

improbable. On the other hand, [ὦ] ξείνοι (Reisig) implies a quite frequent type of corruption, interpolation of ὦ; cf. e.g. S. *OT* 1329, *Tr.* 1010 f.,⁸ E. *Hec.* 186.

The ms. text is the result of double corruption, trivialization of word-order and addition of ὦ.

Zeist

J. A. J. M. BUIJS

⁸ cf. Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, p. 348 n. 2.

NOTES ON ARISTOPHANES' *PEACE*

17–18:

B. οὐ γὰρ ἔθ' οἶός τ' εἴμ' ὑπερέχειν τῆς ἀντλίας.
A. αὐτὴν ἄρ' οἶσω συλλαβὼν τὴν ἀντλίαν.

These verses have occasionally been suspected, and generally misunderstood. Grounds for suspicion are (1) the termination of both lines with the same word, (2) the difficulty of making sense of ὑπερέχειν τῆς ἀντλίας 17. The first objection need not detain us long. The almost identical termination of two successive lines could be due to corruption; but it could result from careless writing (Greek and Roman poets are notoriously tolerant of repetition), or (as I believe) from the desire to point a joke. The real problem is the meaning of ὑπερέχειν τῆς ἀντλίας. Schol. R paraphrases ἀντέχειν καὶ περιγίνεσθαι τῆς ὁσμῆς. Platnauer¹ objects that ὑπερέχειν cannot be used for ἀντέχειν, and that ἀντλία means 'the hold of a ship where the bilge water was', not 'bilge water' (ἀντλος). The second claim is in fact erroneous; ἀντλία is used for ἀντλος at Arist. *HA* 534a, τῆς ἀντλίας ἐκχυθείσης (cf. Lucian, *Cat.* 1 ὅ τε γὰρ ἀντλος ἐκκέχυται, Zen. 1. 23 τὴν ἀντλίαν ἐπαναβῆναι συνέβη καὶ ἐκτῆξαι τοὺς ἄλλας). The first objection is entirely correct. Van Daele translates 'avoir le nez sur cette sentine'.² He is followed in essence by MacDowell,³ who translates: 'I can't stand over this dung-tub any longer'. However, although as MacDowell points out ὑπερέχειν may be used where only part of A is above B, the verb usually means 'emerge/project from' rather than simply 'be above', and almost invariably so where B is a liquid. The verb is so used in Thuc. 3. 23. 5 (cited by MacDowell), and would naturally be so used here with ἀντλίας (whether the word means 'bilge' or 'bilge water').

Once we recognize that ἀντλία may mean 'bilge water' as well as 'bilge', ὑπερέχειν falls neatly into place as part of a nautical metaphor. Bilge water is water which collects in the lowest part of the ship. When a ship leaks, founders or is swamped, the bilge water rises to fill the whole vessel. Cf. Alcaeus 326. 6 LP (metaphor), Aesch. *Sept.* 796 (metaphor), Eur. *Tro.* 686 (bailing during a storm), *Heracl.* 168, Luc. *Tim.* 4. 18, *Nav.* 16. The phrase τὴν ἀντλίαν φυλάξω in *Eq.* 434 refers to the danger of being swamped. οὐκέτι ὑπερέχει τοῦ ἀντλου / τῆς ἀντλίας might be said either of a ship being swamped or a sailor fighting a losing battle to bail. Either way, to indicate that his disgusting task is rapidly becoming unendurable, the slave uses a nautical metaphor. But bilge water, being stagnant, is also foul, as is excrement. So not surprisingly the other slave takes the metaphor literally, and announces that he will take away the tubful of dung instead of individual cakes as heretofore. It makes little difference whether we take ἀντλίαν in v. 18 to be the tub in which the excrement is kneaded or the excrement contained therein; αὐτὴν favours the former. Slave

¹ M. Platnauer, *Aristophanes Peace* (Oxford, 1964), p. 68.

² V. Coulon & H. Van Daele, *Aristophane II* (Paris, 1924), p. 100.

