

HYPERBOREUS

STUDIA CLASSICA

ναυσι δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὔροις
ἔς Ἵπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν

(Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 29–30)

EDITORES

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA DENIS KEYER
NATALIA PAVLICHENKO ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

PETROPOLI

Vol. 21 2015 Fasc. 1

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
VERLAG C.H. BECK MÜNCHEN

CONSPECTUS

DIRK L. COUPRIE	
The Paths of the Celestial Bodies According to Anaximenes	5
MARIA KAZANSKAYA	
A Ghost Proverb in Herodotus (6. 129. 4)?	33
З. А. БАРЗАХ	
Использование разговорных идиом в трагедиях Софокла	53
SERGEY V. KASHAEV, NATALIA PAVLICHENKO	
Letter on an Ostrakon From the Settlement of Vyshesteblievskaya-3	61
ANTONIO CORSO	
Retrieving the Aphrodite of Hermogenes of Cythera	80
ARSENIJ VETUSHKO-KALEVICH	
<i>Batāvi</i> oder <i>Batāvi</i> ? Zu Luc. <i>Phars.</i> I, 430–440	90

ARCHAEOLOGICA

DMITRIJ CHISTOV	
Investigations on the Berezan Island, 2006–2013 (Hermitage Museum Archaeological Mission)	106
VLADIMIR KHRSHANOVSKIY	
An Investigation of the Necropoleis of Kytaiion and the Iluraton Plateau (2006–2013)	111
OLGA SOKOLOVA	
The Nymphaion expedition of the State Hermitage Museum (2006–2013)	121
ALEXANDER BUTYAGIN	
Excavations at Myrmekion in 2006–2013	127

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке
Summary in Russian and English

MARINA JU. VAKHTINA Porthmion Archaeological Expedition of the Institute for History of Material Culture, RAS – Institute of Archaeology, NASU	135
SERGEY V. KASHAEV The Taman Detachment of the Bosporan Expedition of IIMK RAS, 2006–2013	140
YURIJ A. VINOGRADOV Excavations at the Settlement of Artyushchenko–I (Bugazskoe) on the Taman Peninsula	157
VLADIMIR GORONCHAROVSKIY The Townsite of Semibratneye (Labrys) Results of Excavations in 2006–2009	161

DISPUTATIONES

SANDRA FAIT Peter Riedlberger, <i>Domninus of Larissa, Encheiridion and Spurious Works.</i> <i>Introduction, Critical Text, English Translation, and Commentary</i>	173
Key Words	175
Правила для авторов	177
Guidelines for contributors	179

A GHOST PROVERB IN HERODOTUS (6. 129. 4)?

At the end of the sixth book of *Histories*, Herodotus inserts into his appraisal of the role played by the Alcmeonid family in Athenian politics the story of Hippocleides' unsuccessful wooing of Cleisthenes' daughter Agariste who was later to marry Megacles, one of the Alcmeonids. Suitors from all over Greece competed for her hand in the course of a year, and Hippocleides from the Athenian family of Philaidae was decidedly the favorite until the very last evening, when the winner was to be announced. In high spirits over his impending victory, Hippocleides began to dance (καί κως ἑαυτῷ μὲν ἀρεστῶς ὀρχέετο) at first in the Laconic style, then in the Attic style and at last a dance that Herodotus is at a loss to categorize – resting his head on the table, Hippocleides made figures with his legs in the air. This dancing was of course highly revolting to Cleisthenes (Hdt. 6. 129–130):

Κλεισθένης δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα καὶ τὰ δεύτερα ὀρχομένου ἀποστυγέων γαμβρὸν ἄν οἱ ἔτι γενέσθαι Ἴπποκλείδην διὰ τὴν τε ὄρχησιν καὶ τὴν ἀναιδείην κατεῖχε ἑωυτόν, οὐ βουλόμενος ἐκτραγήναι ἐς αὐτόν· ὡς δὲ εἶδε τοῖσι σκέλεσι χειρονομήσαντα, οὐκέτι κατέχειν δυνάμενος εἶπε· “ᾠ παῖ Τεισάνδρου, ἀπορχήσαό γε μὲν τὸν γάμον”. Ὁ δὲ Ἴπποκλείδης ὑπολαβὼν εἶπε· “Οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ”. Ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται...

After these words Herodotus proceeds with the story of Cleisthenes who in the end chose Megacles of the Alcmaeonid family as his son-in-law, and the luckless Hippocleides is no longer mentioned. Herodotus marks this transition in his narrative by the phrase ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται (Hdt. 6. 130. 1) bringing to a close that part of the episode that concerns the dancing suitor.

Translators and commentators are unanimous in their interpretation of ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται as referring to Hippocleides' retort, “Οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ”, and the usual translation is “hence

the proverb”.¹ This interpretation would seem to be confirmed by later sources, both literary and scholarly. Thus Plutarch (*De Her. malign.* 867 b) uses the saying in his criticism of Herodotus, substituting his name for that of Hippocleides’ (chronologically, this is the earliest occurrence of the phrase since the *Histories*):

ὁ δὲ [...] δοκεῖ μοι, καθάπερ Ἴπποκλείδης ὁ τοῖς σκέλεσι χειρονομῶν ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης, εἰπεῖν ἄν ἐξορχούμενος τὴν ἀλήθειαν· “οὐ φροντὶς Ἡροδότῳ”.

After Plutarch οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ appears either *verbatim* or in a modified but recognizable form in several literary contexts from late Antiquity.² The philological tradition of the same period explicitly describes it as a proverb – the earliest author to do so among the scholars whose texts have come down to us is Pausanias Atticista (2nd century AD):

οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ· παροιμία, ἧς μέμνηται Ἑρμιππος ἐν Δημόταις. Ἴπποκλείδης ὁ Τ<ε>ισάνδρου μέλλων γαμῆν Ἀγαρίστην τὴν Κλεισθένους τοῦ Σικωνίου θυγατέρα τοῦ τυράννου ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ τῶν γάμων ἡμέρᾳ ἐπαρχήσατο περιττῶς, μεταβουλευσαμένου δὲ τοῦ Κλεισθένους καὶ Μεγακλεῖ τῷ Ἀλκμαίωνος τὴν θυγατέρα δόντος,

¹ Thus, J. E. Powell 1937, s. v. ὀνομάζω; see also A. Bailly 1963, s. v. ὀνομάζω: « C’est à cause de cela que l’on dit; c’est de là que vient cette expression ». Similar interpretations are to be found in translations and commentaries: “Hinc igitur originem cepit illud proverbium” (Bähr 1834, 410, quoted with approval by Abicht 1883, 214, and Macan 1895, 385); “ὀνομάζεται, is proverbial” (How, Wells 1912, *ad loc.*), “which is a byword from that day” (Godley 1922, 285) « C’est de là que vient cette expression » (Legrand 1948, 120); “da questo episodio deriva il proverbio” (Nenci 1998, 139). Heinrich Stein who glosses “ὀνομάζεται, als Sprichwort” (in Stein 1882, 222) seems to have had his doubts about this use of ὀνομάζεται and later proposed to change it into νομίζεται in the *apparatus criticus* of his 1884 edition.

The most explicit discussion of the choice of the verb ὀνομάζεται is found in Milletti 2010, 143, for whom the verb highlights the transformation of the saying into a proverb: “Erodoto non adotta alcuna forma di metalinguaggio, si affida piuttosto a due deittici e a un verbo (ὀνομάζεται) che mette l’accento sull’atto concreto della denominazione, come a voler indicare che l’intera frase è ‘diventata un nome’, ha acquisito un’identità propria”. This interpretation, however interesting, is based on a very bold metaphor, and seems to find little support either in use of the Greek verb ὀνομάζεσθαι or in general phraseological practices.

