

# humanitas



Vol. XXXIII – XXXIV

IMPrensa DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA  
COIMBRA UNIVERSITY PRESS

FACULDADE DE LETRAS DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA  
INSTITUTO DE ESTUDOS CLÁSSICOS

---

# HUMANITAS

VOLS, XXXIII-XXXIV



MCMLXXXI-MCMLXXXII

COIMBRA

## A FEW OBSERVATIONS ON THE *RANAE* OF ARISTOPHANES \*

When at the Lenaea of 405 B.C. Aristophanes produced the *Ranae*, the most important fact concerning this play could not but escape his notice, for he was unaware of it: that it was the last moment, when old Attic comedy could display its quality. In fact also after that date Arist. wrote comedies and one of them, the *Plutus*, even in Antiquity had become one of his most popular plays (1). However, the splendid background of the city of Athens such as it was before 405 B.C. in the domain of politics, society and culture and which has been represented in such a vivid way in the plays of our author, had disappeared and the culture with its colourful human material was considerably reduced in size and splendour (2). However, a most impressive finale was delivered by comedy which, because of its character, always closely followed events and which, in the *Ranae*, made its mark (3).

Aristophanes owed his victory this time to diverse factors. It was his principal aim, no doubt, to represent a contest between the two great tragic poets, who differed in a marked way from one another. He was able to do this because of his artistic power and his knowledge

---

\* I am grateful to Dr. J. Pinsent of the Department of Greek at Liverpool University, for his help in preparing this English version of my paper.

(1) The *Plutus* was also the most popular play of Aristophanes in the Renaissance, see W. Süß, *Aristophanes und die Nachwelt* (Leipzig 1911), p. 23.

(2) On the effects of the catastrophe of 404 B.C., see also K. Reinhardt, *Tradition und Geist* (Göttingen 1960), p. 270f.

(3) In this respect I consider the *Ranae* to have even been more impressive than contemporary tragedy and its representative, the *Oedipus Coloneus* of Sophocles, which, as is well-known dates from about the same time. A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern 1971, third Ed.), p. 494 says about the *Aves* «das vollendeste unter den erhaltenen Stücken», but this judgement requires some qualification, for in my opinion the *Nubes* as well as the *Ranae* belong likewise to the most important plays.

of Euripides' works (4). However, the representation of such a contest, as one can easily see when reading the second part of the play, would have only fascinated the connoisseurs and would have made too great a demand on the simple interest of the common Athenian public (5). So it alone could not have gained the victory for the poet. Because of it Aristophanes, who in this later part of his career was a very experienced play-wright, combined that project with a play in which the general and common genre of comic plays was presented.

I observe that a number of scholars think that the *Ranae* in reality consists of two plays, because the construction of the play seems to be somewhat loose (6): *a*) The katabasis and the selection of a tragic poet. *b*) the contest and the occupation of the poetical throne. In my opinion, however, the play forms a unity (7), especially on account of the reason proposed above. Therefore, Arist. devoted the first part of his play to a description of a katabasis, an item which constitutes a typical comic theme in which the audience is captivated by a variety of adventures that succeed one another in a rapid succession. The comic element is the more intensified, because one is transposed in the under-world and is confronted at the same time with scenes that form the exact replica of situations that occur in common life on earth: e.g. *Ran.* 466-502; 549-89: the scenes of Aiakos and the two landladies, or the representation of Charon in *Ran.* 180ff.

---

(4) On the relation between Aristophanes and Euripides see also *Lustrum* II 67f., where a number of books on the subject (mainly dissertations) have been reviewed. Special mention must be made of C. Prato, *Euripide nella critica di Aristofane* 1955.

(5) Macaulay in one of his famous essays (*On the Athenian Orators*) greatly praises the Athenian public for having assisted at and having apparently enjoyed the works of the great tragic and comic authors. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that in those days the Athenians fortunately had no Television or Radio, for if that had happened the comic strips of Donald Duck, Mickey Mouse and tutti quanti would have come down to us and would have ousted the works of the great authors.

(6) References about the question are to be found in Gelzer, *Agon* 30, n. 1; Sicking 163-5; Koch, *Kritische Idee und komisches Thema* (Bremen 1968), 150f. See also Erbse, *Gnomon* 1956, 273 (and *ibid.* n. 1); Radermacher 152. Even Gelzer — R.E., *Suppl. Bd. XIII*, pp. 1485-7 — takes the view that we are originally confronted with two plays: the katabasis and the contest. On the point see also Lesky, *Gesch. Gr. Literat.* 500 (and *ibid.* also n. 1).

(7) The unity of the play is also defended by J. Schmidt, *Aristophanes und Euripides*, *Diss. Greifswald* 1940, 52f.; Sicking 167-171; Segall, *Harvard Stud. of Class. Phil.* 65, 1961, 229.

Thus the latter, who to the Athenians was the horrible ferry-man of the dead, is depicted as a civil servant of inferior position (8), a true plebeian, whose part is far removed from the horrible scenes in Dante's *Inferno* or in the pictures of Delacroix. Perhaps he is the first person to have been introduced in such a function in world literature. He is a morose old man who offers his information as a guide as brusque as possible, and who grows angry if some information is asked of him. In fact he cannot expect the exact fare (two obeloi) and could not expect a tip, which would have made him mellower. So he does not take any notice of the civil greetings of the travellers (*Ran.*184) and immediately rattles off the stopping places (*Ran.*185-7) (9). In the first place he offers only a general indication, for *ἀνάπαυλα* denotes a stopping place (10). The word contains, however, a comic allusion, for it properly indicates a resting-place and death is often considered to be a rest from man's troubles.

Thus Charon says *ἀναπαύλας ἐκ κακῶν καὶ πραγμάτων*, an allusion which contains a deep truth (11). He further says to Dionysos *ταχέως ἔμβαινε* (1.188) and when the latter puts a question which in his eyes is superfluous (12), he answers in a surly manner (1.188f.). In the same way he says curtly *δοῦλον οὐκ ἄγω* (1.190) and adds the rude words

(8) I point to the fact that the petty bureaucrats of low birth aroused the contempt of the Athenians. In this connection one can explain Euripides' severe criticism of the *κῆρυκες*; on it see Eur., *Or.* 888-897; *Troad.* 425f.; *Heracl.* 292f. The odious representation of these persons which seems to be strange to us can be understood, if we take account of this representation of Charon. These low-born persons because of their position were apparently inclined to flatter the great and to treat ordinary people in a contemptuous manner.

(9) The practice can be easily paralleled from modern times. At a stop conductors of trams, buses, trains often call out the stops that will come in a monotonous voice.

(10) See LSJ, s.v. *ἀνάπαυλα* II; *Ran.* 113 and 195; *Plat., Resp.* 7, 532 e *δοῦ ἀνάπαυλα*.

(11) See e.g. N.T., *Αποκ.* 14,13 *μακάριοι οἱ νεκροί...., ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν*. See also Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, Act III, Scene II «Duncan is in his grave, After life's fitful fever he sleeps well.» See also Eur., *Or.* 213 *ὦ πότνια λήθη τῶν κακῶν, ὡς εἶ σοφή*.

(12) Erbse in *Gnomon* 28, 1956, 275 and Cantarella have attributed the word *ποῦ* to Dionysos (*Ran.* 188). The nervous god has been alarmed by Charon's words *ἦ ᾗς κόρακας* and therefore he asks for nearer information. Mark also the words *εἰσβαίνε δὴ* in which *δὴ* reveals Charon's impatience.

which characterise him as a plebeian: εἰ μὴ νεναυμάχηκε τὴν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν.

In antiquity some critics took exception to it and replaced it by the more decent νεκρῶν (13). Subjective criticisms of this kind were now and again made in antiquity, as one can learn for instance from a comparison with Homeric textual criticism (14). The low expression is appropriate for a man whose intellectual horizon is very limited and who, therefore, takes an image from animal life (15) with which he is apparently best acquainted. Moreover, grave and serious things are often called by nicknames by men of the street in colloquial language.

The fact that Xanthias cannot go aboard is understandable (16), for the boat is small (see also 1.139); it only contains one rower, who could if necessary act as a κελευστής (17). Xanthias encumbered by the luggage which would occupy too much space in the boat, is on purpose removed because Dionysos is to be constrained to fulfil the part of the rower and so an amusing scene can be presented in which the god shows his weakness. The jokes offered in 11.197-9 are of the lowest order and Attic comedy does not differ very much from the Italian pantomime of the eighteenth century in passages of this kind. Ll. 200-3 are more lively, because Dionysos again tries to understand

---

(13) On the text see Coulon, Ed. and Koster, Tzetzes 757f. Most critics rightly retain κρεῶν, but Koster, 1.1. seems to prefer νεκρῶν. The variant occurs in a few MSS and is mentioned in the Schol. ad loc. One receives the impression from Photius 177,3-5 Porson that it is a conjecture of Demetrius Ixion. Aristarchus rightly retained κρεῶν (cf. Schol. 280a 53-b 4 Duebner), but offered an incorrect explanation; see also v. Leeuwen 42, on Ran. 191.

(14) See e.g. Valk, Researches II, Ch. X and XI.

(15) Λάγως τὸν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν τρέχων, see Zenobius 4,85; v. Leeuwen 42; Stanford 89f.

(16) The hypothesis put forward by Radermacher and other scholars, that Xanthias was needed to fulfil the part of the chorus has been definitely refuted by K. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (London 1972) who rightly pointed out that the chorus of the frogs actually appeared on the stage (cf. *ibid.* 173,89).

(17) Stanford 88, on l. 180 rightly thinks that the words ὄπι, παραβαλοῦ in l. 180 are spoken by Charon himself. One can imagine that a person who exerts himself very much, speaks aloud and encourages himself in this way. In l. 208 Charon speaks the words again, but now he can take his rest, because Dionysos is rowing.

his injunctions (18) and he then gives a summary command (19). At long last the latter understands the situation and is ready to make an excuse (11.203-5) (20): he is completely inexperienced, because he he is *ἄπειρος, ἀθαλάττεντος, ἀσαλαμίνιος* (21). The words present a kind of climax, for *ἀσαλαμίνιος* gives of the three words the greatest precision and also offers a kind of (22) pun, because a sexual connotation may be implied in the word.

