

the easiest verb, and the rest is padding (perhaps inspired by 472 or something like it).

Worcester College, Oxford

ARND KERKHECKER

prompted an unnecessary attempt at restoration'); R. G. M. Nisbet, *JRS* 52 (1962), 235 = *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford, 1995), 23 (cf. 240 = *BICS* 51 [1988], 95) on Juv. 6. 568. See also U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin, 1875), 205–9, on ᾗ-interpolations which make an implicit contrast explicit; cf. Page (n. 16) 51f. on Eur. *Or.* 51; Bond on Eur. *Her.* 452.

### HIPPONICUS' TRAPEZA: HUMOUR IN ANDOCIDES 1.130–1

Andocides is generally not considered one of the best orators. To point up his flawed style, scholars have discussed a notoriously vindictive and humorous section in Andocides 1: in 124ff. Andocides describes the profligate lifestyle of his prosecutor, Callias III the Ceryx, the son of Hipponicus II and *dadouchos* of the Eleusinian Mysteries.<sup>1</sup>

The oration, dated to c. 400, was delivered by Andocides after his return from his second period of exile. The speech was initially a defence against Callias' charge that Andocides profaned the Eleusinian Mysteries of 400, but Andocides also addressed in detail the old charge which implicated him in the Hermocopidae Affair and the profanation of the Mysteries in 415.<sup>2</sup> The following short discussion agrees that Andocides' slanderous response to Callias is humorous, and will point out several instances of humorous puns in sections 124–31. This discussion will argue that these sections do not necessarily diverge from the theme of sacrilege in Andocides 1<sup>3</sup> and will then focus on 130–1, the passage in which Callias is described as a demon overturning a *τράπεζα* (table) in his father's household.

First it is necessary to summarize the context in which 1.130 appears. Sections 113ff. explain that Callias as priest of the Eleusinian rites charged that Andocides profanely placed a bough on the altar of Demeter and Kore. In response Andocides denies the charge and resorts to diatribe. Just as Callias was infatuated by the divine mother and daughter, so also Callias lived with a mother and her daughter, who were Chrysilla, the widow of Ischomachus, and the unnamed widow of Epilycus. This ménage à trois is then described in terms of two ambiguous verbs (124ff.) *συνοικέω* and *λαμβάνω*, which can connote either formal or informal unions. Callias is seen here as taking or living with both women in informal and unholy unions.<sup>4</sup>

The word play in 1.124ff. is within a decidedly religious context. Andocides informs us in 124ff. that Chrysilla became pregnant, Callias dismissed her from his house, and after the son was born disclaimed the infant as his own.<sup>5</sup> Callias swore on the altar

<sup>1</sup> See, for example J. F. Dobson, *The Greek Orators* (Freeport, NY, 1969, 2nd ed.), p. 67; R. C. Jebb, *The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus* (New York, 1962), 1.106, where Jebb feels that this anecdote diverges from Andocides' argument, and 127 where Jebb states that sections 97ff. are 'a confused appendix'. For Callias III's ancestry: J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.*, (Oxford, 1971, henceforth *APF*), pp. 254ff.

<sup>2</sup> The fullest discussion of these events and of Andocides 1 is still D. M. MacDowell, *Andokides on the Mysteries* (Oxford, 1990), and esp. pp. 1–18.

<sup>3</sup> A. Missiou, *The Subversive Oratory of Andokides* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 53 argues that superstition forms the basis of Andocides' argument.

<sup>4</sup> For Callias' marriages: *APF* pp. 263–8. For the vagueness of the term *συνοικέω* see R. Just, *Women in Athenian Law and Life* (London and New York, 1989) pp. 43–4.

