

addressing Calypso) ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς ἐθέλω καὶ ἐέλδομαι ἥματα πάντα | οἴκαδε τ' ἐλθέμεναι καὶ νόστιμον ἡμῶν ἰδέσθαι.

The love of Polyphemus for Galatea, a minor motif in Philoxenus' dithyramb, was nevertheless the element which captured most strongly the Hellenistic imagination, and as a productive literary theme it swiftly outstrips the original Homeric story. Yet the Hellenistic versions, however they manipulate and play with the motif, nevertheless seem to keep Philoxenus' poem firmly in mind throughout. We must remain suspicious that if we had more of the poetry written in the late fifth and fourth centuries, Hellenistic verse would begin to look far less innovative than it does at the moment.

Highgate, London

J. H. HORDERN  
jhordern@hotmail.com

### WHAT DID HE DO? CLEARCHUS ON PHILOXENUS (AP. ATH. 1.5f–6a = CLEARCH. FR. 57 WEHRLI)\*

Among the hundreds of Greek texts preserved in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* is a quotation from Clearchus of Soli which offers a detailed picture of Philoxenus' practice of attending banquets, in his own city<sup>1</sup> as well as in others, and of his behaviour at table. According to Athenaeus—or rather the epitomator to whom we owe the text of the first two and part of the third books—Clearchus relates the exploits of Philoxenus the *opsophagos*<sup>2</sup> as follows (1.5f–6a), portraying him as an uninvited guest and parasite offering the seasonings in exchange for a place at the meal:

Κλέαρχος δέ φησι Φιλόξενον προλούμενον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι κὰν ἄλλαις πόλεσι περιέρχεσθαι τὰς οἰκίας, ἀκολουθοῦντων αὐτῷ παιδῶν καὶ φερόντων ἔλαιον οἶνον γάρον ὄξος καὶ ἄλλα ἡδύσματα· ἔπειτα εἰσιόντα εἰς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας οἰκίας τὰ ἐψόμενα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀρτύειν, ἐμβάλλοντα ὧν ἐστι χρεία.

The next section of the text after this quotation is unclear. The two manuscripts<sup>3</sup> of the Epitome provide the version: εἰθ' οὕτως ἀνακάμψαντα εὖωχεῖσθαι, whereas the

\* The research for this paper has been made possible by the grants awarded by The Foundation for Polish Science and The De Brzezie Lanckoroński Foundation. I would like to express my gratitude to both the Institutions for their support. I should also like to thank Dr M. Griffin and CQ's anonymous referee for their comments on the original draft.

<sup>1</sup> Uncertainty surrounds the name of the city since it is not clear whether Philoxenus of Cythera, the composer of dithyrambs, or Philoxenus of Leucas, the author of the *Deipnon*, is the hero of this story. The confusion between the two poets, deeply rooted in ancient tradition, has been taken over by modern scholars. On the discussion of the question see E. Degani, 'Filosseno di Leucade e Platone comico (fr. 189 K.-A.)', *Eikasmos* 9 (1998), 90–9; J. Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef. The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy* (Oxford, 2000), 345–50. It should also be noticed that Athenaeus (6.239f, 241e, 242b–c, 246a) mentions a certain Philoxenus nicknamed Ham-cleaver, a parasite and glutton, who cannot be identified with either of the two poets called Philoxenus.

<sup>2</sup> On the meaning of *opson*, *opsophagia*, and *opsophagos*, see J. Davidson, 'Opsophagia. Revolutionary eating in Athens', in J. Wilkins, D. Harvey, and M. Dobson (edd.), *Food in Antiquity* (Exeter, 1995), 204–13. See also L. Romeri's polemical remarks on Davidson's interpretation, 'The λογάδειπνον. Athenaeus between banquet and anti-banquet', in D. Braund and J. Wilkins (edd.), *Athenaeus and his World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire* (Exeter, 2000), 266 and 566, n. 24.

<sup>3</sup> C = Parisinus suppl. Gr. 841 and E = Laurentianus LX 2. On the textual tradition of the *Deipnosophistae*, see G. Arnott, 'Athenaeus and the Epitome. Text and early editions', in Braund and Wilkins (n. 2), 41–52.