³ D. M. MacDowell, *CR* n.s. 15 (1965), 17.

B: 'I am being swamped by the bilge.' Slave A: 'Very well, I'll take the bilge itself away.'

This kind of joke, where one character uses a proverb or metaphor (living or dead) and another character takes the utterance literally, is not uncommon in Aristophanes. It is perhaps part of the same concrete imagination which prompts Aristophanes to work with simplified visual or physical images (War, Peace, Peisetaerus' marriage with Basileia),⁴ which sometimes are no more than extensions of metaphors, as *Pax* 236 ff. (a visual image based on the colloquial use of *μυττωτός* / *μυττωτεύω*), *Ra.* 1378 ff. Very similar to the present passage is *Eccl.* 595–6:

*Πρ. κατέδει πέλεθον πρότερός μου.
Βλ. καὶ τῶν πελέθων κοινωνοῦμεν;*

Cf. *Eccl.* 256–7:

*Γυνή. τί δ' ἦν ὑποκρούσωσίν σε; Πρ. προσκινήσομαι
ἄτ' οὐκ ἄπειρος οὔσα πολλῶν κρουμάτων.*

Similarly *V.* 190–1 (Philocleon has just been pulled from under the donkey):⁵

*Φι. εἰ μή μ' ἐάσθ' ἥσυχον, μαχοῦμεθα.
Βδ. περὶ τοῦ μαχεῖ νῶιν δῆτα; Φι. περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς.*

439–40:

*μὰ Δί, ἀλλ' ἐν εἰρήνῃ †διάγειν† τὸν βίον,
ἔχονθ' ἐταίραν καὶ σκαλεύοντ' ἀνθρακας.*

διάγειν is unmetrical. The only merit of *γε διάγειν* (Rogers) is that it scans. *διάξειν* (Dindorf) is possible; *εὔχομαι* may take a future infinitive, as *Soph. OT* 272. But the present or aorist is normal, and the future seems out of place with the aorists of 436, 438, 442. *διαζῆν* (Herwerden) is also possible; but it is difficult to see why so common a word should have been ousted from the text. Lenting's *διαγαγεῖν* is palaeographically plausible (*διαγαγεῖν* > *διάγειν* by haplography). The aorist would express the completion of the process rather than its duration. But I know of no parallel. The present is used elsewhere, as *Bacch.* 5. 53, *Plat. Rep.* 579d, *Ar. V.* 1006. I suspect that *διάγειν* is a gloss which has ousted the true reading *διαπλέκειν*. *βίον διαπλέκειν* is a more elevated *βίον διάγειν* (See LSJ s.v. II); *διαπλέκειν* without *βίον* means 'live' at *Ar. Av.* 754.

1085: *οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῷ πραχθέντι ποιήσεις ὕστερον οὐδέν.*

The ancient interpretation of *ἐπὶ τῷ πραχθέντι* as *ἐπὶ τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην* has seduced the majority of commentators. This involves taking *ποιήσεις οὐδέν* as 'you will achieve nothing'; 'you will be powerless as a result of what has been done'.⁶ This interpretation gives a line of intolerable obscurity and remarkable flatness, but is linguistically no less possible than the alternative interpretation,⁷ 'nor will you again compose (oracles) after the event'. The latter interpretation is supported by *Av.* 963 ff., where the charge of prophesying after the event is made against oracle-mongers in a scene which closely resembles the Hierocles scene in *Peace*. But the acceptability of this, the more lively interpretation, may be increased if we note that its pedigree is as good as that of the popular interpretation. Schol. V on 1101 says: *εἰώθασιν γὰρ*

⁴ See in general H.-J. Newiger, *Metapher und Allegorie* (Munich, 1957).

⁵ See D. M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford, 1971), p. 157 for further examples.

⁶ Or 'against what has been done', i.e. 'to alter what has been done'.

⁷ Adopted by van Daele, p. 145 and R. Cantarella, *Aristofane – le commedie III* (Milan, 1954), p. 521.

