On Aristophanes of Byzantium fr. 360 Slater

(Article begins on next page)

03 May 2024

On Aristophanes of Byzantium fr. 360 Slater

Marco Ercoles
Alma Mater Studiorum -- Università di Bologna, Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Italianistica
marco.ercoles@unibo.it

Among the scholarly works of Aristophanes of Byzantium, a significant place is occupied by his collection of proverbial expressions in six books, which is divided into two main sections: Ἔμμετροι παροιμίαι (frr. 358-362 Sl.) in two books, and Ἄμετροι παροιμίαι (frr. 354-357) in four books.[1] The first section comprises several proverbs in verse form which originate from literary works. This is also likely to have included the following fragment, which I quote using Slater's edition (fr. 360):

> Ps.-Zen. 6,40, cf. Macar. 3,96; Mant. Proverb. 3,44; App. 2,71; Diog. Vind. 3,90: χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον. παροιμία, ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ σώζοντος τὸ σωζόμενον ἀπατηθῇ (Macar.; ἐξαπατηθῇ App.; πάθη cett.). ἀναγράφει δὲ αὐτὴν κακῶς (οὕτως Ν[auck 1848, 237]) Ἀριστοφάνης· ἐξηπάτησεν ἡ χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον (= Ar. *V.* 1291).

> "The vine-pole the vine": proverb, when what is saved is deceived by what keeps it safe. Aristophanes records it incorrectly: "the vine-pole deceives the vine".

The proverbial expression recorded by the grammarian comes from l. 1291 of Aristophanes' *Wasps*, εἶτα νῦν ἐξηπάτησεν ἡ χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον (a trochaic tetrameter catalectic). Here the comic poet, speaking through the Chorus leader, makes reference to an attack made by Cleon against him after the production of either the *Babylonians* or of the *Knights*, two openly anti-Cleonian plays.[2]

Since the circumstances of the historical episode referred to by Aristophanes are unknown, the real identity of the vine and the vine-pole remain uncertain. A likely possibility has been suggested by Mastromarco 1993, 348-354, who supposed that the vine is the comic poet himself, while the vine-pole represents those people who disseminated the false allegations that the poet had surrendered to Cleon. On this view, after having at first acquiesced them, in vv. 1284-1291 the poet reveals them that they had in fact been deceived by him.

Be that as it may, the meaning of the proverb is nonetheless clear: ancient paremiographers unanimously explain that the saying refers to those people who are deceived or ill-treated by their former saviours. The same explanation can be found in the scholia to Aristophanes, in some lexica and in Eustathius' *Commentary on the Iliad*. These passages may be quoted as follows:

> *schol.* vet./Tr. *V.* 1291a K. ἐξηπάτησεν ἡ χάραξ: παροιμία ἐστὶν "ἡ χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον ἐξηπάτησεν", ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ σώζοντος τὸ σωζόμενον ἀπατηθῇ (**VΓ** Ald : ἐξαπατηθῇ **Lh**).
> "The vine-pole deceives": the proverb reads "the vine-pole deceives the vine", when what is saved is deceived by what keeps it safe.

---

[1] For the bipartite structure of the collection see Marcell. fr. 125 Klostermann-Hansen (*ap.* Eus. *Marcell.* I 3). Cf. also *schol. vet.*/Tr. Ar. *Av.* 1292d H. (Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν ταῖς ἀμέτροις παροιμίαις).

[2] For Cleon's attack after the *Babylonians* see Ar. *Ach.* 377-382, 502-508. On the above quoted passage of *Wasps* and its modern interpretations see now Totaro 2000, 179-195.

Hesych. χ 185 Cunn. χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον: παροιμία, ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ σῳζομένου τὸ σῷζον ἀπατηθῇ.[3] "The vine-pole the vine": proverb, when what keeps safe is deceived by what is saved.

Suda ε 1740 A. ἐξηπάτησεν ἡ χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον: ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ σῴζοντος τὸ σῷζον ἐξαπατηθῇ. "The vine-pole deceives the vine": when what keeps safe is deceived by what keeps safe.

Suda χ 97 A. χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον: ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ σῴζοντος τὸ σῳζόμενον πάθῃ. "The vine-pole the vine": when what is saved suffers from what keeps it safe.

