

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](#)



When did Aristophanes Die?

Roland G. Kent

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 03 / April 1906, pp 153 - 155
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00994137, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00994137

How to cite this article:

Roland G. Kent (1906). When did Aristophanes Die?. The Classical Review, 20, pp 153-155
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00994137

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

66. εἰ μὴ προσήκει μοι μὴδὲν ὥστ' ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν.

Logically it should be a past tense and probably Antiphon wrote προσήκε.

6. 21. ἔλεξα ὅτι τὸν μὲν νόμον οὐ δίκαιον οὐ προκαθιστάη Φιλοκράτης κατηγορῶν καὶ διαβάλλον εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, μελλόντων ἔσσεσθαι μοι ἀγώνων . . . ὥνπερ ἕνεκα τοὺς λόγους τούτους λέγειν ἂ μὲντοι αἰτῶτο καὶ διαβάλλοι, ῥαδίως ἐξελεγχθήσοιτο ψευδόμενος.

No one can be said to have made much of the obviously corrupt words at the beginning of this sentence. The prevailing idea has been to alter at any rate προκαθιστάη, and all sorts of words (προσήκον τοιεῖ, προαγαρεύοι, προφασίζεται) have been proposed. It is so peculiar a word that in its case corruption is most unlikely. It should be recognised as a probably technical expression and the error sought elsewhere. Those critics have been on a better track who removed the οὐ before it, an obvious course to take, but this is not enough. What is meant by προκαθιστάναι νόμον? and what law is referred to? The sense still remains very doubtful and obscure.

As soon as one begins to consider the sentence and look for something in it that may easily be wrong, we remember that νόμος and λόγος sometimes get interchanged in MSS. and we find that τὸν μὲν λόγον here will go far to restore an excellent sense. τὸν λόγον προκαθιστάναι suits admirably the remainder of the sentence, the μελλόντων ἔσσεσθαι μοι ἀγώνων and the ὥνπερ ἕνεκα τοὺς

λόγους τούτους λέγειν, which latter is almost τὸν λόγον προκαθιστάναι repeated. The λόγος in question is advanced beforehand with a view not to the occasion on which it is put forward but to one soon coming. The speaker is paving the way for something subsequent, prejudicing his audience in advance. The μὲν and δέ mean that such a λόγος would be unfair, even if it were true, but that as a matter of fact it was not even that.

Having got thus far *a priori*, we are gratified to find that the very phrase we have conjectured actually occurs in the *Ars Rhetorica* which goes under the name of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In 5. 2 then the writer is speaking of the art of constructing conciliatory exordia so as to win over beforehand the goodwill of your hearer, in this case an individual; and when you have done that, he says, οὕτω δὲ προκαταστησάμενον τὸν λόγον, ἐξῆς ἰτέον ἐπὶ τὸ ἐγκώμιον τοῦ βασιλέως, and so on. The two uses tally almost exactly.

As for the double negative in οὐ δίκαιον οὐ προκαθιστάη, it may arise from a confusion or mixture of οὐ δ. π. and δ. οὐ π., either of which would be possible here.

40. αὐτός would perhaps be better than οὗτος. οὕτως αὐτός has already been proposed, but there is no need for both words.

41. ἂ . . . κατηγοροῦσι . . . , τοῦτο δέ (or δὴ) . . . , ἔσται τεκμήριον.

Probably ὁ for ἄ.

H. RICHARDS.

WHEN DID ARISTOPHANES DIE?

The year 385 seems to be agreed upon as the approximate date of Aristophanes' death.

'Il composa encore' (after the second *Plutus*, 388) 'le *Cocalos* et l'*Éolosikon*, pièces perdues, mais il les fit représenter comme des œuvres de son fils Araros, auquel il voulut ainsi gagner la faveur du public . . . Il mourut peu de temps après.'—Croiset, *Hist. de la Litt. Grecque*, iii.² p. 531.

