist. *Meta.* 1022b 35 gives another metaphorical sense: ἄπουν (λέγεται) καὶ τῷ μὴ ἔχειν ὅλως πόδας καὶ τῷ φάβλους and in

the same way Hesych. α6309 ἄποδον· βράδου. ἢ ἀπαγόρευσις.

In any case this adjective could happen to be the similar case as many other α-negative words which generally have been preserved through quotations of Lexicographers, sometimes comic formations, sometimes used in an unusual metaphorical sense (as it might be in this fragment); cf. also fr. 210.

#### Fr. 210

The two adjectives are only found here and it is likely that they were an invention of Pherecrates. The mention of two negative adjectives with very similar sense could be a piece of comic rhetoric or even a parody of poetic language. In Aristophanes we can find several instances: *Pax* 1097 (a citation from *Il.* 9. 63); *Ran.* 204 and 838 (said by Euripides and Stanford ad loc. suggests that <sup>it</sup> is a parody of his own style); and finally *Lys.* 809 (where the rhythm seems to be poetical, cf. Henderson ad loc.). Similar accumulation of this kind of adjectives is found in fr. 87, 168, 210 and *Phryn.com.* fr.19.

It is possible that the parody attempts to show the excess of these adjectives qualifying simple things with poetic intentions. In some way their meaning reminds of Eur. *El.* 1107: σὺ δ' ὄδ' ἄλουτος καὶ δυσελεματος χροῶ, although there is no repetition of α-, Pherecrates may have tried to ridicule this and similar sentences.

**ἄσμηχτος:** from the verb σμήχω 'to wipe off by help of soap or unguent' means here the contrary 'unwashed with soap'. In Ar.

*Nub.* 1237 διεσμήχθην is found.

**ἀπαράλεκτος:** "with disordered hair" (LSJ) or "unplucked" (Edmonds *FAC* I p.279) comes from the verb παραλέγω "to pluck out superfluous hair" (cf. *Ar. Eccl.* 904). Maybe a similar compound is found in *Ar. Lys.* 279.

#### Fr. 211

**ἄγχασσε:** apocope is unusual in Attic except for poetic forms (about it cf. Pearson ad *Soph.* fr. 422 and Thraette I pp. 410-1).

The verb ἀναχάσκω means 'open the mouth, gape wide' and it is found in *Ar. Equ.* 641, *Av.* 502 (meaning 'to gape upwards') and fr. 67. In general in Aristophanes the verb χάσκειν and its compounds had a sense of gaping at with naivety or stupidity (cf. Taillardat *Images* §472) or laughing with mockery (cf. Taillardat *ibid.* §578). Henderson *MM* p.210 suggests that in *Ar. Equ.* 641 it is found in a homosexual context and accordingly it has an erotic sense, but I do not think that the sense of the two lines before can be applied to ll. 641-2 where the words do not seem to contain any erotic connotations.

#### Fr. 212

**ἀδηφάγοι:** "glutton" in this case as in *Ar.* fr. 758 applied to race horses according to our source Phot. α345 (cf. Hesych. α1110: ἀδηφάγοι· τοὺς τε λείους ἵππους οὕτως ἔλεγον Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Βοιωτοὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν πῶλων διάκρισιν). It may refer to the quantity of food or, perhaps better, of money they cost (note that Strepsiades' economic problems are due to his son Pheidippides'

horses, Ar. *Nub.* 14ff.).

In Attic it is mainly found in figurative sense (cf. Soph. *Ph.* 313 of an illness, but fr. 970R. the verb ἀδηφαγοῦσα of a horse according to Pearson and Radt ad loc. and probably also Hermipp. fr. 79; Alc.com. fr. 21 of an oil lamp; Lys. fr. 39 of triremes) and only later it is applied to a person (cf. Theocr. 22. 115, Call. *Dian.* 160). Hesych. loc.cit. distinguishes the metaphorical sense from the one applied to men as if it was said mainly by Argives.

About its etymology cf. Rehrenböck pp. 263-4.

#### Fr. 213

Ἄδωνιος, Ἄδωνιον: example of variation in the forms of Genitive and Accusative of the inflexion -ιδ. About it, cf. Rehrenböck pp. 265-6, Schwyzer *GrG* I pp. 464.1ff. Another Accusative form is Ἄδωνιν (e.g. Sapph. 168V, Pherecr. fr. 181 where see about the Festival of the Adonia). Ἄδωνιον can be found in other instances, e.g. Sapph. 117.136, Ar. fr. 795, Pl.com. fr. 4, Cratin. fr. 404.

#### Fr. 214

ἀκοήν: it is the Attic form of the epic ἀκούη, here meaning οὖς as in Hermipp. fr. 51.2, Sapph. 31.12V and A.R. IV 17, a text that seems to depend on the former one. In the expression δούειν ἀκοαῖς κρίνειν (Arist. *Pol.* 1287 b 27; cf. Call. fr. 43. 16Pf) it has the same sense as in some other ones which seem to tend to identify the act of hearing with its organ (cf. οὐκ εἰς ἀκοὰς ἔτι

δυστυχία / δώματος ἦκει Eur. *Ph.* 1480-1, *IT* 1495-6 μάλα γὰρ  
τερπνὴν κἀνέλπιστον / φήμην ἀκοᾷσι δέδεγμαι; Aesch. *Pr.* 689.

#### Fr. 215

**άλιδος:** contraction of -εως that was kept in written Attic; but not pronounced when speaking. From Homer it was already a long diphthong by synizesis (cf. Chantraine *Grammaire Homérique* I p. 39 Paris 1958 and we find other parallels in Αἰγιαλῶς, Hesych. α1715, ἀντὶ τοῦ Αἰγιαλέως; ἀττικῶς Μηλιῶς Thuc. VIII 3 (instead of Μηλιέως Thuc. IV 100). In inscriptions the diphthong -εως can be found contracted into -υς (cf. Thraette I pp. 345-6). As in fr. 206 Pherecrates seems to have chosen to write the spoken variant rather than the written form. About this form, cf. K-B I pp. 447ff., Schwyzer *GrG* I p. 252 ε.

#### Fr. 216

**ἀλλοκότως:** "of unusual nature". This adjective and adverb is not very frequent in Attic poetry. As adverb it is found in Pl. *Ly.* 216a, while the adjective appears more often in poetry (cf. Soph. *Ph.* 1191, Ar. *Vesp.* 47 and 71, Crat.com. fr. 49, with reference to a dream, cf. Bonanno *Cratete comico* p. 155), Pl.com. fr. 252 (ἀλλοκοτώτατον and ἀλλοκοτώτερον) and in prose in Thuc. III 49, Pl. *Prot.* 346a. About it, see Kamerbeek ad Soph. *Ph.* 1191 [Leiden 1980].

#### Fr. 217

**ἀμυστι:** adverb of the noun ἄμυστις which means "literally a

drink taken without closing the mouth" according to Ussher ad *Cycl.* 417. In this adverbial form it is found only here and in later literature (cf. Galen. 19. 78.13, Anacreont. 9.2 and 18.2W, Luc. *Lex.* 8). The commonest expression is ἄμυστιν πιεῖν or a similar verb (and perhaps for this reason Meineke suggested that Pherecrates said ἄμυστιν instead, cf. K-A ad loc.)

An adverb with similar sense is ἀπνευστί (cf. Antiph. fr. 75. 14, Alex. fr. 246.3).

\*Ἄμυστις -ιος or -ιδος (cf. Alc. 58.20V) could designate a cup probably made for this purpose (cf. Amips. fr. 21.3). This way of drinking was seen as a Thracian custom (cf. Call. fr. 178. 11Pf., Hor. *carm.* I 36.13). Other instances are Epich. fr. 34 Kaib., Eur. *Cycl.* 575, 417, *Rh.* 419, 438, Ael. *NH* VI 51. The verb is ἄμυσσι(ζ)ω, Pl.com. fr. 205, Eur. *Cycl.* 565, Plut. 2. 650c.

#### Fr. 218

ἀναστᾶ: it is only found in Crat.com. fr. 51 and Archipp. fr. 54. The special use which Phot. α1680 seems to make reference is not clearly explained (about it cf. Herwerden *BPhW* 27 (1907) p.286 and Bonanno *Cratete comico* p. 157 who suggests a comic confusion).

Pherecrates could have made the application of an accusative with a verbal form usually intransitive (since ἀναστᾶ seems to be the subjunctive of the intransitive strong aorist ἀνέστην, while ἀναστήσω of the transitive ἀνέστησα). This may have been the reason for Photius to quote it and probably it was a common feature of spoken Attic. The form ἀναστήσω could be a future

indicative; but in this case it is unlikely that it could be used instead of ἀνασιῶ.

#### Fr. 219

ἀνάσχωμαι: cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 513, ἀλλ' ἐάν σιγῶν ἀνάσχη καὶ μάθης ἀγῶ λέγω, *Ach.* 297 οὐκ ἀνασχῆσομαι.

#### Fr. 220

ἀνδράποδον: it is clearly derived from ἀνήρ and this is the reason to notice that Pherecrates is using it here of feminine slaves as other expressions that are applied to women with a comic end, e. g. fr. 39, fr. 200. fr. 70.

It is found elsewhere in Ar. *Av.* 523 and *Eccl.* 593, and it designated originally a slave captured in war. As F. Gschnitzer *Studien zur griechischen Terminologie der Sklaverei* I p. 1292 (12) Wiesbaden 1963 says: "am anderen Ende der Skala steht in weitem Abstand ἀνδράποδον; die beiden Ausdrücke sind voneinander so streng geschieden, daß sie unter sich kaum als Synonyme gelten können (wohl aber liegen οἰκέτης und θεράπων vermittelnd dazwischen) [...] ἀνδράποδον dagegen [δοῦλος] faßt ihn überhaupt nicht als Person, sondern als Sache ins Auge, als ein Stück Besitz oder, ursprünglich, als ein Stück Beute" (cf. also *ibid.* II pp. 14-5 and 113 Wiesbaden 1976). About its etymology, cf. Y. Garland *Slavery in Ancient Greece* Engl. transl. Ithaca/London 1988 p. 20 and n. 48 and about its use in Aristophanes, see Mactoux *Douleia* pp. 152-3 Paris 1980.

#### Fr. 221

**ἀνεψιαδοῦς**: quoted by Phot. α1904 together with Ar. fr. 775, Hermipp. fr. 82. It can designate the "first cousin's son" or "the first cousin once removed". It is doubtful, see further Wyse *The Speeches of Isaeus* pp. 566-7 Cambridge 1904 and Bianchetti *SIFC* 54 (1982) pp. 129-65.

A saying, that refers to these relatives, is suggested to belong to comedy: Com. Adesp. fr. 58D ἀνεψιδὺν δὲ παῖδες οὐκετ' ἐν λόγῳ.

#### Fr. 222

**ἀνούστατος**: cf. Soph. fr. 589. 1R. ἄνους ἐκεῖνος· αἶ δ' ἀνουστέρας ἔτι / ἐκεῖνον ἠνύνανω <πρὸς τὸ> καρτερόν, fr. 1015R. ἀνούστερα, Aesch. *Pr.* 987 οὐ γὰρ σὺ παῖς τε καὶ τοῦδ' ἀνούστερος. The comparative form is common, but not the superlative only found here. About the sense of "having νοῦν", cf. on Pherecr. fr. 156. 6.

#### Fr. 223

**ἀνταπόδος**: cf. fr. 21 and comment ad loc.

#### Fr. 224

**ἀντιβλέπει**: "to look straight at, to look in the face", either with accusative (cf. Men. fr. 590Kδ-T and Com. Adesp. fr. 22.41D); <sup>or</sup> in absolute construction (cf. Arist. *HA* 611a).

Fr. 225

**ἀπολέγομαι:** the meaning Pherecrates has used here is "to decline, refuse". This may be the first instance of this meaning much commoner in later Greek (cf. LSJ ἀπολέγω II, cf. Conti Bizzarro (1986-7) pp.89-90). It seems to have evolved from its sense "to pick up for the purpose of rejecting (cf. LSJ s.v. 2 and see Ar. *Lys.* 576).

