

(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:<sup>1</sup>

Παῖς ὁ Δεινοκράτους με κοί, Θυνώνης[  
κοῦρε, καὶ βασιλῆι τὸν φίλῳνον  
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.<sup>2</sup>

The epigram is remarkable for its metre<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 'Frisky' is known to us from an epigram by Dioscorides, where he guards the tomb of Sositheus, and from a passage of Nonnus;<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup>

The Sicyonian background of the epigram has been already investigated,<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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.*

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

<sup>2</sup> W. D. Lebek, *ZPE* 82 (1990), 297–8.

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

<sup>4</sup> Details in Müller, op. cit. (n. 1), 508–21.

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

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

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

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> E. V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon*<sup>2</sup> (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.

13, just as Phalaecus' hendecasyllables did.<sup>10</sup> There we find, instead, a poem by Theodoridas (a Syracusan by birth, but also active on the Greek mainland, and an adversary of Euphorion),<sup>11</sup> blaming his contemporary Mnasalces of Sicyon for clumsily composing dithyrambs in the manner of Simonides:

ἀ Μῶσα δ' αὐτῷ τὰς Cιμωνίδα πλάτας  
ἦς ἀποσπάραγμα  
κενά τε κλαγγὰν κάπιλακυθίστρια  
διθυραμβοχάνα.<sup>12</sup>

Though mainly known to us for elegiac epigrams, Mnasalces is deservedly itemized in D. F. Sutton's *Dithyrambographi Graeci*.<sup>13</sup> He seems to have been a Sicyonian patriot from the age of Aratus, and was possibly commissioned to write a dedicatory inscription by the Boeotian Orchomenus.<sup>14</sup> Evidence that it was he who wrote the Scirtus epigram is not at hand, but consider the following: (i) he is chronologically compatible; (ii) he probably had connections with Oropus, also a place of interest for Thoenias (*IG* VII 384, 431);<sup>15</sup> (iii) he appears to have written Dionysiac poetry;<sup>16</sup> (iv) the rather artificial disposition of words in the new epigram is somewhat reminiscent of the late-archaic lyric style; (v) Mnasalces used to imitate Simonides, who was in turn the most successful composer of dithyrambs in his time (epigr. 27 *FGE*); (vi) he definitely comes of Sicyonian stock.<sup>17</sup>

Of the huge production of Simonides in this field just one fragment survives, two perhaps.<sup>18</sup> More are likely to lurk among the *incertae sedis*; I surmise that one such is 119/624 *PMG*: κύρτος, Μύρτος ἢ πόλις,

κίρτος·

παρὰ Cιμωνίδῃ ἢ χρησici (Cramer, *An. Ox.* i. 424, 15–16). Now κίρτος is *vox nihili*<sup>19</sup> but Cκίρτος would be easily recommended, if by nothing else, by haplography. In fact it had already been conjectured, as Page and Campbell record, by A. Hecker in 1850:

<sup>10</sup> *A.P.* 13.6. See G. Morelli, 'Origine e formazione del tredicesimo libro dell'*Antologia Palatina*', *RFIC* 113 (1985), 257–96 (esp. 279ff.).

<sup>11</sup> Second half of III century, cf. P. Maas s.v. Theodoridas in *Pauly-Wissowa* (1934), and M. Gabathuler, *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter* (Diss. Basel, 1937), pp. 31–2, 92.

<sup>12</sup> *A.P.* 13.21.3–6 = epigr. 18 Seelbach (1964). I print Beckby's and Buffière's text (πλάτας Salmasius, πλάθας P; κλαγγὰν Jacobs, καὶ γὰν P: *an vaì Γὰν?*; διθυραμβ–Toup, διθυραβ–P), but I am aware of the textual shortcomings of the passage, which Gow and Page obelized, though conceding that 'the first half of διθυραμβοχάνα is evidently rightly corrected and its implication clear' (*HE* ii. 547). Mnasalces is styled ἐλεγεσποιοός at v. 2, and we know that Simonides also wrote elegies (frr. 1–18 *IEG*<sup>3</sup>), but Theodoridas' bombastic language hardly suggests parody of elegy, cf. F. Buffière in the Budé edition (1970).

<sup>13</sup> 'This epigram would appear to show that Mnasalces wrote dithyrambs as well as epigrams' 68 test. 1 (1989). Since the publication of *P. Köln* 204 in 1985 Mnasalces is no longer to be thought of as an exclusively elegiac epigrammatist.

<sup>14</sup> Epigr. 15 Seelbach (attribution discussed on pp. 54–5). On Mnasalces' chronology and political stance see J. Geffcken, s.v. in *Pauly-Wissowa* (1932).

<sup>15</sup> *IG* VII 395, cf. A. Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (Wien, 1915), iv. 3–6.

<sup>16</sup> For dithyramb and Satyrs cf. T. B. L. Webster in Pickard-Cambridge, *DTC*<sup>2</sup> 20, for Pratinas see B. Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung* (Göttingen, 1992), 124–5. Theodoridas too wrote dithyrambs (fr. 739 *SH*) and his link with Sicyon through Mnasalces should not be overlooked; he is a possible candidate too.

