

1. Introduction

Polemon of Ilium was a Hellenistic scholar active in the first half of the II century BCE and is known especially for his periegetical works. One of his lost works was *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* (Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον καὶ Ἀντίγονον), which consisted of at least six books. The title shows that it was a polemic against the writers Antigonus and Adaeus. Antigonus is in all likelihood Antigonus of Carystus, the third-century BCE biographer and art historian¹. Antigonus is known especially for his biographies of philosophers (known to us largely through Philodemus and Diogenes Laertius)², but Pliny the Elder informs us that he also wrote *de toreutice*³ (i.e. on the art of metal engravings), *de pictura*⁴ (i.e. on painting) and *de sua arte*⁵ (which probably refers to Antigonus' activity as a sculptor). Indeed, Pliny says in book 34 that Antigonus was one of the artists that represented the battle of Attalus I against the Galatians.⁶ Antigonus further wrote a work *On Animals* (Περὶ ζώων)⁷ and *On Diction* (Περὶ λέξεως)⁸.

Adaeus is a much more obscure name. He should probably be identified with Adaeus of Mitylene, who wrote a work *On Sculptors* (Περὶ ἀγαλματοποιῶν)⁹ and a work Περὶ διαθέσεως¹⁰. The word διάθεσις in the latter title means disposition or composition. It could refer to rules of composition (so a theoretical work on art), the subject (so a description of the content of artworks)¹¹ or the arrangement (so a description of the distribution and arrangement of the people and the objects portrayed in artworks)¹². Adaeus' dates are unknown. According to Susemihl, he wrote before Antigonus, since Polemon put his name first in the title of his work, viz. Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον καὶ Ἀντίγονον¹³. However, such a conclusion cannot be drawn from the mere title. In fact, Polemon's title is attested three times with the reversed order (i.e. Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον καὶ Ἀδαῖον)¹⁴.

The only complete collection of the fragments of Polemon was made by Preller¹⁵, which Müller excerpted largely without changes in the third volume of his *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*¹⁶. In this paper, I will present and discuss the fourteen fragments collected by Preller under the title Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον καὶ Ἀντίγονον, to which I will add two new fragments, which were not yet found in Preller's edition (§3.2 and §3.4). After reviewing these fragments, I will then discuss the reconstruction of Polemon's work.

¹ On Antigonus, see especially DORANDI 1999. On Antigonus as an artist and art historian, see DORANDI 2019.

² Antig. fr. 1-41 Dorandi. The identification of the biographer with the art historian used to be debated. However, *pace* ONASCH 2001 and KANSTEINER 2014a, p. 683, it can be accepted as more or less certain thanks to the studies of Dorandi. In his biography of the Academic philosopher Polemon, for instance, Antigonus of Carystus (fr. 9b Dorandi = D.L. 4, 18) appears to have cited the judgment found in Melanthius' work *On the Art of Painting* (Περὶ ζωγραφικῆς) that works of art should have a certain stubbornness and austerity, which was also seen in the Academic Polemon's character.

³ Plin. *HN*33 index + 34 index = Antig. fr. 42 Dorandi.

⁴ Plin. *HN*35, 68 = Antig. fr. 44 Dorandi (*DNO* 3471).

⁵ Plin. *HN*34, 84 = Antig. fr. 43 Dorandi (*DNO* 3470).

⁶ Plin. *HN*34, 84 = Antig. fr. 43 Dorandi (*DNO* 3470).

⁷ Antig. fr. 50-4 Dorandi.

⁸ Antig. fr. 55-6 Dorandi.

⁹ See Ath. 13, 606a.

¹⁰ See Ath. 11, 471f.

¹¹ So PRELLER 1838, pp. 101; 193.

¹² So K. MÜLLER 1841-1851, III, p. 132; SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 518 n. 19; VON CHRIST 1920, p. 236.

¹³ SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 518 with n. 17. So also DEICHGRÄBER 1952, p. 1304; HANSEN 1971, p. 401.

¹⁴ See fr. 59, fr. 62 Preller and *P.Oxy.* XVIII 2176 fr. 1 col. 1, 6-7.

¹⁵ PRELLER 1838.

¹⁶ K. MÜLLER 1841-1851, III, pp. 108-48.

2. Fragments on specific artists and artworks

Nearly all fragments of Polemon's work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* are found in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*. I will start with the fragments that have the most straightforward connection with Antigonus and Adaeus, viz. those that comment on specific artists or artworks.

2.1. Fr. 58 on Sillax of Rhegium's painting in the polemarch's stoa in Phlius

A first fragment is fr. 58, which is found in Athenaeus' book 5.

Ath. 5, 210a-b = fr. 58 Preller (*DNO* 713)¹⁷:

ἐν τούτοις ὁ Λυσίας εἰπὼν ὅτι καὶ χαλκῆ ἦν ἡ ἐγγυθήκη, σαφῶς παρίστησιν, ὡς καὶ ὁ Καλλιζεινὸς εἴρηκε, λεβήτων αὐτὰς ὑπόθηματα εἶναι. οὕτως γὰρ καὶ Πολέμων ὁ περιηγητὴς εἶπεν ἐν γ' τῶν Πρὸς Ἀδαίου καὶ Ἀντίγονον ἐξηγούμενος διάθεσιν ἐν Φλιοῦντι κατὰ τὴν πολεμάρχειον στοᾶν γεγραμμένην ὑπὸ Σίλλακος τοῦ Ῥηγίνου, οὗ μνημονεύουσιν Ἐπίχαρμος καὶ Σιμωνίδης, λέγων οὕτως: «ἐγγυθήκη καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς κύπελλον».

When Lysias¹⁸ says in these passages that the *engytheke* is also made of bronze, he clearly shows, as Callixinus (*FGrHist* 627 F2ba)¹⁹ has also said, that they are support stands for cauldrons. So Polemon the Periegete also said in the third book *Against Adaeus and Antigonus*, when explaining the subject painted in the polemarch's stoa in Phlius by Sillax of Rhegium, who is mentioned by Epicharmus (fr. 160 K.-A.) and Simonides (fr. 129 Page, *PMG* 634 = fr. 327 Poltera); he speaks as follows: «an *engytheke* and a goblet on top of it».

Athenaeus quotes Polemon verbatim for an attestation of the object called ἐγγυθήκη, which is identified as a stand for cauldrons (λεβήτων ὑπόθημα)²⁰. In this fragment, Polemon is said to have explained the composition/subject (διάθεσις) of a painting made by the otherwise unknown painter Sillax in the polemarch's stoa of Phlius. As part of his description, Polemon mentioned an *engytheke* with a goblet (κύπελλον) on top. Athenaeus also adds that the painter Sillax was mentioned by Epicharmus and Simonides; these references are probably derived from Polemon as well²¹. Note that Athenaeus uses the word διάθεσις here to refer to the content of the painting, which might recall the title of Adaeus' work Περὶ διαθέσεως²².

According to Zecchini, Athenaeus' direct source for the quotation from Polemon might be Hegesander²³, whom he mentions immediately after this²⁴. However, Athenaeus cites Hegesander's work as ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ ὑπομνήματι ἀνδριάντων καὶ ἀγαλμάτων, thus indicating that Hegesander commented on statues. Polemon, in contrast, is talking about a painting, which makes it less likely that the fragment of Polemon in Athenaeus is derived from Hegesander.

2.2. Fr. 60 on a work portraying Dionysus

Fr. 60 is found in the eleventh book of the *Deipnosophists*, which consists of a catalogue of various words for cups with their attestations in literature. One such word is the κώθων, the

¹⁷ The text is that of KAIBEL 1887-1890, I, p. 465.

¹⁸ Athenaeus is referring to Lysias' speech Περὶ ἐγγυθήκης, which he quoted in the preceding section (Ath. 5, 209f-10a = Lys. fr. 101a Carey = fr. 34 Medda).

¹⁹ Callixinus of Rhodes mentioned cauldrons standing on *engythenkai* (λέβητες [...] ἐπ' ἐγγυθήκαις) in the fourth book of his work *On Alexandria* (Περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας), when he describes the grand procession in Alexandria held by Ptolemy II Philadelphus at the Ptolemaia festival. Earlier in the fifth book, Athenaeus has quoted this description at length (Ath. 5, 196a-203b = *FGrHist* 627 F2); the *engythenkai* are mentioned in Ath. 5, 199c.

²⁰ On the *engytheke*, see also MAU 1894; POTTIER 1900; ARENA 1978; Gulletta in GULLETTA–RADICI COLACE 1992, pp. 64-6; RADICI COLACE–MONDIO 2005, pp. 17-21.

²¹ See BENCKER 1890, p. 18; DEICHGRÄBER 1952, p. 1305.

²² See BENCKER 1890, p. 16.

²³ ZECCHINI 1989, p. 230.

²⁴ Ath. 5, 210b = Hegesander, *FHG* III, 421 fr. 45.

Spartan drinking cup²⁵, and one of the attestation of this word is found in Polemon's fifth book *Against Adaeus and Antigonus*.

Ath. 11, 484b = fr. 60 Preller²⁶:

Πολέμων δ' ἐν πέμπτῳ τῶν Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον καὶ Ἀντίγονόν φησι· «Διόνυσος τέλειος καθήμενος ἐπὶ πέτρας· ἔξ εὐωνύμων δ' αὐτοῦ σάτυρος φαλακρός, ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ κώθωνα μόνωτον ῥαβδωτὸν κρατῶν».

Polemon in the fifth book *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* says: «Dionysus as an adult man²⁷, sitting on a rock: to the left of him a bald satyr, holding a ribbed *kothon* with one ear in his right hand».

Athenaeus again gives a verbatim quotation, which contains a description of an artwork, displaying the adult Dionysus sitting on a rock with to the left a satyr, who is holding a *kothon*. Contrary to the previous fragment, however, it is not clear whether this is a description of a sculpture²⁸ or a painting²⁹. According to Deichgräber, the description of the satyr is taken from a comedy³⁰, but this hypothesis is extremely speculative.

²⁵ On the *kothon*, see also USSLING 1844, pp. 54-5; KRAUSE 1854, pp. 376-9; POTTIER 1887; LEONARD 1922; KIRSTEN 1957; MINGAZZINI 1967; LAZZARINI 1973, pp. 365-9.

²⁶ The text is that of OLSON 2020, p. 309, except that I write τέλειος without a capital letter (see n. 27 below).

²⁷ This is probably how the adjective τέλειος should be translated here, since Dionysus was also often portrayed as a baby or child (cf. LIMC s.v. Dionysos no. 669-717). So LEFEBVRE DE VILLEBRUNNE 1789, p. 298 («Bacchus étoit représenté d'un âge fait»); SCHWEIGHÄUSER 1801-1805, IV, p. 294 («Bacchus adultus»); K. MÜLLER 1841-1851, III, p. 133 («Bacchus adultus»); YONGE 1854, II, p. 772 («Bacchus being full grown»); R. CHERUBINA in CANFORA 2001, II, p. 1197 («Dioniso adulto»); RODRÍGUEZ-NORIEGA GUILLÉN 1998-2014, V, p. 117 («un Dioniso adulto»); cf. also PRELLER 1838, p. 103 («Διόνυσος τέλειος est iuvenis adultus»). GULICK 1927-1941, V, p. 149 with n. b and OLSON 2006-2012, V, p. 353, however, translated «Dionysus Perfecter» and «Dionysus Teleios», respectively, thus interpreting the adjective τέλειος as an epithet, which is often given to gods (cf. LSJ s.v. τέλειος II). This is also why OLSON 2020, p. 309 writes Τέλειος with a capital letter. Now it is true that, in other fragments, too, Polemon often includes the epithets of gods: see fr. 39 Preller = Ath. 10, 416b + Ath. 3, 109a-b (from *Against Timaeus*) on a statue for Demeter of the Grain (Σιτοῦς Δήμητρος ἀγαλμα) and for Demeter the Abundant (Ἰμαλίδος [sc. Δήμητρος]) in Syracuse as well as statues for Demeter of the Great Bread and of the Great Barley-Cake (Μεγαλάρτου καὶ Μεγαλομάζου <Δήμητρος> ἀγάλματα) at Scolus; fr. 74 Preller (Tresp 168) = Ath. 3, 109a (from his *Letter to Diophilus on the Morychus*) on the same cult for Demeter of the Grain and the Abundant (ὑπὸ τῆς Σιτοῦς καλουμένης Δήμητρος καὶ Ἰμαλίδος) in Syracuse + Clem. Al. *Protr.* 4, 47, 7 on a statue for Dionysus the Smearer (Μορύχου τοῦ Διονύσου τοῦ ἀγάλμα) in Athens; fr. 42 Preller = schol. Soph. *OC* 100 de Marco + Suid. v 356, s.v. Νηφάλιος θυσία (from *Against Timaeus*) on sacrifices among others for Aphrodite the Heavenly (Ἀφροδίτη Οὐρανία) in Athens; fr. 44 Preller = Ath. 13, 589b-c (from *Against Timaeus*) on the precinct for Aphrodite the Unholy (τὸ τέμενος κληθῆναι Ἀνοσίας Ἀφροδίτης) in Thessaly; fr. 70 Preller (Tresp 170) = Ath. 7, 346b (from his *Letter to Attalus*) on Apollo the Gourmet (ὀψόφαγον Ἀπόλλωνα) being worshipped in Elis; fr. 71 Preller (Tresp 171) = Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2, 38, 4 on a statue for Apollo the Yawning (κεκνηνόςτος Ἀπόλλωνος [...] ἀγάλμα) and for Apollo the Gourmet (ὀψοφάγου [sc. Ἀπόλλωνος]) in Elis; fr. 72 Preller (Tresp 172) = Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2, 39, 3 + schol. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 29, 10 p. 308 Stählin-Treu (from his *Letter to Attalus*) on Dionysus the Toucher of Genitalia (χοιροφάλας Διόνυσος) being worshipped in Sicyon; fr. 86 Preller (Tresp 100) = Ath. 4, 139b (from *On the Kannathron in Xenophon*) on a temple for Artemis the Crowned (τὴν Κορυθαλίαν καλουμένην Ἄρτεμιν); cf. also fr. 12 Preller = schol. Aristid. *Or.* 1 (Pan.) Jebb 188, 12 Dindorf on a sanctuary for the Libyan Demeter (Δήμητρος Λιβύσσης ἱερὸν) in Argos, but this fragment is probably taken from the *Helladicus*, whose authenticity is debated. All these examples involve local epithets, however, which are far more distinctive than the generic τέλειος. Finally, MINGAZZINI 1967, p. 359 translated the phrase as «Un Dioniso perfetto».

²⁸ So ANGELUCCI 2003, p. 178 n. 60; DORANDI 2019, p. 144.

²⁹ So PRELLER 1838, pp. 97; 103; BENCKER 1890, pp. 9; 18; DEICHGRÄBER 1952, p. 1305; MINGAZZINI 1967, p. 359; HANSEN 1971, p. 401; R. CHERUBINA in CANFORA 2001, II, p. 1197 n. 6. This is contradicted by the inclusion of fr. 60 among the fragments on the history of sculpture in PRELLER 1838, p. 98. However, as BENCKER 1890, p. 17 n. 2 pointed out, «fr. 60» might be a writing error. Indeed, Preller mentions it together with «fr. 59», which does not refer to any painting/painter or statue/sculptor at all. So instead of «frgm. LIX. LX», Preller probably intended to write «frgm. LXVIII. LXIX».

³⁰ DEICHGRÄBER 1952, p. 1305. For this reason, he conjectured restoring the text as ἔξ εὐωνύμων / αὐτοῦ Σάτυρος <τις> φαλακρός ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ / κώθωνα μόνωτον ῥαβδωτὸν κρατῶν ~ - (or ~ - κρατῶν).

2.3. Fr. 61 on the *kothon* cup

Polemon is also mentioned at the beginning of Athenaeus' discussion of the *kóthōn* cup (fr. 61).

Ath. 11, 483b-c = fr. 61 Preller³¹:

καὶ Πολέμων δ' ἐν τῇ <...> τῶν Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον καὶ Ἀντίγονον, ὅτι κεραμεοῖς ἀγγείοις ἐχρῶντο οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, γράφει οὕτως: «ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅτι ἀρχαϊκὸν ἦν τὸ τοιοῦτο τῆς ἀγωγῆς γένος <...>³² ὃ καὶ νῦν δρᾶται³³ παρά τισι τῶν Ἑλλήνων· ἐν Ἄργει μὲν ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις θοίμαις, ἐν Λακεδαίμονι δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐορτὰς ἔν τε τοῖς ἐπινικίοις καὶ τοῖς γάμοις τῶν παρθένων πίνουσιν ἐκ κεραμέων ποτηρίων· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις συμποσίοις καὶ φιδιτίοις ἐν πιθάκναις <...>³⁴»

Polemon in the <...> book *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* also writes that the Spartans used ceramic vessels as follows: «Indeed, that this type of lifestyle was ancient <...> which now too is done by some of the Greeks. In Argos at public feasts and in Sparta at festivals as well as at victory celebrations and weddings of girls, they drink out of ceramic cups. And at the other symposia and public meals, <...> in casks.»

In this fragment, the book number seems to have fallen out, since the transmitted text reads Πολέμων δ' ἐν τῇ <...> τῶν Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον καὶ Ἀντίγονον. The previous fragment (fr. 60 Preller) suggests that this should be the fifth book (ἐν τῇ <ε>)³⁵. Athenaeus quotes Polemon verbatim for the information that the *kothon* was a ceramic cup. The verbatim quotation also contains the information that ceramic cups were used at the public feasts in Argos and at festivals, victory

³¹ The text is that of OLSON 2020, p. 307, except that I do not adopt Olson's conjecture ἐν τρίτῳ τῶν (i.e. ἐν γ' τῶν) for ἐν τῇ τῶν, and I assume a lacuna between γένος and ὃ καὶ (see n. 32 below). I also punctuate before ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις συμποσίοις and assume a lacuna after ἐν πιθάκναις (see n. 34 below).

³² There appears to be a lacuna in which a certain ceremony was described, where the *kothon* was used. See DINDORF 1827, II, p. 1083; PRELLER 1838, p. 104; KAIBEL 1887-1890, III, p. 64; GULICK 1927-1941, V, p. 144; R. CHERUBINA in CANFORA 2001, II, p. 1195 with n. 7; L. CITELLI in CANFORA 2001, IV, p. 536. SCHWEIGHÄUSER 1801-1805, IV, p. 291, MEINEKE 1858-1867, II, p. 383, RODRÍGUEZ-NORIEGA GUILLÉN 1998-2014, V, p. 114 and OLSON 2006-2012, V, p. 348; 2020, p. 307, in contrast, assumed no lacuna.

³³ MEINEKE 1858-1867, II, p. 383; IV, p. 225 and Wilamowitz ap. KAIBEL 1887-1890, III, p. 64 corrected δρᾶται to ὄρᾶται, a conjecture that Kaibel endorsed in his apparatus. So also GULICK 1927-1941, V, p. 144; L. CITELLI in CANFORA 2001, IV, p. 536.

³⁴ SCHWEIGHÄUSER 1801-1805, IV, p. 291, DINDORF 1827, II, p. 1083, MEINEKE 1858-1867, II, p. 383 and OLSON 2020, p. 307 left the text unchanged, probably assuming an implied πίνουσιν (Schweighäuser translated «in aliis vero conviviis, & in phiditiis, doliolis utuntur»). So also LEFEBVRE DE VILLEBRUNE 1789, p. 295, who translated: «mais aux autres festins, ou aux phédities, on boit dans des *pitaknes*»; and MINGAZZINI 1967, p. 359, who translated: «ma negli altri banchetti e nei banchetti collettivi spartani bevono anche nei pithakni (specie di barilotto)». Since πίνω is most commonly combined with ἐκ + genitive to express the vessel from which a person drinks, however, PRELLER 1838, p. 104 corrected the text to ἐκ πιθακνῶν. Preller also assumed a contrast with the previous sentence and therefore concluded that the *pithakne* was a cup in the shape of a jar (*pithos*) and that it was made of wood (to contrast with κεραμέων ποτηρίων). So also R. CHERUBINA in CANFORA 2001, II, p. 1195 n. 8. However, the *pithakne* is not attested anywhere else as a type of cup or as made of wood. Indeed, a *pithakne* seems to have been a variant of the *pithos*, which was a ceramic jar used for storing among other things wine, oil, figs and grain. See USSLING 1844, pp. 33-4; KRAUSE 1854, pp. 238-40; KANOWSKI 1984, p. 151. Moreover, at the public meals (*phiditia*), the Spartans used the *kothon*: see Dicaearch. fr. 72 Wehrli² = fr. 87 Mirhady = *FGrHist* 1400 F23 = Ath. 4, 141b. Therefore, KAIBEL 1887-1890, III, p. 64 was probably right to assume a lacuna after ἐν πιθάκναις, in which another activity than drinking was described. See also RODRÍGUEZ-NORIEGA GUILLÉN 1998-2014, V, p. 115; OLSON 2006-2012, p. 348; Wilamowitz suggested supplementing ἐκεράννυον to Kaibel. So also L. CITELLI in CANFORA 2001, IV, p. 536. Cf. the translation of GULICK 1927-1941, V, p. 145: «but in the case of the symposia and at the public mess (the wine is mingled) in casks...»; and the translation of R. CHERUBINA in CANFORA 2001, II, p. 1195: «ma negli altri simposi e nei pasti comuni mescolavano il vino in barilotti». What Polemon probably wrote was not a contrast with the previous sentence but a further example of the «archaic» use of earthenware vessels. An allusion to the use of ceramic mixing bowls by the Spartans might be found in Eratosth. V fr. 14 p. 201 Bernhardt = Ath. 11, 482a-b (from the *Letter to the Spartan Agetor* [Πρὸς Ἀγήτορα τὸν Λάκωνα ἐπιστολή]).

³⁵ See ZECCHINI 1989, p. 228 with n. 103.

celebrations and weddings in Sparta. This is typical antiquarian information that Polemon also likes reporting in his other works. Polemon probably included this information as a digression in his description of the Dionysus painting or statue. Alternatively, if we assume that Polemon discussed the *kothon* in more than one part of his work, we could consider supplementing ἐν τῇ <η> «in the eighth book», which would have the advantage that the error is paleographically more intelligible (viz. arisen through haplography)³⁶. Olson, finally, conjectured ἐν τρίτῳ, with ENTH as an error for ENI³⁷.

2.4. Fr. 63 on the painter Hippeus

Another fragment found in book 11 of Athenaeus is fr. 63, which describes a painting by Hippeus in Athens portraying the wedding of Peirithous.

Ath. 11,474c-d = fr. 63 Preller (*DNO* 2834)³⁸:

Πολέμων δ' ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον περὶ ζωγράφων φησὶν· «Ἀθήνησιν ἐν τῷ τοῦ Πειρίθου γάμῳ πεποίηκεν Ἴππεύς³⁹ τὴν μὲν οἰνοχόην καὶ τὸ κύπελλον λίθινα χρυσῷ τὰ χεῖλη περιτεταμνίσας, τὰς δὲ κλισίας ἐλατίνια χαμάζε ποικίλοις στρώμασι κεκοσμημένας, <τὰ> ἐκπώματα δὲ κεραμέους κανθάρους, καὶ τὸν λύχνον ὁμοίως <τὸν> ἐκ τῆς ὀροφῆς ἐξηρητημένον ἀνακεχυμένας ἔχοντα τὰς φλόγας».

Polemon in the books *Against Antigonus* on painters says: «In Athens, in the Wedding of Peirithous, Hippeus has represented the wine-pitcher and the goblet as made of stone, covering the rim with gold; the couches as made of fir-limbs laid on the ground, decorated with colorful drapings; and <the> drinking vessels as ceramic *kantharoi*; and in the same way the lamp, suspended from the ceiling, with its flames spreading out».

An interesting detail is that Athenaeus quotes Polemon's work as Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον περὶ ζωγράφων, so without the reference to Adaeus and with the addition of the topic of painting. Polemon is again quoted (this time without a specific book number) for an attestation of a cup word, this time the *κάνθαρος*⁴⁰. According to Preller, however, Polemon is describing a statue and not a painting⁴¹. For this reason, he claimed that Polemon did not discuss the painter Hippeus/Hippys (known from Pliny's book 35⁴²) but the sculptor Hippias (known from Pausanias⁴³). However, this is highly unlikely. Not only does this ignore Athenaeus' addition of περὶ ζωγράφων⁴⁴; it also makes no sense with regard to the description of the lamp, which, in a statue, has no ceiling to hang from and no flames projecting from it⁴⁵.

³⁶ SCHWEIGHÄUSER 1801-1807, VI, p. 185 confusingly wrote: «Fortasse ἐν τῇ Η'. scriptum fuerat olim, id est quinto libro, ut pag. seq. b» (my emphasis).

³⁷ OLSON 2020, p. 307.

³⁸ The text is that of OLSON 2020, p. 289.

³⁹ MEINEKE 1858-1867, II, p. 366; IV, p. 218 and KAIBEL 1887-1890, III, p. 42 corrected Ἴππεύς to Ἴππυς, a conjecture proposed in the apparatus of DINDORF 1827, II, p. 1062 on the basis of Pliny. Note, however, that in Pliny, too, *Hippys* is a conjecture (see n. 42).

⁴⁰ On the *kantharos*, see USSLING 1844, pp. 134-7; KRAUSE 1854, pp. 313-9; FRANKENSTEIN 1924; RICHTER–MILNE 1935, pp. 25-6; KANOWSKI 1984, pp. 48-51.

⁴¹ PRELLER 1838, pp. 105-6. This contradicts the inclusion of fr. 63 among descriptions of paintings in PRELLER 1838, p. 97.

⁴² Plin. *HN* 35, 141. The manuscripts of Pliny transmit the name as *hyppis*, *hyppus*, *hypis* or *iphis*. Most editors have corrected this with Keil to *Hippys*: see SILLIG 1851, p. 264; DETLEFSEN 1873, p. 138; JAN–MAYHOFF 1897, p. 281; RACKHAM 1952, p. 364; CROISILLE 1985, p. 96. On Hippeus/Hippys, see also LIPPOLD 1913a; VOLLKOMMER 2001a; KANSTEINER 2014b.

⁴³ Paus. 6, 13, 5. On the sculptor Hippias, see also LIPPOLD 1913b; VOLLKOMMER 2001b; SEIDENSTICKER 2014.

⁴⁴ PASQUALI 1913, p. 181 n. 1 considered τὰ πρὸς Ἀντίγονον περὶ ζωγράφων the title of a section of Polemon's work. According to BENCKER 1890, p. 16, however, it is an addition by Athenaeus, based on the work that was attacked by Polemon.

⁴⁵ See also JAHN 1840, p. 596; K. MÜLLER 1841-1851, III, p. 134; BENCKER 1890, p. 17; DEICHGRÄBER 1952, p. 1306.

So in all likelihood, Polemon is describing a painting. He seems to have been impressed by the attention to detail displayed by Hippeus and his depiction of the light effects. In particular, he focuses on the use of colors to show what type of material the depicted objects are supposed to be made of: the wine-pitcher and goblet are supposed to be made of stone, the couches of fir-limbs, and the drinking cups of clay. According to Wickhoff, Hippeus/Hippys was the first to apply this type of realism in painting, and that is why Polemon comments on it so extensively⁴⁶. Klein expanded this argument and stated that Polemon disagreed with Antigonos regarding the artist that introduced this innovation⁴⁷. It is impossible, however, to prove that Polemon's polemic revolved around this *πρῶτος εὐρετής* question or even that Polemon is replying to Antigonos rather than Adaeus here. Although Athenaeus cites the work as *Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον*, it is possible that this is simply intended as a shorter version of the title (see also § 3.2 below).

3. *Fragments on other topics*

Thus far, I have looked at fragments that had a clear connection with an artist or artwork. I now turn to the fragments where this connection is less obvious.

3.1. *Fr. 56 on the Cylicranes*

The first is fr. 56, which is again taken from the eleventh book of Athenaeus and deals with the so-called Cylicranes.

