

## NEW LANGUAGE FOR A NEW COMEDY: A LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO ARISTOPHANES' *PLUTUS*

### 1. Introduction

Aristophanes' *Plutus* is often regarded as a dull play. According to two of the leading specialists on Aristophanes in Great Britain, the comedy displays 'a certain amount of disjointedness in its moral and religious themes, and a certain lack of energy in its humour',<sup>1</sup> and the modern reader feels a 'decline in freshness, in verbal agility, in sparkle of wit, in theatrical inventiveness'.<sup>2</sup> Others regret alleged or real inconsistencies,<sup>3</sup> the lack of punning and verbal play,<sup>4</sup> the absence of nearly all choral interludes, a parabasis, and political advice in general,<sup>5</sup> and the dearth of references to historical figures.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the temptation is strong to follow those who read a medical history into *Plutus*: Aristophanes, by now sixty-five years old, had grown tired and saved his *esprit* for every third or fourth play.<sup>7</sup> But such speculations do not do justice to a poet who did not have to write for a living. Before accepting them, we should first try to explain the change in other ways, admitting that *Plutus* may differ from the earlier plays for generic reasons. On this path, the linguistic analysis of *Plutus* will turn out to be helpful.

<sup>1</sup> MacDowell (1995) 349.

<sup>2</sup> Sommerstein (1984) 314; cf. Sommerstein (2001) 25.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. e.g. the assumption that Plutus used to visit *only* the wicked because he was blind. Despite what is often maintained (e.g. Dover (1972) 204, Konstan (1995) 85 and 89, and Lévy (1997) 208–11), the ideas that wealth is distributed equally and that only the good will become wealthy are not contradictory: as soon as only the good become rich, everyone – including the impoverished sycophant (*Plut.* 850–3 and 856–9) – will learn their lesson and become good (*Plut.* 489–97; cf. *Plut.* 146: ἀπαντα τῷ πλουτεῖν γὰρ ἐσθ' ὑπήκοα).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Newiger (1957) 162 on the loss of comic imagery.

<sup>5</sup> This holds true even if one adopts the 'ironic' reading favoured by German scholarship, according to which Aristophanes would want to show that the new order cannot work (see Süß (1954) 311–13, Newiger (1957) 173–8, Hertel (1969) 27–8, Gelzer (1970) 1508–9, Flashar (1975) 411–30; cf. also Heberlein (1980) and (1981) and in English scholarship Bowie (1993) 284–91). Note, however, that the new order *can* work if we accept the comic illusion and operate with a definition of χρηστότης which includes the requirement of an adequate personal contribution to national economy. Also, 'if Aristophanes had wanted his audience to think that Poverty was right, he would have had to show Khremylos' plan failing in the end' (MacDowell (1995) 346).

<sup>6</sup> Or to historical events and the current war (the most prominent exceptions being *Plut.* 665–6 and 716–25; cf. further *Plut.* 170–80, 550); for a discussion see Dillon (1987) 166–73.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. MacDowell (1995) 327 and Sommerstein (2001) 25. The fact that Aristophanes wrote much less in the second half of his career (Sommerstein (1984) 314) shows that he did not feel *obliged* to produce new plays every year. Holzinger (1940) 309 detects the signs of a decline in certain phrasal repetitions (*Plut.* 968/1113/1173, 138/1115, but not 1060/1066 and 862/957 which he regards as motivated).

My present aim is to show that *Plutus* becomes, contrary to the opinions just cited, a most fascinating play once it is read from a linguistic perspective.

In order to make such a point, a certain amount of linguistic detail, including statistics, is necessary. However, it is hoped that not only 'pure' linguists will find something useful in the following observations. They are meant to support a much more general thesis: that the formal analysis of an ancient drama can open up new perspectives on cultural, social, and literary phenomena.

A grand claim like this must of course be substantiated. Hence, I will have to deal with a series of very concrete issues. First and foremost, the linguistic relationship between Aristophanes' *Plutus* and his earlier comedies must be assessed: are they similar or are they different, *is* there a new language for a new comedy? And *if* *Plutus* is different, does this difference go beyond what one could reasonably expect from Aristophanes' latest surviving comedy, of 388 BC, staged nearly forty years after his first play? Second, since I will in fact argue that the language of *Plutus* contains various 'new' features,<sup>8</sup> I will also have to ask how each of them is best accounted for, either on the literary level or from a sociocultural and linguistic point of view. And third, an attempt will be made to shed some light on the most fundamental mystery: *why* is *Plutus* different?

The basis needed to deal successfully with this agenda is a careful linguistic reading of *Plutus*. The major part of this paper therefore consists of a catalogue of linguistic phenomena. It may seem a desperate enterprise to fight against the stigma of a dull comedy by presenting a list whose dullness must be, if anything, worse than that of the raw material it contains. On the other hand, such an approach promises greater structural clarity than could be achieved by other arrangements. For reasons of space, I will have to content myself with few and brief quotations from *Plutus* itself, but the references (mostly banished to some bulky footnotes) should be exhaustive and make the parallel consultation of the Aristophanic text easy.<sup>9</sup>

## 2. *The language of Plutus: a review*

The most systematic way of discussing what one may call the irregular or 'un-Aristophanic' elements in the language of *Plutus* is a review arranged by categories such as 'phonology', 'pragmatics', 'lexicon', etc. We will start with the areas of phonology and word formation because they are quickest to deal with.

<sup>8</sup> A first brief and unsystematic list of linguistic peculiarities in *Plutus* was compiled by van Leeuwen (1904) xix–xx. Unlike van Leeuwen, I will consider not only what is *exclusive* to *Plutus* (or *Plutus* and *Ecclesiazusae*) but also what is uncommonly frequent (or rare) in *Plutus* as compared with Aristophanes' other comedies.

<sup>9</sup> The translations from Aristophanes are taken from, or based upon, Sommerstein's Warminster editions (esp. Sommerstein (2001) for *Plutus*).

## 2.1. Phonology

Phonological changes take some time to become established since phonetic modifications do not affect the phonological system of a language from one day to the next. Moreover, wherever there is a standardised orthography of some sort, texts written according to the rules do not usually represent spoken reality faithfully. Greek iotacism is a case in point: in Attica its beginnings can be traced back to the fifth century BC,<sup>10</sup> but it is not acknowledged in Greek orthography even today. If Aristophanes' actors by the time of *Plutus* should have pronounced a word like ἔχειν with a more closed second vowel than at the time of *Acharnians*, Aristophanes would still have written εχεν or εχειν rather than εχιν.

Nevertheless, there may be one phonological 'lateness signal' in our text. *Plut.* 166 contains the verbal form γναφεύει ([Χρ.] ὁ δὲ γναφεύει γ' – [Κα.] ὁ δὲ γε πλύνει κῶδια '[Chr.] Another is a fuller – [Ca.] And another washes fleeces'). This is the standard orthography in later Greek,<sup>11</sup> whereas the literary<sup>12</sup> and epigraphic<sup>13</sup> evidence for classical Attic points to κναφεύς, κναφεύω, with κ (in Aristophanes cf. *Eccl.* 415). Surprisingly, the variant spelling with γ also occurs in *Wasps*, staged in 422 BC (*Vesp.* 1128).

Now one might object that the manuscript tradition counts for nothing in such a case. That is true for the line in *Wasps*,<sup>14</sup> but not for that in *Plutus*. Whereas γν is a 'heavy cluster' of stop + liquid, where the usual *muta-cum-liquida* rule that a preceding short-vowel syllable remains short does not hold, the cluster κν is light.<sup>15</sup> A short-vowel syllable before κν therefore counts as a short, but a short-vowel syllable before γν counts as long. The situation in *Wasps* is ambiguous: a long vowel precedes the cluster and κν could be written or pronounced without difficulty.<sup>16</sup> In *Plutus*, on the other hand, the preceding word is δέ, placed *in arsi*.<sup>17</sup> Thus, the reading γναφεύει is correct and the phonological change is guaranteed.<sup>18</sup> Since the change did not affect all the words with κν anlaut, this may be evidence for a popular or 'low' pronunciation of a word designating a popular or 'low' profession.<sup>19</sup> Possibly foreign influence also played a

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Duhoux (1987) and Teodorsson (1987).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Mayser-Schmoll (1970) 155 and Gignac (1976) 77–8 for the Ptolemaic and Roman papyri respectively.

<sup>12</sup> As implied by the scholiast on *Plut.* 166 who argues that κν- exceptionally forms position here: cf. below.

<sup>13</sup> The change to γν- is first attested in 401/400 BC, but the evidence is limited to five attestations of κναφεύς/γναφεύς/γναφεύων: Thraette (1980) 560–1.

<sup>14</sup> Even so MacDowell (1971) 102 and 278 prints γν-.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Cratinus fr. 303; Allen (1987) 106–11, referring to Schade (1908). In Aristophanes there is no conclusive evidence: Holzinger (1940) 43.

<sup>16</sup> Compare *Eccl.* 415 where οί precedes κναφῆς. The only other relevant word in Aristophanes is Ar. fr. 18 κνέφαλλον at the beginning of a line; κνάω, κνήμη, etc. remain unchanged everywhere.

<sup>17</sup> Holzinger (1940) 43 reads κν- and inserts καί before κναφεύει, but this spoils the parallelism of the line-beginnings in *Plut.* 164–8 (all starting with simple ὁ δέ).

<sup>18</sup> Even if the orthography conceals no more than a change from a fortis stop to a lenis stop (Thraette (1980) 560), some kind of change has obviously taken place.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Chantraine (1968–80) 547, s.v. κνάπτω.

role,<sup>20</sup> all the more since we will come across such influence elsewhere, for instance as we turn to word formation (§ 2.2).

## 2.2. Word formation

In the area of word formation, there are no sudden changes either. As time passes, some formational patterns gain in prominence and others lose their productivity. Sometimes such a move does not affect the language as a whole, but only certain sociolects. The most famous Aristophanic example is the liking for the suffix *-ικός* among the dandies ridiculed in *Knights* (*Eq.* 1378–81). The point there is not so much the spread of *-ικός* as such, but its new function to form quasi-deverbative adjectives like *κρουστικός* ‘incisive’.<sup>21</sup> This functional extension facilitated the rocket-like spread of *-ικός* in fourth-century Greek. However, *Plutus* does not contain any prominent *-ικός* adjectives, perhaps because most of the new *-ικός* words, unlike the average language of *Plutus* (as will be argued throughout this paper), still belonged to a cultivated register.

The case of colloquial formations in *-κρος* or *-χρός*<sup>22</sup> is hardly more promising. *Plutus* has the only Aristophanic occurrence of *πεινιχρός* (instead of *πέννης*)<sup>23</sup> and the only one of *δείλακρος* (or rather *δειλάκρα*, instead of *δείλαιος*, *δειλαία*).<sup>24</sup> However, both times the speaker is the old hag who wants to get her lover back (*Plut.* 973, 976). At best, we might therefore think of an individualizing feature. Note that the only other example of *δείλακρος/δειλάκρα* in Greek literature occurs in a frivolous woman’s love-song (*Carm. Pop.* 27 Bergk = 853 Campbell).

If we exclude such material, we are left with one observation that does exemplify a development in word formation. Aristophanes uses very few adjectives in *-ώδης*: 14 lexemes totalling 16 attestations. Five of these 16 occur in lyric contexts and are purely

<sup>20</sup> This is implied by Schwyzer (1939) 414 who, because of Alcaeus fr. 338.8 V. *γνόφαλλον*, regards *γν-* as the Proto-Greek anlaut (assimilated from *\*kn-bh-*); only in Attic *γν-φ-* would have been assimilated once again to *κν-φ-*, and the later adoption of *γν-φ-* would be a ‘return’ to the panhellenic variant. Similarly, the mss. reading *πιθάκινη* ‘storage-jar’ of *Plut.* 546, which disagrees with *φιδάκινη* of the Attic inscriptions (Threatte (1980) 468), may represent a return to the original version preserved in other dialects (cf. in Middle Comedy Eubulus fr. 130 *πιθάκινα*).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Willi (2003) 139–45, elaborating on Peppler (1910), Dover (1970) 13 and (1997) 118–19, and others.

<sup>22</sup> On the colloquial character of these suffixes see Chantraine (1933) 225 with n. 1. A further rare formation is *μακαρίτης* in *Plut.* 522, used here as a synonym of *μάκαρ* (≠ Ar. fr. 504 ‘(lately) dead’, as in later Greek: e.g. Men. fr. 554, *Plut. Mor.* 120c, Luc. *D. Meretr.* 6.1).

<sup>23</sup> The occurrences of *πεινιχρός* in ‘high’ literature (e.g. Alc. fr. 360 V., Thgn. 165, 181, Pind. *Nem.* 7.19) may be due to the Homeric precedent in *Od.* 3.348. Given the frequency of *πέννης* (14 times in Aristophanes, 5 in *Plutus*), the rarity of *πεινιχρός* in Aristophanes is remarkable.

<sup>24</sup> Contrast for instance *Eccl.* 391, 1051, *Plut.* 850, and 12 more passages with *δείλαιος* (often *οἶμοι δείλαιος*). As *δειλαία* does not occur beside *δειλάκρα* in Aristophanes, the suffix variation also has a gender-linguistic dimension and can be compared with other features where women are made to prefer more colloquial forms (Willi (2003) 193–4). In colloquial speech the derivative *δεικλακρίων* is also applied to men: *Pax* 193 (Hermes to Trygaeus, who responds with *γλίσχρων* based on *γλίσχρος*), *Av.* 143 (the Hoopoe).

poetic; they do not reveal anything about spoken Attic (*Av.* 1067 εὐώδης, *Av.* 1746 πυρώδης, *Thesm.* 998 ἀνθεμώδης, *Ran.* 449 πετρώδης, *Ran.* 1335 φρικώδης). Five of the remaining 11 attestations occur in *Plutus*. Here, too, are the only lexemes that are repeated: σφηκώδης ‘waspy’ (*Plut.* 561, 562) and πρεπώδης ‘fitting’ (*Plut.* 793, 797). The latter, πρεπώδης, is one out of two that occur in a trimeter, where linguistic realism is strongest.<sup>25</sup> All the rest are used in anapaests, including σφηκώδης and γαστρώδης ‘pot-bellied’: *Penia* is comparing rich and fat to poor and lean people (*Plut.* 560–1).<sup>26</sup> The meaning ‘pot-bellied’ nicely illustrates the change of tone from high-flown words like ἀνθεμώδης. As for πρεπώδης, the word occurs both times in the phrase πρεπῶδες ἔστιν, which stands for πρέπει: a full verb is replaced by an adjective with auxiliary. This and similar syntactic phenomena will be discussed below (§ 2.3). For now it is sufficient to retain that *Plutus* is Aristophanes’ only play in which -ώδης adjectives seem to be a living formational type also outside poetic registers.

This agrees with what is known about their history. It was long believed that -ώδης is contracted from -ο-ειδής. Πυρώδης, for instance, would originally have meant ‘looking like fire’, hence ‘fire-like, fiery’. However, historical phonology strongly speaks against this and Jacob Wackernagel suggested a more convincing derivation: -ώδης belongs to ὄζω ‘to smell of something’. As the verb ὄζω can be used like English ‘to smack of’, a πυρῶδες χρῆμα is something that ‘smacks of fire’.<sup>27</sup> The type in -ώδης is reasonably well-attested only from the second half of the fifth century onward – first with Sophocles and Herodotus –, and one has to wait for post-classical authors such as Polybius to witness its sudden success. The spread is mainly due to the innovation of building deverbative adjectives in -ώδης, which closely resemble participles or quasi-deverbative adjectives in -τικός. The first example of this new type in -ώδης is precisely πρεπώδης, twice attested in *Plutus*.<sup>28</sup> Since the adjectives in -ώδης are extremely frequent in the Ionic dialect of the Hippocratic treatises, a foreign origin for the vogue is most likely.

So far, then, our observations on the linguistic character of *Plutus* already alert us to watch out for (1) further foreign intrusions into Aristophanes’ Attic, and (2) additional evidence for a shift towards a lower, more colloquial, level of language.

<sup>25</sup> The other is *Thesm.* 131 θηλυδριώδης: Euripides’ *Relative* is mocking Agathon’s diction.

<sup>26</sup> *Nub.* 364 τερατώδης, *Nub.* 965 κριμνώδης, *Nub.* 984 Διπωλιώδης, *Vesp.* 383 πρινώδης, and most probably also *Ar. fr.* 751 ὑποζυγιώδης (the phrase ὑποζυγιώδες πρᾶγμα perfectly fits into an anapaest).

