of the plant. Since it may be presumed that a quick and painless end would be desired by those attempting suicide, for which hemlock appears frequently to have been used, Theophrastos' precautions appear unnecessary unless he is, in fact, describing water hemlock or water dropwort.[11]

There are thus three possibilities which Gill has overlooked and which would obviate the need for Plato's description of Socrates' death to have been highly selective. First, the Athenians specifically used poison hemlock in the (possibly few) executions involving this method: this would have provided a death coincident with Plato's description of Socrates' final hours. Alternatively, water hemlock or water dropwort was used but was prepared, as by the Kians, by the removal of the indigestible *keluphos*. Finally, a mixed infusion of this plant was concocted with poppy and other similar herbs in line with a recipe such as that of Thrasyas of Mantineia. It is possible that Plato did indeed want to present Socrates' death in terms that displayed the philosopher's self-control and the endurance of the psyche despite its departure from his body. It is also possible, however, that the manner of Sokrates' death provided just this didactic opportunity. It may even have provided the original inspiration for the philosophical example with which Plato immortalized his mentor.

Headingley, Leeds JANET SULLIVAN
jeremy.anscombe@saqnet.co.uk

[11] See too Bonner (n. 6), *passim*; Ar. *Ran*. 122–3. Although Gill (n. 1) suggests that Aristophanes is minimizing the choking symptoms of hemlock 'to sharpen the contrast with hanging', Heracles dismisses the former method of getting to Hades in terms which imply both that it was used frequently by suicides at the close of the fifth century and that it was not an intrinsically and extremely unpleasant way in which to meet death.

MELANIPPE ECCLESIAZUSA (ARISTOPHANES, *Ecc.* 441–54)

In Aristophanes, *Ecc*. 372–477, Chremes relates to his neighbour Blepyrus how the Ecclesia (under the influence of Praxagora and various other women who attended disguised as men) came to vote that Athens should be turned over to the control of its women. One of these women (probably Praxagora herself) made the following points in favour of the proposal (Blepyrus' interjections have been omitted):[1]

γυναῖκα δ' εἶναι πρᾶγμ' ἔφη νουβυστικὸν
καὶ χρηματοποιόν. κοὔτε τἀπόρρητ' ἔφη
ἐκ Θεσμοφόροιν ἑκάστοτ' αὐτὰς ἐκφέρειν,
σὲ δὲ κἀμὲ βουλεύοντε τοῦτο δρᾶν ἀεί.
. . .
ἔπειτα συμβάλλειν πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἔφη
ἱμάτια, χρυσί', ἀργύριον, ἐκπώματα,
μόνας μόναις, οὐ μαρτύρων ἐναντίον,
καὶ ταῦτ' ἀποφέρειν πάντα κοὐκ ἀποστερεῖν·
ἡμῶν δὲ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἔφασκε τοῦτο δρᾶν. 450
. . .
ἕτερά τε πλεῖστα τὰς γυναῖκας ηὐλόγει·
οὐ συκοφαντεῖν, οὐ διώκειν, οὐδὲ τὸν
δῆμον καταλύειν, ἄλλα πολλὰ κἀγαθά. (441–4; 446–50; 454, 452, 453)

[1] Texts and translations for the play are taken from *Aristophanes*: Ecclesiazusae, ed. A. H. Sommerstein [= *The Comedies of Aristophanes* 10] (Warminster, 1998).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.2.610 Published online by Cambridge University Press

And he said that a woman was a being full of intelligence, and good at raising income. And he said that *they* don't leak the secrets of the Thesmophoria every time they hold it, whereas you and I, when we're on the Council, are always doing that . . . Then he said that they lend each other clothes, jewellery, money, drinking cups, when they're all on their own, not in front of witnesses; and they give it all back and don't cheat the lender; whereas most of us, he said, do do so. . . . And he said many other things in praise of women: they don't become informers, they don't bring prosecutions, they don't subvert the democracy, lots of other good things about them. (trans. Sommerstein)

Ussher's commentary (Oxford, 1973) has no parallels at all to offer for these ideas, while Sommerstein refers to Iamblichus, *V.P.* 55 (for what he calls the only 'similar argument to demonstrate the honesty of women as a sex') and to an article by Demand that discusses the similarity.[2] Demand, however, found only a single parallel in thought between lines 446–50 and the passage in Iamblichus, which purports to report the content of four *Speeches of Pythagoras* supposedly delivered to the people of Croton. The fourth was addressed to the women of the city, and it made (apparently without significant verbal similarities) the same point as Aristophanes, that women lend one another clothing and jewellery in unwitnessed transactions yet never need to resort to lawsuits to recover their property (*V.P.* 55, *ἐκ τοῦ προΐεσθαι μὲν ἀμάρτυρον τὸν ἱματισμὸν καὶ τὸν κόσμον, ὅταν τινὶ ἄλλῳ δέῃ χρῆσαι, μὴ γίγνεσθαι δὲ ἐκ τῆς πίστεως δίκας μηδ' ἀντιλογίας*). Moreover, the context in Iamblichus is quite different: 'Pythagoras' is explaining that the myth of the Graeae, three women who shared a single eye, expresses this very feature of women's conduct.

