



## On the Tragedian Chaereon

C. Collard

*The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 90. (1970), pp. 22-34.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4269%281970%2990%3C22%3AOTTC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-R>

*The Journal of Hellenic Studies* is currently published by The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/hellenic.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ON THE TRAGEDIAN CHAEREMON

CHAEREMON is a shadowy figure in early fourth century tragedy,<sup>1</sup> but one of considerable interest. I attempt here an appraisal of his work, in so far as the fragments and the ancient *testimonia* allow.

### I. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Text of the fragments: Nauck, *TGF*<sup>2</sup> 781–92; P. Hibeh ii 224.

The only general assessments of Chaeremon of any extent date from the nineteenth century with its more expansive approach. Best is G. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen Literatur* ii 2 (Halle 1859<sup>2</sup>) 61–3, who there refers to the ‘sorgfältige Monographie’ of H. Bartsch, *De Chaeremone poeta tragico* (Mainz 1843) (inaccessible to me). Older literature is listed by A. Dieterich s.v. ‘Chairemon’, *PW* iii 2, 2025 (published 1899).

Since Bernhardt the space accorded Chaeremon not just in general works but even in detailed studies of tragedy diminishes sharply. He still warrants a page or so in A. and M. Croiset, *Histoire de la littérature grecque* (Paris 1913<sup>3</sup>) iii 402 f.; in Lesky he gets a brief mention, *Geschichte*<sup>2</sup> 680. He is not mentioned by name in Lesky’s *Tragische Dichtung*, and only in connection with *fr.* 2 by Pohlenz, *Griechische Tragödie* (Göttingen 1954<sup>2</sup>) 407; he is ignored, for example, by Kitto, *Greek Tragedy* (London 1961).

There is a brief discussion by K. Ziegler s.v. ‘Tragoedia’, *PW* vi A2, 1966 (published 1937) and (mainly of two plays) by T. B. L. Webster, ‘Fourth Century Tragedy and the Poetics’, *Hermes* lxxxii (1954) 302 f. (partly reproduced in *Art and Literature in Fourth Century Athens* [London 1956] 66 f.)

Separate aspects of Chaeremon’s work have been studied incidentally elsewhere, and I note them below where appropriate.

### II. EXTENT OF THE FRAGMENTS; THEIR SOURCES AND CHARACTER

Nauck, *TGF*<sup>2</sup> lists 39 fragments of one or more verses, all quotations in ancient authors, which give a total of about 75 lines: all are iambic trimeters and, we may assume from their metrical form, from dialogue.<sup>2</sup> In addition, Nauck records two garbled and perhaps erroneous quotations in very late sources: *fr.* 40 Georgius Pachymeres (thirteenth century) in *Rhet. Gr.* ed. Walz i (1832) 553.21, and *fr.* 41 Cocondrius (date uncertain) in *Rhet. Gr.* ed. Spengel iii (1856) 236.27.<sup>3</sup>

#### *The Contribution of Papyrus*

Papyrus has added little to our texts. The best known fragment, no. 2, stands in a papyrus of the second century A.D. published by P. Collart in *CRAI* (1945) 249–58 (=Pack<sup>2</sup> no. 2656), but it is cited from Euripides’ and not Chaeremon’s *Achilles Thersitoctonus*.

In 1955 E. G. Turner edited Part ii of the Hibeh Papyri. No. 224 (p. 148 f. = Pack<sup>2</sup> no. 1613), of 280–250 B.C., is a small fragment of a gnomic anthology, containing in the left-hand column the very ends of iambic trimeters (16 vv.), in the right the beginnings of hexameters (8 vv. are identifiable). The start of the second column, before which there is

I am grateful to Dr Shirley Barlow for reading a draft of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> I discuss Chaeremon’s use of the trimeter below, pp. 29–30.

<sup>1</sup> Date: the only firm evidence is that of the earliest quotations of *fr.* 2, especially *Pl. Lg.* 709b (c. 350 B.C.?), *D.* ii 22 (349 B.C.).

<sup>3</sup> Earlier editors tried hard to restore these ‘verses’ (see Nauck), but without conviction, and I ignore them here. Attempts have been made to assign *AP* vii 245 (Stadtmüller) and *Stobaeus* iii 4.16 (Hense) to Chaeremon.

an empty space even in the fragmentary papyrus, refers to Chaeremon: Turner suggests this 'heading' introduced quotations from the *Centaurus*, known from Arist. *Po.* 1447b20 to have contained hexameters.<sup>4</sup> Turner can cite no other example of gnomic hexameters on papyrus,<sup>5</sup> and it is therefore likely that all six of the legible beginnings belong to Chaeremon; they seem to have been self-contained verses, like so many of the gnomic trimeters (*frs.* 2, 18–20, 22–30, 32–5, 37, 38). These further scraps can now be added to the fragments in Nauck, but they contribute nothing to the recoverable impression of Chaeremon as poet.<sup>6</sup>

(*Note: the 'Oeneus' papyrus.* Webster suggested that an early third century B.C. papyrus (Hibeh i 4 = Pack<sup>2</sup> no. 1708 = Page, *GLP* no. 28), hesitantly attributed to Euripides' *Oeneus* on the conjectural identification of a speaker with Diomedes, is in style 'certainly not impossible for Chaeremon';<sup>7</sup> he is followed by F. Stoessl.<sup>8</sup> The fragmentary text, in which 10 out of some 60 lines are reasonably complete, covers the end of one iambic episode and the start of another; in between there stands the bare indication *χοροῦ μέλος*: the ode, which would have been supplied at performance, was both inconsequential to the plot and independent of it, according to the theatrical tendency of the fourth century. The implication of this *παρεπιγραφή* is that the play is not Euripidean, otherwise the end of the episode would be followed by a 'regular' choral ode. Pack<sup>2</sup> and Lesky<sup>9</sup> refer the fragment simply to 'post-classical' tragedy: we know nothing at all of the nature of Chaeremon's lyrics, and no rejection may be made for him like that for Euripides. Even if this implication is ignored, the presumable dramatic context adds nothing to the argument for Euripides' *Oeneus*, of which our fragments (Nauck, *TGF*<sup>2</sup> nos. 558–70) are meagre enough.<sup>10</sup> Yet these few verses are very Euripidean in style: the number of Euripidean echoes in vocabulary and phrasing is so striking that if the author was not after all Euripides the attribution to Chaeremon is no more probable than to Sophocles.<sup>11</sup> The main echoes are:

P. Hibeh i 4 *fr.* a 3 = v. 2 Page τέλος]ς γάρ τῶν ἐμῶν λογῶν ἔχεις: *Hec.* 413 τέλος δέχῃ . . . τῶν ἐμῶν προσφθεγμάτων.

*Fr.* a 4 = 3 Page ἐφ' ἦν . . . ] . . . πράξιιν ὁρμήσω ποδί: *fr.* 910.4 εἰς ἀδίκους πράξιιν ὁρμῶν; *IT* 1407 ὠρμήθη ποσίν; cf. *Or.* 1289.

*Fr.* a 5–6 = 4–5 Page δωρήματα|ὄπως γένηται κάποπληρωθῆ τάφος: *Or.* 122 ἄ δ' εἰς ἀδελφὴν καιρὸς ἐκπονεῖν ἐμὴν|ἄπανθ' ὑπισχοῦ νεπτέρων δωρήματα.

*Fr.* a 7 = 6 Page ἀγώνων τῶν κεκαλλιστευμένων: for the rare Middle cf. *Med.* 947 δῶρ' ἄ καλλιστεύεται.

*Fr.* a 8 = 7 Page τυράννοις ἀνδράσιν: *Med.* 308, 700; *Supp.* 166.

*Fr.* a 10 τί ποτ' ἄρα: cf. *Ba.* 639, *Ion* 324; *Ba.* 894, *Rhes.* 135.

*Fr.* b 17 ἀθῶος: *vox Euripidea* (*Med.* 1300, *Ba.* 672, *fr.* 675).

*Fr.* g 57 ἀπ]εμπολῶσιν: *vox Euripidea* (five times).

*Fr.* g 58 πρὸς σε δεξιᾶς χερὸς: *IT* 608, *IA* 909; cf. *Hipp.* 605.