² Julian. *Orat.* 6. 2; Liban. *Epist.* 1025. 3; *Orat.* 42. 53; *Ep. pseudepigr.* 1. 5 (= *Epist.* 1545. 5); Lucian. *Apol.* 15; *Herc.* 8; Pseudo-Lucian. *Philopat.* 29; Theodor. *Epist.* 19.

πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἴπποκλείδην φανερώς εἰπόντος, ὅτι ἀπώρχηται τὸν γάμον τὸν Ἀγαρίστης, ὑποτυχῶν ἔφη: “οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ”.³

Pausanias not only states specifically that οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ is a proverb; he mentions an occurrence in Hermippus’ *Demotai*, a comedy more or less contemporary with the *Histories* of Herodotus, whose text is now lost. In other lexicons the entry οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ has the same structure.⁴

This would seem to give conclusive confirmation to the traditional interpretation of the Herodotean passage: the sources qualify οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ as a proverb and it does appear in literary texts; it must follow then that Herodotus referred to this proverbial usage when he wrote ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται (Hdt. 6. 130. 1). Thus according to the traditional interpretation ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται must be considered an equivalent of the formulas that we find in later scholarship – e. g. ὅθεν εἰς παροιμίαν ἦλθεν ὁ λόγος (Dicaearch. fr. 103. 1 Wehrli); εἰς παροιμίαν παρήλθε τὸ πρᾶγμα (Aristot. fr. 610 Gigon); εἰς παροιμίαν ἦλθε (Aristot. fr. 529 Gigon). It has accordingly been suggested that the whole story of the dancing suitor was included in the *Histories* in order to explain the saying οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ,⁵ and even that Herodotus’ Athenian sources had invented the story in order to account for the existing proverb.⁶

Nevertheless a difficulty remains. Why does Herodotus use the verb ὀνομάζεται? Nowhere else do we find this verb, or the noun ὄνομα from which it is derived, designating a proverb.⁷ It is true that the verb

³ Erbse 1950, 202.

⁴ Photius ο 697; Suda ο 978. The lexicographical evidence will be studied in detail below.

⁵ Thus Swoboda 1913, 1773: “den ersten Anlaß zu [dieser Erzählung] gab der Wunsch, das geflügelte Wort οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ zu erklären, sie ist also ätiologischen Ursprungs” (cf. Grote 1888, 413 and Hohti 1976, 115). C. W. Müller 2006, 259 n. 121 is more cautious in admitting the possibility: “Das ist wenig plausibel, weil es die Proportionen verschiebt, aber ein aitiologisches Element im Rahmen des Ganzen könnte es schon sein”.

⁶ “The phrase originated the year before the Halikarnassian heard it from an Athenian, but what it meant was really up to Herodotos’ source, not to him. And this source can have fashioned the story to supply an origin for the saying when the actual circumstances of its origin were otherwise unknown, lost, obscured – or meant to be obscured” (Lavelle 2014, 325).

⁷ On the most frequent term, παροιμία, see Bieler 1936, 240–247. A comprehensive summary of theoretical views on proverbs in antiquity, as well as the definition of different kinds of proverbial sayings may be found in Kindstrand 1978, Russo 1997 and most recently Tosi 2010.

ὀνομάζω is sometimes used in a weakened sense as a *verbum dicendi*;⁸ however it has been shown that even in the Homeric formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (*Il.* – 17x; *Od.* – 26x), which is a stock example of this less specific usage, the verb ἐξονομάζω does not lose its link with the noun ὄνομα.⁹ But even if for the sake of argument we assume that ὀνομάζω could have been used as a *verbum dicendi* equivalent to λέγω, the transition from a general meaning to the specific designation of proverb would still be extremely hard to explain, especially as it does not correspond to the verb's inner form. It should be noted that a certain uneasiness concerning Herodotus' use of ὀνομάζω is manifest in Godley's and Legrand's translations (see n. 1) as well as in the LSJ entry ὀνομάζω (section IV, *passive*) where the Herodotean passage is translated as “hence this saying is used”. Each of these translations is a compromise that eschews the problematic word “proverb”, but *de facto* accepts the traditional interpretation of the passage.

In view of this difficulty it seems worthwhile to reconsider the later parallels, with special attention to their independence from Herodotus' story of the dancing suitor. Among these late occurrences the two examples of οὐ φροντις Ἴπποκλείδῃ in Lucian occupy a special place. First of these is found at the end of his *Apology for “The Dependent Scholar”* (*Apol.* 15):

Ταῦτά σοι, ὦ ἑταῖρε, καίτοι ἐν μυρίαῖς ταῖς ἀσχολίαις ὧν ὅμως ἀπελογησάμην, οὐκ ἐν παρέργῳ θέμενος τὴν λευκὴν παρὰ σοῦ καὶ πλήρη μοι ἐνεχθῆναι· ἐπεὶ πρὸς γε τοὺς ἄλλους, κἂν συνάμα πάντες κατηγορῶσιν, ἱκανὸν ἂν εἶη μοι τό οὐ φροντις Ἴπποκλείδῃ.

It is not easy to estimate the degree of dependence of this passage from Herodotus, all the more so because it is placed at the absolute end of

⁸ The fact that ὀνομάζω could be used in a wider sense than “to name; to call someone *by name*” was already noted in antiquity – for instance, see Hsch. ε 1739: ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε· καὶ ἔλεγεν· ἐπέιθετο; Hsch. ε 5509 ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε· τὸν τε λόγον εἶπε καὶ τὰ μέρη αὐτοῦ διεξήκει.

⁹ See Jacobsohn 1934, 133–134, and Couch 1937, 129, 139–140. Another possible parallel would be the construction ὀνομάζεται εἶναι (see LSJ s.v. ὀνομάζω, II. 2): e.g. τὰς ὀνομάζουσι Δῆλιοι εἶναι Ὑπερόχην τε καὶ Λαοδίκην... (Hdt. 4. 33. 3; cf. 2. 44. 3); σοφιστὴν δὴ τοὶ ὀνομάζουσί γε, ὦ Σώκρατες, τὸν ἄνδρα εἶναι (Plat. *Prot.* 311 e). As in the previous case the verb ὀνομάζω retains the basic meaning “to call someone something” despite the fact that it is weakened by the pleonastic infinitive εἶναι (a similar usage is also attested for the verb καλέω (see LSJ, s.v. καλέω, II.3.b).

the essay and the preceding context is of no direct use. Neither is the observation of the wider context decisive, as Lucian's technique of references is extremely varied: the text incorporates direct quotations from canonical authors,¹⁰ indirect allusions,¹¹ semiproverbial sayings¹² and proverbs¹³ which are at times difficult to distinguish. Thus, when Lucian (*Apol.* 4) says ἐν γήρα δὲ ὑστάτω καὶ σχεδὸν ἤδη ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐδῶν, we are immediately reminded of the Homeric formula ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ; but it is difficult to decide whether Lucian rephrases the saying in order to introduce a Homeric touch or as a reference to a popular proverb.¹⁴

Although there is no positive proof of Lucian's dependence on or independence from Herodotus, substantial indirect evidence suggests that he did intend to allude to the *Histories*. The emphatic placement of the saying at the end of the *Apology* speaks in favor of a deliberate allusion rather than a common proverb – it would seem to reproduce the position of this saying in the Herodotean novella, where οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ appears as the unlucky suitor's last words and actually concludes the part of the narrative dedicated to Hippocleides.¹⁵ Furthermore the abundance of direct quotations and allusions in the text used to strengthen both Sabinus' presumed censure and Lucian's apology makes it more likely that the last phrase would also be a literary quotation. And finally, as the first essay of this diptych *On the Dependent Scholar* ends with a *verbatim*

¹⁰ The best represented category is that of direct quotations, often accompanied by the name of the author and distinguished from the main body of the text. The *Apology* contains the following quotations: Eur. *Phoen.* 398, Eur. *fr.* 905; Hom. *Il.* 6. 488; 20. 128; 18. 104; 22. 495.

