

**Zeitschrift:** Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique  
**Herausgeber:** Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique  
**Band:** 38 (1993)  
  
**Artikel:** The chorus of initiates in Aristophanes' Frogs  
**Autor:** Dover, Kenneth J.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660883>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 17.01.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# V

KENNETH J. DOVER

## THE CHORUS OF INITIATES IN ARISTOPHANES' *FROGS*

When Dionysus and Xanthias have passed through the region of frightening monsters and are approaching the palace of Pluto, they hear the cry "Ιαχχ' ὦ Ιαχχε, and Xanthias, recalling what Herakles had told them about the initiates (154-158), exclaims (318 f.) οἱ μεμυημένοι / ἐνταῦθά που παίζουσιν. Παίζειν is not an easy word to translate into English; 'play' is either too trivial or too serious (according to context), and 'sport' has misleading associations. I like Del Corno's «fanno festa», and I suggest as its English equivalent 'are enjoying themselves', though there is no way of doing justice, by retaining the same English word-stem throughout, to the dominance of the parodos by παίζειν and words derived from it. There are no less than nine such passages in addition to the one already cited, namely:

(1) 323-333 "Ιαχχε ...

...

ἐλθέ ...

... θρασεῖ δ' ἐγκατακρούων

ποδὶ τὴν ἀκόλαστον

φιλοπαίγμονα τιμήν



Plato's Socrates contemplated the possibility (*Apol.* 40c-41c) that in the afterlife he would meet such men as Orpheus, Minos, Palamedes and Odysseus, converse with them and put questions to them (ἐξετάζειν; cf. *Apol.* 38a ὁ δὲ ἀνεξέταστος βίος οὐ βιωτὸς ἀνθρώπῳ). This, he thinks, would be the height of felicity; and it is an activity which we might fairly classify as σπουδή, the antithesis of παιδιά. But it was not, perhaps, everyone's choice; in *Rep.* II 363 c-d Plato speaks contemptuously of the eschatology of Musaeus as promising the virtuous an eternal succession of drunken parties (μέθη αἰώνιος). The middle ground between the austere pleasure of a searching conversation with Palamedes and the coarser pleasure of free drinks is occupied by two famous passages of Pindar, *Ol.* 2, 61-77 and fr. 129 (from a θρῆνος) describing how the great and the good will be situated in the afterlife. Motifs from those passages recur in epitaphs and on the gold leaves from south Italy. If *Frogs* were a lost play and we knew only that it contained a presentation of the afterlife, we would infer that this portrayal had much in common with Pindar's but was slanted towards the concept of a 'good time' entertained by the average member of Aristophanes' audience. That in fact is what we find in the play.

The paradise enjoyed by the initiates is naturally exempt from toil, fatigue, pain, sickness, sorrow and fear. Greece is a rocky country, and in much of it cultivation of the soil is laborious; its long hot summer withers the flowers which adorn it in spring. Hence the chorus's exultation in meadows (326, 344), flowery meadows (373-374a, 448 f.), flowery groves (441-442), a moist flowery plain (351-352). No toiling up rocky slopes. Pindar's paradise too is a land of meadows, flowers, foliage, fruit and water (*Ol.* 2, 70-75; fr. 129, 3-5). One of the gold leaves from Thurii (*Vorsokr.* 1 B 20, 6) speaks of λειμῶνάς τε ἱεροῦς καὶ ἄλσεα Φερσεφονείας, and the motif recurs in epitaphs: *Griech. Vers-Inschriften*, hrsg. von W. Peek, I (Berlin 1955), 1505.3 f. (Arcadia, s. III/IIa) ὑπεδέξατο Λήθης / λειμῶν καὶ

σεμνὸς Φερσεφόνης θάλαμος, 1572.3 (Thessaly, s. III<sup>a</sup> in.) εὐσεβέων λειμῶνα κατοίχισον. The fortunate souls enjoy sunlight, whereas the rest are enveloped in darkness (454 f.; cf. 155, 273), which is naturally enough associated in Greek thought with the world of the dead. Not too much sunlight, though; the moon, the stars, and the smell of the air at night would be gravely missed in paradise. Pindar's paradise enjoys a perpetual equinox (*Ol.* 2, 61 f.), and our chorus celebrates nocturnal festivities by torchlight (340-344, 350, 446-447). Pindar fr. 129, 6 f. envisages the blessed as spending their time in sport, games and music, freed from agricultural labour and seafaring (*Ol.* 2, 63-65). We may surely take sexual activity for granted; the deliberately 'naughty' touch in 409-412*b*, the entrancing glimpse of the breast of a pretty girl, implies that the initiates are not sexless. Good wine (with no hangover) and delectable food may also be assumed. Interesting work, which some of us would put very high on the list of the ingredients of paradise, does not come into it.

Παίζειν can be used of song, music and dance because in addition to their religious function they are physically and aesthetically enjoyable for their own sake, something which we choose to do rather than something which we are constrained to do by the need to earn a living. Stesichorus (fr. 232 Davies) says that παιγμοσύναι and μολπαί are dear to Apollo, but lamentations to Hades; the ἱερὰ παίγματα of the lotus-pipe accompany the maenads in Eur. *Ba.* 160 f.; the wildly dancing maenad in *Ba.* 866, χλοεραῖς ἐμπαίζουσα λείμακος ἡδοναῖς, is compared to a gambolling fawn; and the chorus in Ar. *Thesm.* 975 says of Hera that she πᾶσι τοῖς χοροῖσιν ἐμπαίζει.

Those in our own time who associate religion with solemnity have some difficulty in coming to terms with Old Comedy, and not least with *Frogs*, where the misadventures of Dionysus in the first half of the play can be classified, in terms of modern television, as 'sitcom'. The Iacchus-song belonged to the procession from Athens to Eleusis for celebration of

the mysteries<sup>1</sup>, an occasion more heavily charged with awe and solemnity than anything else in Athenian religion. The immediate reference to παίζειν when the cry "Ιαχχ' ὦ "Ιαχχε is heard serves as a reminder — a warning, one might say — that the adoption of initiatory motifs will be selective and appropriate to comedy. The reminder is reinforced in the first strophe by the striking words τὴν ἀκόλαστον φιλοπαίγμονα τιμήν (332 f.). Ἀκολασία is the normal antonym of σωφροσύνη, and this passage is the only one in Classical Greek in which it is welcomed or commended<sup>2</sup>. The explanation offered by ΣRV is that it here mean 'faultless', 'not deserving reproach or punishment'. Admittedly, a poet may on occasion give a word an unusual meaning which re-orders the relation between its components — a famous example is ἄφθονος ὄλβος in Aeschylus' *Ag.* 471<sup>3</sup>, where the context demands the meaning 'wealth which does not incur resentment' — but the essence of ἀκολασία is absence of restraint, and to describe the initiates' festive activity as ἀκόλαστος is to emphasize just that aspect of it. We might compare the νάρθηκες ὕβρισται of the maenads in Eur. *Ba.* 113 and the injunction in Ar. *Thesm.* 961 f. γένος ... θεῶν ... γέραιρε φωνῇ ... χορομανεῖ τρόπῳ.