Charon's curt manner is also demonstrated by the fact that he three times begins an injunction with *οὔκουν* (11.193,200,201). The MSS offer *οὔκοῦν* — see Coulon, Ed.; Koster, Tzetzes 758 — and one might think that Charon is ironically polite (thus Stanford 90),

(18) v. Leeuwen 44, on l. 201 says «Dionysus facit quod iussus est, sed remum non corripit». The latter understands as much of rowing as a Hindoo of skating, as Dickens would say (The Pickwick Papers, Ch. XXX).

(19) The verb *φλναγεῖν* does not this time have its usual significance «to speak nonsense», but rather indicates «to commit nonsense»; see also Stanford 91; Xen., Hellen. 3, 1, 18. *νομίσσας τὸν Δερκνλίδαν φλναγεῖν διατρέβοντα*.

(20) On *εἶτα* after a participle which to all appearance presents an Attic colloquialism, cf. v. Leeuwen, on Nub. 624; Dodds, *Plato, Gorgias* (Oxford 1976) p. 213, on Gorg. 457b 5. In l. 203 *εἶτα* (*καῖτα*), as occurs more often, indicates a reproach, see LSJ, s.v. *εἶτα* I 2; K.G.B. II 2, p. 281; Dover, *Clouds* 239, on Nub. 214.

(21) Stanford 91, on l. 204 rightly observes that the tricolon is typical of tragic style. On it see also Fraenkel, *Agam.* II, p. 217; de Benedetti on Eur., Or. 310 (p. 67); see also de Vries, *A commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato*, p. 95, on 240a 6. He rightly observes that the phenomenon is not restricted to poetry. I collected from the Phaedrus these instances: 240a 6; 240d 2; 246e; 247c 6-7; 247d 5-6 (Plato uses *καθορᾶ* thrice successively); 254d 4; 255e 3 (even four verbs are connected here asyndetically). On the point see also Valk, *Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella*, Catania 1972, II, p. 85, n. 1. I further observe that in Ar., Thesm. 436-8 three points are mentioned which all begin with a plural form of *πᾶς*. In this way the chorus praises the speech of the women which in all respects (*πᾶς*) stands the test. I also point to a threefold repetition of words that sometimes occurs in questions or statements: Aesch., Prom. 562 *τίς γῆ; τί γένος; τίνα φῶ λέύσσειν*; Ar., Thesm. 73 *τί τὸ πρᾶγμα τουτί; τί στένεις; τί δυσφορεῖς*;

(22) For the sexual allusion, I refer to Ar., Eccles. 37-40 — see also R.G. Ussher, *Aristophanes, Ecclesiazusae*, Oxford 1973, p. 78, ad loc. — and Lysistr. 59f. V. Leeuwen 45 wrongly connects the word with the Athenian trireme *Salaminia*. I cannot accept either the interpretation of Koster. Tzetzes 760f. who thinks that an allusion has been made to the famous sea-battle of Salamis. It is true that Arist. sometimes makes use of the word *Μαραθωνομάχης*, but there *μάχη* gives precision to the expression, while, moreover, the victory at Marathon, unlike the battle of Salamis, belonged to the Athenians only.

but he is in fact always curt and rude (23). Again we meet (cf. n. 12 and 13 above) with an instance of the pedantic criticism of ancient critics, for in 1.193 a few MSS offer *τρέγων* instead of *κύκλω*, for the latter word when taken strictly in a literal sense, would indicate that Xanthias will arrive again at the starting-point.

When one has in mind the rude character of Charon, his deportment in 11.205-7 seems to be a civil one, for he speaks of fine songs which are to be performed by *βάτραχοι κόκνοι* (24). Again the words form an amusing characterisation of the plebeian, for on account of their low and undeveloped taste such men are inclined to admire the work of a dauber and would be ready to exchange it for a picture by Rubens or Rembrandt.

In 1.194 Charon says that Xanthias has to wait *παρὰ τὸν Ἀδαίον* (25) *λίθον*. Of course the word must be connected (see also Radermacher 166) with *αδαίω* «dry up, desiccate». However, it does not provide, as the Scholia think, an allusion to the dead, the *ἀλίβαντες* («the dry ones»), but to Hades in general, the land of infertility and waste (26), where not even an oasis can be found which at least occurs in the desert, and where trees themselves are fruitless (cf. *κ* 510 *ἰτέασι ὠλεσίκαρποι*). The proper name (*Ἀδαίον λίθος*) is, as I think, a personal invention of Aristophanes, who is very witty in these matters.

Dionysos' attitude is portrayed wittily in 1.195, for he is afraid that his servant has not sufficiently understood Charon's indications and accordingly will not be at the stopping-place and, therefore, he nervously asks him *μανθάνεις*; Thereupon, Xanthias curtly answers *πάνυ μανθάνω*. «I understand it only too well.» A similar por-

---

(23) The diction of the Attic idiom is interesting here. In 1.193 we would have rather expected to meet with the Imperative, but the Athenian says: «Would you not run around, etc.» The words reflect quick-tempered language. In Ran. 200 the Imperative is not used either, when Charon says: *οὔκουν καθεδεῖ* and *οὔκουν προβαλεῖ*.

(24) As for this combination see also Pfeiffer, in *Sophocles, H. Diller*, Darmstadt 1967, p. 482.

(25) Coulon and Cantarella rightly write *Ἀδαίον*, though the MSS (see Coulon, Ed.) seem to write *Ἀδαίον*, the reading also in Tzetzes (cf. Koster 159). Eustathius offers both readings — see Valk, *Eust. Comment. III*, p. 313, App. Cr. — which shows that the text in those days was ambiguous.

(26) On *Ἀδαίον λίθος* see also Dearden, p. 12, whose view is, however, controversial.



trayal of Dionysos can be found in 1.271, for when the latter has got ashore and can lay aside the humiliating attitude which he had to adopt towards Charon, he can again play the master and says in a commanding manner ὁ *Ξανθίας* (27). He expects that his servant, who had to perform a difficult journey, will be available at once. However, when no answer occurs, he grows nervous and says ποῦ *Ξανθίας* and finally he says in a more submissive manner ἦ, *Ξανθία* (28). One sees how in one line only the poet succeeds in representing the successive reactions of the god in a most vivid manner.

Another element which may occur in the katabasis-motif, has been exploited by the poet, too: the fact that one can expect that the order of things has been reversed in Hades: ἄνω κάτω, an element which is especially welcome in comedy. One may compare Vesp. 1351-9, where the rôles of father and son have been reversed, when at last the old Philokleon has changed his conduct and behaves in a wanton manner (29). That comic pattern has been applied by Arist. in all its details. Because fathers are mostly parsimonious with regard to their sons, Bdelykleon is parsimonious, too. Since a son has only one father, Arist. who has wittily reversed the situation, represents Philokleon as the only «son» of his son Bdelykleon, and since fathers who have only one son care for them very much and watch them closely, the same characteristic is ascribed to Bdelykleon with regard to his father.

The same fact also appears in Ran. 416-21, where the politician Archedemos is ridiculed (30). He is said to be a demagogue ἐν τοῖς

---

(27) One may compare Ran. 40 and 521, where the servant is addressed by the words ὁ παῖς; see also Ran. 608, where Aiakos addresses his slave as ὁ Διτύλας. See also Vesp. 935 ὁ θεσμοθέτης. The Nominative is haughty; see MacDowell, *Wasps* 253, ad loc.; Stanford 74, on Ran. 40; Schwyzer, *Gr. Gramm.* II 63, n. 3. It is of interest to compare the way in which the Prussian Kings in the age of Frederick II were accustomed to address their subjects. They did not make use of the address «you», but of «er» = «he»; see Thomas Carlyle, *Frederick the Great*, Book XVI, Ch. V. In this way these kings created distance.

(28) On l. 271 see also Svennung, *Anredeformen* (Uppsala 1958), p. 222.

(29) The fact has been rightly mentioned by MacDowell, *Wasps*, p. 308, on l. 1352.

(30) On this politician and the prominent rôle he played at this time in the question of the battle of the Arginoussai see Stanford 110, on l.417. On the joke φράτρες-φραστήρες see already Schol. Ran. 218 (288a 22-5 Duebner) and the Com-

*ἄνω νεκροῖσι* and is called *τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἐκεῖ μοχθηρίας*. The allusion is not only a comical but also a thoughtful one, since here, too, it has been elaborated in detail and, moreover, been connected with the patriotic motif. Here we converse in the under-world in the company of *mystae*, who as the *parodos* shows, lead a blessed existence (see e.g. 11.454-6). So it is likely that their existence is preferable to life on earth, because they are not plagued by sorrow, grief or illness, and, accordingly, they consider men on earth to be *οἱ ἄνω νεκροί*. In fact in those surroundings, where life after death is not considered as a shadowy existence but as a blessed state, the value of life on earth must be degraded proportionally. To us this state of mind can be understood very well from the standpoint of Christian religion, where it plays an important part (31). In the same way one of the foremost politicians is called here *τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἐκεῖ μοχθηρίας*, for the situation of the dead is often considered to be a lamentable one (see e.g. λ 487-91). One can see that Arist. has thought through the matter and attributes to the *mystae* a view which is understandable because of their situation in the play (32) and by means of which, moreover, he can present a gloomy picture of the actual situation at Athens in 405 B.C., which point is exposed at greater length in the *parabasis*.

Another motif was further added by the poet to his play. In the older *katabaseis* the hero was often accompanied by others such as Odysseus who travelled with his crew or Theseus, with whom the Athenian public was especially familiar, who was accompanied by Peirithoos. Arist. who gave to Dionysos a companion, too, in his servant Xanthias, was enabled in this way to add an interesting and comic motif, the relation and contrast between the cowardly master and the cunning, brave and resourceful servant. So he could represent

---

mentators (Stanford, etc.); Taillardat, Nr. 680. It is interesting to state that the later form *φράτορας* has found its way into all the mss. and the Scholia. The correct form *φράτερες* has been rightly restored by Dindorf, as also appears from the allusion *ε~η (φράτερας= φραστήρας)*.

