

NOTES ON ARISTOPHANES

Vesp. 42–3

- ΣΩ. εἴθ' ἢ μιὰρὰ φάλλαιν' ἔχουσα τρυτάνην
ἴστη βόειον δημόν. ΞΑ. οἶμοι δείλαιος· 40
τὸν δῆμον ἡμῶν βούλεται διυστάναι.
- ΣΩ. ἐδόκει δέ μοι Θέωρος αὐτῆς πλησίον
χαμαὶ καθῆσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν κόρακος ἔχων.
εἴτ' Ἀλκιβιάδης εἶπε πρὸς με τραυλίσας, 45
“ὀλῆς; Θέωλος τὴν κεφαλὴν κόλακος ἔχει.”

Commentators offer no satisfactory explanation of why Cleon's satellite Theorus should be sitting on the ground. Van Leeuwen suggests 'ut infra in convivio', which seems far-fetched and at best premature, for, though it might suit the character of Theorus as flatterer, that character is not revealed by Alcibiades' speech impediment till 45. It may be that there is nothing to explain, that Theorus is sitting on the ground because there is nowhere else to sit. But if an explanation is desired, what is wanted is something that fits the image of the crow. And if a scavenging bird positions itself on the ground in the vicinity of a monster holding a scale on which meat is being weighed out, its object is surely to pick up scraps that fall from the scale. Such behaviour symbolizes accurately enough the relationship posited between Cleon and Theorus the man – whereas a more ambitious and independent crow might try to snatch its food direct from the scale. (The antecedent of αὐτῆς in 42 is probably φάλλαινα, not τρυτάνην, since φάλλαινα is the subject of βούλεται in 41. But since the monster is holding the scale, Theorus, by positioning himself near the monster, is perforce well placed to seize anything that drops.)

Pax 886

- ΤΡ. ἄγε δὴ σὺ κατάθου πρῶτα τὴν σκευὴν χαμαί.
βουλὴ, πρυτάνεις, ὁράτε τὴν Θεωρίαν.
σκέψασθ' ὅσ' ὑμῖν ἀγαθὰ παραδώσω φέρων,
ὥστ' εὐθέως ἄραντας ὑμᾶς τὼ σκέλει 890
ταύτης μετέωρα καταγαγεῖν ἀνάρρυσιν.
τουτὶ δ' ὁρᾶτ' ὀπτάνιον ἡμῖν ὡς καλόν.
- ΟΙ. διὰ ταῦτα καὶ κεκάπνικ' ἄρ' ἐνταυθοῖ γὰρ <οδν>
πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου τὰ λάσανα τῇ βουλῇ ποτ' ἦν.

886 τὴν σκευὴν Meineke: τὰ σκεύη.

Put down your implements or take off your clothes? First it must be admitted that σκευή never has the meaning 'clothes' elsewhere in Aristophanes. Nor is this meaning recorded for other authors by LSJ, and it is absent from the list of types of σκευή in Pollux 10. 11. Therefore, if 'clothes' is to be preferred, emendation with Meineke to τὴν σκευήν seems essential, despite such rough parallels as English 'things', French 'affaires' and German 'Sachen'. This might seem to be methodologically conclusive in favour of the manuscript reading and the rendering 'implements', especially since Pollux mentions in his catalogue τὰ πρὸς θεωρίαν ἢ θυσίας σκεύη, a fact strangely neglected by champions of this interpretation.

But there is still room for doubt. What one is told about Theoria before and after

886 is less helpful than it might initially appear. At 876 the slave enthuses over her *πρώκτος*, while in 879 f. he sketches with his finger a resting-place for his *πέος* at the Isthmian Games. So far there is nothing the slave has to see or do that could not be seen or done over, through or up under a dress. But at 892, after Theoria has dispensed with her *σκεύη* or *σκευήν*, we learn the colour of her pubic hair. At first sight this suggests that she has now removed her dress, but in fact this need not follow. Trygaeus might have lifted it sufficiently to permit the slave's observation, or indeed actions may have been suited to words at 889 f., so that by 891 Theoria might be lying on her back with her legs in the air. Hence what might somewhat paradoxically be called a *non liquet*.

