sex, made her the perfect model for his character. As Apuleius saw himself as 'the purveyor of Greek intellectual culture to an audience for whom he himself is the major source for such material'[28] he could at the same time make a reference to, and a joke about, his literary predecessor.

St John's College, Oxford HENDRIK MÜLLER-REINEKE
mueller-reineke@web.de
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000760

[28] Cf. Harrison (n. 11), 38.

PHILOXENUS ONCE AGAIN*

In a short and interesting contribution published in a previous volume of this journal, Krystyna Bartol pointed to an enigmatic passage in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* (1.5f–6a), containing a quotation from Clearchus (fr. 57 Wehrli) about the notorious glutton and parasite Philoxenus.[1] The fragment, which is also to be found in the *Suda* (*Φ* 395; 4.729.11–16 Adler), deals with Philoxenus' custom of intruding himself upon others and enjoying their meals. Unlike Bartol, and for reasons that will become clear below, I prefer the version of the *Suda* as point of departure:

Φιλόξενος, Λευκαδίου. ὄνομα παρασίτου. τοῦτόν φασιν προλουόμενον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι κἂν ἄλλαις πόλεσι περιέρχεσθαι τὰς οἰκίας, ἀκολουθούντων αὐτῷ παίδων, φερόντων ἔλαιον, γάρον, ὄξος καὶ ἄλλα τῶν ἡδυσμάτων. εἰσιόντα δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας οἰκίας τὰ ἑψόμενα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀρτύειν, ἐμβάλλοντα ὧν ἦν χρεία, κᾆθ' οὕτως [εἰς ἑαυτὸν] κύψαντα εὐωχεῖσθαι.

Philoxenus, of Leucas. Name of a parasite. It is told that he, having first taken a bath, went round among the houses in his own city and others as well, followed by slaves carrying oil, fish-paste, vinegar, and other relishes. And that he entered a house, albeit a stranger's, and seasoned whatever was cooking for the rest of the company, putting in what was lacking. When all was ready, he bent over [towards himself] and greedily enjoyed the feast.
(translation after C. B. Gulick)

The main problem of this passage, presented very well by Bartol, concerns the phrase *κᾆθ' οὕτως [εἰς ἑαυτὸν] κύψαντα εὐωχεῖσθαι*, and more specifically the meaning of the aorist participle *κύψαντα*. At this point, a problem of textual criticism arises. The manuscripts that have preserved the *Epitome* of the first books of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists* provide the reading *ἀνακάμψαντα*: Philoxenus first 'walked up and down', and then enjoyed the luxurious feast. This reading was recently defended by M. L. Gambato, who interprets the verb *ἀνακάμπτειν* as an ironic allusion to Peripatetic walking. In this view, Philoxenus appears as 'una curiosa figura di

* I am greatly indebted to Prof. L. Van der Stockt, and to the anonymous referee of the journal, whose valuable remarks and suggestions on the original draft of this article helped me to refine my position.

[1] K. Bartol, 'What did he do? Clearchus on Philoxenus (ap. Ath. 1.5f–6a = Clearch. fr. 57 Wehrli)', *CQ* NS 54 (2004), 292–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

peripatetico della cucina, un "sofista itinerante" della buona tavola'.[2] Most editors prefer the reading offered by the *Suda*, and insert it into Athenaeus' text through a modern conjecture: <εἰς ἑαυτὸν> κύψαντα.[3] According to this reading, Philoxenus 'bends over towards himself' before feasting. Usually, however, the meaning of Philoxenus' behaviour is left unexplained. Bartol, who also gives preference to this reading, tries to explain the short phrase as an allusion to wrestling practices. In her view, Philoxenus would have imitated the preliminary position of a wrestler as a kind of sympotic entertainment. Furthermore, this imitation of the wrestler's gesture could aptly be applied to the glutton's own situation: 'Philoxenus' fixed posture resembling that of a wrestler who is ready to attack his opponent, transposed to the level of sympotic behaviour, is nothing other than a reference to the glutton's readiness for satisfying—at any price—his appetite. The opponent against whom the parasite is ready to fight is the meal itself.'[4] Several parallels from different ancient sources are quoted in support of this intelligent interpretation. Nonetheless, I think that the solution should be sought elsewhere.

