

ARISTOPHANES, *LYSISTRATE* 264

Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 256–65 ~ 271–80 runs as follows. I print the much-discussed¹ and frequently emended² lines 260–65 ~ 275–80 as they appear in the manuscripts (the strophe survives only in R) and testimonia, and shall argue that they are sound with the exception of 264, for which I suggest an emendation.

ἤ πόλλ' ἄελπτ' ἔνεστιν ἐν τῷ μακρῷ βίῳ, φεῦ,	256/7
ἐπεὶ τίς ἂν ποτ' ἤλπισ', ὦ Στρυμόδωρ', ἀκοῦσαι	258/9
γυναῖκας, ἃς ἐβόσκομεν	260
κατ' οἶκον ἐμφανές κακόν,	261
κατὰ μὲν ἅγιον ἔχευ βρέτας	262
κατὰ τ' ἀκρόπολιν ἐμὰν λαβεῖν,	263
μοχλοῖσιν δέ καὶ κλήθροισιν	264
τὰ προπύλαια πακτοῦν;	265
οὐ γὰρ μὰ τὴν Δήμητρ' ἐμοῦ ζῶντος ἐγχανοῦνται	271/2
ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ Κλεομένης, ὃς αὐτὴν κατέσχε πρῶτος,	273/4
ἀπῆλθεν ἀψάλακτος, ἀλλ'	275
ὅμως Λακωνικὸν πνέων	276
ῶιχετο θῶπλα παραδούς ἐμοί,	277
σμηκρὸν ἔχων πάνυ τριβώνιον,	278
πεινῶν ρυπῶν ἀπαράτιλτος,	279
ἔξ ἐτῶν ἄλουτος.	280

256 Su a 551 (om. φεῦ) 264–5 Su π 31 πακτοῦν κλείειν, ἀσφαλίζεσθαι. μοχλοῖσι τὰ προπύλαια πακτοῦν. Ἀριστοφάνης Λυσιστράτη. 273–5 Su ψ 8 καὶ ἀψάλακτος Ἀριστοφάνης' πρῶτος ἀπῆλθον (–θεν G) ἀψάλακτος ἀλλ' ὅμως Λακωνικὸν πνέων. 279–80 Su a 1361 ἀπαράτιλτος . . . ἄλουτος.

256 ἔνεστιν Reisig: ἐστὶν R Su 259 Στρυμόδωρ' Brunck: Στυμμ– R 277 ὦιχετ' ὅπλα R 279 πινῶν R

The metre is essentially iambic dimeter: 256–9 ~ 271–4 = iambic dimeter + ithyphallic (cf. *Frogs* 395 f.); the ithyphallic returns as a final clausula in

I shall refer to the following works by the author's name only: editions of *Lysistrata*: R. Brunck (Argentorati, 1783); V. Coulon (Paris, 1928); R. Enger (Bonn, 1844); F. W. Hall and W. M. Geldart² (Oxford, 1907); H. Holden (Cambridge, 1868); A. Meineke (Leipzig, 1860); B. B. Rogers (London, 1911); J. van Leeuwen (Leiden, 1903); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Berlin, 1927); other works: A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*² (Cambridge, 1968); J. D. Denniston, 'Lyric Iambics In Greek Drama', in *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray* (Oxford, 1936), pp.121 ff.; E. Fraenkel, 'Lyrische Daktylen', in *Kleine Beiträge zur*

klassischen Philologie i (Rome, 1964), pp.165 ff. (= *RbM* 72 (1918), 161 ff., 321 ff.); J. Henderson, 'Coniecturarum in Aristophanis Lysistratam Repertorium', *HSCPb* 82 (1978); G. Hermann, *Euripidis Iphigeneia Taurica* (Leipzig 1833); M. Platnauer, 'Antistrophic Variation In Aristophanes', in *Greek Poetry and Life* (as above), pp.241 ff.; C. Prato, *I canti di Aristofane* (Rome, 1962); O. Schroeder, *Aristophanis Cantica*² (Leipzig, 1930); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin, 1921).

¹ See Platnauer, pp.243 f.

² For a full listing of proposed emendations, see Henderson, ad loc.

265~280.¹ 262 f. have regular tribrachic resolution: $\cup\cup\cup \cup\cup\cup / \cup-\cup-$, while the antistrophe (277 f.) shows $-\cup\cup -\cup\cup \cup-\cup-$. This responsion is unusual but its genuineness is guaranteed by its repetition in successive lines. We should think of the first metron of 277 f. as 'dactylic anapests'² in which syllable-counting has inverted the normal $\cup\cup-$.³ Compare the similar responsion, in the first half of a dimeter, at 324 $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o} \tau' \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omega\nu$ (Oeri: $\tau\epsilon \nu\acute{o}\mu\omega\nu$ codd.) $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu \sim 338 \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \pi\acute{o}\lambda\omega\nu \acute{\omega}\varsigma \tau\rho\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ (Herkenrath: $\tau\rho\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu$ codd.) $\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$: $\cup\cup\cup\cup - -\cup\cup - \sim -\cup\cup -\cup\cup -\cup\cup -$.

