SUNDIALS, PARASITES, AND GIRLS FROM BOEOTIA

My purpose in this paper is, firstly, to investigate the relationship of the three passages printed below, and, secondly, to illustrate in passing the curious chain of historical accidents which have prevented the truth about that relationship from becoming common lore long ago.

1. Aulus Gellius, *N. A.* 3.3.3–5:

Nam praeter illas unam et uiginti quae Varronianae uocantur, quas idcirco a ceteris segregauit, quoniam dubiosae non erant set consensu omnium Plauti esse censebantur, quasdam item alias probauit [sc. Varro] sicuti istam quam nuperrime legebamus, cui est nomen *Boeotia.* Nam cum in illis una et uiginti non sit et esse Aquili dicatur, nihil tamen Varro dubitauit quin Plauti foret, neque alius quisquam non infrequens Plauti lector dubitauerit, si uel hos solos ex ea fabula uersus cognouerit, qui quoniam sunt (ut de illius Plauti more dicam) plautinissimi, propterea et meminimus eos et ascripsimus. Parasitus ibi esuriens haec dicit:

> ut illum di perdant primus qui horas repperit,
> quique adeo primus statuit hic solarium,
> qui mihi comminuit articulatim diem.
> nam ⟨unum⟩ me puero uenter érat solarium
> multo omnium istorum optumum et uerissumum;
> ubi is te monebat, esse⟨s⟩, nisi quom nil erat:
> nunc etiam quóm est, non estur, nisi Soli lubet.
> itaque adeo iam oppletum oppidum est solariis,
> maior pars populi áridi reptant fame.

Aquili *VPR*: Atilii *Popma. Orationis v. 4* nam me *VPR*: nam ⟨unum⟩ me *Hertz.* ueter *VR*, uetet *P*: uenter *Bentley. v. 6* iste *VPR, corr. Dziatzko.* esse *VPR*: esses *Dziatzko. v. 7* quod est *VP*, quid est *R*: quom est *Bothe, cf. v. 6. v. 9* populi *VPR*: populi iam *Hertz.* aridi *VPR*: arida *Hertz ex Ammiano Marcellino 19.8.8*

2. Varro, *L. L.* 6.89:

. . . 'accensum' solitum ciere *Boeotia* ostendit, quam comoediam Aquili esse dicunt, hoc uersu:

> ubi primum accensus clamarat meridiem . . .

hoc idem Cosconius in *Actionibus* scribit, praetorem accensum solitum tum esse iubere ubi ei uidebatur horam esse tertiam inclamare horam tertiam esse, itemque meridiem et horam nonam.

alii esse dicunt *cod.*: Aquili esse *Turnebus,* alii ⟨Plauti, alii Aquili⟩ esse *Riese.*

3. Alciphron, *Ep.* 3.1 Schepers (3.4 Bergler):

ΕΚΤΟΔΙΩΚΤΗΣ ΛΟΠΑΔΕΚΘΑΜΒΩΙ

1. ὁ γνώμων οὔπω σκιάζει τὴν ἕκτην, ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποσκλῆναι κινδυνεύω τῷ λιμῷ κεντούμενος. 2. εἶεν, ὥρα σοι βουλεύματος, Λοπαδέκθαμβε, μᾶλλον δὲ

μόχλου καὶ καλῳδίου – ἀπάγξασθαι· εἰ γὰρ ὅλην καταβαλοῦμεν τὴν κίονα τὴν τὸ πικρὸν τοῦτο ὡρολόγιον ἀνέχουσαν, ἢ τὸν γνώμονα τρέψομεν ἔκεισε νεύειν οὐ τάχιον δυνήσεται τὰς ὥρας ἀποσημαίνειν, †ἔσται τὸ βούλευμα Παλαμήδειον†· ὡς νῦν ἐγώ σοι αὐτός εἰμι ὑπὸ λιμοῦ καὶ αὐχμηρός. Θεοχάρης δὲ οὐ πρότερον καταλαμβάνει τὴν στιβάδα πρὶν αὐτῷ τὸν οἰκέτην δραμόντα φράσαι τὴν ἔκτην ἐστάναι. 3. δεῖ οὖν ἡμῖν τοιούτου σκέμματος ὃ κατασοφίσασθαι καὶ παραλογίσασθαι τὴν τοῦ Θεοχάρους εὐταξίαν δυνήσεται· τραφεὶς γὰρ ὑπὸ παιδαγωγῷ βαρεῖ καὶ ὠφρυωμένῳ οὐδὲν φρονεῖ νεώτερον, ἀλλ' οἷά τις Λάχης ἢ Ἀπόληξις αὐστηρός ἐστι τοῖς τρόποις καὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπει τῇ γαστρὶ πρὸ τῆς ὥρας τοὐμπίπλασθαι.

ΕΚΤΟΔΙΩΚΤΗΣ *Schepers ex tit. 3.2:* ΤΡΕΧΕΔΕΙΠΝΟΣ *codd., quod ad 3.2 inuicem pertinet.* 2. ἀπάγξασθαι *del. Herelius, Schepers.* εἰ γὰρ καὶ. . . ἢ. . . ἔσται *(ut supra) tres libri,* εἰ γὰρ . . . ἢ. . . καὶ ἔσται *tres ceteri,* εἰ γὰρ ἢ. . . ἢ. . . ἔσται *Schepers post Seiler.* ἔσται . . . Παλαμήδειον *obelis notaui nam uel* <οὐκ> ἔσται . . . Παλαμήδειον *uel* ἔσται τὸ βούλευμ' ἀπαλαμήδειον *uidetur esse ponendum, v.p. 322.*

My thesis is that there is a direct relationship between Alciphron's parasite-letter and both citations of the *Boeotia,* which themselves come from the same speech, probably early in the play; that speech was a typically Romanized adaptation of a corresponding declamation in an evidently well-known *Boiotia*[1] of the New Comedy which independently served as inspiration, if that is the word, for Alciphron. His letter and the longer Latin fragment develop the idea that sundials are a nuisance to parasites impatient to be fed; it is implausible that this should simply be a coincidence, or that Alciphron (2nd or 3rd cent. A.D.) should have read Gellius, still less the script of a 400-year-old Latin play of disputed authorship. It is far more likely that Alciphron went direct to the New Comedy. Three dramatists are known to have written *Boiotiai*—Antiphanes, Theophilus, and Menander—and of course there may well have been others. The Latin speech is certainly the work of a pre-Terentian writer of *palliatae,*[2] and as far as an early Roman dramatist is concerned, no one New Comedy playwright is a more likely source than another. With Alciphron it is different. While he is an original author as regards the rhetorical structure and presentation of his compositions to a greater extent than a Roman dramatist, he drew heavily as did Lucian, Aristaenetus, and others on Menander for ideas in his vignettes and evocations of old Athens, and Menander, *ὁ κωμικός par excellence,* had a central place in Greek education. Everyone knew some Menander, and Alciphron expected and exploited this. A part of such pleasure as was to be had from exercises like Alciphron's was the recognition of a theme, a turn of phrase, a transmuted situation as Menandrian;[3] and, Alciphron might argue, the cleverness and educational value of his compositions lay not only in their manipulation of

[1] Here and *passim Boiotia* means the Greek and *Boeotia* the Latin play.

