

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF ARISTOPHANES' *PEACE***Peace* 107

ἐὰν δὲ μή σοι καταγορεύσῃ;

καταγορεύσῃ fere codd.: καταγορεύῃ Cobet

Cobet, in his second discussion of ἀγορεύω and its compounds,¹ maintained that these verbs in Attic formed all tenses except present and imperfect from ἐρῶ, εἶπον, εἶρηκα, εἶρημαι, ἐρρήθην, save that forms with -αγορευ- were optionally used to distinguish certain alternative meanings. Thus ἀπηγόρευσα etc. (Dem. 40.44, 55.4) could be used in the sense 'forbid', but not in that of 'weary' or 'give up'; προηγορευμένα (Xen. Mem. 1.2.35)² could be used in the sense 'proclaimed', but not in that of 'foretold' or 'said previously'; προσαγορεύσαι etc. (Pl. Phd. 104a, Polit. 288c; Xen. Mem. 3.2.1; Anaxilas fr. 21.4; Dem. 39.38, 40.1; Lyk. Leokr. 9, 18; and several other fourth-century instances, to which add one much earlier, [Aesch.] Prom. 834) could be used in the sense 'call, name' but not in that of 'greet'. These distinctions, he believed, did not break down until about the time of Alexander.³ Hence his rejection of the aorist καταγορεύσῃ offered by the MS. tradition in *Peace* 107.⁴

But καταγορεύειν too is a verb with two clearly distinct ranges of meaning: 'tell, declare' (as here, *Clouds* 518, Eur. Med. 1106) and 'denounce, accuse' (as Hdt. 3.71.5, Pl. Rep. 595b). Is there any reason why a partial differentiation should not have existed between κατηγόρευσα and κατεῖπον as well as between ἀπηγόρευσα and ἀπέειπον, προσηγόρευσα and προσεῖπον? That the evidence consists only of a single passage is no justification for disregarding or 'correcting' it in this case, any more than in the case of προηγορευμένα (see above). On the analogy of the other compounds, we should refuse to emend *Peace* 107, and instead should take it as evidence that καταγορεύειν in the sense 'tell' could optionally form its non-present tenses in morphologically regular fashion.⁵

Peace 246–7

ὦ Μέγαρά Μέγαρ', ὡς ἐπιτετρίψεθ' αὐτίκα
ἀπαξάπαντα καταμεμυττωτευμένα.

246

ὦ RV: ὦ cett. ἐπιτετρ- Elmsley: ἐπιτρ- codd. λΣ^R Σ^v 252

* I gratefully acknowledge the beneficial criticism and advice of the editors and of Dr C. Austin.

¹ *Mnemosyne* (1st ser.) 11 (1862), 127–38.

² Cobet actually deleted the phrase in question (ὡς ἄλλο τι ποιῶ ἢ τὰ προηγορευμένα), but it was accepted by his follower W. G. Rutherford (*The New Phrynichus* [London, 1881], 333–4).

³ This view agrees with the evidence of inscriptions, in which ἀναγορεύσαι begins to appear alongside ἀνείπειν from c. 325 B.C. (K. Meisterhans & E. Schwyzler, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³ [Berlin, 1900], 182).

⁴ Most editors from Blaydes onwards have followed Cobet here. The last not to do so seems to have been Rogers, who in his critical appendix (p. 185) denounced Cobet's 'reckless generalizations' without, however, bolstering his rhetoric by any cogent argument.

⁵ Sharpley (n. ad loc.) asserts, contrariwise, that καταγορεύσῃ could only mean 'accuse'. He cites no evidence in support of this statement, and in classical Attic (which alone is relevant) I am not aware of any.

Failing major emendation, the choice is between ᾠ...ἐπιτετρίψεσθ' and ἰὼ...ἐπιτρίψεσθ'; and every consideration but one (which will be taken up at the end of this note) tells in favour of the former: two considerations of grammar, one of metre, and one of textual criticism.

(i) On the available evidence, the future passive of τρίβω in classical Attic is τρίβομαι for the simple verb (Thuc. 6.18.6; 7.42.5) but -τριβήσομαι in compounds (Soph. *OT* 428; Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.60). This creates an (admittedly weak) presumption against ἐπιτρίψεσθ' here.

(ii) The perfect participle καταμεμυτωτευμένα also tells in favour of a future perfect tense for the main verb: a simple future tense would imply, nonsensically, that Megara will undergo 'crushing' *after* it has *already* been 'made mincemeat of', whereas in fact the two verbs refer to the same operation. The future perfect makes far better sense: Megara, after it has been made mincemeat of, will 'be in a crushed state'.

(iii) Platnauer asserts that 'nothing can be deduced from the metre', because tribrach+anapaest (ἰὼ | Μῆγαῤῥα | Μῆγαῤῥ' ᾠς) and dactyl+tribrach (ᾠ Μῆγαῤῥα Μῆγαῤῥ' ᾠς), though rare, are both found. This statement conceals a fundamental difference in the admissibility of these two metrical combinations. The form -υυ | υυυ for the first metron of the iambic trimeter is a perfectly regular variant, not only in comedy (e.g. *Ach.* 902; *Knights* 115, 125; *Wasps* 216) and satyr-play (e.g. Eur. *Kykl.* 1) but also in tragedy (e.g. Soph. *Ai.* 854, *Phil.* 797, 1420⁶; Eur. *Hel.* 711, *Or.* 248). Tribrach+anapaest, on the other hand – or, more generally, an anapaest directly following a resolution – is unknown in tragedy and satyr-play, and in all the undoubted instances in Aristophanes (*Ach.* 47, 928; *Birds* 108; *Ekkl.* 315)⁷ the juxtaposition is cushioned by a pause.⁸ Many Aristophanic passages once regarded as instances of the phenomenon, in which it was not possible to assume a pause after the resolution, have long since been emended;⁹ the latest to be removed from consideration is *Thesm.* 285 (τὸ πόπαῤῥον ὅπως R), where PSI 1194 has confirmed Porson's conjecture τὰ πόπαν'. Apart from *Peace* 246, only five now remain.¹⁰

