SHORTER NOTES

TWO TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN ARISTOPHANES

I. WASPS 1024

άρθεὶς δὲ μέγας καὶ τιμηθεὶς ὡς οὐδεὶς πώποτ' ἐν ὑμῖν, οὐκ †ἐκτελέσαι† φησὶν ἐπαρθεὶς οὐδ' ὀγκῶσαι τὸ φρόνημα, οὐδὲ παλαίστρας περικωμάζειν πειρῶν οὐδ' εἴ τις ἐραστὴς κωμωδεῖσθαι παιδίχ' ἑαυτοῦ μισῶν ἔσπευσε πρὸς αὐτόν, οὐδενὶ πώποτέ φησι πιθέσθαι, γνώμην τιν' ἔχων ἐπιεικῆ, ἴνα τὰς Μούσας αἶσιν χρῆται μὴ προαγωγοὺς ἀποφήνη.

1025

In 1023ff. the poet explains that he has not been spoiled by success. The verb $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$ in 1024 has been suspected, and though recent editors accept it, taking it as absolute, I am far from convinced that it is what the author wrote. Blaydes, in his usual fashion, records conjectures and makes some of his own, but though he hits the mark quite often in Aristophanes as he does in Sophocles, in this passage his efforts, e.g. $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$, fail to satisfy. I propose instead $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\chi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$, 'relax'. It might be transitive, but I slightly prefer to take it as intransitive. It is a rare word and all the more likely to be corrupted. The best parallel I can find is Hippocrates, De Octimestri Partu 1.2 (ed. Joly, 5 ed. Grensemann): οἱ ὑμένες ἐν οἶσι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐτράφη, ὥσπερ τῶν ἀσταχύων, ἐξεχάλασαν πρόσθεν ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἢ τελείως ἐξαδρυνθῆναι τὸν καρπόν.

The verb is correctly transmitted in the best MS, Marc.gr. 269, while the other main source of the treatise, Vat.gr. 276, offers $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\kappa\dot{a}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ 9, which is clearly due to an error by a scribe who did not recognize the unusual word required by the context. As to the date of this treatise, it is believed by one of the best modern authorities to be no later than the end of the fifth century and is therefore nearly contemporary with Aristophanes.¹

II. LYSISTRATA 324

πέτου πέτου Νικοδίκη, πρὶν ἐμπεπρῆσθαι Καλύκην τε καὶ Κρίτυλλαν περιφυσήτω ἡὑπό τε νόμωνἡ ἀργαλέων ὑπό τε γερόντων ὀλέθρων.

325

Editors up to and including Hall and Geldart found this line difficult. Then Oeri produced the clever suggestion $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\dot{\upsilon}$ $\dot{\tau}$ $\dot{\dot{\upsilon}}\dot{\iota}\nu\dot{\epsilon}\mu\omega\nu$, which has been accepted ever since. Excellent though it is, it involves a change of three letters, and if an equally good result can be achieved with the change of just one, the more economical adjustment should be preferred. Read $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\dot{\upsilon}$ $\tau\dot{\epsilon}$ $\nu\dot{\upsilon}\tau\omega\nu$. For $\nu\dot{\upsilon}\tau\upsilon$ in the plural there are parallels in the Aristotelian corpus, *De Mundo* 394b21, 395a1, *Problems* 862a17, 946a4, and in Athenaeus (citing Galen) 1.26CD. South winds were not always benign; from the passages in the *Problems* it emerges that they could be $\pi\nu\rho\epsilon\tau\dot{\omega}\delta\epsilon\iota s$.

Lincoln College, Oxford

N. G. WILSON

¹ See R. Joly's Budé edn, *Hippocrate* XI (Paris, 1970), 161. H. Grensemann in the *Abhand-lungen* of the Mainz Academy (1968), no. 2, 95, argues for a slightly later date.

² My thanks to Professor C. Collard for his observations on these notes.