

Wars is undoubted. So could almost any series of stories, given a flexible approach to the subject, but all the stories had appeared in art long before, for other purposes, and they do not include some most closely associated with the Persian War symbolism elsewhere (Amazonomachy, Centauromachy).

(iii) The differing style of the two artists of the Treasury, one old-fashioned, one avant-garde, is observed, as it has often been. One dates, obviously, by the latest features, but no one has suggested that these could be anywhere near as late as FV wish and the point of this argument is obscure and can only make sense to those who have already decided that 'advanced Archaic' can be put post-Persian War. And, to add one scholar's tentative reading of Aristion as artist on the Treasury, to another scholar's stylistic comparison between Aristion's work in Attica and the Eretria Temple, and another's observation of stylistic affinities between the Treasury and the Temple (the last two scholars, Stewart and Lullies, making clear that their comparisons do not suggest contemporaneity) is neither a reassuring exercise⁵ nor, at any rate, any indication of a late date except for those who believe that there is already some positive evidence for a date in the 470s for all these monuments.

The last page summarises. FV admit that they cannot prove that the Treasury is of the 470s but have assembled 'the political, documentary and art-historical context in which such a view could be possible. If we are to reject that view or one like it and accept Herodotus' implication regarding the Treasury at face value then we question the confidence most scholars now place in dates derived from stylistic comparisons.' This is ingenious.⁶ Stylistic criteria, which they have selectively used themselves throughout the article, are only placed at risk if the Treasury is *c.* 525 and the Temple, with the other monuments they discuss, in the 470s. Since they have failed to prove the date for the Temple, while that of the other monuments will depend either on this downdating or on the assumption that the treasury is of the 470s too (a spiral rather than circular argument), it seems that security can lie only in ignoring the entire case.

A final paragraph introduces coinage. In recent years numismatists have, with good reason though not total unanimity, been downdating the inception of coinage in general and of the Attic owl series in particular. The cautious numismatist will realise that this downdating, within the generally agreed chronology of Greek art history and archaeology, is quite a different matter from the downdating of FV, which might have further implications for coinage that they would find less acceptable. At any rate, the argument sketched by FV deserves a closer look. They point to Ashmole's

⁵ Arguments based on a highly selective assembly of suggestions from different sources are bound to be insecure. Stewart has already retracted (*J. Paul Getty Mus. J.* x [1982] 95 n. 8) while, e.g., Frel attributes the Eretria sculpture to the artist of Attic *stelai* usually dated *c.* 500 (*ibid.* x [1982] 98–104).

⁶ In *Burl. Mag.* cxxiv (1982) 41–2, FV took a different line, claiming that '... confidence in the Siphnian Treasury as an absolute landmark in the development of Archaic Greek art is based on insufficient evidence and flawed reasoning'. Now, Herodotus is blamed, yet (*ibid.*) '... as long as the visual arts of ancient Greece are considered culturally autonomous and the evidence of Herodotus, for example, can be dismissed as having no archaeological validity, then we shall deprive ourselves of important information not only about "social conditions" but about Greek art itself'. Quite so.

comparison of the Siphnian Treasury with an early owl, and to Kraay's dating for the bulk of the early owls to 483–480, to confirm a 470s date for the Treasury. I observe:

(i) In the article cited Ashmole nowhere mentions the Treasury. He places his owl centrally in a group of monuments (vase painting, sculpture in the round and in relief) which he dated (in 1936) from about 566 to about 550.

(ii) Kraay's date for the owl in question was still in the sixth century, but Price–Waggoner would have it 500–480.⁷ This is very probably correct, but it and its few kin stand out as desperately old-fashioned beside owls of the same group, and by these the period's standards must be judged. Its quaint, early appearance puzzles numismatists too.