Ath. 11, 462a = fr. 56 Preller⁴⁸:

Πολέμων δ' ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Πρὸς Ἀδαίων καὶ Ἀντίγονόν φησιν οὕτως· «τῆς δ' Ἡρακλείας τῆς ὑπὸ τὴν Οἴτην καὶ Τραχῖνος τῶν οἰκητόρων μεθ' Ἡρακλέους τινὲς ἀφικόμενοι ἐκ Λυδίας Κυλικρᾶνες, οἱ δ' Ἀθαμᾶνες⁴⁹, ἀφ' ὧν οἱ τόποι διαμένουσιν <...>⁵⁰. οἷς οὐδὲ τῆς πολιτείας μετέδοσαν <οἱ> Ἡρακλεῶται συνοικοῦσιν ἄλλοφύλους ὑπολαβόντες. Κυλικρᾶνες δὲ λέγονται ὅτι τοὺς ὄμους κεχαραγμένοι κύλικας ἦσαν».

⁴⁶ WICKHOFF 1895, p. 52; 1900, pp. 92-3. *Contra* FURTWÄNGLER–HAUSER–REICHHOLD 1932, p. 55 n. 29.

⁴⁷ KLEIN 1907, pp. 4-5.

⁴⁸ The text is that of OLSON 2020, p. 254, except that I write οὕτως, as the manuscript (Marcianus gr. 447 [A] fol. 211v) reads, not οὕτω. Contrary to Olson, I also indicate a lacuna after διαμένουσιν.

⁴⁹ In his apparatus, KAIBEL 1887-1890, III, p. 6 considered changing Ἀθαμᾶνες to Ἀθαμᾶνας, so that the meaning is either «others (call) them (i.e. the people that came from Lydia together with Heracles) Athamanes» (i.e. instead of Cylicranes) or «others (say that) they (sc. the Cylicranes) are Athamanes» (i.e. not Lydians). See also ASHERI 1975, p. 39.

⁵⁰ DINDORF 1827, II, p. 1025, L. CITELLI in CANFORA 2001, IV, p. 507 and OLSON 2020, p. 254 left the text unchanged. This is also implied in the translations of LEFEBVRE DE VILLEBRUNNE 1789, p. 190, YONGE 1854, II, p. 729, DEICHGRÄBER 1952, p. 1304 and RODRÍGUEZ-NORIEGA GUILLÉN 1998-2014, V, p. 21. Yonge translated «some of whose towns remain to this day», but this would probably require ὧν τόποι (τινὲς) διαμένουσιν, without ἀπό. See also the interpretation of ASHERI 1975, p. 40: «i cui τόποι ancora esistevano ai suoi tempi»; p. 43: «i loro τόποι originali si erano conservati». Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén translated «los lugares fundados por ellos aún perduran», but it is unlikely that ἀφ' ὧν οἱ τόποι can simply mean «the places founded by them»; at best, it could be translated as «the places descended from them». According to PRELLER 1838, p. 99, ὄνομασμένοι is implied after διαμένουσιν. See also the translation of R. CHERUBINA in CANFORA 2001, II, p. 1134: «permangono tuttora i nomi di luoghi da essi derivati». The participle has been supplemented by MEINEKE 1858-1867, IV, p. 209, KAIBEL 1887-1890, III, p. 6 (in his apparatus) and GULICK 1927-1941, V, p. 14 n. 1. This is also adopted in the translations of GULICK 1927-1941, V, pp. 13-5 («the regions continue (to be named) from both»), MALKIN 1998, p. 232 («the places there continue to be named after both»), FRIEDRICH in FRIEDRICH–NOTHERS 1998-2001, IV, p. 7 («nach denen die Örtlichkeiten noch heißen»), OLSON 2006-2012, V, p. 217 («from whom the area continues (to get its name)») and M. CUYPERS, *BNJ* 13 F1 («whose name is still attached to the area»). If this supplement is correct, it could refer to placenames such as the «Athamantian plain» (Ἀθαμάντιον πεδῖον) in Thessaly (cf. A.R. 2, 514; *Et. Gen.* α 130 Lasserre–Livadaras, s.v. Ἀθαμάντιον ~ *EM* s.v. Ἀθαμάντιον p. 24 Kallierges; schol. A.R. 2, 498-527n p. 170 Wendel) and in Boeotia (cf. Paus. 9, 24, 1-3). See SAKELLARIOU 1958, pp. 177-8. SCHWEIGHÄUSER 1801-1805, IV, pp. 193-4 and K. MÜLLER 1841-1851, III, p. 133 translated «a quibus (habitata) supersunt loca», which suggests supplementing οἰκούμενοι. See also SCHWEIGHÄUSER 1801-1807, VI, p. 20.

Polemon in the first book *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* says the following: «Some of the inhabitants of Heraclea below the Oeta and of Trachis were Cylicranes that arrived from Lydia together with Heracles; others were Athamanes, from whom the regions continue to <...>. Although they lived together, <the> Heracleots did not give them a share in government either, considering them foreigners. They are named Cylicranes since they had cups (*kylikes*) tattooed on their shoulders».

At the beginning of book 11, the interlocutor Plutarch, before giving his catalogue of cups, jokes that he is not one of the Cylicranes (probably intended to be analyzed as «cup heads» or «cup mixers»⁵¹), who were mocked by the comic and iambic poet Hermippus (active in the second half of the V century BCE)⁵². This leads him to digress on these Cylicranes and their ancestry. From Athenaeus, we can deduce that the Cylicranes were a subordinate, probably servile⁵³ part of the population of «Heraclea below the Oeta», i.e. Heraclea Trachinia, a city in the Malis region founded by the Spartans around 426 BCE. When the city of Trachis had been destroyed by the neighboring Oetaeans, the Trachinians enlisted the help of the Spartans to rebuild the city, which was renamed Heraclea⁵⁴. Upon its foundation, Heraclea Trachinia was populated with Spartans, Perioeci and other Greeks⁵⁵. The city was soon plagued not only by external threats but also by internal conflicts, particularly between the Peloponnesian and non-Peloponnesian part of the population⁵⁶.

⁵¹ ASHERI 1975, pp. 49-50 rejected this etymology, arguing that, if derived from κύλιξ, the word should be †κυλικο-κράνες or †κυλικη-κράνες. However, κυλι-κράνες could theoretically be the result of a syncope (cf. κιοκόρανον = κιονόκρανον «capital of a column»). Nevertheless, Athenaeus' interpretation is merely based on popular etymology. Indeed, if derived from «head» (κράν- < **k₁h₂-sr-*), the compound should end in -κράνος, pl. -κράνοι, not -κράν, pl. -κράνες (cf. βούκρανος «cow-headed», δίκρανος «two-headed», δορικόρανος «spear-headed», πολύκρανος «many-headed», ταυρόκρανος «bull-headed»). For the same reason, Asheri's alternative etymology according to which Κυλικράνες was originally Κυλλικράνες/Κιλλικράνες, supposedly derived from κύλλος «donkey» (cf. Poll. 7, 56: κύλλον γὰρ τὸν ὄνον οἱ Ἰωραιοὶ καὶ κιλλακτῆρα τὸν ὀνηλάτην λέγουσιν; Hsch. κ 2691 Latte-Cunningham: κύλλος ὄνος) should be rejected. In fact, -άν- is probably a (potentially Pre-Greek) suffix, also seen in other ethnics (cf. Ἀθαμ-άνες, Αἰνι-άνες, Ἀκαρν-άνες).

⁵² Ath. 11, 461e = Hermipp. fr. 4 West.

⁵³ So also PRELLER 1838, p. 99; WACHSMUTH 1846, pp. 403-4; GILBERT 1885, p. 17; GUIRAUD 1893, p. 408; VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1895, pp. 13 n. 25; 75 n. 137; 1931, p. 55; STÄHLIN 1922; BÉQUIGNON 1937, pp. 171-2; ASHERI 1975, p. 47; J.P. SICKINGER on *BN^F* 343 F12. This is also indicated by another fragment of Hermippus (fr. 5 West = schol. Aristoph. V. 1169b Koster), which probably belongs together with fr. 4. In fr. 7, Hermippus describes his visit to Heraclea, «a very young city» (καὶ μάλ' ὄραϊαν πόλιν). In fr. 5, however, Hermippus says: ὕστερον δ' αὐτὴν ἴστρατηγόν, οὓς ἂν εἰλωτημένην†, / καὶ κασαλαβάζουσαν εἶδον καὶ σεσαλακωντισμένην. The corrupt words στρατηγόν, οὓς ἂν εἰλωτημένην should probably be corrected to στρατηγῶν οὓσαν εἰλωτισμένην, so that the meaning is: «later, when I was *strategos*, I saw it helotized, prostituted and pretentious». This is also the interpretation offered by ASHERI 1975, p. 36, who corrected the corrupt words to στρατηγῶν εὐ συνειλωτισμένην. As Asheri further pointed out, the word σεσαλακωντισμένην might also be a pun on the city having become laconized.

⁵⁴ The city appears to have been rebuilt on a different location, about six stades from the old Trachis: see Str. 9, 4, 13 p. 428C. Paus. 10, 22, 1, too, distinguishes Heraclea from the «ruins of Trachis». Heraclea and Trachis also appear as separate cities in Ps.-Scyl. 62. Cf. also Polemon, who states that Cylicranes live both in Heraclea and in Trachis, unless he intends «Trachis» to refer to the entire region. Note, however, that the manuscript of Athenaeus (Marcianus gr. 447 [A] fol. 211v) actually reads τῆς δ' ἠρακλείας τῆς ὑπὸ τὴν οἴτην καὶ τραχίνα «Heraclea below the Oeta and (below) Trachis». This is also how the text is printed by SCHWEIGHÄUSER 1801-1805, IV, p. 193, DINDORF 1827, II, p. 1025 and MEINEKE 1858-1867, II, p. 337. KAIBEL 1887-1890, III, p. 6 and OLSON 2020, p. 254 corrected τραχίνα to Τραχίνοσ with Wilamowitz (though Kaibel added «sed dubito»). So also GULICK 1927-1941, V, p. 12; OLSON 2006-2012, V, p. 216. In either case, Polemon clearly distinguished Trachis from Heraclea.

⁵⁵ See Th. 3, 92; D.S. 12, 59, 3-5. Cf. *Periegesis ad Nicomedem regem* (*vulgo* Pseudo-Scymnus) 597-9.

⁵⁶ On the foundation and early history of Heraclea Trachinia, see WEIL 1873, pp. 380-4; BÉQUIGNON 1937, pp. 349-55; GRAHAM 1964, pp. 206-8; BOCKISCH 1965, pp. 140-2 = 1967, pp. 315-7; ASHERI 1975, pp. 45-7; ANDREWES 1979, pp. 95-9; MALKIN 1998, pp. 221-7. According to BOCKISCH 1965, p. 141 = 1967, pp. 315-6, the Spartan settlers were given more rights than the other settlers, but this is nowhere explicitly stated. In the summer of 419 BCE, after Heraclea had been attacked by the neighboring tribes the previous winter, the Boeotians occupied the city and sent away the Spartan Agesippidas for misgoverning the city (cf. Th. 5, 52, 1). In 399 BCE, the Spartans, who had regained control of the city, sent the harmost Herippidas to resolve the civic conflict in the city,

Before I discuss Polemon's fragment, I will present the two other versions cited by Athenaeus before he quotes Polemon. In his discussion of the Cyclicranes, Athenaeus first gives the story found in Nicander of Thyateira, who wrote sometime after the late III century BCE. According to Nicander, their name goes back to a Lydian man named Cylix, who joined Heracles' expedition⁵⁷. The expedition in question is probably the sack of Oechalia, the city of Eurytus, presumably after Heracles' servitude to Omphale in Lydia (which had been his punishment for killing Iphitus, son of Eurytus)⁵⁸. This would explain the presence of a Lydian man in Heracles' expedition⁵⁹.

This is followed by the story found in Scythinus of Teos' *History*, who probably wrote in the late V or early IV century BCE, i.e. around the time of the foundation of Heraclea Trachinia and the subsequent political turmoil in this city. According to Scythinus, Heracles killed Eurytus and his son⁶⁰ for exacting tribute from the Euboeans; Heracles also annihilated the Cyclicranes, who were brigands, and then built the city of Heraclea Trachinia⁶¹. So, in this version, the Cyclicranes are not allies of Heracles but local bandits⁶². Also, Heracles' motive for destroying Oechalia is not his desire to get Eurytus' daughter, Iole⁶³, or revenge for his previous

which resulted in 500 Trachinian rebels being executed (cf. D.S. 14, 38, 4-5; Polyæn. 2, 21); in addition, the Trachinian population – Diodorus calls them «the people living around the Oeta» – was forced to leave their land. This was reversed again by the Boeotians, who conquered the city in 395/394 BCE, killed the Spartan inhabitants, allowed the other Peloponnesians to leave and brought back the Trachinians that had been banished (cf. D.S. 14, 82, 6-7).

⁵⁷ Ath. 11, 461e-f = Nicander *FGrHist* 343 F12. According to ASHERI 1975, p. 40, Nicander considered Cyclicranes to be a learned name for the Heracleots of Heraclea Trachinia. So also MALKIN 1998, p. 232. However, it is possible that this is not what Athenaeus' text means. The fragment immediately follows after the quotation from Hermippus, who mentions the city simply as «Heraclea». Athenaeus then says: Ἡρακλεῶται δ' εἰσὶν οὗτοι οἱ ὑπὸ τῆ Ὀϊτῆ κατοικοῦντες, ὧς φησι Νίκανδρος ὁ Θυατειρηνός, ὀνομασθῆναι φάσκων αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τινος Κύλικος γένος Λυδοῦ, ἐνὸς τῶν Ἡρακλεῖ συστρατευσαμένων. The first sentence is intended as an explanation of Heraclea in Hermippus: the name refers to Heraclea below the Oeta. In the subsequent explanation, αὐτοὺς might refer to the Heracleots (as in Asheri's interpretation) but might also refer back to the Cyclicranes.

⁵⁸ For Heracles' punishment, see Soph. *Tr.* 69-72; 248-80; D.S. 4, 31; Plut. *Thes.* 6, 6; Ps.-Apollod. 2, 127-33 (2, 6, 1-3); schol. D Hom. *Od.* 21, 22-3 Ernst; Eust. *Od.* 21, 27 vol. 2 p. 247 Stallbaum; schol. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 26, 14 p. 27 Stählin-Treu; Tz. *H.* 2, 36, 415-45. This story is also alluded to in Aesch. *A.* 1040-1. In Hyg. *Fab.* 32 and *Serv. Dan.* 8, 299, this is Heracles' punishment for stealing the tripod from the oracle of Apollo (Heracles also does this in Pseudo-Apollodorus; cf. also Paus. 10, 13, 8). Heracles' servitude to Omphale is also mentioned by Herodor. *FGrHist* 31 F33 = schol. Soph. *Tr.* 253 Xenis; *FGrHist* 31 F41a = Ps.-Apollod. 1, 118 (1, 9, 19); Ter. *Eun.* 1027; Corn. *ND* p. 64 Lang; Luc. *DDeor.* 15; *Hist. conscr.* 10; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2, 35, 1; Origenes *Cels.* 3, 22; 7, 54; Lactant. *Div. inst.* 1, 9, 7; Eus. *PE* 2, 2, 24-5 (relying on Diodorus); Donat. *in Ter.* 1027; schol. Soph. *Tr.* 71 Xenis; *Recensio Bodleiana* 304 Gaisford = *Appendix proverbiorum* 1, 88 Leutsch-Schneidewin = Macar. 3, 11 = Suid. γ 502, s.v. γυνὴ εἰς Ἡρακλέους οὐ φοιτᾷ; Apostol. *Collectio paroemiarum* 12, 74. See also Stat. *Achill.* 1, 260-1. Palaeph. 44 rationalizes the story of Heracles' servitude as the result of him being in love with Omphale. So also Ov. *Her.* 9, 53-119; Ps.-Sen. *Hercules Oetaeus* 371-6; Lactantius Placidus *in Stat. Theb.* 10, 646; Eugraphius *in Ter. Eun.* 1027.

⁵⁹ In Sophocles' *Trachinian Women*, Heracles immediately attacks Oechalia after his year of servitude. In D.S. 4, 32, 1 - 4, 37, 5 and Ps.-Apollod. 2, 134-55 (2, 6, 4 - 2, 7, 7), however, he first goes on other adventures before attacking Oechalia (D.S. 4, 37, 5; Ps.-Apollod. 2, 156 [2, 7, 7]). While ASHERI 1975, pp. 40-1 was right to point out that, in Ps.-Apollod. 2, 134 (2, 6, 4), Heracles does gather an army right after his servitude in Lydia, it is not with this army that he conquers Oechalia. For in Pseudo-Apollodorus, right before the attack on Oechalia, Heracles gathers an army anew. Asheri also seems to wrongly consider the *Bibliotheca* a work written by the second-century BCE mythographer Apollodorus of Athens («Apollodoro, fonte certo nota a Polemon e Nicandro»).

⁶⁰ The son is probably Iphitus: see STOLL 1884-1890, p. 1437; WENIGER 1890-1897, p. 311; F. JACOBY on *FGrHist* 13 F1; FOWLER 2013, p. 333; M. CUYPERS on *BNJ* 13 F1. Note that, in Scythinus' story, Eurytus and Iphitus die at the same time, without Heracles being punished in between.

⁶¹ Ath. 11, 461f-462a = Scythinus *FGrHist* 13 F1.

⁶² ASHERI 1975, pp. 38-9 connected the Cyclicranes with other bandits vanquished by Heracles: the Cercopes and Dryopes. So also ROBERT 1921, pp. 590-1; BÉQUIGNON 1937, pp. 170-1; MALKIN 1998, p. 231.

⁶³ See Soph. *Tr.* 476-8; Herodor. *FGrHist* 31 F37 = schol. Eurip. *Hipp.* 545a Cavarzeran; D.S. 4, 37, 5; Hyg. *Fab.* 35; Ps.-Sen. *Hercules Oetaeus* 219-23; 422-4; *Serv. Aen.* 8, 291; *Myth. Vat.* 2, 182 Kulcsár; schol. D Hom. *Il.* 5,

punishment⁶⁴. Heracles is instead presented as a liberator and benefactor. He even becomes the founder of Heraclea Trachinia (although the city by this name will not be founded until 426 BCE)⁶⁵. While other versions of the Heracles legends put the hero in Trachis at the end of his life (famously dying on mount Oeta), he is usually considered to be a refugee or guest there⁶⁶. This reimagining of the Heracles myth probably served to legitimize the intervention of the Spartans as descendants of Heracles in the Oeta region in the late V and early IV century BCE⁶⁷. After citing the versions found in Nicander and Scythinus, Athenaeus quotes a passage from the first book of Polemon's work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus*. According to Polemon, the Cylicranes were inhabitants of Heraclea below the Oeta and Trachis, who migrated there from Lydia together with Heracles⁶⁸. Like Nicander, Polemon thus considers the Cylicranes migrants that followed Heracles and were not part of the indigenous population⁶⁹. Polemon also mentions that the population of this region further includes Athamanes⁷⁰. He then adds that «they» were not given a share in political power by the Heracleots but were treated like foreigners (ἄλλόφυλοι). By «they» (οἷς), Polemon probably means both the Cylicranes and the Athamanes⁷¹. Polemon also explains the origin of the Cylicranes' name. It is not derived from some eponymous hero named Cylix (as Nicander states); they were called Cylicranes because they had cups (κύλικες) tattooed on their shoulders⁷². This last detail further recurs in the lexicon of Hesychius, who also cites Polemon, though without the book title.

Hsch. κ 4496 Latte–Cunningham⁷³:

Κυλικράνων· Πολέμων φησὶν, ὅτι τοὺς ὄμους κεχαραγμένοι ἦσαν κύλικας, οἱ δὲ τοὺς ὑπὸ τῆ Οἴτῃ Ἡρακλεώτας ἀπὸ τινος <Κύλικος Λυδοῦ> ὠνομάσθαι.

392(2) van Thiel²; schol. Eurip. *Hipp.* 546a; 546b Cavarzeran. So also probably Hes. fr. 26, 31-2 Merkelbach–West = fr. 23, 31-2 Most = *P.Oxy.* XXVIII 2481 fr. 5 col. iii, 31-2 + schol. Soph. *Tr.* 266 Xenis (from the *Catalogue of Women*). See also Bacchylides 16 (*Dith.* 2), 13-29; Ps.-Apollod. 2, 156 (2, 7, 7); Tz. *H.* 2, 36, 472-3. According to Pherecydes *FGrHist* 3 F82a = fr. 74 Dolcetti = schol. Soph. *Tr.* 352-5 Xenis, Heracles wanted Eurytus' daughter as wife for his son, Hyllus.

⁶⁴ In Sophocles' *Trachinian Women*, this is the initial reason given to Deianeira for Heracles attacking Oechalia (*Tr.* 248-83). According to Lysim. *FGrHist* 382 F3 = schol. Eurip. *Hipp.* 545a Cavarzeran, Heracles attacked Oechalia, because they demanded thirty talents of silver as blood money for the death of Iphitus.

⁶⁵ Heracles is also considered the founder of Trachis in *IG XIV* 1293 A, 76-8 = *FGrHist* 40 F1a (a description of the deeds of Heracles) and Steph. Byz. τ 175, s.v. Τραχίς ~ Tz. *Lyc.* 904 Scheer ~ Eust. *II.* 2, 682 vol. 1 p. 498 van der Valk.

⁶⁶ See Soph. *Tr.* 36-40; D.S. 4, 36, 5; Paus. 1, 32, 6; Ps.-Apollod. 2, 150 (2, 7, 6); schol. Soph. *Tr.* 39 Xenis; hyp. Soph. *Tr.*; Tz. *H.* 2, 36, 459-60. In the Pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles*, Heracles is also on his way to Ceyx in Trachis (*Sc.* 353-4; 469-70).

⁶⁷ See also WEIL 1873, p. 381. According to ASHERI 1975, p. 39, however, the depiction of the Cylicranes as bandits (along with the stories about the Cercopes and Dryopes) originated in the context of the war between the Trachinians and their hostile neighbors. According to MALKIN 1998, pp. 231-2, this attitude was inherited by the colonists of Heraclea Trachinia from the Trachinians. See also STÄHLIN 1922, p. 2452.

⁶⁸ It is also unclear whether, according to Polemon, Heracles founded the city of Trachis (which would later become Heraclea Trachinia), as Scythinus wrote, or simply migrated there.

⁶⁹ According to ASHERI 1975, pp. 47-8, this version originated after the «decolonization» of Heraclea Trachinia, which culminated in 370 BCE, when the region was given by Iason of Pherae to the Oetaeans and the Malians (cf. D.S. 15, 57, 2). Asheri assumed that the Cylicranes were given civic rights after the «liberation» from the Spartans, but it is possible that they were still excluded from participation in the polis in Polemon's own time (that is, if the Cylicranes still existed at that time).

⁷⁰ In historical times, the Athamanes populated a region in the south-east of Epirus: see OBERHUMMER 1896. They are considered non-Greeks by Str. 7, 7, 2 p. 321C (cf. also Str. 10, 1, 16 p. 449C).

⁷¹ See ASHERI 1975, p. 40. DEICHGRÄBER 1952, pp. 1304-5 interpreted the sentence only in reference to the Athamanes but at the same time accepted Kaibel's conjecture οἱ δ' Ἀθαμᾶνας sc. λέγουσιν (cf. n. 49), which identifies the Cylicranes with the Athamanes.

⁷² According to BÉQUIGNON 1937, p. 170, the cups were tattooed on their foreheads. However, this theory is purely based on the folk etymology of Cylicranes as derived from κρανίον.

⁷³ The text is that of LATTE–CUNNINGHAM 2020, p. 689.

Cylicranes: Polemon says that they had cups tattooed on their shoulders. Others say that the Heracleots living below the Oeta were named after a certain <Cylix of Lydia>.

Hesychius further mentions the explanation of Nicander (viz. that the Cylicranes are named after a Lydian man named Cylix) as an anonymous tradition (οἱ δέ)⁷⁴. The parallel with Hesychius suggests that Athenaeus' direct source is a lexicon, perhaps that of the first-century CE grammarian Pamphilus, who is often cited in the catalogue of cups in book 11⁷⁵ and is also the ultimate source of Hesychius (through Diogenianus as the intermediate source)⁷⁶.

The main question is how Polemon came to comment on the Cylicranes. The most straightforward solution is that he discussed them in a digression on the foundation myth of Trachis as part of a description of a certain painting or sculpture depicting a specific scene from this myth (or perhaps of the conquest of Heraclea Trachinia by the Thebans). Asheri also considered the possibility that Polemon discussed cups and related etymologies⁷⁷. Alternatively, Polemon may have commented on works of art found in Heraclea Trachinia. Preller also suggested that Antigonus and Adaeus may have defended a different etymology for the Cylicranes⁷⁸.

3.2. Fr. 57 on the *seleucis*, *antigonis*, *rhodias* and *prusias* cups

Another fragment that comments on cups is fr. 57, which is also found in Athenaeus' book 11.

Ath. 11, 497f = fr. 57 Preller⁷⁹:

σελευκίς, ὅτι ἀπὸ Σελεύκου τοῦ βασιλέως τὴν προσηγορίαν ἔσχε τὸ ἔκπωμα προεῖρηται ἱστοροῦντος τοῦτο καὶ Ἀπολλοδώρου τοῦ Ἀθηναίου. Πολέμων δ' ἐν πρώτῳ τῶν Πρὸς Ἀδαίων, «ποτήρια», φησί, «παραπλήσια σελευκίς, ῥοδιάς, ἀντιγονίς».

Seleucis. That the drinking vessel got its name from king Seleucus has been said before⁸⁰; Apollodorus of Athens (*FGrHist* 244 F273) also records this. Polemon in the first book *Against Adaeus* says: «*seleucis*, *rhodias* and *antigonis* are similar drinking vessels».

Athenaeus quotes Polemon verbatim for an attestation of the cup named *seleucis*, which Polemon appears to have mentioned alongside the *rhodias* and *antigonis* cups. The same information recurs in the *Onomasticon* of the second-century CE grammarian Pollux (without

⁷⁴ The only other ancient author (apart from Athenaeus) that mentions the Cylicranes is Macrobius (*Sat.* 5, 21, 18), who says that the «Cylicrani» were a population settled by Hercules near Heraclea (*nationem quandam hominum fuisse prope Heracleam ab Hercule constitutam Cylicranorum*); their name, he says, is derived «from the cup» (*composito nomine ἀπὸ τῆς κύλικος*). According to ASHERI 1975, pp. 43-4, Macrobius is independent of Athenaeus. See also MALKIN 1998, p. 232. However, the differences with Athenaeus (Macrobius calls the Cylicranes a «natio hominum» and places them near and not in Heraclea) might be personal changes. It is also not certain whether the explanation ἀπὸ τῆς κύλικος refers to that of Polemon, is based on a misunderstanding of that of Nicander (ἀπὸ τινος Κύλικος being misread as ἀπὸ (τινος) κύλικος) or is a combination of both. Macrobius is considered to rely on Athenaeus by FOWLER 2013, p. 333 n. 240.

⁷⁵ See Ath. 11, 783a; 470d; 471c; 472e; 473e; 475c; 475d; 478c-d; 479a-b; 487b-c; 487c; 487d; 494f (three times); 496a; 502b. On Pamphilus as a source for Athenaeus, see RANKE 1831, pp. 73-119; SCHMIDT 1864, pp. lx-lxxxiii; SCHOENEMANN 1886, pp. 78-89; BAPP 1888, pp. 253-8. According to RUDOLPH 1892, pp. 133-6 and NYIKOS 1941, pp. 85-9, however, previous scholars have overestimated Athenaeus' indebtedness to Pamphilus.

⁷⁶ Pamphilus' lexicon was first epitomized by Iulius Vestinus (see Suid. praef.; o 835, s.v. Οὔρηστῖνος). This lexicon in its turn was epitomized by Diogenianus (see scholia in orationes Gregorii Naziazeni 18, 6, no. 71 p. 241 Piccolomini). Suid. δ 1140, s.v. Διογενειανός further indicates that the second major source of the epitome of Diogenianus (and perhaps already of Iulius Vestinus) was the lexicon of Zopyrion. Hesychius himself states that his main source was Diogenianus (see Hsch. *Epistula ad Eulogium*).

