SHORTER NOTES

ARISTOPHANES, *PEACE* 246*

ABSTRACT

A conjecture in Aristophanes, Peace *246.*

Keywords: Aristophanes; *Peace*; textual criticism; emendation; corruption; Greek metre; Greek comedy; tense

The earliest MSS (R, V) transmit 246 with faulty metre:[1]

ὦ Μέγαρα Μέγαρ᾽, ὡς ἐπιτρίψεσθ᾽ αὐτίκα

In place of ὦ the *recentiores* (PCH, LB, Ald) give ἰώ.[2] The resulting sequence—tribrach in the second 'foot', anapaest in the third—is uncommon, but there are several uncontestable instances (*Ach.* 47, 928, *Nub.* 663, *Av.* 108, *Eccl.* 315).[3]

Some recent editors, however, restore ἐπιτετρίψεσθ᾽[4] from the lemma of Σ^{R} 246b, objecting that: (i) in Attic, while the future middle of τρίψομαι is attested in a passive sense (Thuc. 6.18.6, 7.42.5), compounds attest only τριβήσομαι (see LSJ s.v. τρίβω);[5] (ii) the future ἐπιτρίψεσθ᾽ does not suit the perfect participle καταμεμυττωτευμένα at 247—as 'a simple future would imply, nonsensically, that Megara will undergo "crushing" *after* it has *already* been "made mincemeat of", whereas in fact the two verbs

* I am grateful to Professor James Diggle for invaluable advice.

[1] I refer to modern editions by the name of their editors: Blaydes = F.H.M. Blaydes, *Aristophanis Comoediae,* V*: Pax* (Halle, 1883); van Leeuwen = J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Pax* (Leiden, 1906); Rogers = B.B. Rogers, *The Peace of Aristophanes* (London, 1913^{2}); Coulon = V. Coulon, *Aristophane,* II: *Les Guêpes – La Paix* (Paris, 1924); Platnauer = M. Platnauer, *Aristophanes. Peace* (Oxford, 1964); Sommerstein = A.H. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes. Peace* (Warminster, 1990^{2}); Olson = S.D. Olson, *Aristophanes. Peace* (Oxford, 1998); Henderson = J. Henderson, *Aristophanes,* II: *Clouds, Wasps, Peace* (Cambridge, MA, 1998); Wilson = N.G. Wilson, *Aristophanis Fabulae*, I–II (Oxford, 2007).

[2] For the Aristophanic usage of this interjection, common in tragic laments, see J.M. Labiano Ilundain, *Estudio de las interjecciones en las comedias de Aristófanes* (Amsterdam, 2000), 231–41. The text of the *recentiores* is accepted by K. Reisig, *Coniectaneorum in Aristophanem libri duo,* I (Leipzig, 1816), 13–14; G. Hermann, *Elementa doctrinae metricae* (Leipzig, 1816), 137; R. Hanow, *Exercitationum criticarum in comicos Graecos libri tres,* I (Halle, 1830), 97–8; Coulon 109 (see also V. Coulon, 'Observations critiques et exégétiques sur l'*argument* II des "Oiseaux" et sur le texte d'Aristophane', *REG* 38 [1925], 73–98, at 82); Platnauer 16; N. Dunbar, *Aristophanes. Birds* (Oxford, 1995), 168.

[3] See A.H. Sommerstein, 'Notes on the text of Aristophanes' *Peace*', *CQ* 36 (1986), 353–62, at 354, who argues that in all of them the sequence of tribrach + anapaest would be 'cushioned by a pause' after the tribrach. These verses exhibit word-end after the first metron. The presence of a syntactic pause is accessory, not mandatory (see M.L. West, *Greek Metre* [Oxford, 1982], 89: 'usually', not always).

[4] Already [P. Elmsley], rev. of R. Porson, *Euripidis Hecuba* (London, 1808^{3}), *Edinburgh Review* 19, no. 37 (1811), 64–95, at 68 n. *.

[5] In Luc. *Icar.* 33 ἐπιτρίψονται αὐτῇ διαλεκτικῇ is unanimously attested, while ἐπιτετρίψονται is offered by Σ in *recentiores* (N, φ*A*, Urb. 121). Editors print ἐπιτρίψονται in a passive sense: M.D. Macleod, *Luciani Opera*, I (Oxford, 1972), 309; J. Bompaire, *Lucien. Œuvres*, III (Paris, 2003), 250.