(iii) Ashmole sounds a warning about comparisons of coins with other media, echoed by Price–Waggoner, and the method, where medium, technique and scale are so different, must by now be discredited, especially since it is used with equal vigour to thrust the dating of coinage earlier as well as later. Comparisons with gem engraving, where the technique and medium are similar, and the scale if anything smaller, are more rewarding.⁸

The conventional dating of styles and objects in the Archaic period depends on 'fixed points' of varying quality and some fluctuation of preferred dates is endemic in the discipline. Thus, the elastic downdating proposed by Tölle-Kastenbein in *AA* 1983, 573–84, moving nothing more than fifteen years, a half-generation, seems at first sight to present no serious art-historical or iconographical problems (which, of course, does not mean that it is correct). In broad terms, and allowing such adjustments, the old scheme is coherent and makes good historical and art-historical sense. To disturb it radically will require arguments mounted with more attention to relevance and consistency than those in the article under discussion. And any novel hypothesis which, whatever its superficial attraction, can only be sustained by a succession of other novel hypotheses, must be suspect.

JOHN BOARDMAN

Lincoln College, Oxford

⁷ *Archaic Greek Silver Coinage: the 'Asyut' Hoard* (London 1975) 66–8, Group IVc. The impression of an owl on a tablet at Persepolis shows that the series starts earlier at least than 494: C. G. Starr, *NC* 1976, 219–22.

⁸ See Boardman in the Cincinnati symposium 'Archaic to Classical', publication forthcoming.

The Frogs in the Frogs

W. S. Gilbert's very model of a modern major-general knew among other things the croaking chorus of the *Frogs* of Aristophanes, and their refrain is perhaps the most widely-quoted line in Greek literature.¹ But the interpretation of the *Frogs*' scene gives rise to debate, and there is no agreement on even basic

¹ An early version of this article was read to the Classical Association of Canada in May 1980 and to the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast in November 1980. I should like to thank Rosemary Harriott for her helpful comments.

questions: for example, were the Frogs visible in the theatre or did they croak unseen behind the *skene*? What is the nature of the competition between the Frogs and Dionysus?² Is the scene simply a self-contained piece of entertainment or has it an element of literary parody which would make it relevant to the main theme of the play? Here I attempt to answer the last of these questions.

Most recent critics find relevance in the scene and see the contest between the Frogs and Dionysus as in some way an anticipation of the contest between Aeschylus and Euripides; or they regard the song of the Frogs as an unfavourable comment on contemporary writers. But their approaches differ.

Nancy Demand³ notes that frogs (*βάτραχοι*) are often confused with toads (*φρῦναι*) and that *φρῦναι* suggests Phrynichus, Aristophanes' rival, whose play the *Muses* was competing against the *Frogs* at this very festival. But this is too farfetched: Aristophanes was certainly fond of that underrated form of humour, the pun, but his examples are straightforward and involve one step, e.g. from *κύων* to *Κλέων*; two steps, *βάτραχοι* to *φρῦναι*, *φρῦναι* to Phrynichus, are too many, particularly when Aristophanes has not prepared the way by using the word *φρῦνη* in the play or indeed in any earlier extant play.⁴ Even Lycophron might have hesitated before foisting this on his readers.

Leo Strauss⁵ writes: 'The duality of choruses [in *Frogs*] corresponds to the duality of the terrors of Hades and the bliss in Hades. The chorus of frogs takes the place of a possible chorus of the archcriminals of Hades, i.e. of the admirers of Euripides (771–80). . . .' But the Frogs are not in any way represented as criminal: the only description of them is as frog-swans, the singers of *μέλη κάλλιστα*, 'the most beautiful songs', *θαυμαστά*, 'marvellous songs' (205–7); and their dramatic role is purely comic: certainly they finish by being the opponents of Dionysus in a shouting match, but there is nothing of the criminal in their make-up. In any case there is no suggestion at this point in the plot that there will be two literary camps in the underworld, one supporting Aeschylus and the other Euripides; that is a later surprise development.

