Philologus	**154**	2010	2	187–208

Robert J. Gorman and Vanessa B. Gorman

ΤΡΥΦΗ AND *ΥΒΡΙΣ* IN THE ΠΕΡΙ ΒΙΩΝ OF CLEARCHUS

Recent discussions of the fragments of the Περὶ Βίων have seen the concept of pernicious luxury as a key to understanding aspects of this work of Clearchus[1]. In particular, it is thought that Clearchus reflects a moralizing historiographical schema according to which wealth leads to an effeminate luxury (τρυφή), eventually producing satiety (κόρος), which in turn provokes the afflicted to violence (ὕβρις), ultimately bringing the subject's destruction[2]. We maintain, in contrast, that it is anachronistic to attribute this pattern of thought to Clearchus, and further, that the state of the evidence does not permit us to establish that the idea of pernicious luxury was in any way important to the organization of the Περὶ Βίων.

All texts pertaining to the representation of τρυφή in the Περὶ Βίων come to us through Athenaeus. Anyone trying to investigate prose fragments in the *Deipnosophistae* must face the task of disentangling the material ascribable to the original author from Athenaeus' own contributions[3]. In the case of the Clearchus fragments, it is possible to identify certain parts of the relevant texts as Athenaean with a reasonable degree of probability.

In a recent study, we have pointed out certain turns of phrase which are not at all likely to be original to the cited authority, but which represent rather a later layer of the transmission[4]. What is of greatest relevance for our argument here is not so much the particular phraseology identified as non-original, but the observation that, as one

---

[1] Bollansée (2008) 405 notes that 'the single recurring theme in the fragments is the concept of τρυφή, which we encounter either by itself, or in close combination with its seemingly inevitable corollary, ὕβρις, in no less than 22 of the 26 surviving fragments'.

[2] Tsitsiridis (2008) 70–1 states: 'Das ideologische Erklärungsmotiv ist durchsichtig. Es handelt sich … um die verweichlichende, unhellenische Truphe, die sowohl für Einzelpersonen als auch für Völker verhängnisvoll sein kann. Es ist wichtig für das Verständnis des Werkes, sich das erklärende Schema vor Augen zu halten: Überdruss und Glück führen mächtige Menschen und reiche Völker zur Hybris, und diese wiederum führt unvermeidlich zum Verderben'. The schema as here described has obvious inconsistencies. In particular, a life of luxury leads both to softness and acts of ὕβρις, although the two would seem incompatible. Nonetheless, the pattern is generally accepted by the scholarship without qualm: for example, Nenci (1989) relies on it to identify a new fragment of Clearchus, while Bollansée (2008) sees no problem in finding 'an inseparable bond between τρυφή and ὕβρις' (408). We will take a closer look at this question below.

[3] Lenfant (2007) warns that 'une grande prudence' is necessary when dealing with fragments drawn from Book 12's discussion of τρυφή. Other studies explicating the hazards involved in interpreting prose fragments from the *Deipnosophistae* are Pelling (2000) and Ambaglio (1990).

[4] Gorman and Gorman (2007).

might expect, this later material is most often found in sentences introducing an authority's evidence or in sentences forming a transition between material drawn from two parts of an original. As an illustration, we may look at an expression which one may confidently suppose is not original to the sources cited: ἐξοκέλλειν (completed by εἰς τρυφήν or a similar moral term), meaning 'to run aground on' a given vice[5]. Every occurrence of this phrase is in a position which is clearly introductory or transitional in the sense we have indicated[6]. For example, after a lengthy discussion of the lifestyle of the Sybarites, Athenaeus introduces, at 522a, the subject of luxury among their conquerors[7]:

> καὶ Κροτωνιᾶται δ', ὥς φησι Τίμαιος, μετὰ τὸ ἐξελεῖν Συβαρίτας ἐξώκειλαν εἰς τρυφήν·
>
> The Crotoniates, too, as Timaeus says, after capturing the Sybarites, ran aground on *truphē*[8].

The transitional function is in evidence at 521c: we are first told (521b) that Phylarchus 'in the twenty-fifth book of his *Histories*' discussed Syracusan sumptuary laws. Then, by way of contrast, come Sybarite laws promoting luxury: Συβαρῖται, φησίν, ἐξοκείλαντες εἰς τρυφὴν ἔγραψαν νόμον ('The Sybarites, he says, running aground on *truphē*, wrote a law …', 521c). Note that the presence of φησίν makes it clear that Athenaeus is still relying on the authority of Phylarchus' *Histories.* However, because the phrasing shows that the juncture between the two passages was made by Athenaeus, we cannot be sure whether the Syracusan and Sybarite νόμοι were in fact compared in the original. A few lines later, Athenaeus turns from the subject of Sybarite extravagance at table to the murder by the Sybarites of thirty

---

[5] In Athenaeus, this expression occurs in eight 'fragments' from four (or five) different authors. Yet a comparison to the diachronic data establishes that a securely datable parallel for the metaphorical usage of ἐξοκέλλειν εἰς τρυφήν vel sim. does not occur before Philo in the first century CE. These two facts, taken together, make it very difficult to see this phrase as anything other than a later addition to the sources, perhaps by Athenaeus himself. For the detailed argument, see Gorman and Gorman (2007) 41–4. In a study of the 'topographical' aspect of Athenaeus' composition, Wilkins (2008) argues that the sources of the *Deipnosophistae* are sometimes 'reshaped for "navigational purposes."' (149). Of particular interest is his observation that '[t]he shipwreck of a city or people through its wealth and extravagance is the most striking application of the navigational metaphor' in Athenaeus (149). These comments give us further reason for confidence that the 'run aground on' metaphor was not original to the various fragments in which it occurs.

[6] We recognize that these terms are not completely satisfactory; any of the introductory sentences we examine is also transitional in that it changes the focus from one example of decadence to another. Similarly, it is often the case that we are not in a position to tell whether a transitional sentence links two parts of the same work, or if Athenaeus has rather turned to another source.

[7] The other cases of an introductory use are 12. 523c, where the topic of the people of Siris is raised after a treatment of the Iberians and the Massiliotes; 12. 526a, Colophonians after the Samians; 12. 528a–b, the Capuans after the Arycandes of Lycia; 12. 543a, Lucullus after Demetrius of Phaleron. 4. 141f probably also belongs on this list: although it continues a discussion of Spartan customs, it introduces the evidence of Phylarchus after that of Demetrius of Scepsis.

[8] We prefer to leave τρυφή untranslated; the usual rendering as 'luxury' misses completely the sense of subjective willfulness which we feel is demonstrably central to the word's meaning.

ambassadors from Croton. Once more, the author effects the transition with the familiar expression: πάνυ οὖν ἐξοκείλαντες εἰς ὕβριν ('running thoroughly aground on *hybris* …', 521d). This time, the text gives no indication that Athenaeus is still drawing from Phylarchus, and so the source of the subsequent discussion of Sybarite atrocities remains in doubt.

From these few examples, it is apparent that when trying to recover prose fragments from Athenaeus and to evaluate their content, we would be well advised to display extra caution when dealing with the words with which Athenaeus introduces the evidence of a source. The Athenaean material in such passages is not necessarily limited to the announcement of author and work, but may also include, for example, attributions of theme which may not be in harmony with the original. Timaeus, for instance, may not have been interested in any moral implication when he described the extravagant dress of the Crotoniate archon. However, if we mistakenly take Athenaeus' Κροτωνιᾶται … ἐξώκειλαν εἰς τρυφήν for words of the historian, we thereby reconstitute a fragment in which Timaeus illustrates the moral decline of Croton, and we present a possibly misleading picture of the historian's interests.

By the same token, transitional wording must be scrutinized for both themes and diction which can be more plausibly attributed to Athenaeus than to his source. This particular task is more complicated, since transitions within a section of the *Deipnosophistae* are usually harder to identify than its external boundaries. Many sections will have to be analyzed carefully to establish their internal structure, and informed opinion will often differ about details. Nonetheless, some sutures are obvious: in 521c, haute cuisine and the slaughter of diplomats cannot without further explanation belong together, and we would be able to recognize the seam between these passages, even if Athenaeus had not stitched it together with his tell-tale ἐξοκείλαντες εἰς ὕβριν.

If we turn now to those fragments of Clearchus' Περὶ Βίων in which the relevant concept of pernicious luxury is thought to play an important part, we will see that almost all the best evidence for this view comes from the kind of introductory or transitional passages which we have discussed. We may conveniently start with F 48 Wehrli, since it presents us with both an introductory statement and an internal transition which are not as likely to reproduce closely Clearchus' wording as that of Athenaeus (or an intermediary). In this passage, the authority of the Περὶ Βίων is invoked to demonstrate the luxury of the people of Tarentum:

> Ταραντίνους δέ φησι Κλέαρχος ἐν τετάρτῳ Βίων ἀλκὴν καὶ δύναμιν κτησαμένους εἰς τοσοῦτο τρυφῆς προελθεῖν ὥστε τὸν ὅλον χρῶτα παραλεαίνεσθαι καὶ τῆς ψιλώσεως ταύτης τοῖς λοιποῖς κατάρξαι. ἐφόρουν δέ, φησίν, καὶ παρυφίδα διαφανῆ πάντες, οἷς νῦν ὁ τῶν γυναικῶν ἁβρύνεται βίος. (12. 522d)
>
> Clearchus says in the fourth book of his *Lives* that after the Tarentines acquired strength and power they advanced to such an extent of *truphē* that they would smooth their whole skin and started this custom of depilation for the remaining peoples. He said all the men wore a transparent cloak with a purple border, by which today the life of women is accoutered.

