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](#)

Aristophanica.—II

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 08 / November 2001, pp 385 - 391

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00031115, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00031115

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (2001). Aristophanica.—II. The Classical Review, 15, pp 385-391
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00031115

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1901.

ARISTOPHANICA.—II.

(Continued from p. 355.)

KNIGHTS.

Why do English editors go on giving us characters called Demosthenes, Nicias and Cleon? There are no such people in the play at all, and it would greatly vex Aristophanes to see his satire so spoiled. From an editor with Dr. Merry's sense of humour the comic poet might have looked for better treatment, and now Messrs. Hall and Geldart in their new *Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* text have done the same thing. The foreign editors are usually too skilful to make this mistake. Neither Kock, nor Von Velsen, nor Van Leeuwen falls into it, though Zacher does. Dr. Blaydes, too, in his monumental Aristophanes knows better. But the editions which in this country will be in every one's hands continue what I must take leave to call the absurd tradition. Cleon, Nicias, Demosthenes do not appear in the *Knights*. There are three slaves, two like those in the *Peace* without any distinctive names at all, the third named Paphlagon, which is as much a name as Syrus. They stand for the distinguished men in question, but the point of the whole thing is that it is a sort of humorous allegory or imaginative burlesque, and attaching the names of the real men to the three slaves dulls and blunts the humour in an unpardonable way. Paphlagon is not Cleon: he only holds towards his master

NO. CXXXVI. VOL. XV.

and his fellow slaves a relation burlesquing that of Cleon towards the people and the other prominent public men of Athens. We must not confound the caricature with the thing caricatured by putting the true names to the fancy picture. As well might Dryden in his great satire have written *Shaftesbury* and *Shadwell* for *Achitophel* and *Og*.

15. [OIK. A] ἀλλ' εἰπὲ θαρρῶν, εἴτα κἀγὼ σοι φράσω.

OIK. B. πῶς ἂν σύ μοι λέξεις
ἀμὲρ ἤ γ' ἔλγεις;

OIK. A. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐνι μοι τὸ θρέπτε. πῶς
ἂν οὖν ποτε
εἴποιμ' ἂν αὐτὸ δῆτα κομψευρι-
πικῶς;

OIK. B. μή μοί γε, μή μοι, μὴ διασκανδι-
κίῃς.

This is the order of the lines in all MSS. Recent editors, seeing that they are rather incoherent as they stand, have put 16 before 15, and it is certainly the case that 17 gains by following directly on 15. But what seems to me the true order of the five lines has not been suggested. Line 16, the quotation from Euripides, is the key to the difficulty. In 18 A asks how he can express himself in subtle Euripidean fashion. He then answers his own question by this quotation (16) πῶς ἂν κ.τ.λ. and it is this quotation which provokes from B the excla-

C C

mation of disgust, μή μοί γε κ.τ.λ., with the reference to the Euripidean manner in διασκανδικίσης. The lines will then run :

[OIK. A.] ἀλλ' εἰπέ θαρρῶν, εἴτα καὶ γὰρ σοὶ φράσω.

OIK. B. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔνι μοι τὸ θρέττε. πῶς ἂν οὖν ποτε

εἴποιμ' ἂν αὐτὸ δῆτα κομψευρικῶς;
πῶς ἂν σὺ μοι λέξεις ἀμὲν
χρὴ λέγειν;

OIK. A. μή μοί γε, μή μοι, μή διασκανδικίσης.

If this transposition be adopted, some slight change must be made elsewhere, if we are not to alter the speakers through the rest of the scene. We might give 11 and 12 to B and so proceed, or λέγε σὺ in 13 might be given to A, σὺ μὲν οὖν κ.τ.λ. to B. For the transposition compare perhaps 258–265, where it seems best to put 264–5 after 260.

188 ἀλλ', ὦγαθ', οὐδὲ μουσικὴν ἐπίσταμαι
πλὴν γραμμάτων, καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι κακὰ
κακῶς.

Dr. Blaydes quotes the imitation in Procopius *Bell. Pers.* p. 70 c: οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἐς γραμματιστοῦ φοιτῶν ἔμαθεν ὅτι μὴ γράμματα, καὶ ταῦτα κακὰ κακῶς, γράφαι. Has he noticed that Gibbon in a note to his fortieth chapter has quoted the historian's description of John of Cappadocia, adding the comment 'a forcible expression'? Apparently Gibbon did not remember that the words were a quotation from Aristophanes, and his editors, as far as I know, have not pointed it out.

