

Εἶσω οὖ is a simple correction, i.e. close to †*ἐκείνου*†³ and gives good sense. This also West admits, adding, however, 'even if it is not altogether clear why further mention of a move is needed after *ὑπὸ δὲ γὰν φυγῶν*'.⁴ Against this one might argue that *ὑπὸ δὲ γὰν φυγῶν* is hypothetical 'even if he escaped, he is never freed but goes where ...'. West ends the discussion with his own proposal *ἀντὶ τοῦ*, 'instead of that one', explaining that *ἐκείνου* could be a gloss on *τοῦ*.

My suggestion would be *ἔσθ' ὅπου* (cf. 517), and the text is now to be read as follows: 'Yes, Apollo is certainly causing pain to me, but him he shall not release: even if Orestes took refuge (i.e. supposing he might escape me) under the earth, there is no possibility that he be freed (since, there, Hades will undertake punishment); and so long as he has not yet been purified he will get, *somewhere*, *ἔτερον μιάστωρα* on his head'. This *ἔτερος μιάστωρ* could be someone of his own family (cf. Weil's *ἐκ γένους*),⁵ for Orestes is now to get *ἔτερον μιάστωρα* not *specifically* under the earth (viz. *Ἄδην*, as *εἶσω οὖ* obliges us to think) but *either* in the underworld, *in the event* that he escape there, *or else* (and perhaps more probably) somewhere on earth.

In favour of *εἶσω οὖ* one might adduce 267–8. But, apart from the fact that what the Erinyes are saying there is simply contemplative (see below), the position is now very different from 177–8, because (a) the scene has changed to Athens, and (b) Orestes has taken refuge in the temple of the goddess, where, presumably, he must be immune from any *human* 'avengers' (*ἔτερον ... μιάστωρα*), and (c) the Erinyes are now thinking in terms of his being punished down in Hades, with no alternative. Thus, they are now contemplating malevolently how pleasant it would be for them if they actually drank Orestes' 'half-clotted' blood (264–5) until he is drained, though still alive (267). This would be his punishment on earth, as a prelude to his punishment when he has submitted to a trial in Hades and been found guilty. In other words, seeing the different circumstances in Athens, where two Olympian deities are involved, the Erinyes have had to modify their threats.

University of Athens

N. GEORGANTZOGLU

³ *ἐκείνου* was *certainly* not written by Aeschylus. The only question is whether the corruption is due to the misreading of a similar word or words or to the intrusion of an explanatory gloss. Either seems possible.

⁴ M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart, 1990), p. 276.

⁵ If Aeschylus actually wrote *ἐκ γένους*, which is an intelligent conjecture, †*ἐκείνου*† could have been a gloss on it. However, I should suggest that †*ἐκείνου*† could well be elucidatory *not* of the missing word(s), as scholars seem to take for granted, but of the expression *ἐν κάρῃ*, or else of the word *μιάστωρ*. Then *ἐκείνου*, originally written in a margin, entered the text later as a correction for the word(s) now lost.

ALCIBIADES VS. PHRYNICHUS

Thucydides' account (8.50–1) of the Athenian general Phrynichus' secret correspondence with the Spartan admiral Astyochus is both troubling and obscure. It may be summarized as follows: Phrynichus, having eloquently opposed Alcibiades' efforts to be recalled from exile and fearing that a repatriated Alcibiades would take vengeance on him, wrote to Astyochus revealing Alcibiades' pro-Athenian (anti-Spartan) activities. Astyochus handed the letter to Alcibiades, who then wrote to the ranking Athenians on Samos concerning Phrynichus' 'treason' and demanded his execution. Phrynichus then wrote again to Astyochus, now proposing to make it possible for the Spartans to destroy the whole Athenian force at Samos. But foreseeing that again Astyochus would pass on the letter to Alcibiades who would

again reveal his treason, Phrynichus warned the Athenian troops of a threatened attack and urged the completion of the fortifications. Therefore, when Alcibiades' message denouncing Phrynichus as a traitor came, he was discredited and thought to be maligning Phrynichus out of hatred.