(a) *Clouds* 663 ἀλεκτρύονα κατὰ ταὐτὸ καὶ τὸν ἄρρενα. Here there is a variant κατ' αὐτὸ (VE^{ac}U); the point of the preposition κατὰ is obscure, and sense as well as metre is improved if we read with Hermann καὶ ταὐτὸ καί.

(b) *Birds* 1283 σκυτάλι' ἐφόρουν, νυνὶ δ' ὑποστρέψαντες αὖ. Corruption is here certain. For the scholia, on the authority of Symmachos, assert that the second syllable of σκυτάλι' is here long; and whether or not they are right in this,¹¹

⁶ On the assumption that, as is always possible and sometimes necessary both in tragedy and in comedy, the first syllable of ἀθάνατον is long.

⁷ In three of these places the resolution is at sentence-end (once with change of speaker), in *Ach.* 928 at clause-end. See M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 89.

⁸ Sharpley, and also at one time V. Coulon (*REG* 38 [1925], 82), tried to defend ἰὼ in *Peace* 246 by supposing what can best be described as a histrionic pause after the first Μῆγαῤῥα. In a later article (cited in n. 10) Coulon rightly abandoned this notion.

⁹ These are listed by J. W. White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy* (London, 1912), 50.

¹⁰ These passages, and others, are discussed by V. Coulon, *REG* 66 (1953), 34–41 (who tends to favour proceleusmatic feet) and H. J. Newiger, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 175–84 (who tends to favour emendation).

¹¹ It is highly probable that they are right. Their language (τὸ α ἐκτείνεται, ὡς ἐν Ὀλκᾷ, ἐνθα καὶ τὸ Νικοφάντος ἐξ Ἀφροδίτης Γονῶν [fr. 2] παρετέθη· οὐκ ἐς κόρακας τῷ χεῖρ' ἀποίσεις ἐκποδῶν | ἀπὸ τοῦ σκυταλίου <τε add. Dindorf> καὶ τῆς διφθέρας;) shows that the

Symmachos could never have entertained such a hypothesis at all unless his text had *νύν* (Porson) rather than *νυνὶ* (codd.). And if Porson's conjecture is accepted, the scansion *σκυτάλι' | ἑφόρουν* will leave the line a syllable short, and we must either emend further (*σκυτάλι' α' τ' ἑφόρουν* [Bergk] is perhaps the least unsatisfactory proposal), or, better, accept *σκυτάλι'*.

(c) The other three Aristophanic passages may be considered together; in all of them there is some uncertainty about the text on other than metrical grounds, but in all of them the text as given below has been generally, and I think rightly, accepted by recent editors.¹²

Wasps 1169 *ὠδὶ διαβὰς τρυφερόν τι διασαλακώνισον*

ita codd. et schol. et lexica complura: et διασαλακ- et διασακ- novit Hesychius: διαλακ- Artemidorus ap. Σ^{VI}Γ: (δια)λυκ- γρ Σ^{RV}Γ.

Here the reading of the direct tradition is strongly supported by Hermippos fr. iamb. 5 West *σεσαλακωνισμένην*.

Lys. 1148 (a Spartan speaks)

ἀδικίόμες· ἀλλ' ὁ πρωκτὸς ἄφατον ὡς καλός.

ἀδικίόμες Elmsley: *ἀδικιούμες* R *ἄφατον ὡς* Bentley: *ἄφατος καὶ* R

Here as elsewhere in *Lysistrate* (183, 198, 1305, 1310) the copyists have had trouble with Laconian *-ίω* for *-έω* → Attic *-ῶ*, but 1002 *μογίόμες*, 1003 *λυχοφορόντες* support Elmsley's emendation: R's reading is no doubt a blend of *ἀδικίόμες* with a gloss *ἀδικούμεν*.

Wealth 1011 *νητάριον ἂν καὶ φάττιον ὑπεκορίζετο*

φάττιον Bentley: *βάτ(τ)ιον* codd.

Here *βάτιον* 'little mulberry' (cf. Athenaios 2.51f and perhaps Aesch. fr. 264N = 248M) cannot be wholly ruled out, but *φάττιον* 'little dove' makes a much better pair with *νητάριον* and is supported by Ephippos fr. 15.8 *ἀλεκτρύνιον, φάττιον, περδίκιον*. Another way to restore metrical normality would be to delete the preverb *ὑπ-* (so Newiger [n. 10] 181); but this is to exchange a compound used in a normal sense for a simplex used in an unattested sense.¹³