There is one crucial passage that Bartol apparently has overlooked and that to my mind may well provide the key to the correct understanding of Clearchus' fragment, viz. Plutarch, *De Latenter Vivendo* 1128B. At the beginning of this little thesis, directed against Epicurus' advice to pursue a sequestered life (λάθε βιώσας, fr. 551 Us.),[5] Plutarch blames his opponent for his unfair conduct: Epicurus tried to become famous by advising other people to remain unknown (1128B). Even more, being himself immoderately fond of fame, Epicurus made it unattractive to others so as to keep it for himself without competition (ibid.). In order to illustrate such behaviour, Plutarch refers to a strategy of Philoxenus:

τοὺς μὲν γὰρ περὶ Φιλόξενον τὸν Ἐρύξιδος καὶ Γνάθωνα τὸν Σικελιώτην ἐπτοημένους περὶ τὰ ὄψα λέγουσιν ἐναπομύττεσθαι ταῖς παροψίσιν ὅπως τοὺς συνεσθίοντας διατρέψαντες αὐτοὶ μόνοι τῶν παρακειμένων ἐμφορηθῶσιν. (*De lat. viv.* 1128B)

Now Philoxenus son of Eryxis and Gnathon of Sicily[6] were so excited about fine food that (it is said) they blew their noses on the dainties to discourage the other banqueters and so be the only ones to stuff themselves with the food on the table. (translation B. Einarson–P. H. De Lacy)

This passage may throw a new light upon both the meaning of Philoxenus' behaviour and the problem of textual criticism. Philoxenus did not bother about wrestler's postures at the crucial moment at which the meal was served. This would have been mere wasting of time, and a risky one, as it would have enabled others to select the best pieces. His action rather aims at reserving as much as possible for himself. In that sense, the passage indirectly reveals a weakness of Bartol's

[2] In *Ateneo: I deipnosofisti (I dotti a banchetto)*, Prima traduzione italiana commentata su progetto di Luciano Canfora (Roma, 2001), 1.19–20.

[3] Many references in Bartol (n. 1), 293.

[4] Bartol (n. 1), 294.

[5] The two most recent commentaries on *De Latenter Vivendo* are *Plutarch. EI ΚΑΛΩΣ EIPHTAI ΤΟ ΛΑΘΕ ΒΙΩΣΑΣ. Ist "Lebe im Verborgenen" eine gute Lebensregel?* Eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit interpretierenden Essays versehen von U. Berner, R. Feldmeier, B. Heininger und R. Hirsch-Luipold (Darmstadt, 2000) and *Plutarco. Se sia ben detto vivi nascosto,* Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di I. Gallo (Naples, 2000).

[6] The phrase τοὺς περὶ Φιλόξενον καὶ Γνάθωνα may refer either (1) to Philoxenus and Gnathon, or (2) to Philoxenus, Gnathon, and their followers, or (3) to their followers alone (cf. Ter. *Eun.* 264). The first meaning seems to be the most common one in Plutarch. On the different meanings of the phrase οἱ περί τινα in the *Corpus Plutarcheum*, see L. Torraca, 'Problemi di lingua e stile nei "Moralia" di Plutarco', in *ANRW* 2,34,4 (Berlin and New York, 1998), 3489–94.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interpretation, which turns out to be at odds with the conduct and purposes of a man like Philoxenus.[7] The action described in this Plutarchan passage suits Philoxenus' gluttony much better in any case, since the strategy which it implies, much more directly—and, no doubt, efficiently—contributes to his egoistic intentions.