(31) See e.g. N.T., Phil. 1, 23. St. Paul prefers to be with Christ in the heavens.

(32) I do not agree with Taillardat, Nr. 41 who believes that Aristophanes had in mind Orphic or Pythagorean doctrines. He may have had some notion of these doctrines, but in our passage he has in mind the blessed state which the *mystae* expected in the after-life.

the element *παρ' ἐπόνοιαν*, which is well-known in Greek authors (33). In these matters the audience is normally inclined to side with the weaker party, which this time (the slave) proves to be the stronger.

Perhaps the relation master-servant has been treated in the *Ranae* for the first time in world literature. This topic was especially popular in the nineteenth century, when servants were as yet mostly inclined to respect their masters (34). Xanthias, too, is a true *Passe-partout*. However, in the 5th century the distance between master and servant was still too great and so their relation could not be portrayed as a friendly and sympathetic one, as it was depicted in the novels of the nineteenth century. In the *Ranae* the two persons form rather a contrast. In the plays of Arist. which have been preserved to us, a relation between master and servant, as it has been represented in the *Ranae*, cannot be found. One might think of the *Plutus*, where, however, the relation is a different one. The poor master Chremylos can only afford one slave, Karion. It is a well-known fact that he who daily converses with one other person only, is inclined, provided he is no ogre, to build up a more closer relation. In the *Plutus*, too, Arist. has drawn the picture of Karion from real life, for the slave cares in fact for the household of his master. In the other plays, however, Arist. has at most pictured a relation between servants (see e.g. the beginning of the *Equites*), but not, as in the *Ranae*, between master and servant.

Another element which is of interest in the *Ranae*, is a kind of affinity which can be traced with the *Nubes* (35). In the *Ranae* Arist. merits have been acknowledged by the public, for the play was even

---

(33) One may compare the *Antigone* of Sophocles, in which play a woman who is ordinarily represented as being weak and inferior to man, and this time even a young unmarried woman, appears to possess a strong and manly spirit, to whom the men of the play are no match. I also point to G. Petrone, *La battuta a sorpresa negli oratori Latini*, Palermo 1971.

(34) I mention the *Pickwick Papers* of Dickens (*Pickwick-Sam Weller*) and some of the books of Jules Verne, e.g. *Cinq semaines en ballon*.

(35) On the *Nubes* as being compared with the *Ranae* see Th. Gelzer, *Mus. Helv.* 13, 1956, 65-93; Dover, *Clouds*, p. 209f.; Denniston, *Class. Quart.* 1927, 119 says «The vocabulary of the *Frogs* often coincides with that of the *Clouds*».

given a second performance (36), whereas earlier Arist. did not succeed with the *Nubes*, which nevertheless is, in my opinion, one of his best works (see also n. 3) above. As to the connection which I try to state between the two plays, we can see first of all that in the *Nubes* as well as in the *Ranae* a contest takes place. Both plays mirror a contrast between the old ways of life, to which the poet adheres, and the new-fashioned manners which prevailed in his own days. However, in the *Nubes* the contest takes place between two unsubstantial and somewhat vague entities: the two *Logoi*, whereas in the *Ranae* it concerns two tragic poets who were very well-known to the public. Accordingly, they give it a much more lively character. Another item can be also found in the credit-balance of the *Ranae*. In the other plays from the *Acharnians* onwards Arist. mostly represented the facts from a negative point of view, in so far as he sharply criticized or ridiculed the modern way of life. In the *Ranae*, however, he focusses our attention on the worthy aspect in which the old culture appears to us when being represented in a poet like Aeschylus. This time the old Athenian society is depicted as a culture which developed in that poet its full vigour (37).

Another factor can be pointed out in this connection. Neither the *Nubes* nor the *Ranae* properly has a hero, i.e. a person who constantly dominates the action (38). I admit that in the *Ranae* Aeschylus has a kind of apotheosis at the end of the play (*Ran.* 1500-3 and 1524-33), but this part is very short and, moreover, Aeschylus himself comes only to the fore in the second half of the play. In this connection I further observe that Arist. did not easily recover from the failure of the *Nubes* with the public, though the rebuff of that work can be explained.

---

(36) See Argument. *Ran.* 273b 2-4 Duebner *ὄντω δὲ ἐθαιμάσθη τὸ δρᾶμα διὰ τὴν παράβασις κτε.* See also Koster, *Prolegomena de Comoedia*, Pars I, Fasc. I A (Groningen 1975), *Vita Aristoph.* XXVIII, p. 135, 40-3, where the parabasis is also mentioned (*Ran.* 686f.). See also Dorrie, *Hermes* 1956, 306, n. 6 *ἀνεδιδάχθη*; Taillardat, Nr. 390, n. 4; Fraenkel, *Beobacht.* 131.

(37) One may compare e.g. *Ach.* 676-718, where the warriors of Marathon are pictured as old decrepit men, whereas in the *Ranae* the representatives of the old culture like Aeschylus are portrayed as high-spirited warriors riding on their horses with fierce crests and in proud harnesses, see e.g. *Ran.* 819-24.

(38) P. Segal, *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.* 65, 1961, 207-42 points to the fact that in the *Ranae* Dionysos is constantly on the scene. However, he attributes too much significance to this fact, for the god is in no way the hero of the play.

A year before the poet had gained an overwhelming victory with his *Equites* and so one can understand that a year afterwards he employed in the *Nubes* the same technique by means of which he had been so successful. Though in the *Equites* the hero is the sausage-seller, the most prominent part is played in the play by the anti-hero, Kleon. In the *Nubes* Socrates is the most prominent character, but just like Kleon, he is the anti-hero, and he has no counter-part, because *Strepsiades* cannot be considered the hero of the play (39).

This time the poet made a mistake, for Kleon was one of the principal Athenian statesmen, whose name was in those days on everybody's lips. Thus the fact that Arist. dared to attack this person, made a great impression and contributed to the victory of the play. On the other hand, Socrates was at that time far less important than Kleon (40) and so the interest of the public was less and this was why the play was unsuccessful (41). Now in the *Ranae* the poet repeated important motifs which had occurred in the *Nubes*, but he made them more acceptable, as we have tried to show.

In order to corroborate the point that motifs of earlier plays were sometimes repeated, I refer to the *Pax* and the *Aves*, which plays can also be connected with one another. In both an important part is devoted to an inauguration, etc. In the *Pax* the inaugural sacrifice is interrupted by one person (*Hierokles*) only, whereas in the *Aves* the motif has been amplified, since several persons interfere. In both plays the hero makes a voyage to the upper regions at the beginning

---

(39) In this way the unusual ending of the *Nubes* can be explained, too. The *Equites* could end with an apotheosis of *Demos* and of the sausage-seller, but in the *Nubes* the only anti-hero, Socrates, was available and he has a kind of anti-apotheosis, for he is punished at the end. This scene (rightly) did not call forth the applause of the audience. One may think of Dickens' novel *Nicholas Nickleby*, where the theme was successful, i.e. when at the end of the novel the Institute of *Dotheboy* is closed. However, in that novel the point was connected with the social problem and with the maltreatment of young pupils. The ancient author did not have such elements at his disposal so as to rouse the indignation of the public.

(40) It is curious to state that later the tables are turned; for to us the importance of Kleon which was ephemeral, has dwindled.

(41) Aristophanes was very soon aware of this fact, for in the following year he abandoned this method with the *Vespae*. The two principal characters, *Philo-kleon* and *Bdelykleon*, reminded as yet the audience of the successful performance of the *Equites*, but no anti-hero appeared in this play.

of the play. In the Pax the scene is only a parody of Euripides' *Bellerophon*, whereas in the Aves the motif has been given a different basis. There hero does not go to the heavens (which is already somewhat obsolete), but directs his voyage to the region between heaven and earth, where the birds live, a motif which is both ingenious and unexpected. In the Pax, as well as in the Aves, the play ends with a representation of a wedding between the hero and a goddess. I think that, as these instances show, Arist. did not lose sight of motifs or ways of composition presented in an earlier play, even if those plays like the *Nubes* and the *Pax* had not been successful. He retained these motifs in his memory, enforced them, and used them more successfully in another play.

Another factor which contributed to the overwhelming success of the play is the patriotic issue which forms the main theme of the parabasis (Ran. 676-737) (42), having been already put forward in the parodos. However, the parabasis forms one coherent unit in this respect, for its two larger parts (11.686-705 and 718-737) present admonitions about the political situation at Athens; also the two Athenians who are ridiculed in 11.674-85 and 706-716, are derided, because the poet wishes to contrast two bad politicians with the Athenians whom he recommends to the public in the general part. The importance of the patriotic admonitions is stressed the more, because they are delivered by one of the most respectable parts of the citizenry, the *mystae*. Their reputation and authority had already been enhanced in the parodos by means of the circumstantial way in which their procession had been described. The Eleusinian mysteries fulfilled, as we know, a most important function at Athens (43). In the under-

---

(42) On this point see also Wilamowitz, *Platon I* (Berlin 1920), 119f.; I also mention W. Kassies, *Aristophanes' traditionalisme* (Amsterdam 1963), 115f. He rightly underlines the fact that, unlike most other passages of Arist. which are only playful, the parabasis of the *Ranae* has a definite political significance. See also Radermacher 238.

(43) A typical instance of the importance of these mysteries at Athens is for instance presented by *Nub.* 302-4. When the Clouds enter the stage (*Nub.* 298-314) they deliver a choral song in which Athens is praised and in which the cults of the gods which are religiously observed there, have been mentioned. Now in this song the Eleusinian Mysteries have pride of place (ll. 302-4), for in the Mysteries the gods were thought to be present (*τελεται ἄγναι* and *σέβας ἀρρήτων ἱερῶν*), whereas in the other part only donations and sacrifices to the gods are mentioned. See also Dover, *Clouds* 141, on *Nub.* 302-4.

