

A BAKER'S DOZEN: *THESM.* × 12, *CLOUDS* × 1

I *Thesm.*

My Oxford edition of the play, jointly produced with Douglas Olson, came out in 2004.¹ A revised paperback followed in 2009. To the reviews listed there in the *Addenda* p. 351 may be added Jeffrey Henderson,² Elizabeth W. Scharffenberger,³ Walter Stockert.⁴ Note also that the Groningen fascicule of the scholia on *Thesm.* and *Eccl.*, edited by R. F. Regtuit, finally appeared in 2007.⁵ In *ZPE* Rudolf Kassel devoted a sizeable section of his ongoing "Aus der Arbeit an den *Poetae Comici Graeci*" to a detailed examination of our edition.⁶ The "Nachtrag"⁷ mentions very briefly some, but not all, of the comments I had made at that time on his survey. I welcome the opportunity of presenting them here in full.

2. ἀλοῶν. Schol. ἔωθεν (ἔξωθεν R) ἐν κύκλῳ περιάγων ὡς οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἄλωσι. Kassel, p. 61: "Danach hat Rutherford βόας hinzugesetzt, besser τοὺς βόας, wie in Reitzensteins Konjektur bei Phot. α 1029⁸ = Lex. Bachm. p. 75, 26 (Σ^b α 984) ἀλοῶν· ἀντὶ τοῦ περιάγων, ὡς ἀλοῶντες τοὺς βόας (statt βόες), im Scholion vielleicht nur in Gedanken zu ergänzen". But τοὺς βόας is clearly the wrong case, as περιάγων is here intransitive:⁹ "Daher scheint ἀλοῶν von den βόες, nicht von den ἐλάυνοντες τοὺς βόας gesagt zu werden".¹⁰

¹ C. Austin, D. Olson, *Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae* (Oxford 2004).

² J. Henderson, *CR* 56 (2006) 28–30.

³ E. W. Scharffenberger, *AJP* 127 (2006) 140–144.

⁴ W. Stockert, *WS* 119 (2006) 319–321.

⁵ R. F. Regtuit (ed.), *Scholia in Thesmophoriazusae, Ranas, Ecclesiazusae et Plutum*, Scholia in Aristophanem III 2–3 (Groningen 2007).

⁶ R. Kassel, "Aus der Arbeit an den *Poetae Comici Graeci*", *ZPE* 154 (2005) 59–67.

⁷ Idem, "Nachtrag zu *ZPE* 154 (2005) 59–68", *ZPE* 155 (2006) 22.

⁸ [R. Reitzenstein, *Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios* (Leipzig 1907) 80.]

⁹ See J. Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane* (Paris 1962) § 218.

¹⁰ Kaibel, as quoted in my "Textual Problems in Ar. *Thesm.*", *Dodone* 16 (1987) 70 (for Kaibel's unpublished commentary see *ibid.* 67 f.). In the same article I explained why Reiske's ἄλύων (which Kassel believes "nicht ganz in Vergessenheit geraten sollte") is simply not on the cards and I also drew attention to Felix Solmsen's *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre* (Strassburg 1901) 106 n. 2: "Es scheint mir deshalb nicht zulässig in diesem ἀλοῶν ein ganz anderes Verbum zu suchen oder zu ändern."

182. τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις, ὅτι κτλ. Kassel, p. 63: “Nur Blaydes geht auf den bei der Angabe der Festtage im Dativ ungewöhnlichen Artikel ein, den er so anstößig findet, daß er {τοῖς} Θεσμοφορίοις<ιν> ὅτι oder -οις ὅτι<ῆ> zu schreiben empfiehlt”. Blaydes seems to be barking up the wrong tree. Our observation p. 117, “Names of festivals normally dispense with the article (cf. 558, 834; *Av.* 1519) unless they are accompanied by a determinative phrase (here τῆμερον); cf. KG I. 445–446, 600”, is corroborated by the presence of the article in τοῖς Ταυροπολίοις at *Men. Epitir.* 863 (qualifying πέρυσιν at 862) and 1119 (qualifying τότε at 1118). Cf. also *Plat. Symp.* 174 a: χθές... τοῖς ἐπινικίοις.