So many reminiscences in so few verses disprove entirely attribution to Chaeremon. Inevitably there are echoes in him from earlier tragedy, but he is never the simple heir to another's style, much less a plagiarist. The two longer fragments, nos. 1 and 14, show him writing in an unmistakably individual way. My conviction that P. Hibeh i 4 is not by

<sup>4</sup> See p. 25.

<sup>5</sup> Pack<sup>2</sup> only rarely gives the metre of verse anthologies: see, for example, nos. 1876–87.

<sup>6</sup> The verses begin *χρηῖ τιμᾶν θ[εόν?; ἀρχὴ γὰρ θη[ητοῖς; ἰμείρον πάση[ς ἀρετῆς; ῥώμην τιμῶμεν; ἦθος ἔχεν ὄσιον ζή[λου; μὴ πᾶν κέρδος ὄρα*; supplements by Turner.

<sup>7</sup> *Hermes* lxxxii (1954) 302.

<sup>8</sup> S.v. 'Chairemon', *Der Kleine Pauly* i (Stuttgart 1964) 1121.

<sup>9</sup> *Geschichte*<sup>2</sup> 680.

<sup>10</sup> A brief discussion in Page, *GLP*; on the single fragment from Chaeremon's *Oeneus*, *TGF*<sup>2</sup> no. 14, see below pp. 32–34.

<sup>11</sup> So O. Rossbach, from the *Chryses*: rejected by A. C. Pearson, *Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge 1917) ii 328. After writing these lines I saw that W. Barrett, *Hippolytus* (Oxford 1964) 438 n. 2 thinks that 'χοροῦ μέλος is no longer a reason for supposing the tragedy of P. Hib. 4 to be post-classical'.

Chaeremon is not weakened by the absence from his remains of any strictly comparable iambic dialogue; even the gnomic fragments are recognisably not Euripidean in manner; in the tonal imagery of their descriptions the two poets display fundamentally differing artistic sensibilities.)

#### *Sources and Character of the Fragments*

The fragments in content and character very largely reflect the particular nature of the two almost exclusive sources, Stobaeus and Athenaeus. The 22 fragments in Stobaeus (16 unique to him) are without exception gnomic, but 12 of Athenaeus' 14 (13 unique) illustrate technical or stylistic points; two only are quoted for their matter. The few in other sources are quite typical of ancient quotations in their variety.

This narrowly-based selection shows the hazards of fragmentary preservation. Chaeremon's plays were primarily a stylistic quarry for the interests of Athenaeus and his predecessors, but no less important and rewarding for the anthologist of *sententiae* (our impression from Stobaeus is confirmed by P. Hibeh ii 224). Probably the fragments illustrate simply extreme poles of the poet's work. The 'middle'—that is, the dramatic matter and the manner of its presentation in episode, rhesis, dialogue and possibly ode—is by some chance almost wholly unrepresented. The polarity found in Stobaeus and Athenaeus cannot, surely, be the whole Chaeremon. The excerpts of Euripides in Stobaeus would be no less difficult to reconcile just with a fragmentary selection from his richly imagined messenger-speeches; his aphorisms look equally stark out of context. Nevertheless, it is odd that the selection of quotations from Chaeremon is so unbalanced in comparison with that from other tragedians.

### III. TESTIMONIA: ARISTOTLE ON CHAEREMON

There are two descriptive judgments surviving from antiquity of real consequence to an appraisal of Chaeremon; both are from Aristotle. P. Lévêque<sup>12</sup> tried to prove Aristotle's high regard for Agathon from the comparative number of times the tragedians are mentioned in the *Poetics*: Euripides 13, Sophocles 11, Agathon 5, Aeschylus 3, Chaeremon 2; he noted that Ion and Achaëus, the only two other poets whose fragments are at all numerous, are not named at all. Aristotle cites Chaeremon in both cases for unusual features of his work, but it is important for us to have these comments from so near a contemporary; I would prefer not to follow Lévêque in drawing any sort of conclusion from the number of citations, and Aristotle both disapproves of Chaeremon (*Po.* 1460a2) and approves (arguably: *Rh.* 1413b12).

The other ancient *testimonia* are of much less importance. Athenaeus' brief stylistic evaluation (608d), as also the one piece of epigraphic evidence (*IG*<sup>2</sup> v 2, 118), are more usefully discussed in other contexts than separately here.<sup>13</sup> The brief article in the Souda (*X* 170 Adler) wrongly describes the poet as *κωμικός*, but gives the titles, not all correctly, of eight plays.<sup>14</sup>

*Aristotle, Rh.* 1413b12: *Chaeremon ἀναγνωστικός*

Aristotle illustrates the employment by the *ἀναγνωστικοί* of the graphic style, which in clarity of expression contrasts with the agonistic style's greater suitability for declamation or acting,<sup>15</sup> by naming Chaeremon and the even more shadowy dithyrambic Licymnius.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> *Agathon* (Paris 1955) 14.

<sup>13</sup> *IG*<sup>2</sup> in the following paragraph, Athenaeus on p. 28.

<sup>14</sup> The Souda acknowledges Athenaeus as source for one title, but probably took them all from him.

<sup>15</sup> 1413b8–9 *λέξις γραφική μὲν ἢ ἀκριβεστάτη, ἀγωνιστικὴ δὲ ἢ ὑποκριτικωτάτη.*

<sup>16</sup> Fragments, *testimonia* in Page, *PMG* nos. 758–63; a rhetorical theorist (*Rh.* 1414b17) and teacher of Polus (*Pl. Phdr.* 267c), as well as poet; cf. E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig 1909<sup>2</sup>) i 73.

The term *ἀναγνωστικός* implies no more than a stylistic judgment, that Chaeremon's plays were in Aristotle's opinion particularly suitable for reading, but not written solely or primarily for it: this was shown by O. Crusius.<sup>17</sup> The remark accords with one of Aristotle's reasons for preferring tragedy to epic, that tragedy loses very little of its effect in reading rather than live performance.<sup>18</sup> Crusius' argument was supported by an inscription from Tegea recording the victory there in the second half of the third century of an athlete actor with a number of plays, including Chaeremon's *Achilles Thersitoctonus*.<sup>19</sup>

As much in point as Aristotle's alignment of Chaeremon with the *ἀναγνωστικοί* is his supplementary comment, which follows from the description of the *λέξις γραφική*, that he was *ἀκριβῆς ὥσπερ λογογράφος*, 1413b13. This remark in turn fits a previous assertion that speeches for a mass audience must resort more to the visual to be effective and less to rigorous clarity of verbal expression: that quality shows best in forensic speaking particularly before a single judge—where, equally, histrionics are disadvantageous; the whole section 1414a8–16 concludes *ἀλλ' ὅπου μάλιστα ὑπόκρισις, ἐνταῦθα ἥκιστα ἀκρίβεια ἔνι*. Chaeremon's *ἀκρίβεια* is essentially that of a *λογογράφος* who writes with precision for the close reasoning of the law-court judge.<sup>20</sup>

We would expect to find in the surviving fragments something at least of the attention to detail and order hinted in Aristotle's remark. Although only *fr.* 1 and 14 afford material enough to make the test, *fr.* 14 reveals just this quality in description: girls dancing are severally pictured, with careful, almost over-careful, detail of the parts of their bodies uncovered by their movements (vv. 1–11); the flowers in the meadow where they collapse in sleep are chosen for the opportunity of emphasising the quality of their colours (vv. 12–5).

*Aristotle*, Po. 1447b20–2, 1459b32–1460a2: *Chaeremon's Centaurus*

G. F. Else has recently examined in detail<sup>21</sup> the probable nature of the *Centaurus*, whose title is in an obvious way appropriate to Aristotle's statement that in it Chaeremon used *ἅπαντα τὰ μέτρα* (47b22; cf. 60a2).<sup>22</sup> Else's conclusion is that the *Centaurus* was a satyric drama of unconventional form: it had no room for choral odes, but in some sense Chaeremon compensated for 'this loss of visual and musical variety by extreme *ποικιλία* in his verses.'<sup>23</sup> Else shows from the associated passage 59b32–60a2 that *ἅπαντα τὰ μέτρα* in 47b22 denotes no more than dactylic hexameters, iambic trimeters and trochaic tetrameters. Although Aristotle thought the mixture *ἀτοπώτερον* (60a1), he seems to have chosen this strange poetical product as a specially good illustration of one of his main themes, that the pre-eminence of tragic *μίμησις* could be unaffected by the loss of visual or musical effects.