But no satisfactory answer has ever been offered to the question 'What might Theoria's implements be?' Σ^R speaks of *εἰρήνης καὶ γεωργίας σύμβολά τινα*. The last word may presumably be taken as an admission that he had no clear idea what he was talking about. More important, agricultural implements are inappropriate to Theoria, as Van Leeuwen realized. The catalogue of delights that she will bring (894–906) makes no mention, literal or metaphorical, of farming: the primary meanings belong entirely to the field of sports. Pollux is therefore of little use, since his theoric implements, labelled generically *χρηστήρια*, are clearly victims and instruments of sacrifice. The proper attributes of Aristophanes' Theoria would presumably be the ancient equivalents of starting-pistols, silver medals and complimentary tickets for *bouleutai*. No doubt these could be excogitated, but it is a little odd to picture Theoria solemnly clutching them ever since 713, while the question 'Why should she put them down to be displayed?' seems never to have been asked. Yet they would hardly interfere with Trygaeus' purposes, and would indeed prevent her from using her hands to protect her modesty. A tentative case can therefore be made for *τὴν σκευήν* and 'clothes', and one may regretfully suspect that superstitious reluctance to believe in naked ladies on the Aristophanic stage has done more than respect for the *paradosis* to keep τὰ *σκεύη* and 'implements' alive.

Lys. 1115–74

- ΛΥ. τί δ' οὐ διηλλάγητε; φέρε τί τοῦμποδῶν;
 ΛΑ. ἄμές γε λῶμες, αἱ τις ἄμιν τῶγκυκλον
 λῆ τοῦτ' ἀποδόμεν. ΛΥ. ποῖον ὦ τὰν; ΛΑ. τὰν Πύλον,
 ὅσπερ πάλαι δεόμεθα καὶ βλιμάττομες.
 ΠΡ. μὰ τὸν Ποσειδῶ τοῦτο μέν γ' οὐ δράσετε. 1165
 ΛΥ. ἄφετ' ὠγάθ' αὐτοῖς. ΠΡ. κᾶτα τίνα κινήσομεν;
 ΛΥ. ἕτερόν γ' ἀπαιτεῖτ' ἀντὶ τούτου χωρίον.
 ΠΡ. τὸ δεῖνα τοίνυν παράδοθ' ἡμῖν τουτονὶ
 πρώτιστα τὸν Ἐχινούντα καὶ τὸν Μηλιᾶ
 κόλπον τὸν ὀπισθεν καὶ τὰ Μεγαρικά σκέλη. 1170
 ΛΑ. οὐ τῶ σιῶ οὐχὶ πάντα γ' ὦ λισσάνιε.
 ΛΥ. ἔατε, μηδὲν διαφέρου περὶ σκελοῖν.
 ΠΡ. ἤδη γεωργεῖν γυμνὸς ἀποδὺς βούλομαι.
 ΛΑ. ἐγὼ δὲ κοπραγωγεῖν γὰ πρῶ ναι τῶ σιῶ.

Van Daele detects throughout this scene a contrast between the sexual preferences of the Spartan and those of the Athenian prytanis. He traces it back initially to 1105, but that is hardly fair to the Spartan in the light of the prytanis' comment at 1092. (Cf. K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (London, 1978), pp. 188 f., against any over-facile assumption of a contrast between Athenian heterosexuality and Spartan

homosexuality.) However, whether or not there is in 1117 f. the implication that a Spartan would be less clumsy than an Athenian in handling another man's penis, even though such a skill properly belongs to a woman, there is ample evidence for Van Daele's view, more indeed than he realized. At 1148 the Spartan can hardly tear himself away from his contemplation of Diallage's *πρῶκτος* to make a very laconic response to Lysistrata's harangue. Neither he nor the prytanis at whom it is aimed pays any attention at all to Lysistrata's next diatribe: the Spartan is again concerned with Diallage's bottom (1157), while the Athenian in pointed contrast singles out her *κύσθος* for praise (1158). (*Pace* Van Daele, 1157 is surely a comment on Diallage, not on Lysistrata, and the reference of *χαϊωτέραν* is physical, not moral. That it was a suitable word to describe the object of the Spartan's adoration is shown by its application to the callipygous Corinthian envoy at 91 f.)

