

dramatic and literary qualities. Andromache's pathetic cry at 1109–10 – *quis tuos artus teget?* – is clearly meant to echo her previous words at 969–71:

nos, Hecuba, nos, nos, Hecuba, lugendae sumus,
quas mota classis huc et huc sparsas feret;
hanc cara tellus sedibus patriis *teget*.

The repeated verb *teget* effectively underlines the thematic connections and dramatic contrasts between the two scenes: both develop the motif of solace in burial; yet whereas Andromache's speech to Hecuba (969–71) furnishes the aged queen some respite from grief, her second outburst (1109–10) is striking for its irony and intense pathos. Unlike Hecuba, Andromache can derive no comfort from knowledge that her son will lie covered in his native soil.

Ohio State University

FRANK T. COULSON

A METRICAL QUOTATION IN JULIAN'S *SYMPOSIUM*

ἐπειδὴ δίδωσιν ὁ θεὸς παίζειν (ἔστι γὰρ Κρονία), γελοῖον δὲ οὐδὲν οὐδὲ περπνὸν οἶδα ἐγώ, τὸ μὴ καταγέλαστα φράσαι φροντίδος ἔοικεν εἶναι ἄξιον, ὦ φιλότῃς. (306a)

So the modern editions print the opening words of the work more popularly known as the *Caesares*.¹ The *Symposium* begins with what I consider to be a playful encounter between the narrator and his interlocutor, in which the latter's expectations of seriousness in the myth which is to follow are frustrated. This playfulness has not been appreciated by Julian's commentators. I suggest that we have here a concealed trimeter which figures largely in the dynamics of this dialogue (the word *δέ* is to be retained in Julian's text as necessary connective tissue):

γελοῖον οὐδὲν οὐδὲ περπνὸν οἶδ' ἐγώ.

A number of arguments must be advanced to make this attractive suggestion plausible, for language and diction are not exclusively poetic, and there is always a possibility that such a collocation of words is a trimeter only by accident.² Surprisingly, the adjectives *γελοῖος* and *περπνός*, common enough by themselves, I do not find paired elsewhere.³ The juxtaposition of the roots of these words is ultimately traceable to Homer (*Od.* 21.106: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ *γελῶ* καὶ *τέρπομαι* ἄφρονι θυμῷ);⁴ this

¹ Pétau's edition (Paris, 1630) prints οἶδ', but does not distinguish a quotation.

² The use of οὐδὲν οὐδέ to connect adjectives may be abundantly paralleled in Plutarch: *Alc.* 20.8, βέβαιον οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἰσχυρόν; *Cim.* 19.4, λαμπρόν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ μέγα; *Cat. Mi.* 53.3, ὑγιές οὐδὲν οὐδὲ δίκαιον; *De curiositate* 521b, σπουδαῖον οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἐπιτερπές; but Plutarch also preserves a quotation from Philemon's ὁ Ἐπιδικαζόμενος (F 23 Kock), *quomodo adulescentes* 35d: ἦδιον οὐδὲν οὐδὲ μουσικώτερον | ἔστ' ἢ δύνασθαι λοιδορούμενον φέρειν. Cf. also Euripides, *Tr.* 733: οὐδ' αἰσχρόν οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἐπίφθονόν σε δρᾶν.

³ There are instances of the close conjunction of the roots *γελ and *τερπ, some in a symposiac context, some not. Most remarkable is a papyrus of a hymn to Aphrodite (Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, epica adespota 9, col. III, line 1): ἀστ[ρ]άπτουσα γελᾷ τ[ε]ρπνοῖσι προσώποις. For symposiac parallels, cf. Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.* 622b, συμποσίου δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀστεῖον ἄθλον ἂν καὶ γέρας προθέῃ τῷ παιδιᾷ ἀνύβριστον εἰσηγησαμένῳ καὶ *τέρψιν* ὠφέλιμον καὶ *γέλῳ* καὶ μῶμον μὴδ' ὕβρειν ἀλλὰ χάριτος καὶ φιλοφροσύνης ἑταῖρον; Lucian, *Symp.* 18, διαλιπόντων δὲ ὀλίγον, ὥσπερ εἰώθασι, τῶν παρακομιζόντων τὰ ὄψα μηχανώμενος Ἀρισταίνετος μὴδ' ἐκείνον *ἄτερπῇ* τὸν καιρὸν εἶναι μὴδὲ κεὶνὸν ἐκέλευσε τὸν *γελωτοποιόν* εἰσελθόντα εἰπεῖν τι ἢ πράξει *γελοῖον*, ὥς ἔτι μάλλον οἱ συμπόται διαχυθεῖν.

