

Were Homeric Glosses Part of School Education in Fifth-century Athens? New Interpretation of Aristophanes' *Daitales* fr. 233*

Elena Yu. Chepel

A. M. Gorky Institute of World Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 25a, Povarskaya ul., Moscow, 121069, Russian Federation; euchepe@gmail.com

For citation: Chepel E. Yu. Were Homeric Glosses Part of School Education in Fifth-century Athens? New Interpretation of Aristophanes' *Daitales* fr. 233. *Philologia Classica* 2022, 17 (2), 244–252. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2022.204>

The article revisits Aristophanes' *Daitales* fr. 233 which is often taken as (the only) evidence of Homeric glosses being drilled by Athenian youth as part of their school education in 5th c. BC. The author discusses in detail the context of Aristophanic citation in Galen's work, the state of the text of the fragment and its modern interpretations. In fact, nothing in the text itself directly suggests that learning glosses was part of the traditional school education in Athens. On the contrary, it can be argued that Aristophanes presented glosses as linguistic innovations and intellectuals studying them as sophists. The parallels between *Daitales* and *Clouds*, as well as Plato's *Kratylos* and other fifth-century texts must be taken into account when interpreting the dialogue between the Father and his Son in fr. 233. As a conclusion, the author suggests that the characters of *Daitales* should be interpreted differently: the Old Man in this episode of the play is not opposing the sophistic teachings, but rather using these in his argument as an instrument to demonstrate the Licentious Son his ignorance. The latter is apparently not a follower of the sophists and defends himself with his more practical knowledge of legal terms.

Keywords: Aristophanes' *Daitales*, school education, glosses, sophists, ancient linguistic theories.

Aristophanes' *Daitales* fr. 233¹ is often cited as evidence of Homeric glosses being part of the traditional *paideia* in fifth-century Athens. In this article, I would like to revisit the interpretation of this fragment and argue for an alternative understanding that sees glosses rather as part of innovative sophistic practices than of conservative education of the youth. I first present the text of the fragment with critical apparatus² and translation, followed by the context in which it is cited; then briefly discuss the state of the text and the place of the fragment in Galen's Glossary of rare words in Hippokrates' writings (Τῶν Ἱπποκράτους γλωσσῶν ἐξηγησις); and ultimately proceed to my main argument:

(A) πρὸς ταύτας δ' αὖ λέξον Ὀμήρου γλώττας· τί καλοῦσι κόρυμβα;
 UU — UU — UU — UU — τί καλοῦσ' ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα;

* The article was written in the framework of the project "Digital commentaries to ancient texts: ancient Greek comedy" financially supported by the grant of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 075-15-2021-571. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for helpful comments.

¹ Number according to Kassel-Austin edition.

² *Ap. crit.* is based on K.-A. with some changes. The sigla of Galen's codd. follow Perilli 2017.

(B) ὁ μὲν οὖν σός, ἐμός δ' οὗτος ἀδελφός φρασάτω· τί καλοῦσιν ἰδύους;
υυ — υυ — υυ — υυ — υ ὀπίειν;

1 ταύτας δ' αὖ Poll.: ταύτας αὖ Perilli: ταύταις δ' αὖ Wilamowitz, prob. Cassio: ταῦτά σοι A: ταῦτα σὺ Bas.^H et Bergk λέξων Poll. et ρ: λέξων A. Ὀμήρου Poll.: Ὀμηρε A: (σὺ λ.) Ὀμηρείους Seidler: (σὺ λ.) Ὀμήρου ἐμοί Bergk. γλώττας τί Poll.: γλώτταστικά A: γλωττατικά vel. γλώττα τί και N: γλώττα τινά R: γλώττη τινί Bas.^{G+H}. καλοῦσι codd.: καλεῖται Poll. κόρυμβα Poll., Helmreich: κόρυβα A 2 καλοῦσιν codd.: καλοῦσ' Seidler metri gratia 3 ἰδύους Fritzsche: ἰδυίους; <εἶτ' > Seidler: ἰδου σιτε A: ἰδοῦ σοι N: ἰδοῦσί τε Ald.: εἰδοῦσι τε ERU 4 τί ποτ' ἐστὶν ὀπίειν Kaibel: τί ποτέ ἐστι τὸ εὔ ποιεῖν A et Cassio inter cruces: τοῦπίειν Dobree: τί καλοῦσιν ὀπιεῖν Dindorf: τί καλοῦσιν ἀποινᾶν Bergk: τί ποτ' ἐστὶν ἀποινᾶν Fauth

“— Now, in addition to these, tell me about Homeric glosses: what is ‘aplustres’? ... What is ‘strengthless heads’?