Fr. 226

**ἀπολοπίζειν:** for the spelling λοπίζειν instead of λεπίζειν see K-A ad Ar. fr. 138 and Rehrenböck p.308. It means 'to skin, to peel'. In Ar. fr.cit. and in Antiph. fr. 126 it is used of fish as ἡ λοπίς can mean 'fish scale'; cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 790. In this case the exact translation would be 'to scale', 'to peel off the scales'.

Fr. 227

**ἀποτυλοῦν:** (or perhaps ἀπειτύλουν according to Blaydes *Adv.* II p.26). It comes from τύλος 'knobbed-bolt' and in Pherecrates is used according to Poll. II 176 in metaphorical sense to mean 'to masturbate' (see also Henderson *MM* p. 119 especially n. 60 and pp. 220ff., about similar expressions). About other comic expressions of Pherecrates with erotic reference, see on fr. 193.

Fr. 228

**ἀρχαῖος:** it is used here with the sense of 'simple, silly' as εὐήθης or ληρός (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 915, 948, 1357, 1469, *Pl.* 581).

It was probably common and Aristophanes modifies it into a comic 'technical' word ending in -ικός as ἀρχαϊκός *Nub.* 821. Other instances are *Isocr.* 4.30, *Pl.* *Euth.* 295c and *Hipp. min.* 371d. About this adjective and other similar expressions, see Dover ad *Nub.* 821 and 398 and K-A ad *Philon.* fr. 17. About its relationship with the subject of old age in Comedy, cf. Taillardat *Images* §462.

#### Fr. 229

**ἀτοπωτάτη:** the adjective in itself is very common, but not so common in the superlative form as here and in *Dem.* 1.26 and *Lys.* 3.7. A similar unusual superlative is found in fr.222.

#### Fr. 230

**αὔξανόμενος:** cf. *Ar. Av.* 1065: ἐκ κάλυκος αὔξανόμενον γένυσι παμφάγοις / δένδρεσσι τ' ἐφημένα καρπὸν ἀποβόσκειται.

#### Fr. 231

**ἀφηλικεστέρων:** it means 'elderly' or literally 'beyond the prime age'. As the word γεραίτερα (*Phercr.* fr. 185) or πρεσβύτερος (cf. *LSJ* s.v. πρέσβυς I 2) it is mainly found in comparative form (e.g. *Hdt.* 3.14, *Hipp. Epid.* VII 5. 454.4, *Morb.* I 6. 186. 12, *Mul.* II 8. 262. 10, *Alciph.* I 6.3, *hCer.* 140 and Richardson ad loc. in *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* Oxford 1974). It occurs in positive grade in two passages of comedy: *Cratin.* fr. 385 and *Phryn.com.* fr. 71 used of a young woman (cf. *Phot* α3340 τινὲς δὲ χρῶνται τῇ λέξει ἐπὶ τοῦ μηδέπω τῆς ἐννόμου ἡλικίας

παιδός, ὅπερ δεῖ φυλάττεσθαι, and Hesych. α863).

About it and other compound forms of ἤλιξ, cf. Forderer *Gnomon* 30 (1958) p.97 and also Chantraine *Études sur le vocabulaire grec* pp. 155f. Paris 1956.

#### Fr. 232

**βλιμάζειν:** as τιτθολαβεῖν (cf. *EM* 200. 37) and θλιβομάζειν (cf. Sch. ad Ar. Av. 530), "βλιμάζειν is equivalent to English 'feel up'; that is, to make sexual advances preparatory to intercourse" according to Henderson *MM* p. 173 (cf. Taillardat *Images* §197 "caresser tâter"). It is also found in Ar. Av. 530, Lys. 1163, Cratin. fr. 335, Soph. fr. 484R., Com. Adesp. fr. 766K.

The Sch. above quoted suggests that κυρίως τὸ τοῦ ὑπογαστροῦ καὶ τοῦ στήθους ἅπτεται, ὅπερ ἐποίουν οἱ τὰς ὄρνιθας ὠνούμενοι, that is to say "to feel the hens to see if they are fat" (LSJ). Henderson *MM* p.174 suggests that the original meaning is the erotic one which is adapted to the context of birds by Aristophanes: "here Peisetaerus makes use of a word usually reserved for sexual encounters in order to arouse pathos in his bird audience". Although the verb could mean "to squeeze, to press" in other contexts (cf. Phot. α169, a honeycomb).

#### Fr. 233

**βοεικόν:** it is an adjective from βοῦς βοός, formed "d'une contamination de βοέιος et de βοικός" (cf. Chantraine *Ét. sur le vocabulaire grec* p. 127 n.1 Paris 1956) and is frequently found in later writers, but rarely in Classical Greek (cf. Thuc. IV 128. 4

Hdn. 2.146 and K-A ad Ar. fr. 111.1). The more usual form is βόειος; but a similar adjective is βεικός (instead of βικός; cf. Axionic. fr.9). This termination in -ικός, -κος is related in Comedy to the new tendencies of technical language and sophists and it is ridiculed often (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 1172, *Pherecr.* fr. 37.3). About this suffix in general see Chantraine *op.cit.* pp.97ff. and Pepller (1910) pp. 428ff.

In our fragment Phot. β189 seems to imply that Pherecrates used βεικόν or τὸ βεικόν as a noun to refer to the lowing of cattle.

#### Fr. 234

**δακτυλιουργόν:** although Poll. VII 179 equates it in its meaning to δακτυλιογλύφος, it seems that δακτυλιουργόν is a more general word to designate a 'ring-maker' probably including the δακτυλιογλύφος or 'engraver of gems' (cf. Crit. 66D-Kr (88B), Pl. *Alc.* 128c). It is also found in *Philyll.* fr. 14. About the technique and methods used for it see Blümner *Techn.* III pp. 280ff.

#### Fr. 235

**διακόκω:** this word is not attested anywhere else and is difficult to explain within the framework of Greek language. Perhaps the only parallel is Hesych. μ998 μετακόκω· ἡμέραι μέθ' ἑορτῶν ἢ ἑορτῆ οὐκ ἔστι. Buehler *BZ* 76 (1983) p. 326 may be right to relate it to διακοχή (cf. Thuc. III 87) as meaning 'cessation' or D.C. 39.47 'armistice' (cf. Phot. δ359, Sud. δ601, Lex. Bachm.

p.194. 31, Sch. ad Thuc. III 81). Another doubtful gloss of Hesychius may be parallel, δ1075 διακλόχητ· ὁ μεταξὺ χρόνος. Rehrenböck pp. 309-10 is favour of reading διοκωχή that he puts in relation to ἀνοκωχεύω and ἀνοκωχή (or ἀνακωχή) and the nouns built from the perfect form of the verbs.

#### Fr. 236

**διδασκάλους:** about the different meanings of διδάκαλος, cf. introductory note on Δουλοδιδάκαλος. The word means here 'chorus trainer', 'producer' of a play, with this sense it is also found in Ar. *Ach.* 628, *Av.* 912, *Pax* 737, *Thesm.* 88, *Pl.* 797, fr. 348 (perhaps in *Ran.* 1055), in Cratin. fr. 276. This function was done sometimes by the poet himself, sometimes by another person (cf. Cratin. fr. 17 and Ar. *Equ.* 516). The frequent mention of this figure in the early plays of Aristophanes has aroused a great deal of scholarly discussion related to the beginning of his career, e.g. G. Mastromarco *QuadSt.* 10 (1979) 153-96, S. Halliwell *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980) 33-45, D.M. MacDowell *CQ* n.s. 32 (1982) 21-6, N.W. Slater *GRBSt* 30 (1989) 67-82.

#### Fr. 237

**ἐγρηγόρειον:** adjective formed from the perfect of ἐγείρω and the ending -σιος commonly found in similar adjective formations (cf. λύσιος, εὐρέσιος, γενέσιος, see Rehrenböck pp. 269-70). Already in *Il.* 10.182 we find the form ἐγρηγορεῖ and the origin of Pherecrates' term must have been the noun ἐγρηγόρεως, common in technical and medical texts (cf. LSJ s.v.). In poetry the forms

ἐγρε- and ἐγερσι- are more frequent as prefix in compound words (cf. ἐγρεκύδοιμος Hes. *Th.* 925 or ἐγερσιμος in Theocr. 24.7, see H. White about compounds with ἐγερσι- in *Theocritus' Idyll XXIV. A commentary* pp. 14-5 Amsterdam 1979).

παυσινύσταλον: it has been disputed whether it belongs to Pherecrates or not. The two main views have been discussed; on one hand, Theodoridis *Eranos* 74 (1976) pp. 65-7 suggests that the text of Pherecrates is as follows: x - υ - x - υ ἐγρηγόρσιον / τοῦτ' ἐστὶ παυσινύσταλον x - υ - (for the use of τοῦτ' ἐστὶ he cites Ar. *Nub.* 93-4, *Pax* 1106, *Alex.* fr. 9. 1-2) arguing that "das Vorkommen des Adjektivs παυσινύσταλον nach der Erwähnung der Komikers Pherekrates spricht dafür, daß dieser jenes Wort um der komischen Wirkung willen geschaffen hat". On the other hand, Rehrenböck pp. 268-70 rejects his proposal, denying that τοῦτέστι could be part of Pherecrates' text because in the instances given by Theodoridis "niemals wird ein Wort durch ein weiteres erklärt" and it is a shorter form to say as Eust. *in Od.* p. 1493.53: τὸ δὲ παυσινύσταλον ὅμοιον, φασί, τῷ ἐγρηγόρσιον.

K-A take an intermediate position considering παυσινύσταλον part of the fragment, but not τοῦτέστι.

I agree that παυσινύσταλον is an uncommon word to define another unusual word; the sources of this fragment, otherwise, show ignorance about the reference of this word in Pherecrates: ἐγρηγόρσιον is usually applied to εἴτε βρῶμα εἴτε ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτο, according to Phot. ε83 and Eust. loc.cit.

In fact if both words were said together or in reference to the same thing, they would be more meaningful and have the effect

of a poetic parody, insofar as ἐγρήγορσιον implies the act of 'awaking' while παυσινύσταλον that of 'stopping being sleepy'. In this case I would agree with K-A's suggestion, because τουτέστι seems to be an addition of the lexicographer. In spite of this, I still remain doubtful, because it seems that the sources for this fragment quote each other or refer to another one, but not the text of Pherecrates.

One could also speculate that both adjectives could ironically refer to the 'awakening' caused by wine, as in the context of a general reference (φασί) Eust. loc.cit. equates παυσινύσταλον to νηφάλιον, that is to say, 'sober' (cf. Eur. *Bacc.* 772 ἄμπελος παυσίλιπος and Dodds ad loc.).

The compounds in παυσι- are very common in poetry, e.g. Eur. *IT* 451, *Phoen.* 165-6, Ar. *Ran.* 1321 παυσιπόνος; Soph. fr. 887R (and Pearson ad loc.) παυσανίαν; Aesch. fr. 360 παυσύβρις; Ar. fr. 314 παυσικαπή ἄλφιτα. The word νύσταλος or νυσταλέος is found in another comic text, Com. Adesp. fr. 875K (cf. Etym.gen. s.v. νυστάζω and *EM* 609. 38). Ar. *Vesp.* 12 uses νυστακτηής, but that seems to be a comic invention.

#### Fr. 238

**ἐμπύγωνα:** hapax of Pherecrates, perhaps a medical term or a comic invention to designate τὰ ἐν ταῖς πυγαῖς ἔλκη καὶ παρατρίμματα (Phot. ε772). The term πυγή and its commonest adjective καταπύγων are used in many contexts as a derogatory comic expression to indicate passive homosexuality, although its strength seems to have diminished to mean simply "worthlessness,

inferiority or shamelessness in general" according to Dover *GH* p. 143. Other compounds are ὀροπύγιον *Ar. Nub.* 162; ἄπυγος *Pl.com.* fr.200.3, παγκατάπυγον *Ar. Lys.* 137, etc. (cf. Henderson *MM* pp.201-2 and n.30).

#### Fr. 239

**ἐξένεγκον:** there is a fluctuation in the use of the second aorist of φέρω in ἤνεγκον or ἤνεγκα whose imperative would be used by Pherecrates (cf. *Ar. Pax* 1109, *Anaxipp.* fr.8.2); although the imperative ἐξένεγκε is commoner (cf. *Ar. Ach.* 887, *Equ.* 95, *Men. Pk.* 332). About the meaning of ἐκφέρω when said on stage see *Pherecr.* fr. 73.1 and note ad loc.

