was still pointed out. It is noteworthy that West has restored the inscription after this to read \dot{o} $\delta \dot{e}$ [Ποσειδών τιμάται ώς $\ddot{\iota}$]ππιος \dot{e} ντ[$\alpha \dot{\nu}$ θα].

The University of St. Andrews

R. JANKO

9 Iambi et Elegi Graeci ad loc. Bacchylides' use of ἴππως is a pun of sorts, but should not be faulted for this reason, especially as it enhances the clarity of the picture presented so admirably. For wordplay indulged for its own sake, contrast βόαρέ τ"Ερίβοια (14), where Bacchylides puns on the name, as if derived from βοάω not βοῦς. Compare Pindar's ἐριβόας (fr. 75. 10B) and especially Bacchylides 13.102 ff. Ἐριβοίας παίδ' ὑπέρθυμον βοάσω in his

only other mention of this redoubtable lady. I now find the same point in Führer, art. cit., p. 196, with the added reinforcement that he reads βdao ' $E\rho i\beta oia$. His assumption of several cases of Responsionsfreibeit in order to defend the papyrus text merits further discussion, but I have not followed his text. I would like to thank Professor West for knowledge of Führer's work, and Dr. C. Carey for helpful advice and encouragement.

SIMULATOR SIMIUS

Claudian compares Eutropius in his consular robes to a monkey, dressed in silk to amuse dinner guests, but with his buttocks bare (Eutr. 1.300–8). The situation has not failed to attract the notice of scholars. Christiansen¹ and Fargues² called attention to the striking and original use of the monkey-simile (though the latter notes that the monkey itself is a banal subject for similes, and compares Juvenal 10.194). Alan Cameron³ has suggested that the present example is drawn from life: 'Who can doubt that this was a typical dinner divertissement in the elegant circles of Claudian's day—or at least one Claudian himself had witnessed?' He cites E. R. Curtius's assertion⁴ that metaphorical apes are uncommon in ancient literature (as opposed to medieval); that may be relatively true, but when Demosthenes is entitled to address his opponent as αὐτοτραγικὸς πίθηκος, similar licence in subsequent invective is unlimited.

In this particular case there are at least three further literary precedents. Lucian cites two different versions of the same story. In Piscator 36 he compares false philosophers, his favourite butt, to apes at an Egyptian court. They have been taught to dance ἀλουργίδας ἀμπεχόμενα; but a spectator throws nuts, so that they immediately tear up their pretentious costumes (and so emerge naked), in order to indulge their natural animal greed. The same tale reappears with different details and only one monkey in Apol. 5. Lucian also knows a proverb based on the same material: πίθηκος γὰρ ὁ πίθηκος . . . κὰν χρύσεα ἔχη σύμβολα (Adv. Ind. 4). There were others: Crusius compared Apostolios 1332 (Leutsch—Schneidewin ii. 614): πίθηκος ἐν πορφύρα οἱ φαῦλοι κὰν καλοῖς περιβληθώσιν διαφαίνονται πονηροί. The anecdote form was in current use in the fourth century: there is a third narrative version in Gregory of Nyssa (De Professione

¹ The Use of Images by Claudius Claudianus (The Hague, 1969), p. 93.

² Commentary on in Eutropium (Paris 1933), ad 303 (cf. id., Claudien, études sur sa poésie (Paris, 1933), p. 323).

³ Claudian, Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius (Oxford, 1970), p. 300.

⁴ Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter (Bern, 1948), pp. 522 f.

⁵ Or. 18.242.

⁶ O. Crusius, *RhM* 49 (1894), 299-308 (with numerous tentative connections with other proverbial material). Also J. Bompaire, *Lucien écrivain* (Paris, 1958), p. 461 and n. 6.

Christiana, Migne, PG 46, 240C-241A). With all three versions side by side it is clear how adaptable the anecdote could be: Lucian himself makes the host an Egyptian king first time round (Pisc. ibid.); but when addressing a specific Roman patron he substitutes Cleopatra (Apol. 5). For Gregory's Christian audience an Alexandrian θαυματοποιός is pressed into service. Claudian can be allowed a similar freedom in adapting the tradition. In the present case the satirist's victim is compared to a monkey exposing his rear end at a symposium (ludibrium mensis 307). Now the sexual aberrations of Eutropius have already taken up the best part of 300 lines; ⁷ since the victim is a eunuch, this gesture is the most obvious way to sustain the innuendo: just as the elegantly dressed monkey presents his posterior, so by implication Eutropius, for all his consular finery, still stands exposed as a licentious catamite. Nor is this the first instance of the monkey in a sexual role. Clement of Alexandria (Paed. iii.2.5) proclaims that the prostitute τότε άληθινού θηρίον έλεγχθήσεται ψιμυθίω πίθηκος.

There is even a precedent for bare bottoms at court (or worse). In Phaedrus 4.19 another animal makes a fool of itself in high places. A group of dogs appears at the lion's court on an embassy. In case of accidents they have stuffed their bottoms with spices, and only make a worse mess as a result. This obscenity is in keeping with the element of folklore so persistent in literary fable. There is also one or more distinguished literary precedents for the monkey's bottom. Schol. Ar. Ach. 120 attributes the original of $\tau o \dot{\eta} \nu \delta \epsilon \delta$, $\dot{\omega} \pi i \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon$, $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi v \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu$ to Archilochus. Now the latter's apes are notoriously elusive; but this may well be an allusion to the material referred to by Aelius Aristides' 'Αρχιλόχου $\pi i\theta \eta \kappa o \iota ... \delta \dot{\nu} o \mu o \rho \phi \dot{\alpha} \varsigma \, \dot{\epsilon} \chi o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \, (II.398D = Phot. Bibl. 437B) \cdot \tau \dot{\alpha} \, \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \, \dot{\epsilon} \, \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\omega}$ σεμνοί, τὰ δ' ἔνδον 'ἄλλος ἄν είδειη τις'.;

Within a rhetorical tradition fables and proverbial material turn out to be highly adaptable. There is at least one 'human' version of Lucian's monkeybusiness, where someone throws chips to distract small boys from their part in an orator's claque (Quint. 6. 1.47): if the monkey's bottom was not originally connected with the anecdote in Lucian, it was only a matter of time before these two clichés of invective came to be linked.

Claudian, then, need not have witnessed such an entertainment, nor need it have been common at fourth-century courts, though by its very nature neither possibility can ever be excluded. Nor can it be excluded that this is a local tradition: Lucian and Gregory set their three versions in Egypt. But Claudian had a routine rhetorical education; it seems just as likely that he came to know fables of this kind from his working of progymnasmata. Fable material is among the most elementary in the rhetorical curriculum: Hermogenes quotes an anecdote about monkeys to illustrate the most elementary kind of variation. 9 We should expect Claudian to be aware of this one: he could rest assured that any eyewitness account of such an incident had a respectable ancestry in rhetorical handbooks.

The University of Kent

⁷ For the innuendos, Cameron, op. cit.,

pp. 127 ff.

8 Fr. 187 West. For a useful collection of references see West, Iambi et Elegi Graeci i (Oxford, 1971), 71 f.; also S. Luria, Ph. N. F. 39 (1929), 1-21 (the latter with scarcely

convincing reconstruction of the Archilochian material).

GRAHAM ANDERSON

9 Progymnasmata, ed. H. Rabe (Teubner, 1913), pp. 2 f.; for the fable in sophistic education, see Bompaire, op. cit., pp. 450-2.