

FRANCIS CAIRNS

A TESTIMONIUM TO A NEW FRAGMENT OF PHILOXENUS OF CYTHERA?  
(Machon 77–80 = fr. 9.14–17<sup>1</sup> Gow and Hermesianax fr. 7.69–74 Powell)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 130 (2000) 9–11

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

---

<sup>1</sup> I print Gow's text with slight variations of punctuation in l. 17 = l. 80.



A TESTIMONIUM TO A NEW FRAGMENT OF PHILOXENUS OF CYTHERA?  
(Machon 77–80 = fr. 9.14–17<sup>1</sup> Gow and Hermesianax fr. 7.69–74 Powell)

τοὺς διθυράμβους σὺν θεοῖς καταλιμπάνω  
ἡνδρωμένους καὶ πάντας ἔστεφανωμένους  
οὓς ἀνατίθημι ταῖς ἑμαυτοῦ συντρόφοις  
Μούσαις, Ἄφροδίτην καὶ Διόνυσον ἐπιτρόπους.

Machon 64–86 (fr. 9) Gow, preserved at Athenaeus *Deipnosophistae* VII 26 p. 341a–d, is a witty anecdote (χρεῖα) about the fifth–fourth century BC dithyrambist Philoxenus of Cythera, notorious for his gluttony.<sup>2</sup> Philoxenus, so Machon tells us, ate an entire two-cubit (i.e. three-foot) long octopus except for its head, fell ill, and was advised by his doctor that his condition was terminal and that he should settle his affairs. Philoxenus replied that he had already done so, summarising his testamentary arrangements in the lines quoted above before breaking off at the end of line 80 in his eagerness to finish up the rest of the octopus before his decease.<sup>3</sup> Commentators seem agreed in taking συντρόφοις (79) in essence passively, either as ‘nursling’ – with συν- given little or no weight – or in the more attenuated sense ‘companion’. Thus Gulick in his Loeb Classical Text renders it as “foster-sisters” and Gow *ad loc.* as “companions of my childhood”, while Hopkinson *ad loc.* explains it – without challenge to his predecessors – as “he <Philoxenus> was a genius from the cradle”. Gow cited as a parallel *AP* 7.26.6 (Antipater of Sidon = 14 Gow–Page *HE*) where Anacreon is φιλακρήτου σύντροφος Ἄρμονίης (translated by Gow–Page *HE* II.44 as “associate from youth of bibulous poetry” with the comment “Similarly 363 μέθας σύντροφον” – i.e. *AP* 7.423.2 (Antipater of Sidon = Gow–Page *HE* 28)). Most recently, Campbell (*Greek Lyric* V, Loeb 1993) 151 translates the phrase of Machon ll.79–80 as “the Muses with whom I was brought up”.

It is undeniable that σύντροφος is often used passively. *LSJ s.v.* I supplies numerous examples;<sup>4</sup> and in epigrammatic contexts ‘nursling’ seems appropriate at *AP* 5.178.10 (Meleager = Gow–Page *HE* 38), as at *I.G.* II/III<sup>2</sup> 2118.2 and Peek, *Gr. Vers-Inschr.* 544.4. ‘Nursling’ might also (although there is reason to think that the active “nurses” is the preferable sense, see below) be appropriate at *AP* 7.423.2 (Antipater of Sidon = Gow–Page *HE* 28), and *AP* 16.308.1 (Eugenes = Page *FGE* 1); or alternatively, as certainly in *AP* 6.257.6 (Antiphilus = Gow–Page *GP* 22), *AP* 12.99.4 (Anon. = Gow–Page *HE* 9), *AP* 16.15.2 (Anon.), and *AP* 16.363.4 (Leontius Scholasticus), σύντροφος means no more than ‘companion’. The commentators, as noted, prefer the latter sense at Machon l.79, presumably reflecting that it would have been ridiculous for Machon to make Philoxenus call the Muses his ‘fellow-nurslings’ when the Muses’ birth and upbringing lay in the dim and distant mythological past. The commentators’ verdict could be reinforced by a number of Latin passages where either the Muses are described as the *comites* of a poet or a poet as the *comes* of the Muses: Propertius 3.2.15: *at Musae comites*; Virgil *Aeneid* 9.775: *Crethea Musarum comitem*; Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 2.279: *ipse licet venias Musis comitatus, Homere*; Statius *Thebaid* 8.548–9: *Corymbus, / ante comes Musis*.