— No — let your son, this brother of mine, explain: what is ‘beholders’? ... ‘to espouse’?”³

ὅτι γὰρ ἐποίουν οἱ παλαιοὶ πολλὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων αὐτοῖς, δέδεικται μὲν ἰκανῶς καὶ πρὸς Ἐρατοσθένους ἐν τοῖς Περὶ ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας, δεῖξαιμι δ' ἂν σοι καὶ γὰρ νῦν διὰ βραχέων ἐπὶ παραδειγμάτων ὀλίγων ὑπὲρ τοῦ γινώσκειν ἐναργέστερον, οἷον μὲν τι ἢ γλώττα ἐστίν, οἷον δὲ τι καὶ τὸ παραπλήσιον αὐτῇ τὸ γεγονὸς ὑπὸ τινος τῶν παλαιῶν. νομίζω δὴ σοι τὰ ὑπὸ Ἀριστοφάνους ἀρκέσειν τὰ ἐκ τῶν Δαιταλέων, ὧδέ πως ἔχοντα· (line 1) πρὸς — κόρυμβα; προβάλλει γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ δράματι ὁ ἐκ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Δαιταλέων πρεσβύτης τῷ ἀκολάστῳ νιεῖ πρῶτον μὲν τὰ «κόρυμβα» τί ποτ' ἐστὶν ἐξηγήσασθαι, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο (line 2) τί — κάρηνα· κάκεινος μέντοι ἀντιπροβάλλει τῶν ἐν τοῖς Σόλωνος ἄξοσι γλωττῶν εἰς δίκας διαφερούσας ὡδὶ πως· (line 3) ὁ — ἰδυίους, εἶτ' ἐφεξῆς προβάλλει (line 4) τί — ὀπίειν. ἐξ ὧν δηλὸν ὡς ἢ γλώττα παλαιὸν ἐστὶν ὄνομα τῆς συνηθείας ἐκπεπτωκός (Gal. gloss. Hippocr., Vol. XIX, 65–66 Kühn [Perilli 2017, 145–147]).

“It was sufficiently shown by Eratosthenes in his books *On Old Comedy* that ancient authors indeed coined many words for the purposes of their writings, and I shall be also able to show you now briefly with the help of few examples, in order to achieve a clearer distinction, what is a gloss, and what is — something similar to it — a coinage by one of the ancient authors. I believe, some examples from Aristophanes will be enough for you, namely, from the *Daitales*, that read somehow as follows: (line 1). You see, in this play, an old man from the deme of Daitales challenges his licentious son to explain first of all what ‘aplustres’ are, and then: (line 2). The son, in his turn, suggests as counter argument some of the important legal glosses in the wooden tablets of Solon, as follows: (line 3). And after that he suggests: (line 4). From these examples, it is clear that a gloss is an old word that has fallen out of usage”.

ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ποιητικὰς φωνὰς γλώττας ἐκάλουν ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης· πρὸς — κόρυμβα.

“But they [comic authors] also used the word glosses for poetic phrases, as in Aristophanes: (line 1)” (Poll. 2. 109).

The fragment is cited in the preface to the Glossary. In this προοίμιον, addressing his fellow citizen and classmate Teuthras,⁴ Galen sets forth that the main subject of his work is γλώτται, obsolete words. He adds that he intends to include not only glosses in this sense, but also neologisms, ὀνόματα καινά. These are words, he explains, that did not circulate in the customary usage of language but were introduced by Hippokrates either by

³ Translation is mine.