<sup>27</sup> Wackernagel (1889) 44–7, referring to passages like *Ar. Nub.* 49–52, 398, 1007, *Lys.* 616–17, 665/6, 689/90. According to Wackernagel the ‘suffix’ originated in adjectives like θυώδης ‘smelling of incense’, δυσώδης ‘ill-smelling’, and εὐώδης. The accent does not follow the usual rules for *s*-stem compounds (cf. εὐμενής) and thus indicates an early date for the loss of the primary meaning and for the subsequent transformation of -ωδης into a suffix; this then took on some of the functions of the (hypothetical) contraction product \*-οιδής < -ο-ειδής (cf. *Ar. Av.* 686 σκιοειδέα): Chantraine (1933) 430, Buck-Petersen (1944) 698.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Wackernagel (1889) 47, who cites Xenophon, Plato, and Isocrates as the first authors to use πρεπώδης. The application of -ώδης to a verbal stem was easiest with πρεπ- because ‘reminiscent of *x*, *x*-like’ (= -ώδης) is semantically similar to ‘fitting for *x*’ (= πρεπ-).

However, it is not until we turn to syntax (§ 2.3) and pragmatics (§ 2.4) that we start to have more plentiful evidence for innovative use of language in *Plutus*.

### 2.3. Syntax

The first syntactic point links up with the issue just raised with regard to *πρεπῶδες ἔστι* for *πρέπει* (§ 2.2). The replacement of a full verb by an adjective with auxiliary is paralleled by periphrastic expressions with participle + full verb. In the verbal paradigm of classical Greek such periphrasis is sometimes mandatory (cf. e.g. the 3rd plural perfect passive, *πεπαιδευμένοι εἰσίν*), but more often it is optional. Most commonly it occurs in the perfect or pluperfect, especially with neuter subjects. Consider, for instance, the sentence at *Plut.* 160–1:

Χρεμύλος· τέχνηαι δὲ πᾶσαι διὰ σὲ καὶ σοφίσματα  
ἐν τοῖσιν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔσθ' ἠὺρημένα.

Chremylus: And all crafts and skills that exist among mankind have been invented because of you.

There is no reason why Aristophanes should not have written *ἠὺρηται*.<sup>29</sup> Now, these ‘irregularities’ are found from *Acharnians* onward, but they are common only in Aristophanes’ fourth-century plays. Nearly half of some 22 or 23<sup>30</sup> examples occur in *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus*.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, *Plutus* shows an exceptional freedom with this type as it is used only here with a first person: in *Plut.* 77 *ἦν παρεσκευασμένος* ‘I was prepared’ stands for *παρεσκευάσμην*.

Similarly, *Plutus* has two cases of the so-called *σχῆμα Χαλκιδιακόν* where a full verb is replaced by present and perfect active participles,<sup>32</sup> as in *Plut.* 49 *ἔστι συμφέρον*

<sup>29</sup> The *σχῆμα Ἀττικόν* (ntr. pl. subject with 3rd sg. verb) is firmly observed in Aristophanic comedy: cf. Wackernagel (1926) 101–3, Poultney (1963) 362–3, and Willi (2003) 254.

<sup>30</sup> Not all cases are easily classifiable: I exclude possessive constructions with the copula (e.g. *Ach.* 512 *κάμοι γὰρ ἔστιν ἀμπέλια κεκομμένα* ‘I too have had vines cut down’) and phrases where the use of the participle is conditioned by the parallelism with an adjective (e.g. *Ecccl.* 746–7 *κακοδαίμων ἀνὴρ ἔσομαι καὶ νοῦν ὀλίγον κεκτημένος* ‘I’ll be an absolute loser and have very little sense’): see further Willi (2003) 152–3, also on similar cases with the present participle not counted below (e.g. *Plut.* 371).

<sup>31</sup> *Ecccl.* 61, 139, 458, 970, 1139, 1147, *Plut.* 77, 161, 626, 1192; cf. *Ach.* 1089, *Eq.* 230, 844, *Vesp.* 127, *Pax* 566, *Av.* 1291, 1301, *Lys.* 26–7, 175, 1038, *Thesm.* 75 (cf. 1119), *Ran.* 761 (cf. 721), and also with a future perfect *Av.* 655 *ἔσεσθον ἐππερωμένω*.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Lesbonax Gramm. fr. 5 Blank (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 7), who only refers to the present participle although the usage with the perfect active participle (here marked with \*) is identical: *Eq.* 468, 854\*, *Pax* 334, *Av.* 652, 1473\*, *Thesm.* 77, *Plut.* 49, 867\*. In *Lys.* 101 and 729–30 the possessive notion makes the situation slightly different (*Lys.* 729–30: *οἶκοι γὰρ ἔστιν ἑρία μοι Μιλήσια ὑπὸ τῶν σέων κατακοπόμενα* ‘I’ve got some Milesian fleeces there, and the moths must be devouring them’; cf. also *Ar.* fr. 74). I also exclude the common idiomatic type *τίς ἔστιν ὁ βῶων* (cf. Björck (1940) 89–92) as well as passages where the participle stands for a relative clause (e.g. *Ecccl.* 1086, 1094; cf. Björck (1940) 15, 102–3).

for συμφέρει. The connection with πρεπῶδες ἐστὶ for πρέπει is obvious, and I would also add *Plut.* 146 ἅπαντα τῷ πλουτεῖν γὰρ ἐσθ' ὑπήκοα 'everything is subordinate to being wealthy'. Instead of ὑπακούει,<sup>33</sup> Aristophanes preferred the quasi-participial ὑπήκοος, an adjective he uses only here. In all these cases we see a 'shift of focus from the action onto the property', as Björck puts it,<sup>34</sup> and a tendency towards a type of verbal periphrasis which is well known from fourth-century literature.<sup>35</sup> Holzinger acutely observes: 'Im IV. Jahrh. ... muss dieser Sprachgebrauch schon recht weit gereicht haben, sonst hätte Aristoteles π. ἐρμην. c. 12, p. 21 nicht sagen können: οὐδὲν διαφέρει εἰπεῖν ἄνθρωπον βαδίζειν ἢ ἄνθρωπον βαδίζοντα εἶναι. Dem Redner Lykophron, der βαδίζων ἐστίν gegenüber βαδίζει, wenn auch nicht aus sprachlichen Gründen, verwirft, tritt er Φυσ. ἀρκ. A p. 185 b 30 entgegen.'<sup>36</sup> How to account for the usage is more difficult to say. Since other writers are just as fond of the new constructions as the comedians, one must not invoke too quickly some kind of 'koineisation' process, even though this too may have contributed to the spread of the structure and Thumb diagnosed a 'Vorliebe des griechisch schreibenden Römers für die Conjugatio periphrastica' in later times.<sup>37</sup>

A second major<sup>38</sup> syntactic point concerns the loss of Attic peculiarities. In Attic, final clauses are traditionally introduced by the conjunction ὅπως with or without ἄν, but in *Plutus* there is only a single example left (*Plut.* 225); four years earlier, *Ecclesiazusae* had a total of seven.<sup>39</sup> In fifth-century texts, ἵνα is common in Herodotus, but Thucydides and the Attic inscriptions clearly prefer ὅπως.<sup>40</sup> Thus, the success of ἵνα in Attic Greek from about 400 BC onward is likely to be related to the 'birth-pangs' of Koine Greek, an increasing de-Atticisation or Ionicisation of Attic.<sup>41</sup>

The same conclusion is valid for the dual, which is lost at an early date in Ionic, but long retained in Attic. The dual is much weaker in *Plutus* than elsewhere in Aristophanes. As with the preceding point, the break cannot be attributed exclusively

<sup>33</sup> ὑπακούω 'to obey' is used in *Ecclesiazusae* (*Eccl.* 515; elsewhere in Aristophanes 'to listen, give heed to').

<sup>34</sup> Björck (1940) 28 ('Verlagerung des Schwergewichts von der Handlung auf das Eigenschaftliche'); cf. also Coseriu (1975) 16–18 ('partialisierende Schau'), Rutherford (1903) 249, and Willi (2003) 153.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Björck (1940) 36, Aerts (1965) 25–6, and Dietrich (1973) 201–9; in Middle Comedy note e.g. Antiphanes fr. 4, 54.3, 122.11, Anaxandrides fr. 57.4.

<sup>36</sup> Holzinger (1940) 14.

<sup>37</sup> Thumb (1901) 152.

<sup>38</sup> Minor irregularities and innovations include *Plut.* 1053 σπινθήρ λαμβάνει τι instead of λαμβάνεται τινος (cf. Holzinger (1940) 291), the attributive use of ἀκαρής in *Plut.* 244 (ἐν ἀκαρεῖ χρόνῳ, Holzinger (1940) 91), the construction of φιλέω + part. (instead of inf.) in *Plut.* 645 (in analogy with ἀγαπάω, στέργω, μισέω, etc., as in *Vesp.* 672 and *Eccl.* 502; cf. Holzinger (1940) 204–5), and perhaps the use of ὦ τᾶν in addressing two people in *Plut.* 66 (van Leeuwen (1904) xix).

<sup>39</sup> According to Todd (1932) the figures are: *Ach.* 3, *Eq.* 0 (!), *Nub.* 5, *Vesp.* 4, *Pax* 3, *Av.* 2, *Lys.* 14, *Thesm.* 2, *Ran.* 5, *Eccl.* 7, *Plut.* 1. The absence of ὅπως (ἄν) in *Knights* may be related to the predominance of lowly speakers in that play (slaves and the sausage-seller).

<sup>40</sup> For statistics see Willi (2003) 264–5, mainly based on Weber (1884) and (1885); cf. Amiguès (1977) 99.

<sup>41</sup> On this see for instance Thumb (1901) 202–53 and more recently López Eire (1991), (1993), and (1996).



to the late date of the play since it is too abrupt to reflect a natural development; more plausibly, it bears witness to a conscious change in tone on the part of the author – a point which will be discussed below (§ 3). The modifications concerning the dual do not so much lie in the use of nominal and verbal forms,<sup>42</sup> but in the increase of incongruent agreement of duals and plurals<sup>43</sup> and in the replacement of dual pronouns by plural pronouns. Most notably, a plural is used in 50 to 60 per cent of the pronominal slots where we should expect a dual.<sup>44</sup> In *Ecclesiazusae* there is not much comparative evidence,<sup>45</sup> but in the play before, *Frogs*, the corresponding number is just 11 per cent.<sup>46</sup>

Of course not all syntactic changes can be explained likewise, by reference to inter-dialectal developments and the transformation of Attic into Koine Greek. Leaving aside erratic changes without an immediately discernible motivation (such as the increased use of articular infinitives)<sup>47</sup> as well as changes without further impact,<sup>48</sup> a third group of innovations consists of intradialectal ‘bottom-up changes’: tendencies which originate in lower-class Attic and gradually conquer further territory. Here, too, Aristophanes seems to have become more ‘open-minded’ in the later stages of his career.<sup>49</sup> For instance, the co-ordinating particle pairs  $\tau\epsilon\text{-}\tau\epsilon$  and  $\tau\epsilon\text{-}\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$  are virtually

<sup>42</sup> Cf. especially Cuny (1906) 183, but also Cuny (1906) 235–42 for the use of a plural instead of an expected dual noun. There are 9 exceptions in *Plut.*; contrast *Ach.* (with the exception of the dialect parts), *Pax*, and *Ran.* with 4 each, *Nub.*, *Av.*, and *Eccl.* with 3 each, *Eq.*, *Vesp.*, *Lys.*, and *Thesm.* with 1 each.

<sup>43</sup> See *Plut.* 73, 429–30, 471, 482, 484, 509, 532, 608–9, 733–4, 735–6; cf. also Poultney (1963) 363–7. According to Cuny (1906) 508, *Plutus* also has fewer duals than the preceding plays.

<sup>44</sup> Contrast (depending on the interpretation of particular passages) 14 to 17 examples with the plural for the dual (*Plut.* 74, 200, 226, 418, 428, 457, 462, 470, 471, 487, 532, 593, 604, 608, 619, 870, 928) against 11 with the expected dual (*Plut.* 54, 218, 401, 433, 437, 467, 482, 484, 509, 563, 958).

<sup>45</sup> Cuny (1906) 170 cites 2 examples of dual observation but none of replaced dual pronouns.

<sup>46</sup> This is very low but cf. *Eq.* 16%, *Vesp.* 8%, *Av.* 26%. *Pax* with 43% and *Thesm.* with 67% are difficult to compare because the overall number is low in these plays (*Pax* 7, *Thesm.* 3; cf. *Eq.* 12, *Vesp.* 12, *Av.* 35, *Plut.* 28). These figures are based on Cuny (1906) 168–79, who does not cite any cases of replacement in the remaining plays and who excludes ambiguous cases (*Eq.* 53, *Vesp.* 67, *Av.* 271, *Ran.* 756, *Plut.* 945).

<sup>47</sup> Especially with prepositions and in the genitive and dative; in the nominative and accusative the use of articular infinitives is traditional (cf. in general Birklein (1888); for Aristophanes, Willi (2003) 149–52, where the phenomenon is placed in a wider context). Birklein (1888) 38 gives the following statistics for Aristophanes: *Ach.* 0 nom.-acc. (0 with prep.) : 0 gen.-dat. (0 with prep.) = 0 total; *Eq.* 1 (0) : 2 (1) = 3; *Nub.* 9 (2) : 1 (1) = 10; *Vesp.* 4 (1) : 5 (4) = 9; *Pax* 1 (0) : 0 (0) = 1; *Av.* 3 (0) : 1 (0) = 4; *Lys.* 2 (0) : 0 (0) = 2; *Thesm.* 0 (0) : 2 (0) = 2; *Ran.* 11 (1) : 2 (2) = 13; *Eccl.* 2 (0) : 2 (2) = 4; *Plut.* 11 (1) : 6 (2) = 17.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. the replacement of  $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\ \omicron\upsilon$  ( $\delta\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ) by  $\acute{\alpha}\phi' \omicron\upsilon$  ( $\delta\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ): whereas Thucydides has both (9x  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ , 4x  $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}$ : data according to an online TLG search on <www.tlg.uci.edu>), Herodotus exclusively uses  $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}$  (6x). In comedy,  $\acute{\alpha}\phi' \omicron\upsilon$  first occurs in Ar. fr. 31 (of 414 BC), but apart from that only in *Plutus* (3x: *Plut.* 968, 1113, 1173) as well as Middle and New Comedy (Alexis fr. 200, Men. fr. 352);  $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\ \omicron\upsilon$  ( $\delta\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ), on the other hand, is typical of the Aristophanic plays before *Plutus* (also *Plut.* 85\*) as well as other authors of Old Comedy (*Ach.* 17\*, 596\*, 597\*, *Eq.* 4, 644, *Nub.* 528\*, 1351\*, *Vesp.* 887, *Av.* 322\*, 694, 1515, *Lys.* 108, 759, 866, Crates fr. 39\*, Eupolis fr. 274\*, Hermippus fr. 63.2, Pherecrates fr. 75.6).

<sup>49</sup> Sometimes it is difficult to decide whether one is dealing with an occasional colloquial licence or a real change. Thus, 2 out of 6 possible examples of a potential optative without  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  occur in *Plutus* (*Vesp.* 472, *Av.* 180, *Lys.* 839, *Thesm.* 872, *Plut.* 374, 438). Although most of them are usually emended, it is wiser to state that the phenomenon is ‘excluded only from the most rigid and fastidious sorts of writing’ (Bers (1984) 135; cf. Hale (1893) 180–3 and 202, Slotty (1915) 139–42, Wackernagel (1926) 236–7, MacDowell (1971) 197, Willi (2003) 259).



given up in favour of the less literary *καί-καί*.<sup>50</sup> Conversely, the preposition *ὡς* ‘to, towards (someone)’ is increasingly common in the fourth-century plays: 18 examples in *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus* contrast with just 26 in the remaining nine plays.<sup>51</sup> If Wackernagel’s etymological suggestion is correct and prepositional *ὡς* is a fossilised directional accusative of the root noun preserved in Latin *os* ‘face’ (compare English *in front of*),<sup>52</sup> the preposition must be very old, even though it becomes established in literature only at a relatively late point.<sup>53</sup> Popular language had retained an archaic usage<sup>54</sup> and eventually succeeded in introducing it into higher registers. Incidentally, frequency changes in prepositional usage can also be observed with *χάριον*,<sup>55</sup> *κατόπιν*,<sup>56</sup> and *ἐπιπολῆς*.<sup>57</sup>

However, the most important ‘bottom-up’ change in the syntax of *Plutus* is a distinct trend towards redundancy. There are many features exemplifying this, but the following two are the most noticeable.<sup>58</sup> The first one is the use of prepositional phrases with verbs that do not normally, or traditionally, require such a phrase. The standard

<sup>50</sup> Figures based on Todd (1932): *Ach.* 11 (of which 8 *τε-καί* : 3 *καί-καί*, *Eq.* 16 (12) : 4, *Nub.* 26 (22) : 2, *Vesp.* 8 (5) : 4, *Pax* 14 (10) : 2, *Av.* 16 (6) : 3, *Lys.* 17 (11) : 6, *Thesm.* 14 (11) : 2, *Ran.* 21 (17) : 3, *Eccl.* 6 (4) : 2, *Plut.* 3 (0) : 5. One of the 3 remaining examples of *τε-τε* in *Plutus* is formulaic (*Plut.* 638 ἦν *τε* βούλησθ’ ἦν *τε* μή; see further *Plut.* 247, 353). The absence of *τε-καί* in *Plutus* is furthered by the predominance of trimeters in the play (cf. Holzinger (1940) 303 on the avoidance of *τε-καί* in trimeters) but since *τε-καί* does occur in fourth-century oratory (cf. Denniston (1954) 511–13), it must have existed in spoken Attic too.