The difficult 264~279 remain. 264 is certainly corrupt but there is nothing objectionable in the language or metre of 279. $\pi\epsilon\omega\omega\nu$, rejected by all editors (except Holden) as a banalization of $\pi\omega\omega\nu$, should stand in the text: $\pi\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega$, not attested elsewhere,⁴ would be tautologous with $\rho\upsilon\pi\omega\nu$. And note *Birds* 1282 (describing 'Lakonizers') $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{o}\mu\omega\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omega\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\omega\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$. The metre of 279 is $-\cup\cup/\cup\cup\cup-\cup$, an iambic metron followed by a trochaic one. Mixed systems in which iambs alternate with trochees are found not infrequently in Euripides' later plays (e.g. *Hel.* 167 ff., *Phoen.* 1018 ff.) and there is a notable example in *Frogs*, 209 ff.⁵ At Pindar, *Ol.* 2.1 and Fr. 108.1 trochees follow iambs in the same dimeter, as also at Aeschylus, *Pers.* 638~645, Euripides, *Suppl.* 374~378 (note 376~380: $\cup-- \cup-\cup-|\cup--$; 375 and 377 are iambic trimeters). In our passage the trochaic metron probably serves as a piquant bridge into the ithyphallic clausula; ithyphallics are appropriate in both iambic and trochaic environments. Note *Lys.* 1305 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \Sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\alpha\nu \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\nu}\iota\omega\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, $--|\cup-$, which bridges an iambic dimeter and a trochaic dimeter (compare Eur. *Hel.* 363).

Is there a simple way to bring 264 into acceptable responsion? Brunck's easy $\mu\omicron\chi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}\sigma[\omega]$ and $\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\iota[\nu]$, accepted by Rogers and Hall/Geldart, involves no change in 279 but would allow a syncopated trochaic metron in 264 to correspond with an unsyncopated one in 279 ($\cup-\cup-|\cup\cup\cup-\cup$); I find no parallels.⁶ Besides, the 'palimbacchius' ($-\cup$) scarcely appears to occur in comedy (Dale, p.88). Other editors resort to emendations in both lines. Coulon prints $\mu\omicron\chi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}\sigma$ but retains $\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\omega\nu$, with Schroeder's $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\pi'$ in 279, giving a catalectic iambic dimeter, $\cup-\cup\cup\cup \cup-\cup$. But $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\pi'$ is unparalleled (this plural only at Homer, *Od.* 6.93) and unlikely ('filthy with regard to his dirt?'). van Leeuwen in 264 adopts, for no apparent reason, Meineke's suggestion, $\mu\omicron\chi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}\sigma \delta\acute{\epsilon} \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\acute{\iota} \mu\omicron\upsilon$, leaving 279 as in the manuscripts instead of going all the way with Meineke and transposing $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\lambda\tau\omicron\varsigma \rho\upsilon\pi\omega\nu$, to give $\cup-\cup\cup\cup --\cup-$, an iambic dimeter. I see no justification for $\mu\omicron\upsilon$, and the Suda seems to tell against the transposition. Wilamowitz is even more violent:⁷ $\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\rho\omicron\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon} <\delta\eta> \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \mu\omicron\chi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}- \sim \pi\omega\omega\nu \rho\upsilon\pi\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\lambda-$, giving iambic + cretic but spoiling, I think, the delicacy of the song's phrasing.

The Suda does, however, support Wilamowitz's transposition of $\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\iota(\nu)$ and $\mu\omicron\chi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota(\nu)$,⁸ as does the only other collocation of these words, Eur. *Andr.* 950 f. $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\acute{\alpha}\delta' \epsilon\acute{\upsilon} \phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon |\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\iota \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \mu\omicron\chi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota \delta\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu \pi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$.

¹ For resolution of the first syllable in 265 cf. *Frogs* 395 f. and see Prato, p.187 (at *Birds* 944).

² For possible parallels see Denniston, pp.139 ff.

³ Dale, p.78 n.1.

⁴ Brunck conjectured $\pi\omega\omega\nu\tau\alpha$ at *Plutus* 297 ($\pi\epsilon\omega\omega\nu\tau\alpha$ codd.).

⁵ Further examples in Denniston,

pp.133 ff. Note that *Birds* 1394, cited by Denniston (p.134), is not an example: see Fraenkel, p.185 n.1.

⁶ See Wilamowitz, *Verskunst*, pp.269 ff. for possible licences in Euripides.

⁷ Cf. *Verskunst*, pp.481 f.

⁸ First suggested by Hermann (at line 192) and Reisig (in Enger, ad loc.).

Accordingly I suggest κλήθροισι δ' αὖ καὶ μοχλοῖσι, giving 264~279 --U-|
 UU-U, iambic + trochaic (for the resolved trochaic responding with an unre-
 solved one cf. Aeschylus, *Pers.* 638~645). Just a few lines earlier (255) R shows
 faulty transposition of words; and for confusion of δ' αὖ and δέ cf. 426 δ' αὖ R:
 δέ cett. δ' αὖ, 'and further', provides an emphatic contrast with μέν (262) and
 marks a fresh item in the oldsters' catalogue of feminine enormities.

Yale University

JEFFREY HENDERSON