

SOME PASSAGES IN ARISTOPHANES

Pax 66–67:

ἄ δ'εἶπε πρῶτον ἡνίκ' ἦρχεθ' ἢ χολή,
πεύσεσθ' κτλ.

ἦρχετο: Is this from ἄρχομαι or ἔρχομαι? Commentators tend to be silent on this question and the translators are ambiguous. Thus, for instance, Sommerstein¹: "... what he said first when the bile came over him" and similarly Henderson²: "... what he said when the bile first came over him". (This latter version seems to interpret πρῶτον correctly, as going with ἦρχετο, not with εἶπε.) Note also a scholium to v. 65 (τὸ γὰρ παράδειγμα τῶν μανιῶν ἀκούετε): λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐνικῶς «ἢ μανία μ' ἐπέρχεται», ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον δὲ πληθυντικῶς, where ἐπέρχεται in the unidentified quotation may suggest that ἦρχεται in v. 66 was interpreted as a form of ἔρχομαι (?). While many will require no assistance in identifying the correct verb, decades of teaching Greek prose composition convince me that not a few will need to be reminded both what the form is and why it must be so. W. G. Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus* (London 1881) 103 observed: "Nothing can better illustrate the precision of Attic Greek than the consideration of the Greek equivalent of the English verb 'to go'. Whether simple or compounded with a preposition, εἶμι had consistently a future signification. The present indicative was ἔρχομαι, but ἔρχομαι did no more than fill the blank left by the preoccupation of εἶμι. There was no ἔρχομαι, ἐρχοίμην, ἔρχου, ἔρχεσθαι, ἐρχόμενος, and no imperfect ἤρχομην". Rutherford, 106 ff., discusses five real or supposed exceptions to this rule – all of them compound verbs be it noted. See further Kühner-Blass II 429–30. The one certain exception in Attic is the compound verb ὑπέρχομαι which, in the sense 'fawn upon', is not restricted to the present indicative but may be used in the imper-

1) Alan H. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes: Peace* (Warminster 1990).

2) Jeffrey Henderson, *Aristophanes: Clouds, Wasps, Peace* (Cambridge, MA 1998).

fect, present participle and all the present moods. See J. Burnet's excellent note in *Plato: Crito* (Oxford 1924) 53E4. In Aristophanes the form ἐπερχομένῳ occurs at *Nu.* 311 in a choral stanza of lyric dactyls (and thus is no true exception to Attic usage), and the compound περιήρχετο is found at *Thesm.* 504, where it has often been pronounced corrupt and conjectured away. Rutherford 108 suspected a case of tragic diction. Be that as it may, normal Attic usage proves that the simplex ἤρχετο here must come from ἄρχομαι, not ἔρχομαι.

Pax 320:

ὥς κυκάτω καὶ πατείω πάντα καὶ ταραπέτω

ὥς : καὶ Blaydes

Platnauer (Oxford 1964) ad loc.: "The MSS ὥς followed by these third person imperatives gives an unparalleled construction, and Blaydes' καὶ (or his συγ-) may be right. Attempts to explain ὥς here as ἴσθ' ὥς will not do; for in such cases we find indicatives, generally futures . . . Commentators often confuse the issue by citing cases (1) in which ἴσθι or some other verb of knowing is expressed . . . (2) in which the ὥς is merely exclamatory . . .". Olsen in his excellent recent edition of the play³ does not seem to me to have entirely answered these objections: "ὥς κτλ.: An odd and elliptical construction, probably equivalent to (ἴσθι) ὥς [e. g. 237, 496; *Ach.* 333; *Nu.* 209; *Lys.* 32] ἡμῖν οὐ μελήσει εἰ κυκάῃ vel sim. (thus Paley). Blaydes' καὶ in place of d's ὥς (adopted by Platnauer) yields an easier text but seems paleographically unlikely." As Platnauer realized, the third-person imperatives are very odd indeed and Olson does not really address this difficulty. The nearest parallel (if it is a parallel) is the familiar οἴσθ' οὖν ὃ δράσον construction, for which see especially Kannicht⁴ on *Eur. Hel.* 315 and perhaps my *Greek Textual Criticism* (Cambridge 1969) 5–6. For the third-person imperative note especially *Eur. IT* 1203 οἴσθά νυν ἅ μοι γενέσθω. But in all these cases the οἴσθα is expressed and in none of them is there a ὥς. Blaydes' καὶ has the advantage not only of sense but of sound in a verse remarkable for its assonances and alliterations (καὶ [?])

3) S.D. Olson, *Aristophanes: Peace* (Oxford 1998).

4) Richard Kannicht, *Euripides: Helena* (Heidelberg 1969).

κυκ- ... καί ... καί; -τω ... -τω ... -τω; πατ- ... πάντ- ... ; -τα ... ταραττέτ-). While καί is not certain here, Olson was wrong to describe it as “paleographically unlikely”. καί and ὡς were often written with abbreviations that could be confused, the one with the other. Jaeger calls attention to the “Häufigkeit paläographischer Vertauschung von ὡς und καί”⁵. For some instances see e. g. Isoc. 16.28; Soph. OC 861; Ar. Ach. 19, in all of which passages ὡς and καί are found as variant readings. Presumably, in conjecturing καί, Blaydes was influenced in part by such considerations.