¹¹ Two allusions may be cited. The first refers to the Bellerophontes story told by Glaucus in Hom. *Il.* 6. 160–183; the second is a close reformulation, incorporated into the text without explicit reference to Homer, of Achilles' saying: ὅς χ' ἔτερον μὲν κεύθη ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἶπη (*Il.* 9. 313).

¹² There is one passage in which the turn of thought is evidently influenced by proverbial usage, although it is not elsewhere attested as a saying, and the *realia* mentioned are perhaps too specific for a common usage: μὴ γὰρ τοσοῦτός ποτε λιμὸς καταλάβοι τὸ Ἄργος ὡς τὴν Κυλλάραβιν σπεῖρειν ἐπιχειρεῖν... (Luc. *Apol.* 11).

¹³ See καὶ σὲ τὸν κολοῖον ἄλλοτριῶν πτεροῖς ἀγάλλεσθαι (Luc. *Apol.* 4).

¹⁴ The expression γήραος οὐδός is used five times in Homer (*Il.* 22. 60; 24. 487; *Od.* 7. 89; 15. 246; 15. 348). It was also used by Hesiod (*Op.* 331) and later writers (Hdt. 3. 14; Jos. *Ant. iud.* 1. 222; Choricus 7. 1. 33; etc.). Plato famously makes Socrates quote this formula in the beginning of his *Republic*: ἐπειδὴ ἐνταῦθα ἤδη εἶ τῆς ἡλικίας ὃ δὴ “ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ” φασιν εἶναι οἱ ποιηταί (Plat. *Rep.* 328 e).

¹⁵ Note a similar placement of οὐ φροντὶς Ἡροδότῳ at the end of a section in Plutarch (*De Her. malign.* 867 b) where the saying deliberately parodies Herodotus.

quotation from Plato,¹⁶ the recognition of a quotation from Herodotus in οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ would reconcile the conclusions of the two essays, establishing an elegant symmetry.

Lucian's ἱκανὸν ἂν εἶη μοι τό οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ gave rise to a whole tradition of similar dismissals. Thus does Libanius terminate one of his letters (*Ep.* 1025. 3):

θαυμαστὸν δὲ οὐδὲν εἶναί τινος καὶ τοὺς τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς σου μεμφομένους. οὕς καλὸν ἀκούειν τὸν Ἴπποκλείδην.

Lucian's and Libanius' imitators also adopted this practice:

τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ληρεῖν ἐάσωμεν ἀρκεσθέντες ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εἰπεῖν τὸ οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν (Pseudo-Lucian. *Philopat.* 29).

ἐγὼ δὲ αὐτός, εἴ τις ἀξιόη τὸν νοῦν προσέχειν, πρὸς τὰ ἐκάστῳ περὶ ἐμοῦ δοκοῦντα ὅπως διάκειμαι, μάθοι γ' ἂν οὐκ ἄλλο ἐπάδοντα ὅτι μὴ τό· οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ (Liban. *Epist. pseudepigr.* 1. 5 = *Epist.* 1545. 1).

These later occurrences leave the impression that the phrase οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ came to be used in the epistolary genre as an ironic break-off formula or the answer of a cultivated person to his critics (whether hypothetical or real). Its popularity was certainly due to the mixture of learned allusion and everyday tone, and we can judge the extent of Lucian's influence from the fact that the paroemiographer Apostolius, besides summarizing Herodotus' novella under the lemma οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ (13. 70), introduces a special entry for Lucian's ἱκανὸν ἂν εἶη μοι τό οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ (9. 19 b).

For the second time the saying οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ occurs in Lucian's *Heracles* (*Her.* 8):

¹⁶ ὅ τι δ' ἂν πράττης, μέμνησο τοῦ σοφοῦ λέγοντος ὡς θεὸς ἀναίτιος, αἰτία δὲ ἐλομένου (Luc. *Merc. Cond.* 42 □ Plato has αἰτία ἐλομένου· θεὸς ἀναίτιος: *Resp.* 10. 15). This saying was of course well known and frequently referred to (see Halliwell 185), but its attribution to a sage (τοῦ σοφοῦ) shows that Lucian, without explicitly mentioning Plato, is using it as a literary quotation. It should be added that the essay *On the Dependent Scholar* and the *Apology* are linked not only thematically, but through references to the same quotations: Hom. *Il.* 22. 95 and Theogn. 175 □ 77 are referred to or quoted in both (Luc. *Merc.* 20 □ *Apol.* 6 and *Merc.* 5 □ *Apol.* 10, accordingly).

ἀλλ' ὅταν ἀναμνησθῶ τοῦ γέροντος ἐκείνου Ἡρακλέους, πάντα ποιεῖν προάγομαι καὶ οὐκ αἰδοῦμαι τοιαῦτα τολμῶν ἡλικιώτης ὢν τῆς εἰκόνας. ὥστε ἰσχύς μὲν καὶ τάχος καὶ κάλλος καὶ ὅσα σώματος ἀγαθὰ χαιρέτω, καὶ ὁ Ἔρωσ ὁ σός, ᾧ Τῆϊε ποιητά, ἐσιδὼν με ὑποπόλιον τὸ γένειον χρυσοφαέννων εἰ βούλεται πτερύγων ταρσοῖς παραπετέσθω, καὶ ὁ Ἴπποκλείδης οὐ φροντιεῖ

This passage is no doubt dependent on Herodotus. The feelings experienced by the narrator as he gazes on the statue of Heracles are similar to the rapture that animated Herodotus' Hippocleides as he danced caring for neither the prestigious marriage nor common decency. Besides this thematic similarity, the allusion to the *Histories* is rendered all the more probable by the proximity of an explicit reference to Anacreon (ᾧ Τῆϊε ποιητά) followed by what is evidently a direct allusion to one of his poems (it is even reconstructed in its metrical form and placed among Anacreontean fragments by the editors):

(a) ὑποπόλιον γένειον χρυσοφαέννων,
εἰ βούλεται

(β) πτερύγων †ἠ ἀετοῖς† παραπετέσθω (fr. 379 Page = 25 b Edmonds).¹⁷

Whether this reconstruction is accurate or not, the placement of what can only be a very accurate reformulation of a poetic text immediately before καὶ ὁ Ἴπποκλείδης οὐ φροντιεῖ shows that this saying must also be a literary allusion.

For a full picture of the use of οὐ φροντις Ἴπποκλείδῃ in late Antiquity, three other authors need to be examined. In his *Ecloga* Phrynichus Atticista (2nd century AD) uses the saying twice when with characteristic outspokenness¹⁸ he dismisses variants that existed outside the correct Attic usage: Κολλάβους τοὺς ἐν τῇ λύρᾳ εἰ μὲν ἄλλη διάλεκτος λέγει, “οὐ φροντις Ἴπποκλείδῃ” φασίν· σὺ δὲ ὡς Ἀθηναῖος λέγε κόλλοπας (*Ecl.* 169); Ἐνεχυριμαῖα οὐδεὶς τῶν δοκίμων εἶπεν – εἰ δὲ τῶν

¹⁷ Bergk proposed a different reconstruction of the fragment: ὅς μ' ἐσιδὼν γένειον // ὑποπόλιον χρυσοφαέννων πτερύγων ἀήταις // παραπέταται (Bergk 1834, 124). Especially indicative of Anacreon's style is the color contrast between the gold associated with Eros (χρυσοφαέννων) and the poet's grey hair (cf. Anacr. fr. 13. 2, 6–7; this parallel was noted by Woodbury 1979, 286 n. 46).