<sup>51</sup> Figures based on Todd (1932): *Ach.* 4 (1 in 308 lines), *Eq.* 2 (1/704), *Nub.* 2 (1/756), *Vesp.* 2 (1/769), *Pax* 2 (1/683), *Av.* 4 (1/441), *Lys.* 2 (1/661), *Thesm.* 6 (1/205), *Ran.* 2 (1/767), *Eccl.* 8 (1/148), *Plut.* 10 (1/121). Because of the parallelism with *Plut.* 242 *ὡς*, most editors replace mss. *εἰς* by *ὡς* in *Plut.* 237, *pace* Holzinger (1940) 85–90.

<sup>52</sup> Wackernagel (1893) 16–18 n. 2: the etymology neatly accounts for the fact that *ὡς*, unlike *πρός*, is used exclusively with persons.

<sup>53</sup> *ὡς* occurs once in Homer and once in Herodotus, but otherwise only in Attic: rarely in tragedy, more frequently in fourth-century prose (cf. Schwyzer-Debrunner (1950) 533–4). For the equivalence of *ὡς* and *πρός* contrast e.g. *Plut.* 32 *ὡς* (most mss., not to be corrected with Coulon (1908) 153) with *Plut.* 653, 823, 827 *πρός*, and cf. passages such as *Av.* 120 *πρός* σέ *δεῦρ’* ἀφίγμεθα and *Av.* 1169 *εἰσθεῖ* *πρός* ἡμᾶς *δεῦρο*.

<sup>54</sup> For this kind of phenomenon cf. Schwyzer (1940) 10 on *Vesp.* 352 οὐκ ἔστιν ὀπής ‘there isn’t enough of a hole’.

<sup>55</sup> *χάριον* with the ‘prospective’ meaning ‘for the purpose of’ occurs 4 times in *Plut.* (53, 154, 260, 1009), 3 times in the earlier plays (*Thesm.* 586, *Eccl.* 140, both spoken by women; *Ran.* 1418); the ‘retrospective’ meaning ‘because of, in return for’ is common from *Acharnians* onward (*Ach.* 892, 915, 1051, 1232, *Eq.* 268, *Vesp.* 62, *Thesm.* 127) and the synonym *ἐνεκα* shows no remarkable distribution (6 times in *Plut.*, 53 times elsewhere).

<sup>56</sup> *κατόπιν* ‘behind’ occurs 4 times in *Plutus* (13, 1094, 1209; in 757 *κατόπιν* is adverbial) and 4 times elsewhere (*Eq.* 625 sausage-seller, *Av.* 1497 Prometheus, *Ar. fr.* 506 from *Ταγηνισταί*; adverbial: *Av.* 1150).

<sup>57</sup> *ἐπιπολῆς* + gen. ‘on top of’ occurs only in *Eccl.* 1108 (redundant *ἄνωθεν ἐπιπολῆς ... ἄνω ἐπιθεῖναι*) and *Plut.* 1207 (redundant *ἐπιπολῆς ἔπεισιν*). Because of its early occurrence in Herodotus (later also in Plato and Xenophon), it might be an Ionism (cf. below § 2.6 on other lexical Ionisms).

<sup>58</sup> Cf. also (1) the addition of a ‘superfluous’ infinitive *γνώναι* in expressions with *δήλον* or *φανερὸν* (*ἔστιν*) ὅτι (‘it is clear to recognise that’ instead of simple ‘it is clear that’), both Aristophanic examples of which occur in *Plutus* (48–9, 489; on *Plut.* 48–9 cf. van Leeuwen (1904) xix, ‘aut solum adiectivum aut ῥάδιος γνώναι expectatur’, and (1904) 11, ‘construe: ὅτι ἡ δοκεῖ καὶ τυφλῶ δήλον γνώναι εἶναι, *quia vel caeco facile agnitu esse videtur*’); (2) the isolated use of *πρός* ἐπὶ τούτοις ‘in addition’ in *Plut.* 1001, where either (adverbial) *πρός* or *πρός* τούτοις (cf. e.g. *Nub.* 720) would be expected; (3) the use of *ἐνθάδε*

construction of *σύνειμι* ‘to be together with’ is a simple dative, as in *Plut.* 774–5 where *Plutus*, after his healing, exclaims:

Πλοῦτος· αἰσχύνομαι δὲ τὰς ἐμαυτοῦ συμφορὰς  
οἷοις ἄρ’ ἀνθρώποις ξυνῶν ἐλάνθανον

*Plutus*: I am ashamed of my past circumstances – the kinds of men with whom I now perceive I consorted unawares!

This regular construction is found 19 times in Aristophanes,<sup>59</sup> but in *Plutus* an alternative *σύνειμι* μετὰ τινος is also read (503–4):

Χρεμύλος· πολλοὶ δ’ ὄντες πάνυ χρηστοὶ  
πράττουσι κακῶς καὶ πεινῶσιν μετὰ σοῦ τε τὰ πλεῖστα σύνεισιν.

*Chremylus*: And many who are very virtuous are in a bad way, and starve, and live most of their lives in your company.

One would hardly notice this if the situation with *ἔπομαι* ‘to follow’ were not exactly the same: four times *ἔπομαι* is used with the dative, as we expect for classical Attic, but in *Plutus* both *ἔπομαι μετὰ τινος* and *ἔπομαι κατόπιν τινός* occur.<sup>60</sup> As the dative case will disappear in (much) later Greek, one wonders whether these are the first symptoms of its decline.<sup>61</sup> Verbs from the lexical field of *ἔπομαι* and *σύνειμι* may call for such semantic support more than other verbs, for *Plutus* also displays the compounds *ἐπακολουθέω* and *συνακολουθέω*, in which the preverbs *ἐπι-* and *συν-* are redundant;<sup>62</sup> these, however, belong to a whole series of verbs with redundant preverbs which will be discussed later (§ 2.6).

αὐτοῦ instead of either *ἐνθάδε* or *αὐτοῦ* in *Plut.* 1187 (also in *Vesp.* 765–6 and *Eupolis* fr. 392); (4) the addition of *τοὺς τρόπους* to the comparative *βελτίων* which in itself expresses the notion of character quality (only in *Eccl.* 214 and *Plut.* 105; cf. van Leeuwen (1904) xix and contrast e.g. *Thesm.* 810); (5) the parallel use of *ἤ μὴν* and *ἔτι* in threats where either one or the other would be sufficient (only in *Eccl.* 1034, *Plut.* 608; cf. van Leeuwen (1904) xix).

<sup>59</sup> Including 6 times in *Plutus* and *Ecclesiazusae*: *Eq.* 1287, *Nub.* 1404, *Vesp.* 475, 1222, 1256, 1273, 1460, *Av.* 418, 650, 704, 1487, *Ran.* 959, *Eccl.* 38, 340, 619, 898, *Plut.* 321, 775.

<sup>60</sup> *Plut.* 823 *ἔπου μετ’ ἐμοῦ*, 1209 *κατόπιν τούτων ἄδοντας ἔπεσθαι*; contrast *Plut.* 308 = 315 *ἔπεσθε μητρὶ* (according to the *scholia* not Aristophanes’ wording but a proverbial expression), *Vesp.* 1278, *Pax* 1366, *Av.* 1755/6. *Pax* 727 *ἔπεσθον ἅμ’ ἐμοί* (Trygaeus) comes close to our ‘redundancy’ phenomenon, but *ἅμα* need not have given up all of its adverbial meaning ‘together, at once’; it reinforces, rather than replaces, the dative construction.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Thumb (1901) 125 on *πολεμῶ μετὰ* etc. in Egyptian papyri; on the later loss of the dative see Humbert (1930).

<sup>62</sup> *συνακολουθέω*: *Plut.* 43, also *Ran.* 399 (popular song to *Iacchus*); *ἐπακολουθέω*: *Plut.* 701 (*ἐπακολουθοῦσ’ ἅμα* plausibly conjectured by Reisig; for the following *ἅμα* cf. Theopompus *Com.* fr. 61), *Eccl.* 479, *Vesp.* 1328 (Philocleon: *ὄπισθεν ἐπακολουθούντων*), *Ar.* fr. 556 (from *Τριφάλης*, postdating 411 BC); note also *παρακολουθέω* in *Eccl.* 725. Without a preverb *ἀκολουθέω* occurs 7 times in the fifth-century plays, 4 times in *Ecclesiazusae*, and 5 times in *Plutus*, but as usual the innovative variants tell us more about language history than the traditional ones.



effect similar to the one that was reached much earlier when οὐ τις was replaced by the stronger οὐδεῖς. The reintroduction of the hiatus, and with it the aspiration of εἶς, will later lead to the Hellenistic form with -θ-, οὐθεις.<sup>67</sup> With *Plutus*, we are still one step before this, but οὐδὲ εἶς and οὐδὲ ἔν are recent enough. In Aristophanes they first occur in *Lysistrata* and *Frogs*, once in each play, and then four times in *Plutus*;<sup>68</sup> Menander will have them more than 30 times. Thus, *Plutus* (but not *Ecclesiazusae*, where 9 cases of οὐδεῖς and 13 of οὐδέν would have given Aristophanes numerous opportunities to employ the younger variants) adopts a fourth-century fashion which, incidentally, encompasses much more than just οὐδεῖς vs. οὐδὲ εἶς: similar changes can be observed with οὐδεπώποτε for οὐπώποτε<sup>69</sup> and with the sudden frequency of emphatic οὐδ' ὅτιοῦν and μηδ' ὅτιοῦν 'not/nothing at all' for οὐδέν and μηδέν.<sup>70</sup>

Turning to positive statements, an increase of emphasis is again easily detected in *Plutus*. Not only do its characters speak more often of 'all x' than those in the earlier plays,<sup>71</sup> they also seem to feel that it is no longer sufficient to say 'all x', and they say 'all x together' instead: about 50 per cent of the Aristophanic examples of ἀπαξάπαντες occur in the two fourth-century plays. Moreover, the relation between the personality of a speaker and the use of such a form is lost, whereas earlier on slaves or simple farmers like Trygaeus had them more often than other characters.<sup>72</sup> In *Plutus*, on the other hand, to say ἀπαξάπαντες is not the prerogative of Carion, the slave most often seen and heard on Aristophanes' stage. For Carion even ἀπαξάπαντα is too weak on one occasion: he prefers συλλήβδην ἅπαντα 'all things taken together'.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Cf. in general Wackernagel (1928) 114 and 268–70 and Moorhouse (1962) 245–6, also on non-Attic examples (e.g. Epich. fr. 213, Hipponax fr. spurium 64 W.).

<sup>68</sup> *Lys.* 1045 (chorus), *Ran.* 927 (Euripides), *Plut.* 37, 138, 1115, 1182. In Old Comedy cf. Crates fr. 16.1, Cratinus fr. 335, Eupolis fr. 392.4. The separated type οὐδ' ἄν εἶς (*Eq.* 573, *Vesp.* 72, *Plut.* 137) is a retained archaism (Wackernagel (1928) 269).

<sup>69</sup> οὐπώποτε occurs 7 times in Aristophanes but never in *Plutus* (or *Ecclesiazusae*), whereas 3 out of 10 instances of οὐδεπώποτε are in *Plutus* (193, 404, 420) and most of the others are put into the mouth of informal speakers (*Ach.* 17, 34; Dicaeopolis, *Vesp.* 14; a slave, *Thesm.* 490; a fake woman; once in *Eccl.*: 384). Cf. further Wackernagel (1928) 269: 'ποτε und πω haben sich neben der Negation auch im Attischen gehalten, nur dass sich davor nach dem Muster der οὐδεῖς-Gruppe das steigemde οὐδέ einstellte, das eigentlich zu einem Indefinitum nicht passt'.

<sup>70</sup> *Plut.* 385, 457, 599, 1030; earlier: *Lys.* 776 (oracular, cf. in dactylic poetry Thgn. 64), *Nub.* 344 (Strepsiades), *Vesp.* 598 (Philocleon); cf. Wackernagel (1928) 270.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. the increasing use of ἅπας: in *Plutus* there are 23 cases, i.e. one every 53 lines and twice as many as in the average fifth-century play (*Ach.* 13 = 1/95, *Eq.* 23 = 1/61, *Nub.* 15 = 1/101, *Vesp.* 20 = 1/77, *Pax* 9 = 1/152, *Av.* 16 = 1/110, *Lys.* 11 = 1/120, *Thesm.* 13 = 1/95, *Ran.* 7 = 1/219, *Eccl.* 18 = 1/66). Similarly, simple πᾶς becomes more frequent (*Ach.* 23 = 1/54, *Eq.* 21 = 1/67, *Nub.* 20 = 1/76, *Vesp.* 19 = 1/81, *Pax* 34 = 1/40, *Av.* 74 = 1/24, *Lys.* 31 = 1/43, *Thesm.* 31 = 1/40, *Ran.* 14 = 1/110, *Eccl.* 37 = 1/32, *Plut.* 41 = 1/29).

<sup>72</sup> *Plut.* 111, 206, 760, 1109, *Eccl.* 217, 719, 766, 1148, Ar. fr. 2 (from Αἰολοσίκων, Aristophanes' last comedy); earlier: *Eq.* 845 (Paphlagon), *Pax* 106, 247, 542, 655, 870 (3 times used by the simple farmer Trygaeus, once by a slave), *Av.* 1539 (Prometheus), *Thesm.* 515, 550 (both in a woman's or pseudo-woman's line).

<sup>73</sup> *Plut.* 646: the adverb συλλήβδην occurs once again in Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 657: Bdelycleon), instead of ἅπας.

The same tendency appears when we consider intensifying adverbs like πάνυ. The people of *Plutus* use πάνυ nearly twice as often as the people of *Frogs*, the play ranking next to it.<sup>74</sup> They also have two thirds of all the Aristophanic occurrences of adverbial τὸ παράπαν (one of which is quoted above in the line of the priest of Zeus).<sup>75</sup> Just as (ἀ)παν is here strengthened through the addition of παρ-, the text of *Plutus* also reads δειλότατον ἔργον παρὰ πολὺ instead of πολὺ δειλότατον ἔργον ‘by far the most cowardly action’.<sup>76</sup> Emphasising ἀντικρυσ ‘absolutely’ and οὐκ ἀντικρυσ ‘not at all’ become common.<sup>77</sup> Adverbial ἐκνομίως and ἐκνομιώτατα ‘extraordinarily’ appear, for the first and last time in all of Greek literature.<sup>78</sup> With ἀσελγῶς ‘outrageously’, too, *Plutus* (560) introduces a new emphasising adverb: its stem is attested in the orators and in Hellenistic Greek, but like ἐκνομίως it seems to have been a colloquialism, comparable to English ‘bloody’.<sup>79</sup> Also, the threefold repetition of the strong assentient particle κομιδῆ (μὲν οὖν) ‘exactly so’ in *Plut.* 833–8 may make fun of a linguistic fashion,<sup>80</sup> but in *Plut.* 1086 the same κομιδῆ – which is attested only three times before *Plutus* –, occurs without any stylistic distinction, just like the most ordinary everyday word.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>74</sup> *Ach.* 4 = 1/308 lines, *Eq.* 4 = 1/352, *Nub.* 9 = 1/168, *Vesp.* 12 = 1/128, *Pax* 9 = 1/151, *Av.* 9 = 1/196, *Lys.* 12 = 1/110, *Thesm.* 5 = 1/246, *Ran.* 15 = 1/102, *Eccl.* 7 = 1/169, *Plut.* 19 = 1/64; note again the break between *Plutus* and *Ecclesiastusae*. Similarly with σφόδρα: *Ach.* 6 = 1/206, *Eq.* 2 = 1/704, *Nub.* 4 = 1/378, *Vesp.* 4 = 1/384, *Pax* 0, *Av.* 2 = 1/883, *Lys.* 1 = 1/1321, *Thesm.* 4 = 1/308, *Ran.* 3 = 1/511, *Eccl.* 1 = 1/1183, *Plut.* 7 = 1/173. On the whole σφόδρα is rarer than πάνυ, but the general tendency towards emphasis is nevertheless seen. Only the traditional μάλα is more frequent in *Pax* (8 = 1/171) and *Lysistrata* (7 = 1/189) than in *Plutus* (5 = 1/242; cf. *Ach.* 0, *Eq.* 3 = 1/469, *Nub.* 2 = 1/756, *Vesp.* 1 = 1/1511, *Av.* 2 = 1/883, *Thesm.* 2 = 1/616, *Ran.* 5 = 1/307, *Eccl.* 1 = 1/1183). For the situation in other authors see Schwab (1895) 179–84.