A tragic chorus is never spoken of as παίζων; but a comic chorus does indeed παίζειν, and not infrequently ἀκολασταίνειν (σωφροσύνη, after all, is not much fun). A consequence of this is a thoroughgoing ambivalence in references by a comic chorus to what it is doing in a play. Its *role* is to portray a company of beings within a fictional situation; its *function* is to communi-

<sup>1</sup> L. DEUBNER, *Attische Feste* (Nachdr. Darmstadt 1956), 72 f.

<sup>2</sup> Mnesimachus, *Hippotrophus* fr. 4, 18-20 K/KA, however, includes πρόποσις χωρεῖ, λέπεται κόρδαξ, / ἀκολασταίνει νοῦς μεिरαχίων, / πάντ' ἔστ' ἔνδον τὰ κάτωθεν ἄνω, in a long description of a party.

<sup>3</sup> J.A. SCHUURSMA, *De poetica vocabulorum abusione apud Aeschylum* (Amsterdam 1932), 153 f.

cate with the audience within the framework prescribed by the festival. Compare, for example, the closing lines of *Thesmophoriazusae* with the closing line of *Clouds*:

*Thesm.* 1226-1231: ἀλλὰ πέπαισται μετρίως ἡμῖν·  
ὥσθ' ὥρα δὴ 'στι βαδίζειν  
οἴκαδ' ἐκάστη. τὼ Θεσμοφόρῳ δ'  
ἡμῖν ἀγαθὴν  
τούτων χάριν ἀνταποδοῖτον.

*Nub.* 1510 f.: ἡγεῖσθ' ἔξω· κεχόρευται γὰρ  
μετρίως τό γε τήμερον ἡμῖν.

Both passages serve the function of 'bringing down the curtain'. In the former, however, the feminine pronoun ἐκάστη, together with the prayer to Demeter and Kore, still portrays the women who have been celebrating the Thesmophoria. Earlier in the play similar considerations resolve the ambivalence in favour of the portrayal of women παίζουσαι:

*Thesm.* 947-948: ἄγε νυν ἡμεῖς παίσωμεν ἅπερ νόμος ἐνθάδε  
ταῖσι γυναιξίν,  
ὅταν ὄργια σεμνὰ θεοῖν ἱεραῖς ὥραις ἀνέχο-  
μεν κτλ.

983 f.: παίσωμεν, ὦ γυναικες, οἷάπερ νόμος.

Such a resolution is more difficult when the beings portrayed by the chorus are male; and in *Peace* 815-818 the call to the Muse to «thrust wars aside» concludes with the words μετ' ἐμοῦ σύμπαιζε τὴν ἐορτήν. Is the ἐορτή the festivity with which the fictional farmers are celebrating the reinstatement of Peace, or the festival in which the comic chorus portraying farmers is participating, or is such a question in such a case misguided?

At any rate the question is answerable in certain passages of the parodos of *Frogs*.

The χορευταί are male, whereas the initiates comprise both males and females (157). Therefore the reference to a young female συμπαίστρια (411) belongs to what they are enacting, and that takes Dionysus's eager intervention (414a-415) with it. In 440-451 we have the exhortation «Go to the holy circle of the goddess», followed by «But I» (ἐγὼ δέ) «will go with the women and girls». This again is the enactment of a fiction. The character of 391 ff., however, is quite different. The chorus's prayer there is for the ribbons of victory (νικήσαντα ταινιοῦσθαι), and since there is no suggestion that the initiates are competing, the passage appears to be a characteristic expression of hope, put into the mouth of the chorus, for victory in the dramatic festival; cf. *Eq.* 589, *Nu.* 520, *Pax* 768, *Av.* 447, 1101, *Lys.* 1293, *Thesm.* 973, *Eccles.* 1181. The preceding part of the prayer is (389-391):

καὶ πολλὰ μὲν γέλοιά μ' εἰ-  
 πεῖν πολλὰ δὲ σπουδαῖα, καὶ  
 τῆς σῆς ἐορτῆς ἀξίως  
 παῖσαντα κτλ.

The chorus does indeed have σπουδαῖα to utter as well as γέλοια, notably in the epirrhemata of the parabasis<sup>4</sup>. Yet just as the prayer for divine gratitude (χάρις) at the end of *Thesmophoriazusae* is addressed to Demeter and Kore, so this prayer of the initiates is included in an invocation of Demeter, the chorus praying that it may παίζειν and σκώπτειν in a manner worthy of *her* festival (τῆς σῆς ἐορτῆς). The Lenaia is not a festival of Demeter' but of Dionysus; but the Eleusinian deities have a firm foothold in it<sup>5</sup>, for one of its ritual formulae (ΣRVE 479)

<sup>4</sup> The advice given in the epirrhema (686-705) differs from that of other plays in that it advocates a precise practical measure, which was in fact taken after the disaster of Aegospotami.

<sup>5</sup> L. DEUBNER, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 124 f.

identifies Dionysus with Iakchos, and a half-share in the management of the Lenaia was in the hands of the managers of the Eleusinian Mysteries (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1496, 74 f. [334/3]; 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία 57, 1). It therefore makes sense for a comic chorus performing at the Lenaia and portraying song and dance in honour of Demeter to say «*your* festival» ambiguously.

There is a further passage in which simultaneous reference to fictional enactment and theatrical function is to be found, 404-407*b*:

σὺ γὰρ κατεσχίσω μὲν ἐπὶ γέλωτι  
 καὶ εὐτελείᾳ τόδε τὸ σανδαλίσκον  
 καὶ τὸ ῥάκος,  
 κάξηῦρες ὥστ' ἄζημίους  
 παίζειν τε καὶ χορεύειν.

Iakchos is credited with instituting the tearing of clothes 'for laughter and economy', as a means of 'enjoying oneself and dancing without loss'. Ragged clothing<sup>6</sup> is associated with the Eleusinian Mysteries also in *Plu.* 842-845, where the Good Citizen, whose fortunes have taken a turn for the better since the god Wealth recovered his sight, comes to pay his respects to the god, accompanied by a slave who is carrying a τριβώνιον. «What's that?» asks Karion, and the Good Citizen replies that he has come to dedicate it to the god. «Why», says Karion,

<sup>6</sup> L. RADERMACHER, *Beiträge zur Volkskunde aus dem Gebiet der Antike*, SAWW 187, 3 (Wien 1918), 94-97. The 'economy' of dressing the chorus in rags has a considerable bearing on the question whether the chorus of frogs appeared in the orchestra or was merely heard (*Σ*<sup>RVE</sup> 209) singing offstage. *Σ*<sup>RVE</sup> 404 remarks that συγχρηγία was in operation in 405 and reasonably treats that fact as evidence for the financial strain imposed on *choregi*; but the point of συγχρηγία, as distinct from acceptance of lower standards of production, was to keep the standard high, and it is questionable whether one hidden chorus and another dressed in rags would have seemed to the Athenians an adequate offering to Dionysus at a time of peril.

