

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* lxxvii (1967) 33–40.

the Hephaestia] . . . knew nothing of musical contests'. On this basis, he rejected the contrary evidence of [Xenophon] *Ath. Pol.* iii 4 which specifically mentions the Hephaestia and Promethia in a list of five festivals to which choregoi were allotted.² He suggested that either the author of *Ath. Pol.* was mistaken, or an emendation of the text proposed by Kirchhoff should be accepted; the emendation inserts seven words into the text, and so switches the reference from choregoi to gymnasiarchs.³

This is, however, at least open to question. Granted that the inscription does not refer to choregoi or choruses in the surviving text, neither does it in fact preserve the word *γυμνασίαρχοι*, which has been restored on the basis of the letters *PXOI* and *XOI* in lines 20/1 and 37 respectively. The restoration is convincing, particularly in view of the full evidence for gymnastic contests at the Hephaestia set out by Davies, but it does not in any way exclude the possibility of a reference or references to choregoi which may have existed elsewhere, perhaps in the very fragmentary passage immediately before line 20; this is perhaps the more likely since line 16 preserves *τ]ε̄ς μουικε̄ς*. To turn to the *Ath. Pol.*, it seems to be doing unnecessary violence to the author to suggest that he has made a mistake here. Admittedly, he is not always precise on detail, but his is contemporary evidence, and it is hard to see why he should have selected the five festivals which he refers to from so many which were celebrated in Athens if it were not for the common element which he states they contain—choral events involving choregoi. The suggested emendation, elegant as the hypothetical *homoeoteleuton* is, is an even more drastic solution; the *Ath. Pol.* is a primary source, and the onus of proof rests firmly on those who wish to make a total alteration of meaning by emendation. Until definite evidence emerges to show that there was *not* some form of choral singing at the Hephaestia and Promethia, the text should be left alone, and the evidence accepted at its face value.

In fact, there is circumstantial evidence which suggests strongly that the *Ath. Pol.* is probably right here. The form of cult of Prometheus in Athens was that of a public hero cult, and ritual songs appear to have been an essential part of this type of cult: typical examples out of a large number are the tragic choral songs to Adrastus in Sicyon which Cleisthenes transferred to Melanippus (Hdt. v 67), and Euripides' account of the cult to be established to Hippolytus in Troezen (*Hipp.* 1423–30), where the choral songs are clearly a vital part.⁴ If, then, choral songs had some

part in the cult of Prometheus, the same must be true for that of Hephaestus, since not merely does the *Ath. Pol.* refer to both festivals equally, but, as Davies pointed out, their cults were closely linked in Athens and the celebrations very similar.

Two conclusions follow from the arguments outlined above; the text of *Ath. Pol.* iii 4 should not be emended, and the minimum annual total of 97 liturgies demonstrated by Davies (*op. cit.* 40) must be increased by at least two, one choregos for each festival; there may have been more choregoi than this involved, but it is not possible to be sure in the absence of evidence as to what form the choral events at these two festivals took. The arguments above tend to support the interpretation of *IG* ii² 1138 as referring to choruses (rejected by Davies); that inscription implies a contest, probably on a tribal basis. For the two festivals, a minimum contest entails four choregoi, and a maximum on a tribal basis would be twenty.

JOHN M. MOORE

The Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington, DC

Cimon, Skyros and 'Theseus' Bones'¹

Thucydides reports the capture of Skyros 'next' (*ε̄πειτα*) after that of Eion under the generalship of Cimon, as the first events in his digression (*ε̄κβολή*) on the Pentekontaëtia.² Further details are added by Diodorus (presumably following Ephorus³) and Plutarch.⁴ It is of some importance to try to determine the date of this event, of even greater importance to see it in correct perspective for Cimon's rising star and Themistocles' falling one.

The only specific indication of time we have is Plutarch's reference to an oracle 'given to the Athenians when they made an inquiry after the Persian Wars in the archonship of Phaidon' (i.e., 476/5 B.C.).⁵ This has generally been taken to provide a date for the capture of Skyros, and the transference of the bones of Theseus to Athens, which Plutarch says followed it. But it is worth pointing out again, with Busolt, that Plutarch's words give a 'date' only for the oracle.⁶ Diodorus dates the Skyros campaign (along with Eion before and the Eurymedon victory after) to the archonship of Demotion, 470/69, but his evidence is worth very little on a point of chronology such as this. It is clear that on the only worthwhile

¹ I wish to thank J. D. Smart and W. G. Forrest for their friendly criticisms of an earlier draft of this paper; the aberrations that remain are my own.

² Thuc. i 98.2.

³ Diod. xi 60. 2; cf. P. Oxy. 1610, *frs.* 6–7 (cf. *fr.* 35).

⁴ Plut. *Thes.* 36, *Cim.* 8.

⁵ *Thes.* 36.1.

⁶ *Griech. Gesch.* ii 1 (1897) 105–6 n. 2. Busolt himself suggested that the capture of Skyros may have occurred as late as 474/3 or 473/2 B.C.

² . . . χορηγοῖς διαδικάζαι εἰς Διονύσια καὶ Θαργήλια καὶ Παναθήναια καὶ Προμήθια καὶ Ἡφαίστια ὅσα ἔτη.

³ . . . καὶ Παναθήναια <ὅσα ἔτη καὶ γυμνασιάρχους διαδικάζαι εἰς Παναθήναια> καὶ Προμήθια κτλ.

⁴ v. Eitrem, in *PW* viii 1 126 for lamentations and dances in connection with early stages in the development of the cult of the dead (from which the hero cult developed its form), and Roscher, *Lexikon* i 2.2502 f for further references to hymns to heroes.