<sup>5</sup> B. Strauss, *Fathers and Sons in Athens* (Princeton, 1993), pp. 196–7 argues that Andocides hopes to demonstrate how Callias was a bad son and, therefore, a bad citizen to his fatherland.

at the Apatouria that the child was not his: Chrysilla's kinsmen brought the sacrificial victim, but Callias, who seems to have officiated at the ritual, possibly as a priest of his phratry, disowned the infant. Callias at a later date regretted his action and swore on an altar in front of the Ceryces, Callias' *genos*, that the child was his; in other words, he admitted to having at first sworn falsely on an altar, a false oath that was then overturned by a true oath.<sup>6</sup>

Then in 130–1 Andocides reminds his audience of the old wives' tale that Hipponicus reared an accursed being, Callias, in his house, who upset his table: 'Ἰππώνικος ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἀλιτήριον τρέφει, ὃς αὐτοῦ τὴν τράπεζαν ἀνατρέπει. Commentators have tended to see a two-fold pun: Callias as a poltergeist (ἀλιτήριος) has upset Hipponicus' table, meaning both his dining table and his banking table.<sup>7</sup> The verb ἀνατρέπω is associated with the overturning of a table in the orations<sup>8</sup> and certainly τράπεζα can mean a banking table as well. Although Hipponicus' branch of the Ceryces was never associated with banking *per se*, its vast wealth, reputedly worth 200 talents, was largely based upon the silver at Laurium.<sup>9</sup> In 130 Andocides stresses Hipponicus' wealth and states that Callias has 'ruined' (ἀνατρέπω) Hipponicus' wealth, σωφροσύνη and livelihood.

τράπεζα may well, however, take on a third meaning, a decidedly religious one, which commentators have not considered. First, the word ἀλιτήριος, which introduces the old wives' tale is a religious term. In another speech on this occasion, [Lysias] 6, the anonymous grandson of a hierophant (54), the speaker, described Andocides twice as an ἀλιτήριος for his role in the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries in 415 (52–3).<sup>10</sup> According to [Lysias] 6, Andocides was excluded from the temples and cursed by the Eleusinian priests and priestesses (51–2). It is this term, ἀλιτήριος, as religious anathema, which Andocides in turn throws into Callias' face. Therefore, the τράπεζα of our wives' tale, which appears in a religious context, may well have summoned up the meaning for the ancients of a specific piece of cult furniture, the cult table, which was the most important cult item next to the cult statue and altar.<sup>11</sup> In fact, reminiscent of Callias' own false oath on the altar, Dinarchus relates how Philocles swore a false oath between a cult statue of Athena and a τράπεζα (3.2).

The cult table could be a very elaborate piece of furniture upon which priests and lay worshippers set non-burnt offerings. At times both priest and laypeople ate the offerings at the table.<sup>12</sup> The priests of a cult, including those at Eleusis, received the shares of food set aside for both themselves and the gods, and certainly for the Ceryces this type of offering added to their already outstanding wealth.<sup>13</sup> A relief from

<sup>6</sup> S. D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica* (Ann Arbor, 1993), pp. 68–71 argues that Callias' first oath was sworn before his phratry and the second, before his *genos*. See also MacDowell, *Andokides*, p. 153.

<sup>7</sup> For the interpretation that the τράπεζα meant 'a bank': G. Dalmeyda, *Andocide Discours* (Paris, 1930), p. 57; MacDowell, *Andokides* p. 155; R. Bogaert, *Banques et banquiers dans les cités grecques* (Leiden, 1968), p. 62.

<sup>8</sup> For example, Dem. 19.198; overturning a boat: Aeschin. 3.158; a couch: Athen. 13.584f.

<sup>9</sup> Davies, *APF*, pp. 254ff.

<sup>10</sup> For which see MacDowell, *Andokides*, pp. 14–15.

<sup>11</sup> S. Dow and D. Gill, 'The Greek Cult Table', *AJA* 69 (1965), 103–14 and esp. 109; D. Gill, 'Trapezomata: A Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice', *HThR* 67 (1974), 118ff. gives archaeological and inscriptional evidence for the use of cult tables; see also his *Greek Cult Tables* (New York and London, 1991, henceforth *GCT*).