Plutarch's precious anecdote may lead to the following interpretation of Clearchus' text as it has come down to us in the version of the *Suda*. The participle *κύψαντα* presumably alludes to the strategy mentioned by Plutarch: Philoxenus bends over so as to blow his nose on the dishes. It is clear that *κύψαντα* in this interpretation refers to the necessary condition of the purposiveness and success of the action of *ἐναπομύττεσθαι*: it is only by bending over and taking care that the mucus falls on the food that Philoxenus can be sure to achieve his purpose. It is hardly necessary to underline the efficiency of Philoxenus' strategy, although it is interesting to note that in antiquity, even blowing one's nose *during dinner* was regarded as an indication of ill-mannered conduct (let alone *on the food*).[8] This also explains Clearchus' use of the verb *εὐωχεῖσθαι*: the feast is sumptuous, of course, as Philoxenus is the only one who still wishes to eat.

There remains one basic problem with this interpretation that still has to be discussed somewhat more in detail. One might object, indeed, that the verb *κύπτειν* does not by itself imply *ἐναπομύττεσθαι*. Now one should note that this objection, *mutatis mutandis*, applies to Bartol's interpretation as well.[9] This is hardly surprising,

[7] Cf. J. Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy* (Oxford, 2000), 70.

[8] See e.g. Clement of Alexandria, *Paedag.* 2.7.60.1 and Theophrastus, *Charact.* 19.4, where *ἐσθίων ἀπομύττεσθαι* is considered to be a characteristic of the offensive man (*ὁ δυσχερής*).

[9] Bartol (n. 1), 294 mentions four parallel texts in order to illustrate the connection between the verb *κύπτειν* and the wrestler's posture of the gluttonous Philoxenus. (1) Three passages are adduced as examples where the verb *κύπτειν* 'is used to create images of greedy eaters', viz. Plato, *Resp.* 586A; Menander, 603 K.-A.; and Plut. *Conv. sept. sap.* 159D. None of these, however, is convincing. Plato's use of the verb in the first passage seems to be primarily conditioned both by the comparison with cattle (*βόσκονται*) and by the general context (*κεκυφότες εἰς γῆν καὶ εἰς τραπέζας* being counterpart to *πρὸς τὸ ἀληθῶς ἄνω οὔτε ἀνέβλεψαν πώποτε οὔτε ἠνέχθησαν*; ibid.), even though it is fair to say that it also fits in with the conduct of the glutton. This is surely the least problematic of the three texts. As to the fragment from Menander, the action of *κύπτειν*, far from referring to gluttony, should rather be regarded as evidence of a certain self-restraint, or shame, as appears from Plut. *De tuenda sanit. praec.* 133B (a somewhat different interpretation can be found in *Quaest. conv.* 706B, where, however, the fragment fits in less well with the context; cf. S.-T. Teodorsson, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Table Talks, Vol. III (Books 7–9)* [Göteborg, 1996], 80). The third parallel, finally, is to be found in a passage where Solon discusses the necessity for human beings of doing wrong by killing animate creatures for food (*Conv. sept. sap.* 159B–E). If the isolated phrase *ἕκαστος ἐγκεκυφὼς ἐδούλευε τῇ περὶ τὴν τροφὴν χρείᾳ* which is quoted by Bartol is placed back into the context to which it belongs, it becomes clear that it does not apply to gluttons but to the sages themselves (*καὶ ἡμεῖς*). Furthermore, and what is especially important in this context, these three passages do not illustrate at all the direct connection between *κύπτω* and the wrestler's posture. (2) Accordingly, Bartol's case turns out to rest on only one passage, viz. Aristophanes, *Peace* 33–4, where the slave describes the way of eating of the gluttonous beetle as follows: *κύψας . . . ἐσθίει ὥσπερ παλαιστής*. Bartol is basically right in finding in this interesting passage an association between the image of a wrestler and that of a glutton. One should note that the action of *κύπτειν* is explicitly connected with gluttony in *Schol. in Aristoph. Pac.* 33c (which actually proves a much better parallel to illustrate the link *κύπτειν*-gluttony than the three passages discussed above). However, the comparison with the wrestler is here clearly connected with a very specific context, that is, the posture which dung-beetles appear to adopt while rolling balls of dung (cf. *Schol. in Aristoph. Pac.* 34a and 34b; A. H. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes: Peace* [Warminster, 1985], 136). The comparison *ὥσπερ παλαιστής*, in short, is conditioned by a context that has nothing to do with Philoxenus' case.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

given the obscurity of the passage and the vagueness of the verb κύπτειν in this particular context. What one can try to do, however, is to explain the vagueness of the term κύψαντα. Why, after all, did Clearchus not express more clearly what he wanted to say?