οἱ μάντιες μετὰ τὴν ἔκβασιν τῶν πραγμάτων λέγειν ὅτι προήιδειν τοῦτο τὸ ἐσόμενον, πρὶν δὲ γενέσθαι οὔτε προΐσασιν οὐδὲν οὔτε λέγουσιν. This comment is meaningless as an explanation of v. 1101, but makes perfect sense as an explanation of v. 1085, whence it has somehow been misplaced. We may conclude that both explanations were current in antiquity.

1265–7:

νῆ τὸν Δί', ὡς τὰ παιδί' ἤδη 'ξέρχεται
οὐρησόμενα τὰ τῶν ἐπικλήτων δεῦρ', ἵνα
ἄττ' αἰσεται προαναβάλληται, μοι δοκεῖ.

Van Leeuwen, followed by Platnauer,⁸ suspected corruption in 1266. Platnauer objects to (1) the word order, which he finds 'artificial and awkward', and (2) the juxtaposition of two incompatible expressions of purpose, οὐρησόμενα, ἵνα προαναβάλληται. To suppose that οὐρησόμενα gives a pretext, ἵνα κτλ. the real purpose, is both linguistically dubious (Platnauer) and unnecessary. Both problems have the same cause, Aristophanes' desire to cram in jokes to keep the audience laughing. V. 1265 gives a brief statement of fact. οὐρησόμενα is added for the sake of a quick joke, and is forgotten almost as soon as it is uttered. It is the insertion of οὐρησόμενα which creates the awkward word order. ἵνα κτλ. gives the factual reason for the boy's exit from the house. For a similar transient joke, discarded as soon as it is made, cf. *Eccl.* 668–9:

Βλ. οὐδ' ἀποδύσουσ' ἄρα τῶν νυκτῶν; Πρ. οὐκ ἦν οἶκοι γε καθεύδεις,
οὐδ' ἦν γε θύραζ' ὥσπερ πρότερον.

We may suppose a slight pause for laughter after οὐρησόμενα.

University of St Andrews

C. CAREY

⁸ J. Van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Pax* (Leiden, 1906), p. 188, Platnauer, p. 170.

A DOUBLE PUN IN ARISTOPHANES, *LYSISTRATA* 1001

Herald 998

Οὐκ, ἀλλ' ἄρχε μέν, οἶῶ, Λαμπιτώ,
ἐπειτα τᾶλλαι ται κατὰ Σπάρταν ἀμᾶ
γυναῖκες ἅπερ ἀπὸ μιᾶς ὑσπλαγίδος
ἀπήλαάν τῶς ἄνδρας ἀπὸ τῶν ὑσσάκων.

Coulon

It is clear from the context that ὑσσάκων here must mean the female genitals, as a scholium says. This is a common comic use of ὤς, other words for pig such as δέλφαξ and χοῖρος, and their compounds. ὕσσαξ (or ὕσσακος) is not a common word; it may be a coinage by Aristophanes.¹ What is its point here?

¹ It is unclear whether Aristophanes' word is to be ascribed to ὕσσαξ otherwise unattested (as Ernout argued) or to ὕσσακος. The form ὑσσάκω occurs in a hypercatalectic iambic line in Doric dialect quoted by Hephaestion (*Ench.* 4. 4, p. 14 Consbruch).

εἴμ' ὦτ' ἀπ' ὑσσάκω λυθεῖσα

Bergk guessed that the author of the line was Alcman; Page sensibly prints it as *Lyr. Adesp.* 974. A scholion on this passage of Hephaestion translates ὑσσάκω as πασσάλου, 'snare', and this is the meaning given the word by the lexicographers (Hsch. s. ὕσσακος with Theognost. *Can.* 24. 9, Phot., *Etym. Magn.* 785. 8 s. ὑσσάκους). Chantraine, 1162 distinguishes this word from ὕσσαξ. But Photius' notice says that ὑσσάκους (which must be from ὕσσακος, not ὕσσαξ) is found in Aristophanes, and it is reasonable, though not necessary, to think he has the *Lysistrata*