Eust. *Il.* 1163,32f. V. δῆλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ χάραξ ἡ κάμαξ ἐλέγετο. ὅθεν καὶ παροιμία "ἐξηπάτηκεν ἡ χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον", ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ δῆθεν σῴζοντος ἀπατηθῇ τὸ σῳζόμενον. It is apparent that the vine-pole was called *charax*. Whence the proverb "the vine-pole deceives the vine", when what is saved is deceived by what pretends to keep it safe.

The strong similarity of these *interpretamenta* with the wording of the paremiographic sources makes it likely that the explanation goes back to a common source, which might be reasonably recognised in Aristophanes of Byzantium, possibly through the mediation of Didymus.[4]

The main difference between all the testimonia quoted above lies in the verbal form employed to describe the condition of the saved: πάθῃ (Zen. vulg. 6,40, Diogenian. Vind. 3,90, *Mantiss. Prov.* 3,44, *Suda* χ 97 A.), ἀπατηθῇ (Hesych. χ 185 C., *schol.* Ar. *V.* 1291a [**Vᴦ** Ald], Eust. *Il.* 1163,32f., Macar. 3,96) or ἐξαπατηθῇ (*schol.* Ar. *V.* 1291a [**Lh**], *App. Prov.* 2,71). Slater, as well as Nauck (1848, 237), printed ἀπατηθῇ in his edition (see above) without providing any comment on this aspect. Nonetheless, the reasons behind this choice are easily discernable: πάθῃ appears to be too generic in the context, while ἐξαπατηθῇ clearly derives from Ar. *V.* 1291 (ἐξηπάτησεν).

Some further considerations, however, make it preferable a different choice, in my opinion. The transmitted text of the so-called Zenobius vulgatus[5] presents the adverb κακῶς together with ἀναγράφει, but it is difficult to explain why Aristophanes of Byzantium "incorrectly writes down" the proverb in his book.[6] The attempt by Rupprecht 1949, 1743 to find an explanation for the adverb does not prove convincing: he suggested that the criticism against Aristophanes's tendency to «den in der Tat oder scheinbar unvollständigen Text der Sprichtwörter ergänzen», but such a criticism is nowhere attested in ancient sources. Other scholars suspected κακῶς of being corrupt. Nauck 1848, 237, for example, took this stance and corrected the word to καὶ οὕτως.[7] More recently, Tosi 1994, 184 n. 75 has suggested the possibility of a larger corruption than that suspected by Nauck, perhaps due to a *saut du même au même* caused by the homonymy between the grammarian and the comic poet. Dyck 1989, 258 has also written that the words ἀναγράφει δὲ αὐτὴν κακῶς Ἀριστοφάνης are

---

[3] Note that Hesychius shares with *Suda* ε 1740 A. τὸ σῷζον instead of τὸ σῳζόμενον of the other sources and is the only one to give ὑπὸ τοῦ σῳζομένου instead of ὑπὸ τοῦ σῴζοντος. In all probability, τὸ σῷζον is to be explained as a misunderstanding of the abbreviated form of σῳζόμενον, and ὑπὸ τοῦ σῳζομένου as an attempt to make sense of the resulting sentence ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ σῴζοντος τὸ σῷζον ἐξαπατηθῇ, which is meaningless (this is what can be read in the *Suda*'s gloss).

[4] On Didymus's role in ancient scholarship see Pfeiffer 1968, 276-279, esp. 279; Tosi 1994, 190; Degani 1995, 513.

[5] On this paroemiographic collection – trasmitted by *Par.* gr. 3070 (12th century) and therefore also known as Zenobios Parisinus – and its main features, see Bühler 1987, 90-96.

[6] Cf. Slater 1986, 128 *ad l.*: «the reason for the criticism is not discernible».

[7] Note, however, that one would expect οὕτως καί ("in this way Aristophanes too"), as has been observed by Tosi 1993, 1027; 1994 185 n. 75. See Ar. Byz. fr. 358 Slater ἣν ἀνέγραψε καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς οὕτως ἔχουσαν.

«likely to be corrupt and to refer to the comic poet rather than the grammarian», and suggested that one should «read ἀναφέρει (cf. LSJ, s.v. ἀναφέρω II. 11) for ἀναγράφει and either delete κακῶς or replace it with Nauck's οὕτως».

