'half of Konnos' brain', and that this was equivalent to 'something worthless' because Konnos was, or was considered, an imbecile.

There is adequate evidence that in fifth- and fourth-century Greece not only philosophers and medical men but also ordinary people regarded the brain as the seat of the intellect. Strepsiades, affecting to believe that one of his creditors has gone out of his mind after a chariot accident, says to him τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ὥσπερ σεσεῖσθαί μοι δοκεῖς (Ar. *Clouds* 1276). Socrates, picturing himself being upbraided by an imaginary interrogator for not giving a proper general definition of τὸ καλόν, envisages this man saying to him οὐδέν σοι μᾶλλον γεγωνεῖν δύναμαι ἢ εἴ μοι παρεκάθησο λίθος, καὶ οὗτος μυλίας, μήτε ὦτα μήτε ἐγκέφαλον ἔχων (Pl. *Hipp. Ma.* 292d) – clearly a popular rather than a philosophical manner of speaking. Hegesippos tells the Athenians that they should liquidate all pro-Macedonians in their midst εἴπερ ὑμεῖς τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἐν τοῖς κροτάφοις καὶ μὴ ἐν ταῖς πτέρναις καταπεπατημένον φορεῖτε ([Dem.] 7.54; Platnauer suspects, probably rightly, that Ar. *Peace* 669 ὁ νοῦς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἦν τότ' ἐν τοῖς σκύτεσιν is a variant on the same idea). It is not therefore surprising to find a proverbial expression presupposing that lack of brain equals lack of intellect.

And lack of intellect is independently attested for Konnos: κοννόφροσιν meant ἄφροσιν (*com. adesp.* 93). There is no reason why this Konnos, who became a byword for stupidity, should not be identical with the musician Konnos son of Metrobios who is supposed to have taught Socrates the kithara (Pl. *Euthyd.* 272c, 295d; *Menex.* 235e), who gave his name to a play by Ameipsias in which Socrates appeared, and who was made fun of by Kratinos fr. 317 and Ar. *Knights* 534. The name is not a common one; and a man who had won many crowns in Olympic and other musical competitions (schol. *Knights* 534) and yet could not make himself a decent living (ibid.) might well be thought stupid or feckless.

And now we can come back to Euphronios. He is reported to have said that the phrase on which he was commenting originated from the fact that Konnos was ἠδύς. He was right; for by ἠδύς he meant 'simple, "soft in the head"' (cf. Pl. *Euthyd.* 300a, *Gorg.* 491e; Men. *Sam.* 412; so also γλυκύς Pl. *Hipp. Ma.* 288b). Konnos was the most extreme contemporary example we know of a type of individual that Socrates found to be distressingly common: the expert in one field who has no understanding of any other aspect of life (Pl. *Apol.* 22c–e).

University of Nottingham ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

ARISTOPHANES, *BIRDS* 13–18[1]

ΕΥΕΛΠΙΔΗΣ.
ἦ δεινὰ νὼ δέδρακεν οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων,
ὁ πινακοπώλης Φιλοκράτης μελαγχολῶν,
ὃς τώδ' ἔφασκε νῷν φράσειν τὸν Τηρέα,
καὶ ἀπέδοτο τὸν μὲν Θαρραλείδου τουτονὶ 15
κολοιὸν ὀβολοῦ, τηνδεδὶ τριωβόλου. 17

τὸν ἔποφ', ὃς ὄρνις ἐγένετ' ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων. 16

So van Leeuwen prints the lines, following Cobet and Meineke in athetizing 16. Nor is it difficult to find grounds for the exclusion; τὸν ἔποφ' is (virtually) repeated at 47;

[1] I am indebted to Mr G. W. Bond for much constructive comment on this note.

the following three words smell of the scholiast; the last three resemble the end of 13. The line taken as a whole seems to play little if any role, and indeed to lack meaning, even if line 47 is some way away and it is a little odd that the three separate elements meld into a perfectly acceptable comic trimeter (but compare *Wasps* 1293). Conjectures are not lacking for the replacement of ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων by something which gives more sense; Köchly's ἄνθρωπος ποτ' ὤν may be taken as typical in both meaning and style.

But it may be possible, with the help of a scholiast, to restore sense and point to the line without changing a letter; and if the joke revealed turns out to be a poor one, let us at least remember that the play has barely started, and not all Aristophanes' jokes were funny. The scholiast on the Ravennas (amid other conjectures) says τινὲς δὲ στίζουσιν εἰς τὸ ἐγένετο meaning, as he goes on to say, that the last three words of 16 are to be taken with what follows, despite the position of καί.

Hardly likely, yet here may lie a germ of the truth. Suppose that the missing punctuation at ἐγένετ' is a dicolon, and let the last three words be an interjection by Peisetairos,[2] thus:

Euelpides ...τὸν Τηρέα
τὸν ἔποφ', ὃς ὄρνις ἐγένετ'—
Peisetairos ἐκ τῶν 'Ορνεῶν;
Euelpides καὶ ἀπέδοτο κτλ.

