Virginia Mastellari

Educating the Youth in Later Greek Comedy *

Abstract
This paper aims to examine the portrayal of education scenes in later Greek Comedy (4th-3rd cent. BC). While it is uncertain whether texts from Middle and New Comedy include plays that focus on education as prominently as Aristophanes' *Banqueters* or *Clouds*, numerous fragments indicate a recurring interest in educational themes. These involve not only portrayals of philosophers and philosophical schools but also the emergence of key figures such as the pedagogue and the cook, who play significant roles in both educational and domestic contexts. The final part of the paper addresses a complementary aspect: the reception of Greek comedy in ancient education. Comic texts were incorporated into ancient curricula at various stages of instruction. Through this analysis, the paper highlights the lasting pedagogical value of comedy in the ancient world and how it both influenced and was influenced by educational practices.

Il presente contributo si propone di esaminare la rappresentazione di scene legate all'educazione nella commedia greca tarda (IV-III sec. a.C.). Sebbene non sia possibile stabilire con certezza se commedie di quest'epoca fossero incentrate sull'educazione in misura paragonabile, ad esempio, ai *Banchettanti* o alla *Nuvole* di Aristofane, numerosi frammenti testimoniano un interesse costante per temi educativi. Tali temi non riguardano soltanto la rappresentazione di filosofi e scuole filosofiche, ma anche l'emergere di figure chiave come il pedagogo e il cuoco, che svolgono ruoli significativi sia in contesti paideutici, sia in quelli domestici. La parte finale del contributo affronta un aspetto complementare: la ricezione della commedia greca nell'ambito dell'educazione antica. I testi comici furono integrati nei curricula scolastici antichi in diverse fasi dell'istruzione. Attraverso questa analisi, il presente lavoro intende mettere in luce il valore pedagogico della commedia nell'antichità e le modalità con cui essa influenzò e fu a sua volta influenzata dalle pratiche educative.

From Aristophanes' corpus, we can identify at least two plays in which scholarly or intellectual education takes center stage. In the *Banqueters*, Aristophanes' first official comedy, staged in 427 BC, education is a central theme[1]. The play revolves around the contrast between two brothers who differ in both upbringing and political beliefs: the

* A former version of this work was presented at the conference "Greek Comedy and Education" (University of Oxford, 26-27 June 2025). I am grateful to the audience for the stimulating discussion and valuable suggestions on that occasion, and to the journal's referees for improving this contribution through their insightful comments. I had the privilege of carrying out this research during a fellowship at the Fondation Hardt, whose generous hospitality I warmly acknowledge. Comic fragments are cited according to R. Kassel – C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci* (1983-2001).

[1] See CASSIO (1977) and SEGOLONI (1994, 109-93); more recently see PELLEGRINO (2015, 138-67) and PELLEGRINO (2024, 61-69) with previous bibliography. On the general presence of education scenes in comedy, see e.g. OKÁL (1964) and LÓPEZ FÉREZ (1997) – both with a focus on Aristophanes –, MARROU (1956, 90-92), SLATER (1997) and recently the contributions in MITSIS – PICHUGINA – REID (2023); on the intellectuals in Greek Comedy see e.g. ZIMMERMANN (1993), GARRIGA (1998), IMPERIO (1998) and WHITEHORNE (2022). With a focus on Menander, see BLANCHARD (2007).

elder was raised in adherence to traditional Attic values, while the younger embraced sophistic teachings and leads a dissolute lifestyle. Alongside comic themes that are highly relevant to the way young people were raised – such as the relationship between parents and children[2] and the contrast between city and countryside[3] – a character mentions a διδάσκαλος (fr. 206)[4] and a fragment from the play (fr. 233) specifically refers to the use of Homeric *glossai* in elementary education (see *infra*). This scene, in particular, illustrates how comedy skillfully intertwines the themes mentioned above: the father, asking his son – who is no longer a child – for the glosses taught at an elementary level, comically highlights his own regression to teaching the early stages of education. In this way, he is portrayed as clinging to the traditions of the past as the only guarantee of continuity, while, by virtue of his comic character, remaining resistant to new developments[5]. Many of these themes reappear four years later, in 423 BC, when Aristophanes returned to the theme of education in *Clouds*. As is well known, the main targets of the satire are Socrates and the sophists, along with their methods of instructing – or misguiding – the Athenian youth[6]. That the education of the young was a topical concern is further evidenced by the contemporary productions of Aristophanes' "rivals", already in the *Panoptai* by Cratinus, and later in the *Konnos* by Amipsias and in the *Kolakes* by Eupolis[7]. All these comedies, to varying degrees, depict a "new" form of education which, from the perspective of traditionalists, was considered dangerous: it involved the unrestrained use of rhetoric and scientific explanations of celestial phenomena, even leading some to question the existence of the gods.

Comic scenes depicting the education and schooling of young people – or the results thereof – persist in comedies of the 4th and 3rd centuries BC, while also evolving to incorporate new developments. When it comes to philosophers and education, the primary comic target shifts to Plato[8]. In a fragment by Epicrates (fr. 10 *inc. fab.*, ap. Ath. II 59d), a dialogue unfolds between two characters, set outside Athens. Speaker A, evidently less informed about current events, asks Speaker B, who has just returned

[2] We know of a *presbutes*, the father of these brothers and a character in the comedy, who was probably closer to the "good" son. On the development of this theme in the comedy see recently IMPERIO (2013).
[3] One son is said to have been educated in the countryside and the other one in the city; however, as fr. 206 suggests (see *infra*), both appear to have attended school under the same *didaskalos*, from whom the "good" son later ran away; see CASSIO (1977, 27).
[4] Cf. SEGOLONI (1994, 109-23).
[5] See CASSIO (1977, 29) and, more recently, SACCONI (2019). For this *topos* in the Greek literature see *infra* fn. 41.
[6] See, for instance, DOVER (1968, xxxii-lvii) and, more recently, FIORENTINI (2024, xv-xxx).
[7] On the three comedies, and more generally on the "intellectual" plays of the fifth century BC, see CAREY (2000).
[8] On Plato in comedy, see most recently FARMER (2017), which includes a collection of fourth-century comic passages. On philosophical parody in later comedy, see now KONSTANTAKOS (*forthcoming*, 48), with previous literature cited in fn. 99.

from the Panathenaic festival, for news about the city. In response, Speaker B recounts an incident involving Plato and his circle of disciples. He humorously describes a group of young men at the Academy, including Plato, engaged in an overly serious debate about whether a gourd is a vegetable, grass, or tree, until a Sicilian doctor mockingly interrupts by breaking wind, satirizing their pedantic excess. Despite the ridicule, Plato calmly encourages them to continue their taxonomic distinctions – but apparently with reference to the fart:

τί Πλάτων
καὶ Cπεύcιππος καὶ Μενέδημος;
πρὸc τίcι νυνὶ διατρίβουcιν;
ποία φροντίc, ποῖοc δὲ λόγοc
διερευνᾶται παρὰ τοῖcιν;
τάδε μοι πινυτῶc, εἴ τι κατειδὼc
ἥκειc, λέξον πρὸc Γᾶc < >
Β. ἀλλ’ οἶδα λέγειν περὶ τῶνδε caφῶc·
Παναθηναίοιc γὰρ ἰδὼν ἀγέλην
< > μειρακίων
ἐν γυμνacίοιc Ἀκαδημείαc
ἤκουca λόγων ἀφάτων ἀτόπων.
περὶ γὰρ φύcεωc ἀφοριζόμενοι
διεχώριζον ζῴων τε βίον
δένδρων τε φύcιν λαχάνων τε γένη.
κᾆτ’ ἐν τούτοιc τὴν κολοκύντην
ἐξήταζον τίνοc ἐcτὶ γένουc.
Α. καὶ τί ποτ’ ἄρ’ ὡρίcαντο καὶ τίνοc γένουc
εἶναι τὸ φυτόν; δήλωcον, εἰ κάτοιcθά τι.
Β. πρώτιcτα μὲν <οὖν> πάντεc ἀναυδεῖc
τότ’ ἐπέcτηcαν, καὶ κύψαντεc
χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον διεφρόντιζον.
κᾆτ’ ἐξαίφνηc, ἔτι κυπτόντων
καὶ ζητούντων τῶν μειρακίων,
λάχανόν τιc ἔφη cτρογγύλον εἶναι,
ποίαν δ’ ἄλλοc, δένδρον δ’ ἕτεροc.
ταῦτα δ’ ἀκούων ἰατρόc τιc
Cικελᾶc ἀπὸ γᾶc
κατέπαρδ’ αὐτῶν ὡc ληρούντων.
Α. ἦ που δεινῶc ὠργίcθηcαν χλευάζecθαί τ’ ἐβόηcαν;
τὸ γὰρ ἐν λέcχαιc τοιαῖcδε †τοιαῦτα ποιεῖν εὐπρεπέc.
Β. οὐδ’ ἐμέληcεν τοῖc μειρακίοιc.
ὁ Πλάτων δὲ παρὼν καὶ μάλα πρᾴωc,
οὐδὲν ὀρινθείc, ἐπέταξ’ αὐτοῖc
πάλιν < >
ἀφορίζecθαι τίνοc ἐcτὶ γένουc.
οἱ δὲ διῄρουν.