In light of this difficulty, I suggest that κακῶς is out of place after ἀναγράφει δὲ αὐτήν and should be moved to precede πάθη: ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ σῴζοντος τὸ σῳζόμενον <κακῶς> πάθη. This would seem to fit the context more appropriately. One may assume that the word has been wrongly omitted and subsequently added in the margin and, finally, inserted into the text, but in the wrong place. Once this happened, it is likely that some (Byzantine) scholars changed the transmitted πάθη into ἀπατηθῇ or ἐξαπατηθῇ to make the sentence read more clearly. If this reconstruction hits the mark, the corruption can be dated before the 5th/6th century, Hesychius being the older dateable source where the correction of πάθη occurs.

For the sake of clarity, I append here the text of fr. 360 Sl. in a new editorial presentation, according to the above discussion:

Zen. vulg. 6,40 = rec. Bodl. 942 ~ Diogenian. Vind. 3,90 χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον· παροιμία, ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ σῴζοντος τὸ σῳζόμενον <κακῶς> πάθη. ἀναγράφει δὲ αὐτὴν {κακῶς} Ἀριστοφάνης· ἐξηπάτησεν ἡ χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον (Ar. *V.* 1291).

Similia ap. Macar. 3,96, *App. Prov.* 2,71, *Mantiss. Prov.* 3,44, ubi tamen Aristophanis nomen deest. Ad proverbium cf. etiam *schol.* (vet./Tr.) Ar. *V.* 1291a K. (unde *Suda* ε 1740 A.), Hesych. η 1000 L., χ 185 C., *Suda* χ 97 A., Eust. *Il.* 1163.32-33

|| **1** παροιμία Zen. vulg., rec. Bodl. : om. Diogenian. Vind. || **2** ὑπὸ Zen. vulg., Diogenian. Vind. : ἀπὸ rec. Bodl. | τοῦ Zen. vulg., rec. Bodl. : om. Diogenian. Vind. | <κακῶς> huc transposui | πάθη Zen. vulg., Diogenian. Vind., *Mantiss. Prov.* 3,44 (cf. *Suda* χ 97 A.) : ἀπατηθῇ Macar. 3,96 (cf. Hesych. χ 185 C., *schol.* Ar. *V.* 1291a [**Vᴦ** Ald], Eust. *Il.* 1163,32f.) : ἐξαπατηθῇ *App. Prov.* 2,71 (cf. *schol.* Ar. *V.* 1291a [**Lh**], unde *Suda* ε 1740 A.) | ἀναγράφει–κακῶς om. Diogenian. Vind. | {κακῶς} Dyck : καὶ οὕτως Nauck, at οὕτως καὶ exspectaveris (cf. Tosi 1993, 1027)

"The vine-pole the vine": proverb, when what is saved suffers ill-treatment from what keeps it safe. Aristophanes records it: "the vine-pole deceives the vine".

Bibliography

Bühler, W. (1987). *Zenobii Athoi proverbia*, Vol. 1. Gottingae.

Degani, E. (1995). La lessicografia. In: G. Cambiano-L. Canfora-D. Lanza, eds, *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, Vol. 2. *La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*, Roma, pp. 505-527.

Dyck, A.R. (1989). Review of Slater (1986). *CPh* 84, pp. 256-260.

Mastromarco, G. (1993). *Il commediografo e il demagogo*. In: A.H. Sommerstein-S. Halliwell-J. Henderson-B. Zimmermann, eds, *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis. Papers from the Greek Drama Conference, Nottingham 18-20 July 1990*, Bari, pp. 341-357.

Nauck, A. (1848). *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*. Halis.

Pfeiffer, R. (1968). *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Engl. transl.). Oxford.

Rupprecht, K. (1949). Paroimiographoi. In: *RE* 18.4, coll. 1735-1778.

Slater, W.J. (1986). *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*. Berlin-New York.

Tosi, R. (1993). La tradizione proverbiale greca e Aristofane di Bisanzio. (Osservazioni sulle ἔμμετροι παροιμίαι). In: R. Pretagostini, ed., *Da Omero agli Alessandrini. Scritti in onore di B. Gentili*, Vol. 3, Roma, pp. 1025-1030.

Tosi, R. (1994). La lessicografia e la paremiografia in età alessandrina ed il loro sviluppo successivo. *Entr. Hardt* 50, pp. 143-197.

Totaro, P. (2000). *Le seconde parabasi di Aristofane* (2nd ed.). Stuttgart.