<sup>75</sup> *Plut.* 17, 351, 961, 1183; elsewhere: *Eccl.* 184 (in Praxagora’s speech), *Vesp.* 478 (Bdelycleon). The only other occurrences in comedy are Pherecrates fr. 117 and Anaxandrides fr. 53.10. In classical prose, with the exception of Plato, τὸ παράπαν is rare (cf. Schwab (1895) 187). Note the absence in Aristophanes of παντάπασι, which is the most common emphasising particle of Attic after μάλα and πάνυ and frequently used by Xenophon, Plato, and Isocrates (though not yet by Thucydides and Lysias): cf. Schwab (1895) 183.

<sup>76</sup> *Plut.* 445; nowhere else in Aristophanes. The addition of a preposition strengthens the emphasis also in ἐπ’ ἀληθεία for ἀληθῶς (only in *Plut.* 891; cf. Holzinger (1940) 258).

<sup>77</sup> *Plut.* 134, 328, 384 (οὐκ ἄ.; cf. *Thesm.* 442, female), *Eccl.* 281 (with verb of movement ‘straight on’, as in *Lys.* 609, 1069), 339; elsewhere: *Eq.* 63, 128 (both spoken by slaves), *Av.* 962, *Ran.* 741 (slave).

<sup>78</sup> *Plut.* 981, 992 (used by the old woman and Chremylus): ἐκνόμιος is attested elsewhere only in Pind. *Nem.* 1.56 and Orph. fr. 121.

<sup>79</sup> In Aristophanes the stem otherwise occurs only in *Vesp.* 61 (spoken by a slave): ἀνασελγαινόμενος Εὐριπίδης ‘Euripides wantonly abused’. Its etymology is unclear but a non-Attic origin is possible: cf. Chantraine (1968–80) 122, s.v. ἀσελγής, and Frisk (1960–72) 1.161, s.v. ἀσελγής, both citing a Boeotian hypothesis. Note also the colloquial use of ὑπερφυῆς in *Plut.* 733–4 (Carion: δύο δράκοντ’ ὑπερφυεῖς τὸ μέγεθος ‘two enormous serpents’) and *Plut.* 750 (Carion: ὄχλος ὑπερφυῆς ὅσος ‘an immense crowd’), although this is shared with some of the earlier comedies (*Ach.* 142, *Eq.* 141, *Nub.* 76, *Pax* 229, *Thesm.* 831, *Ran.* 611, *Eccl.* 386).

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Denniston (1954) lxvii and 88, and Ussher (1973) 184 on the repetition of γάρ in *Eccl.* 773–6; see also *Eccl.* 221–8 with ὡσπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ, which recurs in *Plut.* 95 (but in no other Aristophanic play): had it become usual to recall the good old times (cf. Holzinger (1940) 15–16)?

<sup>81</sup> Earlier: *Nub.* 391 (Strepsiades), *Pax* 820 (Trygaeus), *Thesm.* 3 (Euripides’ Inlaw); Ar. fr. 360, from Κώκαλος, is even later than *Plutus*. Among the other writers of Old Comedy only Pherecrates fr. 28 has κομιδῆ, but in Middle Comedy it apparently became more common. Sommerstein (2001) 189–90 observes that Plato particularly associates the word with Theaetetus, one of his youngest dialogue characters.

In the comparison of adjectives, emphasis also takes hold of morphology (cf. § 2.5): only in *Plutus* do we read a superlative αὐτότατος ‘his very self’ (*Plut.* 83) and the same play has one of just two Aristophanic attestations of the superlative μονώτατος (*Plut.* 182; cf. *Eq.* 352).<sup>82</sup>

Perhaps more than anything on the preceding pages, this wealth of evidence for a new attitude towards pragmatic emphasis calls for a preliminary assessment. We might simply say that Attic Greek had changed. To some degree that must be true, but it cannot be the whole story, for it would leave unexplained why there is also a clear break between *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus*. It is counterintuitive to assume that ‘real’ language changed so much within four years. It is much more likely that, while ‘real’ language was changing *gradually*, Aristophanes’ language changed *quickly*, and that Aristophanes was creating a new type of ‘linguistic poetics’. With *Plutus*, Aristophanic comedy has become more colloquial, more mimetic or ‘realistic’ in the reproduction of everyday speech – at least if emphasis is plausibly attributed to common people’s everyday speech. In order to demonstrate the plausibility of this we must now turn to a second set of pragmatic data which is ultimately connected to the first, ‘emphatic’, set, as will become clear immediately.

Like πάνυ, the adverb ὄντως ‘really’ is well-known: it occurs frequently in Plato, especially in the later dialogues. What is less known is the fact that ὄντως represents another ‘fourth-century-ism’. Thucydides does not use the word, and Aristophanes has it just four times in his fifth-century comedies and once more in *Ecclesiazusae*. Again, even this late play turns out to be written mainly in Aristophanes’ old style as we realise that four years later, in *Plutus*, ὄντως occurs no less than eight times.<sup>83</sup> Moreover, the same picture emerges when we look at δηλόν ὅτι ‘obviously’,<sup>84</sup> at ἴσως ‘perhaps’,<sup>85</sup> and at ὡς ἔοικε or other constructions based on the personal forms of εἶοικα, to be rendered in English with ‘apparently’ or the like:<sup>86</sup> these too are far more common in *Plutus* than in any other comedy.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>82</sup> A comparative αὐτότερος occurs in Epich. fr. 5: cf. Pepler (1918) 181–2 and Sommerstein (2001) 140, who improperly calls αὐτότατος a ‘comic superlative’; there is a difference between colloquial intensifications (cf. the common superlative πρότιστος or *Eq.* 1165 προτεραίτερος, *Vesp.* 1502 μέσαστος) and superlatives designed for comic effect (Ar. fr. 270 Δαναώτατος ‘Danaosest’). Note also that the intensifying comparison ὡς οὐδεις ἀνήρ is limited to the two last plays (*Eccl.* 1130, *Plut.* 247, 901; van Leeuwen (1904) xix).

<sup>83</sup> *Plut.* 82, 286, 289, 327, 403, 581, 836, 960; *Nub.* 86, 1271 (both times used by Strepsiadēs), *Vesp.* 997 (Philocleon), *Ran.* 1898 (Dionysus), *Eccl.* 786 (anonymous man); for examples in Middle and New Comedy (Antiphanes 3 exx., Menander 6 exx.) see Lautensach (1921) 252.

<sup>84</sup> *Plut.* 48, 826, 873, 988, 1003; δηλόν without ὅτι is found in *Eq.* 427, *Av.* 704, *Thesm.* 1013, *Eccl.* 719.

<sup>85</sup> *Plut.* 158, 223, 259, 358, 423, 562, 896, 1012, 1058, 1067, 1080, perhaps also *Plut.* 148 = 11 or 12 times (contrast the figures elsewhere: *Ach.* 1, *Eq.* 2, *Nub.* 3, *Vesp.* 7, *Pax* 2, *Av.* 0, *Lys.* 1, *Thesm.* 2, *Ran.* 4, *Eccl.* 4). The synonym τάχα ‘perhaps’ is very rare: the only examples occur in lyric passages (*Vesp.* 277, 281, 1456, *Av.* 453) and the semantic distinction made by Schmidt (1876) 329–32 between τάχα and ἴσως is irrelevant for the situation in Aristophanes where the difference is one of register and where τάχα usually means ‘quickly, forthwith’.

<sup>86</sup> *Plut.* 76, 826, 862, 1017, 1040, 1045, 1048, 1098, 1131 = 9 times; in the other plays there are another 19 examples. The situation is less clear-cut with δοκεῖ *vel sim.*

<sup>87</sup> Add ἐν/ὀράφ’ ἴσθ’ (ὅτι) (approximately = ‘obviously’) which occurs 3 times in *Plutus* (183, 219, 889) vs. 8 times in the earlier plays (*Ach.* 783, *Pax* 373, 875, *Av.* 604, 1408, *Thesm.* 12, *Ran.* 296, 918).



It appears, then, that Aristophanes' 'new characters' in *Plutus* qualify their utterances more often, sometimes by shyly adding 'apparently' or 'perhaps' and sometimes by adding 'obviously' with what at first sight looks like much self-confidence. 'At first sight' because pragmatic studies on modern languages reveal that such apparent self-confidence only superficially conceals a speaker's greater uncertainty. To take a modern example, a speaker is often less certain about the menu plan when he/she announces 'obviously we are going to have potatoes for dinner' than when he/she says 'we are going to have potatoes for dinner': the former is likely to be a mere inference, made for instance on the basis of a smell from the kitchen, whereas the latter is an unconditional prediction appropriately pronounced by a host or *chef de cuisine*. In the terminology of semantics, it is usual to speak here of 'epistemic modality'. For John Lyons the 'fact of introducing *must*, *necessarily*, *certainly*, etc. [or, one may add, *obviously*, *apparently*, A.W.], into the utterance has the effect of making our commitment to the factuality of the proposition explicitly dependent upon our, perhaps, limited knowledge'.<sup>88</sup>

In fact, it is quite easy to demonstrate that δῆλον ὅτι is by no means more self-confident than ὡς ἔοικε. When Carion first sees the anonymous honest man who has just become rich, he says (*Plut.* 826):

Καρίων· δῆλον ὅτι τῶν χρηστῶν τις, ὡς ἔοικας, εἶ.

Carion: You seem plainly to be one of the good sort.

Sommerstein renders δῆλον ὅτι and ὡς ἔοικας with 'plainly' and 'seem', but one could also opt for 'obviously' and 'apparently' if the resulting English were not so awkward: the general sense would be correct, despite the contradictory surface meaning of the two words. Of course, Carion will turn out to be right, but at this point the statement is nothing but his inference and he marks it as such. Despite the compliment, it might even be more arrogant if he said 'you *are* one of the good sort': he would then imply that he has the authority to act as a moral judge and not just to formulate a personal opinion. Thus, the more epistemic words such as 'obviously', 'apparently', etc. are used in a conversation, the more clearly do speakers 'individualise' their statements. To put it into a simplistic formula, *Plutus* shows a less apodictic world than all the previous comedies.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>88</sup> Lyons (1977) 809. Of course there can be exceptions, but the fact that 'it is belief rather than knowledge which is usually to be assumed' in (not modalised) assertions (Palmer (1986) 87) does not imply that the form without 'obviously' etc. indicates the speaker's weaker commitment; the addition of 'obviously' makes the weakness (or relativity) of the commitment explicit.

<sup>89</sup> Perhaps this reticence also accounts for the success of the colloquial indirect expression οὐχ ὑγιῆς, οὐχ ὑγιαίνειν, etc. for 'no good, crazy' and 'to be crazy' respectively (cf. Stevens (1976) 25–6, Willi (2003) 184–5, 190); the adjectival variant occurs 4 times elsewhere in Aristophanes (twice spoken by a woman: *Thesm.* 394, 636; male: *Ach.* 956, *Eccl.* 325) and 7 times in *Plutus* (37, 50, 274, 355, 356, 362, 870), the verbal one 4 times elsewhere (female: *Av.* 1214; male: *Nub.* 1275, *Pax* 95, *Lys.* 1228) and 4 times in *Plutus* (364, 507, 1060, 1066). In this context, the use of οὐκ ἂν φθάνοις + part. (e.g. *Plut.* 485 οὐκ ἂν φθάνοιτε τοῦτο πράττοντες 'you might just as well do that straight away', instead of πράξατε τοῦτο

From here, we are led back to our earlier observation. By emphasising his or her words and phrases a speaker tries to give them the weight he or she feels they would not have without emphasis. The predilection for emphatic statements betrays the speakers' almost desperate struggle to be taken seriously. This kind of language, which suddenly becomes so common in *Plutus*, is not the kind of language 'big players' need to employ, but the language of those who are not listened to: the poor, the unimportant, those who know that the power of destiny is stronger than their resources. It is telling that no Aristophanic character uses the idiom ἦν θεὸς θέλη or ἦν θεοὶ θέλωσιν as often as Chremylus in *Plutus*.<sup>90</sup>

Indirectly, the recognition that emphasis is omnipresent in *Plutus* also has an immediate impact on the interpretation of the play. It subverts one of the main arguments of those who read the play ironically and suggest that Aristophanes wants to show the pitfalls of universal wealth. According to this view, Chremylus' address to *Plutus* reveals the protagonist's dubious character (*Plut.* 230–3):

Χρεμύλος· σὺ δ', ὦ κράτιστε Πλοῦτε πάντων δαιμόνων,  
εἶσω μετ' ἐμοῦ δεῦρ' εἴσιθ'· ἡ γὰρ οἰκία  
αὕτη 'στὶν ἦν δεῖ χρημάτων σε τήμερον  
μεστὴν ποιῆσαι καὶ δικαίως κάδικως.

Chremylus: And now, Wealth, most powerful of all divinities, come inside here with me; because this is the house which today, by fair means or foul, you've got to fill full of good things.

The scholia correctly note that καὶ δικαίως κάδικως 'by fair means or foul' signifies no more than παντὶ τρόπῳ.<sup>91</sup> Only if we do not see the emphasising function of the idiom are we tempted to take it literally, as if Chremylus was ready to proceed on an evil path if necessary. The absurdity of this conclusion is best revealed by a comparison with Andocides' *Speech on the Mysteries* (*Myst.* 1): no one would argue there, with exactly the same reasoning, that Andocides admits the legitimacy of (some of) his enemies' machinations when he speaks of τὴν προθυμίαν τῶν ἐχθρῶν τῶν ἐμῶν, ὥστ' ἐμὲ κακῶς ποιεῖν ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου καὶ δικαίως κάδικως. All we are really allowed to read into the Aristophanic passage is Chremylus' subjective impression that he would not be listened to if he did not put all his verbal weight onto the scales and if he just

ἀνύσαντες *vel sim.*) can also be mentioned; Aristophanes has this indirect variant for the straightforward imperative (esp. the imperative + part. ἀνύσας) only in *Ecclesiazusae* (118, female) and *Plutus* (485, 874, 1133; cf. also *Plut.* 1102 where the inversion full verb + part. φθάσας instead of φθάνω + part. is analogical with the construction of ἀνύσας).

<sup>90</sup> *Plut.* 347, 405, 1188; elsewhere the idiom occurs in *Pax* 939 and 1187 (chorus) and *Ran.* 533 (Xanthias). Note also the greater frequency of constructions with τυγχάνω in *Ecclesiazusae* (10 times) and *Plutus* (10 times; 33 times in the other plays): the importance of τύχη in fourth-century mentality is well-known (cf. e.g. Hunter (1985) 141–4, Vogt-Spira (1992)).

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Sommerstein (1984) 317, referring to Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1909) 440–1. For the 'ironic' interpretation of this passage see Flashar (1975) 412–13 and cf. Radt (1976) 262 and Lévy (1997) 206.

said δεῖ σε τὴν οἰκίαν μεστὴν ποιῆσαι.<sup>92</sup> The comic Chremylus speaks exactly as a real Chremylus would speak – not surprisingly given the fact that ‘in *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus* ... the category of status-defined figures expands to include certain of the main characters, who are invested with typical names, as for instance the slave Xanthias was in *Frogs*, and as now the old men Chremes and Blepyrus are in *Ecclesiazusae* and their counterpart Chremylus in *Plutus*’.<sup>93</sup>

## 2.5. Morphology

A morphological issue has already been touched upon when we noted the occurrence of the irregular superlatives αὐτότατος and μονώτατος in *Plutus* (§ 2.4). In morphology, however, such specimens of emphasis are less important than the innovation manifesting itself in a trend towards analogical levelling. Not all examples are equally revealing, but taken together they show a remarkable coherence.

For instance, the first singular imperfect ἦν ‘I was’ of εἰμί is guaranteed only in *Plutus* (3 times); in all previous plays, the traditional form without final -ν is metrically possible (ἦ < ἦα).<sup>94</sup> Of course some actors *may* have used ἦν earlier on, but it was not compulsory. We even know that our distribution of ἦ in the earlier plays and ἦν in *Plutus* must reach back to pre-medieval texts: otherwise it would make little sense for the Byzantine grammarian Choeroboscus to write that ‘we have the usage ἦν ἐγώ with Aristophanes in *Plutus*, and with Menander in *Georgos*’.<sup>95</sup> The addition of the final -ν is an analogical process due to the presence of first-singular -ν in the regular imperfect paradigm.

Second, *Plutus* is also the only Aristophanic play displaying a thematic form of a verb in -νυμι: the participle συμπαραμειγνύων instead of συμπαραμειγνύς (*Plut.* 719).<sup>96</sup> The fact that συμ- is a redundant preverb only intensifies the ‘late’ character of the participle: παραμειγνύων would have been synonymous (cf. §§ 2.3

<sup>92</sup> For similar reasons I am hesitant to follow Sommerstein (2001) 205 in his explanation of the unique vocative Πουτοπόσειδον in *Plut.* 1050 (contrast *Theism.* 322 πόντιε Πόσειδον): ‘the use of the compound here may be meant to indicate an *exceptional* degree of shock’. Rather, the compound Πουτοπόσειδον is as strong as a simple Πόσειδον used to be earlier on.