«Were you initiated at Eleusis in it?» «No», says the other, «I shivered in it for thirteen years», and the joke, whatever it is, is not pursued further. The scholia *ad loc.* cite Melanthios (*FGrHist* 326 F 4) to the effect that initiates dedicated to a god (εἰς θεοῦ τινός) the clothes in which they had been initiated. Tzetzes ( $\Sigma^K$  *ad loc.*) adds that «like those who went down into the cave of Trophonius», they continued to wear the garments in which they had been initiated for the rest of their lives or until the garments were completely worn out. We might have suspected that Tzetzes invented this to explain the passage of *Plutus*, were it not for the reference to Trophonius, which cannot be extracted from Aristophanes, or indeed from any source known to us now; and Tzetzes certainly had access to learned material which did not survive the twelfth century<sup>7</sup>. Now, a frugal Athenian, whose piety did not always run deep when it conflicted with good housekeeping, would be strongly tempted to wear old clothes for initiation, knowing that he was expected to sacrifice them by dedication, or tempted to postpone dedication until the clothes needed replacement anyway (cf. the cynical μένετοῖ θεοί to which reference is made in *Av.* 1618-1620). Karion's joke will then be an oblique joke against Athenian habits (cf. the cynical Neighbour of *Eccl.* 746-832). Whatever the correct explanation of this attested relationship between old clothes and initiation, the words 'laughter and economy' refer not only to the enacted festivity but also to economy of production. A comparable reference, though much more explicit, is made in *Pax* 1020-1022, where Trygaios, on the point of sacrificing a sheep, tells his slave to kill the sheep indoors and bring out only the thighbones; «That way», he says, «the choregos will save a sheep».

<sup>7</sup> N.G. WILSON, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983), 194-196.

This fusion of what I differentiate as 'role-ingredients' and 'function-ingredients' is to be found also in the anapaests (354-371), which are a familiar feature of a comic parabasis but in this play, uniquely, are absent from the parabasis and appear instead in the parodos. The opening verses of the anapaests adopt ritual language (354-355):

εὐφημεῖν χρὴ κάξιστασθαι τοῖς ἡμετέροισι χοροῖσιν  
ὅστις ἄπειρος τοιῶνδε λόγων ἢ γνώμη μὴ καθαρεύει.

Those words are immediately followed by two verses which lead us away from initiation in the accepted sense to metaphorical initiation into drama, and in particular into comedy (356 f.):

ἢ γενναίων ὄργια Μουσῶν μήτ' εἶδεν μήτ' ἐχόρευσεν  
μηδὲ Κρατίνου τοῦ ταυροφάγου γλώττης Βακχεῖ' ἐτελέσθη.

Then follows a list of offences against the city, mixing the serious (e.g. 359 ἢ στάσιν ἐχθρὰν μὴ καταλύει) with the ludicrous (366 ἢ κατατιλᾷ τῶν Ἑκαταίων), and ending with a defence of comedy, which is again treated metaphorically as initiation (368 ἐν ταῖς πατρίοις τελεταῖς ταῖς τοῦ Διονύσου). The final three verses bring us back out of 'parabatic' communication into the enactment, with a renewed command to all categories of offender to ἐξίστασθαι μύσταισι χοροῖς, and an exhortation to the initiates (370 f.)

ὕμεῖς δ' ἀνεγείρετε μολπὴν  
καὶ παννυχίδας τὰς ἡμετέρας αἰ' τῇδε πρέπουσιν ἑορτῇ.

We have to remind ourselves that the chorus is not performing the role of Athenians going to Eleusis, or to anywhere else, for initiation; they portray people who *were* initiated in their life on earth and are *now* enjoying themselves in the underworld. It is understandable that their ritual festivity should reproduce elements of the procedures to which they owe their

present felicity, but the ingenuity which has been expended on attempts to show that the parodos adheres in detail to the Eleusinian procession or to the celebration of the Lesser Mysteries<sup>8</sup> at Agrai or the Lenaia<sup>9</sup> is surely misplaced. Since moist flowery meadows are a traditional feature of the afterlife of the blessed, location of such meadows in or near Athens or Eleusis is irrelevant<sup>10</sup>. The fact that the parodos treats Iakchos as a processional god who «completes a long journey without fatigue» (402 f.) rules out the Lenaia and the Lesser Mysteries anyway<sup>11</sup>. Moreover, if the journey of Dionysus and Xanthias is to be seen as closely analogous to a journey to Agrai or the sanctuary of Dionysus ἐν Λίμναις, what corresponds on earth to the zone of monsters which they have to traverse before they reach their destination? Our attention is therefore focussed on Eleusis; but it must be recognised that the Eleusinian ingredients in the parodos are selective<sup>12</sup>. The most obvious are Iakchos in procession, ragged clothing, and the prominence of Demeter. The words τὸν ἡμέτερον τρόπον / τὸν καλλιχορώτατον / παίζοντες in 450-452 are no doubt a deliberate allusion to the well Kallichoron at Eleusis (*h. Hom. Cer.* 272). The series of short

<sup>8</sup> T.G. TUCKER, in *CR* 18 (1904), 416-418; G.T.W. HOOKER, in *JHS* 80 (1960), 112-117; M. GUARDUCCI, in *Studi in onore di Aristide Colonna* (Perugia 1982), 167-172.

<sup>9</sup> M. TIERNEY, in *Proceed. Royal Irish Acad.* 42 C 10 (Dublin 1935), 199-218.

<sup>10</sup> H. LLOYD-JONES, *Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy*, The Academic Papers, Vol. 1 (Oxford 1990), 179 n. 25.

<sup>11</sup> A. KÖRTE, in *JAW* 1911, 298; L. DEUBNER, in *Gnomon* 12 (1936), 506.

<sup>12</sup> P. HÄNDEL, *Formen und Darstellungsweisen in der aristophanischen Komödie* (Heidelberg 1963), 38-43; W. HORN, *Gebet und Gebetsparodie in den Komödien des Aristophanes* (Nürnberg 1970), 122; B. ZIMMERMANN, *Untersuchungen zur Form und dramatischen Technik der Aristophanischen Komödien I* (Königstein 1984), 124, 131 f.

stanzas 416-430, ridiculing Archedemos and others, have commonly been related to the γεφυρισμός, 'abuse at the bridge', directed against individuals in the procession<sup>13</sup>, but the passage exemplifies a comic form used some years earlier by Eupolis in *Demoi* (fr. 99 KA), a succession of five stanzas, each consisting of five iambic metra plus a bacchiac, ridiculing five different men. There is therefore no need to treat the Eleusinian γεφυρισμός (whatever it was) as the source of *Frogs* 416-430.

