The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Greek Burlesque Epic *Corpusculum Poesis Epicae Graecae Ludibundae. Fasciculus prior continens Parodiae Epicae et Arcestrati Reliquias* a Paulo Brandt editas. Leipzig. Teubner. 1888. 3Mk.

J. W. Mackail

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 05 / May 1889, pp 203 - 204

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194776, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194776

How to cite this article:

J. W. Mackail (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 203-204 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194776

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

GREEK BURLESQUE EPIC.

Corpusculum Poesis Epicae Graecae Ludibundae. Fasciculus prior continens Parodiae Epicae et Arcestrati Reliquias a PAULO BRANDT editas. Leipzig. Teubner. 1888. 3 Mk.

THIS volume completes a collection of the fragments of parodies and trifling or satiric poems in hexameter verse, begun by Wachsmuth in his *Sillographi Graeci*. It contains three works which may be called important, the *Batrachomyomachia*, the 'Αττικὸν δέϊπνον of Matro, and the *Hedypathia* of Arcestratus. Besides these it puts together—the first time that this has been thoroughly done—the few fragments in the same style by Hipponax, Hegemon, Euboeus and other unknown writers. These, like the fragments of Matro and Arcestratus, are chiefly gathered from Athenaeus, and Kaibel's improved text has been of great service: the editor also had the advantage of Kaibel's yet unpublished notes besides his two published volumes.

There are good indices, including one very useful index of the passages in Homer and Hesiod parodied or used by these writers. This index shows some interesting facts: thus the *Iliad* is imitated about three times as often as the *Odyssey*, a fact which gives undesigned and strong testimony to the relative popularity of the two poems with the average Greek reader: and in both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the first half of the poem is much more quoted than the second. It does not appear that any help towards determining the Homeric text is given by the parodists: they use Homer so freely and loosely that it is impossible to argue from their lines to his. See however the remarks on p. 59.

A very full apparatus criticus to the *Batrachomyomachia* is given, distinguishing between the Vatican and Laurentian families of MSS. But the editor, perhaps wisely, does not attempt to reconstruct the original form of the poem of Pigras. The interpolations are so frequent and so various, and have in so many cases displaced portions of the genuine work, that he is content to leave the text as it is, with a rather complicated system of brackets showing his conclusions as to the origin of the different parts. In the case of a new edition being called for it might add clearness if the genuine lines were printed in a different type.

A few remarks must be made on the minor fragments before the 'Αττικὸν δέϊπνον and the Ἡδὺπάθεια are spoken of. Brandt defends the statement of Aristotle that Hegemon of Thasos was the first writer of parodies by saying that the fragment of Hipponax is not properly a parody of Homer, but a *bona fide* use of the Homeric form of verse to add gravity and force to a personal attack. This distinction is untenable. Hipponax could have attacked the subject of his parody with much greater point and bitterness in his favourite choliambics. A man who is attacking in earnest does not waste time in making up facetious Homeric epithets: this is the light touch of parody proper. Aristotle's words need not be pressed to mean more than that Hegemon was the first to write parodies systematically on a large scale. In the fragment of Hegemon, l. 1—

Ἐς δὲ Θάσον μ' ἐλθόντα μετεωρίζοντες ἔβαλλον
πολλοῖσι σπελέθουσι—

Brandt rightly keeps μετεωρίζοντες against the μέγα κράζοντες of Jacobs, but his explanation of it as referring to the gesture of a stone-thrower is impossible. It seems to mean 'making me skip,' as in the common phrase μετεωρίζειν τὰ σκέλη or τὸν πόδα. In l. 6 for λῆμμ' ἀνέπεισε γέροντα we should probably read λιμός ἐπεισε γέροντα, ἀνέπεισε having been inadvertently repeated from l. 3 and the metre then mended at the expense of λιμός. In Euboeus of Paros, *Frag.* 1—

βάλλον δ' ἀλλήλους χαλκήρεσιν ἐγχέειν—

a line verbally quoted from the *Iliad* in a humorous description of a fight in a barber's shop, Brandt says 'significanter forcipes quibus ut telis tonsores dimicabant: Schweighaeuserus olim proposuit ἀγγείουσιν quo omnis iocus tollitur.' Yes, but it would be a very small joke to call a pair of scissors a spear. Is there not a pun between ἐγχείη and ἐγγεῖν, the word here meaning the bronze ewer, or rather ladle (ἀρύταινα) used in washing?