But there is another, more characteristically Aristophanic source, that has been missed: this not only explicitly asserts the superiority of women to men, as Aristophanes' Praxagora does elsewhere in the play, but posits the same four areas of superiority, in earning profit, in religious piety, in honesty, and in not causing trouble to others. In Euripides' tragedy *Melanippe (Desmotis)*, the title character delivered an enthusiastic assertion of women's superiority over men that began,[3]

μάτην ἄρ' εἰς γυναῖκας ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ψόγος
ψάλλει κενὸν τόξευμα καὶ λέγει κακῶς·
αἱ δ' εἴσ' ἀμείνους ἀρσένων. δείξω δ' ἐγώ. (fr. 499N = 660.1–3M)

Vainly, it seems, does men's censure twang an idle shaft against women and speak badly of them. In fact they are better than men, and I shall prove it. (trans. Cropp)

Praxagora makes a comparable announcement in an earlier scene when she and her associates practise for their *coup d'état* by pretending to be men at the Ecclesia, declaring that 'I will also show that they [i.e. women] have better qualities than we do [i.e. men]' (*ὡς δ' εἰσὶν ἡμῶν τοὺς τρόπους βελτίονες / ἐγὼ διδάξω*, *Ecc.* 214–15).

Melanippe's first three lines were long known from a biography of Euripides contained in some of our medieval manuscripts, which had in turn taken them from the *Bioi* of Satyrus, partially preserved in P.Oxy. 1176, which apparently cited a full text; both works claim that the play was written after Euripides struck a bargain with the women of Athens to cease criticizing them in his plays. But the discovery of a papyrus copy of the entire speech (P. Berlin 9772 = fr. 660M) has provided much of the context that linked this opening with another fragment (494N) known from citations

[2] N. Demand, 'Plato, Aristophanes, and the *Speeches of Pythagoras*', *GRBS* 23 (1982), 179–84.

[3] Texts and translations of Euripides are taken from *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays* I, ed. C. Collard, M. J. Cropp, and K. H. Lee (Warminster, 1995).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.2.610 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in Stobaeus and Porphyry, and it is here that we find those same four arguments for superiority that are offered in *Ecc*. 441ff.:

]ι ξυμβόλαι' ἀμάρτυρα
]α κοὐκ ἀρνούμεναι
. με . . . . . χο . . . . . ἀλλήλας π[ό]νους
κη . . . . . δε . . . . . θ . . ἀισχ[ύ]νην φέρει
. . . αν σ . . . . . το . . . ωτος ἐκβαλεῖ γυνή.
νέμουσι δ' οἴκους καὶ τὰ ναυστολούμενα
ἔ[σω] δόμων σώιζουσιν, οὐδ' ἐρημίαι
γυναικὸς οἶκος εὐπινὴς οὐδ' ὅλβιος·

< > contracts unwitnessed < > and not reneging (5) < > troubles <to?> one another < > brings disgrace < > a woman will expel(?). . . . They order households, and what is brought in by sea they keep safe within their homes; nor in the absence (10) of a woman can a home be tidy and prosperous. (trans. Cropp)

Melanippe's first point, that women engage in transactions neither recorded in documents nor verified by witnesses but never renege, is the same as that made by Aristophanes in 446–9 and at *V.P.* 55, though in a different context. Although the Euripidean text is very poorly preserved, we can see a possible verbal echo of his *ξυμβόλαι' ἀμάρτυρα* in Aristophanes' use of *συμβάλλειν* in the sense of 'borrow' and his *οὐ μαρτύρων ἐναντίον*.

The few remnants of the next Euripidean line appear to have referred to women '[not] causing each other troubles' in certain circumstances. It seems at least possible that this originally made the same point as the end of the passage from *V.P.* 55 quoted above, that women do not sue each other for the return of borrowed property, but I prefer to see *Ecc*. 452–3 as a characteristically Aristophanic adaptation into the male sphere of sycophancy and politics of an original Euripidean point about women not making difficulties for each other in their daily lives.

Melanippe's assertion that no house is *ὄλβιος* without a woman's presence has its equivalent in Aristophanes' description of women as 'money-making' (*χρηματοποιόν*, 442).