The formal structure of this sentence is noteworthy: a verb of motion controlling a preposition of goal or limit with a neuter demonstrative to which is subordinated a genitive of a noun indicating a vice; upon this construction is dependent a final clause setting forth details of the moral failing. This pattern appears several times in passages of the *Deipnosophistae* where Clearchus is cited, and we might conclude that it was a turn of phrase favored by that author[9]. However, if we look further, we find a number of other instances of this sentence pattern serving as introductions or transitions. For example, at 12. 514e, Athenaeus begins: Χάρης δ' ὁ Μιτυληναῖος ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ τῶν περὶ 'Αλέξανδρον Ἱστοριῶν εἰς τοῦτο, φησίν, ἧκον τρυφῆς οἱ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεῖς ὥστε … ('Chares of Mitylene in the fifth book of his *History of Alexander* says that the Kings of the Persians arrived at such an extent of *truphē* that …'). Likewise, at 12. 515d, Λυδοὶ δὲ εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦλθον τρυφῆς ὡς …, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ξάνθος ὁ Λυδός ('The Lydians went to such an extent of *truphē* that …, as Xanthus the Lydian relates'.)[10]. Thus, the suspicion arises that the εἰς τοσοῦτο τρυφῆς προελθεῖν ὥστε of F 48 is drawn from Athenaeus' repertoire of stock phrases for organizing his presentation of moral *exempla*[11].

Further consideration of the vocabulary of the sentence in question gives us more reason to doubt that it closely reproduces the words of Clearchus. Although λεαίνω meaning 'make smooth' appears from Homer on, the word (with or without a prefix) meaning 'remove hair' or 'shave' is quite rare and relatively late. In texts with direct transmissions, there is only a handful of examples, with the earliest coming from Diodorus Siculus in the first century BCE, followed by Lucian and Pseudo-Lucian[12]. It is noteworthy that each of these authors felt the need to make the unusual meaning

---

[9] In addition to F 48, the construction also occurs at F 46 and F 61, as well as at Athen. 12. 523a, where Nenci (1989) posits a previously overlooked fragment.

[10] Other examples include, 4. 167e (εἰς τοσοῦτον δ' ἀσωτίας ἐληλύθει καὶ Δημήτριος … ὥς φησιν Ἡγήσανδρος, ὥστε …, 'Demetrius too … went to such an extent of prodigality, as Hegesander says, … that …'); 12. 520c (on the extent of Sybarite *truphē,* apparently on the authority of Aristotle); and 12. 528b–c (on the hardihood of the people of Petelia, on the authority of Polybius).

[11] In addition to the ἐξοκέλλειν phrase noted above, another obvious member of this stock is the adjective διαβόητος governing ἐπί plus the dative of a moral term, meaning 'famous for x'. That Athenaeus found this expression useful for introducing citations is clear. At 11. 509d it serves to announce the topic of Book 12 as a whole: ἑξῆς δὲ ἐροῦμεν περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τρυφῇ διαβοήτων γενομένων ('Next we will speak about people who became famous for *truphē*'.). At 12. 513e–f, it introduces the *truphē* of the Persians; at 12. 518c, the *truphē* of the Sicilian diet on the authority of Clearchus; at 12. 543b, Rutilius on the *truphē* and softness of Sittius; and, in the same context, the *truphē* of Pausanias and Lysander on the authority of σχεδὸν πάντες.

[12] D. S. 5. 28. 3, τὰ δὲ γένεια τινὲς μὲν ξυρῶνται, τινὲς δὲ μετρίως ὑποτρέφουσιν· οἱ δ' εὐφενεῖς τὰς μὲν παρειὰς ἀπολειαίνουσι, τὰς δ' ὑπήνας ἀνειμένας ἐῶσιν ('Some shave their chins, others grow them out moderately; the nobles shave off their cheeks, but let their moustaches alone'.). The other relevant passages are Plutarch *De Iside* 352d 10, *De defectu orac.* 410d 5; Lucian *Adv. indoct. et lib. em.* 23. 17; Pseudo-Lucian *Cynicus* 19.16. The usage occurs three times in the fragments of Theopompus and once in a fragment of Polybius, but all are transmitted through Athenaeus and must be set aside for the purposes of our argument. Similarly, an occurrence in Nicolaus of Damascus comes through the Byzantine Extracts, and a possible example from Musonius is preserved by Stobaeus.

clearer by conjoining with it a more obvious term: ξυράω ('shave') in Diodorus, ξυράω and ξυρόν ('razor') in Plutarch, παρατίλλω ('pluck the hair') in Lucian, and ψιλόω ('strip') in Pseudo-Lucian. In all of Greek literature, the form παραλεαίνω occurs only in this passage of Athenaeus[13]. In similar fashion, the noun ψίλωσις is for practical purposes a coinage of the first century CE: the word itself is not attested before Plutarch (*QC* 646d) and Josephus (*AJ* 17. 308)[14], while the connection with depilation does not seem to be in evidence until Galen[15]. Finally, the noun παρυφή is extremely rare: it first occurs in Plutarch (*Mor.* 239c) and then here in Athenaeus. Thus, if one were to assume that Athenaeus presents in this passage something like a verbatim quotation from the Περὶ Βίων, then a single sentence of Clearchus would contain the oldest evidence for two separate lexical usages, each predating parallel instances by several centuries, and the second oldest example of a third, extremely rare word.

In view of these circumstances, we feel that the cautious interpretation of this sentence will attribute both its form and the details of its wording not to Clearchus, but to Athenaeus or an intermediate tradition. Thus, we may assume that with respect to the 'facts' about Tarentine personal hygiene, this sentence paraphrases Clearchus, but it is much less certain that the Περὶ Βίων used this particular Tarentine custom to make a moral point, as would be the case if εἰς τοσοῦτο τρυφῆς προελθεῖν ὥστε accurately reproduces the Peripatetic's view.

F 48 then shifts its focus from τρυφή to Tarentine ὕβρις:

> ὕστερον δ' ὑπὸ τῆς τρυφῆς εἰς ὕβριν ποδηγηθέντες ἀνάστατον μίαν πόλιν Ἰαπύγων ἐποίησαν Κάρβιναν … (12.522d)
>
> Later, led by *truphē* into *hybris,* they made one city of the Iapygians, Carbina, a ruin …

These words clearly constitute an transition between dissipated way of life of the Tarentines and its violent consequences. Such transitions, we have suggested, should be examined especially carefully for indications of Athenaean provenance, and, in fact, there is good evidence that at least the words quoted above stem from Athenaeus rather than Clearchus.

In the first place, εἰς ὕβριν ποδηγεῖσθαι seems to be a variety of one of Athenaeus' favorite ways of framing his material: the metaphor of physical motion into a vice. We have already seen examples in ἐξοκέλλειν εἰς κτλ. and προέρχεσθαι [vel sim.] εἰς τοσοῦτο κτλ. Second, a careful examination of the *Deipnosopistae* shows that the

---

[13] An adjectival form can be found paired with εὔχυλα ('succulent') in the epitomes of Athenaeus, citing Diphilus and describing the qualities of truffles (2. 62c).

[14] The term ἀποψίλωσις occurs once in Theophrastus (*CP* 5. 9. 11).

[15] For example, *De simp. med.* 12. 212. 8, εἰς τὰς ψιλώσεις τῶν τριχῶν ('for the striping of the hair'). Thereafter, the meaning is not unusual in the medical writers.

innocuous-seeming phrase ὑπὸ (τῆς) τρυφῆς is also among Athenaeus' inventory of verbal building-blocks. Setting aside the passages associated with Clearchus, we find the phrase several times in introductory sentences:

> 4. 144e: Θεόφραστος … τοὺς Περσῶν φησι βασιλεῖς ὑπὸ τρυφῆς προκηρύττειν (Theophrastus … says that due to *truphē* the Persian kings publicly proclaim …)
>
> 12. 518b: ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς τρυφῆς οἱ Τυρρηνοί, ὡς Ἄλκιμος ἱστορεῖ, πρὸς αὐλὸν καὶ μάττουσιν καὶ πυκτεύουσι καὶ μαστιγοῦσιν. (Due to *truphē* the Etruscans, as Alcimus relates, knead bread, box, and flog to the sound of the flute.)
>
> 12. 549a: Νύμφις γοῦν ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν τῷ ιβ[1] περὶ Ἡρακλείας Διονύσιος, φησίν, … ὑπὸ τρυφῆς καὶ τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν ἀδηφαγίας ἔλαθεν ὑπερσαρκήσας … (Nymphis of Heracleia, in the twelfth book of *On Heracleia*, says that Dionysius … due to *truphē* and daily gluttony gradually became obese …)

It is admittedly quite possible that these three authors did in fact use the same simple and common expression to give the cause of these actions. A fourth passage, however, casts doubt upon this assumption. The description of an example of Sybarite extravagance allows us the opportunity to see Athenaeus' hand at work, since the original survives and we are in the uncommon position of being able to compare source with citation. Under the authority of Aristotle is preserved an anecdote about a marvelously extravagant piece of clothing:

> ʼΑλκιμένει τῷ Συβαρίτῃ φασὶ κατασκευασθῆναι ἱμάτιον τοιοῦτον τῇ πολυτελείᾳ, ὥστε προτίθεσθαι αὐτὸ ἐπὶ Λακινίῳ … (*Mir.* 838a15)
>
> They say that for Alcimenes the Sybarite there was prepared such an expensive cloak that he put it on display at Lacinium …

To this we may compare the same story in Athenaeus:

> ʼΑλκισθένην δὲ τὸν Συβαρίτην φησὶν ʼΑριστοτέλης ἐν τοῖς [περὶ τρυφῆς][16] Θαυμασίοις ὑπὸ τρυφῆς ἱμάτιον τοιοῦτον κατασκευάσασθαι τῇ πολυτελείᾳ ὡς προτίθεσθαι αὐτὸ ἐπὶ Λακινίου … (12. 541a)
>
> Aristotle in the *Mirabilia* says that due to *truphē* Alcisthenes the Sybarite had such an expensive cloak made that he put it on display at Lacinium …

[16] Deleted by Casaubon in his 1597 edition.