¹⁸ See W. G. Rutherford's characterization of Phrynichus' methods (Rutherford 1881, IX–X).

ἡμελημένων τις, “οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ” –, ἐνέχυρα δέ¹⁹ (*Ecl.* 342). While in the latter example the author, as is usually the case, is identifying himself with the carefree Hippocleides,²⁰ the former occurrence is remarkable for the fact that Phrynichus does not side with Hippocleides: on the contrary, he seems to characterize those unfamiliar with the correct usage as “Hippocleides”, which suggests that the grammarian had in mind the whole episode entailing the confrontation between righteous Cleisthenes and the devious suitor.

A similar ambiguity as regards its dependence on the Herodotean context characterizes the late occurrence of the saying οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ in a letter of Theodore of Kyzikos (*Epist.* 19, 10th century AD):

Ἐγὼ γὰρ μὴ βουλόμενος στασιάζειν τὴν γλῶτταν ἐκείνην ἐτίμησα καὶ εἴτε ἀχνυμένη δόξη ταῦτα σκυτάλη, εἴτε ἢ ἀπὸ Σκυθῶν ῥήσις, εἴτε Ἀβυδηνὸν ἐπιφόρημα ὡς τὸ κολακεύειν οὐκ ἔχοντα, οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ κατὰ τὸ παροιμιαζόμενον.

On the one hand Theodore explicitly notes the proverbial nature of the saying (κατὰ τὸ παροιμιαζόμενον) and as far as we can judge Ἀβυδηνὸν ἐπιφόρημα is really a proverb;²¹ on the other hand the remaining three expressions, οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ, ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη and ἢ ἀπὸ Σκυθῶν ῥήσις, have literary origins, and the latter is also Herodotean.²²

¹⁹ In the second entry, the use of οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ gave rise to a curious misunderstanding. Thomas Magister, a Byzantine monk and scholar of late 13th century, reusing Phrynichus' work in his own *Ecloga nominum et verborum atticorum*, failed to recognize the saying and mistook Hippocleides for one of the ἄδοκιμοι who did not follow the correct Attic usage: Ἐνέχυρα Ἀττικοὶ, ἐνέχυρον Ἑλληνας. τὸ δὲ ἐνεχυριμαῖον λέγειν ὡς Ἴπποκλείδῃς, ἄδοκιμον (ε 107). This mistake was noted by Rutherford 1881, 468 in his note on Phryn. Attic. 342.

²⁰ This is the case in the examples analyzed above; it is therefore not surprising that R. Thomas 1989, 269, when discussing the story in Herodotus, ascribes a similar attitude to the historian: “If we think of the tale from the point of view of the proverb, there is a hint that Hippocleides' retort is approved...”

²¹ It is found in many paroemiographers (Apostol. 1. 1, Diogen. 1. 1, Macarius Chrysoceph. 1. 1, Greg. 1. 26, Zenob. 1. 1), as well as in other scholarly works (Suda α 100, Athenaeus 14. 641 a, Eustathius *Comm. in Dionys. Perieget.* 513).

²² ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη comes from Archilochus (fr. 185 West); it is mentioned without reference to the poet's name by the paroemiographer Apostolius (4. 68) and with reference to Archilochus by *scholia vetera* to Pindar (*Ol.* 6. 154 a, 154 c), Plutarch (*Mor.* 152 e), Demetrius (*De elocut.* 5) and the paroemiographer Diogenianus (3. 25).

The expression ἢ ἀπὸ Σκυθῶν ῥήσις (Hdt. 4. 127) is well attested in paroemiographers (Apostol. 8. 39; Diogen. 5. 11, Macarius Chrysoceph. 8. 21, Suda η 11), and this proverbial use has even led some editors to emend Herodotus' text, arguing that

Finally the only literary context where οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ appears to be wholly independent of Herodotus is Emperor Julian's *In cynicos ineruditos* (Orat. 6. 2):

εἰ δὲ ὑπὸ λιχνείας ἢ μαλακίας ἢ, τὸ κεφάλαιον ἴν' εἶπω ξυνηλὸν ἐν βραχεῖ, τῆς σωματικῆς ἡδονῆς δεδουλωμένοι τῶν λόγων ὀλιγορῆσειαν προκαταγελάσαντες, ὥσπερ ἐνίοτε τῶν παιδευτηρίων καὶ τῶν δικαστηρίων οἱ κύνες τοῖς προφυλαίοις προσουροῦσιν, “οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ”· καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ τῶν κυνιδίων ἡμῖν μέλει τὰ τοιαῦτα πλημμελούντων.

Here οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ appears as a synonym for the more neutral expression οὐ ἡμῖν μέλει,²³ as evidenced in the added explanatory phrase. Indeed this occurrence shows that for Julian this saying had become a *geflügeltes Wort* that could be understood without recollection either of its original context or of Hippocleides' personality. Julian's use of οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ resembles those explanations found in the following scholia to Lucian (to *Her.* 8 and *Apol.* 15, accordingly):

Ἴπποκλείδης*] παροιμία “οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ” ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ πάνυ σπουδαίων ἡμῖν λεγομένη ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ εὐκαταφρόνητον μεταχειριζομένων. VBΦMNOΩΔ

οὐ φροντὶς* Ἴπποκλείδῃ] παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἄγαν καταφρονούντων τινὸς καὶ ἀπεριμερίμως διακειμένων. ΔΕVΦ

Excluding Julian, the use of οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ in most contexts refers either directly to Herodotus or to Lucian using the Herodotean saying. It is also well to keep in mind that this was not the only famous phrase of the scene (Hdt. 6. 129). The oxymoron σκέλεσι χειρονομεῖν seems to have become a stock example of deviation from proper usage, κυρία λέξις (Pollux *Onom.* 2. 153; Eustath. *Comm. in Il.* 1. 246). Even more so,

the proverb had accidentally been incorporated into the text (thus Valkenauer, Stein, Hude, Rosén). We would agree however with Legrand who included the phrase in Idanthyrso's speech: τοῦτό ἐστι ἢ ἀπὸ Σκυθέων ῥῆσις corresponds to an earlier break-off formula ἀμφὶ μὲν μάχῃ τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθω emphasizing the rigorous structure of the speech. Moreover the explanation given by lexicographers shows that they were referring to the Herodotean passage (and in particular to the preceding words, ἀντι δὲ τοῦ ὅτι δεσπότης ἔφησας εἶναί ἐμός, κλαίειν λέγω): e.g. τέτακται ἢ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποτόμως οἰμῶζειν τινὰ λεγόντων· παρ' ὅσον οἱ Σκύθαι Δαρεῖφ τῷ Πέρσῃ, μηνύσαντι περὶ τοῦ εἶξαι, ἀπεκρίναντο κλαίειν αὐτὸν εἰπόντες (Suda η 11).

²³ Pace Cook 1907, 170.

Cleisthenes' words, ἀπορχήσαό γε μὲν τὸν γάμον, were admired and imitated.²⁴ It is remarkable for instance that Athenaeus when recounting this scene omits Hippocleides' retort mentioning only Cleisthenes' censure of his dance (14. 628 c–d):

ὄθεν καὶ τὸ Κλεισθένους τοῦ Σικυωνίων τυράννου χάριεν καὶ σημείον διανοίας πεπαιδευμένης. ἰδὼν γάρ, ὡς φασι, φορτικῶς ὀρχησάμενον ἓνα τῶν τῆς θυγατρὸς μνηστήρων (Ἴπποκλείδης δ' ἦν ὁ Ἀθηναῖος) ἀπορχήσθαι τὸν γάμον αὐτὸν ἔφρασεν, νομίζων ὡς ἔοικεν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τάνδρὸς εἶναι τοιαύτην.