Prima facie, then, these three lines all do exhibit an anapaest directly following a resolution. In each case, however, the abnormality can be obviated in the same way: by assigning consonantal rather than syllabic value to a prevocalic *ι* (*διασαλακώνισον, ἀδικί(ο)με(ν), φάττ(ι)ον*), a licence that is found sporadically in almost every kind of Greek poetry.¹⁴ In relation to *Lys.* 1148 this was suggested by Wilamowitz,¹⁵ and

matter was discussed more fully in a commentator's note on a passage in Aristophanes' *Holkades*. This passage may or may not be Ar. fr. 422 Kock = 432 Kassel-Austin *σκούταλον ὑποσίδηρον*; in any case there is no good reason to reject the commentator's evidence that the text was such as to require the scansion *-τᾱλ-*. It is quite credible that *σκούταλον* and its derivatives may have been optionally pronounceable with [a:] in colloquial Attic: a parallel is provided by *κυνοκεφάλῳ* (*Knights* 416), and the lengthening will have been aided by the existence of several slangy words in which *-ᾱλος* seems to have functioned as a quasi-suffix (*σκούταλος, κόβαλος, *σκίμαλος* implied by *σκιμαλίζω* and itself surviving, it seems, to be recorded, slightly misspelt, in a Greek-Coptic glossary of the sixth century A.D. [*P.Lond.* 1821.308: see *Aegyptus* 6 (1925), 194]).

¹² If, as Dr Austin tells me he believes, the text of *Thesm.* 100 (*μύρμηκος ἀτραπούς, ἧ τί διαμυννρίζεται*;) is sound (*διαμυνύρεται* Dawes and most editors), it constitutes an exact parallel to *Wasps* 1169, and whatever analysis is correct for one of the two lines should be applied also to the other.

¹³ The simplex *κορίζομαι*, in fact, is known only from *Clouds* 68, where it takes as second object not a pet-name or euphemism, as *ὑποκορίζομαι* normally does, but a speech.

¹⁴ See West, *Greek Metre* 14.

¹⁵ Wilamowitz (n. ad loc.) 'Das Iota muss in der Aussprache verschliffen sein'.

it would kill two birds with one stone by getting rid of the 'split anapaest' ἄδικί | ὅμες | ἄλλ' |; similarly in *Wealth* 1011 by assuming a consonantal ι we can obviate the 'split resolution' φάτ|τιών | ὕπ|εκορίζετο.

Outside the eleven surviving comedies of Aristophanes, there are some six or seven other comic trimeters, which, as transmitted, could reasonably be analysed as containing an anapaest directly following a resolution. Most of these, as Newiger¹⁶ has shown, either are easily emendable or betray themselves as corrupt on other than metrical grounds. There remains, however, a line from Eupolis' *Demes* which until now, so far as I am aware, has not been brought into the discussion of this metrical problem.¹⁷

Eupolis, *CGFP* 92.90 (*Demes* fr. IIIr 13 Körte, Plepelits)

...ποι]είτω τις ὃ τι ποτε βούλεται

τις] τίς γ' Page¹⁸ ποτε] πως vel πω Luppe:¹⁹ fort. περ

The text here, however, is open to suspicion for grammatical as well as metrical reasons. The combination ὃ τι ποτε (or ὅστις ποτε, etc.) has two unquestionably valid usages.

Firstly, it is of course very common as an indirect interrogative; it will suffice to cite Pl. *Euthph.* 6d ἐρωτήσαντα τὸ ὅσιν ὃ τι ποτ' εἶη, Ar. *Wealth* 19 ἦν μὴ φράσῃς ὃ τι τῷδ' ἀκολουθοῦμέν ποτε.

Secondly we have the usage whose most famous example is Aesch. *Ag.* 160 Ζεὺς ὅστις ποτ' ἐστίν. In this usage, ὅστις ποτέ refers not (as in the *Demes* line) to someone or something whose identity does not matter ('anyone at all who...', 'anything at all which...') but to someone or something whose identification is desired but has yet to be achieved. Thus in *Ag.* 160 the chorus would like to be able to address Zeus in a manner pleasing to him, but they do not know how to do so.²⁰ The usage may be further illustrated by some Platonic examples:

Kriton 47e ἡ φανλότερον ἡγοῦμεθα εἶναι τοῦ σώματος ἐκεῖνο, ὃ τι ποτ' ἐστὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων, περὶ ὃ ἡ τε ἀδικία καὶ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐστίν; The question itself makes it clear that Socrates regards the unidentified something as very important indeed, and as having a precise identity which only awaits discovery; as both Kriton and Plato's readers will have been well aware, it is in fact the ψυχή.

¹⁶ Op. cit. (n. 10). The relevant passages discussed by Newiger are Plato com. fr. 188.1; Nikostratos fr. 15.2; Antiphanes fr. 234.6; Men. *Sam.* 192 Körte³ = 407 Sandbach; Men. fr. 326 K-T. Another passage, Ar. fr. 345.1 Koch = 359.1 Kassel-Austin, was not considered by Newiger, because Coulon in his 1953 article (see n. 10) had not cited it as evidence for the admissibility of proceleusmatics in the comic trimeter; it is manifestly corrupt.

¹⁷ I am particularly grateful to Dr Austin for alerting me to the relevance of this passage.

¹⁸ D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri* 1 (London etc., 1942), p. 212 (line 74). Page fails to mention the emendation in his apparatus, which at this point says only '63-75 as given by Körte'; similarly K. Plepelits, *Die Fragmente der Demen des Eupolis* (Vienna, 1970), 144 ascribes τίς γ' to Körte, but the conjecture is not to be found in either of Körte's treatments of the passage (*Hermes* 47 [1912], 289; *Berichte Akad. Leipzig (Phil.-hist. Klasse)* 71⁶ [1919], 8). If γ' is inserted, the second metron of the trimeter must be taken to begin with -τω rather than -ει-, so that ποι-, if rightly restored, must be scanned as short.