[2] *Pace* Ritschl, for whose opinion see p. 318.

[3] Cf. I. L. Thyresson, 'Quatre lettres de Claude Elien inspirées par le *Dyscolus de Ménandre*', *Eranos* 62 (1964), 7–35; the discovery in 1959 of that play confirmed what had long been conjectured, that Aelian *Ep.* 14 and 15 are based on material from it, cf. O. Ribbeck, *ASG* X (1888), 12 ff.; P. E. Legrand, *Daos* (Paris, 1910), 22–3. For the relationship of the Epistolographers and Essayists to Comedy in general, see (with caution) Th. Kock, 'Neue Bruchstücke attischer Komödie', *Hermes* 21 (1886), 372–49; id. *CAF* iii (1888), 674–9; id. 'Lucian und die Komödie', *RhMus* 43 (1888), 35–44; P. E. Legrand, op. cit., *passim* and 'Les dialogues des Courtisanes comparées avec la Comédie', *REG* 20 (1907), 176–231, 21 (1908), 38–79.

the good old Attic tongue but also in their demonstration of how to adapt and develop a theme oneself. Menander's *Boiotia* is only represented for us by three moralizing quotations in Stobaeus (5th cent. A.D.) and two citations made by Erotian (1st cent. A.D.) and Photius (9th cent. A.D.). The implication of this 'score' when compared with those of Menander's *oeuvre* in general is that while the *Boiotia* did not rank along with such famous plays as, say, *Epitrepontes* or *Sikyonioi* or *Thais*, it was still quite well known in the Greek world in Imperial times.

I corroborate this with the following arguments:

(i) The theme that sundials are a nuisance to hungry parasites occurs only in the passages under discussion, and is an idiosyncratic τόπος, because it reverses what might seem the more obvious idea that sundials would be useful to them, as in the anecdote reported by Diogenes Laetius 6.104 περιαιροῦσι [sc. οἱ Κυνικοί] δὲ καὶ γεωμετρίαν καὶ μουσικὴν καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα. ὁ γοῦν Διογένης πρὸς τὸν ἐπιδεικνύντα αὐτῷ ὡροσκοπεῖον χρήσιμον ἔφη τὸ ἔργον πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὑστερῆσαι δεῖπνου.

(ii) Alciphron's parasite claims that he is αὖος ὑπὸ λιμοῦ καὶ αὐχμηρός (cf. Alc. *Ep.* iii. 34.5, 39.3); there is a striking parallel in the Latin speech where the speaker asserts that 'maior pars populi aridi reptant—fame', not as the word-order leads one to expect and as Ammianus Marcellinus has it in his recollection of Gellius[4] at 19.8.8, *siti*, 'with thirst'. Now it is a typical trait of Plautine parasites to mix the adjectives of hunger and thirst, taste and sight in this way;[5] the best parallel comes at the end of Ergasilus' first speech in *Captivi*:

108 sed aperitur ostium
und' saturitate saepe ego exii—ebrius

'To be drunk with satiety' is the counterpart of being 'parched with hunger'; and it is this kind of mannerism which constitutes the 'filus atque facetia sermonis Plauto congruentis' which led Varro followed by Gellius to assert the authenticity of the Boeotia as a Plautine play, I think probably rightly. It would appear from the parallel in Alciphron that both he and our Roman author found some similar synaesthesia in the parasite's speech in *Boiotia*.

(iii) 'Theochares', says Alciphron, 'does not sit down to lunch before his slave comes running to tell him it is mid-day': Varro quotes a line of the *Boeotia* 'As soon as the herald had proclaimed mid-day . . .' in order to illustrate the meaning of *accensus* 'herald', a word evidently obsolete by the mid-first century B.C. The proclamation of the time of day by this muezzin-like official in the forum was a feature of Roman life in the earlier second century B.C. The author of the *Boeotia* has either introduced this Roman allusion himself, or he has dressed up some less institutional reference to a timekeeper which he found in his Greek model. The latter is a well-known and characteristic trait of Plautus and Ennius in their *uorsio*. Strip the *accensus* of his job on the praetor's staff, and we are left with Alciphron's private servant whose job it is to tell master

[4] First noticed by M. Hertz, 'Ramentorum Gellianorum (I–V) mantissa', *Academiae Fredericae Guilelmae Rhenanae primorum semisaecularium diem festum . . . celebranti gratulabatur Academia Vratislavensis Viadrina* (Breslau, 1868), p. 18 = *Opuscula Gelliana* (Berlin, 1886), pp. 62 f.; 'Aulus Gellius und Ammianus Marcellinus', *Hermes* 8 (1874), 286 (= *Opuscula*, pp. 182 f.).

[5] Cf. e.g. Pl. *St.* 467 'propino tibi salutem plenis faucibus'; *Cur.* 318 'gramarum habeo dentes plenos, lippiunt fauces fame'.

that it is time to eat. It is in any case no dangerous inference to suppose that the mention of *meridies* in the *Boeotia*-line led directly to a mention of lunch: what else would one do at *meridies*, i.e. *hora sexta*, but begin one's *siesta*?

(iv) Alciphron's parasite claims that to overturn the column supporting the wretched dial, or to turn its pointer where it would be able to count the hours more quickly, would be an 'idea worthy of Palamedes' (*βούλευμα Παλαμήδειον*), i.e. 'brilliant', or, as I suspect, 'unworthy of Palamedes', i.e. 'no good'; for discussion of the text, see below, pp. 321 ff. Here it only matters that either way mention is made of Palamedes in the context of sundials and time-reckoning. Our Latin parasite begins his speech with a round curse on 'is qui primus horas repperit'. And who was that?[6] According to Alciphron's near contemporary Flavius Philostratus, it was Palamedes: *Her.* 10.1 *πρὸ γὰρ δὴ Παλαμήδους ὧραι μὲν οὔπω ἦσαν οὖσαι, μηνῶν δ' οὔπω κύκλος, ἐνιαυτὸς δ' οὔπω ὄνομα ἦν τῷ χρόνῳ οὐδὲ νόμισμα ἦν καὶ σταθμὰ καὶ μέτρα οὐδ' ἀριθμεῖν, σοφίας δ' οὔπω ἔρως, ἐπεὶ μήπω ἦν γράμματα.* Philostratus obviously means 'hours' as marked on a sundial: God invented the 'seasons', not Palamedes; and if Philostratus thought of this heroic inventor as a chronologer, so might Alciphron. According to a tradition current in Alciphron's time Palamedes was supposed to be seventh in line of descent from Belus, to whom the Chaldaeans attributed the invention of astronomy (Serv. ad V. *Aen.* 2.81, Ach. Tat. *Introd. ad Aratum* 1). It is of special interest to parasites that Palamedes instituted fixed meal-times (Aesch. *Pal.* fr. 182 N^2 *σῖτον δ' εἰδέναι διώρισα,/ ἄριστα δεῖπνα δόρπαθ' αἱρεῖσθαι τρίτα*), and also that he devised the games of draughts and dice to divert the hungry soldiery during a famine which troubled the Greeks at Troy (Eustathius p. 228 ad *Il.* 2. 308, Soph. fr. 399; Roscher iii. 1268). Aeschylus and Sophocles represented him in their plays *Palamedes* and *Nauplius* as the *primus inventor* among other things of nocturnal astronomy: he it was who explained the risings and settings and revolutions of the stars, a blessing on mariners and soldiers on watch at night. From this it might be inferred that in Menander's *Boiotia* the parasite began his speech 'Damn Palamedes for inventing hours . . .'; the Latin playwright has kept the rhetorical figure and structure of his model, but dropped the name; Alciphron has kept the name, but employed Palamedes as an *exemplum* of genius vaguely appropriate in a context of time-keeping, meal-times, and hunger.

