pot would have comprised the painting as well as the shaping.[9] If so, where painting is expressly distinguished from 'making', 'making' cannot mean shaping and must refer to ownership.

Some students, not altogether happy about the equation of 'maker' and shaper, concede that the shaping of the pots may often have been done by the owner. Whether or not this would have been practicable in a busy workshop with all the interruptions of prospective customers, it hardly affects the lexical meaning of ἐποίησεν in instances where painting and 'making' were distinct. In small workshops, where the owner worked with little or no assistance and did the shaping and painting himself, no distinction was needed between ownership and manual work, and the use of ἔγραψεν rather than ἐποίησεν in some early signatures may only indicate that painting was more highly regarded than shaping; but from about 570 at the latest, when (with the François vase) double signatures first appear,[10] larger workshops evidently existed and so the use of ἐποίησεν must have become restricted primarily to the sense of ownership.

R. M. COOK
Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge

[9] On this I am obliged for advice to Dr J. Chadwick.
[10] *ABV* 77.

'Planets' in Simplicius *De caelo* 471.1 ff.

In four of the last five numbers of the *JHS*, Doctors D. R. Dicks[1] and D. O'Brien[2] have disputed about Simplicius *De caelo* 471.1 ff. (DK 12A19), which runs (in part, 471.2–6): καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ [i.e. ἐκ τῶν περὶ ἀστρολογίαν] περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν πλανωμένων καὶ περὶ μεγεθῶν καὶ ἀποστημάτων ἀποδέδεικται Ἀναξιμάνδρου πρώτου τὸν περὶ μεγεθῶν καὶ ἀποστημάτων λόγον εὑρηκότος, ὡς Εὔδημος ἱστορεῖ τὴν τῆς θέσεως τάξιν εἰς τοὺς Πυθαγορείους πρώτους ἀναφέρων. In his *History of Greek philosophy* (i 93), Professor Guthrie translates the latter part of this as follows: '(. . . speaking of the planets) "Anaximander was the first to discuss their sizes and distances, according to Eudemus, who attributes the first determination of their order to the Pythagoreans."' Guthrie, Dicks and O'Brien all agree that πλανωμένων is accurately translated as 'planets'; they also evidently agree that Anaximander would not have distinguished the planets from the fixed stars, at least in this matter;[3] and consequently Guthrie (*op. cit.* i 95) finds Simplicius' statement about Anaximander 'confusing'; Dicks finds it

I must thank Professor F. H. Sandbach for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this note.
[1] *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 30 and lxxxix (1969) 120.
[2] *JHS* lxxxviii (1968) 120 n. 44 and xc (1970) 198.
[3] So, explicitly, Guthrie *op. cit.* i 94–5 and Dicks in *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 30.

'nonsensical';[4] and O'Brien speaks of Simplicius' 'rather ragged context', and supposes that Eudemus was actually speaking, not of planets, but of sun, moon and stars,[5] i.e. that Simplicius has quite misrepresented his source.

All three scholars evidently assume that by πλανωμένων Simplicius means the five bodies which we agree with the Greeks in calling 'planets', i.e. Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn; and of course the word can mean this.[6] But in many places οἱ πλάνητες, οἱ πλανώμενοι ἀστέρες and similar phrases denote *all* the heavenly bodies that change their positions relative to the fixed stars, i.e. the five bodies just mentioned *plus the sun and moon*. Thus when Aristotle says (*Cael.* 292b31–3a2), contrasting the fixed stars with the other heavenly bodies: ἡ μὲν γὰρ πρώτη [*sc.* φορὰ] μία οὖσα πολλὰ κινεῖ τῶν σωμάτων τῶν θείων, αἱ δὲ πολλαὶ οὖσαι ἓν μόνον ἑκάστη· τῶν γὰρ πλανωμένων ἐν ὁτιοῦν πλείους φέρεται φοράς, he is clearly including *all* the heavenly bodies except the fixed stars among τῶν πλανωμένων; and other authors, who speak of 'seven planets',[7] are similarly counting the sun and moon among the planets, as well as the five listed above.

