



UDC 821.14

## Matro of Pitane fr. 1 *Symposium Atticum* = SH 534 (Ath. 4. 12 [134d–137c]), 18–21\*

Robert Drew Griffith

Department of Classics, Queen's University,  
49, Bader Lane, Kingston (Ontario), K7L 3N6, Canada; griffitd@queensu.ca

**For citation:** Griffith R. D. Matro of Pitane fr. 1 *Symposium Atticum* = SH 534 (Ath. 4. 12 [134d–137c]), 18–21. *Philologia Classica* 2022, 17 (2), 331–338. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2022.212>

Matro of Pitane's cento of Homeric verses, *The Attic Dinner Party* contains a puzzling episode in which the narrator throws sea-urchins, which he has apparently already eaten, among the feet of the slaves, where they clatter “where waves were washing the beach”. The slaves then draw out the spines “from the head”. Following Elena Ermolaeva's comparison of Matro's lines to the Unswept Floor mosaic, I suggest that his banquet took place in a normal dining room rather than on a beach or in a room with a window facing one. The floor of this room, being a pebble mosaic, could aptly be called a beach from which the slaves were washing the detritus of the meal, a procedure (as we know from Olynthus) the dining rooms of private houses were expressly designed to facilitate. This interpretation entails reading \*λύματ'... κλύζεσκει for the manuscripts' κύματ'... κλύζεσκε). The scribal alteration I postulate has the effect — unique in this poem, and therefore suspect — of reproducing an entire Homeric line unaltered. Lastly, the phrase “from the head” does not refer to whence the slaves are pulling the sea-urchin's spines (for that will be from their own feet), but to where they came from in the first place: a sea-urchin's head.

*Keywords:* cento, Matro of Pitane, mosaic, parody.

In a recent article, Elena Ermolaeva has discussed four puzzling lines of Matro of Pitane's *Attic Dinner Party*.<sup>1</sup> Her valuable article has moved me to consider possible emendations to one line of Matro's text as preserved by Athenaeus, and a new understanding of another. Ermolaeva succinctly sets out the puzzling aspects of these lines: Место, где

\* I am grateful to Dr. Elena Zheltova and three anonymous readers for *Philologia Classica* for many helpful suggestions on an earlier draft of this article.

<sup>1</sup> Ermolaeva 2014.

речь идет о морских ежах, вызывает сразу несколько вопросов: почему рассказчик бросает морских ежей, при чем тут волны, наконец, кто и зачем вырывает колючки на голове у ежей.<sup>2</sup>

Here is the passage:<sup>3</sup>

αὐτὰρ ἐχίνους ῥῖψα κερηκομόωντας ἀκάνθαις,  
οἱ δὲ κυλινδόμενοι καναχὴν ἔχον ἐν ποσὶ παίδων  
ἐν καθαροῦ, ὅθι κύματ' ἐπ' ἠϊόνος κλύζεσκε  
πολλὰς δ' ἐκ κεφαλῆς προθελύμους εἴλκον ἀκάνθας.

20

“Yet I threw away the sea-urchins, long-haired of head with spines, which, as they rolled, made a clatter among the feet of the slaves in the open space, where waves were washing on the beach: and I was/they were drawing out by the roots many spines from the head”.

The parasitical narrator of Matro's poem does not join his fellow diners in eating only vegetables, but partakes of all kinds of food.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, he rejects only one offering, a type of salt-fish (ὠμοσάριχος), which apparently offends him as being Phoenician. In marked contrast is how he treats the dish of sea-urchins.<sup>5</sup> As S. Douglas Olson and Alexander Sens rightly state of line 18, “the narrator eats the sea-urchins with great relish (as opposed to wanting nothing to do with the ὠμοσάριχος) and then throws the creatures' empty shells down on the floor, where they roll about like Patroclus' helmet”.<sup>6</sup>