II

Accordingly, the Latin speech will represent a translation, or more precisely an adaptation, of a parasite's *ῥῆσις* in Menander's *Boiotia*, and not a free composition by the Latin dramatist, a view maintained, I think wrongly, by Salmasius and Ritschl (see below, pp. 315 ff). This would be a conclusion of some historical interest. For the *sine qua non* of the passage is the contrast of that happy time in living memory, when sundials as regulators of social life in general and of meal-times in particular were unknown or rare, and the wretched present, when they

[6] Among the real people whom Vitruvius mentions in the *locus classicus* on sundials *Arch.* 9.8.1 (on which see now J. Soubiran's commentary in his Budé edition of IX (Paris, 1969), pp. 240–71) as having been 'inventors' seven are of the third century or later; only Berosus, Patrocles, and Eudoxus belong to the fourth century. To these may plausibly be added Menaechmus of Syracuse, Philip of Opus, Meton and Euctemon, and Oenopides before we retreat to Anaximenes, Anaximander, Thales, 'The Chaldaeans', 'Babylonians', and 'Egyptians' as those who are or might more or less speciously be connected with sundials.

dominate life. Menander's career as a dramatist fell between 322/1 and 293/2 B.C.; since the dramatic time in his plays may safely be taken simply as 'the present', since it is probable that the scene is Athens and not some other Greek city, and since the parasite of New Comedy is typically neither a very young nor a very old character, the good old days should be *c.* 345 B.C. ± 15; and, as it happens, that fits rather well, for what it is worth as historical evidence, with the date implied in the story about Diogenes the Cynic (*c.* 400–*c.* 325 B.C.) quoted above, p. 310. The external evidence is convergent and ever since Salmasius first argued the case on the basis of what for 1629 was a quite remarkable collation of the available evidence it is agreed that sundials and the seasonal hour-system did not come into common use in Greece before the early Hellenistic period;[7] not but what this raises a problem, for there are passages, of which the best known and most discussed is a passing remark of Herodotus (2. 109), which show that the hollow-surfaced shadow-receiving device with its lines dividing daylight into twelve 'parts' (*μέρη* in Herodotus) was known at Athens in the last quarter of the fifth century; this apparatus, however, was not primarily a clock, but an instrument of the *φυσικοί* used for tracking the motion and position of the sun.[8] It was only later, in the course of the fourth century, that the twelve 'parts' marked by such devices came to be referred to as the twelve 'times' (*ὧραι*) of day. The complete absence of seasonal-hour reckonings in Xenophon, Plato, the fragments of fourth-century historians, Comedy (except here, if we are right), and especially the Orators is surely significant, when one recalls how freely Cicero uses such timings in giving the circumstances of a case to a jury and how common they are in the Gospels. Our passage would provide important evidence from the time when *ὧραι* were a new-fangled imposition on daily life, and indeed the earliest specific reference to seasonal hours as such. The complaints of the parasite would be the more pointed if a few of these wretched computers had already been installed in the Theatre of Dionysus, from which the remains of several much later sundials have in fact been recovered.

The first question, therefore, is whether it is reasonable to regard our speech as a translation at all. The rhetorical skeleton which must lie behind it should contain the following elements:

(i) 'Damn the inventor of seasonal hours (Palamedes?) [and Oenopides/Meton and Euctemon/him/them who first set up a sundial here at Athens]!

(ii) 'When I was a boy, my stomach told me when to eat;'

(iii) 'but nowadays our lives are regimented by these infernal time-keepers.'

At (i) either or both curses would do, and names (suggested *exempli gratia*) may or may not have been named. We are dealing with a well-known species of

[7] *Plinianae exercitationes ad C. Iulii Solini Polyhistora* (Paris, 1629), pp. 632–58; see further D. Petavius, *Variarum Dissertationum ad Vranologion libri VIII* (Paris, 1630), Diss. 7 and 8 (pp. 269–75; unfair to Salmasius). A convenient though sketchy account will be found in Sharon L. Gibbs, *Greek and Roman Sundials* (New Haven and London, 1976), pp. 6–8.

[8] Herodotus' remarks are to be interpreted in the light of the comments of the scholiast on Aristophanes *Av.* 997 (414 B.C.) taken in conjunction with Aristophanes fr. 163 (Pollux 9.46), from *Gerytades* (408 B.C. or later), and a fragment of *Daitaleis* (Aristophanes' first play, 427 B.C.) unknown to Kock and Edmonds in Ach. Tat. *Introd. ad Aratum* 29 (E. Maass, *Aratea* (Berlin, 1892), p. 13; *Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae* (Berlin, 1898), p. 62).

exordium in which the speaker strikes an attitude, i.e. establishes his essential character, by expressing an opinion of someone drawn from myth or history as an *exemplum*:

> εἶτ' οὐ μακάριος ἦν ὁ Περσεὺς κατὰ δύο
> τρόπους ἐκεῖνος, ὅτι κτλ . . .
>
> (Menander *Dysk.* 153 f.)

> credo ego miseram
> fuisse Penelopam,
> soror, suo ex animo,
> quam tam diu uidua
> uiro suo caruit;
> nam nos eius animum
> de nostris factis noscimus, quarum uiri hinc apsunt . . .
>
> (Plautus *Stich.* 1 ff. (Menander, first *Adelphoi*))

The rhetoricians called the figure represented by the first example a μακαρισμός, and one might coin the term ἀντιμακαρισμός, for the second; its rhetorical purpose and use is exactly parallel. Our *Boeotia*-exordium belongs to a sub-species of the second type, in which the exemplum is a *primus inuentor* (Tib. 1. 10 'ferreus ille fuit primus qui protulit enses'), and for which there are close parallels in Comedy, e.g.