Simplicius *De caelo* 454.15–18 refers to both meanings of πλάνης (he seems, I would suggest, to regard the wider meaning as the primary one): ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ τοὺς δὲ πλάνητας μὴ στίλβειν [Aristotle *Cael.* 290a19f] καίτοι τοῦ ἡλίου ἑνὸς ὄντος τῶν πλανήτων καὶ στίλβοντος, ἢ τοὺς ἄλλους παρὰ τὸν ἥλιόν φησιν ἢ πλάνητας ἰδίως λέγοι ἂν τοὺς πέντε τοὺς παρὰ τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην. At 280.28–31 he envisages only the wider meaning, saying that one meaning of οὐρανός is τὸ πλανώμενον . . . ἐν ᾧ σελήνη καὶ ἥλιος καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἄστρα τὰ πλανᾶσθαι λεγόμενα. At 471.2–6, too, he is using πλανωμένων in this wider sense, as is surely clear from the words that follow my original quotation (471.6–10): τὰ δὲ μεγέθη καὶ τὰ ἀποστήματα ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης μέχρι νῦν ἔγνωσται ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκλείψεων τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῆς καταλήψεως λαβόντα, καὶ εἰκὸς ἦν ταῦτα καὶ τὸν Ἀναξίμανδρον εὑρηκέναι, καὶ Ἑρμοῦ δὲ καὶ Ἀφροδίτης ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς τούτους μεταπαραβολῆς, ὥνπερ τὰ μεγέθη καὶ τὰ ἀποστήματα ὑπὸ τῶν μετὰ Ἀριστοτέλην πλέον ἠκριβώθη: sun and moon, like Mercury and Venus, are clearly included among τὰ πλανώμενα.[8]

[4] *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 30.
[5] *JHS* lxxxviii (1968) 120 n. 44.
[6] *cf.*, for example, Aristotle *Metaph.* 1073b17–23 (ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης contrasted with τῶν πλανωμένων ἄστρων), and passages that refer to 'the five planets' (e.g. Geminus p. 10.3–4 Manitius; Cleomedes p. 182.1–2 Ziegler; Aëtius ii 7.7 [DK 44A16]).
[7] See, e.g., von Arnim *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* ii p. 168.32–3 (from Stobaeus *Eclogae* i p. 184.8 ff. Wachsmuth); Cleomedes p. 30.17–18 Ziegler; Aëtius ii 32.2 (DK 41.9).
[8] Aristotle *Cael.* 291a29–b10, on which Simplicius is commenting, is clearly referring to *all* the heavenly bodies, i.e. including sun and moon.

Thus all that Simplicius is saying, on Eudemus' authority, is that Anaximander 'was the first to discuss'[9] the sizes and distances of 'planets',[10] using the latter term to include sun and moon; and this agrees with what the doxographers tell us: Anaximander had views about the distances of sun and moon, and the size of the sun.[11] A sceptic, like Dicks, may question this whole tradition;[12] but it should not be claimed that what Simplicius says of Anaximander and πλανώμενα in 471.2–6 is inconsistent with our other authorities.[13]

J. J. HALL

University Library, Cambridge

[9] Guthrie's translation of λόγον εὐρηκότος, cf. supra.

[10] Nothing in Simplicius suggests that Anaximander discussed *all* the planets.

[11] References given by O'Brien, *JHS* lxxxviii (1968) 120 n. 44. (Simplicius in 471.6–10 seems to regard an estimate of the sun's and moon's sizes and distances as Anaximander's particular contribution, though this is the less valuable as being coupled with his implausible inference about Anaximander making calculations from eclipses.)

[12] *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 36.

[13] Simplicius' words do involve a separate difficulty, viz. that any theory of the heavenly bodies' distances implies an opinion about their order, θέσις: how, then, can Eudemus have referred τὴν τῆς θέσεως τάξιν to the Pythagoreans, not to Anaximander? But this is not inexplicable: for example, Eudemus may have meant that the Pythagoreans worked out the order of the planets which he regarded as correct. (So Zeller *Philosophie der Griechen* i[6] 301 n.) Alternatively, Anaximander may have referred to this point only by implication or in passing, leaving the Pythagoreans as the first to speak of it explicitly and in detail.

Herodas ii 12 ff. (Headlam)

Ἀριστοφῶν δὲ κῆτὶ νῦν ἄγχει:
κεἰ μή ἐστ᾽ ἀληθέα ταῦτα, τοῦ ἡλίου δύντος,
ἴδεσ]θ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ὤ[μ]ων, ἄνδρες, ἥν ἔχει χλαῖναν.

