

hero,<sup>18</sup> it is altogether fitting that he institute a competition for second-rate athletes. It is also consistent with Jason's character as depicted in drama and epic that he carry out the implementation of his invention through trickery and out of love for his dear friend Peleus, the winner of the first pentathlon.

DONALD F. JACKSON

*The University of Iowa*

<sup>18</sup> Jason's less than heroic nature in his dealings with Medea is well known from the tragedies of Euripides and Seneca. For a good description of Jason in Hellenistic epic see G. Lawall, 'Apollonius' *Argonautica*: Jason as anti-hero', *YCS* xix (1966) 121-69. Interesting from our point of view is Lawall's observation that Apollonius has little use for the specialized skills of the Argonauts and that Jason exploits love (136). He notes also that Lemnos is a place where the resourceful Jason begins to emerge (151) and that it is a mark of Jason's character that he sacrifices heroic values for success.

### Theodoret of Cyrus and the Speakers in Greek Dialogues

The modern convention for printing dialogues includes printing the names of the speakers on the margin at the beginning of their statements. But this practice was virtually unknown in ancient Greek dialogues. Instead, the most common convention for showing the shift from one speaker to another is through punctuation such as the colon, the παραγράφος or a horizontal stroke.<sup>1</sup> Recently, N. G. Wilson has attributed the inclusion of the names of the speakers at the transitional points in Greek dialogues to Theodoret of Cyrus (mid-fifth century CE; composed *Eranistes* in 447) who, in this view, 'deserves the credit for devising a literary convention that is now regarded as essential'.<sup>2</sup> This appraisal has since found a receptive audience. G. H. Ettiinger, the editor of the critical edition of Theodoret's *Eranistes* (Oxford 1975), cites Wilson's article and concurs (p. 5, n. 3): 'Thus he [Theodoret] gives a new direction to an ancient literary form.' In the prologue (29) to the *Eranistes*, Theodoret explained his mode of presentation:

I will not include the names of those who pose questions and those who answer in the body of the text (οὐ τῷ σώματι τοῦ λόγου συντάξω), as the wise among the Greeks did, but I will write them on the margin beside the starting-points of the sections (ἀλλ' ἐξωθεν παραγράψω ταῖς τῶν στίχων ἀρχαῖς). For while they [the Greeks] offered their works to people who were thoroughly educated, and to whom literature was life, I wish the reading and the discovery of benefit to be an easy task even for the illiterate. This will be possible, if the names of the characters engaged in the discussion appear outside by the margin (ἐκ τῶν παραγεγραμμένων ἐξωθεν).

<sup>1</sup> J. Andrieu, *Le dialogue antique. Structure et présentation* (Paris 1954) 214-15, 263-66.

<sup>2</sup> 'Indications of speakers in Greek dialogue texts', *CQ* xx (1970) 305.

According to our author, this departure from the convention of οἱ πάλαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων σοφοί was made in the interest of popularisation—in order to make the catechetical dialogue more accessible to readers who were less well-educated than the ideal readers of Platonic dialogues in antiquity.

While Theodoret's statement may well be the first literary attestation of what is now common practice, it does not support the view that Theodoret had done something radically different from the practice of his contemporaries by his inclusion of the names of the speakers. To be sure, Theodoret himself was making a contrast between the mode of presentation in his *Eranistes* and that used by the 'ancient Greeks' who wrote dialogues. Yet, in making this claim, Theodoret was not so much referring to his writing out the names of the interlocutors per se as to his practice of writing the names of the speakers—probably in full when they first made their appearance and in a truncated form thereafter—in the margins, outside the main body of the text. In fact he said as much by his repeated use of forms of παραγράφω with ἐξωθεν. Names placed τῷ σώματι τοῦ λόγου were juxtaposed with those put ἐξωθεν ταῖς τῶν στίχων ἀρχαῖς. In the context of this contrast (ἀλλά), the σώμα τοῦ λόγου referred to is less likely to mean 'the spoken words' (Wilson 305) as the main body of the written text on the page even though Wilson's interpretation is not without merit. Clarity was to be achieved by this distinctive placement of the names rather than by their mere inclusion.