⁴ Cf. Gal. *Ind.* 34–35, *Ven. Sect. Er. Rom.* 11. 193. 7. He is also the addressee of *Puls.* 8. 452.

using common words metaphorically (μετενεγκῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ συνήθους) or by altering the grammatical form of the word (σχῆμα περιθεις ἕτερον)⁵ or by changing the meaning (τὸ σημαῖνον ὑπαλλάξας). These neologisms are similar to glosses (τὸ παραπλήσιον αὐτῇ (sc. τῇ γλώττῃ), τὸ γεγονὸς ὑπὸ τινος τῶν παλαιῶν) because of their rare usage and, hence, obscurity.⁶ Having said that Aristophanes' *Daitales* would have enough examples for the matters being discussed, Galen cites fr. 233 where four glosses from Homer and Solon/archaic legal texts occur. The citation is complemented with a brief account about the play's plot and characters. Galen then defines a gloss as "an old word that has fallen out of usage" and proceeds to illustrate the second type of words under consideration, neologisms, choosing for this purpose fr. 205, another dialogue between the Old Man and his Son.

We do not know whether Galen used the full text of the play or picked passages from an existing compendium of excerpts or a treatise on glosses, although the latter is more plausible. On one hand, Galen's interest in and knowledge of Old Comedy must have been exceptional, which partly can be explained by his own taste and partly by professional reasons.⁷ We know from *Ind.* 23–28 that he compiled a vocabulary of nouns from "the entire of Old Comedy", being an epitome of Didymos' (presumably, Chalkenteros) fifty books on expressions in Old Comedy. This work covered both common and rare terms.⁸ Galen also supposes that the loss of this work in the great fire of Rome would be particularly distressing for the addressee of the treatise, assumingly, because the excerpts from comedy would facilitate reading and understanding of Hippokrates' writings. Furthermore, to illustrate the benefit of comedy for medics, Galen gives an example how he once used a comic word to resolve a medical problem.⁹ In another work, Galen explains that Hippokrates' obscure words can be best elucidated through studying the examples of comic language because Attic comedy based its language on the customary usage of language, συνήθεια, the linguistic term which he also uses to define glosses in the preface to the Glossary.¹⁰ On the other hand, if even for his fundamental work on comedy Galen relied on compilatory texts, he could have used one of those also for the preface to his Glossary. The reference to Eratosthenes' work *On Old Comedy* before the two examples from *Daitales* might be an indication of his source in this particular case.

The attractiveness of frs. 205 and 233 for Galen should be sought, above all, in their accessibility for readers who are unexperienced in linguistic matters. The addressee of the preface, Teuthras, was a professional physician, and hardly could engage with the language on the abstract level to the same extent as Galen did. Thus, comedy was definitely of help. While Galen was acquainted with linguistic studies of his time — besides glossaries, he

⁵ The ancient term for grammatical form is σχῆμα λέξεως. Change of the grammatical form was recognised to be a device for evoking laughter, Kaibel p. 51 n. 16.

⁶ Gal. *gloss. Hipocr.*, Vol. XIX, p. 66 Kühn = Perilli p. 144.

⁷ See Coker 2019, esp. The list of quotations from comedy in Galen's works, 68–70.

⁸ In the two catalogues of his own writings, *Ord. lib.* and *Lib. prop.*, however, his works on comedy are presented differently: there are three books of comic expressions, one for each of major playwrights: Eupolis, Aristophanes, Kratinos, and two general books, one with examples of words found only in comedy, and another titled 'If Old comedy is useful reading for students'. The explanation might be that after the loss of the compendium in the fire, Galen managed to restore it only partly and the structure had to be altered. See Coker 2019 and Boudon-Millet et al. 2010, xxxvii and 76; Olson 2017, 88–89.

⁹ *Ind.* 20–29, *Daitales* fr. 208.

¹⁰ *Med. Nom.*, 31–31 MS. See on Galen's use of this term Manetti 2009.

wrote also theoretical philological treatises¹¹ — his audience was far less competent and needed an introduction that would be easy to understand and to remember: μή σοι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τὰ πρῶτα γράμματα μεμαθηκόσι χρησιμὸν εἶναι τὸ βιβλίον (68 Kühn = 148 Perilli).