⁷⁷ ASHERI 1975, p. 39. So also BENCKER 1890, pp. 19-20.

⁷⁸ PRELLER 1838, p. 99.

⁷⁹ The text is that of OLSON 2020, p. 338.

⁸⁰ At Ath. 11, 783e (when discussing the *antigonis* cup): see below.

explicit reference to Polemon)⁸¹. This parallel is not surprising, since Pollux is known to have used many of the same sources as Athenaeus⁸². Pollux also specifies that the cups were named after the people that used them, viz. Antigonos (probably Antigonos I Monophthalmus [king from 306 to 301 BCE], Antigonos II Gonatas [king from 277 to 239 BCE] or Antigonos III Doson [king from 229 to 221 BCE]⁸³), Seleucus (probably Seleucus I Nicator [king from 305 to 281 BCE], Seleucus II Callinicus [king from 246 to 226 BCE], Seleucus III Ceraunus [king from 226 to 222 BCE] or Seleucus IV Philopator [king from 187 to 175 BCE]⁸⁴) and the Rhodians.

The fragment of Polemon also has a parallel with a new fragment found in Photius' lexicon, in the lemma ἀντιγονίς.

Phot. *Lexicon* α 2087 Theodoridis (not in Preller)⁸⁵:

ἀντιγονίς· Πολέμων ἐν εἴ τῶν Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον. οὕτως φασὶν ὀνομασθῆναι τὸ ἔκπωμα ἀπὸ Ἀντιγόνου τοῦ βασιλέως, καθάπερ ἀπὸ Σελεύκου σελευκίδα καὶ ἀπὸ Προυσίου προουσιάδα.

⁸¹ Poll. 6, 96: ἀντιγονίδα δὲ καὶ σελευκίδα καὶ ῥοδιάδα ἢ ῥοδιακὸν ἀπὸ τῶν χρησαμένων.

⁸² See ΝΥΙΚΟΣ 1941, pp. 36-93.

⁸³ The earliest attestation of the *antigonis* cup is in an inventory of silver vessels bought for the temple of Asclepius in Beroea (third quarter of the III century BCE), *I.Beroia* 16 B, 40-1 = *SEG* XL, 530, 64-5. According to ALLAMANI-SOURI 1984, p. 221 and R. CHERUBINA in CANFORA 2001, II, p. 1151 n. 1, the cup is named after Antigonos II Gonatas. So also GULLETTA in GULLETTA–RADICI COLACE 1992, p. 191 n. 1. The main reason for this identification cited by Allamani-Souri is Antigonos II Gonatas' reported love for drinking and dinner parties: see Lynceus fr. 2 Dalby = Ath. 4, 128b; fr. 4 Dalby = Ath. 3, 101e-f; Zeno Stoic. *SVFI* fr. 289 = Ael. *VH* 9, 26; Pers. Stoic. *SVFI* fr. 451 = Ath. 13, 607c-e; D.L. 4, 41. TARN 1913, p. 248 with n. 93, however, downplayed the importance of these anecdotes and concluded that it was unclear after which Antigonos the *antigonis* cup was named. Yet there is a stronger reason to identify «Antigonos» as Antigonos II Gonatas than these anecdotes. Delian inscriptions inform us that Antigonos II introduced the «Antigoneia» on Delos, where a *phiale* was dedicated each year with money offered by him. Recently, SOSIN 2014 has argued convincingly – against the *communis opinio* – that these «Antigoneia» (along with the «Stratonikeia», which are named after Stratonice, Antigonos II Gonatas' sister) were not eponymous festivals but referred to objects that were offered and paid for by the endowment funds established by Antigonos II. Similarly, the Delian records mention «Mikytheia», «Stesileia», «Echenikeia», «Philonideia», «Nesiadeia», «Sopatreia», «Nikolaeia» and «Eutycheia», which do not refer to festivals either. Indeed, the inscriptions show that the objects were named after the person that established the fund. Thus, they record the offerings of Micythus, for instance, as κύλικες μικύθειοι, σκάφια μικύθεια or simply μικύθεια. In view of the modest size of the endowments, SOSIN 2014, pp. 142-3 argued that the ritual offerings of Antigonos II were not intended to celebrate some military victory but commemorated family events. According to Sosin, the *stratonikeion* fund was established to commemorate the death of Stratonice, and the *antigoneion* fund to commemorate the marriage of Antigonos' son, Demetrius II. In some cases, the endowment funds were even named after the person in whose honor they were established; thus, the *philetaireion* was probably established in 263 BCE by Eumenes I upon the death of his uncle Philetaerus (see SOSIN 2014, pp. 140-1). Sosin even argued that the *antigoneion* (established by Antigonos II) and the *demetrieion* (established by Demetrius II) were actually named after their respective grandfathers (Antigonos I Monophthalmus and Demetrius I Poliorcetes). In short, it is possible that the *antigonis* cup was originally a cup dedicated by Antigonos II in a similar sanctuary and later became the word for this type of cup. Cf. also the *prusias* cup below (n. 87).

⁸⁴ The earliest attestation of the *seleucis* cup is *ID* 443 Bb, 72 (178 BCE). According to R. CHERUBINA in CANFORA 2001, II, p. 1230 n. 7, the cup is named after Seleucus I Nicator. For this identification, he pointed to Ath. 6, 255a and 13, 590a-b. The first passage cites Phylarchus (*FGrHist* 81 F29), who mentions that the Athenians living on Lemnos thanked Seleucus I and Antiochus I Soter for liberating them from Lysimachus; to this day, they call the ladleful of wine poured at their symposia «for Seleucus the Savior» (i.e. instead of «for Zeus the Savior»). However, this does not concern a cup but merely refers to a libation. The second passage mentions Seleucus but in a context completely unrelated to cups or drinking. In fact, a more likely candidate is Seleucus IV Philopator. In the aforementioned inscription, the *seleucis* cup is recorded among the dedications of Heliodorus, who was the chief minister of Seleucus IV. Furthermore, a *phiale* was dedicated by a man named Lamedon in honor of Seleucus IV that same year (*ID* 443 Bb, 75-6; cf. *ID* 1441 A col. 1, 60-1; *ID* 1450 A, 45). Three *phialai* were also dedicated by «king Seleucus» according to the inventories of *ID* 1441 A col. 1, 25-6 and *ID* 1450 A, 26, although it is unclear which Seleucus this refers to. Note, however, that golden and silver drinking vessels and vases were already dedicated by Seleucus I Nicator to the sanctuary of Apollo in Didyma (*I.Didyma* 424 = *CIG* 2852 = *OGIS* 214).

⁸⁵ The text is that of THEODORIDIS 1982-2012, I, p. 201.

Antigonis. Polemon in the sixth book *Against Antigonus*. The drinking vessel is said to have been named so after king Antigonus, as *seleucis* is named after Seleucus and *prusias* after Prusias.

Like Pollux, it specifies that the *antigonis* and *seleucis* cups are named after the kings Antigonus and Seleucus, respectively⁸⁶. Photius also adds the *prusias* cup, which is named after the Bithynian king Prusias (in all likelihood Prusias II Cynegus⁸⁷). The fragment in Photius was not yet known to Preller; it is found in the codex *Zavordensis* 95, which was first discovered in 1959 and contains a more complete version of Photius' lexicon⁸⁸.

Interestingly, Photius gives a different version of this title and a different book number. Athenaeus speaks of the first book *Against Adaeus*, whereas Photius cites it as the sixth book *Against Antigonus*. This raises the question whether Polemon discussed these cups in two different books, or whether Photius or Athenaeus cites an incorrect book number. Furthermore, the lemma in Photius has a close parallel with another section in Athenaeus book 11, which discusses the *antigonis* cup.

Ath. 11,783e⁸⁹

ἀντιγονίς.

ἔκπωμα ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιγόνου, ὡς ἀπὸ
Σελεύκου σελευκίς καὶ ἀπὸ Προυσίου προουσιάς.

Phot. *Lexicon* α 2087 Theodoridis

ἀντιγονίς· Πολέμων ἐν ε' τῶν Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον. οὕτως
φασὶν ὀνομασθῆναι τὸ ἔκπωμα ἀπὸ Ἀντιγόνου τοῦ
βασιλέως, καθάπερ ἀπὸ Σελεύκου σελευκίδα καὶ ἀπὸ
Προυσίου προουσιάδα.

Although that passage in Athenaeus does not mention Polemon, Athenaeus' original text probably contained a nominativum citation of Polemon. Indeed, Athenaeus' discussion of the *antigonis* cup belongs to a section of the *Deipnosophists* that survives only in the epitome of Athenaeus, which is known to have omitted many of the authorities originally cited by Athenaeus.

In this fragment, too, we are left guessing at the original context in which Polemon mentioned these types of cups. One potential guess is that, like the *kothon* (fr. 60) and the *kantharos* (fr. 63), these cups were mentioned in a description of some type of artwork. Another possible

⁸⁶ See also Steph. Byz. σ 100, s.v. Σελεύκεια: ἔστι καὶ ποτηρίων εἶδος σελευκίς, ἀπὸ Σελεύκου; *Fragmentum lexicum Graeci* 11 p. 320 HERMANN 1801: ἀντιγονίς καὶ αὐτὸ εἶδος ποτηρίου, ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιγόνου τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν εἰληφός.

⁸⁷ See HABICHT 1957a, pp. 1124; 1125; 1957b. Prusias II is more likely to be the eponym for the *prusias* cup than his father, Prusias I Cholus. *I.Didyma* 463, 22-3 = *CIG* 2855, 22-3 (ca. 179-176 BCE) records two *prusias* cups among donations made by Prusias II to the temple of Apollo in Didyma. Nicander of Chalcedon (*FGrHist* 700 F1 = Ath. 11, 496d-e) also states that the cup was named after Prusias «who became famous because of his luxurious lifestyle and effeminacy» (ἐπὶ τρυφῇ καὶ μαλακίᾳ διαβοήτου γενομένου). Indeed, contrary to his father (Prusias I Cholus), Prusias II also has this reputation in other writers: see Polyb. 30, 18, 5-6 = *Excerpta Constantina de legationibus* 83 p. 330 de Boor ~ D.S. 31, 15, 3 = XXXI fr. 20, 2 Goukowsky = *Excerpta Constantina de legationibus* 1 p. 82 de Boor ~ Liv. 45, 44, 20; Polyb. 32, 15, 7-9 = *Excerpta Constantina de virtutibus et vitiis* 109 p. 199 Büttner-Wobst-Roos = Suid. π 2914, s.v. Προυσίας (cf. also Suid. ε 1529, s.v. ἐξάλλως); Polyb. 36, 15 = *Excerpta Constantina de virtutibus et vitiis* 114 p. 201-2 Büttner-Wobst-Roos = Suid. π 2913, s.v. Προυσίας ~ D.S. 32, 19, 1 = XXXII fr. 20 Goukowsky = *Excerpta Constantina de virtutibus et vitiis* 303 p. 293 Büttner-Wobst-Roos (cf. also Suid. η 351, s.v. ἥμισος). Moreover, Nicander mentioned this in the *Misfortunes of Prusias* (Προυσίου συμπτώματα); indeed, Prusias II's life (unlike that of his father) had an unhappy end.

⁸⁸ The «codex Galeanus» (Cambridge Trinity College O.3.9/5985 [g]), in contrast, which was the basis for the old editions of Photius' lexicon, has several large lacunae, among others between the lemmas ἀδιάκριτος and ἐπώνυμοι, thus losing 3150 lemmas from alpha (including the lemma ἀντιγονίς) as well as all the lemmas of beta, gamma and delta and part of epsilon. The lemma ἀντιγονίς is also found in the codex *Berolinensis* gr. oct. 22 (b), which preserves only the beginning of Photius' lexicon until the lemma ἄπαρνος. The text of the Berlin manuscript was first published by REITZENSTEIN 1907. According to REITZENSTEIN 1907, p. 147 and THEODORIDIS 1982-2012, I, p. 201, Photius' source for the ἀντιγονίς lemma was Herodian's *Symposium*.

⁸⁹ The text is that of OLSON 2020, p. 270.

context is some depiction of one of the Hellenistic kings (perhaps at a symposium or a procession), which may have led to a digression on objects named after them. In fact, fr. 56 calls the *seleucis*, *antigonis* and *rhodias* cups⁹⁰ «similar» (ποτήρια... παραπλήσια), but similar to what? To each other or to a fourth unnamed cup? Indeed, it is possible that those three cups were compared to the *prusias* cup (not explicitly cited in fr. 56 but mentioned in the new fragment in Photius and its parallel in Athenaeus).⁹¹ If that is the case, the point of departure may have been, for instance, a painting or statue portraying the Bithynian king Prusias II Cynegus. Another possibility is that Polemon originally commented on the inventory of items dedicated to a certain sanctuary (as he also does in his periegetic works), since these royal cups are often recorded in such archives. In his work *On the Acropolis in Athens*, for instance, Polemon mentioned the *therikleion* cups dedicated by the rich Neoptolemus of Melite⁹². In fact, Hellenistic kings (among others Antigonos II Gonatas) are known to have often dedicated drinking vessels to Greek sanctuaries⁹³.

According to Gulletta, the *antigonis*, *prusias*, *seleucis* and *rhodias* cups all had the same shape as the cup named *therikleion/therikleios*, differing only with regard to the material from which they were made⁹⁴. Interestingly, Adaeus in his work Περὶ διαθέσεως seems to have commented on the *therikleion* cup, which he identified with the *karchesion* cup, according to Athenaeus wrongly so⁹⁵. It is possible that Polemon, too, discussed or even refuted this identification by Adaeus.

3.3. Fr. 59 on the purple swamphen

Fr. 59 is found in Athenaeus book 9, which is devoted to various kinds of meat. One subsection deals with types of edible birds, and one such bird is the *porphyriion*⁹⁶, i.e. the purple swamphen or purple gallinule (*porphyrio porphyrio*), which is a type of waterbird⁹⁷. Athenaeus quotes Polemon's fifth book for information about this bird.

⁹⁰ Another cup that seems to be similarly named after a Hellenistic ruler is the *antipatris*, a silver cup attested for the first time in an inventory of Delos in 268 BCE (*IG XI*, 2, 110, 23). The diminutive ἀντιπατρίδιον is attested in *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59038r, 11-2 (257 BCE). Possible eponyms are the Macedonian regent Antipater, king Antipater II (who ruled from 297 to 294 BCE) and Antipater Etesias (king in 279/78 BCE).

⁹¹ Alternatively, Polemon may have also compared the *seleucis*, *antigonis* und *rhodias* cups to the *therikleion*.

⁹² Fr. 1 Preller = fr. 1 Capel Badino = Ath. 11, 472b-c.

⁹³ See BRINGMANN 2000, pp. 84-7; SOSIN 2014. Ptolemy Lagu (later Ptolemy I Soter), for instance, dedicated a golden *therikleion* to the Artemision in Delos around 308 BCE. See BRUNEAU 1970, p. 516; BRINGMANN *et al.* 1995, p. 204.

⁹⁴ GULLETTA 1986, pp. 314-7; 318-9. According to Gulletta, the *therikleion* was made of wood, the *rhodias* of clay, and the cups named after kings (*antigonis*, *seleucis*, *prusias*) of precious metal. However, literary testimonies and inscriptions show that the *therikleion* could be made from a variety of material (wood, clay, gold, silver and even glass). See POTTIER 1892, pp. 213-4; MALFITANA 2004, pp. 224-7. According to schol. Clem. Al. *Paed.* 177, 28f p. 327 Stählin-Treu, the difference between the *therikleion* and the *antigonis* is that the former has a round support, while the latter does not. Gulletta's view that the *rhodias* and *therikleion* cups have the same shape is based on Lynceus fr. 16a Dalby = Ath. 11, 469b, where the Rhodians are said to have imitated the Athenian *therikleia*. However, Athenaeus is speaking of the *hedypotides* cups there, not the *rhodias* cup, and does not claim the *therikleia* are made of wood and the Rhodian cups of clay. In fact, Athenaeus states that the *hedypotides* are less expensive since they use less metal. Nevertheless, the *therikleion* and *rhodias/rhodiakon* appear to have been similar, since Ath. 11, 784d dubs the *bombylios* cup a θηρίκλειον ῥοδιακόν. Similarly, Dionysius Leptus ap. Ath. 11, 475f compares both the *prusias* and *therikleion* to yet another cup, the *kelebe*. Another cup that appears to have been similar to the *therikleion* is the *chonnos* cup from Gortyn (cf. Ath. 11, 502b).

⁹⁵ Adaeus ap. Ath. 11, 471f.

⁹⁶ Athenaeus includes it as an edible bird. Ael. *NA* 3, 42, however, states that he has never heard of anyone killing a purple swamphen for dinner.

⁹⁷ On the purple swamphen, see especially ARNOTT 2007, pp. 286-7; LOPES-GOMEZ-ANDREOTTI-ANDREONI 2016; WEMBER-LUNCZER 2017.

Ath. 9, 388c = fr. 59 Preller⁹⁸:

πορφυρίων. ὅτι καὶ τούτου Ἀριστοφάνης μέμνηται δῆλον. Πολέμων δ' ἐν πέμπτῳ τῶν Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον καὶ Ἀδαῖον πορφυρίωνά φησι τὸν ὄρνιν διαιτώμενον κατὰ τὰς οἰκίας τὰς ὑπάνδρους τῶν γυναικῶν τηρεῖν πικρῶς καὶ τοιαύτην ἔχειν αἴσθησιν ἐπὶ τῆς μοιχευομένης ὥσθ' ὅταν τοῦθ' ὑπονοήσῃ, προσημαίνει τῷ δεσπότη ἀγχόνῃ τὸ ζῆν περιγράψας· «οὐ πρότερόν τε», φησί, «τροφῆς μεταλαμβάνει, εἰ μὴ περιπατήσῃ τόπον τινὰ ἐξευρὼν ἑαυτῷ ἐπιτήδειον· μεθ' ὃ κονισάμενος λούεται, εἶτα τρέφεται».

Porphyrion. That Aristophanes (*Av.* 707; 882; 1249) also mentions it is clear. Polemon in the fifth book *Against Antigonus and Adaeus* says that, when the porphyrion bird is domesticated, it keeps a close eye on the married women and is so strongly affected to see the woman commit adultery that, whenever it suspects this, it warns its master by strangling itself and ending its life. «It does not take food,» he says, «before it walks around and finds a suitable place for itself. After this, it takes a dust bath and then feeds itself».

In this fragment, Polemon describes the behavior of this animal: when the purple swamphen is domesticated, it watches over married women and, when it sees adultery, it alarms its master by strangling itself. Polemon also adds that, before it eats, it walks around to find a suitable spot and takes a so-called dust bath. Dust bathing is a type of behavior seen in birds and certain types of mammals, in which the animal rolls around in the dust or sand in order to remove parasites. Similar information is found in Aelian, who, in his *Nature of Animals*, also mentions the dust bath and the eating habits of the bird and also states that the animal strangles itself when it sees its mistress commit adultery⁹⁹.

Ael. *NA* 3, 42¹⁰⁰:

ὁ πορφυρίων ὠραιότατός τε ἅμα καὶ φερωνυμώτατός ἐστι ζῴων, καὶ χαίρει κονιόμενος, ἤδη δὲ καὶ λούεται τὸ τῶν περιστερῶν λουτρόν· οὐ πρότερον δὲ ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδίδωσι ταῖς κονίστραις καὶ τοῖς λουτροῖς, πρὶν ἂν βαδίσει τινὰ ἀριθμὸν βαδίσεως ἀρκούντά οἱ. σιτούμενος δὲ ἐπὶ μαρτύρων ἄχθεται, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἀναχωρεῖ, καὶ ὑπολανθάνων ἐσθίει. ζηλότυπος δὲ ἐστὶν ἰσχυρῶς, καὶ τὰς ὑπάνδρους τῶν γυναικῶν παραφυλάττει, καὶ ἐὰν καταγνῶ μοιχευέσθαι τῆς οἰκίας τὴν δέσποιναν, ἀπάγγχει ἑαυτόν. οὐ πέτεται δὲ ὑψηλός. χαίρουσί γε μὴν οἱ ἄνθρωποι αὐτῷ, καὶ τρέφουσι πεφεισμένως καὶ προμηθῶς αὐτόν. καὶ ἔοικεν ἢ σοβαρὰς οἰκίας καὶ μέγα πλουσίας ἄθυρμα εἶναι, ἢ ὑποδέχεται νεῶς αὐτόν, καὶ ἄφετος ἀλάται, καὶ ἱερὸς περιείσιν εἴσω περιβόλου.

The *porphyrion* is the most graceful and at the same time the most well-named animal. It enjoys rolling in the dust and bathes like the pigeons do. It does not devote itself to the dusting places and the baths before taking a certain number of steps that satisfies it. It hates eating in the presence of viewers and for that reason retreats and eats while hiding. It is extremely jealous and closely guards the married women¹⁰¹. And if it detects that the lady of the house commits adultery, it strangles itself. It does not fly high. Humans take pleasure in it and tend to it with great care and consideration. And it either appears as a pet in a sumptuous and very rich house, or is admitted into a sanctuary, roams freely and walks around as a sacred animal within the precinct.

⁹⁸ The text is that of OLSON 2020, p. 108.

⁹⁹ See also WELLMANN 1891, pp. 484-6.

¹⁰⁰ The text is that of GARCÍA VALDÉS–LLERA FUEYO–RODRÍGUEZ-NORIEGA GUILLÉN 2009, pp. 70-1, except that I adopt Hercher's conjecture ὑπάνδρους («married») for ἀνάνδρους («without a husband»).

¹⁰¹ I interpret τὰς ὑπάνδρους τῶν γυναικῶν as referring to humans. So also ENGELS 2014, p. 84 n. 107 («die Ehefrauen»); BRODERSEN 2018, p. 163 («die verheirateten Frauen»); MYNOTT 2018, p. 138 («the married females»). SCHOLFIELD 1958, p. 203, however, translated it as «the mated female birds».

Both Athenaeus and Aelian probably go back to the same direct source, which might be Alexander of Myndus¹⁰², who is cited by Athenaeus shortly after Polemon¹⁰³.

In this fragment, we are again left wondering what the original context of Polemon's discussion might have been. The most plausible explanation is perhaps that it is a digression in a description of a painting of this animal. Indeed, there are many depictions of this bird in Roman frescoes and mosaics¹⁰⁴. Alternatively, Polemon may have digressed on it when describing a certain sanctuary. For Aelian, who reports information similar to Athenaeus, informs us that the purple swamphen was also found in temples, where it roamed freely and was considered a sacred animal.

3.4. *A new fragment on Cretan goats*

Animals are also the topic of another new fragment of Polemon, found in a papyrus commentary on Hipponax.

P.Oxy. XVIII 2176 fr. 1 col. 1, 1-11 + fr. 9 = fr. A, 1-11 Degani¹⁰⁵:

«ὦ Σάνν', ἐπειδὴ ῥίνα θεό[συλιν] ¹⁰⁶ φορέ- εις ¹⁰⁷ , / καὶ γαστρὸς οὐ κατακρ[ατέεις]· κύρι- [ο]ν ὄνομα ὁ Σάγνος, ᾧ λοιδορ[εῖται]. ὃ ἔνιοι ¹⁰⁸ »	«Sannus, since you [have] a sacrilegious nose and have no control over your stomach» (Hippon. fr. 129, 1-2 Degani = fr. 118, 1-2
--	--

¹⁰² See also WELLMANN 1891, p. 503; ZECCHINI 1989, p. 230. WELLMANN 1916 later withdrew his theory and considered Pamphilus the common source for parallels between Athenaeus and Aelian's *Nature of Animals*. According to WELLMANN 1916, p. 43, Athenaeus more specifically relied on Pamphilus' lexicon, while Aelian supposedly drew on Pamphilus' *Meadow* (Λειμών), but this speculative theory has found little support. The attribution of Athenaeus' discussion of birds in the ninth book to Pamphilus' lexicon, however, had already been proposed by previous scholars: see SCHOENEMANN 1886, pp. 82-4; BAPP 1888, p. 257. Yet what might speak against Pamphilus is the fact that, unlike the catalogue of cups in book 11 and unlike Pamphilus' lexicon, the list of birds is not alphabetically ordered. For the section on the *porphyryion*, there is also no parallel with Hesychius. However we identify the common source, it is clear, *pace* PRELLER 1838, p. 102, that Aelian did not directly use Athenaeus here, since he includes informations not found in the *Deipnosophists*.

¹⁰³ Ath. 9, 388d = Alexander of Myndus I fr. 8 Wellmann. Between Polemon and Alexander, Athenaeus cites Aristotle (Ath. 9, 388c-d = fr. 348 Rose³ = fr. 255 Gigon). According to PRELLER 1838, p. 102, Aristotle was actually quoted by Polemon. The descriptions of Aristotle and Polemon also seem to lie at the basis of D.P. *Ixeuticon* 1, 29 (presumably through the same source as that used by Athenaeus and Aelian): see WELLMANN 1891, pp. 511-2.

¹⁰⁴ See LOPES-GÓMEZ-ANDREOTTI-ANDREONI 2016, pp. 582-8.

¹⁰⁵ I have reexamined the papyrus for the text presented here.

¹⁰⁶ Other supplements that have been proposed are θεο[μυση] by LATTE 1948, pp. 37; 40; 41 and θεο[ισεχθρήν] by FRAENKEL 1942, p. 54 and VOGLIANO 1948, p. 257. However, θεό[συλιν], first proposed by Lobel ap. MAAS 1942, is confirmed by a passage further on in the papyrus that paraphrases the poetic words as τὴν [ἰ]ερόσυλιν ῥίνα (fr. 1, 14). Lobel's supplement has been accepted by all other editors.

¹⁰⁷ L. 2 seems to have begun with -εις; the Greek syllabification rules imply that l. 1 thus ended in a vowel or diphthong. This excludes supplements that reconstruct a consonant before -εις (such as [ἔ]χ]εις proposed by Maas ap. FRAENKEL 1942, p. 55 n. 1 and VOGLIANO 1948, p. 257, [τρέ]φ]εις by LATTE 1948, pp. 37; 41 and [φέρ]εις by Diehl ap. DIEHL-BEUTLER 1952, p. 116). WEST 1971, p. 152; 1974, pp. 143; 147; 1980, p. 118 supplemented [φύ]εις, which has been accepted by SNELL in FRANYÓ-SNELL 1972, p. 110, METTE 1978, p. 40 and NICOLOSI 2019, pp. 247; 262; 263. However, after θεό[συλιν], there seem to have been at least four letters. For this reason, the supplements [ἄ]εις proposed by Ebert ap. DEGANI 1984, p. 273; 1991, p. 231 and [σί]εις (an Ionic form of σείεις) proposed by NERI 1995; 2011, p. 61 are not likely either. The supplement [φορέ]εις, proposed by LUPPE 1975, p. 691 and accepted by DEGANI 1984, p. 272, WEST 1989, p. 152 and SLINGS in BREMER-VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP-SLINGS 1987, p. 70; 73, in contrast, is long enough to fit the lacuna.

¹⁰⁸ LATTE 1948, p. 37 was the first to propose [ὃ ἔνιοι], which was also accepted by MASSON 1962, p. 85 and GEORGACAS 1984, p. 113. Since l. 4 begins with πεποιθηθαί, however, [ὃ ἔνιοι] should be supplemented in its entirety at the end of l. 3; so also WEST 1971, p. 152; 1980, p. 118; 1989, p. 152 and METTE 1978, p. 40. See also NICOLOSI 2019, p. 263. Another supplement is [ἄλλοι | δὲ], proposed by Maas ap. FRAENKEL 1942, p. 55 n. 1 and accepted by B. SNELL in DIEHL-BEUTLER 1952, p. 116 and DE SOUSA MEDEIROS 1961, p. 175; if accepted, this should be supplemented at the end of l. 3 as [ἄλλοι δὲ], but this might be too long for the available space. SLINGS in BREMER-VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP-SLINGS 1987, p. 74 suggested supplementing λοιδορ[εῖ. τοῦτο γὰρ] (so with

πεποιῆσθαί φασιν παρὰ τῆ[ν σαννάδα],
 Κρ[ῆτ]ας δὲ τὰς ἀγρίας αἴγας λέγειν σαν->¹⁰⁹
 [νάδας, ὡς φη]σιν¹¹⁰ Πολέμων ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς
 [Ἀντίγονον κα]ὶ Ἀδαίου· τὰς δὲ αἴγας ἐπι->
 [c. 10] .οπλήκτους εἶναι καὶ ...
 [c. 10] καὶ ἐν τῷ βίῳ τ[ὸ]ς εὐή->
 [θεῖς c. 7] .μεν[c. 5] λλουδε του>
 [c. 11]ν.

