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HIPPONAX, BOUPALOS, AND THE CONVENTIONS
OF THE PSOGOS *

RALPH M. ROSEN
University of Pennsylvania

Students of the Greek iambics continue to dispute whether the poets’ targets of abuse were fictional or real characters. Most recently the Cologne Archilochos has challenged scholars to square the received biographical tradition about the poet with its new “evidence.” Is the “I” of the poem Archilochos himself? Are the characters generic stock-figures, each bearing an appropriately significant name: Lycambes the “Wolf-walker,” Neobule the woman “of New Plan,” for example? 1 Did the iambic poet wish to vent his private enmity against real figures, whether out of a desire for personal vengeance or for the purpose of exposing reprobates to the public? 2 Or did his inspiration spring less from real life and more from a desire to demonstrate his skill in a literary tradition in which inventive and obscenity were de rigueur? For that matter, could the poet pursue a middle course, enlisting real figures, but in entirely fictional situations?

We may never be able to answer these questions definitively in the absence of any further evidence, but scholars have in recent decades come at least near consensus on one crucial point: iambographic poetry comprises a specific genre, and its practitioners shared certain generic conventions 3 The term ἱδέα, which Aristotle applied to certain Old Comic poets (Poet. 1448b31), has

*  I am most grateful to my colleagues Joseph Farrell, Peter Bing, and R. E. A. Palmer for their comments on an early draft of this article, and to the anonymous referees for their thoughtful criticisms.


2 For example, Aristophanes’ claims for his own inventive enterprise. Cf. Pax 751–60, Vesp. 1029–37, Nub. 549.

equal utility when applied to the poetry of Archilochos and Hipponax. It denotes
the many features that recur in their poetry and help to define it, especially the
antagonism between poet and ἐχθρός that occasioned the ψογός. While this
may at first sight seem self-evident, it is too often overlooked when
commentators consider the identity of characters that appear in the iambos. For
it means that, whether the poet sings of real, fictional or semi-fictional people,
he must conform to the demands of a literary tradition. Even if we believe that
the principal targets of abuse somehow represent real people, we need not
assume that the stories told about them represent real events, since narrative
details may be informed equally by generic considerations. Still, we feel a
persistent curiosity about the people attacked in an iambic ψογός, especially
because this sort of poetry relies for its effects on the pretense of depicting real
events.

Voluminous scholarship on Archilochos has yielded little agreement on the
precise nature of the poet’s relationship to his bêtes-noires. West’s suggestion
that Lycambe and Neobule are significantly named stock-figures seems to have
ranged scholars irreconcilably on opposite sides. There is little doubt, however,
that many other characters in the Archilochean corpus, not graced with the elab-
orate testimonia that accompany Lycambe and family, are in fact fictionalized
(even if they may represent actual people) and serve a contextual purpose 
indicated by their names. One need only cite characters in such fragments as 168W
(Ἐρασμονίδης Χαρίλαος), or 331W (Πασιφέλη, which I accept as genuine). Archilochos,
short, like most poets of antiquity, was intrigued by the

4 We must remember that in antiquity ἱμμβικός predominantly referred to po-
etry of blame and invective. Solon’s iambic poetry, for example, is an iambos
only by virtue of its meter. Aristotle’s term ἱμμβικὴ ἴδεα would hardly be
appropriate to this type of poetry (cf. West Studies 22 and 37–38). See C.
Miralles and J. Pörtulas, Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry (Rome 1983) for a
generic study of the iambos using comparative methods; and B. Gentili, Poesia e
pubblico nella Grecia antica (Rome and Bari 1984) 47, 144.

5 Virtually no one today would claim that Archilochos’ poems are a record of
his personal experiences (as J. Vendryes, Revue Celtique 34 [1913] 94). Even
Rankin (above, note 1) 27 concedes that Archilochos’ poetry is not a “minutely
accurate biography.”

6 A compromise comforting to some is that the names are fictional, but they
stand for historical personalities. See L. Koenen, “Ein wiedergefundenes

7 Rankin ignores names such as these when he voices his skepticism about
any significance in Lycambe’s or Neobule’s name. His objection that
“significance” can be found coincidentally in most Greek names (above note 1,
16–17) is true enough, but ignores the fact that a poet must choose for himself
the names he wants to use, and that this act in itself demands that the audience
seek significance in them. His statement (17) that “fictitious ad hoc names are
certainly made up frequently in Greek literature...but none of them are as improb-
able as Bunyan’s ‘Mr. Worldly Wise Man’ or Dickens’ ‘Mr. Verisoff’ are in an
English speaking environment” is simply not true, as any number of examples
from Aristophanes can attest, (e.g. Ἁδελφεῖων in Vesp., Κόπρειος at Eq. 899).
semantic possibilities of proper names, and exploited them to humorous effect. In the case of Lycambes and Neobule, unfortunately, there is no independent and reliable evidence to help us confirm or deny their historicity. Their names may be etymologized, it is true—and the efforts are indeed tantalizing. But a “Lycambes” or “Neobule” is not outrageous or contextually conspicuous enough to be considered incontrovertibly fictional. In the case of these Archilochean figures, it seems, we must settle for uncertainty.