Of course Cleisthenes' perspicacity will only be appreciated by a reader who kept Hippocleides' answer in mind – his retort was in fact to confirm what, according to Athenaeus, “Cleisthenes” had already guessed, namely that Hippocleides' soul was as perverse as his dancing. Nevertheless the omission of οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδης shows that the expression ἀπορχεῖσθαι τὸν γάμον was in itself sufficiently well known to evoke the Herodotean context in full. The use of the two other expressions shows that the story of the dancing suitor was known not only because of Hippocleides' retort; and it is hardly accidental that Plutarch, when turning it against Herodotus himself, uses all three remarkable expressions for his parody.²⁵ This testimony to the vitality of the novella indirectly corroborates the evidence that can be gathered from references to οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδης in literature and lexicography as to the continuing association of this saying with Herodotus' *Histories*.

Thus on closer examination the literary sources leave the impression that Hippocleides' saying was used in late antiquity as an ἀπόφθεγμα,²⁶ applicable to different situations, but one that rarely lost its connection to its original context. As for the lexicographical tradition, it characterizes

²⁴ ἐξορχούμενος τὴν ἀλήθειαν – Plut. *De mal. Her.* 867 b. The same variant reading ἐξορχεῖσθαι instead of Herodotus' ἀπορχεῖσθαι is used by Zenobius (5. 31) and Diogenianus (7. 21); as no such variant is found in Herodotean manuscripts, this reading (which is perhaps less striking than ἀπορχεῖσθαι) probably appeared in later renderings of the story. It may be added that Diogenianus' formulation τοῦ δὲ Κλεισθένους εἰπόντος, Ἐξορχῆ τὸν γάμον· Οὐ φροντὶς, ἀπεκρίνατο. Εἶπε δὲ τὸ Ἐξορχῆ, ἐπειδὴ ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῷ γάμῳ ἐκυβίστα suggests that the expression used by Cleisthenes was sufficiently known to solicit a gloss, although not current enough to warrant a separate entry as a proverb.

²⁵ ὁ τοῖς σκέλεσι χειρονομῶν ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης, εἰπεῖν ἂν ἐξορχούμενος τὴν ἀλήθειαν “οὐ φροντὶς Ἡροδότῳ” (*De Her. malign.* 867 b).

²⁶ For a definition and discussion, see Russo 1997, 50 and 57–60; Tosi 2010, 16–18.

the saying unequivocally as a proverb and is uniform in its treatment, for even the structure of the entries in Pausanias, Photius and Suidas is identical,²⁷ each of them beginning by stating that οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ is a proverb (παροιμία) then mentioning its occurrence in the *Demotai* and concluding with a summary of Herodotus' story in order to explain the origins of the saying.

In the lexicographical tradition, one piece of information deserves special attention – namely that Hermippus had used οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ in his comedy.²⁸ This would have served as a strong argument in favor of the saying's proverbial use already in Herodotus' times, were it not for the terms in which it is couched. In the four passages (Paus. Att. ο 192, Photius ο 697; Suda ο 978; Hsch. ο 1921), the wording is identical, ἦς μέμνηται (καὶ) Ἐρμιππος (ἐν) Δημόταις; the passage itself is not quoted and the verb μέμνηται is too vague to allow us to determine what kind of reference it was.

The majority of the occurrences of μέμνηται in the ancient scholarly tradition (especially though not exclusively in the scholia and lexica) are of the following types. On one hand μέμνηται may refer to the passage of a canonical author in which a certain expression is used or where certain geographical and personal names are mentioned;²⁹ such references often take the form of οὐ (ἦς) μέμνηται ὁ δεῖνα and are applicable both to the exact word³⁰ and to a more general kind of mention. On the other hand μέμνηται may appear in exegetical scholia discussing the exact meaning of a passage; thus scholia vetera to Apollonius of Rhode, δύο Ἀντιόπαι

²⁷ This is noted by Miletta 2010, 143. Other lexicographers choose to relate only one part of the tradition – either the occurrence in Hermippus (Hesych. ο 1921) or the Herodotus story (Apostol. 13. 70; Diogen. 7. 21; Zenob. 5. 31).

²⁸ The exact date of *Demotai* is unknown. However most of Hermippus' texts date from 440 to 421 BC – see Nesselrath 1998, 438–439. Miletta 2010, 143 suggests the following view of the relationship between Hermippus' play and Herodotus' *Histories*: “È possibile, ma non certo, che il testo comico preceda le *Storie* e che ne sia la fonte attica: le fonti lessicografiche dedicano una voce a questa espressione, attribuendola ad Ermippo senza nominare Erodoto, e sottolineando il carattere proverbial”. But extensive lexical borrowings for the Herodotean novella show that the *Histories*, and not the play *Demotai* were the source used by the paroemiographers in their *lemmata*, which weakens Miletta's hypothesis.

²⁹ Thus Athenaeus (*Deipn.* 1. 28 f) quotes Eubulus and Anaxandrides to illustrate the expression οἶνος ψίθιος; scholion to *Od.* 3. 171 cites Demosthenes' mention of the island of Psyria; Diogenes Laertius (1. 31) quotes Alcaeus' mention of Aristodemus.

³⁰ For example Athen. *Deipn.* 2. 49 e, 2. 64 f, etc.; Aristoph. *Gramm.* fr. 5 and fr. 28; *schol. LRM ad Sophoclis O. C.* 1248 (de Marco). The passages listed are those, where the original source is preserved and the reference can be verified.

ἐγένοντο, ἢ μὲν Νυκτέως, ἢ δὲ Ἄσωποῦ, ἥς καὶ μέμνηται (*schol. vetera in Apol. Rhod. 735–737 a*) establishes which of the two Antiopeae the poet had in mind; similarly the Pindaric scholium BCDEQ *ad Ol. 2. 39 b* (Drachmann) explains the mention of Cadmus' daughters in *Ol. 2. 21–22* (Snell–Maehler): οἰκειότατα πρὸς τὴν γνώμην ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα λαμβάνει, ὅτι τοὺς προδυστυχήσαντας καὶ εὐδαιμονία διαδέχεται, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰς Κάδμου θυγατέρας. ὁ αὐτὸς γὰρ λόγος διαδέχεται αὐτὰς καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἀρμόζει. [...] τούτων δὲ μέμνηται, ἐπεὶ ὁ Θῆρων εἰς Λάιον ἀνάγει τὸ γένος. Thus the verb μέμνηται is applicable to a large variety of references, ranging from a precise indication of passage to a vague allusion.

The following entry from Hesychius (λ 694) illustrates the ambivalence of μέμνηται and the difficulties of its interpretation:

Λέσβιος ᾠδός· οἱ μὲν τὸν Εὐαινετίδαν ἀκούουσι τὸν ἀπὸ Ἄντισσης· οἱ δὲ Φρῦνιν, ὃ καὶ μᾶλλον· ὑπὸ πολλῶν γὰρ κεκωμῶδεται οὗτος, ὡς διαφθείρων τὴν μουσικὴν καὶ πρὸς τὸ βωμολοχεύειν τρέπων. καὶ παροιμία δὲ ἐντεῦθεν ἐλέχθη· μετὰ Λέσβιον ᾠδόν. οἱ δὲ μετὰ τὸν Τέρπανδρον. μέμνηται καὶ Ἄριστοφάνης ἐν Νεφέλαις.