Two names, of the highest importance at Eleusis, are absent from the parodos: Triptolemos is certainly absent, and probably Persephone is also. In 377 ff. the chorus exhorts itself to exalt τὴν σώτειραν, who «declares that she will preserve the country for all time». The title σώτειρα was given to Persephone in a cult of the deme Korydallos (Ammonius, *Diff.* 279), in Arcadia (Paus. VIII 31, 1) and at a sanctuary in Laconia (III 13, 2), and Kore Soteira appears on the coins of Cyzicus over a long period. But Athena Soteira is coupled with Zeus Soter in Athenian documents of the early Hellenistic period (e.g. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 689, 9 f.; *SEG* XVI 63, 14 f.), and the scholia on this passage identify τὴν σώτειραν as Athena without any hint of an alternative explanation<sup>14</sup>. Arist. *Rh.* III 18, 1419 a 3 f. refers, in an anecdote, to τελετὴ τῶν τῆς σωτείρας ἱερῶν in the time of Pericles, but since the point of the anecdote is that neither Pericles nor the seer Lampon had been initiated into that τελετή, it is unlikely to have anything to do with Eleusis' and the identity of τὴν σώτειραν remains in doubt.

There is a link between the question of Eleusinian elements in the parodos and another question which may appear at first to be of quite a different kind: to what extent (if at all), and where exactly, is the chorus divided in the parodos?

<sup>13</sup> Hesych. s. *litt.* γ 469, 470 Latte.

<sup>14</sup> J.A. HALDANE, in *CQ* N.S. 14 (1964), 207-209 makes a strong case for Athena; so too F. GRAF, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Berlin 1974), 47 n. 37.

The anapaests appear to be recited by the chorus-leader, who at the end issues the command (370 f.) cited above

ὕμεῖς δ' ἀνεγείρετε μολπήν κτλ.,

— a command to which the chorus responds by singing *χώρει νυν πᾶς ἀνδρείως κτλ.* There are three further occasions of command and response:

- 1) 383 f. ἄγε νυν ...  
Δήμητρα ... κελαδεῖτε  
~ 385ab Δήμητερ ...  
... συμπαραστάτει.
- 2) 394 f. ἄγ' εἰά / νυν  
καὶ τὸν ὥραϊον θεὸν παρακαλεῖτε ...  
~ 398 f. Ἰακχε ...  
... συναχολούθει
- 3) 440 f. χωρεῖτέ νυν ...  
~ 448 χωρῶμεν ...

The closest formal parallel to this sequence of command and response is to be found in *Thesm.* 101-129, a parody of Agathon's lyrics.

Much confusion has been caused in the textual transmission of our parodos by the belief of Aristarchus (Σ<sup>RVE</sup> 354, 372) that the anapaests were sung by part of the chorus<sup>15</sup>. The words ἡμιχόριον or μέρος χοροῦ or even, once (A at 440), ἄλλος χορός

<sup>15</sup> It seems clear that Aristarchus did not consider that 354-371 can have been spoken by the chorus-leader. According to Σ<sup>RVE</sup> 372, ἐντεῦθεν Ἀριστάρχος ὑπενόησε («inferred from this passage») μὴ ὅλου τοῦ χοροῦ εἶναι τὰ πρῶτα; cf. Σ<sup>BD</sup> Pind. *N.* 1, 25a ἐντεῦθεν ἴσως πλανηθεὶς («misled, perhaps, by this fact») ὁ Τίμαιος κτλ.

occur sporadically at various points in the pre-Triclinian manuscripts<sup>16</sup>, but no one manuscript offers anything like a consistent or plausible scheme of division. Anonymous scholars reported by the scholia disagreed with Aristarchus, one of them observing dismissively that the chorus *may* be divided in some portions of the parodos after the anapaests, but that a chorus often exhorts itself. So indeed it does<sup>17</sup>, using the second person singular or plural; but where we have a precise response to a command, with an echo of the words of the command, it would be perverse to deny a division between chorus-leader and chorus, for the closest analogy in everything except metrical form is to be found when the command is unquestionably spoken by a character in the play and the response is sung by the chorus. 874 is such a case: Dionysus tells the chorus to sing an invocation to the Muses while preparations are made for the formal contest, and they do then sing to the Muses. Compare also *Peace* 580 f., where Trygaeus says

ἀντὶ τούτων τήνδε νυνὶ / τὴν θεὸν προσείπατε,

and the chorus responds with

χαῖρε χαῖρ' · ὥς ἀσμένοισιν ἦλθες ἡμῖν, Φιλτάτη,

*Thesm.* 351 f., the command to utter a prayer for good fortune and the responding song

ξυνευχόμεσθα τέλεα μὲν  
πόλει, τέλεα δὲ δῆμῳ κτλ.,

and *Soph. Tr.* 202-205, where Deianira tells the chorus

<sup>16</sup> On the general question of half-choruses in textual transmission, cf. T. RENNER, in *ZPE* 41 (1981), 6 f.

<sup>17</sup> M. KAIMIO, *The Chorus of Greek Drama within the Light of the Person and Number Used* (Helsinki 1970), 121-143.

φωνήσατ', ὦ γυναῖκες, αἵ τ' εἴσω στέγης  
αἵ τ' ἐκτὸς αὐλῆς ...

and the chorus complies with the song beginning ἀνολολυξάτω δόμος.

*Frogs*, however, presents us with a unique problem at 440-445. The chorus is told χωρεῖτε ... ἐορτῆς, and then come the words

ἐγὼ δὲ σὺν ταῖσιν κόραις εἶμι καὶ γυναιξίν,  
οὗ παννυχίζουσιν θεᾶ, φέγγος ἱερὸν οἴσων.

Van Leeuwen believed that the chorus in the parodos is of abnormally large size, and that the chorus-leader now departs with that part of the chorus which represents females, never to return, leaving for the rest of the play a chorus of normal size, representing male initiates, and without a chorus-leader. Radermacher modified this notion by identifying the singer of 440-445 & 445 f. as the Eleusinian δαδοῦχος (he does after all say that he is going with the women φέγγος ἱερὸν οἴσων).

There are two features of the textual transmission which have been thought to lend support to either of these hypotheses. First, in A Vsl the words ἐγὼ δέ ... οἴσων are given to a 'priest' (ἱερεύς). Secondly, at 905 f. the first κατακελευσμός at the beginning of the formal contest is unanimously given by the manuscripts not, as we would expect, to the chorus, but to Dionysus. Van Leeuwen took that as confirmation that after the parodos there was no chorus-leader; and when we come to the second κατακελευσμός (1004 f.), which all mss. give to the chorus, van Leeuwen felt constrained to 'restore' it to Dionysus.