Yet all the attention paid to Archilochus’ relations with Lycambes has overshadowed the iambographic quarrel between Hipponax and the Chian sculptor Boupalos, where we at least have some evidence, independent of the poetry, about the parties involved. Here we have a unique opportunity to see how an iambographic poet incorporates an apparently known figure into his poetry. This paper will consider how the iambic poet may balance the use of a historically real target with iambographic poetic convention.

---


10 It is indeed difficult to deny that Hipponax’ Boupalos existed. Cf. Pliny *NH* 36.11:

> fuerat in Chio insula Melas sculptor, dein filius eius Micciades ac deinde nepos Archermus, cius filii Bupalus et Athenis vel clarissimi in ea scientia fuere Hipponactis poetae aetate, quem certum est LX Olympiade fuisse.

An inscription on a statue base from Delos dated to c. 550 B.C. seems to offer the name of Boupalos’ father Archermos, (*Inscr. Délos* 9; cf. Masson, 13; Degani ad testimoniun 2, p. 2.) as well as Micciades and Melas, and it is likely that Pliny inherited his information about a family of 6th C. Chian sculptors from a (probably Hellenistic) author who had read (or misread) this inscription. On the problems with the genealogy of the inscription, see now K. Sheedy, “The Delian Nike and the Search for Chian Sculpture,” *AJA* 89 (1985) 619–20. Hipponax fr. 70.1, which mentions an Athenis (“Ὦθηνι κρυ[ ]”, seems to confirm that the Boupalos and Athenis of the testimonia do refer to the Boupalos and Athenis of Hipponax. The testimony of Pausanias about one Boupalos’ works in Smyrna (4.30.6) and Pergamon (9.35.6) gives us little reason to doubt either that this Boupalos was meant to refer to the 6th C. Chian Boupalos or that the 6th C. Boupalos existed. We must not ignore the fact, however, that Pliny is our earliest direct source for a specific connection between Archermos and Boupalos; (Σ Aristoph. *Aves* 574 speaks of an “Ἀρχεμνος (= Archermos) as the father of Boupalos and his brother Athenis, and mentions the 2nd C. B.C. Karystion of Pergamon as a source, though this has been suspected; cf. F. Muenzer, “Zur Kunstgeschichte des Plinius,” *Hermes* 30 (1895) 524–25. It remains possible that these two sculptors were father and son merely because it was chronologically appropriate.
At the center of this discussion lies the contention that the name of Boupa-
os has special significance in Hipponax’ iambos, even though it belonged to a
real person. The sculptor Boupalos is the only figure bearing that name in all
extant sources, and scholars have noted its peculiarity. Yet no one, to my
knowledge, has proposed that it might have some special significance in Hip-
onax’ poetry, presumably because it is accepted as the real name of a historical
person. I would suggest that the key to Boupalos’ status in the Hipponactean
iambos lies in his name, which can be heard as a play on the elements Bou-
(“bull-like”) and –παλας (= φαλλός). So divided, the name could be etymolo-
gized (though no doubt falsely, see below note 16) as either “Bull-Dick” or per-
haps, simply, “Big-Dick.” Several fragments which, as we shall see, place
Boupalos in undeniably sexual situations, strongly suggest that Hipponax was
aware both of this semantic possibility and its suitability for the iambographic
genre. If this is true, it affirms that poetic as well as personal considerations
may lie behind a poet’s attacks on even historically identifiable χθοι.

Burnett has suggested something similar for Lycambes, namely that, al-
though he may be a historical figure, Archilochos attacked him in particular be-
cause his name (when etymologized as “Wolf-walker”) was appropriate to the
iambos. This is apparently an attempt to have a historical character be si-
multaneously a stock generic one. But because we have no certain evidence
about Lycambes’ actual existence, this can only remain speculation. If we had
no credible indication that Hipponax’ Boupalos ever really existed, we would be
in the same situation as we are with Archilochos’ Lycambes. Of course, the
testimonia about a quarrel between Hipponax and Boupalus (and Athenis) are
utterly unreliable. This story, related most fully by Pliny (NH 36.11 [see
above, note 10]) held that the brother-sculptors Boupalos and Athenis made a
sculpture of Hipponax ridiculing his ugliness. The poet then retaliated by
composing such violent psogoi against them that they hanged themselves. A
similar story, of course, was told about Archilochos and Lycambes: Lycambes
broke off the engagement between his daughter Neobule and Archilochos, and
this prompted the poet to compose invectives that likewise drove his targets to