Judging from the structure of this *lemma*, we would expect to find Aristophanes using the expression Λέσβιος ᾠδός (or μετὰ Λέσβιον ᾠδόν) but this is not the case. However the search yields a mention of Phrynys in v. 971 of the *Clouds*, associated with the verb βωμολοχεύειν in v. 970, which suggests that this must have been the passage Hesychius had in mind (Aristoph. *Nub.* 970–972):³¹

εἰ δέ τις αὐτῶν βωμολοχεύσαιτ' ἢ κάμψειεν τινα καμπὴν οἴας οἱ νῦν, τὰς κατὰ Φρῦνιν ταύτας τὰς δυσκολοκάμπτους, ἐπετρίβετο τυπτόμενος πολλὰς ὡς τὰς Μούσας ἀφανίζων.

It is difficult to say whether the lexicographer, when formulating his entry, considered τὰς κατὰ Φρῦνιν in Aristophanes as an equivalent of μετὰ Λέσβιον ᾠδόν or whether he had referred to Aristophanes only because the latter had mentioned Phrynys' name when criticizing new tendencies in music. The main burden of this ambiguity of course lies with the verb μέμνηται.

This and similar passages show that in the testimony ἥς μέμνηται (καὶ) Ἑρμιππος (ἐν) Δημόταις cited by Pausanias, Suda, Photius and

³¹ Kurt Latte, however, is very prudent in his edition: “μέμνηται καὶ Ἄριστοφάνης ἐν Νεφέλαις (970?)” (Latte 1966, 586).

Hesychius, the reference to οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ in *Demotai* might have been a vague allusion or a precise quotation;³² but even in the latter case, there is no way of knowing whether Hermippus had used the saying as a proverb current among his Athenian audience or to refer to the historical figure or even as a direct allusion to Herodotus' *Histories*.³³ Furthermore the uniformity of the lexicographical tradition suggests that the lexicographers – except for the first scholar who suggested this parallel – did not check the text of the comedy and that the reference to *Demotai* was transmitted from lexicon to lexicon. It is also highly probable that this reference was actually incorporated into the lexicographical tradition in order to support the claim that οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ was a proverb – a claim which would have otherwise been founded solely on the Herodotean passage.³⁴

We hope to have shown that later sources are of little relevance to the question of whether this phrase had circulated as a proverb in Herodotus' time or not; the examined texts only show that in late Antiquity the saying was mainly used in reference to the *Histories*. This conclusion calls for a reappraisal of the passage in Herodotus, independent of later sources; and in order to determine the status of οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ in the novella we must examine the elements that contribute the impression of its being a proverb. They seem to be the following: (a) the formulation itself and in particular Hippocleides' referring to himself by name, (b) the verb ὀνομάζεται untypical for capping sentences, and (c) the demonstrative τοῦτο.

³² The alleged occurrence of οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ in *Demotai* has suggested that the saying's anapaestic structure could help to determine the type of verse in which it appeared – see Kassel, Austin 1986, 569. Prosody cannot however be considered as proof, unless we are assured that Hermippus had used these exact words οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ.

³³ That is, if the *Histories* are taken to have been published before the play (see n. 28). That comic poets could incorporate such allusions in their texts may be seen from Aristophanes (in particular *Acharn.* 85–87, 92 ~ Hdt. 1. 1–4; *Av.* 552 ff. ~ Hdt. 1. 179). For these and other references see Hornblower 2006, 307.

³⁴ We find the same exact procedure employed by lexicographers with regard to the expression πτύος τρόπων. It occurs in the *Histories*, in the story of Croesus' threat to the inhabitants of the city of Pithecousae (Hdt. 6. 37). The wording shows that in explaining this proverb the lexicographers were drawing on the Herodotean passage (cf. the variations on the expressions ἐκκοπέισα βλαστὸν οὐδένα μετιεῖ ἀλλὰ πανώλεθρος ἐξαπόλλυται in Zenob. 5. 76; Suda π 1412; Diog. 7. 49; Eustath. *ad Il.* 1. 51). Of all these it is only Eustathius who explicitly mentions Herodotus, whereas Zenobius, after providing an explanation of the proverb derived from Herodotus' narrative, quotes a wholly different source: μέμνηται δὲ αὐτῆς Στάφυλος ὁ Ναυκρατίτης (unfortunately very little is known of him – see Scherling 1929).

(a) The formulation of the answer οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ is no less auxiliary to creating the impression of a proverbial saying than the capping phrase ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται – its conciseness, the ellipsis of copula, the fact that Hippocleides refers to himself in the first person – all these traits contribute to it. But one could be mistrustful of this first impression. Though rare, the expression οὐ φροντὶς is by no means unattested: for example Medea uses it when speaking of her concern for her children, τοῦμοῦ γὰρ οὐ μοι φροντὶς, εἰ φευξόμεθα, // κείνους δὲ κλαίω συμφορᾷ κεχρημένους (Eur. *Med.* 346–347); cf. οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἡμῖν ὅπως // ῥῆσιν εἰ λέξειν ἐμέλλομεν τότε οὐδὲ // συκοφαντήσῃν τινὰ // φροντὶς, ἀλλ’ ὅστις ἐρέτης ἔσοιτ’ ἄριστος (Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1094–1097). The practice of the speaker referring to himself in the third person is seen as early as the Homeric poems (cf. *Il.* 1. 240; 4. 354; 8. 22; 11. 761) where it is used for emphatic sayings, especially those expressing pride.³⁵

(b) Powell in his *Lexicon to Herodotus* attributes to the verb ὀνομάζω the following meanings: (a) “give a name, call,” (b) “mention by name,” (c) “pronounce (a word).” None of these exactly suit the phrase ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται, and it is set apart and translated as “hence the proverb”. However passive forms of denominative verbs in -ζω often display a close association with the noun from which they are derived. The standard example of this phenomenon, ever since it was noted by J. Wackernagel,³⁶ is taken from the inscription *IG* 379 where the construction παιῶν γίνεται in line 12 is taken up by οὐ παιωνίζεται (line 18).³⁷ In Herodotus this usage can be illustrated by the following two examples of the verb νομίζεσθαι:

Χρηστὴ δὲ καὶ πρὶν ἢ διαφθαρῆναι Ἴωνίην Θαλέω ἀνδρὸς Μιλησίου [sc. γνώμη] ἐγένετο, [...] ὃς ἐκέλευε ἐν βουλευτήριον Ἴωνας ἐκτῆσθαι, τὸ δὲ εἶναι ἐν Τέω (Τέων γὰρ μέσον εἶναι Ἴωνίης), τὰς δὲ ἄλλας πόλεις οἰκειομένας μηδὲν ἦσσαν νομίζεσθαι κατὰ περ εἰ δῆμοι εἶεν (Hdt. 1. 170. 3).

Ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ τοῦ ἔργου καὶ τοῦ προτέρου τούτων, τὸ ἐργάσαντο αἱ γυναῖκες τοὺς ἅμα Θόαντι ἄνδρας σφετέρους ἀποκτείνασαι, νενόμισται ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὰ σχέτλια ἔργα πάντα Λήμνια καλέεσθαι (Hdt. 6. 138. 4).

³⁵ See Kirk 1985, 366.

³⁶ Wackernagel 1916, 122–124; Wackernagel 1924, 147; also see Schwyzer, Debrunner 1950, 239–240.

³⁷ Οὐδ’ ἔστι βωμὸς οὐδὲ παιωνίζεται (Aesch. fr. 161. 3), where the impersonal verb παιωνίζεται is also juxtaposed with a nominal construction.