On this reading, the words ὃς ὄρνις ἐγένετ' are an innocuous lead in to a reasonably topical punning interruption by Peisetairos, which the sensitive Athenian audience would undoubtedly have picked up via the accentuation; cf. Ar. *Frogs* 304 and the scholiast on Eur. *Orestes* 279. Orneae, a smallish place in the Argolid[3] (Pausanias 2. 25. 5–6), had been in the news. It was the scene of a minor Athenian success in the winter of 416/15 B.C. – or a little more than a year before the production of *Birds* at the City Dionysia of 414 B.C. Orneae has an undisputed reference later in the play, at 399 (ἀποθανεῖν ἐν 'Ορνεαῖς), nor need we be worried, as was Merry,[4] by the presence of the article in one line and its absence in another: by a happy coincidence Thucydides (6. 7. 2) has both ἐν 'Ορνεαῖς and ἐκ τῶν 'Ορνεῶν in the course of the same sentence. The joke, if such it could be called, would have no point beyond its topicality; as these words are written, it occurs that a modern version might have, with as much or as little relevance:

Euelpides ...introduce us to Terry Falcon.
Peisetairos Ah! From the Falklands?

For a good example of an interrogative interjection in the middle of a line, see Ar. *Frogs* 800, where Xanthias interrupts Aiakos; while (as Mr G. W. Bond observes) interrogative repetition is a common device of Aristophanes, with numerous instances in *Birds* alone (e.g. 277, 299, 300, 467, 470, 500, 608, 974, 997, 1439, 1529, 1691), though it should be observed that, of the questions in these examples, only that at 500 is ignored by the interlocutor, as, on my theory, is the case here. Perhaps this is a needless remedy to save a line which should be allowed to vanish back into the mind of an interpolator; but it has the merit (as I argue) of restoring sense and point to the

[2] As I believe the name should be written; cf. P. Von der Mühll in *Gnomon* 4 (1928), 624, on the Triballian's ναβαισατρεῦ at 1615, partly anticipated by L. Bayard in *Revue de Philologie* 44 (1920), 30.

[3] For further information on the location of Orneae, see A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* IV (Oxford, 1970), 107–10; on the fighting there, see ibid. 222.

[4] W. W. Merry (ed.), *The Birds* (Clarendon Press, 1889), ad loc.

paradosis for the trifling cost of two dots; an easier corruption can hardly be imagined.[5] And the only other even vaguely funny line up to this admittedly early point has been another topical reference, again from Peisetairos, to Exekestides. Finally, if one were to delete 16, does not the reference to Tereus become decidedly bald and uninformative? Though this, admittedly, is very far from being decisive, given Aristophanes' penchant for keeping his audience under-informed.

Pembroke College, Oxford COLIN LEACH

[5] For the ease with which such mistakes could arise, see J. C. B. Lowe, 'The manuscript evidence for changes of speaker in Aristophanes', *BICS* 9 (1962), 27–42.

ANTIPATER CHALDAEUS

In a recent publication of four new inscriptions from Larisa in Thessaly, Kostas Gallis has revealed the helpful presence of a Syrian astrologer in that area of Greece toward the middle of the second century B.C. (or a little later). In honouring this man the Larisaeans identify him, in one of the new texts, as *Ἀντίπατρος Ἀντιπάτρου Ἱεροπολίτης τῆς Σελευκίδος, πεπολιτογραφημένος* [δὲ] *ἐν Ὁμολίῳ ὑπάρχων Χαλδαῖος ἀστρονόμος, ἐνδημῶν τῇ πόλει ἡμῶν ἀπὸ χρόνων*.[1] The Chaldaean astrologer Antipater is accordingly a native of Syrian Hierapolis who acquired the citizenship of Homolion, in the area of Thessalian Magnesia.[2] He evidently spent considerable time in Larisa.

This *Antipater Chaldaeus* must be the very man who appears in the ninth book of Vitruvius' *De architectura* as an astrologer in the tradition of the great Berosus. In his account of those who came *ab ipsa natione Chaldaeorum* Vitruvius declares *primusque Berosus in insula et civitate Coo consedit, ibique aperuit disciplinam, postea †studens† Antipater, iterumque Achinapolus, qui etiam non e nascentia sed ex conceptione genethlialogiae rationes explicatas reliquit*.[3] Rose long ago emended *postea studens* to *post ei studens*, presumably to avoid an intolerable absolute use of *studeo*. *Ei* would resume *disciplina*,[4] but then Antipater would be left without *aperuit disciplinam* as the understood verb. Perhaps the absolute *studens* crept in late from a gloss. Fortunately this crux does not affect the identification proposed here.

The Antipater in Vitruvius can now be seen to have been a Syrian of the second century B.C., who practised the prophetic arts in Thessaly. Chaldaean divination was nothing new to the Greek world of Asia Minor and Greece itself. Attalus I of Pergamum had been much under the sway of a *Χαλδαῖος μάντις*, Sudines;[5] and the Athenians had honoured Berosus with a golden-tongued statue *ob divinas praedictiones*.[6]

Institute for Advanced Study G. W. BOWERSOCK
Princeton, New Jersey

[1] K. Gallis, *Ἀρχ. Ἀνάλεκτα ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν* 13, fasc. 2 (1981), 250–1.
[2] On *ἡ Σελευκίς*, cf. Strabo, 749–53; for *Ὁμόλιον* (or *Ὁμόλη*), Strabo, 443.
[3] Vitruv. *De arch.* 9. 6. 2.
[4] F. H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (1954), 14 mistakenly assumes that Vitruvius designates Antipater and Achinapolus as students of Berosus and therefore of third-century date. Since Cramer's text of Vitruvius (Rose) read *ei studens*, he seems to have misconstrued *ei*.
[5] Polyaen. *Strat.* 4. 20. Cf. Strabo, 739. [6] Pliny, *HN* 7. 37, 123.