11 Cf. Masson 13, note 5.
12 See L. J. Richardson, “The Origin of the Prefix βου- in Comedy,”
Hermathena 95 (1961) 53–66. Richardson argues that βου- did not become an
interchangeable prefix implying huge size until Old Comedy (and he even
suggests [60] that Aristophanes may have invented it, e.g. Vesp. 1206:
βουπαιας). But this conclusion is based on an argument ex silentio. In view of the
close relationship between the iambos and comedy, it would not be surprising to
find intensive βου- also in the iambographers, and perhaps Hipponax’ Βούπαιας
gives evidence of precisely this usage. In any case the distinction between “Bull-
Dick” and “Big-Dick” is negligible in terms of its comic effect.
13 Cf. Burnett (above, note 3) 22: “a man with such a name would be a ready
target for an abusive poet who liked to exploit animal fables as a mode of at-
tack...”
14 Rankin’s brief remarks on the use of historical figures as stock characters
(above, note 1, 12–13) are sensible, although he is not sympathetic to the no-
tion that Lycambes et al. are fictional names representing real people.
suicide by hanging.\footnote{Scholars have long doubted the veracity of the Archilochean story—either that it actually occurred, or that it was related in the poetry—mainly because it recurs elsewhere, (cf. Carey [above, note 9] 60 with notes 1 and 2; M. Lefkowitz, “Fictions of Literary Biography: the New Poem and the Archilochus Legend,” \textit{Arethusa} 9.2 [1976] 184–85), and because the details in the various accounts are so inconsistent. For the various explanations of how the story of the suicides became attached to Archilochus, cf. Degani, \textit{Studi} 88, note 27. It is tempting to see this, with Degani, as a story that could be applied in antiquity to any poet involved in a quarrel. Given the existence of a Chian sculptor named Boupalos, and given a figure named Boupalos who serves as Hipponax’ \textit{ἐχθρός}, it is easy to see how a completely fictitious story could have connected the two figures. Possibly the story of the satirical sculpture arose from fr. 144 (\textit{Ant. Att. An. Gr.} 82.13 Bekk.) which refers to Boupalos as a “stony statue” (\textit{= “senseless, dumb”}; for other refs. to this usage of \textit{λίθινον} cf. Degani \textit{ad loc.}) \textit{ιν} \textit{ἀνδρίσσεται ον \textit{λίθινον ἔφη Ἱππώνας Βούπαλον (τὸν) ἀγαλματοπoιών. That is, since Boupalos was known as a sculptor, a line that refers to his profession as the basis for an insult could be felt to imply that it was this profession that lay at the root of the quarrel. As for the allegation that Hipponax was ugly, it is a biographical convention that a poet’s psogos may be seen as a function of his character and even his physiognomy; cf. Degani, \textit{Studi} 21–24.}

\footnote{Though the actual etymology of Boupalos is uncertain. Bechtel states simply that the name Boupalos = “shaker of the ox-shield.” F. Bechtel, \textit{Die historische Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit} (Halle 1917) 91. Pape-Benseler define the name as “eigent. Barrentrap d. i. stiermässig sich tummelnd, dann aber nach Hesych. ‘überhaupt. Grosse...’” presumably taking the \textit{πάλος} element from the verb \textit{παλέω} = “wrestle,” \textit{Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigenamen} (Braunschweig 1911) s. v. \textit{Βούπαλος}, 224. Both explanations are prima facie linguistically possible, but become less attractive in the face of other considerations. To begin with, both seem to be formations based on intuition and are without any appropriate parallels. Possibly \textit{Βούπαλος} is a dissimilated form belonging to the group of names derived from \textit{βοῦβαλος} = “antelope.” (Cf. L. Robert, \textit{Noms Indigenes dans l’Asie Mineur Greco-Romaine} I (Paris 1963) 23–25.) On this dissimilation, common in Ionic, see Ernst Fraenkel, “Zur griech. Laut- und Formenlehre,” (III) \textit{Glotta} 2 (1910) 34–38. On comic puns involving \textit{φαλ-} and \textit{βαλ-}, see below, note 17.

\footnote{Psilosis, of course, was a common, if sometimes unpredictable, feature of Ionic (cf. Degani xxvii, and West, \textit{Studies} 89). For a discussion of the evidence for the pronunciation of \textit{π}– and \textit{φ}– see Allen, \textit{Vox Graeca} (Cambridge 1974) 16–24. Note the alliteration of \textit{π}– and \textit{φ}– at Aeschylus, \textit{PV} 98 and \textit{Ag.} 268. We}
It is probably no coincidence that the earliest attestation of the word φαλλός and its by-form φαλης in an obscene and non-technical sense comes from Hipponax himself. In the first instance we have under fr. 151 simply the word ἄνακτεσιωφαλλός, used as an abusive epithet of a woman. There can be no question here that the implication is anything but obscene: ‘the one who shakes the φαλλός.’ In fr. 34 the reference is somewhat more obscure, but undoubtedly obscene:

ημείκτων αἰτεῖ τοῦ φάλεω ἔκολαψαεῖ.