<sup>12</sup> Gill, *GCT*, pp. 23ff.

<sup>13</sup> For the shares of food to priests: Gill, 'Trapezomata', 127–33; Gill, *GCT*, pp. 15ff.; for the wealth of this branch of the Ceryces: Davies, *APF*, p. 260.

Eleusis shows Plouton and Persephone reclining at such meals, while in the Eleusinium in Athens the hierophants were regularly appointed officials to care for the spreading of couches and setting of tables for Plouton.<sup>14</sup>

At times the *τράπεζα* did not signify the actual table, but rather the offerings of food on it.<sup>15</sup> Thus, Andocides' use of *τράπεζα* with *ἀνατρέπω* could signify the spoilage of food—the verb here means 'overturn' as well as 'ruin'. The anonymous speaker in [Lysias 6] relates how a religious observant took back his offering of a horse to the Two Goddesses and, in punishment, eventually died of hunger because the products of grain, which were set down on the table (*τράπεζα*) before him, had a vile odour when he attempted to eat them (1ff.). It is unclear from the context, however, whether the *τράπεζα* here refers to a cult table or a private dining table.

Furthermore, the very act of overturning a table appears to have been part of a ritual in one cult that we know of, the cult of Apollo Pythios. At Delphi the overturning of a cult table, which was then followed by the burning of a makeshift hut, commemorated the departure of Apollo from the cult centre after he slew, or subdued, the Python ([Plut.] *Mor.* 293c, 418a–b). It is uncertain what the overturned table represented; it may have symbolized Apollo's attempt to find expiation for his deed (*ibid.* 418a–b) or the Python's inability to pursue Apollo after the latter subdued him.<sup>16</sup>

Although there is no evidence that the act of upsetting a piece of furniture was a part of the Eleusinian Mysteries, the priests of the *genos* Ceryces had special functions in the service of both Apollo Pythios and Delios (Athen. 6.234e–f).<sup>17</sup> Also, an inscription, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 78, possibly dated to the latter half of the fifth century,<sup>18</sup> records a Delphic command to all nations to sacrifice the first stalks of harvested grain, the *aparchai*, to the Eleusinian Demeter. Also, the initiates who travelled to Eleusis from Athens probably stopped at Apollo's shrine at Daphni on the way to Eleusis.<sup>19</sup> Therefore given the close association of the Ceryces with the cult of Apollo, it is not surprising that Andocides took advantage of Callias' religious function to deliver a pun that was heavily laden with cultic symbolism.

Andocides' ability at word play in 130–1 is further evidenced by his use of the two verbs *τρέφω* and *ἀνατρέπω*. In 131 Andocides ends his diatribe against Callias by stating that: *οἰόμενος γὰρ Ἱππόνικος υἱὸν τρέφειν ἀλιτήριον αὐτῷ ἔτρεφεν, ὃς ἀνατέτροφεν ἐκείνου τὸν πλοῦτον...* 'For Hipponicus thinking that he was rearing a son, reared an accursed thing for himself, who has ruined the wealth of that man...' The similarity in the sounds in Greek between the imperfect of *τρέφω* (*ἔτρεφεν*) and

<sup>14</sup> Gill, 'Trapezomata', 122; *id.*, *GCT*, p. 10.

<sup>15</sup> For example Hdt. 1.162; X. *An.* 7.3.22; Gill, 'Trapezomata', 121; *id.*, *GCT*, p. 10.

<sup>16</sup> S. Eitrem, 'Miscellanea', *CR* 35 (1921), 20–1. Eitrem conjectures that this rite mimics the myth of Zeus' overturning the inhospitable table of the Arcadian Lycaon and then setting Lycaon's house on fire.