Pax 1195–96:

ἔπειτ' ἐπιφόρει τοὺς ἀμύλους καὶ τὰς κίχλας
καὶ τῶν λαγῶων πολλὰ καὶ τοὺς κολλάβους.

ἐπιφόρει Dobree : ἐπισφόρει R : ἐπεισόρει VΓ : ἐπέισφερε Ald. :
ἐπίφερε Blaydes

S. D. Olson in his edition (which see for further details on the readings of the MSS) has the following note: “ἐπιφόρει: ‘hear up’ . . ., i.e. on the tables once they have been cleaned. This is Dobree’s emendation of VΓρ’s unmetrical ἐπεισόρει (ἐπισ- R), emended by Triklinios to ἐπέισφερε (t Ald.), and is better than Blaydes’ slightly more violent ἐπίφερε (printed by Starkie and Platnauer), particularly since it is clear that at least some of this food is not, in fact, carried in to the hero’s guests (1305–11/12).” On this last point, it is equally true that much food was brought inside; see vv. 1207–08: ἴθι νῦν . . . εἴσιτε / ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ὡς τάχιστα. In fact, Platnauer preferred Blaydes’ ἐπίφερε precisely because ἐπιφόρει would mean ‘pile up’. He argues that “... the fact that ἐπιφορήματα = ‘dessert’ (i.e. the things brought in) does not justify our supposing that the verb ἐπιφορέω can also mean ‘bring in’.” Thus he desiderates ‘bring in’ as the sense required. Note also a scholium ad loc.: ἐπεισόρει] πρόσφερε, προστίθει. (For -φέρειν and -φορεῖν see Neil on Ar. Eq. vv. 294 and 1215.⁶) The reality is that both ἐπιφόρει and ἐπίφερε (the leading contenders) give adequate, and not necessarily contradictory, sense, since it was the custom to pile food on small tables and then bring the tables into the dining room. See Ar. Vesp. 1216

5) Werner Jaeger, *Hermes* 64 (1929) 39 = *Scripta Minora* (Rome 1960) II 24.

6) Robert Alexander Neil, *The Knights of Aristophanes* (Hildesheim 1966).

τὰς τραπέζας εἰσφέρειν with MacDowell's note ad loc.⁷ It does not follow that either ἐπιφέρει or ἐπίφερε must be the correct conjecture. Both fail to take into account a significant, albeit mechanical, consideration. Although the transmitted reading, ἐπεισφέρει, cannot be sound, because unmetrical, it seems clear that it conceals a verb with double compound (ἐπεισ-). That ἐπι- (as in ἐπιφέρει and ἐπίφερε) could corrupt into the relatively uncommon ἐπεισ- is of course not impossible, but the reverse is surely far more likely (the preceding ἔπειτ' in v. 1195 notwithstanding). Note that Triklinios conjectured ἐπείσφερε (ἐπέσφερε Dindorf). But let us try a different approach.

There is a group of compound verbs from -φέρω (ἀπο-, δια-, εἰσ-, ἐκ-, ἐπεισ-, and other preverbs). The basic meaning of -φέρω seems to be 'bring', 'send', 'admit' and thus, in our passage, the compound ἐπεισφέρειν would mean 'bring in', 'bring on', 'introduce' the food. I therefore conjecture ἐπισφέρει (pres. imper.). The staging is a bit uncertain. (See above.) Most likely the slave is being instructed to 'bring in' the additional (ἐπεισ-) delicacies here mentioned and he accordingly goes inside with them. For this verb and its cognates see Kühner-Blass II 521–22 (s. v. πίφρημι); Mastronarde on Eur. Phoen. 264;⁸ and, especially, Barrett on Eur. Hippol. 866–67.⁹ These verbs are found in prose (e.g. Thucydides, Demosthenes, Xenophon), tragedy (Euripides, who has ἐπεισφέρειν four times and εἰσφέρω once), and comedy, including Aristophanes. The advantage of these forms is that, being uncommon, they are often confused with forms of φέρω and φορῶ and can explain problematic MS readings. Thus at Ar. Vesp. 162 Buttman's ἔκφρες is widely accepted for ἔκφερε of the MSS. (ἔκφερε gives a wrong sense here.) At Ar. Av. 193 most MSS have, correctly, διαφρήσετε, but διαφορήσετε and διαφορήσεται are variant readings. But perhaps the best parallel for our passage is Eur. Hippol. 867 where some MSS have ἐπεισφέρει and others ἐπιφέρει. J. U. Powell conjectured ἐπεισφερῆ,¹⁰ which has been accepted by Barrett (1964) and Diggle.¹¹ As Barrett neatly put it, "... when ἐπεισφερῆ became unintelligible, ἐπεισφέρει was the plain man's change, ἐπιφέρει the

7) Douglas M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes: Wasps* (Oxford 1971).

8) Donald J. Mastronarde, *Euripides: Phoenissae* (Cambridge 1994).

9) W. S. Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford 1964).

10) Reported in CR 17 (1903) 266.

11) J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae*, Tomus I (Oxford 1984).

metrician's; to read ἐπιφέρει would leave the variant ἐπεισφέρει a mystery, to read ἐπεισφέρει would embarrass the metre." It seems to me that, mutatis mutandis, we have much the same situation at Pax 1195.