West (his fr. 21) reads κολάψαι ε and translates ‘she asks eight obols for pecking him on the φάλης,’ which has a plausible ring to it. In any case, despite the uncertainty of the last word, the context is likely to be of another sexual encounter of some sort.  

come close to a play on φαλλός and the suffix –παλος in Aristophanes Av. 1021 where Pithetairos asks of the entering ἐπίσκοπος: τίς ὁ Σαρδανάπαλλος οὐκτεῖ; While there is nothing in the text to suggest an explicit pun on φαλλός, the scholia relate that Sardanapallos was especially famous for his dissolute ways. Cicero Rep. 3 fr. 4 clearly puns on his name: Sardanapallus ille vitius multo quam nomine ipso deformior (cf. J. Adams, The Latin Sexual Vocabulary [Baltimore 1982] 64), and it seems likely that Aristophanes uses the name as a general term of abuse, with an implicit pun on φαλλός. Puns involving the unaspirated root βαλ- (probably from *bhel/bhl; cf. P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque vol. iv.2 [Paris 1980] 1175), are also common in Greek comic genres. Note, for example, Τριβαλλοῖ at Aristophanes Av. 1529ff. (referring to an actual race of Thracians, cf. J. Henderson The Maculaiti Muse [New Haven 1975] 121 note 77). The word is not explicitly comic in Aristophanes, though Eubulus 75.3 (Hunter) assures us that the mere mention of it would be perceived as humorous. Also note βάλλωνος, Aristophanes Lys. 413 (on which cf. Hunter 1919) and Βαλλίον, used as a nickname of the debauched Pythodelus by the Middle comic poet Axionicus (Athen. 166c = Kock 120), (cf. Plautus’ character Ballio the pimp). We may also note the obscure cult title of Dionysus, Ἐφροβαλλίνδος, cited by Hesychius, although without any indication of date.  

18 This word was picked up, no doubt directly from Hipponax, by Old Comedy; cf. Kock, adesp. 1377. Indeed Old Comedy, a generic descendant of the iambos, offers an abundance of references to and puns on the word φαλλός. Most of these have been collected by Henderson (above, note 17) 112–13; of particular note for us are φαληρίς, the bird in Av. 565 that will inherit Aphrodite’s prerogative in sacrifice; Φαλληνίος (Aristoph. fr. 244KA), the archon under whom Alcibiades was allegedly born; and Φαλης at Ach. 263ff., in Dicaeopolis’ invocation Φαλης, Ἐταϊρε Βακχίου...  

19 It is arresting to note that τοῦ φάλεω (with synizesis in -εω, pronounced as -ω), which could rhyme with Βουϊκαλο, occurs in the same metrical position as seven of the nine secure occurrences of the name Βουϊκαλο (fr. 17, 18, 19, 20.2, 86.18, 98.3, 98.4 (possibly also 77.4)), namely as the last three syllables of the second metron (forming a cletic), immediately after the penthemimeral caesura: x—x—xII — — —. This is an emphatic position, and there is no metrical reason why the name must fall there. Given the almost certainly sexual, erotic and/or obscene nature of fr. 34, it is likely that Boupalos figured in it in some capacity (cf. Degani ad loc. p. 48 for various suggestions, with bibliography). If
Fr. 20 offers the first suggestion that Hipponax may have deployed the name Boupalos so as to bring out a pun on φαλλός:

τούτοισι θηπέων τοὺς Ἐρυθραίων παίδας
ὁ μητροκοῖτης Βούσαλος σὺν Ἀρήτη
(χ.—) υφέλξων τὸν δυσώνυμον ἄρτον†

3 (δ)αρτόν Masson

...deceiving (?)\(^{20}\) the sons of the Erythraeans by means of these things (?). Boupalos, the one-sleeping-with-his-mother, with Arete about to pull back the ill-omened †foreskin†"(on this word, see below)

The fragment is full of uncertainties, but the scene is more or less clear: Boupalos reads himself for some sort of sexual activity with Arete. Masson’s (δ)αρτόν for the incomprehensible ἄρτον†, favored by Degani, seems to make the best sense: from an original meaning of a flayed sacrificial victim, the word is attested in medical writers as “scrotum,” and here may mean “foreskin.”\(^{21}\) The first line, however, remains obscure and no satisfactory explanations have been offered. Degani, citing several parallels (e.g., Pindar Nem. 9.30: παιδόν Ἀἰτναίον), notes that the expression παίδας Ἐρυθραίων is a periphrasis meaning no more than “Erythraeans,”\(^{22}\) but this in itself does not help to explain the line. My suggestion for interpreting it is based on several considerations. To begin with, the fragment clearly describes a sexual encounter between two people.\(^{23}\) While the details of the scene are uncertain (the referent of τούτοισι is lost to us), we may be fairly certain that the mention of the “sons of the Erythraeans” is here metaphorical, since it is difficult to imagine why else a foreign people would appear in a scene depicting some sort of sexual

so, his name may have been mentioned in the lines immediately preceding or following our fragment, in the same metrical position as τοὺς φάλεω. The placement of τοὺς φάλεω in fr. 34 would echo Βούσαλος, and create a reciprocal double-entendre.