But the significance of these features of the textual transmission is very limited. 445 is not the first occurrence of ἱερεύς in the manuscript text of the parodos, for at 383 (ἄγε νυν ἑτέραν χτλ.) R A M Npl all have 'half-chorus or priest'. The origin of that idea is to be sought, I believe, in the appeal of

Dionysus at 298 to the priest of his own cult, sitting in the front row:

ἱερεῦ, διαφύλαξόν μ' ἵν' ὦ σοι συμπότης,

for although the correct interpretation of this appeal was understood by ancient scholars, there were alternative explanations, including one ( $\Sigma^{\text{VE}}$ ) to the effect that the priest of the initiates was already on stage. As for the *κατακελευσμός*, the attribution of a *κατακελευσμός* immediately after a choral song regularly caused difficulty for readers of the plays in antiquity, for at the second *κατακελευσμός* of *Frogs* (1004) we find in V E K Npl Vsl the marginal note ἔτι ὁ χορός, just as we do in the Medicean at A. *Pers.* 155, where after the choral songs the chorus-leader addresses Atossa in trochaic tetrameters, ὦ βαθυζώνων ἄνασσα κτλ. One does not trouble to write 'it is still the chorus' unless there is a danger that someone may think it is not. Similarly in Ar. *Nub.* 476, where the chorus exhorts Socrates to begin his teaching of Strepsiades,  $\Sigma^{\text{VE}}$  467 finds it necessary to remind us that

εἴωθε γὰρ μετὰ τὸ ἄσαι ἐπάγειν δίστιχα<sup>18</sup>.

Nevertheless, we have to deal with the plain words «I will go with the women and girls». What does that imply in theatrical terms?

There is no clear and unambiguous indication anywhere in the *parodos* that we are hearing a chorus divided into two half-choruses (male and female) or a normal chorus reinforced by a supplementary chorus. The nearest we come to such an indication *prima facie* is in 416 f.,

<sup>18</sup> The observation is made in order to reject the view that the interlocutor of Strepsiades in the lyric dialogue 457-475 must be Socrates.

βούλεσθε δῆτα κοινῇ  
 σκώψωμεν Ἀρχέδημον ...

In *Lys.* 1042 the hostile exchanges between the half-choruses of old men and old women end in reconciliation, and the old men say:

ἀλλὰ κοινῇ συσταλέντες τοῦ μέλους ἀρξώμεθα,

— after which the two half-choruses sing in unison. The analogy of that passage seems cogent; and yet it is peculiarly difficult to assign any stanzas of the parodos to one sex rather than the other. The joke in 409-413 about the glimpse of a girl's breast suits men, but that is the third of three responding stanzas, and there is nothing in either of the other two to associate them with women. In four out of the seven lyric stanzas between 371 and 414 masculine participles occur, referring to the singers, and feminine participles do not occur anywhere — a striking contrast to the chorus of women in *Thesmophoriazusae* and the half-chorus of old women in *Lysistrata*. We must therefore consider the alternative explanation of κοινῇ, namely that the words are addressed to Dionysus and Xanthias. They, after all, have just interposed their own comments, expressing a wish to dance with the girl whose breast is exposed. Δῆτα is a consequential particle; it does not introduce a new topic, but reacts to the previous speaker's words, as in *Av.* 1025 f. βούλει δῆτα ... / μὴ πράγματ' ἔχειν and 1689 βούλεσθε δῆτ' ἐγώ ... / ὁπτῶ (cf. *Eq.* 439 τί δῆτα; βούλει ... σιωπᾶν; Plato, *Phlb.* 62 c, *Plt.* 272 b, *Sph.* 218 d). If βούλεσθε δῆτα responds to what Dionysus and Xanthias have said, it makes very good sense; but if their words are ignored by the chorus, it does not; and so the word κοινῇ ceases to be evidence for a division of the chorus<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> J.M. STAHL, in *RhM* 64 (1909), 46 takes κοινῇ to mean 'openly', 'publicly'; but on Dem. Or. XXI (*Adv. Mid.*) 148, a passage which he cites in evidence, see D.M. MACDOWELL's commentary *ad loc.*

That does not in itself contribute to solving the problem posed by «But I will go with the women and girls». There is, however, one other elementary consideration which does. If the chorus-leader says «Go to the flowery grove ... but I will go with the women...», and the chorus responds «Let us go...», we might expect, if we took the words literally, that the orchestra will be emptied altogether. Obviously, that does not happen; but if the men, told to go, stay where they are, the women equally can stay where they are after the chorus-leader has declared that he will go with them. «I will go with the women» is a sexy joke, because a female all-night festival provides opportunities for the male prowler<sup>20</sup>, as Menander's Pamphile discovered.

Theatrically, there is no problem, for the departure of two halves of the chorus in different directions can be symbolized by their movements within the orchestra. But before we allow that picture to lodge in our minds, I wish to call in question the assumption that there is *any* division of the chorus into half-choruses in the parodos, and indeed the assumption that *any* of the choreutai are dressed as women. Herakles told Dionysus (156-157) that he would encounter *θιάσους ... ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν*. He could hardly describe them otherwise, since women as well as men were eligible for initiation; but does it necessarily follow that the chorus we see represents both sexes? The women whose all-night festival the chorus-leader says he will join can be just as imaginary as the girl with the torn dress, offstage in time and place. If that hypothesis is tenable, it means that efforts to discern divisions<sup>21</sup> in the parodos have been mis-spent<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. L. RADERMACHER's commentary, p. 207.

<sup>21</sup> E.g. A. COUAT, in *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris 1895), 39-66.

<sup>22</sup> An anonymous (post-Aristarchan) ancient scholar clearly thought so: Σ<sup>VE</sup> 354, Σ<sup>RVE</sup> 372, Σ<sup>V</sup> 440.