¹⁹ W. Luppe, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 28 (1982), 22, bluntly describing the text of the papyrus as 'metrically false'.

²⁰ They have the same problem with Agamemnon in 783ff.; these passages are the beginning of the 'what shall I say?' theme (cf. A. Lebeck, *The Oresteia* [Washington, 1971], 103-4) which runs most of the way through the trilogy.

Theaitetos 160e τοῦτο μὲν δὴ, ὡς ἔοικεν, μόλις ποτὲ ἐγεννήσαμεν, ὃ τι δὴ ποτε τυγχάνει ὄν. This refers to the proposition, just affirmed by *Theaitetos*, that knowledge is identical with sensation; the ὃ τι... clause points forward to the next stage of the inquiry, which will establish whether this product of Socrates' 'midwifery' is ἀξιον τροφῆς or ἀνεμιαῖον τε καὶ ψεῦδος. Socrates has already explained (150b–151d) that this next stage is for him the most important.

Theaitetos 187a μὴ ζητεῖν αὐτὴν (sc. ἐπιστήμην) ἐν αἰσθήσει... ἄλλ' ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ὀνόματι, ὃ τι ποτ' ἔχει ἡ ψυχὴ, ὅταν αὐτὴ καθ' αὐτὴν πραγματεύηται περὶ τὰ ὄντα. The ὄνομα sought by Socrates is at once supplied by *Theaitetos*: it is δοξάζειν.

Philebos 22d ἐν τῷ μεικτῷ τούτῳ βίῳ, ὃ τι ποτ' ἔστι τοῦτο ὁ λαβὼν ὁ βίος οὗτος γέγονεν αἵρετὸς ἅμα καὶ ἀγαθός, οὐχ ἡδονὴ ἄλλὰ νοῦς τούτῳ συγγενέστερον καὶ ὁμοιότερόν ἐστι. The unidentified something here is nothing less than the Good, the definition of which is the formal object of the whole dialogue (11b–c).

Timaios 28b ὁ δὴ πᾶς οὐρανός – ἡ κόσμος ἡ καὶ ἄλλο ὃ τι ποτὲ ὀνομαζόμενος μάλιστα' ἂν δέχοιτο, τοῦθ' ἡμῖν ὠνομάσθω. Here the traditional language of prayer is being consciously echoed in speaking of an entity traditionally thought of as divine: ὃ τι ποτὲ – ὠνομάσθω is a virtual paraphrase of *Ag.* 160–2.

What the *Demes* papyrus offers us, however, is something quite different from these passages. There is no question of ὃ τι ποτὲ βούλεται referring to something specific but as yet unidentified: the point is not that the *συκοφάντης* does not *know* what crime his victim may be committing, but that he does not *care* so long as he receives his blackmail payment. And it is very doubtful whether ὃ τι ποτε can be so used. There is, to be sure, a kindred usage of ὅστις δὴ ποτε (etc.), as in the following passages:

Dem. 18.261 ἐπειδὴ δ' εἰς τοὺς δημότας ἐνεγράψης ὅπως δὴ ποτε, ἐὼ γὰρ τοῦτο: 'somehow or other (exactly how is immaterial)'.

Dem. 21.32 τῶν θεσμοθετῶν τούτων οὐδενὶ θεσμοθέτης ἔστ' ὄνομα, ἀλλ' ὅτι δὴ ποθ' ἐκάστω: what the actual names are is immaterial to the point being made.

But in this usage, so far as I can find, δὴ is never omitted, except in one passage which is marked by other grammatical oddities:

Pl. *Laws* 640e–641a ἡ οὐ συννοεῖς τοῦθ', ὅτι μεθ' ὧν κυβερνήτης καὶ πᾶς παντὸς ἄρχων ἀνατρέπει πάντα εἴτε πλοῖα εἴτε ἄρματα εἴτε στρατόπεδον εἴθ' ὃ τι ποτ' εἴη τὸ κυβερνώμενον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ; As the optative εἴη in primary sequence shows, the writer's sense of the construction of his sentence was somewhat vague; note also his wavering between plural and singular in πλοῖα... ἄρματα... στρατόπεδον.

The particle which we find used, at any rate in fifth-century comedy, to emphasize that the precise reference of an indefinite relative pronoun is a matter of indifference, is not ποτε but περ. Consider these Aristophanic passages:

Knights 1107 ἀνύσατέ νυν ὃ τι περ ποιήσεθ'. There is no sign that the speaker, *Demos*, is much concerned about the precise nature of the services *Paphlagon* and the *Sausage-seller* are going to perform for him; what matters to him is not the quality of these services but their quantity (cf. 1108–9) and the speed with which they are delivered (cf. 1107 ἀνύσατε, 1156–7).

Clouds 476 ἀλλ' ἐγχείρει τὸν πρεσβύτερον ὃ τι περ μέλλεις προιδάσκειν. The speaker is the chorus-leader; she is unlikely to be curious about the exact content of *Socrates'* teaching (indeed, as a goddess and a patron of *Socrates* she might be presumed to know it already) – rather, she is urging *Socrates* to set to work now on educating *Strepsiades*, her ultimate motive being to bring about the punishment of both of them (cf. 1452–61).

Frogs 1105–7 ὃ τι περ οὖν ἔξετον ἐρίζειν, | λέγετον, ἔπιτον, ἀνά τε δέρετον | τά τε παλαιὰ καὶ τὰ καινὰ. Throughout the contest between *Aeschylus* and *Euripides* the chorus see it primarily in agonistic terms, their interest being not in the important issues at stake but in the styles and methods of the contestants: cf. 814–29, 875–84, 895–906, 997–1003, 1100–4, 1370–7. Here too they seem less concerned to find out what the next subject of debate is going to be than to hear it discussed with ingenuity (1108 κάποκινδυνεύετον λεπτόν τι καὶ σοφὸν λέγειν) and combative vigour (1106–7).