West²): Sannus is a [personal] name, with which he is mocked. [Some people] say that [it] has been created on account of the *sannas* and that the Cretans call wild goats *sannades*, [as] Polemon [says] in the books *Against Antigonus and Adaeus*. The goats ... are struck ... and in everyday life, the simpletons ...

Polemon is cited as part of an interpretation of two lines of an invective by Hipponax against a certain gluttonous man named Sannus¹¹¹. According to the commentator, the name Sannus is derived from the word *sannas*. He then cites Polemon for the information that *sannas* is the word used by the Cretans to denote a wild goat. This interpretation of the word *sannas* also recurs in Hesychius¹¹².

The subsequent lacunary section in the papyrus (ll. 7-9) seems to offer an explanation for the link between the nickname Sannus and the Cretan *sannades* goats. The beginning of l. 8 has been supplemented in various ways. The first legible word is some compound in -πληκτος. Before omicron, the papyrus has an upright, which is probably part of iota, pi or nu. Lobel supplemented [ἀ]ποπλήκτους «dumbstruck, dumbfounded»¹¹³, which was accepted by Latte and Slings¹¹⁴. If the first member of the compound in -πληκτος is a substantive (instead of a prefix), the first member can denote the object or entity by which one is struck¹¹⁵, the place where one is struck¹¹⁶ or the manner in which one is struck¹¹⁷. Vogliano proposed [σανν]ιοπλήκτους «struck/afflicted by/in the genitalia»¹¹⁸, which was accepted by de Sousa Medeiros, Masson, West and Mette¹¹⁹. West later supplemented [δαιμο]γοπλήκτους «struck/possessed by a daemon»¹²⁰.

the active λουδορεῖ instead of the passive or middle λουδορεῖται), which would also fit the lacuna. NICOLSI 2019, p. 247 supplemented nothing between λουδορεῖται and πεποιῆσθαι, but this cannot be correct in view of the length of the lacuna.

¹⁰⁹ The *diple* (>) is used as a line filler in this papyrus.

¹¹⁰ The supplement [ὡς φη]σιν goes back to WEST 1971, p. 152; 1980, p. 118; 1989, p. 152 and was also adopted by METTE 1978, p. 40. Another possible supplement is [καθὰ φη]σιν, proposed by LOBEL 1941, p. 89 and accepted by VOGLIANO 1948, p. 258. LATTE 1948, pp. 38; 40 supplemented [παρίστη]σιν, which also fits the lacuna and was accepted by B. SNELL in DIEHL–BEUTLER 1952, p. 116; DE SOUSA MEDEIROS 1961, p. 175; MASSON 1962, p. 85; FARINA 1963, p. 59; GEORGACAS 1984, p. 113. DEGANI 1991, p. 135 and NICOLSI 2019, p. 247 merely supplemented σαν|[νάδας φη]σιν, but this is too short for the lacuna. See also SLINGS in BREMER–VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP–SLINGS 1987, p. 74.

¹¹¹ This is how the commentator interprets the name. It is also possible that Σάνν' is actually the elided form of Σάννᾶ, the vocative of Σάννᾶς. See LOBEL 1941, p. 95; MASSON 1962, p. 163; FARINA 1963, p. 137; MONTANARI 2002, p. 74; NICOLSI 2019, p. 262. According to SLINGS in BREMER–VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP–SLINGS 1987, p. 84, the name Σάννας/Σάννης is unattested, but this is incorrect. Cf. *IG* II², 2404, 3; MERITT 1935, p. 365 no. I, 447 = McCabe, Kolophon 6, 447; Pixodarus Hoard, Ephesus obverse 4 and 5, ASHTON *et al.* 2002, pp. 175; 201; *I.Labraunda* 110, 5 = McCabe, Labraunda 190, 5; *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* V.C s.v. Σαννας (unpublished inscription from Dorylaeum).

¹¹² Hsch. σ 171 Hansen: σαννάδας· τὰς ἀγρίας αἴγας. The text of Hesychius' direct source (Diogenianus' lexicon) also appears to be preserved in a papyrus fragment (*P.Oxy.* XLVII 3329 fr. 1↓ 3-4).

¹¹³ LOBEL 1941, p. 89.

¹¹⁴ LATTE 1948, p. 38; SLINGS in BREMER–VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP–SLINGS 1987, pp. 71; 74-5.

¹¹⁵ E.g. δαιμον(ι)όπληκτος, ἐχιόπληκτος, θηριόπληκτος, κυνόπληκτος, όφιοπληκτος, σκορπιόπληκτος, φαλαγγιόπληκτος, ήλιόπληκτος, σεληνόπληκτος, άστραπόπληκτος, κεραυνόπληκτος, οινόπληκτος, φαντασιόπληκτος.

¹¹⁶ E.g. καρδιόπληκτος, στερνόπληκτος, φρενόπληκτος.

¹¹⁷ E.g. μυριόπληκτος.

¹¹⁸ VOGLIANO 1948, p. 258. The word is attested only once in Hsch. σ 173 Hansen, s.v. σαν<v>ιόπληκτος.

¹¹⁹ DE SOUSA MEDEIROS 1961, p. 175; MASSON 1962, p. 85; WEST 1971, p. 152; 1980, p. 118; METTE 1978, p. 40.

¹²⁰ WEST 1989, p. 152.

Scholars have thus given roughly two interpretations of ll. 7-9. Sannus either gets his name from the sexual appetite of Cretan goats (which are σαννιόπληκτος, i.e. αἰδοιόπληκτος)¹²¹, or from the supposed stupidity¹²² of the goats (which are purportedly easily scared or perplexed)¹²³. In any case, in what follows (ll. 9-10), the commentator seems to treat the interpretation that Sannus is supposed to refer to the man's stupidity (καὶ ἐν τῷ βίῳ τοῦ εὐή[θεις])¹²⁴. Indeed, σάννας appears to have also been a word to denote a stupid person¹²⁵. What follows next in the papyrus (ll. 10-1) is difficult to reconstruct¹²⁶.

¹²¹ See Hsch. σ 173 Hansen: σαν<ν>ιόπληκτος· αἰδοιόπληκτος (cf. also *P.Oxy.* XLVII 3329 fr. 1↓ 5-6 + fr. 2↓ 3). Indeed, σάννιον can denote the male genitalia: cf. Theognost. *Can.* 743 (σάννιον τὸ αἰδοῖον); Hsch. σ 172 Hansen (σάννιον· τὸ αἰδοῖον, ἀντὶ τοῦ κέρκιον) (~ *Synagoge* versio A σ 21 Cunningham ~ Phot. *Lexicon* σ 67 Theodoridis, s.v. σάννιον; cf. also *P.Oxy.* XLVII 3329 fr. 1↓ 5 + fr. 2↓ 3).

¹²² This goes against what Aristotle says about Cretan wild goats in *HA* 8, 6, 612a (~ Ps.-Arist. *Mir.* 4, 830b; Ps.-Antig. *Mir.* 30, 1; cf. Thphr. *HP* 9, 16, 1; Verg. *Aen.* 12, 412-5), where the animals are actually considered to be smart.

¹²³ The exact reconstruction of ll. 7-8 remains difficult. LATTE 1948, p. 38 supplemented τὰς δὲ αἶγας ἐπὶ | [τῷ πάντοτε ἀ]ποπλήκτους εἶναι [κα]λ[οῦ]σιν | [οὔτως], «the goats are given this name because they are always struck dumb». However, this supplement must be rejected for two reasons: (1) fr. 9 (which was published as a separate fragment in the *editio princeps*) was later joined to fr. 1 by LOBEL 1948, p. 153, so that εἶναι is followed by και, then probably nu or mu, and finally the tip of a letter and an upright (perhaps αι or ω); (2) it interprets the *sannades* as being named after stupid people rather than the other way round: see SLINGS in BREMER-VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP-SLINGS 1987, p. 74. For the same reason, the supplement of DE SOUSA MEDEIROS 1961, p. 175 is unlikely, viz. τὰς δὲ αἶγας ἐπὶ | [σανν]ιοπλήκτους εἶναι καλ[οῦ]σιν | [οὔτως], «the goats are given this name because they are possessed by their genitalia». WEST 1971, p. 152; 1980, p. 118 supplemented τὰς δὲ αἶγας ἐπὶ[[σταται σανν]ιοπλήκτους εἶναι, «he (sc. Polemon) knows that the goats are possessed by their genitalia», which was accepted by METTE 1978, p. 40. However, ἐπίσταμαι commonly takes a participle as its complement, not an *accusativus cum infinitivo*. WEST 1989, p. 152 later supplemented τὰς δὲ αἶγας ἐπὶ | [τὸ πολὺ δαιμο]γοπλήκτους εἶναι «the goats are often struck by a daemon». Finally, SLINGS in BREMER-VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP-SLINGS 1987, p. 75 suggested supplementing τὰς δὲ αἶγας ἐπὶ[[φέρουσιν ἀ]ποπλήκτους εἶναι «they adduce as explanation that the goats are dumb struck» or τὰς δὲ αἶγας ἐπὶ | [τὸ πλείστον ἀ]ποπλήκτους εἶναι «the goats are very often dumb struck». The transition from l. 8 to 9 is equally difficult to reconstruct. WEST 1971, p. 152; 1980, p. 118; 1989, p. 152 supplemented εἶναι καὶ ναῖ[[αδολήπτους] (accepted by METTE 1978, p. 40) with a non-existent word *ναιαδὸληπτος. SLINGS in BREMER-VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP-SLINGS 1987, p. 75 more cautiously suggested supplementing either an otherwise unattested word related to ναισιελία (cf. Hsch. ν 37 Latte-Cunningham: ναισιελία· ἡ ἀποπληξία. καὶ ἡ ἐμβροντησία. τινὲς δὲ ναισήματα) or <ἀ>ναῖ[[σθήτους] (cf. Hsch. α 6544 Latte-Cunningham: ἀπόπληκτον· θαυμαστόν. ἀναίσθητον).

¹²⁴ LATTE 1948, pp. 38; 40 supplemented [ὁμοίως] καὶ ἐν τῷ βίῳ τ[οὺς ἄφρο]νας λέγεσθαι ἴ]ζμεν «we know that, in everyday life, stupid people are also given this name»; however, since fr. 9 was later joined to fr. 1, ll. 9-10 cannot be τ[οὺς ἄφρο]νας but in all likelihood reads τοῦ εὐή[θεις], which was first suggested by LOBEL 1948, p. 153 and accepted by all subsequent editors. Latte also mistakenly identified the trace at the beginning of l. 10 as a horizontal bar at line level (Δ, Ξ or Ζ) and therefore conjectured [ἴ]ζμεν (with -ζμ- as an alternative spelling for -σμ-), which was adopted by DE SOUSA MEDEIROS 1961, p. 175. It is actually either the lower trace of an arc (ε, θ, ρ or σ), the foot of a rightward curving upright (η or μ) or a trace of a descending oblique (α, κ, λ or χ). SLINGS in BREMER-VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP-SLINGS 1987, p. 75 considered [ἴ]σμεν but ultimately rejected it, since that would leave out the complement of the name given. He therefore conjectured τοὺς εὐή[θεις τὸδε ὄνομα]σμέν[ους] «the simpletons that have this nickname». WEST 1971, pp. 152-3; 1980, p. 118 supplemented τοῦ εὐή[θεις ἐπιπεφημι]σμέν[ους] «the people (that are) called stupid», which was accepted by METTE 1978, p. 40. Later WEST 1989, pp. 152-3 suggested τοῦ εὐή[θεις σάννου]ς καλο]ῦμεν «we call stupid people *sannoî*». Although this is an attractive conjecture, the trace at the beginning of l. 10 is unlikely to be upsilon, since the upright of upsilon normally descends below the baseline in this papyrus.

¹²⁵ See Ar. Byz. Περὶ τῶν ὑποπτεομένων μὴ εἰρησθαι τοῖς παλαιοῖς p. 427 Miller = fr. 1 Slater (cf. Eust. *Od.* 12, 350 vol. 2 p. 73, 38-9 Stallbaum); Phot. *Lexicon* σ 69 Theodoridis, s.v. σάνναν ~ Eust. *Il.* 9, 607 vol. 2 p. 816 (citing Cratin. fr. 489 Kassel-Austin); Eust. *Od.* 10, 552 vol. 1 p. 395, 13-4 Stallbaum (also citing Cratinus). Cf. also Hsch. σ 175 Hansen, s.v. σάννορος (~ *P.Oxy.* XLVII 3329 fr. 1↓ 7). This interpretation might also be found in *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum* II p. 592, 10 Goetz (*sannus*: *stultus*, where *sannus* might be an error for *sannus*: so PARKER 2013, p. 140 n. 98). According to Eust. *Od.* 12, 350 vol. 2 p. 73, 37-8 Stallbaum, the word is derived from the Asiatic Sannoi, who were considered stupid because of their lack of education.

¹²⁶ SLINGS in BREMER-VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP-SLINGS 1987, p. 75 supplemented [φα]λλοῦ δὲ τοῦ[το ὄνομα] ἐστὶν «this (sc. *sannos*) is a word for penis». Since ll. 11-4 quote more lines of Hipponax, LATTE 1948, p. 40

In this fragment, too, the original context for Polemon's discussion is unclear. Slings pointed out that Polemon's interest in Hipponax is also attested elsewhere¹²⁷. However, Polemon's comments need not have originally been connected with Hipponax at all. An interesting detail overlooked so far is that, in his catalogue of cups, Athenaeus mentions a cup named *sannakra*¹²⁸. Perhaps Polemon digressed on the *sannades* goats when discussing this type of cup and its «ridiculous» name¹²⁹. If Polemon's comment was connected with a discussion of this cup word, the context may have been some artwork in which such a cup was portrayed or perhaps a description of the inventory of a certain sanctuary.

3.5. Fr. 64 on the *plangonion* perfume

Fr. 64 is taken from the fifteenth book of Athenaeus, which is devoted to all types of perfumes and unguents. One such perfume is the *plangonion*.

Ath. 15, 690e = fr. 64 Preller¹³⁰:

Πολέμων δ' ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον παρὰ Ἡλείοις φησὶ μύρον τι πλαγγόνιον καλεῖσθαι εὐρεθὲν ὑπὸ τινος Πλαγγόνος. ὁμοίως ἱστορεῖ καὶ Σωσίβιος ἐν Ὁμοιότησιν.

Polemon in the books *Against Adaeus* says that a certain perfume is called *plangonion* by the Elians. It was discovered by a certain Plangon. Sosibius (*FGrHist* 595 F9) also recounts this in a similar way in *Similarities*.

According to Polemon, the *plangonion* perfume is used in Elis and was invented by a certain woman named Plangon. Athenaeus adds that similar information was found in Sosibius, who wrote among other things about Spartan antiquities¹³¹. He then compares this with the *megalleion* perfume, which is named after Megallus of Sicily. Again, we have a parallel with Pollux' *Onomasticon*, who does not mention Polemon¹³². Here, too, Athenaeus probably cites

supplemented [ἐν ἄλλου δὲ τοῦ] [το οὕτως εὔρο]ν «in another copy, I found the text as follows». Indeed, the commentator partly quotes the same text again as in ll. 1-2. However, ἐν + genitive is impossible here. WEST 1971, p. 153; 1980, p. 118 supplemented [ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦ] [το, ἀλλὰ φησὶ]ν «but this is not the case, but he says...». Later WEST 1989, p. 153 read [διὰ πολλοῦ δὲ τοῦ | [ὑπερβατοῦ φησὶ]ν «through the large hyperbaton, he says...». According to most other scholars, in contrast, the quotation from Hipponax in ll. 11-4 introduces a new lemma. So LOBEL 1941, p. 95; MASSON 1962, p. 85; DEGANI 1984, p. 273; SLINGS in BREMER–VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP–SLINGS 1987, p. 75; NICOLOSI 2019, p. 247. The key problem is that the commentator appears to have omitted the second line of the poem (sc. καὶ γαστρὸς οὐ κατακρατέεις) in this new lemma/quotation.

¹²⁷ SLINGS in BREMER–VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP–SLINGS 1987, p. 74. See Polemon fr. 45 Preller = Ath. 15, 698b-c (from *Against Timaeus*) on the invention of epic parody, which Polemon attributes to Hipponax.

¹²⁸ Ath. 11, 497e-f. The *sannakra* might be a vessel in the shape of an animal: see TUCHELT 1962, p. 118. Athenaeus quotes Philemon (fr. 90 Kassel–Austin), who mentioned the *sannakra* together with the *hippotragelaphoi* (< ἵππος «horse» + τράγος «goat», ἔλαφος «stag») and the *batiakia* (perhaps < βάτος, a type of fish). Note that *σαννάκρα* in Athenaeus is often corrected to *σαννάκια*: so KAIBEL 1887-1890, III, p. 97; L. CITELLI in CANFORA 2001, IV, p. 553; OLSON 2006-2012, V, p. 422. In his Teubner edition, however, OLSON 2020, p. 338 has kept *σαννάκρα*. What speaks against *σαννάκια* is that the lemmas in Athenaeus' catalogue of cups normally appear in the singular form.

¹²⁹ Cf. Ath. 11, 497f (τῆ γελοιοτήτι τοῦ ὀνόματος).

¹³⁰ The text is that of OLSON 2019, p. 348.

¹³¹ This is the only passage that attests Sosibius' work entitled *Similarities*. According to A. BAYLISS on *BNJ* 595 F9, it «was written either to explain similarities between Sparta and other states, or to explain names that were similar». According to this interpretation, the *plangonion* perfume was used by both Eleans and Spartans.

¹³² Poll. 6, 104: ἰστέον μύρον μεγάλλειον ἀπὸ Μεγάλλου Σικελιώτου καὶ πλαγγόνιον ἀπὸ Πλαγγόνος. See also Hellad. ap. Phot. *Bibl. codex* 279 p. 532b Bekker: ὅτι μύρων εἶδη, φησὶ, [...] πλαγγόνιον, ὅπερ εὔρε γυνὴ Ἡλεία καλουμένη Πλάγγων, μεταλλεῖον, ὅπερ εὔρε Μέταλος Συρακούσιος; schol. Clem. Al. *Paed.* 196, 9 p. 329 Stählin–Treu: μετᾶλλον ἀπὸ τινος Μετάλλου, οὕτω καλουμένου, ὃς καὶ εὔρεν πλαγγόνιον ἀπὸ Πλαγγόνος τῆς ἐφευρηκίας. For the *megalleion*, see also Theognost. *Can.* 779; Ps.-Zonar. s.v. μεγαλλεῖον p. 1347 Tittmann; Phot. μ 164 Theodoridis, s.v. μεγάλλειον μύρον ~ Suid. μ 358, s.v. μεγαλεῖον μύρον; Hsch. μ 469 Latte–Cunningham, sv. μεγάλλειον; μ 1011 Latte–Cunningham, s.v. μετᾶλλειον μύρον; Eust. *Od.* 18, 192 vol. 2 p. 175,

Polemon through a lexicon, perhaps that of Pamphilus¹³³. Like in the fragment on the *seleucis* cup (fr. 57), Athenaeus cites only part of the title, viz. Πρὸς Ἀδαίων, without Antigonus. In this fragment, it is less obvious in what context Polemon gave this information. One could speculate that the point of departure may have been some portrayal of a symposium, where perfumes and ointments were often used¹³⁴.

3.6. Fr. 62 on washing one's hands at symposia

Next are two fragments that deal with grammar. Fr. 62 is found at the end of the ninth book of the *Deipnosophists* in a discussion of vocabulary related to washing one's hands at symposia.

Ath. 9, 410c = fr. 62 Preller¹³⁵:

Πολέμων δ' ἐν ἔκτῳ τῶν Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον καὶ Ἀδαίων περὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς λέγει τοῦ κατὰ χειρὸς πρὸς τὸ νίψασθαι.

Polemon in the sixth book *Against Antigonus and Adaeus* speaks about the difference between *kata cheiros* and *nipsasthai*.

One specific problem is the difference between the expressions κατὰ χειρός (ὔδωρ) «(water) over the hand» and (ἀπο)νίψασθαι. Athenaeus cites the opinion of the grammarian Aristophanes of Byzantium, according to whom, in Attic writers, the phrase κατὰ χειρός was only used for washing one's hands before dinner, whereas ἀπονίψασθαι was used after dinner¹³⁶. Athenaeus rejects this distinction¹³⁷ and, in this context, cites Polemon, who in the sixth book *Against Antigonus and Adaeus* also discussed the difference between the expression κατὰ χειρός and νίψασθαι, although we are not told how Polemon interpreted these terms¹³⁸. Here, too, we could assume, for instance, a description of a symposium as Polemon's point of departure. It is also possible that Polemon criticized Antigonus or Adaeus for using the incorrect term.

3.7. Fr. 65 on the pronunciation of Attic demes

Another fragment dealing with grammar is fr. 65, found in Photius and the *Suda* under the lemma Ἄζηνιεῖς, which discusses the pronunciation of the Attic demes of the Azenians, Erchians and Halians.

6-10 Stallbaum; *EM* s.v. μεγαλειῶν p. 574 Kallierges; Orus ap. *EM* s.v. μετάλλειον p. 587 Kallierges. Note also the variants μετάλ(λ)ειον and Μέταλ(λ)ος for μεγάλλειον and Μέγαλλος in Helladius, the scholia on Clement (cf. Clem. Al. *Paed.* 2, 8, 64, 2), the second lemma in Hesychius and the second lemma in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (citing Orus).

¹³³ See also Hsch. π 2410 Hansen: πλαγγόνιον· μύρον τι παρὰ Ἀθηναίους. Hesychius surprisingly speaks of Athens instead of Elis.

¹³⁴ DEICHGRÄBER 1952, p. 1306 suggested a description of a painting as the original context.

¹³⁵ The text is that of OLSON 2020, p. 152.

¹³⁶ Ar. Byz. fr. 368 Slater = Ath. 9, 410b-c (cf. Eust. *Od.* 1, 137 vol. 1 p. 34, 39-41 Stallbaum). Ath. 9, 408f-9a indicates that Aristophanes discussed this in his work *Against Callimachus' Pinaces* (Πρὸς τοὺς Καλλιμάχου πίνακας). See especially the discussion in SLATER 1986, pp. 134-5. See also Tryphon fr. 137 von Velsen = Eust. *Od.* 1, 137 vol. 1 p. 35, 21-2 Stallbaum; schol. Aristoph. V. 1216 Koster; *Synagoge* versio B α 1917 Cunningham, s.v. ἀπονίψασθαι = Phot. *Lexicon* α 2588, s.v. ἀπονίψασθαι = Suid. α 3455, s.v. ἀπόνιπτρον; Thom. Mag. *Ecloga nominum et verborum Atticorum* s.v. ἀπόνιπτρον καὶ ἀπονίψασθαι p. 3-4 Ritschl.

¹³⁷ According to SLATER 1986, p. 134, Athenaeus' criticism of Aristophanes might be based on Polemon.

¹³⁸ According to Ps.-Ammon. *Diff.* 68 Nickau ~ Pseudo-Ptolemaeus, *De differentia vocabulorum* p. 389 Heylbut ~ Lexica synonymica, *Differentiae verborum* 42 Palmieri, κατὰ χειρός was used before dinner, and ἀπονίψασθαι both before and after dinner. Poll. 6, 92, conversely, claims that νίψασθαι was used before eating and ἀπονίψασθαι after eating (κατὰ χειρός is not included in the distinction).

Phot. *Lexicon* α 434 = Suid. α 594 = fr. 65 Preller¹³⁹:

Ἄζηνιεύς καὶ Ἐρχιεὺς καὶ Ἄλιεύς καὶ πάντα τὰ ὅμοια δασέως φησὶ φθέγγεσθαι τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς τοὺς παλαιοὺς Πολέμων ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον καὶ Ἀντίγονον.

Polemon in the books *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* says that the ancient Attic people pronounce Azenians, Erchians, Halians and all similar words with rough breathing.

In the *Suda*, this text is part of the lemma Ἄζηνιεύς and is preceded by «Azenieus: Azenia is a deme of the Hippothontis tribe, after which the tribesman is called Azenieus» (Ἄζηνιεύς: Ἄζηνία δῆμος ἐστὶ φυλῆς τῆς Ἴπποθοωντίδος, ἀφ' ἧς ὁ φυλῆτης Ἄζηνιεύς). Preller also printed this extra text as part of the fragment¹⁴⁰. However, comparison with Photius' text (not yet known to Preller) shows that the *Suda* has actually merged two separate lemmata here. The first part (from Ἄζηνία δῆμος ἐστὶ τοῦ φυλῆτης Ἄζηνιεύς) was the text of the lemma Ἄζηνιεύς, which also appears as a separate lemma in Photius¹⁴¹ and goes back to the epitome of Harpocration¹⁴². The second part belonged to a lemma Ἄζηνιεύς¹⁴³. So the fragment of Polemon can only be associated with the second half of the *Suda* lemma. Photius also shows that the correct reading is φησὶ φθέγγεσθαι (not φασὶ φθέγγεσθαι, as the *Suda* reads it), so with Polemon as its subject, which confirms that the information in the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction indeed goes back to Polemon¹⁴⁴.

The demes in question are Azenia (part of the Hippothontis *phyle*), Erchia (part of the Aegeis *phyle*) and Halae Araphenides (also part of the Aegeis *phyle*) or Halae Aexonides (part of the Cecropis *phyle*). According to Polemon, the ancient people of Attica pronounced all three demotics with rough breathing, so Hazenians, Herchians and Halians. Inscriptions written in the Old Attic alphabet (where H is used to indicate rough breathing) give only partial support to this claim. Ἄλαιεύς (as the demotic is actually spelled¹⁴⁵) is almost always written with rough breathing¹⁴⁶; for the deme Erchia, both Ἐρχιεύς¹⁴⁷ and *herchiεύς*¹⁴⁸ are attested. There are no inscriptions in the Old Attic alphabet that mention the deme Azenia¹⁴⁹. Polemon further refers to «all similar words» (πάντα τὰ ὅμοια). This might refer to other Attic demes that

¹³⁹ I print the text of Photius as edited by THEODORIDIS 1982-2012, I, p. 51, except that I write Ἄζηνιεύς and Ἐρχιεὺς with smooth breathing. That is how the text is read in the codex Zavordensis 95 (z) and in the manuscripts of the *Suda* (so ADLER 1928-1938, I, p. 60). Theodoridis, however, prints Ἄζηνιεύς and Ἐρχιεὺς with rough breathing, which is the reading of the codex Berolinensis gr. oct. 22 (b). Note that some manuscripts of the *Suda* even write ἄλιεύς with smooth breathing (so the codex Parisinus gr. 2625 fol. 14r [A]) and Vaticanus gr. 1296 fol. 18r [S]).

¹⁴⁰ PRELLER 1838, p. 106.

¹⁴¹ Phot. *Lexicon* α 436, s.v. Ἄζηνιεύς. The lemma was transmitted to both Photius and the *Suda* through the interpolated *Synagoge* (cf. *Synagoge* versio B α 415 Cunningham, s.v. Ἄζηνιεύς).

¹⁴² See Harp. α 41 Keaney, s.v. Ἄζηνιεύς.

¹⁴³ The common source of Photius and the *Suda* is probably a version of the expanded *Synagoge*. So ADLER 1928-1938, I, p. 60 and THEODORIDIS 1982-2012, I, p. 51.