Headlam wrote: 'ἔτι ἄγχει in conjunction with l.18 n. suggests amatory capabilities[1] . . . [Battaros'] powers of "wrestling" being compared with Mennes' old victories at boxing. Either this or Blass' supposition that he is a street rowdy will suit τοῦ ἡλίου δύντος: the former hypothesis suits better the character of Battaros . . .' I have no doubt that the word ἄγχει, like the πύξ which it matches in l. 11,[2] is a double-meaning one, and contains the sense: ἔτι οἷός τε ἐστὶ γυναικὶ συγγίγνεσθαι. That, as a

[1] cf. Trypanis, *JHS* lxxvii (1954) 204.

[2] cf. Van Leeuwen on Ar. *Ec.* 964, and for Love as a boxer, Anacr. *fr.* 62; Soph. *Tr.* 442.

buffoon's method of raising a laugh, the punning use of ἄγχω and a congener in their agonistic and erotic senses would not be alien to the proceedings of even a real court, let alone the fictional court of a literary genre having affinities with Old Comedy, is shown by Dem. liv 20 (*Contra. Con.* 1263.5), where it is assumed that defendants on a charge of assault will try τὸ πρᾶγμα . . εἰς γέλωτα καὶ σκώμματ᾽ ἐμβαλεῖν (liv 13 = 1261.13). The form this attempt τὴν σπουδὴν διαφθείρειν τῶν ἐναντίων γέλωτι[3] is to take is: ἰθύφαλλοι τινές ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς συνειλεγμένοι καὶ ἐρῶντες οὓς ἂν ἡμῖν δόξῃ παίομεν καὶ ἄγχομεν (liv 20 = 1263.5). Demosthenes' anticipation of the thing suggests that it may have been a stock piece of ribaldry, and a consideration of it would have strengthened Headlam's obvious inclination to prefer an erotic interpretation of ἄγχει. In ἐπ᾽ ὤμων Headlam had a reading that gave internal consistency in the line; the association of χλαῖνα and ἐπ᾽ ὤμων with ἔχει is obvious and natural (see LSJ s.v. A.II.3); and that it has a sense which coheres with the previous line I hope to show.

Palaeographically, it seems to present the difficulty that the lacuna, amounting to about 1½ cm, between ε and — ων, is being filled by only 3 letters. But spacing in this papyrus is erratic, as is the size of letters. There is sometimes spacing that corresponds to pauses (as at i 15 between ὅσον and τὸ γάρ, and at i 4 following ἰδοῦ, in each case amounting to $\frac{2}{10}$ of a cm); but no such space corresponds to the pause between ὤμων and ἄνδρες in ii 14. And there is spacing even between letters of a word (as between ο and νκ in i 39, and between the ρ and ι of τριῶν in ii 22; in each case $\frac{2}{10}$ cm). In στεγνῶς of i 15, the ω and the space on either side of it together extend $\frac{6}{10}$ cm; the μ of Μέννην in i 10, $\frac{4}{10}$ cm, the μ of σύμποδ᾽ in iii 96, over $\frac{6}{10}$ cm. The π of προστάτη of i 15 is $\frac{4}{10}$ cm in extent, that of ποίον of i 28 as much as $\frac{6}{10}$. Thus — πωμ — as a supplement *could* well amount to the full extent of the lacuna. In view of this, and of the considerations already referred to in its favour, I believe Headlam's reading the best I have seen.

Groeneboom[4] and Puccioni[5] follow the supposition of Blass: Aristophon is a brigand who snatches cloaks; and his prowess at wrestling is to be judged by seeing the χλαῖνα he wears. This does not seem very plausible: how were the dicasts to judge from seeing the χλαῖνα Aristophon was wearing that it was acquired

[3] Arist., *Rh.* iii 1419 b, where the device is attributed to Gorgias.

[4] Groningen, 1922: 'Vous restez sceptiques à l'égard du mérite de mon noble patron . . . ? Aussi je vous en donnerai une preuve éclatante: le manteau qu'il porte, Messieurs, il l'a volé après le coucher du soleil.'

[5] Florence, 1950: ' "se voi non credete che io dico la verità, fate uscire Aristofonte dopo il tramonto vestito di quel mantello che ha indosso, e vi accorgerete da che razza di patrono sono difeso io": cioè Aristofonte è un brigante pieno di forza che agisce nell' oscurità della notte assaltando i viandanti.'