Particularly in the *Centaurus*, then, our scrappy fragments can only frustrate our curiosity: from this *δρᾶμα πολύμετρον* we have only five iambic trimeters (*fr.* 10, 11) and the beginnings of a few hexametric *sententiae* (P. Hibeh ii 224).

<sup>17</sup> 'Die Anagnostikoi', *Festschrift Th. Gomperz* (Wien 1902) 382 ff.; echoes still persist of the view discredited by Crusius that these plays were neither performed nor meant for performance: see the comments of R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 29. I cannot document here a problem long resolved.

<sup>18</sup> Po. 1462a12–18, 1450b18–19; see E. Szanto, also in *Festschrift Gomperz*, 275 ff., who includes a discussion of the passage from *Rh.*

<sup>19</sup> *IG*<sup>2</sup> v 2, 118 = *Sylloge* ii 700; cf. R. Herzog, *Philologus* lx (1901) 440 ff. The strong-man chose plots which made plausible a display of his muscles (the modern film affords similar opportunities to exceptional physiques).

<sup>20</sup> Pace Webster, *Hermes* lxxxii (1954) 302, who thinks the context makes it clear Aristotle is thinking rather of panegyric than forensic composition.

<sup>21</sup> *Aristotle's Poetics* (Harvard 1963) 54–60.

<sup>22</sup> *ἐποίησε Κένταυρον [μικτὴν ῥαφωδίων] ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν μέτρων* is Else's text: he argues convincingly (58 f.) for deletion of a phrase which implies the nature of recited epic for a work quite certainly of dramatic character: Athenaeus 608e calls it *δρᾶμα πολύμετρον*.

<sup>23</sup> Else p. 58; on p. 59 n. 236 he cites in support the similar view of V. Steffen, *Satyrographorum Graecorum Reliquiae* (Posnan 1935) 195–6 (= *idem*, *S. G. Fragmenta* [Poznan 1952] 248–9).

## IV. THE SUBJECTS OF THE PLAYS

The suggestion that the metrically heterogeneous *Centaurus* was satyric is clearly right, and the title alone may confirm it. We have from Athenaeus the names of nine plays, but opinions vary whether most or few of them were satyric.<sup>24</sup>

*Alphesiboea* (*fr.* 1): tragic, dealing with the revenge on Alcmaeon by his deserted wife Alphesiboea; see below, p. 30f.

*Achilles Thersitoctonus* (*frr.* 2, 3). Thersites poked out the eyes of the dead Penthesilea and taunted Achilles with his love for her, who then slew Thersites; Diomedes tried to avenge his grandfather, but a fatal conflict with Achilles was prevented by the Atreidae:<sup>25</sup> probably this was the plot of Chaeremon's play, and satyric form is unlikely.<sup>26</sup> The episodes are depicted on an Apulian vase of *c.* 330.<sup>27</sup> *Fr.* 2 may have been spoken by Achilles defending his impulsive killing of Thersites, and *fr.* 3 is possibly from the same dramatic context.<sup>28</sup>

*Dionysus* (*frr.* 4-7 Nauck = 1-4 Steffen; also, perhaps, *frr.* 15, 16 Nauck = 9, 10 Steffen). Assumed by Nauck to have had the same plot as Euripides' *Bacchae*, since *fr.* 4 indicates that Pentheus' *συμφορά* was dramatised; but Steffen thinks of a satyr-play. Aeschylus' *Pentheus* (*frr.* 363-5 Mette<sup>2</sup>) covered the same ground; the episode may have been mentioned in his *Xantriae* (*frr.* 366-72 Mette<sup>2</sup>): neither seems to have been satyric.<sup>29</sup> *Frr.* 5, 6, 7—and 15 and 16, both evoking the power of wine (see Nauck)—all have an obvious Dionysiac reference.

*Thyestes* (*fr.* 8). The Thyestes-Atreus myth was among the most frequently dramatised:<sup>30</sup> we may assume of Chaeremon's play perhaps only that it was not satyric, and cannot know whether he chose the gruesome banquet or Thyestes' violation in ignorance of his daughter at Sicyon.

*Io* (*fr.* 9 Nauck = 5 Steffen). The mention of flowers in the single fragment suggests that some part of the work played in the vale of Argos where Io was born to the river-god Inachus,<sup>31</sup> and where, presumably, Hera's vengeful transformation occurred: this was the substance of Sophocles' plot in his *Inachus*, a satyr-play<sup>32</sup>—but it does not follow that Chaeremon's play must also have been satyric.

<sup>24</sup> Steffen in 1935 thought all but two satyric (*cf.* Else 59), but in 1952 only *Dionysus*, *Io* and *Centaurus*; even more cautious opinion excludes *Dionysus* and *Io*: see the separate entries. The Souda's erroneous description of Chaeremon as a comedian should not affect this question.

<sup>25</sup> C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* (Berlin 1920<sup>4</sup>) 279 ff., approved by L. Séchan, *Etudes sur la tragédie grecque* (Paris 1926) 528 ff., who gives full details of the myth and ancient literary reflections; *cf.* Röscher v 668.

<sup>26</sup> Nauck thought of a satyr-play, perhaps in view of Thersites' physical ugliness (*Il.* ii 216-19) and scurrilous behaviour. The play is entitled *Thersites* in the Souda's quotation of *fr.* 3; it is not known whether Thersites figured in any other drama, but he must have appeared in this one.

<sup>27</sup> Boston 03.804, discussed most fully by J. Paton, *AJA* xii (1908) 404 ff., with Plate; *cf.* Webster, *Hermes* lxxxiii (1954) 302 for other references, and Séchan. F. Brommer, *Vasenlisten der griechischen Heldensage* (Marburg 1960<sup>2</sup>) 263 gives only this one vase for the story.

<sup>28</sup> J. D. Beazley, *The Development of Attic Black-*

*Figure* (Berkeley 1964<sup>2</sup>) 81 n. 31 shrewdly notes that Achilles would normally have been the aggressor in any quarrel.

<sup>29</sup> *Cf.* H. J. Mette, *Der Verlorene Aischylos* (Berlin 1963) 145 ff. An essentially similar plot in Pacuvius' *Pentheus* (Servius on *Aen.* iv 469); Mette, 'Die Römische Tragödie und die Neufunde zur griechischen Tragödie, 1945-64', *Lustrum* ix (1964) 94, who lists other treatments. See also on *Minyades*.

<sup>30</sup> See Pearson's introduction to Sophocles' *Atreus* (*frr.* 140-1) and *Thyestes in Sicyon* (*frr.* 247-69); Mette, *Lustrum* ix (1964) 64 f. and 114.

<sup>31</sup> A. *Supp.* 538 *ματρός ἀνθρόμονος ἐπωπίας, λειμῶνα βούχλων, ἐνθεν Ἴο . . . φεύγει*—on this point, see Pearson, *Sophocles* i 199.

<sup>32</sup> Pearson *frr.* 270-95, P. Oxy. 2369, ? P. Tebt. 692. Satyric: R. Pfeiffer, 'Ein neues Inachos-Fragment des Sophokles', *SB München* 1958, vi 3-6 (*cf.* *SB* 1938, ii 23 ff.); W. M. Calder's arguments for satyric nature, in *GRBS* i (1958) 137 ff., have found no acceptance. Accius also wrote an *Io* (386-8 Ribbeck: Mette, *Lustrum* ix [1964] 149)—but there is no other Greek play of this title known.

*Centaurus* (fr. 10, 11 Nauck = 6–8 Steffen): satyric (see above, p. 25). The singular of the title suggests the play related an episode involving an individual Centaur, such as Pholus: Hercules' insistence on his opening the wine-jar which was Dionysus' special gift to all the Centaurs would be appropriate to a satyr-play, for example.<sup>33</sup> The fragments give no indication of content.

*Minyades* (fr. 12). In Athenaeus 608 f. and the Souda (X 170 Adler) entitled *Minyae*, but this must be wrong if the plot concerned the rejection of Dionysus by Alcithoe and the other daughters of Minyas: this was the theme of Aeschylus' *Xantriae* (fr. 366–72 Mette<sup>2</sup>).<sup>34</sup> Unlikely to be satyric; the fragment again allows no conclusions for its content.

*Odysseus* (fr. 13). A tragedy with probably the same plot as Sophocles' *Odysseus Acanthoplex* or *Niptra*<sup>35</sup> (fr. 453–61 Pearson): Odysseus is slain in ignorance by his son Telegonus. The story was familiar throughout literature after the sixth century Epic *Telegonia*.