(A.) What about Plato and Speusippus and Menedemus? What’s occupying their time nowadays? What deep thoughts, what sort of speculation is under

> investigation at their establishment? Give me an insightful account of these matters, if you've come with any knowledge of them, by Earth! (B.) I know enough to give you a clear report about this. For during the Panathenaic festival, I saw a herd of young men in the exercise grounds of the Academy, and I listened to unspeakably strange discussions. They were producing definitions having to do with natural history, and trying to distinguish between animals, trees, and vegetables; and in the course of these discussions, they attempted to determine which category the gourd belongs to. (A.) What definition did they settle on? And what category did they put the plant into? Reveal this, if you have any information! (B.) At first they all stood silent and gazed at the ground for a long time, thinking the matter through. Then suddenly, while the other boys were still staring at the ground and considering the question, one of them said that it was a round vegetable; another a type of grass; and a third a tree. And a Sicilian doctor, when he heard this, farted on them for talking nonsense. (A.) I imagine they got terribly angry and shouted that they were being mocked? Because during conversations of this sort † it's appropriate to do something like that. (B.) The young men paid no attention. But Plato was there, and very gently and with no sign of excitement he ordered them once again to try to determine what category it belonged to. And they began drawing distinctions[9].

The lesson reported in the passage consisted of an exercise in διαίρεcιc, namely, the method of division and classification according to genera and species[10]. The interest in natural biology is especially associated with Speusippus (here mentioned at l. 2)[11], and was later developed by Aristotle and Theophrastus; yet Plato himself, in the *Timaeus*, characterizes natural philosophy as an activity for leisure[12] – precisely as in Epicrates' fragment, where the Panathenaic festival is mentioned. Although the fragment displays several characteristics typical of 4th-century comedy[13], it also reveals a clear indebtedness to Old Comedy, most notably to Aristophanes' *Clouds*. The educational setting parallels that of the *Clouds* (the *Phrontisterion* vis-à-vis the Academy): in both, a group of young men is shown receiving instruction from a philosopher in a comparable fashion[14]. Moreover, the debates described in the fragment closely recall the zoological and botanical disputations that take place in the *Phrontisterion* (*Nub*. 144-66)[15]. In both cases, the subjects of inquiry are trivial and mundane, and the humour derives from

[9] Transl. OLSON (2007, 446f.).
[10] Cf. Pl. *Soph*. 219a ff., *Polit*. 258b ff., 275b ff. and see BALTES (1993, 15 and fn. 81 with further bibliography).
[11] Cf. esp. Speusipp. frr. 6-27 Tarán.
[12] Pl. *Tim*. 59c-d. The fragment also employs platonic diction in several cases, see e.g. διερενᾶται l. 5, ἀφορίζομενοι and ἀφορίζεcθαι ll. 13 and 36 respectively, διεχώριζων l. 14, ἐξετάζειν l. 17 with OLSON (2007, 240f.) and FARMER (2017, 24f.).
[13] For which see NESSELRATH (2016, 238-43), especially on the employment of various meters within the dialogue; OLSON (2007, 239) and WILLI (*forthcoming*) for the language employed in the passage (which Olson *l.c.* qualifies as «standard 'Middle Comedy' dialect»).
[14] Cf. e.g. Epicr. fr. 10, 21 οἱ cφόδρ' ἐγκεκυφότεc and Ar. *Nub*. 191 τί γὰρ οἵδε δρῶcιν οἱ cφόδρ' ἐγκεκυφότεc;
[15] See e.g. IMPERIO (1998, 125f.) and FARMER (2017, 25) for a comparison of the two passages.

their ridicule, since they are considered absurd and futile. This sense of futility is further stressed by the reaction of an unexpected character, a Sicilian doctor[16], who «upon hearing this, farted at them for speaking nonsense» (ll. 27-29). The verb καταπέρδομαι ('to break wind at, in sign of contempt', cf. LSJ[9] *s.v.*) is attested elsewhere only in Aristophanes (*Ve.* 618, *Pax* 547, *Pl.* 617f.) and reflects a kind of coarse humor more typical of Old than of Middle Comedy[17]. The doctor's appearance is as abrupt as that of Plato at line 33, further emphasized by δέ, which marks the contrast with the pupils about whom speaker A was inquiring[18]. The students' composure and Plato's serene calm once again recall the pupils of the *Phrontisterion* (*Nub*. 175-80).

Plato's teaching at the Academy is once again ridiculed in a fragment of Ephippus' *Nauagos* ("The castaway", fr. 14)[19]. The source (Ath. XI 509b) reports that Ephippus mocked Plato and his pupils for «sycophantizing for money» (ὡς καὶ ἐπ' ἀργυρίῳ συκοφαντοῦντας). The fragment features a budding orator, a pupil of Plato, who is about to deliver the opening of a speech. However, most of the fragment is devoted to describing his sophistic attitude (ll. 3-5) and physical appearance (ll. 6-10), portraying him as a polished young man who pays excessive attention to his body and clothing[20], symbolizing the corrupt influence of elite education. It is only at the end of the fragment that Athenaeus quotes the opening words of the young man's speech, which take the form of a (para?)tragic variant of the classic incipit ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι (ll. 12f. ἀλλότριον, οὐκ οἰκεῖον, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, | ἔλεξεν 'ἄνδρες τῆς Ἀθηναίων χθονός'[21]). Plato is depicted here as just another sophist, a teacher who corrupts youth through luxury and rhetoric. The focus of this passage lies not on the process of teaching, but on its (negative) consequences.

A similar image of philosophy – or rather its distortion – as a corrupting influence is found in a fragment of Alexis' *Asotodidaskalos* ("The Instructor of Profligacy", fr. 25,

[16] On the foreign ethnic characterization of the doctor in comedy see Crates fr. 46, Alex. fr. 146, Men. *Asp*. 444-64; cf. IMPERIO (1998, 70-73), OLSON (2007, 242) and, most recently, KONSTANTAKOS (*forthcoming*, 46-48) with further bibliography. The predominantly Doric characterization of the doctor in Attic comedy is likely to be connected with the flourishing of medical schools in Doric-speaking regions of the Greek world (chiefly Sicily and Magna Graecia) and, in addition, may be associated with the presence of the doctor's mask in Sicilian drama (cf. Ath. XIV 621d). Some scholars (cf. *PCG* V, p. 162) have identified Epicrates' doctor with Philistion of Locri, a physician with whom Plato came into contact in Magna Graecia.

[17] Few exceptions are registered in 4th/3rd-century Comedy and they are collected by WILLI (*forthcoming*, 273 fn. 63): «Damoxenus fr. 2.15 (μινθώσας ἄφες "shit on him and dismiss him"), Sosipater fr. 1.12 (τοῖς λοιποῖς προσπέρδου "don't give a shit about the others" [lit. "fart on"]; cf. Damoxenus fr. 2.39 πρόσπαρδ(ε), Epicrates fr. 10.29)».

[18] Lines 30f., performed in anapaestic tetrameters, as NESSELRATH (2016, 243) notes «a metre very much used by Old Comedy and there quite often in scenes of confrontation and conflict».

[19] On the fragment see IMPERIO (1998, 128); FARMER (2017, 4-6); PAPACHRYSOSTOMOU (2021, 146-57).

[20] The care of one's appearance was one of the precepts of Platonic discipline (cf. *Resp.* 425b).

[21] For the tragic address see e.g. Eur. *HF* 477, *Ion* 12, 665.

ap. Ath. VIII 336d)[22]. Here, the philosophical schools (the Academy, the Lyceum and the Odeion) are lumped together as centers for idle talk:

> τί ταῦτα ληρεῖc, φληναφῶν ἄνω κάτω
> Λύκειον, Ἀκαδήμειαν, Ὠιδείου πύλας,
> λήρους coφιcτῶν; οὐδὲ ἓν τούτων καλόν.
> πίνωμεν, ἐμπίνωμεν, ὦ Cίκων, <Cίκων>,
> χαίρωμεν, ἕως ἔνεcτι τὴν ψυχὴν τρέφειν. (5)
> τύρβαζε, Μάνη· γαcτρὸc οὐδὲν ἴδιον.
> αὕτη πατήρ coι καὶ πάλιν μήτηρ μόνη.
> ἀρεταὶ δὲ πρεcβεῖαί τε καὶ cτρατηγίαι
> κόμποι κενοὶ ψοφοῦcιν ἀντ' ὀνειράτων.
> ψύξει cε δαίμων τῷ πεπρωμένῳ χρόνῳ· (10)
> ἕξεις δ' ὅc' ἂν φάγηιc τε καὶ πίηιc μόνα,
> cποδὸc δὲ τἆλλα, Περικλέηc, Κόδροc, Κίμων
>
> Why do you say these things, mixing up the Lyceum, the Academy, and the gates of the Odeion, the sophists' babbling? None of these things is good. Let's drink! Let's really drink, Sicon, Sicon! Let's enjoy ourselves as long as we can nourish our souls! Have a wild time, Manes! Nothing gives more pleasure than the belly. It alone is your father and your mother too, whereas personal distinctions, by which I mean ambassadorships and generalships, have the sound of empty boasts equivalent to dreams. A divinity will bring about your death at the fated moment. All you'll have is what you eat and drink; everything else—Pericles, Codrus, Cimon—is dust[23].