¹⁴⁴ For this reason, we should also reject the explanation of K. MÜLLER 1841-1851, III, p. 134, according to which the words Πολέμων ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον καὶ Ἀντίγονον intruded into the lemma Ἄζηνιεύς from the lemma Ἄζησιᾶ (Suid. α 597).

¹⁴⁵ Inscriptions systematically have the form Ἄλαιεύς, not Ἄλιεύς, as Photius and the *Suda* write. A variant attested from the IV century BCE onward is Ἄλαεύς without iota; cf. also Steph. Byz. α 189: Ἄλαϊ Ἀραφηνίδες καὶ Ἄλαϊ Αἰζωνίδες: δῆμοι, ὁ μὲν τῆς Αἰγίδος, ὁ δ' Αἰζωνεύς τῆς Κεκροπίδος φυλῆς. ἐκατέρου ὁ δημότης ἄνευ τοῦ ι Ἄλαεύς, καὶ Ἀλῆθεν καὶ Ἀλῆσι καὶ Ἀλῆνδε. See THREATTE 1980, pp. 280-1.

¹⁴⁶ The only inscription in the Old Attic alphabet where the aspiration is not written is *IG I³ 959, 1* (Ἄλαιε[ὺς]).

¹⁴⁷ Cf. *IG I³ 364, 16* (Ἐρχιεύς); 433, 54 (Ἐρχιεύς); 455, 12-3 (Ἐρχιεύς[ς]); 472 A, fr. a-b, 19 (Ἐρχιεύς).

¹⁴⁸ Cf. *IG I³ 375, 7* (*herchiεύς*); 476, fr. XVII col. 1, 225 (*herchiεύς*); fr. XVII col. 2, 308 (*herchiεύς*). See also MEISTERHANS-SCHWYZER 1900, p. 86.

¹⁴⁹ In later writers, Ἄζηνία/Ἄζηνιεύς is almost always written with smooth breathing.

(occasionally) have rough breathing¹⁵⁰, but it might also refer more generally to words that have rough breathing in Attic but not in other dialects¹⁵¹.

Bencker assumes that the topic under discussion was an inscription, in which Antigonos or Adaeus made a grammatical error, which was criticized by Polemon¹⁵². However, it is equally possible that Polemon mentioned the deme (1) of an artist¹⁵³, (2) of a person portrayed in a work of art¹⁵⁴, or (3) of a person dedicating a certain work (perhaps indicated in an inscription)¹⁵⁵, which led to a digression on the «original» pronunciation of the demotics Ἀζηνιεύς, Ἐρχιεύς and Ἄλ(α)ιεύς. Alternatively, it is also possible that Polemon discussed a dedication by the deme as a whole. Incidentally, Antigonos also mentioned the Halaeans in his work *On Diction* (Περὶ λέξεως), where he discussed a sacrifice offered by them to Poseidon, called the θυνναῖον¹⁵⁶. Note also that one of Polemon's periegetic works also appears to have recorded the eponymous heroes of the Attic demes and *phylai*¹⁵⁷.

4. Fragments without a book title

4.1. Fr. 66 on the painter Androcydes of Cyzicus

The last four fragments cite no book title but were nevertheless attributed by Preller to the work *Against Adaeus and Antigonos*. The first of these is fr. 66, which is found in the eighth book of the *Deipnosophists*. In book 8, Athenaeus discusses various stories about fish and fish eaters. One of these stories concerns the painter Androcydes of Cyzicus¹⁵⁸, who, according to Polemon,

¹⁵⁰ For instance, the deme Oa normally has smooth breathing (Ὅα, Ὅα(ι)εύς/Ὠαιεύς, Ὅαθεν/Ὠαθεν), but Old Attic inscriptions generally use rough breathing: cf. *IG I³* 296, 5 (hoaiεύς); 297, 14 (hoaiεύς); 322, 37 (hoaiεύς); 472 A fr. a-b, 10 (hoaiεύς); Agora XVI 20[3] fr. g, 4 (hoaiεύς); smooth breathing is found in *IG I³* 848, 2 = Raubitschek, *DAA* 160, 2 (Ὅαθεν). For the deme Hagnus, later writers sometimes use rough breathing (Ἄγνοῦς and Ἄγνούσιοι) and sometimes smooth breathing (Ἄγνοῦς, Ἄγνούσιοι), but Old Attic inscriptions always have rough breathing (ἡγνόσιος): see also THREATTE 1980, p. 503. Some words (occasionally) receive secondary breathing in Old Attic inscriptions. Thus, for the deme Oe (Ὅη, Ὅηθεν/Οἰῆθεν), *IG I³* 370 fr. a-c, 21 uses rough breathing (hoēθεν); forms with smooth breathing are found in *IG I³* 476 fr. XVII col. 2, 278 (Ὅεθεν); 1396 (Ὅεθεν). Similarly, for the Agryle, Alopece and Otryne demes (all three normally written with smooth breathing), rough breathing is found in *IG I³* 476 fr. XVII col. 1, 169-70 (ἡαγρυλέ[σι]); 186 (ἡαγρυλέθεν); 173-4 (ἡαλῶπεκέ[σι]); col. 2, 269 (hoτρυνεῖ); elsewhere in this inscription, however, forms without rough breathing are used (Ἄγρυλέθεν, Ἄγρυλέσι and Ἄλῶπεκέσι).

¹⁵¹ Cf. *Synagoge* versio B α 931 Cunningham, s.v. ἀλύειν = Phot. *Lexicon* α 1030 Theodoridis, s.v. ἀλύειν ~ Suid. α 1429, s.v. ἀλύειν (καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀλεαίνεσθαι δασύνουσιν οἱ Ἄττικοί, καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἅμιν ἅμαξα ἄμνός Ἄλαεις ἀνύειν ἄμῳς). For this feature of the Attic dialect, see MEISTERHANS-SCHWYZER 1900, pp. 86-7.

¹⁵² BENCKER 1890, p. 20. Bencker spoke somewhat inaccurately of an error against «historical morphology», although Polemon is discussing phonology (viz. the appearance of rough breathing in Old Attic), not morphology.

¹⁵³ For instance, Erchia was the deme of a stone cutter named Philon (ca. 408 BCE; cf. *IG I³* 476 fr. XVII col. 1, 224-5; col. 3, 308) and a goldsmith named Archephon (ca. 320 BCE; cf. *IG II²* 1469 A col. 1, 21-3; *IG II²* 1471 A col. 1, 14-5).

¹⁵⁴ The most famous person from Azenia was the politician Aristophon, who was honored for his resistance against the Thirty: see MILLER 1895. Among the most famous people from Erchia are the orator Isocrates (cf. *Ps.-Plut. Vitae X oratorum* 4, 836e; *P.Cair.Masp.* II 67175 = *FGrHist* 1124 F1; *Steph. Byz.* ε 138, s.v. Ἐρχιά), the historian Xenophon (cf. *D.L.* 2, 48) and an orator named Deinias (cf. *Demosth.* 20, 146). For other prominent people/families from Erchia, see YOUNG 1891; HUMPHREYS 2018, pp. 871-5. For prominent people from Halae Araphenides, see HUMPHREYS 2018, pp. 880-3. For those from Halae Aexonides, see HUMPHREYS 2018, pp. 1085-97.

¹⁵⁵ See, for example, the dedication of a statue of Lysias by Hegesias in *IG II²* 3843 (Ἡγησίας | Ἡγησίππου | Ἐρχιεύς | [Λ]υσίαν [- - - | - - - | ἀνέθηκεν]).

¹⁵⁶ Antig. fr. 56a Dorandi = *Ath.* 7, 297e.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. fr. 9 Preller = fr. 15 Capel Badino = schol. *Aristoph. Av.* 645b Holwerda (ἀναγράφει δὲ τοὺς ἐπωνύμους τῶν δήμων καὶ φυλῶν Πολέμων). It is uncertain whether this was a separate work (as PRELLER 1838, pp. 41-2; 1848, p. 1791 assumed) or a section of one of the periegetic works. See the discussion in Capel Badino 2018, pp. 223-6.

¹⁵⁸ On the painter Androcydes of Cyzicus, see W. MÜLLER 2001a; MIELSCH 2014.

was such a great fish lover that, in one of his paintings, he meticulously depicted the fish swimming around Scylla.

Ath. 8, 341a = fr. 66 Preller (*DNO* 1790)¹⁵⁹:

καὶ Ἀνδροκύδης δ' ὁ Κυζικηνὸς ζωγράφος φίλιχθους ὄν, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Πολέμων, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἦλθεν ἡδυπαθείας ὡς καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὴν Σκύλλαν ἰχθὺς κατὰ σπουδὴν γράψαι.

And since the painter Androcydes of Cyzicus was also a fish lover, as Polemon recounts, he reached such a degree of indulgence¹⁶⁰ that he also painted the fish around Scylla with great care.

The same information about Androcydes' love for fish recurs twice in Plutarch's *Table Talks*.

Plut. *Quaestiones convivales* 4, 2, 3, 665d (*DNO* 1791)¹⁶¹:

ἐκεῖνος (sc. Ἀνδροκύδης) γὰρ ὧν ἐποίησε πάντων ἐναργέστατα καὶ κάλλιστα τοὺς περὶ τὴν Σκύλλαν ἰχθὺς ζωγραφήσας ἔδοξε τῷ πάθει μᾶλλον ἢ τέχνῃ κεχρησθαι, φύσει γὰρ ἦν φίλοψος».

For of all the things this man (sc. Androcydes) made, he painted the fish around Scylla in the most prominent and most beautiful manner. Therefore, he seems to have applied passion rather than skill. For he was a natural lover of delicacies.

Plut. *Quaestiones convivales* 4, 4, 2, 668c (*DNO* 1792)¹⁶²:

ὄν (sc. τὸν ζωγράφον Ἀνδροκύδην) φασι τὴν Σκύλλαν ζωγραφοῦντα τοὺς περὶ αὐτὴν ἰχθὺς ἐμπαθέστατα καὶ ζωτικώτατα δι' ὀψοφαγίαν ἐξεργάσασθαι.

In painting Scylla, he (sc. the painter Androcydes) is said to have elaborately depicted the fish around it in the most passionate and lifelike manner because of his habit of eating delicacies.

In all likelihood, Plutarch relies on Polemon as well. Polemon is applying the so-called method of Chamaeleon here, i.e. the method of deriving biographical information from an artist's work¹⁶³. In this case, Androcydes' attention to detail with regard to the fish led Polemon to conclude that Androcydes must have been a fish lover. However, attention to fish seems to have been a general trait of this period, also reflected in the «fish plates» from Attica and Campania¹⁶⁴. It says little about Androcydes as a person.

Like the fragments discussed at the start of this article (fr. 58 and fr. 63), this fragment is part of a description of a painting¹⁶⁵. For this reason, an attribution to the work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* is certainly plausible. According to Bencker, however, the fragment is derived from Polemon's *On the Paintings in Sicyon* (Περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικυῶνι πινάκων)¹⁶⁶.

4.2. Fr. 67-9 on the painter Theodorus, the sculptor Bion of Miletus and the sculptor Demetrius

The attribution to the work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* is much less certain for the other three fragments that cite no book title. All three are found in Diogenes Laertius as part of a list of people that had the same name as the philosophers discussed by him. Thus, Polemon is cited

¹⁵⁹ The text is that of OLSON 2020, p. 19.

¹⁶⁰ «So-and-so reached such a degree of luxury that...» is one of Athenaeus' stock phrases. It is often not derived from the authority cited by Athenaeus but is usually his own addition: see GORMAN–GORMAN 2007, pp. 44-7; 2010, pp. 190; 193 with n. 17 and 18; 199 with n. 31.

¹⁶¹ The text is that of FUHRMANN 1978, p. 28.

¹⁶² The text is that of FUHRMANN 1978, p. 35.

¹⁶³ On the «method of Chamaeleon», see ARRIGHETTI 1987 and SCHORN 2012, pp. 426-30; 2014, pp. 682-3.

¹⁶⁴ See RUMPF 1953, pp. 124-5. For the fish plates, see LACROIX 1937. For fish as a delicacy, see DAVIDSON 1997, pp. 3-35.

¹⁶⁵ According to REINACH 1921, p. 245 n. 2, Androcydes may have made the painting for his hometown of Cyzicus, since Scylla is depicted together with fish on coins from Cyzicus.

¹⁶⁶ BENCKER 1890, p. 19 n. 1.

for a painter named Theodorus (fr. 67), the sculptor Bion of Miletus (fr. 68) and a sculptor named Demetrius (fr. 69)¹⁶⁷.

D.L. 2, 103-4 = fr. 67 Preller (*DNO* 3527)¹⁶⁸:

Θεόδωροι δὲ γεγόνασιν εἴκοσι· [...] δωδέκατος ζωγράφος, οὗ μέμνηται Πολέμων.

There have been twenty men named Theodorus: [...] the eleventh is a painter, who is mentioned by Polemon.

D.L. 4, 58 = fr. 68 Preller (*DNO* 665)¹⁶⁹:

γεγόνασι δὲ Βίωνες δέκα· [...] ὄγδοος Μιλήσιος ἀνδριαντοποιός, οὗ μέμνηται καὶ Πολέμων.

There have been ten men named Bion: [...] the eighth is a sculptor of Miletus, who is also mentioned by Polemon.

D.L. 5, 83-5 = fr. 69 Preller (*DNO* 1811)¹⁷⁰:

γεγόνασι δὲ Δημήτριοι ἀξιόλογοι εἴκοσι· [...] ποιηταὶ δὲ [...] πέμπτος ἀνδριαντοποιός, οὗ μέμνηται Πολέμων.

There have been twenty men named Demetrius worth mentioning: [...] Poets: [...] the fifth is a sculptor, who is mentioned by Polemon.

The painter Theodorus cannot be easily identified. He is unlikely to be the painter Theodorus of Athens or Theodorus of Ephesus, since Diogenes Laertius includes them in his list of

¹⁶⁷ The lists of homonyms found in numerous lives in Diogenes Laertius are often attributed to Demetrius of Magnesia, who wrote a work *On Poets and Writers of the Same Name* (Περὶ ὁμωνύμων ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων) and is often cited by Diogenes Laertius. So SCHEURLEER 1858; JANDA 1966; GIGANTE 1984. Other scholars, however, have been more restrictive: see MAASS 1880, pp. 23-58; SCHWARTZ 1901, pp. 2815-6; MEJER 1981, pp. 351-5; P. ZACCARIA on *FGrHist* 1038, Introduction §5.6 (forthcoming). According to VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1881, pp. 9-10, the references to artists cannot be derived from Demetrius, since the title of Demetrius' work suggests that he only included poets and other writers. However, this argument is not conclusive, since nominatim fragments of Demetrius show that he also included non-writers (e.g. the painter Thales of Sicyon in fr. 8 Mejer = D.L. 1, 38). REGENBOGEN 1950, p. 1452 attributed the Bion list (D.L. 4, 58) and Theodorus list (D.L. 2, 103-4) to Demetrius; the edition of Demetrius of Magnesia by MEJER 1981, pp. 461-3, though usually restricted to fragments that cite Demetrius *nominatim*, includes the entire Demetrius list (D.L. 5, 83-5) as fr. 17. Note, however, that a similar work *On People with the Same Name* (Περὶ ὁμωνύμων) appears to have been written by the imperial author Agreophon/Agresphon (*FGrHist* 1081 T1 = Suid. α 3421, s.v. Ἀπολλώνιος on the existence of a second philosopher named Apollonius of Tyana). Furthermore, Favorinus, another source directly used by Diogenes Laertius, also appears to have devoted attention to people with the same name: cf. Favorin. *Apomnemonemata* fr. 39 Amato = D.L. 1, 79 (cited together with Demetrius [fr. 9 Mejer] on the existence of a second lawgiver named Pittacus). It is uncertain, however, whether Favorinus is the man mentioned by Gell. 14, 6, 1 as «a friend of ours, who is not without reputation in the study of literature and spent a great part of his life in books» (*homo nobis familiaris, in litterarum cultu non ignobilis magnamque aetatis partem in libris versatus*); according to Gell. 14, 6, 3, this man gave Gellius his own learned book, which discussed among other things the number of famous men named Pythagoras and Hippocrates. See the discussion in BARIGAZZI 1966, p. 216 and AMATO 2010, pp. 460-2 n. 131 with further literature. The text was included among the fragments of Favorinus' *Miscellaneous History* (Παντοδαπή ἱστορία) by BARIGAZZI 1966, pp. 214-5 as his fr. 52. AMATO 2010, pp. 428-9 relegated it to the «fragmenta dubia vel spuria» as his fr. 157. The attribution to Favorinus was rejected by MENSCHING 1963, pp. 29-30.

¹⁶⁸ The text is that of DORANDI 2013, pp. 211-2.

¹⁶⁹ The text is that of DORANDI 2013, pp. 336-7.

¹⁷⁰ The text is that of DORANDI 2013, pp. 398-9.

homonyms as well¹⁷¹. He might be Theodorus of Samos (known from Pliny)¹⁷² or another, otherwise unknown painter¹⁷³. Bion of Miletus was a sculptor active in Syracuse in the late VI and early V century BCE¹⁷⁴. For the identification of the sculptor Demetrius there are many candidates: (1) Demetrius of Alopece (IV century BCE)¹⁷⁵, (2) Demetrius, a sculptor active in Pergamum in the III or II century BCE¹⁷⁶, (3) Demetrius of Antioch (late III – early II century BCE)¹⁷⁷, (4) Demetrius of Rhodes, son of Diomedon (mid II century BCE)¹⁷⁸, (5) another Demetrius of Rhodes¹⁷⁹, (6) Demetrius of Tegea¹⁸⁰, and (7) Damatrios, another sculptor active on Rhodes (first half of the II century BCE)¹⁸¹. The most likely candidate, however, is Demetrius of Alopece¹⁸², since he is the most famous of all these and is the only one that is attested in other literary sources (particularly Pliny and Quintilian¹⁸³).

The attribution of these three fragments in Diogenes Laertius to Polemon's work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* has rarely been questioned¹⁸⁴. However, Polemon is known to have cited painters and sculptors in his other works, too. Thus, he mentioned the sculptor Lycius in *On the Acropolis* (Περὶ ἀκροπόλεως)¹⁸⁵, the sculptors Scopas and Calamis in *Against Timaeus* (Πρὸς Τίμαιον)¹⁸⁶, the painter Simmias in his *Letter to Diophilus* (Πρὸς Διόφιλον ἐπιστολή)¹⁸⁷ and the painters Aristides, Pausias and Nicophanes in *On the Paintings in Sicyon* (Περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικυῶνι πινάκων)¹⁸⁸. In the case of the sculptors Bion and Demetrius, there is actually evidence to attribute the respective fragments to different works of Polemon. The reference to Bion may go back to Polemon's work *On the Treasures in Delphi* (Περὶ τῶν ἐν Δελφοῖς θησαυρῶν)¹⁸⁹. Indeed, a Delphic inscription informs us that Bion crafted the golden tripod and the golden statue of Nike, which Gelon of Syracuse dedicated in Delphi.

¹⁷¹ Cf. D.L. 2, 104: τρισκαίδεκατος ζωγράφος, Ἀθηναῖος, ὑπὲρ οὗ γέγραφε Μηνόδοτος (DNO 3547): τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατος Ἐφέσιος, ζωγράφος, οὗ μέμνηται Θεοφάνης ἐν τῷ Περὶ γραφικῆς.

¹⁷² Plin. *HN* 35, 146. See LIPPOLD 1934; BIEBER 1938, p. 598. OVERBECK 1868, p. 406, however, identified Theodorus of Samos with Theodorus of Ephesus, while BRUNN 1889, p. 192 suggested identifying him with Theodorus of Athens.

¹⁷³ So SILLIG 1827, pp. 443-4; OVERBECK 1868, p. 413; BRUNN 1889, p. 192; MORENO 1966; VOLKKOMMER 2004; KANSTEINER–LEHMANN 2014.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. ROBERT 1903; W. MÜLLER 2001b; HALLOF–KRUMEICH 2014.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. W. MÜLLER 2001c; VORSTER–HALLOF–LEHMANN 2014. W. MÜLLER 2001d distinguished the Demetrius mentioned in *IG II³* 4321-2 (two inscriptions from the Acropolis) from Demetrius of Alopece.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. W. MÜLLER 2001e.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. W. MÜLLER 2001f; HALLOF–PRIGNITZ 2014.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. W. MÜLLER 2001g; HALLOF 2014a.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. W. MÜLLER 2001h; HALLOF 2014b.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. PRIGNITZ 2014.

¹⁸¹ Cf. HALLOF–KANSTEINER 2014.

¹⁸² So also SILLIG 1827, p. 181; A. MENAGIUS in HUEBNER 1830-1833, I, p. 662; ROBERT 1886, p. 50; 1901, p. 2851; KALKMANN 1898, p. 231 n. 2; AMELUNG 1913, p. 52; LIPPOLD 1950, p. 226 n. 1; T. DORANDI in GOULET-CAZÉ *et al.* 1999, p. 640 n. 5; VORSTER–HALLOF–LEHMANN 2014, p. 13. *Contra* MEJER 1981, p. 463: «5 sculptor (missing in RE)».

¹⁸³ Cf. Plin. *HN* 34, 76 (DNO 1800); Quint. *Inst.* 12, 10, 9 (DNO 1812).

¹⁸⁴ Exceptions are BENCKER 1890, pp. 16-7 and DORANDI 2019, p. 145 n. 54.

¹⁸⁵ Fr. 2 Preller = fr. 2 Capel Badino = Ath. 11, 486d (DNO 1077).

¹⁸⁶ Fr. 41 Preller = Clem. Al. *Protr.* 4, 47, 3 (DNO 591 = 2292).

¹⁸⁷ Fr. 73 Preller (Tresp 167) = Zenobius Vulgatus 5, 13 = Zenobius Athous 3, 68 (A 3, 38 Kugéas = L 1, 40 [formerly Pseudo-Plutarch] Leutsch–Schneidewin) + Phot. *Lexicon* μ 652 Theodoridis, s.v. μωρότερος Μωρόχου = Suid. μ 1343, s.v. μωρότερος Μωρόχου (DNO *153).

¹⁸⁸ Fr. 16 Preller = fr. 9 Capel Badino = Ath. 13, 567b (DNO 2708 = 2713 = 2752). Another fragment probably derived from this work is fr. 17 Preller = Plut. *Arat.* 13, 2 (DNO 2699) on the painting of Aristratus in Sicyon, which was painted by Melanthius and his pupils and to which Apelles also contributed.

¹⁸⁹ Another possibility is Polemon's work *Against Anaxandrides* (Πρὸς Ἀναξανδρίδην), which seems to have contained a polemic against Anaxandrides' work *On the Stolen Votives in Delphi* (Περὶ τῶν συληθέντων ἐν Δελφοῖς ἀναθημάτων) (see §5.2 below).

*Syll.*³ 34b = *DGE* 144 = Meiggs–Lewis, *GHI*² 28 = *IGDS* 93 = Arena V 66 (*DNO* 666)

Γέλων ὁ Δεινομέν[εος]

ἀνέθεκε τὸ πόλλωνι

Συραρόσιος.

τὸν : τρίποδα : καὶ τὴν : Νίκην : ἐργάσατο

Βίον : Διοδόροδ : υἱὸς : Μιλέσιος.

Gelon, son of Deinomenes,

of Syracuse

dedicated this to Apollon.

The tripod and the Nike were made by

Bion, son of Diodorus, of Miletus.

This dedication is also mentioned by Phaenias, Theopompus and Diodorus of Sicily¹⁹⁰, though without reference to Bion's name.

Similarly, if the sculptor Demetrius is Demetrius of Alopece, Polemon's reference to him may instead go back to his work *On the Acropolis in Athens* (Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησιν ἀκροπόλεως)¹⁹¹. Indeed, Pliny the Elder informs us that this Demetrius made a statue of the priestess Lysimache¹⁹². An inscription of the statue base from the Acropolis confirms that the statue was indeed found there¹⁹³.

5. Reconstruction

5.1. Modern reconstructions

Having presented the individual fragments, I will now look at the modern reconstructions of Polemon's work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus*. According to Preller, the full title was Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον περὶ ἀγαλματοποιῶν καὶ Ἀντίγονον περὶ ζωγράφων. In other words, according to him, Polemon's discussion of sculptors was directed against Adaeus, and his discussion of painters against Antigonus¹⁹⁴. Preller concluded this on the basis of fr. 63, where Polemon's work is cited as Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον περὶ ζωγράφων. Arvanitopoulos followed Preller and reconstructed two or even three separate works¹⁹⁵. However, this is an extreme conclusion to be drawn from a single fragment, especially since none of the fragments explicitly discuss either Antigonus or Adaeus.

According to Preller, Polemon's work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* is also mentioned in a passage from the life of Chrysippus in Diogenes Laertius¹⁹⁶.

D.L. 7, 187-8¹⁹⁷:

εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ κατατρέχουσι τοῦ Χρυσίππου ὡς πολλὰ αἰσχροῦς καὶ ἀρρήτως ἀναγεγραφότος. ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων φυσιολόγων συγγράμματι αἰσχροῦς τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἥραν καὶ τὸν Δία ἀναπλάττει, λέγων κατὰ τοὺς ἑξακοσίους στίχους ἃ μηδεὶς ἠτυχηκῶς μολύνειν τὸ στόμα εἶποι ἄν. αἰσχροτάτην γὰρ, φασί, ταύτην ἀναπλάττει ἱστορίαν, εἰ καὶ ἐπαινεῖ ὡς φυσικὴν, χαμαιτύπαις μᾶλλον πρέπουσαν ἢ θεοῖς, ἔτι τ' οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς περὶ πινάκων γράψασι κατακεχωρισμένην· μήτε γὰρ παρὰ Πολέμωνι μήτε παρ' Ὑψικράτει¹⁹⁸, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ παρ' Ἀντιγόνῳ εἶναι, ὅπ' αὐτοῦ δὲ πεπλάσθαι.

¹⁹⁰ Phan. Hist. fr. 16 Engels = *FGrHist* 1012 F1 = Ath. 6, 231e-f; Theopomp. Hist. *FGrHist* 115 F193 = Ath. 6, 231e-f; D.S. 11, 26, 7. Cf. also *AP* 6, 214; schol. vet. Pi. *P.* 1, 152b Drachmann; schol. Patm. Pi. *P.* 1, 149 Semitelos ~ schol. rec. Pi. *P.* 1, 151-4 Abel.

¹⁹¹ So already BENCKER 1890, pp. 16-7.

¹⁹² Plin. *HN* 34, 76 (*DNO* 1800).

¹⁹³ *IG* II² 3453 = *CEG* 757.

¹⁹⁴ PRELLER 1838, pp. 97-8; 1848, p. 1792.

¹⁹⁵ ARVANITOPOULOS 1929, p. 64: Πρὸς Ἀδαῖον περὶ ἀγαλματοποιῶν, Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον περὶ ζωγράφων and potentially a third work περὶ πινάκων.

¹⁹⁶ PRELLER 1838.

¹⁹⁷ The text is that of DORANDI 2013, p. 590.

¹⁹⁸ KOEPKE 1862, p. 25 suggested correcting Ὑψικράτει τοῦ Ξενοκράτει, a conjecture adopted among others by VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1881, p. 8 with n. 3, MARCOVICH 1999, p. 559 and GIGANTE 2010, p. 373 n. 142. Indeed, a reference to the art historian Xenocrates is much more plausible than to the historian Hypsicrates. So also F. JACOBY on *FGrHist* 190 F11; V. COSTA on *BNJ* 190 F11. However, like so often with names that look incorrect in Diogenes Laertius, it is uncertain whether the error goes back to Diogenes himself or to a later scribe. See also DORANDI 1999, p. 37 n. 23; 2019, p. 140 n. 38; SCHOFIELD 1999, p. 7 n. 12.