For her final argument, Euripides' Melanippe goes on for an additional ten lines describing the roles that women play as divine mouthpieces for Apollo's oracle at Delphi and Zeus' at Dodona and in worshipping divinities that cannot be worshipped by men (12–22). These oracles are also mentioned at *V.P.* 56, though with a different sense: the fact that oracles are revealed through a woman at Delphi and Dodona is said to be consonant with the fact that the four stages of a woman's life take their names from goddesses, which is in turn a mark of women's reverence. Euripides' point seems to have its comic parallel in *Ecc*. 442–4, where Praxagora is reported as saying that women keep the secrets of the Thesmophoria while men always blab the secrets of the Boule. Here the specific nature of the adaptation might have been determined by Aristophanes' desire to make a self-referential joke: the slightly casual arrangement of the sentence (*τοῦτο*, the thing that Praxagora said men do, is strictly not just *τἀπόρρητα ἐκφέρειν* but *τἀπόρρητα ἐκ Θεσμοφόροιν ἐκφέρειν*) has Aristophanes' actor say that 'I' revealed secrets from the Thesmophoria—and Aristophanes, as author of two plays called *Thesmophoriazusae*, has done exactly that.

I suggest therefore that scholars have cited the wrong source for the ideas expressed in *Ecc*. 441–54. The fourth 'Speech of Pythagoras' cited in Iamblichus' *V.P.* makes only one of the points made in Aristophanes, while all four of them can be found in Euripides. On the other hand, the fact that Euripides' Melanippe and the *Speech* share

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.2.610 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not one but two points (the one made by all three writers about borrowing; the reference to the oracles at Delphi and Dodona) suggests that they are somehow connected to a shared source. Demand (above, n. 2) has suggested that the *Speeches* were directed by orthodox Pythagoreans against a 'Pythagoreanizing' Socratic circle: whether that is true or not, a 'Socratic' source for Euripides seems plausible—note, for example, Euripides' emphasis (P. Ber. 9772 [= fr. 660M] 9–10) on women's skill in preserving stores and their contribution to household prosperity, paralleled in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* at 7.20–32 (esp. 7.25). But the agreement of Euripides and Aristophanes on four points, as well as the fact that both assert the superiority of women over men, surely demonstrates that *Melanippe (Desmotis)*, not the *Speeches*, was Aristophanes' source. It seems, however, that Aristophanes was not particularly anxious to have his source identified as Euripidean, since the tragedian is not named and there seem to be no really striking verbal echoes (of course a better text of Melanippe's speech might change our minds about this). This is perhaps because the gap in time between *Melanippe (Desmotis)* and *Ecclesiazusae* was a long one, probably even greater than that between the *Telephus* of 438 and its parody in *Acharnians* of 425;[4] or perhaps it is because Euripides himself was now long dead and therefore a much less entertaining target.

Memorial University of Newfoundland J. L. BUTRICA
jbutrica@morgan.ucs.mun.ca

[4] In M. Cropp and G. Fick, *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: The Fragmentary Tragedies*. Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin Supplement 43 (London, 1985), *Melanippe (Desmotis)* is dated 426–412.

ENNIUS, SUETONIUS AND THE GENESIS OF HORACE, *ODES* 4

The first part of this paper demonstrates that Ennius, *Annals* 16 was a more important model for Horace, *Odes* 4 than has been realized. The second part of the paper uses this connection with *Annals* 16 to explain a puzzling inaccuracy in Suetonius' description of the genesis of *Odes* 4.

The only critic truly to have appreciated the influence of Ennius on *Odes* 4 is Suerbaum, who demonstrates that the theme of immortality conferred through commemoration in poetry derives from Ennius as much as from Pindar.[1] Suerbaum[2] concentrates on *O*. 4.8, which begins with a comparison of poetry and the plastic arts and proceeds to mention Ennius[3] as a crowning example of the superiority of poetry to marble inscriptions. The extant fragment of Ennius[4] which refers to kings striving to establish physical monuments to themselves (and which presumably went on to contrast the more lasting monument which could be conferred by poetry)[5] is securely located in the sixteenth book of the *Annals* by the testimony of Macrobius 6.117:

[1] See W. Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter* (Hildesheim, 1968), 167, n. 510, 177ff.

[2] Loc. cit. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 423, n. 1, had already noted in passing the importance of Ennius in *O*. 4.8.

[3] Cf. *O*. 4.8.20 *Calabrae Pierides*.

[4] O. Skutsch, *The* Annals *of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985), *Ann*. 404–5.

[5] Cf. the argument of Suerbaum (n. 1), 151ff. and Skutsch, ad loc. Both scholars agree that *Ann*. 406 *postremo longinqua dies confecerit aetas* almost certainly refers to the impermanence of these lapidary monuments.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.2.610 Published online by Cambridge University Press