

of others to emend the line seems to have stemmed from the presupposition that one who is snatched up by Zeus for divine service would react negatively. But remember that, in Erotium's mind, the gnat was the eagle of Zeus come to effect her apotheosis. Such ironic naiveté is entirely consistent with the more than one hundred Lucillian epigrams in *Anth. Pal.* 11.

The idea of godly service implied in this use of *διδόναι* suggests a similar construction worth consideration, and that is the use of *διδόναι* with a reflexive or equivalent to designate surrender or self-sacrifice.¹² Several examples occur in Euripides with such equivalent reflexives as *σῶμα* or *τάρμά*, the indirect objects in every case being divinities.¹³ In the epigram before us, the interrogative *τί* functions in place of the reflexive. "What am I to give up to you (since in fact I am so very small that there is no 'self' to surrender)?"

12. For the reflexive construction see particularly LSJ, *s.v.*, II. 4 ("give oneself up") and Arndt-Gingrich, *s.v.*, 6 ("self-sacrifice"). Very similar is LSJ, *s.v.*, II. 1, without a reflexive, "hand over" or "deliver up" someone.

This interpretation is indeed an outrageous hyperbole, but scarcely more outrageous than the couplet following it (11. 89), which describes a man so short that the ground was "up." In such a rendering, moreover, one may read either a note of frustration, because she feels inadequate in the face of such an opportunity, or perhaps an incredulous plea that Zeus would surely do better to seek another, larger person. The virtue of this interpretation is that the "point" of Erotium's exclamation turns on the "point" of the parody, her unbelievably diminutive physique.

Both of these interpretations seem plausible and would at least justify retaining in a critical edition the text as given by P and Pl.

BURTON J. ROZEMA

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

13. *IA* 1555: *σῶμα . . . θῆσαι δίδωμι*; *Ion* 1285: *τὸ σῶμα τῷ θεῷ δίδωμι ἔχειν*; and *IT* 714–15: *ὦ [sc. Apollo] ἐγὼ δούς τάρμά . . .*

A NOTE ON DURIS IN ATHENS

Inscriptional studies have revealed a close association between the Antigonids and Samos in the period following the islanders' return from exile in 321.¹ Aside from several decrees honoring agents of Antigonos and Demetrius, the Samians instituted a festival to the kings and named one of their tribes Demetrias; literary evidence confirms Samian representation on the Antigonid military staff.²

Such revelations are useful in determining facts about the tyrant and historian, Duris of Samos. While his activities continue to baffle scholars, the Samian–Antigonid liaison helps clarify at least one aspect of his life.

Athenaeus reports both Duris and his brother Lynceus, the comic poet, had studied under Theophrastus in Athens.³ The circumstances under which they came and the date of their arrival have remained obscure. Demetrius did not "free" Athens until 307, and Duris and Lynceus, sons of an Antigonid-supported tyrant,⁴ would not likely have been welcomed by Cassander's government before that year.⁵ Moreover, the Athenians had a recent history of unfriendly relations with Samos. They had held the island as a cleruchy since 366/65 and relinquished it grudgingly⁶ when Perdiccas enforced Alexander's original decree to restore all exiles to their homes.

1. C. Habicht, "Samische Volksbeschlüsse der hellenistischen Zeit," *Ath. Mitt.*, LXXII (1957), 154–209; and M. Schede, "Aus dem Heraion von Samos," *Ath. Mitt.*, XLIV (1919), 4–20. Cf. J. Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos* (London, 1966), pp. 135–36.

2. Themison of Samos: Diod. 19. 62. 7, 20. 50. 4.

3. *Ath.* 4. 128A, 8. 337D (*FGH* 76 T 1–2); *Suda*, *s.v.* "Lynceus."

4. For Duris' father Kaios, son of Duris, see especially J. Barron, "The Tyranny of Duris of Samos," *CR*, N.S. XII (1962), 189–92.

5. Reflected, perhaps, in Duris' uncomplimentary description of Cassander's governor, Demetrius of Phalerum (*Ath.* 12. 542B–E: *FGH* 76 F 10).