\(^{22}\) Degani Studi 323.

\(^{23}\) L. Koenen, “ΘΕΟΙΣΙΝ ΕΧΘΡΟΣ: Ein einheimische Gegenkönig in Ägypten,” CE 34 (1959) 113 note 3, and scholars after him, cite Catullus 58.5 as a parallel to the activity described in υφέλξων, (δ)αρτόν: glubit (sc. Lesbia) magnanimi Remi nepotes. Degani, Studi 323, also cites magnanimi Remi nepotes as a periphrasis similar to the Ἐρυθραίων παίδας of Hipponax. Though the phrases are not quite parallel (as Romanorum nepotes would be), the several connections between the poems may be more than casual.
intimacy. If we understand the “sons of Erythrae” to mean literally the “Red Men,” the metaphor becomes clearer. In Aristophanes we find the adjective ἐρυθρός applied to the glans of the penis. Nubes 537–39 for example, describes the comically exaggerated artificial phallus, which the poet claims to avoid in his plays, as σκύτον καθεμένον / ἐρυθρόν ἐξ ἄκρον παχύ. Elsewhere in Aristophanes (cf. Pax 927, 1351; Ecc. 1048) the phallus is said to be paxi and m'ga, and at Ach. 787 the Megarian says to Dikaiopolis that his little pigs will one day have a κέρκον (= “penis”) which is μεγάλην τε καὶ παχείαν κηρυθράν. Vase paintings of the 6th and 5th C. show clearly that a large, thick, penis with a red glans would immediately be perceived as comic. It seems likely, therefore, that Hipponax’ “Erythraeans” alludes to this obscene association of the color red. In this light, the Erythraeans as “Red Men” simply represent men characterized by prominent (probably erect) penises, red at the glans. If so, the line may be seen as an attempt to portray, hyperbolically, Boupalos’ lust. Depending on how one takes θηπέον, one can understand Boupalos as either “deceiving the Red Men” in that he is able to outdo them

---

24 Elsewhere in Hipponax we also find place names serving as a joke, e.g. Πυγήλησι (95.15, in a scatological context; cf. Masson ad fr. 92, p. 151), Φλυάσιον (51.2, used of Apollo; probably < φλυάζω. See Degani ad loc. p. 74 for various explanations of the epithet). Λέξης and Τρεπχής at 53.2 (cited by Strabo 14.1.4) seem to refer to actual places in Smyrna, but are no doubt humorously invoked to characterize the people who live there; (cf. Aristophanes’ comic use of λέξης as a place name: Ach. 724; Av. 149, 151). Aristophanes, composing in a kindred genre, (on the generic affinities between the iambos and Old Comedy, cf. Henderson [above, note 17] 1–29), employs the topographical pun similarly. Place names may be either fictionalized but representing some humorous notion (e.g. Ach. 606, τούς δ’ ἐν Καμαρίνη κάν Γέλα κάν Κασαγέλα), or may be actual place names adduced not so much because the context demands such a reference, but because of the potential double-entendre of the name (e.g. Cleon as Paphlagonian in Eq. [with the pun on φλάω]: Κόρινθοι [= bedbugs] at Nub. 710).

25 On the various ways of punctuating and construing this line see K. J. Dover, Aristophanes’ Clouds (Oxford 1968) ad loc. p. 168. “Red at the tip,” as Dover argues, probably refers to the glans exposed by circumcision, since the participle κακεμένον (“hanging down”) seems to preclude an erect penis. Is it possible, however, that “hanging down” would refer to poor stage demeanor of a character bearing an erect phallus? παχύς (and μέγας) is usually applied elsewhere in Aristophanes to an erect phallus; cf. Henderson (above, note 17) 116.

26 Or “red all over”; cf. Herodas 6.19 (and Cunningham ad loc. p. 164) where a leather dildo is painted red (κόκκινον); Horace Sat. 1.8.5, obscenique ruber porrectus ab inguine palus (no doubt with a pun on phallus, (see above, note 17); and the ruber Priapus in the Priapic poem (Buecheler 83) 11.6–8.

with his own erection, or as “marvelling at the Red Men,” as if he is looking to them for erotic inspiration.  