The demand for Pylos (1162–4) again reveals the Spartan's interest: *βλιμάττομες* presumably indicates how he has been passing the time during Lysistrata's orations, while the gesture implied by *τοῦτο* with *ἔγκυκλον* is doubtless more precisely centred. But the response of the prytanis spoils this potentially amicable division of spheres of influence. He demands Echinus, the Malian Gulf which lies behind it, and the legs of Megara (1169 f.). Echinus and the legs present no problems, but, surprisingly, only Rogers grasped the point of *ᾧπισθεν* and understood that in consequence the Malian Gulf lies between Diallage's buttocks, not her breasts. Van Daele assumes that *κόλπον* = 'bosom' and that the fruits are Diallage's breasts, but this cannot be right, since, if it were, the prytanis would not have infringed the Spartan's prerogative: he would have claimed the whole of the front of Diallage, but the rear would still be open to Spartan occupation. But, as Rogers rightly insists, the Spartan accuses the Athenian of wanting everything (1171): not the whole of the front, which would give no offence to the Spartan, but the whole of the lower half. Between them *ᾧπισθεν* and *πάντα* are conclusive, and the location of the Malian Gulf is no difficulty: pomological metaphors are easily enough transferred from one set of rotundities to another.

The underlying point is accurate and bitter. Had negotiations broken down, it would not have been the first time that the Spartans had come to Athens seeking to regain Pylos, only to be repelled because Athenian greed 'reached out for more' (cf. Thuc. 4. 21. 2, 41. 4). But the danger is quickly past, and the antithesis between the metaphorical senses of *γεωργεῖν* and *κοπραγωγεῖν* (1173 f.) has both the prytanis and the Spartan safely back on their respective sides of the conciliatory sandwich.

Thesm. 30–4

- EY. ἐνταῦθ' Ἀγάθων ὁ κλεινὸς οἰκῶν τυγχάνει
ὁ τραγωδοποιός. KH. ποῖος οὗτος Ἀγάθων; 30
EY. ἔστιν τις Ἀγάθων— KH. μὲν ὁ μέλας ὁ καρτερός;
EY. οὐκ, ἀλλ' ἕτερός τις· οὐχ ἑώρακας πώποτε;
KH. μὲν ὁ δασυπῶγων; EY. οὐχ ἑώρακας πώποτε.
KH. μὰ τὸν Δί' οὔτοι γ' ὥστε καὶ μέ γ' εἰδέναί.

Euripides' remark at 33 is customarily punctuated as a question, as in 32. This is unlikely. After In-Law's first mistake it is reasonable for Euripides to say 'No, a different one – have you never seen him?' But when In-Law goes even further astray it is pointless for Euripides to repeat his question. Rather, he makes a statement: 'No! Obviously you've never seen him!', and the line should be punctuated accordingly. There is no difficulty in taking In-Law's reply at 34 as the corroboration of a statement rather than as the answer to a question. In either case the repeated *γε* and the *καί*

combine to highlight In-Law's bewilderment (cf. 20 f., 27) and to explain and excuse his ignorance, while for an oath by one speaker in confirmation of a preceding statement by another, cf. *Ach.* 137, *Nub.* 1228, *Vesp.* 76, 665, 680, 1126, *Pax* 439, *Ran.* 559, 914, 1045, 1089, *Eccl.* 344, *Plut.* 106, 889. If R's *έόρακα* is kept in 32 and the second half of the line given, as a statement, to In-Law (which is possible, with In-Law first claiming never to have seen any other Agathon, then, in 33, having second thoughts), the point still stands: the force of Euripides' rejoinder would be 'You're dead right you've never seen him!'.