-world the poet places their abode in the immediate neighbourhood of Pluto's palace and so they occupy, so to speak, the best place. It can further be seen that the comic poet who derides nearly everybody and who even repeatedly pokes fun at Dionysos, never makes the slightest ridiculous allusion to the *mystae* and treats them always with the greatest respect.

In connection with the patriotic theme it is of interest to compare the *Lysistrata*, which was also produced at a time, when, after the great losses of the Sicilian expedition, the situation at Athens was a critical one. In this play, too, the poet gives advice about the political situation by means of the chorus. Thus in *Lys.* 648 the chorus of old women says that they must give a good advice to the city. This time, however, the chorus, which acts as the mouth-piece of the poet, had to legitimise themselves, so to speak, for it consists of women who had in those days a subordinate function only (44). Therefore, they report that as women they fulfilled important sacrificial (and, accordingly, official) functions (45), on account of which they are entitled (as they pretend) to act at the moment as authoritative citizens. Therefore, Arist. stresses the fact (*Lys.* 649-656) that the women as well as the men (or even more than the men) have contributed to the welfare of the city. However, although in the *Lysistrata* as in the *Ranae* the chorus raises the same point, the patriotic theme, a marked difference exists. Arist. when introducing the issue for the first time in the *Lysistrata*, put the accent on the *ἀπροσδόκητον* and tried to interest the audience in this way, scil. the city must be guided by the counsels of women and not of men. In the *Ranae*, on the other hand, the chorus has no need to plead for its rights and so it can lay at once complete stress on the political situation at Athens. It can speak with authority, because it is a holy chorus and therefore it begins its admonitions with the words (*Ran.* 686) *τὸν ἱερὸν χορὸν δίκαιόν ἐστι χρῆστὰ τῇ πόλει ξυμπαραινεῖν*.

The word *ἱερός* is one of the key-words used in this play about the chorus. Thus in 1.335 the dance of the *mystae* is called *ἀγνήν*,

---

(44) The chorus of old men therefore says: *δεινὰ γάρ τοι τάσδε γ' ἤδη τοῦς πολίτας νοουθετεῖν* (*Lys.* 626).

(45) Wilamowitz, *Lys.* 162, on *Lys.* 638 rightly says «Da die Arrhephoren nur zwei waren, kamen nur ganz wenige, sicherlich vornehme Kinder, zu der Ehre». However, because of the situation pictured above Arist. makes us surmise that all these women had fulfilled this function.

*ἱερὸν ὁσίοις μύσταις χορεύειαν*. No less than three words stress the special character of the dance, for it is called *ἀγνός* (46), because the mystae are ritually chaste; the mystae are called *ὄσιοι*, because their relation to the gods must be irreproachable (47); the dance is called *ἱερός*, because the mystae are in the service of the important goddesses Demeter and Kore (48). Therefore, too, the dance, though it is (Ran. 332-4) *ἀκόλαστος* and *φιλοπαύμων*, is called a *τιμή*, a dignity, honourable function (see also 1.350 *ἱεράς ὑπὸ τιμῆς*). Likewise the torch of the koryphaios is called *ἱερός* (1.446) and at the end of the parodos the mystae go (l. 441 f.) *ἱερὸν ἀνὰ κύκλον θεᾶς* and when entering the sacred meadows, they say *μόνοις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἥλιος καὶ φέγγος ἱερὸν ἔστιν*. Though most MSS write *ἰλαρόν*, RV present *ἱερόν*, which is confirmed by a Rhodian inscription and is rightly accepted at present by a few scholars (49). The mystae are the only persons who in the dark realm of Hades enjoy holy light (50).

If we compare the Lysistrata again, we see that the patriotic theme is much more impressive in the Ranae, for in the Lysistrata the motif was connected with the sexual theme, the main topic of that play, and thus it remained more playful. In the same way in the Lysistrata the military theme is still made an object of derision (cf. Lys. 555-564), just as Arist. had been accustomed to present this theme in other comedies (Acharnians, Pax). The situation was at that time grave but not critical (51). In the Ranae, however, the war had entered its last and decisive stage and so in this play warlike qualities are admired and recommended. Thus Lamachos who is derided in the Acharnians, is called here *Λάμαχος ἥρωος* (Ran. 1039).

(46) Kaibel — see Wilamowitz, *Isyllos von Epidauros* 137 — did not acknowledge this fact and wrongly presented the conjecture *ἀγνόν*.

(47) See also Ran. 327 *ὄσιον ἐς θιασώτας*; as to the word *ὄσιος* see e.g. Valk, *Mnemos.* 1942, 113-40. I observe that a competent scholar like J. A. Haldane, *Class. Quart.* 58, 1964, 207-9 wrongly thinks that Arist. wished to poke fun at the mystery religions.

(48) Radermacher 239 and Stanford 131, on l. 686 think that the chorus is called *ἱερός*, because it acts at the feast of Dionysos, a point which is true. However, in this play the chorus is representing the servants of the Eleusinian goddesses.

(49) See Erbse, *Gnomon* 1956, 272; Stanford 113; REG 1946, 335f.

(50) Homer speaks of *ἱερόν ἡμαρ* (© 77), but he is accustomed to use the epithet of different things; in Arist., however, it stresses the holiness of the mystae.

(51) Wilamowitz, *Lysistr.* 156, on Lys. 558 rightly says about these military matters: «Noch war das neu».



The two general parts of the parabasis (11.686-705 and 718-737) must (see also above) be closely connected. At the beginning of the first part the chorus says that (1.686) it will give an advice that is *χρηστός*, while at the end of the second part it presents the advice *χρησθαι τοῖς χρηστοῖς*. So we have a kind of Ring-composition, a method by means of which one stresses the better the point which one wants to bring home (52). At the beginning the chorus says that it wishes *ξυμπαραινεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν*. The poet and his mouth-piece, the chorus, are considered to be *σοφοί* and to have the *διδασκαλία* of the citizens as their important task. I refer to *Ran.* 1009f., where Arist. says with respect to the two tragic poets that a poet is praised because of his *δεξιότης* (cf. *σοφός*) (53) and his *νουθεσία*, while the latter point is stressed by the addition *ὅτι βελτίους τε ποιῶμεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν*.

The first part, as can be easily seen (see e.g. Stanford 131, on 11.686ff.), is a speech for the defence, in which the advice is given to accept again the citizens who have been made *ἄτιμοι* because of political mistakes. Its character (as a defence-speech) appears especially in the peroration (11.700-5), where the so-called judges are addressed in a very flattering manner: *ὦ σοφώτατοι φύσει*. The address reminds us of the practice of the law-courts, which can be especially traced in Cicero's speeches, for the latter is accustomed to praise the judges and juries as much as possible and to extol their intelligence and integrity. At the end of this part (11.703-5) Arist. again makes an eloquent appeal to the intelligence of the judges and warns them in this respect that if they are not lenient and if they make a false decision, afterwards *εἰδ' φρονεῖν οὐ δόξομεν*, a statement which has been made as palatable as possible, for it is only a negative statement and, moreover, the poet makes on purpose use of the first person of the plural and so includes himself among those who are apt to make a mistake (54).

(52) In the second part of the first parabasis of the *Pax* we read at the beginning (l. 774a) *Μοῦσα* and at the end (l. 816) *Μοῦσα*.

(53) On *δεξιότης* as being connected with a poet, see *Ar., Ach.* 629; *Vesp.* 1265. The *δεξιότης* is one of the typical characteristics of the good poet, see e.g. *Valk, Eust. Comment. II, p. XXVIII, n. 5*. *Schol. Ran.* 1370 offers among other interpretations the explanation *μηχανικοί* i.e. «resourceful, inventive». The word *σοφός*, however, lays special stress on the insight and superior wisdom of the poet. The fine arts are called in *Ran.* 762 *μεγάλαι καὶ δεξιαί*.

(54) A similar method can be found already in Homer; see *Z 70, H 353, E 364* and *369; O 295-7* and *738-40*. See also *Plut., Mor.* 71f-72a who called attention to this point.

The second general part which is longer (11.718-737) forms what the Germans call a *Mahnrede* (55). In such a «*Mahnrede*» the speaker considers himself to be a kind of prophet who offers a serious and wholesome advice and who, because of it, is not constrained (like an advocate in a speech for the defence) to spare or to flatter his audience. On the contrary, since he wishes to be helpful, he points out the faults and abuses committed by his citizens so that they may beware of them or stop them. This point is best illustrated by the tracts of the Israelite prophets and by the elegies of Solon, where the public has not been spared either. Whereas, accordingly, in the first part the chorus addressed its hearers as being *σοφώτατοι φύσει*, it addresses them this time as *ἄνόητοι* (1.734). I refer to the Homeric admonitions in which the speaker says *αἰδῶς Ἀργεῖοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, εἶδος ἀγητοί* (E787, Θ228).

The following fact is also interesting and shows the connection between the two general parts. The speech for the defence which is positive, concludes with a warning and a statement that is negative (*εὖ φρονεῖν οὐ δόξομεν*), whereas the *Mahnrede* that contains a severe warning, ends with a positive statement: *ἐξ ἀξίλου γούν τοῦ ξύλου..... πᾶσχειν τοῖς σοφοῖς δοκῆσετε*. I also point to the fact that in both statements *δοκεῖν* has been used, for it shows the cautious attitude of the poet with regard to the public. In 1.705 he does not say that the Athenians will make a severe mistake when rejecting his advice, but he only suggests that their conduct will make the impression of not being wise. The same comic poets who permitted themselves great liberties with respect to all kinds of persons, were wary of touching political truths that might be displeasing to the audience and couched them in unoffensive terms. Moreover, since Arist. had used *δοκεῖν* in l. 706, he could repeat the idea in l. 737 and so he could present a somewhat positive statement. The occurrences of the war have made the poet aware that the Athenians must also in the future count on the possibility of setbacks. Nevertheless, as he says, the *σοφοί* will approve the poet's advice (56). Stanford (p. 136, on ll. 735-7) had pointed to the fact that in l. 736f. the same point has been mentioned twice

---

(55) Radermacher 238 who has rightly called attention to the rhetorical character of the general part, misjudges this point, for he considers the two parts to form a unit and says *παραίνεσις περὶ τῆς πολιτικῆς κατασκευῆς*.