In fact, Theodoret was not the first person to have included the names of speakers. The 'innovator' was probably a humble stenographer a few centuries back whose name will, in all likelihood, be forever lost to history. The Toura papyrus found near Cairo is significant in this regard. It contains the only MS of a text which is named in the colophon as Ὠριγένους διάλεκτος πρὸς Ἡρακλεῖδην καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπους (dated to c. 300 CE) which purports to be a stenographic transcription of events which transpired in a church in Bostra in the middle of the third century CE.<sup>3</sup> In the first section of this composite document, Origen, the famous Christian teacher from Alexandria, held a discussion with the bishop Heracleides in a way reminiscent of literary and philosophical dialogues. When it becomes necessary to mark off a transition from one speaker to another in their exchange of words, we find that the colon, commonly followed by a blank space, is often used together with a παραγράφος on the left-hand margin. This is highly conventional, and no surprise. What is surprising is the fact that these signs, almost always considered sufficient markers of transitions in themselves, are employed in conjunction with explicit statements of who the next

<sup>3</sup> J. Scherer ed., *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide et les évêques ses collègues sur le père, le fils, et l'âme* (Cairo 1949). On the use of the plural of διάλεκτος, see Scherer, ed., *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide* (Sources chrétiennes lxxvii, Paris 1960) 5, n. 3. It is useful to keep in mind the fact that Origen held a good number of such 'discussions' with many important personages and that these were gathered together into a collection of dialogues in Palestinian Caesarea.

speaker is, e.g. ὠριγενησεῖπεν (Origen said) or ἠρακλειδησεῖπεν (Heracleides said).<sup>4</sup> The only difference between this and the practice which Theodoret seems to be describing in his prologue is that the indications of the names of the speakers are embedded in the body of the text in the former, while they are written on one side or on a margin in the latter. Since the Toura papyrus is not the autograph copy, we cannot know for certain when each of the two ways of identifying speakers (punctuation and name) was introduced into the text. It is quite possible that the 'duplication' occurred early on, when the σημεῖα or short-hand notes taken down during the actual events were transcribed into legible long-hand by a copyist.

This use of the names of the speakers in dialogues might even have been quite common in third-century Christian circles. The earliest surviving MSS of the anonymous *de recta in Deum fide* (attributed to Adimantius; third century CE) include the names of the participants in abbreviation, e.g., ΜΕΓ for Μεγέθιος and ΕΥΤΡ for Εὐτρόπιος. Admittedly these may be later scribal additions, but in addition to the anchor-point of Rufinus of Aquileia's Latin translation, the extant manuscripts of which shared very similar abbreviations of the interlocutors, the variations and errors in the transcriptions of the names in some of the Greek MSS compelled their editor to posit: 'In der alten Hs., aus welcher alle unsere Hss. stammen, waren die Namen der Mitredner nur mit den ersten Buchstaben angedeutet.'<sup>5</sup> With a total of seven protagonists in the dialogue, and with little internal indication of who the speaker is, the use of an 'artless' technique to keep the identity of the speaker clear probably suggested itself.

Thus even if we should be tempted to credit Theodoret with contributing something new to the literary form of the dialogue, it will not be for introducing the practice of naming the new speakers at every turn, but only for putting those names outside the body of the main text, most likely on the left-hand side, where they become much more noticeable. In this particular respect,

<sup>4</sup> See Scherer ed., *Entretien* (1949) 82 and especially plate 1.