Thesm. 418–25

MI. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ξυγγνώσθ'. ἃ δ' ἦν ἡμῖν πρὸ τοῦ
αὐταῖς ταμιεῦσαι καὶ προαιρούσαις λαβεῖν
ἄλφιτον ἔλαιον οἶνον, οὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἔτι 420
ἔξεστιν. οἱ γὰρ ἄνδρες ἤδη κλήδια
αὐτοῖ φοροῦσι κρυπτὰ κακοθέστατα
Λακωνικ' ἄττα, τρεῖς ἔχοντα γομφίους.
πρὸ τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἦν ἀλλ' ὑποῖξαι τὴν θύραν
ποιησαμέναισι δακτύλιον τριωβόλου, 425
νῦν δ' οὗτος αὐτοὺς ὤκότρῃς Εὐριπίδης
ἐδίδαξε θριπῆδεσθ' ἔχειν σφραγίδα
ἐξαφαιμένους.

419 λαβεῖν R λαθεῖν Scaliger.

Micca is complaining that women no longer have access to the storeroom. The point is not that previously women could get away with thefts from the store but that previously they were left in charge of the keys. This is proved both by *ταμιεῦσαι* in 419 and above all by 422, where the force of *αὐτοί* has been neglected by commentators. The men now not only keep the keys: they have fitted new and improved locks, with keys of fearsome design. But if the men carry these new keys *αὐτοί*, themselves, then the old keys must have been in the hands of the women, and so the activities of 419 f. were, at least in essence, legitimate and above board, though the women may of course have abused their privilege. Consequently R's *λαβεῖν* should probably be retained in 419. (Thus rightly Coulon, though Van Daele misses the point of *αὐτοί*. Rogers keeps *λαβεῖν* yet believes in theft; Van Leeuwen believes in legitimate activity yet adopts *λαθεῖν*!)

The door of 424, keys to which the women did not possess of right but had to have illicitly, though cheaply made, must therefore be the house door (as Van Daele), not the storeroom door (as Rogers and Van Leeuwen). This has the virtue of allowing *πρὸ τοῦ* in 424 to refer to the same period as *πρὸ τοῦ* in 418, whereas if the door of 424 is that of the storeroom, *πρὸ τοῦ* in that line must refer to a later stage in the degeneration of the situation than does *πρὸ τοῦ* in 418 (as Van Leeuwen saw and was prepared to accept).

Thesm. 499–501

KH. οὐδ' ἐκεῖν' εἶρηκέ πω,
ὥς ἡ γυνὴ δεικνῦσα τάνδρῃ τοῦγκυκλον
†ὕπ' αὐγὰς† οἶόν ἐστιν, ἐγκεκαλυμμένον 500
τὸν μοιχὸν ἐξέπεμψεν, οὐκ εἶρηκέ πω.

Despite the corruption, the primary meaning is clear and understood by commentators: the wife holds her garment to the light to display it for her husband's admiration, and

while his attention is thus distracted her lover sneaks out, swathed to the eyebrows in his cloak. But given the use of *ἐγκυκλον* in *Lys.* 1162, it seems possible that there is a double meaning, allowing the wife a means of distracting her husband's attention, by flaunting her bare behind in the morning sun, which would be both more interesting for him and more ironical. This would also give an added point to *ἐγκεκαλυμμένον* by introducing an amusing contrast between her total or partial nudity and her lover's muffled-up condition. (Not that *ἐγκεκαλυμμένον* needs defence: Van Leeuwen objected that it would be otiose if the lover were not seen and futile if he were caught; but it would obviously be extremely useful if he were seen but not caught.)

Thesm. 893–4, 758–9

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>ΚΡ. οὗτος πανουργῶν δεῦρ' ἀνῆλθεν ὦ ξένε
ὥς τὰς γυναῖκας ἐπὶ κλοπῇ τοῦ χρυσίου.</p> <p>ΜΙ. οἴμοι τέκνον. δός μοι σφαγεῖον Μανία,
ἵν' ὅν τό γ' αἶμα τοῦ τέκνου τοῦμοῦ λάβω.</p> <p>ΚΗ. ὕπεχ' αὐτό, χαριῶμαι γὰρ ἔν γε τοῦτό σοι.</p> <p>ΜΙ. κακῶς ἀπόλοι', ὥς φθονερός εἰ καὶ δυσμενής.
[τουτὶ τὸ δέρμα τῆς ἱερείας γίγνεται.]
τί τῆς ἱερείας γίγνεται; ΚΗ. τουτί. λαβέ.</p> <p>ΚΡ. ταλαντάτη Μίκα τίς ἐξεκόρησέ σε;</p> | <p>893</p> <p>755</p> <p>760</p> |
|--|----------------------------------|

758 del. Bakhuyzen, Blaydes.