There is a reason why the departure of the chorus from the scene should be explicitly designated (and symbolized in movement) at the end of the parodos: from this point on, the chorus ceases to have the specific character of initiates and functions in a way which is the lowest common denominator of all comic choruses. If *Frogs* were a mutilated play, existing only in a text which began at line 460, it would be peculiarly difficult for us to decide what category of beings the chorus portrayed. There is nothing in the parabasis, the agon, the exodos, or their comments on the activities of the characters, to identify them as initiates. Granted, they invoke the Muse at the beginning of the parabasis (674) with the words χορῶν ἱερῶν ἐπίβηθι, and in the epirrhema they refer to themselves as τὸν ἱερὸν χορόν. It so happens that there is no extant passage outside *Frogs* in which a comic chorus refers to itself as ἱερός, but any chorus performing at a festival is ἱερός in so far as a festival is an offering to a deity. In *Av.* 1718-1719 the chorus is told, in preparation for Peisetairos's wedding,

ἀλλὰ χρὴ θεᾶς  
Μούσης ἀνοίγειν ἱερὸν εὐφημεῖν στόμα,

and earlier in the same play the chorus says of its own bird-song (745) Πανὶ νόμους ἱεροὺς ἀναφαίνω, while the nightingale is exhorted (210) λῦσον δὲ νόμους ἱερῶν ὕμνων. It seems to me therefore unlikely that χορῶν ἱερῶν and ἱερός χορός in the parabasis of *Frogs* are a conscious reminder of the chorus's role as initiates, and more likely that the word serves to reinforce the seriousness of the message which the parabasis is designed to convey<sup>23</sup>.

So the end of the parodos is the valediction of the chorus in its role as initiates. We have seen the extent to which other parts

<sup>23</sup> Cf. n. 4.

of the parodos have closely interwoven ingredients which belong to the role which the chorus is performing and ingredients which belong to the function of a chorus in comedy; and I believe that the valediction also exhibits in its closing words the same combination. The chorus declares that daylight in the afterlife is enjoyed only by those who have been initiated and have lived piously<sup>24</sup>. Piety is defined as (456-459):

εὖ-  
σεβῇ τε διήγομεν  
τρόμον περὶ τοὺς ξένους  
καὶ τοὺς ἰδιώτας.

Ἰδιῶται are individuals as opposed to the state (e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 776; Thuc. III 82, 2; IV 61, 2, both contrasting ἰδιῶται with πόλις), or people not holding office (e.g. Thuc. III 70, 6, contrasting βουλευταί), or not of great influence (Ar. *Pax* 751, v. *infra*), or lacking professional skills (e.g. Thuc. II 48, 3, ctr. doctors, and VI 72, 3, ctr. χειροτέχναι)<sup>25</sup>. Anyone therefore could be simultaneously ἰδιώτης and ξένος, and many people would be neither, whereas what we expect in the chorus's words is an exhaustive division, foreigners and co-nationals. That contrast is normally expressed by ξένοι / πολῖται, e.g. Xen. *Hier.* 5, 3, *Mem.* IV 4, 17 (cf. *Smp.* 8, 7); Pl. *Meno* 91 a, *Euthd.* 282 b, *Grg.* 473 d. Aelius Dionysius i 3 (Erbse) asserts incorrectly that Thucydides

<sup>24</sup> It is striking that two conditions are laid down: initiation, and also a pious life. This would seem to exclude from paradise villainous initiates (thereby meeting the objections of Diogenes the Cynic [Plut. *Quomodo adul.* 4, 21 E-F] and Julian *Or.* VII [*Adv. Heracl.*] 25) and virtuous people who had not been initiated (thereby not meeting the standard objections). I do not think that Aristophanes failed to notice what he was saying.

<sup>25</sup> W.B. STANFORD in his commentary *ad loc.* seems to confuse ἰδιώτης and ἀπράγμων.

uses ἰδιῶται in the sense πολῖται, and accordingly Σ<sup>RVE</sup> explains τοὺς ἰδιώτας in our passage as τοὺς ἰδίους, τοὺς πολίτας. But ἴδιος means 'own', 'private', 'personal', as opposed to 'public'; it is contrasted by Thucydides with δημόσιος (e.g. I 80, 3) or with κοινός (e.g. III 14), and οἱ ἴδιοι never means 'one's co-nationals'<sup>26</sup>. Aristophanes appears to be suggesting, in the final words of the parodos, that godfearing behaviour towards foreign visitors (or hosts) and ordinary, humble people is what matters, whereas in dealing with generals, sophists, poets, politicians and the like no holds are barred. That is the principle which he claims as his own in the parabasis of *Peace* (751 f.):

οὐκ ἰδιώτας ἀνθρωπίσκους κωμῳδῶν οὐδὲ γυναικας,  
ἀλλ' Ἡρακλέους ὀργήν τιν' ἔχων τοῖσι μεγίστοις ἐπεχείρει.

And if that is his point, it is a humorous and elliptical way of making the point which Pl. *Lg.* VI 777 d makes in more serious terms: that the righteousness of the truly righteous man is manifested only in the way he behaves towards those over whom he has power, the power which would enable him to do wrong with impunity.

<sup>26</sup> In 890 f. ἰδιώτης appears at first sight to be synonymous with ἴδιος, for Euripides' gods are ἴδιοί τινές σου (sc. θεοί) and then τοῖσιν ἰδιώταις θεοῖς; but there is a humorous point in treating such gods as ἰδιῶται vis-à-vis the 'official' gods of Olympus.

## DISCUSSION

*M. Handley:* Your extremely interesting discussion of the special role of the chorus of initiates prompts me to wonder if there are ways in which the parodos of *Plutus* is a parallel. There, in the parody of Philoxenos, it is Carion in his dialogue with the chorus who assumes the role of leader, and issues a command to them similar to those in the *Frogs*, especially 384 f. ἄγε νῦν ἐτέραν ὕμνων ἰδέαν, κτλ. The words I have in mind are, *Plut.* 316 ff.: ἀλλ' εἴα νῦν τῶν σκωμμάτων ἀπαλλαγέντες ἤδη / ὑμεῖς ἐπ' ἄλλ' εἶδος τρέπεσθ', / ἐγὼ δέ ... The Chorus abandons the special role it had assumed for the parodos, and from then onwards we have χοροῦ, as in regular in later fourth century plays, to indicate its performances in its conventional, not in its special function. Do you suppose that in *Frogs* the chorus left the orchestra to dispose of its torches and any other special equipment, or handed them to attendants or whatever?

*M. Dover:* There are many ways of indicating departure simply by movements of the chorus within the orchestra. We don't need to take some of them off and bring them on again.

I think they have torches when they enter, and they need torches for escorting Aeschylus at the end of the play, but we don't want them to hold torches all through the agon. When one wants to get rid of a property in a Greek comedy, someone must come to take it away, and slaves can do that after 459. Then torches can be supplied again by slaves before 1500.

*M. Bremer:* If you think Aristophanes would *not* have left the chorus of initiates singing off-stage at all, how about the entry of the chorus in *Nubes*? One must take it that it did sing 275-290 ad 299-313 off-stage and appeared in the *eisodos* only at 326.

*M. Dover:* I recognise the cogency of arguments for the invisibility of the frog's chorus, but if one chorus is invisible and the other dressed in ragged clothing, that is a rather poor offering for a dramatic festival. The purpose of συγχρηγία is to keep the standard up; it is not needed if a lower standard is accepted. And I attach some importance to Professor MacDowell's argument that an off-stage chorus is not audible enough. I have no experience of producing opera, but people who have such experience tell me that an off-stage chorus is 'normally a disaster'.