(56) On this point see also Vesp. 1049 *ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς οὐδὲν χεῖρων παρὰ τοῖς σοφοῖς γενόμεσται*.

(*κἄν τι σφάλητε* and *ἦν τι καὶ πάσχητε*) which makes, as it seems, an inelegant impression. It can, however, be explained, for the poet is again cautious. In l. 736 he had made use of *σφάλλῃσθαι* and though he had diminished the impact of the saying by means of the addition of *τι* («a little») the word was inauspicious. Therefore, he again takes up the idea and purposely uses *πάσχεσθαι* which is less offensive and, moreover, he adds the word *καί* (57). As to l. 736f., the end of the admonitions and of the whole choral song, I again call attention to this point: even if the ancients offered admonitions that were gloomy, they nevertheless liked to end their speeches with words that presented a favourable prospect. In connection with this I may adduce Aesch., Agam. 121. The chorus considers the future fate of Agamemnon's house to be ominous and therefore, it utters a cry of sorrow *ἄλινον ἄλινον εἶπέ*, but it at once adds to it the favourable words *τὸ δ' εἶ ἡκίανω* (58). The comic poet has taken account of this point in his own manner, i.e. by couching his words in the form of a joke.

Schol. Ran. 736 fortunately tells us that Arist. is alluding to a proverbial expression *ἀπὸ καλοῦ ξύλου κἄν ἀπάγξασθαι*. The notice is perhaps due to Didymus, who, as is well-known, had written on proverbs, and it has hit the mark, as the Commentators have rightly pointed out (59), for the proverb indicates that one can hang oneself better from a good tree. The idea is plain, for a bad or weak tree is liable to break so that the unfortunate action has to be repeated. I observe that the original proverb offered *καλοῦ*, which was changed by Arist. into *ἄξιον* which was more appropriate with regard to the aristocratic and distinguished citizens (60). It is interesting to note

---

(57) The word *καί* «even» indicates that this possibility is considered to be unlikely.

(58) The Commentators do not take a sufficient account of this fact. Even the excellent Commentary of Fraenkel, Agam. II 73 only says: «*ἄλινον* forms here a strong contrast to the following *εἶ*». The fact can be illustrated from the Israelite prophets who are mostly accustomed to offer gloomy prophecies.

However, they mostly add at the end of their books passages in which a bright prospect is given of the future of Israel.

(59) v. Leeuwen 118, on Ran. 735-7 and Cantarella 135, on l. 735f. have rightly called attention to a similar proverb which exists in Latin. Willems 60, n. 2 compares very well a word of Mme de Sévigné.

(60) Perhaps the comic author who liked to offer words with ambiguous meanings or to play on the ambiguous or twofold meaning of a word, also liked to

that in the paroemiographical tradition only the subjective and incorrect version of Arist. has been transmitted (61). This shows that the influence of the literary tradition (this time the version of Arist.) was predominant in the circles where learned explanations were given. I believe, moreover, that the original proverb had disappeared in later times. One must not forget that, as experience shows, some proverbs are current only for a longer or shorter time and afterwards disappear completely.

In the first general part (ll. 686-705) the central theme concerned the advice *ἐξισῶσαι τοὺς πολίτας*. Though it was given by a comic poet only (62), it was very sensible advice, which was unfortunately only adopted, when it was too late, i.e. when the city was blockaded by the Spartans (63); it was rightly put into effect after the return of the democrats from Phyle. In the *Lysistrata* a proposal had already been brought forward (ll. 574-86) to enlarge the number of the citizens. However, this proposal was not a practical one (64). We can see again that a motif that had been used in an earlier play, has been ameliorated and made more acceptable in a later play, for it is obvious that after the revolution of 411 B.C. and afterwards the number of citizens who had been deprived of civil rights had swollen and that the situation was deplorable (65). The passage pretends to be advice (l. 686f.), but, as we observed already (see also Radermacher 241-4; Stanford 131f.), it is in reality speech for the defence, i.e. a veiled plea on behalf of the *ἄτιμοι* and of other citizens who were afraid of suffering political

---

allude to the meaning of *ἄξιος* «cheap». One must not forget that the greater part of the audience consisted of ordinary and plebeian citizens.

(61) See Corp. Paroem. Graec., Append. II 67. On the other hand, Sud. *a* 3334 (see also *a* 2815) offers *ἀπὸ καλοῦ ξύλου*. The latter, however, frequently used the Scholia of Arist. and so the original version was known to him. On the relation between Sud. and the Scholia of Arist. see also Holwerda, *Scholia vetera in Nubes* (Groningen 1977), p. XXVII-XXVIII.

(62) I call attention to an interesting view of the ancients, cf. Plut., *Mor.* 68b (*De adul. et am.* § 27). Plutarch observes that the comic authors also present *πολλὰ ἀδστηρὰ καὶ πολιτικά*. However, he (wrongly) considers these admonitions to be worthless, because they occur in comedies.

(63) The proposal was mooted by Patrokleides; on it see Andoc., *De myst.* 73; Dörrie, *Hermes* 1956, 307, n. 2. On the situation see also Radermacher 242 and Plut., *Mor.* 814b, where the *ἀμνηστία* after Phyle is praised especially.

(64) See Wilamowitz' *Lysistrata* 51f., who has rightly pointed to this fact.

(65) See e.g. *Cambridge Ancient History* V 352.

reprisals. The two items which have been treated separately (l. 687 *πρωτόν*; l. 692 *εἶτα*) properly concern one and the same issue, an *ἀμνηστία*, and so *ἐξιῶσαι* which appears in the first part (l. 688) applies to the whole passage. The poet is very skilful in handling a speech for the defence, for he mentions first of all (ll. 689-691) the weakest case and excuses the shortcomings of those citizens by putting all the blame on Phrynichos.

In connection with this Arist. aptly makes use of the image of wrestling, a sport which was very popular and was especially appropriate here, because in it tricks were often used (66). Moreover, the poet only uses here the words *σφάλλειν τι* and *δλισθαίνω* «to slip», whereas in reality it was the aim of the wrestler to throw down his opponent, in which respect the words *καταβάλλω* and *πτῶμα* are usual (67). Those words have been purposely avoided by Arist., for the persons in question have only made a slight mistake, they have stumbled. Perhaps *λύσαι* (l. 691) also alludes to this image, for the wrestler tries to loosen the grip of his opponent and so to free himself (68). The ingenious explanation by Newiger (Gnomon 1960, 54) of the words *αἰτίαν ἐκθεῖσιν* is also interesting. Seemingly the persons must expound (*ἐκπιθέναι*) the point of accusation; in reality they may expose it (as newborn children), i.e. put it off. Thus the passage contains an admission of guilt which has, however, been extenuated as much as possible; conduct which one can expect in the law-courts. Moreover, the poet is deliberately vague in ll. 689-91, for unlike the *ἄτιμοι* of ll. 692ff. these persons have been never condemned in the law-courts and so it would be dangerous to be specific.

I mention also Schol. Ran. 688 on *Φρυνίχον παλαίσμασιν*, because it is of interest for the type of explanation which can sometimes be found in the ancients. The scholiast thinks that Arist. alludes to the poet Phrynichos, who in his *Antaios πολλὰ περὶ παλαισμάτων διεξήλθε*.

(66) See Stanford 131, on l. 689; LSJ, s.v. *πάλασμα* 3 «trick in wrestling»; Taillardat, Nr. 401. This line, as it seems, offers the oldest instance to us of the meaning «trick».

(67) See e.g. Aesch., Prom. 919f. and Groeneboom, Prometheus (Groningen 1928) p. 259, on ll. 916-919, where other instances are given.

(68) Of course the word has here literally the meaning of «dissolve, undo» (cf. Willems, Arist. «abolir»); see also Soph., Phil. 1224 *λύσαν ὅσ' ἐξήμαρτον*. Radermacher 242f. wrongly thinks that the word has been used here in a magical sense.

Here, too, (see also above) we can see how the ancient critics often first of all searched for facts in literature, whereas they neglected the obvious reference to the politician Phrynichos (69).

In the second part (ll. 692-9) Arist., as Radermacher has already pointed out, makes use of the arguments of the *αἰσχρόν* and the *εἰκός*. The poet has arranged the arguments skilfully, for the weightiest one, the *αἰσχρόν* has this time been rightly put in the first place (70). Moreover, the poet diminishes the merits of the persons who had been favoured by the assembly (*ναυμαχῆσαντας*) *μίαν* and exaggerates their rewards *πάντι δούλων δεσπότας*, whereas he stresses at the contrary that the *ἄτιμοι* had met likewise with one *συμφορά* only (cf. ll. 693 and 699 *μίαν*). Whereas the first argument (*αἰσχρόν*) is negative, the last one (*εἰκός*) is positive, for the poet wishes to conclude in a defence his words with a positive argument, i.e. urgent advice.

For the text I refer to Schol. Ran. 694 (295b 37f. Duebner) which really refers to Ran. 692, where the words *μηδέν' εἶναι* are to be found (71). In the Homeric Scholia, too, erroneous displacements sometimes take place (72). In l. 697 *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις* the word *τούτοις* must be connected of course with the part which follows, as the Commentators have rightly

---

(69) Tzetzes, Koster 880, 8-10 has an additional piece of information, for he speaks about *Ἄνταϊον τοῦ Λίβυος καὶ Ἡρακλέος παλαίσματα*. However, he is not indebted to «Scholia uberiora», as Koster, l.1. thinks, but is rather offering the notice on his own account, for he could easily learn from a mythological compendium that Antaios was a Libyan who was vanquished by Herakles. Similar facts are stated in Eustathius, see Valk, Eust. Comment. II, p. LXXVI. Tzetzes explains *Φρυνίχου παλαίσμασιν* by *περιπετείαις τύχης*. The interpretation is of his own making, for a person who wrestles is thrown down and throws down in his turn, see especially the Iliad Ψ 723-734. In the same way *τύχη* now overthrows one party now the other. The interpretation *ισότιμος* (Koster 880,1) is no better than the interpretation of Schol. Ran. 688 *ἐντιμος*, see LSJ, s.v. *ἐντιμος* 1, who rightly say that the word presents a contrast with *ἄτιμος*. So it indicates a person who is in possession of his rights as a citizen.