#### Fr. 240

**ἐπιστάτην:** in general terms it designates an 'overseer, director' (cf. Burnett ad *Pl. Crit.* 47b 10 [Oxford 1924], and on *Ap.* 20a8 for the Socratic sense of this word); but in more specific sense it was used of a παιδοτρίβης or παιδαγωγός, as it is clear in Pherecrates (cf. *Phot.* ε1719) and perhaps even more, related to the physical instruction of a child or an athlete (cf. *Ar. Ecc1.* 10, *Xen. Mem.* 3.5.18, *Lac.* 8.4, *Pl. Legg.* 949a). About the different meanings of this word see Ussher ad *Ar. loc.cit.* who translates it as 'superintendent' in general.

#### Fr. 241

**ἔρη:** here a net for hunting, activity that *Pl. Sph.* 220b defines as πᾶν ὅσον ἂν ἔνεκα κωλύσεως εἴρη τι περιέχον ἀλιερκός

and ἐρκοθηρικός (*Sph.* 219c); cf. Pearson ad *Soph.* fr. 2.

It was used from *Od.* 22. 468-9 especially for birds; cf. *Ar. Av.* 528 and as Rogers ad loc. says: "ἔρκος seems to have been a net fixed in a shrubbery in such a way that the birds flying into it cannot get out of it".

#### Fr. 242

**ἕτερος:** the reason for this gloss is the disappearance of this adjective in favour of ἄλλος in later Greek (cf. Schwyzer *GrG* I p. 614). The later sources (*Phot.* p. 25.21 and *Sud.* ε3292) give this instance and also *Ais.* 2.116 (cf. *Sch.* ad *Ais.* loc. cit.), as example of an uncommon use of the form ἕτερος.

According to the normal use, this adjective would be used in the singular only when there are only two items altogether, and ἄλλος when there are more than two. This ungrammatical usage points towards a colloquial confusion of the two adjectives and their proper sense.

#### Fr. 243

**ἐπιτημένα:** perfect participle of the non-existent verb \*τιάω, only found in compound form διατιάω. It means 'sifted' and probably refers to a kind of flour, ἄλφιτα 'barley-meal' or ἄλευρα 'wheat meal' which has suffered the process of sifting (about it cf. *Pherecr.* fr. 197.1 and commentary on ἀναβράττειν, cf. Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour* p. 159).

Similarly it is found in *Antiph.* fr. 36.5, σεμίδαλις, ἐκ πολλῆς σφόδρ' ἐξητιτημένη and in *Archestratus* apud *Athen.* III 111f.: εὐκάρπου κριθῆς καθαρῶς ἠσσημένα πάντα. In the field of

words derived from this verb one can find the noun ἀλευρότισις (cf. LSJ s.v. and Bluemner *Tech.* I p.53); the noun for a sieve is, otherwise, ἡ κρήσερα (cf. Ar. *Ecc1.* 991 and Ussher ad loc.) and also κόσκινον (cf. Ar. fr. 239, *Nub.* 373, see further Bluemner *ibid.* pp.50-1)

About this word and its synonyms: σήθω and ἡθέω (perhaps more related to liquids 'to strain'), cf. Wackernagel *Kl.Schriften* I pp. 603f. and II pp. 856f. Göttingen 1969-79<sup>2</sup> and about their etymology, cf. Rehrenböck p. 271.

#### Fr. 244

εὖδουλος: referring to a person who 'treats correctly' his slaves cf. Achaeus 20 F32Sn ὡς εὖδουλος, ὡς εὖοικος ἦν. Cratin. 86 quoted afterwards in Athen. VI 267d; κακόδουλος would be the contrary adjective (cf. Meineke ad loc.); but Kaibel apud K-A ad loc. doubts about it. Another compound is ἄδουλος in Eur. *Andr.* 593 'unattended by slaves'.

As Rehrenböck p.273 points out, a parallel adjective would be εὖξενος whose opposite is ἄξενος. He makes a classification of the different εὖ- compounds according to their meaning, but as he remarks the sense can be changeable from 'having good slaves' to 'being good to slaves' and therefore the difficulty of understanding the real sense of this word without context increases.

Some of these εὖ- words appear in poetic parts of Aristophanes, e.g. *Nub.* 276, 300, *Ran.* 213, 241-2, 373.

The word could belong to the play *Doulodidasalos*, but as Kaibel apud K-A says, 'proclivis sed incerta coniectura'.

#### Fr. 245

εὐήμερα: here with the sense of 'happiness' (cf. Hesych. ε6839 εὐήμερα· εὐδαιμον(α), although it can mean 'fine weather' (cf. Xen. *Hell.* II 4.2 and K-A ad Pherecr. fr. 245). In relation to Pherecrates' sense it could mean 'health and wealth' (cf. Eur. *El.* 197) or 'honour and glory' (cf. Pind. *I.* 1.40). In Alex. fr. 166 she is personified: Εὐήμερα δέσποινα καὶ Μοῦσαι φίλαι. Pherecrates, in a similar way as Alexis, might have used it as a name from the poetic adjective εὐημερός 'bright, happy' (cf. Ar. *Av.* 1322 τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀγανόφρονος Ἴησυχ(ας εὐήμερον πρόσωπον).

The antonym is δυσάμερα, Eur. fr. 773. 47, Aesch. fr. 236, Soph. fr. 591R (cf. δυσήμερεῖν, Pherecr. fr. 104).

#### Fr. 246

ζῆθι: in Classical times the imperative of ζάω is ζῆ (cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1169, fr. 167, Eur. *IT* 699, fr. 826) except for this passage and Philem fr. 194 συζῆθι. It seems that it was a secondary formation to ἔζης, ἔζην ζῆτε according to O. Kujore *Gr. Polymorphic Presents* p. 179 Amsterdam 1973 and perhaps as a reinforcement in analogy with the passive imperative or with an uncommon ζῆμι (cf. *EM* 410.48). It can be compared with βᾶθι (cf. Soph. *Ph.* 1196) and compounds ἀνάβηθι, e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 963, (see Orus B12 Alp.; see also πῖθι from πίνω e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 1489, Cratin. fr. 145, Eur. *Cycl.* 570, etc. and κλῦθι in epic language,

cf. Hes. *Op.* 9, Chantraine *Grammaire Homerique* I p. 379 Paris 1958).

It becomes more usual in poetic and gnomic expressions in later times (cf. Men. *Mon.* 191, AP 11.57, 10.43 where it has a symbolical sense, about it see Page *Further Gr. Epigrams* p.393 Cambridge 1981).

The sense of this imperative is not simply 'live', but 'enjoy life' (cf. Soph. fr. 167R ζή, πίνε, φέρβου and Pearson ad loc.).

#### Fr. 247

**θυμέλη:** this word takes here the meaning of θυλήματα or θυηλήματα: "'that which is offered', mostly in plural: cakes, incense", according to LSJ s.v. θυλήμα. The commonest sense is 'altar', but it may have widened to mean the things which are placed on or near it, especially 'barley cakes', according to Phryn. *Praep.soph.* p. 74.9, ἄπερ ἐστὶν ἄλφιστα οἴνω καὶ ἐλαίῳ μεμαγμένα. The word was originally related to burnt offerings (about its etymology, cf. Aly *Glotta* 5 (1914) pp.60ff., Frisk *Eranos* 41 (1943) pp. 51ff.); but frequently it widens its sense to mean all kind of offerings (cf. θύος Aesch. *Ag.* 1409, Eup. fr. 99. 41-3 and see further Lejeune *REG* (1959) pp. 140ff.; θύμα, cf. Soph. *El.* 634).

Perhaps the most comprehensive book about its sense and semantic field is Casabona *Recherches sur le Vocabulaire des Sacrifices* Aix-en-Provence 1966)

Fr. 248

καθέστεον: this verbal adjective is not common, but one can not reach any further conclusion because in general they are often found in prose and Aristophanes, but rare in poetry, see more in detail Bishop *AJP* 20 (1899) pp. 1-21, 121-138, 241-53. About the verbal adjective in general see Buck-Petersen *A reverse Index* p. 530.

Fr. 249

καθηγεῖσθαι: with the same meaning as ὑφηγήσθαι; that is to say, 'to guide', 'to show the way' (in metaphorical sense it can mean 'to begin', cf. Pl. *Smp.* 199c or 'to instruct', sense that perhaps was commoner in later times, cf. καθηγητής). It can be constructed with genitive (cf. K-G I p. 367.7) or dative (cf. *ibid.* p. 409).

Fr. 250

καπανοί: with the meaning ἄλφια, the lemma has been suggested to be corrupted and Kaibel's suggestion is to read κάπανοι according to Phot. p. 130.19, κάπανοι· ἄλφρων εἶδος.

Maybe the lemma is not corrupt, if it is related to καπνός, 'smoke' with reference to the colour of the barley-meal, implying a dark kind in contrast with the white one. Perhaps this kind of ἄλφια is meant by Ar. fr. 725: ἄλφρων μελάνων ἄδδισα. Otherwise, this word καπνός can designate also other plants for their smoky colour (cf. Carnoy *Dictionnaire Étymologique des Noms Grecs de Plantes* s. v. capnos p. 64 Louvain 1959).

Other names of coarse meal are χονδρός, κρίμνα, and of finer ones παιπάλη, γύρις and perhaps σπονδός 'ash' (cf. Hesych. γ1025 and Bluemner *Tech.* I p.53 n.4 and p.54). See also on fr. 66 πάλης 'ash'.

#### Fr. 251

**καραιβαρᾶν:** about the compound form in καραι- instead of καρη- as it is found in Ar. fr.832 and Telecl. fr.66, cf. Rehrenböck (1987) pp. 47-9 who suggests the existence in parallel of both compound forms, one similar to καρᾶδοκεῖν, καρᾶτομεῖν, καρηβοᾶν, and the other in comparison with ἡ κραιπαλή (cf. *ibid.* p.48).

It is possible that the choice was idiomatic, perhaps as Rehrenböck *ibid.* p. 49 suggests "ein Hyperurbanismus eines böotischen Sprechers", for the Boeotian dialect changes -η- into the diphthong -αι-, while καρηβαρᾶν was the word common in Attic dialect. The alternation of the diphthong -αι- with -η- can be found in other expressions which belong to spoken Attic (cf. e.g. λαικάζω and Frisk s. v.).

A synonymous verb is κραιπαλάω (cf. Ar. *Plut.* 298 and *Ran.* 217 κραιπαλόκωμμος) and the expression ἐκ κραιπαλῆς cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1255 and MacDowell ad loc.; also ἱλιγγιάω, Ar. *Ach.* 1218. The sense can be in general 'to have a headache' from alcohol, that is to say, to have a 'hang-over'. It is possible that the ending -αω instead of the commoner one -εω (cf. βαρέω) might be due to analogy with these two verbs.

#### Fr. 252

κλεπτίδης: a mock-patronymic formation from κλεπτής 'thief', as in Ar. *Ach.* 596 and van Leeuwen ad loc. (cf. also Eupol. fr. 248). About other similar forms with -αδης (cf. Ar. *Ran.* 841, 966, and *Vesp.* 401). In general see R. Carden *The Papyrus Fragments of Soph.* Berlin 1979 p. 82. and above all Lobeck on Soph. *Aj.* 880 [Berlin 1866<sup>3</sup>].

A play on names and masculine and feminine genders can be found also in Pherecr. fr. 70, fr. 200 and 254, and comment ad fr. 200 about this topic in comedy.

While τοιχωρύχος, almost synonymous with κλεπτής, seems to have become a general insult similar to πανοβργος (cf. Dover ad Ar. *Nub.* 1327), κλεπτής is only used in its primary sense (cf. Ar. *Ecc1.* 667, *Vesp.* 900 and MacDowell ad loc., 953, 1227).