That the second letter's offer of treason should be seen as Phrynichus' ploy both to extricate himself from danger of prosecution and to discredit Alcibiades was suggested first by Grote and seems to be the view of all recent commentators.¹ It is the possibly less apparent treason of the first letter that has given rise to more various explanations:² J. Hatzfeld asked whether both letters might be an invention of Alcibiades but did not suggest how; Brunt merely doubted that Alcibiades would have given Astyochus as his source lest it make trouble for him with the Spartan government; Westlake maintained that the letter to Astyochus was a political move, like Phrynichus' speech in opposition to Alcibiades, in the interest of Athens but disguised as personal treason benefitting Sparta in order to convince Astyochus; Delebecque and von Fritz viewed it as a reasonable means of thwarting Alcibiades' efforts to bring Tissaphernes over to the Athenians; Schindel argued that the first letter, like the second, was a calculated stratagem following up on unsuccessful verbal efforts to frustrate Alcibiades' plans; Bloedow argued that Phrynichus anticipated Astyochus' action in using the letter to cause Tissaphernes 'to distance himself from Alcibiades because of the latter's double-dealing'.

A somewhat different light may be shed on this first letter if we look first at possible sources of Thucydides' account and then at some of the oddities or obscurities in it. In accord with his general practice, Thucydides gives no source for his account of the letters, not even remarking, as he did earlier in quoting Pausanias' letter to Xerxes, 'as was later discovered' (1.128.6). Both Brunt and Delebecque argue for Alcibiades as the most likely source for these chapters, but the evidence is very uneven, and certainly 8.48 with its Phrynichan censure of Alcibiades' recall and 8.51 with its Phrynichan outwitting of Alcibiades are unlikely to have been supplied by their butt. Andrewes³ thinks of other Greeks at Tissaphernes' court as a possible source, or even friends of Phrynichus.

Concerning other possibilities Westlake⁴ speculated as follows:

Phrynichos was probably himself responsible for the suggestion that purely personal motives caused him to communicate with Astyochus. It is most unlikely that Thucydides merely guessed these motives and much easier to believe that they were expressed in the text of the messages. Thucydides can hardly have seen the originals and doubtless depended for his knowledge of their content upon the report of some informant of which his account is a summary. The brief statements of motive which Thucydides prefixes to his version of both messages can scarcely have been ultimately derived from any source other than the original messages.

Westlake's concern about a source particularly for Phrynichus' motives seems odd in view of Thucydides' talent for mind-reading and ever-ready use of participial

¹ G. Grote, *History of Greece* (1888), VI. pp. 242–4. See n. 2 for recent commentators.

² J. Hatzfeld, *Alcibiade* (Paris, 1940), p. 236; P. A. Brunt, 'Thucydides and Alcibiades', *REG* 65 (1952), 59–96, at 77; H. D. Westlake, 'Phrynichos and Astyochos (Thucydides VIII. 50–51)', *JHS* 76 (1956), 99–104, at 100–101, *Studies in Thucydides and Greek History* (Bristol, 1989), p. 215; W. Delebecque, *Thucydide et Alcibiade* (Aix-en-Provence, 1965), pp. 87–8; K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* Text I, pp. 765–6, Anmerkungen I, p. 324, A. 218; U. Schindel, 'Phrynichos und die Rückberufung des Alcibiades', *RhM* 113 (1970), 281–97, at 287–93; E. F. Bloedow, 'Phrynichus the "intelligent" Athenian', *The Ancient History Bulletin* 5.4 (1991), 89–100, at 96.

³ *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford, 1981), v. 120.