'Die letzten zwei Stücke gab er schon nicht mehr unter seinem Namen, sondern unter dem seines Sohnes Araros, um denselben empfehlend bei dem Publikum einzuführen.² Den uns erhaltenen *Plutos* dichtete er noch für die Dionysien von 388; bald nachher aber muss er gestorben sein; sicher war er

Ol. 101, wo nach Suidas sein Sohn Araros mit eigenen Stücken auftrat, schon tot; wahrscheinlich enthält das 384 geschriebene Gastmahl des Platon ein Gedenkblatt für den kurz zuvor gestorbenen Dichter.'—Christ, *Gr. Litt.—Gesch.*² p. 292 (3d. ed. p. 300).

² Vgl. Arg. *Plut.*; vielleicht auch, weil Aristophanes zu alt war, um selbst noch als Schauspieler die erste Rolle zu spielen.'—*ib.*, footnote referred to in previous quotation.

'Das letzte Stück, das A. selbst zur Aufführung brachte, war der zweite *Plutos* (388, vgl. Hypoth. iv), zwei weitere Stücke, den *Kokalos* und den *Aiolosikon* übergab er seinem Sohne Araros zur Aufführung. Er

kann also etwa bis in die Mitte des 2. Jahrzehnts des 4. Jhdts. gelebt haben.'—Kaibel in *Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyc.* ii p. 972, s. v. *Aristophanes* 12.

This conclusion is based on

I.-IV. *Aristoph. Plut.* τελευταίαν δὲ διδάξας τὴν κωμωδίαν ταύτην (i. e. *Plutum*) ἐπὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀνόματι, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ συστήσαι 'Αραρότα δι' αὐτῆς τοῖς θεαταῖς βουλόμενος, τὰ ὑπόλοιπα δύο δι' ἐκείνου καθῆκε (sc. 'Αριστοφάνης), Κώκαλον καὶ Αἰολοσίκωνα.

II.—*Anon. Vita Aristophanis* § 12. ἐν τούτῳ δὲ τῷ δράματι (i. e. *Κώκαλῳ*) συνέστησε τῷ πληθὲι τὸν υἱὸν 'Αραρότα, καὶ οὕτω μετήλλαξε τὸν βίον, παῖδας καταλιπὼν τρεῖς. . .

III.—*Schol. ad Plat. Apol.* 19c. τρεῖς δ' ἔσχεν υἱούς, Φίλιππον . . . καὶ 'Αραρότα ἰδίους τε καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς δράμασι διηγωνισμένον, καὶ τρίτον . . .

IV.—*Suidas* s. v. 'Αραρός, 'Αθηναῖος, υἱὸς τοῦ 'Αριστοφάνους τοῦ κωμικοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς κωμικός, διδάξας τὸ πρῶτον 'Ολυμπιάδι ρα'.

V.—The fact that Aristophanes appears as a character in Plato's *Symposium*, written not before 385.

From the first three of these, three facts are established. First: the *Κώκαλος* and the *Αἰολοσίκων* were the only plays which Aristophanes composed after the second *Plutus*. Second: Aristophanes gave these plays to his son Araros for presentation.¹ Third: his motive in so doing was to bring Araros favourably before the public.² Now from the fourth passage it is seen that Araros first appeared as chorodidascalus of a play in Ol. 101—hence not before the Lenaea of Ol. 101, 1 or January 375. Christ's interpretation of ἐδίδαξεν here as 'mit eigenen Stücken auftrat' is unjustifiable³; with πρῶτος, the word means simply

¹ *Platonius de div. com.* § 8 τὸν γοῦν Αἰολοσίκωνα 'Αριστοφάνης ἐδίδαξεν, ὃς οὐκ ἔχει τὰ χωρικά μέλη, does not contradict this, for ἐδίδαξεν is here, as the context clearly shows, used loosely and inaccurately in the sense of *composed*.