⁴ This verse is imitated by John Chrysostom, *Hom. in Matth.* 6.7.99 (MPG 57, p. 71), in a passage which condemns popular, comic, entertainments: ὅταν μὲν γὰρ βλάσφημόν τι εἴπωσιν ἢ αἰσχρόν οἱ μῖμοι τῶν γελοίων ἐκείνων, τότε πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνοητοτέρων *γελῶσι καὶ τέρπονται*, ὑπὲρ ὧν αὐτοὺς λιθάζειν ἐχρῆν, ὑπὲρ τούτων κροτούσιν, καὶ τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός διὰ τῆς ἡδονῆς ταύτης κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτὸν ἔλκοντες κεφαλῆς.

suggests that here we have another example of Homer reworked in later poetry. I think that a comic origin would be most likely for this fragment (γελοῖον is not a tragic word);⁵ it is not far removed in language, and may not be far removed in thought, from Menander, *Aspis* 117–21:⁶

οὗτος οὔτε συγγενή
οὔτε φίλον οἶδεν οὔδ' ἐν τῷ βίῳ
αἰσχροῦν πεφρόντικ' οὔδ' ἐν, ἀλλὰ βούλεται
ἔχειν ἅπαντα· τοῦτο γινώσκει μόνον·
καὶ ζῆι μονότροπος, γραῦν ἔχων διάκονον.

But I think that Latin comedy provides the best parallels to this phrase, and constitutes the best evidence that its origin is in comedy. The quotation contains the conventional vocabulary of comedy, and this is used by the narrator in an attempt to establish his story as an anti-comedy (for the thematic function of this in the *Symposium*, see below): cf. the prologue to Plautus, *Asinaria* 13–14, 'inest lepos ludusque in hac comoedia, / ridicula res est.' But, more important, it is in comedy that characters bewail their own lack of capacity to entertain: cf. Terence, *Eunuchus* 244–5, 'at ego infelix neque ridiculus esse neque plagas pati / possum'; Plautus, *Bacchides* 615–615a, '...inamabilis, inlepidus uiuo, / maleuolente ingenio natus'; *Captivi* 956–7, 'fui ego bellus, lepidus: bonu' uir numquam, neque frugi bonae, / neque ero umquam'; *Asinaria* 730: 'nec quid dicatis scire nec me qur ludatis possum.' Most interesting in terms of the argument of the *Symposium* itself is Terence, *Adelphoe* 944–5: 'etsi hoc mihi prauom ineptum absurdum atque alienum a uita mea / uidetur, si uos tanto opere istuc uolti', fiat.⁷

We may also argue from the habits of Julian himself. First, a poetic quotation at the beginning of an essay is in Julian's style. *To the Uneducated Cynics* 180d begins with a reference to a famous line from Euripides' *Medea* (ἄνω ποταμῶν; cf. *Medea* 410, ἄνω ποταμῶν ἱερῶν χωροῦσι παγαί); *To King Helios* 130b quotes Homer (*Il.* 17.447 = *Od.* 18.131: ὄσσα τε γαίαν ἐπι πνείει τε καὶ ἔρπει).⁸ More relevant is *To the Cynic Heracleios* 204a which begins with a reminiscence of Eupolis: ἡ πολλὰ γίνεται ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ· τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς κωμωδίας ἀκηκοῦσι μοι πρῶτον ἐπῆλθεν ἐκβοῇσαι.⁹ Certainly, the proposed quotation in the *Symposium* is not exactly parallel to these, which are either very famous or clearly distinguished as quotations; but I would say that the inclination to begin with a poetic quotation has been adapted to the demands of the comic dialogue of the introduction. As I will show below, much of the humour of the introduction turns on pointed quotations subtly introduced. Second, as the

⁵ The word is found twice in satyr plays: Aeschylus, *Dictyulci* (F 47a.813 Radt), and Sophocles, *Ichneutae* (F 314.369 Radt); and is once attributed to Euripides (F 492 Nauck, possibly from the *Melanippe Desmotis*, though papyrus finds argue against this; see T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* [London, 1967], p. 150). Naturally, given the popularity of Euripides as a source of quotation in Menippean satire generally and in the *Symposium* specifically (313c = *Phoen.* 119–20; 328d = F 417 Nauck; 331b = *Andr.* 693–4), it would satisfy expectations if this quotation were also from Euripides.

⁶ C. Austin, ed., *Menandri Aspis et Samia I, Textus (Cum Apparatu Critico) et Indices*, Kleine Texte 188a (Berlin, 1969).

⁷ Somewhat akin to this device of comedy is the poet's rejection of comic themes to turn to serious topics: cf. Archilochus F 215 West, καὶ μ' οὐτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει; Horace, *Epod.* 11.1–2, 'Petti, nihil me sicut antea iuuat / scribere uersiculos amore percussum graui.' But in these examples the poet claims only that his acknowledged comic gifts are now inappropriate.

