

Besonders der Brand von Lugdunum, aber auch die Gestaltung von Senecas Verhältnis zu seiner zweiten Gemahlin Pompeia Paulina in der Todesszene oder die Charakterisierung seiner Einstellung zu seinem kaiserlichen Zögling geben uns Grund zu der Annahme, daß für Tacitus der *Briefwechsel* Senecas keine Rolle als Primärquelle seiner Darstellung der Jahre 63 und 64 spielte. Der Geschichtsschreiber ist also ungeeignet, in der Kontroverse, ob die Korrespondenz wirklich geführt worden oder freischöpferischer Entwurf des literarischen Genies ist, als Zeuge oder gar als Kronzeuge angerufen zu werden<sup>77</sup>).

Marburg

Karlhans Abel

## ARISTOPHANES, PLUTUS 819–822

Towards the beginning of *Plutus*, Plutus nervously expresses the fear that Zeus may punish him once more if he again consorts with the good rather than the wicked. Chremylus broaches the idea of withholding the money with which men buy the wherewithal to sacrifice: thus Zeus can be starved into submission if he gives trouble (130 ff.). Then at the end of the play Hermes, a priest of Zeus, and Zeus himself, all reduced to impotence by this measure, abjectly turn up and petition to be allowed to live as Chremylus' neighbours, and so to share in his wealth.

This element of the plot is problematic in several ways. To be sure, the passage at 130 ff. prepares the audience for the play's conclusion. But nowhere between these scenes is Zeus represented as trying to oppose Chremylus' plan for rehabilitating Plutus, and in fact the idea of starving the gods into submission is

77) Mommsens klassische Arbeiten zur Quellenanalyse des Tacitus (vgl. Klingner, Studien, Zürich/Stuttgart 1964, 605; zu Klingner: K. Büchner in Büchner-Hofmann, Lateinische Literatur und Sprache in der Forschung seit 1937, Bern 1951, 160 ff. = Gesammelte Schriften Bd. 7 [Nachdruck: Bern/Zürich 1965] 224 ff.; 253 ff.) sind für uns nur im allgemeinen wichtig. Dort der Schluß, der – mutatis mutandis – A. 4 von Cluvius Rufus auf Tacitus übertragen wurde: a. O. 246. – Wichtigere Studien zur Quellenanalyse des Tacitus seit Syme (1958): 1960 (1963<sup>2</sup>) Quеста (zit.) – 1965 Tresch (zit.) – 1968 Borszák (zit.) – 1973 Flach (zit.) Überblick über die Problemgeschichte der Taciteischen Quellenanalyse von Mommsen bis Syme bei Quеста (a. O. 13 ff.).

let drop until the end of the play. Thus this narrative element seems poorly integrated into the fabric of the plot.

Then too, at 802 ff. the slave Cario describes the new, miraculous prosperity that has visited Chremylus' household now that he has befriended *Plutus*. He concludes (819 – 922) with a description of his master, garlanded, sacrificing a pig, goat, and ram so that he, Cario, has been driven outdoors by the sacrificial smoke.

Immediately thereafter, a Good Man appears to thank the god. Surely this god is *Plutus*, now dwelling with Chremylus. But nowhere are we told that Chremylus is giving a thank-offering to *Plutus*. It is only a doubtful conjecture that the audience would thus interpret Cario's description. It is equally doubtful that the audience would understand that this sacrifice is being made to *Asclepius*, who has just cured *Plutus*' blindness<sup>1</sup>). Doubts are raised both because nothing is said about *Plutus* or Chremylus and because the holocaust of animals is a mode of sacrifice normally associated with *Zeus* and the Olympian gods. In the absence of any indication to the contrary, it would seem likeliest that an audience would understand 819 – 822 as a description of a sacrifice to the Olympians, which would of course be desperately contradictory to the idea of starving the gods into submission.

Inasmuch as the plot of *Plutus* is notoriously marked by other self-contradictions and difficulties of plot-construction<sup>2</sup>), it is possible that this sacrifice to the Olympians – or at least the failure to make clear that it is not those gods to whom the sacrifice is being offered – is a blunder on the part of Aristophanes. But a superior explanation of this difficulty deserves to be suggested. The Scholium on 807 reads *σιπύη ἢ ἀρτοθήκη· ταῦτα δὲ παρὰ τὰ ἐν Ἰνάχω Σοφοκλέους, ὅτε τοῦ Διὸς εἰσελθόντος (vel fort. ἐθέλοντος?) πάντα μεστὰ ἀγαθῶν ἐγένετο*. Although such previous editors as August Nauck, A. C. Pearson, and Viktor Steffen have regarded this as a mere lexical note, in his recent edition of Sophocles' fragments Stephan Radt enjoins "cave ne scholiastae verba de Sophoclis imitatione ad solos versus 806/7 referas". This injunction is correct, for in Aristophanic scholia the plural *τὰ* is

1) Suggested (doubtfully) at Schmid-Stählin, *GGL* I.4 383.

2) Cf. for example the discussion of H. Flashar, "Zur Eigenart des aristophanischen Spätwerks", in H. J. Newiger, *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie* (Darmstadt, 1975) 405 – 434.

regularly used to indicate *substantial* borrowing or parody (cf. for example the Scholia on *Birds* 276, *Thesm.* 1015).

In Sophocles' satyric *Inachus* two elements of the plot revealed by fragments were Inachus' anger against the gods caused by the sufferings of Io, and some kind of drought or murrain inflicted on his kingdom, perhaps by a jealous Hera<sup>3</sup>). Satyr plays required happy endings, so surely at the end of *Inachus* this blight was terminated and Inachus' prosperity was renewed, and the king must somehow have become reconciled with the gods. So the dramatic context of the passage parodied in *Plutus* is obvious: at the end of the play a servant of King Inachus – perhaps Silenus – comes out of the palace and describes the sudden resumption of his erstwhile prosperity. Since the happy ending of the play demanded a reconciliation between Inachus and the gods, the picture of the speaker's master making a thank-offering to the Olympians out of the fruit of this prosperity makes as good sense in *Inachus* as it is out of place in *Plutus*.

It is therefore worth proposing the excision from *Plutus* of lines 819 – 822 on the grounds that they are an intrusion from *Inachus*, thereby eliminating this seeming important plot-contradiction. These lines could have come into the text in at least three ways. Aristophanes himself, often thought to be suffering from failing powers by this time, could have parodied more of the *Inachus* passage than was advisable. Some later reader or copyist, having the Sophoclean passage at his disposal, could have unwisely inserted them. Or, if B. B. Rogers was correct in thinking that the play as we have it was reworked by Aristophanes' son Araros<sup>4</sup>), the son (perhaps working on the basis of his father's sketches or notes) could have copied in four lines too many of the Sophoclean passage.

University of California, Irvine

Dana Ferrin Sutton

---

3) D. F. Sutton, *Sophocles' Inachus* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1979) 52–78.

4) Cf. his translator's introduction in *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, V (London, 1913).