² Christ's note, quoted above, is not to the point; Aristophanes, he says, died probably before 384, certainly before 376/5, and had presented the *Plutus* in his own name in 388; but the lapse of these few years could hardly have caused him on the score of advanced age, as Christ thinks, to give up the active work of presenting a play, for he had always been in the habit of giving many of his plays to others for production, notably to Callisthenes and to Philonides, and even if he had desired to present it himself he would not have been obliged to take the part of the first actor.

³ So also Kaibel in *Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyc.* ii p. 381 s.v. *Araros* 2, 'Selbständig als Dichter ist er nach Suidas zuerst Ol. 101 aufgetreten, also mindestens 13 Jahre nach dem *Plutos*.'

presented for the first time a play in his own name.

Hence this refers either to the *Cocalus* or the *Aeolosicon*, or to an early attempt of his own, preceding them. In view of his father's desire to bring him favourably before the public the latter is hardly likely, so that one of the other two is probably the play referred to.⁴ In either case these two plays of Aristophanes did not appear before 375.

The next question is, was Aristophanes alive when these last plays of his appeared? *A priori*, if he wished to commend his son to public favour as a chorodidascalus, he would have had the plays brought out in his own lifetime that he might assist the inexperienced young man with practical advice in the matter; but there is also a much stronger reason for answering the question in the affirmative.

The *Aeolosicon* appeared in two versions, and both of these versions are credited to Aristophanes.⁵

Codex Ambrosianus L 39 ('*Novati Life*'). Αἰολος ἢ εἰκὼν β', *legendum* Αἰολοσίκων β'.

Athenaeus 372A καὶ 'Αριστοφάνης Αἰολοσίκωνι δευτέρῳ.

Schol. ad Hephaest. i p. 56 *Gaisf.* Αἰολοσίκων δράμα γέγονε πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον 'Αριστοφάνους, ὡς καὶ ὁ Πλούτος πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον.

Now there are several instances on record where a play has been worked over by another comic writer, as the *Ἀντεία* of Antiphanes, reworked by Alexis, *Athen.* 127 B.C. 'Αντιφάνους . . . ἐξ . . . Ἀντείας . . . τὸ δ' αὐτὸ δράμα φέρεται καὶ ὡς 'Αλέξιδος ἐν ὀλίγοις σφόδρα διαλλάττον, and the *Δύσπρατος* of Antiphanes, reworked by Epicrates, *Athen.* 262 'Αντιφάνης δ' ἐν Δυσπράτῳ . . . (fr. 89 *Kock*) . . . 'Επικράτης δ' ἐν Δυσπράτῳ . . . (fr. 5 *Kock*) . . . ἐκ τοῦ παραθέσεως τῶν ἱαμβείων δῆλός ἐστιν ὁ 'Επικράτης τὰ τοῦ 'Αντιφάνους μετενεγκών. Other instances of revision are probably concealed, at least in some instances, under disputes as to the authorship of plays, as the *Ἀλείπτρια* and *Ὕπνος* of Antiphanes or Alexis (*Athen.* 123 B, 671 D), the *Ὁμοία* of Alexis or Antidotus (*Athen.* 642 D), and the *Καμπυλίων* of Araros or Eubulus (*Athen.* 471 E, 562 C). But in no case where the revision belongs to one not the original

⁴ It is immaterial here whether the *Cocalus* preceded the *Aeolosicon* or not; *Hyp.* IV. *Plut.* names the *Cocalus* first, while *Anon. Vita Aristoph.* § 12 implies that the *Cocalus* was Aristophanes' last play.

⁵ In fact, of the thirty odd passages in which the play is mentioned, all expressly state or by the immediate context imply that Aristophanes is the author of the play.

author, is that revision attributed to the original author. A view therefore that the second *Aeolosicon* is due to a revision by Araros cannot be accepted, for no passage suggests in the slightest way that the revision was due to any one but Aristophanes himself. Moreover, the two versions of this play, as well as the *Cocalus*, are needed to fill out the full list of Aristophanes' forty-four plays (cf. *Didot edition of Aristophanes*, pp. 445 sq.). We may accordingly regard it as certain that Aristophanes was the author of the second *Aeolosicon* as well as of the first. It follows as a corollary that he survived the performance of the first *Aeolosicon* at least long enough to revise the play for a second production.