Alexis Solomos⁶ sees the Frogs' chorus as 'a satire on contemporary poetasters whose poems contained an overflow of croaking or whose dramatic productions did not leave any other acoustic memory than a monotonous and ill-sounding brekekekex'. But there is no indication in the text that this is Aristophanes' purpose. Comic sounds were part of his comic apparatus, and *brekekekex* is no different in character from the chirping of the birds, *τιοτιοτιοτιοτίγξ* and their other cries, or even from the explosions in Strepsiades' stomach, *παπαπαππάξ* (*Nub.* 391). In any case there is much more to their chorus than the *brekekekex* refrain.

² On both questions I should agree with D. M. MacDowell, who argues in 'The Frogs' Chorus', *CR* xxii (1972) 3–5 that the Frogs were visible and that persistence may have been the only basis of the competition. On the first question see also G. M. Sifakis, *Parabasis and Animal Choruses* (London 1971) 94 f. with n. 1. The case for an invisible chorus is well put by R. H. Allison in *G&R* xxx (1983) 8–20.

³ 'The Identity of the Frogs', *CPh* lxv (1970) 83–7.

⁴ At *Ecl.* 1101 it is uncertain whether the word is a proper name or not: see Ussher *ad loc.*

⁵ *Socrates and Aristophanes* (New York 1966) 241.

⁶ *The Living Aristophanes* (Ann Arbor 1974) 215.

Cedric H. Whitman⁷ says that the Frogs' song balances the Initiates' song and that the contrast between them is relevant to the theme of true and false music, the Frogs of course providing the false music 'with their animal grumpings and unchanging refrain' and balancing 'grotesquely the sublime invocations of the immortal *Mystac*'. The unchanging refrain does not, however, distinguish the Frogs from the Initiates, who repeat their own distinctive call *ἴακχ*, ὦ ἴακχε. Whether the Frogs' song, apart from the animal grumpings, differs in poetic quality from the Initiates' song is a question to which I shall turn in a moment. I should agree with Whitman that the Frogs are there to balance the Initiates, not because of the content or quality of their song, but because the chorus of Initiates, who will form the main chorus of the play, have less comic potentiality than any of Aristophanes' earlier choruses. But is the Frogs' music false music?

Jean Defradas⁸ makes an interesting case for seeing the Frogs' chorus as *musical* parody of the new dithyramb and therefore of Euripides also. Certainly their choice of the word *αἰόλος* to describe their song (248), the mixture of rhythms which they employ, and the long compound creation *πομφολυγοπαφλάσμοισιν* (249) all point in the direction of the dithyramb of Timotheus and company, although it is not so clear that by their references to their jumping (244) or much-diving songs (245) they are alluding to the *καμπαί* of the new compositions. But the element of parody would have been contained above all in the musical setting of their song, and we shall never know whether it mocked the new dithyrambic music or not.

Jeffrey Henderson writes:⁹ 'The frog-chorus has an undeniable connection with the major themes of the play in that it satirizes the poetic ranting of inferior poets; frogs are a traditional symbol of puffed-up conceit that amounts to nothing but *κόαξ*.' He backs up his view with a reference to the relevant pages of Radermacher's commentary;¹⁰ but Radermacher offers little support for Henderson's view: the following are his only remarks about the style of the passage.

(a) 'Dorisms in 212–14 (*βοάν*, *ἐμὴν αἰοιδάν*) and later at 247 (*αἰόλαν*) [add 231 *φορμικτάς*] indicate the lofty tone.' I agree that the tone is lofty, but I should add that the lyric *alpha* is a regular feature of choral lyric of all types, and that Aristophanes uses it also in the hymns of the Initiates in this play (332, 352, *cf.* 814) and in the songs of another non-human chorus, the *Clouds* (278, 282, 289, 300).