In 893 f. Critylla accuses In-Law of having come to steal the women's gold ornaments. Rogers calls this unfair, since she knows perfectly well the true nature of his mission. This is not so. Critylla left the scene at 457 and returned only at 759 or 760. It was during her absence that In-Law made his big speech beginning at 466, Euripides' plot was revealed by Cleisthenes at 584, and In-Law was unmasked as its agent at 635. (Coulon is clearly right in reducing the number of women who speak to two. The marketwoman concerned at the growth of atheism in 450–8 is plainly the same as the uneducated woman who is outraged at the insult to the altar in 888.)

The problem of Critylla's return is complex. In-Law slashes open the wineskin probably at 753. As her 'child' begins to 'bleed' Micca calls for a vessel to catch the precious liquid, and at 756 In-Law appears to grant her the right to do so. One might expect an Athenian woman in comedy to be grateful for a cup of wine, yet Micca's response at 757 is angry and resentful. This suggests that In-Law has contrived, despite his generous words at 756, to pour far more wine on the ground and over Micca's person than into the cup. The next two lines present serious difficulties. If 758 is to be retained, In-Law must be mocking Micca while pretending to placate her: 'Never mind about the wine – have this nice empty skin for your trouble!' The beginning of 759 would then have to be spoken by Critylla, not Micca, since Micca has just been told in 758 what the priestess's reward is and so does not need to ask the question. One would have to suppose that Critylla, entering, half-heard In-Law's statement and asked for further elucidation.

There are two objections. First, this reading of 758 is so elliptical as to be very strained, yet there seems to be no easier interpretation. Secondly, giving the first part of 759 to Critylla produces a very involved result, since it means that in the second half of the line In-Law has to address first Critylla, showing her the skin (*τουτί*), then Micca, to whom he gives or throws it (*λαβέ*), for the skin must clearly end up in the hands of Micca: it is her 'baby' and it was she who served as priestess. It is therefore better to delete 758 (Bakhuyzen, Blaydes) and give the first half of 759 to Micca. The

origin of 758 is presumably a gloss, τὸ δέρμα, intended as an explanation of τουτί in 759 (cf. Blaydes, Van Leeuwen, ad loc.).

Micca's whole speech (757+first half of 759) would thus, given the preceding business, mean 'Damn you! How mean and unfriendly you are! (sc. because you said I could have the 'blood' but in fact you've poured it all over me and the floor – so seeing that I haven't got what you promised me) What does the priestess get?' Both τουτί and λαβέ are then addressed to her by way of answer, and Critylla enters at 760 to the tableau of Micca clutching her disembowelled 'infant' in her arms, which is dramatically far more effective.

Ran. 45–57

- HP. ποῖ γῆς ἀπεδήμεις; ΔΙ. ἐπεβάτευν Κλεισθένι
 HP. κἀναυμαχήσας; ΔΙ. καὶ κατεδύσαμέν γε ναῦς
 τῶν πολεμίων ἢ δώδεκ' ἢ τρεῖς καὶ δέκα. 50
 HP. σφῶ; ΔΙ. νῆ τὸν Ἀπόλλω. ΞΑ. κᾶτ' ἔγωγ' ἐξηγρόμην.
 ΔΙ. καὶ δῆτ' ἐπὶ τῆς νεὼς ἀναγιγνώσκοντί μοι
 τὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν ἐξαίφνης πόθος
 τὴν καρδίαν ἐπάταξε πῶς οἶει σφόδρα.
 HP. πόθος; πόσος τις; ΔΙ. μικρὸς ἡλίκος Μόλων. 55
 HP. γυναικός; ΔΙ. οὐ δῆτ'. HP. ἀλλὰ παιδός; ΔΙ. οὐδαμῶς.
 HP. ἀλλ' ἀνδρός; ΔΙ. ἀπαπαί. HP. ξυνεγένου τῷ Κλεισθένι;

Heracles' question in 48 must mean 'Where had you been got up like that?' It would therefore be pleasing if Dionysus' strange attire of woman's dress, lionskin, buskins and club were somehow appropriate to his service on board the *Cleisthenes*. (Rogers is surely right that the name comes *para prosdokian* instead of that of a ship.) This may indeed be the case. The attributes of Heracles suggest masculinity, so that their combination with the woman's dress produces an ambiguity that would make Dionysus a fit companion for Cleisthenes, whose pathic nature might be attracted to the butch element in Dionysus' get-up, particularly perhaps his large club. Whether buskins could in context suggest sexual, as we know they could political, ambivalence may be left open.