*Oeneus* (fr. 14):<sup>36</sup> tragic, and treating probably the dispossession of Oeneus of his kingdom by his brother Agrius and restoration by his grandson Diomedes. See below, p. 32f.

To summarise: of the nine known titles, only *Centaurus* may safely be thought satyric; four plays, *Alphesiboea*, *Thyestes*, *Odysseus* and *Oeneus*, were almost certainly tragic, and it is fairly safe to presume the same of *Achilles*, *Dionysus* and *Minyades*; the *Io*'s nature remains unknown. There is evidence for earlier treatment of almost all the plots: perhaps only in *Achilles* and *Centaurus* did Chaeremon break wholly new ground.

Most of Chaeremon's plays contain lively and exciting incidents, which would have lent themselves to forceful dramatic and theatrical effects and vivid description in both rhesis and messenger-speech: the revenge of Alphesiboea on Alcmaeon, the quarrel of Achilles and Thersites and the thwarted revenge of Diomedes, Telegonus' tragic killing of his father Odysseus, the strange misfortunes of Io or the ghastly ones of Thyestes. The poet clearly shared with the other early fourth century dramatists the strong influence of Euripidean theatre, and also the contemporary attempt to outdo Euripides' colours and effects.<sup>37</sup> In Aristotle's eyes he seems to have had some success: though Aristotle does not mention in the *Poetics* the quality of Chaeremon's *οικονομία* and disapproves of the metrical experimentation of the *Centaurus*, his plays were not yet such a surrender to the demands of actors for ever more striking opportunities for display (*Po.* 1461b27 ff., *Rh.* 1403b33) that their dramatic composition was inferior: Aristotle chooses rather Carcinus to illustrate the danger of a poet not 'seeing' his plays as he writes (*Po.* 1455a22 ff.). Moreover, Chaeremon is the dramatist Aristotle selects, and by implication approves, to exemplify a very special quality of tragedy as a poetic form: even when it is removed from its proper theatrical setting and read rather than performed, its effectiveness is maintained.

Since Aristotle's attachment of the label *ἀναγνωστικός* was a stylistic judgment, we must look now at the quality of the style which provoked it.

## V. STYLE; FIGURES, IMAGERY AND DICTION; DERIVED AND ORIGINAL ELEMENTS

For an assessment we must rely on the 'poetic' rather than the 'gnomic' fragments.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Much less probably, Chiron's offer, when wounded by an arrow of Hercules, to die for Prometheus (mentioned in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Lyomenus*? —Mette, *Der Verlorene Aischylos* 24).

<sup>34</sup> Juv. vii 12 mentions an *Alcithoe* by Paccius.

<sup>35</sup> Which gave Pacuvius his title (Cic. *Tusc.* ii 21.49); on the relationship with Sophocles see also Mette, *Lustrum* ix (1964) 87. Arist. *Po.* 1453b33 refers to *Τραυματίας Ὀδυσσεύς*: can there have been a *third* title current for the one play of Sophocles? At

Athenaeus 562f severe dislocation has resulted in the apparent ascription to Chaeremon of a *Τραυματίας* (the quotation, clearly comic in style, is from Alexis: *vid.* 562d)—but the Souda dutifully included the title in the list of Chaeremon's plays.

<sup>36</sup> P. Hibeh i 4 is not from Chaeremon's *Oeneus*: above, p. 23f.

<sup>37</sup> See especially Webster, *Hermes* lxxxii (1954) 297 and 306.

<sup>38</sup> For the polarity, see above, p. 24. Usually, I

*Metaphor* is the most common figure, in conformity with the rhetorical tendencies of both poetic and prose styles of Chaeremon's day.<sup>39</sup> In our few fragments human relationships especially are applied to natural objects or plants. Flowers are often associated with spring in poetry from Homer onwards (*Il.* ii 89, *h.Hom.* xix 17, *A.Pr.* 455), and Chaeremon makes them its children, *fr.* 9 ἀνθηροῦ τέκνα/ζᾶρος; in *fr.* 13 roses are the 'offspring of the seasons'<sup>40</sup> and 'nurslings of the spring';<sup>41</sup> in *fr.* 10 they are the 'children of the meadows'<sup>42</sup> and the association again has precedents (*Il.* ii 467, *A. fr.* 727 Mette<sup>2</sup>, *E. IA* 1454). Ivy, wreathed on the thyrsus, is 'lover of the dance',<sup>43</sup> but also 'child of the year', in *fr.* 5. The child-metaphor is not new, only most of Chaeremon's variations.<sup>44</sup>

στέφανοι are ἀγγέλους εὐφημίας in *fr.* 6 and εὐφημίας/κήρυκας in *fr.* 11—but metaphorical ἄγγελος starts in Theogn. 549 ἄγγελος ἄφθογγος (a beacon). Flowers form a 'boundless army without spears', *fr.* 10.1–2—but again parts of the whole metaphor can be traced in earlier writers: ἄστρον δορύπυρον στρατόν Page, *PMG* no. 962 (dithyr.);<sup>45</sup> ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος (*sc.* ὄμβρος) Pind. *Pyth.* vi 2; for ἀπείρων cf. *Il.* xxiv 776 δῆμος, Hes. *Sc.* 472, *A. fr.* 343.32 Mette<sup>2</sup>; Chaeremon's ἄλογχος, however, is a literary *harpax*.<sup>46</sup>

The use of σῶμα in *fr.* 17.2 ὕδωρ ποταμοῦ σῶμα goes beyond the familiar periphrasis<sup>47</sup> because both terms of the comparison are stated in order to make intelligible an otherwise striking enigma (ποταμοῦ σῶμα).<sup>48</sup>

The expression ὀπώρα Κύπριδος in *fr.* 12.1 to indicate the acme of sexual potency (here in young men)<sup>49</sup> echoes Pind. *Isthm.* ii 5 Ἀφροδίτας . . . ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν (also of a youth); of girls, *A. Supp.* 998, 1015 τέρειν' ὀπώρα.<sup>50</sup>

In *fr.* 14.11 the metaphor ὥρας γελώσης appears new; other metaphors at 14.5 and 10. *Simile*: one only, *fr.* 1.5–6, from sculpture, partly original.

*Imagery in general*: Chaeremon has a marked interest in colour, and shading: *fr.* 1.4 contrast of blush and white complexion, *fr.* 8 red and white flowers, *fr.* 14.5–6, 14–15 light and shade. I suggest below<sup>51</sup> that his imagination was prompted by contemporary developments in painting, and he seems to have been in general responsive to art (sculpture *fr.* 1.5–6, painting *fr.* 14.5) and nature, particularly flowers (as Athenaeus 608d noted); he clearly delighted in physical beauty, and observed it closely, *fr.* 1, 14.1–11.

leave *fr.* 1 and 14 for fuller discussion below, p. 30 ff.—and both of these longer pieces were quoted by Athenaeus for their general character rather than particular points or figures.

<sup>39</sup> Arist. *Rh.* iii 2. In Agathon, too, metaphor is most common: Lévêque, *Agathon* 127 ff.

<sup>40</sup> θρέμματ' for σώματ' Nauck, rightly, *Tragicæ Dictionis Index* (St Petersburg 1892) xxvi; cf. *Od.* ix 51.

<sup>41</sup> τιθήνημα here and (literal) *E. Hyps. fr.* 60.i.10 only.

<sup>42</sup> With *fr.* 10.3 θηρώμεναι . . . λειμώνων τέκνα compare *E. fr.* 754.3 ἄγρευμ' ἀνθέων.

<sup>43</sup> New: ἐράν and derivatives elsewhere commonly describe human passions for inanimates or abstracts, e.g. *E. Heracl.* 377 πολέμων ἐραστάς, not of one inanimate for another.

<sup>44</sup> Noted already by Eustathius 1658.56. Flowers are 'earth's children' *A. Pers.* 618; cf. fish the sea's children *Pers.* 678, birds the heaven's *E. El.* 879, wine the vine's child Pind. *Nem.* ix 52, gold Zeus' Pind. *fr.* 222, (inanimates) day the sun's Pind. *Ol.* ii 35, Echo the mountain rocks' *E. Hec.* 1110, death Oath's *Hdt.* vi 86.γ2 (oracle), justice Time's *E. fr.* 222, lot Chance's *E. fr.* 989.