Some people attack Chrysippus (*SVF* II fr. 1071) for having recorded many things in a disgraceful and unspeakable way. For in his treatise *On the Ancient Natural Philosophers*, he makes up a story about Hera and Zeus in a disgraceful way by saying, around line 600, things that no one could say without defiling his mouth. For he makes that up as an absolutely disgraceful story, they say, even though he praises it as being in accordance with natural philosophy. It is more appropriate to prostitutes than to gods. Moreover, it is not recorded by those who have written on paintings. For it is found neither in Polemon nor in Hypsicrates, no not even in Antigonus (fr. 46 Dorandi), but it is an invention of his own making.

Chrysippus is criticized here for describing an inappropriate painting of Hera and Zeus, for which he offered an allegorical interpretation. The painting itself portrayed Hera performing fellatio on Zeus¹⁹⁹ and was found in the temple of Hera in Argos²⁰⁰ and/or Samos²⁰¹. Diogenes Laertius' source, however, rejects Chrysippus' description as his own obscene fabrication, arguing that it is not recorded by Polemon, «Hypsicrates» (probably an error for Xenocrates) or Antigonus. If the citation of Polemon refers to his work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus*, it would imply that (part of) this work contained a more or less exhaustive discussion of the paintings found in Greece. However, as Jahn pointed out, Diogenes might also be referring to other works of Polemon, particularly *On the Paintings in the Propylaea* (Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς Προπυλαίοις πινάκων) and *On the Paintings in Sicyon* (Περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικυῶνι πινάκων)²⁰². Another reconstruction was offered by Urlichs, according to whom Polemon's work devoted special attention to the attribution of works of art to specific artists, school relations and the distinction between homonymous artists. However, this reconstruction is based not on the actual fragments but on pure *Quellenforschung*. A prominent example often cited in this context concerns the «Nemesis of Rhamnus» in Zenobius Vulgatus, where Antigonus is cited.

Zenobius Vulgatus 5, 82 = *Recensio Bodleiana* B 819 Gaisford (*DNO* 1144)²⁰³:

Ῥαμουσία Νέμεσις· ἐν Ῥαμουῦντι Νεμέσεως ἴδρυται ἄγαλμα δεκάπηχυ, ὀλόλιθον, ἔργον Φειδίου, ἔχει δὲ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ μηλέας κλάδον· ἐξ οὗ φησιν Ἀντίγονος ὁ Καρύστιος πτύχιόν τι μικρὸν ἐξηρητῆσθαι τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχον, «Ἀγοράκριτος Πάριος ἐποίησεν». οὐ θαυμαστὸν δέ· καὶ ἄλλοι γὰρ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἔργων ἕτερον ἐπιγεγράφασιν ὄνομα. Εἰκὸς οὖν καὶ τὸν Φειδίαν τῷ Ἀγορακρίτῳ συγκεχωρηκέναι· ἦν γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐρώμενος, καὶ ἄλλως ἐπτόητο περὶ τὰ παιδικά.

The Nemesis of Rhamnus: In Rhamnus, a statue of Nemesis is found, ten cubits long, entirely made of stone, a work of Phidias. In her hand, she holds a branch of an apple tree. Antigonus of Carystus (fr. 47 Dorandi) says that a small tablet is attached to this branch with the inscription: «Made by Agoracritus of

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Pseudo-Clementines, *Homiliae* 5, 18, 6 = *SVF* II fr. 1072 (Χρῦσιππος δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἐρωτικαῖς ἐπιστολαῖς καὶ τῆς ἐν Ἄργει εἰκόνας μέμνηται, πρὸς τῷ τοῦ Διὸς αἰδοίῳ ἴφέρωντ τῆς Ἥρας τὸ πρόσωπον); Theophilus, *Ad Autolycom* 3, 8 = *SVF* II fr. 1073 (Χρῦσιππος δέ, ὁ πολλὰ φλυαρήσας, πῶς οὐχὶ εὐρίσκειται σημαίων τὴν Ἥραν στόματι μιᾶρῶ συγγίνεσθαι τῷ Διί); Origenes *Cels.* 4, 48 = *SVF* II fr. 1074 (ὁ Σολεὺς Χρῦσιππος [...] παρερμηνεύει γραφὴν τὴν ἐν Σάμῳ, ἐν ἣ ἄρρητοποιῶσα ἡ Ἥρα τὸν Δία ἐγγράπτο). Diogenes Laertius might be alluding to this in the words ἠτυχηκῶς μολύνειν τὸ στόμα: see DORANDI 1999, p. 36 n. 22; SCHOFIELD 1999, p. 5 n. 7.

²⁰⁰ Cf. Pseudo-Clementines, *Homiliae* 5, 18, 6 = *SVF* II fr. 1072.

²⁰¹ Cf. Origenes *Cels.* 4, 48 = *SVF* II fr. 1074. According to Origen, Chrysippus' allegorical interpretation was that matter receives the «seminal» principles of god and contains them in itself for the ordering of the universe (τοὺς σπερματικούς λόγους τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ὕλη παραδεξαμένη ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῇ εἰς κατακόσμησιν τῶν ὄλων), where Hera stands for matter, and Zeus for god (ὕλη γὰρ ἢ ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν Σάμον γραφῇ ἡ Ἥρα καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὁ Ζεὺς).

²⁰² JAHN 1840, pp. 595-6. So already A. MENAGIUS in HUEBNER 1830-1833, I, p. 662. Since the erotic painting of Hera and Zeus seems to have been found in Samos and/or Argos, it is possible that Polemon wrote periegetic works on these cities, although no titles are attested. For Argos, see also fr. 11-3 Preller (although these fragments probably belong to the *Helladicus*, whose authenticity is debated).

²⁰³ I print the text of Zenobius Vulgatus as edited by LEUTSCH-SCHNEIDEWIN 1839, p. 153. The lemma is also found in the *Recensio Bodleiana* (B 819 Gaisford = codex Laurentianus 59.30 fol. 134r-v [L] = codex Vaticanus gr. 878 fol. 20r [V]), which omits the words οὐ θαυμαστὸν δέ [...] ἐπιγεγράφασιν ὄνομα and καὶ ἄλλως ἐπτόητο περὶ τὰ παιδικά. The *Recensio Bodleiana* further has the following variants: ἐνδεκάπηχυ for δεκάπηχυ, ἀπηρητῆσθαι for ἐξηρητῆσθαι, ἐπιγραφὴν for τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν, and αὐτῷ ἐρώμενος for αὐτοῦ ἐρώμενος. The first part of the lemma also recurs in Hsch. ρ 100 Hansen (*DNO* 1154): Ῥαμουσία[v] Νέμεσις· ἐν Ῥαμουῦντι Νεμέσεως ἴδρυτο ἄγαλμα δεκάπηχυ, ὀλόλιθον, ἔργον Φειδίου, ἔχον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ μηλέας κλάδον.

Paros». This is not surprising: for many other people, too, have inscribed another name onto their own works. So Phidias probably yielded it to Agoracritus as well. For he was his lover and was passionate about boys in general.

A similar lemma is found in Photius, the *Suda*, the lexicon of Eudemus rhetor and Leutsch' *Mantissa proverbiorum*²⁰⁴. Ulrichs followed Wilamowitz in considering Polemon the source for the lemma Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις²⁰⁵. It was apparently debated whether the statue of Nemesis in the Attic deme of Rhamnus was made by the famous sculptor Phidias (so also Pausanias²⁰⁶) or by his pupil, Agoracritus (so also Pliny, perhaps through Varro²⁰⁷)²⁰⁸. According to Wilamowitz, the remark in Zenobius that Phidias inscribed the name of his lover Agoracritus to please him²⁰⁹ is part of Polemon's criticism against Antigonus. However, this remark might

²⁰⁴ Phot. *Lexicon* ρ 34 Theodoridis, s.v. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις = Suid. ρ 33, s.v. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις = Eudemus rhetor s.v. Ῥαμνουσία νέμεσις, codex Parisinus gr. 2635 fol. 200r + Laurentianus 59.38 fol. 155r = *Mantissa proverbiorum* 2, 76 Leutsch (*DNO* 1145). The common source of these lexica is probably an interpolated version of the *Synagoge*. ERBSE 1950, p. 206 and THEODORIDIS 1982-2012, III, p. 314 considered it an excerpt from the lost lexicon of Pausanias the Atticist. This lemma also includes the bizarre explanation that the Nemesis portrayed in this statue was actually a queen (so not a god), and the statue was supposedly set up by her son, Erechtheus. The lemma also states that the Nemesis statue was originally a statue «in the form of Aphrodite» (ἐν Ἀφροδίτης σχήματι). This recalls Plin. *HN* 36, 17 (*DNO* 1114 = 1143), who states that Agoracritus competed with his fellow student Alcamenes to see who could make the better statue of Aphrodite; when Alcamenes won, Agoracritus reportedly sold his statue and had its name changed to Nemesis. Finally, the lemma also draws a comparison with the statue of Zeus in Olympia, where Phidias inscribed the name of another of his lovers (Pantarces of Argos) on a finger/toe of the statue (cf. also Clem. Al. *Protr.* 4, 53, 5 [*DNO* 995]; Arn. *Adv. nat.* 6, 13 [*DNO* 997]); the latter was also claimed about a statue of Athena (cf. Gregorius Nazianenus, *Carmina* 1, 2, 10, 863-4 [*PG* XXXVII col. 742 Migne] [*DNO* 998] ~ schol. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 41, 19 p. 313 Stählin-Treu [*DNO* 996]) and a statue of Aphrodite (cf. Libanius ap. schol. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 41, 19 p. 313 Stählin-Treu [*DNO* 996]).

²⁰⁵ VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1881, pp. 10-4; H.L. URLICHS 1887, pp. 34-7. So also KALKMANN 1886, pp. 62-3; POSNANSKY 1890, pp. 92-4; SUSEMIHL 1891, pp. 516 n. 14; 519 n. 20; 673 n. 178; 676 n. 187; ROBERT 1894, p. 882; MUENZER 1895, pp. 521-2; SELLERS in JEX-BLAKE-SELLERS 1896, pp. xxxix; xlii-xliii; 190; DESPINIS 1971, p. 1; EHRHARDT 1997, p. 30.

²⁰⁶ Paus. 1, 33, 3 (*DNO* 1141). Cf. also Pomponius Mela 2, 46 (*DNO* 1152). Solin. 7, 26 (*DNO* 1153) inaccurately calls it a statue of Diana.

²⁰⁷ Plin. *HN* 36, 17 (*DNO* 1143). At the end of his discussion, Pliny cites Varro (appendix I fr. 25 Semi = appendice fr. 25 Brunetti), who preferred it to all other statues. The citation of Varro is included among the fragments of the *Imagines* by CHAPPUIS 1868, pp. 98-9 and SALVADORE 1999, pp. 92-3 as fr. 13 Chappuis = fr. 118 Salvatore. HANSEN 1971, pp. 398-9, in contrast, attributed the citation to Varro's *Antiquitates*.

²⁰⁸ Such a controversy is also reported in Str. 9, 1, 17 p. 396C (*DNO* 1142), who speaks of «Diodotus» and Agoracritus (ὁ τινας μὲν Διοδότου φασὶν ἔργον, τινὲς δὲ Ἀγορακρίτου τοῦ Παρίου). Διοδότου is often considered corrupt. H.L. URLICHS 1887, pp. 35-6, who considered Polemon Strabo's source (through Apollodorus), corrected this with K.L. URLICHS 1856 to Φειδίου αὐτοῦ (with a corruption of <ΦΕΙ>ΔΙΟΥΑΥΤΟΥ to ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΥ); this conjecture was also endorsed by VOGEL 1882, p. 313, POSNANSKY 1890, p. 94 with n. 3, SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 516 n. 14, KALKMANN 1898, p. 122 n. 1, ROBERT 1905, p. 716 and SCHEFOLD 1957, p. 552 n. 26. RADT 2008, p. 17 rejected this, since Pausanias goes on to say that «in greatness and beauty, it is a great success and rivals the works of Phidias» (καὶ μεγέθει καὶ κάλλει σφόδρα κατωρθωμένον καὶ ἐνάμιλλον τοῖς Φειδίου ἔργοις). See, however, RAEDER-LEHMANN 2014, p. 396. MEYER 1890, p. 10 with n. 1 corrected Διοδότου to Κολώτου. ROBERT 1905, p. 716 also considered identifying «Diodotus» with «Diodorus, pupil of Critias» (*Diodorus Critiae discipulus*), mentioned in Plin. *HN* 34, 85. This is how Pliny's text is edited by SILLIG 1851, p. 161, JAN-MAYHOFF 1897, p. 192 and LE BONNIEC-GALLET DE SANTERRE 1953, p. 137. Note, however, that other manuscripts of Pliny read *dionysodorus/dyonisiodorus* for *diodorus*. See LE BONNIEC-GALLET DE SANTERRE 1953, pp. 269-70 n. 6. JEX-BLAKE-SELLERS 1896, p. 70 therefore read *Dionysodorus Critiae discipulus*; DETLEFSEN 1873, p. 86 and RACKHAM 1952, p. 190 corrected the text to *Dionysi<us, Di>odorus Critiae discipulus*.

²⁰⁹ Plin. *HN* 36, 17 also says that Phidias often attributed his own works to Agoracritus, although he does not explicitly say this about the Nemesis statue. H.L. URLICHS 1887, p. 37 therefore attributed the first sentence in Pliny (*eiusdem discipulus fuit Agoracritus [...] donasse fertur*) to Polemon but the subsequent story (*certavere autem [...] Rhamnunte pago Atticae*) to Antigonus (through Varro). SELLERS in JEX-BLAKE-SELLERS 1896, p. xliii, however, attributed the first sentence in Pliny to Antigonus as well. According to Tzetzes (*Epistulae* 21 p. 38 Leone [*DNO* 1146]; *H.* 154, 921-8 [*DNO* 1147]), Phidias did this, because Agoracritus was a less talented artist.

equally be part of Antigonus' own argument²¹⁰. And even if it is not, there is no evidence that this is derived from Polemon and not any other writer (e.g. the historian Duris of Samos or the art historian Xenocrates, to name just two examples)²¹¹.

Urlichs' entire reconstruction is based on this kind of *Quellenforschung*. Thus, he assumed that when Pliny the Elder is contradicted by Pausanias, Pliny goes back to Antigonus, and Pausanias to Polemon²¹². For instance, Pliny (like Diogenes Laertius) distinguishes the sculptor Pythagoras of Rhegium from another sculptor named Pythagoras, who came from Samos²¹³; Pausanias, in contrast, knows only one sculptor, viz. Pythagoras of Rhegium²¹⁴. Thus, Urlichs claimed that Polemon rejected Antigonus' supposed distinction between the two sculptors²¹⁵. Other contradictions between Pliny and Pausanias that Urlichs attributed to a supposed polemic of Polemon against Antigonus are the following:

- (1) Plin. *HN* 36, 17-8 (*DNO* 1140): the statue of the Magna Mater in Rhamnus was made by Agoracritus; vs. Paus. 1, 3, 5 (*DNO* 936): the statue was made by Phidias²¹⁶
- (2) Plin. *HN* 35, 54 (*DNO* 1425): Colotes, pupil of Phidias, made a statue of Athena at Elis; vs. Paus. 6, 26, 3 (*DNO* 1426): the statue was made by Phidias²¹⁷

Similarly, Urlichs also believed that, when Pliny reports contrasting anonymous traditions, one goes back to Antigonus, and the other to Polemon. Thus, Pliny cites «artists that have written books about this topic (sc. about famous artists)» (*artifices, qui compositis voluminibus condidere haec*²¹⁸), who claim that the works of the sculptor Telephanes of Phocis/Phocaea remained unknown because he lived in Thessaly; Pliny contrasts this with «others» (*alii*), who explain his lack of fame from the fact that he worked exclusively in the studios of Xerxes and Darius²¹⁹. According to Urlichs, the anonymous *artifices* refer to Antigonus and Xenocrates²²⁰, while *alii* refers to Polemon²²¹. Urlichs further cites the following examples²²²:

²¹⁰ See also DORANDI 2019, pp. 141-2: «Nonostante sulla tavoletta fosse inciso il nome di Agoracrito, il Caristio sembra mantenere l'attribuzione della statua a Fidia [...] per Antigonos, la firma (ἐπιγραφή) di Agoracrito non sarebbe da sola un elemento sufficiente per provare la paternità della statua e la lettura del nuovo dato in relazione con la tradizione parallela confermerebbe invece che l'autore della statua è Fidia». KOEPKE 1862, p. 50, however, omitted the words οὐ θαυμαστὸν δέ [...] περὶ τὰ παιδικὰ from his edition of the fragment of Antigonus.

²¹¹ See also the criticism voiced by GURLITT 1890, p. 179; PALLAT 1894, pp. 10; 13-4; KALKMANN 1898, p. 122 n. 3; HANSEN 1971, p. 402. DORANDI 1999, pp. xcix-c was also more reserved.

²¹² Polemon was often considered a primary source for Pausanias in nineteenth-century *Quellenforschung*. FRAZER 1898, pp. lxxxiii-xc, however, strongly argued against this.

²¹³ Plin. *HN* 34, 59-60 (*DNO* 669); D.L. 8, 47.

²¹⁴ Paus. 6, 26, 3.

²¹⁵ H.L. URLICHS 1887, pp. 39-41. So also SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 516 n. 14; SELLERS in JEX-BLAKE-SELLERS 1896, pp. liii-liv; HANSEN 1971, p. 403. *Contra* KALKMANN 1898, p. 147 n. 2.

²¹⁶ H.L. URLICHS 1887, p. 37. So also SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 516 n. 14.

²¹⁷ H.L. URLICHS 1887, pp. 37-8. So also KALKMANN 1886, pp. 108-9; SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 516 n. 14; SELLERS in JEX-BLAKE-SELLERS 1896, p. liv n. 1.

²¹⁸ *Pace* BRIEGER 1857, p. 48, *haec* probably does not refer to what immediately precedes in Plin. *HN* 34, 67 (viz. information on the pupils of Lysippus) but to the general topic discussed in Plin. *HN* 34, 53-67. See SCHREIBER 1872, p. 27; 9; H.L. URLICHS 1887, p. 39; SELLERS in JEX-BLAKE-SELLERS 1896, p. xxxvii; 54; LE BONNIEC-GALLET DE SANTERRE 1953, p. 238 n. 2; DORANDI 1999, p. 36 n. 15.

²¹⁹ Plin. *HN* 34, 68 (*DNO* 2594).

²²⁰ So also SCHREIBER 1872, pp. 27-8; ROBERT 1886, p. 61; MUENZER 1895, p. 520; SELLERS in JEX-BLAKE-SELLERS 1896, pp. xxii-xxiii; xxxvii; LE BONNIEC-GALLET DE SANTERRE 1953, p. 238 n. 1; DORANDI 1994, pp. cvii; 36 n. 14; 2019, p. 139. In his edition of Antigonus, DORANDI 1999, p. 36 included the text of Pliny as his fr. 45*.

²²¹ H.L. URLICHS 1887, pp. 38-9. So already SCHREIBER 1872, p. 30; SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 516 n. 14.

²²² H.L. URLICHS 1887, p. 45 was uncertain about Plin. *HN* 35, 61 (*DNO* 1710), where the dates of the painter Zeuxis are discussed. Pliny says that Zeuxis «entered upon the scene» in the 95th Olympiad; this is contrasted with «some people» (*a quibusdam*), who wrongly date him to the 89th Olympiad. SUSEMIHL 1891, pp. 516 n. 14; 522 n. 36c, however, interpreted this without hesitation as a polemic of Polemon against Antigonus.

- (1) Plin. *HN* 34, 83 (*DNO* 2515): Xenocrates was a pupil of Tisicrates; according to others (*alii*), he was a pupil of Euthycrates²²³
- (2) Plin. *HN* 36, 32 (*DNO* 625 = 719): the Socrates that made the statue of the Graces in the Propylaea of Athens is different from the painter named Socrates; according to others (*aliqui*), they are the same person²²⁴
- (3) Plin. *HN* 34, 64 (*DNO* 2209): Lysippus made a statue of Hephaestion; others (*quidam*) attribute it to Polyclitus²²⁵
- (4) Plin. *HN* 35, 125 (*DNO* 2702): Pausias' painting of Glycera was called *stephanoplocos*; others (*ab aliis*) call it *stephanopolis*²²⁶

Urlichs also interpreted references to «some people» as an indication of a controversy between Antigonus and Polemon, even if the text itself does not mention an explicit polemic or contrast²²⁷:

- (1) Plin. *HN* 34, 92 (*DNO* 1179): according to some (*quidam*), the sculptor Callimachus was also a painter
- (2) Plin. *HN* 35, 101 (*DNO* 2993): according to some (*quidam*), Protogenes painted ships until the age of fifty
- (3) Plin. *HN* 35, 101 (*DNO* 2993): some people (*quidam*) call the Hammonias ship (painted by Protogenes) Nausicaa

Urlichs even expanded this to other authors²²⁸:

- (1) Paus. 3, 17, 6 (*DNO* 304): the sculptor Clearchus of Rhegium is said to have been a pupil of Dipoenus and Scyllis; according to others (οἱ δέ), he was a pupil of Daedalus
- (2) Vitr. *De arch.* 7 praef. 13 (*DNO* 2123): according to some (*nonnulli*), Timotheus was one of the artists that decorated the mausoleum of Halicarnassus
- (3) Vitr. *De arch.* 2, 8 (*DNO* 2041 = 2124): according to some (*alii*), the statue of Ares in Halicarnassus was made by Leochares; according to others (*alii*), it was made by Timotheus

However, this is all highly speculative. Urlichs' theory is particularly undermined by the fact that Pliny does not cite Polemon in his survey of sources for books 34-6.

Bencker, in contrast, rejected this entire reconstruction. In his view, Polemon's work – unlike that of Antigonus – was not concerned with art history²²⁹. Bencker also argued that Polemon's work dealt exclusively with painting and did not cover sculpture²³⁰. Indeed, as I have argued, there is no unambiguous evidence for a discussion of sculpture in Polemon's work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus*. The two fragments on sculptors in Diogenes Laertius (fr. 68-9) might belong to other periegetic works²³¹, and in fr. 60 it is unclear whether Polemon is describing a statue or painting. For this reason, Bencker also rejected Preller's theory that Polemon's work

²²³ H.L. URLICHS 1887, p. 42. So also SUSEMIHL 1891, pp. 515 n. 9; 516 n. 14.

²²⁴ H.L. URLICHS 1887, pp. 42-3. So also SUSEMIHL 1891, pp. 516 n. 14; 587-8 n. 325. Urlichs also cites Paus. 1, 22, 8 (*DNO* 626), according to whom the statue of the Graces was made by Socrates the philosopher. Note, however, that the tradition that Socrates used to be a stone cutter also recurs in Duris (*FGrHist* 76 F78 = D.L. 2, 19). After citing Duris, Diogenes Laertius goes on to say that, according to some people (ἔνιοι φασιν), the statue of Graces on the Acropolis was made by him. *Pace* H.L. URLICHS 1887, p. 43 and SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 587 n. 325, the reference to ἔνιοι need not indicate that the information is derived from a different source than Duris. Unlike MÜLLER 1841-1851, III p. 487, however, F. JACOBY, *FGrHist* 76 F78 did not include the extra sentence in the edition of Duris.

²²⁵ H.L. URLICHS 1887, pp. 43-4. So also SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 516 n. 14.

²²⁶ H.L. URLICHS 1887, p. 44. So also SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 516 n. 14.

²²⁷ H.L. URLICHS 1887, p. 44. So also SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 516 n. 14.

²²⁸ H.L. URLICHS 1887, p. 44. So also SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 516 n. 14.

²²⁹ BENCKER 1890, pp. 20-1.

²³⁰ BENCKER 1890, pp. 16-8.

²³¹ *Contra* DORANDI 1999, p. xcix: «je ne trouve pas de motif solide pour exclure aucun des fragments rassemblés par Preller».

was a partial reply to Adaeus' work *On Sculptors* and claimed instead that his polemic was directed against Adaeus' *Περὶ διαθέσεως*²³². This would also explain the addition of *περὶ ζωγράφων* in fr. 63, unless this was simply added by Athenaeus. Deichgräber, however, did not follow Bencker in this reconstruction but instead assumed that Polemon's work dealt with art history in the form of a *periegesis*²³³.

5.2. Polemon's polemical works

One of the main problems that impede a reliable reconstruction of the content of Polemon's work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* is that nearly all fragments are derived from Athenaeus, who was mainly interested in Polemon insofar as he attests certain vocabulary. By consequence, although many of the fragments deal with cups and other drinking vessels, we should not assume that these had a prominent place in Polemon's work. It merely reflects Athenaeus' personal interests. Another consequence of this one-sided transmission is that none of the fragments show any clear polemical content. This raises a further question that also has repercussions for our reconstruction of Antigonus' and Adaeus' works: did Polemon's work discuss the same topics as Antigonus and Adaeus, and which works was it directed against?

A comparison with other polemical works of Polemon offers us a few hints. For Polemon is also known to have written *Πρὸς Τίμαιον*²³⁴ (against the historian Timaeus, in at least 12 books), *Πρὸς Νεάνθη*²³⁵ (against the historian Neanthes of Cyzicus), *Πρὸς Ἐρατοσθένη* or *Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησιν Ἐρατοσθένους ἐπιδημίας*²³⁶ (against Eratosthenes; the aim seems to have been to prove that Eratosthenes never visited Athens and is therefore unreliable in his description of monuments²³⁷), *Πρὸς Ἀναξανδρίδην*²³⁸ (against Anaxandrides, who wrote a work *On the Stolen Votives in Delphi* [*Περὶ τῶν συληθέντων ἐν Δελφοῖς ἀναθημάτων*]²³⁹) and perhaps also against the Callimachean Ister²⁴⁰. For instance, in his work *Against Timaeus*, Polemon discussed the city of origin of the courtesan Laïs²⁴¹, just like Timaeus had done²⁴². In

²³² BENCKER 1890, p. 16.

²³³ DEICHGRÄBER 1952, p. 1307.

²³⁴ Fr. 39-46 Preller.

²³⁵ Fr. 53 Preller.

²³⁶ Fr. 47-52 Preller.

²³⁷ Cf. Str. 1, 2, 2 p. 15C = Eratosth. *FGrHist* 241 T10: ἔστι δ' ὁ Ἐρατοσθένης οὐθ' οὕτως εὐκατατρόχαστος, ὥστε μηδ' Ἀθήνας αὐτὸν ἰδεῖν φάσκειν, ὅπερ Πολέμων ἐπιχειρεῖ δεικνύουσαι.

²³⁸ Polemon *FHG* III, 137 fr. 76a (Tresp 97) (not found in Preller) = Anaxandr. Hist. *FGrHist* 400 T1 = schol. Eurip. *Or.* 1637 Schwartz. See also PRELLER 1840, pp. 7-8. K. MÜLLER 1841-1851, III, pp. 111; 137 and WESTERMANN 1855, p. 10 considered the work a letter addressed to Anaxandrides (or «Alexandrides», as they erroneously called him). So also ANGELUCCI 2003, p. 166; 167; 2014, p. 14. The transmitted text of the scholion cites the work as ἐν τῷδε τῷ πρὸς ἀναξανδρίδην, which should probably be corrected with Cobet to ἐν τῷ δ' τῶν Πρὸς Ἀναξανδρίδην: so SCHWARTZ 1887, p. 236. In general, when the title refers to a letter addressed to someone, ἐπιστολή is added. Therefore, the most plausible interpretation is that Polemon's Πρὸς Ἀναξανδρίδην was a polemical work. So PRELLER 1848, p. 1792; WENIGER 1865, pp. 26-7; 38-9; 44; 47-8; BENCKER 1890, p. 23; SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 671 with n. 156; PASQUALI 1913, p. 185; BISCHOFF 1937, p. 731; DEICHGRÄBER 1952, p. 1311; F. JACOBY, *FGrHist* 404 (introduction p. 217); ENGELS 2014, p. 77; CAPEL BADINO 2018, p. 23; 24 n. 77. HULLEMAN 1848, pp. 130-3 even identified the work Πρὸς Ἀναξανδρίδην with Περὶ τῶν ἐν Δελφοῖς θησαυρῶν. Tresp's view is inconsistent. He called it a letter (TRESP 1914, pp. 29; 208) but elsewhere claimed that Polemon wrote a work against Anaxandrides (TRESP 1914, p. 115). Similarly, J. RZEPKA on *BN²* 404 T1 called it both a polemical work and a letter.