598 ἀλλὰ τὰν τῇ γῇ μὲν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἄγαν
θαυμάζομεν,
ὥς ὅτ' εἰς τὰς ἱππαγωγὰς εἰσεπήδων ἀνδρικῶς.

This very imperfect sentence should not have been left so long uncorrected. Herwerden, indeed, has proposed for οὐκ ἄγαν to write οὐ τόσοι, but Attic prose and comedy do not use τόσοι for τοσούτος or τοῖος for τοιοῦτος. It is curious that the μέν of 598 has not suggested to any one the true correction, ὥς <δ' > ὅτ', for it points to it very clearly. Compare a few sentences of more or less similar form :

Ach. 654 καὶ τῆς νήσου μὲν ἐκείνης
οὐ φροντίζουσ', ἀλλ' ἵνα τοῦτον τὸν
ποιητὴν ἀφέλωνται.

Wasps 482 ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν οὐδὲν ἀλγείς, ἀλλ'
ὅταν κ.τ.λ.

Plato *Lysis* 204 D καὶ ἃ μὲν καταλογάδην διηγείται δεινὰ ὄντα οὐ πάντ' ἐστιν δεινὰ ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴν τὰ ποιήματα ἡμῶν ἐπιχειρήσῃ κιναντλεῖν.

Ar. Eth. 4. 7. 1127 b 12 εἰ δ' ἐνεκά τινός, ὁ μὲν δόξης ἢ τιμῆς οὐ λίαν ψεκτός... ὁ δὲ ἀργυρίου... ἀσχημονέστερος, though not elliptic in construction, is worth citing for the οὐ λίαν.

1385 ἔχε νυν ἐπὶ τούτοις τουτονὶ τὸν ὀκλαδῖαν
καὶ παῖδ' ἐνόρχην ὅσπερ οἶσε τόνδε σοι.

I ventured to say in vol. xi. p. 19 of this *Review* that ὅσπερ could not be used thus for ὅστις or ὅς. I ought to have seen then what is very obvious on a little thought, that Aristophanes wrote ὅς περιόισι. So in 727 of this play Elmsley corrected the unmetrical οἷάπερ ἰβρίζομαι to οἷα περινιβρίζομαι, and in Lucian *Eunuchus* 7 the MSS. vary between εἶπερ ἦν and εἰ περιῆν.

CLOUDS.

145 ἀνῆρετ' ἄρτι Χαιρεφῶντα Σωκράτης
ψύλλαν ὀπόσους ἄλλοιτο τοὺς αὐτῆς πόδας—
δακούσα γὰρ τοῦ Χαιρεφῶντος τὴν ὀφρὺν
ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τὴν Σωκράτους ἀφήλατο.

All the editors seem to give ἄλλοιτο. Both R and V however, with other MSS., are said to have ἄλοιτο, and that (or perhaps ἄλαιοτο) must be right. The question is not a general one, how far fleas jumped. 148 shows that it refers to the particular flea by which Chaerephon was bitten: δακούσα γὰρ κ.τ.λ. is inconsistent with anything else. The question of Socrates therefore (if it was not rather Chaerephon's, as Piccolomini thinks, reading Χαιρεφῶν τὸν Σωκράτην) was, how far a flea *had* jumped. So apparently the scholiast took it, who wrote in his note ὀπόσους (πόδας) πηδήσειε.

1366 ἐγὼ γὰρ Αἰσχύλον νομίζω πρῶτον ἐν
ποιηταῖς
ψόφου πλέων, ἀξύστατον, στόμφακα,
κρημνοποιόν;

There should be no doubt that these two verses are a *question*, indignantly uttered by Pheidippides. In a *statement* made by Strepsiades the second line could hardly pass as a stroke of humour, but there is no need to have recourse to transposing 1365 and 1366 with Hermann, Kock and Thompson. To the precisely similar questions of indignant surprise quoted by Blaydes (*Vesp.* 1159: *Av.* 815) add the following: *Vesp.* 1188 ἐγὼ δὲ τεθεώρηκα πῶποτ'; οὐδαμοῖ (for so it should be written): *Soph. Aj.* 1130 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἂν ψέξαιμι δαιμόνων νόμους; *Plat. Rep.* 344 E ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶμαι, ἔφη ὁ Θρασύμαχος, τοῦτ' ἄλλως ἔχειν; *Euthyd.* 297 B ἀδελφὸς γάρ, ἔφη, ἐγὼ εἰμι Εὐθυδήμον; Every one of these passages except *Vesp.* 1188 has a γάρ and every one

an emphatic ἐγώ. Probably the obscure passage in Xen. *Symp.* 4. 45 is to be explained in the same way.