However, the matter cannot rest there as far as Machon l.79 is concerned: another text, which has not, it seems, been brought to bear on Machon l.79, throws new light on συντρόφοις. Hermesianax fr. 7.69–74 Powell concern the same Philoxenus of Cythera.<sup>5</sup> Lines 69–71 read:

<sup>1</sup> I print Gow’s text with slight variations of punctuation in l. 17 = l. 80.

<sup>2</sup> His lyric fragments are collected at Page *PMG* Nos. 814–35; the collection does not include Machon fr. 9 Gow.

<sup>3</sup> Gow *ad loc.* claimed that l.80 ends in aposiopesis; but asyndeton within this legalistic passage is perhaps more likely.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also Arnott (*Alexis: The Fragments*, Cambridge 1996) on Alexis fr. 218, noting that “In Alexis’ time and subsequently σύντροφος was the standard word for ‘foster-child’”.

<sup>5</sup> The reason why the testimonies of Hermesianax and Machon have not hitherto been coordinated may well be that, as

ἄνδρα δὲ τὸν Κυθήρηθεν ἀνεθρέψαντο τιθῆναι  
 Βάκχου καὶ λωτοῦ πιστότατον ταμίην  
 Μοῦσαι παιδευθέντα Φιλόξενον κτλ.  
 69. ἀνεθρέψαντο A; ὄν ἐθρέψαντο Hermann; Powell<sup>6</sup>

As Powell notes, τιθῆναι (69) stands in apposition to Μοῦσαι (71) and has no connection with Βάκχου (70):<sup>7</sup> hence line 70 (Βάκχου καὶ λωτοῦ πιστότατον ταμίην) is in apposition to ἄνδρα (69), i.e. Philoxenus. Hermesianax, then, is characterising the Muses as Philoxenus' 'nurses'; the implication is that they brought up and (παιδευθέντα, 71) educated him. The two concepts – the Muses 'rearing' or 'nurturing' and the Muses 'educating' or 'training' someone or something – must have been fairly widespread in antiquity, if the casualness of the surviving parallels is any indication. Thus, for nurturing/nursing, cf. ἀρετᾶ[ς γε μ]ὲν οὐ μινύθει / βροτῶν ἅμα σ[ώμ]ατι φέγγος, ἀλλὰ / Μοῦσά νιν τρ[έφει.] (Bacchylides *Epin.* 3.90–92); οἱ δὲ δὴ ἕτεροι παῖδες, οὓς αἱ Μοῦσαι ἐκτρέφουσι καὶ τιθηνοῦνται κτλ. (Themistius, *or.* 32 ed. Schenkl–Downey–Norman 2.195.12); for 'educating/training', cf.: καὶ τρίτον ὅτι αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις ἄμεινόν ἐστι τεθνάναι διεφθαρμένοις οὕτω τὴν ψυχὴν [ὡς ἀνίατον ἔχειν τὴν κακίαν], ὡς μὴδ' ὑπὸ τῶν Μουσῶν αὐτῶν παιδεύεσθαι, μὴ τί γ' ὑπὸ Σωκράτους ἢ καὶ Πυθαγόρου βελτιοῦσθαι δύνασθαι (Galen *Quod animi mores corporis temperamenta sequantur* Marquardt = Kühn IV, p. 816.4–8); καὶ ἡ μὲν ὄντως ἔργον τῶν Μουσῶν τῶν παιδευουσῶν τὰς νοεράς ἡμῶν δυνάμεις καὶ τελειουσῶν καὶ πρὸς τὴν οὐρανίαν τάξιν ἀφομοιουσῶν, ἡ δὲ Σειρήνων οὐσά τινων ταῖς τὴν γένεσιν ἀξούσαις ἀρμονίαις προσεικυῖα (Proclus *In Platonis rem publicam Commentarii* II p. 68 Kroll) and for both, cf.: τρέφεται μὲν ὑπὸ Νυμφῶν, παιδεύεται δὲ ὑπὸ Μουσῶν συρίζειν, ἀυλεῖν, τὰ πρὸς λύραν, τὰ πρὸς κιθάραν, πᾶσαν ᾠδὴν, ὥστε καὶ παρθενίας εἰς ἄνθος ἀκμάσασα ταῖς Νύμφαις συνεχόρευε, ταῖς Μούσαις συνῆδεν κτλ. (Longus *Daphnis and Chloe* 3.23.2).<sup>8</sup>