<sup>17</sup> L. Farnell, *The Cult of the Greek States* (Oxford, 1896–1909), iii.163; P. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis* (Paris, 1914), pp. 157–8; G. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton, 1961), 234. The sacred calendar of Eleusis stated that the Eumolpid hierophant and the priestesses were sent as delegates to the Pyanopsia, the festival of Pythian Apollo, which took place in Athens: K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (TAPhS 64.3, 1974), p. 22. In the late fifth century Eleusinian Demeter and Kore were associated with Apollo's son, the healing god Asclepius: H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (Ithaca, NY, 1977), pp. 63–4.

<sup>18</sup> A. C. Brumfield, *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and Their Relation to the Agricultural Year* (New York, 1981), p. 67 n. 29 gives the inscription a sixth-century date, but see Lewis in *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 78 and *SEG* 40.12 for later dates.

the last three syllables of the perfect of ἀνατρέπω (τέτροφεν) underlines the link between 'upsetting' and 'upbringing'.

In short, Andocides is trying to turn the tables on his critics' accusations. In this word play and punning Andocides is emphasizing the fact that Callias, one of his critics, was evil from the very beginning, a severe religious flaw which inextricably bound his role as priest with his outrageous private life. Hipponicus may have reared Callias, but Callias was a holy terror and not worth any sacrifice.

*The University of Memphis*

CHERYL ANNE COX

### ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE 'SYRACUSIA' (ATHENAEUS V. 207 A-B)

It is perhaps significant that one of the more informative texts on ancient shipbuilding predates the period in which Greco-Roman shipping flourished. It is Homer's description of how Odysseus built a ship (σχεδία) on the island of the nymph Calypso, with which he intended to return to his native island of Ithaca (*Od.* 5.244-57). The text is of exceptional interest because it gives as early as the eighth century B.C. a step-by-step description of the tenon-and-dowel 'shell-first' method typical of Greco-Roman ship-building, which has been so amply confirmed in the last few decades by underwater archaeology in the Mediterranean.

The early date of the Homeric description, well before the period of dominance of Greco-Roman shipping, could indicate a foreign origin of the tenon-and-dowel shipbuilding system. Actually, in Cato's description of a large wooden disk of an oil press which apparently was constructed in this manner (*Agr.* 18.9), it is called by the name of *coagmenta Punicana*, Phoenician joinery,<sup>1</sup> therefore this attribution, whether it is correct or not, should not surprise us.

Because of the general concordance between Homer's description of this method of shipbuilding and the results of nautical archaeology, it is tempting to think that no other method was used. However, in the last few years a historical picture of ancient shipbuilding has emerged which is not a simple one. Not only have wrecks been found which have been built by a method which differed on a number of points from the standard 'shell-first' system, but analyses of ancient texts also show that deviations from it did exist.<sup>2</sup>

Our aim is to discuss here a classical text in which the deviation from the standard 'shell-first' system appears to have been so large that it would seem more correct to regard it as a variation on the 'skeleton-first' principle. Although in some wrecks indications have been found showing that not all ribs were inserted after the entire shell of the hull had been finished, in this instance there are strong indications that, except perhaps for this first few strakes, when strakes were added to the shell during construction of the hull, they were fastened to all of the frames, which had been at least partly pre-erected. The finding has been briefly discussed earlier by one of us;<sup>3</sup> we now present a more complete analysis.

<sup>1</sup> A. W. Sleeswyk, 'Phoenician joints, *coagmenta punicana*', *IJNA* 9.3 (1982), 243-4.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. P. Pomey, 'Plaute et Ovide architectes navals', *MEFR* 85 (1973), 401-9; F. J. A. M. Meijer, 'Ovide, *Heroïdes* 16.112 et la construction navale romaine', *Mnemosyne* 43 (1990), 450-2.

<sup>3</sup> A. W. Sleeswyk, 'Voorwoord', in A. J. Hoving, *Nicolas Witsens Scheepsbouw Konst Open Gestelt* (Franeker, 1994).