The lines from Aristophanes are cited by Galen to illustrate what a gloss is. Since Pollux also cites the first line of fr. 233 as an example of a poetic gloss, it is probable that both authors used a common source, perhaps, even Eratosthenes, to whom Galen refers. Remarkably, the dramatic lines chosen do not simply contain obsolete words, but also identify them as glosses and further thematise them in a way that demonstrates, underlines and, in the end, mocks their uncommonness in the language, which makes this excerpt from *Daitales* particularly suitable to serve as a textbook example for a philological clarification of different types of poetic words.¹² It is also important for Galen's explanation that the quoted text refers to the ancient authors who had used words that later became glosses: Homer and Solon. Aristophanes' text thus functions here, on one hand, as an ancient and, therefore, authoritative, source of glosses itself, and, on the other hand, as a linguistic discussion of the glosses in works of ancient authors, at which Galen himself aims in his *Glossary*.

Galen's comments on the dialogue shape our understanding of the fragment. He names the characters speaking, the Old Man and the Licentious Son, interprets their conversation as an argument, and provides additional information which the text of the fragment itself does not contain, such as the attribution of the glosses to Solon. The context, thus, on one hand gives additional details and clues on reading and understanding the fragment. On the other hand, Galen's comments require a critical approach, as they are his own reader's view of the fragment and of the play.¹³ The question to which extent Galen's account of the fragment and the play in general is accurate remains open. For instance, we trust Galen's distribution of speech between characters, although, if he did not possess his own copy of the play and took the citation from a compendium, a confusion of which line belongs to which character would be possible. After all, Galen was most likely wrong about the deme of *Daitales* from which, he reports, the Old Man came, and which is not attested as an Athenian deme elsewhere.

The text of the citations in the mss is significantly damaged. The first line is attested also in Pollux, who gives better readings. Perilli argues that only the last word in line 4 should be attributed to Aristophanes, while the rest is paraphrase by Galen since it repeats his earlier phrasing about κόρυμβα. This also means that the place of ὄπυειν in the line is not certain. The first half of the second line probably contained one more gloss.

The metre suggests that these verses may have been part of the agon. The standard interpretation can be traced back to Fritzsche's commentary or earlier and is as follows: the Old Man is attacking his Licentious Son, challenging him to explain some obscure Homeric glosses, since learning these was part of traditional Athenian education. He speaks in a condescending manner, as a teacher or adult would talk to a child. The son, in an attempt to defend himself, suggests that his brother, the Virtuous Son, explains instead some

¹¹ Soph., Capt., Περί σαφηνείας καὶ ἀσαφείας, Εἰ δύνανται τις εἶναι κριτικὸς καὶ γραμματικὸς, Πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιτιμῶντας τοῖς σολοικίζουσι τῇ φωνῇ. On Galen's philological expertise, see Hanson 1998.

¹² Cf. Strato *Phoenicides* fr. 1 thematising Homeric style and glosses used in a papyrus textbook in Ptolemaic Egypt, P. Cair. inv. 65445, Guéraud-Jouguet 1938.

¹³ See also on this problem Novokhatko 2017, 237–238.

legal expressions. The Licentious Son redirects the question since he himself is ignorant about the answer, that is, lacks elementary school knowledge, although he spends all his time studying new fashionable sophistic teachings. The Old Man and the Virtuous Son, on the contrary, being exponents of the old education, are familiar with Homeric diction but are ignorant of legal vocabulary that is used in speeches of the time. This interpretation, in our opinion, needs to be revisited.

The fragment has been frequently quoted in scholarship as a source on fifth-century Athenian education. In particular, it has been suggested that fr. 233 attests the drill of Homeric glosses as part of school curriculum.¹⁴ It is true that memorizing and reciting poems was an element of traditional education, and young people had to learn Homeric poems by heart (προμαθεῖν).¹⁵ In *Clouds*, the old-style education is illustrated through monotonous repetition of poems after the teacher, in order to memorize them (προμαθεῖν, *Nu.* 966–967). This image is different from discerning and understanding rare Homeric words which requires certain critical thinking and abstract notion of language. There is no direct evidence neither that glosses received special attention as standard exercise at that time, nor that they circulated in lists or textbooks.¹⁶ Therefore, the possibility should be considered that in fr. 233 Homeric glosses are the opposite of the old *paideia*: a sophistic innovation.