<sup>93</sup> Silk (2000) 231.

<sup>94</sup> *Plut.* 29, 695, 822, each time with a following vowel.

<sup>95</sup> Choeroboscus in *Theodosii Alexandrini canones isagogicos de flexione verborum*, p. 339.36–340.2 Hilgard (ἔχομεν δὲ τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ ἦν ἐγώ’ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει ἐν Πλούτῳ [line 28] ἐγώ’ θεοσεβῆς καὶ δίκαιος ὦν ἀνήρ. Κακῶς ἔπραττον καὶ πένης ἦν’, καὶ παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ ἐν τῷ Γεωργῶ’ ἦν δ’ οὐ πονηρὸς οὐδ’ ἐδόκουν’, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπῆρχον); cf. van Leeuwen (1904) vi. Porph. *ad Hom.* E 533 et θ 186 (*quaest. Hom. ad Il. pert.* p. 83.20 Schr.) cites for this ἦ only Cratinus fr. 194 among the comic poets, but since he is clearly selecting his examples this does not imply that he read ἦν everywhere else in comedy.

<sup>96</sup> Contrast especially *Eq.* 1399 and *Ran.* 944 μειγνύς. In *Eq.* 424 ἀπώμυου is transmitted but metrically impossible for ἀπώμυου; similarly, the correct reading in *Av.* 520 must be ἄμυυ rather than ἄμυυε. The only other example in Old Comedy is Pherecrates fr. 152.9 (undated); for examples from Middle and New Comedy cf. La Roche (1893) 155–60 and Holzinger (1940) 222. According to Thumb (1901) 58–9. the origin of the thematisation must be sought in Ionic Greek.

and 2.6).<sup>97</sup> For the thematisation, analogical simplification is again the most straightforward explanation.

Third, *Plutus* yields the best Aristophanic evidence for the pronominal neuter τοιοῦτο without -ν, instead of τοιοῦτον. In order to read τοιοῦτον in *Plut.* 361 one would have to introduce a conjecture and to argue that the following interjection φεῦ stands *extra metrum*.<sup>98</sup> It is preferable to assume that analogy with τοῦτο was at work, as in later comedy.

Fourth, only in *Plutus* do we find a future ζήσειν (*Plut.* 263) instead of ‘proper’ Attic βιώσομαι.<sup>99</sup> Similar forms are occasionally read elsewhere in fourth-century Attic. Herodotus, however, has an aorist ἔζωσα already in the fifth century, and in the Hippocratic corpus the middle future ζήσομαι is used.<sup>100</sup> Perhaps, then, the analogical completion of the paradigm of ζῶ ‘to live’ followed the footsteps of literary Ionic. Ionic influence must also be made responsible for the form ἔνεκεν instead of ἔνεκα in *Plut.* 989,<sup>101</sup> and possibly for the replacement of the genitive singular -εως of the *i*-stem ὕβρις in *Plut.* 1044. The old woman complains:

Γραῦς·           τάλαιν' ἐγὼ τῆς ὕβρεος ἧς ὕβρίζομαι.

Old Woman:    Poor me, the insults I have to endure!

Elsewhere Aristophanes uses regular Attic ὕβρεως (e.g. *Lys.* 425).<sup>102</sup> The remodelled ending -εος was more in line with other genitives in -ος, and the existence of Ionic

<sup>97</sup> Contrast *Vesp.* 878 παραμείξας; the preverb συν- does not express the collaboration of another person but is synonymous with παρα-. The closest parallel is *Lys.* 581 ἐγκαταμείξαι ‘to mix in/under’.

<sup>98</sup> σὺ μηδὲν εἰς ἔμ' ὑπονδὲι τοιοῦτο. φεῦ | mss. : τοιοῦτον | φεῦ. | Porson. The unanimously transmitted τοσοῦτο in *Eq.* 1234 can be changed more easily into τοσοῦτον, although there, too, τοσοῦτο may be correct since the speaker is the Paphlagonian slave with his lower-class style. In other cases -ο is transmitted but metrically impossible: *Pax* 759 and *Lys.* 485. In *Ran.* 1399 both τοιοῦτον and τοιοῦτο are transmitted and possible. In *Plut.* 897 τοιοῦτον is metrically ambiguous but transmitted with -ν (similarly *Eq.* 948, *Nub.* 832, *Lys.* 1225, *Thesm.* 747, *Eccl.* 394).

<sup>99</sup> Contrast *Eq.* 699 βιώσομαι; the authorship of Ar. fr. dub. 976 ζήσεις is most doubtful. LSJ cite from other Attic authors Pl. *Rep.* 465d (add Pl. *Rep.* 591c, *Leg.* 792c), Men. *Mon.* 186, from elsewhere also [Epich.] fr. 256.

<sup>100</sup> Hdt. 1.120, Hp. *Nat. puer.* 30; cf. Hp. *Prog.* 1 ἔζησα and for the future ζήσομαι later Dem. 25.92 and Arist. *Pol.* 1327b5.

<sup>101</sup> At least ἔνεκεν is read in most manuscripts (except V: ἔνεκα). Sobolewski (1890) 99–100 and Coulon (1908) 32–5 excise ἔνεκεν everywhere, but in the anapaests of *Nub.* 420 and *Eccl.* 659 -εν can be defended given the epic and tragic precedents. A separate explanation is needed only for the trimeter of *Plut.* 989 (as for ἔνεκεν in the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία: cf. Thumb-Scherer (1959) 296). Probably ἔνεκεν is a contamination of Ionic εἵνεκεν (nearly 30 times in Herodotus and a few times in the Hippocratic corpus: cf. Smyth (1894) 595–6) with Attic ἔνεκα and its absence on the Attic inscriptions until the end of the fourth century is due to the conservatism of epigraphic documents (cf. Thumb-Scherer (1959) 311). For other Aristophanic forms of this preposition (esp. οὔνεκα) see Wackernagel (1887) 591–612 and Willi (2003) 234.

<sup>102</sup> Outside iambic trimeters a genitive φύσεος is transmitted in *Vesp.* 1282 (deleted by MacDowell (1971) 298) and *Vesp.* 1458. *Metri causa φύσεος* was also conjectured by Porson in Theopompus Com. fr. 33.3. For similar forms in Middle Comedy see Eubulus fr. 67.9 ὕβρεος, 93.7 ὕβρεος, and 118.8 πόλεος. Tragedy also has πόλεος *metri gratia*: Kühner-Blass (1890–2) 1.442; cf. *CEG* 473 μάντεος.

-τος (and occasionally -εος)<sup>103</sup> may have made it even more attractive. De-Atticisation and analogy here go hand in hand.

Of course, all this morphological material does not amount to much when compared with the pragmatic data (§ 2.4) or the lexical innovations to be discussed in the next section (§ 2.6). Even if two or three points were added,<sup>104</sup> no more than a handful of lines would be at issue. However, since morphological innovations need much more time than lexical novelties to take roots, even five small indications add up to a relevant phenomenon if they point in the same direction, as they do in the present case.

What is the advantage of a morphological system regularised by analogy? Above all, such a system is more easily learned. This is the reason why children often create analogical forms until they are corrected by a ‘monitoring community’. The same applies to adult learners, i.e. speakers who join a linguistic community from outside. Thus, a mixed and open society almost automatically develops a more regular morphological system than a closed society where all language learning takes place in early childhood and where conservative native speakers have enough influence to ‘monitor’ the language of the community members.<sup>105</sup> As soon as this monitoring is reduced or falls away completely, the natural wish for regularity prevails: for a fluctuating society it is difficult (and not worthwhile) to prevent linguistic change. The analogical regularisations of *Plutus* may therefore parallel similar developments in the formation of international ‘Koine’ Greek: the highly traditional Attic of Old Comedy is yielding to a modern Attic influenced by and adapted for non-Athenians.

<sup>103</sup> See Thumb-Scherer (1959) 272 on Ionic πόλεος (already in *DGE* 750, Amorgos, 6th cent.; later: *DGE* 702.16–17 Πόσεος and *DGE* 811.41 πόλεος, both 4th cent.) and πρυτάνεος. Two or three cases of -εος are found in the Attic inscriptions (esp. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1749.76 of 341/40 BC with δ[ι]αδόσεος, Threatte (1996) 213).

<sup>104</sup> (1) The optative of sigmatic aorists has two sets of endings in the 2nd and 3rd sg. and in the 3rd pl.: ‘Aeolic’ -σειας, -σειε, -σειαν and ‘non-Aeolic’ -σαις, -σαι, -σαιεν. In Attic, the ‘Aeolic’ forms were used traditionally, but analogy with -οις, -οι, -οιεν favoured the ‘non-Aeolic’ ones. Third pl. -σαιεν is not attested in Aristophanes and 3rd sg. -σαι is most uncertain in *Plut.* 505 (παῦσαι V, παύσει other mss.). Second sg. -σαις, on the other hand, is attested 9 times in Aristophanes (against 13 -σειας): 3 times in anapaests where the form is poetic rather than innovative (*Vesp.* 572, 726, *Lys.* 506) and 2 out of the remaining 6 times in *Plutus* (*Plut.* 1036, 1134; cf. *Nub.* 776 Strepsiades, *Pax* 405 Hermes, *Vesp.* 819 Philocleon, Ar. fr. 332.15 from the second *Thesmophoriazusae* staged after 410 BC). Note that -σαις is more common than -σειας in Middle and New Comedy: Lautensach (1917) 169–80, Willi (2003) 246. (2) Aristophanes uses a sigmatic aorist ἔφθασα only in *Plut.* 685 and 1102 (against 5 times ἔφθην in earlier plays including *Ecclesiazusae*) but in serious literature ἔφθασα is already attested in Herodotus, Aeschylus, and Thucydides. (3) The passive aorist καταδάρθεντα in *Plut.* 300 is usually corrected into classical καταδάρθοντα, but Holzinger (1940) 116–17 prefers the manuscript reading since κατεδάρθη is attested in later Greek.

<sup>105</sup> A vicious (or virtuous) circle is established when the regularity of a system ensures that more ‘outsiders’ are able to master it, but even then there is an interrelation between a language’s grammatical ‘simplicity’ and its sociolinguistic success in a multicultural society.

## 2.6. Lexicon

A further symptom of this transformation is the adoption of foreign words and phrases in the lexicon of *Plutus*. Because Attic and Ionic are closely related it is easier to uncover intruders from West Greek dialects. On the other hand, Ionic Greek influenced Attic much more deeply than these varieties. Nevertheless, there are occasional Dorisms which indicate that Athens was a melting-pot for visitors from all parts of Greece.

In *Plutus* three recent Dorisms can be identified. Two of them are interjections and thus form part of a lexical subgroup where foreign elements are integrated most easily. The first of these interjections is ὦ Δάματερ, used by both Chremylus and Carion to express astonishment (*Plut.* 555, 872), but not occurring in any other Aristophanic play.<sup>106</sup> Perhaps the connotation of Demeter as a mystery goddess gave the exclamation a comically solemn note,<sup>107</sup> which was additionally strengthened by the Doric vocalism.<sup>108</sup> In any case, shouting ὦ Δάματερ must have been a usage imported from, or inspired by, other parts of the Greek world – for instance Sicily or Magna Graecia where the cult of Demeter and Kore was prominent.<sup>109</sup>

The same conclusion is valid for the interjection πώμαλα, which is approximately equivalent to οὐδαμῶς or English ‘why on earth, no way!’. There are two Aristophanic attestations: one in *Plutus* (66) and the other in *Κώκαλος*, one of the two fragmentary comedies that post-date *Plutus* (Ar. fr. 361).<sup>110</sup> Since the old ablative πῶ was used in some Doric dialects as a synonym of Attic πρόθεν,<sup>111</sup> πώμαλα was obviously taken over from such a source; its pragmatic function is similar to that of πρόθεν for ‘why?’<sup>112</sup> or with German *ja woher!* for ‘no way, certainly not’.

The third new word that is neither Attic nor Ionic is the quasi-hapax lexeme σάκτας ‘bag’. This is used by Carion in *Plut.* 681 although we should expect σάκτης from a speaker of Attic. There can only be guesses as to why such a variant was introduced

<sup>106</sup> According to Sommerstein (2001) 176, it ‘may be significant that both Chremylus here [i.e. at *Plut.* 555] and Carion there [at *Plut.* 872] are speaking in mocking tones’, but this does not explain the Doric colour. Eust. in *Od.* p. 1385.54 calls the exclamation θαυμαστόν and adds: Δωρικὸν μὲν ὄν φιληθὲν δὲ εἰς κοινήν χρῆσιν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς. It recurs in Theopompus Com. fr. 24 (undated).

<sup>107</sup> Excepting the many (22) ‘indirect’ addresses/oaths of the type μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα, Demeter is usually addressed as a mystery goddess in Aristophanes (cf. *Ran.* 385, 886; also *Thesm.* 286 with Demeter as θεσιμοφόρος). Early poetry makes Demeter the mother of Plutus (cf. Newiger (1957) 166, MacDowell (1995) 330) but this is irrelevant for Aristophanes’ play, although there may be an Eleusinian element in the picture of Plutus (Sfyroeras (1995) 234–40, against Bowie (1993) 270).

<sup>108</sup> Cf. the West Greek vocalism of Av. 570 βροντάτω νῦν ὁ μέγας Ζάω with its Orphic or Pythagorean connotations (Willi (2003) 102–3).

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Headlam (1922) 29 and in general Zuntz (1971); see also the Sybarite woman’s oath ναὶ τὰν Κόρα in *Vesp.* 1438 (where the context is Attic) and similar Doric oaths in Epicrates fr. 8.2–3, 10.7, and Plaut. *Capt.* 881.

<sup>110</sup> See further Lys. fr. 254 S. = 110 T., Dem. 19.51; in comedy only Pherecrates fr. 9 (of 420 BC).

<sup>111</sup> Cf. e.g. Sophron fr. 121, Thumb-Kieckers (1932) 169, 217. Hesychius’ information that Doric πῶ; also equals Attic ποῦ; ‘where?’ is probably imprecise. In Attic, πω- is fossilised in πῶποτε.

<sup>112</sup> See e.g. *Plut.* 83–4 πρόθεν οὐδ’ ἀυχμῶν βαδίσεις; ‘how come you’re walking around in such a filthy state?’.



for an ordinary word like σάκ(κ)ος.<sup>113</sup> Since σάκτας designates a storage item<sup>114</sup> it may have been introduced by household slaves from Northern or Western territories, or by foreign merchants and slaves on ships where goods were stored in σάκται. Thus, it would have originated as a lower-class word, perhaps in the Attic of the Piraeus or similar places.

The sociolinguistic and pragmatic level of lexical imports from Ionia is different and they look less like colloquialisms,<sup>115</sup> as two examples will demonstrate. The first concerns the use of ἔνιοι and ἐνίοτε which, in Aristophanes, is limited to *Plutus* and to one probably late fragment.<sup>116</sup> In *Plut.* 864–7 the informer is outraged about the effects of Plutus’ healing:

Συκοφάντης· ποῦ ποῦ ὄσθ’ ὁ μόνος ἅπαντας ἡμᾶς πλουσίους  
 ὑποσχόμενος οὗτος ποιήσειν εὐθέως,  
 εἰ πάλιν ἀναβλέψειεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς; ὁ δὲ  
 πολὺ μᾶλλον ἐνίους ἐστὶν ἐξολωλεκώς.

Informer: Where is he, where is he, the one who promised that he’d make us all rich straight away, all by himself, if only he could recover his sight once again? What he’d *done* is much more like totally *ruin* some of us!

In earlier plays Aristophanes would simply have written τινάς. The replacement of τινές by ἔνιοι recalls the replacement of τις by εἷς γέ τις. This lends strength to Wackernagel’s etymology of ἔνιοι as an adjective in -ιος from the numeral stem ἐν- of εἷς ‘one’.<sup>117</sup> If the word originated in psilotic East Ionic, the absence of the rough breathing is unproblematic. In fact, ἔνιοι and its cognates are missing in early Attic prose (Thucydides, Antiphon, Andocides), but they are attested in Herodotus and more commonly in the Hippocratic corpus.<sup>118</sup> In Attic literature only Eupolis and Euripides ‘dared’ to write ἔνιοι before the end of the fifth century, whereas

<sup>113</sup> For σάκ(κ)ος in Aristophanes cf. *Ach.* 745, 822, *Lys.* 1211, *Eccl.* 502 (‘bag’ > ‘beard’), and also *Ar. fr.* 343 σακίον, *Lys.* 824 σάκανδρος ‘pubic hair’ (cf. Henderson (1987) 173; for a similar development of σάκτας see *fr. com. adesp.* 536). σάκκος itself is a Semitic loan-word (cf. Chantraine (1968–80) 985, s.v. σάκκος) and likely to have been introduced by (Phoenician?) merchants. Although σάκτας may originally have denoted a particular kind of bag (Björck (1950) 68, 74), σάκκος and σάκτας became synonyms: see Pollux 3.155, 10.64.

