πατροφόνωι χερὶ, τῶν
†κρεισσοτέκνων† δωμάτων ἐπλάγχθη.

τέκνοις δ' ἀθλίας ἐφῆκεν [ἀντ. ε]
ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς, αἰαί, 786
πικρογλώσσους ἀράς.

782 δίδυμ' ἃ West 784 δωμάτων Schütz 785 ἀθλίας Prien

Tel Aviv University MARGALIT FINKELBERG
finkelbe@post.tau.ac.il
doi:10.1017/S0009838814000147

ARISTOPHANES, *ACHARNIANS* 833

in memory of Eric Handley

Dicaeopolis brushes the informer aside and closes his deal with the starving Megarian:

ΔΙ. … λαβὲ ταυτὶ τὰ σκόροδα καὶ τοὺς ἄλας
καὶ χαῖρε πόλλ'. ΜΕ. ἀλλ' ἀμὶν οὐκ ἐπιχώριον.
ΔΙ. πολυπραγμοσύνη νῦν ἐς κεφαλὴν τράποιτ' ἐμοί. 833

Even before Douglas Olson's thorough study of the tradition in his commentary on *Acharnians* (Oxford, 2002) it was clear that the oldest manuscript, R, has as much weight as the agreement of the others that editors report. In 833 it reads πολυπραγμοσύνη, the others –σύνης. A scholion runs λείπει (δὲ) τὸ ἕνεκα, (ἵνα ᾖ) ἕνεκα τῆς πολυπραγμοσύνης ('*because of* is not expressed, [to make it] *because of the meddling*'), plainly written for a text that had –σύνης, which is also the lemma in one manuscript; the lemma in the other that has one is –σύνῃσιν.[1] It has not been shown, however, either that this scholion is ancient or that its agreement with all the manuscripts but R overrides the testimony of R. As regards attestation, therefore, the tradition offers two readings of equal weight, or three if –σύνῃσιν is taken to be a relic of a text different from the one that prompted the scholion.[2]

J. van Leeuwen, in his edition of the play (Leiden, 1901), observed of –σύνη and –σύνης that *in utraque lectione aegre desideratur articulus*, and A. Willems expressed the point more strongly: 'L'article manque devant πολυπραγμοσύνη, ce qui rend la phrase inintelligible.'[3] It led him to propose replacing –σύνης νυν, attested by 'la plupart des manuscrits',[4] with –σύνη 'στιν; 'paléographiquement, le changement de σνυν en στιν est insignifiant'. This conjecture remedies the absence of the article by making πολυπραγμοσύνη the complement of 'στιν, and in support he adduced καταπυγοσύνη ταῦτ' ἐστιν from a fragment of Aristophanes (now *PCG* III 2 fr. 128.3). V. Coulon in the Budé edition (1923) accepted the conjecture.

[1] N.G. Wilson, *Scholia in Aristophanem Ib* (Groningen, 1975), 108. He correctly reports -σύνῃσιν, but it loses its iota subscript both in Olson's edition and in his own Oxford text (2007).
[2] I am cutting a long story short. I also ignore the other variants in 832–3.
[3] A. Willems, 'Notes sur les *Acharniens* d'Aristophane', *BAB* (1903), 617–51, at 639–40.
[4] Enclitic νυν was printed by R.F.P. Brunck, *Aristophanis comoediae ex optimis exemplaribus emendatae III* (Strasbourg, 1783), with the note '*Male vulgo* νῦν. *Hic particula illa valet* οὖν'. Editors ascribe it to Elmsley (Oxford, 1809), who cites Brunck elsewhere and was doubtless following him in this detail.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881400038X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Objecting that nothing fit to be called πολυπραγμοσύνη has come to pass, Denys Page emended it.[5] Here is his text, with his translation of 832–3 χαῖρε … ἐμοί:

> ΔΙ. … λαβὲ ταυτὶ τὰ σκόροδα καὶ τοὺς ἅλας
> καὶ χαῖρε πόλλ'. ΜΕ. ἀλλ' ἀμὶν οὐκ ἐπιχώριον
> πολυχαρμοσύνη νῦν. ΔΙ. ἐς κεφαλὴν τράποιτ' ἐμοί.
>
> Farewell. – But faring well is not the custom in our country.
> – May the ill-omen recoil on me.

Nevertheless, Kenneth Dover spoke up for πολυπραγμοσύνη,[6] and editors go on printing it. Like Dover, Jeffrey Henderson in the new Loeb edition (vol. 1, 1998) and Douglas Olson accept πολυπραγμοσύνη νυν, but Alan Sommerstein (Warminster, 1980) and Nigel Wilson in the new Oxford text (2007) follow Willems, though Sommerstein takes the conjecture as a question. Only Wilson mentions πολυχαρμοσύνη, which he puts in his apparatus and judges 'clever'.[7]

Walter Lapini now reiterates at length Page's objection to πολυπραγμοσύνη.[8] Though he observes that Page should have written πολυχαρμοσύνα, he finds the conjecture plausible. His own solution, however, which he defensively calls 'nothing more than a hypothesis', is to follow Willems but move 833 so that the remark about meddling comes from the informer:

> ΔΙ. τί δαὶ μαθὼν φαίνεις ἄνευ θρυαλλίδος; 826
> ΣΥ. πολυπραγμοσύνη 'στιν. ΔΙ. ἐς κεφαλὴν τράποιτ' ἐμοί. 833
> ΣΥ. οὐ γὰρ φανῶ τοὺς πολεμίους; 827
>
> Dic. What on earth possessed you to do your exposing without a wick?
> Inf. It's meddling. Dic. On my head be it.
> Inf. What, am I not going to expose enemy personnel?