<sup>45</sup> *A. Ag.* 4 ἄστρον . . . ὀμήγηρον.

<sup>46</sup> *S. OT* 191 ἀχαιλκος ἀσπίδων; ἀτενχίς *E. And.* 119, ἄξιφος Lycophron, ἄνασπις Nonnus (all literal).

<sup>47</sup> Simple in e.g. *A. Th.* 947 ὑπό/σώματα γᾶς, *S. OC* 1568, *E. Ph.* 1508, *Pl. Tim.* 31b; complex, Emped. *B* 100.11 ὕδατος . . . τέρειν δέμας ἀργυπέοιο, *S. fr.* 255.4 Pearson. Cf. also δέμας in *LSJ* s.v. 1.2.

<sup>48</sup> See Nauck on Choer. *fr.* 2 (p. 719).

<sup>49</sup> The correct text of *fr.* 12 is πολλὴν ὀπώραν Κύπριδος εἰσορᾶν παρῆν/ἀκραῖσι περκάζουσιν οἰνάνθαις γέννιν, 'Cypris' high season could be seen in his chin's darkening bloom'. The ungrammatical χρόνον, replaced with γέννιν by Kaibel on Athenaeus 608f, cannot be defended from Pind. *Nem.* v 6 τέρειων ματέρ' οἰνάνθαις ὀπώραν, where both οἰνάνθη and ὀπώρα are literal in sense. The presence of Κύπρις confirms a context of sexual ripeness, as in Pind. *Isthm.* ii 5, but Chaeremon's comparison of the darkening beard to the colour of the grape is again second-hand: *E. Cret.* 15 (cf. *Call. hymn.* v 75); οἴνωπος γέννς *E. Ba.* 438 (*ornans Ph.* 1160).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Pl. Lg.* 837c ὁ . . . ἐράν . . . τῆς ὥρας καθάπερ ὀπώρας πεινῶν, adesp. trag. 403 γλυκεῖ' ὀπώρα φύλακος ἐκλειπότος.

<sup>51</sup> *P.* 32f.



*Diction: other echoes:* fr. 7 κισσῶ τε ναρκίσσω τε τριέλικας †κύκλω/στεφάνων ἐλικτῶν has a partial precedent in E. Ph. 652 κισσὸς . . . περιστεφῆς ἐλικτός (cf. S. OC 683–5); another pairing of obviously associated flowers in fr. 8 ῥόδον and κρίνον (Hdt. i 195.2; cf. AP ix 384.11), but for δξύς of colour fr. 8 ῥόδ' δξυφεγγῆ cf. Ar. Pax 173 (a brilliant purple garment).<sup>52</sup>

*Lexical peculiarities: hapax legomena:* ἄλογχος fr. 10.2, ἐξεπισφραγίζω 14.10, καλλίχειρ 14.7, κηροχρῶς 1.5, μελανόφυλλος<sup>53</sup> 14.13, δξυφεγγής 8, ρίζοφίτυτος 39.2, σεληνόφως 14.1, τριέλιξ 7.1; nine instances in 75 iambic trimeters are surprisingly many; *unique or earliest uses:* ἠλιώδης 14.14 (next in Philostr. Imag. i 6), θέαμα 14.4 in active sense, 'gaze' (omitted by LSJ and Supplement 1968), πτερὸν 14.13 'petal' ('branch', S. fr. 23.3 Pearson). It is striking that most of these rare locutions occur in the only extensive fragments: may we assume that Chaeremon's descriptive style was always and evenly so coloured?

#### Other Stylistic Features

*Assonance:* fr. 7 κισσῶ τε ναρκίσσω τε, fr. 12.1 πολλὴν ὀπώραν Κύπριδος εἰσορᾶν παρῆν; with antithesis fr. 15 σοφίαν, ἀμαθίαν, εὐβουλίαν, 25 πρὶν γὰρ φρονεῖν εὖ καταφρονεῖν ἐπίστασαι.

*Rhyme:* fr. 14.5 ὄμμασιν, 6 θεάμασιν.

*Repetition:* fr. 1.2 †χρώματι, 4 χρώματι, 5 κηροχρῶτος.

*'Staccato' asyndeton* (with antithesis): fr. 15 γέλωτα, σοφίαν, ἀμαθίαν, εὐβουλίαν.

*Paronomasia:* fr. 4 Πενθεὺς ἐσομένης συμφορᾶς ἐπώνυμος.

#### General Comment on 'Style'

Our fragmentary selection from Chaeremon's work depends on deliberate quotations in ancient authors and is quite dissimilar to that of an author whose work we know almost entirely through the very different fortunes of survival in papyrus. The selection is therefore inevitably uneven stylistically and may well be more unrepresentative than we would like to believe; we have already noted the consequences to any attempt at a general appraisal of our almost total dependence on Stobaeus and Athenaeus and their very different aims in choosing illustrative quotations. Nevertheless, it seems safe to think of Chaeremon as a conscious, perhaps self-conscious stylist, intent on colourful and evocative description. He seems to have sought deliberately rarer locutions and introduced very many of his own invention. He is not shy of contemporary rhetorical fashion in the frequent employment of figures, to a degree we find exaggerated. The 'gnomic' fragments, many of them pithy and compressed, show an easy command of aphorism; it may be permissible to imagine that his dialogue was constantly enlivened by them, holding the audience's interest and offering the actors no less a chance for their skill and display than the longer speeches: and both served exciting plots full of incident and theatrical opportunity.

## VI. THE IAMBIC TRIMETER IN CHAEREMON

*Prosody:* there are no irregular quantities, and only one example of synizesis, in the first *longum* of 10.2 (ἀνθέων).

εἶδος Σοφοκλείων: 21.1 has ὅτι at the end of the line.<sup>54</sup>

*Caesura:* there are 74 lines where the place may be established: 52 have caesura after second *anceps* (only one over elision),<sup>55</sup> 22 after second *breve*.

<sup>52</sup> Also of colour, Nicand. fr. 74.64; δξύς 'bright', of natural light or whiteness, Il. xiv 345, xvii 352 (cf. Pind. Ol. vii 70), Pind. Pyth. i 20.

<sup>53</sup> μελάμφυλλος S. OC 481, lyric; also in P. Hiebeh ii 172 col. 1.2 (from ?Philitas' Ἀτακτοὶ γλώσσαί, R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* [Oxford 1968] 79 n. 6).

<sup>54</sup> Accented conjunctions are not uncommon here in Sophocles, very rare otherwise; in the *minores* cf. e.g. Dionys. fr. 7.1; in general, see J. Descroix, *Le Trimètre Iambique* (Macon 1931) 288–95.

<sup>55</sup> I include fr. 24 οἱ τι//μῆ συνιέντες σοφόν.

Porson's Law is observed; the rhythm ( $\times -$ ) ( $\cup -$ ) at verse-end occurs only in 30, 35; ( $- \cup$ ) ( $- \cup -$ ) occurs only in 14.8.

Resolutions (total, 30): 5 'first foot' anapaests, all 'within' polysyllables, no proper names; 7 'second foot' tribrachs; 12 'third foot' dactyls, in 10 cases across caesura; 6 'fourth foot' tribrachs.<sup>56</sup> Five verses have two resolutions, though never with an anapaest.<sup>57</sup> There is never resolution across word-end. The frequency of resolution, of about 40 instances in every 100 verses (30 in the surviving 75), is a little higher than that of late Euripides, 35–8,<sup>58</sup> and would seem to confirm the opinion of Müller<sup>59</sup> that the *poetae minores* of the late Peloponnesian War and after maintained and perhaps increased slightly this freedom.

In all respects, Chaeremon's trimeter conforms to the regular practice of Attic Tragedy.

## VII. THE TWO LONGER FRAGMENTS, I AND 14

Athenaeus at 608a introduces a new topic of conversation for his dinner-sophists, female beauty, and illustrates it at once with Chaeremon's sensuous description of maidens dancing by moonlight and then collapsing in sleep in a flowery meadow (*fr.* 14). In the MS. tradition this quotation is followed at 608d with the words *ἐπικατάφορος δὲ ὦν ὁ ποιητῆς οὗτος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνθη ἐν Ἀλφεισιβοίᾳ φησὶν* as the lemma to seven verses from Chaeremon's play (*fr.* 1)—but the lines contain no mention of flowers, only a second description of a beautiful woman; the poet's fondness for flowers is fully illustrated only in the subsequent quotations in 608d-f (*fr.* 9, 10, 5, 13, 8, 12). The theme of *κάλλος* is resumed at 608f, with a fresh headline *ἐπὶ κάλλει δέ*.