<sup>114</sup> The origin of the Boeotian meaning ‘doctor’ (cf. Strattis *fr.* 49.5) remains obscure: perhaps ‘celui qui bouche, arrange’ (Chantraine (1968–80) 990, s.v. σάπτω).

<sup>115</sup> Admittedly, lower-class intrusions from Ionia would be more difficult to detect because Ionic words were more similar to Attic ones; literary loans, on the other hand, are recognisable since we can compare the distribution of any given lexeme in Ionic (Herodotus, Hippocratic corpus) and Attic writers respectively.

<sup>116</sup> *Plut.* 867, 1125; the lateness of *Ar. fr.* 194 with ἐνίοτε is suggested by εἷς γέ τις in *fr.* 191 (cf. above § 2.3).

<sup>117</sup> Wackernagel (1907) 6 n. 1, following Benfey, against the traditional derivation of ἔνιοι from ἐνι ὄϊ; the latter is implausible because ἐνι = ἐστίν is not attested before late Hellenistic Greek. For the formation cf. μύρ-ιοι (and for ἐνίοτε cf. ἄλλοτε, ἐκάστοτε).

<sup>118</sup> See Wackernagel (1907) 6 n. 1, with references.

Aristophanes appears to have been impeded by his linguistic conservatism for another ten or twenty years.<sup>119</sup>

The adverb ἐξαπίνης ‘suddenly’ is a second good candidate for new Ionic vocabulary in *Plutus*. Despite their surface similarity, the exact formal and etymological relationship of ἐξαπίνης with its synonym ἐξαίφνης is unclear; the resemblance might even be secondary and result from the synonymy.<sup>120</sup> Aristophanes normally uses ἐξαίφνης, 11 times between his first play, the *Δαιταλῆς* of 427 BC, and the last transmitted fifth-century play, *Frogs*. In *Ecclesiazusae* neither variant occurs, but in *Plutus*, we suddenly find three times ἐξαπίνης next to one traditional ἐξαίφνης.<sup>121</sup> ἐξαπίνης is absent from Attic tragedy and the prose of Plato, Demosthenes, and Isocrates. On the other hand, it does exist in Ionic and other poetry,<sup>122</sup> in Herodotus, and again frequently in the Hippocratic treatises. We may therefore regard it as an Ionic loan-word adopted in fourth-century spoken Attic.<sup>123</sup>

It would be possible to prolong the list of isolated lexical innovations in *Plutus* (cf. e.g. *Plut.* 706 αἶ,<sup>124</sup> *Plut.* 434 ἀνθ’ ὧν for (δι)ότι ‘because’,<sup>125</sup> *Plut.* 388 ἀπαρτί ‘on the contrary’,<sup>126</sup> *Plut.* 1081 ἐπιτρέπω in the sense of ἐπιτάττω ‘to order’<sup>127</sup>) or in *Plutus* and *Ecclesiazusae*<sup>128</sup> (cf. the frequency of colloquial μεῖραξ ‘girl’<sup>129</sup> and the use of τι τῶν προὔργου ‘something important, something that needs doing’,<sup>130</sup>

<sup>119</sup> Eupolis fr. 221 (in Πόλεις of 422 BC), Eur. *Hel.* 1213. Wackernagel’s doubts ((1907) 6 n. 1) about the transmission of ἐνίστε in Eupolis fr. 221 and Ar. fr. 194 are hardly justified.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Chantraine (1968–80) 41 and 353, s.vv. αἶψα and ἐξαπίνης. Does ἐξαπίνης contain the suffix -ινός of temporal adjectives (e.g. εἰαρινός, ὀπωρινός) and adjectives based on time measuring (πικινόν/-ά ‘often’, θαμνός ‘frequent’/θαμινά ‘often’, βραδινός ‘slow’, ταχινός ‘quick’: cf. Schwyzler (1939) 490) as would be plausible for a word meaning ‘suddenly’? From a wrong segmentation of the distributive numeral ἅπαξ (i.e. ἄπ-αξ instead of ἄ-παξ, suggested by Homeric μουν-άξ or τετρ-άκ-ις etc.) a ntr. pl. ἄπ-ινά ‘once’ could have been derived in analogy with πικ-ινά and θαμ-ινά ‘frequently’. The ending -ης would then be analogical after ἐξαίφνης, and Hellenistic ἐξ-άπινα would reflect the original. For the meaning English at *once* and German *auf einmal* ‘suddenly’ could be compared.

<sup>121</sup> *Plut.* 336, 339, 815 vs. *Plut.* 353. The occurrence in *Δαιταλῆς* is Ar. fr. 237.

<sup>122</sup> For instance in Homer (*Il.* 5.91, 9.6, etc.), Alcaeus (fr. 298.27 V.), and Pindar (*Pyth.* 4.273).

<sup>123</sup> Sophocles has 7 ἐξαίφνης : 0 ἐξαπίνης; Euripides 4 : 0; Plato 36 : 0; Demosthenes 13 : 0 (ἐξαπίνης occurs once in the spurious *Or.* 59); Isocrates 2 : 0; Herodotus 0–1 (very uncertain: Hdt. 9.45.3) : 2; Hippocratic corpus 58 : 88; Thucydides 7 : 6 (perhaps influenced by Ionic historiography); Xenophon 17 : 8; Menander 7 : 4.

<sup>124</sup> The (typically female: Bain (1984) 35–6) interjection αἶ becomes common only in Menander (Sommerstein (2001) 183) whereas doubled αἶαἶ occurs earlier, usually in paratragic contexts (*Ach.* 1083–4, *Thesm.* 885, 1042, *Lys.* 961) unless spoken by women (*Lys.* 393, *Eccl.* 911).

<sup>125</sup> As in later Greek: cf. Schwyzler-Debrunner (1950) 661.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. elsewhere in comedy Pherecrates fr. 77 and fr. 98, Pl. *Com.* fr. 59, and (as in Herodotus) with a meaning ‘completely’ Eupolis fr. 429.

<sup>127</sup> As in Xen. *Anab.* 6.5.11 and in later Greek; however, Sommerstein (2001) 207 doubts that *Plut.* 1081 has been correctly transmitted.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. van Leeuwen (1904) xix–xx.

<sup>129</sup> The colloquial character of μεῖραξ is shown by the suffix (Chantraine (1968–80) 678, s.v. μεῖραξ). Five occurrences in the fourth-century plays (*Eccl.* 611, 696, 1138, *Plut.* 1071, 1079) stand against one earlier example (*Thesm.* 410, female); cf. also Cratinus fr. 60 and fr. 334. μεῖρακίσκη, too, occurs rather late (*Ran.* 409, *Plut.* 963) but μεῖράκιον is common throughout Aristophanes’ plays.

<sup>130</sup> *Eccl.* 784, *Plut.* 623. For προὔργου cf. also the comparative in *Lys.* 20 (female speaker) and occasional occurrences in Thucydides, but most examples occur in fourth-century texts.

φιμύθιον ‘white lead (make-up),’<sup>131</sup> ἀκρατίζομαι ‘to breakfast,’<sup>132</sup> and ἄμης ‘milk-cake’).<sup>133</sup> More interesting, however, is the discussion of three more general points.

The first of these ties in with our earlier observations on syntactic redundancy. The compounds ἐπακολουθέω, συνακολουθέω, and συμπαραμειγνύναι with their redundant preverbs ἐπι- and συν- have already been mentioned (§§ 2.3 and 2.5). Now, this series can be extended. The verb πυνθάνομαι becomes ἐκπυνθάνομαι in *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus*,<sup>134</sup> simple βιάζομαι is προσβιάζομαι in *Plutus*,<sup>135</sup> instead of δῆλος we have κατὰδῆλος,<sup>136</sup> and the adverb ἐπίτηδες ‘on purpose’ is strengthened into ἐξεπίτηδες.<sup>137</sup> The reason for these remodellings is the same as before: semantic weakening is counterbalanced by emphatic redundancy. Thus, the lexical data completes the picture sketched in the sections on syntax and pragmatics (§§ 2.3 and 2.4).

A second general point concerns linguistic fashions. The innovative words cited so far will already have made it clear that some lexical changes advance our understanding of the sociolinguistic environment of the play more than others. If we see that κόσμιος and κοσμιότης start to be used next to, and instead of, σῶφρων and σωφροσύνη,<sup>138</sup> it is difficult to relate this to a wider context. Once in our play we even find an explicit remark on such ‘random’ lexical change. Chremylus addresses the chorus of fellow-demesmen who have come to share in his riches (*Plut.* 322–5):

Χρεμύλος· ‘χαίρειν’ μὲν ὑμᾶς ἔστιν, ὦνδρες δημόται,  
ἀρχαῖον ἤδη προσαγορεύειν καὶ σαπρόν·  
ἀσπάζομαι δ’ ὅτι ἡ προθύμως ἤκετε  
καὶ συντεταμένως κοῦ κατεβλακευμένως.

<sup>131</sup> *Eccl.* 878, 929, 1072, *Plut.* 1064; also in fr. 332 of *Thesmophoriazusae* II (undated) and in Plato, Xenophon, *Amipsias* fr. 3.

<sup>132</sup> *Plut.* 295; also in Ar. fr. 621 (undated)

<sup>133</sup> *Plut.* 999; also in Middle and New Comedy.

<sup>134</sup> *Eccl.* 752 (‘perhaps here the prefix should be stressed, “make full inquiries”’, Ussher (1973) 182), *Plut.* 60. There are no further occurrences in comedy (contrast 38 times πυνθάνομαι etc. in Aristophanes) but the compound occurs in tragedy; tragic redundancy is ridiculed in Ar. *Ran.* 1152–79.

<sup>135</sup> *Plut.* 16 (Carion), against 7 times βιάζομαι elsewhere in Aristophanes (incl. *Plut.* 1092). Since βιάζομαι usually refers to sexual force, ἀναγκάζω may be closer to Carion’s meaning and the very use of βιάζομαι reveals the search for stronger expressions. Note also that 2 out of 3 Aristophanic examples of ἐπ-ἀναγκάζω occur in *Plutus* (525, 533), and that in *Eccl.* 1137 and *Plut.* 1079 ξυλλαβών, -οῦσα is used in the sense of simple λαβών (ἄγων) ‘taking along (of a person)’ (not: ‘collecting, assisting, arresting, etc.’; cf. elsewhere in Aristophanes only *Vesp.* 122, spoken by a slave).

<sup>136</sup> *Plut.* 1065 (Chremylus); elsewhere in Aristophanes 25 times δῆλος (6 times in *Plutus*).

<sup>137</sup> *Plut.* 916, against 10 examples of ἐπίτηδες (until *Eccl.* 116). Because of all this, Sommerstein (2001) 145 puts too much emphasis on the distinction between παρατίλλειν and τίλλειν when he explains παρατίλλεται in *Plut.* 168: presumably παρατίλλειν in *Plutus* is the same as τίλλειν in earlier plays (*Nub.* 1083, *Thesm.* 543).

<sup>138</sup> The adjective κόσμιος is found 2 or 3 times in Aristophanes, exclusively in *Plutus* (89, 565; *Plut.* 566 is often deleted). The noun κοσμιότης occurs only at *Plut.* 564. The adverb κοσμίως occurs 3 out of 5 times in *Plutus* (*Plut.* 671, 709, 978) and twice more in a woman’s line of *Thesmophoriazusae* (573, 853; cf. Willi (2003) 191). For the equivalence κόσμιος = σῶφρων compare *Plut.* 89 with *Plut.* 386–7 (Sommerstein (2001) 176).

Chremylus: To greet you with ‘good day’, my fellow-demesmen, is old-fashioned and past it now. So, a warm welcome to you for having come so eagerly, so energetically and so unslothfully.

One or two other Aristophanic passages confirm the impression that ἀσπάζομαι was a fashionable way of saying ‘hello’ around 400 BC, but we also know that ἀσπάζομαι never replaced χαῖρε entirely.<sup>139</sup> If we want to learn something reliable about social changes in the world of *Plutus* we must refrain from (over-)interpreting short-lived linguistic fads.

Even so, the third and last general point shows that there are areas where such efforts to elucidate the interrelation of lexical and social changes can prove worthwhile. The term κекτημένος for ‘master’, which was chastised by the more severe atticists,<sup>140</sup> is attested only in Aristophanes’ two fourth-century comedies;<sup>141</sup> earlier on, the same concept is always (and frequently) denoted by δεσπότης.<sup>142</sup> Apparently, a master-slave focus is given up in favour of an owner–slave focus. Thus, the crucial factor to determine a man’s status has become economic rather than social: his wealth and possessions count more than his birth and origin. Carion, for instance, mentions that he became a slave out of debts, and there is nothing to suggest that the audience should be surprised to hear this even though debt-slavery of Athenians had been abolished since the time of Solon (*Plut.* 147–8):<sup>143</sup>

Καρίων· ἔγωγέ τοι διὰ μικρὸν ἀργυρίδιον  
δοῦλος γεγένημαι, πρότερον ὦν ἐλεύθερος (*or* διὰ τὸ μὴ πλουτεῖν ἴσως).

Carion: I certainly became a slave because of a petty little sum of money, having previously been free (*or* perhaps because of not being rich).

<sup>139</sup> Cf. e.g. *Plut.* 788 χαίρετε and Sommerstein (2001) 161. ‘Performative’ ἀσπάζομαι (i.e. ἀσπάζομαι (σε/ὕμᾱς) in the 1st sg. or 1st pl. used to address people) recurs in *Plut.* 1042 where the young man ironically addresses the old woman. In earlier comedies it is found in *Nub.* 1145 with the modernist Socrates and in *Av.* 1377 where Peisetaerus greets the poet Cinesias in Cinesias’ own exalted style. The tragic use of ἀσπάζομαι reveals its stylistic level (cf. paratragic/elevated passages like Alexis fr. 172.5, Men. fr. 1, and Ar. fr. dub. 965): Eur. *Ion* 1363 and perhaps Soph. fr. 602.1 come closest to a ‘performative’ usage (see also Pl. *Apol.* 29d, *Euthd.* 273c). Eur. fr. 362.33 N. implies that ἀσπάζομαι was felt to be more emotional than simple χαῖρε. Non-performative ἀσπάζεσθαι ‘to greet (esp. with kisses or an embrace)’ is common at all times (e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 607, *Pax* 559, *Eccl.* 971, 975, *Plut.* 743, 752). In Hellenistic and Byzantine letters, ἀσπάζομαι is a standard greeting formula (cf. e.g. Paul’s *Letter to the Romans* 16.22).

<sup>140</sup> Cf. Antitatticista p. 102.20–1 Bekker: κекτημένος occurs for instance in Menander, but also in Xen. *Oec.* 20.22, Pl. *Leg.* 882b, and already in Phrynichus Com. fr. 50.

<sup>141</sup> *Plut.* 4; in *Eccl.* 1126 the term used is κекτημένη, and we do not know if this was felt to be a comic form like κερύκαϊνα and στρατηγίς in the same play (*Eccl.* 713, 835) or a normal ‘slave’s way of referring to his mistress’ (Ussher (1973) 229; cf. later e.g. Men. *Dysk.* 411, *Her.* 37, *Perik.* 181). *Plut.* 7 ἔωνημένος can be added here because the underlying concept is the same. In Soph. fr. 762 ἡ κекτημένη refers to ownership of animals and Pearson (1917) 17 points out that, for ‘mistress’, ‘tragedy elsewhere uses ἡ κρατούσα, Aesch. *Cho.* 730, Soph. *Trach.* 405’. However, κекτημένος is certain in Aesch. *Supp.* 337 and Eur. *IA* 715 (‘master’ = ‘husband’) though perhaps meant to shock the audience.

<sup>142</sup> Δεσπότης occurs more than 70 times in Aristophanes (16 times in *Plutus*); δεσποῖνα, too, is very common.

<sup>143</sup> For the existence of debt-slavery and debt-bondage outside Athens see Sommerstein (2001) 142–3. Aristophanes by no means *had* to refer to Carion’s original status.

On an ideological level it may at first sight seem more liberal to see in a δεσπότης not a better man but just a richer one, and perhaps this ‘liberalisation’ allowed the comic poets to invent leading characters like Carion (although this might also be due to the wish to retain some ‘roguish’ elements in a ‘softer’ comedy).<sup>144</sup> On the other hand, though, the real status of slaves as mere possessions also became more explicit this way.<sup>145</sup> The agon of *Plutus* presents a telling example of how little attention could be paid to the human nature of slaves. When Penia asks Chremylus who is going to do the hard work when all men have become rich, Chremylus replies that everyone will simply buy slaves. Now, Penia does not counter this idea with what might constitute a straightforward argument: that slaves, too, should become rich and free. Instead, she makes a logistic point: no one will supply slaves any longer (*Plut.* 510–26).

Of course, to read a change from a social to an economic mentality into a single lexeme<sup>146</sup> means putting much weight on little linguistic evidence. However, there is a further issue that points in the same direction. No part of the lexicon of a language reveals as much about mentality as a language’s terms of abuse: they betray where the taboos of a society are.