> ut illum di perdant qui primus holitor cepam protulit
>
> (Naevius, *CRF* 18 (*Apella*))

> qui illum di omnes perduint qui primus commentust . . .
> contionem habere
>
> (Plautus, *Men.* 451)

> ἐξώλης ἀπόλοιθ' ὅστις ποτέ
> ὁ πρῶτος ἦν γήμας, ἔπειθ' ὁ δεύτερος,
> εἶθ' ὁ τρίτος, εἶθ' ὁ τέταρτος, εἶθ' ὁ μεταγενής . . .
>
> (Menander fr. 142 (*Empimpramene*))

> (cf. ὡς ὄλοιτο παγκακῶς
> ἥτις πρὸς ἄνδρας ἦρξατ' αἰσχύνειν λέχη
> πρώτη θυραίους . . .
>
> Euripides, *Hipp.* 407).

Taking the species and the sub-species together and looking at many examples, one sees that such exordia tend to come at a character's first entrance in a play, which is not surprising; for the formula enables the dramatist to do several things at once. The evaluation ('God bless . . .'; 'O happy he . . .'; 'Damn X . . .'; 'Poor Y . . .') establishes attitude, i.e. character, straight away, as well as intriguing and amusing the audience in proportion to its bizarre and extravagant quality. The sequel (iv) to such an introduction as we have should be the transition from general complaints to specific circumstances, i.e. to matters concerning the plot and the character's role in it. Knemon's entrance-speech (the beginning of which is quoted above) in *Dyskolos* is a model of the type.

The bold alliteration of the Latin passage, its exaggerated antitheses, the Latin puns (*est/estur* for example), the weighty and end-stopped versification, and the triple repetition of the hated polysyllable *solarium* (one can hear the actor savouring those line-ends)—all these are the gaudy paint of a Plautus, but the underlying structure is economical and functional and organic; when Plautus adds *de suo,* the result does not look like this. There is therefore no *a priori* rhetorical or stylistic ground for supposing that this passage is Roman in origin.

It is to be noted that in the context of late-fourth-century Athens there will have been a transparently absurd aspect to a curse on the *primus inventor* of ὥραι, whether Palamedes was named or not. *Primi inventores* are normally remote figures; since everyone knew that ὥραι were in fact a quite recent if unattributable innovation, to assign the invention of the system to such as Palamedes will have been a joke in the spirit of Offenbach, a point lost in the Roman version, and forgotten by the time of Philostratus and Alciphron, to whom the invention of hours was indeed a discovery plausibly attributable to the remotest antiquity. At the same time, of course, the audience may well have believed (rightly) that the subject in general of shadow-measurement and observation was of great antiquity, just as in the fifth century Herodotus attributed the bowl-and-gnomon with its twelve 'parts' to 'the Babylonians', implicitly contradicting those of his contemporaries who thought that it came from 'the Egyptians'.

III

A very competent stylistic analysis of the *Boeotia*-passage is now available in J. Wright's *Dancing in Chains* (Rome, 1974), pp. 81–5, and I have little to add to that.[9] However, he does not seem to have been aware of the Alciphron-parallel and its implications. In this he is not alone. It is not mentioned in a single modern edition of the fragments of Menander or Attic Comedy, of Plautus, of the fragments of Roman Comedy, of Alciphron, or Gellius. It is, for example, surprising not to find it alluded to in Meineke, and still more so in Kock, who was over-zealous in the last volume of *CAF* in combing later Greek writers for echoes of New Comedy. If, as is the case, Legrand in *Daos* (Paris, 1910) and Webster in *Studies in Menander* (Manchester, 1950) and *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester, 1953) did not know about it, it is hardly to be expected that it would be found in handbooks less minutely concerned with the indirect evidence

[9] For a parasite's curse against a *primus inventor,* cf. Pl. *Men.* 451 ff.; for the expansion of the curse with *-que adeo, Men.* 597, *Rud.* 1167; for the personification of *dies* by a parasite and its maltreatment, *Cur.* 464 (*St.* 436, 453, *As.* 291). Adverbs in *-atim* are calqued freely by Plautus in violent contexts (*Cur.* 576 *frustillatim, Men.* 858 f. *assulatim; articulatim Ep.* 488. Plautus likes bizarre identifications (*uenter* = *solarium*), antithesis (*unum/omnium*), superlatives (*optumum et uerissumum*), gross exaggeration (three cases in the last three lines), puns (*est/estur,* cf. *Per.* 103 'nam Essurio uenio non aduenio Saturio', assonance (*oppletum oppidum*). Plautus' parasites mix the vocabulary of the senses (see above, p. 310) and they like sub-Stoic paradoxes. The versification is Plautine: endstopping, cf. *Men.* 77 ff.; 'uénter érat solárium', cf. *Aul.* 655 '. . . álter érat tecúm simul', *Poen.* 374 '. . . dehinc érit uerax tibi'; for 'ub(i) is té . . .' cf. *Poen.* 561 'úb(i) is detúlerit . . .' The only handles that I can see for the suspicious to grasp are the use of *ubi* with the imperfect indicative *monebat* in the sense 'whenever' (cf. Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum* ii s.v. *ubi* B. 2. b), and the subjunctive *esses* (= *ederes,* not *edebas*) where in Old Latin an indicative would be expected.

for New Comedy, and it is not. Yet the parallel was noted by Leo, and the inference to be drawn from it all but made explicit, in 1895 when he wrote in a footnote in the first edition of *Plautinische Forschungen* (p. 138 n. 4; 2nd edn., 1912, p. 154 n. 1)

> Dass Ritschl im Unrecht war, als er die von Gellius angeführte Stelle der *Boeotia* einer späteren Zeit zuwies [*Parerga zu Plautus und Terenz* i (Leipzig, 1845), 208 (see also pp. 83, 123–5)], und dass die Sonnenuhren aus dem Original stammen, hat [F.] Ostermayer [*De historia fabulari in comoedia plautina*, Diss. Greifswald, 1884] p. 57 bemerkt. Zu beweisen ist es aus Alkiphr. III 4, wo der Parasit sich in gleicher Weise beschwert, dass er hungern müsse weil das ὡρολόγιον noch nicht die sechste Stunde zeige.