#### Fr. 253

ληκῆσαι: surely used by Pherecrates in the sense of βινεῖν or κινεῖν. The meaning is considered by Frisk s.v. ληκάω as "euphemistisch und sekundär", while its primary would be 'to jump', as Hesych. λ847 explains: τὸ πρὸς ῥῶδην ὀρχεῖσθαι (cf. Athen. I 15d) A synonym would be πεδάω (which in modern Greek has the same secondary sense). About it see Henderson *MM* p. 153. It seems to be related to λαικάζω and λαικαστρία (cf. fr. 159)

It is found in Ar. *Thesm.* 493-4: οὐδ' ὡς ὅταν μάλισθ' ὑπὸ του ληκόμεθα / τὴν νύχθ'. The similarity of these words with the ones that our source, Phot. p. 219.16 attributes to Pherecrates: ληκούμεσθ' ὄλην τὴν νύχτια have raised the doubt if they belong to

Pherecrates or if they are a corruption of the words of Aristophanes (cf. Dobree *Adv.* I p.599) or if we actually have here the proper text of Ar. *Thesm* 493 according to van Velsen apud K-A (following Sud. λ434) and also van Leeuwen ad loc.

It is noteworthy, nonetheless, that this similarity would not be so difficult to understand if we were speaking of a poet of Middle Comedy (cf. Hunter on Eub. p.155). One wonders whether this activity was already frequent in Old Comedy, above all if we take into account the striking similarities in the form of fr.113 for instance with other comic poets dealing with the same subject.

#### Fr. 254

μητρῖδα: in Pl. *Rep.* 575d it is quoted as an expression of the Cretan dialect, instead of πατρίς, to refer to the 'fatherland'; the fact that Plato mentions the origin of the expression might mean that it was not widely known and therefore Pherecrates can be using it as a comic invention implying a change in the gender of a common word (cf. fr. 220 and 200). It could be also a pun on μήτρα, as "swine's 'matrix', reckoned a great dainty" (cf. LSJ s.v. 2), perhaps in a similar way as Alex. fr. 198: ὑπὲρ πάτρας μὲν πᾶς τις ἀποθνήσκειν θέλει, / ὑπὲρ δὲ μήτρας Καλλιμέδων ὁ Κάραβος / ἐφθῆς ἴσως προσεῖτ' ἄν ἄλλως ἀποθανεῖν.

#### Fr. 255

μίμωρυς: a kind of 'hare-soup or jugged hare' which became

a delicacy in ancient Athens as the λαγῶα did (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1110); but cooking the entrails in their own blood (cf. Sch. Ar. *Ach.* 1112, Sud. μ1073, Poll. VI 56). In a similar way the sauce καρυκῆν was prepared (cf. ad fr. 195). It could be made of pork as well (cf. Sch. ad Ar. loc.cit., Hesych. μ1371, Sud. loc.cit.) or as in our case, as a joke, of 'donkey-meat'. The etymology of the word is uncertain (cf. Chantraine *Dict.étym.* s.v.), but the kind of food it means might suggest that it is a word borrowed from another language, perhaps in parallel to ἀβυρτάκη or καρυκή from Lydian (cf. fr. 195).

In Ar. loc.cit. Dicaeopolis is tempted to eat it before a meal and Diph. fr. 1 says, χελιδόνειος ὁ δασύπους, γλυκεῖα δ' ἢ μίμαρκος, that is to say, 'sweet', maybe in the sense of 'pleasant'. The entrails of some animals were used to cook different meals and frequently mentioned in Comedy (cf. the enumeration of Dioxipp. fr.1, Ar. *Equ.* 365 and Neil ad loc.).

#### Fr. 256

**ναικισήρεις:** this word quoted by Phot. p.285.15 is clearly a comic formation. There are several explanations of its function and origin;

- ναικισήρεις is an adjective that could mean 'one who sneers or carps' (LSJ), form accepted by all the editors of Pherecrates.

- ναικισηρεύεις, as a verb, is suggested by Blaydes *Adv.* II p. 26 (apud K-A) probably in comparison with Hesych. v22 ναικισσηρεύοντας (another source of our fragment). It seems,

notwithstanding, that both words are probably totally different and quoted by Hesychius together because of the similarity of their form (cf. Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s. v. *ναικισσηρεύοντας*).

- *ναικισσηρεῖς* as a verb is suggested by Rehrenböck (1987) pp. 49-52. He proposes that it is a verb, because Phot. loc. cit. explains it with another verb *ἀληθεύειν* and Hesych. loc. cit. with a participle construction taking into account that the main lemma is a participle and the spelling is with *-σσ-*.

Another question, the elements which form this word, is also difficult to solve. It seems to be generally accepted that the first part comes from *ναίχι* 'yes'; but, as for the second part, the suggestions are pretty uncertain. As Rehrenböck *ibid.* p. 51 suggests: "alle bisherigen Erklärungen kränken u. a. daran, daß das *-o-* in *ναικισσορεύω* nicht berücksichtigt wird: kompositum aus *ναίχι ἑρεῖς* (Valckernaer); aus *ναίχι* und *σύρειν* (Runkel); aus *ναί* (*ναίχι*, *ναίχι*) und *σσηρέναι* (Kock); aus *ναίχι* (sic!) und *ῖσσα/ῖσση* (Edmonds). Die neue Edition Kassels und Austins vermag zum Hermipp-Fragment (s. Anm. 13) lediglich die bisher unpublizierte Notizen Kaibels zur Alten Komödie: 'obscura omnia et ne illud quidem probabile quod Valck. coniecit ab *ναίχι* vel *ναίχι* vocabulum factum esse'".

His own explanation is that it is a denominative verb in *-ηρέω*, formed from the adjective in *-ηρός* which would be originated from *\*ναίχισσω* meaning 'to say yes'. But this is a very complicated explanation of a word which is formed from an unusual verb (at least it does not exist in any text which has reached us) and it is difficult to say how the subsequent meaning

came about in Pherecrates and in Hermipp. fr. 87 with the same form: 'to say yes without meaning it'. Perhaps he thinks that the adjective *ναικισσηρός* would qualify a person who is saying 'yes' without meaning it and then the verb will be formed. In this case it may have been simpler to understand that it is an adjective like *ναικισσηρός* from a verb perhaps used in Attic dialect, *ναικίζω* or *ναικίσσω*, but not preserved at all in our texts.

Another proposal I would favour, is that of Kock: '*ναικισσηρέναι*', which would be a visual comic formation "saying 'yes' smiling ironically"; but this would not fit the word as it stands; perhaps it might be possible to modify it into *ναικισσηρώς*, understood as a participle of *σσηρέναι*, which would fit the participle of the gloss of Hesych. v22 *ναικισσορεύοντα*, and the fact that Phot. loc.cit. explains it with another verb. About the verb *σαίρω* when cheating someone, cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 901, *οἶον σσηρώς ἑξαπατήσειν μ' οἶεται*.

#### Fr. 257

*οὔλοκέφαλος*: a comic epithet that means "with curling hair". It is possibly a parody of the Homeric one *οὔλοκάρηνος* *Od.* 19.246, *hMerc.* 137 or separately *οὔλας ἦχε κόμας ὑακινθίνῃ ἄνθει ὄμοιας* *Od.* 6.231 (23.158) Perhaps *οὔλοκομος* in Alex. fr. 325 is a similar kind of adjective (cf. also *οὔλοθρίξ* *Hdt.* II 104 in opposition to *εὐθυθρύξ* according to LSJ s. v.).

The word *κέφαλη* appears frequently in comic compounds sometimes related to monstrous figures as *κυνοκεφάλους* Ar. *Equ.* 416 (cf. Neil ad loc. and Aesch. fr. 431Sn); *ἀμφικέφαλος* Eub. fr.

106.10; σχινοκέφαλος (about Pericles) Cratin. fr. 73; βουκέφαλος Ar. fr. 42 and 43; έκατογκέφαλος έχιδνα Ran. 473; έκατογκέφαλα Τυφώ Nub. 336; Έρμης τρικέφαλος fr. 566; χρυσοκέφαλος Phryn. com. fr. 52 (ironically about βεμβράδες, a very common kind of fish, see K-A ad Ar. fr. 140).

#### Fr. 258

**πλατειάσαι:** about the form πλατειάσαι instead of πλατιάσαι in Sud. π1704, cf. Rehrenböck p.284.

In literal sense 'to slap with the flat of the hand' (cf. Ar. Ran. 1096 ό δέ τυπτόμενος ταΐσι πλατείαις and Sch. ad loc. who refers to a custom in the Cerameicus to treat slow runners and the proverb Κεραμεικαί πληγαί; cf. Hesych. x2263). A metaphorical sense is found in Theocr. 15. 88 and perhaps in Sud. π1704 (πλατιάζω).

The contrary way of hitting with the fist is said in Ar. Ran. 547 πδέ πατάξας; Pax 899 παλιν, όρύττειν, πδέ; Vesp. 1384 εΐτα τή πυγμή θενών; πυκτεύω, or κονδύλοις Vesp. 254. Also πυκτεύω (Pl. Grg. 456d) and πυκταλλίζω (Anacr. 62.4 PMG) exist also and mainly refer to the sport of 'boxing'.

#### Fr. 259

**πλοκάδας:** as in Ar. Thesm. 567 ποκάς (from ό πόκος 'fleece', about it cf. Taillardat *Images* §72). The suffix -ας is poetic and used with adjectives generally related to feminine nouns and that fairly soon became substantives (cf. K-B I p.549).

πρωτόβαθρον: it is a hapax that, as adjective, designates a person who deserves or is 'in the first seat', μάλιστα μὲν δικάστων according to Pol. IV 121, that is to say, of the law-courts .

The theme of being first or occupying the first bench of the Pnyx or the law courts is frequently found in Aristophanes either as a reference to the privilege of being given the first seat, the προέδρος (cf. Th. VIII 67) or getting the front seat by pushing or arriving early (cf. Ach. 25, see further Vesp. 90, Ecc1. 86-7). This term πρωτόβαθρον can mean either.

Βάθρον is a general word for a stand or base (cf. Hdt. I 183) or more specifically a 'bench made of wood or stone' with or without back (cf. Richter *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* pp. 47ff. London 1966). It could also designate the steps of a temple (cf. Soph. OT 142), a kind of δ(φρος used in the school (cf. Dem. 18. 258 and Wankel ad loc.) or perhaps the 'subsellia porticibus fori et tabernis unguentariis' (cf. Meineke ad Phryn.com. fr. 3.5). About its metaphorical sense cf. Eur. Cycl. 358 and Seaford ad loc.

Although it could also designate the theatre benches, ἔκρια (originally 'deck at the stern of a ship', cf. Od. 12.414) seems to have been especially used of them, when at first they were made of wood, but still they were so called when made of stone (cf. Pickard-Cambridge *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* pp. 11ff. Oxford 1946). Other words which were generally used of benches at

public places (mainly the Assembly or law courts) are ξύλον (Ar. Ach. 25, Vesp. 90), or πέτραι (Equ. 313, 754, 783).

#### Fr. 261

**ῥάδια:** a kind of shoe that, from the quotation of Poll. VII 94 is ποικίλον καὶ πολυέλικτον, that is to say, colourful and with a lot of laces. It seems to be a feminine kind of shoe (quoted also among other shoes for women). Women probably used shoes all the time (in contrast with men who had to take their shoes off when entering a banquet, cf. on fr. 162.7) and they are mentioned in Comedy as an important item of women's fashion (cf. *Stone Costume in Aristophanic Comedy* pp. 222ff. New York 1981).

The only description we have is that of Pollux before cited and it suggests an elaborate kind of shoes. LSJ s. v. explains it as 'easy shoes', probably in relation to the adjective ῥάδιος. But this interpretation seems not to coincide with Pollux's description and maybe the noun has an ironical sense in it (cf. καρκίνοι in Pherecr. fr. 192).

#### Fr. 262

**ῥυπαίνω:** about denominative verbs formed with -αίνω, cf. Fraenkel *Griechische Denominativa* pp. 4ff. (above all p. 10) Göttingen 1906.

The sense of this verb here is ὑβρίζω 'to abuse, disparage', according to Thom. Mag. p. 326. 10 (apud K-A): διὰ τὸ τὴν ὕβριν ὡσπερὶ μολυσμὸν εἶναι πρὸς ὄντινα λέγεται. In the instances given by LSJ it is the oldest mention of this verb, which was

commoner in later Greek (cf. Xen. *Lac.* 11.3, Theophr. *Char.* X 14, Arist. *Rh.* 1405a 25). The verb μολύνω (cf. Taillardat *Images* §577) and ἐπισμάω in middle voice (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 389, Cratin. fr. 97) can be also found in the same sense.

