

could not otherwise be explained. (We will then, of course, have to assume that this anecdote was copied before the corruption of the manuscript(s) of the *Lives*.) But it is far more likely that the collection of anecdotes represents Plutarch's raw material for the *Lives*, whether composed by himself or someone else.<sup>18</sup> Thus, when he composed the *Life of Lysander*, he had before him the two anecdotes in the form in which they now appear in the correct manuscripts of the *Apophthegmata Laconica*, that is, with Aristas' name. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that Plutarch intended the second of our anecdotes in the *Life* to be referred to Aristas, and that the ambassador's name has fallen out of our manuscript tradition. Most likely Plutarch wrote ἀποσταλὲς ἀρίστας, as in *Apophthegmata Laconica* 229A, and the word πρεσβευτής was written over the name by some scholar as explanation.<sup>19</sup> Then the explanatory word replaced the name, because πρεσβευτής makes sense whereas ἀρίστας, unless it is recognized as a proper name, does not. The error is understandable because Aristas is an uncommon name and the scribe is anyway not expecting to find another name in what ought to be an anecdote about Lysander.

DAVID SANSONE  
University of Illinois,  
Urbana

18. See the discussion, with the literature there cited, by K. Ziegler, s.v. "Plutarchos," *RE* 41 (1951): 865–67. (Note also *De tranquill. an.* 464F—a reference I owe to J. Buckler—where Plutarch speaks of using as a source notebooks on a specific topic that he had compiled for his own use.) This view finds confirmation in our examination of this anecdote for, if someone copied the anecdote from the *Life*, why would he change the wording so as to introduce hiatus (see n. 9) where there was none before? Rather Plutarch, in the *Life*, altered the wording of his model to avoid hiatus.

19. Alternatively, perhaps Plutarch himself wrote ἀποσταλὲς ἀρίστας πρεσβευτής. Considering the difficulties that the manuscripts of the *Apophthegmata Laconica* had with these anecdotes (see n. 10), it should not surprise us if a single word—and, apparently, a *vox nihili* at that—has been omitted here.

## PLUTARCH *LYSANDER* 2: AN ADDENDUM

Professor Sansone's analysis, in the present issue of *CP*, of the two anecdotes in *Lysander* 2. 7–8 as illustrating "(1) Lysander's personal abstention from luxury and (2) the acquisitiveness that, paradoxically, Lysander engendered in Sparta" (p. 203) is an acute piece of detective work. He seems quite correct in arguing that the second anecdote cannot refer to Lysander (as it does not in the full version of the *Apophthegmata Laconica*). He is also, I think, correct in regarding the *Apophthegmata Laconica* as the raw material for the *Lysander* rather than vice versa. His conclusion, however, that πρεσβευτής in *Lysander* 2. 8 should be replaced by a proper name, 'Αρίστας (*vel sim.*), assumes a not particularly easy corruption, however explained, and is perhaps unnecessary.

'Αποσταλὲς πρεσβευτής in this passage has apparently been universally taken as a reference to Lysander ("Lysander having been sent *as ambassador* . . ."), and it is a real merit of Sansone to have perceived the contextual difficulties in this. But the transmitted text admits of a different interpretation which gives the requisite sense. Construe πρεσβευτής not as appositional to an understood subject Λύσανδρος, but as itself the subject: "But a little later from the same city to the same tyrant

an ambassador having been despatched, when that tyrant sent *to him* two garments. . . ." Note the relative positions of *αὐτῷ* and *ἐκείνου* in the phrase *προσπέμψαντος αὐτῷ δύο στολὰς ἐκείνου*: the normally emphatic demonstrative *ἐκείνου* has been relegated to the end of the clause, thereby giving more prominence to *αὐτῷ*.

The slightly unusual postponement of the subject *πρεσβευτής* was necessitated by the rhetoric of the sentence, which correctly places the emphatic *πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν τύραννον ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως* first; *ἀποσταλείς* then properly follows immediately so as not to be separated by *πρεσβευτής* from the local prepositional phrases with which it belongs. That is perfectly correct Greek; one sees at once (after the fact and thanks to Sansone) how in this context it could have been misunderstood.<sup>1</sup> *Πρεσβευτής* (*τις*), an easy change,<sup>2</sup> would remove any ambiguity, but I do not press that. Sansone has pointed out (nn. 9 and 18) instances in this passage where Plutarch has deliberately revised the wording of the *Apophthegmata Laconica*. The replacement of the proper name found there by *πρεσβευτής* is such a revision. The motive was to contrast emphatically Lysander with the corrupt Spartans in general rather than with any particular Spartan. By omitting the personal name Plutarch makes the anecdote appear to be of wider application; that is a delicate touch.

R. RENEHAN  
University of California,  
Santa Barbara

1. Before objecting to the word order, one should reflect that any objections raised against *πρεσβευτής* in this postponed position would apply equally to *Ἀρίστας*.

2. *Της* and *τις* (1) came to be identical in pronunciation and (2) were visually liable to haplography.

### HERODAS *MIMIAMB* 5

A mistress, presumably a free woman, Bitinna, berates her slave-lover Gastron for his infidelity; she has him stripped and bound by a fellow slave, Pyrrhies; she threatens him with two thousand lashes at the hands of Hermon the jailer and with tattooing. Only the intercession of her favorite, the home-slave Cydilla, saves the wayward Gastron: the Gerenia festival is at hand, Cydilla reminds Bitinna, and during that feast for the dead punishments must be postponed. A sordid business, to be sure, in which critics have found little to edify. Yet the surface is deceptive and beneath the ignoble exterior, as is the case generally with Herodas, themes of some significance are latent.

The unfortunate Gastron is a cipher in whom various states of humanity are briefly represented. As slave he is first of all *κτῆμα*, a thing bought and owned (21), an *ἐμψυχον ὄργανον* as P. Groeneboom notes,<sup>1</sup> not yet even in quality human; it is

1. *Les "Mimiambes" d'Herodas I-VI* (Groningen, 1922), p. 161, citing Arist. *EN* 1161b4; cf. W. Headlam and A. D. Knox (eds.), *Herodas, The "Mimes" and Fragments* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 237, and O. Crusius, *Untersuchungen zu den "Mimiamben" des Herodas* (Leipzig, 1892), p. 110, who cites the double sense of *τιμή* at 5. 68. In addition to the above-mentioned works, the following will henceforth be referred to by the last name of the author or editor: I. C. Cunningham (ed.), *Herodas "Mimiambi"* (Oxford, 1971); J. A. Nairn (ed.), *The "Mimes" of Herodas* (Oxford, 1904). The text used here is that of Cunningham.