Av. 178–80:

Πε. εἰδέεσ τι;
 Επ. τὰς νεφέλας γε καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν.
 Πε. οὐχ οὗτος οὖν δήπου ἴστιν ὀρνίθων πόλος;
 Επ. πόλος; τίνα τρόπον;

For some supplementary remarks on the history and meanings of πόλος beyond what Dunbar observes in her note ad loc.¹² see R. Renehan, *Aristotelian Explications and Emendations: II.*, CP 91 (1996) 228–231.

Av. 961:

ὦ δαιμόνιε, τὰ θεῖα μὴ φαύλως φέρε·

Dunbar ad loc.: “φαύλως φέρειν, ‘treat lightly, not take seriously’, is cited only here and E. IA 850, but cf. A. Pers. 520.” This is not quite accurate; add E. IA 897 . . . τὸ δ’ ἐμὸν οὐ φαύλως φέρω and Ar. fr. 674 K.-A. (ap. Eustath. in Il. 1357.1): φαύλως τὸ ἀπλῶς καὶ ἡσυχῇ. Ἀριστοφάνης· φαύλως φέρει νῦν τὸ κακόν.

Av. 1097–98:

χειμάζω δ’ ἐν κοίλοις ἄντροις
 νύμφαις οὐρανεῖαις συμπαίζων·

The bird chorus is singing. Dunbar remarks: “The key-note of the stanza is struck by the opening εὔδαιμον φύλον πτηνῶν οἰωνῶν: unlike mankind, it is implied, birds do not have to suffer from the extremes of temperature at different seasons . . . Ar. was clearly unaware of the havoc caused by a severe winter on the smallest species (1097–8n.). ” (Dunbar, note to vv. 1088–1101.) From a comic fan-

12) Nan Dunbar, *Aristophanes: Birds* (Oxford 1995).

tasy emphasizing that birds have a pleasant existence during every season of the year one wonders whether it is a necessary inference that Aristophanes did not in fact know that in real life birds could be adversely affected by cold winter weather. Aristophanes' dramatic predecessor Aeschylus, at least, certainly knew better. See the herald's account of the hardships endured on campaign at Troy in *Ag.* 563–64:

χειμῶνα δ' εἰ λέγοι τις οἰωνοκτόνον,
οἶον παρεῖχ' ἄφερτον Ἰδαία χιῶν κτλ.

χειμῶνα ... οἰωνοκτόνον is a striking phrase; the epithet by itself tells a full tale. It is certain that Aristophanes knew the Aeschylean play, which he cites more than once in the *Frogs*.

Av. 1280–82:

πρὶν μὲν γὰρ οἰκίσσαι σε τήνδε τὴν πόλιν,
ἐλακωνομάνουν ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι τότε,
ἐκόμων, ἐπείνων κτλ.

ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι in v. 1281 seems to have caused some misunderstanding if one is to judge from various translations of the passage; Rogers:¹³ “All men had gone Laconian-mad.” Sommerstein:¹⁴ “All men were Spartan-mad.” Henderson:¹⁵ “All men were crazy about the Spartans.” Dunbar *ad loc.* observes: “ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι. From the rest of the speech it emerges that only Athenians are meant ...”. Correct enough, but it is clear from this very comment that she finds the use of ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι a bit curious. So too, for example, Sommerstein (*ad loc.*): “‘all men were Spartan-mad’: an exaggeration; in fact it was certain upper-class, anti-democratic circles of young men at Athens who tended to adopt Spartan habits and fashions in the late fifth century ...”. But (ἅ)παντες ἄνθρωποι is not an “exaggeration,” it is a colloquial idiom meaning ‘everybody’ and can be used of quite a small group just as the English

13) Benjamin Bickley Rogers, *The Birds of Aristophanes* (London 1930).

14) Alan H. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes: Birds* (Warminster 1987).

15) Jeffrey Henderson, *Aristophanes: Birds, Lysistrata, Women at the Thesmophoria* (Cambridge, MA 2000).

‘everybody’. See for instance Dem. 34.29 ... προσήκέν γε τοσούτο ... περιβόητον ποιεῖν ἐν τῷ ἐμπορίῳ, καὶ παρακαλεῖν πάντας ἀνθρώπους, πρῶτον δὲ τὸν παῖδα τὸν τούτου καὶ τὸν κοινωόν. This use should be strictly distinguished from the more literal, and common, sense of ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι = omnes homines, ‘all human beings’. For further discussion and more illustrative examples of the looser use that Aristophanes is employing here see R. Renehan, *Isocrates and Isaeus: Lesefrüchte*, CP 75 (1980) 247. The idiom is common in prose, despite the silence of the lexica and commentators; there is nothing unusual about it. (Note the similarly free use of πάντες below in v. 1286.)

A like confusion can be seen at Pax 914–15:

σωτήρ γὰρ ἅπασιν ἀν-
θρώποις γεγένησαι

Olson comments here “σωτήρ ... ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις: A somewhat more expansive claim than 866a ἔσωσα τοὺς Ἕλληνας”. Perhaps. But take ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις in the idiomatic sense ‘everybody’, as discussed above, and the claim is not a universal one. This has a bearing on the text at Pax 909–11 just above:

ἢ χρηστὸς ἀνὴρ πολί-
της ἐστὶν ἅπασιν ὅσ-
τις ἐστὶ τοιοῦτος

πολίτης : πολίταις Hermann

Hermann’s πολίταις has found some acceptance; it seems attractive to me. Olson objects: “Hermann’s πολίταις is unnecessary and sits awkwardly with the Chorus’ insistence in 914–15 that Tr. has benefited not just his fellow-citizens but all mankind.” The objection fails if ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις does not mean ‘all mankind’ here, as it need not.