We see that Athenaeus has adapted the original to his purposes by adding the name of the author and work, and by inserting the phrase in question. The Sybarite ἱμάτιον, which in the original is related as a marvel, becomes through a slight alteration a moral example.

Thus, in addition to helping establish that Athenaeus uses the phrase ὑπὸ τρυφῆς to fit material into his framework, putting these two passages side by side also shows that Athenaeus might sometimes ignore the intentions of the authors whose works he cites. However, this comparison at the same time reveals that Athenaeus makes only minimal changes to the text of the Aristotelian model, which he goes on to quote nearly verbatim. Athenaeus' adherence here to the original may seem to contradict our argument, since we suggest phrases such as εἰς τοσοῦτο τρυφῆς προελθεῖν ὥστε and the like are possible indications of more serious changes and significant paraphrasing. Our response is to note that the *Mirabilia* passage is in its original form practically made to order for inclusion in Book 12 of the *Deipnosophistae:* it is relatively short, contains few non-pertinent details, and begins with one of Athenaeus' introductory formulae[17]. Of course, it is not surprising that the *Mirabilia* would provide Athenaeus with material needing only the most minor of adjustments, since that work, like the *Deipnosophistae,* consists in large measure of a loosely connected series of quotations[18]. In contrast, when Athenaeus was citing from more extensive narratives, greater alterations would have been frequently necessary.

---

[17] To serve this function, Athenaeus often emphasizes his topic using a correlative word pointing to a result clause (e.g., 'the Colophonians were such drunks that …'). For example: 6. 275a, πρότερον δὲ οὕτως ὀλιγοδεεῖς ἦσαν οἱ τὴν Ἰταλίαν κατοικοῦντες ὥστε καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἔτι, φησὶν ὁ Ποσειδώνιος … ('Earlier the occupants of Italy were so modest in their wants that still in our day, says Posidonius, …'); 8. 346c–d, καίτοι γε Ἀντίπατρος ὁ Ταρσεὺς ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς στοᾶς ἐν τετάρτῳ περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας λέγεσθαί φησι πρός τινων ὅτι Γάτις ἡ τῶν Σύρων βασίλισσα οὕτως ἦν ὀψοφάγος ὥστε … ('In fact, the Stoic Antipater of Tarsus, in the fourth book of his *On Superstition,* says that it is reported by some that Gatis the queen of Syria was such a gourmet that …'); 12. 536b–c, ἐτρύφησεν δὲ καὶ Φάραξ ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ τεσσαρακοστῇ ἱστορεῖ· καὶ ταῖς ἡδοναῖς οὕτως ἀσελγῶς ἐχρήσατο καὶ χύδην ὥστε … ('Pharax the Lacedaemonian was also given to *truphē,* as Theopompus relates in Book 40; indeed, he cultivated his pleasures so wantonly and promiscuously that …'). We may consider the εἰς τοσοῦτο τρυφῆς προελθεῖν ὥστε sentences to be a subspecies of this more general type.

[18] A principal difference between Athenaeus' work and the *Mirabilia* is that the latter renders the sources of its information anonymous, introducing its marvels with φασίν and the like. However that may be, it is striking that the author of the *Mirabilia* exhibits a strong predilection for the type of sentence under discussion. In introductory sentences alone, it appears more than fifteen times in seventeen Bekker pages. For example: 830b23–4, Φασί τινας ἐν Ἀχαΐᾳ τῶν ἐλάφων, ὅταν ἀποβάλωσι τὰ κέρατα, εἰς τοιούτους τόπους ἔρχεσθαι ὥστε … ('They say that some of the deer in Achaea, whenever they cast off their antlers, go to such places that …'); 832a14–15, Περὶ Θετταλίαν μνημονεύουσιν ὄφεις ζῳογονηθῆναι τοσούτους ὥστε … ('Concerning Thessaly they recall that such snakes are engendered that …'); 837a12–14, Φασὶ δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Κελτοῖς φάρμακον ὑπάρχειν … ὃ λέγουσιν οὕτω ταχεῖαν ποιεῖν τὴν φθορὰν ὥστε … ('They say that among the Celts there is a drug … which they say brings such a quick death that …'). This similarity between the two authors may be due to nothing more than their shared rhetorical heritage. On the other hand, it brings to mind the possibility that Athenaeus was drawing the relevant quotations not from his own reading of the original works, but from a collection of *exempla* arranged in a pattern similar to the *Mirabilia.* Such an

To return now to Clearchus F 48, the appearance in the transitional phrase εἰς ὕβριν ποδηγηθέντες of the verb ποδηγέω adds force to the suspicion that the sentence is not Clearchan in origin but is at best a paraphrase. Ποδηγέω ('to lead the foot', 'guide'), along with its nominal and verbal cognates, is quite rare before the Current Era: Plato has ποδηγεῖ once in the *Laws,* describing the power which guides the movement of the sun (899a4); in the *Statesman* the compound συμποδηγέω occurs twice in the same passage, here, too, referring to the rationality of celestial movement (269c5–270a3); and ποδηγεῖν appears once at *Ep.* 7. 340c with reference to finding one's way on the path of philosophy[19]. Lycophron has, in addition to ποδηγέω, the nouns ποδηγέτης and ποδηγία, and the denominative ποδηγετέω (*Alex*. 12, 220, 385, 846, and 965). These instances constitute all the evidence for this set of words until Philo. With that author, ποδηγέω begins to become much more common in all its forms. The words appear with relative frequency in the medical writers, with Athenaeus' contemporary Galen using the words more than eighty times. Thus, in view of the diachronic distribution of ποδηγέω and cognates, as well as the considerations discussed in the preceding paragraphs, it is the prudent course to assume that the expression ὕστερον δ' ὑπὸ τῆς τρυφῆς εἰς ὕβριν ποδηγηθέντες κτλ. is not from Clearchus. The difficult question of whether Athenaeus' words here accurately represent the Clearchan view must remain open. We will return to the idea of τρυφή as a cause of ὕβρις after we have examined the other pertinent fragments of Clearchus[20].

Immediately following F 48 in Athenaeus is a discussion of the Iapygians, neighbors of the Tarentines. Athenaeus does not name a source for his information about the Iapygians, and Wehrli does not include this passage in his collection, but strong parallels between the presentation of Tarentine and Iapygian decadence have led to the suggestion that the latter is also of Clearchan origin[21]. This identification may well be correct, but at the same time we must recognize that, as far as the connection between τρυφή and ὕβρις is concerned, the parallelism between the two passages is probably due to Athenaeus rather than Clearchus. The Iapygians, we are told, after emigrating from Crete, gave up their old morals:

---

intermediate source has often in the past been suggested for much of Athenaeus' discussion of *truphē,* but the idea has fallen out of favor. It may be worth reconsidering.

[19] A fragment of Sophocles has a form of συμποδηγετέω (F 314. 169).

[20] On the question of whether the subsequent description of Tarentine ὕβρις is more likely to be paraphrase or quotation, it is worth pointing out that the verb σκηνοποιέω, which appears here at 522e, while rare at all periods of Greek, occurs only a handful of times before Athenaeus (Aristotle *Meteor*. 348b; Josephus *BJ* 1. 73 and 6. 300; D. S. 3. 27. 4; Appian *Iber*. 374 and *BC* 5. 8. 73; Polybius 14. 1. 7; Herodian 7. 2. 4 and 8. 4. 4) and never metaphorically until Eusebius.

[21] Arguments for the identification are presented by Nenci (1989).

> οἱ μετὰ τούτους λήθην λαβόντες τῆς Κρητῶν περὶ τὸν βίον εὐκοσμίας εἰς τοῦτο τρυφῆς, εἶθ' ὕστερον ὕβρεως ἦλθον ὥστε πρῶτοι τὸ πρόσωπον ἐντριψάμενοι καὶ προκόμια περιθετά [τε] λαβόντες στολὰς μὲν ἀνθινὰς φορῆσαι, τὸ δὲ ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ πονεῖν αἰσχρὸν νομίσαι. (12. 523a)
>
> Their descendents, choosing to forget the decent Cretan way of life, went to such an extent of *truphē*, then later of *hybris*, that they were the first to rub cosmetics into their face and to put on false forelocks; they wore flowered robes and considered it a shameful thing to work and toil.