At this point, the problem of textual criticism returns. The presence of two rather different readings (εἰς ἑαυτὸν κύψαντα versus ἀνακάμψαντα) shows that the text has in any case been corrupted in at least part of the manuscript tradition. I completely agree with Bartol in rejecting the reading ἀνακάμψαντα offered in the manuscripts of Athenaeus. Two alternatives then remain to be considered.

First, one could also reject the reading of the *Suda* and turn to conjecture. In that case, one could defend, on the basis of the Plutarchan passage from *De Latenter Vivendo*, a reading such as ἑαυτὸν ἀπομύξαντα.[10] It is not hard to imagine that later copyists failed to understand the precise meaning of the phrase, or the relevance of the action it describes, and tried to adapt the text—probably written in a quite labored style, which may not really have facilitated the reading[11]—in different ways in order to obtain a 'more satisfactory' result.

The second alternative is to opt for the reading κύψαντα of the *Suda*, while rejecting the addition εἰς ἑαυτόν as not only redundant but even misleading and wrong. If one would like to add anything at all, it should be 'εἰς τὰ ὄψα' rather than 'εἰς ἑαυτόν', but such addition is unnecessary, and may rather reflect a copyist's need of supplementary information than the author's concern for greater clarity. This alternative has the important advantage of remaining closer to the text of the manuscripts, to be sure, but it again entails the problem of the vague allusiveness of Clearchus' words (and thus the objection regarding the link κύπτειν-ἐναπομύττεσθαι). One could argue, of course, that the vagueness of Clearchus' words merely illustrates the great degree of knowledge he presupposes on the part of his readers, but (as was pointed out to me by the referee) it is more difficult for us to suppose degrees of knowledge among fourth-century fragmentary authors than authors whose world is richly attested—such as Plutarch or Athenaeus. The argument that Clearchus wrote for educated people who were already familiar with even such minor aspects of the previous tradition is of no great help, as it likewise remains largely hypothetical. There might, however, be a different solution. It is not impossible indeed that this anecdote about Philoxenus returned in several places of the same work (*Περὶ βίων*) or even in different works, sometimes in a fairly elaborate way, sometimes in a more allusive form. Examples of such repetitions are very frequent in Plutarch,[12] and can also be found in the fragments of Clearchus.[13]

[10] For the construction of the verb ἀπομύττω with direct object, see Epictetus 1.6.30; cf. also Diog. Laert. 6.44.

[11] For examples of Cleanthes' artificial style, see Athenaeus, *Deipnosophist.* 4.157cd (= fr. 38 Wehrli) and 12.514e (= fr. 51a Wehrli); cf. F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form* (Leipzig, 1901), 99.

[12] The great achievements that are described at length in the *Lives* are very often in a concise and allusive way referred to in the *Moralia*. To give but a few examples out of many, all connected with Plutarch's anti-Epicurean polemics: Plato's 'setting free of Sicily through Dion' (*Non posse* 1097B; *Adv. Col.* 1126C; *De lat. viv.* 1129C, related in great detail in the *Life of Dion*), or Solon's concern for the freedom of Athens (*Adv. Col.* 1127B; cf. *Sol.* 14.1–15.6), or Themistocles' victory at Salamis (*Non posse* 1099E; *De lat. viv.* 1129BC; cf. *Them.* 12.1–17.4). Or, to confine myself to the field of eating and to the *Moralia*: the references to the digestive disorders from which many Epicureans suffered (allusive in *De tuenda sanit. praec.* 135C and *Non posse* 1103A, explicit in *Non posse* 1089EF) and to their common meals (allusive in *Non posse* 1089C, more explicit in *De lat. viv.* 1129A).