(70) Radermacher 243 observes that in his criticism of the Athenians Arist. rightly makes a restriction in l. 695f. We meet with the same cautious attitude with regard to political matters as in l. 705f. and l. 736f., see above.

(71) Kallistratos wishes to split *μηδέν'* into *μή* and *δεν* which he explains as a dialectical form of *δεῖν*. We do not receive here a high idea of Aristarchus' contemporary, who, besides, does not take account of the fact that the idea of *δεῖν* is already expressed by the verb *χρῆναι*.

(72) See Valk, Researches I 189-91.

stated. However, the words *πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις* constitute a well-known expression and so I think that in the original play which was performed orally, the actor paused after *δέ* and so could indicate that *τούτοις* ought to be connected with the word that follows (73).

The final part, as we already observed, has the character of a peroration (ll. 700-705) and, as one can expect, it contains the two important points which often occur in a peroration, an urgent appeal to the Athenians to accept the advice (ll. 700-2) and a severe warning (ll. 703-5), if they do not give credit to it. Arist. had, I think, witnessed eloquent perorations delivered in law-suits. In the tragic authors, too, speeches attest the practice of the law-courts which must have been very important in those days at Athens. I refer e.g. to final lines of speeches which may be considered to be perorations: Eur., Phoen. 521-5 and I also mention Eur., Or. 602-4 and El. 1097-9. The speaker does not this time in these two passages make a direct appeal to the audience, but nevertheless he summarizes the point which he had put forward in his speech (74).

As to the last part (ll. 718-736) I take the view that the speaker has tried to drive home his point in a way which is as convincing as possible and that it forms a climax to the whole parabasis. This is the more possible, because the parabasis focusses the attention on one point only (see above): the patriotic issue. Now Arist. gradually and in a skilful manner reaches this end (the climax). First of all (ll. 674-85) one of the most influential politicians of the moment, Kleophon, is held up to ridicule. Nevertheless, the poet intimates that even this powerful man is not unassailable and that his position will be undermined very soon. Thereupon, the chorus tenders their advice (ll. 686-705) to offer a general pardon (see above) and then an unpopular politician of the dominant party, Kleigenes, is derided (ll. 706-716). This time not only an impending law-suit is announced, but also the imminent downfall of the politician himself. Finally a most serious piece of advice on the whole political situation is put forward, for

---

(73) In a similar case v. Leeuwen, Pax 179f., on Pax 1204-6 says «utrumque pronomen demonstrativum spectantibus fuit intellectu facilius quam nunc est legentibus».

(74) In both speeches the speaker who defends his conduct himself attacks the faithless conduct of a wife. Therefore, in the final lines in question the point of marriage is again put forward. Both passages are often wrongly athetized.

whereas the preceding part (ll. 686-705) only concerned a section of the citizens, the final bears upon the whole city and its government.

As to the contents of this part I point especially to the image which it introduces, for an image or theme is most convincing, when it is familiar to the audience and has been taken from everyday life, and so makes a direct appeal to the audience. In this connection I mention the similes of Homer or the Parables of the New Testament. So in the image of the bad money issued by the State in the last years of the war, Arist. presented a very telling example to the audience (75), which of course preferred and would have liked back the old trustworthy money, i.e. the government of the city must be entrusted to the old caste of aristocrats and landowners (l. 727f. *εὐγενεῖς, καλοὶ καγαθοί*), who had been educated in accordance with the old and well-tried Attic manners (76). So far all is clear and the Commentators have rightly pointed to the fact that *τὰρχαῖον νόμισμα* (l. 720) refers to these aristocratic citizens and that the *πονηρὰ χαλκία* (l. 725) denote the bad plebeian demagogues who held sway over the assembly. However, a difficulty has arisen because of the words *τὸ καινὸν χρυσίον* (l. 720) which point has been complicated by a notice from the Atthidographers (cf. n. 74). The ancient critics, as one can understand and applaud, investigated the situation conscientiously. From their sources they learned that in 407/6 B.C. golden statues were melted down at Athens and that gold coins were issued. They also inform us (Schol. Ran. 725) that in 406/5 bronze coins were issued by the state and they have rightly connected this fact with the *πονηρὰ χαλκία* mentioned in l. 725. One can also understand that the ancient critics connected the issue of the gold coins with the *χρυσίον* mentioned in l. 720.

Their view has been supported by a paper of Thompson (Mnemos. 1966, 337-343), whose judgement as that of an expert in these matters seems authoritative. He thinks that the gold coins issued in 407/6 B.C. were of pure gold and are the *καινὸν χρυσίον* of l. 720, which must be contrasted with the *χαλκία* of l. 725 (77). Thus (so

---

(75) Schol. Ran. 720 has fortunately preserved two passages from Atthidographers: Hellanicus (4 FGrH 172) and Philochorus (328 FGrH 141); see also Taillardat, Nr. 682 (p. 390, n. 4); Stanford 134, on ll. 718ff.; Gnomon 1933, 583f.

(76) The advice is the same as that which was offered in Nub. 1002ff., for in politics the poet cannot but repeat himself.

(77) On the question see also Radermacher 247; Stanford 134; Taillardat 389f. However, I do not think that their explanations are right.



Thompson thinks) in l. 720 one and the same class, the aristocrats, are indicated by the words *τὰρχαίων νόμισμα* and *τὸ καινὸν χρυσίον*. However, a few points must not be lost sight of. It is likely that in l. 720 the words *ἀρχαῖος* and *καινός* form a contrast, the more so since in this passage the old aristocrats and the new and bad plebeians are opposed to one another. If this is true, the two statements in l. 720 present no parallel, but form a contrast. This might seem a subjective assertion, if it were not supported by the following argument. The gold coins, issued in 407/6 B.C. had been, as Thompson himself admits, used only in a few foreign countries to cover the expenses of the Athenian state, for the Athenians had of course to defray in hard currency costs incurred abroad. Accordingly, the gold money was hardly known to the Athenian public, for as we know only too well from present circumstances, the State's own citizens can be satisfied or rather disappointed by means of debased money. Aristophanes, however, alludes here to money that was familiar to the citizens. We further know that *χρυσίον* can denote money in general — see e.g. LSJ, s.v. *χρυσίον* I 3 (78) — I further point to the fact that the silver coins are not referred to in terms of their metal, but are only called «money» (*νόμισμα*); so in the same way the bad money is also called «money» (*χρυσίον*). We can summarize the question, as follows. The Scholiasts were led astray by the information offered by the Atthidographers, which they wrongly connected with l. 720. Moreover, the gold coins, as we observed, had been nearly unnoticed at Athens itself and so Arist., who called money by means of an ordinary name: *χρυσίον*, did not in the least suspect that his words could be misunderstood and connected with the gold money issued in 407/6 B.C.

The good money is indicated by long and accordingly impressive words *οὐδ' ἐκεκλιβηλευμένοις* (l. 721) and *ἐκεκωδωνισμένοις* (l. 723), while also the virtues of the good citizens are described at length (l. 727f.). The bad citizens are also characterised at length and in a most contemptible way (79). It is also interesting to note that Arist. pleads

(78) One might also think that part of the gold had been left over and had been alloyed with the bronze coins issued in 406/5 B.C., but the other interpretation offered above, is, I think, preferable.

(79) On *εἰκῆ ἑραδίως* (Ran. 733) see de Vries, *Mnemos.* 1960, 171; see especially *ibid.* on *ἑραδίως*; the word *εἰκῆ* has the meaning «without having scrutinized them; at random». The words contain a gross exaggeration, a fact which can be expected

here for a government which must be entrusted to the aristocrats. *Experientia docet usum* and when the advice was put to the test in the near future the government degenerated into the terror of the thirty tyrants (80).

The parabasis begins with a passage in which Kleophon, one of the two Athenian politicians mentioned above, is derided. I point to Eq. 1267-89, where a few Athenians are ridiculed so as to contrast them with the aristocrats mentioned in Eq. 1263-6, who in the poet's eyes constitute the best part of the citizens over against those most contemptible Athenians. Whereas in the Equites, however, the second part of the parabasis (Eq. 1290-1315) is also devoted to making fun of Athenians, in the *Ranae* the greater part of the parabasis is occupied by comment on the political situation, for in the earlier play the situation of Athens was not as critical, as was the plight of the city in 405 B.C. and the poet could be less serious.

Arist. again shows his special wit in linking the audience and the Muse with the bad politician. He succeeds in doing so by means of the idea «clever», for he says that the σοφίαι of the public are φιλοτιμότεραι Κλεοφώντος. The word φιλότιμος is used here as a vox media. As far as the public is concerned, it has a favourable meaning, for the public is φιλότιμος (ambitious), because it strives after great and good things, a characteristic on which the Athenians prided themselves (81). Kleophon is ambitious, too, a bad property, which is, however, typical of a politician (82). The passage while offering an

---

in comedy. On l. 731 the words *πονηροῖς καὶ πονηρῶν* see de Vries, *Commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato*, p. 126f., on Phaedr. 246a 8.

(80) A similar phenomenon appeared at the end of the eighteenth century, for the philosophers and idealists who preached the gospel of equality were not aware of it that these theories would lead up to the guillotine and to the reign of terror. Nevertheless, the results of the French Revolution were afterwards in the main beneficent, whereas the reign of the 30 tyrants only remains a gloomy episode in the history of Athens.