Birds 928–30, though part of the beggar-poet's Pindaric pastiche, is not itself, so far as we know, directly quoted or adapted from Pindar, and forms the closest parallel of all to *CGFP* 92.90:

δὸς ἔμιν ὁ τι περ
τεῦ κεφαλῇ θέλεις²¹
πρόφρων δόμεν...²²

The poet's request is for whatever gift Peisetairos is graciously pleased to give him – it matters not what.

There is a rather similar usage of ὁ τι περ which is fairly common in Plato,²³ who, however, invariably uses it with the indefinite subjunctive or optative, rather than the indicative as Aristophanes does.

Thus, to say the least, there is nothing to tempt one to claim that the metrical irregularity of ὁ τι ποτε in *CGFP* 92.90 is outweighed by its appropriateness in grammar and sense, and it would be most unsafe to cite that line in support of the metrical irregularity of ἰὼ Μέγαρά Μέγαρ' in *Peace* 246. That irregularity is therefore left high and dry without a parallel, and metre joins grammar in favouring the 'Elmsleian' text ὦ...ἐπιτετρίψεσθ'.

(iv) It might appear at first sight that from the point of view of textual criticism ἰὼ...ἐπιτετρίψεσθ' was preferable, in that it requires us to assume only one corruption rather than two. How likely, though, is it that ἰὼ would become ὦ (in the ancestor of RV) in just one of the four parallel occurrences within a short space of text (the others are 236, 242, 250)? The reverse corruption would be far easier²⁴ – particularly as RV offer a line (with ὦ...ἐπιτετρίψεσθ') which is no sort of iambic trimeter and which positively invites a 'correction' that would restore both the parallelism and metre of a kind. For the loss of a reduplicative syllable in a future-perfect verb form cf. *Knights* 1371 ἐγγεγράφεται] ἐγγράφεται RA; *Birds* 1503 ἐκκεκαλύφμαι] ἐκκαλύφμαι RMVp2HL; Thuc. 7.14.3 διαπεπολεμήσεται BM^{pc} διαπολεμήσεται ACEFGM^{ac}; Xen. *Anab.* 1.5.16 κατακεκόψεσθαι plerique κατακόψεσθαι vel -θε DVC^{ac}BA.

For all these reasons ἰὼ...ἐπιτετρίψεσθ' is most unlikely to be right. There is, nevertheless, one argument of some weight that tells against the 'Elmsleian' alternative ὦ...ἐπιτετρίψεσθ'. This is that ἰὼ is, as it were, the trade-mark of this particular speaker (the ogre War): it opens his first, second and fourth speeches, and it is hard to see why Aristophanes should have been so inartistic as to give a different opening to his third speech, the couplet 246–7, which is completely parallel in content and accompanying action (throwing a fresh ingredient into the mortar for pounding) to 242–3 and 250.

If this argument is considered to have force, the solution can only lie in emendation more far-reaching than has so far been tried. Suspicion may then rest on *Μέγαρά Μέγαρ'* as a possible dittography, perhaps influenced by 236 ἰὼ βροτοὶ βροτοὶ βροτοί, and one might propose e.g. ἰὼ Μέγαρ', ὡς <ξυν>ἐπιτετρίψεσθ' αὐτίκα | ἀπαξάπαντα, comparing Xen. *Anab.* 5.8.20 ἰκανὰ γὰρ...καὶ μικρὰ ἀμαρτηθέντα πάντα συνεπιτρίψαι. But there may well be other possibilities.

²¹ θέλεις MΓU: θέλεις RVEA.

²² The following words (ἐμιν τείν codd.) are a notorious crux (see M. L. West, *CR* 18 [1968], 7–8), but are not relevant to the problem with which we are concerned here.

²³ *Euthph.* 3d, 5d; *Charm.* 168d; *Rep.* 492e; *Parm.* 142e, 153de, 154d; *Tim.* 77b; *Soph.* 224e, 234b (ὁ τι περ ἂν βουληθῇ δρᾶν, τοῦτο ἰκανώτατος ὢν ἀποτελεῖν ἔργω), 255a, d; *Laws* 645c, 656c, 662a (ποιῶν ὁ τι περ ἐπιθυμοῖ), 753c, 780d, 863b, 878a, 915a; *Epist.* 7.335b.

²⁴ Cf. *Ach.* 566, where ὦ (Hermann: metrically necessary) has become ἰὼ in all MSS., influenced by ἰὼ Λάμαχ' just before and in 568.

Peace 435–6

σπένδοντες εὐχόμεσθα τὴν νῦν ἡμέραν
 "Ἐλλησιν ἄρξαι πᾶσι πολλῶν κάγαθῶν.