As Lapini just paraphrases 833, the translation is mine. Quite apart from making two changes, however, this 'hypothesis' leaves ἐς κεφαλὴν τράποιτ' ἐμοί baffling and spoils the repartee by separating οὐ γὰρ φανῶ; from φαίνεις.

Page's objection is indeed unanswerable, but his conjecture has a drawback: in spite of rejecting –σύνη 'στιν, he omitted νῦν from his translation, and it blunts the edge of ἀλλ' ἀμὶν οὐκ ἐπιχώριον. True as it is that the Megarians are 'now' in a sorry plight, that point was made in 535 and is amply conveyed by the present encounter as a whole; and nowhere else in Aristophanes is anything that a speaker dubs ἐπιχώριον a merely passing trait (cf. *Clouds* 1173; *Wasps* 859; *Wealth* 47, 342).[9] Accept πολυχαρμοσύνη but apportion the dialogue as follows:[10]

[5] D. Page, 'Some emendations in Aristophanes' Acharnians', *WS* 69 (1956), 116–27, at 123–4.

[6] K. Dover, 'Notes on Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *Maia* 15 (1963), 6–25, at 19.

[7] N. Wilson, *Aristophanea: Studies on the Text of Aristophanes* (Oxford, 2007), 33. His apparatus does not make it clear that Page gave πολυχαρμοσύνη νῦν to the Megarian. In a review of *Aristophanea* and the Oxford text, V. Tammaro, *Eikasmos* 21 (2010), 547, declares πολυχαρμοσύνη improbable but gives no reason.

[8] W. Lapini, 'L'addio del Megarese (Aristofane, *Acarnesi* 833)', in G. Bastianini, W. Lapini, and M. Tulli (edd.), *Harmonia: scritti di filologia in onore di Angelo Casanova* (Florence, 2012), 1.425–33. He provides a full bibliography, much of it not cited here.

[9] I owe the latter observation to a referee. At *Ach.* 523, 'local' means 'confined to Athens', unlike the events that follow. On the other hand, Page's sentence might not have seemed unidiomatic to Plato, who at *Phaedo* 57a writes τῶν πολιτῶν [Φλειασίων] οὐδεὶς πάνυ τι ἐπιχωριάζει τὰ νῦν 'Αθήναζε.

[10] Nigel Wilson kindly tells me that to the best of his knowledge the proposal is new.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881400038X Published online by Cambridge University Press

ΔΙ. … λαβὲ ταυτὶ τὰ σκόροδα καὶ τοὺς ἅλας
καὶ χαῖρε πόλλ'. ΜΕ. ἀλλ' ἀμὶν οὐκ ἐπιχώριον.
ΔΙ. πολυχαρμοσύνη νυν ἐς κεφαλὴν τράποιτ' ἐμοί.

The comedies are full of imperatives accompanied by νυν, and it accompanies an optative at *Wasps* 758, *Lysistrata* 285, 531, and *Frogs* 177. Olson's rendering 'in that case' is appropriate here, but 'then' would serve equally well. The nonce-word πολυχαρμοσύνη invited corruption to the everyday word πολυπραγμοσύνη, and it suits Dicaeopolis, who in his opening speech is given another from the same root: φέρ' ἴδω, τί δ' ἥσθην ἄξιον χαιρηδόνος; – the subject of the first discussion in a much cited monograph.[11]

Pembroke College, Cambridge MICHAEL D. REEVE
mdr1000@cam.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S000983881400038X

[11] E. Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Rome, 1962), 15–16.

TWO OLD HYPERCORRECTIONS IN CONTEMPORARY EDITIONS OF EURIPIDES' *MEDEA* 497 AND STRATTIS, FR. 9 K.–A.*

There is a widespread practice of spelling the forms κεχρώσμεθα in Euripides' *Medea* 497 and φώζειν in Strattis, fr. 9 K.–A. with the long diphthong omega–iota, that is, κεχρώισμεθα or κεχρῴσμεθα and φώιζειν or φῴζειν. These spellings are not correct from the etymological point of view, but are recommended by ancient grammarians. In this note I identify the foundation on which these recommendations rest, and provide an assessment of its philological solidness.

We should begin by addressing the issue of the etymology of the two forms. First, the iota in κεχρώισμεθα has no etymological justification. It is true that χρώιζω does have an iota; however, this iota does not belong to the root of the verb but to the suffix of the present tense, that is, to –ίζω. So there is no reason why this iota should be transferred to the perfect tense κεχρώσμεθα. Etymological dictionaries unanimously acknowledge this;[1] on the other hand, Kühner–Blass (II 575), LSJ (s.v. χρώιζω) and recent editors of Euripides' *Medea* 497[2] adopt the form κεχρώισμεθα. Second, forms universally recognized as parallel to φώζω such as φώγω, φώγνυμι, πεφωγμένος, φώγανον, and φωκτός, have no iota in their root. To analyse *φώιζω as *φω + ίζω

* I thank Professor Charalambos Symeonides and Professor Anna Panayotou for their observations on this article, and the anonymous referee for contributing some judicious material in n. 24.

[1] H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1960–72), s.v. χρόα; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (Paris, 1968–80), s. v. χρώς; R. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden and Boston, MA, 2010), s.v. χρόα.

[2] E.g. D. Page, *Euripides: Medea* (Oxford, 1938); J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1984); H. van Looy, *Euripides: Medea* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1992); D. Kovacs, *Euripides*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2001); D. Mastronarde, *Euripides: Medea* (Cambridge, 2002); J. Mossman, *Euripides: Medea* (Oxford, 2011), who reprints Diggle's text. An exception is L. Méridier, *Euripide*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1956).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881400038X Published online by Cambridge University Press