⁴ *JHS* 76 (1956), 100.

motivation.⁵ This is demonstrated throughout the history but perhaps most tellingly in his divination of every shifting thought of Cleon as, with participles of thinking, knowing and fearing, that slippery demagogue is shown both to weasel his way out of responsibility for blocking peace with Sparta and then is trapped into the generalship against the Spartan forces on Sphacteria (4.27–8). Here Phrynichus' motive in sending the first letter to Astyochus is similarly based on knowledge and resulting fear (8.50.1):

γνούς δὲ ὁ Φρύνιχος ὅτι ἔσοιτο περὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου καθόδου λόγος καὶ ὅτι Ἀθηναῖοι ἐνδέξονται αὐτήν, δείσας πρὸς τὴν ἐναντίωσιν τῶν ὑφ' αὐτοῦ λεχθέντων μὴ, ἣν κατέλθῃ, ὡς κωλυτὴν ὄντα κακῶς δρᾶ, τρέπεται ἐπὶ τοιόνδε τι.

Not only is Phrynichus' motive for his later participation in the oligarchic conspiracy in Athens similarly expressed with the participles *δεδιώς/νομίζων* (8.68.3) but we find much the same kind of motivation given to a Persian satrap (*νομίσας/δείσας*, 8.109.1), to two Spartans (Brasidas—*δεδιώς/νομίζων*, 5.8.1; Agis—*δείσας/νομίσας*, 5.71.3) as well as to Cleon (*γνούς/γνούς/ὄρων*, 4.27.3–4; *οἰόμενος/γνούς/δεδιώς/οἰόμενος*, 4.28.2). It seems obvious that there is little need to search for sources of men's motives as recorded by Thucydides.

It is the action reported in 8.50.2 thus motivated in 8.50.1 for which we need not only a source but an explanation of how the very indefiniteness of *τρέπεται ἐπὶ τοιόνδε τι* fits with the very definite letter that Phrynichus wrote.

πέμπει ὡς τὸν Ἀστύοχον τὸν Λακεδαιμονίων ναύαρχον ἔτι ὄντα τότε περὶ τὴν Μίλητον κρύφα ἐπιστείλας ὅτι Ἀλκιβιάδης αὐτῶν τὰ πράγματα φθείρει Τισσαφέρην Ἀθηναίους φίλον ποιῶν, καὶ τάλλα πάντα σαφῶς ἐγγράψας· ζυγνῶμην δὲ εἶναι ἑαυτῷ περὶ ἀνδρὸς πολέμιου καὶ μετὰ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἀξυμφοροῦ κακόν τι βουλευεῖν.

As was pointed out by Schindel,⁶ a very similar phrase is used of Alcibiades in 8.56.2, when he needed to make the Athenians responsible for breaking off negotiations with Tissaphernes: *τρέπεται ἐπὶ τοιόνδε εἶδος*. The parallel at least suggests a kinship between the two schemes, both of which employ roundaboutness to achieve their ends: Alcibiades, having failed to persuade Tissaphernes to come over to the Athenians, covered his failure by manoeuvring the Athenians into breaking off negotiations. Phrynichus, having failed effectively to oppose the Athenian plan for Alcibiades' recall 'turned to something of the following sort'. Why did Thucydides not simply follow the motivating participles with the motivated action, that is, *πέμπει ὡς τὸν Ἀστύοχον*? The use of *τρέπεται ἐπὶ τοιόνδε τι* suggests that the letter was only one possible action out of several. But the fact that Thucydides recorded it in factual terms must mean that, although it was not the only action of such a sort that Phrynichus could take, there was a report of the letter given 'to those in authority in Samos' (8.50.4) some of whom were most probably the source on which Thucydides depended for this as for the preceding events in the Athenian camp. That the letter was reported by Alcibiades making accusation of 'what sort of things Phrynichus had done'⁷ and demanding Phrynichus' death is hardly a guarantee of its genuineness, especially given the nature and history of the two men involved. Only Alcibiades

⁵ See my article ('Participial Motivation in Thucydides', *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995), 48–65) for a demonstration of the way in which Thucydides presumes thoughts and feelings to motivate individual actions.