Where the concepts originated is uncertain; the Bacchylides parallel quoted might indicate sources in commonly diffused metaphors. But a locus, at least for their development, in a fifth/fourth century philosophic context is possible;<sup>9</sup> this is hinted at by the majority of the parallels above, as by a number of Platonic passages where μουσική is a 'rearing' agent – *Timaeus* 18a, *Respublica* 401d, 402a, 403c, 411c–d – and by one where the Muses themselves are linked with τροφή: θεοὶ δὲ οἰκτίραντες τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπίπονον πεφυκὸς γένος, ἀναπαύλας τε αὐτοῖς τῶν πόνων ἐτάξαντο τὰς τῶν ἑορτῶν ἀμοιβὰς τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ Μούσας Ἀπόλλωνά τε μουσηγέτην καὶ Διόνυσον συνεορταστὰς ἔδοσαν, ἵν' ἐπανορθῶνται, τὰς τε τροφὰς γενομένας ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς μετὰ θεῶν (*Leges* 653c–d). A further advantage of these passages is that they illustrate the convergence of the two notions τροφή and παιδεία, which overlap even more clearly elsewhere in Plato, viz. *Crito* 54a, *Menexenus* 235d–236a, and *Respublica* 442a.

In the light of Hermesianax's account of Philoxenus, it is hard to resist the conclusion that Machon l.79's συντρόφοις also describes the Muses as Philoxenus' '<joint> nurses'. There is no difficulty in

---

mentioned above (n. 2), Machon fr. 9 is absent from the fragments of Philoxenus assembled by Page. Page No. 815 presents the relevant lines of Hermesianax, described by Page as 'corruptissima'. The most recent edition – Campbell (*Greek Lyric* V, Loeb 1993) – does include both items under Philoxenus of Cythera: Machon (150–1); Hermesianax (154–5). But no link is made between them.

<sup>6</sup> Kobiliri (*A Stylistic Commentary on Hermesianax*, Amsterdam 1998) prints A's reading at p. 15 and argues for its retention at p. 179 (although by an oversight printing at p. 178 ὄν ἀνεθρέψαντο). She cites *inter alia* τῶ μὲν ἐγὼ θαλέεσσιν ἀνέτρεπον (Call. fr. 337 Pf.) and ἀνεθρέψαντο δὲ μαζοί (*AP* 9.126.2 Anon.). The choice of reading does not affect the argument of this paper.

<sup>7</sup> The nurses of Bacchus (precisely Βάκχου ... τιθῆναι at Oppian *Cyneg.* 4.236) were his aunts Ino, Autonoe, and Agaue. For further parallels, cf. Kobiliri (n. 6) p. 180.

<sup>8</sup> Kobiliri (n. 6) 182–3 offers further parallels for the Muses as teachers. The earliest, viz. Hom. *Od.* 8.480–1; Hes. *Th.* 22–3; *Op.* 662, use διδάσκω.

<sup>9</sup> I owe this suggestion to Prof. S. A. White, who raises the further tantalising possibility that Plato owed such notions to Philoxenus. Their paths may have crossed in Sicily, at the court of Dionysius I (although no evidence survives).

thus taking σύντροφος actively: *LSJ s.v.* II cites two passages of Plato for active usage of the term (*Politicus* 267e and *Leges* 845d);<sup>10</sup> the fact that *simplex* τροφός is always active must have helped; and in any case hellenistic poets (like some of their predecessors) are fond of exploiting the potential possessed by Greek compound and verbal adjectives/adjectival nouns for variation in voice.<sup>11</sup> If this proposal is correct, Machon 77–80 and Hermesianax fr. 7.69–71 together constitute a new testimonium to a lost fragment of Philoxenus: they are apparently writing independently, and are both drawing on a passage of Philoxenus in which he himself claimed to have been a nursling of the Muses (Machon and Hermesianax) and probably also to have received training from them (Hermesianax), and in which he described his poems as his ‘children’ (Machon).<sup>12</sup>

