οἱ μάντεις 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:

> νὴ τὸν Δί᾽, ὡς τὰ παιδί᾽ ἤδη ᾽ξέρχεται
> οὐρησόμενα τὰ τῶν ἐπικλήτων δεῦρ᾽, ἵνα
> ἅττ᾽ ἄισεται προαναβάληται, 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 προαναβάληται. 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 οἴκοι γε καθεύδῃς,
> οὐδ᾽ ἦν γε θύραζ᾽ ὥσπερ πρότερον.

We may suppose a slight pause for laughter after οὐρησόμενα.

University of St Andrews C. CAREY

A DOUBLE PUN IN ARISTOPHANES, *LYSISTRATA* 1001

Herald 998

> Οὔκ, ἀλλ᾽ ἄρχε μέν, οἰῶ, Λαμπιτώ,
> ἔπειτα τἄλλαι ταὶ κατὰ Σπάρταν ἁμᾶ
> γυναῖκες ἆπερ ἀπὸ μιᾶς ὑσπλαγίδος
> ἀπήλαάν τὼς 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 ὗς, 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?

In his edition of the *Lysistrata* (Berlin, 1927), Wilamowitz suggested that the word was a compound of ὗς and σάκος. A. Ernout, *BSL* 41 (1940), 120–1 with n. 1, explained the form as a development from ὗς and the suffix -αξ; Ernout has been followed by J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy* (New Haven and London, 1975), p. 132 n. 131, and P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* 4. 1 (Paris, 1977) p. 1162. But whatever the word's derivation, I think Aristophanes intended a double pun on the word σάκος.

The neuter noun σάκος means 'shield'. The masculine noun σάκος, properly 'a coarse hair-cloth' or 'sackcloth', is also used as a comic term for hair (Ar. *Eccl.* 502 with Schol.). The comic poet Plato puns on these two words when he has a character address the politician Epicrates as σακεσφόρε (122E. = Schol. Ar. *Eccl.* 71; cf. Plut. *Pel.* 30. 7, Harp. s. *Epikrates*). Epicrates, notably hirsute, was also apparently something of a warmonger. He is said to have taken Persian money to keep up the war with Sparta (*Hell. Oxy.* 7. 2, Paus. 3. 9. 8; cf. Pl. Com. 119E. = Ath. 6. 229 f.).

This double pun well suits the present passage. A reference to a weapon, especially a defensive weapon like a shield, is appropriate to the context – an account of Spartan women repelling their men. And Spartan men were notoriously heavily bearded (Ar. *Vesp.* 476, *Lys.* 1072, Plut. *Phoc.* 10. 1) and hairy in general (e.g. Hdt. 1. 82. 8, Ar. *Av.* 1281–2 with Schol., Xen. *Lac.* 11. 3, Plut. *Lyc.* 22. 1). We would expect Spartan women to have the same reputation, especially in view of the Athenians' own practice of depilating female genital hair (e.g. Ar. *Thesm.* 540–3, 590–1, *Lys.* 151, 825–8, *Eccl.* 12–13, Pl. Com. 174. 14–15E. = Ath. 10. 441e).

University of British Columbia   MARK GOLDEN

passage in mind. Perhaps he confused the two words; then we may suppose that Aristophanes coined ὗσσαξ. But it is also possible that ὗσσακος ordinarily had two connotations, or that Aristophanes merely noticed its comic possibilities and decided to exploit them. I do not think this uncertainty affects my argument here: a gesture by the herald to one of the Spartan women's pubic area would make the reference of ὗσσάκων clear.

F. Lasserre thought he saw ὗσσακος or ὗσσαξ in Archilochus fr. 48. 8 W. (= *POxy.* 2311 fr. 1 [a]): αἱ [δ'] ὑσσά[κ-. M. L. West is suitably sceptical.

XENOPHON AND PLATO

At *Meno* 95d–96a, Socrates is demonstrating to Meno that Theognis is confused regarding the teachability of virtue, this confusion being indicated by his saying in one place that virtue is teachable and in another that it is not. As to its not being teachable, Socrates quotes Theognis 436–8:

> of a good father no bad son would come,
> obeying wise counsel. But through teaching [διδάσκων]
> you shall never make the bad man good.

As to its teachability, Socrates quotes Theognis 33–6:

> and with [παρά] these [good men] drink and eat, and sit with
> them, and please them, who are a great force.
> For from the noble you shall be taught [διδάξεαι¹] noble things. While
> should you mix with the bad, you shall lose what mind you have.

Plato has altered the text of Theognis here, substituting παρά for μετά (33) and διδάξεαι for μαθήσεαι (35).² The former substitution may be insignificant, but the

---

[1] Cod. Vindobonensis 54: διδάξεται.

[2] Unless I am mistaken, μαθήσεαι stands in all mss. of Theognis.