#### Fr. 263

**σαπράν:** it comes to have the same meaning as παλαιός or γέρον; but still when referring to persons it could have the more abusive sense of 'too old for sexual activity' (cf. MacDowell on *Vesp.* 1343). Other instances of this word are *Ach.* 1101, *Pax* 554, 698, *Vesp.* 1380, *Lys.* 378, *Thesm.* 1025, *Eccl.* 884, 926, 1098, *PL.* 323, 1086, *Hermipp.* fr.9, *Eup.* fr. 237, 478. In *Alex.* fr. 172.4 it is a pun on the other sense of σαπρός that in connexion with wine means 'mellow', cf. Ar. *Pl.* 1086; this might be also the case of Ar. *Pax* 554, although it is contested by Platnauer ad loc. About σαπρός applied to persons and to wine, see Arnott *GRBS* 11 (1970) p. 44.

#### Fr. 264

**σιναμωρέματα:** according to *Et. gen.* AB (cf. also *EM* 713. 29 and *Et. Sym.* CV) this is the word used by Pherecrates. The *Append. prov.* IV 71 gives σινδαρωνεύεσθαι (probably corrupted): μέμνηται ταύτης Φερεκράτης. ἔστι δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦ ἀνδραρ σίνεσθαι (cf. also *Prov. Bodl.* 861, *Sud.* σ453).

It is only found in Pherecrates who might have invented it as a comic noun from the commoner verb σιναμωρέω: 'to ravage or destroy wantonly' also related to the verb σίνομαι (cf.

Chantraine *Dict. étym.* s.v.). The sense of the verb σιναμωρέω is according to *Et. gen.* loc.cit. also λιχνεύειν, that is to say, 'to gormandize, to desire greedily'. In this sense his definition of σιναμωρεύμα is τὰ τοιαῦτα κλέμματα, literally translated as 'things stolen in a greedy way' and perhaps as Chantraine loc.cit. says, "il s'agit de 'nourritures fines volées', tous ces mots impliquent la notion de violence, de désir de nuire". Therefore it would refer to the food stolen by a glutton, (cf. *Ar. Pl.* 665ff., and *Pherecr.* fr. 1, 37, 109 about the subject of gluttony).

Henderson *MM* pp. 158-9 starts from the erotic sense of the expression γυνή δὲ σιναμωρωμένη χαίρει in *Ar. Nub.* 1070 to suggest a similar meaning for our word. As he says: "there is some indication that σιναμωρεῖν implied amatory acts, fellatio. Attic writers apparently used σιναμώρευμα to mean τὸ λιχνεύειν (*EM* 713. 29), and σιναμωρεύματα at *Pherecr.* 230 [264] is glossed as meaning τὰ τοιαῦτα κλέμματα, 'that kind of schema', referring to fellatio, see also for this sense his n. 37 in p. 159.

Perhaps it is necessary to remark that, on one hand, according to *EM* loc.cit., Attic writers used σιναμωρεῖν and not σιναμωρεύμα, as Henderson says, with the sense of λιχνεύειν and according to the same source, σιναμωρεύμα seems to be an invention of Pherecrates only, rather than a common word. On the other hand it seems clear from *Ar. Nub.* 1070 (cf. K-A on this fragment) that σιναμωρεῖν had an erotic sense; but that its connexion with the sexual activity of the fellatio seems to be an inference of Henderson from the verb λιχνεύειν that has no clear

erotic sense and he does not give any instance of it except for λιχνεύμα in Sophr. fr. 24 Kaib. (where the meaning 'dainty or delicacy' is a metaphor for ὄλισσος). The expression in Ar. loc.cit. implies rather the contrary: the verb σιναμωρεῖν is used in passive of a woman.

The compounds in -μα or -ευμα can have in Comedy a tone of parody of the tragic vocabulary (cf. χόρδευμα, Ar. *Equ.* 315, κήπευμα Av. 1100, ἀλαζόνευμα Ach. 87, νωγάλευμα Arar. fr. 8. 1, τόρευμα Men. fr. 24Kδ-T, Sopat. fr. 19 Kaib.). About it, cf. Neill ad *Equ.* 79 and Fraenkel *Griechische Denominativa* pp. 225ff. Göttingen 1906.

#### Fr. 265

Σκίρα: here it designates the festival that takes place the 12<sup>th</sup> day of Skirophorion, the last month of the Attic year, June in our calendar.

It was a special festival for the women in Athens who had the privilege of forming their own organization; after a day of rest, it was followed by the Bouphonia, two days later the Kronia where the slaves were free from their masters' orders and finally the Synoikia. About its sources see Jacoby *FGrH* on Philoch. 328 f14-16 (III B Suppl. pp.286-9 and especially IIIb Suppl. II p.208).

Further interpretation and discussion about the origin of this word is found in Deubner (1969) pp.40-50, Burkert *Homo necans* pp.143ff., and A. Chandor Brumfield *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and their Relation to the Agricultural Year* pp. 156ff.

New York 1981.

In Old comedy plots in which women had a special role seem to have been connected sometimes with the celebration of a festival; the most evident example is *Thesmophoriazusaë*.

Fr. 266

Σκίτων: the question whether it is a name or an adjective is unresolved. Phot. p.522.12 seems to suggest that it is an adjective meaning ἀσθενής, ἄξιος οὐδενός, but Sch. ad *Equ.* 632 explaining Σκίταλοι suggests that it was a name: οἱ εὐτελεῖς καὶ πονηροί· ἦν γὰρ Σκίτων κναφεύς τις εὐτελής, ἐπὶ πονηρίᾳ κωμωδούμενος. As Rehrenböck (1987) p.52 says, "jener Skiton muß ein sehr bekannter Zeitgenosse gewesen sein, wenn Aristophanes seinetwegen eigens die 'Skitaloi' erfindet, und es is daher sehr wahrscheinlich, daß Pherekrates denselben Mann verspottete". This name is also attested in *Hdt.* III 130.5 (of a slave) and *Dem.* 21.182 (of a citizen).

To reach a clear conclusion is difficult, insofar as, in my opinion, it would be possible that it was a name and Pherecrates might have a pun or a comparison as in *Ar. Ran.* 55: μικρός, ἡλικος Μόλων (cf. Taillardat *Images* §246) and, on the other hand, it is possible that it was an adjective invented for the occasion as στίλη in *Vesp.* 213, στριβολ(χι)γέ in *Ach.* 1035, φεψάλυξ in *Lys.* 107 (cf. Taillardat *ibid.* §254).

Fr. 267

σόφισμα: according to K-A ad *Ar.* fr. 206.1 "σοφίσματα cum

contemptu dicta *Ran.* 17, cf. *Av.* 431, sine contemptu *Plut.* 160, ambigue *Ran.* 872 et 1104 (cf. *Nub.* 547)".

As Dover ad *Ar. Nub.* 205 defines, "σόφισμα: Essentially an exercise of σοφ(α (cf. 94n.) as in *Pl.* 160f. 'it is on your account' -addressing Wealth- 'that all τέχναι and σοφίσματα have been invented in the human race'. But a derogatory sense was gaining ground in Aristophanes' time: cf. *Av.* 431, where it is coupled with terms of abuse".

This word and its verb σοφίζω (above all in middle σοφίζομαι, cf. *Equ.* 299 and 721) was also related to trickery and contrivance (cf. Θέσσαλον σόφισμα in *Athen.* I 11b and especially in military terminology, cf. E.L. Wheeler *Stratagem and the vocabulary of Military Trickery* pp. 26ff. Leiden 1988).

#### Fr. 268

στομοδόκον: adjective that designates a talkative and wordy person, and formed by Pherecrates probably in parody of the common poetic adjectives ending in -δόκος. This ending implies generally 'to receive' or 'to contain' something or both senses at the same time when it is applied to containers, e.g. ξεινοδόκος *Od.* 8.543, *Theocr.* 16.27; ἰοδόκος *Il.* 15.44, *Od.* 21.12; μηλοδόκος *Pi. P.* 3.27; οἶνοδόκος *I.* 6.40; λαοδόκος *Simon.* 107.10; πρεσβυτοδόκος *Aesch. Supp.* 607; ἱεροδόκος *ibid.* 363; θυοδόκος *Eur. Ion.* 511, 1549, *Andr.* 1157; βουδόκος *Call. fr.* 250; and it becomes very frequent in the *AP*.

In Aristophanes two compounds with -δόκος have been found μυστοδόκος in *Nub.* 303 which seems to be a parody as it is

applied to the road of Eleusis which 'receives the mysteries or the initiated' and in *Equ.* 403 δωροδόκος which seems to be commoner in connexion with the 'taking presents or bribes' (cf. *Pl. Rep.* 340d and *Dem.* 18. 61), although the line is ironically poetic and its ambiguous sense increases its comic purpose: ὧ περι πάντ' ἐπι πᾶσι τε πράγμασι / δωροδόκοισιν ἐπ' ἄνθεσιν ἴζων.

According to Pearson ad *Soph.* fr. 76 ἄστομος, 'the word στόμα seems to become familiar in the sense of speech'. Accordingly our adjective could designate a person 'who contains speech', as the φαρέτρη is called ἰοδόκος in *Il.* 15. 444 and *Od.* 21.12 (cf. *Nicoch.* fr. 3 κυμινοδόκος and μυοδόκος *Nic. Th.* 795).

The commoner word for this meaning is στωμύλος. Other compounds with στόμα are στομάργος (cf. *Aesch. Th.* 447, *Soph. El.* 607, *Eur. Med.* 525), στομαυλέω (cf. *Pl. Crat.* 417e) and στόμφαξ 'bombastic' in *Ar. Nub.* 1367 (cf. *Taillardat Images* §508ff. about this adjective and other ways of referring to talkativeness in *Aristophanes*).

#### Fr. 269

στρατηγίς: comic substantivation of the adjective στρατηγίς (cf. *Hdt.* VIII 92 ναύς) to refer to the feminine of the στρατηγός, 'general'. Similarly it is found in *Ar. Eccl.* 835 and 870 (van Leeuwen, according to K-A, suspects that this fragment should be ascribed to *Aristophanes*' passages instead, although it seems very likely that *Pherecrates* used it).

Similar nouns in feminine can be found in *Pherecr.* fr. 39, 70, 200, 220 and the title of the play *Tyrannis* to which it could

belong as Edmonds suggests; but the same kind of joke can be found in fr. 39 that belongs to Graes or fr. 70 that belongs to Ἴπνός ἢ Παννουχίς.

#### Fr. 270

στρόφιγγες: pivots (cf. Eur. *Ph.* 1126), especially those of doors (cf. Theophr. *HP* 5.5.4). Here it has a metaphorical sense referring to the vertebrae as in Pl. *Tim.* 74a: καὶ περὶ τὸν διαυχένιον ἄμα καὶ νωτιαῖον μυελὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ σφονδύλοις πλάσας ὑπέτεινεν οἷον στρόφιγγας ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς, διὰ παντός τοῦ κύτους and later on 74b (cf. Taylor *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* p.529 Oxford 1928). A comic use of this word is found in Ar. *Ran.* 892 αἰθήρ, ἐμὸν βόσκημα, καὶ γλώττης στρόφιγγες (referring to Euripides, about it see Taillardat *Images* §512).

Σφόνδυλοι seems to have been the word usually applied to vertebrae (cf. σφόνδυλον in Pherecr. fr. 28.4 perhaps meaning the 'backbone' altogether) and although στροφεύς could also have the same sense (cf. Poll. II 130), it seems to be used mainly of 'socket in which the pivot of a door moved' (cf. LSJ s.v. II, Ar. *Thesm.* 987, fr.266, Hermipp. fr. 48.9).

#### Fr. 271

σuhn(α (καὶ) ὕhn(α: either word could have been used by Pherecrates, the lexicographer does not specify which one (cf. K-A ad loc. and compare it with fr. 272). The word σuhn(α is not found anywhere else and it might have been invented by Pherecrates in parallel with ὕhn(α for a suitable context.

Both are compounds of σῦς and ὄς respectively and they are related to the traditional insult of calling someone a swine: a symbol of stupidity. The noun ὄνηϊα is also found in Ar. *Pax* 928 and Call. fr. 38Pf. Similarly Ar. *Equ.* 984 invents ὄμουσίας 'swine's music' (LSJ) or 'pig-education' (Sommerstein ad loc.).