Once again we find that the only explicit evidence which the fragment contains for the idea that an effeminate sort of luxury can be a cause of violent and insulting acts appears in one of Athenaeus' favored phrases (εἰς τοῦτο τρυφῆς, εἶθ' ὕστερον ὕβρεως ἦλθον ὥστε …). Likewise, the occurrence here of the odd expression λήθην λαβόντες ('taking hold of forgetfulness') is a further indication that this sentence is at most a paraphrase of Clearchus. Aside from one occurrence in Pseudo-Hippocrates, the phrase does not appear in a directly transmitted author before the 1st century CE. Thereafter, Josephus and Aelian, for example, each use it a handful of times[22]. Similarly, the mention here of στολὰς ἀνθινὰς is also good evidence that we cannot assume that the diction of the passage is Clearchan. There is no securely attested example of the adjective ἀνθινός 'flowery' used to describe the color or pattern of cloth before Strabo: e. g., 3. 3. 7, ἐν … ἀνθίναις ἐσθήσεσι ('in … flowery garments'). For his part, Athenaeus has the usage at least eight times in addition to the passage under discussion[23]. Once again, if this passage is taken to be a verbatim quotation of Clearchus, we must accept the consequence that a single sentence of that author is the source of the first appearance of two unrelated expressions. Since both usages are unremarkable in Athenaeus' own milieu (although λήθην λαβόντες is admittedly rare even then), it is implausible that the fragment reproduces Clearchus' words closely. Thus, like F 48, this 'new' fragment of Clearchus tells us little definite about the pernicious effects of τρυφή as the *Lives* may have represented them, because the diction in question should be attributed to the transmitting source rather than the original author.

---

[22] Ps. Hippocrates *Herm*. 28. 2; 2 Peter 1. 9. 2; Josephus *AJ* 2. 163, 2. 202, 4. 304, 5. 107, 10. 242; Ael. *NA* 4. 35, 5. 39, 8. 1, 8. 27; *VH* 3. 18; Paus. 4. 23. 5.

[23] 4. 153d (authority of Posidonius), 12. 521b (Phylarchus), 12. 523d (Timaeus), 12. 528d–e (Hyperochus), 12. 530c (Mnaseas), 12. 542d (Duris), 14. 622b (Semus); at 7. 281d it appears not as part of a citation but in the comments of an unnamed deipnosophist.

Similar observations can be made about the other places where the text seems to reflect Clearchus' interest in the connection between τρυφή and ὕβρις. In F 43a we are told that, because of τρυφή, the Lydians built paradises and that subsequently in one of these parks they carried out a mass rape of foreign women. The passage moves in a familiar way between the two phases of Lydian decadence:

> καὶ [τέλος] πόρρω προάγοντες ὕβρεως τὰς τῶν ἄλλων γυναῖκας καὶ παρθένους εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν διὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν Ἁγνεῶνα κληθέντα συνάγοντες ὕβριζον. (12. 515f)
>
> Advancing further into insulting violence, they gathered the women and girls of others into the Place of Chastity, called so because of this act, and raped them.

The image of a subject advancing into a vice has already been identified above as an Athenaean motif. A certain degree of skepticism is therefore warranted before presuming that Clearchus himself saw the direct link which this passage makes between providing oneself with some shade and a penchant for sexual assault[24].

The same caution is necessary in evaluating the fragment's report of the catastrophe which followed the Lydians' misdeeds, as they were subjected to the rule of the female tyrant, Omphale. The transitional sentence here also is problematic:

---

[24] The characterization of the Lydian program of shade building as due to τρυφή is also not certain to be Clearchan: 12. 515e, Κλέαρχος δ' ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ περὶ Βίων, Λυδοί, φησί, διὰ τρυφὴν παραδείσους κατασκευασάμενοι καὶ ἀνηλίους αὐτοὺς ποιήσαντες ἐσκιατροφοῦντο, τρυφερώτερον ἡγησάμενοι τὸ μηδ' ὅλως αὐτοῖς ἐπιπίπτειν τὰς τοῦ ἡλίου αὐγάς ('Clearchus in the fourth book of his *Lives* says that the Lydians, because of *truphē* constructing parks and making them sunless, lived in the shade; they considered it a matter of greater *truphē* that the rays of the sun should not fall on them at all'.). Like the phrase ὑπὸ τρυφῆς which we have looked at above, διὰ τρυφὴν is often likely to represent Athenaeus' own interpretation of the events under discussion. At any rate, in the *Deipnosophistae*, διὰ τρυφὴν occurs frequently in passages we would define as clearly introductory or transitional: 6. 255e (authority of Clearchus), 12. 518e–f (Timaeus), 12. 522b (those who disagree with Timaeus), 12. 523f (Heracleides Ponticus), 12. 528c (Phylarchus), 12. 550d (Agatharchides), 12. 552f (Heracleides Ponticus). In contrast, the phrase seems to appear only once in what we might term the 'body' of a fragment: at 12. 536b, Athenaeus reports that Nymphis of Heracleia in his history of that city discussed the outrageous behavior at Byzantium of the Spartan king Pausanias. He includes a dedicatory inscription which Pausanias composed διὰ τὴν τρυφὴν καὶ ὑπερηφανίαν ἐπιλαθόμενος αὑτοῦ ('forgetting himself through *truphē* and arrogance'). This pattern is unsurprising if we recognize that in the Classical period the expression διὰ τρυφὴν is almost never used to give the cause of some action or event. Of directly transmitted authors, Plato notes that kings live haughtily διὰ τρυφάς (*Laws* 691a), and at *Pol.* 1295b17, Aristotle says that the children of the rich and successful, διὰ τὴν τρυφὴν, would not let themselves be ruled, even in school. On the other hand, the phrase becomes relatively much more common in the Roman period. Strabo is able to say that an invasion force was driven out (5. 1. 10) or that civil discord arose (10. 4. 16) διὰ τρυφὴν. Plutarch, Josephus and Dio Chrystotom have similar examples. Thus, the contours of the distrubution of the phrase διὰ τρυφὴν, both within Athenaeus' own work and within Greek literature generally, suggest that we should hesitate to affirm Clearchus' interest in Lydian τρυφή on the basis of this passage.

καὶ τέλος τὰς ψυχὰς ἀποθηλυνθέντες ἠλλάξαντο τὸν τῶν γυναικῶν βίον … (12. 515f)

And finally, becoming effeminate in their souls, they took up the life of women …

The occurrence of ἀποθηλύνειν is suspicious. Although a Clearchan origin might seem secure, since F 41 has συνεκθηλύνειν, the usage in both passages is probably anachronistic: θηλύνειν and its compounds become a regular part of the vocabulary of decadence in the Roman era, and in works of this period, their primary function is describing a moral process[25]. Earlier, the lexical group is rare and the moral dimension secondary[26]. Athenaeus is, then, the more likely source of this wording. Thus, the idea that Omphale's rise to power was due to a wide-spread 'effeminacy of soul' among the Lydians may well not be in the original[27].

In F 46 the Scythians go from τρυφή to outrageous violence to decline. This time, the details of their luxury are not spelled out; we hear only vaguely of the 'dress and way of life' (ἐσθής καὶ δίαιτα) of the Scythian rulers. Then comes the transition to the acts of ὕβρις:

τρυφήσαντες δὲ καὶ μάλιστα δὴ καὶ πρῶτοι πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τὸ τρυφᾶν ὁρμήσαντες εἰς τοῦτο προῆλθον ὕβρεως ὥστε πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς οὓς ἀφίκοιντο ἠκρωτηρίαζον τὰς ῥῖνας· (12. 524d)

Indulging especially in *truphē* and being first of all men to rush into *truphē,* they advanced to such a point of *hybris* that they cropped the noses of all the people they could reach.

Once again, we see the pertinent connection made in an expression (εἰς τοῦτο προῆλθον ὕβρεως ὥστε κτλ.) which we have found reasons to identify as one of

[25] Philo, for example, has ἐκθηλύνειν ten times, all referring to the idea of moral decay. *Som.* 2. 9 is especially instructive for its cluster of terms which are frequently found in Roman-era discussions of moral decline: εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι μὲν τῆς μαλακωτέρας καὶ τρυφερᾶς διαίτης, τὸν πλείω χρόνον ἐν γυναικωνίτιδι καὶ τοῖς γυναικωνίτιδος ἐκτεθηλυμμένοις ἔθεσιν ἀπ' αὐτῶν σπαργάνων ἀνατραφέντες ('These are people of a way of life softer and marked by *truphē,* raised from the crib in the woman's chamber and in its effeminized customs'.).

[26] At Xenophon *Oec.* 4. 2, the bodies of certain craftsmen are 'effeminized' (τῶν σωμάτων θηλυνομένων) due to being kept indoors by their jobs. It is noteworthy that Xenophon spells out the moral corollary: καὶ αἱ ψυχαὶ πολὺ ἀρρωστότεραι γίγνονται ('and their souls become much weaker'); from Philo's time, this addition would have been unnecessary. Perhaps the only solid example before Philo of -θηλύνειν with a primarily moral sense is at Euripides F 360. 28–9, τὰ μητέρων δὲ δάκρυ' ὅταν πέμπῃ τέκνα, / πολλοὺς ἐθήλυν' εἰς μάχην ὁρμωμένους ('Whenever mothers' tears escort their children, they effeminize many men setting off to battle'.).

[27] In fact, a few lines below, the text seems to consider Omphale's rule as the result of a different cause: 12. 515f, τὸ γὰρ ὑπὸ γυναικὸς ἄρχεσθαι ὑβριζομένους σημεῖόν ἐστι βίας ('For that they were ruled with impudence by a woman is a sign of violence'.).