In both cases νομίζεσθαι / νενόμισται appears as a synthetic analogue of a nominal construction such as νόμος ἐστί.³⁸ The same type of usage fits well in the context of Hdt. 6. 130; it is even slightly surprising that the choice of the verb ὀνομάζεσθαι has never, to our knowledge, been explicitly connected with the fact that Hippocleides mentions his own name in his retort. Although in Herodotus this is the only example of this use of ὀνομάζεσθαι,³⁹ parallels can be found in other authors: φύσις δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀνομάζεται ἀνθρώποισιν (Emped. fr. 8. 7); παρανομίαν τε ἐπὶ τοῖς μὴ ἀνάγκη κακοῖς ὀνομασθῆναι (Thuc. 4. 87). If we are right in the reconstruction of the verb's meaning in Hdt. 6. 130, then the literal meaning of the capping phrase would be: "From this, this came to be associated with [Hippocleides'] name".

(c) The reference of τοῦτο must also be re-examined. As we have seen, according to the traditional interpretation, by τοῦτο Herodotus meant Hippocleides' utterance. It should be noted however that in his novella the phrase ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται· Κλεισθένης δὲ σιγὴν ποιησάμενος ἔλεξε ἐς μέσον τάδε... functions as a boundary that concludes the narrative of Hippocleides (which had been a digression from the main line of the story) and marks the return to the subject of Alcmaeonidae and of Cleisthenes' choice of son-in-law. The relatively unusual trait is that the delimiting formula occurs in the middle of a scene. But Hippocleides will not be mentioned again in the *Histories*, and in this case the phrase ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται separates the narrative of individual conflict that concerned only two persons, Cleisthenes and Hippocleides, to which the other suitors were passive witnesses, from the announcement of Cleisthenes' decision, which concerned the remaining suitors.

The particularity of the use of boundary formulas lies in the fact that they may summarize the whole episode or only the closest context.⁴⁰ In this case it seems preferable to interpret τοῦτο as denoting

³⁸ Concerning this use of νομίζεται, see Heinimann 1972, 74–75, with parallels.

³⁹ Note however the similarity of ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ τοῦ ἔργου ... νενόμισται... καλέεσθαι in the second example to ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται; the correction of ὀνομάζεται to νομίζεται in Hdt. 6, 130 proposed by Heinrich Stein (see n. 1) may have been influenced by this parallel.

⁴⁰ For instance in Hdt. 4. 88 the boundary phrase ταῦτα μὲν νῦν τοῦ ζεύξαντος τὴν γέφυραν μνημόσυνα ἐγένετο refers not only to the inscription that has just been quoted but to the picture that had been described before. In Hdt. 1. 27 the phrase ἐόντων δὲ οἱ πάντων ἐτοίμων ἐς τὴν ναυπηγίην, οἱ μὲν Βίαντα λέγουσι τὸν Πριηνέα ἀπικόμενον ἐς Σάρδις, οἱ δὲ Πιττακὸν τὸν Μυτιληναῖον, εἰρομένου Κροίσου εἶ τι εἶη νεώτερον περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, εἰπόντα τάδε καταπαῦσαι τὴν ναυπηγίην... cannot refer to the speech it introduces. It is clear that εἰπόντα τάδε

Hippocleides' conduct in general rather than just his saucy retort, οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ. In the vast majority of phrases following direct speech in the *Histories* the demonstrative pronouns denoting the quoted words appear in the plural; thus, had the demonstrative following οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ referred to Hippocleides' words, we would have expected it to take the plural form as well (ταῦτα).

We hope to have shown that the traditional interpretation of the passage (that the phrase οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ circulated as a proverb in Herodotus' time) needs to be revised. Not only does it find little confirmation in later sources, but it runs counter to Herodotus' text. The most economic explanation of Herodotus' choice of the verb ὀνομάζεται in this passage seems to be that the capping sentence ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται refers to Hippocleides' conduct on the last evening in general, and not only to his retort. Herodotus' wording shows that οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ was not for him a παροιμία; it was probably a repartee that the historian himself had invented for this episode. On the other hand, ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται seems to indicate that Hippocleides' name came to be associated with a distinctive type of behavior among Athenians of the fifth century BC.⁴¹ This is not surprising, seeing that Hippocleides himself was undoubtedly well known;⁴² what

envelopes both of Bias' (Pittacus') speeches and, it may be argued, refers to the second one to an even greater degree.

⁴¹ Should one wish to reconstruct which type of phraseological unit Herodotus was referring to, there are two possibilities. First, there is a well attested type of expressions associating a proper name with a noun or a qualitative adjective, so that the person exemplifies the quality in question (Φρυγίχου πάλαισμα in Diog. 8. 29; Apost. 19. 39; Ἀγαθόνιος ἀύλησις in Zen. 1. 2; cf. Ἠλιθιώτερος τῆς Πραξιλλῆς: αὕτη γὰρ ἐρωτωμένη τί κάλλιστον, Ἥλιος, ἔφη, καὶ σῦκα. Ὀμοία τῆ, Ἀνοητότερος Ἰβύκου, καὶ Κοροΐβου, καὶ Μελιτίδου in Diog. 5. 12) or expressions of similar structure evoking a well-known mythological or historical episode (Ζωπύρου τάλαντα in Zen. 4. 9; Συλοσῶντος χλαμῦς in Diog. 5. 14; Γύγου δακτύλιος in Diog. 4. 99, to cite some examples related to Herodotus' *Histories*). By ἀπὸ τούτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται Herodotus may have been referring to an expression of this kind that was known to his Athenian audience, but later fell into desuetude (its form we can only conjecture at, but Ἴπποκλείδου γάμος and Ἴπποκλείδου ὄρχησις could be suggested as plausible guesses). The second possibility is that Hippocleides' name had in the fifth century become a fairly common designation for a conceited person or one capable of giving up his own advantage for a moment's whim. Whichever the case, the meaning of ὀνομάζεται must be much less precise than the translators and commentators usually assume.

⁴² Hippocleides' name is mentioned by Pherecydes (*FGrHist* 3 F 2) in connection with the institution of Panathenaic games (for a discussion see Lavelle 2014, 314–321). Pherecydes also tells us that Hippocleides was the father of Miltiades (the founder of

is perhaps even more important, he belonged to a prominent family that had once competed with the Alcmaeonidae. It is fairly easy to imagine that the story of Hippocleides' outrageous behavior would have made the rounds among the Athenians of the fifth century BC; but the anecdote could not have survived for long, had it not been perpetuated in a literary text. And accordingly, in later times, Herodotus' delightful novella became so famous that its "punchline" οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδη began to circulate as a *gefliigeltes Wort* in its own right – although there are serious reasons to doubt that it was entirely independent of its original context in the *Histories*.

As regards Herodotus' text, the established translation of ἀπὸ τοῦτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται, commonly found in editions and dictionaries, needs to be modified. It is not easy to render Herodotus' idea into modern languages without using the word "proverb" or its analogues; but if the translation "[Hippocleides' conduct] became proverbial" quite adequately transmits the sense of the phrase, the translation "hence the proverb" should best be avoided. This reinterpretation of the passage and of the saying's status in Herodotus' text places οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδη among other examples of Herodotean borrowings in later literature and paroemiography (such as τοῦτο τὸ ὑπόδημα ἔρραψας μὲν σύ, ὑπεδήσατο δὲ Ἀρισταγόρης or ἡ ἀπὸ Σκυθέων ῥήσις⁴³) which testify to the continuing popularity of the *Histories* in ancient times.⁴⁴

Maria Kazanskaya

*Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
St Petersburg*

subura@mail.ru

the Athenian colony of Chersonese). R. Thomas has noted that the genealogy given by Pherecydes is limited to the illustrious members of the Philaid family and the fact that Hippocleides is included in the list shows that the family was not ashamed of him (Thomas 1989, 168–169).