There is, I think, a quite simple explanation of the discrepancy between the lemma and the content of *fr.* 1. Since it concerns beauty and not flowers, it must originally have followed at once on *fr.* 14, the headline illustration to the new topic of *κάλλος*. It would have been introduced by the regular formula in Athenaeus' successive quotations from the same author, *ἐν δὲ Ἀλφεισιβοίᾳ φησὶν*.<sup>60</sup> The words *ἐπικατάφορος δὲ ὦν ὁ ποιητῆς οὗτος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνθη* are the displaced introduction to a short digression of the kind Athenaeus can never resist in order to air his curious learning, and we may assume that after *ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνθη* he went on *ἐν τῇ Ἰοῖ ἔαρὸς τέκνα προσηγόρευε*. It is easy to find comparable displacements: of quotations, e.g. 660a, 676b; of lemmata, e.g. 645e, 650e—651a, 663a (referring to 662f), 666e.<sup>61</sup>

### *Text and Commentary*

Fragment 1 (Athenaeus 608d), from *Alphesiboea*:

καὶ σώματος μὲν †ὄψεις κατειργάζετο†  
 στίλβοντα λευκῶ †χρῶματι διαπρεπῆ†·  
 αἰδῶς δ' ἐπερρύθμιζεν ἠπιώτατον  
 ἐρύθημα λαμπρῶ προστιθείσα χρῶματι·

<sup>56</sup> The corrupt text of *fr.* 1.2 has a 'fifth foot' tribrach: cf. below, p. 31 n. 66.

<sup>57</sup> 1.7, 15, 17.2, 33 (20 is corrupt). Cf. C. F. Müller, *De pedibus solutis in tragicorum minorum trimetris iambicis* (Berlin 1879), whose figures are based on Nauck, *TGF*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>58</sup> T. Zielinski, *Tragodumenon* (Cracow 1925) 141.

<sup>59</sup> *De pedibus, etc.* 34; a slightly different view in Descroix, 125.

<sup>60</sup> Which is often slightly varied, of course: com-

pare the lemmata to the six quotations from Chaeremon which follow. On Athenaeus' 'formulae' see K. Zepernick, *Philologus* lxxvii (1921) 311 ff., and on the accuracy of his tragic quotations, my article in *RFIC* xcvi (1969).

<sup>61</sup> Kaibel altered the lemma of *fr.* 1 to read *ἐπικατάφορος . . . ἄνθη καὶ ἐν Ἀλφεισιβοίᾳ φησί*, maintaining the continuity of *fr.* 1 with *fr.* 14 as illustrations of *κάλλος*, but also the displacement of the introduction to the flower-quotations.

5 κόμαι δέ, κηροχρῶτος ὡς ἀγάλματος  
αὐτοῖσι βοστρύχοισι ἐκπεπλασμένον,  
ξουθοῖσιν ἀνέμοις ἐνετρήφων φορούμεναι.

Attempts to heal vv. 1 and 2 are recorded in *TGF*<sup>2</sup>. 5 Wilamowitz (and Kaibel): κηροχρῶτες Ath. 6 Meineke: ἐκπεπλασμένοι Ath. 7 Hermann: φορούμενοι Ath.

Most probably the theme of the play was the revenge on her husband Alcmaeon by the deserted Alpheisiboea, a version of a myth which in the form adopted by Sophocles and Euripides told of punishment by the second wife Callirhoe. The first wife is sometimes named Arsinoe,<sup>62</sup> but plays entitled *Alpheisiboea* are known by Timotheus, Achaeus (*fr.* 16 Nauck) and Accius (71–82 Ribbeck).<sup>63</sup> It seems probable, therefore, that Chaeremon's play was tragic and not satyric. Our fragment describes a 'blushing beauty' in the open air;<sup>64</sup> possibly this was (in a messenger-speech?) Callirhoe, daughter of the river-god Achelous, who displaced Alpheisiboea.<sup>65</sup>

1–2: irremediably corrupt, but apparently describing the luminous quality of the whole body's appearance, while 3–4 particularise facial colour and 5–7 the hair. Perhaps a whole verse has dropped out which once contained a noun for *στίλβοντα*, though both this and *διαπρεπή*<sup>66</sup> are easy to emend, e.g. to *στίλβουσα* and *διαπρεπή*, and ὄψις is tempting: Thuc. vii 44.2 τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ σώματος (in moonlight: cf. *fr.* 14 below). The clear whiteness of a woman's skin is a frequent motif from Epic (e.g. *Il.* xi 73) on, but *στίλβω* is usually applied to the sheen of an athlete's oiled body (*Od.* vi 237, Achaeus *fr.* 4.3).

3–4: ἐπερρύθμιζεν: the compound also Pl. *Lg.* 802b, variant in Luc. *Pisc.* 12; ῥυθμίζω metaph. A. *Pr.* 243, S. *Ant.* 318, E. *Hec.* 924. ἐρύθημα has medical associations: 'healthy flush' Hp. *Aer.* 24, 'fevered flush' *Aph.* vii 49, Thuc. ii 49—as also ἥπιος of a mild fever, Hp. *Epid.* vii 1, v 73. λαμπρῶ: not a loose synonym for λευκῶ, and implying rather more than in our 'clear complexion': so, e.g. Thuc. vi 54.2 Ἀρμοδίου ὄρα ἡλικίας λαμπροῦ.

5–7: κηροχρῶτος (*harax*): Wilamowitz' correction is confirmed by e.g. Pl. *Thet.* 197d κήρινον . . . πλάσμα, *Tim.* 74c κηροπλάστης. Euripides was Chaeremon's model for the simile from sculpture, *Hec.* 560 μαστούς τ' . . . στέρνα θ' ὡς ἀγάλματος, *fr.* 125.2–4 παρθένου τ' εἰκὼ τινα/ἐξ αὐτομόρφων λαῖνων τυκισμάτων/σοφῆς ἀγαλμα χειρός (see also on *fr.* 14.4–5 below); *Cat.* 64.61 *saxea ut effigies bacchantis*. ξουθοῖς: Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1142 has shown that in the fifth century ξουθός is always of colour (*Bacchyl.* v 17 πτέρυγες); p. 520 n. 2 he cites Bartsch's paper (p. 22 above) for retaining the sense here 'gave their waxy colour to the winds that played amongst them', and compares Antiph. *fr.* 217.22 Kock (Ath. 623c) ξανθαῖσιν αὔραις σῶμα πᾶν ἀγαλλεται (a squid); for wind-waving hair see also Sappho *fr.* 194 LP. (Himerius, *Or.* ix 4 Colonna). ἐνετρήφων: a Euripidean compound, *Cyc.* 588, *fr.* 362.24: cf. *Ba.* 150 τρυφερόν τε πλόκαμον εἰς αἰθέρα ῥίπτων (*Βακχεύς*) with Dodds' n. there and on 862–5. The statue-simile strictly illustrates only the colour of the hair: a streaming effect was unobtainable (as still today) in free-standing plastic art, though partly so in relief-work (e.g. the famous Maenads in the Madrid National Museum: these late fifth century copies are shown in, e.g. Rhys Carpenter, *Greek Sculpture* (Chicago 1960), pl. xxvii and pp. 156–9), but occasionally

<sup>62</sup> So Euripides, Apollodorus: see Lévêque, *Agathon* 93 n. 4 and Pearson, *Sophocles* i 69 for the evidence.

<sup>63</sup> Details of tragic treatments of the Alcmaeon myth and of discussions in Else, *Poetics* 392 and Mette, *Lustrum* ix (1964) 142 f.; cf. Lévêque, *Agathon* 95 n. 1.

<sup>64</sup> There is no reason to distrust Athenaeus' use of the quotation to illustrate female beauty and think that Chaeremon may have been describing a youth: see the note on vv. 5–7.

<sup>65</sup> It is most unlikely that Chaeremon here gave a

unique (and satyric?) dramatisation of the seduction of the nymph Alpheisiboea by Dionysus in the guise of a tiger on the banks of the Tigris (pseudo-Plutarch, *Mor.* 1165d).