*Suda*,<sup>4</sup> which seems to be an independent witness of Clearchus' text, differs from their readings and quotes: *καθ' οὕτως <εἰς ἑαυτὸν> κύψαντα εὐωχεῖσθαι*.

The verb *εὐωχεῖσθαι* undoubtedly underlines Philoxenus' taking pleasure in the feast, and suits the luxurious menu of the banquet. The preceding phrase with the aorist participle, found difficult by editors and commentators, must refer to his action at the gathering of diners which immediately followed the preparation of food and preceded its consumption.

The textual variant given by the *Suda* (<εἰς ἑαυτὸν> κύψαντα) is usually preferred<sup>5</sup> to the reading *ἀνακάμψαντα* found in both MSS (C and E) of the Epitome. However, scholars have shown little interest in the interpretation of this ambiguous phrase which seems to play a significant part in Clearchus' picture of Philoxenus' behaviour. They confine themselves to rendering it literally, finding for <εἰς ἑαυτὸν> κύψαντα modern equivalents: 'he would bend over' (Gulick),<sup>6</sup> 'replié sur lui-même' (Desrousseau),<sup>7</sup> 'vorgebeut' (Friedrich),<sup>8</sup> 'dobládose sobre sí mismo' (Guillén),<sup>9</sup> 'curvatosi su sè stesso' (Turturro).<sup>10</sup> Further commentaries do not pursue the matter of the sense of this phrase within Clearchus' discourse.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Schweighäuser<sup>11</sup> confessed: 'Cum apud Suidam ( . . . ) <εἰς ἑαυτὸν> κύψαντα legeretur, id quidem quid esset haud percepi.'<sup>12</sup> Exactly two hundred years later Maria Luisa Gambato faced the need to explain Clearchus' words in her brilliant commentary on Book 1 of the Epitome.<sup>13</sup> She aptly remarked that the phrase <εἰς ἑαυτὸν> κύψαντα, which she translates 'rimpiiegato su se stesso', might have been an allusion to greediness or embarrassment of Philoxenus the *opsophagos*, since the two meanings of *κύπτειν* are supported, respectively, by Aristophanes' *Peace* (33) and *Knights* (1354).<sup>14</sup> However, she favours the variant *ἀνακάμψαντα*; in her opinion, Clearchus, using the verb *ἀνακάμπτειν* ironically,

<sup>4</sup> *Suda* Φ 395, s. v. Φιλόξενος Λευκαδίου. ὄνομα παρασίτου. Τοῦτόν φασιν προλουόμενον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι κὰν ἄλλαις πόλεσι περιέρχεσθαι τὰς οἰκίας κτλ. (*Suda* omits οἶνον).

<sup>5</sup> See G. Kaibel, *Athenaei Naucratis Deipnosophistarum libri XV* (Lipsiae, 1887), I; Ch. B. Gulick, *Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists I* (Cambridge-London, 1927); A. M. Desrousseaux, *Athénée de Naucratis. Les Deipnosophistes. Livres I et II* (Paris, 1956).

<sup>6</sup> Gulick (n. 5), 24.

<sup>7</sup> Desrousseaux (n. 5), 12.

<sup>8</sup> C. Friedrich and Th. Nothers, *Athenaios. Das Gelehrtenmahl. Buch I–VI, Erster Teil: Buch I–III* (Stuttgart, 1998), 11.

<sup>9</sup> L. Rodríguez Guillén, *Ateneo. Banquete de los eruditos. Libros I–II* (Madrid, 1998), 88.

<sup>10</sup> G. Turturro, *Ateneo. I deipnosofisti o sofisti a banchetto. Libri I e II* (Bari, 1961), 25.

<sup>11</sup> I. Schweighäuser, *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas, tomus primus* (Argentorati, 1801), 72.