Lys. 74–76:

μὰ Δί’ ἄλλ’ ἐπαναμείνωμεν ὀλίγου γ’ οὐνεκα
τάς τ’ ἐκ Βοιωτῶν τάς τε Πελοποννησίων
γυναῖκας ἐλθεῖν.

Henderson in his commentary to this play¹⁶ observes here: “ὀλίγου γ’ οὐνεκα: This phrase only here, cf. Nu. 843 ἀλλ’ ἐπανάμεινόν μ’ ὀλίγον ἐνταυθοῖ χρόνον”. The meaning is clear enough, ‘as far as a little (sc. while) goes’, ‘for a little while’. For this use of the preposition see LSJ s. v. ἔνεκα I. 2. While, strictly speaking, the phrase is not found elsewhere (?) (as Henderson remarks), there is, for all practical purposes, a second example in Aristotle, PA 689b5:

κέρκον δ’ ἔχει πάντα σχεδόν, οὐ μόνον τὰ ζωοτόκα ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ φυτόκα·
καὶ γὰρ ἂν μὴ μέγεθος αὐτοῖς ἔχον ἢ τοῦτο τὸ μόριον, ἀλλὰ σμικροῦ γ’
ἔνεκεν ἔχουσί τινα στόλον.

Context: Aristotle is talking about quadrupeds and noting that they all have a tail. “For even if this part be not large, they have a kind of appendage to a little extent at least.” Here the sense is local, not temporal, and the substantive is σμικροῦ, not its synonym ὀλίγου, and the preposition has the ordinary prose form ἔνεκεν, not the poetic form οὐνεκα. Nevertheless it is perfectly clear that both phrases are ultimately identical, down to the inclusion of a γ’. This is by no means the only passage where an ‘Attic’ author can illustrate Aristotle’s allegedly ‘koinē’ Greek – or vice versa.

In fact, this very passage of Aristophanes may help establish the text of the Aristotle passage, for the text has been questioned there. Bussemaker in the Didot edition¹⁷ and Bonitz, apparently independently (?), conjectured σημείου γ’ ἔνεκεν for σμικροῦ γ’ ἔνεκεν. This proposal has found wide acceptance. P. Louis in the Budé edition,¹⁸ L. Torraca in his Italian edition,¹⁹ and A. L. Peck in the Loeb edition²⁰ all print σημείου. Düring considered Bonitz’s restoration to be “evident”²¹ and Ross also accepted the conjecture.²² The reason for this widespread approval is that elsewhere Aristotle discusses rudimentary organs which are found “by way of a token (σημεῖον)”, “for a token”. See HA 502b23, 611a31; PA

16) Jeffrey Henderson, *Aristophanes: Lysistrata* (Oxford 1987).

17) U. C. Bussemaker, *Aristotelis opera omnia* (Paris 1854).

18) Pierre Louis, *Les parties des animaux* (Paris 2^e 1957).

19) Luigi Torraca, *Le parti degli animali* (Padova 1961).

20) A. L. Peck and E. S. Forster, *Aristotle: Parts of Animals, Movement of Animals, Progression of Animals* (Cambridge, MA 1968).

21) I. Düring, *Aristotle’s De Partibus Animalium* (Göteborg 1943) 194.

22) W. D. Ross, *Aristotle* (London 5th 1949) 127 n. 1.

669b29–30, 670b12. Although confusion of σημείου and σμικροῦ is not particularly easy paleographically, the proposal has a certain initial attraction. But closer inspection should give one serious pause. First, Aristotle almost always qualifies the phrase σημείου χάριν: HA 502b22–23 ὅσον σημείου χάριν; HA 611a31, PA 669b29–30 ὡσπερ σημείου χάριν. Secondly, Aristotle never inserts a γε in this expression. Thirdly, and most importantly, the preposition used is always χάριν, not ἔνεκεν. That all this has escaped the notice of scholars is clear from Bonitz's entry s. v. σημείον in his great *Index Aristotelicus* (Berlin 21870) 677b31–34: "... ὅσον (ὡσπερ) σημείου χάριν ... HA 502b23, 611a31. PA 669b29, 670b12 (inde σημείου χάριν PA 689b5 scribendum est pro σμικροῦ χάριν)." Bonitz's false attribution of the 'reading' σμικροῦ χάριν rather than σμικροῦ γ' ἔνεκεν at PA 689b5 is telling (wrong preposition, omission of γ') and serves to highlight the real differences between ὡσπερ / ὅσον σημείου χάριν on the one hand and σμικροῦ γ' ἔνεκεν on the other. If we then compare the true parallel, Ar. Lys. 74 ὀλίγου γ' οὐνεκα, it will be seen that there is every justification for restoring from the MSS the good idiom σμικροῦ γ' ἔνεκεν to Aristotle at PA 689b5.