Ostermayer in fact simply asserts the possibility that the passage is a translation, against the then canonical view of Ritschl, that the passage was an interpolation of the Gracchan era in a genuine *Boeotia* of Plautus; neither was aware of the parallel, and the only other scholar, as far as I am aware, who has mentioned it in the last 300 years is Ribbeck, who had evidently read Leo and alluded to the parallel in passing in *Kolax* (*ASG* xxi, 1901, p. 35). In the circumstances it seems particularly unfortunate that Leo did not allude to the parallel in his edition of Plautus in his apparatus to the fragment (1898, vol. ii, p. 527), for thus it would surely have become common knowledge; instead, he (and Ribbeck in the third edition of *CRF*, also 1898) mention echoes in Ammianus Marcellinus (19.8.8, 23.6.77) which attest to Ammianus' reading of Gellius, but which (*pace* Hertz, who noted them) are of no textual or exegetical relevance to the fragment itself. Lindsay, and Ernout in their Plautus editions, and Marshall in the Oxford *Gellius* duly copy this out, but still fail to mention Alciphron.

An explanation, though hardly an excuse, for this extraordinary silence is partly to be found in the early *fortunae* of both passages, partly in the undeserved authority allowed to the ill-informed opinions of Ritschl on the *Boeotia.*

Apart from Wright and Ritschl, the only scholar who has discussed the *Boeotia* fragment is Cl. Salmasius, who, in the course of his essay on ancient time-keeping (*Plinianae exercitationes in C. Iulii Solini Polyhistora* (Paris, 1629), pp. 632–58), considered the passage (pp. 650 f.) along with Pliny's account of early Roman time-keeping at *N. H.* 7. 60 (quoted below, p. 318). He could and should have known that Menander had a claim to the authorship,[10] but he asserts *suo Marte* that the Greek playwright was Antiphanes. He proceeds:

> an in Boeotia Antiphanis haec eadem parasiti querimonia super horologiorum inuentione fuerit nescio. inde colligi posset horologia in Graecia reperta fuisse ipsius Antiphanis aetate. sed uerius fortasse est Plautum ῥῆσιν illam parasiti . . . fabulae adtexuisse ex temporum suorum usu.

Later, at the end of his argument developing this thesis in the light of what Pliny has to say, he adds

> nisiquis contendat hoc idem in Antiphane fuisse, idque ad uerbum Plautum reddidisse, quod non fit mihi uerisimile. Antiphanem quidam adscribunt poetis antiquae comoediae.[11] certe

[10] Editions of Stobaeus (from whom two of the extant fragments come) were not specially rare (Trincavelli, Venice, 1536; Gesner (iii–iv only), Tiguri, 1543, 1559; Basle, 1549); and Grotius mentioned Menander's play in his *Excerpta ex tragediis et comediis graecis tum quae exstant tum quae perierunt* (Paris, 1626). p. 712.

[11] In fact, the only extant sources (the *Suda* and Anon. *De Comoedia* 12) explicitly say that he is a poet of the Middle Comedy.

post nonagesimam octauam Olympiadem fabulas in scena dictasse dicitur [386–3 B.C.; this from Anon. *De com.* 12 (p. 9 Kaibel)]. at eo tempore certum est nondum repertam horarum obseruationem nec horologiorum usum fuisse notum.[12]

Evidently Salmasius was not at all sure how to regard the Latin passage, and the reason why he inclined away from the view that it is a translation is the chronological problem (largely of his own making) which this would apparently pose. Unfortunately these doubts are no longer apparent in the abbreviated and doctored version of Salmasius' discussion taken by M. Boxhorn to serve as a note to the fragment in his, the first edition of Plautus to include notes on the fragments (Leiden, 1645). Boxhorn cut among other things the sentences 'an in Boeotia . . . Antiphanis aetate', and substituted 'sed uerissimum ego putem . . .' for 'sed uerius fortasse est . . .'; J. F. Gronovius took Boxhorn's version of the note verbatim for his *Variorum* Plautus (Leiden, 1664). Operarius boiled it down to the reference to Pliny for his Delphin edition (Paris, 1679); both of these were reprinted several times and remained standard well into the nineteenth century.

One cannot blame Salmasius for not knowing of the Alciphron-letter in 1629; the Aldine *Alciphron* (Venice, 1499) included only forty-four letters, and it was not until 1715 that S. Bergler published a much fuller edition containing seventy-two more, including all the *epistolae parasiticae.* However this was not the *editio princeps* of the letter which concerns us. Bergler's *dedicatio* to the Royal Librarian at Vienna mentions that his predecessor in that post, P. Lambecius, had not only discovered important manuscripts of Alciphron at Vienna, but before that had as a student made a copy of another eight letters 'ut nancisci potuit', and that 'temperare sibi non potuit quin unam earum, data occasione, uulgaret, debito elogio, elegantem eam uocans.' This refers rather cryptically to the fact that Lambecius at the remarkable age of nineteen had published his *Prodromus lucubrationum criticarum in Auli Gelli Noctes Atticas* (Paris, 1647), in which he remarked apropos of Gellius at *N. A.* 3.3.5 'habes simillimam esurientis parasiti querelam in Alciphronis rhetoris epistola; quae quoniam elegans est et hactenus inedita, non ingratum fore arbitror si hic adscripsero', which he does, without further comment.[13] This, then was the *editio princeps* of the Alciphron letter in question (1647); and it received a wider currency when the note and letter were taken verbatim by Jac. Gronovius in his revision (Leiden, 1706) of his father J. F. Gronovius' edition of Aulus Gellius (Leiden, 1685); to this day this is the only comprehensively annotated Gellius.

It is an unlucky accident that Salmasius wrote eighteen years before Lambecius published the letter, and that this publication fell two years after Boxhorn's adaptation of Salmasius. The lines of transmission were frozen, as it were,

[12] Salmasius' treatment of Hdt. 2. 109 (op. cit., pp. 635 ff., 640–1) does not bear examination, but he is right on the essential point that *horarum obseruatio* came in the late fourth century; there is some misleading manipulation in his dating of Antiphanes, for he makes it sound as though 386/3 B.C. is a *floruit*, and not what his source quite clearly means, the beginning of Antiphanes' career. That Salmasius is quoting not the Suda but the pamphlet *De Comoedia* is clear from the peculiar expression '*after* the 98th Olympiad', reproducing μετὰ τὴν in the Greek. He will have read the work in the Aldine *Aristophanes.*

[13] From which manuscript of Alciphron Lambecius took the letter is unclear; suffice to say that the letter is present in manuscripts which are known to have been in Paris, Rome, and Vienna in the seventeenth centuries, at all of which Lambecius studied. Schepers regrettably did not go into the anomalous textual history of this letter in his introduction to the Teubner *Alciphron* (2nd edn., 1895).

thereafter right into modern times. The context for Ritschl's discussion of the *Boeotia* was the abbreviated and dogmatic version of Salmasius' note as he found it in a Gronovius Plautus; and it is to Ritschl's discredit that he did not bother to consult a Gronovius *Gellius*, which would have led him to the letter.