⁶ Op. cit. (n. 2), 285–6.

⁷ Is the *οἶα δέδρακε* an unconscious echo of *τοιόνδε τι*?

could profit from such a disclosure and use it to dispose of the most important opponent to his recall; that he was capable of making such an accusation is clear from his sharp practice with Tissaphernes and the Athenians; and it is only too likely that his own history of dealing with the enemy could have suggested how his opponent could be most easily damned. Phrynichus, on the other hand, is shown to be an effective general by Thucydides, who credited him with truly exceptional good sense.⁸ Therefore, if such a letter as Alcibiades reported both seems out of character for the general praised by Thucydides and is very much the sort of ploy (*τοῖονδε εἶδος*) that would occur to an experienced turncoat while serving at the same time to dispose of an enemy, there is even a strong possibility that the reported letter had no foundation in fact but existed only in Alcibiades' report to those in authority on Samos.

It seems worthwhile to test this possibility by examining more closely Thucydides' account both of the reported letter and its effect not only on its reported recipient but also on the authorities to whom it was reported. First, the reported letter contains an admission of treachery that is not really applicable to its supposed writer: informing the Spartan admiral that he is being harmed by a faithless ally who is diverting Persian aid to the Athenians is a betrayal only from the point of view of Alcibiades, for whom it might interfere with Persian help to Athens. But would Phrynichus, who believed that the Persians had no interest in aiding Athens (8.48.4), ever admit that an attempt to prevent that illusory aid was treacherous? If then it seems unlikely that any letter from Phrynichus to Astyochus would have included an admission of unpatriotic behaviour, still more unlikely is Astyochus' reported reaction to the supposed letter: his becoming an informer to Tissaphernes might make sense, but what possible motive could lead him to share the letter with Alcibiades himself? That Thucydides himself is somewhat puzzled by this is suggested by his inclusion of the possibly explanatory report, for which he takes no responsibility, that Astyochus had become Tissaphernes' man (8.50.3). Certainly, Astyochus had had orders from Sparta to kill Alcibiades (8.45.1) and may indeed have joined Alcibiades and Tissaphernes in Magnesia to scout out the possibility of carrying out that order. And if Alcibiades was already seeking some means to counter Phrynichus' opposition to his recall, Astyochus' arrival would have lent verisimilitude to any treasonous charge he might invent. Not only would he be able to use Astyochus' presence to lend credence to his report of a treasonous letter but also he could somewhat gleefully include in his report his escape from the Spartan government's death warrant of 8.45.1: *ὁ δὲ Ἀστυόχος τὸν μὲν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἄλλως τε καὶ οὐκέτι ὁμοίως ἐς χεῖρας ἰόντα οὐδὲ διανοεῖτο τιμωρεῖσθαι* (8.50.3).

The pointlessness of Astyochus' acting as informer (*μηνυτής*) for any purpose of his own makes it necessary to find some other explanation for the report of that action. And since the only purpose served by Astyochus as informer was Alcibiades' need to show evidence of treasonous activity on the part of the man who was attempting to block his recall, this looks to be another pointer to the whole story of the first Phrynichan letter being an invention of Alcibiades. That is, the only person who derived any advantage from the letter was Alcibiades, for whom it was a means by which he could put an end to the chief opponent of his recall. He had the motive to invent Phrynichus' 'treason' in order to lay an accusation against him before the Athenians; he had his own treason as a reminder of the odium it involved and the

⁸ Thuc. 8.27.5: *οὐχ ἀξύνετος*, used elsewhere only to describe the kind of man who was chosen to speak at a public funeral for those who died in the war (2.34). Thucydides uses the positive expression (*ξυνετός*) elsewhere only of Archidamos (1.79), of Themistocles (1.138) and Theseus (2.15).

punishment it incurred (6.61.7); he had in his old Spartan associate the means by which evidence could be produced; and he had the *πολυπραγμοσύνη* and *νοῦς* to invent the evidence itself.

