

## MISZELLEN

EUPOLIS, FR. 245 K.-A. (*POLEIS*)

Τήνος αὔτη,  
πολλοὺς ἔχουσα σκορπίους ἔχεις τε συκοφάντας

Understanding of this fragment, in which a character remarks on the arrival of a member of the chorus who represents the city of Tenos, has undergone a curious retrogression since the start of the millennium. Ian Storey translates, “She is Tenos, with many scorpions, and you have informers”, commenting on the ‘awkward’ repetition of ἔχειν.<sup>1</sup> More recently, Douglas Olson, dividing the text between two speakers, gives the following translation: “(A.) This is Tenos. (B.) You’ve got a lot of scorpions – and informers, too!”<sup>2</sup> Olson also notes that, unlike this fragment, fr. 246 K.-A., which is from the same scene, is “addressed to the audience in the theatre” (96). That is, the two most recent commentators on these lines take ἔχεις to be a form of the verb ἔχειν.

It is, however, as certain as such things can be that ἔχεις is here the accusative plural of ἔχις, viper.<sup>3</sup> This, at any rate, is how the source of the fragment, Σ Ar. Pl. 718, understood the word; for, immediately after quoting our fragment, the Venetian manuscript continues: καὶ Αντίμαχος [= frag. 91 Matthews] Τήνου τ’ ὀφιοέσσης. We find the same comparison of the sycophant to a scorpion or a viper in the first speech *Against Aristogeiton* in the Demosthenic corpus: πορεύεται διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς, ὡσπερ ἔχις ἢ σκορπίος.<sup>4</sup> And, in Aristophanes’ *Plutus*, when the Honest Man is harassed by the Sycophant, he protects himself by holding up a ring which he claims (884) to have purchased for a drachma from Eudamus, who, the scholia inform us, was mentioned also in Eupolis’ *Baptai* (fr. 96 K.-A.) and whose rings were supposed to have protected the wearer against evil spirits, serpents and the like: πρὸς δαίμονα καὶ ὄφεις καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα.

1) I. C. Storey, *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford 2003) 22 and 229. Wilamowitz was also uncomfortable with ἔχεις, which he proposed replacing with πολλοῦς, but he neglected to share with his readers either the reason for his discomfort or the way he construed the manuscript text: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aus Kydathen, Philologische Untersuchungen 1* (Berlin 1880) 73. I should like to thank the Editor for helpful suggestions that have served to improve this note.

2) S. D. Olson, *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy* (Oxford 2007) 426.

3) For the form, see Arist. HA 594a10; Thphr. Char. 1,7; HP 9,11,1; CP 4,9,2.

4) [Dem.] 25,52. The subject of the verb is Aristogeiton, who is repeatedly and explicitly referred to as a sycophant elsewhere in the speech (e. g. 45, 46 and especially 96, where the comparison with a viper is repeated: συκοφάντην καὶ πικρὸν καὶ ἔχιν τὴν φύσιν ἀνθρώπων); cf. M. R. Christ, *The Litigious Athenian* (Baltimore / London 1998) 56–59. For the authenticity of the speech, see (in favor) L. Rubinstein, *Litigation and Cooperation: Supporting Speakers in the Courts of Classical Athens* (Stuttgart 2000) 30–32.

What is surprising is that all of this was known to scholars up until only a few years ago. Indeed, Σ Ar. Pl. 718, [Dem.] 25,52 and Ar. Plut. 883sq. are all cited in the apparatus to their edition of this fragment in volume 5 of Kassel and Austin's *Poetae Comici Graeci*, published in 1986. And J.M. Edmonds was well aware of the truth of the matter, translating the fragment: "And this is Tenos, notable for scorpions and sneak-vipers."<sup>5</sup> Further, Douglas Olson himself and Colin Austin, in their commentary to Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousae* 529–30 (ὕπὸ λίθῳ γὰρ / παντί που χρῆ μὴ δάκη ῥήτωρ ἀθρεῖν), have the following note: "Here 'orator' appears *para prosdokiam* for 'scorpion,' just as 'sycophants' is attached to 'scorpions and snakes' at Eup. fr. 245!"

The only question that remains (which I have not seen addressed in the literature) is that of the relationship between *συκοφάντας* on the one hand and *σκορπίους ἔχεις τε* on the other. Now, either *συκοφάντας* is the final word of a sentence or it is not. If it is, it can only stand in apposition to *σκορπίους ἔχεις τε* or to *ἔχεις* alone, which appears to have been how Edmonds understood the construction, as his translation "sneak-vipers" suggests. This seems odd and pointless and, if this is what Eupolis had intended to convey, he could more creatively have made up some comic compound, like Aristophanes' ὄρθροφίτοσυκοφάντοδικοταλαιπώρων (*Wasps* 505). But if the sentence continues beyond *συκοφάντας* – Kassel and Austin print the fragment as above, with no final punctuation, according to their normal practice –, there is no place for a postpositive connective, as this is the end of the catalectic tetrameter line.