[13] In his work *On Panic* (fr. 36 Wehrli = Athenaeus, *Deipnosophist.* 9.389f), Clearchus

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

However that may be, one should further note that the interpretation proposed here on the basis of the anecdote at the outset of Plutarch's *De Latenter Vivendo* gains further support from the passage that immediately precedes our fragment in Athenaeus. There, Athenaeus offers a quotation from Chrysippus concerning Philoxenus (*Deipnosophist.* 1.5d–f; cf. also *Suda O* 1091; 3.603.3–8 Adler). The famous Stoic philosopher recalls how the glutton accustomed his hand to heat by plunging it into hot water, and gargled his mouth with hot water, and how he then won the cooks over to serving their dishes very hot. In this case too, Philoxenus thus appears to have developed a strategy that enables him to secure everything for himself (cf. 5f: *καὶ μόνος καταναλίσκῃ αὐτὸς τῶν λοιπῶν συνακολουθεῖν μὴ δυναμένων*). The juxtaposed quotations from Chrysippus and from Clearchus illustrate two different but analogous strategies which are ultimately rooted in exactly the same attitude. In that way, the interpretation proposed here explains Athenaeus' association of the two passages much better than that proposed by Bartol.

One could finally ask whether this Plutarchan passage also offers a solution to the vexed problem of the identity of Philoxenus or of the different Philoxeni.[14] Already in antiquity, there existed a great confusion between Philoxenus of Cythera and Philoxenus of Leucas. The first one, a well-known dithyrambic poet, was the son of Eulytidas (according to the *Suda Φ* 393; 4.728.27 Adler), the second one may have been the son of Eryxis.[15] It is clear that our interpretation supports the latter identification. However, it also calls for an important *caveat*. Both Athenaeus[16] and Plutarch[17] appear to confuse Philoxenus of Cythera and Philoxenus of Leucas, and moreover, Athenaeus explicitly tells us that Chrysippus' story about Philoxenus of Leucas is also told about Philoxenus of Cythera (*Deipnosophist.* 1.5f). Even if both Plutarch and Athenaeus give evidence of an astonishing erudition, the confusion between the different Philoxeni had probably taken on such dimensions at the moment they were writing, that they were themselves unable to distinguish between them.

If that is true, one better brackets the identity problem in order to focus on the story itself. There, the passage from Plutarch's *De Latenter Vivendo* can help in clarifying one of the strategies of the notorious glutton. The question remains, of course, whether it would not be best to forget it again as quickly as possible.

Department of Classical Studies, Leuven GEERT ROSKAM
geert.roskam@arts.kuleuven.be
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000772

describes how different birds at the season of mating can be caught by placing a mirror in their path: they run up to the mirror so as to meet the reflection and are caught. The phrase *προστρέχοντας γὰρ διὰ τὴν ἔμφασιν ἁλίσκονται* remains rather vague and allusive. The relevant information which is absent in this passage is provided in a different work, entitled *On the Mathematical Passages in Plato's Republic* (fr. 3 Wehrli = Athenaeus, 9.393a). There, we learn that one should actually place a noose in front of the mirror. The term *ἁλίσκονται* of the previous passage should be understood as *ἐμπίπτουσιν εἰς τὸν βρόχον*.

[14] Relevant literature in Bartol (n. 1), 292, n. 1.

[15] See e.g. F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Heft 3: *Klearchos* (Basel and Stuttgart, 1969), 66: 'Als dritten Namensträger unterscheiden manche den Sohn des Eryxis [...], obwohl nichts hindert, ihn mit dem Leukadier gleichzusetzen.' In the *RE* 20.1, on the other hand, Philoxenus the son of Eryxis (no. 5; p. 190) and Philoxenus of Leucas (no. 24, p. 194) are kept apart.

[16] See Wilkins (n. 7), 345.

[17] See S.-T. Teodorsson, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Table Talks*, vol. 2 *(Books 4–6)* (Göteborg, 1990), 82.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press