Assuming for the moment then that Thucydides' account of the first letter (8.50.2–3) is squarely based on what Alcibiades had invented in order to report on it to the Athenians on Samos, it is consistent with Thucydides' usual practice⁹ that, given Phrynichus' action as a reported fact, he supplied the reasonable motive, that is, fear of what Alcibiades might do. But just as the letter itself could serve to discredit either Alcibiades or Phrynichus, depending on whether it was composed by Phrynichus or invented by Alcibiades, so the motive was equally interchangeable, with fear of what the other might do motivating either the writing or the inventing. What Phrynichus actually did (*τοιόνδε τι*) we must assume was completely lost to history, crowded out by Alcibiades' invention.

What was the reaction of those in authority to Alcibiades' report of the treasonous letter? Thucydides does not say, and it perhaps goes without his saying anything that there was mixed response and no immediate action was taken. About Phrynichus' reaction he is very definite: he is thrown into confusion (because the attack came out of the blue?) and in the greatest danger. We ask how could he prove his innocence? That he was astute and sharp-witted we know from his ability to see through and argue against Alcibiades' promised packaging of oligarchy at Athens with help from Tissaphernes (8.48). It would have been only natural for him to see that this was an occasion for fighting fire with fire, for turning the tables, for the trickster to be tricked and the biter bit. By writing what would purport to be a second letter to Astyochus and proposing an act of treason which he could be sure that it was in his power to disprove, he could expect that Alcibiades would be informed and tempted¹⁰ to make doubly sure of his dishonour and execution. Since he was showing the Spartans how they might take advantage of the incomplete Athenian fortifications, his own action in urging and effecting the completion of that work would be, and turned out to be, signal disproof of renewed charges of treason from Alcibiades.

The only other contemporary reference to Phrynichus is in Aristophanes' *Frogs* 689–91:

κεῖ τις ἤμαρτε σφαλεῖς τι Φρυνίχου παλαίσμασιν,
ἐγγενέσθαι φημί χρήναι τοῖς ὀλισθοῦσιν τότε
αἰτίαν ἐκθεῖσαι λῦσαι τὰς πρότερον ἀμαρτίας.

Isn't this 'second' letter of Phrynichus the kind of wrestling trick that uses an opponent's own strength to defeat him? That is, by using Alcibiades' readiness to report anything that would destroy his opponent, Phrynichus managed both to discredit him and to save himself. If Aristophanes' use of *παλαίσματα* refers to Phrynichus' 'second' letter, the *τις* of line 689 would be Alcibiades, and the Chorus would be not only urging general amnesty (686–8, 698–705) but making a special plea for the reinstatement of one who, having been tripped up by Phrynichus' manoeuvres,

⁹ See especially L. Pearson, 'Thucydides as Reporter and Critic', *TAPA* 78 (1947), 37–60, at 53–6, and H. Montgomery, *Gedanke und Tat zur Erzählungstechnik bei Herodot, Thukydides, Xenophon und Arrian* (Lund, 1965), 54–95.

¹⁰ If Astyochus knew nothing of the previous letter invented by Alcibiades, he would still have reported this 'second' letter as an important Spartan coup to Tissaphernes, with whom Alcibiades was in constant attendance. Or if Astyochus had known of the invention, he could have reported this letter as evidence of Phrynichus' desperation resulting from the invention. Alcibiades in turn might well think that Astyochus' 'information' against Phrynichus was a certain indication that the victim of his invented first letter had no alternative but real treason.

should be allowed as one of those who slipped in the past to undo his earlier errors by stating his case. Certainly the presence of this reference to Phrynichus both in the context of amnesty in the parabasis and in anticipation of the coming debate about the recall of Alcibiades is suggestive, as is also the proverb *Φρυνίχου πάλαισμα*, although its application is confused.¹¹

And what was Thucydides' source for this 'second'¹² letter? If it is rightly seen as Phrynichus' wrestling trick to overset Alcibiades, it is most likely to have been a boast by Phrynichus himself, delighted with the way in which he had managed not only to destroy public confidence in Alcibiades but also to retrieve his own reputation. It is likely that he would enjoy embroidering on his cleverness in writing reproaches to Astyochus for having betrayed him to Alcibiades (*μεμφόμενος ὅτι οὐ καλῶς ἐκρύβθη*) and so could be sure that he would again play the informer.