In the fragment, a slave named Xanthias urges his fellow slaves – Sicon and Manes, both conventional names for comic servants – to pursue a life of luxury in keeping with the comic representation of the Epicurean ideals[24]. The hedonistic ethic, both topical and widespread in 4th-century comedy[25], recalls the Worse-Argument's speech in Aristophanes' *Clouds* (cf. e.g. l. 1078 χρῶ τῇ φύcει, cκίρτα, γέλα, νόμιζε μηδὲν αἰcχρόν), reinforcing continuity with Old Comedy[26]. On the basis of the surviving fragment alone, however, it remains uncertain whether the title alludes to an actual teacher dispensing corrupt doctrines or to a character who sets a bad example through his behavior.

The corruption of the youth in relation to philosophical teachings is found once

[22] The authorship of the fragment has been questioned by ARNOTT (1996, 819-22; cf. OLSON 2007, 254), who, on the basis of the quotation context and a number of linguistic and structural considerations, regarded it as spurious and the result of falsification within the context of the Cynic school of the 3rd-2nd century BC. In defense of its authenticity, however, NESSELRATH (2010, 450f.) and TAMMARO (2014) have taken the opposite view. A *status quaestionis* is now provided by STAMA (2016, 93f.).
[23] Transl. OLSON (2007, 449).
[24] On the fragment see ARNOTT (1996, 819-30), OLSON (2007, 254f.), STAMA (2016, 93-96).
[25] On the comic motive see recently PAPACHRYSOSTOMOU (2016, 62f.).
[26] See moreover the opening vis-à-vis Ar. *Nub.* 1475, παραφρόνει καὶ φληνάφα.

again in Bato's *Synexapaton* ("The partner in deception", fr. 5)[27].

(A.) ἀπολώλεκας τὸ μειράκιόν μου παραλαβών,
ἀκάθαρτε, καὶ πέπεικας ἐλθεῖν εἰς βίον
ἀλλότριον αὐτοῦ· καὶ πότους ἑωθινοὺς
πίνει διὰ σὲ νῦν, πρότερον οὐκ εἰθισμένος.
(B.) εἶτ' εἰ μεμάθηκε, δέσποτα, ζῆν, ἐγκαλεῖς;
(A.) ζῆν δ' ἐστὶ τὸ τοιοῦθ'; (B.) ὡς λέγουσίν οἱ σοφοί.
ὁ γοῦν Ἐπίκουρός φησιν εἶναι τἀγαθὸν
τὴν ἡδονὴν δήπουθεν· οὐκ ἔστιν δ' ἔχειν
ταύτην ἑτέρωθεν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ζῆν παγκάλως
† ευσωσιαπαντη τυχὸν δώσεις ἐμοί.
(A.) ἑόρακας οὖν φιλόσοφον, εἰπέ μοι, τινὰ
μεθύοντ' ἐπὶ τούτοις θ' οἷς λέγεις κηλούμενον;
(B.) ἅπαντας· οἱ γὰρ τὰς ὀφρῦς ἐπηρκότες
καὶ τὸν φρόνιμον ζητοῦντες ἐν τοῖς περιπάτοις
καὶ ταῖς διατριβαῖς ὥσπερ ἀποδεδρακότα,
οὕτως, ἐπὰν γλαυκίσκος αὐτοῖς παρατεθῇ,
ἴσασιν οὗ δεῖ πρῶτον ἅψασθαι τόπου
καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ζητοῦσιν ὥσπερ πράγματος
ὥστ' ἐκπεπλῆχθαι πάντας

10 om. CE utrobique ευσωσιαπαντη τυχὸν [1]A : εὖ σῶς ἅπαντας ἢ τυχὸν [2]A : ἴσως ἅπαντας εὐτυχεῖν Herwerden : εὔζως δ' ἅπαντας εὐτυχεῖν Diels : εὔσως ἅπαντας ἂν τυχεῖν Usener : ἔσθ', ὡς (vel ὥσθ') ἅπαντας ἂν τυχεῖν Kaibel : :: εὖ, Σωσία, παντ', εἰ τυχὸν Desrousseaux

(A.) You've taken my boy and ruined him, you bastard; and you've convinced him to adopt a lifestyle that's foreign to him. He's drinking in the morning now, because of you, which isn't something he used to do. (B.) Are you complaining, master, because he's learned how to live? (A.) Is this kind of behaviour "living?" (B.) That's what the wise say. Epicurus, for example, identified the Good with pleasure, I believe. And you can't get pleasure from anywhere else; but by living very well [corrupt] you'll grant me is to the point. (A.) Tell me, then – have you ever seen a philosopher drunk or enchanted by the sort of actions you're describing? (B.) All of them! Because the ones with a haughty expression, who are on the look-out for the "prudent man" in their discussions and their debates, as if he were a runaway slave – if they're served a *glaukiskos*, they're so knowledgeable about where to take hold of it first, and they get to the "head of the matter", as it were, so fast, that everyone's stunned[28].

The fragment presents a comic exchange in which a father accuses a pedagogue of

[27] The fragment is quoted by Ath. III 103b and VII 278f. In the first locus, Athenaeus provides useful context: καὶ Βάτον (Πλάτον codd., corr. Casaubon) δ' ἐν Συνεξαπατῶντι δυσχεραίνοντα ποιήσας μειρακίου πατέρα ὡς διαφθαρέντος κατὰ τὴν δίαιταν ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ φησιν —— (fr. 5), «Bato too says in *The partner in deception*, in which he presents a father upset about his son, who has descended into a life of debauchery under the influence of his slave guardian: —— (fr. 5)» (transl. OLSON 2006, 559).

[28] Transl. OLSON (2006, 516).

corrupting his son by introducing him to hedonistic habits such as morning drinking[29]. The pedagogue – identified by Gallo (1981, 45) as the eponymous character of the comedy – defends this conduct as true wisdom, invoking Epicurean ideas of pleasure as the supreme Good and ironically claiming that even the most austere philosophers indulge eagerly when given the chance. As in the previous example, the fragment does not depict a scene of education *per se*, but rather the aftermath of a corrupting form of education, recalling once more the scenario of Aristophanes' *Clouds*, where a father entrusts his son to a tutor who ultimately debases him. The "lesson" claimed by the pedagogue is, in fact, that he taught the boy how to live (l. 5), once again blending an educational context with philosophical parody. This parody operates not only through the caricatured representation of Epicurean doctrine – embodied in the pedagogue and, by extension, the young man – but also through a broader philosophical satire. In the pedagogue's words, Epicurus at least possesses the merit of honesty, openly proclaiming pleasure as the goal of life, whereas other philosophers hypocritically condemn pleasure in theory while indulging in it in practice[30].

The motif of the educator who leads a young man astray and conspires with him to deceive his elderly father is a recurrent topos in both Greek and Roman comedy. By Bato's time[31], the stage figure of the pedagogue had already developed into a stock character, originating in 5th-century tragic theatre[32]. He did not function as a formal teacher, but rather as a supervisory figure – typically a slave – responsible for overseeing boys of school age[33]. Along with the cook, he became a key figure in comic scenes concerned with education and moral instruction.

A particularly illustrative scene involving a pedagogue's role in education is preserved by Plautus *Bacchides*, a Roman adaptation of Menander's *Dis exapaton*[34] (ll. 419-34)[35].

(Lyd.) Non sino, neque equidem illum me uiuo corrumpi sinam.

[29] For a commentary on the fragment, see GALLO (1981, 45-52).
[30] See GALLO (1981, 51). On the final pun on κεφαλή ('head' but also 'crucial point') see WILLI (*forthcoming*, 244f.).
[31] i.e. 3rd century BC. For a biographical profile of the comic poet see Sommerstein in *EGC*, s.v. "Baton".
[32] On this character's evolution on the dramatic stage see recently FUNAIOLI (2011) with previous bibliography; for the character in comedy see RIZZO (1990) and KRIETER-SPIRO (1997).
[33] Only wealthy families could afford to purchase a slave tutor to look after their sons (cf. Lys. 32, 28; [Dem.] 47, 56; Pl. *Alc.*122b). The duties of the pedagogue also included accompanying the child to various events outside the home. In *Ch.* 9, 5, Theophrastus describes a man who takes his sons and their slave tutor to the theatre. Plato counts both the nurse and the pedagogue among the members of the household who strive to raise the child as well as possible (*Prot.* 325c; cf. Eur. fr. 866 Ka.). See further MARROU (1956, 201f.) and GOLDEN (1988; 1990).
[34] On the relationship between the two comedies see recently HOLZBERG (2024, 80 with bibliography at fn. 167).
[35] The text follows the edition of QUESTA (2008).

sed tu, qui pro tam corrupto dicis causam filio,
eademne erat haec disciplina tibi, cum tu adulescens eras?
nego tibi hoc annis uiginti fuisse primis copiae,
digitum longe a paedagogo pedem ut efferres aedibus.
ante solem exorientem nisi in palaestram ueneras,
gymnasi praefecto haud mediocris poenas penderes.
id quoi optigerat, hoc etiam ad malum accersebatur malum:
et discipulus et magister perhibebantur inprobi.
ibi cursu, luctando, hasta, disco, pugillatu, pila,
saliendo sese exercebant magis quam scorto aut sauiis:
ibi suam aetatem extendebant, non in latebrosis locis.
inde de hippodromo et palaestra ubi reuenisses domum,
cincticulo praecinctus in sella apud magistrum adsideres:
quom librum legeres, si unam peccauisses sillabam,
fieret corium tam maculosum quam est nutricis pallium.