The overtly sexual context of the fragment leads one to suspect, finally, that the name of Boupalos is employed strategically to make the pun on Boupalos’ name as Βού-φοκάλος. Such a pun would portray most economically (and humorously) the essence of the speaker’s quarrel with Boupalos. Boupalos, that is, is about to have sex with Arete, and the poet’s graphic emphasis on his adversary’s penis highlights his enemy’s excessive lust. The epithet δύσωνυμος (v.3), moreover, used of the foreskin, seems to reinforce this interpretation. Not only does it probably allude humorously to the euphemistic epithet ἀνάωνυμος (used of the penis at, e.g., Herod. 5.45 [ἀνάωνυμον κέρκνον] and AP 12.232), but if we understand it quite literally, we end up with a line meaning: “Big-Dick, about to pull back his ill-named foreskin”!

Fr. 86 also makes better sense if the poet was using “Boupalos” with this sort of word-play in mind. Boupalos again appears in a context involving the manipulation of the penis, but this time, probably after sexual intercourse:

\[δ' \, \hat{\eta}λθεν \, οἴ[\]

28 In Herodas 6, a mimiambl that relates a conversation between two women about a leather dildo, at 43ff. Metro asks about the identity of the skillful shoemaker who made it. Koritto says that his name is Kerdon, but that he is neither of the Kerdons whom Metro knows about: οὐδὲτέρος αὐτῶν ἔστιν.../ ἀλλ’ οὗτος οὖκ οἶδ’ ἡ (‘χ) Χίων τις ἡ ἤρωβρέων / ἢκελ... (57–59). F. Jung, (Hipponax Redivivus [Bonn 1929] 38–39), following a suggestion of Crusius, is no doubt right to say that Erythrae and Chios are meant to be significant. As Ionian cities, they were emblematic of luxurious and dissolute behavior (cf. A. Cassio, “Attico ‘volgare’ e Ioni in Atene alla fine del 5 secolo A.C.,” Aion 3 [1981] 90–92). Jung explicitly connects the Herodas line with Hipponax’ Erythraeans, though he does not elaborate. (On the close relationship between Hipponax and Herodas, cf. R. Ussher “The Mimiamboi of Herodas,” Hermathena 129 [1980] 65–76.) On Chios as a similarly ridiculed place, cf. Aristophanes Daitales fr. 225 KA and Adams (above, note 17) 202. If the Erythraeans in fr. 20 have some relevance to the obscene context, it is hardly out of character for Hipponax to play on the color indicated by the name, as well as any other more general notions of debauchery inherent in it.

29 See Miralles-Portulas (above, note 4) 12–13, 39–45, on the iambic poet as a “trickster” figure, and how such a figure is often portrayed as having a great sexual appetite and a huge penis. The main drawback of their discussion is that the evidence from the iambographers does not show clearly that the phallic allusions refer to the poet himself. But Hipponax does seem to vie with Boupalos to be the supreme trickster, a relationship we see again most clearly between the Sausageseller and the Paphlagonian in Aristophanes’ Eq. It seems to be a central paradox of the psogos that the aggressor stoops to the level of the target, accusing him of reprehensible behavior while wishing to behave that way himself. The Dikaios Logos is so portrayed in Nub. 975–80. Cf. also Hipponax 126, which attacks a glutton (= Boupalos?), and compare the several declarations of poverty and hunger in other fragments (e.g. 42, 43, 44, 47, 48). On food in the iambos, see Miralles-Portulas 35–37.
καὶ μ’ εἰρετ’ ὅ[ειπασ .[]κοῦδιψ[]άλλ’ ἔστεγ[]χαμαι πιφ[]
10 ἕκδόντες α[]ἐδάκνομεν τε κάφ[ιλέομεν]διέκ θυρέων βλέ[ποντες]μὴ ἡμεῖς λάβ[]γυμνος ἔρυ.[
20 ἐγ[ω μὲν ὁσπ[ερ]μο[ν ἱστι...]σφάζειν ὑπ[ει]....[.]φαλ...τ[]
10 κάφ[ιλέομεν] suppl. West

In its broadest outline this fragment appears to describe a rather impassioned and involved sexual experience. The verb βίνειν is, of course, a common obscenity for copulation,30 and the biting and kissing of line 11 (ἐδάκνομεν τε κάφ[ιλέομεν]) has been compared by West to the erotic kissing (κυνείν) and biting (δάκνειν) in Aristophanes Ach. 1208–9.31

Line 17 derives its humor from a sexual obscenity, namely the identification of a sausage (ἄλλαζέ) with the male organ. The details of the line are not clear, but it is fairly certain that we should not accept the emendation ψήχων, first proposed by Knox, for the transmitted ψύχων (Degani restores ψύχων). Ψήχων has been preferred, no doubt, because at first sight it seems to provide a more natural obscenity. Knox translates "as one that strokes a sausage, drew tipward," but it is hard to imagine in what (non-metaphorical) context one would have occasion to "stroke a sausage," or for that matter, what activity in particular Knox felt was going on in the line. If we retain ψύχων (= "cooling") we may understand the speaker as "drawing out the penis to the tip in order to cool it as one cools a sausage." Although, surprisingly enough, there is no