Like the line before it, the alliterative line 19 makes perfect sense. It is modelled on Hom. *Il.* 16. 794, in which Apollo knocks the helmet off Patroclus' head, ἡ δὲ κυλινδομένη καναχὴν ἔχε ποσσὶν ὑφ' ἵππων (“and, as it rolled, it made a clatter among the feet of the horses”). Our narrator has thrown the inedible bits of his meal — the shells, now as empty as Patroclus' helmet in his Homeric model<sup>7</sup> — onto the floor, in the manner depicted in Sosos of Pergamon's trompe-l'œil ἀσάρωτος οἶκος, “unswept floor” mosaic (Plin. *HN* 36, 184). Sosos' work is lost, but a replica by a certain Heraclitus from around 130 C. E., discovered in a villa in front of the Aurelian wall south of the Aventine, is now in the Vatican Museum (inv. 10132). That Heraclitus' mosaic even depicts a mouse contemplating half a walnut suggests that its spirit is much akin to that of the epic parodists.<sup>8</sup> Ermolaeva's

<sup>2</sup> “The passage about the sea urchins raises several questions: why does the narrator throw away the sea urchins, what do the waves have to do with them, and finally, who pulls out quills from the urchins' heads and why?” (Ermolaeva 2014, 120).

<sup>3</sup> Lloyd-Jones-Parsons 1983, 260.

<sup>4</sup> On the narrator as parasite, see Bertolín Cebrián 2008, 55.

<sup>5</sup> As Olson-Sens point out the word αὐτὰρ emphatically placed at the beginning of this section marks the contrast. Brandt's suggestion (on which see below), revived by Condello (2002, 141), that the slaves pull out the sea urchins' spines in order to eat them is therefore impossible: the sea urchins have already been eaten. Ermolaeva (2014, 132) offers a further reason to reject Brandt's idea: Ματρον уже отказался от овощей «в пользу бедных», от соленой рыбы «в пользу финикийцев», вряд ли он откажется и от деликатеса в пользу слуг (“Matron has already given up vegetables ‘as being for the poor’, and salt fish ‘as being for Phoenicians’. He is unlikely also to give up a delicacy to the servants”). Degani (1995, 417) has our narrator discard the sea urchins (uneaten, Degani implies) when he catches sight of the more appetizing anchovy, but the anchovy arrives in line 22 (ἡ δὲ Φαληρικὴ ἦλθ' ἀφύη) only after the sea urchins have landed on the floor.

<sup>6</sup> Olson-Sens 1999: 88. This makes much better sense than Gulick's (1951, 2, 118–119) idea that he has thrown the sea-urchins on the ground in order to break them.

<sup>7</sup> Or “hypotext” in Condello's 2002, 133 parlance.

<sup>8</sup> Clarke 2007, 58–59 with figures 18 and 19. Clarke writes that “the unswept floor could easily become a kind of game board, encouraging guests to throw trash on the floor — and possibly at each other”. Matro's

biggest contribution to understanding Matro's lines is the attention she draws to the similarity of our scene to Sosus'/Heraclitus' artwork. Olson and Sens add that, "walking about among rolling sea-urchin shells is a very dangerous business, and the nasty idea that the noise the shells produce is to be connected with their presence among the slave's feet (since the slaves will inevitably produce howls of pain when they step on them) is probably part of the joke".<sup>9</sup>

The line immediately following, however, is problematic as it stands. Line 20 is identical to Hom. *Il.* 23. 61 (ἐν καθαρῷ, ὅθι κύματ' ἐπ' ἠϊόνος κλύζεσκον [v. l. κλύζεσκε], "in the open space, where waves were washing the beach", said of the site of Achilles' mourning for Patroclus). H. G. Paessens writes of this line as follows:

*Erravit Peltzerus ex h. v. intelligi dicens, domum, ubi coena erat, prope portum fuisse antequam domum pueros ludentes poetam finxisse: ut integrum ex Homero versum sententia nullatenus mutata vel in rem ridiculam conversa Matro desumpsisse credendus esset, quod ab ingenio parodi nostri abhorret. Jam autem, quo tandem spectet festiva Homerici versus accommodatio, me ipsum fateor nescire.*<sup>10</sup>