They refer specifically to the lack of education that, according to Athen. III 96e, was identified with the sons of Hippocrates (cf. Eup. fr. 112, Ar. *Nub.* 1001 and Schol. ad loc., Phot. s.v. σῦς). In general it is found in some proverbial expressions: σῦς πρὸς Ἄθηνᾶν or σῦς τὴν Ἄθηνᾶν, Βοιωτῖα ὄς cf. Pind. *Ol.* 6. 90 and σοβοιωτοί in Cratin. fr. 77 (cf. other sayings in GC III 93 and Leutsch ad loc., *ibid.* 94, *App.* V 9); for further references see Taillardat *Images* §451.

#### Fr. 272

σφηκίσκοι: according to Theodoridis in Phot. I p. XLVIII, the reading σφηκῖαι in Photius' text is a conjecture of the scribe himself. The word σφηκίσκοι, preserved by most of the other sources (cf. K-A's app.crit.) would be the text of Pherecrates, although van Leeuwen suspects a confusion in the attribution of this lemma with Ar. *Pl.* 301.

This word means 'splinters' and similar nouns are ὀσπινδάλαμος (cf. Sch. ad *Nub.* 130) or ὀσόλοψ, a more general term. About other meanings of this word see Rhodes on *AP* 65.2.

#### Fr. 273

ταχεωσί: cf. μεγαλωσί in Homeric poetry, *Il.* 16. 776, 18.

26, *Od.* 24.40. Other adverbs with the -τι suffix are νεωστί, ἰρωςτί *Anacr.* 478 *PMG*, ἀμυστί *Pherecr.* fr. 217 (cf. Schwyzer *GrG* I p.624 about its composition and Risch *Kl. Schriften* p.171 n.10 Berlin 1981).

#### Fr. 274

**τραπέμαλιν:** unusual adverb formed probably from the common expression πάλιν (or ἔμαλιν) τρέπειν (see *LSJ* s.v. τρέπω II 'turn round or about'). It could mean 'in a turning-backwards manner' and probably it could be taken in literal or metaphorical sense. In this case it would be synonymous with the expression ἐπ' ἀριστερᾶ or the adjective ἐπαρ(ί)στερος given by *Phot.* p. 598.19, cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἐπαρ(ί)στερος II "'gauche' beginning at the wrong end"; pace *Rehrenböck* pp. 296-7.

It has been restored in *Crat.* fr. 17. 1 and *K-A* ad loc. seem to suggest that there is a mistake in the attribution of this adverb to *Pherecrates* (see also *Crat.* fr. 14 and 20). Perhaps they could be right if it was a comic invention of one of them, but even in this case, a poet could borrow from other poets, insofar as the sense of originality was not so important and, according to *LSJ* s.v., it seems that it should be restored in other texts (see on fr. 253 about repetition of lines in several poets).

#### Fr. 275

**τραύξανα:** also τραύσανον in *Hesych.* τ1279 (cf. Schwyzer *GrG* I p.211, *Threatte* I pp. 551-3) and maybe τρώξανον in *Theophr.* *CP*

3.2.2 (referred to dry twigs). In Pherecrates it designates 'dry and thorny chips'. In general the lexicons (Phot. p. 598.19, *Et.gen.* AB, *Et.magn.* p.764. 29 and Sud. τ916) give also the sense, τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς φάτινης ἀποπίπτοντα τῶν ἵππων ἢ τῶν βοῶν ἢ τῶν ἄλλων κτηνῶν λεῖψανα.

#### Fr. 276

**ὑφόλμιον:** one of the parts of the complicated mouthpiece of an aulos (cf. Poll. IV 70: τῶν δ' αὐλῶν τὰ μέρη γλῶττα καὶ τρυπήματα καὶ βόμβικες καὶ ὄλμος καὶ ὑφόλμια).

In general terms, J.W. McKinnon in S.Sadie (ed.) *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* s.v. aulos London 1981, describes this instrument as follows: "the aulos, appearing usually in identical pairs as in figs. 1 and 2, consists of a cylindrical or slightly conical tube ('bombyx' [a word with several senses; about it cf. S. Michaelidis *The Music of Ancient Greece, An Encyclopaedia* s.v. London 1987]) of greatly variable length but generally about 50 cm. Primitive examples were of reed or even bone, but eventually wood and ivory became common. These materials are reflected in the instrument's many Greek and Latin names, for example 'kalamos' ('reed-pipe'), 'lotos', ('wood', from the Libyan lotus tree) and 'tibia' ('shinbone'). At the player's end of the 'bombyx' is the 'holmos', a bulb of lathed wood or ivory, which serves as staple for the 'glottai', or reeds; frequently there are two bulbs, the one intervening between the 'bombyx' and 'holmos' being termed the 'hypholmion'".

The reeds could be simple or double: the name for them could

be γλῶττα or γλωττίς without specification, although the noun ζεῦγος seems to have specified a double reed (cf. Chailley *La musique Grecque Antique* p.62 Paris 1979). It is these straw lengths that "offended the aesthetic sense of the Greeks, who concealed the stalks by means of the graceful olive-shaped bulbs, one, two or three in number, which occur in many of the vase paintings. These bulbs are made hollow and tubular at each end to fit into the resonator or into each other. so as to form a continuous passage for the stem of the mouthpiece. Adhesion is secured by rows of waxed thread. To add or to take off a bulb was, therefore, a visible sign of a change of Mode", according to K. Schlesinger *The Gr. Aulos* p. 71 London 1939 (cf. also Eup. fr. 289 for other reference to this part of the aulos).

#### Fr. 277

ὑφός: about different possibilities of understanding this gloss cf. K-A ad loc. They seem to favour the reading ὑφός (cf. λίνυφος found in later papyri, LSJ s.v.). It would mean 'weaver' as ὑφεύς would be understood.

This explanation seems reasonable, although ὑφεύς is not found in any instance except here. This is the reason why some changes have been suggested, as Meineke *CGF* V 1 p. 30 ὕφος for ὕφη (web, also a later term), or Kaibel ὑφέος - συφέος ingeniously meaning 'pig-sty'.

#### Fr. 278

φῖτυ: poetic term for φῖτυμα 'shoot', as in Ar. *Pax* 1163ff.,

fr. 307 (see K-A ad loc.), Eup. fr. 56, Soph. fr. 889R. Other words compound with φιτυ- are very common in tragedy (cf. φιτύμα Aesch. *Ag.* 1281, φιτυποίημην *Eum.* 911, φιτύω Hes. *Th.* 986, Aesch. *Prom.* 233, *Supp.* 313; see H. Friss Johansen/ E.W. Whittle in Aeschylus *The Suppliants* II p. 254 Denmark 1980, Soph. *Ant.* 645).

#### Fr. 279

φοβερός: cf. LSJ s.v. II 1 'opp. θαρσαλέος'.

#### Fr. 280

χολλάδας: 'bowels, guts' in general. Phryn. *Praep. soph.* p.126.5 distinguishes two meanings between χολάδες, a common epic word (cf. *Il.* 4. 526, 21. 181) and χολλάδες with a double λ, but it seems that it is simply a vernacular gemination (cf. Frisk s.v. χολάδες).

See also Men. fr. 23Kδ-T ἴδιον ἐπιθυμῶν μόνος <sup>μοι</sup> θάνατος οὔτος φαίνεται / εὐθάνατος, ἔχοντα πολλὰς χολλάδας κεῖσθαι παχύν.

A similar word, but designating the 'guts of an oxen' is χόλικες (cf. Pherecr. fr. 113. 15, Eub. fr. 63. 4, Ar. *Ran.* 576, fr. 83).

#### Fr. 281

χυτρῖζειν: normally ἐγχυτρῖζειν (although it could also be said καταχυτρῖσαι Ar. fr. 833), it means 'to expose a child in a pot' with reference to this way of exposing a child, above all in tragedy and mythology, cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 505, *Ran.* 1190.

This could also have a culinary sense, synonymous with βλάπτειν, cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 289 and Taillardat *Images* §600.

Fr. 282

ὥς: in a causal sense, cf. LSJ s.v. B IV 'in as much, since' who mainly give poetic references and for prose instances, cf. K-G II p. 397e.

## DUBIA

### Fr. 283

Meineke *CGF* II p. 359 suggests that "sententiae quidem is color est, ut mediae potius vel novae quam antiquae comoediae poetam decere videatur"; perhaps the reason for it is the pompous tone of its terminology (cf. on ἐπαχθές) and the gnomic character (about it in New Comedy, cf. Webster *Studies in Later Gr. Comedy* p.50 Manchester 1970<sup>2</sup>) in contrast with the more colloquial tone of Pherecr. fr. 156 quoted next by Stobaeus, which deals with the same theme as this fragment (about this theme, cf. ad fr. 156).

1. ὦ γῆρας: this vocative is a rhetorical way of introducing this kind of complaints about old age. It is also found in Eur. *Supp.* 1108, *Antiph.* fr. 94, fr. 256, *Men.* fr. 644K<sup>5</sup>-T.

ἐπαχθές: the earliest instance<sup>of</sup> this word is [Aesch.] *Pr.* 48 (an emendation suggested by Stanley instead of ἐπράχθη in the manuscripts), and *Ar. Ran.* 940 where the sense is ambiguous, for it refers to the words in a tragedy (ῥημάτων ἐπαχθῶν). Otherwise, the term is only found in metaphorical sense referring to the grievance or offence suffered by someone. As Wankel ad *Dem.* 18.10 says, "das Adj. ἐπαχθές bei dem Anstoß, wenn man 'von sich' spricht (vgl. ἄχθεσθαι § 3, auch ἐνοχλεῖν §4), kommt so bei D. noch 5,4 vor (zusammen mit φορτικόν, vgl. für diese synonyme Metapher jetzt auch *Men. Dysc.* 772)". In prose besides this instance in Demosthenes, cf. *Thuc.* VI 54, *Pl. Phd.* 87a, *Lgg.* 688d.

3-4. Cf. on fr. 156. 4ff.

**δυνάμεθ'**: "δύνασθαι peut exprimer la notion de balidité physique, dans le cadre d'une opposition dont l'autre terme est, explicitement ou implicitement, ἀδύνατος 'invalide'", cf. Nadia van Brock *Recherchs sur le vocabulaire médical du Grec Ancien* p. 196 Paris 1961.

**ἰσχύμεν**: about the verb ἰσχύειν (related to ὑγιαίνειν in Xen. Cyr. VI 1. 24) in medical terminology cf. Nadia van Brock op.cit. pp. 195ff.

**τηνικαῦθ'**: more commonly found with another adverb or a noun in genitive with a specification of time (cf. Gow ad Theocr. 2. 119), but it can also be used as here without any specification (cf. Ar. Pax 1142).

**προδιδάσκειν**: means 'to teach', as προμαθεῖν "because teaching precedes the practice of what is taught; cf. Alexis 110.24ff. [115K-A]" according to Dover ad *Nub.* 476. See also van Leeuwen ad *Nub.* loc.cit.

#### Fr. 284

This fragment is quoted by Sud. τ236 after Pherecr. fr. 120. Kock ad loc., followed by Edmonds, suggests that it belongs to the same play as the latter *Myrmekanthropoi* (cf. also Phot. p.573.9 s.v. τεθολωμένον). As K-A ad loc. point out the word ἀν(α is not found in comic texts and it might be a similar case as Pherecr. fr. 122, where Sud. α4045 quotes it first of all and next a line of tragedy without author, but which has been identified with Soph. *Ai.* 941.

If it was part of a comedy, it would have had a paratragical tone stressed by the proximity of two words: ἀνία, as I have already said, a tragic word only found outside poetic texts in Plato, according to LSJ (cf. above all *Prot.* 255a), meaning specifically 'grief, distress' (meanwhile the verb ἀνιάω is commoner in Aristophanes, e.g. *Pax* 764) and ἀνεθολοῦθ' from ἀναθολόω, only found here in metaphorical sense it is commoner in technical texts with the meaning of 'make something turbid' (cf. LSJ s. v.); the simple form θολόω has notwithstanding, this sense in tragedy (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 1067).