Frag. Incert. 6 is interesting to all readers of the *Poetics* as restoring a complete line quoted there by Aristotle from the Arabic version of the *Poetics* recently edited by Prof. Margoliouth; the Greek MSS. of the *Poetics* having dropped the second half of the line. It should be noticed that Brandt includes in this volume the two half-lines also quoted in the *Poetics* (1457, b. 13) as instances

of metaphor, χαλκῷ ἀπὸ ψυχὴν ἀρύσας and τεμὼν [μιν] ἀτειρεῖ χαλκῷ. These do not sound like parodies, and there is no reason whatever for suspecting them to be other than serious metaphors.

Frag. Incert. 9 (the passage quoted by Galen on the natural inferiority of man regarded as a mere animal to other animals). Part of the passage is paraphrased in prose by Galen and two passages quoted in verse. In each case the quotation is introduced by φησὶν: and so in the second passage the verse should begin earlier than Brandt prints it—

αὐτὰρ ἐν ἱστορίῃ πολυπείρῳ
γράφει' ὅνος ὅτι παγκράτιον νίκησέ ποτ' ἄνδρας·
εἰκοστή κτλ.

The date of Matro's Ἀττικὸν δεῖπνον is fixed by Brandt within a few years of 300 B.C. It is written with great spirit and humour: nothing could be happier for instance than the mock-heroic descriptions of the cooks, ll. 11–13, 46, 47, and the description of the dessert, ll. 104–122, is the best and most vivid we possess. The guests wash their hands: a boy carries round perfume of iris-root, and another rose-garlands: the crater is filled with Lesbian wine: pears, apples, pomegranates and grapes are set on the table, with a large sweet cake: then two female jugglers come in to amuse the company.

The difficult l. 90

ἐν δὲ σίναπι
κεῖτ' ἀγχοῦ γλυκὺ πλείονα χρυσὸς ὦν ἀπερύκων
is still left a puzzle. Wachsmuth's conjecture,

Κεῖτ' ἀγχοῦ γλυκὺ πνεῖον, ἀτὰρ χέρας οὐκ
ἀπέρυκον,

is very clever but, as Brandt points out, the shortening of the final *υ* in such a position is unexampled, and any satisfactory emendation must retain *χρυσός*. It seems a pity therefore to have placed the conjecture in

the text. In l. 122 (and again in *Frag. Incert.* 8 B) a word of protest must be put in against a tendency to find improper meanings in innocent passages.

The Ἡδονάθεια of Archestratus of Gela (*fl. circ.* 330 B.C.) is a work of a different class from Matro's. It is a didactic poem on eating, probably written rather seriously, and sometimes, as in the pretty description of autumn (*Fr.* xxxvi), going off into fine writing of the usual Alexandrian type. The editor points out that the numerous other names by which it is alluded to, Δειπνολογία, Γαστρονομία, Ὀψολογία, and *Hedynphagetica* in the Latin version of Ennius, arise from the true title being wider than the subject actually treated of. Athenaeus calls Archestratus 'the Hesiod of epicures,' and the work went under the name of 'Golden Words.' From the fragments now collected together, about 335 lines in all, one gets a pretty clear idea of Greek cookery. He is specially strong on sauces. Most of them are comparatively simple: cheese, oil, vinegar, wine, silphium, and minced pot-herbs are the list of ingredients; and there is a strong condemnation (*Fr.* lvii) of the rich sauces 'like glue' that make it impossible to tell a cat from a hare.

In *Fr.* xv. on the fish κάπρος—

ὅσοι μὴ πλεκτὸν ὕφασμα
σχοῖνον ἐλειοτρόφου κοῖλον χεῖρεσσιν ἔχοντες
εἰώθασι δονεῖν ψήφους αἰθῶνι λογισμῷ
ἄρθρων μηλείων τ' ἐπ' ἄγρην δωρήματα βαλλειν—

I was glad to find by a note at the end of the volume that Wachsmuth would read *λογισμῷ*, a conjecture that had occurred to me.

This book will be very useful. But it must be added that it has the faults so common in modern German scholarship—a mass of erudition in the notes which has never been put properly into shape, and a Latin style in the introduction which has all the obscurity of German itself.

J. W. MACKAIL.

TEXTE UND UNTERSÜCHUNGEN, IV. 1, V. 2, 3.

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur. Band 4. Heft i. Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos recensuit EDUARDUS SCHWARTZ. 1888. 3 Mk. 60.

THIS edition of Tatian's *Oratio* is the first-fruits of a larger scheme proposed to themselves by Gebhardt and Schwartz in refer-

ence to the Greek Apologists. This volume contains the text, carefully constructed, with little or no reference to previous editions. The documentary evidence is of two kinds. (1) There are three principal MSS. (of which later MSS. are but copies), two of which were collated by Gebhardt as well as Schwartz. (2) There are quotations in the *Praeparatio*