Paul Brandt's commentary, written three decades later, adds:

*Ex v. 20, quem unum, ut nunc res se habet, Matro probum et integrum ex Homero excerpit, discere videmur convivium in ipso maris litore fuisse (cf. ad v. 105); quod credi vix potest, licet huic interpretationi non repugnant verba ἐν Ἀθήναις (v. 2), si cum Schweighauesero prope portum cenam apparatus fuisse statuimus (sic Archestratus fr. IX postquam apuam omnem iussit respui πλὴν τὴν ἐν Ἀθήναις, adiungit capiendam illam esse ἐν εὐκόλοιο Φαλήρου ἀγκῶσιν). Recte enim iudicat Paessensius non posse concedi Matronem adeo sibi ipsum non constitisse, ut versum homericum incorruptum mutuaretur, neque magis mihi poetae facetiae ut oblitteratae videbantur, ita quo modo recuperandae essent liquebat. Nunc subsidio venit Wachsmuthius, cuius verba ipsa apponam: 'Die Seeigel werden durchs Fenster auf die Strasse geworfen: dort stürzt sich die Schaar der Gassenbuben darüber her; das wird mit dem Branden der Wogen am Gestade verglichen: κύματα ἀνδρῶν und ähnlich sagt man ja auch sonst von wogenden Menschenmassen. Das muss der Sinn sein; die Herstellung ist zweifelhaft',<sup>11</sup> (εἰλαπίνης e. gr. positum est.) *Aliam post Wachsmuthium viam ingreditur Stadtmuellerus: ἐν δαπέδῳ (vel προθύρῳ), ὅθι λύματ' ἀπ' ἠϊών κλύζεσκεν (vel ἀπ' ἠϊών προσκλύζεσκεν) 'in solo' (vel 'ante fores') 'quo sordes i. e. res abiectae e convivio mittebantur, ut fluctuum instar adluerent'*.<sup>12</sup>*

poem too resembles a kind of game, a puzzle in which readers are teased with hints as to what Homeric lines lie behind the surface narrative. From another point of view, the cento (in Greek κέντρων) form is the literary equivalent of a mosaic in which found objects are arranged to make a new pattern with a different meaning; cf. Degani 1995, 421. The mouse Psicharpax gives a catalogue of his favourite foods, including walnuts, in *Batrachomyomachia* 24–55; cf. Hosty 2020, 140.

<sup>9</sup> Olson-Sens 1999, 89.

<sup>10</sup> Paessens 1855, 14. Peltzer's view that Matro's παῖδες are *pueri ludentes* rather than slaves, like Wachsmuth's idea that they are *Gassenbuben* (see below), is a further unfortunate consequence of his way of explaining the presence of a beach in the poem.

<sup>11</sup> "The sea urchins are thrown through the window onto the street: there the crowd of street kids rush over them; this is compared to the pounding of the waves on the shore: "waves of men" is how one speaks in similes of surging masses of people. That must be the point, though the phrasing is doubtful".

<sup>12</sup> Brandt 1888, 74–75. Wachsmuth, author of volume two of *Corpusculum poesis epicae Graecae ludibundae, Sillographorum Graecorum reliquiae* made his suggestion while helping Brandt correct the proofs of his book (see page viii); I am unable to determine where Stadtmüller suggested his emendation.