The *Cocalus* is likewise of unquestioned authority. Wherever mentioned, it is stated or clearly implied to be a play of Aristophanes. Once only do we find it attributed to another, and then by a late author, who assigned it to its chorodidascales, a not unnatural error.

Clem. Alex. Strom. vi 752. τὸν μέντοι Κώκαλον τὸν ποιηθέντα Ἀραρότι τοῦ Ἀριστοφάνους υἱεῖ¹ Φιλῆμων ὁ κωμικὸς ὑπαλλάξας ἐν Ὑποβοκμαίῳ ἐκωμώδησεν. It cannot have been given before 375, for the same reasons which govern the dating of the *Aeolosicon*. Perhaps the two plays were given at the two festivals of that year, and the second *Aeolosicon* in the next year; but this must remain a mere surmise, for the twenty-eight fragments of the two plays (given by Kock, *Frag. Com. Att.* i) give no clue whatever to their dates. Certainty is assured only for the statements that that one of them which was first produced appeared in Ol. 101, or 376-2, and that Aristophanes was alive during a great part of the year 375, if the *Aeolosicon* was produced at the earliest date possible in that period, and otherwise longer.

It remains to consider how his appearance

¹ This is Casaubon's correction for the manuscript reading ἀραρότως τῷ Ἀριστοφάνει ποιεῖ.

as a character in Plato's *Symposium* affects the question. Christ (*l.c.*) suggests that it was meant as a tribute to the poet soon after his death, and that he therefore died before 384. But the date of the composition of the dialogue is by no means certain, the only clue being the year 385 as a *terminus post quem* (p. 193 A), and the poet's appearance as a personage does not necessarily mean that he was no longer living at the time of its composition. Furthermore, the fantastic views upon the origin of love may be put into the poet's mouth as a species of gentle retort for the satire upon the Platonic state in the *Ecclesiazusae* (if that play be indeed hitting at Plato's communism of family, cf. Rogers, *Aristoph. Eccles.* xxiv-xxviii), and for the reference to Plato himself in the *Τελεμῆσις*.²

Aristophanes' death may therefore be set in 375 or the next few years. He was accordingly, at the time of his death, about seventy years of age, if he was born in 445/4, the generally accepted date, or eighty, if as the writer believes (*Class. Rev.* xix pp. 153-155) he was born in 455/4. Even eighty years is not an unlikely age for him to have reached, for Epicharmus, Cratinus, and Alexis, to mention comic poets only, all far surpassed fourscore.

May it be permitted to hazard a conjecture as to the reason for the appearance of the *Aeolosicon* a second time? Possibly, like the *Frogs*, the play received such a hearty reception that a second performance was demanded, for the public had not forgotten that it was Aristophanes, the old champion of morality, who was speaking again in his old age after a silence of many years.³

ROLAND G. KENT.

University of Pennsylvania.

² He is there spoken of as Ἀπίστυλλος, which is a nickname of Aristocles, the philosopher's real name (cf. Kock, *Frag. Com. Att.* i p. 528, *Aristophanes fr.* 538).

³ From the second *Plutus*, 388, to this play, 375 at the earliest.

THE PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE, OPTATIVE, AND IMPERATIVE IN GREEK.

PROF. HARRY'S *Duplik* fortunately requires no long *Triplik* from me. I expect that if he were to lay his hand to the practical task of writing a Greek Grammar he would come to the same result as others who have laboured in this field: *i.e.* he would find it necessary to include the Perf. Subj. and

Optat. (labelled 'rare') in his paradigms, and also to call them by their ordinary names, *e.g.* *πεποιθοίη*¹ Perfect Optat. (though of course it has present meaning, like *πέποιθα*)—and this not from any regard for 'the Roman

¹ I am sorry that I missed seeing this in Prof. Harry's article.