⁸ *Misopogon* 337a–b begins with a series of references to, though not quotations from, Anacreon, Alcaeus, and Archilochus, as Julian ponders the proprieties of writing satire.

⁹ Eupolis F 391 Kassel-Austin: ἡ πολλὰ γ' ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ γίνεται μεταλλαγῇ | <τῶν πραγμάτων>· μένει δὲ χρῆμ' οὔδ' ἐν ταύτῳ ῥυθμῷ.

Symposium is a Menippean satire and contains verses both quoted and parodied, this quotation would be especially at home.

It is also a convention of Menippean satire that the narrator appear speaking in poetic quotation. The beginning of Lucian's *Necymantia* is instructive: Menippus, back from the Underworld, enters quoting trimeters from Euripides, and it helps to establish his comic character that he speaks in poetic tags.¹⁰ Again, it must be admitted that the case is not exactly parallel in the *Symposium*; the narrator does not speak entirely in verse, but works an otherwise unknown quotation into his prose. Yet true to the conventions of Menippean satire, the narrator is establishing himself as a wise fool, claiming no knowledge of the arts of comedy when in fact he is an adept (compare the introduction of the *Apocolocyntosis*, in which the narrator comically claims that he is objective, serious, and sober even as he produces his dreadful poetry). We can say then that Julian quotes from the poets, and from comic poets no longer extant, in the introductions to his various works; that the genre of the work makes such quotation in such a place appropriate; it is also important to note that Julian elsewhere is fond of working such quotations directly into his prose.¹¹

Such a quotation in Julian's text would constitute a poetic disclaimer of comic talent; this fits exactly the dynamics of the dialogue which introduces the *Symposium*. The topic is whether the narrator will tell a funny or an instructive story; the narrator plays with the interlocutor, who misunderstands the narrator's ironies and constantly expects the opposite of what the narrator intends.¹² This general interpretation of the introduction is confirmed, I think, by the interlocutor's final words, which introduce the central myth of the *Symposium* (307a):

τουτι μὲν οὖν ἤδη μυθικῶς ἄμα καὶ ῥητορικῶς ἐξείργασται σοι τὸ προοίμιον· ἀλλὰ μοι τὸν λόγον αὐτόν, ὁποῖός ποτέ ἐστιν, ἤδη διέελθε.

And this prologue of yours has already been tricked out in mythical and rhetorical colours! Come now, relate the story itself, whatever it is.

The prologue is a game of cat and mouse, played to a large extent around the texts of Plato and Aristotle.¹³ The opening sentence echoes the words with which Aristophanes prefaces his philosophical myth in Plato's *Symposium* (189b). Aristophanes also wishes to avoid the absurd (*καταγέλαστα*) while accepting the need for the comic (*γελοία*):

ἀλλὰ μὴ με φύλαττε, ὡς ἐγὼ φοβοῦμαι περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ῥηθήσεσθαι, οὐ τι μὴ γελοία εἶπω – τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ἂν κέρδος εἴη καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας μούσης ἐπιχώριον – ἀλλὰ μὴ καταγέλαστα.

¹⁰ In *Nec.* 1, Menippus quotes *H.F.* 523–4; *Hec.* 1–2; F 936 Nauck; F 149 Nauck; his last quotation is an altered version of *Od.* 11.164–5 (substituting ὦ φιλότῃς for μήτερ ἐμή). Menippus is clearly a comic character, dressed in Odysseus' hat and Hercules' lion skin, and carrying Orpheus' lyre (thus his success in returning from the Underworld); his amazed and impatient interlocutor demands that he stop speaking in verse: παῦσαι, μακάριε, τραγῳδῶν καὶ λέγε οὕτωςί πως ἀπλῶς καταβὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ἱαμβείων, τίς ἢ στολή;

¹¹ cf. D. Bartoňková, 'Prosimetrum, Smíšený Styl, V Dile Julianově', *SPFFBU* E 18–19 (1973–4), 225–40 (Czech, with Russian and German summaries). At 95c Julian quotes *Iliad* 2.356 omitting the word δέ to fit his own syntactical requirements: Ἀγαμέμνων δέ ὠρμητο τίσασθαι <δέ> Ἑλένης ὀρμημάτα τε στοναχάς τε, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς Τρῶας ἐστράτευε γυναῖκα μίαν ἐκδικεῖν ἐθέλων (Bartoňková, p. 227).

¹² The interlocutor of the *Symposium* is not to be confused with the neo-platonist Sal(l)ustius or Salutius (for the form of the name see G. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* [Cambridge, 1978], p. 125, who favours Salutius); this association has been refuted by B. Baldwin, 'The *Caesares* of Julian', *Klio* 60 (1978), 449–66, p. 452, and we need not worry about this characterization of the interlocutor as a straight-man in the *Symposium*.