217. ἴπιδοῦναι ἴμαυτὸν Dawes (ἐμαυτὸν iam Scaliger): διδόναι γ' αὐτον R. Kassel, p. 59: “Daneben gab es Versuche, mit dem überlieferten Praesens auszukommen, ἴπιδιδόναι γ' αὐτὸν Toup: ἴπιδιδόν' ἐμαυτὸν Dindorf: ἴπιδιδόναι ἴμαυτὸν Bergk”. Why resurrect these “Versuche”, when only Dawes' emendation gives “das hier geforderte Tempus”?¹¹ Cf. 249: ἐπειδὴ σαυτὸν ἐπιδοῦναι φθονεῖς. Kaibel (see above on 2) wrote in shorthand: “Übrigens der Aorist notwendig wegen μήποτε, *dies einmal nicht*”.¹²

305–309. Kassel, p. 63: “R hat καὶ τὴν δρῶσαν τὴν ἀγορεύουσαν τὰ βέλτιστα περὶ τὸν δῆμον τῶν (τὸν Grynaeus) Ἀθηναίων καὶ τὸν τῶν γυναικῶν ταύτην νικᾶν. Vor τὴν ἀγορεύουσαν hat eine jüngere Hand s. l. καὶ eingefügt, τὴν hat van Leeuwen gestrichen, wie nach ihm Coulon und jetzt Austin–Olson, καὶ τὴν δρῶσαν <καὶ> {τὴν} ἀγορεύουσαν. Bothe tilgte τὴν ἀγορεύουσαν, eher könnte man, durch Sommersteins Cruces ermutigt, τὴν δρῶσαν ausscheiden, also καὶ {τὴν δρῶσαν} τὴν ἀγορεύουσαν τὰ βέλτιστα... νικᾶν”. In my review of Sommerstein¹³ I wrote: “306 δρῶσαν should not be daggered or deleted. δρῶσαν καὶ ἀγορεύουσαν is an adaptation of the orators' πράττοντα καὶ λέγοντα. See Wankel on *Dem.* 18. 57 (p. 361 f.)”.¹⁴ The suppression of τὴν δρῶσαν makes the prayer lopsided and gratuitously removes a key element in the carefully crafted “series of paired and contrasting terms in which Aristophanes works out in detail the parallel between the women's festival and the Ecclesia”.¹⁵ Here the ritual δρῶμενα are paired and contrasted with the speeches in the assembly.

¹¹ E. Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Roma 1962) 115.

¹² For further examples of μή ποτ' ὄφελον with aorist infinitive see *Fraenkel* (n.11) 116 n. 1.

¹³ [Rev.]: A. H. Sommerstein (ed., tr.), *Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae*, CR 45 (1995) 432.

¹⁴ [H. Wankel, *Demosthenes, Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz* (Heidelberg 1976).]

¹⁵ Joan Haldane, “A Scene in the *Thesmophoriazusae* (295–371)”, *Philologus* 109 (1965) 40.

325. ἐναλίου R. Kassel, p. 59: “εἰναλίου Dindorf, nicht Bentley”. It seems that an objective *mise au point* on the question of attributions is called for. As I remarked,¹⁶ “the πρῶτος εὐρετής of many an emendation turns out to be a very elusive bird indeed”. Bentley’s *inedita* on *Thesm.* were first published by G. Burges,¹⁷ “not without mistakes and omissions”, as Olson and I record on p. cii of our introduction. In my *Dodone* article I was at pains to demonstrate that “Burges misreports Bentley several times and leaves out a fair number of good suggestions, which are now attributed to later critics”,¹⁸ including εἰναλίου here – jotted down by Bentley before Dindorf was born, and long before Brunck printed εἰνάλιοι in his 1783 edition – as well as ἐξαπατώσι<v> at 357, where Bentley anticipated Bothe’s *Lectiones Aristophaneae*.¹⁹ In his autograph in the British Library Bentley has “l. εἰν:” at 325 and “leg. σιν” at 357. At 364 λέγουσ’ too belongs to Bentley, as R’s λέγουσιν is also the reading of the *Suda* α 3501 and of Grynaeus (ed. Brubach., Francof. 1544, p. 247). To claim, as Kassel does, “135 stammt Λυκουργείας statt -γίας nicht von Dindorf”, is to overlook the fact that Λυκουργείας already appears in Dindorf’s 1825 edition (II, p. 96), the same year as Dobree’s death and eight years before the publication of the latter’s *Adversaria*. See also Prato in his 2001 “Valla” edition.²⁰ We know that Dindorf started work on the play in 1821 (see the preface to vol. VIII of Invernizzi’s edition, where *à propos* of *Lys.* and *Thesm.* Dindorf announces on p. V “novas ego paro harum fabularum editiones”), so he may also have “anticipated” Dobree at 644 τοδὶ διέκυψε, since in his 1830 edition (II, p. 102) he notes: “correxi quod in libris est τοδὶ δὴ ἔκυψε”, and still claims paternity for the conjecture in his 1837 edition (III, p. 773). Finally, if Pierson is to be remembered beside Bentley at 1194 (Kassel, p. 60), should we not systematically list all the corrections first printed by Brunck in 1783 (283 <καὶ>, etc.) which were much later found lurking in Bentley’s unpublished *marginalia*? We could even try to assemble the large number of conjectures made by Porson himself before he “cried with delight” when he saw the copy where “the great Aristarch” had anticipated him.²¹