<sup>66</sup> Metrically possible: there are 22 'fifth foot' tribachs in Euripides' complete plays (Zielinski, *Tragodumenon* 140), all in terminal quadrisyllables, including one example of 'position' in the resolved *longum* at *Ph.* 494 περιπλοκάς. Müller 15 (see n. 57 above), however, can give no example from the *minores* before Lycophron *fr.* 2.1 (satyric).

attempted in vase-paintings: a combination of streaming hair and light golden-brown glaze (*ξουθός?*) as early as a cup by the Brygos Painter (c. 490) with a maenad (Beazley, *ARV<sup>2</sup>* 247.14; P. Arias, M. Hirmer, *History of Greek Vase-Painting* ([London 1962] pl. xxxiv).

Fragment 14 (Athenaeus 608bcd), from *Oeneus*:

ἔκειτο δ' ἡ μὲν λευκὸν εἰς σεληνόφωσ  
 φαίνουσα μαστὸν λελυμένης ἐπωμίδος,  
 τῆς δ' αὖ χορεία λαγὸνα τὴν ἀριστεράν  
 ἔλυσε· γυμνὴ δ' αἰθέρος θεάμασιν  
 5 ζῶσαν γραφὴν ἔφαινε, χρῶμα δ' ὄμμασιν  
 λευκὸν μελαίνης † ἔργον ἀντηύγει σκιᾶς.  
 ἄλλη δ' ἐγύμνου καλλιχείρας ὠλένας,  
 ἄλλης προσαμπέχουσα θῆλιν αὐχένα.  
 ἡ δὲ ῥαγέντων χλανιδίων ὑπὸ πτυχαῖς  
 10 ἔφαινε μηρόν, κάξεπεσφραγίζετο  
 ὦρας γελώσης χωρὶς ἐλπίδων ἔρωσ.  
 ὑπνούμεναι δ' ἐπιπτον ἐλενίων ἐπι  
 ἴων τε μελανόφυλλα συγκλῶσαι πτερὰ  
 κροκόν θ', ὃς ἠλιῶδες εἰς ὑφάσματα  
 15 πέπλων σκιᾶς εἶδωλον ἐξωμόργνυτο,  
 [ἔρση δὲ θαλερὸς ἐκτραφεῖς ἀμάρακος]  
 λειμῶσι μαλακοῖς ἐξέτεινον αὐχένα.

1 δ' Jacobs: γὰρ Ath. 3 Casaubon: χορείας Ath. 4 ἔδειξε Nauck/γυμνὴ Valckenaer: γυμνῆς Ath. 6 Schweighäuser: ἀνταυγεί Ath. 9 Meineke: ἡ δεκλαγεν τῶν Ath./Nauck: πτύχας Ath. 10 κάξεπεσφραγίζετο Hermann. 12 *correxī*: ὑπνωμένοι Lobbeck: ὑπνωμένοι Ath. 15 Casaubon: οἰκίας Ath./Meineke: εἰσομόργνυται Ath. 16 *secl.* Meineke, *ad fr.* 1 *ref.* Friebel. 17 Grotius: μαλθακοῖσιν Ath./μαλακοῖς ἐξέτεινεν (*sc.* ἀμάρακος) Wilamowitz.

Euripides' dramatisation of an Oeneus story is known in outline: Oeneus in his old age was dispossessed of his kingdom by his brother Agrius or Agrius' sons, but restored by his grandson Diomedes (*fr.* 558–70 Nauck, *cf.* Page, *GLP* no. 28).<sup>67</sup> The story was worked by the Roman tragedians, in Pacuvius' *Periboea* and Accius' *Diomedes* especially.<sup>68</sup> If Chaeremon followed the same plot, it is difficult to see the relevance of the bacchic scene described in our fragment except as part of the atmospheric or even ornamental narrative (in messenger-speech?) of the Dionysiac celebration whose opportune confusion Diomedes probably used to execute vengeance on the careless Agrius: but we know of this association only from Pacuvius' play (291 Ribbeck).<sup>69</sup>

The contrast between this evocatively sensuous description of exhausted bacchantes and the restrained account by Euripides' messenger of a similar scene at *Ba.* 678 ff. has been stressed by Dodds (683 n.)—but there can be no doubt that Euripides' imagination was the spur to Chaeremon's.<sup>70</sup> The rich tonal detail of this fragment is dictated by the memory of artistic representations, and there are hints in it of Chaeremon's interest in the fresco-technique of *σκιαγραφία* (see on vv. 5–6).

Bacchantes in Greek art: a good synoptic guide is E. Simon, s.v. 'Menadi', *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica* (Roma 1961) iv 1002–13 (with bibliography); other useful aids are L. B. Lawler, *The Dance in Ancient Greece* (London 1964) and G. Prudhommeau, *La Danse Grecque Antique* (Paris 1965). Some works relevant to Chaeremon's description are:

<sup>67</sup> Philocles also wrote an *Oeneus* (Souda Φ 378 Adler), perhaps Sophocles too, though the evidence is flimsy: Pearson, *Sophocles* ii 120.

<sup>68</sup> Mette, *Lustrum* ix (1964) 147–8.

<sup>69</sup> Mette, *Lustrum* 93; *cf.* Séchan, *Études* 444.

<sup>70</sup> For the immediate influence of the *Bacchae*, see the Introduction to Dodds' edition.

vv. 1-2: maenad with one breast bared: Carlsruhe hydria in style of Meidias Painter of c. 420, Beazley *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1315, Lawler fig. 2, Prudhommeau fig. 446; Bologna volute-crater of Dinos Painter of c. 420, Beazley *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1151, Prudhommeau fig. 686, E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen* (München 1923) fig. 581.

v. 7: maenad with arms once fully covered: Lawler figs. 3, 24, 31 (cf. K. Latte, *De saltationibus Graecorum* [Giessen 1913] 90 n. 2); arms covered to elbow, Lawler fig. 28; arms bare, Munich amphora of Kleophrades Painter of c. 500, Beazley *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 182, Lawler fig. 22, Arias and Hirmer, *History* . . . pls. xxx, xxxi, pls. 122-4.

v. 8: maenad with arms around another's neck: Paris neck-amphora of Amasis of middle sixth century, Beazley *ABV* 152, Pfuhl fig. 220, Arias and Hirmer, pl. xv; Paris amphora of Achilles Painter of c. 450, Beazley *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 987, Pfuhl fig. 523.

vv. 9-11: complete baring of one thigh and flank (cf. vv. 3-4), with exactly the erotic suggestiveness hinted by Chaeremon: Dresden dancing maenad in style of Scopas, P. Arias, *Skopas* (Roma 1952) 126-7 and pl. x, Lawler figs. 32 and 33.

1-2: ἔκειτο: inceptive, as 12 ὑπνοῦμενοι ἐπιπτον, 17 ἐξέτεινον; cf. E. *Ba.* 683 ff. ἠῶδον δὲ πᾶσαι σώμασιν παρεμμέναι, αἰ μὲν πρὸς ἑλάτης νῶτ' ἐρείσασαι φόβην, αἰ δ' ἐν δρυὸς φύλλοις πρὸς πέδω κᾶρα/εἰκῆ βαλοῦσαι σωφρόνως. Chaeremon's careful detailing of the appearance of individuals is to some extent matched in E.'s description of their separate actions, *Ba.* 683 ff., 689, 692, 704, 706, 708. λευκόν: taken by Croiset (*Histoire* 402) with μαστόν as *epitheton ornans* (though the precise pairing is unexampled), but perhaps goes rather with the *hapax* σεληνόφως: Hes. *Th.* 19, 371 λαμπρὰ σελήνη; λευκός of the sun *Il.* xiv 185 (v. l.), Emped. B 21.3, dawn E. *El.* 730.