1415 κλάουσι παῖδες, πατέρα δ' οὐ κλάειν δοκέεις;

Many have been the suggestions for adding on three syllables at the end to make this a tetrameter. I think the addition quite necessary, but I would not add anything like Cobet's σὺ χρῆναι or Herwerden's προσήκειν. Though some such word as χρῆναι seems logically necessary, the poet might venture to dispense with it under the circumstances; the parody is more perfect without it. Suggestions are rather idle, but I will contribute mine—ἴσως δὲ or ἴσως οὖν, going with the next verse, φήσεις κ.τ.λ.

WASPS.

967 ὦ δαιμόνι, ἐλέει τοὺς τάλαιπωρομένους.

Mr. Starkie in his admirable edition (1897) reads αἰδοῦ for the unmetrical ἐλέει. Perhaps I may put on record that I made the same suggestion to the Oxford Philological Society at a meeting on November 2, 1894. I should prefer to regard ἐλέει as a gloss on αἰδοῦ and not as a corruption of it. With αἰδοῦ the line reminds us to some extent of *Nub.* 1468 ναί, ναί, καταιδέσθητι πατρῶν Δία, in which the last three words are of course borrowed from tragedy. There is a certain mock solemnity about both. For this use of αἰδεῖσθαι may be compared such passages as *Od.* 3. 96 μηδέ τί μ' αἰδόμενος μειλίσσο μῆδ' ἐλεάειν: *Eur. Med.* 326: *Hec.* 286: *I.A.* 1246: *Antiphon* 1. 26 and 27.

PEACE.

24 For ὥσπερ write ὅσαπερ, not with Blaydes ὅτιπερ. In *Plat. Rep.* 390 B I have suggested the alteration of ὥς to ὅσα, omitting α̃.

83 μή μοι σοβαρῶς χῶρει λίαν.

σοβαρός is much more likely. Such words are much preferred, especially in verse, in their adjectival form. So *Nub.* 406, φέρεται σοβαρός: *Plut.* 872, ὡς σοβαρός...εἰσελήλυθεν.

139 τοῦτοις τοῖς αἰτοῖσι τῶτον χορτάσω.

It is such a fixed thing in Greek that ὁ αὐτός comes before, not after, οὗτος (ταῦτα ταῦτα, not ταῦτα ταῦτά, &c.) that perhaps we ought to find some way of altering this verse. We may think of τοῦτόν γε τοῖς

αἰτοῖσι τοῦτοις χορτάσω, contrasting the beetle with Pegasus (135). [Dr. Postgate suggests τοῦτοις κοῦκ ἄλλοις, comparing *Soph. O.C.* 908.]

180 πόθεν βροτοῦ με προσέβαλ'; ὦναξ Ἡράκλεις,

τουτὶ τί ἐστι τὸ κακόν;

Write πόθεν βροτοῦ με προσέβαλ'—; ὦναξ, κ.τ.λ. Dr. Merry sees that the sentence is thus imperfect, not elliptical. Perhaps other editors see it too. If so, why not write it accordingly?

306 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως ἀπειπεῖν ἂν δοκῶ μὲν τήμερον.

If this is really the text of the MSS. (Messrs. Hall and Geldart do not notice it), δοκοῦμεν rather than Blaydes' δοκοῖμεν would seem the alternative to the δοκῶ μοι usually read.

479 ὅσοι γ' αἰτῶν ἔχονται τοῦ ξύλου.

If this refers to the prisoners from Sphacteria, may not ἐνέχονται τῷ ξύλῳ be suggested? The loss of ἐν after ὦν might lead to the corruption of τῷ ξύλῳ.

729 ἀλλ' ἴθι χαίρων ἡμεῖς δὲ τέως τάδε τὰ σκευὴ παραδόντες

τοῖς ἀκολούθοις δώμεν σφάζειν.

Certainly δώμεν and παραδόντες cannot be right together. Cobet approved (*N.L.* 51) of Hamaker's τήνδε σκευὴν ἀποδόντες, in which an article would surely be wanted. σκευή is confirmed by 552, 886, 1318, and by ταῦτα in 732. Dr. Blaydes reads τάδε τὰ σκευὴ καταθέντες, though it ought rather to be καταθέμενοι (886).