<sup>12</sup> He also rejected the variant *ἀνακάμψαντα* given by MSS which the commentators understood as either *domum reversum* or in the meaning of *deglutire*, and, following Brunck, accepted *ἀνακύψαντα*. See *ibid.* 72: 'collata Suidae scriptura cum ea quam dabant libri nostri, verissimam prodire lectionem *ἀνακύψαντα*, quam et Brunckius noster in ora sui libri commendaverat, iudicavi. Dicitur autem *ἀνακύπτειν* is, qui, postquam incurvatus et versus terram inclinatus fuerat, erigit se, et caput attollit; tum metaphorice, qui e modestiis et aerumnis se recipit, reficit, recreatque: quae notio perapta huic loco videtur, ut, qui curvato corpore adhuc culinario labori fuerat intentus, dein opere perfecto, caput erexisse et ex labore se recepisse dicatur.' A number of scholars were thinking along the same lines, see e.g. C. D. Yonge, *The Deipnosophists or Banquet of the Learned of Athenaeus* 1 (London, 1853), 9: 'when he had finished his labours'. See also F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles, B. 3: Klearchos* (Basel and Stuttgart, 1969), 26, but see D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric, V: The New School of Poetry and Anonymous Songs and Hymns* (Cambridge and London, 1993), 169: 'he gulped it down'.

<sup>13</sup> M. L. Gambato, in *Ateneo. I deipnosofisti (i dotti a banchetto)*, Prima traduzione italiana commentata su progetto di Luciano Canfora 1 (Roma, 2001), 19–20.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

explores imagery of circular movement and alludes to the idea of Peripatetic walking which here should indicate Philoxenus' moving around the table or, in general, his wandering lifestyle.<sup>15</sup> Although the association of Clearchus himself with the Peripatos does not make Gambato's proposal unpalatable, I do not follow her interpretation of this difficult passage.

It seems likely that the author of the *Suda* used an edition of Clearchus' treatise which carried readings superior to the text which Athenaeus drew on, or—what is more probable—that he consulted, when quoting Clearchus, a version of Athenaeus' text<sup>16</sup> which was better than that used by the Byzantine scholar who epitomized the initial section of the *Deipnosophistae*.

I am inclined to prefer the variant <εἰς ἑαυτὸν> κύψαντα to ... in this place, and to think that Clearchus indulges here in allusiveness that contains references to the body-language used by a parasite in the course of his self-performance. Such displays, regarded as a kind of sympotic entertainment, included visual elements, like gesture and posture, which—beside witty sayings spoken by parasites—were of great importance at a banquet<sup>17</sup> since they caused much hilarity and produced pleasure, the essential quality of a sympotic gathering. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Philoxenus, as described by Clearchus, intends to show that he is trying to act like a wrestler here. He seems to imitate the wrestler's preliminary position<sup>18</sup> adopted by a competitor as a match begins: head bent down with knees slightly bent were elements of the typical attitude of the παλαιστής before taking hold.<sup>19</sup> Philoxenus' fixed posture resembling that of a wrestler who is ready to attack his opponent, transposed to the level of sympotic behaviour, is nothing other than a reference to the glutton's readiness for satisfying—at any price—his appetite. The opponent against whom the parasite is ready to fight is the meal itself.

A similar association between the image of a wrestler and that of a glutton can be found in Aristophanes' *Peace* (33–4) where the slave says about the greedy beetle: κύψας . . . ἐσθίει ὥσπερ παλαιστής.<sup>20</sup> What is more, the verb κύπτειν appears also in other authors' texts where it is used to create images of greedy eaters, for example in Plato (*Resp.* 586a),<sup>21</sup> Menander (603 K-A),<sup>22</sup> and Plutarch (*Conv. sept. sap.* 159D).<sup>23</sup> It seems that Philoxenus, when depicted by Clearchus as a parasite who is intentionally displaying his excessive appetite as well as his determination to satisfy his craving,

<sup>15</sup> Gambato (n. 13), 19 calls Clearchus' Philoxenus 'una curiosa figura di peripatetico della cucina, un "sofista itinerante" della buona tavola'.

<sup>16</sup> See Degani (n. 1), 91. Generally it seems that the *Suda* quotes Athenaeus from a better text than the Marcianus.

<sup>17</sup> They belong to the 'ritualized behaviour patterns' the purpose of which was to enable the symposiasts to attain pleasure, as E. Pellizer rightly observed. See his 'Outlines of a morphology of sympotic entertainment', in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptica. A Symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford, 1990), 178. On this subject see also valuable remarks made by B. Fehr, 'Entertainers at the Symposium: the *Akletei* in the Archaic period', *ibid.* 185–95.