3-4: χορεία in Tragedy also E. *Ph.* 1265. ἔλυσε: pregnant, 'laid bare', helped by 2 λελυμένης ἐπωμίδος. θεάμασιν: apparently unique in the Active sense 'gaze', but for the idea cf. E. *IA* 365 αἰθῆρ . . . ἤκουσε. ζῶσαν γραφήν: the imagery and vocabulary of 2-5 are very similar to E. *Hec.* 558-61 λαβοῦσα πέπλους ἐξ ἀκρᾶς ἐπωμίδος/ἔρρηξε λαγόνας ἐς μέσας παρ' ὀμφαλὸν/μαστούς τ' ἔδειξε στέρνα θ' ὡς ἀγάλματος/κάλλιστα (though Chaeremon changes the sense of ἐπωμίδος to 'shoulder-piece': in *Hec.* (and *IT* 1404, even more obviously) it is anatomical, 'point of shoulder': LSJ need correction); Chaeremon has the vividness of a fresco in mind: similes from painting begin in tragedy at A. *Ag.* 242 (Iphigeneia at the altar); cf. *Eum.* 50, E. *Hipp.* 879, *Ion* 271, *Ph.* 129. ζωγράφος and relatives occur first in literature in the later fifth century (e.g. Hdt. ii 46), and are very common in Plato; Xen. *Mem.* iii 11.1 considers the interest of a ζωγράφος in a beautiful model (cf. the quotations at Ath. 588e). Dittenberger *OIG* 90.3 has εἰκὼν ζῶσα τοῦ Διός, Aristaen. i 1 ἔμψυχος τῆς Ἀφροδίτας εἰκὼν.

5-6: ἔργον gives no sense (though accepted in the *Oxford Book of Greek Verse* no. 455), and perhaps the corruption goes deeper, but the general meaning is clear: 'the whiteness of her body stood out against the black shadows'. ἀνταυῶ is normally transitive, so Dobree conjectured μελαίνῃ στέρνον (nom.) ἀντηγῶ σκιᾷ; but the intransitive use is attested in Eub. *fr.* 56 Kock (Ath. 471d). Chaeremon has in mind the technique of σκιαγραφία evolved towards the end of the fifth century, chiefly in the studio of Apollodorus: Plut. *Mor.* 346a (cf. 863e τὰ λαμπρὰ τῇ σκιᾷ τρανότερα ποιοῦσι); Pfuhl, *Malerei* ii 674 ff. (cf. *Masterpieces of Greek Drawing and Painting* [London 1955] 7). An interest in light-effects also in E. *Oed.*, P. Oxy. 2459 *fr.* 1, 7-9 (=adesp. trag. 541 Nauck) εἰ μὲν πρὸς ἵππους (αὐγὰς Plut.) ἡλίου, χρυσοπὸν ἦν/νώτισμα θηρός· εἰ δὲ πρὸς νέφος βάλοι,|κυανωπὸν ὡς τις Ἴρις ἀντηγῶι σέλας; cf. *Ion* 890 χρυσοανταυγῆ. See also on vv. 14-15 below.

7-8: καλλιχείρας: *hapax*, but cf. E. *Hipp.* 200 εὐπηχεῖς χεῖρας,, 605 δεξιᾶς εὐωλένου, *Tro.* 1194 (a man's) καλλιπήχυν . . . βραχίονα. προσαμπέχουσα: a rare word, but LSJ's meaning 'veil besides' cannot be right: a dancer baring her own arm can hardly 'veil' the neck of another. The sense 'embracing' is confirmed by a glance at the vase-paintings noted (Pfuhl figs. 220, 523); προσ- is directional, and ἀμπίσχω 'embrace' occurs in E. *Supp.* 165 γόνυ σὸν ἀμπίσχων χερσί. θῆλυον: 'delicate', E. *Med.* 928, Theocr. xvi 49.

9–11: *ραγέντων*: rather a strong word (*post* E. *Hec.* 559? *cf.* Ar. *Ran.* 414 *χιτωνίου παραρραγέντος*), but perhaps we are to understand that the dancer has torn her clothes in ecstasy. *Cf.* S. *fr.* 872 *ἄς ἔτ' ἄστυλος χιτῶν/θυραῖον ἀμφὶ μηρὸν/πτύσσεται* with Pearson's note for other references in literature and art to baring of the thigh. *ἐξεπεσφραγίζετο*: *haraax* (*ἐπισφραγίζω* is very common). Though the language is remarkably explicit for tragedy, the idea is not rare: see particularly Barrett's note on E. *Hipp.* 540 *Ἔρωτα τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας θαλάμων κληδοῦχον*, Ar. *Th.* 976 *κληῆδας γάμου*, Ec. 12 *μηρῶν εἰς ἀπορρήτους μύχους*. *γελώσης*: the verb has a wide metaphorical use, though Chaeremon here innovates: *Il.* xix 362 *χθῶν* (*h. Cer.* 14), Hes. *Th.* 40 *δώματα* (see West's note), A. *Pr.* 90 *γέλασμα κυμάτων*. *χωρὶς ἐλπίδων*: S. *Ant.* 330 *ἐκτὸς ἐλπίδος*, E. *Tro.* 345 *ἔξω . . . μεγάλων ἐλπίδων*.

12–13: *ἐλενίων*: the obscure flower-name (only here in verse) adds extra colour: *cf.* [16] *ἀμάρακος*. *μελανόφυλλα*: *haraax*, the normal form being *μελάμφυλλος*: above, p. 29 n. 53. Violets are 'black' (*cf.* Theoc. x 28 and LSJ *s.v.* ἴον) for lack of a more exact colour-adjective (to the well-known discussions of M. Platnauer, 'Greek Colour Perception', *CQ* xv [1921] 153 ff. and A. E. Kober, *The use of color-terms in the Greek poets* [New York 1932] should now be added H. Osborne, 'Colour Concepts of the Ancient Greeks', *Brit. Journ. Aesthet.* viii [1968] 269 ff.).

14–17: *κροκόν*: 'collective' sing., as e.g. *ἄμπελος* Thuc. iv 90: Kühner-Gerth i 13. . . . *πέπλων*: *cf.* Epic *κροκόπεπλος*, A. *Pers.* 660, *Ag.* 239. The crushed saffron rubbed off on to the linen impressions of its flowers which were blurred (*σκιᾶς εἴδωλον*) but still brightly coloured (*ἠλιώδες*: next in Philostr. *Imag.* i 6; *cf.* S. *OC* 685 *χρυσανγῆς κροκός*). Chaeremon uses the phrase *σκιᾶς εἴδωλον* to convey the idea of imperfect or blurred reproduction of shape as Aeschylus did (*Ag.* 839, of a mirror) and Sophocles (*fr.* 659.6, of a horse reflected in water), but in the context of colour, and light and shade, *σκιᾶ* is already gaining overtones from the technique of *σκιαγραφία* (see on vv. 4–5): so our passage throws light on, and is itself illumined by, some difficult lines of Menander, *fr.* 667 K<sup>2</sup>. *τῆς σκιᾶς τὴν πορφύραν/πρῶτον ἐνυφαίνουσ' εἶτα μετὰ τὴν πορφύραν/ἐνυφαίνεται τὸ λευκόν, ὡσθ' ὕφασμα δὴ >/τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὔτε λευκὸν οὔτε πορφύρα, ἀλλ' ὡσπερ ἀγγὴ τῆς κρόκης κεκραμένη*, supplemented *ex. gr.* and explained by W. G. Arnott (*apud* Koerte ii 298): Menander describes the cross-weaving of purple and white threads to achieve colour-shimmer according to the direction of the light. *ὑφάσματα πέπλων* also E. *Hel.* 1243. *ἐξωμόργυντο*: *vox Euripidea* (seven times), but not rare elsewhere: 'smear, imprint on' *HF* 1399, *Ba.* 344, *Pl. Grg.* 525a. *λειμῶσι μαλακοῖς*: *Od.* v 72, viii 172, etc.: so Wilamowitz' *μαλακοὺς ἐξέτειεν* (*sc.* *ἀμάρακος*), an attempt to accommodate [16], may be discounted.

[16]: an intruder, perhaps through dislocation at an early stage in the tradition of Athenaeus (*cf.* p. 30 above); most probably the single verse was a further illustration of Chaeremon's fondness for flowers, but its lemma was lost. *ἔρση*: so Bergk, for *περσης* in Ath., but right: dew was regarded as nutritive (so *θαλερός*): *Od.* v 467 *θῆλυς ἔέρση* ('gentle', LSJ, but schol. BQ have *τρόφιμος δρόσος*), Hes. *Sc.* 395 (*cf.* *Od.* xiii 245), Pind. *Nem.* viii 40 *χλωραῖς ἔέρσαις ὡς ὅτε δένδρεον ἄσσει*. *ἀμάρακος*: see on 12 *ἐλενίων*.

C. COLLARD.

University of Kent at Canterbury.