Athenaeus' formulae for structuring parts of the *Deipnosophistae.* The presence of the word ἀκρωτηριάζειν in the sense of 'cut off' or 'mutilate' also gives us pause. As was the case for –λεαίνειν and ψίλωσις of F 48, if this word is genuinely Clearchan, the *Lives* would be the first attestation of ἀκρωτηριάζειν with this meaning[28]. Thus, we suggest that this sentence is a very loose paraphrase of the original with much added by the transmitting author, and its value as evidence for the belief on Clearchus' part that τρυφή begets ὕβρις is open to doubt.

F 47, concerning the ruin of Dionysius II of Syracuse, presents an unusually complicated problem for a student of Clearchus' view of τρυφή. Dionysius, it seems, raped a series of Locrian women, and, when he had fallen from power, the Locrians inflicted the same and worse on the women of the tyrant's family. The story is also preserved by Athenaeus' contemporary Aelian (*VH* 9. 8), and the two clearly rely ultimately on the same source. However, each version contains details the other lacks, suggesting that both are at least in part paraphrases. It is impossible to determine which is closer to the original in any given detail[29]. Nonetheless, it is important to note that the two passages differ in respect to the cause which brought Dionysius to his pathetic end. In Athenaeus, the tale is a warning against the effects of opulence:

> εὐλαβητέον οὖν τὴν καλουμένην τρυφὴν οὖσαν τῶν βίων
> ἀνατροπὴν ἁπάντων τε ὀλέθριον ἡγεῖσθαι τὴν ὕβριν (12. 541e)
>
> One must therefore beware of what is called *truphē,* since it
> overthrows lives; and outrageous violence should be considered
> the ruination of all.

Aelian (*VH* 9. 8) sees it another way: Dionysius died, πολλαῖς καὶ ποικίλαις χρησάμενος βίου μεταβολαῖς διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀπορίαν ("having experienced many and various changes in his way of life because of an overwhelming lack of resources"). Given that Aelian does not present these events as a process of moral decadence, perhaps the same was true of Clearchus.

---

[28] Herodotus (3. 59) and Xenophon (*Hell.* 6. 2. 36) each use the word once of cutting off *akroteria* of ships. Demosthenes is the first to extend the word: *Cor.* 296, ἠκρωτηριασμένοι τὰς … πατρίδας ('cutting the extremities from their fatherlands'); it is unclear in this case whether the author intends to personify the nations referred to, or if he is invoking the ship-of-state metaphor. The first example in a direct transmission of ἀκρωτηριάζειν with an animate object is Polybius 1. 80. 13, ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὰς χεῖρας ἀπέκοψαν, ἠκρωτηρίαζον τοὺς ταλαιπώρους ('when they had cut off their hands, they mutilated the wretches'). The relevant sense is well established in Philo, where it occurs half a dozen times. It appears also in Diodorus (13. 57. 3), Strabo (15. 1. 54, 16. 2. 31, 17. 1. 27), Plutarch (*Alc.* 18. 6, *Nic.* 13. 3, *Mor.* 479d), and others.

[29] Athenaeus often uses more elaborate diction than Aelian. For example, Athenaeus relates the sex between Dionysius and the Locrian women in this way: 12. 541d, καὶ γυμνὸς μετὰ γυμνῶν οὐδὲν αἰσχύνης παρέλιπεν ἐπὶ τοῦ στρώματος κυλινδούμενος ('and rolling naked upon the covers with the naked girls, he omitted no shameful act'); Aelian has καὶ συνῆν αὐταῖς ἀκολαστότατα ('and he had intercourse with them most licentiously').

F 49, although it does not contain the term ὕβρις, presents a progression from τρυφή to insulting violence to the downfall of the powerful. It is thus relevant to our investigation:

> Κλέαρχος δὲ ὁ Σολεὺς ἐν τετάρτῳ Βίων προειπὼν περὶ τῆς Μήδων τρυφῆς καὶ ὅτι διὰ ταύτην πολλοὺς εὐνουχίσαιεν τῶν περικτιόνων … (12. 514d)
>
> Clearchus of Soli in the fourth book of the *Lives* first talking about the *truphē* of the Medes and that because of this they made eunuchs of many of their neighbors …

A closer look at this passage stirs the usual misgivings: the verb εὐνουχίζειν is first attested in a direct transmission from the last decades of the first century CE[30]. It is relatively common in works of Athenaeus' contemporaries[31]. Of course, it is of little importance to the sense of the fragment that Athenaeus changed Clearchus' word for 'castrate'. However, if Athenaeus could make this adaptation, he could have added περὶ τῆς Μήδων τρυφῆς and διὰ ταύτην as well[32]. These phrases are key to the value of this fragment as a witness to the idea of pernicious luxury.

The passages we have examined represent the best evidence that an important theme in the Περὶ Βίων was the evolution from effeminate τρυφή to ὕβρις to catastrophe. In every instance we have argued that there is good cause to suspect that the form in which this process is articulated is not original to Clearchus. However, it remains possible *a priori* that the words are accurate paraphrases of the *Lives* and that Clearchus truly presented the effects of opulence as these fragments seem to indicate. We believe this is very unlikely. The idea that τρυφή could lead to ὕβρις in the way Clearchus seems to depict is as anachronistic as much of the language we have looked at: there is no solid evidence from the Classical period in support of this idea. We will close our paper with a very brief discussion of this matter.

In the fragments of the *Lives* as presented by others, the presence of τρυφή is taken as a sufficient explanation for the violent behavior of the subjects. No other contributing factor is described or suggested. The men of Tarentum, for example,

---

[30] Josephus *AJ* 10. 33; Plutarch *QC* 692c (ἐξευνουχίζειν).

[31] Galen has it fifteen times and Athenaeus' compatriot Clement of Alexandria seven. Athenaeus himself uses the verb in the introduction to a fragment of Xanthus. It is worth quoting the first few words: 12. 515d, Λυδοὶ δὲ εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦλθον τρυφῆς ὡς καὶ πρῶτοι γυναῖκας εὐνουχίσαι, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ξάνθος ὁ Λυδὸς ('The Lydians went to such an extent of *truphē* that they first made eunuchs out of women, as Xanthus the Lydian says'.). It would be rare for a sentence to show Athenaeus' fingerprints so clearly: the formulaic εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦλθον τρυφῆς ὡς …, and the indication that the subjects were the first to perform some outrageous act (cf. Clearchus' Tarentines, who were first to shave their bodies and his Scythians, who were first to 'throw themselves upon *truphē*'). In this context, it would be unreasonable not to recognize εὐνουχίσαι also as Athenaeus' own contribution.

[32] On περὶ τῆς Μήδων τρυφῆς as one of Athenaeus' set of introductory phrases, see 4. 144c, περὶ δὲ τῆς τρυφῆς τῶν ἐν Πέρσαις βασιλέων Ξενοφῶν ἐν 'Αγησιλάῳ οὕτω γράφει ('This is what Xenophon writes about the *truphē* of the Persian kings in the *Agesilaus*'.). Τρυφή and its cognates do not occur in that work.

shaved their bodies and wore effeminate clothing; as a result, they gathered the boys, girls and women of Carabina and raped them. Faced with this strange progression, modern scholarship has taken it as a compressed example of a paradigmatic pathology of decadence according to which τρυφή eventually gives rise to κόρος, which begets ὕβρις[33]. However, we cannot establish the existence of this pattern before the first century BCE[34].

One might object that the idea of decadence of this sort is already present in Solon and other archaic literature; the *locus classicus* is the well-known couplet:

> τίκτει γὰρ κόρος ὕβριν, ὅταν πολὺς ὄλβος ἕπηται
> ἀνθρώποις ὁπόσοις μὴ νόος ἄρτιος ᾖι (Solon F 6. 3–4)

> Excess breeds *hybris,* whenever great prosperity attends upon people whose minds are not right.

However, the parallelism between Clearchus' alleged line of thinking and the earlier pattern is specious. Fisher may be correct that the Clearchan fragments represent 'a reworking of the traditional pattern of the type "*koros-hybris-ate*"', but he neglects to note that the differences between original and imitation are as significant as the similarities. In the first place, Solon's focus is κόρος and ὕβρις manifested in the *acquisition* of wealth, not its enjoyment[35]. Clearchus' fragments, in contrast, show no

---

[33] Fisher (1992) 115.

[34] Clear elaborations of the τρυφή-κόρος-ὕβρις schema are in Philo Judaeus. For example, *Spec.* 3. 43, ἔνιοι τὰς Συβαριτῶν … ἐπιθυμίας ζηλώσαντες τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὀψοφαγίαις καὶ οἰνοφλυγίαις καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ταῖς γαστρὸς καὶ τῶν μετὰ γαστέρα ἡδοναῖς ἐνησκήθησαν, εἶτα δὲ κορεσθέντες ἐξύβρισαν – ὕβριν γὰρ κόρος γεννᾶν πέφυκεν –, ὡς … ἐπιμεμηνέναι μηκέτ' ἀνθρώποις εἴτ' ἄρρεσιν εἴτε θηλείαις ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλόγοις ζῴοις ('Some, rivaling the desires … of the Sybarites, first practiced fine eating and drunkenness and the other pleasures of the belly and the parts below the belly; then, satiated, they turned to violence, so that … they were madly in love no longer with humans, either male or female, but even with dumb animals'.); *Mos.* 2. 13 πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τρυφὴ πλεονάσασα χορηγίαις καὶ περιουσίαις ἀφθόνοις καθεῖλε νόμους, 'τὰ λίαν ἀγαθὰ' τῶν πολλῶν φέρειν οὐ δυναμένων, ἀλλὰ διὰ κόρον ἐξυβριζόντων· ὕβρις δ' ἀντίπαλον νόμῳ ('Often, too, *truphē,* growing abundant through unstinting supplies and resources, has destroyed the laws, since many people are unable to bear excessive good fortune but turn to violence because of surfeit. Violence is the enemy of law'.).