Wilamowitz has no very high opinion of Matro (an eccentric position, given that as considerable a scholar as Isaac Casaubon could describe our poem as, *elegans parodia, carmen ingeniosum et leporis ac venustatis plenissimum*).<sup>13</sup> Wilamowitz writes, “Jeder von uns wird zuerst mehr Pointen erwarten, aber die Hörer waren befriedigt, wenn die ihnen vertrauten homerischen Phrasen und Verse in einer Verbindung auftraten, die von der epischen Würde möglichst weit abwich. Es störte sie nicht, wenn’s auch Unsinn war, den lachen kann man auch über Unsinn”. Specifically of line 20 he adds, “Den ganzen Vers Ψ 61, von dem nur ἐν καθαρῷ herpaßt, führt er in der oben besprochenen Weise nur als lustigen Unsinn an”.<sup>14</sup> Or, as Olson and Sens put it, since the words, “can scarcely be taken as a description of any actual feature of the dinner-party or its surroundings, they must be intended to be ridiculous”.<sup>15</sup>

But, while one might debate whether Matro plays the parody-game well or badly, one expects him at least to *play* it, by distorting rather than merely repeating his original source verbatim, as he never otherwise does in this fragment, and only once elsewhere in his extant work (fr. 7, 1 Olson-Sens = Hom. *Il.* 11, 825 = 16, 23). Could he really have given up altogether, and that a mere twenty lines into his poem? Even worse, the line as transmitted leaves εἶλκον in 21 with no obvious subject, for the neuter κύματα cannot in the Greek of Matro’s day govern a plural verb.<sup>16</sup> Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Peter Parsons caution would-be textual critics that: *totum carmen in parodia est, i. e. versuum Homericorum detorsione: idcirco nec nimis mirandum nec semper corrigendum, si orationem hiantem, si flosculos ioci causa magis quam ad rem insertos hic illic sibi permisit poeta centonarius*.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, the uniquely unaltered nature of our line, and its lack of pertinence (apart from its first two words) to the new context in which Matro has set it, arouse suspicion that some corruption has taken place.

Ermolaeva compares a passage of Oppian’s *Halieutica*, written some five centuries after Matro using similar Homeric vocabulary, in which sea urchins are said to tremble before waves above all else, lest the agitated swell roll them onto the shore (τὸ γὰρ τρομέουσι μάλιστα, / μὴ σφὰς ἐπ’ ἠϊόνεσσι κυκώμενον οἶδμα κυλίση, 2, 230–31<sup>18</sup> — to guard against this eventuality, Oppian says, they carry ballast-stones on their spines.) She concludes, Так или иначе, пассаж у Оппиана подтверждает, что Матрон как нельзя более удачно приспособил гомеровские стихи с морским берегом к своим строчкам о морских ежах, которых пирующие бросают на пол, словно морская волна во время бури — на берег, где их подстерегают опасности.<sup>19</sup> The seafood served at Matro’s banquet is

<sup>13</sup> Casaubon 1796, 1, 318.

<sup>14</sup> “Each of us will at first expect more punchlines, but the listeners were satisfied when the Homeric phrases and verses familiar to them appeared in a combination that deviated as far as possible from epic dignity. It didn’t bother them, even if it was nonsense, for one can laugh at nonsense too... The whole verse *Il.* 23.61, of which only ἐν καθαρῷ fits the context, he cites only as amusing nonsense in the manner discussed above” (Wilamowitz 1923, 75, 77 = 1962, 4, 331, 333). Ermolaeva (2014, 134) agrees with Wilamowitz that the very absence of meaning can itself be funny.

<sup>15</sup> Olson-Sens 1999, 89, cf. 34.

<sup>16</sup> This was not yet a hard and fast rule for Homer. In Homer the verbs used with neuter plural subjects are plural 40% of the time; see Scott 1929.

<sup>17</sup> Lloyd-Jones-Parsons 1983, 263.

<sup>18</sup> Which Fajen 1999, 99 translates as, “Denn davor zittern die am meisten, daß die aufgewühlte See sie an das Ufer spült”.

