

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 εύρηκότος*, 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 *τήν 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* i⁶ 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 κῆτι νῦν ἄγχει:
κεῖ μὴ ἔστ' ἀληθέα ταῦτα, τοῦ ἡλλίου δύντος,
ἴδεσθ' ἐπ' ὤ[μ]ων, ἄνδρες, ἣν ἔχει χλαῖναν.

Headlam wrote: 'ἔτι ἄγχει in conjunction with l. 18 n. suggests amatory capabilities[?] . . . [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 ἡλλίου 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 οἶός 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 σπουδῆν διαφθεῖρειν τῶν ἐναντίων γέλωτι³ is to take is: *ἰθύφαλλοι τινές ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς συνειλεγμένοι καὶ ἐρῶντες οὐδ' ἂν ἡμῖν δόξη 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 *ῶσον* 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 *υκ* 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 *πόλου* 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.

Groeneboom⁴ and Puccioni⁵ 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 accorgete da che razza di patrono sono difeso io”: cioè Aristofonte e un brigante pieno di forza che agisce nell' oscurità della notte assaltando i viandanti.'

by robbery with violence? The logical link does not seem very obvious. The reading and interpretation of Crusius-Herzog appear to involve an even greater logical leap.

That Headlam, although sensing the meaning of ἄρχει, did not take account of it in his translation may have been due to that innocence referred to by Housman⁶ (an innocence that affected Van Leeuwen with regard to what Mime vi is about),⁷ which made him fail to draw what I believe is the right conclusion, namely that we have here, in keeping with the sly, ironical language of the leering pander,⁸ a reference to the *figura venevea* mentioned so often in Old Comedy (Ar. *Pax* 889 f., *Av.* 1254, *Lys.* 299, 799, *Ec.* 265; Eupolis *fr.* 47K, 50K) and illustrated on vases.⁹ τοῦ ἡλόου δόντος, then, is used *amatorie*, like εἰς ἐσπέραν Ar. *Pax.* 966, *Ec.* 1047. As to χλαῖνα, we read in Nonius 304 a: *paenulam abusive (ad) omne quicquid tegit nobilissimi veteres transtulerunt.* Aristotle (*Rh.* iii 1412 a 6) says: ἔστι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀστεῖα τὰ πλεῖστα διὰ μεταφορᾶς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ προεξαπατᾶν, and (*ib.* 1405 b; cf. 1412 a 5): *μεταφοραὶ ἀνίπτονται.* I believe the answer to the enigma posed by χλαῖνα is *γυναικῶς τὰ σκέλη.*

The frequency in Greek and Latin of metaphors from the domain of clothing is partially shown by the examples given by Headlam in his note on line 15 of our poem. The metaphors there cited (apart, perhaps, from that of Ehippus), are of an elevated kind (to which might be added: Soph. *Ant.* 705; Ar. *Ec.* 288; Plut. *Per.* 4; Fronto *Aur.* 2 p. 62, 144 N).¹⁰ Humorous applications of the metaphor are, as one might expect, numerous; Ar. *Ach.* 1135, *Eq.* 757, *Vesp.* 1195, *Pax* 686, 1122, 1286, *Ec.* 1057, *Plut.* 589, 764 ff., with Van Leeuwen's notes; Eubulus *fr.* 35K; the citation from Stesichorus in Arist. *Rh.* iii 1412a6 about the man whose feet were *shod* in chilblains; Cratinus *fr.* 69K; Herodas v 61 f; Plaut. *Asin.* 696 *circumda torquem brachiiis*, *ib.* 277 *omnem in tergo thesaurum gerit* (of weals), *Most.* 894 *culcitella* (sens. obsc.), *ib.* 991, *Men.* 255 *aestive viaticatus* 'lightly clad' with regard to money, *Capt.* 187, *Stich.* 639; Ter. *Eun.* 236 *pannis annisque obsitus*; Petron. *Cena* 38.15 *apri gausapati*; Alciph. iii 42.5 *τοῖς γυμνοῖς σισύρα καὶ ἐφροστρίξ ἢ φλόξ.* The conceit in Philostratus *Ep.* 54 (cf. *Ep.* 20) is a sort of converse form of the metaphor I have here suggested for Herodas. It has been pointed out to me by Professor Sandbach that χλαῖνα, being a long rectangular piece of cloth, when worn with the two ends down the back may present a very suggestive likeness to the *figura* here proposed.