The difficulties in Thucydides' narrative may, as we have seen, be ironed out if we take Alcibiades' report to those in authority at Samos as the historian's only source for the first letter, with Alcibiades having invented it both to dispose of Phrynichus as chief opponent of his recall and to use for his own purposes Astyochus' visit to Magnesia to carry out Spartan governmental orders. With regard to the second letter, we add to the general estimate of it as Phrynichus' trick both the likelihood of Phrynichus himself being the original source with his boasting and the probability that both Aristophanes' reference to his trickery and the proverb point directly to his relations with Alcibiades.¹³

What Thucydides' personal reaction to this ploy of Phrynichus may have been is perhaps to be seen from what he has to say in connection with the general's strategy on an earlier occasion (8.27.5):

ἔδοξεν οὐκ ἐν τῷ αὐτίκα μᾶλλον ἢ ὕστερον, οὐκ ἐς τοῦτο μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐς ὅσα ἄλλα Φρύνιχος κατέστη, οὐκ ἀξύνετος εἶναι.

Andrewes¹⁴ rightly points out the deficiencies of that earlier policy and consequently speculates on why Thucydides so explicitly approved, but as far as the other things

¹¹ It is uncertain whether either the trick itself or Aristophanes' reference to it gave rise to the proverb, if we are to judge from the varying applications and explanations given to it by the paroimiographoi and the Suda:

Apostol. XVII.16: *Τὸ Φρυνίχου πάλαισμα: κατὰ τῶν πανοῦργως σοφίζομένων· προδότης γὰρ οὗτος γέγονε τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων.*

Makar. VIII.75: *Φρυνίχου πάλαισμα: ἐπὶ τῶν πονηρῶν καὶ δολίων ἀνθρώπων.*

Diogen. III.80: *Τὰ Φρυνίχου παλαίσματα: ἐπὶ τῶν φρονίμως καὶ συνετῶς σοφίζομένων.*

The Suda apparently takes the reference from Aristophanes:

62 *Παλαίσματιν: ἀντὶ τοῦ στρατηγήματι. καὶ Ἀριχτοφάνης· Φρυνίχου παλαίσματι. στρατηγούντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἡττήθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ πολλοὶ αὐτῷ προσεκρούεσθαι, ὡς προδόντι τὸν πόλεμον.*

766 *Φρυνίχου πάλαισμα: αὕτη τέτακται κατὰ τῶν πανοῦργως καὶ συνετῶς σοφίζομένων. Ἱστορεῖ δὲ Θουκυδίδης, ὅτι Φρύνιχος (Thucydides' version of the trick is then summarized). With the difference in applications of the proverb ranging from ἐπὶ τῶν φρονίμως καὶ συνετῶς σοφίζομένων to ἐπὶ τῶν πονηρῶν καὶ δολίων ἀνθρώπων there seems to be some guessing as to the meaning. It may therefore be that the reference to Phrynichus as general causing an Athenian defeat and being opposed by many as a traitor is also a muddled interpretation of the Thucydean account, just as the reference in Apostolios to betrayal of the Lacedaemonians seems to be.*

¹² It is only natural for Thucydides, having accepted the account of the 'first' letter as that of Phrynichus from those in authority on Samos, to write about Phrynichus 'writing again' to Astyochus.

¹³ As a figure of speech *πάλαισμα* should have reference to a two-man confrontation rather than to any trickery Phrynichus may have been guilty of in connection with the 400.