<sup>19</sup> “Anyway, the passage in Oppian confirms that Matro could not have been more successful in adapting Homer’s verse about the seashore to his lines about the sea urchins, which the revelers throw to the floor like a sea wave during a storm — to the shore, where danger awaits them” (Ermolaeva 2014, 130).

certainly capable of feeling strong emotion: for example, the head of a tuna stands apart like Ajax, angered over the loss of its armor, in this case the rest of its body (lines 53–55). Yet, it is hard to see what further risk the sea urchins have to fear, since they have already been eaten. The only danger — and it is a comic one — is to the waiters’ feet now vulnerable to the spines.<sup>20</sup> Ermolaeva is right, however, that the unswept floor of the *andron* with its mosaic (κέντησις), из мельчайших тессер мраморов и полудрагоценных камней... выкладывались<sup>21</sup> — in other words, laid out from pebbles — has become metaphorically a beach (ἡϊών) on which, as in Oppian, the sea urchins are exposed.

This thought suggests an emendation similar to, but simpler than, Stadtmüller’s. If in line 20 Matro wrote something like \*ἐν καθαρῷ, ὅθι λύματ’ ἀπ’ ἡϊόνος κλύζεσκον (“in the open space, where they [i. e. the slaves] washed off dirt from the ‘beach’ [i. e. the mosaic floor]”), he would be altering a Homeric verse according to his usual custom, rather than merely transcribing one intact. He would also be depicting an actual feature of a dinner-party, for, as we know from the excavations at Olynthos, a standard design of the *andron* was to have a floor, slightly lower in the middle than on the edges where the couches were placed, equipped with a narrow drain leading into the street.<sup>22</sup> The obvious point of this design is that the waiters would pour water onto the floor, perhaps at various points of the meal, to wash away the scattered debris. The similarity between the \*λύματ’ I hypothesize and Homer’s κύματ’ could have induced a copyist inadvertently to supply from memory the rest of the Homeric line (κύματ’ ἐπ’ ἡϊόνος κλύζεσκε) in place of what Matro himself had written (\*λύματ’ ἀπ’ ἡϊόνος κλύζεσκον), whether we construe ἀπό as an independent preposition or consider ἀπο... κλύζεσκον to be in tmesis. While Homer uses κλύζω only of the sea or weather, post-Homeric usage takes it to mean, “to wash out” or “clean thoroughly”.<sup>23</sup> What one washes away is often characterized as λύματα,<sup>24</sup> and one washes it away from (ἀπό) something, whether the verb of washing is νίζω, λούω or κλύζω.<sup>25</sup> This would not be the only instance in which Athenaeus’ copyist has “corrected” the text by supplying what he thinks ought to be there, even at the expense of destroying a joke. As Geoffrey Arnott writes, “When at 6.224e (Amphis fr. 30.12–13) we find a passage describing how a fishmonger cut off his initial syllables (συλλαβὴν ἀφελών) and said τάρων βολών and κτώ βολών, the scribe writes out τεττάρων, ὀκτώ and (on one occasion) ὀβολών in full, affording an opportunity to Musurus, Kock and Schweighaeuser to restore

<sup>20</sup> The narrator’s carelessness for the slaves’ well-being resembles the rude welcome the men of Thasos gave to his predecessor, the parodist Hegemon (μ’ ἐλθόντα μετεωρίζοντες ἔβαλλον/ πολλοῖσι σπελέθοισι, “when I arrived, they lifted up and hit me with many pieces of dung,” fr. 1.1–2 Degani, *Poesia parodica greca*<sup>2</sup> = Athen. 15, 55 [699a]).

<sup>21</sup> “Laid out from the smallest tesserae of marble and semi-precious stones” (Ermolaeva 2014, 124).

<sup>22</sup> Cahill 2002, 93–94.

<sup>23</sup> Bullock 1985, 120 on Callim. *Hymn.* 5, 10 and Harder, 2012, 2.607 on Callim. *Aet.* III fr. 75, 24–25 Pfeiffer.

<sup>24</sup> ἀπὸ θήρης/ ἔκλυζεν ποταμῷ λύματα, “she was washing off the dirt from the hunt in the river” (Callim. *Aet.* III fr. 75, 24–25 Pfeiffer) and ἀπονόμων τῶν δυναμένων ἐκκλύζειν τὰ λύματα τῆς πόλεως εἰς τὸν Τίβεριν, “Water channels capable of washing the city’s refuse into the Tiber,” Str. 5, 3, 8, 235C.