<sup>18</sup> The fullest description of this position can be found in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, 10.31.

<sup>19</sup> See E. N. Gardiner, 'Wrestling', *JHS* 25 (1905), 263, and *id.*, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London, 1910), 382. See also W. Rudolph, *Olympischer Kampfsport in der Antike. Faustkampf, Ringkampf und Pankration in der griechischen Nationalfestspielen* (Berlin, 1965), 16.

<sup>20</sup> On this passage, cf. S. Douglas Olson, *Aristophanes. Peace* (Oxford, 1998), 73.

<sup>21</sup> *Κεκυφότες εἰς γῆν καὶ εἰς τραπέζας βόσκονται χορταζόμενοι.*

<sup>22</sup> *Κύψας καθ' αὐτὸν* (Plut. *De tuenda sanit. praec.* 20 p. 133AB: *εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν τραγημάτων ἔφλα.*)

<sup>23</sup> *Ἐκαστος ἐγκεκυφῶς ἐδοῦλεν τῇ περὶ τὴν τροφὴν χρειᾷ.*

pretends to imitate the exaggerated behaviour of a gluttonous ἄκλῆτος who causes much laughter before heartily eating.<sup>24</sup>

Greek texts contain numerous references to the association of parasites with athletics and sport. In Aristophon's *Latros* (5.3–4 K-A) a parasite presents himself as a good παλαιστής. Lucian (*Par.* 51) offers an example of a parasite's taking pleasure in visiting the gymnasia and athletic schools, and in Alciphron's letter (3.23.4) one can find the picture of a parasite who is ready to go to the bathing-place or the wrestling-school. The attractiveness of such places for gluttonous parasites, who are incessant food-seekers, is naturally connected with the presence of rich people, that is potential hosts and powerful patrons<sup>25</sup> who provide the food and drink. But the high-class parasites, such as Philoxenus, frequented athletic fields also because they cared about their physique.<sup>26</sup> The treatment of the parasite-theme in Greek literature at any period must have reproduced many aspects of the everyday affairs of real parasites. Clearchus then, when representing Philoxenus the parasite as a 'wrestling-enthusiast', certainly assumed in his readers an acquaintance with the issues and personalities from their local social scene. The allusion to the fighting spirit of Philoxenus the parasite could add significantly to the comic effect of this portrait.

Clearchus' representation of Philoxenus, which focuses on his strategy to gain a meal and at the same time to delight his table companions with witty gestural vocabulary, nicely portrays two complementary aspects of the parasite's role at the symposium: as the laughter-maker Philoxenus shows the importance of both food and entertainment<sup>27</sup> or—to allude to Plutarch's words<sup>28</sup>—of the main menu and the extras at the banquet.

Although Clearchus, the Peripatetic philosopher, seems to be dismissed as a superficial and mediocre artist,<sup>29</sup> the passage from his *Περὶ βίων* concerning Philoxenus

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Epicharm 32 K-A, where the parasite himself presents the sequence of events at the dinner in which he is an active participant, namely joking and eating.

<sup>25</sup> The relationship between parasites or flatterers and their hosts reflected the socio-economic hierarchical structure of the society in the Graeco-Roman world. On this idea see the excellent chapter by T. Whitmarsh, 'The politics and poetics of parasitism. Athenaeus on parasites and flatterers', in Braund and Wilkins (n. 2), 304–15.

<sup>26</sup> Not all gluttons and parasites were characterized by big bellies and deformed bodies. On this subject, see H. G. Nesselrath, *Lukians Parasitendialog. Untersuchungen und Kommentar* (Berlin and New York, 1985), 36–7, who contrasts 'total abgemachte Parasiten' with those proud of their 'körperliche Vollkommenheit'. He says: 'Sehr auffällig ist es ein Merkmal, das in keinem erkennbaren inneren Zusammenhang mit der Tätigkeit der Parasitierens als solches steht. Simon [i.e. the speaker in Lucian's dialogue] schildert seinen Parasiten als großen, kräftigen und energischen Mann, der als regelmäßiger Besucher von Gymnasion und Palaistra über einen durchtrainierten Körper zu verfügen scheint und auch ästhetischer Betrachtung einen vollkommen befriedigten Anblick bietet.'