[35] This emphasis is clear, e.g., at F 13. 9–13, πλοῦτον δ' ὃν μὲν δῶσι θεοί, παραγίγνεται ἀνδρὶ / ἔμπεδος ἐκ νεάτου πυθμένος ἐς κορυφήν· / ὃν δ' ἄνδρες τιμῶσιν ὑφ' ὕβριος, οὐ κατὰ κόσμον / ἔρχεται, ἀλλ' ἀδίκοις ἔργμασι πειθόμενος / οὐκ ἐθέλων ἕπεται, ταχέως δ' ἀναμίσγεται ἄτηι ('Wealth which the gods give, remains securely established from the bottom to the top. But wealth which men honor with *hybris* arrives in disorder and remains in attendance unwillingly, persuaded by unjust deeds. Ruin quickly joins the company'.). F 13 ends (71–6) by pointing out that the desire for riches is unbounded and its consequences disastrous. Other relevant texts are at Frr. 4 and 5. Fisher (1992) does recognize the importance to Solon of the proper acquisition of wealth in his discussion of these passages: 69–82, esp. 81: 'Similarly he [Solon] was aware of the dangers of hybristic behaviour from any quarter, but for him, as for the fourth-century orators, *hybris* was especially the crime of the upper class, striving to increase their wealth and enjoy its fruits in contempt of the rights and honour of others'.

interest in how wealth was accumulated, but only in its use for pleasure: the Lydians build parks for the shade, the Scythians favor luxurious clothing and cuisine, and the Tarentines shave their bodies.

The second principal distinction between the Archaic *koros-hybris-ate* chain and decadence as apparent in the texts of Clearchus is the importance in the latter of effeminacy. All the Clearchan passages are alike in describing τρυφή in a way which highlights its power to make men womanish. It is in this state of advanced enervation that the subjects resort to the violence of ὕβρις. In Archaic criticism of the ὕβρις of the wealthy, on the other hand, effeminacy seems to play no significant role[36]. We cannot detail the evidence here, but will simply refer to the work of Leslie Kurke on Archaic ἁβροσύνη, a concept which was in many ways the forerunner of τρυφή. Kurke reaches two conclusions important in our present context: 1) for much of the Archaic period, luxury was not linked particularly closely with 'the world of women' or with effeminacy[37]; 2) connecting the luxury of ἁβροσύνη with tyranny and ὕβρις is a 'misreading' of the Archaic evidence[38]. If Kurke is correct, it is *a fortiori* most dubious to assume an early chain of causation joining luxury, effeminacy, satiety, and ὕβρις.

The same stricture applies to the evidence of the Classical period. Although a luxurious lifestyle certainly becomes the object of moral criticism in the 5th and 4th centuries, the pattern is not the same as the one revealed in the fragments of Clearchus. We may take Herodotus as our representative of 5th century thought, since that author is often cited as a strong believer in the idea of pernicious luxury as a historical force. Herodotus' criticism of opulence is two-pronged. On the one hand, the

---

[36] To take the example of Solon, unusually F 4. 9–10 connects κόρος and ὕβρις in a criticism of the enjoyment rather than the gaining of wealth; the leaders of the demos will suffer pain for their great ὕβρις: οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστανται κατέχειν κόρον οὐδὲ παρούσας εὐφροσύνας κοσμεῖν δαιτὸς ἐν ἡσυχίηι ('For they do not know how to restrain excess nor to put quietly in order the merriment of the present feast'.). Fisher (1992) believes that the missing lines following this text rebuked the rich for the 'extravagant, drunken and violent flaunting of their wealth at *symposia* and subsequent *komoi* through the streets' (p. 72). Fisher then connects displays of such 'sympotic and komastic *hybris*' (p. 72 n. 115) with the so-called Anacreontic vases' depiction of κῶμοι of cross-dressing Athenians (p. 206 n. 31). Following a line of analysis initiated by De Vries (1973), Kurke (1992) points out that the dress in question 'was not effeminate' (p. 98). In any case, when we can once again follow the thought of Solon F 4 after the lacuna, the focus is decidedly on ὕβρις in *obtaining* wealth: οὔθ' ἱερῶν κτεάνων οὔτε τι δημοσίων / φειδόμενοι κλέπτουσιν ἁφαρπαγῆι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος ('Sparing neither sacred nor public property, they steal greedily, one from one place, one from another'.).

[37] It is worth noting here that where Solon speaks clearly about the enjoyment of luxury, he expresses approval: F 24. 1–7, ἶσόν τοι πλουτέουσιν, ὅτωι πολὺς ἄργυρός ἐστι / καὶ χρυσὸς καὶ γῆς πυροφόρου πεδία / ἵπποι θ' ἡμίονοί τε, καὶ ὦι μόνα ταῦτα πάρεστι, / γαστρί τε καὶ πλευραῖς καὶ ποσὶν ἁβρὰ παθεῖν … ταῦτ' ἄφενος θνητοῖσι ('The two are equally rich. One has much silver and gold and fields of wheat-bearing earth and horses and mules. The other has only this: to enjoy fine things with his stomach, sides, and feet. … This is abundance for mortals'.). It is striking that the things Solon most appreciates – high-quality food and apparel – are just the items later most frequently criticized for their effeminizing effects.

[38] Kurke (1992) 98–101.

historian goes beyond Solon to find a source of ὕβρις in the possession (and presumably enjoyment) of wealth, not simply in its acquisition[39]. On the other hand, Herodotus may well hold that indulgence in luxury may cause effeminization: 'soft men naturally arise from soft lands' (9. 122. 3)[40].

But the two lines of criticism seem everywhere to be kept separate. Mardonius, for example, is the chief instigator and instrument of the main act of ὕβρις, which is Xerxes' invasion of Hellas. After the Battle of Plataea, the Spartan king Pausanias mocks the opulence of Mardonius' pavilion and mess (9. 82). Here, if anywhere in the *Histories,* we might expect to see the themes of ὕβρις and effeminacy joined. This is not the case; Herodotus singles out Mardonius not for his weakness, but for his manliness (9. 71. 1).

> Ἠρίστευσε δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων πεζὸς μὲν ὁ Περσέων, ἵππος δὲ ἡ Σακέων, ἀνὴρ δὲ λέγεται Μαρδόνιος.
>
> Among the barbarian infantry, the prize for valor went to the Persians, for horse to the Sacae. Mardonius is said to have been the bravest man.

The evidence of Herodotus, therefore, does not support the existence of a theory according to which luxury leads to ὕβρις by way of effeminacy and κόρος. Rather, when luxury seems to induce effeminacy, this very process apparently excludes ὕβρις on the part of the luxurious: Cyrus' 'soft men' (9. 122. 3), for example, are imagined as progressing not to the commission of acts of aggression, humiliation, and violence, but, on the contrary, to becoming the recipients of such acts. The proposed migration of Persians to 'soft lands' would lead to δουλεία, which as we can see from our discussion of Isocrates' evidence (below), is conceptually opposite to ὕβρις.

Fourth century examples in non-fragmentary works of τρυφή leading to violence and ὕβρις are rare, and, when they do occur, the process at work likewise bears little resemblance to that suggested for the Περὶ Βίων. In Plato's *Laws*, we read that the

---

[39] For example, in the Persian 'constitutional debate' in Book 3, Otanes objects to the ὕβρις inevitable in a monarchy: 3. 80. 3, κῶς δ' ἂν εἴη χρῆμα κατηρτημένον μουναρχίη, τῇ ἔξεστι ἀνευθύνῳ ποιέειν τὰ βούλεται; … 'Εγγίνεται μὲν γάρ οἱ ὕβρις ὑπὸ τῶν παρεόντων ἀγαθῶν ('How would monarchy be a sensible thing, since it can do whatever it wants without giving an account. … For *hybris* springs up from the presence of good things'.). Of course, by τὰ ἀγαθά Herodotus may mean primarily power or the like rather than a certain elevated level of dining or dress, but for the sake of argument we can stipulate that such luxuries are at least part of his reference.

[40] This is the usual interpretation of this passage, where Cyrus the Great responds to a request that he allow the Persians to dwell in richer lands: Κῦρος, δέ, ταῦτα ἀκούσας καὶ οὐ θωμάσας τὸν λόγον, ἐκέλευε ποιέειν ταῦτα, οὕτω δὲ αὐτοῖσι παραίνεε κελεύων παρασκευάζεσθαι ὡς οὐκέτι ἄρξοντας ἀλλ' ἀρξομένους· φιλέειν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν μαλακῶν χώρων μαλακοὺς ἄνδρας γίνεσθαι· οὐ γάρ τι τῆς αὐτῆς γῆς εἶναι καρπόν τε θωμαστὸν φύειν καὶ ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς τὰ πολέμια ('Hearing this, Cyrus was no admirer of the plan. He instructed them to go ahead, but he also advised them that they be prepared no longer to rule but to be ruled: soft men naturally arise from soft lands. It is not a property of the same land to grow a marvelous harvest and men good at the deeds of war'.).

Persian prince Cambyses was motivated by τρυφή when he killed his brother after Cyrus' death (695b); significantly, it was not τρυφή per se which spurred Cambyses to violence. Rather, it was the prospect that some limit might be imposed upon his life of indulgence which drove him to murder[41]. There is no inkling here of the idea of boredom or surfeit which is implicit in κόρος[42] or of the effeminacy supposed to be its cause.