<sup>25</sup> σφιν κύμα θαλάσσης ἰδρῷ πολλόν/ νίψεν ἀπὸ χρωτὸς, “for them the wave of the sea had washed much sweat from their body” (*Il.* 10. 574–75), μηροῦ δ’ ἔκταμι’ οἰστόν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ δ’ αἶμα κελαινὸν/ νίζ’ ὕδατι, “cut the arrow from my thigh and off it wash the black brine with warm water”, ἄλμην ὠμοῖν ἀπολούσομαι, “I may wash the brine off my shoulders” (*Od.* 6. 219) and θέρμετε δ’ ὕδωρ / ὡς ἂν θεῖον ὄνειρον ἀποκλύσω, “and warm water, so that I can wash off [of myself] the divine dream”, Ar. *Ran.* 1339–40 parodying Euripides’ style.

what the fishmonger actually said”<sup>26</sup> This is the “substitution of [a] subconscious idea”, which Arnott has catalogued for the text of Alexis.<sup>27</sup> (Naturally, the corruption might already have happened in Matro’s text before it reached Athenaeus, but of that we have no way of telling.)

We then come to line 21, which is modelled on Hom. *Il.* 10. 15 (πολλὰς ἐκ κεφαλῆς προθελύμνους ἔλκετο χαίτας, “he was pulling many hairs out of his head”, of Agamemnon’s reaction to his realization that he cannot see how to win the war). If the corruption I posit in line 20 had already taken place, readers would have been left to take εἶλκον as first person singular, as do Schweighäuser, Gulick and Olson.<sup>28</sup> Alternatively, one can read the verb as third person plural, in which case the subject could be the slaves, scavenging the sea-urchins discarded by our narrator, as Brandt argues (*Pueri echinos a Matrone proiectos spinis extractis comedunt*).<sup>29</sup> Olson and Sens rightly object to Brandt’s view that, “this is not how one eats sea-urchins”.<sup>30</sup> It is possible, however, that the subject is the sea-urchins themselves, performing some act akin to what Agamemnon is doing in the Homeric model. This too is unlikely, however, because were that the meaning, εἶλκον ought to be middle, like Homer’s ἔλκετο, and, because these sea-urchins (to repeat what I said above) can hardly feel distress, having already been devoured! Federico Condello puts this latter problem well: “L’idea, in verità, pare alquanto bizzarra, e troppo richiede alla fantasia e alle tacite integrazioni del lettore: bisognerebbe pensare che gli animaletti, disperati per il destino inflitto loro dal narratore, reagiscano con un gesto che nel codice prossemico greco, e non solo greco, può connotare soltanto l’estrema afflizione”.<sup>31</sup>

However, if line 20 originally had something like the form I suggest, then the subject of εἶλκον in line 21, as of \*κλύζεσκον in 20, will be the slaves, and they will be drawing spines out of their own bodies, because they will have stepped on them, as Olson and Sens reasonably predicted. The phrase ἐκ κεφαλῆς will not, however, refer to whence the spines are drawn (for that must be from the slaves’ feet), but will rather explain where they came from in the first place — they are from the sea urchins’ heads, as one can say that a horn has grown “from a head” (ἐκ κεφαλῆς, *Il.* 4, 109) or that hairs have poured down “from one’s head” (ἐκ κεφαλῆς, *Hymn. Hom. Ven.* 228–29). The word κεφαλή will no longer refer to one head only, as in Homer, but be singular for plural (anticipated by the accusative singular κάρη implied in the word, κερηκομώντας). This repurposing, effected by change of context rather than by any rewording, testifies to Matro’s cleverness.

In conclusion, I suggest that Matro wrote something like the following (I have underlined the four letters in line 20 that differ from the paradosis):

---

<sup>26</sup> Arnott 2000, 45.