²³⁹ Anaxandr. Hist. *FGrHist* 404 F1 = *Recensio Bodleiana* B 207 Gaisford.

²⁴⁰ Fr. 54-5 Preller. Although these two fragments cite no book title, they have been attributed to a work against Ister by PRELLER 1838, pp. 8; 19; 21; 26; 96-7; 1848, p. 1792. So also K. MÜLLER 1841-1851, III, pp. 111; 131-2; ARVANITOPOULOS 1929, p. 64; ENGELS 2014, p. 77. *Contra* JAHN 1840, p. 595; SUSEMIHL 1891, p. 671 n. 158.

²⁴¹ Fr. 44 Preller = Ath. 13, 588b-c + 589a-b.

²⁴² Timae. *FGrHist* 566 F24a = Ath. 13, 589a-b. Both Polemon and Timaeus appear to have claimed that Laïs came from Hycarra in Sicily. Timaeus also appears to be cited in Steph. Byz. ε 157, s.v. Εὐκαρπία (= *FGrHist* 566 F24b), but that text is corrupt. Stephanus writes: ἔστι δὲ καὶ Εὐκαρπία φρούριον Σικελίας ἢ ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις τιμαίοις·

his work *Against Neanthes*, Polemon rejected the story about the death of the lovers Cratinus and Aristodemus found in Neanthes' *On Rites* (Περὶ τελετῶν)²⁴³. And in his work *Against Eratosthenes*, Polemon discussed the *kyrbeis* or *axones*, i.e. the wooden tablets upon which Solon's laws were inscribed, and argued against Eratosthenes²⁴⁴ that these were rectangular and not triangular in shape²⁴⁵.

Thus, the other polemical works suggest that, even though the fragments of Polemon's *Against Adaeus and Antigonus* have no direct parallels with the (scanty) fragments of Antigonus or Adaeus, we should probably assume that Polemon discussed the same topics as these two writers. However, we cannot simply assume that everything that Polemon wrote was the direct opposite of what Adaeus and Antigonus had written. In his work *Against Timaeus*, for instance, he agreed with Timaeus about the city of origin of Laïs.

Despite the relatively large number of fragments, it is difficult to reconstruct the overall structure of the work *Against Adaeus and Antigonus*. The table below summarizes the content of the fragments with the respective book number (if extant), the title by which the work is cited and the city or region with which the comment is connected.

I	fr. 56	Πρὸς Ἀδαίων καὶ Ἀντίγονον	Cylicranes	Heraclaea Trachinia and Trachis
	fr. 57	Πρὸς Ἀδαίων	<i>antigonis, seleucis, rhodias</i> cups	
III	fr. 58	Πρὸς Ἀδαίων καὶ Ἀντίγονον	painting of Sillax of Rhegium	Phlius (polemarch's stoa)
V	fr. 59	Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον καὶ Ἀδαίων	purple swamphen	
	fr. 60	Πρὸς Ἀδαίων καὶ Ἀντίγονον	painting/statue of Dionysus	
VI	(new)	Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον	<i>antigonis, seleucis, prusias</i> cups	
	fr. 62	Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον καὶ Ἀδαίων	expressions for washing one's hands at symposia	
?	fr. 61	Πρὸς Ἀδαίων καὶ Ἀντίγονον	<i>kothon</i> cup	Sparta; comparison with Argos

καὶ γενέσθαι ἐν τούτῳ Λαΐδα, τὴν ἐπὶ κάλλει διαβεβημένην ἑταίραν, ἣν οἱ πολλοὶ Κορινθίαν φασί. τὴν δὲ Λαΐδα τινὲς ἐξ Ὑκάρων λέγουσι καὶ Ὑκαρικὸν ἀνδράποδον, ὡς Συνέσιος ἐν ἐπιστολῇ. The words ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις τιμαίοις have been corrected in various ways: ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις <Ὑκκάρους, ὡς> Τίμαιος (HOLSTENIUS 1692, p. 121); ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις <...> Τίμαιος (MEINEKE 1849, p. 285); <ὡς Πολέμων> ἐν τοῖς <ἀντι>λεγομένοις <πρὸς> Τίμαιον (Schwartz ap. F. JACOBY, *FGrHist* 24b app.); <ὡς> ἐν τοῖς Πολέμωνος <πρὸς> Τίμαιον (ROEPER 1849, pp. 356-7). In view of the corrupt state of the text, it is uncertain whether, according to Stephanus, Timaeus/Polemon considered Eucarpia (an otherwise unattested city in Sicily) Laïs' hometown, which would contradict the fragment in Athenaeus (unless it goes back to an error EYKΑΠΠΙΑ for YKΑΠΙΑ in Stephanus' source: so BERKELIUS 1688, p. 370 n. 74). See also ANGELUCCI 2018, p. 252. A further point that causes confusion is found in Ath. 13, 589a-b, who writes: Τίμαιος δ' ἐν τῇ τρισκαίδεκάτῃ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν ἐξ Ὑκκάρων, καθὰ καὶ Πολέμων εἶρηκεν, ἀναιρεθῆναι φάσκων αὐτήν, etc. The subsequent story about Laïs' death and her grave near the Peneus river (in Thessaly) is introduced with φάσκων, but it is unclear whether this refers to Τίμαιος (so BARON 2013, pp. 133; 241; LACHENAUD 2017, p. 171 n. 90) or Πολέμων (so PRELLER 1838, p. 75; F. JACOBY on *FGrHist* 566 FF23-4). Athenaeus' discussion of Laïs closes with the comment that «those who say that she is buried in Corinth near the Craneum speak without thinking» (αὐτοσχεδιάζουσιν οὖν οἱ λέγοντες αὐτὴν ἐν Κορίνθῳ τεθάρθαι πρὸς τῷ Κρανεΐῳ). According to PRELLER 1838, p. 75, this is part of Polemon's polemic against Timaeus. In another lemma, Steph. Byz. κ 209, s.v. Κραστός cites Apion (*FGrHist* 616 F30), who claims that Polemon was the only one who said that Laïs came from Corinth(!). This also contradicts the fragment in Athenaeus. According to PRELLER 1838, pp. 75-6, the contradiction with the fragment in Athenaeus is the result of incorrect epitomization in Stephanus of what Polemon actually wrote (presumably something along the lines of «Polemon says that most/some people consider Laïs a woman from Corinth»). So also K. MÜLLER 1841-1851, III, pp. 128 and ANGELUCCI 2018, p. 252. Another possibility is that Polemon spoke of more than one woman named Laïs. Furthermore, it is possible that this citation of Polemon in Stephanus is derived from Polemon's work *Against Neanthes*. So GÖLLER 1818, p. 167; ROEPER 1849, p. 356; SCHORN 2018, pp. 4-5. Indeed, Neanthes, who is cited at the beginning of the lemma (*FGrHist* 84 F13), claimed that Laïs came from Crastus in Sicily.

²⁴³ Neanth. *FGrHist* 84 F16 = Polemo fr. 53 Preller = Ath. 13, 602c-d.

²⁴⁴ Eratosth. *FGrHist* 241 F37b = fr. 80 Strecker = *EM* s.v. κύρβεις p. 547 Kallierges.

²⁴⁵ Fr. 48 Preller = Harp. α 166 Keaney, s.v. ἄζονι.

?	fr. 63	Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον περὶ ζωγράφων	painting of Wedding of Peirithous by Hippeus/Hippys	Athens
?	fr. 64	Πρὸς Ἀδαίου	<i>plangonion</i> perfume	Elis
?	fr. 65	Πρὸς Ἀδαίου καὶ Ἀντίγονον	pronunciation of the demotics Azenieis, Erchieis, Halieis	Athens
?	(new)	Πρὸς [Ἀντίγονον καὶ] Ἀδαίου	<i>sannades</i> goats	Crete

It remains unclear whether specific books were directed exclusively against Antigonos or Adaeus, or whether Polemon discussed both of these writers throughout the entire work. Since this is the only polemical work written by Polemon against more than one writer, it also remains difficult to decide whether a specific fragment of Polemon argues against Antigonos or Adaeus, even if the work is cited specifically as Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον or Πρὸς Ἀδαίου. This is clear from fr. 57 (on the *seleucis*, *antigonis*, *rhodias* and *prusias* cups), where Athenaeus cites the work as Πρὸς Ἀδαίου, while Photius uses the title Πρὸς Ἀντίγονον.

A further question is whether Polemon only reacted against their works on painting, as Bencker assumed. While it is true that there is no unambiguous reference to sculpture, the work might nevertheless have touched on more topics than merely painting. Indeed, it is not always easy to reconstruct a discussion of a painting for all fragments. It is possible, for instance, that Polemon's discussion of the purple swamphen (fr. 59) and the Cretan *sannades* goats (*P.Oxy.* XVIII 2176 fr. 1 col. 1, 1-11 + fr. 9) is somehow connected with or replied to Antigonos' work *On Animals* (Περὶ ζώων). Similarly, there might also be a link with Antigonos' lexicographical work *On Diction* (Περὶ λέξεως) (cf. fr. 65). Indeed, one of the fragments of Antigonos shows that this work also devoted attention to local words for certain animals²⁴⁶. It is possible that this also applies to the fragments on the *plangonion* perfume (fr. 64) and the vocabulary related to washing one's hands at symposia (fr. 62). Furthermore, Polemon's discussion of the *antigonis*, *seleucis*, *rhodias* and *prusias* cups (fr. 57) – all probably made of precious metal – might be connected with Antigonos' work on metal engravings (*de toreutice*). It is even possible that Polemon discussed sanctuaries in general, as he does in his periegetic works, without restricting himself to paintings.

Finally, since Polemon's *Against Adaeus and Antigonos* discussed the same type of topics as those treated in his periegetic works, it remains difficult to attribute fragments that cite no book title to a specific work. For instance, Preller attributed Polemon's story about a certain man that hid money in the hollow cloak of a statue of the singer Cleon in Thebes²⁴⁷ to a periegetic work on Boeotia²⁴⁸, but Maass and Hansen instead considered it derived from *Against Adaeus and Antigonos*²⁴⁹. Similarly, Bencker attributed Polemon's discussion of the *προσωποῦττα*, a type of vessel²⁵⁰, to this work²⁵¹, while Preller merely printed it under the heading «*varia incertae sedis*»²⁵².

6. Conclusion

If we evaluate the extant fragments of Polemon's work *Against Adaeus and Antigonos*, we see that, when he described artworks, he identified the artist and the place where the works were found and offered numerous digressions on mythology, cultural-historical information, grammar and even biology. At the same time, however, Polemon's polemic with Antigonos and

²⁴⁶ Antig. fr. 55a = Ath. 3, 88a on the Aeolic word οὄς Ἀφροδίτης for oyster.

²⁴⁷ Fr. 25 Preller = fr. 21 Capel Badino = Ath. 1, 19b.

²⁴⁸ PRELLER 1838, pp. 52-3. CAPEL BADINO 2018, p. 262 considers Polemon's works *On the Sanctuaries of Heracles in Thebes* (Περὶ τῶν Θήβησιν Ἡρακλείων) or *On the Inscriptions in Cities* (Περὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις ἐπιγραμμάτων).

²⁴⁹ MAASS 1880, pp. 38-9; HANSEN 1971, pp. 402-3.

²⁵⁰ Fr. 94 Preller = Hsch. π 3961 Hansen, s.v. *προσωποῦττα*.

²⁵¹ BENCKER 1890, p. 19 n. 1.

²⁵² PRELLER 1838, p. 147.

Adaeus may have gone beyond painting. Thus, he may have commented on Antigonus' works on metal engraving and biology as well. The approach of Polemon's work thus seems to have been the same as in his periegetical works. He visited and described local monuments, paintings and sanctuaries in Greece, commented on the artists who made these artworks, described the inventory of temples, inspected inscriptions, recounted the mythical origins of a city, discussed local cults and traditions and made all sorts of digressions.

Literature

- ADLER 1928-1938: *Suidae Lexicon*. Edidit A. Adler, 5 vols., Leipzig 1928-1938.
- ALLAMANI-SOURI 1984: V. ALLAMANI-SOURI, *Ἀπόλλωνι, Ἀσκληπιῶδι, Ὑγιείαι. Επιγραφικὴ μαρτυρία για το Ἀσκληπιεῖο της Βέροιας*, «Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον. Μελέτες», 39, 1984, pp. 205-31.
- AMATO 2010: *Favorinus d'Arles. Oeuvres, III: Fragments*. Texte établi, traduit et commenté par E. Amato, Paris 2010.
- AMELUNG 1913: W. AMELUNG, *Demetrios II*, in *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, hrsg. von U. Thieme, IX, Leipzig 1913, pp. 52-3.
- ANDREWES 1979: A. ANDREWES, *Spartan Imperialism?*, in *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, ed. by P.D.A. Garnsey, C.R. Whittaker, Cambridge 1979, pp. 91-102.
- ANGELUCCI 2003: M. ANGELUCCI, *Polemone di Ilio: fra ricostruzione biografica e interessi antiquari*, «SCO», 49, 2003, pp. 165-84.
- ANGELUCCI 2014: M. ANGELUCCI, *Reiseliteratur im Altertum: die periegesis in hellenistischer Zeit*, in *Mobilität in den Kulturen der antiken Mittelmeerwelt. Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums 11, 2011*, hrsg. von E. Olshausen, V. Sauer, Stuttgart 2014, pp. 11-23.
- ANGELUCCI 2018: M. ANGELUCCI, *Polemone di Ilio e la sua opera Πρὸς Τίμαιον*, «Maia», 70, 2018, pp. 242-59.
- ARENA 1978: R. ARENA, *Ἐγγυθήκη/ἀγγοθήκη*, «Acme», 31, 1978, pp. 5-9.
- ARNOTT 2007: W.G. ARNOTT, *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z*, London-New York 2007.
- ARRIGHETTI 1987: G. ARRIGHETTI, *Poeti, eruditi e biografì. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura*, Pisa 1987.
- ARVANITOPOULOS 1929: A.S. ARVANITOPOULOS, *Πολέμων ὁ περιηγητής: βίος καὶ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, «Polemon», 1, 1929, pp. 60-4.
- ASHERI 1975: D. ASHERI, *Eracle, Eraclea e i Cyclicranes: mitologia e decolonizzazione nella Grecia del IV sec. a.C.*, «AncSoc», 6, 1975, pp. 33-50.
- ASHTON *et al.* 2002: R.H.J. ASHTON, N. HARDWICK, P. KINNS, K. KONUK, A. MEADOWS, *The Pixodarus Hoard (CH 9.421)*, in *Coin Hoards*, ed. by A. Meadows, U. Wartenberg, IX: *Greek Hoards*, London 2002.
- BAPP 1888: K. BAPP, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik des Athenaeus*, in *Commentationes philologicae quibus Ottoni Ribbeckio praeceptoris inlustri sexagensimum aetatis magisterii Lipsiensis decimum annum exactum congratulantur discipuli Lipsienses*, Leipzig 1888, pp. 251-65.
- BARIGAZZI 1966: *Favorino di Arelate. Opere*. Introduzione, testo critico e commento a cura di A. Barigazzi, Firenze 1966.
- BARON 2013: C.A. BARON, *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography*, Cambridge 2013.
- BENCKER 1890: M. BENCKER, *Der Anteil der Periegesen an der Kunstschriftstellerei der Alten*, München 1890.
- BÉQUIGNON 1937: Y. BÉQUIGNON, *La vallée du Spercheios des origines au IV^e siècle. Études d'archéologie et de topographie*, Paris 1937.

- BERKELIUS 1688: *Στεφάνου Βυζαντίου Ἐθνικὰ κατ' ἐπιτομὴν, Stephani Byzantini Gentilia per epitomen, antehac Περι πόλεων De urbibus inscripta*, Quae ex MSS. Codicibus Palatinis ab Cl. Salmasio quondam collatis & Ms. Vossiano restituit, supplevit, ac Latina versione & integro commentario illustravit A. Berkelius. Accedunt collecta ab Jacobo Gronovio variae lectiones ex codice MS. Perusino, & admixtae ejusdem notae, Leiden 1688.
- BIEBER 1938: M. BIEBER, *Theodoros*, in *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, hrsg. von H. Vollmer, XXXII, Leipzig 1938, pp. 598-9.
- BISCHOFF 1937: H. BISCHOFF, s.v. *Perieget*, in *RE*, XIX.1, 1937, coll. 725-42.
- BOCKISCH 1965: G. BOCKISCH, *Ἀρμυσταί (431-387)*, «Klio», 46, 1965, pp. 129-239.
- BOCKISCH 1967: G. BOCKISCH, *Die Harmostie Herakleia Trachis (ein Kolonisationsversuch der Lakedaimonier vom Jahre 426)*, «AAntHung», 15, 1967, pp. 311-7.
- BREMER-VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP-SLINGS 1987: J.M. BREMER, A.M. VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP, S.R. SLINGS, *Some Recently Found Greek Poems. Text and Commentary*, Leiden 1987.
- BRIEGER 1857: A. BRIEGER, *De fontibus librorum XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, Naturalis historiae Plinianae, quatenus ad artem plasticam pertinent*, Greifswald 1857.
- BRINGMANN 2000: K. BRINGMANN, *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer. Teil II. Historische und archäologische Auswertung, I: Geben und Nehmen. Monarchische Wohltätigkeit und Selbstdarstellung im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Mit einem numismatischen Beitrag von H.-C. Noeske*, Berlin 2000.
- BRINGMANN *et al.* 1995: K. BRINGMANN, H. VON STEUBEN, W. AMELING, B. SCHMIDT-DOUNAS, *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer. Teil I. Zeugnisse und Kommentare*, Berlin 1995.
- BRODERSEN 2018: *Ailianos. Tierleben. Griechisch-deutsch*. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von K. Brodersen, Berlin-Boston 2018.
- BRUNEAU 1970: P. BRUNEAU, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris 1970.
- BRUNN 1889: H. BRUNN, *Geschichte der griechischen Künstler*, 2 vols., Stuttgart 1889².
- CANFORA 2001: *Ateneo. I deipnosofisti. I dotti a banchetto*. Prima traduzione italiana commentata su progetto di L. Canfora. Introduzione di C. Jacob, 4 vols., Roma 2001.
- CAPEL BADINO 2018: *Polemone di Ilio e la Grecia. Testimonianze e frammenti di periegesi antiquaria*, a cura di R. Capel Badino, Milano 2018.
- CHAPPUIS 1868: *Fragments des ouvrages de Varron intitulés Logistorici, Hebdomades vel De imaginibus, De forma philosophiae*, recueillis, mis en ordre accompagnés d'introductions et de notes par C. Chappuis, Paris 1868.
- CROISILLE 1985: *Pline l'Ancien. Histoire naturelle. Livre XXXV*. Texte établi, traduit et commenté par J.-M. Croisille, Paris 1985.
- DAVIDSON 1997: J.N. DAVIDSON, *Courtesans & Fishcakes. The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*, London 1997.
- DE SOUSA MEDEIROS 1961: *Hipónax de Éfeso I. Fragmentos dos Iambos*, por W. de Sousa Medeiros, Coimbra 1961.
- DEGANI 1984: E. DEGANI, *Studi su Ipponatte*, Bari 1984.
- DEGANI 1991: *Hipponactis testimonia et fragmenta*. Iterum edidit E. Degani, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1991².
- DEICHGRÄBER 1952: K. DEICHGRÄBER, s.v. *Polemon 9*, in *RE*, XXI.2, 1952, coll. 1288-320.
- DESPINIS 1971: G.I. DESPINIS, *Συμβολή στη μελέτη του έργου του Ἀγορακρίτου*, Athina 1971.
- DETLEFSEN 1873: *C. Plinii Secundi Naturalis historia*. D. Detlefsen recensuit, V: *Libri XXXII-XXXVII*, Berlin 1873.
- DIEHL-BEUTLER 1952: *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*. Edidit E. Diehl. *Fasc. 3. Iamborum scriptores*, Leipzig 1952³.
- DINDORF 1827: *Athenaeus*, ex recensione G. Dindorfii, 3 vols., Leipzig 1827.

- DORANDI 1994: T. DORANDI, *Prolegomeni per una edizione dei frammenti di Antigono di Caristo, II*, «MH», 51, 1994, pp. 5-29.
- DORANDI 1999: *Antigone de Caryste. Fragments*. Texte établi et traduit par T. Dorandi, Paris 1999.
- DORANDI 2013: *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Edited with Introduction by T. Dorandi, Cambridge 2013.
- DORANDI 2019: T. DORANDI, *Antigono di Caristo artista e scrittore d'arte*, in *Περὶ γραφικῆς. Pittori, tecniche, trattati, contesti tra testimonianze e ricezione*, a cura di G. Adornato, E. Falaschi, A. Poggio, Milano 2019, pp. 135-49.
- EHRHARDT 1997: W. EHRHARDT, *Versuch einer Deutung des Kultsbildes der Nemesis von Rhamnus*, «AK», 40, 1997, pp. 29-39.
- ENGELS 2014: D. ENGELS, *Polemon von Ilion. Antiquarische Periegesis und hellenistische Identitätssuche*, in *Athen und/oder Alexandria? Aspekte von Identität und Ethnizität im hellenistischen Griechenland*, hrsg. von K. Freitag, C. Michels, Köln-Weimar-Wien 2014, pp. 67-97.
- ERBSE 1950: H. ERBSE, *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika*, Berlin 1950.
- FARINA 1963: *Ipponatte*. Introduzione - testo critico - testimonianze - traduzione - commento a cura di A. Farina, Napoli 1963.
- FOWLER 2013: R.L. FOWLER, *Early Greek Mythography, II: Commentary*, Oxford 2013.
- FRAENKEL 1942: E. FRAENKEL, *An Epodic Poem of Hipponax*, «CQ», 36, 1942, pp. 54-6.
- FRANKENSTEIN 1924: L. FRANKENSTEIN, s.v. *Kantharos 5*, in *RE*, Supplementband IV, 1924, coll. 866-7.
- FRANYÓ–SNELL 1972: *Frühgriechische Lyriker. Zweiter Teil. Die Jambographen*. Deutsch von Z. Franyó. Griechischer Text bearbeitet von B. Snell, Berlin 1972.
- FRAZER 1898: *Pausanias's Description of Greece*. Translated with a Commentary by J.G. Frazer, I: *Translation*, London 1898.
- FRIEDRICH–NOTHERS 1998-2001: *Athenaios. Das Gelehrtenmahl*. Eingeleitet und übersetzt von C. Friedrich. Kommentiert von T. Nothers, 5 vols., Stuttgart 1998-2001.
- FUHRMANN 1978: *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales, IX.2: Propos de table. Livres IV-VI*. Texte établi et traduit par F. Fuhrmann, Paris 1978.
- FURTWÄNGLER–HAUSER–REICHHOLD 1932: A. FURTWÄNGLER, F. HAUSER, K. REICHHOLD, *Griechische Vasenmalerei*, Serie III: *Text*, München 1932.
- GARCÍA VALDÉS–LLERA FUEYO–RODRÍGUEZ-NORIEGA GUILLÉN 2009: *Claudius Aelianus. De natura animalium*. Ediderunt M. García Valdés, L.A. Llera Fueyo, L. Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén, Berlin-New York 2009.
- GEORGACAS 1984: D.J. GEORGACAS, *The αἴγυγος and Synonyms. A Study in Greek Etymology*, in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. by K.J. Rigsby, Durham (N.C.) 1984, pp. 101-20.
- GIGANTE 1984: M. GIGANTE, *Demetrio di Magnesia e Cicerone*, «Ciceroniana», 5, 1984, pp. 189-97.
- GIGANTE 2010: *Diogene Laerzio. Vite dei filosofi*, a cura di M. Gigante, Milano 2010⁸.
- GILBERT 1885: G. GILBERT, *Handbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer*, II, Leipzig 1885.
- GÖLLER 1818: *De situ et origine Syracusarum ad explicandam Thucydidis potissimum historiam scripsit atque Philisti et Timaei rerum Sicularum fragmenta adjecit F. Göller*, Leipzig 1818.
- GORMAN–GORMAN 2007: R.J. GORMAN, V.B. GORMAN, *The Tryphê of the Sybarites: A Historiographical Problem in Athenaeus*, «JHS», 127, 2007, pp. 38-60.
- GORMAN–GORMAN 2010: R.J. GORMAN, V.B. GORMAN, *Τρυφή and ὕβρις in the Περὶ βίων of Clearchus*, «Philologus», 154, 2010, pp. 187-208.

- GOULET-CAZÉ *et al.* 1999: *Diogène Laërce. Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres*. Traduction française sous la direction de M.-O. Goulet-Cazé. Introductions, traductions et notes de J.-F. Balaudé, L. Brisson, J. Brunschwig, T. Dorandi, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, R. Goulet et M. Narcy. Avec la collaboration de M. Patillon, Paris 1999.
- GRAHAM 1964: A.J. GRAHAM, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, Manchester 1964.
- GUIRAUD 1893: P. GUIRAUD, *La propriété foncière en Grèce jusqu'à la conquête romaine*, Paris 1893.
- GULICK 1927-1941: *Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists*. With an English Translation by C.B. Gulick, 7 vols., Cambridge (Mass.) 1927-1941.
- GULLETTA 1986: M.I.P. GULLETTA, *Nomi propri di sovrani, toponimi e nomi di coppe*, «AAPel», 62, 1986, pp. 313-23.
- GULLETTA–RADICI COLACE 1992: M.I.P. GULLETTA, P. RADICI COLACE, *Lexicon vasorum Graecorum*, I, Pisa 1992.
- GURLITT 1890: W. GURLITT, *Über Pausanias. Untersuchungen*, Graz 1890.
- HABICHT 1957a: C. HABICHT, s.v. *Prusias 2*, in *RE*, XXIII.1, 1957, coll. 1107-27.
- HABICHT 1957b: C. HABICHT, s.v. *Prusias 4*, in *RE*, XXIII.1, 1957, col. 1128.
- HALLOF 2014a: K. HALLOF, *Demetrios (Δημήτριος VII) von Rhodos*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von S. Kansteiner *et al.*, IV: *Spätklassik, Hellenismus. Maler des 4./3. Jhs. v.Chr., Bildhauer des 3./2. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 2678-3582*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 492-6.
- HALLOF 2014b: K. HALLOF, *Demetrios (Δημήτριος VIII) von Rhodos*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von K. Hallof *et al.*, IV: *Spätklassik, Hellenismus. Maler des 4./3. Jhs. v.Chr., Bildhauer des 3./2. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 2678-3582*, Berlin-Boston 2014b, pp. 496-8.
- HALLOF–KANSTEINER 2014: K. HALLOF, S. KANSTEINER, *Damatris (Δαμάτριος), auf Rhodos tätig*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von S. Kansteiner *et al.*, IV: *Spätklassik, Hellenismus. Maler des 4./3. Jhs. v.Chr., Bildhauer des 3./2. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 2678-3582*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 490-1.
- HALLOF–KRUMEICH 2014: K. HALLOF, R. KRUMEICH, *Bion (Βίων) aus Milet*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von S. Kansteiner *et al.*, I: *Bildhauer und Maler von den Anfängen bis zum 5. Jh. v.Chr. DNO 1-719*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 573-5.
- HALLOF–PRIGNITZ 2014: K. HALLOF, S. PRIGNITZ, *Demetrios (Δημήτριος V) aus Antiochia*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von K. Hallof *et al.*, IV: *Spätklassik, Hellenismus. Maler des 4./3. Jhs. v.Chr., Bildhauer des 3./2. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 2678-3582*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 575-7.
- HANSEN 1971: E.V. HANSEN, *The Attalids of Pergamon*, Ithaca (N.Y.) - London 1971².
- HERMANN 1801: G. HERMANN, *De emendanda Ratione Graecae Grammaticae. Pars prima*, Leipzig 1801.
- HOLSTENIUS 1692: L. HOLSTENIUS, *Notae et castigationes in Stephanum Byzantium de urbibus*, Leiden 1692.
- HUEBNER 1830-1833: H.G. HUEBNER, *Commentarii in Diogenem Laertium*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1830-1833.
- HULLEMAN 1848: J.G. HULLEMAN, *Disputatio critica de Anaxandrida Delpho*, in *Symbolae literariae*. Curarunt, mandatu societatis, A. Ekker, J.G. Hulleman, Utrecht 1848, pp. 123-34.
- HUMPHREYS 2018: S.C. HUMPHREYS, *Kinship in Ancient Athens. An Anthropological Analysis*, I, Oxford 2018.