Isocrates' criticism of Persian military failings in his *Panegyricus* is of great interest for our discussion. In sections 149–153, he focuses his attention on two Persian characteristics which should lead to their downfall: 'softness' or effeminacy (μαλακία) and a ὕβρις which is at least partially caused by τρυφή. This looks like a parallel to the Clearchan view. However, a closer examination of the *Panegyricus* passage surprisingly reveals that effeminacy and τρυφή are brought about by separate causes, although the explanation for both is found in the matrix of Persian social relationships. The Persians have no experience dealing with people as equal members of a community or as fellow citizens (151 οὐδὲ κοινῶς οὐδὲ πολιτικῶς οὐδεπώποτ' ἐβίωσαν). They scorn their social inferiors, striking an attitude of τρυφή and ὕβρις towards them. At the same time they abase themselves before their superiors, adopting a servile stance (151 εἰς μὲν τοὺς ὑβρίζοντες, τοῖς δὲ δουλεύοντες). The first of these contributes to the contempt which Persian generals show their friends and allies, the second to the cowardice and fear they show their enemies. Isocrates, then, does not present a single causal chain running from wealth and effeminacy to ὕβρις and destruction[43]. Nor does κόρος have a place, even implicitly, in his line of thinking.

The evidence we have discussed, however briefly, leads us to conclude that the progression from τρυφή to ὕβρις as depicted in the Clearchus fragments is an inno-

---

[41] *Laws* 695b, τῷ ἴσῳ ἀγανακτῶν ('angry at having an equal').

[42] Note that in Philo *Mos.* 2. 13 (above n. 34) it is a τρυφή oversupplied with its desires which engenders ὕβρις. This process is practically the opposite to that which affects Cambyses.

[43] *Paneg.* 151–152 Οἱ δ' ἐν ταῖς μεγίσταις δόξαις … ἅπαντα δὲ τὸν χρόνον διάγουσιν εἰς μὲν τοὺς ὑβρίζοντες, τοῖς δὲ δουλεύοντες, ὡς ἂν ἄνθρωποι μάλιστα τὰς φύσεις διαφθαρεῖεν, καὶ τὰ μὲν σώματα διὰ τοὺς πλούτους τρυφῶντες, τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς διὰ τὰς μοναρχίας ταπεινὰς καὶ περιδεεῖς ἔχοντες …. Τοιγαροῦν οἱ καταβαίνοντες αὐτῶν ἐπὶ θάλατταν, οὓς καλοῦσιν σατράπας, οὐ καταισχύνουσιν τὴν ἐκεῖ παίδευσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς ἤθεσι τοῖς αὐτοῖς διαμένουσιν, πρὸς μὲν τοὺς φίλους ἀπίστως, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἀνάνδρως ἔχοντες, καὶ τὰ μὲν ταπεινῶς, τὰ δ' ὑπερηφάνως ζῶντες, τῶν μὲν συμμάχων καταφρονοῦντες, τοὺς δὲ πολεμίους θεραπεύοντες ('The Persian notables … spend all their time acting with *hybris* to some and acting as slaves to others, in a manner that is particularly destructive to human nature. And they characterize their bodies with *truphē* on account of their riches, while on account of their monarchy they have abased and timid souls.… And so those coming down to the sea, whom they call satraps, don't put their training to shame, but keep to the very same customs: they behave faithlessly toward their friends and with cowardice toward their enemies, living now abasedly, now overweeningly, scorning their allies, paying court to their foes'.). In this passage, note especially that from monarchy derive δουλεία, ταπεινότης, τὸ περιδεές, ἀνανδρία, and θεραπεία. Τρυφή, on the other hand, is aligned with ὕβρις, ἀπιστία, ὑπερφανία, and καταφρόνησις. Thus, the same person can exhibit both characteristics of effeminacy and ὕβρις, but Isocrates does not relate the two causally.

vation with respect to Archaic and Classical thinking about pernicious luxury. It is of course quite possible on the face of it that Clearchus' work presented a newer theory of decadence. In fact, scholars of Hellenistic historiography widely recognize an emphasis on pernicious luxury as a key element in the moralizing history of the period[44]. However this may be, we have undertaken an extensive study of the surviving fragments of these historians and can find little or no evidence which can securely establish the effeminacy/τρυφή-κόρος-ὕβρις chain in this period. As an example of the weakness of the evidence, we may return to a fragment of Phylarchus which we have already discussed.

In Phylarchus F 45 we are told of the remarkable τρυφή of the Sybarites and their subsequent ὕβρις and annihilation. More specifically, τρυφή is exemplified by a law passed in Sybaris, according to which the women of the city should be given a year's notice of public celebrations, so that they could be ready to appear in appropriate finery. The Sybarite ὕβρις is illustrated by their murder of a group of Crotoniate ambassadors, whose bodies they threw outside the city walls for the beasts to eat (Athen. 12. 521c–e). On its face, this fragment seems to offer a good parallel to the Clearchus fragment: although Phylarchus does not explicitly attribute effeminacy to the Sybarites, the 'world of women' is integrally associated with their τρυφή; likewise, the Sybarites' savagery against Croton is reminiscent of the rapes and mutilations carried out by the Clearchan Lydians, Scythians, and Tarentines. When we look closer, however, we find that the Phylarchus fragment does not clearly support a third century date for the train of thought apparent in the Clearchus. In brief, both the characterization of the Sybarite legislation as an instance of τρυφή and the connection of their luxurious behavior with the violence against the ambassadors are presented in a formula which we have already identified as a favorite of Athenaeus[45].

Given the likelihood that the relevant wording belongs not to Phylarchus, but to the Athenaean 'cover-text', it is unsafe to assume that the historian had recourse to the concept of τρυφή to explain the murder which provoked Sybaris' destruction at the hands of the Crotoniates. What's more, since it seems to have been Athenaeus who formulated the transition between the topics of luxury and ὕβρις, we cannot be confident that Phylarchus drew any kind of causal link here between lifestyle and the workings of history. In any case, with respect to the effeminacy/τρυφή-κόρος-ὕβρις progression, Phylarchus F 45 turns out to be of little evidentiary value.

---

[44] The classic statement is A. Passerini (1934). Most recently see Bollansée (2008) on the supposed similarity between Clearchus' view and 'a number of aspects connected with τρυφή in historical treatises' (408, with pertinent bibliography at n. 33).

[45] 12. 521c Συβαρῖται, φησίν, ἐξοκείλαντες εἰς τρυφὴν ἔγραψαν νόμον ('the Sybarites, he says, running aground on *truphē*, wrote a law'); 12. 521d, πάνυ οὖν ἐξοκείλαντες εἰς ὕβριν τὸ τελευταῖον παρὰ Κροτωνιατῶν λ' πρεσβευτῶν ἡκόντων ἅπαντας αὐτοὺς ἀπέκτειναν ('so, running aground on *hybris,* in the end, when thirty ambassadors came from Croton, they killed them all'.).

Similar objections can be brought against all evidence known to us which dates from before the Roman era[46]. In contrast, the line of thought in question is clearly attested from the first century BCE. It occurs, apparently without the need for explanation, in the geographical verses of Pseudo-Scymnus (c. 90 BCE)

> Λέγεται γὰρ αὐτοὺς μήτε τοῖς νόμοις ἔτι
> τοῖς τοῦ Ζαλεύκου τἀκόλουθα συντελεῖν,
> τρυφὴν δὲ καὶ ῥᾴθυμον ἑλομένους βίον
> χρόνῳ προελθεῖν εἰς ὕβριν τε καὶ κόρον
> (*Ad Nic. reg.* 346–349)

> It is said that they did not fulfill the measures in accord with the laws of Zaleucus, but, choosing τρυφή and the careless life, in time they advanced into *hybris* and satiety.

Philo, for example, has the idea at *Arg.* 48. 2, *Mos.* 2. 13, and *Prov.* 2. 12[47]; Plutarch, in turn, reflects it in a striking characterization of Alcibiades' lifestyle.

> Ἐν δὲ τοῖς τοιούτοις πολιτεύμασι καὶ λόγοις καὶ φρονήματι καὶ δεινότητι πολλὴν αὖ πάλιν τὴν τρυφὴν τῆς διαίτης καὶ περὶ πότους καὶ ἔρωτας ὑβρίσματα, καὶ θηλύτητας ἐσθήτων ἁλουργῶν ἑλκομένων δι' ἀγορᾶς (*Alc.* 16. 1)

---

[46] For example, Flower (1994) argues that Theopompus' most significant impact on subsequent historiography was his 'interest in luxury (τρυφή) as an explanation of historical change' (p. 166). Nonetheless, it is difficult to find reliable evidence that Theopompus also saw a link between τρυφή and ὕβρις like that evident in the Clearchus passages. Consider F 31 (Athen. 12. 531e–532a), where we are told about the Thracian king Cotys. Most dedicated to a life of pleasure, Cotys eventually committed mad acts of insulting violence (certainly ὕβρις, though the word does not appear). If we examine this text carefully, we find that the language which makes the causal connection between opulence and violence may be best taken as part of the cover text: Cotys' τρυφή is introduced with the πρὸς ἡδυπαθείας καὶ τρυφὰς ὥρμησε ('he set out toward indulgence in pleasures and τρυφαί'); this metaphorical use of ὁρμάω – to set out toward drunkenness, or τρυφή or αἱ ἀφροδισίοι ἡδοναί vel sim. – is a favorite expression of Athenaeus. In addition, the description of the behavior which constituted Cotys' τρυφαί contains at least one term (ἑστιατόριον) hardly attested before the first century BCE. Skepticism about the Theopompan origin here of a τρυφή-ὕβρις scheme is therefore in order, and, in any case, the process of decadence described in this fragment contains no hint of effeminacy: Cotys built parks in order to hold sacrifices and feasts, and at one such he blasphemed against Athena, claiming he was going to have her as his wife. Those of his attendants who were not clever enough to play along with his delusion, Cotys shot and killed. The Thracian king's violence is obviously associated with a kind of hypermasculinity – he was man enough to sleep with Athena – nor does the passage explicitly connect the acts of building the parks with any effeminate behavior.