<sup>27</sup> Arnott 1996, 879, referring to Fraenkel 1950, 3. 655 n. 1, who writes of, “a corruption of the common type in which two elements are combined, a mechanical error arising from the literal similarity of two words, and a mental error, the writer’s thought straying to some word suggested by the context”.

<sup>28</sup> Johann Schweighäuser apud Gulick 1951, 2, 118–119 and Olson 2006, 2, 147, who has the narrator pull spines out of his “face”, a meaning for κεφαλῆς for which I know of no parallel.

<sup>29</sup> Brandt 1888, 75.

<sup>30</sup> Olson-Sens 1999, 89.

<sup>31</sup> “The idea really seems quite bizarre, and demands too much of the imagination and tacit supplements supplied by the reader, who would have to imagine that the little animals, in despair over the fate imposed on them by the narrator, react with a gesture that in the Greek proxemic code, like that of other peoples, can only denote extreme affliction” (Condello 2002, 139).

αὐτὰρ ἐχίνους ῥίψα κρηκομόωντας ἀκάνθαις,  
οἱ δὲ κυλινδόμενοι καναχὴν ἔχον ἐν ποσὶ παιδῶν  
ἐν καθαρῷ, ὅθι λύματ' ἀπ' ἠϊόνος κλύζεσκον  
πολλὰς δ' ἐκ κεφαλῆς προθελύμνους εἶλκον ἀκάνθας.

20

“Yet I threw away the [empty] sea-urchins, long-haired of head with spines, which, as they rolled, made a clatter among the feet of the slaves in the open space, where they washed off dirt from the ‘beach,’ and they were drawing by the roots many spines [that came] from the head[s]”.

It could be seen as a weakness of the proposed interpretation that the pathos of Agamemnon's suffering — transferred with the absurdity of a Daniil Kharmis from an army general to mere sea urchins — no longer survives in Matro's text. However, this loss is offset by another kind of suffering — the very real pain in the servants' feet — and a different emotional register — not the detachment of the Absurd, but rather that of Schadenfreude (ἐπιχαίρεκακία).

If it is true that, “lachen kann man auch über Unsinn”, it is even more true that one can laugh when confronted by a meaningful, if also surprising, turn of phrase. It may be true, as Condello says, that a mechanical perversion of epic does not allow for clarity of detail,<sup>32</sup> but what one asks of a parodist is precisely that he *not* proceed mechanically, but rather with the wit and charm Casaubon found in our author.

## References

- Arnott W.G. (ed. comm.) *Alexis: The Fragments: A Commentary*. Cambridge, CUP, 1996.
- Arnott W.G. Athenaeus and the Epitome: Texts, Manuscripts and early Editions, in: D. Braund, J. Wilkins (eds). *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Exeter, UEP, 2000, 41–52.
- Bertolín Cebrián R. *Comic Epic and Parodies of Epic: Literature for Youth and Children in Ancient Greece*. Spudasmata 122. Hildesheim — Zürich — New York, Olms, 2008.
- Brandt P. *Parodorum Epicorum Graecorum et Archestrati Reliquiae = Corpusculi poesis epicae Graecae ludibundae*. Vol. 1. Leipzig, Teubner, 1888.
- Bulloch A. W. (ed. comm.) *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge, CUP, 1985.
- Cahill N. *Household and City Organization at Olynthus*. New Haven — London, Yale UP, 2002.
- Casaubon I. *Animadversionum in Athenaei Deipnosophistas libri quindecim*, Leipzig, Kuehn, 1796.
- Clarke J. R. *Looking at Laughter: Humor, Power, and Transgression in Roman Visual Culture, 100 B. C. — A. D. 250*. Berkeley — Los Angeles — London, U of California P, 2007.
- Condello F. Note al *Convivium Atticum* di Matrone (fr. 1 O.-S. = SH 534). *Eikasmos* 2002, 13, 133–150.
- Degani E. Problems in Greek Gastronomic Poetry: On Matro's *Attikon Deipnon*, in: J. Wilkins, D. Harvey, M. Dobson (eds). *Food in Antiquity*. Exeter, UEP, 1995, 413–428.
- Ermolaeva E. L. Matro Pitaneus, Symposium Atticum fr. 1, 18–21 (O.-S.). *Philologia Classica* 2014, 9, 118–141.
- Fajen F. (ed.) *Oppianus: Halieutica / Der Fischfang*. Stuttgart — Leipzig, Teubner, 1999.
- Fraenkel E. (ed. comm.) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Gulick C. B. *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists*. Cambridge, MA — London, Harvard UP, 1951.
- Harder A. (ed. comm.) *Callimachus Aetia: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford, OUP, 2012.
- Hosty M. (ed. comm.) *Batrachomyomachia (Battle of the Frogs and Mice), Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford, OUP, 2020.

