The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On Aristophanes *Peace* 990

J. Elmore

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 09 / December 2005, pp 436 - 437

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00992461, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00992461

How to cite this article:

J. Elmore (2005). On Aristophanes *Peace* 990. The Classical Review, 19, pp 436-437
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00992461

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Hesych. ἐτά: ἀληθῆ· ἀγαθά. Joann. Alex. on adverbs in a p. 29. 5 καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐτός πάλιν δξυτόνου ἐτά δξυτόνω, ὡς 'ἐτά Τημενίδος χρύσειον γένος'. The form has been restored by Bergk in three passages of Pindar: *Nem.* vii. 25 ἐτὰν ἀλάθειαν for ἐὰν or εἰάν of the MSS., *Isth.* ii. 10 ῥῆμ' ἀληθείας <ἐτᾶς> ἄγχιστα βαίνων, and *Nem.* x. 11 Ζεὺς ἐπ' Ἀλκμήναν Δανάαν τε μολὼν ἐτὸν κατέφανε λόγον for MSS. τὸν (as Eur. *El.* 816 δειξόν τε φήμην ἔτυμον ἀμφὶ Θεσσαλῶν). It survived in colloquial Attic in the phrase οὐκ ἐτός, and it does not seem unlikely that it should have survived at this date in combination with ἀληθής.

There is a late inscription in iambs (*C.I.G.* I. 569, Kaibel 128, Cougny *Anthol.* p. 399) of which the legible part is

ἀλλ' εἰ μάτην οὐ πάντα βουλευή, σαφῶς
ΕΤΑΤ εἰσάκουε καὶ λόγοις πείραν μαθὼν
ΖΗΘΟΙ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν βίῃ χρόνον καλῶς,

εἰδὼς ὅτι κάτω Πλουτέως τὰ σώματα
πλούτου γέμουσι μηδενὸς χρήζονθ' ὅλως.

This, if correct, is σαφῶς ἐτά τ' εἰσάκουε: one can hardly say more than 'if correct': Kaibel thought with Hermann that it should be CTAC (στὰς) εἰσάκουσε.—ΖΗΘΟΙ looks like a mistake for ΖΗΘΙ: but the author of these lines cannot have thought that that would be metre, though Cougny gave it without comment. He may have intended ζῆ. Kaibel adopts Hermann's view that ΖΗ belongs to the margin and the line should begin ΘΟΥ i.e. θοῦ καλῶς.

If αὐτοῦς is genuine in Crates, something (at least one iambus) must have been omitted before ἐτά: grammarians of course commonly omitted what was not pertinent in their quotations. But ἐτά δ' ἔστ' ἀληθῆ as the antithesis to οὐκ ἀσκήψ would be very pertinent.

W. HEADLAM.

ON ARISTOPHANES *PEACE* 990.

οἷ σου τρυχόμεθ' ἤδη
τρία καὶ δέκ' ἔτη.

Aristophanes (*Achar.* 266) accepts 431 B.C. as the date of the beginning of the war with Sparta, and the *Peace* as we have it, according to the generally accepted statement of the first hypothesis, was brought out in 421. Hence the apparent chronological difficulty in Trygaeus' reference to this interval in his address to Peace as τρία καὶ δέκ' ἔτη.

This difficulty (remarked by the scholiast and insisted on by the commentators) has been met in three ways: first, by assuming a second production of the play in 418; second, by supposing that Aristophanes is here referring to the preliminary hostilities between Corinth and Corcyra; third, by emending the text. It is possible that there was a second performance of the *Peace* in 418, but at this time there was only a nominal peace; in fact, Thucydides (5. 75) counts the period from 421 to 416 as among the years of the war. Rogers (p. xiii) goes so far as to say that 'the entire play would have been an anachronism in any other year [than 421]. Not only do all the incidental historical notices scattered throughout the

scenes . . . accord with this epoch and no other, . . . but the cardinal historical fact on which the Play itself is founded absolutely excludes the possibility of any other date.' As the second supposition, the first battle between Corinth and Corcyra occurred in 435 and the second in 432; the year required for the interval of 13 years is 434, but there is no apparent reason for dating the outbreak of the war from this year. On the whole Van Herwerden, in his authoritative edition of the play, is inclined to think that the text is unsound, but that none of the proposed corrections (including his own) is really convincing.

Before giving up the text as hopeless there is another possibility to be considered,—that Aristophanes is here using τρία καὶ δέκα as an indefinite number. There are three other places where he himself unmistakably employs the number in this sense:

Plut. 194 ἀλλ' ἦν τάλαντά τις λάβῃ τριακαί-
δεκα,
πολὺ μάλλον ἐπιθυμεῖ λαβεῖν ἑκκαί-
δεκα.