¹⁶ Austin (n. 10) 65 n. 1.

¹⁷ *CIJ* 14 (1816) 130–137.

¹⁸ Austin (n. 10) 66.

¹⁹ F. H. Bothe, *Lectiones Aristophaneae* (Berolini 1808) 118. See Austin (n. 10) 77.

²⁰ C. Prato, *Aristofane: Le Donne alle Tesmoforie* (Milano, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 2001) 22.

²¹ See the memoir on Porson by H. R. Luard in *Cambridge Essays* (London 1857) 153; J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* II (Cambridge 1908) 429.

326. Kassel, p. 59: “ὀριπλάγκτους (ὀρει- R) schon Blaydes”. More accurately: “ὀρίπλαγκτοι Austin (ὀρί- Blaydes): ὀρεί- R”.²²

354. τὰδ' εὐγµατα γενέσθαι. Kassel, p. 64: “Dindorfs <ἐκ> γενέσθαι hätte eine Erwähnung verdient”. Hardly, as ἐκ- is out of place here. When not used impersonally, as at *Pac.* 345, where ἐκγένειτ' = “may it be granted” (cf. *Equ.* 851), the compound verb always means “to originate from”, never “to turn out”. Coulon, Kassel maintains, “muß bei seiner editorischen Arbeit sehr müde und schwach geworden sein, als er sich von Willems die Änderung von γενέσθαι in ἀποτελεῖσθαι einreden ließ”. Willems had quoted Plat. *Rep.* IV. 443 b τέλειον ἄρα ἡμῖν τὸ ἐνὸπνιον ἀποτετέλεσται,²³ so Coulon's Greek is at least intelligible and is in fact the version advocated by Laetitia Parker,²⁴ and now printed by Nigel Wilson in the new *OCT!*²⁵ But R's γενέσθαι is perfectly in order (“simplex solum aptum est verbum” van Leeuwen),²⁶ as are the two resolved bacchiacs in this passage, which safely protect each other (Austin – Olson [n. 1] metrical note, p. 168).

398. δρᾶσαι δ' ἔθ' ἡμῖν οὐδὲν ὥσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ / ἔξεστι. Kassel, p. 64: “Küsters weithin akzeptierte Änderung ὦνπερ wird auch künftig Anhänger behalten, neque enim de modo et ratione, sed de rebus ipsis quaeritur (Fritzsche p. 146)”. Fritzsche had misunderstood the Greek, as Enger pointed out in his edition:²⁷ “At non est hoc ita intelligendum, *nihil iam facere nobis licet ea ratione, qua id antea faciebamus, sed nihil iam facere nobis licet, ut antea licebat, wir duerfen nichts mehr thun, wie wir doch frueher durften, quod etsi non satis accurate dictum est, reprehendi tamen neque in Graeca, neque in Latina nostraque lingua potest*”. So ὦνπερ, though attractive, is not inevitable.

812. εἰς πόλιν. Kassel, p. 60: “Der Ravennas hat ἐς πόλιν, was im Apparat erwähnt werden sollte, da die Schreibung umstritten ist; Dindorf setzte vor Konsonant überall selbst contra codices ἐς ein”. The problem, as the *Nachtrag* (n. 7) duly acknowledges, was set out succinctly in our introduction p. xcvi under the heading *Alternative forms and spellings*:

²² As in B. Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen zur Form und dramatischen Technik der Aristophanischen Komödien* III (Frankfurt 1987) 71, referred to in Austin (n. 10) 21 (cf. Austin – Olson [n. 1] metrical note [14] p. 156).

²³ A. Willems (ed.), *Aristophane* II (Paris – Bruxelles 1919) 550.

²⁴ L. Parker, *The Songs of Aristophanes* (Oxford 1997) 412.