(Lyd.) No, I won't, and I won't let him be corrupted while I'm alive. But you, who are defending such a corrupt son, was there the same sort of education when you were a teenager? I say no, in your first twenty years you didn't have the chance to put your foot out of the house one finger's breadth away from your tutor. If you didn't come to the sports ground before sunrise, you'd pay a heavy price to the head of the gymnasium. If this happened to anyone, this trouble would be added to the other trouble: both pupil and tutor would be considered worthless. There they'd train themselves by running, wrestling, throwing the spear and the discus, boxing, playing ball, and jumping, rather than with a prostitute or kisses. There they'd spend their lives, not in dark dens. When you came home from there, the race court and the sports ground, you'd sit down on a chair by your teacher, clad in a loincloth; when you were reading your book, if you got a single syllable wrong, your skin would become as spotted as a nurse's shawl[36].

In the Roman version of the play, the slave Lydus is the only character to retain his original name. The Greek form is attested in *POxy* 4407, which preserves most of the surviving material from Menander's original[37]. Although there is no direct Greek correspondence for the scene in question, scholars have argued that it likely derives, more or less faithfully, from Menander's version[38]. Lydus, the pedagogue of Pistoclerus, is dismayed by his pupil's immoral behavior, as the young man consorts with courtesans[39]. Although he tries to hinder Pistoclerus' actions, he receives no support

[36] Transl. DE MELO (2011, 409-11).
[37] Now edited in *PCG* VI 1 pp. 53-62.
[38] See BLANCHARD (2007, 19), who refers to FRAENKEL (1960) and BARSBY (1991, 133f.). See also QUESTA (1975, 34): «la lunga descrizione della buona educazione del buon tempo antico ch'è il nocciolo di III 3 […] doveva essere uno dei capisaldi della 'moralità' della commedia menandrea».
[39] On Lydus and other tutors in Greek and Roman comedy see recently HANSES (2023, 291-95), with previous bibliography at fn. 15. For a commentary on this passage, see now RICHLIN (2017, 231-33), who emphasizes the confident attitude of the slave addressing his master and the significance of line 434: «a non-heroic simile that gives a shout-out to another set of caregivers in the audience, and also a reminder of free children's debt to the slaves who raised him. It is also a reversal of the kind of language used to describe a slave's bruised skin» (p. 232).

from the boy's father, Philoxenus, whose help he had sought. In III 3, Lydus reappears with Philoxenus lamenting his son's misconduct. When Philoxenus responds with indulgence, Lydus launches into a pointed reflection on the erosion of discipline and the increasing difficulty of the tutor's role in the absence of firm parental authority.

In this passage, the situation is reversed compared to the previous example: the pedagogue laments his pupil's immoral conduct, which is nonetheless condoned by the young man's father. Lydus complains about the boy's corrupted *mores*, reminding the father of how things used to be when he was young[40]. In doing so, he outlines the duties and roles traditionally expected of a pedagogue in the moral and physical education of boys. The theme of educational decline once again finds a precedent in Aristophanes' *Clouds*[41], and, likely, this influence was already present in Menander's original, as Barsby (1991, 134) maintains. It is difficult to isolate Plautus' reworking in this scene, but at least the first part of the speech, which focuses on physical education, is certainly of Greek origin, as *palaestra* and *gymnasium* were not elements of Roman education. Fraenkel (1960, 233) points out that, also by comparison with Terence's *Adelphoe*, Menander's comedy was primarily concerned with the broader issue of education.

Interestingly, at line 155, in a previous rather heated exchange between Lydus and Pistoclerus (in which the pedagogue complains about his pupil's insubordination and arrogance) the latter retorts: *fiam, ut ego, opinor, Hercules, tu autem Linus*[42]. The allusion is to a well-known mythological episode: Linus, a semi-divine figure, son of Apollo, was traditionally regarded as the mythical inventor of music. According to the myth, he was appointed to teach Heracles the lyre, but the hero's lack of musical sensitivity and discipline led to Linus' death at his pupil's hands[43]. This motif was also exploited in Greek comic theatre[44]. The most interesting surviving instance, depicting a school-like educational scene, is preserved in Alexis' fr. 140 from the comedy *Linos.*

The source of the fragment, Athenaeus, provides valuable context, explaining that Alexis depicts Heracles receiving instruction in the house of Linus. During the lesson, Heracles is asked to read from a selection of papyrus rolls laid out before him, but instead of choosing a serious text, he seizes a cookery book and holds on to it with

[40] For Lydus as *laudator temporis acti* see SCHÖNBECK (1981, 65-90).
[41] In lines 961-1023, the anapaestic epirrhema, the Better Argument nostalgically illustrates the traditional *paideia*, focusing on what young men used to learn from their music and gymnastics teachers. See DOVER (1968, 214-23) and, most recently, FIORENTINI (2024, 284-97). For the Greek *topos* of novelty criticism concerning the *paideia*, see DE MARTIN (2022).
[42] This quotation is also believed to derive from the Greek original, as argued by FRAENKEL (1960, 25s.) and BARSBY (1991, 108-10), both of whom provide insightful remarks on Plautus' use of mythological references.
[43] Cf. [Apollod.] II 4, 9, Diod. III 67, 2. See e.g. W. Kroll s.v. *Linos* in *RE* XIII 715; J. Bordman s.v. *Linos* in *LIMC* VI 1, 290.
[44] Beside Alex. fr. 140 discussed below, see Anaxandr. fr. 16 (*Herakles*) with MILLIS (2015) *ad loc*.

eager enthusiasm[45].

(Λι.) βιβλίον
ἐντεῦθεν ὅ τι βούλει προσελθὼν γὰρ λαβέ,
ἔπειτ' ἀναγνώσει πάνυ γε διασκοπῶν
ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων ἀτρέμα τε καὶ σχολῇ.
Ὀρφεὺς ἔνεστιν, Ἡσίοδος, τραγῳδίαι,
Χοιρίλος, Ὅμηρος, † Ἐπίχαρμος, συγγράμματα
παντοδαπά. δηλώσεις γὰρ οὕτω τὴν φύσιν
ἐπὶ τί μάλισθ' ὥρμηκε. (Ηρ.) τουτὶ λαμβάνω.
(Λι.) δεῖξον ὅ τι ἐστὶ πρῶτον. (Ηρ.) ὀψαρτυσία,
ὥς φησι τοὐπίγραμμα. (Λι.) φιλόσοφός τις εἶ,
εὔδηλον, ὃς παρεὶς τοσαῦτα γράμματα
Σίμου τέχνην ἔλαβες. (Ηρ.) ὁ Σῖμος δ' ἐστὶ τίς;
(Λι.) μάλ' εὐφυὴς ἄνθρωπος. ἐπὶ τραγῳδίαν
ὥρμηκε νῦν καὶ τῶν μὲν ὑποκριτῶν πολὺ
κράτιστός ἐστιν ὀψοποιός, ὡς δοκεῖ
τοῖς χρωμένοις, τῶν δ' ὀψοποιῶν ὑποκριτής
***
(Λι.) βούλιμός ἐσθ' ἄνθρωπος. (Ηρ.) ὅ τι βούλει λέγε·
πεινῶ γάρ, εὖ τοῦτ' ἴσθι

(Linus) Yes, go over and pick any papyrus roll you like out of there, and then read it— (Heracles) Absolutely! (Linus) examining them quietly, and at your leisure, on the basis of the labels. Orpheus is in there, Hesiod, tragedies, Epicharmus, Homer, Choerilus, prose treatises of every type. This way you'll show me what subject you're naturally inclined to. (Heracles) I'm picking this one! (Linus) First show me what it is. (Heracles) It's a cookbook, according to the label. (Linus) It's obvious you're quite a philosopher, since you've passed by works like these and chosen Simus' trade! (Heracles) Who's Simus? (Linus) A very clever person. He's now turned to tragedy; he's far and away the best cook among the actors, according to the people who employ him, and the best author among the cooks
. . . (a line or more is missing) . . .
(Linus) This guy can't stop eating! (Heracles) Say what you want; I'm hungry, that's for sure![46]

In Alexis' fragment, Linus functions not as a music teacher but as a *grammatistēs*, a schoolmaster[47], and grants Heracles access to his collection of book rolls, providing an accurate physical description of fourth-century book rolls[48]. This collection reflects a literary canon that, we may reasonably assume, had already begun to consolidate in the

[45] Ath. IV 164b: ὑποτίθεται δὲ τὸν Ἡρακλέα παρὰ τῷ Λίνῳ παιδευόμενον καὶ κελευσθέντα ἀπὸ βιβλίων πολλῶν παρακειμένων λαβόντα ἐντυχεῖν. ἐκεῖνος δ' ὀψαρτυτικὸν λαβὼν βιβλίον ἐν χεροῖν περισπουδάστως ἐκράτει.
[46] Transl. OLSON (2007, 449f.).
[47] On this figure in Greek education see e.g. MARROU (1956, 202ff.).
[48] On the fragment see ARNOTT (1996, 406-15), OLSON (2007, 266-68), WRIGHT (2013, 609-11), STAMA (2016, 273-76).

4th century BC[49]. The canon includes Orpheus (or, more likely, the *Orphic Hymns*)[50], epic poetry represented by Homer, Hesiod, and possibly the fifth-century epic poet Choerilus of Samos[51], as well as tragedy, and Epicharmus[52]. The list also features prose[53] works, generally referred to as *syngrammata*. As scholars have noted[54], the selection consists largely of serious literary texts drawn from genres that were commonly employed in educational contexts. Therefore, both the setting and the situation depicted in the scene closely mirror actual school practices.