Ran. 318–22:

- Ξα. τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖν', ᾧ δέσποθ'· οἱ μεμνημένοι
 ἐνταῦθά που παίζουσιν, οὓς ἔφραζε νῶν.
 ἄδουσι γοῦν τὸν Ἰακχον ὄνπερ δι' ἀγορᾶς.
 Δι. κάμοι δοκοῦσιν. ἤσυχίαν τοίνυν ἄγειν
 βέλτιστόν ἐστιν, ὡς ἂν εἰδῶμεν σαφῶς.

320 δι' ἀγορᾶς : διαγόρας v. l.

What to read in v. 320, δι' ἀγορᾶς or Διαγόρας? The controversy goes back to antiquity. We learn from the scholia that Apollodorus of Tarsus supported the former, Aristarchus the latter. Modern editors remain divided; thus, for example, among those favoring δι' ἀγορᾶς are Coulon,²³ Radermacher,²⁴ and Dover²⁵ while van

23) Victor Coulon and Hilaire van Daele, *Aristophane, Tome III: Les oiseaux – Lysistrata* (Paris 1958).

24) Ludwig Radermacher, *Aristophanes' 'Frösche'* (Graz 1967).

25) Kenneth Dover, *Aristophanes: Frogs* (Oxford 1997).

Leeuwen,²⁶ Hall and Geldart,²⁷ Stanford,²⁸ Sommerstein,²⁹ and Henderson³⁰ defend *Διαγόρας*. It is generally agreed that, if *Διαγόρας* is correct, there is some allusion to Diagoras of Melos, the well-known ‘atheist’ and lyric poet, who was reputed to have ridiculed, or otherwise acted impiously towards, the Eleusinian Mysteries. For details see Dunbar on Ar. Av. 1073 (where Diagoras is mentioned by Aristophanes).

Discussion of the reading to be adopted here tends to be centered around the question of what verb is to be supplied with the *ὄνπερ*-clause in v. 320, which we shall consider in a moment. But first I wish to raise a question which seems to have been all but entirely neglected. Dover is an exception; in his note on v. 320, he concludes his case for *δι’ ἀγορᾶς* as follows: “It makes much better sense to believe, on the strength of this passage [emphasis mine], that the procession to Eleusis went through the Agora, whether or not that was the shortest route from the *Iakcheion* (and it probably was not; cf. Paus. 1.2.4 and Judeich 364).” It may be doubted whether Dover has entirely avoided a *petitio principii* here when he accepts the disputed reading *δι’ ἀγορᾶς* and then, on the strength of that alone, argues for a procession through the Agora of which we hear nothing elsewhere. The length of the route would of course not be a problem; religious processions would not necessarily follow the shortest route. But one may not unfairly fault Dover for not discussing the explicit testimony to be found in Pausanias, *loc. cit.*, for it suggests a somewhat different interpretation. Note that in vv. 316–17 *Iacchos* has been invoked several times and will be so again at vv. 323 ff. (In v. 320 *Ἰακχος* refers to a hymn sung in honor of *Iacchos* = Dionysus, who, as is well known, had come to be associated with the great procession to Eleusis.) Now what does Pausanias say? He says that as one enters the city there is a building intended for the preparation of processions (*ἔσελθόντων δὲ ἐς τὴν πόλιν οἰκοδόμημα ἐς παρασκευὴν ἔστι τῶν πομπῶν*). This is a reference to the store-

26) J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Ranae* (Leiden 1896).

27) F. W. Hall and W. M. Geldart, *Aristophanis comoediae, tomus II* (Oxford 1970).

28) W. B. Stanford, *Aristophanes: The Frogs* (London 2nd 1968).

29) Alan H. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes: Frogs* (Warminster 1996).

30) Jeffrey Henderson, *Aristophanes: Frogs, Assemblywomen, Wealth* (Cambridge, MA 2002).

house, elsewhere called πομπεῖον, where the sacred processional vessels were kept.³¹ He proceeds to state that “nearby” there is a temple of Demeter in which there were images (ἀγάλματα) of the goddess, of her daughter, and of Iacchos “holding a torch”. He goes on to mention porticoes “from the gates to the Ceramicus” (στοαὶ ... ἀπὸ τῶν πυλῶν ἐς τὸ Κεραμεικόν). While taking into account that Pausanias is writing centuries after Aristophanes and changes may have occurred, one cannot but find all this very suggestive. The gate referred to is almost certainly the Dipylon Gate, through which the procession proceeded onto the road to Eleusis, and the temple has been identified by some as the Iaccheion. Thus we appear to have the right deities at the right gate with the right storehouse nearby. Surely it is far more probable that the participants assembled here and then made their way through the Dipylon Gate (or the Sacred Gate) on the road leading to Eleusis than that they went in the opposite direction through the Agora, a route about which we hear nowhere else. Compare Parke: “The procession probably formed up near the Dipylon Gate as it is indicated that the shrine of Iacchos was somewhere in the humbler quarter of Athens near there ...”.³² I conclude on these grounds that δι’ ἀγορᾶς is wrong.