[47] *Mos.* 2. 13 may stand as the example here: πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τρυφὴ πλεονάσασα χορηγίαις καὶ περιουσίαις ἀφθόνοις καθεῖλε νόμους, 'τὰ λίαν ἀγαθὰ' τῶν πολλῶν φέρειν οὐ δυναμένων, ἀλλὰ διὰ κόρον ἐξυβριζόντων ('often *truphē,* becoming excessive through its resources and unstinted surpluses, has destroyed the laws; most people are not able to endure "excessive good fortune", but commit *hybris* because of satiety'.). Admittedly, in this passage (as in the pseudo-Scymnus), τρυφή is not specified in a way which makes clear its connection with effeminacy. However, such a connection is clear elsewhere in Philo; for example, *De somniis* 2. 9, εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι μὲν τῆς μαλακωτέρας καὶ τρυφερᾶς διαίτης, τὸν πλείω χρόνον ἐν γυναικωνίτιδι καὶ τοῖς γυναικωνίτιδος ἐκτεθηλυμμένοις ἔθεσιν ἀπ' αὐτῶν σπαργάνων ἀνατραφέντες ('These are people of a lifestyle softer and marked by *truphē;* from the cradle they were raised for the greater part of their time in the women's quarters and in the effeminized customs of the women's rooms'.).

> But among his policies and his speeches and his cleverness and his forcefulness [they saw] in contrast much *truphē* of life and acts of *hybris* at parties and in love-affairs, and acts of effeminacy when he dragged his purple gowns through the market-places.

Furthermore, the links between τρυφή and ὕβρις on the one hand and between τρυφή and effeminacy on the other become common at this time[48]. It is not safe to assume that this phenomenon is merely due to the chance preservation of evidence[49]. Thus, the last century BCE and the first centuries CE constitute a much more plausible matrix for the development of the 'Clearchan' idea of pernicious luxury than does Clearchus' own era[50].

Accordingly, it is best to be as circumspect with the content of these fragments as with their form. The idea that pernicious luxury could stimulate those who enjoy it to acts of extreme violence is well attested in Athenaeus' own period. On the other hand, if we accept the evidence of the *Lives* as Athenaeus transmits it, Clearchus would be the first attested exponent of this view. Furthermore, if we assume that these fragments include much verbatim material, Clearchus would have originated this paradigm of historical analysis using many of Athenaeus' favorite turns of phrase and an outré diction including the first occurrence of certain words and expressions that would become unremarkable by the second century CE.

It is therefore our conclusion that in evaluating the significance of the idea of pernicious luxury in Clearchus' *Lives* it is important to recognize the strong possibility that much of our evidence for both language and thought may not accurately reflect the original. In addition, we believe that our arguments show that the state of scholarly understanding of the accuracy of prose fragments in Athenaeus would benefit from a more thorough study of that author's diction[51]. Particularly advantageous would be a

---

[48] E.g., τρυφή with ὕβρις: D. S. 13. 58, 17. 108; Dion. Hal. 7. 55; Strabo 6. 1. 13; Plut. *Thes.* 10. 1, *Lyc.* 8. 1, *Alc.* 23. 8, *Ant.* 9. 9; Dio Chr. 3. 40, 12. 36, 33. 22. Effeminacy and τρυφή: D. S. 2. 23–24 *passim* (on Sardanapallus), 4. 4. 2, 9. 1. 4; Philo *De somniis* 1. 123, 2. 240; Strabo 5. 4. 3; Plut. *Pel.* 1. 6, *Cato Mai.* 16. 7, *Marius* 34. 3.

[49] From before the Roman era there are many hundreds of passages which may serve as evidence for the denotation and application of ὕβρις or τρυφή. If Clearchus' fragments did offer a traditional idea of decadence, this would be ample material to establish that fact.

[50] When considering the causal nexus of τρυφή and ὕβρις, it is worth noting as well that the cause-effect relationships which are presented in 5th and 4th century sources do not show up in Clearchus. There is no sign, for example, that violence was provoked by any attempt to limit a subject's τρυφή, as we have seen in Plato. Nor does Clearchus seem to follow Isocrates by showing interest in the internal political circumstances in which τρυφή might become a catalyst for violence, although, with the Isocrates passage in mind, it is interesting to observe that, according to F 46, the Scythians, before they turned to τρυφή, enjoyed νόμοις κοινοῖς. If there was any further elaboration in Clearchus of the political dimension of the events related, it has been effaced.

[51] As matters stand, studies of prose fragments drawn from Athenaeus too frequently assume that they are dealing with the original authors' words. To cite only one very recent example, Schütrumpf (2009) presumes without further discussion that the expression καθ' ὑπερβολὴν τρυφήσαντας at Athenaeus 12. 526a comes verbatim from Heraclides Ponticus; the focus of Schütrumpf's argument is whether the phrase καθ' ὑπερβολὴν need be an instance of Heraclides using 'Aristotelian terminology' (71 n. 13). We observe only that the

series of comparisons in this regard of the fragments of a given author as preserved in Athenaeus with those transmitted elsewhere. In the meantime, relying on the evidence of the *Deipnosophistae* to make firm claims about the moralizing stance taken in fragmentary works is extremely dubious[52].

Bibliography

Ambaglio, D., I Deipnosofisti di Ateneo e la tradizione storica frammentaria, Athenaeum 78 (1990) 51–64.
Bollansée, J., Clearchus' Treatise *On Modes of Life* and the Theme of *Tryphè,* Ktema 33 (2008) 403–11.
De Vries, K., East Meets West at Dinner, Expedition 15 (1973) 32–9.
Fisher, N., Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honor and Shame in Ancient Greece, Warminster 1992.
Flower, M., Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC, Oxford 1994.
Gorman, R. J./V. B. Gorman, The *Truphē* of the Sybarites: A Historiographical Problem in Athenaeus, JHS 127 (2007) 38–60.
Kurke, L., The Politics of ἁβροσύνη in Archaic Greece, ClAnt 11 (1992) 91–119.
Lenfant, D., Les «fragments» d'Hérodote dans les *Deipnosophistes*, in D. Lenfant, ed., Athénée et les fragments d'historiens, Paris 2007, 43–72.
Nenci, G., Un nuovo frammento di Clearco sulla TRYPHE Iapigia (Athen. 12, 522f–523b), Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa 19. 3 (1989) 893–901.
Passerini, A., La τρυφή nella storiografia ellenistica, SIFC n. s. 11 (1934) 35–56.
Pelling, C., Fun with Fragments: Athenaeus and the Historians, in D. Braund & J. Wilkins, edd., Athenaeus and His World, Exeter 2000, 171–90.
Schütrumpf, E., Heraclides, *On Pleasure,* in W. Fortenbaugh and E. Pender, edd., Heraclides of Pontus, New Brunswick (2009) 69–91.
Tsitsiridis, S., Die Schrift Περὶ Βίων des Klearchos von Soloi, Philologus 152 (2008) 65–76.
Wilkins, J., Athenaeus the Navigator, JHS 128 (2008) 132–52.

University of Nebraska – Lincoln
Classics and Religious Studies
History
Lincoln, NE 68588-0337
U.S.A

Abstract

Current scholarship on Clearchus' *Lives* emphasizes a moralizing historiographical schema of pernicious luxury, in which *truphē* leads to *koros*, then to *hybris*, and finally to destruction. Yet all the fragments used to construct this theory are preserved in one late source, the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus. A study of the

words in question come from an introductory passage, Ἡρακλείδης δ' ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἡδονῆς Σαμίους φησὶ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν τρυφήσαντας ('Heraclides Ponticus says in the *On Pleasure* that the Samians, giving themselves excessively to *truphē* …') and that καθ' ὑπερβολὴν is common enough in Athenaeus.

[52] Bollansée (2008), in spite of a discussion of the complex relationship between cover-text and fragment, feels able to identify what Clearchus had in mind when recounting 'these tales of sumptuous living, lust and moderation'; namely, 'that τρυφή is a dissipated mode of life which is bound to lead to ruin' (406).

diction and immediate context of these so-called fragments demonstrates that the moral themes are presented in language that is far more likely to originate in the cover text rather than in the *Lives*. Furthermore, this moralizing schema that binds together acts both effeminate and hybristic – as if the one followed naturally from the other – cannot be found securely attested elsewhere in Greek thought before the Roman Era. Thus we argue that, based on the evidence that survives, it is anachronistic to suggest that Clearchus espoused this principle. In addition, those who study Hellenistic fragments need to scrutinize more carefully the exact phrasing and framework of the *Deipnosophistae*, and be more wary about Athenaeus' attribution of contemporary values to his sources.

Keywords: Clearchus, Athenaeus, luxury, truphē, hybris