Plut. 846 οὐκ, ἀλλ' ἐνεργίῳσ' ἔτη τριακαίδεκα

where we find precisely the same phrase as in the *Peace* passage, and

Plut. 1083 οἷκ ἂν διαλεχθείην διεσπλεκωμέην
ὑπὸ μυρίων ἐτῶν τε καὶ τρισχιλίων.

The other passages to be noted are Homer E 387 χαλκῶν δ' ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας referring to the binding of Ares by the sons of Aloeus, Bacchylides xi. 192 (describing the sufferings of the frenzied daughters of Proetus)

τρискаίδεκα μὲν τελέους
μῆνας κατὰ δάσκιον ἡλύκταζον ὕλαν, and

Herod. 1. 119. ἦν γὰρ οἱ παῖς εἰς μῶνος, ἕτεα τρία καὶ δέκα κου μάλιστα γεγονώς.

This last passage giving the age of Harpagos' son may be questioned, but as Herodotus is here probably dealing with a folk tale, it is fair to suppose that he is giving merely the concrete but indefinite form in which the popular imagination indicated a youth of considerable size. Of the same character, doubtless, is the statement attributed to the historian Chares in Gell. 5. 2. 2 *Emptum (equum Alexandri) Chares scripsit talentis tredecim et regi*

Philippo donatum. It is obvious that there would not be precise information about such a matter, and so we have the popular conception of a large sum.¹

On the supposition that thirteen was used as an indefinite number by the Greeks, the passage in the *Peace* is of course easy of interpretation. Trygaeus, speaking here in the popular way as befits his character, has no thought of historical accuracy, but when he says to Peace, 'We have been longing for you for thirteen years,' he merely desires to convey the idea that she has been absent a long time. This view is favoured by the fact that thirteen is near to the actual number (ten), since, as König has pointed out (Art. Number, Hastings' Dict. of the Bible 3. 562), this approximation, real or imagined, to the definite number is usually a characteristic of the indefinite one.

J. ELMORE.

Stanford University, Cal.

¹ In Latin thirteen is of infrequent occurrence, but there is at least one undoubted example of its use as an indefinite number in Juv. 14. 28. Cf. Cic. *Rosc. Amer.* 20 and 99.

UNCANNY THIRTEEN.

MR. ELMORE's collections draw attention to an interesting and, so far as I know, a neglected point. I will first add to his list some passages of which account must be taken.

Pindar *Ol.* 1. 81 sqq.

ἐπεὶ τρεῖς τε καὶ δέκ' ἄνδρας ὀλέσαιοι
μναστῆρας ἀναβάλλεται γάμον
θυγατρός.

Thren. *Fr.* 135 (100).

πέφνε δὲ τρεῖς καὶ δέκ' ἄνδρας τετράτῳ
δ' αὐτὸς πεδάθη.

Both these passages refer to the same thing—the number of his daughter's suitors killed by Oenomaus of Pisa.

In the next passage the fighter succumbs to his *thirteenth* adversary.

Nem. 4. 25.

σὺν ᾧ ποτε Τροίαν κραταῖος Τελαμὼν
πύρθησε καὶ Μέροπας
καὶ τὸν μέγαν πολεμιστὰν ἔκπαγλον Ἀλκωνῇ

οὐ τετραορίας γε πρὶν δυώδεκα πέτρῳ
ἡρώας τ' ἐπεμβεβαῶτας ἱπποδάμους ἔλεν
δὺς τόσους.

Theocritus 15. 15 sqq.

ἀπφῶς μὰν τήνος τὰ πρόαν (λέγομες δὲ πρόαν θην
πάντα) νίτρον καὶ φύκος ἀπὸ σκανᾶς ἀγοράσδων
ἦνθε φέρων ἄλας ἄμμιν ἀνὴρ τρισκαίδεκά-
πηχυς.

In considering all the passages which are now before us it does not appear enough to say simply that *thirteen* is an indefinite number. This interpretation cannot in fact be applied to e.g. Chares' statement ap. Gell. 5. 2. 2 any more than to Cic. *Verr.* 3. § 184 sq. 'tu ex pecunia publica HS *terdeciens* scribam tuum cum abstulisse fateare . . . ut HS uno nomine *terdeciens* auferret.' Chares intended to state the exact sum paid for the horse and Gellius who turns the price into its equivalent in Roman money so understood him. In Cicero *Rosc. Amer.* 20 and 99 it is quite clear that the thirteen *fundi* of Sextus