Since these are the first lines of a parabasis, the right word and the least possible change is παραβάντες. So immediately below in 735 αὐτὸν ἐπῆναι πρὸς τὸ θέατρον παραβὰς ἐν τοῖς ἀναπαίστοις: *Eq.* 508 πρὸς τὸ θέατρον παραβῆναι: *Thesm.* 785 ἡμεῖς τοῖνυν ἡμᾶς αὐτὰς εὖ λέξωμεν παραβᾶσαι: *Plato Comicus*, frag. 92 οὐκ ἂν παρέβην εἰς λέξιν τοιάνδ' ἐπῶν. [Dr. Postgate suggests 'παποδόντες. cf. *Ach.* 627.]

BIRDS.

79 τρόχιλος ὄρνις οὔτοσί.

I commented above on the mistake of calling Paphlagon Cleon. In its way it is equally a mistake and equally the spoiling of a joke, that this servant-bird (ὄρνις δοῦλος 70) should appear as a *dramatis persona* bearing the name of Τρόχιλος, just as his

master does that of Ἔποψ. If he really were a trochilus, cannot the editors see that there would be no joke in saying of him here, *τρόχιλος ὄρνις οὐτοσί?* In the lines which precede he has been describing how he runs (*τρέχει*) for this or that thing, and so Euelpides says, 'why, he is a trochilus, this fellow.' The one thing then certain about him is that he was not recognised by the spectators as belonging to that kind. He may have been any bird in the world, real or imaginary, except a trochilus.

280 ΠΕΙ. τί τὸ τέρας τουτί πότ' ἔστιν; οὐ σὺ
μόνος ἄρ' ἦσθ' ἔποψ,
ἀλλὰ χοῦτος ἕτερος; ΕΠ. ἀλλ' οὐ-
τος μὲν ἔστι Φιλοκλέους
ἐξ ἔποπος, ἐγὼ δὲ τούτου πάππος,
ὥσπερ εἰ λέγοις
Ἴππόνικος Καλλίου καὶ Ἴππονίκου
Καλλίας.

The editors find great difficulty in explaining ἐξ ἔποπος. Some say 'son of Philocles' hoopoe, others 'son of Philocles, the hoopoe's son.' In the second case 'the hoopoe' would be the speaker: in the first the alternation of generations (283) would be lost, since son, father, and grandfather, would be 'hoopoe' all three.

Εἰς ἔποψ might, I think, make fair sense. He is asked, 'Is this another hoopoe?' and answers, 'Yes, he is one hoopoe, and I (whom you already know as hoopoe) am his grandfather. It is like Callias, etc.' The confusion of ΕΙC and ΕΚ is familiar (see above on *Ach.* 410). Cf. Cobet ad Dion. Hal. p. 182, who corrects ἐκ δὲ τῶν δημάρχων . . ἀνίσταται to εἰς δὲ τῶν δημάρχων.

519 αὐτοί is obscure and awkward here. Perhaps οὔτοι or αὐτοῦ.

701 ξυμμυγνυμένων δ' ἐτέρων ἐτέροις γένετ' οὐ-
ρανὸς ὠκεανὸς τε.

The unauthenticated γένετ' is absolutely unparalleled in Aristophanes and must be regarded with the very greatest suspicion. γέγον' is a correction which has found favour, though the tense is much against it. We might, however, compare Thuc. 1. 50. 2 ναυμαχία αὐτῇ—μεγίστη δὴ τῶν πρὸ ἐαυτῆς γεγένηται: Plat. *Apol.* 28 c τῶν ἡμιθέων ὅσοι ἐν Τροίᾳ τετελενηκάσι: Lycurg. 70 μόνοι δ' ἀμφοτέρων περὶγεγόνασι: and γέγονα = the aorist is quite common in late Greek. The use being at least suspicious and the perfect here being only conjectural, perhaps another conjecture may be admitted, namely, that (ἐ)γένετ' was originally a gloss on some quite different word, e.g. ὤπτ' or φύετ' (φύεται:

there is no objection to the elision of such an *αι* in verbs).

753 εἰ μετ' ὀρνίθων τις ὕμῶν, ᾧ θεαταί, βού-
λεται
διαπλέκειν ζῶν ἡδέως τὸ λοιπόν, ὥς ἡμᾶς
ἴτω.