In fact, Homeric texts were of great interest for fifth-century sophists. The juxtaposition between traditional and sophistic ways of reading Homer is shown in Xen. *Symp.* 3. 5–6: sophists sought to understand the true meanings of Homeric poems, not to learn them by heart as stupid rhapsodes, ἔθνος ἡλιθιώτερον ῥαψωδῶν, a disdainful expression of Sokrates' disciple Antisthenes. According to Protagoras in Pl. *Prot.*, the early poets, such as Homer, Hesiod and Simonides, were first sophists who used their poetry as a cover-up for their real purpose (*Prot.* 316D).¹⁷ In this dialogue, sophists compete with Sokrates about moral meanings of poetic texts. This adaptation of archaic poets for sophistic argument is reflected in *Nu.* 1057, where the Unjust Speech cites Homer, arguing that the great poet approved of the art of public speeches at the agora by portraying Nestor an orator (*Il.* 1. 248; 4. 293). The word he uses, ἀγορητής, is a Homeric gloss and does not occur in fifth-century texts besides *Clouds*.

It is not accidental that Aristophanes chose the figure of Nestor for illustrating the sophistic argument. Nestor seems to have been popular in intellectual discussions of the time. In the passage from Xen. *Symp.* mentioned above, Nikeratos, who was extensively educated on Homer by the sophists, enthusiastically quotes Nestor's speech from the *Iliad* (23. 335–337). The Homeric verse on Nestor lifting his cup (*Il.* 11. 636–637) was especially attractive for sophistic debates on interpretation: Porphyry in his *scholia to the Iliad* reports how Antisthenes and Stesimbrotos understood it (*schol. in Il.* Λ 636, Antisthenes fr. 191 Gianantoni). Hippias of Elis wrote *Trojan Dialogue* in which Nestor instructs Neoptolemos about how to gain a good reputation.

¹⁴ Cassio 1977, 29 and 75: “questi versi, che appratengono certamente a un agone, ci confermano che l'apprendimento delle glosse omeriche e della corrispondente spiegazione era parte integrante del *curriculum* di studi nell' insegnamento elementare”. Cf. Dunbar 1998, 293; Revermann 2013, 111.

¹⁵ Pl. *Prot.* 325e, *Leg.* 810e–11a, Xen. *Symp.* 3. 5; Isoc. 11. 159; Aeschin. 3. 135; Ar. *Ran.* 1038–1039, cf. Pritchard 2015, 113–114.

¹⁶ Pfeiffer (1968, 79–80) concludes that glossographoi started their work not earlier than 3rd c. BC.

¹⁷ See discussion in Richardson 1975.

Particularly, sophists relied on literary works of Homer and other poets in their linguistic studies.¹⁸ One of the key topics of sophistic language theory was ‘correctness of names’, ὀρθοέπεια/ ὀρθότης ὀνομάτων, and by names they meant words in general and even sentences. Antisthenes who claimed that ἀρχὴ παιδείσεως ἢ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπίσκεψις (Epict. Dissert. 1. 17.10–12 = fr.160 Gianantonni), wrote treatises on Homeric criticism and exegesis such as περὶ Ὀδυσσεύς, περὶ Ὀμήρου, περὶ Ὀδυσσεάς etc (Diog. Laert. 6. 15–18 = fr.41 Gianantonni). He also interpreted in detail the Homeric epithet πολύτροπος (fr. 187 Gianantonni, Porph. *schol. in Od.* α 1). Demokritos, the teacher of Protagoras, wrote a treatise on ὀρθοέπεια with the title Περί Ὀμήρου ἢ Ὀρθοεπείης καὶ γλωσσέων, implying a distinction between the correct usage of words and Homeric obsolete vocabulary. The term γλῶττα itself was probably freshly coined around the time of the performance of *Daitales*.¹⁹

Protagoras, who is according to the *opinio communis* mocked in *Clouds*, developed the theory of ὀρθοέπεια as usage of words in their direct meaning, the opposition of glosses and poetic diction.²⁰ He also applied grammatical categories, such as gender and types of discourse (wish, question, answer, command etc.) to Homeric text as an instrument of criticism (Diogenes Laertios 9.54; Arist. *Poet.* 1456b15–17). Another sophist, Prodikos, known for his interest in ὀρθότης ὀνομάτων (Pl. *Prot.* 341c9, *Crat.* 384b, 277e3–4) and subtle distinction (διαίρεσις) of synonyms, was probably inspired by Homer for his etymological hypotheses.²¹