However, the coarse Heracles – depicted here, as often in comedy, as a glutton[55] – ultimately chooses a cookbook, the recipe collection of Simos, over the canonical works, following, as his teacher advises, his natural inclinations (l. 7 δηλώσεις γὰρ οὕτω τὴν φύσιν). This point is particularly noteworthy: the idea that the choice of a book reflects a reader's innate disposition is far less attested than the more traditional belief in the morally formative power of literature[56]. Rather than reflecting a genuine pedagogical practice, the idea likely serves a comic purpose, legitimizing Heracles' expected course of action as a comic glutton and parodying the story of his legendary choice. Intriguingly, the cookbook is referred to as a *techne*, the same term used for rhetorical handbooks by Antiphon, Aristotle, Isocrates[57], an ironic elevation of culinary expertise to the level of intellectual and rhetorical training[58]. Linus' sarcastic remark,

[49] Poetry was the most read genre, cf. e.g. Pl. *Prot*. 325e, 339a, *Hip.Mi*. 363a-b, Xen. *Mem*. IV 2, 1 and see MORGAN (1998, 15).
[50] On this presence in the list see FIORENTINI (2009).
[51] The name could also refer to the homonymous tragedian, see ARNOTT (1996, 410).
[52] Possibly cited here in his capacity as a gnomic poet, as WILAMOWITZ (1900, 25) suggested. Epicharmus enjoyed in antiquity a widespread reputation as a creator of moral teachings expressed in a sententious form and as a proponent of doctrines of a philosophical nature. This interpretation has more recently been supported by KONSTANTAKOS (2014, 166) and FAVI (2020, 15); *contra* ARNOTT (1996, 410) and STAMA (2016, 275), who argued that the mention of Epicharmus would serve to fill the gap represented by the absence of comic texts in the list of βιβλία.
[53] See ARNOTT (1996, 411). More recently, FAVI (2020, 15) does not exclude «un impiego riassuntivo del termine (come suggerisce anche παντοδαπά), ovvero nel senso generico di "scritti"».
[54] See e.g. WRIGHT (2013, 610) with previous references.
[55] See e.g. GALINSKY (1972, 81-100).
[56] However, the idea of choices that reflect one's nature is an old one, and this scene may in fact parody the story attributed to Prodicus in Xen. *Mem.* II 1, 21-34, where Heracles must choose between Vice and Virtue (I owe this valuable observation to Xavier Riu). RIU (2025, 247 n. 19) suggests that, in Alexis, this reference may be combined with Aristotelian ideas; cf. e.g. Arist. *Poet*. 1449a 2-5 (οἱ ἐφ' ἑκατέραν τὴν ποίησιν ὁρμῶντες), which may allude at «the connection between the nature of the poet and the nature of the poetry. The verb ὁρμάω and the noun ὁρμή designate an impulse, an inclination».
[57] See WRIGHT (2013, 610 fn. 32), who suggests that «[t]he word τέχνη in the fragment […] may have been the actual title of Linus' book».
[58] Cookbooks are further mentioned in Anaxipp. fr. 1, where a boastful cook claims that his teacher helped to «rub the old-fashioned spices out of the books» (ll. 4f. τὰ μὲν παλαιὰ καὶ θρυλούμενα | ἀρτύματ' ἐξήλειψαν ἐκ τῶν βυβλίων), a hyperbolic way of expressing culinary innovation or reform. Similarly, in Bato fr. 4, another braggart cook boasts of staying up late to study the treatises of his predecessors. See further OLSON (2007, 266).

«you're a true philosopher!», in response to Heracles' choice, alludes, as Nesselrath (1990, 228) has noted, to the comic stereotype of philosophers as parasites and gluttons, a cliché already familiar from Aristophanes and further developed in later comedy.

The link between education and cooking in comedy is not an isolated occurrence in this fragment. On the contrary, it becomes a recurring motif on the comic stage, particularly in connection with the increasing prominence of the figure of the cook[59]. As extensively discussed in the scholarship, the comic cook is typically characterized by pompous speech and a strong assertion of the superiority of his craft over all others. This portrayal gives rise to what may be termed a "culinary pedagogy". The cook is presented as a *didaskalos* (Dionysius fr. 3, 3 and 19; Euphron fr. 9), who instructs his pupils (Posidippus fr. 28, 1), relying on written texts and treatises (Anaxippus fr. 1; Bato fr. 4, cited above; see *infra* Strato fr. 1), and offering a form of training that could be described as holistic (Sosipater fr. 1; Damoxenus fr. 2; Hegesippus fr. 1). His culinary discourse frequently employs mock-elevated language (Antiphanes frr. 55, 215; Eubulus fr. 75; Timocles fr. 13), which often proves incomprehensible to his employers. This language barrier becomes a source of comic misunderstanding, as illustrated in Strato fr. 1[60], where the cook adopts Homeric diction that the householder either fails to grasp or misinterprets entirely:

> cφίγγ' ἄρρεν', οὐ μάγειρον, εἰc τὴν οἰκίαν
> εἴληφ'. ἁπλῶc γὰρ οὐδὲ ἕν, μὰ τοὺc θεούc,
> ὧν ἂν λέγῃ cυνίημι· καινὰ ῥήματα
> πεποριcμένος πάρεcτιν. ὡc εἰcῆλθε γάρ,
> εὐθύc μ' ἐπηρώτηcε προcβλέψαc μέγα·
> "πόcουc κέκληκαc μέροπαc ἐπὶ δεῖπνον; λέγε."
> "ἐγὼ κέκληκα Μέροπαc ἐπὶ δεῖπνον; χολᾷc.
> τοὺc δὲ μέροπαc τούτουc με γινώcκειν δοκεῖc;"
> "οὐδ' ἄρα παρέcται δαιτυμὼν οὐθεὶc ὅλωc;"
> "ἥξει Φιλῖνοc, Μοcχίων, Νικήρατοc,
> ὁ δεῖν', ὁ δεῖνα." κατ' ὄνομ' ἐπεπορευόμην·
> οὐκ ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖc οὐδὲ εἷc μοι Δαιτυμών.
> ὁ δ' ἠγανάκτηc' ὥcπερ ἠδικημένοc
> ὅτι οὐ κέκληκα Δαιτυμόνα· καινὸν cφόδρα.
> "οὐδ' ἄρα θύειc ῥηξίχθον';" "οὐκ", ἔφην, "ἐγώ."
> "βοῦν εὐρυμέτωπον;" "οὐ θύω βοῦν, ἄθλιε."
> "μῆλα θυciάζειc ἆρα;" "μὰ Δί', ἐγὼ μὲν οὔ."
> "τὰ μῆλα πρόβατα." "μῆλα πρόβατ'; οὐκ οἶδ'", ἔφην,
> "μάγειρε, τούτων οὐθέν, οὐδὲ βούλομαι·

[59] On the comic cook see now DE MARTIN (2025, 357) and KONSTANTAKOS (*forthcoming*, 21-33 and fn. 56), both with previous bibliography.

[60] Lines 1-4 of the fragment are also attested for Philemon in Ath. XIV 659b. Scholars have variously suggested a plagiarism, a *diaskeué* or a revised version, or simply an error on Athenaeus' part. For a full overview of the text transmission, see now DE MARTIN (2025, 352f.)

ἀγροικότερός εἰμ’, ὥσθ’ ἁπλῶς μοι διαλέγου.” (25)
– – – –
“τὰς οὐλοχύτας φέρε δεῦρο.” “τοῦτο δ’ ἐστὶ τί;” (34)
“κριθαί.” “τί οὖν, ἀπόπληκτε, περιπλοκὰς λέγεις;” (35)
“πηγὸς πάρεστι;” “πηγός; οὐχὶ λαικάσει,
ἐρεῖς σαφέστερόν θ’ ὃ βούλει μοι λέγειν;”
“ἀτάσθαλός γ’ εἶ, πρέσβυ,” φησίν. “ἄλα φέρε·
τοῦτ’ ἐσθ’ ὁ πηγός, τοῦτο δεῖξον.” χέρνιβον
παρῆν· ἔθυεν, ἔλεγεν ἕτερα μυρία (40)
τοιαῦθ’ ἅ, μὰ τὴν Γῆν, οὐδὲ εἷς συνῆκεν ἄν,
μίστυλλα, μοίρας, δίπτυχ’, ὀβελούς· ὥστ’ ἔδει
τὰ τοῦ Φιλιτᾶ λαμβάνοντα βυβλία
σκοπεῖν ἕκαστον τί δύναται τῶν ῥημάτων.
ἀλλ’ ἱκέτευον αὐτὸν ἤδη μεταβαλὼν (45)
ἀνθρωπίνως λαλεῖν τι. τὸν δ’ οὐκ ἄν ποτε
ἔπεισεν ἡ Πειθὼ παραστᾶς’ αὐτόθι.
καί μοι δοκεῖ ῥαψωιδοτοιούτου τινὸς
δοῦλος γεγονὼς ἐκ παιδὸς ἁλιτήριος
εἶτ’ ἀναπεπλῆσθαι τῶν Ὁμήρου ῥημάτων. (50)