Heracles' reply to the news of Dionysus' encounter with Cleisthenes has not been fully understood. His question is both literal and sexual. Once the double meaning of ἐπεβάτευν Κλεισθένι is recognized, as it generally is by commentators, the sexual implication of κἀναυμαχήσας is obvious enough. (For the obscene sense of ναυμαχεῖν cf. 434, where Bothe's κύσθω should be read: to the best of my knowledge no editor who prints κύσθου has ventured to explain or even construe it. If further clarification be needed, cf. τὸν ἔμβολον at fr. 317. 3.) But the literal aspect of the question has been missed. It contains yet another gibe at Cleisthenes' much pilloried cowardice in battle: Heracles incredulously asks 'And you took part in the naval battle – on board the *Cleisthenes*?' – not a ship that might have been expected to turn up for a fight! It is this aspect of the question that Dionysus takes up, leaving the sexual side of it unanswered, so that Heracles is justified in bringing the subject up again in clear at 57, though his question in 57 is not a repetition of that in 49: it refers to a point after the battle, when Dionysus was smitten by his sudden desire. Heracles then asks if he worked it off on Cleisthenes.

These considerations reinforce the view held by most commentators that σφῶ in 51 refers to Dionysus and Cleisthenes (not Xanthias): not because we know from 33 that Xanthias was not at Arginusae, since, as has been remarked, Dionysus was not

really there either, but because (a) this gives more point to Heracles' question: 'What? You two fairies and one of you the biggest coward in Athens?' and (b) neither Heracles nor Dionysus is thinking about Xanthias at this point: *κατεδύσαμεν* must refer to Dionysus and Cleisthenes, therefore so must *σφώ*.

Ran. 338–9

ΞΑ. ὥς ἡδύ μοι προσέπνευσε χοιρείων κρεῶν. 338
ΔΙ. οὐκουν ἀτρέμ' ἔξεις, ἦν τι καὶ χορδῆς λάβῃς;

Radermacher suspected an allusion to the obscene sense of *χοῖρος* in *χοιρείων κρεῶν*. This would be feeble unless a comparable double meaning were present in Dionysus' reply, so that his remark capped that of Xanthias on the sexual as well as on the gastronomic level. It would not be implausible for *χορδή* to equal 'penis' and *τι χορδῆς λαμβάνειν* 'be bugged'. Though no such double meaning appears to be securely attested elsewhere, it may be noted that the equation of *χορδή* with 'penis' at *Ach.* 1119–21 would allow some phallic by-play, while at Hipponax 84. 17W another word for 'sausage', *ἀλλᾶς*, seems to mean 'penis' (cf. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, New Haven–London, 1975, p. 144). Such a sense for *ἀλλᾶς* would produce an acceptable double meaning at *Eq.* 208. These instances should outweigh the somewhat bizarre fact that at *Pax* 717 yet another sausage, *χολιξ*, appears in a reference to cunnilinguism (cf. Henderson, loc. cit.); such a reference might also be possible at *Eq.* 1179.

Eccl. 587

ΒΛ. περὶ μὲν τοίνυν τοῦ καινοτομεῖν μὴ δείσης· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡμῖν 586
 δρᾶν ἀντ' ἄλλης ἀρχῆς ἐστίν, τῶν δ' ἀρχαίων ἀμελήσαι.

Rogers, Van Leeuwen and Ussher agree in seeing a play on *ἀρχή* = 'empire' here. This is unlikely. I have shown elsewhere (*JHS* 87, 1967, 107 n. 110) that the *Ecclesiazusae* cannot have been produced before 391 or more probably 390, at a time, that is, when the revival of imperialism at Athens was at its height. But even if a date of 392 were possible, the claim that empire was the least of Athens' interests would still be merely absurd. Van Daele is therefore right to render *ἀρχή* as 'principe', without any play on words.