It is plausible that these and other debates on the ‘correct’ use of words, that were in vogue in the intellectual circles in fifth-century Athens, were reflected also in Aristophanes’ *Daitales*, as they certainly were in *Clouds*.²² If so, fr. 233 could have been part of a debate about the meaning and correct usage of words and/or correct interpretation of Homer which was a feature of new sophistic education. The interest in law courts, on the other hand, is more characteristic in Aristophanic comedy of the old generation, cf. Philokleon and the chorus of juries-old men in *Wasps* and Strepsiades in *Clouds* whose practical interest in winning a court case is contrasted with the abstract teaching of Sokrates and his school.

Furthermore, the verb καλέω, that is repeated three times in the fragment, has a special meaning in the light of sophistic theories of language. In *Clouds*, when Sokrates introduces Strepsiades to the wisdom of his school, he uses it almost as a *terminus technicus* of saying the correct form of the word according to its gender: Σω. ὀρᾶς ἄ πάσχεις; τὴν τε θήλειαν καλεῖς | ἀλεκτρυόνα κατὰ ταυτὸ καὶ τὸν ἄρρενα (662–663); Στ. νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ. νῦν δὲ πῶς με χρὴ καλεῖν; (665); Σω. ἰδοὺ μάλ’ αὐθις, προὔθ’ ἕτερον. τὴν κάρδοπον | ἄρρενα καλεῖς θήλειαν οὖσαν (670–671). Olson, 2021, 196, in his translation implies the scholarly technicality of this verb: “you’re referring to the male by a term also used for the female”; and for v.1258, Olson 2021, 299: (ἐ)κάλεσας ... τὴν κάρδοπον “you used the word *kardopos*”. This translation is supported by the scholia: ‘ὅτι ἦν ἔδει σε καρδόπην εἰπεῖν’, cf. also Dover 1968, 242.

¹⁸ On sophists’ linguistic activities, see Kerferd 1981, 68–77, Wolfsdorf 2015, 69; Grintser 2017, esp. 372–374 on using poetry.

¹⁹ Pfeiffer 1968, 78–79; Novokhatko 2020, 57–58; Novokhatko 2020a, 95–96.

²⁰ Pl. *Phdr.* 267c. See Grintser 2017, 369.

²¹ Grintser 2017, 372–374.

²² Willi 2003, 97–105, 118–120; Kerferd 1981, 69.

The word κάρδοπος was later included in lexica as an Aristophanic gloss and was perhaps a rare word already in the fifth century. It could hint at some cosmological teaching of sophists (cf. Pl. *Phaed.* 99b 10). Sokrates' preoccupation with the gender of the word in this scene — the feminine form of κάρδοπος, καρδόπη, was probably coined by Aristophanes — alludes to Protagoras who was concerned with the grammatical category of gender and with the correct use of gender. This parody of sophistic teachings is significant in the play, as it re-appears again at the end of the play when Strepsiades applies the fruits of his sophistic education to a real-life task (1248–1258). The scene in *Clouds* is, therefore, a close parallel to fr. 233, featuring linguistic theories of sophists and discussing separate words in a quasi-school context that is essential for the plot and thematical structure of the play. It is possible that the use of καλέω in fr. 233 is not accidental and hints at sophistic theories of ὄνοματα.