That τοιχωρύχος ‘burglar’ occurs six times in *Plutus* and only three times in all the other comedies at first looks natural given the theme of Aristophanes’ last play.<sup>147</sup> Yet, in four of these six attestations, the meaning of τοιχωρύχος is not ‘burglar’ but unspecifically ‘villain, crook’. In the earlier plays, τοιχωρύχος had been used in this way, as a general term of abuse, only by the rustic Strepsiades in *Clouds* and by the slave Xanthias in *Frogs*.<sup>148</sup>

Another innovative term of abuse is ἱερόσυλος, which originally meant ‘temple-robber’, but which came to be used, in various fourth-century authors, in the same generic sense as English ‘criminal’. Aristophanes has ἱερόσυλος just once, again in *Plutus*.<sup>149</sup>

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Dover (1972) 207–8; Sommerstein (2001) 138 stresses the impertinence of Carion’s address to his master in *Plut.* 46 ὦ σκαϊότατε ‘you stupid fool’. However, Carion’s situation is not changed at the end of the play and it is only ‘from the master’s point of view ... that the social structure of Wealth’s new world is a marked improvement over the old’ (Olson (1989) 199).

<sup>145</sup> Legally slaves had of course always been κτήματα (Eur. *Med.* 49, Arist. *Pol.* 1253b32 κτήμά τι ἔμφυχου) and enjoyed very limited rights only (e.g. that of not being killed by the owner: cf. MacDowell (1978) 80).

<sup>146</sup> Or two or three, if one adds the vaguely materialistic idioms τί/οὐδὲν πλέον σοί ἐστι (‘what’s the good of/it’s no good’: *Eccl.* 1094, *Plut.* 531) and καταλείπειν/ἔχειν οὐδὲ ταφήναι (‘to leave behind/to have not even enough to pay for one’s funeral’: *Eccl.* 592, *Plut.* 556), which are attested only in the last two plays (van Leeuwen (1904) xix).

<sup>147</sup> Cf. Pl. *Leg.* 831c–e, where burglary and temple-robbery are seen as results of lust for wealth. The frequency of πένια/Πενία and πέννης, for instance, is not more surprising than the frequency of σφήκες in *Wasps* (πένια: 9 times in *Plut.*, once in *Eccl.*, once in *Vesp.*; πέννης: 5 times in *Plut.*, 9 times elsewhere).

<sup>148</sup> *Nub.* 1327, *Ran.* 808, *Plut.* 869 (Carion), 909 (honest man), 939, 1141 (both Carion). The original meaning is preserved in *Ran.* 773 (slave), *Plut.* 204 (Plutus), and (verbally) *Plut.* 165 (Carion). Elsewhere τοιχωρύχος occurs as a general term of abuse, e.g. in Amipsias fr. 23 (undated), Dem. 35.9, and Diphilus fr. 3 (applied to an object).

<sup>149</sup> *Plut.* 30 ἱερόσυλοι βήτορες ‘crooked politicians’ (Chremylus); cf. Sommerstein (2001) 136–7, who cites as parallels Men. *Dysk.* 640, *Epitr.* 952, 1064, 1100, *Perik.* 366, Lys. 30.21, and Eubulus fr. 6.4 (applied to an object). In *Vesp.* 845 the verb ἱεροσυλέω is used literally for ‘temple-robbing’.

If we thus find two new terms of abuse borrowed from the sphere of robbing and thieving,<sup>150</sup> we may legitimately conclude that the taboo-status of breaking property rights had become stronger and threatened the primacy of *social* offences like shamelessness (ἀναίσχυντος), impertinence (τολμηρός), denunciation (συκοφάντης), pollution (μιαρός), father-beating (πατραλοίας), or pathic homosexuality (καταπύγων).<sup>151</sup>

Finally, to conclude on a different and even less respectable note, this loss of interest in social rules helps to explain a third new term of abuse, σκατοφάγος 'shit-eater'. Dover has recently observed that Aristophanes 'abstains from the use of "basic" [i.e. heterosexual and scatological in contrast to homosexual, A.W.] obscene metaphor in reproaching stupidity and unpleasantness'.<sup>152</sup> In fact, *Plut.* 706, where Carion shockingly<sup>153</sup> calls the god Asclepius σκατοφάγος, is the only exception. Since socially established taboos like pathic homosexuality presuppose a cohesive social framework, a 'functioning society', the loss of such an environment may favour the linguistic exploitation of 'natural' taboos (like the eating of excrement) which are controlled by each individual in his or her own interest.<sup>154</sup> I would therefore suggest that the abusive lexicon of *Plutus* mirrors a 'change of scenery', a turn away from the world of the community and a turn towards the private sphere of personal rights and wrongs.

<sup>150</sup> Of course, *λερροσυλία* is *also* a religious offence but unlike *μίσμα* it operates on an economic level.

<sup>151</sup> For these and other terms of abuse in Aristophanes see now Dover (2002). Some of them are not found at all in *Plutus* (τολμηρός, ἀναίσχυντος, πατραλοίας, and καταπύγων). Similarly, the common word πανούργος is as rare as in later comedy (only *Plut.* 37; cf. Menander with only 5 exx.): contrast for instance *Knights* with 12 and *Thesmophoriazusae* with 10 attestations. Verbal πανουργέω, on the other hand, is rare before *Plutus* (*Ach.* 658, *Eq.* 803, *Nub.* 1309, *Thesm.* 893), but occurs 3 times there (*Plut.* 368, 876, 1145). The reason is probably the increasing use of compound verbs in -έω in fourth-century Greek (cf. Sütterlin (1891) 63, Debrunner (1917) 95, Willi (2003) 122–6).

<sup>152</sup> Dover (2002) 97, who speaks of a 'semantic niche' but does not mention σκατοφάγος. Both σκατοφάγος and σκατοφαγέω are common in later comedy (*Men.* fr. 571, *Dysk.* 488, *Perik.* 394, *Sam.* 427, 550). For the same notion cf. already *Pax* 48 (σπατίλην ἐσθίει, said by an Ionian), *Eccl.* 595 (κατέδει πέλεθον πρότερός μου 'You'd want to eat shit ahead of me!'), and *Plut.* 305: Circe made the companions of Philonides eat kneaded shit (μεμαγμένον σκῶρ ἐσθίειν) like pigs; cf. Sommerstein (2001) 158, who compares Antiphanes fr. 124 and Crobylus fr. 7 (add Epich. fr. 56) where σκατοφαγέω/σκατοφάγος are used literally, as vulgar but not abusive terms.

<sup>153</sup> Cf. Henderson (1991) 192; the word is introduced climactically after Chremylus' wife has used the mildly abusive term ἄγροικος (*Plut.* 705).

<sup>154</sup> To explain the 'semantic niche' in this way is probably preferable to assuming that oral and anal sexual practices were 'more taboo' than excremental phenomena and therefore potentially more abusive (Willi (2002) 10). Σκῶρ 'shit' itself may have been a taboo word before the late fifth century; being an Indo-European collective noun like ὕδωρ, it must be very old although it is not attested before *Ran.* 146 (Heracles), *Plut.* 305 (Carion), Sophron fr. 11, and Strattis fr. 8 (where the source claims that *Ran.* 146 is the first occurrence).



### 3. *New language for a new comedy: summary and conclusion*

The features and changes that have been listed and discussed in the preceding sections bear testimony to three comprehensive innovative trends in the language of Aristophanes' *Plutus*:

(1) A trend towards a more colloquial and sometimes distinctly lower-class style is perceived, above all, on the syntactic and pragmatic levels (§§ 2.3 and 2.4: semantic weakening and redundancy, emphasis and epistemic modality), supplemented by one phonological point (§ 2.1).

(2) A loss of 'Atticness' and an increase of foreign, especially Ionic, elements is seen in the gradual disappearance of the dual and of ὅπως beside ἴνα (§ 2.3), in the new adjectives in -ώδης (§ 2.2), and in certain new words like ἔνιοι and ἐξαπίνης (§ 2.6). Probably the morphological trend towards analogy also belongs in the wider context of this 'internationalisation' of Aristophanes' Attic (§ 2.5).

(3) A partial restructuring of the lexicon reflects ongoing social changes, a replacement of social interests and concerns by individual ones and a new economic mentality which presumably resulted from an 'across-the-board decrease in fortunes' in the early fourth century<sup>155</sup> and led to growing tensions between the rich and the poor (§ 2.6).<sup>156</sup>

It is easy to see the link between all three developments since the linguistic analysis mainly corroborates what is already known about the novelty of *Plutus* as a literary text. With the disastrous defeat in the Peloponnesian War, Athens had lost not only her empire but also her pride. Even though some form of cultural leadership remained the city's prerogative, this was no longer the cultural leadership of the Athenian *polis*, but rather a cultural leadership of certain Athenian *individuals*. Whereas Aeschylus and Sophocles had written tragedies to teach the *polis*, Plato was now writing dialogues to teach the individual, and whereas Pericles had addressed the Athenian as an Athenian, Isocrates was now addressing the Athenian as a Greek.

There are limits to such generalisations and it is certainly true that 'the reasons why comedy ceased to perform the function of rebellion in fantasy against the publicly accepted ideal of good citizenship ... must not be sought solely in political and social history without reference to the autonomous development of comedy as an artistic genre'.<sup>157</sup> Nevertheless, the generalisations also contain some truth, and no literary

<sup>155</sup> Dillon (1987) 162; cf. *Plut.* 130–97, David (1984) 32–8, and Ehrenberg (1951) 238 = (1968) 240–2: 'All these passages prove that financial questions came to be of ever-increasing importance in both public and private life. This would not have been the case if economics in general had not taken hold of the minds of almost the whole people and even influenced ethics and religion.'

<sup>156</sup> See David (1984) 19, who illustrates this with speeches from the Lysianic corpus (Lys. 22.15, 22.20; 27.10–11).

<sup>157</sup> Dover (1974) 301.

genre mirrors the political and social, as well as mental, ‘revolution’ more clearly than comedy – as has been acknowledged since antiquity. With the end of the great war, political comedy, ‘Old Comedy’, has lost its fertile soil and ‘Middle Comedy’, hovering between parody of myth<sup>158</sup> and the domestic world of cooks, slaves, and *hetairai*, takes over the stage. In *Ecclesiazusae* a political theme is still at the heart of the play when the poet asks how the state should be organised,<sup>159</sup> but in *Plutus* the style of Old Comedy is retained only in a few formal reminiscences such as the (limited) existence of an integrated chorus, the anapaestic agon, and the episode series in the second half of the play;<sup>160</sup> politics, however, has virtually disappeared and the distribution of wealth is represented not so much as a *social* problem, but as the problem of every (good) *individual* – a far cry from the communism of *Ecclesiazusae*, to which everyone must contribute his or her share. Admittedly, *Plut.* 1191–5 briefly mentions that Plutus is going to be (re-)installed in the treasury located in the temple of Athena on the acropolis, but Bowie rightly notes that this remark ‘receives curiously less emphasis than the induction into Chremylus’ house’.<sup>161</sup>

After the defeat of 404 BC, and during the unlucky years of the Corinthian war,<sup>162</sup> the *polis* Athens could no longer serve as a glorified reference-point for the self-identification of its citizens: being Athenian gradually came to mean being a loser. In this situation, it was distinctly unattractive to maintain the symbols of the past and, by implication, to defend traditional language against the attacks and demands of the present new world, which had been internationalised not least by the same unfortunate wars. Similarly, there was no longer much point in getting involved with the communal life of a *polis* whose desperate struggle to regain its former greatness was patently unsuccessful. As Dillon points out, the loss of importance of ‘political’ (in the sense of

<sup>158</sup> As in Aristophanes’ last comedies, *Αἰολοσίκων* and *Κώκαλος*: cf. Webster (1970) 17–18 and Perusino (1987) 61–4, 69–70. *Κώκαλος* also contained a rape and a recognition *à la* Menander (cf. Ar. test. 1.49–51).

<sup>159</sup> See especially Praxagora’s programme (*Eccl.* 583–688) and the war theme of the speech rehearsed in *Eccl.* 170–240 (esp. *Eccl.* 193–203, 233–4): ‘Old Comedy makes its last brilliant bow in the *Ekklesiazousai* and the curtain goes up on mythological comedy in the *Ploutos*’ (Webster (1970) 36).

<sup>160</sup> Nesselrath (1990) 334; this is hardly sufficient to make *Plutus* the ‘last representative of Old (or better: Aristophanic) Comedy’ (Dillon (1985) 215, cited by Nesselrath (1990) 337 n. 8; cf. also Sfyroeras (1995) 253, who detects metatheatrical reflection reminiscent of Old Comedy). The boundary between Old and Middle Comedy is more distinct than that between Middle and New Comedy (cf. Nesselrath (1990) 337, citing Landfester (1979) 354).

<sup>161</sup> Bowie (1993) 290. Attica is also referred to in *Plut.* 772–3, but note that Penia will be thrown out of Greece (not Athens) according to *Plut.* 463. McGlew (1997) 47–52 pays too little attention to this when he reads the play as a call for *Athenian* reunification.

<sup>162</sup> For the problematic situation of Athens around 390 BC cf. David (1984) 33–4 and Sommerstein (2001) 1–4: in 389 an expedition to besiege Aegina was unsuccessful, in 388 the hopes for Persian support faded away, and in 387 Athens had to accept an unconditional peace dictated by Persia. The general feeling of hopelessness (underestimated by Dillon (1987) 157–8) is reflected in *Lys.* 28.15, of 389 BC (καίτοι πάντες ἐπίστασθε ὅτι οὐδεμία ἐλπίς σωτηρίας ὑμῖν δυστυχήσασι. ὥστε ἄξιον ὑμᾶς παρακλευσάμενους ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς παρὰ τούτων νυνὶ τὴν μεγίστην δίκην λαβεῖν, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἕλλησιν ἐπιδείξει ὡς τοῖς ἀδικούντας τιμωρεῖσθε, καὶ τοῖς ὑμετέροισι ἄρχοντας βελτίους ποιήσετε); cf. Ehrenberg (1951) 248 = (1968) 252.

social and communal) structures concretely manifests itself also outside comedy: for instance, in the necessity of introducing payment for assembly attendance, in the professionalisation of speech-writing, in the increasing use of mercenary troops, in a professionalisation of the civil service, and in the invention of private ‘euergetism’;<sup>163</sup> perhaps one may add the abolition of radical democracy in 403/2, which meant that the powers of the people’s assembly were reduced: ‘legislation and jurisdiction came to be the monopoly of the 6,000 persons each year who had sworn the Heliastic Oath, who served partly as *nomothetai* (legislators), and partly as *dikastai* (jurors)’.<sup>164</sup> Even though most Athenians remained *potential* decision-makers in the socio-political sphere, other – by implication more private or ‘individual’ – interests would now come to dominate the daily agenda.

Being a keen observer of society, Aristophanes could not fail to notice these developments. As he had always identified himself with the role as a teacher of the *polis*, they must have hit him hard. In this brave new world, teaching the *polis* was no longer a real option. Instead, there was a choice between two possibilities. Either, the comic poet could proceed as if nothing had happened and as if comedy still had to bite people like Cleon – although such people had disappeared together with the political and social environment upon which they had relied. To some degree and with some success, this is what Aristophanes tried to do in *Ecclesiazusae*. Or else, the comic poet could (re)invent a new type of comedy: again of course a comedy for the people (for there could not be another kind of comedy), but no longer a comedy for the *Athenian* people, the *demos*. Aristophanes’ *Plutus* is precisely such a ‘new’ comedy for the people *tout court*.<sup>165</sup> If this seems dull to us, it need not have seemed so to an ancient audience who had grown tired of tradition and traditions.

Even today, however, *Plutus* deserves some credit, and this is above all due to its new language. The symbiotic unity of theme and words is as perfect as ever, for here too Aristophanes was facing a choice between two options. Either, he could adopt the language which he had always used and brought to perfection: a purely Athenian, conservative *polis* discourse regulated by its own poetics of humour, a *Kunstsprache* which the anonymous author of the *Prolegomena de comoedia III* called the ποιητικὸν πλάσμα of Old Comedy. Or else, he could develop a new language of comedy, imitating the συνήθης λαλιά of those for whom he *now* wrote, the common man, no matter if Athenian or not.<sup>166</sup> This new

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Dillon (1987) 176–80; note also the growing importance of Zeus Soter (David (1984) 24, Parker (1996) 238–41; in Aristophanes Zeus Soter is mentioned with increasing frequency from *Thesmophoriazusae* onward: *Thesm.* 1009, *Ran.* 738, 1433, *Eccl.* 79, 761, 1045, 1103, *Plut.* 877, 1175, 1186, 1189) and of the ‘private’ healing god Asclepius (whom Aristophanes mentions only in *Plut.* 411, 621, 636, 640, as well as *Vesp.* 123 where the god is still so much of an outsider that he is visited only after a try with a Corybantic ceremony).

<sup>164</sup> Hansen (1991) 151.