εὐχόμε(σ)θα codd.: εὐχόμεσθα Brunck

For parallels to help us decide between the subjunctive and the indicative here, we must look for passages where the leader or spokesman of a group or congregation begins a prayer which is intended to be taken up by the whole group. Thus the indicatives of Aesch. *Seven* 481 and *Eum.* 979 (both ἐπέχομαι) are not evidence, since they are uttered (in the 'choral singular') by the group as a whole; nor is the indicative of Eur. *Phoin.* 783, since the prayer is an individual one (προσευχόμεσθα like ὀρμώμεθ' 781 being 1st plur. for 1st sing.); nor (*pace* Rogers) can we regard the subjunctive of *Peace* 973 (to which add *Peace* 560, 967; *Birds* 903) as decisive evidence, since in those passages εὐχόμεθα (*vel sim.*) is not grammatically linked, as it is in *Peace* 435–6, with the actual content of the prayer, and therefore could be regarded as announcing or looking forward to the prayer rather than forming part of it. The more cogent parallels, which appear to have been overlooked,²⁵ are *Birds* 864ff. εὔχεσθε τῇ 'Εστίᾳ τῇ ὀρνιθείᾳ κτλ. . . διδόναι Νεφελοκοκκυγιδῶν ὑγίαν καὶ σωτηρίαν, *Thesm.* 297ff. εὔχεσθε τοῖν Θεσμοφόροις κτλ. . . ἐκκλησίαν τήνδε . . . κάλλιστα καὶ ἄριστα ποιῆσαι, *Thesm.* 331ff. εὔχεσθε τοῖς θεοῖσι . . . εἰ τις ἐπιβουλεύει τι τῷ δήμῳ κακὸν τῷ τῶν γυναικῶν . . . κακῶς ἀπολέσθαι, in all of which, as in *Peace* 453ff., the introductory verb directly governs one or more petitions expressed in the (accusative and) infinitive. In these three prayers (two of which are in prose and therefore probably modelled fairly closely on prayer-formulae in actual public use) the introductory verb is each time the imperative εὔχεσθε: that is, the prayer-leader does not so much utter the prayer on the congregants' behalf as exhort them to utter it themselves. They obey this exhortation not (or not normally) by repeating the leader's key words, but by expressing assent in word (δεχόμεθα *Thesm.* 312; ξινευχόμεσθα *Thesm.* 352; cf. *Wasps* 885) or by gesture. In *Peace* 453 the MSS. offer us an exhortative form, namely the 1st plur. subjunctive: to alter this to an indicative is to move away from, not closer to, the available parallels. The transmitted εὐχόμεσθα should be retained.

Peace 548–50

ὁ δὲ δρεπανουργὸς οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὥς ἥδεται	548
καὶ τὸν δορυξὸν οἶον ἐσκιμάλισεν	549
ἴθι νυν ἄνειπε τοὺς γεωρθοὺς ἀπιέναι.	550

I have omitted all internal punctuation in this passage in order not to prejudge the question at issue, which is how it should be divided among the speakers, Trygaeos and Hermes.

548 is shown to belong to Hermes by οὐχ ὁρᾷς (cf. ἄθρει 538, σκόπει 543, οὐχ ὁρᾷς 545).²⁶ 550 is probably also his. It is true that one might have expected the proclamation 551–5 to be made by Hermes as the divine Herald,²⁷ which would entail

²⁵ They are not mentioned in the recent defence of the MSS.' reading by B. Marzullo, *Museum Criticum* 18 (1983), 99 n. 19.

²⁶ Accepting in 538–47 the speaker-assignments of van Leeuwen, which gave the passage a liveliness and a consistency of pattern never before perceived, and which have been adopted by Coulon, Platnauer, and Mastromarco.

²⁷ So van Herwerden and Mazon, and most recently A. C. Cassio, *Commedia e partecipazione: la Pace di Aristofane* (Naples, 1985), 66 n. 28.

assigning 550 to Trygaïos; but it was Hermes who began the *tour d'horizon* of earth and auditorium (with ἔθι νυν ἄθρει... 538), and it therefore he who should end it and initiate the next stage of the action (with ἔθι νυν ἀνέπτε... 550).

Those recent editors (e.g. Coulon, Platnauer, Mastromarco) who have given both 548 and 550 to Hermes have all given 549 to Trygaïos as an interjected comment similar to 541–2 and 546b–547. As the wording of the text stands, this is not very likely: if Trygaïos were intervening to ‘cap’ the remarks of Hermes, he would almost certainly have been made to say καὶ τὸν δορυξόν γ’. . . (cf. 546 ὁ δὲ γε τὰς σμινύας ποιῶν).²⁸ Perhaps that is what Aristophanes did make him say – though hitherto no one seems to have suggested it. The alternative is to continue 549 to Hermes (placing a question-mark at the end of 549 rather than of 548); I opted for this in my text²⁹ out of a reluctance to emend that may have been misplaced, since 549 with its reference to a rude gesture of contempt (ἐσκιμάλισεν) suits Trygaïos well after his reference to another rude gesture of contempt in 547 (κατέπαρδεν). But if he is to have the line, it needs that γ’.³⁰

Peace 564–7

Ερ. ὦ Πόσειδον, ὡς καλὸν τὸ στίφος αὐτῶν φαίνεται
καὶ πυκνὸν καὶ γοργόν, ὥσπερ μᾶζα καὶ πανδαισία.
Τρ. νῆ Δί', ἡ γοῦν σφύρα λαμπρὸν ἦν ἄρ' ἐξέπλισμένη, 566
αἱ τε θρίνακες διαστίλβουσι πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον.