Pliny mentions a tradition that the first dial at Rome was set up in 294 B.C., but dismisses this in favour of an account which he has from Varro according to which the first sundial set up in public near the Rostra was brought as booty from Catina in Sicily in the first year of the First Punic War, 264/3 B.C. 'Its lines', he continues, 'did not agree with Roman time, but nevertheless they obeyed it (*paruerunt ei*) for ninety-nine years, until Q. Marcius Philippus as censor . . . set up another alongside more carefully drawn up.' Salmasius made a number of questionable assumptions in interpreting this information, and these should be made explicit:

(a) That Pliny's account is intended to be exhaustive, listing public *and* private timepieces. In fact, he is exclusively concerned with arrangements made and devices introduced under the aegis of the *res publica* and its magistrates; naturally enough there is nothing about sundials owned by e.g. shopkeepers and private individuals in their gardens, because there would be no official records of these. Varro (*L.L.* 64) mentions a dial at Praeneste which by what he infers from it must date from well before Philippus' censorship (165/4 B.C.).

(b) That Pliny was right to reject the tradition of an earlier sundial than the one from Catina. In fact there were other traditions about an earliest sundial that Pliny does not even mention; see Censorinus, *De die natali* 23, quoted below.

(c) That Varro and Pliny intend us to understand that there was literally only one sundial at Rome for nearly a hundred years. They do not actually say this; Pliny's words are that the Romans 'obeyed it' for ninety-nine years, which is consistent with the interpretation that during that period the Catina-dial served as a standard and a model; for what matters after all is not whether a sundial tells true solar time, but that they should be many and that they should all more or less agree. As to the practical accuracy of the Catina dial set at Rome, see below.

(d) That Plautus *floruit c.* 218 B.C., a date which Salmasius apparently arrived at by taking the mean of what passed as the dates of his birth and death (254–184 B.C.).[14]

(e) That this was the rough date of Plautus' *Boeotia*.[15]

[14] There is no ancient authority *whatever* for either of the birthdates still regularly repeated in handbooks for the birth of Plautus, 254 or 259/8 B.C.; the former is arrived at by counting back three score years and ten from 184 B.C., the date Cicero quotes (from Atticus) for his death (*Brut.* 60), the latter by counting back the same from 205/4 B.C., by a ludicrous combination of the supposed evidence of *Mil.* 629, where Periplecomenus says he is fifty-four years old, and *Mil.* 211 f., the famous supposed allusion to Naevius' imprisonment on which rests the dating of *Mil.* to 205/4 B.C. It would be interesting to identify the authors of these conjectures. The first is evidently older than Salmasius; Crinitus, *De poetis* (Florence, 1505), was not responsible.

[15] Much too early on any view. Only *Cistellaria* is quite certainly to be dated before the end of the Second Punic War, and not by very long (cf. *Cist.* 202); there is no *a priori* reason to look further back than about 210 B.C. Plautus could quite easily have been born only a few years before Caecilius, *c.* 230 B.C.

(f) That the Catina-dial was brought to Rome in 254 B.C. not 264 B.C., a rather careless error perpetuated in Boxhorn and Gronovius.[16]

He concludes from (d), (e), and (f) that the parasite's remarks about the old days, when he was a boy, suit Roman circumstances well, but that the claim that the town is 'now' (i.e. *c.* 218 B.C.) stuffed with sundials cannot be literally true, because then and for long after there was one only; 'sed parasiticam personam cogitanti qui deridiculi causa omnia exaggerat mirum non uidebitur haec de pluribus horologiis conquestio, cum unicum tantum esset in urbe.'

Ritschl (*Parerga,* loc cit.) uncritically accepted the dogmatic statement (not in fact to be attributed to Salmasius) that the *Boeotia*-passage must be Roman in origin, and also points (a), (b), and (c); but with less good taste than Salmasius, he was unwilling to make allowance for parasitic exaggeration, and inferred that the statement that the town was full of sundials was absolutely incompatible with composition at any time during Plautus' or Terence's period; the passage must date from twenty or thirty years later than 165 B.C. The conclusion that one might expect to be drawn from this is that Accius was right in condemning the play as un-Plautine; instead, since Varro is the source of the supposed statement that there was only one sundial at Rome throughout Plautus' career and beyond, and yet Varro himself thought the *Boeotia* a genuine work, Ritschl offers the following incredible suggestion: the lines quoted by Gellius are an interpolation of later date, 'which Gellius seized on most unfortunately in his eagerness to validate Varro's criticism with the subtlety of his own, and which Varro did not read in his copy' (*Parerga,* pp. 123 f.). Such was Ritschl's authority on matters Plautine that when F. Winter wrote what is to this day the only monograph devoted to the fragments of Plautus (*Plauti fabularum deperditarum fragmenta* (Bonn, 1885)) he actually excluded the *Boeotia*-fragment altogether on the extraordinary ground that it was impossible to determine whether the passage was by Plautus or not (p. 5); it was possibly this *damnatio* by Ritschl that deterred Kock and others from treating the passage as evidence for New Comedy, as it surely should be.

IV

XII Tabulis ortus tantum et occasus nominantur; post aliquot annos adiectus est meridies, accenso consulum id pronuntiante, cum a curia inter Rostra et Graecostasin prospexisset solem; a columna Maenia ad carcerem inclinato sidere supremam pronuntiavit, sed hoc serenis tantum diebus, usque ad primum bellum punicum. princeps solarium horologium statuisse ante XII annos quam cum Pyrrho debellatum est [294 B.C.] ad aedem Quirini L. Papirius Cursor, cum eam dedicaret a patre suo uotam a Fabio Vestali proditur. sed neque facti horologii rationem uel artificem significat nec unde tralatum sit aut apud quem scriptum id inuenerit. M. Varro primum statutum in publico secundum Rostra in columna tradit bello punico primo a M'. Valerio Messalla cos. Catina capta in Sicilia, deportatum inde post XXX annos quam de Papiriano horologio traditur, anno urbis CCCCLXXXX [264/3 B.C.]. nec congruebant ad horas eius lineae, paruerunt tamen ei annos undecentum, donec Q. Marcius Philippus, qui cum L. Paullo fuit censor, diligentius ordinatum iuxta posuit [164 B.C.], idque munus inter censoria opera gratissima acceptum est. etiam tum

[16] Salmasius has 'anno post urbem conditam quadringentesimo nonagesimo nono idque anno ferme post bellum coeptum aduersum Poenos primum', the date given in words; Boxhorn and Gronovius reproduce the same date in figures; *nonagesimo* is an error for *octagesimo,* for a.u.c. 499 is 254/3 B.C., and Pliny means 264/3 B.C.

tamen nubilo incertae fuere horae usque ad proximum lustrum. tunc [159 B.C.] Scipio Nasica collega Laenati primus aqua diuisit horas aeque noctium ac dierum idque horologium sub tecto dicauit anno urbis DXCV: tam diu populo Romano indiscreta lux fuit. (Pliny *N.H.* 7. 60).