I’ve taken a male Sphinx into my house, not a cook! For, by the gods, I don’t understand a single word he says. He’s here with a full supply of strange vocabulary. The minute he entered the house, he immediately looked me in the eye and asked in a loud voice: “How many meropes (‘people’) have you invited to dinner? Tell me!” “I’ve invited the Meropes to dinner? You’re crazy; do you think I know these Meropes?” “Isn’t a single daitumôn (‘guest’) going to be present?” “Philinus is going to come, and Moschion, and Niceratus, and so-and-so, and so-and-so.” I went through them, name by name; I didn’t have a single Daitumôn among them. He got irritated, as if he was being treated badly because I hadn’t invited Daitumôn. Very strange. “Aren’t you sacrificing an earthbreaker?” “No, I’m not,” I said. “A bull with a wide forehead?” “I’m not sacrificing a bull, you miserable creature.” “Are you making a sacrifice of mêla (‘sheep’, but also ‘apples’)?” “No, by Zeus, I’m not.” “Mêla are sheep.” “Apples are sheep? I don’t know anything about any of this, cook,” I said, “and I don’t want to. I’m quite unsophisticated; so talk to me very simply.” “Bring the oulochutes here!” “What’s that?” “Barley.” “Why then, you idiot, do you talk in riddles?” “Is any pêgos available?” “Pêgos? Suck me! Will you say what you want to say to me more clearly?” “You’re an ignoramus, old man,” he says. “Bring me salt; that’s what pêgos is. Let me see it.” A basin was there. He made the sacrifice and said countless words of the sort no one, by Earth, could have understood: mistulla, moires, diptucha, obeloi. The result was that you would have had to get Philetas’ books to understand everything he said. But now I took a different tack and began to beg him to talk a bit like a human being. Persuasion herself would never have convinced him if she were standing right there next to him. I suspect the bastard’s been the slave of some sort of rhapsode ever since he was a boy, and has got stuffed full of Homeric vocabulary[61].

[61] Transl. OLSON (2007, 436f.)

The fragment[62] presents a characteristic scene of later Comedy, centered on a *megeiros* hired by an elderly man to prepare a banquet. The cook, speaking in a flamboyant and highly mannered register, employs obscure vocabulary (primarily Homeric glosses) that the interlocutor fails to understand[63]. This exchange results in a sequence of miscommunications that test the patience of both characters. As in the fragment from Aristophanes' *Banqueters*, the use of Homeric *glossai* recalls elements of formal education[64]: many of the cook's terms, while arcane, would have been recognizable to an audience with a basic school education[65]. However, the use of Homeric glosses in the *Banqueters* passage and in Strato's fragment is profoundly different. In the former, it highlights the father's tendency to treat his son as if he were still a child, asking him to perform a task normally undertaken soon after literacy was first acquired, even though he is already old enough to attend rhetorical circles (cf. *supra*). In the latter, by contrast, the humor of the scene arises not so much from the cook's grandiloquent speech as from the master's exaggerated ignorance, since he fails to understand even the basic terms encountered at the very earliest stages of education.

Further levels of humor arise from the inversion of the roles: the hired cook, far from being subservient, assumes the posture of a *grammatistes*, effectively subjecting his employer to an impromptu examination in Homeric vocabulary[66]. The cook's imperatives (e.g., λέγε, l. 6; φέρε, ll. 34, 38) and insults (e.g., ἀτάcθαλοc, l. 38) reinforce the reversal of traditional social hierarchies, casting the master in the role of a baffled pupil.

Scholars have drawn attention to several key points: (1) a number of the glosses

[62] For a discussion on the textual transmission and constitution, and a detailed commentary see now DE MARTIN (2025, 325-402), with previous bibliography at p. 333.

[63] This feature is typical of later-comedy cooks, who use technical jargon and boast about their techne (e.g. Dionys. Com. fr. 2; Alex. frr. 129, 20; 153, 13; Sotad. fr. 1, 34; Diph. fr. 17, 4; Philem. fr. 82, 25; Euphr. fr. 10, 16) and formal training (e.g. Alex. fr. 24). For the topicality of the scene see REVERMANN (2013, 102-104). Nonetheless, as WILLI (*forthcoming*, 233) observes, the passage employs comic techniques more characteristic of Old than of New Comedy, particularly in its extensive use of linguistic misunderstandings. Moreover, the cook is no more 'riddling' as he was in 4th-century comedy: «Homeric glosses take over from the enigmatic circumlocutions that had been the hallmark for the (new) dithyramb as parodied in Middle Comedy» (*ib*. pp. 234f.)

[64] The explanation of Homeric glosses – unfamiliar or obscure words – was one of the core components of Greek education from its very beginnings. See MONTANARI 2003 and the recent discussion in PRAUSCELLO (2024, 370-78 with previous bibliography) and WILLI (*forthcoming*, 231-36).

[65] For a perceptive observation on the audience's reception, see BING (2003, 346): «[t]he quality of audience appreciation assumed by the poet is very telling. How different from that on which Aristophanes could count in his plays, where the humor required a high level of literary awareness […]! In our scene, by contrast, […] a schoolboy grasp of epic is to generate the happy smile of superior knowledge». See also REVERMANN (2013, 102f.).

[66] Interestingly, we cannot even be certain that the *mageiros* ever appeared on stage; instead, the entire exchange is reported by the old man, effectively reducing the cook to a mediated voice within another's monologue. On the device of "speech within speech" in the fragment, see WILLI (*forthcoming*, 234).

provided by the cook correspond to known lexicographical interpretations preserved in the ancient scholia[67], and it is plausible that some glosses had already appeared in early glossographic sources[68]. (2) Many of the so-called "Homeric" words are used in conspicuously un-Homeric ways[69], thereby undermining the authority of the cook's learned persona and imbuing it with an air of absurdity. (3) The master's apparent familiarity with the literary breadth of Homer's corpus[70] and his reference to the books of Philitas (l. 43) might introduce a comic inconsistency: he describes himself as ἀγροικότερος (l. 25), yet he claims access to high literary culture and ultimately proves incapable of deciphering even elementary glosses.

While the passage does not explicitly stage an educational scene, the dense use of glosses and the compositional strategy underlying the episode likely evoked, for the audience, a moment of instruction. Interestingly, Strato's fragment is transmitted not only by Athenaeus (cf. *supra*), but it also survives in a 3rd-century BC papyrus (*PCair* 65445)[71]. The papyrus was likely produced by a trained yet non-professional scribe, most probably a schoolteacher[72], and appears to have served as an elementary instructional manual comprising three sections: letter exercises of increasing complexity designed to teach reading and writing; a heterogeneous literary anthology[73]; and a brief set of basic mathematical problems. The variety of its contents suggests it functioned as a pedagogical tool, offering foundational instruction in general education and serving as a teaching repertoire. The presence of Strato's text is particularly noteworthy because, as recently emphasized by De Martin (2025, 335), although comic texts are not

[67] See DE MARTIN (2025, 359f.). For a long time, scholars believed that Philitas was the source of some of the glosses in the fragment, an idea rejected by LATTE (1925, 162 n. 53). The reference to Philitas' books in l. 43 is better understood as a humorous aside (cf. l. 19), intended to evoke his reputation as the premier glossographer of the time. On the influence of early philological scholarship on Greek comedy, see now NOVOKHATKO (2023), who discusses this fragment at pp. 150f. Strato's parody may target not so much contemporary glossographic tendencies as the very practice of glossing itself.

[68] DE MARTIN (2025, 358) highlights the cluster of sacrificial terminology, otherwise dispersed throughout the Homeric corpus, which may indicate the existence of a thematic glossary devoted to sacrificial and banquet-related vocabulary. This could suggest reliance on an early glossographic compilation organized by topic, a sort of proto-lexicon.

[69] See OLSON (2007, 164) and commentary on lines 6, 9, 23, 25, 29; cf. 15, 17.

[70] He uses χέρνιβον at l. 39, a word otherwise attested before the 4th century only in Homer (*Il*. XXIV 304), on which see DE MARTIN (2025, 387f.). OLSON (2007, 167) remarks that it is curious for the master to employ a Homeric term after all the complaints. However, the word also occurs in a cook's mouth in adesp. com. fr. 1072.

[71] First edited by GUÉRAUD – JOUGUET (1938).

[72] GUÉRAUD – JOUGUET (1938, xiv), CRIBIORE (1996, 269).

[73] Including Eur. *Ph*. 529-34; fr. 420, 1f., 4f. Ka.; Hom. *Od.* V 116-24; *SH* 978 (= Posidipp. fr. *113 Austin – Bastianini) and 979; adesp. com. fr. 1072 (a cook's lament while waiting for instructions) and fr. 1073 (again featuring a cook boasting of thefts committed during a banquet); finally, Strato fr. 1. See GUÉRAUD – JOUGUET (1938, xx), CRIBIORE (1996, 269), PORDOMINGO (2013, 191 and 201-204) and, recently, MECCARIELLO (2024) (who maintains that the anthology conveys a narrative of Ptolemaic power for classroom use).

infrequently found in school repertoires (cf. *infra*), this piece is one of the few long monologues preserved in papyrus educational aids. The fragment would have provided an excellent tool for the alternative (and entertaining) memorization of Homeric glosses.

The inclusion of Strato's text in the school curriculum aptly illustrates the dual relationship between education and didacticism as applied to comedy. As we have seen, comic playwrights could, on the one hand, represent scenes implicitly or explicitly related to education within their plays; on the other hand, excerpts of comedy were themselves incorporated into school programme and thus became instruments of instruction. More broadly, theatre possessed an inherently didactic dimension from its very beginnings. This is evident, for instance, in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, where Aeschylus and Euripides agree that the purpose of drama is to educate and that the poet himself is a διδάσκαλος[74], or in the self-referential *parabasis*, in which the chorus underscores the political and pedagogical role of comedy[75]. Moreover, in the technical vocabulary of the theatre, the very verb διδάσκειν can signify 'to stage', while the διδάσκαλος can denote the 'chorus instructor'[76]. This didactic impulse persisted into later Comedy, where comic poets frequently articulated clear moral stances onstage.