No one that I know of has demurred to this, but the sense is surely most unsatisfactory. We want 'If any one wishes for a pleasant life, let him join us birds,' not 'if any one wishes to lead a pleasant life with the birds, let him come to us.' In the first place, there are not various communities of birds, between which the Athenian yearning for a pleasant time might make his choice. The chorus are *the* birds, all the birds that are, and there is no other set of birds elsewhere for any one to join. The chorus are not comparing themselves advantageously with other feathered peoples. The things they say of themselves prove this, if proof were needed. Secondly, 'if any one wishes to join the birds' is not the thing to say. It is Aristophanes' own fancy that there is a bird-community and that men might join it with advantage. He must not put the case of people having formed the wish to join it independently of him and before he made the pleasant, wise suggestion. He can only have said 'if you want to enjoy yourselves, join the birds.' This being so, I do not see how μετ' ὀρνίθων can be right. It also strikes one that this is the only passage in Greek in which διαπλέκειν is used without an accusative. It occurs some half-dozen or more times, but always with some word like βίον (Herod. 5. 92: *Λαῖος* 806 A) or ἡμέραν (Alderman 16. 4). τὸ λοιπόν here is adverbial as usual—so L. and S. and the editors take it—and not the object of the verb: I doubt whether it is ever used except adverbially. We may say therefore that, while μετ' ὀρνίθων is not wanted, we do want an object for the verb.

Then we remember the line in the *Wasps*

1071 εἴ τις ὕμῶν, ᾧ θεαταί, τὴν ἐμὴν ἰδὼν
φύσιν,

and think that the line in the *Birds* may very well have run in the same way down to θεαταί; the missing words might come at the end. Finally we arrive at something like

εἴ τις ὕμῶν, ᾧ θεαταί, βούλεται τὰς ἡμέρας
διαπλέκειν ζῶν ἡδέως τὸ λοιπόν, ὥς ἡμᾶς ἴτω.

Of course no one would venture to say that this is exactly what Aristophanes wrote. I

only submit that it makes good sense and that the vulgate does not.

FROGS.

167 μὴ δῆθ' ἵκετεύω σ', ἀλλὰ μίσθωσαί τινα
τῶν ἐκφερομένων, ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται.

The last words are a great difficulty and have moved many scholars to think that the whole line should be omitted. To my mind that is not at all the way to deal with it. The fault is not in τοῦτ', however, but in ἔρχεται. Xanthias is proposing that instead of himself one of the dead men taken out to burial shall be hired to carry the luggage. 'Hire' he says 'a dead man, who (or any one who)—for this.' What is the blank? Something like *will serve, will do*, i.e. ἀρκέσει. It is not every corpse that is competent. They must have a stout stalwart corpse for their purpose. Cf. Plat. *Rep.* 369 D, πῶς ἡ πόλις ἀρκέσει ἐπὶ τοσαύτην παρασκευήν; *Theaet.* 174 A ταῦτον δὲ ἀρκεῖ σκῶμμα ἐπὶ πάντας: Xen. *Mem.* 2. 6. 30 εἰ ἐξαρκέσει μοι ἡ αὐτὴ ἐπιστήμη ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς κ.τ.λ.: *Oecon.* 12. 4 ὅστις μέλλει ἀρκέσειν... ἀντ' ἐμοῦ ἐπιμελούμενος, τί αὐτὸν καὶ δεῖ ἄλλο ἐπίστασθαι ἢ ἅπερ ἐγώ; *Cyrop.* 6. 2. 34 τὸ ἐφ' ἡμέραν ἀρκέσον and *ib.* 31 ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀρκεῖ. For the future cf. e.g. 98 of this play, ὥδὲ γόνιμον ὅστις φθέγγεται κ.τ.λ.

The change of α to ε and κ to χ is not difficult. Thus on Lucian *De Calumn.* 2 Cobet remarks (*V.L.* 286) *libri confundunt ἄρχεται et ἔρχεται perculgato errore*, which he illustrates from the miswriting of ἄρχομαι with future participles in the place of ἔρχομαι, and he gives some examples of a different kind in *Misc. Crit.* 141. See also the *index Graecitatis* in Bast. p. 1042 A. In [Xen.] *R.A.* νομίζουσι τό ὀπλιτικὸν ἄρχειν is now corrected to ἀρκεῖν, and *Hell.* 3. 5. 15 ἔχοντες ναυτικὸν οὐχ ἐκόντων ἤρχετε to οὐκ ἐχόντων. In 1099 of this play ἔρχεται is by no means certainly right.

301 ἴθ' ἥπερ ἔρχει. δεῦρο δεῦρ', ὦ δέσποτα.