The relevance of Pliny's account of old Roman time-reckoning to the *Boeotia*-fragment and its reliability in general have been too easily accepted. The method of announcing noon attributed to the *accensus* would work at any time of year if the bearing taken was in fact in the meridian plane (a plane passing through the observer, a point due south, and a point overhead). We do not know the precise relative positions of the *columna Maenia* (erected 338 B.C. or later) and the Graecostasis and the curia in the old Roman forum, which itself was aligned N.—S. and E.—W. The absolute time of the last hour would vary from season to season on the *accensus*'s method, but not by intolerably much. It is noteworthy that in the version of the *accensus*'s job given by Cosconius and reported from him by Varro (see p. 308) there is a comically primitive attempt at quarterly division of daylight; the very notion of a quarterly division is in fact a direct function of a sundial, and it would not occur to anyone that such a division was of any use until sundials and seasonal hours were well known. Pliny's phrase 'usque ad primum bellum punicum' gives the impression that as soon as the Catina-dial had arrived, the *accensus* was rendered redundant. But a sundial is dumb, and what use is one sundial anyway? It would be natural for the *accensus* to use the dial to proclaim noon and the quarters; and if he had a relay of deputies in hailing-distance of one another, they could take up his cry, or blow horns (cf. Luc. *B. C.* 2. 684, Petronius 26)[17] to proclaim 'Roman standard time' to a wider area than that of the forum.

Pliny clearly prefers the second of the two versions which he gives of the introduction of sundials at Rome, evidently because it has Varro's authority (*De rebus humanis*?); so Salmasius and Ritschl, overlooking the point that the double tradition itself implies that there was no simple certainty, a fact which emerges more clearly from Censorinus' account:

In horas duodecim diuisum esse diem noctemque in totidem uulgo notum est. sed hoc credo Romae post reperta solaria obseruatum quorum antiquissimum quod fuerit inuentu difficile est. alii enim apud aedem Quirini primum statutum dicunt [this is Papirius' dial]; alii in Capitolio, nonnulli ad aedem Dianae in Aventino [neither mentioned by Pliny]. illud satis constabat, nullum in foro [note this qualification—not 'Romae'] prius fuisse quam id quod M. Valerius ex Sicilia aduectum ad Rostra in columna posuit. quod quoniam ad clima Siciliae descriptum ad horas Romae non conueniret, L. Philippus censor aliud iuxta constituit . . .

(Cens. *De die natali* 23)

There is in fact nothing implausible in the tradition that a dial should have been set up at Rome as early as 294 B.C., for this is precisely the period in which the use of sun-reckoners and the seasonal hour-system was spreading through the *oecumene*. But let us accept for the sake of the argument that the first dial at Rome was indeed the one brought from Catina. Varro and Pliny the arm-chair scientists comment that its lines did not agree with the hours, *and yet* the Romans obeyed it for ninety-nine years. Clearly the Roman reader is invited to smile at

[17] See G. Bilfinger, *Die antike Stundenangaben* (Stuttgart, 1888), pp. 56–8 for later evidence for horn-blowing to mark the principal hours.

his unsophisticated ancestors. This criticism is supercilious and invalid. If the dial was aligned truly in the meridian plane, it would tell noon precisely every day of the year; and for the hours near to noon the lateral displacement of the hour-lines which is entailed by a move from Catina (lat. 37° 31′) to Rome (lat. 41° 53′) is so slight that the chisel could hardly express it accurately. Gibbs has calculated that the greatest error of a hemispherical dial (as this may safely be supposed to have been) cut for Catina and set at Rome would be very slight;[18] a midsummer hour at Catina is 73.26 minutes; at Rome 75.68 minutes. On the other hand, it would be very clear that the transverse lines marking the summer solstice, the equinox, and the winter solstice would be wrong. As Gibbs points out, the shadow of a Catina-dial would cross the winter-solstice-line twice at Rome, about a month before and a month after midwinter, and would never reach the summer-solstice-line.

The valid criticism which Pliny might have made is then not that the Catina-dial was an unsatisfactory timepiece, but that it was seriously wrong for the seasons at Rome. Even this could have been remedied by simply tipping the dial 4° to take account of the difference in latitude. But it seems unlikely that the pontifices should have worried about the calendaric function of the sundial, which was used simply as a day-clock. A huge error of nearly four months had been allowed to accumulate in the civil calendar by the late 190s, the effect of which was to cause the month *martius* to fall in late autumn. This had come about through the omission over a period of the biennial intercalations required by the civil year of 355 days to keep it in line with the solar year; the restoration of regular intercalation in the early 180s caused the error gradually to diminish, but it was still as much as six weeks at the beginning of Terence's career (167 B.C.). Thus throughout Plautus' career, the civil calendar was seriously 'fast' with respect to the sun.[19]

Even with an *accensus* proclaiming the time from the forum, it is surely incredible that the Catina-dial should have been the only one at Rome for nearly a century, as Salmasius and Ritschl suppose. This is not in fact what Pliny says anyway: he says that the Romans 'obeyed' it, which is consistent with the interpretation suggested above, that they used its layout as a standard model. That Plautus and his audiences were quite familiar with sundials and seasonal hours is proved by *Pseud.* 1303 f.:

> SIM. credo equidem potesse te scelus
> Massici montis uberrimos quattuor
> fructus ebibere in hora una. PS. hiberna . . . addito

In this passage of boisterous *canticum* Plautus is certainly composing freely; he assumes that the audience knows what is implied by a 'winter hour', knowledge of which could only come from familiarity with seasonal hours and therefore sundials; and, what is even more significant, though less striking, he uses the expression 'in an hour' just as we might. Evidently such expressions were common parlance by the late 190s B.C.; and this proves that sundials must have been well established at Rome, for the concept of 'an hour' as a rough average unit corresponding to an equinoctial hour could not otherwise have developed. The loan must have been taken along with the apparatus some time early in the third

[18] See S.L. Gibbs, *Greek and Roman Sundials* (New Haven and London, 1974), p. 96 n. 25.

[19] See P. S. Derow, 'The Roman Calendar, 190–168 B.C.', *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 345–56.

century B.C. It is only in Latin, never in Greek, that one finds such expressions in everyday contexts; in Greece, the word ὥρα never came to be used in expressions 'I'll see you in an hour' or 'I saw him an hour ago'.[20] Its basic sense 'season' (long or short) survived too strongly; it is only in scientific contexts that we find the word used with ordinal numerals to denote specifically equinoctial hours.