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Ch. Jacob, 'Ateneo, o il Dedalo delle parole', in *Ateneo* (n. 13), XXI: 'un simposio riuscito . . . è il luogo della "buona mescolanza": mescolanza del vino . . . , mescolanza dei convitati, gli scherzi, i giochi dei quali devono assicurare l'armonia della riunione, il piacere di tutti e di ciascuno'. The separation between food and sympotic entertainment, including talk, reflected in literary works from Plato onwards, does not correspond to the traditional practice, as L. Romeri, 'Platon e la tradition conviviale', *REA* 104 (2002), 51–9 rightly pointed out.

<sup>28</sup> *Quaest. Conv.* 629C. Plutarch distinguishes between the essential components of a feast and the *epeisodia* added for pleasure.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. E. Zeller and R. Mondolfo, *La filosofia dei Greci nel suo sviluppo storico* II.6 (Firenze, 1996), 474: 'Clearco dà l'impressione di essere . . . un letterato piuttosto superficiale, non privo di qualche cultura.'

should not remain neglected. Its brilliant allusiveness not only reveals the author's knowledge of sympotic tradition but also proves that he was a talented<sup>30</sup> writer.

University of Poznań

KRYSZYNA BARTOL  
ifkuam@amu.edu.pl

<sup>30</sup> That he was also poetically talented is proven by the inscription with the epigram composed by him. On the epigram see L. Robert, 'Inscriptions grecques nouvelles de la Bactriane', *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1968), 448–9 (= L. Robert, *Opera minora selecta. Épigraphie et Antiquités grecques V* [Amsterdam, 1989], 542–3).

### FERIMUS

Cicero seems to have avoided the first-person plural of the present indicative of *fero* and of its compounds: a search on the PHI Latin Texts CD 5.3 (1991) shows only one occurrence of *ferimus*, none of *adferimus*, *auferimus*, *conferimus*, or similar compound forms. Since *fero* and its numerous compounds are common words, this is unlikely to be coincidence. Of course, some forms will be rare because an author will have had little occasion to use them; Cicero may, for instance, have wanted to say 'let us endure' or 'we shall endure' more often than 'we are enduring'. The table below (which compares words with similar meanings) suggests that this is not the explanation for the extreme rarity here.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Occurrences in Cicero*

<i>ferimus</i>	1	<i>feremus</i>	9	<i>feramus</i>	13
<i>patimur</i>	5	<i>patiemur</i>	3	<i>patiamur</i>	10
<i>gerimus</i>	5	<i>geremus</i>	1	<i>geramus</i>	4

Of the three forms, the future indicative occurs least frequently in most verbs; so it is no surprise that this is the case for *patiemur* and *geremus* too. Beyond that, there is no general pattern of usage. But in proportion to the frequency of its word, only *ferimus* seems to be avoided. The reason for this is not obvious; perhaps doubts about the correct form could have been created by *fers*, *fert*, *fertis*. Without actually believing that *fermus* could be correct, speakers may have felt uneasy with *ferimus* (especially since occasions for using it would in any case have probably been too infrequent to establish its legitimacy beyond question).<sup>2</sup>

The only instance of *ferimus* in Cicero is at *Flac.* 2–3: *non sum arbitratus quemquam amicum rei publicae, postea quam L. Flacci amor in patriam perspectus esset, novas huic inimicitias nulla accepta iniuria denuntiaturum. sed quoniam, iudices, multa nos et in*

<sup>1</sup> Again a search of the PHI disk in the text of Cicero. The *ad Herennium*, letters by writers other than Cicero (*Att.* 8.11c; *ad Brut.* 25[1.17].2) and quotations (*Att.* 1.16.10) have been removed from the figures.

<sup>2</sup> For an example of doubts about the correct form causing avoidance in Latin, cf. E. Dickey, 'O egregie grammaticae: the vocative problems of Latin words ending in *-ius*', *CQ* 50 (2000), 548–62, particularly 553–6.