Moreover, it seems that the verb καλέω might have been a marker of sophistic language debates.²³ Plato's *Kratylos*, which is dedicated to sophistic language theory and has the subtitle 'about the correctness of names' (περὶ ὀνομάτων ὀρθότητος), opens with Kratylos' proposition on the 'correctness of names' which uses emphatically the verb καλέω with ὄνομα as its object: ΕΡΜ. Κρατύλος φησὶν ὅδε, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὀνόματος ὀρθότητα εἶναι ἐκάστῳ τῶν ὄντων φύσει πεφυκυῖαν, καὶ οὐ τοῦτο εἶναι ὄνομα ὃ ἂν τινες συνθέμενοι καλεῖν καλῶσι, τῆς αὐτῶν φωνῆς μῦριον ἐπιφθεγγόμενοι, ἀλλὰ ὀρθότητά τινα τῶν ὀνομάτων πεφυκέσθαι καὶ Ἑλλήσι καὶ βαρβάροις τὴν αὐτὴν ἅπασιν. After that, throughout the dialogue, this verb is used *passim* to argue about the meanings and etymologies of separate words.²⁴ Similarly, it is used in the scene in Xen. *Mem.* 3,14, 2–5 where the meaning and etymology of words are discussed.

In the light of these parallels, it seems plausible that both the Old Man and his Virtuous Son were followers of the new sophistic movement, whereas the Licentious Son was adherent to traditional and more practical legal education. The Old Man is proud of his knowledge of obscure words in Homer and exposes his Son's ignorance, while the latter finds this kind of expertise ridiculous and redirects the question to some legal terms, which, in his opinion, are much more relevant in real life.

Bibliography

- Barney R. *Names and nature in Plato's Cratylus. Studies in philosophy.* New York — London, Routledge, 2001.
- Bergk T. *Aristophanis fragmenta.* Berlin, Reimer, 1840.
- Boudon-Millot V., Jouanna J., Pietrobello A. (eds) *Galien. Ne pas se chagriner.* Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2010.
- Cassio A. C. (ed., comm.) *Aristofane, Banchettanti (Daitales): i frammenti.* Pisa, Giardini, 1977.
- Coker A. Galen and the Language of Old Comedy: Glimpses of a Lost Treatise at Ind. 23b–28, in: C. Petit (ed.) *Galen's Treatise Περὶ Ἀλυτίας (De indolentia) in Context: A Tale of Resilience.* Leiden, Brill, 2019, 63–90.
- Dindorf G. *Aristophanis fragmenta.* Leipzig, Libraria Weidmannia, 1829.
- Dindorf G. *Poetarum scenicarum graecorum... fabulae superstites et perditarum fragmenta.* Leipzig, Teubner, 1869.
- Dobree, see Scholefield Dover 1968: K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes' Clouds* (Oxford).
- Dunbar N. *Aristophanes' Birds.* Oxford, OUP, 1998.
- Fritzche F. *De Daetalensibus Aristophanis commentatio.* Leipzig, Lehnhold, 1831.
- Grintser N. The Birth of European Linguistic Theory: The Idea of Language in the Sophists, in: T. Li, K. Dyer (eds) *From Ancient Manuscripts to Modern Dictionaries: Select Studies in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek.* Piscataway, NJ, 2017, 365–378.

²³ See also Willi 2003, 64, 84 n. 85, on this verb indicating the technical status of a word in comedy.

²⁴ See Sedley 2003, 51–54 and Barney 2001, 26–29, on the implications of 'calling' in *Kratylos*.