#### Fr. 285

The identity with Eup. fr. 194: καὶ πόλλ' ἔμαθον ἐν τοῖσι κουρείοις ἐγὼ / ἀτόπως καθίζων κούδὲ γιγνώσκειν δοῶν, makes this fragment suspicious of a mistake in the attribution. K-A ad Eup. loc. cit. say: "'errore manifesto' Kaibel Meinekium secutus, cf. Cohn *Jb. cl. Ph.* Suppl. 13 (1884) 798<sup>4</sup>; 'potuit uterque poeta eodem versu uti' Kock ad Pherecr. fr. 163, prob. Kann *De iteratis* p. 26".

I have not been able to consult this last work, but I think that the only way of accepting this sentence is either to consider it an expression (or even as proverb) that can be said by both writers (as perhaps it is the case in fr. 287), or it is a cliché (as at another level Pherecr. fr. 100 and Ar. *Ran.* 1004 refer to Aeschylus with a similar metaphor and see on fr. 253).

Cohn loc. cit. suggests: "da schol. Phaed. 60b und lex. Bekk. 460. 8 offenbar aus derselben Quelle sind, so kann es nur auf einem Irrtum beruhen, dass in lex. Bekk, der komiker Pherekrates

statt des Eupolis genannt wird. Das Fragment des Pherekrates (Mein. Com. II 348, 30. Kock I 195 frg. 163) ist also zu streichen".

Certainly the solution of a mistake in the attribution to the author is more likely, although the subject of this line could make reference (at least Eupolis seems to do it clearly) to the life and behaviour of rich young men and in this sense it is not impossible to consider that Pherecrates was using a cliché, that he develops in a very similar way in fr. 70. 1-3 where καθήμενον / ὑψηλῶς perhaps makes reference to ἀτόπως καθ(ζων).

ἀτόπως: according to Phot. α3105 τὸ ἀσυνήθως καὶ ἀνεπιφάτως; LSJ s.v. ἄτοπος, ἀνυπόπτως (cf. further K-A ad Eup. fr.cit. 2).

δοκῶν: with the meaning of 'simulans' cf. Eup. fr. 172.10, Ar. Equ. 1146, Pax 1051, Ran. 564, Pherecr. fr. 156. 4.

#### Fr. 286

Papyrus fragment probably supplemented by Guida *RhM* 116 (1973) p.361. The authorship is still doubtful. Wilamowitz in Schubart-Wilamowitz *Berliner Klassikertexte* V 2 p.123 Berlin 1907 (Pack<sup>2</sup> 1568) suggested Pherecrates because he 'ist der einzige Komiker auf -κρατης, den man in einem Florilegium erwarten kann'. A similar opinion seems to be held by K-A, who reject the suggestions of Edmonds *FAC* I p.282 'Epicrates' and Guida loc.cit. 'Sosicrates'.

This text would contain a comic sense in the substitution of ἐπιγαμεῖ, found in *Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis* I vv.51-2

Jaekel ὅστις γυναικὸς ἀποθανούσης ἐπιγαμεῖ, / ὁ τοιοῦτος ὄντως οὐκ ἐπίστατ' εὐτυχεῖν, for δυσφορεῖ, according to Guida loc.cit.: "la scherzosa variazione ἐπιγαμεῖ ammonisce che, se è da sciocchi piangere la moglie morta, lo è altrettanto lo sposarsi di nuovo".

About the topic of this fragment, cf. Hippon. fr.68W, Chaerem. 71 F32Sn.: γυναῖκα θάπτειν κρείσσόν' ἐστὶν ἢ γαμεῖν, Eur. fr. 1112N<sup>2</sup>, CPG II 373. 24, Automed. AP XI 50.3ff.

1. **δυσφορεῖ**: this verb, δυσφορεῖν, implies according to Barrett in R. Carden *The Papyrus Fragments of Soph.* p.217 Berlin 1974 "to take things hard (Hesych. βαρύνεσθαι), is used of one's reaction to intolerable misfortune or injustice"

#### Fr. 287

Leutsch ad Macar. VII 86 considers that there might be a confusion in the ascription of this line with a very similar <sup>one</sup> in Ar. Pl. 1085, συνεχποτέ' ἐστὶ σοι καὶ τὴν τρύγα.

In my opinion the text may be a proverbial expression and therefore it could be used by both poets, having in mind that the expression in Aristophanes derives from a dialogue with erotic references (cf. also about a possible sense of the word τρύξ Theocr. 7. 70). Another similar expression is σαπρότερος τρυγός (cf. Macar. VII 58 and Leutsch ad loc. and Eust. *in Il.* 59. 30).

#### Fr. 288

The authorship of this gloss is doubtful according to Kock

because it could have<sup>been</sup> confused with στρατηγίς found in fr. 269. The gloss στρατηγιᾶν seems to be correct, explained with another infinitive and this verb is, otherwise, common in later prose (cf. Dem. 19. 293, Xen. *An.* 7. 133, Plut. *Eun.* 14) meaning "wish to be a general". There is no reason to doubt that Pherecrates may have used it as Rehrenböck p.300 suggests. About the verb formation in -λαω, see on fr. 35.

## ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

For the abbreviations which are not self-explanatory I follow Liddell-Scott *Greek-English Dictionary* rev. by Jones (LSJ); but in some cases I use less drastic abbreviations, e.g. "Aesc." for "A.", "Xen." for "X.", "Theophr." for "Thphr.". For secondary works in connexion with the edition of the fragments, the abbreviations are those found in Kassel-Austin *Poetae Comici Graeci* vol. VII pp. Xff. Berlin/New York 1989). For the periodicals I follow *L'Année Philologique*.

I generally give the Latinized Greek names, but for the titles of the less known plays of comic poets I give the Hellenized transliteration.

The fragments of comic poets other than Menander and the Adespota are cited from K-A by number; fragments not in K-A follow Körte-Thierfelder (K<sup>g</sup>T) for the fragments of Menander, and Kock (K) for the Adespota (Com. Adesp.).

All dates are B.C. unless otherwise stated.

### I. Editions and Commentaries of Ancient Authors and Works.

#### 1. Collections.

Austin *CGFPR*

*Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*, ed. C. Austin, Berlin/New York 1973.

Dem. *Suppl. Com.*:

*Supplementum Comicum Comoediae Graecae*, ed. J. Demiańczuk, Krakau 1912.

Edmonds *FAC*:

*The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, ed. J.M. Edmonds, Leiden 1957-61.

*GrGr*:

*Grammatici Graeci I-IV*, ed. A. Hilgard, A. Lentz, R. Schneider, G. Uhlig, Leipzig 1867-1910.

Gow-Page *Hell. epigr.*:

*The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic epigrams*, ed. A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page Cambridge 1965.

Gow-Page *Garland*:

*The Greek Anthology, The Garland of Philip*, ed. A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, Cambridge 1968.

Jacoby *FrGrH*

*Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. F. Jacoby, Berlin 1923-1930, Leiden 1940-1958.

K-A *PCG*:

*Poetae Comici Graeci*, ed. R. Kassel et C. Austin, Berlin/New York 1983ff.

Kock *CAF*:

*Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, ed. Th. Kock, Leipzig 1880-1888.

Leutsch-Scheidewin *CPG*:

*Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, ed. E.L. Leutsch et F.G. Scheidewin, Göttingen 1839-1851. Supplement Hildesheim 1961.

Lloyd-Jones/Parsons *SH*

*Supplementum Hellenisticum*, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, Berlin/New York 1983.

Page *PMG*:

*Poetae Melici Graeci*, ed. D.L. Page, Oxford 1962.

Meineke *FCG*:

*Fragmenta Comicoorum Graecorum*, ed. A. Meineke, Berlin 1839-57.

- Ed. Min.

Editio Minor Berlin 1847.

Nauck *TGF*<sup>2</sup>:

*Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, A. Nauck, Leipzig 1889<sup>2</sup>

*TrGF*:

*Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. B. Snell, R. Kannicht, St.

Radt. Goettingen 1971ff.

West *IEG*:

*Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, ed. M.L. West,

vol.1 1990<sup>2</sup>, vol.2 1972.

## 2. *Aristophanes*.

a) Complete editions.

Blaydes:

*Aristophanis comoediae*, ed. Fr. H.M. Blaydes, Halis Saxonum

(1880-1893).

Coulon:

*Aristophane*. ed. V. Coulon & transl. H. Van Daele 5 vol. Paris

1923-1930

Rogers:

*The Comedies of Aristophanes*, ed. B.B. Rogers, London 1906-1916.

Sommerstein:

*The Comedies of Aristophanes*, ed. A.H. Sommerstein, Warminster  
1980ff.

Van Leeuwen:

*Aristophanis Vespaee, Ranae, etc.*, ed. J. van Leeuwen, Leiden  
1893-1906.

b) Editions of single plays with commentary.

Dover:

*Aristophanes Clouds*, ed. K.J. Dover, Oxford 1968.

Henderson:

*Aristophanes Lysistrata*, ed. J. Henderson, Oxford 1987.

Holzinger:

*Aristophanes Ploutos*, ed. K. Holzinger, Vienna/Leipzig 1940.

MacDowell:

*Aristophanes Wasps*, ed. D.M. MacDowell, Oxford 1971.

Neil:

*Aristophanes The Knights*, ed. R.A. Neil, Cambridge 1901.

Platnauer:

*Aristophanes Peace*, ed. M. Platnauer, Oxford 1964.

Stanford:

*Aristophanes Frogs*, ed. W.B. Stanford, London 1963<sup>2</sup>.

Starkie:

*Aristophanes Acharnians*, ed. W.J.M. Starkie, London 1909.

Ussher:

*Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae*, ed. R.G. Ussher, Oxford 1973.

Wilamowitz:

*Aristophanes Lysistrate*, ed. U.v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Berlin  
1927.

3. *Other comic poets.*

Bonanno *Cratete comica*

M. G. Bonanno *Studi su Cratete comico* Padua 1972.

Gomme/Sandbach, Men.:

A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach *Menander: A Commentary* Oxford 1973.

Handley, *Dysc.*:

E. W. Handley *The Dyscolos of Menander* London 1965.

Hunter on Eub.:

Eubulus *The Fragments* ed. R. L. Hunter, Cambridge 1983.

Kö-T:

A. Körte *Menandri quae supersunt* vol. 2, add. A. Thierfelder,  
Leipzig 1959<sup>2</sup>.

4. *Other authors.*

Barrett on Hi.:

Euripides *Hippolytus*, ed. W. S. Barrett, Oxford 1964.

Cunningham on Herod.:

Herodas *Mimiambi*, ed. I. C. Cunningham, Oxford 1971.

Dodds on Pl. *Gorg.*:

Plato *Gorgias*, ed. E. R. Dodds, Oxford 1959.

Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.*:

Aeschylus *Agamemnon*, ed. E. Fraenkel, Oxford 1950.

Gow on Theocr.:

A. S. F. Gow *Theocritus* Cambridge 1952<sup>2</sup>.

Gow on Machon:

Machon *The Fragments*, ed. Gow, Cambridge 1965.

Headlam on Herod.:

W. Headlam and A. D. Knox *Herodas* Cambridge 1922.

Lloyd on Hdt. 2:

A. B. Lloyd *Herodotus' Book II* Leiden 1979.

Pearson on Soph. fr.:

A. C. Pearson *The Fragments of Sophocles* Cambridge 1917.

MacDowell on Dem. 21:

Demosthenes *Against Meidias*, ed. D. M. MacDowell, Oxford 1990.

Rhodes on AP:

P. J. Rhodes *A Commentary on the Aristotelian 'Athenaion Politeia'*

Oxford 1981.

Seaford on Eur. *Cycl.*:

Euripides *Cyclops*, ed. R. Seaford, Oxford 1984.

Ussher on *Cycl.*:

Euripides *Cyclops*, ed. R. G. Ussher, Roma 1978.

- on Theophr. *Char.*:

R. G. Ussher *The Characters of Theophrastus*, London 1960.

West on *Theog.*:

Hesiod *Theogony*, ed. M. L. West, Oxford 1965.

West on *Op.*

Hesiod *Works and Days*, ed. M. L. West, Oxford 1978.

Wankel on Dem. 18:

Demosthenes *Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz*, ed. H. Wankel,  
Heidelberg 1976.

#### 4. *Later writers and Lexica.*

Antiatt.:

I. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca I*: Ἀντιαττικιστής Berlin 1814.

Ar. Byz. :

Aristophanis Byzantii *Fragmenta*, ed. W.J. Slater, Berlin/New York  
1986.