It seems to have escaped notice that ἴθ' ἥπερ ἔρχει is not addressed to Dionysus (nor spoken by him to Xanthias, as Van Leeuwen gives it) but to the imaginary goblin Empusa, with whom the slave is terrifying his master. This appears clearly from the parallel passage *Lysistr.* 833.

ὦ πότνια Κύπρον καὶ Κυθήρων καὶ Πάρον
μεδέουσ', ἴθ' ὁρθὴν ἥπερ ἔρχει τὴν ὁδόν.

369 τοῦτοις αὐδῶ καῖθις ἀπανδῶ καῖθις τὸ
τρίτον μάλ' ἀπανδῶ
ἐξίστασθαι μύσταισι χοροῖς.

τούτοις αὐδῶ V and the text of Aulus Gellius: τοῦτοις ἀπανδῶ R and most MSS. Two things are clear: (1) αὐδῶ and ἀπανδῶ cannot be combined in one and the same sense: (2) ἀπανδῶ *forbid* is quite out of place. It is ludicrous to suppose that ἀπανδῶ ἐξίστασθαι is a confused expression for ἀπανδῶ (μὴ) ἐμποδῶν εἶναι. I cannot see any plausibility in *πρωδῶ* (*ter*) read by Blaydes and after him by Van Leeuwen. The true reading really stares one in the face:

τούτοις αὐδῶ καῖθις ἐπανδῶ καῖθις τὸ τρίτον μάλ'
ἐπανδῶ.

ἐπανδῶ *tell again* does not happen to occur elsewhere, but that is quite immaterial. ἀπανδῶ seems to occur only in Soph. *El.* 1478: κατανδῶ only in *Ant.* 86; συνανδῶ only in *Ag.* 943 and once in Theophrastus. ἐπὶ and ἀπό are quite easily confused in compounds: thus in Thuc. 5. 50. 1 ἀπομόσαι must be corrected to ἐπομόσαι (Stahl).

456 ὅσοι μεμνήμεθ' εὐ-
σεβῇ τε διήγομεν
τρόπον κ.τ.λ.

Perhaps ὅσοι 'μεμνήμεθ', had been initiated and then went on living (διήγομεν).

467 ὃς τὸν κύν' ἡμῶν ἐξελάσας τὸν Κέρβερον
ἀπῆξας ἄγχων κάποδρὰς ᾤχου λαβών.

He did not *drive* Cerberus out; he *dragged* him out. Should we change ἐξελάσας to ἐλκύσας?

553 καὶ κρέα γε πρὸς τούτοιςιν ἀνάβραστ'
εἵκοσιν
ἀνημιωβολιαῖα.

So apparently the best MSS. with others; some, however, ἀν' ἡμιωβολιαῖα, and in this form Pollux quotes it 9. 64, if Bekker's text may be trusted. Both seem impossible. 'At half an obol apiece' is either ἡμιωβολιαῖα or ἀν' ἡμιωβόλιον. Van Leeuwen πάνθ' for ἀν'. Did Aristophanes write εἵκοσιν ἐν ἡμιωβολιαῖα with a comic exactitude as to the number? cf. 49

καὶ κατεδύσαμεν γε ναὺς
τῶν πολεμίων ἢ δώδεκ' ἢ τρεῖς καὶ δέκα.

and 1129 τούτων ἔχειν ψέγεις τι;
ΕΥ. πλεῖν ἢ δώδεκα.

814 foll. In the four stanzas here beginning, and too long to quote, I cannot doubt

that Dobree was right in thinking that 822-825 should follow on 817. φρίξας δ' αὐτοκόμου κ.τ.λ. is strictly continuous with ὄμματα στροβήσεται. It is most awkward for 818-821 to come between the two passages in which Aeschylus is described, and it much obscures the subject of φρίξας κ.τ.λ. But I think Dobree was wrong for once in putting 818-821 after 825. They should stand at the very end after 829. First come lines (814-817, 822-825) which depict Aeschylus bearing himself in the fray like a Titan or a mighty beast of the forest: then a stanza (826-829) setting forth the deft and subtle art of Euripides: finally one (818-821) which gives the conflict and the contrast of the two. In 826 read ἐνθεν δέ on the other side, not ἐνθεν δῆ.

905 ἀλλ' ὡς τάχιστα χρὴ λέγειν· οὕτω δ' ὅπως ἐρεῖτον
ἀστεία καὶ μήτ' εἰκόνας μήθ' οἷ' ἂν ἄλλος εἴποι.