<sup>165</sup> Cf. e.g. Gelzer (1970) 1505, Arnott (1972) 67, and especially Olson (1990) 232–3: ‘on a practical level [*Plutus*] proposes only a (somewhat theoretically incoherent) withdrawal from common affairs’.

<sup>166</sup> *Prolegomena de com. III*: τῆς δὲ μέσης κωμωδίας οἱ ποιηταὶ πλάσματος μὲν οὐχ ἦψαντο ποιητικοῦ, διὰ δὲ τῆς συνήθους ἰόντες λαλιᾶς λογικᾶς ἔχουσι τὰς ἀρετάς, ὥστε σπάνιον ποιητικὸν εἶναι χαρακτήρα παρ’ αὐτοῖς; cf. Nesselrath (1990) 50.

mimetic<sup>167</sup> language so strongly shapes our *Plutus* and it has so much to do with the history of early fourth-century Athens that MacDowell must be wrong when he sees in our play nothing but a superficially revised version of the first *Plutus* of 408 BC.<sup>168</sup>

By way of conclusion, I would like to put forward one more thought arising from all this, but pointing far beyond the realm of comedy. As has been argued repeatedly in this paper, the four years that separate *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus* are no sufficient time-span to explain the linguistic gaps between the two fourth-century plays solely by reference to natural language development. If we account for this gap, as I suggest, with Aristophanes' conscious decision to write no longer in the *polis*-oriented, traditional style of Old Comedy, but in a new 'popular' way,<sup>169</sup> we discover here for the first time an awareness of one great issue that came to threaten and enrich Greek literature until this day: *diglossia*. The observation that Aristophanes made up his mind between a 'pure' language respecting the established norms of the genre and a language imitating how *people* really spoke can also be formulated in *Greek* terms – and then anachronistically reads as follows: Aristophanes wrote his second *Plutus* not in *καθαρεύουσα* but in *δημοτική*.<sup>170</sup>

SEMINAR FÜR KLASSISCHE PHILOLOGIE, BASEL

ANDREAS WILLI

<sup>167</sup> Parodic disruptions are rare in *Plutus* (for a list of paratragic passages see Rau (1967) 207–9). For instance, the paratragic potential of the initial motif of a fatal encounter ordained by an oracle (as in Euripides' *Ion*) is not fully exploited; cf. Rau (1967) 160–1 and Silk (2000) 25: 'granted that the slave is to some degree talking the language of tragedy, his talk is still broadly "in character"' and we 'recognize a consistent type: a grumbling, honest, street-wise servant'. The rarity of integrated choral pieces and topical allusions produces 'a more coherent and unified work of art in which the dramatic illusion [is] more consistently maintained' (Dillon (1987) 174–5).

<sup>168</sup> Cf. MacDowell (1995) 324–7; for a refutation on non-linguistic grounds see Sommerstein (2001) 31–3. Van Leeuwen (1904) i–xxiv and Hertel (1969) 28–32 deny the existence of the earlier *Plutus* altogether.

<sup>169</sup> Of course Aristophanes need not have been the first to make such a decision: cf. e.g. Silk (2000) 51–2 on Middle Comedy elements in Crates and Pherecrates.

<sup>170</sup> This is not to say that *modern* *καθαρεύουσα* and *δημοτική* are in any way comparable to the two Aristophanic 'codes': the latter were both rooted in 'real' language, whereas modern *καθαρεύουσα* and modern *δημοτική* are, to a greater or lesser extent, artificial creations.

## REFERENCES

- Aerts, W. J. (1965) *Periphrastica: an investigation into the use of εἶναι and ἔχειν as auxiliaries or pseudo-auxiliaries in Greek from Homer up to the present day*, Amsterdam.
- Allen, W. S. (1987) *Vox graeca: a guide to the pronunciation of classical Greek* (3rd edn.), Cambridge.
- Amigües, S. (1977) *Les subordonnées finales par ὅπως en attique classique*, Études et commentaires 89, Paris.
- Arnott, W. G. (1972) 'From Aristophanes to Menander', *G&R* 19, 65–80.
- Bain, D. (1984) 'Female speech in Menander', *Antichthon* 18, 24–42.
- Bers, V. (1984) *Greek poetic syntax in the classical age*, Yale Classical Monographs 5, New Haven and London.
- Birklein, F. (1888) *Entwicklungsgeschichte des substantivierten Infinitivs*, Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache 3.1, Würzburg.
- Björck, G. (1940) *Ἡυδιδάσκων. Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen*, Uppsala and Leipzig.
- (1950) *Das Alpha impurum und die tragische Kunstsprache. Attische Wort- und Stilstudien*, Uppsala, Wiesbaden, and Leipzig.
- Bowie, A. M. (1993) *Aristophanes: myth, ritual and comedy*, Cambridge.
- Buck, C. D., and Petersen, W. (1944) *A reverse index of Greek nouns and adjectives arranged by terminations with brief historical introductions*, Chicago.
- Chantraine, P. (1933) *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Collection linguistique 38, Paris.
- (1968–80) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, Paris.
- Coseriu, E. (1975) 'Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt im Altgriechischen', *Glotta* 53, 1–25.
- Coulon, V. (1908) *Quaestiones criticae in Aristophanis fabulas*, Strasburg.
- Croft, W. (1990) *Typology and universals*, Cambridge.
- Cuny, A. (1906) *Le nombre duel en grec*, Paris.
- David, E. (1984) *Aristophanes and Athenian society of the early fourth century B.C.*, Leiden.
- Debrunner, A. (1917) *Griechische Wortbildungslehre*, Heidelberg.
- Denniston, J. D. (1954) *The Greek particles* (2nd edn.), Oxford.
- Dietrich, W. (1973) 'Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt im Griechischen und Lateinischen', *Glotta* 51, 188–228.
- Dillon, M. J. (1985) 'Aristophanes *Ploutos*: comedy in transition', PhD thesis, Yale.
- (1987) 'Topicality in Aristophanes' *Ploutos*', *CA* 6, 155–83.
- Dover, K. J. (1970) 'Lo stile di Aristofane', *QUCC* 9, 7–23 (English tr. in K. J. Dover, *Greek and the Greeks: collected papers, I: language, poetry, drama*, Oxford and New York, 1987, 224–36).
- (1972) *Aristophanic comedy*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- (1974) *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford.
- (1997) *The evolution of Greek prose style*, Oxford.
- (2002) 'Some evaluative terms in Aristophanes', in A. Willi (ed.) *The language of Greek comedy*, Oxford, 85–97.
- Duhoux, Y. (1987) 'Le vocalisme des inscriptions attiques: une question de méthodes', *Verbum* 10, 179–98.
- Ehrenberg, V. (1951) *The people of Aristophanes: a sociology of Old Attic Comedy*, Oxford.
- (1968) *Aristophanes und das Volk von Athen. Eine Soziologie der altattischen Komödie*, tr. G. Felten, Zurich.
- Flashar, H. (1975) 'Zur Eigenart des aristophanischen Spätwerks', in H.-J. Newiger (ed.) *Aristophanes und die Alte Komödie*, Darmstadt, 405–34 (repr. from *Poetica* 1, 1967, 154–75; English tr. in E. Segal (ed.) *Oxford readings in Aristophanes*, Oxford and New York, 1996, 314–28).
- Frisk, H. (1960–72) *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Gelzer, T. (1970) 'Aristophanes 12', *RE Suppl.* 12, 1392–1569.
- Gignac, F. T. (1976) *A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods, I: phonology*, Milan.

- Hale, W. G. (1893) "'Extended" and "remote" deliberatives in Greek', *TAPA* 24, 156–205.
- Hansen, M. H. (1991) *The Athenian democracy in the age of Demosthenes: structures, principles, and ideology*, Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.
- Headlam, W. (1922) *Herodas: the mimes and fragments* (ed. by A. D. Knox), Cambridge.
- Heberlein, F. (1980) *Pluthygieia. Zur Gegenwelt bei Aristophanes*, Frankfurt am Main.
- (1981) 'Zur Ironie im "Plutos" des Aristophanes', *WJA* n.s. 7, 27–49.
- Henderson, J. (1987) *Aristophanes: Lysistrata*, ed. with introduction and commentary, Oxford.
- (1991) *The maculate muse: obscene language in Attic comedy* (2nd edn.), New York and Oxford.
- Hertel, G. (1969) *Die Allegorie von Reichtum und Armut. Ein aristophanisches Motiv und seine Abwandlungen in der abendländischen Literatur*, Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft 33, Nuremberg.
- Holzinger, K. (1940) *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zu Aristophanes' Plutos*, Vienna and Leipzig.
- Humbert, J. (1930) *La disparition du datif en grec (du I<sup>er</sup> au X<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, Collection linguistique 33, Paris.
- Hunter, R. L. (1985) *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, Cambridge.
- Konstan, D. (1995) *Greek comedy and ideology*, New York and Oxford.
- Kuhlmann, P. (1997/8) 'Εἷς als Indefinitpronomen im Griechischen in diachroner Sicht', *Glotta* 74, 76–93.
- Kühner, R. (1890–2) *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, I. Teil: Elementar- und Formenlehre* (3rd edn. by F. Blass), Hanover.
- Landfester, M. (1979) 'Geschichte der griechischen Komödie', in G. A. Seeck (ed.) *Das griechische Drama*, Darmstadt, 354–400.
- La Roche, J. (1893) *Beiträge zur griechischen Grammatik: Erstes Heft*, Leipzig.
- Lautensach, O. (1917) 'Grammatische Studien zu den attischen Tragikern und Komikern: Optativ [und Imperativ]', *Glotta* 8, 168–96.
- (1921) 'Grammatische Studien zu den attischen Tragikern und Komikern: Infinitive und Partizipien', *Philologus* 77, 46–76 and 228–55.
- Lévy, E. (1997) 'Richesse et pauvreté dans le *Ploutos*', *Ktèma* 22, 201–12.
- López Eire, A. (1991) *Ático, koiné y aticismo. Estudios sobre Aristófanes y Libanio*, Murcia.
- (1993) 'De l'attique à la koiné', in C. Brixhe (ed.) *La koiné grecque antique, I: une langue introuvable?* Études anciennes 10, Nancy, 41–57.
- (1996) 'L'influence de l'ionien-attique sur les autres dialectes épigraphiques et l'origine de la koiné', in C. Brixhe (ed.) *La koiné grecque antique, II: la concurrence*, Études anciennes 14, Nancy and Paris, 7–42.
- Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- MacDowell, D. M. (1971) *Aristophanes: Wasps*, ed. with introduction and commentary, Oxford.
- (1978) *The law in classical Athens*, London.
- (1995) *Aristophanes and Athens: an introduction to the plays*, Oxford.
- McGlew, J. (1997) 'After irony: Aristophanes' *Wealth* and its modern interpreters', *AJP* 118, 35–53.
- Mayer, E. (1970) *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften. I: Laut- und Wortlehre, I. Teil: Einleitung und Lautlehre* (2nd edn. by H. Schmoll), Berlin.
- Moorhouse, A. C. (1962) 'εὖ ὄδα and οὐδὲ εἷς: cases of hiatus', *CQ* n.s. 12, 239–47.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (1990) *Die attische Mittlere Komödie. Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte*, Berlin and New York.
- Newiger, H.-J. (1957) *Metapher und Allegorie. Studien zu Aristophanes*, Munich.
- Olson, S. D. (1989) 'Cario and the new world of Aristophanes' *Plutus*', *TAPA* 119, 193–9.
- (1990) 'Economics and ideology in Aristophanes' *Wealth*', *HSP* 93, 223–42.
- Palmer, F. R. (1986) *Mood and modality*, Cambridge.
- Parker, R. (1996) *Athenian religion: a history*, Oxford.
- Pearson, A. C. (1917) *The fragments of Sophocles, vol. 3*, Cambridge.
- Pepler, C. W. (1910) 'The termination -κός, as used by Aristophanes for comic effect', *AJP* 31, 428–44.
- (1918) 'Comic terminations in Aristophanes: part IV', *AJP* 39, 173–83.



- Perusino, F. (1987) *Dalla commedia antica alla commedia di mezzo: tre studi su Aristofane*, Urbino.
- Poultney, J. W. (1963) 'Studies in the syntax of Attic comedy', *AJP* 84, 359–76.
- Radt, S. L. (1976) 'Zu Aristophanes' *Plutos*', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 29, 254–67.
- Rau, P. (1967) *Paratragodia. Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*, Zetemata 45, Munich.
- Rutherford, W. G. (1903) 'Aristophanes, *Knights* 414: a neglected idiom', *CR* 17, 249.
- Schade, J. (1908) *De correptione Attica*, Diss. Greifswald.
- Schmidt, J. H. H. (1876) *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache, I. Band*, Leipzig.
- Schwab, O. (1895) *Historische Syntax der griechischen Comparation in der klassischen Litteratur. 3. Heft: Des besonderen Teiles III. & IV. Abschnitt*, Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache 4.3 = 13, Würzburg.
- Schwyzler, E. (1939) *Griechische Grammatik, I: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.1.1, Munich.
- (1940) 'Syntaktische Archaismen des Attischen', *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, philosophisch-historische Klasse Nr. 7.
- Schwyzler, E., and Debrunner, A. (1950) *Griechische Grammatik. II: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.1.2, Munich.
- Sfyroeras, P. (1995) 'What wealth has to do with Dionysus: from economy to poetics in Aristophanes' *Plutus*', *GRBS* 36, 231–61.
- Silk, M. S. (2000) *Aristophanes and the definition of comedy*, Oxford.
- Slotty, F. (1915) *Der Gebrauch des Konjunktivs und Optativs in den griechischen Dialekten, I: Der Hauptsatz*, Forschungen zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik 3, Göttingen.
- Smyth, H. W. (1894) *The sounds and inflections of the Greek dialects: Ionic*, Oxford.
- Sobolewski, S. (1890) *De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo*, Moscow.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (1984) 'Aristophanes and the demon Poverty', *CQ* n.s. 34, 314–33.
- (2001) *Aristophanes: Wealth*, ed. with tr. and commentary, Warminster.
- Stevens, P. T. (1976) *Colloquial expressions in Euripides*, Hermes Einzelschriften 38, Wiesbaden.
- Süss, W. (1954) 'Scheinbare und wirkliche Inkongruenzen in den Dramen des Aristophanes (Schluss)', *RhM* n.s. 97, 289–313.
- Sütterlin, L. (1891) *Zur Geschichte der Verba denominativa im Altgriechischen, I: Die Verba denominativa auf -άω, -έω, -όω*, Strassburg.
- Teodorsson, S.-T. (1987) 'Boeotian and Attic: vowel development related?', *Verbum* 10, 199–209.
- Threatte, L. (1980) *The grammar of Attic inscriptions, I: Phonology*, Berlin and New York.
- (1996) *The grammar of Attic inscriptions, II: Morphology*, Berlin and New York.
- Thumb, A. (1901) *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der κoinή*, Strassburg.
- (1932) *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte: Erster Teil* (2nd edn. by E. Kieckers), Heidelberg.
- (1959) *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte: Zweiter Teil* (2nd edn. by A. Scherer), Heidelberg.
- Todd, O. J. (1932) *Index Aristophaneus*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Ussher, R. G. (1973) *Aristophanes: Ecclesiazusae*, ed. with introduction and commentary, Oxford.
- Leeuwen, J. van (1904) *Aristophanis Plutus cum prolegomenis et commentariis*, Leiden.
- Vogt-Spira, G. (1992) *Dramaturgie des Zufalls. Tyche und Handeln in der Komödie Menanders*, Zetemata 88, Munich.
- Wackernagel, J. (1887) 'Miscellen zur griechischen Grammatik', *KZ* 28, 109–45 (repr in J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen, 1953, 1.591–627).
- (1889) 'Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Composita', Rektoratsprogramm Basel, 1–65 (repr in J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen, 1953, 2.897–961).
- (1893) 'Beiträge zur Lehre vom griechischen Akzent', Rektoratsprogramm Basel, 3–38 (repr in J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen, 1953, 2.1072–1107).
- (1907) 'Hellenistica', Programm Göttingen, 3–27 (repr in J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen, 1953, 2.1034–58).

- (1926) *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch: Erste Reihe* (2nd edn.), Basle.
- (1928) *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch: Zweite Reihe* (2nd edn.), Basle.
- Weber, P. (1884) *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze, I: Von Homer bis zur attischen Prosa*, Würzburg.
- (1885) *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze, II: Die attische Prosa und Schlussergebnisse*, Würzburg.
- Webster, T. B. L. (1970) *Studies in later Greek comedy* (2nd edn.), Manchester.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1909) *Euripides Herakles* (2nd edn.), Berlin.
- Willi, A. (2002) 'The language of Greek comedy: introduction and bibliographical sketch', in A. Willi (ed.) *The language of Greek comedy*, Oxford, 1–32.
- (2003) *The languages of Aristophanes: aspects of linguistic variation in classical Attic Greek*, Oxford.
- Zuntz, G. (1971) *Persephone: three essays on religion and thought in Magna Graecia*, Oxford.