I should like to propose, therefore, that *συκοφάντας* must be the start of a second speaker's utterance, which continued in the following line with *λέγεις*, vel sim. Elsewhere in comedy one character glosses another's words with *λέγει* or *λέγεις*: Aristophanes, *Plutus* 922 and 992; Menander, *Dyscolus* 116–17; Alexis, fr. 228; Nausicrates, fr. 1,5 and 11; Timocles, fr. 38 K.-A.<sup>6</sup> Closest to what is suggested here are Antiphanes, fr. 249 K.-A.:

(A.) ἐν νόσημα τοῦτ' ἔχει·  
αἰεὶ γὰρ ὀξύπεινός ἐστι. (B.) Θετταλὸν  
λέγει κομιδῆ τὸν ἀνδρα

and Alexis, fr. 223,10–12 K.-A.:

(A.) ἄρτος καθαρὸς εἰς ἑκατέρῳ, ποτήριον  
ὔδατος· τοσαῦτα ταῦτα. (B.) δεσμοτηρίου  
λέγεις διαίταν.

The omission of marks indicating change of speaker is not at all uncommon in the surviving manuscripts of Greek drama;<sup>7</sup> reliability in the indirect tradition must have been even more questionable. Thus it would not be surprising if the source of

5) J.M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, vol. 1 (Leiden 1957), frag. 231.

6) See also Headlam and Knox (W. Headlam and A. D. Knox [eds.], *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments* [Cambridge 1922]) on Herodas 6,95; A. Oguse, *Sur une édition récente du Dyscolos de Ménandre*, *REA* 67 (1965) 131–32; W. G. Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments, A Commentary* (Cambridge 1996) 638–39, on frag. 223,11–12 K.-A.

7) See J. C. B. Lowe, *The Manuscript Evidence for Changes of Speaker in Aristophanes*, *BICS* 9 (1962) 27–42, who notes, "Omissions are too common to need illustration, not only in the careless Ravennas but also in the Venetus, as in the Mediceus of Aeschylus and in much earlier papyri" (38).

the scholion that preserves our fragment simply continued the quotation to the end of the line, in ignorance of the fact that the last word of the line belonged to a new speaker. In similar fashion, for example, the *Suda* (τ 648) quotes Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae 868, (KH.) Τί οὖν ἐτι ζῶ; (ΓΥ. Β') Τὼν κοράκων πονηρία, as if it were the uninterrupted utterance of a single speaker.

In our passage, then, the first speaker is making a literal statement about the presence of vipers and scorpions in Tenos, which the other speaker, a *bomolochos*, converts into political criticism.<sup>8</sup> Tenos was in fact noted as being θηριώδης.<sup>9</sup> And we can be certain that this scene, like that in Aristophanes' *Birds* in which the entrance of individually characterized chorus-members is similarly described from the stage (267–326), involved more than one actor.<sup>10</sup> Fragments 246 and 247 K.-A., in which chorus-members representing Chios and Cyzicus are introduced and which manifestly derive from the same scene, are printed by Kassel and Austin without indications of change of speaker. But in the case of all three fragments, the introduction of the chorus-member begins mid-line and, in the case of fragments 246 and 247, convincing proposals have been made to divide them between two speakers. For the former, see the apparatus criticus to Kassel and Austin's edition. The latter has been subject to various suggestions for division;<sup>11</sup> the decisive point was raised by Olson, that τοῖνυν in line 2 "marks this as a comment that responds to Speaker B's remark (Denniston 572–3)".<sup>12</sup> As Denniston elsewhere (569) notes, "All the 80 Aristophanic examples [of τοῖνυν] occur near the opening of an answer", so it would appear that comedy avoided the use of this particle to mark a progression within one speaker's argument.<sup>13</sup> Our fragment, therefore, like the other two, is part of a dialogue in which one character asks another to identify each of the entering chorus-members in turn and then comments on the answers that he is given. I suggest that it be printed, then, as follows:

(A.) (x—υ—x—υ—x—υ;) (B.) Τῆνος αὐτή,  
πολλοὺς ἔχουσα σκορπίους ἔχεις τε. (A.) συκοφάντας  
(λέγεις)

Urbana

David Sansone

8) Storey (above, n. 1) 22 and 229 had earlier suggested that the line be divided between a "straight man" and a *bomolochos*, to whom he assigned ἔχεις τε συκοφάντας, "and you have informers". The passages cited above, in which sycophants are identified with serpents and scorpions, suggest that it is appropriate to supplement the fragment in the way proposed here, rather than that "sycophants" was intended as yet a third item in the catalogue of Tenos' fauna.

9) For the evidence, see V.J. Matthews, *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary* (Leiden / New York / Cologne 1996) 254.

10) See Olson (above, n. 2) 95–96; Storey (above, n. 1) 228–229.

11) In addition to Kassel and Austin's apparatus, see Storey (above, n. 1) 228–229 and V. Tammaro, *Note eupolidee*, *Museum Criticum* 25–28 (1990–93) 123–38, at 131–33.

12) Olson (above, n. 2) 97, referring to J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954). For τοῖνυν more generally, see van Ophuijsen, in: C. M. J. Sicking / J. M. van Ophuijsen, *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage: Lysias and Plato* (Leiden / New York / Cologne 1993) 152–64.

13) According to Denniston (above, n. 12) 569, the "logical" use of the particle in "continuous speech" is "entirely absent from drama".