Athen. :

Athenaei Naucraticae *Dipnosophistarum libri XV*, ed. G. Kaibel,  
Leipzig 1887-90.

- *Epitome librorum III-XV*, ed. S.P. Peppink, Leiden 1937-9.

Athenaeus *The Deipnosophists*, ed. C.B. Gulick, London/Cambridge  
Mass. 1927-41.

*Et. magn. :*

*Etymologicum magnum*, ed. Th. Gaisford, Oxford 1848.

Eust. *in Il. :*

Eustathii *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem ad fidem exempli Romani  
editi*, ed. M. van der Valk, Leiden 1971-1987.

Eust. *in Od. :*

Eustathii *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam ad fidem exempli Romani  
editi*, Leipzig 1825-1826.

Harp. :

Harpocratonis *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*, ed. G. Dindorf,  
Oxford 1853.

Hesych. :

Hesychii Alexandrini *Lexicon*, ed. K. Latte, vol. I-II (α-ο)  
Copenhagen 1953-1966; ed. M. Schmidt, vol. III-IV (π-ω), Jena  
1861-1862.

Orus:

Kl. Alpers *Das attizistische Lexicon des Oros* Berlin/New York  
1981.

Phot.:

Photii patriarchae *Lexicon*, ed. Chr. Theodoridis, I (α-δ)  
Berlin/New York 1974; ed. R. Porson London 1822.

Poll.:

Pollucis *Onomasticon* ed. E. Bethe, Leipzig 1900-1937.

Proleg. de com.:

W.J.W. Koster *Scholia in Aristophanem* Prolegomena de comoedia, I  
1A Groningen 1975.

Sch. Ar.:

W.J.W. Koster *Scholia in Aristophanem*, Groningen, I-II 2 1969-  
1983, IV (Tzetzae comentarii) 1960-1964.

Sud.:

Suidae *Lexicon* ed. A. Adler Leipzig 1928-1938.

## II. Secondary sources.

### 1. About Pherecrates.

Carrière *Carnaval*:

J.C. Carrière *Le Carnaval et la politique* pp. 268-9 Paris 1979.

Conti Bizzarro 'Ταλαρίσκος' (1987):

F. Conti Bizzarro in U. Criscuolo (ed.) 'Ταλαρίσκος'. *Studia  
Graeca Antonio Garzya discipulis oblata* pp. 26-32 Naples 1987,

- (1986-7):

"Note a Ferecrate" *MCr* 21-2 (1986-7) pp. 85-93.

- (1988-9):

"Note a Ferecrate" *MCr* (1988-9) pp. 259-292.

Kraus *Kl. P.*:

W. Kraus *Der Kleine Pauly* IV (1972), 728f.

Körte *RE* XIX:

A. Körte *RE* XIX (1938) 1985-1991.

Norwood *Gr. Com.*:

G. Norwood *Greek Comedy* pp. 154-165 London 1931.

Schmid *GGrL*:

W. Schmid - O. Stählin *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* I 4  
pp. 99-108 Munich 1946.

Rehrenböck:

G. Rehrenböck *Pherekrates-Studien* diss. Vienna 1985,

- (1987):

"Bemerkungen zum Wortschatz des Pherekrates" *WSt* 100 (1987) pp.  
47-68,

- *Wien Human. Blätter* (1987):

"Das Schlaraffenland im Tartaros" *Wien Human. Blätter* 129 (1987)  
pp. 14-25.

- (1988):

"Pherekrates' Persai, fr. 193K., und die Datierung der  
sophokleischen Elektra" *WSt* 101 (1988) pp. 47-57.

## 2. General literature.

Baldry (1953):

H.C. Baldry "The Idler's Paradise in Attic Comedy" *Gr&R* 22 (1953)  
pp. 49-60.

Bluemner *Tech.*:

H. Bluemner *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste  
bei Griechen und Römern* I Leipzig/Berlin 1912<sup>2</sup>, II-IV Leipzig

1879-1887.

Buck-Petersen *A reverse Index*:

C.D. Buck-W. Petersen *A reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* Chicago 1940.

Burkert *Homo necans*:

W. Burkert *Homo necans* Engl. transl. London/California 1983.

- *Gr. Religion*:

*Greek Religion* Engl. transl. Oxford/Cambridge Mass. 1985.

Carter (1986):

L.B. Carter *The quiet Athenian* Oxford 1986.

Chantraine *Dict. étym.*:

Chantraine *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque* Paris 1968ff. .

Cook *Zeus*:

A.B. Cook *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion* Cambridge 1914-40.

D-S:

C. Daremberg-E. Saglio *Dictionnaire des antiquités Grecques et Romaines* Paris 1873-1919.

Davies *APF*:

J.K. Davies *Athenian Propertied Families* Oxford 1971.

Davies-Kathirithamby *Gr. Insects*:

M. Davies-J. Kathirithamby *Greek Insects* London 1986.

Denniston *GP*:

J.D. Denniston *The Greek Particles* Oxford 1954<sup>2</sup>.

Deubner (1969):

L. Deubner *Attische Feste* Vienna/Darmstad 1969.

Dobree *Adv.*:

P.P. Dobree *Adversaria* ed. J. Scholefield Cambridge 1831-3.

Dohm *Mageiros*:

H. Dohm *Mageiros. Die Rolle des Kochs in der griechisch-römischen Komödie* Munich 1964.

Dover I:

K. Dover *Greek and the Greeks. Collected Papers* vol. I Oxford/New York 1987,

- *GH*:

*Greek Homosexuality* London 1978,

- *Pop. Mor.*:

*Greek Popular Morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle* Oxford 1974.

- *Ar. Com.*:

*Aristophanic Comedy* Berkeley/Los Angeles 1972.

Ehrenberg *The People of Ar.*:

V. Ehrenberg *The People of Aristophanes* London 1974<sup>2</sup>.

Ferguson (1975):

J. Ferguson *Utopias of the Classical World* Ithaca 1975.

Frisk:

H. Frisk *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* Heidelberg 1954-1973.

Geissler (1925):

P. Geissler *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie* Berlin 1925.

Gelzer *Ag.*:

Th. Gelzer *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes. Untersuchungen zur Struktur der attischen alten Komödie* Munich 1960.

Ghiron-Bistagne (1976):

Ghiron-Bistagne *Recherches sur les Acteurs dans la Grèce Ancienne*  
Paris 1976.

Ginouvés *Balaneutiké*:

R. Ginouvés *Balaneutiké. Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque* Paris 1962.

Goodwin:

W. W. Goodwin *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*  
London 1897<sup>2</sup>.

Hauschild *Die Gestalt der Hetäre*:

H. Hauschild *Die Gestalt der Hetäre in der Griechischen Komödie*  
diss. Leipzig 1933.

Henderson *MM*:

J. Henderson *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*  
New York/Oxford 1991<sup>2</sup>.

- (1987):

"Older Women in Attic Old Comedy" *TAPA* 117 (1987) pp. 105-129.

Humbert *Syntaxe Gr.*:

J. Humbert *Syntaxe Grecque* Paris 1982<sup>2</sup>.

*Kl. P.*:

K. Ziegler- W. Sontheimer *Der kleine Pauly* Stuttgart 1964-1975.

K-B:

R. Kühner *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache I*  
Elementar- und Formenlehre, 3. Aufl. von F. Blass, Hannover 1890-  
1892.

K-G:

- II Satzlehre, 3. Aufl. von B. Gerth, Hannover 1898-1904.

Kirchner PA:

J.E. Kirchner *Prosopographica Attica* rev. S. Lauffer Berlin 1966<sup>2</sup>.

Langerbeck (1963):

H. Langerbeck "Die Vorstellung vom Schlaraffenland in der alten attischen Komödie" *ZfVolsk* 59 (1963) p. 192-204.

Lembach (1970):

K. Lembach *Die Pflanzen bei Theokrit* Heidelberg 1970.

LSJ:

Liddell and Scott *A Greek-English Lexicon* revised by H.S. Jones Oxford 1940<sup>3</sup>. Appendix 1961.

Long *Barbarians in Gr. Com.*:

T. Long *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* Carbondale/Edwardsville 1986.

Maas *Kl. Schr.*:

P. Maas *Kleine Schriften* Munich 1973.

Meisterhans *Grammatik*<sup>3</sup>:

K. Meisterhans *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, 3. Aufl. von E. Schwyzer, Berlin 1900.

Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour*:

L.A. Moritz *Grain-Mills and Flour in Classical Antiquity* Oxford 1958.

Müller *Handwerk und Sprache*:

D. Müller *Handwerk und Sprache* Meisenheim am Glan 1974.

Nesselrath *Lukians Parasitendialog*:

H.-G. Nesselrath *Lukians Parasitendialog* Berlin/New York 1985,

- MK:

*Die Attische Mittlere Komödie* Berlin/New York 1990.

Oeri *Der Typ der Komischen Alten:*

H.G. Oeri *Der Typ der komischen Alten in der griechischen Komödie seine Nachwirkungen und seine Herkunft* Basel 1948.

Pape *Wörterbuch Gr. Eigennamen:*

W. Pape *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen*, 3. Aufl. von G.E. Benseler Braunschweig 1884.

Parke (1977):

H.W. Parke *Festivals of the Athenians* London 1977.

Peppler (1910):

C.W. Peppler "The termination -κός, as used by Aristophanes for comic effect" *AJPh* 31 (1910) pp. 428-44,

- (1918):

"Comic terminations in Aristophanes" *AJPh* 39 (1918) pp. 173-183:

[suffix -της, -ίς, -άλια, -τρια. Comparative and superlative.

Varia]

- (1921):

"Comic terminations in Aristophanes" *AJPh* 42 (1921) pp.152-161:

[Suffix -ύλλω, -ύτω, -άτω, -ιάω, -ίζω. Adverbs. Interjections.

Varia. Addenda].

Pickard-Cambridge *DTC:*

A.W. Pickard-Cambridge *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* rev. T.B.L.

Webster Oxford 1962<sup>2</sup>.

- *DFA:*

*The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. by J.Gould and D.M.

Lewis, Oxford 1968. Select addenda 1988 (pp. 359-365).

*RE:*

*Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*

Stuttgart/Munich 1893-1978.

Renehan *St. Gr. Texts*:

Renehan *Studies in Greek Texts* (Hypomn. 43) Göttingen 1976.

Roscher *Lexicon*:

W.H. Roscher *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* Leipzig 1884-1937.

Sifakis *Parabasis*:

G. Sifakis *Parabasis and Animal Choruses* London 1971.

Schwyzer *GrGr*:

E. Schwyzer (-A. Debrunner) *Griechische Grammatik* Munich 1939-1950.

Sparkes-Talcot:

B.A. Sparkes - L. Talcott *Pots and Pans of Classical Athens* Princeton 1951.

Στεφάνης 'Ο Δοῦλος:

I. E. Στεφάνης 'Ο Δοῦλος στις Κωμωδίες τοῦ Ἀριστοφάνη p. 105 ff. Thessaloniki 1980.

Taillardat *Images*:

J. Taillardat *Les Images d'Aristophane* Paris 1965<sup>2</sup>.

Thompson *Birds*:

D.W. Thompson *A Glossary of Greek Birds* London/Oxford 1936<sup>2</sup>,

- *Fishes*

*A Glossary of Greek Fishes* London 1947.

Threatte:

L. Threatte *The grammar of Attic Inscriptions I Phonology* Berlin/New York 1980.

Tichy:

Eva Tichy *Onomatopoetische Verbalbildungen des Griechischen*  
Vienna 1983.

West Gr. *Metre*:

M. L. West *Greek Metre* Oxford 1982.

Whittaker (1935):

M. Whittaker "The Comic Fragments in their Relation to the  
Structure of Old Attic Comedy" *CIQ* 29 (1935) pp. 181-191.

White (1912):

J. W. White *The Verse of Greek Comedy* London 1912.

~ *Sch. on Av.* (1914):

*The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes* Boston/London 1914.

Wilamowitz *Gr. Versk.*:

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff *Griechische Verskunst* Darmstadt  
1958<sup>2</sup>.

Zimmermann *Untersuchungen*:

B. Zimmermann *Untersuchungen zur Form und dramatischen Technik  
der aristophanischen Komödien* Königstein 1984-1987.