566 νῆ Tricl.: νῆ τὸν vetustiores γοῦν scripsi: γὰρ codd.: γε Blaydes: τε Lenting

Is the particle γὰρ appropriate in 566? Trygaïos is not trying to *explain* or *account for* the fact that Hermes has just mentioned (the beauty of the quasi-military³¹ ‘parade’ of the farmers); rather he is citing evidence that, as far as it goes, *confirms the truth* of Hermes’ statement. This is one of the normal uses of γοῦν,³² which appears in similar circumstances after νῆ Δία *vel sim.* in *Clouds* 408, *Lys.* 561, *Frogs* 980, and which has been corrupted into γάρ by V²M² in *Knights* 87.³³

Peace 640–1

τῶν δὲ συμμάχων ἔσειον τοὺς παχεῖς καὶ πλουσίους,
αἰτίας ἂν προστιθέντες ὡς “φρονεῖ τὰ Βρασιδίου”.

αἰτίας codd.: αἰτίαν Hamaker

²⁸ For καί...γε used by a speaker capping the remark of another, cf. *Knights* 963, *Clouds* 293, *Wasps* 500, *Birds* 1552, *Lys.* 1221, *Thesm.* 709, *Ekkl.* 476, 816, *Wealth* 99, 153, 217, 622, 1168. Dr Austin objects that the insertion of γ’ after τὸν δορυξόν might ‘put too much emphasis’ on that phrase; compare however *Wealth* 217 αὐτὸς διαπράξω ταῦτα. – κἂν βούλῃ γ’, ἐγὼ where the main emphasis must be on ἐγὼ rather than on ἦν βούλῃ. It is true that ‘the effect of γε in καί...γε is to stress the addition made by καί’ (J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² [Oxford, 1954], 157); but in *Peace* 549 ‘the addition made by καί’ is not just τὸν δορυξόν but the whole sentence.

²⁹ *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, Vol. 5: *Peace* (Warminster, 1985).

³⁰ There are nine other passages in *Peace* where metre and/or sense strongly support the insertion of a γ’ or γε absent from the paradosis: 387 (emended by Triklinios), 402 (Triklinios), 439 (Rogers), 449 (Neil), 497 (Bentley), 630 (Bentley), 824 (Dindorf: see below), 916 (Dindorf), 1029 (Triklinios).

³¹ Cf. F. Heberlein, *Pluthygieia: Zur Gegenwart bei Aristophanes* (Frankfurt, 1980), 89.

³² Cf. Denniston, *Particles* 451–3.

³³ Cf. also *Wasps* 795 (γὰρ Suda), *Peace* 220 (γὰρ ed. Aldina), *Frogs* 804 (γὰρ Suda codd. AVFM^{ac}). In *Peace* 545 γοῦν survives in RV alone and Triklinios had before him a defective text which he supplemented with γὰρ; in *Wasps* 217, contrariwise, he altered a seemingly unmetrical γὰρ to γοῦν (better with Porson γ’ ἄρ’: see J. C. B. Lowe, *Glotta* 51 [1973], 45).

In 1913 Rogers printed αἰτίας without qualms and without comment; but ever since then αἰτίαν has been the vulgate. Yet the transmitted text is perfectly acceptable. The plural is used because different persons were prosecuted on different occasions (note the 'iterative' ἄν,³⁴ which recurs in 643). Platnauer's argument that 'each victim had only one charge levelled against him' is not valid, since not till we reach φρονεῖ are we invited to think in terms of a single victim rather than of the plural παχεῖς καὶ πλουσίους of 640. For the shift in mid-sentence from the plural (referring to the victims as a group) to the singular (focusing on a typical instance) cf. *Wasps* 564–5 οἱ μὲν γ' ἀποκλάνονται πενίαν αὐτῶν, καὶ προστιθέασιν | κακὰ πρὸς τοῖς οὖσιν, ἔως ἂν ἴων ἀνισώσῃ τοῖσιν ἐμοῖσιν, 704–5.

Peace 824

Οἱ. ὦ δέσποθ', ἦ κεις;

Τρ. ὥς γ' ἐγὼ 'πυθόμην τινός.

γ' ἐγὼ 'πυθ- Dindorf: ἐγὼ πυθ- PSI 720 et Tricl.: ἔγωγ' ἐπυθ- codd. vetustiores

If there were no trace of γ' in the manuscript tradition, the general neglect of Dindorf's conjecture³⁵ would probably be justified; the use of γε is normal where an affirmative answer is amplified or qualified,³⁶ but it is not invariable (cf. e.g. *Peace* 1061 ἀλλ' οἶσθ' ὃ δρᾶσον; – ἦν φράσης). As it is, however, the scales are tipped in favour of γ' by the fact that it accounts for the unmetrical reading of the medieval MSS. Presumably the particle was first omitted (as in the papyrus), then inserted above the line as a correction, and finally brought into the text in the wrong place.

Peace 1045–6

Οἱ. τίς ἄρα ποτ' ἐστίν; ὥς ἀλαζῶν φαίνεται.

μάντις τίς ἐστιν;

Τρ. οὐ μὰ Δί', ἀλλ' Ἱεροκλέης. . .

personarum vices ita constituit Blaydes: vulgo aut 1045a Trygaeo, 1045b–1046a servo tribuunt³⁷ aut 1045a servo, 1045b Trygaeo, 1046a iterum servo³⁸

In dividing this passage between the speakers it is easiest to begin at the end: Trygaios, as the character of superior status and presumably broader knowledge, should be the one to identify Hierokles (1046b). Hence the guess he is correcting (1046a) must have been made by the slave. It is nearly as certain that 1045a also belongs to the slave; this is indicated (1) by its close similarity to 1048a τί ποτ' ἄρα λέξει; which is undoubtedly his, (2) by the probability that the puzzled question 1045a does not come from the same person who will presently be giving a knowledgeable and fairly confident answer.