Eccl. 601–10

ΧΡ. πῶς οὖν ὅστις μὴ κέκτηται γῆν ἡμῶν, ἀργύριον δὲ
 καὶ Δαρεικοὺς ἀφανὴ πλοῦτον; *ΠΡ.* τοῦτ' ἐς τὸ μέσον καταθήσει.
ΒΛ. καὶ μὴ καταθεῖς; *ΠΡ.* ψευδορκήσει. *ΒΛ.* κακῆσαιτο γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο.
ΠΡ. ἀλλ' οὐδέν τοι χρήσιμον ἔσται πάντως αὐτῷ. *ΧΡ.* κατὰ δὴ τί;
ΠΡ. οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν πενία δράσει· πάντα γὰρ ἐξουσιν ἅπαντες, 605
 ἄρτους τεμάχῃ μάζας χλαίνας οἶνον στεφάνους ἐρεβίνθους,
 ὥστε τί κέρδος μὴ καταθεῖναι; σὺ γὰρ ἐξευρὼν ἀπόδειξον.
ΒΛ. οὐκουν καὶ νῦν οὗτοι μᾶλλον κλέπτουσ' οἷς ταῦτα πάρεστιν;
ΧΡ. πρότερόν γ' ὤταῖρ' ὅτε τοῖσι νόμοις διεχρώμεθα τοῖς προτέροισιν·
 νῦν δ' ἔσται γὰρ βίος ἐκ κοίνου, τί τὸ κέρδος μὴ καταθεῖναι; 610

603 Bentley; uerba καὶ μὴ καταθεῖς ψευδορκήσει Prax. continuat Ussher 608 Chrem. tribuit Ussher 609 f. Chrem. tribuit Wilamowitz, Prax. Ussher.

Ussher, who has done great service in carrying on the task begun by Rogers of rescuing the part of Chremes from oblivion, gives the first half of 603 to Praxagora, the second

half to Blepyrus, 608 to Chremes, and 609–10 to Praxagora. But in 603 καὶ μὴ καταθείς is surely an interrogative interjection by one of the men (Blepyrus according to Bentley, followed by Coulon). The financial cynicism of 603 occurs again at 608: surely the same speaker. If therefore Blepyrus speaks most of 603 he should also speak 608, which leaves Chremes free to speak 609 f. (thus Wilamowitz). Ussher objects that the repetition in 610 of Praxagora's question of 607 proves her the speaker, but ὦταιρ' and perhaps διεχρώμεθα in 609 are better suited to Chremes, and the repetition is more effective as a sedulous parroting of Praxagora's words by her enthusiastic convert, who has been immediately and completely satisfied by the explanation he asked for (thus rightly Ussher) in 604.

Eccl. 680

ΒΛ. τὸ δὲ βῆμα τί σοι χρήσιμον ἔσται; *ΠΡ.* τοὺς κρατήρας καταθήσω
καὶ τὰς ὑδρίας, καὶ ῥαψωδεῖν ἔσται τοῖς παιδαρίοισιν
τοὺς ἀνδρείους ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ, κεῖ τις δειλὸς γεγένηται,
ἵνα μὴ δειπνῶσ' αἰσχυρόμενοι. *ΧΡ.* νῆ τὸν Ἀπόλλω χάριέν γε. 680
ΒΛ. τὰ δὲ κληρωτήρια ποῖ τρέψεις;

All editors assign the second half of this line to Blepyrus. It would surely be better to give this ostentatious exclamation of approval to Praxagora's chief supporter Chremes, before Blepyrus comes back with another question in 681. For a similar phenomenon, cf. 662, as correctly printed by Ussher, following Rogers.¹

University of Liverpool

ROBIN SEAGER

¹ I am grateful for advice and comments to Dr A. M. Bowie, Mr E. L. Bowie, and above all *CQ*'s anonymous reader, but they are not of course responsible for my errors, nor do they necessarily agree with my interpretations.