6. Diod. 18. 8. 7; Habicht (n. 1), pp. 156–64 (No. 1).

Polyperchon's attempt to return it in 319, though ineffectual, undoubtedly produced further tensions. The Athenians may even have attacked Samos in the years just before 307.⁷ All of which serves to dispel any thoughts that the brothers might have found security in the liberal atmosphere of the Lyceum prior to Demetrius' victory.

While Duris is silent, corroborating testimony from Lynceus demonstrates beyond doubt his presence in Athens only after 307. He mentions attending Antigonos' banquet to celebrate the festival of Aphrodite and the dinner which Lamia, the mistress of Demetrius, had given for the king⁸—reaffirming Samian–Antigonid propinquity. There can be little question, then, that Demetrius cleared the way for both Duris and Lynceus to come to Athens for their studies.

The *exact* year of Duris' arrival is, of course, still vague. Theophrastus' brief exile in 307/6 and the Four Years' War with

Cassander may have postponed his coming until after Demetrius returned from an extended absence to relieve the city in 304. This would be consistent with Plutarch's placement of Lamia's dinner, recounted by Lynceus, before Demetrius' departure again in 302 to aid his father in the coming battle at Ipsus.⁹ Presuming the brothers came together—it is likely given the conditions—304/2 is a good estimate of their arrival. Since Duris succeeded his father as tyrant and was given his grandfather's name,¹⁰ he conceivably was the eldest son. This, however, is of minor value in dating his birth since the age at which he went to Athens cannot be known. But if he was born *circa* 330, he would have been in his middle twenties, a reasonable age to pursue his higher education with Theophrastus.

ROBERT B. KEBRIC

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

7. Habicht (n. 1), pp. 182–86 (Nos. 18–19). Cf. Barron, *Coins*, p. 136.

8. Ath. 4. 128A–B, 3. 101E–F; and Plut. *Demetr.* 27. 2.

9. Plut. *loc. cit.* (n. 8).

10. See n. 4.

HADES AS BENEFACTOR: PLUTARCH *DE ISIDE* 362D

Καὶ γὰρ Πλάτων τὸν Ἄδην ὡς †Αἰδοῦς υἱὸν† τοῖς παρ' αὐτῷ (Wytttenbach: αὐτοῦ codd.) γενομένοις καὶ προσηγῇ θεὸν ὠνομάσθαι φησί. This is W. Sieveking's text of 1935. The extant attempts at emendation of αἰδοῦς υἱὸν are either paleographically unlikely or semantically unconvincing. They are:

διδασκαλικὸν	[A. E. J. Holwerda, 1878]
ἀειδέσμιον	[W. R. Paton, <i>JPh</i> , XX (1892), 169]
αἰδοῦς κύριον	[L. Parmentier, 1913]
ὠφελήσιμον	[F. C. Babbitt, 1936]
ἀηδοῦς κύριον	[T. Hopfner, 1941]
αἰδέσμιον	[M. Pohlenz, 1959]

More recently, J. Gwyn Griffiths, in his major edition of the *De Iside et Osiride* (Cardiff, 1970), pp. 162 f., 406, prints εἰδήμονα (for αἰδοῦς υἱὸν) in his text with reference to Plato *Cratylus* 404B3 (where the name of Hades is deduced from εἰδέναι). The reviewer

of Griffiths' edition, R. E. Witt (*CR*, N.S. XXII [1972], 208) calls the emendation "convincing." Nevertheless, I find Griffiths' emendation paleographically impossible and linguistically wrong. He translates his text as follows: "For Plato (*Cratyl.* 404B) says that Hades has been called by his associates a knowledgeable and friendly god." Here ὡς has not been accounted for.

Even more recently, C. Froidefond (*REG*, LXXXV [1972], 63–65) suggests πλούσιον for the transmitted αἰδοῦς υἱὸν: "Selon Platon, si on a donné à Hadès son nom, c'est qu'à ceux qui sont venus résider auprès de lui il apparaît comme un dieu riche et bienveillant." Here again, the emendation is paleographically unlikely and syntactically weak. For the dative τοῖς γενομένοις followed by προσηγῇ θεὸν ("a friendly god toward the inhabitants of his realm") is not likely to be that of judgment (as Froidefond