¹³ The parallel passages discussed below are given in the apparatus of Lacombrade's Budé edition: *L'Empereur Julien, Oeuvres Complètes*, Tome II, 2e Partie (Paris, 1964).

The narrator's disingenuousness certainly intends to frustrate his interlocutor's requests; the narrator certainly does know about Aristophanes and comedy.¹⁴ His seeming rejection of Saturnalian joking leaves the interlocutor feeling that the narrator is dim-witted and old-fashioned (306a): εἶτα τίς οὕτω παχύς ἐστι καὶ ἀρχαῖος, ὦ Καίσαρ, ὥστε καὶ παίζειν πεφροντισμένα; ἐγὼ ὥμην τὴν παιδιὰν ἀνεσὶν τε εἶναι ψυχῆς καὶ ἀπαλλαγὴν τῶν φροντίδων. The interlocutor is quoting Aristotle here (*Eth. Nic.* 1150b17: ἡ γὰρ παιδιὰ ἀνεσὶς ἐστίν, εἴπερ ἀνάπαυσις) in order to make the narrator look foolish;¹⁵ the narrator will turn the tables on the interlocutor in just a few lines and himself quote from Aristotle to justify speaking in riddles (306b: ἐπεὶ δὲ χρὴ τῷ νόμῳ πείθεσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ, βούλει σοι ἐν παιδιᾷς μέρει μῦθον διεξέλω πολλὰ ἴσως ἔχοντα ἀκοῆς ἄξια; cf. *Eth. Nic.* 1128a19, ἐστὶ γάρ τινα πρέποντα τῷ τοιούτῳ λέγειν ἐν παιδιᾷς μέρει καὶ ἀκούειν, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἐλευθερίου παιδιὰ διαφέρει τῆς τοῦ ἀνδραποδώδους, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πεπαιδευμένου καὶ ἀπαιδευτοῦ). It is not just that Julian knows Aristotle, but that the characters in his dialogue know Aristotle. The poetic quotation that I propose we read at the introduction of this dialogue shows that the narrator is, from his first words, displaying a comic talent, as he exploits a comic poet in a sly attempt to disguise his desire to tell a funny story. This hardly exhausts the comic twists and turns of the prologue to the *Symposium*, but should be sufficient to illustrate how appropriate the poetic citation would be.

I suggest then that the introduction of Julian's *Symposium* contains an otherwise unknown dramatic trimeter, most likely from New Comedy, used to heighten a comic confrontation between a playful narrator and his slow-witted interlocutor.¹⁶

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

JOEL C. RELIHAN

¹⁴ Commentators take these words at face value as proclaiming that Julian has no talent for comedy and will therefore tell a serious story full of philosophical edification. See R. Pack, 'Notes on the *Caesares* of Julian', *TAPA* 77 (1946), 151–7, p. 154, Baldwin, art. cit. (n. 12), 449.

¹⁵ The interlocutor has in mind the context of the Aristotelian passage, in which fondness for amusement is a sign of weakness (1150b16–17: δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ παιδιώδης ἀκόλαστος εἶναι, ἐστὶ δὲ μαλακός). But is the narrator thinking of the passage before this, in which we are told that one can have sympathy for those who try hard to restrain their laughter but ultimately cannot (1150b8–12: ἀλλὰ συγγνωμικὸν εἰ ἀντιτείνων, ... καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ κατέχειν πειρώμενοι τὸν γέλωτα ἄβρόσιον ἐκκαγαλζουσιν, οἷον συνέπεσε Ξενοφάντῳ)?

¹⁶ I should like to thank my colleague David Sansone, and an anonymous reviewer of an earlier draft of this article, for their many helpful suggestions.

PROCOPIUS, JUSTINIAN AND THE *KATASKOPOI*

Among the accusations Procopius brings against Justinian in the *Secret History* is the following:

The matter of the *kataskopoi* is as follows. From ancient times many men were maintained at public expense. They would enter enemy territory and gain access to the palace of the Persians, either under the guise of trading or by some other ploy. After investigating everything thoroughly, they would return to Roman territory and be able to report all the secrets of the enemy to the government officials. Forewarned, they were on their guard and nothing unforeseen would take them by surprise.

The Persians had long made use of this method too. It is said that Khusrāu increased the pay of his *kataskopoi* and gained an advantage by his foresight. For nothing [concerning Roman affairs escaped] him, [but Justinian spent nothing at all on them] and erased [the very] name of *kataskopoi* from the land of the Romans. As a result, many mistakes were made and Lazica was seized by the enemy, since the Romans had no idea where on earth the Persian king and his army were.¹

¹ 30.12–16. There are lacunae in the text, and I have followed Haury's suggested restorations in the Teubner edition. The lacunae do not, however, affect the main concerns of this paper.