Within the educational system, however, comedy's presence becomes pervasive and deeply ingrained. Comic *gnomai*, for instance, were integrated into the school curriculum from its earliest stages, granting both linguistic accessibility and moral utility, as Aeschines testifies[77]. This channel granted to authors as Menander a primary position, second in prominence only to Homer, as well as a channel of survival: such maxims appeared in anthologies as early as the Classical period and were first preserved on papyrus in the Hellenistic age[78]. Comic texts constituted standard material for reading and writing exercises, supplied topics for the *progymnasmata*, and – particularly in the case of theatrical monologues – exemplified the techniques of character portrayal (*persona loquens*) required for the composition of *ethopoeiae* and declamations (Sext.

[74] Cf. Ar. *Ra*. 1053-56 Aeschylus emphatically reiterates the idea, probably referring to high poetry: μὰ Δί', ἀλλ' ὄντ'· ἀλλ' ἀποκρύπτειν χρὴ τὸ πονηρὸν τόν γε ποιητήν, | καὶ μὴ παράγειν μηδὲ διδάσκειν. τοῖς μὲν γὰρ παιδαρίοισίν | ἐστι διδάσκαλος ὅστις φράζει, τοῖσιν δ' ἡβῶσι ποιηταί. | πάνυ δὴ δεῖ χρηστὰ λέγειν ἡμᾶς.

[75] Among other genres, especially tragedy. At lines 686f. the Chorus embodies the didactic function of comedy: τὸν ἱερὸν χορὸν δίκαιόν ἐστι χρηστὰ τῇ πόλει | ξυμπαραινεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν. See recently Ruffell in *EGC* s.v. "didacticism" with further bibliography. For a broader discussion of the literary-critical concept in classical antiquity, see FORD (2002, 197-208).

[76] See e.g. the passages collected by LÓPEZ FÉREZ (1997, 83 fn. 20 and 93).

[77] *Ctes*. 135: λέξω δὲ κἀγὼ τὰ ἔπη· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ οἶμαι ἡμᾶς παῖδας ὄντας τὰς τῶν ποιητῶν γνώμας ἐκμανθάνειν, ἵν' ἄνδρες ὄντες αὐταῖς χρώμεθα.

[78] In Menander's case, both authentic and attributed *gnomai* contributed to the corpus of the so-called *Menandri Sententiae*, transmitted in over forty medieval manuscripts. On the education popularity of Menander see e.g. MARROU (1956, 156 for primary education; 163 for secondary education; 188 for higher education); MORGAN (1998, 97-100; 121-23) CRIBIORE (2001, 199-201 and 2009); NERVEGNA (2013, 213-18).

Emp. *Adv. Mathem.* 1, 58). Even in the rhetorical training, the culmination of ancient pedagogy, comedy, and Menander in particular, found renewed utility. Quintilian notes that Menander is «more helpful to declaimers because they must portray a range of characters according to the nature of their *controversiae*: fathers and sons, bachelors and husbands, the rich and the poor, the angry and the suppliant, the kind and the harsh»[79]. Greek and Roman comedy provided declaimers with a vivid repertoire of conventional personae and situations considered more relatable and realistic for practice in character portrayal.

Envoi

This study has examined the multiple ways in which educational themes and instructional contexts are represented in later Greek comedy, adopting a broad definition of education that encompasses both formal schooling and education as a model of life. Our analysis has included not only explicit depictions of school practices – such as philosophical instruction (Epicr. fr. 10) or grammatical parody (Alex. fr. 140) – but also scenes involving pedagogical figures and the social impact of educational processes (e.g. Alex. fr. 25; Plaut. *Bacch.* 419ff.), and situations likely to have elicited an implicit memory of instruction in the audience (e.g. Strato fr. 1). Without claiming exhaustiveness, we have traced the development of this theme in post-Aristophanic comedy, highlighting both lines of continuity and significant innovations.

Regarding continuity, later Comedy demonstrates a clear indebtedness to Old Comedy, particularly in its treatment of philosophical parody. The representation of philosophers as a disruptive force in youth education shows affinities with earlier models, most notably Aristophanes' *Clouds*. While we do not posit Aristophanes' play as a direct model for subsequent authors – given the fragmentary nature of the evidence – it remains a crucial point of reference as the only fully extant philosophical comedy. At the same time, our analysis has underscored how identical motifs were adapted and recontextualized to suit new narrative and performative contexts: for instance, the deployment of Homeric *glossai* differs strikingly between Aristophanes' *Banqueters* and Strato's *Phoinikides*, reflecting the distinctive aims and settings of each production.

In addition to thematic continuities, we have identified the consolidation of two major stock characters associated with education from the fourth century onward: the pedagogue and the cook. Although both figures have antecedents in earlier drama, they

[79] *Inst.* X 1, 71 = Men. T 101 *ego tamen plus adhuc quiddam conlaturum eum declamatoribus puto, quoniam his necesse est secundum condicionem controversiarum plures subire personas, patrum filiorum, <caelibum> maritorum, militum rusticorum, divitum pauperum, irascentium deprecantium, mitium asperorum. in quibus omnibus mire custoditur ab hoc poeta decor.*

acquire renewed prominence and complexity in this period. The pedagogue, originally a tragic figure, is recast as a comic type, while the cook – rarely attested in fifth-century comedy – emerges as a versatile character with explicit links to educational discourse. These roles frequently intersect with other educational motifs: Bato fr. 5 presents a convergence of philosophical parody and pedagogical presence, while Alexis fr. 140 combines the schoolmaster figure with the didactic potential of culinary texts, and Strato fr. 1 depicts a cook using Homeric *glossai*, effectively conducting a vocabulary lesson. These intersections demonstrate how later Comedy reconfigures traditional education authority, dispersing it among new social types.

Finally, this study has tackled the reciprocal relationship between comedy and education. Comedy does not merely depict scenes of instruction; it actively becomes a medium of instruction. Comic excerpts were integrated into the school curriculum and employed as teaching tools across various levels of education. This dynamic is exemplified in the fragment of Strato, where pedagogical terminology (*glossai*) appears in a comic exchange by a cook, only to reappear later in genuine scholastic contexts as instructional material. This bidirectional influence underscores the cultural permeability between stage and school, suggesting that comedy both reflected and helped to shape educational practices in the Greek world.

In sum, the comic stage functioned as a vital arena for negotiating educational values, reimagining pedagogical roles, and contributing to the formation of cultural knowledge. By tracing these developments, this paper has shed new light on how later Greek Comedy not only mirrored, but actively participated in, the discourse of education.

bibliography

ARNOTT 1996
W.G. Arnott, *Alexis: The fragments. A commentary*, Cambridge.

BALTES 1993
M. Baltes, *Plato's school, the Academy*, «Hermathena» CLV 5-26.

BARSBY 1991
J. Barsby (ed.), *Plautus Bacchides*, Eastbourne.

BING 2003
P. Bing, *The Unruly Tongue: Philitas of Cos as Scholar and Poet*, «CPh» XCVIII 330-48.

BLANCHARD 2007
A. Blanchard, *Éducation et politique dans le théâtre de Ménandre*, in J.A. Fernández Delgado – F. Pordomingo – A. Stramaglia (eds.), *Escuela y literatura en Grecia antigua*, Cassino, 19-37.

CAREY 2000
C. Carey, *Old Comedy and the sophists*, in D. Harvey – J. Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, London, 419-36.

CASSIO 1977
A.C. Cassio (a cura di), *Aristofane Banchettanti. I frammenti*, Pisa.

CRIBIORE 1996
R. Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Atlanta.

CRIBIORE 2001
R. Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton.

CRIBIORE 2009
R. Cribiore, *Education in the Papyri*, in R.S. Bagnall (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, Oxford, 320-37.

DE MARTIN 2022
S. De Martin, *Criticising Change, from Theognis to Plato*, «Lexis» XL/2 387-414.

DE MARTIN 2025
S. De Martin, *Proclide – Timoteo. Introduzione, traduzione e commento* (FrC 16.8), Göttingen.

DE MELO 2011
W. De Melo (ed.), *Plautus* I, Cambridge (MA)-London.

DOVER 1968
K.J. Dover (ed.), *Aristophanes. Clouds*, Oxford.

EGC
A.H. Sommerstein (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Greek Comedy*, I-III, Hoboken 2019.

FARMER 2017
M.C. Farmer, *Playing the philosopher: Plato in Fourth-Century Comedy*, «AJPh» CXXXVIII/1 1-41.

FAVI 2020
F. Favi, *Epicarmo e pseudo-Epicarmo (frr. 240-297). Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Göttingen.

FIORENTINI 2009
L. Fiorentini, *Orfeo in un frammento del commediografo Alessi (Alex. fr. 105,5 K.-A.)*, in A.M. Andrisano – P. Fabbri (a cura di), *La favola di Orfeo: letteratura, immagine, performance*, Ferrara, 23-29.

FIORENTINI 2024
L. Fiorentini (a cura di), *Aristofane, Le Nuvole*, Santarcangelo di Romagna.

FORD 2002
A. Ford, *The origins of criticism: literary culture and poetic theory in classical Greece*, Princeton.

FRAENKEL 1960[2]
E. Fraenkel, *Elementi plautini in Plauto*, Firenze (1922[1]).