<sup>17</sup> From the deme of Plataeae, see no. 212 Skalet, *Prosopographia Sicyonia* (1928). Epigr. 1 S. deals with a vine shedding its leaves prematurely.

<sup>18</sup> 34/539 *PMG*, cf. Ar. Byz. fr. 124 Slater.

<sup>19</sup> 'Haeremus' says F. W. Schneidewin (ed.), *Simonidis Cei reliquiae* (Brunsvigae, 1835), 129.

‘κίρτος ignotum: κίρτος coni. Hecker’.<sup>20</sup> Actually what Hecker wrote was not a common noun but *Κίρτος*,<sup>21</sup> the satyr. Was this a forerunner of the Sicyonian-Phliasian namesake, whom we met at Pergamum?<sup>22</sup>

State University of Milan/  
Wolfson College, Oxford

L. LEHNUS

<sup>20</sup> Page, cf. Campbell (ed.), *GL* iii. pp. 488–9.

<sup>21</sup> See *Philologus* 5 (1850), 510.

<sup>22</sup> Doubts on the assumed attribution of the poem to Dionysodorus (most recently *SEG* 39, 453) arose during the discussion following a paper on Callimachean chronology, which I gave in Cambridge in November 1994: I am indebted to members of the Literary Seminar for many thought-provoking comments. I am especially grateful to Dr (now Professor) James Diggle, Cambridge, and to Mr Franco Basso, Oxford, for reading subsequent drafts of this note and offering helpful suggestions, as well as for greatly improving my English. For what is here I am solely responsible.

# AELIAN, *VARIA HISTORIA* 8.1 AND THE TRANSMISSION OF [PLATO], *THEAGES* 128d2–3

φωνήν πολλάκις ἔφασκε [sc. *Ὁκράτης*] θεία πομπή  
ἐγκεκληρωμένην αὐτῷ κτλ.

Dilts (Teubner, 1974) prints *ὁσία πομπή* (*ὁσίαν πομπής* codd., *corr.* Faber). Hercher before him (Teubner, 1866) adopted the conjecture *θεία πομπή* (Davis). Several pieces of evidence tell in favour of the latter text.

1) For *θεία πομπή* cf. Hdt. I.62.4, III.77.1, IV.152.2, VIII.94.2; Ael. *NA* 3.47; Plu. *Rom.* 9.7, *Mor.* 323e; Aristid. I.36, I.37 Lenz–Behr; Joseph. *AJ* 11.335. *ὁσία πομπή* on the other hand seems to be unattested.

2) ΘΕΙΑΙ and ΟCΙΑΙ are easily confused in majuscule script (cf. Pl. *Grg.* 492b2 ὄοις F, θεοῖς BTP; Dodds ad loc. compares also Eur. *Heracl.* 911 ὁ cὸς Wecklein, θεὸς L). The confusion is encouraged by the similarity in meaning of the two words.

3) In *VH* 8.1 Aelian is paraphrasing [Pl.] *Theages* 128d2–129a1; his model for the lemma above is 128d2–3, which in our mss. and printed texts runs: ἔστι τι θεία μοῖρα παρεπόμενον ἐμοὶ... δαιμόνιον (Aelian’s *φωνήν* alludes to Socrates’ divine sign, τὸ δαιμόνιον). *θεία πομπή* therefore has every appearance of being a deliberate reminiscence of *θεία μοῖρα*.

A little further reflection on the precise relation between Aelian’s text and *Thg.* 128d2–3 may shed unexpected light on the ancient state of the Platonic passage (and, incidentally, strengthen the case for *θεία πομπή* as the true reading in *VH* 8.1). A third text provides our point of departure.

In a loose quotation of *Thg.* 128d2–7 in the anonymous *Frag. Comm. in Arist. Rhet.* 325.6 Rabe, *παραπεμπόμενον* is given in place of *παρεπόμενον* (128d2).<sup>1</sup> This could, admittedly, be nothing more than our commentator’s personal contribution to the text he was quoting: the substitution of *παραπεμπόμενον* can be accounted for contextually, since *πέμπω* and related forms are sometimes applied to the activity of *δαίμονες*<sup>2</sup> (and *Thg.* 128d2ff. is assuredly a ‘demonological’ context). Yet I suspect that *παραπεμπόμενον* is in fact no mere aberration but represents rather the reading which Aelian found in his copy of *Thg.*, i.e. ἔστι τι θεία μοῖρα *παραπεμπόμενον*

<sup>1</sup> *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, vol. XXI.2 (Berlin, 1896): πολλάκις ἔλεγεν [sc. *Ὁκράτης*] ὅτι cύνεστιν αὐτῷ τὸ δαιμόνιον θεία μοῖρα *παραπεμπόμενον* ἐκ παιδὸς αὐτῷ κτλ.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g. Soph. *El.* 1156–8; Pl. *R.* 620d8; Plu. *Mor.* 361c, *Sull.* 7.10; Cass. Dio 57.15.7; Iamb. *Myst.* 3.16; *Lyr. Adesp.* 1018 (b) 3–7 (*PMG*); *AP* VI.182.5; see F. Pfister, *RE* suppl. 7, 106.