30 Cf. Henderson (above, note 17) 151–2; and note Archilochos 152.2W.
31 On φίλειν in the erotic sense, see Henderson (above, note 17) 181. Cf. also Aristophanes Aves 442 (and van Daele’s note ad loc.) where δάκνειν may be used erotically.
33 See Degani ad loc. p. 99 for editors who endorse this reading, and for other explanations. Ψύχω can also mean "to dry," which Degani prefers in this con-
clear case in Old Comedy where ἀλλὰς is used in an obscene sense, Hipponax’s sausage metaphor clearly belongs to that type of obscene comic humor which equates the sexual parts (male and female) with various foods.34

Up to line 17 Hipponax seems to be narrating his own sexual escapades with a woman (Arete perhaps?). Then, if the supplement is correct, the text has “ordering Boupalos to go hang.” But how does Boupalos fit in here? Is he present at or involved in the action? Such a “threesome” seems unlikely. Rather, it seems more probable that Boupalos is mentioned as foil for the sexual prowess of Hipponax himself. Probably the fragment describes how Hipponax has sexual relations with the same woman with whom Boupalos had had intercourse earlier. In fr. 18 a speaker whom we may assume is the poet berates a woman (presumably) for sleeping with Boupalos, implying that his enemy was successful with a woman he was pursuing himself. If he has here finally won her over and had intercourse with her, which seems likely (ἐγὼ δ’ ἐβίνει[ν], he seems to be urging her (and himself) to forget about Boupalos (Υλοι[ν] κελεύ[ον Βού]παλο[ν]). The fact that Boupalos is juxtaposed to the metaphorical description of the speaker’s sexual organ as a sausage (…ἐλκον ὁσπερ ἀλλὰντα ψύχων…κελεύων…) does seem to suggest a connection between the two, and it was probably the sausage metaphor that called him to mind. The juxtaposition, moreover, of ἀλλὰντα and Βούπαλον, may even suggest a more direct, phonological connection between the two. If Hipponax is here punning on Boupalos’ name as suggested for fr. 20, the speaker means to imply here that he is as sexually capable as his rival Boupalos. A suitable translation to capture the pun might run: “…and I was fucking [or began to fuck]…and as I was drawing out [my cock] to the tip (i.e. “all the way out”) just as one who hangs out a sausage to cool, (and) bidding Boupalos (= Big-Dick) to go hang…” In other words, the speaker has performed with such sexual expertise that the figure whose very name embodies sexual prowess, Boupalos, is no match for him.

As a final point, it is worth noting that such a pun would be eminently consonant with the way other proper names are used in the iambos. Hipponax often uses names that reflect some specific character trait. The difficulty, of course, lies in determining whether these names are “significant” or not, given the fragmentary state of the corpus. Many are either well-attested elsewhere as genuine names or certainly sound genuine. In such cases the contextual significance may elude us. There are other cases, however, where context and/or etymology make us suspect an ulterior motive to the choice of the name.

We may cite from Hipponax, for example, the patronymic συκοτραγίδης (“son of Fig-nibbler” = “son of Cunnilingctor”) of fr. 177 (attested in Eustathius for Archilochos as well [= fr. 250 W]), and Αἰσχυλίδης (fr. 196.9 = “son of Shameful/Disgusting”), used of a potter with whom the poet quarrels.35 When

text. One of the anonymous referees has proposed that we read φαλλόν at the end of v.16, an attractive, if somewhat bold, supplement.

34 See Henderson (above, note 17) 129, 144, 186.
35 The details of fr. 196 are quite obscure, although the suggestion that it concerns a λαποδύτης seems most likely (as Masson 161; West Studies 146; for
we compare these to the Archilochean Κερκιδής (185W), Ἑραμονίδη Χαριλάε (168W), Cratinus’ Ἑραμονίδη Βάθυππε (fr. 11KA, borrowed no doubt directly from Archilochos)\textsuperscript{36} and the numerous comic patronymics in Aristophanes,\textsuperscript{37} it is readily apparent that such formations were closely identified, not surprisingly, with genres embodying the ἡμβηκίδα ἱδέα.