- Guéraud O., Jouguet P. *Un livre décolier du IIIe siècle avant J.-C.* Cairo, Société Royale Égyptienne de Papyrologie, 1938.
- Hanson A. E. Galen: author and critic, in: G. Most (ed.) *Editing texts — Texte edieren.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998, 22–53.
- Kaibel G. *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Berlin, Weidmann, 1899.
- Kerferd G. B. *The Sophistic Movement.* Cambridge, CUP, 1981.
- Kuhn K. G. (ed.) *Claudii Galeni Opera omnia.* Lipsiae, Car. Cnoblochii, 1821–1833.
- Manetti D. Galen and Hippocratic medicine: language and practice, in: C. Gill, T. Whitmarsh, J. Wilkins (eds) *Galen and the world of knowledge.* Cambridge, CUP, 2009, 157–174.
- Novokhatko A. Discourse markers in a comic fragmentary dialogue, in: F. Logozzo, P. Poccetti (eds) *Ancient Greek Linguistics: New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives.* Berlin — Boston, De Gruyter, 2017, 227–242.
- Novokhatko A. The Origins and Growth of Scholarship in Pre-Hellenistic Greece, in: F. Montanari (ed.) *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age.* Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2020, 9–131.
- Novokhatko A. Homeric Hermeneutics on the way from Athens to Alexandria, in: A. Rengakos, P. Finglass, B. Zimmermann (eds) *More than Homer Knew — Studies on Homer and His Ancient Commentators.* Berlin — Boston, De Gruyter, 2020, 87–171.
- Olson S. D. (comm.) *Eupolis. Testimonia and Aiges — Dêmoi (fr. 1–146). Translation and Commentary.* Heidelberg, Verlag Antike, 2017.
- Olson S. D. (comm.) *Aristophanes' Clouds: A Commentary.* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2021.
- Perilli L. *Galenii vocum Hippocratis Glossarium / Galeno, Interpretazione delle parole difficili di Ippocrate. Testo, Traduzione e Note di Commento.* Berlin — Boston, De Gruyter, 2017.
- Pfeiffer R. *History of classical scholarship: from the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic age.* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Pritchard D. M. Athens, in: W. M. Bloomer (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Education.* Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2015, 112–122.
- Revermann 2013: M. Revermann M. Paraepic comedy: point(s) and practices, in: E. L. Prauscello, M. Telò (eds) *Comic Interactions: Comedy and Other Genres.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013, 101–128.
- Richardson N. J. Homeric professors in the age of the Sophists. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 1975, 21, 65–81.
- Scholefield J. (ed.) *Dobree Petri Pauli Advresaria II.* Cambridge, 1843.
- Sedley D. *Plato's Cratylus.* New York, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Seidler A. *Brevis disputatio de Aristophanis fragmentis.* Halle, Paxonum, 1818.
- Willi A. *The languages of Aristophanes. Aspects of Linguistic variation in classical Attic Greek.* Oxford, OUP, 2003.
- Wolfsdorf D. Sophistic Method and Practice, in: W. M. Bloomer (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Education.* Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2015, 63–76.

Были ли гомеровские глоссы частью школьного образования в Афинах V в.? Новое прочтение фр. 233 «Пирующих» Аристофана*

Елена Юрьевна Чепель

Институт мировой литературы им. А. М. Горького РАН,
Российская Федерация, 121069, Москва, ул. Поварская, 25а; euchepel@gmail.com

Для цитирования: Chepel E. Yu. Were Homeric Glosses Part of School Education in Fifth-century Athens? New Interpretation of Aristophanes' *Daitales* fr. 233. *Philologia Classica* 2022, 17 (2), 244–252. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2022.204>

В статье предлагается новое прочтение фрагмента 233 (по изданию Касселя-Остина) несохранившейся комедии Аристофана «Пирующие». Этот фрагмент в научной лите-

* Работа подготовлена при поддержке Правительства РФ (проект № 075-15-2021-571 «Цифровые комментарии к античным текстам: древнегреческая комедия»).

ратуре часто приводится в качестве свидетельства того, что афинская молодежь V в. до н. э. заучивала в школе глоссы из поэм Гомера. В статье подробно разбирается контекст цитирования Аристофана Галеном, степень сохранности текста фр. 233 и существующие интерпретации данного отрывка из комедии. Автор отмечает, что в самом тексте ничто прямо не указывает на принадлежность глосс к обязательной школьной программе в Афинах. Напротив, можно утверждать, что Аристофан преподносит глоссы как определенное лингвистическое новаторство, а интеллектуалов, изучающих их, как представителей нового модного движения софистов. В качестве аргументации нового прочтения фрагмента автор статьи приводит параллели между комедиями Аристофана «Пирующие» и «Облака», а также параллели с диалогом Платона «Кратил». В заключении автор предлагает переосмыслить диалог между Отцом и Сыном в фр. 233 и делает вывод о действующих лицах «Пирующих» и их роли в сюжете комедии: Старик-отец не противится софистическим учениям, а использует их в споре, чтобы показать Распутнику-сыну его невежество. В свою очередь этот сын не является последователем софистов и их нововведений, как обычно считается, и защищается от нападок отца с помощью своих знаний юридических терминов и таким образом выступает как представитель традиционной и почтенной профессии судебного оратора.

Ключевые слова: *Пирующие*, Аристофан, школьное образование, глоссы, софисты, античные теории языка.

Received: 15.05.2022

Accepted: 23.09.2022