The welcome which we are told was given to Marcius Philippus' new standard dial in 164 B.C. was presumably an accolade not for its better-drawn hour-lines (since they will not have made any particularly noticeable difference), but its accurate day-lines. For in the 150s it could be seen that at last the civil calendar would soon achieve a reasonable correlation with the solar year, and, to keep it right, it was desirable to have accurate fixings of the solstices and equinoxes. The water clock set up by Scipio Nasica Corculum (cf. Varro *L. L.* 6. 4) at the next *lustrum* was, according to Pliny's own reporting of Varro, an *equinoctial* clock, and therefore it did not tell the seasonal hours and was of no relevance to problems of everyday time-measurement, even though Pliny seems to think it was. Enough has been said to show that Pliny has not thought very closely in this chapter, and that it certainly provides no basis for theories as to when and by whom the *Boeotia* was written. All that can be said is that sundials were becoming increasingly familiar at Rome in the third century B.C., that the belief that there was only one sundial at Rome during the Plautine era is intrinsically absurd and probably a misreading of Pliny, and that since in a comedy 'none' can quite easily mean 'not many' and 'lots' can mean 'some more', our *Boeotia*-passage would make good sense in Plautinopolis (which is not simply the same as Rome) at any time during the age of Roman Comedy.

EXCURSUS: THE TEXT AND TRAIN OF THOUGHT OF ALCIPHRON'S LETTER

He who subscribes to the young Lambecius' description of Alciphron's letter as *elegans* (see above, p. 316) is a complaisant critic. The scene having been set in the first sentence, the rest of the speech—for that is really what it is—amounts to a thinly disguised piece of internal deliberation; Lopadecthambus, 'Plattermad', the addressee of the 'letter', really represents the *miser Catulle* of Cat. 8, the ὦ θῦμε of a tragic soliloquy such as Medea's, or the self-address of a distressed Menandrian lover; Hektodioktes, 'Noonchaser', is a formation suggested by σκιωθήρης 'shadow-hunter', i.e. 'sundial'. The particular species of deliberative speech to which the rhetoric of the 'letter' belongs and by which we are to interpret its train of thought is represented in Comedy by, for example, Plautus, *Epid.* 81 ff., *Mil.* 200 ff., *Pseud.* 394 ff., Ter. *H. T.* 668 ff., and probably Anon. *P. Antinoop.* 55 fr. (a), all soul-searchings which end in ἀπορία. The basic idea is not a happy one; it is pointless rather than witty to use the letter-form, given that it is less than half an hour to lunchtime anyway (ὁ γνώμων οὔπω σκιάζει

[20] Ter. *Ph.* 514 'unam praeterea horam ne oppertus sies' cannot be a literal translation; cf. Cato *Agr.* 156. 4 'deambulet horas IIII', Quadrigarius *Hist.* fr. 51, Lucilius 472 M 'puncto uno . . . horae inuasit'. Whatever Pollux is attesting for Menander at *Onom.* 1. 71 (is it σκιάδεων?) it is not the scientists' word ἠμιώριον which passes as Menander fr. 850 and has been cited by E. J. Bickermann (*Chronology of the Ancient World* (London, 1968), p. 12) along with other evidence which if genuine attests not to the seasonal hour system in late-fourth-century Greece but to equinoctial reckonings.

τὴν ἕκτην), and the total effect is enfeebled by our awareness that Alciphron is really more interested with how Hektodioktes uses his Attic than with what he says, an impression which is only strengthened by a comparison with the forthright if gaudy Latin speech.

However, the composition is not quite so feeble as it appears in the vulgate text, which is at fault in three places—the bold excision of *ἀπάγξασθαι* and of *καὶ* in the second sentence, and in the reading *ἔσται τὸ βούλευμα Παλαμήδειον*. The sense of the text as printed by Schepers is as follows:

'The shadow of the pointer has not yet reached noon, and I am in danger of withering away, goaded by hunger. Well, time for a plan from you, Lopadecthambus, or rather a rope and beam (deleting *ἀπάγξασθαι*); for if we either completely overturn (*εἰ γὰρ ἤ*) the pillar supporting this wretched hour-watcher, or turn the pointer where it will be able to mark off the hours more quickly, the idea will be Palamedean; I am now so dry and parched with hunger. Moreover Theochares does not take to his couch before his slave comes running to tell him that it is high noon. We therefore need such a scheme as will be able to outwit and surprise Theochares' regular habits. For, brought up under the eye of a grave and beetle-browed tutor, he lacks any youthful sense of fun, and like some Laches or Apolexis, he is dry in his ways and does not permit his stomach its fill before the proper time'.

This is deficient in rhetorical and logical sense. The reasoning behind the very bold deletion of *ἀπάγξασθαι* is this: the rope and beam must exclusively be intended for that Palamedean idea, the overthrow of the sundial. This is subject to a number of serious objections:

(a) The interpolator of *ἀπάγξασθαι* must have been a dreadful fool not to realize the purpose of the beam and rope, and we ought not lightly to postulate dreadful fools. The word-order is significant; *ἀπάγξασθαι* is a gloomy joke *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* and should be printed with a dash, as above (p. 309).

(b) If either or both the ploys which Hektodioktes mentions are Palamedean, i.e. brilliant (the rope-and-beam idea is merely violent), what is the point of the apologetic phrase 'I am now so withered with hunger', immediately after the triumphant allusion to Palamedes? And why go on writing at all?

(c) The reflection that Theochares relies on his servant to be told when it is lunchtime is an admission that destroying the sundial can do no possible good, and that the more subtle notion of bending the pointer on *this* dial will not do either, since there are lots of sundials; they must think of some way of deceiving the servant.

(d) On a point of basic Greek grammar, *τοιούτου σκέμματος ὃ δυνήσεται . . .* cannot refer back to some idea already mentioned; that would be *τοῦ τοιούτου σκέμματος, ὃ δυνήσεται . . .* The Greek says not 'We therefore need some such idea (as those mentioned) which will outwit Theochares' regularity', but 'We therefore need the kind of idea that will . . .', and this makes it quite clear that the so-called Palamedean ideas mentioned earlier have been cited only to be rejected as no good. The Loeb-translator gets this wrong.

These difficulties are removed, and sense restored, if we read *⟨οὐκ⟩ ἔσται τὸ βούλευμα Παλαμήδειον* or *ἔσται τὸ βούλευμ' ἀπαλαμήδειον*; for thus the train of thought will run: '. . . Time, Lopadecthambus, for a plan, or rather a beam and rope—to hang ourselves; for even if (*'εἰ γὰρ καὶ . . .*) we overturn this whole sundial, column and all, or if we bend the pointer to mark the hours

more quickly, the idea will not be Palamedean' (or 'will be un-Palamedean'), 'so shrivelled and parched I am with hunger' (implying this is why he is unable to come up with anything better). 'Moreover, Theochares doesn't take lunch until his servant runs in to tell him it's mid-day; so we need the kind of a plan which will craftily get round Master Theochares' regularity . . .': so the letter ends, as it should, in ἀπορία after the rejection of two inadequate suggestions.[21]

University of St. Andrews A. S. GRATWICK

[21] I should like to thank several scholars who have read earlier drafts of this paper for their criticisms and suggestions, and in particular Professor R. M. Ogilvie, who originally drew my attention to Sharon L. Gibbs's *Greek and Roman Sundials.*