No edition that I have looked at explains εἰκόνας properly. Thus Kock *Der Chorführer verlangt dass sie unverblümt die Wahrheit sagen*: Blaydes *imagines, similitudines. Quibus indulgebat Aeschylus multo frequentius quam Euripides*: Merry ἀστεία implies 'smartness' and 'neatness'; either of which would be lost by the use of metaphor (εἰκόνες) or commonplace. But any one who remembers what Aristotle says with truth about metaphors (Poetics 22. 1459 a 7), that a good use of them is a mark of fine natural parts (εὐφυΐα) and not a thing to be just taken from somebody else (παρ' ἄλλου λαβεῖν) must be surprised to find metaphors put side by side with things οἷ' ἂν ἄλλος εἴποι. Moreover the scene that follows is full of metaphorical expressions, e.g. 941 foll. The truth is εἰκόνες here are not metaphors, but comparisons. The reference is to the rude humour of comparing a man to so and so, usually something ridiculous. This seems to have been a rather favourite, if unmannerly, pleasantry at Athens. See for instance *Wasps* 1308

εἰτ' αὐτὸν ὡς εἶδ' ἦκασεν Λυσίστρατος,
'ἔοικας, ὦ πρέσβυτα, νεοπλούτῳ τρυγί (Φρυγί
Kock)

κλητήρῃ τ' εἰς ἀχυρμόν ἀποδεδρακότε.
ὁ δ' ἀνακραγὼν ἀντήκασ' αὐτὸν πάρνοπι
τὰ θρία τοῦ τριβῶνος ἀποβεβληκότε
Σθενέλῳ τε τὰ σκευάρια διακακαρμένῳ.

Av. 804-7: Xen. *Symp.* 6. 8 σὺ δὲ μέντοι δεινὸς εἰ...εἰκάξαι...ἀλλ' ὅμως...σὺ αὐτὸν μὴ εἰκάξαι: Plat. *Meno* 80 a the famous com-

parison of Socrates to a torpedo-fish, followed by ΣΩ. γινώσκω οὐπερ ἐνεκά με ἤκασας. MEN. τίος δὴ οἶε; ΣΩ. ἵνα σε ἀντεικάσω. ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦτο οἶδα περὶ πάντων τῶν καλῶν ὅτι χαίρουσιν εἰκαζόμενοι: and Plat. *Symp.* 215 a the still more famous comparison of him to a silenus-image: Aristotle *De Gen. An.* 4. 3. 769 b 18 διὰ πολλάκις οἱ σκώπτοντες εἰκάξουσι τῶν μὴ καλῶν ἐνίους τοὺς μὲν αἰγὶ φυσῶντι πῦρ, τοὺς δ' οὐκ κυρίττοντι. What is meant in the *Frogs* therefore is that great men like Aeschylus and Euripides are not to indulge in these easy and often vulgar jokes at one another's expense. They are to contend in a way more worthy of their genius.

949 ἀλλ' ἔλεγεν ἡ γυνὴ τέ μοι χῶ δούλος οὐδὲν ἦττον
χῶ δεσπότης χῆ παρθένος χῆ γράυς ἂν.

I can never read these lines without wondering whether χῶ δεσπότης should not be τοῦ δεσπότη, or possibly ἡ δεσπότης. 'The master' has no business to come in third and on a level with the rest without even an ἴσως or an ἐξ ἴσης to carry it off. Also οὐδὲν ἦττον might stand if there were no χῶ δεσπότης there, but with those words surely it is very odd.

964 γνῶσει δὲ τοὺς τοῦτου τε κάμους ἐκατέρου
μαθητάς.

Perhaps these words should be datives, τοῖς...μαθηταῖς. Cf. *Eccles.*

780 γνῶσει δ' ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν γε τῶν ἀγαλμάτων.

1180 ἔθι δὲ λέγ'· οὐ γὰρ μούστῃν ἀλλ' ἀκουστέα
τῶν σῶν προλόγων τῆς ὀρθότητος τῶν ἐπῶν.

It had occurred to me whether ἀλλ' ἀκουστέα does not conceal ἀλλὰ γευστέα. I should, however, hardly have mentioned this, if I had not subsequently noticed the mysterious scholium γινῶναι πρὸ τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι. γινῶναι points to some other reading.

1415 τὸν ἔτερον λαβὼν ἅπει
ὀπότερον ἂν κρίνης, ἵν' ἔλθῃς μὴ μάτην.