It may be asked whether ἄρχω (which means to throttle an opponent in the arena as a means of disabling him, not 'hug' as it is rendered by Headlam at i 18) is an appropriate word for the *figura* in question.

⁶ CR xxxvi (1922) 110, with a witty and convincing interpretation of lines 65–71.

⁷ See Gerhard, PW s.v. 'Herondas', p. 1092.

⁸ cf. line 44, and Housman, *loc. cit.*

⁹ Vorberg, *Ars Erotica Veterum*, 29, 35, 51.

¹⁰ cf. Homer *Il.* iii 57.

The answer to this, I believe, is that, in Greek, metaphors from wrestling, boxing and the pancratium were used of such a variety of personal encounters, physical, moral and intellectual, that their literal meaning cannot be pressed in particular cases. The same *figura* elsewhere (Ar. *Lys.* 799) is associated with the word λακτιζω, another metaphor from the pancratium, and meaning 'hamming', or 'the outside click' (E. N. Gardiner, *JHS* xxv [1905] 24), and so no more to be taken literally with this *figura* than ἄρχω. The word ἄρχω belongs to a large number of drastic expressions that were used as erotic metaphors, such as ἐπείδω, θλάω (Herodas ii 83), κόλασμα (Alciph. iv 2. 6–7), κολάζω (Hesych.), ἐνεργέω (used, like ἄρχω itself, of both men and women; Alciph. iii 19.9 and iv 14.4), παίω, κρούω, σποδέω (Ar. *Ec.* 111 ff.), ὀρύττω (Ar. *Pax.* 899, *Av.* 442, with Van Leeuwen's notes; another metaphor from the pancratium, and, again, perhaps of dual applicability, although the reference at *Pax* 899 is obscure). Comparable drastic expressions were used in comedy of eating and drinking, and cannot be taken any more literally than in their erotic significance (cf. Ar. *Pax.* 31, Photius s.v. ἐπείδω, and the use of such names as Artopyctes, Oenopnictes, etc., of parasites in Alciphron).

Gerhard in PW s.v. 'Herondas', p. 1098, and Nairn in his edition of the Mimes (p. xxvii f.), give many correspondences between Herodas and Attic Comedy — Old, Middle and New. Consider, further, Van Leeuwen on Ar. *Ec.* 1056, *Plut.* 276; and the way in which, in the Mime we are dealing with, as in Ar. *Ec.* 215 ff., a set speech, couched in formal language, is interspersed with ribaldries. The pander's 'claim' (75 ff.) that his villainy is a family inheritance is also very much in the manner of comedy (cf. Ar. *Eq.* 185, 337; Plaut. *Pers.* 53 ff., *Mil.* 372 ff.). So, too, if my interpretation of the above lines of Herodas is right, we have, in the spirit of comedy, a paratragic counter-part of metaphors such as that at Aesch. *Supp.* 463.

J. F. KILLEEN

University College, Cambridge

[Xenophon] Ath. Pol. iii 4 and the question of choruses at the Hephaestia and Promethia

In a recent article,¹ J. K. Davies suggested that there were no choral events at the festivals of the Hephaestia and Promethia. He rested his case on the fact that 'the basic document concerning the festival [*sc.* the Hephaestia], IG i² 84 of 421/0 refers (probably) to gymnasiarchs (lines 20–21) and nowhere to choregoi or choruses', and he went on to say that 'the general hortological tradition [*sc.* about

I am very grateful to Mrs Theodora Hadzisteliou Price for discussing this note with me and supplying many of the references on hero cult, and to the editorial committee for comments on an early draft.

¹ 'Demosthenes on Liturgies: a note' *JHS* lxxxvii (1967) 33–40.