Such statements would place Philoxenus in the literary ancestry of Callimachus. First, Callimachus also asserted that the Muses had favoured him as a child (*Aetia* fr. 1.37–8 Pf., cf. l.2). Secondly, if Hermesianax l.71's παιδευθέντα (the exact equivalent of *doctum*) reflects a further claim by Philoxenus, then it moves him even closer to the standard self-image of Callimachus and his followers, for whom *doctrina* was a constant aspiration. Thirdly, if Philoxenus called his works his children, this too places him in same category as Callimachus and his successors: at *Aetia* fr. 1.19–20 the same image recurs in μηδ’ ἄπ’ ἐμεῦ διφᾶτε μέγα ψοφέουσιν αἰοιδὴν / τίκτεσθαι; and in a Callimachean programme Propertius writes: *a me / nata ... Musa* (3.1.9–10).<sup>13</sup> It seems almost inescapable that the passage in which Philoxenus made his claims was some sort of literary manifesto. As a dithyrambist Philoxenus will quite naturally have followed Pindar in this area, as Callimachus did later.<sup>14</sup> This reconstruction of a ‘Callimachean’ literary programme by Philoxenus is not unwelcome, given the major influence which Philoxenus’ dithyrambic treatment of the tale of Polyphemos and Galatea (*PMG* Nos 815–24) is known to have exercised upon Theocritus in *Idylls* 6 and 11.<sup>15</sup>

Some left-overs: three of the passages noted above in which σύντροφος is used passively concern Anacreon. Curiously, despite the passive uses of the adjective, they may nevertheless fit the conceptual pattern exemplified by Philoxenus. At *AP* 7.26.6 (Antipater of Sidon = Gow–Page *HE* 14) the point may be that Anacreon has been reared by (a presumably personified) bibulous ‘Harmonia’, and at *AP* 7.423.2 (Antipater of Sidon = Gow–Page *HE* 28) that he has been reared by (a personified?) ‘Drunkenness’. Similarly at *AP* 16.308.1 (Eugenes = Page *FGE* 1) the poet could have been raised by the (dative) ‘sweet Desires’. Finally, the apparent absence of Latin passages describing the Muses as poets’ nurses or poets as nurslings of the Muses, together with those Latin uses of *comes/comites* to link poet and Muses noted above, may reflect a doctrine of their teachers, Greek γραμματικοί of hellenistic training, about the usage of σύντροφος. If so, the present discussion<sup>16</sup> has revealed it as incomplete.

University of Leeds

Francis Cairns

<sup>10</sup> Prof. P. Parsons reminds me that in both passages an active cognate (τροφόν / τρόφιμον) precedes.

<sup>11</sup> Cf., e.g., with reference to Callimachus, F. Bredau *De Callimacho Verborum Inventore* (Diss. Bratislava 1892) 76–7; F. Lapp *De Callimachi Cyrenaei tropis et figuris* (Diss. Bonn 1965) 131. On the phenomenon in general, cf. Barrett (*Eur. Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964) General Index *s.v.* adjective, compound or verbal, range of meaning of.

<sup>12</sup> The link between Bacchus/Dionysus and Philoxenus stressed in both passages presumably relies on his status as a dithyrambist; the Aphrodite connection found in Machon probably alludes to his poem on the love of Polyphemos and Galatea. Philoxenus himself may have emphasised these links in the very passage in which he claimed *inter alia* to be a nursling of the Muses, although this cannot be shown.

<sup>13</sup> Machon 77–80 establishes beyond doubt the correctness of the challenged reading *nata*, which had already been upheld on the basis of *Aet.* fr. 1.19–20: cf. Fedeli (*Properzio: il libro terzo delle elegie*, Bari 1985) *ad loc.* with bibliography.

<sup>14</sup> Pindaric influence on Callimachus’ literary programme is now best followed with Massimilla (*Callimaco: Aitia: Libri primo e secondo*, Pisa 1996) on *Aet.* fr. 1.17, 18 and 25–8.

<sup>15</sup> For an up-to-date assessment of the nature of this work of Philoxenus and of its interactions with Athenian Comedy (which will have given it currency in Athens), cf. Arnott (*Alexis: The Fragments*, Cambridge 1996) 139–41.

<sup>16</sup> I am grateful for advice on this paper to Professors W. G. Arnott, Peter Bing, Peter Parsons, and Stephen A. White. Errors and opinions are my own.