(b) 'The choice of the word *εὐγηρὺς* (213) matches this lofty tone.' But compound adjectives are another standard feature of choral lyric, and this example, not attested before Aristophanes, is unadventurous compared with formations such as Pindar's *ποικιλόγαρῦς*. Other compound adjectives in the Frogs' songs are *ξύναυλον* (212), *κραπαλόκωμος* (218), *εὐλυροί* (229), the striking *κεροβάτας* and *καλαμόφθογγα* (230), *υπόλυριος* (232), *πολυκολύμβοισι* (245), *ἔνυδρον* (247);

⁷ *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero* (Cambridge, Mass. 1964) 247–9.

⁸ 'Le Chant des Grenouilles: Aristophane Critique Musical', *REA* lxxi (1969) 23–37.

⁹ *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven/London 1975) 93.

¹⁰ Pp. 171–3; cited also by G. Wills, 'Why are the Frogs in the *Frogs*?', *Hermes* xcvi (1969) 306–17, with the remark that Radermacher 'realizes that [the style of the Frogs' chorus] is meant to satirize poetic ranting' (316 n.1).

and the splendid compound noun *πομφολυγοπαφλάσ-μασιν* (249) ends their last little song.

(c) 'The circumlocutions of *λιμναία κρηνῶν τέκνα* (211) and *ξύναυλον ὕμνων βοάν* (212) are pompous, and the parallelism of the lines is affected.' But a circumlocution of exactly this type occurs in the Initiates' song (347 *χρονίους τ' ἐτῶν παλαιῶν ἐνιαυτούς*, 'the lengthy cycles of their ancient years'), where there is no question of pomposity;¹¹ and parallelism of phrases or lines is not uncommon in lyric especially in hymns: the Initiates begin one of their songs with *χωρεῖτε / νῦν ἱερὸν ἀνά κύκλον θεᾶς, ἀνθοφόρον ἀν' ἄλλος* (441). Besides, in the present passage *τέκνα* is vocative, *βοάν* accusative, so that the parallelism is not exact, and the listener's attention is carried on to the verb *φθεγξώμεθα* which completes the sense. The Euripidean line, *ἀλλ' ἴτω ξύναυλος βοὰ χαρᾶ* (*El.* 879), does not afford a parallel close enough to suggest parody.

(d) 'λαῶν' (219a) has an archaic ring.' But archaisms too are at home in choral lyric.

(e) 'βυθός' (247) belongs to elevated speech.' But the language of choral poetry in general is elevated.

Radermacher might have mentioned two other features of the high poetic manner, the use of *ἀμφί*+accusative in 215, common in lyric, especially Pindar, and the first person plural forms in *-μεσθα* for *-μεθα* at 242, 248, 252, 258.¹²

It is possible to interpret these data without reference to parody or satire of contemporary writers.¹³ The term 'parody' in particular should be used with caution and reserve in connection with lyric poetry: dorisms, compound adjectives, elevated diction and archaisms are features of all Greek choral lyric, and they do not indicate parody any more than they indicate plagiarism.

Aristophanes, perhaps to compensate for the uncomic nature of his principal chorus, the Initiates,¹⁴ hit on the idea of a short scene with a chorus of frogs. Trygaeus in *Peace* had achieved his flight to heaven without the help—or hindrance—of birdsong, but Dionysus will have company as he crosses the lake, and frogs will make the audience laugh by reason of their appearance, their antics and their noises as, for example, swans or water-nymphs could not. Moreover, the frogs will be a novel breed, *βατράχων κύκνων* (207), frogs but first-rate singers;¹⁵ there is no need to link the

swan-singers with the idea of approaching death,¹⁶ even if the scene is set in the underworld: the swans are simply beautiful singers, as in Alcman (*PMG* 1.101). Their songs are introduced as *κάλλιστα* and *θαυμαστά* (207), and with the exception of the croaking noise¹⁷ this is exactly what they are. Their language scarcely drops from the lofty level of choral song: certainly the first element of the word *κραιπαλόκωμος* (218) denotes a hangover and is at home in comedy, but Hippocrates could use it in his medical writings;¹⁸ *πομφολυγοπαφλάσμασιν* (249) is comic by virtue of its sound and length, and the comic poets liked the verb *παφλάζω*; but *παφλάζω* is also in Homer and Alcaeus, *πομφολύζω* in Pindar.¹⁹ For the most part the Frogs' language is elevated: it is Dionysus who lowers the tone, notably at 221–2 and 236–8.