Let us consider now the sense and construction of this sentence. The final clause, whether one reads ὄνπερ δι’ ἀγορᾶς or ὄνπερ Διαγόρας, is strangely abrupt – more strangely than seems to have been appreciated. Take first ὄν δι’ ἀγορᾶς. Those who favor this reading usually supply ἄδουσιν along the lines of Apollodorus’ interpretation: ἄδουσι γοῦν τὸν Ἰακχόν, ὄνπερ ἄδουσιν οἱ μύσται ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεος διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐξιόντες εἰς Ἐλευσίνα. (Compare Hesychius, s. v. Διαγόρας: Διόδωρος [sic] ὁ Ταρσεὺς ἀναγινώσκει περισπῶν δι’ ἀγορᾶς, διὰ τὸ τοὺς μύστας βακχάζειν, τουτέστιν ἄδειν τὸν Ἰακχόν δι’ ἀγορᾶς βαδίζοντας.) I suppose that it is not impossible to understand all this with ὄνπερ δι’ ἀγορᾶς but it is hardly natural or easy. For this reason Radermacher (ad loc.) proposed a different interpretation: “Erträglich ist streng genommen nur ὄν δι’ ἀγορᾶς (ἄδουσιν) d. h. cantant deum vulgo cantatum ‚den stadtbekannten‘ ...”. Radermacher’s own interpretation

31) For the πομπεῖον see W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen* (Munich²1931) 360 ff. with the map on 137.

32) H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (Ithaca 1971) 65.

has rightly been rejected. In sum, no truly satisfactory interpretation of the variant δι' ἀγορᾶς has yet been proposed.

What of Διαγόρας? An allusion to Diagoras of Melos would be appropriate in Aristophanes; compare Av. 1073 ff. and Nu. 830. But again the verb to be supplied in the ellipsis is problematic, more so in fact than with the reading δι' ἀγορᾶς. Radermacher correctly observed: “Für Diagoras hat sich Aristarch ausgesprochen, doch ist die von ihm angenommene Ergänzung des verkürzten Satzes (χλευάζει) unmöglich, möglich ist nur eine Ergänzung mit ᾄδειν (Wilamowitz) ...”. Sommerstein (above, n. 29), accepting Διαγόρας, translates: “At any rate they’re singing the Iacchus hymn, the one by Diagoras”, which is quite impossible. In his note ad loc. he gives a ‘literal’ rendering: “They’re singing the Iacchus, the one that Diagoras (sang) (i. e. composed).” This is no more likely. To supply the past tense (“sang”) is difficult, to glide from “sang” to “composed”, when neither concept has been expressed, is intolerable. Not to mention that a ‘composition’ on Iacchos by Diagoras is made out of whole cloth. Henderson in his Loeb edition (2002) renders the Greek exactly as Sommerstein; it remains impossible. He adds in a note that δι' ἀγορᾶς entails “unlikely Greek”, which is correct.

The upshot of all this is that neither reading yields very satisfactory sense or syntax. A cold hard look at the final relative clause in v. 320, with the odd and too abrupt ellipsis, strongly suggests that there is something not quite right with this sentence. It would be an easy matter to posit a lacuna after v. 320, but it is unnecessary. A change of punctuation will remove the difficulties:

- Ξα. ᾄδουσι γοῦν τὸν Ἰακχὸν ὄνπερ Διαγόρας –
 Δι. κάμοι δοκοῦσιν. ἡσυχίαν τοίνυν ἄγειν
 βέλτιστόν ἐστιν, ὡς ἂν εἰδῶμεν σαφῶς.

What we have in v. 320 is a case of contextus interruptus. The sentence is never finished. Either Xanthias deliberately breaks off without supplying the verb, which would have been a vulgar and rude one or Dionysus (= Iacchos here), realizing what Xanthias was about to say, deliberately interrupts to prevent an uncomplimentary remark being uttered. (Aristarchus was not wide of the mark with χλευάζει.) Dionysus’ comments in vv. 321–22 seem to agree with such a scenario: “I think so too. We would do well to

keep quiet ...". This is to put a good face on an embarrassing comment. Such aposiopesis is actually well-attested in Greek. See the excellent note of Lloyd-Jones (on Semonides fr.7.110),³³ where a number of examples are adduced, to which add Eur. Or. 1145. Particularly illustrative is a passage from Aristophanes, *Vesp.* 1178: ἐπειτα δ' ὡς ὁ Καρδοπίων τὴν μητέρα –. MacDowell ad loc. remarks: "the verb would be a vulgar one ... [Philokleon] is about to utter the verb when Bdelykleon hastily interrupts him." So too here. Xanthias was about to utter a rude verb indicative of the contemptuous treatment accorded to the Iacchos-song by Diagoras – about whom the audience would have known much more than we do – when the interruption occurred. Naturally the delivery would have made clear to the audience what was happening. The advantage of positing an aposiopesis is that the ὄνπερ-clause, which seemed so intractable as long as it was assumed that the sentence was complete, no longer remains so. The interruption itself explains the abruptness. It is not even necessary to supply one particular verb; aposiopesis, so common when rude and vulgar words are left unexpressed, would have been suggestive enough.

After reaching the conclusions set forth above I discovered that one commentator had proposed a similar interpretation, namely van Leeuwen (1896), who printed v.320 thus:

ἄδουσι γοῦν τὸν Ἰακχὸν ὄνπερ Διαγόρας ...

That the three dots of punctuation perform the same function as a dash is clear from his comment: "ὄνπερ Διαγόρας] sc. ἐχλεύαζε vel simile quid (sic recte Aristarchus), quod verbum prae verecundia proferre non vult Xanthias (cf. *Vesp.* 1178) ...". Note that he even cites the same passage from the *Vesp.* as a parallel. I differ from him only in thinking it more likely that Dionysus actively interrupts Xanthias than that Xanthias deliberately breaks off. Either is possible, but I do not regard Xanthias as particularly noteworthy for "verecundia". In any event, van Leeuwen deserves full credit as the πρῶτος εὑρετής.