FUNAIOLI 2011
M.P. Funaioli, *Il pedagogo sulla scena greca*, «DeM» II 76-87.

GALINSKY 1972
G.K. Galinsky, *The Herakles Theme. The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*, Oxford.

GALLO 1981
I. Gallo, *Teatro ellenistico minore*, Urbino.

GARRIGA 1998
C. Garriga, *La sagesse de la comédie*, in N. Loraux – C. Miralles (eds.), *Figures de l'intellectuel en Grèce ancienne*, Paris, 107-20.

GOLDEN 1988
M. Golden, *The effects of slavery on citizen household and children: Aeschylus, Aristophanes and Athens*, «Historical Reflections» XV 455-75.

GOLDEN 1990
M. Golden, *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens*, Baltimore.

GUÉRAUD – JOUGUET 1938
O. Guéraud – P. Jouguet (eds.), *Un livre d'écolier du 3. siècle avant J.-C.*, Le Caire.

HANSES 2023
M. Hanses, "Ulixem Anteit Malis" *Enslavement and Allusivity in Plautus's Bacchides*, in P. Mitsis – V. Pichugina – H.L. Reid (eds.), *Paideia on Stage*, Siracusa, 285-307.

HOLZBERG 2024
N. Holzberg, *Menander. Einleitung* (FrC 24.1), Göttingen.

IMPERIO 1998
O. Imperio, *La figura dell'intellettuale nella commedia greca*, in A.M. Belardinelli *et al*. (a cura di), *Tessere. Frammenti della commedia greca: studi e commenti*, Bari, 43-130.

IMPERIO 2013
O. Imperio, *Il conflitto generazionale nei* Banchettanti *di Aristofane*, in D. Susanetti – N. Distilo (a cura di), *Letteratura e conflitti generazionali*, Roma, 75-95.

KONSTANTAKOS 2014
I.M. Konstantakos, *Comedy in the Fourth-Century I. Mythological Burlesques*, in M. Fontaine – A. Scafuro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, Oxford, 160-80

KONSTANTAKOS *forthcoming*
I.M. Konstantakos, *Characters and Comic Poetics in Diphilus and Philemon*, in V. Mastellari (ed.), *Greek New Comedy beyond Menander*, Berlin-Boston, 9-56.

KRIETER-SPIRO 1997
M. Krieter-Spiro, *Sklaven, Köche und Hetären. Das Dienstpersonal bei Menander. Stellung, Rolle, Komik und Sprache*, Stuttgart-Leipzig.

LATTE 1925
K. Latte, *Glossographika*, «Philologus» LXX 136-75.

LÓPEZ FÉREZ 1997
J.A. López Férez, *La educación en Aristófanes*, in Id. (ed.), *Sociedad, política y literatura: comedia griega antigua: actas del I congreso internacional, Salamanca, noviembre 1996*, Salamanca, 81-101.

MARROU 1956
H.-I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, London.

MECCARIELLO 2024
C. Meccariello, *Teaching Propaganda: Water, Food, and Power in the* Livre d'Écolier, in L. Del Corso – A. Ricciardetto (eds.), *Greek Culture in Hellenistic Egypt. Persistence and Evolutions*, Berlin-Boston, 295-310.

MILLIS 2015
B.W. Millis, *Anaxandrides. Introduction, Translation, Commentary* (FrC 17), Heidelberg.

MITSIS – PICHUGINA – REID 2023
P. Mitsis – V. Pichugina – H.L. Reid (eds.), *Paideia on Stage*, Siracusa.

MONTANARI 2003
F. Montanari, *I percorsi della glossa. Traduzioni e tradizioni omeriche dall'antichità alla cultura bizantina*, in P. Volpe Cacciatore (a cura di), *Erudizione scolastico-grammaticale a Bisanzio*, Napoli, 81-88 (repr. in A. Rengakos (ed.), *In the Company of Many Good Poets. Collected Papers of F. Montanari*, I: *Ancient Scholarship*, Berlin-Boston 2023, 536-42).

MORGAN 1998
T. Morgan, *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*, Cambridge.

NERVEGNA 2013
S. Nervegna, *Menander in Antiquity. The Contexts of Reception*, Cambridge.

NESSELRATH 1990
H.-G. Nesselrath, *Die attische Mittlere Komödie*, Berlin-New York.

NESSELRATH 2010
H.-G. Nesselrath, *Comic Fragments: Transmission and Textual Criticism*, in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*, Leiden-Boston, 423-53.

NESSELRATH 2016
H.-G. Nesselrath, *A minor but not uninteresting poet of Athenian Middle Comedy: Epicrates of Ambracia*, «Logeion» VI 231-44.

NOVOKHATKO 2023
A.A. Novokhatko, *Greek Comedy and Embodied Scholarly Discourse*, Berlin-Boston.

OKÁL 1964
M. Okál, *Aristophane et l'éducation*, in H.J. Diesner *et al.* (eds.), *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der alten Welt. Zweite Internationale Tagung der Fachgruppe Alte Geschichte der Deutschen Historiker-Gesellschaft vom 4. bis 8. September 1962 in*

Stralsund. 1, *Alter Orient und Griechenland*, Berlin, 203-37.

OLSON 2006
S.D. Olson (ed.), *Athenaeus, The learned banqueters*, books I-III.106e, Cambridge (MA)-London.

OLSON 2007
S.D. Olson (ed.), *Broken Laughter. Select fragments of Greek Comedy*, Oxford.

PAPACHRYSOSTOMOU 2016
A. Papachrysostomou, *Amphis. Introduction, Translation, Commentary* (FrC 20), Heidelberg.

PAPACHRYSOSTOMOU 2021
A. Papachrysostomou, *Ephippos. Introduction, Translation, Commentary* (FrC 16.3), Göttingen.

PELLEGRINO 2015
M. Pellegrino (a cura di), *Aristofane. Frammenti*, Lecce-Brescia.

PELLEGRINO 2024
M. Pellegrino (a cura di), *Aristofane. Commedie perdute. Antologia di frammenti*, Roma.

PORDOMINGO 2013
F. Pordomingo, *Antologías de época helenística en papiro*, Firenze.

PRAUSCELLO 2024
L. Prauscello, *Before Atticism: Early Hellenistic scholarship on Attic*, in O. Tribulato – F. Favi – L. Prauscello (eds.), *Ancient Greek Purism 1: The Roots of Atticism*, Berlin-Boston, 356-442.

QUESTA 1975[2]
C. Questa (ed.), *T. Maccius Plautus, Bacchides*, Firenze (1965[1]).

QUESTA 2008
C. Questa (ed.), *T. Maccius Plautus, Bacchides*, Sarsina-Urbino.

REVERMANN 2013
M. Revermann, *Paraepiccomedy: Point(s) and Practices*, in E. Bakola – L. Prauscello – M. Telò (eds.), *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres*, Cambridge, 101-28.

RICHLIN 2017
A. Richlin, *Slave Theater in the Roman Republic. Plautus and Popular Comedy*, Cambridge.

RIU 2025
X. Riu, *On History and the History of Tragedy According to Aristotle*, in M. Ornaghi (ed.), *Chronology and History of the Attic Theatre: Origins, Fifth Century, Fourth-Century (and Later) Reception*, Berlin-Boston, 237-56.

RIZZO 1990
S. Rizzo, *Da Crisalo a Siro: per una ricostruzione del* Dis Exapaton *di Menandro (con alcune riflessioni sui pedagoghi in commedia)*, in Dicti studiosus. *Scritti di filologia offerti a Scevola Mariotti dai suoi allievi*, Urbino, 11-48.

SACCONI 2019
K.A. Sacconi, Convivas *de Aristófanes: o coro devoto de Héracles e a educação do sensato e do pervertito*, «Classica» XXXII/1 23-42.

SCHÖNBECK 1981
H.-P. Schönbeck, *Beiträge zur Interpretation der plautinischen "Bacchides"*, Düsseldorf.

SEGOLONI 1994
L.M. Segoloni, *Socrate a banchetto. Il* Simposio *di Platone e i* Banchettanti *di Aristofane*, Roma.

SLATER 1997
N.W. Slater, *Bringing up father:* paideia *and* ephebeia *in the* Wasps, in A.H. Sommerstein – C. Atherton (eds.), *Education in Greek Fiction*, Bari, 27-52.

STAMA 2016
F. Stama, *Alessi. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Castrovillari.

TAMMARO 2014
V. Tammaro, *Un riesame di Alex. fr. 25 K.-A.*, in M. Tulli (ed.), ΦΙΛΙΑ. *Dieci contributi per G. Burzacchini*, Bologna, 55-66.

WHITEHORNE 2022
J. Whitehorne, *Aristophanes' Representations of 'Intellectuals'*, «Hermes» CXXX/1 28-35.

WILAMOWITZ 1900
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker*, Berlin.

WILLI *forthcoming*
A. Willi, *Language and Linguistic Themes in the Fragments of Later Greek Comedy*, in V. Mastellari (ed.), *Greek New Comedy beyond Menander*, Berlin-Boston, 213-51.

WRIGHT 2013
M. Wright, *Poets and poetry in later Greek comedy*, «CQ» LXIII/2 603-22.

ZIMMERMANN 1993
B. Zimmermann, *Aristophanes und die Intellektuellen*, in J.M. Bremer – E.W. Handley (eds.), *Aristophane* ("Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt sur l'antiquité Classique" XXXVII), Vandœuvres-Genève, 255-80.