*Clouds* was in fact a disaster, and the off-stage chorus may have contributed to that. In any case, it is possible to produce the scene in such a way that we have the chorus in view even though *Strepsiades* does not. It all depends where we situate *Strepsiades* and *Socrates* in the orchestra.

*M. Zimmermann:* Ein weiterer Fall für ein hinterszenisches Lied ist die Arie des Wiedehopfes in *Av.* 227 ff.

*M. Dover:* The hoopoe in *Birds* does not have to be behind the skene. We can have a 'bush' forward of the skene. And the words of a solo singer can be heard more clearly than those of a chorus.

*M. Handley:* We might remind ourselves that nearly twenty years before, in *Knights*, Aristophanes recalled a play of *Magnes* by the striking visual feature of its chorus in clothes dyed frog-green (*Eq.* 523: cp. *PCG* V p. 627 f.): it would be like him — one can claim no more — to have returned to that memory.

*M. Gelzer:* Es gibt drei Aufforderungen zur Bewegung, die man miteinander in Beziehung setzen kann, um Anhaltspunkte für die damit Gemeinten und die Richtung ihrer Bewegung zu gewinnen: *Ran.* 369 f. fordert der Chorführer die vorher genannten 'Frevler' auf, den Tänzen der Mysteren aus dem Wege zu gehen (vgl. schon 354). Dann wird jedermann (im masc.) aufgefordert voranzugehen und zu schreiten (372 ff., 377 ff.) und schliesslich folgt eine Aufforderung χωρεῖτε (444 ff.), aufgenommen durch die Angeordneten χωρῶμεν (448 ff. auch masc.), aufzubrechen. Die erste (369 f.) richtet

sich wohl nicht an in der Orchestra sichtbare Personen, aber die beiden folgenden. Die Frage wäre, wie sie zueinander in Beziehung stehen. Natürlich kann der Chor nicht nur zu Anapästen einmarschieren, und nicht alle Anapäste sind Marschanapäste.

*M.Dover:* I know that change of metre can be marked by a paragraphos in papyri of late Hellenistic and Roman date, but I wonder how early that use of the paragraphos is attested; is it earlier than Aristarchus?

*M.Handley:* With the help of E.G. Turner's *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (London 1987) we can consider a very early example of the metrical use of a paragraphos to mark the end of strophe and antistrophe in the Lille Stesichorus, *PLille* inv. 76a + 73, which Turner (under No. 74) would date as early as 270-230 B.C., while others prefer a later date.

*M.Gelzer:* Nur wenige Zeichen können wohl auf die Manuskripte der Dichter selber zurückgeführt werden, vermutlich die Paragraphoi (nicht die Angaben der Namen) beim Personenwechsel. Das System der Zeichen zur Angabe des Wechsels der Metren (bei Wiederholung von Strophen, beim Übergang zu anderen Metren etc.) ist wohl erst von Aristophanes von Byzanz eingeführt und dann von anderen verfeinert und verändert worden. Es ist bekanntlich manchmal schwierig von den antiken Zeichen diejenigen zu scheiden, die erst die Byzantiner eingesetzt haben, und die Überlieferung gibt doch wohl kaum Zeugnisse für das von Aristophanes selber Gemeinte wieder.

*M.Bremer:* Is it too speculative to suppose that the chorus entered the *eisodos* from 323 onwards and remained there, until the coryphaeus came forward centre stage to recite the anapaests? The text of 354-371 seems aimed at removing non-initiates, and all kinds of rogues, precisely to make open space for the chorus to dance in (ἐξίστασθαι τοῖς ἡμετέροισι χοροῖσιν). Then they dance into the orchestra 372-460 (at the end some extra-members going off with the torches).

*M.Handley*: Lines 315 and 321 f. remind me of the «Let's stand aside» formulae at *Thesmophoriazusae* 36 and elsewhere which I mentioned in my paper (p. 114 n. 22); they excite immediate anticipation of the arrival of the chorus, but are, of course, not a precise indication of the way in which Aristophanes imagined the chorus to be entering.

*M.Gelzer*: Könnten etwa die Versmasse darüber Aufschluss geben, zu welchen Abschnitten man sich eine Bewegung des Chors, zu welchen einen Gesang oder — wenn er schon sichtbar war — einen Gesang mit Tanz des Chors vorstellen soll? Die respondierenden Strophen *Ran.* 323-336 = 340-353 sehen eher nach 'statischen' Sing-, oder Sing- und Tanzversen aus und die Anapäste könnten als Marschrhythmus interpretiert werden (zum Einzug?).

*M.Dover*: The rhythm of 372 ff. is certainly 'marching anapaests'.

*M.Gelzer*: Εὐφημεῖν χρή καέλίστασθαι τοῖς ἡμετέροισι χοροῖσιν (*Ran.* 354, vgl. 369 f.) ist keine Aufforderung an den Chor zu marschieren; aber die kultisch Unreinen sollen Platz machen, damit der Chor mit seinen heiligen Tänzen anfangen kann (372 ff., 449 ff.). Könnte das bedeuten, dass er mit der Anapästen (354 ff.) einzieht, um dann in der Orchestra diese Tänze auszuführen?

*M.Dover*: Yes, I see your point — that until 354 the chorus is 'over there', and is only 'here' at 354.

*M.Zimmermann*: Ich könnte mir durchaus vorstellen, dass grosse Teile des Eröffnungslieds vom Chor noch unsichtbar gesungen werden (vgl. 338 προσέπνευσε χοιρείων κρεῶν mit 314 αὔρα τις εἰσέπνευσε μυστικωτάτῃ, d.h. beide Male wird nur eine Ahnung vermittelt, aber noch nichts gesehen). In 351-353 (προβάδην ἔξαγ' ἐπ' ἀνθηρὸν ... δάπεδον) müsste der Chor jedoch bereits in die Orchestra gehen; auch haben die Anapäste 354 ff. nicht die Funktion der Einzugsanapäste, sondern die der Parabasanapäste.

*M. Dover:* I agree that 354-371 must seem to the audience the kind of thing that belongs to a parabasis rather than something which belongs to a parodos.