© The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838826101803 Published online by Cambridge University Press

refer to the same operation'.[6] Metre forbids ἐπιτετρίψεσθ' with ἰώ, but allows it with ὦ.[7] Yet ἰώ, not ὦ, is the appropriate word. The speaker (Polemos) delivers a sequence of four interjections, the first, second and fourth introduced by ἰώ (236, 242, 250); to introduce the third with ὦ would interrupt this pattern.[8] Moreover, the future perfect (-)τετρίψομαι does not appear to be attested with certainty in Classical Greek. Μέγαρα Μέγαρ' has been judged dittographic; Elmsley (n. 4) proposed ἰὼ Μεγαρῆς, ὡς ἐπιτετρίψεσθ' αὐτίκα with ἀπαξάπαντες καταμεμυττωτευμένοι at 247,[9] Sommerstein (n. 3), 358 ἰὼ Μέγαρ', ὡς <ξυν>επιτετρίψεσθ' αὐτίκα,[10] adopted by Henderson 456.

I suggest a different approach, replacing the future or future perfect with a perfect:

ἰὼ Μέγαρα Μέγαρ', ὡς ἐπιτέτριψ'[11] αὐτίκα

'Now you are done for'. For this idiomatic perfect (KG 1.150) in combination with αὐτίκα compare 366–7 EP. ἀπόλωλας, ἐξόλωλας. TP. εἰς τίν' ἡμέραν; | EP. εἰς αὐτίκα μαλ' … The perfect verb ties in nicely with the perfect participle which follows. Restoration of a second-person singular, in place of a second-person plural, is commended by the fact that Μέγαρα is found elsewhere only with a singular verb (Thuc. 1.114.1, 4.70.1; Dem. 4.9; Strab. 8.1.2). Corruption to a second-person plural future will have been aided by the use of the second-person plural future in the first and second in this sequence of interjections (236–7 ἰὼ βροτοὶ … ὡς αὐτίκα μάλα … ἀλγήσετε, 242–3 ἰὼ Πρασιαὶ … ὡς ἀπολεῖσθε τήμερον). The switch to a perfect, in the third, is followed by a further switch, to a present, in the fourth (250 ἰὼ Σικελία, καὶ σὺ δ' ὡς ἀπόλλυσαι). The same form appears at 369 καὶ μὴν ἐπιτέτριψαί γε.

Liceo Ginnasio Statale 'B. Secusio', Caltagirone/ University of Catania

GIACOMO MANCUSO
platocomicus@yahoo.it
doi:10.1017/S0009838826101803

[6] Sommerstein (n. 3); the first objection had already been raised by Elmsley (n. 4).

[7] So Blaydes 29; van Leeuwen 45; Rogers 32; Olson 16 and 119; Wilson I, 293; ὦ had already been conjectured by Bentley (see G. Burges, 'Bentleii emendationes ineditae in Aristophanem V: in *Vespas*, in *Pacem*', *The Classical Journal* 13, no. 25 [1816], 132–44, at 139), who corrected ἐπιτρίψεσθ' to ἐπιτριβήσεσθ'.

[8] Sommerstein (n. 3), 358 acknowledges this point (see also Reisig [n. 2], 14). The claim (Sommerstein, ibid.) that ὦ may have been altered to ἰώ through assimilation to 236, 242 and 250 is less convincing than the reverse. It is more likely that ὦ was introduced to accommodate the metrically longer ἐπιτετρίψεσθ'. Reasons of *concinnitas* also caution against Porson's deletion of ὡς (see J.H. Monk and C.J. Blomfield, *Ricardi Porsoni Adversaria* [Cambridge, 1812], 242) or Μέγαρ', ὦ Μεγαρ' proposed by K.G.A. Erfurdt, 'Observationes criticae maxime in Athenaei Deipnosophistas', *Königsberger Archiv für Philosophie, Theologie, Sprachkunde und Geschichte* 1 (1812), 424–72, at 434.

[9] Sommerstein (n. 3), 358 and Olson 119 misleadingly credit Elmsley with ὦ … ἐπιτετρίψεσθ'. For previous editors' conduct see Rogers 189.

[10] But Sommerstein 26 prints ὦ … ἐπιτετρίψεσθ', in line with most (see n. 7).

[11] The elision of -αι in middle and passive endings is common in comedy: M. Hose, 'Zur Elision des αι im Tragödienvers', *Hermes* 122 (1994), 32–43, at 35 n. 15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838826101803 Published online by Cambridge University Press