(81) I refer to the celebrated speech of Pericles, cf. Thuc. 2,40,1 *φιλοκαλοῦμεν γὰρ μετ' εὐτελείας* and to Thuc. 2,44,4 *τὸ γὰρ φιλότιμον ἀγῆρων μόνον* — on it see also Plut., *Mor.* 783c.

(82) See e.g. also Ar., *Thesm.* 383, where the woman who has risen first in the assembly so as to deliver a speech against Euripides, says that she has risen from her seat *φιλοτιμία μὲν οὐδεμιᾶ*. So the professional politicians were suspected to be *φιλότιμοι*.

apparent correspondence, further contains an *ἀπροσδόκητον*, for the public is praised because of their *σοφία* (intelligence), whereas the *σοφία* of Kleophon only consists in the power of his so-called song, which in reality is the object of derision. Seemingly the praise of it is great and justified, for it contains even two tones (*ἀμφίλαλος*) and is likened to that of the greatest singing-bird, the nightingale. First of all, Arist., I think, when saying that a swallow is sitting on the lips of Kleophon (ll. 679-81), alludes to the famous description of Perikles by Eupolis (fgm. 94,5 Kock), who said that the goddess Peitho was seated on his lips. The praise of Kleophon is seemingly greater, for the bird on his lips is *ἀμφίλαλος* and *ἀμφίγλωσσος* which is an advantageous property for an orator, as appears from the later Rhetoricians (83). However, the bird is a swallow which the Greeks unlike us held in contempt because of its chattering (84). In reality the swallow only twitters, but the words *δεινὸν ἐπιβρέμεται* have been used, because the democratic orator of the new style will have thundered from the pulpit like his model and predecessor Kleon (85). Thereupon, a new blow is administered: *κελαδεῖ δ' ἐπὶ κλαντὸν* (86) *ἀηδόμιον νόμον κτε*. It is obvious, as the critics have rightly stated, that the bird is mentioned, because it indicates grief and sorrow (87). When a person is mourning, the ancients liked to represent him as giving vent to his feelings in loud tones. Thus *κελαδεῖ* which occurs in some of the MSS and which completely suits this situation, represents the correct text (88). Kleophon is again seemingly praised, because the tones of

(83) See e.g. Valk, *Eust. Commentarii* II, p. XXIX. The word *λάλος* «prattling» is of course derogatory.

(84) See Taillardat, Nr. 522; Fraenkel, *Agam.* II 477, on Ag. 1050f.; Willems 56, n. 2; Stanford 80, on l. 93.

(85) See Vesp. 1034 and Pax 757, where Kleon's voice is compared to the roaring sound of a cataract. As for *ἐπιβρέμω* cf. LSJ, s.v.; the word is for instance used of the roaring of the wind.

(86) The Editors mostly write *ἐπὶ κλαντον* and of course the exact reading which the poet offered, cannot be ascertained this time. However, the adjective *κλαντός* also occurs, see LSJ, s.v. I think that Aristophanes wishes to say: And, moreover, to it (i.e. to the tune of the swallow) — *δ' ἐπι* — he chirps etc.

(87) See e.g. Radermacher 241; Willems, p. 57, n. 2. Taillardat, Nr. 522 is wrong this time.

(88) It has been rightly accepted by Erbse, *Gnomon* 28, 1956, 276, and by Stanford 130. The reading of RS *κελαροῦζει* is a corruption of *κελαδεῖ*. The emendation *τροῦζει* has been wrongly accepted by Radermacher and Coulon.

the nightingale are variegated (see v.c. the Odyssey τ518f.), but in reality these tones prophesy his imminent doom in a law-suit (89).

In the passage on Kleigenes (Ran. 706-717) a member of the war-party is attacked again — cf. l. 715 *οὐκ εἰρηνικὸς ἔσθ'*, the only allusion to this fact, but a clear one (90). — One receives the impression that just like Kleophon he belonged to the radical wing of the democratic party. He is assailed here with a special and venomous hatred and in a manner which is even more humiliating than the passage on Kleophon. I think that he is attacked in a merciless way, because he was less influential than Kleophon and so the poet need not be afraid of vilifying him (91). Whereas the picture of Kleophon is grotesque that of Kleigenes is humiliating and so two entirely different representations of two politicians of one and the same party are represented by the inventive poet.

Arist. begins with a quotation from the poet Ion (92). We do not know in which connection the latter's words were used, but presumably of Arist. own words *ὅστις ἔτ' οἰμώξεται* present an *ἀπροσδόκητον*, when compared with Ion's passage, for this can be expected

(89) The fact itself is unknown to us; it may have been invented by Aristophanes. Kleophon was at that time an influential politician and so it seems unlikely that his adversaries would have dared to assail him in a law-suit, but one never knows. As to *ἴθαι* one cannot but think that *ψῆθαι* must be supplemented, as most Commentators and the Scholia wish to present. Radermacher's (p. 241) supplement *σοφία* is not convincing. The Athenians of those days were *φιλόδοκοι* and so the public may have instinctively supplemented to *ἴσαι* the word *ψῆφοι*, the more so since the idea of *ἴσαι ψῆφοι* was well-known at Athens. As far as I know, no other instance of *ἴσαι = ἴσαι ψῆφοι* is found.

(90) Stanford 133, on ll. 715-6 has rightly presumed that the words have a double meaning here. One must not forget that Aristophanes repeatedly likes to offer words or ideas which have a double meaning: the first one offers the apparent meaning that suits the passage; the other offers an allusion.

(91) One must not lose sight of this point, for authors, as one can understand, are often wary of treading on dangerous ground. Therefore, minor persons can be attacked with impunity. On Kleigenes see also Stanford 133, on l. 708-9, who rightly observes that Kleigenes seems to have made himself especially hateful because of law-suits against other citizens.

(92) As to the words *ὀρθὸς ἰδεῖν*, as far as I know, no other instances can be adduced in which *ὀρθός* is connected with an infinitive. The point can, however, be explained, see Kühner-Gerth-Blass II 2, p. 9, Nr. 3. Perhaps the expression is a Ionism, for Ion was a Chian. Arist. adds *καὶ τρόπον (ἀνέρος)*, because he is going to expose the hateful and derisive manners of Kleigenes.

in a quotation made by a comic author. All kinds of abuses are heaped on him, for he is ridiculed in his outward appearance as well as his trade. He is called *μικρός* which characteristic has had a contemptuous tinge in all ages (93). He is called a monkey, a beast which was considered by the Greeks as being specifically ugly, while another characteristic of the animal is put forward yet: it is meddlesome and annoying: *ὁ πίθηκος ὁ νῦν ἐνοχλῶν*. Thus the characterisation is a felicitous one, for Kleigenes is branded in his outward appearance as well as in his demeanour, viz. he was a troublesome politician (94). The word *οὔτος* (*ὁ πίθηκος οὔτος*) will have also indicated contempt (see e.g. LSJ, s.v. *οὔτος* C I 3). Perhaps he was present at the performance and was pointed at.

He is also attacked because of his profession: *ὁ ποτηρότατος βαλανεύς* and so he seems to have belonged to the class of politicians who had a flourishing trade like Kleon and Hyperbolus. Because these persons did not belong to the landed aristocracy, they were often held up to ridicule (95). He is called *ποτηρότατος βαλανεύς*, again a two-sided epithet, which characterises him as a bad politician and a bad representative of his trade. The slander was common in those days, for Kleon, too, is depicted in the *Equites* as a tanner who cheats his customers. One must not forget that it was not so easy as in modern times to make enormous profits and so traders, just as fifty years ago with us, may have been easily suspected of trying to get the better of their customers to make even a small profit. Arist. also says *ὅποσοι*

---

(93) See Stanford 133, on l. 708-9 and the paper of Moorhouse quoted by him. In the *Iliad* (E 801) the word is not used in a contemptuous manner. However, the point is stressed that Tydeus was a valiant warrior notwithstanding the fact that he was small. Since the Greeks ordinarily are not very tall, Kleigenes may have been very small and one may think of the sons of Karkinos who are called *νανοφρονεῖς* (Pax 790).

(94) On the monkey see Radermacher 298f.; Stanford 167; McDermott, *TAPA* 66, 1935, 165-176 The ape in Greek literature; Taillardat, p. 228, n. 8. See also Heraclitus, D.K. 22 B 82 and 83; Plat., *Resp.* 9, 590b and 10,620c; Plut., *Mor.* 64e. I should say that in the Athens of Aristophanes the monkey apparently fulfilled the rôle in this respect which in Homer was occupied by the dog.

(95) I remind the reader of the fact that as late at the eighteenth century LeSage in his *Gil Blas* represented the son of a rich manufacturer as being ridiculed by the noblemen of his acquaintance. I observe that about the same time Santerre, who during the French revolution was well-known as a politician, was ridiculed, because he was a brewer.

κρατοῦσι γῆς. The tradesman is derisively represented as a landowner, an aristocrat. Only his landed property consists of soap and dust: long and stately epithets (see also Stanford 133, on ll. 710-2) are deliberately used (*κωκησίτεφροι* and *ψευδολίτρον κονίας*) which suggest epic, but in reality denote petty matters (96).

Ll. 714-7 describe the fate that awaits him. Again the representation is humiliating, even though the sharp side of it has been somewhat blunted (97).

Kleophon had at least the distinction of being attacked in a law-court, but Kleigenes is afraid that he will be attacked by a highwayman, when in the evening he is going home in an inebriated state, and that he will be deprived of his clothes: *μὴ κάποδυθῆ* (98). In reality he might be rather afraid *μὴ κάπόληται* i.e. that he might be killed or, when peace is concluded, might be condemned by the partisans of the opposing party. The poet by representing him carrying a stick or cudgel, offers a genre-picture such as can be found in Acharn. 1165-73. I call also attention to the word-order, for in l. 708 the proper-name is deliberately placed at the end of the line which introduces him and so leads up to a climax (*ὁ πίθηκος - Κλειγένης*). Likewise the part which mentions his fate, begins with the words *οὐ πολὺν* (l. 707) which are supplemented at the very end (l. 713) by the words *χρόνον ἐνδιατρίψει* (99): these words, so I think, have been left vague on purpose, for they can be actually supplemented by *τῷ βίῳ*, but also by *τῆ πόλει* (v. Leeuwen) or *τῆ ἀρχῆ* (Tzetzes).