*M. Gelzer:* Die Anapäste 354-371 sind sicher nicht in dem Sinn als 'Marschanapäste' zu verstehen, dass darin der Chor zum Einmarschieren aufgefordert wird. Der Inhalt steht — wie gesagt — für die in den *Fröschen* vor der Parabase (674-737) nicht vorhandene Parabasenrede in Anapästen. Aber, dass der Chor ohne selber etwas zu singen und zu sagen hereinkommt, während andere (dort Schauspieler) sprechen, das ist zum Beispiel in den *Vögeln* der Fall, wo Peishetairos und Euelpides vier Vögel von irgendwo oben herunterkommen sehen und beschreiben (267-293), während der Chor von ihnen unbemerkt durch die Parodos hereinkommt und plötzlich von ihnen bemerkt wird (294 ff.). Unsichtbaren Gesang (und Musik von unsichtbaren Instrumenten) gibt es ja in den *Vögeln* schon bei der Vorbereitung der Parodos: das Wecklied (209-222) und die Arie (227-262) des Wiedehopfs, der vorher in die *λόχμη* hineingegangen ist (206-208) und die Musik, die die beiden von draussen hören (223-226); in den *Wolken* vgl. 264 ff. *εὐφημεῖν* *χρή*; 274 ff., 298 ff. unsichtbarer Gesang, 323 ff. Einzug des Chors zu Anapästen.

*M. Dover:* We are becoming involved in speculation about cause and consequence in the poet's mind. Does he put 354-371 where it is because he wants an 'entrance march' there, or does he make the chorus enter, marching, at that point because he wants 'parabatic' anapaests there?

*M. Gelzer:* Das *κοινῇ* in *βούλεσθε δῆτα κοινῇ σκώψωμεν* (420 f.) richtet sich doch wohl an Xanthias und Dionysos, die eben sagten (408-409), sie wollten sich am *παίζειν* des Chors beteiligen. Dann folgen weitere sieben, im ganzen sind es also acht Ströphchen (420-443), von denen die letzten (435-443) wieder von Dionysos, dem Chor und Xanthias gesungen werden. Sind das rituelle Strophen, die als solche auch bei Eupolis vorkommen?

*M. Handley:* We know that from time to time Aristophanes and Eupolis exchanged comments on the borrowing (or stealing) of material from each

other. The fragments of *Taxiarchoi* first published as *POxy.* XXXV 2740 in 1968 give cause to suppose that the rowing scene in *Frogs* (180-270) may owe something to Eupolis (see fr. 268 KA [*PCG* V p. 453] for the text and relevant references); and it seems not unreasonable to suppose that the Phormio who appeared as a character from that play was resurrected from the dead for that purpose. Parallels with Eupolis, *Demoi*, which is assigned to 412 B.C., would certainly be acceptable.

*M. Dover:* Yes, ghosts are indeed called up from the underworld in the *Demoi* of Eupolis, but is there anything in fr. 99 (*PCG* V pp. 344 ff.) to suggest any association with initiation or Eleusis? There is certainly a reminiscence of Eupolis (*inc. fab.* fr. 357, 7 K/392, 7 KA) in *Ran.* 734 ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν ὠνόητοι μεταβαλόντες τοὺς τρόπους κτλ.

*M. Handley:* In welcoming the analysis of παίζειν and related words in the earlier part of the paper, I should like to offer two extra passages. Menander, *Epitrepontes* 302/478, in a context to which you have referred, has συμπαίζειν of joining in the festival of the Tauropolia (I would myself take it that συνέπαιζον is Habrotonon speaking of herself, but see F.H. Sandbach *ad loc.*); by contrast, a 'secular' use of the word is in Asclepiades, Nr. IV Gow-Page, = *Anthol. Pal.* V 158, where the poet recalls a time he spent with a hetaira.

*M. Gelzer:* Wie ist der Anruf an die Muse χορῶν ἱερῶν ἐπίβηθι (674, vor 686 τὸν ἱερὸν χορόν) ganz unabhängig und ohne Rückverweis auf die ἱερὰ χορεία (335 f.) und die ὄργια Μουσῶν (356) und ähnliches in der Parodos zu verstehen?

*M. Dover:* Well, I ask myself: if *Frogs* existed only from line 460 onwards, would we see any significance in χορῶν ἱερῶν and τὸν ἱερὸν χορόν?

*M. Bremer:* M. Silk (in *YCS* 26 [1980]) observed that the parodos of the Initiates, much praised by Eduard Fraenkel, among others, is in fact a rather shallow and repetitive piece of poetry; he finds more authentic and original lyrical power in what the frogs sing, esp. 241-249. Would you agree?

*M. Dover:* Personally, I found Silk's criticism of Aristophanes' lyrics salutary, because I had for so long accepted without question Fraenkel's high estimation of the 'serious' lyrics. I don't agree with Silk at all points; for example, I admire the phrase ἄγριον μοχλευτήν in *Nub.* 568. Apart from the obsessive use of παίζειν in the parodos, I don't like the rather flat repetition δεινὸν ... χόλον ... μανίας ὑπὸ δεινῆς in 814-816 and the recurrence of ῥήματα in 821, 824, 828.

*Mme Loraux:* Je glisse ici juste un mot. Ne pensez-vous pas toutefois que lorsque nous, modernes, nous considérons les répétitions comme une faiblesse stylistique, nous raisonnons plus avec nos propres catégories qu'avec les catégories qui pouvaient être celles des Grecs? Il n'est pas sûr que les Athéniens du V<sup>e</sup> siècle, élevés comme ils l'ont encore été sur fond de tradition orale, aient éprouvé la même aversion que nous pour le phénomène de la répétition.

*M. Dover:* True, the excessive use of *variatio* is a peculiarity of some authors, notably Thucydides, where it is sometimes pursued at the expense of clarity, not of Greek authors in general. There is a very good collection of examples of repeated words in dialogue in John Jackson's *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford 1955).

*M. Gelzer:* Die Repetition und die Vermeidung der Repetition und ihre ästhetische Würdigung sind sicher wechselnden Anschauungen unterworfen. Das gilt nicht für die Wiederholung von Wörtern oder Phrasen in der Rede, sondern auch in anderen Medien wie besonders etwa in der Musik. Wiederholung und Wiederholungsfiguren sind etwa in der barocken Musik in verschiedenen Formen häufig und werden als solche keineswegs abgelehnt. Die Ablehnung der einfachen Wiederholung ist dann in der Klassik schon ausgeprägter und kommt zu einem Höhepunkt in der Romantik. Selbst ein romantischer Klassizist wie Mendelssohn vermeidet es, z.B. in einem Trio, das Thema mehrmals gleich einzuführen, oder in der Reprise einfach zu wiederholen. Repetition gilt nun als banal, Variation ist gefordert. Wenn wir *variatio* als Stilprinzip auch im Altertum erwarten, so folgen wir ebenfalls

einer nicht zu allen Zeiten gültigen Forderung. In der rhetorischen Theorie des Klassizismus, etwa bei Quintilian, ist sie beschrieben, bei einigen seiner Zeitgenossen wie Tacitus und Seneca sehr stark herausgearbeitet, aber offensichtlich für frühere Stilepochen nicht verbindlich.

*M. Dover:* Repetition of musical phrases is a different kind of thing from repetition of words. After all, we hear a musical phrase as a sequence of sounds for its own sake, but when words are repeated concepts and images are necessarily repeated also.

