In his edition of the Lysistrata (Berlin, 1927), Wilamowitz suggested that the word was a compound of δ_S and $\sigma \acute{\alpha} \kappa o_S$. A. Ernout, BSL 41 (1940), 120–1 with n. 1, explained the form as a development from δ_S and the suffix $-\alpha \xi$; Ernout has been followed by J. Henderson, The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy (New Haven and London, 1975), p. 132 n. 131, and P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque 4. 1 (Paris, 1977) p. 1162. But whatever the word's derivation, I think Aristophanes intended a double pun on the word $\sigma \acute{\alpha} \kappa o_S$.

The neuter noun $\sigma\acute{a}\kappa os$ means 'shield'. The masculine noun $\sigma\acute{a}\kappa os$, properly 'a coarse hair-cloth' or 'sackcloth', is also used as a comic term for hair (Ar. Eccl. 502 with Schol.). The comic poet Plato puns on these two words when he has a character address the politician Epicrates as $\sigma a\kappa \epsilon \sigma \phi \acute{o} \rho \epsilon$ (122E. = Schol. Ar. Eccl. 71; cf. Plut. Pel. 30. 7, Harp. s. Epikrates). Epicrates, notably hirsute, was also apparently something of a warmonger. He is said to have taken Persian money to keep up the war with Sparta (Hell. Oxy. 7. 2, Paus. 3. 9. 8; cf. Pl. Com. 119E. = Ath. 6. 229 f.).

This double pun well suits the present passage. A reference to a weapon, especially a defensive weapon like a shield, is appropriate to the context – an account of Spartan women repelling their men. And Spartan men were notoriously heavily bearded (Ar. Vesp. 476, Lys. 1072, Plut. Phoc. 10. 1) and hairy in general (e.g. Hdt. 1. 82. 8, Ar. Av. 1281–2 with Schol., Xen. Lac. 11. 3, Plut. Lyc. 22. 1). We would expect Spartan women to have the same reputation, especially in view of the Athenians' own practice of depilating female genital hair (e.g. Ar. Thesm. 540–3, 590–1, Lys. 151, 825–8, Eccl. 12–13, Pl. Com. 174. 14–15E. = Ath. 10. 441e).

University of British Columbia

MARK GOLDEN

passage in mind. Perhaps he confused the two words; then we may suppose that Aristophanes coined $\upsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\xi$. But it is also possible that $\upsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\kappa$ ordinarily had two connotations, or that Aristophanes merely noticed its comic possibilities and decided to exploit them. I do not think this uncertainty affects my argument here: a gesture by the herald to one of the Spartan women's pubic area would make the reference of $\upsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\kappa\omega\nu$ clear.

F. Lasserre thought he saw ὕσσακος or ὕσσαξ in Archilochus fr. 48. 8 W. (= POxy. 2311 fr. 1 [a]): α_k^{τ} [δ'] ὑσσά[κ-. M. L. West is suitably sceptical.

XENOPHON AND PLATO

At *Meno* 95d-96a, Socrates is demonstrating to Meno that Theognis is confused regarding the teachability of virtue, this confusion being indicated by his saying in one place that virtue is teachable and in another that it is not. As to its not being teachable, Socrates quotes Theognis 436-8:

of a good father no bad son would come, obeying wise counsel. But through teaching $[\delta\iota\delta\acute{a}\sigma\kappa\omega\nu]$ you shall never make the bad man good.

As to its teachability, Socrates quotes Theognis 33–6:

and with [παρά] these [good men] drink and eat, and sit with them, and please them, who are a great force. For from the noble you shall be taught [διδάξεαι¹] noble things. While should you mix with the bad, you shall lose what mind you have.

Plato has altered the text of Theognis here, substituting $\pi a \rho \acute{a}$ for $\mu \epsilon \tau \acute{a}$ (33) and $\delta \iota \delta \acute{a} \xi \epsilon a \iota$ for $\mu a \theta \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon a \iota$ (35). The former substitution may be insignificant, but the

- 1 Cod. Vindobonensis 54: διδάξεται.
- ² Unless I am mistaken, $\mu \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \alpha \iota$ stands in all mss. of Theognis.

latter would appear, given the context of *Meno*, to be a deliberate misquotation. The distinction may be a subtle one, but 'teachability' is not the same as 'learnability',³ and Socrates is here concerned with demonstrating confusion regarding precisely the *teachability* of virtue.