²⁵ N. G. Wilson (ed.), *Aristophanes, Fabulae* II (Oxford 2008) 86.

²⁶ Cf. A. Meineke, *Vindiciarum Aristophanearum liber* (Lipsiae 1865) 152: “εὐγµατα enim τέλεα γίγνεται, non τέλεα ἐκγίγνεται”.

²⁷ R. Enger (ed.), *Ar. Thesm.* (Bonnae 1844) 76.

“εἰς/ἔς: R rightly has ἔς in the colloquial phrase ἔς κόρακας (1079–1082 n., cf. 1226), in paratragedy (1098, cf. 1122), and once in lyric (1149; cf. *Lys.* 786; *Ra.* 1352). But we restore εἰς for ἔς at 89, 485, 645, 767 twice, 812, 951, 954, 1137 as εἰς is the standard Attic form used elsewhere in R (224, etc.). See further Thraette I. 178. For 657, see note ad loc.”

981 f. ἔξαιρε δὴ προθύμως / διπλὴν χάριν (χαίρειν R) χορείας. Kassel, p. 66: “Es fehlt ein Hinweis auf den Aufsatz von A. Bierl, *Drama* 7 (1998) 27–40.” Our silence was deliberate: why mention a critic who beats about the bush for 11 pages before coming up with *unmetrischen Unsinn*, πόδας χαίρειν (*sic*) for διπλὴν χάριν (p. 38)?²⁸ The “double delight of the dance” is explained by us in our note and by Furley and Bremer.²⁹ If ἔξαιρε “wird nicht erklärt”, that is because we took for granted the meaning “arouse, stir up”, as in *LSJ* ἔξαιρω I. 3, where the passage is listed.

1004. ἐπικρούεις. Kassel, p. 67: “Das überlieferte Futur ἐπικρούσεις versucht Wilamowitz zu verteidigen (als Frage), *Kl. Schr.* IV 485 (aus dem Jahr 1929)”. His “Versuch” was a *faux pas*, which Coulon rectified at once:³⁰ “C’est à grand tort que Wilamowitz garde la leçon de R, ἐπικρούσεις, dans le v. 1004, en ponctuant ainsi: οἴμοι κακοδαίμων, μᾶλλον ἐπικρούσεις σύ γε; Le Parent ayant prié l’Archer de desserrer la cheville (χάλασον τὸν ἦλον), celui-ci dit: “*Allons, je vais faire ça*”, tout en faisant le contraire. Le Parent s’en ressent et s’écrie: οἴμοι κακοδαίμων, μᾶλλον ἐπικρούεις σύ γε. “*Aïe, malheur! tu l’enfonces davantage*”. Vers la fin de la pièce nous avons un jeu de scène analogue, où le Choeur dit à l’Archer de monter tout droit: ὀρθὴν ἄνω δῶκε (v. 1223). Mais cet imbecile de Scythe court à contre-sens, ce que le Choeur lui reproche: τοῦμπαλιν τρέχεις σύ γε. *Tu cours du côté opposé*”.

1088. κλαυσ’ ἔτι (κλαύσαιμι R) : κλαῦσ’ ἔτι (κλαύσαιμι R). Kassel, p. 67: “Das Konjizierte ἔτι ist hier ebenso fehl am Platz wie in 1187 καλο γε το πυγη. κλαυσ’ ἔτ’ (κλαυσ’ εἰ γ’ R), ἦν μὴ ἕδον μενης”. This curiously misses the joke. In *QUCC* 72 (2002) I wrote:³¹ “Most editors adopt Brunck’s κλαύσει, but why make the Scythian speak good Greek?” κλαυσ’ ἔτι would certainly be “fehl am Platz” in the mouth of an Athenian,

²⁸ See also his *Der Chor in den Alten Komödie* (München – Leipzig 2001) 141 n. 90 = *Ritual and Performativity. The Chorus of Old Comedy*, trans. A. Hollmann (Harvard 2009) 117 n. 90.

²⁹ W. D. Furley, J. M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns* (Tübingen 2001): I 358 f., II 356 f.

³⁰ V. Coulon, “Aristophane, Ménandre et Anacréon”, *REG* 44 (1931) 12 f.