⁴³ τοῦτο τὸ ὑπόδημα ἔρραψας μὲν σύ, ὑπεδήσατο δὲ Ἀρισταγόρης (Hdt. 6. 1) is quoted by paroemiographers Apostolius (16. 81) and Diogenianus (8. 49), and used by Libanius: καὶ τὸ ὑπόδημα ἄλλος μὲν ἔρραψεν, ἄλλος δὲ ὑπεδήσατο (Liban. *Epist.* 52. 2). On ἡ ἀπὸ Σκυθέων ῥήσις see n. 22.

⁴⁴ This paper was first presented before the Department of Classical Philology of St Petersburg State University. I am grateful to my colleagues for their suggestions. I would also like to thank Professor Alexander Verlinsky for the care with which he read this article. His generous comments and helpful advice have helped me to improve the earlier draft. Any flaws that remain are of course entirely mine.

Bibliography

- K. Abicht (ed., comm.), *Herodotos erklärt für den Schulgebrauch* III (Leipzig 1883).
- J. Chr. F. Bähr (ed., comm.), *Herodoti Musae* III (Berlin 1834).
- A. Bailly, *Dictionnaire grec – français*, rédigé avec le concours de É. Egger (Paris 1963).
- Th. Bergk (ed.), *Anacreontis Carminum Reliquiae* (Lipsiae 1834).
- L. Bieler, “Die Namen Sprichworts in der klassischen Sprachen”, *RhM* 85 (1936) 240–253.
- A. B. Cook, “Hippokleides’ Dance”, *CR* 21 (1907) 169–170.
- H. N. Couch, “A Prelude to Speech in Homer”, *TAPhA* 68 (1937) 129–140.
- H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Berlin 1950).
- A. D. Godley (ed., tr.), *Herodotus with an English translation* III (London 1922).
- G. Grote, *A History of Greece* ⁵II (London 1888).
- S. Halliwell (ed., comm.), *Plato: Republic 10* (Warminster 1988).
- F. Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis: Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt 1972).
- P. Hohti, *The Interrelation of Speech and Action in the Histories of Herodotus* (Helsingfors 1976).
- S. Hornblower, “Herodotus’ Influence in Antiquity”, in: C. Dewald, J. Marincola (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge 2006) 306–318.
- W. W. How, J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* II (Oxford 1912).
- H. Jacobsohn, “Zum homerischen ἔπος τῷ ἔφατ’ ἔκ τῷ ὀνόμαζε”, *ZVS* 62 (1934) 132–140.
- R. Kassel, C. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci* V (Berolini–Novi Eboraci 1986).
- J. F. Kindstrand, “The Greek Concept of Proverbs”, *Eranos* 76 (1978) 71–85.
- G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary* I (Cambridge 1985).
- K. Latte (ed.) *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* II (Hauniae 1966).
- B. M. Lavelle, “Hippocleides, the ‘Dance’, and the Panathenaia”, *GRBS* 54 (2014) 313–341.
- Ph.-E. Legrand (ed., tr.), *Hérodote, Histoires* VI (Paris 1948).
- E. L. Leutsch, F. G. Schneidewin (eds.), *Corpus paroemiographorum graecorum* I–II (Gottingae 1839–1851).
- R. W. Macan (ed., comm.), *Herodotus, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books* I (London–New York 1895).
- L. Milletti, “‘Ippoclide non se ne cura!’ Erodoto storico delle forme brevi”, in: E. Lelli (ed.), ΠΑΡΟΙΜΙΑΚΩΣ: *il proverbio in Grecia e a Roma* I (Pisa–Roma 2010) 137–144.
- C. W. Müller, *Legende – Novelle – Sage: dreizehn Kapitel zur erzählenden Prosaliteratur der Antike* (Göttingen 2006).
- G. Nenci (ed., tr., comm.), *Erodoto, Le Storie. Libro VI: la battaglia di Maratona* (Milano 1998).
- H.-G. Nesselrath, “Hermippos”, *DNP* 5 (1998) 438–439.

- J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Hildesheim 1937).
- J. Russo, “Prose Genres for the Performance of Traditional Wisdom in Ancient Greece: Proverb, Maxim, Apothegm”, in: L. Edmunds, R. W. Wallace (eds.), *Poet, Public and Performance in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore–London 1997) 49–64.
- W. G. Rutherford (ed.), *The New Phrynichus, Being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus with Introduction and Commentary* (London 1881).
- K. Scherling, “Staphylos 3”, *RE* 3A (1929) 2149.
- E. Schwyzer, A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik* II (München 1950).
- H. Stein (ed., comm.), *Herodotos* II⁴ (Berlin 1882).
- H. Swoboda, “Hippokleides 1”, *RE* 8 (1913) 1772–1773.
- R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1989).
- R. Tosi, “Introduzione”, in: E. Lelli (ed.), ΠΑΡΟΙΜΙΑΚΩΣ: *il proverbio in Grecia e a Roma* I (Pisa–Roma 2010) 13–29.
- J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916).
- J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, I. Reihe (Basel 1924).
- L. Woodbury, “Gold Hair and Grey, or the Game of Love: Anacreon fr. 13:358 PMG, 13 Gentili”, *TAPhA* 109 (1979) 277–287.

This article analyzes the status of Hippocleides’ famous retort “οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ” (Hdt. 6. 129. 4); in Herodotus’ text it is followed by the remark ἀπὸ τοῦτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται (Hdt. 6. 130. 1) which is usually understood to mean “hence the proverb”. But Herodotus’ choice of words raises a problem, as the verb ὀνομάζεσθαι was not normally used to denote popular sayings. This calls for a re-examination of the evidence that could then permit us to determine whether for the historian “οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ” was a proverb or not.

The analysis of attested references to οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ in late antiquity shows that in the absolute majority of cases it is used in reference to the Herodotean context; nor does the scholarly paroemiographic tradition yield conclusive evidence. A close study of the original passage (Hdt. 6. 129–130) suggests that the exact wording of the dancing suitor’s answer, οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ, was actually invented by Herodotus (to become in later times a *geflügeltes Wort*) but that the anecdote of his unseemly behavior was well known in Herodotus’ times so that Hippocleides’ *name* had become “proverbial” (ὀνομάζεται).

Статья посвящена знаменитой реплике Гиппоклида “οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ” (Hdt. VI, 129, 4) и степени ее фразеологичности. В тексте Геродота за этими словами следует авторское пояснение, ἀπὸ τοῦτου μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται (Hdt. VI, 130, 1), относящееся, по мнению издателей, к реплике, и которое

обычно переводится: “отсюда пошла поговорка”. Однако данная интерпретация плохо согласуется с выбором слов, поскольку глагол ὀνομάζεσθαι не используется применительно к фразеологическим выражениям. В связи с этим предпринимается попытка разобрать свидетельства того, было ли выражение οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ расхожим выражением уже во времена Геродота или стало таковым позже.

Анализ упоминаний οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ в произведениях поздней античности показывает, что подавляющее большинство отсылает к геродотовскому рассказу; также и свидетельства паремнографов и лексикографов не позволяют решить вопрос о статусе οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ в “Истории”. Подробный анализ исходного пассажа (Hdt. VI, 129–130) позволяет предположить, что сама реплика οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ была изобретена историком *ad hoc* и лишь позже стала крылатым выражением, однако анекдот о недостойном поведении Гиппоклида был хорошо известен во времена Геродота, так что *имя* незадачливого жениха стало именем нарицательным (ὀνομάζεται).