Only 1045b remains to be assigned. There is widespread agreement among editors that it belongs to a different speaker from 1045a; but Aristophanic usage strongly suggests that the speaker is the same. What we have here is a question about a person's

³⁴ See Kühner-Gerth, i.211–12. Properly ἄν belongs with the imperfect ἔσειον, but it is displaced to accompany a participle specifying an important circumstance, as in Xen. *Anab.* 4.7.16 ἐσφαττον ὡν κρατεῖν δύναιντο, καὶ ἀποτέμνοντες ἂν τὰς κεφαλὰς ἔχοντες ἐπορεύοντο (cf. K-G i.242–3).

³⁵ It was printed by Blaydes, who claimed to have conjectured it independently. Sharpley prints ὥς γ' ἐγὼ as lemma to his note, but for some reason not in his text.

³⁶ Denniston, *Particles* 133–8.

³⁷ So e.g. Bruck, Meineke, Hall-Geldart, Sharpley, Rogers.

³⁸ So van Leeuwen, Coulon, Platnauer, Mastromarco. Dobree, followed e.g. by Holden, gave all of 1045 to Trygaios and 1046a to the slave. Mazon gave 1045a to the slave and the rest to Trygaios. The MSS. have no explicit identifications of speakers whereabouts.

identity followed by a comment on his appearance; and in seven parallel passages³⁹ the question and the comment each time come from the same person. We should thus assign the whole of 1045, as well as 1046a, to the slave. With 'a lively feeling of interest'⁴⁰ engendered largely by the ἀλαζών-like appearance of the newcomer, he asks who the man might be and, like many another Aristophanic character from *Ach.* 122 on,⁴¹ makes a guess at the answer.

Peace 1115–6

Τρ. ...
 ἄγε δὴ, θεαταί, δεῦρο συσπλαγχνέετε
 μετὰ νῶν.
 Ιε. τί δαί 'γώ;
 Τρ. τὴν Σίβυλλαν ἔσθιε.

δαί 'γώ Blaydes: δὴ 'γώ RV: δ' ἐγώ (ἐγωγε Tricl.) cett.: δὲ δὴ 'γώ Richter

The reading of RV, which Platnauer prints, must be rejected: it fails to provide any *adversative* particle, and such a particle is essential to the sense, since Hierokles is complaining of the way in which, in stark contrast to the offer of a share of the σπλάγχνα to the entire audience, no provision is being made for him. Of the emendations proposed, that of Blaydes has two clear advantages:

(1) It produces a type of question idiomatic in comedy: for τί δαί followed by a personal pronoun or a personal name cf. *Ach.* 612, 803; *Peace* 700; *Birds* 136; *Lys.* 136; *Frogs* 1454.

(2) Corruption of δαί is exceedingly common. Of 44 passages in the eleven comedies of Aristophanes where δαί is certainly or probably what the poet wrote (excluding the present passage), there are nine at most⁴² in which δαί is the reading of all MSS. and testimonia. The result of corruption is usually the homophonous δέ (which almost always violates the metre), sometimes δῆ.⁴³

No objection can be taken to δαί 'γώ on the ground of the 'prodelision' of ἐγώ after a diphthong, in view of more extreme instances such as χρῆσθαι 'τέρω (253).⁴⁴

University of Nottingham

A. H. SOMMERSTEIN

³⁹ *Knights* 728–9, 786–7; *Birds* 93–4, 1495–6; *Thesm.* 134–45; *Frogs* 38–9; *Wealth* 422. In some of these passages the comment is on the actions of the person(s) concerned rather than on their appearance; in some it takes the form of one or more further questions.

⁴⁰ Denniston, *Particles* 33, 39–40.

⁴¹ Other such question–guess sequences include *Clouds* 1260–1, *Wasps* 1509, *Birds* 269, 1203, *Lys.* 982 (where read with Bentley σὺ δ' εἰ τί; πότερ' ἄνθρωπος ἢ Κονίσσαλος;), *Ekkl.* 327.

⁴² *Knights* 351, 493; *Peace* 1224; *Birds* 225, 1153; *Lys.* 136; *Frogs* 6; *Ekkl.* 404; *Wealth* 905. In addition, at *Ach.* 802 and *Thesm.* 140 only the Suda is in error. My information on MS. readings is derived from published apparatuses, collations and reports (among which special mention is due to C. N. Eberline, *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Ranae of Aristophanes* [Meisenheim, 1980]), and more complete information would probably result in the above list of passages being further pruned. For the similar fortunes of δαί in Euripides see Page on *Med.* 339.

⁴³ δῆ appears in R at *Clouds* 656, in G at *Birds* 1615 and in all MSS. at *Peace* 929 (where the sequence δῆ...δῆτα would be without parallel, and Meineke's δαί is now generally accepted): cf. perhaps τῇ (V) and δτιῇ (M) for τί δαί at *Frogs* 867. In *Birds* 136, however, δῆ (B^{pc}) is a metrical correction of δέ (B^{ac}ΓU al.), like the Triklinian δ' αὖ at *Birds* 832 (for δέ VEMΓU). Eur. *Med.* 1012 provides an interesting spectrum of error; Diggle reports δαί BOEAL, δέ CVP, δῆ D, δ' αὖ *Christus Patiens* 731.

⁴⁴ That many would prefer to write χρῆσθαι τέρω there, whereas no one thinks of writing δάγώ here or (e.g.) γράφομάγώ at *Wasps* 538, is of no significance: all these passages are examples of the same linguistic phenomenon. See M. Platnauer, *CQ* 10 (1960), 141; West, *Greek Metre* 13.