<sup>32</sup> “È quindi inutile chiedere al brano una chiarezza di dettagli che la meccanica *detorsio* epica non consente” (Condello 2002, 141).

- Lloyd-Jones H., P. Parsons. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Teil 1 = Texte und Kommentare 11. Berlin — New York, De Gruyter, 1983.
- Olson S. D. *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters*. Cambridge, MA — London, Harvard UP, 2006.
- Olson S. D., A. Sens. *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1999.
- Paessens H. G. (ed.) *De Matronis Parodiarum Reliquiis*. Münster, Brunn, 1855.
- Schweighäuser I. (ed.) *Athenaei Naucraticae Deipnosophistarum Libri Quindecim*. Strasbourg, ex typographia Societatis Bipontinae, 1801–1807.
- Scott J. A. Plural Verbs with Neuter Plural Subjects in Homer. *AJPh* 1929, 50, 71–76.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff U. Lesefrüchte. *Hermes* 1923, 58, 73–79.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff U. *Kleine Schriften*. Ed. K. Latte. Berlin, Weidmann, 1962.

## Матрон из Питаны, fr. 1 *Symposium Atticum* = SH 534 (Ath. 4, 12 [134d–137c]), 18–21

Роберт Дрю Гриффит

Университет Квинс,  
Канада, K7L 3N6, Кингстон (Онтарио), Бэйдер-лэйн, 49; griffitd@queensu.ca

Для цитирования: Griffith R. D. Matro of Pitane fr. 1 *Symposium Atticum* = SH 534 (Ath. 4. 12 [134d–137c]), 18–21. *Philologia Classica* 2022, 17 (2), 331–338. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2022.212>

Центон из гомеровских стихов Матрона из Питаны «Аттический обед» содержит загадочный эпизод: рассказчик бросает морских ежей, которыми он, очевидно, уже полакомился, под ноги рабам, и они бьются «там, где волны омывают берег», рабы же вытаскивают шипы «из головы». Вслед за Еленой Ермолаевой, сопоставившей эти стихи Матрона с мозаикой «Неприбранный пол», я предполагаю, что описываемое застолье происходило в обычной столовой, а не на берегу моря, или в комнате с окном, выходящим на море. Пол этой комнаты, выложенный мозаикой из гальки, вполне мог быть назван берегом, с которого рабы смывали остатки трапезы — процедура, для которой (как стало известно из раскопок в Олинфе) столовые в частных домах были определенным образом приспособлены. Такая интерпретация подразумевает чтение \*λύματ' ... κλύεσκου вместо рукописного κύματ' ... κλύεσκε. Исправление, которое, по моему убеждению, было сделано переписчиком, имело эффект — уникальный для этой поэмы и потому подозрительный — воспроизведения целой гомеровской строки без каких-либо изменений. Наконец, выражение «из головы» относится не к тому месту, откуда рабы вытаскивают шипы морского ежа (поскольку это означало бы «из их собственных ног»), а к тому, откуда они вообще происходят, т. е. из головы морского ежа.

*Ключевые слова:* центон, Матрон из Питаны, мозаика, пародия.

Received: 16.04.2022

Accepted: 18.10.2022