In 1163 Hirschig pointed out that ἐλθεῖν is a mistake for ἤκειν. The point of the whole passage there is the distinction of the synonyms ἤκειν and κατέναι, and this is lost if ἐλθεῖν is stupidly substituted for ἤκειν (ἐλθ εἰν μὲν εἰς γῆν ἔσθ' ὅτῳ μετῇ πάτρας). Here in 1416 is it not equally clear that the same error has occurred? The sense should be 'that you may not have come here for nothing,' and this is ἵν' ἤκῃς μὴ μάτην. The

only possible meanings of ἵν' ἔλθῃς are (1) 'that you may come,' (2) 'that you may go.' The first would be unmeaning. As to the second, the sense of 'go' is comparatively uncommon, and indeed hardly possible where any ambiguity would ensue. Also μάτην can only apply to the coming, not to the going: 'that you may not go away for nothing' would be nonsense.

It may be pointed out on the one hand that MSS. sometimes vary between the corresponding parts of ἦκω and ἦλθον, e.g. Thuc. 1. 18. 2 ἦλθε and ἦκε: 8. 65. 1 ἦλθον and ἦκον: Xen. *Hell.* 1. 3. 11 the codices

ἦλθεν, the papyrus fragment ἦκεν: and on the other that in the scholia we find parts of ἦκω glossed by the corresponding parts of ἦλθον, which fact suggests how the latter may here and elsewhere have driven out the former. See for instance the scholia to the *Plutus* 357. 828. 841. 1179. 1190. 1201 and to the *Prometheus* 284. 299. They take such straightforward forms as ἦκεις: ἦλθες (*Plut.* 357). Of course in Attic the two words are in most cases not really equivalent, but this the scholiasts did not know.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ON PLATO, *REPUBLIC* X 616 E.

THE passage which I propose to discuss reads as follows:—

Τὸν μὲν οὖν πρῶτόν τε καὶ ἐξωτάτω σφόνδύλον πλατύτατον τὸν τοῦ χείλους κύκλον ἔχειν, τὸν δὲ τοῦ ἑκτοῦ δεύτερον, τρίτον δὲ τὸν τοῦ τετάρτου, τέταρτον δὲ τὸν τοῦ ὀγδοοῦ, πέμπτον δὲ τὸν τοῦ ἐβδόμου, ἕκτον δὲ τὸν τοῦ πέντε, ἑβδομον δὲ τὸν τοῦ τρίτου, ὄγδοον δὲ τὸν τοῦ δευτέρου.

The astronomical theory of which this sentence forms a part has been much discussed. The conclusions at which, after long study of the subject, I have arrived, and which I hope shortly to establish in my forthcoming edition of the *Republic*, are in general agreement with Boeckh and Zeller, as well as with the incidental remark—so far as it goes—dealing with this subject in Professor Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 203. Briefly stated, they are these. The ἡλακᾶτη is the axis of the Universe, and passes through the middle of the Earth, which is a motionless body occupying the centre of the Universe. The ὑπόζωμα is the Milky Way. Inside the whole are 7 concentric bowls, or as Plato calls them whorls, in the 'lips' or rims of which globes of fire are fixed, and these globes are the planets. The whorls are carried round from East to West every day together with the celestial sphere, but in order to account for the movements of the planets in their own orbits, Plato assigns to each of them also an independent motion on its own account from West to East. The order of the different circles is as follows, proceeding, as Plato does, from the outermost to the innermost:—

1. The Fixed Stars.
2. Saturn.
3. Jupiter.
4. Mars.
5. Mercury.
6. Venus.
7. The Sun.
8. The Moon.

So much for the general outline of the theory, which is as clearly conceived and lucid as Plato's theories always are. The particular difficulty with which this article deals concerns the breadth of the rims of the different whorls. What does Plato intend us to understand by the different breadths? On this question there is no agreement of opinion among those who have investigated the subject. Zeller, so far as I have noticed, does not touch upon the question, and I have not found anything satisfactory in Boeckh. It is difficult, or rather impossible, to understand how 'the breadth of the rings may be intended to signify the supposed distances of the orbits from each other' (Jowett and Campbell), or 'the surfaces traversed by the different Sirens,' (Donaldson in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* X 305–316), or 'interiecta inter aequatores et tropicos arcticos planetarum spatia' (Schleiermacher, quoted by Schneider. Cf. Schleiermacher's translation of the *Republic* 622 f.). Stallbaum says that Plato's meaning is here involved in 'Cimmerian darkness,' and even Schneider, who rarely evades a difficulty, complains that 'it is easier to say what the words cannot, than what they do, mean.' The simple