¹⁴ Op. cit. (n. 3), 65–7.

(ὄσα ἄλλα) are concerned, it may be that both Phrynichus' stance against Alcibiades' recall and his adroitness in dealing with a charge of treason confirmed the historian in his opinion of Phrynichus' *ξύσεις*.

Bryn Mawr College

MABEL L. LANG

ON THE METRICAL INSCRIPTION FOUND AT PERGAMUM (SEG 39.1334)

Written in Phalaecians *κατὰ στίχον* and dating from the second decade (230–220) in the reign of Attalus I, the following inscription was found at Pergamum in 1966 and published by H. Müller in 1989:¹

Παῖς ὁ Δεινοκράτους με κοί, Θυνώνης[
κοῦρε, καὶ βασιλῆι τὸν φίλοινον
Ἀττάλῳ Διονυσόδωρος εἶπεν
5 Σκίρτον οὐ Ξικυνῶνος· ἃ δὲ τέχνα
Θοινίου, τὸ δὲ λῆμμα Πρατίνειον.
μέλοι δ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁ ἀναθεῖς[με

6 με suppl. Lebek.²

The epigram is remarkable for its metre³ as well as for the amount of erudition it displays. Thoenias of Sicyon was already known as a later representative of the school of Lysippus; that Dionysodorus was a fellow-citizen of his has not emerged so far, but he is mentioned by Polybius as an admiral and an emissary of Attalus.⁴ 'Frisky' is known to us from an epigram by Dioscorides, where he guards the tomb of Sositheus, and from a passage of Nonnus;⁵ Cornutus, *N.D.* 30 classified Scirti along with Satyrs and Silens. But the poet remains unnamed: Dionysodorus, a military man, can hardly be credited with such a piece of refined Hellenistic versification.⁶

The Sicyonian background of the epigram has been already investigated,⁷ but I should like to offer a further suggestion. Dionysodorus and Thoenias as well as Pratinas of Phlius, Scirtus and Dionysus all seem to point to that corner of the Peloponnesus which lies west of Acrocorinth. The lower Asopus valley between Phlius and Sicyon was prominent in antiquity for its vineyards and for Dionysiac revelry.⁸ I wonder if we should not apply there also for an author's name. Despite efforts to suggest the contrary, Pergamum in the early reign of Attalus was hardly an abode for poets.⁹ Had the epigram been transmitted in literary rather than inscriptional form, it would have been likely to end up in one of the sources of *A.P.*

¹ 'Ein neues hellenistisches Weiheepigramm aus Pergamon', *Chiron* 19 (1989), 499–553.

² W. D. Lebek, *ZPE* 82 (1990), 297–8.

³ On stichic hendecasyllables in Hellenistic poetry see R. Kassel, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin & New York, 1991), 138–9.

⁴ Details in Müller, op. cit. (n. 1), 508–21.

⁵ *A.P.* 7.707 and *Dion.* 14.111. Add *SEG* 36.1263, from late-antique Paphos.

⁶ Müller, op. cit. (n. 1), 535 rightly discards Dioscorides, who was active in Alexandria. But Dionysodorus is no appropriate replacement.

⁷ Most thoroughly by A. Kerkhecker, 'Zum neuen hellenistischen Weiheepigramm aus Pergamon', *ZPE* 86 (1991), 30–2.

⁸ Antiph. fr. 233.2 K.-A., Athen. 33bc, Plin. *N.H.* 14.74. Claiming Sicyonian origin and λῆμμα Πρατίνειον Scirtus seems to enjoy being involved in that tangle of τραγικοί χοροί, dithyramb and satyr-play which had Sicyon and Phlius as its joint background.

⁹ E. V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon*² (Ithaca & London, 1971), 408 would incline to attribute *P. Hamb.* inv. 381 to that milieu, but see Lloyd-Jones and Parsons on *SH* 958. Leschides was later.