Another apparently comic name in Hipponax occurs in fr. 129, which addresses one Σάννος:

\begin{align*}
a) \quad \dot{\omega} \ Σάνν\, έπειδή \ άνινα \ θεό[σουλιν] \ έτις \\
καὶ γαστρὸς οὐ κατακρα[τείς]
\tauοὺς \ μοι \ παράσχες, \ ο[\]
σύν τοί τι βοηλεύσαι \ θέ[λω] \quad \nu \cdot
\end{align*}

Once again the person addressed here is the object of a psogos, as is clear from the papyrus commentary from which the fragment is extracted: κύριον ὄνομα ὁ Σάννος, ὄ(ι) λοιδοφεύται ... Sannos is ridiculed here for his gluttony (v.2) and possibly for his impiety (Comm. A.14, ἱερόσυλιν ἄνω), as well as for the emasculation he suffers in spite of all his eating (Comm. C.8–10). As Masson has shown, the name Sannos is a nickname which is cognate with σάννιον (= "penis") and the verb σαίνω, and belongs to the type of obscene nicknames formed from such words as κέρκος and σάθη.\textsuperscript{38} Σάννος, it is true, is attested as an actual name,\textsuperscript{39} so this Sannos may have existed. But it seems more probable, since the poem is a comic psogos, that the name was chosen precisely because it could deme the target even further.\textsuperscript{40} We already know that he is a glutton; to call such a person a "penis" would no doubt imply, in this context, an excessive sexual appetite as well, which in turn would be viewed by the audience as a (comic) term of reproach.\textsuperscript{41}

other interpretations cf. Degani 173). While one might wish to deny that Αἰσχυλίδης is fictional by pointing to the attested name Aeschylus, the framework of the fragment (an individual held up for censure) and the rhetorical devices are typical of a psogos, and the ideal suitability of such a name to this context is probably more than coincidental. See Koenen (above, note 21) 81–87 for a discussion of these elements; and Degani Studi 69–70.

\textsuperscript{36} Cf. M. L. West, Greek Metre (Oxford 1982) 97.
\textsuperscript{37} E.g. Vesp. 81, 185, 325, 680; Nub. 67; Pax 103; Plu. 179, 303.
\textsuperscript{38} Masson 166, and note 1; See Eupolis, fr. 471KA σάννιον, and the testimonia ad loc.
\textsuperscript{39} Masson 165, note 7; Chantraine, (above, note 17) 984, s.v. σάθη; Pape-Benseler (above, note 16) 1340.
\textsuperscript{40} Note that the form σάννιος (or Σάννιος) is attested for Cratinus 489 KA = μόρος; in English slang likewise we may call someone a "dick" or "prick," implying that he is "foolish."
\textsuperscript{41} Koenen goes so far as to suggest that this Sannos actually stands for Boupalos, on the strength of the similar insult in fr. 69, τὸν θεοσίς(ν) ἐξθρόνησον τοῦτον (v. 7) (referring most likely to Boupalos) and the fact that Sannos in fr. 129 is said to have a ἄνια θεό[σουλιν. (Cf. West Studies, 143 on ρῖς as "phallic," an attractive though highly speculative explanation; also C. G. Brown, "Noses in Aristophanes, Clouds 344?," QUCC n.s. 14 [1983] 87–90). Lines 7–8 of fr. 69 refer to the sexual "despoliation" (ἐσκύλευε) of a sleeping "mother,"
Once Boupalos is considered as a strictly poetic character, it should be clear that his name could function exactly like the comic names discussed above: it could plausibly stand as a real name, and, at the same time, suggests a humorously insulting etymology well suited for an iambographic ξυρός. Moreover, whether or not the pun on Boupalos was made explicit every time it occurred (we can not be sure that it was even in every extant occurrence of the name), it is likely that at some level the semantic was always operative, that the name was meant to sound intrinsically humorous.

Several unanswerable questions, of course, remain: if Hipponax used the name Boupalos for its word-play, as we have suggested, does this mean that he chose the name for this purpose? Was it, perhaps, a nickname, given to the sculptor by Hipponax and retained thereafter? We shall probably never know exactly why Hipponax chose Boupalos as his target—whether he simply was intrigued by the name, as has been suggested for Archilochos’ choice of Lycaemons, or whether the inspiration goes deeper. But if we accept the premise that generic demands would exert a greater influence over the poet than historical or personal details, then we may be sure that what was most important for Hipponax was how Boupalos could best be portrayed so as to perform the role of the traditional iambographic ξυρός.

and it is usually held to refer to the μητρομεζία of Boupalos (cf. fr. 20 above, page 35). Koenen argues that the impiety alluded to in fr. 129 refers to this incest imputed to Boupalos (above, note 23) 114. However, on the problems of interpreting fr. 69, cf. Degani, Studi 261–62. A precise identification is of course impossible, but if our argument about the connotation of Boupalos is correct, it would be all the more fitting for him also to be called by the obscene nickname Sannos ( = “penis”).

42 As we noted earlier (note 15), the testimonia leave us with no reason to assume that Hipponax’ poetry necessarily reflected a historical quarrel with Boupalos. Certainly this does not prove that one never did exist—on this question it is unlikely that we will ever be able to decide for sure—but it does offer us the freedom to apply what we do know of the iambographic quarrel as a literary convention in order to ascertain how poetic factors may have influenced Hipponax’ portrayal of his relationship with Boupalos.

43 On Boupalos as playing a role in Hipponax’ poetry, cf. Koenen (above, note 21) 76, note 14.