³¹ C. Austin, “Seven Cruces in Aristophanes (*Acharnians* and *Thesmophoriazuesae*)”, *QUCC* 72 (2002) 75.

but is exactly the kind of “broken language” or amusing linguistic slip to be expected from a comic barbarian.³²

II *Clouds* 1119

In the new *OCT* Nigel Wilson prints the line as follows:³³

εἶτα τὰς καρπὸν τεκούσας ἀμπέλους φυλάξομεν

τὰς Sommerstein: τὸν codd.

In *Aristophanea* he writes:³⁴ “I am pretty sure that Sommerstein³⁵ has hit the mark with his simple emendation of τὰς for τὸν. The point, which he does not explain in full, is that once the vines have formed their fruit, extreme weather brings with it the danger that the vintage will fail to live up to its promise. The summer of 2003 in most European countries has shown all too clearly the reality of this risk. The previous remedy for the difficulty in this line was to follow Korais and write τε καὶ τὰς for τεκούσας, but it is so much inferior that, however much one admires Korais, it cannot merit inclusion in the apparatus any longer”.

I venture to disagree:

1. The change of τὸν to τὰς had already been proposed by G. Hermann in the preface to his first edition of the play (Leipzig 1799, p. XIII): “neque enim aliquas vites se curaturum spondet chorus, sed omnes, ubi uvae tulerint”. He however went on to defend the transmitted reading p. XIV: “Nimirum commode hic non cunctae, sed aliquae vites intellegi possunt, siquidem hoc dicit chorus: *et terram fodientibus vobis pluemus, et, si frustum si quae vites tulerint, eas pariter a calore nimio atque ab humore defendemus*”. In his second edition (Leipzig 1830, p. 152) Hermann printed instead:

εἶτα καρπὸν τὰς τεκούσας ἀμπέλους φυλάξομεν.³⁶

2. In my review of Dover’s edition I wrote:³⁷ “It is sad to see relegated to the apparatus Coraes’ brilliant τε καὶ τὰς (for τεκούσας) – perhaps the best conjecture ever made on the text of *Clouds*”. In his note on Plutarch’s

³² For “foreigner talk” in *Thesm.* see now Andreas Willi, *The Languages of Aristophanes* (Oxford 2003) 198–225.

³³ Wilson (n. 25) I, 185.

³⁴ N. G. Wilson, *Aristophanea* (Oxford 2007) 77.

³⁵ A. H. Sommerstein (tr.), *Aristophanes, Wealth* (Warminster 2001) 256.

³⁶ Hermann’s note was quoted in full in I. Bekker’s *variorum* edition (London 1829) III, 434.

³⁷ [Rev.]: K. Dover (ed.), *Aristophanes, Clouds* (Oxford 1968), *CR* 20 (1970) 20.

Agis 15.4: τοὺς καρποὺς σχεδὸν ἅπαντας συγκεκριομισμένων ἤδη τῶν γεωργῶν Coraes had compared the “storehouses full of grain and Bacchic stream” at *Eccl.* 14 f. στοάς τε καρποῦ Βακχίου τε νόμαντος / πλήρεις.³⁸ His “palmaria conjectura”, as Blaydes called it,³⁹ not only widens the focus (crops too get badly affected by extreme weather), but neatly restores to the passage one of its characteristic features, the repeated use of paired and symmetrical phrases:

1118 you first ~ and everyone else later, πρώτοισιν ὑμῖν, τοῖσι δ' ἄλλοις ὕστερον,

1119 your crops ~ and your vines, τὸν καρπὸν τε καὶ τὰς ἀμπέλους,

1120 neither drought ~ nor excessive rain, μήτ' ἀρχμὸν... μήτ' ἄγαν ἐπομβρίαν,

1121 any mortal ~ we goddesses, τις θνητός... ἡμᾶς θεάς,

1123 neither wine ~ nor anything else, οὔτ' οἶνον οὔτ' ἄλλ' οὐδέν,

1124 both olives ~ and vines, αἶ τ' ἐλαῖαι... αἶ τ' ἄμπελοι,

1128 any of his relatives ~ or friends, ἢ τῶν συγγενῶν τις ἢ φίλον.

† Colin Austin
Trinity Hall, Cambridge

В статье обсуждаются трудные для интерпретации пассажи из *Жениин на празднике Фесмофорий* и *Облаков* Аристофана в ответ на критические замечания Р. Касселя.

³⁸ A. Κοραΐς (ed.), *Πλουτάρχου Βίοι παράλληλοι* V (Paris 1813) 352.

³⁹ F. H. M. Blaydes (ed.), *Aristophanes, Nubes* (Halis Saxonum 1890) 151.