- JAHN 1840: O. JAHN, rev. Preller 1838, «Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik», 1840, pp. 585-97; 601-5.
- JAN–MAYHOFF 1897: *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis historiae libri XXXVI*. Post L. Iani obitum recognovit et scripturae discrepantia adiecta edidit K. Mayhoff, V: *Libri XXXI-XXXVII*, Stuttgart 1897.
- JANDA 1966: J. JANDA, *D'Antisthène, auteur des Successions des philosophes*, «LF», 89, 1966, pp. 341-64.
- JEX-BLAKE–SELLERS 1896: *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. Translated by K. Jex-Blake with Commentary and Historical Introduction by E. Sellers, London 1896.
- KAIBEL 1887-1890: *Athenaei Naucraticae Dipnosopistarum libri XV*. Recensuit G. Kaibel, 3 vols., Leipzig 1887-1890.
- KALKMANN 1886: A. KALKMANN, *Pausanias der Perieget. Untersuchungen über seine Schriftstellerei und seine Quellen*, Berlin 1886.
- KALKMANN 1898: A. KALKMANN, *Die Quellen der Kunstgeschichte des Plinius*, Berlin 1898.
- KANOWSKI 1984: M.G. KANOWSKI, *Containers of Classical Greece. A Handbook of Shapes*, St Lucia-London-New York 1984.
- KANSTEINER 2014a: S. KANSTEINER, *Antigonos (Ἀντίγονος)*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von S. Kansteiner et al., IV: *Spätclassik, Hellenismus. Maler des 4./3. Jhs. v.Chr., Bildhauer des 3./2. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 2678-3582*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 681-3.
- KANSTEINER 2014b: S. KANSTEINER, *Hippys (Ἴππυς), auch Hippeus, in Athen tätig*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von S. Kansteiner et al., IV: *Spätclassik, Hellenismus. Maler des 4./3. Jhs. v.Chr., Bildhauer des 3./2. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 2678-3582*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 114-5.
- KANSTEINER–LEHMANN 2014: S. KANSTEINER, L. LEHMANN, *Theodoros (Θεόδωρος) aus Athen und Theodoros*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von S. Kansteiner et al., IV: *Spätclassik, Hellenismus. Maler des 4./3. Jhs. v.Chr., Bildhauer des 3./2. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 2678-3582*, Berlin-Boston 2014, p. 734.
- KIRSTEN 1957: E. KIRSTEN, *Kothon in Sparta und Karthago*, in *Charites. Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*, hrsg. von K. Schauenburg, Bonn 1957, pp. 110-8.
- KLEIN 1907: W. KLEIN, *Geschichte der griechischen Kunst*, III: *Die Kunst der Diadochenzeit*, Leipzig 1907.
- KOEPKE 1862: R. KOEPKE, *De Antigono Carystio*, Berlin 1862.
- KRAUSE 1854: J.H. KRAUSE, *Angeiologie. Die Gefäße der alten Völker insbesondere der Griechen und Römer aus den Schrift- und Bildwerken des Alterthums in philologischer, archäologischer und technischer Beziehung dargestellt und durch 164 Figuren erläutert*, Halle 1854.
- LACHENAUD 2017: *Timée de Tauroménion. Fragments*. Traduits et commentés par G. Lachenaud, Paris 2017.
- LACROIX 1937: L. LACROIX, *La Faune Marine dans la décoration des plats à poissons. Étude sur la Céramique grecque d'Italie méridionale*, Verviers 1937.
- LATTE 1948: K. LATTE, *De nonnullis papyris Oxyrrhynchiis*, «Philologus», 97, 1948, pp. 37-57.
- LATTE–CUNNINGHAM 2020: *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, recensuit et emendavit K. Latte, editionem alteram curavit I.C. Cunningham, IIa: *E-O*, Berlin-Boston 2020².
- LAZZARINI 1973: M.L. LAZZARINI, *I nomi dei vasi greci nelle iscrizioni dei vasi stessi*, «ArchClass», 25-6, 1973, pp. 341-75.

- LE BONNIEC–GALLET DE SANTERRE 1953: *Pline l'ancien. Histoire naturelle. Livre XXXIV.* Texte établi et traduit par H. Le Bonniec. Commenté par H. Gallet de Santerre et par H. Le Bonniec, Paris 1953.
- LEFEBVRE DE VILLEBRUNNE 1789: *Banquet des savans par Athénée.* Traduit, tant sur les Textes imprimés; que sur plusieurs Manuscrits, IV, Paris 1789.
- LEONARD 1922: F. LEONARD, s.v. *Kothon 5*, in *RE*, XI.2, 1922, coll. 1517-20.
- LEUTSCH–SCHNEIDEWIN 1839: E.L. LEUTSCH, G.F. SCHNEIDEWIN, *Corpus paroemiographorum Graecorum*, I: *Zenobius, Diogenianus, Plutarchus, Gregorius Cyprius cum appendice proverbiorum.* Ediderunt E.L. Leutsch, G.F. Schneidewin, Göttingen 1839.
- LIPPOLD 1913a: G. LIPPOLD, s.v. *Hippeus 2*, in *RE*, VIII.2, 1913, coll. 1700-1.
- LIPPOLD 1913b: G. LIPPOLD, s.v. *Hippias 17*, in *RE*, VIII.2, 1913, col. 1712.
- LIPPOLD 1934: G. LIPPOLD, s.v. *Theodoros 200*, in *RE*, V A 2, 1934, col. 1920.
- LIPPOLD 1950: G. LIPPOLD, *Handbuch der Archäologie*, III.1: *Die griechische Plastik*, München 1950⁵.
- LOBEL 1941: E. LOBEL, 2176. *Commentary on Hipponax*, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVIII*, ed. by E. Lobel, C.H. Roberts, E.P. Wegener, London 1941, pp. 87-96.
- LOBEL 1948: E. LOBEL, *Additions and Corrections to Pieces Published in Previous Volumes*, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XIX*, ed. by E. Lobel, E.P. Wegener, C.H. Roberts, London 1948, pp. 147-54.
- LOPES *et al.* 2016: R.J. LOPES, J.A. GOMEZ, A. ANDREOTTI, M. ANDREONI, *Purple Swamphen or Gallinule (Porphyrio Porphyrio) and Humans. Forgotten History and Past Interactions*, «Society & Animals», 24, 2016, pp. 574-95.
- LUPPE 1975: W. LUPPE, rev. West 1974, «DLZ», 96, 1975, pp. 689-92.
- MAAS 1880: P. MAAS, *Commentarii in Hipponactem P.Oxy. 2176¹ fragm. 6*, «CQ», 36, 1942, p. 133.
- MAASS 1880: E. MAASS, *De biographis Graecis quaestiones selectae*, Berlin 1880.
- MALFITANA 2004: D. MALFITANA, *Θηρίκλεια ποτήρια: note per una rilettura. Ateneo (Deipn., XI 470e–472e) e alcuni kantharoi da una santuario cipriota*, «NAC», 33, 2004, pp. 217-47.
- MALKIN 1998: I. MALKIN, *Myth, Religion, and Spartan 'Ideology'*, in *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum*, hrsg. von W. Schuller, Darmstadt 1998, pp. 43-9.
- MARCOVICH 1999: *Diogenis Laertii Vitae philosophorum*, I: *Libri I-X*. Edidit M. Marcovich, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1999.
- MASSON 1962: *Les fragments du poète Hipponax.* Édition critique et commentée par O. Masson, Paris 1962.
- MAU 1894: A. MAU, s.v. *Ἀγοθήκη*, in *RE*, I, 1894, col. 2192.
- MEINEKE 1849: *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt*, ex recensione A. Meineke, I, Berlin 1849.
- MEINEKE 1858-1867: *Athenaei Deipnosopistae*, e recognitione A. Meineke, 4 vols., Leipzig 1858-1867.
- MEISTERHANS–SCHWYZER 1900: K. MEISTERHANS, E. SCHWYZER, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*, Berlin 1900³.
- MEJER 1981: J. MEJER, *Demetrius of Magnesia. On Poets and Authors of the Same Name*, «Hermes», 109, 1981, pp. 447-72.
- MENSCHING 1963: *Favorin von Arelate. Der erste Teil der Fragmente. Memorabilien und Omnigena historia (Ἀπομνημονεύματα und Παντοδαπή ἱστορία).* Herausgegeben und kommentiert von E. Mensching, Berlin 1963.
- MERRITT 1935: B.D. MERRITT, *Inscriptions of Colophon*, «AJPh», 56, 1935, pp. 358-97.
- METTE 1978: H.J. METTE, *Die 'Kleinen' griechischen Historiker heute*, «Lustrum», 21, 1978, pp. 5-43.

- MEYER 1890: P. MEYER, *Straboniana*, Grimma 1890.
- MIELSCH 2014: H. MIELSCH, *Androkydes (Ἀνδροκύδης) aus Kyzikos*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von S. Kansteiner et al., II: *Bildhauer und Maler des 5. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 720-1798*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 907-11.
- MILLER 1895: J. MILLER, s.v. *Aristophon 3*, in *RE*, II.1, 1895, coll. 1005-7.
- MINGAZZINI 1967: P. MINGAZZINI, *Qual'era la forma del vaso chiamato dai greci kothon?*, «AA», 1967, pp. 344-61.
- MONTANARI 2002: F. MONTANARI, *Filologia ed erudizione antica*, in *Da Αἶών a Eikasmós. Atti della giornata di studio sulla figura e l'opera di Enzo Degani*, Bologna 2002, pp. 73-88.
- MORENO 1966: P. MORENO, *Theodoros 6*, in *Enciclopedia dell'arte antica classica e orientale*, VII, Roma 1966, pp. 813-4.
- MUENZER 1895: F. MUENZER, *Zur Kunstgeschichte des Plinius*, «Hermes», 30, 1895, pp. 499-547.
- K. MÜLLER 1841-1851: *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, collegit, disposuit, notis et prolegomenis illustravit, indicibus instruxit C. Müllerus, 4 vols., Paris 1841-1851.
- W. MÜLLER 2001a: W. MÜLLER, *Androkydes (II)*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von R. Vollkommer, I, München-Leipzig 2001, pp. 42-3.
- W. MÜLLER 2001b: W. MÜLLER, *Bion*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von R. Vollkommer, I, München-Leipzig 2001, pp. 116-7.
- W. MÜLLER 2001c: W. MÜLLER, *Demetrios (I)*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von R. Vollkommer, I, München-Leipzig 2001, pp. 163-4.
- W. MÜLLER 2001d: W. MÜLLER, *Demetrios (II)*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von R. Vollkommer, I, München-Leipzig 2001, p. 164.
- W. MÜLLER 2001e: W. MÜLLER, *Demetrios (IV)*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von R. Vollkommer, I, München-Leipzig 2001, p. 164.
- W. MÜLLER 2001f: W. MÜLLER, *Demetrios (V)*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von R. Vollkommer, I, München-Leipzig 2001, p. 164.
- W. MÜLLER 2001g: W. MÜLLER, *Demetrios (VII)*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von R. Vollkommer, I, München-Leipzig 2001, p. 165.
- W. MÜLLER 2001h: W. MÜLLER, *Demetrios (VIII)*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von R. Vollkommer, I, München-Leipzig 2001, p. 165.
- MYNOTT 2018: J. MYNOTT, *Birds in the Ancient World*, Oxford 2018.
- NERI 1995: C. NERI, *L'empietà del naso (Hippon. fr. 129a, 1 Dg.)*, «Eikasmos», 6, 1995, pp. 11-4.
- NERI 2011: *Lirici greci. Età arcaica e classica*. Introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commento a cura di C. Neri, Roma 2011.
- NICOLOSI 2019: A. NICOLOSI, *Hipponax 2*, in *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta (CLGP). Pars I. Commentaria et lexica in auctores*, ediderunt G. Bastianini et al., II.6: *Galenus – Hipponax*, Berlin-Boston 2019, pp. 242-80.
- NYIKOS 1941: L. NYIKOS, *Athenaeus quo consilio quibusque usus subsidiis Dipnosophistarum libros composuerit*, Basel 1941.
- OBERHUMMER 1896: E. OBERHUMMER, s.v. *Athamania*, in *RE*, II.2, 1896, coll. 1928-9.
- OLSON 2006-2012: *Athenaeus. The Learned Banqueters*. Edited and Translated by S.D. Olson, 8 vols., Cambridge (Mass.)-London 2006-2012.
- OLSON 2019: *Athenaeus Naucratis. Deipnosophistae, IV.A: Libri XII-XV*. Edidit S.D. Olson, Berlin-Boston 2019.
- OLSON 2020: *Athenaeus Naucratis. Deipnosophistae, III.A: Libri VIII-XI*. Edidit S.D. Olson, Berlin-Boston 2020.

- ONASCH 2001: C. ONASCH, *Antigonos*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von R. Vollkommer, I, München-Leipzig 2001, pp. 52-3.
- OVERBECK 1868: J. OVERBECK, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen*, Leipzig 1868.
- PALLAT 1894: L. PALLAT, *Die Basis der Nemesis von Rhamnus*, «JDAI», 9, 1894, pp. 1-22.
- PARKER 2013: R. PARKER, *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*, Oxford 2013.
- PASQUALI 1913: G. PASQUALI, *Die Schriftstellerische Form des Pausanias*, «Hermes», 48, 1913, pp. 161-223.
- POSNANSKY 1890: H. POSNANSKY, *Nemesis und Adrasteia. Eine mythologisch-archäologische Abhandlung*, Wrocław 1890.
- POTTIER 1887: E. POTTIER, *Cothon*, in *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments*, sous la direction de C. Daremberg, E. Saglio, I.2, Paris 1887, pp. 1543-4.
- POTTIER 1892: E. POTTIER, *Thericlea vasa*, in *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments*, sous la direction de C. Daremberg, E. Saglio, V, Paris 1892, pp. 212-4.
- POTTIER 1900: E. POTTIER, *Incitega*, in *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments*, sous la direction de C. Daremberg, E. Saglio, III.1, Paris 1900, pp. 456-7.
- PRELLER 1838: *Polemonis Periegetae fragmenta*, collegit, digessit, notis auxit L. Preller. Accedunt de Polemonis vita et scriptis et de historia atque arte periegetarum commentationes, Amsterdam 1838.
- PRELLER 1840: L. PRELLER, *De locis aliquot Pausaniae disputatio brevis. Accedit additamentum Polemonis*, Dorpat 1840.
- PRELLER 1848: L. PRELLER, *Polemon 4*, in *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft in alphabetischer Ordnung*, hrsg. von A. Pauly, V, Stuttgart 1848, pp. 1790-3.
- PRIGNITZ 2014: S. PRIGNITZ, *Demetrios (Δημήτριος) und Diognetos (Διόγνητος) aus Tegea*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von K. Hallof et al., IV: *Spätclassik, Hellenismus. Maler des 4./3. Jhs. v.Chr., Bildhauer des 3./2. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 2678-3582*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 392-3.
- RACKHAM 1952: *Pliny. Natural History. Books 33-35*. With an English Translation by H. Rackham, Cambridge (Mass.)-London 1952.
- RADICI COLACE-MONDIO 2005: P. RADICI COLACE, A. MONDIO, *Lexicon vasorum Graecorum*, V, Pisa 2005.
- RADT 2008: *Strabons Geographika*. Mit Übersetzung und Kommentar herausgegeben von S. Radt, VII: *Buch IX-XIII: Kommentar*, Göttingen 2008.
- RAEDER-LEHMANN 2014: J. RAEDER, L. LEHMANN, *Agorakritos (Αγοράκριτος) von Paros*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von K. Hallof et al., II: *Klassik. Bildhauer und Maler des 5. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 720-1798*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 390-407.
- RANKE 1831: K.F. RANKE, *De lexicis Hesychiani vera origine et genuina forma commentatio*, Leipzig-Quedlinburg 1831.
- REGENBOGEN 1950: O. REGENBOGEN, s.v. *Πίναξ 3*, in *RE*, XX.2, 1950, coll. 1409-82.
- REINACH 1921: A. REINACH, *Recueil Milliet. Textes grecs et latins relatifs à l'histoire de la peinture ancienne publiés, traduits et commentés*, I, Paris 1921.
- REITZENSTEIN 1907: R. REITZENSTEIN, *Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios*, Leipzig-Berlin 1907.
- RICHTER-MILNE 1935: G.M.A. RICHTER, J.M. MILNE, *Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases*, New York 1935.

- ROBERT 1886: C. ROBERT, *Archaeologische Maerchen aus alter und neuer Zeit*, Berlin 1886.
- ROBERT 1894: C. ROBERT, s.v. *Agorakritos*, in *RE*, I.1, 1894, coll. 882-3.
- ROBERT 1901: C. ROBERT, s.v. *Demetrios 122*, in *RE*, IV.2, 1901, coll. 2850-1.
- ROBERT 1903: C. ROBERT, s.v. *Bion 15*, in *RE*, Supplementband I, 1903, col. 252.
- ROBERT 1905: C. ROBERT, s.v. *Diodotos 17*, in *RE*, V.1, 1905, coll. 715-6.
- ROBERT 1921: C. ROBERT, *Die griechische Heldensage*, II: *Die Nationalheroen*, Berlin 1921.
- RODRÍGUEZ-NORIEGA GUILLÉN 1998-2014: *Ateneo. Banquete de los eruditos*. Traducción y notas de L. Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén, 5 vols., Madrid 1998-2014.
- ROEPER 1849: G. ROEPER, *Parerga critica*, «Philologus», 4, 1849, pp. 352-7.
- RUDOLPH 1892: F. RUDOLPH, *Die Quellen und die Schriftstellerei des Athenaios*, «Philologus Supplementband», 6, 1892, pp. 109-62.
- RUMPF 1953: A. RUMPF, *Handbuch der Archäologie*, IV: *Malerei und Zeichnung*, München 1953⁶.
- SAKELLARIOU 1958: M.V. SAKELLARIOU, *La migration grecque en Ionie*, Athina 1958.
- SALVADORE 1999: *M. Terenti Varronis Fragmenta omnia quae extant. Pars I. Supplementum*. Collegit recensuitque M. Salvatore, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1999.
- SCHEFOLD 1957: K. SCHEFOLD, *Agorakritos als Erbe des Pheidias*, in *Robert Boehringer. Eine Freundesgabe*, Tübingen 1957, pp. 543-72.
- SCHEURLEER 1858: W.A. SCHEURLEER, *Disputatio philologica de Demetrio Magnete*, Leiden 1858.
- SCHMIDT 1864: *Ἡσύχιος. Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*. Post I. Albertum recensuit M. Schmidt, IV.2: *Quaestiones Hesychianae*, Jena 1864.
- SCHOENEMANN 1886: J. SCHOENEMANN, *De lexicographis antiquis qui rerum ordinem secuti sunt quaestiones praecursoriae*, Hannover 1886.
- SCHOFIELD 1999: M. SCHOFIELD, *The Stoic Idea of the City*, Chicago 1999².
- SCHOLFIELD 1958: *Aelian. On the Characteristics of Animals*. With an English Translation by A.F. Scholfield, I: *Books I-V*, London 1958.
- SCHORN 2012: S. SCHORN, *Chamaeleon. Biography and Literature Peri tou deina*, in *Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea. Text, Translation, and Discussion*, ed. by A. Martano, E. Matelli, D. Mirhady, New Brunswick-London 2012, pp. 411-44.
- SCHORN 2014: S. SCHORN, *Biographie und Autobiographie*, in *Die Literatur der klassischen und hellenistischen Zeit*, hrsg. von B. Zimmermann, A. Rengakos, München 2014, pp. 678-733.
- SCHORN 2018: S. SCHORN, ‘*Periegetische Biographie*’ – ‘*Historische Biographie*’: *Neanthes von Kyzikos (FGrHist 84) als Biograph*, in *Studien zur hellenistischen Biographie und Historiographie*, hrsg. von id., Berlin-Boston 2018.
- SCHREIBER 1872: T. SCHREIBER, *Quaestionum de artificum aetatibus in Plinii Naturalis historiae libris relatis specimen*, Leipzig 1872.
- SCHWARTZ 1887: *Scholia in Euripidem*. Collegit recensuit edidit E. Schwartz, I: *Scholia in Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas*, Berlin 1887.
- SCHWARTZ 1901: E. SCHWARTZ, s.v. *Demetrios 80*, in *RE*, IV.2, 1901, coll. 2814-7.
- SCHWEIGHÄUSER 1801-1805: *Ἀθηναίου Ναυκρατίτου Δειπνοσοφιστῶν. Athenaei Naucratis Deipnosophistarum libri quindecim*, ex optimis codicibus nunc primum collatis emendavit ac supplevit, nova Latina versione et animadversionibus cum Is. Casauboni aliorumque tum suis illustravit commodisque indicibus instruxit I. Schweighaeuser, 5 vols., Strasbourg-Zweibrücken 1801-1805.
- SCHWEIGHÄUSER 1801-1807: *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, post Isaacum Casaubonum conscripsit I. Schweighaeuser, 8 vols., Strasbourg-Zweibrücken 1801-1807.

- SEIDENSTICKER 2014: B. SEIDENSTICKER, *Hippias (Ἱππίας), in Olympia tätig*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von S. Kansteiner et al., III: *Spätclassik. Bildhauer des 4. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 1799-2677*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 692-3.
- SILLIG 1827: J. SILLIG, *Catalogus artificum sive architecti statuarii sculptores pictores caelatores et scalptores Graecorum et Romanorum*, Dresden-Leipzig 1827.
- SILLIG 1851: *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis historiae libri XXXVII. Recensuit et commentariis criticis indicibusque instruxit I. Sillig, V*, Hamburg-Gotha 1851.
- SLATER 1986: *Aristophanis Byzantii fragmenta*. Post A. Nauck collegit, testimoniis ornavit, brevi commentario instruxit W.J. Slater, Berlin-New York 1986.
- SOSIN 2014: J.D. SOSIN, *Endowed Eponymous Festivals on Delos*, «Kernos», 27, 2014, pp. 127-57.
- STÄHLIN 1922: F. STÄHLIN, s.v. *Κυλικράνες*, in *RE*, XI.2, 1922, coll. 2452-3.
- STOLL 1884-1890: H.W. STOLL, s.v. *Eurytos 2*, in *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, hrsg. von W.H. Roscher, I, Leipzig 1884-1890, coll. 1435-7.
- SUSEMIHL 1891: F. SUSEMIHL, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, I, Leipzig 1891.
- TARN 1913: W.W. TARN, *Antigonos Gonatas*, Oxford 1913.
- THEODORIDIS 1982-2012: *Photii patriarchae lexicon*. Edidit C. Theodoridis, 3 vols., Berlin - New York 1982-2012.
- THREATTE 1980: L. THREATTE, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, I: *Phonology*, Berlin 1980.
- TRESP 1914: *Die Fragmente der griechischen Kultschriftsteller*, gesammelt von A. Tresp, Gießen 1914.
- TUCHELT 1962: K. TUCHELT, *Tiergefäße in Kopf- und Protomengestalt. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte tierförmiger Gießgefäße*, Berlin 1962.
- H.L. URLICHS 1887: H.L. URLICHS, *Über griechischen Kunstschriftsteller*, Würzburg 1887.
- K.L. URLICHS 1856: K.L. URLICHS, *Strabo*, «RhM», 1856, pp. 465-6.
- USSLING 1844: J.L. USSLING, *De nominibus vasorum Graecorum disputatio*, Kopenhagen 1844.
- VOGEL 1882: A. VOGEL, *Jahresberichte. 48. Strabon*, «Philologus», 41, 1882, pp. 309-40.
- VOGLIANO 1948: A. VOGLIANO, *Nota Hipponattea*, «Acme», 1, 1948, pp. 257-9.
- VOLLKOMMER 2001a: R. VOLLKOMMER, *Hippeus*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von id., I, München-Leipzig 2001, p. 320.
- VOLLKOMMER 2001b: R. VOLLKOMMER, *Hippias (I)*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von id., I, München-Leipzig 2001, p. 320.
- VOLLKOMMER 2004: R. VOLLKOMMER, *Theodoros (VIII)*, in *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, hrsg. von id., II, München-Leipzig 2004, p. 450.
- VON CHRIST 1920: W. VON CHRIST, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, II.1: *Die nachklassische Periode der griechischen Litteratur*, München 1920.
- VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1881: U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Antigonos von Karystos*, Berlin 1881.
- VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1895: U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Euripides. Herakles*, I, Berlin 1895².
- VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1931: U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, I, Berlin 1931.
- VORSTER-HALLOF-LEHMANN 2014: C. VORSTER, K. HALLOF, L. LEHMANN, *Demetrios (Δημήτριος) aus Attika, Demos Alopeke*, in *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, hrsg. von S. Kansteiner et al., III: *Spätclassik. Bildhauer des 4. Jhs. v.Chr. DNO 1799-2677*, Berlin-Boston 2014, pp. 2-14.
- WACHSMUTH 1846: C. WACHSMUTH, *Hellenische Alterthumskunde*, I, Halle 1846².

- WEIL 1873: H. WEIL, *Die Oetaea im vierten Jahrhundert*, «Hermes», 7, 1873, pp. 380-92.
- WELLMANN 1891: M. WELLMANN, *Alexandros von Myndos*, «Hermes», 26, 1891, pp. 481-566.
- WELLMANN 1916: M. WELLMANN, *Pamphilos*, «Hermes», 51, 1916, pp. 1-64.
- WEMBER–LUNCZER 2017: V. WEMBER, C. LUNCZER, *Flamingo und Purpurhuhn – Eine neue Interpretation des Vogelnamens πορφυρίων und eine neue Bewertung von Aristoteles' Systematik des Trinkvorgangs der Säugetiere und Vögel*, in *Antike Naturwissenschaft und ihre Rezeption*, hrsg. von J. Althoff, S. Föllinger, G. Wöhrle, XXVII, Trier 2017, pp. 163-85.
- WENIGER 1865: L. WENIGER, *De Anaxandrida, Polemone, Hegesandro rerum Delphicarum scriptoribus*, Berlin 1865.
- WENIGER 1890-1897: L. WENIGER, s.v. *Iphitos 2*, in *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, hrsg. von W.H. Roscher, 1890-1897, coll. 310-4.
- WEST 1971: *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. Edidit M.L. West, I: *Archilochus. Hipponax. Theognidea*, Oxford 1971.
- WEST 1974: M.L. WEST, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin-New York 1974.
- WEST 1980: *Delectus ex iambis et elegis Graecis*. Edidit M.L. West, Oxford 1980.
- WEST 1989: *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. Edidit M.L. West, I: *Archilochus. Hipponax. Theognidea*, Oxford 1989².
- WESTERMANN 1855: A. WESTERMANN, *Commentationis de epistolarum scriptoribus graecis pars septima*, Leipzig 1855.
- WICKHOFF 1895: F. WICKHOFF, *Der Stil der Genesisbilder und die Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*, in *Die Wiener Genesis*, hrsg. von W. Ritter von Hartel, F. Wickhoff, Wien 1895, pp. 1-96.
- WICKHOFF 1900: F. WICKHOFF, *Roman Art. Some of Its Principles and Their Application to Early Christian Painting*. Translated and Edited by S.A. Strong, London 1900.
- YONGE 1854: *The Deipnosophists or Banquet of the Learned of Athenaeus*. Literally Translated by C.D. Yonge with an Appendix of Poetical Fragments, Rendered into English Verse by Various Authors, and a General Index, 3 vols., London 1854.
- YOUNG 1891: C.H. YOUNG, *Erchia. A Deme of Attica*, New York 1891.
- ZECCHINI 1989: G. ZECCHINI, *La cultura storica di Ateneo*, Milano 1989.