The comic quality of the scene is due in part to the incongruity of elevated lyric on the lips of frogs. The introductory words *βατράχων κύκνων* prepare the way by means of an oxymoron, and throughout the scene the high poetic utterance is juxtaposed with the croaking call. There is whimsy in the Frogs' description of their song as *εὐγηρως*, in the reference to the song they once sang about Dionysus, and in their claim that they are loved by the most musical of the gods, the Muses, Pan, Apollo himself. Humour dependent on the use of incongruous language can be found in non-comic choral lyric also: Simonides' greeting of the victorious mules,

χαίρετ' ἀελλοπόδων θύγατρεις ἵππων (*PMG* 515)

and Pindar's address to the Corinthian girls of Aphrodite,

πολύξενοι νεάνιδες, ἀμφίπολοι Πειθοῦς (*fr.* 122)

are in the same tone as *λιμναία κρηνῶν τέκνα*; but Aristophanes' singers are humorous at their own expense.

DAVID A. CAMPBELL

University of Victoria

answer); the frogs are as musical as swans; their songs will be astonishing.

¹⁶ So L. Spatz, *Aristophanes* (Boston 1978) 122.

¹⁷ I take it that all the *βρεκεκεκέξ* lines were shouted and not sung. At the beginning of the scene they are marked off also by their trochaic rhythm.

¹⁸ *Aér.* 3.

¹⁹ *Il.* xiii 798, *Alc.* 72.5 LP, *Pyth.* iv 121. On *παφλάζω* in comedy see Neil on *Eq.* 919.

¹¹ M. S. Silk, 'Aristophanes as a lyric poet', *YCS* xxvi (1980) 114 notes the appropriateness of the pleonasm: 'the laborious phrase *χρονίους . . . ἐνιαυτούς* gives the feeling of overwhelming senescence, which the mystae can shake off so easily.'

¹² On *-μεσθα* see Silk (n. 11) 125 n. 82.

¹³ Cf. Stanford on 210 ff.: 'There is no need to imagine (with Tucker) that any special parody is intended'; P. Rau, *Paratragodia* (Munich 1967) 13.

¹⁴ The only humour that arises from their identity as Initiates lies in their references to their rags (404–6) and to the girl's peeping tit (409–12). Certainly the list of offenders in 354–71 begins and ends as a version of the proclamation that the uninitiated keep away, and the *σκώμης* of 416–30 can be seen as an example of the Initiates' *ἀκόλαστος φιλοπαίγμων τιμή* (331: cf. *παίσαντα καὶ σκώψαντα*, 392); but the spirit of both passages is little different from that of the parabasis in other plays. From 460 onwards the identity of the Chorus as Initiates is of no importance. Allison (n. 2) 18 n. 1 writes of 'the occasionally rather lack-lustre and anonymous character of the principal chorus of shabbily dressed initiates'.

¹⁵ Charon gives three pieces of information in his answer to the question, 'Whose beautiful songs?': the songs are to be sung by frogs (if the play was 'billed' as *Frogs*, the audience will be ready for this

BOD in Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Andromache*

What relationship exists in *Alcestis* and *Andromache* between O (*Laur.* 31.10, saec. xii ex.)¹ and D (*Laur.* 31.15, saec. xiv) and B (*Par. gr.* 2713, saec. xi) is a question which, for want of full and accurate collations, has long stood unresolved. The reports of these manuscripts offered by Kirchhoff² are inaccurate and

¹ Dated c. 1320 by A. Turyn, *The Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1957) 333. But N. G. Wilson, *Scrittura e Civiltà* vii (1983) 161–76, has given reasons for assigning it to the second half of the twelfth century,

² Berlin 1855.