33) H. Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the Species. Semonides on Women* (London 1975) 90.

Commentators are often curiously silent on the syntax of this elaborate sentence, or else offer questionable explanations. Thus W. W. Merry:³⁶ “Perhaps we might take ἰδέαν as an adverbial accusative, ‘by way of a different kind of hymn,’ so as to leave βασιλείαν as object to κελαδεῖτε: but it is simpler to take it with ἐπικοσμούντες.” Van Leeuwen similarly interprets κελαδεῖτε as governing ἰδέαν and ἐπικοσμούντες as governing βασιλείαν. Most recently Dover and Sommerstein are silent on the syntax in their commentaries, although the latter’s version (sc. “... honor in another form of song the Queen who makes the land fruitful, the goddess Demeter, and hymn her in holy melodies”) suggests that he takes βασιλείαν with both κελαδεῖτε and ἐπικοσμούντες (an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction), with ἐτέραν ὕμνων ἰδέαν apparently functioning as an adverbial accusative with ἐπικοσμούντες. Henderson’s version also implies an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction for βασιλείαν and an adverbial use of the ἰδέαν-phrase (rendered “in another form of song” exactly as in Sommerstein’s version) although, conversely, he takes it with κελαδεῖτε rather than with ἐπικοσμούντες (“... celebrate in another form of song the queen ... adorning her with holy hymns”).

The root cause of all this confusion seems clear. There appear to be two candidates, mutually exclusive, competing for the honor of being the direct object of κελαδεῖτε, namely the accusativus rei ἰδέαν and the accusativus personae βασιλείαν. Only one is wanted. One solution, as we have seen, is to govern ἰδέαν by κελαδεῖτε and to take βασιλείαν only with the participle ἐπικοσμούντες. But the full phrase, τὴν καρποφόρον βασιλείαν, / Δήμητρα θεάν, is so central and emphatic that it seems rhetorically undesirable to subordinate it so. The other solution is to take ἐτέραν ὕμνων ἰδέαν ‘adverbially’ here, thus leaving κελαδεῖτε free to govern βασιλείαν. But the adverbial accusative assumed on this interpretation seems in context artificial, not to say odd. There is a way out of this dilemma. In my *Studies in Greek Texts* (Göttingen 1976) 50–54 I examined a well-attested poetic construction. To quote what I wrote then (51): “It is not uncommon, especially in elevated language, for a periphrasis, consisting of a verb and direct object, itself to be regarded as equivalent to a transitive verb and govern in turn an additional accusative.” To put it simply, just as, for instance,

36) W. W. Merry, *Aristophanes: The Frogs* (Oxford 1887).

ὑμνεῖτε or ᾄδετε may govern a direct object (μῆνιν ᾄειδε) or cognate accusative, so also such combinations as ὑμνεῖτε / ᾄδετε ὕμνους may themselves be felt as transitive verbs and govern a second accusative (= ‘sing songs in honor of/about’). For abundant examples see op. cit. 51–53. (This passage of the *Ranae* is discussed on 52.) Such is the construction here. ἐτέραν ὕμνων ιδέαν ... κελαδεῖτε go closely together (observe that the first words of v. 384, ἄγε νῦν, go with the last word of v. 385, κελαδεῖτε) and ὕμνων ιδέαν is a ‘cognate’ accusative with κελαδεῖτε. Then the resultant periphrasis is equivalent to a transitive verb which itself governs βασιλείαν as a direct object. ἐπικοσμοῦντες also governs βασιλείαν in an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction. The following translation (repeated from my 1976 book) will illustrate the syntax of the whole sentence: “Come now, sound aloud with holy songs another form of hymns about the fruitful queen, goddess Demeter, thereby giving honor unto her.”

Ran. 508:

κάλλιστ’, ἐπαινῶ.

Commentators on Aristophanes regularly describe this phrase as an expression of “polite refusal”. Compare, for example, van Leeuwen (detailed discussion), Radermacher, Stanford, and Sommerstein (“a formula for politely declining an offer or invitation [cf. 512, 888, Plut. Mor. 22F–23A]”) ad loc. Similarly also commentators to other authors; note especially A. S. F. Gow on Theocritus 15.3.³⁷ See also LSJ s.vv. ἐπαινέω III and καλός C. 6 and the scholia to this passage. While this and similar expressions do indeed occur in such contexts, the situation is somewhat more complex. Dover, in his concise remarks on this verse states: “κάλλιστ’, ἐπαινῶ: formula of gratitude used equally in accepting and declining; cf. Xen. Smp. 1.7 ἐπαινοῦντες τὴν κλήσιν οὐχ ὑπισχνούντο συνδειπνήσειν, ‘while thanking him for his invitation, they didn’t commit themselves to having dinner with him’.” Dover is certainly correct in stating that such language was used both “in accepting and declining” (although, curiously, the only parallel he cites is, like the *Ranae* passage itself, a case of declining). The surprising

37) A. S. F. Gow, Theocritus (Cambridge 1965).

thing is only that neither Dover nor Sommerstein (the commentators recent enough to be in a position to do so) cite J. H. Quincey, *Greek Expressions of Thanks*, JHS 86 (1966) 133–158, an article with copious illustrations of the various formulae for accepting and declining and precise – sometimes too precise – indications of the differences of meaning and usage among them. This is the standard discussion of this topic.