We find this substitution of $\delta \iota \delta \delta \xi \epsilon a \iota$ in only two other authors, Hermogenes⁴ and Xenophon. E. C. Marchant claims there are no 'trustworthy indications' that Xenophon relied on any of Plato's published works when writing the first two chapters of *Mem.* 1. He states: 'At I. ii. 20, indeed, Xenophon quotes in support of his arguments two passages from the poets that are in the *Meno* and *Protagoras* of Plato, but it would be absurd to suppose that he went to Plato for two commonplace passages that would be familiar to every educated Athenian.'5

In his quotation of Theognis 35–6 at Mem. 1. 2. 20, Xenophon substitutes $\delta\iota\delta\acute{a}\xi\epsilon\alpha\iota$. He does so again at Symp. 2. 4. If I am correct in claiming that Plato is misquoting Theognis 35, whether deliberately (as it seems to me) or from faulty memory, 6 given that all our Theognis mss. read $\mu\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota$, Xenophon's substitution of $\delta\iota\delta\acute{a}\xi\epsilon\alpha\iota$ would suggest that here, at least, he did indeed go to Plato. This possibility perhaps raises the question of the extent to which Theognis was employed in Athens as a 'text' at the primary level. (Or perhaps we ought only to question the reliability of Xenophon's memory – but then also the reliability of his memories of Socrates.) It also bears upon the discrepancies between Xenophon's and Plato's accounts of Socrates, which become all the more significant when Xenophon is regarded as having relied even here upon one of Plato's 'Socratic' works.

University of Guelph

J. MITSCHERLING

- ³ But see section 6 of the $\Delta\iota\sigma\sigma$ 0ì $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\sigma$ 0, 'Concerning $\sigma\sigma\acute{\phi}(as)$ and $\mathring{a}\rho\epsilon\tau\hat{a}s$ 5, whether they are teachable', Diels-Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th ed. (Berlin, 1964), p. 414.
- ⁴ Rhet. Gr. 2, 593 W. So cod. Par. 1983 (following Plato?). Clem. Strom. 5. 52. 4 retains $\mu a\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon a\iota$.
 - ⁵ E. C. Marchant, tr., Xenophon, Memorabilia and Oeconomicus (London, 1923), p. x.
- ⁶ See T. Hudson-Williams' response to Bergk with regard to Theognis 429 and *Meno* 95, *The Elegies of Theognis* (London, 1910), p. 260.
- ⁷ See Dorothea Wender's discussion of such use of Theognis, *Hesiod and Theognis* (Penguin, 1976), pp. 90–1.

NOTES ON CALLIMACHUS, HECALE

```
(a) fr. 238 Pfeiffer, 10-14
                                                       ]..., \mu \in \nu. \phi. . [
                                                       ]κέλευε δὲ μήποτ' ἐλέγξα[ι
                                                       ]v\epsilon \cdot \eta \delta' \dot{v}\pi\dot{o} \pi\dot{a}v\tau ac \dot{a}\dot{\epsilon}\theta\lambda ov[c]
                                                       ] cόον δέ κεν α[ὖ]θι δέχοιο
                                                       ]\hat{\phi}...'...\epsilon \chi..\acute{\alpha}...[
                                                        ] αρὴν κεκύθεςθε κ .[
                                                        ]. . . [ . ]΄. . . \dot{\nu}ξ . [ ]ε δ' \dot{\eta}\nu τόδε χειραεςα[
                                                        ] \tau as \dot{a}\kappa\dot{\eta}\nu \ddot{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon \tau\dot{\eta} \delta\epsilon . [
                                                        ] ν. ου αίςυμνητις[
10
                              †η τ' ἄκρηςθ† ἵΙνα Γλαυκώπιον ἵζειι
                                                       ]εν ἀεὶ περὶ πότνια γα[
                                                        ]ς ὅθι πτολέμοιό μ' ἐπ·[
                                                            1.[
                                                                        ľ
```