<sup>5</sup> W. H. Van de Sande Bakhuyzen ed., *Der Dialog des Adamantius ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ* GCS iv (Leipzig 1901) xviii. See also C. P. Hammond, 'A product of a fifth-century scriptorium preserving conventions used by Rufinus of Aquileia. Part I: Rufinus and western monastic libraries and scriptoria', first of a series of three articles, in *JTS* n.s. xxix (1978) 366-91. This evidence, however, is not at all certain, as the acute anonymous reader of this note points out, because of some amount of confusion in the manuscript tradition itself about the attribution of names. Yet the types of deviations which resulted suggest that some might have come from conflicting interpretations of the sharply-abbreviated indications of speakers contained in the earliest MSS, see Van de Sande Bakhuyzen, xvi-xviii, n.4. In addition, the *de autexusio* of Methodius of Olympus is another (late) third-century dialogue in which the three protagonists, an orthodox Christian = ΟΡΘΟ(ΔΟΞΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ), a Valentinian Christian = ΟΥΑΛ(ΕΝΤΙΝΙΑΝΟΣ) and his companion = ΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ, were named in abbreviation probably from early on in the tradition; see Greek text in G. N. Bonwetsch, ed., GCS xxvii (Leipzig 1917); the F MS (Cod. Laurent. Plut. IX, 23, 10th century) consistently has ΟΡΘ for ΟΡΘΟΔ.

even though Theodoret himself cannot properly be called the Father of the modern dialogue form, his *Eranistes* bear witness to a significant shift in emphasis of the genre as a whole in the post-classical period.

In late Antiquity, the dialogue form was seen as a suitable vehicle for carrying out the wars of sectarian rivalry among Christians and was put to use in apologetic and polemical efforts as well as in prophylactic and catechetical exercises—sometimes if only to breathe some life into tiresome, pedantic patristic florilegia of proof-texts. According to Hirzel, 'Der dialogische Form, die, bei ihrem ersten Hervortreten in der Geschichte, der Kritik der Meinungen und der Befreiung des Geistes gedient hatte, war in den Katechismen das Gefäß des rohesten Dogmatismus geworden. Daher besiegelt die Katechismenliteratur das Ende des antiken Dialog.'<sup>6</sup> If one's goal in composing a dialogue was to inculcate the correct dogma in one's readers (and to offer them memorable weapons with which to refute opposing positions), to allow them to take up the views and arguments of the wrong side by mistake, however understandable, would be much more serious a matter than simply creating a 'muddle' at a public reading or at an intimate symposium.

RICHARD LIM

Princeton University

<sup>6</sup> R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch* (Leipzig 1895) ii 265.

### The introduction of athletic nudity: Thucydides, Plato, and the vases\*

A swell of recent books on Greek athletics has resurrected, often no higher than a footnote, an old question: when did Greek athletes begin to exercise nude? Bronze Age archaeology and the Homeric poems make it fairly certain that athletic nudity was not practiced before the late eighth century.<sup>1</sup>

\* I am indebted to a number of persons and institutions for their generous help in the preparation of this article. Over the course of many months the ideas presented here were read, discussed, and improved by my colleagues in the Cannon classical seminar, Lee Sherry, David Sider, and Alexander Tulan. Early drafts were read and improved by Jocelyn Penny Small and Alan Shapiro, and the final version benefited from the comments of James Russell and of *JHS*'s referees and editor. I also wish to thank New York University's Institute of Fine Arts for the use of its efficient library, as well as the librarians of Columbia University's Avery Library. My greatest debt is owed to Larissa Bonfante for, among other things, bringing the topic to my attention, encouraging me to pursue it, and providing me with most of the scholarly references.

<sup>1</sup> Minoan art regularly shows athletes wearing loincloths; see the boxers and wrestlers on the rhyton from Hagia Triada, S. Marinatos, M. Hirmer, *Crete and Mycenae* (New York 1960) pls 106-7; the boxers of Thera, S. Marinatos, *Die Ausgrabungen auf Thera und ihre Probleme* (Vienna 1973) pl. 3; D. Levi, 'Le cretule di Hagia Triada e di Zakrò', *AsAtene* vii-ix (1925-6) 156. In Homer heroes don loincloths for athletic contests; see *Il.* xxxiii 710, 683-5, *Od.* xviii 66-69, 74ff. with D. H. *Ant. Rom.* vii 72.3-4, and L. Bonfante, 'Nudity as a costume in classical art', *AJA* xciii (1989) 543-70, esp. 547-48.