Ran. 948:

ἔπειτ' ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἐπῶν οὐδένα παρήκ' ἂν ἀργόν

There is a minor puzzle here. Not a few editors print the Greek as above, while regularly reporting οὐδένα as Lenting's conjecture for the MS reading οὐδέν. They also report παρήκ' ἂν οὐδέν' as Blaydes' conjecture (based on Lenting's οὐδένα παρήκ' ἂν). Coulon in the Budé edition (1954) prints οὐδέν and reports no conjectures, understandable in a conservative text. Hall and Geldart's Oxford edition (²1907) had already done the same thing. Stanford (²1962) printed οὐδένα παρήκ' ἂν, observing in his note ad loc.: "I have adopted (with Blaydes) Lenting's emendation of οὐδέν in the MSS. here." This remark is either careless or confused; he should have merely stated that he had adopted Lenting's conjecture, for that is what he did. Blaydes took Lenting's conjecture a step further and Stanford did not follow him in this although his note seems to imply that he did. Sommerstein (1996, which is to say, writing after Dover) printed οὐδένα παρήκ' ἂν. I give his app. crit. entry for clarity's sake:

οὐδένα παρήκ' ἂν Lenting : οὐδέν παρήκ' ἂν codd. : παρήκ' ἂν οὐδέν' Blaydes.

The situation thus seems clear: the MSS have οὐδέν, which some conservative editors retain. Most, however, adopt Lenting's conjecture οὐδένα pro οὐδέν or Blaydes' refinement of it. (For the latter see van Leeuwen's edition [1896] or Henderson's [2002].) So far so good. But Dover (1993), while printing οὐδένα παρήκ' ἂν with most modern editors, gives no indication in his app. crit. that οὐδένα is a conjecture or that οὐδέν is the reading of the MSS. One hesitates to pronounce so careful a scholar in error here, especially without having inspected the MSS oneself, but either he is silently

correcting his predecessors, based on his own autopsy, or he has in fact made a minor slip. A cautionary tale either way.

Ran. 1245:

ἀπολείς· ἐρεῖ γὰρ «ληκύθιον ἀπόλεσεν».

ἀπολείς : ἀπολεῖ σ' v.l.

Either ἀπολείς or ἀπολεῖ σ' will make sense here. Editors generally, and rightly, prefer the absolute ἀπολείς. For other instances of this idiom see, for example, Dover on this passage and Seaford on Eur. Cyc. 558.³⁸ (Note that the fuller form with object expressed is also correct usage.) Here I add only that λυπέω shows a similar idiom: Soph. Ant. 1084 λυπεῖς γάρ; Ai. 589 ἄγαν γε λυπεῖς; OT 1231. For further discussion see R. Renehan, *The New Oxford Sophocles*, CP 87 (1992) 347.

Ran. 1261:

πάνυ γε μέλη θαυμαστά· δείξει δὴ τάχα.

Dover ad loc.: “δείξει: most commonly with αὐτό as subject, (‘the event itself’), but in Vesp. 994 the question ‘How has the trial gone?’ is answered by δείξειν ἔοικεν as Bdelykleon empties the voting-urns, and cf. Dem. ii.20 δοκεῖ δ’ ἔμοιγε ... δείξειν οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ‘it seems to me we shan’t have long to wait for the answer.’” More could have been said and, perhaps, more clearly. Briefly, all three passages cited above are part and parcel of one and the same basic idiom. (It is not quite clear to me whether and, if so, to what extent Dover regards δείξει and αὐτὸ δείξει as distinct idioms. His paraphrase of Dem. 2.20 sheds no light on this.) As far as the subject goes, the expression is found (1) in the full form, αὐτὸ τὸ ἔργον δείξει, *res ipsa demonstrabit*, (2) with the noun omitted, αὐτὸ δείξει, (3) with the αὐτό omitted, τὸ ἔργον δείξει, and (4) with no subject at all expressed, δείξει. (Van Leeuwen ad Ran. 1261: “... δείξει: subiectum hic et Vesp. 994 mente supplendum est τοῦργον ...”) Other substantives also occur as subject (τὸ πρᾶγμα and τὰ πρᾶγματα, τὰ πεπραγμένα) as well as τὰ ἔργα, plural. Even αὐτά,

38) Richard Seaford, *Euripides: Cyclops* (Oxford 1984).

plural with no noun expressed, is found. One might infer from Dover's note that the idiom is confined to one verb and one tense, which is hardly the case. δηλοῦν, e. g., is common ([Dem.] 35.17 ὡς αὐτὸ τὸ ἔργον ἐδήλωσεν); διδάσκειν and βοᾶν (Dem. 19.81 τὰ πεπραγμέν' αὐτὰ βοᾶ) are also found. For instances with σημαίνειν see D. J. Mastronarde's note on Eur. Phoen. 623. For copious references to, and illustrations of, the various changes that are rung on this widespread idiom see R. Renehan, *Aristotelian Explications and Emendations. II*, CP 91 (1996) 239–41.

Santa Barbara, Calif.

R o b e r t R e n e h a n