We may have also a look at the parabases of a few other plays of Arist. so as to understand the better the parabasis of the *Ranae* which has a special function in the play, as we have tried to show (100). It is a well-known fact that the later plays (*Plutus* and *Eccles.*) have no

(96) One may compare *Ran.* 249, where the long epithet *πομφολυγοπαφλάσμων* is used to describe the activity of small animals, the frogs.

(97) See e.g. *Ran.* 145-153, where the criminals who are punished in Hades are mentioned. Among these «bad» criminals the innocuous «transgression» has been mentioned of persons who transcribe lines of bad poets.

(98) The robbing of one's clothes is often substituted for or added to the robbing of one's money, see e.g. N.T., Luke 10,30 of the robbers *καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτόν*.

(99) Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen* 136f. believes that this point is typical of lyrical poetry. I believe rather that Aristophanes does not imitate here lyrical poetry but aims at an effect by means of the word-order.

(100) On the parabasis in general see Gelzer, *Agon* 203-212.

parabasis, while the *Lysistrata* has a particular parabasis (101). On the other hand, the *Equites* (ll. 498ff. and 1263ff.), the *Pax* (ll. 729ff. and 1127ff.) and the *Aves* (ll. 676ff. and 1058ff.) have two parabases each, a fact which is of interest for the *Ranae*, for although this play has one parabasis only, the *parodos* (ll. 316ff.) contains elements which are elsewhere typical of the parabasis.

As for the *Equites* the point is understandable. The poet has devoted great care to the parabasis, because the aristocratic equites had condescended to constitute the chorus and for this reason Arist. deliberately gave the chorus the opportunity to show their mettle for a second time. In the *Aves* the second parabasis can be explained, too, on account of the theme of the play which is very bold and particular. In other plays Arist. had also sometimes introduced a chorus consisting of animals, but these chorusses only aimed at presenting an amusing picture of the life of these beings, whereas in the *Aves* the chorus of the birds did play a central part, for it enabled the poet to put a link between the aerial and unsteady life of these birds (102) and the fantasies of man which he tries to give shape to and to realise in actual life. Thus in the first parabasis attention is entirely focussed on the chorus and their peculiar way of life (*Av.* 685-800) and this interesting theme has not been exhausted yet, because in the second parabasis the birds again constitute the main theme (*Av.* 1058-1117), which has been cleverly connected with the victory that the poet hopes to obtain (*Av.* 1101-7), a subject that was often mooted in the parabasis.

In the *Pax*, too, the occurrence of a second parabasis can be explained, for in it the chorus, which consists of peasants, depicts the blessings of rural life (*Pax* 1127-90) (103), which are contrasted with the inconveniences caused by the war and so the main theme of the play can be put forward, just as in the *Ranae* the patriotic theme of the parabasis constitutes a central theme. However, this peaceful situation of rural life is only a result of the peace brought about by *Trygaios* and could therefore only be treated after *Trygaios* had returned from

---

(101) On the parabasis of the *Lysistrata*, cf. Wilamowitz, *Lysistr.* 159f.; Gelzer, *Agon* 210, n. 4.

(102) In this connection the idea *κοῦφος* is important. This word is typically used for unsteadiness and so it can be connected in the ancients with lack of insight, see e.g. Pind., *Ol.* 8,61 *κοιφότερα γὰρ ἀπειράτων φρένες*; the *Iliad* T 108; *Ran.* 1396.

(103) The fact has been appreciated by Gelzer, *Aristophanes* 1546.

his mission and its results had been described (Pax 819-1127). So one can understand why a second parabasis was needed in this play (104).

The first parabasis could now be reserved for other purposes, and since in the earlier plays (Eq., Nub., Vesp.) the poet had in the parabasis often mentioned his personal matters and interests, he could in the Pax too enlarge on this theme and sing his own praise. Because of the reason we mentioned he even devoted the whole parabasis to this theme, whereas in the other plays we mentioned, only part of the parabasis had been occupied by these matters. Thus he makes the claim: *a)* To have put comic art on a better basis, because he has avoided cheap jokes that were a common element in the plays of the other comic authors. *b)* He prides himself on having attacked the most dangerous politician Kleon and to this end he repeats lines which he had already put to use in the parabasis of the *Vespae* (Pax 751-760). *c)* Because of it he expects that the public will recognise his merits and will take his sides (Pax 760-774).

The theme of self-praise is interesting here, for the poet is well aware of the difficulties caused by such conduct. Therefore, Arist. also derides himself because of his baldness. An encomium of oneself tends to be unattractive to the public and it may attract the anger and jealousy of the gods. Because of it Arist. is wise enough to connect the praise which he bestows at his art with the mention of one of his defects (105). Likewise at the beginning of the parabasis (Pax 734f.) he had said already that a poet who praises himself in the parabasis, must be beaten (106) and that if a person must be praised at all, he must be worthy of it (Pax 736-8). So he praises himself only indirectly and, moreover, he deliberately uses words derived from Simonides — Simon. Fgm. 62 Diehl *εἰ δ' ἄρα τιμῆσαι κτε.* — So he could defend himself

---

(104) On the parabasis of the Peace see also Platnauer 129f., on Pax 729-817.

(105) The fact that he may have been sensitive on this point appears from Nub. 540, where he says *οὐδ' ἔσκωψε τοὺς φαλακροὺς*. Perhaps he alludes to the play of a competitor who had derided him on account of it.

(106) In the Thesm. (ll. 785ff.) the chorus praises itself without any restriction, but here we are confronted with a special situation. In the older poets (Hesiod, Semonides) women are often severely and unjustly attacked. In the face of this criticism Aristophanes offers here to the women the opportunity of praising themselves unreservedly.



by saying that he had only been following the example of an illustrious predecessor. He also makes an allusion to the moral domain, because he did not try after his victory to seduce young men in the palaestra (Pax 762f.). Because the point is also mooted in the *Vespae* (l. 1025), Arist. is apparently alluding to another comic poet who was not so sober-minded as his colleague (107). In this way too, he recommends himself so as to make acceptable the claims for his art.

In the last part of the parabasis (Pax 774a-816) he apparently offers a passage which does not concern himself directly, for he invites the Muse to join the dance of the chorus. However, he describes here three poets who have no talents and must be repudiated by the Muse and so by means of the derisive description of these poets, he presents a contrast with the picture he had offered just now of his own art, in the same way as at the end of the second parabasis (see above) he had contrasted military life with the peaceful existence of the peasants.

We have mentioned the occurrence of a second parabasis in some plays of Arist., because, as we observed, the parodos of the *Ranae* presents elements which elsewhere occur in a parabasis. Thus e.g. the victory of the poet is mentioned in it ((*Ran.* 384-393), while I also refer to the solemn prorrhesis of the hierophantes (108). In this prorrhesis the personal element viz. the comic art of the poet occurs (*Ran.* 355-8 and 367f.) and this point has been connected this time with the patriotic theme, to which in the parodos, too, a prominent part has been attributed (*Ran.* 359-365). The latter issue similarly comes to the fore in the prayer to Kore (*Ran.* 376-382) and in the passage in which the politician Archedemos is ridiculed (*Ran.* 416-421). So by the prominence of these two themes (The victory of the poet and the patriotic element) the parodos in a way fulfils the function of a parabasis.

---

(107) The Schol. says that he has in mind Eupolis which may in fact be correct. One sees that the exploiting by successful artists of their successes for erotic purposes did not only occur in modern times.

(108) I hope to have the opportunity to discuss in another paper the passage of the hierophantes and the parodos in general.

## THE FOLLOWING ABBREVIATIONS APPEAR IN THIS PAPER

- Cantarella = R. Cantarella, *Aristofane, Le Commedie, Tome V (Ranae)*, Milano 1948  
 Coulon, Ed. = V. Coulon et H. van Daele, *Aristophane, Édition, Tome IV (Ranae)*, Paris 1964  
 Dearden = C. Dearden, *The stage of Aristophanes*, London 1976  
 Dover, *Clouds* = K.J. Dover, *Aristophanes, Clouds*, Oxford 1970  
 Duebner — *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*, Parisiis 1877  
 Fraenkel, *Beobacht.* = Ed. Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*, Roma 1962  
 Fraenkel, *Agam.* = Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, Ed. Fraenkel, Oxford 1950  
 Koster, *Tzetzes* = *Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem, Pars IV, Fasc. III (Ranae)*, ed. W.J.W. Koster, Groningen 1962  
 KGB = *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Kühner-Gerth-Blass, Hannover 1966  
 v. Leeuwen = v. Leeuwen, *Aristophanes, Ranae*, Leiden 1896 and *Nubes*, Leiden 1898  
 LSJ = *A Greek-English Lexikon*, Liddell, Scott, Jones, Oxford 1951  
 MacDowell = *Aristophanes, Wasps*, D.M. MacDowell, Oxford 1971  
 Platnauer, *Peace* = *Aristophanes, Peace*, M. Platnauer, Oxford 1970  
 Radermacher = L. Radermacher, *Aristophanes, Frösche*, besorgt von W. Kraus, Wien 1967  
 Schwyzer = E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, München 1953-59  
 Sicking = Chr. Sicking, *Aristophanes Ranae*, Leiden 1962  
 Stanford = W.B. Stanford, *The Frogs*, sec. ed., Edinburgh 1971  
 Taillardat = J. Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane*, Paris 1965.  
 Valk, *Eust. Comment.* = M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, Vol. I-III, Leiden 1971-9  
 Valk, *Researches* = M. van der Valk, *Researches on the text and scholia of the Iliad*, Leiden 1963-4  
 Wilamowitz *Lysistr.* = U von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristophanes, Lysistrate*, Berlin 1927; sec. ed. 1964  
 Willems = A. Willems, *Aristophane, Traduction, Tome III (Ranae)*, Paris 1919